



EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

2014 - 2019

---

*Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety*

---

**2014/2150(INI)**

5.2.2015

# **AMENDMENTS**

## **1 - 81**

**Draft opinion**  
**Giovanni La Via**  
(PE546.616v01-00)

Regulatory Fitness and Performance Programme (REFIT): State of Play and  
Outlook  
(2014/2150(INI))

AM\_Com\_NonLegOpinion

**Amendment 1**  
**Annie Schreijer-Pierik**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 1**

*Draft opinion*

1. Welcomes the Commission's commitment to a simple, clear and predictable regulatory framework expressed in the REFIT programme;

*Amendment*

1. Welcomes the Commission's commitment to a simple, clear, **harmonised** and predictable regulatory framework expressed in the REFIT programme;

Or. nl

**Amendment 2**  
**Jytte Guteland**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 1**

*Draft opinion*

1. **Welcomes** the Commission's commitment to a simple, clear and predictable regulatory framework expressed in the REFIT programme;

*Amendment*

1. **Notes** the Commission's commitment to a simple, clear and predictable regulatory framework expressed in the REFIT programme; **calls on the Commission not to lower its level of ambition with regard to key public policy objectives including environmental protection, food safety and consumer rights, safety at work, gender equality and labour rights;**

Or. en

**Amendment 3**  
**Julie Girling**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 1**

*Draft opinion*

1. Welcomes the Commission's commitment to a simple, clear and predictable regulatory framework expressed in the REFIT programme;

*Amendment*

1. Welcomes the Commission's commitment to a simple, clear and predictable regulatory framework expressed in the REFIT programme;  
***underlines that the work foreseen in the REFIT Communication should be part of an ongoing process, ensuring that the legislation in force at European level is fit for purpose, achieving the shared objective of the legislators and meeting the expectations of citizens, businesses and other stakeholders;***

Or. en

**Amendment 4**  
**Jytte Guteland**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 2**

*Draft opinion*

2. ***Welcomes*** the first edition of the annual REFIT scoreboard that allows for the assessment of progress made in all policy areas and of each initiative identified by the Commission, including actions taken by the European Parliament and the Council;

*Amendment*

2. ***Notes*** the first edition of the annual REFIT scoreboard that allows for the assessment of progress made in all policy areas and of each initiative identified by the Commission, including actions taken by the European Parliament and the Council;

Or. en

**Amendment 5**  
**Julie Girling**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 2**

*Draft opinion*

2. Welcomes the first edition of the annual REFIT scoreboard that allows for the assessment of progress made in all policy areas and of each initiative identified by the Commission, including actions taken by the European Parliament and the Council;

*Amendment*

2. Welcomes the first edition of the annual REFIT scoreboard that allows for the assessment of progress made in all policy areas and of each initiative identified by the Commission, including actions taken by the European Parliament and the Council; ***believes that the scoreboard should be complemented with an annual statement of net costs and benefits of European legislation adopted and repealed by the European Union, in order to provide a more complete assessment of the progress being made in addressing unnecessary red tape and a recognition by the Commission that often the cumulative cost of regulation is the problem for businesses;***

Or. en

**Amendment 6  
Renate Sommer**

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

*Draft opinion*

**Amendment 7  
Renate Sommer**

*Amendment*

***2a. Welcomes the Commission's announcement that, in reviewing existing and planned legislation, it will take account of the particular interests of micro-companies and SMEs and apply lighter regimes to such companies in the form of exemptions and simplifications;***

Or. de

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

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

***2b. Stresses the Commission's estimate that up to one-third of administrative burden linked to EU legislation stems from national implementing measures or flexible transposition options; calls on the Commission, therefore, in reviewing the legal framework of regulations and directives, to promote a revival of the principle of the common internal market and, wherever possible, to avoid allowing scope for differing national provisions;***

Or. de

**Amendment 8**  
**Christofer Fjellner**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 3**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

***3. Agrees in principle with the aim of cutting red tape and removing unnecessary regulatory burdens; expresses, however, its concern about potential deregulation, in particular in the fields of the environment, food safety and health, under the guise of 'cutting red tape';***

***3. Supports the aim of cutting red tape and removing unnecessary regulatory burdens;***

Or. en

**Amendment 9**  
**Mara Bizzotto**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 3**

*Draft opinion*

3. Agrees *in principle* with the aim of cutting red tape and removing unnecessary regulatory burdens; *expresses, however, its concern about potential deregulation, in particular in the fields of the environment, food safety and health, under the guise of ‘cutting red tape’;*

*Amendment*

3. Agrees with the aim of cutting red tape and removing unnecessary regulatory burdens;

Or. it

**Amendment 10**  
**Jytte Guteland**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 3**

*Draft opinion*

3. Agrees in principle with the aim of cutting red tape and removing unnecessary regulatory burdens; expresses, however, its concern about potential deregulation, *in particular in the fields of* the environment, food safety *and health*, under the guise of ‘cutting red tape’;

*Amendment*

3. Agrees in principle with the aim of cutting red tape and removing unnecessary regulatory burdens; expresses, however, its concern about potential deregulation *and underlines that the REFIT programme should not be used to undermine* the environment, food safety, *health and consumer rights*, under the guise of ‘cutting red tape’; *underlines in this regard that the quality of legislation is the appropriate benchmark for evaluation, as opposed to the number of legislative acts; reminds of Member States’ regulatory independence in cases where EU law only provides for minimum standards;*

Or. en

**Amendment 11**  
**Gesine Meissner, Jan Huitema**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 3**

*Draft opinion*

3. Agrees *in principle* with the aim of cutting red tape and removing unnecessary regulatory burdens; *expresses, however, its concern about potential deregulation, in particular in the fields of the environment, food safety and health, under the guise of ‘cutting red tape’;*

*Amendment*

3. Agrees with the aim of cutting red tape and removing unnecessary regulatory burdens; *supports the idea of smart regulation;*

Or. en

**Amendment 12**  
**József Nagy**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 3**

*Draft opinion*

3. Agrees in principle with the aim of cutting red tape and removing unnecessary regulatory burdens; expresses, however, its concern about potential deregulation, in particular in the fields of the environment, food safety and health, under the guise of ‘cutting red tape’;

*Amendment*

3. Agrees in principle with the aim of cutting red tape and removing unnecessary regulatory burdens, *provided that this is done in such a way that, while a high standard of protection of health and the environment is achieved, the competitiveness of European industry is preserved;* expresses, however, its concern about potential deregulation, in particular in the fields of the environment, food safety and health, under the guise of ‘cutting red tape’;

Or. hu

**Amendment 13**  
**Julie Girling**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 3**

*Draft opinion*

3. Agrees *in principle* with the aim of cutting red tape and removing unnecessary regulatory burdens; *expresses, however, its concern about potential deregulation*, in particular in the fields of the environment, food safety and health, *under the guise of 'cutting red tape'*;

*Amendment*

3. Agrees with the aim of cutting red tape and removing unnecessary regulatory burdens; *believes that*, in particular in the fields of the environment, food safety and health, *'cutting red tape' should deliver proportionate and evidence-based protections for citizens, whilst ensuring that EU businesses can grow, create jobs and boost competitiveness; notes that deregulation and better regulation are not mutually exclusive*;

Or. en

**Amendment 14**

**Mireille D'Ornano, Sylvie Goddyn, Jean-François Jalkh**

**Draft opinion  
Paragraph 3**

*Draft opinion*

3. Agrees in principle with the aim of cutting red tape and removing unnecessary regulatory burdens; expresses, however, its concern about potential deregulation, in particular in the fields of the environment, food safety and health, under the guise of 'cutting red tape';

*Amendment*

3. Agrees in principle with the aim of cutting red tape and removing unnecessary regulatory burdens; expresses, however, its concern about potential deregulation, in particular in the fields of the environment, food safety and health, under the guise of 'cutting red tape'; *is concerned about the risk of deregulation associated with the TTIP negotiations and the dangers that this treaty poses to the stringency of applicable standards in the EU*;

Or. fr

**Amendment 15  
Bas Eickhout**

**Draft opinion  
Paragraph 3**

*Draft opinion*

3. Agrees *in principle* with the aim of cutting red tape and removing unnecessary regulatory burdens; expresses, however, its concern about *potential* deregulation, in particular in the fields of the environment, food safety and health, under the guise of ‘cutting red tape’;

*Amendment*

3. Agrees with the aim of cutting *unnecessary* red tape and removing unnecessary regulatory burdens; expresses, however, its *strong* concern about *REFIT serving also as a tool to achieve* deregulation, in particular in the fields of the environment, food safety and health, under the guise of ‘cutting red tape’;

Or. en

**Amendment 16**

**Marco Affronte, Eleonora Evi, Piernicola Pedicini**

**Draft opinion**

**Paragraph 3**

*Draft opinion*

3. Agrees in principle with the aim of cutting red tape and removing unnecessary regulatory burdens; *expresses, however, its concern about potential* deregulation, in particular in the fields of the environment, food safety and health, *under the guise of ‘cutting red tape’*;

*Amendment*

3. Agrees in principle with the aim of cutting red tape and removing unnecessary regulatory burdens; *calls strongly for the REFIT programme not to be used as a pretext for applying* deregulation *measures*, in particular in the fields of the environment, food safety and health, *and measures to exclude from decision-making processes non-governmental organisations, citizens’ associations and committees representing local interests concerning the protection of the environment, public health and consumers*;

Or. it

**Amendment 17**

**Jo Leinen, Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy, Bas Eickhout, Catherine Bearder, Seb Dance**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 3**

*Draft opinion*

3. Agrees in principle with the aim of cutting red tape and removing unnecessary regulatory burdens; expresses, however, its concern about potential deregulation, in particular in the fields of the environment, food safety and health, under the guise of ‘cutting red tape’;

*Amendment*

3. Agrees in principle with the aim of cutting red tape and removing unnecessary regulatory burdens; expresses, however, its concern about potential deregulation, in particular in the fields of the environment, food safety and health, under the guise of ‘cutting red tape’; ***urges the Commission to take the benefits environmental legislation has on citizens, the economy and the environment fully into account when assessing the administrative burdens of regulations;***

Or. en

**Amendment 18**  
**Nicola Caputo**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 3**

*Draft opinion*

3. Agrees in principle with the aim of cutting red tape and removing unnecessary regulatory burdens; expresses, however, its concern about potential deregulation, in particular in the fields of the environment, food safety and health, under the guise of ‘cutting red tape’;

*Amendment*

3. Agrees in principle with the aim of cutting red tape and removing unnecessary regulatory burdens; expresses, however, its concern about potential deregulation, in particular in the fields of the environment, food safety and health, under the guise of ‘cutting red tape’; ***calls on the Commission not to lower its level of ambition and calls for public policy objectives, including environmental and health standards, not to be jeopardised;***

Or. it

**Amendment 19**  
**Julie Girling**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 3 a (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

***3a. Underlines that simpler, smarter regulation leads to consistent transposition and more effective and uniform enforcement by Member States;***

Or. en

**Amendment 20**  
**Nicola Caputo**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 3 a (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

***3a. Stresses that certain administrative burdens are necessary if the objectives of the legislation and the required level of protection are to be complied with appropriately, in particular with regard to the environment and protection of public health, sectors in which information requirements must be maintained;***

Or. it

**Amendment 21**  
**Jo Leinen, Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy, Catherine Bearder, Bas Eickhout, Seb Dance**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 3 a (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

***3a. Highlights the consistently strong support expressed by European citizens for EU action on the environment; stresses that the work of regulatory***

*simplification (REFIT) in particular in the context of the Commission work programme, must not be taken as a pretext for lowering the level of ambition on issues of vital importance to the protection of the environment;*

Or. en

**Amendment 22**  
**Bas Eickhout**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 3 a (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

*3a. Is concerned that REFIT takes an unbalanced view of regulation as 'administrative burden', insufficiently acknowledging the positive aspects of regulation;*

Or. en

**Amendment 23**  
**Julie Girling**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 3 b (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

*3b. Believes, to that end, that the Commission should publish provisional impact assessments, in particular to accompany a public consultation, setting out the full range of impacts that the options proposed could have;*

Or. en

**Amendment 24**  
**Bas Eickhout**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 3 b (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

***3b. Recalls that four Members of the High Level Group on Administrative Burden, those representing the views of workers, public health, the environment and consumers, adopted a dissenting opinion with regard to the Final Report of the High Level Group of 24 July 2014<sup>1a</sup>;***

---

<sup>1a</sup><http://www.eeb.org/EEB/?LinkServID=93589C92-5056-B741-DBB964D531862603>

Or. en

**Amendment 25**  
**Nicola Caputo**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 3 b (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

***3b. Points out that 32 % of administrative burdens of EU origin are the result of the decision of some Member States to go beyond what is required by EU legislation and of the inefficiency in their administrative procedures<sup>1a</sup>. It is therefore vital to avoid ‘gold-plating’, that is, when transposing EU directives, introducing further requirements and burdens over and above those laid down by EU law. ‘Gold-plating’ increases complexity and the costs which have to be borne by local and regional authorities and public and private companies. An***

*EU-wide definition of ‘gold-plating’ is required, to ensure certainty in the application of EU law and to be able to judge those countries which deny ‘gold-plating’;*

---

<sup>1a</sup> COM(2009)544, paragraph 2, p. 6.

Or. it

**Amendment 26**  
**Julie Girling**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 3 c (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

*3c. Reminds the Commission, further, of Parliament's requests that the independence of the Impact Assessment Board (IAB) be strengthened, and in particular that members of the IAB must not be subject to political control; considers that the IAB should be composed only of appropriately qualified people who are competent to assess the analysis presented as regards relevant economic, social and environmental impacts;*

Or. en

**Amendment 27**  
**Bas Eickhout**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 3 c (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

*3c. Opposes the setting of a net target for reducing regulatory costs, as this*

*unnecessarily reduces the range of instruments available for addressing new or unresolved issues, and ignores the corresponding benefits of regulation;*

Or. en

**Amendment 28**  
**Nicola Caputo**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 3 c (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

*3c. Stresses that a survey of unnecessary burdens and costs by those who are subject to them can be a vital complement to the cost–benefit analysis. That is why consultations and public debate are essential and should be strengthened by the Commission;*

Or. it

**Amendment 29**  
**Bas Eickhout**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 3 d (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

*3d. Opposes the concept of offsetting new regulatory 'burdens' by removing existing 'burdens'; if an existing rule creates an unnecessary burden or is outdated, it should be removed; if it is serving a useful purpose where the benefits outweigh the burden, it should not be removed, just because a new measure has been taken elsewhere;*

**Amendment 30**  
**Nicola Caputo**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 3 d (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

***3d. Points out that a cost-benefit analysis should be carried out wherever possible, but is not an exact science, as the necessary data cannot always be collected and/or processed. Stresses, moreover, that every change has a cost, even though transition costs are often not taken into due consideration. They should be carefully assessed and compared to the costs of failing to act. The legal certainty requirement also needs to be assessed, in addition to the time required to amend the legislation;***

Or. it

**Amendment 31**  
**Christofer Fjellner**

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

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

4. Underlines that when evaluations and fitness checks of environmental, food safety and health legislation are carried out, ***environmental*** and health ***considerations*** must be ***given the same weight as economic considerations***;

4. Underlines that when evaluations and fitness checks of environmental, food safety and health legislation are carried out, ***the impact on the environment*** and health must be ***taken into consideration***;

Or. en

**Amendment 32**  
**Annie Schreijer-Pierik**

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

*Draft opinion*

4. Underlines that when evaluations and fitness checks of environmental, food safety and health legislation are carried out, environmental and health considerations must be given the same weight as ***economic*** considerations;

*Amendment*

4. Underlines that when evaluations and fitness checks of environmental, food safety and health legislation are carried out, environmental and health considerations must be given the same weight as ***socioeconomic*** considerations;

Or. nl

**Amendment 33**  
**Lampros Fountoulis**

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

*Draft opinion*

4. Underlines that when evaluations and fitness checks of environmental, food safety and health legislation are carried out, environmental and health considerations must be given the same weight as economic considerations;

*Amendment*

4. Underlines that when evaluations and fitness checks of environmental, food safety and health legislation are carried out, environmental and health considerations must be given ***at least*** the same weight as economic considerations;

Or. el

**Amendment 34**  
**Jytte Guteland**

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

*Draft opinion*

4. Underlines that when evaluations and fitness checks of environmental, food

*Amendment*

4. Underlines that when evaluations and fitness checks of environmental, food

safety and health legislation are carried out, environmental and health considerations must be given the same weight as economic considerations;

safety and health legislation are carried out, environmental and health considerations must be given the same weight as economic considerations; ***points out that long-term benefits of regulatory action are often more difficult to quantify in monetary terms (for example, reducing health impairments or maintaining ecosystems), whereas the emphasis on quantification introduces a structural bias in favour of more easily quantifiable aspects such as costs to economic operators as compared to social and environmental benefits;***

Or. en

#### **Amendment 35**

**Jean-François Jalkh, Mireille D'Ornano, Sylvie Goddyn, Joëlle Mélin**

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

##### *Draft opinion*

4. Underlines that when evaluations and fitness checks of environmental, food safety and health legislation are carried out, environmental and health considerations must be given the same weight as economic considerations;

##### *Amendment*

4. Underlines that when evaluations and fitness checks of environmental, food safety and health legislation are carried out, environmental and health considerations must be given ***at least*** the same weight as economic considerations;

Or. fr

#### **Amendment 36** **Julie Girling**

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

##### *Draft opinion*

4. ***Underlines*** that when evaluations and fitness checks of environmental, food

##### *Amendment*

4. ***Acknowledges*** that when evaluations and fitness checks of environmental, food

safety and health legislation are carried out, *environmental* and health *considerations* must be *given the same weight as economic considerations*;

safety and health legislation are carried out, *robust scientific evidence detailing the potential impacts on the environment* and health must be *considered alongside evidence on potential economic impacts, in equivalence with analysis conducted under the impact assessment procedures*;

Or. en

#### **Amendment 37**

**Marco Affronte, Eleonora Evi, Piernicola Pedicini**

#### **Draft opinion**

#### **Paragraph 4**

##### *Draft opinion*

4. Underlines that when evaluations and fitness checks of environmental, food safety and health legislation are carried out, environmental and health considerations *must be given the same weight as economic considerations*;

##### *Amendment*

4. Underlines that when evaluations and fitness checks of environmental, food safety and health legislation are carried out, environmental and health considerations *should always take precedence* over economic considerations, *in compliance with the precautionary principle, the preventive action principle and the 'polluter pays' principle*;

Or. it

#### **Amendment 38**

**Bas Eickhout**

#### **Draft opinion**

#### **Paragraph 4**

##### *Draft opinion*

4. Underlines that when evaluations and fitness checks of environmental, food safety and health legislation are carried out, environmental and health considerations must be given the same weight as economic considerations;

##### *Amendment*

4. Underlines that when evaluations and fitness checks of environmental, food safety and health legislation are carried out, *qualitative* environmental and health considerations must be given the same weight as *quantitative* economic

considerations, *all the more as protection of health and the environment is often difficult or even impossible to quantify, unlike business costs; underlines also that costs and benefits are considered not only for the short term, but also for the long term;*

Or. en

**Amendment 39**  
**Annie Schreijer-Pierik**

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

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

*4a. Stresses that, when these evaluations and fitness checks are carried out in the case of environmental legislation, account should also be taken of the importance of a level playing field within Europe, with regulations being implemented and complied with in the same way in the various Member States;*

Or. nl

**Amendment 40**  
**Christofer Fjellner**

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

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

*4a. Highlights the importance of avoiding legislative duplication;*

Or. en

**Amendment 41**  
**Julie Girling**

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

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

***4a. Supports the continued improvement in impact assessments, ex-ante and ex-post, fostering evidence-based policy-making;***

Or. en

**Amendment 42**  
**Nicola Caputo**

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

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

***4a. Calls on the Commission to strengthen the effectiveness and raise the profile of the EU Pilot mechanism, which is designed to provide quick and exhaustive answers to questions from citizens and businesses on EU legislation. Stresses that most EU Pilot questions concern infringements relating to waste and to environmental impact assessment requirements, which are key areas for public health and the environment;***

Or. it

**Amendment 43**  
**Jo Leinen, Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy, Bas Eickhout, Catherine Bearder, Seb Dance**

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

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

***4a. Reiterates that the Commission has previously acknowledged that environmental standards and progressive regulation do not constitute a hindrance for the economy, but rather an advantage for economic growth and job creation;***

Or. en

**Amendment 44  
Nicola Caputo**

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

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

***4b. Calls on the Commission to review its evaluation guidelines, by stepping up the participation and consultation of stakeholders and using the most direct method in order to enable EU citizens to take part in decision-making;***

Or. it

**Amendment 45  
Tom Vandenkendelaere**

**Draft opinion  
Paragraph 5**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

5. Emphasises that improving environmental protection creates opportunities for businesses, especially in the context of the transition towards a green economy;

5. Emphasises that improving environmental protection creates opportunities for businesses, especially in the context of the transition towards a ***sustainable*** green economy ***with a focus on a more energy self-sufficient Europe;***

**Amendment 46**  
**Annie Schreijer-Pierik**

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

*Draft opinion*

5. Emphasises that improving environmental protection creates opportunities for businesses, especially in the context of the transition towards a green economy;

*Amendment*

5. Emphasises that improving environmental protection creates opportunities for businesses, especially in the context of the transition towards a green economy, ***but that this must not increase costs for SMEs***;

Or. nl

**Amendment 47**  
**Ivan Jakovčić**

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

*Draft opinion*

5. Emphasises that improving environmental protection creates opportunities for businesses, ***especially*** in the context of the transition towards a green economy;

*Amendment*

5. Emphasises that improving ***regulations and investments in*** environmental protection creates opportunities for businesses, ***especially for SMEs*** in the context of the transition towards a green economy;

Or. en

**Amendment 48**  
**József Nagy**

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

*Draft opinion*

5. Emphasises that improving environmental protection creates opportunities for businesses, especially in the context of the transition towards a green economy;

*Amendment*

5. Emphasises that improving environmental protection creates opportunities for businesses, especially in the context of the transition towards a green economy, ***while particularly stressing support for SMEs***;

Or. hu

**Amendment 49**  
**Sirpa Pietikäinen**

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

*Draft opinion*

5. Emphasises that ***improving*** environmental protection creates opportunities for businesses, especially in the context of the transition towards a green economy;

*Amendment*

5. Emphasises that ***high-level*** environmental ***and public health*** protection creates ***innovations and*** opportunities for businesses ***and therefore benefits the European economy***, especially in the context of the transition towards a green economy;

Or. en

**Amendment 50**  
**Julie Girling**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 5 a (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

***5a. Highlights that risk management and science are the basis for environmental and health protection in EU legislation***;

Or. en

**Amendment 51**  
**Jan Huitema, Gesine Meissner**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 5 a (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

***5a. Stresses that the ongoing fitness check of the Birds Directive (2009/147/EC) and the Habitats Directive (92/43/EEC) should take socio-economic activities around Nature 2000 areas into account as economic activities are disproportionately hampered, which might prevent new innovations that could contribute towards a more sustainable co-existence of economic activities and address ecological concerns; moreover, differences in national implementation lead to detrimental economic, social and environmental outcomes and distort an European level playing field;***

Or. en

**Amendment 52**  
**Jo Leinen, Bas Eickhout, Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy, Catherine Bearder, Seb Dance**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 5 a (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

***5a. Underlines that the EU's environment policy has stimulated innovation and investment in environmental goods and services, generating jobs and export opportunities;***

Or. en

**Amendment 53**  
**Jo Leinen, Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy, Catherine Bearder, Bas Eickhout, Seb Dance**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 5 b (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

***5b. Notes that the Commission is undertaking a Fitness Check of the Birds and Habitats Directives; underlines that these Directives are the cornerstone of Europe's efforts to halt the loss of biodiversity and restore degraded ecosystems and that their regulatory framework is both flexible and modern and is a framework within which business can adapt and operate successfully;***

Or. en

**Amendment 54**

**Jo Leinen, Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy, Catherine Bearder, Bas Eickhout, Seb Dance**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 5 c (new)**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

***5c. Opposes in this context the opening of the operational provisions of the Birds and Habitats Directives;***

Or. en

**Amendment 55**

**Christofer Fjellner**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 6**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

***6. Notes with astonishment the Commission's announcement that it intends to withdraw the proposal on the revision of waste legislation and to modify***

***deleted***

*the proposal on the reduction of national emissions;*

Or. en

**Amendment 56**  
**Lampros Fountoulis**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 6**

*Draft opinion*

6. Notes with astonishment the Commission's announcement that it intends to withdraw the proposal on the revision of waste legislation and to modify the proposal on the reduction of national emissions;

*Amendment*

6. Notes with astonishment ***and displeasure*** the Commission's announcement that it intends to withdraw the proposal on the revision of waste legislation and to modify the proposal on the reduction of national emissions;

Or. el

**Amendment 57**  
**Jytte Guteland**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 6**

*Draft opinion*

6. Notes with astonishment the Commission's announcement that it intends to withdraw the proposal on the revision of waste legislation and to modify the proposal on the reduction of national emissions;

*Amendment*

6. Notes with astonishment the Commission's announcement that it intends to withdraw the proposal on the revision of waste legislation and to modify the proposal on the reduction of national emissions; ***deplores the Commission's announcement to withdraw its proposal on a reviewed energy taxation directive;***

Or. en

**Amendment 58**  
**José Inácio Faria**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 6**

*Draft opinion*

6. Notes with astonishment the Commission's announcement that it intends to withdraw the *proposal* on the revision of waste legislation and to modify the proposal on the reduction of national emissions;

*Amendment*

6. Notes with astonishment the Commission's announcement that it intends to withdraw the *proposals* on the revision of *the* waste legislation *and of the transparency on the pricing and reimbursement of medicinal products legislation*, and to modify the proposal on the reduction of national emissions;

Or. en

**Amendment 59**  
**Julie Girling**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 6**

*Draft opinion*

6. Notes with *astonishment* the Commission's announcement that it intends to withdraw the proposal on the revision of waste legislation and to modify the proposal on the reduction of national emissions;

*Amendment*

6. Notes with *concern* the Commission's announcement that it intends to withdraw the proposal on the revision of waste legislation and to modify the proposal on the reduction of national emissions;

Or. en

**Amendment 60**  
**Jean-François Jalkh, Mireille D'Ornano, Sylvie Goddyn, Joëlle Mélin**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 6**

*Draft opinion*

6. **Notes with astonishment** the Commission's announcement that it intends to withdraw the proposal on the revision of waste legislation and to modify the proposal on the reduction of national emissions;

*Amendment*

6. **Regrets** the Commission's announcement that it intends to withdraw the proposal on the revision of waste legislation and to modify the proposal on the reduction of national emissions; **notes that this withdrawal undermines the momentum generated by the Member States in the direction of a circular economy;**

Or. fr

**Amendment 61**  
**Bas Eickhout**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 6**

*Draft opinion*

6. **Notes with astonishment** the Commission's **announcement that it intends** to withdraw the proposal on the revision of waste legislation and to modify the proposal on the reduction of national emissions;

*Amendment*

6. **Is opposed to the** Commission's **intention** to withdraw the proposal on the revision of waste legislation **in the name of 'better regulation'** and to modify the proposal on the reduction of national emissions;

Or. en

**Amendment 62**  
**Simona Bonafè, Giovanni La Via, Karl-Heinz Florenz, Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy, Davor Škrlec, Mark Demesmaeker, Eleonora Evi**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 6**

*Draft opinion*

6. Notes with astonishment the Commission's announcement that it intends to withdraw the proposal on the

*Amendment*

6. Notes with astonishment the Commission's announcement that it intends to withdraw the proposal on the

revision of waste legislation and to modify the proposal on the reduction of national emissions;

revision of waste legislation and to modify the proposal on the reduction of national emissions; *deplores the fact that the proposal for the two withdrawals was announced without presenting any analysis or evidence to justify it nor was there any preceding consultation with the co-legislators and stakeholders; stresses the Commission's announced commitment, as stipulated in its Work Programme 2015, to consider the view of the European Parliament and the Council before finalising its decision on its Working Programme 2015, especially the withdrawal of legislation; therefore underlines the fact that in several votes in plenary the majority of MEPs expressed their support for maintaining the Circular Economy package unchanged on the table; emphasises in this context the need to proceed with the work on the package as scheduled in order to avoid further waste of time and resources;*

Or. en

**Amendment 63**  
**Kateřina Konečná**

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

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

***6a. Calls on the Commission to take the outcome of the work of European Citizens' Initiative 'Right2Water' seriously, and to ensure that its proposals are implemented to the general satisfaction of all stakeholders and, in particular, all European citizens;***

Or. cs

**Amendment 64**  
**Jytte Guteland**

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

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

***6a. considers that the legitimacy of the REFIT programme hinges on separating those issues which pertain to regulatory fitness and efficiency, from the political aim of the regulation and the inherent trade-offs between stakeholders, which is the responsibility of the lawmakers; underlines, with regard to the REFIT actions foreseen in the Commission Work Programme of 2015 Annex 3 in the fields of Climate Action and Energy, Environment, Maritime Affairs and Fisheries, Health and Food Safety, and Internal Market, Industry, Entrepreneurship and SMEs, the importance of limiting the scope of those actions to simplification and that public policy objectives should not be undermined.***

Or. en

**Amendment 65**  
**Jo Leinen, Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy, Bas Eickhout, Catherine Bearder, Seb Dance**

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

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

***6a. Recalls the findings of the High Level Group on Administrative Burdens' report "Cutting Red Tape in Europe" which does not list environmental legislation among the most burdensome; urges the Commission to keep these findings in mind when considering to withdraw or withhold further environmental***

*proposals; stresses in this regard that the same report found that environmental regulation only contributes 1% to the total amount of unnecessary administrative burden;*

Or. en

**Amendment 66**  
**Renate Sommer**

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

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

*6a. Calls on the Commission, in view of the serious and persistent problems which arise in the implementation of Regulation (EC) No 1924/2006 on nutrition and health claims made on foods, including problems of distortion of competition, to review the scientific basis of this regulation and how useful and realistic it is, and, if appropriate, to eliminate the concept of nutrient profiles or repeal the regulation in its entirety; considers that the aims of Regulation (EC) No 1924/2006, such as ensuring that information which is provided concerning foods is true and that specific indications are given concerning fat, sugar and salt content, have now been attained by Regulation (EU) No 1169/2011 on the provision of food information to consumers;*

Or. de

**Amendment 67**  
**Bas Eickhout**

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

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

**6a. Calls on the Commission not to do stand-alone and one-sided cumulative cost assessments in addition to REFIT, as intended for example for the most relevant EU legislation and policies relevant for the European chemicals industry, and instead integrate this aspect into the general Fitness Check so as to ensure a balanced approach that also takes into consideration the benefits of the legislation concerned;**

Or. en

**Amendment 68**  
**Ivan Jakovčić**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 7**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

7. **Expects** the Commission to carry out a structured consultation, including with the European Parliament, prior to the announcement of any withdrawal of a Commission proposal;

7. **Calls on** the Commission to carry out a structured consultation, including with the European Parliament, prior to the announcement of any withdrawal of a Commission proposal;

Or. en

**Amendment 69**  
**Julie Girling**

**Draft opinion**  
**Paragraph 7**

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

7. **Expects** the Commission **to carry out a structured consultation, including with the European Parliament, prior to the**

7. **Recognises that the right of initiative conferred upon** the Commission **extends to include a right to withdraw proposals;**

*announcement of any withdrawal of a Commission proposal;*

*believes that proposals which have failed to have been agreed by co-legislators should not be simply repackaged, but should be the subject of a more thorough analysis in order to identify smarter solutions which build upon practices that have proven successful in the Member States or further afield; considers such proposals should be accompanied by supporting evidence, in line with a scientific approach towards policy-making;*

Or. en

#### **Amendment 70**

**Jean-François Jalkh, Joëlle Mélin, Sylvie Goddyn, Mireille D'Ornano**

#### **Draft opinion**

##### **Paragraph 7**

#### *Draft opinion*

*7. Expects the Commission **to** carry out a structured consultation, including with the European Parliament, **prior to the announcement of any withdrawal of a Commission proposal;***

#### *Amendment*

*7. **Hopes that** the Commission **will** carry out a structured consultation, including with the European Parliament, **at each stage of the legislative process;***

Or. fr

#### **Amendment 71**

**José Inácio Faria**

#### **Draft opinion**

##### **Paragraph 7 a (new)**

#### *Draft opinion*

#### *Amendment*

*7a. **Emphasises the Commission's obligation under the Framework Agreement on relations between the European Parliament and the European Commission to provide a detailed***

*explanation in due time before withdrawing any proposals on which Parliament has already expressed a position at first reading, such as is the case for the Transparency Directive on the pricing and reimbursement of medicinal products;*

Or. en

*Justification*

*Paragraph 39 of the Framework Agreement on relations between the European Parliament and the European Commission (OJ L 304, 20.11.2010) states that "The Commission shall provide a detailed explanation in due time before withdrawing any proposals on which Parliament has already expressed a position at first reading". Parliament adopted its first reading position on the Transparency directive in February 2013.*

**Amendment 72**  
**Julie Girling**

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

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

**8. Deplores the fact that the Commission considered withdrawing its proposal for a directive on plastic bags after the conclusion of an agreement by the co-legislators;**

*deleted*

Or. en

**Amendment 73**  
**Christofer Fjellner**

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

*Draft opinion*

8. **Deplores** the fact that the Commission considered withdrawing its proposal for a directive on plastic bags after the conclusion of an agreement by the co-legislators;

*Amendment*

8. **Takes note of** the fact that the Commission considered withdrawing its proposal for a directive on plastic bags after the conclusion of an agreement by the co-legislators;

Or. en

**Amendment 74**  
**Lampros Fountoulis**

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

*Draft opinion*

8. Deplores the fact that the Commission considered withdrawing its proposal for a directive on plastic bags after the conclusion of an agreement by the co-legislators;

*Amendment*

8. Deplores **strongly** the fact that the Commission considered withdrawing its proposal for a directive on plastic bags after the conclusion of an agreement by the co-legislators;

Or. el

**Amendment 75**  
**Bas Eickhout**

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

*Draft opinion*

8. Deplores the fact that the Commission **considered withdrawing its proposal for a** directive on plastic bags **after** the conclusion of an agreement by the co-legislators;

*Amendment*

8. Deplores the fact that the Commission **did not act as a facilitator in the negotiations over a new** directive on plastic bags, **and even threatened publicly to withdraw its proposal shortly before** the conclusion of an agreement by the co-legislators **in the name of 'better regulation'**;

Or. en

**Amendment 76**  
**Julie Girling**

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

*Draft opinion*

9. Reminds the Commission of the prerogatives of the co-legislators in the legislative procedure and urges the Commission to respect the co-legislators' right to amend Commission proposals.

*Amendment*

9. Reminds the Commission of the prerogatives of the co-legislators in the legislative procedure and urges the Commission to respect the co-legislators' right to amend Commission proposals; ***also recalls the co-legislators' responsibility to adhere to principles of better regulation, and in particular the inter-institutional agreements that exist between the institutions; further considers that a revision of the inter-institutional agreement on better law-making is overdue and welcomes initiatives by the Commission to begin negotiations to update this agreement;***

Or. en

**Amendment 77**  
**Jean-François Jalkh, Joëlle Mélin, Sylvie Goddyn, Mireille D'Ornano**

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

*Draft opinion*

9. Reminds the Commission of the prerogatives of the co-legislators in the legislative procedure and ***urges*** the Commission to respect the co-legislators' right to amend Commission proposals.

*Amendment*

9. Reminds the Commission of the prerogatives of the co-legislators in the legislative procedure and ***exhorts*** the Commission to respect the co-legislators' right to amend Commission proposals.

Or. fr

**Amendment 78**  
**Jytte Guteland**

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

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

**9a. Considers it inappropriate to introduce blanket exemptions from legislation for SMEs; takes the view that proposals which permit the option of lighter regimes and exemptions should be assessed on a case-by-case basis;**

Or. sv

**Amendment 79**  
**Tibor Szanyi**

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

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

**9a. Draws the attention of the Commission to the fact that any deprivation of Intellectual Property Rights – such as banning the use of trademarks – needs to be justified on scientific grounds also having regard to consumers' protection, that any deprivation may not be excessive or disproportionate and that trademarks need to have equal protection throughout Europe.**

Or. en

**Amendment 80**  
**Julie Girling**

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

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

***9a. Believes that where legislation is proposed in a complex and multi-faceted field, a second stage of consultation should be envisaged whereby a draft legislative act is published, accompanied by a provisional impact assessment, for comment by all relevant stakeholders; considers that this second stage would introduce further rigour into the Commission's analysis and strengthen the case for any proposal adopted following this process;***

Or. en

**Amendment 81  
Nicola Caputo**

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

*Draft opinion*

*Amendment*

***9a. Calls on the Commission to extend the mandate of the High Level Group, which expired on 31 October 2014, ensuring that its members are immune from any kind of conflict of interest and that an MEP from the Committee on Legal Affairs also joins the group;***

Or. it