



TEXTS ADOPTED

P10_TA(2026)0021

Choice of performance indicators for audit and budgetary control in the context of financing measures to support the implementation of future European competitiveness

European Parliament resolution of 22 January 2026 on the choice of performance indicators for audit and budgetary control in the context of financing measures to support the implementation of future European competitiveness (2025/2034(INI))

The European Parliament,

- having regard to the Treaty on European Union,
- having regard to the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU), in particular Article 318 and Article 322(1)(a) thereof,
- having regard to Council Regulation (EU, Euratom) 2020/2093 of 17 December 2020 laying down the multiannual financial framework for the years 2021 to 2027¹,
- having regard to Council Regulation (EU, Euratom) 2022/2496 of 15 December 2022 amending Regulation (EU, Euratom) 2020/2093 laying down the multiannual financial framework for the years 2021 to 2027²,
- having regard to Council Regulation (EU, Euratom) 2024/765 of 29 February 2024 amending Regulation (EU, Euratom) 2020/2093 laying down the multiannual financial framework for the years 2021 to 2027³,
- having regard to the Interinstitutional Agreement of 16 December 2020 between the European Parliament, the Council of the European

¹ OJ L 433 I, 22.12.2020, p. 11, ELI:
<http://data.europa.eu/eli/reg/2020/2093/oj>.

² OJ L 325, 20.12.2022, p. 11, ELI:
<http://data.europa.eu/eli/reg/2022/2496/oj>.

³ OJ L, 2024/765, 29.2.2024, ELI:
<http://data.europa.eu/eli/reg/2024/765/oj>.

Union and the European Commission on budgetary discipline, on cooperation in budgetary matters and on sound financial management, as well as on new own resources, including a roadmap towards the introduction of new own resources⁴,

- having regard to the Commission communication of 8 June 2021 on the performance framework for the EU budget under the 2021-2027 MFF (COM(2021)0366) and the accompanying staff working document (SWD(2021)0133),
- having regard to the Commission proposal of 16 July 2025 for a Council regulation laying down the multiannual financial framework for the years 2028 to 2034 (COM(2025)0571),
- having regard to the Commission proposal of 16 July 2025 for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing a budget expenditure tracking and performance framework and other horizontal rules for the Union programmes and activities (COM(2025)0545) and the accompanying impact assessment report (SWD(2025)0590),
- having regard to the Commission proposal of 16 July 2025 for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on establishing the European Competitiveness Fund ('ECF'), including the specific programme for defence research and innovation activities, repealing Regulations (EU) 2021/522, (EU) 2021/694, (EU) 2021/697, (EU) 2021/783, repealing provisions of Regulations (EU) 2021/696, (EU) 2023/588, and amending Regulation (EU) [EDIP] (COM(2025)0555),
- having regard to Regulation (EU, Euratom) 2024/2509 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 23 September 2024 on the financial rules applicable to the general budget of the Union⁵ (Financial Regulation), and in particular Article 33 thereof,
- having regard to the publication of 18 July 2024 by Commission President Ursula von der Leyen entitled 'Europe's choice: political guidelines for the next European Commission 2024-2029',
- having regard to the report of 9 September 2024 by Mario Draghi entitled 'The future of European competitiveness' (Draghi report),
- having regard to the report of 17 April 2024 by Enrico Letta entitled 'Much more than a market' (Letta report),

⁴ OJ L 433 I, 22.12.2020, p. 28, ELI:
http://data.europa.eu/eli/agree_interinstit/2020/1222/oj.

⁵ OJ L, 2024/2509, 26.9.2024, ELI:
<http://data.europa.eu/eli/reg/2024/2509/oj>.

- having regard to the Commission communication of 29 January 2025 entitled 'A Competitiveness Compass for the EU' (COM(2025)0030),
 - having regard to the Commission communication of 11 February 2025 entitled 'The road to the next multiannual financial framework' (COM(2025)0046),
 - having regard to its resolution of 7 May 2025 on a revamped long-term budget for the Union in a changing world⁶,
 - having regard to the publications of the European Court of Auditors (ECA),
 - having regard to the study requested by its Committee on Budgets entitled 'Performance framework for the EU budget - Concepts and practices', published in March 2024⁷,
 - having regard to Rule 55 of its Rules of Procedure,
 - having regard to the report of the Committee on Budgetary Control (A10-0268/2025),
- A. whereas sound financial management, as defined in the Financial Regulation, requires that EU funds be implemented in accordance with the principles of economy, efficiency and effectiveness; whereas the concept of performance as regards the budget should be linked to the direct application of the principle of sound financial management;
- B. whereas Article 318 TFEU requires the Commission to submit annually to Parliament and to the Council the accounts of the preceding financial year relating to the implementation of the budget, along with an evaluation report on the Union's finances based on the results achieved; whereas, furthermore, under Article 322 TFEU, financial rules should be adopted that determine the procedure for implementing the budget and for presenting and auditing accounts; whereas using appropriate, reliable and transparent indicators for measuring the achievement of results and for the purposes of auditing may enhance the evaluation of budget implementation and comparison performed by Parliament and the Council on an annual basis;
- C. whereas in line with the Financial Regulation, a link should be established between the objectives set and the performance indicators, the results and the principles of economy, efficiency and effectiveness; whereas the 2024 recast of the Financial Regulation

⁶ Texts adopted, P10_TA(2025)0090.

⁷ Study - 'Performance framework for the EU budget - Concepts and practices', European Parliament, Directorate-General for Internal Policies, Policy Department for Budgetary Affairs, March 2024.

has strengthened the legal basis of the performance framework and confirmed that progress in achieving objectives should be monitored using performance indicators that fulfil the RACER criteria (relevant, accepted, credible, easy, robust), that are based on widely recognised scientific evidence, that have clear definitions and that are made available in an open, machine-readable format; whereas, where applicable, these indicators should be broken down by gender and aggregable; whereas an effective, transparent and comprehensive methodology should be defined, where relevant;

- D. whereas the Commission proposal for a regulation establishing a budget expenditure tracking and performance framework establishes a single framework for performance budgeting; whereas the proposal defines 'output indicator' as a quantitative performance indicator that monitors what is directly produced or supported by the implementation of an activity, and 'result indicator' as a quantitative performance indicator that monitors the direct effects of supported activities; whereas 'impact indicators' are commonly used for measuring trends in the long-term objectives addressed by an intervention; whereas 'input indicators' are commonly used for measuring the financial, human, material, administrative or regulatory resources used to implement an intervention;
- E. whereas ensuring the EU's sustainable prosperity and competitiveness, promoting social fairness and strengthening regional cohesion form part of the Commission's political priorities for 2024-2029; whereas it is necessary to attract and mobilise private investment to deliver these objectives effectively, and completing the banking union and developing the savings and investment union will be essential to this end;
- F. whereas the Draghi report has cautioned that the EU's declining competitiveness, exacerbated by the increasingly unstable geopolitical environment, together with the succession of crises it has faced in recent years, poses an existential threat to the Union; whereas the report estimates that the EU needs to mobilise additional public and private investment equivalent to 4,4-4,7 % of EU GDP – approximately EUR 750-800 billion annually between 2025 and 2030 – to close the investment gap;
- G. whereas the Competitiveness Compass, also building on the Draghi report, sets out the EU's strategic path to restore its competitiveness globally by focusing on three central pillars – innovation, decarbonisation and economic security – complemented by horizontal enablers such as simplification, increased coordination at EU and Member State level and a reinforced single market, in line with the Letta report;
- H. whereas the ECA has repeatedly found weaknesses in the design, implementation and accountability of the performance measurement

systems used for EU funding programmes, and called for the increased use of performance indicators that measure and monitor the longer-term effects of EU spending; whereas ensuring the reliability of performance information is indispensable for the protection of the EU's financial interests and for strengthening public trust in the EU budget;

- I. whereas decisive measures are needed to increase Europe's competitiveness in order to support higher levels of productivity, employment and prosperity; whereas the integrated single market remains the backbone of EU's economic strength and the foundation of its long-term prosperity; whereas innovation, skills development and the free movement of goods, services, capital and labour are key drivers of competitiveness and growth;

General remarks on the performance framework for the EU budget and the use of performance indicators

1. Recalls the need to ensure that the EU budget delivers on the EU's policy priorities, including boosting competitiveness, fostering sustainable and inclusive prosperity and securing the EU's sovereignty and independence as a geopolitical actor; emphasises that regulatory changes are as important as funding measures in achieving these goals; underlines that EU spending should achieve tangible results in line with the principles of sound financial management and should be invested in areas where joint EU action has a greater impact and added value than national or subnational policy action;
2. Stresses that measures to enhance competitiveness can contribute to broader societal benefits, provided that those measures remain focused on productivity, growth and job creation; insists that any overarching performance framework for the EU budget should primarily provide economic results and measurable policy outcomes, while taking into account, where relevant, broader societal effects, without undermining the principles of efficiency and effectiveness;
3. Considers it imperative that the EU budget should focus more on results and that every euro spent should deliver measurable value for citizens and businesses; reaffirms the need to set and use performance indicators that are specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and time-bound (SMART), ensuring that the EU's resources are spent efficiently, effectively and sustainably in order to monitor and evaluate progress towards achieving EU policy objectives; considers that all types of indicators are essential for assessing programme performance and that, therefore, a balance between input, output, result and impact indicators should be sought; underlines that performance indicators must be explicitly derived from the objectives of each programme; emphasises that the administrative burden involved, the cost of collecting data, and

comparability and aggregability should also be considered when choosing the appropriate indicators;

4. Notes with concern that the ECA, in its audits, has repeatedly found that most performance indicators used for EU funding programmes are input and output indicators, which do not provide relevant information on progress in achieving the objectives of EU-funded actions; finds it regrettable, furthermore, that in many cases baseline data for indicators was found to be missing and that the underlying data used for the indicators was neither traceable nor reliable; is concerned that definitions of performance indicators diverge across funding programmes; calls on the Commission and the Member States to ensure that indicators used for EU-funded projects are measurable, verifiable and based on reliable data sources that ensure the traceability of the underlying data down to contract and final beneficiary level, with clear baselines and definitions to prevent divergent interpretations;
5. Regrets the fact that the performance framework for the EU budget for 2021-2027 remains overly complex and fragmented; notes with regret the Commission's assessment⁸ that over 5 000 heterogeneous, non-aggregable performance indicators are being used under the 2021-2027 multiannual financial framework (MFF), rendering it more difficult to comprehensively evaluate the effectiveness of EU spending across funding instruments, and that around 7 000 milestones and targets have been set under the Recovery and Resilience Facility (RRF) that address different needs, such as assessing performance in the context of the draft budget and monitoring and evaluating programmes, Member State plans and payment disbursements;
6. Stresses, in particular, that the design of the RRF does not ensure the sufficient traceability, transparency and auditability of the use of EU funds or the comparability of the results with those of other EU spending instruments; calls on the Commission to establish a more comprehensive, harmonised, transparent and verifiable performance indicator framework for future instruments, ensuring that Parliament and the ECA can fully exercise their oversight responsibilities; calls on the Commission to analyse the implementation of performance-based instruments in other country and regional contexts, identifying lessons learnt;
7. Notes the Commission's proposal that the 2028-2034 MFF, including the European Competitiveness Fund (ECF), be monitored through a standardised set of performance indicators applicable to all EU budget programmes, as set out in its proposal for a performance

⁸ Impact assessment report (SWD(2025)0590) accompanying the Commission's proposal for the regulation establishing a budget expenditure tracking and performance framework (COM(2025)0545).

regulation⁹; notes that a simplified application of the performance framework has been proposed for the budgetary guarantees and financial instruments under the ECF;

8. Considers that the performance framework for the EU budget should be simplified so as to ensure a harmonised and proportionate approach to measuring the effects of EU spending across the Member States in an accurate manner, rationalise the overall administrative burden and reporting obligations, especially for small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) and local authorities, and increase transparency by reducing information overload, while still enabling the effects of EU funding to be captured in full, including the added value of EU interventions that could not be achieved by Member States acting alone; calls on the Commission to streamline indicators, simplify templates, avoid duplicate data requests and apply the 'once-only' principle;
9. Considers that impact can best be assessed through evaluations; stresses that the ECF and all future instruments must include mid-term evaluations by the Commission; calls on the Commission to ensure that corrective measures, including those recommended by the ECA following its audits, are introduced without delay if results fall short of objectives;
10. Underlines that simplification should not come at the expense of transparency, accountability and auditability, but should help rationalise reporting and make information on the performance of EU funding more accessible and useful; underlines, furthermore, that a reduction in the number of indicators should be accompanied by a cost-benefit and risk analysis; highlights the need for clearer links between spending and measurable policy outcomes;
11. Recalls that approaches to data collection vary across Member States and also within Member States, making it difficult to aggregate and compare performance data at EU level; reiterates its call for the Commission to develop secure and interoperable IT infrastructure, while also capitalising on artificial intelligence, machine learning and data mining capabilities to improve policy delivery and facilitate monitoring, reporting and oversight; stresses that the use of artificial intelligence in monitoring and data processing must be accompanied by robust human oversight and governed by ethical principles to prevent misuse and algorithmic discrimination or bias and ensure transparency and accountability, while guaranteeing data protection and full respect for fundamental rights;
12. Insists that indicator data and methodologies be made publicly available in real time through an interoperable monitoring, reporting

⁹ COM(2025)0545.

and audit system, thereby increasing transparency and ensuring traceability down to project and final beneficiary level; recalls the importance of ‘final beneficiary transparency’ for EU funds; stresses that EU funding, including that under indirect management, must be transparent and should allow for effective auditing and prevention of double funding; insists further that this data should include comprehensive information regarding the projects financed;

13. Calls on the Commission to strengthen its performance reporting by integrating the financial and performance information related to EU funds and to publish clear, user-friendly performance and spending summaries, including one-page overviews and interactive dashboards with machine-readable datasets, in line with OECD recommendations¹⁰;
14. Considers it essential to verify and ensure the reliability of data used to establish performance indicators; notes with concern that, owing to the introduction and increasing use of delivery models, such as the RRF, that are based on financing not linked to costs – where disbursements are made against the achievement of previously set milestones and targets – weaknesses in data reliability make it more difficult to protect the financial interests of the EU; insists, therefore, on mandatory ex ante and ex post verification of milestones and targets, systematic referral of suspected fraud or serious irregularities to the European Anti-Fraud Office and the European Public Prosecutor’s Office, and the possibility to suspend payments;
15. Calls on the Commission to include in its performance reporting substantive information concerning the quality assurance measures used for the performance indicators; underlines that a regular, transparent review of indicator relevance and reliability is essential to ensure credibility and public trust in EU spending; demands that performance data reported by Member States be subject to independent verification, including by national audit bodies and the ECA, with results made available to Parliament; further requests that verification reports and datasets be made available to the competent oversight authorities in a format that is accessible, comparable and verifiable, thus ensuring that citizens have access to the outcome of the scrutiny of the use of EU funds, while ensuring adherence to data protection and confidentiality rules;
16. Stresses that effective performance management presupposes respect for the rule of law and the protection of the EU’s financial interests; recalls that where serious deficiencies in control systems persist, payments must be suspended and financial corrections applied;

¹⁰ OECD (2025), ‘[Strengthening performance reporting practices](#)’, *OECD Papers on Budgeting*, No 2025/07, OECD Publishing, Paris.

17. Considers the rule of law an essential precondition for strengthening EU competitiveness; underlines that challenges to the rule of law adversely impact investor confidence, consumer trust and the integrity of the single market, as noted in the Commission's 2025 Rule of Law Report; considers, therefore, that the performance framework for the EU budget should also include indicators related to the rule of law, such as the functioning of the justice system, the fight against corruption and effective checks and balances, which contribute to legal certainty and a predictable environment for businesses to operate in;

Performance indicators related to fostering EU competitiveness

18. Recalls that the Draghi report urges the EU to pursue deep reforms to boost competitiveness, focusing on innovation, decarbonisation and defence, and calls for massive investment in strategic sectors such as green energy, digital infrastructure and advanced manufacturing, supported by regulatory simplification and stronger coordination at EU level; considers, in this regard, that a robust performance framework and indicator system are essential for tracking progress and measuring impact on the EU's competitiveness, economic strength, sustainability and resilience, while linking performance directly to the principles of economy, efficiency and effectiveness;
19. Stresses that competitiveness-oriented spending should prioritise efficiency and long-term productivity gains rather than short-term redistribution; underlines that EU resources should be directed towards correcting market inefficiencies, catalysing private investment and supporting projects with a measurable economic impact and clear added value;
20. Underlines that the implementation of Draghi report recommendations should be monitored with relevant, robust and transparent performance indicators that capture the EU's progress in boosting its competitiveness and economic growth through innovation, technological leadership and industrial resilience, while ensuring social fairness; stresses that indicators must be carefully designed and should capture not only outputs (e.g. number of projects financed), but also results and impacts (e.g. productivity growth, reduced emissions, sustainable and secure jobs created, improvements in social and territorial cohesion, changes to trade balance, increase in export diversification, leverage effect of EU programmes, especially in terms of mobilising private investment, and strengthened strategic autonomy), in order to measure the efficiency and effectiveness of EU spending; recalls that reforms are integral to achieving competitiveness objectives and must be reflected in performance measurement frameworks;

21. Recalls that indicators on the absorption of funds or the rate of budget execution provide information on administrative progress rather than on the actual economic or societal impact of EU spending; highlights that such indicators can create a misleading perception of success when funds are fully spent but fail to generate measurable improvements in innovation, investment or employment; recalls that the ECA has repeatedly criticised the excessive reliance on spending rates and payment milestones in the performance framework for EU programmes; calls for a shift towards result indicators and impact indicators that capture the real effects of EU spending on competitiveness;
22. Underlines that competitiveness is dependent on a coherent set of enabling conditions, including a skilled and healthy workforce, efficient strategic infrastructure, a robust financial sector capable of providing tailored financing for innovation, and well-functioning institutions and markets that reward performance and entrepreneurship; calls on the Commission to develop specific performance indicators reflecting these structural enablers and their contribution to productivity and growth;
23. Recalls that the Draghi report underlines that excellence in research and innovation is fundamental to the EU's competitiveness and that there should only be one selection criterion, namely excellence, within the EU research and innovation system, including the Horizon Europe programme; reiterates, in this regard, its position that funding for research and innovation should continue to be guided by the principle of excellence and should remain merit-based;
24. Stresses that project-level data should be the basis for enhanced performance reporting for financial instruments implemented under indirect management, such as InvestEU; notes, however, that these should be in a standardised format and limited to the key information needed for measuring the success of the programme, such as the mobilisation of public and private investments that could not have taken place without the programme; recognises that, owing to the market- and demand-driven nature of financial instruments, the performance of such programmes depends on their take-up by the market, which limits the Commission's ability to establish predefined milestones and targets;
25. Stresses that boosting the EU's competitiveness requires a shift from short-term crisis management towards a long-term strategy based on innovation, efficiency, sustainability, strategic autonomy and global openness; calls for a renewed commitment to strengthening the single market, reducing regulatory fragmentation and ensuring that EU programmes support the real economy; highlights that the success of European competitiveness projects depends on the mobilisation of public and private capital; calls on the Commission to introduce specific indicators to measure the leverage effect of EU

funds in mobilising public and private investment, the ratio of public-to-private funding and the return on investment achieved;

26. Considers it necessary to establish a comprehensive ex ante risk assessment framework, particularly for projects characterised by a high-risk, high-reward profile, in order to ensure a balanced evaluation of their added value, costs and benefits; underlines that achieving the EU's policy objectives on competitiveness requires a robust audit and control system supported by a coherent risk assessment methodology; stresses that such a methodology should allow for proportionate levels of risk essential for fostering innovation, while ensuring adequate safeguards for the protection of the EU budget, especially against fraud and non-financial risks;
27. Suggests that, in order to better evaluate the impact of EU funding on competitiveness, more thorough macroeconomic modelling should be employed, integrating the latest advances in economic research; notes that models that capture household and firm heterogeneity and distributional effects allow for a more comprehensive ex ante assessment of the impact of EU funding on productivity, investment behaviour and regional competitiveness; suggests that this approach be complemented by the use of microdata and regional performance indicators to improve the evidence base for policy design and the targeting of funds;
28. Calls on the Commission and the Member States to establish and consistently use, throughout the next MFF, a harmonised set of core indicators such as those that are already part of the European Innovation Scoreboard, aimed at fostering competitiveness across Member States so as to enable comparability, benchmarking and aggregation of data at EU level, while also allowing for the use of indicators tailored to national or regional needs, where appropriate; stresses that all relevant stakeholders should be consulted in defining and reviewing indicators in order to ensure that they reflect real competitiveness needs, while adhering to high labour and social standards;
29. Considers that, in the case of projects that foster innovation and support strategic technologies, the following output indicators could be used: the volume of EU and private sector funding mobilised, the number of projects funded per sector (i.e. artificial intelligence, quantum, biotech), and the number of unicorns, start-ups and scale-ups created or expanded in the EU that have received EU funding, also measuring the percentage of women-led start-ups funded where appropriate; considers that result indicators could include the number of patents filed by EU-funded projects, the return on EU investment by sector, the change in the employment rate, the survival rate of EU-funded companies after three years, the increase in the number of European initial public offerings (IPOs), the increase in the number of exporting companies, and the number of

enterprises reaching high digital intensity; considers that it is necessary to track and report impact indicators such as the increase in capacity (output per year) in the manufacturing of deep and digital technologies (e.g. specific equipment types), the increase in the volume of venture capital invested in the EU, the increase in the market capitalisation of EU companies, and market adoption and revenue growth attributable to EU-funded innovations;

30. Considers that industrial relocation and self-sufficiency in critical raw materials should be supported in order to reduce the EU's strategic dependencies; proposes that progress could be measured with output indicators such as the number of projects and SMEs that have relocated to the EU, the number of start-ups and scale-ups created or expanded – also measuring the percentage of women-led start-ups and scale-ups where appropriate – and the level of industrial job creation in targeted regions; considers that result indicators could include the increase in the share of critical raw materials imported from new strategic partners or sourced from the EU and the increase in the volume (tonnes) of critical raw material recycled, higher productivity and gross value added in targeted value chains, greater resilience of supply, and improved trade performance;
31. Stresses the need to invest in smart grids, energy storage and hydrogen corridors to facilitate a resilient and competitive energy system; underlines that measures in this regard are essential to reduce energy price volatility, strengthen industrial competitiveness and secure Europe's transition to a sustainable, low-carbon economy;
32. Considers that joint industrial energy purchasing and industrial decarbonisation should be pursued in order to reduce energy costs and enhance security of supply, while ensuring that the resulting measures do not have an undue impact on any Member State's energy security; proposes that progress could be measured with output indicators such as the number of participating companies, the volume of energy purchases and the share of renewable energy in joint contracts; considers that result indicators such as additional energy capacity installed in electricity production (MW) could be used; further considers that impact indicators could include the changes to average energy prices in targeted industries, the reduction in supply interruption, the increase in clean energy use and the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions (e.g. in tCO₂e) ;
33. Considers that the EU should invest in talent in strategic and critical sectors to increase its long-term competitiveness through a capable workforce, including by supporting participation in vocational training, lifelong learning and skills development; suggests that progress could be measured with output indicators such as the number of people trained annually (with a specific focus on gender balance and social inclusion), the number of people who have

graduated with a science, technology, engineering or mathematics (STEM) degree from university or who have undertaken vocational education and training courses with a STEM focus, the participation rate in adult and lifelong learning programmes and the satisfaction rate of partner companies and social partners; considers that result indicators could include changes in the employment rate, the transition rate from training or temporary employment to permanent employment, the occupation rate, the wage progression rate and the retention rate in targeted sectors;

34. Notes with concern that excessive regulatory and administrative burdens continue to undermine the competitiveness of EU companies compared with other global economic blocs; stresses that such burdens raise operational costs, reduce sectoral productivity and create barriers to market entry for new firms, thereby discouraging competition and innovation; notes, furthermore, that these inefficiencies may also translate into higher prices for consumers;
35. Considers that in order to accelerate both the green and digital transitions, particular attention should be paid to innovative SMEs for which simplification is critical; stresses that simplification should focus on reducing unnecessary red tape and administrative costs for SMEs; emphasises that simplification must be carried out while ensuring a proportionate and efficient regulatory framework, guaranteeing regulatory certainty as well as proper impact assessment; suggests that progress in reducing the administrative burden could be measured with indicators such as the number of projects approved and the number of projects concluded annually with SMEs, the decrease in the rate of appeals or disputes related to application procedures and the reduction in time required to access EU funding, from application to disbursement;
36. Calls on the Commission to further step up efforts to reduce regulatory burden and to ensure that EU legislation is proportionate, evidence-based and delivers clear added value for citizens and businesses; considers the current 'one in, one out' approach to be insufficient in this regard; calls, therefore, for the application of a 'one in, two out' principle, whereby the introduction of any new costs through regulatory obligations is offset by reductions in regulatory costs stemming from other EU legislation by at least twice the equivalent amount, with the objective of achieving a net reduction in the regulatory burden, while treating separately the burden on companies and public administration.

◦

◦ ◦

37. Instructs its President to forward this resolution to the Council and the Commission.

