



**2019/2055(DEC)**

16.12.2019

# **AMENDMENTS**

## **1 - 41**

**Draft opinion**  
**Tomáš Zdechovský**  
(PE642.933v01-00)

2018 discharge: General budget of the EU - European Commission  
(2019/2055(DEC))



## Amendment 1

Alex Agius Saliba, Vilija Blinkevičiūtė, Alicia Homs Ginel, Estrella Durá Ferrandis, Elisabetta Gualmini, Marianne Vind, Milan Brglez

### Draft opinion

#### Paragraph 2

##### *Draft opinion*

2. Notes with concern that payment claims for a substantial value have been delayed and will be submitted in future years and that this has affected the use of pre-financing and outstanding commitments, and will affect payment appropriation needs at the start of the next MFF;

##### *Amendment*

2. Notes with concern that payment claims for a substantial value have been delayed and will be submitted in future years and that this has affected the use of pre-financing and outstanding commitments, and will affect payment appropriation needs at the start of the next MFF; ***acknowledges that the European Commission is taking measures to avoid undue pressure on the level of payment appropriations in the first years of the 2021-2027 MFF;***

Or. en

## Amendment 2

Alex Agius Saliba, Vilija Blinkevičiūtė, Alicia Homs Ginel, Estrella Durá Ferrandis, Elisabetta Gualmini, Marianne Vind, Milan Brglez

### Draft opinion

#### Paragraph 3

##### *Draft opinion*

3. Welcomes that in 2018, for the first time, audit authorities reported errors using a common methodology agreed between the Commission and the Member States; notes the fact that there has been a sustained improvement in the overall estimated level of error in expenditures made from the Union budget in the past few years (4.4 % in 2014; 3.8 % in 2015; 3.1 % in 2016; 2.4 % in 2017 and 2.6 % in 2018);

##### *Amendment*

3. Welcomes that in 2018, for the first time, audit authorities reported errors using a common methodology agreed between the Commission and the Member States ***and that ineligible expenditure and public procurement procedures have been detected as the most common types of irregularities;*** notes the fact that there has been a sustained improvement in the overall estimated level of error in expenditures made from the Union budget in the past few years (4.4 % in 2014; 3.8 % in 2015; 3.1 % in 2016; 2.4 % in 2017 and 2.6 % in 2018);

### Amendment 3

Alex Agius Saliba, Vilija Blinkevičiūtė, Alicia Homs Ginel, Estrella Durá Ferrandis, Elisabetta Gualmini, Marianne Vind, Milan Brglez

#### Draft opinion

#### Paragraph 3 a (new)

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

**3 a. Welcomes that the European Commission has implemented high proportion of the Court's follow-up recommendations and supports the Court's commitment, in line with its strategy for the period 2018-2020, to carry forward a follow-up on all performance audit recommendations it made to the Commission three years earlier;**

Or. en

### Amendment 4

Alex Agius Saliba, Vilija Blinkevičiūtė, Alicia Homs Ginel, Estrella Durá Ferrandis, Elisabetta Gualmini, Marianne Vind, Milan Brglez

#### Draft opinion

#### Paragraph 4

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

4. Notes that the European Court of Auditors (ECA) found a significant increase in payment claims for the European Structural and Investment funds (ESI funds) which include the European Social Fund, by Member States in 2018; notes at the same time, that for those funds absorption had continued to be slower than planned - a phenomenon that had contributed to increasing ESI funds outstanding commitments;

4. Notes that the European Court of Auditors (ECA) found a significant increase in payment claims for the European Structural and Investment funds (ESI funds) which include the European Social Fund, by **the** Member States in 2018 **mainly because of the relatively low level of ESI fund payment claims in the early years of the 2014-2020 programmes**; notes at the same time, that for those funds absorption had continued to be slower than planned - a phenomenon that had contributed to increasing ESI funds outstanding commitments; ***calls on the***

***Commission to analyse the reasons for the low absorption level and to simplify the new rules for the post-2020 period in order to avoid unnecessarily complex and/or burdensome rules that do not add value to the EU policies;***

Or. en

**Amendment 5**  
**Tomáš Zdechovský**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 4**

*Draft opinion*

4. Notes that the European Court of Auditors (ECA) found a significant increase in payment claims for the European Structural and Investment funds (ESI funds) which include the European Social Fund, by Member States in 2018; notes at the same time, that for those funds absorption had continued to be slower than planned - a phenomenon that had contributed to increasing ESI funds outstanding commitments;

*Amendment*

4. Notes that the European Court of Auditors (ECA) found a significant increase in payment claims for the European Structural and Investment funds (ESI funds) which include the European Social Fund, by Member States in 2018; notes at the same time, that for those funds absorption had continued to be slower than planned - a phenomenon that had contributed to increasing ESI funds outstanding commitments; ***regrets those delays in the implementation of the ESI funds, which will continue to affect the final years of this MFF; fully supports the ECA's recommendation that the Commission takes measures to avoid undue pressure on the level of payment appropriations in the first years of the 2021-2027 MFF;***

Or. en

**Amendment 6**  
**Lucia Ďuriš Nicholsonová**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 4 a (new)**

**4 a.** *Notes that delays in the implementation of the ESI funds continue to affect the final years of the MFF, affecting the use of pre-financing and outstanding commitments and will affect payment appropriation needs in the next MFF; to that end, recommends that the Commission takes measures to avoid undue pressure in the level of appropriations in the first years of the next MFF 2021-2027;*

Or. en

**Amendment 7**

**Kira Marie Peter-Hansen, Alexandra Louise Rosenfield Phillips**

**Draft opinion**

**Paragraph 5**

*Draft opinion*

5. *Notes with concern* the increase of the estimated level of error in the policy area ‘Economic, social and territorial cohesion’ at 5.0 %, which is largely above the 2 % materiality threshold;

*Amendment*

5. *Is highly concerned about* the increase of the estimated level of error in the policy area ‘Economic, social and territorial cohesion’ at 5.0 %, which is largely above the 2 % materiality threshold; *calls for urgent action to decrease the error rate in the future, and especially for the new funding period;*

Or. en

**Amendment 8**

**Alex Agius Saliba, Vilija Blinkevičiūtė, Alicia Homs Ginell, Estrella Durá Ferrandis, Elisabetta Gualmini, Marianne Vind, Milan Brglez**

**Draft opinion**

**Paragraph 5**

*Draft opinion*

5. Notes with concern the increase of the estimated level of error in the policy

*Amendment*

5. *Stresses the importance of the EU cohesion policy in supporting the*

area 'Economic, social and territorial cohesion' at 5.0 %, which is largely above the 2 % materiality threshold;

***implementation of the European Pillar of Social Rights and in assisting the Member States and regions to harness new and persistent challenges, such as globalisation, unemployment, industrial change, digitalisation and reskilling of people;*** notes with concern the increase of the estimated level of error in the policy area 'Economic, social and territorial cohesion' at 5.0 %, which is largely above the 2 % materiality threshold; ***stresses that the new control and assurance framework was designed to ensure that annual residual error rates are below 2 %; agrees with the Court's conclusions that further improvements are necessary, in particular in terms of the implementation of the framework by managing authorities, audit authorities and the Commission to reduce the high level of error;***

Or. en

## **Amendment 9**

**Elena Lizzi**

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

#### *Draft opinion*

5. Notes with concern the increase of the estimated level of error in the policy area 'Economic, social and territorial cohesion' at 5.0 %, which is largely above the 2 % materiality threshold;

#### *Amendment*

5. Notes with concern the increase of the estimated level of error in the policy area 'Economic, social and territorial cohesion' at 5.0 %, which is largely above the 2 % materiality threshold; ***recalls that, in the 220 transactions examined, the Court identified and quantified 36 errors that had not been detected by the audit authorities, to which the 60 errors already detected by the authorities themselves must be added;***

Or. it

## **Amendment 10**

**Alex Agius Saliba, Vilija Blinkevičiūtė, Alicia Homs Ginell, Estrella Durá Ferrandis, Elisabetta Gualmini, Marianne Vind, Milan Brglez**

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

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

**6 a.** *Notes that weaknesses persist with regard to the regularity of the expenditure declared by managing authorities and that, despite recent improvements, shortcomings, undetected or uncorrected errors remain; stresses in this regard that the audit authorities play a crucial role in the framework for assurance and control of cohesion spending and calls on them to address the reported weaknesses and to make better use of the Commission's assurance model in the future;*

Or. en

**Amendment 11**  
**Véronique Trillet-Lenoir, Marie-Pierre Vedrenne, Dragoș Pișlaru, Sylvie Brunet, Jordi Cañas, Samira Rafaela, Atidzhe Alieva-Veli**

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

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

**6 a.** *Stresses that the complexity of the rules can contribute to a higher risk of error and notes that a significant source of complexity arises for beneficiaries where national eligibility requirements go beyond what is required by EU legislation;*

Or. en

**Amendment 12**  
**Alex Agius Saliba, Vilija Blinkevičiūtė, Alicia Homs Ginell, Estrella Durá Ferrandis, Elisabetta Gualmini, Marianne Vind, Milan Brglez**



**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 8**

*Draft opinion*

8. Stresses, this year again, the need to take effective measures to reduce those sources of error while achieving a high performance and urges the Commission to implement swiftly the ECA's recommendations in this policy area;

*Amendment*

8. Stresses, this year again, the need to take effective measures to reduce those sources of error while achieving a high performance and urges the Commission to implement swiftly the ECA's recommendations in this policy area ***and in particular invites the Commission to better implement appropriate control measures aimed to ensure that no programme can be closed with a material level or irregular expenditure and that regular checks are carried out at the level of financial intermediaries by an audit authority;***

Or. en

**Amendment 13**  
**Kira Marie Peter-Hansen, Alexandra Louise Rosenfield Phillips**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 9 a (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

***9 a. Takes note that the ECA found the estimated level of error in high-risk expenditure, such as cost reimbursements, to be 4.5 %; recalls that Heading 1B (economic, social and territorial cohesion, including ESF) is dominated by reimbursements and thus high-risk expenditure, and that it was the single biggest contributor to the estimated level of error for high-risk expenditure in 2018 (at 43,0 % of all errors); calls urgently for the use of simplified cost options in order to reduce the error rate;***

Or. en

**Amendment 14**  
**Tomáš Zdechovský**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 9 a (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

**9 a.** *Acknowledges that the number of warning letters and interruptions significantly increased in 2018 compared to previous year due to the increased number of assurance packages received in February 2018 and the results of the compliance audits performed during the year;*

Or. en

**Amendment 15**  
**Alex Agius Saliba, Vilija Blinkevičiūtė, Alicia Homs Ginell, Estrella Durá Ferrandis, Elisabetta Gualmini, Marianne Vind, Milan Brglez**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 9 a (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

**9 a.** *Reminds that the European Social Fund (ESF) and the Youth Employment Initiative (YEI) aim to encourage a high level of employment and the creation of more and better jobs, including through the YEI targeting regions with a high youth unemployment rate, and should, therefore, have the continued financial and political support of the EU, national and regional institutions in the delivery of their targets in the years to come;*

Or. en

**Amendment 16**  
**Alex Agius Saliba, Vilija Blinkevičiūtė, Alicia Homs Ginell, Estrella Durá Ferrandis, Elisabetta Gualmini, Marianne Vind, Milan Brglez**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 9 b (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

**9 b. Welcomes the European Commission's commitment to make YEI a permanent instrument to fight youth unemployment; reiterates that the financial management procedures, as well as the reporting requirements in the YEI should be improved and better directed towards young people who are furthest away from education, training, and employment;**

Or. en

**Amendment 17**  
**Lucia Ďuriš Nicholsonová**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 9 a (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

**9 a. Recalls that in its Special report No 5/2017 ('Youth unemployment – have EU policies made a difference?'), the Court found that, while some progress had been made in implementing the Youth Guarantee, and while some results had been achieved, the situation fell short of the initial expectations raised at the launch of the Youth Guarantee;**

Or. en

**Amendment 18**  
**Lucia Ďuriš Nicholsonová**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 9 b (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

**9 b. Acknowledges that while redirection of the ESF funding has been achieved, following the recommendations made in the Court of Auditors' Special report No 17/2015, there is still insufficient focus on results;**

Or. en

**Amendment 19**  
**Lucia Ďuriš Nicholsonová**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 9 c (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

**9 c. Recalls that there are still 10 recommendations referring to special reports (one from Special report No 16/2016 ('EU education objectives: programmes aligned but shortcomings in performance measurement'), two from Special report No 14/2016 ('EU policy initiatives and financial support for Roma integration: significant progress made over the last decade, but additional efforts needed on the ground') and seven from Special report No 6/2018 ('Free Movement of Workers – the fundamental freedom ensured but better targeting of EU funds would aid worker mobility')) that need to be implemented, most of them by 31 December 2019; in particular, takes note of the Special report No 14/2016 according to which most projects were carried out as planned but 'best practices' criteria contributing to successful Roma inclusion were not always applied and monitoring performance was difficult; recalls that the lack of robust and comprehensive data on Roma is not only a problem in relation to projects but also for policy making at EU and national level; deplores the fact that this situation might remain unchanged unless swift action is taken;**

**Amendment 20**

**Véronique Trillet-Lenoir, Marie-Pierre Vedrenne, Sylvie Brunet, Dragoş Pîslaru, Monica Semedo, Jordi Cañas, Samira Rafaela, Atidzhe Alieva-Veli**

**Draft opinion****Paragraph 10***Draft opinion*

10. Recalls the findings of ECA Special report No 05/2019 ('FEAD-Fund for European Aid to the Most Deprived: Valuable support but its contribution to reducing poverty is not yet established'), in particular the ECA conclusion that, in addition to alleviating poverty through food aid (which represents 83 % of FEAD budget), the innovative social policy elements of FEAD offer possibilities to Member States to foster social inclusion;

*Amendment*

10. Recalls the findings of ECA Special report No 05/2019 ('FEAD-Fund for European Aid to the Most Deprived: Valuable support but its contribution to reducing poverty is not yet established'), in particular the ECA conclusion that ***FEAD is a significant instrument in ensuring the provision of food and material support and***, in addition to alleviating poverty through food aid (which represents 83 % of FEAD budget), the innovative social policy elements of FEAD offer possibilities to Member States to foster social inclusion;

**Amendment 21**

**Alex Agius Saliba, Vilija Blinkevičiūtė, Alicia Homs Ginell, Estrella Durá Ferrandis, Elisabetta Gualmini, Marianne Vind, Milan Brglez**

**Draft opinion****Paragraph 11***Draft opinion*

11. *Notes with concern that, due to limitations in its monitoring, FEAD's contribution to reducing poverty has not been established, and deplores in particular that the Commission does not have data which demonstrates the relative importance of FEAD in overall support to deprived people in the Union;*

*Amendment*

11. ***Supports the FEAD which aims to alleviate the worst forms of poverty in the EU such as food deprivation, homelessness, and child poverty; highlights that the results of the 2018 mid-term evaluation show that the Fund has a notable effect in nearly each Member State and that the supported food, material aid, and social inclusion measures make a difference to the most***

*deprived, including those who may be otherwise left out by mainstream social assistance or who need immediate support; notes that the evaluation identified several weaknesses in the implementation of the Fund and that the Court of Auditors suggested to better target the Fund to the ones most in need and that the Commission has to improve the collected data to better demonstrate the relative importance of FEAD in overall support to deprived people in the Union;*

Or. en

## Amendment 22

Sylvie Brunet, Monica Semedo, Véronique Trillet-Lenoir, Marie-Pierre Vedrenne, Jordi Cañas, Atidzhe Alieva-Veli

### Draft opinion

#### Paragraph 11

#### *Draft opinion*

11. Notes *with concern* that, due to limitations in its monitoring, FEAD's contribution to reducing poverty has not *been established, and deplores in particular that the Commission does not have data which demonstrates the relative importance of FEAD in overall support to deprived people in the Union;*

#### *Amendment*

11. *Believes that EU committed action for the most deprived is of paramount importance having in mind that, on average, more than one out of five persons and one out of four children are still at risk of poverty or social exclusion in the European Union;* notes that, due to limitations in its monitoring *and lack of EU-wide data*, FEAD's contribution to reducing poverty has not *yet been quantitatively demonstrated; nonetheless recalls that available data presented in the European Court of Auditors' special report<sup>1a</sup> indicate that this fund represents a significant share of the total social support activities in some Member States and that, according to food banks, one third of the food they provide is financed by FEAD, and that FEAD allows to be less dependent on the irregular flow of donation and therefore enables to better plan the redistribution of specific foods;*

*<sup>1a</sup> European Court of Auditors, Special report No 5/2019: FEAD-Fund for European Aid to the Most Deprived: Valuable support but its contribution to reducing poverty is not yet established, April 2019, p. 19.*

Or. en

**Amendment 23**  
**Anne Sander**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 11**

*Draft opinion*

11. Notes with concern that, due to limitations in its monitoring, FEAD's contribution to reducing poverty has not been established, and deplores in particular that the Commission does not have data which demonstrates the *relative* importance of FEAD in overall support to deprived people in the Union;

*Amendment*

11. Notes with concern that, due to limitations in its monitoring, FEAD's contribution to reducing poverty has not been established, and deplores in particular that the Commission does not have data which demonstrates the *substantial* importance of FEAD *as a vector of European solidarity and a way of helping to combat social divides in the Union*, in overall support to deprived people in the Union, *particularly including food aid*;

Or. fr

**Amendment 24**  
**Lucia Ďuriš Nicholsonová**

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

*Draft opinion*

*11 a. Recalls to that end that in its assessment on the effectiveness of the Fund, the mid-term evaluation (MTE) considered that the provision and monitoring of accompanying measures could be further exploited;*

*Amendment*

**Amendment 25**  
**Tomáš Zdechovský**

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

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

***11 a. Regrets that targeting aid to any given vulnerable group is left to the discretion of the partner organisations, with the associated risk of a scattering effect of the limited funding; also regrets the fact that the ECA could not identify how well FEAD and other support schemes (whether national or the ESF) complemented each other and emphasises the need to further improve synergies between FEAD and the ESF in 2019 and 2020;***

Or. en

**Amendment 26**  
**Guido Reil**

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

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

***11a. Notes with concern, in this regard, that, according to FEANTSA - the European association of organisations working with the homeless - and the Abbé Pierre Foundation, there are 700 000 homeless people in the EU, which represents an increase of around 70% over the last ten years; considers that this increase has structural causes, such as migration motivated by poverty, the lack of affordable housing and rising inequality and poverty; welcomes, therefore, food aid and other material***



*assistance as Type I FEAD measures,  
while stressing that only structural  
measures can reduce homelessness;*

Or. de

**Amendment 27**

**Kira Marie Peter-Hansen, Alexandra Louise Rosenfield Phillips**

**Draft opinion**

**Paragraph 12 a (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

*12 a. Highlights the need for more  
stringent public procurement verification  
during the entire financing cycle;*

Or. en

**Amendment 28**

**Lucia Ďuriš Nicholsonová**

**Draft opinion**

**Paragraph 12 a (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

*12 a. Acknowledges the efforts made by  
the European Commission and the  
Member States in this respect and  
encourages them to further develop the  
ARACHNE risk assessment tool with the  
active participation of the Member States;  
to that end, calls on the Member States to  
use the ARACHNE data base to the  
greatest possible extent in order to prevent  
fraudulent and irregular use of EU funds;*

Or. en

**Amendment 29**

**Elena Lizzi**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 14**

*Draft opinion*

14. Notes ***with satisfaction*** that the estimated error level in the area of ‘Competitiveness for growth and jobs’ is 2.0 % - ***which represents a substantial decrease compared to 2017 (4.2 %) and 2016 (4.1 %)*** and notes that most of the errors were related to the research spending while errors on other spending are limited;

*Amendment*

14. Notes that the estimated error level in the area of ‘Competitiveness for growth and jobs’ is 2.0 %, and notes that most of the errors were related to the research spending while errors on other spending are ***more*** limited;

Or. it

**Amendment 30**

**Alex Agius Saliba, Vilija Blinkevičiūtė, Alicia Homs Ginel, Estrella Durá Ferrandis, Elisabetta Gualmini, Marianne Vind, Milan Brglez**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 14**

*Draft opinion*

14. Notes with satisfaction that the estimated error level in the area of ‘Competitiveness for growth and jobs’ is 2.0 % - which represents a substantial decrease compared to 2017 (4.2 %) and 2016 (4.1 %) and notes that most of the errors were related to the research spending while errors on other spending are limited;

*Amendment*

14. Notes with satisfaction that the estimated error level in the area of ‘Competitiveness for growth and jobs’ is 2.0 % - which represents a substantial decrease compared to 2017 (4.2 %) and 2016 (4.1 %) and notes that most of the errors were related to the research spending while errors on other spending are limited; ***acknowledges the Commission’s efforts to improve the level of error, which is lower than in the last two years and reiterates the importance of the spending programmes in the competitiveness’ chapter, which play an important role in fostering an inclusive society, stimulating growth and creating employment in the EU;***

Or. en

**Amendment 31**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 15**

*Draft opinion*

15. Notes that, according to the Commission, the EaSI mid-term evaluation showed that its objectives are still relevant and that the programme is effective in reaching the relevant stakeholders, generating outcomes and achieving its objectives; also notes that, even though the three axes (Progress, EURES and Microfinance and Social Entrepreneurship) seem to operate independently, some areas which could result in increased effectiveness ('synergies') have been identified;

*Amendment*

15. Notes that, according to the Commission, the EaSI mid-term evaluation showed that its objectives are still relevant and that the programme is effective in reaching the relevant stakeholders, generating **good-quality** outcomes and achieving its objectives ***in particular in light of the current challenging socio-economic context characterised by the aftermath of the financial and economic crisis***; also notes that, even though the three axes (Progress, EURES and Microfinance and Social Entrepreneurship) seem to operate independently, some areas which could result in increased effectiveness ('synergies') have been identified;

Or. en

**Amendment 32**  
**Tomáš Zdechovský**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 15 a (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

***15 a. Urges that under the EaSI strand, the ESF+ should include a series of improvements, including a sharper focus on disadvantaged groups, greater budgetary flexibility and better integration between the current activities;***

Or. en

**Amendment 33**

**Alex Agius Saliba, Vilija Blinkevičiūtė, Alicia Homs Ginell, Estrella Durá Ferrandis, Elisabetta Gualmini, Marianne Vind, Milan Brglez**

**Draft opinion  
Paragraph 15 a (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

***15 a. Encourages the Commission to improve the implementation of the employment and social innovation programme, especially through enhanced flexibility and through targeting groups in need of specific support, through the simplification of procedures, improved internal consistence and linkages with other funds;***

Or. en

**Amendment 34  
Tomáš Zdechovský**

**Draft opinion  
Paragraph 15 b (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

***15 b. Notes in particular that the mid-term evaluation highlighted a number of ways to improve the implementation of the employment and social innovation programme, especially through the simplification of procedures, improved internal consistence and linkages with other funds;***

Or. en

**Amendment 35  
Elena Lizzi**

**Draft opinion  
Paragraph 16**

*Draft opinion*

16. Notes that the Commission completed in 2018 the first cross-cutting evaluation of the European Commission Agencies working in the employment and social affairs policy field (Eurofound, Cedefop, ETF and EU-OSHA) to complement the founding regulation revision of the three tripartite agencies; ***notes with satisfaction that the assessment confirms the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, coherence and added value of the agencies, as well as the need to reinforce cooperation in order to exploit synergies;***

*Amendment*

16. Notes that the Commission completed in 2018 the first cross-cutting evaluation of the European Commission Agencies working in the employment and social affairs policy field (Eurofound, Cedefop, ETF and EU-OSHA) to complement the founding regulation revision of the three tripartite agencies; ***notes, however, that these four agencies, to which the European Labour Authority must also now be added, cost money and employ resources which are not always used efficiently; stresses the importance of rationalising costs, reducing waste and avoiding duplication of work;***

Or. it

**Amendment 36**  
**Guido Reil**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 16**

*Draft opinion*

16. Notes that the Commission completed in 2018 the first cross-cutting evaluation of the European Commission Agencies working in the employment and social affairs policy field (Eurofound, Cedefop, ETF and EU-OSHA) to complement the founding regulation revision of the three tripartite agencies; ***notes with satisfaction that the assessment confirms the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, coherence and added value of the agencies, as well as the need to reinforce cooperation in order to exploit synergies;***

*Amendment*

16. Notes that the Commission completed in 2018 the first cross-cutting evaluation of the European Commission Agencies working in the employment and social affairs policy field (Eurofound, Cedefop, ETF and EU-OSHA) to complement the founding regulation revision of the three tripartite agencies;

Or. de

**Amendment 37**

Alex Agius Saliba, Vilija Blinkevičiūtė, Alicia Homs Ginell, Estrella Durá Ferrandis, Elisabetta Gualmini, Marianne Vind, Milan Brglez

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 16**

*Draft opinion*

16. **Notes** that the Commission completed in 2018 the first cross-cutting evaluation of the European Commission Agencies working in the employment and social affairs policy field (Eurofound, Cedefop, ETF and EU-OSHA) to complement the founding regulation revision of the three tripartite agencies; notes with satisfaction that the assessment confirms the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, coherence and added value of the agencies, as well as the need to reinforce cooperation in order to exploit synergies;

*Amendment*

16. **Welcomes** that the Commission completed in 2018 the first cross-cutting evaluation of the European Commission Agencies working in the employment and social affairs policy field (Eurofound, Cedefop, ETF and EU-OSHA) to complement the founding regulation revision of the three tripartite agencies; notes with satisfaction that the assessment confirms ***a very positive evaluation report on*** the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, coherence and added value of the agencies, as well as the need to reinforce cooperation in order to exploit synergies;

Or. en

**Amendment 38**

Alex Agius Saliba, Vilija Blinkevičiūtė, Alicia Homs Ginell, Estrella Durá Ferrandis, Elisabetta Gualmini, Marianne Vind, Milan Brglez

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 16 a (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

***16 a. Welcomes the creation of the European Labour Authority (ELA) and highlights the need to ensure that sufficient financial resources are set aside for its establishment; insists that funding cannot be accomplished by redeploying allocations from the other employment and social affairs agencies and budgetary lines and should not result in a reduction of resources and capabilities for EURES; highlights therefore the need to maintain clear and separate budget lines for both ELA and EURES;***

**Amendment 39**

**Elena Lizzi**

**Draft opinion**

**Paragraph 17**

*Draft opinion*

17. ***Welcomes*** that the Commission has launched four thematic evaluations in 2018 (on support to youth employment, on ESF support to employment and mobility, on ESF support to education and training and on ESF support to social inclusion);

*Amendment*

17. ***Notes*** that the Commission has launched four thematic evaluations in 2018 (on support to youth employment, on ESF support to employment and mobility, on ESF support to education and training and on ESF support to social inclusion);

Or. it

**Amendment 40**

**Marc Botenga**

**Draft opinion**

**Paragraph 17**

*Draft opinion*

17. Welcomes that the Commission has launched four thematic evaluations in 2018 (on support to youth employment, on ESF support to employment and mobility, on ESF support to education and training and on ESF support to social inclusion);

*Amendment*

17. Welcomes that the Commission has launched four thematic evaluations in 2018 (on support to youth employment, on ESF support to employment and mobility, on ESF support to education and training and on ESF support to social inclusion); ***furthermore, highlights that transparency and citizens' awareness of the existence of the agencies are essential for their democratic accountability; considers that usability and ease of use of agency resources and data are of paramount importance; calls therefore for an assessment of how data and resources are currently presented and made available and of the degree to which citizens find them easy to identify, recognise and use;***

Or. en

## **Amendment 41**

**Elena Lizzi**

### **Draft opinion**

#### **Paragraph 18**

##### *Draft opinion*

18. ***Acknowledges*** that the ECA recommendation – following which the Commission should, across all its activities, use the terms input, output, result and impact consistently and in line with its better regulation guidelines – has been only implemented in some respects and urges the Commission to strive for full implementation of this recommendation;

##### *Amendment*

18. ***Notes with concern*** that the ECA recommendation – following which the Commission should, across all its activities, use the terms input, output, result and impact consistently and in line with its better regulation guidelines – has been only implemented in some respects and urges the Commission to strive for full implementation of this recommendation;

Or. it