

Basic information	
2020/2859(DEA) DEA - Delegated acts procedure	Procedure completed - delegated act enters into force
Fund for European Aid to the Most Deprived: detailed minimum requirements for audit purposes and the data to be recorded and stored Supplementing 2012/0295(COD)	
Subject 4.10.15 European Social Fund (ESF), Fund for European Aid to the Most Deprived (FEAD)	

Key players				
European Parliament	Committee responsible		Rapporteur	Appointed
	<div style="border: 1px solid red; display: inline-block; padding: 2px;">EMPL</div> Employment and Social Affairs			

Key events			
Date	Event	Reference	Summary
04/11/2020	Non-legislative basic document published	C(2020)07504	
04/11/2020	Initial period for examining delegated act 2.0 month(s)		
11/11/2020	Committee referral announced in Parliament		
12/01/2021	Delegated act not objected by Parliament		

Technical information	
Procedure reference	2020/2859(DEA)
Procedure type	DEA - Delegated acts procedure
Procedure subtype	Examination of delegated act
	Supplementing 2012/0295(COD)
Stage reached in procedure	Procedure completed - delegated act enters into force
Committee dossier	EMPL/9/04567

Documentation gateway			
European Commission			
Document type	Reference	Date	Summary
Non-legislative basic document	C(2020)07504	04/11/2020	
Document attached to the procedure	C(2021)1614	08/03/2021	

Fund for European Aid to the Most Deprived: detailed minimum requirements for audit purposes and the data to be recorded and stored

2020/2859(DEA) - 20/06/2013

The Council took stock of progress on the Fund for European Aid to the Most Deprived Regulation. In February 2013, the European Council confirmed that the support for aid for most deprived people will be EUR 2.5 billion for the period 2014-2020 and will be taken from the ESF allocation.

Substantial progress has been achieved under the Irish Presidency on many parts of the text. More particularly, the discussions in the working party have shown **broad support** to the objectives of the Fund, with a majority of delegations also supporting the instrument itself; however, at the same time, some delegations have reservations as to whether a new EU-level Fund, covering all Member States, would be the most appropriate way of assisting the most deprived persons, and what form such a fund should take.

Based on guidance from the Coreper and taking into consideration legal concerns, the Presidency has suggested a series of **compromise proposals** based on certain principles:

- participation in the FEAD would be **voluntary**;
- the **overall level of Structural Funds of a Member State would remain unaffected** and, in particular, funding for FEAD would be earmarked from a Member States' Structural Funds allocation;
- a Member State could **opt in/out** at the Programme review stage (in the middle of the programming cycle in 2016) without impacting on the allocation or programming of other Member States;
- the allocations would be **indicatively calculated on the basis of the indicators** set out in Article 6 (i.e. average population suffering from severe material deprivation and changes in the population living in households with very low work intensity);
- to ensure that a Member State would not be allocated disproportionately large FEAD funding, the Member State would have the **flexibility** to state, within a context of discussions with the Commission, the desired level of funding allocated to it;
- to compensate for expected low allocations to FEAD for the **smallest Member States**, a **minimum level of funding** to be allocated for them would be set.

The Presidency concludes that **securing agreement on the proposal would only be possible if based on such a voluntary approach**, providing Member States with flexibility with respect to the allocation of resources from their Structural Funds. In particular, the option for Member States to participate should not affect the programming of other Member States.

The Council's working party will further examine the text, including the EP's opinion. The vote of the European Parliament on its mandate to enter informal trilogues (with a view to a possible first reading agreement) took place on 12 June 2013.

The **Czech Republic, Germany, Denmark, the Netherlands, Sweden and the UK** have maintained reservations on the proposal. In addition, the **UK has maintained its parliamentary scrutiny reservation** while a number of national parliaments have issued opinions on the proposal.

Estonia, Greece, France, Cyprus and Slovakia have maintained linguistic scrutiny reservations on the proposal, as has Finland, on Title V.