



2015/2345(INI)

9.12.2016

AMENDMENTS

1 - 66

Draft opinion
Mireille D'Ornano
(PE587.699v01-00)

Budgetary Control of financing NGOs from the EU Budget
(2015/2345(INI))

Amendment 1

Benedek Jávor

on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Draft opinion

Recital A

Draft opinion

A. whereas *NGOs* are a huge asset to the European Union and play a vital role in the lives of EU citizens, by safeguarding their right to **health and to a healthy environment and** by defending their rights as consumers, and whereas they boost research, innovation and development cooperation;

Amendment

A. whereas ***not-for-profit organisations which are independent from public authorities or commercial organisations and that develop activities aiming at enhancing EU public interest*** are a huge asset to the European Union and play a vital role in the lives of EU citizens, by safeguarding their right to ***quality, affordable and accessible healthcare, food safety, and by contributing to sustainability, addressing climate change and protecting the environment as well as*** by defending their rights as consumers, and whereas they boost research, innovation and development cooperation; ***they bridge the gap between the EU and its citizens through people's empowerment, both at a local and a European level.***

Or. en

Amendment 2

Ivan Jakovčić

Draft opinion

Recital A

Draft opinion

A. whereas NGOs are a huge asset to the European Union and play a ***vital*** role in the lives of EU citizens, by safeguarding their right to health and to a healthy environment and by defending their rights as consumers, and whereas they boost research, innovation and development cooperation;

Amendment

A. whereas NGOs are a huge asset to the European Union and play a ***major*** role in the lives of EU citizens, by safeguarding their right to health and to a healthy environment and by defending their rights as consumers, and whereas they boost research, innovation and development cooperation;

Or. hr

Amendment 3
Julie Girling

Draft opinion
Recital A a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

A a. Whereas Regulation (EU) No 1293/2013 on the establishment of a Programme for the Environment and Climate Action (LIFE) contains specific priority areas on Environmental Governance and Information and Climate Governance and Information; whereas the specific objectives for these priority areas include calls ^{1a} "to promote better environmental governance by broadening stakeholder involvement, including NGOs, in consultation on and implementation of policy"

^{1a} Articles 12(d) and 16(d) of Regulation (EU) No 1293/2013 of the European Parliament and Council of 11 December 2013 on the establishment of a Programme for the Environment and Climate Action (LIFE) and repealing Regulation (EC) No 614/2007

Or. en

Amendment 4
Mireille D'Ornano

Draft opinion
Recital A a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

Aa. whereas the WHO was very critical of the European Union's management of the Ebola crisis; whereas the imperatives of effectiveness and the ability to react to events are just as important as the requirement of transparency in the

funding of NGOs; whereas solutions which make it possible to reconcile these differing requirements are needed, therefore;

Or. fr

Amendment 5
Benedek Jávor
on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Draft opinion
Recital A a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

A a. Whereas the financial crisis has limited access to public and private funding while the need for civil society action has increased; notes the diversity of so-called NGOs including in size, area of action and capacity;

Or. en

Amendment 6
Benedek Jávor
on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

Amendment

1. Takes the view that the Commission should foster the independence of NGOs *and* public *involvement in their funding, with a view to dynamising the relationship between citizens and NGOs*; points out that NGOs' primary task *is* to promote and defend the interests *of civil society, which consists of citizens*;

1. Takes the view that the Commission should *come up with a clear EU-wide definition of "NGO"*, foster the independence of NGOs *from* public *authorities or commercial organisations and ensure transparency, accountability, control and traceability of EU public involvement in their funding*; points out that NGOs' primary task *should be* to promote and defend the *public* interests *in its broadest sense, including also future generations and ecosystems; welcomes therefore the proposal of the European*

Commission within the review of the financial regulations to consider the contribution of volunteers as eligible funding and contributions in kind as co-funding; stresses nevertheless the need to increase the ceiling of indirect expenses;

Or. en

Amendment 7
Jasenko Selimovic, Frédérique Ries

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Takes the view that the Commission should foster the independence of NGOs and public involvement in their funding, with a view to dynamising the relationship between citizens and NGOs; *points out that NGOs' primary task is to promote and defend the interests of civil society, which consists of citizens;*

Amendment

1. Takes the view that the Commission should foster the independence of NGOs and public involvement in their funding, with a view to dynamising the relationship between citizens and NGOs;

Or. en

Amendment 8
Ivan Jakovčić

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Takes the view that the Commission should foster the independence of NGOs and public involvement in their funding, with a view to dynamising the relationship between citizens and NGOs; points out that NGOs' primary task is to promote and defend the interests of civil society, which consists of citizens;

Amendment

1. Takes the view that the Commission should foster the independence of NGOs and public involvement in their funding, with a view to dynamising the relationship between citizens and NGOs; points out that NGOs' primary task is to promote and defend the interests of civil society, which consists of citizens *at all levels of governance;*

Amendment 9
Julie Girling

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Takes the view that the *Commission should foster the independence of NGOs and public involvement in their funding, with a view to dynamising the relationship between citizens and NGOs; points out that NGOs' primary task is to promote and defend the interests of civil society, which consists of citizens;*

Amendment

1. Takes the view that the *EU's existing approach to meeting its policy objectives through the funding of NGOs is counterproductive; stresses the importance of addressing the deficiencies in current policy and realigning it with the primary task of NGOs, which is to promote and defend the interests of civil society;*

Or. en

Amendment 10
Christofer Fjellner

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Takes the view that the Commission should foster the independence of NGOs *and public involvement in their funding*, with a view to dynamising the relationship between citizens and NGOs; points out that NGOs' primary task is to promote and defend the interests of civil society, which consists of citizens;

Amendment

1. Takes the view that the Commission should foster the independence of NGOs, with a view to dynamising the relationship between citizens and NGOs; points out that NGOs' primary task is to promote and defend the interests of civil society, which consists of citizens;

Or. en

Amendment 11
Mireille D'Ornano

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

1a. Points out that independence from governments and public authorities is fundamental to the work of an NGO; points out, further, that some NGOs remain dependent on rich benefactors, some of whom seek to benefit from the policies advocated by the NGOs in question; calls on the Commission and the Member States to ensure that EU-funded NGOs remain operationally and politically independent, at EU level and at national, regional and local level; emphasises the need to ensure that NGOs which receive grants act primarily with the common good in mind, and not for purely political or ideological motives;

Or. fr

Amendment 12
Jasenko Selimovic, Frédérique Ries

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

1 a. Recalls that according to the World Association of Non-Governmental Organization (WANGO), an overall total of 13 194 operate in the European region; deeply regrets, however, the shrinking space for civil society in a number of EU Member states;

Or. en

Amendment 13
Elisabeth Köstinger, Claudia Schmidt, Paul Rübig

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 a (new)

PE595.634v01-00

8/31

AM\1112292EN.docx

Draft opinion

Amendment

1 a. underlines the role of impartial NGOs in a democratic society and thus their need to adhere to democratic values and standards such as accountability, responsible use of resources and transparency;

Or. en

Amendment 14
Jasenko Selimovic, Frédérique Ries

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

1 b. Calls on the Commission to foster an inter-institutional dialogue on a potential consistent EU-level definition of the term 'NGO' for reporting purposes, in order to facilitate the measurement of EU financing of NGOs and contribute to more transparency on the financing of NGOs from the EU budget;

Or. en

Amendment 15
Elisabeth Köstinger, Claudia Schmidt, Paul Rübig

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

Amendment

2. Welcomes the fact that the EU has a financial transparency system; emphasises, however, that it does not concern only NGOs; takes the view, therefore, that the information available about NGOs could be made clearer, in order to improve public understanding of their role;

2. stresses the principle of sound financial management and proportionality and the importance of openness, transparency, efficiency and accountability; underlines the importance of the established EU Financial Transparency System; calls on the European Commission to make

*information more easily accessible by improving the Transparency System by disclosing detailed information on the funds allocated and disbursed as well as respective projects and results achieved; takes the view that the information available about NGOs, **their affiliated associations and sub-contractors shall** be made clearer, in order to improve public understanding of their role;*

Or. en

Amendment 16
Kateřina Konečná

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Welcomes the fact that the EU has a financial transparency system; **emphasises, however, that it does not concern only NGOs**; takes the view, therefore, that **the** information available about NGOs **could** be made clearer, in order to improve public understanding of their role;

Amendment

2. Welcomes the fact that the EU has a financial transparency system; takes the view, therefore, that **all** information available about NGOs, **especially their financing have to** be made clearer, **transparent and easily accessible**, in order to improve public understanding of their role; **calls for the revision of the the European Commission Financial Transparency System in order to be able to extract data per categories of beneficiaries within the different funding programmes and areas of policy action and for the creation of links with the Transparency Register to allow for greater transparency.**

Or. en

Amendment 17
Jasenکو Selimovic, Frédérique Ries

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Welcomes the fact that the EU has a financial transparency system; emphasises, however, that it does not concern only NGOs; takes the view, therefore, that the information available about NGOs could be made clearer, in order to improve public understanding of their role;

Amendment

2. Welcomes the fact that the EU has a financial transparency system; emphasises, however, that it does not concern only NGOs; takes the view, therefore, that the information available about NGOs could be made clearer, in order to improve public understanding of their role, ***particularly regarding key information about funding allocated, amounts committed or disbursed, projects and key results achieved, while securing a high level of protection for personal data and sensitive information disclosure which might put the security of actors at risk;***

Or. en

Amendment 18

Benedek Jávor

on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Draft opinion

Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Welcomes the fact that the EU has a financial transparency system; ***emphasises, however, that it does not concern only NGOs;*** takes the view, therefore, that the information available about ***NGOs could*** be made clearer, in order to improve ***public understanding of their role;***

Amendment

2. Welcomes the fact that the EU has a financial transparency system; takes the view, therefore, that the information available about ***for-profit and non-for-profit recipients of EU grants should*** be made clearer, in order to improve ***transparency, accountability and control of EU grant funding;***

Or. en

Amendment 19

Jasenko Selimovic, Frédérique Ries

Draft opinion

Paragraph 2 a (new)

2 a. *Regrets that the Joint Transparency Register (JTR) does contain a significant number of incorrect and unverifiable information; calls therefore on the Commission to rapidly address the existing official complaints on data inaccuracy that have been filled, and to considerably improve the reliability of the JTR within the current revision process, notably by designing a robust system with better legal definitions, monitoring procedures and an enforcement mechanism;*

Or. en

**Amendment 20
Julie Girling**

**Draft opinion
Paragraph 2 a (new)**

2 a. *Notes in accordance with data listed by the European Commission's Financial Transparency System (FTS) that NGOs with humanitarian, social, or environmental missions receive approximately five times as much funding as NGOs promoting industry, civil society, or research^{1a}; takes the view that this imbalance should be corrected to reflect the preferences of citizens in the Member States (i.e. in terms of private donations to charities);*

^{1a} *Helping Themselves: Six ways to reform EU Funding of NGOs, New Direction – The Foundation for European Reform, Adolfas Mackonis & Zilvinas Silenas, September 2013*

Or. en

Amendment 21
Benedek Jávor
on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

2 a. Takes the view that Financial Transparency System should be improved in order to improve its user friendliness and transparency of EU funding by allowing to identify funding amounts allocated to different categories of beneficiaries, including NGOs, according to different funding programmes; furthermore, it should also give details of the amount and purpose of the grants paid out to each recipient, including commitments and actual disbursements;

Or. en

Amendment 22
Jens Gieseke

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

2 a. Stresses that the financial transparency system should be improved with the aim to indicate how commitments are allocated between multiple beneficiaries listed under each commitment position. Takes the view that the system should also include organisational typology in order to analyse data per organisational type (e.g. NGO) and it should also use a consistent way to enter beneficiary names and a unique identifier number;

Or. en

Amendment 23
Elisabeth Köstinger, Claudia Schmidt, Paul Rübiger

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

2 a. *underlines the role of the European Court of Auditors in the continuous audit of NGOs and their funds received.*

Or. en

Amendment 24
Jasenko Selimovic, Frédérique Ries

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

2 b. *Believes that the Financial Transparency System (FTS) and the Joint Transparency Register (JTR) should be linked or merged, in order to facilitate the availability of information on the financing of NGOs from the EU budget and to avoid unnecessary duplication of information as well bureaucratic burden for registrants;*

Or. en

Amendment 25
Jens Gieseke

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

2 b. *Takes the view that the LIFE database should be linked to the financial transparency system.*

Amendment 26
Benedek Jávor
on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

2 b. Asks the Financial Transparency System to be linked to the Transparency register;

Or. en

Amendment 27
Jens Gieseke

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2 c (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

2 c. Takes the view that it could be made clearer to the public how money is passed through by NGO networks to partner organisations. Stresses that the transparency of redistribution among project partners could be made clearer.

Or. en

Amendment 28
Jens Gieseke

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2 d (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

2 d. Calls on the Commission to ensure that it is possible to identify at least the top 50 NGO recipients of EC funding, using

publicly available databases.

Or. en

Amendment 29
Jens Gieseke

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2 e (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

2 e. *Stresses that OLAF should analyse investigations by type of organisation to increase transparency.*

Or. en

Amendment 30
Benedek Jávor
on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

Amendment

3. *Takes the view that a public register of EU-funded NGOs should set up and that it should also give details of the amount and purpose of the subsidies paid out;*

deleted

Or. en

Amendment 31
Jasenko Selimovic, Frédérique Ries

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

Amendment

3. *Takes the view that a public register of EU-funded NGOs should set*

deleted

up and that it should also give details of the amount and purpose of the subsidies paid out;

Or. en

Amendment 32
Julie Girling

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Takes the view that a public register of EU-funded NGOs should *set up* and that it should also give details of the amount and purpose of the subsidies paid out;

Amendment

3. Takes the view that a public register of EU-funded NGOs should *be established* and that it should also give details of the amount and purpose of the subsidies paid out; *believes furthermore that the relevant authorities in the Member States should disclose information on all NGO recipients using the same standardised evaluation methodology and database as the EU; this database should be publicly available and show aggregated EU-funding per NGO;*

Or. en

Amendment 33
Mireille D'Ornano

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Takes the view that a public register of EU-funded NGOs should set up and that it should also give details of the amount and purpose of the subsidies paid out;

Amendment

3. Takes the view that a public register of EU-funded NGOs should set up and that it should also give details of the amount and purpose of the subsidies paid out; *emphasises that, with a view to optimum accessibility, this register must be available in all the 24 official languages of the European Union;*

Or. fr

Amendment 34
Kateřina Konečná

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Takes the view that a public register of EU-funded NGOs should set up and that it should also give details of the amount and purpose of the subsidies paid out;

Amendment

3. Takes the view that a *easy accessible and transparent* public register of *all* EU-funded NGOs, *including even those operating outside of the EU's borders*, should set up and that it should also give details of the amount and purpose of the subsidies paid out;

Or. en

Amendment 35
Csaba Molnár

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Takes the view that a public register of EU-funded NGOs should set up and that it should also give details of the amount and purpose of the subsidies paid out;

Amendment

3. Takes the view that a public register of EU-funded NGOs - *similar to the EU's transparency register* - should set up and that it should also give details of the amount and purpose of the subsidies paid out;

Or. hu

Amendment 36
Aldo Patriciello

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Takes the view that a public register of EU-funded NGOs should set up

Amendment

3. Takes the view that a public register of EU-funded NGOs should *be* set

and that it should also give details of the amount and purpose of the subsidies paid out;

up, *available in all the official languages of the Union*, and that it should also give details of the amount and purpose of the subsidies paid out;

Or. it

Amendment 37

Elisabeth Köstinger, Claudia Schmidt, Paul Rübzig

Draft opinion

Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Takes the view that a public register of EU-funded NGOs should set up and that it should also give details of the amount and purpose of the subsidies paid out;

Amendment

3. Takes the view that a public register of EU-funded NGOs should *be* set up and that it should also give details of the amount and purpose of the subsidies paid out *as well as the final beneficiary*;

Or. en

Amendment 38

Ivan Jakovčić

Draft opinion

Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Takes the view that a public register of EU-funded NGOs should set up and that it should also give details of the amount and purpose of the subsidies paid out;

Amendment

3. Takes the view that a public register of EU-funded NGOs should *be* set up and that it should also give details of the amount and purpose of the subsidies paid out *and the ways in which they are spent*;

Or. hr

Amendment 39

Christofer Fjellner

Draft opinion

Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Takes the view that a public register of EU-funded NGOs should set up and that it should also give details of the amount and purpose of the subsidies paid out;

Amendment

3. Takes the view that a public register of EU-funded NGOs should set up and that it should also give details of the **total** amount and purpose of the subsidies paid out;

Or. en

Amendment 40
Christofer Fjellner

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3 a. Advises strongly against co-funding requirements under 20 %, which would bring an increased risk of the EU budget being used ineffectively and of the instrumentalisation of voluntary organisations, as in practice they are ceasing to be simply voluntary organisations and are instead being treated as part of the institutions;

Or. en

Amendment 41
Benedek Jávor
on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

Amendment

4. Calls on the Commission, with a view to optimising **its cooperation with civil society**, to carry out regular assessments of the way in which funds allocated to **NGOs** are administered;

4. Calls on the Commission, with a view to optimising **transparency, accountability and control of EU grant funding**, to carry out regular assessments of the way in which funds allocated to **beneficiaries** are administered, **to develop uniform and transparent audit procedures across funding programmes;**

Amendment 42
Jasenko Selimovic, Frédérique Ries

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Calls on the Commission, with a view to optimising its cooperation with civil society, to **carry out** regular assessments of the way in which funds allocated to NGOs are administered;

Amendment

4. Calls on the Commission, with a view to optimising its cooperation with civil society, to **streamline and improve its** regular assessments of the way in which funds allocated to NGOs are administered;

Or. en

Amendment 43
Ivan Jakovčić

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Calls on the Commission, with a view to **optimising** its cooperation with civil society, to carry out regular assessments of the way in which funds allocated to NGOs are administered;

Amendment

4. Calls on the Commission, with a view to **placing** its cooperation with civil society **on a credible footing**, to carry out regular assessments of the way in which funds allocated to NGOs are administered;

Or. hr

Amendment 44
Csaba Molnár

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Calls on the Commission, with a view to optimising its cooperation with civil society, to carry out **regular** assessments of the way in which funds

Amendment

4. Calls on the Commission, with a view to optimising its cooperation with civil society, to carry out **continuous** assessments of the way in which funds

allocated to NGOs are administered;

allocated to NGOs are administered;

Or. hu

Amendment 45

Julie Girling

Draft opinion

Paragraph 4 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4 a. *Underlines the importance of preventing NGOs from using professional grant application as a specialised component of their income-generating activities; takes the view that the Commission should formally assess repeat grant applications on the basis of merit and ensure full transparency;*

Or. en

Amendment 46

Jasenko Selimovic, Frédérique Ries

Draft opinion

Paragraph 4 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4 a. *Calls on the Commission to foster dialogue with NGOs on how to strengthen the link between NGO activities and outputs to specific EU-funded actions, notably through the Financial Transparency System (FTS) and NGO annual reports;*

Or. en

Amendment 47

Benedek Jávor

on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4 a. *Requests the EU logo to be clearly put on the communication tools for each project and/or product financed from an EU grant as well as links to the publicly available information in EU databases about the project on the digital outputs;*

Or. en

Amendment 48
Jens Gieseke

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4 a. *Calls on the Commission to set up a clear definition on NGOs. Stresses that the definition of LIFE, that clusters NGOs into 16 types, could be used as a role model.*

Or. en

Amendment 49
Jasenko Selimovic, Frédérique Ries

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4 b. *Recalls that overly burdensome grant administration and reporting procedures may divert resources away from project delivery, both on the side of the European Commission as well as on the side of NGOs;*

Or. en

Amendment 50
Jasenko Selimovic, Frédérique Ries

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 c (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4 c. Reminds that overly burdensome grant administration and reporting procedures may discourage potential candidate NGOs to apply for EU grants, particularly in the case of smaller NGOs;

Or. en

Amendment 51
Mireille D'Ornano

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

Amendment

5. Takes the view that a single portal giving access to rationalised and simplified subsidy application procedures should be set up for all EU subsidies intended for NGOs; stresses the importance of an approach based on interoperability between the directorates-general;

5. Takes the view that a single portal giving access to rationalised and simplified subsidy application procedures should be set up for all EU subsidies intended for NGOs; stresses the importance of an approach based on interoperability between the directorates-general, ***so that NGOs working in areas which fall within the remits of several DGs can combine the operating grants available from all of them;***

Or. fr

Amendment 52
Jens Gieseke

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Takes the view that a single portal giving access to rationalised and simplified subsidy application procedures should be set up for all EU subsidies intended for NGOs; stresses the importance of an approach based on interoperability between the directorates-general;

Amendment

5. Takes the view that a single portal giving access to rationalised and simplified subsidy application procedures should be set up for all EU subsidies intended for NGOs; stresses the importance of an approach based on interoperability between the directorates-general; ***stresses that a simplified application procedure could also reduce error rates.***

Or. en

Amendment 53

Jasenko Selimovic, Frédérique Ries

Draft opinion

Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Takes the view that a single portal giving access to rationalised and simplified ***subsidy*** application procedures should be set up for all EU ***subsidies*** intended for NGOs; stresses the importance of an approach based on interoperability between the directorates-general;

Amendment

5. Takes the view that a single portal giving access to rationalised and simplified ***grant*** application procedures should be set up for all EU ***grants*** intended for NGOs; stresses the importance of an approach based on interoperability between the directorates-general;

Or. en

Amendment 54

Benedek Jávor

on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Draft opinion

Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Takes the view that a single portal giving access to rationalised and simplified subsidy application procedures should be set up for all EU ***subsidies intended for NGOs***; stresses the importance of an approach based on interoperability between

Amendment

5. Takes the view that a single portal giving access to rationalised and simplified subsidy application procedures should be set up for all EU ***grants***; stresses the importance of an approach based on interoperability between the directorates-

the directorates-general;

general;

Or. en

Amendment 55

Elisabeth Köstinger, Claudia Schmidt, Paul Rübzig

Draft opinion

Paragraph 5 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

5 a. calls on the Commission to urgently establish a common and consistent definition of Non Governmental Organisation to ensure uniform accounting and traceability of funds and the aforementioned interoperability between directorates general;

Or. en

Amendment 56

Jasenko Selimovic

Draft opinion

Paragraph 5 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

5 a. Calls on the Commission to consider implementing multi-annual funding for NGOs, as well as shared rules for its funding programmes and a flexible grant mechanism set up to respond to unforeseen policy emergencies;

Or. en

Amendment 57

Elisabeth Köstinger, Claudia Schmidt, Paul Rübzig

Draft opinion

Paragraph 5 b (new)

PE595.634v01-00

26/31

AM\1112292EN.docx

Draft opinion

Amendment

5 b. *calls for the establishment of a single standardized, highly recognisable "EU funded" logo and the obligation for every direct and indirect beneficiary of EU funds to display it in a highly visible manner on their public presentation (such as webpages, promotional material);*

Or. en

Amendment 58
Mireille D'Ornano

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Takes the view that subsidies should be proportional to the other resources available to NGOs, so as to ensure that EU funds are allocated fairly and more appropriately;

Amendment

6. Takes the view that subsidies should be proportional to the other resources available to NGOs, so as to ensure that EU funds are allocated fairly and more appropriately; *underlines that volunteer hours and contributions in kind are often the only resources some NGOs can access; urges the Commission, in its proposal for the next revision of the Financial Regulation, to consider the possibility of including contributions in kind in the accounts as eligible expenditure and of raising the ceiling for indirect expenditure in grants for actions and operating grants and, in the context of the co-funding assessment, to take account of these voluntary contribution by putting a monetary value on them;*

Or. fr

Amendment 59
Benedek Jávor
on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Draft opinion

Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Takes the view that *subsidies* should be *proportional to the other resources available to NGOs, so as to ensure that EU funds are allocated fairly and more appropriately*;

Amendment

6. Takes the view that *grants* should be *allocated fairly throughout the EU, in line with clear political objectives defined in EU legislation and following transparent granting criteria for all recipients*;

Or. en

Amendment 60

Ivan Jakovčić

Draft opinion

Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Takes the view that subsidies should be proportional to the other resources available to NGOs, so as to ensure that EU funds are allocated fairly and more appropriately;

Amendment

6. Takes the view that subsidies should be proportional to the other resources available to NGOs *from other sources*, so as to ensure that EU funds are allocated fairly and more appropriately;

Or. hr

Amendment 61

Julie Girling

Draft opinion

Paragraph 6 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

6 a. Underlines the importance of eliminating all conflicts of interest so that public officials are unable to use their mandate to benefit organisations that support their own agenda; takes the view that organisations where public officials serve as members, board members or associates, should not be eligible for EU funding;

Amendment 62
Jasenko Selimovic

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

6 a. *Expresses support for the co-financing principle; takes the view, however, that smaller NGOs might experience difficulties to raise such co-financing funds; calls therefore on the Commission to reflect on the possibilities to allow for co-financing in kind;*

Or. en

Amendment 63
Benedek Jávor
on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7

Draft opinion

Amendment

7. *Calls, lastly, on the Commission, to give clear, systematic priority to the Union's political objectives in the areas covered by the ENVI committee, in an effort to ensure that EU funds are allocated as effectively as possible.*

deleted

Or. en

Amendment 64
Kateřina Konečná

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7

Draft opinion

Amendment

7. Calls, *lastly*, on the Commission, *to give clear, systematic priority to the Union's political objectives in the areas covered by the ENVI committee, in an effort to ensure that EU funds are allocated as effectively as possible.*

7. Calls on the Commission *and Members states, to ensure that proper budget allocations for funding priorities to respond to several current emergencies and crises is not done at the detriment of ongoing societal challenges in the areas of social inclusion, environmental protection, health, culture, education, development cooperation, and human rights.*

Or. en

Amendment 65
Aldo Patriciello

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7

Draft opinion

7. Calls, *lastly*, on the Commission, to give clear, systematic priority to the Union's political objectives in the areas covered by the ENVI committee, in an effort to ensure that EU funds are allocated as effectively as possible.

Amendment

7. Calls, *lastly*, on the Commission, to give clear, systematic priority to the Union's political objectives, *to be reviewed every five years*, in the areas covered by the ENVI committee, in an effort to ensure that EU funds are allocated as effectively as possible.

Or. it

Amendment 66
Jens Gieseke

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7 a (new)

Draft opinion

7 a. Takes the view that EU-financing should be made visible by the NGO, if they or their projects are (partly) funded by the EU. Suggests to use a standard, highly recognisable "EC-Funded" logo on every web page and/or publication of direct and indirect grant beneficiaries.

Amendment

