



2016/2064(INI)

6.3.2017

AMENDMENTS

1 - 22

Draft opinion

Jill Evans

(PE595.719v01-00)

The implementation of the European Fund for Strategic Investments
(2016/2064(INI))

Amendment 1
Dominique Bilde

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Notes *with disappointment* that only 4 % of EFSI funding – both under the Infrastructure and Innovation and SME Windows – has been allocated to the thematic objective set out in Article 9(2)(g) of the EFSI Regulation and that only a fraction of that 4 % has reached the culture and education sectors;

Amendment

1. Notes that only 4 % of EFSI funding – both under the Infrastructure and Innovation and SME Windows – has been allocated to the thematic objective set out in Article 9(2)(g) of the EFSI Regulation and that only a fraction of that 4 % has reached the culture and education sectors; *points out in his regard that, according to the European Investment Bank, more than EUR 4 billion has been spent on projects linked to the education sector;*

Or. fr

Amendment 2
Emma McClarkin, Andrew Lewer, John Procter, Angel Dzhambazki

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Notes *with disappointment that only* 4 % of EFSI funding – both under the Infrastructure and Innovation and SME Windows – has been allocated to the thematic objective set out in Article 9(2)(g) of the EFSI Regulation and that only a fraction of that 4 % has reached the culture and education sectors;

Amendment

1. Notes *that approximately* 4 % of EFSI funding – both under the Infrastructure and Innovation and SME Windows – has been allocated to the thematic objective set out in Article 9(2)(g) of the EFSI Regulation and that only a fraction of that 4 % has reached the culture and education sectors;

Or. en

Amendment 3
Dominique Bilde

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

1a. Reiterates that Regulation (EU) 2015/1017, which established the EFSI, stressed the need for it to 'support projects in the fields of human capital, culture and health, including projects in the fields of education, training, the development of ICT skills and digital education, as well as projects in the cultural and creative sector, in tourism and in social fields';

Or. fr

Amendment 4
Petra Kammerevert, Silvia Costa

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

1 a. Takes further note of the uneven geographical coverage of the funding; calls for more efforts to further investigate and review the specific needs and gaps in countries that make less use of EFSI support and to provide more technical assistance and local and sector support to ensure that EFSI reaches all Member States;

Or. en

Amendment 5
Dominique Bilde

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

Amendment

2. Highlights the interest among cultural and creative sector (CCS) stakeholders in *EFSI funding as well as the potential of the SME Window for the*

2. Highlights the interest among cultural and creative sector (CCS) stakeholders in *mechanisms encouraging investment and innovation financing;*

sector; regrets, however, the lack of awareness of EFSI and its funding options; insists that communication efforts be scaled up, tailored to the needs of the CCS and rolled out locally in Member States, including through the Creative Europe Desks;

notes, however, the lack of awareness of EFSI and its funding options; stresses the need to focus on short supply chains and to encourage use of investment tools at local and national level to support businesses in the geographical areas concerned and to ensure that this meets the needs of the cultural and creative sectors;

Or. fr

Amendment 6 **Fernando Ruas**

Draft opinion **Paragraph 2**

Draft opinion

2. Highlights the interest among cultural and creative sector (CCS) stakeholders in EFSI funding as well as the potential of the SME Window for the sector; regrets, however, the lack of awareness of EFSI and its funding options; insists that communication efforts be scaled up, tailored to the needs of the CCS and rolled out locally in Member States, including through the Creative Europe Desks;

Amendment

2. Highlights the interest among cultural and creative sector (CCS) stakeholders in EFSI funding as well as the potential of the SME Window for the sector, ***which could develop innovative business models and thus boost growth and job creation in the sector***; regrets, however, the lack of awareness of EFSI and its funding options; insists that communication efforts be scaled up, tailored to the needs of the CCS and rolled out locally in Member States, including through the Creative Europe Desks;

Or. pt

Amendment 7 **Angel Dzhabazki, Emma McClarkin, Andrew Lewer, John Procter**

Draft opinion **Paragraph 2**

Draft opinion

2. Highlights the interest among cultural and creative sector (CCS) stakeholders in EFSI funding as well as the

Amendment

2. Highlights the interest among cultural and creative sector (CCS) stakeholders in EFSI funding as well as the

potential of the SME Window for the sector; regrets, however, the lack of awareness of EFSI and its funding options; insists that communication efforts be scaled up, tailored to the needs of the CCS and rolled out locally in Member States, **including** through the Creative Europe Desks;

potential of the SME Window for the sector; regrets, however, the lack of awareness of EFSI and its funding options; insists that communication efforts be scaled up, tailored to the needs of the CCS and rolled out locally in Member States, **predominantly** through the Creative Europe Desks;

Or. en

Amendment 8
Silvia Costa, Petra Kammerevert

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Highlights the interest among cultural and creative sector (CCS) stakeholders in EFSI funding as well as the potential of the SME Window for the sector; regrets, however, the lack of awareness of EFSI and its funding options; insists that **communication efforts be scaled up**, tailored to the needs of the CCS and rolled out locally in Member States, including through the Creative Europe Desks;

Amendment

2. Highlights the interest among cultural and creative sector (CCS) stakeholders in EFSI funding as well as the potential of the SME Window for the sector; regrets, however, the lack of awareness of EFSI and its funding options **and tools**; insists that **the Commission adopt new, and scale up existing, communication initiatives that need to be** tailored to the needs of the CCS and rolled out locally in Member States, including through the Creative Europe Desks;

Or. en

Amendment 9
Petra Kammerevert, Silvia Costa

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Highlights the interest among cultural and creative sector (CCS) stakeholders in EFSI funding as well as the potential of the SME Window for the

Amendment

2. Highlights the interest among cultural and creative sector (CCS) stakeholders in EFSI funding as well as the potential of the SME Window for the

sector; regrets, however, the lack of awareness of EFSI and its funding options; insists that communication efforts be scaled up, tailored to the needs of the CCS and rolled out locally in Member States, including through the Creative Europe Desks;

sector; regrets, however, the lack of awareness of EFSI and its funding options; insists that communication efforts be scaled up, tailored to the needs of the CCS and rolled out locally in Member States, including through the Creative Europe Desks; *notes that European associations active in culture and education have existing networks of member associations with sectoral and geographical knowledge that could help to better channel awareness-raising measures and foster the creation of investment platforms;*

Or. en

Amendment 10

Bogdan Andrzej Zdrojewski

Draft opinion

Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Highlights the interest among cultural and creative sector (CCS) stakeholders in EFSI funding as well as the potential of the SME Window for the sector; regrets, however, the lack of awareness of EFSI and its funding options; insists that communication efforts be scaled up, tailored to the needs of the CCS and rolled out locally in Member States, including through the Creative Europe Desks;

Amendment

2. Highlights the interest among cultural and creative sector (CCS) stakeholders in EFSI funding as well as the potential of the SME Window for the sector; regrets, however, the lack of awareness of EFSI and its funding options; insists that communication efforts be scaled up, tailored to the needs of the CCS and rolled out locally in Member States, including through the Creative Europe Desks; *stresses, in this context, the need for a more balanced geographical distribution of EFSI funding in the future;*

Or. pl

Amendment 11

Luigi Morgano

Draft opinion

Paragraph 2 a (new)

2 a. *Notes that the cultural and creative sector mainly consists of SMEs with a higher degree of risk; notes, in that respect, that investment platforms may facilitate the outreach of EFSI funding, as they can pool smaller projects together and group contracts; urges the EFSI governing bodies to pay greater attention to investment platforms with a view to maximising the benefits that the latter can bring in overcoming investment barriers; invites the EIB to provide stakeholders with more information on the platforms and to establish mechanisms to finance grouping of contracts;*

Or. en

Amendment 12
Dominique Bilde

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

3. Believes that the CCS also requires targeted advice to understand the financing options and procedures under EFSI, and that financial intermediaries need support to better understand the CCS and its needs; **welcomes**, in this regard, the EFSI 2.0 proposal to boost the role of the European Investment and Advisory Hub **and enhance its national and local presence; insists that the Hub be adequately resourced so as to provide tailored support to the education and cultural sectors throughout the process;**

3. Believes that the CCS also requires targeted advice to understand the financing options and procedures under EFSI, and that financial intermediaries need support to better understand the CCS and its needs; **notes**, in this regard, the EFSI 2.0 proposal to boost the role of the European Investment and Advisory Hub **but stresses that it must not merely duplicate the work of existing national and local agencies, so as not to add yet another layer of bureaucracy that would overshadow and, ultimately, hamper the effectiveness of these agencies;**

Or. fr

Amendment 13
Angel Dzhambazki, Emma McClarkin, Andrew Lewer, John Procter

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Believes that the CCS also requires targeted advice to understand the financing options and procedures under EFSI, and that financial intermediaries need support to better understand the CCS and its needs; welcomes, in this regard, the EFSI 2.0 proposal to boost the role of the European Investment and Advisory Hub and enhance its national and local presence; insists that the Hub be adequately resourced so as to provide tailored support to the education and cultural sectors throughout the process;

Amendment

3. Believes that the CCS also requires targeted advice to understand the financing options and procedures under EFSI, and that financial intermediaries need support to better understand the CCS and its needs; welcomes, in this regard, the EFSI 2.0 proposal to boost the role of the European Investment and Advisory Hub and enhance its national, **regional** and local presence; insists that the Hub be adequately resourced so as to provide tailored support to the education and cultural sectors throughout the process;

Or. en

Amendment 14
Bogdan Andrzej Zdrojewski

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Believes that the CCS also requires targeted advice to understand the financing options and procedures under EFSI, and that financial intermediaries need support to better understand the CCS and its needs; welcomes, in this regard, the EFSI 2.0 proposal to boost the role of the European Investment and Advisory Hub and enhance its national and local presence; insists that the Hub be adequately resourced so as to provide tailored support to the education and cultural sectors throughout the process;

Amendment

3. Believes that the CCS also requires targeted advice to understand the financing options and procedures under EFSI, and that financial intermediaries need support to better understand the CCS and its needs; welcomes, in this regard, the EFSI 2.0 proposal to boost the role of the European Investment and Advisory Hub and enhance its national and local presence; insists that the Hub be adequately resourced so as to provide tailored support to the education and cultural sectors throughout the process; ***points to the significant role the European Investment and Advisory Hub could play in helping to create investment platforms, which in turn could help to secure a better geographical and sectoral balance;***

Or. pl

Amendment 15
Yana Toom

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. **Believes** that the CCS also requires targeted advice to understand the financing options and procedures under EFSI, and that financial intermediaries need support to better understand the CCS and its needs; welcomes, in this regard, the EFSI 2.0 proposal to boost the role of the European Investment and Advisory Hub and enhance its national and local presence; insists that the Hub be adequately resourced so as to provide tailored support to the education and cultural sectors throughout the process;

Amendment

3. **Recalls that most EFSI projects are being approved in the economically more healthy regions of Western Europe; asks the Commission to help the weaker regions with the application process;** believes that the CCS also requires targeted advice to understand the financing options and procedures under EFSI, and that financial intermediaries need support to better understand the CCS and its needs; welcomes, in this regard, the EFSI 2.0 proposal to boost the role of the European Investment and Advisory Hub and enhance its national and local presence; insists that the Hub be adequately resourced so as to provide tailored support to the education and cultural sectors throughout the process;

Or. en

Amendment 16
Petra Kammerevert, Silvia Costa

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 a (new)

Draft opinion

3 a. Calls on the Commission and the EIB Group to build up and integrate expertise focussing specifically on cultural investment in the Hub; asks that the Hub work as closely as possible with National Promotional Banks and participants from the cultural and creative sector to deliver optimal support;

Amendment

Or. en

Amendment 17
Dominique Bilde

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Notes that, since schools and universities in most Member States are legally prohibited from borrowing money, EFSI is largely unsuitable for the sector; regrets that, despite funding being diverted from Horizon2020, EFSI support for research and innovation has not adequately benefited public universities; insists, therefore, that funding be restored to Horizon2020;

Amendment

4. Notes that, since schools and universities in most Member States are legally prohibited from borrowing money, EFSI is largely unsuitable for the sector; regrets that, despite funding being diverted from Horizon2020, EFSI support for research and innovation has not adequately benefited public universities; insists, therefore, that funding be restored to Horizon2020 ***and/or that a proposal be made to reallocate funds to research projects in universities and further education establishments with a view to promoting innovation in a meaningful manner;***

Or. fr

Amendment 18
Angel Dzhambazki, Emma McClarkin, Andrew Lewer, John Procter

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Notes that, since schools and universities in most Member States are legally prohibited from borrowing money, EFSI is largely unsuitable for the sector; regrets that, despite funding being diverted from Horizon2020, EFSI support for research and innovation has not adequately benefited public universities; insists, therefore, that funding be restored to Horizon2020;

Amendment

4. Notes that, since schools and universities in most Member States are legally prohibited from borrowing money, EFSI is largely unsuitable for the sector, ***but it should remain operational for training programmes where possible;*** regrets that, despite funding being diverted from Horizon2020, EFSI support for research and innovation has not adequately benefited public universities; insists, therefore, that funding be restored to Horizon2020;

Amendment 19
Liadh Ní Riada

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4 a. *Notes that persons from rural areas face a distinct disadvantage when trying to access education and calls therefore for better connectivity, infrastructure and accessibility to be implemented;*

Or. en

Amendment 20
Dominique Bilde

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

Amendment

5. Calls for *greater synergies between EFSI and other EU funds, notably the ESI Funds, Horizon2020 and the Creative Europe Guarantee Facility; urges the Commission to frontload the Creative Europe Guarantee Facility through EFSI; underscores that the Hub can play a role in providing information on combining EU funds.*

5. Calls for *all existing structures, such as the ESI Funds, Horizon2020 and the Creative Europe Guarantee Facility, to be consolidated into a single, more intelligible and more efficient instrument dedicated to promoting smart, inclusive and sustainable growth and tailored to suit the Member States' innovation strategies.*

Or. fr

Amendment 21
Angel Dzhambazki, Emma McClarkin, Andrew Lewer, John Procter

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Calls for greater synergies between EFSI and other EU funds, notably the ESI Funds, Horizon2020 and the Creative Europe Guarantee Facility; urges the Commission to frontload the Creative Europe Guarantee Facility through EFSI; underscores that the Hub can play a role in providing information on combining EU funds.

Amendment

5. Calls for greater synergies between EFSI and other EU funds, notably the ESI Funds, Horizon2020 and the Creative Europe Guarantee Facility; urges the Commission to frontload the Creative Europe Guarantee Facility through EFSI ***for the benefit of SMEs***; underscores that the Hub can play a role in providing information on combining EU funds ***and advice and training should be provided accordingly***.

Or. en

Amendment 22

Petra Kammerevert, Silvia Costa

Draft opinion

Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Calls for greater synergies between EFSI and other EU funds, notably the ESI Funds, Horizon2020 and the Creative Europe Guarantee Facility; urges the Commission to frontload the Creative Europe Guarantee Facility through EFSI; underscores that the Hub can play a role in providing information on combining EU funds.

Amendment

5. Calls for greater synergies between EFSI and other EU funds, notably the ESI Funds, Horizon2020 and the Creative Europe Guarantee Facility; urges the Commission to frontload the Creative Europe Guarantee Facility through EFSI; underscores that the Hub can play a role in providing information on combining EU funds ***and urges the Commission to provide a one-stop-shop online portal to allow potential beneficiaries in the culture and education sector to assess all funding options and how they might be effectively combined; is pleased to note, in this regard, the recently published Commission guidelines on combining EFSI with ESI Funds***;

Or. en