General feedback on the work of the Task Force on Subsidiarity, Proportionality and "Doing Less More Efficiently"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of submission</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Mon, 25/06/2018     | EN       | **Applying the principles of subsidiarity and proportionality**  
1) Due to their cross-border nature, environmental issues in almost all cases have EU added value, as they are better addressed by acting together rather than unilaterally. For example, rivers such as the Rhine or the Danube flow through large parts of Europe and water pollution or the construction of a dam in one country can have serious consequences in other countries. Our wildlife doesn’t know borders either, and migratory birds and animals moving across our continent might not everywhere receive the same level of protection without the harmonised protection rules that exist at EU level. And of course, the atmosphere does not care where greenhouse gases are emitted – they all contribute to climate change. The question of subsidiarity thus is only a theoretical one for this sector. 2) Not only does our environment benefit from the protection afforded by common EU rules, but so do public authorities and economic actors. Once EU legislation is approved, measures are changed rarely and infrequently, thereby creating confidence in the legal framework. This helps both public authorities and private investors to plan ahead. Common standards and legislation are a crucial pillar of any common market, ensuring a level-playing field for businesses across the EU and minimising distortions in competition across the EU single market, as well as providing equivalent consumer and environmental protection regardless of the origin of commodities. 3) Before scrutinising existing environmental policies, it is recommended that EU Institutions and Member States must first prioritise on the full implementation of existing policies. The Commission in particular must make use of the full set of tools at their disposal ranging from providing EU Member States with better guidance to initiating infringements against non-complying EU Member States.  
**Identifying policy areas**  
All policy areas, as environmental protection is cross-sectoral and needs to be addressed on highest level |
| Wed, 30/05/2018     | EN       | Stop moving between Strasbourg and Brussels. |
**NL**

Het nationale parlement blijft altijd nummer 1 in beslissing.

Het europese verhaal begint enkel, indien er specifieke akkoorden bestaan over de transfer van bevoegdheden.

De nationale beslissingen staan steeds boven de Europese beslissingen maw Europese beslissingen kunnen nationale beslissingen nooit overrulen.

**EN**

**Applying the principles of subsidiarity and proportionality**

These principles may work best for local matters which are hard to be coordinated centrally. But when it comes to issues of principle, such as the implementation of human rights, fair judicial services, fair distribution of taxation, there you must apply stricter central control. It cannot be that a local Mayor, or even a single country, do what comes to their head when it comes to this. And I have Greece in my mind when I write this. Thank you

**Involving regional and local authorities**

Carrot and stick approach. Direct engagement with local authorities (at municipal level) to control what they do (or not do for their EU citizens) plus share best practices and finance their initiatives

**Applying the principles of subsidiarity and proportionality**

Non-EU spouses of EU citizens should, after immigrating to the EU, be able to work throughout the EU and not just in the EU country they're a citizen of! Just like their EU-spouses! They should have equal rights! I'm a musician and my wife to be is a musician from the United States. I'm Dutch but work and live in Spain. When we're married and she moves to Spain, she'll be allowed to work in Spain, where there is no work, but not in The Netherlands, where I'm a member of several groups that could employ her on a part time basis. I think it's ludicrous that the EU has an open market for goods and services, but those rights do not extend to non-EU spouses of EU citizens. These spouses already give up their careers to join their EU partners, but are severely limited in the work they are allowed to accept. Non-EU spouses should have the same rights as any other EU citizen when they are legally married to an EU citizen and have residency in one of the EU member countries!
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wed, 30/05/2018</td>
<td>SL</td>
<td>Applying the principles of subsidiarity and proportionality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Z)rasti skupaj.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Na Vzhodu se poštuimo državljane druge kategorije. Za ne se pri tem, da proizvajalci ločujejo proizvodne na vzhodne ina zahodne. Proizvajalci na vzhod pošiljajo slabjo hrano.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EU bi si morala prizadevati, da se Evropa ne bi nikdar več delila, po nobenem kriteriju.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed, 30/05/2018</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>Make the tax rate (income, corporate, employee, etc.) the same for all members of the EU. It’s not right that countries like Croatia have high tax rates; thus employees earn less. While other countries are privileged to a lower tax rate; thus citizens take home a greater amount from their paycheque. Standardize the process so the same percentage is taken from each citizen from their paycheque regardless if you live in Croatia or you live in Austria.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Tue, 29/05/2018       | EN       | Politics and democracy are failing across Europe because of corruption, and poverty. Nationalism is on the rise and the growth of Islam is now driving a wedge in societies. EU is not recognised as a democracy and so needs to avoid imposing policies that people feel should have
democratic accountability, such as tax increases, levies etc. Voters feel they should be entitled to hold national politicians accountable for taxation policy.

Where the EU can do most good is to act as a check on national governments spending and budgets so that countries are not driven to austerity and bankruptcy as they practice largesse. Borrowing should only be allowed for capital projects/spending and not day to day spending. Another area is consumer protection and so far the EU is good on this but needs to go further, especially in banking and financial products.

Other areas where the EU has an important role is human rights, cost of access to courts, pollution, food standards, etc.

The main areas to keep out of are immigration policies and social engineering policies, religion and cultural differences. These are what makes up societies and what is acceptable in one culture is not in another. Trying to force change from outside is dangerous and divisive and leads to conflict. Brexit would not have happened if the EU had been more understanding of Britain's underlying nationalism.

| Mon, 28/05/2018 | EN | The EU should repatriate powers to Member States as much as possible and wherever possible. The EU should seek to reduce its size, scope and budget. The EU is not democratic and should seek to help youth unemployment instead of being focused only on helping multinational companies and financial institutions. |
| Mon, 28/05/2018 | EN | **Applying the principles of subsidiarity and proportionality**

The EU does some outstanding work. For example, environmental regulation, consumer protection such as aviation compensation or the single digital market and of course the free movement rights for EU citizens and all the benefits these entail. There should be heavy focus on work that individual EU citizens - including those who move between countries - benefit from.

The EU also does some things which are detrimental. For example, the Common Agricultural Policy, and the conditions imposed on countries that received bailouts during the financial crisis. Not to mention wasteful solutions to the way the EU executive and legislature is organised, and a court system which is slow and expensive.

It is not so much a case that certain things need to be re-devolved. Instead, the EU needs to fundamentally improve the efficiency of things it is currently in charge of. EU Institutions need to be simplified. Financial
Policies must not crush peripheral and poorer EU countries (even if there has been mismanagement, penalising the most vulnerable for the mistakes of their politicians is unjustifiable). The Common Agricultural Policy needs to be designed not just to benefit (primarily French) farmers, but to make agriculture environmentally sustainable, more humane in its treatment of animals, and fundamentally fair.

It would also be useful for the EU to revisit - and streamline - existing regulations for the policy areas it does control. There are people whose job is to come up with regulations and rules for any given market segment. There don't appear to be any people whose job is to revisit those regulations, check if they are being applied across Europe, see if there are any unforeseen side effects or detrimental outcomes, and deregulate if it cannot be shown that the rules had a clear benefit.

Basically, my point can be summed up as: do a better job for the things you ARE in charge of, rather than handing responsibility back to national level.

**Involving regional and local authorities**

Create a free weekly newspaper, written in easy-to-understand language, in each EU member country, about EU laws that have been passed, laws that are to come into effect, and laws that are being discussed. Offer free subscriptions to local government departments, and include an easy method for local gov't (and citizens) to feedback on proposals and raise these with their EU representatives.

**Mon, 28/05/2018**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IT</th>
<th>Applying the principles of subsidiarity and proportionality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1)</td>
<td>Rendere piu' comprensibile i testi delle norme e regolamenti prodotti dalle varie Commissioni UE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2)</td>
<td>Includere i cittadini EU nei vari processi decisionali suggerirei di organizzare tramite le Rappresentanze UE visite di Delegazioni di rappresentanti di cittadini comuni dai Paesi direttamente interessati a una particolare problematica Locale o Nazionale in modo di far giungere alle Commissioni coinvolte i diversi pareri sulle questioni che coinvolgono il bene comune</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3)</td>
<td>Molte notizie sulle attivita' delle Commissioni EU riportano interessi che al comune cittadino risultano distanti dai reali problemi che l'intera Europa da tempo affronta, forse e' piu' importante la qualita' della vita che le dimensioni della frutta, la certezza che i Servizi di Assistenza Domiciliare siano adeguati piuttosto che suggerire di installare piu' rotatorie nelle strade a scorrimento veloce, le persone si sentirebbero tutelate e inserite in una comunita' Sovranazionale che adotta regole piu' semplici e immediate di quelle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Identifying policy areas

1) Mobilita'

2) Qualita' della Vita (Asili nido-Regole per congedi a padri e madri in modo che possano seguire il primo periodo della vita del neonato-Inquinamento nei Centri Urbani(Politiche di rottamazione di veicoli obsoleti-Politiche condivise in ambito EU per Incentivi comuni in tutti gli Stati EU per acquisto mezzi EV)

3) Focus sull'Innovazione Tecnologica per rendere le città realmente SMART valorizzando quanto prodotto in ambito EU di tutti i dispositivi utili per rendere la vita collettiva più semplice dai sistemi per evitare che i Posti Disabili siano occupati da"Cittadini Distratti" a tutto quello che l'attuale tecnologia propone per il monitoraggio ambientale condiviso, a tutto il settore del risparmio energetico, oltre all'attivazione di migliaia di colonnine Fast Charge per la mobilità elettrica, diffusione dei sistemi di produzione energia dal Fotovoltaico, mediante pannelli di ultima generazione, flessibili e applicabili su intere facciate degli edifici, senza cambiarne la forma, cosa problematica fino a oggi, specialmente nei Centri Storici di molte Capitali Europee.

Involving regional and local authorities

Ogni Paese EU e' di immenso valore comune, ogni Paese richiede attenzione e azioni per consegnarlo ai futuri cittadini, ci sono Amministrazioni Locali che sono piu' attive, altre che operano in perenne emergenza, l'azione che consiglio e' quella di inviare Delegazioni EU a cadenza regolare, ma trascorrendo qualche giorno da comuni cittadini, in modo di VIVERE i posti, e avere una visione in prima persona della vita quotidiana, in modo di poter valutare la soluzione o suggerimento piu' indicato caso per caso.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mon, 28/05/2018</th>
<th>FR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applying the principles of subsidiarity and proportionality</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ne cédez pas aux sirènes des euro sceptiques!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Identifying policy areas</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Je pense que les programmes Interreg sont trop dotés. Les projets financés sont en grande partie inintéressants. C'est contre-intuitif car bien sûr on se dit que l'UE a pour mission d'effacer les frontières. Mais je pense qu'elle peut le faire plus efficacement en finançant plus de programmes d'échanges pour la</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
jeunesse et les chercheurs qu'en aidant des projets bien souvent artificiellement bilatéralisé. Cette remarque vient de mon expérience professionnelle dans le domaine. La politique agricole commune doit absolument être repensée! Il n'est pas imaginable qu'une telle partie du budget aille vers un domaine qui représente une si petite part du PIB de la plupart des EM, et aille à des industries polluantes. Le budget de la PAC doit être réduit et aller à des petites productions, favoriser les agricultures bio, extensives etc. L'optique doit être la préservation du milieu rural en général. Au niveau des politiques sociales (type FSE), elles peuvent à mon avis être concentrées sur les Etats Membres les plus en difficultés. C'est plutôt le rôle des EM de prendre en charge leurs politiques sociales, les risques de dépendance aux fonds européens est réel (encore une fois, je parle d'après mon expérience pro). En revanche, l'UE peut faire des choses intéressantes et avoir une vraie valeur ajoutée dans le domaine: - de la justice et des affaires intérieures (JHA) qui est nécessaire étant donné la libre circulation dans l'espace Schengen - de l'énergie, en mutualisant certaines sources (par exemple les éoliennes off-shore). C'est important si l'UE veut montrer l'exemple au niveau de la mise en oeuvre de l'accord de Paris - des droits fondamentaux et de l'état de droit qui sont menacés dans certains EM - de la fin des paradis fiscaux à l'intérieur de l'UE.

**Involving regional and local authorities**

- Je pense que s'appuyer sur les NUTS II est intéressant en théorie mais demande vraiment une redéfinition car les entités ne sont pas très cohérentes pour le moment.

- Je pense que développer des réseaux entre grandes métropoles européennes peut également être intéressant dans la compétition internationale. Il pourrait y avoir une entité européenne entièrement consacrée aux grandes villes qui parlerait de problèmes de type pollution de l'air, transports, tourisme etc.

- Cependant, le problème à l'intérieur de l'UE est plutôt que les zones rurales ne suivent pas politiquement et se sentent loin de Bruxelles. Les communautés de communes peuvent donc également être une cible intéressante. La communication doit être plus claire vers ces entités (15-20k habitants) en particulier pour les réformes qui concernent les zones rurales.

**Applying the principles of subsidiarity and proportionality**

Human rights should be implemented and respected, so I believe it should be implemented without the states consideration, if we believe the EU chart should prevail
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mon, 28/05/2018</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>Identifying policy areas</td>
<td>Human Rights, not at national level when they are not implemented locally, for instance Spain...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon, 28/05/2018</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>Identifying policy areas</td>
<td>The economic prosperity of member states. Job creation and economic prosperity should be the priority for the EU.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon, 28/05/2018</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>Involving regional and local authorities</td>
<td>The aim should be a more devolved EU.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon, 28/05/2018</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>Applying the principles of subsidiarity and proportionality</td>
<td>Ensuring the people of the EU have greater visibility on the work of the EU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon, 28/05/2018</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>Applying the principles of subsidiarity and proportionality</td>
<td>Much more stringent immigration and intra-migration rules - if there was one thing that led to Brexit it was immigration from any country outside of the UK. It's also the root cause for the Italian problem.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Fri, 25/05/2018 | EN    | Applying the principles of subsidiarity and proportionality | Applying the principles of subsidiarity and proportionality  
Focus on trade. Drop political ideologies. Allow countries to be different from each other. Realise one size does not fit all. Stop creating regulations and laws. Thank you  
Identifying policy areas  
Environmental policies should not concern big businesses' standpoint.  
Transfer wealth fiscally from Germany to rest of Europe to reflect the benefit of relatively cheap euro for Germany and relative expense to other euro countries.  
Drop freedom of movement to thwart mass migration and movement of terrorists.  
Involving regional and local authorities  
Send back decision making power to nation states. Cut EU organisations staff to 1/10th current size. |
| Fri, 25/05/2018 | EN    | Applying the principles of subsidiarity and proportionality | Applying the principles of subsidiarity and proportionality |

Fri, 25/05/2018 | EN    | Applying the principles of subsidiarity and proportionality | Applying the principles of subsidiarity and proportionality |

Fri, 25/05/2018 | EN    | Applying the principles of subsidiarity and proportionality | Applying the principles of subsidiarity and proportionality |
The use of footnotes needs to be examined in relation to the transposition of directives!

Guidance on how transposition under subsidiarity can avoid court referrals might be achieved by stricter adoption of certain definitions contained within directives.

Is it possible to set up a group that can intervene early and provide advice and guidance, where conflicts may arise between issues of subsidiarity and proportionality? Possible function that could involve benefit of view by CJEU based on case law.

Can proportionality hinder integration of EU directives and the taking of a holistic approach? If so, can this be overcome by the application of specific tests across potentially diverse issues?

Identifying policy areas

I don't believe in returning powers to national level, beyond what is already in place. I think great improvements in access to democracy and social cohesion can be achieved through greater regional powers (i.e. the European Committee of the Regions and city/region mayors). Internally this already works well, but general public understanding and engagement still appears to be low (that could just be a U.K. perspective, but I'm not giving up on it!).

Involving regional and local authorities

See answer above!

Huge scope for knowledge sharing and for harmonising delivery mechanisms, leading to efficiency savings.

Fri, 25/05/2018

Applying the principles of subsidiarity and proportionality

With regard to the participation of local and regional authorities in policymaking and implementation, and the application of subsidiarity in the work of the institutions it is important to use more the Territorial Impact Assessment (toolbox 33 of the better regulation package). This allows for experts from cities and regions to take part in the analysis of potential impacts that EU regulations and directives might have in different parts of EU on local and regional level. DG REGIO and Committee of the Regions have tested the methodologies the last 3 years and there good results. Commission needs to support them in upscaling the whole exercise.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fri, 25/05/2018</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td><strong>Identifying policy areas</strong>&lt;br&gt;TIA is relevant for all policy areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Involving regional and local authorities</strong>&lt;br&gt;Territorial Impact Assessments and especially the methodology described in the toolbox 33 of the Better Regulation package called Quick Check is ideal since it allows regional and city experts on a given topic of a regulation and/or a directive to provide as part of the Impact Assessment exercise of the Commission key input to help commission services to avoid asymmetrical impacts on cities and regions and make better decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thu, 24/05/2018</td>
<td>DE</td>
<td><strong>Applying the principles of subsidiarity and proportionality</strong>&lt;br&gt;Abolish subsidies and put the power back into the hands of member States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Identifying policy areas</strong>&lt;br&gt;Let member States decide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Involving regional and local authorities</strong>&lt;br&gt;Let member States decide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thu, 24/05/2018</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td><strong>Applying the principles of subsidiarity and proportionality</strong>&lt;br&gt;There isn't a single woman interested in these issues, not a single female Member / on the Committee of the Regions? You can do better than put men in charge, EU.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thu, 24/05/2018</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Identifying policy areas</strong></td>
<td>I am a European citizen first and foremost. I am a federalist who hopes to one day live in the United States of Europe. My answer is: none.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Involving regional and local authorities</strong></td>
<td>Do EU Mayors have an association? Do they get invited to policy discussions in Brussels? They should be. I'm sure capitals/big cities do cooperate, but what about provincial Europe? Small-town Europe should have an Erasmus of mayors. The EU shouldn't be afraid to go into areas where populists often prey on people's fears and put a human face on the EU. Organize a policy debate between mayors of a certain region, get people to discuss local politics with their neighbours from across the border (and everyone gets to bring local food). Is internet connection just as bad on one rural side of the Alps as on the other? Do Croatian and Italian tourist destinations suffer from the same ailments and what solutions can they exchange? What can Bulgarians learn from Portugal's experience with forest fire? How are Finnish rural schools so good? etc. Plant the EU flag in these communities instead of trying to genuflect to the small-mindedness of bigots. Do it before May 2019, if possible. Getting mayors to engage voters in places where people feel overlooked by their national governments is crucial.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applying the principles of subsidiarity and proportionality</strong></td>
<td>Simplify, simplify, simplify. Any new law for the next decade, any new regulations should be required to remove two laws or two regulations (not be necessarily related). Everything area become too complicated, and effectively too obscure.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Identifying policy areas</strong></td>
<td>All areas with a local-only impact, also open areas to local experimentations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Involving regional and local authorities</strong></td>
<td>Require a similar two laws removed for every law added. Require legal texts to be shorter and pass &quot;local comprehension&quot; tests, for instance citizens and official not</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
involved with the new texts should be able to understand the new texts without training of supervision. Any texts that cannot be comprehended busy least 3/4 of a citizen panel would have to be rewritten and reformulated.

| Thu, 24/05/2018 | EN | The EU always first of all a security organisation since 1950. Go back to basics in your narrative and stress the diverse but coordinated elements of EU policy including at local levels which defend or promote citizens’ security e.g rights at work, women pensioner equality, rights of air travellers or consumers or net users as well as anti-terrorism and security against US extraterritorial attacks on member states and their institutions. Keep promoting the diversity of approaches but keep emphasising the integrated narrative which holds the policy together. Keep stressing also how the rights and protection involved cannot be gained by populist or nationalist politics. Don’t talk too much about ‘subsidiarity’ but find vocabulary to show what the EU can achieve for its sub state and state institutions and citizens which are separate from the arguments about whether there are these economic benefits or those economic costs, which is a good argument academically but doesn’t win people over. Ask people if they want to throw their security away. |

| Thu, 24/05/2018 | EN | **Applying the principles of subsidiarity and proportionality**

Minimize the number of EU funding and EU initiatives, which require the principles of subsidiarity and proportionality. Then, focus on the remaining activities that require those principles. Furthermore, limit the number of new instances where the principle of subsidiarity applies in order to allow fair competition on the Single Market. Every EU intervention through subsidiaries impacts the Free Market. Consequently, our EU-based companies on the Single Market are facing non-market terms competition from rivals receiving EU funding in one form or another. And in recent decade, EU has "overdose" on subsidiarity, harming the Competition within the EU Market. Resulting in weak SME Enterprises, unable to compete adequately on the Global Market, because they were working in non-market subsidized terms locally against their local competition. But this kind of experience does not apply on the World scene. So please consider seriously lowering the EU OFFICIAL INITIATIVES which create activities falling under the principle of subsidiarity. Let EU Businesses compete on Market terms within the EU so they can transfer experience in competition abroad vs non-EU competitors.

**Identifying policy areas**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fri, 18/05/2018</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>As a member of the Subsidiarity Expert Group of the CoR since at its beginning I want to contribute to the final 'Hearing' at 28th of May by providing a paper (upload): Subsidiarity and proportionality acc. Article 5 TEU Deficits of the application - solutions “Returning” competences to Member States and regions. Attachment to this input is published at: <a href="https://ec.europa.eu/commission/publications/views-public-organisations-subsidarity-and-proportionality_en">https://ec.europa.eu/commission/publications/views-public-organisations-subsidarity-and-proportionality_en</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Wed, 09/05/2018 | EN | **Applying the principles of subsidiarity and proportionality**
The German Confederation of Skilled Crafts and Small Businesses (Zentralverband des Deutschen Handwerks e. V. – ZDH) expressly welcomes the setting up of the new Task Force on Subsidiarity, Proportionality and "Doing Less More Efficiently". The goal of Better Regulation can only be achieved if the principles of subsidiarity and proportionality are strictly applied. Regarding subsidiarity, the Commission so far limits itself to explaining why the principle of subsidiarity has not been violated. It would, however, be better if the Commission would set out its regulatory approach in a more positive and constructive manner by collecting information and experience on existing legislation and practices in the Member States in order to justify a clear “EU added value”. In addition, the proportionality test should include evidence that content and form of the proposed action do not exceed what is necessary to achieve the objectives. A stricter application of these two principles would clearly help the Commission meet its objectives at minimum cost and administrative burdens. At the same time it would respond to concerns that a new proposal is just another example of over-regulation, i.e. disproportionate, or that the issue being addressed... |
is not pan-European, and should therefore be addressed by individual Member States.

**Identifying policy areas**

The EU should focus on areas in which European regulation brings a significant added value — such as security, external border management or defence — and in the least burdensome way possible. The Commission should therefore identify issues which really need to be dealt with at EU level, and make sure they are dealt with in the most efficient way. On the other hand, Member States should be empowered to deal with everything else themselves. In particular, the details of documentation and reporting requirements can often be dealt with nationally or even locally in a more practical way. Negative examples in this regard are the recent proposals on the “Eurovignette” and the services package as well as the State aid monitoring in case of “de minimis” aid. Please refer to the attached position paper for more detail.

Attachment to this input is published at: [https://ec.europa.eu/commission/publications/views-non-governmental-organisations-subsidiarity-and-proportionality_en](https://ec.europa.eu/commission/publications/views-non-governmental-organisations-subsidiarity-and-proportionality_en)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wed, 04/04/2018</th>
<th>EN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Applying the principles of subsidiarity and proportionality**

In my experience, not being accurate and prescriptive in Directives has led to confusion and difficult implementation. Some technical aspects are not correctly interpreted by non-experts in Member States. For example, implementations of articles 9-11 of the Energy Efficiency Directive 2012/27/EU created "split incentives" in some Member States simply because the problem is very "techy". This finally results in rage by some citizens improperly redirected towards "Brussels". A more prescriptive Directive, if not a Regulation, would have helped avoid this negative image of the "prescriptive EU" that is due, in reality; to "lack of detail on how to do" (guidelines are ignored).

**Identifying policy areas**

We should "streamline" the overly democratic long decisional process of ecodesign; too long and too inclusive to be effective, but only working if completely managed centrally (being very technical, if we give any value to the idea of single market and have citizens and manufacturers same money).

**Involving regional and local authorities**

The Committee of the Regions (CoR) is there to do this, but is irrelevant. The European Economic and Social
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Thu, 22/03/2018 | DE      | **Applying the principles of subsidiarity and proportionality**<br>Gemeinsame naturwissenschaftliche Forschung und entsprechende Förderung. Garantieren der Lebensmittelsicherheit durch gemeinsame Einrichtungen und Forschung der EU. Einhaltung und Durchsetzung von gemeinsamen Umweltschutz Standards durch die EC.  
**Identifying policy areas**<br>Naturwissenschaftliche und angewandte Forschung. Lebensmittelsicherheit. Umweltschutz.  
**Involving regional and local authorities**<br>Einrichtung von übergreifenden Arbeitsgruppen. |
| Wed, 21/03/2018 | EN      | **Applying the principles of subsidiarity and proportionality**<br>This terminology is rather confusing to the lay man. This makes the EU appear remote. Simplifying access to what the EU is to every member state is critical.  
**Identifying policy areas**<br>Luxembourg and Strasbourg should be closed, with Brussels the sole capital.  
Members of European Parliament tend to be unknown. There is a need to them to engage properly with their constituents and hold accessible surgeries. What happens is that people end up voting for marginal or extremist parties rather than those that provide true representation.  
**Involving regional and local authorities**<br>In my humble opinion EU countries are suffering politics and economics changes even many of them are governed by politics which proliferate Euro-sceptic's ideals. Therefore I consider very important to carry out a sustainable project to maintain even strengthening this institution. It's necessary European citizens identify this institution like an organism to improve the local system. |
### Thu, 15/03/2018

**Applying the principles of subsidiarity and proportionality**

- Give grants to Starting a business.
- Paying off debt.
- Covering operational expenses.

However, Grants make available to specific industries and targeted causes identified by the EU. Eg. R&D.

#### Identifying policy areas

- **Small Business**

**Involving regional and local authorities**

Local government and authorities can do this:
- Free counselling, advice and information on starting a business through a SCORE method. Financial assistance for new or existing businesses through guaranteed loans made by area bank and non-bank lenders.
- Free consulting services through the network of Small Business Development Centres established all over EU. SBDCs can also conduct training events throughout the local levels - some can be made to require a nominal registration fee.
- Assistance to businesses owned and controlled by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals like minorities or migrants through a Minority Enterprise Development Program.

**Women's Business Ownership**

---

### Thu, 22/02/2018

Presumably the principle of subsidiarity includes solving common problems with common solutions, particularly in the areas of administration and routine trade-related regulations. This would represent an efficient and effective use of central resources, while freeing up scarce national resources (people, money and time) for solving particular national problems. Thus subsidiarity is a positive benefit of EU membership, not a threat to sovereignty as it is sometimes portrayed.
| Thu, 22/02/2018 | EN | **Applying the principles of subsidiarity and proportionality**

Building on my recent doctoral thesis on Subsidiarity and Multi-Level Governance in the Framework of the EU Institutional Framework (2017) this submission aims to provide a simplified version of that research to address the questions raised by Discussion Paper No.1 (whose questions are used to structure this submission) and Discussion Paper No. 2 of the Task Force on Subsidiarity, Proportionality and Doing Less More Efficiently. In it, it questions the conflicting definitions on subsidiarity that exist in the Treaties and whose use often makes enforcement of subsidiarity politically and legally very difficult. An agreed proposal, building on the works of the European Council Conclusions of February 2016 is proposed instead. This submission also provides different examples where subsidiarity has been misunderstood as in itself is neither an instrument to justify more EU or more national/subnational powers but a mechanism to adjudicate when powers are shared. The definition of shared powers as framed in the treaties is also at the root of the problems to use subsidiarity as a legal principle. Last but not least the submission makes abundant suggestions on how the Commission and Committee of the Regions, as well as Council and Parliament, can make better use of the existing subsidiarity, better regulation and impact assessment toolbox in a way that can better reflect the input of local and regional authorities. However, one critical issue for that to happen is to address the capacity issues and institutional culture of those institutions. For that it is also proposed the recreation of the Consultative Committee of Local and Regional Authorities that existed between 1988 and 1994 for the pre-legislative phase of EU policy formulation.

**Identifying policy areas**

We need to move from a deterministic notion of subsidiarity. As mentioned above, local authorities, regions and certain parliaments narrowly argue their case only referring to the definition of subsidiarity that features in the Lisbon Treaty Preamble and the Charter, in order to justify no transfer of powers to the EU level. By contrast the EU institutions, some Member States interpret subsidiarity as an argument to justify further transfers of powers to the EU on the basis of the notions of "scale" and "effect". For instance, this misunderstanding of subsidiarity of a one-way street is expressed in the recent press release of the European Committee of the Regions (CoR) itself while welcoming their inclusion on the Task Force, it warns against any interpretation of subsidiarity that could mean renationalising powers or the European Parliament failure to even nominate members to the Task Force.
Both biased interpretations are misguided. Subsidiarity is a mechanism whereby shared powers can be transferred to the EU level or being returned to the national and subnational level; it is a dynamic process and any apportionment of powers is not irreversible. If circumstances change over time a power can be renationalised and if circumstances chance once again, be transferred back at EU level. Borrowing the Commission own argumentation for the lack of blank protection for Services of General Interest in spite of the existence of the Protocol 26 due to the changing nature of public service provision (COM(2011) 900: 15), whether to exercise a power at EU or national/subnational level can change over time, in a bidirectional way.

What is lacking is a proper system where subsidiarity scrutiny can result in a more objective and negotiated allocation of responsibilities between different levels of government. This results in the application of the principle of subsidiarity being the result of matrimonial matters that often have little to do with the principle of subsidiarity itself.

The contingency of Subsidiarity: several examples

State Aid

A good example is the already cited "Notion of State Aid" Communication (C/2016/2946) as it means a break with previous Commission policy of centralising by default EU State Aid Policy within the Commission. The new policy does revise the notion of scale and effect of state aid policy thus formally expanding the areas that would be exempt from European Commission detailed rules and supervision on the basis of their limited EU wide, cross-border effect as they are purely local operations. It is a choice based on evidence, but also on reasons of policy shift (the above-mentioned Timmermans Mission Letter) but also, as discussed above, of internal capacity constraints of the Commission as Internal Market overseer and regulator.

Procurement

Another example of the fluidity of evidence of EU-wide impact can be found on public procurement: the Commission 2017 Public Procurement Strategy has come up with updated figures where by "data show that total cross-border procurement (direct and indirect) has increased in recent years, to around 23 %" (COM (2017) 572). This compares with "earlier findings direct cross-border procurement accounts for 1.6% of awards or roughly 3.5% of the total value of contract awards published in Ted during 2006-9". The newer evidence takes into account procurement contracts won by subsidiaries in another Member State.
(European Commission, 2011: 15) Thus the case for more detailed EU legislation varies over time (in this case, increases) in view of the changing circumstances and when more refined evidence that is available.

Urban Mobility

A third and last example, this time of the political nature of subsidiarity is on urban mobility. This is an issue that since the first Transport White Paper of 2011 as the Commission, supported by the haulage industry has been trying to argue for minimum rules on urban mobility in general, access restriction schemes and green zones in particular has been actively resisted by subnational organised interests. It is however an issue that even authorities that are hardly suspect of wanting greater EU legislation on this area such as the UK Government agree that Title VI TFEU does include in its scope urban mobility as a shared power but has that the Commission has chosen so far not to do so (Department for Transport, 2013:12). Indeed, this is an example on subsidiarity being also a matter of political choice and political opportunity. In this case the concerted action of subnational authorities and certain national governments resulted in the Urban Mobility Action Plan finally shied away from introducing binding legislation on this matter. To highlight the point further the latest European Parliament input on this debate, the Delli Report (2015) does make a strong case as subsidiarity as a particular form of NIMBYism. And yet, there is a clear case of some EU legislation on the matter on the basis that local decisions on urban mobility may have a cross border impact. For instance, to introduce a requirement similar to the IMI in the Services Directive so that all access restriction schemes were part of an open access database so that the mapping applications used by the transport industry had real time information of the access, parking and pollution restrictions in a given area, or that, akin to the Intelligent Transport Systems, there were common or interoperable standards on for instance signalling, payment, etc. of such schemes. The reason that there is no legislation on those is not a matter of lack of scale and effect or insufficient evidence but that on this particular example the structure of political opportunity (Tarrow, 1998) i.e. the political power ratio between those in favour of EU regulation and those in favour of no EU regulation is decidedly in favour of the latter.

Subsidiarity as a mechanism for multilevel negotiation

These and many other examples point out to the fact that subsidiarity is a matter of shared competence, evidence existing at a given time, changing needs and, last but not least a matter of political decision.

The difficulty is to define a mechanism or methodology to make that assessment: both the CoR and
Commission 2015 Better Regulation Package's subsidiarity toolbox are exceedingly formulaic for that to be used as a tool to assess whether a power should be transferred at EU level or back.

A key issue is the need for better impact assessment that embed the local and regional impacts of proposed EU actions. This is only indirectly addressed in the 2015 Guidelines for Stakeholder Consultation.

While most countries do not have subsidiarity as a legally defined principle, many do have structured systems of multilevel negotiation of shared legal or financial obligations, including EU derived ones (Pazos-Vidal, 2017). This can happen by way of constitutional recognition (notable case is Austria) or via secondary law (Spain, Italy) or political agreement (Netherlands is a salient example, Denmark) or practice (Finland, Sweden). (COSLA, 2014)

By contrast, the EU does not have such a sophisticated multilevel mechanism when assessing subsidiarity: the provisions of the Better Regulation package does not go as far as ensuring that there is a proper understanding of the national and subnational distribution of powers -formal and actual- , the Council is as a whole unable to reflect this due to the very uneven existence of multilevel arrangements for form national positions on EU legislation, the Parliament and CoR operate mainly in the legislative phase where neither the format of negotiation nor their own institutional positioning agenda provides a locus for fine-tuned subsidiarity assessments. To be effective this has to happen at the policy formulation stage.

Crucially, the various subsidiarity reviews that were taken place in the run up to the UK-EU pre-referendum negotiations, notably the UK Balance of Competence Review and the Dutch Subsidiarity reviews (whose outputs is strongly suggested that is used as one of the starting points of the work of this Task Force) do not deal with the principle subsidiarity as such but on matters of better regulation. The Dutch review is notable for it does not propose any particular area to be renationalised under the principle of Subsidiarity but gives an ample list of EU legislation that was drafted with a poor understanding of the multilevel nature of the problem and competence at hand and the realities on the ground, thus a case of regulatory fitness.

Involving regional and local authorities

The attached submission consider a number of proposals:

- Modifying the internal workings of the Committee of the Regions so that it is a body of territorial representation instead of a mainly party-political assembly, including focusing more on subsidiarity
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|   | assessment.  
|   | • Discarding the notion of local and regional governments as "stakeholders" as the 2015 Better Regulation Package.  
|   | • Recreating, in the pre-legislative phase the Consultative Committee of Local and Regional Authorities.  
|   | • Introducing Territorial Impact Assessments as standard practice.  

The (re)creation of a Consultative Committee of Local and Regional Authorities  
This new body would advise the Commission on the pre-legislative phase a) the principle of subsidiarity, and b) more generally the local and regional impact of draft legislation. Such body would be made up of the local and regional entities that at national level advice national governments when drafting legislation (including EU negotiation lines) that affect local government competences and finances. 
These national bodies, are in some cases such as Austria are even constitutionally recognized and mandated to be consulted. Others, such as the Italian the Conferenza Stato Regione of Italy is another model that can be source of inspiration as it is an efficient, predictable and regular mechanism for multilevel negotiation including on EU issues. As opposed to its 1988 predecessor, it should not be a political platform. Instead, it should bring to Brussels in a regular and structured way the subnational authorities, institutions or bodies that already advice and negotiate with the national government on matters affecting local and regional government. This would allow the Commission to have, at a pre-legislative stage the input of those organisations that would deal with the transposition of that EU legislation and, in some cases such as the few Member States discussed above, the ones that will advise their government as their formulate the national negotiating position on an EU issue.  
As opposed to CoR it would not have appointed elected members and it would be a technical not a political body (meaning elected politicians) who in turn would have imperative mandate. It would centralised engagement at Sec Gen and consultation of LRAs. It would constitute a structured venue for policy formulation and agreement of the apportionment of shared competences and subsidiarity scrutiny. It would meet every quarter and centralise consultation with subnational governments. Clearly, the more CoR could profoundly reform itself to be capable to carry out independent subsidiarity scrutiny and directly represent the local and regional level the less need for this new, nimbler body in the pre-legislative phase would be needed. However given the CoR institutional inertias and lack of follow up of the ambitious 2014
Valcarcel proposals and the Commission own policy silos, creating a new Consultative Committee of Local and Regional Authorities seems at present the most practicable, efficient, and resource limited way to ensure that the EU policies are properly formulated having an accurate knowledge of their potential impact at subnational level, including dealing with matters of subsidiarity and thus avoiding protracted discussions at the legislative and jurisdictional levels later on.

More details on the other proposals can be found in the attached submission, published at: [https://ec.europa.eu/commission/publications/views-non-governmental-organisations-subsidiarity-and-proportionality_en](https://ec.europa.eu/commission/publications/views-non-governmental-organisations-subsidiarity-and-proportionality_en)

| Mon, 12/02/2018 | EN | **Applying the principles of subsidiarity and proportionality**

Great initiative. I think one key thing is educating citizens about how the EU works, showing transparency and explaining where member states have control, and where they share control, without the notion of being “dictated to”. Educating citizens is key to avoid another Brexit.