



EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

2009 - 2014

Committee on Budgets

2012/2016(BUD)

31.5.2012

AMENDMENTS

1 - 164

Draft report
Giovanni La Via
(PE489.403v01-00)

on the mandate for the trilogue on the 2013 Draft Budget
(2012/2016(BUD))

AM\904206EN.doc

PE489.697v01-00

EN

United in diversity

EN

AM_Com_NonLegReport

Amendment 1
Giovanni La Via

Motion for a resolution
Citation 6 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

- having regard to the conclusions of the interinstitutional meeting on payments of May 30th 2012,

Or. en

Amendment 2
João Ferreira

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 1

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

1. Recalls that ***in its resolution of 14 March 2012 the European Parliament has put the promotion of growth and jobs at the centre of its priorities, in line with the Europe 2020 strategy, pledging in particular for the concentration of resources in policies and programmes that are proven to be instrumental in achieving those objectives, notably in support of SMEs and youth; welcomes that the Commission's Draft Budget 2013 goes in the same direction in terms of identified priorities to be reinforced;***

1. Recalls that ***the missed targets of the former 'Lisbon strategy', particularly as regards reducing poverty and creating jobs, have had a negative effect on a large part of the population in the Member States, and the continued implementation of these policies under the current Europe 2020 strategy shows that the EU's budget strategy for 2013 should instead focus on reaching solutions in terms of:***

(i) wealth creation (increased productivity),

(ii) fair redistribution (combating income inequalities),

(iii) exclusion (combating unemployment);

Or. pt

Amendment 3
Marta Andreasen

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 1

Motion for a resolution

1. Recalls that in its resolution of 14 March 2012 the European Parliament **has** put the promotion of growth and jobs at the centre of its priorities, in line with the Europe 2020 strategy, pledging in particular for the concentration of resources in policies and programmes that **are proven to** be instrumental in achieving those objectives, notably in support of SMEs and youth; **welcomes** that the Commission's Draft Budget 2013 **goes in the same direction in terms of identified priorities to be reinforced**;

Amendment

1. Recalls that in its resolution of 14 March 2012 the European Parliament **sought to** put the promotion of growth and jobs at the centre of its priorities, in line with the Europe 2020 strategy, pledging in particular for the concentration of resources in policies and programmes that **it believes may** be instrumental in achieving those objectives, notably in support of SMEs and youth; **notes** that the Commission's Draft Budget 2013 **shares these lofty intentions but is sceptical on the question of whether EU action can bring them about in practice**;

Or. en

Amendment 4
Helga Trüpel

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 1 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

1a. Believes that EU policies and the EU budget should make a substantial contribution to the revitalisation of sustainable growth in the EU and to addressing major societal challenges such as resource scarcity and climate change;

Amendment

Or. en

Amendment 5
Helga Trüpel

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 1 b (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

1b. Calls for more substantial resources to be mobilised in order to boost the green economy as a key driver for future competitiveness and resilience;

Or. en

Amendment 6
Marta Andreasen

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 2

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

2. Recognises the persistent economic and budgetary constraints at national level, as well as the need for fiscal consolidation; ***reiterates, however, its conviction*** that the EU budget represents a common and effective instrument of investment and solidarity, which is needed particularly at the present time to trigger economic growth, competitiveness and job creation in the 27 Member States; stresses that, despite its limited size that does not exceed 2% of total public spending in the Union, the EU budget has had a real economic impact and successfully complemented so far Member States' recovery policies;

2. Recognises the persistent economic and budgetary constraints at national level, as well as the need for fiscal consolidation; ***believes*** that ***these constraints should inform*** the EU budgetary process, ***does not believe that*** economic growth can be triggered by the diktat of a supranational organisation, that notion having been tested to destruction and beyond by the former Council for Mutual Economic Assistance; ***believes that*** job creation is best triggered by economic growth and competitiveness; ***believe that*** competitiveness is best achieved by allowing firms to compete and that EU over-regulation and micromanagement achieve the very opposite of this intention;

Or. en

Amendment 7
Jürgen Klute, Alda Sousa

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 2

Motion for a resolution

2. Recognises the persistent economic and budgetary constraints at national level, **as well as the need for fiscal consolidation**; reiterates, however, its conviction that the EU budget represents a common and effective instrument of investment and solidarity, which is needed particularly at the present time to trigger economic growth, **competitiveness** and **job creation** in the 27 Member States; stresses that, despite its limited size that does not exceed 2% of total public spending in the Union, the EU budget has had **a real** economic impact and **successfully complemented so far** Member States' recovery policies;

Amendment

2. Recognises the persistent economic and budgetary constraints at national level; reiterates, however, its conviction that the EU budget represents a common and effective instrument of investment and solidarity, which is needed particularly at the present time to trigger economic growth, **employment** and **social progress** in the 27 Member States; stresses that, despite its limited size that does not exceed 2% of total public spending in the Union, the EU budget has had economic impact and **attempts to complement** Member States' recovery policies;

Or. en

Amendment 8
Jens Geier

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 2

Motion for a resolution

2. Recognises the persistent economic and budgetary constraints at national level, as well as the need for fiscal consolidation; **reiterates**, however, its conviction that the EU budget represents a common and effective instrument of investment and solidarity, which is needed particularly at the present time to trigger economic growth, competitiveness and job creation in the 27 Member States; stresses that, despite its limited size that does not exceed 2% of total public spending in the Union,

Amendment

2. Recognises the persistent economic and budgetary constraints at national level, as well as the need for fiscal consolidation; **points out**, however, **that savings in the Member States' contributions from their national budgets have been able to make only an inadequate contribution towards consolidation, and reiterates** its conviction that the EU budget represents a common and effective instrument of investment and solidarity, which is needed particularly at the present time to trigger economic

the EU budget has had a real economic impact and successfully complemented so far Member States' recovery policies;

growth, competitiveness and job creation in the 27 Member States; stresses that, despite its limited size that does not exceed 2% of total public spending in the Union, the EU budget has had a real economic impact and successfully complemented so far Member States' recovery policies;

Or. de

Amendment 9

Richard Ashworth

on behalf of the ECR Group

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 2

Motion for a resolution

2. Recognises the persistent economic and budgetary constraints at national level, as well as the need for fiscal consolidation; reiterates, however, its conviction that the EU budget represents a common and effective instrument of investment and solidarity, which is needed particularly at the present time to trigger economic growth, competitiveness and job creation in the 27 Member States; stresses that, despite its limited size that does not exceed 2% of total public spending in the Union, the EU budget has had a real economic impact and successfully complemented so far Member States' recovery policies;

Amendment

2. Recognises the persistent economic and budgetary constraints at national level, as well as the need for fiscal consolidation ***which must be reflected at European level***; reiterates, however, its conviction that the EU budget represents a common and effective instrument of investment and solidarity, which is needed particularly at the present time to trigger economic growth, competitiveness and job creation in the 27 Member States; stresses that, despite its limited size that does not exceed 2% of total public spending in the Union, the EU budget has had a real economic impact and successfully complemented so far Member States' recovery policies;

Or. en

Amendment 10

Richard Ashworth

on behalf of the ECR Group

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 2 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

2a. Believes that advancing the Europe 2020 Strategy requires judicious selection of policy instruments and objectives, such as promoting trade, strengthening the single market and providing a supportive framework for innovation, and takes the view that the Europe 2020 strategy can be credible only if adequately funded but believes that funding for EU2020 should not be increased for 2013 unless accompanied by savings elsewhere in the budget, thus allowing for an inflationary freeze in both commitment and payment appropriations;

Or. en

Amendment 11
Jürgen Klute, Alda Sousa

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 2 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

2a. Emphasises that the EU Budget can have a crucial role to help some of its member states to recover from the crisis and come out stronger, through smart, sustainable and inclusive growth based on the five EU headline targets, namely promoting employment, improving the conditions for innovation, research and development, meeting our climate change and energy objectives, promoting high education standards and social policies, in particular social inclusion and poverty reduction; recalls that the Member States themselves have fully endorsed these five targets;

Or. en

Amendment 12
Jürgen Klute, Alda Sousa

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 2 b (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

2b. Rejects the "Economic Governance" and the Pact for the Euro which enshrine the austerity measures taken both at EU and Member States level; these led to the deepening and aggravation of the economic and social crises, particularly in countries which already had a difficult economic and social situation; reiterates that the EU budget should give priority to policies of real convergence, social and territorial cohesion, focused on job creation, social progress, solidarity, the sustainable use of natural resources and protection of the environment;

Or. en

Amendment 13
Marta Andreasen

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 3

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

3. Intends, therefore, to strongly defend an adequate level of resources for next year's budget, as defined in the Draft Budget, and to oppose any attempt to cut down the resources especially for policies delivering growth and employment; believes that the EU budget, which cannot run a deficit, should not be the victim of unsuccessful economic policies at national level; notes that in 2012 several Member States are increasing the size of their

3. Would like to see strong restraint exercised in next year's budget, and sees the level of increase proposed in the current Draft Budget as unrealistic; believes that the idea that genuine growth and employment can be delivered by the EU budget is fallacious; notes that the statement that the EU budget cannot run a deficit, which is often used to support increased spend at EU level, is tendentious as deficits thus created are

national budgets;

transferred in their entirety to the Member States; deplores the tendency to blame the crisis on alleged unsuccessful economic policies at national level when these policies have been enabled and facilitated by the hasty and unconsidered introduction of a single currency; notes that whilst in 2012 several Member States may be increasing the size of their national budgets others are having to make deep and painful cuts in difficult circumstances;

Or. en

Amendment 14

Richard Ashworth

on behalf of the ECR Group

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 3

Motion for a resolution

3. Intends, therefore, to strongly defend an adequate level of resources for next year's budget, as defined in the Draft Budget, and to oppose any attempt to cut down the resources especially for policies delivering growth and employment; believes that the EU budget, which cannot run a deficit, should not be the victim of unsuccessful economic policies at national level; notes that in 2012 several Member States are increasing the size of their national budgets;

Amendment

3. Believes that in the context of continued challenging economic circumstances, the European Union should freeze its budgets; emphasises, however, the need to respect legally binding obligations and possible subsequent increases, on the basis that increases be offset to maintain the level of an overall freeze; believes that the EU budget, which cannot run a deficit, should not be the victim of unsuccessful economic policies at national level; notes that in 2012 several Member States are increasing the size of their national budgets;

Or. en

Amendment 15

Alexander Alvaro, George Lyon, Carl Haglund

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 3

Motion for a resolution

3. Intends, therefore, to **strongly defend** an adequate level of resources for next year's budget, as defined in the Draft Budget, and to oppose **any attempt to cut down** the resources **especially** for policies delivering growth and employment; believes that the EU budget, which cannot run a deficit, should not be **the victim of unsuccessful economic policies** at national level; notes that in 2012 several Member States are increasing the size of their national budgets;

Amendment

3. Intends, therefore, to **ensure** an adequate level of resources for next year's budget, as defined in the Draft Budget, and to oppose **excessive cuts of** the resources **specifically** for policies delivering growth and employment; believes that the EU budget, which cannot run a deficit **and which is investment-oriented**, should not **however** be **unresponsive to economic circumstances** at national level; notes that in 2012 several Member States are increasing the size of their national budgets **while others are implementing extensive cuts**;

Or. en

Amendment 16
Jens Geier

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 3

Motion for a resolution

3. Intends, therefore, to strongly defend an adequate level of resources for next year's budget, as defined in the Draft Budget, and to oppose any attempt to cut down the resources especially for policies delivering growth and employment; believes that the EU budget, which cannot run a deficit, should not be the victim of unsuccessful economic policies at national level; notes that in 2012 several Member States are increasing the size of their national budgets;

Amendment

3. Intends, therefore, to strongly defend an adequate level of resources for next year's budget, as defined in the Draft Budget, and to oppose any attempt to cut down the resources especially for policies delivering growth and employment; believes that the EU budget, which cannot run a deficit, should not be the victim of unsuccessful economic policies at national level; notes that in 2012 several Member States are increasing the size of their national budgets **and in any case the fiscal consolidation argument is unfounded**;

Or. de

Amendment 17
Jürgen Klute, Alda Sousa

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 3

Motion for a resolution

3. Intends, therefore, to strongly defend an adequate level of resources for next year's budget, as defined in the Draft Budget, and to oppose any attempt to cut down the resources especially for policies delivering growth and employment; believes that the EU budget, which cannot run a deficit, should not be the victim of unsuccessful economic policies **at national level**; **notes** that in 2012 several Member States are increasing the size of their national budgets;

Amendment

3. Intends, therefore, to strongly defend an adequate level of resources for next year's budget, as defined in the Draft Budget, and to oppose any attempt to cut down the resources especially for policies delivering growth and employment; believes that the EU budget, which cannot run a deficit, should not be the victim of unsuccessful economic policies; **underlines** that in 2012 several Member States are increasing the size of their national budgets;

Or. en

Amendment 18
Richard Ashworth
on behalf of the ECR Group

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 4

Motion for a resolution

4. Is convinced that, particularly in a period of crisis, financial responsibility is of utmost importance; believes, therefore, that resources must be concentrated on those areas, where the EU budget can deliver an added value whilst they can be decreased in sectors which are experiencing unjustified delays, **low absorption** and **under-implementation**; on this basis, it intends to identify, together with its specialised committees, both positive and negative priorities for 2013; for this

Amendment

4. Is convinced that, particularly in a period of crisis, financial responsibility is of utmost importance; believes, therefore, that resources must be concentrated on those areas, where the EU budget can deliver an added value whilst they can be decreased in sectors which are experiencing unjustified delays, **takes the view, moreover that the 2013 appropriations should be based on a careful analysis of payment appropriation outturn in 2011 as well 2012, with a view to view to making**

purpose asks the Commission to provide both arms of the budgetary authority with a prompt, regular and complete information on the implementation of the various programmes and initiatives;

savings on lines where problems have arisen in implementation, considers that real savings can be made by identifying overlaps and inefficiencies across budgetary lines; on this basis, it intends to identify, together with its specialised committees, both positive and negative priorities for 2013; for this purpose asks the Commission to provide both arms of the budgetary authority with a prompt, regular and complete information on the implementation of the various programmes and initiatives;

Or. en

Amendment 19 **Helga Trüpel**

Motion for a resolution **Paragraph 4**

Motion for a resolution

4. Is convinced that, particularly in a period of crisis, financial responsibility is of utmost importance; believes, therefore, that resources must be concentrated on those areas, where the EU budget can deliver an added value whilst they can be decreased in sectors which are experiencing unjustified delays, low absorption and under-implementation; on this basis, it intends to identify, together with its specialised committees, both positive and negative priorities for 2013; for this purpose asks the Commission to provide both arms of the budgetary authority with a prompt, regular and complete information on the implementation of the various programmes and initiatives;

Amendment

4. Is convinced that, particularly in a period of crisis, financial responsibility is of utmost importance; believes, therefore, that resources must be concentrated on those areas, where the EU budget can deliver an added value whilst they can be decreased in sectors which are experiencing unjustified delays, low absorption and under-implementation **or are unsustainable**; on this basis, it intends to identify, together with its specialised committees, both positive and negative priorities for 2013; for this purpose asks the Commission to provide both arms of the budgetary authority with a prompt, regular and complete information on the implementation of the various programmes and initiatives;

Or. en

Amendment 20
Eider Gardiazábal Rubial

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 4

Motion for a resolution

4. Is convinced that, particularly in a period of crisis, financial responsibility is of utmost importance; believes, therefore, that resources must be concentrated on those areas, where the EU budget can deliver an added value whilst they **can** be decreased in sectors which are experiencing unjustified delays, low absorption and under-implementation; on this basis, it intends to identify, together with its specialised committees, both positive and negative priorities for 2013; for this purpose asks the Commission to provide both arms of the budgetary authority with a prompt, regular and complete information on the implementation of the various programmes and initiatives;

Amendment

4. Is convinced that, particularly in a period of crisis, financial responsibility is of utmost importance; believes, therefore, that resources must be concentrated on those areas, where the EU budget can deliver an added value whilst they **could** be decreased in sectors which are experiencing unjustified delays, low absorption and under-implementation; on this basis, it intends to identify, together with its specialised committees, both positive and negative priorities for 2013; for this purpose asks the Commission to provide both arms of the budgetary authority with a prompt, regular and complete information on the implementation of the various programmes and initiatives **and to confront them with EU political commitments**;

Or. en

Amendment 21
Barbara Matera

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 4

Motion for a resolution

4. Is convinced that, particularly in a period of crisis, financial responsibility is of utmost importance; believes, therefore, that resources must be concentrated on those areas, where the EU budget can deliver an added value whilst they can be decreased in sectors which are experiencing unjustified delays, low absorption and

Amendment

4. Is convinced that, particularly in a period of crisis, financial responsibility is of utmost importance; believes, therefore, that resources must be concentrated on those areas, where the EU budget can deliver an added value whilst they can be decreased in sectors which are experiencing unjustified delays, low absorption and

under-implementation; on this basis, it intends to identify, together with its specialised committees, both positive and negative priorities for 2013; for this purpose asks the Commission to provide both arms of the budgetary authority with a prompt, regular and complete information on the implementation of the various programmes and initiatives;

under-implementation; on this basis, it intends to identify, together with its specialised committees, both positive and negative priorities for 2013; for this purpose asks the Commission to provide both arms of the budgetary authority with a prompt, regular and complete information on the implementation of the various programmes and initiatives ***together with an adequate performance framework based on targets and indicators***;

Or. en

Amendment 22

Jutta Haug

on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 4 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

4a. Underlines that European policies and programmes are key elements in order to achieve the Europe 2020 targets, notes that climate action and environmental objectives are of a cross-cutting nature which must be translated into concrete actions to be implemented under the various programmes and policies to foster sustainable growth;

Or. en

Amendment 23

Richard Ashworth

on behalf of the ECR Group

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 4 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

4a. Calls on the Commission to budget realistically and insists that the utmost be done to examine the European added value of all current EU programmes, calls for systematic, regular and independent evaluations, ensuring that all spending is achieving the desired outcomes in a cost effective manner while contributing to the EU2020 strategy for smart, sustainable and inclusive growth and respecting the principles of subsidiarity and proportionality;

Or. en

Amendment 24
Barbara Matera

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 4 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

4a. Recalls that Europe is not on track to meet its 2020 Energy saving targets, however moving towards a green economy represents an important goal to exit the crisis, deliver a stronger European economy, create jobs, maximizing economic opportunities in every European region, reducing energy costs and improving energy security. Stresses that an adequate financial effort should be considered as a priority within the next year's budget;

Or. en

Amendment 25
Helga Trüpel

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 5

Motion for a resolution

5. Notes that the EU Draft Budget for 2013 proposed by the Commission amounts to EUR 150.931,7 million in commitment appropriations (CA) (i.e. +2% compared to the Budget 2012) and EUR 137.924,4 million in payment appropriations (PA) (i.e. +6,8% compared to Budget 2012); observes that these amounts represent respectively 1,13% and 1,03% of the EU's forecast GNI for 2013; recalls that the multiannual financial framework (MFF) provides for ceilings of EUR 152.502 million for CA and EUR 143.911 million for PA, in current prices;

Amendment

5. Notes that the EU Draft Budget for 2013 proposed by the Commission amounts to EUR 150.931,7 million in commitment appropriations (CA) (i.e. +2% compared to the Budget 2012) and EUR 137.924,4 million in payment appropriations (PA) (i.e. +6,8% compared to Budget 2012); observes that these amounts represent respectively 1,13% and 1,03% of the EU's forecast GNI for 2013; recalls that the multiannual financial framework (MFF) provides for ceilings of EUR 152.502 million for CA and EUR 143.911 million for PA, in current prices; ***notes the ongoing discrepancy between the level of commitment and payment appropriations which will result in a further increase of reste-à-liquider (RAL)***;

Or. en

Amendment 26
Alexander Alvaro, Carl Haglund, George Lyon

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 5 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

5a. Takes note that the level of appropriations proposed in the Commission's draft budget corresponds to the current Union of 27 Member States and that the Commission intends to present a draft amending budget in early 2013 to integrate the additional operational expenditure which will be required for the accession of Croatia to the European Union; recalls that any new funding requirements shall be financed with fresh money; highlights that the

existing margins currently entered in the draft budget need to be read in this regard;

Or. en

Amendment 27
Marta Andreasen

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 6

Motion for a resolution

6. Understands that the Commission, at the end of the programming period, ***puts the accent on the side of payments, as it intends to also provide a solution to the ever more growing level of RALs; while sharing this approach, is particularly concerned by the proposed freezing of commitment appropriations at the level of the estimated inflation rate for next year; stresses the importance of commitments for determining political priorities and, thus, ensuring that the necessary investments will eventually be put in place to boost growth and employment; does not believe that the freezing of commitment appropriations can be considered as an acceptable strategy to keep the level of RAL under control;***

Amendment

6. Understands that the Commission, at the end of the programming period, ***emphasises the payments side of the budget in an attempt to expend the unused resources it has available, to also provide a solution to the ever more growing level of RALs; is particularly concerned by the ever-growing level of RALs and calls for commitments to be capped at 2% below those of the previous year as a first step towards bringing the level of RAL under control;***

Or. en

Amendment 28
George Lyon

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 6

Motion for a resolution

6. Understands that the Commission, at the

Amendment

6. Understands that the Commission, at the

end of the programming period, puts the accent on the side of payments, as it intends to also provide a solution to the ever more growing level of RALs; ***while sharing this approach, is particularly concerned by*** the proposed freezing of commitment appropriations at the level of the estimated inflation rate for next year; stresses the importance of commitments for determining political priorities and, thus, ensuring that the necessary investments will eventually be put in place to boost growth and employment; ***does not believe that the freezing of commitment appropriations can be considered as an acceptable strategy to keep the level of RAL under control;***

end of the programming period, puts the accent on the side of payments, as it intends to also provide a solution to the ever more growing level of RALs; ***given the current economic context, welcomes*** the proposed freezing of commitment appropriations at the level of the estimated inflation rate for next year; stresses the importance of commitments for determining political priorities and, thus, ensuring that the necessary investments will eventually be put in place to boost growth and employment;

Or. en

Amendment 29

Jan Mulder, Alexander Alvaro, Carl Haglund

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 6

Motion for a resolution

6. Understands that the Commission, at the end of the programming period, puts the accent on the side of payments, as it intends to also provide a solution to the ever more growing level of RALs; ***while sharing this approach, is particularly concerned by the proposed freezing of commitment appropriations at the level of the estimated inflation rate for next year;*** stresses the importance of commitments for determining political priorities and, thus, ensuring that the necessary investments will eventually be put in place to boost growth and employment; ***does not believe*** that the freezing of commitment appropriations ***can*** be considered as an acceptable strategy to keep the level of

Amendment

6. Understands that the Commission, at the end of the programming period, puts the accent on the side of payments, as it intends to also provide a solution to the ever more growing level of RALs; stresses the importance of commitments for determining political priorities and, thus, ensuring that the necessary investments will eventually be put in place to boost growth and employment; ***is of the opinion*** that the freezing of commitment appropriations ***is only a partial solution to the increasing RALs problem and cannot*** be considered as an acceptable strategy to keep the level of RAL under control;

RAL under control;

Or. en

Amendment 30
Helga Trüpel

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 6

Motion for a resolution

6. Understands that the Commission, at the end of the programming period, puts the accent on the side of payments, as it intends to also provide a solution to the ever more growing level of RALs; ***while sharing this approach, is particularly concerned by the proposed freezing of commitment appropriations at the level of the estimated inflation rate for next year; stresses the importance of commitments for determining political priorities and, thus, ensuring that the necessary investments will eventually be put in place to boost growth and employment; does not believe that the freezing of commitment appropriations can be considered as an acceptable strategy to keep the level of RAL under control;***

Amendment

6. Understands that the Commission, at the end of the programming period, puts the accent on the side of payments, as it intends to also provide a solution to the ever more growing level of RALs; is concerned by the proposed freezing of commitment appropriations at the level of the estimated inflation rate for next year; stresses the importance of commitments for determining political priorities and, thus, will ***carefully analyse if such a level of commitments allows for a proper implementation of key EU policies, especially policies which are key for the transition towards a greener economy;***

Or. en

Amendment 31
Marta Andreasen

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 7

Motion for a resolution

7. Considers the proposed increase of 6,8% in PA compared to 2012 ***as an initial response to Parliament's request for a***

Amendment

7. Considers the proposed increase of 6.8% in PA compared to 2012 to ***be irresponsible and unrealistic;***

responsible and realistic budgeting; notes that the increases in payments are concentrated in the areas of competitiveness and cohesion, due to a greater level of claims expected by running projects in these fields; fully endorses such increase that results not only from past commitments that need to be honoured but also from the actual implementation of programmes that is expected to reach at the last year of the current MFF a cruising speed;

Or. en

Amendment 32

George Lyon, Alexander Alvaro

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 7

Motion for a resolution

7. Considers the proposed increase of 6,8% in PA compared to 2012 *as an initial response to Parliament's request for a responsible and realistic budgeting*; notes that the increases in payments are concentrated in the areas of competitiveness and cohesion; *due to a greater level of claims expected by running projects in these fields; fully endorses such increase that results not only from past commitments that need to be honoured but also from the actual implementation of programmes that is expected to reach at the last year of the current MFF a cruising speed;*

Amendment

7. Notes that it is the increased demand from Member States for European co-financing, as a result of past commitments that need to be honoured and the current MFF reaching cruising speed, that has led to the proposed increase of 6,8% in PA compared to 2012; notes that the increases in payments are concentrated in the areas of competitiveness and cohesion; ***Calls on the Commission to verify with Member States that their estimated demands for payment increases are accurate and realistic;***

Or. en

Amendment 33

Richard Ashworth

on behalf of the ECR Group

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 7

Motion for a resolution

7. **Considers the proposed increase of 6,8% in PA compared to 2012 as an initial response to Parliament's request for a responsible and realistic budgeting;** notes that the increases in payments are concentrated in the areas of competitiveness and cohesion, due to a greater level of claims expected by running projects in these fields; fully endorses such increase that results not only from past commitments that need to be honoured but also from the actual implementation of programmes that is expected to reach at the last year of the current MFF a cruising speed;

Amendment

7. Notes that the increases in payments are concentrated in the areas of competitiveness and cohesion, due to a greater level of claims expected by running projects in these fields; fully endorses such increase that results not only from past commitments that need to be honoured but also from the actual implementation of programmes that is expected to reach at the last year of the current MFF a cruising speed;

Or. en

Amendment 34
Jürgen Klute, Alda Sousa

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 7

Motion for a resolution

7. Considers the proposed increase of 6,8% in PA compared to 2012 as an initial response to Parliament's request for a responsible and realistic budgeting; notes that the increases in payments are concentrated in **the areas of competitiveness and cohesion**, due to a greater level of claims expected by running projects in these fields; fully endorses such increase that results not only from past commitments that need to be honoured but also from the actual implementation of programmes that is expected to reach at the last year of the current MFF a cruising

Amendment

7. Considers the proposed increase of 6,8% in PA compared to 2012 as an initial response to Parliament's request for a responsible and realistic budgeting; notes that the increases in payments are concentrated in **Headings 1b and 2**, due to a greater level of claims expected by running projects in these fields; fully endorses such increase that results not only from past commitments that need to be honoured but also from the actual implementation of programmes that is expected to reach at the last year of the current MFF a cruising speed;

speed;

Or. en

Amendment 35

George Lyon

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 8

Motion for a resolution

8. **Remains, however, sceptical** on whether **the proposed level of payment appropriations will be sufficient** to cover **the actual needs** for **next year**, especially in Headings 1b and 2; warns also that the level of payments for 2012 in connection to the level proposed by the Commission for 2013 **would** result in **billions** of decommitments only under cohesion policy; highlights that the current proposal would bring the overall level of payments for the period 2007-2013 to EUR 859,4 billion, i.e. ca. EUR 66 billion lower than the agreed MFF ceilings;

Amendment

8. **Calls on the Commission and the Council to work closely, together with Parliament, to investigate and present options** on whether **there is any flexibility, and to present detailed options for consideration, for payments to be delayed or reduced**, especially in Headings 1b and 2; warns also that the level of payments for 2012 in connection to the level proposed by the Commission for 2013 **may** result in **significant levels** of decommitments only under cohesion policy; highlights that the current proposal would bring the overall level of payments for the period 2007-2013 to EUR 859,4 billion, i.e. ca. EUR 66 billion lower than the agreed MFF ceilings;

Or. en

Amendment 36

Alexander Alvaro, Carl Haglund

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 8

Motion for a resolution

8. Remains, however, sceptical on whether the proposed level of payment appropriations **will be sufficient** to cover the **actual** needs for next year, especially in Headings 1b and 2; warns also that the

Amendment

8. Remains, however, sceptical on whether the proposed level of payment appropriations **is adequate** to cover the needs for next year, especially in Headings 1b and 2; **will carefully monitor the**

level of payments for 2012 in connection to the level proposed by the Commission for 2013 would result in billions of decommitments only under cohesion policy; highlights that the current proposal would bring the overall level of payments for the period 2007-2013 to EUR 859,4 billion, i.e. ca. EUR 66 billion lower than the agreed MFF ceilings;

payments situation during the 2012 with particular attention given to all proposed transfers and reallocations; warns also that the level of payments for 2012 in connection to the level proposed by the Commission for 2013 would result in billions of decommitments only under cohesion policy; highlights that the current proposal would bring the overall level of payments for the period 2007-2013 to EUR 859,4 billion, i.e. ca. EUR 66 billion lower than the agreed MFF ceilings;

Or. en

Amendment 37
Eider Gardiazábal Rubial

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 8

Motion for a resolution

8. Remains, however, sceptical on whether the proposed level of payment appropriations will be sufficient to cover the actual needs for next year, especially in Headings 1b and 2; warns also that the level of payments for 2012 ***in connection to*** the level proposed by the Commission for 2013 ***would*** result in billions of decommitments only under cohesion policy; highlights that the current proposal would bring the overall level of payments for the period 2007-2013 to EUR 859,4 billion, i.e. ca. EUR 66 billion lower than the agreed MFF ceilings;

Amendment

8. Remains, however, sceptical on whether the proposed level of payment appropriations ***in 2013*** will be sufficient to cover the actual needs for next year, especially in Headings 1b and 2; warns also that the ***insufficient*** level of payments for 2012 ***combined with*** the level proposed by the Commission for 2013 ***might not be sufficient to honour the claims being addressed to the Commission and could then*** result in billions of decommitments only under cohesion policy; highlights that the current proposal would bring the overall level of payments for the period 2007-2013 to EUR 859,4 billion, i.e. ca. EUR 66 billion lower than the agreed MFF ceilings;

Or. en

Amendment 38
George Lyon, Alexander Alvaro

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 9

Motion for a resolution

9. Reminds that already in 2011 a significant level of legitimate claims, notably in the field of cohesion policy, could not be paid out by the Commission; notes that those claims will also need to be covered by the Budget 2012, which already suffers from a shortage of funds as a consequence of the limited increase in payment appropriations due to Council's position throughout last year's budgetary procedure; calls, therefore, on the Commission to come up with a draft amending budget as early as possible, in order to rectify this situation, and to avoid shifting 2012 payments to the following year, which would create an unsustainable level of payments in 2013;

Amendment

9. Reminds that already in 2011 a significant level of legitimate claims, notably in the field of cohesion policy, could not be paid out by the Commission; notes that those claims will also need to be covered by the Budget 2012, which already suffers from a shortage of funds as a consequence of the limited increase in payment appropriations due to Council's position throughout last year's budgetary procedure; calls, therefore, on the Commission to come up with a draft amending budget as early as possible, in order to rectify this situation, and to avoid shifting 2012 payments to the following year, which would create an unsustainable level of payments in 2013; ***further calls on the Commission and the Council to work constructively, together with Parliament, to avoid repetition of this situation in future budget cycles by improving forecasting accuracy and agreeing upon realistic budget estimates;***

Or. en

Amendment 39
Ivars Godmanis, Alexander Alvaro

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 9

Motion for a resolution

9. Reminds that already in 2011 a significant level of legitimate claims, notably in the field of cohesion policy, could not be paid out by the Commission;

Amendment

9. Reminds that already in 2011 a significant level of legitimate claims, notably in the field of cohesion policy, could not be paid out by the Commission;

notes that those claims will also need to be covered by the Budget 2012, which already suffers from a shortage of funds as a consequence of the limited increase in payment appropriations due to Council's position throughout last year's budgetary procedure; calls, therefore, on the Commission to come up with a draft amending budget as early as possible, in order to rectify this situation, and to avoid shifting 2012 payments to the following year, which would create an unsustainable level of payments in 2013;

notes that those claims will also need to be covered by the Budget 2012, which already suffers from a shortage of funds as a consequence of the limited increase in payment appropriations due to Council's position throughout last year's budgetary procedure; calls, therefore, on the Commission to come up with a draft amending budget as early as possible, in order to rectify this situation, and to avoid shifting 2012 payments to the following year, which would create an unsustainable level of payments in 2013; ***asks the Commission, by coming up with draft amending budget for 2012 and draft budget 2013, to take into account the real implementation of the European Economic Recovery Plan programmes;***

Or. en

Amendment 40
Helga Trüpel

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 10

Motion for a resolution

10. Deplores Council's reluctance to participate in the inter-institutional political meeting on payments proposed by the Parliament as a follow up to the last year's budgetary conciliation; considers such a meeting the ideal platform for the two arms of the budgetary authority to reach a common understanding - ahead of their respective positions on the Draft Budget - regarding the available data on implementation and absorption capacity and to correctly estimate the payment needs for 2012 and 2013; firmly believes that any doubts –as expressed by some Council delegations- over the Commission's figures and calculations need to be communicated, examined and

Amendment

10. Deplores ***the Presidency of the*** Council's reluctance to participate in the inter-institutional political meeting on payments proposed by the Parliament as a follow up to the last year's budgetary conciliation; ***regards this behaviour as an irresponsible attempt to ignore the lack of payments issue and the question of RAL;*** considers such a meeting the ideal platform for the two arms of the budgetary authority to reach a common understanding - ahead of their respective positions on the Draft Budget - regarding the available data on implementation and absorption capacity and to correctly estimate the payment needs for 2012 and 2013; firmly believes that any doubts –as expressed by some

clarified as soon as possible, in order not to become an impediment for reaching an agreement in this year's conciliation;

Council delegations- over the Commission's figures and calculations need to be communicated, examined and clarified as soon as possible, in order not to become an impediment for reaching an agreement in this year's conciliation;

Or. en

Amendment 41
Giovanni La Via

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 10

Motion for a resolution

10. Deplores Council's reluctance to participate in the inter-institutional political meeting on payments proposed by the Parliament as a follow up to the last year's budgetary conciliation; considers such a meeting the ideal platform for the two arms of the budgetary authority to reach a common understanding - ahead of their respective positions on the Draft Budget - regarding the available data on implementation and absorption capacity and to correctly estimate the payment needs for 2012 and 2013; firmly believes that any doubts –as expressed by some Council delegations- over the Commission's figures and calculations need to be communicated, examined and clarified as soon as possible, in order not to become an impediment for reaching an agreement in this year's conciliation;

Amendment

10. Deplores Council's reluctance to participate in the inter-institutional political meeting on payments proposed by the Parliament as a follow up to the last year's budgetary conciliation; considers such a meeting the ideal platform for the two arms of the budgetary authority to reach a common understanding - ahead of their respective positions on the Draft Budget - regarding the available data on implementation and absorption capacity and to correctly estimate the payment needs for 2012 and 2013; ***reminds that payment appropriations proposed by the European Commission in its draft budget are based on the estimates made by Member States themselves;*** firmly believes ***therefore*** that any doubts ***or any second thoughts*** –as expressed by some Council delegations- over the Commission's figures and calculations need to be communicated, examined and clarified as soon as possible, in order not to become an impediment for reaching an agreement in this year's conciliation;

Or. en

Amendment 42

Richard Ashworth

on behalf of the ECR Group

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 10

Motion for a resolution

10. **Deplores** Council's reluctance to participate in the inter-institutional political meeting on payments proposed by the Parliament as a follow up to the last year's budgetary conciliation; considers such a meeting the ideal platform for the two arms of the budgetary authority to reach a common understanding - ahead of their respective positions on the Draft Budget - regarding the available data on implementation and absorption capacity and to correctly estimate the payment needs for 2012 and 2013; firmly believes that any doubts –as expressed by some Council delegations- over the Commission's figures and calculations need to be communicated, examined and clarified as soon as possible, in order not to become an impediment for reaching an agreement in this year's conciliation;

Amendment

10. **Notes** Council's reluctance to participate in the inter-institutional political meeting on payments proposed by the Parliament as a follow up to the last year's budgetary conciliation; considers such a meeting the ideal platform for the two arms of the budgetary authority to reach a common understanding - ahead of their respective positions on the Draft Budget - regarding the available data on implementation and absorption capacity and to correctly estimate the payment needs for 2012 and 2013; firmly believes that any doubts –as expressed by some Council delegations- over the Commission's figures and calculations need to be communicated, examined and clarified as soon as possible, in order not to become an impediment for reaching an agreement in this year's conciliation;

Or. en

Amendment 43

Alexander Alvaro, George Lyon

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 11

Motion for a resolution

11. Highlights that any reduction in the level of payment appropriations below the Commission proposal would also result into a further increase of the outstanding commitments (RALs), which at the end of 2011 already reached the unprecedented

Amendment

11. Highlights that, ***according to the recent data presented by the Commission in the inter-institutional meeting on payments which took place on 30 May***, any reduction in the level of payment appropriations below the Commission

level of EUR 207 *million*; reiterates, therefore, its call on the Council to act responsibly and refrain from making artificial cuts by deciding on the overall level of payments a priori, without taking into account the assessment of actual needs for the achievement of the EU agreed objectives and commitments; requests, in the event that this occurs, that the Council clearly and publicly identifies and justifies which of the EU programmes or projects should be delayed or dropped altogether;

proposal would also result into a further increase of the outstanding commitments (RALs), which at the end of 2011 already reached the unprecedented level of EUR 207 *billion*; reiterates, therefore, its call on the Council to act responsibly and refrain from making artificial cuts by deciding on the overall level of payments a priori, without taking into account the assessment of actual needs for the achievement of the EU agreed objectives and commitments; requests, in the event that this occurs, that the Council clearly and publicly identifies and justifies which of the EU programmes or projects should be delayed or dropped altogether;

Or. en

Amendment 44
Helga Trüpel

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 12

Motion for a resolution

12. Notes that according to the Commission's estimation all in all 43,7% of the DB 2013 (i.e. EUR 64,5 billion) is allocated to the objectives of Europe 2020, which represents a *0,2%* increase compared to the adopted Budget 2012; appreciates that for the first time the budget lines and programmes contributing to these objectives are clearly identifiable in the Draft Budget;

Amendment

12. Notes that according to the Commission's estimation all in all 43,7% of the DB 2013 (i.e. EUR 64,5 billion) is allocated to the objectives of Europe 2020, which represents a *2,7%* increase compared to the adopted Budget 2012; appreciates that for the first time the budget lines and programmes contributing to these objectives are clearly identifiable in the Draft Budget;

Or. en

Amendment 45
Marta Andreasen

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 13

Motion for a resolution

13. Takes note of the overall margin of EUR 2,4 billion in CA in the DB 2013 and is determined to ***make full use of it - as well as of the other flexibility mechanisms foreseen by the IIA - whenever it proves to be necessary in order to finance objectives and priorities deriving from shared political commitments and decisions, namely those on the Europe 2020 strategy;***

Amendment

13. Takes note of the overall margin of EUR 2,4 billion in CA in the DB 2013 and is determined to ***leave it untouched;***

Or. en

Amendment 46
Eider Gardiazábal Rubial

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 14

Motion for a resolution

14. Recalls that the annual Budget 2013 will be the last budget of the current multiannual financial framework, ***whose ceilings will become the reference for the next financial framework in the event of no agreement, according to what foreseen by point 30 of the IIA of 17 May 2006; is therefore determined to conduct the negotiations with the Council with the view to achieving for the Budget 2013 a realistic and adequate level of appropriations both in commitments and in payments, which can represent an appropriate basis also for the next MFF;***

Amendment

14. Recalls that the annual Budget 2013 will be the last budget of the current multiannual financial framework, ***but reiterates that the MFF 2013 ceilings as agreed in the 17 May 2006 IIA will remain the reference for, at least, 2014 financial framework ceilings in the event of no agreement, according to what foreseen by point 30 of the IIA of 17 May 2006;***

Or. en

Amendment 47

Richard Ashworth

on behalf of the ECR Group

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 14

Motion for a resolution

14. Recalls that the annual Budget 2013 will be the last budget of the current multiannual financial framework, whose ceilings will become the reference for the next financial framework in the event of no agreement, according to what foreseen by point 30 of the IIA of 17 May 2006; is therefore determined to conduct the negotiations with the Council with the view to achieving for the Budget 2013 a realistic and adequate level of appropriations both in commitments and in payments, ***which can represent an appropriate basis also for the next MFF;***

Amendment

14. Recalls that the annual Budget 2013 will be the last budget of the current multiannual financial framework, whose ceilings will become the reference for the next financial framework in the event of no agreement, according to what foreseen by point 30 of the IIA of 17 May 2006; is therefore determined to conduct the negotiations with the Council with the view to achieving for the Budget 2013 a realistic and adequate level of appropriations both in commitments and in payments;

Or. en

Amendment 48

Eider Gardiazábal Rubial

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 14 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

14a. Is concerned of the fact that, apart from administrative expenditure, no appropriations have been entered into the Draft Budget for the accession of Croatia in July 2013; expects that the revision of the MFF 2007 -2013 foreseen by Point 29 of the 17 May 2006 IIA will be adopted swiftly and calls the Commission to present its proposal for the corresponding additional appropriations as soon as the Act of Accession has been ratified by all Member States;

Amendment 49
Jürgen Klute, Alda Sousa

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 15

Motion for a resolution

15. Takes note of the Commission's proposal for increasing commitments under this Heading by 4,1% (to EUR 16.032 million) as compared to Budget 2012; notes, that the proposal of CA below the Financial programming possibilities (i.e. TEN-T, EIT, Progress) leaves an increased margin of EUR 90,9 million compared to the EUR 47,7 million foreseen in the Financial programming; is pleased to see that the highest increases in CA are concentrated in Heading 1a, where most of the policies and programmes triggering growth, *competitiveness* and *jobs* are placed and that they reflect the priorities highlighted by Parliament for 2013;

Amendment

15. Takes note of the Commission's proposal for increasing commitments under this Heading by 4,1% (to EUR 16.032 million) as compared to Budget 2012; notes, that the proposal of CA below the Financial programming possibilities (i.e. TEN-T, EIT, Progress) leaves an increased margin of EUR 90,9 million compared to the EUR 47,7 million foreseen in the Financial programming; is pleased to see that the highest increases in CA are concentrated in Heading 1a, where most of the policies and programmes triggering growth, *employment* and *social progress* are placed and that they reflect the priorities highlighted by Parliament for 2013;

Amendment 50
Jürgen Klute, Alda Sousa

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 15 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

15a. Recalls the importance of the inclusion of payment appropriations for the European Globalisation Fund; reiterates that the use of a transfer for the EGF should mean a speedier process, and underlines the need for the further

Amendment

simplification of the practical modalities of the procedure, as mentioned on the report from the Commission to the European Parliament and Council on the functioning of the Interinstitutional Agreement on the Budgetary discipline and sound financial management of 27 April, 2010;

Or. en

Amendment 51
Marta Andreassen

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 16

Motion for a resolution

16. **Welcomes** in particular the increases for FP7-EC (+6,1%), CIP (+7,3%) and TEN-T (+6,4%) programmes, which are among the main deliverers of the Europe 2020 objectives; **regrets, however**, that with the amounts proposed by the Commission, two flagship programmes such as FP7 and TEN-T will effectively devote less CA than foreseen in their legal bases (FP: EUR -258,8 million and TEN-T: EUR: -122,5 million) for the last year of the current MFF;

Amendment

16. **Notes** in particular the increases for FP7-EC (+6,1%), CIP (+7,3%) and TEN-T (+6,4%) programmes, which are among the main deliverers of the Europe 2020 objectives; **notes** that with the amounts proposed by the Commission, two flagship programmes such as FP7 and TEN-T will effectively devote less CA than foreseen in their legal bases (FP: EUR -258,8 million and TEN-T: EUR: -122,5 million) for the last year of the current MFF;

Or. en

Amendment 52
Helga Trüpel

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 16

Motion for a resolution

16. Welcomes in particular the increases for FP7-EC (+6,1%), CIP (+7,3%) and

Amendment

16. Welcomes in particular the increases for FP7-EC (+6,1%), CIP (+7,3%) and

TEN-T (+6,4%) programmes, which are among the main deliverers of the Europe 2020 objectives; regrets, however, that with the amounts proposed by the Commission, two flagship programmes such as FP7 and TEN-T will effectively devote less CA than foreseen in their legal bases (FP: EUR -258,8 million and TEN-T: EUR: -122,5 million) for the last year of the current MFF;

TEN-T (+6,4%) programmes, which are among the main deliverers of the Europe 2020 objectives; regrets, however, that with the amounts proposed by the Commission, two flagship programmes such as FP7 and TEN-T will effectively devote less CA than foreseen in their legal bases (FP: EUR -258,8 million and TEN-T: EUR: -122,5 million) for the last year of the current MFF; ***regrets as well that the Commission proposal does not provide for the full implementation of the Intelligent Energy Europe Programme;***

Or. en

Amendment 53
Jens Geier

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 18

Motion for a resolution

18. Takes note of the rationale adopted by the Commission when proposing reductions as compared to the Financial programming, which has led, in the view of the Commission, to the identification of potential savings within under-implemented lines of –among others- FP7, TEN-T, Marco Polo, Progress, Statistical programme, Customs and Fiscalis; is determined to carefully analyse the performance under each of these programmes in order to check the appropriateness of the proposed cuts and exclude negative impacts on the programmes concerned;

Amendment

18. Takes note of the rationale adopted by the Commission when proposing reductions as compared to the Financial programming, which has led, in the view of the Commission, to the identification of potential savings within under-implemented lines of –among others- FP7, TEN-T, Marco Polo, Progress, Statistical programme, Customs and Fiscalis; ***points out that all these programmes are priorities for the European Parliament and adequate resources must be made available for them;*** is determined to carefully analyse the performance under each of these programmes in order to check the appropriateness of the proposed cuts and exclude negative impacts on the programmes concerned;

Or. de

Amendment 54
Jürgen Klute, Alda Sousa

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 18

Motion for a resolution

18. Takes note of the rationale adopted by the Commission when proposing reductions as compared to the Financial programming, which has led, in the view of the Commission, to the identification of potential savings within under-implemented lines of –among others- **FP7**, TEN-T, Marco Polo, **Progress**, Statistical programme, Customs and Fiscalis; is determined to carefully analyse the performance under each of these programmes in order to check the appropriateness of the proposed cuts and exclude negative impacts on the programmes concerned;

Amendment

18. Takes note of the rationale adopted by the Commission when proposing reductions as compared to the Financial programming, which has led, in the view of the Commission, to the identification of potential savings within under-implemented lines of –among others- TEN-T, Marco Polo, Statistical programme, Customs and Fiscalis; is determined to carefully analyse the performance under each of these programmes in order to check the appropriateness of the proposed cuts and exclude negative impacts on the programmes concerned;

Or. en

Amendment 55
Alexander Alvaro, George Lyon

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 18

Motion for a resolution

18. Takes note of the rationale adopted by the Commission when proposing reductions as compared to the Financial programming, which has led, in the view of the Commission, to the identification of potential savings within under-implemented lines of –among others- FP7, TEN-T, Marco Polo, Progress, Statistical programme, Customs and Fiscalis; is determined to carefully analyse the performance under each of these programmes in order to check the

Amendment

18. Takes note of the rationale adopted by the Commission when proposing reductions as compared to the Financial programming, which has led, in the view of the Commission, to the identification of potential savings within under-implemented lines of –among others- FP7 (***especially research related to energy***), TEN-T, Marco Polo, Progress, Statistical programme, Customs and Fiscalis; is determined to carefully analyse the performance under each of these

appropriateness of the proposed cuts and exclude negative impacts on the programmes concerned;

programmes in order to check the appropriateness of the proposed cuts and exclude negative impacts on the programmes concerned;

Or. en

Amendment 56

Gesine Meissner, Dominique Riquet, Eider Gardiazábal Rubial, Isabelle Durant, Roberts Zile, Jaromír Kohlíček

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 18

Motion for a resolution

18. Takes note of the rationale adopted by the Commission when proposing reductions as compared to the Financial programming, which has led, in the view of the Commission, to the identification of potential savings within under-implemented lines of –among others- FP7, TEN-T, Marco Polo, Progress, Statistical programme, Customs and Fiscalis; is determined to carefully analyse the performance under each of these programmes in order to check the appropriateness of the proposed cuts and exclude negative impacts on the programmes concerned;

Amendment

18. Takes note of the rationale adopted by the Commission when proposing reductions as compared to the Financial programming, which has led, in the view of the Commission, to the identification of potential savings within under-implemented lines of –among others- FP7, TEN-T, Marco Polo, Progress, Statistical programme, Customs and Fiscalis; is determined to carefully analyse the performance under each of these programmes in order to check the appropriateness of the proposed cuts and exclude negative impacts on the programmes concerned; ***recalls that the main TEN-T programme was fully executed in 2011 and points out that a final judgement on how commitments have been implemented and paid out on projects in the 2007-2013 financial framework can be made only in 2017;***

Or. en

Amendment 57

Gesine Meissner, Dominique Riquet, Eider Gardiazábal Rubial, Isabelle Durant, Roberts Zile, Jaromír Kohlíček

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 18 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

18a. Underlines that at a time of fiscal constraint, innovative solutions are urgently required to mobilise a greater share of private savings and to improve the range of financial instruments available for infrastructure projects;

Or. en

Amendment 58
Gesine Meissner, Dominique Riquet, Eider Gardiazábal Rubial, Isabelle Durant, Roberts Zile, Jaromír Kohlíček

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 18 b (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

18b. Believes that the Programme to support the further development of an Integrated Maritime Policy needs adequate funding for 2013; underlines its disappointment on the absence of a budgetary line on tourism and regrets the constant decrease in the road safety budgetary allocation;

Or. en

Amendment 59
Eider Gardiazábal Rubial

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 19

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

19. Recalls the Joint Declaration of 1 December 2011 on financing the additional

19. Recalls the Joint Declaration of 1 December 2011 on financing the additional

costs of the ITER programme for 2012-2013, where the European Parliament, the Council and the Commission also agree to make available EUR 360 million in CA in the 2013 budget procedure ‘making full use of the provisions laid down in the Financial Regulation and in the IIA of 17 May 2006, excluding any further ITER-related revision of the MFF’; is concerned that the Commission proposes to finance this additional amount only through redeployment from lines of the FP7 programme, contrary to Parliament's long-standing position on the matter; takes **full account** of the Commission's claim that this amount derives from performance savings on FP7, **and** that those **cuts on administrative lines will not harm the operation** of the **programme**; intends to **examine this claim further as well as** to explore other means available under the IIA and the Financial Regulation for this purpose;

costs of the ITER programme for 2012-2013, where the European Parliament, the Council and the Commission also agree to make available EUR 360 million in CA in the 2013 budget procedure “making full use of the provisions laid down in the Financial Regulation and in the IIA of 17 May 2006, excluding any further ITER-related revision of the MFF”; is concerned that the Commission proposes to finance this additional amount only through redeployment from lines of the FP7 programme, contrary to Parliament's long-standing position on the matter; takes **note** of the Commission's claim that this amount derives from performance savings on FP7, **reiterates its strong conviction** that **securing the amount of EUR 360 million in the 2013 budget should not impair the successful implementation of other EU policies, especially those that contribute to achieving the goals of the EU 2020 strategy during this last year of the programming period, and specifically opposes any redeployments infringing upon this budgetary priority**; intends to explore other means available under the IIA and the Financial Regulation for this purpose;

Or. en

Amendment 60
Helga Trüpel

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 19

Motion for a resolution

19. Recalls the Joint Declaration of 1 December 2011 on financing the additional costs of the ITER programme for 2012-2013, where the European Parliament, the Council and the Commission also agree to make available EUR 360 million in CA in

Amendment

19. Recalls the Joint Declaration of 1 December 2011 on financing the additional costs of the ITER programme for 2012-2013, where the European Parliament, the Council and the Commission also agree to make available EUR 360 million in CA in

the 2013 budget procedure ‘making full use of the provisions laid down in the Financial Regulation and in the IIA of 17 May 2006, excluding any further ITER-related revision of the MFF’; is concerned that the Commission proposes to finance this additional amount only through redeployment from lines of the FP7 programme, contrary to Parliament's long-standing position on the matter; ***takes full account of the Commission's claim that this amount derives from performance savings on FP7, and that those cuts on administrative lines will not harm the operation of the programme; intends to examine this claim further as well as to explore other means available under the IIA and the Financial Regulation for this purpose;***

the 2013 budget procedure ‘making full use of the provisions laid down in the Financial Regulation and in the IIA of 17 May 2006, excluding any further ITER-related revision of the MFF’; is concerned that the Commission proposes to finance this additional amount only through redeployment from lines of the FP7 programme, contrary to Parliament's long-standing position on the matter;

Or. en

Amendment 61

Richard Ashworth

on behalf of the ECR Group

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 19

Motion for a resolution

19. Recalls the Joint Declaration of 1 December 2011 on financing the additional costs of the ITER programme for 2012-2013, where the European Parliament, the Council and the Commission also agree to make available EUR 360 million in CA in the 2013 budget procedure ‘making full use of the provisions laid down in the Financial Regulation and in the IIA of 17 May 2006, excluding any further ITER-related revision of the MFF’; is concerned that the Commission proposes to finance this additional amount only through redeployment from lines of the FP7 programme, contrary to Parliament's long-

Amendment

19. Recalls the Joint Declaration of 1 December 2011 on financing the additional costs of the ITER programme for 2012-2013, where the European Parliament, the Council and the Commission also agree to make available EUR 360 million in CA in the 2013 budget procedure ‘making full use of the provisions laid down in the Financial Regulation and in the IIA of 17 May 2006, excluding any further ITER-related revision of the MFF’; is concerned that the Commission proposes to finance this additional amount only through redeployment from lines of the FP7 programme, contrary to Parliament's long-

standing position on the matter; takes full account of the Commission's claim that this amount derives from performance savings on FP7, and that those cuts on administrative lines will not harm the operation of the programme; intends to examine this claim further *as well as to explore other means available under the IIA and the Financial Regulation for this purpose*;

standing position on the matter; takes full account of the Commission's claim that this amount derives from performance savings on FP7, and that those cuts on administrative lines will not harm the operation of the programme; intends to examine this claim further;

Or. en

Amendment 62
Helga Trüpel

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 19 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

19a. Deeply regrets the dramatic increase in budgetary appropriations for nuclear research, whereas this energy form is increasingly questioned in Member States; points out that the Commission proposal will result in an even more serious imbalance between spending on nuclear research compared to renewable energy research; is therefore determined to abolish the foreseen increases for ITER;

Or. en

Amendment 63
Monika Hohlmeier

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 19 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

19a. Emphasises the need for an adequate

staffing level for Fusion for Energy (F4E), the European Joint Undertaking for ITER, to ensure a careful management and sound implementation of Europe's contribution to the ITER project; is concerned by the current staffing level proposed by the Commission;

Or. en

Amendment 64
Eider Gardiazábal Rubial

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 20

Motion for a resolution

20. Recognises the fundamental role played by small and medium enterprises as drivers of the EU economy and creators of 85% of jobs in the last ten years; stresses the traditional difficulties faced by SMES to access capital markets for research and innovation projects, exacerbated by the current financial crisis; is firmly convinced that the EU budget should contribute to overcoming this market failure, by facilitating access to debt and equity financing for innovative SMEs; welcomes, *in this context, that the Draft Budget includes already appropriations for the Project bond initiative as a way to increase payment capacity in this sector through the opening to the private market*; supports as well the proposed increase for the financial instruments under the CIP-EIP programme (by EUR 14,7 million), in line with their positive performance so far and their increased demand by SMEs;

Amendment

20. Recognises the fundamental role played by small and medium enterprises as drivers of the EU economy and creators of 85% of jobs in the last ten years; stresses the traditional difficulties faced by SMES to access capital markets for research and innovation projects, exacerbated by the current financial crisis; is firmly convinced that the EU budget should contribute to overcoming this market failure, by facilitating access to debt and equity financing for innovative SMEs *and welcomes the EC recent proposal to create a special window for SMEs under the existing RSFF*; supports as well the proposed increase for the financial instruments under the CIP-EIP programme (by EUR 14,7 million), in line with their positive performance so far and their increased demand by SMEs;

Or. en

Amendment 65
Jürgen Klute, Alda Sousa

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 20

Motion for a resolution

20. Recognises the fundamental role played by small and medium enterprises as drivers of the EU economy and creators of 85% of jobs in the last ten years; stresses the traditional difficulties faced by SMES to access capital markets for research and innovation projects, exacerbated by the current financial crisis; is firmly convinced that the EU budget should contribute to overcoming this market failure, by facilitating access to debt and equity financing for innovative SMEs; **welcomes**, in this context, that the Draft Budget includes already appropriations for the Project bond initiative as a way to increase payment capacity in this sector through the opening to the private market; **supports as well** the proposed increase for the financial instruments under the CIP-EIP programme (by EUR 14,7 million), in line with their **positive** performance so far and their increased demand by SMEs;

Amendment

20. Recognises the fundamental role played by small and medium enterprises as drivers of the EU economy and creators of 85% of jobs in the last ten years; stresses the traditional difficulties faced by SMES to access capital markets for research and innovation projects, exacerbated by the current financial crisis; is firmly convinced that the EU budget should contribute to overcoming this market failure, by facilitating access to debt and equity financing for innovative SMEs; **notes**, in this context, that the Draft Budget includes already appropriations for the Project bond initiative as a way to increase payment capacity in this sector through the opening to the private market; **takes note of** the proposed increase for the financial instruments under the CIP-EIP programme (by EUR 14,7 million), in line with their performance so far and their increased demand by SMEs;

Or. en

Amendment 66
Marta Andreasen

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 21

Motion for a resolution

21. **Regrets** that appropriations for the PROGRESS programme have been reduced by EUR 5,3 million compared to the Financial programming and practically brought back to the 2012 levels, **despite the**

Amendment

21. **Notes** that appropriations for the PROGRESS programme have been reduced by EUR 5,3 million compared to the Financial programming and practically brought back to the 2012 levels; **welcomes**

good performance of this programme so far; deplores that not even in the last year of the current MFF the Commission has seized the opportunity to reinstate to this programme the EUR 60 million redeployed in favour of the Progress Microfinance Facility, to what it had committed in 2010;

that the Commission has *not reinstated* to this programme the EUR 60 million redeployed in favour of the Progress Microfinance Facility, to what it had committed in 2010;

Or. en

Amendment 67
Marta Andreassen

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 21

Motion for a resolution

21. *Regrets* that appropriations for the PROGRESS programme have been reduced by EUR 5,3 million compared to the Financial programming and practically brought back to the 2012 levels, despite the good performance of this programme so far; deplores that not even in the last year of the current MFF the Commission has seized the opportunity to reinstate to this programme the EUR 60 million redeployed in favour of the Progress Microfinance Facility, to what it had committed in 2010;

Amendment

21. *Notes* that appropriations for the PROGRESS programme have been reduced by EUR 5,3 million compared to the Financial programming and practically brought back to the 2012 levels, despite the good performance of this programme so far; deplores that not even in the last year of the current MFF the Commission has seized the opportunity to reinstate to this programme the EUR 60 million redeployed in favour of the Progress Microfinance Facility, to what it had committed in 2010;

Or. en

Amendment 68
Eider Gardiazábal Rubial

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 21

Motion for a resolution

21. *Regrets* that appropriations for the PROGRESS programme have been reduced by EUR 5,3 million compared to

Amendment

21. *Deeply regrets* that *in times of the economic crisis and especially of high youth unemployment* appropriations for

the Financial programming and practically brought back to the 2012 levels, despite the good performance of this programme so far; deplores that not even in the last year of the current MFF the Commission has seized the opportunity to reinstate to this programme the EUR 60 million redeployed in favour of the Progress Microfinance Facility, to what it had committed in 2010;

the PROGRESS programme have been reduced by EUR 5,3 million compared to the Financial programming and practically brought back to the 2012 levels, despite the good performance of this programme so far; deplores that not even in the last year of the current MFF the Commission has seized the opportunity to reinstate to this programme the EUR 60 million redeployed in favour of the Progress Microfinance Facility, to what it had committed in 2010;

Or. en

Amendment 69
Jens Geier

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 21

Motion for a resolution

21. Regrets that appropriations for the PROGRESS programme have been reduced by EUR 5,3 million compared to the Financial programming and practically brought back to the 2012 levels, despite the good performance of this programme so far; deplores that not even in the last year of the current MFF the Commission has seized the opportunity to reinstate to this programme the EUR 60 million redeployed in favour of the Progress Microfinance Facility, to what it had committed in 2010;

Amendment

21. Regrets that appropriations for the PROGRESS programme have been reduced by EUR 5,3 million compared to the Financial programming and practically brought back to the 2012 levels, despite the good performance of this programme so far; deplores that not even in the last year of the current MFF the Commission has seized the opportunity to reinstate to this programme the EUR 60 million redeployed in favour of the Progress Microfinance Facility, to what it had committed in 2010; ***points out that the European Parliament has highlighted the key role played by social programmes in achieving the social and employment targets of the Europe 2020 Strategy in various resolutions and has expressed its view that these should be treated as a political priority and receive corresponding funding;***

Or. de

Amendment 70
Estelle Grelier, Eider Gardiazábal Rubial

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 21 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

21a. Welcomes the Commission's decision to include in the DB for the third consecutive year payment appropriations (EUR 50 million) for the European Globalisation Adjustment Fund (EGF); underlines the fact that this not only gives higher visibility to the fund but also avoids transfers from other budget lines pursuing different aims and covering different needs;

Or. en

Amendment 71
João Ferreira

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 21 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

21a. Regrets the scant appropriations for the various headings of the Progress programme; maintains that they need to be increased substantially, given that the crisis is such that greater attention and support need to be focused on the social sectors encompassed within the Progress programme; calls for the Community co-financing rate to be increased, above all for social projects, enabling Member States with financial problems to make full use of Community funding, whereby their contribution should not exceed 10%;

Or. pt

Amendment 72
Franziska Katharina Brantner

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 22

Motion for a resolution

22. Regrets that the contribution to Youth on the Move Flagship Initiative is slightly reduced compared to last year; highlights in this context the added value of the Lifelong Learning, Erasmus and Erasmus Mundus programmes which, against a modest financial dimension, have a great return in terms of effective implementation and positive image of the Union vis-à-vis its citizens; opposes therefore to the proposed reduction by EUR 10,2 million as compared to the Budget 2012 for Lifelong Learning and, in line with its established position in the last budgetary procedures and the excellent performance rates of this programme, intends to reinforce commitment appropriations for the corresponding budget line;

Amendment

22. Regrets that the contribution to Youth on the Move Flagship Initiative is slightly reduced compared to last year; highlights in this context the added value of the Lifelong Learning, Erasmus and Erasmus Mundus programmes which, against a modest financial dimension, have a great return in terms of effective implementation and positive image of the Union vis-à-vis its citizens; ***in many EU countries young people are significantly hit by the economic and financial crisis, in this context adequate funding and targeting of educational and mobility schemes and life long learning programmes are significant in modernising education and training system, raising levels of skills, mobility and adaptability of young people and thereby overall contributing to an innovative, knowledge-based, smart and inclusive Europe; to this end, strongly supports the promotion of equal opportunity in order to enable young people no matter their educational background to profit from the EU's various youth programmes and policies;*** opposes therefore to the proposed reduction by EUR 10,2 million as compared to the Budget 2012 for Lifelong Learning and, in line with its established position in the last budgetary procedures and the excellent performance rates of this programme, intends to reinforce commitment appropriations for the corresponding budget line;

Or. en

Amendment 73
Marta Andreasen

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 22

Motion for a resolution

22. **Regrets** that the contribution to Youth on the Move Flagship Initiative is slightly reduced compared to last year; highlights in this context the added value of the Lifelong Learning, Erasmus and Erasmus Mundus programmes which, against a modest financial dimension, have a great return in terms of effective implementation and positive image of the Union vis-à-vis its citizens; opposes therefore to the proposed reduction by EUR 10,2 million as compared to the Budget 2012 for Lifelong Learning and, in line with its established position in the last budgetary procedures and the excellent performance rates of this programme, intends to reinforce commitment appropriations for the corresponding budget line;

Amendment

22. **Notes** that the contribution to Youth on the Move Flagship Initiative is slightly reduced compared to last year; highlights in this context the added value of the Lifelong Learning, Erasmus and Erasmus Mundus programmes which, against a modest financial dimension, have a great return in terms of effective implementation and positive image of the Union vis-à-vis its citizens; opposes therefore to the proposed reduction by EUR 10,2 million as compared to the Budget 2012 for Lifelong Learning and, in line with its established position in the last budgetary procedures and the excellent performance rates of this programme, intends to reinforce commitment appropriations for the corresponding budget line;

Or. en

Amendment 74
Jürgen Klute, Alda Sousa

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 22

Motion for a resolution

22. Regrets that the contribution to Youth on the Move Flagship Initiative is **slightly** reduced compared to last year; highlights in this context the added value of the Lifelong Learning, Erasmus and Erasmus Mundus programmes which, against a modest financial dimension, have a great return in terms of effective implementation and positive image of the Union vis-à-vis

Amendment

22. **Deeply** regrets that the contribution to Youth on the Move Flagship Initiative is reduced **when** compared to last year; highlights in this context the added value of the Lifelong Learning, Erasmus and Erasmus Mundus programmes which, against a modest financial dimension, have a great return in terms of effective implementation and positive image of the

its citizens; opposes therefore to the proposed reduction by EUR 10,2 million as compared to the Budget 2012 for Lifelong Learning and, in line with its established position in the last budgetary procedures and the excellent performance rates of this programme, intends to reinforce commitment appropriations for the corresponding budget line;

Union vis-à-vis its citizens; opposes therefore to the proposed reduction by EUR 10,2 million as compared to the Budget 2012 for Lifelong Learning and, in line with its established position in the last budgetary procedures and the excellent performance rates of this programme, intends to reinforce commitment appropriations for the corresponding budget line;

Or. en

Amendment 75

Gesine Meissner, Dominique Riquet, Eider Gardiazábal Rubial, Isabelle Durant, Roberts Zile, Jaromír Kohlíček

Motion for a resolution Paragraph 23

Motion for a resolution

23. Stresses that the TEN-T programme plays a central role in the attainment of the objectives of **competitiveness and employment in** the Europe 2020 Strategy by creating the missing infrastructure, removing bottlenecks **and** ensuring the future sustainability of the EU transport networks; welcomes the Commission's proposed increase by ca. EUR 85 million compared to the Budget 2012 but asks for further clarifications on the proposed reduction by EUR 118 million as compared to the Financial programming;

Amendment

23. Stresses that the TEN-T programme, **through investment in high European added value infrastructures**, plays a central role in the attainment of the objectives of the Europe 2020 Strategy; **considers this programme as essential to raise the competitiveness of the EU as a whole**, by creating the missing infrastructure **and** removing bottlenecks **within the internal market; highlights that infrastructure projects also directly contribute to growth by stimulating employment during the building phase; underlines the role of the TEN-T programme for meeting the adaptation to climate change goals** by ensuring the future sustainability of the EU transport networks; welcomes the Commission's proposed increase by ca. EUR 85 million compared to the Budget 2012 but asks for further clarifications on the proposed reduction by EUR 118 million as compared to the Financial programming;

Amendment 76
Jürgen Klute, Alda Sousa

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 23

Motion for a resolution

23. Stresses that the TEN-T programme plays a central role in the attainment of the objectives of *competitiveness* and employment in the Europe 2020 Strategy by *creating the missing infrastructure, removing bottlenecks and* ensuring the future sustainability of the EU transport networks; welcomes the Commission's proposed increase by ca. EUR 85 million compared to the Budget 2012 but asks for further clarifications on the proposed reduction by EUR 118 million as compared to the Financial programming;

Amendment

23. Stresses that the TEN-T programme plays a central role in the attainment of the objectives of *growth* and employment in the Europe 2020 Strategy by ensuring the future sustainability of the EU transport networks; welcomes the Commission's proposed increase by ca. EUR 85 million compared to the Budget 2012 but asks for further clarifications on the proposed reduction by EUR 118 million as compared to the Financial programming;

Amendment 77
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 23

Motion for a resolution

23. Stresses that the TEN-T programme plays a central role in the attainment of the objectives of competitiveness and employment in the Europe 2020 Strategy by creating the missing infrastructure, removing bottlenecks and ensuring the future sustainability of the EU transport networks; welcomes the Commission's proposed increase by ca. EUR 85 million compared to the Budget 2012 but asks for

Amendment

23. Stresses that the TEN-T programme plays a central role in the attainment of the objectives of competitiveness and employment in the Europe 2020 Strategy by creating the missing infrastructure, removing bottlenecks and ensuring the future sustainability of the EU transport networks; welcomes the Commission's proposed increase by ca. EUR 85 million compared to the Budget 2012 but asks for

further clarifications on the proposed reduction by EUR 118 million as compared to the Financial programming;

further clarifications on the proposed reduction by EUR 118 million as compared to the Financial programming; ***calls the Commission to increase drastically the sum available for the Project Bonds pilot phase in 2013 in order to realise as many European added value infrastructure projects as possible;***

Or. en

Amendment 78
Marta Andreasen

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 23

Motion for a resolution

23. Stresses that the TEN-T programme plays a central role in the attainment of the objectives of competitiveness and employment in the Europe 2020 Strategy by creating the missing infrastructure, removing bottlenecks and ensuring the future sustainability of the EU transport networks; **welcomes** the Commission's proposed increase by ca. EUR 85 million compared to the Budget 2012 but asks for further clarifications on the proposed reduction by EUR 118 million as compared to the Financial programming;

Amendment

23. Stresses that the TEN-T programme plays a central role in the attainment of the objectives of competitiveness and employment in the Europe 2020 Strategy by creating the missing infrastructure, removing bottlenecks and ensuring the future sustainability of the EU transport networks; **notes** the Commission's proposed increase by ca. EUR 85 million compared to the Budget 2012 but asks for further clarifications on the proposed reduction by EUR 118 million as compared to the Financial programming;

Or. en

Amendment 79
Eider Gardiazábal Rubial

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 23 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

23a. Welcomes that the Draft Budget

includes appropriations for the pilot phase of the Project bond initiative as a way to boost investment capacity in the field of Europe's transport, energy, information and communication networks, even if these appropriations are actually redeployed within the relevant budget lines (CIP - TEN-T - TEN -E) as agreed by the legislative authority;

Or. en

Amendment 80
Jürgen Klute, Alda Sousa

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 24

Motion for a resolution

24. Deplores the Commission's proposed decreases for the European Supervisory Authorities compared what originally foreseen in the Financial programming; considers the current level of appropriations insufficient to allow these agencies to cope efficiently with their tasks; expresses therefore the intention to **reinstate** appropriations **at least at** 2012 level for the European Banking Authority (EBA) and the European Insurance and Occupational Pensions Authority (EIOPA) as well as to further reinforce the European Securities and Markets Authority (ESMA) due to the new tasks entrusted to it;

Amendment

24. **Deeply** deplores the Commission's proposed decreases for the European Supervisory Authorities compared what originally foreseen in the Financial programming; considers the current level of appropriations insufficient to allow these agencies to cope efficiently with their tasks; **strongly** expresses therefore the intention to **reinforce** appropriations **above the** 2012 level for the European Banking Authority (EBA) and the European Insurance and Occupational Pensions Authority (EIOPA) as well as to further reinforce the European Securities and Markets Authority (ESMA) due to the new tasks entrusted to it;

Or. en

Amendment 81
Eider Gardiazábal Rubial

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 24

Motion for a resolution

24. Deplores the Commission's proposed decreases for the European Supervisory Authorities compared what originally foreseen in the Financial programming; considers the current level of appropriations insufficient to allow these agencies to cope efficiently with their tasks; expresses therefore the intention to reinstate appropriations at least at 2012 level for the European Banking Authority (EBA) and the European Insurance and Occupational Pensions Authority (EIOPA) as well as to further reinforce the European Securities and Markets Authority (ESMA) due to the new tasks entrusted to it;

Amendment

24. Deplores the Commission's proposed decreases for the European Supervisory Authorities compared *to what was* originally foreseen in the Financial programming *and which are contrary to the repeated appeal of the European Parliament to fund them adequately* ; considers the current level of appropriations insufficient to allow these agencies to cope efficiently with their tasks *notably the recruitment of highly qualified experts*; expresses therefore the intention to reinstate appropriations at least at 2012 level for the European Banking Authority (EBA) and the European Insurance and Occupational Pensions Authority (EIOPA) as well as to further reinforce the European Securities and Markets Authority (ESMA) due to the new tasks entrusted to it;

Or. en

Amendment 82

Richard Ashworth

on behalf of the ECR Group

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 24

Motion for a resolution

24. **Deplores** the Commission's proposed decreases for the European Supervisory Authorities compared what originally foreseen in the Financial programming; considers the current level of appropriations insufficient to allow these agencies to cope efficiently with their tasks; expresses therefore the intention to reinstate appropriations at least at 2012 level for the European Banking Authority (EBA) and the European Insurance and

Amendment

24. **Is concerned by** the Commission's proposed decreases for the European Supervisory Authorities compared what originally foreseen in the Financial programming; considers the current level of appropriations insufficient to allow these agencies to cope efficiently with their tasks; expresses therefore the intention to reinstate appropriations at least at 2012 level for the European Banking Authority (EBA) and the European Insurance and

Occupational Pensions Authority (EIOPA) as well as to further reinforce the European Securities and Markets Authority (ESMA) due to the new tasks entrusted to it;

Occupational Pensions Authority (EIOPA) as well as to further reinforce the European Securities and Markets Authority (ESMA) due to the new tasks entrusted to it;

Or. en

Amendment 83
Marta Andreassen

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 24

Motion for a resolution

24. *Deplores* the Commission's proposed decreases for the European Supervisory Authorities compared what originally foreseen in the Financial programming; considers the current level of appropriations insufficient to allow these agencies to cope efficiently with their tasks; expresses therefore the intention to reinstate appropriations at least at 2012 level for the European Banking Authority (EBA) and the European Insurance and Occupational Pensions Authority (EIOPA) as well as to further reinforce the European Securities and Markets Authority (ESMA) due to the new tasks entrusted to it;

Amendment

24. *Notes* the Commission's proposed decreases for the European Supervisory Authorities compared what originally foreseen in the Financial programming; considers the current level of appropriations insufficient to allow these agencies to cope efficiently with their tasks; expresses therefore the intention to reinstate appropriations at least at 2012 level for the European Banking Authority (EBA) and the European Insurance and Occupational Pensions Authority (EIOPA) as well as to further reinforce the European Securities and Markets Authority (ESMA) due to the new tasks entrusted to it;

Or. en

Amendment 84
Carl Haglund, Göran Färm, Anne E. Jensen

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 25 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

25a. Regrets the proposed cuts for technical assistance to macro-regional strategies; reiterates the need for

continuous technical and administrative support for the implementation of the strategies as well as for seed money for new projects, as indicated by the high implementation rate in 2011;

Or. en

Amendment 85
João Ferreira

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 25 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

25a. Insists on an across-the-board increase in budget appropriations for social action; considers that the European Social Fund in particular needs to double in volume in order to cope with the social consequences of the crisis, especially unemployment and poverty;

Or. pt

Amendment 86
Marta Andreasen

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 26

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

26. Considers the Structural Funds a crucial instrument - both for their financial size and for the objectives pursued - to accelerate the EU economic recovery and to deliver the objectives of growth and employment enshrined in the Europe 2020 Strategy; welcomes therefore the Commission's initiative of re-programming EUR 82 billion of unallocated Structural funds in some

deleted

Member States in favour of SMEs and youth employment, in line with EP's priorities for 2013; asks to be kept duly informed about implementation of this initiative at national level, its expected impact on growth and jobs and its possible impact for the 2013 budget;

Or. en

Amendment 87

Georgios Stavrakakis, Eider Gardiazábal Rubial

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 26

Motion for a resolution

26. *Considers* the Structural Funds a crucial instrument - both for their financial size and for the objectives pursued - to accelerate the EU economic recovery and to deliver the objectives of growth and employment enshrined in the Europe 2020 Strategy; welcomes therefore the Commission's initiative of re-programming EUR 82 billion of unallocated Structural funds in some Member States in favour of SMEs and youth employment, in line with EP's priorities for 2013; asks to be kept duly informed about implementation of this initiative at national level, its expected impact on growth and jobs and its possible impact for the 2013 budget;

Amendment

26. *Stresses that Cohesion Policy has long proved its added value as a necessary investment tool to deliver growth and job creation effectively by accurately addressing the investment needs of the regions, thus contributing not only to the reduction of the disparities between them, but also to the economic recovery and to the development of the Union as a whole; also considers the* Structural Funds a crucial instrument - both for their financial size and for the objectives pursued - to accelerate the EU economic recovery and to deliver the objectives of growth and employment enshrined in the Europe 2020 Strategy; welcomes therefore the Commission's initiative of re-programming *where possible* EUR 82 billion of unallocated Structural funds in some Member States in favour of SMEs and youth employment, in line with EP's priorities for 2013; asks to be kept duly informed about implementation of this initiative at national level, its expected impact on growth and jobs and its possible impact for the 2013 budget;

Or. en

Amendment 88
Helga Trüpel

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 26

Motion for a resolution

26. Considers the Structural Funds a crucial instrument - both for their financial size and for the objectives pursued - to accelerate the EU economic recovery and to deliver the objectives of growth and employment enshrined in the Europe 2020 Strategy; welcomes therefore the Commission's initiative of re-programming **EUR 82 billion of** unallocated Structural funds in some Member States in favour of SMEs and youth employment, in line with EP's priorities for 2013; asks to be kept duly informed about implementation of this initiative at national level, its expected impact on growth and jobs and its possible impact for the 2013 budget;

Amendment

26. Considers the Structural Funds a crucial instrument - both for their financial size and for the objectives pursued - to accelerate the EU economic recovery and to deliver the objectives of **sustainable** growth and employment enshrined in the Europe 2020 Strategy; welcomes therefore the Commission's initiative of re-programming unallocated Structural funds in some Member States in favour of SMEs and youth employment, in line with EP's priorities for 2013; **notes that according to the Commission, 7,3 billion € of EU financing has in this context been targeted for accelerated delivery or reallocation;** asks to be kept duly informed about implementation of this initiative at national level, its expected impact on growth and jobs and its possible impact for the 2013 budget;

Or. en

Amendment 89
Jürgen Klute, Alda Sousa

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 26

Motion for a resolution

26. Considers the Structural Funds a crucial instrument - both for their financial size and for the objectives pursued - to accelerate the EU economic recovery and to deliver the objectives of growth and

Amendment

26. Considers the Structural Funds a crucial instrument - both for their financial size and for the objectives pursued - to accelerate the EU economic recovery and to deliver the objectives of growth,

employment enshrined in the Europe 2020 Strategy; welcomes therefore the Commission's initiative of re-programming EUR 82 billion of unallocated Structural funds in some Member States in favour of SMEs and youth employment, in line with EP's priorities for 2013; asks to be kept duly informed about implementation of this initiative at national level, its expected impact on growth **and jobs** and its possible impact for the 2013 budget;

employment and social progress in the Europe 2020 Strategy; welcomes therefore the Commission's initiative of re-programming EUR 82 billion of unallocated Structural funds in some Member States in favour of SMEs and youth employment, in line with EP's priorities for 2013; asks to be kept duly informed about implementation of this initiative at national level, its expected impact on growth , **employment, social progress** and its possible impact for the 2013 budget;

Or. en

Amendment 90
Georgios Stavrakakis, Eider Gardiazábal Rubial

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 27

Motion for a resolution

27. Is extremely worried about the payment situation of cohesion projects under this Heading and notes that two thirds of the total level of RAL at the end of 2011 (i.e. EUR 135,8 billion) are due to unpaid projects under the Cohesion policy; reminds that at the end of 2011 the Commission could not reimburse ca. EUR 11 billion of legitimate payment claims submitted by project beneficiaries due to insufficient payment appropriations foreseen in the budget; firmly points out that will not accept that this situation occurs again in 2013;

Amendment

27. Is extremely worried about the payment situation of cohesion projects under this Heading and notes that two thirds of the total level of RAL at the end of 2011 (i.e. EUR 135,8 billion) are due to unpaid projects under the Cohesion policy; reminds that at the end of 2011 the Commission could not reimburse ca. EUR 11 billion of legitimate payment claims submitted by project beneficiaries due to insufficient payment appropriations foreseen in the budget; **this situation has led to a considerable payment backlog, which will have to be addressed through the availability of sufficient payment appropriations in 2012;** firmly points out that will not accept that this situation occurs again in 2013;

Or. en

Amendment 91
George Lyon

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 28

Motion for a resolution

28. Recalls in this context that 2013 is the last year of the current MFF, where implementation of co-financed projects runs at full speed and the bulk of payment requests is expected to reach the Commission in the second half of the year; highlights moreover that 2013 will be a year when, due to the lapsing of the N+3 rule, payment claims submitted by 12 Member States will need to be presented for two annual commitment tranches (2010 and 2011 tranches under the N+3 rule and N+2 rule, respectively); ***considers therefore as a minimum the proposed increase in payment appropriations by 11,7 % (to EUR 48.975 million) as compared to last year since, as mentioned by the Commission, it strictly relates to 2013 and assumes that payment needs from previous years will have been covered;***

Amendment

28. Recalls in this context that 2013 is the last year of the current MFF, where implementation of co-financed projects runs at full speed and the bulk of payment requests is expected to reach the Commission in the second half of the year; highlights moreover that 2013 will be a year when, due to the lapsing of the N+3 rule, payment claims submitted by 12 Member States will need to be presented for two annual commitment tranches (2010 and 2011 tranches under the N+3 rule and N+2 rule, respectively); ***Calls for the Council, the Commission and the European Parliament to work constructively to identify whether there is any room for flexibility and possible reductions in payments that would allow the increase in payment appropriations for the 2013 budget to be brought into line with the Commission's proposed increase in commitment appropriations;***

Or. en

Amendment 92
George Lyon

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 28

Motion for a resolution

28. Recalls in this context that 2013 is the last year of the current MFF, where implementation of co-financed projects runs at full speed and the bulk of payment requests is expected to reach the

Amendment

28. Recalls in this context that 2013 is the last year of the current MFF, where implementation of co-financed projects runs at full speed and the bulk of payment requests is expected to reach the

Commission in the second half of the year; highlights moreover that 2013 will be a year when, due to the lapsing of the N+3 rule, payment claims submitted by 12 Member States will need to be presented for two annual commitment tranches (2010 and 2011 tranches under the N+3 rule and N+2 rule, respectively); ***considers therefore as a minimum the proposed increase in payment appropriations by 11,7 % (to EUR 48.975 million) as compared to last year since, as mentioned by the Commission, it strictly relates to 2013 and assumes that payment needs from previous years will have been covered;***

Commission in the second half of the year; highlights moreover that 2013 will be a year when, due to the lapsing of the N+3 rule, payment claims submitted by 12 Member States will need to be presented for two annual commitment tranches (2010 and 2011 tranches under the N+3 rule and N+2 rule, respectively);

Or. en

Amendment 93
Georgios Stavrakakis, Eider Gardiazábal Rubial

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 28

Motion for a resolution

28. Recalls in this context that 2013 is the last year of the current MFF, where implementation of co-financed projects runs at full speed and the bulk of payment requests is expected to reach the Commission in the second half of the year; highlights moreover that 2013 will be a year when, due to the lapsing of the N+3 rule, payment claims submitted by 12 Member States will need to be presented for two annual commitment tranches (2010 and 2011 tranches under the N+3 rule and N+2 rule, respectively); considers therefore as a minimum the proposed increase in payment appropriations by 11,7 % (to EUR 48.975 million) as compared to last year since, as mentioned by the Commission, it strictly relates to 2013 and assumes that payment needs from previous years will

Amendment

28. Recalls in this context that 2013 is the last year of the current MFF, where implementation of co-financed projects runs at full speed and ***is expected to accelerate further and*** the bulk of payment requests is expected to reach the Commission in the second half of the year; ***calls on the Council and the Commission to immediately analyse and assess, along with Parliament, the figures and requirements in order not to jeopardise implementation for 2013; points out that a lack of payment appropriations could put in danger currently well-functioning programmes;*** highlights moreover that 2013 will be a year when, due to the lapsing of the N+3 rule, payment claims submitted by 12 Member States will need to be presented for two annual commitment

have been covered;

tranches (2010 and 2011 tranches under the N+3 rule and N+2 rule, respectively); considers therefore as a minimum the proposed increase in payment appropriations by 11,7 % (to EUR 48.975 million) as compared to last year since, as mentioned by the Commission, it strictly relates to 2013 and assumes that payment needs from previous years will have been covered;

Or. en

Amendment 94

Alexander Alvaro, Carl Haglund

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 28

Motion for a resolution

28. Recalls in this context that 2013 is the last year of the current MFF, where implementation of co-financed projects runs at full speed and the bulk of payment requests is expected to reach the Commission in the second half of the year; highlights moreover that 2013 will be a year when, due to the lapsing of the N+3 rule, payment claims submitted by 12 Member States will need to be presented for two annual commitment tranches (2010 and 2011 tranches under the N+3 rule and N+2 rule, respectively); **considers therefore as a minimum** the proposed increase in payment appropriations by 11,7 % (to EUR 48.975 million) as compared to last year **since**, as mentioned by the Commission, it strictly relates to 2013 and assumes that payment needs from previous years will have been covered;

Amendment

28. Recalls in this context that 2013 is the last year of the current MFF, where implementation of co-financed projects runs at full speed and the bulk of payment requests is expected to reach the Commission in the second half of the year; highlights moreover that 2013 will be a year when, due to the lapsing of the N+3 rule, payment claims submitted by 12 Member States will need to be presented for two annual commitment tranches (2010 and 2011 tranches under the N+3 rule and N+2 rule, respectively); **takes note of** the proposed increase in payment appropriations by 11,7 % (to EUR 48.975 million) as compared to last year, **bearing in mind**, as mentioned by the Commission **that** it strictly relates to 2013 and assumes that payment needs from previous years will have been covered;

Or. en

Amendment 95

Richard Ashworth

on behalf of the ECR Group

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 29

Motion for a resolution

29. Considers this increase in payments only as a first step to cover the actual needs of running projects and reiterates its concern as to a possible shortage of funds in the field of cohesion policy; ***will therefore oppose any possible cut in the level of payments compared to the proposal included in the DB 2013;***

Amendment

29. Considers this increase in payments only as a first step to cover the actual needs of running projects and reiterates its concern as to a possible shortage of funds in the field of cohesion policy;

Or. en

Amendment 96

Georgios Stavrakakis, Eider Gardiazábal Rubial

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 29

Motion for a resolution

29. Considers this increase in payments only as a first step to cover the actual needs of running projects and reiterates its concern as to a possible shortage of funds in the field of cohesion policy; will therefore oppose any possible cut in the level of payments compared to the proposal included in the DB 2013;

Amendment

29. Considers this increase in payments only as a first step to cover the actual needs of running projects and reiterates its concern as to a possible shortage of funds in the field of cohesion policy; ***calls on the Council and on the Commission to carefully evaluate the real needs in terms of payments for 2013 under heading 1b, not to make any cuts which are unrealistic and not to take decisions that are at odds with forecasts provided by Member States themselves and used as a basis for the Commission's draft budget;*** will therefore oppose any possible cut in the level of payments compared to the proposal included in the DB 2013;

Or. en

Amendment 97
Alexander Alvaro, George Lyon

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 29

Motion for a resolution

29. Considers this increase in payments **only** as a first step to cover the actual needs of running projects and reiterates its concern as to a possible shortage of funds in the field of cohesion policy; will **therefore oppose** any possible **cut** in the level of payments compared to the proposal included in the DB 2013;

Amendment

29. Considers this increase in payments as a first step to cover the actual needs of running projects and reiterates its concern as to a possible shortage of funds in the field of cohesion policy; will **carefully examine** any possible **change** in the level of payments compared to the proposal included in the DB 2013;

Or. en

Amendment 98
João Ferreira

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 30 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

30a. Highlights the fact that in terms of CA the amount proposed for Heading 2 (preservation and management of natural resources) under the DB 2013 falls far short of the amount programmed for 2013 under the multiannual financial framework, falling by EUR 981.5 million, which represents a drop of 1.6% by comparison with the scheduled amount;

Or. pt

Amendment 99
Helga Trüpel

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 34

Motion for a resolution

34. Points out that Heading 2 is instrumental in realising the EU 2020 strategy goals of growth and employment, in particular through its rural development programmes; highlights the need to support SMEs in the rural areas, as main creators of jobs with a particular target on young people; welcomes in this respect the proposed increase of CA by 1,3% (to EUR 14.808 million) for rural development;

Amendment

34. Points out that Heading 2 is instrumental in realising the EU 2020 strategy goals of **sustainable** growth and employment, in particular through its rural development programmes; highlights the need to support SMEs in the rural areas, as main creators of jobs with a particular target on young people; welcomes in this respect the proposed increase of CA by 1,3% (to EUR 14.808 million) for rural development;

Or. en

Amendment 100
Jürgen Klute, Alda Sousa

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 34

Motion for a resolution

34. Points out that Heading 2 is instrumental in realising the EU 2020 strategy goals of growth and **employment**, in particular through its rural development programmes; highlights the need to support SMEs in the rural areas, as main creators of jobs with a particular target on young people; welcomes in this respect the proposed increase of CA by 1,3% (to EUR 14.808 million) for rural development;

Amendment

34. Points out that Heading 2 is instrumental in realising the EU 2020 strategy goals of growth, **employment** and **social progress** in particular through its rural development programmes; highlights the need to support SMEs in the rural areas, as main creators of jobs with a particular target on young people; welcomes in this respect the proposed increase of CA by 1,3% (to EUR 14.808 million) for rural development;

Or. en

Amendment 101
Richard Ashworth
on behalf of the ECR Group

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 36

Motion for a resolution

36. Reminds that price volatility in this sector is a **major** concern and endorses measures to combat speculation in agricultural commodities; urges the Commission and the Council to carefully monitor developments in agricultural markets; ***in this context reminds the Commission of the request by the Parliament to install a price and margins observatory to achieve better price comparability and more transparency in setting food prices, to which no suit has been given so far;***

Amendment

36. Reminds that price volatility in this sector is a concern and endorses measures to combat **abusive** speculation in agricultural commodities; urges the Commission and the Council to carefully monitor developments in agricultural markets;

Or. en

Amendment 102
Helga Trüpel

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 36 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

36a. Calls for a further reduction of export refunds and regrets the continued subsidising of the tobacco production in the EU, which is contrary to the objectives of the EU health policy;

Amendment

Or. en

Amendment 103
Marta Andreasen

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 37

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

37. Notes that climate action and environmental objectives are a priority stipulated in the Europe 2020 strategy, which must be translated into concrete actions to be implemented under the various programmes; welcomes in this context the proposed increase of CA by 3,3% to EUR 366,6 million for LIFE + and considers that a cross-cutting approach should be applied whereby sustainable growth becomes a horizontal priority underpinning all EU policies;

deleted

Or. en

Amendment 104

Jutta Haug

on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 37

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

37. Notes that climate action and environmental objectives are a priority ***stipulated in the Europe 2020 strategy, which must be translated into concrete actions to be implemented under the various programmes;*** welcomes in this context the proposed increase of CA by 3,3% to EUR 366,6 million for LIFE + ***and considers that a cross-cutting approach should be applied whereby sustainable growth becomes a horizontal priority underpinning all EU policies;***

37. Notes that climate action and environmental objectives are a priority; welcomes in this context the proposed increase of CA by 3,3% to EUR 366,6 million for LIFE +; ***will explore, in this context, all provisions as stated in paragraph 37 of the Inter-Institutional Agreement;***

Or. en

Amendment 105

Eider Gardiazábal Rubial

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 37

Motion for a resolution

37. Notes that climate action and environmental objectives are a priority stipulated in the Europe 2020 strategy, which must be translated into concrete actions to be implemented under the various programmes; **welcomes** in this context the proposed increase of CA by 3,3% to EUR 366,6 million for LIFE + **and** considers that a cross-cutting approach should be applied whereby sustainable growth becomes a horizontal priority underpinning all EU policies;

Amendment

37. Notes that climate action and environmental objectives are a priority stipulated in the Europe 2020 strategy, which must be translated into concrete actions to be implemented under the various programmes; **notes** in this context the proposed **slight** increase of CA by 3,3% to EUR 366,6 million for LIFE +, **but regrets that the appropriation is EUR 10,55 million below the financial programming of January 2012**; considers that a cross-cutting approach should be applied whereby sustainable growth becomes a horizontal priority underpinning all EU policies;

Or. en

Amendment 106
Richard Ashworth
on behalf of the ECR Group

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 37

Motion for a resolution

37. Notes that climate action and environmental objectives are a priority stipulated in the Europe 2020 strategy, which must be translated into concrete actions to be implemented under the various programmes; welcomes in this context the proposed increase of CA by 3,3% to EUR 366,6 million for LIFE + and considers that a cross-cutting approach should be applied whereby sustainable growth becomes a horizontal priority underpinning all EU policies;

Amendment

37. Notes that climate action and environmental objectives are a priority stipulated in the Europe 2020 strategy, which must be translated into concrete actions to be implemented under the various programmes; welcomes in this context the proposed increase of CA by 3,3% to EUR 366,6 million for LIFE + and considers that **this increase must be offset by a reallocation of funds from existing budget lines**; considers a cross-cutting approach should be applied whereby sustainable growth becomes a horizontal

priority underpinning all EU policies;

Or. en

Amendment 107

João Ferreira

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 37 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

37a. Notes with concern that the number of projects financed under the LIFE+ programme each year is below the indicative allocation in various Member States; invites the Commission to assess the reasons for this under-implementation and where necessary to propose changes to the rules governing the programme, particularly as regards co-financing levels;

Or. pt

Amendment 108

João Ferreira

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 37 b (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

37b. Advocates greater Community accountability for the protection of natural resources in the Natura 2000 network, especially in terms of its financing; points to the difficulties encountered by various Member States with regard to the management of areas included in the Natura 2000 network owing to the lack of a specific financial instrument geared to the management of such areas, as a complement to the

inclusion of biodiversity in sectoral policies;

Or. pt

Amendment 109

João Ferreira

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 37 c (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

37c. Draws attention to the threats affecting numerous forest ecosystems, including dispersal of invasive exotic species, diseases (e.g. pine nematode) and forest fires; considers that suitable financial resources need to be channelled, via Community programmes and support measures, into the evaluation of ecological and plant health conditions in forests and rehabilitation measures, including reforestation;

Or. pt

Amendment 110

Estelle Grelier, Eider Gardiazábal Rubial

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 37 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

37a. Welcomes the amounts proposed by the Commission for the PEAD; calls on the Council to respect the joint decision taken at the end of 2011 on maintaining funding for this programme for 2012 and 2013;

Or. fr

Amendment 111
João Ferreira

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 37 d (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

37d. Stresses that the common fisheries policy (CFP) should bear responsibility for financing its costs, in particular the decisions and measures adopted as part of that policy,

Or. pt

Amendment 112
Richard Ashworth
on behalf of the ECR Group

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 38

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

38. Considers important to ***maintain*** the financial backing to the common fisheries policy (CFP) with a view to its imminent reform; stresses in particular the need to support SMEs in the fisheries sector and the access to jobs for young people in this field; welcomes in this regard the proposed increase for the European Fisheries Fund by respectively 2,2% (to EUR 687,2 million) in CA and 7,3% (to EUR 523,5 million) in PA, compared to the 2012 Budget;

38. Considers important to ***consider*** the ***arguments in favour and against in terms of value for money of maintaining the current*** financial backing to the common fisheries policy (CFP) with a view to its imminent reform; stresses in particular the need to support SMEs in the fisheries sector and the access to jobs for young people in this field; welcomes in this regard the proposed increase for the European Fisheries Fund by respectively 2,2% (to EUR 687,2 million) in CA and 7,3% (to EUR 523,5 million) in PA, compared to the 2012 Budget; ***Stresses however, that any increases must be reflected by cuts or reallocation in other areas of underperformance or under implementation;***

Amendment 113
Estelle Grelier, Eider Gardiazábal Rubial

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 38

Motion for a resolution

38. Considers important to maintain the financial backing to the common fisheries policy (CFP) with a view to its imminent reform; stresses in particular the need to support SMEs in the fisheries sector and the access to jobs for young people in this field; welcomes in this regard the proposed increase for the European Fisheries Fund by respectively 2,2% (to EUR 687,2 million) in CA and 7,3% (to EUR 523,5 million) in PA, compared to the 2012 Budget;

Amendment

38. Considers important to maintain the financial backing to the common fisheries policy (CFP) with a view to its imminent reform; stresses in particular the need to support SMEs in the fisheries sector and the access to jobs for young people in this field, ***as well as all measures ensuring the social, economic and environmental viability of the sector***; welcomes in this regard the proposed increase for the European Fisheries Fund by respectively 2,2% (to EUR 687,2 million) in CA and 7,3% (to EUR 523,5 million) in PA, compared to the 2012 Budget; ***however, regrets the decrease planned in the field of governance of the CFP, conservation, management and exploitation of fisheries resources and control and enforcement of the CFP***;

Amendment 114
Carl Haglund, Alexander Alvaro

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 38

Motion for a resolution

38. Considers important to maintain the financial backing to the common fisheries policy (CFP) with a view to its imminent reform; stresses in particular the need to

Amendment

38. Considers important to maintain the financial backing to the common fisheries policy (CFP) with a view to its imminent reform; stresses in particular the need to

support SMEs in the fisheries sector and the access to jobs for young people in this field; welcomes in this regard the proposed increase for the European Fisheries Fund by respectively 2,2% (to EUR 687,2 million) in CA and 7,3% (to EUR 523,5 million) in PA, compared to the 2012 Budget;

support SMEs in the fisheries sector and the access to jobs for young people in this field, ***while adhering to the principle of sustainable fisheries***; welcomes in this regard the proposed increase for the European Fisheries Fund by respectively 2,2% (to EUR 687,2 million) in CA and 7,3% (to EUR 523,5 million) in PA, compared to the 2012 Budget;

Or. en

Amendment 115
Helga Trüpel

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 38

Motion for a resolution

38. Considers important to maintain the financial backing to the common fisheries policy (CFP) with a view to its imminent reform; stresses in particular the need to support SMEs in the fisheries sector and the access to jobs for young people in this field; welcomes in this regard the proposed increase for the European Fisheries Fund by respectively 2,2% (to EUR 687,2 million) in CA and 7,3% (to EUR 523,5 million) in PA, compared to the 2012 Budget;

Amendment

38. Considers important to maintain the financial backing to the common fisheries policy (CFP) with a view to its imminent reform; stresses in particular the need to support SMEs in the fisheries sector and the access to jobs for young people in this field, ***which presupposes ensuring the sustainable character of the CFP***; welcomes in this regard the proposed increase for the European Fisheries Fund by respectively 2,2% (to EUR 687,2 million) in CA and 7,3% (to EUR 523,5 million) in PA, compared to the 2012 Budget;

Or. en

Amendment 116
João Ferreira

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 38 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

38a. Deplores the reduction in appropriations earmarked for the common organisation of the market in fishery products by comparison with the 2012 budget (a drop of 10.74% in CA and 6.56% in PA), which will restrict intervention mechanisms at a time when they have been made all the more necessary by the persisting and worsening socio-economic problems in the sector; believes it is essential to devote more budget resources to this area in order to boost stability and incomes in the fisheries sector;

Or. pt

Amendment 117
Helga Trüpel

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 40

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

40. Stresses the need to reinforce appropriations for cyber security in the informatics sector, due to the enormous damage that increasing criminal activity in this domain is causing to the EU national economies; notes that contrary to the Financial programming, a decrease by EUR 64,4 million is foreseen for the Prevention of and fight against crime programme, compared to Budget 2012, although the programme was supposed to cover also cybercrime and illegal use of the internet;

deleted

Or. en

Amendment 118
Monika Hohlmeier

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 40

Motion for a resolution

40. Stresses the need to reinforce appropriations for cyber security in the informatics sector, due to the enormous damage that increasing criminal activity in this domain is causing to the EU national economies; notes that contrary to the Financial programming, a decrease by EUR 64,4 million is foreseen for the Prevention of and fight against crime programme, compared to Budget 2012, although the programme was supposed to cover also cybercrime and illegal use of the internet;

Amendment

40. Stresses the need to reinforce appropriations for cyber security in the informatics sector, due to the enormous damage that increasing criminal activity in this domain is causing to the EU national economies; ***insists that an enhanced fight against cybercrime at Union level via the upcoming European Cybercrime Centre requires adequate funding and therefore deplores the cuts proposed by the Commission for Europol, as the Centre's tasks as identified by the Commission cannot be carried out with Europol's current human and financial resources;*** notes that contrary to the Financial programming, a decrease by EUR 64,4 million is foreseen for the Prevention of and fight against crime programme, compared to Budget 2012, although the programme was supposed to cover also cybercrime and illegal use of the internet;

Or. en

Amendment 119
João Ferreira

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 41

Motion for a resolution

41. Asks for a continued support for FRONTEX, as well as for the number of recently set-up agencies under this heading (European Asylum Support Office and large-scale IT systems in particular; notes the 8,9 % decrease (-

Amendment

deleted

EUR 7,3 million) for the contribution to the European Police Office (EUROPOL) compared to the Budget 2012 and expects the Commission to provide additional details on this proposed cut;

Or. pt

Amendment 120
Jürgen Klute, Alda Sousa

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 41

Motion for a resolution

41. **Asks for a continued support for FRONTEX, as well as for the number of recently set-up agencies under this heading (European Asylum Support Office and large-scale IT systems in particular; notes the 8,9 % decrease (- EUR 7,3 million) for the contribution to the European Police Office (EUROPOL) compared to the Budget 2012 and expects the Commission to provide additional details on this proposed cut;**

Amendment

41. **Calls for the reduction of the support to FRONTEX; asks to reinforce the support for the European Asylum Support Office, a recently set-up agency under this heading, in particular; notes the 8,9 % decrease (- EUR 7,3 million) for the contribution to the European Police Office (EUROPOL) compared to the Budget 2012 and expects the Commission to provide additional details on this proposed cut;**

Or. en

Amendment 121
Monika Hohlmeier

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 42 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

42a. Takes note of the significant increase in commitments and comparatively low level of payments for SIS II; points out that, according to the global schedule for SIS II, in 2013 the development and migration of the SIS II should be

completed and the IT Agency should take over the management of the system; therefore challenges the significant budget increase far beyond its original financial planning at such a late stage before the SIS II is to become operational; recommends to maintain a substantial parts of the budget for SIS II in reserve until operational progress and compliance with the financial planning have been justified;

Or. en

Amendment 122
Jürgen Klute, Alda Sousa

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 43

Motion for a resolution

43. *Appreciates* the increase by EUR 9,8 million compared to the Budget 2012 proposed by the Commission for the European Refugee Fund, *which is coherent with the line taken in the previous years; takes notes of* the 19% increase in the External Borders Fund's budget allocation up to EUR 415,5 million *which is limited to half that foreseen by the Financial programming; recalls its strong request for an appropriate and balanced answer to the challenges, with a view to the management of legal migration and slowing down of illegal migration;*

Amendment

43. *Regrets* the *modest* increase, by EUR 9,8 million compared to the Budget 2012, proposed by the Commission for the European Refugee Fund; *deeply regrets* the 19% increase in the External Borders Fund's budget allocation up to EUR 415,5 million; *regrets* that the *Commission's draft budget continues to focus on migration policies and on the monitoring and management of borders of the Union to the detriment of the promotion of justice and the protection and enhancement of civil liberties; recalls that a that a new and broader strategic approach to development aid and the regulation of migratory flows is needed;*

Or. en

Amendment 123
João Ferreira

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 43

Motion for a resolution

43. Appreciates the increase by EUR 9,8 million compared to the Budget 2012 proposed by the Commission for the European Refugee Fund, which is coherent with the line taken in the previous years; takes notes of the 19% increase in the External Borders Fund's budget allocation up to EUR 415,5 million which is limited to half that foreseen by the Financial programming; ***recalls its strong request for an appropriate and balanced answer to the challenges, with a view to the management of legal migration and slowing down of illegal migration;***

Amendment

43. Appreciates the increase by EUR 9,8 million compared to the Budget 2012 proposed by the Commission for the European Refugee Fund, which is coherent with the line taken in the previous years; takes notes of the 19% increase in the External Borders Fund's budget allocation up to EUR 415,5 million which is limited to half that foreseen by the Financial programming;

Or. pt

Amendment 124
Eider Gardiazábal Rubial

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 43

Motion for a resolution

43. Appreciates the increase by EUR 9,8 million compared to the Budget 2012 proposed by the Commission for the European Refugee Fund, which is coherent with the line taken in the previous years; takes notes of the 19% increase in the External Borders Fund's budget allocation up to EUR 415,5 million which is limited to half that foreseen by the Financial programming; recalls its strong request for an appropriate and balanced answer to the challenges, with a view to the management of legal migration and slowing down of illegal migration;

Amendment

43. Appreciates the increase by EUR 9,8 million compared to the Budget 2012 proposed by the Commission for the European Refugee Fund, which is coherent with the line taken in the previous years ***and the on- going implementation of a Common European Asylum System*** ; takes notes of the 19% increase in the External Borders Fund's budget allocation up to EUR 415,5 million which is limited to half that foreseen by the Financial programming; recalls its strong request for an appropriate and balanced answer to the challenges, with a view to the management of legal migration and slowing down of illegal migration;

Amendment 125
Eider Gardiazábal Rubial

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 46

Motion for a resolution

46. Whilst appreciates the increases in commitments compared to the Budget 2012 for the Culture programme (+1,4%), Media 2007 (+1,1%) and the Union action in the field of health (+3,1%), **will carefully analyse the reasons for cutting** appropriations for Europe for Citizens, the Union action in the field of consumer policy and Media Mundus;

Amendment

46. Whilst appreciates the increases in commitments compared to the Budget 2012 for the Culture programme (+1,4%), Media 2007 (+1,1%) and the Union action in the field of health (+3,1%), **though allocations are slightly below the initial level of the financial programming, regrets the decreases of** appropriations compared to the budget 2012 for the Europe for Citizens **programme, especially during the European Year of Citizens, the** Union action in the field of consumer policy and Media Mundus;

Amendment 126
Richard Ashworth
on behalf of the ECR Group

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 47

Motion for a resolution

47. Is critical of the decreased volume of commitments for communication actions compared to the 2012 Budget at the moment when the gap between the European Union and its citizens is more evident than ever, as shown in ever-diminishing turnout in European elections; is convinced of the need for reinforced communication efforts and

Amendment

deleted

commensurate funding to ensure the visibility of the European Union institutions and showing their contribution to overcoming the economic and financial crisis;

Or. en

Amendment 127
Claudio Morganti

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 47

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

47. Is critical of the decreased volume of commitments for communication actions compared to the 2012 Budget at the moment when the gap between the European Union and its citizens is more evident than ever, as shown in ever-diminishing turnout in European elections; is convinced of the need for reinforced communication efforts and commensurate funding to ensure the visibility of the European Union institutions and showing their contribution to overcoming the economic and financial crisis;

deleted

Or. en

Amendment 128
Jürgen Klute, Alda Sousa

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 47

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

47. Is critical of the decreased volume of commitments for communication actions compared to the 2012 Budget at the

47. Takes note of the decreased volume of commitments for communication actions compared to the 2012 Budget at the

moment when the gap between the European Union and its citizens is more evident than ever, as shown in ever-diminishing turnout in European elections; ***is convinced*** of the ***need for reinforced communication efforts and commensurate funding*** to ensure the visibility of the European Union institutions ***and showing their contribution to overcoming the economic and financial crisis***;

moment when the gap between the European Union and its citizens is more evident than ever, as shown in ever-diminishing turnout in European elections; ***takes note*** of the communication efforts to ensure the visibility of the European Union institutions;

Or. en

Amendment 129
Barbara Matera

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 47

Motion for a resolution

47. ***Is critical of the decreased volume*** of commitments for communication actions compared to the 2012 Budget at the moment when the gap between the European Union and its citizens is more evident than ever, as shown in ever-diminishing turnout in European elections; is convinced of the need for reinforced communication efforts and commensurate funding to ensure the visibility of the European Union institutions and showing their contribution to overcoming the economic and financial crisis;

Amendment

47. ***Regrets the considerable reduction*** of commitments for communication actions compared to the 2012 Budget at the moment when the gap between the European Union and its citizens is more evident than ever, as shown in ever-diminishing turnout in European elections; is convinced of the need for reinforced communication efforts and commensurate funding to ensure the visibility of the European Union institutions and showing their contribution to overcoming the economic and financial crisis;

Or. en

Amendment 130
Eider Gardiazábal Rubial

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 48

Heading 4 compared to the Financial programming for 2013 (from EUR 119,6 million to EUR 391,9 million), which is the net effect of the increase in commitments for ENPI (reinforced by EUR 51,7 million), ICI and ICI + (above Financial programming with EUR 0,3 million) and decreasing the growth in commitments for the Guarantee Fund (-104,5 million EUR), Instrument for Pre-Accession Assistance (-99.3 million EUR), Macro-financial Assistance (-37,4 million EUR), Development Cooperation Instrument (-28,6 million EUR), Instrument for Stability (-41,4 million EUR); **is concerned by the fact that the Commission did not** provide sufficient explanation as to why such a significant scaling down of some programmes was needed compared to the Financial programming; stresses that while the principle of scaling down **projects** that are under-implemented **is** welcomed if it produces efficiency savings, the decrease in the appropriations should not be done across the lines; warns that the use of an artificially high margin as a negotiating tool in the budgetary procedure cannot be considered as a sound budgetary practice;

Heading 4 compared to the Financial programming for 2013 (from EUR 119,6 million to EUR 391,9 million), which is the net effect of the increase in commitments for ENPI (reinforced by EUR 51,7 million), ICI and ICI + (above Financial programming with EUR 0,3 million) and decreasing the growth in commitments for the Guarantee Fund (-104,5 million EUR), Instrument for Pre-Accession Assistance (-99.3 million EUR), Macro-financial Assistance (-37,4 million EUR), Development Cooperation Instrument (-28,6 million EUR), Instrument for Stability (-41,4 million EUR); **calls on** the Commission **to** provide sufficient explanation as to why such a significant scaling down of some programmes was needed compared to the Financial programming; stresses that while the principle of scaling down **programs** that are under-implemented **could be** welcomed if it produces efficiency savings, the decrease in the appropriations should not be done across the lines; warns that the use of an artificially high margin as a negotiating tool in the budgetary procedure cannot be considered as a sound budgetary practice;

Or. en

Amendment 133

Richard Ashworth

on behalf of the ECR Group

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 51

Motion for a resolution

51. Notes the significant increase of EUR 272,3 million in the proposed margin for Heading 4 compared to the Financial programming for 2013 (from EUR 119,6 million to EUR 391,9 million), which is the

Amendment

51. Notes the significant increase of EUR 272,3 million in the proposed margin for Heading 4 compared to the Financial programming for 2013 (from EUR 119,6 million to EUR 391,9 million), which is the

net effect of the increase in commitments for ENPI (reinforced by EUR 51,7 million), ICI and ICI + (above Financial programming with EUR 0,3 million) and decreasing the growth in commitments for the Guarantee Fund (-104,5 million EUR), Instrument for Pre-Accession Assistance (-99.3 million EUR), Macro-financial Assistance (-37,4 million EUR), Development Cooperation Instrument (-28,6 million EUR), Instrument for Stability (-41,4 million EUR); **is concerned by** the fact that the Commission did not provide sufficient explanation as to why such a significant scaling down of some programmes was needed compared to the Financial programming; stresses that while the principle of scaling down projects that are under-implemented is welcomed if it produces efficiency savings, the decrease in the appropriations should not be done across the lines; warns that the use of an artificially high margin as a negotiating tool in the budgetary procedure cannot be considered as a sound budgetary practice;

net effect of the increase in commitments for ENPI (reinforced by EUR 51,7 million), ICI and ICI + (above Financial programming with EUR 0,3 million) and decreasing the growth in commitments for the Guarantee Fund (-104,5 million EUR), Instrument for Pre-Accession Assistance (-99.3 million EUR), Macro-financial Assistance (-37,4 million EUR), Development Cooperation Instrument (-28,6 million EUR), Instrument for Stability (-41,4 million EUR); **Notes** the fact that the Commission did not provide sufficient explanation as to why such a significant scaling down of some programmes was needed compared to the Financial programming; stresses that while the principle of scaling down projects that are under-implemented is welcomed if it produces efficiency savings, the decrease in the appropriations should not be done across the lines; warns that the use of an artificially high margin as a negotiating tool in the budgetary procedure cannot be considered as a sound budgetary practice;

Or. en

Amendment 134

Helga Trüpel

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 51 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

51a. Deplores in particular the ongoing decrease of appropriations in the field of development cooperation; wonders how this is compatible with the international commitments taken by the EU to allocate by 2015 0,7 % of GNP to development aid and the European Consensus on Development;

Or. en

Amendment 135
Nadezhda Neynsky

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 52

Motion for a resolution

52. Considers that a sufficient level of EU financial assistance to the Palestinian Authority and UNRWA is still needed in order to adequately and comprehensively respond to the political and humanitarian situation in the Middle East and the Peace Process;

Amendment

52. Considers that a sufficient level of EU financial assistance to the Palestinian Authority and UNRWA is still needed in order to adequately and comprehensively respond to the political and humanitarian situation in the Middle East and the Peace Process; ***notes that the net effect of the increase in commitments for ENPI is mainly due to continued support to the occupied Palestinian territory at the level of the 2012 Draft Budget;***

Or. en

Amendment 136
Eider Gardiazábal Rubial

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 52

Motion for a resolution

52. Considers that a sufficient level of EU financial assistance to the Palestinian Authority and UNRWA is still needed in order to adequately and comprehensively respond to the political and humanitarian situation in the Middle East and the Peace Process;

Amendment

52. Considers that a sufficient level of EU financial assistance to the Palestinian Authority and UNRWA is still needed in order to adequately and comprehensively respond to the political and humanitarian situation in the Middle East and the Peace Process; ***stresses the particularly difficult situation faced by UNRWA at the moment, notably following the events in Syria;***

Or. en

Amendment 137
Jürgen Klute, Alda Sousa

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 52

Motion for a resolution

52. **Considers** that a sufficient level of EU financial assistance to the Palestinian Authority and UNRWA is still needed in order to adequately and comprehensively respond to the political and humanitarian situation in the Middle East and the Peace Process;

Amendment

52. **Reiterates** that a sufficient level of EU financial assistance to the Palestinian Authority and UNRWA is still needed in order to adequately and comprehensively respond to the political and humanitarian situation in the Middle East and the Peace Process;

Or. en

Amendment 138
Eider Gardiazábal Rubial

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 53

Motion for a resolution

53. Takes note of the fact that, apart from administrative expenditure, no appropriations have been entered into the Draft Budget for the accession of Croatia in July 2013; expects that the revision of the MFF foreseen by Point 29 of the IIA will be adopted swiftly and asks the Commission to present its proposal for the corresponding additional appropriations as soon as the Act of Accession has been ratified by all Member States;

Amendment

deleted

Or. en

Amendment 139
Nadezhda Neynsky

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 54

Motion for a resolution

54. Acknowledges the fact that with the accession of Croatia to the Union, a reduction of EUR 67,6 million will be made to IPA allocations; is nevertheless concerned that the Commission proposes a **significant** cut in support for institutional capacity building for candidate countries (-29,14 million EUR compared to 2012), while the same line for potential candidates is reinforced (+10,5 million EUR compared to 2012); reminds that institutional capacity is of utmost importance for the rightful use of Union funding and is equally important for candidates and potential candidates; notes the proposed increase in CA for IPA rural development of 10,2% compared to Budget 2012;

Amendment

54. ***Calls on the Commission to update the multi-annual indicative financial framework (MIFF) accordingly to reflect the inclusion of Serbia as a candidate country under IPA; reminds that the change in candidacy status is seen as a significant amendment to the MIFF and should normally be revised before its annual revision in the autumn;***
Acknowledges the fact that with the accession of Croatia to the Union, a reduction of EUR 67,6 million will be made to IPA allocations; is nevertheless concerned that the Commission proposes a **larger** cut in support for institutional capacity building for candidate countries **than expected with the reduction of IPA allocations for Croatia** (-29,14 million EUR **in total as** compared to 2012), while the same line for potential candidates is reinforced (+10,5 million EUR compared to 2012); reminds that institutional capacity is of utmost importance for the rightful use of Union funding and is equally important for candidates and potential candidates; notes the proposed increase in CA for IPA rural development of 10,2% compared to Budget 2012;

Or. en

Amendment 140
Jürgen Klute, Alda Sousa

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 54

Motion for a resolution

54. Acknowledges the fact that with the accession of Croatia to the Union, a

Amendment

54. Acknowledges the fact that with the accession of Croatia to the Union, a

reduction of EUR 67,6 million will be made to IPA allocations; is nevertheless concerned that the Commission proposes a significant cut in support for institutional capacity building for candidate countries (-29,14 million EUR compared to 2012), while the same line for potential candidates is reinforced (+10,5 million EUR compared to 2012); reminds that institutional capacity is of utmost importance for the rightful use of Union funding and is equally important for candidates and potential candidates; **notes** the proposed increase in CA for IPA rural development of 10,2% compared to Budget 2012;

reduction of EUR 67,6 million will be made to IPA allocations; is nevertheless concerned that the Commission proposes a significant cut in support for institutional capacity building for candidate countries (-29,14 million EUR compared to 2012), while the same line for potential candidates is reinforced (+10,5 million EUR compared to 2012); reminds that institutional capacity is of utmost importance for the rightful use of Union funding and is equally important for candidates and potential candidates; **welcomes** the proposed increase in CA for IPA rural development of 10,2% compared to Budget 2012;

Or. en

Amendment 141 **Nadezhda Neynsky**

Motion for a resolution **Paragraph 55**

Motion for a resolution

55. Reiterates that especially in times of austerity commitment appropriations should be carefully planned for each CFSP budgetary line in order to guarantee that EU money is streamlined towards the measures where it is mostly needed, as much as possible taking into consideration the flexibility and unpredictability of CFSP operations; will carefully analyse the increase of 9,2% in CA for CFSP in 2013;

Amendment

55. Reiterates that especially in times of austerity commitment appropriations should be carefully planned for each CFSP budgetary line in order to guarantee that EU money is streamlined towards the measures where it is mostly needed, as much as possible taking into consideration the flexibility and unpredictability of CFSP operations; ***in this context, welcomes calls for greater synergies by inter alia pooling, sharing and integration of capabilities and through improved performance, planning and conducting of missions and operations; welcomes efforts for a transparent and complete overview of all CFSP missions;*** will carefully analyse the increase of 9,2% in CA for CFSP in 2013;

Or. en

Amendment 142
Jürgen Klute, Alda Sousa

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 56

Motion for a resolution

56. Recognizes the need for reaction to trans-regional threats of organised crime, trafficking, protection of critical infrastructure and threats to public health **and fight against terrorism**; however calls on the Commission to provide evidence why an increase of 50% is needed for these measures in 2013;

Amendment

56. Recognizes the need for reaction to trans-regional threats of organised crime, trafficking, protection of critical infrastructure and threats to public health; calls on the Commission to provide evidence why an increase of 50% is needed for these measures in 2013;

Or. en

Amendment 143
Derek Vaughan, Eider Gardiazábal Rubial

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 57 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

57a. Acknowledges that most institutions, including the European Parliament, have made an effort to restrict their administrative budgets to an increase below the expected inflation rate, excluding the cost of enlargement to Croatia; in this context, underlines the need for long term rationalisation of administrative resources and insists on the need to strengthen inter-institutional cooperation in areas such as human resources, translation, interpretation, buildings, and information technology;

Or. en

Amendment 144
Derek Vaughan, Eider Gardiazábal Rubial

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 58

Motion for a resolution

58. Stresses that **this** increase is mainly due to statutory or contractual obligations such as pensions or the salary adjustments; notes however that the Commission complied with and even overstepped its commitment to keep the nominal increase in the Commission's administrative appropriations under Heading 5 below the forecast inflation of 1,9%, as compared to 2012, as presented in the letter dated 23 January 2012 from the Commissioner for Budgets and Financial programming;

Amendment

58. Stresses that **the** increase **of 3.2% as compared to 2012** is mainly due to statutory or contractual obligations such as pensions or the salary adjustments; notes however that the Commission complied with and even overstepped its commitment to keep the nominal increase in the Commission's administrative appropriations under Heading 5 below the forecast inflation of 1,9%, as compared to 2012, as presented in the letter dated 23 January 2012 from the Commissioner for Budgets and Financial programming;

Or. en

Amendment 145
Jürgen Klute, Alda Sousa

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 59

Motion for a resolution

59. **Understands** that this was achieved through a reduction in the number of posts in its establishment plans by more than 1% already for 2013, notably in administrative support, budgetary management and anti-fraud, as well as through further cuts in other items of administrative expenditure; **requires further explanation as to the actual need to proceed to such staff reductions to freeze administrative expenditure in real terms, when Commission managed to freeze its administrative expenditure in nominal terms in 2012 without resorting to any**

Amendment

59. **Regrets** that this was achieved through a reduction in the number of posts in its establishment plans by more than 1% already for 2013, notably in administrative support, budgetary management and anti-fraud, as well as through further cuts in other items of administrative expenditure;

staff reduction;

Or. en

Amendment 146

George Lyon

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 59

Motion for a resolution

59. Understands that this was achieved through a reduction in the number of posts in its establishment plans by more than 1% already for 2013, notably in administrative support, budgetary management and anti-fraud, as well as through further cuts in other items of administrative expenditure; ***requires further explanation as to the actual need to proceed to such staff reductions to freeze administrative expenditure in real terms, when Commission managed to freeze its administrative expenditure in nominal terms in 2012 without resorting to any staff reduction;***

Amendment

59. Understands that this was achieved through a reduction in the number of posts in its establishment plans by more than 1% already for 2013, notably in administrative support, budgetary management and anti-fraud, as well as through further cuts in other items of administrative expenditure; ***believes that all institutions of the EU should share equally the efforts towards budget consolidation*** in administrative expenditure;

Or. en

Amendment 147

Jürgen Klute, Alda Sousa

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 60

Motion for a resolution

60. ***Welcomes*** this effort towards ***budget consolidation*** in administrative expenditure at a time of economic and budgetary constraints at national level; is ***however*** concerned about the adverse impact such measures may have on the

Amendment

60. ***Regrets*** this effort towards ***the decrease*** in administrative expenditure, ***it goes against the objectives of job creation and employment in the EU 2020 strategy, specially*** at a time of economic and budgetary constraints at national level; is

swift, regular and effective implementation of EU actions and programmes, especially at a time when EU competences keep increasing and new Member States join the Union; welcomes the presentation of those areas reinforced in staffing, such as European economic governance, Single Market, Security and Justice but requires similar information as to those policy areas and types of posts where cuts in staffing were made as compared to 2012;

concerned about the adverse impact such measures may have on the swift, regular and effective implementation of EU actions and programmes, especially at a time when EU competences keep increasing and new Member States join the Union; welcomes the presentation of those areas reinforced in staffing, such as European economic governance, Single Market, Security and Justice but requires similar information as to those policy areas and types of posts where cuts in staffing were made as compared to 2012;

Or. en

Amendment 148 **George Lyon**

Motion for a resolution **Paragraph 60**

Motion for a resolution

60. Welcomes this effort towards budget consolidation in administrative expenditure at a time of economic and budgetary constraints at national level; ***is however concerned about the adverse impact such measures may have on*** the swift, regular and effective implementation of EU actions and programmes, ***especially at a time when EU competences keep increasing and new Member States join the Union***; welcomes the presentation of those areas reinforced in staffing, such as European economic governance, Single Market, Security and Justice but requires similar information as to those policy areas and types of posts where cuts in staffing were made as compared to 2012;

Amendment

60. Welcomes this effort towards budget consolidation in administrative expenditure at a time of economic and budgetary constraints at national level; ***recognises the need for all EU institutions to share the efforts of this consolidation; acknowledges the need to maintain the*** swift, regular and effective implementation of EU actions and programmes ***by a modern administration based in particular on the need to reward performance and quality of service, taking into account geographical balance***; welcomes the presentation of those areas reinforced in staffing, such as European economic governance, Single Market, Security and Justice but requires similar information as to those policy areas and types of posts where cuts in staffing were made as compared to 2012;

Or. en

Amendment 149

Richard Ashworth

on behalf of the ECR Group

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 60

Motion for a resolution

60. Welcomes this effort towards budget consolidation in administrative expenditure at a time of economic and budgetary constraints at national level; ***is however concerned about the adverse impact such measures may have on the swift, regular and effective implementation of EU actions and programmes, especially at a time when EU competences keep increasing and new Member States join the Union***; welcomes the presentation of those areas reinforced in staffing, such as European economic governance, Single Market, Security and Justice but requires similar information as to those policy areas and types of posts where cuts in staffing were made as compared to 2012;

Amendment

60. Welcomes this effort towards budget consolidation in administrative expenditure at a time of economic and budgetary constraints at national level ***and considers that such consolidation must continue to be appropriately reflected throughout all administrative expenditure in 2013***; welcomes the presentation of those areas reinforced in staffing, such as European economic governance, Single Market, Security and Justice but requires similar information as to those policy areas and types of posts where cuts in staffing were made as compared to 2012;

Or. en

Amendment 150

Jürgen Klute, Alda Sousa

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 61

Motion for a resolution

61. Reiterates ***against this background*** that any ***such*** staff reduction ***should be based on*** a prior impact assessment and take full account of, inter alia, the Union's legal obligations, EU priorities, as well as the institutions' new competences and increased tasks arising from the treaties;

Amendment

61. Reiterates that ***before considering*** any staff reduction, a prior impact assessment ***has to be made*** and take full account of, inter alia, the Union's legal obligations, EU priorities, as well as the institutions' new competences and increased tasks arising from the treaties; stresses that ***within the***

stresses that such assessment should also take carefully into account the effects for the different directorates-general and services, given their size and workload notably, as well as on the different types of posts concerned as presented in Commission's annual screening of human resources (policy making, programmes management, administrative support, budgetary management and antifraud, linguistic, etc.);

EU 2020 growth, employment and social progress objectives, reassignment and job creation is to be prioritised; underlines that such assessment should also take carefully into account the effects for the different directorates-general and services, given their size and workload notably, as well as on the different types of posts concerned as presented in Commission's annual screening of human resources (policy making, programmes management, administrative support, budgetary management and antifraud, linguistic, etc.);

Or. en

Amendment 151

Richard Ashworth

on behalf of the ECR Group

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 62

Motion for a resolution

62. Emphasises that for many areas of EU action, sufficient staffing should be ensured in view of the stage of programmes' implementation, new priorities and other developments; will therefore carefully scrutinise the overall evolution of staff in the different DGs and services also in light of the priorities presented in this report; in addition to more detailed information in this regard, asks the Commission to proceed to such detailed assessment of the impact of the proposed across the board staff cuts, also taking into account in the longer run any further reduction in Commission's staffing, and to report back to the Parliament; insists that this would be a prerequisite *for* the ***budgetary authority to consider accepting, depending of its outcome, this 1% staff reduction and possibly*** endorse Commission's objective to reduce, by

Amendment

62. Emphasises that for many areas of EU action, sufficient staffing should be ensured in view of the stage of programmes' implementation, new priorities and other developments; will therefore carefully scrutinise the overall evolution of staff in the different DGs and services also in light of the priorities presented in this report; in addition to more detailed information in this regard, asks the Commission to proceed to such detailed assessment of the impact of the proposed across the board staff cuts, also taking into account in the longer run any further reduction in Commission's staffing, and to report back to the Parliament; insists that this would be a prerequisite *to ensure cuts are made in the most appropriate services in order* to endorse *the* Commission's objective to reduce, by 2018, the staffing

2018, the staffing level in the Commission by 5% *as compared to 2013*;

level in the Commission by 5%;

Or. en

Amendment 152

Eider Gardiazábal Rubial

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 62

Motion for a resolution

62. Emphasises that for many areas of EU action, sufficient staffing should be ensured in view of the stage of programmes' implementation, new priorities and other developments; will therefore carefully scrutinise the overall evolution of staff in the different DGs and services also in light of the priorities presented in this report; in addition to more detailed information in this regard, asks the Commission to proceed to such detailed assessment of the impact of the proposed across the board staff cuts, also taking into account in the longer run any further reduction in Commission's staffing, and to report back to the Parliament; insists that this would be a prerequisite for the budgetary authority to consider accepting, depending of its outcome, *this* 1% staff reduction *and possibly endorse Commission's objective to reduce, by 2018, the staffing level in the Commission by 5% as compared to 2013*;

Amendment

62. Emphasises that for many areas of EU action, sufficient staffing should be ensured in view of the stage of programmes' implementation, new priorities and other developments; will therefore carefully scrutinise the overall evolution of staff in the different DGs and services also in light of the priorities presented in this report; in addition to more detailed information in this regard, asks the Commission to proceed to such detailed assessment of the impact of the proposed across the board staff cuts, also taking into account in the longer run any further reduction in Commission's staffing, and to report back to the Parliament; insists that this would be a prerequisite for the budgetary authority to consider accepting, depending of its outcome, *the* 1% staff reduction *for* 2013;

Or. en

Amendment 153

Franziska Katharina Brantner

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 62 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

62a. Takes the view that questions remain about the high number of costly management positions at high grade levels among the staff of the European External Action Service; therefore requests the EEAS to provide additional information in particular regarding the significant increase (+9.2%) in AD 14 posts proposed in the draft budget; requests likewise further information on the large increases in proposed appropriations for security and surveillance of buildings (+57.2%);

Or. en

Amendment 154

Franziska Katharina Brantner

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 62 b (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

62b. Is convinced that prevention and mediation are among the most cost-efficient ways to manage conflicts by preventing them from escalating into violence; welcomes therefore the proposal to introduce a budget line amounting to EUR 500 000 for Conflict Prevention and Mediation Support Services in the EEAS budget, following the successful completion at the end of this year of a preparatory action proposed by the European Parliament;

Or. en

Amendment 155

Richard Ashworth

PE489.697v01-00

94/101

AM\904206EN.doc

on behalf of the ECR Group

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 63

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

63. Takes the view that the European Schools should be adequately funded in the interests of addressing the specific situation of the children of agents of the EU institutions; takes note of the proposed overall allocation of 180,7 million, which is a 6,8% increase as compared to 2012, and above the Financial programming amounts; will nonetheless carefully scrutinise each of the European Schools' budget lines, and make, during its reading, any modification it considers appropriate in this respect;

deleted

Or. en

Amendment 156
Jürgen Klute, Alda Sousa

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 63

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

63. Takes the view that the European Schools **should** be adequately funded in the interests of addressing the specific situation of the children of agents of the EU institutions; takes note of the proposed overall allocation of 180,7 million, which is a 6,8% increase as compared to 2012, **and** above the Financial programming amounts; **will nonetheless carefully scrutinise each of the European Schools' budget lines, and make, during its reading, any modification it considers appropriate in this respect;**

63. Reiterates that the European Schools **must** be adequately funded in the interests of addressing the specific situation of the children of agents of the EU institutions; **underlines the need to enhance the support to multicultural pedagogical programmes and to reinforce intercultural projects;** takes note of the proposed overall allocation of 180,7 million, which is a 6,8% increase as compared to 2012, above the Financial programming amounts;

Amendment 157

Jutta Haug

on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 64

Motion for a resolution

64. Stresses the importance of pilot projects and preparatory actions as key tools for the formulation of political priorities and for paving the way for new initiatives that might turn into EU activities and programmes improving the lives of EU citizens; intends to proceed to the identification of a balanced package of PP-PAs based on the Commission's assessment and carefully considering the sustainability and durability of the aimed results produced;

Amendment

64. Stresses the importance of pilot projects and preparatory actions as key tools for the formulation of political priorities and for paving the way for new **long-term** initiatives **both at regional and EU level** that might turn into EU activities and programmes improving the lives of EU citizens; intends to proceed to the identification of a balanced package of PP-PAs based on the Commission's assessment and **recommendations and** carefully considering the sustainability and durability of the aimed results produced;

Amendment 158

Claudio Morganti

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 69

Motion for a resolution

69. Is however worried that for the first time the Commission cut the budgetary requests of almost all agencies, which were in line with Financial programming amounts overall, including of those agencies which belong to Parliament's priorities, for a total amount of some EUR 44 million; will carefully analyse the methodology, rationale and possible

Amendment

deleted

impact of such cuts; Underlines once more that EU agencies' budget allocations are far from consisting in administrative expenditure alone, but instead contribute to achieving the Europe 2020 goals and EU objectives in general, as decided by the legislative authority;

Or. en

Amendment 159
Marta Andreasen

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 69

Motion for a resolution

69. *Is however worried* that for the first time the Commission cut the budgetary requests of almost all agencies, *which were in line with Financial programming amounts overall, including of those agencies which belong to Parliament's priorities, for a total amount of some EUR 44 million; will carefully analyse the methodology, rationale and possible impact of such cuts; Underlines once more that EU agencies' budget allocations are far from consisting in administrative expenditure alone, but instead contribute to achieving the Europe 2020 goals and EU objectives in general, as decided by the legislative authority;*

Amendment

69. *Welcomes the fact* that for the first time the Commission *proposes to* cut the budgetary requests of almost all agencies;

Or. en

Amendment 160
Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy, Alexander Alvaro

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 69

Motion for a resolution

69. ***Is however worried*** that for the first time the Commission cut the budgetary requests of almost all agencies, which were in line with Financial programming amounts overall, including of those agencies which belong to Parliament's priorities, for a total amount of some EUR 44 million; ***will carefully analyse*** the methodology, rationale and possible impact of such cuts; Underlines once more that EU agencies' budget allocations are far from consisting in administrative expenditure alone, but instead contribute to achieving the Europe 2020 goals and EU objectives in general, as decided by the legislative authority;

Amendment

69. ***Notes*** that for the first time the Commission cut the budgetary requests of almost all agencies, which were in line with Financial programming amounts overall, including of those agencies which belong to Parliament's priorities, for a total amount of some EUR 44 million; ***recalls that a careful analysis of*** the methodology, rationale and possible impact of such cuts ***is necessary with regard to several resolutions, the most recent being the 2010 discharge, which stress that the current review of the agencies by the IWG should lead to structural improvements in both the impact and cost-efficiency of the agencies, including by identifying areas of duplication and overlap amongst existing agencies***; Underlines once more that EU agencies' budget allocations are far from consisting in administrative expenditure alone, but instead contribute to achieving the Europe 2020 goals and EU objectives in general, as decided by the legislative authority;

Or. en

Amendment 161

Gesine Meissner, Dominique Riquet, Eider Gardiazábal Rubial, Isabelle Durant, Roberts Zile, Jaromír Kohlíček

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 69

Motion for a resolution

69. Is however worried that for the first time the Commission cut the budgetary requests of almost all agencies, which were in line with Financial programming amounts overall, including of those agencies which belong to Parliament's priorities, for a total amount of some EUR

Amendment

69. Is however worried that for the first time the Commission cut the budgetary requests of almost all agencies, which were in line with Financial programming amounts overall, including of those agencies which belong to Parliament's priorities, for a total amount of some EUR

44 million; will carefully analyse the methodology, rationale and possible impact of such cuts; Underlines once more that EU agencies' budget allocations are far from consisting in administrative expenditure alone, but instead contribute to achieving the Europe 2020 goals and EU objectives in general, as decided by the legislative authority;

44 million; will carefully analyse the methodology, rationale and possible impact of such cuts; Underlines once more that EU agencies' budget allocations are far from consisting in administrative expenditure alone, but instead contribute to achieving the Europe 2020 goals and EU objectives in general, **while aiming at making savings at national level**, as decided by the legislative authority;

Or. en

Amendment 162

Jürgen Klute, Alda Sousa

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 69

Motion for a resolution

69. Is however worried that for the first time the Commission cut the budgetary requests of almost all agencies, which were in line with Financial programming amounts overall, including of those agencies which belong to Parliament's priorities, for a total amount of some EUR 44 million; will carefully analyse the methodology, rationale and possible impact of such cuts; Underlines once more that EU agencies' budget allocations are far from consisting in administrative expenditure alone, but instead contribute to achieving the Europe 2020 goals and EU objectives in general, as decided by the legislative authority;

Amendment

69. Is however worried that for the first time the Commission cut the budgetary requests of almost all agencies, which were in line with Financial programming amounts overall, including of those agencies which belong to Parliament's priorities, for a total amount of some EUR 44 million; will carefully analyse the methodology, rationale and possible impact of such cuts; Underlines once more that EU agencies' budget allocations are far from consisting in administrative expenditure alone, but instead contribute to achieving the Europe 2020 goals and EU objectives in general, **in particular job creation, employment and social progress** as decided by the legislative authority;

Or. en

Amendment 163

Richard Ashworth

on behalf of the ECR Group

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 69 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

69a. Believes that when the ESAs are given additional tasks in the future there should be a cost assessment made at a suitable stage during the legislative process such as during trilogue negotiations in order for MEPs and Member States understand the cost consequences of the proposals they are making;

Or. en

Amendment 164
Giovanni La Via

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 69 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

69a. Considers the following issues to be specific interest for the trilogue due to take place on 9 July 2012:

- support to growth, competitiveness and employment, particularly for SMEs and youth, in the budget 2013,**
- sufficient level of payment appropriations to cover the increasing needs of running projects, in particular under headings 1a, 1b and 2 , at the end of the programming period,**
- the problem of outstanding commitments (RAL)**
- amending budget in 2012, in order to cover past and current payment needs and avoid shifting 2012 payments to 2013 as was the case this year,**

- *sufficient level of commitment appropriations - more Europe in the times of crisis,*
- *interinstitutional meeting on payments,*
- *financing of ITER in budget 2013,*
- *discrepancy between financial programming and DB2013 on Heading 4;*

Or. en