



EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

2014 - 2019

Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs

2014/2121(DEC)

9.1.2015

AMENDMENTS

1 - 23

Draft opinion
Markus Ferber
(PE544.163v01-00)

on discharge in respect of the implementation of the budget of the European Insurance and Occupational Pensions Authority for the financial year 2013 (2014/2121(DEC))

AM\1045556EN.doc

PE546.608v01-00

AM_Com_NonLegOpinion

Amendment 1
Olle Ludvigsson

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

1a. Takes note of the observation made by the Commission, in its recent report on the operation of the European Supervisory Authorities (ESAs) and the ESFS, that, in spite of difficult circumstances, the ESAs have quickly established well-functioning organisations which, overall, have performed well against their broad range of tasks, while facing increasing demands with limited human resources;

Or. en

Amendment 2
Nils Torvalds

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

Amendment

2. Underlines ***that*** EIOPA's role in promoting a common supervisory regime across the Single Market ***is essential to ensure a better integrated and safer insurance and pension sector in the EU;***

2. Underlines EIOPA's role in promoting a common supervisory regime across the Single Market; ***believes that, besides the ECB, the ESAs are a cornerstone of fully functioning financial markets in the Union and are essential for the economic recovery and the creation of jobs and growth in Europe, as well as for the prevention and handling of future crises in the financial sector;***

Or. en

Amendment 3
Bernd Lucke

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Underlines that EIOPA's role in promoting a common supervisory regime across the Single Market ***is essential to ensure a better*** integrated and safer insurance and pension sector in the EU;

Amendment

2. Underlines that EIOPA's role in promoting a common supervisory regime across the Single Market ***aims at an*** integrated and safer insurance and pension sector in the EU;

Or. en

Amendment 4
Olle Ludvigsson

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Underlines that EIOPA's role in promoting a common supervisory regime across the Single Market is essential to ensure a better integrated and safer insurance and pension sector in the EU;

Amendment

2. Underlines that EIOPA's role in promoting a common supervisory regime across the Single Market is essential to ensure a better integrated, ***more efficient*** and safer insurance and pension sector in the EU;

Or. en

Amendment 5
Bernd Lucke

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Acknowledges that the ESFS is still in a setting-up phase and stresses that the tasks already entrusted to EIOPA, as well

Amendment

deleted

as future tasks envisaged in on-going legislative work, require an adequate level of staff and budget to allow for satisfactory supervision; stresses however that any potential increases in its means should be preceded by rationalisation efforts wherever possible;

Or. en

Amendment 6
Hugues Bayet

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Acknowledges that the ESFS is still in a setting-up phase and stresses that the tasks already entrusted to EIOPA, as well as future tasks envisaged in on-going legislative work, require an adequate level of staff and budget to allow for *satisfactory* supervision; stresses however that any potential increases in its means should be preceded by rationalisation efforts *wherever possible*;

Amendment

4. Acknowledges that the ESFS is still in a setting-up phase and stresses that the tasks already entrusted to EIOPA, as well as future tasks envisaged in on-going legislative work, require an adequate level of staff and budget to allow for supervision; stresses however that any potential increases in its means should be preceded, *wherever possible*, by *the* rationalisation efforts *necessary to avert any new crisis in the banking sector and the extremely damaging consequences entailed in human, social, and economic terms*;

Or. fr

Amendment 7
Olle Ludvigsson

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Acknowledges that the ESFS is still in a setting-up phase and stresses that the tasks

Amendment

4. Acknowledges that the ESFS is still in a setting-up phase and stresses that the tasks

already entrusted to EIOPA, as well as future tasks envisaged in on-going legislative work, require an adequate level of staff and budget to allow for satisfactory supervision; stresses however that any potential increases in its means should be preceded by rationalisation efforts wherever possible;

already entrusted to EIOPA, as well as future tasks envisaged in on-going legislative work, require an adequate level of staff and budget to allow for satisfactory supervision; ***emphasizes that, as a general principle, additional tasks should be accompanied by additional resources***; stresses however that any potential increases in its means should be preceded ***and/or complemented*** by rationalisation efforts wherever possible;

Or. en

Amendment 8
Markus Ferber

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4a. Notes in this connection that focusing more closely on the mandate from the European legislator might contribute to a more efficient use of resources and more effective achievement of objectives;

Or. de

Amendment 9
Bernd Lucke

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4a. Stresses with regard to the increasing expenses that the EU budget already faces difficulties due to outstanding payments; therefore urges the EIOPA to make efficient use of synergies arising from close cooperation with national

supervisory agencies and to pay full respect to the principle of subsidiarity by refraining from any tasks assigned to national supervisory agencies; encourages the EIOPA to examine its internal administrative processes with a view to reducing administrative costs;

Or. en

Amendment 10
Markus Ferber

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4b. Stresses that all available resources must first be concentrated on the core tasks necessary for fulfilling the mandate before any further budget increases may be envisaged;

Or. de

Amendment 11
Sven Giegold
on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

Amendment

5. Stresses that, given its limited resources, EIOPA must stick strictly to the tasks assigned to it by the Union legislator and must not seek to broaden its mandate beyond those assignments;

5. Welcomes that EIOPA has taken a proactive approach to insurance supervision as foreseen in Regulation (EU) No 1094/2010 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 24 November 2010 establishing a European Supervisory Authority (European Insurance and Occupational Pensions Authority), amending Decision No

716/2009/EC and repealing Commission Decision 2009/79/EC¹ while negotiations over Omnibus II took longer than foreseen.

¹OJ L 331, 15.12.2010, p. 48.

Or. en

Amendment 12
Jonás Fernández

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Stresses that, given its limited resources, EIOPA must ***stick strictly to*** the tasks assigned to it by the Union legislator ***and must not seek to broaden its mandate beyond those assignments***;

Amendment

5. Stresses that, given its limited resources, EIOPA must ***set priorities when performing*** the tasks assigned to it by the Union legislator;

Or. es

Amendment 13
Olle Ludvigsson

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Stresses that, given its limited resources, EIOPA must stick strictly to the tasks assigned to it by the Union legislator ***and must not seek to broaden its mandate beyond those assignments***;

Amendment

5. Stresses that, given its limited resources, EIOPA must stick strictly to the tasks assigned to it by the Union legislator; ***underlines that EIOPA should carry out those assignments in full, but that it must not seek to de facto broaden its mandate beyond them***;

Or. en

Amendment 14

Matt Carthy

on behalf of the GUE/NGL Group

Draft opinion

Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Stresses that, given its limited resources, EIOPA must stick strictly to the tasks assigned to it by the Union legislator and must not seek to broaden its mandate beyond those assignments;

Amendment

5. Stresses that, given its limited resources, EIOPA must stick strictly to the tasks assigned to it by the Union legislator ***remain free of political agenda*** and must not seek to broaden its mandate beyond those assignments;

Or. en

Amendment 15

Olle Ludvigsson

Draft opinion

Paragraph 5 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

5a. Stresses that EIOPA, while waiting for a stronger mandate on consumer protection, should seek to make broader and more active use of already available powers in that field; underlines that intensified consumer-focused collaboration with the other ESAs through the Joint Committee would be a positive step forward in this regard;

Or. en

Amendment 16

Markus Ferber

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

5a. Notes with concern that EIOPA is spending significant resources on work relating to guidelines and recommendations which are not based on a direct mandate from the European legislator;

Or. de

Amendment 17
Markus Ferber

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

5b. Calls on EIOPA to focus solely on fulfilling the tasks conferred on it by the European legislator;

Or. de

Amendment 18
Bernd Lucke

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

Amendment

6. Concludes that EIOPA's mixed financing arrangement is inflexible, burdensome and a potential threat to its independence; therefore calls on the Commission to reconsider the financing arrangement in favour of an independent budget line from the EU budget and the introduction of fees by market participants.

6. Calls upon the Commission to consider funding the ESAs through direct contributions from financial market participants subject to direct ESA supervision, taking into account Article 38(1) of Regulation (EU) No 1094/2010.

Amendment 19
Nils Torvalds

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Concludes that EIOPA's mixed financing arrangement is inflexible, burdensome and a potential threat to its independence; *therefore* calls on the Commission *to reconsider the financing arrangement in favour of an independent budget line from the EU budget and* the introduction of fees by market participants.

Amendment

6. Concludes that EIOPA's mixed financing arrangement is inflexible, burdensome and a potential threat to its independence; calls *therefore* on the Commission, *if proven by the Commission's assessment, to propose a financing system by 2017 that:*

- is solely based on the introduction of fees by market participants, *or*

- combines fees by market participants with basic funding from a separate budget line in the general EU budget;

Amendment 20
Jonás Fernández

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. *Concludes* that EIOPA's mixed financing arrangement *is inflexible, burdensome and a potential* threat to its independence; *therefore* calls on the Commission to *reconsider* the financing arrangement *in favour of* an independent budget line from the EU budget and the introduction of fees by market participants.

Amendment

6. *Believes* that EIOPA's mixed financing arrangement *should be studied more thoroughly and that the assessment should extend to the hypothetical* threat to its independence; *therefore* calls on the Commission to *consider whether it should remodel* the *existing* financing arrangement *by providing for* an independent budget line from the EU

budget and the introduction of fees by market participants.

Or. es

Amendment 21
Zigmantas Balčytis

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. *Concludes* that EIOPA's mixed financing arrangement is inflexible, burdensome and a potential threat to its independence; *therefore* calls on *the Commission to reconsider* the financing arrangement *in favour of* an independent budget line from the EU budget and the introduction of fees by market participants.

Amendment

6. *Points to the finding of the Court of Auditors* that EIOPA's mixed financing arrangement is inflexible, burdensome and a potential threat to its independence; calls on *EIOPA, when considering* the financing arrangement, *to cooperate actively with the Commission and to opt for* an independent budget line from the EU budget and the introduction of fees *payable* by market participants.

Or. It

Amendment 22
Ildikó Gáll-Pelcz

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Concludes that EIOPA's mixed financing arrangement is inflexible, burdensome and a potential threat to its independence; therefore calls on the Commission to reconsider the financing arrangement in favour of an independent budget line from the EU budget and the introduction of fees by market participants.

Amendment

6. Concludes that EIOPA's *present* mixed financing arrangement is inflexible, *administratively* burdensome and a potential threat to its independence; therefore calls on the Commission to reconsider the financing arrangement in favour of an independent budget line from the EU budget and the introduction of fees by market participants.

Or. hu

Amendment 23
Olle Ludvigsson

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Concludes that EIOPA's mixed financing arrangement is inflexible, burdensome and a potential threat to its independence; therefore calls on the Commission to reconsider the financing arrangement in favour of ***an independent*** budget line ***from*** the EU budget and the introduction of fees by market participants.

Amendment

6. Concludes that EIOPA's mixed financing arrangement is inflexible, burdensome and a potential threat to its independence; therefore calls on the Commission to reconsider the financing arrangement in favour of ***a separate*** budget line ***in*** the EU budget and the introduction of fees by market participants.

Or. en