



2015/2353(INI)

13.5.2016

AMENDMENTS

1 - 293

Draft report

Jan Olbrycht, Isabelle Thomas

(PE580.444v01-00)

on the preparation of the post-electoral revision of the MFF 2014-2020:
Parliament's input ahead of the Commission's proposal
(2015/2353(INI))

Amendment 1
Eider Gardiazabal Rubial

Motion for a resolution
Citation 15 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

– *having regard the
interinstitutional joint declaration
attached to the MFF on gender
mainstreaming*

Or. en

Amendment 2
Ernest Maragall
on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Motion for a resolution
Recital A

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

A. whereas the current multiannual financial framework (MFF) was adopted for the first time under the new provisions of the Treaty of Lisbon, according to which the Council, acting in accordance with a special legislative procedure, shall unanimously adopt the MFF regulation after having obtained the consent of the European Parliament;

A. whereas the current multiannual financial framework (MFF) was adopted for the first time under the new provisions of the Treaty of Lisbon, according to which the Council, acting in accordance with a special legislative procedure, shall unanimously adopt the MFF regulation after having obtained the consent of the European Parliament, *unless the Council decides to use the Passerelle clause, as provided for by Article 48(7) regarding the decision-making procedures for the MFF regulation, in order to switch from unanimity to QMV for its adoption;*

Or. en

Amendment 3
Siegfried Mureşan

Motion for a resolution
Recital A a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

Aa. *whereas the current MFF, which was agreed in 2013, reflects the priorities of the Union at the time of adoption; whereas the EU will continue to face in the coming years challenges which were not foreseen when the MFF was approved; whereas EU's financing priorities have multiplied, while the MFF has remained unchanged;*

Or. en

Amendment 4
Siegfried Mureşan

Motion for a resolution
Recital A b (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

Ab. *whereas the EU must be able to respond to multiple challenges while continuing to address its long-standing priority of creating growth and jobs;*

Or. en

Amendment 5
Ernest Maragall
on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Motion for a resolution
Recital B

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

B. *whereas, in order to ensure the democratic legitimacy of the new MFF and to give the opportunity to the new Commission and the newly elected*

B. *whereas, in order to ensure the democratic legitimacy of the new MFF and to give the opportunity to the new Commission and the newly elected*

Parliament of reconfirming *and reassessing* the EU's political and budgetary priorities by adjusting the MFF accordingly, a post-electoral revision clause was requested by Parliament;

Parliament of reconfirming, *reassessing or revising* the EU's political and budgetary priorities by adjusting the MFF accordingly, a post-electoral revision clause was requested by Parliament;

Or. en

Amendment 6
Richard Ashworth

Motion for a resolution
Recital C

Motion for a resolution

C. whereas the agreement on the MFF 2014-2020 was the outcome of a long and strenuous process of negotiations which took place in a very difficult social, economic and financial context; whereas as a consequence the overall level of the MFF was effectively reduced compared to the previous programming period;

Amendment

C. whereas the agreement on the MFF 2014-2020 was the outcome of a long and strenuous process of negotiations which took place in a very difficult social, economic and financial context; whereas as a consequence the overall level of the MFF was effectively reduced compared to the previous programming period; *considers that the first ever real-terms cut of the EU's multiannual budget was an important signal of solidarity with Member States facing difficult choices with regard to their national budgets;*

Or. en

Amendment 7
Ernest Maragall
on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Motion for a resolution
Recital C

Motion for a resolution

C. whereas the agreement on the MFF 2014-2020 was the outcome of a long and strenuous process of negotiations which took place in a very difficult social,

Amendment

C. whereas the agreement on the MFF 2014-2020 was the outcome of a long and strenuous process of negotiations which took place in a very difficult social,

economic and financial context; whereas as a consequence the overall level of the MFF was effectively reduced compared to the previous programming period;

economic and financial context; whereas as a consequence the overall level of the MFF was effectively reduced compared to the previous programming period; ***whereas the 2014-2020 MFF was reduced by 9% compared to the initial Commission proposal which came forward with a proposal representing a freeze at 2013 level;***

Or. en

Amendment 8

Ernest Maragall

on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Motion for a resolution

Recital D

Motion for a resolution

D. whereas, faced politically with the impossibility of changing the overall MFF figures decided by the European Council, Parliament ***successfully*** negotiated the inclusion of a specific article in the MFF regulation relating to a ***compulsory and*** comprehensive review/revision of the MFF, the establishment of new ***and enhanced*** flexibility provisions, and the setting-up of a High Level Group on Own Resources;

Amendment

D. whereas, faced politically with the impossibility of changing the overall MFF figures decided by the European Council, Parliament negotiated the inclusion of a specific article in the MFF regulation relating to a comprehensive review/revision of the MFF, the establishment of new flexibility provisions, and the setting-up of a High Level Group on Own Resources;

Or. en

Amendment 9

Younous Omarjee, Liadh Ní Riada, Xabier Benito Ziluaga

on behalf of the GUE/NGL Group

Motion for a resolution

Recital D a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

Da. whereas the social, economic,

environmental, migratory and terrorist crises faced by the EU provide all the more grounds for a substantial revision of the MFF, which, as it stands, has demonstrated its limitations as regards effectively addressing recent crises and the EU's new political priorities;

Or. fr

Amendment 10
Ernest Maragall
on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Motion for a resolution
Recital D a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

Da. whereas the EU is presently facing its major crisis since its foundation, as a result of several episodes concatenated — the euro crisis, the cross credit-debt crisis, the Ukraine crisis, the refugee's crisis — all of them with budgetary impacts; whereas the budget cannot stand ignoring such situation but trying to fix it, anticipating instead of reacting when problems become almost unsolvable.

Or. en

Amendment 11
Ernest Maragall
on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Motion for a resolution
Subheading 1

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

Legal framework and scope of the *mid-term review/revision*

Legal framework and scope of the *post electoral revision*

Or. en

Amendment 12

Ernest Maragall

on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 1

Motion for a resolution

1. Recalls that in accordance with Article 2 of the MFF Regulation, the Commission shall present a compulsory review of the functioning of the MFF before the end of 2016, taking full account of the economic situation at that time as well as of the latest macroeconomic projections, and that this review shall, **as appropriate**, be accompanied by a legislative proposal for the revision of the MFF Regulation;

Amendment

1. Recalls that in accordance with Article 2 of the MFF Regulation, the Commission shall present a compulsory review of the functioning of the MFF before the end of 2016, taking full account of the economic situation at that time as well as of the latest macroeconomic projections, and that this review shall be accompanied by a legislative proposal for the revision of the MFF Regulation; ***Reiterates that a binding post-electoral revision clause was one of the key demand from the EP to grant its consent to the MFF regulation;***

Or. en

Amendment 13

Clare Moody

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 1

Motion for a resolution

1. Recalls that in accordance with Article 2 of the MFF Regulation, the Commission shall present a compulsory review of the functioning of the MFF before the end of 2016, taking full account of the economic situation at that time as well as of the latest macroeconomic projections, and that this review shall, as appropriate, be accompanied by a legislative proposal for the revision of the MFF Regulation;

Amendment

1. Recalls that in accordance with Article 2 of the MFF Regulation, the Commission shall present a compulsory review of the functioning of the MFF before the end of 2016, taking full account of the economic situation at that time as well as of the latest macroeconomic projections, and that this review shall, as appropriate, be accompanied by a legislative proposal for the revision of the MFF Regulation; ***is of the view that it is***

not an appropriate time to revise upwards the MFF ceilings;

Or. en

Amendment 14

Anneli Jäätteenmäki

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 1

Motion for a resolution

1. Recalls that in accordance with Article 2 of the MFF Regulation, the Commission shall present a compulsory review of the functioning of the MFF before the end of 2016, taking full account of the economic situation at that time as well as of the latest macroeconomic projections, and that this review shall, *as appropriate*, be accompanied by a legislative proposal for the revision of the MFF Regulation;

Amendment

1. Recalls that in accordance with Article 2 of the MFF Regulation, the Commission shall present a compulsory review of the functioning of the MFF before the end of 2016, taking full account of the economic situation at that time as well as of the latest macroeconomic projections, and that this review shall, *if considered feasible*, be accompanied by a legislative proposal for the revision of the MFF Regulation;

Or. en

Amendment 15

Younous Omarjee, Liadh Ní Riada, Xabier Benito Ziluaga

on behalf of the GUE/NGL Group

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 2

Motion for a resolution

2. Considers, in this respect, that while a review aims at assessing and evaluating the functioning of the MFF against its implementation, new economic conditions and other new developments, and as such could maintain the legislative status quo, a revision implies a modification of the MFF Regulation, which also includes (besides the legislative

Amendment

2. Considers, in this respect, that while a review aims at assessing and evaluating the functioning of the MFF against its implementation, new economic conditions and other new developments, and as such could maintain the legislative status quo, a revision implies a modification of the MFF Regulation, which also includes (besides the legislative

provisions) the MFF ceilings, on a basis of due respect for Article 312 TFEU and the limitations on the scope of the MFF revision laid down in the last sentence of Article 2 of the MFF Regulation; recalls that this article stipulates that the pre-allocated national envelopes shall not be reduced through a revision; stresses in this context that Article 323 TFEU requires that the financial means to fulfil the Union's legal obligations in respect of third parties are being ensured;

provisions) the MFF ceilings, on a basis of due respect for Article 312 TFEU and the limitations on the scope of the MFF revision laid down in the last sentence of Article 2 of the MFF Regulation; recalls that this article stipulates that the pre-allocated national envelopes shall not be reduced through a revision; ***points to the principle of budget unity as the sole guarantee of genuinely democratic decision-taking and oversight in connection with expenditure; stresses therefore that revision of the MFF cannot result in a reduction of envelopes for heading 1b on cohesion policy, for heading 2 on rural development and the EMFF, or for jointly managed programmes under headings 3 and 4, i.e. AMIF, ISF or the Emergency Trust Fund for Africa;*** stresses in this context that Article 323 TFEU requires that the financial means to fulfil the Union's legal obligations in respect of third parties are being ensured; ***takes the view accordingly that the fact that, for most spending items, envelopes cannot be reduced and the imperative for the EU to honour its commitments in other sectors make it all-important to raise ceilings;***

Or. fr

Amendment 16 **Jens Geier**

Motion for a resolution **Paragraph 2**

Motion for a resolution

2. Considers, in this respect, that while a review aims at assessing and evaluating the functioning of the MFF against its implementation, new economic conditions and other new developments, and as such could maintain the legislative status quo, a revision implies a

Amendment

2. Considers, in this respect, that while a review aims at assessing and evaluating the functioning of the MFF against its implementation, new economic conditions and other new developments, and as such could maintain the legislative status quo, a revision implies a

modification of the MFF Regulation, which also includes (besides the legislative provisions) the MFF ceilings, on a basis of due respect for Article 312 TFEU and the limitations on the scope of the MFF revision laid down in the last sentence of Article 2 of the MFF Regulation; recalls that this article stipulates that the pre-allocated national envelopes shall not be reduced through a revision; stresses in this context that Article 323 TFEU requires that the financial means to fulfil the Union's legal obligations in respect of third parties are being ensured;

modification of the MFF Regulation, which also includes (besides the legislative provisions) the MFF ceilings, on a basis of due respect for Article 312 TFEU and the limitations on the scope of the MFF revision laid down in the last sentence of Article 2 of the MFF Regulation; recalls that this article stipulates that the pre-allocated national envelopes shall not be reduced through a revision; ***highlights that no other limitations for the MFF revision were set, so an upward revision of the MFF ceilings is possible***; stresses in this context that Article 323 TFEU requires that the financial means to fulfil the Union's legal obligations in respect of third parties are being ensured;

Or. en

Amendment 17 **Eider Gardiazabal Rubial**

Motion for a resolution **Paragraph 2**

Motion for a resolution

2. Considers, in this respect, that while a review aims at assessing and evaluating the functioning of the MFF against its implementation, new economic conditions and other new developments, and as such could maintain the legislative status quo, a revision implies a modification of the MFF Regulation, which also includes (besides the legislative provisions) the MFF ceilings, on a basis of due respect for Article 312 TFEU and the limitations on the scope of the MFF revision laid down in the last sentence of Article 2 of the MFF Regulation; recalls that this article stipulates that the pre-allocated national envelopes shall not be reduced through a revision; stresses in this context that Article 323 TFEU requires that the financial means to fulfil the Union's

Amendment

2. Considers, in this respect, that while a review aims at assessing and evaluating the functioning of the MFF against its implementation, new economic conditions and other new developments, and as such could maintain the legislative status quo, a revision implies a modification of the MFF Regulation, which also includes (besides the legislative provisions) the MFF ceilings, on a basis of due respect for Article 312 TFEU and the limitations on the scope of the MFF revision laid down in the last sentence of Article 2 of the MFF Regulation; recalls that this article stipulates that the pre-allocated national envelopes shall not be reduced through a revision; ***highlights that no other limitations for the MFF revision were set, so an upward revision of the***

legal obligations in respect of third parties are being ensured;

MFF ceilings is possible; stresses in this context that Article 323 TFEU requires that the financial means to fulfil the Union's legal obligations in respect of third parties are being ensured;

Or. en

Amendment 18
Richard Ashworth

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 2 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

2a. ***Believes that a clear distinction between a mid-term review and a revision of the MFF is an important determinant of the future direction of the current MFF; considers that any legislative proposal for the revision of the MFF Regulation must be on the basis of the mid-term review, and only if the conclusions of this review deem a legislative proposal to be appropriate;***

Or. en

Amendment 19
Richard Ashworth

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 3

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

3. Recalls that Article 311 TFEU states that the Union shall provide itself with the means necessary to attain its objectives and carry through its policies; considers, therefore, that should the review arrive at the conclusions that the current ceilings **were** too low, it **would be a primary law requirement to** increase the

3. Recalls that Article 311 TFEU states that the Union shall provide itself with the means necessary to attain its objectives and carry through its policies; considers, therefore, that should the review arrive at the conclusions that the current ceilings **are** too low, it **is imperative that all possible means of reallocating**

ceilings;

expenditure between programmes and within the existing ceilings must be explored, before an increase in the ceilings is considered;

Or. en

Amendment 20
Christofer Fjellner

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 3

Motion for a resolution

3. Recalls that Article 311 TFEU states that the Union shall provide itself with the means necessary to attain its objectives and carry through its policies; considers, therefore, that should the review arrive at the conclusions that the current ceilings were too low, it would be a primary law requirement to increase the ceilings;

Amendment

3. Recalls that Article 311 TFEU states that the Union shall provide itself with the means necessary to attain its objectives and carry through its policies;

Or. sv

Amendment 21
Anneli Jäätteenmäki

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 3

Motion for a resolution

3. Recalls that Article 311 TFEU states that the Union shall provide itself with the means necessary to attain its objectives and carry through its policies; *considers, therefore, that should the review arrive at the conclusions that the current ceilings were too low, it would be a primary law requirement to increase the ceilings;*

Amendment

3. Recalls that Article 311 TFEU states that the Union shall provide itself with the means necessary to attain its objectives and carry through its policies; *understands, however, that due to budgetary constraints of the Member States, the biggest contributors to the EU budget, it is unlikely that ceilings would be increased and calls therefore for strengthening of the flexibility*

mechanisms and for increased flexibility between headings;

Or. en

Amendment 22
Michał Marusik

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 3

Motion for a resolution

3. ***Recalls*** that Article 311 TFEU states that the Union shall provide itself with the means necessary to attain its objectives and carry through its policies; ***considers, therefore, that*** should the review arrive at the conclusions that the current ceilings were too low, it would be a primary law requirement to increase the ceilings;

Amendment

3. ***Deplores the fact*** that Article 311 TFEU states that the Union shall provide itself with the means necessary to attain its objectives and carry through its policies; ***points out that, as a result of this,*** should the review arrive at the conclusions that the current ceilings were too low, it would be a primary law requirement to increase the ceilings, ***which would mean Member States paying more money into the EU budget;***

Or. pl

Amendment 23
Marco Zanni, Marco Valli

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 3

Motion for a resolution

3. Recalls that Article 311 TFEU states that the Union shall provide itself with the means necessary to attain its objectives and carry through its policies; considers, therefore, that ***should the review arrive at the conclusions that the current ceilings were too low, it would be a primary law requirement to increase the ceilings;***

Amendment

3. Recalls that Article 311 TFEU states that the Union shall provide itself with the means necessary to attain its objectives and carry through its policies; considers, therefore, that ***the Union should identify and focus on clear priorities and calls for a real commitment by Member States to solve the problem of late payments;***

Amendment 24
Ernest Maragall
on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 3

Motion for a resolution

3. Recalls that Article 311 TFEU states that the Union shall provide itself with the means necessary to attain its objectives and carry through its policies; considers, therefore, that should the review arrive at the conclusions that the current ceilings were too low, it would be a primary law requirement to increase the ceilings;

Amendment

3. Recalls that Article 311 TFEU states that the Union shall provide itself with the means necessary to attain its objectives and carry through its policies; considers, therefore, that should the review arrive at the conclusions that the current ceilings were too low, it would be a primary law requirement to increase the ceilings, *especially the payment ceiling*;

Or. en

Amendment 25
Ernest Maragall
on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 3 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

3a. Stresses the key role that the EU budget must play in achieving the jointly agreed EU 2020 Strategy objectives and the EU's international commitments; strongly believes that EU funding, if well devised, can actually trigger and catalyse actions having clear Union added value which Member States are unable to carry out on their own, as well as creating synergies and complementarities with Member States' activities by helping them focus on key future-oriented investment;

Amendment

Amendment 26
Jan Olbrycht, Isabelle Thomas

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 3 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

3a. Stresses that Article 17 of the MFF Regulation provides for the possibility of revising the MFF in the event of unforeseen circumstances; points to the magnitude of the crises that have affected the Union since the adoption of the current MFF in 2013;

Or. en

Amendment 27
Ernest Maragall
on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 4

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

4. Underlines that the scope of this report is to analyse the purely budgetary aspects of the functioning of the MFF and that it will not touch on the legal bases of sectoral legislation; notes, however, that many EU policies and programmes foresee their own review/revision requirements, mainly scheduled for 2017;

4. Underlines that the scope of this report is to analyse the purely budgetary aspects of the functioning of the MFF and that it will not touch on the legal bases of sectoral legislation; notes, however, that many EU policies and programmes foresee their own review/revision requirements, mainly scheduled for 2017 **and, furthermore, that the possibility exists for the Commission to conduct comprehensive Fitness checks of EU policies;**

Or. en

Amendment 28

Younous Omarjee, Liadh Ní Riada

on behalf of the GUE/NGL Group

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 4 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

4a. Calls on the Council to apply the qualified-majority rule provided for by Article 312(2) TFEU for revision of the MFF;

Or. fr

Amendment 29

Gérard Deprez, Martina Dlabajová, Louis Michel, Nils Torvalds, Jean Arthuis, Charles Goerens, Nedzhmi Ali

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 5 – introductory part

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

5. Considers that a review of the MFF in 2016 should take stock of a number of serious crises and new political initiatives, together with their respective budgetary consequences, which **were not** anticipated at the time of the MFF's adoption; notes, inter alia, the migration and refugee crisis, external emergencies, internal security issues, the crisis in agriculture, the funding of the European Fund for Strategic Investments (EFSI), the persistent high level of unemployment, especially among young people, and the payment crisis in the EU budget; observes that, in order to finance the additional pressing needs, an unprecedented recourse to the MFF's flexibility mechanisms and special instruments was deemed necessary, as the MFF ceilings proved to be too tight in some headings; considers that, over the past two years, the MFF has essentially been pushed to its limits;

5. Considers that a review of the MFF in 2016 should take stock of a number of serious crises and new political initiatives, together with their respective budgetary consequences, which **could not be** anticipated at the time of the MFF's adoption; notes, inter alia, the migration and refugee crisis, external emergencies, internal security issues, the crisis in agriculture, the funding of the European Fund for Strategic Investments (EFSI), the persistent high level of unemployment, especially among young people, and the payment crisis in the EU budget; observes that, in order to finance the additional pressing needs, an unprecedented recourse to the MFF's flexibility mechanisms and special instruments was deemed necessary, as the MFF ceilings proved to be too tight in some headings; considers that, over the past two years, the MFF has essentially been pushed to its limits; **in these**

conditions, the Budget of the European Union will be able neither to further address additional financial needs and new political priorities, nor to avoid the resurgence of a payment crisis;

Or. en

Amendment 30

Eider Gardiazabal Rubial, Brando Benifei, Eva Paunova, Terry Reintke

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 5 – introductory part

Motion for a resolution

5. Considers that a review of the MFF in 2016 should take stock of a number of serious crises and new political initiatives, together with their respective budgetary consequences, which were not anticipated at the time of the MFF's adoption; notes, inter alia, the migration and refugee crisis, external emergencies, internal security issues, the crisis in agriculture, the funding of the European Fund for Strategic Investments (EFSI), the persistent high level of unemployment, especially among young people, and the payment crisis in the EU budget; observes that, in order to finance the additional pressing needs, an unprecedented recourse to the MFF's flexibility mechanisms and special instruments was deemed necessary, as the MFF ceilings proved to be too tight in some headings; considers that, over the past two years, the MFF has essentially been pushed to its limits;

Amendment

5. Considers that a review of the MFF in 2016 should take stock of a number of serious crises and new political initiatives, together with their respective budgetary consequences, which were not anticipated at the time of the MFF's adoption; notes, inter alia, the migration and refugee crisis, external emergencies, internal security issues, the crisis in agriculture, the funding of the European Fund for Strategic Investments (EFSI), the persistent high level of unemployment, especially among young people, ***threatening social inclusion and cohesion, rising inequalities, populism and extremism challenging our democratic pluralistic societies*** and the payment crisis in the EU budget; observes that, in order to finance the additional pressing needs, an unprecedented recourse to the MFF's flexibility mechanisms and special instruments was deemed necessary, as the MFF ceilings proved to be too tight in some headings; considers that, over the past two years, the MFF has essentially been pushed to its limits;

Or. en

Amendment 31

Younous Omarjee, Liadh Ní Riada, Xabier Benito Ziluaga

on behalf of the GUE/NGL Group

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 5 – introductory part

Motion for a resolution

5. Considers that a review of the MFF in 2016 should take stock of a number of serious crises and new political initiatives, together with their respective budgetary consequences, which were not anticipated at the time of the MFF's adoption; notes, inter alia, the migration and refugee crisis, external emergencies, internal security issues, the crisis in agriculture, the funding of the European Fund for Strategic Investments (EFSI), the persistent high level of unemployment, especially among young people, and the payment crisis in the EU budget; observes that, in order to finance the additional pressing needs, an unprecedented recourse to the MFF's flexibility mechanisms and special instruments was deemed necessary, as the MFF ceilings proved to be too tight in some headings; considers that, over the past two years, the MFF has essentially been pushed to its limits;

Amendment

5. Considers that a review of the MFF in 2016 should take stock of a number of serious crises and new political initiatives, together with their respective budgetary consequences, which were not anticipated at the time of the MFF's adoption; notes, inter alia, the migration and refugee crisis, external emergencies, internal security issues, the crisis in agriculture, the funding of the European Fund for Strategic Investments (EFSI), the persistent high level of unemployment, especially among young people, and the payment crisis in the EU budget; observes that, in order to finance the additional pressing needs, an unprecedented recourse to the MFF's flexibility mechanisms and special instruments was deemed necessary, as the MFF ceilings proved to be too tight in some headings; considers that, over the past two years, the MFF has essentially been pushed to its limits; ***considers that an upward revision of MFF ceilings is warranted by the fact that flexibility instruments and margins have been fully utilised;***

Or. fr

Amendment 32

Eider Gardiazabal Rubial, Pavel Poc

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 5 – introductory part

Motion for a resolution

5. Considers that a review of the MFF

Amendment

5. Considers that a review of the MFF

in 2016 should take stock of a number of serious crises and new political initiatives, together with their respective budgetary consequences, which were not anticipated at the time of the MFF's adoption; notes, inter alia, the migration and refugee crisis, external emergencies, internal security issues, the crisis in agriculture, the funding of the European Fund for Strategic Investments (EFSI), the persistent high level of unemployment, especially among young people, and the payment crisis in the EU budget; observes that, in order to finance the additional pressing needs, an unprecedented recourse to the MFF's flexibility mechanisms and special instruments was deemed necessary, as the MFF ceilings proved to be too tight in some headings; considers that, over the past two years, the MFF has essentially been pushed to its limits;

in 2016 should take stock of a number of serious crises and new political initiatives, together with their respective budgetary consequences, which were not anticipated at the time of the MFF's adoption; notes, inter alia, the migration and refugee crisis, external emergencies, internal security issues, the crisis in agriculture, ***the continuous decline of European and global biodiversity, the internationally agreed urgency for action on climate change***, the funding of the European Fund for Strategic Investments (EFSI), the persistent high level of unemployment, especially among young people, and the payment crisis in the EU budget; observes that, in order to finance the additional pressing needs, an unprecedented recourse to the MFF's flexibility mechanisms and special instruments was deemed necessary, as the MFF ceilings proved to be too tight in some headings; considers that, over the past two years, the MFF has essentially been pushed to its limits;

Or. en

Amendment 33

Ernest Maragall

on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 5 – introductory part

Motion for a resolution

5. Considers that a review of the MFF in 2016 should take stock of a number of serious crises and new political initiatives, together with their respective budgetary consequences, which were not anticipated at the time of the MFF's adoption; notes, inter alia, the migration and refugee crisis, external emergencies, internal security issues, the crisis in agriculture, the funding of the European Fund for Strategic Investments (EFSI), the persistent high

Amendment

5. Considers that a review of the MFF in 2016 should take stock of a number of serious crises and new political initiatives, together with their respective budgetary consequences, which were not anticipated at the time of the MFF's adoption ***or undermined by the Council***; notes, inter alia, the migration and refugee crisis, external emergencies, internal security issues, the crisis in agriculture, the funding of the European Fund for Strategic

level of unemployment, especially among young people, and the payment crisis in the EU budget; observes that, in order to finance the additional pressing needs, an unprecedented recourse to the MFF's flexibility mechanisms and special instruments was deemed necessary, as the MFF ceilings proved to be too tight in some headings; considers that, over the past two years, the MFF has essentially been pushed to its limits;

Investments (EFSI), the persistent high level of unemployment, especially among young people, ***the unacceptable high levels of poverty, social exclusion and inequality***, and the payment crisis in the EU budget; observes that, in order to finance the additional pressing needs, an unprecedented recourse to the MFF's flexibility mechanisms and special instruments was deemed necessary, as the MFF ceilings proved to be too tight in some headings; considers that, over the past two years, the MFF has essentially been pushed to its limits;

Or. en

Amendment 34

Marco Zanni, Marco Valli

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 5 – introductory part

Motion for a resolution

5. Considers that a review of the MFF in 2016 should take stock of a number of ***serious crises and new political initiatives, together with their respective budgetary consequences, which were not anticipated at the time of the MFF's adoption; notes, inter alia***, the migration and refugee crisis, external emergencies, internal security issues, the crisis in agriculture, ***the funding of the European Fund for Strategic Investments (EFSI)***, the persistent high level of unemployment, especially among young people, and the payment crisis in the EU budget; observes that, in order to finance the additional pressing needs, an unprecedented recourse to the MFF's flexibility mechanisms and special instruments was deemed necessary, as the MFF ceilings proved to be too tight in some headings; ***considers that, over the past two years, the MFF has essentially***

Amendment

5. Considers that a review of the MFF in 2016 should take stock of a number of ***priorities such as*** the migration and refugee crisis, external emergencies, internal security issues, the crisis in agriculture, the persistent high level of unemployment, especially among young people, and the payment crisis in the EU budget; observes that, in order to finance the additional pressing needs, an unprecedented recourse to the MFF's flexibility mechanisms and special instruments was deemed necessary, as the MFF ceilings proved to be too tight in some headings; ***also regrets that policy initiatives such as the European Fund for Strategic Investments (EFSI) have diverted resources earmarked for other programmes without bringing any added value;***

been pushed to its limits;

Or. it

Amendment 35
Michal Marusik

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 5 – introductory part

Motion for a resolution

5. Considers that a review of the MFF in 2016 should take stock of a number of serious crises and new political initiatives, together with their respective budgetary consequences, which were not anticipated at the time of the MFF's adoption; notes, inter alia, the migration and refugee crisis, ***external emergencies***, internal security issues, the crisis in agriculture, the funding of the European Fund for Strategic Investments (EFSI), the persistent high level of unemployment, especially among young people, and the payment crisis in the EU budget; observes that, in order to finance the additional pressing needs, an unprecedented recourse to the MFF's flexibility mechanisms and special instruments was deemed necessary, as the MFF ceilings proved to be too tight in some headings; considers that, over the past two years, the MFF has essentially been pushed to its limits;

Amendment

5. Considers that a review of the MFF in 2016 should take stock of a number of serious crises and new political initiatives ***at Europe's borders***, together with their respective budgetary consequences, which were not anticipated at the time of the MFF's adoption; notes, inter alia, the migration and refugee crisis, internal security issues, the crisis in agriculture, the funding of the European Fund for Strategic Investments (EFSI), the persistent high level of unemployment, especially among young people, and the payment crisis in the EU budget; observes that, in order to finance the additional pressing needs, an unprecedented recourse to the MFF's flexibility mechanisms and special instruments was deemed necessary, as the MFF ceilings proved to be too tight in some headings; considers that, over the past two years, the MFF has essentially been pushed to its limits;

Or. pl

Amendment 36
Victor Negrescu

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 5 – introductory part

Motion for a resolution

5. Considers that a review of the MFF in 2016 should take stock of a number of serious crises and new political initiatives, together with their respective budgetary consequences, which were not anticipated at the time of the MFF's adoption; notes, inter alia, the migration and refugee crisis, external emergencies, internal security issues, the crisis in agriculture, the funding of the European Fund for Strategic Investments (EFSI), the persistent high level of unemployment, especially among young people, and the payment crisis in the EU budget; observes that, in order to finance the additional pressing needs, an unprecedented recourse to the MFF's flexibility mechanisms and special instruments was deemed necessary, as the MFF ceilings proved to be too tight in some headings; considers that, over the past two years, the MFF has essentially been pushed to its limits;

Amendment

5. Considers that a review of the MFF in 2016 should take stock of a number of serious crises and new political initiatives, together with their respective budgetary consequences, which were not anticipated at the time of the MFF's adoption; notes, inter alia, the migration and refugee crisis, external emergencies, internal security issues, the crisis in agriculture, the funding of the European Fund for Strategic Investments (EFSI), the persistent high level of unemployment, especially among young people, and ***of poverty, social exclusion and inequalities, and*** the payment crisis in the EU budget; observes that, in order to finance the additional pressing needs, an unprecedented recourse to the MFF's flexibility mechanisms and special instruments was deemed necessary, as the MFF ceilings proved to be too tight in some headings; considers that, over the past two years, the MFF has essentially been pushed to its limits;

Or. en

Amendment 37

Eider Gardiazabal Rubial, Jean-Paul Denanot

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 5 – introductory part

Motion for a resolution

5. Considers that a review of the MFF in 2016 should take stock of a number of serious crises and new political initiatives, together with their respective budgetary consequences, which were not anticipated at the time of the MFF's adoption; notes, inter alia, the migration and refugee crisis, external emergencies, internal security issues, the crisis in agriculture, the funding of the European Fund for Strategic

Amendment

5. Considers that a review of the MFF in 2016 should take stock of a number of serious crises and new political initiatives, together with their respective budgetary consequences, which were not anticipated at the time of the MFF's adoption; notes, inter alia, the migration and refugee crisis, external emergencies, internal security issues, the crisis in agriculture, ***particularly in the milk and meat sectors,*** the funding

Investments (EFSD), the persistent high level of unemployment, especially among young people, and the payment crisis in the EU budget; observes that, in order to finance the additional pressing needs, an unprecedented recourse to the MFF's flexibility mechanisms and special instruments was deemed necessary, as the MFF ceilings proved to be too tight in some headings; considers that, over the past two years, the MFF has essentially been pushed to its limits;

of the European Fund for Strategic Investments (EFSD), the persistent high level of unemployment, especially among young people, and the payment crisis in the EU budget; observes that, in order to finance the additional pressing needs, an unprecedented recourse to the MFF's flexibility mechanisms and special instruments was deemed necessary, as the MFF ceilings proved to be too tight in some headings; considers that, over the past two years, the MFF has essentially been pushed to its limits;

Or. en

Amendment 38 **Richard Ashworth**

Motion for a resolution **Paragraph 5 – introductory part**

Motion for a resolution

5. Considers that a review of the MFF in 2016 should take stock of a number of serious crises and new political initiatives, together with their respective budgetary consequences, which were not anticipated at the time of the MFF's adoption; notes, inter alia, the migration and refugee crisis, external emergencies, internal security issues, the crisis in agriculture, the funding of the European Fund for Strategic Investments (EFSD), the persistent high level of unemployment, especially among young people, and the payment crisis in the EU budget; observes that, in order to finance the additional pressing needs, an unprecedented recourse to the MFF's flexibility mechanisms and special instruments was deemed necessary, **as the MFF ceilings proved to be too tight in some headings**; considers that, over the past two years, the MFF has **essentially been** pushed to its limits;

Amendment

5. Considers that a review of the MFF in 2016 should take stock of a number of serious crises and new political initiatives, together with their respective budgetary consequences, which were not anticipated at the time of the MFF's adoption; notes, inter alia, the migration and refugee crisis, external emergencies, internal security issues, the crisis in agriculture, the funding of the European Fund for Strategic Investments (EFSD), the persistent high level of unemployment, especially among young people, and the payment crisis in the EU budget; observes that, in order to finance the additional pressing needs, an unprecedented recourse to the MFF's flexibility mechanisms and special instruments was deemed necessary; considers that, over the past two years, the MFF has **been unnecessarily** pushed to its limits **due to a lack of sufficient reprioritisation within the budget to meet**

these new challenges;

Or. en

Amendment 39
José Manuel Fernandes

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 5 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

5a. *Stresses that the Europe 2020 strategy represents the main orientation and overarching priority that underpins the EU budget; believes, therefore, that the MFF review should include, besides the examination of the budgetary implementation of relevant EU programmes, a qualitative analysis of whether and to what extent the objectives set out in this strategy have been attained; insists that this assessment is coupled with a projection on whether the financial resources earmarked in support of this strategy for the remaining years of the current MFF will be sufficient to allow for its successful implementation;*

Or. en

Amendment 40
Ernest Maragall
on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 5 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

5a. *Fully agrees with the European Court of Auditors which states in its first recommendation of its 2014 annual report that the EU strategy and the MFF need to be better aligned, in particular concerning*

the time period and priorities. This would help to ensure that adequate monitoring and reporting arrangements are in place, and so make it easier for the Commission to report effectively on the contribution of the EU budget to the EU strategy. The Commission should make appropriate proposals to the legislator to address this issue;

Or. en

Amendment 41
Richard Ashworth

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 5 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

5a. Considers that the mid-term review of the MFF should also take stock of the performance of funds allocated, in order to ascertain whether they are achieving their objectives and whether appropriations are being under-utilised; suggests that the review should evaluate whether the EU has an optimum number of objectives and consider prioritisation in this regard;

Or. en

Amendment 42
Richard Ashworth

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 6

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

6. Stresses that the conflicts in Syria, the Middle East and several regions in Africa have had humanitarian, security and migratory consequences on an

6. Stresses that the conflicts in Syria, the Middle East and several regions in Africa have had humanitarian, security and migratory consequences on an

unprecedented scale; recalls that the EU has been directly impacted, with more than one million refugees reaching Europe in 2015 alone and more expected in the coming years; recalls that this crisis led to a major financial response on the EU's part and **hence had** a significant impact on the EU budget, notably on headings 3 (Security and Citizenship) and 4 (Global Europe);

unprecedented scale; recalls that the EU has been directly impacted, with more than one million refugees reaching Europe in 2015 alone and more expected in the coming years; recalls that this crisis **has** led to a major financial response on **both** the EU's part and **that of the Member States, with the former's contribution having** a significant impact on the EU budget, notably on headings 3 (Security and Citizenship) and 4 (Global Europe);

Or. en

Amendment 43

Younous Omarjee, Liadh Ní Riada, Xabier Benito Ziluaga
on behalf of the GUE/NGL Group

Motion for a resolution **Paragraph 6**

Motion for a resolution

6. Stresses that the conflicts in Syria, the Middle East and several regions in Africa have had humanitarian, security and migratory consequences on an unprecedented scale; recalls that the EU has been directly impacted, with more than one million refugees reaching Europe in 2015 alone and more expected in the coming years; recalls that this crisis led to a major financial response on the EU's part **and hence** had a significant impact on the EU budget, notably on headings 3 (Security and Citizenship) and 4 (Global Europe);

Amendment

6. Stresses that the conflicts in Syria, the Middle East and several regions in Africa have had humanitarian, security and migratory consequences on an unprecedented scale; recalls that the EU has been directly impacted, with more than one million refugees reaching Europe in 2015 alone and more expected in the coming years; recalls that this crisis led to a major financial response on the EU's part, **which, albeit insufficient by any standard, has** had a significant impact on the EU budget, notably on headings 3 (Security and Citizenship) and 4 (Global Europe);

Or. fr

Amendment 44 **Michał Marusik**

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 6

Motion for a resolution

6. Stresses that the conflicts in Syria, the Middle East and several regions in Africa have had humanitarian, security and migratory consequences on an unprecedented scale; **recalls** that the **EU has been directly impacted**, with more than one million refugees reaching Europe in 2015 alone and more expected in the coming years; **recalls** that this crisis led to a major financial response on the EU's part and hence had a significant impact on the EU budget, notably on headings 3 (Security and Citizenship) and 4 (Global Europe);

Amendment

6. Stresses that the conflicts in Syria, the Middle East and several regions in Africa have had humanitarian, security and migratory consequences on an unprecedented scale; **deplores the fact** that **those events have exposed the powerlessness of Latin civilisation**, with more than one million refugees reaching Europe in 2015 alone and more expected in the coming years; **deplores also the fact** that this crisis led to a major financial response on the EU's part and hence had a significant impact on the EU budget, notably on headings 3 (Security and Citizenship) and 4 (Global Europe);

Or. pl

Amendment 45
Jens Geier

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 6

Motion for a resolution

6. Stresses that the conflicts in Syria, the Middle East and several regions in Africa have had humanitarian, **security** and migratory consequences on an unprecedented scale; recalls that the EU has been directly impacted, with more than one million refugees reaching Europe in 2015 alone and more expected in the coming years; recalls that this crisis led to a major financial response on the EU's part and hence had a significant impact on the EU budget, notably on headings 3 (Security and Citizenship) and 4 (Global Europe);

Amendment

6. Stresses that the conflicts in Syria, the Middle East and several regions in Africa have had humanitarian and migratory consequences on an unprecedented scale; recalls that the EU has been directly impacted, with more than one million refugees reaching Europe in 2015 alone and more expected in the coming years; recalls that this crisis led to a major financial response on the EU's part and hence had a significant impact on the EU budget, notably on headings 3 (Security and Citizenship) and 4 (Global Europe);

Or. en

Amendment 46
Eider Gardiazabal Rubial

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 6

Motion for a resolution

6. Stresses that the conflicts in Syria, the Middle East and several regions in Africa have had humanitarian, *security* and migratory consequences on an unprecedented scale; recalls that the EU has been directly impacted, with more than one million refugees reaching Europe in 2015 alone and more expected in the coming years; recalls that this crisis led to a major financial response on the EU's part and hence had a significant impact on the EU budget, notably on headings 3 (Security and Citizenship) and 4 (Global Europe);

Amendment

6. Stresses that the conflicts in Syria, the Middle East and several regions in Africa have had humanitarian and migratory consequences on an unprecedented scale; recalls that the EU has been directly impacted, with more than one million refugees reaching Europe in 2015 alone and more expected in the coming years; recalls that this crisis led to a major financial response on the EU's part and hence had a significant impact on the EU budget, notably on headings 3 (Security and Citizenship) and 4 (Global Europe);

Or. en

Amendment 47
Michał Marusik

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 7

Motion for a resolution

7. *Recalls* that in the course of 2015 the additional measures approved in line with the European Agenda on Migration have had an immediate budgetary impact, as notably reflected in amending budgets 5 and 7/2015; furthermore *recalls* that the utilisation of an additional EUR 1 506 million in EU budget 2016 by mobilising the Flexibility Instrument was approved in order to provide additional resources for migration/refugee-related measures under Heading 3, such as topping-up of the

Amendment

7. *Deplores the fact* that in the course of 2015 the additional measures approved in line with the European Agenda on Migration have had an immediate budgetary impact, as notably reflected in amending budgets 5 and 7/2015; furthermore *deplores the fact* that the utilisation of an additional EUR 1 506 million in EU budget 2016 by mobilising the Flexibility Instrument was approved in order to provide additional resources for migration/refugee-related measures under

Asylum, Migration and Integration Fund (AMIF) and the Internal Security Fund (ISF), as well as resources for *the* three *migration-related* agencies, namely Frontex, the European Asylum Support Office (EASO) and Europol;

Heading 3, such as topping-up of the Asylum, Migration and Integration Fund (AMIF) and the Internal Security Fund (ISF), as well as resources for three agencies, namely Frontex, the European Asylum Support Office (EASO) and Europol, *the point of whose existence is difficult to fathom*;

Or. pl

Amendment 48
Monika Hohlmeier, Reimer Böge

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 8

Motion for a resolution

8. Notes that the above-mentioned budgetary decisions have completely exhausted the small margin available under this heading and have led to a de facto revision of the ceilings of Heading 3; furthermore draws attention to the new Commission proposals which are expected to have an impact on the EU budget, notably the proposal for the establishment of the European Border and Coast Guard Agency, with an overall budget of EUR 1 212 million for the remainder of the MFF period, and the new emergency support mechanism, with an estimated impact of minimum EUR 700 million in the period 2016 to 2018; stresses that the situation is so critical that the additional appropriations authorised for the Asylum, Migration and Integration Fund (AMIF) in November 2015 had to be reduced in March 2016 so as to finance even more pressing needs, such as the need to provide humanitarian aid in the EU, addressed by the above-mentioned new emergency support mechanism;

Amendment

8. Notes that the above-mentioned budgetary decisions have completely exhausted the small margin available under this heading and have led to a de facto revision of the ceilings of Heading 3; furthermore draws attention to the new Commission proposals which are expected to have an impact on the EU budget, notably the proposal for *a recast of the 'Dublin III' Regulation, with a total budgetary impact of EUR 1 829 million for the remainder of the MFF period, the proposal for* the establishment of the European Border and Coast Guard Agency, with an overall budget of EUR 1 212 million for the remainder of the MFF period, *the proposal for an amending 'EASO' Regulation, with a budgetary implication amounting to EUR 364 million, the proposal for a recast of the 'Eurodac' Regulation, with an estimated cost of EUR 30 million*, and the new emergency support mechanism, with an estimated impact of minimum EUR 700 million in the period 2016 to 2018; stresses that the situation is so critical that the additional appropriations authorised for the Asylum, Migration and Integration Fund

(AMIF) in November 2015 had to be reduced in March 2016 so as to finance even more pressing needs, such as the need to provide humanitarian aid in the EU, addressed by the above-mentioned new emergency support mechanism;

Or. en

Amendment 49
Reimer Böge, Monika Hohlmeier

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 8 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

8a. *Believes that the solution of the European migration and refugee crisis requires a European approach based on solidarity and fair burden-sharing; stresses, in this context, that the EU budget should support member states to alleviate the burden of the costs related to the reception of the refugee as this will relieve the pressure on the budgets of those member states facing a particularly high influx of refugees; emphasizes that this approach will create synergies, and is furthermore efficient and cost effective for all Member States;*

Or. en

Amendment 50
Eider Gardiazabal Rubial, Brando Benifei, Eva Paunova, Terry Reintke

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 9

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

9. Stresses that significant budgetary means have been deployed to tackle the root causes of the refugee and migration

9. Stresses that significant budgetary means have been deployed to tackle the root causes of the refugee and migration

crisis by reinforcing specific EU programmes under Heading 4; recalls the reallocations in favour of migration/refugee-related actions of EUR 170 million in the course of 2015, as well as the approval in 2016 of an additional EUR 130 million under Heading 4 for migration/refugee-related activities, together with the reshuffling of EUR 430 million under the Instrument for Pre-accession Assistance, the Development Cooperation Instrument and the European Neighbourhood Instrument; recalls, furthermore, that in order to address the external dimension of the migration and refugee crisis the Commission has made various additional proposals having an impact on the EU budget, such as those for the establishment of EU trust funds (the Madad Trust Fund and the Emergency Trust Fund for Africa, with an estimated initial budgetary impact of EUR 570 million and EUR 405 million respectively), as well as of the Refugee Facility for Turkey, for which EUR 1 billion is to be funded from the EU budget, not counting possible additional funding; stresses that further pressure on the Union budget might arise from other planned actions announced by the Commission such as the ‘London pledge’ or from events such as the EU-Turkey summit of 18 March 2016; is concerned, however, that owing to the magnitude of the problems the EU is facing further actions might still be required;

crisis by reinforcing specific EU programmes under Heading 4; ***stresses the additional upcoming budgetary means necessary for the inclusion of most vulnerable migrants, especially women and girls, young and under-aged and LGBTI migrants***, recalls the reallocations in favour of migration/refugee-related actions of EUR 170 million in the course of 2015, as well as the approval in 2016 of an additional EUR 130 million under Heading 4 for migration/refugee-related activities, together with the reshuffling of EUR 430 million under the Instrument for Pre-accession Assistance, the Development Cooperation Instrument and the European Neighbourhood Instrument; recalls, furthermore, that in order to address the external dimension of the migration and refugee crisis the Commission has made various additional proposals having an impact on the EU budget, such as those for the establishment of EU trust funds (the Madad Trust Fund and the Emergency Trust Fund for Africa, with an estimated initial budgetary impact of EUR 570 million and EUR 405 million respectively), as well as of the Refugee Facility for Turkey, for which EUR 1 billion is to be funded from the EU budget, not counting possible additional funding; stresses that further pressure on the Union budget might arise from other planned actions announced by the Commission such as the ‘London pledge’ or from events such as the EU-Turkey summit of 18 March 2016; is concerned, however, that owing to the magnitude of the problems the EU is facing further actions might still be required;

Or. en

Amendment 51
Marco Zanni, Marco Valli

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 9

Motion for a resolution

9. Stresses that significant budgetary means have been deployed to tackle the root causes of the refugee and migration crisis by reinforcing specific EU programmes under Heading 4; recalls the reallocations in favour of migration/refugee-related actions of EUR 170 million in the course of 2015, as well as the approval in 2016 of an additional EUR 130 million under Heading 4 for migration/refugee-related activities, together with the reshuffling of EUR 430 million under the Instrument for Pre-accession Assistance, the Development Cooperation Instrument and the European Neighbourhood Instrument; recalls, furthermore, that in order to address the external dimension of the migration and refugee crisis the Commission has made various additional proposals having an impact on the EU budget, such as those for the establishment of EU trust funds (the Madad Trust Fund and the Emergency Trust Fund for Africa, with an estimated initial budgetary impact of EUR 570 million and EUR 405 million respectively), **as well as of the Refugee Facility for Turkey, for which EUR 1 billion is to be funded from the EU budget, not counting possible additional funding**; stresses that further pressure on the Union budget might arise from other planned actions announced by the Commission such as the ‘London pledge’ or from events such as the EU-Turkey summit of 18 March 2016; is concerned, **however, that owing to the magnitude of the problems the EU is facing** further actions might still be required;

Amendment

9. Stresses that significant budgetary means have been deployed to tackle the root causes of the refugee and migration crisis by reinforcing specific EU programmes under Heading 4; recalls the reallocations in favour of migration/refugee-related actions of EUR 170 million in the course of 2015, as well as the approval in 2016 of an additional EUR 130 million under Heading 4 for migration/refugee-related activities, together with the reshuffling of EUR 430 million under the Instrument for Pre-accession Assistance, the Development Cooperation Instrument and the European Neighbourhood Instrument; recalls, furthermore, that in order to address the external dimension of the migration and refugee crisis the Commission has made various additional proposals having an impact on the EU budget, such as those for the establishment of EU trust funds (the Madad Trust Fund and the Emergency Trust Fund for Africa, with an estimated initial budgetary impact of EUR 570 million and EUR 405 million respectively); **notes, however, that the Refugee Facility for Turkey, for which EUR 1 billion ought to be funded from the EU budget, is in fact illegal, since no provision has been made for ratification by the European Parliament**; stresses that further pressure on the Union budget might arise from other planned actions announced by the Commission such as the ‘London pledge’ or from events such as the EU-Turkey summit of 18 March 2016; is concerned, **moreover, that these initiatives are failing to resolve matters where they are not, as in the case of Turkey, actually counterproductive and that** further actions might still be required;

Or. it

Amendment 52

Younous Omarjee, Liadh Ní Riada, Xabier Benito Ziluaga

on behalf of the GUE/NGL Group

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 9

Motion for a resolution

9. ***Stresses that significant budgetary means have been deployed to tackle the root causes of the refugee and migration crisis by reinforcing specific EU programmes under Heading 4; recalls the reallocations in favour of migration/refugee-related actions*** of EUR 170 million in the course of 2015, as well as the approval in 2016 of an additional EUR 130 million ***under Heading 4 for migration/refugee-related activities, together with*** the reshuffling of EUR 430 million under the Instrument for Pre-accession Assistance, the Development Cooperation Instrument and the European Neighbourhood Instrument; recalls, furthermore, that in order to address the external dimension of the migration and refugee crisis the Commission has made various additional proposals having an impact on the EU budget, such as those for the establishment of EU trust funds (the Madad Trust Fund and the Emergency Trust Fund for Africa, with an estimated initial budgetary impact of EUR 570 million and EUR 405 million respectively), as well as of the Refugee Facility for Turkey, for which EUR 1 billion is to be funded from the EU budget, not counting possible additional funding; stresses that further pressure on the Union budget ***might*** arise from other planned actions announced by the Commission such as the ‘London pledge’ or from events such as the EU-Turkey summit of 18 March 2016; is concerned, however, that owing to the magnitude of the problems the EU is facing further actions might still be required;

Amendment

9. ***Points out that migration/refugee-related actions are insufficient by any standard despite the reallocation*** of EUR 170 million ***to them*** in the course of 2015, as well as the approval in 2016 of an additional EUR 130 million for ***them and*** the reshuffling of EUR 430 million under the Instrument for Pre-accession Assistance, the Development Cooperation Instrument and the European Neighbourhood Instrument; recalls, furthermore, that in order to address the external dimension of the migration and refugee crisis the Commission has made various additional proposals having an impact on the EU budget, such as those for the establishment of EU trust funds (the Madad Trust Fund and the Emergency Trust Fund for Africa, with an estimated initial budgetary impact of EUR 570 million and EUR 405 million respectively), as well as of the Refugee Facility for Turkey, for which EUR 1 billion is to be funded from the EU budget, not counting possible additional funding; stresses, ***however***, that further pressure on the Union budget ***will*** arise from other planned actions announced by the Commission such as the ‘London pledge’ or from events such as the EU-Turkey summit of 18 March 2016; is concerned, however, that owing to the magnitude of the problems the EU is facing further actions might still be required; ***points out in addition that migration/refugee-related actions must not be overly outsourced to non-EU countries and that it is the duty of the EU to mount its own response too;***

Or. fr

Amendment 53
Victor Negrescu

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 9 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

9a. *Notes that solidarity should take into account the economic capacity of each member state;*

Or. en

Amendment 54
G rard Deprez, Louis Michel, Nils Torvalds, Jean Arthuis, Charles Goerens, Nedzhmi Ali

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 10

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

10. Concludes that the *activities planned by the Commission to cope with the migrant and refugee crisis* could not have been foreseen at the time of the conclusion of the MFF 2014-2020; highlights the fact that owing to the lack of sufficient resources the EU has had to set up ad hoc, ‘satellite’ instruments such as EU trust funds and the Refugee Facility for Turkey; stresses, however, that Member States have not yet delivered on their contribution pledges to the trust funds, thus undermining the success of those funds;

10. Concludes that the *magnitude of the migrant and refugee crisis and the financial impact of the measures initiated by the Commission to address this issue* could not have been foreseen at the time of the conclusion of the MFF 2014-2020; highlights the fact that owing to the lack of sufficient resources the EU has had to set up ad hoc, ‘satellite’ instruments, *jointly financed by the Member States and by the EU budget*, such as EU trust funds (*the Madad Trust Fund and the EU Emergency Trust Fund for Africa*) and the Refugee Facility for Turkey; stresses, however, that Member States have not yet delivered on their contribution pledges to the trust funds, thus undermining the success of those funds; *calls on Member States to immediately fulfil their commitments to contribute, in order to be able to address the root causes of destabilisation, forced displacement and*

irregular migration by promoting economic and equal opportunities, strengthening resilience of vulnerable people, security and development; stresses, however, that the multiplication of such instruments creates a problem of accountability in the EU, which needs to be taken into account and analysed;

Or. en

Amendment 55

Ernest Maragall

on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 10

Motion for a resolution

10. Concludes that the activities planned by the Commission to cope with the migrant and refugee crisis could not have been foreseen at the time of the conclusion of the MFF 2014-2020; highlights the fact that owing to the lack of sufficient resources the EU has had to set up ad hoc, ‘satellite’ instruments such as EU trust funds and the Refugee Facility for Turkey; stresses, however, that Member States have not yet delivered on their contribution pledges to the trust funds, thus undermining the success of those funds;

Amendment

10. Concludes that the activities planned by the Commission to cope with the migrant and refugee crisis could not have been foreseen at the time of the conclusion of the MFF 2014-2020; highlights the fact that owing to the lack of sufficient resources the EU has had to set up ad hoc, ‘satellite’ instruments such as EU trust funds and the Refugee Facility for Turkey; stresses, however, that Member States have not yet delivered on their contribution pledges to the trust funds, thus undermining the success of those funds; ***calls on the Member states should take their responsibility in such situation, including in the reallocation of refugees; fears moreover that the extremely tense situation might lead to extra financial needs, especially in case of a non-agreement with the Turkish government;***

Or. en

Amendment 56

Reimer Böge, Monika Hohlmeier

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 10

Motion for a resolution

10. Concludes that the activities planned by the Commission to cope with the migrant and refugee crisis could not have been foreseen at the time of the conclusion of the MFF 2014-2020; highlights the fact that owing to the lack of sufficient resources the EU has ***had to*** set up ad hoc, ‘satellite’ instruments such as EU trust funds and the Refugee Facility for Turkey; ***stresses, however,*** that Member States have ***not yet delivered on their contribution pledges*** to the trust funds, thus undermining the success of those funds;

Amendment

10. Concludes that the activities planned by the Commission to cope with the migrant and refugee crisis could not have been foreseen at the time of the conclusion of the MFF 2014-2020; highlights the fact that owing to the lack of sufficient resources the EU has set up ad hoc, ‘satellite’ instruments such as EU trust funds and the Refugee Facility for Turkey ***without an overall budgetary strategy to address the migrant and refugee crisis, which has led to the European Parliament being side-lined as regards the decision on the use of EU budget funds; deplores*** that Member States have ***as yet failed by far to deliver the expected contributions*** to the trust funds, ***i.e. amounting to the same level as the contributions from the EU,*** thus undermining the success of those funds;

Or. en

Amendment 57
Marco Zanni, Marco Valli

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 10

Motion for a resolution

10. ***Concludes that the activities planned by the Commission to cope with the migrant and refugee crisis could not have been foreseen at the time of the conclusion of the MFF 2014-2020; highlights the fact*** that owing to the lack of sufficient resources the EU has ***had to*** set up ad hoc, ‘satellite’ instruments such as EU trust funds ***and the Refugee Facility for Turkey; stresses, however, that***

Amendment

10. ***Regrets that, on adoption of the 2014-2020 MFF, the problems relating to the migrant and refugee crisis were not adequately assessed, despite the numerous warning signals; notes*** that owing to the lack of sufficient resources the EU has set up ad hoc, ‘satellite’ instruments such as EU trust funds; ***considers unacceptable, however, the agreement reached with Turkey providing for disbursement of***

Member States have not yet delivered on their contribution pledges to the trust funds, thus undermining the success of those funds;

substantial funds from the EU budget without any guarantee that the issue will be resolved; stresses, moreover, the lack of solidarity and responsibility on the part of Member States that have not yet delivered on their contribution pledges to the trust funds, thus undermining the success of those funds;

Or. it

Amendment 58

Eider Gardiazabal Rubial, Jean-Paul Denanot

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 10

Motion for a resolution

10. Concludes that the activities planned by the Commission to cope with the migrant and refugee crisis could not have been foreseen at the time of the conclusion of the MFF 2014-2020; highlights the fact that owing to the lack of sufficient resources the EU has had to set up ad hoc, ‘satellite’ instruments such as EU trust funds and the Refugee Facility for Turkey; stresses, however, that Member States have not yet delivered on their contribution pledges to the trust funds, thus undermining the success of those funds;

Amendment

10. Concludes that the activities planned by the Commission to cope with the migrant and refugee crisis could not have been foreseen at the time of the conclusion of the MFF 2014-2020; highlights the fact that owing to the lack of sufficient resources the EU has had to set up ad hoc, ‘satellite’ instruments *with no democratic control by the European Parliament* such as EU trust funds and the Refugee Facility for Turkey; stresses, however, that Member States have not yet delivered on their contribution pledges to the trust funds, thus undermining the success of those funds;

Or. en

Amendment 59

Younous Omarjee, Liadh Ní Riada, Xabier Benito Ziluaga
on behalf of the GUE/NGL Group

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 10 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

10a. *Calls for an immigration clause to be established so as to exclude Member State spending on migrant reception and integration from excessive-deficit calculations;*

Or. fr

Amendment 60
Siegfried Mureşan

Motion for a resolution
Subheading 3 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

Situation in the Eastern Neighbourhood

Or. en

Amendment 61
Siegfried Mureşan

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 10 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

10a. *Recalls that Russia's invasion of Ukraine has created and continues to pose serious security challenges to the EU and its Eastern Partners; stresses that these challenges must be addressed during the MFF revision by providing enhanced support to countries that are currently implementing Association Agreements, in order to advance reforms and ensure the deepening of the relations between the EU and the respective countries;*

Or. en

Amendment 62

Younous Omarjee, Liadh Ní Riada, Xabier Benito Ziluaga
on behalf of the GUE/NGL Group

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 10 b (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

10b. Calls for stepped-up EU budget support for Member States bearing the brunt of migration flows, such as Greece and Italy;

Or. fr

Amendment 63

Ernest Maragall
on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Motion for a resolution
Subheading 4

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

Low level of investment

Development policy

10a. Notes the massive scale of the global needs for humanitarian aid and for disaster risk reduction, disaster preparedness and the building of resilience in developing countries; also notes the upward pressure on these needs stemming from effects of conflicts and wars, growing economic and social inequality, human rights violations, bad governance and corruption, poor provision of basic social services, including weak health systems and the lack of investments into health innovation, as well as climate change and competition for scarce resources; insists that the EU's financial means for responding to humanitarian and development issues require strengthening, especially considering the newly

established 2030 Agenda, and is convinced that this is also essential for the defence of the EU's own interests, including its security in a broad sense;

10b. Reiterates that actions to tackle humanitarian challenges should not come at the expense of the EU's development funding and policies in other areas;

10c. Recalls the EU commitment to allocate 20% of its ODA to human development, with a focus on education and health; believes that enjoying the highest attainable standard of health is a fundamental human right and that universal access to health care and coverage, including sexual and reproductive health and rights, is a powerful development enabler and fundamental to promote gender equality, improved nutrition and education outcomes; consequently stresses the need for health-related expenditure in the context of rapidly emerging epidemics and in light of the need for comprehensive investment to create resilient health systems and provide affordable access to essential medicines in many low and middle income countries in order to deliver on the 2030 Agenda;

10d. Underlines the need for adequate resources for the pursuit of the SDGs; recalls the EU's recent renewal of its collective commitment to raise its ODA to 0.7 % of its GNI; points out that this requires substantial increases, and stresses that the MFF review should take this into account;

Or. en

Amendment 64
Ernest Maragall
on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Motion for a resolution
Subheading 4 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

Low level of investment

Or. en

Amendment 65
Inese Vaidere

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 11

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

11. Recalls that, since the global economic and financial crisis, the EU has suffered from low levels of investment; notes in particular that in 2014 total investment was 15 % below the 2007 level, which corresponds to an investment drop of EUR 430 billion; considers that weak investment slows economic recovery and has direct repercussions on growth, jobs and competitiveness;

11. Recalls that, since the global economic and financial crisis, the EU has suffered from low levels of investment; notes in particular that in 2014 total investment was 15 % below the 2007 level, which corresponds to an investment drop of EUR 430 billion; considers that weak investment slows economic recovery and has direct repercussions on growth, jobs and competitiveness; ***underlines that cohesion policy is still the main source of investment to reduce the economic, social and territorial disparities and improve living standards and quality of life in many EU countries;***

Or. en

Amendment 66
Younous Omarjee, Liadh Ní Riada, Xabier Benito Ziluaga
on behalf of the GUE/NGL Group

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 11

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

11. Recalls that, since the global

11. Recalls that, since the global

economic and financial crisis, the EU has suffered from low levels of investment; notes in particular that in 2014 total investment was 15 % below the 2007 level, which corresponds to an investment drop of EUR 430 billion; considers that weak investment *slows* economic recovery and *has* direct repercussions *on* growth, jobs and competitiveness;

economic and financial crisis, the EU has suffered from low levels of investment; notes in particular that in 2014 total investment was 15 % below the 2007 level, which corresponds to an investment drop of EUR 430 billion; considers that *the austerity measures imposed and* weak investment *have slowed* economic recovery and *have had* direct repercussions *in terms of* growth, jobs, *increased poverty, a fresh upsurge in inequalities, disparities between EU regions and Member States,* and competitiveness;

Or. fr

Amendment 67

Ernest Maragall

on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 11

Motion for a resolution

11. Recalls that, since the global economic and financial crisis, the EU has suffered from low levels of investment; notes in particular that in 2014 total investment was 15 % below the 2007 level, which corresponds to an investment drop of EUR 430 billion; considers that weak investment slows economic recovery and has direct repercussions on growth, jobs and competitiveness;

Amendment

11. Recalls that, since the global economic and financial crisis, the EU has suffered from low levels of investment *and a lack of aggregate internal demand*; notes in particular that in 2014 total investment was 15 % below the 2007 level, which corresponds to an investment drop of EUR 430 billion; considers that weak investment *and low aggregate internal demand* slows economic recovery and has direct repercussions on growth, jobs and competitiveness;

Or. en

Amendment 68

Pina Picierno, Daniele Viotti, Eider Gardiazabal Rubial

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 11

Motion for a resolution

11. Recalls that, since the global economic and financial crisis, the EU has suffered from low levels of investment; notes in particular that in 2014 total investment was 15 % below the 2007 level, which corresponds to an investment drop of EUR 430 billion; considers that weak investment slows economic recovery and has direct repercussions on growth, jobs and competitiveness;

Amendment

11. Recalls that, since the global economic and financial crisis, the EU has suffered from low ***and insufficient*** levels of investment; notes in particular that in 2014 total investment was 15 % below the 2007 level, which corresponds to an investment drop of EUR 430 billion; considers that weak investment slows economic recovery and has direct repercussions on growth, jobs and competitiveness;

Or. en

Amendment 69
Xabier Benito Ziluaga

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 11 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

11a. Recalls that the main threat for the EU economy is the low level of solvency of the private banking system and the high risk of a domino effect if there are some banks "too big to fail" which finally could fall. Deplores that the debates on the changes regarding the capacity budgetary of the Eurozone are being used in order that sustaining a financial regulation and a monetary policy that are protecting rentists practices, jeopardising the investment and employment. These policies are clearly flexible for the oligopolies of the financial system, but unable accomplishing the social and productive function of credit. The integration of the European Stability Mechanism, the future European Monetary Fund, as a huge financial instrument, into the Treaties could be the financing tool to justify several consequences at the same time: the

socialisation of private debt into public debt, through the higher public expenditure to restore the liabilities of the banking system, and the cuts in the field of tax collection, the progressivity of the fiscal regime and their corresponding public, social and labour policies;

Or. en

Amendment 70
Siegfried Mureşan

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 12

Motion for a resolution

12. Underlines that, in response to this pressing problem, the new Commission in 2014 proposed an investment plan for Europe and the establishment of EFSI, with the aim of mobilising EUR 315 billion in new investment in the real economy; notes that the guarantee provided by the Union for EFSI is covered by a Guarantee Fund of EUR 8 billion constituted in the EU budget;

Amendment

12. Underlines that, in response to this pressing problem, the new Commission in 2014 proposed an investment plan for Europe and the establishment of EFSI, with the aim of mobilising EUR 315 billion in new investment in the real economy; **welcomes in this respect the adoption of EFSI, which will serve as one of the main tools for enhancing investments at EU level and will contribute to stimulating the creation of jobs; notes with satisfaction that a significant number of projects and EIF operations have already been approved and synergies between the EFSI and Horizon 2020 could be detected; calls on the Commission and EIB to ensure that geographical concentration is avoided and that all Member States benefit from EFSI;** notes that the guarantee provided by the Union for EFSI is covered by a Guarantee Fund of EUR 8 billion constituted in the EU budget;

Or. en

Amendment 71
Marco Zanni, Marco Valli

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 12

Motion for a resolution

12. Underlines that, in response to this pressing problem, the new Commission in 2014 proposed an investment plan for Europe and the establishment of EFSI, with the aim of mobilising EUR 315 billion in new investment in the real economy; notes that the guarantee provided by the Union for EFSI is covered by a Guarantee Fund of EUR 8 billion constituted in the EU budget;

Amendment

12. Underlines that, in response to this pressing problem, the new Commission in 2014 proposed an investment plan for Europe and the establishment of EFSI, with the aim of mobilising EUR 315 billion in new investment in the real economy; notes, ***however, that the projects selected for the EFSI do not represent new investment in the real economy but the refinancing of existing projects of questionable sustainability in economic, social and environmental terms; stresses also*** that the guarantee provided by the Union for EFSI is covered by a Guarantee Fund of EUR 8 billion constituted in the EU budget, ***which has diverted resources from programmes such as Horizon 2020 or the Connecting Europe Facility (CEF)***;

Or. it

Amendment 72
José Manuel Fernandes

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 12

Motion for a resolution

12. Underlines that, in response to this pressing problem, the new Commission in 2014 proposed an investment plan for Europe and the establishment of EFSI, with the aim of mobilising EUR 315 billion in new investment in the real economy; notes that the guarantee provided by the Union for EFSI is covered by a Guarantee Fund of EUR 8 billion constituted in the EU budget;

Amendment

12. Underlines that, in response to this pressing problem, the new Commission in 2014 proposed an investment plan for Europe and the establishment of EFSI, with the aim of mobilising EUR 315 billion in new investment in the real economy; ***reiterates its strong commitment to EFSI that is expected to deliver a powerful and targeted boost to economic sectors that are conducive to growth and job***; .notes that the guarantee provided by the Union for EFSI is covered by a Guarantee Fund

of EUR 8 billion constituted in the EU budget;

Or. en

Amendment 73

Ernest Maragall

on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 12

Motion for a resolution

12. Underlines that, in response to this pressing problem, the new Commission in 2014 proposed an investment plan for Europe and the establishment of EFSI, with the aim of mobilising EUR 315 billion in new investment in the real economy; notes that the guarantee provided by the Union for EFSI is covered by a Guarantee Fund of EUR 8 billion constituted in the EU budget;

Amendment

12. Underlines that, in response to this pressing problem, the new Commission in 2014 proposed an investment plan for Europe and the establishment of EFSI, with the aim of mobilising EUR 315 billion in new *private* investment in the real economy; notes that the guarantee provided by the Union for EFSI is covered by a Guarantee Fund of EUR 8 billion constituted in the EU budget, *based in the hope it will be enough to multiply private investment by a 21 factor.*;

Or. en

Amendment 74

Xabier Benito Ziluaga

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 12

Motion for a resolution

12. Underlines that, in response to this pressing problem, the new Commission in 2014 proposed an investment plan for Europe and the establishment of EFSI, with the aim of mobilising EUR 315 billion in new investment in the real economy; notes that the guarantee provided by the Union for EFSI is covered by a Guarantee Fund

Amendment

12. Underlines that, in response to this pressing problem, the new Commission in 2014 proposed an *clearly insufficient and poorly conceived* investment plan for Europe and the establishment of EFSI, with the aim of mobilising EUR 315 billion in new investment in the real economy; notes that the guarantee provided by the Union

of EUR 8 billion constituted in the EU budget;

for EFSI is covered by a Guarantee Fund of EUR 8 billion constituted in the EU budget;

Or. en

Amendment 75

Younous Omarjee, Liadh Ní Riada, Xabier Benito Ziluaga
on behalf of the GUE/NGL Group

Motion for a resolution **Paragraph 12**

Motion for a resolution

12. *Underlines* that, *in response to this pressing problem*, the new Commission in 2014 proposed an investment plan for Europe and the establishment of EFSI, with the aim of mobilising EUR 315 billion in new investment in the real economy; notes that the guarantee provided by the Union for EFSI is covered by a Guarantee Fund of EUR 8 billion constituted in the EU budget;

Amendment

12. *Notes* that the new Commission in 2014 proposed an investment plan for Europe and the establishment of EFSI, with the aim of mobilising EUR 315 billion in new investment in the real economy; notes that the guarantee provided by the Union for EFSI is covered by a Guarantee Fund of EUR 8 billion constituted in the EU budget;

Or. fr

Amendment 76

Reimer Böge, Monika Hohlmeier

Motion for a resolution **Paragraph 13**

Motion for a resolution

13. Recalls that, in order to secure this additional funding, the financial allocation for two significant EU programmes, Horizon 2020 and the Connecting European Facility (CEF), *has had to be* reduced by EUR 2.2 billion and EUR 2.8 billion respectively, while the remaining EUR 3 billion are covered by unallocated MFF margins; stresses Parliament's

Amendment

13. Recalls that, in order to secure this additional funding, the financial allocation for two significant EU programmes, Horizon 2020 and the Connecting European Facility (CEF), *were finally* reduced by EUR 2.2 billion and EUR 2.8 billion respectively, while the remaining EUR 3 billion are covered by unallocated MFF margins; stresses Parliament's

commitment during the EFSI negotiations to reduce as much as possible the impact on these two programmes, whose financial envelopes were decided only in 2013;

commitment during the EFSI negotiations to reduce as much as possible the impact on these two programmes, whose financial envelopes were decided only in 2013 *and which are key for supporting research, innovation and competitiveness and thus for future growth and the long-term prosperity of the Union;*

Or. en

Amendment 77

Ernest Maragall

on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 13

Motion for a resolution

13. Recalls that, in order to secure this additional funding, the financial allocation for two significant EU programmes, Horizon 2020 and the Connecting European Facility (CEF), has had to be reduced by EUR 2.2 billion and EUR 2.8 billion respectively, while the remaining EUR 3 billion are covered by unallocated MFF margins; stresses Parliament's commitment during the EFSI negotiations to reduce as much as possible the impact on these two programmes, whose financial envelopes were decided only in 2013;

Amendment

13. Recalls that, in order to secure this additional funding *due to the Guarantee Fund*, the financial allocation for two significant EU programmes, Horizon 2020 and the Connecting European Facility (CEF), has had to be reduced by EUR 2.2 billion and EUR 2.8 billion respectively, while the remaining EUR 3 billion are covered by unallocated MFF margins; stresses Parliament's commitment during the EFSI negotiations to reduce as much as possible the impact on these two programmes *which were already severely cut by the Council during the MFF negotiation (12% and 52% respectively) and* whose financial envelopes were decided only in 2013;

Or. en

Amendment 78

Clare Moody

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 13

Motion for a resolution

13. Recalls that, in order to secure this additional funding, the financial allocation for two significant EU programmes, Horizon 2020 and the Connecting European Facility (CEF), has had to be reduced by EUR 2.2 billion and EUR 2.8 billion respectively, while the remaining EUR 3 billion are covered by unallocated MFF margins; stresses Parliament's commitment during the EFSI negotiations to reduce as much as possible the impact on these two programmes, whose financial envelopes were decided only in 2013;

Amendment

13. Recalls that, in order to secure this additional funding, the financial allocation for two significant EU programmes, Horizon 2020 and the Connecting European Facility (CEF), has had to be reduced by EUR 2.2 billion and EUR 2.8 billion respectively, while the remaining EUR 3 billion are covered by unallocated MFF margins; stresses Parliament's commitment during the EFSI negotiations to reduce as much as possible the impact on these two programmes, whose financial envelopes were decided only in 2013; ***efforts should be made to replenish these cuts from elsewhere in the EU budget including from under other headings;***

Or. en

Amendment 79

Nils Torvalds, Anneli Jäätteenmäki, Nedzhmi Ali

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 13

Motion for a resolution

13. Recalls that, in order to secure this additional funding, the financial allocation for two significant EU programmes, Horizon 2020 and the Connecting European Facility (CEF), has had to be reduced by EUR 2.2 billion and EUR 2.8 billion respectively, while the remaining EUR 3 billion are covered by unallocated MFF margins; stresses Parliament's commitment during the EFSI negotiations to ***reduce as much*** as possible ***the*** impact on these two programmes, whose financial envelopes were decided only in 2013;

Amendment

13. Recalls that, in order to secure this additional funding, the financial allocation for two significant EU programmes, Horizon 2020 and the Connecting European Facility (CEF), has had to be reduced by EUR 2.2 billion and EUR 2.8 billion respectively, while the remaining EUR 3 billion are covered by unallocated MFF margins; stresses Parliament's commitment during the EFSI negotiations to ***avoid as far*** as possible ***a negative*** impact on these two programmes, whose financial envelopes were decided only in 2013;

Or. en

Amendment 80
Clare Moody

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 14

Motion for a resolution

14. Highlights, in this context, that in accordance with Article 15 of the MFF Regulation, a frontloading of resources was implemented in 2014-2015 for Horizon 2020 (EUR 200 million for European Research Council and Marie Curie actions) and COSME (EUR 50 million), in order to compensate in part for the decrease in appropriations between 2013 and 2014; notes that this frontloading does not change the overall financial envelope of the programmes, leading to less appropriations respectively for the second half of the MFF; stresses, however, that the frontloading for Horizon 2020 and COSME was fully absorbed, thus proving the strong performance of these programmes and their capacity to absorb even more;

Amendment

14. Highlights, in this context, that in accordance with Article 15 of the MFF Regulation, a frontloading of resources was implemented in 2014-2015 for Horizon 2020 (EUR 200 million for European Research Council and Marie Curie actions) and COSME (EUR 50 million), in order to compensate in part for the decrease in appropriations between 2013 and 2014; notes that this frontloading does not change the overall financial envelope of the programmes, leading to less appropriations respectively for the second half of the MFF; stresses, however, that the frontloading for Horizon 2020 and COSME was fully absorbed, thus proving the strong performance of these programmes and their capacity to absorb even more; ***would welcome flexibility measures to reallocate from across the EU budget from programmes with lower absorption rates and impact;***

Or. en

Amendment 81
Richard Ashworth

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 15

Motion for a resolution

15. Notes also with great concern that that the success rate for Horizon 2020 has dropped to a level of 13 % from the 20-22 % enjoyed by its predecessor (FP7) in the

Amendment

15. Notes also with great concern that that the success rate for Horizon 2020 has dropped to a level of 13 % from the 20-22 % enjoyed by its predecessor (FP7) in the

previous programming period; regrets the fact that as a result fewer high-quality projects in the field of research and innovation are receiving EU funding; notes, similarly, the rejection of many high-quality applications relating to the CEF owing to insufficient budget funds;

previous programming period; regrets the fact that as a result fewer high-quality projects in the field of research and innovation are receiving EU funding; notes, similarly, the rejection of many high-quality applications relating to the CEF owing to insufficient budget funds; ***regrets that the portion of the EU budget dedicated to research and innovation has often been the first to be adversely affected by any rationalisation of the budget; notes that research and innovation programmes have the potential to generate EU added value, and therefore considers that necessary savings ought to be made elsewhere;***

Or. en

Amendment 82
Clare Moody

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 15

Motion for a resolution

15. Notes also with great concern that that the success rate for Horizon 2020 has dropped to a level of 13 % from the 20-22 % enjoyed by its predecessor (FP7) in the previous programming period; regrets the fact that as a result fewer high-quality projects in the field of research and innovation are receiving EU funding; notes, similarly, the rejection of many high-quality applications relating to the CEF owing to insufficient budget funds;

Amendment

15. Notes also with great concern that that the success rate for Horizon 2020 has dropped to a level of 13 % from the 20-22 % enjoyed by its predecessor (FP7) in the previous programming period; regrets the fact that as a result fewer high-quality projects in the field of research and innovation are receiving EU funding; notes, similarly, the rejection of many high-quality applications relating to the CEF owing to insufficient budget funds ***being allocated to the relevant budget lines; with this in mind reallocation and getting the most out of existing resources under the MFF should be a priority;***

Or. en

Amendment 83
Michal Marusik

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 15

Motion for a resolution

15. Notes also with great concern that **that** the success rate for Horizon 2020 has dropped to a level of 13 % from the 20-22 % enjoyed by its predecessor (FP7) in the previous programming period; **regrets** the fact that as a result fewer high-quality projects in the field of research and innovation are receiving EU funding; notes, similarly, the rejection of many high-quality applications relating to the CEF owing to insufficient budget funds;

Amendment

15. Notes also with great concern that the success rate for Horizon 2020 has dropped to a level of 13 % from the 20-22 % enjoyed by its predecessor (FP7) in the previous programming period, **which clearly shows that taxpayers' money is being wasted**; notes the fact that as a result fewer high-quality projects in the field of research and innovation are receiving EU funding; notes, similarly, the rejection of many high-quality applications relating to the CEF owing to insufficient budget funds;

Or. pl

Amendment 84
Gérard Deprez, Martina Dlabajová, Louis Michel, Nils Torvalds, Jean Arthuis, Nedzhmi Ali

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 15 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

15a. Underlines that while, according to the MFF regulation, the Global Margin for Commitments should be dedicated in priority to the Youth Employment Initiative, it has been mostly redirected, so far, to the European fund for Strategic Investments;

Or. en

Amendment 85
Ernest Maragall

on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Motion for a resolution
Subheading 5

Motion for a resolution

Youth unemployment

Amendment

*Precarious social and employment
situation and persistent inequalities*

Or. en

Amendment 86
Eider Gardiazabal Rubial, Brando Benifei, Eva Paunova, Terry Reintke

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 16

Motion for a resolution

16. Stresses that youth unemployment remains dramatically high and represents one of the most pressing and serious problems that the EU is currently facing; highlights that 4.4 million young persons under 25 were unemployed across the Union in February 2016 and that this corresponds to a proportion of over 40 % in several Member States;

Amendment

16. Stresses that youth unemployment remains dramatically high and represents one of the most pressing and serious problems that the EU is currently facing; highlights that 4.4 million young persons under 25 were unemployed across the Union in February 2016 and that this corresponds to a proportion of over 40 % in several Member States; ***consequently too many young people are at risk of social exclusion and more specific actions on including young people not in education, employment or training (NEETs) should be taken;***

Or. en

Amendment 87
Younous Omarjee, Liadh Ní Riada, Xabier Benito Ziluaga
on behalf of the GUE/NGL Group

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 16

Motion for a resolution

16. Stresses that youth unemployment **remains dramatically high** and represents one of the most pressing and serious problems that the EU is currently facing; highlights that 4.4 million young persons under 25 were unemployed across the Union in February 2016 and that this corresponds to a proportion of over 40 % in several Member States;

Amendment

16. Stresses that youth unemployment **has reached an extremely worrying level** and represents one of the most pressing and serious problems that the EU is currently facing; highlights **the fact** that 4.4 million young persons under 25 were unemployed across the Union in February 2016 and that this corresponds to a proportion of over 40 % in several Member States **and over 60% in several EU regions**;

Or. fr

Amendment 88

Ernest Maragall

on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 16

Motion for a resolution

16. Stresses that **youth unemployment remains dramatically high and represents one of the most pressing and serious problems that the EU is currently facing; highlights that 4.4 million young persons under 25 were unemployed across the Union in February 2016 and that this corresponds to a proportion of over 40 % in several Member States**;

Amendment

16. Stresses that **the MFF and the EU Budget should reflect all the EU 2020 goals, and not the other way round; Underlines in this context, that the EU Budget should be used in a way that improves the labour market access and combats unemployment, poverty and social exclusion and promotes equality, including gender equality**;

Or. en

Amendment 89

Ernest Maragall

on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 16 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

16a. *Points out that the Europe 2020 poverty target is far from being achieved, which highlights that policies in this field have failed, in particular for people in vulnerable situations; Is worried about the worsening social situation caused by the financial and economic crisis is undermining the sustainability of social protection systems; stresses there is a need for increased financial aid to social policies measures, that promotes social investment, including in quality social services and social economy; considers the Commission should thoroughly monitor that the share of the ESF earmarked to fighting poverty and social exclusion, is effectively used for this purpose;*

Or. en

Amendment 90
Victor Negrescu

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 16 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

16a. *Underlines that investing in growth and jobs and promoting territorial cooperation should remain one of the priorities of the EU policies; recalls that the Cohesion Fund for the 2014-2020 period concerning Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Greece, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia allocates 63,4 billion euros; stresses that this budget should remain unchanged in order to ensure the reduction of inequalities between EU countries, regions and cities and achieve our common 2020 targets;*

Amendment 91
Ernest Maragall
on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 16 b (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

16b. *Underlines that the employment rate in the EU currently stands at 69.2 %, which is well below the Europe 2020 target, and considers there is a need for increased public investment in quality and sustainable job creation and skills, including green jobs and jobs in the social economy and the social, health and care sector;*

Or. en

Amendment 92
Victor Negrescu

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 16 b (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

16b. *Recalls that the 2010-2018 EU Youth Strategy set out a framework for cooperation to provide more and equal opportunities for young people in education and the job market and to promote the active citizenship, social inclusion and solidarity of all young people through EU funds such as Erasmus+, ESF and YEI;*

Or. en

Amendment 93
Ernest Maragall
on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 16 c (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

16c. Stresses that youth unemployment remains dramatically high and represents one of the most pressing and serious problems that the EU is currently facing; highlights that 4.4 million young persons under 25 were unemployed across the Union in February 2016 and that this corresponds to a proportion of over 40 % in several Member States and peaking at more than 50% in certain regions or areas;</Date>

Or. en

Amendment 94
Reimer Böge, Monika Hohlmeier

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 17

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

17. Underlines that the EU budget makes a significant contribution to the fight against unemployment, especially through the European Social Fund and the Youth Employment Initiative (YEI); stresses that *despite the initial delays in the designation of national authorities and the implementation of the YEI, the current figures indicate full absorption capacity*; notes that an evaluation of this initiative will soon be concluded, and expects that the necessary adjustments will be introduced to ensure its successful implementation;

17. Underlines that the EU budget makes a significant contribution to the fight against unemployment, especially through the European Social Fund and the Youth Employment Initiative (YEI); stresses that *the full absorption capacity indicated by the current figures has been achieved in part through a significant increase in the pre-financing rate of this programme; points to the indication of the Commission that the designation of implementing authorities has constituted a key challenge for the financial flows of the programme*; notes that an evaluation of this initiative will soon be concluded, and expects that the necessary adjustments, *in*

particular with regard to the setting-up appropriate administrative structures, will be introduced to ensure its successful implementation; considers the legislative proposal for a Structural Reform Support Programme^{1a} to be a valuable initiative to address the issue of insufficient administrative capacity;

^{1a} Proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on the establishment of the Structural Reform Support Programme for the period 2017 to 2020 and amending Regulations (EU) No 1303/2013 and (EU) No 1305/2013 COM(2015) 701 final – 2015/0263 (COD)

Or. en

Amendment 95

Younous Omarjee, Liadh Ní Riada, Xabier Benito Ziluaga
on behalf of the GUE/NGL Group

Motion for a resolution **Paragraph 17**

Motion for a resolution

17. Underlines that the EU budget makes *a significant* contribution to the fight against unemployment, *especially through* the European Social Fund and the Youth Employment Initiative (YEI); stresses that despite the initial delays in the designation of national authorities and the implementation of the YEI, the current figures indicate full absorption capacity; notes that an evaluation of this initiative will soon be concluded, and expects that the necessary adjustments will be introduced to ensure its successful implementation;

Amendment

17. Underlines *the fact* that the EU budget makes *an insufficient* contribution to the fight against unemployment *and that both* the European Social Fund and the Youth Employment Initiative (YEI), *though they are positive actions, are not sufficient*; stresses *also* that, despite the initial delays in the designation of national authorities and the implementation of the YEI, the current figures indicate full absorption capacity; notes that an evaluation of this initiative will soon be concluded, and expects that the necessary adjustments will be introduced to ensure its successful implementation; *calls for the establishment of new programmes with a view to giving substance to a genuinely*

Amendment 96

Raffaele Fitto

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 17

Motion for a resolution

17. Underlines that the EU budget makes a significant contribution to the fight against unemployment, especially through the European Social Fund and the Youth Employment Initiative (YEI); stresses that despite the initial delays in the designation of national authorities and the implementation of the YEI, the current figures indicate full absorption capacity; notes that an evaluation of this initiative will soon be concluded, and expects that the necessary adjustments will be introduced to ensure its successful implementation;

Amendment

17. Underlines that the EU budget makes a significant contribution to the fight against unemployment, especially through the European Social Fund and the Youth Employment Initiative (YEI); stresses that despite the initial delays in the designation of national authorities and the implementation of the YEI, the current figures indicate full absorption capacity; notes that an evaluation of this initiative will soon be concluded, and expects that the necessary adjustments will be introduced to ensure its successful implementation; ***stresses the need to take initiatives to increase the number of programme beneficiaries;***

Amendment 97

Christofer Fjellner

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 17

Motion for a resolution

17. Underlines that the EU budget ***makes a significant*** contribution to the fight against unemployment, especially through the European Social Fund and the Youth Employment Initiative (YEI); stresses that despite the initial delays in the

Amendment

17. Underlines ***the fact that structural reforms are crucial for growth and jobs;*** ***states*** that the EU budget ***can support them and make a*** contribution to the fight against unemployment, especially through the European Social Fund and the Youth

designation of national authorities and the implementation of the YEI, the current figures indicate full absorption capacity; notes that an evaluation of this initiative will soon be concluded, and expects that the necessary adjustments will be introduced to ensure its successful implementation;

Employment Initiative (YEI); stresses that despite the initial delays in the designation of national authorities and the implementation of the YEI, the current figures indicate full absorption capacity; notes that an evaluation of this initiative will soon be concluded, and expects that the necessary adjustments will be introduced to ensure its successful implementation;

Or. sv

Amendment 98

Gérard Deprez, Martina Dlabajová, Louis Michel, Nils Torvalds, Jean Arthuis, Nedzhmi Ali

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 17

Motion for a resolution

17. Underlines that the EU budget makes a significant contribution to the fight against unemployment, especially through the European Social Fund and the Youth Employment Initiative (YEI); stresses that despite the initial delays in the designation of national authorities and the implementation of the YEI, the current figures indicate full absorption capacity; notes that an evaluation of this initiative will soon be concluded, and expects that the necessary adjustments will be introduced to ensure its successful implementation;

Amendment

17. Underlines that the EU budget makes a significant contribution to the fight against unemployment, especially through the European Social Fund and the Youth Employment Initiative (YEI); stresses that despite the initial delays in the designation of national authorities and the implementation of the YEI, the current figures indicate full absorption capacity; notes that an evaluation of this initiative will soon be concluded, and expects that the necessary adjustments will be introduced to ensure its successful implementation *and its extension to the mobility of apprentices*;

Or. en

Amendment 99

Marco Zanni, Marco Valli

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 17

Motion for a resolution

17. Underlines that the EU budget ***makes a significant contribution*** to the fight against unemployment, especially through the European Social Fund and the Youth Employment Initiative (YEI); stresses that ***despite*** the initial delays in the designation of national authorities and the implementation of the YEI, ***the current figures indicate full absorption capacity***; notes that an evaluation of this initiative will soon be concluded, and expects that the necessary adjustments will be introduced to ensure its successful implementation;

Amendment

17. Underlines that the EU budget ***contributes*** to the fight against unemployment, especially through the European Social Fund and the Youth Employment Initiative (YEI); stresses, ***however***, that ***many*** initial delays ***have occurred*** in the designation of national authorities and the implementation of the YEI, ***and that the actual results in terms of youth employment are woefully inadequate***; notes that an evaluation of this initiative will soon be concluded, and expects that the necessary adjustments will be introduced to ensure its successful implementation;

Or. it

Amendment 100

Eider Gardiazabal Rubial, Brando Benifei, Eva Paunova, Terry Reintke

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 17

Motion for a resolution

17. Underlines that the EU budget makes a significant contribution to the fight against unemployment, especially through the European Social Fund and the Youth Employment Initiative (YEI); stresses that despite the initial delays in the designation of national authorities and the implementation of the YEI, the current figures indicate full absorption capacity; notes that an evaluation of this initiative will soon be concluded, and expects that the necessary adjustments will be introduced to ensure its successful implementation;

Amendment

17. Underlines that the EU budget makes a significant contribution to the fight against unemployment, especially through the European Social Fund and the Youth Employment Initiative (YEI); stresses that despite the initial delays in the designation of national authorities and the implementation of the YEI, the current figures indicate full absorption capacity; notes that an evaluation of this initiative will soon be concluded ***by the European Commission***, and expects that the necessary adjustments will be introduced to ensure its successful implementation;

Or. en

Amendment 101
Marco Zanni, Marco Valli

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 18

Motion for a resolution

18. Is particularly concerned, however, at the lack of new commitment appropriations for the YEI as of 2016, given that its entire original envelope was frontloaded in 2014-2015 (Article 15 of the MFF Regulation); stresses that in supporting this frontloading Parliament never intended that the initiative should be terminated after only two years of funding and that other MFF mechanisms, such as the Global Margin for Commitments, were put in place with the purpose of ensuring its continuation; also notes the frontloading of appropriations, on the basis of the same article, for Erasmus + (EUR 150 million), this being another EU programme that ***makes a major contribution*** to improving the employability of young people, ***which was fully implemented in the first two years of this period***;

Amendment

18. Is particularly concerned, however, at the lack of new commitment appropriations for the YEI as of 2016, given that its entire original envelope was frontloaded in 2014-2015 (Article 15 of the MFF Regulation); stresses that in supporting this frontloading Parliament never intended that the initiative should be terminated after only two years of funding and that other MFF mechanisms, such as the Global Margin for Commitments, were put in place with the purpose of ensuring its continuation; also notes the frontloading of appropriations, on the basis of the same article, for Erasmus + (EUR 150 million), this being another EU programme that ***might contribute*** to improving the employability of young people;

Or. it

Amendment 102
Richard Ashworth

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 18

Motion for a resolution

18. ***Is particularly concerned, however, at the lack of new commitment appropriations for the YEI as of 2016, given that its entire original envelope was frontloaded in 2014-2015 (Article 15 of the MFF Regulation); stresses that in supporting this frontloading Parliament never intended that the initiative should***

Amendment

18. ***Notes that the YEI's entire original envelope was frontloaded in 2014-2015 (Article 15 of the MFF Regulation) and that other MFF mechanisms, such as the Global Margin for Commitments (Article 14), allow for unused margins in the years 2014 to 2017 to be used from 2016 to 2020 for policy objectives related to growth and***

be terminated after only two years of funding and that other MFF mechanisms, such as the Global Margin for Commitments, were put in place with the purpose of ensuring its continuation; also notes the frontloading of appropriations, on the basis of the same article, for Erasmus + (EUR 150 million), *this being another EU programme that makes a major contribution to improving the employability of young people, which was fully implemented in the first two years of this period*;

employment, in particular youth employment; also notes the frontloading of appropriations, on the basis of the same article, for Erasmus + (EUR 150 million); *highlights that a report on the implementation of the Youth Guarantee and the operation of the YEI is due later this year, following a request from the European Council in June 2013^{1a} ; considers it necessary to await the outcome of this report in order to determine the appropriate level of funding for the YEI in the years ahead*;

1a

http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/en/ec/137634.pdf

Or. en

Amendment 103

Younous Omarjee, Liadh Ní Riada, Xabier Benito Ziluaga
on behalf of the GUE/NGL Group

Motion for a resolution Paragraph 18

Motion for a resolution

18. Is particularly concerned, *however*, at the lack of new commitment appropriations for the YEI as of 2016, given that its entire original envelope was frontloaded in 2014-2015 (Article 15 of the MFF Regulation); stresses that in supporting this frontloading Parliament never intended that the initiative should be terminated after only two years of funding and that other MFF mechanisms, such as the Global Margin for Commitments, were put in place with the purpose of ensuring its continuation; also notes the frontloading of appropriations, on the basis of the same article, for Erasmus + (EUR 150 million), this being another EU programme that makes a major contribution to improving

Amendment

18. Is particularly concerned at the lack of new commitment appropriations for the YEI as of 2016, given that its entire original envelope was frontloaded in 2014-2015 (Article 15 of the MFF Regulation); stresses that in supporting this frontloading Parliament never intended that the initiative should be terminated after only two years of funding and that other MFF mechanisms, such as the Global Margin for Commitments, were put in place with the purpose of ensuring its continuation; also notes the frontloading of appropriations, on the basis of the same article, for Erasmus + (EUR 150 million), this being another EU programme that makes a major contribution to improving the

the employability of young people, which was fully implemented in the first two years of this period;

employability of young people, which was fully implemented in the first two years of this period;

Or. fr

Amendment 104

Ernest Maragall

on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 18 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

18a. Stresses that the resources of the European Social Fund (ESF), the Fund for European Aid to the Most Deprived and the Employment and Social Innovation Programme (EaSI) contribute to the achievement of the poverty and employment targets of the Europe 2020 strategy which is already in need of increased commitment and achievement; notes that competition for scarce funds may lead to social conflict; calls on the Commission to monitor and on the Member States to ensure that the earmarked budget of 20% of the ESF for spending on social inclusion to be fully met; insists that the ESF share amounts to 25 % of the total cohesion budget, that the 20% earmarking for social inclusion be kept;

Or. en

Amendment 105

Victor Negrescu

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 18 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

18a. *Recalls that Europe's competitiveness, innovative capacity and productivity depend critically on the availability of highly educated and well trained workers; stresses that addressing skills mismatch in sectors with recognised job creation potential, such as ICT should remain a priority;*

Or. en

Amendment 106

Gérard Deprez, Louis Michel, Nils Torvalds, Jean Arthuis, Nedzhmi Ali

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 18 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

18a. *Reminds that, according to the International Labour Organisation (ILO), an efficient Youth Guarantee at the European Union level would cost EUR 21 billion;*

Or. en

Amendment 107

Monika Hohlmeier, Reimer Böge

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 19

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

19. Recalls the recent terrorist attacks in France and Belgium and the increased threat levels in other Member States, which call for more coordinated and reinforced action at EU level; underlines that the Union *already* has the Internal Security Fund as an appropriate instrument and has

19. Recalls the recent terrorist attacks in France and Belgium and the increased threat levels in other Member States, which call for more coordinated and reinforced action at EU level; underlines that the Union has the Internal Security Fund as an appropriate instrument and has several

several agencies operating in this field; considers that more European action, and therefore funding, will be needed in this area to provide an adequate response to this threat;

agencies operating in this field ***facing increased pressure***; considers that more European action, and therefore funding, will be needed in this area to provide an adequate response to this threat; ***recalls furthermore the limited reinforcement of staffing levels of the European Counter-Terrorism Centre in Europol financed by redeployment from the Internal Security Fund; stresses that increased cooperation in the area, in line with the actions currently proposed by the Commission on the table, as well as a fully operational European Counter-Terrorism Centre, Internet Referral Unit, EC3 and joint investigation teams will require increased levels of staffing for the concerned agencies, which may further increase pressure on the EU budget***;

Or. en

Amendment 108

Xabier Benito Ziluaga, Liadh Ní Riada

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 19

Motion for a resolution

19. Recalls the recent terrorist attacks in France and Belgium and the increased threat levels in other Member States, which call for more coordinated and reinforced action at EU level; underlines that the Union already has the Internal Security Fund as an appropriate instrument and has several agencies operating in this field; considers that more European action, and therefore funding, will be needed in this area to provide an adequate response to this threat;

Amendment

19. Recalls the recent terrorist attacks in France and Belgium and the increased threat levels in other Member States, which call for more coordinated and reinforced action at EU level; underlines that the Union already has the Internal Security Fund as an appropriate instrument and has several agencies operating in this field; considers that more European action, and therefore funding, will be needed in this area to provide an adequate response to this threat, ***mainly taking measures in order to halting any economic and trade relationship with all those economic players who trade with the so-called Daesh, sanctioning those companies or States which take advantage of the***

armament selling or the purchasing of oil and gas at low price;

Or. en

Amendment 109

Gérard Deprez, Martina Dlabajová, Louis Michel, Nils Torvalds, Jean Arthuis, Nedzhmi Ali

Motion for a resolution Paragraph 19

Motion for a resolution

19. Recalls the recent terrorist attacks in France and Belgium and the increased threat levels in other Member States, which call for more coordinated and reinforced **action** at EU level; underlines that the Union already has the Internal Security Fund as an appropriate instrument and has several agencies operating in this field; considers that more European action, **and therefore funding, will be needed in this area to provide an adequate response to this threat;**

Amendment

19. Recalls the recent terrorist attacks in France and Belgium and the increased threat levels in other Member States, which call for more coordinated **actions** and reinforced **means** at EU level; underlines that the Union already has the Internal Security Fund as an appropriate instrument and has several agencies operating in this field; considers that more European action **will be needed, as well as new initiatives, especially the enlargement of the missions and the reinforcement of the staff of the relevant agencies and the interconnection and interoperability of various European databases;**

Or. en

Amendment 110

Richard Ashworth

Motion for a resolution Paragraph 19

Motion for a resolution

19. Recalls the recent terrorist attacks in France and Belgium and the increased threat levels in other Member States, which call for more coordinated and reinforced action at EU level; underlines that the

Amendment

19. Recalls the recent terrorist attacks in France and Belgium and the increased threat levels in other Member States, which call for more coordinated and reinforced action at EU level; underlines that the

Union already has the Internal Security Fund as an appropriate instrument and has several agencies operating in this field; considers that *more European action*, and therefore *funding*, will be needed in this area to provide an adequate response to this threat;

Union already has the Internal Security Fund as an appropriate instrument and has several agencies operating in this field; considers that *increased coordination between Member States is necessary to address the current security situation in the EU*, and therefore, *adequate resources* will be needed in this area *in order* to provide an adequate response to this threat;

Or. en

Amendment 111
Marco Zanni, Marco Valli

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 19

Motion for a resolution

19. Recalls the recent terrorist attacks in France and Belgium and the increased threat levels in other *Member States*, which call for more coordinated and reinforced action *at EU level*; underlines that the Union already has the Internal Security Fund as an *appropriate* instrument and has several agencies operating in this field; considers that more European *action, and therefore funding*, will be needed in this area to provide an adequate response to this threat;

Amendment

19. Recalls the recent terrorist attacks in France and Belgium and the increased threat levels in other *countries*, which call for more coordinated and reinforced action *between Member States*; underlines that the Union already has the Internal Security Fund as an instrument and has several agencies operating in this field; considers that more European *coordination initiatives* will be needed in this area to provide an adequate response to this threat;

Or. it

Amendment 112
Michał Marusik

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 19

Motion for a resolution

19. Recalls the recent terrorist attacks in France and Belgium and the increased

Amendment

19. Recalls the recent terrorist attacks in France and Belgium and the increased

threat levels in other Member States, which call for more coordinated and reinforced action at EU level; ***underlines*** that the Union already has the Internal Security Fund ***as an appropriate*** instrument and ***has*** several agencies operating in this field; ***considers that more European action, and therefore funding, will be*** needed in this area ***to provide an adequate response to this threat;***

threat levels in other Member States, which call for more coordinated and reinforced action at EU level; ***deplores the fact*** that the Union already has the Internal Security Fund, ***which is a pointless and largely ineffectual*** instrument, and ***points out that the fact that there have been further terrorist attacks despite there being*** several agencies operating in this field ***undermines the case for having the fund;*** ***believes that what is*** needed in this area ***is action to tighten up counter-terrorism policy;***

Or. pl

Amendment 113
Monika Hohlmeier, Reimer Böge

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 19 – subparagraph 1 (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

Stresses that given the current actions and legislative proposals aimed at increasing judicial cooperation, additional financial and human resources will be progressively required for Eurojust which will impact the Union budget;

Or. en

Amendment 114
Ernest Maragall
on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Motion for a resolution
Subheading 7

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

Crises ***in the agricultural sector***

Agricultural crises

19a. Recalls that 38% of the overall EU budget under the current MFF is

dedicated to the Common Agricultural Policy, making this Policy the top beneficiary of EU spending; therefore considers that the CAP should make a positive contribution to furthering the overall goals of the Union in the field of the economy, society and the environment and that the CAP funds should be spent in full coherence with all agreed EU policies to achieve these goals;

Or. en

Amendment 115

Ernest Maragall

on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 20

Motion for a resolution

20. *Recalls the various crises* that European farmers have faced since the beginning of the current MFF, most notably the dairy *sector* crisis and the long-term negative effects on European farmers of the losses caused by the Russian embargo on agricultural products; highlights the budgetary impact of the emergency measures taken in response to these crises, involving EUR 500 million in the budget 2016 and EUR 300 million in 2015; underlines the persistent situation of crisis in the agricultural sector in several Member States;

Amendment

20. *Notes* that European farmers have *been* faced *with various economic crises* since the beginning of the current MFF, most notably the dairy *and fruits and vegetables sectors* crisis and the long-term negative effects on European farmers of the losses caused by the Russian embargo on agricultural products; highlights the budgetary impact of the emergency measures taken in response to these crises, involving EUR 500 million in the budget 2016 and EUR 300 million in 2015; underlines the persistent situation of crisis in the agricultural sector in several Member States; *concludes that the CAP fails to create the conditions for all farmers to make a decent living from their activity; and urges for the changes in the CAP in order to prioritize the Rural Development pillar as the only efficient strategy to fight against the chronic crisis in the rural areas;*

Or. en

Amendment 116
Eider Gardiazabal Rubial

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 20

Motion for a resolution

20. Recalls the various crises that European farmers have faced since the beginning of the current MFF, most notably the dairy sector crisis and the long-term negative effects on European farmers of the losses caused by the Russian embargo on agricultural products; highlights the budgetary impact of the emergency measures taken in response to these crises, involving EUR 500 million in the budget 2016 and EUR 300 million in 2015; underlines the persistent situation of crisis in the agricultural sector in several Member States;

Amendment

20. Recalls the various crises that European farmers have faced since the beginning of the current MFF, most notably the dairy sector crisis and the long-term negative effects on European farmers of the losses caused by the Russian embargo on agricultural products; highlights the budgetary impact of the emergency measures taken in response to these crises, involving EUR 500 million in the budget 2016 and EUR 300 million in 2015; underlines the persistent situation of crisis in the agricultural sector in several Member States; ***insists that CAP keeps the same level of funding under the MFF 2014-2020; is convinced that a diminished CAP would pose numerous risks and endanger territorial cohesion , in particular as regards the rural areas; is against any movement towards re-nationalization of agricultural policy which would create distortion in the market and unfair competition of farmers;***

Or. en

Amendment 117
Nils Torvalds, Gérard Deprez, Nedzhmi Ali

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 20

Motion for a resolution

20. Recalls the various crises that European farmers have faced since the

Amendment

20. Recalls the various crises that European farmers have faced since the

beginning of the current MFF, most notably the dairy sector crisis and the long-term negative effects on European farmers of the losses caused by the Russian embargo on agricultural products; highlights ***the budgetary impact of*** the emergency measures taken in response to these crises, involving EUR 500 million in the budget 2016 and EUR 300 million in 2015; underlines the persistent situation of crisis in the agricultural sector in several Member States;

beginning of the current MFF, most notably the dairy sector crisis and the long-term negative effects on European farmers of the losses caused by the Russian embargo on agricultural products; highlights ***that*** the emergency measures taken in response to these crises, involving EUR 500 million in the budget 2016 and EUR 300 million in 2015, ***where financed from the margins in Heading 2***; underlines the persistent situation of crisis in the agricultural sector in several Member States ***and is therefore of the opinion that future targeted measures are to be financed promptly and appropriately from within the EU budget***; recalls that ***the crisis is an effect of the foreign policy decision taken by the EU, and Russia, and stresses therefore that further emergency measures should not be funded by the CAP***;

Or. en

Amendment 118 **Anneli Jäätteenmäki**

Motion for a resolution **Paragraph 20**

Motion for a resolution

20. Recalls the various crises that European farmers have faced since the beginning of the current MFF, most notably the dairy sector crisis and the long-term negative effects on European farmers of the losses caused by the Russian embargo on agricultural products; highlights ***the budgetary impact of*** the emergency measures taken in response to these crises, involving EUR 500 million in the budget 2016 and EUR 300 million in 2015; underlines the persistent situation of crisis in the agricultural sector in several Member States;

Amendment

20. Recalls the various crises that European farmers have faced since the beginning of the current MFF, most notably the dairy sector crisis and the long-term negative effects on European farmers of the losses caused by the Russian embargo on agricultural products; highlights ***that*** the emergency measures taken in response to these crises, involving EUR 500 million in the budget 2016 and EUR 300 million in 2015, ***where financed from the margins in Heading 2***; underlines the persistent situation of crisis in the agricultural sector in several Member States ***and is therefore of the***

opinion that future targeted measures are to be financed promptly and appropriately from within the EU budget; recalls that the crisis is an effect of the foreign policy decision taken by the EU, and Russia, and stresses therefore that further emergency measures should not be funded by the CAP;

Or. en

Amendment 119

Younous Omarjee, Liadh Ní Riada

on behalf of the GUE/NGL Group

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 20

Motion for a resolution

20. Recalls the various crises that European farmers have faced since the beginning of the current MFF, most notably the dairy sector crisis and the long-term negative effects on European farmers of the losses caused by the Russian embargo on agricultural products; highlights the budgetary impact of the emergency measures taken in response to these crises, involving EUR 500 million in the budget 2016 and EUR 300 million in 2015; underlines the persistent situation of crisis in the agricultural sector in several Member States;

Amendment

20. Recalls the various crises that European farmers have faced since the beginning of the current MFF, most notably the dairy sector crisis and the long-term negative effects on European farmers of the losses caused by the Russian embargo on agricultural products, *free-trade agreements with many non-EU countries and the financialisation of global agricultural trade*; highlights the budgetary impact of the emergency measures taken in response to these crises, involving EUR 500 million in the budget 2016 and EUR 300 million in 2015; underlines the persistent situation of crisis in the agricultural sector in several Member States, *and calls for European agricultural programmes for small and medium-sized farmers to be stepped up*;

Or. fr

Amendment 120

Inese Vaidere

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 20

Motion for a resolution

20. Recalls the various crises that European farmers have faced since the beginning of the current MFF, most notably the dairy sector crisis and the long-term negative effects on European farmers of the losses caused by the Russian embargo on agricultural products; highlights the budgetary impact of the emergency measures taken in response to these crises, involving EUR 500 million in the budget 2016 and EUR 300 million in 2015; underlines the persistent situation of crisis in the agricultural sector in several Member States;

Amendment

20. Recalls the various crises that European farmers have faced since the beginning of the current MFF, most notably the dairy sector crisis and the long-term negative effects on European farmers of the losses caused by the Russian embargo on agricultural products; highlights the budgetary impact of the emergency measures taken in response to these crises, involving EUR 500 million in the budget 2016 and EUR 300 million in 2015; underlines the persistent situation of crisis in the agricultural sector in several Member States, ***therefore calls for further exceptional temporary targeted direct support measures for countries, which have suffered the major losses due to the Russian embargo and fall in market prices.***

Or. en

Amendment 121
Petri Sarvamaa

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 20

Motion for a resolution

20. Recalls the various crises that European farmers have faced since the beginning of the current MFF, most notably the dairy sector crisis and the long-term negative effects on European farmers of the losses caused by the Russian embargo on agricultural products; highlights the budgetary impact of the emergency measures taken in response to these crises, involving EUR 500 million in the budget 2016 and EUR 300 million in 2015; underlines the persistent situation of

Amendment

20. Recalls the various crises that European farmers have faced since the beginning of the current MFF, most notably the dairy sector crisis and the long-term negative effects on European farmers of the losses caused by the Russian embargo on agricultural products; highlights the budgetary impact of the emergency measures taken in response to these crises, involving EUR 500 million in the budget 2016 and EUR 300 million in 2015; underlines the persistent situation of

crisis in the agricultural sector in several Member States;

crisis in the agricultural sector in several Member States; ***considers it necessary to continue with adequate emergency measures in coordination with other action to alleviate the crisis of European agriculture;***

Or. en

Amendment 122

Raffaele Fitto

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 20

Motion for a resolution

20. Recalls the various crises that European farmers have faced since the beginning of the current MFF, most notably the dairy sector crisis and the long-term negative effects on European farmers of the losses caused by the Russian embargo on agricultural products; highlights the budgetary impact of the emergency measures taken in response to these crises, involving EUR 500 million in the budget 2016 and EUR 300 million in 2015; underlines the persistent situation of crisis in the agricultural sector in several Member States;

Amendment

20. Recalls the various crises that European farmers have faced since the beginning of the current MFF, most notably the dairy sector crisis and the long-term negative effects on European farmers of the losses caused by the Russian embargo on agricultural products; highlights the budgetary impact of the emergency measures taken in response to these crises, involving EUR 500 million in the budget 2016 and EUR 300 million in 2015; underlines the persistent situation of crisis in the agricultural sector in several Member States; ***stresses the need for new initiatives to promote the European farming sector;***

Or. it

Amendment 123

Richard Ashworth

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 20 – subparagraph 1 (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

Member States' fiscal positions

Amendment 124

Peter Jahr, Michel Dantin, Albert Deß, Monika Hohlmeier, Czesław Adam Siekierski, Norbert Lins, Herbert Dorfmann, Elisabeth Köstinger

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 20 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

20a. Stresses that the fixed ceilings for the CAP until 2020 entail much lower margins than in the previous MFF, while the sector faces more challenges; stresses in this regard, that any use of the margin must be exclusively to address the needs of the agricultural sector; warns that the current margin within the agriculture budget may prove insufficient, with market volatility, veterinary and phytosanitary risks and other unforeseen events making increasing demands on the budget to such an extent that the margin is expected to be depleted at the end of this planning period;

Or. en

Amendment 125

Eider Gardiazabal Rubial, Pavel Poc

Motion for a resolution

Subheading 7 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

Climate change and environmental challenges

Recalls that global warming represents an unprecedented challenge to the whole of mankind; is concerned that, according to the mid-term review of the EU biodiversity strategy, no significant progress has been made towards reaching the headline

target of halting biodiversity loss and ecosystem degradation in the EU by 2020; gives utmost importance to biodiversity protection and restoration in the EU; notes the significant needs for financing to climate action, biodiversity protection and the sustainable use of natural resources;

Or. en

Amendment 126
Richard Ashworth

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 20 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

20a. Welcomes the fact that a number of the programme countries have exited their relief programmes; notes, however, that Bulgaria, Croatia, France, Italy and Portugal remain in the excessive imbalances category without triggering the Excessive Imbalances Procedure and Finland, Germany, Ireland, The Netherlands, Spain, Sweden and Slovenia are found to experience imbalances^{1b};

1b

http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/economic_governance/macroeconomic_imbalance_procedure/index_en.htm

Or. en

Amendment 127
Ernest Maragall
on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 20 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

20a. *Regrets that the CAP fails to support a number of farming systems that contribute to the EU biodiversity targets; deplores that public money is used inefficiently in pursuit of the Union's goals in the field of the environment; calls for better use of MFF heading 2 funds to the benefit of farmers, society and the environment;*

Or. en

Amendment 128

Younous Omarjee, Liadh Ní Riada, Xabier Benito Ziluaga
on behalf of the GUE/NGL Group

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 20 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

20a. *Calls for an early response to be made to the impact of the abolition of sugar quotas in 2017, which is likely to undermine the sugar cane sector in the outermost regions, and for provision to be made for support measures for small-scale sugar cane planters in those regions;*

Or. fr

Amendment 129

Nils Torvalds, Gérard Deprez, Nedzhmi Ali, Anneli Jäätteenmäki

Motion for a resolution
Subheading 7 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

The Paris Agreement on climate change

Amendment 130

Nils Torvalds, Anneli Jäätteenmäki, Gérard Deprez, Nedzhmi Ali

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 20 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

20a. Underlines that the agreement reached on 12 December 2015 in Paris by the 196 parties to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change is a universal, binding, dynamic and differentiated agreement aimed at facing the challenge of climate change; recalls that the EU successfully steered the efforts to reach the Paris Agreement; calls on the Commission to present its first evaluation of the possible impact of the COP21 agreement on the EU budget in due time for the revision, including an assessment on which climate change related action are being funded and whether these guarantee that the targets under the Paris Agreement will be met; calls, in this regard, on the Commission to guarantee that the mechanism of climate action mainstreaming is fully operationalized; further notices that under the Paris Agreement, EU funding needs to be allocated for supporting climate action in developing countries and asks the Commission to address it in the MFF review/revision;

Or. en

Amendment 131

Richard Ashworth

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 20 b (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

20b. *Notes that the United Kingdom, Spain, Slovenia, Ireland, Croatia, Cyprus, France, Portugal and Greece are in Excessive Deficit Procedure^{1c} ;*

1c

http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/economic_governance/macroeconomic_imbalance_procedure/index_en.htm

Or. en

Amendment 132
Richard Ashworth

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 20 c (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

20c. *Notes that approximately 70% of the EU budget is made up of Own Resources based on GNI; underlines that Member States who are struggling to reduce their deficits are prioritising spending on essential services, such as welfare, healthcare and defence; believes that all institutions must take this into account during the mid-term review, particularly before considering any increase the MFF ceilings from the amounts agreed in 2013;*

Or. en

Amendment 133
Richard Ashworth

Motion for a resolution
Subheading 7 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

Public Opinion

Or. en

Amendment 134
Richard Ashworth

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 20 d (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

20d. Believes it to be essential that the views of EU citizens are taken into account during the mid-term review, and possible revision of the MFF; highlights that a plurality of EU citizens are both opposed to an increase in the Union's budget, and believe the budget gives poor value for money^{1d} ; notes that in the Czech Republic, Sweden, Germany, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Denmark, Lithuania, Latvia, Slovakia, the United Kingdom, France, Finland, Italy, Spain, Slovenia, Belgium, and Austria more people are opposed to increasing the size of the Union's budget than are in favour;

^{1d} Eurobarometer, Spring 2015:
http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/eb/eb83/eb83_budget_en.pdf

Or. en

Amendment 135
Ernest Maragall
on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Motion for a resolution
Subheading 8

Payments backlog

Cohesion policy

20a. Underlines the important contribution of Cohesion Policy in achieving the target of dedicating 20% of the EU budget to climate action as set out in the Conclusions of the European Council from 7/8 February 2013 on the MFF; Emphasises the need to take into account the agreements of COP 21 and to accelerate and improve effectiveness of climate spending whilst underlining the huge potential of Cohesion Policy in boosting the EU's efforts for climate protection; Invites the Commission and the Member States to increase their commitment and dedicate 30% of the current EU budget to climate action;

20b. Invites the Commission to take into account the extraordinary efforts made by Member States and regions in providing appropriate reception conditions and integrating asylum seekers and other migrants, and to explore the possibility, in compliance with the expenditure ceilings set out in the MFF, of providing additional assistance and flexibility within the ESI funds in order to support such Member States and regions, including those situated on EU external borders, when reviewing the functioning of the MFF, without decreasing commitment or payment appropriations under heading 1b and without prejudice to the adjustment of the cohesion policy budget, pursuant to Article 7 of the Regulation No 1311/2013;

20c. Recalls its opposition on introducing macroeconomic conditionalities in Cohesion Policy 2014-2020; Strongly rejects any intention to attach further conditions or to extend the scope of its application;

20d. Stresses that grants are an effective form of support in many areas of public intervention; recognises the potential of

financial instruments as a form of support for ESI Funds; calls for a more simplified use of grants and financial instruments in future; Notes the lack of evidence on the outcomes and results achieved by financial instruments and the loose link of those financial instruments to overarching objectives and priorities of the EU; Considers necessary to further strengthening the accountability, transparency and result-orientation of financial instruments;

20e. Believes that result-orientation in Cohesion Policy should be further strengthened; Underlines the urgent need to increase synergies with other EU policies on competitiveness, in particular in the field of research and development, ICT, renewable energies and SMEs in view of increasing the exploitation rate of EU R&D results, creating new high-quality jobs and maintaining existing ones and promoting the green economy; Calls on the Commission to assess options for increasing the synergetic use of different EU instruments;

Or. en

Amendment 136
Ernest Maragall
on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Motion for a resolution
Subheading 8 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

Payments backlog

Or. en

Amendment 137
Siegfried Mureşan

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 21

Motion for a resolution

21. Recalls the build-up over the previous (2007-2013) MFF of a backlog of unpaid bills, which rose from a ‘normal’ level of EUR 5 billion at end 2010 to EUR 11 billion at end 2011, EUR 16 billion at end 2012, and EUR 23.4 billion at end 2013; warns that this backlog has spilled over into the current (2014-2020) MFF, reaching an unprecedented peak of EUR 24.7 billion at the end of 2014; stresses that, at the insistent request of Parliament, a payment plan has been agreed with the aim of reducing the backlog of outstanding cohesion policy-related payment claims for 2007-2013 to EUR 2 billion by the end of 2016; points out that at least EUR 8.2 billion of unpaid bills were identified at the end of 2015 for 2007-2013 in the field of cohesion policy, a figure which is expected to fall below EUR 2 billion by the end of 2016; notes that this decrease provides merely temporary relief as it is only the result of submissions of payable claims for both the 2007-2013 and 2014-2020 programmes being less than announced; regrets that no action has been undertaken to address the ‘hidden backlog’ identified under other headings;

Amendment

21. Recalls the build-up over the previous (2007-2013) MFF of a backlog of unpaid bills, which rose from a ‘normal’ level of EUR 5 billion at end 2010 to EUR 11 billion at end 2011, EUR 16 billion at end 2012, and EUR 23.4 billion at end 2013; warns that this backlog has spilled over into the current (2014-2020) MFF, reaching an unprecedented peak of EUR 24.7 billion at the end of 2014; stresses that, at the insistent request of Parliament, a payment plan has been agreed with the aim of reducing the backlog of outstanding cohesion policy-related payment claims for 2007-2013 to EUR 2 billion by the end of 2016; points out that at least EUR 8.2 billion of unpaid bills were identified at the end of 2015 for 2007-2013 in the field of cohesion policy, a figure which is expected to fall below EUR 2 billion by the end of 2016; notes that this decrease provides merely temporary relief as it is only the result of submissions of payable claims for both the 2007-2013 and 2014-2020 programmes being less than announced; regrets that no action has been undertaken to address the ‘hidden backlog’ identified under other headings; ***draws the attention that the situation of 2012-2014 might recur at the end of the current MFF if no concrete measures are taken;***

Or. en

Amendment 138

Gérard Deprez, Louis Michel, Nils Torvalds, Jean Arthuis, Nedzhmi Ali

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 21

Motion for a resolution

21. Recalls the build-up over the previous (2007-2013) MFF of a backlog of unpaid bills, which rose from a ‘normal’ level of EUR 5 billion at end 2010 to EUR 11 billion at end 2011, EUR 16 billion at end 2012, and EUR 23.4 billion at end 2013; warns that this backlog has spilled over into the current (2014-2020) MFF, reaching an unprecedented peak of EUR 24.7 billion at the end of 2014; stresses that, at the insistent request of Parliament, a payment plan has been agreed with the aim of reducing the backlog of outstanding cohesion policy-related payment claims for 2007-2013 to EUR 2 billion by the end of 2016; points out that at least EUR 8.2 billion of unpaid bills were identified at the end of 2015 for 2007-2013 in the field of cohesion policy, a figure which is expected to fall below EUR 2 billion by the end of 2016; notes that this decrease provides merely temporary relief as it is only the result of submissions of payable claims for both the 2007-2013 and 2014-2020 programmes being less than announced; regrets that no action has been undertaken to address the ‘hidden backlog’ identified under other headings;

Amendment

21. Recalls the build-up over the previous (2007-2013) MFF of a backlog of unpaid bills, which rose from a ‘normal’ level of EUR 5 billion at end 2010 to ***unprecedented levels of*** EUR 11 billion at end 2011, EUR 16 billion at end 2012, and EUR 23.4 billion at end 2013; warns that this backlog has spilled over into the current (2014-2020) MFF, reaching an unprecedented peak of EUR 24.7 billion at the end of 2014; stresses that, at the insistent request of Parliament, a payment plan has been agreed with the aim of reducing the backlog of outstanding cohesion policy-related payment claims for 2007-2013 to EUR 2 billion by the end of 2016; points out that at least EUR 8.2 billion of unpaid bills were identified at the end of 2015 for 2007-2013 in the field of cohesion policy, a figure which is expected to fall below EUR 2 billion by the end of 2016; notes that this decrease provides merely temporary relief as it is only the result of submissions of payable claims for both the 2007-2013 and 2014-2020 programmes being less than announced; regrets that no action has been undertaken to address the ‘hidden backlog’ identified under other headings;

Or. en

Amendment 139

Jens Geier

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 21

Motion for a resolution

21. Recalls the build-up over the previous (2007-2013) MFF of a backlog of unpaid bills, which rose from a ‘***normal***’ level of EUR 5 billion at end 2010 to EUR

Amendment

21. Recalls the build-up over the previous (2007-2013) MFF of a backlog of unpaid bills, which rose from a level of EUR 5 billion at end 2010 to EUR 11

11 billion at end 2011, EUR 16 billion at end 2012, and EUR 23.4 billion at end 2013; warns that this backlog has spilled over into the current (2014-2020) MFF, reaching an unprecedented peak of EUR 24.7 billion at the end of 2014; stresses that, at the insistent request of Parliament, a payment plan has been agreed with the aim of reducing the backlog of outstanding cohesion policy-related payment claims for 2007-2013 to EUR 2 billion by the end of 2016; points out that at least EUR 8.2 billion of unpaid bills were identified at the end of 2015 for 2007-2013 in the field of cohesion policy, a figure which is expected to fall below EUR 2 billion by the end of 2016; notes that this decrease provides merely temporary relief as it is only the result of submissions of payable claims for both the 2007-2013 and 2014-2020 programmes being less than announced; regrets that no action has been undertaken to address the 'hidden backlog' identified under other headings;

billion at end 2011, EUR 16 billion at end 2012, and EUR 23.4 billion at end 2013; warns that this backlog has spilled over into the current (2014-2020) MFF, reaching an unprecedented peak of EUR 24.7 billion at the end of 2014; stresses that, at the insistent request of Parliament, a payment plan has been agreed with the aim of reducing the backlog of outstanding cohesion policy-related payment claims for 2007-2013 to **a 'normal' level of EUR 2 billion** by the end of 2016; points out that at least EUR 8.2 billion of unpaid bills were identified at the end of 2015 for 2007-2013 in the field of cohesion policy, a figure which is expected to fall below EUR 2 billion by the end of 2016; notes that this decrease provides merely temporary relief as it is only the result of submissions of payable claims for both the 2007-2013 and 2014-2020 programmes being less than announced; regrets that no action has been undertaken to address the 'hidden backlog' identified under other headings;

Or. en

Amendment 140 **Eider Gardiazabal Rubial**

Motion for a resolution **Paragraph 21**

Motion for a resolution

21. Recalls the build-up over the previous (2007-2013) MFF of a backlog of unpaid bills, which rose from a '**normal**' level of EUR 5 billion at end 2010 to EUR 11 billion at end 2011, EUR 16 billion at end 2012, and EUR 23.4 billion at end 2013; warns that this backlog has spilled over into the current (2014-2020) MFF, reaching an unprecedented peak of EUR 24.7 billion at the end of 2014; stresses that, at the insistent request of Parliament,

Amendment

21. Recalls the build-up over the previous (2007-2013) MFF of a backlog of unpaid bills, which rose from a level of EUR 5 billion at end 2010 to EUR 11 billion at end 2011, EUR 16 billion at end 2012, and EUR 23.4 billion at end 2013; warns that this backlog has spilled over into the current (2014-2020) MFF, reaching an unprecedented peak of EUR 24.7 billion at the end of 2014; stresses that, at the insistent request of Parliament,

a payment plan has been agreed with the aim of reducing the backlog of outstanding cohesion policy-related payment claims for 2007-2013 to EUR 2 billion by the end of 2016; points out that at least EUR 8.2 billion of unpaid bills were identified at the end of 2015 for 2007-2013 in the field of cohesion policy, a figure which is expected to fall below EUR 2 billion by the end of 2016; notes that this decrease provides merely temporary relief as it is only the result of submissions of payable claims for both the 2007-2013 and 2014-2020 programmes being less than announced; regrets that no action has been undertaken to address the ‘hidden backlog’ identified under other headings;

a payment plan has been agreed with the aim of reducing the backlog of outstanding cohesion policy-related payment claims for 2007-2013 to a *"normal" level of* EUR 2 billion by the end of 2016; points out that at least EUR 8.2 billion of unpaid bills were identified at the end of 2015 for 2007-2013 in the field of cohesion policy, a figure which is expected to fall below EUR 2 billion by the end of 2016; notes that this decrease provides merely temporary relief as it is only the result of submissions of payable claims for both the 2007-2013 and 2014-2020 programmes being less than announced; regrets that no action has been undertaken to address the ‘hidden backlog’ identified under other headings;

Or. en

Amendment 141
Marco Zanni, Marco Valli

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 21 – subparagraph 1 (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

considers it essential to consider various options with regard to payments, including a freeze on future low-priority programme commitments pending the settlement of all outstanding arrears;

Or. it

Amendment 142
Eider Gardiazabal Rubial, Jean-Paul Denanot

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 22 – introductory part

Motion for a resolution

22. Regrets that the consequences of this payment crisis have been severe, affecting beneficiaries of the EU budget such as students, universities, SMEs **and researchers**, as well as local and regional authorities; recalls, in particular, the dramatic shortage of payments in the field of humanitarian operations in 2014, which negatively affected the EU's life-saving operations; recalls that the Commission had to resort to 'mitigating measures' such as reducing pre-financing percentages and postponing calls for proposals/tenders and related contracting; recalls that an artificial slowdown in the implementation of the new 2014-2020 programmes occurred owing to the general lack of payments, an example being an artificial delay relating to EUR 1 billion worth of calls for proposals under Horizon 2020 in 2014, which aimed at ensuring that payments would fall due in 2015 rather than in 2014; stresses, furthermore, that penalties for late payments have been charged to the EU budget, reaching some EUR 3 million in both 2014 and 2015;

Amendment

22. Regrets that the consequences of this payment crisis have been severe, affecting beneficiaries of the EU budget such as students, universities, SMEs, **researchers and project leaders**, as well as local and regional authorities; recalls, in particular, the dramatic shortage of payments in the field of humanitarian operations in 2014, which negatively affected the EU's life-saving operations; recalls that the Commission had to resort to 'mitigating measures' such as reducing pre-financing percentages and postponing calls for proposals/tenders and related contracting; recalls that an artificial slowdown in the implementation of the new 2014-2020 programmes occurred owing to the general lack of payments, an example being an artificial delay relating to EUR 1 billion worth of calls for proposals under Horizon 2020 in 2014, which aimed at ensuring that payments would fall due in 2015 rather than in 2014; stresses, furthermore, that penalties for late payments have been charged to the EU budget, reaching some EUR 3 million in both 2014 and 2015;

Or. en

Amendment 143

Ernest Maragall

on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 22 – introductory part

Motion for a resolution

22. Regrets that the consequences of this payment crisis have been severe, affecting beneficiaries of the EU budget such as students, universities, SMEs and researchers, as well as local and regional

Amendment

22. Regrets that the consequences of this payment crisis have been severe, affecting beneficiaries of the EU budget such as students, universities, SMEs and researchers, **NGOs**, as well as local and

authorities; recalls, in particular, the dramatic shortage of payments in the field of humanitarian operations in 2014, which negatively affected the EU's life-saving operations; recalls that the Commission had to resort to 'mitigating measures' such as reducing pre-financing percentages and postponing calls for proposals/tenders and related contracting; recalls that an artificial slowdown in the implementation of the new 2014-2020 programmes occurred owing to the general lack of payments, an example being an artificial delay relating to EUR 1 billion worth of calls for proposals under Horizon 2020 in 2014, which aimed at ensuring that payments would fall due in 2015 rather than in 2014; stresses, furthermore, that penalties for late payments have been charged to the EU budget, reaching some EUR 3 million in both 2014 and 2015;

regional authorities; recalls, in particular, the dramatic shortage of payments in the field of humanitarian operations in 2014, which negatively affected the EU's life-saving operations; recalls that the Commission had to resort to 'mitigating measures' such as reducing pre-financing percentages and postponing calls for proposals/tenders and related contracting; recalls that an artificial slowdown in the implementation of the new 2014-2020 programmes occurred owing to the general lack of payments, an example being an artificial delay relating to EUR 1 billion worth of calls for proposals under Horizon 2020 in 2014, which aimed at ensuring that payments would fall due in 2015 rather than in 2014; stresses, furthermore, that penalties for late payments have been charged to the EU budget, reaching some EUR 3 million in both 2014 and 2015;

Or. en

Amendment 144 **Victor Negrescu**

Motion for a resolution **Paragraph 22 – introductory part**

Motion for a resolution

22. Regrets that the consequences of this payment crisis have been severe, affecting beneficiaries of the EU budget such as students, universities, SMEs **and researchers**, as well as local and regional authorities; recalls, in particular, the dramatic shortage of payments in the field of humanitarian operations in 2014, which negatively affected the EU's life-saving operations; recalls that the Commission had to resort to 'mitigating measures' such as reducing pre-financing percentages and postponing calls for proposals/tenders and related contracting; recalls that an artificial slowdown in the implementation of the

Amendment

22. Regrets that the consequences of this payment crisis have been severe, affecting beneficiaries of the EU budget such as students, universities, SMEs, **researchers and NGOs**, as well as local and regional authorities; recalls, in particular, the dramatic shortage of payments in the field of humanitarian operations in 2014, which negatively affected the EU's life-saving operations; recalls that the Commission had to resort to 'mitigating measures' such as reducing pre-financing percentages and postponing calls for proposals/tenders and related contracting; recalls that an artificial

new 2014-2020 programmes occurred owing to the general lack of payments, an example being an artificial delay relating to EUR 1 billion worth of calls for proposals under Horizon 2020 in 2014, which aimed at ensuring that payments would fall due in 2015 rather than in 2014; stresses, furthermore, that penalties for late payments have been charged to the EU budget, reaching some EUR 3 million in both 2014 and 2015;

slowdown in the implementation of the new 2014-2020 programmes occurred owing to the general lack of payments, an example being an artificial delay relating to EUR 1 billion worth of calls for proposals under Horizon 2020 in 2014, which aimed at ensuring that payments would fall due in 2015 rather than in 2014; stresses, furthermore, that penalties for late payments have been charged to the EU budget, reaching some EUR 3 million in both 2014 and 2015;

Or. en

Amendment 145
Richard Ashworth

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 22 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

22a. *Underlines that reprioritising funds from poorly performing programmes to better performing programmes, or to areas where there is a genuine need, should be the first consideration when identifying new areas of spending;*

Or. en

Amendment 146
Ernest Maragall
on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 23

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

23. Stresses that, in order to secure the additional appropriations that have been needed to respond to crises or to finance

23. Stresses that, in order to secure the additional appropriations that have been needed to respond to crises or to finance

new political priorities since 2014, the budgetary authority has approved a substantial mobilisation of the flexibility provisions and special instruments included in the MFF regulation, after exhausting all available margins; recalls that several of those provisions resulted directly from proposals of the European Parliament, which ranked the call for maximum possible flexibility as one of its key demands in the MFF negotiations;

new political priorities since 2014, the budgetary authority has approved a substantial mobilisation of the flexibility provisions and special instruments included in the MFF regulation, after exhausting all available margins; recalls that several of those provisions resulted directly from proposals of the European Parliament, which ranked the call for maximum possible flexibility as one of its key demands in the MFF negotiations; ***Points out that the Flexibility provisions were sharply reduced by the Council (-48%) during the MFF negotiations;***

Or. en

Amendment 147
Wim van de Camp

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 23

Motion for a resolution

23. Stresses that, in order to secure the additional appropriations that have been needed to respond to crises or to finance new political priorities since 2014, the budgetary authority has approved a substantial mobilisation of the flexibility provisions and special instruments included in the MFF regulation, after exhausting all available margins; recalls that several of those provisions resulted directly from proposals of the European Parliament, which ranked the call for maximum possible flexibility as one of its key demands in the MFF negotiations;

Amendment

23. Stresses that, in order to secure the additional appropriations that have been needed to respond to crises or to finance new political priorities since 2014, the budgetary authority has approved a substantial mobilisation of the flexibility provisions and special instruments included in the MFF regulation, after exhausting all available margins; recalls that several of those provisions resulted directly from proposals of the European Parliament, which ranked the call for maximum possible flexibility as one of its key demands in the MFF negotiations; ***stresses that the MFF budget has to match with the political and strategic priorities of the EU policies;***

Or. en

Amendment 148
Marco Zanni, Marco Valli

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 23 – subparagraph 1 (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

considers that, for the funding of non-budgeted initiatives, the first option should always be the redeployment of appropriations from existing non-priority budget lines, taking care to avoid waste and mismanagement;

Or. it

Amendment 149
Richard Ashworth

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 23 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

23a. Highlights Point 8 of the 2013 Interinstitutional Agreement^{1f}, which emphasises that the institutions should ensure sufficient margins are left available beneath the ceilings for the purposes of sound financial management; considers maintaining suitable margins under the budget headings to be the most fiscally responsible means of ingraining flexibility within the budget, enabling the EU to better react to unforeseen circumstances;

^{1f} OJ C 373, 20.12.2013, p. 2.

Or. en

Amendment 150
Gérard Deprez, Louis Michel, Nils Torvalds, Jean Arthuis, Nedzhmi Ali

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 24

Motion for a resolution

24. Notes, in particular, that the special instruments were mobilised to tackle the refugee and migration crisis (full amount of the Flexibility Instrument exhausted in 2016 - EUR 1 530 million; Emergency Aid Reserve in 2016 - EUR 150 million), the payments shortage problem (Contingency Margin activated in 2015 - EUR 3.16 billion), and the financing of the EFSI Guarantee Fund (full use of Global Margin for Commitments 2014 - EUR 543 million); recalls that the decision to mobilise the Contingency Margin in payments is coupled with a decrease in the payment ceilings for the years 2018 to 2020;

Amendment

24. Notes, in particular, that the special instruments were mobilised to tackle the refugee and migration crisis (full amount of the Flexibility Instrument exhausted in 2016 - EUR 1 530 million; Emergency Aid Reserve in 2016 - EUR 150 million), the payments shortage problem (Contingency Margin activated in 2015 - EUR 3.16 billion), and the financing of the EFSI Guarantee Fund (full use of Global Margin for Commitments 2014 - EUR 543 million); recalls that the decision to mobilise the Contingency Margin in payments is coupled with a decrease in the payment ceilings for the years 2018 to 2020, ***at the same time when the payment needs should reach their normal peak and when payment ceilings will also face a stronger pressure with the cumulated impact of the slow start of programmes under shared management and of the Youth Employment Initiative, as well as the successful frontloading of COSME, Horizon 2020 and Erasmus + and the effect of frontloading in favour of Greece, notwithstanding the impact of the actions taken in the frame of the migration and refugee crisis;***

Or. en

Amendment 151
Reimer Böge, Monika Hohlmeier

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 24

Motion for a resolution

24. Notes, in particular, that the special instruments were mobilised to tackle the

Amendment

24. Notes, in particular, that the special instruments were mobilised to tackle the

refugee and migration crisis (full amount of the Flexibility Instrument exhausted in 2016 - EUR 1 530 million; Emergency Aid Reserve in 2016 - EUR 150 million), the payments shortage problem (Contingency Margin activated in 2015 - EUR 3.16 billion), and the financing of the EFSI Guarantee Fund (full use of Global Margin for Commitments 2014 - EUR 543 million); recalls that the decision to mobilise the Contingency Margin in payments is coupled with a decrease in the payment ceilings for the years 2018 to 2020;

refugee and migration crisis (full amount of the Flexibility Instrument exhausted in 2016 - EUR 1 530 million; Emergency Aid Reserve in 2016 - EUR 150 million), the payments shortage problem (Contingency Margin activated in 2015 - EUR 3.16 billion), and the financing of the EFSI Guarantee Fund (full use of Global Margin for Commitments 2014 - EUR 543 million); recalls that the decision to mobilise the Contingency Margin in payments is coupled with a decrease in the *already tight* payment ceilings for the years 2018 to 2020, *which will put additional pressure on the budget towards the end of the period*;

Or. en

Amendment 152 **Richard Ashworth**

Motion for a resolution **Paragraph 25**

Motion for a resolution

25. Anticipates that *any* further needs *that* arise *with* relation to the migration and refugee crisis in 2016, including the tranche of EUR 200 million for the new instrument to provide emergency support within the Union, should *result in the mobilisation* of the *Contingency Margin as soon as necessary*; *recalls* that no more margins are available under Heading 3, while the Flexibility Instrument has already been used up in its entirety for this year;

Amendment

25. Anticipates that further needs *could* arise *in* relation to the migration and refugee crisis in 2016, including the tranche of EUR 200 million for the new instrument to provide emergency support within the Union; *considers the mobilisation of the Contingency Margin to be an instrument of last resort, and that its mobilisation should be fully offset against the margins in one or more headings for the current or future financial years in accordance with Article 13(3) of the MFF Regulation^{1g} ; furthermore, considers its mobilisation should only be considered after all other avenues or reallocation and redeployment from existing budget lines have been explored*; *regrets* that no more margins are available under Heading 3, while the Flexibility Instrument has already been

used up in its entirety for this year;

^{1g} OJ L 347, 20.12.2013, p. 884.

Or. en

Amendment 153

Monika Hohlmeier, Reimer Böge

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 25

Motion for a resolution

25. Anticipates that any further needs that arise with relation to the migration and refugee crisis in 2016, including the tranche of EUR 200 million for the new instrument to provide emergency support within the Union, should result in the mobilisation of the Contingency Margin as soon as necessary; recalls that no more margins are available under Heading 3, while the Flexibility Instrument has already been used up in its entirety for this year;

Amendment

25. Anticipates that any further needs that arise with relation to the migration and refugee crisis in 2016, including the tranche of EUR 200 million for the new instrument to provide emergency support within the Union, ***the necessary staff increases for the migration-related agencies required in order to tackle the on-going refugee and migration crisis and implement the measures reforming the Common European Asylum System, as well as the proposal for the establishment of the European Border and Coast Guard Agency***, should result in the mobilisation of the Contingency Margin as soon as necessary; recalls that no more margins are available under Heading 3, while the Flexibility Instrument has already been used up in its entirety for this year;

Or. en

Amendment 154

Eider Gardiazabal Rubial, Paul Tang

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 25

Motion for a resolution

25. Anticipates that any further needs that arise with relation to the migration and refugee crisis in 2016, including the tranche of EUR 200 million for the new instrument to provide emergency support within the Union, should result in the mobilisation of the Contingency Margin as soon as necessary; recalls that no more margins are available under Heading 3, while the Flexibility Instrument has already been used up in its entirety for this year;

Amendment

25. Anticipates that any further needs that arise with relation to the migration and refugee crisis in 2016, including the tranche of EUR 200 million for the new instrument to provide emergency support within the Union, should result in the mobilisation of the Contingency Margin as soon as necessary; recalls that no more margins are available under Heading 3, while the Flexibility Instrument has already been used up in its entirety for this year; ***suggests to investigate further opportunities for flexibility for emerging challenges, including easier access to unspent margins for any budget line, so that these margins can be redeployed for emergencies in other headings;***

Or. en

Amendment 155
Richard Ashworth

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 26

Motion for a resolution

26. Recalls that the legislative flexibility, as enshrined in Point 17 of the Interinstitutional Agreement (IIA), allows for an ***increase*** in the overall envelope of programmes adopted by the ordinary legislative procedure of up to 10 % over the seven-year period; notes that ‘new, objective, long-term circumstances’ allow the budgetary authority to depart even further from the original envelope; welcomes the fact that this provision ***has already been used to allow the Union to respond to unforeseen events by considerably increasing the original annual allocations of programmes such as AMIF;***

Amendment

26. Recalls that the legislative flexibility, as enshrined in Point 17 of the Interinstitutional Agreement (IIA), allows for an ***adjustment*** in the overall envelope of programmes adopted by the ordinary legislative procedure of up to 10 % over the seven-year period; notes that ‘new, objective, long-term circumstances’, ***with account being taken of the results obtained from implementing the programme, in particular on the basis of assessments^{1h}***, allow the budgetary authority to depart even further from the original envelope; welcomes the fact that this provision ***stipulates that any increase resulting from such variation shall***

remain beneath the existing ceiling for the heading concerned;

^{1h} OJ C 373, 20.12.2013, p. 3.

Or. en

Amendment 156

Gérard Deprez, Louis Michel, Nils Torvalds, Jean Arthuis, Nedzhmi Ali

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 26

Motion for a resolution

26. Recalls that the legislative flexibility, as enshrined in Point 17 of the Interinstitutional Agreement (IIA), allows for an increase in the overall envelope of programmes adopted by the ordinary legislative procedure of up to 10 % over the seven-year period; notes that ‘new, objective, long-term circumstances’ allow the budgetary authority to depart even further from the original envelope; welcomes the fact that this provision has already been used to allow the Union to respond to unforeseen events by considerably increasing the original annual allocations of programmes such as AMIF;

Amendment

26. Recalls that the legislative flexibility, as enshrined in Point 17 of the Interinstitutional Agreement (IIA), allows for an increase in the overall envelope of programmes adopted by the ordinary legislative procedure of up to +/- 10 % over the seven-year period; notes that ‘new, objective, long-term circumstances’ allow the budgetary authority to depart even further from the original envelope; welcomes the fact that this provision has already been used to allow the Union to respond to unforeseen events by considerably increasing the original annual allocations of programmes such as AMIF;

Or. en

Amendment 157

Ernest Maragall

on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 26 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

26a. Recalls that global warming represents an unprecedented challenge to

the whole of mankind, bringing major threats as well as major opportunities of innovations if sufficient resources are dedicated to climate research;

Or. en

Amendment 158
Ernest Maragall
on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 26 b (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

26b. Underlines that the European Union successfully led international efforts to reach the ambitious climate agreement agreed in Paris in 2015; therefore considers that the Union should dedicate sufficient resources to fulfilling its own commitments and objectives in the field of climate action;

Or. en

Amendment 159
Richard Ashworth

Motion for a resolution
Subheading II

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

II. Mid-term revision of the MFF – *an imperative requirement*

II. Mid-term revision of the MFF

Or. en

Amendment 160
José Manuel Fernandes

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 27

Motion for a resolution

27. Is convinced, on the basis of the above analysis, that the review of the functioning of the current MFF entails the conclusion that a genuine mid-term revision of the MFF as provided for in the MFF Regulation is absolutely indispensable if the Union is to effectively confront a number of challenges while fulfilling its political objectives; recalls that delivering on the Europe 2020 strategy remains the main priority to be supported by the EU budget;

Amendment

27. Is convinced, on the basis of the above analysis, that the review of the functioning of the current MFF entails the conclusion that a genuine mid-term revision of the MFF as provided for in the MFF Regulation is absolutely indispensable if the Union is to effectively confront a number of challenges while fulfilling its political objectives; recalls that delivering on the Europe 2020 strategy remains the main priority to be supported by the EU budget; ***stresses the need for the EU budget to be endowed with adequate resources to effectively ensure investments conducive to growth and jobs, achieve economic, social and territorial cohesion and promote solidarity;***

Or. en

Amendment 161

Ernest Maragall

on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 27

Motion for a resolution

27. Is convinced, on the basis of the above analysis, that the review of the functioning of the current MFF entails the conclusion that a genuine mid-term revision of the MFF as provided for in the MFF Regulation is absolutely indispensable if the Union is to effectively confront a number of challenges while fulfilling its political objectives; recalls that delivering on the Europe 2020 strategy remains the main priority to be supported by the EU budget;

Amendment

27. Is convinced, on the basis of the above analysis, that the review of the functioning of the current MFF entails the conclusion that a genuine mid-term revision of the MFF as provided for in the MFF Regulation is absolutely indispensable if the Union is to effectively confront a number of challenges while fulfilling its political objectives; recalls that delivering on the Europe 2020 strategy remains the main priority to be supported by the EU budget; ***challenges the Council, in case it does not share this approach, to***

clearly identify which of its political priorities or projects could be dropped altogether, despite their proven European added value;

Or. en

Amendment 162
Richard Ashworth

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 27

Motion for a resolution

27. *Is convinced, on the basis of the above analysis, that the review of the functioning of the current MFF entails the conclusion that a genuine mid-term revision of the MFF as provided for in the MFF Regulation is absolutely indispensable if the Union is to effectively confront a number of challenges while fulfilling its political objectives*; recalls that delivering on the Europe 2020 strategy remains the main priority to be supported by the EU budget;

Amendment

27. *Believes* that the *mid-term* review of the functioning of the current MFF *will provide the basis for deciding whether a legislative proposal on a revision of the MFF is appropriate*; recalls that delivering on the Europe 2020 strategy remains the main priority to be supported by the EU budget;

Or. en

Amendment 163
Christofer Fjellner

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 27

Motion for a resolution

27. Is convinced, on the basis of the above analysis, that the review of the functioning of the current MFF *entails the conclusion that a genuine mid-term revision of the MFF as provided for in the MFF Regulation is absolutely indispensable if the Union is to effectively*

Amendment

27. Is convinced, on the basis of the above analysis, that the review of the functioning of the current MFF *affords a major opportunity to prioritise EU spending so as to redistribute funds to areas where the EU is clearly contributing added value, such as research and*

confront a number of challenges while fulfilling its political objectives; recalls that delivering on the Europe 2020 strategy remains the main priority to be supported by the EU budget;

development, competitiveness and the internal market, and environmental protection; recalls that delivering on the Europe 2020 strategy remains the main priority to be supported by the EU budget;

Or. sv

Amendment 164

Peter Jahr, Michel Dantin, Reimer Böge, Albert Deß, Monika Hohlmeier, Czesław Adam Siekierski, Norbert Lins, Elisabeth Köstinger, Herbert Dorfmann

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 27 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

27a. *Insists that the amounts for direct payments in Heading 2 should be left untouched; points out that this is crucial for the income situation of many farmers, particular in times of crises, and that the absorption rate per year is almost 100%;*

Or. en

Amendment 165

Younous Omarjee, Liadh Ní Riada, Xabier Benito Ziluaga
on behalf of the GUE/NGL Group

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 28

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

28. Urges the Commission, when preparing its legislative proposal, to take into consideration the following demands of Parliament regarding changes to the MFF Regulation, with respect both to the figures and to several provisions relating to the functioning of the MFF which need to be applicable already for the current MFF;

28. Urges the Commission, when preparing its legislative proposal, to take into consideration the following demands of Parliament regarding changes to the MFF Regulation, with respect both to the figures and to ***the raising of ceilings and*** to several provisions relating to the functioning of the MFF which need to be applicable already for the current MFF;

Amendment 166
Richard Ashworth

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 28

Motion for a resolution

28. Urges the Commission, *when preparing its* legislative proposal, to take into consideration the *following* demands of Parliament regarding changes to the MFF Regulation, *with respect both to the figures and to several provisions relating to the functioning of the MFF* which *need to be applicable already for the current MFF*;

Amendment

28. Urges the Commission, *if it decides that a* legislative proposal *on revision is appropriate*, to take into consideration the demands of *both Council and* Parliament *as the budgetary authority* regarding changes to the MFF Regulation, *in particular, the need to respect the ceilings* which *were agreed to in 2013*;

Or. en

Amendment 167
Younous Omarjee, Liadh Ní Riada, Xabier Benito Ziluaga
on behalf of the GUE/NGL Group

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 28 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

28a. Points out that the specific envelopes for regions and Member States initially provided for under the MFF must simply be complementary and in no way result in a reduction in funding granted to regions and Member States in line with the criteria laid down in cohesion policy regulations; calls for any reduction in envelopes to be rectified as part of this mid-term revision;

Amendment

Or. fr

Amendment 168
Eider Gardiazabal Rubial, Jens Geier

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 28 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

28a. *Gives utmost importance to the well-timed implementation of any modification which will be agreed under the Mid-term revision of the MFF; stresses that these changes should be echoed in the EU budget for the year 2017; calls on the Commission to ensure that negotiations on both MFF Revision and the annual EU budget are concluded until the end of 2016 as this will influence Parliament's decision making process on the EU budget 2017;*

Or. en

Amendment 169
Younous Omarjee, Liadh Ní Riada, Xabier Benito Ziluaga
on behalf of the GUE/NGL Group

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 28 b (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

28b. *Calls for stepped-up budget support for all Member States carrying out excessive-deficit reduction programmes;*

Or. fr

Amendment 170
Younous Omarjee, Liadh Ní Riada, Xabier Benito Ziluaga
on behalf of the GUE/NGL Group

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 28 c (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

28c. *Calls for the investment clause to be revised so that national and regional investments which co-financed ESI funds are excluded from the calculation of national deficits under the Stability and Growth Pact;*

Or. en

Amendment 171
Eider Gardiazabal Rubial

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 29

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

29. Is convinced that, while fully confirming the notion of large-scale political and financial support for EFSI, the EU budget should not be financing new initiatives to the detriment of existing Union programmes and policies; intends to deliver on its commitment to fully offset the EFSI-related cuts affecting Horizon 2020 and CEF, in order to allow them to accomplish their objectives as agreed only two years ago;

29. Is convinced that, while fully confirming the notion of large-scale political and financial support for EFSI, the EU budget should not be financing new initiatives to the detriment of existing Union programmes and policies; intends to deliver on its commitment to fully offset the EFSI-related cuts affecting Horizon 2020 and CEF, in order to allow them to accomplish their objectives as agreed only two years ago; ***furthermore stresses that reinforcements are needed for the EU programmes and policies contributing to growth, jobs and competitiveness as well as transition to a low carbon economy; believes that margins in Subheading 1a are not sufficient for accommodating these needs, hence calls for an increase of the ceiling in this subheading;***

Or. en

Amendment 172
Gérard Deprez, Martina Dlabajová, Louis Michel, Nils Torvalds, Jean Arthuis, Nedzhmi Ali

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 29

Motion for a resolution

29. Is convinced that, while fully confirming the notion of large-scale political and financial support for EFSI, the EU budget should not be financing new initiatives to the detriment of existing Union programmes and policies; intends to deliver on its commitment to fully offset the EFSI-related cuts affecting Horizon 2020 and CEF, in order to allow them to accomplish their objectives as agreed only two years ago;

Amendment

29. Is convinced that, while fully confirming the notion of large-scale political and financial support for EFSI, the EU budget should not be financing new initiatives to the detriment of existing Union programmes and policies; intends to deliver on its commitment to fully offset the EFSI-related cuts affecting Horizon 2020 and CEF, in order to allow them to accomplish their objectives as agreed only two years ago ***and to allow the EU to reach its research and innovation targets; stresses that this compensation should not be proposed at the expense of other important programmes of the current MFF (in particular COSME, Galileo and Copernicus); considers that an upward revision of the ceilings under sub-Heading 1A is required;***

Or. en

Amendment 173
Richard Ashworth

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 29

Motion for a resolution

29. Is convinced that, while fully confirming the notion of large-scale political and financial support for EFSI, the EU budget should not be financing new initiatives to the detriment of existing Union programmes and policies; intends to deliver on its commitment to fully offset the EFSI-related cuts affecting Horizon 2020 and CEF, in order to allow them to accomplish their objectives as agreed only two years ago;

Amendment

29. Is convinced that, while fully confirming the notion of large-scale political and financial support for EFSI, the EU budget should not be financing new initiatives to the detriment of existing Union programmes and policies, ***except in cases where such programmes and policies have a demonstrably poor rate of implementation or performance;*** intends to deliver on its commitment to fully offset the EFSI-related cuts affecting Horizon

2020 and CEF, in order to allow them to accomplish their objectives as agreed only two years ago;

Or. en

Amendment 174

Reimer Böge, Monika Hohlmeier

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 29

Motion for a resolution

29. Is convinced that, while fully confirming the notion of large-scale political and financial support for EFSI, the EU budget should not be financing new initiatives to the detriment of existing Union programmes and policies; intends to deliver on its commitment to fully offset the EFSI-related cuts affecting Horizon 2020 and CEF, in order to allow them to accomplish their objectives as agreed only two years ago;

Amendment

29. Is convinced that, while fully confirming the notion of large-scale political and financial support for EFSI, the EU budget should not be financing new initiatives to the detriment of existing Union programmes and policies; intends to deliver on its commitment to fully offset the EFSI-related cuts affecting Horizon 2020 and CEF *while maintaining the funding level of the other programmes in Subheading 1a*, in order to allow them to accomplish their objectives as agreed only two years ago;

Or. en

Amendment 175

Marco Zanni, Marco Valli

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 29

Motion for a resolution

29. Is convinced that, *while fully confirming the notion of large-scale political and financial support for EFSI*, the EU budget should not be financing new initiatives to the detriment of existing Union programmes and policies; intends to deliver on its commitment to *fully* offset

Amendment

29. Is convinced that the EU budget should not be financing new initiatives to the detriment of existing Union programmes and policies, *as was the case for EFSI*; intends to deliver on its commitment to offset the EFSI-related cuts affecting Horizon 2020 and CEF, *through*

the EFSI-related cuts affecting Horizon 2020 and CEF, in order to allow them to accomplish their objectives as agreed only two years ago;

redistribution, in order to allow them to accomplish their objectives as agreed only two years ago;

Or. it

Amendment 176
Clare Moody

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 29

Motion for a resolution

29. Is convinced that, while fully confirming the notion of large-scale political and financial support for EFSI, the EU budget should not be financing new initiatives to the detriment of existing Union programmes and policies; intends to deliver on its commitment to fully offset the EFSI-related cuts affecting Horizon 2020 and CEF, in order to allow them to accomplish their objectives as agreed only two years ago;

Amendment

29. Is convinced that, while fully confirming the notion of large-scale political and financial support for EFSI, the EU budget should not be financing new initiatives to the detriment of existing **priority** Union programmes and policies; intends to deliver on its commitment to fully offset the EFSI-related cuts affecting Horizon 2020 and CEF, in order to allow them to accomplish their objectives as agreed only two years ago;

Or. en

Amendment 177
Ernest Maragall
on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 29

Motion for a resolution

29. ***Is convinced that, while fully confirming the notion of large-scale political and financial support for EFSI, the EU budget should not be financing new initiatives to the detriment of existing Union programmes and policies; intends to deliver on its commitment to fully offset***

Amendment

29. ***Stresses therefore that the maximalist approach of the revision of the MFF might lead to an upward revision of the MFF up to the own resources ceiling (1,29% of the EU GNI in commitments) which would lead to an approximate increase by € 150 bn investment within***

the EFSI-related cuts affecting Horizon 2020 and CEF, in order to allow them to accomplish their objectives as agreed only two years ago;

and outside the EU in order to reach the EU2020 strategy targets and to fulfil the EU's international commitments, such as the COP21 and the post MDG objectives;

Or. en

Amendment 178

Zbigniew Kuźmiuk, Stanisław Ożóg

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 29 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

29a. Calls also for direct payment appropriations under Heading 2 to be kept at their current level; points out that this is of key importance for the incomes of many farmers, in particular at a time of crisis, and that the annual takeup rate is close to 100%; stresses, at the same time, that the process of bringing direct payment rates in the Member States into line with one another, which began during the current MFF, must be completed as soon as possible; takes the view that differences in production volumes and intensity dating back several decades cannot form the basis for decisions on the level of support to be provided with a view to achieving current and future CAP objectives; believes the alignment of direct payment rates to be essential in order to ensure a level playing field on the single market and the sustainable use of agricultural resources throughout the EU;

Or. pl

Amendment 179

Ernest Maragall

on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 29 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

29a. *Therefore reiterates its views that the Commission proposal, which was then cut by € 85 bn, was not sufficient to finance existing policy priorities linked to Europe's strategy for smart, sustainable and inclusive growth, the new tasks provided for by the Treaty of Lisbon, or unforeseen events, not to mention the political objectives and commitments set by the European Council itself; therefore considers that the outcome of the revision should logically end up between those two minimum and maximum limits;*

Or. en

Amendment 180

Peter Jahr, Michel Dantin, Reimer Böge, Albert Deß, Czesław Adam Siekierski, Norbert Lins, Herbert Dorfmann, Elisabeth Köstinger

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 29 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

29a. *Insists that the current amount in Heading 2 as foreseen in the current MFF remains at least at the same level; refers in this respect to Art.2 of the MFF regulation, which clearly states that allocated national envelopes may not be reduced by the midterm revision; considers furthermore that other Union policies must have the necessary financial means to allow the Union to honour its legal obligations in accordance with the corresponding sectoral legislation;*

Or. en

Amendment 181
Victor Negrescu

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 29 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

29a. *Stresses the fact that the Pilot Projects and Preparatory Actions budget should be extended and the implementation time improved;*

Or. en

Amendment 182
Ernest Maragall
on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 29 b (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

29b. *Is convinced that, while fully confirming the notion of large-scale political and financial support for EFSI, the EU budget should not be financing new initiatives to the detriment of existing Union programmes and policies; intends to deliver on its commitment to fully offset the EFSI-related cuts affecting Horizon 2020 and CEF, in order to allow them to accomplish their objectives as agreed only two years ago; notes that this should entail an upwards revision of the ceilings of Subheading 1a, as no margins are available;*

Or. en

Amendment 183
Zbigniew Kuźmiuk, Stanisław Ożóg

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 29 b (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

29b. *Notes that a whole series of changes that have an effect on farming, food production and rural areas are currently being planned and introduced under other EU policies, including trade policy and environment and climate policy; stresses that the new requirements laid down for the agri-food sector with a view to meeting non-agricultural EU objectives should, in the future, be appropriately reflected in a larger CAP budget;*

Or. pl

Amendment 184
Ernest Maragall, Helga Trüpel
on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 29 c (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

29c. *Asks for an increased financial support to the three European programmes concerning directly citizens: Creative Europe, Europe for citizens and Erasmus+, as those programmes develop new subvention lines to react to the present situation on refugees integration, education and are on the front of actions lead by the Union and Member States to improve the overall social situation, mutual understanding and the living together in our different societies;*

Or. en

Amendment 185
Ernest Maragall, Helga Trüpel
on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 29 d (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

29d. Urges the Commission and Council to review their position on the "Europe for Citizens" programme, the only programme which involves all citizens directly, and to provide it with a substantial additional budget allowing better implementation of the goals of the programme and avoiding further frustration among participants to the calls; indeed, having been cut beyond any reason, the programme can only accept a dramatically low percentage of projects, a situation that it is not sustainable and defensible towards the EU citizens, even more so in the present social and humanitarian situation in the EU;

Or. en

Amendment 186
Ernest Maragall, Helga Trüpel
on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 29 e (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

29e. Considers that Erasmus+ would reach its cruising speed only if it takes on board a growing number of smaller projects that allow a larger diffusion of the programme at schools or for youth, an increase of VET mobility, and therefore a better efficiency in realising its educative, social and humanitarian goals; welcomes therefore all efforts made by the EACEA and national agencies to improve not only

their financial transparency but the simplification procedures for the project leaders;

Or. en

Amendment 187

Ernest Maragall, Helga Trüpel
on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 29 f (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

29f. Recommends the Commission to pay special attention to the implementation of the financial Guarantee facility tool which is delayed by more than a few months; is concerned that cultural NGOs and small associations will not be eligible for this tool, and only cultural and creative SMEs would be able to participate; recommends a thorough analysis of the experiences done throughout the whole process in order to check the pertinence and sustainability of such a tool, aside COSME;

Or. en

Amendment 188

Ernest Maragall, Helga Trüpel
on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 29 g (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

29g. Notes that the revision of the MFF is a key point in the management of Union spending by ensuring that Union investment programmes remain efficient; insists on a thorough simplification of the

application forms and criteria, of reporting and reimbursement, especially for small-scale projects, both in Erasmus+ and in the Creative Europe and Europe for Citizens programmes;

Or. en

Amendment 189

Xabier Benito Ziluaga, Liadh Ní Riada, Younous Omarjee

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 30

Motion for a resolution

30. Strongly supports the continuation of the Youth Employment Initiative (YEI), as a means of ensuring an urgent response in the fight against youth unemployment, following the necessary adjustments brought about by the ongoing evaluation; considers that this can only be achieved through the provision of an adequate level of commitment appropriations for the YEI for the remaining years of the current MFF; notes that this should entail an upwards revision of the ceilings of Subheading 1b, as no margins are available;

Amendment

30. Strongly supports the continuation of the Youth Employment Initiative (YEI), as a means of ensuring an urgent response in the fight against youth unemployment, following the necessary adjustments brought about by the ongoing evaluation; considers that this can only be achieved through the provision of an adequate level of commitment appropriations for the YEI for the remaining years of the current MFF; ***in order to increase the utilisation rate of this funding, very low in those less developed regions, which need in a larger extent this sort of budgetary line; points out the necessity of making easier the anticipation of available funds at the outset of the programs;*** notes that this should entail an upwards revision of the ceilings of Subheading 1b, as no margins are available;

Or. en

Amendment 190

Ernest Maragall

on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 30

Motion for a resolution

30. Strongly supports the continuation of the Youth Employment Initiative (YEI), as a means of ensuring an urgent response in the fight against youth unemployment, following the necessary adjustments brought about by the ongoing evaluation; considers that this can only be achieved through the provision of ***an adequate*** level of commitment appropriations for the YEI for the remaining years of the current MFF; notes that this should entail an upwards revision of the ceilings of Subheading 1b, as no margins are available;

Amendment

30. Strongly supports the continuation of the Youth Employment Initiative (YEI), as a means of ensuring an urgent response in the fight against youth unemployment, following the necessary adjustments brought about by the ongoing evaluation; considers that this can only be achieved through the provision of, ***at least, the same*** level of commitment appropriations ***than the one agreed in 2013 (€ 6 billion for 2 years)*** for the YEI for the remaining years of the current MFF; ***concludes that at least, 12 billion should be available for the YEI programme for the period 2017-2020***; notes that this should entail an upwards revision of the ceilings of Subheading 1b, as no margins are available;

Or. en

Amendment 191

Eider Gardiazabal Rubial, Brando Benifei, Eva Paunova, Terry Reintke

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 30

Motion for a resolution

30. Strongly supports the continuation of the Youth Employment Initiative (YEI), as a means of ensuring an urgent response in the fight against youth unemployment, following the necessary adjustments brought about by the ongoing evaluation; considers that this can only be achieved through the provision of an adequate level of commitment appropriations for the YEI for the remaining years of the current MFF; notes that this should entail an upwards revision of the ceilings of Subheading 1b, as no margins are available;

Amendment

30. Strongly supports the continuation of the Youth Employment Initiative (YEI), as a means of ensuring an urgent response in the fight against youth unemployment, following the necessary adjustments brought about by the ongoing evaluation ***of European institutions as well as a continued assessment of its performance by all relevant stakeholders, especially young people and youth organisations***; considers that this can only be achieved through the provision of an adequate level of commitment appropriations for the YEI for the remaining years of the current MFF; notes that this should entail an upwards

revision of the ceilings of Subheading 1b,
as no margins are available;

Or. en

Amendment 192

Marco Zanni, Marco Valli

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 30

Motion for a resolution

30. ***Strongly supports the continuation of the Youth Employment Initiative (YEI), as a means of ensuring an urgent response in the fight against youth unemployment, following the necessary adjustments brought about by the ongoing evaluation; considers that this can only be achieved through the provision of an adequate level of commitment appropriations for the YEI for the remaining years of the current MFF; notes that this should entail an upwards revision of the ceilings of Subheading 1b, as no margins are available;***

Amendment

30. ***Takes the view that the Youth Employment Initiative (YEI), as a means of ensuring an urgent response in the fight against youth unemployment, has to date failed to achieve its objectives; considers that the objective of facilitating youth employment can only be achieved by addressing the imbalances resulting from the single currency, eliminating the social and economic constraints imposed by the EU and generating massive public investment;***

Or. it

Amendment 193

Gérard Deprez, Martina Dlabajová, Louis Michel, Nils Torvalds, Jean Arthuis, Nedzhmi Ali

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 30

Motion for a resolution

30. Strongly supports the continuation of the Youth Employment Initiative (YEI), as a means of ensuring an urgent response in the fight against youth unemployment, following the necessary adjustments brought about by the ongoing evaluation;

Amendment

30. Strongly supports the continuation of the Youth Employment Initiative (YEI), as a means of ensuring an urgent response in the fight against youth unemployment, following the necessary adjustments brought about by the ongoing evaluation;

considers that this can only be achieved through the provision of an adequate level of commitment appropriations for the YEI for the remaining years of the current MFF; *notes that this should entail an upwards revision of the ceilings of Subheading 1b, as no margins are available;*

considers that this can only be achieved through the provision of an adequate level of commitment appropriations for the YEI for the remaining years of the current MFF; *reminds that the global margin for commitments, to be made available over and above the ceilings established in the MFF, should be directed, in priority, for youth employment;*

Or. en

Amendment 194
Richard Ashworth

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 30

Motion for a resolution

30. *Strongly supports the continuation of the Youth Employment Initiative (YEI), as a means of ensuring an urgent response in the fight against youth unemployment, following the necessary adjustments brought about by the ongoing evaluation; considers that this can only be achieved through the provision of an adequate level of commitment appropriations for the YEI for the remaining years of the current MFF; notes that this should entail an upwards revision of the ceilings of Subheading 1b, as no margins are available;*

Amendment

30. *Notes the Youth Employment Initiative (YEI) as a complementary means to national policies of ensuring an urgent response in the fight against youth unemployment; considers it necessary to await the outcome of the report on the implementation of the Youth Guarantee and the operation of the YEI in order to determine the appropriate level of funding for the YEI in the years ahead; believes that due consideration should also be given to the restricted room for manoeuvre in Subheading 1b, as no margins are available;*

Or. en

Amendment 195
Eider Gardiazabal Rubial

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 30

Motion for a resolution

30. Strongly supports the continuation of the Youth Employment Initiative (YEI), as a means of ensuring an urgent response in the fight against youth unemployment, following the necessary adjustments brought about by the ongoing evaluation; considers that this can only be achieved through the provision of ***an adequate level of*** commitment appropriations for the YEI ***for the remaining years of*** the current MFF; notes that this should entail an upwards revision of the ceilings of Subheading 1b, as no margins are available;

Amendment

30. Strongly supports the continuation of the Youth Employment Initiative (YEI), as a means of ensuring an urgent response in the fight against youth unemployment, following the necessary adjustments brought about by the ongoing evaluation; considers that this can only be achieved through the provision of ***at least EUR 21 billion in*** commitment appropriations for the YEI ***under*** the current MFF; notes that this should entail an upwards revision of the ceilings of Subheading 1b, as no margins are available;

Or. en

Amendment 196

Alain Lamassoure, Michel Dantin

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 30 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment 197

Eider Gardiazabal Rubial, Eva Paunova, Brando Benifei, Terry Reintke

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 30 a (new)

Amendment

30a. Considers that beyond the preservation of the pre-allocated national envelopes stipulated in the Article 2 of the MFF Regulation, the preservation of the heading 2 margins is essential in order to face the impacts of the various crisis in agricultural markets in the second half of the MFF;

Or. en

30a. *In a context of new increasing challenges, including migration and diverse societies, more investments in education, training, youth and culture are very much needed to reinforce cohesive, equal and inclusive societies as well as intercultural dialogue;*

Or. en

Amendment 198

Gérard Deprez, Martina Dlabajová, Louis Michel, Nils Torvalds, Jean Arthuis, Nedzhmi Ali

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 31

31. Considers that the magnitude of the migration and refugee crisis goes to show that additional needs with significant budgetary consequences may be expected to arise in the coming years; underlines, moreover, that the need for internal security in the EU and the fight against terrorism are expected also to necessitate additional funding to back up reinforced action at EU level; is of the firm opinion that, even with the mobilisation of the small margins available under Heading 3 (Security and Citizenship) and existing flexibility provisions, the resources available will not be sufficient to tackle the increased needs under this heading; calls, therefore, for significant reinforcements for the AMIF and the Internal Security Fund, as well as for the Union agencies operating in the field, *as well as* other initiatives that *can* be undertaken; considers that an upward revision of the ceilings under Heading 3 is required;

31. Considers that the magnitude of the migration and refugee crisis goes to show that additional needs with significant budgetary consequences may be expected to arise in the coming years; *asks the Commission to draw up as soon as possible an updated estimate of the budget required, by the end of the current MFF, to meet all the challenges of migration pressure (safe and rescue, interception, reception, registration, control, accommodation, transportation, relocation, resettlement, return, integration), the implementation of a genuine European asylum system, the common management of external borders and the internal security of the Schengen area;* underlines, moreover, that the need for internal security in the EU and the fight against terrorism *should be included in all the budgetary projections and* are expected also to necessitate additional funding to back up reinforced action at EU level; is of the firm opinion that, even with the mobilisation of the small margins

available under Heading 3 (Security and Citizenship) and existing flexibility provisions, the resources available will not be sufficient to tackle the increased needs under this heading; calls, therefore, for significant reinforcements for the AMIF and the Internal Security Fund, as well as for the Union agencies operating in the field (*FRONTEX, EASO, EUROPOL, EU-LISA, FRA*) **to ensure the proper functioning of their missions and appropriate staffing levels, and urges for other initiatives that will be undertaken not to be funded at the expense of existing programmes and agencies**; considers that an upward revision of the ceilings under Heading 3 is required;

Or. en

Amendment 199

Xabier Benito Ziluaga, Liadh Ní Riada

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 31

Motion for a resolution

31. Considers that the magnitude of the migration and refugee crisis goes to show that additional needs with significant budgetary consequences may be expected to arise in the coming years; ***underlines, moreover, that the need for internal security in the EU and the fight against terrorism are expected also to necessitate additional funding to back up reinforced action at EU level***; is of the firm opinion that, even with the mobilisation of the small margins available under Heading 3 (Security and Citizenship) and existing flexibility provisions, the resources available will not be sufficient to tackle the increased needs under this heading; calls, therefore, for significant reinforcements for the AMIF ***and the Internal Security Fund***, as well as for the Union agencies operating

Amendment

31. Considers that the magnitude of the migration and refugee crisis goes to show that additional needs with significant budgetary consequences may be expected to arise in the coming years; is of the firm opinion that, even with the mobilisation of the small margins available under Heading 3 (Security and Citizenship) and existing flexibility provisions, the resources available will not be sufficient to tackle the increased needs under this heading; calls, therefore, for significant reinforcements for the AMIF, as well as for the Union agencies operating in the field, as well as other initiatives that can be undertaken; considers that an upward revision of the ceilings under Heading 3 is required;

in the field, as well as other initiatives that can be undertaken; considers that an upward revision of the ceilings under Heading 3 is required;

Or. en

Amendment 200
Richard Ashworth

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 31

Motion for a resolution

31. Considers that the magnitude of the migration and refugee crisis goes to show that additional needs with significant budgetary consequences may be expected to arise in the coming years; underlines, moreover, that the need for internal security in the EU and the fight against terrorism are expected also to necessitate additional funding to back up reinforced action at EU level; is of the firm opinion that, even with the mobilisation of the small margins available under Heading 3 (Security and Citizenship) and existing flexibility provisions, the resources available will not be sufficient to tackle the increased needs under this heading; calls, therefore, for significant reinforcements for the AMIF and the Internal Security Fund, as well as for the Union agencies *operating in the field, as well as other initiatives that can be undertaken; considers that an upward revision of the ceilings under Heading 3 is required;*

Amendment

31. Considers that the magnitude of the migration and refugee crisis goes to show that additional needs with significant budgetary consequences may be expected to arise in the coming years; underlines, moreover, that the need for internal security in the EU and the fight against terrorism are expected also to necessitate additional funding to back up reinforced action at EU level; is of the firm opinion that, even with the mobilisation of the small margins available under Heading 3 (Security and Citizenship) and existing flexibility provisions, the resources available will not be sufficient to tackle the increased needs under this heading; calls, therefore, for significant reinforcements for the AMIF and the Internal Security Fund, as well as for the Union agencies *who have undertaken new responsibilities; considers that the severity of the current situation may require an upward revision of the ceilings under Heading 3, provided that the raising of this ceiling is offset by the lowering of another ceiling, in accordance with Article 17(4) of the MFF Regulation;*

Or. en

Amendment 201
Marco Zanni, Marco Valli

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 31

Motion for a resolution

31. Considers that the magnitude of the migration and refugee crisis goes to show that additional needs with significant budgetary consequences may be expected to arise in the coming years; underlines, moreover, that the need for internal security in the EU and the fight against terrorism *are expected also to* necessitate additional funding *to back up reinforced action at EU level*; is of the firm opinion that, even with the mobilisation of the small margins available under Heading 3 (Security and Citizenship) and existing flexibility provisions, the resources available *will* not be sufficient to tackle the increased needs under this heading; *calls, therefore, for significant reinforcements for the AMIF and the Internal Security Fund, as well as for the Union agencies operating in the field, as well as other initiatives that can be undertaken*; *considers that* an upward revision of the ceilings under Heading 3 *is* required;

Amendment

31. Considers that the magnitude of the migration and refugee crisis goes to show that additional needs with significant budgetary consequences may be expected to arise in the coming years; underlines, moreover, that the need for internal security in the EU and the fight against terrorism *might* necessitate additional funding *so as to step up coordination between the Member States*; is of the firm opinion that, even with the mobilisation of the small margins available under Heading 3 (Security and Citizenship) and existing flexibility provisions, the resources available *might* not be sufficient to tackle the increased needs under this heading; *considers therefore that* an upward revision of the ceilings under Heading 3 *might be* required, *to be offset through cuts elsewhere*;

Or. it

Amendment 202
Eider Gardiazabal Rubial, Jean-Paul Denanot

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 31

Motion for a resolution

31. Considers that the magnitude of the migration and refugee crisis goes to show that additional needs with significant budgetary consequences may be expected to arise in the coming years; underlines,

Amendment

31. Considers that the magnitude of the migration and refugee crisis, *caused by wars and climate change*, goes to show that additional needs with significant budgetary consequences may be expected

moreover, that the need for internal security in the EU and the fight against terrorism are expected also to necessitate additional funding to back up reinforced action at EU level; is of the firm opinion that, even with the mobilisation of the small margins available under Heading 3 (Security and Citizenship) and existing flexibility provisions, the resources available will not be sufficient to tackle the increased needs under this heading; calls, therefore, for significant reinforcements for the AMIF and the Internal Security Fund, as well as for the Union agencies operating in the field, as well as other initiatives that can be undertaken; considers that an upward revision of the ceilings under Heading 3 is required;

to arise in the coming years; underlines, moreover, that the need for internal security in the EU and the fight against terrorism are expected also to necessitate additional funding to back up reinforced action at EU level; is of the firm opinion that, even with the mobilisation of the small margins available under Heading 3 (Security and Citizenship) and existing flexibility provisions, the resources available will not be sufficient to tackle the increased needs under this heading; calls, therefore, for significant reinforcements for the AMIF and the Internal Security Fund, as well as for the Union agencies operating in the field, as well as other initiatives that can be undertaken; considers that an upward revision of the ceilings under Heading 3 is required;

Or. en

Amendment 203

Xabier Benito Ziluaga, Liadh Ní Riada

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 32

Motion for a resolution

32. Expects that concerted action to effectively respond to the external dimension of the migration and refugee crisis will intensify over the coming years, and will be accompanied by increased requests for funding under Heading 4 (Global Europe); underlines that such requests for additional funding should not be deployed to the detriment of the EU's existing external action, including its development policy; calls, therefore, for a significant reinforcement of appropriations under this heading;

Amendment

32. Expects that concerted action to effectively respond to the external dimension of the migration and refugee crisis will intensify over the coming years, and will be accompanied by increased requests for funding under Heading 4 (Global Europe); ***which entails implementing solutions in origin, persecuting those practices which promoting directly or indirectly the Daesh and those who are taking advantage of human traffic, guaranteeing a safe mobility for the people under refugee status, and setting the resources needed in order to provide a worthy social integration during the period of stay for this population in Europe;*** underlines that

such requests for additional funding should not be deployed to the detriment of the EU's existing external action, including its development policy; calls, therefore, for a significant reinforcement of appropriations under this heading;

Or. en

Amendment 204
Michal Marusik

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 32

Motion for a resolution

32. ***Expects that concerted action to effectively respond to the external dimension of the migration and refugee crisis will intensify over the coming years, and will be accompanied by increased requests for funding under Heading 4 (Global Europe); underlines that such requests for additional funding should not be deployed to the detriment of the EU's existing external action, including its development policy; calls, therefore, for a significant reinforcement of appropriations under this heading;***

Amendment

32. ***Is concerned that EU policy and action to respond to the external dimension of the migration and refugee crisis will merely serve to increase funding under Heading 4 (Global Europe);***

Or. pl

Amendment 205
Reimer Böge, Monika Hohlmeier

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 32

Motion for a resolution

32. Expects that concerted action to effectively respond to the external dimension of the migration and refugee crisis ***will intensify*** over the coming years,

Amendment

32. Expects that concerted action to effectively respond to the external dimension of the migration and refugee crisis, ***notably the political stabilisation of***

and will be accompanied by increased requests for funding under Heading 4 (Global Europe); underlines that such requests for additional funding should not be deployed to the detriment of the EU's existing external action, ***including its development policy***; calls, therefore, for a significant reinforcement of appropriations under this heading;

the European neighbourhood and Sub-Saharan Africa and the tackling of humanitarian and economic causes of migration, will require a substantial reform of the European Neighbourhood and development policy as well as humanitarian assistance over the coming years, and will be accompanied by increased requests for funding under Heading 4 (Global Europe); underlines that such requests for additional funding should not be deployed to the detriment of the EU's existing external action; calls, therefore, for a significant reinforcement of appropriations under this heading;

Or. en

Amendment 206

Marco Zanni, Marco Valli

Motion for a resolution Paragraph 32

Motion for a resolution

32. Expects that concerted action to effectively respond to the external dimension of the migration and refugee crisis will intensify over the coming years, and will be accompanied by ***increased*** requests for funding under Heading 4 (Global Europe); underlines that such requests for ***additional*** funding should not be deployed to the detriment of the EU's existing external action, including its development policy; ***calls, therefore, for a significant reinforcement of appropriations under this heading***;

Amendment

32. Expects that concerted action to effectively respond to the external dimension of the migration and refugee crisis will intensify over the coming years, and will be accompanied by ***better allocation in response to*** requests for funding under Heading 4 (Global Europe); underlines that such requests for additional funding should not be deployed to the detriment of the EU's existing external action, including its development policy;

Or. it

Amendment 207

Gérard Deprez, Martina Dlabajová, Louis Michel, Nils Torvalds, Jean Arthuis, Charles Goerens, Nedzhmi Ali

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 32

Motion for a resolution

32. Expects that concerted action to effectively respond to the external dimension of the migration and refugee crisis will intensify over the coming years, and will be accompanied by increased requests for funding under Heading 4 (Global Europe); underlines that such requests for additional funding should not be deployed to the detriment of the EU's existing external action, including its development policy; calls, therefore, for ***a significant reinforcement of appropriations under this heading;***

Amendment

32. Expects that concerted action to effectively respond to the external dimension of the migration and refugee crisis will intensify over the coming years, and will be accompanied by increased requests for funding under Heading 4 (Global Europe); underlines that such requests for additional funding should not be deployed to the detriment of the EU's existing external action, including its development policy; calls, therefore, for ***an upward revision of the ceilings under Heading 4;***

Or. en

Amendment 208
Ernest Maragall
on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 32 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

32a. Recalls the Union's commitments of spending at least 20% of the EU budget on climate-related actions; regrets that currently, the Union does not respect this internal budget commitment since the Commission's own figures show only 12.5% allocated to climate change in the 2015 draft budget; underlines that a revision of the MFF would provide an opportunity to ensure that this target is met in the future; calls upon the Commission and Member States to increase immediately the climate spending in the EU budget from 20 to 30% and to improve the current method of tracking such spending In light of the Paris

agreement on global action to combat climate change and to show European leadership in this regard;

Or. en

Amendment 209
Charles Goerens, Gérard Deprez

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 32 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

32a. Urges the Commission and Member States to ensure that funding mechanisms and budgetary lines reflect all 2030 Agenda commitments agreed to; calls on the EU and its Member States to re-commit without delay to the 0.7% of GNI target for ODA and submit a timeline on how to gradually increase ODA in order to reach the 0.7% by 2030;

Or. en

Amendment 210
Victor Negrescu

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 32 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

32a. Calls for an increase to the overall budget targeted at reducing child poverty and social exclusion and for a children's budget to be established, which would provide an opportunity to establish child budgeting procedures and support the implementation of the Recommendation 'Investing in Children: Breaking the Cycle of Disadvantage';

Or. en

Amendment 211
Ernest Maragall
on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 32 b (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

32b. *Believes that new political priorities must not be proposed at the expense of the agreed programmes of the current MFF, such as H2020, CEF, COSME, Galileo and Copernicus, and pre-allocated national envelopes, that should be fully implemented; points however to the fact that the budget of ITER is larger than any other R&D investment in the field of energy; deeply regrets that some Member States are compelled to review their funding priorities for research, because of the surge of ITER costs; stresses that the European Parliament has voted to withhold approval of the 2014 accounts of ITER on ground of lack of coherence in the budgetary and financial management;*

Or. en

Amendment 212
Ernest Maragall
on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 32 c (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

32c. *Firmly believes that ITER is the largest misallocated EU investment in energy R&D; calls for the investment dedicated to ITER to be halted and reallocated to the development and deployment of sustainable energy*

solutions that are already available, or available in the foreseeable future to deliver the climate and energy 2020 goals;

Or. en

Amendment 213

Ernest Maragall

on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 33

Motion for a resolution

33. *Considers that, as a matter of priority, it is necessary to act to prevent a new payment crisis occurring towards the end of the current MFF; firmly believes that every effort should be made to avoid building up a backlog of unpaid bills like the one that was observed during the previous period; stresses, however, the significant pressure on payments that can already be anticipated for the second half of the MFF, which is due, inter alia, to the offsetting of the Contingency Margin against the payments ceilings for 2018-2020, the considerable delay in launching the new programmes under shared management, the payment profile of EFSI, and the additional payments corresponding to the recent increases in commitments in relation to the migration and refugee crisis;*

Amendment

33. *Stresses therefore that the maximalist approach of the revision of the MFF might lead to an upward revision of the MFF up to the own resources ceiling (1,23% of the EU GNI in payments) which would roughly lead to an additional € 120 bn;*

Or. en

Amendment 214

Ernest Maragall

on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 33 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

33a. *Therefore reiterates its views that the Commission proposal, which was ten cut by € 91 bn in payments, was not sufficient to close the gap between the commitments and the payments and to reduce the RAL; therefore considers that the outcome of the revision should logically end up between those two minimum and maximum limits;*

Or. en

Amendment 215

Ernest Maragall

on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 33 b (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

33b. *Considers that, as a matter of priority, it is necessary to act to prevent a new payment crisis occurring towards the end of the current MFF; firmly believes that every effort should be made to avoid building up a backlog of unpaid bills like the one that was observed during the previous period; stresses, however, the significant pressure on payments that can already be anticipated for the second half of the MFF, which is due, inter alia, to the offsetting of the Contingency Margin against the payments ceilings for 2018-2020, the considerable delay in launching the new programmes under shared management, the payment profile of EFSI, and the additional payments corresponding to the recent increases in commitments in relation to the migration and refugee crisis;*

Or. en

Amendment 216
Jan Olbrycht, Isabelle Thomas

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 34

Motion for a resolution

34. Expects, therefore, that new reinforcements in commitment appropriations will be accompanied by a corresponding increase in payment appropriations, including an upward revision of the annual payments ceiling if necessary; considers, moreover, that the mid-term review/revision of the MFF provides an excellent opportunity to take stock of payment implementation and updated forecasts for the expected evolution of payments up to the end of the current MFF; believes that a joint payment plan for 2016-2020 should be developed and agreed between the three institutions;

Amendment

34. Expects, therefore, that new reinforcements in commitment appropriations will be accompanied by a corresponding increase in payment appropriations, including an upward revision of the annual payments ceiling if necessary; considers, moreover, that the mid-term review/revision of the MFF provides an excellent opportunity to take stock of payment implementation and updated forecasts for the expected evolution of payments up to the end of the current MFF; believes that a joint payment plan for 2016-2020 should be developed and agreed between the three institutions; ***insists that such a new payment plan should be based on sound financial management and provide for a clear strategy to meet all payment needs in all headings until the end of the current MFF, and to avoid a "hidden backlog" caused by an artificial slowdown in the implementation of certain multiannual programmes and other mitigating measures such as the reduction of pre-financing rates;***

Or. en

Amendment 217
Gérard Deprez, Martina Dlabajová, Louis Michel, Nils Torvalds, Jean Arthuis, Nedzhmi Ali

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 34

Motion for a resolution

34. Expects, therefore, that new reinforcements in commitment appropriations will be accompanied by a corresponding increase in payment appropriations, **including** an upward revision of the **annual** payments ceiling **if necessary**; considers, moreover, that the mid-term review/revision of the MFF provides an excellent opportunity to take stock of payment implementation and updated forecasts for the expected evolution of payments up to the end of the current MFF; **believes that a** joint payment plan for 2016-2020 **should** be developed and agreed between the three institutions;

Amendment

34. **Reminds that payments appropriations are the orderly consequence of past commitments**; expects, therefore, that new reinforcements in commitment appropriations will be accompanied by a corresponding increase in payment appropriations, **and considers that** an upward revision of the payments ceiling **is required**; considers, moreover, that the mid-term review/revision of the MFF provides an excellent opportunity to take stock of payment implementation and updated forecasts for the expected evolution of payments up to the end of the current MFF; **calls for a binding** joint payment plan for 2016-2020 **to** be developed and agreed between the three institutions **and enshrined in the Interinstitutional agreement of 2 December 2013 between the European Parliament, the Council and the Commission on budgetary matters and on sound financial management**;

Or. en

Amendment 218
Christofer Fjellner

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 34

Motion for a resolution

34. Expects, therefore, that new reinforcements in commitment appropriations will be accompanied by a corresponding **increase in payment appropriations, including an upward revision of the annual payments ceiling if necessary**; considers, moreover, that the mid-term review/revision of the MFF provides an excellent opportunity to take stock of payment implementation and

Amendment

34. Expects, therefore, that new reinforcements in commitment appropriations will be accompanied by corresponding **reductions in other areas**; considers, moreover, that the mid-term review/revision of the MFF provides an excellent opportunity to take stock of payment implementation and updated forecasts for the expected evolution of payments up to the end of the current MFF;

updated forecasts for the expected evolution of payments up to the end of the current MFF; believes that a joint payment plan for 2016-2020 should be developed and agreed between the three institutions;

believes that a joint payment plan for 2016-2020 should be developed and agreed between the three institutions;

Or. sv

Amendment 219
Richard Ashworth

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 34

Motion for a resolution

34. Expects, therefore, that new reinforcements in commitment appropriations will be accompanied by a corresponding increase in payment appropriations, ***including an upward revision of the annual payments ceiling if necessary***; considers, moreover, that the mid-term ***review/revision*** of the MFF provides an excellent opportunity to take stock of payment implementation and updated forecasts for the expected evolution of payments up to the end of the current MFF; believes that a joint payment plan for 2016-2020 should be developed and agreed between the three institutions;

Amendment

34. Expects, therefore, that new reinforcements in commitment appropriations will be accompanied by a corresponding increase in payment appropriations; ***believes that a thorough evaluation of existing commitment appropriations should take place before new commitments are entered into***; considers, moreover, that the mid-term ***review*** of the MFF provides an excellent opportunity to take stock of payment implementation and updated forecasts for the expected evolution of payments up to the end of the current MFF; believes that a joint payment plan for 2016-2020 should be developed and agreed between the three institutions;

Or. en

Amendment 220
Anneli Jäätteenmäki

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 34

Motion for a resolution

34. ***Expects, therefore, that new***

Amendment

34. ***Is of the opinion that the EU***

reinforcements in commitment appropriations will be accompanied by a corresponding increase in payment appropriations, including an upward revision of the annual payments ceiling if necessary; considers, moreover, that the mid-term review/revision of the MFF provides an excellent opportunity to take stock of payment implementation and updated forecasts for the expected evolution of payments up to the end of the current MFF; believes that a joint payment plan for 2016-2020 should be developed and agreed between the three institutions;

should only make commitments which it can deliver and expects, therefore, a more orderly relation between commitments and payments; considers, moreover, that the mid-term review/revision of the MFF provides an excellent opportunity to take stock of payment implementation and updated forecasts for the expected evolution of payments up to the end of the current MFF; believes that a joint payment plan for 2016-2020 should be developed and agreed between the three institutions;

Or. en

Amendment 221
Marco Zanni, Marco Valli

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 34

Motion for a resolution

34. Expects, therefore, that new reinforcements in commitment appropriations will be **accompanied** by a corresponding increase in payment appropriations, including an upward revision of the annual payments ceiling if necessary; considers, moreover, that the mid-term review/revision of the MFF provides an excellent opportunity to take stock of payment implementation and updated forecasts for the expected evolution of payments up to the end of the current MFF; believes that a joint payment plan for 2016-2020 should be developed and agreed between the three institutions;

Amendment

34. Expects, therefore, that **any** new reinforcements in commitment appropriations will **at least** be **offset** by a corresponding increase in payment appropriations, including an upward revision of the annual payments ceiling if necessary; considers, moreover, that the mid-term review/revision of the MFF provides an excellent opportunity to take stock of payment implementation and updated forecasts for the expected evolution of payments up to the end of the current MFF; believes that a joint payment plan for 2016-2020 should be developed and agreed between the three institutions;

Or. it

Amendment 222
Michal Marusik

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 34

Motion for a resolution

34. **Expects, therefore,** that new reinforcements in commitment appropriations will be accompanied by a corresponding increase in payment appropriations, including an upward revision of the annual payments ceiling if necessary; considers, moreover, that the mid-term review/revision of the MFF provides an **excellent** opportunity to take stock of payment implementation and updated forecasts for the expected evolution of payments up to the end of the current MFF; believes that a joint payment plan for 2016-2020 should be developed and agreed between the three institutions;

Amendment

34. **Deplores the fact** that new reinforcements in commitment appropriations will be accompanied by a corresponding increase in payment appropriations, including an upward revision of the annual payments ceiling if necessary; considers, moreover, that the mid-term review/revision of the MFF provides an opportunity to take stock of payment implementation and updated forecasts for the expected evolution of payments up to the end of the current MFF; believes that a joint payment plan for 2016-2020 should be developed and agreed between the three institutions;

Or. pl

Amendment 223
Ernest Maragall
on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 34

Motion for a resolution

34. Expects, therefore, that new reinforcements in commitment appropriations will be accompanied by a corresponding increase in payment appropriations, including an upward revision of the annual payments ceiling **if necessary**; considers, moreover, that the **mid-term review/revision** of the MFF provides an excellent opportunity to take stock of payment implementation and updated forecasts for the expected evolution of payments up to the end of the current MFF; believes that a joint payment plan for 2016-2020 should be developed and agreed between the three institutions;

Amendment

34. Expects, therefore, that new reinforcements in commitment appropriations will be accompanied by a corresponding increase in payment appropriations, including an upward revision of the annual payments ceiling; considers, moreover, that the **post electoral revision** of the MFF provides an excellent opportunity to take stock of payment implementation and updated forecasts for the expected evolution of payments up to the end of the current MFF; believes that a joint payment plan for 2016-2020 should be developed and agreed between the three institutions;

Amendment 224

Gérard Deprez, Louis Michel, Nils Torvalds, Jean Arthuis, Charles Goerens, Nedzhmi Ali

Motion for a resolution**Paragraph 35***Motion for a resolution*

35. Is determined to settle in an unequivocal way the issue of budgeting the payments of the MFF special instruments; recalls the unresolved conflict of interpretation between the Commission and Parliament on the one hand, and the Council on the other, which has been in the forefront of the budgetary negotiations in recent years; reiterates its long-standing position that payment appropriations resulting from the mobilisation of special instruments in commitment appropriations should also be counted over and above the annual MFF payment ceilings;

Amendment

35. Is determined to settle in an unequivocal way the issue of budgeting the payments of the MFF special instruments; recalls the unresolved conflict of interpretation between the Commission and Parliament on the one hand, and the Council on the other, which has been in the forefront of the budgetary negotiations in recent years; ***notes that the Council's practice of considering the payments of these instruments within the ceiling, make them similar to simple budgetary transfers, which is not their function;*** reiterates its long-standing position that payment appropriations resulting from the mobilisation of special instruments in commitment appropriations should also be counted over and above the annual MFF payment ceilings;

Or. en

Amendment 225

Christofer Fjellner

Motion for a resolution**Paragraph 35***Motion for a resolution*

35. Is determined to settle in an unequivocal way the issue of budgeting the payments of the MFF special instruments; recalls the unresolved conflict of

Amendment

35. Is determined to settle in an unequivocal way the issue of budgeting the payments of the MFF special instruments; recalls the unresolved conflict of

interpretation between the Commission and Parliament on the one hand, and the Council on the other, which has been in the forefront of the budgetary negotiations in recent years; *reiterates its long-standing position that payment appropriations resulting from the mobilisation of special instruments in commitment appropriations should also be counted over and above the annual MFF payment ceilings;*

interpretation between the Commission and Parliament on the one hand, and the Council on the other, which has been in the forefront of the budgetary negotiations in recent years;

Or. sv

Amendment 226
Richard Ashworth

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 35

Motion for a resolution

35. Is determined to settle in an unequivocal way the issue of budgeting the payments of the MFF special instruments; recalls the unresolved conflict of interpretation between the Commission and Parliament on the one hand, and the Council on the other, which has been in the forefront of the budgetary negotiations in recent years; *reiterates its long-standing position that payment appropriations resulting from the mobilisation of special instruments in commitment appropriations should also be counted over and above the annual MFF payment ceilings;*

Amendment

35. Is determined to settle in an unequivocal way the issue of budgeting the payments of the MFF special instruments; recalls the unresolved conflict of interpretation between the Commission and Parliament on the one hand, and the Council on the other, which has been in the forefront of the budgetary negotiations in recent years; *believes that the mid-term review of the MFF provides an opportunity to examine institutional differences and for a resolution to be found in the interests of budgetary stability and predictability;*

Or. en

Amendment 227
Eider Gardiazabal Rubial, Pina Picierno, Daniele Viotti, Paul Tang

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 35 a (new)

35a. Conditionality to ensure fundamental right of the EU

Insists that all countries should assume full share of responsibilities in the context of the refugee crisis and the Decision on the dedicated reallocation mechanism; calls on the Commission to introduce a financial bonus and malus mechanism as regards the Member States' fulfilment, or not, of their commitments under measures adopted by the EU; upholds that any financial contribution coming from sanctioning a Member state who does not respect these measures should flow back into the EU budget as an extra revenue;

Or. en

Amendment 228
Christofer Fjellner

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 36

36. Strongly believes that the automatic transfer to the following years of any surplus **resulting** from **under-implementation of** the EU budget or fines imposed on companies for breaching EU competition law **would contribute to easing the payment problem; stresses that this surplus should be budgeted as extra revenue in the EU budget, with no corresponding adjustment of the GNI contributions; calls on the Commission to make appropriate legislative proposals in this regard;**

36. Strongly believes that the automatic transfer to the following years of any surplus from the EU budget or fines imposed on companies for breaching EU competition law **should continue to be accompanied by a** corresponding adjustment to **GNP contributions;**

Or. sv

Amendment 229
Jan Olbrycht, Isabelle Thomas

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 36

Motion for a resolution

36. Strongly believes that ***the automatic transfer to the following years*** of any surplus resulting from under-implementation of the EU budget or fines imposed on companies for breaching EU competition law ***would contribute to easing the payment problem; stresses that this surplus*** should be budgeted as extra revenue in the EU budget, with no corresponding adjustment of the GNI contributions; calls on the Commission to make appropriate legislative proposals in this regard;

Amendment

36. Strongly believes that any surplus resulting from under-implementation of the EU budget or fines imposed on companies for breaching EU competition law should be budgeted as extra revenue in the EU budget, with no corresponding adjustment of the GNI contributions; ***considers that this measure would significantly contribute to easing the payment problem of the EU budget***; calls on the Commission to make appropriate legislative proposals in this regard;

Or. en

Amendment 230
José Manuel Fernandes, Marian-Jean Marinescu, Reimer Böge, Lambert van Nistelrooij, Maria Spyra
on behalf of the PPE Group

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 36 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

36a. Is convinced that decommitments across all headings, resulting from total or partial non-implementation of the actions for which they were earmarked, should be made available again in the EU budget and be mobilised by the budgetary authority in the framework of the annual budgetary procedure; strongly believes that, given the current constraints affecting the EU budget and the additional financing needs that the Union is facing, such provision should also apply to decommitments resulting from the

Amendment

implementation of the 2007-2013 programmes, including the closure of cohesion policy programmes; calls on the Commission to make appropriate legislative proposals in this regard;

Or. en

Amendment 231
Christofer Fjellner

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 37

Motion for a resolution

37. Stresses that the mere frequency and level of mobilisation of the MFF special instruments over the past two years prove beyond any doubt the worth of the flexibility provisions and mechanisms enshrined in the MFF Regulation; *stresses the long-standing position of Parliament that flexibility should allow for a maximum use of the global MFF ceilings for commitments and payments;*

Amendment

37. Stresses that the mere frequency and level of mobilisation of the MFF special instruments over the past two years prove beyond any doubt the worth of the flexibility provisions and mechanisms enshrined in the MFF Regulation;

Or. sv

Amendment 232
Inese Vaidere

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 37

Motion for a resolution

37. Stresses that the mere frequency and level of mobilisation of the MFF special instruments over the past two years prove beyond any doubt the worth of the flexibility provisions and mechanisms enshrined in the MFF Regulation; stresses the long-standing position of Parliament that flexibility should allow for a

Amendment

37. Stresses that the mere frequency and level of mobilisation of the MFF special instruments over the past two years prove beyond any doubt the worth of the flexibility provisions and mechanisms enshrined in the MFF Regulation; stresses the long-standing position of Parliament that flexibility should allow for a

maximum use of the global MFF ceilings for commitments and payments;

maximum use of the global MFF ceilings for commitments and payments; *while stresses the importance of ensuring the balance between the principle of long-term priorities and new challenges;*

Or. en

Amendment 233

Inese Vaidere

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 38

Motion for a resolution

38. Believes, therefore, that the mid-term revision of the MFF Regulation should provide for the lifting of a number of constraints and limitations that were imposed by the Council on the flexibility provisions at the time of adoption of the MFF; considers, in particular, that any restrictions on the carry-over of unused appropriations and margins, either by setting annual ceilings (Global Margin for Payments) or by imposing time-limits (Global Margin for Commitments) should be revoked;

Amendment

38. Believes, therefore, that the mid-term revision of the MFF Regulation should provide for the lifting of a number of constraints and limitations that were imposed by the Council on the flexibility provisions at the time of adoption of the MFF; considers, in particular, that any restrictions on the carry-over of unused appropriations and margins, either by setting annual ceilings (Global Margin for Payments) or by imposing time-limits (Global Margin for Commitments) should be revoked; *the mid-term revision of the MFF Regulation should also provide solution for ambiguities regarding the use of special instruments as the current MFF Regulation does not expressly stipulate if the special instruments may exceed the MFF annual payment ceilings;*

Or. en

Amendment 234

Jan Olbrycht, Isabelle Thomas

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 38

Motion for a resolution

38. Believes, therefore, that the mid-term revision of the MFF Regulation should provide for the lifting of a number of constraints and limitations that were imposed by the Council on the flexibility provisions at the time of adoption of the MFF; considers, in particular, that any restrictions on the carry-over of unused appropriations and margins, either by setting annual ceilings (Global Margin for Payments) or by imposing time-limits (Global Margin for Commitments) should be revoked;

Amendment

38. Believes, therefore, that the mid-term revision of the MFF Regulation should provide for the lifting of a number of constraints and limitations that were imposed by the Council on the flexibility provisions at the time of adoption of the MFF; considers, in particular, that any restrictions on the carry-over of unused appropriations and margins, either by setting annual ceilings (Global Margin for Payments) or by imposing time-limits (Global Margin for Commitments) should be revoked; ***believes that, given the current budgetary constraints across several headings, no specific scope should be defined as regards the utilisation of resources under the Global Margin for Commitments;***

Or. en

Amendment 235
Christofer Fjellner

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 38

Motion for a resolution

38. Believes, therefore, that the mid-term revision of the MFF Regulation should ***provide for the lifting of a number of*** constraints and limitations that were imposed by the Council on the flexibility provisions at the time of adoption of the MFF; ***considers, in particular, that*** any restrictions on the carry-over of unused appropriations and margins, ***either by setting annual ceilings (Global Margin for Payments) or by imposing time-limits (Global Margin for Commitments) should be revoked;***

Amendment

38. Believes, therefore, that the mid-term revision of the MFF Regulation should ***evaluate*** the constraints and limitations that were imposed by the Council on the flexibility provisions at the time of adoption of the MFF, ***including*** any restrictions on the carry-over of unused appropriations and margins;

Or. sv

Amendment 236
Richard Ashworth

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 38

Motion for a resolution

38. Believes, *therefore*, that the mid-term revision of the MFF Regulation should provide *for the lifting of a number of constraints and limitations that were imposed by the Council on the flexibility provisions at the time of adoption of the MFF*; considers, *in particular*, that any *restrictions on the carry-over of unused appropriations and margins, either by setting annual ceilings (Global Margin for Payments) or by imposing time-limits (Global Margin for Commitments) should be revoked*;

Amendment

38. Believes, that the mid-term revision of the MFF Regulation should provide *an opportunity to evaluate the flexibility provisions included in the current MFF, including the constraints and limitations of these provisions*; considers *that constraints and limitations on flexibility provisions are entirely consistent with the principles of budgetary discipline and sound financial management, ensuring that the EU budget lives within its means*;

Or. en

Amendment 237
Christofer Fjellner

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 39

Motion for a resolution

39. Stresses, in particular, the mobilisation of the full amount of the Flexibility Instrument in 2016; notes that this instrument allows for financing clearly identified expenditure that cannot be financed within the ceiling of one or more headings and is not linked to a specific EU policy; considers, therefore, that it provides genuine flexibility in the EU budget, especially in the event of a major crisis; *calls, accordingly, for a substantial increase in its financial envelope up to an annual allocation of EUR 2 billion*,

Amendment

39. Stresses, in particular, the mobilisation of the full amount of the Flexibility Instrument in 2016; notes that this instrument allows for financing clearly identified expenditure that cannot be financed within the ceiling of one or more headings and is not linked to a specific EU policy; considers, therefore, that it provides genuine flexibility in the EU budget, especially in the event of a major crisis; *stresses, however, that this does not obviate the need for significant redistribution of the financial envelope*;

pointing out that this amount is budgeted only in the event of a decision of the budgetary authority for mobilisation of this instrument; recalls that the Flexibility Instrument is not linked to a special policy field and can be mobilised for any purpose that is deemed necessary;

Or. sv

Amendment 238
Richard Ashworth

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 39

Motion for a resolution

39. Stresses, in particular, the mobilisation of the full amount of the Flexibility Instrument in 2016; notes that this instrument allows for financing clearly identified expenditure that cannot be financed within the ceiling of one or more headings and is not linked to a specific EU policy; considers, therefore, that it provides genuine flexibility in the EU budget, especially in the event of a major crisis; ***calls, accordingly, for a substantial increase in its financial envelope up to an annual allocation of EUR 2 billion, pointing out that this amount is budgeted only in the event of a decision of the budgetary authority for mobilisation of this instrument; recalls that the Flexibility Instrument is not linked to a special policy field and can be mobilised for any purpose that is deemed necessary;***

Amendment

39. Stresses, in particular, the mobilisation of the full amount of the Flexibility Instrument in 2016; notes that this instrument allows for financing clearly identified expenditure that cannot be financed within the ceiling of one or more headings and is not linked to a specific EU policy; considers, therefore, that it provides genuine flexibility in the EU budget, especially in the event of a major crisis; ***recalls that the Flexibility Instrument is not linked to a special policy field and can be mobilised for any purpose that is deemed necessary; highlights both an increase in the annual appropriations available and an increased carry-over possibility of unused appropriations from the previous MFF; notes that over EUR 3.7 billion is available in the current MFF, of which EUR 1.53 billion has been mobilised thus far;***

Or. en

Amendment 239
Richard Ashworth

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 40

Motion for a resolution

40. Points to the role of the Emergency Aid Reserve in providing a rapid response to specific aid requirements for third countries for unforeseen events, and stresses its particular importance in the current context; ***calls for a substantial increase in its financial envelope up to an annual allocation of EUR 1 billion;***

Amendment

40. Points to the role of the Emergency Aid Reserve in providing a rapid response to specific aid requirements for third countries for unforeseen events, and stresses its particular importance in the current context; ***highlights an increase in the annual appropriations available from the previous MFF, with the additional possibility of carry-over of unused appropriations;***

Or. en

Amendment 240
Christofer Fjellner

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 40

Motion for a resolution

40. Points to the role of the Emergency Aid Reserve in providing a rapid response to specific aid requirements for third countries for unforeseen events, and stresses its particular importance in the current context; ***calls for a substantial increase in its financial envelope up to an annual allocation of EUR 1 billion;***

Amendment

40. Points to the role of the Emergency Aid Reserve in providing a rapid response to specific aid requirements for third countries for unforeseen events, and stresses its particular importance in the current context; ***calls for substantial redistribution of its financial envelope in order to meet those needs;***

Or. sv

Amendment 241
Richard Ashworth

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 41

Motion for a resolution

41. Notes the different rules in force as regards the time-span for carrying over unspent appropriations for the MFF special instruments, namely the Flexibility Instrument, the Emergency Aid Reserve, the EU Solidarity Fund and the European Globalisation Adjustment Fund; ***calls for the harmonisation of these rules so as to enable a general N+3 rule to apply to these instruments;***

Amendment

41. Notes the different rules in force as regards the time-span for carrying over unspent appropriations for the MFF special instruments, namely the Flexibility Instrument, the Emergency Aid Reserve, the EU Solidarity Fund and the European Globalisation Adjustment Fund;

Or. en

Amendment 242

Marco Zanni, Marco Valli

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 42

Motion for a resolution

42. Attaches particular importance to the Contingency Margin, as a last-resort instrument for reacting to unforeseen circumstances; stresses that, according to the Commission, this is the only special instrument that can be mobilised only for payment appropriations and thus to prevent a payment crisis in the EU budget as in 2014; ***deplores the fact that, contrary to the previous period, a compulsory offsetting of the appropriations is stipulated in the MFF Regulation; is of the firm opinion that this requirement creates an unsustainable situation with regard to the MFF ceilings of the last years of the period; stresses that the Contingency Margin is in any event a last-resort instrument, whose mobilisation is jointly agreed by the two arms of the budgetary authority; calls, therefore, for the rule of compulsory offsetting to be lifted immediately with retroactive effect;***

Amendment

42. Attaches particular importance to the Contingency Margin, as a last-resort instrument for reacting to unforeseen circumstances; stresses that, according to the Commission, this is the only special instrument that can be mobilised only for payment appropriations and thus to prevent a payment crisis in the EU budget as in 2014;

Amendment 243
Richard Ashworth

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 42

Motion for a resolution

42. Attaches particular importance to the Contingency Margin, as a last-resort instrument for reacting to unforeseen circumstances; stresses that, according to the Commission, this is the only special instrument that can be mobilised only for payment appropriations and thus to prevent a payment crisis in the EU budget as in 2014; *deplores* the fact that, contrary to the previous period, a compulsory offsetting of the appropriations is stipulated in the MFF Regulation; is of the firm opinion that this requirement *creates an unsustainable situation with regard to the MFF ceilings of the last years of the period; stresses that the Contingency Margin is in any event a last-resort instrument, whose mobilisation is jointly agreed by the two arms of the budgetary authority; calls, therefore, for the rule of compulsory offsetting to be lifted immediately with retroactive effect;*

Amendment

42. Attaches particular importance to the Contingency Margin, as a last-resort instrument for reacting to unforeseen circumstances; stresses that, according to the Commission, this is the only special instrument that can be mobilised only for payment appropriations and thus to prevent a payment crisis in the EU budget as in 2014; *recognises* the fact that, contrary to the previous period, a compulsory offsetting of the appropriations is stipulated in the MFF Regulation; is of the firm opinion that this requirement *instils a sense of budgetary discipline;*

Or. en

Amendment 244
Christofer Fjellner

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 42

Motion for a resolution

42. Attaches particular importance to the Contingency Margin, as a last-resort

Amendment

42. Attaches particular importance to the Contingency Margin, as a last-resort

instrument for reacting to unforeseen circumstances; stresses that, according to the Commission, this is the only special instrument that can be mobilised only for payment appropriations and thus to prevent a payment crisis in the EU budget as in 2014; *deplores* the fact that, contrary to the previous period, a compulsory offsetting of the appropriations is stipulated in the MFF Regulation; is of the firm opinion that this requirement *creates an unsustainable situation with regard to the MFF ceilings of the last years of the period; stresses that the Contingency Margin is in any event a last-resort instrument, whose mobilisation is jointly agreed by the two arms of the budgetary authority; calls, therefore, for the rule of compulsory offsetting to be lifted immediately with retroactive effect;*

instrument for reacting to unforeseen circumstances; stresses that, according to the Commission, this is the only special instrument that can be mobilised only for payment appropriations and thus to prevent a payment crisis in the EU budget as in 2014; *notes* the fact that, contrary to the previous period, a compulsory offsetting of the appropriations is stipulated in the MFF Regulation; is of the firm opinion that this requirement *is essential in order to prevent a waste of taxpayers' money;*

Or. sv

Amendment 245

Gérard Deprez, Martina Dlabajová, Louis Michel, Nils Torvalds, Jean Arthuis, Nedzhmi Ali

Motion for a resolution Paragraph 42

Motion for a resolution

42. Attaches particular importance to the Contingency Margin, as a last-resort instrument for reacting to unforeseen circumstances; stresses that, according to the Commission, this is the only special instrument that can be mobilised only for payment appropriations and thus to prevent a payment crisis in the EU budget as in 2014; deplores the fact that, contrary to the previous period, a compulsory offsetting of the appropriations is stipulated in the MFF Regulation; is of the firm opinion that this requirement creates an unsustainable situation with regard to the MFF ceilings of the last years of the period; stresses that the

Amendment

42. Attaches particular importance to the Contingency Margin, as a last-resort instrument for reacting to unforeseen circumstances; stresses that, according to the Commission, this is the only special instrument that can be mobilised only for payment appropriations and thus to prevent a payment crisis in the EU budget as in 2014; deplores the fact that, contrary to the previous period, a compulsory offsetting of the appropriations is stipulated in the MFF Regulation; is of the firm opinion that this requirement creates an unsustainable situation with regard to the MFF ceilings of the last years of the period; stresses that the

Contingency Margin is in any event a last-resort instrument, whose mobilisation is jointly agreed by the two arms of the budgetary authority; calls, therefore, for the rule of compulsory offsetting to be lifted immediately with retroactive effect;

Contingency Margin is in any event a last-resort instrument, whose mobilisation is jointly agreed by the two arms of the budgetary authority; calls, therefore, for the rule of compulsory offsetting to be lifted immediately with retroactive effect, *as well as for an upward revision of its maximum annual amount to 0.05% of EU GNI*;

Or. en

Amendment 246
Siegfried Mureşan

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 42

Motion for a resolution

42. Attaches particular importance to the Contingency Margin, as a last-resort instrument for reacting to unforeseen circumstances; stresses that, according to the Commission, this is the only special instrument that can be mobilised only for payment appropriations and thus to prevent a payment crisis in the EU budget as in 2014; deplores the fact that, contrary to the previous period, a compulsory offsetting of the appropriations is stipulated in the MFF Regulation; is of the firm opinion that this requirement creates an unsustainable situation *with regard to the* MFF ceilings *of* the last years of the period; stresses that the Contingency Margin is in any event a last-resort instrument, whose mobilisation is jointly agreed by the two arms of the budgetary authority; calls, therefore, for the rule of compulsory offsetting to be lifted immediately with retroactive effect;

Amendment

42. Attaches particular importance to the Contingency Margin, as a last-resort instrument for reacting to unforeseen circumstances; stresses that, according to the Commission, this is the only special instrument that can be mobilised only for payment appropriations and thus to prevent a payment crisis in the EU budget as in 2014; deplores the fact that, contrary to the previous period, a compulsory offsetting of the appropriations is stipulated in the MFF Regulation; is of the firm opinion that this requirement creates an unsustainable situation *which will in fact lower the annual* MFF ceilings *in* the last years of the period *and thus create additional pressure on the EU Budget*; stresses that the Contingency Margin is in any event a last-resort instrument, whose mobilisation is jointly agreed by the two arms of the budgetary authority; calls, therefore, for the rule of compulsory offsetting to be lifted immediately with retroactive effect;

Or. en

Amendment 247
Richard Ashworth

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 42 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

42a. *Believes that the Commission should consider creating a mechanism based on the principle of Article 17(4) of the MFF Regulation; suggests that in order to increase flexibility, funding could be re-allocated between headings by offsetting any increase of the ceiling in one heading by an equivalent decrease in the ceiling of another heading, on agreement from both arms of the budgetary authority; underlines that this tool should be limited to a relatively small percentage of the headings in question order to achieve budgetary stability;*

Or. en

Amendment 248
Gérard Deprez, Martina Dlabajová, Louis Michel, Anneli Jäätteenmäki, Nils Torvalds, Jean Arthuis, Charles Goerens, Nedzhmi Ali

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 42 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

42a. *Stresses that the rigid structure of the Union budget deprives the budgetary authority of the possibility of reacting adequately to changing circumstances; calls, therefore, for allowing the transfer of available margins between headings at qualified majority in Council, with the aim of fully exploiting the MFF ceilings;*

Or. en

Amendment 249
Eider Gardiazabal Rubial

Motion for a resolution
Subheading 14 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

Gender Mainstreaming

Or. en

Amendment 250
Gérard Deprez, Martina Dlabajová, Louis Michel, Nils Torvalds, Jean Arthuis, Charles Goerens, Nedzhmi Ali

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 42 b (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

42b. Welcomes the creation of an emergency support instrument within the European Union and takes note of the solution proposed by the Commission as a matter of urgency, while repeating its strong concerns as regards its exclusion from the decision-making process as well as the foreseen termination of this instrument by the end of 2018; Considers that a more sustainable legal and budgetary framework should be envisaged in order to allow for emergency aid within the Union to be mobilised in the future, meant at responding to crisis and unforeseen situations, should by its very nature be covered by special instruments and be counted outside the MFF; calls, consequently, for this instrument to be perpetuated in the form of a new MFF flexibility mechanism;

Or. en

Amendment 251
Eider Gardiazabal Rubial

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 42 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

42a. Welcomes the MFF mid-term review as an opportunity to make significant progress in a more effective integration of the gender mainstreaming in the MFF and in the implementation and monitoring of the Joint Declaration attached to the MFF on this regard;

Or. en

Amendment 252
Eider Gardiazabal Rubial

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 42 b (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

42b. Underlines that in addition to the ability to react flexibly to changing circumstances without prejudice to the agreed programming, there is also a necessity for the Union to be able to react quickly to developing crises; calls, therefore, for the establishment of a permanent EU crisis reserve within the Union budget over and above the MFF ceilings and below GNI limit of 1.23%, in order to avoid ad hoc solutions like the setting-up of trust funds; this reserve would enable the EU to deal with unforeseen circumstances or to cope with substantial and lasting changes in political priorities;

Or. en

Amendment 253
Ernest Maragall
on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Motion for a resolution
Subheading 15

Motion for a resolution

Simplification

Amendment

Greening the EU budget

42a. Strongly believes that the post electoral revision of the MFF should not be limited to the figures both in commitments and payments but also in a qualitative reform of the MFF in order to make it compatible with the EU's commitments such as the EU-2020 strategy, the COP21, including the targets of the EU on GHG emissions reduction, and the post MDG; therefore calls on the Commission and the Member states to use all legislative and non-legislative tools to improve the added value of the EU budget in line with the ECA's statement; Moreover calls on the Commission and Member States to ensure that the EU budget does not contain subsidies that are potentially harmful for the climate, the health and the environment, including those which lock in fossil fuel infrastructure;

42b. Calls on the Commission and Member States to take further efforts to mainstream climate protection, to integrate horizontal principles of sustainable development and the Energy Union priorities of putting energy efficiency first and becoming world number one in prosumer led renewables throughout all EU budget plans and programmes In order to improve the quality of the EU budget;

42c. Calls on the Commission to introduce an effective method of tracking biodiversity spending in the Union budget and to ensure Union financial resources do not contain subsidies that are harmful

to biodiversity;

42d. Calls for the Commission to immediately start a Fitness Check of the CAP, as the recipient of nearly 40% of the EU spending which is supposed to be delivering on sustainable management of natural resources objectives, on the basis of the five fitness check questions: EU value added, relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and policy coherence;

42e. Notes that before the last CAP reform, it was argued that CAP funding should continue, on the condition that it reformed to respond to citizens' demands and the realities of a new century; although the subsequent reform only addressed to a limited extent the major sustainability challenges of transitioning to food production systems that are resilient to volatility of markets and climate.

Or. en

Amendment 254
Clare Moody

Motion for a resolution
Subheading 15

Motion for a resolution

Simplification

Amendment

Budgeting for Results & Simplification

Or. en

Amendment 255
Ernest Maragall
on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Motion for a resolution
Subheading 15 a (new)

Gender-responsive budgeting

42c. Recognises that gender equality is enshrined in the EU Treaty and should be included in all EU policies to deliver equality in practice; stresses that gender equality must become a policy objective in all budget titles and similarly, gender mainstreaming must be recognised as an implementation method in all budget titles; stresses that therefore, gender budgeting must become an integral part of the budgetary procedure at all its stages, and notes that progress on this front has been marginal; welcomes the MFF mid-term review as an opportunity to make significant progress, in light of the 'Budget for Results' agenda; expects the Commission, therefore, to present further measurable objectives in order to truly embed gender perspectives in the EU budget for the remainder of this programming period;

42d. Recalls the Parliament's crucial scrutiny role on gender-responsive budgeting; calls for all committees to take gender equality into consideration in the design and revision of budgets and of the financial framework in order to increase accountability and transparency regarding this Institution's commitment to gender equality; urges in this regard to systematically include specific gender indicators and gender-disaggregated data in the monitoring and evaluation of all actions that are funded by the EU budget.

42e. Stresses that the MFF should reflect the Commission's goal to achieve 40% of female senior and middle management in the Commission as set out in Jean-Claude Juncker's mission letter to Commissioner Kristalina Georgieva.

Or. en

Amendment 256
Ernest Maragall
on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Motion for a resolution
Subheading 15 b (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

Simplification

Or. en

Amendment 257
Wim van de Camp

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 43

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

43. Believes that the mid-term review/revision provides for an excellent opportunity for the first-time assessment of the functioning of the EU policies and programmes concerned, and expects the Commission to supply an analysis identifying the shortcomings of the current implementation system; invites the Commission to come up with concrete proposals to address the possible deficiencies and to improve the implementation environment for the remaining years of the current MFF, in order to ensure the best possible use of scarce financial resources;

43. Believes that the mid-term review/revision provides for an excellent opportunity for the first-time assessment of the functioning of the EU policies and programmes concerned, and expects the Commission to supply an analysis identifying the shortcomings of the current implementation system; invites the Commission to come up with concrete proposals to address the possible deficiencies and to improve the implementation environment for the remaining years of the current MFF, in order to ensure the best possible use of scarce financial resources; ***but supports a future system in which the allocation and amount of the national envelopes should be based on the principles of performance based budgeting, also within the country specific recommendations and the control systems should be risk based: in which higher risks imply more controls and lower risks, less controls;***

Amendment 258**Jan Olbrycht, Isabelle Thomas****Motion for a resolution****Paragraph 43***Motion for a resolution*

43. Believes that the mid-term review/revision provides for an excellent opportunity for the first-time assessment of the functioning of the EU policies and programmes concerned, and expects the Commission to supply an analysis identifying the shortcomings of the current implementation system; invites the Commission to come up with concrete proposals to address the possible deficiencies and to improve the implementation environment for the remaining years of the current MFF, in order to ensure the best possible use of scarce financial resources;

Amendment

43. Believes that the mid-term review/revision provides for an excellent opportunity for the first-time assessment of the functioning of the EU policies and programmes concerned, ***as well as the operation of the MFF flexibility provisions and special instruments***, and expects the Commission to supply an analysis identifying the shortcomings of the current implementation system; ***pays particular attention to the assessment of the impact on the implementation process of the new elements introduced in the current programming period, such as ex-ante conditionalities under cohesion policy***; invites the Commission to come up with concrete proposals to address the possible deficiencies and to improve the implementation environment for the remaining years of the current MFF, in order to ensure the best possible use of scarce financial resources;

Or. en

Amendment 259**Gérard Deprez, Louis Michel, Anneli Jäätteenmäki, Nils Torvalds, Jean Arthuis, Nedzhmi Ali****Motion for a resolution****Paragraph 43***Motion for a resolution*

43. Believes that the mid-term

Amendment

43. Believes that the mid-term

review/revision provides for an excellent opportunity for the first-time assessment of the functioning of the EU policies and programmes concerned, **and** expects the Commission to supply an analysis identifying the shortcomings of the current implementation system; invites the Commission to come up with concrete proposals to address the possible deficiencies and to improve the implementation environment for the remaining years of the current MFF, in order to ensure the **best** possible use of scarce financial resources;

review/revision provides for an excellent opportunity for the first-time assessment of the functioning, **impact, and where appropriate the tangible results**, of the EU policies and programmes concerned, **suggests the Commission to apply result-oriented framework in analysing how the EU funds are spent**, expects the Commission to supply an analysis identifying the shortcomings of the current implementation system **and** invites the Commission to come up with concrete proposals to address the possible deficiencies and to improve **and rationalize** the implementation environment for the remaining years of the current MFF, in order to ensure the **most efficient** possible use of scarce financial resources;

Or. en

Amendment 260
Clare Moody

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 43

Motion for a resolution

43. Believes that the mid-term review/revision provides for an excellent opportunity for the first-time assessment of the functioning of the EU policies and programmes concerned, and expects the Commission to supply an analysis identifying the shortcomings of the current implementation system; invites the Commission to come up with concrete proposals to address **the possible** deficiencies and to improve the implementation environment for the remaining years of the current MFF, in order to ensure the best possible use of scarce financial resources;

Amendment

43. Believes that the mid-term review/revision provides for an excellent opportunity for the first-time assessment of the functioning of the EU policies and programmes concerned, and expects the Commission to supply an analysis identifying the shortcomings of the current implementation system; invites the Commission to come up with concrete proposals to address **inefficiencies**, deficiencies and to improve the implementation environment for the remaining years of the current MFF, in order to ensure the best possible use of scarce financial resources; **believes that Budget for Results agenda holds potential and in light of the huge pressure the EU**

budget is under, it could also boost the faith of citizens in EU expenditure;

Or. en

Amendment 261

Eider Gardiazabal Rubial, Brando Benifei, Eva Paunova, Terry Reintke

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 43

Motion for a resolution

43. Believes that the mid-term review/revision provides for an excellent opportunity for the first-time assessment of the functioning of the EU policies and programmes concerned, and expects the Commission to supply an analysis identifying the shortcomings of the current implementation system; invites the Commission to come up with concrete proposals to address the possible deficiencies and to improve the implementation environment for the remaining years of the current MFF, in order to ensure the best possible use of scarce financial resources;

Amendment

43. Believes that the mid-term review/revision provides for an excellent opportunity for the first-time assessment of the functioning of the EU policies and programmes concerned, and expects the Commission to supply an analysis *involving relevant stakeholders such as civil society in a structured dialogue*, identifying the shortcomings of the current implementation system; invites the Commission to come up with concrete proposals to address the possible deficiencies and to improve the implementation environment for the remaining years of the current MFF, in order to ensure the best possible use of scarce financial resources;

Or. en

Amendment 262

Marco Zanni, Marco Valli

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 43

Motion for a resolution

43. Believes that the mid-term review/revision provides for an excellent opportunity for the first-time assessment of the functioning of the EU policies and

Amendment

43. Believes that the mid-term review/revision provides for an excellent opportunity for the first-time assessment of the functioning of the EU policies and

programmes concerned, and expects the Commission to supply an analysis identifying the shortcomings of the current implementation system; invites the Commission to come up with concrete proposals to address the possible deficiencies and to improve the implementation environment for the remaining years of the current MFF, in order to ensure the best possible use of scarce financial resources;

programmes concerned, and expects the Commission to supply an analysis identifying the shortcomings of the current implementation system **and possible priority areas**; invites the Commission to come up with concrete proposals to address the possible deficiencies and to improve the implementation environment for the remaining years of the current MFF, in order to ensure the best possible use of scarce financial resources;

Or. it

Amendment 263
Eider Gardiazabal Rubial, Pavel Poc

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 43

Motion for a resolution

43. Believes that the mid-term review/revision provides for an excellent opportunity for the first-time assessment of the functioning of the EU policies and programmes concerned, and expects the Commission to supply an analysis identifying the shortcomings of the current implementation system; invites the Commission to come up with concrete proposals to address the possible deficiencies and to improve the implementation environment for the remaining years of the current MFF, in order to ensure the best possible use of scarce financial resources;

Amendment

43. Believes that the mid-term review/revision provides for an excellent opportunity for the first-time assessment **and evaluation** of the functioning of the EU policies and programmes concerned, and expects the Commission to supply an analysis identifying the shortcomings of the current implementation system; invites the Commission to come up with concrete proposals to address the possible deficiencies and to improve the implementation environment for the remaining years of the current MFF, in order to ensure the best possible use of scarce financial resources;

Or. en

Amendment 264
Ernest Maragall
on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 43

Motion for a resolution

43. Believes that the *mid-term review/revision* provides for an excellent opportunity for the first-time assessment of the functioning of the EU policies and programmes concerned, and expects the Commission to supply an analysis identifying the shortcomings of the current implementation system; invites the Commission to come up with concrete proposals to address the possible deficiencies and to improve the implementation environment for the remaining years of the current MFF, in order to ensure the best possible use of scarce financial resources;

Amendment

43. Believes that the *post electoral revision* provides for an excellent opportunity for the first-time assessment of the functioning of the EU policies and programmes concerned, and expects the Commission to supply an analysis identifying the shortcomings of the current implementation system; invites the Commission to come up with concrete proposals to address the possible deficiencies and to improve the implementation environment for the remaining years of the current MFF, in order to ensure the best possible use of scarce financial resources;

Or. en

Amendment 265
Monika Hohlmeier, Reimer Böge

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 43 – subparagraph 1 (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

Expects targeted actions aimed at optimising and simplifying the rules of procedure applicable to the use of EU programs, required in order to decrease considerably the administrative burden for beneficiaries; stresses furthermore, the necessity for a strict application and interpretation of the principle of subsidiarity, in order to achieve better efficiency of EU intervention and transition from a system of mistrust of EU institutions to a system of confidence and transparency for Member States and their citizens;

Or. en

Amendment 266
Marco Zanni, Marco Valli

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 43 – subparagraph 1 (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

calls on the European Commission and Member States to decide in which cases programmes can be funded and implemented more effectively at European level and in which cases measures at national level are more reasonable and more in line with the subsidiarity principle;

Or. it

Amendment 267
Eider Gardiazabal Rubial

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 43 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

43a. Stresses that the Commission's proposal to improve European spending via the so called performance based budgeting remains unclear; is convinced that the EU must strive to best use taxpayer's money, but that it must not take a form of a technocratic exercise aiming at reducing budgetary support in certain policy areas; recalls that a poor evaluation of the functioning of a programme should primarily lead to revision of its legal basis and its functioning in a Member state and not to the end of it financing; repeats that by no means should performance based budgeting lead to a budget reduction or transfer of fund; underlines that better spending cannot solve the main problem the EU is faced with- allocating scarce

resources while the needs are growing;

Or. en

Amendment 268
Wim van de Camp

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 43 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

43a. Encourages the Commission to come up with a future system in which the allocation and amount of the national envelopes will be subject to performance based budgeting and country specific recommendations within the EU semester;

Or. en

Amendment 269
Clare Moody

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 43 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

43a. Believes that the Budget for Results agenda should be a vehicle for the boosting performance of underperforming programmes and that political priorities should not be abandoned due to technical or programming failures;

Or. en

Amendment 270
Clare Moody

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 43 b (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

43b. Reminds the Commission that as one arm of the budgetary authority the European Parliament must be included in budgetary decision making and must be included in developing the Commissions Budget for Results strategy;

Or. en

Amendment 271
Clare Moody

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 43 c (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

43c. Believes that new priorities often correspond with very real need and require budgetary support; the Parliament would be more able to meet these needs under existing budgetary ceilings if more performance information and greater flexibility were available;

Or. en

Amendment 272
Clare Moody

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 43 d (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

43d. The lack of adequate flexibility and accurate information has led to across the board cuts in some instances and the cutting of high demand, high performance programmes such as

Horizon 2020; in this regard the current system is damaging to the EU's aims and reputation;

Or. en

Amendment 273
Clare Moody

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 43 e (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

43e. *Believes that many social challenges, such as achieving gender equality, would be better addressed by improved setting of targets and measurement of results across budget lines and headings;*

Or. en

Amendment 274
Xabier Benito Ziluaga

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 44

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

44. *Acknowledges* the increased role of financial instruments in the Union budget ***as a complementary form of funding as compared to*** subsidies and grants; ***recognises the potential of these instruments in terms of increasing the financial, and therefore the political, impact of the Union budget;*** underlines, however, that a shift from traditional financing to more innovative instruments is not advisable in all policy areas, as not all policies are entirely market-driven; underlines that increasing use of financial instruments should not lead to a reduction

44. *Deplores* the increased role of financial instruments in the Union budget ***and acknowledges that the budget must go beyond a sum of*** subsidies and grants, ***and claims for a new strategy fostering public investment in well selected sectors at European level. The financial instruments are failing in order to attract enough private capital insofar the investors are searching higher profit rates than the low interest provided; furthermore, these funds persist in concentrating investments in activities that would be likewise carried out; and, finally, integrate particular***

in the Union budget; recalls Parliament's repeated calls for greater transparency and democratic scrutiny regarding the implementation of financial instruments supported by the Union budget;

interests and private actors into public activities which detract a surplus and determine functioning conditions which prevent undertaking projects that were looking fully for the general interest; and they issue bonds backed by public guarantees, putting the risk charge into the public contributions; underlines, however, that a shift from traditional financing to more innovative instruments is not advisable in all policy areas, as not all policies are entirely market-driven; underlines that increasing use of financial instruments should not lead to a reduction in the Union budget; recalls Parliament's repeated calls for greater transparency and democratic scrutiny regarding the implementation of financial instruments supported by the Union budget;

Or. en

Amendment 275
Eider Gardiazabal Rubial

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 44

Motion for a resolution

44. Acknowledges the increased role of financial instruments in the Union budget as a complementary form of funding as compared to subsidies and grants; recognises the potential of these instruments in terms of increasing the financial, and therefore the political, impact of the Union budget; underlines, however, that a shift from traditional financing to more innovative instruments is not advisable in all policy areas, as not all policies are entirely market-driven; underlines that increasing use of financial instruments should not lead to a reduction in the Union budget; recalls Parliament's repeated calls for greater transparency and democratic scrutiny regarding the

Amendment

44. Acknowledges the increased role of financial instruments in the Union budget as a complementary form of funding as compared to subsidies and grants; recognises the potential of these instruments in terms of increasing the financial, and therefore the political, impact of the Union budget; underlines, however, that a shift from traditional financing to more innovative instruments is not advisable in all policy areas, as not all policies are entirely market-driven; **highlights that financial instruments provide an alternative and complementary way of funding and should not be used for the projects which can only benefit from the use of grant;** underlines that increasing

implementation of financial instruments supported by the Union budget;

use of financial instruments should not lead to a reduction in the Union budget; recalls Parliament's repeated calls for greater transparency and democratic scrutiny regarding the implementation of financial instruments supported by the Union budget; ***stresses that when assessing a financial instrument, the leverage dimension cannot be the only evaluation criteria; in this context reminds of the importance of the "additionality" criteria and the ability to contribute fulfilment of the EU's political objectives;***

Or. en

Amendment 276

Ernest Maragall

on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 44

Motion for a resolution

44. Acknowledges the increased role of financial instruments in the Union budget as a complementary form of funding as compared to subsidies and grants; ***recognises the potential of these instruments in terms of increasing the financial, and therefore the political, impact of the Union budget; underlines, however, that*** a shift from traditional financing to more innovative instruments ***is not advisable in all policy areas, as not all policies are entirely market-driven; underlines that*** increasing use of financial instruments should not lead to a reduction in the Union budget; recalls Parliament's repeated calls for greater transparency and democratic scrutiny regarding the implementation of financial instruments supported by the Union budget;

Amendment

44. Acknowledges the increased role of financial instruments in the Union budget as a complementary form of funding as compared to subsidies and grants; ***Notes however the lack of evidence on the outcomes and results achieved by financial instruments and the loose link of those financial instruments to overarching objectives and priorities of the EU; Considers necessary to further strengthening the accountability, transparency and result-orientation of financial instruments; Is opposed to*** a shift from traditional financing to more innovative instruments ***especially in both the Cohesion policy and research policy which should remain the main EU's EU2020-compatible investment capacity ; highlights that any*** increasing use of financial instruments should not lead to a reduction in the Union budget; recalls Parliament's repeated calls for greater

transparency and democratic scrutiny regarding the implementation of financial instruments supported by the Union budget;

Or. en

Amendment 277
Wim van de Camp

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 44

Motion for a resolution

44. Acknowledges the increased role of financial instruments in the Union budget as a complementary form of funding as compared to subsidies and grants; recognises the potential of these instruments in terms of increasing the financial, and therefore the political, impact of the Union budget; underlines, however, that a shift from traditional financing to more innovative instruments is not advisable in all policy areas, as not all policies are entirely market-driven; underlines that increasing use of financial instruments should not lead to a reduction in the Union budget; recalls Parliament's repeated calls for greater transparency and democratic scrutiny regarding the implementation of financial instruments supported by the Union budget;

Amendment

44. Acknowledges the increased role of financial instruments in the Union budget as a complementary form of funding as compared to subsidies and grants; recognises the potential of these instruments in terms of increasing the financial, and therefore the political, impact of the Union budget; underlines, however, that a shift from traditional financing to more innovative instruments is not advisable in all policy areas, as not all policies are entirely market-driven; ***stimulates that where possible a new balance between grants and loans should be achieved, in order to stimulate the multiplier effect on investments;*** underlines that increasing use of financial instruments should not lead to a reduction in the Union budget; recalls Parliament's repeated calls for greater transparency and democratic scrutiny regarding the implementation of financial instruments supported by the Union budget;

Or. en

Amendment 278
Richard Ashworth

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 44

Motion for a resolution

44. Acknowledges the increased role of financial instruments in the Union budget as a complementary form of funding as compared to subsidies and grants; recognises the potential of these instruments in terms of increasing the financial, and therefore the political, impact of the Union budget; underlines, however, that a shift from traditional financing to more innovative instruments is not advisable in all policy areas, as not all policies are entirely market-driven; ***underlines that increasing use of financial instruments should not lead to a reduction in the Union budget***; recalls Parliament's repeated calls for greater transparency and democratic scrutiny regarding the implementation of financial instruments supported by the Union budget;

Amendment

44. Acknowledges the increased role of financial instruments in the Union budget as a complementary form of funding as compared to subsidies and grants; recognises the potential of these instruments in terms of increasing the financial, and therefore the political, impact of the Union budget; underlines, however, that a shift from traditional financing to more innovative instruments is not advisable in all policy areas, as not all policies are entirely market-driven; recalls Parliament's repeated calls for greater transparency and democratic scrutiny regarding the implementation of financial instruments supported by the Union budget;

Or. en

Amendment 279

Eider Gardiazabal Rubial, Brando Benifei, Eva Paunova, Terry Reintke

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 44

Motion for a resolution

44. Acknowledges the increased role of financial instruments in the Union budget as a complementary form of funding as compared to subsidies and grants; recognises the potential of these instruments in terms of increasing the financial, and therefore the political, impact of the Union budget; underlines, however, that a shift from traditional financing to more innovative instruments is not advisable in all policy areas, as not all

Amendment

44. Acknowledges the increased role of financial instruments in the Union budget as a complementary form of funding as compared to subsidies and grants; recognises the potential of these instruments in terms of increasing the financial, and therefore the political, impact of the Union budget; underlines, however, that a shift from traditional financing to more innovative instruments is not advisable in all policy areas, as not all

policies are entirely market-driven; underlines that increasing use of financial instruments should not lead to a reduction in the Union budget; recalls Parliament's repeated calls for greater transparency and democratic scrutiny regarding the implementation of financial instruments supported by the Union budget;

policies are entirely market-driven (*e.g. youth and education sectors*); underlines that increasing use of financial instruments should not lead to a reduction in the Union budget; recalls Parliament's repeated calls for greater transparency and democratic scrutiny regarding the implementation of financial instruments supported by the Union budget;

Or. en

Amendment 280
José Manuel Fernandes

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 44 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

44a. *Calls on the Commission to conduct an in-depth analysis of the use of the financial instruments since the beginning of the current programming period in the course of the mid-term review/revision; encourages the Commission to identify all EU policy areas where grants could be combined with financial instruments; is of the firm opinion that the possibility of a combination of various EU resources under harmonised management rules would help optimizing the synergies between available sources of financing at EU level;*

Or. en

Amendment 281
Ernest Maragall
on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 44 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

44a. *Follows the debate about a new Eurozone budgetary capacity (EBC) and considers it must be included in the MFF revision, whether it could be funded by regular incomes and/or by EU debt issuance; calls for an integrated management and parliamentary control for the EU budget, the ESM and the EBC;*

Or. en

Amendment 282

Inese Vaidere

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 44 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

44a. *Supports the use of the financial instruments, where it can contribute to a more efficient use of resources, however, stresses the importance of maintaining the EU grant elements, which are particularly important to less developed regions;*

Or. en

Amendment 283

Ernest Maragall

on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 44 b (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

44b. *Recalls to the Commission that grants and loans do not finance the same type of activities and that those different instruments support different types of beneficiaries and projects; stresses the*

need of continuing with grants for financing fundamental and collaborative research, in particular research performed by the academia; alerts against the tendency in the Commission of transforming grants into loans or equity, in particular when university research budgets are suffering cuts in many Member States; believes that this tendency works towards the losing of the research basis, which in turn significantly reduces the innovation potential of the European Union in the future;

Or. en

Amendment 284
Reimer Böge, Monika Hohlmeier

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 45

Motion for a resolution

45. Recalls that according to Article 25 of the MFF regulation, the Commission shall present a proposal for a new multiannual financial framework before 1 January 2018; stresses, therefore, that a number of key elements for the next MFF should already be debated in the framework of the upcoming review/revision;

Amendment

45. Recalls that according to Article 25 of the MFF regulation, the Commission shall present a proposal for a new multiannual financial framework before 1 January 2018; stresses, therefore, that a number of key elements for the next MFF should already be debated in the framework of the upcoming review/revision *to set the stage for the negotiations and to allow for good progress and a timely conclusion;*

Or. en

Amendment 285
Richard Ashworth

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 45 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

45a. *Considers that the key priority to be addressed should be the future needs of the Union; suggests that the Union carefully consider the merits of every cent spent and prioritise spending on the most value generating areas or areas with proven EU added value;*

Or. en

Amendment 286
Richard Ashworth

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 46

Motion for a resolution

46. Considers that *the key priorities* to be addressed must include adjustments to the duration of the MFF, a *thorough reform of the own resources system*, a greater emphasis on the unity of the budget, and more budgetary flexibility; *is furthermore convinced that the modalities of the decision-making process need to be reviewed in order to ensure democratic legitimacy and comply with the provisions of the Treaty;*

Amendment

46. Considers that *further issues* to be addressed must include adjustments to the duration of the MFF, a greater emphasis on the unity of the budget, and more budgetary flexibility;

Or. en

Amendment 287
Petri Sarvamaa

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 46

Motion for a resolution

46. Considers that the key priorities to be addressed must include adjustments to

Amendment

46. Considers that the key priorities to be addressed must include adjustments to

the duration of the MFF, a thorough reform of the own resources system, a greater emphasis on the unity of the budget, and more budgetary flexibility; is furthermore convinced that the modalities of the decision-making process need to be reviewed in order to ensure democratic legitimacy and comply with the provisions of the Treaty;

the duration of the MFF, a thorough reform of the own resources system, a greater emphasis on the unity of the budget, and more budgetary flexibility; is furthermore convinced that the modalities of the decision-making process need to be reviewed in order to ensure democratic legitimacy and comply with the provisions of the Treaty, ***specifically ensuring that the Parliament's role in adopting the multiannual financial framework is fully respected and that the Council doesn't act without Parliament's consent;***

Or. en

Amendment 288

Ernest Maragall

on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 46

Motion for a resolution

46. Considers that the key priorities to be addressed must include adjustments to the duration of the MFF, a thorough reform of the own resources system, a greater emphasis on the unity of the budget, ***and*** more budgetary flexibility; is furthermore convinced that the modalities of the decision-making process need to be reviewed in order to ensure democratic legitimacy and comply with the provisions of the Treaty;

Amendment

46. Considers that the key priorities to be addressed must include adjustments to the duration of the MFF, a thorough reform of the own resources system, a greater emphasis on the unity of the budget, more budgetary flexibility ***and a debate on the own resources ceilings which has not been modified for the last two decades*** ; is furthermore convinced that the modalities of the decision-making process need to be reviewed in order to ensure democratic legitimacy and comply with the provisions of the Treaty;

Or. en

Amendment 289

Wim van de Camp

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 46

Motion for a resolution

46. Considers that the key priorities to be addressed must include adjustments to the duration of the MFF, a thorough reform of the own resources system, a greater emphasis on the unity of the budget, and more budgetary flexibility; is furthermore convinced that the modalities of the decision-making process need to be reviewed in order to ensure democratic legitimacy and comply with the provisions of the Treaty;

Amendment

46. Considers that the key priorities to be addressed must include adjustments to the duration of the MFF, a thorough reform of the own resources system, a greater emphasis on the unity of the budget, ***a thorough revision of programs like Horizon 2020 and others***, and more budgetary flexibility; is furthermore convinced that the modalities of the decision-making process need to be reviewed in order to ensure democratic legitimacy and comply with the provisions of the Treaty;

Or. en

Amendment 290
Christofer Fjellner

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 46

Motion for a resolution

46. Considers that the key priorities to be addressed must include adjustments to the duration of the MFF, ***a thorough reform of the own resources system***, a greater emphasis on the unity of the budget, and more budgetary flexibility; is furthermore convinced that the modalities of the decision-making process need to be reviewed in order to ensure democratic legitimacy and comply with the provisions of the Treaty;

Amendment

46. Considers that the key priorities to be addressed must include adjustments to the duration of the MFF, a greater emphasis on the unity of the budget, and more budgetary flexibility; is furthermore convinced that the modalities of the decision-making process need to be reviewed in order to ensure democratic legitimacy and comply with the provisions of the Treaty;

Or. sv

Amendment 291
Clare Moody

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 46

Motion for a resolution

46. Considers that the key priorities to be addressed must include ***adjustments to the duration of the MFF, a thorough*** reform of the own resources system, a greater emphasis on the unity of the budget, and more budgetary flexibility; is furthermore convinced that the modalities of the decision-making process need to be reviewed in order to ensure democratic legitimacy and comply with the provisions of the Treaty;

Amendment

46. Considers that the key priorities to be addressed must include reform of the own resources system, a greater emphasis on the unity of the budget, and more budgetary flexibility; is furthermore convinced that the modalities of the decision-making process need to be reviewed in order to ensure democratic legitimacy and comply with the provisions of the Treaty;

Or. en

Amendment 292

Gérard Deprez, Martina Dlabajová, Louis Michel, Anneli Jäätteenmäki, Nils Torvalds, Jean Arthuis, Nedzhmi Ali

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 47 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

47a. Reminds that, at a time of scarcity of resources and erosion of the European citizens' confidence and belief in the EU project, it is important to show the added-value of EU budget delivery; believes that bringing the performance culture at the heart of the EU budget should constitute the roadmap of the inter-institutional working group on performance-based budgeting, which conclusions should be taken into account by the Commission in its legislative proposal for the post 2020 MFF, at the latest;

Amendment

Or. en

Amendment 293

Gérard Deprez, Louis Michel, Anneli Jäätteenmäki, Nils Torvalds, Jean Arthuis, Nedzhmi Ali

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 47 b (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

47b. Emphasizes that, where appropriate and in particular in innovation-focused programmes, performance and output-related assessment should become a key principle;

Or. en