

[IT: rights protection vs rights violations?](#)

IT: rights protection vs rights violations? | European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights

1. [Home](#) >
2. [Media](#) >
3. [Press releases](#) >
4. IT: rights protection vs rights violations?

Copyright © 2017 **European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights**

[IT: rights protection vs rights violations?](#)

IT: rights protection vs rights violations? | European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights

1. [Home](#) >
2. [Media](#) >
3. [Press releases](#) >
4. IT: rights protection vs rights violations?

Copyright © 2017 **European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights**

[Cities and regions critical about top-down reform delivery strategy proposed by the European Commission](#)

The members of the European Committee of the Regions (CoR) reject the European Commission's proposal to divert money from cohesion policy to finance top-down structural reforms in the Member States. The [opinion](#), drawn up by Olga Zrihen (BE/PES), Member of the Walloon Parliament and adopted during the CoR plenary session, further highlights the importance of adopting a mixed bottom-up and top-down approach involving local and regional authorities in the design and implementation of reform processes.

The European Commission proposal of a new [reform delivery tool](#) would grant budgetary support to Member States that voluntarily engage to undertake complex structural reforms. This support would be complemented by technical assistance provided through the [Structural Reform Support Programme](#) (SRSP). For the period 2017-2020, the Commission has proposed to [double the initial financial allocations for the SRSP](#) of 142,8 mln by using the flexibility margins of the EU budget and by giving Member States the chance to divert resources from European Structural and Investment Funds to the SRSP.

The European Committee of the Regions strongly opposes the idea of diverting resources from the European Structural and Investment Funds (ESIF) – the EU's main investment tool managed in partnership with regions and cities – towards a programme which is managed centrally, with a top-down approach that does not take into account the specific needs of local communities and the crucial role of local governments in delivering structural reforms.

" The current proposal lacks transparency and assessment criteria. It is also more than questionable to bind and commit substantial financial resources to an instrument providing assistance on a pure voluntary basis. We want EU support for reforms that have a European added value, respect democratic rules and make a difference on the ground ", said **Olga Zrihen** (BE/PES), member of the Walloon Parliament.

The rapporteur warns that disregarding local and regional authorities as partners of structural reforms would be a mistake naming lack of ownership a key reason for the slow progress of structural reforms in the framework of the European Semester. Adding a territorial dimension to the European Semester by taking into account territorial diversity in Europe and ensuring full participation of local and regional authorities in the National Reform Programmes would be a step in the right direction.

" Any further link between EU-relevant structural reforms and cohesion policy makes it even more important that the European Semester becomes more democratic at European level. Complementing it by a [Code of conduct](#) setting standards for the involvement of local and regional authorities would help to increase efficiency and ownership. The principles of subsidiarity, proportionality and partnership should be the common foundation not only of cohesion policy but of all EU policies supporting structural reforms ", said **Ms Zrihen**.

In relation to the new budgetary instruments for the Euro area proposed by the European Commission in December 2017, the opinion supports the creation of an EU instrument to address asymmetric shocks. However, any potential support should not overlap with but rather complement existing instruments such as the European Structural Investment Funds (ESIF) and the European Fund for Strategic Investment (EFSI). The CoR further welcomes the proposal to set up a credit line or guarantee within the future European Monetary Fund, in case the Single Resolution Fund – managing the impact of failing banks on the real economy and public finances – is not sufficient.

More information:

Contact:

Carmen Schmidle

Tel. +32 (0)2 282 2366

Mobile +32 (0)494 735 787

carmen.schmidle@cor.europa.eu

[ESMA consults on supplementary guidance under the endorsement regime](#)

The European Securities and Markets Authority (ESMA) has today published a [Consultation Paper \(CP\)](#) with proposed supplementary guidance on the application of the endorsement regime. This consultation follows on from the updated Guidelines on endorsement (November 2017), and comes in response to requests from the industry.

The aim of the proposed supplementary guidance is twofold:

1. To provide clarity regarding the general principle ESMA relies on when assessing whether an alternative requirement can be considered as stringent as a requirement set out in the CRA Regulation (CRAR); and
2. ESMA's concrete assessment of a number of alternative internal requirements which are currently in place in a third-country Credit Rating Agency (CRA).

Requirements which are at least as stringent as those set out in CRAR

In the updated Guidelines on endorsement which ESMA published in [November 2017](#), ESMA clarified that compliance with the third-country legal framework will no longer be considered proof that a third-country CRA "fulfils requirements which are at least as stringent as" those set out in the CRAR. Instead, an endorsing CRA has two options to demonstrate to ESMA that the "as stringent as" condition is met:

- Stating that the third-country CRA complies with the relevant provisions of CRAR; or,
- Stating that the third-country CRA has established and fulfils alternative internal requirements, which are at least as stringent as the relevant endorsement provisions of CRAR.

Next steps

The consultation will be open for a two-month period, with a deadline for submissions on 25 May 2018. The CP proposes to add the supplementary guidance as an additional subsection of ESMA's updated Guidelines on Endorsement which will apply to credit ratings issued after 1 January 2019 or reviewed after that date.

Consultation on Draft Guidelines on “as stringent as” notion in the CRA Regulation

This paper may be of interest to users of credit ratings, credit rating agencies and entities interested in applying to be a registered CRA.

This consultation follows on from the updated Guidelines on endorsement (November 2017), and comes in response to requests from the industry.

The aim of the proposed supplementary guidance is twofold:

1. To provide clarity regarding the general principle ESMA relies on when assessing whether an alternative requirement can be considered as stringent as a requirement set out in the CRA Regulation (CRAR); and
2. ESMA's concrete assessment of a number of alternative internal requirements which are currently in place in a third-country Credit Rating Agency (CRA).

Publication of responses

All contributions received will be published following the close of the consultation, unless you request otherwise. Please clearly and prominently indicate in your submission any part you do not wish to be publically disclosed. A standard confidentiality statement in an email message will not be treated as a request for non-disclosure. A confidential response may be requested from us in accordance with ESMA's rules on access to documents. We may consult you if we receive such a request. Any decision we make not to disclose the response is reviewable by ESMA's Board of Appeal and the European Ombudsman.