



EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

2009 - 2014

Committee on Industry, Research and Energy

2013/2017(BUD)

22.5.2013

AMENDMENTS

1 - 19

Draft opinion
Reinhard Bütikofer
(PE510.513v01-00)

on 2014 Budget - Mandate for the Trilogue
(2013/2017(BUD))

AM\936908EN.doc

PE510.847v01-00

AM_Com_NonLegOpinion

Amendment 1
Silvia-Adriana Țicău

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Deeply regrets that the Council has cut EUR 38 billion in Heading 1a, under which main EU policies on innovation, research, infrastructure, SMEs, youth and education, needed to address the current economic crisis and important societal challenges, are financed; ***believes that an appropriate capping of CAP payments would make it possible to release further budget resources for Heading 1a;***

Amendment

2. Deeply regrets that the Council has cut EUR 38 billion in Heading 1a, under which main EU policies on innovation, research, infrastructure, SMEs, youth and education, needed to address the current economic crisis and important societal challenges, are financed; ***stresses that appropriations under Heading 1a could help meet EU priority policies in areas such as: measures to combat unemployment, EU industrial policy, research and innovation and energy;***

Or. ro

Amendment 2
Paul Rübzig

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Deeply regrets that the Council has cut EUR 38 billion in Heading 1a, under which main EU policies on innovation, research, infrastructure, SMEs, youth and education, needed to address the current economic crisis and important societal challenges, are financed; believes that ***an appropriate capping of CAP payments would make it possible to release further budget resources for Heading 1a;***

Amendment

2. Deeply regrets that the Council has cut EUR 38 billion in Heading 1a, under which main EU policies on innovation, research, infrastructure, SMEs, youth and education, needed to address the current economic crisis and important societal challenges, are financed; believes that ***the release of further budget resources for Heading 1a should be made possible;***

Or. de

Amendment 3
Jean-Pierre Audy

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

2a. Wishes to know the approximate amount of unused payment appropriations from the period 2007 – 2013, in particular for the final year, 2013, and to this end asks the Commission to provide a financial statement on the take-up of payment appropriations under the current financial perspectives for 2007-2013, indicating the amounts provided for and committed for the period 2007-2012; take-up shortfall; amounts still to be committed and all financial information regarding the utilisation of payment appropriations;

Or. fr

Amendment 4
Reinhard Bütikofer
on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

2 a. Calls on the budgetary authorities to establish the maximum possible flexibility to direct unused annual appropriations towards the programmes under Heading 1a, in particular Horizon 2020, COSME and the Connecting Europe Facility;

Or. en

Amendment 5
Edit Herczog

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

2 a. Strongly opposes any attempt to cover the necessary resources through redeployment from Heading 1a to settle any future, potential failure to cover all unpaid payment claims of the actual financial year of the next MFF;

Or. en

Amendment 6
Reinhard Bütikofer
on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

Amendment

3. *Calls* for an ambitious allocation of funds to the Horizon 2020 programme; firmly objects to any proposal for 2014 ceilings below the 2013 levels; calls on the Commission to establish dedicated budget lines for the SME Instrument, Science in Society and Widening Participation Programmes, as well as for the follow-up of CIP Eco-innovation and Intelligent Energy Europe programmes;

3. *Reminds the Council's of its statement whereby funding for the Horizon 2020 programme must represent a real growth compared to 2013 level; calls therefore* for an ambitious allocation of funds to the Horizon 2020 programme ***and*** firmly objects to any proposal for 2014 ceilings below the 2013 levels; calls on the Commission to establish dedicated budget lines for the SME Instrument, Science in Society and Widening Participation Programmes, as well as for the follow-up of CIP Eco-innovation and Intelligent Energy Europe programmes;

Or. en

Amendment 7
Kent Johansson

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Calls for an ambitious allocation of funds to the Horizon 2020 programme; firmly objects to any proposal for 2014 ceilings below the 2013 levels; calls on the Commission to establish dedicated budget **lines for** the SME Instrument, Science in Society and Widening Participation Programmes, as well as for the follow-up of CIP Eco-innovation and Intelligent Energy Europe programmes;

Amendment

3. Calls for an ambitious allocation of funds to the Horizon 2020 programme; firmly objects to any proposal for 2014 ceilings below the 2013 levels; calls on the Commission to establish **a** dedicated budget **for** the SME Instrument, **and dedicated budget lines for the** Science in Society and Widening Participation Programmes, as well as for the follow-up of CIP Eco-innovation and Intelligent Energy Europe programmes;

Or. en

Amendment 8
Kent Johansson

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3 a. Calls for one single budget allocation for the European Institute of Innovation and Technology in order to provide stakeholders in the Knowledge and Innovation Communities with a stable and predictable framework to make investments;

Or. en

Amendment 9
Kent Johansson

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3 b. Calls for an ambitious allocation of funds to the European Institute of Innovation and Technology in order to reach the critical mass needed to establish the new foreseen Knowledge and Innovation Communities;

Or. en

Amendment 10
Paul Rübig

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

Amendment

5. Stresses the need to address the problems faced by SMEs through an ambitious COSME programme; in view of the particularly difficult situation for accessing finance, calls for the allocation of at least 60% of the COSME budget to the financial instruments;

5. Stresses the need to address the problems faced by SMEs through an ambitious COSME programme; in view of the particularly difficult situation for accessing finance, calls for the allocation of at least 60% of the COSME budget to the financial instruments; ***insists that the MFF should continue to provide for microfinancing programmes (such as the European Progress Microfinance Facility and the JASMINE); calls in addition for closer networking of existing and future tools for the promotion of entrepreneurship, e.g. the European Social Fund, the Globalisation Adjustment Fund, the Youth Guarantee and Erasmus for Young Entrepreneurs, with a view to generating incentives and synergies at national and local levels;***

Or. de

Amendment 11
Reinhard Bütikofer
on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Stresses the need to address the problems faced by SMEs through an ambitious COSME programme; in view of the particularly difficult situation for accessing finance, calls for the allocation of at least 60% of the COSME budget to the financial instruments;

Amendment

5. Stresses the need to address the problems faced by SMEs through an ambitious COSME programme; ***believes that the level of funding currently proposed is insufficient and restates Parliament's position to double the amount allocated to the programme over the MFF period;*** in view of the particularly difficult situation for accessing finance, calls for the allocation of at least 60% of the COSME budget to the financial instruments;

Or. en

Amendment 12
Edit Herczog

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Stresses the need to address the problems faced by SMEs through an ambitious COSME programme; in view of the particularly difficult situation for accessing finance, calls for the allocation of at least 60% of the COSME budget to the financial instruments;

Amendment

5. Stresses the need to address the problems faced by SMEs through an ambitious COSME programme; in view of the particularly difficult situation for accessing finance, calls for the allocation of at least 60% of the COSME budget to the ***most effective*** financial instruments;

Or. en

Amendment 13
Edit Herczog

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Insists that the major EU infrastructure projects (such as Galileo and Copernicus) must be financed *outside* and above the MFF *budget and insists that no EU funds must be used to cover additional cost overruns or to cover the costs of the ITER project*;

Amendment

6. Insists that the major EU infrastructure projects (such as Galileo and Copernicus) *and the ITER project* must be financed *over* and above the MFF *ceilings, so as to ensure that possible cost overruns do not threaten the funding and successful implementation of other Union policies particularly in the research area, while maintaining the full powers of both arms of the budgetary authority; on the basis of the overall cost to be agreed, the funding should be ring fenced in commitment appropriations in the MFF regulation in order to guarantee the funding for these projects without jeopardising other EU priorities like Horizon 2020, COSME or the Erasmus Programme*;

Or. en

Amendment 14
Paul Rübig

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Insists that *the* major EU infrastructure projects (such as Galileo *and* Copernicus) *must be financed outside and above the MFF budget and insists that no EU funds must be used to cover additional cost overruns or to cover the costs of the ITER project*;

Amendment

6. Insists that *funding packages for* major EU infrastructure projects (such as Galileo, Copernicus *and ITER*) *should be above the MFF ceiling so that, where necessary, additional appropriations can be released by the Member States*;

Or. de

Amendment 15
Jean-Pierre Audy

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Insists that the major EU infrastructure projects (such as Galileo and Copernicus) must be financed *outside* and above the MFF *budget* and insists that *no EU funds must be used to cover additional cost overruns or to cover the costs of the ITER project*;

Amendment

6. Insists that the major EU infrastructure projects (such as Galileo, *ITER* and Copernicus) must be financed *over* and above the MFF *ceilings* and insists that *the funding and successful implementation of other EU programmes should not be threatened by possible cost overruns of these large-scale projects*;

Or. en

Amendment 16
Jens Rohde, Kent Johansson

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Insists that the major EU infrastructure projects (such as Galileo and Copernicus) must be financed *outside* and above the MFF *budget* and insists that *no EU funds must be used to cover additional cost overruns or to cover the costs of the ITER project*;

Amendment

6. Insists that the major EU infrastructure projects (such as Galileo, *ITER* and Copernicus) must be financed *over* and above the MFF *ceilings* and insists that *the funding and successful implementation of other EU programmes should not be threatened by possible cost overruns of these large-scale projects*;

Or. en

Amendment 17
Reinhard Bütikofer
on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Insists that the major EU infrastructure projects (such as Galileo and Copernicus) must be financed ***outside*** and above the MFF budget and insists that no EU funds must be used to cover additional cost overruns or to cover the costs of the ITER project;

Amendment

6. Insists that the major EU infrastructure projects (such as Galileo and Copernicus) must be financed ***over*** and above the MFF budget and insists that no EU funds must be used to cover additional cost overruns or to cover the costs of the ITER project;

Or. en

Amendment 18

Edit Herczog

Draft opinion

Paragraph 7

Draft opinion

7. Believes that better governance and coordination of spending between the EU and the Member States is needed in order to implement the EU 2020 strategy; calls for optimal use of existing EU financing with a focus on EU added value, effective streamlining and leveraging effects; asks for the European Semester process to monitor investments in research, innovation, industrial policy ***and SMEs***.

Amendment

7. Believes that better governance and coordination of spending between the EU and the Member States is needed in order to implement the EU 2020 strategy; calls for optimal use of existing EU financing with a focus on EU added value, effective streamlining and leveraging effects, ***together with appropriate and urgent implementation in the Member States***; asks for the European Semester process to monitor investments in research, innovation, industrial policy, ***SMEs, energy and ICT infrastructures***.

Or. en

Amendment 19

Jean-Pierre Audy

Draft opinion

Paragraph 7

Draft opinion

7. Believes that better governance and coordination of spending between the EU **and** the Member States is needed in order to implement the EU 2020 strategy; calls for optimal use of existing EU financing with a focus on EU added value, effective streamlining and leveraging effects; asks for the European Semester process to monitor investments in research, innovation, industrial policy and SMEs.

Amendment

7. Believes that better governance and coordination of spending between the EU, the Member States **and the regions** is needed in order to implement the EU 2020 strategy; calls for optimal use of existing EU financing with a focus on EU added value, effective streamlining and leveraging effects; asks for the European Semester process to monitor investments in research, monitor investments in research, innovation, industrial policy and SMEs.

Or. fr