



2024/0275(COD)

15.11.2024

AMENDMENTS

1 - 17

Draft budgetary assessment
Sandra Gómez López
(PE765.338v01-00)

Proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council
RESTORE - Regional Emergency Support to Reconstruction amending
Regulation (EU) 2021/1058 and Regulation (EU) 2021/1057

Proposal for a regulation
(COM(2024)0496 – C10-0147/2024 – 2024/0275(COD))

Amendment 1
Ignazio Roberto Marino

Draft budgetary assessment
Recital A

Draft budgetary assessment

A. whereas the proposal does not modify existing budgetary commitments and remains within the limits of the overall allocations for the period 2021-2027 **and is therefore budgetary neutral**;

Amendment

A. whereas the proposal does not modify existing budgetary commitments and remains within the limits of the overall allocations for the period 2021-2027;

Or. en

Amendment 2
Ignazio Roberto Marino

Draft budgetary assessment
Recital B

Draft budgetary assessment

B. whereas the combined effect of 30% pre-financing, 100 % co-financing and the eligibility for physically completed or fully implemented operations under the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) and European Social Fund Plus (ESF+), while taking into account the cap for re-programming of 10 % of the total 2021-2027 allocation, leads to a partial frontloading of payment appropriations, followed by lower payments at a later stage:

Amendment

B. whereas the combined effect of 30% pre-financing, 100 % co-financing and the eligibility for physically completed or fully implemented operations **as of 1st of January 2024** under the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) and European Social Fund Plus (ESF+), while taking into account the cap for re-programming of 10 % of the total 2021-2027 allocation, leads to a partial frontloading of payment appropriations, followed by lower payments at a later stage:

Or. en

Amendment 3
Ignazio Roberto Marino

Draft budgetary assessment

Paragraph 1

Draft budgetary assessment

1, Recalls that the European Parliament has repeatedly called for more resources for the European Union Solidarity Fund (EUSF) in view of the increasing number and intensity of natural disasters and the need to speed-up procedures so that support reaches Member States and regions hit by natural disasters more quickly; notes that the RESTORE proposal provides additional **assistance** and further flexibility to Member States affected by natural disasters for their cohesion policy programmes 2021-2027 to respond to such disasters; regrets that cohesion policy is again used as an emergency response tool and maintains that this approach risks undermining its longer-term policy and investment objectives and is a symptom of a lack of flexibility and crisis response capacity in the EU budget;

Amendment

1. Recalls that the European Parliament has repeatedly called for more resources for **response to natural disasters and in particular** the European Union Solidarity Fund (EUSF) in view of the increasing number and intensity of natural disasters **in particular linked to climate change** and the need to speed-up procedures so that support reaches Member States and regions hit by natural disasters more quickly; notes that the RESTORE proposal provides additional **opportunities** and further flexibility to Member States affected by natural disasters for **the use of** their cohesion policy programmes 2021-2027 to respond to such disasters; regrets that cohesion policy is again used as an emergency response tool and maintains that this approach risks undermining its longer-term policy and investment objectives and is a symptom of a lack of flexibility and crisis response capacity in the EU budget; **acknowledges, however, that the present proposal offers a pragmatic solution to deal with insufficient budgetary flexibility and crisis response capacity in the EU budget, in order to provide a fast response to the needs of the affected populations;**

Or. en

Amendment 4

Julien Sanchez, Angéline Furet

Draft budgetary assessment

Paragraph 1

Draft budgetary assessment

1. Recalls that the European Parliament has repeatedly called for more resources for the European Union Solidarity Fund (EUSF) in

Amendment

1. Recalls that the European Parliament has repeatedly called for more resources for the European Union Solidarity Fund (EUSF) in

view of the increasing number and intensity of natural disasters and the need to speed-up procedures so that support reaches Member States and regions hit by natural disasters more quickly; notes that the RESTORE proposal provides additional assistance and further flexibility to Member States affected by natural disasters for their cohesion policy programmes 2021-2027 to respond to such disasters; regrets that cohesion policy is again used as an emergency response tool and maintains that this approach risks undermining its longer-term policy and investment objectives and is a symptom of a lack of flexibility and crisis response capacity in the EU budget;

view of the increasing number and intensity of natural disasters and the need to speed-up procedures so that support reaches Member States and regions hit by natural disasters more quickly; notes that the RESTORE proposal provides additional assistance and further flexibility to Member States affected by natural disasters for their cohesion policy programmes 2021-2027 to respond to such disasters; regrets that cohesion policy is again used as an emergency response tool and maintains that this approach risks undermining its longer-term policy and investment objectives and is a symptom of a lack of flexibility and crisis response capacity in the EU budget; ***calls for the RESTORE proposal to explicitly include a commitment to allocate a significant portion of the funds to support the creation or renovation of infrastructure for natural disaster risk prevention, which would help mitigate the impact of future disasters and consequently reduce the costs required for repairs;***

Or. en

Amendment 5 **Ignazio Roberto Marino**

Draft budgetary assessment **Paragraph 3**

Draft budgetary assessment

3. Notes further that for 2025 the Commission proposes additional payment appropriations for ERDF of a total of EUR 3 000 million through the amending letter (AL); refers to the estimated payment needs in 2025 of a total amount of EUR 3 000 million in the RESTORE proposal, of which EUR 2 070 million for ERDF and EUR 930 million for ESF+; regrets the inconsistency of figures between the AL and the Legislative Financial Statement

Amendment

3. Notes further that for 2025 the Commission proposes additional payment appropriations for ERDF of a total of EUR 3 000 million through the amending letter (AL); refers to the estimated payment needs in 2025 of a total amount of EUR 3 000 million in the RESTORE proposal, of which EUR 2 070 million for ERDF and EUR 930 million for ESF+; regrets the inconsistency of figures between the AL and the Legislative Financial Statement

and urges the Commission to provide for coherent information and rectification, where necessary;

and urges the Commission to provide for coherent information and rectification, where necessary; *is of the opinion that the estimate (whichever is the actual one) does not take into account that there is some retroactive eligibility, that means that clearly the increased payments will not only go to pre-financing and does not take into account the possibility of delays with the opening of the negotiations of the programs as well as the fact that at this date the Commission does not have any estimates on initial take-up of the proposal by Member States, let alone the potential volumes of the program amendments and therefore is very difficult to assess and there is a likelihood that this will therefore need to be corrected in an amending budget;*

Or. en

Amendment 6 **Michalis Hadjipantela**

Draft budgetary assessment **Paragraph 4**

Draft budgetary assessment

4. *Expects* the Commission to take into account in its draft budget for 2026 the updated payment needs for ERDF and ESF+ following the actual re-programming by Member States and to keep the European Parliament informed in a timely manner about the evolution of RESTORE uptake in the Member States;

Amendment

4. *Calls on the Commission to assist Member States in the reprogramming of the available resources under the ERDF and ESF+, to explore options of simplified administrative procedures, and to quickly assess modified programmes in order to inject liquidity to cover the most pressing needs in affected Member States, alleviating the burden on local, regional and national budgets; moreover, expects* the Commission to take into account in its draft budget for 2026 the updated payment needs for ERDF and ESF+ following the actual re-programming by Member States and to keep the European Parliament informed in a timely manner about the evolution of RESTORE uptake in the

Member States;

Or. en

Amendment 7
Ignazio Roberto Marino

Draft budgetary assessment
Paragraph 5

Draft budgetary assessment

5. Requests the Commission to provide for traceable information including on transfers referred to in Article 26 of Regulation (EU) 2021/1060 to ERDF and ESF+ and on payment forecasts for cohesion policy programmes 2021-2027 to make the impact of RESTORE clearly identifiable for the budgetary authority;

Amendment

5. Requests the Commission to provide for traceable information ***in the form of timely reports*** including on transfers referred to in Article 26 of Regulation (EU) 2021/1060 to ERDF and ESF+ and on payment forecasts for cohesion policy programmes 2021-2027 to make the impact of RESTORE clearly identifiable for the budgetary authority;

Or. en

Amendment 8
Ruggero Razza

Draft budgetary assessment
Paragraph 5a (new)

Draft budgetary assessment

5a. Requests the funds allocated to the regions under this new regulation may be reprogrammed, up to 10% of the total allocation, to pursue the objectives set out in this Regulation. The Commission shall commit to approving such reprogramming through a simplified procedure within 30 days from the submission of the request;

Or. en

Amendment 9
Michalis Hadjipantela

Draft budgetary assessment
Paragraph 7

Draft budgetary assessment

7. Notes that payments to 2021-2027 cohesion policy programmes were on a very low level in the first years of implementation leading to an increase of payment needs towards the later years; recalls that this actual payment cycle does not co-incide with the more linear payment profile set out in the MFF Regulation and that this situation results in a risk of exceeding payment ceilings in the later years; considers that the frontloading of payments towards 2025 and 2026 could alleviate the pressure on payments; calls on the Commission to closely monitor the payments evolution **and** provide timely information to the European Parliament in this regard;

Amendment

7. Notes that payments to 2021-2027 cohesion policy programmes were on a very low level in the first years of implementation leading to an increase of payment needs towards the later years; recalls that this actual payment cycle does not co-incide with the more linear payment profile set out in the MFF Regulation and that this situation results in a risk of exceeding payment ceilings in the later years; considers that the frontloading of payments towards 2025 and 2026 could alleviate the pressure on payments; calls on the Commission to closely monitor the payments evolution, provide timely information to the European Parliament in this regard **and to propose any necessary remedial action to the budgetary authority in due time if the risk of a backlog of payments materialises;**

Or. en

Amendment 10
Ignazio Roberto Marino

Draft budgetary assessment
Paragraph 7

Draft budgetary assessment

7. Notes that payments to 2021-2027 cohesion policy programmes were on a very low level in the first years of implementation leading to an increase of payment needs towards the later years; recalls that this actual payment cycle does not co-incide with the more linear payment profile set out in the MFF Regulation and

Amendment

7. Notes that payments to 2021-2027 cohesion policy programmes were on a very low level in the first years of implementation leading to an increase of payment needs towards the later years; recalls that this actual payment cycle does not co-incide with the more linear payment profile set out in the MFF Regulation and

that this situation results in a risk of exceeding payment ceilings in the later years; considers that the frontloading of payments towards 2025 and 2026 could alleviate the pressure on payments; calls on the Commission to closely monitor the payments evolution and provide timely information to the European Parliament in this regard;

that this situation results in a risk of exceeding payment ceilings in the later years; considers that the frontloading of payments towards 2025 and 2026 could alleviate the pressure on payments; calls on the Commission to closely monitor the payments evolution and provide timely information to the European Parliament in this regard; ***considers that the frontloading of payments towards 2025 and 2026 could alleviate the pressure on payments;***

Or. en

Amendment 11
Ignazio Roberto Marino

Draft budgetary assessment
Paragraph 8

Draft budgetary assessment

8. Notes that support under RESTORE is considered not to alter the contribution of ERDF and ESF+ to climate targets as set out in the relevant regulations and in point 16 of the IIA; underlines, however, that re-programming and inclusion of repair and reconstruction measures, particularly under ERDF support, could lead to shifting resources from interventions with a higher coefficient for calculation of support to climate change objectives to lower coefficients, thus potentially reducing the expenditures supporting climate objectives; regrets that the Commission has not made an impact assessment of the proposal on the requirement for climate spending or climate-related classification of spending;

Amendment

8. Notes that support under RESTORE ***according to the Commission*** is considered not to alter the contribution of ERDF and ESF+ to climate targets as set out in the relevant regulations and in point 16 of the IIA; underlines, however, that re-programming and inclusion of repair and reconstruction measures, particularly under ERDF support, could lead to shifting resources from interventions with a higher coefficient for calculation of support to climate change objectives to lower ***actual*** coefficients ***stemming from the programs agreed***, thus potentially reducing the expenditures supporting climate objectives ***therefore, while still respecting the regulation threshold and insist that the commitment made by the Commission not to allow for prevention measures already programmed to alter their geographical scope is the bare minimum in this regard;*** regrets that the Commission has not made an impact assessment of the proposal on the requirement for climate spending or

climate-related classification of spending;

Or. en

Amendment 12
Danuše Nerudová

Draft budgetary assessment
Paragraph 8a (new)

Draft budgetary assessment

Amendment

8a. Stresses the need for more flexibilities in the regulatory framework covering the Common Provisions Regulation, the European Regional Development Fund and Cohesion Fund Regulation, the European Social Fund Plus Regulation in order to enable the Member states to help affected regions more effectively; calls on the Commission to consider flexibilities in the rules related to thematic concentration of ERDF support;

Or. en

Amendment 13
Ignazio Roberto Marino

Draft budgetary assessment
Paragraph 9

Draft budgetary assessment

Amendment

9. Fears that a broader definition of ‘natural disaster’ could lead to more than estimated programme amendments, thus potentially triggering higher than estimated payment needs ***that have not yet been factored in for the coming years;***

9. Fears that ***the accelerating frequency and intensity of natural disasters and to some extent*** a broader definition of ‘natural disaster’ ***than the one used in EUSF but already used in state aid (GBER) and CAP context*** could lead to more than estimated programme amendments, thus potentially triggering higher than estimated payment needs;

Or. en

Amendment 14
Julien Sanchez, Angéline Furet

Draft budgetary assessment
Paragraph 9

Draft budgetary assessment

9. Fears that a broad definition of ‘natural disaster’ could lead to more than estimated programme amendments, thus potentially triggering higher than estimated payment needs that have not yet been factored in for the coming years;

Amendment

9. Fears that a broad definition of ‘natural disaster’ could lead to more than estimated programme amendments, thus potentially triggering higher than estimated payment needs that have not yet been factored in for the coming years; ***recalls the need for a more precise definition of the concept of ‘natural disaster’ to avoid ambiguous interpretations and to ensure that RESTORE resources are allocated exclusively to genuine emergencies and to supporting the creation or renovation of infrastructures for natural disaster risk prevention; calls on the Commission to revise this definition to prevent any misuse or improper reallocation of funds;***

Or. en

Amendment 15
Ignazio Roberto Marino

Draft budgetary assessment
Paragraph 9a (new)

Draft budgetary assessment

Amendment

9a. Welcomes the commitment for building back better as the best way to ensure effectiveness of the spending also beyond climate-proofing in this context; stresses therefore that reconstruction in response to natural disasters, operations based on the “build back better principle” should be prioritised in line with other Union instruments and using the recovery, rehabilitation and

reconstruction phases after a disaster to increase the resilience of communities through integrating disaster risk reduction measures as indicated in the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030;

Or. en

Amendment 16
Ignazio Roberto Marino

Draft budgetary assessment
Paragraph 9b (new)

Draft budgetary assessment

Amendment

9b. Fears that the possible reprogramming of ESF+ objectives Art 4 (m) exempting reprogramming from accompanying measures will impact the overall delivery of this particular objective significantly, especially in light of the passivity to use this retroactively;

Or. en

Amendment 17
Julien Sanchez, Angéline Furet

Draft budgetary assessment
Paragraph 10

Draft budgetary assessment

Amendment

10. Highlights the importance to prevent double financing and calls on the Member States and the Commission to ensure that support under RESTORE is in addition to support under Union programmes, including the EUSF;

10. Highlights the importance to prevent double financing and calls on the Member States and the Commission to ensure that support under RESTORE is in addition to support under Union programmes, including the EUSF; *calls on the Commission to establish strict monitoring mechanisms to ensure the exclusive use of funds, limit redundancy in financing, and*

strengthen transparency;

Or. en