

'GALICIA' DECLARATION



**European Committee
of the Regions**

**Position of the Spanish delegation to the CoR regarding
the proposal for the Multiannual Financial Framework
2028-2034**

**Under the presidency of Alfonso Rueda Valenzuela,
President of the Xunta de Galicia**

Santiago de Compostela, October 2025

The Spanish delegation to the European Committee of the Regions (CoR), composed of 21 members representing the autonomous communities and local authorities, **rejects the European Commission's proposal¹ for the next Multiannual Financial Framework 2028–2034** and, in particular the creation of the National and Regional Partnership Plans.

By concentrating on single plans per Member State a limited set of resources for policies as diverse as cohesion, agriculture and fisheries, employment and social inclusion, housing or security and defence, there is a dilemma of resource allocation between strategic priorities that may jeopardise consensus around the plans and thus reduce their effectiveness. In addition, this approach leads to a **centralization of decisions in the Member States to the detriment of their own organization of competencies**, undermines transparency in the territorial distribution of resources and weakens the role of the regions in defining investment priorities.

It therefore reiterates the call made by the CoR on 15 October for the proposal on the Fund for National and Regional Partnership Plans to be revised and **calls on the Government of Spain to defend this position in the Council**.

Budget size

- 1 Recognises the European Commission's efforts to strengthen and make the EU budget more efficient but regrets its **lack of ambition** in presenting a proposal below 2% of the EU's Gross National Income, which is well below the proportion of other public administrations' budgets.
- 2 Calls, therefore, for the EU to be provided with **sufficient financial means to address the current major geopolitical challenges, as well as to meet the objectives of the Treaty**, such as economic, social and territorial cohesion, agriculture and fisheries.
- 3 Regrets **the reduction of the proportion of funds under shared management among the European Commission, the State and the regions in favour of those managed directly by the Commission² and calls for a rebalancing of the budget to strengthen the former**. The shared management of funds has proved to be very positive and has allowed for closer and more tailored approaches to the needs of the territories. This is particularly important for cohesion, agriculture and fisheries funds, as these policies make a decisive contribution to the Union's competitiveness and strategic autonomy.

Cohesion

- 4 Recalls that economic, social and territorial cohesion is one of the objectives of the European Union recognised in the Treaties. Correcting territorial imbalances not only benefits the regions receiving the funds but also strengthens the European single market by widening opportunities for all and fostering social inclusion.
- 5 **Calls for a specific, differentiated and sufficient budget for cohesion** and for a system of distribution between Member States and regions aimed at reducing disparities between the levels of development of the various regions. Only a cohesive Europe can respond to current geopolitical challenges and contribute to strengthening democracy and competitiveness within the Union.
- 6 Welcomes the ring-fenced resources for less developed regions but calls for **cohesion policy for all regions**. The current proposal does not ensure sufficient support for all categories of regions and for those with geographical handicaps under Article 174 TFEU. In the long term, this can lead to new territorial inequalities.

¹Communication "A dynamic EU budget for the priorities of the future: the Multiannual Financial Framework 2028–2034" and the proposal for a Regulation establishing the European Fund for Economic, Social and Territorial Cohesion, Agriculture and Rural Areas, Fisheries and the Sea, Prosperity and Security for the period 2028–2034.

²This reduction would go from 65% in the 2021–2027 period to 45% in 2028–2034, even without taking into account the NextGenerationEU funds.

- 7 Takes note of the explicit mention of the **outermost regions but regrets** that their specificity has been transferred from the European to the national level, ignoring the need for specific European policies recognised in Article 349 TFEU and the *acquis* of European law.
- 8 As they are now formulated, these National and Regional Partnership Plans would lead to great competition between territories and between areas of intervention. It therefore calls for **objective, clear and concise pre-defined regional allocation criteria to be established at EU level** and openly negotiated with the states and regions.
- 9 Warns that **competitiveness should not be alien to partnership schemes**. Cohesion funds have played a key role in the development of regional innovation ecosystems, especially through the design and implementation of Smart Specialisation Strategies. It regrets that S3 are practically absent from the plans and that Interregional Innovation Investments (I3) do not have a specific reserved budget. It also regrets the lack of reference to just transition mechanisms in areas affected by the industrial transition.
- 10 Appreciates the explicit recognition of **integrated territorial and urban development strategies**, as well as **community-led local development**, but regrets the lack of a specific allocation for both, given their importance in addressing key challenges such as housing, adaptation to climate change or depopulation in urban, rural and coastal areas. These instruments have proven to have positive effects on reducing unemployment, improving digital connectivity and strengthening the business and entrepreneurial fabric, especially in areas with severe and permanent natural or demographic handicaps.
- 11 Appreciates the contribution of the European Union's **cross-border, interregional and transnational cooperation programmes** to European integration. It claims the key role of the regions in these programmes and calls for their governance not to be affected by state centralisation processes.

Agriculture and fisheries

- 12 Recalls the important contribution of agriculture and fisheries to the EU's food security and to population settlement in rural areas. It therefore stresses the need to **ensure the viability of these two economic sectors**.
- 13 It is therefore concerned about the **decrease, in real terms, in funding for both the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) and the Common Fisheries Policy (CFP)**. It considers that the EU budget should not stop supporting these unique EU policies, as their implementation on the ground entails significant costs.
- 14 With regard to the CAP, it denounces the fact that the specific budget for income support and market regulation is being reduced, as well as incorporating **new measures**, while there is no specific allocation for rural development, which will have to "compete" with the other areas of intervention within National and Regional Partnership Plans.
- 15 Warns of the introduction of **national co-financing of certain measures** that in the current CAP are 100% financed by EU funds, which would imply a greater effort on the part of Spanish administrations when applying the CAP on the ground.
- 16 Regrets the **drastic reduction of resources under shared management for fisheries, aquaculture and EU maritime policy**. It calls for the EU to allocate the necessary resources for the conservation of marine biological resources under the Common Fisheries Policy, as this is one of its exclusive competences.
- 17 Stresses that **EU funding in the maritime domain should reflect a balance between the three sustainability pillars of the CFP** (environmental, economic and social) and **support the competitiveness of the fleet** in adapting to the challenges of decarbonisation, sustainability, digitalisation, control and traceability.

Governance

- 18 Warns with deep concern that the implementation of these plans would lead to a **more centralised management of resources at national level**, as it does not legally guarantee the participation of regional and local authorities in either the definition of priorities or the funds' implementation. The partnership principle has not served to guarantee multilevel governance. In Spain, it has not ensured a real participation of all regional and local administrations in the programming of all cohesion funds. It therefore calls for a **key role to be given to all public authorities**.
- 19 Warns that the merging of all shared management funds into a single plan per State could result in the **needs of the territories being neglected**. In Spain, such a merger would mean moving from the current 50 or so fund programmes, most of which are designed and implemented at regional level, to a single programme designed at Member State level. More centralised management at the national level does not imply greater simplification, neither for administrations nor for citizens.
- 20 Recalls that the Autonomous Communities have a solid experience in the **design and management of funds**, backed by the development of their own strategies that give them a deep knowledge of the territory and a long-term vision. They are also responsible for the co-financing of actions, as well as the implementation of reforms.
- 21 Regarding the **necessary budgetary flexibility**, warns that reserving 25% for unforeseen crises seems excessive and that its programming should in no case be left exclusively to the Member States and the European Commission.

Reforms

- 22 Points out that a considerable number of the **recommendations given to Spain under the European Semester concern areas where autonomous communities and local administrations have important competences** - exclusive in some cases - such as water management, housing or social inclusion.
- 23 To take a further step in the conditionality between the receipt of funds and the reforms resulting from these recommendations, **local and regional authorities should be involved, and not only consulted**, in the preparation of national progress reports and country-specific recommendations under the European Semester, especially in those affecting areas of their own competence.
- 24 Urges, in any case, that **regional allocations** should not be compromised by the degree of implementation of reforms decided exclusively at national level.

New territorial cooperation framework for a more efficient and fairer management of European funds

- 25 To ensure that territorial needs are fully taken into account in the design, implementation and distribution of European funds, the Spanish delegation of the CoR puts forward the following proposals within a new structure of the EU Multiannual Financial Framework 2028-2034:
- a) Recognition of the role of the Autonomous Communities as **managing authorities** in the areas of their competence, promoting close collaboration with local administrations
 - b) The maintenance of **specific funds earmarked for integrated territorial and urban development**, which will make it possible to continue promoting local strategies aimed at cohesion, sustainability and competitiveness.
 - c) The promotion of **coordination and cooperation structures between the different levels of government** that are more agile, effective and stable than the current system of sectoral conferences.