



EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

2009 – 2014

Plenary sitting

A7-0311/2010

9.11.2010

*****I**
REPORT

on the proposal for a decision of the European Parliament and of the Council
establishing a European Union action for the European Heritage Label
(COM(2010)0076 – C7-0071/2010 – 2010/0044(COD))

Committee on Culture and Education

Rapporteur: Chrysoula Paliadeli

Symbols for procedures

- * Consultation procedure
- *** Consent procedure
- ***I Ordinary legislative procedure (first reading)
- ***II Ordinary legislative procedure (second reading)
- ***III Ordinary legislative procedure (third reading)

(The type of procedure depends on the legal basis proposed by the draft act.)

Amendments to a draft act

In amendments by Parliament, amendments to draft acts are highlighted in ***bold italics***. Highlighting in *normal italics* is an indication for the relevant departments showing parts of the draft act which may require correction when the final text is prepared – for instance, obvious errors or omissions in a language version. Suggested corrections of this kind are subject to the agreement of the departments concerned.

The heading for any amendment to an existing act that the draft act seeks to amend includes a third line identifying the existing act and a fourth line identifying the provision in that act that Parliament wishes to amend. Passages in an existing act that Parliament wishes to amend, but that the draft act has left unchanged, are highlighted in **bold**. Any deletions that Parliament wishes to make in such passages are indicated thus: [...].

CONTENTS

	Page
DRAFT EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTION.....	5
EXPLANATORY STATEMENT.....	35
PROCEDURE.....	39

DRAFT EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTION

on the proposal for a decision of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing a European Union action for the European Heritage Label (COM(2010)0076 – C7-0071/2010 – 2010/0044(COD))

(Ordinary legislative procedure: first reading)

The European Parliament,

- having regard to the Commission proposal to the European Parliament and the Council (COM(2010)0076),
 - having regard to Article 294(2) and Article 167 of the Treaty on Functioning of the European Union, pursuant to which the Commission submitted the proposal to Parliament (C7-0071/2010),
 - having regard to Article 294(3) of the Treaty on Functioning of the European Union,
 - having regard to the reasoned opinion sent to its President by a national parliament on the compliance of the draft act with the principle of subsidiarity,
 - having regard to the opinion of the Committee of the Regions¹,
 - having regard to Rule 55 of its Rules of Procedure,
 - having regard to the report of the Committee on Culture and Education (A7-0311/2010),
1. Adopts its position at first reading hereinafter set out;
 2. Calls on the Commission to refer the matter to Parliament again if it intends to amend the proposal substantially or replace it with another text;
 3. Instructs its President to forward its position to the Council, the Commission and the national parliaments.

Amendment 1

Proposal for a decision

Recital 1

Text proposed by the Commission

(1) The *Treaty* aims at an ever closer union among the peoples of Europe and Article 167 in particular gives the European Union

Amendment

(1) The *Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU)* aims at an ever closer union among the peoples of Europe

¹ OJ C 267, 1.10.2010, p.52.

the task of contributing to the flowering of the cultures of the Member States, while respecting their national and regional diversity and at the same time bringing the common cultural heritage to the fore.

and Article 167 *TFEU* in particular gives the European Union the task of contributing to the flowering of the cultures of the Member States, while respecting their national and regional diversity and at the same time bringing the common cultural heritage to the fore. ***Furthermore, Article 167(2) TFEU specifies that, in accordance with the principle of proportionality, the Union is to contribute to improvement of the knowledge and dissemination of the culture and history of the European peoples.***

Amendment 2

Proposal for a decision

Recital 3

Text proposed by the Commission

(3) The Treaty also establishes citizenship of the Union, which complements national citizenship of the respective Member States, and which is an important element in safeguarding and strengthening the process of European integration. For citizens to give their full support to European integration, greater emphasis should be placed on their common values, history and culture as key elements of their membership of a society founded on the principles of freedom, democracy, respect for human rights, cultural diversity, tolerance and solidarity.

Amendment

(3) The Treaty also establishes citizenship of the Union, which complements national citizenship of the respective Member States, and which is an important element in safeguarding and strengthening the process of European integration. For citizens to give their full support to European integration, greater emphasis should be placed on their common values, history and culture as key elements of their membership of a society founded on the principles of freedom, democracy, respect for human rights, cultural ***and linguistic*** diversity, tolerance and solidarity.

Amendment 3

Proposal for a decision Recital 6 a (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(6a) The European Heritage Label should benefit from the experience hitherto gathered from the intergovernmental initiative.

Justification

All experience acquired so far in the intergovernmental initiative has to be put in good use for the new EU Action.

Amendment 4

Proposal for a decision Recital 7

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(7) The European Heritage Label should seek ***synergies and complementarities with other*** initiatives such as the UNESCO World Heritage List and the Council of Europe's 'European Cultural Routes'. The added value of the new European Heritage Label should be based on the contribution made by the selected sites to European history and culture, on a clear educational dimension reaching out to citizens, ***including*** young people, and on networking between the sites to share experiences and best practices. The main focus of the initiative should be on the promotion and the access of the sites, and on the quality of the explanations given and of the activities proposed, rather than on the conservation of the sites, which should be guaranteed by existing protection regimes.

(7) The European Heritage Label should seek ***to supplement but not duplicate*** initiatives such as the UNESCO World Heritage List, ***the UNESCO Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity***, and the Council of Europe's 'European Cultural Routes'. The added value of the new European Heritage Label should be based on the contribution made by the selected sites to European history and culture, ***including the creation of the Union***, on a clear educational dimension reaching out to citizens, ***especially*** young people, and on networking between the sites to share experiences and best practices. The main focus of the initiative should be on the promotion and the access of the sites, ***thereby contributing to a shared historical and cultural heritage within the Union***, and on the quality of the explanations

given and of the activities proposed, rather than on the conservation of the sites, which should be guaranteed by existing protection regimes.

Amendment 5

Proposal for a decision Recital 10 a (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(10a) Member States should be able to propose sites which have already been awarded the European Heritage Label under the intergovernmental European Heritage Label scheme. Those sites should be assessed on the basis of the new criteria and procedures.

Justification

The current intergovernmental sites of the EU Member States are invited to be part of the new EU initiative. In order to ensure the overall coherence of the new initiative, these sites would need to be assessed against the new criteria.

Amendment 6

Proposal for a decision Recital 10 b (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(10b) Future evaluations of the European Heritage Label could examine enlarging the initiative to third countries participating in the Culture Programme.

Amendment 7

Proposal for a decision Recital 11

Text proposed by the Commission

(11) The administrative arrangements for the European Heritage Label should **remain** light and flexible in compliance with the principle of subsidiarity.

Amendment

(11) The administrative arrangements for the European Heritage Label should **be** light and flexible in compliance with the principle of subsidiarity.

Justification

This new initiative introduces new administrative arrangements.

Amendment 8

Proposal for a decision Article 2

Text proposed by the Commission

For the purposes of this Decision, ‘sites’ shall mean monuments, natural or urban sites, cultural landscapes, places of remembrance, cultural goods and objects, intangible heritage attached to a place, including contemporary heritage.

Amendment

For the purposes of this Decision, ‘sites’ shall mean monuments, natural, **underwater, archaeological, industrial** or urban sites, cultural landscapes, places of remembrance, cultural goods and objects, intangible heritage associated with a place, including contemporary heritage.

Justification

Archaeological sites are directly related to European cultural heritage and as such should be mentioned in the definition. Underwater sites should also be classified under this definition due to the long maritime tradition of the European people from prehistory to the present.

Amendment 9

Proposal for a decision Article 3 – paragraph 1 – indent 1

Text proposed by the Commission

– **Strengthen** European citizens’ sense of belonging to the *European* Union, based on

Amendment

– **Strengthening** European citizens’ sense of belonging to the Union, **in particular**

shared elements of history and cultural heritage, *as well as an appreciation of diversity*;

that of young people, based on shared *values and* elements of *European* history and cultural heritage;

Justification

Promoting the access of young people to European cultural heritage is a priority of the European Heritage Label and should be emphasised. European Heritage Label is not about the conservation of sites, but their educational dimension. The educational value of the European Heritage Label is part of response to the growing gap between the citizens and Europe, especially for young people.

Amendment 10

Proposal for a decision

Article 3 – paragraph 1 – indent 2

Text proposed by the Commission

– *Strengthen* intercultural dialogue.

Amendment

– *Strengthening* intercultural *and inter-territorial* dialogue, *as well as an appreciation of diversity*.

Amendment 11

Proposal for a decision

Article 3 – paragraph 2 – introductory part

Text proposed by the Commission

2. *The intermediate objectives* of the action shall *be* to:

Amendment

2. *To that end*, the action shall, *as its intermediate objectives*, *seek* to:

Justification

See justification for amendment to Article 3,- paragraph 1, introduction.

The intermediate objectives refer to the impact of the European Heritage Label on individuals and on heritage as a whole. At this level, the impact can be measured and/or assessed with a degree of certainty according to intermediate impact indicators.

Amendment 12

Proposal for a decision

Article 3 – paragraph 2 – indent 1

Text proposed by the Commission

– **Enhance** the value and profile of sites which have played a **key** role in the history **and** the building of the *European Union*;

Amendment

– **Stress** the **symbolic** value and **raise the** profile of sites which have played a **significant** role in the history **and culture of Europe and/or** the building of the Union;

Justification

The label will promote already present value of sites. The initiative is important both for fostering European integration via knowledge of European culture and history and for strengthening the sense of belonging to the European Union and bringing its people closer to its institutions.

Amendment 13

Proposal for a decision

Article 3 – paragraph 2 – indent 2

Text proposed by the Commission

– Increase European citizens' understanding of the **building** of Europe, and of their common yet diverse cultural heritage, especially related to democratic values and human rights that underpin the process of European integration.

Amendment

– Increase European citizens' understanding of the **history** of Europe **and the building of the Union**, and of their common yet diverse **tangible and intangible** cultural heritage, especially related to democratic values and human rights that underpin the process of European integration.

Justification

The history and culture of Europe and the building of the European Union are two distinct concepts of equal importance for the European cultural and symbolic heritage.

Amendment 14

Proposal for a decision

Article 3 – paragraph 3 – introductory part

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

3. The specific objectives **of the action are as follows:**

3. The **sites themselves shall, as** specific objectives, **seek to:**

Justification

See justification for amendment to Article 3,- paragraph 1, introduction.

The specific objectives relate to those improvements which the sites themselves – individually and collectively - would commit to in the bidding process for the European Heritage Label.

Amendment 15

Proposal for a decision

Article 3 – paragraph 3 – indent 2

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

– Raise **young people's awareness** of their common cultural heritage;

– Raise **the awareness of young people in particular and European citizens in general** of their common cultural heritage **and enhance their sense of European identity;**

Justification

The development of European identity is a vital objective of the European integration process, and as such can be actively promoted through the European Heritage Label.

Amendment 16

Proposal for a decision

Article 3 – paragraph 3 – indent 4

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

– Increase access to heritage sites for all **members of the public**, especially young people;

– Increase **and/or improve** access to heritage sites for all, especially young people;

Amendment 17

Proposal for a decision

Article 3 – paragraph 3 – indent 5

Text proposed by the Commission

– Increase intercultural dialogue, especially among young people, through artistic, cultural **and** historical education;

Amendment

– Increase intercultural dialogue, especially among young people, through artistic, cultural, historical **and interactive online** education;

Justification

Young people socialise, network, learn and interact through the use of ICT and social networking sites. It is very easy for the younger generation to express themselves via blogs, facebook and other educational sites. Interactive online learning is the best and most cost effective tool to advance intercultural dialogue and therefore should be included in the amendment.

Amendment 18

Proposal for a decision

Article 3 – paragraph 3 – indent 6

Text proposed by the Commission

– Foster synergies between cultural heritage and contemporary creation and creativity;

Amendment

– Foster synergies between cultural heritage and contemporary creation and **support** creativity;

Justification

Synergies between cultural heritage and contemporary creation could act as catalyst for creativity.

Amendment 19

Proposal for a decision

Article 3 – paragraph 3 – indent 6 a (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

– Foster interaction between the cultural heritage and the economic activities growing up around it, while fully

respecting the integrity thereof and contributing to its sustainability and that of its surroundings;

Justification

The cultural heritage of an area may be one of its principal assets, with the potential to generate a flourishing economy fuelled by cultural tourism, cultural industries etc. Furthermore, interaction with productive economic activity will enable heritage sites to contribute to their own upkeep, given that the high costs involved can often make the task of running them extremely onerous.

Amendment 20

Proposal for a decision

Article 3 – paragraph 3 – indent 7

Text proposed by the Commission

– Contribute to the attractiveness and ***the*** sustainable development of the regions.

Amendment

– Contribute to the ***promotion, attractiveness, cultural influence, tourist development*** and sustainable development of the regions;

Amendment 21

Proposal for a decision

Article 3 – paragraph 3 – indent 7 a (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

– ***Encourage the creation of European networks to enhance the common European heritage.***

Justification

The European heritage is extremely diverse and interregional networks could highlight the common European theme running through very different periods and artistic styles. Networks could for example be created for the Cistercian Order, the Roma, Modernism or Art Nouveau, solstice rites etc, thus helping European citizens to appreciate that much of what they consider to be their own cultural heritage exists throughout Europe.

Amendment 22

Proposal for a decision Article 5

Text proposed by the Commission

The Commission and the Member States shall ensure **the complementarity of** the European Heritage Label **with** other initiatives in the field of cultural heritage such as the UNESCO World Heritage List and the Council of Europe's 'European Cultural Routes'.

Amendment

The Commission and the Member States shall ensure **that** the European Heritage Label **supplements but does not duplicate** other initiatives in the field of cultural heritage such as the UNESCO World Heritage List, **the UNESCO Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity** and the Council of Europe's 'European Cultural Routes'.

Justification

See justification to amendment in Recital 7.

Amendment 23

Proposal for a decision Article 7 – point 1 – introductory part

Text proposed by the Commission

(1) Candidates for the **label** shall have a symbolic European value and shall have played a **key** role in the history **and** the building of the **European** Union. **The candidates** shall therefore justify:

Amendment

(1) Candidates for the **European Heritage Label** shall have a symbolic European value and shall have played a **significant** role in the history **and culture of Europe and/or** the building of the Union. **They** shall therefore justify:

Justification

See justification for an amendment to Article 3,- paragraph 2, indent 1

Amendment 24

Proposal for a decision Article 7 – point 1 – indent 2

Text proposed by the Commission

– and/or the place and role of a site in European history and European integration, and its links with key European events or personalities, as well as with cultural, artistic, political, social, scientific, technological or industrial movements;

Amendment

– and/or the place and role of a site in European history and European integration, and its links with key European events or personalities, as well as with cultural, artistic, **religious**, political, social, scientific, technological, **environmental** or industrial movements;

Justification

Religion, in whatever form, has been of fundamental importance in a European context, leading to wars and influencing philosophy, thought and general culture, as well as much artistic output up to the nineteenth century, not to mention other issues concerning to religion. Furthermore, Europe's major monuments are essentially religious in nature, and it would therefore be absurd not to include religion.

Amendment 25

Proposal for a decision

Article 7 – point 2 – introductory part

Text proposed by the Commission

(2) Candidates for the **label** shall submit a project **which promotes their European dimension and commits them to** all the following elements:

Amendment

(2) Candidates for the **European Heritage Label** shall submit a project, **the implementation of which is to begin by the end of designation year at the latest, which includes** all the following elements:

Justification

Setting up a deadline for implementation of the criteria by the end of the designation year would oblige the candidates to fulfil their commitments.

Amendment 26

Proposal for a decision

Article 7 – point 2 – indent 3

Text proposed by the Commission

– promoting multilingualism by using

Amendment

– promoting multilingualism **and regional**

several languages of the *European* Union;

diversity by using several languages of the Union *as a key to intercultural dialogue*;

Amendment 27

Proposal for a decision

Article 7 – point 2 – indent 4

Text proposed by the Commission

– *taking part in the activities of networks of sites awarded the European Heritage Label in order to exchange experiences and initiate common projects*;

Amendment

– *cooperating with sites already awarded the European Heritage Label*;

Amendment 28

Proposal for a decision

Article 7 – point 2 – indent 5

Text proposed by the Commission

– raising the profile and attractiveness of the site on a European scale, *for example by using modern* technology;

Amendment

– raising the profile and attractiveness of the site on a European scale, *inter alia through new information and communication* technology;

Amendment 29

Proposal for a decision

Article 7 – point 2 – indent 5 a (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

– *ensuring that the site is made accessible to the European citizens while fully respecting its integrity*;

Justification

At the risk of stating the obvious, many monuments are not open to the public, making it difficult to identify with them in any way.

Amendment 30

Proposal for a decision

Article 7 – point 2 – indent 6

Text proposed by the Commission

- **the organisation of** artistic and cultural activities (for example events, festivals, residencies) which foster the mobility of European artists and collections, stimulate intercultural dialogue and encourage linkage between heritage and contemporary creation and creativity **are** welcomed whenever the specificity of the site allows it.

Amendment

The organisation of artistic and cultural activities (for example events, festivals, residencies) which foster the mobility of European **cultural agents**, artists and collections, stimulate intercultural dialogue and encourage linkage between heritage and contemporary creation and creativity **is** welcomed whenever the specificity of the site allows it.

Justification

This sentence shall not be a part of compulsory criteria, but an optional element, as the criteria shall be applied proportionally to the size and type of the sites. Not all sites might be able to carry out artistic and cultural activities.

Amendment 31

Proposal for a decision

Article 7 – point 3 – indent 4

Text proposed by the Commission

– ensuring access for the widest possible public, for example through site adaptations or staff training;

Amendment

– ensuring access for the widest possible public, for example through site adaptations or staff training, **and through the use of the internet, including for elderly persons and people with disabilities;**

Amendment 32

Proposal for a decision

Article 7 – point 3 – indent 6

Text proposed by the Commission

– **undertaking the promotion of** sites as

Amendment

– **promoting** sites as tourist destinations

tourist destinations;

whilst limiting potential negative impacts affecting the sites or their environment;

Justification

Tourist development should by no means distort the site and its surrounding environment.

Amendment 33

Proposal for a decision

Article 7 – point 3 – indent 8

Text proposed by the Commission

– ensuring the management plan is as environmentally friendly as possible *in order to limit potential negative impacts of tourism.*

Amendment

– ensuring the management plan is as environmentally friendly as possible.

Justification

See amendment to Article 7, paragraph 3, indent 6.

Amendment 34

Proposal for a decision

Article 8 – paragraph 2

Text proposed by the Commission

2. The European panel shall consist of **12 members**. Four of the members shall be nominated by the European Parliament, four by the Council *and* four by the Commission. The panel shall designate its chairman.

Amendment

2. The European panel shall consist of **13 members**. Four of the members shall be nominated by the European Parliament, four by the Council, four by the Commission *and one by the Committee of the Regions, in accordance with their respective procedures*. The European panel shall designate its chairman.

Justification

Including a member of the Committee of Regions in the European panel would give voice to the local and regional authorities, thus be more representative and also attract local and regional interest. This would also result in having an odd number of the panel's members.

Amendment 35

Proposal for a decision Article 8 – paragraph 3

Text proposed by the Commission

3. The European panel members shall be independent experts. They shall have substantial experience and expertise in the **field of culture, heritage, European history, or other** fields relevant to the objectives of the European Heritage Label.

Amendment

3. The European panel members shall be independent experts. They shall have substantial experience and expertise in the fields relevant to the objectives of the European Heritage Label. ***The institutions nominating the experts shall seek to ensure as far as possible the complementarity of their respective fields of expertise and a geographically balanced representation.***

Justification

The European panel should be composed by cultural experts covering all fields related to the objectives of the EUHL (the list should not be restrictive, it could vary from humanitarian studies to management of cultural goods), whilst also preserving an equitable representation of all Member States.

Amendment 36

Proposal for a decision Article 8 – paragraph 4

Text proposed by the Commission

4. The European panel members shall be nominated for three years. By way of derogation, in the first year during which this Decision is in force, four experts shall be nominated by the Commission for one year, four by the European Parliament for two years and four by the Council for three years.

Amendment

4. The European panel members shall be nominated for three years. By way of derogation, in the first year during which this Decision is in force, four experts shall be nominated by the Commission for one year, four by the European Parliament ***and one by the Committee of the Regions*** for two years and four by the Council for three years.

Justification

See amendment to Article 8(2).

Amendment 37

Proposal for a decision Article 8 – paragraph 5

Text proposed by the Commission

5. ***If a*** conflict of interest ***between a member of the panel and*** a specific site comes to light, the member ***of the panel*** shall not ***take part*** in the evaluation of the said site.

Amendment

5. ***Members of the European panel shall declare any*** conflict of interest ***or potential conflict of interest in respect of*** a specific site. ***In the event of such a declaration, or if such a conflict of interest*** comes to light, the member shall not ***participate*** in the evaluation of the said site ***or of any other sites from the same Member State.***

Justification

Those practical arrangements ensure the transparency of the procedure.

Amendment 38

Proposal for a decision Article 9

Text proposed by the Commission

With a view to keeping procedures as streamlined and light as possible, a common application form based on the selection criteria shall be prepared by the Commission and used by all the candidates. Only applications submitted on the official application form will be considered for selection.

Amendment

A common application form based on the selection criteria ***laid down in Article 7*** shall be prepared by the Commission and used by all the candidates. Only applications submitted on the official application form will be considered for selection.

Amendment 39

Proposal for a decision Article 10 – paragraph 1

Text proposed by the Commission

1. The pre-selection of the sites for the attribution of the European Heritage Label shall be under the responsibility of the

Amendment

1. The pre-selection of the sites for the attribution of the European Heritage Label shall be under the responsibility of the

Member States.

Member States, *in close cooperation with local and regional authorities*.

Amendment 40

Proposal for a decision Article 10 – paragraph 2

Text proposed by the Commission

2. Each Member State shall have the possibility to pre-select up to a maximum of two sites *per annum* in accordance with the calendar in the Annex. ***No selection procedure shall take place in the years reserved for the monitoring procedure.***

Amendment

2. Each Member State shall have the possibility to pre-select up to a maximum of two sites ***every two years*** in accordance with the calendar in the Annex.

Justification

Selection of the sites every two years will ensure better quality of selection process as well as of the selected sites. The number of sites has to be kept reasonable in order not to endanger the quality, credibility, and prestige of European Heritage Label. The selection procedure would be carried out one year at the Member State level, but next year- at the European level with an official designation of the sites. In this case, the monitoring of the sites can be performed in parallel to the selection process.

Amendment 41

Proposal for a decision Article 10 – paragraph 3

Text proposed by the Commission

3. Each Member State shall establish its own procedures and its own calendar for the pre-selection of the sites in accordance with the principle of subsidiarity, ensuring that administrative arrangements remain as light and flexible as possible. It shall however notify the Commission of the results of the pre-selection at the latest on ***31 January*** of the year of the ***selection*** procedure.

Amendment

3. Each Member State shall establish its own procedures and its own calendar for the pre-selection of the sites in accordance with the principle of subsidiarity, ensuring that administrative arrangements remain as light and flexible as possible. It shall however notify the Commission of the results of the pre-selection at the latest on ***1 March*** of the year of the ***pre-selection*** procedure.

Justification

In accordance with the newly proposed calendar (see Annex)

Amendment 42

Proposal for a decision Article 10 – paragraph 4

Text proposed by the Commission

4. The pre-selection shall be **based on** the criteria laid down in Article 7 and shall use the application form referred to in Article 9.

Amendment

4. The pre-selection procedure shall be **carried out in accordance with** the criteria laid down in Article 7 and shall use the application form referred to in Article 9.

Justification

Pre-selection must be carried out according to the same criteria and using the same application forms in each Member State.

Amendment 43

Proposal for a decision Article 10 – paragraph 4 a (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

4a. The Commission shall publish the full list of pre-selected sites and shall inform the European Parliament, the Council and the Committee of the Regions thereof.

Justification

Publication of preselected sites and informing all involved EU institutions makes the procedure more transparent.

Amendment 44

Proposal for a decision Article 11 – paragraph 3

Text proposed by the Commission

3. The final selection shall be **based on** the

Amendment

3. The final selection shall be **carried out**

criteria laid down in Article 7 and shall use the application form referred to in Article 9.

in accordance with the criteria laid down in Article 7 and shall use the application form referred to in Article 9.

Justification

Final selection at EU level must be carried out according to the same criteria and using the same application forms.

Amendment 45

Proposal for a decision Article 11 – paragraph 4

Text proposed by the Commission

4. The European panel shall issue a report on the pre-selected sites at the latest on **31 October** of the year of the *selection* procedure. This report shall include a recommendation for the attribution of the European Heritage Label and a justification for the sites which were not retained in the final list.

Amendment

4. The European panel shall issue a report on the pre-selected sites at the latest on **15 December** of the year of the *pre-selection* procedure. This report shall include a recommendation for the attribution of the European Heritage Label and a justification for the sites which were not retained in the final list.

Justification

In accordance with the newly proposed calendar (see Annex).

Amendment 46

Proposal for a decision Article 12 – paragraph 2

Text proposed by the Commission

2. Applications for transnational sites shall follow the same procedure as applications for other sites. They shall be pre-selected by *one* of the Member States concerned within *the* limit of a maximum of two sites as laid down in Article 10, *and proposed in the name of all the Member States concerned after consultation and*

Amendment

2. Applications for transnational sites shall follow the same procedure as applications for other sites. They shall be pre-selected by *all* of the Member States concerned within *their* limit of a maximum of two sites as laid down in Article 10. *Transnational sites shall designate one of the sites involved as their coordinator,*

agreement of these Member States.

which will constitute the single contact point for the Commission. The coordinator shall provide information on the transnational candidacy in due time in all the Member States so as to ensure the participation of relevant sites all across the Union. All the sites participating in a transnational site shall complete the application form referred to in Article 9 and shall meet the criteria laid down in Article 7.

Justification

Transnational sites are given a favourable position as they by its nature promote main objectives of the European Heritage Label and create networks. Therefore, all participating Member States should give their quota for their sites participating in the transnational site. It is also important to inform all member States in due time about an intention to bid for the label for a transnational site so as everyone interested can be included. For practical reasons, there is a need to appoint one coordinator for each transnational site, who then would be the contact for the European panel and the Commission.

Amendment 47

Proposal for a decision

Article 12 – paragraph 2 – subparagraph 1 a (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

Particular consideration shall be given to transnational sites which foster the essence of cross-border European heritage, through their representation of tangible and intangible symbolism.

Justification

It is very significant if a European Heritage Label is awarded to a transnational site as it would promote European heritage on a deeper level that would impact on more citizens. Peace is an example of intangible symbolism.

Amendment 48

Proposal for a decision

Article 12 – paragraph 3 a (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

3a. If one of the sites comprised in a transnational site ceases to fulfil the criteria for the European Heritage Label or the commitments made in the application, the procedure laid down in Article 15 shall apply.

Amendment 49

Proposal for a decision

Article 13 – paragraph 1

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

1. The Commission shall officially designate the sites to be awarded the European Heritage Label during the year following the selection procedure, ***in the light of*** the recommendation of the European panel. The Commission shall inform the European Parliament ***and*** the Council.

1. The Commission shall officially designate the sites to be awarded the European Heritage Label during the year following the selection procedure, ***having due regard to*** the recommendation of the European panel. The Commission shall inform the European Parliament, the Council ***and the Committee of the Regions of the decisions taken.***

Justification

In line with amendments to Article 8.

Amendment 50

Proposal for a decision

Article 13 – paragraph 2

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

2. The European Heritage Label shall be awarded to the sites ***in principle*** on a permanent basis under the conditions laid down in Articles 14 and 15 and subject to

2. The European Heritage Label shall be awarded to the sites on a permanent basis under the conditions laid down in Articles 14 and 15 and subject to the continuation

the continuation of the action.

of the action.

Amendment 51

Proposal for a decision

Article 13 – paragraph 2 a (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

2a. The attribution of the European Heritage Label shall not entail any obligation of an urban planning, judicial, landscaping, mobility or architectural nature. The sole law applicable shall be the local law.

Amendment 52

Proposal for a decision

Article 14 – paragraph 3

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

3. The report shall be sent to the Commission and submitted to the European panel for examination at the latest on **31 January** of the year of the monitoring procedure.

3. The report shall be sent to the Commission and submitted to the European panel for examination at the latest on **1 March** of the year of the monitoring procedure.

Justification

In accordance with the newly proposed Calendar (see Annex).

Amendment 53

Proposal for a decision

Article 14 – paragraph 4

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

4. The European panel shall issue a report on the state of the labelled sites in the Member State concerned at the latest on **31 October** of the year of the monitoring

4. The European panel shall issue a report on the state of the labelled sites in the Member State concerned at the latest on **15 December** of the year of the monitoring

procedure, including if necessary recommendations to be taken into account for the next monitoring period.

procedure, including if necessary recommendations to be taken into account for the next monitoring period.

Justification

In accordance with the newly proposed calendar (see Annex).

Amendment 54

Proposal for a decision Article 14 – paragraph 5

Text proposed by the Commission

5. The Commission shall establish common indicators for the Member States to ensure a coherent approach for the monitoring procedure.

Amendment

5. The Commission, ***after consulting the European panel***, shall establish common indicators for the Member States to ensure a coherent approach for the monitoring procedure.

Amendment 55

Proposal for a decision Article 15 – paragraph 4

Text proposed by the Commission

4. The Commission shall take the final decision to withdraw the European Heritage Label. The Commission shall inform the European Parliament ***and*** the Council.

Amendment

4. The Commission shall take the final decision to withdraw the European Heritage Label ***having due regard to the recommendation from the European panel***. The Commission shall inform the European Parliament, the Council ***and the Committee of the Regions thereof***.

Justification

The involvement of the European panel in the procedure of withdrawal is essential for reasons of transparency.

Amendment 56

Proposal for a decision

Article 15 – paragraph 5 a (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

5a. Sites may at any time choose to renounce the European Heritage Label. In that event, they shall notify the Member State concerned, which shall, in turn, inform the Commission. The Commission shall take a decision to withdraw the European Heritage Label and shall inform the European Parliament, the Council and the Committee of the Regions of thereof.

Justification

An option of voluntary withdrawal from the EUHL initiative makes is more democratic, taking into consideration situations when the site for some objective reasons cannot any longer respect their commitments or they do not wish to participate at this initiative.

Amendment 57

Proposal for a decision

Article 16 – paragraph 1 – indent 3

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

– establish guidelines *for* the selection and monitoring procedures, as well as the application form;

– ***in the light of the objectives set out in Article 3 and in accordance with the criteria laid down in Article 7***, establish guidelines ***to assist with*** the selection and monitoring procedures, as well as the application form;

Amendment 58

Proposal for a decision

Article 16 – paragraph 2

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

2. The Commission shall be responsible for

2. The Commission shall be responsible for

the communication and the visibility of the European Heritage Label at Union level, in particular through the creation and the maintenance of a specific website.

the communication and the visibility of the European Heritage Label at Union level, in particular through the creation and the maintenance of a specific website **and a new logo, raising the profile and attractiveness of the site on a European scale, for example by using the possibilities offered by new technologies and digital and interactive means and by seeking synergies with other European initiatives. All the notifications and recommendations of the European panel referred to in Article 8(6), Article 10(4a) and Article 15(5) shall be published on that website.**

Justification

A new logo would contribute to the visibility of the EUHL and in an awareness raising process of this initiative. The work of the European Panel has to be as transparent as possible.

Amendment 59

Proposal for a decision Article 17 – paragraph 1

Text proposed by the Commission

1. The Commission shall ensure the external and independent evaluation of the European Heritage Label action. This evaluation shall take place every six years in accordance with the calendar set out in the Annex and shall examine all elements, including the efficiency of the processes involved in running the action, the number of sites, the impact of the action, how it could be improved and whether the European Heritage Label should be continued.

Amendment

1. The Commission shall ensure the external and independent evaluation of the European Heritage Label action. This evaluation shall take place every six years in accordance with the calendar set out in the Annex and shall examine all elements, including the efficiency of the processes involved in running the action, the number of sites, the **geographical scope and** impact of the action, how it could be improved and whether the European Heritage Label should be continued.

Justification

If necessary, future evaluations of the European Heritage Label could examine the appropriateness of enlarging the initiative to the third countries participating in the Culture Programme, or even beyond that.

Amendment 60

Proposal for a decision Article 17 – paragraph 2

Text proposed by the Commission

2. The Commission shall present a report on these evaluations to the European Parliament and the Council within six months of the finalisation of the evaluations.

Amendment

2. The Commission shall present a report on these evaluations to the European Parliament and the Council within six months of the finalisation of the evaluations ***accompanied, if appropriate, by relevant proposals.***

Amendment 61

Proposal for a decision Article 18

Text proposed by the Commission

Article 18

Transitional provisions

1. Sites already awarded the label in the framework of the intergovernmental European Heritage Label and situated in Member States shall be assessed [the year following the entry into force of the present Decision].

A new application shall be submitted for these sites on the basis of the new criteria and procedures laid down in Articles 6 to 9 and shall be transmitted to the Commission by the relevant Member States at the latest on 31 January [of the year in question].

The new applications shall be assessed by the European panel.

If one of the sites proposed by a specific Member State does not fulfil the criteria or if further information is needed, the European panel shall initiate a dialogue

Amendment

deleted

with the Member State via the Commission in order to examine whether the application can be improved before a final decision is taken. Visits to the site may be organised if necessary.

The European panel shall deliver a report on sites with a recommendation for the attribution of the European Heritage Label by the end of [the year in question] unless further clarifications are necessary from the Member State.

The Commission shall then officially designate the sites.

The European Heritage Label shall be awarded to the sites covered by this paragraph in principle on a permanent basis under the conditions laid down in Articles 14 and 15 and subject to the continuation of the action.

Candidates which were not retained in the final list may submit a new application for the pre-selection at national level in the following years.

2. Member States which did not participate in the intergovernmental European Heritage Label shall have the possibility to propose up to a maximum of four sites for the attribution of the European Heritage Label in [the second year following the entry into force of the present Decision].

An application shall be submitted for these sites on the basis of the criteria and procedures laid down in Articles 6 to 9 and shall be transmitted to the Commission by the relevant Member States at the latest on 31 January [of the year in question].

The new applications shall be assessed by the European panel. If one of the sites proposed by a specific Member State does not fulfil the criteria or if further information is needed, the European panel shall initiate a dialogue with the Member State via the Commission in

order to examine whether the application can be improved before a final decision is taken. Visits to the site may be organised if necessary.

The European panel shall deliver a report on sites with a recommendation for the attribution of the European Heritage Label by the end of [the year in question] unless further clarifications are necessary from the Member State.

The Commission shall then officially designate the sites.

The European Heritage Label shall be awarded to the sites covered by this paragraph in principle on a permanent basis under the conditions laid down in Articles 14 and 15 and subject to the continuation of the action.

Candidates which were not retained in the final list may submit a new application for the pre-selection at national level in the following years.

3. The selection and monitoring procedure for the European Heritage Label as laid down in Articles 6 to 15 shall start in [the third year following the entry into force of the present Decision].

Justification

The new European Union Heritage Label derives from the intergovernmental European Heritage Label. Nevertheless, it is an EU Action based on new, common, clear and transparent criteria, common application and new logo, well differentiated from the intergovernmental initiative. The sites awarded with the EHL will preserve it and will be treated equally to all other candidates for the EUHL. This will not diminish the value of the old intergovernmental label and will give stronger credit to the new one.

Amendment 62

Proposal for a decision Annex – table

<i>Text proposed by the Commission</i>		<i>Amendment</i>	
[Year n]	Adoption of the Decision	[Year n]	Adoption of the Decision

	Preparatory work		Preparatory work
[Year n+1]	<i>Re-evaluation of the sites already awarded the European Heritage Label in the framework of the intergovernmental initiative</i>	[Year n+1]	<i>Preparatory work</i>
[Year n+2]	<i>First submission of sites by the Member States which did not participate in the intergovernmental initiative</i>	[Year n+2]	<i>Pre-selection by the Member States</i>
[Year n+3]	<i>Selection</i>	[Year n+3]	<i>Final designation of the sites</i>
[Year n+4]	<i>Monitoring</i>	[Year n+4]	<i>Pre-selection by the Member States</i>
[Year n+5]	<i>Selection</i>	[Year n+5]	<i>Final designation of the sites and monitoring</i>
[Year n+6]	<i>Selection Evaluation of the European Heritage Label</i>	[Year n+6]	<i>Pre-selection by the Member States</i>
[Year n+7]	<i>Selection</i>	[Year n+7]	<i>Final designation of the sites Evaluation of the European Heritage Label</i>
[Year n+8]	<i>Monitoring</i>	[Year n+8]	<i>Pre-selection by the Member States</i>
[Year n+9]	<i>Selection</i>	[Year n+9]	<i>Final designation of the sites and monitoring</i>
[Year n+10]	<i>Selection</i>	[Year n+10]	<i>Pre-selection by the Member States</i>
[Year n+11]	<i>Selection</i>	[Year n+11]	<i>Final designation of the sites</i>
[Year n+12]	<i>Monitoring Evaluation of the European Heritage Label</i>	[Year n+12]	<i>Pre-selection by the Member States</i>
...	...	<i>[Year n+13]</i>	<i>Final designation of the sites Evaluation of the European Heritage Label</i>

Justification

See justification for amendment to Article 10, paragraph 2.

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT

The formation of a joint European identity and the growth in interest in the European Union and its genesis are challenges with which the European institutions are faced in their bid to achieve broad cohesion and solidarity.

There certainly are other, more radical and obvious ways to enhance the Europeans' faith in the European Union and its leaders (the recent financial crisis has shown that there is still much to be achieved at the upper levels of the administration); however, knowledge of the history of our continent, familiarity with its multinational, yet common cultural heritage and stepped up education of the younger generation in the ideas and people who led to the building of the European Union, may actually contribute to bridging the gap between the EU and its citizens.

The Commission proposal

The Commission proposal stems from the original concept of the *European Heritage Label* which emerged in 2005 as one of the proposed solutions towards closing the gap between the EU and its citizens. Initially launched in April 2006 by a few European states (France, Spain, and Hungary) on an intergovernmental basis, it aimed at making use of our shared cultural heritage and history to strengthen European citizens' sense of belonging to Europe. To-date, a total of 64 sites located in 17 EU Member States and Switzerland have been awarded the label.

On November 20th, 2008, the Member States asked the European Commission to transform the intergovernmental European Heritage label into a formal action of the EU that would serve the same purpose, but would streamline its functioning and thereby ensure its long-term success.

A broad public consultation as well as an Impact Assessment showed that the European Heritage Label could better reach its goals if it operated as a European Union initiative, with the same well-defined criteria, along with a strong monitoring system in place that would help step up the Label's visibility and credibility - without the drawbacks inherent in an unstable, rotating administration, poor communication and waning interest in participation.

In order to achieve its political goal, the new European Heritage Label, as proposed, should focus on symbolism and/or educational value, rather than on the beauty of a site - as other initiatives in the field of cultural heritage already do - and should insist on close cooperation among the labelled sites so as to share best practices and initiate common projects.

The Rapporteur's position

The Rapporteur welcomes the Commission's proposal to use the European Heritage label as a tool, among other more efficient ways, to fill in the gap between the European Union and its citizens; as a way to stress that European history is the result of the diverse, yet rich and complementary, common cultural heritage; as an appreciation that the EU is rooted in strong values such as freedom, democracy, respect for human rights, cultural diversity, tolerance and solidarity. The decision of the Member States to place the European Heritage Label within the framework of the EU will not only help increase its visibility, prestige and credibility, but will

contribute to achieving long-sought ideals of cohesion and solidarity among European citizens.

The rapporteur originally expressed the idea of a label which would extend beyond the borders of the European Union and which could be used as an ambitious means serving outwards-oriented politics, owing to the widely recognised contribution of European culture to the world. However, it seems more realistic for the time being to treat the label as a tool for deepening European Union cohesion among Member States and their people, before any attempt is made at using it as an award beyond the EU's borders towards any contribution to human history and heritage originating from the values once born and applied in our continent.

A number of points in the proposal should require, however, further improvement and clarification:

I. EUROPEAN UNION HERITAGE LABEL

Renaming the intergovernmental European Heritage Label (EHL) into European Union Heritage Label (EUHL) - under a Community action - is of great importance for the rapporteur's standpoint and the label's concept as set forth in the proposal: it clearly distinguishes the latter from the former, and reflects that the new Label should be used as a means towards trying and achieving cohesion and solidarity, first and foremost among the citizens of the EU.

As a new action, with more concrete criteria and a well-defined monitoring system, a new name for a new label and a new logo would differentiate the latter from its forerunner. This suggestion, apart from affording time for testing the action and its implementation, helps to deal with the issue of the transitional provisions, described below.

II. NUMBER OF SITES: SELECTION EVERY 2 YEARS

A yearly award of the Label to a maximum of 27 sites per annum would not only dramatically multiply the number of sites bearing it in the early years, but would run a definite risk of lowering the Label's prestige. In addition, this would impact the quality of the monitoring procedure, especially by the European panel, whose task will be to review the monitoring reports published by Member States and issue recommendations.

The rapporteur believes that a bi-annual selection of sites would ensure better quality both of the process and of the selected sites, that it would give more time for the pre-selection (at the Member State level) and the following selection (at the European level), while facilitating site monitoring.

III. TRANSNATIONAL SITES

The rapporteur agrees that owing to the symbolic value of the label as a contributory vehicle towards European integration, transnational sites should be favoured since they promote commonalities; they promote networking, and encourage co-operation and collaboration between States or regions. Therefore, transnational sites should feature prominently in all Member States' ordinary 'quota' of two proposed sites per year. For practical reasons, a

Member State will be the 'coordinator' and will be the contact point in discussions with the European panel and the Commission.

IV. NO TRANSITIONAL PROVISIONS

The rapporteur envisions the new label not merely as a transformation of the old one, but as a chance for creating an action based on the experience accumulated during its existence as an intergovernmental initiative. The new well-defined criteria, the networking, the panel and the monitoring of the new action imply a different concept, which should not be seen as identical with the previous one. In order to preserve the prestige of the old label and promote the prestige of the new one, no transitional provisions should be needed.

In addition, a more reasonable number of labelled sites will help keep selection and monitoring procedures manageable. The number of sites covered each time should stay both reasonable and representative. If the transitional period occurs, then more than hundred sites could potentially be participating in the initiative by the end of the first 4-year period. For purposes of comparison, there are about 330 sites from the EU-27 on the UNESCO World Heritage List; however, it took more than 30 years to reach this number.

V. THE ROLE OF THE EUROPEAN PANEL

A question was raised as to whether it would be possible to step up the role of the European panel within the process of awarding or withdrawing the EHL from specific sites. Indirectly this question touches upon a more general legal question as to whether the EU legislator can create, through secondary legislation, entities with decision-making power, not provided for by the Treaties. It is ostensible from the Treaty (the principle of attribution of competences, Article 5 TEU) and also from well-established case-law of the Court of Justice, that the EU legislator can only act within the limits of competences provided for by the Treaty and also only within the institutional framework provided for by the Treaty.

Article 17 TEU provides that the Commission, among its functions, "manages programmes" as well as it "exercise[s] coordinating, executing and management functions" as laid down in the Treaties, while Article 291 TFEU provides that in cases where uniform conditions for implementing legally binding acts are needed, those implementing powers are conferred on the Commission. Consequently, the panel may not be involved in the process of awarding to, or withdrawing the label from, sites.

VI. A STRONGER ROLE FOR THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

For the same reason it is legally difficult for the European Parliament to be given more power, either in the designation or the withdrawal of the label, apart from its participation as described in the proposal.

The ways to improve involvement of the EP in the selection process would be either by asking the EP to give an opinion on preselected sites, or by being better informed on this initiative in an early stage. A downside of the first option is that it would slow down the process.

The rapporteur believes that the Commission should publish a full list of preselected sites and inform the European Parliament and the Council about it. That would afford the European Parliament enough time to react should any issues emerge.

Conclusion

The rapporteur shares the view expressed in the Impact Assessment that "*the (old) Label alone could not fill the gap between citizens and the EU*" but "*it was meant more modestly to be one contribution alongside other initiatives aimed at addressing the same problem*". She also agrees with the remarks of the same text about "the disappointing turnout in the European elections in June 2009", and the results demonstrated by a number of *Eurobarometer* surveys "*showing that the perception of the image of the EU has not improved over the past few years, but on the contrary the number of Europeans who have a positive image of the EU (45%) is at its lowest level since the autumn of 2005*".

There is still much left to be done by the European institutions on more crucial issues in order to alter these facts. The idea of a European Union Heritage Label that aims to increasing the European citizens' sense of sharing a common heritage (through knowledge of history and participation in actions supporting intercultural dialogue) and envisioning the building of the EU as a still in-progress process is a step in this direction.

Values such as democracy and freedom going back to the European cultural past are as important as transparency and solidarity and are every bit as much in need today, as we need and wish to fill in the gap between the European institutions and the citizens of the Member States of the EU.

PROCEDURE

Title	European Heritage Label	
References	COM(2010)0076 – C7-0071/2010 – 2010/0044(COD)	
Date submitted to Parliament	9.3.2010	
Committee responsible Date announced in plenary	CULT 24.3.2010	
Committee(s) asked for opinion(s) Date announced in plenary	REGI 24.3.2010	
Not delivering opinions Date of decision	REGI 27.4.2010	
Rapporteur(s) Date appointed	Chrysoula Paliadeli 23.3.2010	
Discussed in committee	23.6.2010	2.9.2010
Date adopted	27.10.2010	
Result of final vote	+: 28	–: 0
	0: 0	
Members present for the final vote	Magdi Cristiano Allam, Maria Badia i Cutchet, Zoltán Bagó, Malika Benarab-Attou, Lothar Bisky, Piotr Borys, Jean-Marie Cavada, Silvia Costa, Santiago Fisas Ayxela, Petra Kammerevert, Morten Løkkegaard, Marek Henryk Migalski, Doris Pack, Chrysoula Paliadeli, Marie-Thérèse Sanchez-Schmid, Marietje Schaake, Marco Scurria, Joanna Senyszyn, Emil Stoyanov, Hannu Takkula, Helga Trüpel, Sabine Verheyen, Milan Zver	
Substitute(s) present for the final vote	Ivo Belet, Luigi Berlinguer, Knut Fleckenstein, Nadja Hirsch, Oriol Junqueras Vies, Seán Kelly, Timothy Kirkhope, Iosif Matula, Monika Smolková, Rui Tavares, Róza Gräfin von Thun und Hohenstein	