AMENDMENTS
1 - 77

Draft opinion
Helmut Scholz
(PE704.776v01-00)

Better regulation: Joining forces to make better laws
(2021/2166(INI))
Amendment 1
Alin Mituța
Maite Pagazaurtundúa

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

1. Welcomes the Commission’s communication’s aim to make the approach to the Better law-making more dynamic and adaptive to further developments;

Amendment

1. Welcomes the Commission communication’s intention to make the approach to better law-making more dynamic and adaptable to further developments; **underlines the need for legislation that is fit for purpose, balanced, clear, and transparent and does not add administrative and regulatory burden;**

Or. en

Amendment 2
Helmut Scholz

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

1. Welcomes the Commission’s communication’s aim to make the approach to the Better law-making more dynamic and adaptive to further developments;

Amendment

1. Welcomes the Commission’s communication’s aim to make the approach to the Better law-making more dynamic and adaptive to further developments; **insists nevertheless that its operational aspects will become clearer only with the revision of the Better regulation guidelines and toolbox, which will be thoroughly scrutinized by the Parliament;**

Or. en

---

1 COM(2021)0219.
Amendment 3
Domèneç Ruiz Devesa

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1a (new)

Draft opinion

1a (new) Highlights the need to provide a better assessment of the social and environmental consequences of the Commission’s proposals, as well as of their impact on the rights of citizens;

Or. en

Amendment 4
Helmut Scholz

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Welcomes the efforts to consolidate the consultation process and the commitment to report on each public consultation within eight weeks of its closure; calls for improved systematic assessments of public consultations and for the Commission to increase its outreach activities and measures to promote greater participation;

2. Welcomes the efforts to consolidate the consultation process and the commitment to report on each public consultation within eight weeks of its closure; calls for improved systematic assessments of public consultations and for the Commission to increase its outreach activities and measures to promote greater participation; calls on the Commission to better engage with its representations in the Member States, with consultative bodies on the EU level and with national authorities with the view to disseminating more information about public consultations;

Or. en

Amendment 5
Jacek Saryusz-Wolski

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2
2. Welcomes the efforts to consolidate the consultation process and the commitment to report on each public consultation within eight weeks of its closure; calls for improved systematic assessments of public consultations and for the Commission to increase its outreach activities and measures to promote greater participation; 

Amendment

2. Calls for more effective and thorough implementation of ‘doing less more efficiently’ approach; calls to improve the application of principles of subsidiarity, proportionality, and proximity; welcomes the efforts to consolidate the consultation process and the commitment to report on each public consultation within eight weeks of its closure; calls for improved systematic assessments of public consultations and for the Commission to increase its outreach activities and measures to promote greater participation;

Or. en

Amendment 6
Angel Dzhambazki

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Welcomes the efforts to consolidate the consultation process and the commitment to report on each public consultation within eight weeks of its closure; calls for improved systematic assessments of public consultations and for the Commission to increase its outreach activities and measures to promote greater participation;

Amendment

2. Welcomes the commitment to report on each public consultation within eight weeks of its closure; calls for improved systematic assessments of public consultations and to promote greater participation; urges the Commission to ensure better involvement of national, regional and local authorities;

Or. en

Amendment 7
Damian Boeselager

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

2a (new) **Calls on the institutions to step up efforts for establishing a dedicated and user-friendly joint database on the state of play of legislative files for which work is ongoing as agreed in the Interinstitutional Agreement on Better Law-Making;**

**Or. en**

---

**Amendment 8**
Angel Dzhambazki

**Draft opinion**
Paragraph 3

3. **Reiterates that there is a need to fully engage citizens in the EU decision-making process; reiterates its call for the establishment of permanent participatory mechanisms to further facilitate and engage citizens’ participation in the EU decision-making process; supports awareness-raising activities for these mechanisms and highlights the need to establish them at the national, regional and local levels for adequate horizontal and vertical coordination among institutions at different levels;**

**Or. en**

---

**Amendment 9**
Damian Boeselager

**Draft opinion**
Paragraph 3

3. **Reiterates its call to facilitate and engage citizens’ participation in the EU decision-making process which is founded on representative democracy; supports awareness-raising activities and highlights the need to establish them at the national, regional and local levels;**

**Or. en**
3. Reiterates that there is a need to fully engage citizens in the EU decision-making process; reiterates its call for the establishment of permanent participatory mechanisms to further facilitate and engage citizens’ participation in the EU decision-making process; supports awareness-raising activities for these mechanisms and highlights the need to establish them at the national, regional and local levels for adequate horizontal and vertical coordination among institutions at different levels;

Amendment

3. Stresses that Article 10(3) TEU recognises participatory democracy as one of the main democratic principles of the EU, thereby highlighting that decisions must be taken as close to citizens as possible, which is indispensable to increase citizens’ trust in the EU institutions; reiterates that there is a need to fully engage citizens in the EU decision-making process; reiterates its call for the establishment of permanent participatory mechanisms, such as, but not limited to, online policy debate platforms, Youth consultations, a continuation of the Citizens’ Panels, to further facilitate and engage citizens’ participation in the EU decision-making process; supports awareness-raising activities for these mechanisms, such as, but not limited to, Commission, Council Presidency and Parliament citizens’ hours and dialogues, and highlights the need to establish them at the national, regional and local levels for adequate horizontal and vertical coordination among institutions at different levels;

Or. en

Amendment 10
Helmut Scholz

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

3. Reiterates that there is a need to fully engage citizens in the EU decision-making process; reiterates its call for

Draft opinion

3. Recalls the rapidly changing character of citizens’ views about the impact of the EU governance on
the establishment of permanent participatory mechanisms to further facilitate and engage citizens’ participation in the EU decision-making process; supports awareness-raising activities for these mechanisms and highlights the need to establish them at the national, regional and local levels for adequate horizontal and vertical coordination among institutions at different levels;
	heir daily life and impact on future developments against the backdrop of increasingly social media driven information society, establishment of which accelerates and increases awareness functioning of the EU decision-making; reiterates that there is a need to fully engage citizens in the EU decision-making process; reiterates its call for the establishment of permanent participatory mechanisms to further facilitate and engage citizens’ participation in the EU decision-making process beyond the act of voting and other channels and instruments; supports awareness-raising activities for these mechanisms and highlights the need to establish them at the national, regional and local levels for adequate horizontal and vertical coordination among institutions at different levels;

Amendment 11
Victor Negrescu

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Reiterates that there is a need to fully engage citizens in the EU decision-making process; reiterates its call for the establishment of permanent participatory mechanisms to further facilitate and engage citizens’ participation in the EU decision-making process; supports awareness-raising activities for these mechanisms and highlights the need to establish them at the national, regional and local levels for adequate horizontal and vertical coordination among institutions at different levels;
coordination among institutions at different levels; these mechanisms and highlights the need to establish them at the national, regional and local levels for adequate horizontal and vertical coordination among institutions at different levels;

Amendment 12
Alin Mituța
Maite Pagazaurtundúa

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

3. Reiterates that there is a need to fully engage citizens in the EU decision-making process; reiterates its call for the establishment of permanent participatory mechanisms to further facilitate and engage citizens’ participation in the EU decision-making process; supports awareness-raising activities for these mechanisms and highlights the need to establish them at the national, regional and local levels for adequate horizontal and vertical coordination among institutions at different levels;

Amendment

3. Reiterates that there is a need to fully engage citizens in the EU decision-making process in a manner which takes into account the entire policy cycle; reiterates its call for the establishment of permanent participatory mechanisms to further facilitate and engage citizens’ participation in the EU decision-making process; highlights the need to embed this permanent participatory mechanism in the consultation process that establishes the Annual Work Programme of the European Commission, as provided by Annex X of the IIA on Better Law-Making; supports awareness-raising activities for these mechanisms and highlights the need to establish them at European, national, regional and local levels, including the necessary tools for adequate horizontal and vertical coordination among institutions at different levels; calls on all EU decision-makers to take stakeholders’ input into account and ensure effective follow-up in the ensuing decision-making processes;

Or. en
Amendment 13
Seán Kelly
Antonio Tajani
Sven Simon
Paulo Rangel
Loránt Vincze
Othmar Karas

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

3. Reiterates that there is a need to fully engage citizens in the EU decision-making process; reiterates its call for the establishment of permanent participatory mechanisms to further facilitate and engage citizens’ participation in the EU decision-making process; supports awareness-raising activities for these mechanisms and highlights the need to establish them at the national, regional and local levels for adequate horizontal and vertical coordination among institutions at different levels;

Amendment
3. Reiterates that there is a need to fully engage citizens in the EU decision-making process; reiterates the importance of effective participatory mechanisms to further facilitate and engage citizens’ participation in the EU decision-making process; supports awareness-raising activities for these mechanisms and highlights the need to establish them at the national, regional and local levels for adequate horizontal and vertical coordination among institutions at different levels; emphasises that more in-depth information regarding citizens’ concerns will assist the EU institutions in their efforts to be responsive to these concerns under the Union’s core principles of representative democracy;

Or. en

Amendment 14
Victor Negrescu

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3a (new)

3a (new) Calls for greater transparency of the consultation process and calls for the publication of public reports, available in all EU languages and
also accessible to people with disabilities;

Amendment 15
Nathalie Colin-Oesterlé
Draft opinion
Paragraph 3a (new)

3a (new)  Calls on the institutions to take all necessary measures to ensure the participation of vulnerable people such as disabled people and children in the EU decision-making process; highlights the need for a better access to information for these citizens;

Amendment 16
Seán Kelly
Antonio Tajani
Sven Simon
Paulo Rangel
Loránt Vincze
Othmar Karas
Draft opinion
Paragraph 3a (new)

3a (new)  Welcomes the Commission’s commitment to making better use of strategic foresight since it plays a key role in helping to future-proof EU policy-making by ensuring that short-term initiatives are grounded in a longer-term perspective;
Amendment 17
Domènec Ruiz Devesa

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3a (new)

Amendment

3a (new) Acknowledges the current trend of national parliaments asking for more political dialogue on Union policies in order to develop a greater added value for citizens, and a further involvement of the European Committee of the Regions in this regard;

Or. en

Amendment 18
Nathalie Colin-Oesterlé

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3b (new)

Amendment

3b (new) Highlights the need for the European Parliament to have an oral or written translation at each stage of the legislative process and in all official languages of the EU;

Or. en

Amendment 19
Domènec Ruiz Devesa

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3b (new)

Amendment

3b (new) Calls again on Member States to reduce the issues related to “gold-plating” and to avoid unnecessary
administrative burdens when implementing EU law;

**Amendment 20**
Damian Boeselager

*Draft opinion*
*Paragraph 4*

**Draft opinion**

4. Highlights the acknowledged lack of impact assessments for several key legislative files, *which can only partly be attributed to the COVID-19 pandemic*;

**Amendment**

4. Highlights the acknowledged lack of impact assessments for several key legislative files;

**Amendment 21**
Victor Negrescu

*Draft opinion*
*Paragraph 4*

**Draft opinion**

4. Highlights the acknowledged lack of impact assessments for several key legislative files, which can only partly be attributed to the COVID-19 pandemic;

**Amendment**

4. Highlights the acknowledged lack of impact assessments for several key legislative files, which can only partly be attributed to the COVID-19 pandemic; *underlines the need of extensive assessment of the impact the COVID-19 pandemic and related legislation and calls for adequate solutions and policies tackling the causes and limiting the negative impact of the pandemic*;
Amendment 22
Alin Mituța
Maite Pagazaurtundúa

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

4. Highlights the acknowledged lack of impact assessments for several key legislative files, which can only partly be attributed to the COVID-19 pandemic; underlines the need for evidence-based legislation, comprehensive impact assessment reports and in-depth analysis of all available data; calls on the Commission to ensure the transparency of the decision-making process;

Amendment

4. Highlights the acknowledged lack of impact assessments for several key legislative files, which can only partly be attributed to the COVID-19 pandemic and welcomes the Commission’s commitment to publish a staff working document together with the proposal or within the three months of its publication;

Or. en

Amendment 23
Helmut Scholz

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

4. Highlights the acknowledged lack of impact assessments for several key legislative files, which can only partly be attributed to the COVID-19 pandemic;

Amendment

4. Highlights the acknowledged lack of impact assessments for several key legislative files, which can only partly be attributed to the COVID-19 pandemic and welcomes the Commission’s commitment to publish a staff working document together with the proposal or within the three months of its publication;

Or. en

Amendment 24
Seán Kelly
Antonio Tajani
Sven Simon
Paulo Rangel
Loránt Vincze
Othmar Karas

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Highlights the acknowledged lack of impact assessments for several key legislative files, which can only partly be attributed to the COVID-19 pandemic;

Amendment

4. Highlights and regrets the acknowledged lack of impact assessments for several key legislative files, which can only partly be attributed to the COVID-19 pandemic;

Amendment 25
Angel Dzhambazki

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4a (new)

Draft opinion

4a (new) Stresses that the functioning of the European Union is founded on representative democracy;

Amendment

4a (new) Insists that impact assessments should never replace political decisions nor delay the legislative process; considers that impact assessments must pay equal attention to the evaluation of social, health and environmental consequences in particular, and that the impact on the fundamental rights of
Draft opinion

Paragraph 5

5. Acknowledges the need for the co-legislators to conduct impact assessments when substantially amending legislative proposals, in line with paragraph 15 of the Interinstitutional Agreement on Better Law-Making\(^2\) (IIA on BLM);\(^3\)

Amendment

5. Acknowledges the need for the co-legislators to conduct impact assessments when substantially amending legislative proposals, in line with paragraph 15 of the Interinstitutional Agreement on Better Law-Making\(^3\) (IIA on BLM); calls for impact assessments to be published immediately upon their completion, and not only when the policy proposal is presented, thus ensuring greater transparency of how decisions at EU-level are taken, as stated by the CJEU in Case C 57/16P, ClientEarth v Commission;\(^4\)

---

\(^3\) OJ L 123, 12.5.2016, p. 1.  
Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

5. Acknowledges the need for the co-legislators to conduct impact assessments when substantially amending legislative proposals, in line with paragraph 15 of the Interinstitutional Agreement on Better Law-Making (IIA on BLM); encourages the establishment of internal procedures for the Parliament to produce its own impact assessments on substantial amendments and the committees to avail themselves fully of the possibility to request expertise for such amendments;

Amendment 30
Helmut Scholz

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5a (new)

5. Acknowledges the need for the co-legislators to conduct impact assessments when substantially amending legislative proposals, in line with paragraph 15 of the Interinstitutional Agreement on Better Law-Making (IIA on BLM); recalls the commitment of all three institutions to systematically consider the use of review clauses in legislation to carry out ex-post evaluations;

---

Draft opinion

5a (new) Stresses that the updated toolbox on better law-making, in particular the “do not significant harm” principle, shall consider the costs that may arise from inaction, notably on the climate and environment, as well as the social dimension, and the cumulative effects arising from delay in action;

Or. en

Amendment 31
Damian Boeselager

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5a (new)

Draft opinion

5a (new) Stresses furthermore that impact assessments are a tool to help reaching well-informed decisions in the legislative decision-making process and must not lead to undue delays in decision-making or hinder political decisions in a context of green and digital transition to answer global challenges; highlights that such processes should take into consideration economic, environmental, gender and social impacts in an integrated and balanced way and use both qualitative and quantitative analyses, as well as addressing the costs of non-harmonisation at EU level; recalls that making regulation which is ‘fit for the future’ should entail the adoption of a ‘think sustainability first’ approach in the Better Regulation Guidelines;
Amendment 32
Victor Negrescu

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5a (new)

5a (new) Calls for the wide implementation of evaluation and impact markers of the policies implemented at European level; praises the UNICEF proposal for a children-marker evaluating the impact of policies on children and calls for the development of similar mechanisms on other policies and impact factors;

Amendment 33
Helmut Scholz

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5b

5b (new) Recalls the need to apply consistent principles of legislative drafting, in particular transparency, accountability as well as clarity and precision in line with the principles recognized by the jurisprudence of the CJEU6;
6. Recalls the commitment of all three institutions to setting up a joint legislative register; insists on the need to make this joint portal fully operational and transparent as soon as possible and to include all publicly disclosed documents under Regulation (EU) 1049/2001 automatically; deplores the persistent lack of transparency in the Council’s decision-making process and the practice of over-classifying documents and applying an excessively broad interpretation of the exceptions included under Regulation (EU) 1049/2001;

---

6. Recalls the commitment of all three institutions to setting up a joint legislative register; insists on the need to make this joint portal fully operational and transparent by the end of 2022 and to include all publicly disclosed documents under Regulation (EU) 1049/2001 automatically; deplores the persistent lack of transparency in the Council’s decision-making process and the practice of over-classifying documents and applying an

---

excessively broad interpretation of the exceptions included under Regulation (EU) 1049/2001;

believes that the use of secrecy exceptions for Council documents should be applied in a coherent system with external oversight and complying with CJEU caselaw;

Amendment 36
Helmut Scholz
Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

6. Recalls the commitment of all three institutions to setting up a joint legislative register; insists on the need to make this joint portal fully operational and transparent as soon as possible and to include all publicly disclosed documents under Regulation (EU) 1049/2001\(^{10}\) automatically; deplores the persistent lack of transparency in the Council’s decision-making process and the practice of over-classifying documents and applying an excessively broad interpretation of the exceptions included under Regulation (EU) 1049/2001;

6. Recalls the commitment of all three institutions to set up a Joint legislative register, to allow for an increased transparency of the legislative process and allow the citizens and both informed and general public to follow the evolution of legislative text in a clear and comprehensive way; insists on the need to make such joint portal fully operational and transparent as soon as possible and to include automatically all publicly disclosed documents under Regulation (EU) 1049/2001; deplores the persistent lack of transparency in the decision-making process in the Council as well as practice of over-classification of documents and of applying excessively broad interpretation of exceptions under the Regulation (EU) 1049/2001, in particular with regard to the protection of decision-making process and protection of legal advice, contrary to the principle of overriding public interest in the disclosure of related documents;

\(^{10}\) OJ L 145, 31.5.2001, p. 43.
6. Recalls the commitment of all three institutions to setting up a joint legislative register; insists on the need to make this joint portal fully operational and transparent as soon as possible and to include all publicly disclosed documents under Regulation (EU) 1049/2001\textsuperscript{[1]} automatically; deplores the persistent lack of transparency in the Council’s decision-making process and the practice of over-classifying documents and applying an excessively broad interpretation of the exceptions included under Regulation (EU) 1049/2001; calls on the three institutions to ensure a forward-looking and consistent application of the above mentioned Regulation allowing appropriate access to registered documents and to all types of communication, provided they concern a matter relating to the policies, activities and decisions falling within the institution’s sphere of responsibility;

\textsuperscript{[1]} \textit{OJ L 145, 31.5.2001, p. 43.}
register; insists on the need to make this joint portal fully operational and transparent as soon as possible and to include all publicly disclosed documents under Regulation (EU) 1049/2001 automatically; 

Amendment 39
Domènec Ruiz Devesa

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

6a (new) Is convinced that considering also the cost of non-legislation at European level (the so-called cost of non-Europe) is an important source of narrative and understanding when dealing with the available tools for better regulation;

Amendment 40
Helmut Scholz

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

6a (new) Insist that the effective implementation of the EU law is essential in order to enhance citizen’s trust in EU policies and institutions; recalls that under Article 197 TFEU, such implementation shall be regarded as o
matter of common interest for the Member States and stresses the need for them to avoid gold-platting when transposing EU legislation;

Or. en

Amendment 41
Seán Kelly
Antonio Tajani
Paulo Rangel
Loránt Vincze
Othmar Karas

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6a (new)

Draft opinion
6a (new) Believes that EU legislation should always be fit for purpose, proportionate and aim at keeping the burden for citizens and businesses, especially SMEs, as low as possible; reiterates the need to avoid unnecessary administrative, adjustment and compliance burdens when designing, transposing and implementing EU acts; underlines the need for the strengthening of the principle of being ‘big on big things, small on small things’;

Or. en

Amendment 42
Damian Boeselager

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6a (new)

Draft opinion
6a (new) Is of the opinion that access to documents rules in Council activities should be as transparent as those of the European Parliament; stresses in...
that the positions defended by the representatives of the Member States, already at the level of the Working Groups of the Council, should be made public in order for citizens, media and civil society to be able to know what position their government took on their behalf at the EU level and to contribute to the enhancement of scrutiny of EU decision-making by national parliaments, applying to all decisions, from legislative files to implementing and delegated acts; points out that bodies with even less levels of transparency such as the Eurogroup should as a first step be submitted to the Council’s rules of procedure, making available to the public the voting procedures, minutes, results, and explanation of votes and its deliberations;

Or. en

Amendment 43
Damian Boeselager

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

6b (new) Requests urgent measures to enhance the transparency of decisions taken in infringement procedures;

Or. en

Amendment 44
Domènec Ruiz Devesa

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6b (new)

**Draft opinion**

**Amendment**

6b (new)  Calls for providing for sufficient resources with the EP Services entitled to support the members capacity to improve their function of co-legislators, such as the EP Directorate for Impact Assessment and European Added Value;

Or. en

---

**Amendment 45**
Seán Kelly
Antonio Tajani
Sven Simon
Paulo Rangel
Loránt Vincze
Othmar Karas

---

**Draft opinion**
Paragraph 6b (new)

**Draft opinion**

**Amendment**

6b (new)  Stresses that ‘gold plating’ often creates additional administrative or compliance burdens, especially for SMEs; Calls on Member States to increase their efforts at a national level regarding better regulation and the avoidance of unnecessary burdens; considers that the principle of better regulation should not prevent Member States’ parliaments from maintaining or taking more ambitious measures in cases where only minimum standards are defined by Union law;

Or. en

---

**Amendment 46**
Damian Boeselager

---

**Draft opinion**
Paragraph 6c (new)
Believes that the EU needs more ambitious access to documents rules, including for documents related to internal, trilogue and international negotiations; recalls that according to the European Ombudsman, restrictions on access to documents, particularly legislative documents, should be exceptional and limited to what is absolutely necessary; further recalls that transparency and publicity of an ongoing legislative procedure are inherent to the legislative process and can therefore be applied to the access of documents for trilogues as stated by the CJEU in its case-law, case T540/15, De Capitani v Parliament in particular; adds furthermore that openness and transparency confer greater legitimacy and confidence in the democratic legislative process of the European Union;

Amendment 47
Helmut Scholz

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7

7. Warns against a mechanical application of the ‘one in’ / ‘one out’ principle, which results in an excessive focus on regulatory burdens, which may lead the consideration of benefits to be neglected;
domestic regulatory framework;

Amendment 48
Alin Mituța
Maite Pagazaurtundúa

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7

Draft opinion
7. Warns against a mechanical application of the ‘one in’ / ‘one out’ principle, which results in an excessive focus on regulatory burdens, which may lead the consideration of benefits to be neglected;

Amendment
7. Warns against a mechanical application of the ‘one in’ / ‘one out’ principle, which may result in an excessive focus on regulatory burdens, which may in turn may negatively impact the achievement of other legitimate policy goals;

Amendment 49
Victor Negrescu

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7

Draft opinion
7. Warns against a mechanical application of the ‘one in’ / ‘one out’ principle, which results in an excessive focus on regulatory burdens, which may lead the consideration of benefits to be neglected;

Amendment
7. Warns against a mechanical application of the ‘one in’ / ‘one out’ principle, which results in an excessive focus on regulatory burdens, which may lead the consideration of benefits to be neglected; reiterates the need of wide-EU consultation at European, national and local level and insists on the need for extensive evaluations of policy-impact at all levels in order tackle potential specific challenges;
7. **Warns against** a mechanical application of the ‘one in’ / ‘one out’ principle, *which results in an excessive focus on regulatory burdens*, which may lead the consideration of benefits to be neglected;

7. **Welcomes the ‘one in, one out’ approach**, by which the Commission aims to offset newly introduced burdens by relieving citizens and businesses of equivalent burdens at EU level in the same policy area; highlights that the ‘one-in, one-out’ approach strengthens the REFIT programme by extending the programme beyond the burdens from individual pieces of existing legislation to include also burdens from new legislation as well as managing the accumulative burden in each policy area; calls on the Commission to increase its efforts regarding regulatory offsetting, and to thoroughly examine how new legislative elements overlap with existing laws and regulations, without going so far as to introduce a mechanical application of the ‘one in’ / ‘one out’ principle, which may lead the consideration of benefits to be neglected;

Or. en
Paragraph 7a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

7a (new) Emphasises the essential role of the EU’s 24 million SMEs, which employ around 100 million people, in our economy; reiterates that special attention must be given to administrative, adjustment and compliance costs for SMEs when conducting impact assessments; regrets the unsatisfactory application of the SME test to date, and calls for a binding SME test to do justice to the importance of SMEs;

Or. en

Amendment 52
Seán Kelly
Antonio Tajani
Sven Simon
Paulo Rangel
Loránt Vincze
Othmar Karas

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

7b (new) Strongly believes that better regulation is necessary to enable the EU to reach the targets set out in the Green Deal; welcomes the Commission communication’s commitment to work with Member States, regions and key stakeholders to remove obstacles and red tape hindering the progress of the green transition; stresses the importance of ex-post evaluations of climate legislation to ensure that the EU is delivering on its commitments;

Or. en

Amendment 53
Damian Boeselager
Draft opinion
Paragraph 8

8. Recalls the importance of maintaining close contact between the co-legislators in advance of interinstitutional negotiations, including by inviting representatives of other institutions to informal exchanges of views on a regular basis, in line with the commitment outlined in paragraph 34 of the IIA on BLM;

8. Recalls the importance of maintaining a close contact between the co-legislators in advance of interinstitutional negotiations, including by inviting representatives of other institutions to informal exchanges of views on a regular basis, in line with the commitment outlined in paragraph 34 of the IIA on BLM;

regrets that this commitment has not given rise to any new structures of cooperation neither to systematic practice for facilitate such exchange; suggests that the co-legislators agree on a code of good practice in that respect;

Amendment 54
Helmut Scholz

Draft opinion
Paragraph 8

8. Recalls the importance of maintaining close contact between the co-legislators in advance of interinstitutional negotiations, including by inviting representatives of other institutions to informal exchanges of views on a regular basis, in line with the commitment outlined in paragraph 34 of the IIA on BLM;

8. Recalls the importance of maintaining close contact between the co-legislators in advance of interinstitutional negotiations, including by inviting representatives of other institutions to informal exchanges of views on a regular basis, in line with the commitment outlined in paragraph 34 of the IIA on BLM;
Amendment 55
Damian Boeselager

Draft opinion
Paragraph 9

9. Calls on the Council and the Commission to assess jointly with Parliament the extent to which the IIA on BLM should be revised to eliminate possible barriers to Parliament’s ability to exercise its power to propose legislative initiatives;

Amendment

9. Calls on the Council and the Commission to assess jointly with Parliament the extent to which the IIA on BLM should be revised to eliminate possible barriers to Parliament’s ability to exercise its power to propose legislative initiatives; reminds the Council and the Commission of the recommendations taken by the Focus Groups of the European Parliament underlining the need to revise Rule of Procedure 132 as well as rule 166 on the access to the Chambers of the Council and the European Commission so as to allow members to assist or be questioned during Council Working Group, COREPER or Council meetings;

Or. en

Amendment 56
Helmut Scholz

Draft opinion
Paragraph 9

9. Calls on the Council and the Commission to assess jointly with Parliament the extent to which the IIA on BLM should be revised to eliminate possible barriers to Parliament’s ability to exercise its power to propose legislative initiatives;

Amendment

9. Welcomes the commitment of the Commission’s President to support the right of initiative of the European Parliament and its commitment to always respond with a legislative act to the requests under Article 225 TFEU; calls on the Council and the Commission to assess jointly with Parliament the extent to which the IIA on BLM should be revised to eliminate possible barriers to Parliament’s ability to exercise its power to propose
legislative initiatives; *considers that the Framework Agreement might be revised to increased facilitation of this right;* highlights the need to also clarify differences between the various types of EP reports and clarify the action requested from the Commission;

Amendment 57
Seán Kelly  
Antonio Tajani  
Sven Simon  
Paulo Rangel  
Loránt Vincze  
Othmar Karas

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 9**

**Draft opinion**

9. Calls on the Council and the Commission to assess jointly with Parliament the extent to which the IIA on BLM should be revised to eliminate possible barriers to Parliament’s ability to exercise its power to propose legislative initiatives;

**Amendment**

9. *Stresses that a parliamentary right of initiative is an important feature of representative democracy at Member State level and sees the necessity to empower MEPs, as the direct representatives of EU citizens, by strengthening their right to shape the EU legislative agenda;* Calls on the Council and the Commission to assess jointly with Parliament the extent to which the IIA on BLM should be revised to eliminate possible barriers to Parliament’s ability to exercise its power to propose legislative initiatives; *points out that better law-making requires effective legislative procedures conducive to concluding EU decision-making procedures within a suitable timeframe; regrets that, due to the lack of commitment of the Council and in the absence of effective procedural guidelines, the special legislative procedures set out in the Treaties have too seldom been successfully concluded;*
Amendment 58
Nathalie Colin-Oesterlé

Draft opinion
Paragraph 9a (new)

Draft opinion

9a (new) Considers that when the Treaties are to be revised, the European Parliament as the only directly elected institution should be granted the right of legislative initiative;

Amendment

Or. en

Amendment 59
Alin Mituța
Maite Pagazaurtundúa

Draft opinion
Paragraph 9b (new)

Draft opinion

9b (new) Calls on the Council, the Commission and the Parliament to revise the Interinstitutional Agreement on Better Law-Making in order to integrate a permanent citizen’s consultation mechanism in the process leading to the establishment of the Annual Work Programme of the European Commission;

Amendment

Or. en

Amendment 60
Domèneç Ruiz Devesa

Draft opinion
Paragraph 9c (new)
Draft opinion

Amendment

9c (new) Considers that in cases in which Parliament exercises the right of initiative, such as on the regulations relating to its own composition, the election of its Members and the general conditions for the exercise of its functions, and the statute of the Ombudsman as well as the constitution of temporary committees of inquiry, it is necessary to contemplate measures in a future Interinstitutional Agreement to avoid the Council's refusal to negotiate with the Parliament;

Or. en

Amendment 61
Domènec Ruiz Devesa

Draft opinion
Paragraph 9d (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

9d (new) Recommends that the legislative process arising from the right of legislative initiative conferred on Parliament by the Treaties must include, a request for the establishment of a legislative calendar for the initiatives concerned, similarly as with the ordinary legislative procedure; underlines, moreover, that such a special legislative procedure must respect the provisions of the IIA concerning the institutional obligation to negotiate of all three institutions;

Or. en

Amendment 62
Jacek Saryusz-Wolski
10. Calls for the need take into full consideration the Conference on the Future of Europe’s deliberations on the participation of citizens in the EU decision-making process, in particular the recommendations of the Citizens Panel No 2, in particular sub stream 4.2, No 29, No 32, sub stream 2.1, No 10 and No 11 thereof;
10. Calls for the need to take into full consideration the Conference on the Future of Europe’s deliberations on the participation of citizens in the EU decision-making process, in particular the recommendations of the Citizens Panel No 2, with a focus on sub stream 4.2, No 29, No 32, sub stream 2.1, No 10 and No 11 thereof;
Othmar Karas

Draft opinion
Paragraph 10

10. **Calls for the need take into full consideration** the Conference on the Future of Europe’s deliberations on the participation of citizens in the EU decision-making process, in particular the **recommendations** of the Citizens Panel No 2, in particular sub stream 4.2, No 29, No 32, sub stream 2.1, No 10 and No 11 thereof;

Amendment

10. **Welcomes** the Conference on the Future of Europe’s deliberations on the participation of citizens in the EU decision-making process, in particular the **work** of the Citizens Panel No 2; **highlights the necessity of meaningful engagement with the recommendations made in the final report on the Conference, which will be drawn up by the Executive Board in collaboration with the Conference Plenary, on the basis of the Conference Plenary’s debates on the recommendations from the national and European Citizens’ Panels, as well as input from the Multilingual Digital Platform**;

Or. en

Amendment 67
Helmut Scholz

Draft opinion
Paragraph 10

10. Calls for the need take into full consideration the Conference on the Future of Europe’s deliberations on the participation of citizens in the EU decision-making process, in particular the recommendations of the Citizens Panel No 2, in particular sub stream 4.2, No 29, No 32, sub stream 2.1, No 10 and No 11 thereof;

Amendment

10. **Emphasizes the need to consider the issue of the Right of initiative at the Conference on future of Europe, as it would strengthen the EU’s democratic legitimacy and further empower EU citizens**; calls for the need take into full consideration the Conference on the Future of Europe’s deliberations on the participation of citizens in the EU decision-making process, in particular the recommendations of the Citizens Panel No 2, in particular sub stream 4.2, No 29, No 32, sub stream 2.1, No 10 and No 11 thereof; **considers that the recommendations of the panels clearly**
demonstrate that the citizens call for more transparency of the public debate in the EU, for more outreach and more information to be provided by the EU institutions with active use of all the channels of communication while emphasizing the role of the social media, which should be accompanying the decision-making in the EU, including legislative processes;

Amendment 68
Domènec Ruiz Devesa

Draft opinion
Paragraph 10

10. Calls for the need take into full consideration the Conference on the Future of Europe’s deliberations on the participation of citizens in the EU decision-making process, in particular the recommendations of the Citizens Panel No 2, in particular sub stream 4.2, No 29, No 32, sub stream 2.1, No 10 and No 11 thereof;

Amendment

10. Calls for the need take into full consideration the Conference on the Future of Europe’s deliberations on the participation of citizens in the EU decision-making process, in particular the recommendations of the Citizens Panel No 2 in particular sub stream 2.1, No 10 and No 11; sub stream 3.1, No 16; sub stream 4.1, No 24 and sub stream 4.2, No 29 and No 32 thereof;

Amendment 69
Nathalie Colin-Oesterlé

Draft opinion
Paragraph 10a (new)

Draft opinion

10a (new) Calls more generally on the Commission, the Council and the European Parliament to implement the
Citizens Panels’ recommendations in accordance with the principle of conferral as laid down in Article 5 TEU;

Or. en

Amendment 70
Damian Boeselager

Draft opinion
Paragraph 11

11. Considers the development of new algorithms and new forms of digitalisation processes in the decision-making of all three institutions to be an essential challenge of the digital era; believes that the commitments of the three institutions on those developments should be clearly identified and included in a revised IIA on BLM.

Amendment

11. Considers the development of new forms of digitalisation processes in the decision-making of all three institutions to be an essential challenge of the digital era; believes that the commitments of the three institutions on those developments should be clearly identified and included in a revised IIA on BLM.

Or. en

Amendment 71
Victor Negrescu

Draft opinion
Paragraph 11

11. Considers the development of new algorithms and new forms of digitalisation processes in the decision-making of all three institutions to be an essential challenge of the digital era; believes that the commitments of the three institutions on those developments should be clearly identified and

Amendment

11. Considers the development of new algorithms and new forms of digitalisation processes in the decision-making of all three institutions to be an essential challenge of the digital era; believes that the commitments of the three institutions on those developments should be clearly identified and
calls upon legislators to employ digitalization in order to facilitate the legislative work and to avoid over-bureaucratization and any form of limitation of democratic expression and opinions of elected officials.

Amendment 72
Alin Mituța
Maite Pagazaurtundúa

Draft opinion
Paragraph 11

11. Considers the development of new algorithms and new forms of digitalisation processes in the decision-making of all three institutions to be an essential challenge of the digital era; believes that the commitments of the three institutions on those developments should be clearly identified and included in a revised IIA on BLM.

Amendment 73
Seán Kelly
Antonio Tajani
Sven Simon
Paulo Rangel
Loránt Vincze
Othmar Karas

Draft opinion
Paragraph 11

11. Considers the development of new algorithms and new forms of digitalisation processes in the decision-making of all three institutions to be an essential challenge and opportunity to strengthen the quality of EU law-making; believes that the commitments of the three institutions on those developments should be clearly identified and included in a revised IIA on BLM.
11. Considers the development of new algorithms and new forms of digitalisation processes in the decision-making of all three institutions to be an essential challenge of the digital era; believes that the commitments of the three institutions on those developments should be clearly identified and included in a revised IIA on BLM.

Amendment 74
Helmut Scholz

Draft opinion
Paragraph 11a (new)

11a (new) Insists on the strong links between the implementation of the Next Generation EU recovery package with the objective of ensuring stronger resilience of EU societies and the need of EU institutions to reach out to the citizens of the Union in order to raise awareness about fundamental nature of these political tasks and their execution; believes that such outreach should ultimately contribute to more flexible and more far-reaching inter-institutional decision-making capable to respond in a robust and decisive manner to the experiences of the pandemic;

Amendment 75
Rainer Wieland

Draft opinion
Paragraph 11b (new)
**Draft opinion**

**Amendment**

11b (new)  
Classifies uniform linguistic versions in the official EU languages as a crucial prerequisite for the submission of a reliable interpretation of existing regulations by courts and authorities and thus as one of the most important contributions to the unitary exertion of European Union Law; calls on the institutions to substantially meet these requirements in the course of future law-making.

Or. en

Amendment 76  
Seán Kelly  
Antonio Tajani  
Sven Simon  
Paulo Rangel  
Loránt Vincze  
Othmar Karas

**Draft opinion**

**Paragraph 11c (new)**

**Draft opinion**

**Amendment**

11c (new)  
Believes that EU participatory democracy requires supporting unorganised citizens and promoting their access to electoral and participatory opportunities within and outside EU channels; highlights that this bottom-up participatory agenda should be capable of complementing, not substituting, representative democracy in the EU;

Or. en

Amendment 77  
Alin Mituţa  
Maite Pagazaurtundúa
Draft opinion
Paragraph 11d (new)

Draft opinion

11d (new) Reiterates that an effective enforcement of EU legislation is a key part of the “Better Law-making” agenda; points out that excessive regulatory burden for citizens and businesses can often be attributed to Member States compliance issues; calls on the Commission to enforce EU legislation in full and without undue delay and to leverage all existing tools; stresses that the Commission’s enforcement policy must be more predictable and transparent and reinforce legal certainty for all stakeholders;

Amendment

Or. en