



2024/2019(DEC)

12.12.2024

AMENDMENTS

1 - 47

Draft opinion

Ľubica Karvašová

(PE765.332v01-00)

2023 discharge: General budget of the EU - Commission
(2024/2019(DEC))

Amendment 1
Lubica Karvašová

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Underlines that the Commission and the Court of Auditors have repeatedly stated that error is not synonymous with fraud; emphasises that the error rate does not necessarily indicate that the resources have been misspent, nor does it call into question the positive results and added value of cohesion policy; acknowledges that the risk of fraud is nevertheless a cause of concern and should be minimised;

Amendment

1. Underlines that the Commission and the Court of Auditors have repeatedly stated that error is not synonymous with fraud; emphasises that the error rate does not necessarily indicate that the resources have been misspent, nor does it call into question the positive results and added value of cohesion policy; ***is worried that the Court of Auditors' estimate of the level of error in cohesion might be contributing to a negative image of the policy and of shared management in general;*** acknowledges that the risk of fraud is nevertheless a cause of concern and should be minimised;

Or. en

Amendment 2
Mārtiņš Staķis
on behalf of the Greens/EFA Group

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Underlines that the Commission and the Court of Auditors have repeatedly stated that error is not synonymous with fraud; emphasises that the error rate does not necessarily indicate that the resources have been misspent, nor does it call into question the positive results and added value of cohesion policy; acknowledges that the risk of fraud is nevertheless a cause of concern and should be minimised;

Amendment

1. Underlines that the Commission and the Court of Auditors have repeatedly stated that error is not synonymous with fraud; emphasises that the error rate does not necessarily indicate that the resources have been misspent, nor does it call into question the positive results and added value of cohesion policy; acknowledges that the risk of fraud is nevertheless a cause of concern and should be minimised; ***stresses therefore the importance of strengthening the single audit principle,***

reducing duplication, and clearly distinguishing between unintentional errors and frauds;

Or. en

Amendment 3

Waldemar Tomaszewski

on behalf of the ECR Group

Draft opinion

Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Underlines that the Commission and the Court of Auditors have repeatedly stated that error is not synonymous with ***fraud***; emphasises that the error rate does not necessarily indicate that the resources have been misspent, nor does it call into question the positive results and added value of cohesion policy; acknowledges that the risk of ***fraud*** is nevertheless a cause of concern and should be minimised;

Amendment

1. Underlines that the Commission and the Court of Auditors have repeatedly stated that error is not synonymous with ***financial abuse***; emphasises that the error rate does not necessarily indicate that the resources have been misspent, nor does it call into question the positive results and added value of cohesion policy; acknowledges that the risk of ***financial abuses*** is nevertheless a cause of concern and should be minimised;

Or. en

Amendment 4

Hannes Heide, Sabrina Repp, Nora Mebarek, Matthias Ecke, Klára Dobrev

Draft opinion

Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Considers that the increase in the error rate for cohesion policy funds is rather symptomatic of the complexity of the rules applicable to this spending area and the insufficient administrative capacity of national authorities;

Amendment

2. Considers that the increase in the error rate for cohesion policy funds is rather symptomatic of the complexity of the rules applicable to this spending area and the insufficient administrative capacity of national authorities; ***notes that overlapping eligibility periods and the simultaneous implementation of RRF, CRII(+), CARE and REACT-EU have***

created additional complexity for managing authorities; calls to provide clear guidance to Member States to mitigate these challenges and ensure effective fund management.

Or. en

Amendment 5
Elena Nevado del Campo

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Considers that the increase in the error rate for cohesion policy funds is rather symptomatic of the complexity of the rules applicable to this spending area and the insufficient administrative capacity of national authorities;

Amendment

2. Considers that the increase in the error rate for cohesion policy funds is rather symptomatic of the complexity of the rules applicable to this spending area and the insufficient administrative capacity of national authorities; ***highlights that there is currently an overlap in the cohesion policy between the previous 2014-2020 programming period and the current 2021-2027 period, together with the funds from the Recovery and Resilience Facility;***

Or. es

Amendment 6
Mārtiņš Staķis
on behalf of the Greens/EFA Group

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Considers that the increase in the error rate for cohesion policy funds is rather symptomatic of the complexity of the rules applicable to this spending area and the insufficient administrative capacity of national authorities;

Amendment

2. Considers that the increase in the error rate for cohesion policy funds is rather symptomatic of the complexity of the rules applicable to this spending area and the insufficient administrative capacity of national, ***regional and local*** authorities;

calls for the adoption of a single set of eligibility rules for all cohesion policy funds and further expansions of SCOs (simplified cost options);

Or. en

Amendment 7
Gabriella Gerzsenyi

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Considers that the increase in the error rate for cohesion policy funds is rather symptomatic of the complexity of the rules applicable to this spending area and the insufficient administrative capacity of national authorities;

Amendment

2. Considers that the increase in the error rate for cohesion policy funds is rather symptomatic of the complexity of the rules applicable to this spending area, ***the lack of intermediary managing bodies between the national and local levels*** and the insufficient administrative capacity of national authorities;

Or. en

Amendment 8
Waldemar Tomaszewski
on behalf of the ECR Group

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Considers that the increase in the error rate for cohesion policy funds is rather symptomatic of the complexity of the rules applicable to this spending area ***and the insufficient administrative capacity of national authorities;***

Amendment

2. Considers that the increase in the error rate for cohesion policy funds is rather symptomatic of the complexity of the rules applicable to this spending area;

Or. en

Amendment 9
Lubica Karvašová

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Stresses that the Committee on Regional Development called for **urgent** additional advisory support from the Commission to national authorities to avoid **that** situation;

Amendment

3. Stresses that, ***in its most recent discharge opinions***, the Committee on Regional Development called for ***an*** additional advisory support from the Commission to national authorities to avoid ***this*** situation; ***recognises the Commission's efforts but, observes that, regrettably, these have not been sufficient to mitigate the error risk; warns that a similar administrative overload might arrive at the end of the RRF eligibility period and the final years of the MFF; underlines the need to address the insufficient administrative capacity of national authorities as a matter of urgency;***

Or. en

Amendment 10
Elena Nevado del Campo

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Stresses that the Committee on Regional Development called for urgent additional advisory support from the Commission to national authorities to avoid that situation;

Amendment

3. Stresses that the Committee on Regional Development called for urgent additional advisory support from the Commission to national authorities to avoid that situation; ***calls, in this regard, also for strengthening of the support for staff training in the regional and local administrations involved in managing cohesion policy funds;***

Or. es

Amendment 11
Mārtiņš Staķis
on behalf of the Greens/EFA Group

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Stresses that the Committee on Regional Development called for urgent additional advisory support from the Commission to national authorities to avoid that situation;

Amendment

3. Stresses that the Committee on Regional Development called for urgent additional advisory support from the Commission to national authorities ***and respective municipalities*** to avoid that situation ***and to support administrative capacity building, best practice sharing, peer-to-peer reviews, technical assistance, etc.***;

Or. en

Amendment 12
Mārtiņš Staķis
on behalf of the Greens/EFA Group

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3 a. Underlines the need for genuine simplification and administrative improvements, ensuring that these reforms are pursued consistently by all relevant EU and national actors;

Or. en

Amendment 13
Mārtiņš Staķis
on behalf of the Greens/EFA Group

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3 b. *Underlines that shared management, the partnership principle and subsidiarity should remain the cornerstone of any reform and simplification of cohesion policy;*

Or. en

Amendment 14

Mārtiņš Staķis

on behalf of the Greens/EFA Group

Draft opinion

Paragraph 3 c (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3 c. *Urges the Commission to enhance a bottom-up approach in the upcoming simplification of the cohesion policy by ensuring a proper consultation and involvement of LRAs, NGOs, and SMEs;*

Or. en

Amendment 15

Lubica Karvašová

Draft opinion

Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

Amendment

4. Reiterates its previous calls for further simplification *to* help reduce the risk of errors; urges the Commission and Member States to simplify unnecessarily complex rules and procedures wherever possible, work on a common interpretation of certain legal requirements and avoid gold-plating;

4. Reiterates its previous calls for further simplification, ***which would make cohesion policy funding more accessible for beneficiaries and, at the same time,*** help reduce the risk of errors; ***reminds that the 2021-2027 CPR already introduced far-reaching simplification and flexibility measures, but that it is still early to draw lessons from the current programming period; acknowledges that more drastic changes are needed in respect of***

simplification in the post-2027 legislative framework; urges the Commission and *the* Member States *to continue their cooperation in the current programming period* to simplify unnecessarily complex rules and procedures wherever possible, work on a common interpretation of certain legal requirements and avoid *gold-plating*;

Or. en

Amendment 16
Maravillas Abadía Jover

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Reiterates its previous calls for further simplification to help reduce the risk of errors; urges the Commission and Member States to *simplify unnecessarily complex* rules and procedures *wherever possible, work on a common* interpretation of *certain* legal requirements *and avoid gold-plating*;

Amendment

4. Reiterates its previous calls for further simplification to help reduce the risk of errors, *especially in a context marked by the exceptional measures applied, which have boosted flexibility in fund management*; urges the Commission and Member States to *streamline* rules and procedures, *avoiding unnecessarily complexities and fostering a consistent* interpretation of *the* legal requirements; *stresses also the importance of strengthening administrative capacities at national level to ensure proper implementation of funds in a simplified regulatory environment*;

Or. es

Amendment 17
Dan-Ştefan Motreanu

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Reiterates its previous calls for

Amendment

4. Reiterates its previous calls for

further simplification to help reduce the risk of errors; urges the Commission and Member States to simplify unnecessarily complex rules and procedures wherever possible, work on a common interpretation of certain legal requirements and avoid gold-plating;

further simplification to help reduce the risk of errors; urges the Commission and Member States to simplify unnecessarily complex rules and procedures wherever possible, work on a common interpretation of certain legal requirements and avoid gold-plating; ***emphasizes the necessity, post-2027, of a simpler budgetary framework with greater flexibility at the local and regional levels, and the adoption of a single set of rules for beneficiaries to facilitate access and compliance.***

Or. en

Amendment 18

Mārtiņš Staķis

on behalf of the Greens/EFA Group

Draft opinion

Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Reiterates its previous calls for further simplification to help reduce the risk of errors; urges the Commission and Member States to simplify unnecessarily complex rules and procedures wherever possible, work on a common interpretation of certain legal requirements and avoid gold-plating;

Amendment

4. Reiterates its previous calls for further simplification to help reduce the risk of errors; urges the Commission and Member States to simplify unnecessarily complex rules and procedures wherever possible, work on a common interpretation of certain legal requirements and avoid gold-plating; ***furthermore, stresses the critical role of digitalisation in the management of EU funds and utilization of Artificial Intelligence (AI) for detecting frauds in financial transactions;***

Or. en

Amendment 19

Elena Nevado del Campo

Draft opinion

Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Reiterates its previous calls for further simplification to help reduce the risk of errors; urges the Commission and Member States to simplify unnecessarily complex rules and procedures wherever possible, work on a common interpretation of certain legal requirements and avoid gold-plating;

Amendment

4. Reiterates its previous calls for further simplification to help reduce the risk of errors; urges the Commission and Member States to simplify unnecessarily complex rules and procedures wherever possible, work on a common interpretation of certain legal requirements and avoid gold-plating; ***asks for there to be a push in the next period for a stable legal framework that is not subject to recurrent revisions;***

Or. es

Amendment 20
Sakis Arnaoutoglou

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Reiterates its previous calls for further simplification to help reduce the risk of errors; urges the Commission and Member States to simplify unnecessarily complex rules and procedures wherever possible, work on a common interpretation of certain legal requirements and avoid gold-plating;

Amendment

4. Reiterates its previous calls for further simplification to help reduce the risk of errors; urges the Commission and Member States to simplify unnecessarily complex rules and procedures wherever possible, work on a common interpretation of certain legal requirements and avoid gold-plating ***and provide for the proper education and training of staff;***

Or. el

Amendment 21
Waldemar Tomaszewski
on behalf of the ECR Group

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Reiterates its previous calls for

Amendment

4. Reiterates its previous calls for

further simplification to help reduce the risk of errors; urges the Commission **and Member States** to simplify unnecessarily complex rules and procedures wherever possible, work on a **common** interpretation of certain legal requirements and avoid gold-plating;

further simplification to help reduce the risk of errors; urges the Commission to simplify unnecessarily complex rules and procedures wherever possible, work on a **clear** interpretation of certain legal requirements and avoid gold-plating;

Or. en

Amendment 22
Ciaran Mullooly

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4 a. Underlines that in order to simplify unnecessarily complex rules, and cut red tape, it is crucial to work with those with the best understanding of the regions where the funds are spent; with simplification in mind, urges the Commission and the Member States to adopt a more territorial and decentralised approach to regional development policy, ensuring that funding decisions are made by those closest to the ground;

Or. en

Amendment 23
Mārtiņš Staķis
on behalf of the Greens/EFA Group

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4 a. Recalls the importance of a stronger gender mainstreaming and gender budgeting in cohesion policy that represent a real benefit to the distribution of funds;

Amendment 24
Mārtiņš Staķis
on behalf of the Greens/EFA Group

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4 b. Calls for a commitment to partnership and evidence-based approaches, with all simplification proposals developed through open and continuous dialogue with stakeholders, civil society organisations, and audit institutions;

Or. en

Amendment 25
Mārtiņš Staķis
on behalf of the Greens/EFA Group

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 c (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4 c. Recalls that, in line with Article 11.2 TEU, EU institutions must maintain an open, transparent and structured dialogue with civil society organisations and representative associations; stresses in particular in this regard that access to structural funding is a prerequisite to ensure public participation, without which it would not be possible for citizens to have their voice channelled at the EU level through their representative associations, sustain a regular dialogue with EU institutions contributing to democratic participation in policy making, establish an open and wide-ranging dialogue, ensuring that the diversity of

views and concerns are taken into account with equal access for public interest as compared to commercial interest, exercise a monitoring role on the implementation of EU policies and legislation, including the use of EU funds, or act as checks and balances to the rule of law; recalls the commitment of the Commission in its political guidelines to step up its engagement with civil society organisations that have expertise and an important role to play in defending specific societal issues and upholding human rights; reminds that this entails that, while the Commission should not mandate NGOs to pursue certain activities or support specific positions or policies, it remains fundamental that civil society organisations, through EU funding, can engage in an “open, transparent and structured dialogue with EU institutions” as enshrined in article 11 TEU through activities such as advocacy activities, demonstrations, or judicial actions and that these should remain eligible in the relevant funding programs and have sufficient dedicated funding available;

Or. en

Amendment 26
Lubica Karvašová

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Highlights the role of the European Anti-Fraud Office and the European Public Prosecutor’s Office in protecting the financial interests of the Union; welcomes that in 2023 *a* working **arrangement was** signed *with* Denmark *and* cooperation started with Poland and Ireland;

Amendment

5. Highlights the role of the European Anti-Fraud Office and the European Public Prosecutor’s Office (**EPPO**) in protecting the financial interests of the Union; welcomes that in 2023 working **arrangements have been** signed *between the EPPO and* Denmark, *and that* cooperation started with Poland and Ireland; **stresses the need to keep supporting the EPPO with the necessary**

financial and human resources; is of the opinion that a strengthened EPPO is essential for the legislator to be able to further simplify the regulatory framework for cohesion;

Or. en

Amendment 27

Hannes Heide, Sabrina Repp, Nora Mebarek, Matthias Ecke, Klára Dobrev

Draft opinion

Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Highlights the role of the European Anti-Fraud Office and the European Public Prosecutor's Office in protecting the financial interests of the Union; welcomes that in 2023 a working arrangement was signed with Denmark and cooperation started with Poland and Ireland;

Amendment

5. Highlights the role of the European Anti-Fraud Office and the European Public Prosecutor's Office in protecting the financial interests of the Union; welcomes that in 2023 a working arrangement was signed with Denmark and cooperation started with Poland and Ireland; ***stresses the need for enhanced cooperation between OLAF, EPPO and national authorities to strengthen the detection and prevention of fraud in cohesion policy spending.***

Or. en

Amendment 28

Waldemar Tomaszewski

on behalf of the ECR Group

Draft opinion

Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Highlights the role of the European Anti-Fraud ***Office and the European Public Prosecutor's*** Office in protecting the financial interests of the Union; ***welcomes that in 2023 a working arrangement was signed with Denmark***

Amendment

5. Highlights the role of the European Anti-Fraud Office in protecting the financial interests of the Union;

and cooperation started with Poland and Ireland;

Or. en

Amendment 29

Mārtiņš Staķis

on behalf of the Greens/EFA Group

Draft opinion

Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Highlights the role of the European Anti-Fraud Office and the European Public Prosecutor's Office in protecting the financial interests of the Union; welcomes that in 2023 a working arrangement was signed with Denmark and cooperation started with Poland and Ireland;

Amendment

5. Highlights the *important* role of the European Anti-Fraud Office and the European Public Prosecutor's Office in protecting the financial interests of the Union; welcomes that in 2023 a working arrangement was signed with Denmark and cooperation started with Poland and Ireland;

Or. en

Amendment 30

Mārtiņš Staķis

on behalf of the Greens/EFA Group

Draft opinion

Paragraph 5 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

5 a. *Underlines that cohesion policy must not contribute to misuse of EU funds or further deterioration of the Rule of Law and democracy in Member States;*

Or. en

Amendment 31

Mārtiņš Staķis

on behalf of the Greens/EFA Group

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

5 b. Stresses the fundamental role cohesion policy has played in addressing the emergency crisis over the last years and emphasizes the need to keep its long-term strategic investment rationale and objectives;

Or. en

Amendment 32
Maravillas Abadía Jover

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

Amendment

6. Acknowledges that through CRII(+), CARE and REACT-EU, cohesion policy played a key role in **addressing** the consequences of crises; **reiterates**, however, that the role of cohesion policy is to bring added value **in** regional development **and contribute to** competitiveness, **not to bear the consequences of those crises, and therefore** crisis **repair** should not **come at the expense of the long-term cohesion objectives**;

6. Acknowledges that through CRII(+), CARE and REACT-EU, cohesion policy played a key role in **the response to** the consequences of **recent** crises; **stresses**, however, that the role of cohesion policy is to bring **a real** added value **to** regional development, **foster** competitiveness **and ensure its complementary nature to national actions**; **stresses also that** crisis **response measures** should not **compromise strategic long-term cohesion objectives or divert resources away from key priorities**;

Or. es

Amendment 33
Dan-Ştefan Motreanu

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

Amendment

6. Acknowledges that through CRII(+), CARE and REACT-EU, cohesion policy played a key role in addressing the consequences of crises; reiterates, however, that the role of cohesion policy is to bring added value in regional development and contribute to competitiveness, not to bear the consequences of those crises, and therefore crisis repair should not come at the expense of the long-term cohesion objectives;

6. Acknowledges that through CRII(+), CARE and REACT-EU, cohesion policy played a key role in addressing the consequences of crises; reiterates, however, that the role of cohesion policy is to bring added value in regional development and contribute to competitiveness, not to bear the consequences of those crises, and therefore crisis repair should not come at the expense of the long-term cohesion objectives; ***emphasizes that, while flexibility should enable managing authorities to reallocate funds in response to critical emergencies or changes in policy priorities, such actions should adhere to the principles of the partnership principle, ensuring they are undertaken in consultation with the stakeholders of cohesion policy.***

Or. en

Amendment 34
Lubica Karvašová

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Acknowledges that through CRII(+), CARE and REACT-EU, cohesion policy played a key role in addressing the consequences of crises; reiterates, however, that the ***role of cohesion policy is to bring added value in regional development and contribute to competitiveness, not to bear the consequences of those crises, and therefore crisis repair*** should not come at the expense of the long-term cohesion objectives;

Amendment

6. Acknowledges that, ***thanks to the short-term, targeted flexibilities introduced*** through CRII(+), CARE and REACT-EU, cohesion policy played a key role in addressing the consequences of ***the Covid-19 pandemic, Russia's aggression in Ukraine and the resulting energy*** crises; reiterates, however, that the ***EU's response to crises or to emerging priorities*** should not come at the expense of the long-term ***structural*** cohesion objectives ***of reducing disparities across the EU and that the new MFF should be designed with an upfront crisis flexibility;***

Or. en

Amendment 35

Mārtiņš Staķis

on behalf of the Greens/EFA Group

Draft opinion

Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Acknowledges that through CRII(+), CARE and REACT-EU, cohesion policy played a key role in addressing the consequences of crises; reiterates, however, that the role of cohesion policy is to bring added value in regional development and contribute to competitiveness, not to bear the consequences of those crises, and therefore crisis repair should not come at the expense of the long-term cohesion objectives;

Amendment

6. Acknowledges that through CRII(+), CARE and REACT-EU, cohesion policy played a key role in addressing the consequences of crises; reiterates, however, that the role of cohesion policy is to bring added value in regional development and contribute to ***fight against climate change, Green Deal, just transition and*** competitiveness, not to bear the consequences of those crises, and therefore crisis repair should not come at the expense of the ***strategic*** long-term cohesion objectives;

Or. en

Amendment 36

Waldemar Tomaszewski

on behalf of the ECR Group

Draft opinion

Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Acknowledges that through CRII(+), CARE and REACT-EU, cohesion policy played a key role in addressing the consequences of crises; reiterates, however, that the role of cohesion policy is to bring added value in regional development ***and contribute to competitiveness***, not to bear the consequences of those crises, and therefore crisis repair should not come at the expense of the long-term cohesion objectives;

Amendment

6. Acknowledges that through CRII(+), CARE and REACT-EU, cohesion policy played a key role in addressing the consequences of crises; reiterates, however, that the role of cohesion policy is to ***ensure economic cohesion through convergence and*** bring added value in regional development, not to bear the consequences of those crises, and therefore crisis repair should not come at the expense of the long-term cohesion objectives;

Amendment 37
Ľubica Karvašová

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

6 a. *Notes that a significant number of errors were detected on transactions related to 100% co-financed measures; notes that, without taking into account transactions with funding from REACT-EU, CRII+ and CARE, the error rate in Heading 2 would have been 4.3 %;*

Or. en

Amendment 38
Ľubica Karvašová

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

6 b. *Reiterates that the above mentioned factors have also contributed to the delays in the absorption of cohesion policy funds 2021-2027; notes that in 2023 payments for 2021-2027 programmes remained low, at 3.2%, which amounts to a one year delay when compared to the equivalent stage in the previous programming period;*

Or. en

Amendment 39
Ľubica Karvašová

Draft opinion

Paragraph 6 c (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

6 c. *Draws attention to the Court's review on the main causes of errors in cohesion spending 2014-2020; welcomes the Court's conclusion that the cohesion policy assurance framework has helped reduce the overall error level since 2007, but regrets it has not managed to bring it below the materiality threshold; points out that ineligible expenditure and projects were the most prevalent type of error, followed by non-compliance with state aid and public procurement rules;*

Or. en

Amendment 40
Ľubica Karvašová

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6 d (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

6 d. *Notes the uncertainties regarding the closure of the 2014-2020 programming period and welcomes that the Commission has taken additional steps to address this; emphasises the importance of a successful closure of the 2014-2020 programming period and urges the Commission to implement the Court's recommendations (6.4) in this respect;*

Or. en

Amendment 41
Ľubica Karvašová

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6 e (new)

6 e. *Notes that the latest long-term payment forecast produced by the Commission foresees substantial decommitments as of 2027 unless member states undertake additional efforts and implement at a much faster pace than in the period 2014-2020; notes that for the CF, ERDF, and ESF+ cohesion policy funds, the Commission forecast total decommitments for 2024-2027 at €2.2 billion, more than five times its 2022 forecast of €0.4 billion; warns that for Just Transition Fund (JTF), the low implementation in 2023 puts important amounts at risk from 2025 onwards; calls on the Commission and on the member states to use all the available possibilities to avoid decommitments;*

Or. en

Amendment 42
Dan-Ştefan Motreanu

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7

Draft opinion

7. Underlines the need for the new multiannual financial framework to be better designed to allow the use of relevant instruments, outside of cohesion policy, to adapt to emerging needs in the post-2027 period; stresses that local and regional authorities should be more involved in setting the policy's priorities and have direct access to cohesion funds.

Amendment

7. Underlines the need for the new multiannual financial framework to be better designed to allow the use of relevant instruments, outside of cohesion policy, to adapt to emerging needs in the post-2027 period; ***considers that, if the cohesion policy continues to serve as the primary mechanism for addressing new political priorities and responding to emerging crises, it should, in the post-2027 framework, be established as the foremost expenditure priority of the European Union, reflecting its critical role in reducing development disparities between regions and addressing evolving challenges;*** stresses that local and regional authorities should be more involved in

setting the policy's priorities and have direct access to cohesion funds; ***calls for a revision of the European Code of Conduct on Partnership to enhance its application and extend its reach to the European Semester, in order to enable investment and reform priorities to be developed in collaboration with local and regional governments, ensuring alignment with the specific needs of EU's regions.***

Or. en

Amendment 43

Hannes Heide, Sabrina Repp, Nora Mebarek, Matthias Ecke, Klára Dobrev

Draft opinion

Paragraph 7

Draft opinion

7. Underlines the need for the new multiannual financial framework to be better designed to allow the use of relevant instruments, outside of cohesion policy, to adapt to emerging needs in the post-2027 period; stresses ***that*** local and regional authorities ***should be more involved in setting the policy's priorities and have direct access to cohesion funds.***

Amendment

7. Underlines the need for the new multiannual financial framework to be better designed to allow the use of relevant instruments, outside of cohesion policy, to adapt to emerging needs in the post-2027 period; stresses ***the importance of involving*** local and regional authorities ***in both the design and implementation of cohesion policy to ensure that funds are effectively targeted and address the specific needs of communities; calls for the establishment of mechanisms to facilitate*** direct access ***for local authorities, particularly in less-developed regions.***

Or. en

Amendment 44

Mārtiņš Staķis

on behalf of the Greens/EFA Group

Draft opinion

Paragraph 7

Draft opinion

7. Underlines the need for the new multiannual financial framework to be better designed to allow the use of relevant instruments, outside of cohesion policy, to adapt to emerging needs in the post-2027 period; stresses that local and regional authorities should be more involved in setting the policy's priorities and have direct access to cohesion funds.

Amendment

7. Underlines the need for the new multiannual financial framework to be better designed to allow the use of relevant instruments, outside of cohesion policy, to adapt to emerging needs in the post-2027 period; stresses that local and regional authorities should be more involved in setting the policy's priorities and have direct access to cohesion funds;
furthermore, recalls the need for minimizing administrative burden for local and regional authorities but for beneficiaries in particular.

Or. en

Amendment 45
Ľubica Karvašová

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7

Draft opinion

7. Underlines the need for the new multiannual financial framework to be better designed to allow the use of relevant instruments, outside of cohesion policy, to adapt to emerging needs in the post-2027 period; stresses that local and regional authorities should be more involved in setting the policy's priorities and have direct access to cohesion funds.

Amendment

7. Underlines the need for the new multiannual financial framework to be better designed to allow the use of relevant instruments, outside of cohesion policy, to adapt to emerging needs in the post-2027 period; stresses that local and regional authorities should be more involved in setting the policy's priorities and have direct access to cohesion funds ***in an appropriate manner, always in line with cohesion policy long-term objectives;***

Or. en

Amendment 46
Waldemar Tomaszewski
on behalf of the ECR Group

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7

Draft opinion

7. Underlines the need for the new multiannual financial framework to be better designed to ***allow the use of relevant instruments, outside of cohesion policy, to adapt to*** emerging needs in the ***post-2027*** period; stresses that ***local and regional authorities should be more involved in setting the policy's priorities and have direct access to cohesion funds.***

Amendment

7. Underlines the need for the new multiannual financial framework to be better designed to ***to strengthen*** cohesion policy ***in the face of*** emerging needs in the period ***after 2027***; stresses that ***maintaining cohesion policy in its current form is crucial for the functioning of the Single Market and the entire European Union.***

Or. en

Amendment 47
Marta Wcisło

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7 a (new)

Draft opinion

7a. Stresses the need to draw up new regulations and a financial framework, as part of the cohesion policy, which would include aid instruments for border regions at the eastern border of the European Union, in countries bordering Russia, Belarus and Ukraine;

Or. pl