



2017/2043(BUD)

4.5.2017

AMENDMENTS

1 - 35

Draft opinion
Morten Løkkegaard
(PE601.262v01-00)

2018 Budget - Mandate for the Trilogue
(2017/2043(BUD))

Amendment 1
Helga Trüpel

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Deplores the fact that the EUR 200 million top-up for Erasmus+ proposed under the MFF revision for 2017-2020 has been reduced by Council to EUR 100 million, with EUR 50 million already allocated in 2017; recalls that *Erasmus+ helps to deliver growth and is a* strategic investment in Europe's young people;

Amendment

1. Deplores the fact that the EUR 200 million top-up for Erasmus+ proposed under the MFF revision for 2017-2020 has been reduced by Council to EUR 100 million, with EUR 50 million already allocated in 2017; *recalls that these funds should be used in the policy framework for which they have been attributed, as Erasmus+ remains the main strategic investment in Europe's young people;*

Or. en

Amendment 2
Dominique Bilde

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. *Deplores* the fact that the EUR 200 million top-up for Erasmus+ proposed under the MFF revision for 2017-2020 has been reduced by Council to EUR 100 million, with EUR 50 million already allocated in 2017; recalls that Erasmus+ *helps to deliver growth and is a strategic investment in Europe's young people;*

Amendment

1. *Notes* the fact that the EUR 200 million top-up for Erasmus+ proposed under the MFF revision for 2017-2020 has been reduced by Council to EUR 100 million, with EUR 50 million already allocated in 2017; recalls that *for young people in European nations Erasmus+ can be an interesting opportunity to train abroad and acquire new and enriching experiences;*

Or. fr

Amendment 3
Eleftherios Synadinos

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Deplores the fact that the EUR 200 million top-up for Erasmus+ proposed under the MFF revision for 2017-2020 has been reduced by Council to EUR 100 million, with EUR 50 million already allocated in 2017; recalls that Erasmus+ helps to deliver growth and is a strategic investment in Europe's young people;

Amendment

1. Deplores ***strongly*** the fact that the EUR 200 million top-up for Erasmus+ proposed under the MFF revision for 2017-2020 has been reduced by Council to EUR 100 million, with EUR 50 million already allocated in 2017; recalls that Erasmus+ helps to deliver growth and is a strategic ***long-term*** investment in Europe's young people ***with particular added value***;

Or. el

Amendment 4

Santiago Fisas Ayxelà, Javi López, Esteban González Pons, Virginie Rozière, Bogdan Brunon Wenta, Theodoros Zagorakis, Marc Tarabella, Pilar Ayuso, Luis de Grandes Pascual, Ramón Luis Valcárcel Siso, Pilar del Castillo Vera, Rosa Estaràs Ferragut, Agustín Díaz de Mera García Consuegra, Esther Herranz García, Carlos Iturza, Teresa Jiménez-Becerril Barrio, Verónica Lope Fontagné, Antonio López-Istúriz White, Gabriel Mato, José Ignacio Salafranca Sánchez-Neyra, Francisco José Millán Mon, Hannu Takkula, Eider Gardiazabal Rubial, Heinz K. Becker, María Teresa Giménez Barbat, Clara Eugenia Aguilera García, Inés Ayala Sender, José Blanco López, Soledad Cabezón Ruiz, Jonás Fernández, Iratxe García Pérez, Enrique Guerrero Salom, Sergio Gutiérrez Prieto, Ramón Jáuregui Atondo, Juan Fernando López Aguilar, Inmaculada Rodríguez-Piñero Fernández, Elena Valenciano, Jana Žitňanská, Karoline Graswander-Hainz, Silvia Costa, Francesc Gambús, Ernest Urtasun, Ramon Tremosa i Balcells, Javier Nart, Jordi Solé, Josep-Maria Terricabras, Milan Zver, Julie Girling

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 – subparagraph 1 (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

Calls for maintaining the EU support to sports policy, the sports chapter of the Erasmus+ programme and the financing of Special Events, such as the Special Olympics in 2017;

Amendment 5
Dominique Bilde

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

Ia. Stresses, however, that some shortcomings in its administrative and budget management have been noted, notably by the European Parliament in its report of 2 February 2017 on the implementation of the Erasmus+ programme; states that, in view of these problems, and the restrictions on the budget, it is important that the programme focuses on its original basic tasks and that funding for this programme is not used to finance new initiatives launched by the Commission, such as the European Solidarity Corps, whose usefulness moreover still remains to be seen;

Or. fr

Amendment 6
Luigi Morgano

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

Ia. Notes, in the context of new societal challenges for Europe, the need to strengthen a European approach to facing common European challenges by supporting large-scale innovation projects in the field of education, training and youth carried out by European civil society networks; points out that this could be done by allocating part of the

*overall Erasmus+ funding of KA2
'Cooperation for innovation and the
exchange of good practices' to centralised
actions;*

Or. en

Amendment 7
Luigi Morgano

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

***1b.** Notes the need to increase the operational support to European networks under KA3 'Support for policy reform' in order to maximise the promotion and dissemination of the opportunities offered by Erasmus+;*

Or. en

Amendment 8
Luigi Morgano, Silvia Costa

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

Amendment

2. Notes that proposed funding for the new Solidarity Corps draws heavily on Erasmus+ (circa EUR 58 million in 2017) **and** Europe for Citizens (around EUR 3.5 million a year); insists that new initiatives require a legal base and clear policy design and must be coordinated with other programmes; stresses that the future roll-out of the Solidarity Corps must not undermine funding for priority education and culture programmes;

2. Notes that proposed funding for the new Solidarity Corps draws heavily on Erasmus+ (circa EUR 58 million in 2017), Europe for Citizens (around EUR 3.5 million a year), **as well as the Employment and Social Innovation programme (14.2 million a year); notes, furthermore, that the distinction between the volunteering and occupational strands is not clear, and there is therefore a risk of jeopardising the effectiveness of the existing European Voluntary Service (EVS) programme;**

insists that new initiatives require a *new* legal base and clear policy design, and must be coordinated with other programmes; stresses that the future roll-out of the Solidarity Corps must not undermine funding for priority education and culture programmes; *stresses, furthermore, that the initiative does not provide a clear distinction between volunteering activities and job placements in order to avoid any substitution of potential quality jobs with unpaid volunteering;*

Or. en

Amendment 9 Dominique Bilde

Draft opinion Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Notes that proposed funding for the new Solidarity Corps draws heavily on Erasmus+ (circa EUR 58 million in 2017) and Europe for Citizens (around EUR 3.5 million a year); insists that new initiatives require a legal base and clear policy design and must be coordinated with other programmes; stresses that the future roll-out of the Solidarity Corps *must not* undermine funding for priority education and culture programmes;

Amendment

2. Notes that proposed funding for the new Solidarity Corps draws heavily on Erasmus+ (circa EUR 58 million in 2017) and Europe for Citizens (around EUR 3.5 million a year); insists that new initiatives require a legal base and clear policy design and must be coordinated with other programmes; stresses that *it appears as if* the future roll-out of the Solidarity Corps *is being superimposed on top of other EU initiatives in the same field, such as the European Voluntary Service; wonders therefore how useful it will be to launch a further initiative in this field, and one, what is more, that will* undermine funding for priority education and culture programmes;

Or. fr

Amendment 10
Eleftherios Synadinos

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Notes that proposed funding for the new Solidarity Corps draws **heavily** on Erasmus+ (circa EUR 58 million in 2017) and Europe for Citizens (around EUR 3.5 million a year); insists that new initiatives require a legal base and clear policy design and must be coordinated with other programmes; stresses that **the future roll-out** of the Solidarity Corps must not undermine funding for priority education and culture programmes;

Amendment

2. Notes that proposed funding for the new **and already controversial** Solidarity Corps draws **mainly** on Erasmus+ (circa EUR 58 million in 2017) and **secondarily on** Europe for Citizens (around EUR 3.5 million a year); insists that new initiatives require a legal base and clear policy design and must be coordinated with other programmes; stresses that **tolerating the maintenance** of the Solidarity Corps, **as a tool for pursuing political ends, indulging in high-cost political rhetoric and promoting new channels of illegal migration**, must not, **in addition**, undermine funding for priority **and substantive** education and culture programmes;

Or. el

Amendment 11
Helga Trüpel

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2 a (new)

Draft opinion

2a. Welcomes the initiatives taken by the Commission in creating, under Erasmus+ and Creative Europe, a special call for projects dealing with refugees; calls on the Commission to evaluate and continue to put forward these calls for proposals with an increased funding capacity, which would cover more needs and enable a forward-looking policy for the next MFF period;

Amendment

Amendment 12
Morten Løkkegaard

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

2a. Welcomes the decision to include in the EU budget for 2017 funds for Special Annual Events; underlines the need to continue supporting such unique European events financially from this budget line in 2018 and beyond;

Or. en

Amendment 13
Morten Løkkegaard

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

2b. Recognises the role of grassroots sports in spreading the core European values of civic engagement, democracy, participation, human rights, volunteering and equality; calls for greater synergies between the fields of culture and sport and the EU's external programmes; calls, in particular, for these programmes to include initiatives and budget lines for cultural and sport activities, including grassroots sport and its role in external relations;

Or. en

Amendment 14

Bogdan Andrzej Zdrojewski

Draft opinion

Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Underlines that both the Culture sub-programme under Creative Europe and the Europe for Citizens programme continue to have low project success rates (11 % and 16 % respectively in 2016), causing frustration among applicants and hampering programme functioning; calls for more funds to be allocated to the programmes in 2018 in order to ensure effective delivery;

Amendment

3. Underlines that both the Culture sub-programme under Creative Europe and the Europe for Citizens programme continue to have low project success rates (11 % and 16 % respectively in 2016), causing frustration among applicants and hampering programme functioning; calls for more funds to be allocated to the programmes in 2018 in order to ensure effective delivery; **welcomes the efforts made by the EU institutions in recent years to address the payments backlog; points out that delays in finalising contracts between the relevant bodies and beneficiaries and late payments jeopardise full implementation of the programmes by the Commission;**

Or. pl

Amendment 15

Dominique Bilde

Draft opinion

Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Underlines that both the Culture sub-programme under Creative Europe and the Europe for Citizens programme continue to have low project success rates (11 % and 16 % respectively in 2016), **causing frustration among applicants and hampering programme functioning; calls for more funds to be allocated to the programmes in 2018 in order to ensure effective delivery;**

Amendment

3. Underlines that both the Culture sub-programme under Creative Europe and the Europe for Citizens programme continue to have low project success rates (11 % and 16 % respectively in 2016); **insists on management of the funds allocated to these EU actions being reviewed, just like some of these programmes' objectives, notably Strand 2 of the 'Europe for Citizens' programme, in order to be sure of their efficient and**

effective delivery;

Or. fr

Amendment 16
Eleftherios Synadinos

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Underlines that both the Culture sub-programme under Creative Europe and the Europe for Citizens programme continue to have low project success rates (11 % and 16 % respectively in 2016), ***causing frustration among applicants and hampering programme functioning***; calls for ***more funds to be allocated to the programmes in 2018*** in order to ensure effective delivery;

Amendment

3. Underlines that both the Culture sub-programme under Creative Europe and the Europe for Citizens programme continue to have low project success rates (11 % and 16 % respectively in 2016), ***raising questions about the soundness of the initial planning and the real objectives of the programmes***; calls for ***funds for the programmes in 2018 and the allocation of these funds to be re-examined*** in order to ensure ***targeted and*** effective delivery;

Or. el

Amendment 17
Dominique Bilde

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. ***Calls for greater synergies between culture and education programmes and*** EFSI and the ESI Funds; urges the Commission to frontload the Creative Europe Guarantee Facility through EFSI to support the cultural and creative sector and thereby drive growth;

Amendment

4. ***Makes known its doubts regarding the use made to date of EFSI and the ESI Funds; emphasises that as regards culture and education, the latter should be used for investment in school facilities, notably for rural areas suffering a population exodus, as well as to facilitate accessibility to culture and education for persons with a disability***; urges the Commission to ***follow up on its declarations of good***

intent with tangible actions and to frontload the Creative Europe Guarantee Facility through EFSI to support *small and medium-sized enterprises in* the cultural and creative sector and thereby drive growth;

Or. fr

Amendment 18
Bogdan Andrzej Zdrojewski

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Calls for greater synergies between culture and education programmes and EFSI and the ESI Funds; urges the Commission to frontload the Creative Europe Guarantee Facility through EFSI to support the cultural and creative sector and thereby drive growth;

Amendment

4. Calls for greater synergies between culture and education programmes and EFSI and the ESI Funds; urges the Commission to frontload the Creative Europe Guarantee Facility through EFSI to support the cultural and creative sector and thereby drive growth; *welcomes the EFSI 2.0 proposal to enhance the role of the European Investment Advisory Hub and notes its significant potential as a source of information on the potential pooling of EU funds and the creation of investment platforms, which can lead to a more balanced sectoral and geographical coverage;*

Or. pl

Amendment 19
Luigi Morgano, Silvia Costa

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Calls for greater synergies between

Amendment

4. Calls for greater synergies between

culture and education programmes and EFSI and the ESI Funds; urges the Commission to frontload the Creative Europe Guarantee Facility through EFSI to support the cultural and creative sector and thereby drive growth;

culture and education programmes and EFSI and the ESI Funds; ***calls on the EIB to consider allocating a greater share of EFSI funding to cultural and creative industries (CCIs), as they can disseminate more and better than other sectors information about funding opportunities provided by EFSI***; urges the Commission to frontload the Creative Europe Guarantee Facility through EFSI to support the cultural and creative sector and thereby drive growth;

Or. en

Amendment 20
Luigi Morgano, Silvia Costa

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Calls for greater synergies between culture and education programmes and EFSI and the ESI Funds; urges the Commission to ***frontload the Creative Europe*** Guarantee Facility ***through EFSI*** to support the cultural and creative sector and thereby drive growth;

Amendment

4. Calls for greater synergies between culture and education programmes and EFSI and the ESI Funds, ***in particular the ESF***; urges the Commission to ***promote the interaction between the Cultural and Creative Sector*** Guarantee Facility ***and EFSI in order to provide fit-for-purpose loans for cultural and creative industries***, to support the cultural and creative sector, and thereby drive growth;

Or. en

Amendment 21
Eleftherios Synadinos

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

Amendment

4. Calls for greater synergies between culture and education programmes and EFSI and the ESI Funds; urges the Commission to frontload the Creative Europe Guarantee Facility through EFSI to support the *cultural* and *creative sector* *and* thereby *drive* growth;

4. Calls for *significantly* greater synergies *and the further development thereof* between culture and education programmes and EFSI and the ESI Funds; urges the Commission to frontload the Creative Europe Guarantee Facility through EFSI to support the *culture of the nations that make up the European Union* and *the dormant creativity in the Member States*, thereby *providing a further means to support* growth;

Or. el

Amendment 22
Eleftherios Synadinos

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. *Welcomes* the agreement reached on the European Year of Cultural Heritage (EYCH) 2018 with a budget of EUR 7 million in 2018, 4 million of *which is* fresh money; reiterates that funding for the EYCH must have *no* negative impact on *Creative Europe*;

Amendment

5. *Notes* the agreement reached on the European Year of Cultural Heritage (EYCH) 2018 with a budget of EUR 7 million in 2018; *stresses that EUR* 4 million of *the EUR 7 million are* fresh money; reiterates that funding for the EYCH must *neither* have *a* negative impact on *other programmes nor, because of its title or any related actions, cast doubt on the only apposite term relating to the respective cultural heritage of the Member States*;

Or. el

Amendment 23
Dominique Bilde

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. **Welcomes** the agreement reached on the European Year of Cultural Heritage (EYCH) 2018 with a budget of EUR 7 million in 2018, 4 million of which is fresh money; **reiterates that funding for the EYCH must have no negative impact on Creative Europe;**

Amendment

5. **Takes note of** the agreement reached on the European Year of Cultural Heritage (EYCH) 2018 with a budget of EUR 7 million in 2018, 4 million of which is fresh money; **makes known, however, its concerns regarding the directions the Commission seems to be taking for this Year, which boil down, it would seem, to ‘communications actions’;**

Or. fr

Amendment 24
Luigi Morgano

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Welcomes the agreement reached on the European Year of Cultural Heritage (EYCH) 2018 with a budget of EUR 7 million in 2018, 4 million of which is fresh money; reiterates that funding for the EYCH must have no negative impact on Creative Europe;

Amendment

5. Welcomes the agreement reached on the European Year of Cultural Heritage (EYCH) 2018 with a budget of EUR 7 million in 2018, 4 million of which is fresh money; reiterates that funding for the EYCH must have no negative impact on Creative Europe, **in line with the Council and Commission statements;**

Or. en

Amendment 25
María Teresa Giménez Barbat

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Welcomes the agreement reached on the European Year of Cultural Heritage (EYCH) 2018 with a budget of EUR 7

Amendment

5. Welcomes the agreement reached on the European Year of Cultural Heritage (EYCH) 2018 with a budget of EUR 7

million in 2018, 4 million of which is fresh money; reiterates that funding for the EYCH must have no negative impact on Creative Europe;

million in 2018, 4 million of which is fresh money; reiterates that funding for the EYCH must have no negative impact on Creative Europe *and on Europe for Citizens*;

Or. en

Amendment 26
Dominique Bilde

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

5a. States that as the EU budget is made up of money from taxpayers in the Member States, it is essential that the Year of Cultural Heritage 2018 serves citizens' real needs and expectations; stresses that for this to happen, monies allocated to this Year ought to be used on specific work to restore and conserve cultural buildings and artefacts in Europe and to help, for instance, save the 10 000 churches threatened with destruction in France, or even to restore buildings destroyed by natural disasters, for example those hit by the earthquakes in Italy in August 2016;

Or. fr

Amendment 27
Morten Løkkegaard

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

5a. Welcomes the positive efforts towards a provisional solution for the

continuation of Euranet Plus; encourages the Commission to take action to ensure the sustainability of the network beyond 2018 by securing its funding for the following years reflected in its own budget line, and including it in the scope of the next MFF; recalls the importance of the independent news coverage of EU affairs provided by this pan-European radio network and its proven track record in better informing EU citizens;

Or. en

Amendment 28
Bogdan Andrzej Zdrojewski

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Notes the success of the New Narrative for Europe, now in its final year as a Preparatory Action; stresses that the initiative has proven its worth, fostering debate and fresh thinking among young people on the challenges facing the EU; calls, in light of those challenges, for the initiative to be continued through the Youth strand of Erasmus+.

Amendment

6. *Points to the potential of pilot projects and preparatory actions as means of testing out measures in EU policy areas and introducing new innovative initiatives that might become long-term EU measures;* notes the success of the New Narrative for Europe, now in its final year as a Preparatory Action; stresses that the initiative has proven its worth, fostering debate and fresh thinking among young people on the challenges facing the EU; calls, in light of those challenges, for the initiative to be continued through the Youth strand of Erasmus+.

Or. pl

Amendment 29
Dominique Bilde

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. *Notes the success of the New Narrative for Europe, now in its final year as a Preparatory Action; stresses that the initiative has proven its worth, fostering debate and fresh thinking among young people on the challenges facing the EU; calls, in light of those challenges, for the initiative to be continued through the Youth strand of Erasmus+.*

Amendment

6. *States that people in Europe do not need ‘a new narrative’ created out of nothing for the benefit of an ideological project that is out of step with reality to reconcile them to the European Union, but rather for Europe to be made democratic again via the establishment of a Europe of nations and cooperation, as well as recognition of specific national historical and cultural characteristics, and of being part of a European civilisation founded on a very specific heritage; calls in light of this analysis for an end to the ‘New Narrative for Europe’ initiative which constitutes a waste of resources for a questionable end.*

Or. fr

Amendment 30
Eleftherios Synadinos

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Notes the *success* of the New Narrative for Europe, now in its final year as a Preparatory Action; stresses that the *initiative has proven its worth, fostering* debate and fresh thinking among young people on *the* challenges facing the EU; calls, in light of those challenges, for the initiative to be continued through the Youth strand of Erasmus+.

Amendment

6. Notes the *initiative* of the New Narrative for Europe, now in its final year as a Preparatory Action; stresses that the *theoretical objective is to foster* debate and fresh thinking among young people on *specific* challenges facing the EU; calls, in light of those challenges, for the initiative to be *re-examined and potentially* continued through the Youth strand of Erasmus+.

Or. el

Amendment 31
Luigi Morgano

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

6a. *Recalls that the Youth Guarantee scheme and Youth Employment Initiative are key tools to address the persistent problem of high levels of youth unemployment and calls for their continued improvement as well as a substantial budget increase; takes note of the conclusions of the European Court of Auditors report on the Youth Guarantee; points out that more investments, growth-enhancing structural reforms and coordination in social policies are needed to support quality transitions of young people into the labour market in a sustainable way;*

Or. en

Amendment 32
Liadh Ní Riada

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

6a. *Recalls the decision taken by the Parliament within the 2017 Parliament budget procedure, which establishes the creation of an 'interpretation in International Sign Language' service, for all plenary debates and calls upon the administration to implement this decision with no further delay;*

Or. en

Amendment 33
Helga Trüpel

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

6a. *Recalls the excellent work done by Euranet+ but reminds the Commission to find a sustainable solution for this media provider, which would enable it to function on the basis of a multiannual funding arrangement;*

Or. en

Amendment 34
Helga Trüpel

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

6b. *Welcomes the permanent development of the Lux Prize towards a model based on the participation of all EU citizens, the first year of functioning of the House of European History and the success of the Parlamentarium, which has surpassed expectations; calls for a multiannual funding base for what are all excellent tools for communicating with EU citizens;*

Or. en

Amendment 35
Luigi Morgano

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

6b. *Stresses that, in order to address the chronically low success rates of some EU programmes that are caused by underfunding and to provide for a*

counter-cyclical function of the EU budget, a system of genuine and consistent own resources must be put in place for the post-2020 MFF;

Or. en