



2018/2597(RSP)

6.3.2018

AMENDMENTS

1 - 71

Draft question for oral answer

**Dubravka Šuica, Nicola Caputo, Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy, Stefan Eck,
Marco Affronte, Mireille D'Ornano, Bolesław G. Piecha**

Mid-term evaluation of the LIFE programme
(2018/2597(RSP))

Amendment 1
Mireille D'Ornano

Draft motion for a resolution
Recital A

Draft motion for a resolution

A. whereas the LIFE programme **contributes** to sustainable development and to the achievement of the objectives and targets of the Europe 2020 Strategy, the 7th Union Environmental Action Programme and other relevant EU environment and climate strategies and foresees addressing challenges such as halting the loss of biodiversity or reducing the costs of inaction related to the consequences and effects of climate change;

Amendment

A. whereas the LIFE programme **is supposed to contribute** to sustainable development and to the achievement of the objectives and targets of the Europe 2020 Strategy, the 7th Union Environmental Action Programme and other relevant EU environment and climate strategies and foresees addressing challenges such as halting the loss of biodiversity or reducing the costs of inaction related to the consequences and effects of climate change;

Or. fr

Amendment 2
Merja Kyllönen, Stefan Eck

Draft motion for a resolution
Recital A a (new)

Draft motion for a resolution

Aa. whereas the LIFE programme plays an important role in promoting environmental priorities by financing projects that demonstrate holistic solutions for complex and interlinked problems in variety of land use activities including agriculture and works alongside agri-environmental-climate measures under the CAP on numerous Natura 2000 sites;

Amendment

Or. en

Amendment 3
Dubravka Šuica

Draft motion for a resolution
Recital B

Draft motion for a resolution

B. whereas the mid-term evaluation provides a first overview on the changes implemented and *concludes* that the **LIFE programme is on track to be effective as it is well placed to meet its targets and deliver on environmental and climate objectives**;

Amendment

B. whereas the mid-term evaluation provides **only** a first overview on the changes implemented and **whereas the external independent evaluation provides reasonable assurance** that the **programme's implementation is progressing in the right direction**;

Or. en

Amendment 4
Mireille D'Ornano

Draft motion for a resolution
Recital B

Draft motion for a resolution

B. whereas the mid-term evaluation provides a first overview **on** the changes implemented and concludes that the LIFE programme **is on track to be effective as it is well placed to meet** its targets and **deliver** on environmental and climate objectives;

Amendment

B. whereas the mid-term evaluation provides a first overview **of** the changes implemented and concludes that the LIFE programme **could** be effective **if it meets** its targets and **if it delivers** on environmental and climate objectives;

Or. fr

Amendment 5
Dubravka Šuica

Draft motion for a resolution
Recital B a (new)

Draft motion for a resolution

Amendment

Ba. whereas the mid-term evaluation report identifies weaknesses; such as the need to have more strategic focus with the possibility of addressing Union environmental and climate policy issues depended on the quality and quantity of the applications received; such as that the application process and reporting obligations need to be simplified; such as that the objectives of certain strands need to be better defined, which is especially the case with environmental policy and governance and information and communication as well as a deeper focus on implementing and creating multipliers to improve the utilisation of project results and the transfer of know-how; such as the need to be more complementarity and synergies with other EU Funds;

Or. en

Amendment 6 **Dubravka Šuica**

Draft motion for a resolution **Recital C**

Draft motion for a resolution

C. whereas the mid-term evaluation reports recognises that most projects have yet to begin and few projects have been completed (the average duration of a LIFE project is 4 to 5 years), claiming that a full analysis of the long-term effect of LIFE, as required by the LIFE Regulation on Article 15(2) and 9, is premature at this stage; which has led to the fact that the mid-term evaluation has focused mainly on the processes put in place, ongoing activities (such as projects already financed) and, where relevant their anticipated results;

Amendment

C. whereas the mid-term evaluation reports recognises that most projects have yet to begin and few projects have been completed (the average duration of a LIFE project is 4 to 5 years), claiming that a full analysis of the long-term effect of LIFE, as required by the LIFE Regulation on Article 15(2) and 9, is premature at this stage; which has led to the fact that the mid-term evaluation has focused mainly on the processes put in place, ongoing activities (such as **contracts and** projects already financed) and, where relevant their anticipated results;

Or. en

Amendment 7
Mireille D'Ornano

Draft motion for a resolution
Recital C

Draft motion for a resolution

C. whereas the mid-term evaluation reports *recognises* that most projects have yet to begin and few projects have been completed (the average duration of a LIFE project is 4 to 5 years), claiming that a full analysis of the long-term effect of LIFE, as required *by the LIFE Regulation on Article 15(2) and 9, is* premature at this stage; which has led to the fact that the mid-term evaluation has focused mainly on the processes put in place, ongoing activities (such as projects already financed) and, where relevant their anticipated results;

Amendment

C. whereas the mid-term evaluation reports *recognise* that most projects have yet to begin and few projects have been completed (the average duration of a LIFE project is 4 to 5 years), claiming that a full analysis of the long-term effect of LIFE, as required *under Article 15(2) and Article 9 of the LIFE Regulation, is largely* premature at this stage; which has led to the fact that the mid-term evaluation has focused mainly on the processes put in place, ongoing activities (such as projects already financed) and, where relevant their anticipated results;

Or. fr

Amendment 8
Luke Ming Flanagan

Draft motion for a resolution
Recital C

Draft motion for a resolution

C. whereas the mid-term evaluation reports *recognises* that most projects have yet to begin and few projects have been completed (the average duration of a LIFE project is 4 to 5 years), claiming that a full analysis of the long-term effect of LIFE, as required by the LIFE Regulation on Article 15(2) and 9, is premature at this stage; which has led to the fact that the mid-term evaluation has focused mainly on the processes put in place, ongoing activities

Amendment

C. whereas the mid-term evaluation reports *recognise* that most projects have yet to begin and few projects have been completed (the average duration of a LIFE project is 4 to 5 years), claiming that a full analysis of the long-term effect of LIFE, as required by the LIFE Regulation on Article 15(2) and 9, is premature at this stage, which has led to the fact that the mid-term evaluation has focused mainly on the processes put in place, ongoing activities

(such as projects already financed) and, where relevant their anticipated results;

(such as projects already financed) and - where relevant - their anticipated results;

Or. en

Amendment 9

Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy, Fredrick Federley, Frédérique Ries

Draft motion for a resolution

Recital C

Draft motion for a resolution

C. whereas the mid-term evaluation reports recognises that most projects have yet to begin and few projects have been completed (the average duration of a LIFE project is 4 to 5 years), ***claiming*** that a full analysis of the long-term effect of LIFE, as required ***by*** the LIFE Regulation ***on Article 15(2) and 9***, is premature at this stage; ***which has led to the fact that*** the mid-term evaluation has focused mainly on the processes put in place, ongoing activities (such as projects already financed) and, where relevant their anticipated results;

Amendment

C. whereas the mid-term evaluation reports recognises that most projects have yet to begin and few projects have been completed (the average duration of a LIFE project is 4 to 5 years), ***meaning*** that a full analysis of the long-term effect of LIFE, as required ***under Article 27 of*** the LIFE Regulation, is premature at this stage; ***as a consequence*** the mid-term evaluation has focused mainly on the processes put in place, ongoing activities (such as projects already financed) and, where relevant their anticipated results;

Or. en

Amendment 10

Stefan Eck

Draft motion for a resolution

Recital D

Draft motion for a resolution

D. whereas the LIFE programme also consists of a new category of projects, jointly funded integrated projects, which will operate on a large territorial scale. These projects aim to implement environmental and climate policy and better integrate such policy aims into other

Amendment

D. whereas the LIFE programme also consists of a new category of projects, jointly funded integrated projects, which will operate on a large territorial scale. These projects aim to implement environmental and climate policy and better integrate such policy aims into other

policy areas;

policy areas; *the projects financed should contribute to the fulfilment of updated and strengthened EU2020 objectives in a measurable way;*

Or. en

Amendment 11
Stefan Eck

Draft motion for a resolution
Recital D a (new)

Draft motion for a resolution

Amendment

Da. whereas it is essential that LIFE programme unlocks private finance to protect the environment, fight climate change and provide cleaner energy to citizens as it is important for European companies to increase their responsibility regarding all aspects of the environment and to adapt their practices to cause less environmental damage; thus, harnessing this awakening responsibility within the corporate sector should therefore be a key element in LIFE programme strategies for achieving the goal of sustainable development;

Or. en

Amendment 12
Stefan Eck

Draft motion for a resolution
Recital D b (new)

Draft motion for a resolution

Amendment

Db. whereas green investment in sustainable development and in green innovation generates societal benefits and is more likely to respect the ecological

limits of our planet, it will facilitate the transition to a more sustainable European economy and will increase the quality of public health;

Or. en

Amendment 13

Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy, Fredrick Federley, Frédérique Ries

Draft motion for a resolution

Paragraph 1

Draft motion for a resolution

1. Stresses that final conclusions cannot be properly drawn as there is an insufficient amount of information and data available within the mid-term evaluation report; looks forward to the preparation of an impact assessment on a continued LIFE programme post-2020;

Amendment

1. Stresses that final conclusions cannot be properly drawn as there is an insufficient amount of information and data available within the mid-term evaluation report; looks forward to the preparation of an impact assessment on a continued LIFE programme post-2020; *Stresses that final conclusions about the implementation of the LIFE programme cannot yet be properly drawn as there is an insufficient amount of information and data available within the mid-term evaluation report; therefore calls on the Commission to continue to regularly monitor and report on the implementation and to inform Parliament about the conclusions; looks forward to a proposal for a continued LIFE programme post-2020 based on an impact assessment and on the lessons drawn from the previous programmes;*

Or. en

Amendment 14

Mireille D'Ornano

Draft motion for a resolution

Paragraph 1

Draft motion for a resolution

1. Stresses that final conclusions cannot be properly drawn as there is an insufficient amount of information and data available within the mid-term evaluation report; looks forward to the preparation of an impact assessment on a continued LIFE programme post-2020;

Amendment

1. Stresses that final conclusions cannot be properly drawn ***under any circumstances*** as there is an insufficient amount of information and data available within the mid-term evaluation report; looks forward to the preparation of an impact assessment on a continued LIFE programme post-2020;

Or. fr

Amendment 15
Luke Ming Flanagan

Draft motion for a resolution
Paragraph 1

Draft motion for a resolution

1. Stresses that final conclusions cannot be properly drawn as there is an insufficient amount of information and data available within the mid-term evaluation report; looks forward to the preparation of an impact assessment on a continued LIFE programme post-2020;

Amendment

1. Stresses that final conclusions cannot be properly drawn as there *is* an insufficient amount of information and data available within the mid-term evaluation report; looks forward to the preparation of an impact assessment on a continued LIFE programme post-2020;

Or. en

Amendment 16
Nicola Caputo, Marco Affronte

Draft motion for a resolution
Paragraph 1 a (new)

Draft motion for a resolution

Amendment

1a. Believes that there is a need to focus on existing and new priorities: the circular economy, delivery of the 2030 climate and energy framework especially by encouraging innovation, the

implementation of the Paris Agreement, the possible review of the EU adaptation strategy, the achievement of the objectives of the Nature Directives, the implementation of the 2030 Agenda and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), within available financial resources; highlights that these priorities should be addressed through fine-tuning the financing per priority area;

Or. en

Amendment 17
Marco Affronte

Draft motion for a resolution
Paragraph 1 a (new)

Draft motion for a resolution

Amendment

1a. Recognises the importance of the LIFE programme to contribute to the development of EU environmental and climate policy notwithstanding the criticisms examined in the mid-term evaluation. Calls on the Member States and the Commission to enhance the role of the LIFE programme in the European agenda and to face correctly the lack of efficiency and effectiveness of the programme by improving its functioning mechanics and procedures;

Or. en

Amendment 18
Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy, Fredrick Federley, Frédérique Ries

Draft motion for a resolution
Paragraph 1 a (new)

Draft motion for a resolution

Amendment

1a. Welcomes the conclusions of the mid-term evaluation showing that based on the available information the LIFE programme is well on track to deliver its objectives, in particular in terms of delivering EU added value, providing value for money, and achieving concrete and measurable environmental impacts;

Or. en

Amendment 19
Dubravka Šuica

Draft motion for a resolution
Paragraph 1 a (new)

Draft motion for a resolution

Amendment

1a. Is of the opinion, that the evaluation report shows a number of key shortcomings which should be addressed by the Commission as soon as possible in order to guarantee the efficient and effective implementation of LIFE;

Or. en

Amendment 20
Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy, Carolina Punset, Fredrick Federley, Frédérique Ries

Draft motion for a resolution
Paragraph 1 b (new)

Draft motion for a resolution

Amendment

1b. Underlines that LIFE is the only programme dedicated specifically to environment and climate action and that it plays an important role in supporting the implementation of Union legislation in these areas;

Or. en

Amendment 21

Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy, Carolina Punset, Fredrick Federley, Frédérique Ries

Draft motion for a resolution

Paragraph 1 c (new)

Draft motion for a resolution

Amendment

1c. Calls on the Commission to propose a new LIFE programme for 2021 onwards specifically dedicated to environment and climate change and building on the long experience of previous LIFE programmes;

Or. en

Amendment 22

Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy, Carolina Punset, Fredrick Federley, Frédérique Ries

Draft motion for a resolution

Paragraph 1 d (new)

Draft motion for a resolution

Amendment

1d. Supports the conclusions of the mid-term evaluation that LIFE can provide a positive contribution to the EU economy by supporting the development of best practices, incentivising sustainable technologies and delivering close-to-market solutions that can be up-scaled; calls on the Commission to keep a continued focus on projects that can be replicated and transferred in order to maximise the EU added value, and to encourage projects that are investment-ready and economically viable;

Or. en

Amendment 23

Mireille D'Ornano

Draft motion for a resolution

Paragraph 2

Draft motion for a resolution

2. **Regrets** that two Member States share more than a third of the entire LIFE budget for traditional grants for 2014 and 2015, leading to an uneven distribution of funds among Member States **and confirming that national allocations are not effective in ensuring a more balanced distribution of projects; Considers it therefore necessary that** new, effective mechanisms **are** to ensure a more equitable distribution and greater effectiveness of LIFE funds between Member States need to be further developed in order to boost Member States' capacity to submit more good quality projects and provide a better geographical balance of the integrated projects;

Amendment

2. **Points out** that two Member States share more than a third of the entire LIFE budget for traditional grants for 2014 and 2015, leading to **what could be seen as** an uneven distribution of funds among Member States; **considers, therefore, that consideration could be given to introducing** new, effective mechanisms to ensure a more equitable distribution and greater effectiveness of LIFE funds between Member States need to be further developed in order to boost Member States' capacity to submit more good quality projects and provide a better geographical balance of the integrated projects;

Or. fr

Amendment 24

Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy, Frédérique Ries

Draft motion for a resolution

Paragraph 2

Draft motion for a resolution

2. Regrets that two Member States share more than a third of the entire LIFE budget for traditional grants for 2014 and 2015, leading to an uneven distribution of funds among Member States and confirming that national allocations **are not** effective in ensuring a **more** balanced distribution of projects; Considers it **therefore** necessary **that new**, effective mechanisms **are** to ensure a more equitable distribution **and greater effectiveness** of

Amendment

2. Regrets that two Member States share more than a third of the entire LIFE budget for traditional grants for 2014 and 2015, leading to an uneven distribution of funds among Member States and confirming that national allocations **have not been** effective in ensuring a balanced distribution of projects; **welcomes the phasing out of national allocations in the second multiannual work programme as foreseen by the LIFE Regulation;**

LIFE funds between Member States *need to be further developed in order* to boost Member States' capacity to submit more *good* quality projects *and* provide a better geographical balance of the integrated projects;

considers it necessary *to develop more* effective mechanisms to ensure a more equitable distribution of LIFE funds between Member States *and* to boost Member States' capacity to submit more *high* quality projects *as well as to* provide a better geographical balance of the integrated projects;

Or. en

Amendment 25 **Dubravka Šuica**

Draft motion for a resolution **Paragraph 2**

Draft motion for a resolution

2. Regrets that two Member States share more than a third of the entire LIFE budget for traditional grants for 2014 and 2015, leading to an uneven distribution of funds among Member States and confirming that national allocations are not effective in ensuring a more balanced distribution of projects; Considers it therefore necessary that new, effective mechanisms *are to* ensure a more equitable distribution and greater effectiveness of LIFE funds between Member States need to be further developed in order to boost Member States' capacity to submit more good quality projects and provide a better geographical balance of the integrated projects;

Amendment

2. Regrets that two Member States share more than a third of the entire LIFE budget for traditional grants for 2014 and 2015, leading to an uneven distribution of funds among Member States and confirming that national allocations are not effective in ensuring a more balanced distribution of projects; Considers it therefore necessary that new, effective mechanisms *that will* ensure a more equitable distribution and greater effectiveness of LIFE funds between Member States need to be further developed in order to boost Member States' capacity to submit more good quality projects and provide a better geographical balance of the integrated projects;

Or. en

Amendment 26 **Pilar Ayuso**

Draft motion for a resolution

Paragraph 2

Draft motion for a resolution

2. Regrets that two Member States share more than a third of the entire LIFE budget for traditional grants for 2014 and 2015, leading to an uneven distribution of funds among Member States and confirming that national allocations are not effective in ensuring a more balanced distribution of projects; **Considers it therefore necessary that new, effective mechanisms are to ensure a more equitable distribution and greater effectiveness of LIFE funds between Member States need to be further developed in order to** boost Member States' capacity to submit **more good** quality projects and provide a better geographical balance of the integrated projects;

Amendment

2. Regrets that two Member States share more than a third of the entire LIFE budget for traditional grants for 2014 and 2015, leading to an uneven distribution of funds among Member States and confirming that national allocations are not effective in ensuring a more balanced distribution of projects; **considers, therefore, that selecting projects on the basis of their merits will make it possible to ensure more equitable distribution, increase the effectiveness of LIFE funds between Member States, boost Member States' capacity to submit better quality projects and provide a better geographical balance of the integrated projects;**

Or. es

Amendment 27 Luke Ming Flanagan

Draft motion for a resolution Paragraph 2

Draft motion for a resolution

2. Regrets that two Member States share more than a third of the entire LIFE budget for traditional grants for 2014 and 2015, **leading to an uneven** distribution of funds among Member States **and** confirming that national allocations are not effective in ensuring a more balanced distribution of projects; **Considers it therefore necessary that new, effective mechanisms are to ensure a more equitable distribution and greater effectiveness of LIFE funds between Member States need to be further developed** in order to boost

Amendment

2. Regrets that two Member States share more than a third of the entire LIFE budget for traditional grants for 2014 and 2015, **a major imbalance in the** distribution of funds among Member States, confirming that national allocations are not effective in ensuring a more balanced distribution of projects; **Considers it necessary therefore that new, effective mechanisms are put in place to ensure greater effectiveness and** a more equitable distribution of LIFE funds between Member States, in order to boost Member

Member States' capacity to submit more **good quality** projects and provide a better geographical balance of the integrated projects;

States' capacity to submit more **good-quality** projects and provide a better geographical balance of the integrated projects;

Or. en

Amendment 28

Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy, Carolina Punset, Fredrick Federley, Frédérique Ries

Draft motion for a resolution

Paragraph 3

Draft motion for a resolution

3. Recognises the importance of the integrated projects which serve as a catalyst to implement environmental **or** climate plans **or** strategies at regional, multi-regional or national level. Highlights also the importance of having international projects included in LIFE as environmental and climate issues often have a transboundary dimension. Considers that the scope and number of these projects should be increased in the future and that the Commission should ensure that integrated projects are selected on the basis of merit and should give an equal chance to all applicants;

Amendment

3. Recognises the importance of the integrated projects, which **support the implementation of EU environmental legislation and** serve as a catalyst to implement environmental **and** climate plans **and** strategies at regional, multi-regional or national level. Highlights also the importance of having international projects included in LIFE as environmental and climate issues often have a transboundary dimension. Considers that the scope and number of these projects should be increased in the future and that the Commission should ensure that integrated projects are selected on the basis of merit and should give an equal chance to all applicants;

Or. en

Amendment 29

Mireille D'Ornano

Draft motion for a resolution

Paragraph 3

Draft motion for a resolution

3. Recognises the importance of the

Amendment

3. Recognises the importance of the

integrated projects which serve as a catalyst to implement environmental or climate plans or strategies at regional, multi-regional or national level. **Highlights also** the importance of having international projects included in LIFE as environmental and climate issues often **have a transboundary** dimension. **Considers** that the scope and number of these projects should be increased in the future and that the Commission should ensure that integrated projects are selected on the basis of merit and should give an equal chance to all applicants;

integrated projects which serve as a catalyst to implement environmental or climate plans or strategies at regional, multi-regional or national level; **also highlights** the importance of having international projects included in LIFE as environmental and climate issues often, **by nature, have an international** dimension; **considers** that the scope and number of these projects should be increased in the future and that the Commission should ensure that integrated projects are selected on the basis of merit and should give an equal chance to all applicants;

Or. fr

Amendment 30 **Pilar Ayuso**

Draft motion for a resolution **Paragraph 3**

Draft motion for a resolution

3. Recognises the importance of the integrated projects which serve as a catalyst to implement environmental or climate plans or strategies at regional, multi-regional or national level. **Highlights also** the importance of having international projects included in LIFE as environmental and climate issues often have a transboundary dimension. **Considers** that **the scope and number of these projects should be increased** in the future **and that** the Commission should ensure that **integrated** projects are selected on the basis of merit **and should give** an equal chance **to all applicants**;

Amendment

3. Recognises the importance of the integrated projects which serve as a catalyst to implement environmental or climate plans or strategies at regional, multi-regional or national level; **also highlights** the importance of having international projects included in LIFE as environmental and climate issues often have a transboundary dimension; **considers** that, in the future, the Commission should ensure that **all** projects are selected on the basis of merit, **guaranteeing that applicants are given** an equal chance **and that the projects chosen are of a high quality**;

Or. es

Amendment 31

Merja Kyllönen, Stefan Eck

**Draft motion for a resolution
Paragraph 4**

Draft motion for a resolution

4. Underlines that reaching the full potential of these integrated projects depends on the availability of complementary finance, in particular from mainstreaming of environment and climate in the major EU financing instruments;

Amendment

4. Underlines that reaching the full potential of these integrated projects depends on the availability of complementary finance, in particular from mainstreaming of environment and climate in the major EU ***policies such as the CAP and cohesion policy and their*** financing instruments;

Or. en

**Amendment 32
Luke Ming Flanagan**

**Draft motion for a resolution
Paragraph 4**

Draft motion for a resolution

4. Underlines that reaching the full potential of these integrated projects depends on the availability of complementary finance, in particular from mainstreaming of environment and climate in the major EU financing instruments;

Amendment

4. Underlines that reaching the full potential of these integrated projects depends on the availability of complementary finance, in particular from mainstreaming of environment and climate ***elements*** in the major EU financing instruments;

Or. en

**Amendment 33
Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy, Carolina Punset, Fredrick Federley, Frédérique Ries**

**Draft motion for a resolution
Paragraph 4 a (new)**

Draft motion for a resolution

Amendment

4a. *Notes that the demand for funding traditional projects is very high, with a ratio of submitted proposals to projects awarded reaching 9 to 1, and that the demand for integrated projects has also significantly exceeded the available resources; believes that this shows the continued relevance of the LIFE programme;*

Or. en

Amendment 34
Marco Affronte

Draft motion for a resolution
Paragraph 5

Draft motion for a resolution

5. Stresses that LIFE has played a significant role in implementing Natura 2000 and the Birds and Habitats Directives in the Member States, and in increasing the general level of awareness concerning biodiversity at regional and local level;

Amendment

5. Stresses that LIFE has played a significant role in implementing Natura 2000 and the Birds and Habitats Directives in the Member States, and in increasing the general level of awareness concerning biodiversity at regional and local level; ***stresses that LIFE only receives 0.3% of the entire EU budget while its absorption rate is close to 100%, which suggest that the potential benefits of LIFE are largely limited by lack of funding and the Fitness Check of the Birds and Habitats Directive as well as the Special Report No 1/2017 by the European Court of Auditors have shown that both directives and the Natura 2000 network as such need to be better financed. Emphasizes that a substantial increase in LIFE post 2020 to 1% of the EU budget is needed for innovation and experimental approaches for biodiversity and climate protection, however, LIFE has to be complimented by a dedicated nature and biodiversity instrument within the next CAP in order to tackle large scale biodiversity decline and loss with the long-term measures needed for the***

*protection and management of the Natura
2000 network;*

Or. en

Amendment 35

Stefan Eck

Draft motion for a resolution

Paragraph 5 a (new)

Draft motion for a resolution

Amendment

5a. *Notes LIFE's high potential to help reducing dependence on an ecologically destructive economic model and to deploy economic capacities towards an economic model which addresses major challenges of our time such as the fight against climate change and overall environmental degradation.*

Or. en

Amendment 36

Annie Schreijer-Pierik

Draft motion for a resolution

Paragraph 5 a (new)

Draft motion for a resolution

Amendment

5a. *Emphasises that, in future, LIFE projects should devote more attention to ecosystem dynamics and changing natural values;*

Or. nl

Amendment 37

Nicola Caputo, Marco Affronte

Draft motion for a resolution
Paragraph 6

Draft motion for a resolution

6. Agrees with the report that ‘after-LIFE’ plans are a positive improvement and that a systematic follow-up of all projects to identify best practices, cost-saving measures and a comprehensive customised support for the most promising ones could allow the replication/sustainability potential to further elaborate;

Amendment

6. Agrees with the report that ‘after-LIFE’ plans are a positive improvement and that a systematic follow-up of all projects to identify best practices, cost-saving measures and a comprehensive customised support for the most promising ones could allow the replication/sustainability potential to further elaborate; ***notes that, in order to increase project transferability, it is essential to target obstacles preventing activities continuing after the project ends (such as lack of financial resources and capacity/human resources for investment planning), thereby developing a pipeline of projects for investment from other Union and private sector sources;***

Or. en

Amendment 38
Mireille D'Ornano

Draft motion for a resolution
Paragraph 6

Draft motion for a resolution

6. Agrees with the report that ‘after-LIFE’ plans ***are*** a positive improvement and that a systematic follow-up of all projects to identify best practices, cost-saving measures and a comprehensive customised support for the most promising ones could allow the replication/sustainability potential to further elaborate;

Amendment

6. Agrees with the report that ‘after-LIFE’ plans ***can be*** a positive improvement and that a systematic follow-up of all projects to identify best practices, cost-saving measures and a comprehensive customised support for the most promising ones could allow the replication/sustainability potential to further elaborate;

Or. fr

Amendment 39

Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy, Carolina Punset, Fredrick Federley, Frédérique Ries

Draft motion for a resolution

Paragraph 6

Draft motion for a resolution

6. Agrees with the report that ‘after-LIFE’ plans are a positive improvement and that a systematic follow-up of all projects to identify best practices, cost-saving measures and a comprehensive customised support for the most promising ones could allow the replication/sustainability potential to further *elaborate*;

Amendment

6. Agrees with the report that ‘after-LIFE’ plans are a positive improvement and that a systematic follow-up of all projects to identify best practices, cost-saving measures and a comprehensive customised support for the most promising ones could allow the replication/sustainability potential to *be* further *strengthened*;

Or. en

Amendment 40

Luke Ming Flanagan

Draft motion for a resolution

Paragraph 6

Draft motion for a resolution

6. Agrees with the report that ‘after-LIFE’ plans are a positive improvement and that a systematic follow-up of all projects to identify best practices, cost-saving measures and a comprehensive customised support for the most promising ones could allow the replication/sustainability potential to further *elaborate*;

Amendment

6. Agrees with the report that ‘after-LIFE’ plans are a positive improvement and that a systematic follow-up of all projects to identify best practices, cost-saving measures and a comprehensive customised support for the most promising ones could allow the replication/sustainability potential to further *expand*;

Or. en

Amendment 41

Mireille D'Ornano

Draft motion for a resolution

Paragraph 7

Draft motion for a resolution

7. Welcomes that the transfer of most of the grant management from the Commission to the executive agency **EASME** seems to be well on track and **it is expected to** produce an overall gain in efficiency, above the EUR 8.2 million gains initially planned for 2014-2020;

Amendment

7. Welcomes **the fact** that the transfer of most of the grant management from the Commission to the **EASME** executive agency seems to be well on track and **could** produce an overall gain in efficiency, above the EUR 8.2 million gains initially planned for 2014-2020;

Or. fr

Amendment 42 Stefan Eck

Draft motion for a resolution Paragraph 8

Draft motion for a resolution

8. Emphasises the need to reinforce the role of NGOs and civil society associations in proposing, designing and piloting the LIFE projects;

Amendment

8. Emphasises the need to reinforce the role of NGOs and civil society associations in proposing, designing and piloting the LIFE projects **and LIFE investment decisions; the participation of citizens through an active bottom-up involvement in LIFE projects is crucial to promote integrated, sustainable development at local and regional levels and will lead to a higher degree of public ownership;**

Or. en

Amendment 43 Annie Schreijer-Pierik

Draft motion for a resolution Paragraph 8

Draft motion for a resolution

8. Emphasises the need to reinforce

Amendment

8. Emphasises the need to reinforce

the role of NGOs and civil society *associations* in proposing, designing and piloting the LIFE projects;

the role of *land owners, active farmers*, NGOs and *other* civil society *stakeholders* in proposing, designing and piloting the LIFE projects, *and in implementation*;

Or. nl

Amendment 44
Annie Schreijer-Pierik

Draft motion for a resolution
Paragraph 8 a (new)

Draft motion for a resolution

Amendment

8a. Stresses the need for peer reviews, scientific counter-checking and consideration of practical knowledge in the development of proposals for LIFE projects, by means of best practices such as field labs, to which farmers and land owners must also be able to contribute;

Or. nl

Amendment 45
Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy, Carolina Punset, Frédérique Ries

Draft motion for a resolution
Paragraph 8 a (new)

Draft motion for a resolution

Amendment

8a. Welcomes the new pilot financial instruments under LIFE but takes note of the challenges highlighted by the mid-term evaluation; encourages the Commission to make further efforts to support the development of these innovative projects as a means of promoting models for sustainable finance;

Or. en

Amendment 46

Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy, Carolina Punset, Fredrick Federley, Frédérique Ries

Draft motion for a resolution

Paragraph 8 b (new)

Draft motion for a resolution

Amendment

8b. Emphasises that one of the strengths of the LIFE programme has always been its flexible structure and the involvement of a range of different stakeholders including SMEs, civil society, universities and national, regional and local authorities; welcomes the conclusion of the mid-term evaluation that these strengths have been maintained and calls on the Commission to further develop and strengthen these aspects in its upcoming proposal for a new LIFE programme after 2020;

Or. en

Amendment 47

Annie Schreijer-Pierik

Draft motion for a resolution

Paragraph 8 b (new)

Draft motion for a resolution

Amendment

8b. Urges the Commission to ensure that, when allocating LIFE funds to projects in which large grazing animals are used for management purposes, the welfare of those animals is guaranteed and it is not possible for large-scale starvation to occur in enclosed areas during periods of food shortage, if the grazing animals cannot move to areas where there is more food;

Or. nl

Amendment 48

Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy, Fredrick Federley, Frédérique Ries

Draft motion for a resolution

Subheading 2

Draft motion for a resolution

Amendment

Effectiveness of the programme

Efficiency of the programme

Or. en

Amendment 49

Marco Affronte

Draft motion for a resolution

Paragraph 9

Draft motion for a resolution

Amendment

9. Considers that the grant management procedures, in particular the application and reporting processes not only need to be simplified but also significantly accelerated;

9. Considers that the grant management procedures, in particular the application and reporting processes not only need to be simplified but also significantly accelerated; **welcomes the Commission's decision to introduce a two-stage application in the Environment sub-programme. Stresses that Projects targeting priority species should be awarded higher scores in the application procedure;**

Or. en

Amendment 50

Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy, Carolina Punset, Fredrick Federley, Frédérique Ries

Draft motion for a resolution

Paragraph 9

Draft motion for a resolution

Amendment

9. Considers that the grant

9. **Welcomes the conclusion that**

management procedures, in particular the application and reporting processes *not only* need to be simplified *but also significantly accelerated*;

LIFE is significantly less costly to manage than other comparable programmes; however considers that the grant management procedures, in particular the application and reporting processes need to be *further* simplified *and streamlined to reduce the administrative burden of applicants and accelerate the procedures*;

Or. en

Amendment 51
Pilar Ayuso

Draft motion for a resolution
Paragraph 9

Draft motion for a resolution

9. Considers that the grant management procedures, in particular the application and reporting processes not only need to be simplified but also significantly accelerated;

Amendment

9. Considers that the grant management procedures, in particular the application and reporting processes, not only need to be simplified but also significantly accelerated, *as long as the quality of the projects is maintained, and the use of funds continues to be monitored*;

Or. es

Amendment 52
Luke Ming Flanagan

Draft motion for a resolution
Paragraph 9

Draft motion for a resolution

9. Considers that the grant management procedures, in particular the application and reporting processes not only need to be simplified but also significantly accelerated;

Amendment

9. Considers that the grant management procedures, in particular the application and reporting processes, not only need to be simplified but also significantly accelerated;

Amendment 53
Nicola Caputo, Dubravka Šuica

Draft motion for a resolution
Paragraph 9 a (new)

Draft motion for a resolution

Amendment

9a. *Notes that, given that not all the originally envisaged simplification measures proposed have been introduced in the current LIFE Regulation, the scope and demand for simplification of LIFE procedures for grants remain, in particular for the submission of proposals and reporting;*

Or. en

Amendment 54
Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy, Carolina Punset, Fredrick Federley, Frédérique Ries

Draft motion for a resolution
Paragraph 9 a (new)

Draft motion for a resolution

Amendment

9a. *Notes the simplifications to the grant management procedures introduced in the 2018-2020 multiannual work programme, based on the outcome of the mid-term evaluation, and expects the Commission to report to the Parliament about the effects of these revisions;*

Or. en

Amendment 55
Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy, Carolina Punset, Fredrick Federley, Frédérique Ries

Draft motion for a resolution

Paragraph 9 b (new)

Draft motion for a resolution

Amendment

9b. *Welcomes the conclusion of the mid-term evaluation that the LIFE programme is well managed with a very low error rate; notes that this finding is preliminary and insists on the importance of a continued strict monitoring of funds;*

Or. en

Amendment 56

Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy, Carolina Punset, Frédérique Ries

Draft motion for a resolution

Paragraph 10

Draft motion for a resolution

Amendment

10. Calls on the Commission to improve the access to information regarding LIFE programme application and management at the national, regional and local level;

10. Calls on the Commission to improve ***communication about, and*** the access to, information regarding LIFE programme application and management at the national, regional and local level; ***encourages the Commission to strengthen the national contact points;***

Or. en

Amendment 57

Nicola Caputo, Marco Affronte, Dubravka Šuica

Draft motion for a resolution

Paragraph 10 a (new)

Draft motion for a resolution

Amendment

10a. *Notes that the national contact points need a stronger role to ensure a minimum level of service across Member States and a more proactive approach;*

Amendment 58
Mireille D'Ornano

Draft motion for a resolution
Paragraph 11

Draft motion for a resolution

11. Requests that each project should be accompanied by *a* communication strategy to better target audiences, deliver more objective-specific and target-specific key messages and ensure more structured coordination between players;

Amendment

11. Requests that each project should be accompanied by *an appropriate* communication strategy to better target audiences, deliver more objective-specific and target-specific key messages and ensure more structured coordination between players;

Or. fr

Amendment 59
Luke Ming Flanagan

Draft motion for a resolution
Paragraph 11

Draft motion for a resolution

11. Requests that each project should be accompanied by a communication strategy to better target audiences, deliver more objective-specific and target-specific key messages and ensure more structured coordination between players;

Amendment

11. Requests that each project should be accompanied by a communication strategy to better target audiences, deliver more objective-specific and target-specific key messages, and ensure more structured coordination between players;

Or. en

Amendment 60
Ulrike Müller

Draft motion for a resolution
Paragraph 11 a (new)

Draft motion for a resolution

Amendment

11a. *Stresses that the long-term success of projects depends on the support of and hence a good cooperation with land- and forest owners; therefore urges project leaders to include affected land- and forest-owners at all stages of project planning and implementation;*

Or. en

Amendment 61

Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy, Fredrick Federley, Frédérique Ries

Draft motion for a resolution

Paragraph 12

Draft motion for a resolution

Amendment

12. Regrets that at present the existing monitoring and reporting systems are focused exclusively at the project level, and recognises the importance of increasing the programme *performance* to strengthen the coherence of the *LIFE programme* objectives;

12. Regrets that at present the existing monitoring and reporting systems are focused exclusively at the project level, and recognises the importance of increasing the *strategic focus of the programme in order* to strengthen the coherence of the objectives of *LIFE*;

Or. en

Amendment 62

Stefan Eck

Draft motion for a resolution

Paragraph 12 a (new)

Draft motion for a resolution

Amendment

12a. *For better understanding the impact of Life programme and projects, a clear and well defined set of indicators should be established: smarter, greener, more inclusive indicators to support the Europe 2020 strategy; these would*

include a quality indicator with the application of performance audits on the supported projects to assess how green investments cover the externalised costs of pollution due to industrial activities; reducing or avoiding the huge environmental and social costs and externalities generated by our current economic model should be a clear priority set out for green investment under LIFE.

Or. en

Amendment 63

Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy, Fredrick Federley, Frédérique Ries

Draft motion for a resolution

Subheading 3

Draft motion for a resolution

Amendment

Efficiency of the programme

Effectiveness of the programme

Or. en

Amendment 64

Mireille D'Ornano

Draft motion for a resolution

Paragraph 13

Draft motion for a resolution

Amendment

13. Calls for further evidence of the effectiveness and efficiency of the projects, especially with regard to costs and savings, as they are expected to provide value for money;

13. Calls for further evidence of the effectiveness and efficiency of the projects, especially with regard to costs and savings, as they are expected to provide value for money; *stresses the need for an in-depth assessment of the beneficial effects of the programmes receiving support in the areas of the environment and combating climate change;*

Or. fr

Amendment 65

Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy, Carolina Punset, Jan Huitema, Fredrick Federley, Frédérique Ries

Draft motion for a resolution Paragraph 13

Draft motion for a resolution

13. Calls *for* further *evidence of* the effectiveness and efficiency of the projects, *especially with regard to costs and savings, as they are expected to provide* value for money;

Amendment

13. Calls *on the Commission to* further *monitor and report on* the effectiveness and efficiency of the projects, *using both qualitative and quantitative indicators, and carefully examining the possibilities for cost savings, with a focus on the delivery of* value for money *and environmental improvements as set out in Article 3 of the LIFE Regulation;*

Or. en

Amendment 66

Nicola Caputo, Marco Affronte, Dubravka Šuica

Draft motion for a resolution Paragraph 13

Draft motion for a resolution

13. Calls for further evidence of the effectiveness and efficiency of the projects, especially with regard to costs and *savings, as they* are expected to provide value for money;

Amendment

13. Calls for further evidence of the effectiveness and efficiency of the projects, especially with regard to costs and *benefits deriving from the good implementation of EU environment and climate action objectives, as the projects* are expected to provide value for money;

Or. en

Amendment 67

Merja Kyllönen, Stefan Eck

Draft motion for a resolution
Paragraph 13

Draft motion for a resolution

13. Calls for further evidence of the effectiveness and efficiency of the projects, especially with regard to costs and savings, as they are expected to provide value for money;

Amendment

13. Calls for further evidence of the effectiveness and efficiency of the projects, especially with regard to costs and savings, as they are expected to provide value for money ***and therefore calls for a clear and well-defined set of indicators to be established;***

Or. en

Amendment 68

Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy, Carolina Punset, Fredrick Federley, Frédérique Ries

Draft motion for a resolution
Paragraph 13 a (new)

Draft motion for a resolution

Amendment

13a. Notes that concrete results about the effectiveness of LIFE are not available at this stage; nevertheless welcomes the fact that preliminary analyses indicate that the programme is effective in delivering towards its objectives and that the target milestones are set to be achieved;

Or. en

Amendment 69

Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy, Carolina Punset, Jan Huitema, Fredrick Federley, Frédérique Ries

Draft motion for a resolution
Paragraph 13 b (new)

Draft motion for a resolution

Amendment

13b. Supports an enhancement of the results-orientation including through a

requirement to produce measurable effects on the environment and climate change in all projects under all priority areas; in this regard welcomes the changes included in the 2018-2020 multiannual work programme;

Or. en

Amendment 70

Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy, Carolina Punset, Fredrick Federley, Frédérique Ries

Draft motion for a resolution Paragraph 14

Draft motion for a resolution

14. Underlines that in order to achieve maximum *output of the EU financing, a similar project in a same place should not be financed from other EU budgetary sources. Programmes receiving financial assistance under the LIFE Programme shall not receive assistance from other Union financial instruments;*

Amendment

14. Underlines that in order to achieve maximum *EU added value of LIFE funding, the Commission must ensure complementarity with other EU funds and avoid overlaps with other Union financial instruments;*

Or. en

Amendment 71

Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy, Carolina Punset, Frédérique Ries

Draft motion for a resolution Paragraph 14 a (new)

Draft motion for a resolution

Amendment

14a. Recalls the general need to step up financing for biodiversity and for the Natura 2000 network; underlines that LIFE is the only EU programme investing directly in the protection of natural capital and an important instrument for the implementation of the Birds and Habitats Directives and the EU

biodiversity strategy; calls on the Commission to increase funding within LIFE to these objectives through the sub-programme for Environment and through the integrated projects, as highlighted inter alia in the Commission's Action Plan for nature, people and the economy (COM(2017)198);

Or. en