



2018/0166R(APP)

13.9.2018

AMENDMENTS

1 - 63

Draft opinion

Ivo Belet

(PE625.523v01-00)

Interim report on the Multiannual Financial Framework 2021-2027 –
Parliament's position with a view to an agreement
(2018/0166R(APP))

Amendment 1
Bas Eickhout

Draft opinion
Paragraph -1 (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

-1. Stresses the importance of, and the EU'S role in, preserving, protecting and improving the quality of the environment and tackling climate change, the degradation of ecosystems and biodiversity loss; Points out that the EU must deliver on its commitment to be a frontrunner in implementing the UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), which provide a global roadmap for more sustainable, equitable and prosperous societies within planetary boundaries; Recalls the EU's obligations under the Paris Agreement and the urgent need to transition to a low-carbon, sustainable circular economy;

Or. en

Amendment 2
Bas Eickhout

Draft opinion
Paragraph -1 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

-1 a. Believes that negotiations on Own Resources and the MFF 2021-2027, also in the context of Brexit, provide an opportunity to make the income side of the EU budget more sustainable and more transparent, to make the EU more autonomous and to ultimately make better use of the EU budget's transformative power; calls for a fundamental reform of the own resources system, to scrap all rebates and to introduce new funding sources that are fully in line with the Union's policies on, inter alia,

Amendment 3
Bas Eickhout

Draft opinion
Paragraph -1 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

-1 b. Calls a quadrupling for LIFE+ for the period 2021-2027 and for it to amount to at least 1% of the EU budget; Furthermore calls for LIFE+ to be broadened in scope to support local initiatives on renewable energy and energy efficiency; Calls for the establishment of dedicated envelopes for biodiversity and the management of the Natura 2000 network;

Amendment 4
Nicola Caputo

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

Amendment

1. Notes that a significant share of the proposed 50 % budget increase for LIFE+ for 2021-2027 is directed towards the new Clean Energy Transition sub-programme; supports the establishment of a comprehensive programme for energy transition, but considers that this should not be to the detriment of funding for nature and biodiversity, the circular economy, and climate adaptation and mitigation; reiterates, therefore, its call for the financial resources for these priorities to be doubled;

1. Notes that a significant share of the proposed 50 % budget increase for LIFE+ for 2021-2027 is directed towards the new Clean Energy Transition sub-programme; supports the establishment of a comprehensive programme for energy transition, but considers that this should not be to the detriment of funding for nature and biodiversity, the circular economy, and climate adaptation and mitigation; reiterates, therefore, its call for the financial resources for these priorities to be doubled; ***considers it 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;

Or. en

Amendment 5
Stefan Eck

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Notes that a significant share of the proposed 50 % budget increase for LIFE+ for 2021-2027 is directed towards the new Clean Energy Transition sub-programme; supports the establishment of a comprehensive programme for energy transition, but considers that this should not be to the detriment of funding for nature and biodiversity, the circular economy, and climate adaptation and mitigation; reiterates, therefore, its call for the financial resources for these priorities to be doubled;

Amendment

1. Notes that a significant share of the proposed 50 % budget increase for LIFE+ for 2021-2027 is directed towards the new Clean Energy Transition sub-programme; supports the establishment of a comprehensive programme for energy transition, but considers that this should not be to the detriment of funding for nature and biodiversity, the circular economy, and climate adaptation and mitigation; reiterates, therefore, its call for the financial resources for these priorities to be doubled; *besides, sufficient funds in the EU's direct payments to farmers should be allocated to climate action and the reduction of water and air pollution and environmental destruction generated by industrial farming and by intensive livestock production systems;*

Or. en

Amendment 6
Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy, Nils Torvalds

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Notes that a significant share of the proposed **50 %** budget increase for **LIFE+** for 2021-2027 is directed towards the new Clean Energy Transition sub-programme; supports the establishment of a comprehensive programme for energy transition, but considers that this should not be to the detriment of funding for nature and biodiversity, the circular economy, and climate adaptation and mitigation; reiterates, therefore, its call for the financial resources **for these priorities** to be doubled;

Amendment

1. ***Underlines that LIFE is the only programme dedicated specifically to environment and climate action and that it plays a crucial role in supporting the implementation of Union legislation in these areas;*** notes that a significant share of the proposed budget increase for **the LIFE Programme** for 2021-2027 is directed towards the new Clean Energy Transition sub-programme; supports the establishment of a comprehensive programme for **a clean** energy transition, but considers that this should not be to the detriment of funding for nature and biodiversity, the circular economy, and climate adaptation and mitigation; reiterates, therefore, its call for the financial resources **of the LIFE Programme** to be **at least** doubled;

Or. en

Amendment 7
Boleslaw G. Piecha

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Notes that a significant share of the proposed 50 % budget increase for LIFE+ for 2021-2027 is directed towards the new Clean Energy Transition sub-programme; supports the establishment of a comprehensive programme for energy transition, but considers that this should not be to the detriment of funding for nature and biodiversity, the circular economy, and climate adaptation and mitigation; **reiterates, therefore, its call for the financial resources for these priorities to be doubled;**

Amendment

1. Notes that a significant share of the proposed 50 % budget increase for LIFE+ for 2021-2027 is directed towards the new Clean Energy Transition sub-programme; supports the establishment of a comprehensive programme for energy transition, but considers that this should not be to the detriment of funding for nature and biodiversity, the circular economy, and climate adaptation and mitigation;

Or. en

Amendment 8
Giorgos Grammatikakis

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Notes that a significant share of the proposed 50 % budget increase for LIFE+ for 2021-2027 is directed towards the new Clean Energy Transition sub-programme; supports the establishment of a comprehensive programme for energy transition, but considers that this should not be to the detriment of funding for nature and biodiversity, the circular economy, and climate adaptation and mitigation; reiterates, therefore, its call for the financial resources for *these priorities* to be doubled;

Amendment

1. Notes that a significant share of the proposed 50 % budget increase for LIFE+ for 2021-2027 is directed towards the new Clean Energy Transition sub-programme; supports the establishment of a comprehensive programme for energy transition, but considers that this should not be to the detriment of funding for nature and biodiversity, the circular economy, and climate adaptation and mitigation; reiterates, therefore, its call for the financial resources for *LIFE+* to be doubled *with a budget of at least EUR 6.442 billion*;

Or. en

Amendment 9
Mireille D'Ornano

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Notes that a significant share of the proposed 50 % budget increase for LIFE+ for 2021-2027 is directed towards the new Clean Energy Transition sub-programme; supports the establishment of a comprehensive programme for energy transition, but considers that this should not be to the detriment of funding for nature and biodiversity, the circular economy, and climate adaptation and mitigation; reiterates, therefore, its call for the financial resources for these priorities to be doubled;

Amendment

1. Notes that a significant share of the proposed 50 % budget increase for LIFE+ for 2021-2027 is directed towards the new Clean Energy Transition sub-programme; supports the establishment of a comprehensive programme for energy transition, but considers that this should not be to the detriment of funding for *other essential topics such as* nature and biodiversity, the circular economy, and climate adaptation and mitigation; reiterates, therefore, its call for the financial resources for these priorities to be doubled;

Or. en

Amendment 10
Luke Ming Flanagan

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Notes that a significant share of the proposed 50 % budget increase for LIFE+ for 2021-2027 is directed towards the new Clean Energy Transition sub-programme; supports the establishment of a comprehensive programme for energy transition, but considers that this should not be to the detriment of funding for nature and biodiversity, the circular economy, and climate adaptation and mitigation; reiterates, therefore, its call for the financial resources for these priorities to be doubled;

Amendment

1. Notes that a significant share of the proposed 50 % budget increase for LIFE+ for 2021-2027 is directed towards the new Clean Energy Transition sub-programme; supports the establishment of a comprehensive programme for energy transition, but considers that this should not be to the detriment of funding for nature and biodiversity, the circular economy, and climate adaptation and mitigation; reiterates, therefore, its call for the financial resources for these priorities to be doubled, *at least*;

Or. en

Amendment 11
Stefan Eck

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

1 a. The Cohesion policy should also contribute to improving the health status of the European citizens; this should be translated in the legal basis of the cohesion programmes; the health status of the population should be taken into account when determining the funds regions receive; a share of the investments under this policy should be targeted at reducing health inequalities;

Or. en

Amendment 12
Stefan Eck

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

1 a. It is crucial to include a dedicated target for nature conservation & biodiversity spending;

Or. en

Amendment 13
Bas Eickhout

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

Amendment

2. Welcomes the proposed increase in the budget earmarked for Horizon Europe and, in particular, the dedicated envelopes for research and innovation in Health (EUR 6.83 billion), Climate, Energy and Mobility (EUR 13.31 billion), and Food and Natural Resources (EUR 8.87 billion); reiterates, however, its call for the 9th Framework Programme to be financed more heavily, with a budget of at least EUR 116.895 billion;

2. Welcomes the proposed increase in the budget earmarked for Horizon Europe and, in particular, the dedicated envelopes for research and innovation in Health (EUR 6.83 billion), Climate, Energy and Mobility (EUR 13.31 billion), and Food and Natural Resources (EUR 8.87 billion); reiterates, however, its call for the 9th Framework Programme to be financed more heavily, with a budget of at least EUR 116.895 billion; ***Calls for significant funding to be allocated to fundamental research into the environment, climate, health and food safety;***

Or. en

Amendment 14
Giorgos Grammatikakis

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

Amendment

2. **Welcomes** the proposed increase in the budget earmarked for Horizon Europe and, in particular, the dedicated envelopes for research and innovation in Health (**EUR 6.83 billion**), Climate, Energy and Mobility (**EUR 13.31 billion**), and Food and Natural Resources (**EUR 8.87 billion**); reiterates, however, its call for the 9th Framework Programme to be financed more heavily, with a budget of at least EUR 116.895 billion;

2. **Notes** the proposed increase in the budget earmarked for Horizon Europe and, in particular, the dedicated envelopes for research and innovation in Health, Climate, Energy and Mobility, and Food and Natural Resources; reiterates, however, its call for the 9th Framework Programme to be financed more heavily, with a budget of at least EUR 116.895 billion **of which 8,183% earmarked for cluster 'Health', 15,940% for cluster 'Climate, Energy and Mobility' and 10,627% for cluster 'Food and Natural Resources'**;

Or. en

Amendment 15 **Luke Ming Flanagan**

Draft opinion **Paragraph 2**

Draft opinion

2. Welcomes the proposed increase in the budget earmarked for Horizon Europe and, in particular, the dedicated envelopes for research and innovation in Health (EUR 6.83 billion), Climate, Energy and Mobility (EUR 13.31 billion), and Food and Natural Resources (EUR 8.87 billion); reiterates, however, its call for the 9th Framework Programme to be financed more heavily, with a budget of at least EUR 116.895 billion;

Amendment

2. Welcomes the proposed increase in the budget earmarked for Horizon Europe and, in particular, the dedicated envelopes for research and innovation in Health (EUR 6.83 billion), Climate, Energy and Mobility (EUR 13.31 billion), and Food and Natural Resources (EUR 8.87 billion); reiterates, however, its call for the 9th Framework Programme to be financed more heavily, with a budget of at least EUR 116.895 billion, **with those extra costs possibly being raised through a Financial Transaction Tax**;

Or. en

Amendment 16 **Ivo Belet**

Draft opinion **Paragraph 2 a (new)**

2 a. Welcomes the substantial increase of the Connecting Europe Facility – Energy to EUR 7.675 billion in constant (2018) prices for 2021-2027;

Or. en

Amendment 17
Giorgos Grammatikakis

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Expresses serious concern over the proposed reduction in funding for the health programme; reiterates its call for the health programme to be restored as a robust stand-alone programme with increased funding in the next MFF 2021-2027, in order to ensure an ambitious health policy, including in particular a thorough increase in common EU efforts *in the fight against cancer and easier access to cross-border healthcare*;

Amendment

3. Expresses serious concern over the proposed reduction in funding for the health programme; reiterates its call for the health programme to be restored as a robust stand-alone programme with increased funding in the next MFF 2021-2027, in order to ensure an ambitious health policy, including in particular a thorough increase in common EU efforts *to implement SDG on public health, health systems and environment-related health problems on a cross-border basis , and to support Member States in eliminating growing health inequalities*;

Or. en

Amendment 18
Mireille D'Ornano

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Expresses serious concern over the proposed reduction in funding for the health programme; reiterates its call for the health programme to be restored as a robust stand-alone programme with

Amendment

3. Expresses serious concern over the proposed reduction in funding for the health programme *even as the European population ages and this leads to a significant increase in chronic diseases* ;

increased funding in the next MFF 2021-2027, in order to ensure an ambitious health policy, including in particular a thorough increase in common EU efforts in the fight against cancer and easier access to cross-border healthcare;

reiterates its call for the health programme to be restored as a robust stand-alone programme with increased funding in the next MFF 2021-2027, in order to ensure an ambitious health policy, including in particular a thorough increase in common EU efforts in the fight against cancer and easier access to cross-border healthcare;

Or. en

Amendment 19
Luke Ming Flanagan

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. ***Expresses serious concern over*** the proposed reduction in funding for the health programme; reiterates its call for the health programme to be restored as a robust stand-alone programme with increased funding in the next MFF 2021-2027, in order to ensure an ambitious health policy, including in particular a thorough increase in common EU efforts in the fight against cancer and easier access to cross-border healthcare;

Amendment

3. ***Deplores*** the proposed reduction in funding for the health programme; reiterates its call for the health programme to be restored as a robust stand-alone programme with increased funding in the next MFF 2021-2027, in order to ensure an ambitious health policy, including in particular a thorough increase in common EU efforts in the fight against cancer and easier access to cross-border healthcare;

Or. en

Amendment 20
Bas Eickhout

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 a (new)

Draft opinion

3 a. Recalls that, as a signatory to the Paris Agreement, the EU is obliged to pursue efforts to limit global warming to 1.5C, which is contingent on carbon neutrality globally by the second half of the century, and calls for a thorough

Amendment

climate mainstreaming of future EU spending; Demands that the structure and execution of the MFF 2021-2027 is carried out in such a way so as to help achieve this goal through, inter alia, a binding climate-related spending target of 50% by 2027, a total exclusion of climate harmful spending and the planning of climate spending during the development of MFF programmes and not simply as an accountancy exercise ex-post as part of the annual budgetary procedure;

Or. en

Amendment 21
Stefan Eck

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3 a. Any decrease is unacceptable given the seriousness of the state of the health of the Union with 550,000 people of working age dying from chronic diseases every year, with huge financial losses to the economy and considering the majority of these cases is preventable;

Or. en

Amendment 22
Stefan Eck

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3 b. The budget allocated to health should be significantly increased to be commensurate with the magnitude of the challenges, including the prevention of chronic diseases, tackling the threat of antimicrobial resistance and reducing

health inequalities among countries and social groups;

Or. en

Amendment 23
Stefan Eck

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 c (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3 c. Adequate safeguards and conditionality need to be put in place to ensure that the allocation of public funds under Horizon Europe responds to public needs, delivers affordable and accessible R&I solutions to improve people's health and well-being;

Or. en

Amendment 24
Giorgos Grammatikakis

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

Amendment

4. Reiterates the risk of falling short of the current climate-related spending target and notes the proposed increase of this target to at least 25 % of the EU budget for 2021-2027; calls, however, for a more ambitious increase in climate-related spending to 30 % **by 2027** at the latest and for the development of a reliable and transparent tracking method;

4. Reiterates the risk of falling short of the current climate-related spending target and **consequently achieving the EU's international commitments such as a the Paris agreements;** notes the proposed increase of this target to at least 25 % of the EU budget for 2021-2027; calls, however, for a more ambitious increase in climate-related spending to 30 % **as soon as possible and** at the latest **by 2027** and for the development of a reliable and transparent tracking method; **reiterates that the EU should not finance projects and investments that undermine the achievement of EU climate goals in the mid- and the long-term);**

Amendment 25**Jo Leinen****Draft opinion****Paragraph 4***Draft opinion*

4. Reiterates the risk of falling short of the current climate-related spending target and notes the proposed increase of this target to at least 25 % of the EU budget for 2021-2027; calls, however, for a more ambitious increase in climate-related spending to 30 % by 2027 at the latest **and** for the development of a reliable and transparent tracking method;

Amendment

4. Reiterates the risk of falling short of the current climate-related spending target and notes the proposed increase of this target to at least 25 % of the EU budget for 2021-2027; calls, however, for a more ambitious increase in climate-related spending to 30 % by 2027 at the latest ***in order to achieve and implement the objectives of the Paris Agreement and the Sustainable Development Goals as well as to reflect the increased importance and urgency of climate action and the need for further climate diplomacy actions; calls*** for the development of a reliable and transparent tracking method;

Or. en

Amendment 26**Bas Eickhout****Draft opinion****Paragraph 4***Draft opinion*

4. ***Reiterates the*** risk of falling short of the current climate-related spending target and notes the proposed increase of this target to at least 25 % of the EU budget for 2021-2027; ***calls***, however, for a more ***ambitious increase in*** climate-related spending ***to 30*** % by 2027 at the latest and for the development of a reliable and transparent tracking method;

Amendment

4. ***Regrets that there is a*** risk of falling short of the current climate-related spending target and notes the proposed increase of this target to at least 25 % of the EU budget for 2021-2027, ***which is*** however ***non-binding; calls*** for a more ***realistic binding target for*** climate-related spending ***of 50*** % by 2027 at the latest, ***which is essential if the EU is to meet its obligations under the Paris Agreement and to help alleviate the worst impacts of***

climate change, and for the development of a reliable and transparent tracking method;

Or. en

Amendment 27
Christofer Fjellner

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Reiterates the risk of falling short of the current climate-related spending target and notes the proposed increase of this target to at least 25 % of the EU budget for 2021-2027; ***calls, however, for a more ambitious increase in climate-related spending to 30 % by 2027 at the latest and for the development of a reliable and transparent tracking method;***

Amendment

4. Reiterates the risk of falling short of the current climate-related spending target and notes the proposed increase of this target to at least 25 % of the EU budget for 2021-2027;

Or. en

Amendment 28
Boleslaw G. Piecha

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Reiterates the risk of falling short of the current climate-related spending target and notes the proposed increase of this target to at least 25 % of the EU budget for 2021-2027; ***calls, however, for a more ambitious increase in climate-related spending to 30 % by 2027 at the latest and for the development of a reliable and transparent tracking method;***

Amendment

4. Reiterates the risk of falling short of the current climate-related spending target and notes the proposed increase of this target to at least 25 % of the EU budget for 2021-2027;

Or. en

Amendment 29
Luke Ming Flanagan

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Reiterates the risk of falling short of the current climate-related spending target and notes the proposed increase of this target to at least 25 % of the EU budget for 2021-2027; *calls*, however, for a more ambitious increase in climate-related spending to 30 % by 2027 at the latest and for the development of a reliable and transparent tracking method;

Amendment

4. Reiterates the risk of falling short of the current climate-related spending target and notes the proposed increase of this target to at least 25 % of the EU budget for 2021-2027; *in light of the many recent cataclysmic climate events*, however, *calls* for a *far* more ambitious increase in climate-related spending to 30 % by 2027 at the latest and for the development of a reliable and transparent tracking method;

Or. en

Amendment 30
Mireille D'Ornano

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Reiterates the risk of falling short of the current climate-related spending target and notes the proposed increase of this target to at least 25 % of the EU budget for 2021-2027; *calls*, however, for a more ambitious increase in climate-related spending to 30 % by 2027 at the latest and for the development of a reliable and transparent tracking method;

Amendment

4. Reiterates the risk of falling short of the current climate-related spending target and notes the proposed increase of this target to at least 25 % of the EU budget for 2021-2027; *calls*, however, *given the urgency of combating climate change*, for a more ambitious increase in climate-related spending to 30 % by 2027 at the latest and for the development of a reliable and transparent tracking method;

Or. en

Amendment 31
Nils Torvalds, Anneli Jäätteenmäki, Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy

Draft opinion

Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Reiterates the risk of falling short of the current climate-related spending target and notes the proposed increase of this target to at least 25 % of the EU budget for 2021-2027; calls, however, for a more ambitious increase in climate-related spending to 30 % **by 2027 at the latest** and for the development of a reliable and transparent tracking method;

Amendment

4. Reiterates the risk of falling short of the current climate-related spending target and notes ***in this regard*** the proposed increase of this target to at least 25 % of the EU budget for 2021-2027; calls, however, for a more ambitious increase in climate-related spending to 30 % ***of the EU budget for 2021-2027*** and for the development of a reliable and transparent tracking method;

Or. en

Amendment 32

Bas Eickhout

Draft opinion

Paragraph 4 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4 a. Stresses that all EU funded projects and financial instruments including EFSI and EFSD as well as EIB activities should be subject to sustainability proofing and should not have a negative impact on the transition to a circular, low carbon economy; Calls for the methodology to calculate climate related spending to be revised and clarified in order to be Paris Agreement compatible and for urgent comprehensive screening across all MFF programmes to ensure the exclusion of environmentally and climate harmful spending, which should be put onto a negative list;

Or. en

Amendment 33

Jo Leinen

Draft opinion

PE627.809v01-00

18/33

AM\1162867EN.docx

Paragraph 4 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4 a. *Stresses the need to align the EU budget as a whole to the objectives of the Paris Agreement and the Sustainable Development Goals in order to ensure that budget spending does not run contrary to achieving the climate and energy targets of the EU or the UN's 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development;*

Or. en

Amendment 34
Boleslaw G. Piecha

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4 a. *Stresses the need for strengthening the focus on performance across all programmes by setting clearer objectives and focusing on a smaller number of higher quality performance indicators;*

Or. en

Amendment 35
Bas Eickhout

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4 b. *Insists that the MFF 2021-2027 should exclude any direct or indirect support for fossil fuels and fossil fuel-related infrastructure or technology, in the EU or abroad;*

Or. en

Amendment 36
Biljana Borzan

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Is concerned about the proposed 5 % decrease in financial resources for the decentralised agencies under the remit of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety; calls for the **decentralised** agencies to be allocated more financial and human resources, at least at the level of 2014-2020 in real terms, where appropriate and based on their individual needs;

Amendment

5. Is concerned about the proposed 5 % decrease in financial resources for the decentralised agencies under the remit of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety (***ECHA, ECDC, EEA, EFSA, EMA***); calls for the **decentralized** agencies to be allocated more financial and human resources, at least at the level of 2014-2020 in real terms, where appropriate and based on their individual needs, ***in particular if new tasks are allocated; notes in particular that the EMA is facing an increased workload and further budgetary needs in 2019 as a consequence of the decision of the UK to withdraw from the Union;***

Or. en

Amendment 37
Bolesław G. Piecha

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Is concerned about the proposed 5 % decrease in financial resources for the decentralised agencies under the remit of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety; calls for the decentralised agencies to be allocated more financial and human resources, at least at the level of 2014-2020 in real terms, where appropriate and based on their individual needs;

Amendment

5. Is concerned about the proposed 5 % decrease in financial resources for the decentralised agencies under the remit of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety (***ECHA, ECDC, EEA, EFSA, EMA***); calls for the decentralised agencies to be allocated more financial and human resources, at least at the level of 2014-2020 in real terms, where appropriate and based on their individual needs, ***in particular if new tasks are allocated, such as in the case of ECHA;***

Amendment 38**Benedek Jávor**

on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Draft opinion**Paragraph 5***Draft opinion*

5. ***Is concerned*** about the proposed 5 % decrease in financial resources for the decentralised agencies under the remit of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety; calls for the decentralised agencies to be allocated more financial and human resources, at least at the level of 2014-2020 in real terms, where appropriate and based on their individual needs;

Amendment

5. ***Concerns*** about the proposed 5 % decrease in financial resources for the decentralised agencies under the remit of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety (***ECHA, ECDC, EEA, EFSA, EMA***); calls for the decentralised agencies to be allocated more financial and human resources, at least at the level of 2014-2020 in real terms, where appropriate and based on their individual needs, ***in particular if new tasks are allocated, such as in the case of ECHA;***

Or. en

Amendment 39**Giorgos Grammatikakis, Nils Torvalds, Ivo Belet, Peter Liese, Karl-Heinz Florenz, Julie Girling****Draft opinion****Paragraph 5***Draft opinion*

5. Is concerned about the proposed 5 % decrease in financial resources for the decentralised agencies under the remit of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety; calls for the decentralised agencies to be allocated more financial and human resources, at least at the level of 2014-2020 in real terms, where appropriate and based on their individual needs;

Amendment

5. Is concerned about the proposed 5 % decrease in financial resources for the decentralised agencies under the remit of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety (***ECHA, ECDC, EEA, EFSA, EMA***); calls for the decentralised agencies to be allocated more financial and human resources, at least at the level of 2014-2020 in real terms, where appropriate and based on their individual needs, ***in particular if new tasks are allocated;***

Amendment 40
Christofer Fjellner

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Is concerned about the proposed 5 % decrease in financial resources for the decentralised agencies under the remit of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety; ***calls for the decentralised agencies to be allocated more financial and human resources, at least at the level of 2014-2020 in real terms, where appropriate and based on their individual needs;***

Amendment

5. Is concerned about the proposed 5 % decrease in financial resources for the decentralised agencies under the remit of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety; ***highlights the need for sufficient funding for these agencies to strengthen public confidence in science-based regulation;***

Or. en

Amendment 41
Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy, Adina-Ioana Vălean, Nils Torvalds

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

5 a. Reiterates that the mission of the European Environment Agency (EEA) is to help the Union and the Member States make informed decisions about protecting and improving the environment, integrating environmental considerations into economic policies and moving towards sustainability; underlines that the Commission has demanded additional tasks of the EEA, including, but not limited to, monitoring new legislation and policy developments on the Low Carbon Economy, Circular Economy agenda and the implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals and stresses that this should be appropriately reflected by the

financial envelope of the agency, which should at least be categorised as stable in real terms in the budget for 2021-2027;

Or. en

Amendment 42
Boleslaw G. Piecha

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

Amendment

6. Welcomes the proposal for an own resource based on non-recycled plastic packaging waste and calls for its revenues to be directed as a priority towards fostering the packaging waste recycling targets; stresses that the steering effect of a possible contribution must be coherent with the waste hierarchy and give priority to the prevention of waste generation; calls for effective registration and control mechanisms and a clarification of the calculation method;

deleted

Or. en

Amendment 43
Christofer Fjellner

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

Amendment

6. Welcomes the proposal for an own resource based on non-recycled plastic packaging waste and calls for its revenues to be directed as a priority towards fostering the packaging waste recycling targets; stresses that the steering effect of a possible contribution must be coherent with the waste hierarchy and give priority to the prevention of waste generation; calls for effective registration and control

deleted

mechanisms and a clarification of the calculation method;

Or. en

Amendment 44

Nils Torvalds, Anneli Jäätteenmäki

Draft opinion

Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. *Welcomes* the proposal for an own resource based on non-recycled plastic packaging waste and calls *for* its revenues *to be directed* as a priority towards fostering the packaging waste recycling targets; stresses that the steering effect of a possible contribution must be coherent with the waste hierarchy and give priority to the prevention of waste generation; calls for effective registration and control mechanisms and a clarification of the calculation method;

Amendment

6. *Takes note of* the proposal for an own resource based on non-recycled plastic packaging waste and calls *on the Commission to look into the possibilities of directing* its revenues as a priority towards fostering the packaging waste recycling targets; stresses that the steering effect of a possible contribution must be coherent with the waste hierarchy and give priority to the prevention of waste generation; calls for effective registration and control mechanisms and a clarification of the calculation method;

Or. en

Amendment 45

Giorgos Grammatikakis

Draft opinion

Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Welcomes the proposal for an own resource based on non-recycled plastic packaging waste *and calls for its revenues to be directed as a priority towards fostering the packaging waste recycling targets*; stresses that the steering effect of a possible contribution must be coherent with the waste hierarchy *and give* priority to the prevention of waste generation; calls for effective registration and control

Amendment

6. Welcomes the proposal for an own resource based on non-recycled plastic packaging waste; stresses that the steering effect of a possible contribution must be coherent with the waste hierarchy; *underlines therefore that priority should be given* to the prevention of waste generation; calls for effective registration and control mechanisms and a clarification of the calculation method;

mechanisms and a clarification of the calculation method;

Or. en

Amendment 46
Luke Ming Flanagan

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Welcomes the proposal for an **own resource** based on non-recycled plastic packaging waste and calls for its revenues to be directed as a priority towards fostering the packaging waste recycling targets; stresses that the steering effect of a possible contribution must be coherent with the waste hierarchy **and give** priority to the prevention of waste generation; calls for effective registration and control mechanisms and a clarification of the calculation method;

Amendment

6. Welcomes the proposal for an **own-resource** based on non-recycled plastic packaging waste and calls for its revenues to be directed as a priority towards fostering the packaging waste recycling targets; stresses that the steering effect of a possible contribution must be coherent with the waste hierarchy, **with priority given** to the prevention of waste generation; calls for effective registration and control mechanisms and a clarification of the calculation method;

Or. en

Amendment 47
Bolesław G. Piecha

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7

Draft opinion

7. ***Calls for a share of the increasing emissions trading system (ETS) auctioning revenue, from phase 4 (2021) onwards, to be directed gradually towards EU projects for low-carbon innovation in industry and cross-border energy infrastructure and storage; considers that this should be a gradual exercise, in order to avoid putting pressure on national budgets dedicated to climate and energy policy (as 50 % of revenues are***

Amendment

deleted

earmarked for this purpose in the ETS Directive (Directive 2003/87/EC));

Or. en

Amendment 48
Giorgos Grammatikakis

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7

Draft opinion

7. Calls for *a* share of the increasing emissions trading system (ETS) auctioning revenue, from phase 4 (2021) onwards, to be directed *gradually* towards *EU* projects for *low-carbon innovation in industry and* cross-border energy infrastructure and storage; considers that this should be a gradual exercise, in order to avoid putting pressure on national budgets dedicated to climate and energy policy (as 50 % of revenues are earmarked for this purpose in the ETS Directive (Directive 2003/87/EC));

Amendment

7. Calls for *an important* share of the increasing emissions trading system (ETS) auctioning revenue, from phase 4 (2021) onwards, to be *considered as EU own resource and to be* directed *as a matter of priority* towards projects for cross-border energy infrastructure and storage *for the integration of renewable energy, and investments in breakthrough low-carbon innovation in industry*; considers that this should be a gradual exercise, in order to avoid putting pressure on national budgets dedicated to climate and energy policy (as 50 % of revenues are earmarked for this purpose in the ETS Directive (Directive 2003/87/EC));

Or. en

Amendment 49
Bas Eickhout

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7

Draft opinion

7. Calls for a share of the increasing emissions trading system (ETS) auctioning revenue, from phase 4 (2021) onwards, to be directed *gradually* towards EU projects for low-carbon innovation *in industry* and cross-border energy infrastructure and storage; considers that this should be a

Amendment

7. Calls for a *significant* share of the increasing emissions trading system (ETS) auctioning revenue, from phase 4 (2021) onwards, to be directed towards EU projects for low-carbon innovation and cross-border *sustainable renewable* energy infrastructure and storage; considers that

gradual exercise, in order to avoid putting pressure on national budgets dedicated to climate and energy policy (as 50 % of revenues are earmarked for this purpose in the ETS Directive (Directive 2003/87/EC));

this should be a gradual exercise, in order to avoid putting pressure on national budgets dedicated to climate and energy policy (as 50 % of revenues are earmarked for this purpose in the ETS Directive (Directive 2003/87/EC));

Or. en

Amendment 50
Bas Eickhout

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

7 a. Calls for, in parallel, the introduction of a carbon border adjustment mechanism, as a new own resource for the EU budget, which should also have the effect of ensuring a level playing field in international trade and reducing the offshoring of production, while internalising the costs of climate change into the process of imported goods;

Or. en

Amendment 51
Giorgos Grammatikakis

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

7 a. Calls for the introduction of a carbon border adjustment mechanism, as a new own resource for the EU budget, which should also have the effect of ensuring a level playing field in international trade and reducing the offshoring of production, while internalising the costs of climate change into the prices of imported goods;

Amendment 52
Boleslaw G. Piecha

Draft opinion
Paragraph 8

Draft opinion

Amendment

8. *Believes that, in the absence of harmonised international measures for kerosene taxation, a carbon content-based aviation levy should be explored at EU level to provide further incentives for research, development and investment in more efficient, low-carbon aircraft and fuels, while ensuring a level playing field;* *deleted*

Amendment 53
Mireille D'Ornano

Draft opinion
Paragraph 8

Draft opinion

Amendment

8. *Believes that, in the absence of harmonised international measures for kerosene taxation, a carbon content-based aviation levy should be explored at EU level to provide further incentives for research, development and investment in more efficient, low-carbon aircraft and fuels, while ensuring a level playing field;* *deleted*

Amendment 54
Bas Eickhout

Draft opinion
Paragraph 8

Draft opinion

8. Believes that, in the absence of harmonised international measures for kerosene taxation, a carbon content-based aviation levy should be *explored* at EU level to provide further incentives for research, development and investment in more efficient, low-carbon aircraft and fuels, while ensuring a level playing field;

Amendment

8. Believes that, in the absence of harmonised international measures for kerosene taxation, a carbon content-based aviation levy should be *put in place* at EU level to provide further incentives for research, development and investment in more efficient, low-carbon aircraft and fuels *and in order to curb aviation's growing aviation emissions*, while ensuring a level playing field *and fairer competition in the transport sector*;

Or. en

Amendment 55
Christofer Fjellner

Draft opinion
Paragraph 9

Draft opinion

9. Encourages ongoing efforts to establish a financial transaction tax (FTT) and calls for the chosen method to differentiate according to sustainable finance criteria, in order to foster investment in the low-carbon, resource-efficient and circular economy; believes that a share of a common FTT could be used as a future own resource.

Amendment

deleted

Or. en

Amendment 56
Bolesław G. Piecha

Draft opinion
Paragraph 9

Draft opinion

9. Encourages ongoing efforts to establish a financial transaction tax

Amendment

deleted

(FTT) and calls for the chosen method to differentiate according to sustainable finance criteria, in order to foster investment in the low-carbon, resource-efficient and circular economy; believes that a share of a common FTT could be used as a future own resource.

Or. en

Amendment 57
Giorgos Grammatikakis

Draft opinion
Paragraph 9

Draft opinion

9. Encourages ongoing efforts to establish a financial transaction tax (FTT) *and calls for the chosen method to differentiate according to sustainable finance criteria, in order to foster investment* in the low-carbon, resource-efficient and circular economy; believes that a share of a common FTT *could* be used as a future own resource.

Amendment

9. Encourages ongoing efforts to establish a financial transaction tax (FTT); *considers that the FTT will shift funds from short-term and speculative investments towards long-term investments in the real economy and will therefore increase investments* in the low-carbon, resource-efficient and circular economy; believes that a share of a common FTT *should* be used as a future own resource.

Or. en

Amendment 58
Mireille D'Ornano

Draft opinion
Paragraph 9

Draft opinion

9. Encourages ongoing efforts to establish a financial transaction tax (FTT) and calls for the chosen method to differentiate according to sustainable finance criteria, in order to foster investment in the low-carbon, resource-efficient and circular economy; *believes*

Amendment

9. Encourages ongoing efforts to establish a financial transaction tax (FTT) and calls for the chosen method to differentiate according to sustainable finance criteria, in order to foster investment in the low-carbon, resource-efficient and circular economy.

that a share of a common FTT could be used as a future own resource.

Or. en

Amendment 59

Nils Torvalds, Anneli Jäätteenmäki

Draft opinion

Paragraph 9

Draft opinion

9. *Encourages* ongoing efforts to establish a financial transaction tax (FTT) and calls for the chosen method to differentiate according to sustainable finance criteria, in order to foster investment in the low-carbon, resource-efficient and circular economy; *believes that* a share of a common FTT could be used as a future own resource.

Amendment

9. *Notes* ongoing efforts to establish a financial transaction tax (FTT) and calls for the chosen method to differentiate according to sustainable finance criteria, in order to foster investment in the low-carbon, resource-efficient and circular economy; *considers that the Commission could examine whether* a share of a *possible* common FTT could be used as a future own resource.

Or. en

Amendment 60

Bas Eickhout

Draft opinion

Paragraph 9

Draft opinion

9. Encourages ongoing efforts to establish a financial transaction tax (FTT) and calls for the chosen method to differentiate according to sustainable finance criteria, in order to foster investment in the low-carbon, resource-efficient and circular economy; believes that a *share of a* common FTT *could* be used as a future own resource.

Amendment

9. Encourages ongoing efforts to establish a financial transaction tax (FTT) and calls for the chosen method to differentiate according to sustainable finance criteria, in order to foster investment in the low-carbon, resource-efficient and circular economy; believes that a common FTT *should* be used as a future own resource.

Or. en

Amendment 61
Tiemo Wölken

Draft opinion
Paragraph 9 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

9 a. *Regrets that the call for the creation of just transition fund for coal- and carbon-intensive regions under the new multiannual financial framework (MFF) was not reflected in the new MFF proposal; appeals to create a Just Transition Fund with the aim to support workers and communities adversely affected by transitions away from fossil fuels and industries that imply use of fossil fuels such as the automotive industry, especially in regions that are strongly reliant on such industries; in this respect calls on the Commission to set up a financing platform at Union level for this initiative; furthermore stresses that under this fund sufficient resources should be ensured for creation of decent and sustainable jobs, together with re-skilling and up-skilling in clean processes and technologies, as well as enhancing social protection schemes, including active labour market policies;*

Or. en

Amendment 62

Peter Liese, Ivo Belet, Jytte Guteland, Francesc Gambús, Jo Leinen, Susanne Melior, Renate Sommer, Peter Jahr, Miriam Dalli

Draft opinion
Paragraph 9 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

9 a. *Calls to transfer 25 % of the budget of the Structural Reform Support Programme (SRSP) to the Structural Funds to be directed towards additional support for carbon-dependent regions affected by the transition of jobs due to*

the necessary structural transition to a low-carbon economy. These regions shall have access to this additional support for the PO2 objectives of the Regional Development Fund and the Cohesion Fund in order to facilitate a just transition. The aim is to support such regions, in particular those which are not already qualified for support under the Modernisation Fund under Directive 2003/87/EC, by promoting the redeployment, re-skilling and up-skilling of workers, education, job-seeking initiatives as well as development of new jobs, for example through start-ups, in close dialogue and coordination with the social partners."

Or. en

Amendment 63

Ivo Belet

Draft opinion

Paragraph 9 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

9 a. *Underlines that the expenditure and revenue side of the next MFF should be treated as a single package, and that no agreement can be reached with Parliament on the MFF without an agreement on own resources;*

Or. en