C/2024/3247

7.6.2024

Euro-Wechselkurs ([1])

6. Juni 2024

(C/2024/3247)

1 Euro =

	Währung	Kurs		Währung	Kurs
USD	US-Dollar	1,0865	CAD	Kanadischer Dollar	1,4879
JPY	Japanischer Yen	169,74	HKD	Hongkong-Dollar	8,4853
DKK	Dänische Krone	7,4592	NZD	Neuseeländischer Dollar	1,7584
GBP	Pfund Sterling	0,85088	SGD	Singapur-Dollar	1,4648
SEK	Schwedische Krone	11,2930	KRW	Südkoreanischer Won	1 486,44
CHF	Schweizer Franken	0,9687	ZAR	Südafrikanischer Rand	20,6281
ISK	Isländische Krone	149,70	CNY	Chinesischer Renminbi Yuan	7,8715
NOK	Norwegische Krone	11,5000	IDR	Indonesische Rupiah	17 670,67
BGN	Bulgarischer Lew	1,9558	MYR	Malaysischer Ringgit	5,1000
CZK	Tschechische Krone	24,632	PHP	Philippinischer Peso	63,734
HUF	Ungarischer Forint	390,68	RUB	Russischer Rubel	
PLN	Polnischer Zloty	4,3015	THB	Thailändischer Baht	39,679
RON	Rumänischer Leu	4,9758	BRL	Brasilianischer Real	5,7623
TRY	Türkische Lira	35,0263	MXN	Mexikanischer Peso	19,1254
AUD	Australischer Dollar	1,6368	INR	Indische Rupie	90,7135

([1]) *Quelle*: Von der Europäischen Zentralbank veröffentlichter Referenz-Wechselkurs.

C/2024/3409

7.6.2024

GEMEINSAMER SORTENKATALOG

für Gemüsearten – Ergänzung H 2024/5

(Text von Bedeutung für den EWR)

(C/2024/3409)

1. Die vorliegende Ergänzung der konsolidierten Fassung des Gemeinsamen Sortenkatalogs für Gemüsearten ([1]) enthält die Änderungen, die durch die bei der Kommission eingegangenen Mitteilungen der Mitgliedstaaten notwendig geworden sind.

2. Die vorliegende Ergänzung folgt in ihrer Einteilung der konsolidierten Fassung. Es kann auf die Erläuterungen zu der genannten Ausgabe Bezug genommen werden.

3. Diese Ergänzung berücksichtigt die Mitteilungen, die zwischen dem 1.4.2024 und dem 30.4.2024 eingegangen sind.

4. Die Änderungen gegenüber der konsolidierten Fassung sind wie folgt gekennzeichnet:

   — (add.): Es handelt sich um eine neue Position im Gemeinsamen Sortenkatalog.

   — (mod.): Es handelt sich um eine Änderung an einer schon enthaltenen Position. Die Angaben zu dieser Position in der vorliegenden Ergänzung ersetzen die in der konsolidierten Fassung hierzu enthaltenen Angaben.

   — (del.): Die genannte Position wird mit allen Angaben aus dem Gemeinsamen Sortenkatalog gestrichen.

5. Die vorliegende Ergänzung betrifft die notifizierten Sorten, für die die Bestimmungen des Artikels 16 Absatz 1 der Richtlinie 2002/55/EG des Rates ([2]) gelten.

6. Wenn die Nummer des Verantwortlichen für die Erhaltungszüchtung nicht in der konsolidierten Fassung erscheint, können sein Name und seine Anschrift bei der Stelle ermittelt werden, die in der Liste für den betreffenden Mitgliedstaat bzw. EFTA-Staat angegeben ist.

([1]) Konsolidierte Fassung vom 22. Dezember 2022: https://ec.europa.eu/food/plant/plant_propagation_material/plant_variety_catalogues_databases_en.

([2]) ABl. L 193 vom 20.7.2002, S. 33.

Inhalt

		Seite
1.1	*Allium cepa L.* >> Aggregatum Group – Shallot	3
1.2	*Allium cepa L.* >> Cepa Group – Onion, Echalion	3
2	*Allium fistulosum L.* – Japanese bunching onion, Welsh onion	6
4	*Allium sativum L.* – Garlic	6
7.1	*Apium graveolens L.* >> Celery Group	6
7.2	*Apium graveolens L.* >> Celeriac Group	6
8	*Asparagus officinalis L.* – Asparagus	7
9.1	*Beta vulgaris L.* >> Garden beet Group (beetroot, including Cheltenham beet)	7
10.10	*Brassica oleracea L.* >> Tronchuda Group (Portuguese cabbage)	7
10.1	*Brassica oleracea L.* >> Kale Group	7
10.2	*Brassica oleracea L.* >> Cauliflower Group	7
10.3	*Brassica oleracea L.* >> Broccoli Group (calabrese type and sprouting type)	9
10.4	*Brassica oleracea L.* >> Brussels sprouts Group	9
10.6	*Brassica oleracea L.* >> Capitata Group – White cabbage	9
10.7	*Brassica oleracea L.* >> Capitata Group – Red cabbage	10
11.1	*Brassica rapa L.* >> Chinese cabbage Group	11
11.2	*Brassica rapa L.* >> Vegetable turnip Group	11
12	*Capsicum annuum L.* – Chili, Pepper	11
13	*Cichorium endivia L.*	18
14.1	*Cichorium intybus L.* >> Witloof chicory Group	19
14.2	*Cichorium intybus L.* >>Leaf chicory Group (Large-leaved chicory or Italian chicory)	19
14.3	*Cichorium intybus L.* >> Industrial chicory Group	19
15	*Citrullus lanatus (Thunb.) Matsum. et Nakai* – Watermelon	20
16	*Cucumis melo L.* – Melon	21
17.1	*Cucumis sativus L.* >> Cucumber Group	25
17.2	*Cucumis sativus L.* >> Gherkin Group	26
18	*Cucurbita Maxima Duchesne* – Gourd	27
19	*Cucurbita pepo L.* – Marrow / Courgette	27
21	*Daucus carota L.* >> Carrot and fodder carrot	30
21.1	*Daucus carota L.* >> Carrot	31
22	*Foeniculum vulgare Miller* – Fennel - Azoricum Group	31
23	*Lactuca sativa L.* – Lettuce	32
24	*Lycopersicon esculentum Mill.* – Tomato	42
25	*Petroselinum crispum (Mill.) Nyman ex A. W. Hill* – Leaf parsley and root parsley Group	54
27.1	*Phaseolus vulgaris L.* >> Dwarf French bean Group	54
27.2	*Phaseolus vulgaris L.* >> Climbing French bean Group	55
28.1	*Pisum sativum L. (partim)* >> Wrinkled pea Group	56
28.2	*Pisum sativum L. (partim)* >> Round pea Group	56
28.3	*Pisum sativum L. (partim)* >> Sugar pea Group	56
29.1	*Raphanus sativus L.* >> Radish Group	57
29.2	*Raphanus sativus L.* >> Black radish Group	57
32	*Solanum melongena L.* – Aubergine / Egg plant	57
33	*Spinacia oleracea L.* – Spinach	58
34	*Valerianella locusta (L.) Laterr.* – Corn salad / Lamb's lettuce	61
35	*Vicia faba L. (partim)* – Broad bean	61
36.1	*Zea mays L. (partim)* >> Sweet corn Group	61
37.2	*Cucurbita maxima Duch. x C. moschata Duch.*	62
37.4	*Solanum lycopersicum L. x S. habrochaites*	62

1.1 *Allium cepa L.* >> Aggregatum Group – Shallot

Davidor		**del.**
Davidor	NL 8 a	(del.)

Grisor		**mod.**
Grisor	FR S9504 a	(mod.)

Innovator		**del.**
Innovator	NL 8 a	(del.)

1.2 *Allium cepa L.* >> Cepa Group – Onion, Echalion

Aglaia		**add.**
Aglaia	PL 1277 a	(add.)

Archangel		**add.**
Archangel	PL 1261 a	(add.)

Augusta		**mod.**
Augusta	PL 1040|1087 a	(mod.)
Augusta	CZ 000 a	

BB ALO 0811		**add.**
BB ALO 0811	PL 994 a	(add.)

Baragan		**add.**
Baragan	PL 994 a	(add.)

Boston		**del.**
Boston	NL 105 b	(del.)

Cordelia		**add.**
Cordelia	PL 1277 a	(add.)

Friso		**del.**
Friso	NL 105 b	(del.)

1.2 Allium cepa L. >> Cepa Group – Onion, Echalion

Frontera		**del.**
Frontera	NL 425 b	(del.)

Goldbank		**add.**
Goldbank	PL 1040 a	(add.)

Goldriver		**add.**
Goldriver	PL 1040 a	(add.)

Goldstone		**add.**
Goldstone	PL 1040 a	(add.)

Hummer		**add.**
Hummer	BG 25 b	(add.)

Imperatriz		**del.**
Imperatriz	NL 78a b	(del.)

Jack		**mod.**
Jack	FR S14502 a	(mod.)

Kendra		**add.**
Kendra	PT 384 b	(add.)

Keravel		**mod.**
Keravel	FR S14502 a	(mod.)

Kutnowska		**add.**
Kutnowska	PL 1173 a	(add.)

Labrador		**add.**
Labrador	PL 1040 a	(add.)

Matilda		**del.**
Matilda	NL 425 b	(del.)

Montneige		**del.**
Montneige	NL 78 b	(del.)

Red Comet		**del.**
Red Comet	NL 78 b	(del.)

Redkeep		**del.**
Redkeep	NL 78 b	(del.)

Revolution		**add.**
Revolution	NL 8 a	(add.)

Reyana		**add.**
Reyana	PL 1277 a	(add.)

Rolex		**del.**
Rolex	NL 31 b	(del.)

SV2657NK		**del.**
SV2657NK	NL 78a b	(del.)

Shakespeare 200		**add.**
Shakespeare 200	NL 246 a	(add.)

Suleika		**add.**
Suleika	PL 1277 a	(add.)

Thespion		**mod.**
Thespion	EL 000 a	(mod.) Conservation Variety=Yes Region of Origin=Prefecture of Viotia

1.2 Allium cepa L. >> Cepa Group – Onion, Echalion

Toli		**mod.**
Toli	FR S11629 a	(mod.)

2 *Allium fistulosum L.* – Japanese bunching onion, Welsh onion

Sparky		**add.**
Sparky	NL 1133 a	(add.)

4 *Allium sativum L.* – Garlic

Arkus		**mod.**
Arkus	PL 1087|92 a	(mod.) Vegetative Propagation=Yes

Harnaś		**mod.**
Harnaś	PL 1087|92 a	(mod.) Vegetative Propagation=Yes

Silvia Prima		**add.**
Silvia Prima	PL 1258 a	(add.) Conservation Variety=Yes Region of Origin= woj. kujawsko-pomorskie \ woj. łódzkie \ woj. mazowieckie \ woj. świętokrzyskie \ woj. wielkopolskie

7.1 *Apium graveolens L.* >> Celery Group

Enterprise		**add.**
Enterprise	NL 439 a	(add.)

Laboni		**del.**
Laboni	NL 108 b	(del.)

7.2 *Apium graveolens L.* >> Celeriac Group

Ibis		**mod.**
Ibis	NL 274 b	(del.)
Ibis	DE 8147 a	

Planeta		**add.**
Planeta	BG 16 b	(add.)

8 *Asparagus officinalis L.* – Asparagus

Purple Passion		**del.**
Purple Passion	NL 12 b	(del.)

9.1 *Beta vulgaris L.* >> Garden beet Group (beetroot, including Cheltenham beet)

Burpees Golden		**add.**
Burpees Golden	CZ 1187 a	(add.)

Nochowski		**mod.**
Nochowski	PL 1173|92 a	(mod.)

Okrągły Regulski		**add.**
Okrągły Regulski	CZ 682 a	(add.)

Privilege		**add.**
Privilege	PL 1261 a	(add.)

Red Karo		**add.**
Red Karo	PL 1040 a	(add.)

10.10 *Brassica oleracea L.* >> Tronchuda Group (Portuguese cabbage)

Esperança		**del.**
Esperança	NL 8 b	(del.)

10.1 *Brassica oleracea L.* >> Kale Group

White Flame		**add.**
White Flame	NL 1145 a	(add.)

10.2 *Brassica oleracea L.* >> Cauliflower Group

Agility		**del.**
Agility	NL 26 b	(del.)

Armorique		**del.**
Armorique	NL 26 b	(del.)

Azeris		**add.**
Azeris	FR S15200 a	(add.)

10.2 Brassica oleracea L. >> Cauliflower Group

Campohana		**add.**
Campohana	NL 108 b	(add.)

Clasic		**add.**
Clasic	NL 79 a	(add.)

Diben		**add.**
Diben	FR S14502 a	(add.)

Dionis		**mod.**
Dionis	FR S15200 a	(mod.)

Icerok		**add.**
Icerok	FR S15050 a	(add.)

Lisboa		**add.**
Lisboa	FR S15350 a	(add.)

Longton		**add.**
Longton	FR S15350 a	(add.)

Nairobi		**add.**
Nairobi	FR S15350 a	(add.)

Pontblanc		**add.**
Pontblanc	NL 108 b	(add.)

Siria		**del.**
Siria	HR 243 a	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026

Vedis		**mod.**
Vedis	FR S15200 a	(mod.)

10.2 Brassica oleracea L. >> Cauliflower Group

Whitaker		**add.**
Whitaker	NL 108 b	(add.)

10.3 *Brassica oleracea L.* >> Broccoli Group (calabrese type and sprouting type)

Aquiles		**mod.**
Aquiles	FR S8706 a	(mod.)

Chronos		**mod.**
Chronos	FR S8706 a	(mod.)

Grandisimo		**del.**
Grandisimo	NL 78 b	(del.)

Ovation		**del.**
Ovation	NL 78 b	(del.)

Sun King		**add.**
Sun King	NL 728 a	(add.) Amateur Variety=Yes

10.4 *Brassica oleracea L.* >> Brussels sprouts Group

Brest		**del.**
Brest	NL 105 b	(del.)

10.6 *Brassica oleracea L.* >> Capitata Group – White cabbage

Autumn Baron		**add.**
Autumn Baron	CZ 1275 a	(add.)

Balashi		**add.**
Balashi	PL 994 a	(add.)

Dallas		**add.**
Dallas	CZ 1275 a	(add.)

10.6 Brassica oleracea L. >> Capitata Group – White cabbage

Dolmas		**add.**
Dolmas	CZ 1266 a	(add.)

Green Sapphire		**add.**
Green Sapphire	PL 928 a	(add.)

Judge		**del.**
Judge	HR 243 a	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026

KBN106		**add.**
KBN106	PL 1282 a	(add.)

KBN117		**add.**
KBN117	PL 1282 a	(add.)

KBN118		**add.**
KBN118	PL 1282 a	(add.)

Paltar		**del.**
Paltar	NL 78 b	(del.)

Queen		**add.**
Queen	BG 25 b	(add.)

Summergreen		**del.**
Summergreen	NL 78 b	(del.)

10.7 *Brassica oleracea L.* >> Capitata Group – Red cabbage

Zelox		**del.**
Zelox	NL 78 b	(del.)

11.1 *Brassica rapa L.* >> Chinese cabbage Group

Veraflex		**add.**
Veraflex	PL 1266 a	(add.)

11.2 *Brassica rapa L.* >> Vegetable turnip Group

Noir long		**mod.**
Noir long	FR b	(mod.)

Rouge plat hâtif à feuille entière		**mod.**
Rouge plat hâtif à feuille entière	FR a	(mod.)
Rouge plat hâtif à feuille entière	BE 000	

Scarlet Queen Red Stem		**mod.**
Scarlet Queen Red Stem	FR S11516 b	(mod.) Amateur Variety=Yes

12 *Capsicum annuum L.* – Chili, Pepper

Aderans		**add.**
Aderans	NL 108 a	(add.)

Alessandro		**add.**
Alessandro	NL 60 a	(add.)

Andekha		**add.**
Andekha	BG 15 b	(add.)

Ares		**add.**
Ares	BG 15 b	(add.)

Arlequin		**mod.**
Arlequin	HR 243 a	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026
Arlequin	FR S15050 a	

Aveda		**mod.**
Aveda	EL 21 b	(mod.)

12 Capsicum annuum L. – Chili, Pepper

Basalt		**add.**
Basalt	FR S15050 a	(add.)

Beered		**add.**
Beered	PL 286 a	(add.)

Break		**add.**
Break	CZ 1463 a	(add.)

CBA 500		**add.**
CBA 500	PL 1022 a	(add.)

Cabole		**del.**
Cabole	NL 79 b	(del.)

Carmelo		**del.**
Carmelo	NL 26 b	(del.)

Catriona		**del.**
Catriona	NL 26 b	(del.)

Corrado		**del.**
Corrado	NL 304 b	(del.)

Cremina		**add.**
Cremina	CZ 1187 a	(add.)

Cupra		**del.**
Cupra	NL 26 b	(del.)

Danubius		**del.**
Danubius	FR S12893 a	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026

Doux très long des Landes		**mod.**
Doux très long des Landes	FR S15050|S9676 b	(mod.)

E 420088		**del.**
E 420088	NL 26 b	(del.)

E 490264		**del.**
E 490264	NL 26 b	(del.)

Elegia		**add.**
Elegia	PL 286 a	(add.)

GALIKA		**add.**
GALIKA	NL 108 a	(add.)

Gaia		**mod.**
Gaia	EL 21 b	(mod.)

Gepard		**del.**
Gepard	NL 79 b	(del.)

Gorria		**mod.**
Gorria	FR S11879 a	(mod.)

Guadalupe		**add.**
Guadalupe	BG 15 b	(add.)

Gypsy		**mod.**
Gypsy	FR S13853 a	(mod.)

Hawker		**del.**
Hawker	NL 108 b	(del.)

12 Capsicum annuum L. – Chili, Pepper

Hungarian sweet wax		**add.**
Hungarian sweet wax	CZ 1187 a	(add.)

Jabana		**add.**
Jabana	NL 79 a	(add.)

Jalapeno M		**mod.**
Jalapeno M	CZ 1187 a	(add.)
Jalapeno M	NL 65 b	Amateur Variety=Yes

Kaiser		**del.**
Kaiser	NL 78 b	(del.)

Kaite		**del.**
Kaite	NL 26 b	(del.)

Karpex		**del.**
Karpex	NL 78 b	(del.)

Krakos		**add.**
Krakos	NL 60 a	(add.)

Laerte		**del.**
Laerte	NL 26 b	(del.)

Lamuyo		**mod.**
Lamuyo	FR S15200 b	(mod.)
Lamuyo	ES 2082 b	

Lazuli		**add.**
Lazuli	NL 108 a	(add.)

Lesley		**del.**
Lesley	NL 73 b	(del.)

Lionello		**mod.**
Lionello	FR S15200 a	(mod.)

Maravilla		**del.**
Maravilla	NL 78 b	(del.)

Miyabi		**del.**
Miyabi	NL 79 b	(del.)

Moonwalk		**del.**
Moonwalk	NL 108 b	(del.)

Nestor		**del.**
Nestor	NL 78 b	(del.)

PFHO340030		**add.**
PFHO340030	PL 1209 a	(add.)

PFHR340010		**add.**
PFHR340010	PL 1209 a	(add.)

PFHY340020		**add.**
PFHY340020	PL 1209 a	(add.)

PPGO310030		**add.**
PPGO310030	PL 1209 a	(add.)

PPGR310010		**add.**
PPGR310010	PL 1209 a	(add.)

12 Capsicum annuum L. – Chili, Pepper

Pablo		**add.**
Pablo	BG 15 b	(add.)

Palermo Rock		**add.**
Palermo Rock	NL 108 a	(add.)

Palette		**mod.**
Palette	EL 21 b	(mod.)

Petit marseillais		**mod.**
Petit marseillais	FR S8057 a	(mod.)

Praktica		**del.**
Praktica	NL 108 b	(del.)

Primula		**add.**
Primula	PL 286 a	(add.)

Pritavit		**del.**
Pritavit	NL 78 b	(del.)

Puncho		**add.**
Puncho	BG 36 b	(add.)

Ramiro		**mod.**
Ramiro	FR S13853 a	(mod.)

Rimal		**add.**
Rimal	BG 36 b	(add.)

SV9687PH		**del.**
SV9687PH	NL 78 b	(del.)

SV9702PP		**del.**
SV9702PP	NL 78a b	(del.)

Salonikas		**add.**
Salonikas	NL 60 a	(add.)

Sciscitou		**add.**
Sciscitou	CZ 1552 a	(add.)

Silverstone		**add.**
Silverstone	NL 108 a	(add.)

Smile		**add.**
Smile	CZ 1463 a	(add.)

Spencer		**add.**
Spencer	NL 108 a	(add.)

Sromboli		**del.**
Sromboli	BG 35 b	(del.)

Stromboli		**add.**
Stromboli	BG 35 b	(add.)

Sucette de Provence		**add.**
Sucette de Provence	FR 12645 a	(add.)

Taco		**add.**
Taco	PL 1261 a	(add.)

Tempest		**del.**
Tempest	NL 108 b	(del.)

12 Capsicum annuum L. – Chili, Pepper

Terence		**add.**
Terence	BG 15 b	(add.)

Thanos		**add.**
Thanos	BG 15 b	(add.)

Trinidad		**add.**
Trinidad	CZ 1266 a	(add.)

Troofle		**add.**
Troofle	NL 108 a	(add.)

Tsarska kapia		**add.**
Tsarska kapia	BG 16 b	(add.)

Tweety		**del.**
Tweety	NL 26 b	(del.)

Ténor		**add.**
Ténor	FR S8057 a	(add.)

Yellowstone		**del.**
Yellowstone	NL 26 b	(del.)

Zino		**add.**
Zino	BG 36 b	(add.)

13 *Cichorium endivia L.*

Allure		**del.**
Allure	NL 26 b	(del.)

Fucines		**del.**
Fucines	NL 79 b	(del.)

13 Cichorium endivia L.

Pirales		**del.**
Pirales	NL 79 b	(del.)

Rizaleta		**del.**
Rizaleta	NL 26 b	(del.)

Robbie		**del.**
Robbie	NL 79 b	(del.)

Sonari		**del.**
Sonari	NL 26 b	(del.)

14.1 *Cichorium intybus L.* >> Witloof chicory Group

Ombline		**mod.**
Ombline	FR S15200 a	(mod.)

Passion		**mod.**
Passion	FR a	(mod.)

Selkis		**mod.**
Selkis	FR a	(mod.)

Tobix		**add.**
Tobix	NL 108 b	(add.)

14.2 *Cichorium intybus L.* >>Leaf chicory Group (Large-leaved chicory or Italian chicory)

Agrio Kokkino		**add.**
Agrio Kokkino	BG 3 b	(add.)

14.3 *Cichorium intybus L.* >> Industrial chicory Group

Coveline		**add.**
Coveline	FR S8444 a	(add.)

Dolomine		**add.**
Dolomine	FR S8444 a	(add.)

14.3 Cichorium intybus L. >> Industrial chicory Group

Okeus		**add.**
Okeus	FR S12769 a	(add.)

15 *Citrullus lanatus (Thunb.) Matsum. et Nakai* – Watermelon

Alto		**add.**
Alto	BG 36 b	(add.)

BB CWA 0935		**add.**
BB CWA 0935	PL 994 a	(add.)

Crimson Sweet		**mod.**
Crimson Sweet	CZ 1187 a	(add.)
Crimson Sweet	ES 31 b	
Crimson Sweet	IT 000 b	
Crimson Sweet	NL 000 b	

Gioiosa		**add.**
Gioiosa	PL 1261 a	(add.)

Kamelia		**add.**
Kamelia	BG 15 b	(add.)

Pilar		**add.**
Pilar	ES 10 b	(add.)

Prios		**add.**
Prios	BG 36 b	(add.)

Red Comet		**del.**
Red Comet	NL 60 a	(del.)

Red Sweet		**del.**
Red Sweet	NL 78 b	(del.)

15 Citrullus lanatus (Thunb.) Matsum. et Nakai – Watermelon

Regalo		**mod.**
Regalo	EL 18 a	(mod.)

Rhiana		**add.**
Rhiana	ES 10 b	(add.)

SS 009		**add.**
SS 009	CZ 1553 a	(add.)

Safrane		**add.**
Safrane	PL 1277 a	(add.)

Super Roth		**add.**
Super Roth	BG 36 b	(add.)

Talesia		**add.**
Talesia	PL 1277 a	(add.)

Wizard		**add.**
Wizard	BG 36 b	(add.)

16 *Cucumis melo L.* – Melon

Akela		**add.**
Akela	BG 15 b	(add.)

Ancestral		**del.**
Ancestral	NL 26 b	(del.)

Arapaho		**mod.**
Arapaho	FR S12567 a	(mod.)
Arapaho	NL 79 b	

Arenales		**del.**
Arenales	NL 26 b	(del.)

16 Cucumis melo L. – Melon

Calipso		**del.**
Calipso	HR 243 a	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026

Canopia		**mod.**
Canopia	FR S13112 a	(mod.) Market extension date=30/06/2026

Dalton		**del.**
Dalton	FR S13112 a	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026

Diabolo		**mod.**
Diabolo	FR S15200 a	(mod.)

Donar		**del.**
Donar	NL 108 b	(del.)

ESM 190814		**add.**
ESM 190814	ES 10 b	(add.)

Edecos		**mod.**
Edecos	FR S13853 a	(mod.)

Etika		**del.**
Etika	NL 26 b	(del.)

Festibel		**mod.**
Festibel	FR S13112 a	(mod.)

Fonzy		**del.**
Fonzy	NL 78 b	(del.)

Freeda		**add.**
Freeda	BG 36 b	(add.)

Giasone		**del.**
Giasone	NL 26 b	(del.)

Gioviale		**del.**
Gioviale	NL 78a b	(del.)

Kenavo		**del.**
Kenavo	NL 26 b	(del.)

Limal		**del.**
Limal	NL 108 b	(del.)

MA7902		**mod.**
MA7902	FR a	(mod.)

MAB79001		**del.**
MAB79001	FR S13112 a	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026

MB 17415		**del.**
MB 17415	FR S13112 a	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026

MC 18 2000		**mod.**
MC 18 2000	FR S13112 a	(mod.)

MC 18 2001		**mod.**
MC 18 2001	FR S13112 a	(mod.)

Melvel		**add.**
Melvel	NL 60 a	(add.)

Monique		**add.**
Monique	ES 10 b	(add.)

16 Cucumis melo L. – Melon

Nevour		**mod.**
Nevour	FR S15200 a	(mod.)

Nun 5156		**del.**
Nun 5156	FR S13112 a	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026

Plato		**add.**
Plato	BG 36 b	(add.)

Polinyka		**mod.**
Polinyka	FR S13853 a	(mod.)

Salmeron		**del.**
Salmeron	NL 108 b	(del.)

Sveglio		**del.**
Sveglio	NL 78a b	(del.)

Tango		**add.**
Tango	BG 36 b	(add.)

Tatlistar		**del.**
Tatlistar	NL 26 b	(del.)

Tracey		**del.**
Tracey	NL 26 b	(del.)

Waksone		**mod.**
Waksone	FR S13112 a	(mod.)

Yelostone		**del.**
Yelostone	FR S13112 a	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026

Alanis		**del.**
Alanis	NL 108 b	(del.)

Amaluna		**del.**
Amaluna	NL 26 b	(del.)

Bonifacio		**del.**
Bonifacio	NL 108 b	(del.)

Dee Host		**del.**
Dee Host	NL 26 b	(del.)

Electric		**add.**
Electric	CZ 1266 a	(add.)

Jardi		**del.**
Jardi	CZ 1191 a	(del.)

Kung Fu		**del.**
Kung Fu	NL 26 b	(del.)

Laureen		**del.**
Laureen	NL 108 b	(del.)

Mahour		**add.**
Mahour	ES 10 a	(add.)

Minotaurus		**mod.**
Minotaurus	FR a	(mod.)

Stelvio		**del.**
Stelvio	NL 108 b	(del.)

17.1 Cucumis sativus L. >> Cucumber Group

Stockeu		**del.**
Stockeu	NL 108 b	(del.)

Sudica		**del.**
Sudica	NL 79 b	(del.)

Urus		**add.**
Urus	BG 13 b	(add.)

17.2 *Cucumis sativus L.* >> Gherkin Group

Aljibe		**add.**
Aljibe	ES 10 a	(add.)

Alpita		**del.**
Alpita	NL 60 b	(del.)

Bond		**add.**
Bond	PL 92 a	(add.)

Chorus		**add.**
Chorus	PL 286 a	(add.)

Koko		**add.**
Koko	BG 36 b	(add.)

Lokata		**add.**
Lokata	PL 1087 a	(add.)

Lokus		**add.**
Lokus	PL 92 a	(add.)

Sigurd		**del.**
Sigurd	NL 26 b	(del.)

17.2 Cucumis sativus L. >> Gherkin Group

Troyara		**add.**
Troyara	NL 108 a	(add.)

Vero		**add.**
Vero	BG 36 b	(add.)

18 *Cucurbita Maxima Duchesne* – Gourd

Bambino		**mod.**
Bambino	PL 1173|286|92 a	(mod.)
Bambino	CZ 682 a	

Rugby		**add.**
Rugby	CZ 239 a	(add.)

19 *Cucurbita pepo L.* – Marrow / Courgette

Aeolos		**add.**
Aeolos	PT 838 b	(add.)

Anissa		**mod.**
Anissa	FR S15200 a	(mod.)

Astra Polka		**mod.**
Astra Polka	PL 1173|286 a	(mod.)

Aurore		**mod.**
Aurore	FR S15200 a	(mod.)

Broncos		**add.**
Broncos	NL 79 a	(add.)

Cardano		**add.**
Cardano	NL 79 a	(add.)

Cassiopee		**mod.**
Cassiopee	FR S12821 a	(mod.)

19 Cucurbita pepo L. – Marrow / Courgette

Celiena		**add.**
Celiena	NL 79 a	(add.)

Cora		**mod.**
Cora	HR 243 a	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026
Cora	FR S15050 a	

Darling		**add.**
Darling	NL 79 a	(add.)

Ebano		**del.**
Ebano	NL 26 b	(del.)

Edison		**del.**
Edison	NL 100 b	(del.)

Everglade		**add.**
Everglade	NL 79 a	(add.)

Giotto		**add.**
Giotto	PL 1261 a	(add.)

Goldena		**mod.**
Goldena	CZ 682|1495 a	(mod.)

Homero		**add.**
Homero	NL 79 a	(add.)

Ice Ball		**mod.**
Ice Ball	FR a	(mod.)

Karmen		**add.**
Karmen	BG 15 b	(add.)

19 Cucurbita pepo L. – Marrow / Courgette

Lantern		**add.**
Lantern	BG 36 b	(add.)

Meridio		**add.**
Meridio	BG 15 b	(add.)

Nevira		**mod.**
Nevira	FR S15200 a	(mod.)

Okapi		**add.**
Okapi	PL 286 a	(add.)

Paros		**add.**
Paros	NL 79 a	(add.)

Patroklos		**add.**
Patroklos	PT 838 b	(add.)

Pattymat		**add.**
Pattymat	PT 462 b	(add.)

Picasso		**add.**
Picasso	PL 1261 a	(add.)

SV1118YG		**del.**
SV1118YG	NL 78a b	(del.)

SV8655YL		**del.**
SV8655YL	NL 78a b	(del.)

SV9480YG		**del.**
SV9480YG	NL 78 b	(del.)

19 Cucurbita pepo L. – Marrow / Courgette

Salzillo		**add.**
Salzillo	ES 10 b	(add.)

Sawa		**add.**
Sawa	PL 286 a	(add.)

Sirio		**add.**
Sirio	PL 1261 a	(add.)

Sofia		**mod.**
Sofia	HR 243 a	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026
Sofia	FR S15050 a	

Spooktacular		**del.**
Spooktacular	NL 78 b	(del.)

Tendor		**mod.**
Tendor	FR S15200 a	(mod.)

Tuba		**add.**
Tuba	BG 36 b	(add.)

21 *Daucus carota L.* >> Carrot and fodder carrot

Amsterdam 3		**mod.**
Amsterdam 3	CZ 682 a	(add.)
Amsterdamse Bak 3	NL 000 b	
Amsterdam 3	PL 761 a	

Fortedo		**add.**
Fortedo	FR S15200 a	(add.)

Karotan		**mod.**
Karotan	CZ 682 a	(add.)
Karotan	NL 108 b	

21 Daucus carota L. >> Carrot and fodder carrot

Myrna		**del.**
Myrna	NL 78 b	(del.)

Nantes 2		**add.**
Nantes 2	CZ 682 a	(add.)

Silvano		**mod.**
Silvano	FR S15200 a	(mod.)

Soprano		**mod.**
Soprano	FR S15200 a	(mod.)

21.1 *Daucus carota L.* >> Carrot

Lanceros		**add.**
Lanceros	PL 1261 a	(add.)

22 *Foeniculum vulgare Miller* – Fennel - Azoricum Group

Archimede		**del.**
Archimede	NL 78 b	(del.)

Géant Mammouth perfection		**add.**
Géant Mammouth perfection	FR b	(add.)

Nettuno		**add.**
Nettuno	BG 22 b	(add.)

Odino		**add.**
Odino	PL 1261 a	(add.)

Pitagora		**del.**
Pitagora	NL 78 b	(del.)

Pompeo		**del.**
Pompeo	NL 78 b	(del.)

23 *Lactuca sativa L.* – Lettuce

Abago		**del.**
Abago	NL 108 b	(del.)

Aberin		**add.**
Aberin	NL 108 a	(add.)

Acula		**del.**
Acula	NL 26 b	(del.)

Adara		**del.**
Adara	NL 60 b	(del.)

Agros		**del.**
Agros	NL 60 b	(del.)

Albenitez		**add.**
Albenitez	NL 26 a	(add.)

Alesso		**del.**
Alesso	NL 26 b	(del.)

Aletta		**del.**
Aletta	NL 108 b	(del.)

Alfon		**add.**
Alfon	NL 26 a	(add.)

Alfonsina		**add.**
Alfonsina	NL 26 a	(add.)

Alpera		**add.**
Alpera	NL 26 a	(add.)

Andrade		**del.**
Andrade	NL 26 b	(del.)

Anesca		**add.**
Anesca	NL 26 a	(add.)

Antartica		**mod.**
Antartica	FR S15200 a	(mod.)

Antigua		**del.**
Antigua	NL 78 b	(del.)

Apache		**del.**
Apache	NL 108 a	(del.)

Aspirina		**add.**
Aspirina	NL 79 a	(add.)

Augita		**add.**
Augita	NL 108 a	(add.)

Aviatore		**del.**
Aviatore	NL 79 b	(del.)

Balboa		**add.**
Balboa	FR S15200 a	(add.)

Batblond		**del.**
Batblond	NL 26 b	(del.)

Batdark		**del.**
Batdark	NL 26 b	(del.)

23 Lactuca sativa L. – Lettuce

Bonispy		**del.**
Bonispy	NL 79 b	(del.)

Boyanas		**del.**
Boyanas	NL 108 b	(del.)

Brian		**del.**
Brian	NL 60 b	(del.)

Brondinas		**add.**
Brondinas	NL 108 a	(add.)

Brundle		**add.**
Brundle	NL 108 a	(add.)

Burela		**add.**
Burela	NL 108 a	(add.)

Calesita		**add.**
Calesita	NL 108 a	(add.)

Canavo		**del.**
Canavo	NL 26 b	(del.)

Casparo		**del.**
Casparo	NL 79 b	(del.)

Cayena		**del.**
Cayena	NL 79 b	(del.)

Celestial		**del.**
Celestial	NL 79 b	(del.)

Chandler		**del.**
Chandler	NL 60 b	(del.)

Chianti		**del.**
Chianti	NL 79 b	(del.)

Colai		**add.**
Colai	NL 108 a	(add.)

Colanzi		**add.**
Colanzi	NL 108 a	(add.)

Coraine		**add.**
Coraine	NL 108 a	(add.)

Ermita		**del.**
Ermita	NL 108 b	(del.)

Escale		**mod.**
Escale	FR S12821 a	(mod.)

Estelle		**del.**
Estelle	NL 60 b	(del.)

Exbul		**add.**
Exbul	NL 108 a	(add.)

Exframe		**add.**
Exframe	NL 108 a	(add.)

Flintoff		**add.**
Flintoff	NL 26 a	(add.)

23 Lactuca sativa L. – Lettuce

Floriantine		**add.**
Floriantine	NL 108 a	(add.)

Florine		**mod.**
Florine	HR 243 a	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026
Florine	FR S15050 a	

Funtime		**del.**
Funtime	NL 79 b	(del.)

Gennari		**del.**
Gennari	NL 60 b	(del.)

Gianella		**add.**
Gianella	NL 108 a	(add.)

Ginita		**add.**
Ginita	NL 79 a	(add.)

Gloire du Dauphiné		**mod.**
Gloire du Dauphiné	FR a	(mod.)

Hamlin		**add.**
Hamlin	NL 108 a	(add.)

Ice Callas		**del.**
Ice Callas	NL 79 b	(del.)

Kaylian		**add.**
Kaylian	NL 79 a	(add.)

Kigera		**add.**
Kigera	NL 108 a	(add.)

Kinesic		**add.**
Kinesic	NL 108 a	(add.)

Kingita		**del.**
Kingita	NL 79 b	(del.)

Klausia		**del.**
Klausia	NL 79 b	(del.)

La Brillante		**add.**
La Brillante	FR S12377 b	(add.) Amateur Variety=Yes

Lamberto		**del.**
Lamberto	NL 108 b	(del.)

Lavendria		**del.**
Lavendria	NL 108 b	(del.)

Lentenas		**add.**
Lentenas	NL 108 a	(add.)

Leotine		**del.**
Leotine	NL 108 b	(del.)

Lidetta		**del.**
Lidetta	NL 26 b	(del.)

Littlespy		**add.**
Littlespy	NL 79 a	(add.)

Lucchino		**add.**
Lucchino	NL 108 a	(add.)

23 Lactuca sativa L. – Lettuce

Lucita		**del.**
Lucita	NL 79 b	(del.)

Lysian		**del.**
Lysian	NL 79 b	(del.)

Mandelina		**del.**
Mandelina	NL 79 b	(del.)

Maraine		**del.**
Maraine	NL 108 b	(del.)

Masanas		**del.**
Masanas	NL 108 b	(del.)

Maïko		**add.**
Maïko	FR S15050 a	(add.)

Melibea		**del.**
Melibea	NL 108 b	(del.)

Mellita		**del.**
Mellita	NL 79 b	(del.)

Mislata		**del.**
Mislata	NL 108 b	(del.)

Murcina		**del.**
Murcina	NL 79 b	(del.)

Nagore		**del.**
Nagore	NL 79 b	(del.)

Paddington		**del.**
Paddington	NL 108 b	(del.)

Pamelita		**add.**
Pamelita	NL 108 a	(add.)

Papiro		**del.**
Papiro	NL 26 b	(del.)

Passion blonde à graine blanche		**mod.**
Passion blonde à graine blanche	FR b	(mod.)

Petrian		**add.**
Petrian	NL 79 a	(add.)

Pinatubo		**del.**
Pinatubo	NL 78 b	(del.)

Primice		**del.**
Primice	NL 79 b	(del.)

Quevedo		**del.**
Quevedo	NL 108 b	(del.)

Rabeau		**add.**
Rabeau	NL 108 a	(add.)

Ralove		**add.**
Ralove	NL 108 a	(add.)

Ralph		**del.**
Ralph	NL 108 b	(del.)

23 Lactuca sativa L. – Lettuce

Redfun		**del.**
Redfun	NL 79 b	(del.)

Redium		**del.**
Redium	NL 26 b	(del.)

Riccardo		**add.**
Riccardo	NL 79 a	(add.)

SV0967LB		**del.**
SV0967LB	NL 78a b	(del.)

SV3343LA		**del.**
SV3343LA	NL 78 b	(del.)

Scandinas		**add.**
Scandinas	NL 108 a	(add.)

Severo		**del.**
Severo	NL 26 b	(del.)

Sierra		**mod.**
Sierra	FR S15200 a	(mod.)

Socca		**mod.**
Socca	FR S12821 a	(mod.)

Soliflore		**del.**
Soliflore	NL 108 b	(del.)

Tantra		**del.**
Tantra	NL 26 b	(del.)

Tarraco		**del.**
Tarraco	NL 26 b	(del.)

Techal		**add.**
Techal	NL 60 a	(add.)

Valerina		**add.**
Valerina	NL 79 a	(add.)

Vargas		**del.**
Vargas	NL 108 b	(del.)

Vermekia		**del.**
Vermekia	NL 108 b	(del.)

Veronial		**add.**
Veronial	NL 79 a	(add.)

Victorhugo		**add.**
Victorhugo	NL 79 a	(add.)

Wavin		**del.**
Wavin	NL 108 b	(del.)

Weaverville		**del.**
Weaverville	NL 26 b	(del.)

Wengen		**del.**
Wengen	NL 108 b	(del.)

Xanstart		**add.**
Xanstart	NL 26 a	(add.)

23 Lactuca sativa L. – Lettuce

Xanxanext		**add.**
Xanxanext	NL 26 a	(add.)

Yiorice		**del.**
Yiorice	NL 79 b	(del.)

Zikita		**add.**
Zikita	NL 108 a	(add.)

24 *Lycopersicon esculentum Mill.* – Tomato

Agora		**mod.**
Agora	FR S15200 a	(mod.)

Amoreroz		**add.**
Amoreroz	BG 16 b	(add.)

Aretusa		**add.**
Aretusa	BG 13 b	(add.)

BTAO421015		**add.**
BTAO421015	PL 1209 a	(add.)

Babino chudo		**add.**
Babino chudo	BG 16 b	(add.)

Balkonstar		**del.**
Balkonstar	NL 274 b	(del.)

Barny		**add.**
Barny	BG 36 b	(add.)

Bernadine		**mod.**
Bernadine	FR a	(mod.)

Bivolsko sartse		**add.**
Bivolsko sartse	BG 121 b	(add.)

Bradia		**add.**
Bradia	BG 36 b	(add.)

Byalo sartse		**add.**
Byalo sartse	BG 16 b	(add.)

Calista		**del.**
Calista	FR S8618 a	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026

Calvente		**del.**
Calvente	NL 73 b	(del.)

Camparosa		**del.**
Camparosa	NL 26 b	(del.)

Carambola		**del.**
Carambola	NL 78a b	(del.)

Carmello		**mod.**
Carmello	FR S12567 a	(mod.)

Cayman		**add.**
Cayman	PL 1261 a	(add.)

Chroma		**add.**
Chroma	BG 36 b	(add.)

Cipro		**add.**
Cipro	BG 13 b	(add.)

24 Lycopersicon esculentum Mill. – Tomato

Cobra		**mod.**
Cobra	FR S15200 a	(mod.)
Cobra	ES 6390 a	

Coccinella		**add.**
Coccinella	CZ 1266 a	(add.)

Colibri		**mod.**
Colibri	HR 243 a	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026
Colibri	FR S15050 a	

Colossal		**del.**
Colossal	EL 18 a	(del.)

Compass		**add.**
Compass	PL 1261 a	(add.)

Costi		**add.**
Costi	BG 36 b	(add.)

Cyclade		**mod.**
Cyclade	FR S12821 a	(mod.)

DR7856TH		**del.**
DR7856TH	NL 78a b	(del.)

Danuxia		**add.**
Danuxia	NL 123 a	(add.)

Duci		**add.**
Duci	PT 841 b	(add.)

Elin Sweet		**add.**
Elin Sweet	PL 1119 a	(add.)

Enygma		**del.**
Enygma	NL 509 b	(del.)

Erika d'Australie		**mod.**
Erika d'Australie	FR b	(mod.) Amateur Variety=Yes

Ernest		**add.**
Ernest	BG 36 b	(add.)

Eurora		**add.**
Eurora	BG 36 b	(add.)

Feytor		**del.**
Feytor	NL 26a b	(del.)

Forty		**del.**
Forty	NL 79 b	(del.)

Fulvento		**add.**
Fulvento	NL 78a a	(add.)

Gaios		**add.**
Gaios	PT 838 b	(add.) Vegetative Propagation=Yes

Glitter		**add.**
Glitter	PT 841 b	(add.)

Godoria		**add.**
Godoria	PL 994 a	(add.)

24 Lycopersicon esculentum Mill. – Tomato

Gourmet Sweet		**add.**
Gourmet Sweet	PL 1119 a	(add.)

Granwest		**del.**
Granwest	NL 78a b	(del.)

HBDO410075		**add.**
HBDO410075	PL 1209 a	(add.)

HBDY410078		**add.**
HBDY410078	PL 1209 a	(add.)

HBVO410025		**add.**
HBVO410025	PL 1209 a	(add.)

Hardwin		**add.**
Hardwin	PL 1277 a	(add.)

Hazel		**add.**
Hazel	NL 89 b	(add.) Amateur Variety=Yes

Hector		**mod.**
Hector	HR 243 a	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026
Hector	FR S15050 a	

Heinz1014		**add.**
Heinz1014	PT 464 b	(add.)

Heinz2239		**add.**
Heinz2239	PT 464 b	(add.)

Heinz2247		**add.**
Heinz2247	PT 464 b	(add.)

Heinz2249		**add.**
Heinz2249	PT 464 b	(add.)

Hermione		**del.**
Hermione	NL 79 b	(del.)

Horizon		**add.**
Horizon	BG 36 b	(add.)

Irga		**add.**
Irga	PL 286 a	(add.)

Isiaki		**add.**
Isiaki	NL 79 a	(add.)

Journey		**add.**
Journey	NL 78a a	(add.)

Joyau d Oaxaca		**add.**
Joyau d Oaxaca	FR S12377 b	(add.) Amateur Variety=Yes

Juventino		**del.**
Juventino	NL 78a b	(del.)

KG279		**del.**
KG279	PT 37 b	(del.)

Krakus		**mod.**
Krakus	PL 1173|1087|92 a	(mod.)

24 Lycopersicon esculentum Mill. – Tomato

Kumara		**add.**
Kumara	PT 838 b	(add.)

Lennox		**add.**
Lennox	PT 122 b	(add.)

Leonisher		**add.**
Leonisher	NL 78a a	(add.)

Linnea		**del.**
Linnea	NL 78 b	(del.)

Lorely		**mod.**
Lorely	HR 243 a	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026
Lorely	FR S15050 a	

M100440100		**add.**
M100440100	PL 1209 a	(add.)

Mandaro		**add.**
Mandaro	NL 79 a	(add.)

Marguerite		**del.**
Marguerite	NL 78 b	(del.)

Minadoro		**add.**
Minadoro	ES 10 a	(add.)

Minilou		**mod.**
Minilou	FR S12821 a	(mod.)

Mirror		**add.**
Mirror	BG 15 b	(add.)

Mizo		**del.**
Mizo	NL 73 b	(del.)

Mozateco		**del.**
Mozateco	NL 26 b	(del.)

Murano		**mod.**
Murano	FR S15200 a	(mod.)

Naram		**del.**
Naram	NL 26 b	(del.)

Nettarino		**add.**
Nettarino	PT 841 b	(add.)

Nomdimba		**del.**
Nomdimba	NL 73 b	(del.)

Nopi		**add.**
Nopi	PT 838 b	(add.)

Nykos		**del.**
Nykos	NL 73 b	(del.)

PTCO450045		**add.**
PTCO450045	PL 1209 a	(add.)

PTYY450038		**add.**
PTYY450038	PL 1209 a	(add.)

Padrino		**del.**
Padrino	NL 26 b	(del.)

24 Lycopersicon esculentum Mill. – Tomato

Pako oranzh		**add.**
Pako oranzh	BG 34 b	(add.)

Paronema		**add.**
Paronema	NL 79 a	(add.)

Penelope		**add.**
Penelope	BG 15 b	(add.)

Phoenix		**del.**
Phoenix	NL 78 b	(del.)

Pullrex		**del.**
Pullrex	NL 78 b	(del.)

Purpurno rozovo sartse		**add.**
Purpurno rozovo sartse	BG 16 b	(add.)

Raksha		**add.**
Raksha	BG 15 b	(add.)

Rebelion		**mod.**
Rebelion	FR S15200 a	(mod.)

Renegade		**add.**
Renegade	PL 1261 a	(add.)

Rexy		**add.**
Rexy	BG 36 b	(add.)

Rhianna		**mod.**
Rhianna	FR S8706 a	(mod.)

Ribbon		**add.**
Ribbon	BG 35 b	(add.)

Rodiax		**add.**
Rodiax	NL 123 a	(add.)

Romulus		**add.**
Romulus	BG 35 b	(add.)

Rosamei		**add.**
Rosamei	ES 10 b	(add.)

Rovino		**add.**
Rovino	NL 79 a	(add.)

SV0610TC		**del.**
SV0610TC	NL 78a b	(del.)

SV7020TS		**del.**
SV7020TS	NL 78 b	(del.)

SV7844TH		**del.**
SV7844TH	NL 78a b	(del.)

Santella		**del.**
Santella	NL 100 b	(del.)

Satola		**del.**
Satola	NL 79 b	(del.)

Secolo		**del.**
Secolo	NL 78 b	(del.)

24 Lycopersicon esculentum Mill. – Tomato

Seduction		**del.**
Seduction	NL 79 b	(del.)

Sepide		**add.**
Sepide	BG 36 b	(add.)

Shokoladova chushka		**add.**
Shokoladova chushka	BG 16 b	(add.)

Shokoladovo sartse		**add.**
Shokoladovo sartse	BG 16 b	(add.)

Slonovo sartse		**add.**
Slonovo sartse	BG 16 b	(add.)

Spark		**add.**
Spark	BG 13 b	(add.)

TFMO520021		**add.**
TFMO520021	PL 1209 a	(add.)

TFRB520041		**add.**
TFRB520041	PL 1209 a	(add.)

TPFY430048		**add.**
TPFY430048	PL 1209 a	(add.)

TS501		**mod.**
TS501	FR S13112 a	(mod.)

TS503		**mod.**
TS503	FR S13112 a	(mod.)

TSDO475015		**add.**
TSDO475015	PL 1209 a	(add.)

Tastyno		**mod.**
Tastyno	FR S12821 a	(mod.)

Taurus		**add.**
Taurus	BG 13 b	(add.)

Teradion		**add.**
Teradion	NL 78a a	(add.)

Tinkite		**add.**
Tinkite	BG 15 b	(add.)

Tomamini Yellow		**add.**
Tomamini Yellow	NL 89 b	(add.) Amateur Variety=Yes

Topkapi		**mod.**
Topkapi	FR S15200 a	(mod.)

Trifilia		**del.**
Trifilia	NL 26 b	(del.)

Tyvelas		**del.**
Tyvelas	NL 26 b	(del.)

UG 6617		**add.**
UG 6617	PT 838 b	(add.)

Uzeda		**add.**
Uzeda	ES 10 b	(add.)

24 Lycopersicon esculentum Mill. – Tomato

VP1		**mod.**
VP1	FR S15200 a	(mod.)

Velocity		**del.**
Velocity	NL 26 b	(del.)

Vice		**add.**
Vice	BG 36 b	(add.)

Xarissa		**add.**
Xarissa	NL 123 a	(add.)

Yoga		**del.**
Yoga	NL 100 b	(del.)

25 *Petroselinum crispum (Mill.) Nyman ex A. W. Hill* – Leaf parsley and root parsley Group

Lenka Ożarowska		**add.**
Lenka Ożarowska	PL 1087 a	(add.)

Medici		**add.**
Medici	NL 742 a	(add.)

27.1 *Phaseolus vulgaris L.* >> Dwarf French bean Group

Cocobel		**mod.**
Cocobel	FR S15200 a	(mod.)

Delinel		**mod.**
Delinel	FR S15200 a	(mod.)
Delinel	CZ 1187 a	
Delinel	NL 65 b	

Nestos		**mod.**
Nestos	EL 76 a	(mod.)

27.1 Phaseolus vulgaris L. >> Dwarf French bean Group

Obraztsov chiflik 12		**add.**
Obraztsov chiflik 12	BG 4 a	(add.)

Oxinel		**mod.**
Oxinel	FR S15200 a	(mod.)

Polder		**mod.**
Polder	FR S15200 a	(mod.)

Rigalex		**mod.**
Rigalex	FR S15200 a	(mod.)

Rocdor		**mod.**
Rocdor	FR S15200 a	(mod.)
Rocdor	PL 1040 a	

Royal		**mod.**
Royal	FR S9676 a	(mod.)

Tonivert		**mod.**
Tonivert	FR S9676 a	(mod.)

Verdelys		**mod.**
Verdelys	FR S9676 a	(mod.)

Vilbel		**mod.**
Vilbel	FR S15200 a	(mod.)

27.2 *Phaseolus vulgaris L.* >> Climbing French bean Group

Alaric		**mod.**
Alaric	FR S11617 a	(mod.)

Fascine		**del.**
Fascine	NL 108 b	(del.)

27.2 Phaseolus vulgaris L. >> Climbing French bean Group

Sofia		**del.**
Sofia	NL 78a b	(del.)

28.1 *Pisum sativum L. (partim)* >> Wrinkled pea Group

Agami		**mod.**
Agami	FR S9676 a	(mod.)

Alexandra		**mod.**
Alexandra	FR S9676 a	(mod.)

Kelvil		**mod.**
Kelvil	FR S15200 a	(mod.)

Markana		**del.**
Markana	NL 274 b	(del.)

28.2 *Pisum sativum L. (partim)* >> Round pea Group

Alicia		**mod.**
Alicia	FR S9676 a	(mod.)

Bomba		**mod.**
Bomba	FR S15200 a	(mod.)

28.3 *Pisum sativum L. (partim)* >> Sugar pea Group

Carouby de Maussane		**mod.**
Carouby de Maussane	FR a	(mod.)
Carouby	IT 1412 b	
Carouby de Maussane	ES 6390 a	

Corne de bélier		**mod.**
Corne de bélier	FR S9676 b	(mod.)
Corne de bélier	BE 000	

29.1 *Raphanus sativus L.* >> Radish Group

De dix-huit jours		**mod.**
De dix-huit jours	FR S15200|S9676 b	(mod.)
De dix-huit jours	CZ 1187 a	

Fluo		**mod.**
Fluo	FR S15200 a	(mod.)

Rowa		**mod.**
Rowa	PL 1173|1087|286|92 a	(mod.)

29.2 *Raphanus sativus L.* >> Black radish Group

Hilds Blauer Herbst und Winter		**mod.**
Hilds Blauer Herbst und Winter	FR 45006|S11516 b	(mod.) Amateur Variety=Yes

32 *Solanum melongena L.* – Aubergine / Egg plant

Baladona		**add.**
Baladona	CZ 1275 a	(add.)

Baluroi		**mod.**
Baluroi	FR S15050|S15200|S9676 b	(mod.)

Beam		**add.**
Beam	BG 36 b	(add.)

Black Stream PC		**add.**
Black Stream PC	NL 134a a	(add.)

Bonica		**mod.**
Bonica	FR S15050|S15200|S9676 a	(mod.)
Bonica	ES 2082 b	

Ciclope		**add.**
Ciclope	PL 1261 a	(add.)

32 Solanum melongena L. – Aubergine / Egg plant

Galine		**mod.**
Galine	HR 243 a	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026
Galine	FR S15050 a	

Gloriana		**del.**
Gloriana	NL 26 b	(del.)

Picola		**mod.**
Picola	FR S15200 a	(mod.)

Puma		**add.**
Puma	BG 36 b	(add.)

SS 304		**add.**
SS 304	CZ 1553 a	(add.)

Vittoria		**add.**
Vittoria	CZ 1463 a	(add.)

33 *Spinacia oleracea L.* – Spinach

Apache		**del.**
Apache	NL 95a b	(del.)

Basalt		**add.**
Basalt	NL 743 a	(add.)

Brolga		**del.**
Brolga	NL 108 b	(del.)

Calisteo		**del.**
Calisteo	NL 60 b	(del.)

33 Spinacia oleracea L. – Spinach

Dolomite		**add.**
Dolomite	NL 743 a	(add.)

EL Futuro		**del.**
EL Futuro	NL 79 b	(del.)

El Caballo		**del.**
El Caballo	NL 79 b	(del.)

El Forte		**del.**
El Forte	NL 78 b	(del.)

Ganister		**add.**
Ganister	NL 743 a	(add.)

Hades		**del.**
Hades	NL 79 b	(del.)

Haku		**add.**
Haku	NL 743 a	(add.)

Kauai		**del.**
Kauai	NL 78 b	(del.)

Maya		**del.**
Maya	NL 95a b	(del.)

Onyx		**add.**
Onyx	NL 743 a	(add.)

Opal		**add.**
Opal	NL 743 a	(add.)

33 Spinacia oleracea L. – Spinach

PV-1022		**add.**
PV-1022	NL 743 a	(add.)

PV-1172		**add.**
PV-1172	NL 743 a	(add.)

PV-1367		**add.**
PV-1367	NL 743 a	(add.)

PV-1374		**add.**
PV-1374	NL 743 a	(add.)

PV-1715		**add.**
PV-1715	NL 743 a	(add.)

PV-1716		**add.**
PV-1716	NL 743 a	(add.)

PV-1717		**add.**
PV-1717	NL 743 a	(add.)

PV-1719		**add.**
PV-1719	NL 743 a	(add.)

PV-1721		**add.**
PV-1721	NL 743 a	(add.)

Quartz		**add.**
Quartz	NL 743 a	(add.)

SV1514VC		**del.**
SV1514VC	NL 78a b	(del.)

33 Spinacia oleracea L. – Spinach

Scorpius		**del.**
Scorpius	NL 60 b	(del.)

Skarne		**add.**
Skarne	NL 743 a	(add.)

Talc		**add.**
Talc	NL 743 a	(add.)

Tectonite		**add.**
Tectonite	NL 743 a	(add.)

34 *Valerianella locusta (L.) Laterr.* – Corn salad / Lamb's lettuce

Etap		**del.**
Etap	NL 274 b	(del.)

Granon		**del.**
Granon	NL 60 b	(del.)

35 *Vicia faba L. (partim)* – Broad bean

Carmana		**mod.**
Carmana	EL 71 a	(mod.)

The Sutton		**add.**
The Sutton	CZ 1187 a	(add.)

36.1 *Zea mays L. (partim)* >> Sweet corn Group

Bonanza		**mod.**
Bonanza	HR 243 a	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026
Bonanza	FR S15050 a	

Overland		**del.**
Overland	HR 99 a	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026

36.1 Zea mays L. (partim) >> Sweet corn Group

SF 2169		**add.**
SF 2169	ES 10 b	(add.)

SF 2186		**add.**
SF 2186	ES 10 b	(add.)

37.2 *Cucurbita maxima Duch. x C. moschata Duch.*

Bolt		**add.**
Bolt	CZ 239 a	(add.) Rootstock=Yes Rootstock Info=CUCUR_MMO

RM 703		**add.**
RM 703	CZ 1266 a	(add.) Rootstock=Yes Rootstock Info=CUCUR_MMO

RM 707		**add.**
RM 707	CZ 1266 a	(add.) Rootstock=Yes Rootstock Info=CUCUR_MMO

37.4 *Solanum lycopersicum L. x S. habrochaites*

Bandix		**add.**
Bandix	ES 10 b	(add.) Rootstock=Yes Rootstock Info=SOLAN_LHA

Body		**del.**
Body	NL 78 b	(del.) Rootstock=Yes Rootstock Info=SOLAN_LHA

Brigeor		**mod.**
Brigeor	FR S12821 b	(mod.)

Amtsblatt
der Europäischen Union

DE
Reihe C

C/2024/3531

7.6.2024

AUSFÜHRLICHE SITZUNGSBERICHTE VOM 28. NOVEMBER 2018

(C/2024/3531)

EUROPÄISCHES PARLAMENT

SITZUNGSPERIODE 2018-2019

Sitzungen vom 28. und 29. November 2018

BRÜSSEL

Inhalt

Seite

1. Wiederaufnahme der Sitzungsperiode 3
2. Eröffnung der Sitzung 3
3. Erklärung des Präsidenten 3
4. Genehmigung des Protokolls der vorangegangenen Sitzung: siehe Protokoll 3
5. Zusammensetzung des Parlaments: siehe Protokoll 4
6. Prüfung der Mandate: siehe Protokoll 4
7. Antrag auf Aufhebung der parlamentarischen Immunität: siehe Protokoll 4
8. Zusammensetzung der Ausschüsse und der Delegationen: siehe Protokoll 4
9. Verhandlungen vor der ersten Lesung des Parlaments (Artikel 69c GO): siehe Protokoll 4
10. Delegierte Rechtsakte (Artikel 105 Absatz 6 GO): siehe Protokoll 4
11. Durchführungsmaßnahmen (Artikel 106 GO): siehe Protokoll 4
12. Vorlage von Dokumenten: siehe Protokoll 4

Inhalt Seite

13. Anfragen zur mündlichen Beantwortung (Einreichung): siehe Protokoll 4

14. Weiterbehandlung der Standpunkte und Entschließungen des Parlaments: siehe Protokoll 4

15. Unterzeichnung von nach dem ordentlichen Gesetzgebungsverfahren angenommenen Rechtsakten (Artikel 78 GO) 4

16. Arbeitsplan 6

17. Aussprache mit dem dänischen Ministerpräsidenten Lars Løkke Rasmussen über die Zukunft Europas (Aussprache) 8

18. Strategie für die langfristige Verringerung der Treibhausgasemissionen der EU nach Maßgabe des Übereinkommens von Paris (Aussprache) 31

19. Binnenmarktpaket (Aussprache) 45

20. WTO: Wie geht es weiter? (Aussprache) 52

21. Zusammensetzung der Ausschüsse und Delegationen: siehe Protokoll 61

22. Bericht 2018 über Serbien (Aussprache) 61

23. Bericht 2018 über das Kosovo (Aussprache) 70

24. Begrüßung 78

25. Bericht 2018 über die ehemalige jugoslawische Republik Mazedonien (Aussprache) 78

26. Bericht 2018 über Albanien (Aussprache) 88

27. Bericht 2018 über Montenegro (Aussprache) 93

28. Schutz der akademischen Freiheit im auswärtigen Handeln der EU (Aussprache) 98

29. Ausführungen von einer Minute zu Fragen von politischer Bedeutung 102

30. Tagesordnung der nächsten Sitzung: siehe Protokoll 105

31. Schluss der Sitzung 105

AUSFÜHRLICHE SITZUNGSBERICHTE VOM 28. NOVEMBER 2018

PRESIDENZA DELL'ON. ANTONIO TAJANI

Presidente

1. Wiederaufnahme der Sitzungsperiode

Presidente. – Dichiaro ripresa la sessione del Parlamento europeo interrotta il 15 novembre 2018.

2. Eröffnung der Sitzung

(La seduta è aperta alle 15.02)

3. Erklärung des Präsidenten

Presidente. – Onorevoli colleghi, il 25 novembre 3 navi ucraine – un rimorchiatore e due navi da guerra – hanno tentato di passare lo stretto di Kerč' sulla rotta da Odessa a Mariupol; le autorità russe hanno impedito loro il passaggio. Il rimorchiatore è stato successivamente speronato da una nave militare di Mosca e la marina russa ha sparato contro le navi ucraine e le ha sequestrate; almeno 6 militari ucraini sono stati feriti e 23 sono stati arrestati. A seguito di questi eventi, l'Ucraina ha dichiarato la legge marziale in 10 regioni per un periodo di 30 giorni.

Di fronte a quest'ulteriore grave escalation delle tensioni nella regione, voglio esprimere tutta la nostra preoccupazione e ricordare che per noi l'integrità territoriale dell'Ucraina è fondamentale: la Russia non ha il diritto di impedire il passaggio delle imbarcazioni ucraine o di altri paesi verso il Mare di Azov e ha l'obbligo di rispettare la convezione delle Nazioni Unite sul diritto marittimo e l'accordo di cooperazione concluso con l'Ucraina nel 2003. Chiediamo quindi che le autorità russe si impegnino a garantire il rispetto dei loro obblighi e rilascino i militari ucraini che sono stati arrestati.

Nel mio incontro di ieri con il Presidente del parlamento ucraino, Andrij Parubij, ho tenuto ad assicurare che questo Parlamento segue con grande attenzione la vicenda e che farà tutto il possibile per facilitare una soluzione positiva. L'ho messo altresì al corrente della risoluzione che abbiamo adottato il 30 ottobre, nella quale si deplorano le azioni sproporzionate delle autorità russe nel Mare di Azov.

4. Genehmigung des Protokolls der vorangegangenen Sitzung: siehe Protokoll

5. Zusammensetzung des Parlaments: siehe Protokoll

6. Prüfung der Mandate: siehe Protokoll

7. Antrag auf Aufhebung der parlamentarischen Immunität: siehe Protokoll

8. Zusammensetzung der Ausschüsse und der Delegationen: siehe Protokoll

9. Verhandlungen vor der ersten Lesung des Parlaments (Artikel 69c GO): siehe Protokoll

10. Delegierte Rechtsakte (Artikel 105 Absatz 6 GO): siehe Protokoll

11. Durchführungsmaßnahmen (Artikel 106 GO): siehe Protokoll

12. Vorlage von Dokumenten: siehe Protokoll

13. Anfragen zur mündlichen Beantwortung (Einreichung): siehe Protokoll

14. Weiterbehandlung der Standpunkte und Entschließungen des Parlaments: siehe Protokoll

15. Unterzeichnung von nach dem ordentlichen Gesetzgebungsverfahren angenommenen Rechtsakten (Artikel 78 GO)

Presidente. – Comunico di aver proceduto, congiuntamente al Presidente del Consiglio, alla firma dei seguenti atti approvati secondo la procedura legislativa ordinaria:

— regolamento del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio relativo all'uso del sistema d'informazione Schengen per il rimpatrio di cittadini di paesi terzi il cui soggiorno è irregolare (00034/2018/LEX - C8-0485/2018 - 2016/0407(COD));

— regolamento del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio sull'istituzione, l'esercizio e l'uso del sistema d'informazione Schengen (SIS) nel settore delle verifiche di frontiera, che modifica la convenzione di applicazione dell'accordo di Schengen e abroga il regolamento (CE) n. 1987/2006 (00035/2018/LEX - C8-0486/2018 - 2016/0408(COD));

— regolamento del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio sull'istituzione, l'esercizio e l'uso del sistema d'informazione Schengen (SIS) nel settore della cooperazione di polizia e della cooperazione giudiziaria in materia penale, che modifica e abroga la decisione 2007/533/GAI del Consiglio e che abroga il regolamento (CE) n. 1986/2006 del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio e la decisione 2010/261/UE della Commissione (00036/2018/LEX - C8-0487/2018 - 2016/0409(COD)).

Philippe Lamberts (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, two days ago, in Estonia, a demonstration was organised by the parliamentary party, the Conservative People's Party of Estonia, in front of the Estonian Parliament. It was a protest against the United Nations migration compact, and our colleague, Indrek Tarand, wanted to address the floor with a different point of view from those of the organisers. He was violently taken off stage by the organisers, including members of the National Parliament of Estonia.

Democracy supposes that we can peacefully exchange different opinions, different points of view and different perspectives on society. What we try to strive for in Europe is for all this to be organised within the framework of democratic institutions and in a peaceful way. That was blatantly not the case on this occasion.

Therefore, I would like to request, Mr President, that you react to this. When, for any reason, a Member of Parliament is deprived of his right of free expression, especially by violent means, I think that you, as the President of our Parliament, have to react and to condemn these cases, especially when members of national parliaments are actively condoning that kind of violence.

(Applause)

Presidente. – Com'è avvenuto in passato, non mancherà la mia condanna e quella del Parlamento per gli atti di violenza nei confronti di parlamentari che siedono in questa Assemblea.

Prima di qualsiasi dichiarazione ufficiale – se fosse vero sarebbe un fatto molto grave – voglio avere una conferma ufficiale. Chiamerò l'ambasciata di questo Paese per chiedere conto di ciò che è accaduto e se mi verranno confermati i fatti – io credo alle sue parole ovviamente – protesterò formalmente con l'ambasciatore del Paese in questione. La informerò sull'esito di questi colloqui.

Jörg Meuthen (EFDD). – Herr Präsident! Es läge mir fern, Ihnen das Wort abschneiden zu wollen. Ich bitte um Entschuldigung.

Ich stütze mich auf Artikel 46 und 52 der Geschäftsordnung hinsichtlich der Entscheidung der Konferenz der Fraktionsvorsitzenden, ein zweites Verfahren über die humanitären Visa durchzuführen. Ich erinnere daran, dass der Initiativbericht über humanitäre Visa am Mittwoch, dem 14. November, mit demokratischer Mehrheit vom Plenum abgelehnt wurde.

Das war eine einwandfreie Prozedur und Abstimmung. Doch Demokratie gefällt einigen im Hause offenbar nur, wenn das gewünschte Ergebnis herauskommt. Die hausinterne grün-linke Lobby hat deswegen bewirkt, dass derselbe Vorschlag noch einmal in den Innenausschuss eingebracht werden darf. Ich frage Sie, Herr Präsident, zu welchem Ergebnis Sie hinsichtlich der Prüfung der Rechtsgrundlage des Vorschlages gelangt sind, zu der Sie nach Artikel 46 Absatz 2 verpflichtet sind? Können Sie zudem garantieren, dass das Verfahren im Ausschuss den Regeln der Geschäftsordnung entspricht, wenn das Verfahren schon im Dezember in Straßburg abgeschlossen werden soll?

Auf welcher Rechtsgrundlage geht es überhaupt, dass die Konferenz der Fraktionsvorsitzenden entscheidet, sich über ein Votum des Plenums hinwegzusetzen, um eine zweite Abstimmung zu einem bereits verworfenen Text anzuberaumen?

Ich frage: Welche Fraktionen haben dem zugestimmt und wie haben die PPE und die ECR in der Konferenz der Fraktionsvorsitzenden abgestimmt?

(Beifall)

Presidente. – Onorevole, non ha bisogno di informazioni da parte mia perché il presidente del suo gruppo ha partecipato come tutti i presidenti dei gruppi, quindi era perfettamente informato. Il suo gruppo sa come si è svolta la vicenda….

Non c'è nessuna violazione del regolamento. Io sono stato molto chiaro: il voto non si poteva ripetere. Se si vuole riiniziare l'iter legislativo nulla vieta che si riinizi l'iter legislativo. E tutto deve essere fatto nel rispetto del regolamento. Questo è quello che ho detto alla Conferenza dei presidenti e questo è quello che hanno accettato tutti i rappresentanti che partecipavano alla Conferenza dei presidenti.

Quindi nessuna violazione del regolamento e nessun favoritismo né per una parte né per l'altra. Il voto era assolutamente valido. La proposta è stata respinta. Se poi si volesse adottare un'altra iniziativa, nessuno può impedire a parlamentari che vogliono un'iniziativa analoga di ripresentarla. Non è vietato da nessun articolo del regolamento.

Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE). – Señor presidente, este Parlamento apuesta por trabajar por la igualdad en la escuela y desde la educación, y por eso quiero pedir solidaridad para personas como la consejera de Educación del Gobierno de Navarra, María Solana. ¿Cuál ha sido su delito? Introducir en la escuela un programa pionero para educar en valores de igualdad, «Skolae»; un programa que ha sido aplaudido por técnicos de toda Europa. La consecuencia: lleva escolta desde el mes de junio para protegerse de las amenazas. Acosan a los técnicos que gestionan este proyecto; su departamento acaba de ser asaltado y allanado. Por eso hago esta denuncia. Porque es urgente, pido que se interese por el caso y, sobre todo, pido solidaridad hoy de esta Cámara hacia este Gobierno, esta consejera y todos sus

técnicos.

Pavel Svoboda (PPE). – Mr President, I wanted just to inform the plenary that today it is Red Wednesday, which is the day of commemoration of those who are suffering persecution linked to liberty of belief – those who are persecuted for their belief, for their faith. Public buildings are being lit in red, people are wearing red ties and other such things. There are hundreds of millions of people suffering only because of their faith. I wanted the plenary to commemorate this.

(Applause)

Presidente. – Ci associamo tutti a questa battaglia di libertà in difesa della libertà di espressione religiosa, non soltanto all'interno dell'Unione europea ma in tutto il mondo.

Bruno Gollnisch (NI). – Monsieur le Président, je ne souhaitais pas du tout vous interrompre mais j'ignorais à quel moment vous auriez fini de parler au sujet de l'interpellation de notre collègue, M. Lamberts. Je suis heureux d'avoir entendu la seconde partie de votre réponse, à savoir que vous commenceriez par enquêter sur les faits.

J'ai bien écouté ce qu'a dit M. Lamberts et je suis partisan de la liberté d'expression, mais j'ai cru comprendre qu'il s'agissait d'une manifestation privée organisée par des personnes qui sont hostiles à la politique migratoire. En ce qui me concerne, je peux dire que si, en France, par exemple, il me prenait la fantaisie de venir parler à une manifestation organisée par des personnes qui sont favorables à l'invasion migratoire, je doute très fort qu'elles me donnent la parole.

Mais je dis que, s'il doit y avoir une intervention en faveur de notre collègue, que mentionnait M. Lamberts, je suis sûr que la réciprocité prévaudra et qu'à toutes les manifestations autorisées, on entendra des points de vue contradictoires.

Elżbieta Katarzyna Łukacijewska (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Dokładnie 100 lat temu, 28 listopada 1918 r., Polki uzyskały prawa wyborcze, wcześniej niż Francuzki czy Amerykanki. Więc myślę, że tutaj, wprost z Parlamentu Europejskiego, należą się wielkie brawa dla wszystkich Polek, a zwłaszcza dla tych, które cały czas walczą o demokrację, o wolność, równość i starają się o tyle dobrych rzeczy dla Polski i Polaków. Ślijmy im pozdrowienia i gratulacje.

Presidente. – È un impegno comune di tutto questo Parlamento battersi per la parità di genere. Io ho cerato di dimostrarlo anche domenica scorsa, in occasione della Giornata contro la violenza di nei confronti delle donne.

16. Arbeitsplan

Presidente. – Il progetto definitivo di ordine del giorno, fissato dalla Conferenza dei presidenti, ai sensi dell'articolo 149 del regolamento, nella riunione del 15 novembre 2018, è stato distribuito. Sono state presentate le seguenti proposte di modifica:

Mercoledì

Dopo la discussione sul futuro dell'Europa, l'ordine dei primi due punti è così modificato: inizieremo alle 17.30 con la dichiarazione della Commissione sulla strategia a lungo termine dell'UE per la riduzione delle emissioni di gas a affetto serra conformemente all'accordo di Parigi, seguita dalla dichiarazione della Commissione sul pacchetto sul mercato unico.

La dichiarazione sulla relazione dell'onorevole Khan relativa alla difesa della libertà accademica nell'azione esterna dell'Unione è aggiunta come ultimo punto prima degli interventi di un minuto. Di conseguenza, la seduta si protrarrà fino alle 24.

Giovedì

A seguito del mancato accordo al termine del periodo di conciliazione di bilancio, la discussione sulla procedura di bilancio per il 2019 è rinviata. È aggiunta come primo punto all'ordine del giorno una discussione sulle dichiarazioni del Consiglio e della Commissione relative al recesso del Regno Unito dall'Unione europea. Saranno rinviate le votazioni sulle seguenti relazioni, tutte legate alla procedura di bilancio:

— relazione dell'onorevole Viotti, sulla mobilitazione di uno strumento di flessibilità per finanziare misure di bilancio immediate per affrontare le sfide attuali della migrazione, del flusso di rifugiati e delle minacce alla sicurezza;

— relazione dell'onorevole Christoforou, relativa alla mobilizzazione del Fondo di solidarietà dell'Unione europea per il versamento degli anticipi a titolo del bilancio generale dell'Unione per il 2019;

— relazione dell'onorevole Mureșan, sul progetto di bilancio rettificativo n. 6/2018: riduzione degli stanziamenti di pagamento e di impegno: le risorse proprie.

Inoltre, i seguenti punti sono aggiunti direttamente alle votazioni:

— relazione dell'onorevole Dalli, sul reimpegno degli importi rimanenti impegnati a sostegno dell'attuazione delle decisioni del Consiglio nn. 2015/1523 e 2015/1601 o della loro assegnazione ad altre azioni nell'ambito dei programmi nazionali, e obiezione a norma dell'articolo 106 sull'autorizzazione per taluni usi del bicromato di sodio.

Tanja Fajon (S&D). – Mr President, on behalf of the S&D Group, I request the Council and Commission statement on the preparation of the Marrakesh Intergovernmental Conference of 10 and 11 December on the UN Global Compact for Migration to be the second item on Thursday morning. Why now, and why again, after it was on the agenda of the plenary in Strasbourg? We see growing insecurity in Member States and a debate which has become so critical that in Parliament, we should use this last occasion before Marrakesh to stress the importance of global cooperation to tackle global challenges. In Parliament, back in April, we supported the Global Compact for Migration with a big majority and if all over Europe, the UN Compact is being debated, Parliament should use this last opportunity to strengthen its voice.

Presidente. – C'è qualcuno che vuole intervenire contro la proposta del gruppo S&D?

Marek Jurek (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! Parlament Europejski jest jednym z organów Unii Europejskiej, który działa w ramach traktatów zawartych przez nasze państwa. Kwestia globalnego porozumienia w sprawie migracji jest w bardzo wielu krajach kwestią sporną. Musimy sobie odpowiedzieć na elementarne pytanie: czy tak naprawdę chcemy Europę łączyć czy dzielić. Debata i stanowisko Parlamentu Europejskiego przeciwko polityce wielu krajów Unii będzie działaniem w sposób otwarty Europę dzielącym i dlatego z szacunku do krajów, które nie chcą zawierać tego porozumienia, wnioskuję o nieprzeprowadzanie debaty.

Presidente. – Pongo in votazione per appello nominale la proposta del gruppo socialista di aggiungere un punto…. Non è un dibattito, è già intervenuto qualcuno a favore della proposta e adesso uno contro.

Il gruppo socialista chiede di aggiungere all'ordine del giorno di giovedì mattina la preparazione della Conferenza intergovernativa di Marrakech del 10 e 11 dicembre 2018.

(Il Parlamento accoglie la richiesta)

Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE). – Señor presidente, era para solicitarle una aclaración. En el orden del día de mañana estaba el debate sobre la situación de las mujeres con discapacidad, muy oportuno porque el día 3 de diciembre celebramos el Día Internacional de las Personas con Discapacidad y acabamos de celebrar el Día Internacional contra la Violencia de Género. Es para certificar que este debate no se ha quitado y se celebra mañana, porque lo está esperando el sector para hacerlas visibles y oír su voz.

Presidente. – Si aggiunge il punto in questione ma nulla viene sacrificato. La discussione avrà luogo.

Claudia Țapardel (S&D). – Domnule președinte, aș fi vrut să vorbesc înainte de începerea ordinii de zi, dar este un subiect foarte important pentru România.

La 1 decembrie, sâmbătă, România sărbătorește Centenarul Marii Uniri, adică o sută de ani de la formarea României Mari. Este un eveniment important pentru România, în care sărbătorim rolul important pe care România îl are în Europa, ca o țară puternică și lider regional.

Regret că v-am întrerupt dezbaterea pe ordinea de zi, dar cred că este un eveniment important, pentru o țară importantă a Uniunii Europene.

Presidente. – Buon compleanno. Prima di invitare a entrare in Aula il Primo ministro danese, onde evitare fraintendimenti vi ricordo che i presidenti dei gruppi devono attenersi al tempo di parola loro assegnato perché più parlano loro meno parleranno i rappresentanti dei gruppi. Il tempo di parola a disposizione dei gruppi e assegnato in base al sistema d'Hondt. Non è il Presidente che decide quando parla questo o quel gruppo. Più non si rispettano i tempi, più si crea confusione. Quindi invito sia i presidenti dei gruppi che i parlamentari durante la procedura catch-the-eye a rispettare i tempi assegnati perché più si parla, meno deputati parlano.

(L'ordine dei lavori è così fissato).

17. Aussprache mit dem dänischen Ministerpräsidenten Lars Løkke Rasmussen über die Zukunft Europas (Aussprache)

Presidente. – L'ordine del giorno reca la discussione con il Primo ministro danese Lars Løkke Rasmussen sul futuro dell'Europa (2018/2734(RSP)).

Thank you for coming, Prime Minister. It is a pleasure for us to have this debate with you. It is important for us to know the position of your country on the future of the European Union.

The European Parliament wants to be the heart of European democracy. We want to pave the way for a better Europe. We need to change this Europe, but to destroy this Europe would be a big mistake.

We are working hard. As you know, the European Parliament wants more power. We are the only democratic institution. For us it is important to vote on our budget for 2021-2027 before the European elections. For us it is important to achieve an agreement on the Dublin reform. For us it is also important to work on immigration through a strong action plan in Africa. On Brexit, we will vote on a report – we will be ready by January, but this will probably be held in February or March — on the agreement between the United Kingdom and the European Union.

Thank you very much for coming. You have the floor.

Ricordo che aprirò il sistema per il catch-the-eye da allora sino dopo l'intervento del Primo Ministro Rasmussen, quindi per registrarvi bisogna premere sul pulsante.

Lars Løkke Rasmussen, *Prime Minister of Denmark*. – Mr President, let me begin by quoting from the Danish debate on the European Union: 'The European Union has too much power!', 'The European Union is not for the people!' These are statements – made by Danish citizens – during our citizens' consultations on the future of the EU. I bring up these statements today not because they are shared by me or because they are shared by the majority – far from it, but because these are views that are not uncommon in Denmark or the rest of Europe. I bring up these statements because I care. I care about my country, about Europe, about our Union: a Union born from the ashes of war and division turned into the greatest and most successful peace project in the history of the world.

My grandfather witnessed the First World War from a distance. My mother witnessed the Second World War up close. To her, the golden stars were not only symbols of peace; they were also a reminder of the opposite: fear, destruction, war. She was born on the island of Bornholm and she witnessed the Russian bombardment after Denmark had regained freedom in May 1945, so she witnessed the burning fire when bombs fell from the sky. To people like my mother, the Anthem of Europe was the anthem of peace, but to my daughter and my sons, war in Europe is a long time ago. It's a story, not a memory. To them and to younger generations, bringing peace in the past will not be enough to justify our Union in the future. This puts new pressure on the European Union. How should we respond? We must keep reminding people of what we have achieved together in the past, but we must also listen – listen to what the people of Europe

want the EU to be in the future. If we don't, we risk jeopardising European solidarity.

Brexit is a case in point. We must respect the choice of the British people, but we also need to learn from this choice. For forty years, the people of Britain were told how European cooperation was holding them back, but in fact, Brexit has revealed how European cooperation was solving problems that the Brits now have to deal with on their own: securing open borders, frictionless trade, peace and security. In Britain, the Government perhaps forgot to tell people about the results in Europe, forgot to tell people about what we have achieved together, and perhaps, along the way, they forgot to listen to the voices of concern, too – before it was all too late.

Many of you would maybe claim that the Danes, too, are reluctant Europeans. You saw how the Danes rejected the Maastricht Treaty in 1992, rejected the Euro in the year 2000, and, in 2015, rejected the ability to fully participate in cooperation on Justice and Home Affairs, but you would be greatly mistaken to cast the Danes as being in opposition to the European Union. In fact, the share of people supporting the EU is larger in Denmark than in most other European countries and the share of Danes who believe their voice is heard at European level ranks 2nd among all 28 Member States.

How can that be? Part of the reason is that in Denmark, we have a long tradition of discussing the European Union. Not as much as I would like, but politicians from left to right have, in fact, promoted this debate for the last 30 years. This has given everyone, including myself, a much more pragmatic view on our Union. Perhaps this is also why Danes are not swayed by distant dreams of a future that might be. Grand ideas of the 'United States of Europe' fall on deaf ears. We are concerned about finding down-to-earth solutions to present-day problems, to making the EU work better. As a people with a thousand-year long tradition for trading, Danes recognise a good deal when they see it, and the EU is a good deal. The Single Market is a tremendous benefit to our economy which cannot be understated. The EU is also a close-knit political community of nations that share and seek to protect the same fundamental values, a Union of nations that solve their problems through peaceful means. That is a good deal.

Denmark belongs in the European Union, but, at the same time, Danes are proud of their unique model of society. Over the course of this past century, Denmark has developed one of the best welfare states known in history. People pay a large share of their income to ensure that every citizen, regardless of gender, race or origin, has a fair chance to succeed. For the most part, our model of society is well protected under the EU Treaties and in EU regulations.

In fact, the EU has helped to strengthen our economy: estimates say that real wages in Denmark are 10 percent higher than they would have been had we been outside the EU. The freedom of movement ensures that our businesses have direct access to half a billion consumers and that Danes can work and deliver services all over Europe.

However, in certain key areas, I have a hard time defending and explaining the EU rules. For instance, our high levels of child benefit payments – financed by Danish tax payers – are made available to all workers in Denmark, regardless of whether their children actually live in Denmark or not. This is, from a Danish perspective, not fair, and it is a challenge to the Danish model of society, which is based on a shared sense of solidarity and on our ability to ensure a sustainable balance of rights and responsibilities. The EU must guarantee the freedom to move, but freedom of movement must also be fair and freedom of movement must not be abused.

During this very fall, a number of third-country truck drivers – technically employed in another EU country – were found to be working permanently in Denmark under horrible conditions, apparently under the pretext of the freedom of movement. Stories like this hurt the image of the EU and we need to work together to ensure that they are not repeated and that rules are strongly enforced for the benefit of the people.

In some cases, the solution is for the EU to step down, to interfere less; yet, in other areas, the EU needs to step up. In four existential areas, I hear our citizens calling for more cooperation. Our time will be defined by our ability to solve these issues – together in this room and in the Council.

The first issue is migration. This is a challenge that will not disappear anytime soon, but even if the challenge is still here, we could all do a better job of explaining to citizens that the EU and the Member States have already achieved quite a lot: for instance, a 95% drop in arrivals since the crisis of 2015. However, more needs to be done. We have to break the cynical business model of human traffickers. We must develop European policies which remove the incentive for those with no real need for protection to embark on a dangerous journey towards Europe. Common solutions are necessary, but not all European solutions are equally good. I continue to believe that redistribution of asylum seekers is not the right way to solve the problem, but make no mistake: Denmark is willing to take responsibility and support those frontline Member States in need. We support a more flexible – yet mandatory – mechanism of solidarity and we are ready to put actions behind our words. In 2019, we will significantly enhance our contribution to Frontex. We already rank among the top four when it comes to financing the EU Trust Fund for Africa. We are among only three or four European Member States who actually have managed to allocate 0.7% of GDP to aid, and we are actively exploring further contributions.

Speaking of Africa, I believe it is time for Europe to start rebuilding our partnership with the nations of Africa. Our two continents are bound to each other: what is good for Africa will also be good for Europe. Europe has flourished because of decades of international trade liberalisation by the EU. There is no reason why the same benefits cannot be applied to Africa. That is why I believe we must help Africa in building a true African free trade area which can serve as the bedrock for future African jobs and prosperity. While pushing for further progress on return and readmission, our aim should be to create a full and equal partnership.

The second issue where increased EU action is essential is the fight against climate change. Almost three years ago, Paris, the City of Lights, turned into the shining city on the hill as the world agreed to save the planet from climate breakdown. Two months earlier, at the UN Assembly in New York, I had the privilege to co-chair the very UN meeting where we adopted the Sustainable Development Goals. These are two historic agreements offering new hope for future generations. Denmark is determined to act in support of both agreements. During the last 17 years, we have tripled our consumption of green electricity. On windy days, all of our electricity is produced by windmills, and we are well on the way to reaching our goal of net zero emissions by 2050. I was happy to learn earlier today that the Commission has adopted the same vision of carbon neutrality for all of Europe. Decades ago, a political decision on renewable energy was taken in Denmark and it has proven to be a good deal for Danish companies. They were forced to innovate and now we all profit: businesses as well as the environment. Recently, my government has launched a new vision. In 17 years – in 2035 — every single new car bought in Denmark must be an electric car or another type of zero-emission car. It is a big ambition that will not be easy to reach, but it is precisely this kind of decision that I believe will foster innovation, and I will push hard to make this a European policy. Make no mistake about it: if we set ambitious goals for the green transition at European level, we will motivate our own industry to be frontrunners – to the benefit of all of us in Europe, and not least to the benefit of our children and grandchildren. Today, the EU has become the global voice of the climate and green transition. We need to live up to that responsibility and I urge everyone in this room to work to that end. Now is not the time to slow down.

The third issue where more EU action is needed is on expanding and modernising and implementing the Single Market. That is, after all, the backbone of our European cooperation. Our internal market needs to be brought up to speed. I can be blunt: the internal market is no longer only about physical goods at physical borders; the modern economy is much more than that. Today, services, and in particular digital services, constitute an increasingly important part of our economy; goods and services are intertwined in global value chains. The Single Market must match this development: it must be digitally competitive, data must flow freely, every corner of the Internal Market must be digitally fit – from production to consumer protection. As legislators, we have to stimulate innovation, not kill it in regulation. The digital transformation of the Internal Market is a huge challenge, but the US and China will not wait for Europe.

Finally, the fourth issue where the EU needs to do more is on free trade. Europe itself is a testament to how trade liberalisation brings both prosperity and peace among free people. It is our duty to safeguard free trade, even when we find ourselves under historic pressure. In the US, the land of dreams, they are now dreaming of less free trade, of fewer international obligations, of barriers to trade and perhaps even of breaking up the international rules-based trading system. We must not allow that to happen and it has become increasingly clear that only Europe will be able to prevent it.

My fellow Europeans, I started my speech by saying that the European Union must be justified by more than the memory of division and war, but that doesn't mean that we should forget about the past. In contrast to my parents, I didn't witness the two world wars; I witnessed the Cold War, but I also witnessed the end of it 28 years ago. On 2 October 1990, my wife and I fastened the seatbelts in our wrecked Volvo and headed for Berlin. We took the ferry to Rostock and we reached the Brandenburger Tor at midnight, just in time to witness the official reunification of Germany. In my old passport, there are two stamps from that trip: one from 2 October saying 'Rostock, DDR', the other from 3 October saying 'Rostock, Bundesrepublik Deutschland'. To me, these stamps prove that even the deepest wounds can be healed and that Europe must always strive to fulfil its potential – together and in peace.

Valdis Dombrovskis, *Vice-President of the Commission*. – Mr President, honourable Prime Minister Rasmussen, honourable Members, good after midday.

Before moving today's discussion on the future of Europe, let me come back to the point which President Tajani raised at the beginning of this plenary, namely concerning the situation in Ukraine.

Escalating tensions in the Azov Sea over the past days have led to the seizure of Ukrainian vessels and shots being fired at them by Russia, as well as injuries to a number of Ukrainian servicemen. These developments are unacceptable and we expect Russia to immediately release the vessels and the crew and to ensure the medical assistance needed is given to the Ukrainian servicemen. International law obliges the Russian Federation to ensure unhindered and free passage of all vessels through the Kerch Strait. Therefore we expect Russia to restore freedom of passage at the Kerch Strait.

As you know, the EU does not and will not recognise the illegal annexation of the Crimean peninsula by Russia and condemns its aggression towards Ukraine.

High Representative Federica Mogherini has been in touch with several partners since this escalation started, and will continue to engage on this issue with a view to a broader international response. The EU's Political and Security Committee also met earlier this week to discuss the situation and the next steps.

(Applause)

Mr President, now let me move to today's discussion on the future of Europe. Speaking on behalf of President Juncker, who is on his way to Buenos Aires for the G20 meeting, allow me to start by thanking Prime Minister Rasmussen for taking part in today's debate on the future of the Union.

At the start of this year we celebrated 45 years since Denmark joined the European Union. In that time Denmark has given the Union so much, from its effective social model, its growth-friendly business environment and its well-functioning social dialogue to the richness of its culture.

It was Denmark that pioneered a successful model for labour markets, combining flexibility with a high degree of social protection. In a political sphere Danish leadership was also as visible. As a Latvian I well remember that Denmark was among the first countries to recognise Latvia's restoration of independence in 1991; it was a concrete expression of European solidarity.

This support continued and together with other Nordic countries, Denmark provided important political backing for the accession of the Baltic states in 2004.

This leadership role has continued since the crisis. For instance, in the post-crisis period Denmark was quick to implement difficult but effective public spending controls. Crucially this was achieved by still maintaining the second highest level of social protection spending in the EU. This serves as a good example of how prudent fiscal policy is compatible with the delivery of high-quality public services.

More recently, Denmark has been working hard to further improve competitiveness and increase productivity. Ultimately it is productivity gains that will allow for continued improvements in living standards. That too is a lesson for all countries to draw on.

These are good economic times. Europe's economy is now entering its sixth year of uninterrupted growth. Employment has risen to a record level of 239 million people and unemployment has fallen back to pre-crisis levels, helping more than 10 million people out of poverty or social exclusion.

But we cannot become complacent. External risks are there and mounting while at the same time important reforms remain incomplete. The current economic sunshine is an opportunity for us to finish what we have started before the next storm arrives.

Completing reforms is not just a matter of individual countries. Building a stronger, more democratic and more united Union will require us to stay close and build trust with one another. As President Juncker said in his State of the Union address, Europe succeeds when it speaks with one voice.

Now more than ever, global events highlight the importance of this message. The reality is that European nations have neither the size nor the means to shape global affairs on their own and the strength is only going in one direction. By 2060, no single European nation will have more than 1% of the world's population.

This is why European countries, big or small, pool and share their sovereignty to build a stronger form of common sovereignty. As part of the world's largest single market, and a bloc which accounts for a fifth of the global economy, each country is better placed to defend its national interests and to ensure fairness and prosperity for its people.

This pooling of sovereignty begins with a single market, a concept that Denmark has embraced and made the most of since 1973. Last week we presented the communication to highlight the achievements of the single market over the past 25 years, but we also stressed the need to improve and deepen it for our future prosperity.

This is why we have set out our road map for deepening economic and monetary union. A strong economic and monetary union is vital to the stability and prospects of the euro area, but as the Prime Minister has often said, it is equally important for the European Union as a whole.

In that spirit, Denmark has played an active and positive role in the debate on strengthening our economic and monetary union, but now it is time to move from debate to decision in order to strengthen the resilience of the euro area. This means completing the banking union, which Denmark might decide to join soon, and completing the capital markets' union on which the Commission adopted a report today.

Strengthening the single market and economic and monetary union also means strengthening the role the euro plays in the global currency system. Even if Denmark remains outside the currency area, its peg to the euro has given it a solid anchor for low and stable inflation and to reduce uncertainty in trade.

This is true for Denmark, as it is true for many other countries. Countries across the globe rely on the euro as a safe store of value. Around 20% of international reserves of foreign central banks are denominated in euros. Yet there is scope for the further development of the euro's global political role.

Recent political events should serve as a wake-up call in this area. Now it's time for us to take the initiative. The Commission will put out a communication and an accompanying act on this important issue next week.

Last but not least, if we want to be truly ready for the future, we need to invest in it now. We need to plan together with a common purpose. This is why we have focused our proposals for the new multiannual financial framework on areas where we can achieve more together and which are crucial to Denmark's and Europe's future.

Our proposal is balanced. As Denmark and others have called for, we have put forward programmes that are modern, more efficient and more focused on urgent priorities. For instance, there has been almost a three-fold increase in funding for migration and security to make sure that Europe can protect its citizens.

Funding for research and innovation, of which Denmark is one of the highest recipients, will be increased by 50% to reach EUR 100 billion. We have proposed a new digital Europe programme worth EUR 9 billion to support Europe's digital transformation, and we will also ensure that 25% of the budget will support our climate and sustainable development targets.

But, just as we cannot delay or postpone our future, we should not lose time in agreeing on the resources needed to bring that future alive. As President Juncker said, there would be no better message, no greater symbol to Europeans that their Union will invest in the future and take its destiny in its own hands.

To conclude, when we think about the future of Europe, we should perhaps recall an old and wise Danish saying, 'making predictions is hazardous, especially about the future'.

But there are two things I feel confident in predicting. Firstly if we are going to protect our citizens, harness the benefits of a rapidly changing world and create more opportunities for more prosperity, we will have to remain strong and united. And my second prediction is that Denmark will continue to play a positive role for shaping a better, stronger, European future.

Manfred Weber, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Mr President, I would like to welcome the Prime Minister to the European Parliament. Denmark has been a member of the European Union for 45 years – Valdis Dombrovskis was referring to this – so that gives you a lot of knowledge and a lot of experience about the future of Europe and what the experience of the Danish people and Danish society on Europe has been in the last decades.

As you said, it was not always easy with Europe in Denmark and the Maastricht Treaty, but finally there was always a clear 'yes' to membership and to readiness to contribute to positive development. I was surprised when I saw the Eurobarometer data, which said that Denmark is a country where the people say that their voice counts the most in Europe.

So Denmark is in first place and public involvement in the European decision-making process is obviously working very well in Denmark. Congratulations on this because I think that the most important thing for the future of Europe is the bridge between the European decision-making process and the people of Europe. You said it: some call us bureaucrats and some call us elites. People have the feeling that, after the votes in the elections next year, nothing will have changed. Some people will have been removed, but nothing will have changed in the political direction. I think that is the key question.

When we talk about Brexit and the lesson we have to learn from Brexit, it is about getting sovereignty back. People want to have a say. People must know that their voice counts at a European level.

That's why I welcome the ideas in this regard to make it clearer to people what we are doing here. I want to strongly underline that the most important issue for the future of Europe is – and I think all of us here in this plenary agree – the field of foreign affairs and defence.

Russia is giving us a concrete case at the moment where we have to give a proper answer as Europeans together. For us it is clear that the Ukrainians must decide about their way towards the future, whether they want to go in the direction of the European Union or whether they see their future more in the east. it is up to Kiev to decide. it is not for Russia, not for Moscow and not for Brussels, but for Kiev to decide.

I also want to underline that we urgently need a common voice in these fields of external affairs. We understand that unanimous voting is an old concept. We have to come to the majority decision-making process in this field to be stronger and more active.

Finally, on the Russian thing, I want to underline that, when Russia is still provoking Europe and European partners and friends, I think we also have to rethink the investments on Nord Stream 2. I do not think we should be more dependent on Russian gas than we already are now, and it should be a European decision-making process when we talk about Nord Stream 2.

We have a lot of these points on the table. I only want to mention the key issues. When we want to discuss a Europe for the future, we have to defend Europe. That's why the Schengen question, the border protection issue – in my home region between Germany and Austria, but also in the Danish-German border region – is not something which is good for the future. That's why we should invest in Frontex. Let's protect the Bulgarian and the Greek border with Turkey. That would be much more efficient and would also bring the same effect.

Another element is to continue to convince – you had all of the decisions about Europol in your country where people didn't trust cooperation on data exchange – and to strengthen the data exchange for more security and for the fight against organised crime at a European level.

Prime Minister, I thank you for your engagement in this regard to try still to convince the Danish people that it is in all of our interests to have this data exchange and, finally, to strengthen Europe. Yes, the single market is the future. In this period, frankly speaking, we did not do much to strengthen the single market, or only the digital single market but not the rest.

We have to be more engaged in this. You have the full support of the EPP. We have to create prosperity and that's why free and fair trade agreements are the future of this continent. We have to do so. You have the full support of the EPP. Finally, let me switch to German.

Ich möchte nämlich am Schluss einen grundsätzlichen Gedanken anbringen: Die Sorge der Menschen, wie es weitergeht auf dem Kontinent, wird zum einen durch Populisten mit einfachen Antworten bedient, aber wir haben leider auch die Situation, dass einfach Schuldige gesucht werden. Der Antisemitismus auf diesem Kontinent nimmt zu, sowohl in meinem Land, in Deutschland, als auch in Frankreich, in Großbritannien, in vielen Staaten sind die Entwicklungen beunruhigend. Ich habe letzte Woche Auschwitz besucht. Man wird dort an diesem Ort still, es ist kalt dort, die Tötungsmaschine der Nazideutschen hat dort ihr unsägliches Werk vollbracht. Ich spreche das deswegen an, weil es auch der Gründungsimpuls für Europa war. Simone Veil war die erste Präsidentin dieser Institution und Auschwitz-Überlebende. Sie hat beim vierzigsten Jahrestag der Befreiung von Auschwitz in einer Rede gesagt, dass der Gründungsimpuls für Europa das 'Nie wieder!' war. 'Nie wieder Krieg!', so wie Sie es angesprochen haben. Aber auch nie wieder Rassismus, Antisemitismus, Ausgrenzung, kein Respekt vor den Menschenrechten. Auch das war das Gründungsmoment für die Europäische Union. Warum spreche ich das heute an? Weil ich in den Unterlagen gesehen habe, dass in Dänemark 99 % aller Juden den Holocaust überlebt haben. Dänemark hat gehandelt. In Dänemark sind die Menschen aufgestanden und haben den Juden einen Weg aus dem Land heraus ermöglicht und haben sie gerettet, die Bürgergesellschaft hat sie gerettet, die Werte hochgehalten, die Europa ausmachen. Ich finde das, gerade wenn wir über die Zukunft Europas reden, einen wichtigen Gedanken, dass Menschen, dass wir zu unseren Werten stehen, dass wir sie verteidigen, auch in dunklen Zeiten, und da ist Dänemark ein Vorbild.

Jeppe Kofod, *for S&D-Gruppen*. – Hr. formand! Kære statsminister, kære Lars Løkke Rasmussen, velkommen til Europa-Parlamentet. Tillad mig og tale på mit modersmål i dagens anledning. Fredens projekt, migration, klimaforandringer, det at få et velfungerende indre marked, fri og fair handel, alt sammen vigtige ting, som vi kan blive enige om skal styrkes i det samarbejde, vi står i.

Men det er også vigtigt at sige, at når der er utilfredshed blandt borgerne i Europa, skyldes det jo også, at der også er forfejlede politikker. Vi har set en globalisering igennem de sidste årtier, som har bragt mange positive ting, men også negative ting med sig. Vi har mistet kontrollen over områder, hvor borgerne med rette efterspørger, at vi tager kontrollen tilbage på demokratisk vis. Så nogle – liberale og konservative især – har jo hyldet globaliseringens vindere og lukket øjnene for dem, der betaler prisen i form af løntrykkeri og social dumping. Lad mig tage et eksempel: De sidste 20 år er selskabsskatten i EU-landene faldet fra 35 % til 22 %. Udviklingen fortsætter. Der er et skatteræs mod bunden. Apple, Facebook og Google har betalt under 1 procent af deres fortjenester i Europa i skat. Europas statskasser er blevet frastjålet over 400 milliarder kroner i skandalen Cum-Ex, Cum-Cum-skandalen, som vi har set i mange europæiske lande. Danmark alene har mistet over 12 milliarder kroner på de svindlere. De stjal af vores statskasse, banditter i habitter. Skat på digitale giganter, fælles bund under selskabsskatten i Europa, afgift på finansielle transaktioner, åbne

regnskaber for multinationale selskabers datterselskaber, en konsolideret selskabsskattebase i EU, en EU-alarmcentral mod skattesvig og hvidvask, økonomisk kriminalitet. Alle disse konkrete løsninger på internationalt skattefusk, kæmper din regering – din regering! – aktivt imod på EU-niveau. Statsministerens egen skatteminister nægtede sågar og mødes med det særlige skattesnydsudvalg her i parlamentet, da vi inviterede ham. Så statsminister, i kampen mod international skattefusk er din regering alt for ofte, desværre ikke – og jeg begræder det – en del af løsningen, men en del af problemet.

Og kære statsminister, EU-samarbejdet handler jo netop om og samarbejde – det er vi enige om – og at finde nogle gode pragmatiske fælles løsninger. Og beslutninger træffes af dem, der er til stede ved bordet, det ved vi allesammen i dette rum. Derfor undrer det mig også, at den danske regering er så lidt aktiv i EU, som den er. Selv på egne helt erklærede mærkesager – og det blev også nævnt her i talen af statsministeren – er regeringen fraværende. Syv dage før valget i 2015 udsendte du, Venstre, Dansk Folkeparti, de Konservative og Liberal Alliance i en fælles erklæring under overskriften, jeg citerer; »borgerlige partier vil sikre dansk velfærd i EU«. I gik til valg på – og jeg citerer; »sikre dagpengeregler så EU borgere ikke fremover kan opnå fuld ret til danske dagpenge efter bare få ugers medlemskab af en a-kasse og fuldtidsarbejde i Danmark«. Nu må vi så konstatere, at regeringen ikke kan leve op til det valgløfte, man lovede før sidste valg, at man ikke har gjort de nødvendige anstrengelser i Ministerrådet, og at vi nu har den samme situation her i Parlamentet. Hvorfor skulle der gå hele 1266 dage fra Venstre, Dansk Folkeparti, Liberal Alliance og de Konservative lovede danskerne at begrænse mulighederne for eksport af velfærdsydelser, til de nu tager sagen op i Europa-Parlamentet, som vi hørte i dag. Det forstår jeg ikke.

Det der er vigtigt, hr. statsminister, det er, at vi har et stærkt Europa omkring de værdier, som kendetegner os velfungerende velfærdsstater, velfungerende demokratier og beskyttelse af borgernes rettigheder. Så det er mennesker før markedet. Det er, arbejder før aktiekurs, og det er, også klima før konkurrencehensyn. På den måde kan vi bygge et fremtidigt Europa, der respekterer borgernes bekymringer, og beskytte vores særlige sociale model i Europa. Det skal vi stå sammen om. Vi har brug for en ny kurs, og den ville jeg gerne have hørt noget mere om i dag.

Anders Primdahl Vistisen, *for ECR-Gruppen*. – Hr. formand! Velkommen til Europa-Parlamentet på vegne af ECR-Gruppen og Dansk Folkeparti, hr. statsminister. Vi har set meget frem til at høre din vision for fremtidens EU. Jeg kan forstå, at det drejer sig meget om EU som fredens projekt, og man kunne måske på den baggrund foranlediges til at spørge statsministeren, hvilke konflikter Danmark kunne have rodet sig ud i, hvis vi ikke var blevet medlem af EU i 1973. Men i dag er det mere nærliggende for mig at spørge statsministeren om forsvarsforbeholdet, som statsministeren og hans forsvarsminister jo fornyligt har sagt, vi skal afskaffe. Det kan jo undre, at man nu for ikke første, men anden – og heller ikke anden, men tredje gang kræver af danskerne, at de skal forholde sig til forbeholdene ved en folkeafstemning, selv om man hver gang har bekræftet dem. Men det, der mere undrer mig omkring forsvarsforbeholdet, hr. statsminister, det er, hvad Venstres logik er? Venstre vil – som jeg har hørt det – af med forsvarsforbeholdet, for at vi ikke kan deltage i en europæisk hær. Det er jo internt modstridende, og jeg kan forstå, at logikken er, at statsministeren finder, at hvis han bare sidder med ved bordet, så kan han forhindre etablering af en europæisk hær på trods af, at dette Parlament, Kommissionen, Tysklands Angela Merkel og præsident Macron alle er varme fortalere for projektet. Ja, sidstnævnte Macron har endda sagt, at initiativet delvist er rettet mod vores nære ven og allierede USA. Men, hr. statsminister, undskyld, jeg tror desværre, at din selvtillid er lidt rigelig stor på det område. Jeg tror ikke, at du kan vende tidevandet her i Europa, når det kommer til føderaliseringen, og grunden til, at jeg mener det, er netop det, du selv har bragt op i dag med velfærdsydelserne.

Det er jo sådan, at din en regering er løbet ind i det ene nederlag efter det andet, når det kommer til at bekæmpe velfærdsturisme, som ellers var en fælles ambition fra vore partier før sidste valg. Du har undladt at indeksere børnepengene, selv om den østrigske regering er gået ned ad den vej. Desværre vil du jo ikke løbe den samme procesrisiko over for EU-Domstolen. Og i forhold til kampen om dagpenge – danske dagpenge – hvor det før valget var en katastrofe, at der kunne gives fuld dagpengeret efter en lille måned, så tegner flertallet sig nu til, at det skal ske efter én dags arbejde i Danmark, og man i øvrigt må tage den her dagpengeret med sig til et andet EU-land i op til seks måneder. Så kære statsminister, jeg respekterer, at du gerne vil sidde med ved bordet, men det ser ikke ud til, at det nytter særlig meget for danske interesser, om du er der eller ej.

Man kunne så foranlediges til at tro, at den stribe af nederlag, som regeringen er løbet ind i dens EU-politiske mærkesager, der blev fremlagt før valget, havde fået statsministeren og hans parti til at reflektere over alle de positive følelser, man generelt har for EU-projektet. Det lader ingenlunde til at være tilfældet. Statsministeren har jo netop haft landsmøde i Venstre, og jeg kan forstå, at mantraet, der kom ud derfra frem mod EU-valget, var, at Venstre er Danmarks mest EU-positive parti, og ret skal være ret, sådan føler jeg egentlig også sagen her fra Europa-Parlamentets side. I sidder jo i den føderalistiske ALDE-Gruppe, I har støttet hr. Verhofstadt som gruppeformand for gruppen, I har støttet ham som Spitzenkandidat i den sidste EU-parlamentsvalgkamp, og I har endda støttet ham til formandsposten her i Europa-Parlamentet. Det var en varm støtteerklæring hr. Verhofstadt fik, forfatteren til bogen om Europas Forenede Stater. Det er godt med kærligheden i ALDE, og støtteerklæringen var, at hr. Verhofstadt havde de klareste visioner for Europa. Og hr. Verhofstadts visioner er klare! Der er tale om en ny EU-forfatning, der indeholder alt fra en fælles præsident, udenrigsminister, finansminister, direkte skatter, EU-hær, afskaffelse af alle nationale forbehold og tvangsfordeling af migranter.

Og hr. Verhofstadts visioner går endnu videre: Han har også sagt, at den yderste konsekvens af at tænke i national identitet er gaskamrene i Auschwitz, og endelig, at vort fædreland nu er Europa, vor nationalsang nu er glædeshymnen, vort flag er de 12 gule stjerner på den azurblå baggrund. Det må siges at være klare liberale visioner for Europa, hr. statsminister. Og jeg glæder mig til, at du og Danmarks mest EU-glade parti, Venstre, vil anfægte de synspunkter i valgkampen frem mod valget til Europa-Parlamentet i 2019.

Guy Verhofstadt, *on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – Mr President, I should like to say to Prime Minister Rasmussen, Mr Vistisen tried to tell you what a devil I am and that you are in fact working with the devil at the European level. But let me explain what I think about Europe – it's not necessary to believe what Mr Vistisen is telling you this morning.

In fact I was very pleased that you were talking about your red Volvo. I don't know, was it a 122 or a 140 or a 240? If it is a 140 or a 240 then it could have been made in Ghent, in Belgium, and that says everything about Europe today. The single market is what you are talking about. It's a Swedish car, used by a Danish Prime Minister, built in Belgium to go to the Berlin Wall. And that is in fact why I'm so pleased about the way you talked about the future of the European Union. The future of the European Union is not the centralistic nightmare that Mr Vistisen is telling us it is. I am very much pleased by what you have told us today, namely that also Denmark is of the opinion that the worst thing to do today is to throw away the European Union, and that is exactly what didn't happen in recent years, Mr Vistisen.

It's a pity that Mr Farage is not here, because the first thing Mr Farage told us after Brexit was that the next domino stone to fall would be Denmark. After Brexit we should have seen immediately a Dexit! That is what he was telling us here two years ago, but we have seen exactly the opposite. There was No Dexit, and in today's Eurobarometer the Danish people are in favour of the European Union; they like the European project. They are still critical towards the European project. I don't think that every Danish citizen finds that everything is going well – certainly not Mr Vistisen! But anyway they are saying that they are not so stupid as to leave the European Union. Let's reform the European Union: that is the message of the Danish people as I see it in the Eurobarometer. And I hear this not only in Denmark but in many countries of the European Union when we are talking about the future.

What we have to do now, Prime Minister – and this is in opposition to Mr Vistisen who wants everything as a conservative, so nothing will change for him, otherwise he is not a conservative – what we have to do now is to take the lesson of Brexit seriously. Not say 'oh Brexit, it's only the UK going out and let's just go on the same way'. No, take the lessons from Brexit, because the UK leaving the European Union is not an enormous success, it's a failure of the European Union. So we have to reform the European Union.

I want to mention two things. First, the so-called European army, as Angela Merkel called it. I think that Mr Weber has given all the arguments about why we need a foreign policy, why we need a European army – and Mr Vistisen, it has nothing to do with killing NATO – for me a European army is the European pillar of the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation, and it is absolutely not in opposition to that. But we have to stop the waste of money on defence in Europe: we are spending 40% of what the Americans spend on their army but we are incapable of doing 10% what the American army does. We are spending three times more than the Russians on military defence in Europe – three times more! But I'm not sure, Prime Minister, that if the Russians come over our borders we will be capable of stopping them without American help.

My second point concerns the single market. We need the single market to complete it. You are totally right. We have a single market for Belgian chocolates. Very good. We have a single market for French champagne. Good also. We have a single market for German cars. Fine. We have a German market for Danish design. I'm not talking about IKEA now, I am talking about real design, especially in Denmark.

But we do not have a single market for the services of the future. We don't have one for telecom, or for digital, or for the capital markets. That can only be realised when we have a single regulator in Europe. At one time we had one standard for mobile, you might remember, the GSM standard, a European standard. We had champions in Europe, Nokia, Eriksson… And now we don't have European standards, and among the 200 biggest high-tech companies there are only eight Europeans. None of the 20 biggest high-tech companies in the world are European. So I want to support you in your endeavour to create this digital single market as quickly as possible and to do it with one regulator.

And finally, on the values, also there Denmark has to play a role, Manfred – we cannot go forward with illiberal tendencies in the European Union, and there also Denmark will play a key role.

Philippe Lamberts, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Mr President, I would like to welcome the Prime Minister to the European Parliament. When Denmark comes into the conversation, many good things spring to mind: the global champion of renewable energy, a world leader in development aid, a country that has the guts to confront Russia's power plays by saying 'no' to Nord Stream 2 (and for that thank you), and a country where the social partners are strong and which invented flexicurity as a way to give security to workers and flexibility to employers, and not the other way round. Your country also gave us Margrethe Vestager, the most impressive Competition Commissioner for a very long time, a real liberal fighting rent-extraction, even when it gets in the way of sweetheart deals given by governments to multinationals.

Denmark, as a small country like my own, has a lot to offer to the European Union. You had four points. I have only three, but at least we have two in common. Let me start with the ecological and just transition. We share your view that it's vital for Europe to be a world leader in that transition. We need to ensure that all societies operate within the boundaries that our planet has set for them. We also need to do it in a way that is good for everyone and not just for the happy few like we can see in France. it is an environmental imperative, a social necessity, a geopolitical aspiration, but also – and you mentioned this – an economic opportunity not to be missed.

One could expect Denmark to share in that aspiration towards leadership – and listening to you, I tend to believe this – and we praise you for pushing Europe to the most ambitious standards for instance on CO_2 emissions for cars. Thank you for that as well. But your country – and this is a bit surprising – ranks fifth in Europe in terms of carbon footprint by household. If you don't change political course, the non-renewable part of your energy mix is actually expected to increase, and thus your CO_2 emissions would rise and not fall.

On the second point, migration, we believe that the European Union should assume its part of the responsibility in facing the asylum and migration challenge. We agree with you when you say that this is a place where more European action is needed. But, under your party's leadership, Denmark is now joining hands with those who want to make Europe a fortress, slamming its door shut to those in need.

When you speak about tackling the root causes of migration, you are only focusing on the smugglers. Not only is your country reducing its development budget, because you claim – and rightly so – that it is 0.7% of GDP, but it used to be 1% of GDP. But it is now increasingly using this development budget to force beneficiary countries to lock their borders and take back migrants who might have escaped.

Prime Minister, when people forcibly leave their country, it is because they are fleeing wars, persecution, climate change, natural resource exhaustion or their social and economic conditions. If they turn to smugglers, it is for a lack of safe and legal ways to access safe countries such as ours.

Nowadays, the key words of EU asylum and migration policy are pushback and containment. We believe that we should welcome our fair share, while working on the real root causes. Of course Europe cannot solve all the world's problems. But we can do much more to fight climate change, to have a fairer global economic system, and to promote democracy and the rule of law instead of supporting tyrannies, notably by selling them weapons and buying natural resources extracted with little respect for the local communities.

Let me conclude with a point that you didn't tackle: the euro. Denmark is in the unenviable position of actually not being part of the euro, but having its currency pegged to it. We are disappointed that your country is now joining the camp of the naysayers who deny reality by claiming that the euro is safe and viable just by applying the current rules.

On the contrary, we are convinced that no monetary union is viable without strong financial solidarity, both in the private and public sectors. That means a fiscal union where common taxes fund a common budget and, possibly, basic elements of a common social safety net. It also means a full banking union that eliminates the doom loop between states and their banking systems. And of course financial solidarity comes with responsibility enshrined in rules.

But these rules need to be based on sound economic science, which is not always the case – far from it – and protect the general, rather than particular, interests. Indeed, mutual trust is badly affected when these rules are breached. Speaking of which, Mr Prime Minister, such breaches sometimes come from unexpected quarters, like when Danske Bank is exposed as one of the worst money launderers in Europe.

Mr Prime Minister, we share your European ambition. I'm not sure that we agree on everything, but I'm glad to see Denmark engaging. I'm sure that we are going to have lively debates because in this – we could hear this, for instance, from Mr Vistisen – we have strikingly different visions about the future of Europe. But you know what? I am confident that next year, during the European elections, those who are committed to discourse in our continent, to keep it as a beacon of peace, human rights, liberty and freedoms will prevail.

Dennis de Jong, *on behalf of the GUE/NGL Group*. – Mr President, a big welcome to the Danish Prime Minister. I must confess that I have a bit of a weak spot for Denmark, coming from the Netherlands myself. I am thinking not only of the landscape and the windmills – the old ones but especially also the new ones are a good example – but also the people's character. Danes are pretty stubborn, you can't tell the Danes what to do and in that they are very much like the Dutch. I mean, they have the same sort of character.

I must say that, when you started, Mr Prime Minister, the reactions like 'the EU has too much power' or also 'it is not good for the ordinary citizen' sound like what I am hearing in my country. At the same time we have the, now famous, 84% of the Danes saying that the EU has brought Denmark advantages. I really am a bit puzzled how you could bring these together. Is the Eurobarometer representative or is your public consultation representative? What is the real opinion in Denmark at the moment?

Now, the other particular aspect of Denmark is all its opt-outs. To go through them one-by-one, you have opted out of EU citizenship. I have asked my Danish colleagues what that means – nobody knew – but perhaps it is relevant in the context of Brexit. It would be nice to know if there is a difference between how the rest of Europe will deal with British citizens after Brexit and how Denmark will deal with them, or is this just not a problem?

Then, on justice and home affairs you have an opt-out. In 2015, the Danes confirmed that they didn't want an opt-in, instead of an opt-out. Again, the question of organised crime doesn't stop at the Danish border. Do you think you will have another referendum shortly on this issue, and what is the general opinion these days on that?

Then on the opt-out on defence. It has been mentioned by others, we had a meeting in Copenhagen, hosted by you, of the Liberal prime ministers in Europe. Apparently, the European army was discussed there because at least the Dutch Minister of the Interior said, 'yes, in the long term we are in favour of a European army'. Is that true? Do you share that opinion or what was the outcome of that meeting, because there's a lot of confusion about it.

You have no euro but are pegged to the euro. I can see that Denmark is not doing so badly at the moment. My question there, again, is there still discussion on the euro? Do you think this is a better solution than being part of the euro yourself and having the euro instead of the Danish crown?

Just one or two minutes on the single market. I think that we can safely say that the single market, as such, brings economic benefits, but the point is always: to whom? And if we look at the general situation, then I think workers, employees, are generally of the opinion that the single market works better for employers, for the factor of capital, than for the factor of labour and work.

I'm just curious how you see this. If you see the new single market programme of the Commission, the word 'employee' doesn't occur anywhere. So no money for the workers, whereas we also see Commission proposals for mobility of companies. But where is the voice of the workers? If your company, where you have worked for many decades, suddenly goes to another Member State, does the worker have to right to say 'no, we don't want that'? Do we give a golden share to the workers for these type of decisions are so important for their daily lives?

Also, this morning we had the transport trade unions at our group and I saw a documentary on 200 Filipinos being exploited in Denmark because of the freedom of movement of services. It was completely legal, this works via subsidiaries in Poland which hired Filipinos who are now being used all over Europe, and especially in Denmark.

How can we counter that, and make these practices illegal? And how can we counter the fact that, for example, Ukrainians are now working in the Polish construction sector, while Poles are working in the construction sector elsewhere in Europe? That's not right. So I call for there to be a single market for workers too, what are your views about that?

Laura Agea, *a nome del gruppo EFDD*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, Primo ministro Rasmussen, Commissario Dombrovskis, questo è un'altra delle tante discussioni che facciamo sul futuro dell'Europa. Noi questo confronto ovviamente lo apprezziamo, lo apprezziamo davvero. Ma dovremmo essere altrettanto sinceri e dovremmo dirci e ammettere che l'Unione europea sta attraversando un momento di estrema difficoltà, una difficoltà che riguarda i cittadini; immagino riguardi in parte anche i suoi cittadini, ministro. Riguarda soprattutto le istituzioni che non godono né di ottima salute, né tantomeno di una buona reputazione e noi dobbiamo chiederci quali sono realmente le cause di questa situazione infelice.

I cittadini sono in grandi difficoltà. Ovviamente, le scelte che quest'Europa ha fatto negli ultimi anni – e soprattutto le scelte delle istituzioni europee – hanno veramente fatto danni irreparabili ai cittadini e al tessuto sociale di quest'Europa. Sono anni di politiche austere e anni di austerità che hanno causato disastri nel tessuto sociale; le politiche economiche e fiscali hanno messo in ginocchio non solo i cittadini ma anche le imprese e le politiche economiche sbagliate portano danni e ingiustizie.

Ogni tanto io seguo le domande che ci poniamo, i colleghi, i professori che si interrogano sul perché c'è tanta disaffezione da parte dei cittadini nei confronti delle istituzioni; ci facciamo delle domande, ci poniamo degli interrogativi, addirittura commissioniamo studi per capire che cosa in quest'Europa non ci piace. In realtà, la verità è sotto i nostri occhi: peccato che noi abbiamo dimenticato di confrontarci e di parlare costantemente con i cittadini.

Noi ci siamo e voi, soprattutto, vi siete rinchiusi in queste gabbie dorate, in questi palazzi dorati e non vi confrontate con la realtà; non parlate con i cittadini, perché i cittadini sarebbero in grado di dirvi quali sono le difficoltà che affrontano, quali sono i problemi e le sofferenze che oggi si trovano a vivere. È come se vi foste rinchiusi in una campana di vetro, nella quale non arrivano le parole dei cittadini che però negli Stati e nella nostra società vivono situazioni di grande difficoltà e noi dovremmo tornare a parlare costantemente con loro.

I cittadini vogliono un cambiamento sostanziale, immediato e radicale e io porto l'esempio del mio paese, dell'Italia. Noi stiamo cercando di cambiare radicalmente quella che è la realtà del nostro paese con delle riforme che siano veramente fatte per i cittadini, perché l'agenda dei governi non deve essere dettata né dall'austerità né dalle regole di bilancio, né dalle imposizioni, né dai trattati. L'agenda dei governi deve essere dettata dalle esigenze, dai bisogni e dalle sofferenze dei cittadini e noi stiamo cercando di realizzare il reddito di cittadinanza.

Credo che in tutti i paesi voi conosciate bene questa misura, una misura che voi avete già tranne l'Italia, che ancora non ce l'ha perché non c'è stato modo di realizzarla. Una misura di dignità che possa permettere ai cittadini di vivere in condizioni dignitose e rientrare nel circuito del lavoro, così come i giovani – e questa è una misura fondamentale. Noi stiamo cercando di riformare le pensioni: l'Europa ci ha imposto veramente la riforma delle pensioni che è stata realizzata dal precedente governo in maniera sostanziale e pedissequa con risultati devastanti per tutti i cittadini e nel tessuto sociale italiano. Abbiamo creato gli «esodati», abbiamo creato veramente una voragine e un disastro sociale.

Oggi stiamo cercando di mettere mano a questa riforma, imposta dall'Europa e realizzata in maniera prona dal precedente governo, che però è stato, tra l'altro, mandato a casa proprio sulla base delle riforme scellerate che ha fatto in questi ultimi anni e stiamo cercando di dare dignità con la riforma delle pensioni. Abbiamo creato un fondo per i truffati delle banche, perché i precedenti governi, con i soldi dei cittadini, salvano le banche private e ci sono cittadini che sono rimasti sul lastrico: hanno visto i propri conti correnti azzerati; oggi noi dobbiamo adoperarci per poter dare sostegno ai cittadini che sono stati truffati. Noi siamo sicuri che questi sono cambiamenti che verranno accettati perché solo attraverso questi cambiamenti sostanziali l'Europa potrà ripartire e ricostruire le proprie basi.

Noi ci crediamo profondamente nell'Europa e vogliamo restare in Europa, ma a condizioni sostenibili e sostanziali, cambiate per i nostri cittadini. Noi vogliamo un'Unione che sia un'Unione non solo di nome ma anche di fatto: un'Unione che fondi le sue radici sui bisogni e sulle necessità dei cittadini. Noi abbiamo apprezzato, per esempio, il voto di ieri sul no all'inserimento del *fiscal compact* nei trattati: è fondamentale. Questo è un accordo scellerato e il fatto che la commissione per gli affari economici e monetari ha detto un no così intransigente – e siamo assolutamente favorevoli a questo passaggio – è la dimostrazione di come le politiche dell'austerità stanno fallendo e si deve invertire la rotta.

Io credo che sia questo il cambiamento che i cittadini ci stanno chiedendo: lo stanno chiedendo in Italia, lo stanno chiedendo qui in Europa e, sicuramente, lo chiederanno fra pochi mesi con il voto delle europee. Sicuramente un vento di cambiamento, che sta soffiando non solo in Italia ma anche in Europa, porterà cambiamenti sostanziali il prossimo anno e forse, allora, il prossimo anno sarà anche molto più interessante sedersi qui e parlare del futuro dell'Europa, quando ci saranno condizioni diverse, una base diversa, fatta di bisogni reali e di un'agenda politica e veramente di riforme dettate sulla base dei bisogni e delle necessità dei cittadini.

Nicolas Bay, *au nom du groupe ENF.* – Monsieur le Premier ministre, votre pays a adhéré à la Communauté européenne en 1973, c'est-à-dire en même temps que le Royaume-Uni. À l'instar des Britanniques, les Danois ont su faire valoir leur singularité dès le départ. En effet, votre pays a négocié un certain nombres d'*opt out*, c'est-à-dire des exceptions au droit européen. Quand d'autres dirigeants livraient leur pays pieds et poings liés à la Commission européenne, vos prédécesseurs ont su préserver des pans entiers de votre souveraineté, c'est-à-dire de votre liberté en fonction de vos intérêts.

Ainsi n'avez-vous pas adhéré à l'espace de liberté, de sécurité et de justice, la flatteuse et pompeuse appellation du système d'asile européen. Vous n'avez pas non plus adhéré, et vous êtes le seul État membre dans ce cas, à la PSDC, la politique de sécurité et de défense commune. Vous avez également obtenu une option de retrait lors des négociations sur le traité de Maastricht, qui a transformé la Communauté européenne en Union européenne. Vous n'avez donc pas adhéré à l'Union économique et monétaire et vous utilisez toujours la couronne danoise et non l'euro.

Proche de la Suède, culturellement mais aussi et d'abord géographiquement, vous n'avez pas commis les mêmes erreurs que votre voisin en matière de politique migratoire. En vous reliant à la Suède, le pont construit entre Copenhague et Malmö a sans doute contribué à vous éloigner de votre voisin, du moins de son prétendu modèle d'intégration des communautés immigrées. Malmö, le Molenbeek de Scandinavie, où près de la moitié de la population est d'origine immigrée; Malmö, où la criminalité a explosé, de la petite délinquance au grand banditisme; Malmö, qui subit régulièrement des émeutes du type de celles que la France a connues en 2005. Votre gouvernement a su prendre des mesures drastiques pour éviter une pareille désintégration de la société danoise.

Vous avez vous-même dénoncé l'émergence de zones de non-droit et, je cite, «de sociétés parallèles musulmanes». En septembre, vous avez encore plaidé pour le renforcement des frontières extérieures, alors que vous avez déjà rétabli le contrôle effectif de frontières intérieures. En octobre, votre ministre de l'immigration et de l'intégration a annoncé que le Danemark n'accepterait plus aucun réfugié jusqu'à nouvel ordre.

Cependant, après ce portrait flatteur, permettez-moi de vous dire qu'il y a tout de même quelque chose de pourri au royaume du Danemark. Loin de moi, bien sûr, l'idée d'offenser votre pays, dont je viens de faire un large éloge. Mais par cette phrase de Shakespeare, devenue proverbiale dans la langue de Molière, je voudrais pointer une forme de schizophrénie. Malgré toutes ces mesures qui vous placent, à bien des égards, presqu'à la droite de Viktor Orbán, vous appartenez toujours au groupe libéral fédéraliste de M. Verhofstadt et vous ne tarissez pas d'éloges pour M[me] Merkel et pour M. Macron.

M. Macron est un ultralibéral et, en même temps, pour reprendre sa formule fétiche, un adepte du racket fiscal. Oui, il accable les Français de nouvelles taxes, alors même que la France est déjà l'un des pays les plus taxés – ou surtaxés – d'Europe. C'est ce même M. Macron qui dépense des milliards pour une politique migratoire qui est d'ailleurs diamétralement opposée à la vôtre.

Alors que votre pays ne fait pas partie de la PSDC, vous avez étonnamment soutenu l'idée macronienne d'une armée européenne. Seriez-vous prêt, Monsieur le Premier ministre, à placer des soldats danois sous les ordres directs de M. -Juncker ou de celui qui lui succédera? Personnellement, je ne veux pas que des soldats français aillent verser leur sang sur ordre des bureaucrates non élus et sans légitimité de la Commission européenne.

Enfin, pas plus tard qu'hier, au Parlement danois, vous avez déclaré que le Danemark bénéficierait du pacte mondial des Nations unies pour les migrations. Pourtant, ce pacte est immigrationniste, il est rejeté par les États-Unis, l'Australie, Israël, l'Autriche, la Hongrie, la Pologne, la Bulgarie, la Suisse, la Croatie et sans doute beaucoup d'autres encore.

Aujourd'hui, l'avenir de l'Europe, c'est l'objet de notre débat, se joue à Budapest, à Rome et à Varsovie. Le tandem entre M. Macron et M[me] Merkel, qui représente le fédéralisme et l'immigrationnisme, appartient déjà bel et bien au passé.

Λάμπρος Φουντούλης (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, κύριε Πρωθυπουργέ, η συζήτησή μας σήμερα αφορά το μέλλον της Ευρώπης. Δυστυχώς όμως, αδυνατώ να συμμεριστώ την αισιοδοξία που διακατέχει πολλούς από τους παρόντες. Η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, αυτήν τη στιγμή, θεωρεί ότι έχει ξεπεράσει την οικονομική κρίση και περιμένει να έρθουν οι ημέρες της ανάπτυξης. Ή έτσι θέλει να παρουσιάζει την κατάσταση. Στην πραγματικότητα όμως, η Ένωση βρίσκεται στην αρχή μιας πολύ μεγαλύτερης κρίσης, και αυτό συμβαίνει διότι οι ηγεμονικές ελίτ της Ένωσης αδυνατούν -ή δεν θέλουν- να καταλάβουν την τεράστια απόσταση που χωρίζει τις δικές τους προτεραιότητες από εκείνες των ευρωπαϊκών λαών. Η νέα αυτή κρίση θα είναι κρίση πολιτική, η οποία όμως ευελπιστώ ότι θα φέρει στην εξουσία δυνάμεις που θα εκφράζουν τη θέληση των λαών και όχι των πολυεθνικών εταιρειών.

Τέλος, θα ήθελα να αναφερθώ και στο σημαντικό ζήτημα της λαθρομετανάστευσης. Η χώρα σας ακολουθεί μία πολιτική που κινείται στη σωστή κατεύθυνση και έχει καταφέρει σε μεγάλο βαθμό να σταματήσει τις επιπλέον ροές. Δυστυχώς, δεν νομίζω ότι αυτό από μόνο του αρκεί. Επιπλέον, πολλές άλλες κυβερνήσεις χωρών, συμπεριλαμβανομένης και της ελληνικής, αρνούνται να υιοθετήσουν παρόμοιες πολιτικές παρά το γεγονός ότι οι χώρες αυτές είναι σημεία εισόδου στην Ένωση. Εάν δεν αντιμετωπιστούν τα φλέγοντα προβλήματα της καθημερινότητας των πολιτών από εθνικά σκεπτόμενες κυβερνήσεις, προβλέπω δυστυχώς πολύ ασταθείς ημέρες για την Ένωση.

Lars Løkke Rasmussen, *Prime Minister of Denmark*. – Mr President, I would like to thank everyone for sharing their views with me. It is not easy to respond because you brought many issues to the table.

First of all, I would like to thank the Vice-President of the Commission for your very kind comments about the Danish society model, flexicurity, etc. I think that is in response to some remarks given by good colleagues here, that is one of the reasons – because you asked me, which is right, the Eurobarometer or the people's consultations – I think that's probably the secret why the Danes are still so open-minded towards this idea of European cooperation and the single market, it is due to our social model. The fact that we, perhaps better than many other countries, have managed to redistribute what we have achieved from being a part of this more and more global economy.

I think that should be a lesson learned, but not necessarily something we should then reinvent in a European context because countries are different. But it should be something that should inspire each of the 28 – unfortunately soon 27 – member countries to look inwards. How can we secure sound fiscal policy? How can we introduce flexicurity? How can we strike a balance between high taxation and at the same time citizens' freedom to choose within services provided to the public, etc.

I think that's exactly why both figures are right. The Danes are reluctant in certain aspects and are pragmatic and not as warm-blooded as perhaps you will find in other countries, and that is why political leaders will not make speeches like my good friend Guy, but at the same time, they share these values. That is, I think, an important point to make.

Now, if you will excuse me, I will turn to my mother tongue in order to respond to some of the Danes present here today.

Og det står lidt i kontrast, hr. Vistisen og hr. Kofoed, når man ligesom portrætterer det billede af den danske regering. Der blev sagt, at der skulle gå 1200-et-eller-andet dage, før jeg bragte temaerne omkring mere fairness i den frie bevægelighed op i Europa Parlamentet, og det er jo rigtigt i den forstand, at det er første gang, jeg optræder i Europa Parlamentet. Jeg har jo heller ikke været inviteret før, jeg er ikke medlem, så jeg har jo ikke rigtig haft mulighed for at komme lige her før. Men det er jo ikke et rigtigt billede at tegne, at der ikke har været arbejdet med den sag, og hele denne sag handler jo altså om, hvordan vi – inden for visionen om den frie bevægelighed – sikrer, at befolkningen føler rimelighed, og at vi undgår løntrykkeri, social dumping, noget af det vi har set på den dansk-tyske grænse. Det har der været arbejdet med, og det er jo rigtigt, hr. Vistisen, at vi jo ikke har haft den store succes. Jeg var selv glad ved, at vi op til den britiske folkeafstemning jo rent faktisk begyndte at nå nogle resultater. For under indtryk af en britisk folkeafstemning om brexit eller remain lykkedes det jo faktisk i Rådet at lave et kompromis, som betød – under den forudsætning, at briterne stemte remain – at nogle af de danske prioriteter, f. eks omkring indekseringen af børnechecken, kunne sættes igennem. Det er jo sådan set bare en ekstra grund til at beklage udkommet af den britiske folkeafstemning, og jeg bliver nødt til at sige, også i dette rum, at vi kommer til at genbesøge nogle af disse spørgsmål. Og det bør vi jo gøre allerede i forbindelse med forordning 883, hvor jeg har noteret mig, at der nu er opbakning her i Parlamentet til, at der kommer en generaldebat i Parlamentet om den forordning. For vi skal finde de balancer, der gør, at vores befolkninger stadigvæk omfavner den frie bevægelighed. Og det gør de ikke, hvis man optjener retten til dagpenge allerede efter én dag. Det gør de ikke, hvis man kan hjemsende en børnecheck, der modsvarer mere end en månedsløn, til børn, der bor i et andet land, hvor leveomkostningerne er langt lavere end i f.eks Danmark. Og her er der en kæmpe opgave for Parlamentet, som jeg håber, man vil gribe ud efter. Jeg har jo lyttet nok til debatten allerede nu til at kunne konstatere, at der jo ikke i Parlamentet er konsensus om alting, men der ligger en vigtig opgave for Parlamentet her.

Så kunne jeg godt have lyst til at sige en bemærkning omkring de spørgsmål og kommentarer, der har været rejst fra forskellige sider, om en europæisk hær, den nye sikkerhedspolitisk situation, etc.

We are living in a different security situation, that goes without saying: a more aggressive Putin to the East – and I totally share what the Vice-President said about Russia's aggression in Ukraine – but it's not only about Russia, it's also about what we experience in the Middle East, in Turkey, a US President who is not as engaged in world policy as one perhaps could wish, and we have to respond to this. But we have to respond to this in a clever way, and introducing this vision of a European army as something very operational, something that is kind of in competition with NATO, that's not, at least in my opinion, the right way to respond.

We need to uphold this strong transatlantic defence cooperation. With the UK leaving the European Union, I think the rest of us together will represent less than 20% of NATO's total capacity. So the idea that we should, among ourselves, be able to do something which can compete with the NATO alliance, that's not a good idea, but that's not what is proposed either. So I think we should be careful in the way we use words.

My perspective is that it is absolutely necessary that Europe steps up – it's about spending but it's also about closer cooperation. But by doing so we have to be sure that we do not duplicate capacity that already exists in the NATO framework. So we should stick to the idea of added value, and that's not a European army in the sense that I think people will interpret the idea if you just say 'a European army'. It's all about closer cooperation in the defence industry, it's about closer cooperation when we, for instance, go in and stabilise things after wars in neighbouring countries.

And the reason why I have called for a debate in Denmark about this defence opt-out is exactly this. We are known as a country who always participates and steps up. This is the case for aid: we haven't reduced our aid actually, due to the growth in our economy our aid budget is increasing year on year. We are always ready to contribute soldiers to the NATO framework, and if we develop in the future a different division of labour between NATO and Europe, then it will be from my perspective a disaster if Danish soldiers wearing a NATO cap can do the tough missions but then if we turn the tough missions into soft missions and stabilise nations – talking about nation-building within the European framework – then Danish soldiers have to return home.

That's exactly why I raised this debate about a possible referendum sometime in the future about this defence opt-out. Not joining a European army under the leadership of Juncker, as was said, but a stronger cooperation between national defence capacities within the European Union.

Given the time, I think I should bring this to a conclusion and just respond perhaps to one very concrete question about the Nord Stream, which is in my eyes, or in my opinion, linked to this discussion about the new security situation in Europe. And that's why I have been asking again and again and again – and I really hope that the Parliament will give a big push towards this – for us to discuss this infrastructure project at a European level, because it is definitely a project which comes with some geopolitical implications as well. And honestly speaking, I must say that I think it shouldn't be up to Denmark, squeezed in between countries who have already given a clear 'yes' to this line, to take the final decision. So what we need is a European answer to that challenge.

I think I will limit myself to these short comments and I'm looking forward to this catch-the-eye element.

(Applause)

Procedura «catch the eye»

Bendt Bendtsen (PPE). – Hr. Formand! Først vil jeg sige tak til statsministeren for en flot tale, tak for det udsyn, der ligger specielt på klima, bæredygtighed, energi. At så statsministeren sådan blev overfaldet lidt indenrigspolitisk, det må vi jo så tage, som det kommer. Nu er der jo tradition for, her i salen, at når vi har statsministre fra Danmark, så bliver de overfaldet af Dansk Folkeparti. Nå, men til det jeg vil sige omkring klima, bæredygtighed og lignende: Jeg er glad for de momenter, der kom i talen i dag. Der er et sted, hvor jeg gerne vil høre, om statsministeren er enig. Det drejer sig om Europas bygningsmasse. Vi bruger 40 % af vores energi i vores huse, 75 % af Europas bygninger er energiineffektive, derfor er der behov for, at vi får gjort noget ved den eksisterende bygningsmasse for at nå klimamålene. Derfor ligger der nu nogle langsigtede planer om, at EU medlemslande får øget renoveringsraten af vores bygninger i Europa, så vi også kan nå klimamålene, samtidig med at det jo faktisk er den billigste måde, man overhovedet kan skære CO_2 af. Og endnu engang velkommen!

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Domnule președinte, domnule prim-ministru – aștept să vă puneți căștile, o să vorbesc în limba mea, măcar pentru faptul că sărbătorim o sută de ani.

Domnule prim-ministru, am încercat să fiu prezentă la toate prezentările făcute de toți șefii de stat și de guverne, pentru că vreau să înțeleg ce viziune și ce viitor al Europei dorește Consiliul, doresc șefii de stat și de guverne. Trebuie să recunosc că din discursul dumneavoastră eu am înțeles că subliniați foarte clar că Danemarca are drumul ei, că vreți mai departe cele opt excepții, că, în același timp, doriți mobilitatea forței de muncă, dar vorbiți de *dumping* social. Singura țară care poate să facă *dumping* este Danemarca, dacă primiți un lucrător din țara mea și nu îl plătiți la salariul din Danemarca. De asemenea, tot contradictoriu, spuneți de faptul că doriți să ascultăm cetățenii și să fie solidaritate, dar vorbiți de alocațiile pentru copii, care ar trebui scăzute pentru că sunt cetățeni din alte țări care vin la dumneavoastră.

Sincer, eu vreau vă întreb foarte concret, nu ne-ați spus nimic: care este viziunea dumneavoastră legată de noul cadru financiar multianual? Nu ne-ați spus nimic: care este viziunea dumneavoastră referitoare la pachetul de mobilitate, lucruri foarte importante care ne preocupă pe noi. Nu ne-ați spus nimic: cum vedeți dumneavoastră viitorul Europei, dacă să punem condiționalitatea de stat de drept? Sigur, dumneavoastră nu aveți teamă de o rezoluție: țara mea a avut o rezoluție. Nedreaptă, de fapt.

Hans-Olaf Henkel (ECR). – Mr President, I would like to say to the Prime Minister: you mentioned Brexit and I would like to take you up on the subject.

Today the UK's economic institutions have projected the impact of Brexit on the British economy, and it is a disaster. Less known is the fact that there will also be a significant impact on the European economy.

You mentioned that there were numerous referenda in Denmark, that there were special deals for Denmark, there were opt-outs for Denmark. On 8 December the British Parliament will decide on the new deal. It is possible that the new deal will be rejected. Mr Prime Minister, this would be your hour because you could lean on Brussels and make sure that Brussels offers Britain a new deal. A new deal, possibly, on freedom of movement, which will enable the remainers to get some more dynamic support in Britain, and it will offer the Brexiteers a face-saving way out. So it increases the chances of a second referendum.

I think one thing we can learn from Denmark: a democracy which ceases to learn, ceases to be a democracy.

Morten Helveg Petersen (ALDE). – Hr. Formand! Tak til statsministeren og velkommen her til Europa-Parlamentet. Jeg er – ikke overraskende – helt enig i, at EU selvfølgelig er vejen frem for Danmark, at EU er utrolig vigtig for Danmarks fremtid. Men en offensiv dansk EU-politik kræver, at EU prioriteres i Danmark. Det gør det ikke tilstrækkeligt i øjeblikket efter min bedste mening. Lad mig nævne et par eksempler: Danske ministre er blandt de mindst flittige, når det gælder om at møde op i EU's Ministerråd, viser en undersøgelse for tænketanken EUROPA. Danmark har ingen stærke partnere i EU, viser en undersøgelse for European Council on Foreign Relations. De manglende venner betyder, at Danmark kæmper under sin vægtklasse på EU-scenen, hedder det i undersøgelsen. Og Danmark kunne være en grøn stormagt, der trak EU i en endnu grønnere retning, hvis vi ville. Derfor er min opfordring til statsministeren her i dag, at Danmark søger de reelle fælles løsninger på de reelle problemer. Min opfordring til statsministeren vil være, at Danmark afstår fra de bilaterale initiativer med Østrig på flygtningeområdet og søger de reelle fælles løsninger på de fælles problemer, vi står overfor, i fællesskab.

Margrete Auken (Verts/ALE). – Hr. Formand! Velkommen her, kære statsminister, og tak for talen – hvis det holdt alt sammen, så tror jeg, at jeg kunne være enig i det meste af det. Jeg har et enkelt punkt, der ligger mig voldsomt på sinde. En meget stærk værdi i det europæiske fællesskab er humanismen. Og det er dejligt at høre, at du står fast på, at Danmark også skal underskrive traktaten i Marrakesh, at du ikke lader dig presse. Men jeg må sige, at jeg er meget foruroliget over at høre, at du måske ikke modstår presset for at introducere et nyt princip i vores asylpolitik, nemlig et skrub af-princip. I stedet for at fortælle mennesker, at når de er kommet her og har været her en tid, og børnene er her og så videre, så kan de få et liv. Børn kan få et liv. Så er der jo nu en tendens, desværre, i Danmark til og sige, at dem, der er her på en eller anden form for flygtningestatus, de skal vende hjem. Jeg håber ikke, det bliver en dansk position, og jeg håber i særdeleshed ikke, det bliver en europæisk position, og at du vil gå videre med den, men det er meget skræmmende, hvis vi kommer til og samle os først og fremmest om at bygge store mure, grænsekontrol og så sige skrub af til de mennesker, der kommer her, og som jo også har – ja undskyld mig – ret til et liv.

Rina Ronja Kari (GUE/NGL). – Hr. Formand! Og velkommen til Europa-Parlamentet, hr. statsminister. Jeg har lyttet med særlig stor interesse til dine ord om at lytte til borgerne. For der er i sandhed brug for at lytte til borgerne og tage dem med på råd og sørge for, det bliver dem, der er i fokus. Derfor undrer det mig også, at du så kategorisk afviser folkeafstemninger. Det er jo netop her, vi kan få afklaret, hvad borgernes holdning er. Nu kan det godt være, at du har en eller anden form for særlig evne, sådan at du kan forudse, hvad borgerne mener, men helt ærligt, den eneste måde vi kan sikre os, er jo faktisk ved en folkeafstemning. Derfor bekymrer det mig, når du snakker om, at Danmark skal med i en bankunion, men fuldstændig afviser at spørge borgerne om, hvad de mener om bankunionen. Eller som når du i dag taler om, at vi skal have flere handelsaftaler, på trods af at de møder stor modstand, netop fordi de begrænser vores demokrati, og fordi de udsætter kernedele af vores velfærd, for at blive ødelagt. Derfor, hr. statsminister: Gør nu alvor af dine egne ord, spørg nu borgerne, hvad deres egen holdning er, hold en folkeafstemning. Tak!

David Coburn (EFDD). – Mr President, George Orwell said if you want a picture of the future, imagine a boot stamping on a human face forever. The EU has tried to stamp the jackboot down on Britain with this recent so-called Brexit deal for democratically daring to leave. An attempted enslavement of the very nation that fought the Nazis and liberated Europe.

The EU is supposed to be about government by consent, not force. I asked the Parliament when we voted on an arrangement for Lake Lugano's Italian-Swiss border why the same arrangement could not be made for Northern Ireland. No answer. Well it is because the EU are using the tragedy of Ulster as a bargaining chip. Well that's not government by consent with friends.

In reality, I tried in vain to explain to Mr Barnier that the UK constitution explicitly forbids one Parliament binding another. The deal must be fair to stick. Well, he obviously hasn't got that message through – obviously I got it wrong.

When the Brexit deal fails in the UK Parliament and we have a World Trade Organisation deal, a totally liberated UK economy will take on a command economy – Europe – and we will win. We will see that happen. A potentially despotic EU army controlled by unelected bureaucrats, more EU isolationism and regulation. Crazy immigration, a false currency, mass unemployment as you isolate your greatest trading partner, London, the financial centre of the world with which you can never compete.

The future of Europe is one of a division like the Berlin Wall. On one side we will have those countries outside the EU, particularly in the Anglosphere and its free enterprise, which will prosper and grow as it always has.

On the other side will be a command economy – the EU. Once again plunged into poverty, darkness and held back from real progress like the Soviet Union. It is the EU folly, along with the absence of a proper relationship which will cause Europe to collapse.

We should try to part amicably as friends. Orwell's picture of the future is probably accurate. The EU, however, should not think too soon, that theirs is the boot rather than the face.

Presidente. – Ognuno è libero in quest'Aula di dire ciò che pensa. Io spero che le sue profezie non si avverino perché altrimenti sprofonderemmo tutti. Ma non credo che sprofonderemo e, anzi, spero che tutti quanti noi potremo vivere a lungo.

Γεώργιος Επιτήδειος (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, κύριε Πρωθυπουργέ, καλώς ήρθατε. Ο τρόπος με τον οποίον αντιμετωπίζουμε τα σημερινά προβλήματα προδικάζει και τις μελλοντικές εξελίξεις. Με βάση αυτήν την πραγματικότητα, θα σας θέσω δύο ερωτήματα. Πρώτον, ποια είναι η θέση σας σχετικά με την αντιμετώπιση του σοβαρού προβλήματος της λαθρομετανάστευσης; Αναφέρατε προηγουμένως ότι η αναδιανομή όσων ζητούν πολιτικό άσυλο δεν είναι η λύση. Είστε δηλαδή υπέρ της άποψης ότι οι παράνομοι μετανάστες πρέπει να παραμένουν στις χώρες εισόδου; Με άλλα λόγια, η Ιταλία και -κυρίως- η πατρίδα μου, η Ελλάδα, θα πρέπει να σηκώσουν το βάρος των εσφαλμένων και τραγικών λαθών της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, που διόγκωσε το πρόβλημα αυτό, και να γίνουν μόνιμοι καταυλισμοί δυστυχισμένων και εξαθλιωμένων ανθρώπων;

Το δεύτερο ερώτημα αφορά την αρχή της ομοφωνίας. Θεωρείτε ότι η κατάργηση της αρχής αυτής και -ουσιαστικά- η απαξίωση της ισχύος της ψήφου των μικρών χωρών, όπως είναι και η δική σας, που θα δημιουργήσει την Ευρώπη των δύο και τριών ταχυτήτων, είναι το ιδανικό πρότυπο και μέσο για τη δημιουργία της Ευρώπης του μέλλοντος έτσι όπως την οραματίζονται όσοι αγαπούν την πατρίδα και το έθνος τους;

Christel Schaldemose (S&D). – Hr. Formand! Kære statsminister, kære Lars, velkommen her til Europa Parlamentet. Selv om vi ikke er enige om alt i politik, så synes jeg det er dejligt og se sit lands statsminister her. Jeg er også rigtig glad for, at du lagde vægt på det her med den frie bevægelighed og den fair bevægelighed, da du fortalte om situationen med chaufførerne nede i Padborg. Men jeg kunne godt tænke mig at få dig til at prøve og folde det lidt mere ud – hvad er det, du forestiller dig, vi rent faktisk kan gøre for at løse det her? Vi taler om EU i fremtiden: Hvad kan vi gøre på det sociale område? Er du tilhænger for eksempel af en social protokol, som kan ligestille arbejdstagerrettigheder og fri bevægelighed? Det er jo en måde og gøre det på, selv om det ikke ligger ligefor. Det er en hamrende vigtig sag for os. Jeg tror, det er ret afgørende for, at vi får løst de forhold, for at få befolkningens opbakning til, at vi fortsat skal være stærkt engageret i vores europæiske samarbejde, så jeg er meget spændt på at høre din holdning til det.

Bogdan Andrzej Zdrojewski (PPE). – Panie Premierze! Panie Przewodniczący! Chcę postawić, ze względu na ograniczony czas wypowiedzi, trzy krótkie tezy. Mam nadzieję, że pan Premier się do nich odniesie.

Po pierwsze, odczuwam, że najwięksi przeciwnicy Unii Europejskiej są jednak wśród euroentuzjastów. Ci którzy nie widzą wad, ci którzy nie widzą mankamentów, ci którzy nie widzą przeszkód, koniec końców muszą doprowadzić do kolizji. Przeciwników po skrajnej lewej, czy skrajnej prawej stronie doskonale rozpoznajemy, wiemy czego chcą i potrafimy się z nimi uporać.

Druga kwestia to widzenie wad. Dobra inwentaryzacja to jedynie szansa na sukces. Natomiast brakuje nam narzędzi do tego, aby z tego kryzysu, krótko mówiąc, wyjść. I trzecia, ostatnia teza. Dziś nie stoimy w miejscu, jak twierdzą niektórzy teoretycy. My albo maszerujemy, albo wręcz biegniemy, ale niestety w miejscu. I to jest gorsze od stania, bo stojąc, nie marnujemy energii. My niestety marnujemy energię, nie poprawiając swojej kondycji.

Ramón Jáuregui Atondo (S&D). – Señor primer ministro, por este salón de plenos han pasado ya veinte primeros ministros de la Unión Europea. Todos han dicho cosas muy importantes sobre el futuro de Europa, pero si hubiera que establecer un común denominador, un valor común de lo que han dicho es que afrontamos retos tan grandes que solo podemos afrontarlos juntos.

Si hubiera una frase que pudiera resumirlo bien, sería algo así como «debemos hacer mejor lo que solo podemos hacer juntos». Bajo esta idea, el Parlamento Europeo viene expresando la reclamación de que se superen dos problemas fundamentales para el futuro de Europa.

El primero es que haya que hacer más aportaciones al marco financiero de los próximos siete años. ¿Está su país dispuesto a hacer más aportaciones económicas para una Europa que tiene que afrontar todos estos retos de los que le hablaba?

Y, segundo problema: la unanimidad. ¿Está su país dispuesto y a favor de superar la unanimidad para establecer mayorías absolutas que permitan ser más ágiles, más flexibles, más eficaces a la hora de afrontar los retos del futuro de la Unión?

Morten Løkkegaard (ALDE). – Hr. Formand! Velkommen hr. statsminister, velkommen Lars. Også fra Venstres side. Og tak til alle mine udemærkede danske kolleger for at have startet valgkampen her i rummet, jeg synes, det er rart at blive mindet om, at vi nu er i gang.

Jeg vil egentlig pege på, at det, der optager mig en hel del – jeg skal ikke gentage nogle af de mange spørgsmål og kommentarer og emner, der er blevet bragt op, som jo også er valgkampsemner – men bare pege på, at meget af en debat, der foregår, som bekymrer lidt, er en debat, som jo – og det kan man jo også høre illustreret her – er en debat om mere eller mindre. Der er også et par af mine kolleger, der ligesom har fået gjort det til et spørgsmål om mere eller mindre EU, hvilket jo er en forfejlet – helt igennem forfejlet præmis for en samtale, så jeg kunne godt tænke mig, at du, hr. statsminister, måske ville sige et par ord om, at det jo måske i virkeligheden handler om et bedre EU, og ikke mere eller mindre EU. Hvis du kunne elaborere lidt på det, for det synes jeg, debatten fortjener, inden alle går i det sædvanlige selvsving med at gøre det til et spørgsmål om mere eller mindre EU.

Og så en enkelt bemærkning til hele den diskussion, der i øjeblikket kører om forordning 883: Jeg synes, det er helt rigtigt at understrege, at vi har en særlig forpligtelse her i huset, fordi vi jo netop er i en situation i Rådet, hvor det ikke nødvendigvis er særlig hjælpsomt, det der foregår. Så hvis du måske kunne uddybe den situation, der er, for at kunne gøre det klart, også for andre medlemmer i huset her, at vi har en særlig forpligtelse til at sørge for, at den debat ikke skrider fuldstændig af sporet.

Zigmantas Balčytis (S&D). – Premjere, labai dėkingas už labai nuosekliai išsakytą savo poziciją dėl Danijos šalies, mes Jums tikrai pavydim ir pavydim tam tikrų dalykų – kad dar šiandieną kai kuriuose klausimuose esat nepriklausomi.

Tačiau pirmiausia aš norėčiau Jūsų paklausti. Aš esu iš Lietuvos, iš vienos Baltijos šalies. Mes, kaip Baltijos šalys, Europos Sąjungoje esame gana ne tiktai aktyvūs ir ištikimi tiems bendriems principams, už ką esam pasirašę.

Pirmiausia, ką darytumėt mūsų vietoje, kada mūsų pragyvenimo lygis – ir Jūs žinote dėl ko, todėl, kad mes turėjome kitus kaimynus ir kitokią savo praeitį šešiasdešimties metų – kada mūsų valstybės pragyvenimo lygis yra mažas ir kada mūsų įmonės negali mokėti tiem vairuotojam tokio atlyginimo, kaip Jūs kad mėginate mums pasakyti? Antra, ką darytumėte, kada didžiosios šalys Europos Sąjungoje apeina susitarimus bendrus ir apsirūpina dujom per Nord Stream I, Nord Stream II? Ką darytumėte, kada mūsų kaimynas pastoviai, kiekvieną kartą, grasina, ir mes esame kiekvieną vakarą išsigandę, kad nebūtų tam tikros invazijos, kas buvo, kas taip atsitiko keturiasdešimt pirmais metais? Aš labai sveikinu Jus, kad keturiasdešimt penktais įgijot nepriklausomybę, tačiau mes ją gavome tiktai devyniasdešimt pirmais metais.

Tai, Premjere, jeigu Jūs atsakysite, kad „nežinau“, aš būsiu labai patenkintas.

Jens Rohde (ALDE). – Hr. Formand! Jamen også jeg vil gerne sige velkommen, hr. statsminister. Når man hører Anders Vistisens tale til dig, så vil det jo nok undre en del her i huset, at det jo er dem, du deler politisk dyne med i det daglige. Man kan jo blive helt bekymret for, om du egentlig lider af Stockholmsyndromet, men ellers vil jeg sige, at vi, Radikale Venstre, jo er et åbensindet parti, og vi er jo også asylvenlige, så hvis statsministeren skulle få brug for hjælp en dag, så diskuterer vi gerne det.

Jeg vil gerne som en af dem, der normalt plejer at kritisere dig, have lov til at kvittere for både, at du står her i dag, og også regeringens holdning til Marrakeshtraktaten, trods interne skærmydsler og pres fra Dansk Folkeparti om ikke at underskrive den, og for støtte til, at vi begynder at diskutere forsvarspolitik i EU. Selv din tale i dag handlede om, hvad vi skal i EU, i stedet for at vi hele tiden i Danmark taler om, hvad vi ikke skal. Men det er altså ikke løst med fire fikspunkter, hvis vi vil skabe opbakning til det europæiske samarbejde. Det kræver sammenhæng i forsvars- og sikkerhedspolitik, fælles skattebase, så vi kan gøre op med alt det snyderi, der foregår i den finansielle sektor, fælles migrationsregler – hvad gør regeringen for at afblokere den situation, der er i Rådet i øjeblikket, hvor tingene er låst fast på asylpakken? Det kræver også social lighed, en vis social lighed, hvis vi skal have opbakning til den frie bevægelighed. Så kræver det forsvar for demokrati og retsstat, og så kræver det, at vi får nogle børnerettigheder i EU. Og der er det, jeg gerne vil spørge statsministeren: Hvad gør den danske regering i Rådet for at fremme disse sager?

Statsministeren siger, at man skal lægge hovedet til jorden og lytte til folket, Ja, men det er også fint nok, Churchill svarede bare, da han fik at vide, at han skulle lægge øret mere til jorden, at »så er det vanskeligere for folk at se op til mig«. Jeg kunne godt tænke mig, om den danske statsminister stod lidt mere op i den danske EU-debat i stedet for altid og ligge og rode nede på gulvet sammen med Dansk Folkeparti. Men tak for fremmødet her i dag.

Liisa Jaakonsaari (S&D). – Arvoisa puhemies, te, herra pääministeri sanoitte, että meidän pitää kuunnella kansalaisia. Me varmasti teemme sitä joka päivä, me Euroopan parlamentin jäsenet. Te sanoitte myös, että meidän pitää kertoa saavutuksista. Sitäkin me teemme.

Mutta en kuitenkaan usko, että menneillä saavutuksilla voitetaan koskaan lisää kannatusta, vaan meidän täytyy pystyä löytämään tämän päivän kuumiin kysymyksiin ratkaisut ja meillä täytyy olla jonkinlainen käsitys tulevaisuudesta.

Yksi näistä asioista on maahanmuutto. Täällä on tänään keskusteltu tästä, mutta valitettavasti minun täytyy sanoa, että Tanska ei tässä kelpaa kyllä esimerkiksi siitä, koska teiltä puuttuu humanismia. Teillä on pragmatismia mutta humanismia ei kyllä juuri ole. Mutta uskon siihen, että se, mitä sanoitte nostamalla Afrikan puheenvuoronne keskiöön, niin se on se ydinkysymys. Kyllä Afrikka on Euroopan unionin kohtalonkysymys. Meidän täytyy yhdessä pohtia todellakin kaikkia niitä asioita, joilla voidaan auttaa Afrikkaa, ja nähdä se kumppanina eikä pelkästään minään kehitysavun kohteena. Sitäkin tarvitaan.

(Fine della procedura «catch the eye»)

Lars Løkke Rasmussen, *Danmarks statsminister.* – Hr. formand! Tusind tak for de mange kommentarer, de mange spørgsmål, mange af dem jo fra danske engagerede medlemmer af Europa Parlamentet. Jeg skal prøve at nå at svare på så meget som overhovedet muligt.

I forhold til den grønne omstilling, er Bendt Bendtsen jo inde på – og det synes jeg er klogt – at man også skal række ud efter de lavt hængende frugter, og de er jo til og få fat på. Og der er jo ingen tvivl om, at en større indsats mod energieffektivisering og energirenovering er en del af det. Der er sådan set meget, der kan gøres, hvis alle europæere vaskede med 10 grader lavere temperatur, end det, vi almindeligvis gør, så svarer det til den samlede kapacitet fra alle tyske a-kraftværker – altså hvis vi vaskede ved 30 grader i stedet for 40 grader – og tilsvarende kan man omkring energirenovering lave tilsvarende regnestykker. Det viser vel sådan set bare, at vi i den grønne omstilling skal tage alle instrumenter i brug, og det, du peger på, Bendt, er jo et af dem.

Så vil jeg gerne sige til Grapini, som skaber et billede af, at jeg skulle være imod, at folk, der for eksempel arbejder i Danmark, ikke har de samme rettigheder som danskere, der arbejder i Danmark. Det er ikke. hvad jeg siger! Det er klart, at hvis man kommer til Danmark, og man har sine børn med sig, så skal man jo kunne arbejde og leve under de samme vilkår som alle mulige andre. Jeg taler om det forhold, hvor man ikke har sine børn med, og hvor den danske børnecheck, der sådan set er tilsigtet at skulle dække de omkostninger, der knytter sig til at have børn i det danske samfund, sendes til andre lande, hvor leveomkostningsniveauet er langt lavere, og pengene derfor rækker længere. Det er den situation, jeg taler om.

Så spurgte Grapini også til mine synspunkter omkring MFF, og det kunne blive et meget langt foredrag. Jeg vil bare sige ganske kort, at under en rimelig ramme, 1 % af BNI, som vil være et stigende budget, givet at der er vækst i Europa, vil vores prioriteter jo være, at vi investerer i nye områder. Det er blandt andet udvikling, forskning, innovation, men det er også – for at give en bemærkning til det allersidste spørgsmål fra det finske parlamentsmedlem – en mere holistisk indsats i forhold til hele den udfordring, der knytter sig til migration i alle former, og flere har været inde på det: Margrethe Auken har været inde på det, Jens Rohde antyder det, flere andre er inde på det, og jeg tror altså, at tiden er kommet, hvor vi har brug for at tale om disse ting i en sammenhæng og være lidt klare, når vi taler om disse ting. For der er en ekstrem forskel på en ung afrikaner, der sådan set, helt naturligt, kan man sige, søger lykken i et velstående Europa for at forbedre sin livssituation, og så den individuelle forfulgte, der er reelt på flugt, kontra den interne bevægelse i Europa på et arbejdsmarked. Og der er en tendens til i debatten – muligvis ikke her, men så andre steder, hvor jeg deltager i debatten – til at blande det hele sammen i en stor pærevælling.

Jeg er varm tilhænger af den frie bevægelighed i Europa. Danmark vil ikke kunne fungere, medmindre vi havde det privilegium, at man ville kunne trække på arbejdskraft, der kommer andre steder fra. Engang imellem viser der sig også nogle problemer. Jeg er varm tilhænger af, at vi skal gøre en indsats i forhold til og bekæmpe, i forhold til og sikre folk, der på flugt. Det er jo derfor jeg er stolt af at komme fra et land, hvor vi, som kun en håndfuld lande i hele verden, øger FN's målsætning 0,7 i udviklingshjælp. Derfor er der jo brug for – og hr. Jens Rohde spørger til, hvad vi så gør i Rådet – der er jo brug for, at vi udvikler en samlet strategi, som ikke kun handler om at beskytte de ydre grænser, som ikke kun handler om at lave udviklingshjælp i Afrika, som ikke kun handler om at understøtte en egentlig fri markedsøkonomi i Afrika, der har potentiale til, i spejlbillede af Europa, at udvikle et Afrikansk indre marked. Men det kan ikke kun handle om det. Det er nødt til at handle om det hele på én gang, og det er den eneste måde, hvorpå vi får alle ombord. Det er også derfor, at jeg har det synspunkt i forhold til hr. Morten Helveg og andre, der har været inde på spørgsmålet omkring reallokering og solidaritet, at vi jo er nødt til og arbejde med et afsæt i virkeligheden, og virkeligheden er den, at det ikke lader sig gøre at lave en reform af Dublinsystemet, der hviler på en obligatorisk reallokering. Det lader sige ikke gøre, det kommer til og splitte Europa. Og så må man jo med det afsæt pragmatisk diskutere, hvad man så sætter i stedet. Det, man kan sætte i stedet, er jo en anden form for forpligtet solidaritet, som ikke kun handler om at tage imod folk på flugt, men som handler om og yde et andet bidrag på en anden måde et andet sted. For hvis ikke vi får skred i udviklingen af dette koncept, som både handler om at beskytte Europa og række hånden ud til Afrika, og som også handler om at sikre midlertidighed til de mennesker, der midlertidigt flygter fra noget, en mulighed for og vende tilbage, så får vi ikke håndteret den samlede udfordring, som er kæmpe, kæmpe stor, og måske i virkeligheden den største, vi står med.

Jeg må så sige til Ronja omkring folkeafstemning og demokrati: Den danske deltagelse i Den Europæiske Union hviler jo på ikke bare en, men flere folkeafstemninger. Efter den danske befolknings nej til Maastricht, blev der så indgået i Danmark et nationalt kompromis, som også blev sendt til folkeafstemning, og det er derpå, vores forbehold hviler. Og det siger sig selv, at hvis der skal ændres på de forudsætninger, som danskerne har sagt ja til i Maastrichttraktaten på, så skal der selvfølgelig en folkeafstemning til. Men det kan man jo ikke trække til et synspunkt om, at en hvilken som helst justering af samarbejdet, som ikke er dækket af de danske forbehold, så kræver en folkeafstemning. Jeg abonnerer ikke på det synspunkt, at vi skal have årets folkeafstemning for at tage stilling til, om vi så stadigvæk ønsker, at vi skal være med. Jeg siger også dette som en bemærkning til Hekel og overvejelserne om en new deal, hvis og såfremt man i det britiske underhus ikke når frem til en beslutning om at støtte den aftale, der er indgået, og Danmark her qua vores

historik skulle byde ind og sige, at så finder vi bare en anden løsning. I min læsning af det, så er den aftale, Theresa May har indgået, jo at sammenligne med det, vi gjorde i Danmark, da danskerne tilbage omkring Maastricht sagde nej til Maastricht, nemlig at vi definerede vores nationale bud på, under hvilke omstændigheder, vi så kan have en relation. Det gik vi til en folkeafstemning om, og det vandt vi, og det vil ikke være en farbar vej, hvis det skal genforhandles successivt. Så jeg tror, at jeg må sige, at jeg er på linje med Juncker og alle kolleger i Rådet, der har sagt, at nu har der været et langt kompliceret forløb, hvor hvert et komma i en meget, meget kompliceret aftale har været vendt. Det er ligesom den konstruktion, der ligger på bordet, og det er så den, man må tage stilling til.

Så vil jeg godt måske afslutningsvis sige, når det Litauiske parlamentsmedlem spørger mig, hvordan jeg ville se på tingene, fra f.eks. et Litauisk perspektiv i lyset af, at der er forskelle i levestandarder. Og det er også et svar til Christel Schaldemose og andre, der har berørt spørgsmålet om den frie bevægelighed og rimeligheden i tingene – Jens Rohde også, hr. Morten Lykkegaard såmænd også. Grundlæggende handler det jo om, som en forudsætning for den frie bevægelighed, at sikre sig, at når man ligesom bevæger sig et andet sted hen, så optræder man på de samme vilkår, under de samme betingelser som dem, der var der i forvejen – altså når vi snakker løn og ansættelsesforhold. Hvis man ser på Danmark som en showcase her, så må man sige, at der, hvor vi er udfordret, er jo ikke der, hvor folk flytter ind i Danmark for kortere eller længere tid, og siger: »Jeg tager et job her«. Hvis vi kigger på deres dækningsgrad overenskomstmæssigt, så er det næsten på niveau med danskerne i al almindelighed, det er ikke der, problemerne opstår. Problemerne opstår i relation til service, problemerne opstår i relation til transport. Og de problemer, vi har set på det seneste, er netop linket til det. Det bliver vi jo nødt til og gøre noget ved, og det bliver vi nødt til at angribe helt konkret, og her har Parlamentet jo også et arbejde, der skal gøres. For det handler jo om at sikre sig mod, at man kan bruge postkassefirmaer til i virkeligheden proforma at vinde nogle rettigheder til at krydse grænser. Det handler om at stille nogle krav til, på hvilke lønvilkår man kan køre rundt. Det handler om og sikre sig, at man ikke i forhold til transportsektoren får en masse undtagelser fra det almindelige servicedirektiv. Det er jo et helt praktisk stykke arbejde, der skal gøres, og som vi må arbejde sammen om, hvis vi skal sikre os befolkningernes opbakning. For min egen læsning af den danske befolkning er, at den er ikke imod den frie bevægelighed, den er imod de situationer, hvor man oplever, at man under dække af den frie bevægelighed i virkeligheden tilbyder mennesker løn og vilkår, som vi ikke ville acceptere at tage på vores egen krop. Det er jo det, det handler om, og det er et stykke praktisk arbejde, der skal laves.

Så tror jeg bare, at jeg vil slutte af med at sige tak til Jens Rohde for de pæne ord. Og så lige måske en enkelt ting om FN-papiret, den globale migrationspagt, som jo ikke er en traktat, og som ikke er nogen Marrakeshtraktat, men som er et FN-papir, som så skal diskuteres i Marrakesh. Og jeg vil bare prøve og sætte det ind i en sammenhæng at slutte af på. Det kan jo ikke nytte noget, at vi introducerer et internationalt samarbejde, hvor standarden bliver den, at man kun deltager, hvis alle mener det samme som en selv. Og det er jo lidt den skygge, jeg synes, man ser kaste sig ud i det europæiske landskab, i hvert fald i en tendens, og som man også fornemmer på et par af indlæggene her i dag. Vi vil have det, ligesom vi vil have det, ellers vil vi ikke være med. Det er jo imod hele konceptet, og jeg taler selvfølgelig ind i en aktuel dansk debat, men jeg taler også ind i en europæisk debat. EU er jo en drøm, men det er jo også en realitet, noget vi skal forholde os praktisk til. Og det kan ikke nytte noget, hvis vi deler os i de lejre, hvor man enten ligesom skal anprise hele projektet med alle sine herligheder, for ellers er man nok ikke en sand europæer, og eller også skal man kritisere alting. Vi er nødt til og have den balancerede tilgang til det, at når vi taler om grænseoverskridende problemer og om at løfte europæisk velstand, også i en global konkurrence, der bliver skarpere og skarpere med et mere og mere selvbevidst Kina, med et USA der i nogen grad vender ryggen til sig selv, så skal der et samarbejde til! Og der har vi allesammen en forpligtelse til, at få den dialog i gang med vores borgere, hvor vi får sagt – for jeg tror sådan set godt, vi alle sammen forstår det – at hvis alting skal være vores egen løsning, så bliver der ikke noget at samarbejde om.

Det er den tunge opgave, og det er også der hvor jeg synes – og derfor vil jeg gerne takke for, at jeg måtte komme her i dag – at hele idéen om at prøve at iværksætte en europæisk debat med europæerne på nationalt niveau og forankret her i parlamentet har noget for sig. Det er ikke gjort med det, vi skal også levere på det konkrete indhold, men vi er nødt til at starte der, hvor vi får sagt, at der er intet alternativ til et samarbejde, andet end at vi vender ind i os selv og glider baglæns velstandsmæssigt etc. Og med de ord vil jeg sige tusind tak, hr. formand, fordi jeg måtte være her i dag.

President. – Thank you very much, Prime Minister Rasmussen. Thank you for your participation in this very important debate on the future of the European Union.

Presidente. – La discussione è chiusa.

Dichiarazioni scritte (articolo 162)

Eva Maydell (PPE), *in writing*. – If we are to reflect on the Future of Europe, we must take stock of what we have achieved. European citizens enjoy freedom of movement in the biggest single market in the world, education opportunities under the Erasmus programme; and solidarity in times of crisis.

Nevertheless, the unity of our union is put into question. I believe we need to learn to live in this new environment, where the European idea will be under attack and it will need to compete with other less liberal and less globalist ideas for the future of the European continent. What is more important, we need to learn to defend the European idea, by providing real solutions to the public's fears like migration, security and climate change while upholding the values our Union is based on.

In the physical world, strengthening the Schengen area, the eurozone and the accession of the Western Balkans will ensure security and stability for our continent. In the digital world, in spite of setting the highest existing standard for data protection with GDPR, Europe should also be a digital frontrunner with investments in new technologies and innovations, and ethical AI.

Pirkko Ruohonen-Lerner (ECR), *kirjallinen*. – Viimeisten vuosien aikana Euroopan parlamentissa on käyty useita keskusteluja miljardiluokan veronkierto- ja rahanpesutapauksista. Tänä syksynä käsittelyssä on ollut tanskalaisen Danske Bankin rahanpesuskandaali. Tanskalaispankin Viron-yksikössä pestiin rahaa jopa 200 miljardin euron arvosta. Ensimmäinen vinkki rikollisesta toiminnasta tuli Venäjän keskuspankilta jo vuonna 2007, mutta toiminta sai jatkua vielä vuosikausia. Kukaan ei ollut halukas puuttumaan rikolliseen toimintaan ja rahanpesun valvonnassa epäonnistuttiin totaalisesti.

Tapauksen ilmiantaja britti Howard Wilkinson oli kuultavana marraskuun lopulla parlamentin talousrikoksia, veropetoksia ja veronkiertoa käsittelevässä TAX3-erityisvaliokunnassa. Wilkinsonin esittämien todisteiden mukaan Tanskan rahoitusvalvontaviranomainen on tietoisesti sulkenut silmänsä ongelmilta ja jopa kokenut velvollisuudekseen auttaa kotimaansa pankkia sen vaikeassa tilanteessa. Valvontaviranomaisen tehtävä ei varmasti ole auttaa kotimaansa pankkia vaan valvoa sitä. Mikäli Wilkinsonin antamat tiedot pitävät paikkansa, vaikuttaa rahoitusvalvontaviranomaisen toiminta ammattitaidottomalta ellei jopa korruptoituneelta.

Rahanpesun torjuntaa, viranomaistoimintaa ja tietojenvaihtoa eri maiden välillä tulee tehostaa. Toivottavasti pääministeri Rasmussen ja kollegansa tekevät kaikkensa, jotta vastaavanlaista ei enää tapahdu yhdessäkään EU-maassa. Kun pankkimaailmassa havaitaan rikoksia, on erityisesti toimintaa valvovien viranomaisten velvollisuus puuttua niihin välittömästi.

IN THE CHAIR: MAIREAD McGUINNESS

Vice-President

18. Strategie für die langfristige Verringerung der Treibhausgasemissionen der EU nach Maßgabe des Übereinkommens von Paris (Aussprache)

President. – The next item is the debate on the Commission statement on the strategy for long-term EU greenhouse gas emissions reduction in accordance with the Paris agreement (2018/2941(RSP)).

We have two Commissioners with us this evening. You are both very welcome. I will now give the floor to Vice-President Šefčovič, who is also responsible for the energy union.

Maroš Šefčovič, *Vice-President of the Commission*. – Madam President, under this mandate we focused primarily on what needs to be done for the clean energy transition between now and 2030, and by the end of it, also thanks to the great cooperation we had with this House, we will have delivered on all our commitments. The policies put in place will go a long way even after 2030, but they will only bring us to emission reductions of around 60% by 2050, and this is not sufficient for the EU to contribute to the Paris Agreement temperature goals.

Climate change is already impacting on the European Union. We had extreme heat waves in four of the last five years and this summer temperatures in the Arctic Circle were five degrees higher than normal. Central Europe was so dry that the Rhine was in places too shallow for inland navigation. And this is just the beginning: a planet with a climate that's out of control would not be a safe and prosperous home, and we have to act.

Today we are therefore looking further ahead towards 2050 and towards a climate-neutral Europe, not only to contribute but to lead on the Paris goals. The Commission is responding to a call by this Parliament from last October which was renewed last month. In March the European Council also called on the Commission to present a long-term strategy by the first quarter of 2019, taking into account national plans.

Parliament called for an ambitious mid-century zero emission strategy for the EU, providing a cost-efficient pathway towards a net zero carbon economy in the Union by 2050 at the latest.

The Commission has taken up this challenge and we are starting from a good basis: we have reduced emissions by 22% while our economy grew by 58% since 1990 and this was accomplished by investing in clean energies, energy efficiency, innovation and cleaner transport.

We have seen that this not only produces benefits for the environment and therefore for the citizens, but that it also creates growth and jobs. Four million green jobs already exist in the European Union.

Under this Commission we have learned how to better integrate climate, energy, transport and other policies into the energy union and we are the world leader in designing coherent policies that drive investment, and investment that delivers results.

The strategy we are presenting today builds on this comprehensive approach. The strategy looks at all the key economic sectors, at innovation, finance, agriculture, the circular economy, trade… in short, how to make climate neutrality a cornerstone of a modern European economy fit for the 21st Century that will leave the planet clean.

Climate neutrality in 2050 will require additional investment – EUR 175 to 290 billion a year – but it will drastically reduce our bill for fossil fuel imports, which today is EUR 266 billion a year. The mathematics are clear, instead of paying to burn fuels that pollute our climate and our air, we can invest in cleaner and modern European industries that provide good local jobs.

I'm particularly proud of one aspect. It's a strategy that makes sure that we do not leave any Europeans or any regions behind. It analyses which sectors will benefit, which will transform and which will lose out, and it looks into how to mitigate these losses, especially through upskilling for higher quality jobs, and it has European solidarity at its core.

Honourable Members, there are many strong reasons to put forward the long-term strategy now: global commitments, economic rationale, but also a key political reason. More and more people are asking in the run-up to the European elections about the future of Europe. There is widespread public support for climate action and actually widespread optimism: 85% of Europeans agree that fighting climate change and using energy more efficiently can create economic growth and jobs in Europe, and I am one of them.

Miguel Arias Cañete, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, the long-term strategy adopted by the Commission today spells out a clear vision for the European Union climate and energy policy, one that can lead to net-zero greenhouse gas emissions by 2050, through a socially fair transition in a cost-efficient manner.

The strategy is meant to set the direction of travel for European Union climate efforts and to frame the European Union contribution to achieving the Paris Agreement goals. In Paris, the world committed to keeping the global temperature rise to well below 2ºC and to pursue efforts to limit it to 1.5ºC, and thanks to the support of the European Parliament, the European Union has adopted all the legislation needed to meet our Paris commitment, and in fact in doing so we have de facto increased the level of ambition to some -45%, and the role of the Parliament was instrumental in this process.

We should now follow through and start preparing the next step, looking at the 2050 perspective. The difference between 1.5ºC and 2ºC is considerable, and the IPCC Special Report presented this year provides a clear signal. If we are to avoid the more disastrous impact of climate change we should seek to limit it to 1.5ºC.

The IPCC report also told us what we have to do collectively to limit climate change. The world will have to go to net zero greenhouse emissions in the second half of the century, but if the aim is to pursue 1.5º this goal needs to be reached at global level by 2070.

The European Union should lead in this transformation, demonstrating to others that the transition to net zero greenhouse gas emissions is possible and opens up many opportunities, and this is what the Commission is doing today. With this strategy, the European Union would become the first major economy to be climate neutral. If we succeed, others will follow. If we do not lead, nobody else will, and if nobody else acts unrestrained climate change will severely impact Europe and rest of the world.

The Commission proposal is based on a detailed assessment looking at the possibilities for economic and social transformation that deliver such decarbonisation pathways. Some pathways are looking at reductions going to 80% by 2050, while others look into pathways leading to net zero greenhouse gas emissions by 2050.

The results clearly point to a comprehensive vision with seven key strategic building blocks that will be required to achieve a net zero greenhouse gas economy by 2050.

First, energy efficiency plays a central role. In the future our economy will grow but we need to prepare for reducing energy consumption by as much as a half compared to 2005. Energy efficiency is central to continue reducing emissions from industry but equally in the housing sectors.

Second, we need to advance the deployment of renewables. By 2050 more than 80% of electricity will be coming from renewable energy sources and these will have beneficial effects on our security of energy supply and deliver cumulative savings on our import bill of between EUR 2 and 3 trillion over the period 2031-2050.

There will also be additional benefits due to the reduced fugitive emissions of fossil fuels used in the energy sector and in this context, the Commission is looking into policy options for addressing methane emissions. A central tenet here is the electrification of our energy system, at least doubling its share in final energy demand by 2050 and with electricity generated by renewable sources, spreading to more uses such as heating and transport.

Thirdly, we have to embrace a clean mobility system. The automotive industry already invested in this new future and electrification is a promising option but some transport modes will not be able to electrify. For them alternatives in the form of advanced biofuels and e-fuels would need to be applied. And it's not only the vehicle or the fuel that can change. With 75% of our population living in urban areas, cities are breeding grounds for new solutions and we already see movement towards smart urban planning and traffic management. These, together with clean public transport, have the potential to reduce emissions and improve the quality of life.

Our industry is already one of the most efficient globally, but the transformation will converge with the need for modernising industrial assets. Steel, cement and chemicals dominate industrial emissions and in the next 10 to 15 years technologies already known in these sectors will need to be demonstrated at a scale to facilitate investment in clean and competitive industrial installations. Electrification, hydrogen, biomass and synthetic fuels are part of the solution.

The transformation will require an adequate smart network infrastructure and interconnections and we need also to harmonise the potential of the bio-economy while preserving our carbon sinks.

European Union agriculture and forestry will continue to provide food, feed and fibres as well reduce emissions. Continued efficiency improvements, better fertiliser application and nutrient management, and healthy animal stocks will benefit both farmers and the climate.

Agriculture and forestry will contribute also to decarbonising other sectors and EU forests will play a central role in providing biomass.

The transition of our economy will always have to be careful of how to make best use of scarce land and other natural resources.

And finally, we need to look into how to tackle with carbon capture and storage those CO_2 emissions which we cannot otherwise reduce. Thanks to the rapid deployment of renewable energy this is no longer the silver bullet to decarbonising. Still, CCS has a crucial role to close the circle for a net-zero economy, notably for energy intensive industries. If combined with sustainable biomass it could create negative emissions, helping to compensate for remaining emissions in our economy.

While by no means easy, these options, if deployed together, can make our path towards net-zero greenhouse gas emissions a reality. But to achieve this vision we will need additional investment of around 0.8% of our GDP. But this can also benefit our GDP by up to 2% by 2050.

This transformation will also save on health costs, with estimated reductions in premature death of more than 40% and health damage reduced by around EUR 200 billion per year.

The European Union climate policy relies on global cooperation and next week's Conference of the Parties – COP 24 – is decisive for the future of the Paris Agreement.

In Katowice the European Union has a good story to tell. We have adopted all the legislation needed for implementing our Paris contribution and our 2030 targets are projected to reduce greenhouse emissions by around 45% by 2030, which is the starting point for long-term planning. With the strategic vision that we adopted today we can also show our partners that we have started preparing for a climate-neutral economy fully in line with the Paris Agreement. It demonstrates our determination to shape together the best future for our planet, and this should inspire others to follow.

In the months ahead our proposals and different pathways should be studied in detail to understand how the European Union can best achieve a net-zero greenhouse gas emission economy in 2050 in a cost-effective way. We look forward to engaging with you, the European Parliament, Member States, national parliaments, business, NGOs, cities, communities and our citizens on the EU's long-term ambition and its contribution to the Paris Agreement.

Whatever the outcome of this debate, the European Union objective needs broad and deep endorsement, not only by our decision-makers, by our legislators, but also by all stakeholders and citizens. These debates and discussions should allow the European Union to adopt and submit an ambitious and broadly supported long-term strategy by 2020 to the UNFCCC. I look forward to continuing this essential work with you in the months to come.

Ivo Belet, *namens de PPE-Fractie*. – Voorzitter, collega's, commissarissen, goedenavond. Dit plan komt inderdaad op het juiste moment, aan de vooravond van de klimaatconferentie in Katowice. We kunnen de wereld nu een duidelijk signaal geven dat we in Europa onze verantwoordelijkheid nemen om de Overeenkomst van Parijs in de praktijk om te zetten.

Onze fractie steunt dit plan voluit. Wij steunen alle investeringen die u in het vooruitzicht stelt op het vlak van onderzoek en ontwikkeling. Die zijn uiteraard cruciaal. Wij steunen uw voorstellen, mijnheer Šefčovič, om in Europa een batterijenalliantie tot stand te brengen om in Europa zelf batterijen te realiseren en te produceren. Wij steunen ook uw voorstellen om CO_2-opslag te realiseren. U hebt verwezen naar de chemiesector, de staalsector en de cementsector, waar dat uiteraard essentieel is.

Op een aantal punten kunnen we nog ambitieuzer zijn. Ik verwijs naar het transport. Ik verwijs naar de luchtvaart en de scheepvaart. De luchtvaart wordt een van dé grote bedreigingen voor ons klimaat de komende jaren. Deze sector dreigt alweer te ontsnappen en zijn verantwoordelijkheid te ontlopen. De Corsia-onderhandelingen (over de koolstofcompensatie- en -verminderingsregeling voor de internationale luchtvaart) dreigen geboycot en uitgehold te worden. Wij rekenen op u, mijnheer Šefčovič en mijnheer Cañete, om dat tegen te houden.

Tot slot nog een opmerking over de flankerende sociale maatregelen. Die zijn alleen realistisch als we het sociale draagvlak behouden. Werknemers wier baan bedreigd wordt in de automobielnijverheid of in steenkoolgebieden, moeten zeker zijn dat we hen zullen begeleiden bij de overgang naar een koolstofarme economie. Dat dubbele aspect van deze transitie moeten we goed in het oog blijven houden.

Ik wens u veel succes, volgende week in Katowice.

Kathleen Van Brempt, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Madam President, we can say 'yes we can'. Yes, we can take the right decision to go to a fully climate-neutral economy. This is one of the real 'TINAs' – there is no alternative to taking this decision.

But let me also be very clear. There are different pathways to get there and we need to change that as well. it is not just about greening the economy. it is about making a just transition to do so.

We've witnessed the *gilets jaunes* in Belgium, and more in France. We should not say these are climate sceptics. We should not say that. We need to make sure that moving in that direction – and we really need to do that – is done in such a way that takes everybody on board. I'm looking to my good colleague, Ivo Belet. I liked your speech and I hope that next time, if we vote on CO_2 car emissions or energy efficiency that we have your support to do so.

That is really very clear because it is not good enough just to give speeches. We need to get results, and one of the results that we have to work on – and we need your support, Commissioners – is: we need to change the governance in Europe. We need to change the European Semester, take ecological and social indicators into account and change the way we govern the European Union. I sincerely hope that we will have the support of the EPP on that as well.

Jadwiga Wiśniewska, *w imieniu grupy ECR*. – Pani Przewodnicząca! Panowie Komisarze! Polityka klimatyczno-energetyczna jest szczególnie trudnym wyzwaniem dla Polski, w której węgiel jest podstawowym surowcem w procesie wytwarzania energii elektrycznej i ciepła. Doceniam fakt, że w strategii dostrzeżono rolę lasów w pochłanianiu CO_2, które jest efektywną metodą zmniejszania koncentracji dwutlenku węgla w powietrzu.

Polska jest otwarta na uczciwą, rzetelną i konstruktywną dyskusję o tym, jak wspólnie osiągnąć cele klimatyczne w sposób efektywny kosztowo, akceptowalny społecznie i bez wpływu na bezpieczeństwo energetyczne kraju. Obawiam się jednak, że restrykcyjne scenariusze będą miały nikłe znaczenie w skali globalnej, za to wywołają ogromne problemy w Unii Europejskiej, szczególnie w mojej ojczyźnie, Polsce.

Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy, *on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – Madam President, I would like to thank both Commissioner Šefčovič and Commissioner Arias Cañete very much. I would like to congratulate them on this visionary document. It's a really fundamental document. I would argue that it's the most radical transition of our economy and society in 150 years, and that is quite something. It means that climate change is not business as usual. We have to do things differently, not in an incremental way, but in a quite radical way. In that sense, it's essential that we build the trust of citizens, as my colleague, Ms Van Brempt emphasised, but also the private sector.

One other thing is very obvious to me. We have to be focused, we have to be united and our policies have to be coherent. That means not just mainstreaming a part of our budget like we're doing now. It means climate-proofing the entire budget. My plea is that the Commission should launch a climate-proofing exercise of the next 2021-2027 budget proposal. I do not think we can leave it like this after you have published this fundamental document. The Commission should also look again at its plans for sustainable finance because just sustaining a very small part of the financial sector will not be sufficient for this fundamental change of our economy and society.

Bas Eickhout, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Madam President, I would like to thank the Commission for this strategy. I quote Mr Šefčovič, 'our strategy now shows that by 2050 it's realistic to make Europe both climate neutral and prosperous, while leaving No European and no region behind' – it's beautiful – and Mr Arias Cañete, 'going climate neutral is necessary, possible and in Europe's interest'. It's a beautiful press release, so I was eager to read it. I'm a bit confused now because, at the end of the document, you conclude, 'well, you know, the EU should adopt and submit an ambitious strategy by early 2020 to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), as requested under the Paris agreement', so our mid-century strategy for this beautiful scenario will be published sometime in early 2020. Now I'm really confused. I thought we were doing that here. This is just eight scenarios on the table and, more importantly, it's avoiding one of the key questions: what are we going to do by 2030? If you are sketching a beautiful scenario out there that we should do it for everything – for people, for the economy, for the environment – so we are creating a heaven on earth, but we wait until 2030 before we take additional action, it doesn't make sense economically. Environmentally it doesn't make sense because the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) was very clear: we need early action to meet the 1.5 degrees goal. 2030 is not early action and for Katowice, it doesn't make sense because everyone will watch Europe. Are you going to raise ambition before 2030? There is a gap in reaching the Paris commitments. This document is beautiful, but this document is avoiding the question 'what is Europe going to do by 2030?' That's the question in Katowice. That's our economic and our environmental challenge, and the Commission is just postponing, as always. Unfortunately, I can only conclude that, despite the nice words, climate change policy is not a priority for this Commission.

Lynn Boylan, *on behalf of the GUE/NGL Group*. – Madam President, this is an ambitious strategy. On paper it's aiming to keep all Member States on board and reacting to the alarm bells from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) UN Special Report. If it's lived up to, it would be a step in the right direction, but is the strategy really safe-guarded, given that it is so dependent on the strong political will that we need across the board in every single Member State.

If we want to be serious about curbing global warming at 1.5° Celsius rather than 2°, we have to make sure we are providing a realistic chance to achieve this. We firstly need to avoid factoring in reliance on technologies that are not even proven yet. We cannot cross our fingers with techno-fixes when it comes to the climate.

Secondly, to ensure that this target is actually achieved and that we don't miss it, has the Commission considered any pathways looking at reaching carbon neutrality already by 2040? Taking account of the EU's huge responsibility for historical emissions, logically we should be aiming for zero net emissions before 2050. We are talking about human existence on this planet, so we cannot risk missing this contribution to curbing global warming at 1.5°.

Mireille D'Ornano, *au nom du groupe EFDD*. – Madame la Présidente, tandis que le Parlement débat d'environnement, de pollution atmosphérique et automobile, un mouvement citoyen inédit est né en France: les gilets jaunes, soutenus par 80 % des Français.

Écrasés de taxes, certains compatriotes ne pourront bientôt plus se rendre à leur travail en voiture tellement le carburant est cher. Au même moment, les Nations unies alertent sur l'écart croissant entre l'action des États et les engagements de la COP21. Or, c'est la mondialisation qui a favorisé la pollution, et ce, via l'importation massive de produits conçus à l'autre bout du monde. Alors, qu'attendons-nous pour sanctionner non pas les citoyens, mais les vrais pollueurs? Le transport maritime utilisant du fioul de très mauvaise qualité avec des rejets d'oxyde de soufre, d'oxyde d'azote et de particules fines est bien pire que le diesel. Qu'attendons-nous pour favoriser les circuits courts?

Soyons lucides, ce n'est pas en favorisant le libre-échange avec le monde entier que l'Union européenne remplira les objectifs annoncés.

Barbara Kappel, *im Namen der ENF-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Kommissar Cañete, Herr Kommissar Šefčovič! Sie haben heute ihre Netto-Null-Emissionsstrategie für das Jahr 2050 vorgestellt.

Die vollständige Dekarbonisierung soll jährlich 290 Mrd. Euro kosten und es sind bis 2050 positive Effekte von 2 % der Wirtschaftsleistung zu erwarten. Einige Branchen – also speziell die, die an fossilen Energieträgern hängen – können in diesem Szenario komplett vom Markt verschwinden, aber das wird in Kauf genommen. Auch für die Mitgliedstaaten bedeutet es enorme Anstrengungen, die Klimaneutralität zu erreichen, bisher wurde der CO_2-Ausstoß lediglich um ein Fünftel reduziert. Selbst wenn die kürzlich auf EU-Ebene beschlossenen Maßnahmen, wie der Ausbau der erneuerbaren Energie, die Steigerung der Energieeffizienz und die Reform des Emissionshandels umgesetzt würden, würde der Ausstoß bis 2050 um 60 % reduziert. Das ist ja noch weit entfernt von der Hundert-Prozent-Grenze des Null-Prozent-Szenarios.

Der Weg dorthin führt über einen höheren CO_2-Preis, bis zu 68 Euro/Tonne, sagt der *Emmissions Gap Report*. Derzeit liegen wir bei 19,77 Euro/Tonnen, eine Erhöhung also um das Dreifache – der Tod für manche Industrien. Deshalb bitte ich Sie: Lassen Sie uns weltweit hier im Einklang mit anderen Regionen handeln, lassen Sie uns die Energiewende nicht allein vollziehen. Lassen Sie Europa Vorreiter sein für eine klimaneutrale Wirtschaft – aber im Einklang mit den anderen.

Jerzy Buzek (PPE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Panowie Komisarze! Ta strategia jest najbardziej ambitną próbą realizacji Porozumienia paryskiego, które mówi o neutralności klimatycznej dopiero w drugiej połowie XXI wieku. O sukcesie strategii zdecydują dwa czynniki: wewnętrzny i zewnętrzny.

Wewnętrzny – na ile nasz przemysł, małe i średnie firmy, ośrodki naukowo-badawcze będą w stanie tę strategię zrealizować. Mówię o technologiach, ich dostępności i koszcie. Ważne jest też poparcie obywateli, dobrze więc, że strategia pojawia się przed wyborami europejskimi. Pojawia się również przed COP24.

I tu przejdę do czynnika zewnętrznego – tytuł strategii to „Czysta Planeta dla wszystkich". Unia Europejska jest istotną, ale małą częścią tej planety i odpowiada za 10% emisji CO_2. Już w Katowicach dowiemy się, na ile poważnie reszta świata traktuje porozumienie z Paryża i czy jest gotowa w swych ambicjach do roku 2050 iść nawet dalej. To kluczowe dla uratowania całej planety i przed nami wielkie zadanie na spotkaniu w Katowicach. Jak przekonać wszystkich największych emitentów do tego, żeby poszli w nasze ślady, bo przecież naszym planem jest ograniczenie temperatury do 2 stopni. A według najnowszych badań, według tego do czego się zobowiązaliśmy w Paryżu, to może być nawet około 3 stopni, a może więcej. A więc jest to groźne.

Miriam Dalli (S&D). – Sinjura President, Kummissarji, Jekk hemm messaġġ li dan id-dokument iwassal b'mod b'saħħtu, huwa l-fatt li ma nistgħux nibqgħu nipposponu d-deċiżjonijiet li rridu nieħdu. Jekk verament irridu li sas-sena 2050, tletin sena biss 'il bogħod mil-lum, ikollna ekonomija dekarbonizzata, irridu naħsbu għaliha mil-lum.

Il-liġijiet li qegħdin niddiskutu llum se jwittu t-triq għat-tnax-il sena li ġejjin. Eżempju tipiku hija l-liġi dwar it-tnaqqis fit-tniġġis mill-karozzi. Huwa llum li nistgħu, jew nieħdu d-deċiżjonijiet li verament jagħmlu d-differenza, jew inkella noqogħdu sottomessi għall-interessi ta' min ma jaqbillux li din it-tranżizzjoni sseħħ.

Dan id-dokument jidher pożittiv, imma ma nistgħux nibqgħu biss kliem fuq karta. Dan id-dokument wassal messaġġ ċar li fl-Unjoni Ewropea, l-aġħar li se jkunu milquta, huma dawk il-pajjiżi li qegħdin fil-Mediterran, dawk il-pajjiżi li jmissu mal-kosta, jew il-pajjiżi li qegħdin taħt il-livell tal-baħar. B'indikazzjonijiet li l-baħar jista' anki jogħla b'seba' metri jekk it-temperaturi globali jitilgħu b'1.5 gradi Celsius jew 2 gradi Celsius, inħallikom taħsbu x'jistgħu jkunu l-konsegwenzi għal min, bħali u bħan-nies li jiena nirrappreżenta, jgħix qrib il-baħar.

Għalina u għal ħafna ċittadini madwar l-Ewropa, il-prezz tan-nuqqas ta' azzjoni huwa għoli żżejjed, ifisser l-eżistenza ta' pajjiżna u tal-ħajja tagħna. Sakemm se nibqgħu naħsbu li l-ekonomija u l-ambjent huma separati minn xulxin m'inix konvinta li se jinbidlu l-affarijiet. Irridu, illum, naqblu biex ninvestu fl-innovazzjoni u fir-riċerka biex ikollna soluzzjonijiet li jagħmlu sens ekonomiku u li jpoġġu lill-Unjoni Ewropea fit-triq tad-dekarbonizzazzjoni.

Evžen Tošenovský (ECR). – Paní předsedající, určitě souhlasím, že musíme zvyšovat ochranu životního prostředí a chránit je před narůstajícími vlivy civilizace – růst dopravy, výrobní aktivity a obecného vlivu na přírodní bohatství je v současné době enormní.

Na druhé straně ale získáváme nové technologie a věda a výzkum přináší neuvěřitelný pokrok, poznání a pomoc s technologiemi vstřícnými vůči životnímu prostředí. Na druhé straně při definování cílů a strategií pro nejbližší desetiletí v oblasti klimatu musíme být velmi obezřetní. Při přehnaném nastavení limitů, které dnes vypadají velmi hezky a ambiciózně, bychom mohli dosáhnout velmi negativního vývoje v mnoha oblastech.

Taktéž jsem přesvědčen, že naším zájmem musí být komplexní přístup, tak jak se to nakonec povedlo v programu platformy pro postuhelné regiony. Za tuto aktivitu panu komisaři velmi děkuji. Jsem pro výraznou podporu vědy, výzkumu a inovací, které jedině umožní vstřícné a rozumné chování lidí vůči životnímu prostředí.

Michèle Rivasi (Verts/ALE). – Madame la Présidente, je remercie les commissaires de présenter enfin une stratégie sur le long terme, mais vous nous proposez huit scénarios, dont seulement les deux derniers visent à atteindre zéro émission en 2050. Ceux-ci reposent sur des techniques d'apprentis sorciers pour capturer d'énormes et irréalistes quantités de carbone, voire à les éliminer de l'atmosphère.

Si nous voulons montrer au reste du monde que l'Union européenne reste le champion du climat et faire en sorte de rester sous la barre de 1,5 degré, la priorité est d'abord la réduction de nos émissions. La barre doit être mise plus haut pour arriver, au sein de l'Union européenne, à une économie à zéro émission d'ici 2040. C'est cela être leader au niveau du changement climatique.

D'autre part, le dernier rapport du Groupe d'experts intergouvernemental sur l'évolution du climat (GIEC) appelle à des transitions rapides et de grande envergure pour limiter le réchauffement planétaire à 1,5 degré. Que nous dit la Commission européenne pour 2030? Rien. Elle commence les scénarios en 2030, comme si l'Union européenne était en bonne voie.

Le dérèglement climatique est là. Il faut agir dès maintenant. Soyons ambitieux: il faut réduire les émissions de 65 % par rapport à 2010 si on veut vraiment atteindre la neutralité en gaz à effet de serre.

Robert Jarosław Iwaszkiewicz (EFDD). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Poziom ograniczenia emisji gazów cieplarnianych, jaki został narzucony przemysłowi, osiągnął już granice absurdu. Nie ma technologii, które zadowoliłyby Wasze wybujałe ambicje, i żadne zaklęcia tego nie zmienią. Porozumienie paryskie było błędem, z którego już wycofują się najważniejsi partnerzy. Emisja CO_2 w Chinach jest prawie trzy razy większa niż we wszystkich krajach Unii Europejskiej i nie da się tego zmienić.

Podkreślacie zyski z rozwoju zielonej energii i ograniczenia emisji, ale dlaczego milczycie o kosztach? Dlaczego nie mówicie o ucieczce przemysłu do krajów wschodnich graniczących z Unią Europejską? Tymczasem koszty unijnej polityki energetycznej dla mojego kraju, Polski wynoszą około 5 mld złotych rocznie i ciągle rosną. Polska już wkrótce będzie miała najwyższe ceny energii w całej Europie. To realny efekt Waszej polityki. Należy natychmiast zawiesić ramy czasowe polityki klimatycznej i zlikwidować tzw. uprawnienia do emisji.

Seán Kelly (PPE). – A Uachtaráin, déanaim comhghairdeas leis an mbeirt Choimisinéirí Cañete agus Šefčovič as ucht na lainseála inniu. Is dúshlán mór é chun ár n-astaíochtaí carbóin a laghdú go náid faoi 2050 ach, tá sé indéanta.

So as one who represented Parliament at COP 21 and 22 and will be at COP 24 in Poland, and as the rapporteur for the renewable energy file here for the EPP Group, I welcome these announcements today. Also, I think that we are being ambitious, regardless of what people say, and as the Commissioner said: "if we don't lead, nobody will follow". Europe is doing that and I think that's what we need to do.

I am going to mention something I haven't mentioned before, and that is those who might be left behind. I welcome the emphasis on the socio-economic impact. Citizens and workers were made redundant in my own constituency. Bord Na Móna has announced 430 job losses because of the closure of peat factories or power stations. I would be the last person to say these should be left open – obviously they should not, but we do need to show empathy with these people and I think there are opportunities for us to have a just transition fund at national level to use the MFF. I'm the rapporteur for my Group on InvestEU. All these possibilities need to be explored so that nobody is left behind. This is a very important point. I think if we do that, we can make progress, but it has to be inclusive and fair, and I think we can bring citizens with us in that way.

Sylvie Goddyn (EFDD). – Suite aux conclusions alarmistes du Groupe d'experts intergouvernemental sur l'évolution du climat (GIEC), la Commission européenne a décidé d'accélérer la réalisation des objectifs des accords de Paris pour 2050. Les peuples européens vont devoir expier ce qui a structuré leur mode de vie depuis un siècle et faire pénitence.

La pénitence sera douloureuse, et la Commission le sait puisqu'elle envisage prudemment un traitement différencié selon les États membres.

Mon pays, la France, est classé parmi les pays riches. La réalité est pourtant différente: 10 millions de Français vivent sous le seuil de pauvreté, l'économie française stagne et le chômage ne descend pas sous la barre des 10 %. Sur ce sujet, le président de la République, M. Macron, s'est heurté à la réalité sociale, il a déclenché la colère des gilets jaunes en augmentant les taxes sur l'essence.

Cela doit servir d'avertissement: l'écologie punitive, qui presse les plus démunis, est sans issue.

Je vais donc vous faire des propositions: tout d'abord, pour diminuer les gaz à effet de serre et pour financer la transition écologique, il faut taxer les flux mondiaux avant de taxer les peuples. Nous pouvons aussi utiliser la Banque centrale européenne, comme vous l'avez fait pour sauver le système bancaire. Enfin, il faut mettre en place un protectionnisme intelligent, fondé sur des normes environnementales vertueuses et qui donneront un avantage compétitif à nos entreprises par rapport à leurs concurrentes étrangères.

Giovanni La Via (PPE). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, ringrazio il Commissario Šefčovič e il Commissario Cañete per la proposta oggi pubblicata, che delinea la strategia per un'Europa a emissioni zero al 2050. Così, come avete sentito, in quest'Aula, c'è chi ritiene la vostra proposta, da un lato dell'Aula, poco ambiziosa, e chi invece, ritiene che sia una proposta che vada molto in avanti. Quindi, è chiaro che avete centrato l'obiettivo: avete dato un percorso a quest'Europa perché continui ad essere leader sul piano internazionale e a guidare la lotta al cambiamento climatico; così come abbiamo fatto dopo Parigi e così come stiamo continuando a fare.

Come tutti voi sapete, quest'anno abbiamo avuto diversi eventi avversi sul continente europeo – eventi scatenati sicuramente dal cambiamento climatico – che hanno comportato anche la morte di centinaia di persone. È chiaro che questo ci deve spingere ad agire, a fare di più, soprattutto per salvare le zone che sono più sensibili. Dobbiamo tutelare, da un lato, il nostro ambiente, ridurre ovviamente l'incremento della temperatura; però, dall'altro lato, dobbiamo sempre essere attenti a quello che è il sistema economico, perché non dobbiamo andare troppo in là dove non possiamo spingerci.

Credo che la strategia che avete delineato è una strategia equilibrata che potrà raggiungere gli obiettivi al 2050 ma che potrà senz'altro aiutare la crescita di un'economia verde e sostenibile.

Dario Tamburrano (EFDD). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, sono molto orgoglioso come cittadino europeo di ricevere questa comunicazione. È un segnale importante – e lo è – se è il primo firmatario di Parigi a darsi un obiettivo preciso per un'economia a zero emissioni nette al 2050. Infatti, gli effetti dell'instabilità climatica, previsti già da tempo dalla scienza, sono oggi fatti di cronaca quotidiana, delineando quella che è la nostra nuova quotidianità. Inoltre, noto con piacere un cambio di passo anche terminologico, dal momento che già nel titolo della comunicazione è citata non la parola «crescita» ma la parola «prosperità»: le parole sono importanti, oltre ai contenuti.

Tuttavia, per evitare effetti più disastrosi, sappiamo che è necessario un più profondo cambio di paradigma. Siamo entrati in un'era di sfide enormi, dove l'economia neoliberista basata sul mercato non sempre è in grado di gestire più il nostro futuro. Per superare queste sfide, sono necessarie politiche economiche fortemente espansive e il superamento dell'*austerity*, dando finalmente attenzione al bilancio del capitale naturale e non solamente ai bilanci finanziari che hanno perso di vista quello che è l'equilibrio termodinamico, che regola l'economia e la nostra esistenza sulla Terra, prestando quindi attenzione a quello che è il cosiddetto *spread* ecologico.

Contemporaneamente, è inefficace pensare alla leadership nella lotta al cambiamento climatico senza considerare l'effetto degli scambi commerciali; i prodotti non sono sottoposti a un'analisi del carbonio emesso con la delocalizzazione delle produzioni che noi importiamo: è quindi urgente l'istituzione di una tassa sul carbonio alla frontiera europea e, eventualmente, una riforma dell'OMC in questo senso.

Per essere leader responsabili e consapevoli, inoltre, non possiamo nemmeno trascurare le necessità dei paesi in via di sviluppo: viviamo sullo stesso pianeta! Dobbiamo evitare che prendano le scelte sbagliate da noi imboccate nel secolo scorso e quindi dobbiamo permettere che non solo le persone, ma soprattutto la conoscenza possa fluire liberamente. Noi abbiamo un debito nei confronti di alcuni paesi ai quali abbiamo levato risorse ed è un debito che possiamo ripagare fornendo loro le conoscenze e le tecnologie necessarie alla lotta al cambiamento climatico.

Francesc Gambús (PPE). – Señora presidenta, señores comisarios, quisiera empezar agradeciendo a los comisarios Arias Cañete y Šefčovič la rápida respuesta de la Comisión en la lucha contra el cambio climático tras la publicación del alarmante informe de las Naciones Unidas.

Hoy, a las puertas de la Cumbre del Clima de Katowice, la Unión Europea debe renovar su liderazgo y compromiso en la lucha contra el cambio climático y les deseo, en ese sentido, acierto y suerte a partes iguales.

Debemos avanzar más y más rápido. Para ello, conjuntamente con las inversiones necesarias, debemos dotarnos de los instrumentos para apoyar un proceso de descarbonización y desfosilización que permita conjugar nuestros compromisos a nivel internacional con el mantenimiento de una industria europea competitiva, capaz de crear nuevos puestos de trabajo que permitan la transición social, que permitan también recuperar a aquellos que se van quedando atrás.

Para 2020, los Estados miembros y los principales emisores de CO_2 deben participar y facilitar a la Comisión toda la información disponible para que, conjuntamente con este Parlamento, puedan decidir la mejor estrategia para alcanzar tan alto objetivo que, a mi entender, pasa por una apuesta decidida por las energías renovables; la neutralidad tecnológica; la colaboración estrecha, en consecuencia, con los principales actores de la industria, de la innovación, de la investigación; la mejora en eficiencia energética; y una mayor implantación de la economía circular en todas las etapas del proceso productivo.

Y, para ello, la Comisión también debe entender que es urgente actualizar la Directiva de ecodiseño.

Catch-the-eye procedure

Bogdan Andrzej Zdrojewski (PPE). – Jestem zwolennikiem rozwiązań proekologicznych, ale oczywiście realnych. A także zwolennikiem liczenia kosztów brutto a nie tylko i wyłącznie netto. Jeżeli ktoś mówi, iż energia ekologiczna jest droższa, to zapomina o tym, że życie w smogu jest kosztowne dla państw. Kosztowne, jeżeli chodzi o leczenie, utratę zdrowia, a w niektórych wypadkach życia.

Opowiadam się za realnymi programami i za realnym monitorowaniem. W ramach tego monitorowania trzeba szukać także dodatkowych zachęt dla tych państw, które muszą ponosić koszty zmieniania swojego systemu energetycznego, bo rzeczywiście to w niektórych wypadkach buduje negatywne skutki dla kosztów życia, te bezpośrednie, płacone przez konsumentów. Ale podkreślam jeszcze raz, że dla nas dzisiaj, po to żeby osiągnąć realne cele, potrzebny jest dobry monitoring, skuteczne narzędzia i dobra motywacja.

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Doamnă președintă, stimați domni comisari, dragi colegi, evident că subiectul este interesant și important pentru toată lumea, evident că noi, ca parlamentari, suntem de acord, ca Parlament European, cu reducerea emisiilor, însă, așa cum s-a mai spus aici, există nivele diferite de posibilități ale statelor membre și domnii comisari au subliniat aici: avem nevoie de investiții în tehnologie, de investiții în infrastructură.

Întrebarea mea către Comisie este: dacă vrem să atingem aceste ținte și să nu rămână niște vise puse pe hârtie, cum gândiți în noul cadru financiar multianual să existe alocate resurse pentru a veni cu o tehnologie modernă, pentru a putea îmbunătăți infrastructura și pentru a putea să ajungem la aceste ținte care sunt, evident, benefice pentru umanitate?

Aș mai avea o întrebare legat de faptul că Uniunea Europeană este lider în scăderea emisiilor noi, noi nu suntem singuri aici pe glob: ce părere aveți, ce se poate face ca și celelalte continente și celelalte instituții să lupte pentru scăderea emisiilor lor, global?

Jakop Dalunde (Verts/ALE). – Fru talman, kommissionen och kära kolleger! I sin nya klimatstrategi bekräftar kommissionen äntligen det som Parisavtalet redan förpliktar – EU måste bli koldioxidneutralt. Det är en såväl välkommen som senkommen insikt.

Kommissionen har också insett värdet i den gröna omställningen. Strategin beskriver väl hur klimatsatsningar kan gå hand i hand med ekonomisk utveckling, stärkt konkurrenskraft och nya arbetstillfällen. Mot bakgrund av just detta ställer jag mig emellertid mycket kritisk till varför man väntar till 2030 med att börja arbeta från den nya strategin. Om man beskriver att det är bråttom, varför inte agera redan nu?

Det är avgörande att denna strategi översätts till nya initiativ nu – skarp lagstiftning, högre pris på klimatpåverkan och offensiva gröna investeringar. Annars är målet om nollutsläpp omöjligt att nå. Det är dags att agera nu – klimatet kan nämligen inte vänta.

Xabier Benito Ziluaga (GUE/NGL). – Señora presidenta, señores comisarios, la Comisión ha dado un buen paso proponiendo la neutralidad climática para 2050. Sin embargo, veo en esta propuesta el mismo baile de fechas y cifras que cuando usted, señor comisario Arias Cañete, tiene que responder sobre cuándo se cerraron las cuentas *offshore* de su familia.

Y, sin embargo, yo me pregunto también: ¿es creíble este objetivo viniendo de ustedes y de lo que han estado haciendo hasta ahora? ¿Cómo les vamos a creer cuando están proponiendo retrasar la mayoría de los esfuerzos para después de 2030, cuando la clave es lo que hagamos en esta década? A eso, en fútbol —usted, señor comisario, lo sabe— se le llama el «patapúm palante»: el retrasar lo urgente.

¿Cómo creerles cuando acabamos de aprobar unos objetivos de renovables y eficiencia energética totalmente insuficientes que, o bien son papel mojado, o bien hay que revisarlos al alza, como ya reclamábamos desde nuestro Grupo?

¿Cómo creerle si pretenden seguir manteniendo y dando prioridad al gas fósil en la estrategia de la Unión Europea? El cambio climático, señores comisarios, afecta ya a millones de personas, entre ellos muchos europeos, así que, por favor, sean coherentes.

John Stuart Agnew (EFDD). – Madam President, agriculture will be expected to reduce its greenhouse gas emissions. Farmers can reduce CO_2 emissions by reducing tractor use. This is possible without reducing productivity if GM seeds and glyphosate are regularly used to establish crops. The green lobby hate GM and glyphosate even more than they hate CO_2, so the alternative is to abandon some land and reduce food production.

Farmers can reduce methane emissions by feeding their ruminants expensive cereals and soya instead of grazing grass. This significantly raises the costs of producing meat, milk leather and wool. The green lobby insist that ruminants should be able to graze naturally so the only alternative is for the farmer to reduce ruminant numbers.

Farmers can reduce nitrous oxide emissions by growing fewer leguminous crops, but the green lobby want more protein crops grown in Europe. These are leguminous. The green lobby cannot have it both ways.

Farmers can reduce water vapour emissions by maintaining large areas of bare soil, preventing transpiration. The green lobby do not like bare soil because of erosion risk. Perversely, but fortunately, the green lobby do like the greenhouse gas water vapour.

Dobromir Sośnierz (NI). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Ja może nie wiem, jak obniżyć temperaturę na Ziemi o dwa stopnie, ale wiem, jak tego nie należy robić. Nie należy tego robić tak, że państwa odpowiedzialne za 10 % światowych emisji będą się wykrwawiały, próbując obniżyć swoje emisje o 40 %, co da w skali świata mniejszy efekt, niż gdybyśmy namówili wszystkich, żeby obniżyli emisje o 5 %. Taka postawa to frajerstwo, bo emisje, które wykluczymy na swoim terenie, przeniosą się w inne miejsce, inni na tym zarobią, my stracimy i nic z tego wszystkiego nie będzie. Dodatkowo podbijając stawkę i podnosząc cele coraz wyżej, do 30, 40, 50 %, zniechęcamy innych do tego, żeby poszli naszą drogą, bo pokazujemy tylko negatywne skutki i wysokie koszty, które nie przynoszą w skali świata żadnych efektów. Dlatego nie idźmy tą drogą.

Florent Marcellesi (Verts/ALE). – Señora presidenta, señores comisarios, gracias por sus propuestas, pero me temo que ninguno de los escenarios propuestos por la Comisión es realmente compatible con limitar a tiempo el calentamiento global a un grado y medio, y eso no puede ser, porque, con esos escenarios, el sur de España podría convertirse en un desierto y los próximos refugiados climáticos podrían ser las y los andaluces. No lo digo yo: lo dicen los expertos climáticos de las Naciones Unidas.

Y digo yo, ya que vamos a descarbonizar la economía, por qué no hacerlo bien ahora; es decir, más rápido y con más ambición, para cumplir el Acuerdo de París tal y como pedimos en el Parlamento Europeo. Esto significaría miles de empleos y una economía mucho más próspera, además de grandes beneficios para la salud.

A pocos días de la COP24, estamos perdiendo la oportunidad de liderar la ambición climática mundial. Si Donald Trump no se cree el cambio climático, y la UE no da ejemplo, díganme quién más lo va a hacer.

(End of catch-the-eye procedure)

Maroš Šefčovič, *Vice-President of the Commission*. – Madam President, if you'll allow me to elaborate on three points on the deepest transformation. We started with our European economy, on the importance of social inclusion and the need for more advanced technology to use to power this transformation. Before I start, I really would like to thank the honourable Members for what I feel was broad support for our approach and for seeing this importance in the same way as we do. I absolutely agree with honourable Member Gerbrandy that what we started under the Energy Union is the deepest transformation of our energy systems since they were built in Europe one hundred years ago. I would like to assure Ms Rivasi and Mr Eickhout that climate change is a top priority for this Commission and I am ready to say that no other Commission in the history of the European Union did more to tackle climate change than this one, and it was in close cooperation with this House, the European Parliament.

Looking at the parameters, at the pace and milestones – and here I am sure that my colleague, Commissioner Miguel Arias Cañete, will explain the calendar and the timelines of our efforts – it is very important to have public support and to have people on board. Therefore, the issues like energy poverty and the need for upskilling for those who might lose their job because of this energy transformation are so important. Therefore, we started close cooperation with the co-regions in the transition, where we already have seven countries working with us and we will have our first annual assessment already this Friday and, yes, already in Katowice, just to show that we care, we have the solution and we have to offer these people a new, brighter, cleaner economic future.

When it comes to technologies, as you will see from our strategy, we've been looking at all aspects of the technologies and some of them would need help through our research and innovation programmes, would need help through our eligible Important Projects of Common European Interest (IPCEI) state aid programmes, like we do for batteries. Of course, we need to de-risk some of the financing for these cutting-edge new technologies, but it is very important, because what I see in the world of batteries is that if we hadn't started at European level a year ago, we would really have risked being behind our competitors in Asia for many, many years. We need cleaner mobility, we need electric cars, we need less air pollution in our cities. Therefore, we are aiming to have 35 million electric cars in Europe by 2030, and I want to make sure that they will be powered by high-quality green energy batteries in Europe because the market for that would be enormous: EUR 250 billion a year. That is the challenge. That's a market we have to capture.

What we are announcing today is the opening of the debate. We need to have the people with us. We need to analyse all the aspects of it and I'm sure that we will present an excellent story and clear European leadership, not only in Katowice, but also later when we present the document to the UN.

PRZEWODNICTWO: ZDZISŁAW KRASNODĘBSKI

Wiceprzewodniczący

Miguel Arias Cañete, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, I would like to thank all the honourable Members who have participated in this debate.

Some of you have complained that this strategy is not ambitious. Others considered the importance and dimension of this strategy. I would just say that the strategy proposed by the Commission is fully in line with the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) Special Report. The Special Report talks of global greenhouse gas neutrality by 2070 and carbon neutrality, which is not as ambitious as greenhouse gas neutrality, in 2050. The Commission strategy is far more ambitious because it nails down climate neutrality and greenhouse gas neutrality already in 2050, 20 years before what the IPCC, with the better science available, recommends at global level, so we have ambitious objectives. It is very clear, if you read the communication, that the Commission considers that the European Union should, by 2050, be among the first to achieve net-zero greenhouse gas emissions and lead the way worldwide. To do so, the European Union needs to step up its efforts. That means that we have to go through scenario 7 and 8, which are the most ambitious scenarios and those which lead to climate neutrality. The ambition is here and it touches all sectors of the economy.

Some of you say, 'well, but there is no action'. We have started taking action. We have delivered, as Vice-President Šefčovič said, all the legislation needed on the climate, the Emissions Trading System that performs as foreseen, regulations on, land use, land use change and forestry, the whole energy union package. With the cooperation of Parliament, which has been more ambitious than the Commission – for sure, I have to recognise it – we could have a very good dialogue and we convinced also the Council to go along and now we have legislation that permits us to reach a reduction in emissions in 2030 of at least 45% – it might be bigger if other legislation comes – and this simple legislation, as the Vice-President said, will lead us in 2050 to emission reduction of greenhouse gas emission levels of 60%. So we are already working, but also because of you, we have excellent review clauses in 2023 and 2024 in all the legislation. That means that there will be more ambitious targets in 2030 because there are review clauses there that you have introduced and you have agreed, Mr Eickhout. So we have the tools, we have the elements to start being ambitious, but for sure we have to step up efforts in the future. This is a revolutionary change, a societal change. It's a radical change. That's why I don't understand very well why Mr Eickhout considers that we can lead this exercise in 20 minutes. No, because now we, the Commission, are inviting the European Parliament, the European Council, the Committee of the Regions, the Economic and Social Committee and the European Investment Bank to consider this mission for a climate neutral Europe in 2050. We have to prepare the special summit of the Heads of State and of Government for shaping the future of Europe at the European Council on 9 May 2019 in Sibiu. In order to prepare for that Council, we want to have a real Council – all the relevant Council formations should have extensive political debates on the contribution of the respective policy areas to the world vision because this touches every area: industry, transport, mobility – all of them –energy, buildings, heating. This is a very complex debate at Council and at Parliament level. It touches all the committees of the House.

All the Commissioners have worked together in project teams in order to deliver this communication. It has been a complicated exercise, but we have the product here. Also, in parallel to this political exercise, during the first half of 2019, the European Commission will take the debate on the necessary deep economic transformation and the profound societal change in an open and inclusive manner to all Member States, to national parliaments, to business, NGOs, cities, communities, citizens and youth. They should participate in a dialogue in the European Union and give their contributions on what is the level of ambition we really want and what is the speed of travel we really want with this informed debate in the whole of Europe.

I expect in the European elections we will talk about the climate and that could be one of the most important topics. Nine out of ten Europeans think that the climate is an important problem and more than 74% that it is a very important problem. I think these topics will be at the election. If the different political parties show their positions and we have a world debate, then we are ready to go to the United Nations in 2020 with the final strategy.

This is the first Commission communication to launch the debate. We have preferred scenarios, for sure. We have four ambitions and we also want an informed debate and that, finally, we follow an ambitious path and we are the first major economy to reach climate neutrality in 2050. It's hard. We will require huge investments but with huge benefits also: for health, the economy and also for the responsibility we have with the rest of the world.

Some of you said it, if we don't lead, nobody will lead us. The United States are on climate holidays, as the Governor of California, Jerry Brown, said, and it is up to us to lead the way. But if we show that it is feasible and all our impact assessments – and I recommend that you have a look at the in-depth analysis that supports the Commission communication, which is a communication with 20-something pages, the documents here show the difficulties and the challenges, but the possibility to achieve our targets. This is a complex exercise. It touches all society and is something we have to discuss in depth. This is the first moment we sit together. There will be much conversation on it and I expect that we will reach agreement on a very ambitious pathway to deliver what is expected of the European Union: the leading climate change policy in the world.

(Applause)

Przewodniczący. – Zamykam debatę.

Oświadczenia pisemne (art. 162)

Clara Eugenia Aguilera García (S&D), *por escrito*. – El Grupo S&D apoya una economía neta con cero emisiones de carbono para 2050, pero demanda acciones para una transición justa. En este sentido, los socialdemócratas españoles en el Parlamento Europeo celebramos la propuesta de la Comisión Europea de poner fin a las emisiones de gases de efecto invernadero para el año 2050, pero teniendo en cuenta que hay que asegurar que la transición a una economía neta cero en carbono beneficie a todos los ciudadanos y no cree nuevas desigualdades. La estrategia debería contribuir a cerrar la brecha creciente entre ricos y pobres y reforzar la cohesión social entre los ciudadanos y entre las regiones. Los eurodiputados socialdemócratas han liderado el trabajo legislativo en el Parlamento Europeo para conseguir una legislación ambiciosa sobre energía renovable y eficiencia energética. Sin embargo, se necesita una visión global para garantizar una sociedad sostenible y liderar una transformación ecológica que vaya de la mano con una reforma de la gobernanza económica y de políticas sociales para garantizar que esta sea una transición justa para todos. Por último, somos conscientes de que, para alcanzar los objetivos a largo plazo, se deben mejorar las ambiciones de objetivos intermedios de cara a 2030.

José Blanco López (S&D), *por escrito*. – El Grupo S&D apoya una economía neta con cero emisiones de carbono para 2050, pero demanda acciones para una transición justa. En este sentido, los socialdemócratas españoles en el Parlamento Europeo celebramos la propuesta de la Comisión Europea de poner fin a las emisiones de gases de efecto invernadero para el año 2050, pero teniendo en cuenta que hay que asegurar que la transición a una economía neta cero en carbono beneficie a todos los ciudadanos y no cree nuevas desigualdades. La estrategia debería contribuir a cerrar la brecha creciente entre ricos y pobres y reforzar la cohesión social entre los ciudadanos y entre las regiones. Los eurodiputados socialdemócratas han liderado el trabajo legislativo en el Parlamento Europeo para conseguir una legislación ambiciosa sobre energía renovable y eficiencia energética. Sin embargo, se necesita una visión global para garantizar una sociedad sostenible y liderar una transformación ecológica que vaya de la mano con una reforma de la gobernanza económica y de políticas sociales para garantizar que esta sea una transición justa para todos. Por último, somos conscientes de que, para alcanzar los objetivos a largo plazo, se deben mejorar las ambiciones de objetivos intermedios de cara a 2030.

Soledad Cabezón Ruiz (S&D), *por escrito*. – El Grupo S&D apoya una economía neta con cero emisiones de carbono para 2050, pero demanda acciones para una transición justa. En este sentido, los socialdemócratas españoles en el Parlamento Europeo celebramos la propuesta de la Comisión Europea de poner fin a las emisiones de gases de efecto invernadero para el año 2050, pero teniendo en cuenta que hay que asegurar que la transición a una economía neta cero en carbono beneficie a todos los ciudadanos y no cree nuevas desigualdades. La estrategia debería contribuir a cerrar la brecha creciente entre ricos y pobres y reforzar la cohesión social entre los ciudadanos y entre las regiones. Los eurodiputados socialdemócratas han liderado el trabajo legislativo en el Parlamento Europeo para conseguir una legislación ambiciosa sobre energía renovable y eficiencia energética. Sin embargo, se necesita una visión global para garantizar una sociedad sostenible y liderar una transformación ecológica que vaya de la mano con una reforma de la gobernanza económica y de políticas sociales para garantizar que esta sea una transición justa para todos. Por último, somos conscientes de que, para alcanzar los objetivos a largo plazo, se deben mejorar las ambiciones de objetivos intermedios de cara a 2030.

Iratxe García Pérez (S&D), *por escrito*. – Los socialdemócratas apoyamos una economía neta con cero emisiones de carbono para 2050 y reclamamos acciones para una transición justa. En este sentido, los socialdemócratas españoles en el Parlamento Europeo celebramos la propuesta de la Comisión Europea de poner fin a las emisiones de gases de efecto invernadero para el año 2050, pero teniendo en cuenta que hay que asegurar que la transición a una economía neta cero en carbono beneficie a todos los ciudadanos y no cree nuevas desigualdades. La estrategia debería contribuir a cerrar la brecha creciente entre ricos y pobres y reforzar la cohesión social entre los ciudadanos y entre las regiones. Los eurodiputados socialdemócratas han liderado el trabajo legislativo en el Parlamento Europeo para conseguir una legislación ambiciosa sobre energías renovables y eficiencia energética. Sin embargo, se necesita una visión global para garantizar una sociedad sostenible y liderar una transformación ecológica que vaya de la mano con una reforma de la gobernanza económica y de políticas sociales para garantizar una transición justa para todos. Por último, somos conscientes de que, para alcanzar los objetivos a largo plazo, se deben mejorar las ambiciones de objetivos intermedios de cara a 2030.

João Ferreira (GUE/NGL), *por escrito*. – Há um problema de partida na abordagem da União Europeia ao objetivo de redução das emissões de gases de efeito de estufa: a opção e a insistência por uma abordagem de mercado que revelou sobejamente não apenas a sua ineficácia, mas também a sua perversidade. O resto é muita propaganda e algumas medidas de discutível acerto. A criação de um comércio de licenças para poluir nada fez nem faz pela desejada redução da emissão de gases de efeito de estufa, sobretudo se a quisermos concretizada num quadro de justiça e de sustentabilidade. Deixar nas mãos do mercado objetivos ambientais – que bem podiam e deviam ser logrados por outras vias – será útil para alguns, sem dúvida, mas prejudicial para o ambiente e para as populações. Ademais, esta abordagem da UE tem associadas as limitações, as insuficiências e as contradições do próprio Acordo de Paris. A propaganda não chega. Sobretudo, quando as ações concretas ou não a acompanham ou laboram em sentido contrário. Continuamos, no fundamental, perante um quadro de incoerência entre os objetivos proclamados no domínio do ambiente e o conteúdo das políticas sectoriais relevantes – da política agrícola à política comercial, entre outras. Se são necessários meios para alcançar determinados objetivos, a proposta de Quadro Financeiro Plurianual pós-2020 não autoriza triunfalismos.

Miguel Viegas (GUE/NGL), *por escrito*. – A criação de um comércio de licenças para poluir nada fez nem faz pela desejada redução da emissão de gases de efeito de estufa, sobretudo se a quisermos concretizada num quadro de justiça e de sustentabilidade. Deixar nas mãos do mercado objetivos ambientais – que bem podiam e deviam ser logrados por outras vias – será útil para alguns, sem dúvida, mas prejudicial para o ambiente e para as populações. Ademais, esta abordagem da UE tem associadas as limitações, as insuficiências e as contradições do próprio Acordo de Paris. A propaganda não chega. Sobretudo, quando as ações concretas ou não a acompanham ou laboram em sentido contrário. Continuamos, no fundamental, perante um quadro de incoerência entre os objetivos proclamados no domínio do ambiente e o conteúdo das políticas sectoriais relevantes – da política agrícola à política comercial, entre outras.

Carlos Zorrinho (S&D), *por escrito*. – A comunicação da Comissão Europeia intitulada «um planeta limpo para todos», hoje debatida, é extremamente oportuna, e segue-se à apresentação pela Agência Internacional da Energia de previsões muito pessimistas sobre o grau de cumprimento global do Acordo de Paris, que considerou que mesmo os melhores esforços da UE podem não ser suficientes para conter o aumento de emissões a ocorrer, sobretudo na Ásia.

Esta comunicação vem realçar a importância da implementação rápida do pacote de energia limpa, bem como da finalização com objetivos ambiciosos das negociações institucionais em curso no que diz respeito à mobilidade limpa. Importa sublinhar que a comunicação «um planeta limpo para todos» propõe-se ser um pilar de uma visão estratégica de longo prazo que permita à União Europeia fazer uma transição sustentável e justa para uma economia próspera, moderna, competitiva e descarbonizada. A União Europeia está, neste momento, bem-dotada de ferramentas conceptuais e está em vias de dispor das ferramentas legislativas necessárias para aspirar a uma posição favorável para as pessoas, para a economia e para o ambiente no processo de transição energética. A chave, num plano intergovernamental, é a implementação. Os governos têm de dar seguimento a esta legítima ambição europeia e cidadã.

19. Binnenmarktpaket (Aussprache)

Przewodniczący. – Kolejnym punktem porządku dziennego jest oświadczenie Komisji w sprawie pakietu dotyczącego jednolitego rynku (2018/2903(RSP)).

Elżbieta Bieńkowska, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, today we have the opportunity to talk about the communication we have just issued on the Single Market. In March, maybe some of you remember, the European Council asked us to present the state of play of the Single Market. They called on us to assess the remaining barriers, but also to set out opportunities for the future. Of course, there are more reasons why we decided to and why we needed to put this out right now. First, and most obviously, because this Parliament has six months left in this term and this Commission has just under one year. It is right to tell citizens and businesses where each of us stands. It is right that they know what the Commission has done and what the co-legislators have done so far. Second, because everyone in this room knows that the Single Market and the freedoms of the Single Market are really under threat today. Third, because there is no time to lose: what I hear again and again from businesses and entrepreneurs is that every minute we delay in creating the true Single Market is really an extra minute for our competitors in Asia or in the United States.

We need to revive the case for the Single Market. We need to shift the narrative from the traditional – completing the Single Market – to the new one: the Single Market as a tool to improve the lives of our citizens, raise our industrial competitiveness, to boost our standing and influence in the world. The traditional narrative of completing the Single Market really means only ticking the boxes, and this is what really, really a lot of bureaucrats do, but this is not really what we need right now in this moment of history.

Our communication shows that there are very real benefits for our citizens and for businesses, not just in terms of jobs, not just in terms of more growth, but also in terms of freedoms and opportunities for people's lives. It shows also three main areas where we really need to do more. These areas are as follows:

First, we need to adopt the proposals on the table. We have put forward, as a Commission, proposals only where there were the highest priority and all of them passed the most strict impact assessment. We have not flooded both Parliament and the Council with the new proposals, but still the statistics are stark. For instance, out of 67 proposals from the Commission directly relevant to the proper functioning of the Single Market, 44, for now, have still not been agreed by Parliament and the Council. The situation is especially bad on services and on capital markets and the banking union. We also need to agree on some key proposals for our digital Single Market, for example, copyright, e-privacy and platforms to business, just to name a few. We have four months to remedy this. We have four months to find truly intelligent compromises.

Secondly, we need to ensure that the rules deliver in practice. The Single Market needs everybody in the EU to play by the agreed rules. Let me just mention two words: defeat devices. I am currently dealing with over 1 000 infringement cases and this is over 1 000 unfair limitations on our citizens and on our businesses. I don't exempt businesses from the criticism either. We recently, for example, found out that 40% of websites do not allow customers from other Member States to conclude purchases online. Geo-blocking: our geo-blocking regulation enters into force next week, and it needs to be implemented very swiftly.

Third, a real third point, we must continue adapting the Single Market so that it really fits a changing economy. We have to be more precise on how services become more important because they complement products or replace products. We need to be more ambitious in integrating digital technology in our traditional service sectors. The Single Market for services, as we all know, does not work as well as the Single Market for goods, but it offers really great opportunities and it shows enormous untapped potential. We need to look more at how the Single Market supports our trade agenda and we need to reflect more on how to be much more consistent and ambitious on enforcement and how this fits with our competition rules.

Let me conclude by saying that of course I understand that these are not easy issues. I understand that they take political courage and they need strong leadership, but time and again, I hear representatives of different institutions and different Member States declaring their belief in the Single Market outside the negotiating room. Once they enter this negotiation room, the proposals are blocked or watered down. Decent proposals are blocked or watered down. When the European Council addresses or discusses the future of the Single Market next month, I hope that the leaders will renew their commitments, not only in words but also in deeds, and I hope that they will show true leadership on this.

Andreas Schwab, *im Namen der PPE-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, Frau Kommissarin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Ich finde es gut, dass die Kommission einige Monate vor den Europawahlen mit dieser Mitteilung nochmals deutlich gemacht hat, dass der Binnenmarkt und die Zusammenarbeit der Volkswirtschaften der 28 Mitgliedstaaten das Wohlstandspotenzial beinhalten, das uns in Europa Wachstum beschert und letztlich für den Wohlstand von knapp 500 - Millionen Bürgerinnen und Bürgern in Europa verantwortlich ist. Leider kann man das am Ende nur mit Zahlen zeigen, und Zahlen führen immer ein Stück weit dazu, dass Emotionen verloren gehen. Aber um mich kurz zu fassen: Dass es uns in Europa heute so gut geht – und das gilt ja statistisch für alle Mitgliedstaaten im Durchschnitt, auch wenn es viele Bürgerinnen und Bürger nicht wahrhaben wollen –, das liegt daran, dass wir in Europa zusammenarbeiten, dass wir ganz häufig statt 28 unterschiedlichen einzelnen Regelungen nur eine europäische haben. Deswegen muss man ganz deutlich sagen: Europa steht nicht für Bürokratie, sondern mit einer europäischen Regelung schaffen wir gleichzeitig 27 ab. Deswegen bedeutet der Binnenmarkt weniger Bürokratie.

Das gilt natürlich insbesondere auch im Hinblick darauf, was Frau Kommissarin angesprochen hat, dass die Mitgliedstaaten, die betroffenen *economic stakeholders* im Außengespräch immer darauf hinweisen, wie stark sie für den Binnenmarkt sind, aber wenn es konkret wird, tun sie sich schwer. Wir haben das mit dem Dienstleistungspaket der Kommission gesehen. Aber ich darf natürlich auch darauf hinweisen, dass das Europäische Parlament in harter Arbeit auch bei manchem Widerstand des Rates dafür gesorgt hat, dass wir jedenfalls zwei der Vorschläge mehrheitsfähig gemacht haben, die sich letztlich genau diesen Anfeindungen in den Mitgliedstaaten auch ausgesetzt sahen.

Deswegen glaube ich, dass wir in den kommenden Jahren viel stärker darauf hinweisen müssen, dass der Binnenmarkt eben nicht nur die Zuständigkeit des Binnenmarktkommissars ist, dass der Binnenmarkt eben nicht nur GD GROW ist, sondern dass der Binnenmarkt von sehr vielen weiteren Zuständigkeiten in der Europäischen Kommission geprägt ist, die alle zusammenarbeiten müssen, damit sie die europäischen Mitgliedstaaten entsprechend überzeugen können.

Nicola Danti, *a nome del gruppo S&D*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, voglio ringraziare anche la Commissaria per questa comunicazione. Credo sia importante celebrale questi 25 anni di mercato unico – che è sicuramente una storia di successo dell'Europa – ma cominciare anche ad avere un approccio diverso, perché comunque non tutto va bene, e qui si mette anche il bene in evidenza e, soprattutto, bisogna cominciare a far passare il concetto che il mercato unico non è semplicemente una categoria astratta ma impatta sulla vita dei cittadini ogni giorno: dal *roaming* ai prodotti digitali, ai consumatori. Insomma, un sacco di cose che migliorano la vita dei cittadini.

Io penso che sia importante fare un bilancio di questo fine legislatura: è chiaro che la Commissione ha avuto molte proposte sul tavolo – lo ha ricordato lei Commissaria – è anche vero che molte di queste proposte sono state sostenute con convinzione dal Parlamento. Tra queste: sicuramente l'abolizione del *roaming*, lo sportello unico digitale, il regolamento sulla cooperazione in materia di consumatori, le iniziative in materia dei dati – sia il *free flow* che i dati personali, insomma il *geo-blocking* – lo ha ricordato – tutte cose sulle quali il Parlamento ha dato il contributo in senso migliorativo.

Certamente, abbiamo perso tempo su delle proposte che non erano delle migliori, quelle sul pacchetto servizi; queste non andavano incontro alle esigenze dei cittadini né davano un valore aggiunto alla qualità della loro vita. Penso all'*e-card* – che abbiamo fermato in questo Parlamento – anche se abbiamo trovato poi alcuni compromessi sul test di proporzionalità e sulle notifiche.

Però, Commissaria, me lo faccia dire: ci sono anche delle proposte che sono arrivate tardi. Lei ha ragione, abbiamo pochi mesi davanti a noi, ma abbiamo avuto, solo nell'ultimo anno, proposte importanti che riguardano la tutela dei consumatori, che riguardano il pacchetto beni, che riguardano le piattaforme. Queste proposte con sei mesi di tempo in più sarebbero state sicuramente portate a termine da questo Parlamento e invece, purtroppo, ci troviamo in queste ore a fare le corse per portare a termine cose molto importanti per i consumatori e i cittadini europei.

Però Presidente, mi faccia dire un'ultima cosa alla Commissaria: io penso che il mercato unico avrà un'evoluzione solo se affronteremo anche il tema fiscale, senza un tema fiscale in Europa il mercato unico avrà sempre maggiori difficoltà ad andare avanti.

(L'oratore accetta di rispondere a una domanda «cartellino blu» (articolo 162, paragrafo 8, del regolamento)).

Paul Rübig (PPE), *Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte"*. – Ich möchte mich bei Herrn Danti recht herzlich bedanken, weil er angesprochen hat, dass die Roaming-Regelung für unsere Bürgerinnen und Bürger einen echten Nutzen der Europäischen Union darstellt.

Jetzt geht es natürlich darum, dass wir „*roam like at home*" entwickelt haben – das ist auch bei der Bevölkerung sehr gut angekommen. Aber die SIM-Karten, die wir kaufen, dürfen wir nur in unserem eigenen Mitgliedstaat kaufen. Deshalb ist ein Wettbewerb zwischen den europäischen Mitgliedstaaten bis jetzt nicht möglich.

Glauben Sie, dass es in Zukunft möglich wird, eine SIM-Karte in allen 28 Mitgliedstaaten zu kaufen und echten Wettbewerb zu generieren?

Nicola Danti (S&D), *Risposta a una domanda «cartellino blu»*. – Signor Presidente, io penso che ancora abbiamo da fare molti passi avanti sul tema della concorrenza a livello europeo. Sicuramente possiamo fare passi avanti. È chiaro che noi dobbiamo però garantire a livello europeo che vi sia una reale concorrenza ed equità anche da un punto di vista fiscale, perché un'azienda che paga poche tasse in un paese rischia di fare concorrenza sleale in questo settore, come in altri settori, alle aziende che invece pagano un livello di tassazione maggiore. Per questo io penso che il mercato unico avrà una grande prospettiva se accompagneremo la parte normativa di rafforzamento del mercato unico con un rafforzamento della politica fiscale.

Daniel Dalton, *on behalf of the ECR Group*. – Mr President, I'd like to start by thanking the Commission because this report is a stark warning that the Single Market is far from complete, lacks political support from Member States and is, in fact, under threat. At the heart of this report is a goods-services divide. The Single Market in goods is well developed, although often undermined by national regulations, but the Single Market in services has barely got out of the starting gates. Only a third of Single Market-related legislation proposed this term has been approved. If we didn't already have the Services Directive, does anyone really believe that it would be passed today?

The European Parliament is often as guilty as Member States of protectionism. The e-card system, which would have made it easier for professionals to work across borders, was blocked here. The Single Market is supposed to be at the heart of the EU. Services is supposed to be one of the four freedoms – that's what I keep hearing in the Brexit negotiations – yet this Parliament seems to show little interest in it. Try being a hairdresser in Germany or a ski instructor in France. It's virtually impossible, and we are discriminating against other European citizens here. We need to match rhetoric with delivery and real commitment if the Single Market is to progress further. The risk today is that it slips backwards.

Dita Charanzová, *on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – Mr President, I will start with a quote from the Mario Monti report: 'the single market is less popular than ever, yet it's more needed than ever.'

So 20 years since Jacques Delors declared the single market, people now take for granted the benefits it has brought our citizens: from cheaper and safer products to the right to work freely in any Member State, the four freedoms of the single market are the crown jewels of the European Union. It is something to treasure and to protect. The daily benefits of the European Union can be found in the single market. I do share your conclusions, your regret that after 25 years the single market is still not complete. The four freedoms, especially on services, are not fully implemented. So we must do more.

I believe the European Council must commit to a new pledge to further complete the single market by 2025, including a new binding timetable for action as European leaders did in 1985, a new pledge based on a proactive movement towards strengthening the single market and away from a defensive national focus. We must not fall into the trap of returning to national protection measures and new regulatory barriers, such as gold-plating European legislation. Our citizens need to understand that it is the single market and trade that supports jobs and growth, it is not isolationism in the form of new barriers.

João Ferreira, *em nome do Grupo GUE/NGL*. – Senhor Presidente, Senhora Comissária, o Mercado Único tem ganhadores e tem perdedores. A livre concorrência capitalista no Mercado Único tem efeitos assimétricos, que tendem a acentuar a divergência económica e social. De um lado, as principais economias da União Europeia e da zona euro, e as respetivas multinacionais, que colonizaram mercados do centro às periferias, são os ganhadores. Do outro lado, os países economicamente mais frágeis, expostos a uma concorrência desigual e destrutiva, cujos mercados foram colonizados com forte disrupção do tecido empresarial, são os perdedores.

A política de coesão insuficiente nunca compensou por inteiro este efeito divergente e assimétrico. O aprofundamento do Mercado Único, por outro lado, foi subjugando ao mercado esferas crescentes da vida económica e social, e é indissociável das liberalizações, das privatizações e do ataque aos serviços públicos e às funções sociais do Estado. O retrato idílico que a direita e a social-democracia recorrentemente fazem do Mercado Único corresponde apenas a uma das faces da moeda: a dos interesses que defendem.

Os trabalhadores e os povos não têm razões para se reverem neste retrato.

Robert Jarosław Iwaszkiewicz, *w imieniu grupy EFDD*. – Panie Przewodniczący! Jednolity rynek to największy, o ile nie jedyny sukces Unii Europejskiej. Jednak w ostatnich latach widać, że wciąż dużą rolę odgrywa na nim indywidualne podejście i interesy państw członkowskich, głównie dobrze rozwiniętych krajów Europy Zachodniej, kosztem słabszych partnerów z krajów nowej Unii. Interesy te wspierane są przez unijną administrację i unijne agencje.

To właśnie bizantyjska administracja tworzy kolejne bariery wejścia na wspólny rynek, tym samym nakładając kaganiec na wolność i wolny handel. W 2017 r. obowiązywało aż 7076 dyrektyw dotyczących jednolitego rynku. Czy to wciąż jest jeszcze wolny rynek? Jeśli chcemy utrzymania wolnego handlu, jeśli chcemy zwiększyć konkurencyjność, jeśli chcemy wzmocnić nasz przemysł, to wstrzymajmy legislacyjną machinę i pozwólmy firmom na spokojną konkurencję na faktycznie wolnym rynku.

Dobromir Sośnierz (NI). – Panie Przewodniczący! Jednolity rynek będzie wtedy, kiedy państwa powstrzymają się od jego regulowania. Każda regulacja, nawet próba regulacji wspólnej dla wszystkich państw dokonanej przez Parlament Europejski, prowadzi do tego, że rynek nie jest jednolity. Nawet te wspólne regulacje są bowiem wdrażane przez parlamenty narodowe trochę inaczej i kończy się to – jak ja to mówię – pozłacaniem, czyli tym, że przy wdrażaniu niektóre państwa podważają czasami sens danego aktu, a przynajmniej intencje prawodawcy unijnego.

Poza tym muszę się odnieść do tych nieprawdopodobnych bzdur wygłaszanych przez mojego przedmówcę na temat nieuczciwej konkurencji podatkowej. Nieuczciwe to jest opodatkowanie ludzi w sposób nadmierny. Nieuczciwe jest w ogóle opodatkowanie ludzi, by przeznaczyć uzyskane środki na rzeczy, które nie są absolutnie niezbędne dla funkcjonowania państwa. Nieuczciwe jest zabieranie siłą ludziom pieniędzy i dawanie ich innym ludziom. To jest nieuczciwe. Nie ma nic nieuczciwego w tym, że gdzieś obniża się podatki, bo obniżanie podatków jest właśnie formą uczciwości. Uczciwe jest, kiedy każdy dysponuje tym, co sam wypracował.

Jiří Pospíšil (PPE). – Pane předsedající, já se zde také hlásím k těm řečníkům, kteří jednoznačně vyzdvihují význam a pozitiva jednotného trhu. Zkrátka a dobře i pro ty občany EU, kteří jsou třeba kritičtí k některým našim politikám, tak politika jednotného trhu je jasně vysvětlitelná a obhajitelná. Nicméně bojujeme pořád s protekcionismem a myšlenky jednotného trhu musíme pořád obhajovat a vysvětlovat.

Paní komisařka ve svém vystoupení položila řečnickou otázku, jestli bude jednotný trh někdy dokončen. Já se domnívám, že jednotný trh nebude nikdy dokončen. Pořád budou oblasti, ve kterých bude vhodné upravovat již přijaté právní předpisy anebo nacházet jednotnou regulaci pro celou Evropu. Kdyby se ty základní institucionální rámce jednotného trhu podařilo přijmout do roku 2025, bylo by to skvělé. V každém případě se domnívám, že je třeba na konci volebního období udělat revizi toho, co nebylo ještě přijato, a tyto věci předat příští administrativě, příští Komisi, příštímu Parlamentu. Bylo by totiž velkou škodou, kdyby příští Parlament a příští Komise začínaly tzv. od nuly a nenavázaly na to, co udělala tato Komise, co schválil tento Parlament.

Vedle toho, co nebylo dokončeno, bychom také měli sdělit vize, kde si myslíme, že by v příštím volebním období měly být cíle Parlamentu i Komise napjaty, je to třeba v oblasti služeb. Já i jako někteří moji kolegové cítím, že v oblasti služeb zkrátka a dobře ta regulace nefunguje příliš efektivně.

Christel Schaldemose (S&D). – Hr. Formand! Tak for det. Jeg vil starte med og sige tusind tak til fru Bienkowska for at gøre en rigtig vigtig sag for bilindustrien og for det indre marked, nemlig at gå i rette med de medlemslande, der ikke sørger for og overholde vores lovgivning. Tak for det, det er nødvendigt, selv om det er hårdt arbejde. Det indre marked er rigtig rigtig vigtigt for os, og vi fejrer dets 25 års fødselsdag. Men når vi så samtidig alligevel også ser oversigten, og ser, at vi ikke er i mål med alle tingene, så kan det måske også skyldes at vi nogen gange får fokuseret på en smule af det forkerte. Det er altså, rigtig vigtigt, at vi selvfølgelig har de rigtige love på det indre marked. Men implementeringen skal også være i orden, og håndhævelsen skal også være i orden, og det har den ikke været. Måske skal vi fremadrettet være mere fokuserede på at have lidt færre love, vi arbejder med, for at få det indre marked til og fungere. Det skal ikke forstås som om, jeg er imod regulering, jeg vil gerne have regulering, men lidt færre, lidt vigtigere love, og så sørge for, at de bliver vedtaget, implementeret og håndhævet Det tror jeg er vejen frem for vores gode indre marked.

Zgłoszenia z sali

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – Pane předsedající, volný pohyb zboží, služeb, lidí a kapitálu je zásadním faktorem pro celoevropskou prosperitu. Vytváříme tak druhou nejsilnější ekonomiku na světě a měli bychom umět tento potenciál využívat.

Přesto zde existují zásadní problémy, např. jednotný trh zboží znamená také jistou neférovost, a proto jsem přivítala iniciativu Komise, která naplnila volání poslanců i některých členských států po jedné kvalitě potravin a zboží. Není možné, aby zde byli spotřebitelé dvojí úrovně. Tedy opatření, které bude zavedeno – tzn., že některé praktiky obchodních řetězců budou považovány za neférové –, považuji za správné řešení.

Další otázkou je volný pohyb služeb, už to tady bylo zmíněno. Volný pohyb služeb by měl být zjednodušován a ne, aby byly budovány nové bariéry, jako je to např. u směrnice pro vysílání pracovníků.

Osobně chci poděkovat paní komisařce za předložení návrhu e-karty, poněvadž jsem ji považovala za velmi dobré zjednodušení služeb pro některé sektory, a bohužel byl to právě EP, který tuto iniciativu Komise prozatím zablokoval. Věřím, že bude obnovena a že na evropském trhu služeb bude zjednodušen tento pohyb.

Julie Ward (S&D). – Mr President, the Single Market is vital for the prosperity and economic well-being of citizens in the UK and the EU. It gives UK businesses access to the world's largest market, of 500 million people, generating about GBP 10 trillion in economic activity. It is therefore a tragedy that the UK has agreed, in principle, to leave the EU and the Single Market. It is an act of self-harm and beneficial for neither side. It's obvious that the UK's best interests would be served by remaining as a Member State and continuing to be a part of the Single Market, enjoying all four EU freedoms – movement of goods, capital, services and people. EU countries trade twice as much with each other as they do with third countries. The Single Market is responsible for income gains in the UK between 2 and 6% – that's up to GBP 3300 a year per British household. Leaving the EU and the Single Market means that we will GBP 100 billion worse off a year, with our economy reduced by 3.9% by 2030. This will cost the average person, in each year, GBP 1090. Trade between the UK and EU will fall by 46% and foreign direct investment into our shores will fall by 21% and there would also be a fall in *(off mike)* revenue, up to GBP 23 billion less to spend on public services,

pay …

(The President cut off the speaker)

Ruža Tomašić (ECR). – Poštovani predsjedavajući, jedinstveno tržište najveća je snaga Europske unije jer osigurava ekonomski prosperitet, a pristup njemu može se koristiti kao važna karta u odnosima s drugim globalnim igračima, jer svi žele prodavati svoje proizvode i usluge na velikom i bogatom tržištu.

Umjesto što gubimo vrijeme na daljnju političku integraciju koja je izazvala odlazak Ujedinjene Kraljevine i potiče rast nepovjerenja u Uniju kod građana, trebamo se fokusirati na ono što dokazano funkcionira, a to je jedinstveno tržište. Potrebna nam je daljnja ekonomska, a ne politička, integracija.

Stoga se nadam da će do kraja ovog mandata Komisija nastaviti s jačanjem jedinstvenog tržišta, smanjenjem administrativnog tereta i uklanjanjem barijera koje još uvijek postoje u financijskom sektoru, uslugama i energetici.

Tibor Szanyi (S&D). – Tisztelt Elnök Úr! Kontinensünk tartós békéje mellett az egységes piac az európai integráció legjelentősebb eredménye. Jelentőségét a belső integrációellenes politikai nyomás, és a nemzetközi versenytársak részéről jelentkező új kihívások erősödése ma méginkább aláhúzza.

Többek között a tőkepiaci unió és a digitális egységes piac példái nyomán áttörésre van szükség a szolgáltalások, a foglalkoztatás és a szociális rendszer, a körkörös, illetve a fenntartható gazdasági fejlődési modellek, vagy a mesterséges intelligencia oldaláról jelentkező újszerű kihívások megválaszolása érdekében.

Külön hangsúlyozom az adópolitikát, ahol meggyőződésem szerint az ÁFA rendszerek, és a közös konszolidált adóalap egységesítése irányába tett lépések nyomán reális cél lehet a fiskális unió teljeskörű megvalósítása.

Seán Kelly (PPE). – Mr President, without doubt the single market is probably the single best example of what Europe has done in its time, and I suppose it has helped to create jobs, it has helped to create wealth. My own country is probably as good an example as you'll get. One of the poorest countries when we joined in 1973, now one of the wealthiest and fastest growing economies, because it opened up a market of 500 million people to us basically free of charge.

My friend Paul Rubig mentioned what we can achieve when we work together, particularly in relation to the roaming charges, which has been hugely beneficial to businesses and indeed individuals, probably knocking 50% off their phone bills every month. So for that reason one wonders why is there a reluctance to complete the single market. I just don't understand it, and my question for Commissioner Bieńkowska is how much can she achieve in the next 12 months? Maybe not all but everything would be a help. How much realistically can be achieved?

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Domnule președinte, doamnă comisar, cred că măcar o concluzie avem: că piața unică este importantă și că nu am finalizat-o.

Pornind de la aceste idei, eu aș vrea să adaug la cele discutate aici și câteva lucruri și, poate, puteți în răspuns să și aduceți informații noi. Funcționarea pieței unice, sigur, depinde foarte mult și de alte lucruri care nu sunt în portofoliul dumneavoastră, eu cred că Comisia în ansamblu trebuie să lucreze pentru funcționarea pieței unice. Avem foarte multe probleme încă cu uniunea vamală. Dacă uniunea vamală nu funcționează unitar, evident că sunt efecte asupra pieței unice. Avem o segmentare a pieței unice. Nu avem piață unică, pentru că avem Schengen și non-Schengen, avem euro și non-euro, avem probleme cu foarte multe directive, plățile întârziate, de exemplu, sau directiva pe achiziții și foarte multe exemple vă mai pot da, euro și non-euro.

Ce ne propunem să facem concret, pentru că avem foarte puține realizări din punctul meu de vedere, le-au nominalizat colegii, nu le mai spun și eu, dar, poate, în răspunsurile dumneavoastră, puteți, sintetic, să ne spuneți care sunt următoarele lucruri pe care le-am putea rezolva în piața unică, pentru că aici avem nevoie de locuri de muncă, de sustenabilitate pentru IMM-uri, de creștere economică, în competiția aceasta globală.

Inmaculada Rodríguez-Piñero Fernández (S&D). – Señor presidente, muchísimas gracias comisaria. Sin duda alguna el mercado único es uno de los principales logros de la Unión Europea. Pero estoy muy de acuerdo con lo que acaba de decir quien ha utilizado la palabra antes que yo, para señalar la dificultad de no tener una auténtica unión aduanera, porque eso implica que no hay un auténtico mercado único.

Una unión arancelaria es una cosa, una unión aduanera requiere que haya un criterio homogéneo en materia de inspecciones, en materia de sanciones, en materia de controles; y me gustaría que la comisaria me escuchara porque me gustaría que me pudiera responder a mis preguntas. Le quiero preguntar: ¿cuál es la coordinación que tiene como comisaria con el comisario responsable de finanzas para poner fin a este problema? No podemos seguir defendiendo un mercado único sin una auténtica unión aduanera que garantice la competencia leal a nuestros productores frente a la competencia desleal de productos que llegan a otros puertos que incumplen las normas. Desgraciadamente veo que no me ha escuchado.

(Koniec zgłoszeń z sali)

Elżbieta Bieńkowska, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, thank you very much for your input, for your questions. I think all of us agree that, because it was repeated many times, the Single Market is one of the greatest achievements of the European Union, but of course, we have to face the truth, we have to face the reality that we are not using the full potential of this greatest achievement. We are not using it in 100% as was said, mostly in the services sector. The goods sector is more unified under the Single Market.

I welcome very much your constructive approach on the various issues, although I very much do not agree on one of the statements saying that some of our proposals were a waste of time. It was not a waste of time, for example, the e-card proposal was – I'm completely sure – a step in a good direction, it was a step to allow our companies to go cross border and to trade cross border and to provide their services cross border. Unfortunately, it was blocked, as some other proposals were.

I definitely also want to state that a fully functioning Single Market – because it is also under the framework of this communication – together with a properly functioning standardisation system will make the European Union, in an economic sense, more attractive, more powerful internationally and at the same time, ensure the high standards in the various sectors of our lives. Of course, those benefits should not be taken for granted. As we see also under this term of the Commission, of the Parliament, there is a lot of untapped potential.

The question was what else we can achieve in the next month to come. Let me say – and I regret it very much – that three of our proposals, notification, e-card and Single Market Information Tool (SMIT), were blocked either in the Parliament or in the Council. Still to go are the single digital gateway, mutual recognition, market surveillance and some parts of type approval in different sectors. There are still proposals that are being negotiated in trilogue. Some of them have not started yet, but I think we'll be able to deliver on all of those that I have just listed now before the end of this term. Definitely, those three, notification, SMIT and e-card, although seen by some as not highly ambitious, were really very important and substantial steps in a good direction, as I said.

Przewodniczący. – Zamykam debatę.

Głosowanie odbędzie się podczas następnej sesji miesięcznej.

Oświadczenia pisemne (art. 162)

Cristian-Silviu Buşoi (PPE), *in writing*. – The European Single Market is, unquestionably, one of the European Union's paramount achievements which significantly improves our citizens lives on a daily basis. However, our common market needs immediate adaptation to a fast-changing global economic environment, emerging business models and evolving digital technologies. I stress that existing fragmentations of the Single Market are to a high degree detrimental to EU's overall global competitiveness and its role within a world-connected economy that gathers ambitious and aggressive actors. I strongly believe that a fast, feasible solution would be to focus on implementation, instead of new legislation, especially in those cases where transposition overlaps existing national laws and standards.

Lidia Joanna Geringer de Oedenberg (S&D), *in writing*. – The Single Market is one of the most basic and biggest successes of the European Union. We have accomplished the creation of the Single Market, but we have not completed it yet. Now it is time to implement needed improvements for the benefit of consumers and businesses. As achievements, we can mention the elimination of roaming, te recognition of qualification and university degrees across the EU, the enforcement of passengers' rights facing delays and inconveniencies or removing obstacles in claiming social security abroad. The Single Market solutions bring tangible benefits to the everyday lives of European citizens.

Nevertheless, there is still work to be done. The proposals regarding copyright, the free flow of non-personal data, e-privacy and other crucial files need to be finalised before the end of the parliamentary term. The main challenges have not changed: explaining the idea and advantages of the Single Market; facing protectionist flows at various levels of governance; and the lack of a concrete deadline by when the Single Market will be completed. Every month of delay harms the competitiveness of the European Union market.

Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D), *por escrito*. – A petición del Consejo, la Comisión realiza esta Comunicación donde recalca que no se puede perder más tiempo a la hora de legislar en el mercado único. Se cumplen 25 años de la creación de este, no obstante, actualmente sus libertades están bajo amenaza. Debemos abandonar la narrativa tradicional y ser más ambiciosos para poder alcanzar un mercado interior plenamente armonizado y eficiente, realmente justo, transparente y equitativo. Asimismo, debemos ser mucho más ambiciosos a la hora de integrar la economía digital, la cual crece a un ritmo 5 veces mayor que la «analógica». El Parlamento ha apoyado a la Comisión en sus iniciativas, pero tristemente parte de ellas están siendo bloqueadas por algunos Estados miembros en el Consejo. De igual manera, debemos tratar de forma prioritaria las cuestiones fiscales. Para alcanzar una competitividad real en el mercado único es imprescindible que la fiscalidad sea la misma para todas las empresas, independientemente del Estado miembro en el que estén basadas. Si una empresa paga menos impuestos que otra, pero compite en el mismo mercado, está compitiendo «de forma desleal». Para avanzar en la armonización y cohesión de nuestro mercado único, también debemos avanzar de forma conjunta en materia fiscal.

20. WTO: Wie geht es weiter? (Aussprache)

Przewodniczący. – Kolejnym punktem porządku dziennego jest debata nad sprawozdaniem sporządzonym przez Bernda Langego i Paula Rübiga w imieniu Komisji Handlu Międzynarodowego w sprawie WTO: Przyszłe działania (2018/2084(INI) (A8-0379/2018).

Bernd Lange, *Berichterstatter*. – Herr Präsident, Frau Kommissarin! Wir haben eine globale ökonomische Realität, die von globalen Wertschöpfungsketten geprägt ist.

Da geht es in der Tat um Regeln für diese globalen Wertschöpfungsketten. Es geht darum, sicherzustellen, dass auf allen Stufen dieser globalen Wertschöpfungsketten vernünftige Arbeitsbedingungen vorherrschen. Alles das heißt eigentlich, dass wir mehr internationale Regeln, mehr multilaterale Regeln, brauchen. Da kommt natürlich die WTO in den Blick.

Auf der anderen Seite haben wir die Tendenz, dass einzelne Länder, genau diese so notwendig gebrauchten Regeln unterlaufen. Deswegen ist eine der ersten Aussagen in unserem Bericht, alle Partner, alle 164 Partner in der WTO, zu ermahnen, dieses Regelwerk nicht in Frage zu stellen, sondern weiterzuentwickeln.

Das gilt natürlich insbesondere für die Vereinigten Staaten, die immer noch blockieren, dass die Gerichtsbarkeit der WTO funktionieren kann und dass Richterinnen und Richter wieder nominiert und neue ernannt werden, und die auch in anderen Bereichen ihrer Handelspolitik die Regeln der WTO nicht akzeptieren und nicht respektieren.

Wenn das Schule macht, Regeln nicht mehr zu akzeptieren, dann bricht natürlich das ganze System auseinander, und das hat immense politische und wirtschaftliche Konsequenzen. Deswegen ist es so wichtig, dass wir jetzt darangehen, dieses Instrument zu erhalten, aber gleichzeitig auch weiterzuentwickeln, weil wir natürlich sehen, dass dieses Instrument, das 1994 gegründet worden ist, Reformen bedarf.

Deswegen wollen wir den Reformweg gehen und unterstützen dabei auch die Aktivitäten der Kommission, in allen drei Bereichen zu sagen: Wir müssen die Regeln überprüfen, sowohl zu gucken, dass Entwicklung für weniger entwickelte Länder gefördert werden kann, aber auch neue Elemente – wie elektronischen Handel – mit zu integrieren, so dass wir auch hier ein modernes Regelwerk der Welthandelsorganisation haben.

Wir müssen auch noch mal gucken, wie die Gerichtsbarkeit funktioniert, der zweite Pfeiler der Welthandelsorganisation. Ob man da vielleicht mehr Transparenz hineinbringen kann, die Prozesse auch schneller abwickeln kann und auch die Frage der Nominierung und der Funktionsweise des Gerichts reformieren kann, so dass Kritikpunkte damit aufgefangen werden.

Zum Dritten müssen wir uns auch die Arbeitsmethoden angucken. Zu meinen, dass alle 164 Partner alles zusammen auf einmal entscheiden können, dieses *single undertaking*, das glaube ich, ist eine Illusion. Wir müssen flexible *Facing in*-Methoden entwickeln, wie wir das ja auch schon beim *trade facility agreement* und bei anderen Abkommen auch gemacht haben, dass Gruppen von Ländern vorangehen können, ohne andere Länder zurückzulassen und dabei auch darauf zu achten, dass jedes Land die Möglichkeit hat, mitzumachen, also einen Kapazitätsaufbau zu organisieren, so dass hier wieder Dynamik in den Verhandlungsprozess hineingelangen kann.

Alles in allem müssen wir natürlich darauf achten, dass die WTO auch mit anderen internationalen Herausforderungen, wie den globalen Nachhaltigkeitszielen den SDGS kohärent ist, und die gilt es auch zu integrieren.

Paul Rübig, *Berichterstatter.* – Herr Präsident! Ich möchte mich zuerst beim Kollegen Lange recht herzlich bedanken, weil wir in diesem Bereich wirklich gut zusammenarbeiten.

Die WTO ist die Grundlage dafür, dass wir Kaufkraft weltweit stärken. Kaufkraft entsteht durch Export auf der einen Seite, weil hier neue Jobs entstehen und gute Löhne verdient werden können, und sie dient den Arbeitnehmern dazu, ihren Job zu sichern und ein noch besseres Einkommen zu haben. Der Import dient uns allen. Wir alle sind Konsumenten. Wenn wir Produkte billiger und besser von irgendwo auf der Welt kriegen können, dann erhöht das auch unsere Kaufkraft. Also Export und Import verdoppeln die Kaufkraft unserer Bevölkerung. Ich glaube, das ist das wesentliche Merkmal des Handels, er dient beiden Seiten und es ist eine globale positive Entwicklung, wenn wir Handel fördern, und letztlich sichert Handel auch Demokratie.

1995 wurde die WTO gegründet. Ich muss sagen, ich war das erste Mal 1999in Seattle dabei, wo es nur Demonstrationen auf den Straßen gegeben hat, wo man sich gegen Handel und für Protektionismus ausgesprochen hat. Ich werde es nie vergessen, dass der Präsident damals zu den Hafenarbeitern gefahren ist und gesagt hat: Wir machen die Grenzen dicht, ich helfe euch – was ich nie verstanden habe. Wir haben dann 2001 die Doha-Runde gehabt. Pascal Lamy hat hier die Idee verfolgt, dass wir Handelserleichterungen in den Mittelpunkt stellen. Dieses Kapitel wurde positiv abgeschlossen.

Wir haben natürlich auch die Frage der Landwirtschaft, wo es noch viel zu diskutieren gibt, und *aid for trade* liegt eigentlich im Zentrum unserer Entwicklungspolitik. Ich glaube, dass in diesem Bereich die nachhaltigen Entwicklungsziele eine ganz wichtige Rolle spielen: Nr. 2 – sichere Ernährung, nachhaltige Ernährung; Nr. 6 – *sanitation*, sauberes Wasser; Nr. 7 – erneuerbare Energie. Hier gibt es wirklich Handlungsbedarf, und hier können wir die Kaufkraft nicht nur in Europa, sondern auch in den Ländern, denen es wirklich schlecht geht, erhöhen und sie damit auch unterstützen.

Ich kann mich noch gut daran erinnern, wie wir dann 2002 gesagt haben: Es kann doch nicht nur Aufgabe der Minister und unserer hervorragenden Beamten sein, dieses Thema international zu bearbeiten. Wir haben dann begonnen, die Konferenz der Parlamentarier für die WTO zu gründen. Ich kann mich noch daran gut erinnern, mit Erika Mann haben wir gemeinsam mit der internationalen Parlamentarierunion auf gleicher Augenhöhe diese Konferenz der Abgeordneten geschaffen. Und das letzte Mal, in Buenos Aires, haben wir 300 bis 400 Abgeordnete gehabt, wo die Minister und die Verhandler Rede und Antwort standen. Das gehört auch dazu, dass die Abgeordneten, nicht nur die Regierungsparteien, sondern auch die Opposition, gerade in den *least developed countries* die Möglichkeit haben, diesen Entwicklungen zu folgen. Das ist aus meiner Sicht entscheidend, dass wir auch versuchen, die Erfolge zu kommunizieren. Wenn wir sehen, dass aus vielen *least developed countries* jetzt hochentwickelte Industrieländer geworden sind, dann ist das auch ein Erfolg der WTO. Dass wir Handelsstreitigkeiten vor Gericht lösen können, vor dem *Appellate Body*, und nicht mehr mit militärischen Mitteln austragen müssen, das ist auch ein Riesenerfolg der WTO. Und wir wissen schon, dass mit 164 - Staaten ein einstimmiges Ergebnis zu erzielen, viel Arbeit und viel Zeit bedeutet. Und ich weiß, dass wir in der Konferenz der Parlamentarier der WTO inzwischen schon 42 Meetings gehabt haben und dass sich diese 16 Jahre wirklich gelohnt haben, weil natürlich die Aufmerksamkeit für Welthandelsfragen dementsprechend stärker geworden ist.

Jetzt ist es wieder Zeit für eine Reform, in die nächste Runde zu gehen. Das System hat sich bewährt, wir müssen es zukünftig noch verbessern.

Cecilia Malmström, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, I would like to thank the two rapporteurs, Mr Lange and Mr Rübig, for your report. It is very timely and you highlight many of the challenges that the World Trade Organisation (WTO) is facing. You also point at ways forward and they are very much in line with what we are trying to do in the Commission with support from you and Member States. It also sends a political signal in this moment that the European Union is strongly committed to strengthening and to modernising and to preserving the WTO.

As you said, the multilateral trading system has been good for Europe. It has been good for the world. We have had clear rules. It has been good for companies. It's been good for economies. It has helped economies to grow, lifting hundreds of millions out of poverty and promoting stability and peace. As you say, the WTO is now under huge pressure and experiencing a very, very severe crisis and, even though the WTO is not perfect, without the WTO, we would not be well off. That would be bad for us in Europe and it would be really bad for the most vulnerable countries in the world.

We in the European Union depend on open, rule-based, fair trade. That is essential for our economic prosperity and that is why the European Council, already in June last year, asked the Commission to take forward comprehensive approaches to modernising the WTO in its main functions – rulemaking, monitoring and dispute settlement – as a way out of the crisis. This was also echoed in the G20 meeting, for instance, so this is something that the whole world is aligned on.

There are many threats to the WTO. The Appellate Body is the most urgent one and there is a clear realisation about the need to resolve the Appellate Body crisis. Until recently, we hadn't seen a real strong awareness in the WTO community about the urgent need to reform, but I think this is gradually changing. The European Union is leading the reform efforts here and working with many other countries as well, and we are deepening and accelerating the work that I presented to you in September. There is a long list of challenges that need to be addressed – you mentioned them in your report – and it is absolutely necessary to put the WTO at the centre of a rules-based, multilateral trading system. As I said, the Appellate Body is the most urgent challenge. We believe that the proposal that we put on the table this week, together with 11 other countries, is a credible basis to engage with the WTO and show a way forward that would lead to a strengthened and modernised Appellate Body. We have also tabled, together with the US, Japan and a handful of other countries, a proposal on transparency and notification, which is important for trust and the functioning of the WTO internal procedures.

We also need to address gaps in the WTO rulebook. Mr Lange said that the rulebook is from 1995. Absolutely. So, of course, we need to update it. We need to address issues such as non-market policies, forced technology transfer and other items. We are working with the US and Japan to try to see if we can draft new rules in the WTO on these, and, of course, there are many other issues as well.

We are working together with a large group of WTO members on e-commerce. There were more than 80 countries engaging in this in Geneva as a result of the joint statement made in Buenos Aires almost a year ago – many of you were there – and that has translated to very active engagement and that is really good news.

Of course, there are the outstanding Doha issues, the development issues, which are not to be forgotten. We need to address them as well.

Finally, I agree with you that more should be done to contribute to achieving the Sustainable Development Goals, as we set out in the September paper. This is a vital strand of the WTO modernisation. We are engaged in the fisheries subsidies. That is one key in this, of course, but we are also working on identifying how the WTO could contribute to achieving the Sustainable Development Goals.

I am committed – and so are we all – to continuing to make every effort to engage with the WTO membership. The members of the Council of the EU countries are all supporting this strategy. We're engaging with major trading partners, as well, to support our ideas and to push this forward. Prospects are uncertain. They are gloomy and, therefore, I very much appreciate not only the support that you are giving to the Commission, but also the hard work that you are doing and I encourage you to continue reaching out to parliamentarians across the world to support this as well.

Thank you very much for this very timely debate and I am looking forward to the debate.

PRESIDENZA DELL'ON. DAVID-MARIA SASSOLI

Vicepresidente

Linda McAvan, *deputising for the rapporteur for the opinion of the DEVE Committee*. – Mr President, I'm speaking tonight on behalf of Lola Sánchez, who was the rapporteur for opinion in the Committee on Development (DEVE).

There are two key messages from our committee which tie in with what people have already said. The first is that, yes, we need a rules-based system, but this is particularly important for developing countries, because in a multilateral system they've got a better chance of getting a level playing field, of getting a seat at the table and having their voice heard, unlike in bilateral deals where bigger economies can call the shots.

Secondly, our key message is that the multilateral trade system must be fair to all countries including the least developed countries (LDCs) and be set in the context of the sustainable development goals (SDGs). Free trade alone will not be enough to lift all boats, and so we need trade agreements which are broadly based, cover human rights, social and environmental aspects, and not just tariffs and trade liberalisation issues.

We also need concrete steps to deliver on this agenda, like supporting the UN process to negotiate a UN binding treaty on business and human rights, and we need initiatives on the value chains that Bernd Lange spoke about. We have two areas where we could make quick progress: the first is cocoa and the second is textiles. These are areas where there is a growing mood to get something done, and I think we could work with businesses and Member States to get things done. Otherwise, we're going to see national legislation and patchworks of national laws instead of having an EU law.

Christofer Fjellner, *för PPE-gruppen*. – Herr talman! Världshandelsorganisationen, WTO, möter två hot just nu. För det första den tilltagande protektionismen i världen, där allt fler länder utmanar den regelstyrda handeln, tydligast USA. Detta har vi dock pratat mycket om.

För det andra, vilket är minst lika viktigt, det allvarliga hotet om att WTO blir omodernt, att det faktiskt inte klarar av vår tids, och framtidens, utmaningar: kinesisk statskapitalism, tjänstehandeln, den digitala handeln och våra alltmer överreglerade samhällen. Därför menar jag att den som värnar världshandeln och Världshandelsorganisationen, värnar en reform av Världshandelsorganisationen. Därför är kommissionens förslag väldigt bra.

Lyckas vi inte med det, så kommer vi att lämna den regelstyrda handeln. Då blir Europa och länder som Sverige de största förlorarna. Då lämnar vi en ordning där regler styr handeln, och det blir i stället den starkes rätt som styr. Det måste vi till varje pris förhindra, och detta arbete har bara börjat.

Inmaculada Rodríguez-Piñero Fernández, *en nombre del Grupo S&D*. – Señor presidente, señora comisaria, la Comisión de Comercio Internacional manifestó un apoyo casi unánime al informe que han hecho y que mañana será votado en el Pleno. Y, por cierto, felicito a los dos coponentes porque creo que levantamos la voz alta clara, fuerte y firme en representación de quinientos millones de ciudadanos en defensa del multilateralismo, en defensa de un orden internacional basado en el diálogo, basado en la democracia, basado en el respeto mutuo que algunos parecen haber olvidado —o puede que nunca lo tuvieran—.

Pero esas son las bases para poder avanzar y, para avanzar, es fundamental —usted lo ha dicho, señora comisaria— modernizar la OMC para hacer frente a los retos que tenemos que abordar y dar soluciones, como es el comercio digital, como son, efectivamente, los objetivos de desarrollo sostenible, como es la normalización en los derechos laborales.

Pero necesitamos también —no lo olvidemos— resolver los problemas que han quedado pendientes de la Ronda de Doha y hacer más fuerte a la Organización Mundial del Comercio, porque es la mejor garantía de poder resolverlos y plantar cara a los que defienden el proteccionismo. Y, desde luego, hay que manifestar mañana todo el apoyo al esfuerzo que está haciendo la Comisión en defensa de esa reforma, buscando la alianza con los socios solidarios. Creo que es el mejor mensaje que podemos dar a los ciudadanos: juntos por un futuro mejor.

Elsi Katainen, *ALDE-ryhmän puolesta*. – Arvoisa puhemies, kuten hyvin tiedetään, WTO on hyvin monella tavalla umpisolmussa. Maailman kauppajärjestön toiminta on rampautunut, kun sen tärkein osa – riitojenratkaisuelin – on muuttunut toimintakyvyttömäksi.

Tämä heikentynyt järjestelmä murtaa globaalin kaupan pelisääntöjä, heikentää eurooppalaisten yritysten mahdollisuuksia, kun kaupan ennakoitavuus ja säännönmukaisuus ei ole taattu, ja siihen asiaan on saatava muutos.

Avoimen, sääntöpohjaisen ja syrjimättömän kauppajärjestelmän säilyttäminen on elinehto eurooppalaisille yrityksille, jotka elävät viennistä. WTO on tärkeää toimija monien globaalien kysymysten ratkaisemisessa, kuten ruokaturvallisuuden varmistamisessa. Samoin se antaa mahdollisuuden edistää ilmastotavoitteiden toteutumista globaalisti, jossa ratkaisujen on löydyttävä globaalilla tasolla.

Mikäli me haluamme säilyttää yhteisen maailmankaupan pelisääntöjä valvovan järjestön, meidän tulee muuttaa sen sääntöjä. Komission esittämä aloite kauppajärjestön uudistamisesta on aivan välttämätön. EU:n tulee toimia tässä keskustelussa kaupan puolustajana ja löytää samanmieliset WTO:n jäsenet, joiden kanssa uudistusten kehittäminen on mahdollista.

Klaus Buchner, *im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident! Wir brauchen eine Welthandelsorganisation, die einen fairen Handel garantiert.

Heute bestimmen oft die internationalen Konzerne das Geschehen, das manchmal alles andere als fair ist. Wir haben z. B. eine hochsubventionierte Produktion von Milch und Hühnerfleisch. Wenn wir das exportieren, können die einheimischen Bauern mit den Preisen nicht mithalten; ihnen wird die Existenzgrundlage entzogen.

Unsere Freihandelsabkommen machen es möglich, dass Landraub geschieht, bei dem die Bauern aus ihrem angestammten Gebiet vertrieben werden. Wir bekommen billige Waren, wie Kaffee, Kakao und so weiter, von diesen Ländern aus Gebieten, die eigentlich für den Anbau der Nahrung für die eigene Bevölkerung herhalten müssten. Dadurch erzeugen wir Flüchtlingsströme. Eine Reform der Welthandelsorganisationen kann hier Abhilfe schaffen.

Helmut Scholz, *im Namen der GUE/NGL-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, Frau Kommissarin, liebe Kollegen und Kollegen! Wie selten zuvor in den letzten Jahren sind Fragen der Handelspolitik, der Regulierung der internationalen Handelsströme und über sie auch die Fragen, wie produzieren wir eigentlich, wie konsumieren wir, in den Mittelpunkt des öffentlichen Interesses gerückt.

Eine stärkere An- und Verbindung der WTO mit der IAO, mit der UNCTAD mit anderen internationalen Organisationen ist, für den Erhalt und die Stärkung eines verbindlichen, regelbasierten und transparenten internationalen Systems wichtig und notwendig und eins zu eins auf das gesamte, multilaterale Handelsarchitekturgebäude zutreffend. Nicht der wirtschaftlich Stärkere darf die Spielregeln setzen und entscheiden, vielmehr müssen partnerschaftliches Agieren und eine auf Problemlösung ausgerichtete Herangehensweise Maßstab für das Handeln, auch bei der Reform der WTO, sein – einschließlich der WTO Gerichtsbarkeit.

Die WTO zukunftsfähig zu machen, erfordert von uns klar, auch zu beantworten, wie weit wir als Parlament und Regierung in der Lage sind, globale Wertschöpfungsprozesse und das Agieren der transnationalen Unternehmen und der an den Finanzmärkten agierenden Kapitalgruppen im Interesse der Menschen und der Umwelt einzuhegen und zu regulieren.

France Jamet, *au nom du groupe ENF.* – Monsieur le Président, mes chers collègues, ce projet de rapport tend curieusement à renforcer le dogme passéiste du libre-échangisme globalisé, qui est rejeté par de plus en plus de pays.

Pourquoi demander à l'OMC de la transparence dans les négociations et se dire garant du multilatéralisme alors qu'ici même toutes nos compétences commerciales ont été dévolues à la Commission de M. Juncker? Pourquoi engager l'OMC à renforcer ses pouvoirs afin de forcer la main aux États alors que c'est, avant tout, nos intérêts que l'Union devrait ici défendre? Non, le libre-échangisme ne crée pas d'emplois. Non, les tribunaux d'arbitrage ne protègent ni les États ni les consommateurs. Oui, un protectionnisme intelligent, à l'instar de l'ALENA renégocié, peut être une solution.

S'il y avait une seule réforme à proposer, dès aujourd'hui, dans le cadre d'un juste échange, ce serait d'ores et déjà de sortir l'agriculture de la compétence de l'OMC et des accords de libre-échange.

Le principe d'autosuffisance et la sécurité alimentaire n'appartiennent pas aux firmes mais aux nations.

Jarosław Wałęsa (PPE). – Mr President, while the WTO has been at the centre of trade liberalisation, free trade agreements (FTAs) have also been a part of pushing free trade forward. It has actually been the interplay between the FTAs and successive GATT rounds that drove liberalisation forward, but now this has changed. Why? Among others, we reduced our tariffs and non-tariff barriers. We also grant generalised system of preferences (GSP) tariff privileges to developing countries. We did all this for the benefit of our consumers and industrial users, but now we have almost nothing to offer to our developing trading partners.

Also I don't think we have done enough in our trade system to protect our industry from those imports that have contributed to high CO_2 and other greenhouse gas emissions. I note that there is an opinion from the Committee on Development (DEVE) that calls for a carbon emission tax. I think we should follow this call. Our EU industries are very efficient at reducing CO_2 emissions. We should consider imposing fees on imports that are not subject to similar achievements in the place of production.

David Martin (S&D). – Mr President, I think we're nearly all agreed in this Chamber that the World Trade Organisation (WTO) is in crisis. Our message should be that this is the occasion for fundamental change and not an excuse for postponing it.

We need to use this opportunity to trigger negotiations on social and environmental standards in order to make sure that trade delivers on sustainable development.

We need to start the discussion on ending the present consensus rule because as it stands, it threatens to paralyse the whole system.

We need to rethink the definition of a developing country. Should China, given its prominent role in global trade, still be considered a developing country? Surely this is unfair on real developing countries which are in most need of special and differential treatment.

The WTO needs saving. We need a strong rules-based global trading system, but if we don't act soon I'm afraid it will wither on the vine.

José Ignacio Salafranca Sánchez-Neyra (PPE). – Señor presidente, señora comisaria, señorías. La Unión Europea, con el 6 % de la población mundial, es el principal bloque exportador de bienes, el principal bloque exportador de servicios, uno de los principales importadores y, al mismo tiempo, el principal emisor y receptor de inversión extranjera directa. Sobre esta base es evidente, señora comisaria, que la Unión Europea tiene que liderar los esfuerzos para la reforma de la Organización Mundial de Comercio sobre la base de las Conclusiones del Consejo de junio y adaptarlo, evidentemente, a las nuevas circunstancias económicas. Un modelo basado en principios, basado en valores, basado en reglas que sea predecible y, sobre todo, que sea eficaz para nuestras empresas.

Por eso, apoyamos los esfuerzos de la Comisión para esta reforma, sus contactos con el conjunto de los organismos internacionales y, por supuesto, su dinámica de acuerdos preferenciales comerciales. Usted sabe muy bien, señora comisaria, cuál es mi tendencia clara en un acuerdo muy particular, y espero que en esta reunión del G20 en Buenos Aires podamos hacer avances sustanciales y culminar los trabajos que usted viene desempeñando.

Procedura «catch the eye»

Ruža Tomašić (ECR). – Poštovani predsjedavajući, promjenom političke karte na Zapadu slobodna globalna trgovina izgubila je dio podrške. I u Americi i u Europi jačaju pozivi za protekcionističkim mjerama. Mnogi bi to rado svalili na Brexit i Trumpa, ali prava je istina da je Europa odavno utonula u to ludilo.

Možemo se slobodno podsjetiti kako su CETA i TTIP primljeni diljem kontinenta i kako je lijevi spektar u ovome domu na njih reagirao. I Europa snosi svoj dio odgovornosti za sužavanje prostora slobode u globalnoj trgovini, ali moram priznati da se stanje mijenja nabolje, makar i samo zbog otpora Trumpu. U tom se smislu on pokazuje jako korisnim.

WTO se mora prilagoditi novonastalim okolnostima, ali i novim trendovima na svjetskom tržištu. Prije svega, digitalizaciji trgovine. EU u tome mora biti podrška i glavni zagovaratelj slobodne trgovine.

Jean-Luc Schaffhauser (ENF). – Le commerce, pour être durable et avoir un avenir, doit être juste. Tel était le principe – je l'ai déjà dit ici, M[me] Malmström le sait et je pense qu'elle connaît la charte de La Havane: pas trop de déficits, pas trop d'excédents.

Le commerce ne doit pas devenir une guerre économique qui appauvrit les autres, parce qu'alors, s'il se transforme en guerre économique, il ne peut pas avoir d'avenir. Et pour cela, la charte de La Havane proposait des équilibres.

Mettez-vous à la place des États-Unis: ils ont plus de 600 milliards de déficit, 400 milliards avec la Chine; sur la moitié – 200 milliards –, ils veulent mettre des droits de douane. Il faut les comprendre: auparavant, évidemment, ils étaient pour un commerce ouvert puisqu'ils dominaient le monde. Mais dans les nouveaux équilibres, ils sont pour rétablir les équilibres, ils retrouvent la charte de La Havane.

Et nous, l'Europe, nous devrions faire de même, Madame Malmström. Nous avons 120 milliards d'excédent avec les États-Unis, nous devrions nous poser la question de savoir comment équilibrer nos échanges et nous devrions nous poser la question de savoir comment équilibrer nos 170 milliards de déficit avec la Chine.

Prenons une nouvelle organisation, retrouvons l'esprit de la charte de La Havane.

João Ferreira (GUE/NGL). – Senhor Presidente, instaurar uma nova ordem mundial, assente na desregulação e na liberalização do comércio internacional – ou seja, uma nova forma de protecionismo dos ricos, uma ditadura das multinacionais, forçando a concorrência da força de trabalho com proveniências geográficas distintas para obter a desvalorização geral da força de trabalho – foi, e é este, em grande medida, o intuito da Organização Mundial do Comércio.

Os últimos anos foram marcados por uma substantiva alteração das relações de forças no plano mundial, pela ascensão e crescente preponderância das economias emergentes e pela quebra da hegemonia relativa dos Estados Unidos e, também, da União Europeia e do Japão, o que ditou contradições, constrangimentos e bloqueios no seio da OMC, com os quais estas potências imperialistas não conseguiram lidar da forma que queriam.

Surgem, assim, as teses da reforma da OMC para superar bloqueios e contradições. Há que conformar melhor a OMC aos interesses ao serviço dos quais foi criada. Não correspondem seguramente aos interesses dos trabalhadores e dos povos. Esses reclamam uma outra ordem, assente no comércio justo e regulado, na complementaridade, no progresso social e no benefício mútuo.

Bogdan Andrzej Zdrojewski (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! WTO jest w kryzysie. Co do tego wszyscy się zgadzają, jednak nie ma jednolitej opinii, czy wystarczy tylko lifting czy potrzebna jest głęboka reforma. Wiemy, że brakuje aktualnych rozwiązań prawnych. Wiemy, że nowoczesne technologie umykają WTO, i to w dwóch aspektach: przede wszystkim jako przedmiot handlu, a także coś, co może temu handlowi służyć jako instrument nie tylko kontroli, ale także rozwiązań. Z mojego punktu widzenia istotne jest przede wszystkim antycypowanie sytuacji.

Natomiast chciałbym się przeciwstawić opinii, która się tutaj pojawiła, że niewiele zrobiono w ostatnim czasie. Otóż ja uważam, że jeżeli chodzi o zmiany w WTO, przeprowadzono naprawdę dość dużo różnych działań, choć są one dziś oczywiście niewystarczające.

(Fine della procedura «catch the eye»)

Cecilia Malmström, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, we are discussing a lot of issues here, but let me just focus on the World Trade Organisation (WTO) reform and the reports that are in front of us here.

You're absolutely right that there's a lot to be done. When the WTO was created the world looked very different to the one we have today, so it needs to be updated. But it's also an international organisation with 164 members operating by unanimity. We have difficulties agreeing among 28 countries, but with 164 countries is indeed complicated. Nevertheless, it is in urgent need of strengthening, updating and modernisation, to live up to the demands that we face.

So it's far from perfect, but if we did not have the WTO we would be much worse off. We would have total anarchy and those who would suffer the most, I have to repeat that, would be the poorest countries. It has been good for them to have these rules, this predictability, to be helped, to be inside the global system with the multilateral rules, and that's what we need to preserve, strengthen and develop.

But there's so much to do. We need to develop the internal function. Here the EU has been in the lead, together with a couple of other countries, to try to emphasise the need for continued transparency and notification. That is key for the WTO to function and to have its trust.

We need to make sure that the rules that we have agreed upon in the WTO are enforced. It is the appellate body, it has served us well in the European Union, it has served many other countries well as well, and that's what the most urgent need is. We have proposed here, with several other countries joining up, a way to come out of that deadlock and I hope this will be discussed in the coming weeks.

We do need to address the so-called old issues, the old Doha issues, absolutely we need to do so, and we are engaging with other countries to try to see if there's a way we can break the deadlock here.

We need to address new issues. As I said, we are talking about e-commerce and digital trade with many other countries. That is a good thing. Furthermore, we are discussing how women can be included in a more systematic way in trade, and we need to discuss, I fully agree with you, how the WTO can play a greater role in living up to the sustainable development goals.

We need to find ways there where we can work with all the other members and we need of course to make sure that we have modern rules, that the rule book is updated. And here, as I said, we are working with the US and Japan, but also with other countries.

So we are trying to put forward proposals. We will continue to do so. We will continue to ally with countries across the globe to work on this, but we do need your strong support here, and therefore I really appreciate the reports that we have been discussing, I thank again the two rapporteurs and also for the opinion of the Committee on Development (DEVE), I think that is very useful. So thank you very much for this and I think we will see each other again to discuss this further as the issue develops.

Bernd Lange, *Berichterstatter*. – Herr Präsident, Frau Kommissarin! Es gibt zunehmend Menschen, die Globalisierung sehr kritisch sehen. Da sind ja auch viele Ursachen mit verbunden, was ihre eigene Lebensperspektive und die Möglichkeit, Zukunft zu gestalten, anbetrifft.

Dann ist die Frage: Welche Lösung gibt es eigentlich für diese Ängste? Es gibt einige, die meinen, man müsse zurück zum Nationalstaat und alles dann dort organisieren. Ich bin der festen Überzeugung, in einer Welt von heute ist das eine absolute Illusion.

Wir können unsere Zukunft nur gemeinsam gestalten und dann brauchen wir auch starke internationale Regeln. Darum geht es doch: Diese Globalisierung mit Leitplanken zu versehen, so dass das Leben der Menschen dadurch gestärkt werden kann. Wenn man sich global umguckt, haben wir im Grunde global nur eine Institution: die WTO, die Gleichberechtigung in dem Stimmverhalten der Länder organisiert und die eine Gerichtsbarkeit hat.

96 % der Richtersprüche werden eingehalten. Das haben wir bei der UNO nicht, das haben wir bei keiner anderen globalen Institution. Dieses Gut, das sollten wir wirklich verteidigen, erweitern und ausbauen. Das wir wirklich für die Globalisierung Leitplanken haben, die gerecht die Interessen der Nationen im Sinne einer nachhaltigen Entwicklung gestalten können.

Ich glaube, wir müssen auch viel stärker öffentlich diskutieren, was für eine Möglichkeit wir damit haben. Die WTO führt so ein bisschen ein Schattendasein. Sie ist nicht so im Zentrum der Öffentlichkeit. Da müssen wir, glaube ich, alle daran arbeiten, zu sagen: Das ist ein Instrument, was wir gemeinsam weiterentwickeln wollen, damit Globalisierung gerecht gestaltet werden kann.

Paul Rübig, *Berichterstatter.* – Herr Präsident Sassoli! Es freut mich auch, dass die Ratspräsidentschaft bei dieser wichtigen Reform anwesend ist, und Staatssekretärin Edtstadler weiß, wie wichtig Handel ist. Ich glaube, dass wir gemeinsam mit der Kommission und mit der Kommissarin Malmström Folgendes erkannt haben: Wenn es keinen Handel gibt, gibt es keine Kaufkraft, und wenn es keine Kaufkraft gibt, dann gibt es Armut für alle. Wir sehen das in Nordkorea: Wenn die Grenzen dicht sind, Diktatur herrscht, dann leiden die Menschen Hunger und die Armut ist dort bitter. Man kann sich das anschauen, wie es den Menschen geht, wenn wir keinen Handel treiben.

Ich glaube, dass wir auch mehr Respekt brauchen gegenüber unseren Partnern, wenn wir verhandeln. Nicht immer ist das, was wir glauben, in der Politik das Ideale. Wir können auch von anderen lernen und gemeinsam eine bessere Basis schaffen. Deshalb sollten wir gegen Protektionismus auftreten, sollten schauen, wo ist Reziprozität sinnvoll, und letztlich sollten wir auch tolerant sein. Toleranz gehört dazu, zuhören zu können, wo unsere Partner Probleme im Handel mit uns sehen, und dass wir auch Standards setzen, die für beide Seiten nützlich sind.

Letztlich ist Handel eine Win-Win-Situation. Wir wissen, dass Militär in der Regel genau den Gegenauftrag hat, *lose-lose*, beide Seiten verlieren, wer am meisten verloren hat, ist der Loser.

Nein, Politik heißt etwas anderes: Wir wollen gewinnend sein für unsere Menschen, wir wollen die Kaufkraft stärken, wir wollen Arbeitsplätze schaffen, nicht nur in Europa, sondern vor allem in den ärmsten dieser Länder, und dazu kann die WTO einen wesentlichen Beitrag leisten. Die Streitbeilegung ist natürlich etwas Substanzielles. Wir wollen mit der Rechtsstaatlichkeit, mit den Rechtsetzungsmaßnahmen für beide Seiten faire Bedingungen schaffen. Ich glaube, das ist in der Zukunft das Entscheidende. Und deshalb freut es mich, dass die Reform der WTO im Mittelpunkt steht.

Presidente. – La discussione è chiusa.

La votazione si terrà domani.

Dichiarazioni scritte (articolo 162)

Birgit Collin-Langen (PPE), *schriftlich.* – Ich habe für diesen Bericht gestimmt. In einer Welt, in der wir wieder mit Straf- und Schutzzöllen zu kämpfen haben, spielt die WTO eine wichtige Rolle, um den Welthandel weiterhin zu gestalten. Die WTO hat seit ihrer Gründung entscheidend zur Stärkung des Multilateralismus, zur Förderung einer inklusiven Weltwirtschaftsordnung und zur Stärkung eines offenen, regelgestützten und diskriminierungsfreien multilateralen Handelssystems beigetragen. Ungeachtet dessen muss sich auch die WTO der Zeit anpassen. Globale Wertschöpfungsketten, digitaler Handel, ökologische und gesellschaftliche Herausforderungen, um nur einige Punkte zu nennen, bei denen die WTO Nachholbedarf hat.

Karol Karski (ECR), *na piśmie.* – Grupa ECR chciałaby wyrazić swoje poparcie dla tekstu sprawozdania odzwierciedlającego podejście KE do modernizacji WTO, która ma usprawnić wielostronny system handlowy, tak by stał się on bardziej sprawiedliwy oraz przejrzysty. Zgadzamy się w zupełności, iż najbardziej problematyczne kwestie dotyczą dotacji zakłócających rynek, przymusowego transferu technologii, impasu w dauhańskiej agendzie rozwoju oraz utrudnień w mianowaniu przez USA nowych członków Organu Apelacyjnego.

Chciałbym skorzystać z okazji i podkreślić również, że niewłączenie norm i standardów dotyczących praw człowieka do globalnych zasad regulujących handel i inwestycje w znacznym stopniu utrudni pociąganie przedsiębiorstw do odpowiedzialności. Jest to niezmiernie ważne w kontekście przywrócenia równowagi między prawem handlowym a prawami człowieka. Uważam za bardzo słuszne aktywne zaangażowanie UE w prace międzyrządowej otwartej grupy roboczej ONZ ds. korporacji transnarodowych i innych przedsiębiorstw w kontekście praw człowieka oraz obronę nadrzędności praw człowieka w stosunku do interesów handlowych korporacji. Powinno być to wsparcie instytucji UE i ESDZ, w tym przedstawicielstwa UE przy ONZ w Genewie, dla przyjęcia w tym zakresie traktatu. Jednocześnie mój niepokój wzbudza niedoprecyzowanie roli Parlamentu Europejskiego w tej kwestii. Apeluję o rzeczywistą ochronę praw człowieka oraz ustanowienie skutecznych i dostępnych dla obywateli mechanizmów dochodzenia roszczeń w celu rozstrzygania sporów dotyczących wspomnianych naruszeń.

Tokia Saïfi (PPE), *par écrit*. – L'OMC traverse une crise sans précédent et il est urgent de rappeler notre soutien au multilatéralisme. Il permet en effet de développer un commerce international basé sur des règles et de lutter contre les pratiques concurrentielles déloyales. L'OMC est aujourd'hui dans une impasse: le cycle actuel est bloqué et les dernières réunions ministérielles n'ont pas permis d'aboutir à des accords significatifs.

La réforme et la modernisation de l'OMC sont la clé de voûte d'un nouveau souffle pour l'organisation. L'OMC doit désormais répondre et prendre en compte les défis actuels et ceux de demain que sont le numérique, le commerce des services, le rôle moteur des PME, la lutte contre le changement climatique ou encore l'égalité femmes-hommes. L'UE doit être leader dans la modernisation de l'OMC afin de garantir un commerce juste, équitable, fondé sur des règles et mené dans un esprit de réciprocité et de bénéfices mutuels.

Enfin, il est plus qu'urgent qu'une solution soit trouvée concernant le blocage par les États-Unis du renouvellement des juges de l'organe d'appel du mécanisme de règlement des différends de l'OMC. Ce blocage met gravement en danger la pérennité de l'OMC et là aussi, nous comptons sur l'impulsion européenne pour aboutir à une solution.

Tom Vandenkendelaere (PPE), *schriftelijk*. – De afgelopen decennia heeft de Wereldhandelsorganisatie mee helpen zorgen voor een stabiel en voorspelbaar kader voor bedrijven in de hele wereld. Zo zorgde de WTO mee voor significante groei van vele economieën. Maar de wereld verandert en helaas is de WTO niet altijd mee geëvolueerd.

Ik schaar mij achter het mandaat dat de Commissie in juni dit jaar van de Europese Raad heeft ontvangen om een versnelling hoger te schakelen en de WTO de 21e eeuw te helpen inloodsen. Voor mij zijn twee zaken van belang. Ten eerste moet de rol van de WTO als mediator in handelsconflicten worden versterkt. Dat kan door de handelsregels aan te passen aan de technologische en economische ontwikkelingen van de laatste 20 jaar. Er ligt ook nog te weinig nadruk op duurzaamheid en sociale uitdagingen. Meer flexibiliteit kan een deel van het antwoord zijn. Daarnaast moeten we waken over het gelijk speelveld van marktdeelnemers door marktverstorende subsidiëring aan te pakken.

Tot slot wil ik nog benadrukken dat de huidige politieke tendensen in verschillende delen van de wereld, nota bene de VS en de situatie in het VK, opnieuw en meer dan ooit de noodzaak benadrukken van een goed presterende en doeltreffende WTO.

21. Zusammensetzung der Ausschüsse und Delegationen: siehe Protokoll

22. Bericht 2018 über Serbien (Aussprache)

Presidente. – L'ordine del giorno reca la relazione di David McAllister, a nome della commissione per gli affari esteri, sulla relazione 2018 della Commissione sulla Serbia [2018/2146(INI)] (A8-0331/2018)

David McAllister, *Rapporteur*. – Mr President, let me start by thanking the shadow rapporteurs, who are all present here tonight, for this report. Let me also welcome Commissioner Hahn and thank him personally for his dedication and good work in the Western Balkans region.

Today we are debating the European Parliament's last annual report on Serbia in this legislative term. It has often been said, including in this Chamber, that Serbia is moving towards the European Union. I would like to underline this by looking back at the beginning of this legislature in 2014, when the accession negotiations had just started and, concerning the opening of chapters, Serbia literally started from zero. Today, four and a half years later, 14 chapters have been opened in the negotiation process while two have already been provisionally closed. I sincerely hope that at least three more chapters will be opened at the intergovernmental conference in December.

Three points are of utmost importance on Serbia's path towards the European Union. Firstly, the rule of law. I would like to use this opportunity to recall that Serbia's progress on the rule of law – Chapters 23 and 24 – remains essential for the overall pace of the negotiating process. Judicial independence has to be assured in practice. Corruption and organised crime still remain an obstacle, not only to Serbia's but to all Western Balkan countries' democratic, social and economic development.

On another note, I agree with the European Commission and the Council on guaranteeing unhindered exercise of the freedom of expression and media. Shortcomings in this area should be addressed as a matter of priority.

Secondly, the economy. The criteria for membership are intended to help Serbia to stand on its own feet and become fit for the European Union, the common market, and for the global economy in general. The government in Belgrade is implementing an impressive agenda of economic and structural reforms. This has already yielded results in terms of growth prospects and reduction of domestic and external imbalances.

Thirdly, regional cooperation and good neighbourly relations. We all know Serbia's EU accession process is closely linked to the normalisation of relations with Kosovo. Agreements need to be concluded and, afterwards, implemented. That said, both sides – Belgrade and Priština – should continue to move forward with the full implementation of the already-reached agreements in good faith and in a timely manner. Serbia and Kosovo have expressed on many occasions concerns about their relations. The format where these concerns should be addressed is the Brussels dialogue. The decision of the Kosovo government to increase tax on goods from Serbia and from Bosnia and Herzegovina to 100% clearly violates the CEFTA Agreement and the spirit of the EU-Kosovo stabilisation and association agreement. I call on the government in Priština to revoke this decision immediately.

A final remark – effective communication is key. We, as the European Union, are by far the most important donor in the Western Balkans. We are engaged in several thousand projects to support reform efforts and assist in preparations for EU membership. If too many people in the region are voicing a sentiment of being left alone by the EU, we need to take this seriously. It shows that there is an urgent need for the European Union to communicate effectively about the extent of our engagement.

Karoline Edtstadler, *President-in-Office of the Council.* – Mr President, on behalf of the Austrian Presidency, it is my great pleasure to participate in your discussion on the series of annual reports from the Commission, starting with the one on Serbia.

As you know, this year the Western Balkans have been in the spotlight of the European Union, highlighted in particular by the EU leaders meeting with the Western Balkans leaders in Sofia in May and the adoption of the Council conclusions on Enlargement and Stabilisation and Association Process in June. During our Presidency, we have continued to pursue the Union's engagement with the region, aiming to achieve further progress in the accession negotiations. This is one of the priorities of our Presidency.

Serbia has made important progress since the last country report by the Commission in 2016 and accession negotiations have advanced at a steady pace, as has already been mentioned by the rapporteur. We hope to keep up the momentum in Serbia's accession negotiations under our Presidency by opening further negotiation chapters. In the June Council conclusions, we welcomed the reaffirmed commitment of the Serbian Government to EU integration as its strategic objective. This also needs to be further demonstrated by Serbia's commitment to reforms, because progress on the rule of law and fundamental rights chapters, as well as on the normalisation of Serbia's relations with Kosovo, as set out in the negotiation framework, is essential and will continue to determine the pace of accession negotiations overall.

Many areas which require further reform efforts are rightly spelt out in your draft resolution. The implementation of interim benchmarks for Chapters 23 and 24 and of the respective action plans should continue to guide the reform process as the rule of law continues to be at the heart of the enlargement process. As you do in your draft resolution, we consider that Serbia needs to significantly step up its reform efforts in this area and, in particular, to ensure the independence and overall efficiency of the judicial system.

Special focus should be put on tangible results and a sustainable track record, notably as regards the fight against corruption, organised crime and money laundering. The lack of progress in the area of freedom of expression raises increasing concerns. We strongly believe that the authorities should guarantee a safe climate conducive to the unhindered exercise of freedom of expression and the independence of the media as a matter of priority.

Serbia also needs to pay particular attention to full respect for fundamental rights, including the protection of the most vulnerable groups, as well as the non-discriminatory treatment of national minorities throughout Serbia. Guaranteeing the rule of law and fundamental rights would also contribute to improving the business environment in Serbia and underpin the current positive economic developments and the continuous progress made in this area.

The normalisation of relations with Kosovo continues to be essential for the overall pace of negotiations. The Council will continue to monitor closely Serbia's engagement towards visible and sustainable progress here so that Serbia and Kosovo can continue on their respective European paths. We continue to call on Serbia to progressively align with EU common foreign and security policy, in line with the negotiation framework. Serbia should also refrain from diverging from the EU common visa policy as Serbia's conclusion of visa liberalisation agreements with certain third countries has raised real concerns. We note that Serbia has, in the meantime, revoked again its visa liberalisation regime with Iran.

We stress the importance of regional cooperation and good neighbourly relations. We encourage Serbia to continue sustained efforts to strengthen good neighbourly relations and to resolve outstanding bilateral issues. In this context, actions undermining regional cooperation are not helpful. We regret the introduction of tariffs by Kosovo on products originating from Serbia and Bosnia and Herzegovina. There is an urgent need for calm and de-escalation in the interest of the whole region. We welcome Commissioner Hahn's offer of help to work on rapid practical solutions to the various trade issues at hand.

I will conclude my intervention by again welcoming the continued progress in Serbia's EU accession negotiations and the continued good cooperation with the EU and within the region.

Finally, let me also recall our appreciation for the constructive contribution of Parliament, and in particular of your rapporteur, David McAllister, to advance Serbia's accession process to the EU. I can assure you that we pay particular attention to the views of Parliament in this regard.

Johannes Hahn, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, honourable Members, State Secretary, I would like to congratulate, first and foremost, David McAllister for his outstanding report on Serbia. This is a balanced and accurate assessment of Serbia's progress on its path to the European Union. It's also in line with the findings of our own report of April this year and the Commission's assessment since then.

I share your view that Serbia has made good progress towards EU membership. With 14 chapters opened and two provisionally closed, Serbia's prospects for joining the EU are tangible, and this shows our firm commitment to Serbia's EU path. This European perspective is even more important today when we witness a resurfacing of tensions between Belgrade and Priština. Let me stress once again that both sides need to resume dialogue. There is no alternative to this if they want to make progress on their European paths. No country can join the Union without having resolved outstanding bilateral issues. For Serbia, this means that it needs to conclude a legally binding agreement with Priština before it can join the Union.

However, let me also stress that the solution with Kosovo is not the only prerequisite on Serbia's path to the Union. Reforms in the area of rule of law, fundamental rights and good governance, remain at the heart of the country's accession process. And, similar to the findings in your report, we found a mixed picture in our recent assessment on the rule of law in Serbia. Serbia has adopted some important pieces of legislation and carried out necessary institutional reforms. However, delays have been building up in important areas and concrete results are still difficult to demonstrate. It's therefore crucial that efforts increase in fields such as the reform of the judiciary, anti-corruption and fundamental rights, including media freedom.

In addition, and this is particularly relevant for this House, we have concerns about the process of adopting legislation in the Serbian Parliament. The continued use of urgent procedures, as well as other practices, limits legislative scrutiny and debate. I also share your views that strategic communication is of key importance. It will ensure public support for European values and understanding of the benefits and obligations of EU accession. The Union is by far Serbia's most important partner, including on assistance, and without any possible comparison with other global players. This needs to be put up in lights.

Finally, whatever the difficulties – and they are real – Serbia should not lose sight of its EU membership goal. It should keep focusing on fundamental reforms, with continued EU support, and I really appreciate that the European Parliament is on the same page. I thank you, not only for your attention, but for your strong commitment, engagement and support on the ground.

Cristian Dan Preda, *în numele grupului PPE*. – Domnule președinte, aș vrea întâi de toate să îl felicit pe David McAllister pentru raportul pe care îl prezintă Parlamentului. Este, cum spunea și comisarul Hahn, un raport foarte echilibrat. M-aș bucura foarte tare ca Serbia să devină stat membru al Uniunii Europene în 2025, dar, sigur, sunt multe de făcut în această privință. Cred că dialogul cu kosovarii e un dialog-cheie. Din păcate, iată, apar obstacole pe care nu putem decât să le privim cu stupefacție. Recenta decizie a kosovarilor de a introduce taxe pentru produsele din Serbia și Bosnia și Herțegovina este o mare greșeală. Nici sârbii nu se lasă mai prejos. Am auzit-o recent pe doamna prim- ministru Brnabić explicând că Srebrenica nu a fost un genocid pentru că au fost uciși doar bărbați și băieți, nu și femei și fete. Este inacceptabil așa ceva și, din păcate, știu că și în Republika Srpska, parlamentul de la Banjaluka a hotărât să revoce raportul prin care declara Srebrenica genocid. Cred că influența Serbiei în Bosnia și Herțegovina și în general în regiune trebuie să fie una pozitivă, bazată pe moderație și orice declarație de genul celei recente a primului ministru de la Belgrad cred că trebuie evitată.

Tanja Fajon, *v imenu skupine S&D*. – Po nedavnem obisku v Srbiji žal ne morem biti preveč optimistična.

Zdi se, da je razkol med zapisanim v dokumentih Unije in dejanskim stanjem v državi izjemen.

Medtem ko ima Srbija ugodne gospodarske kazalce, pa skrb ostaja vladavina prava, globoka polarizacija družbe in svoboda medijev. Tu je primer ene od naslovnic v Srbiji: „Psi so spuščeni" s fotografijo peščice tistih, ki še vedno uspejo kritizirati na glas, in to je nesprejemljivo, Srbijo oddaljuje od Unije.

Ljudje v Srbiji mi pravijo, da želijo biti del Unije, želijo več delovnih mest in višje plače, manj korupcije, delujoč pravni sistem.

Unija ne bo nikoli popolna brez Srbije, vendar takšne Srbije, v kateri namesto novic o pretepenih članih opozicije beremo o zdravi demokraciji, v kateri so namesto nacionalističnega podajanja žoge urejeni odnosi s Kosovom, na katero so mladi ponosni in imajo vizijo doma.

In takšno Srbijo vidim v Uniji in za takšno Srbijo se bom še vedno zavzemala.

Ruža Tomašić, *u ime kluba ECR*. – Poštovani predsjedavajući, postupak pridruživanja trebao bi biti proces koji se temelji na zaslugama i koji u potpunosti ovisi o objektivnom napretku svake države kandidatkinje za članstvo.

U tom smislu, držim iznimno zabrinjavajućim umjereni ton kojim ovo izvješće pristupa pitanju kažnjavanja ratnih zločina u Srbiji. Sam od sebe nameće se zaključak da se Srbiji ili gleda kroz prste, ili nije vršena detaljna i dubinska analiza. Oba scenarija su uznemiravajuća.

Ratni zločinci u Srbiji niti se istražuju, niti se kažnjavaju. Trenutno, vladajuća garnitura u Srbiji koristi se nedopustivim metodama kako bi prikrila zločine počinjene u Hrvatskoj i Bosni i Hercegovini. U predmetu Ovčara, koji se odnosi na pokolj gotovo 300 ranjenika iz vukovarske bolnice, vlast štiti zločince, daje im imunitet, nove identitete te opstruira rad drugih država u istraživanju tih zločina.

Stoga, iz ovog visokog doma pozivam sve svoje kolege u Europskom parlamentu i nadležne povjerenike da konačno otvore oči kako bi spriječili da po Europskoj uniji uskoro slobodno hodaju notorni zločinci odgovorni za smrt stotina ljudi te kako takve metode ne bi postale sastavni dio europskog pravosudnog sustava.

Ivo Vajgl, *v imenu skupine ALDE*. – Spoštovani predsednik, spoštovani komisar, zahvaljujem se za vestno in kvalitetno delo, ki ga je opravil poročevalec gospod David McAllister. V imenu skupine ALDE lahko zagotovim, da podpiramo vključevanje Srbije v Evropsko unijo, in izražam zadovoljstvo nad dosedanjim potekom pogajanj o prilagoditvi zakonodaje, ki bodo to omogočili.

Kot poročevalec v senci pa bi želel izpostaviti tudi nekaj kritičnih pripomb: Srbija bo morala storiti več za spoštovanje vladavine prava, za vzpostavitev resnično pluralnih, demokratičnih odnosov v svojem parlamentu in spoštovanje opozicije in njene vloge, zagotavljanje svobode medijev, ki je resno ogrožena, varnosti in integritete novinarjev, posebno raziskovalnih, tistih, ki so kritični do vlade.

Potreben je višji nivo kulture komuniciranja, odprava sovražnega govora, tako v domači rabi kot v mednarodnem komuniciranju Srbije s sosedi.

Takšna in samo takšna Srbija bo dobrodošla članica Evropske unije v prihodnje.

Igor Šoltes, *v imenu skupine Verts/ALE*. – Najprej seveda zahvala kolegu McAllisteru za odlično opravljeno delo pri pripravi tega poročila.

Nedvoumno uvodoma gre ugotoviti, da je Srbija v opazovanem obdobju naredila napredek na več področjih: reforma javne uprave, tržno gospodarstvo, gospodarska rast, makroekonomska, monetarna stabilnost in napredek v boju proti korupciji in organiziranemu kriminalu.

Ker pa je seveda Srbija pomemben igralec v sami regiji, je toliko bolj pomembno spremljati in tudi reagirati na določene izjave najvidnejših predstavnikov, ki včasih lahko izzvenijo v napačno smer. Zato so tudi predloženi določeni amandmaji.

Tisto, kar bi želel … *(Predsednik govorniku odvzame besedo.)*

Jaromír Kohlíček, *za skupinu GUE/NGL*. – Pane předsedající, v úvodu zprávy o Srbsku se považuje za normální vyjádření Mezinárodního soudního dvora v souvislosti s rezolucí Valného shromáždění OSN 64/298 z roku 2010, které de facto vzalo na vědomí jednostranné vyhlášení samostatnosti Kosova. Jaké pokrytectví!

Srbsko, přes všechny snahy o jeho oslabení, je i po krvavé agresi NATO stále klíčovou zemí uprostřed Balkánu. Navíc, jeho vedení bylo při posledním hodnocením kandidátských zemí označeno za premianta. Zásadně protestuji proti snaze určovat této kandidátské zemi, s kým může a s kým nesmí spolupracovat v zahraniční a obranné politice. Upozorňuji vážené kolegy na dlouhodobé mírové soužití desítek národnostních menšin v severovýchodní části země. Kéž by podobné podmínky považované autorem zprávy za nedostatečné měly menšiny v baltských zemích či v jiných zemích EU.

I přes dobrou vůli Srbska, avšak kvůli malé součinnosti ze strany Kosova, se nedaří uspokojivě řešit technické problémy spojené s nezákonným vydělením tohoto území ze Srbska. Toto je však úkol hlavně pro Evropskou komisi. Paní Tomašićová, ani vrazi z Chorvatska by neměli běhat po EU, nejen z jiných balkánských států.

Mario Borghezio, *a nome del gruppo ENF*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la relazione, indubbiamente equilibrata, saluta con favore il costante impegno della Serbia sulla via dell'integrazione nell'Unione europea e si chiede se questa decisione strategica venga attivamente promossa fra il pubblico serbo; compito non facile, conoscendo il favore popolare verso la prospettiva di un inserimento della Serbia nella strategia euroasiatica di Mosca. Bisogna tenerne conto, perché può avere un ruolo molto importante anche nei rapporti fra l'Europa, l'Unione europea e il mondo che fa capo a Mosca. Non dobbiamo dimenticare il messaggio che il Presidente Putin ha inviato direttamente a Vučić: entro poche ore possa inviare una forza di intervento rapido per difendere i serbi del Kosovo. L'Europa fa montagne di carta; Putin reagisce.

È centrale, l'irrisolto problema del Kosovo. Di recente, Kosovo e Serbia si sono incontrati e parlati per cercare di normalizzare i rapporti, passo evidentemente necessario ai fini dell'integrazione nell'Unione europea. A settembre, erano arrivati a un passo dal firmare un accordo e poi tutto è stato compromesso, nonostante ci fosse l'intesa per restituire al Kosovo i territori serbi abitati da persone di etnia albanese maggioritaria in Kosovo e alla Serbia quei territori kosovari a maggioranza etnica serba. All'ultimo minuto l'accordo era saltato ed è emerso il rischio evidente che le tensioni degli ultimi giorni, specialmente quelle legate all'introduzione inconscia dei dazi, possano bloccare o rallentare i nuovi tentativi di riconciliazione fra i due Stati, che noi evidentemente vediamo con grande speranza e favore.

Zoltán Balczó (NI). – Tisztelt Elnök Úr! A jelentés felkéri a szerb kormányt, hogy hajtsa végre a nemzeti kisebbségek jogaira vonatkozó nemzetközi szerződéseket. Megállapítja, hogy a nemzeti kisebbségek jogainak garantálása terén nem történt előrehaladás, nem kielégítő az, ami megtörtént. Létezik cselekvési terv, de azt teljes körűen végre kellene hajtani. Felhívja Szerbia figyelmét a kisebbségi nyelvhasználat biztosítására az oktatásban, a közigazgatásban, és a médiában.

Sajnálatos, hogy pont ugyanezek a megállapítások szerepelnek az előző jelentésben is, vagyis nincs előrelépés, miközben a nemzeti kisebbségek jogainak védelme az uniós csatlakozás előfeltétele. Ideje lenne megállapítások helyett felszólítani Szerbiát ezek teljesítésére. Nem kívánunk többet a Szerbiában élő nemzeti kisebbségeknek, köztük a vajdasági őshonos magyar népességnek, mint amilyen jogokat Szerbia elvár a koszovói szerbek számára.

Victor Boștinaru (S&D). – Mr President, I will start by congratulating David McAllister for his excellent and very balanced report.

I would like to emphasise the most important thing, which is that Serbia has made tremendous efforts to implement the most needed democratic reforms and Serbia is to be judged on its own merits. This is the only way forward for the enlargement process to remain credible and give a clear perspective to the Serbian people and to the people from the region as well.

Of course, there are still important steps to be taken in order to achieve the full alignment of Serbia's foreign and security policy with the EU one – and I am referring notably to the problems relating to its relations with Russia.

We Socialists and Democrats remain concerned about the situation regarding freedom of expression and freedom of the media. At the same time, I have to repeat, and I will never stop saying – people in Belgrade, the ruling coalition, should treat the opposition fairly and should work with the opposition, in their country's best interests.

Finally, I welcome Serbia's engagement in the normalisation of relations with Kosovo. But in this situation I do condemn the decision taken by Priština by increasing to 100% the taxes on imports from Serbia and Bosnia and Herzegovina.

PRZEWODNICTWO: BOGUSŁAW LIBERADZKI

Wiceprzewodniczący

Jean-Luc Schaffhauser (ENF). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, mes chers collègues, je voudrais d'abord rendre hommage à la Serbie à l'occasion du centenaire de la Première Guerre mondiale. 16 % de sa population périt dans cette guerre. La Serbie fut la première victime de cette guerre mondiale en pourcentage, la France en nombre. Une fois de plus, ce sont les empires qui ont fait cette guerre, voulue par le Deuxième Reich, entre autres, et les nations, comme la Serbie et la France, qui l'ont subie.

Mais la Serbie subit de nouveaux martyrs: l'Union exige que Belgrade choisisse entre l'Est et l'Ouest, contre son histoire, sa culture, son identité. Elle est un pont. L'Union l'oblige à reconnaître également l'indépendance du Kosovo, territoire qui lui fut arraché par une guerre d'agression illégale menée en 1999 avec l'OTAN.

L'Union, quelque part, c'est un coup d'État permanent contre les peuples, les nations et leur identité.

Veut-on ainsi forcer la Serbie à choisir un camp contre l'autre, alors qu'elle est de ces deux histoires communes? Veut-on l'empêcher de retrouver son histoire lorsque le Kosovo et son pouvoir légitime est donné à une mafia déguisée en État? Il faut arrêter cette politique du *Drang nach Osten*. Elle ne conduit qu'à la guerre et elle ne peut conduire qu'à la guerre.

Zgłoszenia z sali

Eduard Kukan (PPE). – Mr President, this is a really good report on Serbia. I would like to thank David McAllister. The report strikes the right balance with points that underline the progress Serbia has made over the last year, but also the areas where we would like to see more done.

The accession process should not be taken for granted. It's a chance to reform, not only in terms of technical requirements, but also to adjust to the values and principles of the European Union. We have seen good progress in some reforms. Yet there are still many key areas where more effort is needed. Let us be clear: the rule of law and the independence of the judiciary is one of the fundamentals of the accession process. Serbia needs to engage seriously in these reforms, strengthening the accountability, impartiality, professionalism and overall efficiency of the judiciary. I would also like to underline the need to improve the atmosphere concerning freedom of the media.

Ivan Jakovčić (ALDE). – Poštovani predsjedavajući, htio bih odmah na početku podržati ovaj izvještaj i reći da se nalazimo u jednoj klasičnoj poziciji. Svi znamo da je Srbija puno toga napravila, a da treba još jako puno toga učiniti. Svi želimo vidjeti Srbiju u ovome domu jednog dana, vidjeti zastupnice i zastupnike ovdje i svi je želimo poduprijeti, ali domaću zadaću Srbija mora odraditi.

Kao čovjek koji je u Hrvatskoj učinio sve što je bilo moguće da pomogne srpskoj manjini kada je bila ugrožena na mjestima gdje je bila ugrožena, želim isto sada jasno reći da želim podržati hrvatsku manjinu koja je u Srbiji i da o tome treba razgovarati jer to je isto tako jedan od problema u Vojvodini.

Ostali su govorili o ostalim potrebama koje Srbija treba ispuniti, ali važno je da govorimo i o ljudskim i manjinskim pravima i, naravno, onome što je, nažalost, još uvijek teška ostavština sukoba na Balkanu koji je bio 90-ih godina.

Igor Šoltes (Verts/ALE). – Žal sem bil prej prekinjen pred koncem samega govora, tako da bi še par misli v nadaljevanju.

Dejstvo je, da poleg teh znakov napredka in poglavij, kjer se kaže, da gre Srbija po pravi poti, pa so seveda še druge teme in področja, kjer je pa veliko manevrskega prostora za izboljšave.

Kolegi so že večkrat omenili svobodo izražanja in pa svobodo medijev. Zlasti opozorila nevladnih organizacij Srbije pričajo o tem, da je tukaj še ogromno prostora za izboljšave. In ravno ta komunikacija z nevladnim sektorjem mislim, da je ena od priložnosti zato, da se popolnoma različni sliki o stanju v Srbiji, ki jo predstavlja recimo vlada ali pa nevladna organizacija, počasi začenjajo zbliževati.

In kot poročevalec za Kosovo bi si seveda želel, da tudi konstruktivnost dialoga med Beogradom in Prištino se nadaljuje. Seveda pa ni pravi odgovor na to tudi zviševanje carin in mislim, da seveda obe strani se morata vzdrževati aktivnosti, ki poslabšujejo odnose.

In tu je še potreben velik napor in napredek.

Fabio Massimo Castaldo (EFDD). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, nei Balcani occidentali si gioca una sfida importante per il futuro e per la stabilità del nostro intero continente e noi vogliamo dare il nostro contributo per vincerla. La Serbia è un paese amico, vicino geograficamente ma anche vicino ai nostri valori, nelle tradizioni e nella cultura e nello spirito europeo. Ringrazio il relatore per i suoi importanti sforzi e in questa relazione sottolinea i passi avanti compiuti dalla Serbia in questi anni, anche riguardo a tematiche delicate, come la cooperazione regionale, i diritti delle minoranze, il sistema giudiziario e lo Stato di diritto.

Certo, sono necessari ulteriori passi in avanti nella lotta contro la corruzione, alla criminalità organizzata, nell'indipendenza dei media: ma siamo e restiamo fiduciosi e ottimisti. Il nostro voto favorevole vuole proprio sottolineare questi sforzi del popolo serbo nel suo cammino di adesione verso l'Unione europea, senza però chiedergli di snaturare i rapporti tradizionali che la Serbia ha con altri partner. Le recenti tensioni con il Kosovo ci preoccupano ma voglio ribadire che non può esserci un'Europa veramente unita senza i Balcani incidentali o senza la Serbia. Per questo auspichiamo l'apertura di ulteriori capitoli negoziali per scrivere presto insieme un nuovo capitolo importante della storia europea: obiettivo 2025.

Λάμπρος Φουντούλης (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, το μόνο που έχω να πω προς το φιλικό έθνος των Σέρβων είναι ότι θα πρέπει να το σκεφτούν πολύ καλά πριν αποφασίσουν να ενταχθούν στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση. Η Σερβία διαθέτει ήδη μια ανεπτυγμένη βιομηχανία και έχει όλες τις προϋποθέσεις για να αποτελέσει στο μέλλον μια σταθερή δύναμη στην περιοχή της. Η οικονομία της συνεχώς αναπτύσσεται, μετά τις προηγούμενες δύσκολες δεκαετίες, και έχει κάθε λόγο να ατενίζει με αισιοδοξία το μέλλον. Η ένταξη στην Ένωση μπορεί αρχικά να φαίνεται ως μια συμφέρουσα επιλογή, όμως σε βάθος χρόνου δεν είναι. Για κάθε ένα ευρώ οικονομικής βοήθειας που δίνει η Ένωση ζητάει και ένα τμήμα της εθνικής ανεξαρτησίας.

Δυστυχώς, εμείς στην Ελλάδα γνωρίζουμε πλέον πολύ καλά το τίμημα της ένταξης. Είδαμε στην πράξη τι σημαίνει ευρωπαϊκή αλληλεγγύη όταν, κατά τη διάρκεια της οικονομικής κρίσης, οι Ευρωπαίοι προσπάθησαν -και προσπαθούν ακόμη- με κάθε μέσο να υφαρπάξουν την ελληνική δημόσια περιουσία, αδιαφορώντας ταυτόχρονα για τα δεινά που προκάλεσαν και προκαλούν στον ελληνικό λαό. Οι Έλληνες θα στηρίξουμε κάθε απόφαση της Σερβίας, αρκεί αυτή να έχει ληφθεί με γνώμονα τη θέληση του σερβικού λαού και το συμφέρον της χώρας.

Andor Deli (PPE). – Mr President, during the summer we could see some promising signals connected to the Belgrade-Priština negotiations, but recent economic measures and other acts of provocation by the Kosovo government triggered events which are undermining not just bilateral relations but also EU efforts in the region, such as with the Common Economic Area.

It is high time for the Council to take action. The lack of European leadership in the Western Balkans is getting more and more obvious and pressing. The Commission does play a very important role but political decisions must be made by political bodies such as the Council, together with the Member States. They must stop hiding behind the Commission's skirt of technocratic and bureaucratic criteria, benchmarks and checklists. Hoping that legal harmonisation and reaching European standards will automatically solve the issues on the Balkans are illusory and naive. They must take these matters seriously, otherwise we will have, as was always the case, the US and Russia rushing in solving European issues.

Γεώργιος Επιτήδειος (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, όπως προκύπτει από την ισορροπημένη έκθεση του κυρίου McAllister, η Σερβία καταβάλλει προσπάθειες για να εναρμονιστεί με τις απαιτήσεις των κριτηρίων της Κοπεγχάγης, ώστε να γίνει μέλος της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης. Έχει υποχρέωση να εξομαλύνει τις σχέσεις της με το Κοσσυφοπέδιο. Αυτή είναι μία υποχρέωση συναισθηματικά επαχθής για τη Σερβία, διότι όλοι γνωρίζουμε ότι το Κοσσυφοπέδιο είναι το λίκνο του σερβικού πολιτισμού, είναι το βάθος της καρδιάς της Σερβίας.

Παρά ταύτα, το Κοσσυφοπέδιο προκαλεί τη Σερβία και δυσχεραίνει τις προσπάθειες εξομάλυνσης των σχέσεων. Προκαλεί, όπως είπαμε, τη Σερβία και η μεγαλύτερη πρόκληση είναι αυτήν τη στιγμή η αύξηση κατά 100% των δασμών για τις εισαγωγές προϊόντων από τη Σερβία και τη Βοσνία. Οφείλει η Σερβία να αντιδράσει και οφείλει η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση να μην πιέζει μόνο τη Σερβία να αλλάξει την πολιτική της απέναντι στη Ρωσία, αλλά και το Κοσσυφοπέδιο. Ως Έλληνας, εύχομαι οι προσπάθειες της Σερβίας να ευδοκιμήσουν και να ενταχθεί στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση με καλές συνθήκες.

Bogdan Andrzej Zdrojewski (PPE). – Serbia nie jest łatwa do oceny zwłaszcza, że nie można jej wyrwać z kontekstu gorących Bałkanów. Z tego też powodu gratulacje dla Davida McAllistera, nie tylko za przygotowany raport, ale także za opinię, która mu towarzyszy. Zwłaszcza za te dwa kluczowe zdania, które dotyczą oceny praworządności, a zwłaszcza wymienienia 23 i 24 rozdziału jako rzeczywiście kluczowych, które będą przesądzać czy Serbia, ewentualnie, po akcesji nie będzie źródłem problemów prawnych związanych z praworządnością.

Podzielam także ocenę, tę drugą dużo korzystniejszą, jeżeli chodzi o zmiany w gospodarce. Rzeczywiście w tej materii Serbia dokonała sporo, można to ocenić pozytywnie i trzymać kciuki za pozostałe paragrafy, rozdziały, aby rzeczywiście to przygotowanie nie budziło wątpliwości.

Marijana Petir (PPE). – Poštovani predsjedavajući, cijenim napore koje izvjestitelj David McAllister ulaže kako bi dao podršku europskoj perspektivi Srbije. Žao mi je što na ispruženu ruku podrške Srbija ne daje zadovoljavajući odgovor.

Ponekad mi se čini da značajnih pomaka nema, zato što ne postoji politička volja. Kako drugačije objasniti da Srbija i dalje krši prava hrvatske nacionalne manjine, da do danas nije dostavila podatke o zatočenima i nestalima i da svoje ratne zločince ne procesuira, već im omogućava da budu politički aktivni, pa čak i zastupnici u Skupštini? Kako protumačiti srbijanski zakon kojim si je Srbija uzela ulogu malog Haaga i koji je prijetnja za sve hrvatske branitelje? Nije prihvatljivo da srbijanska granična policija uhiti hrvatske građane, koji su ujedno branitelji, izvrgne ih poniženju i prijetnjama kako bi ih zastrašila da prestanu istraživati ratne zločine, koji su posljedica velikosrpske agresije na Hrvatsku.

Sve to govori u prilog tezi da Srbija ide stranputicom, a ne europskim putem, i jedino što mogu jest izraziti žaljenje zbog toga.

Franc Bogovič *(PPE).* – Čestitke, David, za odlično in uravnoteženo poročilo. Strinjam se tako s tistim delom, kjer opozarjaš na pomanjkljivosti v napredku na področju pravne države, svobode medijev. Veseli me, da lahko tudi izpostaviš napredek na področju gospodarstva, ki je ključno, da bo tudi Srbija prosperirala in da bodo mladi ostali v Srbiji, kar je ključni pogoj.

Čestitam in zahvaljujem se tudi gospodu Hahnu, ki je opravil odlično delo na Zahodnem Balkanu, in mislim, da opravlja to, kar je najbolj potrebno, da izboljša regionalno sodelovanje. Iz zadnjih primerov carin iz Kosova, ki jih strogo obsojam, je vidno, kako zahtevno je to delo, in čestitke za vaše delo.

Prepričan sem, da bo na tem področju potrebno nadaljevati, kajti razmere v relaciji tako Srbije-Kosova, Srbije-Hrvaške in ostale rabijo moderiranje s strani Evropske unije.

Podpiram, da se čim več poglavji še odpre, da gre napredek naprej. Brez ureditve regionalnih razmerij, kjer bo igrala Evropska unija ključno vlogo, si pa težko predstavljam vstop Srbije v Evropsko unijo.

(Koniec zgłoszeń z sali)

Johannes Hahn, *Member of the Commission.* – Mr President, honourable Members, State Secretary, again thank you for this very interesting and ultimately encouraging debate, which reflects the importance of the enlargement process and of our relations with Serbia.

I fully appreciate the sensitivity of bilateral issues. Clearly, further efforts will be needed to overcome the legacy of the past and to foster trust and reconciliation. At the same time we should ensure that bilateral issues don't hamper the firm prospect of EU membership, which continues to drive transformation and anchor stability and security in Serbia and elsewhere in the region. Today this is more important than ever.

At the same time we should focus on good neighbourly relations, democratic values and respect for the rule of law, protection of national minorities, freedom of expression and of the media, the ability to address the legacy of the past, and war crimes issues. Those are core European values and these are simply not negotiable.

Thank you for your attention and also for your strong commitment.

Karoline Edtstadler, *President-in-Office of the Council.* – Mr President, to conclude, I would like to thank honourable Members very much for this really useful debate. I have listened attentively to the views expressed. We look forward to continuing this constructive dialogue and engagement.

When moving ahead in the accession process with Serbia, I would like to assure you that we closely monitor its progress, paying particular attention to the area of the rule of law, freedom of the media, the Belgrade-Priština dialogue and the other important issues which were mentioned here today.

David McAllister, *Berichterstatter.* – Herr Präsident, sehr verehrte Frau Staatssekretärin, sehr geehrter Kommissar! Ich darf mich zunächst bei Ihnen beiden bedanken für die freundlichen Worte und die sachlichen Hinweise zu meinem Bericht. Ich darf mich ebenso bedanken bei allen Kolleginnen und Kollegen, die sich an dieser – aus meiner Sicht weitestgehend sehr sachlichen – Debatte beteiligt haben. Ich bedanke mich für das Lob, ich bedanke mich auch für kritische Hinweise. Ich möchte ausdrücklich die Botschafterin der Republik Serbien, Frau Hrustanović, auf der Tribüne begrüßen, die, glaube ich, heute auch gesehen hat, dass wir in dieser Debatte über Fraktionsgrenzen hinweg deutlich gemacht haben, dass wir bereit sind, Serbien auf einem langen, nicht immer einfachen aber steten Weg in Richtung Europäische Union positiv zu begleiten.

Ich glaube, es gibt viel Potenzial in diesem Land. Serbien ist eine europäische Kulturnation. Ich begrüße es ausdrücklich, dass dieses Land so klar auf einer proeuropäischen Ausrichtung unterwegs ist. Ich glaube, wichtig ist jetzt im Dezember, verehrte Frau Staatssekretärin, wenn der Rat tagt, dass die Mitgliedstaaten sich dafür entscheiden, weitere Kapitel zu eröffnen, damit der Reformprozess auch weiterhin in Serbien eine aktive Unterstützung findet.

Nochmals herzlichen Dank für die gute Zusammenarbeit, für die vielen Änderungsanträge, die wir in Kompromissen zusammengeführt haben. Es wäre schön, wenn wir morgen mit einer breiten parlamentarischen Mehrheit diesen Bericht beschließen, um deutlich zu machen, dass das Europäische Parlament an der Seite der proeuropäischen Kräfte in diesem großartigen Land steht.

Przewodniczący. – Zamykam debatę.

Głosowanie odbędzie się w czwartek 29 listopada 2018 r.

Oświadczenia pisemne (art. 162)

Dominique Bilde (ENF), *par écrit.* – Que dire de ce rapport sans nuances duquel transpire à chaque ligne un parti pris antiserbe que le rapporteur ne tente même pas de dissimuler?

Tout d'abord, il est inacceptable d'assimiler un possible échange de territoires entre la Serbie et le Kosovo à la création d'un État «ethniquement pur». Deuxièmement, à l'heure où l'Union européenne se fait fort d'imposer à la Serbie la reconnaissance du Kosovo, elle ne parvient pas en revanche à exiger de ce dernier le retrait de sa mesure appliquant des droits de douane de 100 % aux importations serbes.

Du reste, l'échec cuisant ce lundi du Commissaire européen Johannes Hahn en visite à Priština dit tout ce qu'il faut savoir sur l'influence réelle de Bruxelles dans une poudrière des Balkans où l'étincelle n'est jamais loin, et ce en dépit des privilèges divers et variés généreusement accordés au Kosovo, à l'instar de sa participation anticipée à certains programmes européens.

Mais le plus inadmissible est le véritable chantage exercé contre la Serbie concernant ses relations avec la Russie, qui révèle l'essence même d'un projet européen résolument contraire aux intérêts nationaux.

23. Bericht 2018 über das Kosovo (Aussprache)

Przewodniczący. – Kolejnym punktem porządku dziennego jest sprawozdanie sporządzone przez Igora Šoltesa w imieniu Komisji Spraw Zagranicznych w sprawie sprawozdania Komisji za rok 2018 dotyczącego Kosowa (2018/2149(INI)) (A8-0332/2018).

Igor Šoltes, *Rapporteur.* – Najlepša hvala predsedujoči za besedo. Lep pozdrav seveda tudi spoštovanemu komisarju in predstavnici Sveta.

Najprej bi se želel zahvaliti vsem poročevalcem v senci za odlično opravljeno delo in pa za vse sugestije in amandmaje, ki smo jih prejeli v tem času priprave poročila. Vodilo pri pripravi poročila je predvsem to, da je na neki… način refleksija področja, kjer je bil napredek storjen, in tudi opozorila na teme in pa na področja, kjer še vedno obstajajo pomanjkljivosti in kjer so potrebne izboljšave.

Če izpostavim nekaj ključnih točk iz poročila, bi začel tako:

Kosovo je seveda v opazovanem obdobju naredilo pomemben korak naprej, napredek, ki pa ni bil povsem takšen, kot smo si želeli. Na mnogih področjih bi si želeli več, na mnogih področjih so še vedno vidni deli, ki ji bo treba izboljšati.

Razlog gre iskati v zunanjih okoliščinah, predvsem pa tudi v notranjih, ker včasih se zdi, da politične skupine v parlamentu težko dosežejo konsenz, in tudi včasih manko v komunikaciji med političnimi skupinami botruje, da se včasih zakonodaja, ki bi morala biti sprejeta, težje prebije v parlament. Predvsem pa je pomembno, da zakoni, ki se sprejmejo v parlamentu na Kosovu, potem doživijo tudi implementacijo. Ker ne pomaga veliko, če imamo še tako dobre zakone, ki pa jih ne uporabljamo.

Bi pa na tem mestu seveda opozoril še na eno od tem, ki je izjemno pomembna, to je vizumska liberalizacija. Že večkrat smo ponovili, da je Kosovo izpolnilo vse zahtevane kriterije, med drugim tudi ratifikacijo meje s Črno goro, ki se je po več kot dveh letih pogajanj zgodila marca letos, in s tem pravzaprav odprlo vrata za vizumsko liberalizacijo. In temu sta tako Komisija kot Parlament dala zeleno luč. In zaradi tudi verodostojnosti evropskih institucij mislim, da je zdaj tudi na strani Evrope, da izpolni svoj del dogovora in to je, da omogoči vizumsko liberalizacijo ljudem na Kosovu in jih na ta način izenači z vsemi drugimi v regiji.

Ko sem omenil zakone, moram reči, da je Kosovo sprejelo kar nekaj pomembnih zakonov, ki jih lahko štejemo kot napredek. Je pa, kot rečeno, v poročilu omenjena tudi problematika korupcije in organiziranega kriminala, ki sta še vedno prisotna in zdi se, da bo potreben še velik dodaten napor za čim večjo neodvisnost tudi sodne veje oblasti in pa to, da se še okrepi delovanje na področju vodenja evidenc o preiskovanju pregona korupcije na visoki ravni. Tu bo potrebno sodelovanje mnogih vpletenih, tudi v regiji.

Seveda na koncu ne morem mimo dialoga med Beogradom in Prištino in vsi si želimo, da se razmere čim bolj normalizirajo in da se preide in nadaljuje s pogovori v iskanju rešitve in izpolnjevanju tistih zahtev, ki… h katerim sta se zavezali obe državi. In to seveda Evropska komisija kot Parlament skrbno spremljata.

Bi pa seveda omenil, in brez tega ne gre, da se dvostranski odnosi ne rešujejo s prekomernimi ukrepi in tudi ta uvedba carin ne izboljšuje odnose med Prištino in Beogradom. In prepričan sem, da je potreben razmislek in drugačno ukrepanje in umik tovrstnih odločitev.

In na koncu še to, da seveda si želimo vsi, da se Kosovo tudi na teh odprtih vprašanjih premakne naprej. In tu sem prepričan, da tudi EU lahko nudi svojo podporo in sodelovanje.

Karoline Edtstadler, *President-in-Office of the Council.* – Thank you Mr President, honourable Members, dear Commissioner, dear rapporteur Šoltes.

Let me start by underlining the importance of the Stabilisation and Association Agreement. This agreement offers Kosovo an opportunity for sustainable progress and rapprochement with the European Union.

It is therefore essential for Kosovo to continue working on the implementation of the agreement. Here we concur with your view that Kosovo should pay particular attention to improving the rule of law, including traditional independence and due process of law. Kosovo also needs to continue its fight against organised crime and corruption, which should be a clear priority of the authorities.

Consensus across the political spectrum is key to advancing Kosovo's European agenda. We share your view that the Assembly is the key forum for legislative work and political dialogue. A strong political will is required from all political actors to move Kosovo forward.

Turning to the EU-facilitated dialogue between Belgrade and Pristina, we welcome the commitment of both sides to work with the High Representative on a comprehensive normalisation of relations, including in the form of a legally binding agreement.

We both agree that this is key for their respective European paths and essential for sustainable regional stability. The Council will continue to monitor closely Kosovo's engagement towards visible and sustainable progress here so that Serbia and Kosovo can continue on their respective European paths.

We stress the importance of regional cooperation and good neighbourly relations. We encourage Kosovo to continue sustained efforts to strengthen good neighbourly relations and to resolve outstanding bilateral issues.

In this context, actions undermining regional cooperation are not helpful. We regret the introduction of tariffs by Kosovo on products originating from Serbia and Bosnia and Herzegovina. There is an urgent need for calm and de-escalation in the interests of the whole region and, again, we welcome Commissioner Hahn's offer of help to work on rapid and practical solutions for the various trade issues at hand.

Let me add a few comments on the visa liberalisation process, which as we know is high on the political agenda in Kosovo. We join the European Parliament in welcoming the ratification by the Kosovo Assembly of the border boundary agreement with Montenegro in March 2018. This fulfilled one of the key criteria for Kosovo's visa liberalisation and was an important achievement in the spirit of good neighbourly relations.

Let me recall here the Commission proposal in May 2016 to transfer Kosovo to the Schengen visa-free list and the Commission's report on the fulfilment of the remaining benchmarks in July 2018. We note that the Parliament has adopted its mandate and is ready to start negotiating with the Council on the proposal to waive visa requirements for Kosovo.

However, as you are aware, the decision on the Commission proposal is currently under consideration in the Council. Today in our discussions we focus on Kosovo's progress in 2017. However, also more generally, I would like to stress that the EU will continue to support Kosovo by putting particular emphasis on furthering Kosovo's socio-economic reform agenda, including through financial and technical assistance. Economic growth and creating employment is a main concern of its people.

Let me finally welcome the agreement reached on the extension of the EULEX mission and underline the importance of continued close and effective cooperation with EULEX.

Johannes Hahn, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, first of all, I would like to thank the Parliament, and in particular the rapporteur, Mr Šoltes, for the report on Kosovo. I believe that it is a balanced report and is in line with the main findings of our 2018 Commission report regarding progress and challenges in Kosovo.

But we cannot hide the fact that today the discussion is overshadowed by what has been happening in recent weeks in Kosovo. The recent decisions by the Kosovo Government to impose a trade tariff increase of up to 100% against Serbia and Bosnia and Herzegovina are very concerning and doing real harm to relations with Kosovo and regional cooperation ambitions. As we have said clearly, these decisions are a clear violation of the Central European Free Trade Agreement and contrary to the spirit of the Stabilisation and Association Agreement between the European Union and Kosovo.

This is why the European Union has called on the Kosovo Government to immediately revoke these decisions. Imposing blanket measures is not the appropriate way to address trade concerns. They must be addressed in the appropriate fora. I have already spoken with the Prime Minister and the President, who agreed on the urgent need to calm and de-escalate, in the interests of the country and the whole region, and offered a rapid and practical solution for the various trade issues at hand between Kosovo and Serbia. I will also use the opportunity of my planned visit to Pristina next week to help find a way out of this crisis.

But now let me turn back briefly to the assessment in our 2018 report on Kosovo. As already noted also in Parliament's report, the picture is a mixed one. We underline progress in certain areas, such as on the investment climate. We also welcome the ratification by the Kosovo Assembly of the Agreement on Border Demarcation with Montenegro last March, which was an important breakthrough. However, our overall conclusion is that Kosovo's pace of EU-related reforms is too slow. This is partly due to a very high political polarisation and the fact that the Assembly has not been functioning as it should. Unfortunately, these conclusions are still valid today. We therefore expect all political actors to increase efforts to build consensus on strategic issues for Kosovo, in particular EU-related priority reforms and on the dialogue with Serbia.

Let me now turn to visa liberalisation, which is of particular importance to Kosovo's citizens. Kosovo has worked hard in recent years to meet its visa liberalisation roadmap criteria. Last July, the Commission confirmed that Kosovo had fulfilled all outstanding criteria. We continue to stand by our assessment that all benchmarks have been met and continue to be met. I welcome Parliament's clear support for the Commission's proposal on visa liberalisation. Your report also – rightly so – insists that the authorities in Kosovo demonstrate sustained efforts in the fight against organised crime and corruption. The ball is now in the Council's court. I hope that the Council will demonstrate that when our partners deliver, the EU delivers too. In that respect I would like to thank the Austrian Presidency for its efforts to put this on the agenda and to try to start negotiations on this subject.

The Commission remains committed to Kosovo and to giving Kosovo a real European perspective. We will continue to support Kosovo in its reform processes in important areas such as the rule of law, public administration, the economy and education. However, we need to see a clear commitment from Kosovo's leaders to focus their attention on measures that will bring Kosovo closer to Europe.

Eduard Kukan, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Mr President, Kosovo has seen turbulent political months. While some issues have moved forward, not much overall progress has been achieved. We are expecting more from the political leaders of Kosovo. We need to see a genuine commitment to the reform process, especially in the rule of law and the fight against corruption. However, political polarisation, and the lack of consensus and efficient work of the Kuvendi hinders progress on EU-related issues. Moreover, escalating tensions between Belgrade and Pristina resulted in unprecedented tariffs and the waste of very valuable time in reaching the agreement.

Finally, the last reporting period in Kosovo has been marked by the fulfilment of requirements for a visa-free regime. This was confirmed by the Commission in July and by this House in September 2018. I will, therefore, appeal to the Council, and especially to the Austrian Presidency, to recognise this progress and move forward with granting a visa-free regime for Kosovo.

Pier Antonio Panzeri, *a nome del gruppo S&D*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, ringrazio innanzitutto il relatore per il testo completo e inclusivo che è stato realizzato; nella relazione sono evidenziati i progressi ma, allo stesso tempo, quanto resta ancora da fare, in particolare per quanto concerne la pubblica amministrazione, il sistema giudiziario e la lotta alla criminalità. Inoltre, in tema di diritti umani, chiediamo una maggiore integrazione delle politiche di genere, la protezione delle minoranze, in particolare i rom e gli ashkali, e la discriminazione delle persone LGBT.

Pur sottolineando, come ha fatto il Commissario, la problematicità delle scelte fiscali fatte recentemente dal Kosovo, ricordo che a luglio la Commissione europea ha affermato che il Kosovo ha finalmente soddisfatto tutte le condizioni necessarie per ottenere la liberalizzazione dei visti. Dopo il voto del Parlamento europeo, la decisione deve essere ora presa in Consiglio; raggiungere questo risultato è fondamentale per la stabilizzazione, l'integrazione e la cooperazione con questa regione geograficamente fondamentale per l'Unione europea. Infine, è importante, per la normalizzazione delle relazioni con la Serbia, che i cinque paesi europei che non l'hanno ancora fatto riconoscano il Kosovo, grazie.

Ангел Джамбазки, *от името на групата ECR*. – Първо искам да поздравя колегата Шолтес за доклада, който е направил. Той е изключително подготвен и изключително добре мотивиран и в дълбочина разследва и изследва ситуацията, в която се намира Косово в момента. Всички с тревога, вероятно всеки един от Вас ще се присъедини към тази тревога, следим ситуацията в момента, нарастващото напрежение в отношенията с един от съседите на Косово, както и продължаващото вътрешно напрежение в самата държава, което не е в интерес нито на косовските граждани, нито помага на промените, на реформите в Косово и на пътя му на интеграция в Европейския съюз, където е пътят на тази държава.

Уважаеми г-н Комисар, искам да се обърна специално към Вас да обърнете по-сериозно внимание на правата и законните интереси на различните малцинства в Косово, защото има съществени проблеми и провокации. Те са видими, а не могат да бъдат оставени по този начин. По-специално, разбира се, обръщам и на правата и на законните интереси на българската общност в Косово.

Jasenko Selimović, *on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – Mr President, my thanks go to the rapporteur for the excellent report that shows that certain things are developing in a good direction in Kosovo, especially when it comes to the economy and economic criteria. However, certain other issues have to be worked on: relations with Serbia, certainly, and the rights of minorities, while the informal economy remains an issue, a big one.

However, the ratification of the border agreement with Montenegro in March 2018 was important, a major breakthrough. On this matter, Kosovo showed that it fulfilled the criteria, together with the development of the economic area and together with the fight against corruption. It shows that it fulfilled the criteria to get the visa liberalisation, as the Commissioner has stated. Now it's up to the Council to do its job. We cannot play with Kosovo, they fulfilled the criteria, we have to give them what we have promised.

Jaromír Kohlíček, *za skupinu GUE/NGL*. – Pane předsedající, Kosovo, správně Kosovo a Metohije, je kolébkou srbského státu. Protiprávní odtržení tohoto území od Srbska, které je navíc v rozporu s rezolucí 1244 Rady bezpečnosti OSN, je dostatečným zdůvodněním pro neuznání samostatnosti tohoto uměle vytvořeného státu.

Jestliže se hovoří o Balkánu jako o místě největší korupce v Evropě, o místě, odkud vychází cesty distribuce drog, kde se nedaří odsoudit zločince z teroristických skupin, kteří zde mají své zázemí, a kde právní stát je absolutní fikcí, pak tento popis nejlépe vystihuje situaci v Kosovu. Zpráva se nezmiňuje ani o protiprávní existenci největší základny USA v Evropě, *Bond Steel*, naopak se snaží najít alespoň náznaky pozitivního vývoje.

Je namístě vyslovit hluboké znepokojení nad některými kroky místní administrativy, včetně praktické nevymahatelnosti práva a technických excesů, jako je narušení evropské propojené elektrizační soustavy nevhodnou činností místních autorit.

S takto formulovanou zprávou nemohu rozhodně vyslovit souhlas. Komisi blokování jednání místními orgány nevadí? S tímto státem chcete udělat vízovou liberalizaci, pane komisaři?

Dominique Bilde, *au nom du groupe ENF*. – Monsieur le Président, les rapports de la Commission sont toujours l'occasion d'un foisonnement d'euphémismes. Celui relatif au Kosovo n'échappe pas à la règle.

Nous apprécierons la mention de «stade précoce de la lutte contre le crime organisé», dans cet État au cœur de trafics en tous genres. Pire, comment la Commission peut-elle vanter l'engagement du Kosovo dans le processus de normalisation avec la Serbie quand les provocations s'enchaînent à une cadence qui donne le tournis? En témoigne l'annonce récente d'une taxation de 100 % sur les importations serbes, comble de l'ironie à l'heure où Bruxelles se pose en chantre du libre-échange face à Donald Trump.

Enfin, de quelle normalisation parle-t-on quand, fin octobre, des pèlerins orthodoxes ont été accueillis au monastère de Studenica à coups de pierres?

La levée des visas est d'ailleurs d'autant plus inconcevable qu'elle portera peut-être bientôt sur un monde révolu, à en juger par l'appel du Premier ministre albanais à une Grande Albanie, qui achève de mettre le feu à la poudrière des Balkans.

Tonino Picula (S&D). – Poštovani predsjedavajući, čestitam kolegi Šoltesu na kvalitetnom izvješću. Jasna perspektiva članstva u Europskoj uniji mora ostati jedan od poticaja za provedbu prijeko potrebnih reformi u zemljama Zapadnog Balkana, pa tako i u slučaju najmlađe europske države.

Dobru vijesti s Kosova, u pogledu ispunjavanja uvjeta za liberalizaciju viznog režima, ovoga puta ne prate dobre vijesti iz Europske unije. Parlament i Komisija poslali su jasnu poruku i podržali ukidanje viza građanima Kosova kako bi im olakšali putovanja, poslovanje te pomogli u borbi protiv krijumčarenja ljudi. Iskazujem žaljenje što Vijeće još uvijek nije omogućilo konačnu liberalizaciju viznog režima. To bi bila jasna poruka Kosovu, ali i regiji, da ispunjavanje obveza uvijek donosi korist, u suprotnom rastu frustracije.

Pred Kosovom je i dalje veliki posao u jačanju vladavine prava, procesuiranju politički motiviranih ubojstava, borbi protiv organiziranog kriminala i korupcije. Jedino opipljivi reformski rezultati opravdavaju daljnju europsku podršku koja, međutim, u slučaju Kosova mora prijeći s obećanja na provedbu istih.

Ryszard Czarnecki (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! Panie Komisarzu! Byłem w Kosowie. Nie ma co ukrywać, że to państwo było przedmiotem kontrowersji. Powstawało przy wielkiej pomocy amerykańskiej, na co z pewnym sceptycyzmem patrzyły niektóre państwa członkowskie Unii Europejskiej. Z perspektywy lat możemy powiedzieć, że na pewno warto, aby Unia Europejska inwestowała w ogóle w Bałkany Zachodnie i że integracja tych państw z Unią jest elementem stabilizacji. Stworzenie europejskiej perspektywy – nie jutro, nie pojutrze, lecz nawet w dłuższym czasie – sprawi, że mówiąc wprost, wpływy rosyjskie w tamtym regionie będą mniejsze. Rosja bowiem cały czas stara się grać kartą Bałkanów Zachodnich, także gdy chodzi o Kosowo, i trzeba to dostrzegać.

Zgłoszenia z sali

Dubravka Šuica (PPE). – Poštovani predsjedavajući, želim se nakratko priključiti ovoj raspravi budući da sam bila izvjestiteljica u sjeni ovoga izvješća, ujedno sam i nekoliko puta, kao članica delegacije, posjetila Kosovo. Poznato mi je stanje u regiji, poznato mi je stanje na Kosovu.

Odnosi između Srbije i Kosova vrlo su komplicirani, to je svima jasno ovdje i povjerenik je to rekao. Normalizaciji tih odnosa uvođenje carina i tarifa sigurno neće doprinijeti, ali, isto tako, liberalizacija viza je nešto što smo im obećali, nešto što je ovaj Parlament velikom većinom izglasovao i sigurno da građani Kosova očekuju da im se omogući liberalizacija viza. Ja očekujem da će Vijeće o tome uskoro odlučivati, u protivnom to neće biti dobar znak da bi građani doživljavali taj europski put.

Isto tako, neophodna je borba protiv korupcije, neophodne su reforme, to je evidentno, ali isto tako Kosovo je vrlo važno za regiju i stanje na Kosovu važno je za cijelu Europu, a posebno za jugoistok Europe.

Julie Ward (S&D). – Mr President, as a friend of Kosovo, I am saddened to see that its participation in the European processes – in fact, its very existence, even – is still called into question in this House.

On the contrary, colleagues, we should be putting all our efforts into Kosovo's accession to the EU. As we engage with the country, I believe one of our priorities should be the fight against anti-gypsyism. Roma people remain a very marginalised group who face daily discrimination in all areas of life in Kosovo and everywhere else.

We must double our efforts to achieve full equality for Roma people and this process should start with holding ourselves to account.

In a country where the European Parliament was instrumental in ensuring compensation will be paid to women victims of sexual violence during the conflict, I'm appalled to see that the UN refuses to provide proper compensation for Roma, Ashkali and Egyptian people affected by lead poisoning in the UN-run camps.

So the UN and us should lead by example. We must take responsibility for anything that caused wrongdoings or lifelong damage to affected … *(The President cut off the speaker).*

Ivan Jakovčić (ALDE). – Poštovani predsjedavajući, jedna riječ je dovoljna da opiše odnose između Kosova i Europske unije u današnjem trenutku. Ta riječ je za mene vjerodostojnost.

Vjerodostojnost Europske unije kada govorimo o liberalizaciji viza. Nakon glasanja ovoga Parlamenta očekujem glasanje u Vijeću jer u pitanju je naša vjerodostojnost budući da je Kosovo, barem u ovom dijelu, ispunilo svoje uvjete koje smo im dali.

S druge strane, vjerodostojnost Kosova dovedena je u pitanje i njihova namjera ulaska u Europsku uniju dovedena je u pitanje s nametanjem carina Bosni i Hercegovini i Srbiji u stopostotnom iznosu. Ako netko želi Berlinski proces, ako netko želi ući u Europsku uniju, ako netko želi ući na jedinstveno tržište, ako netko želi regionalnu suradnju, ne može uvesti stopostotnu carinu.

Dakle, vjerodostojnost s naše strane da bi vjerodostojno mogli tražiti od Kosova da se oni prilagode nama.

Jordi Solé (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, I regret that five EU Member States still don't recognise Kosovo as an independent state and I welcome the fact that the report from my colleague, Igor Šoltes, invites them to do so.

One of the states that still denies this recognition is Spain. The controversial Foreign Affairs Minister, Josep Borrell, recently reiterated that his government wouldn't change this position. This is the same minister who, in 2008, in a not very visionary and even less rigorous way, stated that the secession of Kosovo was illegal from the point of view of international law. This opinion was clearly discredited by the International Court of Justice which, in its 2010 opinion, established that general international law does not provide for prohibitions on declarations of independence, and therefore the declaration of Kosovo didn't violate international law.

For the sake of reconciliation in the Balkans and for the sake of European integration, Spain should recognise the states that are born of democratic decisions by their national parliaments.

Fabio Massimo Castaldo (EFDD). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, questa relazione sottolinea in maniera bilanciata i piccoli progressi e le diverse sfide a cui il Kosovo deve ancora far fronte e che scandiranno il ritmo del suo cammino verso l'integrazione europea. Un cammino lungo e irto di ostacoli, che richiede un impegno costante, determinazione e pazienza per realizzare quelle riforme di cui il paese ha urgentemente bisogno. In questo senso va letta la relazione del collega Šoltes, che ringrazio: un ulteriore stimolo a fare meglio, soprattutto in alcuni campi, come la lotta alla corruzione, alla criminalità organizzata, al traffico di esseri umani, al narcotraffico, alla radicalizzazione e a qualsiasi tipo di discriminazione.

Le relazioni bilaterali con la Serbia sono indubbiamente di fondamentale importanza e devono essere impostate su un dialogo stretto, affidabile, trasparente e verso un accordo di normalizzazione vincolante ed esaustivo, concordato da entrambi i paesi. Ecco quindi che invito le autorità kosovare a non prendere decisioni avventate, che compromettano gli sforzi di cooperazione regionale. Mi riferisco in particolare alla recente imposizione di dazi sulle merci importate dalla Serbia che violano le regole di libero commercio nell'accordo CEFTA. Ancora una volta il dialogo deve tornare protagonista nel risolvere i problemi nei Balcani occidentali.

Σωτήριος Ζαριανόπουλος (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, μεγάλη διαφθορά, οργανωμένο έγκλημα, εμπορία ναρκωτικών, εμπορία ανθρώπων, τζιχαντιστές. Αυτή είναι η εικόνα του Κοσόβου, αλλά και της Αλβανίας -σε διαφορετική έκταση. Δεν το λέμε εμείς· εσείς το λέτε στην έκθεσή σας. Ασκείτε πιέσεις για την προοπτική προσχώρησης του Κοσόβου στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση και για την ένταξη της Αλβανίας και των Σκοπίων. Η διεύρυνση της επιρροής, της δικής σας και του ΝΑΤΟ -πρωτοστατούσης της κυβέρνησης ΣΥΡΙΖΑ-ΑΝΕΛ στην Ελλάδα, και ο έλεγχος των βαλκανικού διαδρόμου κόντρα στη Ρωσία είναι αυτά που σας ενδιαφέρουν και μόνον· ούτε τα κριτήριά σας, ούτε -βέβαια- τα συμφέροντα των λαών. Το Κόσοβο, ένα προτεκτοράτο-αμερικάνικη βάση που είναι κατασκεύασμα των βομβαρδισμών και της διάλυσης της Γιουγκοσλαβίας, συνεχίζει την αλλαγή συνόρων για να συμμετάσχει στη Μεγάλη Αλβανία, το αγαπημένο παιδί των Αμερικανών, του ΝΑΤΟ και της Ένωσης, ανοίγοντας την όρεξη για εδαφικές διεκδικήσεις και άλλων, όπως των Αλβανών για την Τσαμουριά και των Τούρκων για το Αιγαίο και τη Δυτική Θράκη. Το «διαίρει και βασίλευε», που υποδαυλίζεται με εθνικισμούς, είναι κίνδυνος-θάνατος για τους λαούς, οι οποίοι πρέπει να απαντήσουν με συντονισμένη πάλη και κόντρα στα πολεμικά σας σχέδια, για πραγματική συνεργασία, ασφάλεια και ειρήνη.

(Koniec zgłoszeń z sali)

Johannes Hahn, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, I intend to travel to Pristina next week. The focus will be on the tariff decisions, but I'm also going to assess the implementation of the European Reform Agenda. I will be insisting that the Kosovan authorities need to get back to the issues that matter for Kosovo's future, namely reforms and engagement in the dialogue. Kosovo's priorities should remain the rule of law, economic development and education. Kosovo needs to become an attractive place for business, provide citizens with high-quality education and reduce the very high unemployment levels, in particular among young people.

It's also crucial that Kosovo continues to build confidence by demonstrating sustained progress in the fight against organised crime and corruption. The Commission is providing strong support for the implementation of these priorities through substantive financial assistance and technical advice. For this part Kosovo needs to keep pace with the rest of the region to promote economic growth and foster political stability, which is essential for the security of the Western Balkans as a whole.

Regarding dialogue, it's vital that Kosovo and Serbia remain committed to the full normalisation of their relations. A comprehensive, legally binding normalisation agreement should be reached as soon as possible. Both Kosovo and Serbia have expressed on many occasions concerns and grievances about their relations. They should be addressed through the dialogue which the European Union is committed to continue to facilitate.

I would like to conclude by saying that the Commission remains strongly committed to driving forward Kosovo's European agenda despite the current difficult political context.

Karoline Edtstadler, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Mr President, at the outset of my concluding remarks, let me express my sincere gratitude to the rapporteur of the European Parliament on Kosovo, Igor Šoltes.

I would like to reiterate that stability in the neighbourhood and the enlargement of the European Union is a priority of the Austrian presidency. The EU will continue to assist Kosovo, including through its presence on the ground. And of course this applies also to visa liberalisation, but the Council's deliberations are currently ongoing and the outcome cannot be pre-judged.

The Austrian Presidency remains committed to moving the process forward. However, the primary responsibility for progress lies with Kosovo, its leaders, institutions and civil society. Reforms are crucial and they will require consensus across the political spectrum, and the political leaders to live up to their responsibilities for the good of Kosovo and of its citizens.

Igor Šoltes, *poročevalec*. – Torej to, kar smo poslušali danes, in to, kar tudi piše v samem poročilu, Kosovu ne bo zmanjkalo dela tudi v prihodnjih letih, to je definitivno, ampak tri stvari bi želel za zaključek povedati.

Upam, da je tudi Svet danes slišal to, kar smo povedali, da Kosovo je izpolnilo svoje pogoje glede vizne liberalizacije, in dogovori obstajajo zato, da se seveda spoštujejo, in če je ena stran to izpolnila, utemeljeno se pričakuje, da to stori tudi druga stran.

Verjemite, da ljudje na Kosovu že nestrpno pričakujejo, da niso predmet diskriminacije še naprej, in pričakujejo, da bo Evropska unija tudi v imenu verodostojnosti izpolnila svoj del obveznosti.

Drugo, mislim, da je vlada v Prištini danes slišala, da nismo najbolj navdušeni nad uvedbo oziroma nad povišanjem carin za 100 procentov kot sredstvo za reševanje sporov med Beogradom in Prištino, in upam, da bo ponovno razmislila, ali je to je res primeren ukrep, ker reševanje sporov se odvija oziroma rešuje tudi na drugačen način.

Zadnja stvar, ki bi jo želel še izpostaviti, je okolje, okoljevarstvena problematika.

Mislim, da premalo izpostavljamo tudi problematiko okolja na Kosovu, zlasti bi tukaj opozoril na resen problem, s katerim se srečuje Priština, to je onesnaženost zraka, ki je ena najvišjih v Evropi.

In mislim, da tukaj je potrebno storiti več na tem področju in tudi vložiti sredstva za izboljšanje. To pa je povezano seveda tudi z elektrarnami in onesnaževalci v regiji, zato mislim, da je tudi to ena od stvari, kjer lahko Evropska unija in Kosovo dobro sodelujeta.

Przewodniczący. – Zamykam debatę.

Głosowanie odbędzie się w czwartek 29 listopada 2018 r.

24. Begrüßung

Przewodniczący. – Zanim przejdziemy do odpowiedniego punktu porządku obrad, niech mi wolno będzie najpierw powitać obecną na sali delegację byłej jugosłowiańskiej republiki Macedonii. Serdecznie witam Państwa, szczególnie wiceministra spraw zagranicznych Andreja Žernovskiego oraz wielopartyjną delegację parlamentu macedońskiego. *(Oklaski)* Dziękuję bardzo Paniom i Panom Posłom za tak życzliwe i gorące przyjęcie.

Drogi Panie Wiceministrze! Drodzy Państwo Posłowie! Chciałbym Was zapewnić, że Parlament Europejski nadal będzie wspierał Wasz kraj w wysiłkach zmierzających do przeprowadzenia reform, w tym do wdrożenia umowy znad Prespy, które stanowi pozytywny sygnał o porozumieniu dla całego regionu.

Jeśli mogę sobie pozwolić na osobistą uwagę, to kiedyś jako student miałem przyjemność przebywać trzy miesiące w Skopje na stypendium, stąd i miasto, i naród macedoński są mi bardzo bliskie. Dziękuję za danie mi wtedy tej możliwości.

25. Bericht 2018 über die ehemalige jugoslawische Republik Mazedonien (Aussprache)

Przewodniczący. – Kolejnym punktem porządku dziennego jest sprawozdanie sporządzone przez Ivo Vajgla w imieniu Komisji Spraw Zagranicznych w sprawie sprawozdania Komisji za rok 2018 dotyczącego byłej jugosłowiańskiej republiki Macedonii (2018/2145(INI)) (A8-0341/2018).

Ivo Vajgl, *poročevalec*. – Gospod predsednik, hvala za teh nekaj vaših osebnih ljubeznivih besed, ki ste jih namenili Makedoniji.

Zaradi časa bom jaz nekoliko skrajšal svoj predvideni nastop in se omejil na najbolj bistvene stvari.

Članstvo Makedonije v Evropski uniji, ko bodo za to izpolnjeni pogoji in ko bodo izpolnjene naše obljube tej državi, ki je bila predolgo v čakalnici, bo gotovo zagotovilo najbolj zanesljivo prihodnost državi, sedanjim in bodočim generacijam njenih državljanov, in bo hkrati konkreten prispevek k stabilnosti, varnosti in napredku celotne regije jugovzhodne Evrope.

Pot do današnjega trenutka Makedonije je bila strma, lahko pa ugotovimo, da je v državi prevladala demokratična volja ljudi, kreativno in odgovorno odzivanje politike, ki je izbrala poti sporazumevanja, vzpostavljanja ravnovesja v večnacionalni skupnosti, iskanja zaveznikov v mednarodni skupnosti in novih poti za krepitev plodnih in prijateljskih odnosov s sosednjimi državami.

V resoluciji, ki jo danes obravnavamo, je zato poudarjena konstruktivna vloga državnikov Makedonije, Grčije in Bolgarije, ki so postavili ob stran podedovane probleme iz preteklosti in se sporazumeli o skupnih interesih v prihodnosti.

Vlado in parlament v Skopju čakajo zahtevne naloge: najprej uresničenje dogovorjenega z grško vlado o spremembi ustave in s tem povezano premostitvijo dolgoletnega spora o imenu, nato pa zahtevno delo na reformah, ki bodo pogoj za začetek pogajanj o prihodnem članstvu države v Evropski uniji, upam in verjamem, da že v naslednjem letu v juniju.

Za vse to bo potrebno ustvariti demokratično, vsevključujoče vzdušje v državi, sodelovanje vseh političnih strank, civilne družbe in državnih institucij.

V skladu s sprejetimi obvezami bo morala država posodobiti zakonodajne postopke, sodstvo, zagotoviti spoštovanje vladavine prava, odpiranje prostora za resnično svobodne in pluralne medije, zaščito novinarjev pred pritiski in nasiljem, učinkovitejši boj proti organiziranemu kriminalu in korupciji.

Potrebne bodo sistemske spremembe v gospodarstvu, izboljšava poslovnega okolja, izvrševanje pogodb, uvedba kontrole in preglednosti podatkov v zvezi z javnimi naročili, državno pomočjo in uporabo sredstev Evropske unije in podobno.

V resoluciji je med drugim opažen napor vlade, da bi izboljšala življenjske pogoje mladih. Vladi je namenjen tudi poziv, naj celovito rešuje problem dolgotrajne nezaposlenosti žensk. Pomembno je stalno in transparentno izpolnjevanje obvez iz ohridskega sporazuma in celovito spoštovanje pravic in zaščite vseh narodnostnih in drugih družbenih manjšin.

Spoštovani, Makedonija je prišla po dolgih letih negotovosti in političnih kriz do položaja, ko si lahko z lastnimi močmi in po svoji volji utre pot v bolj obetavno prihodnost kot članica Evropske unije in zveze Nato. To je pot iz zapletene zgodovine, na Balkanu pogosto začinjene z nasiljem, vojnami in spori, v prihodnost vzajemnosti in skupne odgovornosti. Prav je, da se v državi zagotovi popolna neodvisnost in funkcionalnost pravosodja, ki preiskuje in sankcionira nepravilnosti in kršitve zakonov iz preteklosti.

Žal je v te postopke na nerazumljiv in nesprejemljiv način posegla madžarska oblast. O tem več govori resolucija in amandmaji, ki so jih predložile različne stranke v našem Parlamentu.

Zdi se mi primerno, da na tem mestu poudarim, da je Makedonija kot potencialna članica za članstvo v Evropski uniji vseskozi uživala podporo Evropskega parlamenta in da lahko s to podporo računa tudi v prihodnje.

Mislim, da je prav, da izpostavim tudi napor Komisije, komisarja Johannesa Hahna in njegove ekipe, ki je tudi v sodelovanju s tem parlamentom vztrajno iskal in našel način za reševanje zapletenih političnih protislovji, ki so ovirala napredek Makedonije proti članstvu v Evropski uniji.

Za izredno konstruktivno in vsebinsko sodelovanje se zahvaljujem tudi vsem poročevalcem v senci. Ne zahvaljujem se vam, gospod predsednik, ker sem imel šest minut, uporabil sem štiri.

Karoline Edtstadler, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Mr President, honourable Members, dear rapporteur, dear Commissioner, ladies and gentlemen, and especially dear Minister, dear Ambassador.

Let me begin by recalling the Council conclusions of last June where the Council decided to respond positively to the progress made by the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and set out the path towards opening accession negotiations in June 2019.

We welcome the European Commission's necessary preparatory work. The country has overcome its deep political crises, including through the continued implementation of the Prespa Agreement, and has made substantial progress on the urgent reform priorities. This is extremely important for the country's further progress.

Let me emphasise that even in the difficult political context, the government has taken significant steps to gradually restore a culture of compromise. It has reached out to all stakeholders, including the opposition, to strengthen democracy and the rule of law and to show a genuine desire to reform in an inclusive and transparent manner.

We welcome the changes in the tenor of atmosphere in the country. We also welcome the first concrete progress towards the restoration of the independence of the judiciary, the improvement of the work of the courts, and a follow-up to the work of the Special Prosecutor's office, which has started to reverse the backsliding of previous years.

Let me here recall the need to find a suitable, sustainable solution for the continuation of the work of the Special Prosecutor's office.

Moreover, we share your calls for the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia to intensify efforts to properly implement the judicial reform strategy and to make further efforts to address the outstanding recommendations.

Sustained efforts are needed to ensure implementation of all commitments and to ensure that the judiciary can function independently. The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia has achieved progress on the EU reform agenda and continues its efforts. We encourage it to deepen the reform momentum further, in particular showing real results in key rule of law areas such as the fight against corruption and organised crime, where it needs to further deliver.

The institutions in charge of preventing and fighting corruption must have the necessary autonomy and the financial and human resources. The government must also implement other reforms, such as the reform of the intelligence and security services, and of the public administration.

The EU will continue to follow these efforts very closely. We take note of the adoption of the public administration reform strategy and the public financial management reform programme and look forward to their implementation.

We encourage the government to continue to deepen the current reform momentum, including through Plan 18. We welcome the intention to continue working with the opposition parties, civil society and other stakeholders. Therefore, a constructive dialogue between all actors is required. We urge all parliamentary parties to put their divisions aside and work jointly on the common strategic goal of EU integration for the benefit of all citizens.

The implementation of the name agreement is one major step in this regard. Moreover, we welcome the holding of the Jean Monnet Dialogue, initiated by the European Parliament, aimed at improving the atmosphere and culture of compromise among the members of the Assembly as well as the work of the Assembly.

We join you in applauding the country for reaching out to its neighbours in the spirit of good neighbourly relations. In particular, the conclusion of the Treaty on Friendship, Good Neighbourliness and Cooperation with Bulgaria, and the signature of the agreement on the name issue with Greece, have demonstrated the government's determination to resolve all outstanding bilateral issues and build good neighbourly relations with all countries in the region.

Let me finally welcome the continued active participation and the constructive approach of the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia in different regional initiatives. Together these have contributed to an improved regional context.

Johannes Hahn, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, I would like to start by thanking the European Parliament, in particular the rapporteur, Ivo Vajgl, for this report. May I also say thank you for your kind words on behalf of my team, not only here in Brussels, but also on the ground in Skopje, and I would like to include in this our previous Ambassador, Aivo Orav, who also did an excellent and outstanding job.

I would also like to use this opportunity to thank the Honourable Members of the Parliament, Knut Fleckenstein and previously John Howarth, but also Eduard Kukan, who together with Ivo Vajgl have shown their commitment to move, not only once but many times, to the country and to contribute to resolving the severe political crisis by engaging together with me in the facilitation of the provisional agreement. They also played a key role in the organising of the first Chamonix dialogue, which aims at creating an atmosphere of compromise among the political parties in the Parliament. These are only a few examples of how this House contributes to reinforcing democratic processes and, hopefully, standards.

Let me underline that overall this draft reflects the main findings of our 2018 report and the latest developments have shown to be crucial. As you have rightly pointed out, the country has finally overcome its political crisis and is now firmly back on its Euro-Atlantic path. In the light of the latest developments, let me emphasise that the rule of law is a fundamental principle of the Union, for Member States and candidate countries alike. After years of backsliding, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia has been making good progress in this area and it's important that we collectively support this process.

I have been impressed by the energy and efforts invested by the government to strengthen good neighbourly relations, in particular with the bilateral treaty with Bulgaria and later on with the name agreement reached with Greece. This historic agreement sets an example for the region and the Union as a whole. It shows that with vision, leadership and determination, the obstacles of the past can be overcome for once and for all.

Last month, the Parliament took a courageous step by initiating the process of constitutional change. We now expect the national procedures for the implementation of the agreement to continue without delay. In our 2018 report, we stated that we were satisfied that the Pržino agreement has been largely implemented and that substantial progress has been achieved in the implementation of the Urgent Reform Priorities. Therefore, we recommended opening accession negotiations with the country.

In June, our Member States acknowledged the progress achieved in advancing the EU reforms and set out the path towards opening accession negotiations in June 2019. It's important that the current reform momentum continues to deepen, primarily in the interests of the citizens. Over the coming months we look forward to further progress, in particular in key areas such as judicial reform, the fight against corruption and organised crime, public administration reform and the oversight of intelligence services. All these areas have been identified in the so-called Plan 18 of the government.

On a very personal note, I welcome the opening of accession talks with NATO and look forward to cooperating on key reforms of common interest. Finally, let me reiterate the Commission's strong commitment to accompanying the country's reform efforts to advance on its EU path, including through the technical explanation of the acquis.

Tunne Kelam, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Mr President, this report is being debated in a hopeful atmosphere and is based on broad political consensus.

I think it's a new spirit of mutual understanding with Macedonia's neighbours that has opened the real EU and NATO perspective for this country. It is really high time for this, because in the meantime Macedonia has made impressive progress in aligning its legislation with the EU acquis.

Most importantly, there is now a positive political dynamic. Still, it is all about implementation. In the actual context it is vital for the government to prove the judiciary is truly independent and unbiased to avoid any doubts of possible political misuse of it.

The media environment has clearly improved but the progress has been modest and more should be done to free especially the investigative press from internal and external influences. To make any progress credible it should firmly rely on cross-party cooperation. Broad-based political and moral support for the reforms is the only way to further success.

Victor Boștinaru, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Mr President, Severna Makedonija has implemented robust, democratic reforms. They have taken a clear step towards good neighbourly relations and regional cooperation and the country is demonstrating every day its commitment to pursuing those efforts.

Today it is considered the candidate country that has made the most progress in aligning its legislation and its policy with the EU acquis. I trust that the Prespa Agreement, like now the Pržino Agreement, will be ratified, as it has to be, and will send a much needed positive signal for stability and reconciliation in the region. Of course, there is no doubt this brave step by Prime Minister Zaev paves the way for the country's European integration.

This being said, I want to tell you something else. I am very worried about the Gruevski case. We urge Hungary to reject the asylum request and immediately return Mr Gruevski. What Hungary has done in this case is a dangerous precedent without any grounds for asylum. Never in the history of the EU has a Member State organised such an extraction operation. It is very important to make it clear that the European Parliament and Europe does not tolerate such actions.

(The President cut off the speaker)

Ангел Джамбазки, *от името на групата ECR*. – Първо поздравявам докладчика. Многократно стана дума за договора за приятелство и междусъседство между България и Република Македония, който ние приветстваме и за който работихме много силно. Това обаче, което нас ни притеснява и ни тревожи, е че от страна на правителството на г-н Заев този договор не се спазва или се спазва изключително бавно. Отдавна трябваше да бъдат приведени редица мерки, като например трябваше да приключи езикът на омразата, трябваше да бъдат издадени учебници на български език, не трябваше да се правят антибългарски изказвания. Нищо от това не се е случило все още. Това тревожи българското общество. Г-н Заев се бави, обещава на всеки всичко, но не изпълнява поетите задължения. И това няма да доведе до добър ефект и до добър краен резултат.

Нашият призив към г-н Заев е да спазва този договор, ако желае да продължи да получава подкрепата и на нас като на европейски представители, и на българското общество като цяло.

Reinhard Bütikofer, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Mr President, the Prespa Agreement is a key towards a more hopeful future for the Macedonian people. It is a vital step in building the bridges that the Western Balkans needs in order to overcome old divisions. It paves the way towards the EU integration of Macedonia and it helps Europe to continue shaping its common fate together, and to reject foreign interference. I thank all the members of the Macedonian Parliament who facilitated the progress that we are cherishing here, and I hope that next June we will be able to celebrate having a date for the opening of accession talks.

The way forward is still going to be challenging but I'm optimistic that the hurdles can be overcome.

Σοφία Σακοράφα, *εξ ονόματος της ομάδας GUE/NGL*. – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, έχω δηλώσει επανειλημμένα ότι είμαι κατά της συμφωνίας των Πρεσπών, επειδή πιστεύω ότι είναι ένα κείμενο που δεν μπορεί να εφαρμοστεί. Δημιουργεί αμφισημίες που δεν λύνουν τις διαφωνίες, αλλά τις αναδεικνύουν. Ήδη, οι τροποποιήσεις του Συντάγματος που πέρασαν από το κοινοβούλιο των Σκοπίων παραβιάζουν τη συμφωνία, όπως επισημαίνει άλλωστε και ο ένθερμος υποστηρικτής της συμφωνίας, τέως υπουργός Εξωτερικών, κύριος Κοτζιάς. Δεν αμφιβάλλω ότι η ελληνική πλευρά θα κάνει πως δεν βλέπει, γιατί κάποιοι έχουν επενδύσει την πολιτική τους επιβίωση σε αυτήν τη συμφωνία.

Το αποκορύφωμα της σκοπιμότητας, όμως, είναι η παράγραφος του ψηφίσματος που αναφέρεται στο δημοψήφισμα των Σκοπίων. Τι σημαίνει «λαμβάνουμε υπόψη το αποτέλεσμα», κύριοι συνάδελφοι; Ούτε το 40% δεν πήγε να ψηφίσει. Οι πολίτες της FYROM γύρισαν την πλάτη στη συμφωνία, παρά την απροκάλυπτη προπαγάνδα, τόσο της Ευρωπαϊκής Επιτροπής όσο και του Συμβουλίου, υπέρ του «ναι». Το μόνο που ενδιαφέρει είναι η πάση θυσία άμεση ένταξη της χώρας στο ΝΑΤΟ, σε βάρος και της δημοκρατίας και της ειρηνικής συνύπαρξης των λαών στην περιοχή.

Κωνσταντίνος Παπαδάκης (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η έκθεση του Ευρωκοινοβουλίου για τη FYROM αποτελεί μία ακόμα παρέμβαση της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης σε όλους τους τομείς, σε συνέργεια με εγχώρια συμφέροντα και πολιτικές δυνάμεις. Οικονομία, εξωτερική πολιτική, δικαιοσύνη, παιδεία και άλλα -όλα για την κερδοφορία των ευρωπαϊκών μονοπωλίων! Η χώρα -μέσα σε μια νύχτα- μετατρέπεται από ανέτοιμη σε πανέτοιμη για ένταξη. Ο λόγος βέβαια είναι προφανής: η έκθεση πανηγυρίζει για την ένταξη της χώρας στο ΝΑΤΟ, με βάση την απαράδεκτη συμφωνία των Πρεσπών. Γι' αυτό υπογράφηκε.

Το ΝΑΤΟ, που διέλυσε τη Γιουγκοσλαβία, σπέρνει αλυτρωτισμούς με το «διαίρει και βασίλευε», αλλάζει σύνορα (βλέπε Κόσοβο) και αναγορεύεται σε ειρηνοποιό από τον σημαιοφόρο του, την κυβέρνηση ΣΥΡΙΖΑ-ΑΝΕΛ. Αποκαλύπτονται οι υπερασπιστές της συμφωνίας, αλλά και οι εθνικιστές αρνητές της, που δεν λένε κουβέντα για το ΝΑΤΟ και την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, αποπροσανατολίζοντας μόνο με την ονοματολογία. Βρίσκονται στην ίδια επικίνδυνη πλευρά: την αμερικανο-νατοϊκή. Το ΚΚΕ καταψηφίζει την έκθεση και καλεί τους λαούς της περιοχής σε συντονισμένη πάλη ενάντια στο ΝΑΤΟ και την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, που είναι πηγές πολέμων και κινδύνων.

Cristian Dan Preda (PPE). – Domnule președinte, aș vrea în primul rând să îl felicit pe colegul Ivo Vajgl pentru raportul pe care îl prezintă în acest an. Cred că este un raport care exprimă foarte bine starea în care se află Macedonia în acest moment. Personal, regret că Macedonia sau Macedonia de Nord, cred că îi putem spune deja în acest fel, nu a primit semnalul începerii negocierilor încă din această vară. Cred că a fost o greșeală să se mai amâne un an. În orice caz, transformarea din Macedonia în Macedonia de Nord cred că este cel mai important lucru care s-a petrecut în Balcanii de Vest în acest an și sper ca Grecia să înțeleagă acest lucru și să sprijine ceea ce s-a întâmplat în această țară candidată. Sper, de altfel, ca și celelalte state membre să sprijine Macedonia.

În particular, nu cred că ceea ce a făcut recent premierul Orbán vine în sprijinul Macedoniei. Cred că este o mare greșeală să acorde azil politic lui Gruevski. De altfel, țin să vă reamintesc că același premier maghiar a acordat azil și unui deputat din România, care tot așa, ca și Gruevski, a fost condamnat definitiv și a găsit azil acolo. Iată că Budapesta devine un azil pentru corupți.

Knut Fleckenstein (S&D). – Herr Präsident, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Ich glaube, eines zeigt uns die Entwicklung in Mazedonien ganz besonders deutlich: Man braucht mutige Politiker, und man braucht eine mutige Regierung. Wenn man etwas für richtig hält und für das Land als positiv erachtet, dann muss man es auch durchsetzen wollen, wenn einem der Wind ins Gesicht weht. Das können keine Politiker, die sich morgens erst die Umfrageergebnisse angucken, um dann entsprechend zu handeln. Führung wurde gebraucht in diesem Land, und Führung hat es gegeben. Ich wünschte, der Europäische Rat würde zu ähnlicher Qualität aufsteigen.

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, ο Zaev και η παρέα του συνεχίζουν τις αλυτρωτικές τους προκλήσεις. Μάλιστα, στο νέο Σύνταγμα των Σκοπίων, στο άρθρο 36, συνεχίζονται οι αλυτρωτικές αναφορές σε δήθεν «Μακεδονία» και δήθεν «μακεδονικό λαό». Επιπλέον, στο προοίμιο του νέου Συντάγματος των Σκοπίων γίνεται αναφορά στη διακήρυξη της πρώτης συνεδρίασης της ASNOM -της γνωστής αντιφασιστικής συνέλευσης- του 1944, όπου, κύριε Hahn, αναφέρεται ρητά το δικαίωμα αυτοδιάθεσης του δήθεν «μακεδονικού έθνους» και του δήθεν «μακεδονικού λαού» και απαιτείται η κατάργηση των συνόρων που δήθεν χωρίζουν, όπως λέει η ASNOM, αδερφό από αδερφό και Μακεδόνα από Μακεδόνα.

Επομένως, με το νέο Σύνταγμά τους, τα Σκόπια καπηλεύονται το όνομα της Μακεδονίας μας και της ιστορίας μας και εκφράζουν ακόμη πιο επιθετικά τον αλυτρωτισμό τους σε βάρος της Ελλάδας, παραβιάζοντας κατάφωρα ακόμα και την κατάπτυστη συμφωνία των Πρεσπών. Γι' αυτό τα Σκόπια δεν μπορούν να έχουν καμία θέση στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση και διακηρύσσω, για άλλη μια φορά, ότι είμαι αντίθετος σε οποιαδήποτε μελλοντική ένταξη των Σκοπίων στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση.

Stelios Kouloglou (GUE/NGL). – Mr President, I welcome the report and also the references to the Prespa Agreement. This is an agreement for peace in the Balkans. It is a model for solving international relations, and it also takes political courage by both Mr Tsipras and Mr Zaev to proceed, because do you know what is happening in Greece? The nationalists and the extreme right and the neo-Nazis are accusing the government of treason and now they are trying to mobilise secondary school students. You know the system, the main slogan of the mobilisation: democracy is selling out Macedonia, they mean Greek Macedonia. Democracy is betraying Macedonia. That's their slogan and those mobilisations are also supported – and I am referring to my colleagues from the Popular Party – those mobilisations of the extreme right are supported by new democracy. So you have to say to your cameras in new democracy not to play with fire.

Андрей Ковачев (PPE). – Да повторим още веднъж – подкрепям евроатлантическото бъдеще на Македония. Надявам се процесът на ратификация да завърши в най-скоро време, както в парламента в Скопие, така и в Атина. Това би позволило страната да бъде приета в НАТО още през пролетта на 2019 г. и да започне в най-скоро време преговори за присъединяване към Европейския съюз. Македония винаги е била неизменна част от Европа, както и част от българското наследство. Всички исторически спорове трябва да бъдат разрешение по пътя на добросъседството, толерантността и историческата справедливост. Във връзка с това не мога да скрия моето разочарование от продължаващите антибългарски изказвания в някои македонски медии.

Не само физическите граници трябва да бъдат символични. Нашето общо бъдеще, за което работят правителствата и на България, и на Македония, но и духовните граници, които бяха изградени от тоталитарните режими, говорът на омразата, всичко това трябва да бъде преодоляно по пътя на европейската интеграция. Благодаря много и пожелавам успех на нашите приятели и братя от Вардар.

Puhetta johti HEIDI HAUTALA

varapuhemies

Tonino Picula (S&D). – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, čestitam kolegi Vajglu na dobro izbalansiranoj Rezoluciji koja, prije svega, jasno uočava i podržava pozitivne procese u Makedoniji.

Makedonija je primjer dugo očekivane dobre vijesti iz regije opterećene kroničnim, ali i nekim sasvim novim deficitima. Istodobno, od Makedonije očekujemo da nastavi ključne reformske procese, poglavito u jačanju vladavine prava. Na taj princip, na žalost, potrebno je podsjetiti i neke države članice koje su dio Europske unije više od desetljeća. Od Skoplja se traži da prije ulaska u blok ispuni ozbiljne preduvjete kojih se ne pridržava jedna od članica Unije, o čemu svjedoči uloga Mađarske u slučaju Gruevski. Ako želimo ostati vjerodostojna zajednica, poštivanje vladavine prava ne smije biti arbitrarno.

Čestitam makedonskoj Vladi na napretku u implementaciji Sporazuma iz Prespe. Pozivam da ovaj pozitivni momentum iskoriste za nastavak reformi kako bi što skorijim otvaranjem pregovora o članstvu približili mogućnost boljeg života svim svojim sugrađanima.

László Tőkés (PPE. – Elnök Asszony! Előre bocsátom, hogy Magyarország elkötelezett támogatója a nyugat-balkáni országok, köztük Macedónia európai csatlakozásának. Üdvözöljük, hogy az úgynevezett névvita megoldásával várhatóan a csatlakozási tárgyalások elkezdődhetnek.

Azt azonban visszautasítjuk, hogy a váratlanul kirobbant Gruevszki-ügy kapcsán a szocialisták és a zöldek a macedóniai országjelentést ideológiai hátterű támadásra használják fel Magyarország ellen. Nikola Gruevszki volt kormányfő megbuktatása, majd elítélése hátterében minden bizonnyal a migrációs kérdés, illetve a Soros-lobby áll. A néppárti politikus menekültstátuszának megadása az illetékes magyar hatóságok törvényes eljárása keretében valósult meg.

Csak egyetérteni lehet a jelentéssel abban, hogy Macedóniában a korrupcióellenes harcot folytatni kell, valamint abban, hogy további erőfeszítésekre van szükség a bírói kar politikai beavatkozással szembeni védelme tekintetében. Az igazságszolgáltatás nem válhat a politika eszközévé.

Pyynnöstä myönnettävät puheenvuorot

Eduard Kukan (PPE). – Madam President, may I extend my congratulations to Ivo Vajgl on this report. Macedonia made good progress over the last year, which has been well noted in the report.

I am pleased to see the country moving ahead with many important initiatives and reforms. Also I would like to congratulate the government on the agreement with Greece.

I strongly believe these efforts will open the doors for closer integration of the country and involve the European Union and NATO. At the same time the Macedonian Government needs to concentrate on continuous reforms in the area of the judiciary with the implementation of the judicial reform strategy, in the economy and in the fight against corruption and organised crime. It will be important not to lose this pace and come up with concrete results and records of accomplishments.

Julie Ward (S&D). – Madam President, I recently attended an important conference organised by the Equal Rights Association in Skopje where I met many brilliant, brave, LGBTIQ+ activists from across the Balkans. I really admire their courage and commitment as they defend the rights of LGBTIQ+ people in sometimes very hostile environments.

In the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, gender based discrimination and the situation of sexual minorities is particularly difficult. The legal framework has significant shortcomings in terms of non-discrimination, legal gender recognition and body autonomy. But the conference I attended was organised in partnership with the Socialist government of fYROM which demonstrated their political commitment to improving the situation of LGBTIQ+ people. It's an excellent example of how governments can work with and support civil society, and we have to make human rights defenders and civil society support one of our priorities in the Balkans.

I know that the Macedonian parliament is currently discussing draft laws aimed at improving the situation of LGBTIQ+ people in the country, and so I hope these discussions will bring tangible results that better fulfil human rights.

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Doamnă președintă, doamnă secretar de stat, domnule consilier domnule comisar, de la bun început vreau să spun că susțin raportul. Este un raport care reflectă realitatea. De altfel, din prezentarea reprezentantei Consiliului, a domnului comisar, a celorlalți colegi a rezultat foarte clar că Macedonia a făcut progrese.

Eu cunosc țara foarte bine, trăiesc în partea de vest a României, am vizitat țara de foarte multe ori, am vrut să fac investiții acolo și m-au surprins receptivitatea guvernului, instituțiilor, modul cum lucrează, transparența. Deci, cred că merită să meargă pe drumul european și cred că trebuie să votăm și să nu mai întârziem, pentru că orice întârziere frânează de fapt un drum european al unor cetățeni care își doresc acest lucru, sunt foarte ambițioși și le doresc mult succes. Aveți toată susținerea mea.

Jasenko Selimovic (ALDE). – Madam President, I just want to remind everybody of something that the rapporteur has hinted at, which is what a tremendous sacrifice the citizens of northern Macedonia have made. It has demanded a tremendous amount of energy and no other single European country would accept to change the name of a country, which is so deeply connected with identity. You can see from the reactions here in Parliament from the nationalists as to how this affected it.

So now I really beg the Council, really beg, to fulfil our part of our obligation and start opening the negotiations as soon as possible. The Commission has hinted it will do it. Parliament will do it. It's up to the Council now, because if we let these people down we will lose every credibility and it will make a mess in the region of outrageous proportions.

(Applause)

Λάμπρος Φουντούλης (NI). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, καλό θα είναι το Ευρωκοινοβούλιο να μην τρέφει αυταπάτες και, κυρίως, να μην εκφράζει τις επιθυμίες του ως πραγματικότητα. Αυτό το κακέκτυπο κράτους, που δημιουργήθηκε μόνο για να εξυπηρετήσει τα επεκτατικά σχέδια ενός κομμουνιστή δικτάτορα, όπως και το ίδιο το ιδεολόγημα του δήθεν «Μακεδονισμού» των Σλάβων κατοίκων του, δεν πρόκειται να εισέλθει στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση. Ακόμα και αν αυτή τη στιγμή, στην Ελλάδα, μια προδοτική κυβέρνηση προσπαθεί να επιβάλει τη συμφωνία των Πρεσπών, σύντομα αυτή θα αποτελέσει παρελθόν, όπως και η ίδια η συμφωνία. Όλα τα υπόλοιπα που αναφέρονται στην έκθεση είναι άνευ ουσίας, καθώς πριν από την αποκήρυξη εκ μέρους τους κάθε αναφοράς στο ελληνικότατο όνομα της Μακεδονίας δεν μπορεί να γίνει καμία άλλη συζήτηση.

Τέλος, μιας και αναφέρεται εντός του κειμένου η ικανοποίησή σας σχετικά με το αποτέλεσμα του δημοψηφίσματος, είναι εντυπωσιακή η υποκρισία της Ένωσης, δεδομένου ότι πολύ βολικά ξεχνάτε το γεγονός ότι η συντριπτική πλειοψηφία των πολιτών δεν προσήλθε ποτέ για να ψηφίσει. Η συμφωνία των Πρεσπών αποτελεί, λοιπόν, μια νεκρή συμφωνία η οποία δεν θα εφαρμοστεί ποτέ, μιας και οι δύο λαοί είναι αντίθετοι με αυτήν και μόνο το Βερολίνο, οι Βρυξέλλες και οι κατά τόπους υποτακτικοί τους τη στηρίζουν.

Marijana Petir (PPE). – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, prošlog tjedna gostovala sam na događaju u organizaciji makedonske nacionalne manjine u Hrvatskoj. Kada je netko u dvorani uzviknuo: „Hej, ti koja voliš Makedoniju!", ja sam se odazvala jer ja volim Makedoniju. To ne znači da nisam svjesna slabosti koje Makedonija ima i na kojima treba raditi iznutra.

Za većinu njih uzroke treba tražiti na mjestu njihova nastanka, no uvjerena sam da te slabosti ne bi danas bile toliko snažne da je EU bila pravedna prema Makedoniji. Makedonija je, niti kriva niti dužna, postala talac nerazumne politike Europske unije koja 10 godina drži stranu jedne svoje članice, uništavajući tako europsku perspektivu i budućnost Makedonije. Žao mi je da ovo izvješće ne daje objektivan prikaz stanja i ne nudi samokritičan pregled propusta od strane Europske unije.

Smatram da još uvijek nije prekasno da se greška ispravi i da se Makedoniji otvore pregovori, a građanima Makedonije izrazi podrška kako bi se prevladale poteškoće i provele potrebne reforme te osigurala stabilnost u regiji.

Ivan Jakovčić (ALDE). – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, htio bih se obratiti kolegama na balkonu i kolegicama. Godine 2000. u Zagrebu imao sam prilike ugostiti Ured za europske integracije makedonske vlade i počeli smo, Hrvatska i Makedonija zajedno, europski put.

Dragi prijatelji i prijateljice, ja sam ovdje, a vi ste na balkonu. Šteta je da se nije uspjelo ići zajedno. I ja sam očekivao da će Hrvatska ući barem zajedno s Rumunjskom i Bugarskom u Europsku uniju, ali nismo uspjeli. Žao mi je zbog toga što još uvijek ne sjedite zajedno s nama, ali želim zaista, i vjerujem, da ćete biti sposobni ispuniti tu domaću zadaću koja je pred vama, ambiciozne planove koje ima Vlada i nadam se, pametna opozicija, će omogućiti da Sjeverna Makedonija, nadam se uskoro, otvori sve puteve i napokon dođe ovdje, gdje vam je i mjesto.

(Pyynnöstä myönnettävät puheenvuorot päättyvät)

Johannes Hahn, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, honourable Members, State Secretary. In the coming months, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia will have to make important decisions concerning the finalisation of the process of constitutional changes on the one hand and the continuation of the implementation of key reforms on the other. This will require focus and determination to fundamentally improve the lives of citizens.

I count on all political forces to put the interests of the country first and support the common strategic goal of Euro-Atlantic integration.

In that respect I think it's time that everyone starts to accept the outcome of the referendum. Just last Sunday we had several referenda in Switzerland, usually considered one of the role models of mature democracy, and there the turnout rate is usually below 50% but nobody criticises or challenges the democratic result and the consequences. In that respect I can only urge everybody to start to respect the people's vote and the people's thinking by participating in a meaningful way in such a referendum.

The Commission, in any case, will support and continue to support the reform efforts in every way we can in order to prepare the country to open accession negotiations.

So I count on the support of this House to remain engaged and to send common messages of encouragement to the country and in particular to all your sister parties, but even more importantly, to all the citizens of the country.

More than ever, the Union needs to continue to show its unity and fight for our fundamental values and principles.

Karoline Edtstadler, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Madam President, let me thank once again Parliament's rapporteur on the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Mr Vajgl, for his excellent work.

The EU attaches great importance to moving forward with the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, and we hope to see continued progress. Reforms are crucial and will require the political leaders to live up to their responsibilities. The EU remains fully engaged and stands ready to support the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia in its efforts.

Ivo Vajgl, *poročevalec*. – Spoštovana predsedujoča, jaz bi se rad zahvalil vsem kolegom, ki so sodelovali v tej zelo zanimivi razpravi.

Jaz sem iz te razprave razbral, da je v Evropskem parlamentu še vedno oziroma vedno bolj utrjeno prepričanje, da bo članstvo Makedonije v Evropski uniji dodana vrednost k naši Uniji, da bo tudi dodatna garancija stabilnosti in varnosti tega dela Evrope.

Danes smo slišali tudi nekaj disonančnih mnenj in jaz bi ta mnenja komentiral samo s tem, da ne morem razumeti, da se komu zdi bolj ugodno, če ima soseda, s katerim ima odprte probleme in se prepira, namesto da ima soseda, s katerim ima skupne cilje za prihodnost in skupne interese, zlasti tudi za mlade generacije.

Rad bi rekel to, kar je veliko kolegov danes ugotovilo, da je Makedonija, da je makedonska politika, da so makedonski ljudje bili pripravljeni sprejeti precej pomembno, veliko žrtvovanje, veliko žrtev, s tem ko so pristali na zares težke pogoje: spremembo ustave in spremembo imena države.

Ampak to so naredili in razveseljivo je to, da je tudi makedonska opozicija (tudi s podporo bratskih oziroma sestrskih strank iz tega parlamenta) dojela, da je treba podpreti to priložnost, ki je mogoče v zgodovini Makedonije in njenih ljudi enkratna in neponovljiva.

Zato bi rad s tega mesta tudi naslovil makedonske politike, člane sobranja, da sodelujejo aktivno pri ratifikaciji sporazuma in pomagajo odpreti vrata Evropske unije in tudi Nata za članstvo njihove države v teh organizacijah.

Puhemies. – Keskustelu on päättynyt.

Äänestys toimitetaan torstaina 29.11.2018.

Kirjalliset lausumat (162 artikla)

Csaba Molnár (S&D), *írásban*. – A Bizottság macedón országjelentése kapcsán kénytelenek vagyunk újra Orbán Viktorról beszélni. Ki kell mondani: Nikola Gruevszki volt miniszterelnök nem egyszerűen megszökött az igazságszolgáltatás elől, hanem Orbán Viktor személyes utasítására magyar diplomaták csempészték ki. Az akciót a magyar közvélemény jelentős része, az ellenzék és a maradék szabad sajtó is elítélte. Orbán magánakciója ez, amely újra megmutatja, miért volt helyes, hogy az EP megszavazta a Sargentini jelentést. Orbán Viktor újra fittyet hányt a jogállamiságra, nem csak otthon, hanem a Balkánon is. Újra megengedhetetlen módon használta fel az állami szerveket az általa kitalált jogsértések végrehajtására és fedezésére. Most pedig Orbán maffiakormánya vattába csomagol egy hatalmi visszaélésért jogszerűen elítélt politikust. A Külügyminisztérium szöktetési akciója még Orbán Viktor Magyarországán is bűncselekmény. Az, hogy ennek nincsenek következményei, újra bizonyítja, hogy Magyarország ma nem jogállam.

Minden demokrata magyar polgár nevében követelem, hogy a magyar kormány adja ki Nikola Gruevszkit Macedóniának; kövesse meg a macedón, az albán és a szerb kormányt, amiért a magyar diplomáciai testületet törvényellenesen használták fel. Kérem, hogy a Parlament támogassa azokat az S&D indítványokat, amelyek elítélik Gruevszki megszöktetését; felszólítom az Európai Néppártot, hogy vonja le a következtetést Orbán újabb jogsértéséből, és hozza meg a régóta halogatott döntést a FIDESZ kizárásáról a kereszténydemokrata pártcsaládból.

Bogusław Sonik (PPE), *na piśmie*. – Macedońscy posłowie zatwierdzili wniosek rządu o wprowadzenie poprawek do konstytucji, aby wprowadzić w życie podpisaną w czerwcu umowę z Grecją. Na jej mocy kraj zmieni swoją nazwę i stanie się oficjalnie Republiką Północnej Macedonii. Zakończy to toczony od 27 lat spór z Atenami i otworzy Macedończykom drzwi do akcesji do UE i NATO. Macedonia jest uważana za państwo kandydujące, które poczyniło największe postępy w zakresie dostosowania swojego ustawodawstwa do dorobku prawnego UE.

Mimo tego pozytywnego otwarcia, muszę wyrazić zaniepokojenie faktem, że były premier Macedonii Nikoła Gruewski, który zbiegł ze swojego kraju w obawie przed więzieniem, otrzymał na Węgrzech status uchodźcy. W Macedonii został skazany prawomocnym wyrokiem za wywieranie nacisków na urzędników w sprawie zamówień publicznych, dodatkowo toczy się wobec niego jeszcze pięć innych dochodzeń. Trudne do zrozumienia jest dlaczego władze w Budapeszcie przychyliły się do jego wniosku, uznając, że jest prześladowany z powodów politycznych i udzieliły azylu politykowi, który działał przeciwko przystąpieniu Macedonii do UE i NATO.

W pełni popieram zalecenie Komisji i decyzję Rady, według której negocjacje akcesyjne miałyby rozpocząć się w czerwcu 2019 r. Sprawne otwarcie procesu monitorowania i negocjacji ma szanse przyspieszyć tempo reform w Macedonii w jeszcze większym stopniu.

Tibor Szanyi (S&D), *in writing*. – This report reconfirms that the fYR of Macedonia is a functioning state of law, and has been making important progress in reforming its judicial system to deal with – among other things – corruption-related crimes. That is why in this debate we cannot avoid facing the ongoing Gruevski scandal: the fact that a member of the EU – the Hungarian authorities, acting upon orders from Viktor Orbán himself – have actively assisted the illegal escape of the former Macedonian Prime Minister, and granted asylum to this legally convicted criminal. Orbán's unprecedented provocation, in total contempt of international – and EU – law deliberately damages European interests and jointly agreed CFSP and enlargement policy decisions. The Gruevski scandal raises the responsibility of those who just recently decided to keep Orbán in their ranks, and – naively, or cynically – took his promise to behave more democratically. Well, Mr Weber, you cannot hold this actual dictator on a short leash. What you got from your political friend Orbán is a slap in the face, another humiliating, anti-European provocation, making the PPE an accomplice to his – and Gruevski's – illegal actions… and hopefully the conviction that it is time to act now, to get rid of this source of embarrassment.

26. Bericht 2018 über Albanien (Aussprache)

Puhemies. – Esityslistalla on seuraavana Knut Fleckensteinin mietintö Albaniaa koskeva vuoden 2018 kertomus (2018/2147(INI) – A8-0334/2018).

Knut Fleckenstein, *Berichterstatter.* – Frau Präsidentin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen, Frau Staatssekretärin, Herr Kommissar! Ich freue mich, dass die Debatte zum Albanien-Bericht gerade heute auf den Unabhängigkeitstag Albaniens fällt, und ich möchte den Menschen in Albanien und in der Diaspora meine herzlichen Glückwünsche dazu aussprechen, sicher auch in Ihrem Namen. Vor der morgigen Abstimmung möchte ich mich zunächst bei den Schattenberichterstattern der anderen Fraktionen für die sehr konstruktive Zusammenarbeit bedanken. Ich habe mich bemüht, die wesentlichen Punkte der einzelnen Fraktionen mit an Bord zu nehmen. Daher bin ich zuversichtlich, dass wir bei der morgigen Abstimmung ein großes Maß an Übereinstimmung zum Inhalt des Berichts erzielen werden.

Ich möchte auf die wesentlichen Botschaften eingehen, die wir als Ausschuss für auswärtige Angelegenheiten mit dieser Entschließung an unsere albanischen Partner, aber auch an Rat und Kommission senden wollen. Es ist mittlerweile mehr als vier Jahre her, dass Albanien von der EU offiziell als Kandidat für den Beitritt zur EU anerkannt wurde. Wir machen deutlich, dass sich dies auch in der praktischen Realität widerspiegeln muss, und unterstützen die Empfehlung der Europäischen Kommission, Beitrittsverhandlungen mit Albanien zu eröffnen. Gleichzeitig nehmen wir den Beschluss des Rates von vor dem Sommer zur Kenntnis und begrüßen den eindeutigen Pfad, der zum Start dieser Verhandlungen aufgezeigt wurde.

Wir erwarten – und können es wohl auch erwarten –, dass die albanische Regierung die Zeit bis dorthin nutzt, um alle Vorkehrungen für die Verhandlungen zu treffen. Wir erwarten allerdings auch, dass der Rat zu seinem Wort steht und im Juni nächsten Jahres den entsprechenden Beschluss fasst, denn alles andere wäre unverständlich und kontraproduktiv, was die Rolle und die Glaubwürdigkeit der Europäischen Union in der Region angeht.

Natürlich ist der vorliegende Bericht auch und in erster Linie ein Beitrag für die albanische Regierung und die Opposition im Hinblick auf die Arbeit, die in dem Land noch getan werden muss, und auf die Arbeit, die bisher getan wurde. Dabei ist mir wichtig, darauf hinzuweisen, dass diese Reformanstrengungen immer ein Ziel haben müssen: die praktische Lebensrealität der Menschen vor Ort zu verbessern und nicht einem Kommissar oder einem Abgeordneten oder Abgeordneten generell etwas Gutes zu tun.

Im Hinblick darauf, was bereits geleistet wurde, muss man feststellen, dass sich Albanien durch die Umsetzung der geforderten Reformen bei den *key priorities* die Eröffnung der Beitrittsverhandlungen verdient hat – allen voran die sehr ambitionierte Justizreform, die über das hinausgeht, was ursprünglich von der Kommission gefordert worden war. Sie zeigen klare Resultate: Der *Vetting*-Prozess im Justizsektor ist im vollen Gange und zeigt nicht nur erste Ergebnisse, sondern besitzt auch eine abschreckende Wirkung für die Zukunft. Es könnte ein gutes Vorbild sein für alle Regierungen in der Region, die noch nach Wegen suchen, ihre Justizreform durchzuführen.

Lassen Sie mich zum Abschluss noch zwei Punkte anführen: Wir brauchen dringend eine Wahlrechtsreform. Es ist unbedingt notwendig, dass diese Reform im Sinne der Empfehlung der OSZE durchgeführt wird, und zwar schon vor den Lokalwahlen 2019. Und ich bin – noch – sehr hoffnungsfroh und hoffe, dass ich das auch bleiben kann, dass die beiden Vorsitzenden der Ad-hoc-Kommission von der Demokratischen Partei und der Sozialistischen Partei einen gemeinsamen Weg finden, einen guten Vorschlag zu machen. Wir sollten sie dabei auf jeden Fall unterstützen.

Wir müssen Albanien ermutigen, den eingeschlagenen Reformweg weiterzugehen, denn das ist genau der Weg zu gefestigten demokratischen Institutionen und zu einer funktionierenden Rechtsstaatlichkeit, der in die EU führt. Ich freue mich auf die morgige Abstimmung.

Karoline Edtstadler, *President-in-Office of the Council.* – Madam President, honourable Members, dear Commissioner, dear rapporteur, let me begin by recalling the Council conclusions of June 2018, in which the Council decided to respond positively to the progress made by Albania and set out the path towards opening accession negotiations in June 2019. We welcome the Commission's necessary preparatory work. We concur with your view that Albania has made steady progress in addressing the five key priorities. These are positive signals which show that Albania is on the right path, and we strongly encourage it to continue its efforts. Moreover, Albania is implementing a comprehensive justice reform, as the rapporteur already mentioned; the re-evaluation process for judges and prosecutors – the so-called vetting – has started to deliver under the oversight of the international monitoring operation. We encourage Albania to build on the progress made and to pursue the justice reform in order to achieve increased independence, accountability

and professionalism of the judicial system. Establishment of the independent judicial structures, as provided for by the constitutional reform, should be finalised. Albania has worked towards the establishment of a solid track record in the fight against corruption and organised crime. However, it is important that the Government delivers tangible and sustainable results, including against the cultivation and trafficking of drugs. Dismantling organised groups remains an important challenge. We commend Albania for its close cooperation with external law enforcement agencies. We welcome its participation in international police operations and joint investigations, in particular with EU Member States, and urge it to be even more proactive in international police cooperation.

On elections, as set out in your report, we expect Albania to address the outstanding OSCE/ODIHR recommendations, amend its electoral code and introduce measures for further enhancing the independence, impartiality, professionalism and capacity of election administration.

We emphasise the need for legislative and policy measures to reinforce the protection of human rights and anti-discrimination policies, including the equal treatment of all minorities and access to rights for persons belonging to them throughout the country. Albania has made efforts to put in place effective measures to counter the high flow of manifestly unfounded asylum applications lodged to Albanian citizens. These measures need to be further pursued with the countries most affected until sustained results are achieved.

We welcome Albania's constructive engagement in regional cooperation and good-neighbourly relations, which remain an essential element of the enlargement process. I equally want to commend Albania for its full alignment with the EU's common foreign and security policy. Today in our discussion we are focusing on Albania's progress in 2017, on which we have a very similar opinion. However, and more generally, I would like to stress the importance of tangible and sustainable results focusing in particular on the rule of law: this will take Albania closer to the opening of accession talks.

Johannes Hahn, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, I would also like to congratulate the Albanians on their national day, at least as long as we are still on the same day. I would also like to thank the rapporteur and the shadow rapporteurs for their work leading up to this resolution. Clearly, significant coordination efforts resulted in a document which, in my view, is a very balanced one. The resolution captures the progress that Albania has made in the past years and it highlights well the challenges that lie ahead in order to move the country closer to the Union.

Starting with the progress, Albania continues to advance in many crucial areas. The vetting of judges and prosecutors has proven to be a thorough and fair process and continues to yield concrete and tangible results. The ongoing judicial reform is a major demand from Albanian citizens and its successful implementation will foster public trust in state institutions, enhance the credibility and effectiveness of the justice system, and contribute to the embedding of the rule of law throughout the country. We cannot compromise on quality in this very important process and we are monitoring it thoroughly.

As regards current challenges, constructive political dialogue and cooperation across parties is crucial for further advancing in delicate areas such as the restructuring of the judiciary, as well as the electoral reform process. Cross-party consensus is necessary to guarantee that outstanding OSCE/ODHIR recommendations are met. This includes, in particular, the transparency of party financing, as well as the independence and professionalism of the electoral administration.

Strengthening the administrative capacity of institutions is essential, not only for the successful implementation of reforms, but also for the effective preparation of EU accession negotiations. That is why we continue to encourage Albania to pursue public administration reform by adhering to the highest standards.

Progress in the fight against organised crime and corruption also continues to be necessary for Albania to further advance on its path towards EU accession. Further achievements are expected towards establishing a solid direct record of proactive investigations, prosecutions and convictions in the fight against organised crime and corruption at all levels.

Good neighbourly relations and regional stability are essential elements of the stabilisation and association process. Albania is an important actor in promoting regional cooperation. We appreciate in this regard the full convergence of foreign and security policy between Albania and the European Union, as already highlighted by previous speakers.

The Commission maintains its strong commitment to support Albania's efforts to advance further on its path towards European integration.

I look forward to continuing the fruitful cooperation with the European Parliament in all of these matters in the months ahead.

Eduard Kukan, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Madam President, I want to express my appreciation for the work of Mr Fleckenstein on this report and the very good cooperation of the shadow rapporteurs.

I welcome the Commission's recommendation for opening the accession negotiations as well as the Council decision to reevaluate the progress made by Albania next year.

Albania has achieved good progress in the implementation of justice reform, which is crucial for the further integration process. It has also proved its readiness to go through other difficult reforms. This progress was possible only through constructive political dialogue and cooperation with all the major political parties from the government and the opposition.

Therefore, I can only strongly encourage all political actors in Albania to work together on the consolidation of reforms across all five priorities. I hope this will be also the case in upcoming electoral reforms. Albania is indeed our key partner in the region. We should fully appreciate its full alignment with EU common foreign and security policy and active participation in the regional initiatives.

Eugen Freund, *im Namen der S&D-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Kommissar, Frau Staatssekretärin! Ich sage das gerne noch einmal, was ich schon beim letzten Mal über Albanien gesagt habe: Es ist erstaunlich, wie positiv sich das Land in den vergangenen zwei Jahrzehnten entwickelt hat. So sind zu Beginn der 90er-Jahre noch Tausende über das Mittelmeer nach Italien geflüchtet. Heute ist Albanien ein ernst zu nehmender Beitrittskandidat der Europäischen Union. Gerade der jüngste Bericht stellt fest, dass das Land Fortschritte macht, was die politischen Kriterien und die fünf wichtigsten Prioritäten für die Aufnahme in die EU betrifft.

Dennoch gilt für Albanien, was für alle EU-Beitrittskandidaten ein Maßstab sein muss: Die höchsten Standards müssen erreicht werden. Alle Zweifel müssen ausgeräumt werden, dass Albanien die notwendigen Reformen auch wirklich bis zum Ende führt.

Und bevor es zu einer Erweiterung der Europäischen Union kommt, müssen wir uns ernsthafte Gedanken darüber machen, wie wir die europäischen Institutionen stärken, denn in einer größeren Union darf die Entscheidungsfähigkeit nicht eingeschränkt werden.

Ελένη Θεοχάρους, *εξ ονόματος της ομάδας ECR*. – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, ως σκιώδης εισηγήτρια της έκθεσης δεν προέβαλα ενστάσεις, για να βοηθήσω το έργο του εισηγητή τον οποίον εκτιμώ βαθύτατα. Ειπώθηκαν πολλά για την πρόοδο της Αλβανίας, αλλά -δυστυχώς για όλους μας- προχθές ο Rama, με μία μόνο φράση που είπε στην Πρίστινα, τα εξουδετέρωσε όλα· ακύρωσε όλα όσα ειπώθηκαν σήμερα. Είναι σαφές ότι η διεφθαρμένη κυβέρνηση της Αλβανίας συνεχίζει την εγκληματική της δράση εναντίον της ελληνικής μειονότητας. Οι Έλληνες ζουν μέσα στον φόβο, στερούμενοι όλων των ανθρωπίνων δικαιωμάτων, υφίστανται τη βάρβαρη συμπεριφορά των αλβανικών αρχών και οι περιουσίες τους καταπατούνται από το ίδιο το κράτος, ενώ παρεμποδίζεται η εκπαίδευση των παιδιών και η χρήση της ελληνικής γλώσσας. Ο εποικισμός, ο εξισλαμισμός, η δημογραφική αλλοίωση και η εθνοκάθαρση είναι αυτά που βιώνουν καθημερινά οι Έλληνες στη Βόρειο Ήπειρο. Ένα τέτοιο κράτος δεν έχει καμιά θέση στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση και κάθε ενταξιακή διαδικασία πρέπει να σταματήσει αμέσως, μέχρι να γίνουν σεβαστά τα δικαιώματα των Ελλήνων σε μια δημοκρατική Αλβανία.

Ivan Jakovčić, *u ime kluba ALDE*. – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, moram reći da sam iznimno zabrinut za stanje u Albaniji i za ono što je europski put Albanije.

Naime, susreti koje imamo redovito s delegacijom u albanskom parlamentu i u našem parlamentu, i zadnji susret koji smo imali u Bruxellesu ovdje pokazao je da postoji zaista jako podijeljena zemlja. Ja mogu razumjeti da opozicija napušta parlament, da odlazi jer sam i ja to radio 90-ih godina, ali da napušta sjednicu s našom delegacijom, to ne mogu razumjeti jer ja mislim da ako zaista žele ući u Europsku uniju, ako žele biti dio Europskog parlamenta, onda moraju sjediti i razgovarati s nama, a ne dizati se i odlaziti sa sjednice.

Zato sam zabrinut za političku kulturu i političke odnose s Albanijom narednih godina.

Γεώργιος Επιτήδειος (NI). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, παρά την προσπάθεια της έκθεσης να ωραιοποιήσει την κατάσταση που επικρατεί στην Αλβανία, η χώρα αυτή απέχει πολύ από το να πληροί τα κριτήρια της Κοπεγχάγης. Δεν εφαρμόζει τις αρχές του κράτους δικαίου και, ως εκ τούτου, παραβιάζει με ωμό τρόπο τα δικαιώματα της ελληνικής μειονότητας στη Βόρειο Ήπειρο. Επιπλέον, αποκορύφωμα αυτής της κατάστασης αποτελεί η δολοφονία του Αριστοτέλη Γκούμα το 2010 και, πριν από έναν μήνα, του Κωνσταντίνου Κατσίφα. Μάλιστα, οι αλβανικές αρχές έφτασαν στο σημείο να ρωτούν τους γονείς του θανόντος, του δολοφονηθέντος, πού βρήκαν τα χρήματα για να κάνουν την κηδεία του. Τον εξύβρισε ο ίδιος ο πρωθυπουργός της Αλβανίας και, επιπλέον, κάθε βράδυ, για να τρομοκρατήσουν τους συμπατριώτες του, πυροβολούν τη νύχτα και διακόπτουν, άνευ λόγου, για δώδεκα ώρες την ηλεκτροδότηση των μειονοτικών χωριών. Τη στιγμή που επικρατεί μια τέτοια κατάσταση, η Αλβανία δεν έχει δικαίωμα να διεκδικεί την ένταξή της στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση και αυτό πρέπει πάση θυσία να το αποτρέψουμε.

Doru-Claudian Frunzulică (S&D). – Madam President, I welcome this report and congratulate the rapporteur, and recognition of the progress achieved by Albania over the last year. While examining the state of EU-Albanian relations I consider it essential to emphasise Albania's solid commitment to the European Union integration process, and in line with this I support the opening of its accession negotiations in 2019.

The opening of negotiations will give us a tangible incentive for further developments in the positive perspective for the Western Balkans region as a whole. In this respect, I share the opinion that Albania needs to keep the reform momentum, and to intensify its efforts to consolidate the reform achieved and to continue preparing for EU membership obligations across all chapters. Therefore further strengthening is needed, especially of the administrative capacity of institutions and bodies responsible for the implementation of accession-related reforms, for the transposition of EU-legislation into national law, and for the preparations to be made for EU accession negotiations. To fight corruption has to be also a high…

(The President cut off the speaker)

Pyynnöstä myönnettävät puheenvuorot

Κώστας Μαυρίδης (S&D). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, ένας τρόπος για να αξιολογήσουμε τον βαθμό σεβασμού του κράτους δικαίου και των ανθρωπίνων δικαιωμάτων στην πράξη είναι η διαχείριση των μειονοτήτων. Στην Αλβανία, η μεγαλύτερη εθνική μειονότητα, που είναι αναγνωρισμένη από την ίδια την Αλβανία, είναι η ελληνική μειονότητα, που υπόκειται σε εθνικό ξεκαθάρισμα για το οποίο δεν γίνεται, δυστυχώς, καμία αναφορά στην έκθεση.

Ως Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, πρέπει να ενθαρρύνουμε την Αλβανία προς τη δημοκρατία και πρέπει, επίσης, να την ωθήσουμε να ξεφύγει από την τουρκική επιρροή του Ερντογάν. Όμως, μετά το πάθημα από την αντιευρωπαϊκή πολιτική της Τουρκίας -την οποία κάποιοι εδώ μέσα ακόμη και τώρα ονομάζουν «στρατηγικό εταίρο»- ελπίζουμε ότι πήραμε το μάθημά μας απέναντι στις διεφθαρμένες κυβερνήσεις και στους διεφθαρμένους ηγεμόνες. Πρέπει να τους αντιμετωπίζουμε με αποτελεσματικά εργαλεία και να ζητείται η εκπλήρωση των κριτηρίων και των υποχρεώσεών τους· αυτή είναι η ουσία από το πάθημα με την Τουρκία.

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, σήμερα συμπληρώθηκε ένας μήνας από τη δολοφονία του Κωνσταντίνου Κατσίφα, στη Βόρειο Ήπειρο, από την αλβανική αστυνομία. Οι προκλήσεις, οι απειλές, οι εκφοβισμοί και οι τραμπουκισμοί των αλβανικών δυνάμεων ασφαλείας συνεχίζονται καθημερινά κατά της ελληνικής εθνικής μειονότητας της Βορείου Ηπείρου. Μιας μειονότητας που έχει αναγνωριστεί διεθνώς και η οποία, με βάση το Πρωτόκολλο της Κέρκυρας του 1914, έχει αποκτήσει το αναφαίρετο δικαίωμα της αυτονομίας.

Επιπλέον, παρά τις ρητορικές παρεμβάσεις της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, συνεχίζεται η αρπαγή των περιουσιών των Βορειοηπειρωτών από τις αλβανικές αρχές, ενώ μόλις χθες ο Edi Rama λοιδόρησε τους ίδιους τους ευρωβουλευτές. Πρέπει, λοιπόν, να ληφθούν μέτρα κατά της Αλβανίας και να διακοπεί κάθε χρηματοδότηση και κάθε ενταξιακή πορεία της, μέχρις ότου αρχίσει να σέβεται τα δικαιώματα της ελληνικής εθνικής μειονότητας της Βορείου Ηπείρου. Διακηρύσσω, για άλλη μια φορά, την πλήρη αντίθεσή μου σε οποιαδήποτε μελλοντική ένταξη της Αλβανίας στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση.

Κώστας Χρυσόγονος (GUE/NGL). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, η έκθεση σχετικά με την Αλβανία έχει ιδιαίτερη σημασία ενόψει της έναρξης διαπραγματεύσεων προσχώρησής της στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση τον Ιούνιο του 2019. Δεν συμμερίζομαι, όμως, την αισιοδοξία της έκθεσης ως προς την καταπολέμηση της διαφθοράς και του οργανωμένου εγκλήματος στη χώρα αυτή. Χρειάζεται να γίνουν πολλά περισσότερα από αλβανικής πλευράς, ιδιαίτερα όσον αφορά την καλλιέργεια και τη διακίνηση ναρκωτικών.

Πρέπει, ακόμα, να σταματήσει η δυσμενής διακριτική μεταχείριση σε βάρος της ελληνικής μειονότητας, που πρόσφατα εκδηλώθηκε χαρακτηριστικά, με την υπερβολική και μη αναγκαία χρήση θανατηφόρου βίας από την αλβανική αστυνομία για τη σύλληψη του Κωνσταντίνου Κατσίφα. Δεν αντιλαμβάνομαι, εξάλλου, πώς δικαιολογείται μια υποψήφια προς ένταξη χώρα να απαγορεύει την είσοδο σε ευρωβουλευτές, όπως στην περίπτωση της Ελένης Θεοχάρους. Για τους λόγους αυτούς, θα ψηφίσω λευκό για την έκθεση.

Λάμπρος Φουντούλης (NI). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, το αλβανικό κράτος βαρύνεται με την εν ψυχρώ και προμελετημένη δολοφονία του έλληνα Βορειοηπειρώτη Κωνσταντίνου Κατσίφα. Δεν μπορώ, ως έλληνας ευρωβουλευτής, να συμφωνήσω σε οποιουδήποτε είδους αξιολόγηση όσο ο Edi Rama, ο ηθικός αυτουργός της δολοφονίας, δεν έχει λογοδοτήσει για το έγκλημα αυτό. Επιπλέον, όσο η Αλβανία συνεχίζει να καταπιέζει την ελληνική μειονότητα, να τραμπουκίζει και να απειλεί τους Βορειοηπειρώτες, να γκρεμίζει εκκλησίες και να προσπαθεί να εξαλείψει την παρουσία του Ελληνισμού στη Βόρεια Ήπειρο, καμία καλή γειτονία δεν μπορεί να υπάρξει.

Η ίδια η Αλβανία έχει αποδεχθεί το Πρωτόκολλο της Κέρκυρας, βάσει του οποίου η ελληνική μειονότητα δικαιούται αυτονομία. Για πάνω από 100 χρόνια, η Αλβανία αρνείται να συμμορφωθεί. Επιπλέον, έχει δημιουργήσει συνθήκες τέτοιες που μόνο με την ενσωμάτωση της Βορείου Ηπείρου στον εθνικό κορμό θα αποφευχθεί η σχεδιαζόμενη γενοκτονία εις βάρος των Ελλήνων. Τέλος, η αλβανική κυβέρνηση, διαμέσου του πρωθυπουργού Rama, απέδειξε πόσο υπολογίζει την Ένωση και τους θεσμούς, όταν -με εκφράσεις πεζοδρομίου- αναρωτήθηκε πώς ευρωβουλευτές τολμούν να διατυπώνουν γνώμη για αλβανικά ζητήματα. Όπως είναι προφανές, η Αλβανία αποτελεί ένα εχθρικό προς τη χώρα μου κράτος, η δε ένταξή της στην Ένωση μού ακούγεται μάλλον σαν κακόγουστο αστείο.

(Pyynnöstä myönnettävät puheenvuorot päättyvät)

Johannes Hahn, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, State Secretary, honourable Members, thank you for this debate. Albania is expected to advance on the rule of law reforms to move forward on the path towards the Union, but first and foremost, it needs to deliver progress for the daily benefit of all its citizens across the country. We trust that advancing on the rule of law will progressively result in a better business environment which is crucial to create more jobs and hence foster socio-economic stabilisation.

The observations in your resolution provide very good guidance for Albania in all these areas. However, I would like to reiterate one issue that concerns regional cooperation and good neighbourly relations. I think everybody should aim at calming down the situation, especially concerning the Kosovo-Serbia relations. There is no alternative to dialogue and normalisation. This is in the interest of the entire region and its EU perspective, therefore everybody across the region should refrain from unhelpful statements that could be seen as inflammatory or taking sides.

To conclude, I would like to reiterate that the Commission will continue to support Albania while monitoring results thoroughly. Concrete results will not only bring the country closer to the Union but also guarantee that all Albanian citizens can rely on a functioning democratic state that successfully provides welfare, security and opportunities. The EU reform agenda requires broad political support which needs to be matched by concrete efforts from all the parties to engage in constructive dialogue. I hope that all political actors in Albania will also work with this important objective in mind, in particular in the forthcoming months.

Karoline Edtstadler, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Madam President, again, let me express my sincere gratitude for the excellent work and commitment of Parliament's rapporteur on Albania, Mr Fleckenstein.

Albania has taken many steps in the right direction and the reform efforts are bearing fruits. We expect the political leaders to overcome internal difficulties and join their forces on advancing on the EU path. In this regard we count on the continued support of the European Parliament to call on all leaders of Albania to cooperate in good faith. Decisive action is now needed to make the required progress. The EU will continue to assist Albania.

Knut Fleckenstein, *Berichterstatter.* – Frau Präsidentin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Nur drei Bemerkungen will ich machen. Die eine Bemerkung ist zu den Minderheiten. Wir haben uns darauf geeinigt, dass wir die Minderheitenrechte nicht nach einzelnen Minderheiten spezifizieren, sondern dass sie für alle gelten müssen und dass sie deshalb auch für alle aufgeschrieben werden. Dennoch – und das wissen Sie ja – wird es einen Antrag geben, der sich exakt um die Tötung des albanischen Staatsbürgers griechischer Herkunft kümmern wird und Fragen stellen wird. Aber von ethnischen Säuberungen zu reden, geht mir entschieden zu weit.

Zweitens. Herr Jakovčić, ich habe auch manchmal Angst und frage mich, ob ein Land eventuell auch nicht in die EU aufgenommen werden kann, weil die Opposition noch nicht so weit ist. Wir kennen das immer nur, wenn die Regierung nichts tut, keine Reformen macht und so weiter. Aber manchmal muss man auch die Opposition ein bisschen daran erinnern, dass sie auch nicht nur Rechte, sondern auch Aufgaben hat, und denen muss sie nachkommen, um dem Land insgesamt ein Antlitz zu geben, das es auch möglich macht, einzutreten.

Und Herr Kommissar Hahn, wenn ich Sie richtig verstanden habe – Sie haben es ja sehr diplomatisch ausgedrückt –, dann haben Sie sich eben vielleicht auf jüngste Begebenheiten bezogen. Und auch da gebe ich Ihnen recht: Wenn man große Hände hat, kann man große Aufgaben anfassen, aber sollte irgendwelche Fingerspiele vielleicht bleiben lassen.

Puhemies. – Keskustelu on päättynyt.

Äänestys toimitetaan torstaina 29.11.2018.

27. Bericht 2018 über Montenegro (Aussprache)

Puhemies. – Esityslistalla on seuraavana Charles Tannockin mietintö Montenegroa koskeva vuoden 2018 kertomus (2018/2144(INI) – A8-0339/2018).

Charles Tannock, *Rapporteur.* – Madam President, this report as ever seeks to offer as wide and broad a commentary as possible on Montenegro. On the whole, we see a picture of that country progressing well, with 31 of the 35 chapters now open in total. The government of Montenegro remains positively engaged with the negotiation process and there continues to exist a strong consensus, both in the political arena and in terms of public opinion, for the Euro-Atlantic integrationist agenda.

Obviously, events during the 2016 parliamentary elections, however, show that there is no room for complacency, given the efforts of a big third country to exploit the fears and concerns of a small minority.

Court proceedings concerning the coup plot continue, and whilst we wait to see the final judgments, I have little doubt that events played out in the way that the prosecution is now arguing. The general political climate has improved since then and the handling of this case has proved the robustness of Montenegro, strengthening democracy and legal systems.

I am pleased to see that much of the opposition have now returned to the parliament, and I strongly urge the remaining boycotting parties to do so as well. As a first step, it would be good to see all political parties participating in the working group on reform of the law on the judicial council.

Furthermore, during the reporting period, we have seen presidential elections that passed smoothly and fully in line with the ODIHR/OSCE fundamental freedoms. Clearly there is room for improvement in some of the state electoral commission's working methods, and my report calls for reinforcing the transparency and professionalisation of the electoral administration with that end in mind.

Despite the overall level of progress, there remain concerns about the media landscape in Montenegro. Three successive Commission reports have concluded that no progress has been made in the area of freedom of expression and media freedom – an important issue to satisfy the benchmark requirements of Chapters 23 and 24 of the acquis.

Ongoing disputes about the role of RTCG and changes to the members of its council and leading executives have had a negative effect on public confidence in the network's editorial integrity.

The attack against Olivera Lakić in May of 2018 has highlighted again the plight of journalists and acts of violence against journalists. We cannot forget that this is the second attack against her. Given her involvement in investigating cases of corruption, such incidents highlight the continuing need to fight organised crime and corruption in all its forms and at all levels.

On a more positive note, engagement and cooperation in the fields of CFSP and CSDP remain very positive. Montenegro has for many years been fully compliant in these areas, and its well deserved accession to NATO in June of last year will only cement that cooperation. I particularly welcome Montenegro's full alignment with all the sanctions regimes, particularly those concerning Russia.

I should also say a few words on the elements related to the environment in this report, which has been given a much stronger focus than in previous years. As my two amendments demonstrate, this is being pushed by other political groups in this House, and to my mind has given the subject a slightly disproportionate coverage in relation to the overall balance of my report. As a self-declared ecological state, it could be argued that Montenegro deserves to be held to higher standards than others. However, we must account for the budgetary pressures that this small country faces in this regard, and we cannot seek to be too prescriptive, particularly when calls go beyond the requirements of the acquis communautaire.

To conclude, ahead of the wider debate: for some nine years as rapporteur for Montenegro, I have referred to it as the 'good news story' of the Western Balkans. It remains today the leading EU accession candidate, but I hope that it will not be too long until we see it progress from the good news story of negotiations to the success story of accession as an EU Member State.

Karoline Edtstadler, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Madam President, Montenegro remains the front-runner in the accession process and has made further progress over the past years, as already mentioned in detail by the rapporteur. With the institutional framework complete and the legal framework largely in place, the entire rule of law system should now deliver more tangible results and a strengthened and sustainable track record. Progress in particular on the rule of law and fundamental rights chapters, as set out in the negotiation framework, will continue to determine the pace of accession negotiations overall. Therefore, Montenegro should now focus its reform efforts on meeting the interim benchmarks for Chapters 23 and 24 and on implementing the respective action plans.

The Council strongly encourages Montenegro to demonstrate real results in the fight against corruption and organised crime, money laundering and trafficking in human beings, including through effective investigations, prosecutions and final convictions, and to improve the seizure and confiscation of criminal assets. Recent attacks against journalists highlight the urgent need for the authorities to guarantee a safe climate conducive to freedom of expression and the independence of the media.

On economic reforms, the Council has taken positive note of the continuous economic growth and has encouraged Montenegro to take measures to ensure fiscal sustainability, decrease the high public debt, reduce the trade deficit, advance reforms in important areas, such as public procurement and labour market, and improve the business environment.

With regard to elections, Montenegro's authority needs to address all irregularities reported by international observers. Returning the political debate to the parliament remains the responsibility of all parties. The Council has warmly welcomed Montenegro's continued positive role in further developing regional cooperation and advancing good neighbourly relations, strongly commended it also for its consistent cooperation on foreign policy issues and, in particular, for its continuous full alignment with the EU Common Foreign and Security Policy.

The clear messages in your draft resolutions are well appreciated. It is clear that Montenegro has homework to do. Montenegro will have to intensify its focus on implementing reforms with determination and on fulfilling all benchmarks.

To conclude, let me use this opportunity to assure you that we, as the Presidency, will continue to support Montenegro in its reform process and will do our utmost to move the accession negotiations forward. We also count on Montenegro to do its part and maintain the reform momentum.

Johannes Hahn, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, State Secretary, honourable Members, let me start by congratulating the rapporteur Charles Tannock for his well-balanced report on Montenegro. I also want to thank all honourable Members who have contributed to this. Montenegro has indeed made steady progress on its EU path. Montenegro's legal and institutional framework is now largely in place. The country is strongly committed to regional cooperation and has good relations with its neighbours and, in the context of the Western Balkans, this is not a minor achievement. Let me also welcome again Montenegro's complete alignment with the Union's common foreign and security policy positions. Montenegro is a country with a clear EU perspective. It is well in the EU integration process

with 31 chapters open for negotiation, three of which are provisionally closed. There's overwhelming support for EU membership among the population and across the political spectrum.

Fully functioning national parliaments play a key role in this process. I am glad that, finally, after a prolonged boycott of parliament by the opposition, there has been real progress in political dialogue with the return of most of the opposition to the parliament.

In October a temporary parliamentary committee for the reform of electoral and other legislation was formed. Its mandate is based on the proposal made by the two civic opposition parties in June. I regret and I fail to understand that these two opposition parties have decided not to participate in the work of this committee. All parties should play an active and constructive role in the work of this committee.

I look forward to the continuation of Montenegro's EU integration process. As ever, the base of negotiations is in Montenegro's hands. We start seeing initial results with concrete cases in some areas, including the fight against corruption and organised crime and investigations into money laundering. I look forward to now seeing a similar track record for the fight against trafficking in human beings, media freedom and investigations into attacks against journalists.

Attacks against journalists are unacceptable and need to be followed and cleared up. The overall priority for Montenegro remains to meet the interim benchmarks for Chapters 23 and 24 and therefore continue advancing in the accession process.

Further fiscal consolidation measures are also required, combined with the timely implementation of Montenegro's reform priorities, which would lead to a more flexible economy, improved functioning of markets and a good investment climate. I also expect the effective implementation of the public administration reform to ensure effective depoliticisation of the public service and to allocate state administration resources where they are needed for the country's EU accession process.

On its side the European Commission will continue supporting Montenegro on its EU path with both technical and financial assistance, so that the journey towards EU membership already brings concrete benefits to all citizens of Montenegro.

Andrey Kovatchev, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Madam President, this the 12th year that, as an independent state, Montenegro has shown that all the fears related to its sustainability were unfounded. It is now the leading Western Balkan state for EU accession and is a full and reliable member of NATO.

I welcome the progress the country has made in the area of public administration, fundamental rights and regional cooperation. Montenegro has further aligned itself to the EU Common Foreign and Security Policy and to EU legislation in the areas of company law, food safety and agriculture. However, I have to mention the low trust in the electoral framework and the prolonged parliamentary boycott still enacted by some opposition parties. All political actors should share the responsibility in sustaining a healthy democratic political dialogue.

Montenegro still has a lot to do in the area of freedom of expression and the fight against corruption and organised crime. I would like to use this opportunity to remind you of the critical importance that European integration and the EU membership perspective have in holding the Western Balkans together in a peaceful and prosperous way. It is only through Euro-Atlantic integration that the Western Balkan states can be reconciled with their very difficult past and build their stronger future together.

Νίκος Ανδρουλάκης, *εξ ονόματος της ομάδας S&D*. – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, είναι η τελευταία φορά που συζητάμε στη θητεία αυτή για την ενταξιακή πορεία του Μαυροβουνίου. Ως παιδί, μεγάλωσα με τις εικόνες φρίκης του πολέμου στην τότε ενωμένη Γιουγκοσλαβία. Σήμερα όμως, χαίρομαι ιδιαίτερα που οι χώρες αυτές βελτιώνουν συνεχώς τη θέση τους, προσεγγίζοντας τον στόχο ένταξης στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση. Όμως, παρά τη σημαντική πρόοδο που έχει σημειωθεί τα τελευταία χρόνια και η οποία αποτυπώνεται στις εκθέσεις τόσο της Επιτροπής όσο και του Κοινοβουλίου, απομένουν ακόμα να γίνουν πολλά.

Οι προσπάθειες για την εμπέδωση του κράτους δικαίου, της διαφάνειας και της ενίσχυσης των θεσμών πρέπει να είναι συνεχείς. Χρειάζεται, επίσης, να υπάρξει πρόοδος στην καταπολέμηση της χρόνιας ανεργίας και ιδιαίτερα της ανεργίας των νέων. Η κυβέρνηση έχει δείξει τη θέληση να προχωρήσει στις απαιτούμενες μεταρρυθμίσεις. Πρέπει, όμως, αυτή η θέληση να μετουσιωθεί σε συγκεκριμένες πράξεις. Είμαι σίγουρος ότι, αν τελικά ολοκληρωθεί η αποχώρηση του Ηνωμένου Βασιλείου με το Brexit, τότε το Μαυροβούνιο, συνεχίζοντας στον ίδιο ρυθμό, θα μπορέσει να γίνει το εικοστό όγδοο μέλος της Ένωσής μας.

Jozo Radoš, *u ime kluba ALDE.* – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, gospodine povjereniče, kolegice i kolege, ja bih izrazio potporu i zahvalnost gospodinu Tannocku na cjelovitom izvješću i na dobroj suradnji izvjestitelja u sjeni. Želim se posebno osvrnuti na pitanje slobode medija, o kojem je ovdje bilo govora.

Dakle, uz nastavak zastrašivanja i napada na novinare, radi se i o napadima na nezavisnost nacionalnog radiotelevizijskog operatera i vijeća za elektroničke medije. Treba naglasiti da se u sličnom položaju ovisnosti nalaze i lokalni javni mediji, a generalno treba napomenuti da je radno-pravni položaj novinara vrlo težak, nesiguran, s malim plaćama i plaćama koje često kasne i pri tome, naravno, treba napomenuti i nejasnu vlasničku strukturu medija.

U takvim uvjetima, naravno, ne može biti kvalitetnih i slobodnih medija i mislim da bi se tim pitanjima trebali više baviti u našim izvješćima.

Петър Курумбашев (S&D). – Благодаря Ви, госпожо председател. Вече е станало клише да се каже за Монтенегро или за Черна гора, че е най-напред в преговорите, но кажете ми, какво означава да си първи, когато състезанието е между две държави. Дали е голяма гордост това, че Черна гора е пред Сърбия и няма никакви други състезатели? Позволете ми да изразя разочарованието си, че другите две държави, които трябваше да бъдат поканени през юни на заседанието на Съвета на Европейския съюз, а именно Албания и Македония, не получиха такава покана. Представете си, че Черна гора вече води преговори шест години и в най-щастливия си хоризонт през 2025 г. може би може да стане член на Европейския съюз. Как се чувства една държава и едно общество, което преговаря евентуално поне 13 г. за влизането си в Европейския съюз?

Необходимо е да дадем по-ясни сигнали и да бъдем по-откровени с тези, които преговарят за членство, защото на мен ми е трудно да видя партньори на запад от Австрия и Италия, които имат искрено желание да видят държавите от Западните Балкани действително членове на нашето европейско семейство.

Pyynnöstä myönnettävät puheenvuorot

Eduard Kukan (PPE). – Madam President, I would like to thank Charles Tannock for his report – unfortunately, his last one, and I think we should also thank him for many years of personal devotion to the country.

Montenegro is advancing towards EU accession at a steady pace with the support of its citizens for the strategic goal of the country. Despite the fact that a partial boycott of the Parliament has concluded, a fully functioning legislative branch with effective oversight of the executive is essential to every modern democracy.

I also strongly condemn the intimidation, smear campaigns and verbal and physical attacks against journalists. We reiterate and this report calls on the authorities to investigate previous attacks. Last but not the least, I would also like to praise Montenegro for its full alignment to the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) and Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP). Since our last discussion on Montenegro in this House, the country has become a NATO member. The country should also be applauded for its constructive and positive approach to regional cooperation.

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, η ηγεσία της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης προσπαθεί να αντισταθμίσει την αποχώρηση του Ηνωμένου Βασιλείου με την ένταξη των χωρών των Δυτικών Βαλκανίων. Αντιλαμβάνεται κανείς ότι κάτι τέτοιο δεν μπορεί να αναπληρώσει το κενό που αφήνει το Brexit και, βεβαίως, αντιλαμβάνεστε ότι εάν ενταχθούν στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση οι χώρες αυτές, το Μαυροβούνιο, τα Σκόπια, η Αλβανία ή το Κόσοβο, δηλαδή η σφηκοφωλιά των τζιχαντιστών, θα δημιουργήσουν τεράστια προβλήματα. Πρόκειται για χώρες με έλλειψη δημοκρατίας, διαφθορά και οργανωμένο έγκλημα, στις οποίες δεν υπάρχει κράτος δικαίου και τα ναρκωτικά είναι στην ημερήσια διάταξη, και όπου υφίστανται καταπίεση οι μειονότητες. Επομένως, πρόκειται για κράτη τα οποία είναι μια φάρσα αυτήν τη στιγμή και δεν μπορούν να ενταχθούν στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση. Αυτό σύντομα θα το αντιληφθούν οι ίδιοι οι λαοί της Ευρώπης, οι οποίοι θα αντιδράσουν απέναντι στην ηγεσία τους.

Ivan Jakovčić (ALDE). – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, kako danas stvari stoje, potpuno je jasno da će Crna Gora biti prva zemlja koja će biti novoprimljena članica Europske unije.

Želim, naravno, vjerovati da će Crna Gora ispuniti svoje obaveze, što je u ovom izvještaju jasno podcrtano, i da će učiniti sve da se i medijske slobode i sve ostale slobode koje građani trebaju imati dovedu na onaj nivo kada zemlja postaje zrela za ulazak u Europsku uniju, ali ja ovdje želim reći i podcrtati naš problem.

Gospodine povjereniče, ja znam da vi jako dugo pratite i odlično radite na zapadnom Balkanu, ali mi smo u situaciji da ćemo morati ovoga puta jasno reći da je „regata princip" princip ulaska u Europsku uniju. Ne blok, ne ne znam što, ne znam koje čekanje, nego regata princip. Tko je prvi došao na cilj, ima pravo ući u Europsku uniju, kao što je to, na kraju krajeva, i Hrvatska napravila.

Mirosław Piotrowski (ECR). – W przedłożonym sprawozdaniu porusza się wiele bardzo ważnych kwestii dotyczących Czarnogóry. Dobrze, że w punkcie 22 ubolewamy między innymi nad brakiem postępów w zwalczaniu handlu ludźmi i nad zmuszaniem dzieci do żebractwa. Jest to haniebny proceder i żaden kraj mający aspiracje do członkostwa w Unii Europejskiej nie może tego tolerować.

Niepotrzebnie jednak, znów w specyficzny sposób, w sprawozdaniu promuje się ideologię gender. Tym razem niepokojąc się w punkcie 34 trudnościami z akceptacją różnorodności seksualnej w czarnogórskim społeczeństwie. Uważam, że jest to zbędne.

(Pyynnöstä myönnettävät puheenvuorot päättyvät)

Johannes Hahn, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, I would like to thank honourable Members very much for this very fruitful debate, just like our other exchanges today. The Commission's Western Balkan Strategy, the May Sofia Declaration and the June Council conclusions all represent a clear signal of encouragement and the EU's engagement with Montenegro and the whole region.

As I said earlier, the EU is in a unique position to help address the country's challenges. The European perspective is of crucial importance for the stability of the whole region and I think we all agree that Montenegro has achieved a lot. It's firmly committed to its EU path and the EU remains equally dedicated to Montenegro's future in the Union. However, as you rightly point out in your report, there is work ahead and the focus needs to be kept firmly on the rule of law, the fight against corruption and organised crime, freedom of the media, public administration reform, and a genuine involvement of civil society, to mention only a few of the key areas. The accession negotiations' benchmarks will help Montenegro to address these and other priority reforms, which will move Montenegro closer to the EU.

Negotiations will continue to proceed on the basis of the own merits principle. The Commission will continue to support the country. The pace of progress as such is entirely in the hands of Montenegro.

I would like to use this opportunity to thank honourable Members for the exchange of views today and I look forward to further progress on Montenegro's EU path. I would also like to use the opportunity to thank the Austrian Presidency for its decision to choose the Western Balkan enlargement as one of its core areas during its Presidency, and not only to choose it, but also – as we could see today and on many other occasions – to pursue it with very strong dedication.

Karoline Edtstadler, *President-in-Office of the Council.* – Madam President, I wish to thank you for a very useful debate. I take note that our institutions have a very similar approach and assessment. We look forward to continuing this constructive dialogue and engagement. The Council will continue to closely monitor Montenegro's progress, paying particular attention to the area of rule of law and other important issues mentioned here today and also by the Commissioner.

Let me express our appreciation for the constructive contribution of the European Parliament and in particular rapporteur, Charles Tannock, in advancing Montenegro's succession process. I can assure you that we will continue to pay particular attention to the views of Parliament in this regard.

Charles Tannock, *Rapporteur.* – Madam President, I would like to thank Commissioner Hahn and the Austrian Presidency-in-Office for their comments and take this opportunity, in particular, to thank Commissioner Hahn for his ceaseless efforts in supporting the EU enlargement agenda over the previous five years – not always in the easiest of political climates.

Can I also take the opportunity to thank the shadow rapporteurs and the many other colleagues over the years who helped me compile my annual reports on Montenegro.

When I first became the rapporteur for Montenegro in September 2009 it was a very different country. Montenegro was then a newly independent state with an uncertain future. Today it's a NATO member. It's aligned fully with the EU CFSP. It's prospering economically and it's the front runner amongst those countries wishing to join the European Union.

So my report highlights Montenegro's strong overall progress and is positive about its general direction of travel and excellent regional neighbourly relations with its Western Balkan partners.

With such achievements, however, come greater responsibilities. In this regard, Parliament has clearly laid out its concerns about media freedom in the country and the need to intensify the fight against corruption and organised crime and diversify its economy.

This is my last report as Montenegro rapporteur, but I wish Montenegro well in the future and have no doubt whatsoever about its successful eventual path to EU membership.

Puhemies. – Keskustelu on päättynyt.

Äänestys toimitetaan torstaina 29.11.2018.

28. Schutz der akademischen Freiheit im auswärtigen Handeln der EU (Aussprache)

Puhemies. – Esityslistalla on seuraavana Wajid Khanin mietintö akateemisen vapauden puolustaminen EU:n ulkoisessa toiminnassa (2018/2117(INI) – A8-0403/2018).

Wajid Khan, *Rapporteur.* – Madam President can I firstly thank all the shadow rapporteurs for their input in this report. Academic freedom is not some dry obscure subject. I want to highlight two reasons why academic freedom matters so much. The contributions that academics make and the fact that attacking academics is an early step on a familiar path towards tyranny. The truth is, threats to academic freedom impact everyone in our society, when researchers, professors and students can't explore certain issues, society doesn't get the benefit of their skills and talents looking into important questions. When research on gun violence, tobacco or other health-related issues can't happen, public health is endangered. When research into global warming, pollution and air quality doesn't happen, the whole of society and the environment suffers. Attacks on academic freedom hamper social, political, economic and cultural development.

Today, I hosted an event on academic freedom in the Parliament. I learned that 294 attacks have been reported on higher education communities in 47 countries between September 2017 and August this year.

Thousands of academics and students are threatened, attacked, imprisoned, censored, expelled or even killed each year because of what they teach, write or say. Recently, I was in Turkey as part of a Subcommittee on Human Rights mission. Turkey is a clear example of a country where a crack down on critical thinking occurs with an unprecedented witch-hunt targeting teachers, academics and other professionals. But Turkey is not the only country threatening academic freedom, we also hear reports of the detentions of Uighur scholars and students in China, targeted attacks on scholars in Iran, pressures on student expression in Nicaragua, mounting tensions in the United States and state-driven threats to institutional autonomy in Russia.

I should also address the elephant in the room, the terrible attacks on academic freedom in our own EU Member State, Hungary.

Sadly, violations of academic freedom claims are rarely brought under human rights law. This is in part due to a lack of familiarity with issues of academic freedom amongst human rights advocates; and secondly, the fact that claims often referred to other rights being violated, such as freedom of expression or opinion. As a result, standards in this area are under developed and violations of academic freedom go underreported. Therefore, recognising these incidents as a part of a single global phenomenon is a crucial first step in devising solutions.

There is an urgent need to raise awareness of the importance of academic freedom and to create opportunities to improve the capacity for its advocacy and defence. There is also an urgent need to explain why academics' work is fundamental to democratic societies and the protection of our rights, especially in the current rise of autocratic leaders. There are organisations and universities that already do excellent work monitoring and reporting attacks and assisting those who are under threat.

I have been hugely inspired by the work of Scholars at Risk which launched its EU chapter today in this Parliament. However, they struggle with financial and administrative limitations, which preclude otherwise qualified at-risk academics or students from being able to obtain access to programme opportunities. More needs to be done and the EU could lead in this area, supporting persecuted and at-risk academics as well as defending and promoting academic freedom worldwide.

Madam President my report deals with the EU's exchange external actions as its title says but we cannot approach and tackle external issues without being honest with what is happening in our own backyard. We cannot talk about the inclusion of academic freedom in the Copenhagen criteria for EU candidate countries without referring to the case of Hungary, a Member State that has been through the accession process. This case provides evidence that there are shortcomings in the accession process and an urgent need to address it. We cannot be hypocrites. The EU global strategy clearly states that living up consistently to our values internally will determine our external credibility and influence. That is why I am saddened and disappointed by some of my EPP colleagues' actions. It seems that, for some, the priority about this report was to ensure that it does not make references to EU Member States actions, it seems that the priority was to protect Mr Orbán.

Finally, to those people we say that we will not be silenced, we will be banging on about this for years to come. We will keep highlighting the importance of academic freedom and institutional autonomy and we will never stop saying that academics must be free to research and publish the truth, in Hungary, throughout the EU and across the world.

(Applause)

Johannes Hahn, *on behalf of the Vice-President of the Commission / High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy.* – Madam President, the Khan report rightly draws attention to the importance of academic freedom for open and stable pluralistic societies. The right to think and speak freely is fundamental for democracy and we see the increasing attacks on academic freedom as part of a general trend of shrinking civil and political rights across the globe.

Let me assure you that we wholeheartedly share the concerns expressed in the report and welcome the initiative by Mr Khan to respond to this crisis, which is building up and threatening to erode our liberal societies.

I note that this morning Mr Khan organised a roundtable on 'Ideas are not crimes' where colleagues from the European External Action Service (EEAS) already had an opportunity to share some of our activities in this area.

Human rights and democratic values are at the heart of our external relations and policies and I thank the European Parliament for its leading role in upholding these values.

The Khan report affirms that ideas are not crimes and that critical discourse is not disloyalty and that academic freedom plays an essential role in educational advancement and the development of humankind in modern society. This is true and our actions show that we mean it.

The Khan report calls for explicitly recognising the importance of academic freedom in public statements, policies and actions relating to the EU's external action.

We are doing this in our relations with partner countries. The most recent statement on Turkey on 16 November 2018 condemns the detention of prominent academics and civil society representatives and calls for a rapid resolution based on the principles of presumption of innocence and in line with the European Convention on Human Rights.

We also address these issues in our human-rights dialogues, raising attacks on basic freedoms like freedom of thought, speech, assembly and association in general terms, and by enquiring about specific cases.

Academic freedom and freedom of thought are closely linked to fundamental freedoms and implicitly covered by some of our human-rights guidelines – notably the EU Guidelines on Freedom of Expression – on-line and off-line (ex 2014), EU Guidelines on Human Rights Defenders (ex 2016), and EU Guidelines on the Promotion and Protection of Freedom of Religion or Belief (from 2013).

These guidelines were drafted to ensure a maximum of coherence, consistency and visibility of human-rights priorities in external relations. They provide practical guidance for the work of delegations in this domain.

On top of these guidelines we have a number of financial instruments which directly support our human-rights agenda which scans for vulnerable groups like journalists, human-rights defenders and religious minorities. Academics have directly or indirectly benefitted from a number of such instruments.

For instance, the PreotectDefenders.eu programme covers all types of human-rights defenders including academics or people defending academic freedom – at least 219 academics with this instrument. The EIDHR (European Instrument for Democracy & Human Rights) emergency fund also covers human-rights defenders including academics at risk helping them with relocation if necessary.

A number of EIDHR projects are implemented by our support universities. Our flagship is the European Masters Programme on Human Rights, which was established in 1997 thanks to the vision of ten pioneer universities.

EMA (The European Master's Programme in Human Rights and Democratisation) is the oldest Masters programme supported by the European Union. Over the years, it has developed according to changing approaches to human rights and democratisation in Europe and in the world and to more integrated strategies in trans-European human-rights education.

Today, EMA counts on the participation of 41 prestigious universities and human-rights centres from all Member States of the European Union. The EIDHR also supports the work of the UN Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of the right to freedom of opinion and expression.

Thank you for your attention. It's clear that the recommendations proposed by Mr Khan's report and the actions of the Commission and the EEAS follow the same joint objectives. I therefore look forward to our discussion on how to improve our cooperation on this matter even further.

Andrea Bocskor, *a PPE képviselőcsoport nevében*. – Köszönöm szépen, Elnök Asszony, és köszönöm a lehetőséget, hogy a Néppárt árnyékelőadójaként kifejthettem a véleményem erről a jelentésről, melynek a címe: Ajánlások a Tanácsnak, a Bizottságnak és a külügyi főképviselőnek, hogy az EU külügyi tevékenysége során hogyan védjék az akadémiai szabadságot.

A téma nagyon fontos, hiszen az akadémiai szabadság, a kutatás és a tudományos élet megvédése egy nemes cél, és mint tapasztaljuk, szerte a világban számtalan eset van, amikor tanároknak és tudósoknak menekülniük kell, hogy az életüket megmentsék. Amikor olyan oktatási törvényeket alkotnak, hogy több százezer kisebbségi nyelvű diákot és egyetemistát fosztanak meg az anyanyelven való tanulás jogától – és még sorolhatnám – az általános megfogalmazásokkal tehát egyetértek.

Azonban sem ezekkel a konkrét jelenségekkel, sem egyetlenegy harmadik vagy partnerországgal nem foglalkozik a jelentés nevesítve, csak Magyarországgal és a CEU-val érdekes módon. Mi ez, ha nem egy újabb politikai koholmány Magyarországgal szemben? Egy újabb lejáró kampány, amit a baloldal, a szocialisták, a zöldek és a liberálisok közösen szerveztek, hogy politikailag lejárassák Magyarországot.

És a legszomorúbb az egészben az, hogy Önök, kedves harcias jogvédők, sosem szólaltak még fel a kárpátaljai magyar iskolarendszer védelmében, amit az új ukrán oktatási törvény alapján akarnak felszámolni, de még a marosvásárhelyi magyar egyetem ügyében sem szólaltak meg, amit a románok szeretnének beolvasztani. Tehát világos, hogy a maguk célja nem az akadémiai szabadság védelme valójában, hanem csupán az, hogy egy újabb támadást indítsanak Magyarország ellen. Sajnálom!

Clare Moody (S&D). – Madam President, I would like to thank my colleague, Wajid Khan, for his excellent work. This report highlights the need to defend academic freedom when it is under threat. That must also include inside the EU.

Hungary signed up to European values in the Copenhagen criteria, and we have to call out the assault on those values that is happening there today. Forcing the Central European University out of the country is a clear breach of all that Hungary signed up to. Further, European citizens in Hungary are being prevented from following gender studies because the Hungarian Government refuses to accredit them.

We cannot preach values abroad which are ignored in the EU. I hope this Parliament will support the amendments that highlight and condemn undermining European values by any country, inside or outside the EU.

Judith Sargentini, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Madam President, in the report on Hungary that this Parliament voted in September, we addressed the issue of the Central European University and its insecure situation in Budapest. Since then, things have got worse. I have to conclude that the Hungarian Government is on purpose trying to ruin a highly regarded university and it sends a message to its people that it looks down on academic debate.

I'm outraged, not only at the Hungarian Government, but also at the 27 Member States that have still not found the courage to correct their fellow Member. How is it possible that, in Europe in 2018, an academic institution is being bullied into closing down? Is this our Europe? This is such a bad example for the rest of the world. I stand with the Central European University, and all prime ministers should do so too.

Johannes Hahn, *on behalf of the Vice-President of the Commission / High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy*. – Madam President, allow me to conclude by again thanking Mr Khan for raising awareness about the urgent need to continue and step up our action to preserve academic freedom and the right to think and speak freely. I would also like to commend him for his efforts to launch the Scholars at Risk Europe network, which took place this morning on the occasion of the Round Table.

Finally, let me also thank all honourable Members for their interventions, comments and suggestions. It's a topic which unfortunately will accompany us and therefore we need all dedication and commitment to fight against any shrinking of academic space.

Wajid Khan, *Rapporteur*. – Madam President, it is great to have a Commissioner Hahn, who actually sounds like 'MEP Khan'. Thank you for your kind words, Commissioner. I'd just like to say, once again, thank you to all colleagues who have worked and made contributions toward this report. Hopefully tomorrow we can vote the amendments through, as well as the final report.

I'm very disappointed that my esteemed colleague, the PPE shadow rapporteur, isn't here to listen to your comments, Commissioner, and to other interventions from esteemed colleagues who have worked on this report.

I'll keep it brief: thank you very much to everybody and I look forward to tomorrow's vote.

Puhemies. – Keskustelu on päättynyt.

Äänestys toimitetaan torstaina 29.11.2018.

29. Ausführungen von einer Minute zu Fragen von politischer Bedeutung

Puhemies. – Esityslistalla on seuraavana minuutin puheenvuorot poliittisesti tärkeistä asioista työjärjestyksen 163 artiklan mukaisesti.

László Tőkés (PPE). – Elnök Asszony! Ordító ellentmondás, hogy miközben az Európai Parlament és a Bizottság jelentései ultimátumszerű megrovásban részesítik a mélyponton álló romániai jogállamiságot, Jean-Claude Juncker és Antonio Tajani elnökök fesztív módon ünneplik annak a nagy Romániának a jubileumát, mely megalakulásának centenáriumán újabb és újabb merényleteket követ el az európai jogállamiság sérelmére.

A kommunizmus idején elkobzott magyar köztulajdonok visszaszolgáltatásának a megtagadása, másfelől a mégis visszajuttatott Székely Mikó Református Kollégium, a gyulafehérvári Batthyáneum és az ozsdolai közbirtokossági erdők visszaállamosítása egyszerre jelent a magántulajdon rovására elkövetett és a kisebbségi magyarokat diszkrimináló durva jogfosztást. Románia legméltóbb módon a jogosság és a törvényesség helyreállításával, a demokratikus jogállamiság biztosításával ünnepelhetne. Ehhez kérjük Európa, és Ferenc pápa támogatását.

Julie Ward (S&D). – Madam President, this month the UN reported that the Conservative Party's misogynistic, punitive, mean-spirited and often callous austerity policies have inflicted great misery on people across the UK. A fifth of the UK population live in poverty. In parts of my North West constituency over 50% of children live in poverty. The Tories have brushed aside these expert findings, but it's negligent for any government to dismiss consistent evidence that they have compounded suffering through their domestic legislative agenda.

Meanwhile, in 2017, the EU adopted a European Pillar of Social Rights to encourage poverty reduction and the creation of more equal societies. Brexit hasn't even happened yet, but the effects are already being felt. Austerity continues, the economy suffers and households are already GBP 900 a year worse off since the referendum result. It's the poorest families who have borne the brunt of the sharpest cuts and Brexit will only add to their misery.

Mirosław Piotrowski (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Nie tak dawno Parlament przyjął rezolucję potępiającą neofaszyzm i neonazizm, które podobno odradzają się w Europie. Wielu europosłów głosowało przeciwko, gdyż w tekście tym zabrakło potępienia neokomunizmu. O ile dwie pierwsze napiętnowane zbrodnicze ideologie nawiązują do faszyzmu Benita Mussoliniego i narodowego socjalizmu Adolfa Hitlera, o tyle przemilczano komunizm, czyli międzynarodowy socjalizm, który wyszedł z Rosji sowieckiej Józefa Stalina.

Komunizm w jego różnych odsłonach pochłonął na całym świecie więcej ofiar niż dwa napiętnowane totalitaryzmy razem wzięte. Przyzwolenie na rozprzestrzenianie się neokomunizmu może przynieść zgubne dla Europy skutki. Parlament nie może być bierny i powinien zacząć od siebie, delegalizując działającą tu grupę komunisty Altiera Spinelliego, który w manifeście z Ventotene postulował likwidację państw narodowych, zniesienie własności prywatnej i wzniecenie europejskiej rewolucji socjalistycznej. Należy też jak najszybciej usunąć jego wizerunek i nazwisko z gmachu Parlamentu.

Ivan Jakovčić (ALDE). – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, želim upozoriti Komisiju na najavu mogućega ukidanja sredstava koja su potrebna za talijansku manjinu u Hrvatskoj i Sloveniji.

Nova talijanska vlada, čini se, ignorira vlastite zakone i dovodi u pitanje funkcioniranje organizacije talijanske manjine. Pogotovo će to biti problem ako se ne nađu sredstva za vrtiće, škole i sve ono što je do sada uobičajeno od trećeg mjeseca 2001. godine do danas bilo financirano. Ne vjerujem da će ni hrvatska vlada, ni Istarska županija ni primorsko-goranske općine i gradovi naći lako sredstva. Pogotovo je to važno za dnevnik „La voce del popolo", dnevnik koji izlazi na talijanskom jeziku i koji doprinosi prepoznatljivosti talijanske manjine.

Želim zamoliti Komisiju i upozoriti da bude budna oko toga jer zaista nema smisla da sada, nakon svega, dovedemo u pitanje talijansku manjinu u Hrvatskoj.

Liadh Ní Riada (GUE/NGL). – A Uachtaráin, in Éirinn déantar teaghlaigh a chaitheamh amach ó thithe agus ó fheirmeacha ó lá go lá. Leis an gcruatan atá ann go forleathan sna pobail tuaithe agus leis an ngéarchéim tithíochta atá againn inár dtír, tá díbirt ag dul ar aghaidh go laethúil.

Ba cheart go mbeadh náire ar Fhine Gael agus ar Fhianna Fáil, agus tá milleán ar an Aontas Eorpach chomh maith. Nuair atá fiacha neamh-inbhuanaithe i gceist, ba chóir do na bainc glacadh le níos lú airgid. Ba cheart go ndéanfadh na bainc idirbheartaíocht as an nua le feirmeoirí agus le húinéirí tí atá ag streachailt.

Ná dearúd go bhfuil na bainc ag baint leas ollmhór as an tarrtháil airgeadais agus ní íocann siad fiú amháin cáin. Tá sé soiléir go gcuireann an AE brú ar na bainc a morgáistí a dhíol ar phraghasanna i bhfad níos ísle ná na luachanna le *vulture funds* móra idirnáisiúnta.

Is slí é seo do *vulture funds* chun talamh a cheannach ar lascainí ollmhóra. Táimse ag rá anois leis an Aontas Eorpach: in ionad cosaint a thabhairt do na bainc ba chóir cosaint agus tacaíocht a thabhairt dár saoránaigh; sin é!

Ivan Štefanec (PPE). – Vážená pani predsedajúca, útoky Ruska v azovskom mori proti lodiam ukrajinského námorníctva nás majú zastrašiť. Majú ukázať, aké je Rusko silné, hocikedy vraj môže napadnúť slabšieho a že nemusí rešpektovať medzinárodné ani svoje vlastné zákony. V skutočnosti je to však ukážka slabosti. Putin je slaboch a zbabelec. Nezvládol dôchodkovú reformu, ľudia sa búria, ekonomika klesá a tak isto aj jeho popularita. Je pozoruhodné, že naopak Európska únia je v Rusku vnímaná viac pozitívne ako negatívne, a to prvýkrát od marca 2014. Preto sa Putin uchýlil k osvedčenej zbrani zbabelcov a tou je hrubá sila. Musíme to rezolútne odsúdiť a ukázať, že Európa sa Putina nezľakne. Je dôležité rozšíriť sankcie a potrestať osoby, ktoré za tento útok nesú priamu zodpovednosť. Ukrajina je suverénny štát tak ako každý iný. Musíme sa jej zastať a pomáhať jej, pretože stabilita a mier na Ukrajine je stabilitou a mierom aj v celej Európe.

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Doamnă președintă, domnule comisar, în această seară voi vrea să vorbesc despre statul de drept și dubla măsură. Statul de drept, domnule comisar, așa cum îl definește Comisia, este total diferit de ceea ce înțelegem noi, parlamentele naționale și statele membre. Statul de drept nu înseamnă că trebuie să legifereze Comisia. Nu înseamnă că trebuie să schimbe șefi de instituții Comisia. Așa cum, recent, în rezoluția pentru țara mea, pentru România au fost scrise aceste măsuri care țin de subsidiaritate, care nu au legătură cu atribuțiile Comisiei Europene. Vreau să vă spun, domnule comisar, -îmi pare rău că nu este și Consiliul – se folosește dubla măsură. România îndeplinește – și chiar Parlamentul a constatat acest lucru încă din 8 iunie 2011 — toate condițiile Regulamentului Schengen și nu se află în Schengen. Cetățenii noștri sunt tratați ca cetățeni de mâna a doua, țara este discriminată, companiile stau mii de ore – și plătesc pentru acest lucru – la controalele vamale. De ce nu se ia decizia ca România să intre în spațiul Schengen? De ce avem un sistem MCV pentru două state, un sistem care nu are legătură cu tratatul. Vă rog, domnule comisar, să luați în calcul și aceste lucruri!

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, επανέρχομαι στο ζήτημα των Σκοπίων, γιατί δεν πήρα, ούτε από τον κύριο Hahn ούτε από τους συναδέλφους, καμία απάντηση στα επιχειρήματα τα οποία έθεσα. Επεσήμανα, κύριε Hahn, το άρθρο 36 του νέου Συντάγματος των Σκοπίων, στο οποίο γίνεται λόγος για δήθεν «Μακεδονία» και δήθεν «μακεδονικό λαό». Συνάδει αυτό με τη συμφωνία των Πρεσπών;

Δεύτερον, σας είπα ότι στο προοίμιο αναφέρονται στην ASNOM. Διαβάστε, λοιπόν, στα αγγλικά τι λέει η ASNOM, η απόφαση του 1944 που κάνει λόγο για δήθεν αυτοδιάθεση «μακεδονικού έθνους», για δήθεν αυτοδιάθεση «μακεδονικού λαού», για κατάργηση των συνόρων και για ενοποίηση των Μακεδόνων με τους Μακεδόνες. Αυτά δεν είναι αλυτρωτικές ρήσεις; Αυτά υπάρχουν στο νέο Σύνταγμα των Σκοπίων. Βεβαίως υπάρχουν και να μου απαντήσετε! Είναι δεδομένα και καλό θα είναι να διαβάσετε! Δεν διαβάζετε ούτε εσείς ο ίδιος τις αλυτρωτικές λογικές των Σκοπίων! Αν θέλετε απαντήστε, λοιπόν, στα θέματα αυτά! Εγώ σας αναμένω ή σας καλώ και σε δημόσιο διάλογο, διότι έτσι είναι τα πράγματα, κύριε Hahn! Να διαβάζετε καλύτερα!

Csaba Sógor (PPE). – Az elmúlt néhány napban Európának egyik olyan régiójában jártam, amely az elmúlt száz év folyamán nem volt mindig egyike a legbékésebb és legfejlettebb régióknak, de mára méltán nevezhetjük annak. Dél-Tirolról van szó, erről az Olaszországhoz tartozó, de jelentős németajkú lakossággal rendelkező területi autonómiával bíró régióról, amely mára Olaszország és Európa egyik legfejlettebb része.

Az egymás mellett élő népcsoportok között nem volt mindig egyetértés, a történelem viszontagságait nem tudták meg nem történtté tenni, de párbeszéddel, tárgyalással, Olaszország és Ausztira közötti sorozatos egyeztetéssel, egymás szempontjainak figyelembevételével elérték azt, hogy ma harmonikus és békés példáját adják a területi autonómia intézményének, és egyértelműen stabilitást hoztak egy korábbi feszültségektől terhes régióba.

Meggyőződésem, hogy vannak még olyan többnemzetiségi régiói Európának, például a ma Romániához tartozó Erdély, ahol szükség lenne erre a jól bevált módszerre, hiszen száz évvel az első világháború lezárását követően a nemzeti kisebbségek nem tűntek el Európából … *(az elnök megvonja a szót a felszólalótól),*

John Howarth (S&D). – Madam President, I want to speak about a group of citizens tonight who have been badly let down by their Member State government. They settled in European Union countries to live, to work, to pursue their dreams, to retire, as European Union citizens. As of 1 January 2021, they are due to become third country citizens.

I don't believe that we are in the business of removing rights from individual citizens of this Union and I do not believe that the status of these UK citizens in the EU27 should change. I don't believe, and neither do they, that they should lose their freedom of movement rights and be effectively discriminated against, because EU citizens in the UK will retain those rights. This is a wrong, it's a historic wrong; it has not been righted in 12 months. We have time to right this wrong on behalf of those people.

Alex Mayer (S&D). – Madam President, black Friday is one of the biggest online shopping days of the year, but workers say that they are treated like robots in the rush to get deliveries out to customers. That is why I joined demonstrators outside the Peterborough Amazon warehouse. Workers have told the GMB that they don't have enough time for toilet breaks, 87% are in pain due to their workload and they are fracturing limbs and being taken away in ambulances. It wasn't just in my constituency – protests happened right across the UK and in Italy, France, Germany and Spain. It's international solidarity.

Of course, when you order a book or headphones or a new laptop online you can't wait for them to arrive but for that to happen safely there needs to be enough well trained, well paid staff.

So my message to Amazon is, please get around the table with the union representing your workers and remember, staff can't be treated as robots.

Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu (S&D). – Doamnă președintă, stimați colegi, în luna septembrie, Guvernul României și Confederația Sindicală Meridian, una dintre cele mai mari confederații sindicale europene, au dat publicității o declarație comună despre necesitatea unei tranziții energetice juste în Valea Jiului și în alte regiuni miniere carbonifere din Uniunea Europeană. Documentul cere Comisiei Europene prelungirea dincolo de data de 31 decembrie 2018 a cadrului legal asigurat privind acordarea ajutoarelor de stat pentru producția de cărbune. Încetarea activităților în minele de cărbune nu se poate face decât cu îndeplinirea strictă a obligațiilor pe care unitățile miniere le au față de salariați și de comunitate, dar și a celor legate de protecția mediului înconjurător. Astfel, pentru a evita o criză majoră în zone precum Valea Jiului, pe multiple planuri, de la cel social la cel ecologic este necesară o prelungire a cadrului juridic numărul 787 din 2010 al Consiliului European. Măsura cerută are avizul Comitetului Economic și Social European și nu intră în contradicție nici cu obiectivul Comisiei Europene.

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Paní předsedající, já bych chtěl upozornit na dlouhodobý závažný problém, který se týká radikálních náboženských vůdců, především z řad islámu. Tito imámové a problém s nimi se vyskytuje v Bruselu, samozřejmě v Německu, ve Francii jsou popsány případy a dnes se objevil, zdá se podle zveřejněných informací, i v ČR. Těch informací je poměrně málo, nicméně indicie naznačují, že tento člověk měl být částečně placen Saúdskou Arábií.

Já si myslím, že takovýto postup je dlouhodobě neakceptovatelný a jsme jeho svědky vlastně právě dlouhodobě. Z tohoto důvodu nevolám po žádném legislativním řešení, protože toto je věc samozřejmě především národních legislativ, ale pokud jde o terorismus a bezpečnost, tak to je věc EU a především diplomatického tlaku, který by měl být učiněn. Možná, že právě v těchto chvílích, teď, je možná nejlepší doba se s touto otázkou vypořádat. Ano, podporujte náboženskou svobodu, samozřejmě i verzi islámu, ale v žádném případě není přípustné v evropském prostoru radikální islám podporovat ze strany Saúdské Arábie.

Andrejs Mamikins (S&D). – Madam President, this year we celebrate the 70th anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. After the terrible Second World War, humanity needed new values and new points of support. For the first time, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights powerfully declared that every person has rights that must be respected by any authority. Its adoption has become a unique embodiment of the great will of people and their leaders.

It's alarming that today such a declaration would hardly have been adopted. Most of the current political leaders would find in it something they didn't like, fail to accept it and start blaming each other. The lessons of the World Wars are forgotten by a new generation. Human rights are no longer popular. For many they cease to be of value, they simply do not comply or are used as a tool against a competitor. Do we need great terror again to come to our senses? Dear colleagues, my answer is yes.

Maria Gabriela Zoană (S&D). – Doamnă președintă, domnule comisar, stimați colegi nu voi vorbi astăzi despre contraargumentele românilor în ceea ce privește raportul MCV și nici despre modul discreționar în care ați votat Rezoluția referitoare la România în contextul în care Jandarmeria franceză a avut un comportament mult mai dur față de protestatari, însă Parlamentul European nu a sancționat această țară, așa cum a sancționat țara mea.

Vă voi vorbi doar despre un sentiment pe care îl trăim noi, românii. Sentimentul poporului român este acela că suntem nedreptățiți de prevederile raportului MCV. Acest sentiment de nedreptate va rămâne multă vreme de acum înainte în sufletul românilor. De ce? Identitatea românească și mândria de a fi român vor atinge apogeul pe 1 decembrie. Peste exact două zile, România celebrează Centenarul Marii Uniri, 100 de ani de la momentul în care am fost recunoscuți ca o singură națiune de către Europa și întreaga lume. În contrast, românii spun că Europa de acum îi nedreptățește. Nu vrea să înțeleagă resorturile acțiunilor interne și nu îi dorește ca parteneri cu drepturi egale în marea familie europeană. Românii vor sărbători Centenarul peste două zile, având în suflet afirmațiile nefondate din cuprinsul raportului MCV. Românii nu vor fi recunoscători familiei europene anul acesta. Vă solicit…

(Președinta a întrerupt vorbitoarea)

Puhemies. – Kohdan käsittely on päättynyt.

30. Tagesordnung der nächsten Sitzung: siehe Protokoll

31. Schluss der Sitzung

(Istunto päättyi klo 23.59.)

Legende der verwendeten Zeichen

*	Konsultationsverfahren
***	Zustimmungsverfahren
***I	Ordentliches Gesetzgebungsverfahren, erste Lesung
***II	Ordentliches Gesetzgebungsverfahren, zweite Lesung
***III	Ordentliches Gesetzgebungsverfahren, dritte Lesung

(Das angegebene Verfahren entspricht der von der Kommission vorgeschlagenen Rechtsgrundlage.)

Abkürzungen der Ausschüsse

AFET	Ausschuss für auswärtige Angelegenheiten
DEVE	Entwicklungsausschuss
INTA	Ausschuss für internationalen Handel
BUDG	Haushaltsausschuss
CONT	Haushaltskontrollausschuss
ECON	Ausschuss für Wirtschaft und Währung
EMPL	Ausschuss für Beschäftigung und soziale Angelegenheiten
ENVI	Ausschuss für Umweltfragen, öffentliche Gesundheit und Lebensmittelsicherheit
ITRE	Ausschuss für Industrie, Forschung und Energie
IMCO	Ausschuss für Binnenmarkt und Verbraucherschutz
TRAN	Ausschuss für Verkehr und Fremdenverkehr
REGI	Ausschuss für regionale Entwicklung
AGRI	Ausschuss für Landwirtschaft und ländliche Entwicklung
PECH	Fischereiausschuss
CULT	Ausschuss für Kultur und Bildung
JURI	Rechtsausschuss
LIBE	Ausschuss für bürgerliche Freiheiten, Justiz und Inneres
AFCO	Ausschuss für konstitutionelle Fragen
FEMM	Ausschuss für die Rechte der Frau und die Gleichstellung der Geschlechter
PETI	Petitionsausschuss

DROI	Unterausschuss Menschenrechte
SEDE	Unterausschuss Sicherheit und Verteidigung

Abkürzungen der Fraktionen

PPE	Fraktion der Europäischen Volkspartei (Christdemokraten)
S&D	Fraktion der Progressiven Allianz der Sozialdemokraten im Europäischen Parlament
ECR	Fraktion der Europäischen Konservativen und Reformer
ALDE	Fraktion der Allianz der Liberalen und Demokraten für Europa
GUE/NGL	Konföderale Fraktion der Vereinigten Europäischen Linken/Nordische Grüne Linke
Verts/ALE	Fraktion der Grünen/Freie Europäische Allianz
EFDD	Fraktion Europa der Freiheit und der direkten Demokratie
ENF	Fraktion Europa der Nationen und der Freiheit
NI	Fraktionslos

Amtsblatt
der Europäischen Union

DE
Reihe C

C/2024/3532

7.6.2024

AUSFÜHRLICHE SITZUNGSBERICHTE VOM 29. NOVEMBER 2018

(C/2024/3532)

EUROPÄISCHES PARLAMENT

SITZUNGSPERIODE 2018-2019

Sitzungen vom 28. und 29. November 2018

BRÜSSEL

Inhalt

Seite

1. Eröffnung der Sitzung 4

2. Der Cum-Ex-Skandal: Finanzkriminalität und die Schlupflöcher im geltenden Rechtsrahmen (eingereichte Entschließungsanträge): siehe Protokoll 4

3. Austritt des Vereinigten Königreichs aus der Europäischen Union (Aussprache) 4

4. Vorbereitung der Regierungskonferenz am 10. und 11. Dezember in Marrakesch zu dem Globalen Pakt für Migration der Vereinten Nationen (Aussprache) 16

5. Situation von Frauen mit Behinderungen (Aussprache) 24

6. Wiederaufnahme der Sitzung 32

7. Begrüßung 32

8. Abstimmungsstunde 33

8.1. Anwendung der Stufe Euro 5 auf die Typgenehmigung von zwei- oder dreirädrigen und vierrädrigen Fahrzeugen (A8-0346/2018 - Daniel Dalton) (Abstimmung) 33

8.2. Handel mit bestimmten Gütern, die zur Vollstreckung der Todesstrafe, zu Folter oder zu anderer grausamer Behandlung oder Strafe verwendet werden könnten (A8-0387/2018 - Lidia Joanna Geringer de Oedenberg) (Abstimmung) 33

8.3. Asyl-, Migrations- und Integrationsfonds: erneute Bindung verbleibender Mittel (A8-0370/2018 - Miriam Dalli) (Abstimmung) 33

8.4. Beitritt Samoas zum Interims-Partnerschaftsabkommen zwischen der EU und den Pazifik-Staaten (A8-0376/2018 - David Martin) (Abstimmung) 33

Inhalt Seite

8.5. Ernennung des Vorsitzenden des Aufsichtsgremiums der Europäischen Zentralbank (A8-0380/2018 - Roberto Gualtieri) (Abstimmung) . . . 33

8.6. Inanspruchnahme des Europäischen Fonds für die Anpassung an die Globalisierung – EGF/2018/003 EL/Attika – Verlagswesen – Griechenland (A8-0377/2018 - Eider Gardiazabal Rubial) (Abstimmung) . . . 34

8.7. Vorübergehende Wiedereinführung von Kontrollen an den Binnengrenzen (A8-0356/2018 - Tanja Fajon) (Abstimmung) . . . 34

8.8. Gemeinsame Vorschriften für die Durchführung von Luftverkehrsdiensten (A8-0150/2018 - Claudia Țapardel) (Abstimmung) . . . 34

8.9. Einwand gemäß Artikel 106 GO: Natriumdichromat (B8-0548/2018) (Abstimmung) . . . 34

8.10. Der Cum-Ex-Skandal: Finanzkriminalität und die Schlupflöcher im geltenden Rechtsrahmen (B8-0518/2018, B8-0519/2018, B8-0520/2018, B8-0521/2018, B8-0525/2018, RC-B8-0551/2018, B8-0551/2018, B8-0552/2018) (Abstimmung) . . . 34

8.11. Rolle des Jugendamts in Deutschland bei grenzüberschreitenden Familienstreitigkeiten (B8-0546/2018) (Abstimmung) . . . 34

8.12. WTO: Wie geht es weiter? (A8-0379/2018 - Bernd Lange, Paul Rübig) (Abstimmung) . . . 34

8.13. Bericht 2018 über Serbien (A8-0331/2018 - David McAllister) (Abstimmung) . . . 34

8.14. Bericht 2018 über das Kosovo (A8-0332/2018 - Igor Šoltes) (Abstimmung) . . . 34

8.15. Bericht 2018 über die ehemalige jugoslawische Republik Mazedonien (A8-0341/2018 - Ivo Vajgl) (Abstimmung) . . . 35

8.16. Bericht 2018 über Albanien (A8-0334/2018 - Knut Fleckenstein) (Abstimmung) . . . 35

8.17. Bericht 2018 über Montenegro (A8-0339/2018 - Charles Tannock) (Abstimmung) . . . 35

8.18. Schutz der akademischen Freiheit im auswärtigen Handeln der EU (A8-0403/2018 - Wajid Khan) (Abstimmung) . . . 35

8.19. Situation von Frauen mit Behinderungen (B8-0547/2018) (Abstimmung) . . . 35

9. Stimmerklärungen . . . 35

9.1. Der Cum-Ex-Skandal: Finanzkriminalität und die Schlupflöcher im geltenden Rechtsrahmen (B8-0518/2018, B8-0519/2018, B8-0520/2018, B8-0521/2018, B8-0525/2018, RC-B8-0551/2018, B8-0551/2018, B8-0552/2018) . . . 35

9.2. Rolle des Jugendamts in Deutschland bei grenzüberschreitenden Familienstreitigkeiten (B8-0546/2018) . . . 36

9.3. WTO: Wie geht es weiter? (A8-0379/2018 - Bernd Lange, Paul Rübig) . . . 38

9.4. Bericht 2018 über Serbien (A8-0331/2018 - David McAllister) . . . 40

9.5. Bericht 2018 über das Kosovo (A8-0332/2018 - Igor Šoltes) . . . 40

Inhalt Seite

9.6. Bericht 2018 über die ehemalige jugoslawische Republik Mazedonien (A8-0341/2018 - Ivo Vajgl) . . . 40

9.7. Bericht 2018 über Albanien (A8-0334/2018 - Knut Fleckenstein) . . . 42

9.8. Bericht 2018 über Montenegro (A8-0339/2018 - Charles Tannock) . . . 42

9.9. Schutz der akademischen Freiheit im auswärtigen Handeln der EU (A8-0403/2018 - Wajid Khan) 43

9.10. Situation von Frauen mit Behinderungen (B8-0547/2018) . . . 44

10. Berichtigungen des Stimmverhaltens und beabsichtigtes Stimmverhalten: siehe Protokoll . . . 45

11. Mittelübertragungen und Haushaltsbeschlüsse: siehe Protokoll . . . 46

12. Vorlage von Dokumenten: siehe Protokoll . . . 46

13. Übermittlung der in dieser Sitzung angenommenen Texte: siehe Protokoll . . . 46

14. Zeitpunkt der nächsten Sitzungen: siehe Protokoll . . . 46

15. Schluss der Sitzung . . . 46

16. Unterbrechung der Sitzungsperiode . . . 46

AUSFÜHRLICHE SITZUNGSBERICHTE VOM 29. NOVEMBER 2018

IN THE CHAIR: MAIREAD McGUINNESS

Vice-President

1. Eröffnung der Sitzung

President. – Good morning. My apologies for the slight delay. I think some people had difficulty with traffic this morning, so thank you for your patience. The sitting is now open.

(The sitting opened at 9.06)

Before we move to the first item on the agenda, there is a point of order from Mr Corbett.

Richard Corbett (S&D). – Madam President, under Rule 162(3) and (6), Parliament has decided that this debate we are about to start on Brexit will only have a round of speakers from the leaders of each of the political groups. That has a consequence, Madam President. There will be three British voices in that debate, each and every one of them from those who support Brexit. Parliament will not hear a single British voice from those who oppose Brexit, which according to the latest opinion polls actually represents the majority view of the British population.

(Applause)

President. – Thank you, Mr Corbett. Your point is noted. It was a decision of the political groups to have this format. I'm in the hands of the decision of the political groups, but I think your point is well taken by the plenary.

2. Der Cum-Ex-Skandal: Finanzkriminalität und die Schlupflöcher im geltenden Rechtsrahmen (eingereichte Entschließungsanträge): siehe Protokoll

3. Austritt des Vereinigten Königreichs aus der Europäischen Union (Aussprache)

President. – The next item is the debate on the Council and Commission statements on the UK's withdrawal from the European Union 2018/2958(RSP)).

Karoline Edtstadler, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Madam President, honourable Members, Chief Negotiator Barnier, ladies and gentlemen, the European Council endorsed the agreement of the withdrawal of the UK from the EU and Euratom. The European Council then invited the Commission, the European Parliament and the Council to take the necessary steps to ensure that the agreement can enter into force on 30 March 2019.

The European Council also approved the political declaration setting out the framework for the future relationship between the EU and the UK. On that occasion, the Union's determination to have as close as possible a partnership with the UK in the future was restated in line with that declaration. This outcome would not have been possible without the commitment and the determination of Mr Barnier and his team, to which the European Council paid tribute. No less important was the sense of unity, shared purpose and responsibility amongst the EU's 27 Member States, as well as amongst the EU institutions.

On this particular occasion, I should like to express my appreciation for the constant involvement and timely contribution of the Brexit Steering Group and, more broadly, the European Parliament. In the coming months we will have to secure the conclusion of the withdrawal agreement. The Council is doing its utmost to adopt its decision on signature in the coming weeks, which should allow the EP to complete its consent procedure in good time, before the end of March 2019.

Michel Barnier, *négociateur en chef sur le Brexit*. – Madame la Présidente, Madame la Secrétaire d'État, Mesdames et Messieurs les députés, bonjour à chacune et chacun d'entre vous. Je vous remercie de me donner l'occasion de m'exprimer au nom de la Commission européenne et vous prie d'excuser le président Jean-Claude Juncker, qui participe en ce moment au sommet du G20.

Madame la Présidente, nous sommes à un moment important et grave, dix-sept mois après le début des négociations, que j'ai eu l'honneur et que j'ai l'honneur de conduire sous l'autorité et avec la confiance du président Jean-Claude Juncker et avec le soutien de toute la Commission européenne.

Dimanche, comme vous l'avez rappelé, Madame la Secrétaire d'État, le Conseil européen a approuvé notre projet d'accord de retrait. Il a approuvé aussi la déclaration politique qui fixe le cadre de notre future relation. À ce stade, je veux de mon côté remercier le Conseil européen, son président, Donald Tusk, toutes ses équipes, mais aussi les présidents successifs avec lesquels j'ai travaillé et bien travaillé, la Présidence autrichienne aujourd'hui, mais aussi la Bulgarie, l'Estonie et Malte. Puis, nous continuerons avec la Roumanie dans les mois qui viennent.

Mesdames et Messieurs, le temps des négociations sur l'accord de retrait et sur la déclaration politique est terminé. C'est maintenant le temps de la ratification par le Parlement britannique, par votre Parlement et par le Conseil.

Compte tenu des circonstances difficiles de cette négociation et de l'extrême complexité de tous les sujets de ce retrait britannique, l'accord qui est sur la table – le projet de retrait ordonné et la déclaration politique – est le seul et le meilleur possible.

Nous avons réussi cette première grande étape ensemble et, du côté européen, grâce à l'unité très forte des vingt-sept États membres et de toutes les institutions entre elles.

En particulier, Madame la Présidente, l'accord de retrait et cette déclaration politique doivent beaucoup à vos quatre résolutions et à la vigilance attentive dont vous avez fait preuve depuis le début de cette négociation, évidemment, pour préserver les droits des citoyens que vous représentez – c'était votre priorité, c'était ma priorité –, pour préserver les intérêts de l'Union européenne, l'intégrité du marché unique et l'indivisibilité des quatre libertés, et l'autonomie de décision de l'Union.

Ces deux documents, nous les avons co-construits ensemble tout au long du processus. Madame la Présidente, à travers vous, je veux aussi remercier le président Tajani et vous me permettrez de dire un mot plus personnel à Guy Verhofstadt, coordinateur de votre assemblée pour le Brexit, et à tous et à chacun des membres du groupe de pilotage sur le Brexit, Danuta Hübner, Elmar Brok, Roberto Gualtieri, Gabriele Zimmer et Philippe Lamberts qui ont suivi avec toutes leurs équipes, que je remercie, les négociations jour après jour au sein de ce groupe de pilotage. Je remercie aussi les présidents de groupe, les présidents de commission et Cécilia Wikström, sachant que nous ne sommes pas au bout d'une longue route qui restera difficile.

L'accord trouvé dimanche est aussi le résultat d'une méthode que nous avons décidée ensemble et avec vous. Nous avons mis les choses dans l'ordre, en commençant – comme c'était logique – par négocier l'accord de retrait, un retrait ordonné, avant de discuter du cadre de notre future relation avec le Royaume-Uni. Nous avons insisté pour régler en amont certaines questions qui étaient et qui sont toujours prioritaires pour votre Parlement, à savoir les droits des citoyens, la paix et la stabilité en Irlande, et le règlement financier. Mesdames et Messieurs, dès le départ, nous avons surtout travaillé en toute transparence, c'est-à-dire en toute confiance, et nous continuerons.

Cette méthode nous a permis d'expliquer les enjeux de chaque sujet, de montrer ce qui était possible et ce qui ne l'était pas compte tenu des principes fondamentaux de notre Union.

Depuis le début, nous avons expliqué comment nous pouvions et devions respecter nos principes et, en même temps, prendre en compte les lignes rouges officiellement indiquées par le Royaume-Uni. Finalement, nous avons trouvé un terrain d'entente. En un mot, le cadre que nous avons posé a donné une stabilité et une prévisibilité à cette négociation. Personne ne peut être objectivement surpris par le contenu de notre accord.

Mesdames et Messieurs, il est peut-être utile de rappeler à ce stade que l'Union européenne n'a pas souhaité le Brexit. À ce jour, personne d'ailleurs n'a été capable de me démontrer la valeur ajoutée du Brexit, mais nous respectons le vote démocratique et souverain des citoyens britanniques et nous avons donc, comme le gouvernement britannique l'a demandé, mis en œuvre ce processus pour une sortie ordonnée. Simplement, les deux documents agréés dimanche permettent de limiter les conséquences négatives du Brexit des deux côtés mais aussi, en particulier, pour les vingt-sept États membres de l'Union.

L'accord de retrait apporte de la sécurité juridique à toutes les personnes, aux entreprises, aux régions inquiètes des conséquences de la décision britannique de quitter l'Union européenne: évidemment, les citoyens européens, 4 millions et demi de personnes qui vivent au Royaume-Uni et les citoyens britanniques établis dans l'un des pays de l'Union; les habitants et les entreprises d'Irlande et d'Irlande du Nord, Madame la Présidente, qui participent à toutes les dimensions humaine, sociale, économique de la coopération Nord-Sud. La solution de dernier recours sur laquelle nous nous sommes mis d'accord pour éviter le retour d'une frontière physique en Irlande tout en protégeant le marché unique fait partie intégrante de l'accord de retrait. Sans cette solution pour l'Irlande, il n'y a pas d'accord de retrait. Les collectivités ensuite, les universités et les entreprises qui portent tant de projets financés par les politiques et les budgets européens, y compris avec les partenaires britanniques, les universités, les laboratoires extrêmement dynamiques au Royaume-Uni. Les agriculteurs qui bénéficient de la politique agricole commune et qui souhaitaient légitimement protéger leurs droits de propriété intellectuelle, et bien plus que cela, à travers les indications géographiques. Et puis, tous ceux dont les données personnelles ont été échangées avec des organismes ou des entreprises basées au Royaume-Uni.

Voilà les personnes et les secteurs pour lesquels nous avions le devoir de remettre de la sécurité là où le Brexit a créé de l'insécurité. C'est l'objet de cet accord de retrait très dense – j'en conviens – parce qu'il s'agit d'un traité juridique, précis et complet.

Quant à la déclaration politique, elle fixe le cadre dans lequel nous allons, dès que possible, négocier notre relation future.

Mesdames et Messieurs les députés, dans cette négociation, l'Union européenne continuera à défendre ses intérêts et à appliquer exactement les mêmes principes.

Dans cette négociation qui va s'ouvrir, l'Union adoptera, tout comme votre négociateur, la même attitude. Il n'y aura jamais et il n'y a jamais eu d'agressivité. Il n'y aura jamais et il n'y a jamais eu d'esprit de revanche. Il n'y aura jamais et il n'y a jamais eu de ma part un quelconque esprit de punition. Nous continuerons à travailler avec le Royaume-Uni, et non pas contre lui, pour bâtir ce partenariat futur et nous continuerons à travailler avec le respect qui est dû à un grand pays qui restera en toute hypothèse notre ami, notre partenaire et notre allié.

La vérité, s'agissant de cette relation future, c'est que, compte tenu de la décision britannique de quitter l'Union européenne et le marché unique, cela ne peut pas être le statu quo à l'avenir. Cela ne peut pas être «*business as usual*» et notre devoir est de le dire, notamment aux entreprises, qui doivent se préparer. Mais notre intérêt mutuel, c'est bien de bâtir un partenariat ambitieux sur les biens, les services, le numérique, la mobilité, les transports, les marchés publics, l'énergie, la sécurité intérieure – évidemment – pour la stabilité de notre continent, la politique étrangère avec ce pays qui restera actif au sein du Conseil de sécurité des Nations unies, la défense et dans bien d'autres domaines.

Plus ce partenariat sera ambitieux, plus nous serons, de notre côté, attentifs et exigeants sur le cadre des conditions de concurrence entre nous. Au total, si nous concrétisons cette déclaration politique dans toutes ces dimensions, permettez-moi de vous dire – et je dis bien si nous concrétisons cette déclaration politique dans toutes ces dimensions –, le partenariat avec le Royaume-Uni sera sans précédent par l'étendue et le nombre des sujets de coopération.

Comme l'a souhaité le président Juncker et comme l'ont souhaité les États membres et votre Parlement, nous nous préparerons et nous serons prêts à lancer cette négociation sur la future relation, une fois le Royaume-Uni devenu pays tiers.

Mais avant cela, Madame la Présidente, il reste évidemment une étape décisive, celle de la ratification de notre accord de retrait. Le temps est maintenant venu pour chacun de prendre ses responsabilités. Les parlementaires britanniques auront dans les semaines qui viennent à se prononcer sur cet accord de retrait et sur le texte de la déclaration politique et ce vote engage l'avenir de leur pays. Nous devons respecter – et je respecterai – ce débat et ce temps de débat parlementaire et démocratique au Royaume-Uni. De notre côté, nous devons laisser ce temps de la ratification au Parlement européen qui a été et qui restera étroitement associé à chacune des étapes de cette négociation, et qui aura le dernier mot.

Mesdames et Messieurs les députés, merci pour votre confiance et votre attention.

Guy Verhofstadt, *(Parliament's Brexit coordinator) on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – Madam President, first of all, I would like to welcome the withdrawal agreement and the political declaration. I think that we can say easily today that both have been built around the principles of the European Union – that means the integrity of the Single Market, that means the four freedoms which underpin that Single Market and that means the ability, the capacity of the European Union to decide in an autonomous way.

But I have to tell you, and I think it's important in these debates, that also two other elements have been taken into account. The first are naturally the positions – maybe I have to say the red lines – of the UK Government following the decision to end the membership of the European Union. Then, a second important point that underpins this agreement or these agreements, and that is something often underplayed and not fully understood, is the 1998 Good Friday Agreement, though the European Union is in fact not a direct party in this. The 1998 Agreement was only possible among EU Member States, between EU Member States, and it shows, in my opinion, that the European Union is about that, about reconciliation, about the end of violence, about peace. The result of all this is the withdrawal agreement, and I think the only and best agreement possible, considering these three elements that I have just described.

In achieving this, I would like to thank, naturally, and congratulate – it's not the first time that I'm doing this – Michel Barnier personally. He has done a tremendous job in close cooperation with the European Parliament and with the Brexit Steering Group, and this also gives me the possibility to congratulate all the members of the Brexit Steering Group for the good cooperation beyond the lines of the political parties. I think that it worked very well.

Now, the result, Michel, is an agreement that, in my opinion, does three things. The first is to minimise the disruption for both sides, in particular for the economy, and to allow for an orderly withdrawal and allow for a timeframe between two and four years to conclude the negotiations on the future relationship. The second result is to avoid a hard border on the island of Ireland, to safeguard the Good Friday Agreement and to secure peace. Then the third thing – and I think this was the first priority of the European Parliament – is to safeguard the rights of all citizens. Here the European Parliament has, with the help and with the support of our negotiators, significantly improved the agreement and the text. Moreover, we are also committed – and I want to tell you this today – to ensuring that, before we start the consent procedure in the European Parliament, we receive from our British counterparts the necessary guarantees that all these citizens' rights will be fully implemented.

I believe that this framework – withdrawal agreement and political declaration – provides for the possibility to establish in the future a really close relationship between the European Union and the United Kingdom and the basis, therefore, as you have seen in the agreement, in the political declaration, is an association agreement, as the European Parliament has proposed from day one. Why an association agreement, on which also the British Government has agreed? Well, it will be applicable, once concluded, in a provisional way after approval at the European level. Secondly, it will be ratified in one round of ratification by the Member States, so as to avoid – if I may say so – the complexity of, for example, our relationship with Switzerland, which is based not on one association agreement, but on a patchwork of agreements.

The Brexit Steering Group, along with the whole European Parliament, will further scrutinise the deal, the withdrawal agreement and the political declaration on the future relationship, as part of the consent procedure.

President. – *(Exclamations by certain members of Parliament)* Colleagues, I am in the Chair, so I will call time, with due respect. Thank you for your guidance, but you will respect the Chair please.

Guy Verhofstadt, *on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – Madam President, Parliament will, in this respect, look very carefully into how the so-called Joint Committee will work. We want to ensure that the decisions that are taken by the Joint Committee are legitimate and, where necessary, also require the approval of the Parliament. I hope that, before we start the consent procedure, we can have an agreement with the Council.

Let's be clear that there will be no winners in this. I think that the departure of the UK from the Union is a failure for everybody – for the UK and for the EU. Last Sunday – we have to tell our colleagues this – was a sad day for both. So let us make the best of it in the knowledge that in the near future there will be a new generation in Britain who will – and I'm pretty sure about this – decide to come back into the great political European family.

(Applause)

Elmar Brok, *im Namen der PPE-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin, Frau Ratspräsidentin, Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Der Brexit ist eine schlechte Angelegenheit, für uns in der Europäischen Union und für Großbritannien – mehr für Großbritannien wegen der unterschiedlichen Größe als für uns, aber auch für uns. Deswegen war der Sonntag, wie Guy Verhofstadt – dem ich für die Zusammenarbeit danke – richtig analysiert hat, ein trauriger Tag. Aber aufgrund der Verhandlungskunst von Michel Barnier und seines Teams, seiner Geduld und seiner Informationspolitik innerhalb der Europäischen Union ist es gelungen, den bestmöglichen Deal herauszuholen.

Ich muss sagen, in Großbritannien ist die Regierung gespalten, die Regierungspartei ist gespalten, die Opposition ist gespalten, das Land ist gespalten. Diese Europäische Union, die angeblich am Ende ist, war einig, mit 27 Ländern, mit Rat, Kommission und Parlament, und auch das Parlament war einig. Diese Europäische Union hat eine große Zukunftschance; das hat sie in diesen Brexit-Verhandlungen bewiesen.

Wir müssen sehen, dass wir diesen Schaden für Großbritannien möglichst gering halten, der etwa durch die Äußerung der Bank of England gestern noch einmal deutlich geworden ist: Es wird in Großbritannien größere Wachstumsverluste durch den Brexit als durch den Finanzschaden von 2008 geben. Das ist die Erklärung der Bank of England von gestern. Da kann Herr Farage, der ja der Redenschreiber von Herrn Trump ist, erklären, was er will, sein Land weiter belügen. Das wird an den Fakten nichts ändern.

Wir müssen sehen, dass dies aber bedeutet – und ich glaube, das Europäische Parlament unterstützt das –, dass es keine weiteren Verhandlungen gibt. Es ist dieser Deal und kein anderer. Es geht nicht noch mal, nicht nach der Methode „noch einmal ablehnen, dann verhandeln wir noch mal, und dann gibt es wieder einen neuen Deal". Dies ist eine Vereinbarung, die steht, die muss man so nehmen, die ist lange verhandelt worden. Und aus diesem Grund muss klar sein, dass der Austrittsvertrag eine Bedingung ist für eine Übergangsregelung. Ich habe den Eindruck, das ist manchen in Großbritannien nicht klar. Wenn der Austrittsvertrag nicht kommt, gibt es keine Übergangsregelung. Der Bruch wird donnerartig sein – für beide Seiten.

Wir müssen sehen, dass mit diesem Vertrag auch deutlich gemacht werden muss, dass es eine schwierige und risikoreiche Angelegenheit der *Remainer* ist, wenn sie jetzt meinen, diesen Vertrag abzulehnen und vielleicht dann noch vor dem 29. März etwas anderes, einschließlich eines Referendums, hinzubekommen. Dies halte ich für ein sehr gefährliches Unterfangen. Man sollte aus Sicherheitsgründen, damit der Schaden gering bleibt, diesen Deal nehmen. Deshalb appelliere ich an beide Seiten in Großbritannien in diesem Spiel.

Wir haben festgestellt, dass damit die Übergangsregelung durch diesen Vertrag kommt , dass die Rechte der Bürger gewährleistet sind, die sich von beiden Seiten auf den Bestand der Europäischen Union verlassen haben in ihrer persönlichen Lebensplanung, dass es keine harte Grenze mit katastrophalen menschlichen und ökonomischen Konsequenzen zwischen Nordirland und der Republik Irland geben wird, und dass wir dabei einen Backstop vereinbart haben, der, solange die Übergangsperiode läuft, überhaupt nicht in Kraft tritt, und dass wir dann eine Verhandlung durchführen über den zukünftigen Vertrag, ohne dass er in Kraft tritt. Ziel des Backstops ist es, dass er nicht in Kraft tritt. Das muss deutlich sein, und deswegen darf dieses nicht missbraucht werden, auch nicht in den Diskussionen in Großbritannien.

Ich meine, dass wir die zukünftigen Beziehungen im gemeinsamen Interesse – ich wiederhole mich –, um den Schaden gering zu halten, mit großem konstruktivem Bewusstsein für eine Lösung führen müssen. Großbritannien will keine Zollunion, weil sie eigene Handelsverträge machen wollen. Sie wollen nicht Mitglied des Binnenmarkts sein, weil sie die vier Freiheiten nicht erfüllen wollen. Aber alles, was danach möglich ist, sollten wir möglich machen. Und deswegen sollten wir einen Freihandelsvertrag machen, der sehr weitgehend ist. Theresa May hatte Recht, als sie im Frühjahr sagte: Je mehr wir in unseren Standards ähnlich sind, je mehr *level playing field* wir haben, desto mehr Marktzugang gibt es. Das sollte man in dem Zusammenhang sehen, um auf die Art und Weise den Schaden möglichst gering zu halten.

Wir sollten aber deutlich machen, dass dieses Partnerschaftsabkommen, das ja vom Europäischen Parlament initiiert worden ist, das jetzt in der Vereinbarung drinsteht – wir haben es noch Assoziierungsabkommen genannt –, dass das diesen Handelsvertrag weitgehend beinhalten soll, aber auch Fragen der inneren und äußeren Sicherheit. Es ist im beiderseitigen Interesse, dass wir Vereinbarungen treffen im Kampf gegen den Terrorismus, dass wir eine Beteiligung Großbritanniens in einem bestimmten möglichen Sinne auch bei der Gemeinsamen Sicherheits- und Verteidigungspolitik haben. Beide Seiten wollen dies. Dafür setzt dieser Austrittsvertrag die entsprechenden Rahmenbedingungen, um das in einem weiteren Vertrag zu verhandeln, um die Sicherheit unserer Völker sicherzustellen. Das gilt auch für andere Bereiche wie Forschung, wenn ich die Situation der englischen Universitäten sehe und wie sehr sie im Forschungsprogramm sein wollen.

Lassen Sie mich eine letzte Bemerkung machen: Herr Farage schreibt Herrn Trumps Reden, und Herr Trump hat vorgestern gesagt, er würde nicht einmal dieses *Withdrawal Agreement* machen, weil er so mit Großbritannien nicht verhandeln will. Herr Trump möchte, dass alle europäischen Länder geteilt, vereinzelt werden, damit er sie sich einzeln vornehmen kann, einzeln in die Breschen schlagen kann und sie fertigmachen kann. Diese Trump-Rede ist die beste Begründung, dass wir in Zukunft eine Europäische Union brauchen, damit sich unsere Völker gemeinsam gegen die Trumps und Putins und Xis. verteidigen können. Das werden wir uns auch durch Herrn Farages Reden, die er für Herrn Trump schreibt, nicht zerstören lassen.

Roberto Gualtieri, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Madam President, after long and difficult negotiations, the agreement reached on Sunday sets the basis for an orderly withdrawal of the United Kingdom from the European Union, and we are ready to ratify it.

On behalf of the S&D Group, I would like to thank Michel Barnier for the outstanding work he and his team have done in dealing with this historic challenge. At the same time, I cannot hide my profound sadness about the UK's choice to leave the Union. Our Group respects this decision, but we deeply regret it. We consider it an historic mistake. In our eyes, it will always be a lose-lose situation.

Despite the disappointment and the frustration, the EU – and all of us – have acted, since the very beginning of the process, with responsibility and respect. We have worked tirelessly for more than two years to protect those most affected by the decision and to alleviate its worst possible consequences. This was achieved thanks to the guidance of our lead negotiators and thanks to the unity within, and between, the EU institutions. I would also like to thank Guy Verhofstadt and all the members of the Brexit Steering Group. We have been – and we shall be – always united.

The EU has been responsible towards the UK by providing the basis to deliver an orderly withdrawal without any feelings of revenge or resentment. We have also been responsible towards ourselves and our citizens not to endanger the European project and the integrity of our Union. This sense of responsibility shall continue to guide us going forward.

One thing must be clear, though. There is no alternative deal to the one agreed on Sunday. Considering the United Kingdom's red lines, this is the best, and the only possible, agreement. It is a deal that protects citizens' rights, safeguards the integrity of the single market and the customs union and, crucially, prevents a hard border on the island of Ireland, respecting the Good Friday Agreement in all its parts.

We know that on citizens' rights, which have been our priority from the start, our work is far from being finished and we will remain vigilant with respect to the implementation of this part of the agreement. We will never allow EU citizens to fall victim to the same disgraceful hostile-environment policies that saw members of the Windrush generation wrongly deported.

The political declaration accompanying the withdrawal agreement establishes the framework and basis for an ambitious, broad and deep partnership. This unprecedented partnership, which should take the form of an association agreement, shall fully respect the integrity of the single market and the autonomy of our legal order. We also welcome all the interpretative declarations adopted by the Council and consider them legally binding, including with regard to Gibraltar. On the future relationship, the UK has made its red lines clear throughout the process – just as we have – and we respect this.

In the negotiations we have shown a high degree of flexibility and we have stretched the deal as much as we could in order to take into account the position and the constraints of the United Kingdom. We have always said – and we repeat it now – that if the UK changes its mind our arms are, and will remain, open. But insofar as you want to leave the single market and no longer apply the principle of free movement of persons, this is the only possible way to leave the European Union in an orderly manner, avoiding the severe disruption of a no-deal scenario. There is no other deal that could respect such limits without compromising or endangering our European project. This Parliament is the very symbol of our common project and of the links between countries and people. This is why we will continue to play a responsible and proactive role in safeguarding the integrity of the Union and ensuring a positive future relationship with the United Kingdom.

(Applause)

Geoffrey Van Orden, *on behalf of the ECR Group*. – Madam President, *(inaudible)* … lot of experts on domestic British policy these days. Look, Brexit was always about much more than the economy. In a way, because the European Union strayed so far into many other areas, into our national lives, it is why the British people voted for Brexit. They were increasingly unhappy with this tendency. You say you didn't want Brexit, but you did nothing to avoid it.

But of course the economic aspects are central. A bad deal for Britain or no deal will have repercussions in many European countries as well as Britain. Much time seems to be spent here on predicting events in London and the consequences of Brexit for Britain. Perhaps we should look at the impact of a bad deal or a sour relationship on the European Union. Certainly, the British government entered into negotiations in a spirit of goodwill, aiming for a positive future partnership. There's been astonishment in Britain over the legalistic inflexibility that has been shown quite often. But we all know that the EU will bend or break any of its own rules when it suits it, and instead of defending the long-term interests of EU countries, it seems to have chosen to pursue a narrow ideological course defending a particular view of the EU project, which is increasingly repudiated by citizens across Europe; it may appeal to the leaders of a couple of the larger countries in the European Union. Instead of listening to citizens, your answer to everything is just more Europe. And by the way, I think a lot of people have been very cross in Britain about the discourteous way in which our Prime Minister seems often to have been treated.

Because of your insistence on a bizarre sequencing arrangement, you've wasted two years when you could already have made progress on a free trade agreement. All other issues would then have fallen into place – it wasn't necessary to do it in the way you did. This makes it all the more important to move quickly into negotiating our future relationship and reaching rapid but correct conclusions, but we need some reassurance and flexibility – indeed, guarantees – from the EU over concerns that have been expressed. We need an atmosphere of trust and goodwill from your side if we are to have that future positive, stable relationship that is surely the least that all our citizens demand.

(Applause)

Philippe Lamberts, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Madam President, dear colleagues, at the EU Council last Sunday, many asked me if I felt sad. Actually rather than sadness, I felt gratitude first to Michel Barnier and his outstanding team. Not only did they negotiate the agreement, keeping in mind the common interests of the EU without ever losing their nerve, they did so – and that is one of Michel's defining qualities – involving the Council and Parliament on an equal footing, keeping the EU team together in more than one way. Of course, this agreement is not perfect; as far as we Greens/EFA are concerned, we would have liked to see something more than non-regression clauses on social and environmental matters as a condition for the UK staying in the customs union, and the political declaration should, again, have been more explicit about conditioning our future relationship on the UK not becoming a tax haven or a money laundering country. The countdown has to be tough on these issues as we move forward.

I also felt relieved: relieved that, after 18 months of very hard work, an agreement could be found. Had that not been the case, the worst-case scenario of the UK crashing out of the European Union would have become the likeliest, causing major damage not just to business but above all to people. Relief that the EU could reach this agreement with the UK without compromising on its integrity. Relief that the British government had finally come to terms with reality.

The ball is now clearly in the UK's court. The Prime Minister has come to terms with reality, but it remains to be seen whether she will find a majority supporting the deal in the House of Commons.

To the dissatisfied Brexiteers I will say this: if a negotiated Brexit is what you want and unless you would also consider keeping the country inside the single market, no other deal is available. Whoever negotiates on behalf of the UK will face the same legal constraints as Theresa May did, and I hope no one of you is seriously considering leaving without an agreement. Because if the UK did that, it would be in breach of the Good Friday Agreement, because at once a border would be re-erected in Ireland. It would also be in breach of its financial commitments taken under the EU Treaties during its membership period, because leaving a club, my friends, does not free you from paying your outstanding debt.

In other terms, crash Brexit would make the UK a rogue state, a country whose signature with any other partner would amount to just nothing. The real choice, therefore, is only between Brexit under the terms negotiated, and No Brexit at all.

That choice will have such an impact on the future of the country that as a Democrat I would find it normal that we would ask the people, especially as the major parties seem to be very divided on the issue.

(Applause)

I will agree with remainers that your country finds itself in a less enviable position now than it was as a Member State, because indeed, European Union is a boost to sovereignty. In this world, if we want to have impact, we need to act together. And I think many British citizens realise that.

Are they a majority? We don't know. Can we find a way to ask them? If there is one, it is very narrow.

(Applause)

But I'm certain, though, that if the UK wants to renounce its intention to leave, we should embrace it back with pleasure. Equally – and that is my final word, Madam President – I think it would be a utterly, utterly irresponsible to end up with the UK crashing out of the European Union, either voluntarily or inadvertently.

(Applause)

Gabriele Zimmer, *im Namen der GUE/NGL-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin! Der Rat hat in seiner Sitzung am vergangenen Wochenende dem Scheidungsabkommen, das zwischen EU und UK ausgehandelt wurde, zugestimmt. Und trotzdem kann in diesem Moment niemand sagen, ob damit ein geregelter Brexit wahrscheinlicher wird. Es ist deshalb richtig, sich seitens der EU und der Mitgliedstaaten auf den schlimmsten Fall vorzubereiten: auf eine *No-Deal-Situation*.

Unsere Mitwirkung als Fraktion in der Brexit Steering Group und auch die Mitarbeit an der allerersten Entschließung des Parlaments vom vergangenen Jahr – April 2017 — war nicht von vorneherein selbstverständlich. Die Entscheidung, dass wir diese Plattform mittragen, dass wir als linke Fraktion in die Arbeit der Brexit Steering Group einsteigen, war richtig. Und ich möchte in diesem Zusammenhang auch sagen, dass die Kooperation mit Michel Barnier Maßstäbe gesetzt hat für die künftige Kooperation zwischen den Institutionen in der Europäischen Union.

Schon jetzt aber muss auch klar gesagt werden: Das Scheidungsabkommen lässt uns nicht jubeln. Wir sind besorgt, dass gerade bei den Bürgerrechten und in Bezug auf Nordirland eine Reihe unserer Forderungen nicht so verankert sind, dass sie tatsächlich ausreichend Rechtssicherheit für die vom Brexit Betroffenen schaffen könnten. Was im *Withdrawal Agreement* nicht wasserdicht ist, kann auch durch Absichtserklärungen nicht behoben werden. Wir atmen auf, weil im *Withdrawal Agreement*, also im Rückzugsabkommen, im Scheidungsabkommen, der Backstop, die Notfalllösung, vereinbart wurde, um damit ein Horrorszenario in Irland zu vermeiden. Dennoch leistet der Backstop nicht, was noch im *Joined Report* vom Dezember letzten Jahres versprochen wurde: Die Grenze, die Irland teilt, wird härter werden, die grenzüberschreitende Wirtschaft wird beeinträchtigt, Rechte, die im *Good Friday Agreement* verankert sind, werden minimiert.

Uns macht ebenfalls besorgt, wie sich Theresa May um die Stimmen von Zweiflern, Kritikern aus ihrem Lager für das *Withdrawal Agreement*, das Scheidungsabkommen, bemüht. Sie versichert ihnen nunmehr, das *jumping* von Migranten aus den EU-Mitgliedstaaten nach Großbritannien zu stoppen. Offenbar hat die britische Regierung – und mit ihr nicht nur die Regierung, sondern auch einige der Kollegen, die hier drüben sitzen – bis heute nicht begriffen, worin das Wesen der *European citizenship* besteht. Sie vergessen, dass sie auch ihren eigenen Bürgern Rechte entziehen, und sie erwecken den begründeten Verdacht, dass EU-Bürger, die nach dem Brexit in Großbritannien leben, arbeiten, studieren wollen, gegenüber Menschen aus anderen Ländern der Welt benachteiligt und diskriminiert werden könnten.

Am Wochenende versicherten die Regierungschefs – auch das wurde hier heute mehrfach angesprochen –, dass auch nach der Trennung Großbritannien und die EU eine möglichst enge Partnerschaft betreiben wollen. Das unterstützen wir. Wenn dies aber nicht nur leere Worte sein sollen, liegt noch viel Arbeit auf beiden Seiten vor uns. Als Europäisches Parlament sollten wir uns deshalb – hier stimme ich Guy Verhofstadt voll und ganz zu – weiterhin vor allem den Interessen der Bürger und Bürgerinnen in Großbritannien, aber auch innerhalb der Europäischen Union verpflichtet fühlen. Wir fühlen uns auch den Interessen der UK-Bürger innerhalb der EU verpflichtet. Das möchte ich auch noch mal sehr deutlich sagen. Das werden wir auch weiterhin in den Vordergrund stellen, genauso wie die Frage Nordirlands.

Nigel Farage, *on behalf of the EFDD Group*. – Madam President, I'm in no doubt that this withdrawal agreement is a good deal. It's a good deal because it involves large transfers of money. It's a good deal because it maintains free movement of people. It's a good deal because it keeps Britain in the customs union and stuck with the EU's rulebook. And crucially, the key point, as Mr Barnier said this morning: there is the backstop, which means of course the United Kingdom can be held effectively as a hostage for many years to come.

It's a good deal for the European Union; for the UK, I think it's probably the worst deal in history. Something, Mr Brok, that President Trump has noticed – and, by the way, he is a great respecter of the great nation states of Europe, and certainly no enemy of any single one of them. No, Mr Barnier, I have to say I wish you were on our side really, because it's game, set and match to you. You probably can't even believe your luck that you came up against a British Prime Minister who met every single demand of yours whilst at the same time trying to deceive the British public, and you took it to the big summit on Sunday, and in 38 minutes it was all agreed, done and dusted, and off to lunch.

Well, I have to say, we will be leaving on 29 March next year, but any illusion at home that we're going to be an independent country, I'm afraid, has been shattered. And before the ink was even dry last Sunday, President Macron of France stood up and decided to start to threaten us. Now, I understand the French do catch 90% of the haddock in the west of the English Channel and we get 10; I understand their interests. But I fear that we're very much now open and at your mercy over the course of the next few years, and the truth of it is, in the political declaration, you haven't got to give us anything. You don't need to give us a thing, and that is why this is going to fail in Parliament, and probably fail by a very big margin.

Now, Mr Barnier, you say this is the only possible deal. But this deal isn't going to be accepted. So perhaps we all need to grow up and recognise that there is a strong chance now of the UK leaving on 29 March with a WTO no deal. We need a negotiated deal, to deal with sensible border issues. I wonder, Mr Barnier, are you prepared for that? Because you seemed this morning to assume that the British Parliament is going to ratify this. It isn't.

(Applause from certain quarters)

Gilles Lebreton, *au nom du groupe ENF*. – Madame la Présidente, le peuple britannique a décidé il y a deux ans de quitter l'Union européenne. Il faut respecter sa décision souveraine.

Pour le groupe Europe des nations et des libertés, que je représente aujourd'hui, le respect de la souveraineté de chaque nation est un principe fondamental. Il est choquant, à cet égard, qu'une demande de remise en cause du Brexit ait été déposée devant la Cour de justice de l'Union, qui statuera le 4 décembre. J'estime, en effet, qu'aucun tribunal n'est compétent pour remettre en cause les effets d'un référendum. En France, le Conseil constitutionnel l'a compris et refuse de contrôler les référendums. Je souhaite vivement que la Cour de justice de l'Union adopte la même position. Si elle venait à interpréter l'article 50 du traité sur l'Union européenne dans un sens défavorable au Brexit, il faudrait lui résister. La souveraineté n'est pas un ensemble de compétences qu'on peut ligoter par des traités ou abandonner à la subjectivité des juges. C'est un pouvoir métajuridique qui permet à chaque nation de décider librement de son destin.

Vive le peuple britannique. Vive le Brexit.

James Carver (NI). – Madam President, last week Angela Merkel said, and I quote, 'what's been important to us it that the UK cannot decide unilaterally when the customs union ends but rather has to define that timeframe jointly with the EU.'

The European institutions took control in 1973 and, ironically, continue that control through this 2018 Brexit betrayal deal. This deal means that we remain a nation of supplicants. We've lost the freedom teasingly dangled before us through the 2016 referendum results, when a British establishment and political class were rudely reminded that the British people want to take back their sovereign control.

Ataturk's wise words now seem more appropriate than ever when he said 'sovereignty is not given, it is taken'. This is a terrible deal: bad because the EU continues to hold my country over a barrel and the British politicians who sign up to it need to understand that history will be their judge, and believe you me it will judge them all very badly.

Madam President, a number of friendly pro-European colleagues within this Parliament have openly admitted to me that they cannot believe their luck in how bad a deal this is for the UK, and it surely cannot be allowed to proceed on such a one-sided basis.

(Applause from some quarters)

Michel Barnier, *négociateur en chef sur le Brexit*. – Madame la Présidente, merci à ceux qui se sont exprimés, en particulier Guy Verhofstadt, Elmar Brok, Roberto Gualtieri, Philippe Lamberts et Gabriele Zimmer pour dire, au nom de leur groupe, leur appréciation sur le travail que nous avons fait. J'y suis sensible. C'est un travail vraiment collectif. Cela n'a pas été un travail solitaire ou personnel, c'est un travail collectif. J'étais heureux d'y participer parce que je connais cette assemblée – j'y ai été élu à un certain moment –, je connais aussi le Conseil européen et évidemment la Commission, et il me paraissait très important de travailler comme un ouvrier – j'espère qualifié – à cette unité entre les Vingt-sept et entre les institutions. L'appréciation porte sur le travail de mon équipe, la task force 50, et je la transmettrai évidemment à mon adjointe, Sabine Weyand, à Stéphanie Riso et à toute l'équipe qui a mérité cette appréciation et qui la recevra comme un encouragement.

Cependant, nous sommes dans un moment grave et triste, comme vous l'avez dit les uns et les autres. Aussi, je dis à Monsieur Farage et à d'autres que je n'ai pas envie de faire des polémiques. Je n'en ai jamais fait et je ne vais pas commencer aujourd'hui. Nous écoutons tout le monde, nous répondons à tout le monde, nous dialoguons avec tout le monde et nous continuerons. Il reste, comme l'a dit Gabriele Zimmer, le moment de la ratification et, dans les mois qui viennent, il faut préparer la future négociation dont nous avons besoin, sur d'autres bases juridiques d'ailleurs, pour le partenariat avec le Royaume-Uni. Nous devons être vigilants, comme Guy Verhofstadt l'a rappelé, aussi sur la mise en œuvre de ce qui est dans ce traité, notamment sur les droits des citoyens et les garanties qui doivent être confirmées et concrétisées pour que les procédures pour les citoyens européens au Royaume-Uni soient peu coûteuses et les plus simples possibles. Par conséquent, il faut de la vigilance et de la détermination.

Ce vote, qui est attendu de part et d'autre, engage l'avenir de l'Union. Il engage l'avenir du Royaume-Uni. Je le dis avec le respect évoqué tout à l'heure pour le temps du débat démocratique au Royaume-Uni, que nous respectons. Le Royaume-Uni, par sa culture, par son histoire, par sa solidarité, en particulier dans les grands moments tragiques que l'Europe a traversés au XXe siècle, sa solidarité totale, par son économie, par la qualité de sa diplomatie, est un très grand pays. J'ai pour ce pays définitivement du respect et c'est pourquoi je souhaite que le plus tôt possible nous puissions travailler à un vrai partenariat sans précédent par l'étendue des sujets de coopération pour consolider notre alliance au-delà de ce que nous faisons déjà pour beaucoup de pays dans l'Alliance atlantique évidemment ou bilatéralement pour renforcer notre partenariat dans un autre cadre et pour consolider notre amitié aussi.

Monsieur Farage, dans cette négociation, on m'a parfois demandé si l'Union allait faire des concessions. Non, il n'a jamais été question dans mon esprit qu'il y ait un gagnant ou un perdant. Le Brexit, c'est «*lose-lose*». Il n'y a pas de valeur ajoutée. Par conséquent, il s'agit de tenir compte de votre décision souveraine – je dis bien souveraine, Monsieur Lebreton. Nous respectons cette décision souveraine d'une majorité de citoyens britanniques et nous la mettons en œuvre selon les indications, les demandes et les lignes rouges exprimées par le gouvernement de Londres.

J'ai travaillé tout au long de cette année et demie avec le gouvernement de Theresa May et selon ce qu'elle disait accepter ou ne pas accepter. Comment voulez-vous que je fasse autrement? Nous avons négocié avec le gouvernement de Londres, qui a exprimé la volonté de quitter l'Union européenne à la suite du référendum, ensuite de quitter le marché unique, parce que vous ne voulez plus respecter le cadre réglementaire, parce que vous ne voulez plus respecter la liberté de circulation des personnes, parce que vous ne voulez plus reconnaître le rôle de la Cour de justice et que vous ne voulez plus payer. De plus, vous quittez l'union douanière parce que vous ne voulez plus être dans une politique commune de commerce. Voilà les lignes rouges qui sont les vôtres et nous les respectons. Mais vous devez respecter notre détermination à préserver les fondations de l'Union européenne et notamment ce marché unique. J'ai eu l'honneur d'en être le commissaire pendant cinq ans. Ce marché unique, il doit beaucoup au Royaume-Uni. Vous avez eu un très grand degré d'influence dans sa construction et dans son évolution, mais vous le quittez parce que vous ne voulez plus respecter ces quatre libertés qui sont indivisibles. Je veux dire avec beaucoup de respect à Geoffrey van Orden:

It's not inflexibility, it's not inflexibility; it is just responsibility. We have a duty, a responsibility, to work for an orderly withdrawal, to create security and stability where Brexit creates insecurity. It's only an orderly withdrawal which creates a basis of trust for the deep and ambitious partnership we all want.

Voilà ce que je voulais dire. Cette négociation est une négociation parce que vous quittez l'Union européenne. Vous avez décidé de quitter l'Union européenne et nous le regrettons. C'est une négociation évidemment négative, sans valeur ajoutée. Voilà pourquoi nous avons ce sentiment de gravité, ce qui n'interdit pas la lucidité de notre côté aussi pour tirer les leçons de ce Brexit. Il y a, comme l'ont dit Guy Verhofstadt et Elmar Brok, des leçons à tirer pour nous-mêmes, à savoir comprendre les raisons de ce vote et, le cas échéant, changer un certain nombre de choses qui devraient l'être pour répondre mieux aux préoccupations, aux demandes et parfois aux angoisses des citoyens.

Voilà, nous avons travaillé à cette unité qu'ont voulue les dirigeants européens dans le contexte géopolitique très grave dans lequel nous sommes. À l'ouest, à l'est, au sud, on voit bien que nous sommes interpellés de tous côtés et nous avons travaillé avec cette unité entre les vingt-sept États membres et entre les institutions.

Ce que je peux simplement formuler comme vœu à ce stade de ce processus qui n'est pas terminé, car la route est longue et est encore très escarpée – nous attendons le vote du 11 décembre et le processus de ratification du côté britannique sur cet accord qui est le seul et le meilleur possible –, je souhaite simplement et humblement que cette unité que nous avons forgée ensemble dans cette négociation négative, les dirigeants européens dont vous faites partie décident de la mettre au service d'un agenda positif.

President. – Thank you, Mr Barnier, and could I thank you on behalf of the Parliament and President Tajani for your work with Parliament on this issue, your transparency and, above all else, your patience.

If I may say on a personal note, the word 'rubbish' has been bandied about. Mr Coburn, you use it frequently. It is not the view of the majority of this House.

The debate is closed.

Written statements (Rule 162)

Barbara Kappel (ENF), *schriftlich*. – Die EU-Mitgliedstaaten stimmten letzte Woche dem Austrittsabkommen und der politischen Erklärung zu den künftigen Beziehungen zwischen der EU und Großbritannien zu. Dieser sogenannte „Brexit-Deal" muss noch im Dezember vom britischen Parlament genehmigt werden. Ziel ist es, auch weiterhin eine erfolgreiche wirtschaftliche und politische Zusammenarbeit zwischen der EU und Großbritannien zu gewährleisten.

Die Bank of England und das britische Finanzministerium haben nun im Vorfeld der Parlamentsdebatte im britischen Unterhaus Studien veröffentlicht, in denen aufgezeigt wird, dass ein No-Deal-Szenario eine tiefe und schädliche Rezession im Vereinigten Königreich auslösen könnte. Ein No-Deal-Brexit würde die britische Wirtschaft in einen heftigen Angebotsschock versetzen, der dazu führte, dass die Nachfrage nach Gütern und Dienstleistungen das Angebot übersteigt, was die Inflationsrate erhöhen würde. Das britische Bruttoinlandsprodukt könnte im nächsten Jahr um bis zu 8 % sinken, die Arbeitslosenquote von derzeit 4,1 % auf 7,5 % ansteigen, während die Zinssätze bei einer Inflation von 6,5 % ebenfalls ansteigen würden.

Der zwischen der EU und Premierministerin May ausverhandelte Brexit-Deal hilft, dieses Szenario zu vermeiden, weiterhin enge Handelsbeziehungen zu unterhalten und in den nächsten fünf Jahren ein BIP-Wachstum von 1,75 % zu erreichen. Auf diese Weise blieben sowohl das Ergebnis des demokratischen Referendums als auch die wirtschaftlichen Interessen gewahrt.

Светослав Христов Малинов (PPE), *в писмена форма*. – Днес Мишел Барние докладва за напредъка по оттеглянето на Обединеното кралство. Споразумението за Брекзит предстои да бъде одобрено от Британския парламент. Пред очите ни евродепутатите от Великобритания се скараха. Очевидно разделението в страната е станало още по-дълбоко. Анализите на британския бизнес показват негативни тенденции за британската икономика. Няма добър сценарий! Най-малко лошият е Британският парламент да одобри споразумението. На 11 декември ще бъде гласуването, но ако трябва да сме откровени, на този етап няма мнозинство, за да бъде прието. В такъв случай се пораждат много рискове за бизнеса и най-вече за гражданите, включително за българите, които са там. Ще си позволя един практичен съвет към тях. Ако споразумението не бъде прието от Британския парламент, най-вероятният сценарий е Обединеното кралство да напусне без сделка. Не разчитайте на идеите за втори референдум или за предсрочни избори. На практика това означава, че ще бъде изключително трудно, макар и не невъзможно, за част от хората, които нямат пълната документация, да докажат своите права и да поискат право на уседналост. Затова моят съвет е още отсега да започнете да събирате документи си за легално пребиваване, работа, доходи, платени университетски такси, наеми за жилище и здравни осигуровки. Така ще сте подготвени и за най-лошия сценарий.

Alfred Sant (S&D), *in writing*. — On the one hand, it is clear that the Brexit deal just signed is the only one possible in the circumstances. On the other hand it is equally clear that while the EU has safeguarded all its imperatives, the UK has retreated along all lines of engagement. In part this was because for various reasons, its negotiating positions and strategies were not so coherent. However the EU should be wary of driving its negotiating advantages as of now, to the extreme. This might lead to very serious unintended and unforeseeable consequences. In any agreement, a party that goes away with the feeling it has been given a raw deal, will later be tempted or driven to exact some form of compensation or retribution. Witness the Versailles treaty, or the Russian position over recent years in reaction to how post-Soviet arrangements in Europe were played out. Secondly, should there be any other EU government wishing to exit, it will have learnt the lesson of not doing it the British way under article 50 procedures. It could for instance first do its best to cause havoc from the inside in order to leverage and strengthen its position during exit negotiations.

Ivan Štefanec (PPE), *písomne*. – Rokovania o brexite ukázali, že Európska únia dokáže spolupracovať aj na tej najvyššej úrovni rýchlo a efektívne. Európska rada schválila dohodu o odchode Spojeného Kráľovstva z Európskej únie a vydala vyhlásenie, v ktorom stanovuje rámec pre budúce vzťahy medzi Európskou úniou a Spojeným kráľovstvom. Naším cieľom je zachovať čo najužšie partnerstvo so Spojeným kráľovstvom aj v budúcnosti. Uvedomujeme si, že brexit nie je v konečnom dôsledku výhodný ani pre jednu stranu. Spojené kráľovstvo odmieta colnú úniu, pretože chce mať vlastné obchodné dohody a už nechce byť ani súčasťou spoločného jednotného trhu, pretože nechce zachovať princíp štyroch slobôd. Aj napriek tomu nesmieme zabúdať, že existuje mnoho sfér, v ktorých je naša spolupráca nevyhnutná pre obe strany. Takými oblasťami sú napríklad bezpečnosť, obchod alebo veda a výskum. V dobe, keď si Rusko viditeľne posilňuje svoj vplyv v krajinách bývalého Sovietskeho zväzu, je spolupráca so Spojeným kráľovstvom práve v oblasti bezpečnosti pre našu budúcnosť kľúčová.

Henna Virkkunen (PPE), *kirjallinen*. – On harmillista, että vuoden 2016 Brexit-äänestys perustui pääosin puutteelliselle ja väärälle tiedolle sekä täysin katteettomille lupauksille, joita brittihallitus ei käytännössä pysty lunastamaan.

Britannian lähestyvä EU-ero on suuri tragedia, joka voitaisiin vielä välttää. Sinänsä nyt neuvoteltu erosopimus vastaa niitä vähimmäisehtoja, joita EU-parlamentti sille asetti. Erosopimus turvaa Britanniassa asuvien EU-kansalaisten oikeudet, vahvistaa Britannian tulevat maksuvelvoitteet EU:lle sekä välttää kovan rajan syntymisen Irlannin ja Pohjois-Irlannin välille. Silti on selvää, että sekä Britannia että EU tulevat kärsimään Brexitistä. Tällä sopimuksella pyritään lähinnä pienentämään erosta syntyviä vahinkoja. On myös aivan selvää, ettei Britannia voi EU:n ulkopuolella saada parempia etuuksia kuin jäsenmaat. Alustavien päälinjojen mukaan Britannia haluaisi kuitenkin olla mukana lähes kaikessa EU-toiminnassa myös jatkossa. Tämä herättää kysymyksen siitä, miksi Britannia ylipäänsä haluaa erota?

Nyt neuvoteltu erosopimus siirtymäaikoineen on toiseksi paras vaihtoehto, mihin voimme päästä. Paras ratkaisu olisi, jos Britannia päättäisi perua eronsa. Se olisi vielä täysin mahdollista. Oikein ja kohtuullista olisi, että Britannian kansa saisi ainakin mahdollisuuden äänestää uudelleen erosta nyt, kun tiedossa on, mitä ero käytännössä merkitsee. Tämä luonnollisesti on nyt täysin brittien käsissä.

VORSITZ: RAINER WIELAND

Vizepräsident

4. Vorbereitung der Regierungskonferenz am 10. und 11. Dezember in Marrakesch zu dem Globalen Pakt für Migration der Vereinten Nationen (Aussprache)

Der Präsident. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über die Erklärungen des Rates und der Kommission zur Vorbereitung der Regierungskonferenz am 10. und 11. Dezember in Marrakesch zu dem Globalen Pakt für Migration der Vereinten Nationen (2018/2959(RSP)).

Karoline Edtstadler, *President-in-Office of the Council.* – Mr President, honourable Members, High Representative, ladies and gentlemen, thank you for this opportunity to discuss the issue again after the debate we had in Strasbourg earlier this month. I'm aware that the delegation from Parliament will be present in Marrakech and that you attach great importance to this conference where the Global Compact of safe, orderly and regular migration is due to be politically endorsed.

Since the first draft of the Global Compact was put on the table, Member States engaged in intensive discussions on this document in the Council, both during the Bulgarian and the Austrian Presidency. They also actively engaged in the discussions in New York. Indeed, since the adoption of the New York declaration for refugees and migrants in September 2016, the EU has actively engaged in providing input at the various stages of preparation of the first draft of the Global Compact.

As you are aware the Council does not have a common position on this text. Member States have decided or are in the process of deciding their national position on the Global Compact. The political endorsement of the Global Compact in the intergovernmental conference in Marrakech followed by the adoption of this document by the UN General Assembly will open the way for the implementation phase.

To conclude, I would recall that cooperation with third countries and regions remains a crucial element of the EU's migration policy. The dialogues and the support we provide to our partners through a variety of instruments, including through the EU Trust Fund for Africa, are testimony to our commitment to a policy that recognises the specific responsibilities, needs and concerns of countries of origin, transit and destination.

I can assure you that the Council and the Presidency will continue to contribute to that purpose.

Federica Mogherini, *haute représentante de l'Union pour les affaires étrangères et la politique de sécurité/vice-présidente de la Commission européenne.* – Monsieur le Président, Mesdames et Messieurs les députés, merci à vous tous pour l'attention constante que vous portez à ce débat sur le travail que font les Nations unies, mais aussi sur le thème de l'immigration, qui est un thème crucial de notre temps et de notre travail, en tant qu'institution européenne, avec les États membres, la Commission et le Parlement.

Madam President, I believe there are two mistakes we must not make when discussing the Global Compact, and one additional that I will mention later.

The first one is to pretend that there is a clash between our national interests and the idea of a Global Compact. The opposite is true. If our national interest is to govern migration, and I believe it is – of all of us – to make it orderly, humane and sustainable, then the Global Compact is the most powerful tool we have to serve our national interests.

The second mistake would be to tackle migration as a fight between the north and the south of the world: the developed and the developing countries. Again, the opposite is true. Let me mention just the fact that most of the countries are, at the same time – for instance, in Africa – countries of origin, of transit and of destination. Again, as I said, the opposite is true. It's not north against south or south against north; we all share an interest in managing migration. We all have an interest in investing in sustainable development in the regions that need it the most, and we all have an interest in creating regular pathways for human mobility. The earlier we realise that it's partnership and cooperation that we need, the better for us all, because we are all in this together. No country can address it on its own, neither in Europe nor elsewhere in the world, and all countries have an interest in addressing this effectively. We all support it. The UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon's initiative to hold a high-level meeting on migration – that was back at the UN General Assembly in 2016. Then, we all, collectively and unanimously, adopted the New York Declaration that launched the work on the two Global Combats on refugees and on migration.

And that was an important achievement for us Europeans, because in the middle of the migration crisis in Europe – I add «in Europe» because we have to remind ourselves there are migration crises every single day in every single part of the world – but at that specific moment, after the summer of 2016, in the middle of the European migration crisis, Europe – us – we called for the international community to engage, to build partnerships, and we received a positive response. And there the Global Compact process started.

The European Union took an early lead in the discussions on the Global Migration Compact. We also participated from the beginning, actively, in the work leading to the clear common positions that are now in front of us, and this has allowed us to bring forward a Global Compact that largely reflects European objectives and that respects all our key concerns. I know that Commission Stylianides said it very clearly in the European Parliament in the plenary session in Strasbourg a couple of weeks ago. We regret the decision by some European Union Member States not to join or to support the Global Compact on Migration. We do believe that all Member States' interests are best served in supporting the proposed framework that will establish a basis for international cooperation and dialogue – that basis that was missing up to now and that we asked for: dialogue and cooperation that lie already at the basis of the first results that would need to be consolidated, that we have achieved as Europeans, in the past years: reducing irregular arrivals, offering alternatives to migrants, bringing smugglers to justice and also tackling difficult topics, including return and readmission. Results that were achieved by way of cooperation, partnership and mutual respect and understanding, with a strong role of the United Nations – all elements that are the basis of the Global Compact.

There are some misconceptions in the debate on the Global Compact, as I said already. I would like to underline one that is self-evident to me, but maybe we need to repeat it in view of the national debates that are going on. It is not a legally-binding framework. I think national parliaments in particular, but also the European Parliament, have to acknowledge that from the very beginning: it is not legally binding. It will not create any legal obligation for the states. It is a menu of policy actions; it is a menu of best practices from which states may draw to implement their national migration policies in a cooperative way and in any international manner. It provides a framework. The Compacts are built on this basis and are grounded on the respect of the principle of national and sovereign rights of states to determine their national migration policies. But they do provide that framework that is missing today, and that is definitely needed, as we Europeans asked for it.

We will continue to work to improve migration management worldwide, which is already done today on the European side, on the basis of the work strands that are developed under the Global Compact. We will, notably, continue our engagement with the International Organisation for Migration, who will lead the implementation and follow-up of the Compact, which will entail sharing experiences, helping countries to overcome shortcomings, and searching for solutions to an issue that is global, by definition. We will also continue to support partnerships at bilateral, regional and global level in the area of migration. With our partners in the world, the Migration Compact will be an important basis for cooperation along what has been agreed as the common European Union approach to migration. And that, as I said, is largely reflected in the Compact.

So here, our common work and your contribution as the European Parliament will be essential. Mr Avramopoulos will be leading the Commission delegation to Marrakech on 10 and 11 December, and I'm very happy to see that Members of the European Parliament will join the European Union delegation to the Intergovernmental Conference at Marrakech. I believe the role of Parliament is going to be crucial. I very much appreciate the European Parliament's strong interest and engagement and confirm our full commitment to work very closely with you in this joint endeavour.

Željana Zovko, *u ime kluba PPE*. – Poštovani predsjedavajući, poštovana uvažena povjerenice, kao članica Odbora za vanjske poslove i Odbora za razvoj obišla sam krizna žarišta u svijetu susrećući se s brojnim izbjeglicama te sam uvidjela kako oni svi imaju jedan zajednički cilj – pronaći sigurno utočište za sebe i svoju obitelj.

2015. godine vidjeli smo kako je dovoljna samo jedna iskra da se osjetljivi mir na Zapadnom Balkanu poremeti izbjegličkim valom koji se kretao prema Europi. Hrvatska, koja ima najdužu kopnenu granicu prema Zapadnom Balkanu, to vrlo dobro zna. Italija i Španjolska s morskim granicama prema Africi bile su najizloženije izbjegličkim valovima i nisu mogle dizati zidove. Države članice Europske unije, a ni države članice Ujedinjenih naroda ne bi smjele pristupati ovom problemu individualno, već sudjelovati i zajednički djelovati u kreiranju sveobuhvatnih rješenja.

Žalim što Globalni sporazum o migracijama nailazi na kontroverze, ali se nadam da će se pronaći srednji put, kao što je to učinio Europski parlament u svojoj rezoluciji o Globalnom sporazumu, na kojoj sam radila kao pregovaračica u ime Europske pučke stranke, koji će poslužiti kao putokaz kako postupiti u ovom pitanju na human i prihvatljiv način.

Tanja Fajon, *v imenu skupine S&D*. – Gospod predsednik, današnjo razpravo smo zahtevali, ker se je vse več evropskih vlad umaknilo od globalnega dogovora za varne, urejene in nadzorovane migracije in ker ne smemo ostati tiho.

Politiki smo odgovorni, da verodostojno pojasnimo odločitve. Evropski parlament je aprila globalni dogovor podprl z veliko večino, saj ta poudarja pomen človekovih pravic, ki so univerzalne.

Vsem, ki pravijo, da gre z globalnim dogovorom za uvoz migrantov, za nacionalno izdajo ali izdajo suverenosti in uničevanje zahodne civilizacije, kar so obtožbe desnice tudi v slovenski javnosti, naj povem, da je takšno ustrahovanje ljudi napačno in zavajajoče.

Gre za politično deklaracijo, ki temelji na sodelovanju, suverenosti držav, delitvi odgovornosti, ki temelji na svetovnem, evropskem in nacionalnem pravnem redu, ki ne izenačuje migrantov z begunci in ne prinaša novih pravnih obveznosti.

Globalne izzive lahko rešujemo le skupaj. Ravno sem se vrnila iz države Niger. Tam je boj za dostojno življenje del vsakdana, saj bogate zahodne države zlorabljajo naravne vire in ljudi.

Dokler bo tako, bo Evropa privlačna celina. Zato je globalni dogovor še kako pomemben, da bodo migracije lahko varne, nadzorovane in urejene in da bo to globalna skrb vseh nas, kar Evropejci od nas tudi pričakujejo.

Anders Primdahl Vistisen, *for ECR-Gruppen*. – Hr. formand! Marrakesherklæringen er en skamstøtte af kulturradikale og liberale idéer, der har ført Europa ud i det morads, vi ser i dag, hvor medlemsstaterne er vendt mod hinanden, fordi man ikke længere kan kapere den enorme ulovlige indvandring, der finder sted. Hvad er løsningen så, hvis man spørger FN? Det er at anerkende et koncept som »klimaflygtninge«, det er at give migranter sociale rettigheder, og det er at tale om integration i stedet for hjemsendelse af flygtninge, hvis ophold pr. definition skal være midlertidigt, indtil de får beskyttelse. Heldigvis nærmer vi os ti EU-medlemsstater, der ikke vil være med til at skrive under på det her vanvittige dokument, inklusiv fornuftige lande uden for EU som Schweiz, USA og Australien. Men det er beskæmmende, at mit eget hjemland Danmark endnu ikke har taget beslutningen om ikke at underskrive Marrakesherklæringen, selv om regeringens egne politiske holdninger er i direkte modstrid med indholdet. Derfor en opfordring til min egen regering

i Danmark om at følge de fornuftige i EU, lad være med at tage til Marrakesh, lad være med at underskrive dette FN-vanvid!

Judith Sargentini, *namens de Verts/ALE-Fractie*. – Voorzitter, wat een schizofrenie! Aan de ene kant spreekt mevrouw Edstädtler, staatssecretaris in de Oostenrijkse regering, namens de Europese Raad. Ze praat er omheen, maar de Oostenrijkse regering wil niet tekenen.

Aan de andere kant zit mevrouw Mogherini, die niet alleen de Europese Commissie maar ook de Raad vertegenwoordigt. Zij omarmt gelukkig wel het Mondiaal Pact voor veilige en geordende migratie.

We staan als Europa echt voor gek! Dat Donald Trump niet mee ging doen, was vrij logisch. Maar wij, in het Europa van de zachte krachten, gingen aan de wereld laten zien dat je met zijn allen ook tot afspraken kunt komen om ervoor te zorgen dat kinderen van migranten naar school gaan, dat er een terugkeerbeleid gevoerd wordt, en dat kinderen niet zonder papieren komen te zitten maar een bestaan kunnen hebben. Dit was ons moment om ervoor te zorgen dat wij niet langer gegijzeld werden door de migratiecrisis vanaf 2015.

Maar wat doen wij? We maken het tot een intern spelletje en we vergeten dat we hiermee normen stellen die ook gelden voor Afrika en Azië.

Malin Björk, *för GUE/NGL-gruppen*. – Herr talman! Jag tycker att det är häpnadsväckande att flera EU-länder nu, under tryck av nationalism och rasism, drar sig ur den globala överenskommelsen om migration. Från vänsterns sida ser vi stora problem med texten inför Marrakech, men vi stöder helt och fullt ut att det måste finnas globala målsättningar och processer som kan hantera migration inom FN:s ram.

Migration är inte ett problem. Det är utnyttjandet av migranter, till exempel på den europeiska arbetsmarknaden, som är ett problem. Vi måste se över vår utrikespolitik, vapenhandeln i Europa, våra klimatutsläpp, som gör att människor söker sig iväg och måste flytta och migrera. Det är detta som måste ändras. Vi måste också ha dessa förhandlingar på en mer jämlik bas mellan nord och syd.

Jag kan tycka att detta misslyckande med all tydlighet också visar att EU är på fel väg, att vi inte lyckats komma överens om någonting här hemma, att vi inte tar emot flyktingar med värdighet, att vi låter döden på Medelhavet fortsätta, att vi sätter upp 10 000 gränsvakter i stället för att prata om hur vi ska hantera migration och flyktingar på ett värdigt och människorättsbaserat sätt. Den kriminalisering av NGO som pågår nu är fruktansvärd. Jag ser inte varför vi …

(Talmannen avbryter talaren.)

Jörg Meuthen, *im Namen der EFDD-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident! Wir reden erneut über den *Global Compact for Migration*, weil sich die links-grün-utopistische Migrationslobby erhofft, dass von diesem Hause aus ein bejahendes Signal für eine Welt grenzenloser Migration gesetzt wird. Das Gegenteil ist der Fall. Gestern hat endlich auch die Regierung von Italien entschieden, dem Pakt nicht zuzustimmen. Es reiht sich damit ein in eine immer länger werdende Liste von Staaten, die sich dieser absurden Agenda verweigern. Die USA lehnen den Pakt ab, ebenso Australien und Israel, in der EU Ungarn, Österreich, die Slowakei, Polen, Tschechien und Bulgarien. Belgien hat deswegen eine Regierungskrise. Auch in Deutschland zeichnet sich eine Krise ab, denn den bisherigen Befürwortern dämmert inzwischen, in was für einen weiteren Irrsinn Frau Merkel unser Land als nächstes hineintreiben will.

Behaupte also niemand, das EU-Parlament stünde auch nur halbwegs geschlossen hinter der Unterzeichnung dieses hinterhältigen Pakts. Denn das stimmt nicht, es stimmt sogar ganz und gar nicht. Lassen Sie diese *Fake News*! Es reicht. Stoppen wir diesen suizidalen Pakt – bevor es zu spät ist!

Harald Vilimsky, *im Namen der ENF-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, meine sehr geehrten Damen und Herren! Ein guter Tag beginnt mit einem weiteren Land, das dem UN-Migrationspakt nicht beitritt, so gestern Italien. Danke an Matteo Salvini, der hier der Impulsgeber war, genauso wie in Österreich Heinz-Christian Strache Impulsgeber dafür war, dass Österreich diesem Pakt nicht beitritt. USA, Australien, Ungarn, Polen, Tschechien, Bulgarien, Slowakei, Slowenien – immer mehr sagen „Nein“ dazu.

Und wenn Sie sich die Hauptziele der Vereinten Nationen ganz ehrlich ansehen, hat das nichts mit dem UN-Migrationspakt zu tun. Die Hauptziele sind Abrüstung, Frieden, Sicherheit und Freundschaft zu gewährleisten, Menschenrechte zu gewährleisten, und auch ein Ort der Begegnung zu sein. Aber die Vereinten Nationen haben mit Sicherheit nicht das Ziel, weltweit die Frage der Migration zu lösen und damit in die Entscheidungshoheit nationaler Parlamente und von deren Volksvertretern entsprechend einzugreifen.

Dieser Pakt ist etwas Schlechtes; immer mehr Länder erkennen es. Ich bin froh über jedes weitere Land, das diesem Pakt nicht beitritt.

Udo Voigt (NI). – Herr Präsident! Ich bin schon sehr überrascht, Frau Mogherini, wie Sie sagen können, dass dieser Pakt kein verpflichtendes Recht für die Nationen ist, wenn doch die Nationen nach vier Jahren dahingehend überprüft werden sollen, ob sie die Maßnahmen dieses Paktes umgesetzt haben. Und wenn ich mir auf der einen Seite vorstelle, dass Integration jetzt das neue Zauberwort wird und über die Rückführung gar nicht mehr nachgedacht wird, dass man gar nicht mehr daran denkt, was eigentlich die Genfer Flüchtlingskonvention sagt, nämlich, dass diejenigen Migranten zurückgeführt werden sollten, wenn wieder Frieden in ihrer Heimat ist. Alles dieses ist nicht berücksichtigt. Integration soll das künftige Zauberwort sein statt Rückführung. Die Völker Europas sind durch diesen Migrationspakt bedroht, und viele Völker haben jetzt die Antwort gefunden, dieses nicht zu unterschreiben. Ich denke, auch die Migranten haben mit diesem Pakt keine wirkliche Zukunft. Denn die Zukunft sollte nicht darin liegen, nach Europa zu kommen …

(Der Präsident entzieht dem Redner das Wort.)

Anna Maria Corazza Bildt (PPE). – Mr President, the Global Compact is important as it recognises that migration is a global challenge that requires a global response and solidarity.

There is nothing binding. Richer countries have to share responsibility and, for example, do more resettlement. I regret that Trump turned them back but, even worse, that some Member States walked out. To just say 'go home and stay home' is no solution. No state can deal with migration alone. A common European response and global cooperation is the way forward to safe and legal migration because Europe must work with third countries, from prevention to combating trafficking, and to implement return.

It is also crucial to invest in Africa in the long term. I was in Agadez in Niger with the European Parliament delegation and, thanks to the EU's effective action, we have reduced migration, we have saved lives, and we are combating trafficking: more of those partnerships. I look forward to participating, on behalf of the PPE Group, in the European Parliament…

(The President cut off the speaker)

Péter Niedermüller (S&D). – Tisztelt Elnök úr! A Global Compact fontos hozzájárulás a migráció, a menekültügy globális kihívására adandó válaszokhoz. A tervezet pontosan megfogalmazza a kereteket, és világossá teszi, hogy a menekültek védelme, a menedékjog kérelme olyan emberi jog, amelyet nem lehet kétségbe vonni.

Több mint sajnálatos, hogy van néhány olyan EU-tagország, amelynek vezetői önös politikai okokból és indokokból nem hajlandók a Global Compact elfogadására. Tudnunk kell, hogy azok, akik elutasítják ezt a nyilatkozatot, nem érdekeltek a probléma megoldásában, sőt, éppen ellenkezőleg, abban érdekeltek, hogy a menekültek, a bevándorlás kérdése ne rendeződjön, hiszen ebből kovácsolnak maguknak politikai tőkét. Mérhetetlen felelőtlenség, szégyenletes, erkölcstelen és embertelen politika ez, aminek a következményei mindannyiunkat sújtani fogják. Éppen ezért kell fel emelnünk a hangunkat – a közös felelősségvállalás mellett – a gyűlölet és félelemkeltő politika ellen.

Raffaele Fitto (ECR). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la vicepresidente Mogherini ha poc'anzi detto che il *Global compact* non ha alcun impatto giuridicamente vincolante per i paesi. Allora, io mi chiedo se il 10 e 11 dicembre a Marrakech ci sarà un grande convegno dove discutere di questo.

La verità è che sull'immigrazione – grande fallimento delle politiche europee di questi anni – si sta giocando una partita culturale e politica con il *Global compact* ed è assolutamente giusto che non si firmi e non si partecipi a una iniziativa nella quale l'incertezza è assoluta e soprattutto si sta tentando esclusivamente di mettere in campo un'azione politica mirata per poter continuare su una strada sbagliata.

Ho ascoltato diversi colleghi che hanno parlato del ritiro dell'Italia: l'Italia discute da qualche giorno di *Global compact* grazie all'azione di Giorgia Meloni di Fratelli d'Italia, che si è inserita all'interno di un governo nel quale la situazione è poco chiara: Salvini ha detto di non andare e di non partecipare a Marrakech; il Presidente del Consiglio Conte ha detto il contrario. Staremo a vedere cosa accadrà. Noi lavoreremo con decisione, perché l'Italia non partecipi.

Mario Borghezio (ENF). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, io non cito Salvini, cito Papa Francesco che, nell'Aula del Parlamento europeo, ha ammonito l'Europa, affermando testualmente: «se sarà in grado di proporre con chiarezza la propria identità culturale e difendere, oltre al diritto all'accoglienza, anche i diritti dei cittadini, aiutando questi popoli nel loro paese». Tranne le invocazioni, che sembrano cadere nel vuoto, del Presidente Tajani a un piano Marshall, l'Europa su questo piano non risponde.

In questo testo la parola identità non esiste: si dice che si tutela la sovranità degli Stati ma poi si precisa che deve essere subordinata agli accordi internazionali e quindi è una sovranità limitata. Io credo che noi dobbiamo ispirarci agli insegnamenti di chi ha una certa idea dell'Europa, come Papa Francesco. Se l'avesse scritta Papa Francesco, io, a scatola chiusa, la firmerei subito! Credo che questa sia anche l'impostazione del governo italiano, che non è insensibile ai diritti di chi fugge dalle persecuzioni, eccetera, ma che intende mettere fine all'osceno commercio dei migranti che servono solo…

(Il Presidente interrompe l'oratore).

Cécile Kashetu Kyenge (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, io sarò a Marrakech con la delegazione del Parlamento. Il *Global compact* fornisce un risvolto globale al tema della migrazione, dando continuità al nostro lavoro iniziato con la risoluzione sull'approccio olistico alla migrazione.

Troppi gli Stati membri che hanno deciso di sabotare la conferenza intergovernativa: a questi paesi, soprattutto al mio, l'Italia, dico: andateci! Orban, Salvini e tutti i leader dei paesi che hanno deciso di fare questo passo: andate a Marrakech, venite con me, venite con noi!

Opporsi al patto globale significa non solo opporsi a delle soluzioni per una migrazione più sicura e regolare, ma ben peggio: opporsi alla dignità e ai diritti umani dei migranti! Non restate al di fuori della storia: questa è la storia! E le immigrazioni non si fermeranno. Le immigrazioni continuano. Dobbiamo essere responsabili nell'affrontare le cause profonde dell'immigrazione.

Ancora una volta emerge l'ipocrisia del governo italiano che predica la responsabilità di affrontare il fenomeno migratorio in maniera solidale e poi si oppone a delle proposte

(Il Presidente interrompe l'oratrice).

Der Präsident. – Für das nun folgende *Catch-the-eye*-Verfahren muss ich Ihnen sagen, dass ich doppelt so viele Meldungen habe wie Zeit vorgesehen ist. Wir werden heute eine sehr lange Abstimmung haben. Deshalb bitte ich um Nachsicht, wenn ich nicht alle Kolleginnen oder Kollegen berücksichtigen kann.

Spontane Wortmeldungen

Milan Zver (PPE). – Spoštovani gospod predsedujoči, jaz sem eden tistih, ki nasprotuje marakeški deklaraciji, predvsem zaradi tega, ker ne predstavlja globalnega dogovora, ni niti globalen niti dogovor.

Od njega so že odstopile velike države, veliki svetovni akterji, kot so ZDA, Avstralija, Izrael, več kot deset evropskih držav članic, in to zagotovo ni splošen dogovor. V Sloveniji je 70 odstotkov javnosti proti njej. Še niti politične elite se niso mogle oglasiti okoli njega, kaj šele evropska in svetovna javnost.

Predvsem sem proti temu, ker je besedilo slabo, zato ker temelji na napačnih predpostavkah, in tudi ni res, da ni zavezujoče, še kako je zavezujoče, če ga temeljito preberete, to delo.

Skratka, nasprotujem temu dogovoru, zato ker bo v prihodnje še poslabšal situacijo pri upravljanju z migracijami.

Evropska unija bi morala veliko več vložiti, več napora in denarja v države izvora, od koder prihajajo migracije, nikakor pa ne na ta način reševati ta problem.

Eugen Freund (S&D). – Herr Präsident! Ganz offensichtlich haben diejenigen, die den Migrationspakt ablehnen, ihn nicht gelesen. Denen geht es nur um Populismus und um Parteipolitik. Denn was wird abgelehnt, was in diesem Migrationspakt steht? Zum Beispiel, dass man Daten erhebt, um damit eine Grundlage für die Migrationspolitik zu haben, oder dass man schaut, jene Triebkräfte zu verhindern, deretwegen die Menschen ihre Heimat verlassen, oder dass man korrekte und zeitnahe Informationen in allen Phasen der Migration erhebt – abgelehnt, ebenso wie, dass Menschenleben gerettet und internationale Maßnahmen koordiniert werden, wenn es vermisste Migranten gibt. Abgelehnt wird auch der grenzübergreifende Kampf gegen Schleuser oder ein integriertes, sicheres und koordiniertes Grenzmanagement. Unsere Regierung will nicht einmal, dass Möglichkeiten geschaffen werden, um für schnellere, sichere und kostengünstigere Rücküberweisungen von Migranten in ihre Heimatländer zu sorgen.

Ruža Tomašić (ECR). – Poštovani predsjedavajući, potreba da se na globalnoj razini stvori okvir za migracije postoji jer je evidentno da veliki broj država ne poštuje međunarodni poredak i otvoreno propušta migrante prema njihovim finalnim odredištima.

Deseci tisuća ljudi u ovom trenutku bez dokumenata, s lažnim identitetom i bez prave provjere prelaze granice i odlaze prema nekoj od zapadnih država, dok oni koji ih propuštaju okreću glavu od problema i tako ugrožavaju sve nas. Migracije moraju biti sigurnije i za migrante, ali i za domicilno stanovništvo. U Europu je ušlo puno ljudi za koje dan danas ne znamo tko su i koje su im stvarne namjere.

UN-ov kompakt o migracijama ne predstavlja taj okvir za rješenje ovog globalnog izazova jer ga odbijaju Amerikanci, Australija, Izrael i niz europskih država. To znači da ga uglavnom podržavaju one države iz kojih ljudi odlaze, ali ne i one koje bi ih trebale primiti. Tako se problem ne rješava, nego samo pogoršava.

Igor Šoltes (Verts/ALE). – Spoštovani gospod predsedujoči, tak globalni dogovor seveda bi potrebovali že mnogo prej in mnogo lažje bi ob sodelovanju vseh držav reševali mnoge probleme, s katerimi se danes soočamo.

In dejstvo je, da ta globalni dogovor tudi pomeni učinkovito upravljanje migracij, kar je tudi obramba suverenosti in varnosti držav, kar skušajo oporekati nasprotniki tega dogovora. Pa tudi varnost za tiste najšibkejše v karavanah bežečih.

Ta deklaracija, ta dogovor ima seveda velike ambicije in če preberemo vse cilje, ki so povzetek same vsebine, vidimo, da ponuja rešitve, za katere do danes nismo našli ustreznega dogovora.

In mislim, da je res nerazumno zavračati tovrstne pobude, dejstvo pa je, da rešitev lahko najdemo vsi skupaj, zelo težko pa vsaka država posebej, in tu ne pomagajo nobene visoke ograje.

Γεώργιος Επιτήδειος (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, το παγκόσμιο σύμφωνο για τη μετανάστευση είναι ένα κείμενο όχι μόνο άχρηστο, αλλά και επικίνδυνο. Πρώτα απ' όλα, αναγνωρίζει το δικαίωμα της μαζικής κινητοποίησης και μετακίνησης για οικονομικούς λόγους σε οποιονδήποτε από τρίτη χώρα θέλει να εισέλθει ή ακόμη και να εισβάλει -κυρίως- στην Ευρώπη και τις Ηνωμένες Πολιτείες. Κατά δεύτερο λόγο, δημιουργείται σύγχυση μεταξύ του ποιος είναι νόμιμος και ποιος παράνομος μετανάστης. Αυτό έχει ως αποτέλεσμα τα κράτη να μην μπορούν να ακολουθούν μία ανεξάρτητη εθνική μεταναστευτική πολιτική και να προστατεύουν τα σύνορά τους.

Επιπλέον, υπάρχει κίνδυνος, στο μέλλον, οι μη δεσμευτικοί -αυτήν τη στιγμή- στόχοι που αναφέρονται στο σχέδιο να γίνουν δεσμευτικές διατάξεις και, λαμβάνοντας υπόψη τις αγκυλώσεις και την εμμονή της Αριστεράς, δεν θα προκαλέσει εντύπωση εάν οποιαδήποτε επίκριση για το φαινόμενο της παράνομης μετανάστευσης γίνει ποινικό αδίκημα. Αυτός ακριβώς είναι και ο λόγος για τον οποίον πολλά κράτη δεν επιδιώκουν πλέον να υπογράψουν το εν λόγω κείμενο.

(Ende der spontanen Wortmeldungen)

Federica Mogherini, *Vice-President of the Commission / High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy.* – Mr President, I want to underline the fact that I am speaking here on behalf of the Commission. It's for the Austrian Presidency to express the position of the Council.

The Commission has a very clear position on the Global Compact. As I explained, this is the result of a process that we Europeans have initiated in the UN Framework, asking for partnership and asking to have a political global framework for managing together, on the basis of what we had already started to do with our African friends, with our Asian friends, and with friends from Latin America and everywhere. We initiated this process in the UN Framework, asking for a global approach – political, not legally binding – to establish partnerships because we Europeans found out – in my view quite late, in 2015-2016, but still we did – that we needed to build strong partnerships with the countries of origin, of transit and of destination, supporting a common system and a common approach to manage migration, fight traffickers, offer opportunities and also to tackle, as some of you have said, difficult issues like returns, in an effective manner. It's a difficult process, but it's a process that is now reflected in a Compact that, starting from a European approach, has moved to a global level.

As I said, the Compact largely reflects the positions of the European Union and the work that we are currently doing, together with our partners, on migration, starting from the work we're doing with the International Organisation for Migration (IOM) and the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNNHCR). I can tell you this: the Commission will not only be represented in Marrakesh with a delegation, as I said, led by Commissioner Avramopoulos, but will continue to actively engage with the UN and with the UN system on its implementation. Technically, as you might know – but maybe not – after the Conference in Marrakech, there will be a vote in the General Assembly, where Member States of the UN will take a vote, but the Commission will continue to work with the UN system, with the UN agencies and with our partners globally to implement this agenda because we have seen that, in the first couple of years of work that we have done, along the lines that are reflected in the Global Compact, these have started to bring results.

So we will continue to work in this direction, investing in the Global Compact's implementation as a political, non-binding, cooperative framework that will guide our work over the coming decades.

Karoline Edtstadler, *President-in-Office of the Council.* – Mr President, High Representative, honourable Members, it was useful to have this discussion today in view of the conference next month and of the forthcoming adoption of the Global Compact in New York. I would like to conclude by reiterating what I already stated at the beginning, and that is the fact that migration in general and more specifically cooperation with third countries will remain high on the agenda of the Council and the Presidency. Therefore we will continue to contribute to that purpose. I would like to thank you for sharing your doubts, your questions, your concerns, and also your thoughts in this regard.

Der Präsident. – Die Aussprache ist geschlossen.

Schriftliche Erklärungen (Artikel 162)

Kinga Gál (PPE), *írásban.* – Ha az ENSZ globális migrációs csomagját alaposan átolvassuk, nyilvánvaló válik, hogy nem Európa érdekeit tükrözi, sőt Európára káros és veszélyes. A dokumentum pozitív jelenségnek tünteti fel a migrációt, egybemossa az illegális gazdasági migrációt a valódi menekültek kérdésével, illetve a legális migrációval, és az illegális migrációt mintegy alapvető jogként állítja be. Arra kötelezné az országokat, hogy tájékoztassák a migránsokat a migrációs útvonalakról, és indítsanak tájékoztató kampányokat nekik. Továbbá megkönnyítené a migránsok családegyesítését, és ugyanolyan szolgáltatásokat kéne nyújtani a migránsoknak, mint az adott ország polgárainak. A dokumentumban nyolcvan alkalommal szerepel a kötelezettség szó, így messze nem igaz az az állítás, hogy csak ajánlásokat fogalmaz meg. A csomag elfogadásának ezért a jogértelmezés és szokásjog kialakulása miatt visszafordíthatatlan következményei lennének, hiszen ezek hivatkozási ponttá és a nemzetközi bíráskodás alapjává válnának. Ez ellentétes az európai emberek érdekeivel. Magyarország példáját követve már nyolc ország döntött amellett, hogy kilép a csomag elfogadásának folyamatából, és számos más tagállam fontolgatja a migrációs kompakttól való elállást. Úgy látom, kezd visszatérni a józan ész kontinensünkre, és egyre többen veszik észre, hogy ez egy nemzeti érdekeket sértő, a mi Európánkra veszélyes dokumentum, ami egyértelműen megosztja az Uniót.

Marijana Petir (PPE), *napisan*. – SAD, Austrija, Bugarska, Češka i Mađarska države su koje su odustale od potpisivanja Marakeške deklaracije, dok Slovačka, Poljska, Estonija, Australija, Izrael i Švicarska imaju izražene rezerve prema Deklaraciji te navode da neće sudjelovati u ratifikaciji Deklaracije. Odustajanje navedenih država od ratifikacije Deklaracije treba nas pozvati na određeni oprez.

Mene najviše, u okviru teksta Deklaracije, brine činjenica da se brišu granice između legalnih i ilegalnih migracija. Bez obzira što Deklaracija predstavlja neobvezujući dokument, države članice mogu ga uvrstiti u svoje zakonodavstvo, što može stvoriti dugoročne probleme po pitanju migracija i po pitanju suvereniteta u budućnosti.

EU je pogriješio u samom pristupu migracijama, nije ih rješavao na mjestu gdje su nastajale, već je svojom usvojenom politikom dodatno poticao migrantske valove. Smatram da je važno pomoći ljudima koji bježe od rata i svojom humanošću im pokazati da smo uz njih, ali kada je riječ o ekonomskim migracijama, potrebno je stvoriti socijalne, gospodarske i političke uvjete u državama iz kojih migranti dolaze, kako bi mogli ostati i pristojno živjeti u svojoj domovini.

Smatram kako EU ne smije vršiti pritisak na države članice, već one same moraju odlučiti hoće li pristupiti Marakeškoj deklaraciji te im treba dati mogućnost da same odluče mogu li i koliko primiti migranata u svoju državu.

Monika Smolková (S&D), *písomne*. – Globálny rámec o bezpečnej, riadenej a legálnej migrácii považujem za vážny politický dokument, ktorý mal byť pre všetky štáty, ktoré sú zastúpené v OSN, zárukou toho, aby problém migrácie vo svete bol koordinovaný, aby mal jednotnú platformu a aby štáty spoločne čelili problémom migrácie, ktoré sú všade vo svete. Bohužiaľ, dokument prináša okrem dobrých návrhov aj body, ktoré sú kontroverzné, a preto aj neprijateľné pre mnohé štáty. Aj keď sa v preambule v článku 7 uvádza, že globálny právny rámec predstavuje nezáväzný rámec, vzápätí sa v článku 9 uvádza, že tento globálny rámec stanovuje naše spoločné chápania, spoločné povinnosti, zdieľané zodpovednosti a jednotu účelu v súvislosti s migráciou, aby bola prospešná pre všetkých. Dokument má 23 cieľov, s niektorými môžeme súhlasiť, ale niektoré sú neprijateľné. Určite všetci súhlasia s tým, aby sa minimalizovali nepriaznivé podnety a štrukturálne faktory, ktoré nútia ľudí, aby opustili svoju krajinu. Na druhej strane je bod o integrácii migrantov a ich začleňovaní, ich vzdelávaní, o ich finančnej podpore, ktorý by si mali osvojiť iba krajiny, ktoré pre svoju ekonomiku potrebujú migrantov. OSN by si mala uvedomiť, že nejednotnosť pri hodnotení dokumentu je vážny moment, preto by v čo najkratšom čase mala hľadať kompromisné návrhy, lebo problémy migrácie je potrebné riešiť spoločne.

5. Situation von Frauen mit Behinderungen (Aussprache)

Der Präsident. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über die Anfrage zur mündlichen Beantwortung an die Kommission über die Situation von Frauen mit Behinderungen von Rosa Estaràs Ferragut im Namen des Ausschusses für die Rechte der Frau und die Gleichstellung der Geschlechter (O-000117/2018 – B8-0418/2018) (2018/2685(RSP)).

Rosa Estaràs Ferragut, *autora*. – Señor presidente, hablamos hoy en nombre de los más de 46 millones de mujeres con discapacidad; ellas representan el 16,6 % de la población total de la Unión Europea. Hoy, con este debate, vamos a hacerlas más visibles. Vamos a ser su altavoz. Hoy vamos a crear una imagen que favorezca de verdad que puedan ejercer sus derechos. Ellas son, ante todo, seres humanos.

Son ciudadanas que no pueden ser definidas por su discapacidad y, de hecho, no quieren serlo. Se enfrentan día a día a los mismos problemas que el resto de mujeres: son madres, hijas, amigas, trabajadoras; tienen multitud de talentos y multitud de habilidades y enriquecen nuestra sociedad haciéndola más diversa. Es crucial la contribución que ellas pueden hacer, y por eso hay que promoverla y asegurar que los planes que tienen estas mujeres van a ser escuchados.

Hoy, con este debate, vamos a crear una concienciación positiva sobre la diversidad y vamos a hacer que la cultura de la diferencia se imponga, porque es la que genera más ventajas sociales.

Esas mujeres se enfrentan día a día al reto de que las hacemos invisibles. Las mujeres que no ven, que no oyen, que viven de otra manera, que no tienen movilidad; en definitiva, las mujeres con discapacidad, son mujeres que la sociedad excluye. Se trata muchas veces de barreras mentales: las invisibiliza, y se generan así muchísimas discriminaciones en todos los sectores en todos los países.

Hablaremos de educación —la educación inclusiva—, que significa que todos participamos libremente en la sociedad y todos aportamos y contribuimos a la misma. Cuando se discrimina en educación se hace culpable al alumno diverso de esta exclusión; eso no puede pasar. El trabajo y la educación inclusivas y accesibles son los instrumentos para poder vincularnos a una sociedad y para poder participar en todos los sectores; solamente un 18,8 % de las mujeres con discapacidad están empleadas en la Unión Europea, un porcentaje menor que sus homólogos hombres o que, indudablemente, el resto de personas que no tienen discapacidad.

Necesitamos hablar también de alfabetización digital, porque un colectivo importante de estas mujeres son mayores de sesenta años y por eso deberemos elaborar una estrategia para la mujer mayor y discapacitada.

Hablaremos también de la necesidad de la plena participación en todos los asuntos de las mujeres con discapacidad; no pueden quedar al margen de nada; y, por supuesto, garantizar el sufragio activo y pasivo de estas mujeres. Recientemente se ha hecho una modificación legislativa en España en este sentido.

Hablaremos de la igualdad de trato: la necesidad de que todos seamos iguales —uno de los valores de la Unión Europea —. Para eso habrá que crear políticas activas y públicas para poder romper todas las barreras a esa igualdad y, sobre todo, dar información veraz, simple y eficaz a estas mujeres para que puedan desarrollar sus derechos.

La accesibilidad es el requisito previo para poder tener participación e igualdad. Es verdad que el 8 de noviembre nos han comunicado que Consejo y Comisión han acordado ya que salga adelante esta Acta Europea de Accesibilidad, que es más de lo que teníamos y menos de lo que pedíamos, pero que es un paso adelante para trabajar en una Europa sin barreras.

La accesibilidad significa que todo se haga en todos los lenguajes, en todas las formas, en todos los formatos. Piensen ustedes que, por ejemplo, en las revisiones ginecológicas, las mujeres con discapacidad tienen problemas de accesibilidad para ir a hacerse una mamografía o una revisión ginecológica. Hay dificultad en la accesibilidad a muchos servicios de salud, a muchos servicios contra la violencia de género, a servicios de apoyo, a los de maternidad, a la protección, a la comunicación. Hay que romper esas barreras. El pilar social es una oportunidad para poder incluir a las mujeres con discapacidad y hacerlas también protagonistas.

Y hablaremos también de dignidad. Hay que salir del silencio del acoso que sufren estas mujeres: una de cada tres mujeres con discapacidad ha sido o va a ser maltratada y víctima de violencia de género. Por eso necesitamos una estrategia de apoyo y respeto en este sentido.

Y hablaremos también de otra forma de discriminar, como la esterilización forzosa, el aborto coercitivo o excluirlas del derecho a la adopción o a la maternidad. Es también una discriminación en toda regla y supone un trato inhumano.

Y también hablaremos de la necesidad de tener indicadores para saber cuál es la situación de estas mujeres; indicadores de género; indicadores de discapacidad en la propia Estrategia Europea sobre discapacidad y en todos los departamentos.

Y acabo diciéndoles que el objetivo 5 de los Objetivos de Desarrollo Sostenible hablaba de empoderar a las mujeres. Empoderar a las mujeres con discapacidad es empoderar a la humanidad. Hoy tenemos una oportunidad para aprender, para sentir, para vivir y para crear. «Ser mujer —dice una discapacitada y buena amiga— me encanta; tengo una discapacidad y tengo muchísimas capacidades como cualquier otra persona, pero ante todo soy un ser humano, con todos los derechos que me corresponden; espero no tener nunca más que volver a justificar el porqué».

Marianne Thyssen, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, honourable Members of Parliament, fundamental rights, inclusive growth and social fairness are at the core of this Commission's agenda. We are working hard to make sure that no one is left behind, and I would like to think Madam Estaràs Ferragut and the FEMM Committee for putting forward this question on the situation of women with disabilities.

The Commission has undertaken important legislative initiatives for fostering the participation of persons with disabilities in society and for promoting gender equality.

Just to give you two examples: the European Accessibility Act, on which there has recently been a provisional agreement among co-legislators, will break down barriers to key products and services. The Accessibility Act will, in particular, be a key tool to bridge the digital divide.

Secondly, the Commission has proposed a work-life balance package in order to enable carers – mainly women – to better balance work and caring responsibilities. This is a key initiative to contribute to bridging the existing employment gap, pay gap and pension gap between men and women, and I hope the ongoing trilogues will produce results soon.

Let me now respond to the three questions you've put forward.

Together with all of our Member States, the European Union has committed to implement the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. The European Disability Strategy is the main instrument to support the Union's implementation of the Convention until 2020. It is part of the wider efforts under the Europe 2020 strategy to succeed in creating smart, sustainable and inclusive growth. Indeed, full economic and social participation of people with disabilities is essential to fulfil the objectives of the European 2020 strategy.

The Commission is currently preparing an evaluation of the implementation of the current European Disability Strategy. The evaluation will cover all aspects of this ability. This includes, in particular, the situation of women and girls with disabilities and the challenges stemming from inter-sectional discrimination. And of course, as part of our preparations, we will consult as many stakeholders as possible. We will take into account the European Parliament's views, such as last year's resolution on the concluding observations of the UN Committee.

Now on the gender-disaggregated data. Reliable and accurate data are essential for policy development. The Commission already disaggregates by gender the disability-related data it collects, including within the European semester. These data provide us with an objective basis for identifying intersectional discrimination. Our data show, for instance, that in the areas of poverty risk and employment, women with disabilities are disadvantaged compared to men with disabilities. In the area of education, however, we observe a higher percentage of early school-leaving with boys with disabilities than with girls.

Attention to gender equality is also paid in the Union's external action activities. We notably provide support to partner countries to improve data collection disaggregated by sex and disability. There is also the obligation to complete a gender analysis for each development cooperation project or programme.

As a last point, I want to address the question on what the Commission is doing to enable participation of women with disabilities in the European elections.

My colleague, Commissioner Jourová, has delivered a statement on the participation of people with disabilities in the European elections at the European Parliament's plenary session on 5 July this year, and she pointed out the Commission's recommendation of February 2018, which addresses the exchange of best practices with a view to promote the exercise of electoral rights of under-represented groups, including persons with disabilities.

In April this year we followed up with a dedicated session on this topic, involving our network of Member States experts in electoral matters, and this week, on 26 and 27 November, we dedicated the annual colloquium on fundamental rights to democracy and the European Union, including the promotion of broad participation as a condition for inclusive democratic societies.

And finally, I want to mention that the directive on the accessibility of public sector bodies' websites, which came into effect last September, will contribute to assuring the accessibility of information issued by public bodies across the Union about political participation and elections. Thank you again for these questions.

Agnieszka Kozłowska-Rajewicz, *w imieniu grupy PPE.* – Panie Przewodniczący! Pani Komisarz! Przede wszystkim gratuluję Rosie Esteraz znakomitego tekstu rezolucji na temat sytuacji kobiet niepełnosprawnych.

W Europie żyje 80 mln osób z niepełnosprawnościami, z czego 46 mln to kobiety. Tylko 18% z nich posiada zatrudnienie. Niepełnosprawnymi osobami opiekują się głównie kobiety. 80% z nich robi to nieformalnie i nieodpłatnie. To zamknięte koło nierówności, niekończącego się wysiłku i niesprawiedliwości.

Dlaczego tak mało niepełnosprawnych kobiet dostaje się na rynek pracy? Jakie przepisy lub ich brak stoją na przeszkodzie do ekonomicznej samodzielności niepełnosprawnych kobiet? To nie tylko kwestia pieniędzy, niewykorzystanych talentów i kompetencji. To także kwestia ludzkiej godności związana z faktem bycia osobą niezależną i w pełni włączoną do życia społecznego i ekonomicznego. Przecież dzisiejsze technologie, na co rezolucja zwraca uwagę, dają osobom niepełnosprawnym duże możliwości do prowadzenia normalnego życia i samorealizacji.

Pani Komisarz! Należy jak najszybciej wdrożyć w praktyce zalecenia Konwencji ONZ ds. praw osób niepełnosprawnych oraz europejską strategię w sprawie niepełnosprawności. Apeluję także do Komisji i państw członkowskich o rewizję i pełne stosowanie przepisów na rzecz osób niepełnosprawnych, o włączenie do tych przepisów zasad projektowania uniwersalnego oraz o lepsze wykorzystanie technologii cyfrowych i postępu medycyny, tak aby zwiększyć samodzielność, zatrudnialność, oraz poczucie wolności i godności niepełnosprawnych kobiet i mężczyzn.

Vilija Blinkevičiūtė, *S&D frakcijos vardu.* – Gerbiamas Pirmininke, apie neįgalių žmonių teises, jų tarpe neįgalių moterų teises ir jų gyvenimo kokybės gerinimą, turėtume kalbėti ir ieškoti sprendimų ne tik neįgalių žmonių dienos išvakarėse, bet prie šio klausimo turime dirbti nuolatos – kartu su Komisija, valstybėm narėm, žinoma, įtraukiant ir neįgaliųjų visuomenines organizacijas.

Mes vis kalbame apie Europos socialinių teisių ramstį, apie Europos strategiją dėl negalė, bet deja nesugebame sumažinti neįgaliųjų, ypač neįgalių moterų, diskriminacijos, niekaip nesugebame užtikrinti paprasčiausių dalykų, atrodo, šitiems žmonėms, t.y. darbo, pajamų, įtraukimo į pilietinį ir politinį gyvenimą.

Neįgaliųjų nedarbo lygis išlieka nepriimtinas, dėlto jiems gresia žymiai didesnė skurdo ir socialinės atskirties rizika. Be to, neįgalios moterys susiduria su didesnėm kliūtim norėdamos patekti į darbo rinką, o dėlto joms sunkiau gyventi įprastą ir nepriklausomą gyvenimą, nes darbas yra ne tik pajamų šaltinis, bet ir socialinės įtraukties priemonė, padedanti užmegzti ryšius su platesne visuomene. Neįgalių moterų darbas dažnai apmokamas nepakankamai, o ką jau kalbėti apie jų senatvės pensijas, sulaukus senatvės amžiaus.

Dar viena problema yra ta, kad duomenų apie negalę turinčių moterų darbo pobūdį ir užimtumo situaciją apskritai yra nedaug. O neturint konkrečių duomenų suskirstytų pagal lytį, labai sunku spręsti diskriminacijos atvejus, todėl, ponia komisare, raginu visą Komisiją nustatyti konkrečias priemones minėtoms problemoms spręsti, užtikrinti pakankamą finansavimą, per Europos Sąjungos struktūrinius fondus.

Jadwiga Wiśniewska, *w imieniu grupy ECR.* – Panie Przewodniczący! Nasza wrażliwość na potrzeby osób niepełnosprawnych objawia się w przededniu Międzynarodowego Dnia Osób Niepełnosprawnych. Dla mnie trąci to trochę jednak hipokryzją, że oto w związku ze zbliżającym się Dniem Osób Niepełnosprawnych w Parlamencie Europejskim podejmujemy tematykę osób, które powinniśmy wspierać i którym powinniśmy stwarzać szanse i możliwości na edukację, rozwój zawodowy, dostęp do dóbr kultury. Warto dzisiaj postawić pytanie, dlaczego Parlament Europejski działa akcyjnie. Ponad podziałami politycznymi powinniśmy podejmować działania, które pozwolą osobom niepełnosprawnym po prostu godnie żyć.

Szkoda, że do tego dokumentu wrzucacie Państwo – tutaj zwracam się do lewej strony sali parlamentarnej – tematy związane ze zmianą płci. Uważam, że to godne pożałowania, aby w tak ważnej…

(Przewodniczący odebrał mówczyni głos)

Tilly Metz, *im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, werte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Respektieren wir wirklich die UN-Konvention für die Rechte von Menschen mit einer Behinderung? Nein! Noch immer werden Menschen mit einer Behinderung diskriminiert, und vor allem Frauen mit einer Beeinträchtigung – das im Bereich der Ausbildung, im Bereich der Arbeit, aber auch im Bereich der persönlichen, privaten Entwicklung.

Aber jeder hat das Recht darauf, glücklich zu sein. Jeder hat das Recht darauf, ein selbstbestimmtes Leben zu leben – ein Leben, wo Sexualität kein Tabu ist, ein Leben, wo ich meine Sexualität ausleben kann, wo aber auch „Nein" sagen „Nein" heißt, das Recht darauf, eine Familie zu gründen, das Recht darauf, aber auch zu heiraten oder mit meinem Partner oder meiner Partnerin zusammenleben zu können. Und genau in diesen Bereichen brauchen gerade Frauen mit einer Beeinträchtigung unsere Unterstützung und unsere Begleitung.

Es geht hier nicht um Mitleid, es geht um ein fundamentales Menschenrecht.

João Pimenta Lopes, *em nome do Grupo GUE/NGL*. – Senhor Presidente, a União Europeia não se pode demitir de responsabilidades na degradação da situação socioeconómica das pessoas com deficiência, onde as mulheres são duplamente discriminadas. As políticas de austeridade que promove, o recorte de direitos sociais e laborais, o condicionamento ao investimento nos orçamentos dos Estados em áreas como a saúde, a educação ou os apoios sociais não se dissociam do retrocesso social desta franja da população.

Todos os dias, os direitos fundamentais são negados às pessoas com deficiência. Nas dificuldades de acesso ao emprego com direitos, nas limitações e desadequação da formação profissional, na perpetuação da pobreza e exclusão, na insuficiente proteção social, na falta de meios humanos, materiais e pedagógicos na escola pública para o adequado acompanhamento e inclusão efetiva de crianças e jovens, nas dificuldades no acesso a cuidados de saúde, medicamentos e terapias direcionadas, nas persistentes limitações à mobilidade e no acesso à cultura e ao desporto, entre outros.

Uma realidade que exige o reforço de políticas e de respostas públicas que deem resposta cabal às necessidades das pessoas com deficiência.

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – Pane předsedající, zajištění rovných podmínek pro ženy s postižením, ať už v oblasti vzdělávání, ve zdravotnictví nebo na pracovišti by mělo být samozřejmé. Přesto tomu tak v některých oblastech není. Zdravotně postižené ženy mají např. v praxi často problém vyhledat pomoc i běžných lékařů. Tyto ženy se potýkají se zatíženým přístupem i v jiných službách a čelí různým podobám násilí. Tento návrh usnesení obsahuje řadu důležitých výzev, které by měly tuto situaci žen zlepšit. Na tyto problémy upozorňuje a doufá, že pro státy bude toto usnesení impulzem pro zajištění kvalitnějších služeb.

Přesto musím upozornit na témata, se kterými nesouhlasím. Nesouhlasím s doporučením na přijetí Istanbulské úmluvy, se začleněním problematiky sexuálního a reprodukčního zdraví a se specifickou zdravotní péčí pro transgender osoby. Domnívám se, že tyto výzvy nemají místo v takto pojaté rezoluci, a proto, obávám se, nebudu moci ji podpořit.

Spontane Wortmeldungen

Λευτέρης Χριστοφόρου (PPE). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, είναι γεγονός ότι, μέσα από τη συζήτηση για τις διακρίσεις κατά των γυναικών και κατά των ατόμων με αναπηρίες, αναδεικνύεται ένα μείζον θέμα για την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση: ότι δεν είναι μόνον οι γυναίκες με αναπηρίες που τυγχάνουν δυσμενών διακρίσεων, αλλά οι δυσμενείς διακρίσεις παρατηρούνται εις βάρος όλων των γυναικών, σε όλα τα επίπεδα. Πιστεύω ότι η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση έπρεπε να είναι πρωτοπόρα και πρωταγωνίστρια, και να εφαρμόζει πλήρως και απόλυτα την αρχή της απαγόρευσης των διακρίσεων μεταξύ ανδρών και γυναικών.

Η ισότητα των φύλων στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση ήταν, είναι και παραμένει μια βασική, ατράνταχτη και απαραβίαστη αρχή που οφείλουν όλοι να την εφαρμόζουν, και ιδιαίτερα η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή. Δεν γίνεται μόνο με λόγια και διακηρύξεις. Οι διακηρύξεις είναι εδώ και υπάρχει σήμερα η δυνατότητα να δεσμευτούν η Ευρωπαία Επίτροπος και η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή για την πλήρη και απόλυτη εφαρμογή όσον αφορά την ισότητα των φύλων και για την επιβολή κυρώσεων σε όσα κράτη μέλη δεν εφαρμόζουν την αρχή της ισότητας των δύο φύλων. Μόνον έτσι θα γίνει πράξη η πλήρης και απόλυτη εφαρμογή της αρχής της ισότητας των δύο φύλων.

Helga Stevens (ECR). – Voorzitter, allereerst wil ik graag de rapporteur bedanken om via deze ontwerpresolutie aandacht te vragen voor de situatie van vrouwen met een beperking. Vrouwen met een beperking worden vaak geconfronteerd met interseksuele discriminatie vanwege hun geslacht en hun beperking. Zij hebben twee tot vijf keer meer kans om geweld en seksueel misbruik mee te maken dan vrouwen zonder handicap, vooral wanneer ze een verstandelijke beperking hebben.

Zij zijn bovendien ondervertegenwoordigd op de arbeidsmarkt en in de politiek. Hierdoor voelen veel vrouwen met een handicap aan dat zij uitgesloten zijn in de samenleving. Ik hoop oprecht dat de Commissie gendergelijkheid dit expliciet zal meenemen bij het ontwerp van de *EU-strategie inzake handicaps 2030* zodat discriminatie van vrouwen en meisjes met een handicap krachtig kan worden aangepakt.

Gelijkheid, non-discriminatie, respect en gelijke kansen voor vrouwen met een handicap. Geen woorden maar daden, nu!

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, νομίζω ότι η συζήτηση έχει αποκαλύψει ότι πραγματικά υφίστανται, δυστυχώς, διακρίσεις κατά των γυναικών με αναπηρία. Και αυτό που χρειάζεται είναι να μην λέμε πολλά λόγια· να μην βρίσκουμε σαν αφορμή το γεγονός ότι στις 3 Δεκεμβρίου είναι η Παγκόσμια Ημέρα των Ατόμων με Αναπηρία για να κάνουμε αυτή τη συζήτηση. Πρέπει να πάρουμε συγκεκριμένα μέτρα και έχουμε πει επανειλημμένως σε παρεμβάσεις μας στην ολομέλεια του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου ότι πρέπει να εφαρμοστεί η σύμβαση του ΟΗΕ για τα άτομα με αναπηρία.

Επίσης, δεν πρέπει να υπάρχουν διακρίσεις. Δεν πρέπει να υπάρχουν διακρίσεις κατά των γυναικών οι οποίες είναι ΑΜΕΑ. Αυτό το βλέπουμε να συμβαίνει· υπάρχει δυσκολία στην πρόσβασή τους στην αγορά εργασίας. Πολύ δε περισσότερο στην Ελλάδα, όπου εκεί οι διακρίσεις είναι πολύ έντονες και, λόγω των μνημονίων, έχουν μειωθεί και τα αναπηρικά επιδόματα. Επομένως, χρειάζονται μέτρα συγκεκριμένα για να μπορέσουμε να αντιμετωπίσουμε αυτό το κοινωνικό πρόβλημα.

(Ende der spontanen Wortmeldungen)

Marianne Thyssen, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, this debate shows once more the relevance of the strategic and long-term approach we have chosen for both the specific issues of gender equality and disability. I should mention here that gender equality, equal opportunities and the inclusion of persons with disabilities are also among the principles of the European Pillar of Social Rights, which was jointly proclaimed just over a year ago by all three European political institutions.

There is no doubt that the considerable input of the European Parliament over the past years will feed into the reflection about the form and the content of future European disability policies. The Commission is also committed to ensure the involvement of people with disabilities and their representative organisations in this reflection. I count on the European Parliament and, of course, also on the Member States to be strong allies in putting the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities into practice.

Der Präsident. – Gemäß Artikel 128 Absatz 5 der Geschäftsordnung wurde ein Entschließungsantrag eingereicht.

Die Aussprache ist geschlossen.

Die Abstimmung findet heute, 29. November 2018, statt.

Schriftliche Erklärungen (Artikel 162)

Monika Beňová (S&D), *písomne*. – Ženy a dievčatá so zdravotným postihnutím sú obzvlášť zraniteľné z hľadiska hrozby diskriminácie a násilia. Z dostupných štatistík vyplýva, že v porovnaní so zdravou populáciou existuje až niekoľkonásobne vyššia pravdepodobnosť, že hendikepovaná žena bude vystavená násiliu alebo nejakej forme zneužívania. Práve preto potrebujeme vytvárať efektívne normy na ochranu občanov so zdravotným postihnutím a fungujúci systém ich aktívneho zapájania do bežného života. Veľmi dôležitá je tiež podpora zjednodušovania a lepšieho prístupu hendikepovaných ľudí k novým technológiám. Pre plné začlenenie žien a dievčat so zdravotným postihnutím do spoločnosti je nevyhnutná pomoc a participácia rodiny, kolegov či zamestnávateľa. Základ zmeny tak spočíva v konaní okruhu ich najbližších ľudí. Z pohľadu nadchádzajúcich európskych volieb je nezastupiteľný aktívny prístup Európskej komisie smerom k hendikepovaným občanom. Tak, aby ženy so zdravotným postihnutím mohli nielen voliť, ale predovšetkým sa jednoduchšie uchádzať o dôveru ľudí vo voľbách.

Nicola Caputo (S&D), *per iscritto*. – Tutte le persone con disabilità devono avere la possibilità di beneficiare pienamente dei propri diritti sulla base dell'inclusione e della piena partecipazione alla società. La partecipazione sociale ed economica delle donne con disabilità è essenziale per il successo della strategia economica e sociale globale dell'Europa. Ad esse deve essere garantito il pieno godimento dei diritti per quanto riguarda un'istruzione di qualità, accessibile e a prezzi abbordabili, l'assistenza sanitaria, comprese cure sanitarie specifiche per le persone transgender e per la salute sessuale e riproduttiva e i diritti ad essa connessi, l'occupazione, la mobilità, la vita familiare, l'autonomia fisica, la sessualità e il matrimonio, nonché le salvaguardie che garantiscono tali diritti. Chiedo alla Commissione di presentare una proposta di strategia europea sulla disabilità 2020-2030 che integri pienamente le disposizioni della Convenzione delle Nazioni Unite sui diritti delle persone con disabilità nella legislazione, nelle politiche e nei programmi futuri dell'UE e che sia coerente con la Convenzione delle Nazioni Unite sui diritti del fanciullo e con l'impegno strategico a favore della parità di genere 2016-2019, al fine di assicurare che le donne e le ragazze con disabilità possano godere pienamente dei propri diritti come ogni altra persona.

Beata Gosiewska (ECR), *na piśmie*. – Kobiety niepełnosprawne w zależności od wieku, miejsca zamieszkania, statusu społecznego czy wreszcie rodzaju niepełnosprawności doświadczają różnych trudności związanych z codziennym funkcjonowaniem. Są to problemy dwojakiego rodzaju: z jednej strony dotyczą uzyskania odpowiedniego wykształcenia czy znalezienia wymarzonej pracy, z drugiej zaś indywidualnych cech związanych z samoakceptacją oraz poczuciem własnej wartości. Ponadto bariery komunikacyjne oraz architektoniczne powodują, że w życiu codziennym proste czynności stają się dla nich bardzo skomplikowane lub wręcz niewykonalne.

Zgadzam się z założeniami rezolucji o promowaniu inicjatyw wspierających aktywizację zawodową i zapewnieniu równego dostępu do edukacji i pracy. W przeciwnym wypadku może to skutkować ubóstwem i wykluczeniem społecznym. Należy egzekwować usunięcie wszelkich barier i przeciwdziałać dyskryminacji społecznej, której te osoby doświadczają. Konieczne jest wdrożenie polityki zapobiegania, leczenia, rehabilitacji i integracji w odniesieniu do osób niepełnosprawnych, a także zapewnienie wsparcia ich rodzinom.

Uważam, że dyskutując na temat osób niepełnosprawnych, nie powinniśmy wprowadzać do debaty różnic ideologicznych. Moim zdaniem rezolucja powinna być pozbawiona jakichkolwiek światopoglądowych zapisów, a szczególnie tych dotyczących orientacji seksualnej i aborcji. Włączenie tych tematów powoduje, że rezolucja staje się przedmiotem sporów ideologicznych i nie służy niepełnosprawnym. Miejmy na uwadze, że zagadnienie pomocy kobietom niepełnosprawnym jest bliskie większości eurodeputowanych, a kwestia dostępności aborcji czy zmiany płci już nie.

Czesław Hoc (ECR), *na piśmie*. – Przyjęło się stwierdzenie, że stosunek do osób niepełnosprawnych jest miarą dzisiejszej cywilizacji. Podejście do niepełnosprawności ewoluowało od traktowania osób niepełnosprawnych jako przedmiotu działań charytatywnych do postrzegania ich jako obdarzonych prawami. W nowoczesnym ujęciu niepełnosprawności, w pełni uznając wagę człowieczeństwa i godność osób niepełnosprawnych, wskazuje się na prawa im przysługujące na równi z innymi ludźmi.

Nie możemy już patrzeć na osoby niepełnosprawne przez pryzmat ciągłej opieki i pomocy. Dzisiaj niepełnosprawni nie oczekują litości i superprzywilejów. Pragną traktowania ich w świetle praw człowieka, a także osiągnięć naukowych prowadzących do postępów w leczeniu, rehabilitacji i edukacji, która gwarantowałaby wyrównywanie szans i ochronę przed dyskryminacją. Pragną poczucia bezpieczeństwa i postawy solidarnościowej. Najpierw należy widzieć osobę, potem ewentualnie jej wózek inwalidzki. W szczególności dotyczy to niepełnosprawnych kobiet i dziewcząt, które są trzykrotnie bardziej narażone na przemoc niż kobiety pełnosprawne.

Musimy pilnie doprowadzić do likwidacji istniejących przeszkód i barier, w tym barier architektonicznych, aby stworzyć równość praw i szans udziału kobiet i dziewcząt w życiu rodzinnym, politycznym, kulturalnym, społecznym i zawodowym.

Ivan Jakovčić (ALDE), *napisan*. – Riječ „invaliditet" obuhvaća mnogo različitih privremenih, kratkoročnih ili dugoročnih osobnih situacija koje zahtijevaju prilagođene političke odgovore i uključuju psihičke poteškoće. Sve osobe s invaliditetom trebale bi moći u potpunosti uživati u svojim pravima na temelju uključenosti i u potpunosti sudjelovati u društvu.

To je moguće samo uz provedbu aktivnih i javnih politika te uz uklanjanje svih prepreka za sudjelovanje. U EU-u danas živi oko 46 milijuna žena i djevojčica s invaliditetom koje čine oko 16 % ukupnog broja žena u Uniji i 60 % ukupnog stanovništva s invaliditetom, a samo je 18,8 % žena s invaliditetom u EU-u zaposleno. Žene i djevojčice s invaliditetom izložene su dvostrukoj diskriminaciji zbog kombinacije spola i invaliditeta i često mogu biti izložene višestrukoj diskriminaciji koja proizlazi iz kombinacije spola i invaliditeta.

Ovaj Prijedlog rezolucije poziva države članice da provedu politike za prevenciju, liječenje, rehabilitaciju i integraciju osoba s invaliditetom i za pružanje potpore njihovim obiteljima te da preuzmu odgovornost za efektivno ostvarenje njihovih prava, ne dovodeći u pitanje prava i dužnosti roditelja ili skrbnika.

Također, poziva na razvoj pedagogije kojom se društvo osvješćuje o dužnosti poštovanja i solidarnosti u pogledu osoba s invaliditetom u cilju borbe protiv socijalne diskriminacije kojoj su te osobe izložene.

Ádám Kósa (PPE), *írásban*. – 2013-ban 33 igen és 6 tartózkodás mellett fogadta el az EMPL bizottság a fogyatékossággal élő nőkről szóló véleményt, amelynek én voltam az előadója. 5 évvel később is fontos hangsúlyozni: a fogyatékosságon és nemi alapon történő megkülönböztetés valamennyi formáját tiltani kell. A fogyatékossággal élő nők csoportja nagyobb kirekesztettségnek, többszörös megkülönböztetésnek van kitéve. Fel kell használni az Európai Szociális Alapot a fogyatékossággal élő nők az élet minden fontos területén – munkaerőpiachoz, képzéshez és (általános) oktatáshoz való szabad hozzáférés terén – való nagyobb bevonásának hatékony eszközeként. A nők inaktivitási rátája magasabb, kevesebb készséget igénylő, kevesebb felelősséggel és alacsonyabb fizetéssel járó munkát végeznek, nagyobb társadalmi elszigeteltségben élnek, pénzügyileg jobban függnek a családtól és gondozóktól. A népesség elöregedésével egyre nagyobb a fogyatékossággal élő idősek aránya, akik közt több a nő a hosszabb várható élettartamuk miatt. Nagyobb figyelmet kell fordítani a jelnyelvet használó siketekre, különösen a gyengén halló idősekre (az ő számuk, arányuk a társadalmon belül növekszik). Az Uniónak és tagállamoknak meg kell osztani az innovatív tervezés példáit és együtt kell működjenek a szabványosítás területén. A sztereotípiákkal való szembeszállás a fogyatékossággal élő nők valós, inspiráló példája révén is megvalósítható, bemutatva, hogy képességeik hogyan kompenzálják fogyatékosságukat és teszik lehetővé, hogy sikeresek legyenek a szakmai és családi élet terén.

Urmas Paet (ALDE), *kirjalikult*. – ELis on üle 80 miljoni puuetega inimese, neist 60% on naised. Vananeva ühiskonna üks probleem on ka suurenev puuetega inimeste hulk kõrgemas vanuses. 45% tööealistest puuetega naistest ei ole tööturul aktiivsed. Halvenenud on ka puuetega naiste olukord, kes töötavad, võrreldes meestega – seda nii sissetuleku kui ka sotsiaalse tõrjutuse osas. Puuetega inimeste hooldajaks on 2/3 juhtudest naised; 80% puuetega inimeste hooldajatest palka ei saa; 75% neist on naised.

Kõike eeltoodut arvestades tuleb võtta rohkem meetmeid selleks, et puuetega inimeste, aga eriti naiste olukord paraneks. Tehnoloogia areng annab palju võimalusi suurendada puuetega inimeste kaasatust tööturul. Kõik puuetega inimesed peavad saama kasutada oma õigusi ning olla täieväärtuslikult ühiskonda kaasatud. Puuetega naiste puhul tuleb suuremat rõhku panna tervishoiu ning seksuaal- ja reproduktiivtervisega seonduvatele õigustele ning aidata kaasa naiste suuremale iseseisvusele. Samuti tuleb murekohti teadvustada poliitilisel tasandil ning teha kõik, et kaotada barjäärid puuetega inimeste täisväärtuslikule elule ning aidata kaasa nende õiguste ja võimaluste edendamisele ühiskonnaelus.

Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE), *kirjallinen*. – YK:n vammaisten henkilöiden oikeuksien sopimuksen tarkoituksena on taata vammaisille henkilöille täysimääräisesti ja yhdenvertaisesti kaikki ihmisoikeudet ja perusvapaudet sekä edistää heidän ihmisarvonsa kunnioittamista.

Vammaisten ihmisten oikeudet eivät toteudu itsestään, vaan ne vaativat paitsi tekoja päättäjiltä, myös osallistamista ja aktiivista vuoropuhelua. Saavutettavuusdirektiivin tarkoituksena taas on, että kaikilla olisi tasavertaiset toimintamahdollisuudet yhteiskunnassa, myös digitaalisessa.

Meillä kaikilla on oikeus tarvitsemiimme peruspalveluihin. On tärkeää tunnistaa yksilöiden, erilaisten ihmisten, erilaiset tarpeet. Myös naisten ja miesten erilaiset tarpeet on tärkeä tunnistaa. Tasa-arvon saavuttamiseksi sen edellytysten pitää olla kunnossa. Olennaista on esimerkiksi laajentaa syrjimättömyys myös työpaikan ulkopuolelle hyväksymällä jäsenmaiden käsittelyssä jumissa oleva yhdenvertaisen kohtelun direktiivi. Euroopan sosiaalisten oikeuksien pilarissa esitetyt periaatteet sukupuolten tasa-arvosta ja naisten ja miesten yhdenvertaisista mahdollisuuksista tulee toteuttaa käytännön tasolla.

Olga Sehnalová (S&D), *písemně*. – V příštím týdnu budeme slavit Mezinárodní den osob s postižením. Je velmi důležité si tyto dny připomínat – nicméně na to, že lidé s postižením mají stejná práva jako kdokoliv jiný, bychom měli myslet v průběhu celého roku. Lidé s postižením jsou pro společnost často neviditelní, obzvláště to bohužel platí pro ženy. Považuji za skutečně nepřijatelné, že žen s postižením je zaměstnán zhruba jenom poloviční počet v porovnání s muži. Nemůžeme se proto divit, že jsou nejvíce ohroženy chudobou a sociálním vyloučením. Kromě toho, že mají nižší příjmy i důchody, také častěji než muži zůstávají doma, aby se bez nároku na odměnu staraly o další rodinné příslušníky. Tuto praxi musíme změnit. Ženy s postižením musí mít možnost plně se zapojit do veřejného života a přihlásit se o svá práva. Jedním ze základních způsobů, jak toho dosáhnout, je i možnost volit a vybrat si své zástupce. Doufám proto, že příští volby do Evropského parlamentu, a nejen ty, budou plně přístupné pro všechny, včetně lidí s postižením. Ráda bych také vyzvala své kolegy, aby při své legislativní činnosti a při přípravě veškerých návrhů konzultovali organizace zastupující lidi s postižením, protože jenom tak můžeme dosáhnout toho, že na jejich práva bude skutečně brán zřetel.

(Die Sitzung wird bis zum Beginn der Abstimmung unterbrochen.)

PRÉSIDENCE: Sylvie GUILLAUME

Vice-présidente

6. Wiederaufnahme der Sitzung

(La séance est reprise à 11 h 31)

7. Begrüßung

La Présidente. – Chers collègues, je voudrais vous indiquer que nous avons le plaisir d'accueillir aujourd'hui dans la tribune des visiteurs une délégation du Majlisi Oli, présidée par Sharif Rahimzoda. La délégation est ici à Bruxelles pour participer à la septième commission de coopération parlementaire Parlement européen-Tadjikistan.

Nous sommes très heureux d'accueillir cette importante réunion qui renforcera notre dialogue et notre coopération. C'est un honneur de vous voir ici, au cœur de la démocratie européenne, signe de notre engagement commun à promouvoir les droits de l'homme, le pluralisme politique à travers l'état de droit.

Au nom de l'ensemble du Parlement européen, Mesdames et Messieurs, je vous souhaite une réunion fructueuse et un bon séjour en Europe.

Julie Ward (S&D). – Madam President, I would like to say to my colleagues that, in the

context of today's historic address by two Nobel Peace laureates – one to another, because the EU itself won the Peace Prize in 2012 — I want to inform you that yesterday. 28 November, was the seventh anniversary of the Brussels Declaration – a Pledge to Peace, signed here in this House in the European Parliament under the patronage of Gianni Pittella, then First Vice-President.

The pledge encourages projects and actions aimed at promoting peace in its most universal meaning, based on the significance of each individual person. It's inspired by the universal ideas of human dignity, freedom, equality and solidarity enshrined in the preamble of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union and confirmed by the Lisbon Treaty in 2009. So let's remember, folks, that the European Union is, and always will be, a peace project.

(Applause)

8. Abstimmungsstunde

La Présidente. – L'ordre du jour appelle l'Heure des votes.

(Pour les résultats des votes et autres détails les concernant: voir procès-verbal)

8.1. Anwendung der Stufe Euro 5 auf die Typgenehmigung von zwei- oder dreirädrigen und vierrädrigen Fahrzeugen (A8-0346/2018 - Daniel Dalton) (Abstimmung)

8.2. Handel mit bestimmten Gütern, die zur Vollstreckung der Todesstrafe, zu Folter oder zu anderer grausamer Behandlung oder Strafe verwendet werden könnten (A8-0387/2018 - Lidia Joanna Geringer de Oedenberg) (Abstimmung)

8.3. Asyl-, Migrations- und Integrationsfonds: erneute Bindung verbleibender Mittel (A8-0370/2018 - Miriam Dalli) (Abstimmung)

— *Après le vote*:

Miriam Dalli, *Rapporteur.* – Fil-fatt, abbażi tal-Artikolu 59, paragrafu 4, nixtieq nitlob li din il-materja tiġi rreferuta lill-Kumitat biex inkunu nistgħu nagħtu bidu għan-negozjati interistituzzjonali.

(Le Parlement approuve la demande)

8.4. Beitritt Samoas zum Interims-Partnerschaftsabkommen zwischen der EU und den Pazifik-Staaten (A8-0376/2018 - David Martin) (Abstimmung)

8.5. Ernennung des Vorsitzenden des Aufsichtsgremiums der Europäischen Zentralbank (A8-0380/2018 - Roberto Gualtieri) (Abstimmung)

8.6. Inanspruchnahme des Europäischen Fonds für die Anpassung an die Globalisierung – EGF/2018/003 EL/Attika – Verlagswesen – Griechenland (A8-0377/2018 - Eider Gardiazabal Rubial) (Abstimmung)

8.7. Vorübergehende Wiedereinführung von Kontrollen an den Binnengrenzen (A8-0356/2018 - Tanja Fajon) (Abstimmung)

— *Après le vote:*

Tanja Fajon, *Rapporteur.* – Madam President, I request that the matter be referred back to committee for interinstitutional negotiations, pursuant to Rule 59(4).

(Le Parlement approuve la demande)

8.8. Gemeinsame Vorschriften für die Durchführung von Luftverkehrsdiensten (A8-0150/2018 - Claudia Țapardel) (Abstimmung)

8.9. Einwand gemäß Artikel 106 GO: Natriumdichromat (B8-0548/2018) (Abstimmung)

8.10. Der Cum-Ex-Skandal: Finanzkriminalität und die Schlupflöcher im geltenden Rechtsrahmen (B8-0518/2018, B8-0519/2018, B8-0520/2018, B8-0521/2018, B8-0525/2018, RC-B8-0551/2018, B8-0551/2018, B8-0552/2018) (Abstimmung)

8.11. Rolle des Jugendamts in Deutschland bei grenzüberschreitenden Familienstreitigkeiten (B8-0546/2018) (Abstimmung)

— *Après le vote sur la proposition de résolution:*

Cecilia Wikström (ALDE). – Madam President, I have a point of order. I'd like to take my name off the resolution by the Committee on Petitions (PETI) on *Jugendamt*. The text that we have just voted is not the draft text that I proposed. It has been substantially changed by the vote in the committee, and therefore I'd like to take my name off the text. This is not my text and should not be recorded as such.

La Présidente. – Madame, nous enregistrons effectivement le retrait de votre nom.

8.12. WTO: Wie geht es weiter? (A8-0379/2018 - Bernd Lange, Paul Rübig) (Abstimmung)

8.13. Bericht 2018 über Serbien (A8-0331/2018 - David McAllister) (Abstimmung)

8.14. Bericht 2018 über das Kosovo (A8-0332/2018 - Igor Šoltes) (Abstimmung)

8.15. Bericht 2018 über die ehemalige jugoslawische Republik Mazedonien (A8-0341/2018 - Ivo Vajgl) (Abstimmung)

8.16. Bericht 2018 über Albanien (A8-0334/2018 - Knut Fleckenstein) (Abstimmung)

— *Après le vote sur l'amendement 7:*

Knut Fleckenstein (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin! Wir hätten gerne einen mündlichen Änderungsantrag. Das heißt: Ziffer 21a:

„Notes with concern that women living in rural and remote areas and Roma and Egyptian women continue to have limited access to primary health care and sexual and reproductive health services and are often unaware about the availability of such services, calls on the Albanian authorities to ensure better information about such services and ensure that they are accessible, affordable and of quality".

(L'amendement oral est retenu)

8.17. Bericht 2018 über Montenegro (A8-0339/2018 - Charles Tannock) (Abstimmung)

8.18. Schutz der akademischen Freiheit im auswärtigen Handeln der EU (A8-0403/2018 - Wajid Khan) (Abstimmung)

8.19. Situation von Frauen mit Behinderungen (B8-0547/2018) (Abstimmung)

La Présidente. – Ceci clôt l'heure des votes.

ELNÖKÖL: JÁRÓKA LÍVIA

alelnök

9. Stimmerklärungen

A szavazáshoz fűzött szóbeli indokolások

9.1. Der Cum-Ex-Skandal: Finanzkriminalität und die Schlupflöcher im geltenden Rechtsrahmen (B8-0518/2018, B8-0519/2018, B8-0520/2018, B8-0521/2018, B8-0525/2018, RC-B8-0551/2018, B8-0551/2018, B8-0552/2018)

A szavazáshoz fűzött szóbeli indokolások

Bogdan Andrzej Zdrojewski (PPE). – Niezwykle istotne przy tej rezolucji jest wskazanie państwa, w którym doszło do tak poważnych problemów z nadużyciem kwestii finansowych: to są Niemcy. Jest to bardzo smutny obraz, że tak ważne państwo w Unii Europejskiej dopuściło lukami prawnymi do tak poważnej afery.

Przypomnę, że niemieckie prawo pozwoliło na to, aby fiskus stracił 55 miliardów euro w 11 państwach członkowskich Unii Europejskiej. Wszystko to dzięki nieuczciwym bankierom, prawnikom, maklerom giełdowym. To kwota, która z pewnością pokryłaby większość potrzeb niemieckiej Bundeswehry. Zwrócę uwagę na istotność tej rezolucji w dwóch elementach, po pierwsze w tym zaniepokojeniu dotyczącym możliwości doprowadzenia do takiej luki i drugie: wezwania, które zostało sformułowane przez, mojego kolegę, Dariusza Rosatiego, za co chciałem bardzo serdecznie podziękować i podkreślić znaczenie tego wezwania.

Monica Macovei (ECR). – Doamnă președintă, scandalul Cum-Ex a demonstrat încă o dată faptul că acolo unde autoritățile închid ochii, jurnaliștii de investigație aduc adevărul la suprafață. Ei au descoperit cum au fost furate 55 miliarde de euro de la oamenii cinstiți care își plătesc taxele. A durat zece ani până când Germania a modificat legislația și a interzis returnarea frauduloasă a taxelor pe dividende. Cu această problemă se confruntă și Franța și Danemarca și Olanda și multe alte țări. Autoritățile se împiedică însă de proceduri greoaie, de colaborare nefuncțională și, practic, rezultatul este că cei care ne fură, infractorii, rămân nepedepsiți. Cum-Ex este cea mai mare escrocherie din istoria Europei și ne demonstrează că este nevoie de un răspuns european, ferm, rapid, acum, ieri, pentru a opri acest furt din banii publici.

§Pirkko Ruohonen-Lerner (ECR). – Arvoisa puhemies, EU:n jäsenvaltiot ovat menettäneet cum ex -osinkokikkailujen takia ainakin 55 miljardia euroa. Tämäkin veroskandaali tuli päivänvaloon tutkivien toimittajien työn ansiosta. Jälleen kerran viranomaiset ovat istuneet tiedon päällä, eikä tieto ole kulkenut toivotulla tavalla jäsenvaltioiden välillä.

Cum ex -skandaali antaa myös hyvän esimerkin pyöröovi-ilmiön ongelmallisuudesta.

Frankfurtin veroviraston entinen johtaja, verolakimies Hanno Berger, palkattiin pankkimaailman puolelle monimutkaisia osinkokikkailumalleja kehittämään. Bergerin näkemyksen mukaan aggressiivinenkin osinkojen pesu on ollut laillista. On vaikea käsittää, miten esimerkiksi järjestelyt, joissa useat henkilöt hakevat samaa veronpalautusta, vaikka veroa ei ole maksettu edes yhteen kertaan, ovat voineet joissain maissa olla laillisia.

Skandaali osoittaa, että paljon on vielä tehtävää veronkierron ja aggressiivisen verosuunnittelun vastaisen työn saralla. Tämän johdosta oli helppo äänestää päätöslauselman puolesta.

Seán Kelly (PPE). – Madam President, the Cum-Ex tax fraud scheme, as has been mentioned, has cost EU countries a reported 55 billion: a huge sum of money. Through complex share deals with no economic purpose other than to receive tax reimbursements from the state and no actual tax being paid, European citizens have, to put it bluntly, been robbed. The EU has made significant progress in tackling money laundering and tax fraud. However, the Cum-Ex scandal has shown that there is still a gap in effective implementation, enforcement and administrative cooperation between Member States. This scandal has, naturally, caused outrage across Europe. Urgent coordinated action at EU level is needed. This kind of large-scale tax fraud needs to be clamped down on, and we must assess the strength of the laws we have in place to this end.

Daniel Hannan (ECR). – Madam President, you might say that once the scandal was unveiled, the system worked. Investigative journalists did their job, legislation was changed. I'm struggling to understand why the rest of us are now piling in to opine on what is essentially a German domestic matter. Germany is not a failed state; on the contrary, it's a country whose rule of law is beyond question and whose authorities operate according to impartial rules. A little bit of me wonders whether this isn't part of this Chamber's constant obsession with trying to have a common fiscal policy, which would really be about reducing competition rather than about cracking down on avoidance.

But I have to say – perhaps I'm the only person in the House who feels this – isn't it slightly odd to hear all of these outraged squeals about tax avoidance from Members of the European Parliament, who are exempt from paying national income tax?

9.2. Rolle des Jugendamts in Deutschland bei grenzüberschreitenden Familienstreitigkeiten (B8-0546/2018)

A szavazáshoz fűzött szóbeli indokolások

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, ψήφισα υπέρ της έκθεσης, διότι η γερμανική υπηρεσία κοινωνικής μέριμνας παιδιών και νέων, η περίφημη «Jugendamt», έχει πραγματικά ξεπεράσει τα όρια με τη δράση της αυτά τα χρόνια. Είναι άπειρες οι καταγγελίες που έχουν γίνει στην Επιτροπή Αναφορών. Οι γονείς διαμαρτύρονται, και κυρίως αυτοί που είναι εγκατεστημένοι στη Γερμανία και δεν είναι Γερμανοί πολίτες, αλλά είναι Έλληνες, Γάλλοι, Κροάτες. Έχουμε λάβει επανειλημμένα πάρα πολλές καταγγελίες και από Πολωνούς. Η Jugendamt ακολουθεί την εξής λογική: εάν ο ένας εκ των γονέων είναι Γερμανός, πάντοτε τον υποστηρίζει· πάντοτε υποστηρίζει τους Γερμανούς. Και αυτό είναι πλέον μια διοικητική πρακτική που εφαρμόζεται χρόνια ολόκληρα. Παρεμβαίνει η Jugendamt στη λειτουργία του οικογενειακού δικαίου με διακριτικό τρόπο εις βάρος όσων δεν είναι Γερμανοί.

Marek Jurek (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Działalność niemieckich *Jugendamtów* od lat budziła sprzeciw i bardzo często bezskutecznie musieliśmy rozmawiać o tym, żeby szanowały one prawa każdego rodzica, szczególnie w przypadkach rozbitych rodzin. Dobrze, że temat ten – choć późno – został w końcu podjęty przez Parlament Europejski.

Zawsze musimy pamiętać, że prawa człowieka najpierw dotyczą wiary, rodziny, wychowania, godności ludzkiej, tożsamości narodowej. Prawa walczących o władzę polityków są dopiero pochodną. I dobrze, że dzisiaj wyraźnie o tym w tej rezolucji mówimy. Mam nadzieję, że jej efektem będzie większa otwartość na krytykę liberalnego państwa, świadomość tego, że inżynieria społeczna nie może niszczyć najbardziej elementarnych praw ludzkich i że ludzie, po prostu ludzie będą dzięki temu bezpieczniejsi.

Urszula Krupa (ECR). – Głosowałam za sprawozdaniem, które zwraca uwagę na dyskryminację rodziców przez niemiecki Jugendamt, który powołany do dbania o dobro dzieci w rzeczywistości działa przeciwko nim, odbierając dzieci rodzicom, szczególnie obcokrajowcom. Dyskryminacja rodziców, którzy nie są narodowości niemieckiej, odbieranie dzieci z błahych powodów, dotyczy także Holandii i innych krajów, w których dochodzi do łamania artykułu 24 Karty praw podstawowych, gdzie napisano, że każde dziecko ma prawo do utrzymania stałego osobistego związku i bezpośredniego kontaktu z obojgiem rodziców, jeśli nie jest to sprzeczne z jego interesami.

W petycjach wpływających do Komisji są liczne dowody na łamanie praw dziecka, tożsamości, wolności, bezpieczeństwa osobistego i na zakaz porozumiewania się w języku ojczystym, następczą germanizację, co prowadzi do rozbicia rodziny i jest powodem wielkiej traumy dzieci, choroby sierocej, a nawet może skutkować śmiercią dzieci odłączonych od matek. Jugendamt otrzymujący ogromne zasiłki na dzieci, w wysokości kilku tysięcy euro, wkracza praktycznie w każdą sferę życia.

Czesław Hoc (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Zagłosowałem za rezolucją w sprawie *Jugendamtu*, gdyż temat ten wywołuje wiele kontrowersji, sprzeciwu i emocji, o czym świadczy ogromna liczba petycji wpływających do Parlamentu Europejskiego. Na tę kwestię należy spojrzeć przede wszystkim z perspektywy autentycznych dramatów ludzkich, szczególnie dramatów dzieci, a nie z uwagi na tzw. poprawność polityczną.

Z informacji przekazywanych przez Polskie Stowarzyszenie Rodziców Przeciw Dyskryminacji Dzieci w Niemczech wynika, że tylko w 2016 roku *Jugendamt* odebrał rodzinom 77 tysięcy dzieci, z czego co najmniej 20 tysięcy to polskie dzieci. Rodzice często latami nie mają kontaktu ze swoimi dziećmi, a w czasie nadzorowanych wizyt nie mogą porozumiewać się z nimi w języku ojczystym.

Pamiętajmy, że kilka lat temu Komisja Petycji Parlamentu Europejskiego także przyjęła krytyczne sprawozdanie dotyczące *Jugendamtów*, jednak nie było żadnej pozytywnej reakcji, refleksji nad poprawą czy empatii ze strony *Jugendamtów*. Zatem najwyższy czas, by niemieckie Urzędy ds. Dzieci i Młodzieży zaczęły działać tylko i jedynie w imię dobra dziecka i wzmacniania potencjału rodziny biologicznej.

Seán Kelly (PPE). – A Uachtaráin, dar ndóigh tá obair an-mhaith á déanamh ag Coiste PETI, agus thug mé féin cúpla agóid ós a chomhair agus thug siad moladh an-mhaith faoi na hagóidí sin. Ach sa chás seo, cé go nglacaim go hiomlán gur cheart do thuismitheoirí go háirithe a bheith in ann cumarsáid a dhéanamh lena mic agus lena gclann ina dteanga dhúchais féin, ag an am céanna vótáil mise agus mo ghrúpa i gcoinne na tuarascála, mar dáiríre baineann sé seo le tír amháin agus tá sé de dhualgas ar an tír sin é a réiteach.

Freisin, fuair Coiste PETI agóidí ó thrí thír eile, dá bhrí sin, ba chóir dúinn féachaint orthu go léir le chéile gan díriú ar thír amháin. Fós féin, aontaím go hiomlán leis an bprionsabal atá anseo.

Daniel Hannan (ECR). – Madam President, this is an area where we have to tread very sensitively. We're talking about the most intimate and important matters: relations between parents and children. I've come across a number of heart-breaking cases both on the Petitions Committee and indeed as constituency cases in the UK, and yet I have to come down on the same side as my EPP friend Sean Kelly. This is fundamentally – precisely because of its sensitive nature – the sort of issue that should be determined by each country through its national democratic mechanisms and procedures. For the second time in a row I find myself rising in defence of German sovereignty. That's not to say that there isn't a problem. But the people to sort that problem out are those most directly involved, namely the authorities of the Member State in question.

9.3. WTO: Wie geht es weiter? (A8-0379/2018 - Bernd Lange, Paul Rübig)

A szavazáshoz fűzött szóbeli indokolások

Jude Kirton-Darling (S&D). – Madam President, the multilateral rules-based system is under threat as never before. It is our collective responsibility to uphold it in these trying times, especially under the attack of the current US President. In a world of raw power politics, neither the EU nor any of its Member States, individually, stands a chance of promoting a progressive future.

The keystone of the global order is the WTO. It is to date the most advanced of all the multilateral institutions. Its dispute settlement mechanism is one of the very few instruments at international level with the power to resolve conflicts peacefully. In the past, we know as a continent that economic conflicts often lead to military conflicts. But the WTO is far from perfect. It's high time we broadened its scope to make it a real instrument for development, workers and the environment.

So to save the WTO we must make it more efficient and accountable, and that's why I supported the report today.

Bogdan Andrzej Zdrojewski (PPE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Niezwykle ważne jest źródło wczorajszej debaty, jak i również samego sprawozdania. Przypomnę – to porażka, to jednak porażka, która zaczęła się w 2008 roku, czyli w czasie kiedy przyjęto pierwszą rezolucję popierającą konieczność dokonania przeglądu WTO. Dlaczego? Bo utknęły w martwym punkcie.

Dla mnie bardzo istotne jest, że od tego 2008 roku do 2018 nie tyle nic nie zrobiono, ile nie zrobiono zbyt wiele. Przypomnę, że po ostatniej konferencji ministerialnej WTO w Buenos Aires w grudniu dokładnie ubiegłego roku okazało się, że funkcja negocjacyjna organizacji została kompletnie sparaliżowana. Stało się to jeszcze w związku z tym pilniejszym zadaniem i stąd nasza debata. Jeszcze raz podkreślam, że nie można powiedzieć, że w ostatnim okresie 10 lat zrobiono niewiele albo nic. Zrobiono sporo, ale jest to kompletnie niewystarczające dla sprawnego funkcjonowania tej instytucji.

Rory Palmer (S&D). – Madam President, commercial property values plunging by almost half, house prices down 30%, sterling down by 25%, living standards hit, GDP down 8% on what was forecast – just some of this week's forecasts on the hits the UK economy would take in the event of a no-deal Brexit.

We heard earlier in this House some advocating a no-deal Brexit and trade purely and only on WTO rules. Those who advocate that position never seem to be able to answer the most obvious question: that if WTO rules are so perfect, why do countries spend so much time and energy to secure FTAs over and above WTO arrangements? Those advocating a hard deal / no-deal Brexit today must answer the question, why do they want to see people across the UK made poorer? Talk of a no-deal Brexit must be dismissed today for what it is, which is dangerous, preposterous nonsense.

Alex Mayer (S&D). – Madam President, I welcome this report into how we make the WTO more relevant. WTO rules are, for the first time in my memory, being talked about in everyday conversation in Britain. The hard-line Brexiteers tell us a no-deal Brexit is simply about adopting WTO rules. But what would that mean in practice for British businesses that export to Europe? An end to zero tariffs, a big change from today. It would result in a 12% tariff to export the fish that we capture around Suffolk shores and in Luton van parts will be taxed at 10% every time they cross the border between the UK and the EU and a 21% tariff to sell the tomatoes grown in Essex into Europe. Plus, unlike today, there will be quotas limiting the amount that we could sell into the EU and that's before we even start to think about renegotiating and starting the 124 new trade agreements currently handled through the EU with the rest of the world.

President, it seems to me that our proud exporting nation would be decimated.

Andrejs Mamikins (S&D). – Madam President, the WTO remains an example of a rules-based multilateral institution that brings a certain degree of order into the house of post-modern states. It is a precious platform for the EU to promote the values of multilateralism. However, it is becoming even more difficult considering the free-riding behaviour of some states, like the USA.

I am glad to see that the report calls for the eradication of poverty and removing barriers to women's participation in trade. I believe that our task is to make commerce as inclusive as possible. I also welcome the fact that the report calls for more transparency in international trade as a way to increase stability.

My special attention goes to the provisions on developing countries. I believe that both these and the EU, in compliance with WTO principles, should avoid a situation of donor-charity-receiver. To allow our partners to grow we need to treat them as equals and demand the same level of trade compliance from developing countries as from our developed countries.

Seán Kelly (PPE). – Madam President, I welcome the approval drafted by Mr Lange and Mr Rübig regarding the modernisation of the World Trade Organization and the way in which it operates. I welcome this report, as I believe this change is essential in order to make the WTO more relevant and adaptive to a changing, more globalised world, while strengthening the effectiveness of the organisation itself. I believe this legislation will help to overcome the difficulties and the failure of the Ministerial Conference held in Buenos Aires last December and deliver on some of the issues of the DDA. This legislation, if passed, will address the current gaps in the rule book, which create an uneven playing field in regards to subsidies and state-owned enterprises as well as regulatory barriers to services and investments. This legislation also looks at creating the necessary framework to cope with technological developments, including e-commerce, global value change and SMEs.

A Uachtaráin, is jab maith é, comhghairdeas le Lange agus Rübig.

Daniel Hannan (ECR). – Madam President, to consider the miracle – the power – of free trade, consider the story of Hong Kong. After the Second World War its GDP was a third of that of the UK. By 1997 it had drawn level; now it's 30% higher. Based on what? What natural resources does that island have? It has to import its drinking water, its food, its electricity – it is utterly reliant on things it brings in from elsewhere. Its magic was simply to remove all obstacles to trade and not to make it contingent on what any other country did. There was a unilateral removal of tariff and non-tariff barriers that led to this extraordinary flowering of prosperity. Similar thing in Singapore: went from half of our level of wealth in the 1950s to twice what it is today. And Britain outside the customs union as a WTO member will have the opportunity to do something similar to return to what first raised us above the run of nations in the 19th century, which is to remove barriers between businesses and their customers. That's all you need to do; the magic follows.

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Paní předsedající, já chci souhlasit se svým předřečníkem, že ekonomové se skutečně shodují na tom, že pro obchod je nejdůležitější odstranění všech bariér, nicméně takhle bohužel mezinárodní politika a vztahy mezi státy nefungují.

Důležitou roli skutečně plní tato organizace, která se snaží vnést pořádek do obchodních vztahů a vlastně i řešení obchodních sporů, nicméně v poslední době sledujeme jakousi paralýzu této organizace, minimálně už ve více než 10 letech a ty obchodní spory narůstají. Čína vstoupila do této organizace, nicméně neplní ideje nebo ducha této organizace.

V zásadě stojíme i díky rozporuplným opatřením Trumpovy administrativy na prahu obchodní války, takže je důležité, aby se Evropa ujmula své aktivní role, proto já jsem toto usnesení podpořil, protože ono skutečně počítá se stabilitou, s transparentností v této organizaci, s pravidly pro rozvojové země anebo s pravidly pro nové technologie. Toto všechno je potřeba, Evropa musí být aktivní. Pojďme do toho.

9.4. Bericht 2018 über Serbien (A8-0331/2018 - David McAllister)

A szavazáshoz fűzött szóbeli indokolások

Bogdan Andrzej Zdrojewski (PPE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Przypomnę, że Serbia rozpoczęła oficjalne negocjacje w 2014 r. Od tego czasu mamy 35 rozdziałów, z tego otwartych 14, czyli nawet nie połowa. Zamkniętych zostało zaledwie 2. Chcę na ten fakt zwrócić uwagę ze względu na to, że w tym tempie perspektywa przyjęcia Serbii do Unii Europejskiej to 40 czy nawet 50 lat, jeżeli oczywiście to tempo zostanie utrzymane.

Dla mnie niezwykle ważne jest, że samo sprawozdanie dotyczące tej problematyki jest bardzo dobre i zostało pozytywnie ocenione, natomiast postęp Serbii, jeżeli chodzi o wdrażanie tych elementów, do których sama się zobowiązała, niestety jest niesatysfakcjonujący. Podkreślę zwłaszcza, że z tych 35 rozdziałów największe uchybienia czy brak postępu odnotowano przede wszystkim w zakresie praworządności i wolności słowa. A przypomnę, że uznano te kwestie za niezwykle istotne.

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Paní předsedající, Srbsko je hrdá země s dlouhou, bohatou historií. Ta moderní historie je poměrně překotná. Od rozpadu státu, války, přes ukrývání některých válečných zločinců, já chci ocenit pokrok, byť je skutečně malý, na straně této země, který učinila, a předpokládám, že skutečně směřuje do toho demokratického společenství Evropy.

Je důležité ale, aby si tato země plnila ty úlohy, které si předsevzala. Je skutečností, že pro ČR a myslím, že i pro celou Evropu je podstatné, abychom skutečně dokázali balkánským zemím dát naději. Některé státy na Balkáně toho ale dokázaly daleko více, budeme o tom mluvit možná v následujícím bodě.

Mírová budoucnost a spolupráce, hospodářská prosperita, pokud skutečně o ně Srbsko usiluje, myslím, že musí zabrat. Zpráva to skutečně popisuje, myslím, že věrohodně, a já jsem ji podpořil. Tím ale dávám najevo, že by i Srbsko, pokud to myslí vážně, mělo více zabrat.

9.5. Bericht 2018 über das Kosovo (A8-0332/2018 - Igor Šoltes)

A szavazáshoz fűzött szóbeli indokolások

Dobromir Sośnierz (NI). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Kosowo otrzymuje od Unii Europejskiej bezcenne porady, jak walczyć z terroryzmem. Otóż Unia Europejska zaleca, żeby terrorystów rehabilitować, poddawać edukacji i integracji społecznej. No, naprawdę, już widzę, jak terrorystom uginają się teraz ze strachu kolana i ojciec terrorysta mówi synowi, uważaj, bo jak się złapią, to zostaniesz poddany w Unii Europejskiej takiej edukacji, rehabilitacji i integracji, że naprawdę pożałujesz.

Ludzie drodzy, terroryzm zwalcza się przez przywrócenie kary śmierci. To co wy mówicie, ta edukacja, rehabilitacja i integracja, to jest nagroda a nie kara. Na edukację trzeba sobie zapracować, na integrację sobie trzeba zasłużyć, a wy chcecie dawać to ludziom za darmo w imię walki z terroryzmem za to, że byli terrorystami. To broń Boże Kosowo przed takimi doradcami jak Unia Europejska.

9.6. Bericht 2018 über die ehemalige jugoslawische Republik Mazedonien (A8-0341/2018 - Ivo Vajgl)

A szavazáshoz fűzött szóbeli indokolások

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – Paní předsedající, já jsem podpořila zprávu o Makedonii, protože udělala značný pokrok směrem k možnému vstupu do EU. Mezi kandidátskými státy patří k nejpokročilejším, i když přetrvávají problémy s demokratickým charakterem politiky, s dodržováním zásad právního státu, včetně problémů korupce a začleňování menšin. Proto také dostává značný příspěvek od EU, aby mohla provádět reformy.

Velmi pozitivní je skutečnost, že se podařilo nalézt dohodu mezi Makedonií a Řeckem o názvu země, kterou již schválil makedonský parlament. V této zprávě je také zmínka o tom, že bývalý premiér Gruevski uprchl z Makedonie do Maďarska, kde žádá o azyl. Já předpokládám, že bude bývalý premiér vydán Makedonii, kde by měl nastoupit jako pravomocně odsouzený ke svému trestu, že tedy bude vydán.

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). – Κυρία πρόεδρε, τα Σκόπια συνεχίζουν να καπηλεύονται το όνομα της Μακεδονίας μας και την ιστορία μας. Ταυτόχρονα, ακόμη και με το νέο Σύνταγμα που υιοθέτησαν, συνεχίζουν την αλυτρωτική τους πολιτική, καθώς στο άρθρο 36 συνεχίζουν να αναφέρονται σε δήθεν «Μακεδονία» και σε δήθεν «μακεδονικό λαό». Ταυτόχρονα, στο προοίμιο του Συντάγματος, αναφέρονται στην απόφαση της ASNOM, του 1944, όπου αναφέρεται ρητά ότι υπάρχει το δικαίωμα αυτοδιάθεσης του δήθεν «μακεδονικού έθνους» και αυτοδιάθεσης του δήθεν «μακεδονικού λαού». Επομένως, παραβιάζεται από την πλευρά των Σκοπιανών ακόμη και αυτή η κατάπτυστη συμφωνία των Πρεσπών, και άρα η συμφωνία των Πρεσπών είναι νεκρή και δεν δικαιούται καν η ελληνική κυβέρνηση να την καταθέσει στο ελληνικό κοινοβούλιο. Είμαι, λοιπόν, αντίθετος με οποιαδήποτε μελλοντική ένταξη των Σκοπίων στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση και, φυσικά, καταψήφισα τη συγκεκριμένη έκθεση.

Mirosław Piotrowski (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! W przegłosowanym sprawozdaniu Parlament pochwala znaczne wysiłki Macedonii i Grecji, dzięki którym znaleziono przyjęte za obopólną aprobatą rozwiązanie kwestii nazwy kraju. Macedonia boryka się jednak z podobnymi problemami jak inne kraje tego regionu. W ustępie 32. wzywamy władze do podjęcia działań w celu rozbijania siatek przestępczych zaangażowanych w handel ludźmi, bronią i środkami odurzającymi.

Podobnie jak w przypadku Albanii i Czarnogóry w sprawozdaniu dotyczącym Macedonii wykazuje się nadmierną troskliwość wobec osób LGBTI. W ustępie 43. Parlament domaga się karania za przemoc na tle homofobicznym i transfobicznym, cieszy się natomiast z ustanowienia międzypartyjnego koła parlamentarnego do spraw praw społeczności LGBTI. Zapisy te uważam za zbędne, dlatego głosowałem przeciwko temu sprawozdaniu.

John Howarth (S&D). – Madam President, as a member of the Joint Parliamentary Committee of this House and that of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, I am pleased to support this report. There's clearly much work yet to be done before Macedonia can accede to this Union, but it should be clear to anyone whose eyes are open that significant progress has been made.

Settling disputes like the name dispute between Macedonia and Greece requires politicians of courage, who are prepared to tell the truth to the people that they seek to lead. The simple truth here is that the Prespa Agreement might not be perfect but nobody – not the nationalists in Macedonia nor the nationalists in this place – have suggested any alternative to the Prespa Agreement other than stagnation and stalemate. So let's praise the courage of those members of the Sobranie who supported the constitutional changes and look forward to progress on media freedom, and political and civil administration.

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Paní předsedající, Makedonie má status kandidátské země od roku 2005 a od té doby skutečně učinila velmi významný pokrok. Ostatně změna ústavy, ke které má dojít na základě dohody z Prespy, na základě toho hlasování z 19. října, je opravdu obrovský kus práce, který byl odveden. Nacionalisté žádné jiné řešení nenabízí. Já chci toto úsilí ocenit. Chci podpořit ty proudy, které směřují k usmíření mezi těmi dvěma státy, a myslím si, že pokud někdo kvůli tomu mění ústavu, tak myslím, že to úsilí tímto demonstruje.

Je ale třeba také učinit mnoho z toho, co tíží minulost této země, např. ve zprávě se zmiňuje otázka zvláštního státního zástupce, který má došetřit trestné činy z minulosti. Tím myslím kriminální závažné delikty, to je myslím důležitý úkol, který si bude muset Makedonie splnit, ale ta cesta je myslím, že dobrá.

9.7. Bericht 2018 über Albanien (A8-0334/2018 - Knut Fleckenstein)

A szavazáshoz fűzött szóbeli indokolások

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, έχω δηλώσει επανειλημμένα, εδώ στο Σώμα, ότι είμαι αντίθετος με οποιαδήποτε μελλοντική ένταξη της Αλβανίας στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση. Πολύ δε περισσότερο καθώς συνεχίζεται η καταπίεση της ελληνικής εθνικής μειονότητας της Βορείου Ηπείρου. Είχαμε πρόσφατα, πριν από έναν μήνα, τη δολοφονία του Κωνσταντίνου Κατσίφα από την αλβανική αστυνομία. Συνεχίζει, λοιπόν, η Αλβανία να αρπάζει τις περιουσίες των Ελλήνων, να γκρεμίζει τις εκκλησίες, να αλλοιώνει τον πληθυσμό στη Βόρειο Ήπειρο και, αυτή τη στιγμή, προβαίνει και σε νέα αντίποινα. Κόβει το ρεύμα και εκφοβίζει όλους τους Έλληνες που βρίσκονται στη Βόρειο Ήπειρο, και όλα αυτά για να περάσει το μήνυμα ότι δήθεν θα συνεχίσει αυτή την πολιτική της· την πολιτική της καταπίεσης. Της λέμε, λοιπόν, ότι αυτά δεν περνάνε και ότι συνεχώς θα την καταγγέλλουμε -εδώ, στο Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο- μέχρις ότου αναγνωρίσει και εφαρμόσει τα δικαιώματα της ελληνικής εθνικής μειονότητας της Βορείου Ηπείρου. Γι' αυτό και καταψήφισα τη συγκεκριμένη έκθεση.

Mirosław Piotrowski (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! W przegłosowanym sprawozdaniu Komisja zaleca otwarcie negocjacji akcesyjnych z Albanią. Mają one, jak podkreślono w dokumencie, umożliwić ściślejszą kontrolę ze strony Unii i przeprowadzenie reform.

Podobnie jak w innych krajach kandydujących zwracamy uwagę na powtarzającą się niebezpieczną tendencję handlu ludźmi. Mowa jest o tym w punkcie 18, gdzie nasz Parlament wzywa władze albańskie do podjęcia zdecydowanych działań w celu rozbijania siatek przestępczych zaangażowanych w handel ludźmi, a także bronią palną i środkami odurzającymi. Niepotrzebnie jednak w punkcie 23 w specyficzny sposób promuje się ideologię gender, umieszczając zapisy dotyczące LGBTI. Dlatego też głosowałem przeciwko temu sprawozdaniu.

Jasenko Selimovic (ALDE). – Madam President, Albania has made significant progress, and this needs to be acknowledged and rewarded. That's why I very much like the idea of supporting the accession negotiations with Albania next year. While being aware of the progress that has been made, especially in the juridical reform, we have as well to point out the things that still remain to be done. The electoral reforms remain a concern. The issues of corruption, organised crime and good neighbourhood relations – the reforms in these areas are painful, but they have to be done; they are essential. The rule of law, respect for human rights and the fight against corruption have to be improved. With this goal, we should all ensure the opening of the negotiations and avoiding further backsliding.

Dobromir Sośnierz (NI). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Chciałem odnieść się do skandalicznej sytuacji polegającej na tym, że na posiedzeniu plenarnym wnosi się ustną poprawkę niebędącą jedynie ortograficznym sprostowaniem, lecz zaśmiecaniem unijnych dokumentów jakimiś seksistowskimi bajdułami o kobietach na wsi, którym trzeba coś – oczywiście na koszt pozostałych podatników – zapewniać. Taką formułę należy ocenić krytycznie, podobnie jak skandaliczną treść samej poprawki. Ponadto z przykrością stwierdzam, że nie znalazło się czterdziestu sprawiedliwych posłów, którzy sprzeciwiliby się dołożeniu tej poprawki w czasie sesji. Tylko kilku posłów powstało, żeby się temu sprzeciwić. Naprawdę jest to smutne i żałosne, że boicie się wystąpić w tak oczywistej sprawie.

9.8. Bericht 2018 über Montenegro (A8-0339/2018 - Charles Tannock)

A szavazáshoz fűzött szóbeli indokolások

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – Paní předsedající, chtěla bych vysvětlit, proč jsem podpořila zprávu o Černé Hoře, která usiluje o přistoupení do EU. Považuji ji za zemi, která sdílí naše evropské kořeny a usiluje tedy o vstup do EU, což prokazuje svojí snahou o splnění kodaňských kritérií.

Ve zprávě se uvádí, že Černá Hora udělala pokrok ve vyjednávání s EU, především ve své domácí politice. Došlo ke zlepšení stavu nezávislosti soudů, elektronické správy. Dalším pozitivním ukazatelem byly i nedávné prezidentské volby v dubnu tohoto roku, kdy nebyly zjištěny žádné závažné přestupky v otázce svobodného rozhodování občanů. Jisté znepokojení máme o svobodu médií a zde budeme samozřejmě i jako EP sledovat další vývoj.

Mirosław Piotrowski (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Głosowałem przeciwko tego temu sprawozdaniu. Wczoraj wieczorem zabierałem głos na ten temat. Chcę zwrócić uwagę na pewne *iunctim* łączące sprawozdania w sprawie Macedonii i Albanii. Tutaj również, w sprawozdaniu w sprawie Czarnogóry w punkcie 22 Parlament ubolewa nad brakiem postępu w zwalczaniu handlu ludźmi. To się powtarza w każdym sprawozdaniu. Tam handluje się ludźmi, a także tutaj dodatkowo wskazuje się, że zmusza się dzieci do żebractwa.

Mówiłem wczoraj, że jest to proceder haniebny i żaden kraj aspirujący do członkostwa w Unii Europejskiej nie powinien tego tolerować, ale jest druga też tendencja, gdzie Parlament nasz zbytnio troszczy się o tak zwane mniejszości. W punkcie 34 piszemy, że niepokoimy się trudnościami z akceptacją różnorodności seksualnej w czarnogórskim społeczeństwie. Uważam te zapisy za zbędne. Dlatego, powtarzam, głosowałem przeciwko temu sprawozdaniu.

Jasenko Selimovic (ALDE). – Madam President, I thank Mr Tannock for his excellent and detailed report. Montenegro remains a frontrunner in the Western Balkans, with Chapter 31 open, and we would like the process to continue on that path.

However, certain things have to be pointed out, like the fact that media freedom remains an issue in that country. The Olivera Lakić case is one that should never happen in a country wishing to join the EU. Freedom of expression needs to be guaranteed and attacks on journalists need to be condemned.

I would also like to urge Montenegrin officials to launch public awareness-raising campaigns to fight discrimination and violence against LGBT and Roma people and to safeguard investigations and prosecutions in cases of crimes committed against them.

9.9. Schutz der akademischen Freiheit im auswärtigen Handeln der EU (A8-0403/2018 - Wajid Khan)

A szavazáshoz fűzött szóbeli indokolások

Alex Mayer (S&D). – Madam President, I welcome this debate and would make three points. Firstly, postgraduate research in the field is vital and risk can never be entirely eliminated, but it is vital that the safety of European students studying abroad remains paramount. Second, we must be vigilant when European universities host foreign branch campuses in countries where governments restrict freedom of speech. Thirdly, it is vital that we get our own house in order.

In Hungary, gender studies courses are being cancelled after a government ban, and the attacks on the CEU continue. Last week I met Professor Betegh, a visiting professor from the CEU, who told me that the university is a hub for state universities and attracts high calibre speakers who Hungarian students would not otherwise come into contact with, and that its move to Vienna would be a huge blow. Academic freedom is not an abstract notion. The right to question all and search for truth is fundamental.

Andrejs Mamikins (S&D). – Madam President, academic education is a starting point of political awareness. If we want our efforts in promoting democracy to be successful, we need to ensure that the population of the countries we engage with is able to make an informed political choice. The more freedom we give to academia, the more democratic a society we achieve. A democratic society is always a more peaceful and balanced society.

I particularly appreciate the plenary amendments tabled by S&D group that require academic freedom to become a part of the Copenhagen criteria. If a country restricts free academic research we must take it as the first symptom of illiberalism and encourage our partners to refrain from political manipulation of universities and schools. A failure in education brings about a failure in all spheres of public life, and in addition it results in a huge loss in economic opportunities.

Therefore, I support this report and hope that its provisions are fully implemented.

Rory Palmer (S&D). – Madam President, I want to congratulate my colleague, Wajid Khan, for bringing forward this important report. I think my generation grew up perhaps taking for granted, and benefiting immensely, from freedoms secured by previous generations – democracy, the rule of law, media freedom and indeed academic freedom as well.

In this era today, where all those things are being challenged, in this era of populism, of fake news and of other challenges as well, those of us who believe in those freedoms must stand up and defend them.

Academic freedom is crucial and set against those things are populism and fake news, fake facts – almost a poisoning in places of our public discourse. We must protect that space of free, unfettered scholarship and academic freedom. So I welcome this report. I was pleased to vote for it and I hope we can enact the proposals that it has brought forward.

John Howarth (S&D). – Madam President, I am delighted to support the work of my colleague, Wajid Khan, in this report which is regrettably necessary. Those of us who have taught or researched understand that academic freedom is something that must be cherished. The notion that the state should in any way dictate what is studied in academic institutions is entirely unacceptable, and I believe incompatible with European values.

We should be prepared to defend academic freedom fiercely. If a Member State or third country are acting to contain this essential freedom of inquiry then they should not be able to benefit from Union funding or collaborative programmes under Horizon Europe.

But we should also be prepared to defend academic freedom from the pressures of the market. It is rumoured that three institutions in my region are under threat for financial reasons. We need to understand that many of the greatest gains for humanity have been made from research with no obvious economic output at the time it was undertaken. We need to defend that pure research ability.

9.10. Situation von Frauen mit Behinderungen (B8-0547/2018)

A szavazáshoz fűzött szóbeli indokolások

Liadh Ní Riada (GUE/NGL). – A Uachtaráin, tuigimid ar fad, is dócha, mar mhná go bhfuil go leor constaicí agus dúshlán ann ach, samhlaigh a bheith mar bhean atá faoi mhíchumas agus feictear ansin agus tuigtear na dúshláin ollmhóra atá acusan.

Léiríonn an tuarascáil seo é sin go maith. Feicimid an t-idirdhealú abair, 18.8% de mhná faoi mhíchumas fostaithe san Aontas Eorpach i gcomparáid le 35% de na fir. Níor chóir dúinn glacadh leis seo, níl sé sásúil agus mar sin, is dóigh liom gur chóir dúinn fáilte a chur roimh na huirlisí atá sa tuarascáil seo. Ach, is faoi na Ballstáit iad sin a chur i bhfeidhm.

Agus caithfimid tosú ag cur tacaíocht faoi leith ann, ionas go mbeidh deiseanna comhionannais ann i dtaobh oideachais, i dtaobh cúrsaí sláinte, i dtaobh spóirt agus a chinntiú go mbeidh mná faoi mhíchumas in ann páirt iomlán a ghlacadh inár saol ó thaobh cúrsaí toghcháin, ó thaobh vótála agus ní dóigh liom go bhfuil na tacaíochtaí sin ann faoi láthair.

Mar sin, cuirim fáilte mhór roimhe seo, ach arís, tá sé chomh tábhachtach go gcuirfeadh na Ballstáit na huirlisí seo i bhfeidhm agus go ndéanfaidís é láithreach.

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – Paní předsedající, přestože považuji rovný přístup zdravotně postižených žen za velmi důležitý a souhlasím s tím, že by v této oblasti měly členské státy vyvíjet větší úsilí, nemohla jsem podpořit návrh zprávy kvůli zásadním výhradám, které mám k některým doporučením.

Týká se to především těch doporučení, která přesahují kompetenci EU a zasahují do rozhodování členských států, zejména v oblastech etických a zdravotní péče. Usnesení totiž doporučuje značná rozšíření v oblasti reprodukčního zdraví, což je jen jiný název pro potraty. Já se domnívám, že bychom měli chránit život, a to život všech, jak žen, tak nenarozených dětí. Kriticky se také stavím k výzvě k zajištění specifických podmínek ve zdravotnictví pro transgender osoby. Domnívám se, že to je plně v kompetenci členských států stejně jako rozhodování o změně pohlaví.

Urszula Krupa (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Głosowałam za rezolucją dotyczącą kobiet niepełnosprawnych, która szeroko omawia sytuację kobiet i dziewcząt ocenianych na 46 milionów, co stanowi 60 % całkowitej populacji osób z niepełnosprawnością. Pomimo licznych międzynarodowych konwencji i przepisów prawa europejskiego, europejskich strategii w sprawie niepełnosprawności osoby dotknięte jakimś rodzajem niepełnosprawności nadal mają problemy z korzystaniem z praw obywatelskich, socjalnych, a szczególnie opieki zdrowotnej czy też praw wyborczych. Kwestie te z różnych przyczyn ciągle wymagają rozwiązania.

Poruszone w dokumencie tematy orientacji seksualnej, przynależności płciowej, klasy czy nawet religii wydają się nie do zaakceptowania i mają drugorzędne znaczenie, jednak w związku z rolą dokumentu głosowałam za. Warto natomiast przypomnieć, że stosunek do osób słabszych, w tym dzieci, osób starszych, chorych, niepełnosprawnych, świadczy o poziomie rozwoju osobowego poszczególnych osób, ale także o stopniu poczucia odpowiedzialności i poszanowania praw obywatela ze strony państw, narodów czy instytucji.

Andrejs Mamikins (S&D). – Madam President, I support this report and want to underline that the strength of a society is assessed based on its attitude towards fragile groups. Even though European countries have achieved better social standards than the majority of our international partners, the issue of female disability is far from being solved. If you look at the figures, there is good reason to be disappointed and even ashamed. We have 46 million women and girls with disabilities in the EU, but only 18% of them are employed. 34% of them have experienced physical or sexual violence by a partner.

These women and girls not only face discrimination in the labour context, but also in education, in the social spheres of public life. As a result, their choice of profession and lifestyle is restricted. They become victims of poverty and social exclusion, and this all creates a situation where cruelty almost seems to be socially acceptable.

On those grounds, I voted in favour.

Anna Záborská (PPE). – Vážená pani predsedajúca, oceňujem snahu riešiť problémy žien so zdravotným postihnutím v našej spoločnosti. Podpora a doplnenie politík členských štátov v oblasti sociálneho zabezpečenia a sociálnej ochrany patrí k úlohám únie. Ak však chceme naozaj posilniť práva žien a dievčat so zdravotným postihnutím, musíme predovšetkým chrániť ich ľudskú dôstojnosť. Žiaľ, v uznesení o nej nenájdeme jedinú zmienku. Namiesto toho propaguje neobmedzený prístup k zariadeniam a službám v oblasti sexuálnych a reprodukčných práv, ktoré zahŕňajú aj prístup k potratom. Kompetenciu v tejto oblasti pritom majú členské štáty, a nie Európska únia. To som nemohla podporiť. Ľudský život, jeho dôstojnosť, ale aj princíp subsidiarity patria k základným hodnotám Únie. Mali by ich rešpektovať aj uznesenia jej Parlamentu.

Dobromir Sośnierz (NI). – Pani Przewodnicząca! To jest kolejna skandaliczna, seksistowska inicjatywa Parlamentu. Nie rozumiem w ogóle, co to ma oznaczać? Jak daleko zabrnęliście w tym szaleństwie Państwo? Jakie inne prawa mają mieć niepełnosprawne kobiety niż niepełnosprawni mężczyźni? Co to w ogóle ma być? Wydajemy rezolucję na temat tylko niepełnosprawnych kobiet, czyli będą osobne podjazdy dla niepełnosprawnych kobiet, a osobne dla mężczyzn? Czy jeśli mowa tu, na przykład, o usuwaniu barier do głosowania, czy ten problem jakoś bardziej dotyczy kobiet niż mężczyzn?

A już w ogóle szczytem przewrotności jest punkt 7, w którym się stwierdza, że ze względu na to, że kobiety żyją dłużej częściej są niepełnosprawne i dlatego należy je jakoś uprzywilejować. No przecież, jeśli kobiety żyją dłużej, a mężczyźni żyją krócej, to dla mężczyzn jest gorzej, to mężczyzn należałoby w tym momencie jakoś wynagradzać za ich ciężkie życie, które szybciej się kończy, a nie traktować tego jako powód do uprzywilejowania kobiet, które już z tego powodu, że żyją dłużej, w jakiś sposób są uprzywilejowane. Więc jest to absolutnie chora i przewrotna logika.

10. Berichtigungen des Stimmverhaltens und beabsichtigtes Stimmverhalten: siehe Protokoll

11. Mittelübertragungen und Haushaltsbeschlüsse: siehe Protokoll

12. Vorlage von Dokumenten: siehe Protokoll

13. Übermittlung der in dieser Sitzung angenommenen Texte: siehe Protokoll

14. Zeitpunkt der nächsten Sitzungen: siehe Protokoll

15. Schluss der Sitzung

(Az ülést 13.28-kor rekesztik be)

16. Unterbrechung der Sitzungsperiode

Elnök asszony. – Bejelentem az Európai Parlament ülésszakának megszakítását.

Legende der verwendeten Zeichen

*	Konsultationsverfahren
***	Zustimmungsverfahren
***I	Ordentliches Gesetzgebungsverfahren, erste Lesung
***II	Ordentliches Gesetzgebungsverfahren, zweite Lesung
***III	Ordentliches Gesetzgebungsverfahren, dritte Lesung

(Das angegebene Verfahren entspricht der von der Kommission vorgeschlagenen Rechtsgrundlage.)

Abkürzungen der Ausschüsse

AFET	Ausschuss für auswärtige Angelegenheiten
DEVE	Entwicklungsausschuss
INTA	Ausschuss für internationalen Handel
BUDG	Haushaltsausschuss
CONT	Haushaltskontrollausschuss
ECON	Ausschuss für Wirtschaft und Währung
EMPL	Ausschuss für Beschäftigung und soziale Angelegenheiten
ENVI	Ausschuss für Umweltfragen, öffentliche Gesundheit und Lebensmittelsicherheit
ITRE	Ausschuss für Industrie, Forschung und Energie
IMCO	Ausschuss für Binnenmarkt und Verbraucherschutz
TRAN	Ausschuss für Verkehr und Fremdenverkehr
REGI	Ausschuss für regionale Entwicklung
AGRI	Ausschuss für Landwirtschaft und ländliche Entwicklung
PECH	Fischereiausschuss
CULT	Ausschuss für Kultur und Bildung
JURI	Rechtsausschuss
LIBE	Ausschuss für bürgerliche Freiheiten, Justiz und Inneres
AFCO	Ausschuss für konstitutionelle Fragen
FEMM	Ausschuss für die Rechte der Frau und die Gleichstellung der Geschlechter
PETI	Petitionsausschuss

DROI	Unterausschuss Menschenrechte
SEDE	Unterausschuss Sicherheit und Verteidigung

Abkürzungen der Fraktionen

PPE	Fraktion der Europäischen Volkspartei (Christdemokraten)
S&D	Fraktion der Progressiven Allianz der Sozialdemokraten im Europäischen Parlament
ECR	Fraktion der Europäischen Konservativen und Reformer
ALDE	Fraktion der Allianz der Liberalen und Demokraten für Europa
GUE/NGL	Konföderale Fraktion der Vereinigten Europäischen Linken/Nordische Grüne Linke
Verts/ALE	Fraktion der Grünen/Freie Europäische Allianz
EFDD	Fraktion Europa der Freiheit und der direkten Demokratie
ENF	Fraktion Europa der Nationen und der Freiheit
NI	Fraktionslos

Amtsblatt
der Europäischen Union

DE
Reihe C

C/2024/3535

7.6.2024

AUSFÜHRLICHE SITZUNGSBERICHTE VOM 12. NOVEMBER 2018

(C/2024/3535)

EUROPÄISCHES PARLAMENT

SITZUNGSPERIODE 2018-2019

Sitzungen vom 12. bis 15. November 2018

STRASSBURG

Inhalt

Seite

1. Wiederaufnahme der Sitzungsperiode . . . 3
2. Eröffnung der Sitzung . . . 3
3. Erklärungen des Präsidenten . . . 3
4. Genehmigung des Protokolls der vorangegangenen Sitzung: siehe Protokoll . . . 4
5. Zusammensetzung des Parlaments: siehe Protokoll . . . 4
6. Antrag auf Aufhebung der Immunität: siehe Protokoll . . . 4
7. Zusammensetzung der Fraktionen: siehe Protokoll . . . 4
8. Zusammensetzung der Ausschüsse und Delegationen: siehe Protokoll . . . 4
9. Verhandlungen vor der ersten Lesung des Parlaments (Artikel 69c GO): siehe Protokoll . . . 4
10. Unterzeichnung von nach dem ordentlichen Gesetzgebungsverfahren angenommenen Rechtsakten (Artikel 78 GO) . . . 4
11. Vorlage von Dokumenten: siehe Protokoll . . . 5
12. Anfragen zur mündlichen Beantwortung (Einreichung): siehe Protokoll . . . 5

Inhalt Seite

13. Arbeitsplan 5

14. Energieeffizienz – Governance-System der Energieunion – Förderung der Nutzung von Energie aus erneuerbaren Quellen (Aussprache) 7

15. Mehrjahresplan für kleine pelagische Bestände im Adriatischen Meer und für die Fischereien, die diese Bestände befischen (Aussprache) 33

16. Überschwemmungen in Europa (Aussprache) 43

17. Mindestnormen für Minderheiten in der EU (kurze Darstellung) 49

18. Digitalisierung für die Entwicklung: Armut mit Technologie bekämpfen (kurze Darstellung) 56

19. Entwicklungshilfe der EU für das Bildungswesen (kurze Darstellung) 59

20. Ausführungen von einer Minute zu Fragen von politischer Bedeutung 63

21. Tagesordnung der nächsten Sitzung: siehe Protokoll 70

22. Schluss der Sitzung 70

AUSFÜHRLICHE SITZUNGSBERICHTE VOM 12. NOVEMBER 2018

PRESIDENZA DELL'ON. ANTONIO TAJANI

Presidente

1. Wiederaufnahme der Sitzungsperiode

Presidente. – Dichiaro ripresa la sessione del Parlamento europea interrotta giovedì 25 ottobre 2018.

2. Eröffnung der Sitzung

(La seduta è aperta alle 17.07)

3. Erklärungen des Präsidenten

Presidente. – Cari colleghi, in apertura di questa seduta voglio ricordare il centenario dell'armistizio, che nel novembre del 1918 ha posto fine alla Prima guerra mondiale. Sabato e domenica ho partecipato, in rappresentanza di tutti voi, alle cerimonie di commemorazione che si sono tenute a Parigi, in presenza dei leader del mondo intero.

La storia è una grande maestra, ma non sempre riusciamo ad apprenderne la lezione. È quindi dovere di ciascuno di noi mantenere vivo il ricordo dei milioni di morti della Grande guerra. È nostro compito preservare la memoria storica di quegli avvenimenti, ricordando alle generazioni attuali e future che quell'immane tragedia, in cui l'Europa commise il proprio suicidio, fu figlia di scontri, di egoismi e della contrapposizione tra popoli.

Venti anni dopo, purtroppo, i nazionalismi portarono ancora una volta gli europei a combattersi fra loro. Oggi, a cent'anni dalla conclusione della Prima guerra mondiale, possiamo constatare che l'amicizia e la collaborazione su cui si fonda l'Unione europea rendono impensabile una guerra tra Stati, ma guai a considerare irreversibile questo stato di cose.

Il progetto europeo unisce le nazioni e garantisce pace, libertà e prosperità. Esso ci permette di risolvere i nostri problemi attraverso confronti politici e non sui campi di battaglia. Difendiamo questo progetto e questi ideali, non solo per chi verrà dopo di noi, ma anche per rendere omaggio ai diciassette milioni di morti della Prima guerra mondiale, il cui sacrificio non può essere stato vano.

Vorrei infine salutare, con affetto ed orgoglio, le molte nazioni europee nate da questo conflitto, che quest'anno celebrano i cento anni della loro esistenza, e fra queste la Polonia, la Romania, la Lettonia, la Lituania e l'Estonia.

Voglio anche esprimere il nostro cordoglio alle famiglie delle decine di vittime causate dal maltempo in Italia. In molte regioni, in particolare in Valle d'Aosta, Veneto, Trentino, Liguria, Lazio, Campania e Sicilia, le condizioni meteorologiche hanno causato la perdita di numerose vite umane e provocato danni enormi all'economia devastando molti territori.

L'Unione europea è pronta ad aiutare le popolazioni colpite attraverso il Fondo europeo di solidarietà per le emergenze. Ringrazio la Commissione europea per aver messo a disposizione la protezione civile. Ricordo inoltre che, grazie all'impegno del Parlamento europeo, è possibile trattare più rapidamente le richieste d'aiuto e anticipare parte dei fondi richiesti.

Il fatto che molti paesi dell'Unione europea siano colpiti da eventi climatici devastanti è però un segnale di allarme per tutti quanti noi. È innegabile che questi eventi meteorologici estremi siano le conseguenze del più ampio problema del cambiamento climatico. Dobbiamo quindi raddoppiare i nostri sforzi per combatterlo. La riunione COP 24, che si terrà a dicembre a Katowice, in Polonia, ci offre l'opportunità di ribadire la leadership europea nella lotta ai gas a effetto serra e alle emissioni nocive.

Saluto anche con soddisfazione la sentenza con cui la Corte Suprema del Pakistan ha riconosciuto l'innocenza di Asia Bibi, che ha potuto così riabbracciare la sua famiglia dopo otto anni di carcere. Aspettiamo ora la conclusione dell'iter giudiziario e della revisione in corso e siamo fiduciosi che la sua assoluzione verrà definitivamente confermata. Sono in contatto con Jan Fige e con le autorità pakistane per offrire il nostro sostegno agli sforzi per garantire la libertà e la sicurezza di Asia Bibi e dei suoi cari.

(Applausi)

4. Genehmigung des Protokolls der vorangegangenen Sitzung: siehe Protokoll

5. Zusammensetzung des Parlaments: siehe Protokoll

6. Antrag auf Aufhebung der Immunität: siehe Protokoll

7. Zusammensetzung der Fraktionen: siehe Protokoll

8. Zusammensetzung der Ausschüsse und Delegationen: siehe Protokoll

9. Verhandlungen vor der ersten Lesung des Parlaments (Artikel 69c GO): siehe Protokoll

10. Unterzeichnung von nach dem ordentlichen Gesetzgebungsverfahren angenommenen Rechtsakten (Artikel 78 GO)

Presidente. – Voglio informare l'Aula che mercoledì firmerò, insieme al Presidente del Consiglio, nove atti approvati nel quadro della procedura legislativa ordinaria, conformemente all'articolo 78 del regolamento del Parlamento. I titoli di tali atti saranno pubblicati nel processo verbale della presente seduta.

* * *

Jerzy Buzek (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Chciałbym przez chwilę kontynuować to, co Pan mówił na początku naszego posiedzenia. Wczoraj w Polsce w tysiącach miejscowości miliony Polek i Polaków świętowały setną rocznicę niepodległości. Była to też okazja do refleksji nad historią ostatnich stu lat. Przeżyliśmy w tym czasie straszliwą wojnę i totalitarny system komunistyczny. Wolność i demokracja nie są dane raz na zawsze. W 2004 r. Polska powróciła do europejskiej wspólnoty i znów współtworzymy cywilizację Zachodu. O to walczyli nasi przodkowie. Polki i Polacy dzisiaj – i o tym chciałem powiedzieć Koleżankom i Kolegom z Parlamentu Europejskiego – rozumieją, że gwarantem niepodległej i silnej Polski jest Unia Europejska, unia dialogu i partnerstwa, ale jednocześnie bezkompromisowa w przestrzeganiu zasad wolności, praw człowieka i praworządności. To jest kontynuacja tego, co Pan Przewodniczący przed chwilą mówił z okazji zakończenia pierwszej wojny światowej.

11. Vorlage von Dokumenten: siehe Protokoll

12. Anfragen zur mündlichen Beantwortung (Einreichung): siehe Protokoll

13. Arbeitsplan

Presidente. – Il progetto definitivo di ordine del giorno, fissato dalla Conferenza dei presidenti, ai sensi dell'articolo 149 del regolamento, nella riunione di giovedì 8 novembre 2018 è stato distribuito.

* * *

Ana Miranda (Verts/ALE). – Señor presidente, más de ocho millones de personas están afectadas en estos momentos por la decisión del Tribunal Supremo del Estado español —no es una broma—, y por eso queremos que Europa diga algo y que tenga la última palabra, como hizo con el impuesto de actividades económicas, como hizo también con la dación en pago de las hipotecas. No sería la primera vez.

Y queremos traer este tema aquí porque hay casi ocho millones de personas afectadas por una decisión que hace que sean nuevamente los bancos los beneficiados.

No es la primera vez que el Tribunal de Justicia decide; ya lo hizo a finales del 2016, a finales del 2017. Y esperemos que también a finales del 2018 les dé la razón a las personas que han sido robadas por los bancos.

Sajjad Karim (ECR). – Mr President, some days ago we all received the wonderful news about the Supreme Court's verdicts as far as the case of Asia Bibi was concerned. Indeed, you made an interaction on behalf of this whole House in a very timely way and in a very constructive way. Bearing in mind that the proceedings are at such a sensitive stage within Pakistan at this moment in time, I really make a request to colleagues to allow for the matter at this stage to remain in our President's hands, because this House is standing completely unified behind the President at this stage, and if we are to have a debate on this at such a sensitive time, it may be that we in some way end up compromising Asia Bibi's situation. So, I call on colleagues: let's stand united behind our President and allow him to make representations on our behalf at this stage.

Presidente. – Ne parleremo fra poco, ma credo che i gruppi politici siano d'accordo con lei. Prima però di passare a trattare questi argomenti ha chiesto la parola l'on. Blanco López.

José Blanco López (S&D). – Señor presidente, quería aclarar a la Cámara, para que no haya confusión, que, a raíz de esa sentencia del Supremo, el Gobierno de España ya tomó la decisión para que precisamente lo que había acordado el Tribunal Supremo —que era que un impuesto español recayera sobre los ciudadanos y no lo pagara la banca— ya se ha revertido y ya, a partir del decreto que entró en vigor el pasado sábado, ese impuesto lo paga la banca. En cualquier caso, si hay algún recurso, como sucedió en otras ocasiones, será el Tribunal de Estrasburgo el que decida.

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, θέλω να υποστηρίξω το αίτημα του ECR προκειμένου να εγγραφεί ένα νέο θέμα για σήμερα, Δευτέρα, σχετικά με τη δολοφονία του έλληνα πολίτη.

Piernicola Pedicini (EFDD). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, io faccio un richiamo al regolamento, articolo 184 bis e articoli 1, 2 e 3 del Codice di condotta dei deputati, che non possono trarre alcun vantaggio dal proprio ruolo che rivestono, né economico, né tantomeno politico. Mi rivolgo proprio a lei, Presidente, che negli ultimi mesi è presente tutti quanti i giorni, in tutti quanti i telegiornali italiani, con continue dichiarazioni pubbliche contro l'operato del governo italiano.

Questo non si può fare. Io richiamo lei a svolgere il proprio ruolo regolarmente – questo è importante – perché non si può fare campagna elettorale visto che lei ha un ruolo istituzionale. Questo è fondamentale. Se lei vuole fare campagna elettorale, allora si dimetta, scenda da quel piedistallo e faccia campagna elettorale come tutti quanti i deputati di quest'Aula.

Presidente. – Le ricordo, onorevole Pedicini, che il Presidente del Parlamento è un deputato come tutti gli altri. Sono eletto nella mia circoscrizione e quindi sono libero di parlare senza mai violare il mio ruolo di parlamentare. Sono sempre stato – e lo possono testimoniare anche i rappresentanti del suo gruppo – imparziale nello svolgere la mia attività.

Se vuole le aggiungo pure che sono fiero di essere un giornalista e non condivido le vergognose dichiarazioni e gli insulti che sono stati rivolti ai giornalisti da parte dei rappresentanti del governo italiano. Difendo la libertà della stampa in tutta Europa. E questo lo faccio, onorevole Pedicini, come Presidente del Parlamento. Ripeto, sono fiero di essere giornalista e non accetto che si dica che i giornalisti sono delle prostitute, come hanno fatto autorevoli rappresentanti del suo partito e del governo che lei difende.

Così le rispondo. Chieda le mie dimissioni allora.

(Applausi)

Non c'è replica, onorevole Pedicini. Non c'è da replicare.

* * *

Passiamo ora alle proposte di modifica dell'ordine del giorno.

Mercoledì

A seguito delle consultazioni con i gruppi politici, desidero sottoporre all'Aula la seguente proposta di modifica del progetto definitivo dell'ordine del giorno, così come sollecitato dall'on. Karim. La dichiarazione del vicepresidente della Commissione/Alto rappresentante dell'Unione per gli affari esteri e la politica di sicurezza sul caso di Asia Bibi e la situazione delle minoranze religiose in Pakistan è rinviata a una tornata successiva, proprio per evitare che ci possano essere, a causa del nostro dibattito, rallentamenti o problemi per l'incolumità di Asia Bibi e della sua famiglia. Mi sembrava che questa fosse anche la richiesta dell'on. Karim.

(Il Parlamento approva la richiesta)

Lunedì

Il gruppo ECR ha chiesto di aggiungere, come quarto punto all'ordine del giorno, le dichiarazioni del Consiglio e della Commissione su Albania, in particolare il caso della violazione dei diritti della minoranza etnica greca dell'Epiro settentrionale e l'omicidio di Konstantinos Katsifas. La discussione dovrà concludersi con la presentazione di una risoluzione che sarà posta in votazione giovedì.

Do la parola all'onorevole Marias per formulare la richiesta a nome del gruppo ECR.

Νότης Μαριάς, *εξ ονόματος της ομάδας ECR.* – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, κύριοι συνάδελφοι, η ελληνική κοινή γνώμη είναι συγκλονισμένη από τη δολοφονία του Κωνσταντίνου Κατσίφα, έλληνα πολίτη, αλλά και μέλους της ελληνικής εθνικής μειονότητας της Βορείου Ηπείρου στην Αλβανία, στις 28 Οκτωβρίου -την ημέρα που γιορτάζει η Ελλάδα τη νίκη κατά του φασισμού του Μουσολίνι. Η επέτειος αυτή γιορτάζεται και στη Βόρειο Ήπειρο, δηλαδή εντός της Αλβανίας. Η προσπάθεια που έκανε ο Κατσίφας να εξηγήσει και να γιορτάσει κι αυτός αντιμετωπίστηκε με εκφοβισμό από την πλευρά των αλβανικών αρχών και, κυρίως, στο πλαίσιο εκκαθαριστικής επιχείρησης της αστυνομίας της Αλβανίας, δολοφονήθηκε.

Εμείς καταγγέλλουμε αυτή την υπόθεση της δολοφονίας του Κατσίφα, η οποία στηρίχθηκε πολιτικά από τον ίδιο τον πρωθυπουργό της Αλβανίας, τον κύριο Rama. Και δεν έφτανε μόνον αυτό! Οι αλβανικές αρχές, επί δέκα ημέρες, δεν επέτρεπαν στην οικογένεια να πάρει τη σορό και να θάψει τον νεκρό. Συνέταξα και επιστολή προς εσάς, κύριε Πρόεδρε, για να παρέμβετε σχετικά με το θέμα αυτό.

Παράλληλα, επικράτησε τρομοκρατικό κλίμα κατά τη διάρκεια της κηδείας του Κατσίφα. Όλα αυτά δρουν συμπληρωματικά προς την καταπίεση που υφίσταται η ελληνική εθνική μειονότητα της Βορείου Ηπείρου. Γκρεμίζονται εκκλησίες, γκρεμίζονται σπίτια, γίνονται βίαιες απαλλοτριώσεις. Πρόκειται για ένα σοβαρό θέμα.

Ζητούμε, λοιπόν, ως ECR να προστεθεί αυτό το θέμα ως ειδική συζήτηση, σήμερα, πριν από τη σύντομη συζήτηση για τις μειονότητες και θέλουμε, παράλληλα, να εκδοθεί και ψήφισμα. Η άποψη που ακούστηκε από ορισμένες πολιτικές ομάδες, ότι το θέμα μπορεί να συζητηθεί στη μικρή σύνοδο όπου συζητούμε για την Αλβανία, δεν ισχύει. Διότι εμείς συζητούμε ένα ειδικό θέμα επείγον για τα δικαιώματα της ελληνικής εθνικής μειονότητας της Βορείου Ηπείρου και για τη δολοφονία του Κατσίφα. Ζητούμε λοιπόν από τους συναδέλφους να υποστηρίξουν την πρότασή μας, την πρόταση του ECR.

Presidente. – Onorevole Marias, quindi lei chiede anche una risoluzione oltre alla discussione?

Νότης Μαριάς, *εξ ονόματος της ομάδας ECR*. – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, ζητούμε συζήτηση και ψήφισμα, το οποίο θα προετοιμάσουμε και επί του οποίου μπορούμε να ψηφίσουμε την Τετάρτη ή την Πέμπτη το πρωί.

Knut Fleckenstein, *im Namen der S&D-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident! Meine Fraktion lehnt diesen Antrag für die heutige Plenarsitzung ab. Auch wir bedauern den Tod des jungen Mannes, albanischer Staatsangehöriger der griechischen Minderheit. Wir wissen nicht genau, warum er mit einer Kalaschnikow um sich schießend und einer griechischen Flagge in der Hand am 28. dort tätig war. Und wir wissen nicht genau, ob es notwendig war seitens der Polizei, diesen jungen Mann zu erschießen, oder ob man es auch anders hätte regeln können.

Meine Bitte an Sie, Herr Präsident, ist, sich über die EU-Mission die Informationen zu besorgen, damit wir hier eine wirklich sachdienliche Debatte führen können und kein politisches Süppchen kochen. Das ist, glaube ich, bei einer solch tragischen Situation nicht angemessen.

Presidente. – Allora mettiamo ai voti la proposta del gruppo ECR, che chiede di aggiungere come quarto punto all'ordine del giorno di lunedì una dichiarazione del Consiglio e della Commissione sull'Albania, in particolare il caso della violazione dei diritti della minoranza etnica greca nell'Epiro settentrionale e l'omicidio di Konstantinos Katsifas, con la presentazione di una risoluzione che dovrebbe essere votata giovedì.

(Il Parlamento respinge la richiesta di modifica)

Martedì e giovedì

Non sono proposte modifiche.

(L'ordine dei lavori è così fissato)

VORSITZ: EVELYNE GEBHARDT

Vizepräsidentin

14. Energieeffizienz – Governance-System der Energieunion – Förderung der Nutzung von Energie aus erneuerbaren Quellen (Aussprache)

Die Präsidentin. – Als erster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die gemeinsame Aussprache über

— den Bericht von Miroslav Poche im Namen des Ausschusses für Industrie, Forschung und Energie über den Vorschlag für eine Richtlinie des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates zur Änderung der Richtlinie 2012/27/EU zur Energieeffizienz (COM(2016)0761 – C8-0498/2016 – 2016/0376(COD)) (A8-0391/2017),

— den Bericht von Michèle Rivasi und Jakop Dalunde im Namen des Ausschusses für Umweltfragen, öffentliche Gesundheit und Lebensmittelsicherheit und des Ausschusses für Industrie, Forschung und Energie über den Vorschlag für eine Verordnung des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates über das Governance-System der Energieunion, zur Änderung der Richtlinie 94/22/EG, der Richtlinie 98/70/EG, der Richtlinie 2009/31/EG, der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 663/2009, der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 715/2009, der Richtlinie 2009/73/EG, der Richtlinie 2009/119/EG des Rates, der Richtlinie 2010/31/EU, der Richtlinie 2012/27/EU, der Richtlinie 2013/30/EU und der Richtlinie (EU) 2015/652 des Rates und zur Aufhebung der Verordnung (EU) Nr. 525/2013 (COM(2016)0759 – C8-0497/2016 – 2016/0375(COD)) (A8-0402/2017) und

— den Bericht von José Blanco López im Namen des Ausschusses für Industrie, Forschung und Energie über den Vorschlag für eine Richtlinie des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates zur Förderung der Nutzung von Energie aus erneuerbaren Quellen (Neufassung) (COM(2016)0767 – C8-0500/2016 – 2016/0382(COD)) (A8-0392/2017).

Miroslav Poche, *zpravodaj*. – Vážená paní předsedající, vážený pane komisaři, když v lednu 2016 Evropská komise představila své návrhy tzv. zimního balíčku, bylo jasné, že právě odstartoval dlouhý maraton velmi náročné práce.

Stáli jsme před výzvou, jak dosáhnout takových znění legislativních návrhů, která by byla přijatelná jak pro Evropský parlament, tak Evropskou radu, tak i Evropskou komisi, ale zároveň umožnila naplnit evropské cíle v energetické oblasti a v oblasti boje proti změnám klimatu. Jsem přesvědčen, že Evropa má nejen svůj dlouhodobý díl odpovědnosti za celosvětové životní prostředí, ale také, na rozdíl od mnoha jiných, má prostředky a potenciál pro to, jak být hlavním strůjcem těchto změn.

Věřím, že není náhodou, že dnešní diskuze nad balíčkem předpisů, týkajících se čisté energie, a vlastně vůbec celé dnešní plenární zasedání, začíná právě směrnicí o energetické účinnosti, protože tím naplňujeme pravidlo „energetická účinnost na prvním místě“ v praxi, a já věřím, že tento trend převezme i většina členských států při tvorbě své energetické politiky.

Na druhou stranu jsme na začátku všichni nesdíleli úplně stejný pohled na to, jak ambiciózní bychom měli v energetické účinnosti být. Často, a bylo to tím, že jsme jinak vykládali výsledky dopadových studií, či používali jiné zdroje matematických modelů nákladů na opatření pro zvýšení energetické účinnosti, jsme se velmi lišili. Ale Evropský parlament vždy patřil mezi lídry, pokud jde o prosazování ambiciózní evropské politiky na ochranu klimatu. Jako volení zástupci obyvatel Evropské unie neseme plnou zodpovědnost za nalezení účinných opatření, která od nás, podle mého názoru, občané očekávají.

Do jednání s Radou jsme na jaře vstupovali s požadavkem závazného třicetiprocentního cíle pro energetickou účinnost na konci roku 2030, zatímco Rada podporovala komisní návrh na úrovni třiceti procent v nezávazném formátu. Vedli jsme velmi dlouhé a technické diskuze nad nákladností zaváděných opatření, jejich návratností a dopadem na hospodářský růst. Vždy jsem byl a zůstávám přesvědčen a podporují mě v tom i výsledky dopadových studií a řady analýz, že i přes počáteční výdaje budou mít tato opatření pro zvyšování energetické účinnosti velmi pozitivní dopad na hospodářský růst, zaměstnanost a na snižování závislosti Evropské unie na dovozu fosilních paliv. Jsem rád, že se nám po velmi náročných vyjednáváních a mnoha kolech trialogů podařilo dosáhnout kompromisu na úrovni 32,5 %. Rád bych toto číslo samozřejmě viděl vyšší, koneckonců jasně jsem v Evropském parlamentu opakovaně podporoval číslo 40 %, ale mějme na paměti, že 32,5 % znamenalo velký ústupek pro Radu.

Velké diskuse probíhaly i o takzvaném článku sedm, kde jsme nakonec dosáhli velmi dobré úrovně 0,8 % konečné spotřeby energie. To je velmi ambiciózní, ambiciózněji než původní návrh Evropské komise. Přál bych si zde, já osobně, zařazení dopravy do tohoto článku, což se na konci nepodařilo, ale věřím, že členské státy se v tomto ohledu budou chovat zodpovědně.

Chtěl bych závěrem také zmínit téma energetické chudoby. Jak víte, naše politická skupina je na této půdě dlouhodobě zastáncem myšlenky boje proti energetické chudobě. I díky tomu bylo možné v poslední době pozorovat, že problémy lidí, kteří nemají na zaplacení účtů za teplo či energie, stále více a více rezonuje mezi politiky na všech úrovních. Jsem proto nesmírně rád, a považuji to za velký úspěch, že se nám podařilo výrazně posílit tento aspekt a motivovat členské státy k tomu, aby ve svém plánování úspor upřednostnily investice do bydlení těch nejohroženějších skupin obyvatel.

Návrh směrnice bude předmětem revize v roce 2023, a to ve světle naplňování klimatických dohod a také pokroku v inovacích a technologiích. Dohodli jsme se, že nezůstáváme uzavřeni vyšším ambicím, a já v tyto vyšší ambice pevně věřím. V klimatické dohodě jsme se zavázali ke snížení emisí skleníkových plynů o minimálně 40 % do roku 2030 a zvyšování energetické účinnosti je ta nejúspornější cesta, která k tomu vede. Domnívám se, že jsme dojednáním legislativy o energetické účinnosti skutečně vytvořili obrovskou příležitost nejenom pro naše životní prostředí, ale také pro evropský průmysl, služby a občany, včetně těch nejchudších skupin, a pro naši konkurenceschopnost na světovém trhu, která je čím dál více ohrožena. Proto bych byl velmi rád, kdyby zítra Evropský parlament tuto dohodu odsouhlasil velkou většinou tak, aby všechny naše závazky, které z této směrnice vyplývají, byly jasně zřetelné.

Michèle Rivasi, *rapporteure*. – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Commissaire, je pense que le texte que nous allons voter est un texte historique parce qu'il s'agit vraiment d'un projet global, qui renferme plus de huit propositions législatives, dont la proposition de règlement sur la gouvernance de l'union de l'énergie. En outre, il pose les bases d'une compatibilité avec l'accord de Paris et, eu égard au dernier rapport du GIEC (Groupe d'experts intergouvernemental sur l'évolution du climat), il indique que l'on peut arriver à une hausse des températures limitée à 1,5° C.

Ce texte est aussi un accord historique parce que, pour la première fois, il est question d'une stratégie à long terme. On déclinera ensuite les objectifs pour 2030, qui devront être cohérents avec ce que l'on veut obtenir en 2050. Le texte sur la gouvernance indique que les émissions de gaz à effet de serre seront nulles. Cela signifie donc que tous les gaz à effet de serre que nous produirons devront en parallèle être absorbés. Il s'agit vraiment d'un objectif qu'il faut se fixer. On parle souvent de 2050, mais je pense qu'au niveau de l'Union européenne, avec la contribution des pays développés, ce serait bien que ce soit en 2040. Pour cela, il faut donc être cohérent avec les objectifs de l'efficacité énergétique à 32,5 % et ceux des énergies renouvelables à 32 %. C'est vrai que ces objectifs sont supérieurs à ceux que proposaient la Commission et les États. Toutefois, ce ne sera pas suffisant pour atteindre 1,5° C parce que si on suit ces objectifs, on peut être au-delà de 2° C. Autrement dit, le réexamen en 2023 sera très important. Cela fait aussi partie de la gouvernance, puisqu'il y a des objectifs en 2022, en 2025 et en 2027. Ces étapes-là sont donc essentielles pour que nous soyons cohérents avec les accords de Paris.

C'est aussi un texte innovant au niveau de la gouvernance puisqu'il fait en sorte que, dans les États, il y ait de véritables débats et discussions avec les différents partenaires, que ce ne soit pas toujours l'exécutif qui décide, que les différents partenaires participent et que, en même temps, ce soit transparent. Car la Commission a besoin aussi de la société civile des différents États membres pour que les objectifs – puisque ce sont des objectifs européens – puissent être atteints. Je pense donc qu'à la fois la transparence et la plateforme internet permettront d'avoir accès à ces données. Mais il y a un bémol: il faut que nous soyons encore plus ambitieux. Pour les gaz à effet de serre, on a dit 40 %, mais chacun sait que si l'on se donne comme objectifs les énergies renouvelables et l'efficacité, il faut aller jusqu'à 45 %, et si l'objectif est zéro émission de carbone en 2050, il faut aller beaucoup plus loin. Il est même question de 55 % en 2030.

De même – la Commission et les États ont été d'accord –, nous avons inclus la stratégie du méthane, qui ne figurait pas du tout dans les propositions de la Commission. En ce sens, c'est donc un texte innovant.

Mais j'ai une question à poser à la Commission, puisqu'elle devra présenter, le 28 novembre, des scénarios pour la stratégie à long terme. J'aimerais donc demander à M. Cañete où en est la Commission sur cette stratégie à long terme et, surtout, je tiens à lui dire qu'il faut qu'elle propose des scénarios à 1,5° C, tels que le groupe du GIEC le demande pour que, justement, nous soyons – et mon collègue l'a dit tout à l'heure – ambitieux quant au positionnement de l'Union européenne vis-à-vis du reste du monde.

Jakop Dalunde, *föredragande*. – Fru talman, kära kolleger, herr kommissionär! Förordningen om styrningen av EU:s energiunion och om klimatåtgärder är en av de mest betydelsefulla förordningar som vi har kunnat leverera i energi- och klimatpolitiken under denna mandatperiod.

För första gången får vi ett enhetligt och samlande verktyg för att skapa ordning och reda i klimatpolitiken. Vi hade aldrig kommit hit utan skickliga kolleger från den gröna gruppen. Jag vill framför allt lyfta fram Michèle Rivasis och Claude Turmes stora arbete med denna lagstiftning, men ej att förringa, också mina kollegor från de andra politiska grupperna som tillsammans med kommissionen och ministerrådet har visat på stor kompromissvilja. Vi tycker ofta olika, inte minst i klimatpolitiken, men på grund av det mycket akuta läget är jag väldigt glad över att vi har kunnat samlas, enas och visa gemensam kompromissvilja. Vi har nämligen inte längre råd att vara passiva. Vi kan inte längre skjuta den djupare gröna omställningen på framtiden. Konsekvenserna av klimatförändringarna blir alltmer uppenbara, och vi ser hur det kommer att bli alltmer dyrt och alltmer smärtsamt om vi inte agerar.

I Sverige var denna sommar den varmaste på mycket länge. Vi hade allvarliga skogsbränder i hela landet, och hade inte varit för den undsättning vi fick från våra europeiska kolleger hade läget varit mycket problematiskt. Nu ser vi också hur det brinner i Kalifornien. Läget är alltmer akut i allt fler länder. De senaste veckorna har vi fått rapporter från IPCC om hur långt vi har kvar för att ligga i linje med våra klimatmål.

Därför är denna förordning så viktig. Det är en färdplan för att vi ska uppnå Parisavtalet. Vi ser hur ett tydligt klimatpolitiskt ramverk för att ta oss hela vägen till Paris nu börjar ta form då vi äntligen fått till ett mål om nollutsläpp. Vi har krav på att alla länder måste ta fram nationella energi- och klimatplaner och att det införs en mekanism för att identifiera när våra åtgärder inte ligger i linje med våra mål, så att vi kan korrigera kursen med ett fast mål mot Paris.

Den här förordningen skapar också långsiktiga spelregler för Europas företag och industrier. Europas företag måste kunna veta vad det är som gäller, vilka strategier, vilken teknik Europas länder kommer att satsa på, så att de vet att de investeringar som de gör i ny och grön teknik kommer att vara lönsamma.

I denna lagstiftning ser vi också hur EU för första gången börjar arbeta med koldioxidbudgetar. Det är ett viktigt och historiskt steg för att vi ska kunna ha en vetenskapligt robust klimatpolitik. Klimatet kommer nämligen inte att räddas av vackra tal utan av vetenskapligt förankrad politik och koldioxidbokföring.

Denna förordning är ett första betydande steg på vägen mot att unionen tar sitt ansvar i klimatfrågan. Med denna färdplan lägger vi nu grunden för ett framtida klimatpolitiskt ramverk som säkerställer att EU gör sin del för att vi ska uppnå Parisavtalets mål.

José Blanco López, *ponente*. – Señora presidenta, hoy podemos afirmar que Europa está dando respuestas al desafío del cambio climático.

El acuerdo alcanzado en junio sobre la Directiva relativa al fomento del uso de energía procedente de fuentes renovables es un gran acuerdo. Por múltiples razones:

En primer lugar, porque vamos a duplicar la actual tasa de energías renovables e ir más allá, no me cabe duda, en la revisión del año 2023; porque aumentamos la seguridad jurídica y simplificamos los procedimientos administrativos, que son cruciales para garantizar las inversiones; o porque elevamos la cuota de renovables en sectores muy contaminantes, como la calefacción, la refrigeración o el transporte.

Pero hay un elemento singular en esta Directiva que yo quiero destacar.

Muchas veces se acusa a Europa de estar alejada, de no estar en sintonía y de no escuchar a los ciudadanos, y hoy podemos decir con orgullo que Europa no solo les ha escuchado sino que les ha situado en el corazón de la política energética.

Lo hemos hecho al consagrar por primera vez el derecho al autoconsumo, es decir, el derecho a producir, el derecho a consumir, el derecho a almacenar y el derecho a vender el excedente de la energía producida.

Lo hemos hecho al apostar por extender los beneficios de las renovables a los ciudadanos más vulnerables, contribuyendo a la lucha contra la pobreza energética.

Y lo hemos hecho al impulsar medidas de transición energética justa para que aquellos territorios en los que el peso del carbón era muy importante puedan tener un proceso de transición justa, que entiendan que nadie les abandona a su suerte.

La apuesta por las renovables es una apuesta por la innovación, es una apuesta por la actividad económica, es una apuesta por el empleo de calidad en un sector donde Europa sienta las bases para recuperar el liderazgo mundial, y es una apuesta por nuestras propias fuentes de energía para ser más independientes energéticamente.

Sí, uno de los pilares de la Unión de la Energía es precisamente reforzar nuestra independencia energética. De ahí el camino que abrimos con esta Directiva.

Es más, este acuerdo que hemos alcanzado, junto al acuerdo de eficiencia, nos va a permitir ser mucho más ambiciosos, señor comisario, en los objetivos de descarbonización que se había marcado la Unión Europea de un 40 % para el año 2030. Podemos ir más allá, podemos revisarlo y podemos alcanzar el 45 %.

Europa debe ser ambiciosa y, por lo tanto, elevar sus compromisos en la próxima Cumbre del Clima dando una señal de liderazgo y dando, sobre todo, una señal de compromiso al mundo, sobre todo una vez que los Estados Unidos han abandonado el Acuerdo de París.

Y si estos logros han sido posibles, ha sido por el clima de confianza mutua, el trabajo en equipo y el compromiso de todo el equipo negociador del Parlamento y también el compromiso de la Comisión y, muy singularmente, de los ponentes alternativos -de Kelly, de Federley, de Tamburrano, de Henkel, de Paloma y de Turmes- y también de los colegas de la Comisión de Medio Ambiente, capitaneados por Bas.

El lema de la Unión Europea es «Unidos en la diversidad». Diversos eran nuestros puntos de vista, pero hemos sido capaces de avanzar unidos para lograr nuestras metas. Sin duda, ahí ha residido nuestra fortaleza y la clave del éxito.

Miguel Arias Cañete, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, it is a real pleasure to be here today to discuss three files which are central for the Clean Energy for All Europeans package. I would like to take this opportunity in plenary to thank you all for the role that the European Parliament delegation played in June in securing a political agreement. My special thanks go to the four rapporteurs: José Blanco López, Miroslav Poche, Michèle Rivasi and Claude Turmes, and also Jakop Dalunde. I would of course also like to thank President Jerzy Buzek and Adina-Ioana Vălean, and all the shadow rapporteurs involved. Without them we would not have got such an ambitious package.

At the beginning of next month the COP 24 meets in Katowice, where we are aiming for a successful outcome to agree on the detailed rules for the implementation of the Paris Agreement. The European Union needs to assert its leadership and, by giving the files under the Clean Energy Package its strong support, this Parliament can play an important role in making this happen. Closing these files strengthens the European Union position as one of the most active leaders in the energy transition process and helps raise our collective ambition. These are perhaps the three most important dossiers in terms of delivering tangible benefits because of the targets contained in these new rules. They will set a stable and predictable legal framework for the way forward and enable us to make this major transformation for the economy and society – the clean energy transition.

Let me now say a few words about the three different dossiers, starting with energy efficiency. The key element in the agreement is that it sets a new headline energy efficiency target for the European Union for 2030 of at least 32.5%, with an upward revision clause by 2023. Thanks to the European Parliament, we now have an ambitious outcome for 2030.

The changes will also extend the current annual energy-saving obligation beyond 2020. This is a measure that has been a key driver in the progress made in recent years.

Taken together, these targets are vital as they will attract private investment and support the emergence of new market actors. This will also help drive research and innovation towards finding new solutions.

'Energy efficiency first' is a key principle of our energy policy. It is an area where ambition pays off in terms of benefits for reinforced security of supply, improved competitiveness of our industries, GDP growth, and increased employment.

The agreed text includes a number of tangible benefits for consumers, such as possible savings on their energy bills, improved living conditions and improved air quality. Furthermore, consumer rights on billing and individual metering will be strengthened. The new rules will make household bills more transparent to ensure that they are more understandable.

Last but not least, energy efficiency measures also represent an important instrument for alleviating energy poverty.

Let me turn now to the Renewable Energy Directive. Here again the position of the Parliament delegation was instrumental in securing a higher target for 2030. The text foresees a new binding renewable energy target for the European Union for 2030 of at least 32%. It also includes a review clause by 2023 for an upward revision of the European Union-level target. This is considerably higher than the 27% target originally outlined two years ago.

In broader terms, the revised directive further 'Europeanises' our approach to renewable energy, creating conditions for a cost-efficient deployment of renewables across the European Union. It introduces the principle of non-retroactivity for support provided, improves the design of support schemes for renewables to make it more market-oriented, and it streamlines the administrative procedures.

For consumers, it establishes a clear and stable regulatory framework on self-consumption – for the first time in European Union legislation – which I believe will encourage more and more households to become actively involved in the clean energy transition as consumers.

On the design and support schemes and the scope of tendering, the Commission would like to reiterate, though, that while fully supporting the objectives of the Directive, the Commission considers that they could be achieved without the respective wording of Article 4. This declaration has been transmitted to the European Parliament and will be annexed to the minutes.

That brings me to the third and final file, the new Governance Regulation. While the revisions of the two directives will provide further impetus for investment in renewables and energy efficiency – the two major elements contributing to reducing greenhouse gas emissions – the Governance Regulation establishes the process, ensuring Member States achieve this in a coherent and the most efficient way possible across all dimensions of the Energy Union. It complements the European Union ETS Directive, the Efforts Sharing and LULUCF regulations, and provides genuine European added value.

The new regulation requires each Member State to prepare an integrated national energy and climate plan for a 10-year period, starting with 2021 to 2030. This unique tool will allow assessing progress in achieving the Energy Union and our targets as it will, for the first time, encompass all relevant policies and measures of Member States and the results of regional cooperation. The Commission may then make recommendations on the plans aimed at ensuring, in case of deviations, that the European Union meets the 2030 energy and climate targets in the most coherent, collaborative and cost-effective way.

The European Parliament and the Council will address, on an annual basis, progress achieved in the Energy Union in all dimensions of energy and climate policy.

I must underline that the rules fully respect Member States' choices in determining their own energy mix. But it brings a fair and robust mechanism to facilitate the collective attainment of the binding European Union renewables target, the European Union energy efficiency target and the 15% interconnection target, while also considering research, innovation and competitiveness.

For the sake of completeness, let me recall two declarations made by the Commission during the negotiations: our commitment to analyse methane emissions, while at the same time preserving our right of initiative; and on the importance of a clear division of competences within the future two committees assisting the Commission in the implementation of the regulation, which we would have preferred to be in one single committee. These declarations are transmitted to the European Parliament and will be annexed to the minutes.

The adoption of these three dossiers will mean that we will have finalised half of the Clean Energy for All Europeans package and set our main energy-related targets for 2030.

The fact that the targets agreed are higher than those originally proposed by the Commission means that we can probably achieve even steeper emission reductions by 2030. Our latest modelling suggests that meeting these targets will de facto enable a reduction of emissions of roughly 45% across the European Union by 2030, going beyond the 40% Paris Agreement commitment. This will allow the European Union to show true leadership with real action in next month's COP 24 talks in Katowice.

We are making progress on the other clean energy dossiers – regarding electricity market design, including risk preparedness – and I am optimistic that, with the same ambition and constructive approach from all sides that we have shown on these files, we can conclude these before the end of the year under the Austrian Council Presidency.

Taken together with other parts of the package, I am convinced that these changes will have a positive impact on our quality of life and ultimately lead to cheaper household energy bills.

Similarly, negotiations on the low-carbon mobility package are advancing and we hope to conclude the files under this Parliament.

You will also be aware that the Commission concept for the next Multiannual Financial Framework will put climate-related spending at the heart of our budget.

As well as raising the ambition for climate, including clean energy transition mainstreaming across all European Union programmes from 20% to at least 25% from 2021 onwards, we are looking to boost the level of spending in all the main budget areas, notably research and structural investment.

One of the main legacies of this Commission and this Parliament will be that we have put climate change and clean energy transition at the heart of our agenda. This is what we need to explain to our citizens, especially in the run-up to the next European elections, where you can be proud of the important progress achieved together. I look forward to the debate.

Statements by the Commission

(in writing)

Proposal for a Directive of the European Parliament and of the Council on the promotion of the use of energy from renewable sources (recast)

'The Commission notes that both Co-Legislators have agreed on Article 4 with the content going beyond the general principles of the Commission proposal COM(2016) 767 final. While fully supporting the objectives of the Directive, the Commission considers that they could be achieved without the agreed wording of paragraphs 3 (third sub-paragraph), 4 (second and third sub-paragraphs), 5 and 6 of Article 4, as demonstrated by the currently applicable Directive 2009/28/EC.'

Proposal for a Regulation of the European parliament and of the Council on the Governance of the Energy Union amending Directive 94/22/EC, Directive 98/70/EC, Directive 2009/31/EC, Regulation (EC) No 663/2009, Regulation (EC) No 715/2009, Directive 2009/73/EC, Council Directive 2009/119/EC, Directive 2010/31/EU, Directive 2012/27/EU, Directive 2013/30/EU and Council Directive (EU) 2015/652 and repealing Regulation (EU) No 525/2013

Commission Statement on methane on Article 16

The Commission notes the agreement of the co-legislators relating to Article 16 by which a strategic plan should be presented for methane.

The Commission confirms its commitment to analyse methane emissions, notably in the context of the Union's long-term strategy.

The Commission emphasizes however that it reserves the right to respond in accordance with the rules of the Treaty, with due regard in particular to its right of initiative.

Commission Statement on Article 44

The Regulation on the Governance of the Energy Union is central to the Clean Energy for All Europeans Package. This Regulation aims to set out the process ensuring the ambition and coherence of policies and measures which are taken at various levels for the achievement of the Energy Union objectives and, in particular, the 2030 EU climate and energy targets.

In their Joint Declaration on the EU's legislative priorities for 2018-2019, the three Institutions committed to delivering on the objective of an ambitious Energy Union with a forward-looking climate change policy, notably by implementing the 2030 EU climate and energy framework, by continuing to follow up the Paris Agreement, including through legislation on clean energy for all Europeans.

Against this background, the Commission notes the agreement of the co-legislators relating to Article 44, which provides that the Commission shall be assisted by two committees in the implementation of the Regulation.

The Commission regrets that the co-legislators could not accept the Commission proposal that the exercise of implementing powers conferred on the Commission should be under the control of a single committee, in full compliance with the applicable comitology rules set forth in Regulation 182/2011 and in view of streamlining and Better Regulation.

The Commission reiterates the importance of a clear division of competences between the committees which is essential for a proper exercise of the Commission's implementing powers and the application of Regulation 182/2011 establishing horizontal rules applicable to committees.

Florent Marcellesi, *ponente de opinión de la Comisión de Desarrollo*. – Señora presidenta, los expertos de la ONU son muy caros. Para evitar las tremendas consecuencias del cambio climático y aprovechar los enormes beneficios económicos, sociales y ecológicos de cumplir el acuerdo climático de París debemos ser realistas, es decir, ambiciosos. O sea, reducir un 55 % nuestras emisiones antes de 2030, como ha propuesto esta Cámara, y lograr cero emisiones netas en 2040.

Cualquier estrategia a largo plazo de la Comisión Europea tiene que ser compatible con limitar el calentamiento global a 1,5 ºC. Falta un mes solo para la COP 24 y Europa tiene la capacidad y la responsabilidad de liderar la ambición climática mundial. Y para ello es fundamental el potencial de la energía ciudadana.

Hagamos que las y los europeos sean los verdaderos protagonistas de la revolución energética, apostando por un modelo que sea democrático, justo, sostenible y descentralizado. Ese es el camino, señor comisario.

Jytte Guteland, *föredragande av yttrande från utskottet för sysselsättning och sociala frågor*. – Fru talman! Denna vecka tar Europa ytterligare steg mot effektivare och klimatsmartare samhälle. Alla uträkningar visar att ju mer energi vi sparar, desto bättre för samhället, klimatet, människors hälsa, vår energisäkerhet. Dessutom skapar vi nya jobb och tillväxt när vi nu satsar på en effektivare användning av energi. Det är en riktig *win-win-win*.

Som miljöutskottets huvudförhandlare har jag deltagit genom hela processen. Jag var självklart extra nöjd med att få med ambitionen i miljöutskottet till 40 procent energibesparingar till 2030. Jag har tyvärr sett en del urvattning av den ståndpunkten och kan konstatera att vi inte kom riktigt hela vägen. Vi lyckades emellertid ändå nå många bra beslut, och jag vill tacka föredraganden för ett mycket gott samarbete.

Med ett mål om 32,5 procent mer energieffektivitet till 2030 kommer hundratusentals nya jobb att skapas i Europa samtidigt som klimatutsläppen minskar, våra importer av fossilt bränsle minskar och hälsan förbättras. Tack vare detta gör vi väldigt mycket *win-win* för Europa.

Bas Eickhout, *rapporteur for the opinion of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety.* – Madam President, first I would like to point out that what we are going to adopt tomorrow is going to be a historic package for 2030. An energy package that is stimulating on efficiency, renewables and also making sure that we have a governance in place, that it's not only numbers on paper but that we are really going to deliver.

I think it cannot be stressed enough that it was really Parliament, at the core, that raised the ambitions on all these files. The Commission was probably forced by the Member States to come up with a proposal that was written some time in 2014, but I have to say that the Commission, during the negotiations, was helpful and realised that it could step up. It was helpful also in indicating that the numbers that were being used were outdated and that therefore we could do more on efficiency and renewables, which we are all celebrating here today. But it was really Parliament that played a crucial role in achieving that.

In the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety (ENVI), we were very much focusing on issues surrounding biofuels and biomass. I think it is good to realise that, for the first time ever, we have sustainability criteria in place for biomass use in, for example, power plants. However, that was another big fight, especially with the forestry countries who do want to sell their biomass all over Europe but do not want any European regulation. We are taking the first steps now, but you will see that more will be needed to make sure that we're not just burning trees in coal-fired power plants in the future, which is still a concern for citizens.

On biofuel specifically, I think the market signal is very clear: we are moving away from food-based crops and we are moving towards advanced biofuels. That market signal is very clear and it was also an achievement of Parliament to make sure that the caps we put in place make sense.

However, there is still one big discussion and that's specifically on palm oil. We managed in the end, and Parliament was very clear: we want to phase out palm oil. We have now agreed on delegated acts with a deadline of the beginning of next year, but we hear some concerns that forces in the Commission are a bit doubtful about really making a strong proposal on that. Let me be very clear: if the Commission is not going to deliver on this, the debate on biofuels will continue forever. It's in your interest to make sure that this system can work, but then you have to be credible on limiting the worst biofuels, palm oil in particular. We will be watching closely.

Jan Huitema, *Rapporteur voor advies van de Commissie landbouw en plattelandsontwikkeling.* – Voorzitter, commissaris, klimaatwetenschappers over de hele wereld concluderen dat, willen we de ergste gevolgen van klimaatverandering voorkomen, we de aarde niet verder op moet laten warmen dan anderhalve graad. Maar individuele landen kunnen dit niet alleen, dus Europese samenwerking is hard nodig.

Ik ben daarom ook blij dat de EU nu ambitieuze plannen heeft om energie te besparen en in te zetten op hernieuwbare energie. Alleen het moet niet een doel op zich worden. Het gaat erom de CO_2-uitstoot te verminderen, en ik ben ook van mening dat we serieus moeten kijken naar de inzet van kernenergie.

Waar ik heel blij mee ben, is dat in deze wetgeving de criteria voor biobrandstof zijn aangescherpt. Want het kan natuurlijk niet zo zijn dat we biobrandstoffen gebruiken die een hogere CO_2-uitstoot hebben dan bijvoorbeeld fossiele brandstoffen en dat dit bij de productie van die biobrandstoffen gaat leiden tot een botsing.

Marijana Petir, *izvjestiteljica za mišljenje Odbora za poljoprivredu i ruralni razvoj.* – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, usvajanjem energetskog paketa zakona Europska unija nastavit će graditi svoju budućnost temeljeći je na održivosti, brizi za okoliš, prilagodbi klimatskim promjenama i održivom upravljanju resursima. Europska unija također brine da se novac građana ne troši nepotrebno na uvoz energije ako taj novac možemo iskoristiti kod kuće, primjerice za otvaranje novih radnih mjesta u biogospodarstvu ili energetskoj učinkovitosti.

U Direktivi o promicanju obnovljive energije zadan je ambiciozan, ali ostvariv cilj od najmanje 32 % udjela obnovljive energije u bruto potrošnji do 2030. godine.

Mi, u odboru AGRI, bavili smo se najviše pitanjima biogoriva i biomase. Konvencionalna biogoriva i nadalje će zadržati svoju ulogu u dekarbonizaciji prometnog sektora, dok će se posebno promicati uvođenje naprednih biogoriva i veće korištenje obnovljive električne energije.

Države članice bogate šumskom biomasom i nadalje će moći koristiti taj važan prirodni i obnovljiv resurs poštujući kriterije održivosti zasnovane na procjeni rizika.

Zahvaljujem svim kolegama u odboru AGRI na podršci.

Eleonora Evi, *relatrice per parere della commissione per le petizioni* . – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, centinaia di petizioni di cittadini europei hanno contribuito ad aggiornare l'importantissima direttiva sulla promozione delle energie rinnovabili ed io, in qualità di relatrice per parere della commissione per le petizioni, sono onorata di aver portato la loro voce.

Le petizioni hanno fatto emergere delle lacune e delle criticità, anche sistematiche, tanto nel quadro giuridico esistente, quanto nella sua applicazione concreta negli Stati membri, come in particolare nel caso citato delle modifiche retroattive ai regimi di sostegno. Questa nuova direttiva vieta tassativamente tale pratica, per evitare appunto che oggi chi intende investire nelle energie rinnovabili debba temere che il proprio investimento possa essere messo in pericolo proprio da norme retroattive che compromettano la stabilità economica dei progetti.

Bene quindi anche quelle disposizioni per gli Stati membri sulla pubblicazione di un piano a lungo termine per i meccanismi di supporto, che copra un arco temporale di almeno cinque anni, così da migliorare la chiarezza e la sicurezza degli investimenti nel settore.

La commissione per le petizioni era stata un po' più ambiziosa, però, per quanto riguarda il *target* unionale di energia rinnovabile. Chiedevamo il 35 % e, tuttavia, il 32 % ottenuto nell'accordo finale è un ottimo passo avanti rispetto alla proposta iniziale della Commissione europea, soprattutto perché è salvaguardato da una revisione al rialzo al 2023.

L'Europa si fa vedere finalmente vicino ai cittadini quando scrive norme come questa sulle rinnovabili, perché promuovere l'uso e l'autoconsumo di energia rinnovabile significa aumentare il grado di democrazia della nostra società, significa agire concretamente per proteggere il pianeta dal riscaldamento globale, significa creare posti di lavoro nell'economia verde, significa affrontare il problema della povertà energetica che oggi colpisce ancora cinquanta milioni di persone in tutta l'Unione europea, e significa soprattutto lavorare concretamente per cercare di lasciare un futuro alle prossime generazioni, perché purtroppo fino ad oggi questa Europa andava nella direzione opposta. Quindi andiamo avanti con la rivoluzione energetica.

Markus Pieper, *im Namen der PPE-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Kommissar, meine Damen und Herren! Zunächst ein Lob und ein Dank an die Kommission: Dieses *Clean Energy package* ist von Energieeinsparung über den Ausbau der Erneuerbaren bis hin zur Governance und auch den Bezügen zum Emissionshandel wirklich sehr gut aufeinander abgestimmt. Das war in der europäischen Gesetzgebung, gerade in der Energiegesetzgebung, nicht immer so.

Dann möchte ich aber auch ein Lob an uns – Selbstlob – aussprechen. Ich finde, das Parlament hat an wichtigen Punkten eine intensivere Energiewende durchgesetzt, ohne allerdings zu übertreiben. Den Mitgliedstaaten und Regionen bleibt Spielraum, ihre ganz speziellen Stärken in die Energieproduktion und auch in die Energieeinsparung einzubringen. So erreichen wir die Umwelt- und Klimaziele, ohne die Industrie zu vertreiben und ohne unsere Städte und Gemeinden zu überfordern.

Allerdings waren das im Parlament sehr knappe Entscheidungen. Die linke Seite – rot, grün, gelb – wollte 40 % Energieeinsparung. Das hätte den Strukturwandel zu den Erneuerbaren verlangsamt, und Sanierungsquoten für öffentliche Gebäude hätten Städte und Gemeinden überfordert. 3 % Sanierungsquote, das wären für ein Bundesland in Deutschland, Nordrhein-Westfalen, 2 Milliarden Euro im Jahr gewesen.

Einsparzwang, Verpflichtung, Vorgabe, Regulierung – das sind die Lieblingsworte der Linken, Grünen und vieler Populisten, auch hier im Haus. Klimaschutz geht aber auch kreativ. Nur muss dazu jede Region das einbringen können, was sie am besten kann. Anstatt Bevormundung sind deshalb Flexibilität und Versorgungssicherheit gefragt. Seit 1990 ist das europäische Sozialprodukt um 55 % gestiegen, im selben Zeitraum sind die Emissionen um 25 % zurückgegangen. Diesen Weg wollen wir mit Freude am Umweltschutz und an den Arbeitsplätzen weitergehen.

Kathleen Van Brempt, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Madam President, as has been mentioned, tomorrow we will be voting on three very important reports on the Clean Energy Package. This package represents the most important work done in the field of energy in this term, and it defines the way forward for our energy landscape for the next decade. It has been a tough battle for Parliament to succeed, as we all know and as has been mentioned, on the energy efficiency and the renewable goals.

In the first reading in this Parliament we asked for 35% for both. We were not able to maintain that, but we can be proud of this result as we had to overcome the resistance of the Council and, unfortunately, also a rather weak basis to work on from the Commission. This again is proof that this Parliament is of utmost importance to keep ambitions very high, and in that sense the regulation on governance is very important, especially given the absence of national binding targets on energy efficiency and renewable energy.

The Governance Regulation provides the Commission with the tool to integrate and evaluate the National Energy and Climate Plan. Each Member State has to come forward by the end of this year. If the sum of the pledges in these plans do not add up to the Union's collective goals, the Commission can make a Member State step up that ambition. It is extremely important to step them up because, as we know, the proposals that are in front of us are a first step but are not enough to meet our climate objectives to keep the temperature well below the 2 degrees – and, you know, that should be 1.5 degrees.

This package deals with the goals towards the 2030 targets, and in that context of climate and energy targets, that means tomorrow. Therefore, however important, this is not an end, and this is not a stop. These reports are a crucial step of many to come. Reaching our climate and energy goals, as well as each of the SDGs, in a socially just manner, is the top priority of the S&D Group, and we shall put these challenges not just here, but in all the files that we negotiate: for instance, the Multiannual Financial Framework is the next step to come. We are also looking to the long-term Decarbonisation Strategy for 2050, Mr Commissioner. We expect the Commission to take into account the most recent developments and challenges ahead of us – like, for instance, the again alarming results of the IPCC report and Parliament's request stated in the resolution on COP24.

The last but very crucial point for our Group is the requirement of combating energy poverty that we managed to get into the energy efficiency and into the government's report. It's the first time – and very important – that very specific obligations aimed at people living in energy poverty have been enshrined in European legislation. And that, I can say, is a true victory for my political group.

Anneleen Van Bossuyt, *namens de ECR-Fractie*. – Voorzitter, beste collega's, morgen zetten we een grote stap op weg naar meer hernieuwbare energie en meer energie-efficiëntie in de Europese Unie. We hebben lang en hard onderhandeld over deze wetgeving en het wordt nu tijd om knopen door te hakken. Ik reken hiervoor op een overweldigende steun in het Parlement. Iedereen heeft water bij de wijn moeten doen, ook ikzelf als schaduwrapporteur.

Het is duidelijk dat we allemaal de doelstellingen van Parijs willen halen, maar we mogen niet vergeten dat we ook onze burgers mee moeten krijgen, want het zijn zij, onze burgers en onze bedrijven, die al deze maatregelen zullen betalen. In landen waar de vlucht vooruit werd genomen, zoals in Duitsland met de *Energiewende*, zien we dat in de eerste decennia de gehoopte resultaten zullen uitblijven voor het milieu, tenzij we de Duitsers willen opzadelen worden met een toren-hoge factuur.

We moeten dus ambitieus zijn, maar wel realistisch blijven. Ook moeten we onze handelspartners blijven overtuigen om mee te doen aan een eco-realistisch verhaal. De EU is goed voor amper 10 % van de mondiale uitstoot. We mogen onszelf dus niet wegconcurreren en we moeten ook in andere delen van de wereld de groene revolutie bepleiten.

Morten Helveg Petersen, *for ALDE-Gruppen*. – Fru formand! For tre år siden gav Europas ledere håndslag på en ambitiøs klimaaftale i Paris. Håndslag på at gå forrest i klimakampen. Men det kan indimellem virke som om, at de selvsamme regeringer er blevet ramt af, hvad man kan kalde et akut grønt hukommelsestab. De lovede os guld og grønne skove ved skåltalerne i Paris, men ved forhandlingsbordene i Bruxelles, så kan der pludselig være lang vej til at indfri løfterne. Og det gælder såmænd også min egen regering i Danmark, der førhen var endnu mere ambitiøs på det grønne område.

Se bare de nye målsætninger for vedvarende energi og energieffektivitet, som vi skal stemme om i denne uge. Det er en oplagt mulighed for at hæve de grønne ambitioner. Oplagt fordi vi ved, at klimaforandringerne udgør en større trussel end nogensinde før. Og oplagt fordi vi ved, at prisen på sol- og vindenergi falder år efter år. Oplagt fordi vi skal være uafhængige af Putin i øst og sheikerne i Mellemøsten. Det er godt, at vi i det mindste kunne lave nogle aftaler, og stort tillykke til alle ordførerne, der har været involveret, men vi er ikke ambitiøse nok på klimaets vegne. Vi er nødt til at være endnu mere ambitiøse, for ellers taber vi den kamp mod klimaforandringer, der foregår i øjeblikket. Vi er den første generation, der oplever disse klimaforandringer, og vi er den sidste, der kan gøre noget reelt og effektivt for at begrænse dem. Derfor skal vores regeringer holde, hvad de har været med til at love i Paris, og hvis de glemmer det, så skal vi her i Europa-Parlamentet være mere end parate og villige til at hjælpe dem på vej, ligesom vi har gjort det gennem alle de forhandlinger, vi har været igennem her.

Benedek Jávor, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Madam President, I am really happy that, after lengthy discussions, common sense won over short-sighted interests and the co-legislators set a 2030 headline target of 32.5% for the Energy Efficiency Directive to be implemented across sectors.

However, we cannot sit back and relax. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) report clearly points out that we have to do much more than we are doing already, and we should increase our ambition. Let me remind you that the Greens/EFA Group in the European Parliament have asked for a binding 40% target, in line with the Paris Agreement objective and in line with the needs, according to the IPCC report.

Some colleagues are referring to realism and reality. But let me clarify that there is no stronger reality in the future than climate change. We can do nothing with our economic growth or industrial activity if the climate collapses. There is a huge difference between the 1.5º or the 2º climate change, and that depends on our ambition in the Energy Efficiency Directive and the Renewables Directive. This depends on this Clean Energy Package.

I have to emphasise also that it's not only about climate change and the environment. A higher ambition is a strong policy signal leading to more business actors to come on board for the energy transition. It means consumers living in decent homes, saving on their energy bills, and hundreds of thousands of jobs created in the green industries – up to 900 000 jobs according to the European Commission.

Finally, let me emphasise also that this is the way to lift out millions of European citizens from energy poverty.

Merja Kyllönen, *GUE/NGL-ryhmän puolesta*. – Arvoisa puhemies, hyvät kollegat, komission puhtaan energian pakettia on odotettu hartaudella. Toivottavasti me myös saamme nämä yhteiset tavoitteet toteutettua jäsenvaltioiden tasolla. Äänestykset eivät pelkästään parlamentissa riitä vaan konkretiaa odotetaan jäsenvaltioilta. Esimerkiksi uusiutuvan energian käytölle on nyt annettu suuntaviivat seuraavalle kahdelletoista vuodelle. Suuntaviivat olisivat tietenkin voineet olla vieläkin kunnianhimoisempia, sillä ilmastomme jatkaa lämpenemistään ja IPCC:n raportti ei todellakaan ollut mitään iloista luettavaa.

On surullista havaita, että edelleen me asetamme työpaikat ja ilmasto- ja ympäristötyön vastakkain ymmärtämättä, että todellinen vihreä vallankumous syntyy siitä, että me luomme uusia tapoja tuottaa energiaa, me luomme uusia tapoja tehdä asioita ja niitä pystytään myös markkinoimaan maailmalle eteenpäin. Tuskin mikään maa haluaa olla tuhoamassa ympäristöä, ilmastoa, planeettaamme enää pidempään.

On ehkä ollut hetkittäisiä pettymyksiä, mutta täytyy sanoa, että nyt kokonaispaketti on sellainen, jota voin kyllä itse henkilökohtaisesti tukea. Sillä tilanne ainakin paranee suhteessa tämän päivän arkisiin tositilanteisiin, joita jäsenmaissa toteutetaan.

Dario Tamburrano, *a nome del gruppo EFDD*. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, abbiamo iniziato questo percorso nella revisione della legislazione europea sull'energia a inizio legislatura. La prima proposta della Commissione è addirittura del 28 maggio 2014. Quindi, questo lavoro ha contrassegnato il lavoro mio e di tutti i colleghi in questi anni.

Devo dire, da cittadino che è entrato nelle istituzioni, che mi sento particolarmente orgoglioso di aver lavorato insieme a dei colleghi fantastici, che hanno portato sicuramente a dei risultati che io stesso mai avrei immaginato. Io sognavo che finalmente si sancissero i diritti dei produttori e dei consumatori di energia rinnovabile, che in Europa ci fosse il diritto europeo di costituire delle comunità dell'energia, era un sogno che avevo da cittadino e qui in quest'Aula, insieme ai colleghi, ho trovato persone che volevano la stessa cosa e siamo riusciti a renderla legge europea. Questa dovrebbe essere l'Europa del futuro, la stiamo scrivendo qui, perché finalmente ci si concentra su un qualcosa di reale: l'energia, la materia, l'economia circolare.

Allora l'Unione europea è nata come Comunità del carbone e dell'acciaio e stiamo in qualche maniera tornando all'origine, concentrandoci sull'energia, non più sul carbone ma su una nuova forma di energia e su una nuova forma di gestione della materia che non è più quella della semplice produzione dell'acciaio e dei manufatti. Questa dovrebbe essere l'Europa del futuro.

Si parla tanto di sovranismi, di nazionalismi. Allora io sogno un'Unione europea sovrana, non spezzettata in singoli Stati, dove ognuno vuole fare quel che vuole, perché se noi dobbiamo affrontare il cambiamento climatico e l'esaurimento delle risorse dobbiamo costruire un'Europa forte. Ho visto nelle negoziazioni che tutti i vantaggi, diciamo le cose ambiziose che noi nel Parlamento avevamo scritto, anche supportati dalla Commissione, venivano ostacolate dal desiderio e dall'interesse particolare di qualche Stato. Allora cosa vuol dire sovranismo? Vuol dire che dobbiamo proiettarci verso un'Europa diversa per combattere il cambiamento climatico e l'esaurimento delle risorse e insieme ce la possiamo fare. Questo è il nostro futuro.

Christelle Lechevalier, *au nom du groupe ENF.* – Madame la Présidente, si la lutte contre le changement climatique est nécessaire, il est dommage que cette noble cause soit dévoyée. Dans le cadre de l'union de l'énergie, la transition énergétique devient un prétexte à la prise de pouvoir de la Commission européenne sur les questions énergétiques. Indispensables au fonctionnement de nos entreprises, à la vie des particuliers ou aux déplacements, l'énergie est, par nature, l'une des principales politiques stratégiques d'un État. La souveraineté nationale dans ce domaine est, pour notre famille politique, non négociable.

Les objectifs d'efficacité énergétique vont dans le sens de l'intérêt commun et d'une lutte efficace contre le gaspillage d'énergie, ils sont l'un des rares points positifs des textes discutés ce jour. À l'inverse, les objectifs d'interconnexion devraient continuer à relever de la libre coopération entre les États. Or, ils seront soumis aux desiderata de la Commission qui entend organiser l'interdépendance des nations libres.

De la même façon, les objectifs contraignants d'énergies renouvelables sont une atteinte grave aux souverainetés nationales. Dans le cas de la France, ils ne tiennent pas compte de la forte présence de l'énergie nucléaire décarbonée dans notre mix énergétique. Avec les énergies intermittentes nécessitant des énergies fossiles pour pallier leurs variations de production, nous risquons d'arriver au paradoxe d'une hausse des émissions de CO_2.

Par ailleurs, la gouvernance prévoit l'obligation pour les États membres de présenter des plans nationaux en matière d'énergie et de climat. Elle permet aussi à la Commission d'obtenir des pouvoirs contraignants sur les choix stratégiques des mix énergétiques. Un État membre qui ne suivrait pas les orientations de vos technocrates devrait s'expliquer publiquement et s'exposerait à des sanctions. Nous l'avons déjà dit dans cet hémicycle et nous le redirons, ce n'est pas cette Europe-là que nous voulons.

Enfin, au-delà de cette union de l'énergie, notons que la lutte contre la pollution massive due à un libre-échange outrancier et au transport qui en résulte, n'est jamais évoquée. Il est vrai qu'une politique volontariste en la matière remettrait en cause votre dogme ultralibéral. Il y a pourtant là un combat d'avenir contre l'une des principales sources d'émissions de CO_2.

Dobromir Sośnierz (NI). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Sposób, w jaki próbujemy walczyć z tym poważnym problemem – bo ocieplanie klimatu, zmiany klimatyczne wywołane przez człowieka i zanieczyszczenie środowiska jest problemem – jest jak zawsze niewłaściwy. Po pierwsze, nie zachowujemy neutralności technologicznej, próbujemy ewidentnie forsować pewne technologie kosztem innych technologii, czasem z niejasnych przyczyn i bez dostatecznej wiedzy w tym kierunku. Powinniśmy dążyć do tego, żeby stworzyć mechanizmy równomiernie obciążające wszystkich użytkowników środowiska jakimiś opłatami, a technologie, jakie oni wypracują w celu unikania tych opłat, to już jest ich sprawa, nie możemy my im tych technologii narzucać. Poza tym wiara w to, że ograniczając udział Europy, która i tak odpowiada tylko za 10% emisji w skali świata, uratuje klimat tej planety, jest błędna, a opieranie się na błędnych mrzonkach prowadzi do złych zasad i zniechęcania innych, bo wszyscy widzą, że przemysł energochłonny ucieka z Europy gdzie indziej, i obserwując to, nie będą chcieli iść w nasze ślady. Podnoszenie tych stawek z 30% do 50% tym bardziej temu

nie sprzyja. To wszystko to jest zła droga i to jest źle przemyślane.

PRÉSIDENCE: SYLVIE GUILLAUME

Vice-présidente

Angélique Delahaye (PPE). – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Commissaire, chers collègues, je me réjouis de la conclusion des négociations de ce trilogue qui ont permis d'aboutir à un accord équilibré entre le Parlement et le Conseil. Nous nous sommes en effet accordés sur une voie raisonnable et raisonnée, qui reprend la vision de notre groupe dans les négociations, à savoir des objectifs environnementaux ambitieux mais réalistes, qui sont en phase avec l'accord de Paris.

Construire une Europe de l'énergie, c'est encourager tous les acteurs à réduire leur consommation énergétique, mais c'est aussi les accompagner vers une consommation plus durable. Aussi, la protection de l'environnement et la compétitivité des entreprises doivent aller de pair et les objectifs fixés dans ce texte ouvrent des perspectives qui permettront aux acteurs privés comme publics d'inventer les solutions de demain.

Mais construire l'Europe de l'énergie, c'est aussi garantir notre indépendance et nous permettre d'être compétitifs dans le concert mondial. Je plaide depuis de nombreuses années pour le développement de cultures protéiniques à destination de l'alimentation animale sur notre continent, et ce afin de réduire notre dépendance aux importations de produits OGM ou de ceux issus de la déforestation.

C'est pourquoi, je suivrai de très près les préparations des actes délégués, notamment en ce qui concerne les biocarburants. Ces futures décisions sont d'une grande importance pour l'avenir des filières agricoles européennes.

Theresa Griffin (S&D). – Madam President, I am very proud to have been part of this Clean Energy Package: incredibly important legislation that will affect all European citizens. We were able to demonstrate clear progressive leadership on all three files. It commits the European Union to renewable energy and energy efficiency targets in line with the Paris Agreement, of at least 32% and 32.5%. The UK must remain part of this legislation.

Our work means we'll be able to integrate renewables further into our energy mix as well as phase out high-polluting biofuels and increase industry's investment in innovative technologies while supporting self-generation among consumers and local renewable-energy communities.

Energy efficiency is a fundamental part of the sustainable transition and is central to achieving our Paris goals. It is crucial for the competitiveness of our industries, for future growth and job creation. Improved energy efficiency targets will secure a better quality of life for those in energy poverty. For every 1% improvement in energy efficiency, three million homes can be properly renovated and seven million people lifted out of energy poverty.

Significantly, these targets must apply not only across the EU but in the United Kingdom. The need for the UK to meet our climate change commitments cannot and must not be a victim of Brexit. The targets must be seen as a bare minimum, not as aspirational. The UK must commit to meeting these targets as part of the Brexit negotiations and to staying an active member of the Internal Energy Market, for the sake of our planet and our children's future.

So I urge this Chamber: what we need now is implementation, and we need Member States to fulfil their targets and promises. We can no longer delay action, and Europe needs to be a real world leader in combating climate change. In Brexit, I urge the UK to take its climate change responsibilities seriously and to do the same.

Evžen Tošenovský (ECR). – Paní předsedající, pane komisaři, jsem rád, že v průběhu trialogu doznaly podle mého názoru až příliš ambiciózní cíle značných změn. Zvýraznil bych obzvláště energetickou účinnost. Zde by přijetí původně programovaných cílů znamenalo neuvěřitelně vysoké investiční náklady a obrovské cenové výkyvy. Jsem také rád, že se nám podařilo zmírnit povinnosti vyplývajících z takzvané „Governance" a udržet balíček co nejvíce v oblasti energetiky: o té vlastně „Governance" je. Není tak nadměrný posun do oblasti klimatu.

Zásadním pro mne zůstává zajištění bezpečnosti a spolehlivosti dodávky elektřiny na odpovědnosti členských států. Na úrovni členského státu tedy také musí zůstat nezbytně nutné působnosti a rozhodovací pravomoci týkající se zajištění bezpečnosti a spolehlivosti dodávek elektřiny. Role regionálních či evropských organizací a jejich akty musí zůstat pouze doporučující, bez rozhodovacích pravomocí.

To samé se týká také energetického mixu. Pouze členský stát si musí zachovat právo volby energetického mixu a zároveň schopnost využívat jeho výhod. Znamená to i povinnost nést nevýhody z této volby vyplývající. Členský stát nesmí mít povinnost, ale pouze možnost, nést solidárně náklady vyplývající z volby energetických mixů v okolních členských státech.

Fredrick Federley (ALDE). – Fru talman! Det är, som sagt, historiska beslut vi nu fattar, vilket många kolleger här har påpekat. Vi lägger grunden för att känna en ökad energisäkerhet inom unionen där vi inte är beroende av tredjeland utanför unionen. Vi tar tydliga kliv mot att klara de mål som vi har satt upp genom Parisavtalet.

Men är detta nog? Jag vågar säga att det faktiskt inte är det. Det är därför som vi både i denna och annan miljö- och klimatlagstiftning, som till exempel ETS-regleringen, har lagt in en översynsklausul som gör att vi efter det att vi har gjort den stora översynen av Parisavtalet 2023 även ser över vår egen lagstiftning för att se om den är tillräckligt kraftfull.

Jag är särskilt glad över att ha varit med och förhandlat om paketet om förnybar energi som är oerhört viktigt inte bara för att klara energiomställningen, utan också för jobben tvärs över hela Europeiska unionen. Det är dock med beklagande som jag hört kolleger här i dag stå och sprida en lögn som inte är sann om att vi som kommer från länder med mycket skog bara vill exportera biomassa till dem som har väldigt mycket kol. Det är inte sant! Det vi vill göra med vår skog är att se till att vi producerar produktiva saker av fibern och inte bränner skogen.

Yannick Jadot (Verts/ALE). – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Commissaire, il y a un peu plus de 65 ans, l'Union européenne créait sa première institution: la Communauté européenne du charbon et de l'acier. Évidemment les défis ont changé: il ne s'agit plus de faire la paix au sein de l'Union européenne mais, finalement, de faire la paix avec notre avenir, de faire la paix avec l'environnement et puis, évidemment, de bâtir une économie et créer des emplois au sein de l'Union européenne.

Le moins que l'on puisse dire, c'est que la Commission européenne et les États membres n'ont pas eu le courage de nos pères fondateurs face à ces défis. Le Parlement européen s'est montré plus ambitieux, mais, 32 %, ce n'est pas encore à la hauteur de ce que nous devons faire ni de ce que nous pouvons faire.

Mais je suis optimiste parce que je suis réaliste. Les énergies renouvelables représentent la rationalité économique et industrielle si nous savons protéger nos industries, notamment de la concurrence chinoise. Elles reflètent d'abord la réalité économique évidemment. Les énergies renouvelables ont un coût qui a été divisé par deux en dix ans pour l'éolien, par sept pour le photovoltaïque pendant que le coût du nucléaire a été multiplié par trois.

Les énergies renouvelables représentent évidemment la rationalité sociale. Un million d'emplois sont créés par an dans le monde autour des énergies renouvelables, c'est deux à trois fois plus d'emplois par unité de production que les énergies fossiles ou l'énergie nucléaire. Les énergies renouvelables sont aussi synonymes de rationalité en matière d'aménagement de nos territoires. Combien de nos territoires aujourd'hui sont marqués par les pertes d'emplois, par les pertes économiques, par les pertes d'activité?

Investissons dans nos territoires avec la transition énergétique, c'est cela la rationalité géopolitique, c'est cela la rationalité citoyenne. Enfin nous permettons aux communautés citoyennes d'accéder aux énergies renouvelables. Mais il faut faire preuve de rationalité géopolitique, rationalité démocratique, parce que, franchement, dépendre de l'eau, du vent et de la mer, c'est quand même plus sympa que de dépendre de Poutine ou des pétromonarchies du Golfe ou du Gabon.

Paloma López Bermejo (GUE/NGL). – Señora presidenta, no se pueden negar los aspectos positivos que contiene la Directiva relativa al fomento del uso de energía procedente de fuentes renovables en cuanto a las comunidades de energía renovable, el autoconsumo y las medidas de apoyo, entre otros.

Lamentablemente, el resto del paquete —eficiencia y gobernanza— no ha tenido el mismo resultado y, por tanto, el conjunto será insuficiente para cumplir con los objetivos establecidos en el Acuerdo de París y poner freno a las graves consecuencias del cambio climático.

El Consejo ha estado por debajo de las ambiciones que la ciudadanía europea demanda, especialmente en lo referente al transporte, el uso de biocarburantes y la falta de objetivos vinculantes por países. Necesitamos más ambición que dé respuesta a las exigencias para la preservación de la vida en el planeta, porque es esto precisamente de lo que hablamos.

Una vez más, algunos países han situado los intereses a corto plazo de las multinacionales por encima de los intereses generales de las sociedades. En el escenario actual, el ascenso de la extrema derecha en países como Brasil o los Estados Unidos añade más preocupaciones en este terreno. La agenda autoritaria considera la defensa del medio ambiente como un enemigo a batir y la naturaleza, un recurso que puede ser esquilmado.

Tenemos poco tiempo para revertir esta situación, y las energías renovables son una parte de la solución en un proceso de transición energética justa. Pero no es suficiente.

No desaprovechemos la ocasión: nos jugamos el futuro, y la Unión Europea puede y debe ponerse al frente de este desafío.

Julia Reid (EFDD). – Madam President, we are all aware of the catastrophic consequences that pollution has for our health and the environment. It's been estimated that 43% of deaths globally are caused by environmental air pollution and, if this is true, it is costing billions of euros a year. It should be our right as human beings to breathe fresh air and live in a clean environment. Member States should actively monitor the activities of big polluters in their countries and take ad hoc measures to reduce pollution levels.

However, regarding the EU's clean energy package, I believe the Commission should not interfere with Member States' plans to reduce pollution. The EU should be more realistic and understand that the world's climate debate is coming to an end. The alarmist dialogue about man-made climate change should be replaced by a more realistic attempt at cooperation among national parliaments to reduce the levels of pollutants in Europe. Member States should not be struggling to comply with unrealistic EU energy standards. National parliaments should be free to exploit their energy resources, bearing in mind the fundamental need to protect their citizens' health and the environment.

Olaf Stuger (ENF). – Voorzitter, er zijn ook wel eens zinnige onderwerpen die op de politieke agenda worden gezet door de establishmentpartijen: schone energie of plastic afval in de natuur of in zee, daar kunnen we moeilijk tegen zijn. Ik vind niet dat de EU zich ermee moet bemoeien, maar het zijn op zich zinnige onderwerpen.

De vraag is: waarom nu? Waarom nu ineens deze opwinding? Want als we het hebben over plastic in zee is dat al 10--20 jaar een probleem. In mijn tijd in het nationaal parlement kwamen er al actiegroepen en milieubewegingen langs om dat te vertellen. En ze zijn hier zeker ook langs geweest. Er zijn hier heel veel parlementsleden die er nu nog zitten, maar de partijen ook, die wisten van de problemen, zij wisten van de ernst en hebben toen niets gedaan. En nu ineens wel!

En dat is omdat oude politieke partijen pas in beweging komen als de politieke agenda gedomineerd wordt door een hun onwelgevallig onderwerp. En dat is in dit geval migratie en islam, het onderwerp van mijn politieke beweging. Dat slaat enorm aan bij de Europese bevolking en daarom moeten de oude politieke partijen als een dolle op zoek naar een concurrerend onderwerp. En dat hebben ze nu gevonden. Maar dat is niet intrinsiek gemotiveerd! Want als dat zo was geweest, dan hadden de partijen die hier toen ook al in grote meerderheid aan de macht waren daar toen iets aan gedaan. En dat hebben ze niet! Dat kun je ze kwalijk nemen, want daardoor is het probleem alleen maar vergroot.

En u kunt het eens zijn met mijn politieke lijn over migratie en islam of u kunt het ermee oneens zijn, maar het is in ieder geval intrinsiek gemotiveerd en consistent, al vijftien jaar.

Λάμπρος Φουντούλης (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, το θέμα της προστασίας του περιβάλλοντος είναι ένα από τα ελάχιστα, κατά τη γνώμη μου, θέματα στα οποία η συμβολή της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης έχει αποδειχθεί καθοριστική. Στο ζήτημα της ενεργειακής ασφάλειας και, συνολικότερα, της εξοικονόμησης ενέργειας, οφείλω να αναγνωρίσω ότι, κατ' αρχήν, η Ένωση κινείται σε θετική κατεύθυνση. Όμως, δεν θεωρώ πως οι προτάσεις της Ένωσης μέχρι σήμερα απαντούν στο σημαντικότερο, ίσως, ερώτημα: πού θα βρεθεί όλη αυτή η ενέργεια, η οποία χρειάζεται, αν εγκαταλείψουμε και τα ορυκτά καύσιμα αλλά και την πυρηνική ενέργεια; Οι ανανεώσιμες πηγές ενέργειας -παρά τη θετική συμβολή τους- δεν επαρκούν σε καμία περίπτωση, τουλάχιστον με τις σημερινές τεχνολογίες. Επίσης, τα βιοκαύσιμα ίσως δημιουργούν περισσότερα προβλήματα από αυτά που προσδοκούν να λύσουν.

Η δεύτερη παρατήρηση αφορά την ενεργειακή ένδεια. Στα περισσότερα κράτη μέλη υπάρχουν κάποιες προβλέψεις για ενίσχυση των αδύναμων οικονομικά στρωμάτων. Όμως, στην Ελλάδα για παράδειγμα, οι προβλέψεις αυτές περιορίζονται σε νοικοκυριά με συνολικό οικογενειακό εισόδημα κάτω των 11 000-12 000 ευρώ. Στην πράξη, είναι αδύνατον μια οικογένεια με εισόδημα 15 000 ευρώ ετησίως να μπορέσει να εφαρμόσει τις δράσεις που προβλέπονται στις εκθέσεις και να ανακαινίσει την κατοικία της ώστε να πετύχει εξοικονόμηση ενέργειας.

Jerzy Buzek (PPE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Jako szef komisji ITRE chciałem pogratulować w pierwszej kolejności wszystkim sprawozdawcom za osiągnięcie tego rezultatu. To naprawdę wielka sprawa. Cele są ambitne, ja bym proponował, żeby ich już teraz nie mnożyć, tylko skupić się przede wszystkim na wykonaniu zadania. Dzięki temu, że mamy mechanizm zarządzania unią energetyczną, bo jeśli chcemy być wiarygodni w ramach porozumienia paryskiego, to trzeba spełnić te cele, na które się zdecydowaliśmy. Chodzi także o ratowanie naszej planety od innego zagrożenia, równolegle niejako, mianowicie od smogu. Czterysta tysięcy ludzi przedwcześnie umiera w Unii Europejskiej i dlatego niektóre zapisy, chciałem o tym powiedzieć, niektóre zapisy w dyrektywie OZE są bardzo korzystne z tego punktu widzenia, na przykład dla systemu ciepłowniczego albo dla prosumentów, co na wsi jest szalenie ważne.

Jeszcze jedna sprawa, pan Blanko López wspomniał o konieczności poparcia naszych propozycji przez obywateli, zgadzam się. Może mają również duże ambicje w zakresie ochrony klimatu, bardzo dobrze, ale w niektórych regionach jest ich aż czterdzieści jeden. Takim regionem jest Górny Śląsk, na który państwo przyjedziecie za miesiąc na COP24. Tam potrzebna jest sprawiedliwa transformacja energetyczna i właśnie w komisji ITRE przegłosowaliśmy program na prawie pięć miliardów euro. Taka była propozycja, moja zresztą, aby taki program był w ramach budżetu. Musimy go przegłosować w środę, to jest bardzo ważne dla naszych obywateli.

Carlos Zorrinho (S&D). – Chegámos aqui, após um grande trabalho de equipa. Saúdo todos os relatores, também a Comissão e o Conselho. Mas agora a questão-chave é convocarmos para esta equipa os poderes nacionais, os poderes regionais, os cidadãos.

Esta é uma grande oportunidade estratégica, para a economia, para o ambiente, para a qualidade de vida. Temos de concretizar. Como correlator-sombra da Governação da União da Energia queria deixar uma palavra muito especial à minha colega Theresa Griffin, que me acompanhou num trabalho estimulante de reforço da dimensão inclusiva, sustentável e inovadora da nova política energética europeia.

Destaco alguns resultados que nesse regulamento estão plasmados. São incorporadas metas sectoriais. Podem não ter sido as mais ambiciosas, mas é importante cumpri-las: 32,5% na eficiência energética, 32% nas energias renováveis em 2030.

A execução dos planos a dez anos, a comparabilidade desses planos, o abranger as cinco dimensões da União da Energia é muito importante. Já estamos a dar passos na descarbonização dos transportes, é por aí que temos de continuar, e devemos pugnar por uma governação participada, estabelecendo um diálogo multilateral e exigindo uma mobilização muito forte da sociedade civil.

Saliento também a introdução das estratégias a longo prazo, com a estratégia do clima, para podermos alinhar o progresso com o Acordo de Paris. E também a transição justa. É muito importante que os cidadãos, as regiões, sintam que há um sentido de justiça na transição energética, de ganho para todos de forma justa, reforçando a cooperação regional entre os Estados-Membros e entre estes e a União.

Senhor Comissário, caros colegas, acredito que amanhã aprovaremos este pacote com uma clara maioria, mas isso não é o ponto de chegada, isso é o ponto de partida. Agora é preciso que cada um faça a sua parte, com urgência e com empenho, com o mesmo entusiasmo com que trabalhámos neste pacote no Parlamento Europeu.

Jadwiga Wiśniewska (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Panie Komisarzu! U podstaw pakietu czystej energii leży unia energetyczna, której jednym z filarów jest dekarbonizacja. Przypomnę, że do porozumienia paryskiego doszło dlatego, że z ostatecznego jego kształtu zniknęła właśnie dekarbonizacja. Z dekarbonizacją absolutnie się nie zgadzam. Stawianie na dekarbonizację grozi trwałą utratą konkurencyjności przemysłu i gigantycznymi kosztami społecznymi, szczególnie dla gospodarek z dużym udziałem węgla w miksie energetycznym, takich jak Polska. Dekarbonizacja bierze niestety górę nad solidarnością energetyczną i sprawiedliwą transformacją. Mocno uderzy w regiony górnicze, takie jak Śląsk. Z kolei dyrektywa o efektywności energetycznej wprowadza absurdalny wymóg rocznej redukcji energii końcowej o 0,8%, myląc tym samym efektywność energetyczną z oszczędzaniem energii. Spowoduje to zagrożenie dla wzrostu gospodarczego oraz wzrost ubóstwa energetycznego. Więcej uznania mam dla rozporządzenia o odnawialnych źródłach energii. Przepisy dotyczące biomasy, biopaliw czy włączenia OZE do ciepłownictwa sieciowego zostały skonstruowane w sposób wyważony i uznaję je za dobry przykład kompromisu między tym, co pożądane, a tym, co możliwe. Obawy moje

natomiast budzi wysoki cel ogólny. Przykład Niemiec udowadnia, że masowa transformacja w kierunku OZE prowadzi do wysokich kosztów.

Pavel Telička (ALDE). – Madam President, the Clean Energy Package is really one of the most important and significant pieces of legislation of our mandate and I'm very glad that I have been able to participate in the deliberations.

It is absolutely necessary to modernise and shape the energy market, that is for sure, especially if we want to succeed in global competition, but at the same time, we need to focus on the other side of the coin: reducing consumption. It has dropped but, at the same time, we have new technologies, electro-mobility, other sources, renewables, and we obviously will have to focus on further reducing consumption.

For me, the question is energy efficiency, an energy efficiency policy first, definitely. I would appreciate it if we could focus on that and I invite the Member States to implement, as soon as possible, as thoroughly as possible, the Clean Energy Package, with an emphasis not just on the opportunities in terms of technology, renewables, etc. but also on lowering consumption.

Lynn Boylan (GUE/NGL). – Madam President, in the wake of the alarming UN climate reports, we are meeting this week in Strasbourg to vote on the outcomes of important energy files which will of course affect our climate policies. But on the energy efficiency directive, here we had the opportunity to make some real change. But, as expected, the agreement has been battered and bruised through negotiations with the Council, all the important provisions have been watered down, weakening ambition and reducing obligations on tackling energy poverty to nothing but a footnote.

On the Renewable Energy Directive we have an acceptable EU target and even good provisions on making biofuel sustainable. An end to palm oil is in sight but we cannot have any backsliding on this. However, that said, is it wrong of me to expect a directive on renewable energy to be about climate action, rather than paving the way for a liberalised energy market? Climate goals – not an energy market – should be at the heart of these directives.

Diane James (NI). – Madam President, Oxfam Germany last week produced a report that claims that European Union biofuels are causing widespread global deforestation, and NGO Fern reported that people's lives were being threatened by the European Union's set of clean energy policies. Greenpeace have claimed that the European Union is even choosing to ignore its own advice on biofuels, and another expert academic opinion indicated recently the damage to birdlife from windfarms directly affecting negatively the wildlife food chain.

The European Union is, and always has been, a monstrous threat to the environment. In short, the European Union's strive for clean energy, justified by its obsession with climate change targets, has been – and will continue to be – nothing short of an ecological disaster. And that's not an epitaph I would want the European Union to have.

Bendt Bendtsen (PPE). – Fru formand! Tak til Kommissionen, ordførere og skyggeordførere for et rigtig solidt resultat. I har været med til at lægge kimen til et mere bæredygtigt europæisk energisystem med de nye regler. Og der er jo meget på spil: fremtidens klima, vores internationale klimaaftaler, og så har vi faktisk med disse regler et kæmpe europæisk vækstpotentiale. Vores import er stigende, og det gør os altså sårbare i EU på den lange bane. Vi kan jo ikke fortsætte med at blive mere og mere afhængige af gas fra Putin og olie fra Mellemøsten. Og så taler vi altså også om, at det er borgernes energiregninger og virksomhedernes konkurrenceevne og eksportmuligheder, der er på spil. Hvis vi ikke bruger vores energi klogere og bedre, vil vore virksomheder betale prisen gennem højere CO_2-kvotepriser. Det kræver altså ambitiøse, langsigtede prioriteter for at bringe Europa på rette kurs. Al energi er værdifuld og skal bruges optimalt, derfor skal begrebet »energy efficiency first« omsættes til praksis. De nye regler for håndhævelse skal sørge for, at EU-landene leverer. Europæisk energipolitik er kun så stærk, som EU-landene gør det til. Det er altså et spørgsmål om en god og en rettidig implementering. De opdaterede rammer for vedvarende energi giver en klar bane for Europas grønne omstilling og globale lederskab og endnu mere europæisk innovation og nytænkning i blandt andet biobranchen og transportbranchen.

Jo Leinen (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Mit diesem Gesetzespaket kommen wir in der Energiewende in der Europäischen Union einen großen Schritt voran.

Wir schaffen Planungssicherheit für die Mitgliedstaaten, aber vor allen Dingen für die Unternehmen in der Europäischen Union. Ich glaube, dass wir Investitionen in Milliardenhöhe antreiben, was auch Innovationen bringen wird. Wenn man in China war und sieht, wie die bei Fotovoltaik, bei Elektrobatterien und bei anderen grünen Technologien mit Volldampf vorangehen, der muss wissen, dass wir uns sputen sollten. Dieses Energiepaket hilft auch der Forschung und Entwicklung für effiziente und bessere Lösungen in Europa.

Ich sehe auch, dass wir die Kohlekraftwerke nicht durch Biomassekraftwerke ersetzen dürfen. Die Bioenergie darf nicht verschwendet werden. Holz und Waldreste sollten für die Lücken in der Fotovoltaik und Windversorgung genutzt werden, aber nicht großflächig als Kraftwerke, wie wir das leider mit den Pelletkraftwerken haben.

Ich sehe auch, dass wir bei dieser großen Transformation alle mitnehmen müssen. Erwähnt worden sind die Kohleregionen. Aber bei der Langfriststrategie, Herr Kommissar, haben wir auch andere soziale Nöte – in Städten, in Regionen wie auch bei Bürgern. Ich denke, dass die Klimastrategie auch mit einer Sozialstrategie der Europäischen Union korrelieren muss.

(Der Redner ist damit einverstanden, eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte" gemäß Artikel 162 Absatz 8 der Geschäftsordnung zu beantworten.)

Paul Rübig (PPE), *Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte"*. – Ich möchte mich beim Kollegen Leinen sehr herzlich bedanken, weil wir ja gesehen haben, dass der Import von fossiler Energie letztlich sehr hohe Kosten verursacht. Werden hier die Kosten auch für unsere Konsumenten sinken? Und wird es eine Kaufkraftsteigerung für unsere Konsumenten geben, wenn wir mehr auf erneuerbare Energie und Energieeffizienz setzen?

Jo Leinen (S&D), *Antwort auf eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte"*. – Ja, Herr Kollege, Sie sprechen ein wichtiges Thema an. Energie sparen heißt auch Kosten sparen. Das schlägt sich letztendlich im Geldbeutel der Bürgerinnen und Bürger nieder, das ist der Vorteil. Und mit den erneuerbaren Energien werden wir eines Tages das System bezahlt haben, und dann ist die Energie gratis. Die Sonne schickt keine Rechnung. Das ist der Unterschied zu fossilen Energien, wo wir den Scheichs im Nahen Osten und Putin in Russland jedes Jahr Milliarden überweisen. Die Sonne und der Wind schicken keine Rechnungen. Deswegen ist das vorteilhaft für die Volkswirtschaft wie auch für jeden einzelnen Bürger. Da haben Sie recht.

Pirkko Ruohonen-Lerner (ECR). – Arvoisa puhemies, kansainvälisen ilmastopaneelin hiljattain julkaisema raportti muistutti, että ilmaston lämpenemisen pysäyttämiseksi tarvitaan ripeitä ja kunnianhimoisia toimenpiteitä. Puhtaan energian säädöspaketti sisältää uudistuksia energiatehokkuuden parantamisesta, uusiutuvien energiamuotojen käytön edistämisestä ja energiaunionin hallinnon järjestämisestä. Näillä keinoilla unioni pyrkii saavuttamaan Pariisin sopimuksen mukaiset sitoumuksensa ilmastonmuutoksen torjumiseksi.

Energiatehokkuutta parantamalla vähennetään myös riippuvuutta energian tuonnista EU:n ulkopuolelta sekä alennetaan kotitalouksien ja yritysten energiakustannuksia. Samalla lievitetään energiaköyhyyttä eli tilannetta, jossa esimerkiksi eläkkeelle jääneellä tai työttömäksi joutuneella kansalaisella ei enää ole varaa asua vanhassa kodissa sen korkeiden asumiskustannusten takia. Tulevina vuosikymmeninä energiaköyhyydestä voi tulla pohjoisessa, kuten Suomessa, vielä nykyistä laajempi ongelma, mikäli energian hinta nousee nopeammin kuin ihmisten reaaliansiot.

Toivon, että kaikissa energiapaketin hyvissä pyrkimyksissä onnistutaan. EU:n on tehtävä oma osuutensa ilmastomuutoksen torjunnassa. Samalla on kuitenkin pidettävä huoli siitä, että kansalaisille taataan mahdollisuus kohtuuhintaiseen asumiseen ja elämiseen.

Anneli Jäätteenmäki (ALDE). – Arvoisa puhemies, olen iloinen ja huojentunut siitä, että huomisen äänestysten jälkeen tästä talosta lähtee kannustava ja todellinen viesti kaikille niille eurooppalaisille, jotka ovat kehittämässä maailman edistyneimpiä ratkaisuja päästöjen vähentämiseksi. Pääpainon on oltava siinä, että irtaudumme fossiilisista polttoaineista ja tämä edellyttää pikaisesti erilaisia toimenpiteitä useilla eri toimialoilla.

Esimerkiksi siirtyminen vähäpäästöiseen liikenteeseen tarvitsee kipeästi kestävien biopolttoaineiden tuomia päästövähennyksiä. Biopolttoaineita voi nopeasti soveltaa koko autokantaan ja lisäksi myös lentoliikenteeseen, joka valitettavasti kasvaa koko ajan.

Minulla on kysymys kaikille bioenergiaa vastustaville tahoille tässä parlamentissa. Haluatteko todella saavuttaa ne kunnianhimoiset päästövähennykset, joihin olemme sitoutuneet EU:n tasolla? Minä haluan ja siksi EU:lta tulee saada tällaisia päätöksiä, joihin ihmiset voivat ennakoiden valmistautua.

Paul Rübig (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin! Ich glaube, die EVP hat in diesen Verhandlungen ganz klar gezeigt, dass wir nicht nur im Energiebereich für das Setzen von Anreizen sind – best practice, scoreboard, mapping – für den Konsumenten. Ich glaube, wir sollten Gesetzgebung für die Bürgerinnen und Bürger machen und nicht verhindern, verbieten, strafen, unrealistische Ziele setzen gegen den Willen der Konsumenten. Ich glaube, der Konsument sollte im Mittelpunkt unserer Entscheidungen stehen. Deshalb ist es auch wichtig, dass wir Technologieneutralität in den Zielen so weit wie möglich fixieren.

Wir wissen, dass wir für den Import von fossiler Energie ungefähr den doppelten EU-Haushalt ausgeben. Und deshalb ist es wichtig, dass die Prioritäten richtig gesetzt werden – nämlich im Verkehr, dass wir uns auch Gedanken machen über biologische und synthetische Kraftstoffe. Können wir hier mehr in die Forschung investieren? Hybridtechnologie und vor allem Nutzung von modernen Technologien für kontinuierliches Fahren in den Städten, damit wir in den Städten endlich das Rotlicht wegbekommen, damit nicht Millionen von Kraftfahrzeugen ständig bremsen und Gas geben und deshalb der Feinstaub in wirklich erschreckende Höhen kommt. Kontinuierliches Fahren und intelligentes Parken wird hier ein intelligenter Ansatz sein. Deshalb: Förderung von *machine learning*, *artificial intelligence*, *blockchain*. Und letztlich müssen wir über 130 Millionen Gebäude in Europa sanieren. Hier steckt ein wahres Potenzial für Arbeitskräfte und Wirtschaftswachstum.

Martina Werner (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin, Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Wir haben uns in dieser Wahlperiode vorgenommen, die Energieunion zu schaffen.

Dafür haben Kommission, Parlament und Rat sehr intensiv zusammengearbeitet: Acht Gesetze wurden auf den Weg gebracht. Diese Woche stimmen wir über einen wichtigen Teil des Energiepakets ab. Mit dieser Abstimmung wären dann vier der acht Gesetze des Paketes angenommen. Dafür möchte ich meine Kolleginnen und Kollegen José Blanco López, Miroslav Poche, Theresa Griffin, und Carlos Zorrinho für ihre Erfolge beglückwünschen.

Lassen Sie mich aber auch sagen, warum diese Abstimmung so wichtig ist: Die europäische Energiewende können wir nur gemeinsam schaffen. Dafür brauchen wir vor allen Dingen zwei Dinge: klare Zielvorgaben und gemeinsam abgestimmte Pläne. Und für beides stimmen wir diese Woche. Die Mitgliedstaaten können jetzt ihre Energie- und Klimapolitik noch viel effizienter koordinieren. Wenn wir dann auch noch über das Strommarktdesign-Paket abgestimmt haben, können wir uns alle – symbolisch gesehen – auf die Schulter klopfen. In dieser Legislaturperiode haben wir wirklich Bahnbrechendes für die europäische Energiewende geleistet.

Lassen Sie mich zum Schluss auch meine ganz besondere Freude darüber ausdrücken, dass mit der Governance-Verordnung erstmals das Problem der Energiearmut in einem Rechtsakt der EU überhaupt adressiert wird. Das ist meines Erachtens ein ganz wichtiges Signal dafür, dass die europäische Energiewende nicht auf dem Rücken der Haushalte ausgetragen wird, die ohnehin schon unter den hohen Stromkosten leiden. Es ist ein Signal dafür, dass wir in Europa niemanden zurücklassen.

Ryszard Czarnecki (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Przed chwilą moja koleżanka, pani posłanka Wiśniewska, bardzo kompetentnie, jak zwykle, mówiła o wsparciu systemu ciepłownictwa i istotnych poprawkach, które zostały przyjęte z jej inicjatywy. To ważne poprawki dla mojego kraju, a myślę, że i dla bardzo wielu zainteresowanych w Europie. Ja bym proponował, żebyśmy może mniej mówili na poziomie deklaracji, może mniej haseł, mniej sloganów, a więcej konkretów. Mniej uniesień, a więcej tego, co jest ważne, właśnie dla gospodarstw domowych, o których przed chwilą mówiła moja przedmówczyni. Wydaje mi się, że powinniśmy patrzeć na to przez pryzmat człowieka, przez pryzmat wielu rodzin, także tych, które niekoniecznie żyją w sytuacji uprzywilejowanej ekonomicznie, dla których zmiany, które wprowadzamy, mogą mieć konsekwencje, pytanie jakie? I na koniec zwracam państwa uwagę, że te różne propozycje nie są dla wszystkich krajów równie korzystne i warto też o tym pamiętać.

Gesine Meissner (ALDE). – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Kommissar, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Wir hatten uns schon bis 2020 Energieziele gesetzt: 20 % weniger Energieverbrauch, mehr Effizienz und mehr Erneuerbare. Da sind wir schon sehr gut unterwegs, und es ist vollkommen richtig, dass wir uns jetzt bis 2030 und darüber hinaus weitere und neue Ziele setzen. Ich möchte mich dabei vor allen Dingen auf die erneuerbaren Energien konzentrieren, denn da ist eine ganze Menge zu tun.

Wir haben im letzten Plenum darüber gesprochen, dass zum Beispiel im Transport die Infrastruktur für erneuerbare Energien zwar auf einem guten Weg ist, aber im Grunde genommen noch viel zu wenig ambitioniert. Bioenergie ist angesprochen worden. Da geht es ja nicht darum, irgendwelche Wälder zu verbrennen, sondern eben auch darum, Abfallstoffe zu nutzen. Wir müssen wirklich auch alles an Energie nutzen können, was regional vorhanden ist. Blaue Energie ist noch gar nicht angesprochen worden. Das Meer bietet in Zukunft auch vieles, was wirtschaftlich sein kann, zum Beispiel Wellenenergie, Tidenenergie, sogar Energie, die aus Salz- und Süßwasser gewonnen wird.

Technologieneutral, denke ich, sollte es sein. Wir müssen sehen, welche Region was beitragen kann. Und dann brauchen wir eine Infrastruktur, um die erneuerbare Energie, die wir produzieren, auch wirklich zu den Konsumenten und zu den Produzenten zu bringen. Da ist auch noch eine ganze Menge zu tun. Aber ich hoffe, dass wir das alles gemeinsam schön schaffen.

Peter Liese (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin, lieber Kommissar Miguel Arias Cañete, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Stellen wir uns mal vor, wir hätten eine Welt, in der die Energie zu 100 % aus erneuerbaren Quellen stammt und wir diese Energie auch so effizient nutzen, dass es keine Probleme mit dem Naturschutz – z. B. bei Windkraft oder Biomasse – und auch keine Probleme mit den Anwohnern gibt, weil wir es eben auf die Bereiche beschränken, wo es geht und wo wir das Ganze sehr, sehr effizient nutzen.

Niemand würde auf die Idee kommen, dass wir große Löcher graben, dass wir ganze Dörfer umsiedeln und dann Braunkohle gewinnen. Niemand würde auf die Idee kommen, dass wir jeden Tag etwa 1 Mrd. Euro an Herrn Putin und die Ölscheichs schicken, um Öl und Gas zu importieren. Deswegen sollte das Ziel doch für uns alle klar sein.

Aber der Weg ist schwierig: Wir brauchen Zeit, wir brauchen Investitionen, und wir müssen die Menschen auf diesem Weg mitnehmen. Deswegen finde ich es richtig, dass wir uns ambitionierte Ziele setzen. Wir haben die Vorschläge der Europäischen Kommission deutlich erhöht. Besonders freue ich mich auch, dass wir bei Effizienz noch ein halbes Prozent mehr machen als bei erneuerbaren Energien.

Wenn wir das europäisch gemeinsam machen, wird es günstiger und einfacher. Deswegen brauchen wir in diesem Bereich die europäische Zusammenarbeit. Ich bin sehr froh, wenn wir morgen mit großer Mehrheit die drei Berichte im Europäischen Parlament verabschieden können.

Flavio Zanonato (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, ci troviamo a più di vent'anni dalla prima grande stagione di liberalizzazione dei mercati europei di gas ed elettricità. Tuttavia, il mercato energetico europeo non è tuttora in grado di fornire equità d'accesso, elevati e omogenei standard di tutela dei consumatori, adeguati livelli di cooperazione e interconnessione.

L'energia non circola liberamente ovunque e sempre, e perdurano, anche se sono differenti da Stato a Stato, le prudenze nazionali sulla tabella di marcia climatica. Ben vengano quindi i termini dell'accordo del Consiglio su questi tre dossier – efficienza, rinnovabili e *governance* – perché dettagliano in maniera persuasiva e con *target* europei e nazionali, adeguatamente ambiziosi, una parte importante del nuovo assetto di mercato di cui l'Unione ha urgente bisogno.

Mi auguro che questo accordo sia di buon auspicio per i correnti negoziati su disegno di mercato, sull'Agenzia di cooperazione fra regolatori europei e sulla preparazione alla gestione del rischio.

Jozo Radoš (ALDE). – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, zadovoljstvo mi je da usvajamo ovaj paket čiste energije nakon uspješnih pregovora. On zajedno s paketom čiste mobilnosti čini cjelinu, a zajedno s temeljnim, krovnim uredbama i regulativama koje se tiču emisije CO_2 čini jednu kompliciranu i međusobno povezanu mrežu zakona, uredbi, odnosno direktiva.

Pitanje je koje se otvara – jesmo li pogodili pravu mjeru, jesu li ovi zakoni ostvarivi, jesu li dovoljno ambiciozni ili su možda preambiciozni? Jednako je tako pitanje jesu li ciljevi i mjere koji se nalaze u tim mnogim direktivama i uredbama međusobno povezani i hoće li međusobno, zajedno funkcionirati kako treba? Zato je važno razviti mehanizme praćenja ostvarenja ovih zakona kako bismo mogli imati prave uvjete za njihovu reviziju koja je predviđena u svima od njih.

Andrzej Grzyb (PPE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Panie Komisarzu! Chciałbym się odnieść w szczególności do dyrektywy dotyczącej promocji odnawialnych źródeł energii. Co ważne w tej dyrektywie, to wsparcie nie tylko dla producentów energii, dla których jest to główne źródło działalności, ale przede wszystkim dla prosumentów, czyli konsumentów, osób, firm – szczególnie na obszarach wiejskich – które zainwestowały lub będą mogły inwestować w energię odnawialną na swoje własne potrzeby, ale też będą ją mogły magazynować i odsprzedawać. To ważne, gdyż prosumenci nie będą mogli być, jak do tej pory często, ignorowani przez legislację państw członkowskich.

Po drugie, chcę podkreślić rolę, którą przyznano w tej regulacji lokalnym wspólnotom energetycznym. Mogą one zmienić kształt rynku energii w miejscach, które mimo tego, że są podłączone do sieci, nie mają zapewnionych stałych dostaw energii. Mogą one również wykorzystywać źródła, które związane są z gospodarką cyrkulacyjną.

Biopaliwa: postanowiliśmy ograniczyć ilość na rynku tych biopaliw, które mogą powodować wysokie ryzyko ILUC, ale też chcę podkreślić, że biopaliwa produkowane z rodzimych upraw nie konkurują z produkcją żywności, a jednocześnie przy tej produkcji mogą być wytworzone pasze wysokobiałkowe, a przecież importujemy to białko – z soi chociażby –z tych terenów, gdzie ten efekt ILUC również soja powoduje. Biopaliwa kolejnej generacji, odpady organiczne z rolnictwa, leśnictwa to również przyszłość w tym sektorze.

Adam Gierek (S&D). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Panie komisarzu! Mam wrażenie, że mówiąc o efektywności nie rozumie Pan tego pojęcia. Pojęcia techniczne są trudne do zrozumienia. Podejmując jednak decyzje legislacyjne, musimy wiedzieć, czego one dotyczą. Nie możemy twierdzić, że cel 32,5% zapisany w dyrektywie efektywnościowej oznacza wzrost efektywności o 32,5%. Jest to oszczędność energii finalnej, przeliczana błędnie na energię pierwotną.

Nieprawidłowe rozumienie tego pojęcia, mimo że podana definicja jest właściwa, prowadzi do pominięcia ważnych ogniw w łańcuchu przepływu energii o największym potencjale poprawy efektywności. Komisja, przyjmując jeden nierealny wskaźnik *PEF,* nie rozumie jego roli w kształtowaniu trendów efektywnościowych.

Panie Komisarzu, dyrektywa efektywnościowa jest moim zdaniem bublem legislacyjnym, dotyczy ona bowiem ograniczeń użytkowania energii, a nie prawdziwej efektywności.

Λευτέρης Χριστοφόρου (PPE). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, το ενεργειακό ζήτημα, για το οποίο συζητάμε σήμερα, είναι ιδιαίτερα σημαντικό γιατί αγγίζει όλα τα κράτη μέλη, αλλά και όλους τους ευρωπαίους πολίτες, την οικονομία και την κοινωνία. Η δική μου πατρίδα, η Κύπρος, πληρώνει σκληρό τίμημα λόγω της κλιματικής αλλαγής. Υφίσταται παρατεταμένη ανεργία και λειψυδρία, με αποτέλεσμα να είναι δυσβάσταχτο, πραγματικά, το αγροτικό κόστος, αλλά και το κόστος για κάθε νοικοκυριό και για κάθε κύπριο πολίτη. Φαντάζομαι, όμως, ότι το ίδιο ισχύει και για κάθε ευρωπαίο πολίτη.

Η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση οφείλει να αντιδράσει. Να αντιδράσει λαμβάνοντας μέτρα για εκείνους που υφίστανται τις συνέπειες της κλιματικής αλλαγής. Διότι η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση μπορεί να αντιδράσει και να πραγματοποιήσει επενδύσεις καινοτόμες και πρωτότυπες, ιδιαίτερα στα νησιά μας, τα οποία υφίστανται αυτό το σημαντικό πρόβλημα. Να δημιουργήσει μονάδες αφαλατώσεων ή και, παράλληλα, μεγάλα φωτοβολταϊκά πάρκα για να είναι δυνατή η μείωση του ηλεκτρικού κόστους, δηλαδή του κόστους της ενέργειας, που είναι ιδιαίτερα σημαντικό για την επιβίωση αυτών των χωρών και ιδίως για τον πρωτογενή τομέα παραγωγής. Ωστόσο, είναι σημαντικό και για τον δευτερογενή τομέα, αφού τα φωτοβολταϊκά θα μπορέσουν να μειώσουν την ενέργεια και εκεί. Άρα, η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση μπορεί να επενδύσει για να υπάρχει σε κάθε σπίτι, σε κάθε επιχείρηση και σε κάθε αγροτική παραγωγή ένα αυτόνομο ενεργειακό σύστημα, το οποίο θα συμβάλλει και στις ανανεώσιμες πηγές ενέργειας.

Παράλληλα, στηρίζουμε την Ενεργειακή Ένωση. Την στηρίζουμε και την υποστηρίζουμε γιατί θεωρούμε ότι η Κύπρος και τα ενεργειακά της αποθέματα θα βρίσκονται εντός της Ενεργειακής Ένωσης και η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση πρέπει να είναι σε θέση να στηρίξει, να υποστηρίξει και να διασφαλίσει τα ενεργειακά αποθέματα της Κύπρου. Τα αποθέματα αυτά είναι σημαντικά διότι, δεδομένου ότι η Κύπρος είναι κράτος μέλος της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, εντάσσονται στα ευρωπαϊκά ενεργειακά αποθέματα.

Петър Курумбашев (S&D). – Бих искал да поставя няколко въпроса. На първо място, дали този енергиен пакет ще работи, след като има незадължителни цели като цяло на ниво Европейски съюз? И на второ място, дали той ще работи, след като нямаме конкретни цели за всяка една държава членка? Така беше при първия пакет и той проработи с прочутите цели 20-20-20.

Вторият въпрос, който бих искал да поставя, е дали не трябва да поставим най-после електропреносните мрежи на първо място, защото когато си поставяме амбициозни цели, свързани с възобновяемите енергийни източници и с енергийната ефективност, те ще бъдат невъзможни за реализиране, ако нямаме по-нататъшно развитие на кръвоносната система на енергетиката, а именно енергопреносните мрежи.

И последният въпрос, може би към г-н Комисаря, кажете ми как е възможно в един град като Шънджън в Китай, който има 15 хиляди електрически автобуса, да има повече електрически автобуси отколкото в цяла Европа?

Seán Kelly (PPE). – Madam President, allow me to first of all begin my contribution this evening by paying tribute to the excellent Parliament negotiating team that worked together over the past two years to deliver what is an extremely positive result for this institution. Thanks to Mr Blanco López, Mr Federley, Mr Henkel, Mr Tamburrano, Ms López Bermejo and, of course, Mr Claude Turmes, who has since moved on to pastures new – we wish him the best in the Luxembourg Government.

In addition, I think there is great praise due to the Bulgarian Presidency and particularly Minister Stankov for excellent cooperation over the course of the negotiations. This is a negotiation that has yielded some extremely important results for the renewable energy sector by providing the much needed-ambition and certainly to drive investments into the environment of renewable energy across Europe. Indeed, this is also a great result for consumers, on whom there is a big focus in the text.

I strongly welcome the agreement that we ultimately reached here in Strasbourg, at 4 am on the morning of 14 June — an agreement that will ensure that 32% of energy used in the European Union by 2030 comes from renewable energy sources, such as wind, solar, biomass, ocean or geothermal, etc.

This is significant, and the fact that we expect the text to be strongly supported in the vote tomorrow is testament to this House's recognition of the importance of the switch to renewable energy and the enormous potential it brings for us all.

This is not only about contributing to the EU's 40% emissions reductions by 2030, in accordance with our Paris Agreement pledge. Nor is it only about increasing the efficiency of energy markets and improving air quality. Renewable energy is a rapidly growing sector, and is now contributing a significant amount of jobs globally.

Global employment and renewable energy sectors reached 10.3 million jobs in 2017. This is up 5.3% on the previous year, 2016, and it continues to grow rapidly. Our ambitious text will help to create EU leadership in these sectors and prevent jobs being lost to the rapidly expanding renewables industry in other parts of the world.

Interventions à la demande

Bogdan Andrzej Zdrojewski (PPE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Transformacja energetyczna jest koniecznością, wiemy to wszyscy, natomiast połączenie tych trzech dossier pokazuje, jak poważne różnice są nie tylko na tej sali w obrębie grup politycznych, ale w obrębie poszczególnych państw. Co nas różni przede wszystkim? Prawie wszystko: tempo, zakres, odpowiedzialność, koszty, poziom zarządzania, źródła regulacji, na co zwracam uwagę, bo z jednej strony wskazuje się na przykład na smog, z drugiej strony na ekonomię, z innej jeszcze na źródła ubóstwa.

Chcę zwrócić uwagę na to w chwili obecnej, dlatego że kluczowe dla pogodzenia tych rozmaitych interesów będą użyte narzędzia i ich adekwatność do rozstrzygania pewnych kwestii w poszczególnych państwach.

Nicola Caputo (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, l'obiettivo di un'Unione dell'energia articolata intorno ad una politica ambiziosa per il clima è di fornire ai consumatori europei energia sicura, sostenibile, competitiva e a prezzi accessibili. Il nuovo regolamento sulla *governance* dell'Unione dell'energia permetterà all'Europa di diventare leader mondiale delle energie rinnovabili, ponendo l'efficienza energetica al primo posto e offrendo un trattamento equo ai consumatori.

Il compromesso raggiunto con il Consiglio ha posto obiettivi importanti, anche se ben al di sotto delle aspettative del Parlamento. I *target* del 32 % di energie rinnovabili nel *mix* energetico dell'Unione europea è del 32,5 % di risparmio energetico al 2030 dovranno essere raggiunti mediante un'azione coordinata a livello europeo, macroregionale, regionale, nazionale e locale.

L'obiettivo ultimo di un'Unione dell'energia pienamente funzionale e resiliente è quello di trasformare l'Unione europea in una regione di punta per l'innovazione, gli investimenti, la crescita e in un credibile esempio del perseguimento di alte ambizioni in materia di politica di mitigazione del cambiamento climatico.

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, κύριε Cañete, θα επανέλθω σε ένα θέμα που έχω θίξει αρκετές φορές. Αφορά τα δικαιώματα εκπομπής αερίων ρύπων που πληρώνει η Δημόσια Επιχείρηση Ηλεκτρισμού στην Ελλάδα, η ΔΕΗ. Αυτή τη στιγμή πληρώνει 400 εκατομμύρια ευρώ ανά έτος. Την επόμενη χρονιά, επειδή έχουν ακριβύνει τα δικαιώματα, θα πληρώνει 600 εκατομμύρια ευρώ ανά έτος. Προσέξτε όμως: η Ελλάδα γειτνιάζει με την Αλβανία, η οποία δεν δεσμεύεται από κανέναν κανόνα, καθώς και με τα Σκόπια, την Τουρκία και τη Βουλγαρία, η οποία όμως εξαιρείται και δεν πληρώνει δικαιώματα αερίων ρύπων. Το ίδιο συμβαίνει και με την πολωνική ΔΕΗ. Και σας ερωτώ: δεν θα πρέπει να προβλεφθεί και για την ελληνική ηλεκτροπαραγωγή αυτή η εξαίρεση, δηλαδή η εξαίρεση του άρθρου 10 της οδηγίας 2003/87/ΕΚ; Διότι το κριτήριο ήταν το ΑΕΠ. Το ΑΕΠ στην Ελλάδα το 2013 ήταν 62%. Το 2014, όμως, ήταν 59,7% του μέσου κοινοτικού ΑΕΠ. Έχουμε καταστραφεί από τα μνημόνια. Πρέπει να ενταχθούμε σε αυτή την εξαίρεση για να έχουμε φτηνή ενέργεια και να αναπτυχθεί η παραγωγή.

Franc Bogovič (PPE). – Gospa predsednica. Sprejem energetske unije je eden ključnih ciljev tega mandata Komisije in Parlamenta. Zato z velikim veseljem pozdravljam sveženj treh regulativ s področja čiste energije. Tako tega s področja rabe obnovljivih virov, kakor tudi energetske učinkovitosti in seveda upravljanja energetske unije.

Zmanjšanje porabe energije je zagotovo prvi ukrep, prav tako pa je zelo pomembno tudi, da pospešimo rabo obnovljivih virov, da skozi ta ukrep tudi ustvarimo nova zelena delovna mesta, zmanjšamo energetsko revščino in da Evropa še naprej ostane in postane vodilna sila na področju boja proti klimatskim spremembam.

Resda ustvarjamo samo 10 procentov svetovnih toplogrednih plinov, vendar Evropa že več desetletij tu kaže pot, v katero se mora razvijati cel svet. Zato zelo podpiram in čestitam tako poročevalcem kakor komisarju za sprejem tega svežnja.

Ruža Tomašić (ECR). – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, veći dio zemaljske kugle nije blagoslovljen prosperitetom koji uživa zapadna civilizacija. Razlozi tomu su različiti, ali to je neosporna činjenica.

Da bi se ostatak svijeta mogao neometano razvijati, za što mu je potrebna energija, a da pritom ne bismo ugrozili planet na kojem živimo, potrebno je povećati energetsku učinkovitost i udio obnovljivih izvora energije. Energija je uvijek bila iznimno važno oružje u geopolitičkim razračunavanjima pa Europa nasušno treba energetsku neovisnost. Smanjena potrošnja i održiva proizvodnja čiste energije tu igraju važnu ulogu.

Podržavam ambiciozne planove u tom smjeru, ali naglašavam da moramo biti oprezni kako zbog političkih ambicija ne bismo ugrozili industriju i uzrokovali ekonomsku stagnaciju te gubitak poslova. Tako bismo oslabili i svoju globalnu poziciju i anulirali sve ono dobro što smo postigli na energetskom planu.

(Fin des interventions à la demande)

Miguel Arias Cañete, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, in my introductory statement I underlined how important these dossiers are for the clean energy transition in addressing the climate change challenge, considering the important contribution of energy efficiency and renewable energy to the greenhouse gas emission reductions, and how much progress we are making for setting the framework for our ambition until 2030. This will be good for the planet, the economy and consumers.

But let me end this debate with a clear message that we are not finished yet. We want to look beyond 2030, following on from the call from this House in the run-up to last year's COP23. After a similar call from European Union leaders this March, the Commission is preparing a European Union long-term strategy on greenhouse gas emission reduction, which is due to be adopted by the College of Commissioners at the end of this month. In our strategy we will factor in the latest findings from science and in particular the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change's Special Report on global warming of 1.5ºC. We will look at what should be required to achieve the Paris goals and we will explore different pathways as required by Article 15 of the Governance Regulation, including the scenarios to achieve net zero emissions. I signal to you my intention to come to Parliament to present this document the day that it is adopted, if so agreed by this House.

Let me close by thanking you again for our excellent cooperation and for being such a reliable partner in the course of the negotiations of this dossier. I trust that in your vote tomorrow and in the remaining negotiations that lie ahead, you will maintain your ambitious approach and thereby remain such an important player in defining our future energy policy fit for the 21st century and instrumental for achieving our climate commitments under the Paris Agreement.

Michèle Rivasi, *rapporteure*. – Madame la Présidente, je tiens tout d'abord à réparer une omission et à remercier sincèrement la Commission, le Conseil et tous les corapporteurs pour leur excellente collaboration. Merci à eux. Je remercie tout particulièrement Claude Turmes qui a beaucoup contribué à cette réussite. Ce rapport est un vrai travail d'équipe et, vraiment, je tiens à remercier tous les partenaires.

Ensuite, concernant la COP24, ce serait bien d'envisager un scénario avec une référence de 1,5ººC, car la Commission a un rôle important à jouer pour défendre les propositions de l'Union lors de cette conférence.

Enfin, chers collègues, s'il est un projet, au cours de cette législature, dont la dimension européenne me paraît incontestable, c'est bien celui-ci. Je trouve que le projet que nous avons bâti ensemble montre bien aux anti-européens ce dont l'Europe est capable. Ce projet est tourné vers l'avenir, il vise à protéger la planète et l'humanité, il propose une indépendance énergétique – comme mon collègue l'a évoqué en parlant de géostratégie – et, en même temps, il peut répondre à la précarité énergétique.

C'est donc un projet européen porteur qui montre ce dont l'Europe est capable. Quand je pense aux prochaines élections européennes, je me dis que c'est un bon exemple et que, s'il y avait beaucoup d'autres projets européens comme celui-là, plus personne ne remettrait en question l'utilité de l'Europe. Oui, nous en avons besoin.

Jakop Dalunde, *föredragande*. – Fru talman! Jag skulle vilja tacka så mycket för denna debatt och avsluta med att lyfta fram ett särskilt viktigt inslag i den här förordningen.

Koldioxidbudgetar är ett av de viktigaste instrumenten som vi har för att säkerställa en vetenskapligt robust klimatpolitik. Det är ett lättförståeligt och effektivt instrument som säkerställer att vi når upp till våra klimatmål. Därför är det stort att detta verktyg nu för första gången i ett EU-sammanhang introduceras i denna lagstiftning. Det är på tiden att klimatpolitiken behandlas med samma allvar som finanspolitiken. Med en europeisk koldioxidbudget öppnas möjligheten för det. Då kan vi se, svart på vitt, hur mycket koldioxid vi har kvar att spendera och stämma av våra klimatåtgärder mot den summan.

Likaväl som Europas finansministrar i dag ställs till svars för sina länders budgetar hoppas jag att medlemsstaternas klimatministrar kommer att ställas inför samma behandling. Det ska inte gå att övertrassera sitt lands koldioxidkonto utan konsekvenser.

Mer jobb kvarstår att göra innan vi är där, men omröstningen i morgon är ett otroligt viktigt första steg. Genom att bygga vidare på detta arbete på vägen mot en framtida europeisk sammanhållning, ambitiös klimatlag, med en ordentlig utsläppsbudget för unionen kan vi skapa ordning och reda i klimatpolitiken.

Vi måste ta på allvar medborgarnas oro för de extrema väderhändelser som vi nu ser runtom Europa. Vi måste se till att våra väljare får den klimatpolitik som de förväntar sig.

Puhetta johti HEIDI HAUTALA

varapuhemies

José Blanco López, *ponente*. – Señora presidenta, señorías, lo que está en juego trasciende una Directiva. Lo que está en juego es el futuro del planeta. Los acuerdos que hemos alcanzado en renovables, en eficiencia y en gobernanza son importantes no solo porque hayamos logrado elevar la ambición de esta norma. Son importantes porque ponen a Europa en la senda del cumplimiento de los Acuerdos de París y de los Objetivos de Desarrollo Sostenible. Porque alinean las promesas de Europa con hechos que las hacen posibles. Porque reafirman el liderazgo mundial europeo dando una señal de hacia dónde debe caminar el mundo.

Eso es lo que urge hacer. Urge elevar los objetivos en la Cumbre del Clima para lograr mitigar las consecuencias del calentamiento global. Urge porque, como acaba de recalcar el IPCC en su último informe, el cambio climático es una realidad de muy graves consecuencias para los ecosistemas, la salud humana y la economía. Y lo que viene es peor si no actuamos. Urge porque, además, es crucial para nuestro desarrollo y para nuestra competitividad futura. No hay alternativa. Es aquí y es ahora, no habrá otra oportunidad.

Apoyemos, por lo tanto, estas medidas y sigamos, como han puesto de manifiesto muchos colegas, sigamos trabajando sin descanso para avanzar y, si es posible, para avanzar más deprisa en esa lucha de todos para salvar el planeta.

Este es un paso adelante, pero tenemos un largo camino por delante que recorrer.

Puhemies. – Keskustelu on päättynyt.

Äänestys toimitetaan huomenna tiistaina 13.11.2018.

Kirjalliset lausumat (162 artikla)

András Gyürk (PPE), *írásban*. – A Tiszta Energia Csomag arra hivatott, hogy modernizálja az Unió elektromos áram rendszerét és választ adjon a legégetőbb gazdasági és energetikai kihívásokra. Ezek közül az egyik, ha nem a legsúlyosabb, nem más, mint a globális felmelegedés. A legfrissebb IPCC tanulmány sokkal borúsabb képet fest a klímahelyzetről, mint azt korábban gondoltuk, ezért is különösen fontos, hogy megfelelően kezeljük ezt a problémát. Elengedhetetlen, hogy tartósan és jelentősen csökkentsük a tagállamok szén-dioxid kibocsátását ezért fontos, hogy támogassuk a karbonsemleges technológiákat az energiatermelésben. Magyarországon az egységnyi áramtermelésre eső szén-dioxid kibocsátás jelenleg is a legalacsonyabbak között van, de a magyar kormány ezt tovább kívánja csökkenteni az energiastratégiájában. A jövőbeli magyar energiatermelés két alappillére a nap- és az atomenergia, amelyek közel fele- fele arányban vennék ki a részüket az ország energiaellátásában. Közös ezekben a technológiákban, hogy nem járnak károsanyag kibocsátással, így nem ártalmasak sem a klímára, sem pedig a levegő minőségére nézve. Úgy gondolom, hogy ilyen előre mutató stratégiákkal megfelelő választ tudunk adni korunk kihívásaira.

Krzysztof Hetman (PPE), *na piśmie*. – Europejczycy coraz częściej i dotkliwiej doświadczają negatywnych konsekwencji związanych z przekroczonymi normami powietrza, miasta walczą ze smogiem, zwiększa się też liczba zachorowań będących następstwem zanieczyszczeń. Nie ulega zatem wątpliwości, iż konieczne jest zwiększanie udziału czystej energii w europejskim miksie energetycznym. Z pewnością ambitna polityka w tym zakresie jest potrzebna, musimy jednak przy tym dbać o to, by prowadząc taką politykę, brać również pod uwagę realne możliwości państw członkowskich oraz rzeczywiste koszty. Dlatego też przeciwny jestem wprowadzaniu wiążących zobowiązań dla poszczególnych państw członkowskich w zakresie udziału energii odnawialnej w ich miksie energetycznym. Niezbędne jest bowiem zastosowanie elastycznego podejścia uwzględniającego specyfikę każdego z państw członkowskich.

Carolina Punset (ALDE), *por escrito*. – El tercer paquete legislativo reguló la eficiencia energética y el desarrollo de renovables durante una década en la que no eran pocos los dirigentes europeos negacionistas del cambio climático. Ahora ya no se cuestiona que somos la causa de la modificación del clima, pero si se menosprecian las recomendaciones del IPCC, que, aunque adviertan de las graves consecuencias que tendrán las emisiones, no está previsto que se alcancen las reducciones necesarias para limitar la temperatura global a +1,5 º. El 85 % de la energía primaria consumida en el mundo procede la que quema de petróleo, carbón y gas, que según el FMI reciben más de 4,7 billones de euros anuales en subvenciones. Si bien organismos como la OCDE piden a los líderes mundiales limitar estas subvenciones y descarbonizar la economía, los acuerdos alcanzados en las nuevas Directivas no son lo suficientemente ambiciosos. Aunque el Reglamento de la gobernanza energética asegurará el cumplimiento de los objetivos de renovables y eficiencia, evitando errores del pasado, sin planificación del complimiento, ni mecanismos de ajuste, será necesaria más ambición y convicción por parte de nuestros dirigentes si se quiere ser referente mundial en la lucha contra la mayor amenaza a la que se enfrenta la humanidad.

Henna Virkkunen (PPE), *kirjallinen*. – Euroopan unionin on puolustettava johtavaa rooliaan ilmastonmuutoksen torjunnassa. Euroopan unioni on osoittanut, että kestävä kasvu on mahdollista. Samalla kun olemme laskeneet päästöjämme 23 prosenttia, BKT on kasvanut 53 prosenttia. Tulemme myös saavuttamaan 2020-tavoitteet etuajassa. Euroopan unionin tulee jatkaa kunnianhimoisten, mutta realististen tavoitteiden toteuttamista päästöjen vähentämiseksi. Tavoitteena on lisätä EU:n energiatehokkuutta 32,5 prosenttia ja nostaa uusiutuvan energian osuus 32 prosenttiin vuoteen 2030 mennessä. Nämä ovat tärkeitä askelia päästöjen vähentämiseksi ja keinoja vastata Pariisin ilmastosopimuksen sitoumuksiin.

Ilmastonmuutosta on torjuttava nyt kun ilmaston lämpenemiseen voi vielä vaikuttaa. Euroopan parlamentin tulee pitää kiinni linjastaan, jonka mukaan Euroopan unionin tulisi kiristää omaa päästövähennystavoitettaan 55 prosenttiin vuonna 2030. Euroopan unioni on ilmastonmuutoksen torjunnassa maailman edelläkävijä. Ainoa sektori, jossa päästöt ovat EU-alueella kasvaneet, on liikenne. Tämän takia uusien henkilöautojen lisäksi myös kuorma-autoille ollaan asettamassa ensimmäistä kertaa CO_2-päästörajat. Euroopan unioni ei voi kuitenkaan estää ilmastonmuutosta yksin. Koska Euroopan unionin alueen päästöt ovat alle 10 prosenttia maailman päästöistä, unionin tulee aktiivisesti työskennellä isojen päästöjen aiheuttajien saamiseksi sitoutumaan yhteisiin tavoitteisiin.

15. Mehrjahresplan für kleine pelagische Bestände im Adriatischen Meer und für die Fischereien, die diese Bestände befischen (Aussprache)

Puhemies. – Esityslistalla on seuraavana Ruža Tomašićin kalatalousvaliokunnan puolesta laatima mietintö Euroopan parlamentin ja neuvoston asetukseksi Adrianmeren pienten pelagisten lajien kantoja ja näitä kantoja hyödyntäviä kalastuksia koskevasta monivuotisesta suunnitelmasta (COM(2017)0097 – C8-0095/2017 –2017/0043(COD)) (A8-0337/2018).

Ruža Tomašić, *Rapporteur*. – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, prosperitet čovjeka usko je povezan s njegovim odnosom prema prirodi. Unatoč tehnološkom napretku koji je drastično poboljšao kvalitetu života većem dijelu planeta, bez prirode i njezinih resursa čovjek ne može ostvariti puninu svog postojanja. Naše mjesto na vrhu hranidbenog lanca sa sobom nosi i određene odgovornosti. Jedna od njih je i racionalno upravljanje prirodnim resursima, a toj smo zadaći, i kao Europljani i kao ljudi, često bili nedorasli.

Zaštita ribljeg fonda visoko je na listi prioriteta objema stranama u ovoj raspravi i to je ono što me posebno raduje. Naš je primarni motiv isti i gledamo prema istom cilju, ali put kojim do tamo želimo stići ponešto se razlikuje.

Potrebu za donošenjem Višegodišnjeg plana upravljanja malom plavom ribom u Jadranu nitko ne osporava, ali moramo odoljeti naoko jednostavnim rješenjima koja bi upropastila ribarsku industriju. Komisija smatra da se pelagični stokovi u Jadranskom moru najbolje mogu zaštititi kvotama, s čim se ne slažu ribari i strukovne udruge iz država koje izlaze na Jadran, njihove vlade, Europsko socijalno i gospodarsko vijeće, MEDAC, većina u Odboru za ribarstvo Europskog parlamenta i ja osobno kao izvjestiteljica.

Ovakvo stajalište Komisije predstavlja ignoriranje dobrih rezultata postojećih praksi preporučenih od Opće komisije za ribarstvo Sredozemlja i štetno poigravanje sudbinama stotina tisuća ljudi.

Komisija tvrdi da se u izradi prijedloga konzultirala s dionicima, ali nije jasno koji su to dionici budući da su, kao što sam već rekla, i politika i struka u državama na koje se ovaj plan odnosi oštro protiv Komisijina prijedloga. Postupak konzultacija očito je bio manjkav ili su njegovi zaključci na kraju ignorirani.

Čini se da su i u Komisiji shvatili da njihove ideje nemaju previše saveznika – ni među ribarima, ni među znanstvenicima, a ni među državama članicama koje izlaze na Jadransko more, a ni u ovom domu – pa su na stražnja vrata plasirali tzv. *escapement* strategiju.

Apsolutno sam za to da razmotrimo sve alternative prvotnom štetnom prijedlogu Komisije o uvođenju drastičnih kvota koje bi uništile ribarski sektor na Jadranu, a kasnije i cijelom Mediteranu, i jačale gospodarstvo trećih država na štetu članica Unije. Zaključak struke je da se učinci *escapement* strategije još uvijek ne mogu točno predvidjeti i zato bismo raspravu o njoj trebali ostaviti za budućnost, kad će nam znanstvena istraživanja moći dati konkretnije informacije.

Višegodišnji plan upravljanja malom plavom ribom u Jadranu ne donosimo za pet ili deset godina, nego sad. On mora biti utemeljen na praksama koje dokazano funkcioniraju, a ne na nečijim željama ili političkim ambicijama.

Trenutno je za cjelokupno područje Jadrana na snazi Plan upravljanja Opće komisije za ribarstvo Sredozemlja koji regulira ribolovni napor i kapacitet kroz prostorno-vremensku regulaciju i ograničenje broja ribolovnih dana po plovilu. U Hrvatskoj, Italiji i Sloveniji, državama koje se dosljedno drže preporuka GFCM-a, one već daju opipljive rezultate i nema nikakvog razloga da se kontinuitet zaštite ribljeg fonda razbija novim mjerama potpuno drugačijeg karaktera. Godišnje smanjenje ulova od 4 % za svaku državu članicu, s 2014. kao referentnom godinom, koje predlažem u ovom izvješću razumna je mjera usklađena s preporukama GFCM-a i predstavlja nastavak dokazano učinkovitih napora.

Komisija je, nažalost, još jednom pokazala da nije svjesna regionalnih razlika između sjevera i juga Europe. Kvote sa sjevera ne mogu funkcionirati na jugu. Uvođenje kvota na Jadranu, a zatim i na cijelom Sredozemlju, ne utječe samo na ribarsku flotu, nego i na industriju prerade i tunogojilišta koji ovise o maloj plavoj ribi. Da bi opstali, prerađivačka industrija i uzgajivači tuna morat će uvoziti ribu iz trećih zemalja. To znači da Europska unija zakonodavstvom uništava gospodarstvo vlastitih članica, a jača ekonomsku i političku poziciju drugih.

Nije ovo prvi put da Komisija lošom politikom udara na interese država članica i građana Unije koji žele živjeti od svoga rada, ali Parlament ne bi smio pristati na takvu igru.

Karmenu Vella, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, honourable Members, I would like to thank the rapporteur, Ms Tomašić, the shadow rapporteurs and their teams, as well as the Committee on Fisheries, for the long work on this important proposal for the Mediterranean.

This is a proposal for a first EU multiannual plan in the Mediterranean. Having a meaningful plan in place is crucial, given the overall dramatic state of the stocks in the area, with around 85% of the assessed stocks being over-exploited. In the Adriatic, the picture emerging from the most recent scientific assessments on small pelagics is crystal clear and extremely worrying. The fishing mortality is too high for both sardine and anchovy, and the spawning biomass is at very low levels. While there are slight signs of improvement for sardine, anchovy has a high probability of collapse within one to three years unless drastic action is taken. I want to be very clear: we need to avoid a collapse of anchovy as we had in the past in the Bay of Biscay. We must act now and not allow a new case of collapse in EU waters.

Such a collapse is not only about the fish in the sea, but also about the jobs on land. To be precise, the sector employs 1330 direct jobs in Croatia, around 1000 in Italy, and more in Slovenia. Catches are worth around EUR 85 million per year. This excludes the secondary sector, with 570 processing enterprises with at least 6700 employees on its own and worth EUR 150 million. This is why I have put forward an ambitious and serious proposal, capable of effectively guaranteeing the long-term viability of these jobs and the benefits for EU citizens. I wish to be absolutely clear on this point: without the steps taken in the Commission's proposals, it is only a matter of one to three years before the stock will fail and, in doing so, we would have most certainly failed the industry and EU citizens.

This multiannual plan was designed to allow these stocks to recover. Unfortunately, the majority of amendments voted by the Committee on Fisheries are of serious concern and very problematic for the Commission. They are not in line with the basic principles and objectives of the common fisheries policy (CFP); they deviate massively from the approach agreed in other multiannual plans that are already adopted, like the North Sea and Baltic; and they derogate from key legislation, such as the Mediterranean Regulation, the current European Maritime and Fisheries Fund (EMFF) and the control regulation. Most importantly, some amendments would remove entirely the obligation to reach FMSY or any target with a clear timeline, would eliminate the need to take safeguard measures if certain biomass levels are not reached, and would minimise remedial actions. Amendment 48 also dilutes the landing obligation, which is a central element of the CFP reform. Moreover, amendments completely ignored the scientific advice according to which anchovy and sardines should be managed separately and removed the possibility of setting fishing opportunities on the basis of FMSY.

Finally, the report, as adopted in committee, introduces provisions such as a 2% reduction of the combined catch level of 2014 over the next four years. This is freezing the catch levels at their recent peak, which would neither prevent the collapse of anchovy nor bring the stocks close to FMSY. Such amendments are much less ambitious than what has already been agreed with third countries in the multilateral context of the General Fisheries Commission for the Mediterranean (GFCM), meaning the deductions of 5% per year in the next three years. All this sends the wrong message to our partners around the Mediterranean – in particular, after all the efforts deployed into garnering their support for serious actions in favour of sustainable fisheries in both the MEDFISH4EVER declaration and the GFCM. It is also essential to avoid double standards, whereby northern European Member States have to comply with FMSY and clear timelines, while southern Member States have targets not in line with FMSY and no set timelines. Being the first Mediterranean multiannual plan, this would set a bad precedent.

Therefore, I have to be very clear that these texts are not acceptable for the Commission. Keeping them would result in a make-believe multiannual plan, which would be nothing more than a set of transitional measures that essentially will allow to maintain current excessive overfishing. This is not enough, and this is not what we all promised European citizens when we adopted the current CFP.

Finally, to end on a positive note, there were a number of sensible amendments in the Committee on Fisheries which had been proposed to address some of the criticisms from the sector on the introduction of tax. These concerned notably the introduction of an MSY biomass escapement strategy. In the end, they were not approved by the Committee on Fisheries but have been re-tabled for tomorrow's plenary vote. If adopted tomorrow, the Commission is ready to examine these amendments in the light of scientific advice. We count on your support to take a responsible decision that will allow us to live up to the basic principles and commitments of our CFP and to the standards of other multiannual action plans. Only if we deliver on our joint commitments can we ensure the recovery of the stocks, and thus the profitability of the fleet and livelihood of the coastal communities which depend on them in the mid— and long-term.

Elisabetta Gardini, *a nome del gruppo PPE*. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, caro Commissario, è imbarazzante la sua presentazione. Non ho altri termini per definirla, perché lei sa bene che ha presentato una proposta che, se avesse avuto il coraggio, avrebbe dovuto ritirare e presentare allora un'altra strategia, quella dell'*escapement*, che invece, artatamente – ci sono delle mail forwardate che lo dimostrano – dalla Commissione sono passati come emendamento per un nostro collega. Questo è un atto assolutamente antidemocratico e di prevaricazione sulle prerogative del Parlamento, di cui la Commissione dovrebbe chiedere scusa. Scusa dovrebbe chiedere, perché noi potremmo anche accettare la *escapement strategy* se potessimo emendarla e migliorarla e non prenderla come un emendamento di un collega, anziché di un ripensamento della Commissione.

Detto questo, è chiara la volontà politica della Commissione di uccidere la pesca a favore dell'acquacoltura, che potrebbe anche essere una strategia, ma non so se lei vuole anche il pesce pazzo dopo la mucca pazza. Io vorrei poter prendere dei pesci cresciuti e vissuti in mare e che siano nutrizionalmente positivi e buoni per i miei cittadini, a cominciare dai bambini ai quali non voglio dare il pesce che viene allevato chissà dove e chissà come.

Ha mai preso il salmone, qualche anno fa soprattutto, che quando lo si metteva nel forno usciva tutta la schiuma bianca perché improvvisamente il salmone era talmente grasso, venendo dai vostri allevamenti, che era immangiabile. Io ero appassionata di salmone e non ne mangio più.

Quello che è uscito dalla commissione per la pesca è un testo equilibrato, un'ottima sintesi e in linea anche con la Commissione generale per la pesca del Mediterraneo. Voi parlate sempre di cose sovranazionali, adeguatevi agli organismi sovranazionali, non andate contro gli organismi sovranazionali.

La pesca italiana ha già ricevuto un abbattimento incredibile, dal 2000 ad oggi è più che dimezzato. Ovvio che il pescato è diminuito, ma ci sono gli *Ecosurvey* che ci dicono che gli stock sono molto migliori di quello che dicono i vostri modelli. Volete credere alla realtà o la realtà ha bisogno dei vostri modelli teorici per essere vera. Ma vergognatevi!

Nicola Caputo, *a nome del gruppo S&D*. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, secondo recenti pareri scientifici, gli stock di sardine e di acciughe sono sottoposti nel mare Adriatico ad uno sforzo di pesca eccessivo. In quanto relatore ombra ho condiviso il piano pluriennale per il mare Adriatico quale strumento per la gestione delle risorse biologiche marine, con l'obiettivo di ricostituire gli stock e ripristinare la sostenibilità del settore.

Le misure gestionali proposte della relatrice Tomašić sono insufficienti a garantire la sopravvivenza degli stock di piccoli pelagici e l'assenza di azioni incisive potrebbe portare al collasso degli stock in brevissimo tempo. I dati sono chiari e concordano con quelli del comitato scientifico, tecnico ed economico per la pesca della Commissione.

Negli ultimi anni si è assistito anche ad una forte riduzione della taglia media del pescato. A trarre vantaggio dalla proposta della relatrice sarebbero solo alcuni pescherecci che hanno accordi diretti con le grandi aziende attive nella pesca industriale intensiva. La maggioranza dei piccoli pescatori italiani invece avrebbe bisogno di una regolamentazione in grado di garantire lavoro per tutti, anche per gli anni a venire.

Ho presentato emendamenti sulla *Biomass Escapement Strategy*, che ritengo possano rappresentare un valido compromesso per tutelare una sufficiente biomassa in grado di garantire sostenibilità e riproduttività degli stock, ma anche flessibilità in caso di annate abbondanti.

Gli emendamenti prevedono che per i prossimi tre anni si adotti la proposta della relatrice Tomašić – riduzione delle catture del 4 % – e che dal 2023 se gli stock non saranno in salvo si passi alla *Biomass Escapement Strategy*.

Questa strategia è condivisa anche dalle più rappresentative associazioni di categoria italiane della pesca quale Federpesca e Coldiretti Impresa Pesca. Vi chiedo, dunque, cari colleghi, di sostenere gli emendamenti sulla *Biomass Escapement Strategy* per garantire che i piccoli pelagici continuino ad essere, anche in futuro, una fonte di reddito per i nostri pescatori.

Czesław Hoc, *w imieniu grupy ECR*. – Pani Przewodnicząca! Na wstępie pragnę pogratulować i serdecznie podziękować koleżance posłance Tomašić bardzo ważnego sprawozdania w sprawie wieloletniego planu dotyczącego małych gatunków pelagicznych w Morzu Adriatyckim i połowów tych zasobów. Pragnę podkreślić, że mamy pokoleniowy obowiązek dążenia do zrównoważonych poziomów połowów tych ryb i właściwego podejścia do ekosystemu morskiego. Należy poławiać na takim poziomie, który pozwoli osiągnąć MSY, czyli maksymalny podtrzymywalny połów, jednakże trzeba pamiętać, że sardele i sardynki to istotny element ekonomiczny w dochodach sektorów rybołówstwa poszczególnych państw. Wieloletni plan musi opierać się na faktach naukowych w całkowitej symbiozie z opinią społeczną i z dobrą praktyką poszczególnych krajów łowiących na tym basenie, zatem eksploatacja małych gatunków pelagicznych w Morzu Adriatyckim z jednej strony musi być oparta na stabilnych i skutecznych fundamentach zarządzania i realizowana w aspekcie perspektywy pokoleniowej, ale z drugiej strony na poszanowaniu nauki i opinii społecznej.

Norica Nicolai, *în numele grupului ALDE.* – Doamna președintă, domnule comisar, fără îndoială, planurile multianuale sunt nu numai instrumente în acord cu politica noastră comună de pescuit, dar și instrumente de responsabilitate, pentru că ele vizează protejarea stocurilor și crearea unor stocuri de pește care să poată fi utilizate adecvat de populație. Este o certitudine, stimați colegi, că în Marea Adriatică stocurile de sardină și de anșoa sunt supraexploatate. De aceea, cred că trebuie luate măsuri și măsuri care să aibă utilitate și realitate în practică imediat, pentru că orice continuare a acestei supraexploatări poate distruge stocurile de pește și nu cred că asta își dorește cineva.

Cu siguranță, faptul că măsurile drastice propuse de Comisie afectează comunitățile în zonă și economiile locale și regionale este o certitudine și în acest context trebuie să luăm măsuri pentru a găsi soluții pentru a suplini aceste locuri de muncă.

De asemenea, credem că măsurile care trebuie luate trebuie să fie apropiate de soluții de date științifice dar și de soluțiile adoptate de GFCM și regretăm că în acest raport nu se vorbește decât de măsuri de gestionare după primii trei ani, ceea ce nu dă posibilitatea – în opinia noastră – de a adopta măsuri pe termen lung. Considerăm că este necesar să avem o viziune pe termen lung asupra acestei situații și propunerile noastre nu au fost acceptate, ceea ce – din punctul meu de vedere – ridică o mare problemă în continuare în legătură cu gestionarea acestor stocuri.

Doresc să subliniez că măsurile propuse doar pentru această perioadă sunt relativ echilibrate, dar nu le considerăm suficiente și credem că această abordare trebuie să fie balansată și echilibrată, favorizând și comunitățile, dar și stocurile de pește.

Marco Affronte, *a nome del gruppo Verts/ALE.* – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, in due minuti avrei fatto veramente fatica a elencare tutti i punti che mi preoccupano di questo piano, che è passato in sede di commissione per la pesca, ma per fortuna molti di questi li ha ricordati il Commissario Vella.

Sono quattro anni e mezzo che sono in questo Parlamento europeo e sono quattro anni e mezzo che sento parlare in commissione per la pesca della situazione disastrosa del Mediterraneo, dell'85 % di specie sovrasfruttate, di un settore in grave difficoltà. Eppure, adesso che arrivano i piani pluriennali, che sono uno degli strumenti principi proprio della PCP, vediamo subito quanto questi vengano in qualche modo diluiti, dimenticati, rovinati, ridotti a qualcosa che non ha nessun senso, nessun valore, nessuna efficacia.

Il piano per l'Adriatico prevedeva come proposta iniziale le quote. In Mediterraneo di quote non si può parlare, sono un tabù e sono un qualcosa che non può essere nemmeno preso in considerazione. I colleghi che sono così tanto preoccupati delle ricadute socioeconomiche non pensano alla ricaduta socioeconomica di uno stock che può collassare, e che quindi lascerebbe a piedi le persone che lavorano e che guadagnano su questo stock, e non pensano nemmeno al fatto che dove gli stock sono pescati in maniera sostenibile, la redditività della pesca è aumentata in maniera notevole e quindi con grande ritorno proprio socioeconomico.

Adesso abbiamo per le mani un piano che non abbiamo mai visto negli altri piani pluriennali che abbiamo fatto. Non è pluriennale perché dura soltanto tre anni. È scomparso il concetto di massimo rendimento sostenibile e soprattutto non dà nessun ascolto alle preoccupazioni della scienza o meglio sceglie a quale scienza dare ascolto. Ricordo alla collega Gardini che gli *Ecosurvey* che lei ha citato sono fatti sui demersali, mentre questo qui è un piano per i pelagici. Sono due dati che non si possono mettere insieme, basterebbe un minimo di conoscenza scientifica per saperlo.

Invece lo CSTEP ci dice che gli stock sono in grave crisi e che uno dei due rischia di collassare. Quindi serve una misura molto più efficace di quella che abbiamo in questo piano e spero che l'alternativa che domani avrete in lista, cioè quella dell'*Escapement Strategy*, possa almeno passare per dare in modo ai pescatori di sostenersi con questa risorsa economica.

Anja Hazekamp, *namens de GUE/NGL-Fractie*. – Voorzitter, de Middellandse Zee is groot en de Middellandse Zee is diep maar de bodem is toch in zicht. Vissen en andere diersoorten in de Middellandse Zee verdwijnen in een zorgwekkend tempo, met name in de Adriatische Zee, waar alleen al in de afgelopen vijftig jaar de helft van alle zeezoogdieren en vissen is verdwenen. Wetenschappers waarschuwen dat de druk op het ecosysteem zodanig groot is dat als we nu niks doen het *point of no return* aanstaande is. Er is geen weg terug als we op deze voet doorgaan. Dan zullen de plant- en diersoorten in de Adriatische Zee ten dode opgeschreven zijn.

De afgelopen jaren was ik nauw betrokken bij de visserijplannen van de Noordzee en de Oostzee en die plannen waren al niet best, maar dit plan voor de Adriatische Zee slaat werkelijk alles. Dit is een *carte blanche* voor overbevissing, een *carte blanche* om ansjovis en sardines uit te roeien, soorten die heel belangrijk zijn voor het ecosysteem van de Adriatische Zee.

Ik vind dan ook dat de rapporteurs, die dit visserijplan hebben opgesteld, zich heel diep moeten schamen. Zij zetten het voortbestaan van ecosystemen op het spel en ik hoop dat het Parlement daar een stokje voor gaat steken. De Adriatische Zee heeft een reddingsplan nodig, een plan dat de overbevissing nú stopt en niet over drie jaar, nú, zoals afgesproken is in de duurzame-ontwikkelingsdoelen van de Verenigde Naties.

Voorts ben ik van mening dat de Europese landbouw- en visserijsubsidies moeten worden afgeschaft.

Rosa D'Amato, *a nome del gruppo EFDD*. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, in Adriatico si produce il 70-80 % delle sardine e delle acciughe italiane e operano oltre 160 imbarcazioni e mille operatori. Negli ultimi cinque anni, però, la filiera ha perso il 50-60 % del suo valore a causa della concorrenza. Per questo abbiamo pensato ad interventi di gestione che hanno nella giusta considerazione il reale stato delle risorse e che non si basano solo su approcci precauzionali.

In generale, prima dell'adozione di un piano di gestione, sarebbe opportuno condurre una valutazione di impatto, sia sulla reale disponibilità delle risorse ittiche che sugli aspetti socioeconomici, così come stabilito anche dal regolamento di base sulla politica comune della pesca, che toccano da vicino le micro, piccole e medie imprese, che sono soprattutto italiane.

L'introduzione di un sistema di quote rischia di condurre l'intero settore al collasso dopo oltre vent'anni di crisi. L'obiettivo di questo piano è conseguire e mantenere il rendimento massimo sostenibile per gli stock interessati, rendere il settore della pesca sostenibile e fornire un quadro di gestione efficace. Con questa proposta di regolamento ci si oppone ai tentativi della Commissione di istituire delle quote. Così come la voteremo domani offre una stabilità relativa al settore. Qualsiasi cambiamento rispetto a questa strategia potrebbe perturbare il mercato dell'Unione, aprire spazi per aumentare le importazioni da paesi terzi e mettere il settore della pesca in una posizione di mercato iniqua.

La proposta votata in commissione per la pesca si basa invece su una gestione dello sforzo di pesca e rappresenta la reale necessità del settore con una sostenibilità biologica, ma anche economica e sociale. Domani votiamo con coscienza.

Jarosław Wałęsa (PPE). – Madam President, this strategic file has been long awaited and I hope that we will avoid any unnecessary delays. The aim of this proposal is to establish a framework for the management of Adriatic pelagic stocks. It should provide a balanced approach to the sustainable exploitation of these stocks, because this will lead to the stability of fishing opportunities, and that in turn will lead to the secure livelihood of fishermen. At the same time, it should guarantee that this management is based on the most up-to-date scientific advice regarding the status of stocks covered, and also interactions between species and other aspects related to the ecosystem and fisheries.

There are two points I would like to mention right now. Firstly, the most important thing is the implementation of the Common Fisheries Policy – the reform and the regionalisation as well. The voice of the regions must be heard and put into practice. Secondly, I have always been a big supporter of flexibility of management plans. They should be flexible enough to react to changes in fish populations based on scientific advice, and I hope that the negotiating team will be striving for this during their trilogue negotiations.

Ricardo Serrão Santos (S&D). – Senhor Presidente, Senhor Comissário, desde já o saúdo pela sua intervenção. O principal e final objetivo da Política Comum de Pescas é que a atividade seja realizada da forma mais sustentável possível, não só do ponto de vista económico, mas também social, económico e ambiental.

Todos os pareceres científicos demonstram que a situação dos pequenos pelágicos no Adriático é crítica e que medidas adicionais de gestão específicas e concretas que permitam a recuperação das populações de biqueirão e sardinha têm de ser urgentemente implementadas.

A proposta aprovada em Comissão de Pescas peca, desde já, pela sua limitação temporal, já que as medidas de gestão propostas têm como limite 2022 e alteram muito pouco as medidas que estão atualmente implementadas e que os diferentes pareceres científicos indicam não serem suficientes.

Após negociações intensas e conversações entre os diferentes interessados, foi encontrado um consenso que permite, sem alterar a proposta da relatora, definir medidas de gestão a aplicar após 2022 e que alteram, substancialmente, a forma de gestão preconizada até aqui.

Com as alterações ressubmetidas pelos socialistas e democratas, pretende-se assegurar que, com informação científica recolhida anualmente, se definam as capturas que permitam manter biomassa reprodutora perto de um nível constante.

No S&D, defendemos que apenas com estas medidas adicionais será possível manter esta pescaria e evitar o colapso dos pequenos pelágicos no Adriático. O Comité Científico, Técnico e Económico da Pesca conclui que haverá um colapso das populações de pequenos pelágicos, caso se mantenham apenas medidas como as propostas pela relatora.

As avaliações da Comissão Geral das Pescas para o Mediterrâneo da FAO vão também no mesmo sentido. Sabendo que os efeitos serão enormes para pescadores, empresas e comunidades locais, a curto e médio prazo, incentivo-vos amanhã a votarem favoravelmente as alterações 93 e 97.

Sra. Tomašić, pode haver um mar com peixe e sem pescadores, pode haver um mar com peixe e com pescadores. Uma coisa é certa: não pode haver um mar sem peixe e com pescadores. Sem uma biomassa constante de reprodutores disponíveis, não haverá recrutamento e, como não há gerações espontâneas na Natureza, sem recrutamento não haverá peixe e sem peixe não haverá pescadores.

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, κατ' αρχάς θα ήθελα να συγχαρώ την εισηγήτρια, κυρία Tomašić, για την έκθεσή της. Είναι μια έκθεση ισορροπημένη, η οποία λαμβάνει υπόψη την προστασία των τοπικών κοινωνιών και τα μεγάλα κοινωνικοοικονομικά προβλήματα που μπορεί να υπάρξουν.

Κύριε Vella, μίλησα με τους έλληνες αλιείς και ζήτησα τη γνώμη τους. Μου είπαν, λοιπόν, ότι τους ικανοποιούν οι ρυθμίσεις της Γενικής Επιτροπής Αλιείας για τη Μεσόγειο (ΓΕΑΜ) που ισχύουν σήμερα. Πρόκειται για μέτρα που ελήφθησαν το 2016 και δίνουν λύσεις στα προβλήματα, οπότε μπορώ να πω ότι οι αλιείς είναι ευχαριστημένοι. Ωστόσο, πρέπει να προσέξουμε, είπαν οι έλληνες αλιείς, τα γρι-γρι, τα οποία υπεραλιεύουν και έχουν καταστροφικές συνέπειες. Ως προς το θέμα αυτό, απαιτείται μεγάλη προστασία. Επιπλέον, αυτό που ζητούν οι έλληνες αλιείς, που φτωχοποιήθηκαν από τα μνημόνια, είναι επενδύσεις. Είναι η δυνατότητα να εκσυγχρονίσουν τον αλιευτικό τους στόλο. Να μπορούν να αλιεύουν πέρα από την Αδριατική και σε άλλες περιοχές πέρα από τις ελληνικές θάλασσες, για να μπορέσουν έτσι να σώσουν το επάγγελμά τους. Αυτά είναι τα θέματα που θέτουν οι έλληνες αλιείς, κύριε Vella.

Ivan Jakovčić (ALDE). – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, želim odmah na početku vrlo jasno podržati izvještaj gospođe Tomašić jer ovaj izvještaj kako ga je ona postavila ide u korist onih ljudi koji se bave ribarstvom na Jadranu.

Podsjećam vas da sam bio izvjestitelj za jadransku i jonsku makrostrategiju Europske unije gdje je i ribarstvo jedan od stupova te makrostrategije.

Plavi rast. Kakav ćemo plavi rast imati ako počnemo uvoditi takvu vrstu politike koju predlaže Komisija? Ja želim biti potpuno jasan: ovdje imamo gotovo povijesni dogovor hrvatskih, talijanskih i slovenskih ribara. Ja se ne sjećam kad se to dogodilo oko bilo koje teme. Ovo se sada dogodilo. Molim vas, gospodo iz Komisije, molim vas, kolegice i kolege da uvažite tu činjenicu i da idemo u korist onih koji žive od ribe. Pa valjda oni malo više misle o svojoj budućnosti nego što ovdje čujem ponekad, od nekih, dušebrižničke stavove. Ja razumijem neke teze, ali ne razumijem zašto bismo išli protiv onih koji upravo žive od ribarstva na Jadranu.

Mireille D'Ornano (EFDD). – Madame la Présidente, autrefois d'une taille moyenne de 15 centimètres, la sardine ne mesure plus aujourd'hui que 11 centimètres en Méditerranée. Les anchois sont également touchés par ce phénomène alarmant. Pire, ces pélagiques meurent désormais beaucoup plus jeunes, à tel point que les sardines et les anchois âgés de plus de deux ans ont disparu. La petite taille des poissons a bien sûr une incidence sur leur commercialisation, mais cela soulève aussi la question de la pollution, qui n'a jamais été aussi grave, surtout en Méditerranée, et qui touche également le plancton, principale alimentation de ces poissons.

Il est bien sûr indispensable de gérer les stocks, mais cela pourrait se faire sans l'Union européenne, puisque c'est la Commission générale des pêches pour la Méditerranée qui est compétente en la matière sur le plan international.

L'Union européenne serait davantage utile si elle faisait cesser de toute urgence les rejets de produits chimiques polluants en Méditerranée plutôt que d'enchaîner les grandes déclarations sur l'environnement. Parler c'est bien, traiter les causes, c'est mieux.

Werner Kuhn (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Kommissar, verehrte Frau Kollegin Tomašić! Dieser Plan ist eine logische Konsequenz aus dem, was wir sozusagen über mehrere Jahre auf der Grundlage der *basic regulations* für die gemeinsame Fischereipolitik entwickelt haben: Ostseeplan, Nordseeplan, *Western Waters*.

Natürlich müssen wir uns auch mit den Beständen im Mittelmeer intensiv beschäftigen. Das steht außer Frage. Hier geht es in der Adria um einen Fangbereich, der relativ klar abgegrenzt ist – auch geografisch klar abgegrenzt ist –, um Sardinen und Sardellen, pelagische Arten, die letztendlich auch – entweder mit der stillen Fischerei oder mit Schleppnetzfischerei – gefangen werden.

Die wissenschaftlichen Evaluierungen zur Biomasse sind notwendig und sind auch über Jahre hinweg gemacht worden, aber sie haben natürlich auch einen Toleranzbereich zwischen —20 % und +20 %. Deshalb müssen wir mit einer Quotierung auch sehr vorsichtig umgehen, denn es wird das erste Mal sein, dass wir das sozusagen innerhalb des Mittelmeerraums in Angriff nehmen. Es ist unser gemeinsames Ziel: *maximum sustainable yield*. Wenn diese Quotierung eingeführt wird und eine drastische Reduzierung für die Fischerei, für den kleinen Sektor ins Auge gefasst wird, dann müssen natürlich auch sozioökonomische Maßnahmen da sein, die wir aus dem EMFF, aus dem *European Maritime and Fisheries Fund*, begleiten: zeitweilige Stilllegungen, die dann auch entsprechend vergütet werden, Fangausfallprämien, die entsprechend vergütet werden. Auch die Mitgliedstaaten müssen dort eine Kofinanzierung in Angriff nehmen. So können wir dann auch nur einen über mehrere Jahre hinweg bestehenden Wiederauffüllungsplan organisieren, damit sich die Bestände dann auch wieder erholen können. Das ist für die Fischerei ja auch ganz wichtig. Aber wir wollen natürlich auch nicht, dass die kleine und handwerkliche Fischerei sozusagen insolvent wird, bankrott geht, sondern wir müssen sie finanziell so lange unterstützen, bis die Biomasse wieder so klar und so deutlich ist, dass eine gute Nachwuchsproduktion da sein wird.

In diesem Sinne kann ich nur sagen: Unser gemeinsames Ziel ist *maximum sustainable yield* – maximal möglicher Dauerertrag –, Arbeitsplätze erhalten, aber auch, die touristische Attraktivität dieser Fischereihäfen an der Adria zu erhalten. In diesem Sinne müssen wir mit Vernunft an diesen adriatischen Plan herangehen.

Isabelle Thomas (S&D). – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Commissaire – qui venez de Méditerranée –, mes chers collègues, la Méditerranée se meurt et nous la regardons mourir. Non seulement les pétroliers y nettoient leurs cuves, non seulement l'intensité du trafic conduit à des collisions polluantes comme celle du mois dernier, mais en plus elle se vide de ses richesses sous l'effet de notre impuissance à réguler l'activité de la pêche.

Le rapport du Parlement sur le plan pluriannuel des petits pélagiques de la mer Adriatique ne prend pas la mesure de ces enjeux. Certes, la proposition législative de la Commission aurait pu être un peu plus ambitieuse, mais au moins proposait-elle une harmonisation avec les plans pluriannuels en Europe. La version votée en commission de la pêche la vide de sa substance: pas de TAC (totaux admissibles de captures) ni de quotas, abandon du rendement maximum durable, remplacé par la référence aux limites biologiques, suppression de l'échéance de 2020 sur l'objectif de mortalité et suppression de la protection des juvéniles.

Nous sommes bien loin des objectifs de la politique commune de la pêche. Y aurait-il une Europe coupée en deux, comme pour la directive «soufre» par exemple? Une Europe à géométrie variable, parfois dans le sens de la durabilité, parfois celle de l'irresponsabilité? Non seulement le compte n'y est pas pour préserver la Méditerranée, mais les inégalités ainsi créées désintègrent le projet européen. Je le regrette pour M[me] Tomašić, car je respecte beaucoup son travail – et elle a beaucoup travaillé –, mais je vous engage demain à voter les amendements 93, 94, 95, 96, et 97 pour faire entrer la Méditerranée dans l'ère de la durabilité.

Pyynnöstä myönnettävät puheenvuorot

Seán Kelly (PPE). – Madam President, rarely have I seen such a divergence of opinions, both within and beyond political groups and with the Commission, as on this topic.

I think everybody here wants to see fishermen thrive, they want to see fish stocks increase, but obviously there is a dilemma in the Adriatic which needs to be addressed. When you have a situation where, as has been quoted, sardines go from 15 inches to 11 inches, that has to be explained. What's going on? If that happened to the human race, if over a period of years people declined by four or five inches, there would be an investigation and discussion. I think Mr Kuhn gave the most balanced view when he said if there needs to be measures, the fishermen have to be helped by compensation, maybe even co-financing.

A few weeks ago we brought a fishing delegation from the European Parliament to my constituency, and one of the points made by the fishermen is that they felt their voices weren't heard enough. I think it is important to bring stakeholders, those who are on the sea every day, more into the discussion, and allow them to have their say and let them feel that they are part of the solution, not the problem.

Igor Šoltes (Verts/ALE). – Gospa predsednica. Tudi sam podpiram pravzaprav stališče o tem, da, ko se govori o tako pomembnih temah, kot je na neki način omejevanje ribolova posameznih vrst rib v Jadranu, da bi glede te teme morali z vso resnostjo prisluhniti tudi ribičem.

Ker ribištvo je zelo težek poklic in ribištvo za te, posebej še male ribiče, je edini vir dohodka. In zato gre tudi pri teh vprašanjih za zelo občutljivo temo. Kako po eni strani najti ravnotežje med interesi in seveda potrebami ribičev za ustvarjanje prihodka in po drugi strani za zaščito ribjega staleža sardonov, sardel in drugih ribjih vrst, ki se nevarno zmanjšuje.

In tukaj mislim, da so potrebni dolgoročni ukrepi, ki morajo temeljiti na znanstvenih dokazih, ne na nekih kratkoročnih potrebah in ukrepih, in na ta način zagotoviti tudi dovolj obnovljivega ribjega staleža. Sicer ribiči ne bodo imeli kaj loviti.

(Pyynnöstä myönnettävät puheenvuorot päättyvät)

Karmenu Vella, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, I would like to thank colleagues for their interventions and valuable views. I would like to turn straightaway to some of the specific points raised by honourable Members this evening.

Let me remind you that, according to the common fisheries policy (CFP), conservation measures have to be based on best scientific advice. This does not mean that we can base our management proposal on individual scientific opinions. It means that we should use scientific advice that has been validated by the competent scientific bodies, such as the Scientific, Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries (STECF) or the General Fisheries Commission for the Mediterranean (GFCM) Scientific Advisory Council on the basis of a thorough review process. Such scientific advice cannot simply be dismissed because the outcome is disliked.

Let me comment on the escapement strategy. The maximum sustainable yield (MSY) biomass escapement strategy is a model already used by the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES) to manage nine short-lived species, for instance, in the North Sea, the Bering Sea or the Bay of Biscay, and it has been very successful, for instance for anchovy in the Bay of Biscay. For highly valuable stocks like Adriatic sardine and anchovy, the escapement strategy allows fishing a higher fraction when the stock biomass is high and a smaller fraction when the stock is low, but always maintaining a high probability of sufficient biomass. In the long term, it should ensure higher catches while maintaining a low risk for the stock. STECF considers that the escapement procedure could be an appropriate tool to manage small pelagics in the Adriatic and to achieve the MSY objectives.

With regard to the socio-economic situation: the socio-economic situation of the fisheries sector is closely linked to the stock situation. Healthy fish go hand in hand with healthy profits. This can clearly be seen in sea basins where we have moved to FMSY and profitability has increased. This means that if we do not act or if our action is not ambitious enough, notably when we have a stock close to collapse, the socio-economic cost risks being very high.

With regard to the emergency measures, given the management void for Adriatic small pelagics in 2019 and given the delay with this proposal for the multiannual plan, we proposed transitional emergency measures in the GFCM annual meeting in October. These measures establish an increased number of spatial temporal closures and a catch reduction of 5% per year until 2021. These measures will apply to the EU fleets and will be transposed in the TAC and Quota Regulation of the next three years.

Someone asked why we are moving away from existing measures. Evaluations of the existing management framework have concluded that it is ineffective and insufficient to ensure the stocks will be fished sustainably by 2020. STECF has advised that managers consider using catch or landing restrictions as a more effective management tool for small pelagic. For example, even if effort is reduced by 20%, this does not necessarily translate into a 20% reduction in catches or fishing mortality. If a vessel comes across a school of small pelagic fish, it can take a large quantity in a short amount of time. Reducing catches, on the other hand, translates directly into an equivalent reduction of fishing mortality.

I would like to make three other comments: first of all, that quotas in the Mediterranean do not work; I totally disagree with this. Quotas in the Mediterranean have worked. The only stock in the Mediterranean which managed to recover was tuna, and tuna was recovered with a quota management plan set by the International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas (ICCAT).

Another argument is that fishermen in the south should not be expected to do the same as those in the north. Why? What is the difference? The difference is compliance and the difference in the result is very significant. We have fishermen in the north – in the Baltic and in the North Sea, on the Atlantic – complying and their stocks have improved. Their profitability has improved. Quotas and management have given the result. Ten years ago, we had nine stocks at MSY. Today, thanks to management by quota, we have 54 stocks at MSY. This cannot be said of the Mediterranean, where we have 90% stock still being overfished, and where we have stocks still deteriorating and we will have almost non-existent profitability.

Finally, my last comment concerns the suggestion that I should be ashamed and that I am escaping responsibility. I do not think this is fair. I am not ashamed because I am acting in the long-term interest of the fishermen and in the long-term interest of the stocks. I would be escaping responsibility if I were ignoring scientific advice and if I were supporting overfishing.

In the Mediterranean it was always said that quotas, rules and regulations do not apply. Why? Because in the Mediterranean the Member States are not alone. We have North African countries with us. So rules and quotas only apply to EU Member States, but not to North African countries. Again, this is far from the truth. Here we have two stocks which are dwindling. They only concern three of our Member States and still they do not want to manage. Why? Because they want to be different from the fishermen in the north.

Finally, let me finally remind everyone that all member countries in the Mediterranean signed the MedFish4Ever Declaration in Malta to start better protecting our Mediterranean fish stocks. May I ask if it's going to be our own Member States who run away from this commitment. I hope that tomorrow this House will adopt a report which will set the Adriatic multiannual plan on a course very much in line with the CFP and with other multiannual plans (MAPs).

Ruža Tomašić, *Rapporteur.* – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, iskoristila bih ovu priliku i zahvalila izvjestiteljima u sjeni na njihovom doprinosu, kao i ostalim kolegama iz Odbora za ribarstvo i svima koji su sudjelovali u ovoj raspravi. Velika hvala i ribarima, njihovim udruženjima i državnim institucijama jadranskih zemalja članica čija su iskustva, podaci i prijedlozi bili ključni za izradu ovoga izvješća. Dakle, mela sam u svome dvorištu.

Univerzalna rješenja ne mogu dati očekivane rezultate i zato mi je drago da su pri izradi ovog izvješća razmotreni razni prijedlozi svih relevantnih dionika. Najkvalitetnija rješenja koja imaju gotovo plebiscitarnu podršku ribara i struke našla su svoje mjesto u izvješću i sad je na nama da im damo političku potporu.

Prijedlozi Komisije koji neupitno vode slabljenju naše ribarske industrije, gubitku radnih mjesta, ekonomskom jačanju trećih zemalja na štetu članica Unije i srednjoročnoj diskriminaciji jadranskih ribara u odnosu na ostatak Sredozemlja, neprihvatljivi su. Građani su nas birali da štitimo njihove, a ne tuđe interese.

Sigurna sam da će ovo izvješće dobiti podršku Parlamenta jer je utemeljeno na rješenjima sukladnima preporukama GFCM-a koja već daju rezultate. Uvođenje kvota odbijaju i ribari, i struka, i znanstvenici, i vlade država članica koje izlaze na Jadransko more. Smatram da je Komisija ovdje zauzela dosta rigidnu poziciju, ali isto tako vjerujem da postoji prostor za promjenu te pozicije nakon što Parlament usvoji ovo izvješće.

I, gospodine povjereniče, ovo uspoređujete s tunama – ovo nema veze jedno s drugim. Vi znate da što se tiče tuna, kvote nisu bile jedino što je obnovilo tune. Isto tako, kad su se kvote podigle, mi nismo mogli vratiti sve one poslove, sve one brodove koje su ribari izgubili. Dakle, ne žurimo, idemo polako, moramo zaštiti riblji fond, ali moramo zaštititi i ribare, pogotovo one koji žive na otoku i priobalju.

Puhemies. – Keskustelu on päättynyt.

Äänestys toimitetaan tiistaina 13.11.2018.

16. Überschwemmungen in Europa (Aussprache)

Puhemies. – Esityslistalla on seuraavana komission julkilausuma tulvista Euroopassa (2018/2928(RSP)).

Tässä keskustelussa ei anneta pyynnöstä myönnettäviä puheenvuoroja eikä sinisen kortin kysymyksiä hyväksytä.

Corina Crețu, *Member of the Commission.* – Madam President, allow me to express, on behalf of the European Commission, my most sincere condolences to the families of those who have perished in the recent floods throughout Europe.

Quite tragically, these events have highlighted our vulnerability to both natural and man-made disasters. Hence the continued need for investing on the ground in better preparedness and better prevention. EU support should help regions become more resilient and more sustainable. This is the rationale behind the cohesion policy.

You know very well that under the current programming period, almost EUR 8 billion have been channelled to the climate change adaptation and risk prevention. Clearly, disaster risk management is a main focus of our policy. We invest in early warning systems, awareness-raising, flood-protection infrastructure, green infrastructures such as flood plains or green urban spaces.

Besides prevention, we work on preparedness, in particular support for equipment and vehicles or training for civil protection units.

It is also important to mention the contribution of the EU's rural development policy. Support includes investments for the restoration of damaged agriculture and forestry land and production capacity, the restoration of rural infrastructure and preventive actions and risk-management tools for farmers.

But building prevention and resilience is a very complex process which entails a long lasting match between public investment and the reality on the ground. This is why, following the disasters of last year, the Commission adopted the so-called 'risk EU package', which included a screening of all relevant operational programmes. The aim here was to see whether there were any gaps in the support we provided.

The good news is that the current priorities in our programmes already match very closely with the highest risk that Member States have identified themselves in their national risk assessments. This is partly thanks to our funding.

More generally, we offer flexibility in our programmes. This means amendments can be proposed and swiftly agreed to shift resources towards areas that are most in need. So, if changes are necessary, they can still be made under the current funding period.

The Commission is also supporting Member States in the implementation of the Floods Directive and will publish by the beginning of next year, an assessment for the first flood risk management plans prepared by the Member States under this directive. This mapping will allow adequate and coordinating measures to reduce flood risk.

Besides a long-term approach to natural disasters, there is, of course, an emergency dimension. The Commission's risk EU package, which I just mentioned, was also introduced to upgrade the EU's emergency response, notably by revising the European Union's civil protection mechanism put in place in 2001 to provide external assistance to Member States or a third country. It goes without saying that the Commission stands ready to help any affected country through this mechanism.

Last, but not least, we have the EU Solidarity Fund, directly managed by my services. The European Union Solidarity Fund is pivotal as it complements rapid-response measures helping regions and countries to restore essential infrastructure, ensure continuity of public services, assist populations and protect cultural heritage. The Commission's services are currently working hand-in-hand with the Italian and Austrian authorities who are considering applying for solidarity assistance after the recent floods. As always, we stand ready to help them throughout the process.

Thank you for your attention and I am looking forward to our debate.

Puhemies. – Haluan vielä selventää, että tässä keskustelussa on vain yksi kierros poliittisten ryhmien puheenvuoroja, ei siis pyynnöstä myönnettäviä puheenvuoroja eikä sinisen kortin kysymyksiä.

Herbert Dorfmann, *im Namen der PPE-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin, geschätzte Frau Kommissarin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Ja, in der Tat, in den letzten Tagen im Oktober und in den ersten Novembertagen ist ein Unwetter über ganz Europa gezogen, und das hat insbesondere auch den Alpenraum und den italienischen Alpenraum ganz massiv betroffen. In meiner Region, in Südtirol, in Trentino, vor allem auch im besonders betroffenen Belluno hat es über Tage geregnet, es ist zu Überschwemmungen gekommen, und Windböen bis zu 200 Stundenkilometern haben ganze Wälder umgeknickt. Millionen von Kubikmetern Holz liegen jetzt und müssen aufgearbeitet werden. Allein in meiner Region sind 1,1 Millionen Kubikmeter Holz betroffen. Besonders tragisch ist dies, weil es sich hier auch um ein Weltnaturerbe der Unesco handelt, in das Wunden geschlagen wurden, die über Jahrzehnte sichtbar sein werden. Die Wälder wachsen ja nicht von heute auf morgen nach.

Aber was ganz besonders tragisch ist: Es sind auch Menschen ums Leben gekommen: Insgesamt sind in Italien – es war ja auch Süditalien, die Region Sizilien besonders, betroffen – 32 Menschen ums Leben gekommen. In meiner Region ist ein freiwilliger Feuerwehrmann, der in der Nacht versucht hat, Menschen zu helfen, bei dieser Arbeit für seine Mitmenschen ums Leben gekommen, was ich als ganz besonders tragisch empfinde.

Quindi, penso che sia bene che facciamo questo dibattito oggi, anche per mostrare la nostra solidarietà, e condivido in pieno quello che lei, signora Commissario, ha detto appena adesso. Ma la solidarietà deve diventare concreta. È certo che serve anche la prevenzione, però la gente colpita della prevenzione in questo momento ha poco vantaggio, serve aiuto, serve l'aiuto concreto.

Quindi dobbiamo fare di tutto affinché si apra il Fondo di solidarietà. Viviamo in Italia in un momento dove a volte mi sembra che l'Unione europea viene resa responsabile per tutto. L'Unione europea è responsabile per le difficoltà economiche del paese, per le infrastrutture che crollano e per i flussi migratori. Viene dipinto un quadro molto buio dell'Unione europea.

Quindi questa è anche un'occasione per noi. Un'occasione per far capire agli italiani e alla popolazione italiana che esiste l'Unione europea che aiuta, l'Unione europea solidale, l'Unione europea che in un momento di difficoltà sta dalla parte della gente, e quindi dobbiamo sfruttare questa occasione. Dobbiamo veramente cercare di far presto, di dare anche una risposta alla richiesta del governo italiano, che ha dichiarato lo stato di calamità nazionale, affinché ci siano le possibilità di aiuto del Fondo di solidarietà europeo e che ci siano anche presto.

Michela Giuffrida, *a nome del gruppo S&D*. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, cara signora Commissario, grazie per questo dibattito, che peraltro avevamo vivamente sollecitato, sulle recenti inondazioni in Italia, nel Sud Europa e purtroppo nella mia terra, la Sicilia, dove in sole 24 ore è caduta la metà della pioggia di un intero anno e la tragedia ha avuto le dimensioni di 12 morti e centinaia e centinaia di milioni di euro di danni e a infrastrutture e coltivazioni.

Grazie per le sue condoglianze e per la sua solidarietà, che estenderò alle famiglie delle vittime di una tragedia assurda in un inferno di acqua, fango, incuria e disinteresse. Pensi che il cadavere dell'ultimo disperso, un giovane medico che stava andando al lavoro, è stato recuperato solo quattro giorni fa.

In poco più di dieci anni, i disastri naturali sono costati all'Unione europea circa 100 miliardi di EUR. Parliamo di un terzo dell'intero bilancio che l'Unione dedica per le politiche di coesione. È palese che, di fronte a massicci cambiamenti climatici, se si vogliono limitare i danni bisogna aumentare gli interventi di prevenzione e che la politica di coesione debba essere lo strumento per supportarli oltre al Fondo di solidarietà.

Le autorità locali e regionali beneficiarie delle misure di coesione sono anche le prime a confrontarsi con gli impatti dei disastri. La prevenzione delle calamità è tra gli assi centrali dello sviluppo regionale, ed è chiaro che la coesione deve diventare la prima fonte di finanziamento per la prevenzione e la lotta al cambiamento climatico, se pensiamo che, secondo dati dell'Ispra, entro un secolo l'aumento della temperatura media in Italia potrebbe addirittura superare i due gradi.

Le misure di prevenzione e gli interventi sono lasciati agli Stati membri dell'Unione europea. A loro spetta investire e spendere per politiche infrastrutturali, ma gli Stati e le regioni spesso dimenticano di farlo o non possono sostenere gli investimenti necessari. Allora, signora Commissario, adesso c'è bisogno davvero dell'intervento dell'Unione europea, perché i 114 miliardi dedicati a misure di risposta ai cambiamenti climatici, che sconta il nostro bilancio, non sono più necessari.

C'è bisogno di fronte a una sciagura immane, quale abbiamo registrato nella mia terra solo dieci giorni fa, di tutta la solidarietà concreta, dell'aiuto, di supporto, dei fondi, dei risarcimenti per chi addirittura, oltre alla vita, ha perso anche quello che era il proprio lavoro, la propria quotidianità. È proprio in queste situazioni che l'Unione europea deve concretamente far percepire ai cittadini la propria presenza e la propria, scusatemi, utilità.

Remo Sernagiotto, *a nome del gruppo ECR*. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, saluto la signora Commissaria che mi fa molto piacere vedere, perché nei pochi minuti, nei pochi secondi che abbiamo, io vorrei concentrarmi su quello che è successo nel Sud Europa nei giorni passati e vorrei concentrarmi in particolare in una provincia, la provincia montana per eccellenza: la provincia di Belluno, la provincia delle Dolomiti, per capirci tra noi europei.

Vede, lì sono successi fatti così gravi che abbiamo sentito il dovere di muoverci come comunità veneta. Sono arrivati migliaia di volontari, sono caduti 100 000 ettari di boschi, boschi tutelati da sempre, signora Commissario. C'è un modello lì che si chiama «le regole», che hanno tutelato quel straordinario territorio che è un territorio molto bello ma molto difficile.

Lì abbiamo commesso anche qualche errore. Il primo errore lo abbiamo commesso quando abbiamo deciso di far transitare l'energia via aerea attraverso dei fili e dei pali. Questo ha comportato il grande disastro: migliaia e migliaia di utenze cancellate per giorni, persone in grandissima difficoltà. E tutto questo perché negli anni passati non si è voluto spendere qualche soldo in più per interrare quei cavi.

Io devo ringraziare l'onorevole De Carlo, nonché sindaco di una comunità in provincia di Belluno, perché mi ha accompagnato e mi ha fatto comprendere quanto sia importante. Ho già finito il mio tempo, ma vorrei concludere con tre fatti molto molto importanti. Vede, la basilica di San Marco è stata sommersa totalmente. Detriti e fanghi hanno ucciso l'80 % delle vongole coltivate all'interno delle valli veneziane. Ma soprattutto credo che il Fondo di solidarietà si debba attivare ieri non domani. Perciò chiedo con forza che venga attivato subito il Fondo di solidarietà per un territorio così danneggiato da un evento catastrofico.

Bronis Ropė, *Verts/ALE frakcijos vardu*. – Dėl klimato kaitos ekstremalūs gamtos reiškiniai tampa vis dažnesni. Pernai mano šalis Lietuva kentėjo nuo nuolatinių liūčių ir potvynių. Šiais metais šalį nualino sausros. Dvejus metus iš eilės mūsų žemės ūkis kentėjo ekstremalias situacijas. Europos Sąjunga Lietuvai skyrė dvidešimt šešių milijonų eurų žalos kompensavimui. Tačiau tai sudaro tik šešis procentus tiesioginės patirtos žalos. O tikroji, pinigais nepamatuojama žala tokia, kad vien iš pieno sektoriaus per pastaruosius pusantrų metų iš gamybos pasitraukė 19 proc. ūkių ir karvių skaičius sumažėjo 9 proc. Prie viso to, Baltijos šalių ūkininkai gauna mažiausias Europos Sąjungos tiesiogines išmokas. Todėl atsiduria dar sunkesnėje situacijoje. Mano rankose Baltijos valstybių Europarlamentarų kreipimasis, kuriuo raginama sekančiame finansiniame laikotarpyje suvienodinti išmokas mūsų ūkininkams. Tikiuosi, kad tiek jūs, kolegos, tiek Komisijos, Tarybos nariai pritars, kad Europa turi prisiimti atsakomybę prieš visus savo ūkininkus vienodai ir išmokos turi būti suvienodinamos jau kitam laikotarpyje.

Eleonora Forenza, *a nome del gruppo GUE/NGL*. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, secondo i dati del rapporto 2018 dell'Istituto di protezione ambientale, in Italia 2 milioni di abitanti sono esposti a forte rischio alluvioni e 6 milioni a rischio medio. Il 91 % dei comuni italiani risulta a rischio combinato per alluvioni e frane. E ancora di più, a fronte dei tragici fatti e delle vittime che abbiamo pianto nelle scorse settimane, è evidente che il riassetto idrogeologico è la vera e assoluta priorità per l'Italia. Dovrebbe esserlo per il governo italiano, dovrebbe esserlo per l'Unione europea, e invece continuiamo a sentir parlare di vincoli di bilancio, di *Fiscal compact*, di TAP, di TAV, di grandi opere inutili e dannose che drenano risorse enormi.

Ancora, il governo continua la tradizione di Craxi e Berlusconi con un nuovo condono edilizio. Al contrario, servirebbero risorse, innanzitutto per quei comuni che sono impegnati nelle rilevazioni degli abusi edilizi e che invece sono privi delle strutture essenziali per l'applicazione delle leggi contro l'abusivismo. Comuni che dai tagli e dai vincoli di bilancio sono stati svuotati di risorse, competenze e mezzi per affrontare un problema pesantissimo. In Sicilia, a Casteldaccia, una famiglia intera ha perso la vita perché non si è riusciti a completare l'iter di abbattimento di un edificio costruito in riva a un fiume e certificato come abusivo da anni.

I danni si moltiplicano anche per la sete di profitto continua. Nel bellunese distrutto dall'alluvione di fine ottobre, Terna S.p.a. costruisce linee elettriche aeree con tralicci alti 60 metri in luoghi sottoposti a vincolo paesaggistico e di interesse comunitario e, come si vede, a rischio alluvione. Quei tralicci andrebbero internati. Serve una nuova stagione di investimenti pubblici, servono risorse strutturali non fondi straordinari.

Mara Bizzotto, *a nome del gruppo ENF*. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, porto, a nome della Lega, la solidarietà a tutti i cittadini che sono state vittime della tremenda ondata di maltempo delle ultime settimane. Prima di tutto voglio ringraziare la Protezione civile e le migliaia di volontari che stanno aiutando la nostra gente.

Undici regioni italiane, in particolar modo il Veneto e tutto il Nord Est, sono state messe in ginocchio da alluvioni, trombe d'aria, mareggiate, che hanno spazzato via case, strade, boschi, spiagge e vite umane. Secondo le prime stime, i bilanci dei danni sono pesantissimi. Oltre un miliardo di EUR in Veneto, la mia regione; oltre 500 milioni di EUR, in Friuli Venezia Giulia; 250 milioni di EUR in Trentino Alto Adige, centinaia e centinaia di milioni in Liguria, Lazio, Sicilia e nel resto d'Italia.

Di fronte a questa catastrofe, i nostri cittadini hanno bisogno di avere urgentemente a disposizione tutte le risorse che l'Europa può dare, in primis il Fondo di solidarietà europeo che va erogato il più velocemente possibile. All'Europa, chiediamo la massima collaborazione per aiutare i veneti, i friulani e tutti gli italiani che sono stati colpiti dal maltempo e che sono già al lavoro per ricostruire i nostri paesi.

Noi non vogliamo l'elemosina dell'Europa, perché il nostro popolo è abituato a lavorare, a tirarsi su le maniche e a fare da solo. A Bruxelles noi chiediamo soltanto quello che è nostro, che è degli italiani. Ogni anno hanno dato milioni di EUR che non sono stati tornati indietro al nostro paese. Noi vogliamo indietro i nostri soldi, altro che vincoli di bilancio e austerità. Noi vogliamo spendere i nostri soldi per ricostruire i nostri paesi, per mettere in sicurezza il nostro territorio e per aiutare i nostri cittadini che hanno perso tutto. Per una volta chiedo che l'Europa dimostri vera solidarietà e pensi ai nostri cittadini, non allo *spread* o agli interessi delle banche.

Κωνσταντίνος Παπαδάκης (NI). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, ένα χρόνο μετά τις πλημμύρες στη Μάνδρα, 160 περιοχές στην Ελλάδα είναι σε κίνδυνο για νέα πλημμύρα, ενώ τόσο στο Μάτι όσο και σε άλλες περιοχές οι κάτοικοι είναι ανοχύρωτοι μετά τις πυρκαγιές. Σε ερώτησή μας, η Επιτροπή καλύπτει πλήρως την έρευνα που η ίδια χρηματοδότησε και η οποία κατέληξε στο προκλητικό συμπέρασμα ότι, αν και άδικο, είναι οικονομικά αποδοτικότερο να προστατευτούν οι εύπορες οικογένειες ή τα εργοστάσια από το να προστατευτούν οι φτωχοί, αφού η δικαιοσύνη, λέει, δεν περιλαμβάνεται στην ανάλυση κόστους-οφέλους. Διότι τα αντιπλημμυρικά δεν έχουν διόδια, εισιτήρια, πελάτες «με το κεφάλι» ή πωλήσεις «με το κομμάτι». Γι' αυτό και δεν προτιμώνται και δεν ιεραρχούνται, ενώ παράλληλα δεν προβλέπεται καμία αποζημίωση για τους ίδιους τους πληγέντες από το Ταμείο Αλληλεγγύης, με τα γνωστά άπιαστα όριά του. Επίσης, η Επιτροπή, με ευθύνη και της κυβέρνησης, δεν προβλέπει αποζημιώσεις ούτε για τις πρόσφατες πλημμύρες στη Στερεά Ελλάδα, την Εύβοια και την Πελοπόννησο. Αυτό απάντησε η Επιτροπή σε ερώτηση των ευρωβουλευτών του Κομμουνιστικού Κόμματος Ελλάδας. Ο λαός πρέπει αποφασιστικά να εναντιωθεί στο κριτήριο του καπιταλιστικού κέρδους και με την πάλη του να απαιτήσει άμεσες αποζημιώσεις στο 100% για τους πληγέντες και ουσιαστικά μέτρα ανακούφισης και πρόληψης.

Corina Crețu, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, once again, on behalf of the Commission, I would like to thank you all for sharing your views and for voicing your concerns for the regions and the people that have been deeply affected by the recent floods. Of course, this is not about an ordinary file; it is about people who have lost their loved ones and some of them who have lost everything. To them, I think, we have to have the same message, together: that Europe cares, that Europe is here to help. It is our common job.

You know, of course, that I am in charge of Cohesion Policy, and I think Cohesion Policy has in its very essence the European solidarity. The European Union as a whole has benefited each time about European solidarity. So it's quite natural, when floods occur, that the European Union's mission – European Union added value – lies by the side of the victims in the damaged regions, not only on the ground but also in the air.

Last week, for example, after the request from the Italian authorities, the European Commission mobilised the Copernicus emergency satellite. I think close to 50 highly-detailed satellite maps were provided to assess the damage to the affected regions.

I am sorry to say, but it's not fair to say that Europe didn't show solidarity to Italy. Italy is the first country that benefited in the last year by the Solidarity Fund. I would like to remind you about our solidarity at the time of the earthquakes. I was there on the ground. President Juncker was there on the ground, and on the emergency procedures we released EUR 1.2 billion for the four regions affected by the earthquake in Italy. So let's not be populist. We are waiting now for the assessment of the damage because we cannot do the assessment of the damage. It's part of the job of the Italian government.

We are working hand in hand, but we cannot assess the damage when we don't know how much. And I would like to tell you something: you in the European Parliament and in the Council made the regulation of the Solidarity Fund, and it was not written in the regulation how we measure the life of one person. You put in the regulation – the European Parliament – that we assess only economic damage. It's tragic that we don't compensate, and do you want to do for the next programing period this idea to compensate the families who lose the life of their loved one? But we don't have in the regulations something like that now, so we assess only economic damages and we waiting for the Italian government to give us the assessment.

We are also open to shift or change operational programmes on the request of the Italian government. I am in direct contact with Madam Lezzi, with the Minister. They are working hard with the local administration because it is not easy to evaluate the damage.

But Europe is here, and we are here day by night to help, and we were there during the earthquake. So I think it's very easy to blame the European Commission. But look also at what is happening in local and regional policy, because in some regions – not even now – the money that we have released last year in Italy didn't reach the people affected by the earthquake.

I would like just to say that we have large interventions in Europe – in Madeira, in Greece. You know very well that last year we were in contact in Greece, in Evia. We showed solidarity but it was the same problem: that we don't have how to measure the lives and it was not an economical area there in Greece, so Greece didn't qualify to apply for the Solidarity Fund, unfortunately, but we compensate by more EU funds for the Attica region.

I think we need to show to the people how much and strong the response in the European Union is needed to such tragic circumstances. But we have to be fair: to be fair that we have shared management and shared responsibilities.

Of course we are coming with the emergency response. We come also with the Solidarity Fund, which is not an emergency tool; it compensates for the day one. But at the same time it is also the responsibility of the government and the local authorities, for which I have full sympathies in such moments. So let's face things very clearly: things will not get better. Unfortunately the effects of climate change are getting harsher, and we will certainly continue to pay the price of decades of unsustainable land and country planning.

We need to put all our efforts, all our ideas in prevention and resilience-building to mitigate the effects not only of floods but also, as I said, of forest fires, earthquakes, coastal erosion and drought. Europe must keep strong on emergency response. It's a matter of saving and preserving lives, as I said, but it's also a long-distance run that will go beyond the many multiannual financial frameworks to come. It starts now by giving our Union the capacity to pave the way for a sustainable future.

Thank you very much and, as always, you can rely on us. We are waiting for the assessment of the damages from the governments affected and we are ready to do all the necessary changes for all the emergency bases, because we know how important it is to be here and to show solidarity.

Puhemies. – Keskustelu on päättynyt.

Kirjalliset lausumat (162 artikla)

György Hölvényi (PPE), *írásban*. – A pusztító árvizek mintázatának – gyakoriságának és volumenének – világszerte megfigyelhető változása egyértelmű következménye a klímaváltozásnak. Az egyre gyakrabban előforduló árhullámokat, melyek alkalmával hatalmas vízmennyiségek vonulnak le folyóinkon, rendszeresen rendkívül forró és száraz időszakok követik. A szélsőséges időjárási eseményekhez való alkalmazkodás az emberiség elemi érdeke. Ennek fényében különösen fontos, hogy az életet jelentő vízzel sokkal tudatosabban gazdálkodjunk. Olyan természetbe illeszkedő, ökológiailag átgondolt megoldások kidolgozására és megvalósítására van szükség, ahol az áradások során levonuló hatalmas víztöbbletet elvezetjük, és az aszályos időszakban a vízhiány enyhítésére tudjuk használni. Az áradásokat követően keletkező víztömeggel való fenntartható gazdálkodás során pedig a minél szélesebb körű ökológiai szolgáltatások nyújtására kell törekedni.

A másik tény az árvizek kapcsán, amire szeretném felhívni a figyelmet, az az IPCC legfrissebb publikációja, miszerint mégis van lehetőség a hőmérséklet emelkedésének 1,5C fok alatt tartására! Ez egy hatalmas esély az emberiség számára, hogy a már „beárazott" veszteségeket és költségeket, melyeket a klímaváltozás kontójára beírtunk, mégis elkerüljük, de legalább csökkentsük. Minden kormány, és minden ember számára imperatívusz, hogy saját lehetőségeinek határai között megtegye a szükséges lépéseket ahhoz, hogy gyermekeink egy élhető bolygót örököljenek. Ahol nem pusztító árvizek, és éhínséget hozó aszályok váltogatják egymást, hanem mértéktartó jólét és béke jellemzi a mindennapokat.

17. Mindestnormen für Minderheiten in der EU (kurze Darstellung)

Puhemies. – Esityslistalla on seuraavana lyhyt esittely József Nagyn mietinnöstä vähemmistöjä koskevista vähimmäisnormeista EU:ssa (2018/2036(INI)) (A8-0353/2018).

József Nagy, *Rapporteur.* – Nem véletlenül használom ma is az anyanyelvemet, hiszen többek között éppen az anyanyelvi jogokról szóló jelentésemet kívánom Önök elé beterjeszteni. Az Európai Unió jelmondata „Egyesülve a sokféleségben", amely hangsúlyozza a sokszínűség tiszteletben tartását, mint az Európai Unió egyik alapértékét. A kisebbségi jogok nemcsak a kisebbségek számára fontosak, betartásuk és tiszteletben tartásuk mindannyiunk érdeke. Jól tudjuk, hogy a kisebbségi jogok semmibevétele gyűlölködéshez, etnikai konfliktusokhoz és akár háborúkhoz is vezet. Igen, itt a mi demokratikus kontinensünkön az utóbbi húsz évben több etnikai vérengzést és háborút éltünk át a Balkánnal kezdődően és – remélhetőleg – Ukrajnával végződően. A minap történt macedóniai görög kisebbség elleni tragikus rendőri fellépést és emberölést szintén etnikai feszültség szította. Egy jól működő, erős demokrácia felismeri ezt, és mindent elkövet azért, hogy fenntartsa a békét és a biztonságot. A kisebbségek jogainak védelme ennek az eszköze. Ezért én az EU-s kisebbségi jogminimum intézményét elsősorban békeprojektnek tartom, amely a többségi nemzetek javát is szolgálja. Ma Európában közel 40 millió állampolgár tartja magát nemzeti vagy nyelvi- és kulturális kisebbségekhez tartozónak.

És jogosan, ez a 40 millió ember szeretné megőrizni hagyományait és kulturális identitását. Az EU tagállamai általában magas szintű jogi biztonságot és komfortot biztosítanak a területükön élő kisebbségeknek és az erre irányuló törvényi kereteket a legtöbb tagországban ki is alakították. Sajnos az EU-gyakorlat, illetve az ez irányú szolgáltatásokhoz való hozzáférés már nem ennyire ideális, sőt sajnos gyakran megesik, hogy a nemzetközi egyezményekben deklarált jogokat mellőzve etnikai alapú diszkriminációt alkalmazva szítják a feszültséget a polgárok között és a nemzetiségi kártyát politikai hatalom szerzésére is kihasználják. Ezeknek a visszaéléseknek a megelőzésére készítettem ezt a jelentésemet, amellyel a célom egy számonkérhető európai kisebbségi jogminimum kialakítása. Természetesen a tagállamok a szubszidiaritás elve alapján továbbra is maguk határozzák meg a kisebbségeiket. Jelentésem és a javasolt jogminimum három alappillére: az oktatás, a kultúra és a nyelvi jogok európai uniós szintű garanciája. Mivel úgy gondolom, hogy e három területen az Európai Unió képes a jogalkotásra. Tiszteletben tartottuk a kizárólagos tagállami jogköröket, a politikai jogokat: a területi önkormányzatiság és a választási jogok meghatározása továbbra is a tagállami jogkörökben maradnak. Kiemelten foglalkozom a megkülönböztetés, a gyűlölet-bűncselekmények, valamint a gyűlöletbeszéddel és ezek leküzdésének eszközeivel, ez mindannyiunk érdeke. A célom, hogy a kisebbséghez tartozó személyek félelem nélkül, bátran gyakorolhassák alapvető kulturális és nyelvi jogaikat otthonaikban és az utcákon, bárhol Európában. Célom, hogy a kisebbségi nyelveken történő oktatás Európa-szerte elfogadott és magas színvonalú legyen, hidakat képezve a többség és a kisebbség kultúrái között, egymást megismerve, elfogadva és támogatva. Az Európai Unió szerződése így rendelkezik: „az Unió tiszteletben tartja saját kulturális és nyelvi sokféleségét, továbbá biztosítja Európa kulturális örökségének megőrzését és további gyarapítását". Ha valóban célunk európai kultúránk megőrzése és annak átörökítése a jövő nemzedékek számára, akkor igenis kötelességünk bebiztosítani a kisebbségek jogainak biztosítását is! Kérem a képviselőtársaimat, hogy támogassák a jelentésemet, és a Bizottságot, hogy a lehető legrövidebb időn belül küldje meg jogalkotási javaslatát az uniós minimum-jogszabályok kialakítására!

ELNÖKÖL: JÁRÓKA LÍVIA

alelnök

„Catch the eye" eljárás

Andrea Bocskor (PPE). – Először is szeretném megköszönni Nagy József képviselőtársamnak, hogy elkészítette ezt a jelentést, hiszen ez egy újabb lépés az egységes EU-s szintű kisebbségvédelem megalkotásához. Mint a jelentéshez készült CULT bizottsági vélemény előadója, nagyon örülök annak, hogy az anyanyelven történő oktatás és kultúra témaköre és az anyanyelvhasználat az élet minden területén hangsúlyosan bekerült a jelentésbe. Az anyanyelvű oktatás elengedhetetlen a nyelvi jogok érvényesítéséhez, ezért ösztönözni kell a tagállamokat, hogy a regionális és nemzeti kisebbségek megfelelő lehetőséget kapjanak anyanyelvük elsajátítására, illetve az oktatás minden szintjén anyanyelvükön tanulhassanak azokban a régiókban, ahol élnek. Az oktatáshoz való jog minden ember alapjoga, az anyanyelven történő oktatás kulcsszerepet játszik az identitás és a kultúra megőrzésében.

A jelentés továbbá kimondja, hogy az EU-nak hangsúlyosabban kell foglalkoznia a területén élő nemzeti, regionális és nyelvi kisebbségek jogvédelmével, hiszen – bár a kisebbségi jogokat az EU Alapjogi Chartája és számos nemzetközi dokumentum is rögzíti – mégsincs egységes kisebbségvédelmi jogalkotási mechanizmus.

Ezért örülök annak, hogy a parlamenti jelentés szövegébe bekerült az, hogy a Parlament felhívja az Európai Bizottságot, hogy a szubszidiaritás elvével megfelelően nyújtson be jogalkotási javaslatot, és nagyon várjuk már ezt!

Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D). – Señora presidenta, comisaria, nunca ha sido verdad que la democracia consista tan solo, y sin más, en la regla de la mayoría. No. La democracia consiste esencialmente en la protección de la minoría, y también en la garantía de la función de la oposición; pero, sobre todo, en el respeto de la soberanía del individuo en el disfrute de sus derechos fundamentales. Y eso es exactamente lo que dice el artículo 2 del Tratado de la Unión Europea.

Y si la Unión Europea ha acometido el llamado «dilema de Copenhague» para intentar llenar de contenido el mandato de compromiso con el Estado de Derecho, con la democracia, con el respeto de los derechos fundamentales y su protección judicial por un poder judicial independiente, también debe llegar a un mecanismo estructurado y articulado de protección de minorías en la Unión Europea. Porque esa protección se encuentra francamente en retroceso con el avance del discurso de la discriminación y su práctica, del discurso del odio y su práctica, y con la política de la exclusión y su práctica, que está rampando en un buen número de Estados miembros de manera alarmante y amenazadora para los valores fundacionales de la Unión.

Por eso es importante esta Resolución. Es importante que seamos capaces de construir un mecanismo articulado de protección de minorías que dé una respuesta a este retroceso, a esta regresión de la calidad democrática del Estado constitucional que niega los valores fundacionales de la Unión.

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, στο σημείο 2 της έκθεσης βλέπουμε ότι αναπτύσσεται η άποψη για την προστασία των μειονοτήτων ως κριτήριο προκειμένου τρίτες χώρες να προσεγγίσουν την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση. Τι γίνεται όμως με τα δικαιώματα της ελληνικής εθνικής μειονότητας της Βορείου Ηπείρου στην Αλβανία, όπου υπάρχουν πάνω από 250 000 ψυχές; Η ελληνική εθνική μειονότητα της Βορείου Ηπείρου είναι κατοχυρωμένη από το Πρωτόκολλο της Κέρκυρας του 1914, το οποίο ισχύει μέχρι σήμερα, το έχουν υπογράψει ακόμη και οι Μεγάλες Δυνάμεις και προσδιορίζει την αυτονομία της Βορείου Ηπείρου. Μια αυτονομία πολιτιστική, θρησκευτική και διοικητική, με την αστυνομία να στελεχώνεται υποχρεωτικά μόνον από κατοίκους της Βορείου Ηπείρου. Έχουμε λοιπόν εδώ μια «καραμπινάτη» παραβίαση του Πρωτοκόλλου της Κέρκυρας και των ευρωπαϊκών συνθηκών για την προστασία των ανθρωπίνων δικαιωμάτων. Στην Αλβανία γκρεμίζουν ελληνικές εκκλησίες, καταστρέφουν ελληνικές περιουσίες και αρπάζουν περιουσίες στις Δρυμάδες και στη Χειμάρρα. Και, φυσικά, αυτό που κάνουν είναι να δολοφονούν. Δολοφόνησαν τον έλληνα πατριώτη, Κωνσταντίνο Κατσίφα, επειδή ήθελε να γιορτάσει την 28η Οκτωβρίου στη Βόρειο Ήπειρο.

Indrek Tarand (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, let me first point out that I very much honour the rapporteur, Mr Nagy, and appreciate his activities. But, unlike him, I am one of the few Members of this Parliament who has personal experience of being the minority and the majority. Indeed, in the Soviet Union, I was in an oppressed and often deported minority. Now, for 25 years, I have tried to behave as a member of the responsible majority. My advice to colleagues is to join the rapporteur in his statement that no single best-practice model exists for Europe.

For instance, Estonia is rich in experience of generous and fair relations to its so-called minority, which happened mostly to fight against Estonian independence only a quarter of a century ago. That is why I advise all traditional, non-Soviet-produced minorities as well: be patient and Europe will protect you, do not sound your bugles, and never be aggressive and irredentist.

(The speaker agreed to take a blue-card question under Rule 162(8))

Andrejs Mamikins (S&D), *zilās kartītes jautājums.* – Liels paldies, Taranda kungs, par to, ka pieņēmāt manu zilās kartītes jautājumu. Jūs tikko tik daudz un plaši runājāt par PSRS un par to, kā, iespējams, etniskie igauņi, latvieši bija apspiesti Padomju Savienībā, bet tai pat laikā kāpēc jūs noklusējāt, ka šogad Igaunijas brīvvalsts un Latvijas brīvvalsts svinēs savu simtgadi valstiskuma pastāvēšanā. Igaunija un Latvija pirms simt gadiem bija paraugs visai Eiropai par minoritāšu tiesību saglabāšanu. Kāpēc jūs neatceraties šo lielisko pieredzi?

Indrek Tarand (Verts/ALE), *blue-card answer.* – Thank you for your question, dear colleague. I didn't mention the 100th anniversary of the independence of many of the countries of the European Union because it's very widely known. Indeed, together we appreciate that we are very open to cultural autonomy etc., which doesn't mean that we should be supporting any kind of imperialist approaches to minority rights.

Ελευθέριος Συναδινός (NI). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, για ποια ανθρώπινα δικαιώματα μειονοτήτων μιλάμε εδώ, όταν πριν από 2 εβδομάδες, και συγκεκριμένα την 28η Οκτωβρίου, ημέρα εθνικής εορτής της Ελλάδας, ο Κωνσταντίνος Κατσίφας, Έλληνας και ευρωπαίος πολίτης, δολοφονήθηκε εν ψυχρώ από αλβανούς αστυνομικούς στο χωριό Βουλιαράτες της Βορείου Ηπείρου; Η αλβανική κυβέρνηση του Rama συνεχίζει τις θηριωδίες του κομμουνιστικού καθεστώτος του Hoxha, δείχνοντας με συνέπεια το ανθελληνικό της μένος στην ελληνική εθνική μειονότητα της Βορείου Ηπείρου. Αρπάζει τις περιουσίες των Βορειοηπειρωτών στη Χειμάρρα, διώκει παράνομα και προπηλακίζει ολόκληρες οικογένειες, ενώ δεν επιτρέπει την ελεύθερη άσκηση της χριστιανικής ορθόδοξης πίστης, ούτε και την εκμάθηση των ελληνικών. Απόδειξη των παραπάνω αποτελεί και η άλλη άνανδρη δολοφονία του Έλληνα Βορειοηπειρώτη, Αριστοτέλη Γκούμα, από αλβανούς εξτρεμιστές, λίγα μέτρα έξω από το σπίτι του στη Χειμάρρα το 2010, επειδή δεν παραιτήθηκε από το δικαίωμα να ομιλεί τη μητρική του γλώσσα στη γενέθλιά του γη, την ελληνική.

Κάποιοι, εντός της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, θέλουν να εντάξουν την Αλβανία στην ευρωπαϊκή οικογένεια. Όμως, μια χώρα που δεν σέβεται τα ανθρώπινα δικαιώματα, που δεν τηρεί τις σχέσεις καλής γειτονίας με την Ελλάδα και της οποίας η αστυνομία δολοφονεί πολίτες είναι εχθρός της ειρήνης, της ασφάλειας και της σταθερότητας. Αυτή η χώρα λέγεται Αλβανία και δεν έχει καμία θέση στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση.

Csaba Sógor (PPE). – Az Unió területén élő nemzeti kisebbségek helyzete nagyon változatos képet mutat, de a kérdés korántsem nevezhető rendezettnek és megoldottnak. Egyes tagállamokban komoly problémákkal néznek szembe ezek a közösségek, sok esetben rendszeresen sérülnek az alapjogaik, és komoly asszimilációs nyomással néznek szembe. Örülök, hogy ez a jelentés megszületett és számos kulcsfontosságú területen kéri az Unió beavatkozását. Tarthatatlan, hogy az EU nem vesz tudomást a nemzeti kisebbségek sajátos helyzetéről és az ebből fakadó problémákról, elfogadja, hogy az Európai Tanács egyezményeinek be nem tartása nem jár következményekkel. Több mint 40 millió nemzeti vagy nyelvi kisebbséghez tartozó polgár hosszú évek óta vár egy ilyen jelentésre, amely egy kisebbségvédelmi keretszabályozás kidolgozására szólítja fel az Európai Bizottságot, továbbá iránymutatások, ajánlások és egy irányelvre irányuló jogalkotási javaslat benyújtására. Mi, akik a nemzeti kisebbségeket képviseljük, várjuk a Bizottság lépéseit, amelyek minden bizonnyal meg fognak felelni az ebben a jelentésben foglaltaknak.

Ruža Tomašić (ECR). – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, manjine koje su kvalitetno integrirane u društvo njegovo su veliko bogatstvo. Slažem se da u Europskoj uniji, kao jedinstvenom prostoru ljudskih i ekonomskih sloboda, trebamo ujednačene minimalne standarde za manjine. Najveći je izazov pronaći dobru mjeru za priznavanje manjinske posebnosti jer tanka je granica između nje i segregacije.

Identitetska politika kakvu vidimo u brojnim zapadnim državama jako podsjeća na rasizam. Dugo se na zapadu nisu brojila krvna zrnca u mjeri u kojoj se danas broje, što je posljedica često nerazumnih politika pozitivne diskriminacije.

Bojim se da nas sve te, navodno napredne politike, vraćaju unatrag. Manjinsku posebnost trebamo priznati i njegovati, ali ne u mjeri u kojoj to onemogućava kvalitetnu integraciju manjina i funkcioniranje društva.

Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE). – Señora presidenta, señora comisaria, quiero felicitar al ponente de este informe por su trabajo en defensa de los derechos de los millones de europeos discriminados por ser miembros de una minoría nacional. Es una contribución más frente al nacionalismo, porque los nacionalismos de los Estados frenan muchas de las propuestas de integración europea pero, además, la dificultan también negando realidades nacionales tradicionales, atentando contra derechos fundamentales de sus miembros, impidiendo su representación institucional con legislaciones electorales excluyentes y generando así graves problemas territoriales que, aunque oficialmente se nieguen, afectan de lleno a nuestra Unión.

Las instituciones comunitarias reconocen en privado este secreto a voces y necesitan herramientas. Por eso, apoyamos una legislación vinculante europea para proteger a las minorías, incluso para mediar cuando los problemas se enquistan, porque ya hemos comprobado que un nacionalismo excluyente puede, retorciendo el Derecho, justificar violentas actuaciones policiales contra ciudadanos pacíficos o convertir en un asunto penal un problema político y acabar encarcelando cargos públicos por sus actividades políticas, algo que debería ser imposible en nuestra Unión.

Λάμπρος Φουντούλης (NI). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση αρέσκεται να μιλάει για μειονότητες και να εκδίδει συνεχώς ψηφίσματα και χάρτες προστασίας των δικαιωμάτων τους. Ωστόσο, αν η ύπαρξη μιας μειονότητας δεν εξυπηρετεί τα συμφέροντα της Ένωσης, κανείς δεν μπαίνει στον κόπο να υπερασπιστεί τα δικαιώματά της. Ακόμη και όταν άνθρωποι δολοφονούνται και εκτελούνται από τις κρατικές υπηρεσίες, όταν εκκλησίες κατεδαφίζονται, όταν περιουσίες δημεύονται, όταν οργανωμένες ομάδες 100 και πλέον οπλοφόρων εισβάλλουν στα χωριά και τρομοκρατούν τους κατοίκους. Αυτά τα περιστατικά συμβαίνουν στην Ευρώπη, στην υπό ένταξη Αλβανία, και συγκεκριμένα στην κατεχόμενη ελληνική περιοχή της Βορείου Ηπείρου, όπου προσπαθεί να επιβιώσει η αναγνωρισμένη διεθνώς, ακόμη και από τους ίδιους τους Αλβανούς, εθνική ελληνική μειονότητα. Πριν από μερικά χρόνια, αλβανοί παρακρατικοί δολοφόνησαν τον Αριστοτέλη Γκούμα, Έλληνα και μέλος της μειονότητας. Στις 28 Οκτωβρίου, ανήμερα της ελληνικής εθνικής εορτής, το αλβανικό κράτος εκτέλεσε τον Κωνσταντίνο Κατσίφα. Οι ήρωες αυτοί έχουν ήδη περάσει στην Ιστορία. Όμως εδώ περισσεύει η υποκρισία. Δεν περιμένω καμία λύση από την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση. Μία και μόνη είναι η λύση: απελευθέρωση της Βορείου Ηπείρου και ένωση με τη μητέρα Ελλάδα.

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Paní předsedající, já chci vyzdvihnout, že Evropa je založena na hrdosti ke své rozmanitosti, k různosti kultur, kterými se navzájem obohacujeme, ke sdílení našich znalostí a samozřejmě moudrosti a zkušeností našich předků. Proto úcta k menšinám v rámci Evropské unie patří k naprosto neodmyslitelným základním stavebním kamenům tohoto našeho společenství.

I proto chci přivítat kroky, které povedou ke zlepšení statutu menšin, statutu cizinců, kteří legálně pobývají na našem území, a budou účinně zamezovat diskriminaci. Nesmíme samozřejmě nechat stranou význam vzdělávání, význam případné prevence před útoky na tyto menšiny a zároveň bychom se měli také ptát i sami sebe, co děláme pro to – každý z nás –, aby se vůči menšinám postupovalo ve smyslu práva, ve smyslu slušného chování.

Nejen my, samozřejmě je třeba žádat o spolupráci i obce, regiony, stát a samozřejmě i Evropskou unii jako celek.

Marek Jurek (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Przede wszystkim chciałbym pogratulować koledze Nagy'emu tego sprawozdania dlatego, że przez bardzo długi czas Unia Europejska ignorowała to najbardziej elementarne prawo ludzkie, jakim jest prawo do mówienia we własnym języku, przekazanie własnej kultury. Polska wywiązuje się ze wszystkich zobowiązań na przykład w stosunku do Niemiec, jeżeli chodzi o prawa mniejszości, a my sami nie możemy ciągle korzystać z wszystkich praw należnych ludziom identyfikującym się z naszą kulturą w Niemczech. Dobrze, że te problemy zauważamy. Natomiast to sprawozdanie stało się przedmiotem opresji ze strony większości, bo większość na tej sali może dopisać wszystko i zupełnie niezrozumiałe jest, dlaczego do tego ważnego sprawozdania wpisujemy takie antytraktatowe inwencje jak mechanizm nadzoru demokracji – koncept, który nie ma nic wspólnego z Traktatami i zasadami, na których powinniśmy współpracować. Nie traktujmy mniejszości, którymi się tak długo Unia nie zajmowała, jako zakładnika jej ambicji do większej władzy i do kontroli państw.

(Mówca zgodził się odpowiedzieć na pytanie zadane przez podniesienie niebieskiej kartki (art. 162 ust. 8 Regulaminu))

Andrejs Mamikins (S&D), *zilās kartītes jautājums.* – Liels paldies jums, godātais maršala kungs, par to, ka jūs pieņēmāt manu zilās kartītes jautājumu. Kā jūs zināt, daudz etnisko poļu dzīvo arī manā valstī Latvijā, it īpaši Latvijas austrumos, kas saucas Latgale, un saskaņā ar Latvijas Valsts valodas likumu nav iespējams etniskiem poļiem uzrakstīt pasē "Tomaszewski", jāraksta "Tomaševskis". Vai jūs uzskatāt, ka tas ir pārkāpums un nacionālo minoritāšu, konkrētā gadījumā — poļu, tiesību neievērošana?

Marek Jurek (ECR), *odpowiedź na pytanie zadane przez podniesienie niebieskiej kartki.* – Jedna z naszych koleżanek, z polskich posłanek, ma holenderskie nazwisko, a inna niemieckie. W Polsce każdy może używać takiej ortografii, jakiej potrzebuje – i tak powinno być wszędzie. Mamy różne alfabety, nie ma żadnych przeszkód, żeby w alfabecie łacińskim posługiwać się takim liternictwem, jakie istnieje wszędzie – i tego oczekujemy w stosunku do naszych obywateli, tym bardziej że nikomu nie czynimy z tym przeszkód. Natomiast oczywiście państwa, które sto lat temu odzyskały niepodległość, takie jak państwa bałtyckie, mają pełne prawo do tego, żeby się pozbyć nalotu kolonialnego, jakiemu były poddane w ciągu pół wieku dominacji sowieckiej. Natomiast jeżeli chodzi o współżycie narodów, oczywiście każdy ma prawo pisać się tak, jak pisali się jego rodzice.

Γεώργιος Επιτήδειος (NI). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, παρότι η προστασία των δικαιωμάτων των μειονοτήτων κατοχυρώνεται από τον Χάρτη των Θεμελιωδών Δικαιωμάτων της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, πολλά κράτη παραβιάζουν τα ανθρώπινα δικαιώματα των μειονοτήτων. Μεταξύ των κρατών αυτών είναι και η Αλβανία, η οποία με κάθε τρόπο καταπατά τα δικαιώματα της μεγάλης ελληνικής εθνικής μειονότητας της Βορείου Ηπείρου. Αρπάζει περιουσίες, γκρεμίζει εκκλησίες, προσπαθεί να περιορίσει τον αριθμό των μελών της μειονότητας, δεν διδάσκει τα ελληνικά στα μειονοτικά σχολεία και τρομοκρατεί με απαράδεκτους τρόπους τα μέλη της ελληνικής ομογένειας. Το 2010 δολοφόνησε τον Αριστοτέλη Γκούμα. Την 28η Οκτωβρίου του 2018, ημέρα της εθνικής επετείου της Ελλάδας, οι ειδικές δυνάμεις της αστυνομίας της Αλβανίας, υπό την κάλυψη του πρωθυπουργού, δολοφόνησαν τον Κωνσταντίνο Κατσίφα. Ο πρωθυπουργός, μάλιστα, εξύβρισε και τον νεκρό. Πρόκειται για απαράδεκτες μεθόδους, οι οποίες δεν αρμόζουν σε ένα πολιτισμένο κράτος. Η Αλβανία θέλει να γίνει μέλος της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης. Και καλά κάνει, εφόσον την ανέχεται η υποκριτική Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση. Πολύ καλά κάνει και το επιδιώκει. Πλην όμως, όσο δεν προσάγονται ενώπιον της Δικαιοσύνης οι ηθικοί και φυσικοί αυτουργοί των δολοφονιών των Ελλήνων της Βορείου Ηπείρου, θα εμποδίσουμε με κάθε νόμιμο τρόπο την ευρωπαϊκή προοπτική της Αλβανίας.

(Ο ομιλητής δέχεται να απαντήσει σε ερώτηση με γαλάζια κάρτα (άρθρο 162 παράγραφος 8 του Κανονισμού))

Csaba Sógor (PPE), *Kékkártyás kérdés.* – Harmadszor hallom azt, hogy Albánia az EU tagja, remélem, hogy fordítási tévedés. Kérdésem az, hogy Görögország hogyan bánik a kisebbségeivel, az albánokkal, a macedónokkal és a törökökkel? Nem gondolja, hogy ha jól bánnának velük, példát mutathatnának a csatlakozni kívánó tagállamoknak is, mint például Albániának?

Γεώργιος Επιτήδειος (NI), *απάντηση σε ερώτηση με γαλάζια κάρτα.* – Προφανώς έχετε πρόβλημα με τη διερμηνεία, διότι δεν ισχυριστήκαμε ότι η Αλβανία είναι μέλος της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης αλλά ότι προσπαθεί να γίνει. Όμως, έχετε πρόβλημα και με την Ιστορία και με την πραγματικότητα. Στην Ελλάδα δεν υπάρχουν εθνικές μειονότητες. Υπάρχει μόνο μία μουσουλμανική μειονότητα. Μακεδόνες και Τούρκοι είναι μειονότητες που μόνο σε κάποια φάση του ύπνου σας τις βλέπετε.

Elnök asszony. – Örömmel látom, hogy több olyan képviselő is felszólal, aki maga is kisebbségi, és nagyon jó, hogy ilyen sokan megszólalunk ebben a témában. Sokkal többen kellene lennünk ma este, azt hiszem, ha 40 millió embert képviselünk. És köszönöm, hogy Önök itt vannak.

Σωτήριος Ζαριανόπουλος (NI). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, είναι υποκριτικό και επικίνδυνα ύποπτο το δήθεν ενδιαφέρον της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης για τις μειονότητες και τα δικαιώματά τους, που έτσι και αλλιώς τα καταπατά, όπως και τα δικαιώματα ολόκληρων λαών. Η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, το ΝΑΤΟ και οι κυβερνήσεις τα θυμούνται, όχι για να τα προστατεύσουν, αλλά για να καλλιεργήσουν εθνικισμούς και αλυτρωτισμούς με «διαίρει και βασίλευε» ή επικαλούμενοι τη λεγόμενη αυτοδιάθεση και τον αυτοπροσδιορισμό. Τα αξιοποιούν σαν πρόσχημα για πολιτικές στρατιωτικές επεμβάσεις και αλλάζουν τα σύνορα με το αίμα των λαών για να εξυπηρετήσουν τα συμφέροντά τους. Το έκαναν στη Γιουγκοσλαβία και συνεχίζουν να το κάνουν και στο Κόσοβο, με σχέδια για μια Μεγάλη Αλβανία μέλος του ΝΑΤΟ και κλιμακώνοντας εκατέρωθεν εθνικισμούς, όπως συνέβη τελευταία. Με τη συμφωνία των Πρεσπών μεταξύ Ελλάδας-FYROM, αφήνοντας άθικτους τους αλυτρωτισμούς και ενισχύοντας το δολοφονικό ΝΑΤΟ στην περιοχή, με την κυβέρνηση ΣΥΡΙΖΑ στον βρώμικο ρόλο. Η έκθεση είναι ενδεικτική των σχεδίων της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης για καλύτερα σχεδιασμένη εκμετάλλευση των μειονοτήτων για τέτοιους σκοπούς. Τα πραγματικά δικαιώματα των μειονοτήτων πρέπει να γίνονται σεβαστά βεβαίως. Μοναδικοί αρμόδιοι να τα προστατέψουν είναι οι ίδιοι οι λαοί, με την πάλη και την αλληλεγγύη τους.

Pirkko Ruohonen-Lerner (ECR). – Arvoisa puhemies, vähemmistöjen oikeuksien kunnioittaminen on jokaisen sivistysvaltion velvollisuus. Ihmisiä on kohdeltava yhdenvertaisesti etniseen alkuperään, uskontoon, seksuaaliseen suuntautumiseen tai muihin seikkoihin katsomatta.

Syrjimättömyys on tärkeä periaate, joka pätee kaikkiin suuntiin. En kannata myöskään positiivista syrjintää, jossa vähemmistön edustajia suositaan enemmistön kustannuksella esimerkiksi yliopistojen opiskelijavalinnoissa.

Mietinnössä kannustetaan jäsenmaita sallimaan vähemmistökielten käyttö julkisissa palveluissa ja viranomaiskontakteissa. Tähän suuntaan ollaan menossa esimerkiksi Suomessa, jossa sosiaalietuja jakava Kansaneläkelaitos on aloittanut viikko sitten jopa arabiankielisen puhelinpalveluun. Tästä aiheutuu kuitenkin kustannuksia eivätkä viranomaisresurssit välttämättä riitä palveluiden tarjoamiseen lukuisilla muilla vähemmistökielillä. Pitäisin järkevämpänä sitä, että tällaiset tilanteet hoidettaisiin maan virallisilla kielillä tai englanniksi, joka on maailmankieli.

(„Catch the eye" eljárás vége)

Corina Crețu, *Member of the Commission.* – Madam President, on behalf of the Commission, I would like to thank you for putting this important issue of minority rights in the European Union on the agenda of the European Parliament.

One of the key assets of the European Union is diversity: diversity of languages, cultures, traditions, religions and origins. After all, as has been said here, our motto is 'united in diversity'. Besides, our Union rests on the values of human dignity, equality, the rule of law and human rights, including the rights of persons belonging to minorities. Any discrimination against national minorities is explicitly prohibited under Article 21 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights.

However, as noted in your report, the European Union and the Commission have no overall competence to rule on the protection of national minorities. These questions fall under the sole responsibility of the Member States, which have an obligation to guarantee minorities the full enjoyment of their human rights. In that respect, the Commission closely monitors the transposition of the relevant EU legal framework. This includes the Race Equality Directive, the Employment Equality Directive, the Framework Decision on combating racism and xenophobia by means of criminal law, the EU free movement acquis and the Audiovisual Media Services Directive. To extend the current anti-discrimination legislation, the Commission proposed, ten years ago already, the Horizontal Equality Directive.

I take this opportunity to call on all Member States to adopt this proposal, which will benefit many while disadvantaging nobody. We are also doing substantial work to tackle discrimination, racism and xenophobia. We have a High Level Group on Non-Discrimination, Equality and Diversity, a Group on Racism and Xenophobia and the National Roma Contact Points network. All this work brings together representatives from Member States to exchange good practices and put non-discrimination, hate speech and hate crime on their national agendas. The Commission is also promoting best practices regarding the democratic participation of underrepresented groups. This topic will be part of the discussion at the Annual Colloquium on Fundamental Rights, dedicated this year to democracy.

Promoting minority languages is also an important driver for social and economic inclusion. The Commission has recently adopted a proposal for a Council recommendation on improving the teaching and learning of languages by taking the multitude of linguistic realities into account. We also have the Rights, Equality and Citizenship Programme, the Erasmus Programme and the Creative Europe programme. Besides, the Commission raises awareness on the importance of language learning through public events like the European Day of Languages or the national awards of the European Language Label for innovative learning projects.

Let me conclude by emphasising that the Commission strives – and will continue to do so under the next financial framework – to ensure that fundamental rights – and in particular the right to non-discrimination – are respected when EU law is implemented. Where we cannot propose legislation, we will use a soft law instrument, exchange of best practices and funding to help promote the rights of minorities.

Elnök asszony. – A napirendi pontot ezzel lezárom.

A szavazásra 2018. november 13-án, kedden kerül sor.

Írásos nyilatkozatok (162. cikk)

Danuta Jazłowiecka (PPE), *na piśmie*. – Około 8% obywateli Unii Europejskiej należy do mniejszości narodowych i etnicznych, a blisko 10% posługuje się językiem regionalnym lub mniejszościowym. Mimo to nie ma wspólnych unijnych norm i definicji dotyczących praw mniejszości w Unii. Jest to o tyle istotne, że uporczywe nękanie, dyskryminacja oraz przemoc odbierają obywatelom możliwość pełnego korzystania z podstawowych praw i wolności oraz utrudniają im równy udział w życiu społecznym.

W ostatnich latach możemy zaobserwować promowanie przez siły skrajnie prawicowe przemocy ksenofobicznej i mowy nienawiści. Widoczny jest wzrost liczby przestępstw z nienawiści oraz nasilenie się mowy nienawiści o podłożu rasistowskim, ksenofobicznym lub ze względu na nietolerancję religijną. Jeżeli weźmiemy pod uwagę fakt, iż w coraz większej liczbie państw członkowskich skrajna prawica zyskuje na popularności, to można przypuszczać, że dyskryminacja mniejszości będzie się raczej nasilała.

Podstawowym problemem Unii jest to, że nie ma ona instrumentów pozwalających egzekwować od państw członkowskich poszanowania praw mniejszości. Dlatego też sfera ta powinna być przedmiotem stałego monitorowania i dialogu w obrębie Parlamentu, Komisji i Rady. Dobrym pomysłem jest ustanowienie w ramach istniejących struktur Komisji organu odpowiedzialnego za uznawanie i ochronę mniejszości w Unii. Pomogłoby to przynajmniej monitorować sytuację w państwach członkowskich do czasu, aż ustanowione zostaną wspólne regulacje definiujące mniejszość i jej prawa.

Soraya Post (S&D), *in writing*. – There is a well-known saying: 'A country should be judged on the basis of how it treats its minorities'. This sentence can also be applied to the EU, where we cannot be proud of ourselves yet. The commonly set values in our Treaties demand respect for human rights and human dignity, equality and non-discrimination, also concerning the rights of minorities; however, reports by the EU Fundamental Rights Agency (FRA), NGOs and watchdog organisations show us a very sad reality. Our work is not done until we safeguard that people belonging to minorities can learn and use their language without limitations, can practice their traditions without fear, can live without being deprived of their rights and discriminated against in all spheres of life, and can participate in policymaking and decision-making processes. To achieve this, those in power have to take equal responsibility for people belonging to minority groups; they have to actively fight all forms of discrimination, condemn and impose sanctions for hate speech and hate crime, and they have to ensure minorities' representatives participate in decision-making. Furthermore, they have to raise mainstream society's awareness of the history of minority groups and mark their commemoration days.

Algirdas Saudargas (PPE), *raštu*. – Suprantamas ir savalaikis Europos Parlamento paraginimas Europos Komisijai imtis veiksmų užtikrinant tautinių mažumų teises Europos Sąjungoje. Tai tampa ypač aktualu matant ES kylančią radikalių politinių jėgų bangą. Taipgi yra tikrai pažeidžiamų tautinių bendrijų, kaip, pavyzdžiui, romai, kurie neturėdami savo valstybės ir būdami išsibarstę po įvairias šalis, yra visiškai priklausomi nuo tų šalių tautinių mažumų politikos. Tad dėmesys visos Bendrijos mastu jiems būtų reikšminga parama išlaikant tautinį identitetą, kalbą ir kultūrą. Pats, kaip EP narys, savo šalyje narėje dedu pastangas, kad romų tautinė bendrija turėtų kuo daugiau galimybių puoselėti savo kalbą. Tad žvelgiu į šią ataskaitą kaip į gerą postūmį atkreipiant dėmesį į romų tautinės mažumos reikalus visos ES kontekste. Kitas svarbus ataskaitos akcentas – raginimas vykdyti centralizuotą tautinių mažumų teisių įgyvendinimo stebėseną visoje ES. Tokia objektyvi stebėsena neleistų trečiosioms valstybėms, turinčioms savų, ne visad draugiškų tikslų, spekuliuoti tautinių mažumų padėties vertinimais ES.

Maria Gabriela Zoană (S&D), *în scris*. – În aproape fiecare țară a Uniunii există comunități importante formate din minorități naționale ale altor state. Fie că aceste minorități existau istoric într-o anumită arie geografică, fie că s-au format în urma migrației forței de muncă, cred cu tărie că datoria noastră, a tuturor, este să le asigurăm tuturor acestor oameni drepturi cel puțin la un anumit nivel. România este una dintre țările care se remarcă la nivel european și care este dată exemplu în acest sens prin modul în care a înțeles să asigure un standard minorităților naționale, de la dreptul la învățământ în limba maternă și până la dreptul de a avea inscripții bilingve sau de a te adresa autorităților publice în limba maternă în comunitățile locuite de minoritățile naționale într-un anumit procent din totalul populației. Românii, la rândul lor, formează mari comunități în alte state ale Uniunii Europene. În acest context, consider oportună o discuție cât se poate de constructivă în Parlamentul European în legătură cu asigurarea unor standarde minime pentru minorități, nu numai în beneficiul românilor care au ales să muncească în alte țări, dar în beneficiul tuturor celor care și-au găsit un loc al lor în altă țară decât cea natală.

18. Digitalisierung für die Entwicklung: Armut mit Technologie bekämpfen (kurze Darstellung)

Elnök asszony. – A következő napirendi pont a Bogdan Brunon Wenta által a Fejlesztési Bizottság nevében készített, a „Digitalizáció a fejlődésért: a szegénység csökkentése technológia segítségével" című jelentésről folytatott vita (2018/2083(INI)) (A8-0338/2018).

Ez és az előző téma tulajdonéppen fedi is egymást. A legutolsó jelentések már tisztán megmutatják, hogy a szegénység és a kisebbségi lét nagyon sok esetben fedi egymást. Ezért is volt fontos, hogy az Európai Unió megtalálja azokat a digitális eszközöket, amelyekkel a szegénység felszámolásáért lehet küzdeni.

Bogdan Brunon Wenta, *Rapporteur.* – Madam President, let me start by thanking all shadow rapporteurs for their good cooperation on this report outlining the impact of technology and digitisation in developing countries. I welcome the Commission strategy on mainstreaming digitisation into EU development policy announced last year, and EU Commissioner Mariya Gabriel's statement that Europe is dedicated to helping Africa build a single digital market. We managed to prepare in our committee a very comprehensive text addressing the main opportunities and challenges that digitisation brings to development cooperation and humanitarian action.

Nelson Mandela said that communication technologies have transformed the way people live and the manner in which countries develop. They have the potential to enable us to solve many of the critical problems confronting us. If this potential is to be realised then we must find ways of turning these technologies into a resource for all people, despite the challenges they face within their communities.

What does it mean? Digital technologies have huge potential in terms of reducing poverty, increasing the competitiveness of the economy and creating employment opportunities.

Whereas digitisation is rapidly growing globally our partners from developing countries continue to lag behind, losing the opportunity to fully utilise their human capital towards the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals. According to the 2016 World Development Report on Digital Dividends, six billion people lack access to high-speed internet and four billion still have no internet access at all. At a time when digitisation is growing fast, this lack of access is a major challenge to development as it continues to widen gaps and inequalities in the world. At the same time, a huge increase in mobile services is securing across the planet and the numbers of mobile users are now surpassing the numbers of people having access to electricity, sanitation or clean water.

Digitisation can be a powerful development tool in a number of policy areas such as governance, education, health, gender equality, economic growth and agriculture. In order for it to be effective, bridging the digital divide has to be mainstreamed into every other policy area in accordance with the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals. In order to realise these goals, both developing countries and developed countries, as well as all actors – both public and private – need to maximise and join their efforts.

In the European Consensus on Development which is a crucial document on development policy of the EU and its Member States, we can find the bold statement that they will continue to support information and communication technologies in developing countries as powerful enablers of inclusive growth and sustainable development. Special attention has been given to supporting digital literacy and skills to empower people, especially women, and people in vulnerable and marginalised situations to promote social inclusion and to facilitate the participation in democratic governance and the digital economy.

We are all aware of the fact that in this area of developing cooperation, public funding will not be sufficient for a truly transformative digitalisation process. For this very reason, there is a need for public-private cooperation based on development principles.

The private sector needs to get involved and play a role through its expertise and innovation know-how. I am convinced that the substantial support from the EU, international actors and both public and private sectors, will allow us to step up the process of bridging the digital divide with a strong commitment to this process from the developing countries.

„Catch the eye" eljárás

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – Paní předsedající, já bych chtěla velmi poděkovat za tuto zprávu panu kolegovi Bogdanu Wentovi. On upozornil na to, že bohužel ani v rámci Evropské unie na tom nejsou všechny členské státy v otázce digitalizace stejně. Ještě více to ale platí pro rozvojové země. Například subsaharská Afrika je na tom z pohledu digitalizace a přístupnosti k internetu nejhůře. A právě v těchto rozvojových oblastech platí, že digitalizace představuje velkou příležitost ekonomického a sociálního rozvoje.

Jednotlivé členské státy by tedy měly tuto oblast digitalizace přijmout do svých národních strategií rozvojové spolupráce. Mnohé oblasti jsou na tom velmi dobře, není problém s počtem mobilních telefonů či internetu, ale je to velmi geograficky nevyvážené, a tady potřebujeme udělat změnu. Chtěla bych upozornit na ochranu před nebezpečím, které spočívá ve zneužívání osobních dat, ve zneužívání internetu pro šíření radikalismu. I toto je věc, ve které může být Evropská unie dobrým příkladem.

Maria Gabriela Zoană (S&D). – Doamna președintă, doamna comisar, trăim în epoca digitală, o epocă care a generat o viteză incredibilă în modul în care aflăm sau distribuim informațiile. Digitalizarea a adus cu sine oportunități importante, în special în modul în care avem acces la informații noi, a timpului scurt necesar accesării acestora, dar și în modul în care folosim aceste informații pentru a ne ușura viața de zi cu zi.

Sărăcia este una dintre consecințele directe a lipsei de informație. Fie că vorbim despre rata de alfabetizare dintr-o anumită zonă sau despre accesul la educație superioară, digitalizarea aduce cu sine o serie de avantaje. Digitalizarea înseamnă și dezvoltarea unor aplicații de utilitate publică ce pot fi folosite de administrațiile publice locale în beneficiul cetățenilor. Digitalizarea înseamnă o imensă oportunitate pentru tinerii din ziua de azi: învățarea unui limbaj de programare, dar chiar și deprinderea abilităților digitale de bază oferă o șansă în plus celor care se apleacă spre acest domeniu – tehnologia informațiilor și comunicațiilor. Tineri de oriunde și din orice mediu social pot avea acest succes.

Pe scurt, digitalizarea aduce cu sine oportunitatea unei șanse în plus la obținerea unui loc de muncă, beneficii pentru comunități și, în final, posibilitatea reducerii sărăciei prin accesul la informație și la cunoaștere.

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, συζητούμε για την ψηφιοποίηση, που πρέπει να μπει στην υπηρεσία της ανάπτυξης για τη μείωση της φτώχειας με τη χρήση της τεχνολογίας. Όμως, το ερώτημα είναι, τι εννοούμε με την έννοια «ανάπτυξη»; Θα έχουμε ανάπτυξη για ποιον, για ποια συμφέροντα, προς ποια κατεύθυνση και με ποιον τρόπο; Θα έχουμε ανάπτυξη με δίκαιη κατανομή του πλούτου και με δικαιοσύνη; Ή θα έχουμε ανάπτυξη προκειμένου απλώς οι πλούσιοι να γίνουν πλουσιότεροι και οι φτωχοί φτωχότεροι; Και, ταυτόχρονα, οι χώρες του ευρωπαϊκού βορρά, οι αναπτυγμένες χώρες, να προχωρούν μπροστά και οι αναπτυσσόμενες να μένουν πίσω; Άρα, λοιπόν, είναι πρωτίστως θέμα επιλογής.

Δεύτερον, οι τεχνολογίες δεν είναι κοινωνικά ουδέτερες. Μπορεί να αξιοποιηθούν προς την κατεύθυνση της υπερεκμετάλλευσης των αναπτυσσόμενων χωρών. Μπορούν όμως, εφόσον γίνουν οι σωστές πολιτικές επιλογές, να μπουν στην υπηρεσία της ανάπτυξης των ίδιων των αναπτυσσόμενων χωρών, προκειμένου οι χώρες αυτές να μπορέσουν να δρέψουν τους καρπούς της δικής τους ανάπτυξης και να εκμεταλλευτούν οι ίδιες τον δικό τους πλούτο.

(„Catch the eye" eljárás vége)

Corina Crețu, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, the Commission welcomes this report and I would like to thank rapporteur Wenta and the Committee on Development (DEVE) for their work. Digitalisation is a key factor for achieving the Sustainable Development Goals, and of course it provides cost-effective solutions to development needs by creating high-quality jobs and sustainable growth. It is also an effective instrument to address challenges such as social exclusion and inequality, cybersecurity, data protection and governance.

In May 2017, the Commission services put forward a new Digital4Development strategic approach, the so-called D4D, which outlines four priority areas for future EU interventions: access to open, affordable and secure broadband connectivity and digital infrastructure; digital literacy skills; digital for growth, entrepreneurship and job creation; and digital technologies as an enabler. The D4D approach has gained momentum. It is now reflected in the European Consensus on Development and in the Communication on a new Africa-Europe alliance for sustainable investment in jobs. More generally, under the current period, the Commission's development policy has put a strong emphasis on digitalisation. Last year alone, over EUR 100 million were invested in projects covering mostly regional digital infrastructure. Besides, over EUR 200 million are being invested to support a new initiative in key thematic areas: energy, governance, education, health and agriculture.

We also have the European Union External Investment Plan adopted in September 2017, which can support digital solutions for local needs. Thanks to its financial arm – the European Fund for Sustainable Development – it helps secure private investment. So far, two projects have been selected for a total of EUR 175 million.

Lastly, the European Union, in collaboration with the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, is preparing the first Africa e-commerce week in December. The objective is to trigger policy harmonisation for an African single digital market and to engage with the local private sector.

Now, looking towards the future, the Commission will continue in the context of the next Multiannual Financial Framework to support developments through ambitious digital policies, with a strong focus on youth. We will also prioritise digital education skills and technical and vocational training to ensure the labour offer matches market demand. We also wish to strengthen our political dialogue with partner countries and regional organisations – in particular the African Union – to promote good governance and an investment-friendly climate. We will also strengthen the actions of our EU delegations, notably by setting up a network of contact points on D4D.

To conclude, in the light of our discussion, we can all agree that we have reached a pivotal moment. Together with the EU Member States, the European financial institutions, the private sector and civil society, we have the opportunity to truly influence the impact of digital transformation worldwide. In this endeavour, the Commission is confident that the European Parliament will keep momentum and remain a strong partner. Thank you for your attention. I would also like to congratulate you, rapporteur, on being elected Mayor – I wish you good luck and a lot of success, for the benefit of the citizens of your city.

Elnök asszony. – A napirendi pontot ezzel lezárom.

A szavazásra 2018. november 13-án, kedden kerül sor.

Írásos nyilatkozatok (162. cikk)

Dubravka Šuica (PPE), *napisan.* – Digitalizacija danas predstavlja ključ za održivi razvoj te utječe na sve segmente ljudskih života. Potrebno je premostiti tehnološke podjele koje dovode do društvene nejednakosti te omogućiti pristup internetu širokoj masi kako bi svi ljudi bili jednako informirani te mogli komunicirati međusobno. Tehnološki napredak i digitalizacija moraju biti suština svih razvojnih politika. Uključivanje novih ljudi u donošenje odluka i razmjenu informacija pomoći će razvoju i napretku svijeta.

Jedno od rješenja kojim bi se premostila digitalna podjela je Europski konsenzus o razvoju koji jasno definira obvezu te navodi da će EU i države članice i dalje podupirati informacijske i komunikacijske tehnologije u zemljama u razvoju kao elemente na temelju kojih se omogućuje uključivi rast i održivi razvoj te da će raditi na lakšem uvođenju digitalnih rješenja i promicanju upotrebe digitalnih tehnologija u nizu prioritetnih područja. Ulaganje u digitalizaciju može biti snažan pokretač rasta u tim zemljama, ali je bitno da takvo ulaganje dopire do svih, neovisno o rodu, geografskoj pripadnosti ili ekonomskom statusu.

Cilj je uz bolju infrastrukturu i poboljšani pristup internetu stvoriti energetsku mrežu, smanjiti poreze na digitalne proizvode i usluge te promicati tržišno natjecanje. Smatram da će digitalizacija uvelike pridonijeti rješavanju problema siromaštva u svijetu i nejednakosti u društvu.

19. Entwicklungshilfe der EU für das Bildungswesen (kurze Darstellung)

Elnök asszony. – A következő napirendi pont a Vincent Peillon által a fejlesztési Bizottság nevében készített, az oktatás terén az Uniós fejlesztési támogatásról szóló jelentésről szóló vita (2018/2081(INI)) (A8-0327/2018).

Vincent Peillon, *rapporteur.* – Madame la Présidente, Madame le Commissaire, mes chers collègues, je voudrais d'abord remercier les collègues de la commission du développement, et particulièrement les rapporteurs fictifs. Le travail que nous avons conduit ensemble nous a permis d'obtenir un vote à l'unanimité en commission, moins une abstention. Je souhaite que cette unité se retrouve demain, car cela donnera de la force à la position du Parlement. D'autant plus que cette unité s'est faite non pas au détriment, mais au service de positions fortes, claires et précises.

Ce rapport, il a d'abord pour but de remettre l'éducation au cœur des politiques de développement.

L'éducation, c'est plus que l'éducation. Citée de nombreuses fois ce soir, elle est bien sûr un but en soi parce qu'elle conditionne les progrès dans de nombreux domaines: la santé, la démocratie, le développement économique, l'égalité homme-femme. Essentielle et exigeante, s'agissant d'une politique complexe et à long terme, l'éducation a pourtant été délaissée.

Au niveau mondial, tout comme au niveau de l'Union européenne, l'aide a baissé entre 2009 et 2015. Elle est passée de 11 % de l'aide totale de l'Union européenne à 7,5 %, et, à l'échelle mondiale, de 8,3 % à 6,2 %. C'est tout à fait contradictoire avec les objectifs affichés.

Bien sûr, des efforts ont été engagés depuis 2016, ils méritent d'être salués. Mais ils sont insuffisants pour rattraper le retard accumulé. Ils doivent donc non seulement être poursuivis dans la durée, mais ils doivent aussi être largement amplifiés. Il nous faut pour cela prendre des engagements financiers et consacrer, à l'horizon 2030, 15 % de notre aide au développement à l'éducation.

Des objectifs précis doivent être inscrits dans le prochain cadre financier pluriannuel. Dans le même temps, la Commission doit maintenant s'interroger sur la manière de réaliser l'objectif de développement n° 4 et définir une stratégie en ce sens. Elle doit le faire dans une nouvelle communication, qui viendra remplacer son dernier texte de 2002, mis à jour par un document de travail en 2010.

Il faut donc inscrire l'éducation comme priorité des politiques de développement. Pour être efficace, il faut fixer des priorités claires. C'est ce qu'a fait la commission du développement. Nous assumons des choix.

Nous fixons deux priorités. La première, assurer une éducation de base gratuite et de qualité pour tous. Je parle bien de l'éducation de base, qui a été fortement touchée par les baisses de crédits. L'éducation de base et inclusive correspond au cycle d'enseignement primaire et secondaire de douze ans et doit être gratuite. Nous devons donc soutenir l'éducation publique et non pas des établissements privés commerciaux qui cherchent à tirer profit du marché de l'éducation, comme ils le feraient de n'importe quel autre marché. C'est la première priorité.

La deuxième, c'est de renforcer notre soutien aux pays les moins avancés, non seulement parce que ce sont évidemment ceux qui en ont le plus besoin, mais aussi parce que c'est là que l'aide est la plus efficace. Ces deux priorités ne sont pas les priorités que nous poursuivons aujourd'hui, il faut donc rectifier le tir.

L'Union et les États membres doivent consacrer d'ici à 2030 au moins 50 % de leur aide à l'éducation de base et au moins 40 % de leur aide, toujours à l'horizon 2030, aux pays les moins avancés. Ce sont donc des objectifs clairs et précis, des priorités assumées.

Enfin, il faut que cette aide soit plus efficace, il ne suffit pas seulement de mettre davantage d'argent, il ne suffit pas seulement de répondre à des priorités claires, il faut la mettre en œuvre de manière efficace. Nous avons besoin d'instruments d'évaluation fiables, précis et indépendants.

L'aide des États membres doit se conjuguer, se coordonner avec des délégations ou de la programmation conjointe. Nous voulons aussi que nos partenaires s'approprient ces politiques et c'est pour cela que nous avons choisi de privilégier l'appui budgétaire.

Enfin, un tiers seulement de l'aide destinée à l'éducation vient des organisations multilatérales, contre deux tiers dans le domaine de la santé. Il faut renforcer la participation des organisations multilatérales, et en particulier le partenariat mondial pour l'éducation.

Nous disposons à présent d'un rapport concis et clair, qui fixe des priorités politiques, des méthodes à privilégier et des objectifs chiffrés. Je souhaite que ce texte soit adopté demain par la plus grande majorité du Parlement, de telle sorte qu'il puisse être utile à tous les acteurs de l'éducation.

„Catch the eye" eljárás

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Paní předsedající, já bych chtěl zdůraznit, že snižování prostředků vynaložených do vzdělávání je rozhodně špatný trend, který je nutno zvrátit. S návrhem zvýšit poměr financování do tohoto sektoru se ztotožňuji a považuji jej za krok správným směrem.

Kromě priorit, které jsou uvedeny v návrhu Výboru pro rozvoj, bych chtěl vyzdvihnout ještě jednu skutečnost, a to zásadní a opomíjenou důležitost terciárního vzdělávání. Toto vzdělávání je skutečně důležité pro rozvoj jakéhokoli regionu, nejenom toho postiženého, ale tím více toho postiženého. Bez kvalitních vysokých škol nebudou zvláště chudší regiony schopné čelit odlivu svých mozků, neboť bude samozřejmě docházet k sestěhovávání těchto mozků do míst s kvalitnějším vzděláváním.

Nebudeme-li investovat do terciárního vzdělávání, nebudou evropské univerzity atraktivní pro práci výzkumníků, což může znamenat pro Evropu, že přestane být schopna konkurovat právě globálním hráčům v oblasti technologického rozvoje. Chci zdůraznit, že už nyní sledujeme tento trend a je skutečně potřeba se tomuto trendu postavit a zamezit jeho prohlubování.

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – Paní předsedající, já podporuji tuto zprávu o rozvojové pomoci Evropské unie v oblasti vzdělávání. Vždyť vzdělání patří mezi základní lidská práva, vzdělání je klíčem k osobnímu úspěchu a je také tím nejlepším nástrojem v boji proti chudobě. Proto musíme usilovat o to, aby ke vzdělání měly přístup všechny děti, zejména tam, kde jej dosud nemají, kde není kvalitní, kde se děti nemohou vzdělávat, což je zejména Afrika.

Podporuji také cíl navýšení podílu každého členského státu na investice do výuky a vzdělávání v rámci rozvojové spolupráce o deset procent do roku 2024, případně o patnáct procent do roku 2030. Jsou to správné indikátory. Mnoho se hovoří o tom, že právě v rámci boje proti migraci musíme pomáhat v zemích původu, a investice do vzdělávání by tady byly tím nejlepším nástrojem. Chci také připomenout program adopce na dálku, do kterého mnoho občanů přispívá.

Alex Mayer (S&D). – Madam President, I would like to draw attention to the work of Dr Björn Haßler from the University of Cambridge, who I had the pleasure of speaking to last week at a meeting facilitated by the Humanitarian Centre. We discussed improving educational outcomes in sub-Saharan Africa, where many schools are places of crowded classrooms staffed by overworked, low-paid and often under-qualified teachers.

Dr Haßler told me about his work on school-based teacher professional development and stressed how, by making open educational resources, teachers gain access to more high-quality teaching and learning resources and are empowered to take ownership of them and adapt them to their particular circumstances. Such open models radically reduce costs and have unprecedented scalability, and I believe that this House can learn from his work.

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, η αύξηση των πόρων για την εκπαίδευση είναι καθοριστική, διότι μόνον έτσι μπορούν οι αναπτυσσόμενες χώρες να περάσουν πραγματικά στην οικονομική μεγέθυνση. Βεβαίως, η εκπαίδευση είναι διαβατήριο ζωής προκειμένου να αντιμετωπιστεί η φτώχεια. Όλοι συμφωνούμε ότι πρέπει να αυξηθούν οι πόροι. Το ερώτημα είναι πώς θα γίνει η υλοποίηση. Διότι, το βασικό θέμα είναι ότι οι πόροι πολύ συχνά υπάρχουν αλλά δεν υλοποιούνται σωστά οι πολιτικές, και έχουμε παραδείγματα κατανομής κονδυλίων σε μη κυβερνητικές οργανώσεις, οι οποίες δεν αξιοποιούν με τον καλύτερο τρόπο τα χρήματα που παίρνουν. Νομίζω ότι στο σημείο αυτό πρέπει να είμαστε πολύ πιο αποφασιστικοί και, φυσικά, να εντείνουμε τους ελέγχους. Από την άλλη, βεβαίως, η ενίσχυση της εκπαίδευσης, και ιδίως της τριτοβάθμιας εκπαίδευσης, είναι καθοριστική για τις χώρες της Αφρικής. Μόνο με αυτόν τον τρόπο μπορεί να υπάρξει ανάπτυξη, ώστε οι κάτοικοι της Αφρικής να παραμείνουν στην Αφρική και να περιοριστεί έτσι η μετανάστευση.

(„Catch the eye" eljárás vége)

Corina Crețu, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, first of all, I would like to thank the rapporteurs and all the Members of the European Parliament who contributed to this report, which confirms once again the support of this Parliament for the education sector. We will, of course, take into account a number of recommendations put forward in this report.

The right to quality education is a fundamental right for all. It constitutes an essential condition for the enjoyment of human rights and for the achievement of all the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals. Moreover, by investing in education, we fight poverty. Basic reading skills could take at least 170 million people out of global poverty.

The Commission agrees that education should remain at the core of our development cooperation, focusing on those most in need. The European Consensus on Development highlights the importance of education for promoting responsible citizenship, developing sustainable societies and boosting youth employment.

Your report constitutes an opportunity to recall these objectives. It gives additional input and impetus to our common endeavour. As recently stated by the World Bank, the investments needed in human capital have become more important as the nature of work has evolved. The content of education programmes and the skills acquired by students have to be relevant to the needs of the current and future labour market.

In this context, the European Union will continue to support scholarships and exchange programmes between tertiary education institutions and build capacities and knowledge within universities through actions such as Erasmus+. As recently announced in our new Africa-Europe Alliance for Sustainable Investment and Jobs, by 2020 the European Union will have supported 35 000 African students and academics through the Erasmus Programme. By 2027, these figures should reach over 105 000.

In your report, you also underline the importance of gender equality and the inclusion of vulnerable children and of course, the Commission shares your view. These two elements must remain essential components of quality education, contributing to fulfilling the 2030 Agenda by leaving no one behind.

The Commission also welcomes your emphasis on education in times of emergencies and crisis. Ensuring continuing education for children and young people living in crisis situations is a pressing issue, particularly for girls. Already now, more than 60% of the European Union's bilateral funding for education goes to countries affected by conflict and fragility. Furthermore, our humanitarian budget for education in emergencies has gone up from 1% in 2015 to 8% this year and 10% in 2019.

But of course we need further and more coordinated efforts, also with our international partners. For this reason, the Commission adopted its first ever policy framework on education in emergencies and crises in May 2018, a new major dimension of our actions.

The Commission also welcomes the call in the report to involve all stakeholders in the dialogue at international and local level. Multilateral work is as important as bilateral country work. Currently the European Union supports 45 developing partner countries with bilateral education funding worth around EUR 3.4 billion. The European Union is also a major contributor to the Global Partnership for Education, which brings together all relevant actors to achieve the objective of the United Nations Sustainable Development Goal to ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all.

Overall, the targets set out in your report are ambitious, but consistent with the international agenda and with the Commission approach. We very much look forward to continuing in the years to come our cooperation with Parliament in keeping quality and inclusive education high on the European Union's development cooperation agenda.

Elnök asszony. – A napirendi pontot ezzel lezárom.

A szavazásra 2018. november 13-án, kedden kerül sor.

Írásbeli nyilatkozatok (162. cikk)

Dominique Bilde (ENF), *par écrit*. – L'accès à l'éducation est un défi, particulièrement pour les pays en proie à des guerres ou à des conflits. Dans la seule Afrique subsaharienne, 87 millions d'enfants en âge de rentrer en primaire et d'adolescents n'étaient pas scolarisés en 2014, selon l'UNESCO qui rappelait en 2016 que «la moitié des enfants et adolescents non scolarisés de pays touchés par des conflits en 2013 se trouvaient en Afrique subsaharienne» . La situation est ainsi particulièrement critique dans certains États comme la République démocratique du Congo, rongée par des conflits latents. Il s'agit d'abord d'un enjeu humanitaire, inscrit comme quatrième objectif de développement durable. C'est aussi un enjeu stratégique, au regard du formidable potentiel de croissance de l'Afrique. Le développement de l'éducation primaire et secondaire sera ainsi décisif pour assurer, dans les années à venir, le maintien voire l'essor de la langue française sur le continent. Il convient donc de saluer des initiatives telles que l'Ifadem (initiative francophone de formation à distance des maîtres), déployée sous l'égide de l'Organisation internationale de la Francophonie. Il ne tient qu'à nous que le français devienne, à horizon 2050, la première langue d'Afrique.

Ignazio Corrao (EFDD), *per iscritto*. – L'istruzione non è soltanto un diritto fondamentale ma è anche la chiave per lo sviluppo, in quanto gioca un ruolo essenziale come moltiplicatore per lo sviluppo stesso. Essa infatti implica un ampliamento delle capacità e delle opportunità per gli individui, generando spirito critico e indipendenza economica. Forse sottovalutiamo il fatto che milioni di bambini nel mondo non hanno accesso all'istruzione a causa di conflitti, sfollamenti forzati e violenze, in quanto il rischio concreto è che una generazione intera, rimanga in un perenne stato di bisogno e dipendenza. È per questo motivo che l'istruzione deve essere al centro degli sforzi per la realizzazione dell'Agenda 2030, semplicemente perché è propedeutica al raggiungimento degli altri obiettivi di sviluppo sostenibile. In questo senso però vorrei sottolineare la necessità di vigilare affinché i fondi destinati allo sviluppo siano realmente allocati in maniera coerente e prioritariamente destinati a programmi di istruzione e formazione professionale. Lo sviluppo passa per l'istruzione, e io mi auguro che questo concetto si tramuti in fatti concreti, includendo traguardi e obiettivi specifici nel prossimo Quadro Finanziario Pluriennale.

20. Ausführungen von einer Minute zu Fragen von politischer Bedeutung

Elnök asszony. – A következő napirendi pont a fontos politikai kérdésekkel kapcsolatos egyperces felszólalások (az eljárási szabályzat 163. cikke).

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – Paní předsedající, v těchto dnech si připomínáme sto let od konce první světové války. Připomínáme si to proto, aby miliony mrtvých, miliony obětí, nebyly zapomenuty a abychom mladé generaci připomněli hlavní důvod, proč máme Evropskou unii jako prostor míru.

V roce 1914 lidé také nevěřili tomu, že nějaká válka může být, v době racionality a pokroku. Panovnické rodiny v Evropě byly propleteny příbuzenskými vztahy, a kdo by chtěl válčit proti svým? Ale nacionalismus převážil. V roce 1918 byli přesvědčeni, že tato válka byla poslední, že už se nic takového nemůže opakovat – a přesto za dvacet let opět.

Dnes žijeme v době míru, ale mír není samozřejmý, a mnozí mladí lidé mi říkají, že si nedovedou představit válku, jsou přesvědčeni, že není možná. Proto je potřeba připomínat miliony padlých v obou světových válkách.

Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D). – Señora presidenta, comisaria Crețu, la semana que viene en Las Palmas de Gran Canaria —Canarias, que es mi tierra—, va a tener lugar la cumbre de regiones ultraperiféricas, con la presencia del presidente Jean Claude Juncker. Y las reuniones ultraperiféricas son importantes para los países en que se encuadran: España, Portugal y Francia.

Pero para la Unión Europea las reuniones ultraperiféricas son ultraimportantes, y cito al presidente Tajani de este Parlamento, porque son una ocasión para verificar el alcance del artículo 349 en el futuro de Europa, en el marco financiero plurianual, en las políticas de energía y vecindad, las redes transeuropeas y, sobre todo, el empleo. Pero es importante también revisar el impacto del *Brexit* sobre regiones altamente dependientes del flujo masivo de turistas, muchos de ellos provenientes del Reino Unido.

Y, finalmente, es muy importante que la conquista del futuro no diluya, ni mucho menos destruya ni haga retroceder, las políticas tradicionales de la Unión Europea para el sector primario, que no disminuya el POSEI, que es vital para esa dimensión del sector primario en el terreno económico, en el terreno ecológico y en el terreno social.

Ελένη Θεοχάρους (ECR). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, κυρία Επίτροπε, χθες η κυβέρνηση της Αλβανίας με ανακήρυξε *persona non grata* διότι υπερασπίζομαι τα ανθρώπινα δικαιώματα της ελληνικής μειονότητας της Βορείου Ηπείρου, τα οποία καταπατούνται από το αλβανικό καθεστώς. Η μειονότητα ζει μέσα σε κλίμα τρομοκρατίας και σιωπηρής εθνοκάθαρσης. Η δημογραφική σύνθεση του πληθυσμού σε περιοχές αμιγώς ελληνικές αλλάζει δραματικά με τη μεταφορά εποίκων, τα περιουσιακά δικαιώματα των Ελλήνων καταπατούνται από το κράτος με εκφοβισμό και αυθαίρετες και παράνομες πράξεις, ενώ τα εκπαιδευτικά τους δικαιώματα και η χρήση της ελληνικής γλώσσας διώκονται συστηματικά. Πριν από λίγο καιρό, οι Αλβανοί δολοφόνησαν τον Αριστοτέλη Γκούμα γιατί μιλούσε ελληνικά. Πριν από λίγες μέρες τον Κωνσταντίνο Κατσίφα γιατί ύψωσε την ελληνική σημαία. Λυπάμαι που το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο δεν θέλησε να συζητήσει για την καταπάτηση των ανθρωπίνων δικαιωμάτων της μειονότητας. Θεωρώ ότι οφείλει να αποστείλει πάραυτα μια ad hoc επιτροπή που θα αναζητήσει την αλήθεια για όσα συμβαίνουν στην ελληνική κοινότητα, χωρίς την παρουσία των χαφιέδων του καθεστώτος οι οποίοι τρομοκρατούν τους πολίτες.

Jasenko Selimovic (ALDE). – Fru talman! På vägen hit passerade jag ett antal gamla nationsgränser, som påminner en om vad vi försöker skapa på denna kontinent sedan 1945: en union utan gränser dedikerad åt fred och öppenhet.

Tyvärr har min egen regering alldeles nyligen valt att gå i helt motsatt riktning. Sverige förlängde i torsdags återigen upprätthållandet av inre gränskontroller. Skälet som angetts är inre säkerhet och oro för terrorism. Antalet återvändande jihadister har emellertid minskat kraftfullt. Flyktingvågen från 2015 är bara en rännil. Man kan därför säga att åtgärderna inte syftar till att förebygga terrorism, utan åtgärderna syftar till att minska den extrema högerns inflytande genom att ge dem budskap om ”rasism light”.

Drömmen från 1945 är fortfarande möjlig. Det är viktigt att påminnas om detta dessa dagar, då vi minns hur många människor som dog i dessa slagfält på den här kontinenten. Fungerande inre gränser inom EU förutsätter ju naturligtvis att det finns fungerande yttre gränser. Den drömmen är dock möjlig, och den vägen bör vi gå.

Miroslavs Mitrofanovs (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, at the previous session of the European Parliament we adopted the resolution on the rise of neo-fascist violence in Europe. The overwhelming majority of the Members of Parliament voted in favour of this resolution. It was a clear signal to all Member States and the political forces: Europe is against politically-motivated violence and against the rise of neo-Nazist ideology. What happened then? In my country, in Latvia, the anti-fascist resolution was met either by ignorance or sharp criticism by ruling politicians and the mainstream media, and it is not an exception. All signals coming from the external world which do not fit the nationalistic ideology of the ruling parties are simply ignored by them and the Latvian-language media.

What is important from the point of view of the Latvian Russian minority, because of the ignorance and double standards applied by Latvian authorities also in the case when we need the State to react against hate speech, or the relentless persecution of national minorities – a majority against the minorities. There was no reaction after the Minister for Education asked Latvians to get rid of the empathy towards minorities. There was no reaction when we asked the police several times to investigate the hate speech by one Latvian intellectual who called the local Russians ‘genetic trash’. In these conditions, we ask the European Union to elaborate clear and strong rules for preventing hate speech on the level of national States.

Martina Anderson (GUE/NGL). – Madam President, this day last week, John Downey was arrested in Ireland. The British government have publicly stated in a British court that John Downey was not wanted, and the court ruled to that effect. The European arrest warrant used against John Downey follows a campaign to introduce an amnesty for British state forces at a time when the spotlight is on them for their actions.

John Downey is an Irish republican and a strong advocate of the peace process. His arrest gives lie to claims by Mrs Theresa May that the legacy process is skewed against former British state forces – a lie which was denounced by even the DPP and the PSNI. A lie feeding the British attempts to secure impunity and immunity for British state forces guilty of crimes in Ireland. A lie directly linked to a British government currently in hock to a party, the Democratic Unionist Party, whose leader, Arlene Foster, unlawfully blocked the funding requested for the Lord Chief Justice's legacy plan.

John Downey's arrest was politically motivated.

Mario Borghezio (ENF). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, esattamente quindici anni fa, il 12 novembre 2003, morivano alla base dei carabinieri a Nassiriya decine di nostri cari carabinieri e altri militari, due civili e altre persone di nazionalità straniera. Volevo ricordare questi eroi, anche perché non si metta mai in dubbio il coraggio, la lealtà dei nostri amati carabinieri, specie quando magari qualcuno vorrebbe speculare vergognosamente su casi isolati di comportamenti distanti da questa che è una gloriosa storia di dedizione e fedeltà alle istituzioni. Un pensiero e un ricordo, naturalmente anche alle loro famiglie, di quest'arma dei carabinieri che è lo specchio dell'Italia degli onesti e l'orgoglio di tutti gli italiani onesti.

Dobromir Sośnierz (NI). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Wczoraj Polska obchodziła symboliczne stulecie swojej niepodległości. Problem polega na tym, że ta rocznica troszeczkę jest niefortunna, ponieważ większość tego okresu Polska nie była tak naprawdę krajem niepodległym i dzisiaj także już nim nie jest ze względu na podpisanie traktatu z Lizbony. W 1918 r. musieliśmy pytać Niemców, czy możemy ogłosić niepodległość, w 2018 r. musimy pytać Niemców, w jakim wieku polscy sędziowie mogą przechodzić na emeryturę, więc jeśli zadajemy sobie pytanie, kto tak naprawdę przegrał te dwie wojny światowe, to przede wszystkim to jesteśmy my, jak widać, a nie Niemcy. Chichot historii polega na tym, że partia rządząca, która teraz często powołuje się na taką niepodległościową retorykę, również w starciu z władzami Unii Europejskiej, w 2003 r. za pieniądze unijne brała udział w histerycznej kłamliwej propagandzie na rzecz wstąpienia Polski do Unii Europejskiej. Ona podpisała, jej prezydent podpisał traktat z Lizbony, więc to oni za unijne srebrniki sprzedali polską niepodległość, a teraz sami borykają się z konsekwencjami tego.

Daniel Buda (PPE). – Doamna președintă, guvernul român condus de PSD-ALDE își bate joc de sănătatea românilor. Mai mult, acest guvern iresponsabil îi privează pe aceștia de dreptul la viață și sănătate prin refuzul constant de a folosi fonduri europene pentru investiții în sistemul medical.

Recent, acesta a refuzat folosirea celor 150 de milioane de euro puse la dispoziție de Comisia Europeană pentru construirea a trei spitale regionale de urgență, mai precis, Cluj, Iași și Craiova. Asta în condițiile în care aceeași guvernare solicita bani în aceeași direcție în 2015 în cadrul programului operațional regional. Astfel, deși autoritățile locale din Cluj, de exemplu, au făcut toate demersurile necesare începerii acestei investiții, în mod inexplicabil, guvernul PSD-ALDE refuză pur și simplu banii europeni, răpindu-le românilor șansa de a beneficia de servicii medicale de calitate.

Cer public guvernului României să folosească toate resursele financiare puse la dispoziție de Comisia Europeană pentru a crește calitatea actului medical și pentru a salva viețile românilor.

Alex Mayer (S&D). – Madam President, in Bedfordshire, crime is reaching crisis point with four murders in Bedford and Luton in the last six months, while knife crime is up 86% since 2014. Demand for the police is at an all-time high, and officers are stretched to limit. Indeed, the Bedfordshire Chief Constable said he did not have enough officers to respond to 999 calls.

The problem is well documented. Bedfordshire police is underfunded. It is treated as a rural force, but has urban challenges. Bedfordshire has the third-highest terror risk in the country and a rapidly expanding international airport. A higher proportion of domestic abuse offences happen in the county than in places like Manchester, and 40% of all guns used illegally across my constituency are fired in Bedfordshire. And behind the statistics are people who live in fear, bigger insurance bills, and grieving families. So I wholeheartedly support the Times & Citizen campaign. It is time to fund our police properly.

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, πριν από λίγη ώρα το Σώμα απέρριψε την πρότασή μου και την πρόταση της Ομάδας ECR για ειδική συζήτηση σχετικά με τη δολοφονία του Κωνσταντίνου Κατσίφα από την αλβανική αστυνομία και για να συζητήσουμε, παράλληλα, την παραβίαση των δικαιωμάτων της ελληνικής εθνικής μειονότητας της Βορείου Ηπείρου. Η Ολομέλεια του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου «πέταξε την μπάλα στην εξέδρα». Πιστεύω ότι έτσι δεν προχωρεί σωστά. Πρέπει να αποκαλυφθούν οι δολοφόνοι του Κωνσταντίνου Κατσίφα και νομίζω ότι οφείλει η Eurojust, σε συνεργασία με την Εισαγγελία Αθηνών, να εξετάσει ποιοι ήταν αυτοί που δολοφόνησαν τον Κωνσταντίνο Κατσίφα, διότι ήταν Έλληνας πολίτης· ήταν πολίτης της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης. Επιπλέον, πρέπει το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο, με ειδική επιτροπή, να εξετάσει την παραβίαση των δικαιωμάτων της ελληνικής μειονότητας στη Βόρειο Ήπειρο, διότι παραβιάζονται όλα τα δικαιώματά της. Γίνεται πραγματική εθνοκάθαρση. Γίνεται μεταφορά Κοσοβάρων και εποίκων προκειμένου να εκκαθαριστεί η περιοχή. Ταυτόχρονα, πρέπει να σταλεί το μήνυμα ότι η Αλβανία δεν έχει καμία θέση στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση.

Ana Miranda (Verts/ALE). – Senhor Presidente, Alcoa não se fecha. Quero apoiar a luta dos trabalhadores de Alcoa, pela preocupante situação da multinacional norte-americana Alcoa, que anunciou o fecho das suas fábricas da Corunha, na Galiza, e de Avilez, nas Astúrias, e que representa a perda de 700 postos de trabalho diretos, no monopólio do alumínio do Estado espanhol.

Trata-se do encerramento de uma empresa, depois de receber uma grande quantidade de dinheiro público, e dos riscos que representa para a indústria do meu país ter uma fatura das mais caras da Europa. Não se pode permitir que uma multinacional aumente as suas contas através dos dinheiros públicos e, em seguida, execute uma brutal destruição de emprego. Por isso, denunciamos neste Parlamento Europeu este problema, solidarizamo-nos com os trabalhadores e pedimos que a empresa não utilize o expediente da regulação de emprego. Além disso, que não continue a contornar a legislação e, como há monopólio, pedimos uma intervenção pública do Estado espanhol, mais que justificada por ser uma empresa estratégica.

Alcoa não se fecha!

Kateřina Konečná (GUE/NGL). – Paní předsedající, společnost ArcelorMittal kupuje italské hutě Ilva. Tuto akvizici Evropská komise prověřila a nařídila společnosti prodat některé její další závody.

Ta se rozhodla prodat Ostravské hutní závody, které zaměstnávají v mém Moravskoslezském regionu přes sedm tisíc lidí. Riziko uzavření hutí pro region, spojené s prodejem, je enormní, neboť ten se v současnosti potýká s útlumem těžby uhlí a insolvencemi mnoha dalších společností, kvůli nimž již zanikly v posledních letech tisíce pracovních míst.

Proti výběru kupce Liberty Steel silně protestují všechny odborové organizace působící v ostravských hutích. Mezi jejich hlavní argumenty patří porušení podmínek prodeje dle evropské legislativy týkající se povinnosti, aby kupující disponoval finančními zdroji, prokázanými znalostmi v oboru a motivací rozvíjet prodávanou společnost jako životaschopnou konkurenční sílu.

Pokud jste si jako Komise řekli, že do tohoto prodeje chcete nějakým způsobem zasáhnout, prosím, nenechte zbankrotovat část mé republiky, část mého regionu, jen proto, že to prodáme někomu, kdo na to prostě nemá a nic s tím neudělá.

Gilles Lebreton (ENF). – Madame la Présidente, il y a tout juste cent ans, le 11 novembre 1918, prenait fin la première guerre mondiale. Il faut commémorer cette grande victoire de la France et de ses alliés pour laquelle 1,4 million de soldats français ont donné leur vie. Une délégation du groupe ENL l'a commémorée sur le champ de bataille de Verdun où 163 000 Français sont morts en barrant le passage à l'envahisseur.

Je veux rappeler avec force ma vérité sur cette terrible guerre qui n'est pas la pseudo-vérité colportée par le président - Macron. Ce n'est pas le nationalisme des combattants français et de leurs alliés qui a provoqué la guerre, mais l'impérialisme du Reich allemand. Ce sont des empires qui ont provoqué les deux guerres mondiales et des nations qui ont défendu leur liberté et la liberté du monde. Que l'Union européenne ne l'oublie pas, elle qui rêve de se transformer en un nouvel empire. L'impérialisme, c'est la guerre; le nationalisme, c'est le moteur du droit des peuples à disposer d'eux-mêmes.

Anna Záborská (PPE). – Vážená pani predsedajúca, v auguste som sa obrátila na Radu so žiadosťou o sprístupnenie dvoch dokumentov. Jedným z nich bol pripravovaný návrh usmernení EÚ v oblasti ľudských práv týkajúci sa nediskriminácie vo vonkajšej činnosti.

Minulý týždeň bola po dvoch mesiacoch moja žiadosť Radou oficiálne zamietnutá. V zdôvodnení odmietnutia sprístupniť poslankyni Európskeho parlamentu usmernenie, ktorým sa budú riadiť pracovníci európskej vonkajšej služby, sa píše, že by to delegácie vystavilo neprimeraným tlakom dotknutých strán. Poslanci tohto parlamentu musia byť informovaní o tom, ako sa tvoria zásady fungovania zastúpení EÚ vo svete. Ten, kto záujem poslanca považuje za neprimeraný tlak, pohŕda parlamentarizmom a vysmieva sa z nás všetkých. Žiadam, aby predseda Parlamentu so všetkou rozhodnosťou konal.

Claudia Țapardel (S&D). – Doamna președintă, dragi colegi, rezoluția privind România reprezintă o mare nedreptate pentru o țară profund europeană, care respectă principiile statului de drept, valorile democratice europene, precum și Constituția statului și deciziile Curții Europene. De fapt, în România guvernul și majoritatea parlamentară nu fac altceva decât eforturi uriașe pentru a asigura o reformă a sistemului de justiție, tocmai în sensul respectării drepturilor și libertăților civile, a prezumției de nevinovăție precum și a șansei la o judecată dreaptă și corectă, fără justiție televizată sau interferențe din partea serviciilor secrete. Constat însă cu regret că unii lideri europeni sacrifică România pe altarul intereselor politice generate de viitoarele alegeri europarlamentare, fără să conștientizeze că astfel de jocuri nu fac decât să dezbine Uniunea. Aceiași lideri nu realizează că aceste acțiuni reprezintă un mare pericol pentru viitorul Uniunii Europene, căci puterea stă în unitate și solidaritate, nu în condamnarea și discriminarea statelor membre.

De aceea, cer colegilor români ca măcar în al doisprezecelea ceas să facă un gest de demnitate și să nu voteze această rezoluție, iar tuturor membrilor Parlamentului European să dea un vot negativ, pentru că această rezoluție și astfel de jocuri politice nu fac decât să adâncească prăpastia dintre estul și vestul Europei.

Jordi Solé (Verts/ALE). – Señora presidenta, estamos viendo claramente que la justicia española tiene un problema. Uno de los pilares de cualquier de democracia, un sistema judicial que funcione correctamente y que genere confianza, se está tambaleando ahora mismo en el Estado español.

Nos lo demuestra el Tribunal Europeo de Derechos Humanos cada vez que condena a España por vulnerar derechos fundamentales. Nos lo demostró la semana pasada el propio Tribunal Supremo español, contradiciendo de manera escandalosa sus propias sentencias, que teóricamente son firmes, cuando terminó dando la razón a los bancos y falló que era el cliente quien debía seguir pagando el impuesto de las hipotecas, y nos lo demuestran casos como el de Alsasua, el de La Manada y tantos otros.

En relación con el proceso contra el independentismo democrático catalán, viendo estos antecedentes, viendo la instrucción que ha habido hasta el momento, viendo las fábulas que aparecen en las diligencias judiciales sobre violencia, rebelión, tratándose como se trata de un juicio político, ¿alguien puede confiar en que los presos políticos catalanes tendrán un juicio justo? Nosotros, no.

El sistema judicial español tiene un problema y la Unión Europea debería preocuparse.

Xabier Benito Ziluaga (GUE/NGL). – Señora presidenta, los astilleros de La Naval Sestao, en Vizcaya, son los únicos que han aguantado abiertos hasta la fecha de entre todos los astilleros que fueron privatizados la década pasada. Su plantilla tiene décadas de experiencia. Han construido las dragas más grandes del mundo o gaseros de alto nivel tecnológico. Pero ahora amenazan con cerrarlos. Es preocupante, también, la realidad de su comarca, de Ezkerraldea, una zona que recibe fondos FEDER por las altas tasas de desempleo.

El cierre de una empresa que puede generar hasta cuatro mil puestos de trabajo entre directos e indirectos tendrá, sin duda, un efecto devastador. De poco servirá si las administraciones se quedan de brazos cruzados ante esta amenaza de cierre.

Recuperar la presencia del accionariado público dentro de los sectores estratégicos es hoy en día la mejor receta que se puede tomar. Y no solo es la mejor, sino que además es posible. Es posible la entrada pública en La Naval dentro de las propias reglas de la Unión Europea.

Por tanto, es hora de que el Gobierno de España y el Gobierno vasco dejen de mirar para otro lado, dejen de marear y den un futuro tanto a La Naval como a la comarca de Ezkerraldea.

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Paní předsedající, já bych chtěl vystoupit k bodu, který považuji za skutečně nebezpečný pro naši budoucnost, a to je otázka pesticidů a jejich využívání. Pesticidy jsou užitečnými sluhy, ale zároveň mohou být velmi škodlivými pány, pokud se vymknou skutečné kontrole.

V americké Kalifornii se již projednává výrazné omezení používání pesticidů ve vzdálenosti půl kilometru od škol a školek. V současnosti existuje několik studií, které vliv pesticidů označují za škodlivý nejen pro vývoj dětí, ale také pro vývoj samotného plodu. Pro budoucí regulaci se proto doporučuje zahrnout i těhotné ženy.

Ačkoliv je nutné provést další výzkum, již tyto prvotní studie by pro nás mohly být alarmující. Pesticidy mají vliv na poruchu autistického spektra, také na výskyt ADHD a zvyšují riziko vzniku Parkinsonovy choroby. Pojďme proto vytvářet skutečně odpovědnou politiku pro budoucnost. Pesticidy jsou možná užitečné, ale užitečnost nelze stavět nad zdravě se rozvíjející společnost. Budeme mít ostatně v následující době možnost ukázat, jak to s pesticidy na našem evropském kontinentu myslíme, protože příslušná zpráva už je projednávána ve Výboru pro životní prostředí, veřejné zdraví a bezpečnost potravin.

Wajid Khan (S&D). – Madam President, the Conservative Party continues down a path that experts have warned will spell disaster. For once, I'm not talking about Brexit, I'm talking about fracking. The government's own studies show that fracking will increase air pollution. The British Geological Service say that water supplies could be contaminated. There have been 37 earthquakes since drilling began at Preston New Road in Lancashire: and what benefit is there to local people? A measly 11 jobs will be created. We don't fracking in Lancashire. The community has said no to fracking; local politicians have said no to fracking; the Labour Party has said no to fracking.

It's hard to imagine the Conservatives doing this in their communities in the Surrey heartlands, but they are running roughshod over the north west of England. It cannot continue. I am proud that Labour MEPs have consistently supported ambitious EU proposals that put the protection of our environment first. And to the communities of Lancashire who feel left behind by the Conservatives, I can tell you now: Labour stands with you and with all those standing against fracking in Lancashire and around Europe.

Josep-Maria Terricabras (Verts/ALE). – Señora presidenta, el pasado mes de octubre fueron asesinados en México Julián Carrillo, líder indígena, Gabriel Soriano Kuri, periodista, y Noel Castillo Aguilar, defensor de los derechos de los indígenas.

Según las Naciones Unidas, solo en 2018 han sido asesinados en México diez periodistas y doce defensores.

La renovación del Acuerdo Global entre la Unión Europea y México está a punto de concluirse, pero es fundamental que aparezca en él una cláusula democrática que nos vincule a todos. No debe haber negocio sin ética.

Por ello es importante que la cláusula democrática tenga garantías, pueda ser controlada, revisada, denunciado su incumplimiento por parte de organizaciones civiles y defensores indígenas de la Tierra y del medio ambiente.

La esperanza que nos llega con la elección del presidente López Obrador debe concretarse en un texto fuerte, riguroso, realmente defensor de la democracia y de la justicia para México y para la Unión Europea. Lo contrario sería un desengaño terrible e incomprensible.

Lynn Boylan (GUE/NGL). – Madam President, there has been lots of talk about the rise of right-wing populism and how the Centre must hold in next year's elections. Well, last month, Ireland had its first test of right-wing politics, and while the vast majority of the electorate rejected it, we cannot ignore that 23.1% chose to vote for a candidate that preached division. This time, it wasn't anti-refugee or anti-Islam, but instead he chose to target the traveller community and those on social welfare.

Those of us who believe in equality must stand up and make our voices heard in rejecting the politics of hate and fear, and we must call it out wherever it manifest itself. But we must also address the root causes of discontent among those who vote for such candidates. Lack of housing, insecure work, and the politics of pitting one group of individuals against another are simply the outworkings of the neoliberal economic model loved by the so-called 'centrist' parties in this House. If we really want to defeat right-wing populism, then we must defeat centrist politics.

Csaba Sógor (PPE). – Legutóbbi plenáris ülésünkön az Európai Bizottság elnöke Románia közelgő nemzeti ünnepe alkalmából arról beszélt, hogy az egyben Európa ünnepe is. Én is szeretném, ha ez így lenne, de ehhez meg kell néznünk pontosan, hogy minek a 100 éves évfordulója lesz december 1-jén. Annak a Gyulafehérvári Nyilatkozatnak, amelyben kimondták Erdély Romániához való csatolásának igényét, ám amelyben több fontos ígéretet is megfogalmaztak, például hogy az Erdélyben élő különböző népek számára teljes nemzeti szabadságot biztosítanak, és azt, hogy – idézem – „minden nép saját kebeléből való egyének által", saját nyelvén fog élni a közoktatással közigazgatással és igazságszolgáltatással. Ez tulajdonképpen területi autonómiát jelent a többségében magyarok által lakott Székelyföldön és személyi autonómiát az Erdélyben és más részein élő kisebbségeknek, köztük a magyaroknak.

Ezeket az ígéreteket nem váltotta be a román állam, ezért mi akkor tudjuk ünnepelni a nyilatkozat százéves évfordulóját, amikor ezek megvalósulnak. Juncker úr utalást tett az Erdélyben élő szászokra is: sajnálatos és elgondolkoztató az a tény, hogy a 100 évvel ezelőtt több mint félmilliós német kisebbségből mára alig pár ezer maradt Erdélyben.

Giuseppe Ferrandino (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, negli ultimi dieci giorni, in Italia, sono morte 37 persone a causa di alluvioni. Nelle stesse ore, il governo ha inserito nel decreto Genova misure per le zone colpite dagli ultimi eventi sismici, invece di legiferare seriamente in materia di ricostruzione. Perché ricostruzione significa che lo Stato assiste i propri cittadini, nel pieno rispetto delle regole italiane e comunitarie, individuali e sicure, ed assicura una casa a chi l'ha persa, senza perdersi in cavilli e burocrazia.

Dal governo, invece, sono arrivate solo ipotesi di sanatorie che non aiutano chi ha perso la propria abitazione, ma generano solo false aspettative perché allungano i tempi senza offrire una soluzione. Approcciare a una questione così complicata con tanta superficialità, solo per massimizzare il risultato alle prossime europee, è una sconfitta per la politica e per i cittadini.

Ma ci sono aspetti di gran lunga peggiori di questa vicenda. Il governo italiano ha rigettato un finanziamento di ben 800 milioni dalla BEI per la mitigazione del rischio idrogeologico. È evidente la mancanza di lungimiranza di questa scelta, mentre noi chiediamo di escludere dai vincoli di bilancio i fondi per tali importanti e vitali opere.

Maria Gabriela Zoană (S&D). – Doamna președintă, România este un stat european cu valori europene, al cărei popor a fost cel mai entuziast la vestea aderării dintre toate popoarele statelor membre care au fost primite în marea familie europeană după 1990. În 2007 românii își exprimau într-o proporție covârșitoare încrederea în Uniunea Europeană într-un procent care depășea 65 %. Fac un apel la toți colegii europarlamentari să depună un efort pentru a înțelege aceste lucruri înaintea votului de mâine. Orice vot împotriva României va crea un precedent periculos pentru oricare stat membru și va separa vestul de estul Europei.

Rezoluția referitoare la România arată că mulți dintre colegii care vor vota în favoarea ei nu au înțeles faptul că România este un stat de drept, cu valori proeuropene, în care Constituția, legile țării și voința poporului primează. Această rezoluție demonstrează că mulți colegi europeni nu au înțeles că românii au dreptul să își exprime voința în cadrul unui referendum, indiferent dacă rezultatul acestuia ne place sau nu și că cetățenii români au exact aceleași drepturi și privilegii ca orice alt cetățean european. Vă rog, doamna președintă, vă rog, stimați colegi, gândiți-vă mâine înainte de a vă da votul în ceea ce privește rezoluția pentru România.

Răzvan Popa (S&D). – Doamna președintă, stimați colegi, România s-a dovedit un partener onest al Uniunii Europene și o țară care nu s-a abătut de la calea sa europeană. Nimic nu este acum diferit din acest punct de vedere. Cetățenii români sunt susținători fără rezerve ai proiectului european, guvernul României a arătat deschidere către Parlamentul European și către toate instituțiile europene iar acest lucru trebuie apreciat. Tocmai de aceea consider că agenda unor politicieni sau grupuri politice nu ar trebui să construiască și agenda Parlamentului European. Discuțiile din România privesc exclusiv problemele politice interne și, ca atare, nu pot accepta opinii părtinitoare, așa cum sunt cele ale liderilor de dreapta.

Solicit colegilor eurodeputați să fie corecți față de România la votul de mâine pe o rezoluție care reprezintă o acțiune nejustificată și să o trateze cu înțelepciune, nu într-o cheie politicianistă sau electorală. Uniunea Europeană are nevoie de solidaritate, iar acest lucru nu se poate realiza decât dacă suntem ghidați de corectitudine în deciziile ce privesc statele membre.

Rory Palmer (S&D). – Madam President, I'm not sure there's ever been a time in my lifetime when there's been a greater need for free, independent journalism. But this is also a time when we see journalists facing persecution and violence here in the European Union and across the world.

The Nottingham branch of the National Union of Journalists have recently written to me to raise their concerns about the persecution of journalists – their colleagues – across the world. I know those concerns will be shared by journalists, unions and federations across Europe and indeed across the world, and they have my solidarity. We need journalists to help speak truth to power and to help ask the difficult questions. Every journalist everywhere must be able to go about their work free of harassment, intimidation, bullying and violence. That's a right that we in this European Parliament and in the European Union must ensure is upheld everywhere.

Andrejs Mamikins (S&D). – Madam President, traditional parties in Europe are being defeated in the recent elections. Why? I dare say that the problem is not in the economic situation and not even in the refugee crisis, but in the rapid decline in the significance of Europe in the world.

The population of Greater Europe at the beginning of the 20th century was one-third of the world population. Now the share has dropped to 12%, and by 2050 the Europeans will be only 7% of the world's population. The share of the EU economy by 2050 will be reduced from the current 15% to 9% of the global economy. Visible changes have already occurred, but not only have they become visible to society, but the loss of significance of Europe leads to the loss of many past advantages, and people feel that. This is not a reason for fear and panic, but a reason for honest re-thinking. Then there will be less surprises and more useful solutions for our citizens.

Elnök asszony. – A napirendi pont ezzel lezárul.

21. Tagesordnung der nächsten Sitzung: siehe Protokoll

22. Schluss der Sitzung

(Az ülést 22.44-kor rekesztik be.)

Legende der verwendeten Zeichen

*	Konsultationsverfahren
***	Zustimmungsverfahren
***I	Ordentliches Gesetzgebungsverfahren, erste Lesung
***II	Ordentliches Gesetzgebungsverfahren, zweite Lesung
***III	Ordentliches Gesetzgebungsverfahren, dritte Lesung

(Das angegebene Verfahren entspricht der von der Kommission vorgeschlagenen Rechtsgrundlage.)

Abkürzungen der Ausschüsse

AFET	Ausschuss für auswärtige Angelegenheiten
DEVE	Entwicklungsausschuss
INTA	Ausschuss für internationalen Handel
BUDG	Haushaltsausschuss
CONT	Haushaltskontrollausschuss
ECON	Ausschuss für Wirtschaft und Währung
EMPL	Ausschuss für Beschäftigung und soziale Angelegenheiten
ENVI	Ausschuss für Umweltfragen, öffentliche Gesundheit und Lebensmittelsicherheit
ITRE	Ausschuss für Industrie, Forschung und Energie
IMCO	Ausschuss für Binnenmarkt und Verbraucherschutz
TRAN	Ausschuss für Verkehr und Fremdenverkehr
REGI	Ausschuss für regionale Entwicklung
AGRI	Ausschuss für Landwirtschaft und ländliche Entwicklung
PECH	Fischereiausschuss
CULT	Ausschuss für Kultur und Bildung
JURI	Rechtsausschuss
LIBE	Ausschuss für bürgerliche Freiheiten, Justiz und Inneres
AFCO	Ausschuss für konstitutionelle Fragen
FEMM	Ausschuss für die Rechte der Frau und die Gleichstellung der Geschlechter
PETI	Petitionsausschuss

DROI	Unterausschuss Menschenrechte
SEDE	Unterausschuss Sicherheit und Verteidigung

Abkürzungen der Fraktionen

PPE	Fraktion der Europäischen Volkspartei (Christdemokraten)
S&D	Fraktion der Progressiven Allianz der Sozialdemokraten im Europäischen Parlament
ECR	Fraktion der Europäischen Konservativen und Reformer
ALDE	Fraktion der Allianz der Liberalen und Demokraten für Europa
GUE/NGL	Konföderale Fraktion der Vereinigten Europäischen Linken/Nordische Grüne Linke
Verts/ALE	Fraktion der Grünen/Freie Europäische Allianz
EFDD	Fraktion Europa der Freiheit und der direkten Demokratie
ENF	Fraktion Europa der Nationen und der Freiheit
NI	Fraktionslos

Amtsblatt
der Europäischen Union

DE
Reihe C

C/2024/3537

7.6.2024

AUSFÜHRLICHE SITZUNGSBERICHTE VOM 14. NOVEMBER 2018

(C/2024/3537)

EUROPÄISCHES PARLAMENT

SITZUNGSPERIODE 2018-2019

Sitzungen vom 12. bis 15. November 2018

STRASSBURG

Inhalt

Seite

1. Eröffnung der Sitzung 4
2. Verhandlungen vor der ersten Lesung des Parlaments (Artikel 69c GO) (Billigung): siehe Protokoll 4
3. Aussprache über Fälle von Verletzungen der Menschenrechte, der Demokratie und der Rechtsstaatlichkeit (eingereichte Entschließungsanträge): siehe Protokoll 4
4. Notwendigkeit eines umfassenden Mechanismus für Demokratie, Rechtsstaatlichkeit und die Grundrechte (Bekanntgabe der eingereichten Entschließungsanträge): siehe Protokoll 4
5. Durchführungsmaßnahmen (Artikel 106 GO): siehe Protokoll 4
6. Delegierte Rechtsakte (Artikel 105 Absatz 6 GO): siehe Protokoll 4
7. Europäischer Kodex für elektronische Kommunikation – Gremium Europäischer Regulierungsstellen für elektronische Kommunikation (Aussprache) 4
8. CO_2-Emissionsnormen für neue schwere Nutzfahrzeuge (Aussprache) 18
9. Wiederaufnahme der Sitzung 31
10. Feierliche Sitzung – Südafrika 31
11. Wiederaufnahme der Sitzung 35
12. Mitteilung des Präsidenten 36

Inhalt Seite

13. Zusammensetzung des Parlaments: siehe Protokoll 37

14. Abstimmungsstunde 37

14.1. Zwischenbericht über den Mehrjährigen Finanzrahmen 2021-2027: Standpunkt des Parlaments im Hinblick auf eine Einigung (A8-0358/2018 - Jan Olbrycht, Isabelle Thomas, Janusz Lewandowski, Gérard Deprez) (Abstimmung) 37

14.2. Bestimmungen zu staatlichen Beihilfen: neue Gruppen von staatlichen Beihilfen (A8-0315/2018 - Sander Loones) (Abstimmung) 38

14.3. Waffenexporte und die Umsetzung des Gemeinsamen Standpunkts 2008/944/GASP (A8-0335/2018 - Sabine Lösing) (Abstimmung) 38

14.4. Stärkung der Wettbewerbsbehörden zur Gewährleistung des reibungslosen Funktionierens des Binnenmarkts (A8-0057/2018 - Andreas Schwab) (Abstimmung) 38

14.5. Europäischer Kodex für elektronische Kommunikation (A8-0318/2017 - Pilar del Castillo Vera) (Abstimmung) 38

14.6. Gremium Europäischer Regulierungsstellen für elektronische Kommunikation (A8-0305/2017 - Evžen Tošenovský) (Abstimmung) 38

14.7. CO_2-Emissionsnormen für neue schwere Nutzfahrzeuge (A8-0354/2018 - Bas Eickhout) (Abstimmung) 38

14.8. Notwendigkeit eines umfassenden Mechanismus für Demokratie, Rechtsstaatlichkeit und die Grundrechte (B8-0523/2018, B8-0524/2018) (Abstimmung) 38

14.9. Umsetzung des Assoziierungsabkommens zwischen der EU und Georgien (A8-0320/2018 - Andrejs Mamikins) (Abstimmung) 38

14.10. Umsetzung des Assoziierungsabkommens zwischen der EU und der Republik Moldau (A8-0322/2018 - Petras Auštrevičius) (Abstimmung) 39

14.11. Visa aus humanitären Gründen (A8-0328/2018 - Juan Fernando López Aguilar) (Abstimmung) 39

15. Stimmerklärungen 40

15.1. Zwischenbericht über den Mehrjährigen Finanzrahmen 2021-2027: Standpunkt des Parlaments im Hinblick auf eine Einigung (A8-0358/2018 - Jan Olbrycht, Isabelle Thomas, Janusz Lewandowski, Gérard Deprez) 40

15.2. Waffenexporte und die Umsetzung des Gemeinsamen Standpunkts 2008/944/GASP (A8-0335/2018 - Sabine Lösing) 42

15.3. Stärkung der Wettbewerbsbehörden zur Gewährleistung des reibungslosen Funktionierens des Binnenmarkts (A8-0057/2018 - Andreas Schwab) 43

15.4. CO_2-Emissionsnormen für neue schwere Nutzfahrzeuge (A8-0354/2018 - Bas Eickhout) 44

15.5. Notwendigkeit eines umfassenden Mechanismus für Demokratie, Rechtsstaatlichkeit und die Grundrechte (B8-0523/2018, B8-0524/2018) 44

15.6. Umsetzung des Assoziierungsabkommens zwischen der EU und Georgien (A8-0320/2018 - Andrejs Mamikins) 46

15.7. Umsetzung des Assoziierungsabkommens zwischen der EU und der Republik Moldau (A8-0322/2018 - Petras Auštrevičius) 46

Inhalt Seite

15.8. Visa aus humanitären Gründen (A8-0328/2018 - Juan Fernando López Aguilar) 47

16. Berichtigungen des Stimmverhaltens und beabsichtigtes Stimmverhalten: siehe Protokoll 48

17. Wiederaufnahme der Sitzung 48

18. Genehmigung des Protokolls der vorangegangenen Sitzung: siehe Protokoll 48

19. Vorlage von Dokumenten: siehe Protokoll 48

20. Mittelübertragungen und Haushaltsbeschlüsse: siehe Protokoll 48

21. Stärkung der Widerstandsfähigkeit der EU gegen den Einfluss ausländischer Akteure auf die anstehende Wahlkampagne des EP (Aussprache über ein aktuelles Thema) 48

22. Rechte und Pflichten der Fahrgäste im Eisenbahnverkehr (Aussprache) 76

23. Persistente organische Schadstoffe (Aussprache) 91

24. Unabhängigkeit statistischer Ämter in der Europäischen Union und der Fall von Andreas Georgiou (Aussprache) 98

25. Europäische Sicherheit und die Zukunft des INF-Vertrags (Aussprache) 108

26. Reaktion der USA auf die Karawane mittelamerikanischer Migranten an der mexikanischen Grenze (Aussprache) 116

27. Extraterritoriale Auswirkungen der US-Sanktionen gegen Iran auf europäische Unternehmen (Aussprache) . 124

28. Tagesordnung der nächsten Sitzung 131

29. Schluss der Sitzung 131

AUSFÜHRLICHE SITZUNGSBERICHTE VOM 14. NOVEMBER 2018

PRÉSIDENCE: SYLVIE GUILLAUME

vice-présidente

1. Eröffnung der Sitzung

(La séance est ouverte à 9 h 02)

2. Verhandlungen vor der ersten Lesung des Parlaments (Artikel 69c GO) (Billigung): siehe Protokoll

3. Aussprache über Fälle von Verletzungen der Menschenrechte, der Demokratie und der Rechtsstaatlichkeit (eingereichte Entschließungsanträge): siehe Protokoll

4. Notwendigkeit eines umfassenden Mechanismus für Demokratie, Rechtsstaatlichkeit und die Grundrechte (Bekanntgabe der eingereichten Entschließungsanträge): siehe Protokoll

5. Durchführungsmaßnahmen (Artikel 106 GO): siehe Protokoll

6. Delegierte Rechtsakte (Artikel 105 Absatz 6 GO): siehe Protokoll

7. Europäischer Kodex für elektronische Kommunikation – Gremium Europäischer Regulierungsstellen für elektronische Kommunikation (Aussprache)

La Présidente. – L'ordre du jour appelle la discussion commune sur:

— le rapport de Pilar del Castillo Vera, au nom de la commission de l'industrie, de la recherche et de l'énergie sur la proposition de directive du Parlement européen et du Conseil établissant le code des communications électroniques européen (refonte) (COM(2016)0590 – C8-0379/2016 – 2016/0288(COD)) (A8-0318/2017), et

— le rapport de Evžen Tošenovský, au nom de la commission de l'industrie, de la recherche et de l'énergie sur la proposition de règlement du Parlement européen et du Conseil établissant l'Organe des régulateurs européens des communications électroniques (COM(2016) 0591 – C8-0382/2016 – 2016/0286(COD)) (A8-0305/2017).

Pilar del Castillo Vera, *ponente*. – Señora presidenta, señor vicepresidente Ansip, queridos colegas, vamos a votar hoy la nueva regulación europea sobre comunicaciones electrónicas. La última es del año 2009 y, desde entonces, se han producido cambios tecnológicos extraordinarios, cambios que han afectado a los modelos de negocio, a los intereses de los usuarios, a las experiencias también de los propios consumidores y que han transformado absolutamente el panorama de las comunicaciones electrónicas.

Hay que empezar diciendo que la conectividad ha sido siempre la precondición, la condición necesaria para los avances extraordinarios que se han conocido en la humanidad, sobre todo en el siglo XX de mano de la tecnología.

Pensemos, por ejemplo, en qué situación estaríamos si no hubiera habido una infraestructura de carreteras, de ferrocarriles, de radio, de telefonía o de transporte aéreo: seguro que la situación de nuestra economía y el desarrollo de nuestra sociedad sería muy, muy distinta.

Hoy estamos en una situación similar, donde la conectividad es una condición necesaria y urgente para que la Unión Europea pueda aprovechar el potencial de las tecnologías digitales más avanzadas, como internet de las cosas, *big data*, inteligencia artificial, robótica, computación cuántica y un largo etcétera.

Son tecnologías que se están abriendo paso, que se están abriendo camino de una manera extraordinaria, a una velocidad muy, muy elevada y están a la espera de contar con la capacidad de conexión que necesitan para poder desarrollarse plenamente y así desplegar todo su potencial de nuevas oportunidades para la economía y la sociedad. Pensemos en las posibilidades de desarrollo del 5G que puede ofrecernos para el futuro —para un futuro muy cercano— como, por ejemplo: realizar intervenciones quirúrgicas a larga distancia; los trabajos de alto riesgo que se pueden realizar desde un lugar seguro; o para los propios agricultores, para el sector de la agricultura, que, obteniendo datos en tiempos reales, pueden mejorar muchísimo las explotaciones agrarias.

Por todas estas razones, el nuevo marco regulatorio, además del mercado digital, refuerza y sitúa la conectividad como espina dorsal de esta regulación del mercado de las comunicaciones electrónicas. Incluye una serie de medidas para ello, medidas que van a atraer la inversión, a hacer más atractiva la inversión, como los modelos de coinversión, una mejor y más armonizada gestión del espectro radioeléctrico, mejorando la duración de las licencias con una duración mínima, por ejemplo, de veinte años.

El Código obliga además a todos los Estados miembros a liberar y permitir el uso de las conocidas bandas 5G antes del final de 2020 y, en la protección de los consumidores, establece y mejora los servicios de emergencia, dando más oportunidades de localización en caso de catástrofe, además de introducir una reducción muy significativa de las llamadas paneuropeas, de las llamadas intraeuropeas, lo que, después de la desaparición de los costes del *roaming*, es una muy buena noticia también para los ciudadanos.

En suma, el Código Europeo de las Comunicaciones Electrónicas está destinado a desempeñar un papel fundamental en la digitalización de Europa y lo hace poniendo la conectividad en su corazón.

Evžen Tošenovský, *zpravodaj*. – Paní předsedající, pane komisaři, dovolte mi začít poděkováním kolegyni Pilar Del Castillové, která odvedla v rámci kodexu vynikající práci. Kodex a BEREC jsou úzce provázány, od začátku jsme s paní Pilar Del Castillovou postupovali koordinovaně a nakonec oba návrhy úspěšně uzavřeli na společném trialogu.

Kodex přináší pro BEREC celou řadu nových úkolů, které bylo zapotřebí reflektovat v této zprávě. Otázka speciálních hlasovacích pravidel v radě regulátorů se ukázala jako nejproblematičtější bod závěrečného trialogu a velmi nám pomohla Komise jako mediátor. Nařízení BEREC podle dohody hostí i kapitolu původně dohodnutou v kodexu k regulaci volání v rámci Evropské unie. Nebylo by proto fér, aby toto bylo připisováno k výsledku zprávy BEREC.

Obecně oceňuji kompromis ke kodexu, věřím, že se usnadní rozvoj vysokorychlostních sítí jako předpokladu 5G, tak jak zde Pilar Del Castillová před chvílí zmínila. Z pozice naší politické skupiny jsem rád, že výsledný text ponechává více flexibility členským státům v oblasti spektra a nejsou do něj nakonec zahrnuty jednotná autorizace nebo takzvaný *double lock*.

Zpět k jádru zprávy o sdružení BEREC – struktura sdružení BEREC a podpůrného úřadu BEREC byla výsledkem politické dohody z roku 2009. Nyní Komise navrhla jejich spojení vytvořením jedné velké agentury.

Jako zpravodaj jsem se na začátku snažil posbírat z různých zdrojů informace o tom, zda je tato dvojitá struktura funkční, s kolegy jsme podnikli i misi Výboru pro průmysl, výzkum a energetiku do Rigy. Nejsem příznivcem zásadních dramatických změn tam, kde něco dobře funguje, a pozitivní hodnocení zde v rámci sdružení BEREC silně převažovalo. Dále jsme reflektovali obavy o nezávislost rozhodování regulátorů. Potřebujeme skutečnou nezávislost regulátorů, a to na úrovni členských států i Evropské unie. Jejich odstup od národních vlád a Evropské komise byl proto důležitý. Proto jsem navrhl odmítnout spojení sdružení BEREC a podpůrného úřadu BEREC a soustředit se spíše na drobná vylepšení tak, jak probíhala diskuse.

Přesto byl Evropský parlament v této základní otázce rozdělen, některé politické skupiny preferovaly spojení navržené Komisí. Nakonec nám ke kompromisu na půdě Výboru pro průmysl, výzkum a energetiku pomohly nové úkoly pro BEREC stanovené právě v kodexu, konkrétně nově zaváděné arbitrážní rozhodování sdružení BEREC, které by bylo právně závazné. V důsledku toho by také BEREC obdržel právní subjektivitu. V rámci trialogů s Radou a Komisí jsme pak postupovali opačně – v kodexu nakonec právně závazná rozhodnutí nebudou, a proto zachováváme stávající strukturu i status sdružení BEREC jako nezávislého sdružení regulátorů. Je mi přitom jasné, že všichni kolegové vlastně ani nemohou být v této nejzákladnější otázce zcela spokojeni.

Mé velké poděkování každopádně patří všem stínovým zpravodajům. Myslím, že se nám podařilo dohodnout rozumnou modernizaci pravidel, tak aby byl BEREC efektivní, mohl plnit nové úkoly z kodexu, přispívat k jednotné aplikaci regulatorního rámce pro telekomunikace a k otevření jednotného trhu Evropské unie.

Dita Charanzová, *rapporteur for the opinion of the Committee on the Internal Market and Consumer Protection*. – Madam President, today we are giving our citizens concrete achievements. This 500-page law will mean a future of cheaper calls, safer citizens, faster internet, better access for persons with disabilities, and a final confirmation that internet access is no longer a luxury but a right.

From 15 May next year, everyone will be able to make cheaper calls. International EU rates have been unjustly high for too long. The end of roaming in Europe was a great success, but we stopped half way. I am proud and humbled to have led Parliament to complete the final step in creating an EU where country codes are obsolete and where consumers can call anyone without worrying about the price. Also, every citizen will now have a right to an affordable internet connection. As more and more services, including government services, go online, it is unthinkable to be without internet access today. The internet must be seen as a utility like electricity and gas.

Finally, I want to highlight the introduction of the mobile public warning system. In the 21st century, citizens should not have to rely on rumours to know what is happening in the case of an attack or emergency. There is much more, but I'm running out of time, so let me just thank the rapporteur, Pilar del Castillo Vera, and all my fellow shadow rapporteurs who worked on this proposal.

Andrus Ansip, *Vice-President of the Commission*. – Madam President, updating the EU's telecom rules is an essential step in building the Digital Single Market. For that, two pieces of legislation will be vital: the European Electronic Communications Code and the Regulation on BEREC (the Body of European Regulators for Electronic Communications). Together, they create the legal conditions that will allow us to meet Europe's growing connectivity needs and to boost its competitiveness.

We have succeeded in providing a legal environment for European telecoms that is both investment-friendly and pro-competitive. This is something very much to be welcomed. We should not underestimate the significance of this achievement. I would like to thank the rapporteurs, Pilar del Castillo Vera, Dita Charanzová and Evžen Tošenovský, for their impressive work. The code will lay the groundwork for developing 5G across Europe. It will make sure that 5G radio spectrum is available in the EU by the end of 2020 and will give operators predictability for spectrum licensing for at least 20 years. That includes better coordination of planned radio spectrum assignments and specific rules regarding radio spectrum fees.

Rolling out new, very high-capacity networks is crucial for putting Europe at the forefront of digital innovation. The code's new provisions, including those on core investments, offer strong incentives for deploying these new networks. The new rules ensure close cooperation between the Commission and BEREC on supervising measures related to the new access provisions.

Europeans expect an internet connection that is fast, reliable, affordable and safe. The code will allow that expectation to become a reality. Consumers will benefit from advanced services and from better online protection. It harmonises end-user protection of electronic communications in the EU, whether in relation to bundled services, switching providers or stronger security against hacking. We have extended the end-user protection obligations to web-based services where that makes sense.

Two more important things are to be welcomed: firstly, that the universal service will guarantee that everyone can afford access to an adequate broadband internet service; and secondly, that end-users with disabilities are guaranteed equivalent access to communications. We have also strengthened people's protection in emergency situations, including through the retrieval of more accurate caller location.

The forthcoming vote will be a significant step for the Digital Single Market and for Europe.

Ivan Štefanec, *spravodajca Výboru pre vnútorný trh a ochranu spotrebiteľa požiadaného o stanovisko*. – Pani predsedajúca, jednotný trh pre elektronické komunikácie je jadrom digitálnej ekonomiky, a preto je nevyhnutné posilniť odvetvie elektronickej komunikácie a poskytnúť vysokokvalitnú konektivitu vo všetkých odvetviach európskeho hospodárstva. Cieľom orgánu BEREC je predovšetkým zlepšiť harmonizáciu právnych predpisov a posilniť nezávislosť vnútroštátnych regulačných orgánov. Som presvedčený, že súčasné inštitucionálne usporiadanie založené na nezávislosti národných regulačných orgánov od Komisie a iných inštitúcií Únie, umožňuje BEREC-u poskytovať nezávislé a odborné poradenstvo a pokračovať v spolupráci s inými inštitúciami Únie. Prostredníctvom svojich stanovísk a odporúčaní môže BEREC radiť orgánom Únie a vnútroštátnym regulačným orgánom ako efektívnejšie využívať elektronické komunikácie, poukazovať na nedostatky pri ich využívaní, dozerať na ochranu spotrebiteľa a taktiež zabezpečovať spoluprácu medzi ostatnými regulačnými orgánmi. Podporujem teda ponechanie štruktúry dvojakého riadenia a je dôležité, aby zloženie BEREC-u pozostávalo zo zástupcov jednotlivých národných regulačných orgánov, čo prispieva k lepšej regulácii medzi členskými štátmi, a tým sa podporí rozvoj trhu v Únii pre občanov.

Petra Kammerevert, *Verfasserin der Stellungnahme des mitberatenden Ausschusses für Kultur und Bildung*. – Frau Präsidentin! Dem Kulturausschuss ist es besonders wichtig, dass dem GEREK die Aufgabe zukommt, kulturelle und mediale Vielfalt zu sichern. Darüber zu wachen, dass der Zugang zu Kommunikationsnetzen nicht diskriminiert wird, sei es durch Unternehmensfusionen oder durch technologische Neuerungen, wirkt Vielfalt sichernd. Alles dafür zu tun, jede Form des Datenverkehrs möglichst gleichzubehandeln, wirkt ebenfalls Vielfalt sichernd.

Trotz anfänglicher Skepsis lässt sich feststellen, dass das GEREK zur Wahrung der Netzneutralität gute Arbeit geleistet und damit allen Europäerinnen und Europäern einen Dienst erwiesen hat. Die Gewährleistung von Neutralität, Fairness und Diskriminierungsfreiheit bleibt eine große Herausforderung, und wir statten heute das GEREK mit den notwendigen Mitteln aus, um dies anzugehen.

Auch der europäische Kodex für elektronische Kommunikation ist im Sinne von Diskriminierungsfreiheit verfasst. Es ist essenziell, dass allen Bürgerinnen und Bürgern ein erschwinglicher, universeller, verfügbarer Internetanschluss zur Verfügung steht. Auch für das Radio als einer wichtigen Informationsquelle ist der Umstieg zum Digitalempfang wichtig. Deshalb begrüßen wir, dass alle neuen Autos in den nächsten zwei Jahren für den Empfang mit digital-terrestrischem Rundfunk ausgestattet sein müssen. Ausdrücklich zu begrüßen ist auch, dass Frequenzen im Kodex auch weiterhin als öffentliches Gut anerkannt werden.

Morten Helveg Petersen, *ordfører for udtalelse fra Udvalget om Borgernes Rettigheder og Retlige og Indre Anliggender*. – Fru formand! Vi er midt i den nye digitale tidsalder, og det stiller ekstra store krav til os alle om at skabe de bedst tænkelige rammer for de europæiske brugere og de europæiske borgere. Vores fællesskab er bedst for Europas borgere og virksomheder, når vi frit kan rejse, handle og ikke mindst kommunikere over grænser uden forhindringer. Og det er jo sådan set det, som denne telepakke handler om. Vi i den liberale gruppe er glade for, at det er lykkedes at sikre et hurtigere og bedre internet i hele Europa. Vi er glade for, at det er lykkedes, at det bliver billigere at ringe fra et EU-land til et andet, og vi er rigtig glade for, at der med dette forslag etableres et såkaldt omvendt 112-system, hvor vi som borgere kan få beskeder på mobiltelefonen, hvis der måtte opstå en nødsituation. Jeg synes personligt, at det omvendte 112-system er en fantastisk ide. Under det skrækkelige terrorangreb i Bruxelles husker jeg, hvordan vi ikke vidste, hvad der skete, andet end hvad vi kunne læse om via nyhederne, men med det omvendte 112-system vil vi som

borgere kunne modtage sikker information fra vores myndigheder. Det vil helt konkret kunne komme til at redde liv til gavn for os alle, til gavn for europæerne, og det skal vi være glade for, så stor tak for samarbejdet med de øvrige ordførere. Det er en rigtig fornuftig pakke, vi kan vedtage her i dag!

Krišjānis Kariņš, *PPE grupas vārdā*. – Cienījamie kolēģi! Kā vienmēr, pasaule mainās. Vienmēr tā ir bijis. Pirmās industriālās revolūcijas laikā nāca jaunas tehnoloģijas, kuras radikāli izmainīja cilvēku dzīves. Ja agrāk cilvēki pārsvarā strādāja lauku darbos, varbūt mežsaimniecībā, zivsaimniecībā, veidojās jaunas industrijas, rūpnīcas, pilnīgi jauna darba vide, mūsu, teiksim, vecvectēvi pielāgojās šādiem apstākļiem. Mēs šodien dzīvojam nākamajā revolūcijas ērā, tā saucamajā digitālajā revolūcijā, kad atkal mainās viss darba tirgus, mainās visas iespējas. Un, ja varbūt vēl pirms 50 gadiem daudzi cilvēki burtiski strādāja rūpnīcās, tagad jau rūpnīcās strādā roboti, bet cilvēki ir tie, kas veido nākotnes robotus, veido nākotnes iespējas. Izaicinājums mums šīs te digitālās revolūcijas laikmetā ir tas, ka tās jau ir tehnoloģijas, kuras ir attīstījušās. Eiropā mums ir izveidojies ļoti saskaldīts tirgus — katrā dalībvalstī drusku citādi lietas veidojās. Tas ir arī ietekmējis telekomunikācijas un tā tālāk. Bet mēs zinām, ka Eiropa konkurē pasaules globālajā tirgū: pretī ir Amerikas Savienotās Valstis ar vienotu tirgu 330 miljoniem cilvēku, pretī ir Ķīna ar 1,3 miljardiem iedzīvotāju. Eiropā mums ar 500 miljoniem ir milzu potenciāls, bet liela saskaldētība. Tas, ko dod šī telekomunikāciju pakotne, par ko mēs šodien runājam, ir vienota pieeja, vienota infrastruktūra visai šai jomai. Tātad patērētājiem tas nozīmē telefonsarunas, par kurām nav jāmaksā dārgāk, ja brauc citviet Eiropā, tātad — vienotu tirgu telekomunikācijām. Tas nozīmē vienkāršotu, drošu pieeju internetam. Un industrijai tas nozīmē skaidrus nosacījumus, kā varēs tālāk attīstīt tehnoloģijas, kā, piemēram tā saucamās 5G tehnoloģijas, kas būs nākotnes atslēga autonomai automašīnu vadīšanai, veselības aprūpei un tā tālāk. Atbalstām šo pakotni, atbalstām savu ekonomisko attīstību. Paldies jums par uzmanību!

Miapetra Kumpula-Natri, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Madam President, one of the great drivers we have in our society that is spreading good is information technology. It has made our lives easier, brought with it new services and technologies, but we haven't seen it all yet. The change has only just begun.

This morning I came from Paris where I had the privilege to head the Parliament's delegation to the Internet Governance Forum. Europe is at the forefront of the digital revolution but we need to cooperate with the rest of the world and we have to make sure that we have common goals for the right use of the digital tools. To deliver that digital revolution, we need this European Electronic Communications Code. If we want better digital services, we need better digital infrastructure. If we want connected cars or if we want e-health solutions, we need fast 5G. If we want our schools and universities and businesses to thrive, we need gigabit connectivity to use artificial intelligence and cloud computing. If we want to see the next ground-breaking services to make our lives better, we need fast internet connections for all homes and mobile devices. Internet connectivity is a modern right for every European and we have defined what a very high capacity network is. It's not just in these connections that you see that you are connected but your program doesn't work anyway. We need fibre to boost things and we need more very good connections.

The key problem we're trying to solve here is how we can get faster, better and cheaper connections. We need this for all Europeans while maintaining the right conditions for investment so that it can happen. The outcome here today, agreed after eight months of trialogues and negotiations, reflects the Parliament position well. We have achieved the goal of promoting investments while making sure that consumers in Europe retain the right to choose their operators. The new rules for co-investments are complex and some details will be up to national implementation, but the message is clear: there can be no turning back to the monopolies.

One key technology for revolution is 5G and very fast connections. It's high time for Member States to see that we need common rules for spectrum as well, and we need the spectrum bands to be out there at the latest by 2020. With this legislation I am very happy to continue to 'roam like home' but to turn it the other way round, so next summer everyone can enjoy calling friends in other EU countries for a maximum of 19 cents per minute.

(The speaker agreed to take a blue-card question under Rule 162(8))

Paul Rübig (PPE), *Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“*. – Meine Frage geht in die Richtung: Glauben Sie, dass es möglich sein wird, eine SIM-Karte auf Dauer in allen europäischen Ländern kaufen zu können? Derzeit können wir nur SIM-Karten auf Dauer in den eigenen Mitgliedstaaten kaufen. Bis wann wird es möglich sein, dass wir einen echten digitalen Binnenmarkt kriegen?

Und glauben Sie, dass sich auch auf globaler Ebene etwas ändern kann? Wir zahlen derzeit für 1 GB in Europa 7 Euro, und wenn man außerhalb Europas ist, kostet das 19 500. Glauben Sie, dass hier noch Fortschritte möglich sind?

Miapetra Kumpula-Natri (S&D), *blue-card answer*. – I very much share Mr Rübig's worries. I would like the Commission to react quickly. As we will see the roaming follow-up this year, we see that mobile virtual network operators (MVNOs) cannot join the same retailer operating markets, but then the wholesale market prices are too high – even the ones we agreed with the Council and took down a lot last year. It still shows us that the retail markets for consumers get cheaper prices than the wholesale market caps that we agreed and halved the proposal from the Commission. Even the Council wanted to get it higher. So it's of the utmost importance that we get this functioning, and we need new legislation for that.

Ruža Tomašić, *u ime kluba ECR*. – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, tržište telekomunikacijskih usluga rapidno se mijenja. Novi proizvodi i usluge te promijenjene navike potrošača traže prilagodbu postojećeg zakonskog okvira. Brže, kvalitetnije, fleksibilnije i jeftinije usluge uz maksimalnu zaštitu potrošača, njihovih podataka i privatnosti moraju biti u središtu našeg djelovanja u ovom području.

Telekomi su unutar državnih granica dugo bili moćan oligopol, što je u pojedinim članicama usporavalo razvoj usluga i potrošače stavljalo u nezavidan položaj. Zato smatram da nam jedan od prioriteta mora biti stvaranje jedinstvenog tržišta telekom usluga na kojemu bi natjecanje bilo izraženije, a usluge krajnjim korisnicima bolje i jeftinije. Kako ovaj proces bude napredovao, logičnim smatram osnivanje Europske agencije za telekomunikacije koja bi nadgledala jedinstveno tržište telekom usluga.

(Govornica se složila da odgovori na pitanje podizanjem plave kartice na osnovi članka 162. stavka 8. Poslovnika.)

Maria Grapini (S&D), *întrebare adresată în conformitate cu procedura „cartonașului albastru”*. – Doamna președintă, stimată colegă, sunt de acord cu ce ați spus dumneavoastră. Ați vorbit de protecția datelor, de protecția consumatorilor. Sunt de acord că trebuie să avem un cod european, dar ce părere aveți: suntem în situația în care avem o infrastructură în toate zonele? Ce putem să facem cu zona rurală? Ce putem să facem cu cetățenii care nu au abilitățile de utilizare?

Nu credeți că ar trebui ca acest cod european să fie susținut și de investiții, de un buget pentru zonele îndepărtate și pentru zonele rurale pentru cunoștințe și abilități ale cetățenilor în operare?

Ruža Tomašić (ECR), *odgovor na pitanje postavljeno podizanjem plave kartice*. – Naravno da trebamo, naravno da moramo zajamčiti sigurnost kako bi ljudi u ruralnim područjima ostali u svojim domovima. Moramo im pružiti svu potrebnu infrastrukturu, ali ćemo to tek pružiti kad prestanemo politizirati sve čega se dotaknemo.

Julia Reda, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Madam President, the Telecom Package has undergone quite a transformation since it was first proposed in 2016. First, it was based on the strange notion that the best way to get companies to invest in broadband internet was to reduce competition and to offer deregulation in return for investment. Even the most conservative economists would predict the exact opposite, namely that competition drives innovation and doesn't stifle it.

The Verts/ALE Group has been at the forefront of resisting any deregulation agenda and ensuring that telecom regulators have the necessary powers to regulate. The final deal, thanks to Parliament, is much more balanced than the first draft and is much more ambitious in the field of consumer rights. With the Electronic Communications Code, we're making real improvements to the transparency of contracts, to the ability to take your phone number with you when you switch providers, and to ensuring that everyone has affordable internet access, also recognising community networks. We are making real improvements to people's security, too, by introducing systems that allow people to receive automatic notifications on their phones in the case of disasters.

There's a reason why telecom companies have quite a terrible reputation among consumers. Many people in Europe have the choice between just a small number of providers, and often all the available options are bad. Bad surprises, in the form of ridiculously high phone bills, slow speeds and difficulties in switching providers, are still common.

When we told Europeans years ago that we would abolish roaming, they thought that would mean that wherever you called in Europe, and wherever you used the internet, you would pay the same price. What they soon had to learn was that calling somebody in another EU country is not roaming. That's an intra-EU call – something completely different – where higher prices are considered okay. So it is a great success for Parliament that the proposals from the Greens and the left to abolish charges for intra-EU calls have made it into the final deal, at least in the form of a price cap. That will bring European consumers one step closer to a real single market.

A missed opportunity in the Telecom Package is that of turning the Body of European Regulators for Electronic Communications (BEREC) into a fully-fledged EU regulator. The BEREC Regulation makes some modest improvements, but this Parliament and national governments failed to take the important step of creating an EU regulator with all the powers needed. It's a missed opportunity because global threats to our open internet are becoming bigger. It's not just that the US has abolished Federal net neutrality rules. It's not just that, in Paris this week, Mr Macron said that net neutrality must not stand in the way of internet regulation.

No, Mr Macron, net neutrality is internet regulation, and it's precisely the kind of regulation we need to strengthen. Although the European Union has enshrined net neutrality in law, it has failed to provide a clear and unequivocal ban on zero-rating. The consequence is that today, according to BEREC's own figures, zero-rating still exists in most EU countries and we need to take further steps to ensure that an open internet is available to everybody. I hope that this Telecom Package will be a step in the right direction.

Marisa Matias, *em nome do Grupo GUE/NGL*. – Senhora Presidente, esta legislação relativa ao código apresenta, de facto, elementos muito positivos. Gostaria de salientar alguns, entre eles a independência das autoridades reguladoras nacionais, um sistema de comunicações eletrónicas mais eficaz e mais regulado (isso é fundamental), maiores garantias para os consumidores, sobretudo no que diz respeito a comunicações sobre taxas relacionadas com as comunicações entre os diferentes países, maior velocidade e 5G, mas precisamos também de garantir o acesso igualitário, precisamos de garantir que tudo isto chega a todos os cidadãos.

Há ainda dimensões que têm a ver, por exemplo, com as questões de atualização das regras das telecomunicações e com a resposta que é necessário dar à conectividade entre os diferentes cidadãos e nos diferentes países. Estamos a falar de um pacote que procura seguramente modernizar as atuais regras de telecomunicação, mas nada disto pode ser feito apenas com base na concorrência. Já foi aqui referida a necessidade da regulação e queria chamar a atenção para uma outra questão que me parece fundamental: as comunicações são uma área muito sensível e, portanto, não é apenas de infraestrutura de código que estamos a falar, mas também daquilo que podem ser as ameaças à manutenção e à gestão das comunicações. Por isso, temos de garantir que se mantém a possibilidade de resgatar sempre para o setor público as redes básicas de prestação de serviços de comunicações, como, por exemplo, as redes de gestão de emergências ou, por exemplo, a Proteção Civil ou o sinal audiovisual. Isto é fundamental para impedirmos que alguns desastres possam acontecer nas nossas comunicações.

Marco Zullo, *a nome del gruppo EFDD*. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, il mondo delle telecomunicazioni sta cambiando velocemente. Abbiamo connessioni più prestanti, la concorrenza è sempre più complessa, vi è convergenza di reti fisse e mobili ed è esplosa la domanda dei dati senza fili. Oggi, in risposta a questi significativi cambiamenti strutturali, ci apprestiamo a varare un codice europeo delle telecomunicazioni. Però, se da una parte dobbiamo incoraggiare gli investimenti nelle reti ad elevata capacità, dall'altra dobbiamo assicurare una maggiore competitività dei mercati, abbassando i prezzi e alzando la qualità dei servizi rivolti a consumatori e imprese.

Sono felice che siano state accolte diverse delle nostre richieste che vanno nella direzione di tutelare maggiormente gli utenti. Prima fra tutti l'abbattimento dei costi delle chiamate internazionali tra paesi dell'Unione europea. Queste tariffe non sono affatto collegate ai reali costi sostenuti dai fornitori. Per questo abbiamo chiesto che qualsiasi differenza di prezzo tra le chiamate nazionali e le chiamate intraeuropee venisse eliminata. Purtroppo, questa richiesta è stata accolta solo in parte, però, è importante che sia stato fissato un tetto massimo di 19 centesimi al minuto per le chiamate intraeuropee. Questo, per esempio, in Italia significherà un abbassamento quasi della metà del prezzo di queste chiamate. Spero che i consumatori si renderanno conto di questo cambiamento e che questo sia il primo passo per un abbattimento completo del costo delle chiamate intraeuropee.

Altri successi importanti per la tutela dei consumatori sono le bollette più trasparenti, in modo tale che in bolletta sia fatta esplicita dichiarazione di chi sono i fornitori e della durata dei servizi che poi vengono addebitati, in modo tale che sia chiaro che cosa stiamo pagando. Il cambio di operatore sarà più facile, perché mantenere lo stesso numero e quindi la portabilità è un elemento chiave della libertà di scelta da parte dei consumatori e dell'effettiva concorrenza. Quindi un nuovo numero dovrà essere reso disponibile entro un giorno lavorativo e ci dovranno essere dei rimborsi proporzionati ai ritardi subiti. Tempi certi per il trasferimento della linea, in modo tale che sia concordata con l'utente e sia fatta nel momento in cui si è deciso. Infine, è importante che sia stato intensificato il sostegno agli utenti con disabilità, per esempio, garantendo l'accesso a tutte le informazioni contrattuali e ai servizi d'emergenza. Credo che questo sia un passo importante verso un mercato unico digitale accessibile e trasparente.

Barbara Kappel, *im Namen der ENF-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Kommissar! Ich möchte mich bei Pilar del Castillo und bei Evžen Tošenovský sehr herzlich für ihre Berichte bedanken.

Sie haben sowohl mit dem elektronischen Kommunikationscode als auch mit der GEREK-Verordnung dazu beigetragen, dass in Europa hinkünftig mehr Rechts- und Planungssicherheit im Bereich der Telekommunikation herrschen wird, dass der digitale Binnenmarkt weiterentwickelt wird, gerade was das GEREK betrifft. Sie haben dafür gesorgt, dass mehr Flexibilität in Bezug auf die Regulierung bei den Mitgliedstaaten erhalten bleibt, ohne dabei die Regulierungskompetenz einzuschränken.

Der Ausbau der digitalen Infrastruktur und *digital skills* sind heute – und das hat Kommissar Ansip schon erwähnt – wesentliche Treiber für die Wettbewerbsfähigkeit und somit auch für Wachstum und Beschäftigung in Europa. Allein in Österreich, in meinem Heimatland, würden Investitionen von 10 Mrd. Euro in die digitale Infrastruktur ein BIP-Wachstum von 15 % oder 58 Mrd. Euro auslösen, das ergab eine am Montag dieser Woche präsentierte Studie von Future Business Austria.

Digitale Infrastruktur umfasst den Aufbau von 5G – wir haben es heute schon gehört –, Highspeed-Internet, die Möglichkeit des autonomen Fahrens, das Internet auf*internet of things*, *artificial intelligence* und vieles mehr. Eine wesentliche Voraussetzung dafür ist der europäische Kodex für die elektronische Kommunikation, der mit dazu beitragen wird, dass der Breitbandausbau – insbesondere im ländlichen Raum – forciert wird. Ich glaube, da war heute auch schon eine Frage dazu.

Aber nicht nur das. Der neue Kommunikationskodex wird wesentliche Voraussetzungen auch dafür schaffen, dass Investitionen in superschnelles Internet überhaupt erst stattfinden können. Und wie macht er das? Nämlich indem sichergestellt wird, dass in den nächsten zwei Jahren ausreichend 5G-Frequenzen für den Netzausbau zur Verfügung stehen und Netzbetreiber mindestens 20 Jahre Planungssicherheit bei den Frequenzlizenzen haben.

Aber nicht nur für den Produzenten, auch für die Konsumenten gibt es Vorteile – es wurde heute schon angesprochen: Der Kodex wird sicherstellen, dass Auslandsgespräche innerhalb der EU – wir nennen es immer noch Auslandsgespräche – maximal 19 Cent pro Minute kosten können, dass ein leichterer Dienstewechsel und Rufnummernmitnahme möglich ist, dass preiswerte Kommunikationsdienste zur Verfügung stehen, Transparenz besteht, Sicherheit in Bezug auf Schadprogramme erhöht wird und dass die Bürger in Notfällen besser geschützt sind, indem Notrufe mittels Anruferortung besser nachverfolgbar sind und es auch einen öffentlichen Warnhinweis mit Profil „Telefonie" gibt.

(Die Präsidentin entzieht der Rednerin das Wort.)

Σωτήριος Ζαριανόπουλος (NI). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, τι επιδιώκει αλήθεια η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση με την ανανεωμένη νομοθεσία για τις ηλεκτρονικές επικοινωνίες; Θέλει μήπως οι ευρυζωνικές υποδομές, το ραδιοφάσμα και, γενικά, η τεράστια ανάπτυξη της επιστήμης και της τεχνολογίας να μειώσουν τον μόχθο των εργαζομένων και να καλυτερεύσουν τη ζωή τους; Ακριβώς το αντίθετο! Θέλει να εγγυηθεί τις επενδύσεις και να διασφαλίσει την κερδοφορία των ευρωπαϊκών μονοπωλίων στον ανταγωνισμό με τα αντίπαλα μονοπώλια στην Κίνα, τις Ηνωμένες Πολιτείες και την Ινδία. Γι' αυτό απελευθερώνει εντελώς την αγορά. Ιδιωτικοποιεί ό,τι απέμεινε κρατικό και τους δίνει και «προίκα» όλες τις δημόσιες υποδομές και τη λαϊκή περιουσία. Ο λαός και η νεολαία έχουν πικρή πείρα από τις συνέπειες της απελευθέρωσης των αγορών. Η πρόσβασή τους στις παραδοσιακές ηλεκτρονικές επικοινωνίες θα παραμείνει ακριβή, ενώ η πρόσβασή τους στις νέες τεχνολογίες, υπηρεσίες και προϊόντα θα είναι ουσιαστικά αδύνατη. Οι εργαζόμενοι θα έχουν τη δυνατότητα να απολαύσουν ελεύθερα τα επιτεύγματα της επιστήμης και της τεχνολογίας, αρκεί να βγάλουν από τη μέση τα μονοπώλια, τις ενώσεις και την εξουσία αυτών για να ζήσουν τη ζωή που τους αξίζει και μπορούν να ζήσουν.

Paul Rübig (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin! Ich gratuliere auch den Berichterstattern. Ich kann mich noch gut erinnern, wie im Jahr 2006 während der österreichischen Präsidentschaft eine Studentin zu mir gekommen ist und sich beschwert hat über die überproportionalen Abzocktarife, die es in diesem Bereich gibt, wenn man grenzüberschreitend telefoniert. Und ich war eigentlich stolz darauf, dass die Europäische Kommission geliefert hat und dass innerhalb von sieben Monaten eine Verordnung in Kraft getreten ist, die für ganz Europa gültig war und die von der Ratspräsidentin Merkel – die deutsche Präsidentschaft war dann folgend – gemeinsam mit unserem Team im Plenum des Europäischen Parlaments unterschrieben wurde.

Das war der erste Schritt. Wir haben hier neue Standards gesetzt, erstmals ist es uns nämlich gelungen, eine *sunset clause* einzuführen. Das hat dazu geführt, dass wir jetzt mehr oder weniger die fünfte Roamingverordnung haben. Wir haben ein price *cap* eingeführt, also eine Definition, ab welcher Stufe Betrug beginnt. Unter diesem price *cap* kann sich natürlich der freie Wettbewerb entwickeln. Aber wir haben noch immer keinen freien Wettbewerb zwischen den Mitgliedstaaten. Gerade die virtuellen Betreiber brauchen Zugang zu marktkonformen Preisen. Dazu fordere ich die Kommission auf. Hier ist der *glide path*, den wir entwickelt haben, zu langsam. Ich glaube, diese Preise, die untereinander verrechnet werden, sollten marktkonform sein.

Deshalb ist es klar, dass wir in Europa mit dem GEREK eine Institution haben, die hier in Zukunft marktkonform entwickeln muss. Ich bitte die Kommission, das zu überprüfen.

Constanze Krehl (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin! Der Vorschlag der Kommission zum GEREK hatte zum Ziel, eine eigenständige GEREK-Agentur zu schaffen und damit die bestehende ineffiziente Doppelstruktur zu überwinden.

Meine Fraktion hat dieses Ziel immer mitgetragen, denn nach unserer Überzeugung braucht der zukünftige europäische Binnenmarkt für Telekommunikation eine klare und starke Verwaltungsstruktur, in der das GEREK als Agentur eine zentrale Rolle spielen sollte.

Nach Abschluss der Verhandlungen im Parlament und mit dem Rat nehmen wir jedoch zur Kenntnis, dass die Zeit für diese Veränderung wohl noch nicht gekommen ist. Insbesondere bedauern wir, dass das GEREK auch mit dem nun zur Abstimmung gestellten Text keine Rechtspersönlichkeit erhält und somit auch weiterhin keine rechtlich bindenden Entscheidungen fällen kann.

Wir halten dies für eine kurzsichtige Entscheidung, denn auf dem Weg zum Binnenmarkt werden noch viele Regeln harmonisiert und technische Lösungen gefunden werden müssen. Wir halten den Text somit insgesamt für zu wenig ehrgeizig und zu sehr auf die Erhaltung des Status quo ausgerichtet. Was die überarbeitete GEREK-Verordnung in der Summe für mich zustimmungsfähig macht, ist jedoch etwas ganz anderes, nämlich die Aufnahme des Themas Auslandsanrufe in den Text. Die in den Trilog-Verhandlungen zum Kodex erreichte Deckelung der Preise für Telefonate ins EU-Ausland ab Mai 2019 auf 19 Cent pro Minute ist ein großer Erfolg für das Europäische Parlament. Insbesondere die S&D-Fraktion hat sich seit vielen Jahren für eine Senkung der Telefonkosten für die europäischen Verbraucherinnen und Verbraucher eingesetzt.

Wir können mit Recht stolz auf diese Einigung sein, die nach der Roaming-Abschaffung im Jahr 2017 einen weiteren Meilenstein darstellt.

João Ferreira (GUE/NGL). – Senhora Presidente, Senhor Comissário, o objetivo político assumido deste pacote legislativo das telecomunicações é o de criar o grande e liberalizado mercado europeu das telecomunicações. O organismo regulador das comunicações eletrónicas da União Europeia, ao qual a Comissão Europeia pretendia atribuir o estatuto de agência, foi criado para ajudar a configurar as orientações técnicas e políticas tendentes à conclusão deste grande mercado aberto e liberalizado.

São óbvias as contradições entre os interesses dos Estados-Membros, sobretudo de alguns Estados-Membros, e o interesse dos que pretendem um setor das comunicações totalmente liberalizado, afastando o que consideram ser os incómodos interesses nacionais.

Recorde-se que este era um setor público, dominado por empresas públicas em vários países europeus, público porque estratégico e, porque estratégico, público deve voltar a ser.

São bem visíveis os prejuízos decorrentes da privatização e liberalização para as populações, para os interesses nacionais, para o interesse público; benefícios só mesmo para as multinacionais do setor, que promovem e beneficiam da concentração monopolista à escala europeia.

Este é um caminho que deve ser revertido e não aprofundado.

(O orador aceita responder a uma pergunta «cartão azul» (n.º 8 do artigo 162.º)).

Miapetra Kumpula-Natri (S&D), *blue-card question*. – Mr Ferreira, I disagree with your proposal that, to turn the clock back, we would need more European legislation. At the Congress of the Internet Governance Forum (IGF) I met a farmer from Spain who was very disappointed that the regulator there doesn't support local community networks, building networks for places where there is no connectivity. They are waiting for the incumbent to maybe build there later and they don't get help from the national regulator. This was one case where they wanted the Body of European Regulators for Electronic Communications (BEREC) to have the opportunity also to enhance competition inside the countries. How do you see this?

João Ferreira (GUE/NGL), *Resposta segundo o procedimento «cartão azul»*. – Senhora Kumpula-Natri, agradeço a sua pergunta e aquilo que lhe posso responder, a partir da experiência do meu país, Portugal, é como a privatização de uma empresa estratégica que dominava o setor, que ocupava um lugar de primeira linha do ponto de vista da inovação e que cumpria um conjunto de missões de interesse público, pôs em causa o interesse público e, na prática, levou ao desmantelar dessa empresa, hoje dominada por um grande grupo francês das telecomunicações.

É isto que significa a liberalização que a senhora e outros grupos defendem. É perder o controlo público sobre um setor estratégico da economia, com prejuízo para o interesse nacional, para as populações, para os consumidores, para as empresas e para o interesse público.

Jerzy Buzek (PPE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Ja chciałem przede wszystkim pogratulować panu wiceprzewodniczącemu Ansipowi, całej Komisji Europejskiej, a nade wszystko koleżankom i kolegom z Parlamentu Europejskiego, którzy negocjowali to, nad czym mamy dzisiaj głosować. To są naprawdę świetne rezultaty. Proszę pamiętać, że my dzisiaj zaszliśmy już dalej niż wspólny rynek cyfrowy. O tym marzyliśmy, ale to już naprawdę niemal zrealizowaliśmy. Trzeba myśleć o unii cyfrowej, to jest nasze zadanie na następnych pięć lat. Najlepsze możliwe łącza, sieć 5G, ochrona konsumentów, międzynarodowe ułatwienia, a także start-upy, wspieranie firm. Pamiętajmy, że to jest nasza gospodarka, nasza przyszłość. Bez tego nie będziemy konkurencyjni. Także celów klimatycznych, energetycznych nie jesteśmy w stanie osiągnąć bez tych rozwiązań.

Dobrze, że bierzemy pod uwagę położenie geograficzne, bo kraje graniczące na zewnątrz z innymi krajami europejskimi mają trudności z widmem radiowym, i dlatego cieszę się, że także to rozwiązanie znalazło się w naszych decyzjach.

Marlene Mizzi (S&D). – Illum huwa t-tmiem ta' battalja twila ħafna. Meta bdejna naħdmu fuq it-tneħħija tat-tariffi tar-roaming, kulħadd kien xettiku u bosta m'emmnux li dan huwa possibbli; iżda fil-fatt ġara.

Il-ġlieda tagħna ma waqfitx hemm u minkejja din ir-rebħa, komplejna naħdmu biex intejbu t-telekomunikazzjoni għaċ-ċittadini tagħna u biex inżidu l-benefiċċji f'dan il-qasam. L-għan aħħari kien li ntemmu l-ispejjeż eżorbitanti ta' telefonati bejn Stat Membru tal-Unjoni u ieħor. Erġajna, meta bdejna naħdmu fuq din il-leġiżlazzjoni u daħħalna l-idea tal-*Inter--Union Calls*, ħadd ma emmen li dan seta' jsir u b'hekk ma kienx hemm appoġġ, iżda xorta jibqa' l-fatt li rnexxielna.

Illum se nivvotaw għal leġiżlazzjoni li tistabilixxi limitu fuq il-prezz tat-telefonija bejn Stat Membru u ieħor, u mis-sena d-dieħla ċ-ċittadini Ewropej mhux se jkollhom għalfejn joqogħdu jinkwetaw aktar dwar spejjeż eċċessivi meta jsiru telefonati għal Stat Membru ieħor.

Irnexxielna wkoll ninkludu numru ta' punti importanti, fosthom: tejjibna d-drittijiet tal-konsumaturi u l-obbligi kontrattwali, ħarisna d-drittijiet tal-persuni b'diżabilità, u l-bżonn li nagħrfu li l-internet bażiku huwa affordabbli; huwa dritt universali. L-aħħar u mhux l-anqas, għall-ewwel darba għandna wkoll ftehim dwar sistema ta' reverse 112, li huwa numru li permezz tiegħu l-Istati Membri jkunu jistgħu jwissu u javżaw liċ-ċittadini permezz tal-mowbajls f'każ li jkun hemm emerġenzi u diżastri li huma imminenti jew li qed jiżviluppaw.

Fi żmien fejn iċ-ċittadini Ewropej huma dejjem aktar dubjużi dwar il-merti tal-proġett Ewropa nnifsu, il-vot illum għandu jitqies bħala vot li jista' jħalli impatt pożittiv fuq il-benefiċċji taċ-ċittadini tagħna. Grazzi

Michał Boni (PPE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Rozmawiamy o rozwiązaniu kluczowym dla rewolucji cyfrowej. Dziękuję Komisji, ale głównie – Pilar del Castillo i sprawozdawcom za wielką pracę. Kodeks daje nam, użytkownikom, nowe prawa: dostęp do internetu jako usługi powszechnej bez względu na lokalizację i dochody, nowy pułap stawek za rozmowy międzynarodowe (będzie taniej), dostęp do powszechnego w danym kraju systemu ostrzegania. Przede wszystkim kodeks stawia jednak fundament dla ultraszybkiego internetu 5G, informacji przesyłanych w milisekundach oraz przyszłego społeczeństwa gigabitowego z usługami zmieniającymi jakość życia każdego z nas, także na terenach wiejskich. Wspiera sprawniejsze dzielenie widma radiowego w całej Unii oraz inwestycje, zwiększając przewidywalność prawną i gwarancje dostępu do widma dla operatorów. Zapewnia konkurencyjność dzięki jakości usług, a nie nakazów. Zachęca do współinwestycji. Chciałoby się szybko realnie to wprowadzić, a dodatkowo poprawić jeszcze w praktyce warunki dla inwestycji i wyrównać je między krajami.

Nicola Danti (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, caro Vicepresidente, la definitiva adozione del pacchetto Telecom segna una tappa importante nella modernizzazione del quadro legislativo del settore.

In primo luogo, i cittadini europei potranno contare su un mercato delle telecomunicazioni più efficiente e trasparente e con un migliore accesso ai servizi, in modo particolare per le persone svantaggiate. I consumatori beneficeranno anche di una maggiore concorrenza e di più scelta come saranno più tutelati dalle minacce informatiche. Inoltre, viene dato un impulso agli investimenti infrastrutturali, ad esempio il 5G e la fibra, necessari per adeguare la nostra società alla nuova dimensione digitale e per accrescere la competitività del nostro sistema economico.

Pur non avendo ottenuto la cancellazione dei costi aggiuntivi per le telefonate fisse in Europa, come proponeva il nostro gruppo e come avvenuto per il *roaming*, il tetto dei 19 centesimi al minuto rappresenta una significativa riduzione dei costi per i cittadini e per le imprese.

Angelika Niebler (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Vizepräsident, liebe Kolleginnen, liebe Kollegen! Warum ist das Telekompaket, über das wir heute abstimmen, so besonders wichtig? Wir brauchen schnellen Internetzugang, wir brauchen leistungsfähige Netze, wir brauchen Glasfaserkabel, 5G-Gigabit-Netze. Jeder ist heutzutage mit jedem vernetzt, alles wird künftig über das Netz vernetzt sein. Eine gute Netzinfrastruktur ist das A und O, ist das Rückgrat für die digitale Transformation, ist wichtig für jeden einzelnen Bürger, ist wichtig für unsere Unternehmen, für die Wissenschaft, für die Verwaltung. Ohne leistungsfähige Netzinfrastruktur geht gar nichts. Und deshalb ist es wichtig, dass wir nicht nur in den Großstädten, sondern flächendeckend eine gute Infrastruktur haben.

Das Telekompaket, über das wir heute abstimmen werden, bietet eine gute Grundlage dafür, dass die Regulierung darauf ausgestellt wird, dass es künftig mehr Investitionen in den Ausbau dieser leistungsfähigen Giganetze geben wird. Das ist, glaube ich, ein ganz wichtiges Anliegen.

Der zweite Punkt, den ich ansprechen möchte – das ist die gute Nachricht für die Verbraucher: Künftig gibt es Obergrenzen für die sogenannten *intra-EU calls*. Also wenn man von zu Hause ins europäische Ausland telefoniert, wird es günstiger ….

(Die Präsidentin entzieht der Rednerin das Wort.)

Patrizia Toia (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, siamo tutti consapevoli oggi che la sfida della competizione globale con i paesi asiatici e l'America ma anche con altre aree del mondo, penso al Canada che corre molto sul digitale, si gioca appunto sullo sviluppo dell'economia digitale, sulla sua capacità di integrazione tra manifatturiero e servizi e la sua capacità di innovazione. Tutto questo vede l'Europa di fronte a una grande sfida se saprà reggere questa competizione.

Bene, io penso che questo pacchetto, questo imponente e importante codice, che le colleghe in prima persona ma tanti altri colleghi hanno negoziato, sia un buon quadro che mette l'Europa proprio in condizione di poter affrontare questa competizione dello sviluppo dell'economia digitale. Penso al tema degli investimenti e alle norme che qui ci sono, perché c'è bisogno per sviluppare questa economia in tutti i settori di una infrastrutturazione di rete di connessione adeguata avanzata.

Ecco, io penso che qui dentro, con l'armonizzazione dello spettro di gestione armonizzata e con le norme anche sugli investimenti, si possa offrire questo quadro. Starà ora agli operatori essere capaci di giocare questa sfida e di metterci le risorse necessarie. Due punti soltanto: lo spettro e le tariffe internazionali. Abbiamo negoziato la caduta del *roaming* – io ero relatore ombra per il mio gruppo – e penso che l'abbattimento delle tariffe internazionali e l'abbassamento vada in quella direzione per i consumatori.

Interventions à la demande

Lambert van Nistelrooij (PPE). – Voorzitter, commissaris, rapporteurs, dank. Vanuit de Commissie interne markt en consumentenbescherming heb ik met plezier actief meegewerkt aan dit compromis. Het bij de tijd brengen van de connectiviteit, hetgeen eigenlijk al meteen ingaat, de nieuwe communicatie.

Ik wil vijf punten noemen:

1. heel blij met de maximale prijzen voor bellen en voor sms;

2. dezelfde rechten voor consumenten bij het sluiten en oversluiten van een contract;

3. het feit dat *revers 112*, dat waarschuwingssysteem, dat Nederlandse alert.nl, nu Europa-breed wordt ingevoerd;

4. het verbeteren van toegang voor mensen met een handicap, grote groep, zeer belangrijk;

5. het garanderen van die snelheid, capaciteit, ook op het platteland.

Op die manier maken we die stap. De wetgeving was tien jaar oud. De wereld staat niet stil. Wij zijn nu bij de tijd.

José Blanco López (S&D). – Señora presidenta, señorías, Europa se juega su competitividad futura en su Agenda Digital. Con esta reforma ponemos las bases para impulsar las inversiones en redes de alta velocidad y el despliegue del 5G, cruciales para hacer posibles nuevos servicios como la movilidad autónoma o la nueva era deL internet de las cosas. Es decir, nuevas oportunidades para impulsar la innovación, la actividad económica y el empleo de calidad.

Pero además, gracias al Parlamento —quiero felicitar a Pilar del Castillo y a los ponentes—, hemos introducido límites al precio de las llamadas entre Estados miembros, lo que beneficia al conjunto de los ciudadanos. Es así, derribando barreras a la comunicación, como Europa avanza.

Seán Kelly (PPE). – Madam President, firstly congratulations to the rapporteurs, especially my friend Pilar del Castillo, who has worked on this for many years, as indeed many more colleagues did. I think this is a great example of what the European Parliament can achieve. First of all, dealing with the whole roaming situation – the big operators didn't want us to work on it, they challenged us, but we got there – and then we came along and we did geo-blocking and now we have the cap to calls' costs to the European Union. This is a great success for the European Parliament, and indeed for citizens, because we are seen to deliver for them.

I think one area we need to focus on though, unfortunately – and in my own country especially – is the lack of high-speed broadband across the European Union. It needs to be tackled urgently, and for that reason we would hope that the Member States would up their contributions to the European budget so that we can tackle that at a European level and really make this work for everybody.

Nicola Caputo (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, dalla revisione normativa del 2009 il mercato dei servizi di comunicazione elettronica è cambiato drasticamente. I nuovi attori quali WhatsApp, Telegram e Skipe sono una diretta conseguenza della possibilità di fare affidamento sui servizi di accesso Internet e digitale.

Obiettivo del pacchetto sulle telecomunicazioni è di garantire maggiore protezione ai consumatori, per esempio rendendo più semplice l'operazione di cambio operatore o la ricezione della dovuta compensazione. Dopo l'abolizione del *roaming*, anche le telefonate intraeuropee costeranno molto meno grazie all'introduzione di una tariffazione massima di 19 centesimi. Il cambio strutturale prevede delle misure volte a stimolare gli investimenti nelle reti ad alta capacità e a regolare le nuove frequenze per incoraggiare la connettività dei telefoni cellulari e la rete 5G.

Per l'Europa il 5G è un prerequisito per entrare a far parte della società dei Gigabyte. L'industria 4.0, le città intelligenti, la ricerca o la salute sono solo alcune delle prospettive legate alla crescita esponenziale delle richieste di velocità, sicurezza e maggiore connettività.

(Fin des interventions à la demande)

Andrus Ansip, *Vice-President of the Commission* – Madam President, thank you to everyone who has made it possible for this package to become a reality. It will make a huge difference to people and business, to our society and economy. The European Commission is pleased that the European Parliament and the Council share many of the same objectives that will take us towards a gigabit society.

Together we managed to agree on a balanced text that benefits and protects all Europeans and paves the way towards very high-capacity networks, including 5G. Although we have created a structure and environment for the next decade of European telecoms, our work is not yet done. In fact, it has just started. For the Commission, our focus will now be to make sure that the code is properly implemented, and we will also monitor this. EU Member States have two years to transpose and implement the rules. Not only must they do this on time, they must also do it correctly and efficiently. We will assist Member States in transposing the new rules into national law.

Pilar del Castillo Vera, *ponente*. – Señora presidenta, yo quiero empezar ahora agradeciendo a los ponentes alternativos de otros grupos parlamentarios: a Miapetra Kumpula-Natri, a Evžen Tošenovský, a Kaja Kallas, a Dita Charanzová y a Julia Reda por la magnífica colaboración.

La colaboración con la Comisión ha sido excelente y hay que subrayarlo. Y también quiero mencionar a Jerzy Buzek, que presidió con maestría, con gran maestría, como hace siempre, todos los trílogos que tuvimos con el Consejo.

El debate que hemos tenido hoy sobre el Código Europeo de las Comunicaciones Electrónicas es un magnífico ejemplo de soluciones concretas a problemas concretos que solo se pueden abordar en el marco de la Unión Europea, que tenemos que abordar todos juntos.

En este caso, soluciones a una conexión, a una conectividad absolutamente necesaria si queremos que los ciudadanos y que todos los sectores económicos tengan oportunidades en esta era de la digitalización.

Lo decía aquí, ayer, Angela Merkel: es imprescindible afrontar la digitalización en la Unión Europea.

Y yo insisto: el valor añadido de la Unión Europea para afrontar los grandes desafíos que tiene la digitalización es esencial; solo juntos lo podemos hacer.

Y esta regulación es un magnífico ejemplo que podemos presentar como un gran logro ante los ciudadanos europeos, ante los electores que, en unos meses, volverán a participar en unas elecciones europeas.

Evžen Tošenovský, *zpravodaj*. – Paní předsedající, myslím, že jsme s Radou dohodli užitečné úpravy fungování sdružení evropských regulátorů BEREC a podpůrného úřadu BEREC, které zvýší jejich efektivitu a ochrání nezávislost regulátorů. Jsem přesvědčen, že realita telekomunikačních trhů nenazrála k potřebě zásadnější změny, což ale samozřejmě nevylučuje debatu do budoucna, právě naopak.

Rád bych zmínil ještě jednu důležitou otázku související s úřadem BEREC. V dalším kroku je nutné zajistit personální posílení této nejmenší agentury Evropské unie, aby mohla poskytovat telekomunikačním regulátorům plnou podporu. Věřím proto, že v rámci jednání o rozpočtu na rok 2019 bude Rada akceptovat příslušný návrh Evropského parlamentu.

Dovolte mi ještě jednou poděkovat za spolupráci kolegům, stínovým zpravodajům a všem z našeho parlamentního týmu včetně asistentů, poradců a administrátorů Výboru pro průmysl, výzkum a energetiku, protože ta spolupráce byla vynikající a velmi komplikovaná. Chtěl bych poděkovat ještě jednou kolegyni Pilar Del Castillové, protože práce s ní byla skutečně vynikající. Chtěl bych poděkovat bulharskému předsednictví a za Komisi jmenovitě paní komisařce Gabrielové a generálnímu řediteli generálního ředitelství CONNECT Robertu Violovi, protože díky nim se skutečně podařilo připravit velmi dobrý návrh a velmi životaschopný do budoucna, a věřím, že to bude velmi úspěšná práce do budoucna, která přinese občanům Evropské unie velmi dobré a užitečné propojení tak, jak čas bude běžet.

La Présidente. – Le débat est clos.

Le vote aura lieu mercredi 14 novembre 2018.

Déclarations écrites (article 162)

Olga Sehnalová (S&D), *písemně*. – Přijetí evropského kodexu pro elektronické komunikace, na kterém se dohodl Evropský parlament s členskými státy, vítám. Znamená nejen aktualizaci stávajících právních předpisů, které je potřeba přizpůsobit novým technologiím v rychle se měnícím prostředí, včetně zavádění mobilního standardu 5G, ale také přináší pozitivní zlepšení pro koncové spotřebitele. Jsem ráda, že se sociálním demokratům podařilo završit dlouhodobé úsilí o zastropování cen hovorů z jedné členské země EU do druhé, protože různá výše cen nemá na vnitřním trhu žádné opodstatnění tak, jak byl nesmyslný roaming, který se nám rovněž podařilo zrušit. Dobrou zprávou je to samozřejmě i pro spotřebitele u nás, protože čeští operátoři patří dle evropských průzkumů k vůbec nejdražším unijním poskytovatelům elektronických komunikací mezi 28 členskými státy EU. Osobně za neméně důležité považuji posílení ochrany spotřebitelů, včetně těch nejzranitelnějších. Nový kodex garantuje, že spotřebitelé se zdravotním postižením nebudou znevýhodňování co do kvality poskytování služeb, jejich ceny ani obecně přístupu k telekomunikačním službám.

Tom Vandenkendelaere (PPE), *schriftelijk*. – Vandaag keurt het Europees Parlement het telecom-pakket goed. De nieuwe regels zullen een einde maken aan de excessieve tarieven voor consumenten, voorzien in sneller internet en de uitrol helpen faciliteren van en 5G-netwerk in Europa. Het afschaffen van *roaming* heeft telefonie en internetgebruik in het buitenland al heel wat voordeliger gemaakt, maar toch zijn we met losse eindjes blijven zitten. Nog altijd is het erg duur als iemand naar een vriend of collega in het buitenland belt. Dat wordt nu opgelost door het vastleggen van maximumtarieven, en daar ben ik erg blij om. We moeten niet flauw doen: veel internationale communicatie gebeurt vandaag al online, via Whatsapp bijvoorbeeld. Toch raakt deze maatregel nog 9% van de Europese gebruikers, in het bijzonder mensen die digitaal niet zo uit de voeten kunnen. Dit pakket is een stap vooruit naar een betere interne markt met grotere bescherming voor de consument. Nu de fysieke tussengrenzen weg zijn moeten ook de communicatiegrenzen worden afgeschaft. Belangrijk is ook dat er in heel Europa een waarschuwingssysteem komt in geval van een ramp of een aanslag. Die omgekeerde 112 zal ertoe leiden dat u en ik als burger een bericht krijgen als er in de omgeving een ernstig incident is voorgevallen. Ook dat kan enkel maar een voordeel zijn.

Carlos Zorrinho (S&D), *por escrito*. – A União Europeia tem de se preparar para aproveitar a revolução digital em curso para afirmar uma visão comum de desenvolvimento tecnológico ao serviço dos cidadãos.

O Apelo de Paris, assinado no dia 12 por 51 países e centenas de empresas e organizações, e ao qual os países da União Europeia se associaram com entusiasmo, deve ser um referencial para a implementação do pacote Telecom na dimensão do desenvolvimento das infraestruturas, da regulação e do acesso.

O pacote hoje discutido propõe uma abordagem integrada, flexível, mas com níveis de garantia e previsibilidade adequados à viabilização do investimento empresarial. É dado mais um passo no aprofundamento do mercado único digital através da introdução de um limite máximo para o custo das chamadas telefónicas no espaço intra-UE, complementando a abolição das sobretaxas de *roaming*. É também criado um sistema de alerta em caso de catástrofes naturais ou atentados terroristas, obrigatório em toda a União. Realço ainda que a iniciativa WIFI4EU, como componente do pacote Telecom, é fundamental para reforçar a equidade no acesso dos cidadãos europeus à internet de alta qualidade, devendo o seu sucesso e a sua qualidade de implementação constituir uma prioridade para a Comissão Europeia.

8. CO_2-Emissionsnormen für neue schwere Nutzfahrzeuge (Aussprache)

La Présidente. – L'ordre du jour appelle le débat sur le rapport de Bas Eickhout, au nom de la commission de l'environnement, de la santé publique et de la sécurité alimentaire, sur la proposition de règlement du Parlement européen et du Conseil établissant des normes de performance en matière d'émissions de CO_2 pour les nouveaux véhicules lourds (COM(2018)0284 – C8-0197/2018 – 2018/0143(COD)) (A8-0354/2018).

Bas Eickhout, *Rapporteur.* – Madam President, we are going to discuss here a file on regulating CO_2 standards for heavy-duty vehicles for the first time in European history.

I think that it is very important to stress that quite a few regions in the world are already putting CO_2 standards in place, like the United States, Canada, China and Japan. They have all put CO_2 regulation in place on the heavy-duty vehicle sector. Europe hasn't done so yet. But we now have a proposal on the table from the Commission for CO_2 standards for heavy-duty vehicles, and I think that is of course a very welcome development. Why? Because, if you look at heavy-duty vehicles, this is one of the sectors in Europe that is fast increasing and where CO_2 emissions are also fast increasing. For now, total EU CO_2 emissions are at a level of 6%, of which 25% is from road transport and it is increasing. We know that to meet our climate targets agreed in the Paris Agreement we need to go to zero emissions. This absolutely means that special attention needs to be paid to the heavy-duty vehicle sector, which this proposal is doing.

For context, what we know is that, if you want to be Paris compatible, the heavy-duty vehicle sector needs to go in the direction of minus 40% by 2030. That analysis is from the Dutch institute, TNO, who say that for compatibility with the Paris Agreement, you need to go to those kind of reduction levels, and we're not there yet. That's also why we as a Parliament, in the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety (ENVI), agreed on raising the ambition level compared to what the Commission was proposing to a level that we say should be minus 20% by 2025 and minus 35% by 2030. I want to stress that this level of minus 20% by 2025 is, according to the impact assessment from the Commission, also possible with existing technologies.

We know of course that, if you look to the longer term and we need to go to lower level ambitions, then we need to have an improvement in technologies because existing technologies can get to a level of minus 30%, but not much more than that. This means that we also need to prepare for new technologies in the heavy-duty vehicle sector and that's why, also in ENVI, we have been proposing a zero and low-emission vehicle mandate to push the market into new technologies. The definition of zero and low-emission vehicles is broad, so it's not necessarily electricity – it can also be other technologies. We are not subscribing to any technology, but are pushing just for a mandate on zero and low-emission vehicles of 5% by 2025, rising to 20% by 2030, in order to prepare the market for these new technologies to arrive in order to get to the deeper carbon cuts that are necessary for implementation of the Paris Agreement.

We are also putting forward a specific mandate for buses. I want to stress that this is important because in some of these markets the truck producers also produce buses and, if you have just one mandate and mix them all, you can create an unfair market. Therefore it is important to have separate mandates for buses and trucks because we know that on buses we can move much faster we can than on trucks. The mandate is also for all the trucks, not only the bigger ones, so that you can also achieve those zero and low-emission vehicles mandate for smaller trucks.

My last point is that there was a big discussion on the fine. Let me say very clearly that we would like to stay very close to the Commission proposal because, if you lower the fine to such a level that it's easy for the producer to pay it, what you are putting in place is just an additional price factor – a cost factor of production – and I don't think that is what we want to do.

To conclude, I would like to thank all the shadows for all the good cooperation. On many compromises we had broad support, though not on others. We do of course see some amendments on the targets. That's to be expected. But I would like to thank all the shadows for their great cooperation. I think the vote in ENVI, where 47 people were in favour and only six against, shows that we had broad support in that committee, which we hope also to maintain in the plenary.

(Applause)

Miguel Arias Cañete, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, it is a pleasure to be here today for the debate on the Commission proposal setting CO_2 emission standards for heavy-duty vehicles. Following the debate last month on the proposal on CO_2 emission standards for cars and vans, this is another key proposal to implement the 2030 climate and energy framework and continue to follow up on our commitments under the Paris Agreement.

Shortly before the upcoming COP24 in Katowice, the recent Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) special report on 1.5 degrees Celsius has once again demonstrated the urgency of reducing greenhouse gas emissions in all sectors. This is the first time ever that we are making a proposal to set CO_2 standards for heavy-duty vehicles.

We do this for a number of reasons. First, we need to act to tackle the growing CO_2 emissions from heavy-duty vehicles. Without action, these emissions – which represent almost 25% of road transport emissions – are set to increase by almost 10% by 2030. This new legislation will therefore help to reduce emissions from heavy-duty vehicles, while also supporting the Member States in meeting their binding national targets under the Effort Sharing Regulation.

We also need to act to keep Europe's industrial leadership. As has been said by the rapporteur, other countries, such as the United States, China and Japan, have already set emissions standards and competition in the global market is fierce. This legislation will contribute to Europe's economic prosperity and global competitiveness, keeping us at the forefront of developing low-carbon solutions.

Finally, we need to act to support our transport companies' savings on fuel. Fuel today accounts for about one quarter of transport companies' operating costs. This legislation will bring fuel savings to the 600 000 small and medium-sized enterprises that operate in the European Union freight transport sector and employ almost three million people.

Your vote today is therefore instrumental to allow the adoption of this proposal during the current legislative term. We need to give a clear and stable regulatory signal to our industry as soon as possible because this will stimulate the right investments in the transition towards low and eventually zero-emission mobility. I therefore want to thank the rapporteur Mr Eickhout for his very hard work on this proposal, bringing together very rapidly the position of the European Parliament. I would also like to thank the shadow rapporteurs for their efforts in the same direction.

The Commission proposal, underpinned by a thorough impact assessment, is both ambitious and realistic because it strikes the right balance between the three main policy objectives, which cannot be considered in isolation: first, achieving environmental benefits; second, bringing savings for transport operators; and third, supporting employment, growth and competitiveness.

As this is the first time this sector is being regulated and in view of the uncertainties on some key data, a stepwise approach is followed. The proposed 15% and 30% targets by 2025 and 2030 will bring significant environmental benefits, estimated at around 54 million tonnes of CO_2 in the period 2020 to 2030. This is equivalent to the total annual emissions of Sweden.

An early review is foreseen in 2022 to expand the scope and set the 2030 binding targets based on additional information on new technologies. Besides the targets, the proposal includes an incentive system to speed up the transition to zero— and low-emission vehicles.

The situation in this sector is different than for cars. There are virtually no large zero-emission trucks on European roads, and today 98% of the trucks rely on diesel, while almost all manufacturers have announced plans for zero-emission vehicles. We therefore propose to support the deployment of these technologies through a system of super credits, while preserving the environmental integrity of the CO_2 targets.

Let me conclude by saying once again that the Commission remains fully supportive of the efforts of the European Parliament and the Council to conclude the discussion on this proposal within this legislative term. I look forward to continuing to work with you and bringing it to a successful conclusion.

Henna Virkkunen, *valmistelija TRAN-valiokunta*. – Arvoisa puhemies, todellakin nyt on ensimmäinen kerta, kun kuorma-autoille ollaan asettamassa CO_2-päästörajat Euroopan tasolla. Toisin kuin ympäristövaliokunta liikennevaliokunta kyllä katsoi, että komission esittämät päästörajat ovat varsin tiukat ja vaativat. Vuoteen 2025 mennessä 15 prosenttia vähemmän päästöjä ja vuoteen 2030 mennessä 30 prosenttia vähemmän päästöjä. Liikennevaliokunta katsoo, että nämä ovat äärettömän tiukat tavoitteet. Tuimme näitä komission ehdottomia lukuja, koska siitä huolimatta, että kuorma-autoilla ei ole ollut CO_2-päästöihin liittyviä rajoja, ne ovat jo tällä hetkellä varsin tehokkaita sen johdosta, että polttoaine on niin kallis menoerä kuljetusliikkeille, että jo tähänkin mennessä on pyritty erittäin hyvään energiatehokkuuteen.

Liikennevaliokunta moittii omassa lausunnossaan edelleenkin sitä, että liiaksi keskitymme mittaamaan päästöjä pakoputken päästä. Meidän pitäisi päästä laskentamenetelmään, jossa paremmin katsottaisiin koko energiankulutusta ja tulevaisuudessa myös koko elinkaarta. Silloin saisimme paremman kuvan liikenteen päästöistä ja pystyisimme paremmin myös edistämään erilaisia vaihtoehtoisia polttoaineita.

Christofer Fjellner, *för PPE-gruppen*. – Fru talman! Om vi ska klara klimatutmaningen, måste vi minska utsläppen från tunga transporter – och det radikalt. Därför är det bra att vi nu får det här förslaget till lagstiftning, så att vi för första gången i EU tar frågan om att minska utsläppen från just tunga fordon på allvar.

Det är dock första gången vi gör detta, och därför borde vi göra det med en viss ödmjukhet. Det är nämligen trots allt inte vi i det här rummet, i det här huset, som är de som på allvar genomför minskning av koldioxidutsläpp från lastbilar och bussar, utan det är skickliga tekniker hos fordonstillverkare med rätt förutsättningar som är de som kan göra skillnad.

Detta utvecklas ofta och snabbt till en budgivning, där det ges intryck av att de med högst krav på utsläppsminskningar är de som är till störst nytta för klimatet. Jag skulle dock påstå att det är fel. Det är de som hittar rätt nivå och skapar de starkaste incitamenten för teknisk utveckling som gör skillnad på riktigt.

Vi måste hitta en nivå som teknikerna klarar att leverera. Framför allt måste vi se till att de fordon som produceras är fordon som någon har råd att köpa. Det är nämligen bara genom att byta ut de gamla lastbilarna och bussarna med höga utsläppsnivåer som vi får ner utsläppen på riktigt. Tyvärr tycker inte jag att miljöutskottet lyckas med det, framför allt av tre skäl.

Det första är att man säger att vi ska höja ambitionen för 2025 till 20 procents minskning. Här rör det sig alltså om lastbilar och bussar som redan har utvecklats, de är under utveckling, och detta kommer inte att förändra dem. Frågan är bara om det är så att det kommer att bli höga böter. Det är det andra problemet för den som misslyckas.

Det sista kravet, som vi har svårt att förstå hur det egentligen ska bidra till att minska utsläppen, är att begära en särskild andel av fordon med låga utsläpp, i praktiken el redan till 2025. Vi behöver en omställning till el, men vi i det här huset vet inte och kan inte bestämma exakt när den teknikförändringen kommer att ske. Att därför här försöka beordra fram teknisk utveckling – jag är ledsen, men det går inte. Därför borde vi rösta mot de kraven.

Damiano Zoffoli, *a nome del gruppo S&D*. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, il regolamento in esame, che sosteniamo, colma una grave lacuna, stabilendo per la prima volta in Europa limiti e norme comuni sulle emissioni di CO_2 per i veicoli pesanti – camion, tir, autobus e pullman – che contribuiscono al 25 % delle emissioni totali dell'Unione, emissioni destinate ad aumentare.

Oltre a dei *target* ambiziosi ma raggiungibili di riduzione delle emissioni del 20 % al 2025 e del 35 % al 2030, abbiamo introdotto un test di conformità su strada per avere dei dati sulle emissioni e sul consumo di carburante in condizioni reali di guida, dati che potranno essere utilizzati da soggetti terzi per prove di verifica indipendenti.

Fondamentale poi è la richiesta alla Commissione di una metodologia per valutare le emissioni di un mezzo pesante lungo tutto il suo ciclo di vita, dalla progettazione fino alla rottamazione. Per migliorare il livello della qualità dell'aria nelle nostre città, dove vive oltre il 72 % della popolazione, ci sono due importanti novità. La prima riguarda gli autobus urbani: oltre la metà degli autobus prodotti in Europa nel 2025 dovrà essere a emissioni zero e dal 2030 questa percentuale salirà a 75 %.

Anche per i veicoli professionali, ad esempio i camion per la raccolta dei rifiuti, la Commissione dovrà presentare una proposta di riduzione delle emissioni. Vogliamo incentivare infine il ruolo del gas naturale nella transizione verso la decarbonizzazione del settore dei trasporti. Per un'Europa in movimento sì, ma verso un nuovo modello di sviluppo.

Mark Demesmaeker, *namens de ECR-Fractie*. – De vrachtwagenvloot moet vergroenen! De N-VA-delegatie stemt straks vóór ambitieuze CO_2-normen en steunt de verkoopdoelstellingen voor emissiearme en emissievrije vrachtwagens.

Maar liefst een kwart van de CO_2-uitstoot in het wegtransport is afkomstig van vrachtwagens. Willen we effectief onze klimaatafspraken nakomen en 40% minder CO_2 uitstoten tegen 2030, dan hebben we die normen gewoon nodig. De technologie is overigens beschikbaar!

Laten we bovendien niet vergeten dat een vergroening van de vloot ook essentieel is voor een betere luchtkwaliteit. Onze burgers hebben recht op schone lucht.

De normen zorgen ook voor een besparing op brandstof, wat winst oplevert voor bedrijven en consumenten.

Ambitieuze productnormering is ook nodig om innovatie en investeringen aan te trekken. Derde landen zoals de Verenigde Staten en China zetten hier al volop op in. De Europese Unie mag dus niet achterophinken.

De transportsector is ook zelf vragende partij. Dus waarom zouden we twijfelen?

Ik wil wel de volgende kanttekening plaatsen. Wij steunen de invoering van een bonus-malus-systeem, maar wij vinden het een slecht idee om elektrische stadsbussen mee te tellen voor het bereiken van de doelstellingen voor groene vrachtwagens. Dan geven we immers een oneerlijk voordeel aan die constructeurs die zowel bussen als vrachtwagens bouwen en dreigen we het ambitieniveau voor de vrachtwagens zélf te ondermijnen. Dus denken we daar goed over na.

Nils Torvalds, *ALDE-ryhmän puolesta*. – Arvoisa puhemies, hyvä komission jäsen ja esittelijä Bas Eickhout, ensimmäistä kertaa olemme luomassa järjestelmää, joka koskee raskasta kuljetusta. Silloin olisi tietenkin kohtalaisen viisasta tehdä se enemmän oikein kuin vähemmän väärin. Siinä yhteydessä pitäisi ottaa ainakin kaksi suurempaa asiaa huomioon. Ensimmäinen niistä on IPCC:n äskeinen raportti ja toinen on meidän vanhat päätöksemme taakanjaosta.

IPCC:n raportti osoitti neljä erilaista polkua eteenpäin. Toiset niistä poluista ovat kohtalaisen hyviä, viimeinen polku tulee olemaan seuraaville sukupolville erittäin kallis. Siitä syystä olen tietenkin sitä mieltä, että valitaan sellainen polku, jossa maksut otetaan nyt eikä niitä jätetä seuraavalle polvelle.

Taakanjakopäätöksissä sovimme, että teknologisesti ja taloudellisesti paremmassa kunnossa olevat maat ottavat suuremman askeleen ja vähän heikommassa asemassa olevat ottavat pienempiä askeleita tai ei askeleita ollenkaan. Ne maat, jotka tässä yhteydessä ovat joutuneet tai lupautuneet ottamaan näitä suuria askeleita, saattavat joutua nyt, jos me emme ole riittävän kunnianhimoisia, aika heikkoon asemaan. Siitä syystä olemme olleet Basin kanssa kohtalaisen samaa mieltä siitä, että nyt pitää ottaa selkeitä askeleita eteenpäin. Nyt pitää uskaltaa ja osoittaa, että me kannamme vastuuta ei vaan pelkästään tämän päivän ympäristöstä vaan myöskin tulevien sukupolvien ongelmista ja maailmasta.

Karima Delli, *au nom du groupe Verts/ALE.* – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Commissaire, chers collègues, nous nous apprêtons enfin à fixer des normes d'émissions de CO_2 pour les poids lourds. C'est déjà une victoire, parce que de telles normes n'existaient pas jusqu'à présent. Nous pouvons donc en être fiers, sauf que ce n'est pas suffisant. Il faut aller plus vite, plus fort.

Le GIEC (Groupe d'experts intergouvernemental sur l'évolution du climat), ce collectif de scientifiques qui nous alertent régulièrement sur l'évolution du climat, nous a prévenus. Nous avons peu de temps pour maintenir un réchauffement climatique de seulement 1,5°C au lieu de 2°C.

Pourquoi est-ce si important? Parce que les risques liés au climat, à ce réchauffement de 1,5°C, sont certes nettement plus faibles qu'avec un scénario à 2°C. Parce qu'il s'agit en outre de canicule, de précipitations, d'extinction des espèces, de productivité agricole ou encore d'acidification des océans.

Qu'implique un réchauffement de 1,5°C? Cela veut dire zéro émission nette de CO_2 en 2050 au niveau mondial, bien avant 2050. Vous m'avez bien entendue? Bien avant 2050! C'est la raison pour laquelle nous avons besoin d'objectifs ambitieux à court, moyen et long termes, afin de tracer une trajectoire qui soit fiable, concrète et efficace.

Dans ce rapport nous avons réussi à relever l'objectif de réduction à 20 % pour 2025 et à 35 % pour 2030, parce que c'est non seulement possible technologiquement, mais surtout souhaitable. Nous avons également fixé une part minimale, un peu contraignante, de 10 % des poids lourds à émissions nulles ou faibles pour 2025 et de 35 % pour 2030. Là aussi, c'est possible, les constructeurs peuvent et doivent le faire.

Vous voyez, mes chers collègues, c'est un enjeu pour le climat, c'est un enjeu pour l'emploi, mais c'est aussi innovant pour des véhicules propres. Nous pouvons et nous devons sauver aussi les salariés de l'industrie automobile européens, non pas en les enfermant dans un vieux modèle, dans le vieux monde des carburants fossiles, mais en regardant l'avenir avec espérance et avec de véritables solutions.

Puhetta johti HEIDI HAUTALA

varapuhemies

Stefan Eck, *im Namen der GUE/NGL-Fraktion.* – Frau Präsidentin, sehr geehrte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Lastkraftwagen sind für 25 % der CO_2-Emissionen im Straßenverkehr verantwortlich, obwohl sie weniger als 5 % des Verkehrsaufkommens darstellen. In den letzten Jahrzehnten wurde der Wirkungsgrad der Motoren dieser Fahrzeuge nicht wesentlich verbessert, weil Forschung teuer ist und die Hersteller deshalb auf Kosten der Umwelt sparen wollten.

Trotz der katastrophalen Auswirkungen der Klimaerwärmung haben die industriegesteuerten Fraktionen in diesem Haus immer wieder die besten Vorschläge aus dem Umweltausschuss unterminiert. Ich glaube, das werden sie auch diesmal versuchen. An diejenigen von Ihnen, die meinen, die umweltschädliche Lkw-Industrie weiterhin zulasten des Klimas und der öffentlichen Gesundheit schützen zu müssen: Die Automobilhersteller haben in jüngster Vergangenheit doch bewiesen, dass sie nicht vertrauenswürdig sind, dass sie – um es einmal ganz klipp und klar zu sagen – mit krimineller Energie lügen und betrügen, weil es ihnen immer nur um den Profit geht.

Es liegt jetzt an uns, die CO_2-Emissionen im Lkw-Sektor massiv zu reduzieren. Das erwarten doch die Bürgerinnen und Bürger von uns. Öffentliche Umfragen zeigen, dass das Bewusstsein der Bevölkerung für die mit dem Klimawandel verbundenen hohen Risiken gestiegen ist, weil wir alle einen hohen Preis für die verantwortungslose Klimapolitik der großen Industrienationen zahlen müssen. Überall auf der Welt leiden schon heute die Menschen unter den Auswirkungen der Klimaerwärmung. Sie verlieren Hab und Gut oder sogar ihr Leben wegen der Feigheit der Politik, oder schlimmer noch, weil sie sich korrumpieren ließ.

Es gibt keine Alternative. Entweder handelt die Europäische Union jetzt und versucht mit allen Mitteln, CO_2-Emissionen zu reduzieren, und zwar in allen Bereichen, oder sie geht weiterhin am Gängelband der Industrie und muss sich zu recht von zukünftigen Generationen vorwerfen lassen, dass sie im blinden Wachstumswahn zu einem Lakaien der Konzerne verkommen ist.

Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Wir haben nur eine Erde, und die gilt es zu bewahren. Das sollte unsere höchste Priorität hier in diesem Hause sein. Geben Sie deshalb Bas Eickhout ein starkes Mandat für die kommenden Verhandlungen mit dem Rat!

Eleonora Evi, *a nome del gruppo EFDD*. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, i campanelli d'allarme dell'ultimo rapporto IPCC e delle proiezioni dell'Agenzia ambientale europea sulle emissioni di gas relative al 2017 hanno tuonato con forza dirompente un messaggio che ormai dovrebbe essere chiaro a tutti: siamo entrati nella fase bollino rosso per il clima. Ognuno è chiamato a fare la propria parte e soprattutto il settore dei trasporti, che è quello che più di tutti ha aumentato le sue emissioni negli anni. Perciò è fondamentale raggiungere il migliore risultato possibile sui veicoli pesanti nuovi.

Come Movimento 5 Stelle noi vogliamo definire un regolamento a prova di futuro, che consenta per davvero la diffusione di veicoli a zero e basse emissioni anche in questo segmento di mercato. Veicoli come camion, tir, autobus e pullman generano oltre il 6 % delle emissioni totali di gas a effetto serra nell'Unione e il 25 % del trasporto stradale. Dobbiamo quindi fare del nostro meglio come colegislatori per proteggere il clima definendo dei *target* di riduzione significativi.

Inoltre, spingere sull'acceleratore per stimolare l'elettrificazione dei mezzi pesanti nuovi servirà anche a proteggere la salute degli europei e a rafforzare la sicurezza energetica dell'intero continente. Ci aiuterà a dire addio a quella tecnologia tossica chiamata diesel, che alimenta quasi totalmente i mezzi pesanti oggi, generando costi ambientali e sanitari sconvolgenti.

Secondo i dati disponibili e considerando solamente l'inquinamento da ossidi di azoto e particolato rilasciato durante il suo ciclo di vita normalmente di dodici anni, un solo autobus diesel determina un costo per la collettività, pari a 19 000 EUR. Invece, i 3 200 autobus urbani a zero emissioni che circoleranno per le nostre strade il prossimo anno, oltre a non sporcare l'aria delle nostre città, ci consentiranno di togliere dal mercato quasi seicentomila barili di petrolio all'anno, con un risparmio di oltre 40 milioni.

Il testo a cui abbiamo lavorato in commissione per l'ambiente vuole fortificare e sostenere questo trend. Per questo lo sosterremo convintamente anche qui in plenaria.

Danilo Oscar Lancini, *a nome del gruppo ENF*. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, nel 2017 il settore europeo degli autocarri ha rappresentato una flotta di circolazione di circa 6,5 milioni di veicoli, movimentando 14 miliardi di tonnellate di merci all'anno, trasportando circa il 72 % di tutte le merci terrestri in Europa, ovvero il 90 % del valore totale delle merci. L'importanza del settore per l'economia dell'UE è chiara e sta crescendo e oggi i veicoli pesanti sono alimentati per il 98 % a gasolio.

L'importanza del settore per l'economia UE è chiara e sta crescendo e oggi i veicoli pesanti sono alimentati per il 98 % a gasolio. È giusto puntare a un piano ambizioso per una riduzione delle emissioni di CO_2 generate da questo settore, ma tale piano deve avere obiettivi realistici, sia da un punto di vista tecnologico che in termini di sostenibilità dei costi di produzione. Gli attuali *target* proposti sono frutto più di fantasia che di una reale stima delle tecnologie esistenti e sviluppabili e forzano il mercato verso la sola opzione elettrica, scelta non di per sé sbagliata, ma il mercato e soprattutto la tecnologia non sono assolutamente pronti. Analogamente a quanto ho detto relativamente alle emissioni degli autoveicoli e dei veicoli commerciali leggeri, non è previsto nella proposta un sistema che vada a riconoscere il ruolo dei combustibili rinnovabili.

È invece di fondamentale importanza che per gli obiettivi di decarbonizzazione vengano riconosciuti il contributo e i benefici di tali fondi tramite l'introduzione di una metodologia di calcolo che riconosca la componente rinnovabile immessa in rete a livello europeo. È quindi fondamentale considerare l'intera catena del carburante, compresi l'estrazione e la produzione, il trasporto e l'uso del combustibile o dell'elettricità, al fine di fornire un confronto più realistico delle diverse opzioni e in questo senso è importantissimo riconoscere il ruolo del metano e del biometano.

Infine, le penalizzazioni previste in caso di non conformità dalla Commissione appaiono ispirate ad un confronto tra le emissioni di CO_2 dei veicoli commerciali leggeri con quelle dei camion in grammi di CO_2 per chilometro, che risulta essere fuorviante finendo paradossalmente a disincentivare i viaggi a pieno carico, ossia l'efficienza del trasporto su gomma.

Puhemies. – Tällä kertaa, mikä on hyvin harvinaista, meillä ei ole kiire, joten pyydän senkin takia, että puhutte rauhallisesti, mutta ennen kaikkea se on huomaavaista tulkkeja ja tietenkin sitä kautta myös kaikkia läsnäolijoita ja kuuntelijoita kohtaan.

Dobromir Sośnierz (NI). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Kilka uwag do tego sprawozdania. Po pierwsze, nie ma czegoś takiego jak pojazdy zeroemisyjne. To jest posługiwanie się fałszywą terminologią, która powoduje potem skłonność do fałszywych wniosków. Chyba, że państwo wynaleźli w międzyczasie perpetuum mobile, a ja coś przegapiłem, albo zadeklarowali już, że perpetuum mobile ma być wynalezione do 2030 roku, to bym się nie zdziwił. Być może jest to w którejś nowej poprawce. Nie ma czegoś takiego jak pojazdy zeroemisyjne, one po prostu nie emitują w miejscu, w którym jeżdżą, tylko emitują tam, gdzie prąd jest wytwarzany do ich zasilania. Więc nie opowiadajmy bajek.

Po drugie, jeśli chcemy sprawiedliwie dążyć do poprawy stanu środowiska, to powinniśmy, zamiast posługiwać się taką kazuistyką, że dla takich pojazdów to będzie 15%, ale jeśli są one autobusami to nie, no chyba że przegubowymi, to znowu jakiś inny odsetek. Nie można wprowadzać takiej kazuistyki do prawa. Jest bardzo proste rozwiązanie: opłata środowiskowa powinna być zawarta w paliwie – im więcej ktoś zużyje paliwa, tym więcej zapłaci tej opłaty środowiskowej. I już rzeczą producenta jest, żeby spalić tego paliwa jak najmniej. I tyle.

Peter Liese (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Kommissar, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Das Land, das ich am besten kenne – Deutschland –, da hat sich die Regierung, um das Thema CO_2 bei Pkw sehr gestritten.

Das Umweltministerium hat gesagt: Der Kommissionsvorschlag ist nicht ambitioniert genug. Und Wirtschafts- und Verkehrsministerium haben gesagt: Doch, der Kommissionsvorschlag ist gut.

In diesem Fall, bei den schweren Nutzfahrzeugen, gibt es keinen Streit. Auch die Experten im Umweltministerium sagen: Der Vorschlag der Europäischen Kommission ist ambitioniert. Ich glaube, das stimmt. Ich stimme auch Karima Delli zu, dass es ein großer Fortschritt ist, dass wir erstmals bei den schweren Nutzfahrzeugen überhaupt etwas machen.

Deswegen bin ich doch ein bisschen besorgt, dass der Umweltausschuss über das Ziel hinausgeschossen ist. Insbesondere der Wert für 2025 ist sehr ambitioniert. Das ist ein größerer Sprung als dann noch mal bis 2030. Wir müssen ja diese Gesetzgebung erst mal einführen. Deswegen wäre ich dankbar, wenn wir das insbesondere an der Stelle korrigieren – entweder gleich bei der Plenarabstimmung oder dann im Trilog.

Ich möchte, dass wir am Ende des Prozesses mit großer Mehrheit dem Vorschlag zustimmen, damit sich für das Klima etwas tut. Aber wir können die betroffene Industrie dabei nicht überfordern. Da ist der Umweltausschuss noch nicht am Ziel. Aber ich bin sehr optimistisch, dass wir vor der Europawahl einen realistischen und ambitionierten Vorschlag dann gemeinsam unterstützen können.

Christine Revault d'Allonnes Bonnefoy (S&D). – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Commissaire, chers collègues, tout au long de cette mandature, nous n'avons cessé de réviser le cadre réglementaire européen en matière de contrôle et de réduction des émissions des véhicules.

Après la révision des émissions de polluants des véhicules légers, après la mise en place d'une commission d'enquête, après le durcissement des règles d'homologation et des tests, et après l'adoption de nouveaux objectifs de réduction des émissions de CO_2 pour les véhicules légers, nous allons enfin réglementer, pour la première fois, les émissions de CO_2 de tous les véhicules lourds.

J'appelle tous mes collègues à ne pas revoir à la baisse les objectifs de réduction de 20 % en 2025 et de 35 % en 2030, adoptés en commission parlementaire. J'appelle aussi à voter massivement pour les objectifs contraignants destinés à développer le marché des camions et des bus électriques. Nous devons aussi aller vers des tests en conditions réelles pour éviter de futurs scandales de fraude sur les émissions de CO_2, comme cela a été le cas pour les émissions de polluants.

Enfin, je veux ici m'adresser directement aux citoyens européens pour leur dire que l'Union européenne agit et vous protège pour limiter l'impact des émissions sur votre vie quotidienne. Je veux leur dire que nous, au Parlement européen, nous faisons notre travail pour répondre à l'urgence climatique et pour lutter contre le fléau de la pollution de l'air. Mais il faut maintenant que les États membres s'engagent eux aussi dans cette voie, et je regrette leur absence aujourd'hui.

Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy (ALDE). – Madam President, I assume that if you asked most Europeans if the CO_2 emissions of trucks and buses are tackled in the EU they would say 'yes'. I assume that they would be surprised if we explained to them that that's not the case up till now. So I'm very happy that we are finally catching up with other parts of the world. That's not only necessary to keep the Paris Climate Agreement in sight, it's also necessary, as Commissioner Arias Cañete already emphasised, to safeguard the competitiveness of our own truck manufacturers in Europe. Let's not forget all those truck operators, which most of the time are SME companies, that can save tens of thousands of euros if the trucks that they're using are much more fuel efficient – a very important element as well.

Finally, I'm a great supporter of a separate and ambitious target for zero-emission buses. Our European cities are struggling a lot with air quality. Let's not get the same problem as with zero-emission vehicles, that the clean buses are simply not available if they're asked for. So please also vote in favour of that part of this great report by our colleague, Mr Eickhout.

Andrzej Grzyb (PPE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Uważam, że dbanie o środowisko i klimat oraz tworzenie zachęt do produkcji i użytkowania pojazdów nisko- i zeroemisyjnych są naszym wspólnym zadaniem. Uważam również, że cele środowiskowe da się pogodzić z dbaniem o miejsca pracy i wzrost gospodarczy. Dlatego też sądzę, że redukcja emisji na poziomie 35 % pozwala na utrzymanie takiej synergii. Najbardziej skuteczne rozwiązania to takie, które są powszechnie akceptowane zarówno przez konsumentów, jak i producentów.

W przypadku pojazdów ciężarowych efektywność paliwowa ma pierwszorzędne znaczenie, bowiem paliwo jest największym kosztem stałym firm transportowych. W ich interesie jest więc zakup pojazdów zużywających jak najmniej paliwa. Efektywność paliwowa wiąże się też z ograniczeniem emisji, zatem powinniśmy dążyć do wdrożenia do produkcji i użytkowania pojazdów jak najniżej emisyjnych. Najlepiej gdyby były to pojazdy zeroemisyjne. Nie możemy jednak wymagać od producentów i konsumentów wdrażania rzeczy, które są niemożliwe. Chociaż z technicznego punktu widzenia zaprojektowanie na przykład ciągnika siodłowego zasilanego prądem jest możliwe, barierą jest oczywiście jego zasięg, prędkość ładowania, masa pojazdu. Ta bariera jest łatwiejsza do pokonania na krótkich trasach, na przykład w przypadku samochodów osobowych i autobusów, trudno natomiast pokonać ją przy trakcji, gdy chodzi o pojazdy ciężkie.

Zetknąłem się z tym problemem w pracach nad dyrektywą o wspieraniu czystych pojazdów, dla której mandat negocjacyjny przyjęliśmy podczas ubiegłej sesji i której byłem sprawozdawcą. Tam też przyjęliśmy inne cele dla autobusów i inne, niższe dla samochodów ciężarowych. Sądzę, że w przypadku pojazdów ciężarowych powinniśmy skupić się na poprawie efektywności paliwowej oraz technologiach przejściowych, takich jak gaz ziemny, a w szczególności biometan, który jako paliwo odnawialne może mieć duży wpływ na redukcję emisji gazów cieplarnianych.

Tiemo Wölken (S&D). – Sehr geehrte Frau Präsidentin Hautala! Zu einem umfassenden Mobilitätspaket gehört natürlich auch der Schwerlastverkehr auf den Straßen in Europa. Daher möchte ich mich zunächst bei der Europäischen Kommission für den Vorschlag bedanken und hoffe, dass wir diesen Vorschlag auch noch wirklich in dieser Wahlperiode verabschieden können. Das ist dringend nötig, wenn man bedenkt, dass andere relevante Märkte allesamt bereits Standards für Lkw gesetzt haben. Ich finde, es ist daher an der Zeit, dass wir auch in der Europäischen Union endlich den CO_2-Ausstoß regulieren. Es ist doch keinem Bürger und keiner Bürgerin zu erklären, dass der Ausstoß vom Schwerlastverkehr bisher noch nicht reguliert ist. MAN hat uns Abgeordneten zum Beispiel im September eine Broschüre geschickt, in der ein vollelektrischer Vierzehntonner beworben wird. Also auch in der Industrie bewegt sich tatsächlich etwas, und neue Technologien sind greifbar.

Ich glaube, dass Regulierung notwendig ist und die Regulierung auch der gesamten Volkswirtschaft hilft. In meinem Wahlbereich gibt es z. B. den zweitgrößten Hersteller Europas für Lkw-Trailer, der Windspoiler entwickelt hat, die den Verbrauch reduzieren. Hier müssen wir aber auch die regulatorischen Rahmenbedingungen setzen, dass solche Techniken auch genutzt werden können.

Da es sich um eine neue Gesetzgebung handelt, sollten wir allerdings auch an zwei, drei Stellen noch mal aufpassen. Ich finde, dass wir alternative Kraftstoffe anrechnen lassen können sollten und dass wir bei den Strafzahlungen noch einmal sehr genau bei der Abstimmung hinschauen müssen.

Gesine Meissner (ALDE). – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Kommissar, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Lieber Bas Eickhout, vielen Dank für den Bericht. Ich denke mal, wir sind uns vollkommen einig: Jede Emission ist schlecht fürs Klima. Das wissen wir. Darum müssen wir versuchen, die Emissionen zu reduzieren, soweit es geht. Straßenverkehr ist ein großer Faktor dafür, das wissen wir auch, der wird auch weiter ansteigen. Denn wenn wir weiter mehr Menschen auf der Welt haben, wird es mehr Handel geben, mehr Binnenmarkt mit Europa, und den wird es auch mehr auf der Straße geben, weil das das Hauptmedium ist, auf dem transportiert wird.

Wir haben das erste Mal jetzt verbindliche Ziele. Das ist auch gut so, dass wir uns die vornehmen. Der Punkt ist der, dass wir eben überlegen müssen: Wie weit können wir denn bei den Zielen wirklich gehen? Am besten wäre es vielleicht, den Emissionshandel auch für die Lkw und für die Busse einzuführen. Das haben wir jetzt nicht, und das ist etwas, was wir eigentlich gerne machen würden von meiner Partei. Es ist auch wichtig, den ganzen Lebenszyklus eines Fahrzeugs zu bedenken, nicht nur was hinten aus dem Auspuff herauskommt. Vollkommen richtig!

Lang-Lkw könnten auch eine gute Lösung sein. Das sage ich hier nun mal, weil ich fest davon überzeugt bin, dass das so ist. Die Lkw haben schon viel reduziert mit Euro 6 usw. Ich denke mal, ganz entscheidend ist, dass wir sehen: Wir müssen Forderungen stellen, aber sie müssen auch umsetzbar und praktikabel und machbar sein. Und da habe ich den Eindruck, dass die Kommission eigentlich schon eine ganze Menge vorgeschlagen hat.

Jens Gieseke (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin! Im Umweltausschuss des Europäischen Parlaments haben wir einen schon ambitionierten Vorschlag der EU-Kommission deutlich verschärft. Wir sind auf das Zwischenziel von 20 % für 2025 und auf 35 % bis 2030 gegangen. Ich finde, dass wir in diesem Hause auch die Frage stellen müssen: Was ist technisch und was ist tatsächlich erreichbar und machbar? Ich habe mit technischen Experten gesprochen, die sagen: Ein Reduktionspotenzial von 1,5 % jährlich in den nächsten zehn Jahren im Durchschnitt, das ist wirklich möglich. Dann komme ich auf 15 %. Wenn wir noch mehr Ambitionen unterstellen, kommen wir auf 20 %. Ich glaube, dass wir das sehr ernst nehmen müssen, und auch die physikalischen und technischen Grenzen sollten wir nicht unter den Teppich kehren.

Die betriebliche Realität ist wichtig. Der Produktionszyklus beim Lkw ist so: Der wird heute entwickelt und ist 2025 auf der Strecke. Vor dem Hintergrund ist wichtig – es ist von vielen Kollegen angesprochen worden, Bas Eickhout – gerade die Frage des Zwischenziels 2025 20 %. Das ist uns als EVP zu hoch, hier müssen wir zurück zu den 15 %. Ich freue mich sehr, dass in der Debatte der Kollege Wölken … Wir sind nicht immer einer Meinung, aber bei der Frage Strafzahlungen und Anrechnung von *e-fuels* können wir einen Konsens finden. Insofern glaube ich, dass wir dieses Dossier noch nachhaltig verbessern können.

Carlos Zorrinho (S&D). – Senhora Presidente, quando fui membro da comissão de inquérito do Parlamento Europeu para as emissões do setor automóvel houve um número que me marcou particularmente. Quatrocentos mil cidadãos europeus morrem prematuramente por ano devido à má qualidade do ar. Por isso, a descarbonização dos transportes é um imperativo de cidadania, por razões económicas, ambientais e de saúde pública.

Os veículos pesados são responsáveis por 6% do total de emissões de dióxido de carbono na UE. Temos de ter uma quota significativa de veículos pesados novos de baixas emissões para reduzir em 35% as emissões desse setor.

É um desafio para a indústria europeia desenvolver, produzir e comercializar na Europa e fora dela veículos pesados sem emissões ou com baixas emissões. A investigação nesse sentido deve ser incentivada e apoiada, mas não basta apoiar a indústria. Uma percentagem elevada de operadores de transporte mercadorias da União Europeia são PME. É essencial disponibilizar também uma estrutura de incentivos robusta para os apoiar.

Não podemos ficar para trás. Temos de ambicionar liderar nas tecnologias inovadoras de redução de emissões nos transportes para cumprirmos Paris, mas, sobretudo, para melhorarmos a qualidade de vida dos cidadãos europeus.

Jozo Radoš (ALDE). – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, gospodine povjereniče, pozdravljam donošenje ove uredbe iako se kod ove uredbe kao i kod svih uredbi koje se tiču emisija CO_2 postavlja niz otvorenih pitanja. Pitanje na primjer da li će tehnološki razvoj omogućiti postizanje postavljenih ciljeva? Hoćemo li uspjeti spriječiti uvoz teških gospodarskih vozila sa stranih tržišta? Da li su kazne za neispunjavanje ciljeva dobro pogođene budući da imamo dva radikalna prijedloga ovdje u plenarnoj sjednici, od 5 000 i od 1 000 eura? Hoćemo li uspjeti razviti tehnike mjerenja i praćenja emisija i hoćemo li za reviziju, ranu reviziju, za svega nekoliko godina imati dovoljno podataka da bi ta revizija ove uredbe bila dovoljno kvalitetna?

No unatoč svim postavljenim pitanjima podržavam donošenje ove uredbe jer ako to ne bismo učinili, onda bi emisije CO_2 iz teških gospodarskih vozila mogle doseći gotovo 10 % ukupnih emisija CO_2.

Pilar Ayuso (PPE). – Señora presidenta, señor comisario, yo también celebro esta propuesta que se presenta por primera vez, porque los vehículos pesados suponen el 6 % de las emisiones, estas van en aumento y se necesita también aportar objetivos ambiciosos para la reducción de las emisiones en la Unión Europea.

Este Reglamento es un importante complemento a todo lo que se ha hecho sobre los sectores difusos, como el e4-share o las normas para vehículos ligeros. Pero para dar una señal clara a la industria, como usted muy bien ha dicho, señor comisario, necesitamos unos objetivos de reducción que sean a la vez ambiciosos y alcanzables por parte de los fabricantes. Necesitamos una definición clara de qué son los vehículos de bajas emisiones. Necesitamos los ajustes necesarios para contabilizar las emisiones evitadas por determinadas combustiones de renovables y necesitamos un sistema de multas razonables.

Lo cierto es que llegamos a una votación en este Pleno sin que el ponente haya conseguido llegar a un acuerdo entre los grupos parlamentarios. Yo lo lamento y espero que el ponente pueda llegar pronto a un acuerdo con el Consejo para tener un marco legal estable y previsible antes del final de la legislatura.

Dieter-Lebrecht Koch (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Kommissar, verehrte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Mit der Festlegung von CO_2-Grenzwerten für schwere Nutzfahrzeuge schließen wir eine Gesetzeslücke. Dabei sollten wir vernünftig vorgehen und aus den Fehlern bei der Schaffung von Grenzwertvorschriften für Pkw und leichte Nutzfahrzeuge lernen. Es gilt heute, realitätsfremde Regelungen zu vermeiden. Das Reduktionsziel von 35 % trage ich schweren Herzens mit. Das sollte dann aber auch wirklich der maximale Wert sein.

Anreize sind allemal besser als Bestrafungen. Um die Anschaffung von kraftstoffeffizienten Lkw zu fördern, müssen den Transportunternehmen, die größtenteils KMU sind, Finanzierungsmechanismen der EU zugutekommen. Dies sollte ebenfalls für die Anschaffung von emissionsfreien Bussen gelten. Das Ganze muss von der Schaffung einer angemessenen flächendeckenden Lade- und Tankstelleninfrastruktur flankiert werden, denn auch die strengsten Grenzwerte bringen uns nichts, wenn die Nutzung der emissionsarmen Fahrzeuge nicht ermöglicht wird. Hier muss die EU Hand in Hand mit den Mitgliedstaaten arbeiten.

Pyynnöstä myönnettävät puheenvuorot

José Blanco López (S&D). – Señora presidenta, la descarbonización del sector del transporte es clave para cumplir los objetivos de lucha contra el cambio climático, y necesitamos actuar en este sector de manera especial por su dificultad para reducir emisiones y por su volumen, que representa una cuarta parte de la Unión Europea. Además, este sector representa una fuente de trabajo muy importante en Europa y se enfrenta a una profunda transformación tecnológica.

Señorías, la sociedad nos está demandando respirar aire limpio sin polución, y especialmente esto se agrava en nuestras urbes, en las grandes conglomeraciones urbanas.

Este Reglamento tiene todo el sentido de ser para promover un tráfico más seguro con vehículos menos contaminantes y soluciones tecnológicas más avanzadas, al tiempo que promovemos la competitividad de la industria europea.

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, οι εκπομπές αερίων ρύπων είναι βλαπτικές, καταρχάς για την υγεία όλων μας και δεύτερον -φυσικά- για το περιβάλλον. Επομένως, είναι προφανές ότι πρέπει να ληφθούν μέτρα για να περιοριστούν οι εκπομπές αερίων ρύπων. Αυτό πρέπει να γίνει και στον τομέα των μεταφορών, όπου το 70% των χερσαίων μεταφορών διεξάγεται με βαρέα οχήματα. Επομένως, ο στόχος καταρχάς πρέπει να είναι ο περιορισμός. Βλέπω, όμως, ότι ο στόχος είναι ιδιαίτερα φιλόδοξος. Νομίζω ότι πρέπει να έχουμε μια πιο σταθμισμένη και πιο ισορροπημένη μετάβαση. Κατά κύριο λόγο πρέπει να εξετάσουμε τις δημόσιες μεταφορές όπου υπάρχει παρέμβαση του δημοσίου, δηλαδή τα λεωφορεία -τα οποία βεβαίως μπορεί να είναι ηλεκτρικά- και τα απορριμματοφόρα. Επίσης, η εφαρμογή στον ιδιωτικό τομέα πρέπει να γίνει σταδιακά και να δοθούν κίνητρα στις μικρομεσαίες επιχειρήσεις προκειμένου να στηριχτούν οι μικροϊδιοκτήτες, όπως στην περίπτωση της Ελλάδας, διότι διαφορετικά θα έχουμε πολύ μεγάλα ιδιωτικά μονοπώλια που θα πετάξουν έξω τους μικροεπαγγελματίες.

Kateřina Konečná (GUE/NGL). – Paní předsedající, je mi líto, že zde znovu musím kritizovat emisní návrh z dílny Výboru pro životní prostředí, veřejné zdraví a bezpečnost potravin, ale bohužel ani tentokrát výbor nepředložil racionální dokument.

Navržené cíle požadují, aby v roce 2025 bylo 50 % prodaných městských bezemisních, takzvaných elektrických autobusů a v roce 2030 dokonce 75 %. Tyto cíle však naprosto ignorují jakoukoliv elementární logiku odlišnosti veřejné dopravy od osobní i technickou neutralitu. Dobíjení jednoho těžkého vozidla vyžaduje minimální příkon 40 kW. Pro srovnání – obvyklá rezerva jedné domácnosti je 3 kW. Pokud se elektrobusy mají stát páteřními stroji městské hromadné dopravy, pak garáže typického dopravního podniku budou mít spotřebu srovnatelnou se čtvrtí města, ve které sídlí.

Další věc, o které se zde raději nemluví, je bezpečnost elekrovozidel. Akumulátory obsahují dvě složky potřebné k hoření a klasickou technikou je problematické je uhasit. Přitom v každém těžkém vozidle je na rozdíl od osobního akumulátoru několik tun. Navržené emisní cíle v textu Výboru pro životní prostředí, veřejné zdraví a bezpečnost potravin jsou dvojnásobné oproti tomu, co je podle analýz realistické, a povedou k navýšení cen dopravy, spotřebitelských cen či k nárůstu stáří vozového parku.

Bill Etheridge (EFDD). – Madam President, I've listened to this with real interest. People say the EU doesn't work. Well, this is entirely a great example of how it does. Climate change fanatics come here and tell us that we're going to have plagues and death and species dying out and the world's going to end. They come here with that message, then the people who want to have more control and more power in the EU take this and think, 'Oh, this is great; we can say we're going to tax more, we can say we're going to spend more, control more, fine people, tell them what they can do, how they can produce things, and we can say, "if you don't do it, the world's going to end"'. It's perfect, it's a lovely symmetry that's going on here.

If you really want to make a change, surely the best way is through incentives. Why not create an environment where companies and industries will make research look into this new greener technology that you want and actually make a profit doing it, rather than being forced into it from top down with the threat of all this alarmism and nonsense.

Seán Kelly (PPE). – Madam President, having been involved in the whole clean energy package from the outset, I think we can be very pleased with the progress we have made under the leadership of Commissioner Arias Cañete and, indeed, in this file I would like to thank Mr Eickhout for his good work in this and many other areas. And if we are to deliver on our targets for 2030 and beyond, every sector has to play its part. The transport sector hasn't done as much as it should have up until now and we are nudging them in the right direction, giving them sensible targets over a period of time.

I drive from my home in Killarney to Dublin twice a week every week, coming to Brussels and going back, and the amount of trucks and buses is enormous. Unless they are more energy efficient we will never make progress. I think the proposals here for heavy-duty vehicles make a lot of sense, will make a huge difference, and if every sector plays their part, we will meet our targets and we will give world leadership as well. So well done to Mr Eickhout, Commissioner Arias Cañete and everybody involved.

(Pyynnöstä myönnettävät puheenvuorot päättyvät)

Miguel Arias Cañete, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, I have listened carefully to the debate today and I have heard a broad range of positions, in particular on the level of ambition and on zero— and low-emission vehicle incentives.

I would like to stress once more that the Commission proposal is balanced, ambitious and fully in line with our climate objectives.

Some interventions are calling for higher ambition levels in 2025. With 15% in 2025, the Commission proposal strikes the right balance between being realistic and ambitious. We have based it on a solid impact assessment because a 15% target can be achieved using technologies that are already available on the market but not yet widely deployed.

Today we have also heard calls for setting a binding and higher target for 2030. Let me please remind you that while the 2025 target can be met by deploying readily available cost-effective technologies, achieving a more ambitious 2030 target would require the implementation of new technologies that are not yet on the market. There is currently a lack of robust information on how the performance and costs of those more innovative and prospective technologies might evolve in the medium term, and this creates a risk that a binding 2030 target would not be set at the most cost-effective level right now. The Commission has therefore proposed to review the 2030 aspirational CO_2 emission targets in 2022 once sufficient certified CO_2 emission data has been collected and more information is available.

Some interventions also called for incentives for the deployment of zero— and low-emission vehicles, an objective that the Commission supports. A crediting system based on a benchmark was considered in the impact assessment. However, it was not retained, in particular in view of the very low penetration of zero— and low-emission vehicles in the fleet and of the scarcity of robust data on such markets. Adding a malus would mean that manufacturers meeting the CO_2 targets would actually be penalised if they did not meet the benchmark. Instead, the Commission proposal contains a super-credit system which also preserves the environmental integrity of the CO_2 target.

CO_2 emissions standards cannot be set yet for buses, as the CO_2 emissions are not yet certified. However, as set out in the 2022 review clause, buses will be included in future standards. But, at the same time, this proposal can help to speed up the market uptake of zero-emission bus technologies by including then in the super-credit scheme. There is a competition distortion between manufacturers which is addressed through a cap.

The proposed revision of the Clean Vehicle Directive will be a key tool to steer public authorities' decisions in purchasing zero-emission buses by creating a larger market for those vehicles. A platform has already been created to help cities make joint public procurement, and the European Union budget will also continue to support the financing of a new fleet of clean buses. However, certain zero-emission buses mandates for manufacturers will not be proposed.

We heard today some interventions calling for credits for alternative fuels. The Commission proposal does not include such credits. Our approach is based on the principle of clear responsibilities for clear actors. Manufacturers are responsible for designing vehicles so that they achieve the CO_2 reductions required under the legislation. However, they cannot be held responsible for the type of fuel that is actually used in its vehicle or take advantage of it. More precisely, one vehicle is not necessarily linked to one fuel type as in many cases the same vehicle can use several fuels, either conventional, biofuels or other low carbon fuels. This being said, it does not mean that we are not taking action to decarbonise emissions from fuels. The eight-year reform will ensure decarbonisation of electricity production and the Renewable Energies Directive will ensure that more low-carbon fuels will enter the market. In this context we need to apply the principle of better regulation and avoid double regulation and double accounting for incentivising renewable fuels.

Some interventions today raised concerns about the proposed level of the penalties, considering them too high and possibly putting at risk the economic situation of a manufacturer exceeding its targets. Firstly, ensuring compliance is absolutely necessary for the effectiveness of any regulatory requirements. Secondly, to be in line with the objectives of the regulation, financial penalties have to be set at a level that exceeds the marginal cost of meeting the targets. The penalties need to be a real deterrent. It should not be less expensive to pay penalties than to invest in technologies to meet targets. Thirdly, the approach taken by the Commission is to set an equivalent level of stringency from an environmental point of view, as compared with cars and buses.

Finally, this issue will be part of the review of the effectiveness of the legislation in 2022.

To conclude, I would like to thank all of you for the interesting debate. I am looking forward to the upcoming vote. The Commission is also confident that the Council, under the leadership of the Austrian Presidency, will be able to reach swiftly a position so that the discussion between the two co-legislators can start this year. It is absolutely essential that the final political agreement between the co-legislators can be found before the end of the term of office of this Parliament. I trust that this will be possible thanks to the dedication and hard work of the two co-legislators. Again, my thanks to the rapporteur for a good, fast and ambitious job.

Bas Eickhout, *Rapporteur.* – Madam President, I would like to thank the Commissioner for his replies and to thank my colleagues for this very good discussion that we have had. I feel that there is quite some support for what we did in the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety (ENVI), which is very good.

To touch on a couple of issues that have been raised, first, on the level of ambition, we have to be very clear here that we have already adopted national binding targets for 2030 under effort sharing. This means that we know that if in the transport sector we are not reducing our emissions enough, reductions will need to come from the other sectors that fall under the Effort Sharing Regulation, being housing or agriculture. If we don't go for the cost-effective reductions that are possible in transport, it will mean that agriculture needs to deliver more in those countries where they will have difficulties in meeting their reduction targets. All the analysis shows that a CO_2 standard on cars and heavy-duty vehicles is the cost-effective way to reduce emissions in those sectors that fall under the Effort Sharing Regulation, and that's what we're doing here.

On the level where we, as ENVI, say that we should raise the bar to 20%, I once again want to stress that, in the Commission's impact assessment, it's very clearly stated that an analysis of the cost-effective technologies already at hand shows that full deployment would make it possible to achieve emission reductions between 15% to 20% by 2025. This shows that the existing technologies can be achieved with the 20% target. On top of that, we need to develop new technologies and that's why we are making this Regulation consistent with the cars. In the cars we had super credits and now, later on, the Commission is stepping away from that in cars and comes up with super credits again in this Regulation. We think it's better to skip that mistake that you made on cars and immediately go into a mandate for zero and low-emission vehicles at a very low level of 5%.

My last point, on buses, is that it's very important to realise that there are producers producing both trucks and buses. So if we have one mandate, you are giving very clear priority and a benefit for those who are producing both because, in buses, we can move faster, and the market is moving faster. That's why we have decided on separate mandates for buses and heavy-duty vehicles – in order to make sure that the level playing field remains equal for all the players in the market for new technologies.

Once again, I thank everyone for the discussion. I'm looking forward to the vote and then indeed, what is the intention? A fast resolution in negotiations, hopefully to start under the Austrian Presidency.

Puhemies. – Keskustelu on päättynyt.

Äänestys toimitetaan tänään keskiviikkona 14.11.2018.

Kirjalliset lausumat (162 artikla)

Adam Gierek (S&D), *na piśmie*. – Rozporządzenie w sprawie norm emisji CO_2 dla pojazdów ciężarowych o dużej ładowności jest częścią zintegrowanego podejścia Unii Europejskiej względem dekarbonizacji sektora transportu. Przepisy w nim zawarte niewątpliwie stanowić będą w dłuższej perspektywie duży problem, zarówno dla producentów pojazdów, jak i dla sprzedawców paliw. Zgodnie z obecną metodologią wartość emisji CO_2 przez pojazd jest mu przypisywana na podstawie zmierzonej jej ilości wydalanej z rury wydechowej pojazdu. Nie uwzględnia się jednak przy tym całkowitej emisji CO_2, której źródłem jest wcześniejsze przetwórstwo ropy naftowej w paliwa, jako energii pierwotnej (rafinerie) lub podczas wytwarzania paliw odnawialnych, w tym biogazu. To błąd.

Uważam, iż należy skoncentrować się na kwestii uwzględniania redukcji emisji, która wynika z wykorzystania biopaliw oraz paliw alternatywnych. W tym celu Komisja Europejska powinna opracować nową metodologię obiektywnego sposobu liczenia emisji całkowitej. Nowa metodologia dla zaawansowanych i odnawialnych paliw płynnych, w tym gazowych, przy jednoczesnym uniknięciu podwójnego liczenia umożliwi dalszą, poważną redukcję CO_2. Umożliwi także firmom specjalizującym się w produkcji pojazdów ciężkich śmielsze przygotowywanie nowych, perspektywicznych i konkurencyjnych rozwiązań konstrukcyjnych.

(Istunto keskeytettiin klo 11.14 odotettaessa juhlaistunnon alkamista.)

PRESIDENZA DELL'ON. ANTONIO TAJANI

Presidente

9. Wiederaufnahme der Sitzung

(La seduta è ripresa alle 11.38)

10. Feierliche Sitzung – Südafrika

President. – Dear colleagues, it is my pleasure to welcome the President of the Republic of South Africa, Cyril Ramaphosa. This important visit takes place ahead of the Seventh EU-South Africa Summit, to be held in Brussels tomorrow.

President Ramaphosa, you are the fifth African leader to address this Chamber in the past year. As you can see, strengthening ties with the African continent is a priority for us, but also for me it is one of the most important points for my presidency.

Let me begin by saying that the European Parliament proudly joined the worldwide celebrations to commemorate Nelson Mandela's legacy on the centenary of his birth. He was, as you know, the first person to receive the Sakharov Prize in 1988, in recognition of his struggle to end apartheid and his fight to pursue equal rights for all. We will always remember this great man with admiration and immense respect.

Mr President, in February of this year, you became South Africa's new president. Your reforms are contributing to revitalise South Africa's economy by attracting foreign investments, enhancing private-sector competitiveness, creating jobs, especially for the young, fighting corruption and inequality, and improving citizens' rights.

We welcome your agenda and are confident that in tomorrow's summit we will open a new chapter in our partnership. However, structural challenges in South Africa remain: poverty, income inequality and unemployment are at the top of the list.

The EU stands ready to support you in tackling these challenges. Through stronger economic diplomacy and an ambitious 'Marshall plan' for Africa, we can help you attract investment. South Africa is a champion of multilateralism, an active member of the African Union and of the Southern African Development Community. It is the only African member of the G20. This means we have to work together on our most pressing common challenges – trade, climate change, terrorism, migration and unemployment.

I also wish to congratulate you on the election of your country as a non-permanent member of the United Nations Security Council starting next year. South Africa has a great role to play regionally and on the global stage.

President Ramaphosa, thank you once more for being here with us. You have the floor.

(Applause)

Cyril Ramaphosa, *President of South Africa*. – Mr President, it is indeed a great honour and a privilege to have this opportunity to address this gathering, particularly in the centenary year of the birth of Nelson Mandela, the founding father of our democratic nation, a revered statesman and a committed internationalist. We celebrate the centenary knowing well that Nelson Mandela does not belong to us as South Africans. He belongs to all of us, and indeed to the world.

(Applause)

He is one person who, through his life and deeds, proved to all the people across the world that championing human rights and doing what is right in terms of embracing universal values was the right thing to do, and that is precisely what he dedicated his life to. He belongs not only to those who lived through the tumultuous events of the last century, but he also belongs to the generations that are going to follow all of us. We live in the world that Nelson Mandela and many other great leaders of his age made.

We are grateful to the European Union and to the people, as well as the leaders, of Europe for the tributes they have paid in many different ways to Nelson Mandela on the occasion of his birth, and for this we thank you from the bottom of our hearts. We say thank you for honouring Nelson Mandela in the way that you have.

(Applause)

It is indeed a testament to the universal appeal of his vision that he is as revered on this continent as he is across the African continent. We remember with the nations of the world the centenary of the armistice that marked the end of the First World War. We pay tribute to all those who lost their lives in that great human tragedy, including the many South Africans of all races who also fought in that war and who perished on these foreign shores.

(Applause)

Twenty-six years ago, in the city of Maastricht, the leaders of Europe signed the historic Treaty that would mark a new era in the continent's history. Now, more than a quarter of a century later, that affirmation of democracy, of liberty, of respect for human rights, of fundamental freedoms and the rule of law continues to endure. These timeless values are indeed beacons of hope in our troubled times, for – despite our greatest efforts – the world today is blighted by conflict, poverty and underdevelopment in a number of poor countries. There is still a lack of meaningful social progress, unrest and displacement. The spectre of the resurgence of racism and xenophobia, cloaked in the mantle of nationalism, is rising and is causing a great deal of concern in a number of places. Unilateralism is on the rise and threatens, in many ways, to undermine our collective commitment to democratic values and respect for human rights.

Now, more than ever, we turn to our great leaders for strength and inspiration as we seek to resolve the most pressing challenges of our times. We recall their words and their actions as we reaffirm our commitment to democratic values and upholding the rights of every human being. It was the great statesman and friend of the anti-apartheid cause, Olof Palme, the former Prime Minister of Sweden, who said, 'for us, democracy is a question of human dignity. This includes political liberties, the right to freely express our views, the right to criticise and to influence opinion. It embraces the right to health, work, to education and social security'. This view of democracy resonates with Nelson Mandela's vision of a global community of nations that affirms the centrality of human dignity and strives through all means available to improve the human condition.

Just four months after his release from prison in 1990, Nelson Mandela paid his first visit to the European Parliament to receive the Sakharov Prize for Freedom of Thought. He used this occasion to thank the leaders and the people of Europe for their contribution to the liberation of South Africa. I also stand here, like Nelson Mandela, and thank the people of Europe for the contribution that they made to end apartheid, and we say thank you for all the support you gave us during the dark days of apartheid. Thank you very much.

(Applause)

Nelson Mandela also used the opportunity, as he addressed this European Parliament, to call on the nations of Europe to continue to stand by South Africa as we sought to rebuild our country. We are here today to confirm that, indeed, the nations of Europe answered the call that Nelson Mandela made with conviction and generosity. We are here today, following in the footsteps of Nelson Mandela, to say that we would urge you and we would call on you to continue supporting South Africa as it has embarked on a journey, not only to reform itself, but to build a new South African nation from the ashes of apartheid. We thank you for continuing to support us.

(Applause)

The European Union was born out of the need to end the historic divisions on the continent, to create a firm base for the construction of a new Europe rooted in solidarity and cooperation, and to contribute to global peace, security and development. The countries of Africa have similarly embarked upon a new path of peace, development and transformation. The African Union's Agenda 2063 provides a programme for integration and prosperity on a continent that has been wracked by division, exploitation and strife. Nelson Mandela was an ardent advocate for pan-Africanism, and he believed that the continent could only reach her full potential if her peoples were united. In pursuing this goal, there are many lessons we can draw from the European Union's path to integration, to economic and political union, and to achieving social progress.

South Africa notes the tireless work of the European Parliament to ensure that the provisions of the Lisbon Treaty on the eradication of poverty continue to underpin the EU's approach to external development cooperation. Since 2007, South Africa and the EU have enjoyed the mutual benefits of a strategic partnership that continues to play a meaningful role in our country's economic growth. It covers over 20 sectoral policy dialogues on diverse issues from development cooperation, science and technology, health, climate change, trade, education, skills development to peace migration, security and human rights as well.

An integral part of this partnership are the interparliamentary meetings between the South African Parliament and the European Parliament. These meetings have indeed played a crucial role in strengthening South Africa's, as well as European, relations, contributing to a strategic partnership – a partnership that is based on equality, shared values and issues of mutual interest. Allow me to express our sincere appreciation for the contribution that the European Union – and in this case the European Parliament – have made not only to the development of South Africa, but also towards the achievement of progress across the African continent.

Nelson Mandela led South Africa in its peaceful transition to democracy, but he had a bigger dream: an Africa at peace with itself and the world. In his lifetime, he supported the African Union's effort towards conflict prevention and resolution, peaceful building, as well as post-conflict reconstruction. He would have joined us in applauding the EU's support for the AU peace and security architecture and its steadfast support for efforts to silence the guns on the African continent for good. He always argued that lasting peace and security on the continent will not be possible without economic development. Without opportunity, without investment, without thriving economies that enable us all to enjoy our place in the sun, we cannot hope to have political and social stability on the African continent.

We therefore welcome the support of the European Union for Africa's development needs through initiatives such as the European External Investment Plan, the Economic Partnership Agreement and the new Africa-European Alliance for Sustainable Investment and Jobs. We should strive to ensure that these approaches are developed and implemented in line with Agenda 2063 of the African Union. We should seek to ensure that these developmental initiatives support the establishment of the African Continental Free Trade Area and Africa's overall industrialisation infrastructure development, as well as economic transformation.

We need to work together, as the countries of Europe and Africa, to develop sustainable and humane responses to the challenge of irregular migration. This is a challenge that Europe has had to deal with in recent years. So, too, has South Africa, and several African countries have had to deal with this challenge as well in a number of ways. We need to work together to address the root causes of irregular migration, which include poverty, inequality, unemployment, economic exclusion and competition for scarce resources. This should be informed by the principles of solidarity, compassion and an unwavering commitment to the human rights of all the people of the world.

Africa is the cradle of humankind. It is rich in land and water, abundant in minerals, and blessed with a young and vibrant population. It is the next frontier of growth, of innovation and of social progress. To realise this potential, the people of Africa are in the process of uniting themselves. Africa will continue to strengthen the bonds of partnership and friendship with the citizens of her sister continents and, in this case, her sister continent Europe. It is therefore a matter of great satisfaction and promise that our partnership with the European Union is as strong as it has been enduring. It is grounded in responsibility, respect and mutual accountability. The nations of the EU are a source of investment, trade, skills and knowledge, which has worked with us as South Africa in our quest to grow our economy and improve the lives of our people.

As we look to the future, we continue to count on the strength of this partnership between our countries and our peoples. As we advance forward to address the many challenges that our country faces – the challenges of unemployment, of poverty, and of inequality – we rely on Europe to be our partner. Right now, our country is in the process of transforming and reforming itself. We are seeking to create a South Africa that is conducive for investment flows. A few weeks ago, we held an investment conference that attracted a number of European-based companies to come to South Africa, and we were particularly overjoyed when many of them declared that they will continue to invest in South Africa. We were able, at that conference – and another conference that followed – to raise USD 26 billion that will flow into South Africa, and we are grateful for the support that we have enjoyed also from Europe, for that vote of confidence in our economy.

(Applause)

It is this collaboration and partnership that we seek – a collaboration that has bound South Africa and the countries of Europe together in a pact to never again return to the excesses and divisions of the past. As South Africa, we are dealing with a number of issues that have to do with policies, policies that will consolidate South Africa and make our country more stable.

We are in the process of dealing with the question of land reform. Land reform is one of those challenges that our country has had to face over hundreds of years, where the indigenous people of South Africa were denied access to land, and have over the years been yearning to have access to land. We are now at a stage where we are engaging in a dialogue – an overarching dialogue among the people of South Africa, those who own land and those who don't own land – to see how best this important resource can be utilised to develop our country. Through this, the dialogue is leading us to a point where we are seeking to find solutions that will be inclusive and that will enable all South Africans, as we continue to consolidate our nation and to work together to resolve this problem.

We have said very clearly that this problem of land will be resolved through adherence to the rule of law, through adherence to our constitution, and we will utilise the lessons that Nelson Mandela taught us with regard to resolving problems. We will resolve this problem in an inclusive basis, respecting each other's human rights, respecting each other's hopes and aspirations, and making sure – like we did when we resolved the apartheid problem – that we resolve it with a view to building a nation from the ashes of apartheid. This we shall do, because that is what Nelson Mandela taught us. I can assure you that we will resolve the land issue in line with the values that are enshrined in our Constitution and, when we do so, we will have an all-inclusive solution that will make all the people of South Africa work together and move together into the promised future that we see ahead of us.

(Applause)

Unity and partnership, as well as solidarity, are the principles that have underpinned our cooperation across two vast and different continents out of dark histories and into a promising new dawn. South Africa, Africa and the European Union are bound by shared values of democracy and respect for human rights. We share a commitment to the ideals of free and prosperous societies, societies in which all persons live together in harmony with equal opportunities. We owe it to our great forebears, leaders of the calibre of Nelson Mandela, to focus on what unites us and not that which divides us, and to focus also on what benefits all of us and not what enriches and benefits just a few. We owe it to the leaders who are our forebears to build a strategic partnership that endures, that flourishes, and that – above all else – advances the cause of humanity.

We thank you for your friendship, we thank you for your solidarity, we thank you for your partnership, and we thank you all for your support and for your continued help in everything that we are doing to rebuild the South African nation so that we, too, can enjoy the type of progress that you, as Europeans, have achieved. Thank you very much.

(Sustained applause)

President. – President Ramaphosa, thank you very much. The message from the European Parliament is very clear: we want to strengthen cooperation between the European Union and Africa and between the European Union and the Republic of South Africa. Thank you very much for coming.

(Applause)

(Parliament met for the awarding of the LUX prize)

11. Wiederaufnahme der Sitzung

(La seduta è ripresa alle 12.40)

Reinhard Bütikofer (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, two prominent democratic guests from Hong Kong are today visiting the European Parliament. I would like to welcome Mr Martin Lee, from the Democratic Party, and Mr Alan Leong, from the Civic Party.

(Applause)

Pervenche Berès (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, je n'ai pas voulu interrompre les séances solennelles, mais je voudrais vous interpeller sur la façon dont vous avez présidé nos travaux hier lors de l'échange avec la chancelière Merkel.

Les instructions que nous avons reçues indiquent: «Veuillez noter que le Président répartira le temps d'intervention entre les députés en fonction du temps de parole attribué aux groupes politiques selon leur taille». Mon groupe n'a pas été victime de cela, mais je constate que votre groupe qui représente 29 % des membres de cet hémicycle a reçu 35 % du temps de parole, que le groupe de l'EFDD qui représente 5,7 % de notre hémicycle a reçu 10 % du temps de parole et que le groupe des non-inscrits qui représente 3,9 % de notre hémicycle a reçu 10 % du temps de parole. Je pense qu'il y a un déséquilibre grave dans la répartition de ces fameuses «interventions à la demande».

(Applaudissements)

Presidente. – Onorevole Berès, non sono io che decido il tempo di parola, ma è tutto basato sul sistema d'Hondt. Io ricevo dai servizi il numero dei deputati che possono parlare in base al tempo. Quindi non sono io che decido quanti socialisti, quanti non iscritti possono intervenire.

Sono stati rispettati scupolosamente con una sola eccezione perché, in base al tempo utilizzato dai presidenti dei gruppi, il gruppo GUE, il gruppo liberale e il gruppo Verde non avrebbero avuto diritto ad alcuno intervento. Questa è l'unica violazione che ho compiuto. Per dare rappresentatività anche ai parlamentari e non soltanto ai presidenti dei gruppi, ho fatto una eccezione. Per il resto mi sono scrupolosamente attenuto alla richiesta che mi veniva dai servizi, cercando di far parlare anche i deputati che non avevano mai preso la parola in occasione di altri dibattiti, perché sarebbe ingiusto, in occasione del *catch the eye*, far parlare sempre gli stessi parlamentari.

Ieri più di 200 parlamentari avevano chiesto la parola ma il Cancelliere Merkel doveva assolutamente lasciare l'Aula entro le 17.30, come vi avevo informati. Quindi da parte mia, mi dispiace onorevole Berès, non c'è stata alcuna violazione delle regole del sistema d'Hondt. Che poi non tutti i deputati siano rimasti contenti non dipende da me. Io per me farei parlare tutti, però il tempo è quello che è.

La ringrazio comunque per avermi permesso di spiegare l'organizzazione dei lavori per il *catch the eye* quando vi sono i capi di Stato e di governo che vengono a partecipare ai dibattiti di fronte al Parlamento.

Angelo Ciocca (ENF). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, vorrei chiedere la vostra complicità, da un lato per ringraziare l'associazione ADMO per il grande impegno che ha messo anche in questi giorni e, dall'altro lato, per ringraziare i numerosi donatori di midollo osseo per la sfida che dobbiamo compiere di Alessandro. Mancano, ahimè, due settimane per poter ricevere la donazione di midollo osseo. Entro fine mese, questo bambino di 18 mesi deve arrivare a trovare il donatore. Non è ancora stato trovato, faccio appello a tutti voi: aiutiamoci tutti assieme affinché questo bambino di 18 mesi, entro fine mese, possa trovare il giusto donatore. Grazie della vostra disponibilità e sono certo del vostro aiuto.

12. Mitteilung des Präsidenten

Presidente. – Il 2 ottobre 2018 ho annunciato in Aula la comminazione di una sanzione all'onorevole Giulia Moi per la sua condotta nei confronti di assistenti parlamentari qualificata come molestia psicologica.

Il 16 ottobre 2018 l'onorevole Moi ha presentato un ricorso interno contro tale decisione dinanzi all'Ufficio di presidenza, conformemente all'articolo 167 del regolamento.

Lunedì 12 novembre 2018 l'Ufficio di presidenza ha confermato all'unanimità la portata della sanzione adottata consistente nella perdita del diritto delle indennità di soggiorno per un periodo di 12 giorni.

Giulia Moi (EFDD). – Onorevole Tajani, io vorrei sapere come mai il suo ufficio non mi sta rispondendo da mesi su delle infrazioni fatte da suoi due dipendenti, dove ci sono state irregolarità sulla mia richiesta da più di un anno prima di questa fandonia sul licenziamento di questi miei due dipendenti.

Io non riesco a lavorare, non ci sono state le norme che dovevano tutelare il lavoro di un parlamentare. Il suo ufficio ha ricevuto tutto il materiale da mesi e non mi sta rispondendo. Io sono bloccata nel mio lavoro di parlamentare e voi non mi state assolutamente venendo incontro con le risposte nei tempi stabiliti dalla legge. Le infrazioni dei suoi dipendenti sono notevoli e lei non mi sta dando spiegazioni.

Non mi state permettendo di licenziare due persone che hanno fatto irregolarità. Me le state tenendo e non riesco a fare nulla. Questa farsa di quest'accusa è ridicola e potrebbe essere anche un attacco politico.

Presidente. – Onorevole Moi, comprendo il suo stato d'animo. Ho capito quello che ha detto. Ha avuto tempo di esprimere le sue opinioni, ora mi faccia rispondere. Ha detto quello che pensava. La sanzione è stata comminata, è stata confermata. La decisione non è stata presa da me. La decisione è stata presa dal Comitato dell'*harassement*. Onorevole, la sanzione è stata presa.

Jörg Meuthen (EFDD). – Herr Präsident! Ich komme noch einmal auf das gestrige *Catch-the-eye*-Verfahren zu sprechen. Wenn Sie hier sagen, dass die Wortzuteilung annähernd fair gewesen sei, dann widerspreche ich dem entschieden. Sie haben für die EFDD-Fraktion vier Rednern das Wort erteilt. Ich war einer der Ersten, die sich gemeldet hatten. Wir hatten intern angemeldet, dass ich selbstverständlich zu Wort kommen soll. Sie haben, nachdem der Fraktionsvorsitzende gesprochen hat, Herrn Monot das Wort erteilt, dann zwei Briten, Sie haben mir das Wort verweigert. Es müsste eine …

(Unruhe)

Ja, ja, ja, das sind genau diese pseudodemokratischen Geschichten, die hier laufen. Mit Verlaub, Herr Präsident, wenn die deutsche Bundeskanzlerin in diesem Parlament spricht, dann sollte der einzige Deutsche aus der EFDD-Fraktion wohl die Möglichkeit haben, darauf mit einem eigenen Redebeitrag antworten zu dürfen. Genau das haben Sie mir verwehrt. Das ist schäbig, und es lässt tief blicken in das Verständnis dieses Hauses. Und das Verhalten, das ich hier vonseiten der CDU bekomme, erst recht. Es ist genau Ihr pseudodemokratisches Herangehen. Schämen Sie sich einfach nur!

Presidente. – Onorevole, le ricordo che questo non è il Bundestag e non è neanche il Bundesrat ma è il Parlamento europeo e quindi parlano i rappresentanti dei gruppi politici. Non è un dibattito sulla situazione politica in Germania.

Bruno Gollnisch (NI). – Monsieur le Président, merci de me donner la parole. J'espère que mes collègues voudront bien m'écouter, parce que ceci pourrait aussi les concerner un jour. Je ne connais pas, Monsieur le Président, le cas de Madame Moi. Ce que je puis vous dire en revanche, c'est qu'il est parfaitement anormal, parfaitement scandaleux — et l'autre jour, j'ai pris la défense de collègues de gauche — que le Bureau ne reçoive pas personnellement les députés concernés, ni les questeurs d'ailleurs, quand un problème les oppose à l'administration de ce Parlement. Ceci enfreint toutes les dispositions, y compris celles qui ont été votées par notre Parlement, et plus précisément celles du code de bonne conduite administrative, qui prévoit qu'avant toute mesure faisant grief, l'intéressé doit être entendu par écrit ou oralement, s'il le désire.

Le Secrétaire général Klaus Welle s'assoit sur cette disposition d'une façon régulière, répétitive et scandaleuse, au mépris des droits des parlementaires.

13. Zusammensetzung des Parlaments: siehe Protokoll

14. Abstimmungsstunde

Presidente. – L'ordine del giorno reca il turno di votazioni.

(Per i risultati delle votazioni e altri dettagli che le riguardano: vedasi processo verbale)

14.1. Zwischenbericht über den Mehrjährigen Finanzrahmen 2021-2027: Standpunkt des Parlaments im Hinblick auf eine Einigung (A8-0358/2018 - Jan Olbrycht, Isabelle Thomas, Janusz Lewandowski, Gérard Deprez) (Abstimmung)

Presidente. – Prima di passare alla relazione sul Quadro finanziario pluriennale, voglio sottolineare l'importanza di questo voto perché il Parlamento europeo con questo voto intende rivendicare il suo potere di iniziativa legislativa, intende rivendicare il suo essere legislatore protagonista e intende chiedere fortemente che si decida sul Quadro pluriennale nei tempi più rapidi possibili. È un messaggio politico che il Parlamento invia al Consiglio e alla Commissione europea.

14.2. Bestimmungen zu staatlichen Beihilfen: neue Gruppen von staatlichen Beihilfen (A8-0315/2018 - Sander Loones) (Abstimmung)

14.3. Waffenexporte und die Umsetzung des Gemeinsamen Standpunkts 2008/944/GASP (A8-0335/2018 - Sabine Lösing) (Abstimmung)

— *Prima della votazione:*

Sabine Lösing, *Berichterstatterin*. – Herr Präsident! Ich werde Sie nicht lange aufhalten. Ich möchte nur ankündigen, dass wir einen mündlichen Änderungsantrag eingereicht haben aus Gründen der Aktualität. Sie finden ihn in Ihren Abstimmungslisten.

(L'emendamento orale è accolto)

14.4. Stärkung der Wettbewerbsbehörden zur Gewährleistung des reibungslosen Funktionierens des Binnenmarkts (A8-0057/2018 - Andreas Schwab) (Abstimmung)

14.5. Europäischer Kodex für elektronische Kommunikation (A8-0318/2017 - Pilar del Castillo Vera) (Abstimmung)

14.6. Gremium Europäischer Regulierungsstellen für elektronische Kommunikation (A8-0305/2017 - Evžen Tošenovský) (Abstimmung)

14.7. CO_2-Emissionsnormen für neue schwere Nutzfahrzeuge (A8-0354/2018 - Bas Eickhout) (Abstimmung)

— *Dopo la votazione:*

Bas Eickhout, *Rapporteur*. – Mr President, thank you very much. I will not make a long speech; I will only say according to the fourth subparagraph of Rule 59(4) that the plenary gives a mandate for direct negotiations with the Council.

14.8. Notwendigkeit eines umfassenden Mechanismus für Demokratie, Rechtsstaatlichkeit und die Grundrechte (B8-0523/2018, B8-0524/2018) (Abstimmung)

14.9. Umsetzung des Assoziierungsabkommens zwischen der EU und Georgien (A8-0320/2018 - Andrejs Mamikins) (Abstimmung)

— *Prima della votazione sul paragrafo 23:*

Rebecca Harms (Verts/ALE). – Herr Präsident, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Auf Georgien und auch auf andere Länder in der Nachbarschaft gibt es erheblichen politischen Druck aus der Türkei. Dieser Druck richtet sich sehr oft gegen Schulen und Universitäten. Wir können zu Georgien feststellen, dass der Druck gegen die *Black Sea University* nicht erfolgreich gewesen ist, sondern dass nach einer Gerichtsentscheidung und in sehr guter Zusammenarbeit mit Kollegen in der georgischen Regierung und im georgischen Parlament die Zukunft der *Black Sea University* gesichert ist – gegen den Druck aus der Türkei. Danke an die Kollegen in Georgien. Ich möchte beantragen, die spezielle Erwähnung der *Black Sea University* deshalb in unserem Bericht zu streichen.

(L'emendamento orale è accolto)

14.10. Umsetzung des Assoziierungsabkommens zwischen der EU und der Republik Moldau (A8-0322/2018 - Petras Auštrevičius) (Abstimmung)

14.11. Visa aus humanitären Gründen (A8-0328/2018 - Juan Fernando López Aguilar) (Abstimmung)

— Dopo la votazione sulla proposta di risoluzione:

Sylvia-Yvonne Kaufmann (S&D). – Herr Präsident! Entschuldigen Sie bitte, aber eine ganze Reihe von Kollegen hatten ihre Abstimmungskarten wegen der Pause schon aus den Apparaten genommen, und deshalb ist das Ergebnis meines Erachtens verfälscht. Es ist nicht so, die Zahlen können nicht so sein, wie Sie sie eben vorgetragen haben. Wie gesagt, die Kollegen haben die Karten schon zum Teil herausgenommen.

Presidente. – Ho detto due volte che serviva una maggioranza dei deputati. Ho aspettato più del tempo. Hanno votato 595 parlamentari. Non dipende da me se non hanno votato. Io ho detto due volte che serviva una maggioranza qualificata. C'è stata una voglia di levare le tessere.

Miguel Urbán Crespo (GUE/NGL). – Señor presidente, yo digo lo mismo que ha dicho mi colega. Hay mucha gente que creía que había votado a favor y ha quitado la tarjeta porque el voto ha tardado muchísimo en salir en la pantalla. Hemos podido perder una mayoría a favor de una ley muy importante. Yo creo que es un problema evidente.

Presidente, pediría repetir la votación mañana. Pediría votar mañana otra vez. No podemos mandar un mensaje a la ciudadanía europea de que no estamos a favor de los visados humanitarios, presidente.

Presidente. – Onorevole ho ripetuto per ben due volte che serviva la maggioranza dei parlamentari. Sono tutti parlamentari esperti, non è che devo dire io quando devono levare o mettere la carta. È un errore dei parlamentari. È una decisione dei parlamentari.

Juan Fernando López Aguilar, *ponente*. – Señor presidente, como ponente de una iniciativa legislativa que requiere mayoría cualificada, no puede quedar la menor sombra de duda de que la votación ha sido exactamente el reflejo de la voluntad de todos los diputados presentes en la sala.

Desde el momento en que hay testimonios —faltando veinticinco votos para sumar la mayoría absoluta— de que un buen número de diputados que votaron favorablemente ya habían retirado la tarjeta en el momento en que apareció finalmente el recuento de votos en pantalla, parece procedente que esta Cámara se asegure de que el reflejo de ese cómputo es exactamente la voluntad expresada por los diputados presentes en el Pleno.

Por tanto, le pido que sitúe de nuevo en el orden del día como primer punto en la votación de mañana, jueves, la votación de la iniciativa de visados humanitarios.

(Aplausos)

Presidente. – Onorevole López Aguilar, i parlamentari sanno bene come funziona l'Aula. Io ho ripetuto per ben due volte. Non dipende dal Presidente, più che dire che serve la maggioranza dei voti. Quindi la votazione non si può ripetere.

Michael Cramer (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, that was not a mistake by the Members of Parliament, it was a technical mistake, and therefore you have to repeat it tomorrow.

(Applause from certain quarters)

Presidente. – Non serve urlare onorevole. Non sono sordo.

PŘEDSEDNICTVÍ: PAN PAVEL TELIČKA

místopředseda

President. – That concludes the vote.

Colleagues, I understand that maybe for you there is a reason for an exchange of views but to those who are not participating in the explanations of votes, please leave the Chamber and show respect to your colleagues.

Once again. Those who are not participating in the explanation of votes, please leave the Chamber. Colleagues, would you like to show some respect to those who want to participate in the explanations of vote? Please leave the Chamber.

15. Stimmerklärungen

15.1. Zwischenbericht über den Mehrjährigen Finanzrahmen 2021-2027: Standpunkt des Parlaments im Hinblick auf eine Einigung (A8-0358/2018 - Jan Olbrycht, Isabelle Thomas, Janusz Lewandowski, Gérard Deprez)

Oral explanations of vote

Monica Macovei (ECR). – Domnule președinte, cadrul financiar 2021-2027 va crește cu 8 % fondurile europene structurale și de coeziune pentru România – 27 de miliarde de euro pe care putem să-i folosim să facem autostrăzi reale, și nu la televizor, să facem școli, grădinițe și spitale, să le utilizăm să ne echipăm cu echipamente moderne, așa încât, atunci când intrăm într-un spital, să ieșim vindecați și nu să murim, să fim un popor de oameni sănătoși, educați și deștepți.

Guvernul actual nu a folosit însă nici măcar 20 % din fondurile alocate României în 2014. Coaliția PSD-ALDE nu este interesată de educație, sănătate, autostrăzi care să dezvolte mobilitatea comercială și a oamenilor. Ei sunt interesați numai să atace statul de drept și să omoare presa liberă.

România europeană nu înseamnă imperii pentru șefi de partid. Voi lupta pentru locul României în Europa cu orice preț.

Alex Mayer (S&D). – Mr President, low-lying areas in both Essex and Holland will be affected by rises in the level of the North Sea, so we swapped expertise. Norwich and Ghent are two cities with amazing histories, so sharing tourism best practices makes sense. By cooperating with our European neighbours and partners on challenges of an ageing population in Cambridgeshire, on women's professional development in Norfolk and on food waste in Bedfordshire, these are just some of the 112 projects that European funding for cross-border projects Interreg have supported. They represent tens of millions of pounds of investment that would not have happened were we not in the European Union. I would like to thank the Commission for leaving the door open to Britain to continue to participate in Interreg, and I call on the British Government to help protect jobs, businesses and the environment in my region by negotiating our continued access to these important programmes.

Petras Auštrevičius (ALDE). – Mr President, I support this interim report. We should take good note of the effectiveness of our expenditure to ensure political goals. Having limited political resources, we need to name clear political priorities. I believe that adequate resources have to be ensured to tackle new challenges.

Among other priorities, we should properly finance such fields as defence and security, the Erasmus+ and Horizon programmes, allocate adequate funds to the civil society in the EU neighbourhood and ensure that the cohesion policy is for now kept at least at the 2014-2019 levels before gradually downsizing it.

The MFF needs to be ambitious, effective and forward-looking. Therefore, I fully support developing the EU own resources which should fill in the budget gap left by Brexit without increasing the fiscal burden for citizens.

John Howarth (S&D). – Mr President, I support the proposals for the next seven-year budget framework. It is increasingly clear that it is in the interests of the Member States and of citizens to reform the European Union's system of own resources. The tension that is created by the demands on Member States limits the ability of the EU to run an effective budget that delivers added value. This needs to change. New EU resources need not add to the burden of the EU citizen and should reduce the demands on Member State contributions.

For too long, corporations more powerful than nation states have avoided taxes in ways that citizens never can do. Only this union of Member States acting together can change this. Citizens expect corporations to pay their fair share. Their faith in politicians will only be restored when politicians ensure that fair shares are paid.

Bogdan Andrzej Zdrojewski (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Sprawozdanie sprawozdaniu nierówne. Wieloletnie ramy finansowe to długa praca, niezwykle istotna, z wieloletnią, sześcioletnią perspektywą. Chciałem podziękować przy tej okazji Januszowi Lewandowskiemu i Janowi Olbrychtowi, bo wykonali fantastyczną robotę, ale w szczególności za doprowadzenie do tego, że wreszcie program Erasmus+ został podwojony, a docelowo ma być potrojony w finale tej perspektywy. To niezwykle ważny program. Uważam także, że z perspektywy Komisji Kultury i Edukacji bardzo ważne jest także powiększenie dwóch programów: Kreatywna Europa i Europa dla Obywateli. Tam mamy najniższą efektywność na poziomie 16-19 % – musi to niepokoić, ale za same projekty, za ich wsparcie bardzo dziękuję!

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – Pane předsedající, svým hlasováním jsem podpořila postoj Evropského parlamentu k vyjednávání o příštím finančním rámci Evropské unie. Celkovou úroveň rozpočtu na úrovni 1,08 % HDP Evropské unie považuji za realistickou a střídmou. Domnívám se, že občané od nás neočekávají razantní navýšení objemu prostředků, ale spíše jejich efektivní vynaložení na skutečné priority, jako jsou ochrana hranic, bezpečnost a obrana.

Také se zasazuji o myšlenku ztrojnásobit finance na program Erasmus, souhlasím s tím, aby se nesnižovaly prostředky na kohezní politiku. Naopak nesouhlasím s tím, aby součástí Evropského sociálního fondu plus byla takzvaná záruka za děti. Pokud jde o příjmovou stranu, ztotožňuji se s požadavkem zdanit velké digitální společnosti operující na celém trhu Evropské unie.

Morten Messerschmidt (ECR). – Hr. formand! Det er spændende at høre debatten her, hvordan alle strides om at fordele de europæiske skatteyderes penge mest muligt. Men i virkeligheden er det slet ikke et spørgsmål om, hvem der får penge fra EU's svulmende budget, der er det centrale. Nej, spørgsmålet er i virkeligheden, hvordan pengene kommer dertil! Sagen er jo, at i dag betaler de 28 medlemslande ind til budgettet efter en aftale, men det, der lægges op til her, og det, som det store flertal af europaparlamentarikere ønsker, er jo, at EU skal kunne opkræve sine egne skatter. Og det handler i virkeligheden slet ikke om økonomi. Det handler om magt! For alle ved, at der er en central sammenhæng imellem det demokratiske – at stemme til et parlament – og at det er parlamentet, der så skal stå til ansvar for sine beslutninger, bl.a. for hvordan man finansierer sine budgetter. Derfor ønsker Europa-Parlamentet og alle føderalisterne selvfølgelig at flytte den kompetence over til Parlamentet, væk fra medlemslandene, væk fra regeringerne, væk fra det nationale og demokratiske. Det er det centrale i denne betænkning, og derfor stemte jeg selvfølgelig nej i demokratiets navn.

Tibor Szanyi (S&D). – Tisztelt Elnök Úr! Az egyik legfontosabb feladatnak tartom, hogy mielőbb meghatározzuk az Unió következő hosszú távú költségvetésére vonatkozó, és konkrét összegeket is tartalmazó tárgyalási álláspontunkat. Sajnos jelen formájában azonban nem elégséges az EU költségvetése. Új feladatokra új forrásokat, megoldásokat kell keresni, például a közvetlen uniós bevételek növekedésével. Egyetértek az Európai Parlament kialakított álláspontjával, amely szerint kiemelten kell kezelnünk a fiatalokra, a gazdasági növekedésre, a munkahelyteremtésre, a kutatásra és az éghajlatváltozásra, a migrációra, a védelemi és biztonságpolitikára fordítható összegeket. Mindezek mellett felhívom a figyelmet azonban arra, hogy a mezőgazdaságra és a vidékre továbbra is nagyobb hangsúlyt kell fektessünk. Az okos technológiák olyan beruházásokat eredményezhetnek, amelyek egyrészről olcsóbbá tehetik az élelmiszer-termelést, és egészségesebbé az élelmiszereinket. Sőt, ezekből maguk a vidéki közösségek is profitálhatnak, például az okos falvak révén, pontosabban annak szociális, szolgáltatási, energiatermelési és képzési rendszerein keresztül.

Jan Zahradil (ECR). – Pane předsedající, já jsem pro tento tisk nehlasoval z několika důvodů. Uvedu aspoň dva.

Jedním z těch důvodů je otázka vlastních zdrojů Evropské unie. Asi není žádným překvapením, že naše skupina zásadně nesouhlasí s vytvářením dalších vlastních rozpočtových zdrojů, ať už nějakým novým zdaňováním nebo jiným způsobem. Evropská unie není stát, nemá tedy mít vlastní rozpočtové zdroje a její rozpočet má být striktně, přímo a úzce navázán na příspěvky, především příspěvky z národních států, ze členských států.

Druhým důvodem, proč jsem nehlasoval pro, je celkový výhled struktury těch evropských rozpočtů. Jestli myslíme vážně ochranu vnějších hranic a jestli myslíme vážně, že budeme zvyšovat výdaje na tuto kapitolu, musí to být také zohledněno v celkovém přestrukturování rozpočtu a to se bohužel nestalo. Takže za mě mínus a nesouhlas.

Daniel Hannan (ECR). – Mr President, we spend an awful lot of time in this Chamber talking about money – it's our main topic of interest. On this occasion, it was quite funny to see colleagues whose mandate expires in 2019 demanding the right to have a say over how money is spent between 2021 and 2027. But I think actually there will be a shortfall even before then. Obviously, what happens in that MFF is not Britain's business, but as I speak, the chances of Britain leaving without any withdrawal agreement has hugely increased, which will of course have budgetary implications.

There's been one of those unfortunate misreadings of each other's political conditions and the prospect is now being put of a withdrawal agreement that requires membership of the Customs Union. Plainly, that isn't going to get through Parliament, and so we're losing – I'm afraid – the opportunity to have had a cordial, amicable withdrawal process. There's still time to put a looser, more skeletal deal in place that would cover the basic courtesies you expect to have with friendly neighbours, but that time is very short now.

Luke Ming Flanagan (GUE/NGL). – Mr President, I would like to say this: show me where the money is going and you have shown me your policies. The multi-financial framework proposals for 2021-2027 make this clear. It puts fighting before feeding. We are moving from a common plan to feed ourselves to a common plan to go to war. A twenty-two times' increase in defence spending to pay for this. Agriculture, rural development and cohesion funding to take the hit. A sleeping beauty is born all right, and now we are going to have to pay for it.

Also what is going to take a major hit is the sovereignty of our treasuries moving to a system of own-resources for the European Union. What on first viewing seems like something benign enough is in fact another power grab and the beginnings of creating a Treasury for the EU. The proposed increase in GNI contributions from Member States is something I cannot support, because the soup it creates contains ingredients that are indigestible when it comes to Ireland's neutrality.

15.2. Waffenexporte und die Umsetzung des Gemeinsamen Standpunkts 2008/944/GASP (A8-0335/2018 - Sabine Lösing)

Oral explanations of vote

Petras Auštrevičius (ALDE). – Mr President, in this complex global security environment, it is undeniable that sometimes weapons and other military machinery might also end up in conflict zones, contributing to grave human rights violations. The common position on arms exports lays down procedure and common criteria by which individual Member States should guide their transactions of arms and military technologies. Profits cannot be made at the expense of human security and respect of human rights. Each Member State should take the responsibility for its arms exports. Within this report, we call on the exporting countries to apply assessment criteria when exporting weaponry, and ensure full transparency of such transactions. Selling weapons to violent regimes is not a matter of negotiation.

Bogdan Andrzej Zdrojewski (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! To piąte podejście Parlamentu Europejskiego do nielegalnego eksportu broni i de facto piąta porażka. Może nie taka zupełna, niedruzgocąca, ale niestety efektywność w tym projekcie – projekcie dotyczącym przejrzystości pewnych ograniczeń, budowania standardów, musimy to przyznać, kończy się porażką. Wstrzymałem się od głosu przy tej rezolucji, przy tym sprawozdaniu przede wszystkim dlatego, że jestem przeciwnikiem transportu, eksportu broni i handlu bronią tam, gdzie mamy do czynienia z konfliktami i z wielkimi problemami humanitarnymi. Z drugiej strony jednak cały czas zwracam uwagę na to, że instytucje europejskie i państwa Unii Europejskiej w tej materii są niestety nieskuteczne.

Morten Messerschmidt (ECR). – Hr. formand! Vi så i går her i kammeret Angela Merkel, den tyske kansler, stå og tale for behovet for et fælles, europæisk forsvar. Vi har også tidligere hørt det samme fra Macron i Paris og fra kommissionsformand Juncker osv. Denne betænkning er jo selvsagt et led i den strategi. Jeg kan ikke forestille mig noget mere farligt end tanken om, at det europæiske forsvar skal løsrives fra det Amerika, som i flere generationer nu har været garantien for, at vi netop har så fredelige forhold, som vi har. En 1. verdenskrig hvor det var helt utænkeligt, at udfaldet ville have været, som det var, hvis ikke amerikanerne havde interveneret. En 2. verdenskrig osv. Jeg kan ikke forstå, og jeg kan slet ikke begribe, hvordan det her hus kan have en sådan ahistorisk, historieløs tilgang til noget så væsentligt som europæernes forsvar. Vi har brug for amerikanerne, de har brug for os, også selv om vi måske ikke er enige i alt det, der foregår i Det Hvide Hus i øjeblikket. Alt andet lige ifølge forfatningen sidder man kun i fire år ad gangen, vi skal ikke bruge disse pludselige sentimenter til at kaste barnet ud med badevandet.

Dobromir Sośnierz (NI). – Panie Przewodniczący! To jest kolejna uchwała tego Parlamentu, która podważa niepodległość państw członkowskich. Nie ma żadnego ważnego powodu, żeby Unia Europejska wkraczała w tę dziedzinę. Nie do takiej Unii się zapisywaliśmy, nie na taką Unię się zgadzaliśmy, a teraz po kolei Unia próbuje eliminować kompetencje państw członkowskich ze wszystkiego.

Jeśli chodzi o handel bronią, jest on bardzo szczegółowo regulowany przez prawo wszystkich państw członkowskich. Nie ma żadnej potrzeby, żeby coś do tego dokładać, a jeśli różne kraje różnie interpretują 8 z kryteriów wspólnego stanowiska, to mają do tego prawo. Dlaczego teraz jedne państwa powiedzą drugim, że te drugie interpretują te 8 kryteriów źle? I już jestem w stanie się domyślić, które państwa powiedzą którym, że nie mają racji. Jak zawsze okaże się, że to my nie mamy racji.

Luke Ming Flanagan (GUE/NGL). – Mr President, we're talking about a common standard for exports of weapons. How about we adopt a common standard that we stop exporting weapons in the first place?

Why are we involved in this dirty game? Is the European Union not already filled with massive resources, which means that we can have a very high quality of life and everything we need, if it was properly distributed, without getting involved in the dirty, filthy low-life business of producing the instruments of death?

Ireland, for the first time in centuries, has peace. We are lucky to have it. And the reason why we have peace is because we've moved out of that area. We've started to talk to each other, and as a result of it we now live in a better place. We need higher standards all round here. I'm voting in favour of this report, but, sadly, I have to say it is a floor, a very low floor, like a toilet.

15.3. Stärkung der Wettbewerbsbehörden zur Gewährleistung des reibungslosen Funktionierens des Binnenmarkts (A8-0057/2018 - Andreas Schwab)

Oral explanations of vote

Morten Messerschmidt (ECR). – Hr. formand! Det ligger mig på sinde at sige et par positive ord om Schwabs betænkning, fordi det er så afgørende vigtigt for væksten og samhandlen, at vi har ordentlige regler for det indre marked. Men et af de store problemer med det indre marked er jo netop, at det har udviklet sig i et sådant hastigt tempo, at de fornuftige regler ikke har kunnet følge med. Det ser vi eksempelvis i de domme, der falder ved EU-Domstolen, som forpligter medlemslande til pludselig at udbetale sociale ydelser helt ud over det rimelige, helt ud over det, som vælgerne nogensinde er stillet i udsigt, når de har stemt om traktaterne som følge af det indre marked. Derfor tror jeg, at vi har brug at sætte et kritisk blik på, hvad det indre marked egentlig i dag betyder. Den fri bevægelighed for varer og kapital er nok relativt problemfri, men serviceydelser og arbejdstagere begynder at volde stadig flere problemer i forhold til vores sociale velfærdsordninger. Det må vi ikke lukke øjnene for, heller ikke om hr. Schwab har svært ved at åbne sine.

Tibor Szanyi (S&D). – Tisztelt Elnök Úr! A jelentést szavazatommal támogattam. Örömmel tölt el, hogy a korábbi éves versenypolitikai jelentésbe foglalt kezdeményezésemnek köszönhetően elindult munkánk, és ennek ma már újabb stádiumába léphettünk. A javaslatot az S&D frakció többek között azért is tudta támogatni, mert az garantálja, hogy a nemzeti versenyhatóságok hatékonyabb eljárásokat folytassanak erősebb döntéshozatali és szankcionálási eszközök biztosítása révén. Javaslatunkra került be az európai parlamenti jelentésbe, hogy a nemzeti versenyhatóságok függetlensége nem kerülhet veszélybe az esetleges kormányzati befolyásolási szándékok által. Pozitív szavazatunk feltétele volt továbbá, hogy a tagállami engedékenységi eljárások harmonizálása is kellő módon szabályozásra kerüljön, és hogy a bíróság maximális összegét az érintett vállalkozás teljes világméretű forgalmának legalább tíz százalékában kell megállapítani a jövőben.

15.4. CO_2-Emissionsnormen für neue schwere Nutzfahrzeuge (A8-0354/2018 - Bas Eickhout)

Oral explanations of vote

Paul Brannen (S&D). – Mr President, climate change is the biggest threat that we all face, whether we live in a rich country or a poor country, and emissions from heavy goods vehicles are a major cause of CO_2 emissions.

Heavy goods vehicles delivering heavy loads to construction sites with steel and concrete, brick and block are a major cause of emissions in our major cities around the world. However, if we were to build in wood – which is up to five times lighter than concrete, steel, brick and block – we could drastically reduce the number of deliveries to our construction sites by as much as 80%.

An 80% reduction in heavy goods vehicles delivering steel and concrete, brick and block to building sites around the world, replacing it with wood, would make a considerable contribution to tackling climate change. If we are serious about tackling climate change, we need to build in wood.

Bogdan Andrzej Zdrojewski (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Sprawozdanie dotyczące standardów emisji CO_2 dla samochodów ciężarowych to znakomity przykład, jak dobrą intencję, dobre sprawozdanie, dobrą propozycję można zepsuć w samych głosowaniach. Nie poparłem tego sprawozdania przede wszystkim dlatego, że jest ono ostatecznie całkowicie nierealne, niemożliwe do zaakceptowania przez wiele państw i niezwykle kosztowne w realizacji. Uważam, że w takich przedsięwzięciach Parlament Europejski powinien jednak zachowywać daleko idącą ostrożność przy uwzględnianiu uwarunkowań geograficznych i przemysłowych i starać się, aby propozycje, które przedkłada, były adekwatne i możliwe do zrealizowania. Niestety w efekcie tego głosowania poszliśmy, według mnie, zdecydowanie za daleko w obszar całkowicie nierealny, niezwykle kosztowny i niemożliwy do zrealizowania.

José Inácio Faria (PPE). – Senhor Presidente, votei a favor deste relatório uma vez mais, depois de na Comissão de Ambiente se ter aprovado por larga maioria o melhor compromisso, que defende, simultaneamente, a convergência com as metas ecológicas estipuladas pelo Acordo de Paris e a proteção dos interesses sociais e que, além disso, ainda traz benefícios económicos. Esta é a verdadeira solução de ganho mútuo.

Estamos num momento em que não nos podemos dar ao luxo de falhar compromissos. Por isso, volto a frisar a importância da introdução de medidas de penalização por incumprimento das metas de emissões de CO_2, a par das medidas de incentivo para veículos de emissões zero. Estas penalizações têm de ser eficazes e não se podem cifrar em valores inferiores ao próprio custo da transição tecnológica. Se assim não for, chegaremos ao ridículo de ser mais barato pagar multas do que fazer os investimentos necessários.

Temos de ser coerentes. O fator de correção de CO_2 para combustíveis alternativos de *performance* avançada já está contemplado na Diretiva Energias Renováveis II. Este tipo de medida iria levar ao duplo benefício, o que não faz qualquer sentido neste regulamento, uma vez que os construtores de automóveis estariam a beneficiar de um esforço que é, em boa verdade, feito pelos produtores destes combustíveis.

Caros colegas, só há um futuro… *(O Presidente retira a palavra ao orador.)*

15.5. Notwendigkeit eines umfassenden Mechanismus für Demokratie, Rechtsstaatlichkeit und die Grundrechte (B8-0523/2018, B8-0524/2018)

Oral explanations of vote

Tibor Szanyi (S&D). – Tisztelt Elnök Úr! Támogattam, hogy határozatban is rögzítsük a Parlament elégedetlenségét, amiért a Bizottság, és főleg a Tanács akadályozza az immár két éve előirányzott intézményközi megállapodást egy átfogó, a tagállamok alapjogokat sértő magatartásának szankcionálását célzó mechanizmusról. Azóta a kérdés politikai tétjét csak tovább növelte a szélsőséges EU-ellenes populista erők térnyerése Európában, valamint a demokratikus jogállam szisztematikus leépítése, a tudatos jogsértések napi gyakorlattá válása némely kormány részéről. Sajnos az utóbbira a legjobb, bocsánat, legsúlyosabb példát saját hazámban az Orbán-kormány szolgáltatja, amely az uniós jog hiányosságait, az európai intézmények következetlenségét kihasználva gyakorlatilag következmények nélkül folytatja az európai értékeket és jogot semmibe vevő, a demokratikus intézményeket leromboló politikáját. A magyar példa önmagában is bizonyítja, hogy az EU jelenleg nem rendelkezik a Közösség szabályainak betartását kikényszerítő eszközzel.

Benedek Jávor (Verts/ALE). – Tisztelt Elnök Úr! A jogállamiság lerombolása fertőző kórként terjed az Európai Unióban. Magyarországon kezdődött, Lengyelországban folytatódott, de ma már látnunk kell jeleit Olaszországtól Románián, Csehországon keresztül Szlovákiáig, vagy Bulgáriáig. A jogállamiság kikezdésével ezek az országok nem az EU ellen harcolnak, hanem saját polgáraik ellen. Amikor aláássák a bírói függetlenséget, amikor a korrupciót engedik terjedni az országban, amikor sértik a médiaszabadságot, akkor a saját állampolgáraik jogait sértik. Ugyanakkor mindez veszélyes az Európai Unió számára is. Ha az európai integráció nem képes érvényesíteni az alapvető jogokat és értékeket, amelyeken alapszik, ha hagyja, hogy Orbánok, Kaczyńskik, Dragneák zavartalanul ássák alá a jogállami értékeket, akkor ez a közösség szét fog morzsolódni. Határozott intézkedésekre, határozott lépésekre van szükség, hogy megállítsuk a jogállamiság szétrombolását az európai tagállamokban.

Jiří Pospíšil (PPE). – Pane předsedající, já jsem se při hlasování o této zprávě po dlouhém uvažování zdržel. Chci dopředu říci, že jsem velkým zastáncem hodnot, jako je demokracie, právní stát, principy, na kterých stojí evropská civilizace. Musím ale přiznat, že ta zpráva, jak je napsána a pojata, podle mého názoru tento problém neřeší.

Myslím si, že vytváří určitý princip kolektivní viny a takové mechanismy jako to, že jednotlivé členské státy budou každý rok předkládat zprávu o stavu lidských práv ve své zemi a ta zpráva bude vyhodnocována pravděpodobně Evropskou komisí, spíše vytvoří a posílí antievropské nálady v některých členských státech, než aby efektivně přispěly k ochraně těchto evropských hodnot.

Takže já jsem pro, abychom chránili právní stát, lidská práva, aby Evropská unie zasáhla vůči státům, kde dochází ke zjevnému porušení těchto hodnot, ale tato zpráva bohužel řešení, která by toto mohla přinést, nepřináší.

Marek Jurek (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! Demokracja to kontrola narodu nad władzą, a nie uruchamianie mechanizmów kontroli nad narodami, nad ich demokratycznymi decyzjami, nad ich prawem, nad instytucjami, które tworzą. Dzisiejsze głosowanie to akt uzurpacji Parlamentu w stosunku do traktatów, bo pamiętajmy zawsze, że choćbyśmy reprezentowali większość większości państw, to jesteśmy tylko jedną z władz powołanych na podstawie traktatów przez nasze państwa. Kto kwestionuje ten fakt, kto przypisuje Parlamentowi większą władzę, ten kwestionuje traktaty europejskie. Kto atakuje państwa Europy, ten atakuje Unię, którą te państwa zawarły, bo Unia Europejska jest unią naszych państw, a nie ideologii, którą będzie popierała większość Parlamentu Europejskiego. Dzisiejszy akt jest bardzo groźny nie tylko dla demokracji, ale również dla samej współpracy narodów Europy.

Adam Szejnfeld (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Demokracja, praworządność i prawa człowieka są fundamentem Unii Europejskiej, duszą Europejczyków. Tak też jesteśmy postrzegani na całym świecie, na wszystkich kontynentach. Unia Europejska jest dla innych narodów i dla innych państw wzorem tworzenia demokracji i dobrobytu dla swoich obywateli. Niestety w ostatnich latach przeżywamy w niektórych państwach członkowskich kryzys szacunku dla tych wielkich, wspaniałych wartości cywilizacyjnych. Wzrasta siła ruchów nacjonalistycznych, autorytarnych, antydemokratycznych niszczących państwo prawa i praworządność. Unia Europejska nie posiada jednak sprawnych i realnych narzędzi przeciwdziałania tym ruchom, dlatego w przeciwieństwie do mojego kolegi przedmówcy jestem zwolennikiem przyjęcia tego mechanizmu. Jest on konieczny dla ochrony obywateli Europy przed rządami autorytarnymi.

Andrejs Mamikins (S&D). – Mr President, I support this resolution, but I want to underline that this is only the first concrete step towards ensuring that the Member States respect the principles that the case has subscribed to. Central and Eastern European countries' sole claim to fulfil the Copenhagen criteria, including their political criteria on the respect for human rights and protection of minorities, but they also made promises to improve their unaddressed issues.

Let me take the example of my country, Latvia. Before accession, it was subject to the screening mechanisms that showed the need to give minorities more representation and finish with the practice of statelessness. Since the accession, Latvia put this request into the archives. It might seem ironic if it were not so sad. So, what can the EU do to avoid this moral hazard and post-accession opportunism? The reply can be found in this resolution. The Commission must present a proposal for a comprehensive new mechanism on democracy, the rule of law and fundamental rights.

Dobromir Sośnierz (NI). – Panie Przewodniczący! Cała polityka kija i marchewki w Unii Europejskiej polega na tym, że marchewka jest coraz mniejsza, a kij coraz grubszy. Już dzisiaj przegłosowaliśmy sankcje w związku z wywozem broni, teraz głosujemy nad „porządnym drągiem" na wszystkie państwa, które nie będą się słuchały kierowniczej, przywódczej roli Niemiec w tym przedsięwzięciu.

To jest ewidentne pogwałcenie traktatów i filozofii, na której Unia Europejska miała się opierać. Jest to narzędzie do dyscyplinowania krajów, które się nie słuchają. A co będzie traktowane jako brak praworządności lub praworządność, to już wiemy: będzie to to, co Niemcy uznają za brak praworządności. Nie na przykład to, że każe się posłów za treści ich wypowiedzi w tym Parlamencie, nie to, że w głosowaniu nad zastosowaniem art. 7 wobec Węgier łamie się zasady liczenia głosów, nie to, że przewodniczący Juncker mianuje z pogwałceniem prawa sekretarza generalnego, tylko pogwałceniem prawa i praworządności będzie to, co będzie nie na rękę rządzącym tutaj Unią.

15.6. Umsetzung des Assoziierungsabkommens zwischen der EU und Georgien (A8-0320/2018 - Andrejs Mamikins)

Oral explanations of vote

Petras Auštrevičius (ALDE). – Mr President, I'm very glad the Georgian Government continues to demonstrate political will and determination to further advance the reforms within the scope of the Association Agreement. I also welcome the wide-ranging support of the Georgian people for the country's pro-European choice, as well as the long-standing cross-party accord for this strategic policy goal.

While undergoing economic and social reforms, Georgia equally – as other countries with European inspirations – needs to stay firmly focused on the implementation of its political obligations too. Full respect of core democratic principles and fundamental freedoms is the country's essential commitment within the Association Agreement and needs to remain an absolute priority for this and other Georgian governments for years to come.

Jiří Pospíšil (PPE). – Pane předsedající, já jsem s radostí podpořil tuto zprávu. Pro mě jako pro poslance z České republiky, tedy ze země, která bohužel měla zkušenosti se sovětskou okupací v době komunismu, je pozitivní číst, že bývalá země Sovětského svazu Gruzie je dnes aktivním partnerem Evropské unie, že usiluje o vstup do Evropské unie a že provádí reformy, které jsou součástí dnešního partnerství, dnešního vztahu.

Je velmi pozitivní, že v této oblasti je dneska Gruzie hlavním lídrem spolupráce mezi Evropskou unií a tamním regionem, a jsem velmi rád, že jsme přijali tuto pochvalnou zprávu, a doufám, že ta zpráva povede k tomu, že dále posílíme chuť gruzínské vlády vypracovat strategii pro členství v Evropské unii a i posílíme chuť gruzínského lidu, aby se tato země stala členem Evropské unie.

Jan Zahradil (ECR). – Pane předsedající, Gruzie je velmi důležitá strategicky i geopoliticky. Moje politická rodina má na gruzínské politické scéně své přátele, dokonce i v současné gruzínské vládě máme partnery a myslíme si, že Evropská unie by měla věnovat Gruzii patřičnou pozornost, mimo jiné i proto, že tato země se před časem stala jakýmsi modelovým příkladem pro ruský tlak a je dobré tu situaci dále bedlivě sledovat a monitorovat. Proto je dobře, že sledujeme implementaci asociační dohody, proto je dobře, že jsou tady zaznamenány pokroky. Když se podíváme na tu cestu, kterou Gruzie prošla od doby rozpadu Sovětského svazu, tak je to skutečně obdivuhodné, čeho tato země docílila. Podporu Evropské unie a nás všech si rozhodně do budoucna dále zaslouží.

15.7. Umsetzung des Assoziierungsabkommens zwischen der EU und der Republik Moldau (A8-0322/2018 - Petras Auštrevičius)

Oral explanations of vote

Jiří Pospíšil (PPE). – Pane předsedající, tak toto je bohužel odlišný případ oproti případu, o kterém jsme hovořili, oproti Gruzii. Tentokrát se jedná o provádění dohody o přidružení mezi Evropskou unií a Moldavskem. Bohužel je tato zpráva, podle mého názoru bohužel správně, velmi kritická vůči Moldavsku.

Zkrátka a dobře Moldavsko se svým vnitropolitickým vývojem nepřibližuje k Evropské unii, kritéria, která my máme pro naše členy a partnery, jako je budování právního státu, nezávislé volby, funkční justice a tak dále, bohužel tato země neplní. Ve zprávě je velmi kriticky popsáno to, co je hlavním problémem – stav justice, podivná volební reforma, potlačování nezávislých médií. Souhlasím s tou částí, která říká, že pokud se situace nezlepší, je třeba uvažovat o omezení makrofinanční pomoci této zemi.

Jan Zahradil (ECR). – Pane předsedající, já jsem nedávno v Moldavsku byl. Tuto zemi očekávají velice brzy po Novém roce parlamentní volby. Je to země, která je sužována celou řadou neduhů, zejména různými korupčními skandály a aférami, které je nutno pečlivě vyšetřit.

Musím říci na základě vlastní zkušenosti, vlastního pozorování, že mám pocit, že se tam neměří stejným metrem, že prostě v některých případech jsou ty aféry zametány pod koberec, zatímco v některých případech spíše z politických důvodů jsou zase ti exponenti vystaveni velkému tlaku. Také je to země, která čelí, můžeme to směle nazvat, ruskému vměšování, ovlivňování pomocí sdělovacích prostředků. Moldavsko už přijalo některá opatření tak, aby se proti tomuto tlaku bránilo, ale je zapotřebí v tom pokračovat a opět je zapotřebí vývoj v této zemi bedlivě sledovat.

15.8. Visa aus humanitären Gründen (A8-0328/2018 - Juan Fernando López Aguilar)

Oral explanations of vote

Urszula Krupa (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! Mimo że jestem za przyznawaniem wiz humanitarnych w uzasadnionych przypadkach, głosowałam przeciwko sprawozdaniu, w którym regulacje opierają się na wątpliwej podstawie prawnej.

Umożliwienie wjazdu na terytorium państwa członkowskiego wydającego wizę wyłącznie w celu złożenia wniosku w tym państwie może stwarzać liczne problemy, a miało zapewnić legalne i bezpieczne ścieżki procedur, pozwalające na unikanie śmierci na morzu i działalności przemytników. Istnieje także konieczność zapewnienia dodatkowych regulacji dotyczących postępowania z osobami, którym dane państwo umożliwi przybycie, odmawiając jednak ochrony. Istnieje także uzasadniona obawa nadmiernego obciążenia ambasad, gdy migranci będą przemieszczać się po terytorium Unii Europejskiej.

Ponadto niezwykle skomplikowana procedura przyznawania wizy w maksymalnym okresie dwóch tygodni będzie trudna do realizacji. Równie niekorzystny wydaje się pomysł dopuszczenia składania wniosku wizowego na odległość i mechanizm dopuszczania usługodawców zewnętrznych.

Andrejs Mamikins (S&D). – Priekšsēdētāj! Protams, es balsoju par sava kolēģa *Lopez Aguilar* ziņojumu. Balsoju "par" kopā ar savu politisko grupu un citiem biedriem. Bet tas, kas notika balsojuma brīdī, tas, pirmām kārtām, nerada godu mums — Eiropas Parlamentam. Tā ir tehniska kļūda. Un es saprotu, kad ultralabējie politiķi saka, ka mums nav jāizsniedz humanitārās vīzas tikai tāpēc, ka it kā tur kaut kādi migranti it kā brauks, un mums jācīnās it kā pret migrantiem. Tas ir absurds, tā ir viņu retorika.

Bet, kad Parlamenta priekšsēdētājs Tajāni kungs, redzot, ka tā ir tehniska kļūda, negrib pārbalsot tāpēc, ka vairākums šajā mājā, šajā ēkā ir par humanitāro vīzu izsniegšanu — tā, man šķiet, ir kļūda, un mums obligāti principā būtu bijis jāpārbalso šis dokuments. Viņš ir ļoti svarīgs. Humanitārās vīzas parāda Eiropas karogu pasaulē.

Mums obligāti bija jābalso "par". Paldies!

16. Berichtigungen des Stimmverhaltens und beabsichtigtes Stimmverhalten: siehe Protokoll

(The sitting was suspended at 14.22)

PRESIDE: RAMÓN LUIS VALCÁRCEL SISO

Vicepresidente

17. Wiederaufnahme der Sitzung

(Se reanuda la sesión a las 15.01 horas).

18. Genehmigung des Protokolls der vorangegangenen Sitzung: siehe Protokoll

19. Vorlage von Dokumenten: siehe Protokoll

20. Mittelübertragungen und Haushaltsbeschlüsse: siehe Protokoll

21. Stärkung der Widerstandsfähigkeit der EU gegen den Einfluss ausländischer Akteure auf die anstehende Wahlkampagne des EP (Aussprache über ein aktuelles Thema)

El presidente. – El punto siguiente en el orden del día es el debate de actualidad (artículo 153 bis del Reglamento interno) sobre el refuerzo de la resiliencia de la Unión frente a la influencia de agentes externos en la próxima campaña electoral del Parlamento Europeo (2018/2919(RSP)).

Paulo Rangel, *Autor.* – Senhor Presidente, Senhor representante do Conselho, Senhora Comissária, parece-me que é importante, antes de mais, percebermos que no mundo digital, ou como se dizia antes disso no mundo virtual, as ameaças que ocorrem à transparência, aos princípios da isenção e da independência em processos eleitorais, se quiserem aos pilares da democracia, não são ameaças virtuais, não são ameaças digitais, são ameaças reais. E, por isso, é fundamental que, tendo em vista a experiência dos últimos anos e designadamente aquilo que se suspeita que poderá ter acontecido no caso do Brexit e do referendo do Brexit, que pode ter sucedido nas eleições americanas de 2016, que pode estar a suceder em alguns movimentos, como, por exemplo, os movimentos a respeito da questão da Catalunha e se deve haver mais autonomia, menos autonomia, independência ou não independência.

Aquilo que nós verificamos é que, por via digital, há constantemente interferência nestes processos e interferência cujo autor não somos capazes de identificar e muitas vezes cujo desígnio não somos capazes de identificar.

E, portanto, é com este desafio novo às questões de isenção, de imparcialidade e de transparência no processo eleitoral, mas também no debate que precede o processo eleitoral, que temos de rever aqueles que são os procedimentos das entidades públicas e, em particular, das entidades responsáveis pelo processo eleitoral, seja a nível nacional, seja a nível europeu.

É aqui fundamental, em primeiro lugar, a proteção de dados. Aí já demos um passo importante quando fizemos o enquadramento através deste regulamento para a proteção de dados em que a União Europeia é altamente inovadora. É verdade que a própria Comissão já avançou com um conjunto de ideias e de propostas para combater os ciberataques, mas temos, porventura, de ir mais longe. Temos de ir mais longe e de encarar estas ameaças como ameaças, eu diria, globais.

E aqui queria introduzir um outro fator ainda, antes de dizer quais são os dois campos em que julgo que devemos atuar. Estamos aqui a tratar de ameaças externas. É o tema deste debate de atualidade: as ameaças externas. Mas não tenhamos ilusões, também há ameaças internas. Quer dizer, neste mundo digital, seja do ciberataque, seja do abuso dos dados que são recolhidos, tanto pode haver agentes internos como agentes externos, porque os adversários da democracia, os adversários da transparência, os adversários da isenção não são apenas potências estrangeiras. Temos provas de que estão a atuar de acordo com o seu interesse geoestratégico, mas não haja dúvidas de que há também grupos e entidades dentro das nossas fronteiras, das fronteiras europeias, que têm os mesmos desígnios ou que têm desígnios do mesmo tipo.

E aqui diria que devemos atuar em duas áreas fundamentais: uma é a área da regulamentação do tratamento de dados e da proteção dos cidadãos em geral e dos seus dados e isto vai para os operadores em geral e vai também para as empresas, as fundações, os partidos políticos, as autoridades públicas.

E depois temos de ter uma outra preocupação, que é uma preocupação já de natureza penal. Já é uma segunda preocupação, porque por mais regras e garantias que tenhamos vai sempre haver ciberataques, vai sempre haver criminosos que têm algum sucesso. E temos de ter condições tecnológicas e condições de investigação das polícias que nos permitam também prevenir e repelir e punir esse tipo de ataques, sejam eles ataques estrangeiros, sejam eles ataques nacionais.

Karoline Edtstadler, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Mr President, I would like to thank the House for the opportunity to exchange views on the very topical issue of increasing EU resilience against the influence of foreign actors on the upcoming European election campaign.

As you will be aware, the European Council attaches great importance to the matter. This year it addressed, both in June and October, questions of internal security, including cybersecurity and disinformation, also in the context of the upcoming European elections. Work is also under way in the Council in response to the Commission communication on 'Tackling online disinformation: a European approach', and the package on securing free and fair European elections.

On the latter, the Council is engaged in strengthening the EU Regulation on the Statute and Funding of European Political Parties and Foundations and is examining the non-legislative part of the package in order to adopt conclusions from the Council and Member States as soon as possible.

In addition, we are looking forward to the action plan for a coordinated EU response to disinformation, which is being jointly developed by the Commission and the EEAS. It should be relevant both for EU institutions and for Member States, as well as for international partners, and should propose concrete measures and resources to respond to hostile information operations in a coordinated and comprehensive way.

In 2018, the number of social media users world-wide reached almost 3.2 billion, marking an increase of 13% in just one year. With the number of users expanding at such a rate, it comes as no surprise why social media have become a highly attractive target to cyberattacks, capable of impacting electoral campaigns and thus destabilising the democratic basis of our societies.

Criminal misuse of the internet is a serious concern for the Council. It bears the risk of violating the privacy and fundamental rights of our citizens, attacking the integrity of information and seeking to disrupt the credibility of the internet. Therefore, it should be our common goal to ensure that technology used in electoral campaigns safeguards these basic principles and guarantees the legitimacy of electoral outcomes.

The improvement of our resilience and preparedness to counter cyberattacks, including targeting electoral campaigns, requires our full, immediate and constant effort. In the last two years, we have seen numerous initiatives, measures and instruments in the area of cybersecurity, seeking to enhance the resilience of our systems and networks.

The ambitious Cybersecurity Package, presented by the Commission in September 2017, was followed by a set of Council conclusions and an action plan for the continuous monitoring of their respective implementation. They emphasise the need to enhance the EU's capacity to prevent, deter and respond to cyberattacks. In June 2017, the Council agreed on a framework for a joint EU diplomatic response to malicious cyber-activities. In October 2017, the Political and Security Committee (PSC) agreed on implementing guidelines outlining the measures as part of the framework and decision-making procedures.

Member States have seen repeated their wish to continuously improve the EU's ability to respond to diplomatically to malicious cyber activities in order to influence the behaviour of potential aggressors in the short and the long term. Finally, the European Council, in its conclusion last month, calls for measures to 'protect the Union's democratic system and combat disinformation, including in the context of the upcoming European elections in full respect of fundamental rights'.

It is our firm commitment, in line with the call to ensure rapid examination and follow-up of the recent set of measures proposed by the Commission on election cooperation networks, online transparency, protection against cybersecurity incidents, unlawful data manipulation, fighting disinformation campaigns and tightening the rules on European political party funding. The protection of the European Parliament elections and of the democratic basis of our society, including cyberspace, is our paramount task and joint responsibility.

Věra Jourová, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, I would like to thank Parliament for this most urgent plenary debate. We will have elections to the European Parliament in May 2019 and 50 various elections will have taken place by 2020. We have to adjust the protection of the integrity of our elections to the digital age. And we have to protect our democratic processes from new ways of manipulation by third countries or private interests. The Facebook Cambridge Analytica scandal showed how personal data can be misused for the profiling and targeting of voters, and how valuable our new data protection rules are.

We have seen the spread of fake news or disinformation coordinated on an unprecedented scale, including from outside the EU. We have learnt of hacking of candidates and cyber attacks on elections around the world, including in Europe. Crucial electoral rules have been breached or circumvented, in particular existing rules on the transparency of campaign financing. Investigations are ongoing into allegations of dark financing from undisclosed third country sources. The most cited source of activities interfering with elections in Europe is Russia. But others are learning from Russia. We have observed other countries and private interests increase their capabilities for election interference. Given the very nature of our Union, electoral interference in one Member State affects the EU as a whole. National authorities cannot address these threats by working in isolation, nor can private sector self-regulation solve it all.

Soon we will publish the results of a special Eurobarometer on elections and democracy. Already now I can share with you that it shows that Europeans are worried: 73% are concerned about disinformation or misinformation online in the pre-election period; 81% are in favour of online social networks being fully transparent about political content online and about who is paying for them; 80% are in favour of online social networks making clear the amount of money they receive from political parties.

The Commission and the European External Action Service are working hand in hand to define and implement an appropriate EU-wide response. In the long term, our objective should be that our respective societies all become more resilient and capable of defending themselves against disinformation. This means, for example, improving media literacy, access to quality journalism, supporting independent fact checkers and working with online platforms on how to prevent disinformation campaigns online without – and this is important to mention – restricting freedom of expression and freedom of speech. In the short term, our priority should be a coordinated response to the threats against the upcoming European and national elections.

The recent election package adopted by the Commission includes several concrete measures. They are: the establishment of elections cooperation networks at national and at EU level; guidance on the application of data protection rules in the electoral context; recommendations on greater transparency in paid online political advertisements and communication; strengthened cybersecurity; diligent enforcement of existing electoral rules; awareness-raising and a legislative proposal allowing to sanction the misuse of personal data for electoral purposes.

I encourage the co-legislators to complete their work on it as soon as possible so that it is in force before the elections. We need to improve our analytical capabilities to detect, analyse and expose disinformation campaigns in cooperation with EU Member States and with the intelligence community working on hybrid threats.

Allow me to give you a quick overview of our follow-up actions. The Commission has written to the Member States urging them to set up their national election networks, and to identify appropriate single points of contact by the end of this month. We will convene the first meeting of the European election network in January. This network will facilitate the fast exchange of information and best practices, but also provide support to Member States in addressing the main areas of concern, which are: coordination of all relevant national authorities involved in the protection of elections; cybersecurity; strategy communication; data protection and hybrid threats.

In the area of cybersecurity, the Commission organised in October a high-level conference bringing together, for the first time, 70 representatives of Member States, national electoral and cybersecurity authorities. The results of this important conference, which was organised mainly by Julian King, who is here today with me, will feed into the 2018 colloquium on fundamental rights, which Commission First Vice-President Timmermans and I will organise together in November, and which will be dedicated this year to democracy in the European Union. The Commission welcomes that the leading online platforms and representatives of the online advertising sector have agreed on a self-regulatory code of practice to address online disinformation. The Commission is monitoring closely its implementation.

However, this is not enough. In June this year, the European Council tasked the Commission and the External Action Service to develop an action plan on tackling disinformation. This action plan, which we are currently working on, will outline specific proposals for a coordinated EU response to the challenge of disinformation. We will build on existing initiatives, such as the work of the East StratCom Task Force, which was created in 2015 to address Russia's ongoing disinformation campaigns. It will also build on the work of the Hybrid Fusion Cell, as well as the European Centre of Excellence for countering hybrid threats. An important part of their work is showing who is behind the disinformation attacks that are aimed against EU interests.

Addressing disinformation also means that we need to improve our ability to make our voice heard, to pass our messages and to tell our story. We therefore need to strengthen our strategic communications capacities, both within the EU and abroad. Finally, close cooperation and coordination of our efforts with the European Parliament in the run-up to the 2019 elections is absolutely crucial, and I fully trust we can rely on your support.

David McAllister (PPE). – Mr President, the EU Member States, as we have just heard, are facing an unprecedented threat to their democratic societies. Disinformation campaigns and the continuous support for anti-European political forces are undermining the European project and Western democracies in general. The efforts of non-state actors and third countries – and let's name it, especially Russia – to distort facts, to manipulate reality, to foster distrust in the democratic process and even to interfere in our democratic elections, are completely unacceptable.

We must act immediately and boldly to enhance the EU's resilience against such threats, including the risks for our next European elections in May 2019. In the run-up to the European elections, the European Union should focus on cooperation and information. Member States and EU institutions need to cooperate more intensively and share information more effectively. In this context, Commissioner Jourová, I support the Commission's proposal for a cybersecurity competence centre. The European Union needs an effective, well-targeted and tailor-made strategy to communicate and promote EU policies in the run-up to our next elections.

We have to stand united. The EU cannot, and must not, tolerate an undeclared war against our liberal values underpinning the peace and prosperity of our continent.

(Applause)

Claude Moraes, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Mr President, I would like to thank the EPP and thank the author very much for introducing this topical debate. It could not be more important and better timed. For my group, the S&D, this is a big priority and I think the previous speaker spoke very eloquently on why that is the case, and I should say that very directly to him.

But let's be very clear, colleagues. For years we have been warning about the threat posed by the collection of citizens' data online by a handful of social media companies and the power of those who hold this information. The revelations involving Cambridge Analytica and Facebook highlight the extent of this problem and show that the issue has now reached the point of threatening our core values. The author said that these were real threats to our democracy, and not virtual threats.

The issue today, as the Commissioners have begun to set out, is one of action, and my Group is interested now in action and not just talking about the issue. Seven months out from the European elections, after the presidential elections in the US and after the UK referendum and leaving the European Union, I think it is about time that we talked about what we do, and the Commission has begun this process. But so has Parliament. So let's be clear in what we have to do and let's not leave this debate without saying it.

Recent requirements in the last weeks introduced in the United States, but not here in the European Union – and also by the way, in the United Kingdom – to verify the identity, location and sponsor of political advertisements, have happened, but not here. This is important, and the same standards should be applied throughout the EU. But this does not just reveal the data involved in targeting users, which could help Facebook users contextualise political ads, understand how their data has been used, or potentially misused, and be able to respond to attempts to manipulate their opinion.

We should have full algorithmic accountability and transparency for citizens to be able to protect themselves against any manipulation and to protect our electoral processes from possible foreign interference. We have now proven that this is happening, and we should have GDPR, as the Commissioner said, but also the cybersecurity resilience which Commissioner King should redouble his efforts to provide. And we should if possible – and I say this to the Council – be imaginative about e-privacy regulation if that is also possible, because the Facebook model was not just dealt with by the question of GDPR. But we need further tools and further regulation, and not just GDPR to deal with those further issues.

We have to look at how political parties and campaigns are using social platforms for campaign purposes. We have called for a code of conduct to be developed with the participation of all actors concerned. And if not, then legislative action is needed. Regulation is needed. This is not about robust debate or just aggressive democracy. This is about manipulation and, as the Council said, sometimes about criminal activity and breaking the law. That is where the line has been crossed and that is where we need legislative action when necessary.

But we also believe that applying conventional offline electoral safeguards, such as rules on transparency and limits to spending, respect for silence periods and equal treatment of candidates is essential, making it easy to recognise online political paid advertisements and the organisations behind them. Banning profiling for electoral purposes, including the use of online behaviour that may reveal political preference.

Now is the time for action. We have spoken about the threats to our democracy, to our very core values. We at the European Parliament have had the hearings from journalists from *The Guardian*, we've examined Cambridge Analytica, we have interviewed Facebook. Now is the time for action. We have the commitment from the Commission. Let's ask them to redouble their efforts, but here in Parliament our democracy is under threat. Let's do something about it, and let's have that action now.

Anna Elżbieta Fotyga, *on behalf of the ECR Group*. – Mr President, I would like to thank Commissioner Jourová for naming a series of elections we face in the years to come, because not only European elections, but every election which happens in each and every EU Member State requires a very resilient environment – resilient to external hostile malicious interference as well as, of course, to private interests. There is a role naturally of governments, legislators, national legislators as well as social media companies and civil society to build this resilience, to raise this awareness. Of course, there is a huge role for the EU and, in particular in the case of cybersecurity, for cooperation between the EU and NATO to tackle these challenges and these threats.

I would like to mention also the importance of transatlantic cooperation. Lessons learned from interference elsewhere in both the United States and other parts of the world enable cooperation over political divisions in tackling these problems because, rightly, we say that hostile violation of universal suffrage is a violation of fundamental human rights, and the role of politicians, of public actors, is to raise awareness. Therefore, we stress the importance of quality journalism.

I would like to tackle one thing: the electoral process is still a dominant role and competence of EU Member States. Also, I would like to say that external actors like Russia have tailor-made these attacks, and therefore we have to be rather cautious in imposing common measures to tackle this, although I stress that we have to cooperate and cooperate closely.

Pavel Telička, *on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – Mr President, this is a very serious issue, and I am very happy to see that, judging so far by the speakers that have spoken, we have a very broad consensus here in Parliament. The fight against disinformation, from my point of view, involves two main aspects. One is enhancing our resilience against those that are spreading disinformation and the other is appropriate education awareness, in order to be able to differentiate between what is really disinformation and what is not.

If I look at these two main aspects, I need to say that on the first one, one should also emphasise the regulatory framework, and I did listen very carefully to you, Madam State Secretary and the Council's attitude. To be honest, I use that as an opportunity to say I don't see it, for example, in the trilogue on the Cyber Security Act. I am not talking about the presidency. I know it is a very tough task to achieve, but the mindset in some Member States that co-decide on the common position has not changed.

That brings me to the second aspect, and that is that education awareness is not just about citizens; it is about politicians. I very much appreciate what Commissioner Jourová has said and that is that the main threat is Russia. If we don't use the proper words then we will be failing, and I must say that, once again, I don't hear that clear language from the Council. There is clear evidence of that in terms of scale, coordination and also the stated willingness of the Russians to do so, and it is increasingly dominant.

The European elections are behind doors. They are absolutely key. They are also a test on what we have just spoken about and what we are tackling. A final remark, on the East StratCom. Once again, I do appreciate what the Commissioner said. It is understaffed, but it is doing excellent work. It needs a permanent budget and I would appreciate it if we could see more emphasis from the Commission – I must say I was never impressed by the attitude of High Representative Mogherini in this respect: she can provide better assistance – but also emphasis from the Council. That is key. They are excellent and we are failing to support them.

Rebecca Harms, *im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, sehr geehrte Kollegen! Für eine Weile sah es für mich so aus, als wenn die Kollegen sich in dem Trugschluss wiegen würden, dass im Zentrum der Cyber- und der Fake-News-Attacken des Informationskriegs nur die Ukraine stehen würde. Es hat einige Jahre gedauert – seit 2013 bis 2014, als es in der Ukraine sichtbar wurde –, dass die Europäer verstanden haben, dass sie selber das Ziel dieses Informationskriegs sind. Ich finde, dass diese Anerkenntnis der erste Schritt zur Verteidigung ist, und ich finde, dass viele der Maßnahmen, die inzwischen vorangetrieben werden oder beschlossen sind, auch richtig sind – ganz im Sinne von dem, was gesagt worden ist.

Aber ich bin mir immer noch nicht darüber im Klaren, ob die Dimension dieses Angriffs, den Russland auf die Stabilität der Europäischen Union beschlossen hat, verstanden ist, und ich finde eben, dass die Ausstattung der Programme, die wir bisher beschlossen haben, so schwach ist, dass ich nicht glauben kann, dass die Dimension verstanden worden ist.

Ich möchte außerdem in diesem Rahmen noch mal darauf hinweisen, dass es ein großes Problem ist, wenn prominente Politiker aus europäischen Mitgliedstaaten Teil der Informations- und Verunsicherungskampagnen Russlands werden. Als Deutsche kann ich da nur immer wieder auf den ehemaligen Bundeskanzler und heutigen Rosneft-Boss Gerhard Schröder hinweisen. Ich weiß aber auch, dass man in Österreich über Herrn Gusenbauer oder in Italien über Herrn Prodi reden muss. Die Manafort-Papers haben uns da einige Einsichten geliefert. Damit müssen Parteien umgehen, wenn sie die Herausforderung wirklich annehmen wollen.

Ansonsten möchte ich mich bei Anna Fotyga bedanken. Denn was wir wirklich besser machen müssen, das ist die Stärkung von Journalismus, die Stärkung von unabhängigen Medien. Denn gegen Propaganda gewinnt man nicht mit Propaganda, sondern mit Qualitätsjournalismus und Information.

Martina Anderson, *on behalf of the GUE/NGL Group*. – Mr President, the shady, secretive Constitutional Research Council (CRC), chaired by Richard Cook, donated half a million pounds to the Democratic Unionist Party (DUP), then AggregateIQ – according to openDemocracy – received tens of thousands from the DUP in the last two days of the Brexit campaign to target voters and social media. Electoral law expert, Gavin Millar QC, has said that the Electoral Commission should demand answers from the DUP, Vote Leave and Mr Cook about possible links and allegations that dark money was used to influence Brexit.

Whilst we confront the Cambridge Analytica scandal, the British Government refused to extend electoral transparency legislation to the north of Ireland to expose this rotten saga. Coincidentally, the British Government is being propped up by whom? The DUP – the same DUP who refused to comment on the origins of this dark money, a party with no respect for rights, no respect for privacy and absolutely no concern for how the dark money was used for a Brexit outcome that damages Ireland, particularly the constituency that it represents.

Patrick O'Flynn, *on behalf of the EFDD Group*. – Mr President, all reasonable steps must be taken to protect the integrity of the forthcoming European parliamentary elections. There has been some evidence in recent years of outside actors – and in particular, the Russian state – seeking to interfere. There has also been, going back many years, slack control of the use of data harvested by social media giants and the use it's put to, so vigilance is certainly in order. But I'm afraid to say that something else is going on here today: it's the spectacle of the European political class clutching at straws.

So many votes have gone against its wishes – from Brexit to the defeat of Hillary Clinton, to the Italian election result, and more besides – that an elite which is unwilling to question its own complacent assumptions is looking for a scapegoat. And that scapegoat is the idea that so-called 'fake news' has led people into a false state of consciousness, causing them to turn unfairly against benevolent rulers and break out of parameters for political debate and action set in their own best interests from above.

Part of the thesis is the contention that almost any form of nation-state affiliation represents a giant step back towards the terrifying ethnic nationalism that left Europe drenched in blood in the 20th century. Mr Macron was at it again at the weekend when he claimed that nationalism was the opposite of patriotism. In fact, moderate, sensible nation-state preference is at the heart of sustaining the social solidarity we need to allow collective decision-making to run smoothly, and the revolt against the overreach of the globalist establishment is deep-rooted and based on considered thought. At its heart lies opposition to the 'no borders' ideology being pushed by the left and much of the centrist establishment too, which threatens to shatter social cohesion across Europe. Working-class voters in more prosperous European countries – people who depend on selling their labour for their income – are also in revolt against the creation of a single European labour market, which they quite correctly judge to be against their own best interests.

At a time like this, a wise European Union would be loosening the corset, allowing more room for national decision-making and respecting the mandates handed down to national governments by national electorates, but the EU we have is doing the opposite, picking fights with member nations on an almost weekly basis. My advice, therefore, is to prepare for an election result next year that most of you are not going to like, and don't blame it on Russian bots or fake news because it will be a real message considered and profoundly meant from the people to the political class.

Jacques Colombier, *au nom du groupe ENF*. – Monsieur le Président, craignant une défaite annoncée lors des prochaines élections européennes, les cénacles européistes et mondialistes ont déjà trouvé l'explication: les peuples européens se feraient mystérieusement dépouillés de leur libre arbitre au moment de voter par, je cite, «une grande puissance étrangère».

À ce titre, s'il y a bien une manipulation des esprits que nous venons d'observer, c'est par le biais d'un clip du gouvernement français, payé par les contribuables français, qui s'en prend, comme par hasard, au Premier ministre hongrois et au ministre italien de l'intérieur. Qu'en pensent les experts européistes en interférences électorales? La Commission s'en est-elle offusquée? Point du tout.

À ce titre, avez-vous l'intention de bloquer les comptes et les flux financiers du milliardaire américain George Soros, qui finance nombre de structures influentes au sein de l'Union européenne? Ayez au moins le courage de désigner la Russie dans le dossier! Je pense que le président russe doit bien rire des pouvoirs paranormaux et supra médiatiques que vous lui accordez.

Alors, je vais, dans la même veine, vous donner un conseil. Il y a quelque temps, en ces lieux, votre inspirateur, l'inimitable Jean-Claude Juncker, déclarait, je cite, «qu'il discutait avec les dirigeants des autres planètes». Alors, pourquoi n'accuserait-on pas cette fois-ci les Martiens d'interférence dans les prochaines élections européennes?

Diane James (NI). – Mr President, with tongue firmly in cheek, we all know that the European Union doesn't do electoral interference – 'well, of course not!' But this, of all days – boy, doesn't Brussels do irony! – the EU's cyber enemies would be proud of the choreographed showdown on the deal that our Prime Minister, Theresa May, is presenting to cabinet as we speak. I'd like to find one page out of the 500 that isn't the product of massive, manipulative and misguided interference by the European Union in a democratic decision.

Tell me just where the European Union hasn't interfered. What about the Scottish independence referendum? The EU first refused to comment, and then – just on the eve of purdah – José Manuel Barroso threatened voters in Scotland with European Union expulsion if they dared to assert themselves. A threat to the thousands of European Union Scots citizens, by the way.

For the European Union, those who assert the right to be different are labelled 'populist'. Look, stop the interference in free speech, free thought and free media and free journalistic press.

Esther de Lange, *namens de PPE-Fractie*. – Mijnheer de voorzitter, mevrouw de commissaris, meneer de commissaris, de Nederlandse dichter Lucebert zei: "Alles van waarde is weerloos". Als wij niet optreden, dan lijkt Lucebert gelijk te krijgen en moeten we dus nu de weerbaarheid van onze democratie waarborgen door op te treden tegen buitenlandse beïnvloeding. Dat is een moeilijke balans. Ik heb namelijk net geluisterd naar de laatste drie sprekers die eigenlijk zeggen in het kader van de vrijheid van de media: laat de Russen hier maar aan de touwtjes trekken. De EU krijgt heel snel het verwijt van propaganda. Niets doen is echter geen optie!

Ik zal u de concrete voorbeelden geven, met name voor het vak achter mij. Laat ik beginnen in m'n eigen lidstaat, Nederland. De dag nadat het vliegtuig MH17 neer werd gehaald, gingen de trollenfabrieken van Poetin drie keer zo hard draaien om de schuld via de sociale media richting Oekraïne te schuiven. Dan de Brexit. Er zijn ook bevindingen dat Kremlintrollen het referendum wilden beïnvloeden. Erger nog, we hebben al een regeringspartij in onze eigen Europese Unie die gemanipuleerde videobeelden gebruikt op de sociale media.

Ik ben blij met de voorstellen van de Europese Commissie. De strijd hiertegen is immers hard nodig en moet gevoerd worden op verschillende fronten. Natuurlijk allereerst het bewustmaken van mensen van nepnieuws door middel van onderwijs en door politieke bewustwordingscampagnes, in nauw overleg met de lidstaten. Daar begint het immers.

We hebben behoefte aan meer transparantie. Dit kan gebeuren in overleg met techbedrijven, maar ook door middel van wetgeving als die bedrijven niet over de brug komen. Het gaat om transparantie over de financiering, over waar die vandaan komt, over wie er achter politieke advertenties zitten en over algoritmen op platforms in de sociale media.

Eigenlijk moeten we alweer een stap verder denken. Want wat te denken bijvoorbeeld van ontwikkelingen als Deepface, waar videobeelden zo gemanipuleerd worden dat politici woorden in de mond gelegd worden die ze niet zelf gezegd hebben. Eigenlijk heeft de waarheid of de ontwikkeling ons alweer ingehaald en zullen wij dus misschien nog wel meer moeten doen, beste commissarissen, dan al op tafel ligt. Onze steun daarbij heeft u.

Tanja Fajon (S&D). – Gospod predsednik! Da bi evropski državljani resnično lahko sodelovali na poštenih in varnih volitvah, potrebujemo pošteno in varno informiranje, poštene politike in pa izobražene državljane.

Za pošteno in varno informiranje potrebujemo svobodo, delovanje medijev, ti zagotavljajo za varno delo svojih novinarjev vse pogoje in niso v službi interesov in pritiskov, temveč objektivnega poročanja.

Drugič, pošteni politiki zagotavljajo transparentnost svojega in strankarskega delovanja, financiranja, oglaševanja in ne izrabljajo osebnih in drugih podatkov za svoje interese. In pa izobraženi državljani, to so volivci, ki se ne pustijo zlorabljati dezinformacijam in hujskaštvu po družbenih omrežjih.

Vsa omenjena področja so tudi v Evropi že močno okužena, bila sta omenjena Facebook in Cambridge Analytica, in apetiti po manipulaciji s strani tretjih držav, na čelu z Rusijo, pa tudi s strani zasebnih interesov nedvomno obstajajo. Sami jim pri tem pomagamo, saj narašča politična netransparentnost, politično oglaševanje je nekorektno in deležni smo anarhije volilnih pravil.

Spletni troli, a tudi resnični ljudje, ki po navodilih ali iz zaslepljenosti hranijo ljudstvo z razpihovanjem ideoloških prepirov, predvsem pa s širjenjem laži, jahajo na svojem valu. V nekatere, kolegi, slovenske medije v Sloveniji se je prilil zajeten denar madžarskih podjetij, povezanih z madžarskim premierjem Orbanom, in takšen način financiranja tudi predvolilne propagande preko medijev je izigravanje zakonodaje.

In zloraba spleta, komunikacijskih orodij, ustrahovanje in manipulacija državljanov s strani politike, medijev ali kogarkoli je nedopustna, neodgovorna in jo je treba preprečiti. Evropske volitve, demokracijo in Evropejce, ki morajo imeti vse pogoje za svobodno in pošteno odločanje o tem, v kakšni Evropi si želimo živeti, moramo zaščititi kot tudi integriteto te institucije.

In Evropski parlament in Evropska komisija sta v zadnjem letu naredila nekaj korakov v pravo smer, države pa morajo zagotoviti, da bodo ukrepe izvajale in kršitelje striktno kaznovale. Enako velja seveda tudi za nas, politike in politične stranke.

Ulrike Trebesius (ECR). – Herr Präsident, Frau Kommissarin! Die Meinungsfreiheit ist das höchste Gut einer Demokratie. In meinem Land muss ich erleben, dass der Meinungskorridor der akzeptierten Meinungen sehr eng geworden ist. Zwar erfolgt keine strafrechtliche Verfolgung, aber eine gesellschaftliche Ächtung missliebiger Meinungen ist überall zu beobachten. Das erinnert mich an meine Kindheit in der DDR, nur dass an die Stelle des Westfernsehens heute für viele Deutsche die Berichterstattung aus der Schweiz oder anderer ausländischer Medien getreten ist. Wollen Sie dieses Meinungsspektrum einschränken?

Gerade gestern, bei Frau Merkels Rede hier im Plenum, hat die Kamera des Parlaments keinen einzigen Schwenk zu unserer Seite des Plenums gemacht. Die Opposition soll nicht nur inhaltlich, sondern auch bildlich überhaupt nicht zu sehen sein. Wenn Sie doch von der Richtigkeit Ihrer Argumente so sehr überzeugt sind, dann ist Ihnen doch eine andere Meinung immer eine Debatte wert, oder?

Wo ich gerade bei Frau Merkel bin: Die Praxis, ausländische Wahlen zu beeinflussen, ist auch bei uns nicht unbekannt. Vor dem Auslaufen der Sperrfrist hat die Bundesregierung über ihre Ministerien Steuergelder an die Clinton-Foundation überwiesen. Mutmaßlich wurde dieses Geld auch im US-amerikanischen Wahlkampf eingesetzt. Wurde das in diesem Hause jemals thematisiert? Oder wird das akzeptabel, weil man sich hier moralisch auf der richtigen Seite sieht?

Die Einschränkung anderer Meinungen soll nun auch auf ausländische Akteure ausgedehnt werden. Das ist einer Demokratie unwürdig. Als vor 25 Jahren insbesondere US-amerikanische Wirtschaftswissenschaftler vor den katastrophalen Auswirkungen der Euro-Einführung gewarnt haben, hat man das als antieuropäisch bezeichnet. Hätte man doch damals diese Meinungen ernsthaft diskutiert und sich nicht in seiner eigenen Blase des moralisierenden Wunschdenkens eingeschlossen, dann würde es heute in Europa deutlich anders aussehen.

Wir müssen ausländische Meinungen unbeschränkt zulassen, auch wenn reale oder vermeintliche Falschmeldungen mit dabei sind. Wir haben in Deutschland seit den Ereignissen von Chemnitz unsere eigenen Erfahrungen mit Fake News gemacht. Die EU hat durchaus die Möglichkeit, eine Website aufzubauen, die Gegendarstellungen zu wichtigen Themen veröffentlichen kann. Das würde die Diskussion in der Europäischen Union anregen, und dazu besteht weiß Gott genügend Bedarf.

Marietje Schaake (ALDE). – Mr President, a person's right to vote by secret ballot and universal suffrage for his or her own government representation is enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and this very right is now being challenged by foreign actors – and Russia has been mentioned but it is not alone.

Many are using misinformation as a form of hybrid warfare or even more sophisticated techniques, such as deep fakes, through AI and machine learning, to deceive. They're meant to erode the trust in the public debate and in liberal democracy itself. So there's a lot at stake and we must do what we can.

What I missed in the introduction by the Commissioner, which I generally thought was very comprehensive, is a notion of an assessment of the very business models of Facebook, YouTube and others, that are designed to sell more advertisements. Whether or not that lists conspiracy theories on the top, it doesn't really matter for them, they are not developed to advance democracy, but I do think they should respect the rule of law.

In that context self-regulation is not enough. I think every chance has been taken, and we've seen that it's not enough, so responsibility has to be taken, algorithmic accountability is needed, a sector inquiry is needed and we need to look at bots. Bots don't have freedom of expression the way individuals do. We need transparency of politically-funded advertisements and in the use of micro-targeting. We need stress tests of our election technology, because the weakest link can hurt all of us. And political parties and candidates needs to be prepared, and so should journalists, in how they may or may not deal with leaks.

In other words, we need accountability. The survival of liberal democracy is at stake.

Benedek Jávor (Verts/ALE). – Tisztelt Elnök Úr! A 2019-es EP választásokra nemcsak Európa készül. Külső szereplők is megpróbálják meghekkelni azokat, hogy Európát vakvágányra tolják. Nem konkrét csalással érik ezt el, hanem a politikai diskurzus eltorzításával, hamis hírek gyártásával, félelemkeltéssel. A fő forrás természetesen Oroszország és a vele szövetséges európai szélsőséges populista erők. Egyre több jel mutat azonban arra, hogy egyes EU-s kormányok, amilyen a magyar vagy a lengyel, szintén beszállhatnak a dezinformációba. Nem nézhetjük tétlenül, hogy a kudarcunkban érdekelt szereplők zavartalanul hekkeljék meg közbeszédünket, választásainkat. Ehhez támogatás kell a minőségi független médiának. Oknyomozó munka kell, hogy feltárja a hamis hírgyárak hátterét. Független média kell, hogy ne terjedhessenek állami segítséggel hamis hírek, ahogy Magyarországon. Közös európai nyilvánosságra, hírcsatornákra van szükségünk, hogy európai szintű közbeszédet teremtsünk közös ügyeinkről. Minőségi média nélkül nem lesznek demokratikus tagállamok, azok nélkül pedig nemcsak demokratikus, de semmilyen közös Európa nem lehetséges.

Luke Ming Flanagan (GUE/NGL). – Mr President, during the 1999 European elections, I was left devoid of any ability to get my positions across to the electorate due to unfair national influence – not foreign influence, national influence. With one day left to go for the big debate for the election, I was told by the national broadcaster that they would contact me later, after the election. I was gagged. Who knew? No-one.

In the 2014 elections, I met the same stonewalling. This time, our national broadcaster kept me off the main debate for my constituency. I was instead put in a debate which took place after midnight when everyone – bar those returning from the pub – was tucked up in bed. The major difference between 1999 and 2014 is that I now had the ability through social media to inform the public about what was going on. A hashtag on Twitter, #RTEbias, went viral. On the night of the debate, people knew.

There is no doubt that the power of Facebook & co. must be curtailed. Their collection of data is phenomenal and their motivation questionable. However, one must also question the motivation of those who wish to limit its power – the same people who stayed quiet when my voice was gagged and my words were twisted in the past by 'old' media.

Isabella Adinolfi (EFDD). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signor Commissario, oggi noi tutti siamo chiamati non solo a parlare della sicurezza della prossima campagna elettorale per l'elezione del Parlamento europeo, ma anche del futuro stesso dell'Unione europea.

La possibile influenza di attori stranieri è molto seria ma non dobbiamo farci trascinare dall'emotività degli eventi come lo scandalo Facebook/Cambridge Analytica. Dobbiamo invece essere obiettivi e agire non solo negli interessi dei 500 milioni di cittadini che qui rappresentiamo e, a mio avviso, dobbiamo ragionare su questi tre punti: garantire la sicurezza, non cadere nella censura e puntare sull'istruzione.

È giusto garantire la sicurezza online, ma considerare le elezioni tradizionali in cabine elettorali completamente sicure è solo una favola. Esistono infatti distorsioni come il voto di scambio, i finanziamenti occulti e non dati ai politici. Puntare il dito e pretendere un grado assoluto di sicurezza per le attività svolte online è inverosimile, poiché questo grado non esiste nemmeno nel mondo analogico.

Questa ossessiva ricerca della sicurezza ad ogni costo ci porta al secondo punto, ovvero al rischio di censura e di limitazione della libertà di espressione. L'Unione europea ha tra i suoi valori fondanti lo Stato di diritto, la democrazia e i diritti fondamentali e un'eventuale limitazione della libertà di espressione è intollerabile. Serve pertanto molta cautela nelle risposte da fornire e non è imponendo nuove forme di controllo della rete, che peraltro verrebbero implementate da soggetti privati, che si garantisce la regolarità delle elezioni.

Passando al terzo ed ultimo punto, credo che l'unica risposta da dare sia quella di promuovere politiche educative in grado di fornire ai cittadini gli strumenti necessari per sviluppare consapevolezza, spirito critico e senso civico. Senza istruzione non ci può essere consapevolezza e senza quest'ultima non ci può essere una reale partecipazione democratica.

Da ultimo vorrei dare un consiglio non richiesto alla classe politica che oggi è al potere in Europa: non vi illudete che implementando misure di bavaglio del web riuscirete a non perdere le prossime elezioni europee. Il vento del cambiamento sta soffiando forte in Europa e spazzerà via anche voi.

Marco Zanni (ENF). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, io trovo questo dibattito abbastanza surreale perché mi pare che, ancora una volta, un'Unione europea incapace di analizzare i propri fallimenti e le proprie colpe trasli la critica verso un nemico esterno che non esiste. Si grida al nemico russo, all'*hacker* russo, quando, a mio avviso, i più grossi propagatori di *fake news* stanno all'interno delle istituzioni europee.

Ogni giorno siamo costretti a sentire dichiarazioni folli e non veritiere da parte di rappresentanti delle istituzioni europee e questo non è accettabile. Credo che sia più opportuno focalizzarsi su una critica interna e sul perché l'Europa stia fallendo che gridare a un nemico esterno. Il dubbio legittimo che viene a me e che viene a tanti cittadini europei è che la battaglia sulle *fake news* venga utilizzata per chiudere, vista l'incapacità dell'UE, anche quello spazio di dissenso che i *social network* riescono a dare a chi è in minoranza.

Elmar Brok (PPE). – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar, Frau Ratspräsidentin, meine Damen und Herren! Es ist, glaube ich, bewiesen – aus mancherlei Untersuchungen und Feststellungen von den USA bis in viele andere Länder hinein –, dass heute vom Ausland gesteuert – Cambridge Analytica ist nur ein Beispiel dafür – Fake News systematisch mithilfe von Algorithmen usw. umgesetzt werden. Jeder kann seine Meinung sagen; dafür sind auch die sozialen Medien zur Verfügung. Aber man darf nicht sagen, wie einer meiner Vorredner sagte: „Der Wind des Wandels weht." Ja, das mag ja sein, aber nicht der Wind des Wandels der Lüge. Wenn es einfach Lüge ist, systematisch in großen Möglichkeiten vom Ausland gesteuert durchzusetzen, und wenn ich sehe, dass hier offensichtlich all die Reden, die von rechts gekommen sind, eine vorsorgliche Verteidigung dieser Politik der Lüge im Wahlkampf gewesen sind – denn jede Rede hat doch diesen Ansatz hier gehabt –, dann müssen wir doch dagegenstehen! Die AfD in Deutschland, Herr Gauland hat Vorstandssitzungen mit der AfD in der russischen Botschaft gemacht, wo solche Dinge abgesprochen werden! Die Le Pen hat Geld aus Russland bekommen für ihren Wahlkampf! Sie treten alle für die Politik in der Ukraine ein, um sich dann auf diese Art und Weise dafür bezahlen zu lassen, indem sie gegen europäische Interessen und Interessen von unabhängigen europäischen Nationen vorgehen, um ihre Politik der Lüge durchzusetzen. Das muss gebrandmarkt werden, das muss deutlich gemacht werden. Es sind alle Möglichkeiten des Nutzens da, aber bitte nicht über das Ausland Einfluss zu nehmen auf unsere Politik in der Europäischen Union. Das muss innerhalb der Europäischen Union in einem politischen Wettbewerb ausgefochten werden, um das hier entsprechend voranzubringen.

Wir müssen deshalb sehen – Frau Schaake hat darauf hingewiesen –: Das ist nicht nur Russland, das kommt woanders her. Wenn ich sehe, dass einige dieser Parteien, die dort sitzen, mit Herrn Bannon zusammenarbeiten, von dem hier jeder weiß, mit welchen Methoden er den Wahlkampf in den USA organisiert hat – es wurde deutlich von ihm selbst gesagt, dass er bewusst mit Fälschungen Meinung organisiert –, dann ist das eine Situation, die in einer demokratischen Gemeinschaft nicht akzeptabel ist. Unsere Bürger sollen entscheiden können ohne die Hilfsmaßnahmen aus dem Ausland für die Rechten in diesem Hause, die Demokratie und Europa bekämpfen.

Mercedes Bresso (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, noi sappiamo che lo scandalo di Cambridge Analytica ha dimostrato la facilità con la quale è possibile manipolare le opinioni dei cittadini, tracciando il loro profilo politico dai dati personali degli utenti e quanto sia altrettanto facile farne un cattivo uso per influenzare poi le scelte politiche.

Abbiamo esempi anche in quest'Aula di persone che hanno utilizzato l'Unione europea e delle *fake news* sull'Unione europea a fini elettorali già nelle recenti campagne elettorali in diversi paesi. Quindi pensiamo certamente alle elezioni americane e anche alla campagna della Brexit, ma pensiamo anche a molte campagne avvenute all'interno del dell'Unione europea.

Noi sappiamo che oggi la politica si fa usando i social media, che la tecnologia e i sistemi informatici sono parte integrante delle nostre vite ed è per questo che abbiamo bisogno di assicurarci che chi li usa lo faccia nella legalità e sulla base di regole comuni e che sia possibile prevedere sanzioni anche pecuniarie nel caso di violazioni. Soprattutto dobbiamo stare in guardia e difendere con fermezza la protezione dei nostri dati.

Come sapete, il Parlamento europeo ha già legiferato in questo campo. Oggi sono sul campo delle proposte. Il collega Wieland e io stessa siamo relatori della proposta relativa alla sanzione nei confronti dei partiti politici europei in caso di abusi nell'uso dei dati elettorali. Tuttavia, non servono solo le linee guida, che sono la fase preliminare – noi legiferiamo sulla sanzione, ma la fase preliminare deve impedire che la violazione avvenga –, ma io credo che serva anche una task force messa in campo dall'Unione europea per contrastare l'uso di *fake news* che ci sarà sicuramente utilizzando dati manipolati dei nostri elettori.

Se noi quindi temiamo le influenze nelle prossime elezioni europee di queste pratiche dobbiamo riuscire a difendere il nostro spazio pubblico non solo con queste linee guida, con le norme e le sanzioni, ma dobbiamo anche usare una forte attività politica. Su questo, non solo la Commissione ma tutti i nostri gruppi, i nostri partiti e i nostri paesi devono lavorare perché non sia possibile che azioni di influenza ingannevole modifichino i risultati delle prossime leggi elettorali. Abbiamo visto qualche elemento qui che già ci dice che non sarà affatto qualcosa che non può avvenire, ma che le possibilità concrete ci sono e che tocca a noi evitare che diventino realtà.

Anders Primdahl Vistisen (ECR). – Hr. formand! Det var en af de største amerikanske præsidenter, Abraham Lincoln, der sagde, at man kan narre en del af befolkningen hele tiden, hele befolkningen en del af tiden, men man kan ikke narre hele befolkningen hele tiden. Det kan vi her i Europa været glade for, fordi det lyder som om her i huset, at russisk indflydelse på nationale spørgsmål er noget nyt. I har helt glemt den kolde krig, hvor størstedelen af venstrefløjen, inklusive fredsbevægelsen, modtog i stakkevis af russiske kontanter, hjælp til russisk propaganda for at nedbryde Vestens forsvar. Så I taler om det her med valg – altså indflydelse på valg – som om det er en ny ting. Det er det ikke! Og heldigvis er der allerede en stor forståelse hos de europæiske vælgere for at skille skidt fra kanel. Men når I nu går så meget op i at forhindre indflydelse på nationale valg, skulle I så ikke se på det system, I selv har oprettet her i Den Europæiske Union. I bruger millioner og atter millioner af skatteborgernes penge på at propagandere for alt det gode, alt det rigtige, den fantastiske politiske union, uden i øvrigt at spørge europæerne, om det er den retning, de ønsker. I sidestiller fake news med EU-skepsis i jeres debatter, og I går så langt i de forslag til at bekæmpe fake news, at direktøren for det danske Institut for Menneskerettigheder, Jonas Christoffersen, offentligt på Folkemødet på Bornholm i år advarede imod, at de metoder, I bruger, vil legitimere diktaturstater som Kina, Rusland, Venezuela og alle andre, der ønsker at holde deres befolkningers ytringsfrihed nede. I risikerer at smide ytringsfriheden og demokratiet ud med badevandet, fordi I er så bange for at tabe til de europæiske befolkninger og for de europæiske vælgere, der er skeptiske over for jeres utopiske drøm om Europas Forenede Stater.

Hilde Vautmans (ALDE). – Mijnheer de voorzitter, mevrouw de commissaris, collega's, iedereen heeft het al gezegd: de komende Europese verkiezingen zullen uiterst belangrijk zijn voor onze toekomst. Kiezers zullen moeten kiezen tussen partijen die vóór Europa zijn, die vóór een Europese samenwerking zijn of partijen die de klok willen terugdraaien en zich eigenlijk achter de nationale grenzen willen verschuilen.

Ik denk dat we allemaal wel weten dat er krachten, machten zijn die er eigenlijk baat bij hebben dat Europa geen sterke speler wordt op de internationale markt. Deze krachten zullen dus niet aarzelen om de verkiezingen in hun voordeel te manipuleren. De Romeinen wisten het al: verdeel en heers.

Je kan dat op twee manieren doen, mevrouw de commissaris, door vervalsing van de stemuitslagen of beïnvloeding van de kiezers via valse informatie. Vandaar mijn oproep: we moeten op beide terreinen waakzaam zijn.

Ten eerste moeten we netwerken opzetten waarbinnen lidstaten beste praktijken uitwisselen om de stemprocedures te beschermen. Veel collega's hebben daar hier al voor gepleit. Het tweede is voor mij echter nog veel belangrijker. We moeten ervoor zorgen dat we burgers wapenen tegen nepnieuws, tegen desinformatiecampagnes.

Ik doe graag nog een heel concreet voorstel, mevrouw de commissaris. Ik zou hier vandaag een pleidooi willen houden voor de benoeming van een echte speciale vertegenwoordiger tegen desinformatie, tegen nepnieuws, tegen cybercriminaliteit. Ik denk dat we dat echt nodig hebben: een speciale vertegenwoordiger die dadelijk kan onderzoeken of we met nepnieuws te maken hebben, die dadelijk kan ingrijpen met campagnes om dat nepnieuws recht te zetten, zodat we Europa groots kunnen maken.

Molly Scott Cato (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, a hundred years after the First World War, many have reflected on the risk of war returning to our continent, but in reality the next war has already begun. It's a culture war, an information war, and we're all conscripted into it, many of us without our knowing. The foreign actors distorting our elections are coming from both Russia and the USA. Last week Shahmir Sanni, the Vote Leave whistle-blower, won his unfair dismissal case that exposed the activities of nine lobby groups seeking to undermine action on climate change and help the tax avoiders, all working out of 55 Tufton Street in London. We need this activity by what we have called the 'Brexit Syndicate' called out as propaganda and not given oxygen by the BBC.

A year ago, the Prime Minister drew attention to Russian involvement in British politics, but she is refusing to say whether she blocked an investigation into Arron Banks' Russian connections, and we have learned that the Mueller investigation is making similar inquiries with regard to Nigel Farage. Welcome to the culture war. It's a war between democracy and authoritarianism. Which side are you on?

Steeve Briois (ENF). – Monsieur le Président, cette Union européenne a décidément du mal avec la démocratie et la liberté d'expression. Les eurogagas ont tellement peur de la rencontre avec les peuples en mai prochain que tous les moyens sont bons pour stigmatiser et bâillonner ceux qui ne sont pas d'accord avec eux.

En évoquant les ingérences extérieures dans les futures élections européennes, vous avez le gouvernement russe dans votre ligne de mire. Ces accusations relèvent du fantasme, voire de la paranoïa, à moins qu'elles ne servent à justifier un durcissement des sanctions à l'égard de la Russie.

Vous êtes mal placés pour donner des leçons de morale à propos d'ingérence extérieure, quand on sait que des ONG financées par des puissances publiques étrangères, sous le couvert de la défense des droits de l'homme, servent en réalité des intérêts politiques contraires à ceux des nations.

L'ingérence ne vous dérange pas lorsqu'elle se nomme Open Society, de George Soros, qui faisait pourtant la promotion de l'accueil des migrants, et ce bien évidemment avec la bénédiction de la Commission européenne. L'ingérence lors des futures élections européennes ne vous dérange pas, lorsque le gouvernement de M. Macron finance et diffuse, avec l'argent du contribuable, un clip pour s'attaquer à des dirigeants européens, comme MM. Orbán et Salvini, qui, eux, ne sont pas à 21 % dans les sondages mais sont plébiscités par leur peuple, sans parler de l'ingérence et de la manipulation de nombreux médias qui, gavés d'argent public, ne jurent que par Bruxelles et se permettent de salir les peuples d'Europe en les cataloguant de xénophobes, racistes ou populistes.

Pavel Svoboda (PPE). –Pane předsedající, svobodné volby neznamenají jen možnost vybírat si z více než jedné kandidátky, ale také volby bez dezinformací a manipulací. A my jsme v dezinformační válce s Ruskem, ve válce, která ohrožuje naše demokracie. Teprve v tomto kontextu oceníme, jak vizionářská byla Schumanova deklarace, píše se v ní mimo jiné toto: „Světový mír by nemohl být zachován bez tvůrčího úsilí, jež je úměrné nebezpečím, která tento mír ohrožují." To v naší situaci znamená, že musíme vložit nejméně stejné úsilí a finanční prostředky do boje proti dezinformacím, jaké protivník investuje na druhé straně barikády. Takže mluvíme minimálně o stovkách milionů eur. Ale demokracie za to stojí. Lež je levná, ale pravda je drahá. Nyní tyto dezinformace ohrožují evropské volby.

Jde tedy o celoevropský úkol, kde je třeba celokontinentální spolupráce. Jsem rád, že návrhy Evropské komise směřují k tomu, co opravdu potřebujeme. Vedle ochrany osobních údajů a kontrol financování potřebujeme především toto – musí být k dispozici kvalitní technické monitorovací nástroje ve všech členských státech. Evropská unie musí umět koordinovat tyto nástroje. Národní týmy musejí mít dostatečné kapacity na celoevropské úrovni k šíření zpráv vyvracejících *fake news*. Může jít o placenou inzerci na internetu či o spolupráci s veřejnoprávními médii. Šíření těchto ověřovacích zpráv se musí dít v reálném čase v rozsahu hodin, to je klíčové. Potřebujeme speciální jednotky s dobrými algoritmy a s jediným úkolem – odhalit, oznámit a blokovat dezinformace. Asistence platforem jako Facebook nebo Twitter je podstatná.

Ale především potřebujeme vůli, společnou vůli proti dezinformacím bojovat. Já tuto vůli v Evropském parlamentu, až na určité výjimky, vidím a jsem za to rád.

Victor Boștinaru (S&D). – Mr President, I am convinced that we have seen many forms of state-sponsored cyberattacks and disinformation in the most recent major elections, from the Ukraine crisis to Brexit and Catalan votes, and from the US elections to the Italian and Swedish ones, to name only a few. Moreover, social media have accelerated the spread of fake news. We are facing a global phenomenon with a high political impact, but it is also important to say that we are dealing with the tools of warfare.

So we can only expect this to happen during the next European elections as well. I don't see any reason why it should not. The role of online platforms in the proliferation of conspiracy theories, disinformation and fake news is part of the Kremlin's ongoing influence campaign with the aim of undermining Western values and democracy. In other cases, it is unclear where the attacks are coming from, but the sources appear to be mixed: everything from other countries to lone hackers.

Mr Commissioner, the 2019 vote is consequential for our fate and future. These elections are so important that is not only a matter of actually preserving the vote from disruption, but also preserving it from any rumours, fraud and interference. All available digital radars should be focused on the European election infrastructure and systems that are part of the voting process, but also on foreign intelligence activities, notably the Russian state-sponsored media outlet which operates in various Member States. And, yes, do not forget the financing of the electoral campaign and the political parties and political leaders in some countries which are too close to Moscow.

Ahead of the European elections in 2019, the EU response should face these extremely topical challenges. This has to change and rapidly, before it is too late. As a result of the requested strategic communication plan to address Russia's ongoing disinformation campaign, in 2015, East Stratcom started working. It has only 18 people and does not even have its own budget to face all those challenges. Let's invest in Stratcom and let's invite the Member States to work closely with Stratcom to prevent this.

Finally, let me say that I call on the Commission to analyse the current situation and to address the legal framework needed in order to prevent interference.

Zdzisław Krasnodębski (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! Pani komisarz! Ja się zgadzam z wieloma rzeczami, o których mówili koledzy. Chciałem jednak zwrócić uwagę, że wpływ wrogich Unii ośrodków zewnętrznych szerzących dezinformację przed wyborami w naszych krajach, przed wyborami europejskimi nie ogranicza się jedynie do działań anonimowych, takich jak prowadzenie blogów bądź kont na Twitterze przez fikcyjne postacie, które w rzeczywistości są częścią pewnego projektu politycznego. Naszym problemem nie są tylko trolle i boty. Aktorami zewnętrznych wpływów szerzącymi dezinformację są bardzo często znane postacie publiczne.

Szczególnie niebezpieczne wydaje mi się to w wykonaniu byłych polityków państw narodowych bądź wysoko postawionych urzędników unijnych. Zatrudniając się w charakterze doradców różnych firm, wykorzystują oni swoje koneksje, zależności, znajomości politycznej kuchni w celu obsługi interesów sił niesprzyjających Unii i niesprzyjających państwom europejskim. Gerhard Schroeder jest znacznie groźniejszy niż jakikolwiek troll. Jeżeli koledzy z partii socjalistycznych tak mocno potępiają tego rodzaju praktyki – zdaje się, że jest on ciągle jeszcze politykiem SPD – to wydaje mi się, że to powinno ulec zmianie. Dlatego wydaje mi się, że pilnym działaniem powinno być zaostrzenie polityki przeciwdziałającej *revolving doors*, a co więcej powinniśmy opublikować czarną listę tego rodzaju polityków działających z obcymi nam, wrogimi państwami, naszymi strategicznymi nieprzyjaciółmi, działającymi przeciwko Unii w ramach Unii, bo oni stanowią rzeczywiste i prawdziwe niebezpieczeństwo, o wiele większe niż to, o czym mówimy.

Alyn Smith (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, technology has always evolved – and will continue to evolve – and our laws need to evolve to keep pace with it. So we should avoid hysteria, but we do need to learn the lessons of where our laws are not fit for purpose. And we need to learn the lessons of our most recent experience, Brexit. I come from Scotland, where we comprehensively rejected Brexit, but it remains very much our problem. Because the fact is, colleagues, the UK's a more developed democracy than most, but the UK's laws on campaign finance, data protection, election transparency and the transparency of actors – foreign and domestic – have been proven to be not fit for purpose, and the use of technology – the abuse of data – was very much part of that campaign by a deeply dubious leave campaign which wholesale abused the law. So I support the measures which we've heard about and rise to bring some urgency to them. I commissioned James Patrick to analyse Scottish Twitter, and he produced this report. He analysed 27 000 Twitter accounts, 36 million tweets and found a staggering number that at least 4.25% and rising to at least 12.24% Scottish Twitter accounts are potentially malign. If it's happening in Scottish Twitter, colleagues, it's happening in your democracy as well, and I fear that our laws are not fit for purpose across our House and our all our democracies are under threat. Commissioners, I wish you well in your efforts.

Agustín Díaz de Mera García Consuegra (PPE). – Señor presidente, señora, la injerencia de actores externos en procesos electorales y el mal uso de los metadatos están provocando graves efectos sobre los procedimientos electorales, pues permiten tanto la recopilación masiva de información confidencial del electorado como la distribución de noticias falsas generadas para atraer y desinformar. Cambridge Analytica mató la intimidad de 50 millones de personas y, según el EC3 de Europol, tanto la campaña de Clinton como la de Macron sufrieron ataques.

Mezclar elementos auténticos manipulados es una estrategia para maximizar el impacto negativo de un ataque. Webs de noticias falsas, cuentas y redes sociales se utilizan para difundir noticias inexactas, diseñadas para parecer auténticas y dañar a un candidato o a un partido.

En mayo hay elecciones a esta Cámara. Es necesario que la Unión tome medidas para que ningún proceso electoral sufra injerencias delictivas. Es necesario que los actores públicos y privados coordinen sus acciones para evitar esos ataques y es necesaria también una mejora de la cooperación entre agencias.

La Unión tiene que frenar el mal uso de la minería de datos con el paquete europeo de ciberseguridad, que incluye impulsar la creación de una Agencia Europea de Seguridad, y debe dar recursos y credibilidad a aquellos entes que ya velan por ella, como el Centro Europeo de Ciberdelincuencia —EC3 de Europol—.

Hay que acabar con las amenazas que atacan la democracia, la soberanía de los Estados y los derechos fundamentales de los ciudadanos europeos.

Jeppe Kofod (S&D). – Mr President, this debate is very important because freedom of expression, freedom of opinion, the freedom of having free elections where citizens can cast their ballots freely is fundamental for our European democracy, for democracy as such. I'm honestly quite shocked when I listen to some of our colleagues from the far right saying that the threat of foreign actors is not a threat to the freedom of people and democracy in Europe itself. It's astonishing that they can claim that there's no threat. It's been proven: take the US election as evidence that foreign actors like Russia have interfered with the purpose of destroying our freedoms, our democracy, the free will of people to cast their ballot at the polling station.

This is so important, and we have to ask this very uncomfortable question: if you do not react together and protect our freedoms, our democracy, then I would ask you – how many seats will Russia have in this Parliament at next year's election? Because that's what will happen if we allow ourselves to be fooled into believing that we're not seeing interference by foreign actors. They are not trying to strengthen our democracy. On the contrary, they want to destroy our democracy, our freedoms. They have a totally different world-view. We should not take that threat lightly and, therefore, I'm very happy about the different kind of plans and actions that are being taken now. I'm also happy to see that the concerns – 73% of Europeans have this concern, as the Commissioner alluded to – this is a concern we need to respond to. We need to show people that we protect their right to live in democracy and freedom and, therefore, in my opinion, Russia should have no one elected next year for this Parliament. We should stand together on our core values no matter which political group we belong to.

Ruža Tomašić (ECR). – Gospodine predsjedavajući, razvoj informacijskih tehnologija omogućio je stranim faktorima da se lakše nego ikada miješaju u naš demokratski proces i oblikuju rezultate izbora prema vlastitim željama i interesima. To im naravno ne smijemo dozvoliti.

Iako iz predostrožnosti moramo poduzeti određene mjere kako bismo se zaštitili, ne mogu se oteti dojmu da se ovo pitanje preuveličava. Rusko uplitanje u američke izbore u nekoj većoj mjeri još uvijek nije dokazano, iako istraga traje skoro dvije godine. Rusija nije uspjela izmanipulirati ni javnu raspravu o ulasku u NATO u jednoj Crnoj Gori pa ne vidim kako bi mogla ostvariti odlučujući utjecaj na europske izbore. U redu je da budemo oprezni, ali ostavimo se lova na vještice.

Čini se da se ovu priču o stranom uplitanju ciljano gradi kao opravdanje za rast euroskeptika na sljedećim izborima, a zato su prvenstveno krivi oni koji Uniju vode u krivom smjeru, a ne Rusija.

Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D). – Señor presidente, comisario de Seguridad, comisaria de Justicia, el próximo 26 de mayo de 2019 se elige este Parlamento Europeo, que representa democráticamente, de manera directa, a 500 millones de ciudadanos europeos. Y desde 2014, última elección al Parlamento Europeo, hemos asistido a un conjunto de episodios de injerencia delictiva en procesos electorales y consultas y referendos en Estados miembros de la Unión Europea.

Este Parlamento Europeo, que envía misiones a supervisar la corrección y credibilidad de elecciones en el exterior, tiene toda la razón para preocuparse de que el derecho fundamental de participación política y de elección democrática no se vea interferido por una guerra híbrida de intoxicación, ciberterrorismo, manipulación ni chantaje de ninguna manera.

Por tanto, es urgente que aglutinemos todas nuestras fuerzas para conformar cuanto antes nuestra agenda contra la ciberdelincuencia y por la ciberseguridad con una agencia europea de ciberseguridad y con la unidad de inteligencia contra la cibercriminalidad de Europol, que asegure que estaremos absolutamente preparados para que las elecciones al Parlamento Europeo de 2019 no arrojen la más mínima duda sobre la credibilidad de ninguno de los Estados miembros de la Unión Europea y estemos absolutamente seguros de que el resultado refleja realmente la voluntad de los europeos y no la voluntad de quienes se han puesto de acuerdo desde algún oscuro y remoto taller de manipulación o intoxicación en el exterior para condicionar la composición de este Parlamento Europeo contra la Unión Europea y sus valores fundacionales.

Jussi Halla-aho (ECR). – Mr President, it is important to protect the integrity of our democracy against undue external influence. But there is a dangerous tendency in the mainstream politics and media to explain any unpleasant election result as an indication of such undue influence, a tendency to see Mr Putin and his agents behind every corner and under every stone.

This is a way of de-legitimising democratic elections and the choices people make. I can assure you there are a lot of people out there who genuinely do not want more third-world immigration, more globalisation or more European Union. This is the reason why they vote for Brexit, Trump or nationalist parties. Such developments may, of course, coincide with the interests of certain external actors, but they are caused by the failure and incompetence of the set mainstream.

Gunnar Hökmark (PPE). – Mr President, we need to ensure that those who are elected to the European Parliament and to all the national parliaments are elected in order to do their best for their nation and to do their best for Europe and not for those who want to divide and destabilise us.

We need to ensure that neither Russia nor anyone else can influence the elections but there let's also be aware, this is not anything that is going on just during elections, it is going on now and there is a link between money-laundering by Estonia, Novichok in Salisbury, rumours in Germany, cyberattacks in France and cyberattacks in all of our countries. Let's not be naive, this is not a threat, it is something that is going on right now and it is implemented in order to undermine democracy and the rule of law. And those foreign actors, they have the help and the support of those forces inside here, who would like to undermine the rule of law and democracy.

This is a fight for democracy and freedom. Let's be clear that we shall disclose those who do it, we shall have transparency, we shall sanction, and we shall do with criminal actions what is required to do with the criminal actions. We shall ensure that they are punished and they are revealed and disclosed and that we can safeguard our European Union.

Carlos Zorrinho (S&D). – Senhor Presidente, a política sempre conviveu com estratégias de informação e contrainformação. Hoje, a associação tecnológica permite, contudo, ir muito mais longe e promover campanhas massivas de desinformação, trabalhadas de forma a atingir e manipular setores específicos dos eleitorados.

O vírus da desinformação está a contaminar todo o espetro da comunicação política, lançando a desconfiança mesmo sobre aquela informação que é correta, e essa desinformação pode tornar-se letal para a democracia.

Saúdo o apelo de Paris, assinado no dia 12 de novembro e subscrito por 51 países, entre os quais todos os países europeus, como o manifesto para ajudar a que os valores éticos e do Estado de Direito prevaleçam no novo quadro da sociedade digital.

A estratégia proposta pela Comissão Europeia para combater a desinformação em linha terá uma prova de fogo nas próximas eleições europeias. A verdade é que nós precisamos de uma enorme coligação de cidadania para fazer com que essa estratégia tenha sucesso.

PRZEWODNICTWO: ZDZISŁAW KRASNODĘBSKI

Wiceprzewodniczący

Mirosław Piotrowski (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! Nasza debata ma charakter szczególny: motywowana jest obawą wpływu podmiotów zagranicznych na nadchodzącą kampanię wyborczą do Parlamentu Europejskiego. W tym kontekście mówi się o finansowaniu europejskich partii i fundacji. Padają konkretne nazwiska. Rok temu tu, na tej sali, Nigel Farage wskazał jedno z nich: George'a Sorosa, amerykańskiego finansistę, który z zewnątrz oddziałuje na politykę Unii Europejskiej. Podawał konkretne dane dotyczące kilkudziesięciu spotkań miliardera z Komisją Europejską. Sam Franz Timmermans mówił na początku tego roku, że współpracuje z Sorosem od dwudziestu lat. Oskarżenia o mieszanie się tego amerykańskiego miliardera w wewnętrzne sprawy krajów członkowskich Unii głośno artykułowali przedstawiciele Słowacji, Rumunii, Włoch, Hiszpanii, Wielkiej Brytanii oraz Węgier. Jakie więc mamy gwarancje, że nie będzie on ingerował za pośrednictwem swoich licznych fundacji w zbliżające się wybory europejskie w wielu krajach, także w moim kraju – w Polsce? I co zamierzamy z tym zrobić?

Jeroen Lenaers (PPE). – Ik moest tijdens het debat denken aan de tekenfilmpjes van Popeye, de zeeman die alleen na een blik spinazie sterk genoeg was om zijn vriendinnetje te beschermen. Zoals Popeye Olijfje moest beschermen tegen de schurkachtige Pluto, zo moeten ook wij onze Europese democratie beschermen tegen schurkachtige buitenlandse actoren.

We hebben het gezien bij de verkiezingen in de Verenigde Staten. We hebben het gezien bij het Brexit referendum. We hebben het gezien in Nederland bij het onderzoek naar het neerhalen van MH17, waarbij bijna 300 mensen het leven hebben gelaten. Onze taak is het ervoor te zorgen dat dit lijstje voorbeelden hier stopt, dat er een einde komt aan deze ondermijning van onze democratie. Met het in aantocht zijn van de Europese verkiezingen is het absoluut een belangrijke stap om onze weerbaarheid op dat gebied veel verder te versterken.

De oprichting van de *StratCom Task Force* was en is in principe een goed idee, maar laten we het dan wel goed doen. Pas in januari van dit jaar is er geld voor dit team uitgetrokken: 1,1 miljoen euro. Ter vergelijking: de Russen hebben alleen voor een Brexit campagne al meer dan vier keer zoveel geld besteed! We kunnen het niet bij mooie woorden en het uitspreken van zorgen laten, zeker nu de Europese verkiezingen eraan komen.

Zoals Popeye spinazie nodig heeft om Pluto te verslaan, zo hebben wij ook in de Europese Unie krachtige wapens nodig om deze vorm van buitenlandse inmenging te stoppen. Laten wij er in ieder geval vanuit dit huis voor zorgen dat die wapens er komen.

Paul Tang (S&D). – Inmenging in verkiezingen. Ik kan het hebben over het trollenleger van Poetin of over de Italiaanse vicepremier die journalisten jakhalzen noemt. Maar ik wil het hebben over Amerikaanse inmenging.

Facebook heeft jarenlang volgehouden neutraal te zijn. Maar met al die neutraliteit heeft het toch toegelaten dat er nepnieuws wordt gefabriceerd in een stadje in Macedonië, dat er *dark ads* zijn die filterbubbels beïnvloeden en dat Cambridge Analytica er met 50 miljoen profielen vandoor is gegaan. Zo heeft Facebook bijgedragen aan Trump en Brexit.

In 2016 werd zo'n 1,4 miljard euro aan *online campaining* besteed, waar Facebook en Zuckerber geld aan verdienen. Zuckerberg belooft beterschap. Maar het moet sneller en het moet beter.

Ik zie graag een dwingende Europese aanpak, volledige openheid van uitgaven voor een politiek doeleinde door Facebook (wie, wat, waar, wanneer) en uiteindelijk ook een ex ante toets op de algoritmen, op de publieke opinievorming. Want laat Facebook niet onze democratie zijn wil opleggen, maar omgekeerd.

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, ο αγώνας ενάντια στις κακόβουλες επιθέσεις από τρίτους εντός της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης πρέπει, βεβαίως, να είναι κοινός. Όμως, υπάρχουν διάφορες πλευρές και τρόποι για δόλιους χειρισμούς και, φυσικά, αλλοιώνεται ή καταβάλλονται προσπάθειες για να αλλοιωθεί το Σώμα που θα εκλεγεί στις επόμενες ευρωεκλογές. Αναφέρομαι στις εγγυήσεις πολυφωνίας που πρέπει να υπάρχουν. Σε αυτήν εδώ την αίθουσα, έχω καταγγείλει πάνω από δέκα φορές ότι στην Ελλάδα, τόσο η δημόσια τηλεόραση όσο και τα μεγάλα συστημικά ιδιωτικά κανάλια έχουν φιμώσει το κίνημά μας «Ελλάδα – Ο Άλλος Δρόμος». Δεν μας δίνουν την ευκαιρία να εκφράσουμε τις απόψεις μας και πρόκειται για μια στημένη κατάσταση μέσω της οποίας μας έχουν φιμώσει. Θέλουμε να υπάρξει παρέμβαση και στήριξη στο θέμα αυτό, για να έχουμε το δικαίωμα να συμμετάσχουμε επί ίσοις όροις στις ευρωεκλογές, διότι εφόσον μας φιμώνουν δεν υπάρχει δημοκρατική διαδικασία στην Ελλάδα και δεν δίνεται η δυνατότητα σε εμάς να εκφράσουμε τις απόψεις μας. Επειδή, κυρία Jourová, αναφερθήκατε σε μία παρέμβαση στην Ελλάδα, παρακαλώ να εξηγήσετε ποια είναι η εκλογική παρέμβαση που έχει γίνει στην Ελλάδα και στην οποία αναφερθήκατε στην ομιλία σας.

Dubravka Šuica (PPE). – Poštovani predsjedavajući, gospodo povjerenici, hvala vam što pratite ovu raspravu i što se borite protiv podrivanja europskog projekta. Ova rasprava je došla u pravo vrijeme, u osvit europskih izbora i smatram da trebamo skrenuti pozornost na nju.

Svakako, kao što vidimo, dva su načina podrivanja izbora. Jedan je način financiranje kampanje donacijama, netransparentnim donacijama i kupovanje interesa, bolje rečeno pritisak na građane i na birače. Drugi je način, kao što vidimo, dezinformiranje putem društvenih mreža. Posebno su jake društvene mreže Facebook i Twitter. Posebno su jaki lažni profili kojima se služe oni koji žele podrivati ovaj projekt i žele podrivati ove demokratske izbore. Moramo se svakako tome oduprijeti.

Isto tako, manipulacija je građanima evidentna. U 18 zemalja članica je očito da je bilo, da ne nabrajam sad zemlje o kojima je već bilo riječi, podrivanja. Znači ono što moramo napraviti je definitivno jačati neovisno novinarstvo. To je za nas vrlo važno.

Isto tako nikako ne smijemo kompromitirati ove demokratske, poštene izbore, ali na kraju ipak želim vjerovati da su naši građani dovoljno educirani i dovoljno svjesni da neće podleći niskim strastima i da će razabrati ono što je demokratski i što je transparentno od onoga što je *fake*, a *fake news* je danas zaista postao velika opasnost.

Alfred Sant (S&D). – Mr President, obviously all political and technological means should be employed to fully protect the European Parliament elections from any attempt to manipulate public opinion and results. However, beyond outrage, we should seek to have a coherent position with regard to outside foreign interference in our political affairs.

To achieve such coherence, we must also consider the inputs we make as Europeans to the political and national affairs of outsiders. Europe, as well as the US, has a wide-ranging reputation for having interfered in the internal political processes, democratic or not, of others. From Mossadegh's Iran, to most African countries, to Latin America, the Middle East, Libya and Ukraine, we have interfered. When is our interference legitimate? When is it not? Retaliation for it can take forms unexpected by us, and unacceptable to us. What retaliation is legitimate when others interfere in our affairs? And when we interfere in theirs? Replies to such questions cannot be symmetric between countries and specific cases. After all, this Parliament regularly holds debates that seek to influence political events in, and outside, Europe. We need an overarching, coherent doctrine covering all these scenarios and aspects.

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – Pane předsedající, boj proti dezinformacím by měl být prioritou jak z politických, tak z bezpečnostních důvodů členských zemí a také celé Evropské unie. V oblasti bezpečnosti by výdaje na činnosti kontrarozvědky proto měly být také jednou z národních priorit, protože vliv na vnitřní záležitosti, včetně ovlivňování voleb, je současně i bezpečnostní hrozbou pro členské státy. Chci tady připomenout, že například Česká republika zřídila centrum proti terorismu a hybridním hrozbám za účelem mimo jiné také odhalovat dezinformační kampaně a já věřím, že se to České republice vyplatí.

Nacházející volby do Evropského parlamentu budou testem naší odolnosti a je nepochybné, že zde bude snaha ovlivnit jejich výsledky stejně, jako se to podařilo ve Spojených státech amerických nebo v případě brexitu. Rusko bude podporovat protievropské dezinformační kampaně. Tato hybridní válka je v dnešním digitálním věku účinnější než násilí a musíme zde čelit vzděláváním ke kritickému myšlení, mediální gramotnosti a podporovat veřejnoprávní média.

V této souvislosti chci apelovat na Evropskou službu pro vnější činnost, aby zvýšila finanční podporu pro její součást zvanou StratCom. Její účinnost začala v roce 2015, odhalila tři a půl tisíce případů proruské dezinformace. Tato činnost ovšem potřebuje větší finanční podporu. Bohužel výdaje na StratCom jsou v porovnání s ruskými mediálními výdaji nesrovnatelně menší.

Ivan Štefanec (PPE). – Pán predsedajúci, demokratické voľby musia byť nezávislé od akéhokoľvek zasahovania ďalších strán. Ako sme videli pri referende o brexite, pri amerických prezidentských voľbách alebo pri holandskom referende o asociačnej dohode s Ukrajinou, kybernetické útoky, dezinformácie a propaganda môžu úplne zvrátiť verejnú mienku. Som preto rád, že Európska únia začína voči takýmto útokom bojovať, a oceňujem vytváranie centier, ktoré monitorujú kybernetické útoky a odpovedajú na ne. V tejto oblasti by sme sa však mali inšpirovať od občianskych aktivistov, ktorí – hoci niekedy osamotene, ale veľmi účinne – bojujú v hybridnej vojne. Príkladom takéhoto odhodlania je aj Slovák Ján Benčík, minulý rok ocenený Cenou európskeho občana. Dezinformácie a ich následky môžu natrvalo poškodiť demokraciu a obrana voči nim je nielen legitímna, ale aj veľmi potrebná. Na budúci rok počas volieb do Európskeho parlamentu môžeme, tak ako v minulosti, očakávať ofenzívu útokov na európsky projekt a na podporu strán a hnutí, ktoré si želajú jeho zničenie. Odpoveďou na takúto činnosť môže byť len hovorenie pravdy a systematické odkrývanie lží. Musíme viac hovoriť o tom, čo Európska únia prináša ľuďom a krajinám a ako by náš kontinent vyzeral bez integrácie. Len pravda a blízky kontakt s ľuďmi je liekom na útoky a klamstvá, ktoré sú šírené v kybernetickom priestore. Nebojme sa preto jasne pomenovať klamstvo a odhaliť pôvodcov dezinformácií. Práve my v Európskom parlamente máme túto zodpovednosť. Čím bližšie k ľuďom budeme, tým menší dosah budú mať dezinformácie a hoaxy.

Inese Vaidere (PPE). – Godātie kolēģi, komisāri! Kā vēsta sens sakāmvārds, ja gribi mieru, gatavojies karam. Tas nav jāuztver burtiski, tomēr propagandas karam ir jāgatavojas, lai aizstāvētu mūsu vērtības.

Krievija ir sapratusi, ka tieša intervence, kā Krimā un Dienvidaustrumu Ukrainā, sastop nopietnu Rietumu pretestību, tāpēc tagad ir uzsvars uz viltus ziņām, propagandu internetā, televīzijā, viltus profiliem sociālajos tīklos. Krievija veido ne tikai fake news, kā es saku, bet arī fake views. Tas ir neapstrīdams fakts, traktējot tieši pretējā nozīmē. Tā ir gan par Baltijas valstu okupāciju, tā bija arī Malaizijas lidmašīnas notriekšanas gadījumos.

Ko tad mums darīt? Vispirms jāsakārto partiju finansēšanas likums. Kad es šodien dzirdēju dažus kolēģus, kuri nepamana Krievijas veidotās viltus ziņas, tad es domāju, ka varbūt partiju finansēšanas likuma nesakārtotība ir tam pamats.

Otrkārt, mums ir nopietni jāstrādā ar žurnālistiem, jāvēdina, jāveido mediju pratība, sabiedrības informēšana. Ir vajadzīgs, lai nedominētu tikai sliktās ziņas masu informācijas līdzekļos, bet tās tiktu līdzsvarotas arī ar mūsu sasniegumiem.

Mums ir jāsadarbojas ar mūsu partneriem NATO, lai mūsu tehnoloģijas speciālisti, kiberspeciālisti būtu spēcīgāki par tiem, kas cenšas mūs traucēt, kas cenšas uzlauzt mūsu mājaslapas un tamlīdzīgi.

Paldies, kolēģi, ka jūs atbalstījāt manu pilotprojektu par StratCom finansējuma palielinājumu, bet es tiešām aicinu Komisiju atrast līdzekļus, lai StratCom finansējums kļūtu par pastāvīgu lietu. Paldies jums!

Markus Pieper (PPE). – Herr Präsident! Bannon, Russland, Fake News, technische Manipulation – die Waffen der EU-Gegner haben die Kollegen wirklich treffend beschrieben.

Wir müssen da auch in ganz anderen Dimensionen denken: Wir müssen digital aufrüsten, wir brauchen Frühwarnsysteme gegen Falschmeldungen und technische Eingriffe – nicht nur in Brüssel, nein, auch in allen Mitgliedstaaten, wie das die tschechische Kollegin eben beschrieben hat – wenn uns etwas an dieser europäischen Idee liegt.

Wir müssen aber auch mit Facebook und Google reden. Wir müssen sie in die Pflicht nehmen. Wenn sie in Europa Geschäfte machen wollen, geht das nur, wenn sie auch seriöse Inhalte verbreiten. Wer Multiplikator der Europazerstörer ist, soll nicht von den Freiheiten des europäischen Binnenmarkts profitieren dürfen. Deswegen müssen wir mit Facebook und Google in aller Deutlichkeit Gespräche führen.

Ich frage die Kommission aber auch, wie es sein kann, dass wir uns erst jetzt mit einer Änderung des Statuts für Stiftungen und Parteien befassen. Die neuen Vorschriften sollen doch helfen, faire und freie Wahlen zu garantieren, nicht zuletzt durch transparente Spenden. Leider sind diese neuen Vorschriften erst nach den Europawahlen wirksam.

Liebe Kollegen von der Kommission, so geht das nicht. Lasst uns das als Weckruf nehmen, damit wir das ganze Thema viel ernster nehmen.

Eduard Kukan (PPE). – Mr President, colleagues, in the recent years we have found ourselves responding to untruths, half truths, fake news and propaganda. Misinformation and disinformation dominate and penetrate our daily lives. In an environment more susceptible to foreign interference in our elections, we must find ways how to be proactive and not only retroactive. One of the most important issues in fighting foreign influence in European elections is to strengthen the media environment in our Member States, but also in candidate countries and in the neighbourhood. This goes hand-in-hand with the robust respect for freedom of media and for the work of our journalists. Looking back at the work of Jan Kuciak or Daphne Caruana Galizia, we owe it to all the journalists who put their lives on the frontline in order to report on issues of interest to the public. We owe it to the journalists in Ukraine, Belarus, Moldova, Serbia and in other countries; we owe it to our own societies. Political leaders in some Member States have dishonoured the journalistic profession by public statements against journalists. I strongly denounce these practices. All EU states must protect the personal safety and the livelihoods of investigative journalists and whistleblowers, and not only protect them but champion their causes as well, and in upcoming European elections I think that without dedicated journalists and a free media environment, it will be difficult to protect fully our own democracies.

Jaromír Štětina (PPE). – Pane předsedající, už v roce 2013 vytýčil zásady hybridní války náčelník generálního štábu ozbrojených sil Ruska generál Valerij Gerasimov. Gerasimovova doktrína zdůrazňuje, že nevojenské prostředky mohou být účinnější než tradiční zbraně. Správně volené a aplikované slovo může být destruktivnější než tanky či raketové systémy.

Jedna z divizí této Gerasimovovy hybridní armády ovlivňuje volební procesy. Tak například: nizozemské referendum o ratifikaci asociační dohody mezi Evropskou unií a Ukrajinou, referendum o vystoupení Velké Británie z Evropské unie, německé volby v roce 2017, francouzské prezidentské volby ve stejném roce. Dezinformacemi byly zaplaveny a ovlivněny i prezidentské volby v mé zemi, České republice. Výrazně napomohly vítězství proruského prezidenta Zemana.

Zastavení uměle vyvolávané eroze důvěry v demokratické instituce se musí konečně stát centrálním bodem agendy členských států, ale i Evropské unie samotné. Proto důrazně apeluji na hlavy států a vlád i na vysokou představitelku pro zahraniční věci a bezpečnostní politiku, aby na prosincovém summitu udělali zásadní posun ve vnímání tohoto strategického nebezpečí. Očekávám představení maximálně ambiciózního akčního plánu s konkrétními kroky.

Příštím důležitým cílem dezinformačních kampaní a možných kyberútoků budou volby do Evropského parlamentu v květnu 2019. Rád bych doufal, že už budeme připravenější než v minulosti.

Nuno Melo (PPE). – Senhor Presidente, as *fake news* são uma realidade dos nossos tempos. São mais um elemento a ter em conta nas diferentes variáveis das disputas eleitorais que temos obviamente de combater. Mas quem se convença que a reconfiguração partidária a que assistimos nos últimos anos, da Rússia aos Estados Unidos, passando pela União Europeia, só se deve às *fake news* não está a ver o que está a acontecer.

Algumas forças políticas, normalmente de esquerda, foram colonizando durante décadas os meios clássicos de comunicação. Desde lá, criaram todas as narrativas do politicamente correto: o que pode ser dito e o que não pode ser dito. E, depois, sentiram-se no direito de atacar políticos que não lhes seguissem a cartilha. Titulares de cargos políticos passaram a recear dizer o que genuinamente pensam, temerosos da reação mediática. Os eleitores, por seu lado, deixaram de ouvir respostas de bom senso para problemas concretos. E quem se aproveitou do vazio foram todos os extremismos, ajudados também pelas *fake news*.

Quem não compreender isto dificilmente poderá ajudar a combater aquele que é um dos piores fenómenos dos nossos tempos.

Bogdan Andrzej Zdrojewski (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Chcę zwrócić uwagę na to, że wybory samorządowe są obszarem niezwykle wrażliwym. Są nie tylko testem dla demokracji, ale także dla prawidłowości funkcjonowania wielu instytucji w poszczególnych krajach, także instytucji europejskich. Do tej pory najczęściej zajmowaliśmy się tymi elementami (i niepokoiliśmy się o nie), które są związane z prawami demokratycznymi, z przejrzystością, a także czystością biznesową takich wyborów, czyli przede wszystkim przejrzystością finansową samych komitetów. Dziś otrzymujemy kolejny temat, niezwykle wrażliwy, na który wszyscy zwracamy uwagę już od kilku – podkreślam: od kilku – lat praktycznie bez skutku. Chcę zaznaczyć, że fake newsy to już przemysł. To jest poważna gałąź, z której czerpią korzyści prawdopodobnie państwa, a także duże organizacje biznesowe. Wybory to dla tego przemysłu – trzeba to podkreślić – także poważny interes biznesowy i finansowy o niewyobrażalnych skutkach. Zwracam na to uwagę dlatego, że musimy wiedzieć, iż fake newsy, ingerencje zewnętrzne, fałszywe komunikaty, fałszywa komunikacja, fałszywe portale społecznościowe są wielkim, bardzo często poważnym elementem bezpieczeństwa i zagrożenia bezpieczeństwa. Chcę zwrócić także uwagę na fakt, iż ta kadencja Parlamentu Europejskiego rozpoczynała się właśnie od pierwszego sprawozdania dotyczącego fałszywych informacji, fałszywych przekazów, ingerencji w życie polityczne Europy, a także życie gospodarcze. Jesteśmy jednak niestety w tym samym punkcie, w którym byliśmy cztery lata temu.

Carlos Coelho (PPE). – Senhor Presidente, Senhores Comissários Jourová e King, Senhora Presidente do Conselho, Caras e Caros Colegas, em abril deste ano questionei a Comissão Europeia sobre cibersegurança e a salvaguarda da integridade das eleições europeias. Nenhuma resposta foi dada durante largos meses, mas, finalmente, a 12 de setembro foi apresentado um pacote de medidas pelo qual felicito a Comissão Europeia.

Em 2019, como já foi dito, haverá novas eleições para o Parlamento Europeu. Todos queremos prevenir qualquer manipulação eleitoral. Não somos ingénuos e sabemos que são muitas as forças externas, políticas, estatais, económicas e militares, que querem condicionar o processo eleitoral, seja através de *fake news*, utilização de grandes quantidades de dados para manipulação eleitoral, ou através de financiamento a partidos extremistas que querem destruir o projeto europeu.

Todos recordamos, como já fez a Comissária europeia Jourová, a vergonha do caso «Facebook/Cambridge Analytica» e os fortes indícios de ingerência russa nas eleições em território europeu, todos eles utilizando o mundo digital e as novas tecnologias de informação e comunicação.

É, pois, primordial salvaguardar os direitos dos cidadãos europeus nestas eleições. A cibersegurança é, mais do que nunca, prioritária na defesa dos direitos fundamentais da União.

É fulcral que a Comissão e os Estados-Membros tomem as medidas técnicas e organizativas necessárias para gerir os riscos que recaem sobre a segurança das redes e dos sistemas de informação utilizados nas eleições para o Parlamento Europeu.

Numa Europa contaminada por egoísmos e populismos são muitos os que não vão olhar a meios para destruir o projeto europeu e combater a Europa dos valores e das liberdades.

Temos de agir rapidamente pela liberdade.

Lukas Mandl (PPE). – Sehr geehrter Herr Präsident, Frau Kommissarin, Herr Kommissar, liebe Frau Staatssekretärin Karoline Etdstadler! Wir diskutieren darüber, dass Mächte dieser Welt Wahlen in Europa und damit das öffentliche Meinungsklima beeinflussen wollen.

Wir müssen uns fragen: Warum wollen die Europa beeinflussen? Warum findet diese Beeinflussung statt? Und der Grund liegt auf der Hand: Europa ist stark. Europa ist stärker als je zuvor in der Geschichte, weil es geeint ist, weil es dadurch wirtschaftlich stark ist, ein Faktor ist, den manche Mächte auf dieser Welt nicht kooperativ sehen wollen, sondern im Konkurrenzkampf schwächen wollen.

Wer ist das Ziel dieser Schwächungen? Das Ziel dieser Schwächungen, das sind nicht staatliche Institutionen wie vielleicht in der Vergangenheit, sondern das ist jede Einzelne und jeder Einzelne. Das sind Frauen und Männer, die einfach kommunizieren, die Medien konsumieren. Ja, das sind auch unsere Kinder. Was brauchen wir daher? Wir brauchen Cyberabwehr.

Wir müssen in Europa auch diskutieren über *security* – über Sicherheit –, nicht nur über *privacy*. Wir müssen dort investieren, wo die Digitalisierung Kompetenzen verlangt, die die Abwehr gegen solche Gefahren möglich machen. Wir brauchen Bildung, Bildung, Bildung. Unsere Kinder – alle Menschen – müssen zwischen falschen Nachrichten und wahren Nachrichten, zwischen Verschwörungstheorien und einem echten Meinungsaustausch unterscheiden können. Und wir brauchen Pressefreiheit. Ich stimme da der Kollegin Harms sehr deutlich zu: Wir essen ja auch kein rohes Fleisch, aber wir konsumieren ständig Information, die nicht journalistisch recherchiert wurde, sondern völlig ungefiltert auf uns zukommt. Das müssen wir unterscheiden lernen.

Andreas Schwab (PPE). – Herr Präsident, Frau Kommissarin, Frau Staatssekretärin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Gegen Ende dieser Debatte ist es schwierig, nochmals neue Argumente in den Zusammenhang zu stellen. Deswegen möchte ich das, was die Kollegen hier schon vorgetragen haben, ausdrücklich unterstützen. Ich glaube, dass wir nicht nur auf die Frage von Falschinformationen im Zusammenhang mit Resilienz eingehen dürfen, sondern dass wir zwingend auch den Aspekt sehen müssen, dass eben unsere Netze, die digitalen Datennetze, anfälliger sind für Angriffe, weil sich Angriffe, die früher vielleicht auf ein bestimmtes Land gerichtet und angelegt waren, heute sehr einfach innerhalb der Mitgliedstaaten der Europäischen Union, die stark vernetzt sind, verbreiten können.

Deswegen müssen wir auch die Interaktion zwischen beiden Gefahren sehen. Und wenn der Kollege Mandl unmittelbar vor mir darauf hinweist, dass die große Gefahr natürlich darin liegt, dass viele Einzelne kommunizieren, so ist es die Tatsache, dass die Verunsicherung, die durch Attacken entsteht, bei diesen Einzelnen am Ende am stärksten ankommt und gewissermaßen die Demokratie, die demokratische Verfahren in der Europäischen Union mit Angriffen, die vielleicht auf den ersten Blick gar nicht als so gefährlich gelten, verunsichert und in Frage gestellt werden.

Deswegen müssen wir tatsächlich vor der Europawahl – es ist in der Debatte darauf hingewiesen worden – sicherstellen, dass die Mitgliedstaaten ihre Resilienzanstrengungen verstärken und dass es uns gelingt, auch in Zusammenarbeit mit den großen Unternehmen dafür zu sorgen, dass Fake News und andere Falschinformationen tatsächlich auch dort bekämpft werden, wo sie am schnellsten bekämpft werden können.

Lambert van Nistelrooij (PPE). – Voorzitter, commissarissen, staatssecretaris, het is heel goed om dit debat hier te voeren. Democratie, hier in dit huis, maar zeker ook in alle lidstaten, staat voorop. Overal in de wereld zijn wij als waarnemers bij verkiezingen aanwezig. We tellen precies of de stemmen goed in het busje zijn gekomen, en controleren dan de hele procedure eromheen.

Nu zijn we echter zelf in het geding. Eigenlijk is dit een heel serieus moment. Ik heb meegewerkt aan verslagen over de kritische infrastructuur op het internet in Europa. Welnu, onze democratische verkiezingen, alles daaromheen, ons bestel, vormen zo'n kritisch deel van onze infrastructuur, waar we ons niet van buitenaf op moeten laten pakken.

Ik was begin deze maand in Israël. Als je ziet wat zo'n land investeert in hun *cyber security*, in hun weerbaarheid, en je dan daar tegenover zet wat wij in Europa doen, dan moeten we nog de zesde versnelling vinden. Het moet nadrukkelijk zo zijn dat wij bij de assistentie die we op alle niveau voor verkiezingen verlenen, de weerbaarheid vergroten.

Een heel concreet punt, wat ook is genoemd door de commissaris: de check die nu wordt toegepast op een aantal van onze grote platforms zou verplicht moeten zijn. Er zou op al die grote sites en platforms een knop moeten zitten waarop je kunt drukken om aan te geven: ik zie dit bericht, hoe is de financiering tot stand gekomen? Welke beïnvloeding zit erachter? Zijn die filmpjes echt? Het zal anders moeten, omdat de uitdaging ook anders is.

Jiří Pospíšil (PPE). – Pane předsedající, je těžké na konci této debaty přinést ještě nějaké nové myšlenky do takto zásadního tématu. Já chci pouze podtrhnout a zopakovat to, že jsem přesvědčený, že v nadcházejících evropských volbách bude ze strany Ruska velká snaha ovlivnit průběh volebních kampaní v jednotlivých členských státech, a to zvláště v zemích, které patří z pohledu ruské zahraniční doktríny do takzvaného blízkého sousedství. To znamená v zemích, které bohužel v době komunismu spadaly pod vliv Sovětského svazu. To jsou země, kde zkrátka Rusko chce uplatňovat svůj politický a ekonomický vliv a nepřeje si posilování té části společnosti, která je proevropská. Musíme s tím počítat, musíme proti tomu vytvářet osvětovou kampaň, jak na úrovni národních států, tak na úrovni Evropské unie.

Vystupuji zde v pozici europoslance za Českou republiku a my jsme byli svědky toho, kdy i při posledních volbách, prezidentských volbách, které proběhly před několika měsíci v České republice, zkrátka a dobře, proevropský kandidát na prezidenta čelil velkým mediálním útokům, čelil *fake news*, které proti němu byly šířeny ve statisících mailů, které byly rozesílány a kde byla právě zkreslována témata, která souvisí s evropskou agendou. Byla zkreslována témata, jako je třeba otázka migrace. Musíme počítat s tím, že téma migrace bude ze strany nepřátel Evropské unie výrazně zneužito.

Julian King, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, this is a vitally important subject that we're debating this afternoon. Foreign, domestic, sometimes criminal, actors have, without doubt, sought to break the rules, sought to interfere in our democratic processes and raised questions about our democratic institutions. Make no mistake: that does represent a security challenge.

We, from the Commission side, agree with those of you who say that we need to take action on a number of fronts: we need to build our cybersecurity and our resilience against cyberattacks, we need to tackle cyber manipulation through dis— and misinformation, and we need to tackle the misuse of mined personal data.

We also agree that we need to call out examples of interference. I want to join those of you who have praised the excellent work carried out by the EU's East Stratcom Task Force, which, over the last couple of years, has now gathered more than 4 000 cases of pro-Kremlin disinformation, contradicting publicly available facts, repeated in a number of languages and on a number of occasions. These activities basically reflect a public Russian military doctrine which openly advertises the use of false data and destabilising propaganda as legitimate tools.

As a number of you have also observed, unfortunately it is not only Russia. Others are going down this route as well, which is why we also need to tackle the underlying vulnerabilities. We need to build our resilience through longer term actions – as many of you have said – on education, independent media and building critical awareness, but also through some shorter-term, more immediate actions, not least with the upcoming European parliamentary elections in mind.

So we are pushing for early agreement on the Cybersecurity Act, the package of measures that we have proposed to try and build our cybersecurity and resilience. I note that in the US Congress they've just acted to create a US Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency. I think it is high time we followed that example.

We're also acting to tackle cyber criminality. We will continue to support Europol, who have in EC3 an internationally recognised centre of excellence in tackling cyber criminality. But, more generally, we need to work for transparency, traceability and the accountability of cyber criminals, which is why it is so important that we make progress on e-evidence. Without fast and effective access to electronic evidence, it is very hard to hold cyber criminals to account.

As well as those steps, we need to tackle cyber manipulation and on that, building on the measures we presented last April in our communication on tackling online disinformation, we have – as has been mentioned – now agreed, in what is actually internationally a first, a Code of Practice on Disinformation with the big social media platforms, the big news platforms.

We've asked those platforms to restrict targeting options for political advertising, to ensure transparency around sponsored content, to step up their efforts to identify and delete fake accounts, and to establish clear rules around bots. There should also be greater clarity around algorithms – as has been mentioned in this debate – and information on how they prioritise the content that that we see. This needs to be combined with tools enabling users more easily to discover content and access new sources representing alternative points of view, as well as to report disinformation.

I think this code is a good starting point, but we need to go further. We need to press the platforms now to deliver granular, measurable objectives that we can hold them to account against. We will do that work, as a number of you have asked, as we prepare the action plan for early December.

We still hope that we can see sufficient progress by working quickly together on a voluntary basis, but we've been clear that we reserve the right to consider our options again if we don't see the progress that we need.

As my colleague, Commissioner Jourová, mentioned earlier, in September President Juncker presented a set of measures specifically on election security, asking Member States to set up a national election cooperation network of all the relevant authorities. We have brought them together – representatives from each of the Member States, those responsible for running elections, those responsible for cybersecurity, and those responsible for data protection – and we will build an effective European-level network so that those experts can share best practice and support each other, and we can build our collective resilience.

From the Commission side, we very much welcome your strong engagement on these issues. As we've said before in these debates, raising awareness is the first line of defence, but, in itself, it is not enough. We need to go further. We need to maximise our preparedness ahead of the series of elections that are coming up. We are committed to working with you, with Member States and with the private sector better to secure the foundations of our democracy: free speech, freedom of expression, and indeed the right of all of those who have spoken today, including those who attacked the Commission.

Karoline Edtstadler, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Mr President, it's quite difficult at the end of the debate to say something new in this debate, because I would like to say that this very useful debate showed and demonstrated a high degree of convergence between the European Parliament's and the Council's and also the Commissioner's view on the importance of EU resilience against any influence of foreign actors in the upcoming EP election campaign – and I would like to emphasise this – no matter from which country it is evolving.

I fully second what Commissioner King said: we have a lot to do in a lot of different areas and regarding different topics. It is clear that it is still work in progress, and I'm looking forward to further results in the short— and the medium-term.

Let me assure you of our firm commitment to continuing the work that I outlined already at the beginning of our debate and of our readiness to adopt and effectively implement concrete measures to protect the internet and the cyberspace from criminal misuse. It is clear that these objectives cannot be met without common efforts to ensure a free, open, safe and secure cyberspace and in close cooperation with other public and private stakeholders. This work is actively supported by the contractual public-private partnership on cybersecurity between the European Commission and the European Cyber Security Organisation. But I doubt that we will be able to complete this work at any time. Our work in the cyber domain is now far away from being completed, and against a background of the developing technology, we have to work a lot also in the future – I'm convinced of that.

We need to join forces – and also that was mentioned by the Commissioner – to raise the awareness of all stakeholders, to encourage action, and to improve the capacities and capabilities of the EU and its Member States to tackle the ever-growing sophistication of cyber-attacks and evolving cyber-threats around the world. We need to make good use of all the EU initiatives directed at increasing cyber resilience and invest in the implementation of all recently announced measures. We also need to strengthen the existing framework, based on current experience, to provide more comprehensive response to the constantly evolving challenges which rigorously protect the fundamental rights and freedoms of our citizens.

Przewodniczący. – Zamykam debatę.

Oświadczenia pisemne (art. 162)

Clara Eugenia Aguilera García (S&D), *por escrito*. – En los próximos meses comenzará la campaña electoral para las próximas elecciones al Parlamento Europeo y la UE debe redoblar esfuerzos para que el derecho fundamental de participación política y de elección democrática no se vea interferido por una guerra híbrida de intoxicación, ciberterrorismo, manipulación ni chantaje de ninguna manera. Desafortunadamente, en los últimos años hemos asistido a un conjunto de episodios de injerencia delictiva en procesos electorales y consultas y referendos en Estados miembros de la Unión. Por todo ello, es necesario que el alto grado de convergencia entre las tres instituciones en esta materia se refleje en la rápida adopción de las medidas propuestas por la Comisión, que incluye el establecimiento de redes de cooperación electoral a nivel nacional y de la UE; la puesta en marcha de orientaciones sobre la aplicación de las normas de protección de datos en el contexto electoral y de recomendaciones sobre una mayor transparencia en la publicidad y la comunicación política en línea remunerada; el refuerzo de la ciberseguridad; la aplicación diligente de las normas electorales existentes; y la entrada en vigor de una propuesta legislativa que permita sancionar el uso indebido de los datos personales con fines electorales.

Monika Beňová (S&D), *písomne*. – Opakované pokusy a skúsenosti so zasahovaním do volieb a predvolebnej kampane ukazujú, že demokratické procesy je nevyhnutné dôsledne chrániť. Týka sa to najmä cieleného obmedzovania masových diskreditačných kampaní založených na absolútnych nezmysloch a dezinformáciách v online prostredí, šírených často zo zahraničia. Zneužívanie lží a dezinformácií v politickom boji pritom nie je žiadnou novinkou. Predovšetkým v prostredí sociálnych sietí sa však šíria rýchlejšie a ich vplyv tak má omnoho väčší dosah. Falošné správy sa vďaka tomu stali istým druhom zbrane, ktorá je hrozbou pre našu spoločnosť. Na neustále sa vyvíjajúce kybernetické hrozby tak musíme reagovať posilňovaním bezpečnosti. Jediným účelom šírenia škodlivého obsahu na internete je vznik pochybností, nevraživosti a rozdelenia v spoločnosti.

José Blanco López (S&D), *por escrito*. – En los próximos meses comenzará la campaña electoral para las próximas elecciones al Parlamento Europeo y la UE debe redoblar esfuerzos para que el derecho fundamental de participación política y de elección democrática no se vea interferido por una guerra híbrida de intoxicación, ciberterrorismo, manipulación ni chantaje de ninguna manera. Desafortunadamente, en los últimos años hemos asistido a un conjunto de episodios de injerencia delictiva en procesos electorales y consultas y referendos en Estados miembros de la Unión. Por todo ello, es necesario que el alto grado de convergencia entre las tres instituciones en esta materia se refleje en la rápida adopción de las medidas propuestas por la Comisión, que incluye el establecimiento de redes de cooperación electoral a nivel nacional y de la UE; la puesta en marcha de orientaciones sobre la aplicación de las normas de protección de datos en el contexto electoral y de recomendaciones sobre una mayor transparencia en la publicidad y la comunicación política en línea remunerada; el refuerzo de la ciberseguridad; la aplicación diligente de las normas electorales existentes; y la entrada en vigor de una propuesta legislativa que permita sancionar el uso indebido de los datos personales con fines electorales.

Soledad Cabezón Ruiz (S&D), *por escrito*. – En los próximos meses comenzará la campaña electoral para las próximas elecciones al Parlamento Europeo y la UE debe redoblar esfuerzos para que el derecho fundamental de participación política y de elección democrática no se vea interferido por una guerra híbrida de intoxicación, ciberterrorismo, manipulación ni chantaje de ninguna manera. Desafortunadamente, en los últimos años hemos asistido a un conjunto de episodios de injerencia delictiva en procesos electorales y consultas y referendos en Estados miembros de la Unión. Por todo ello, es necesario que el alto grado de convergencia entre las tres instituciones en esta materia se refleje en la rápida adopción de las medidas propuestas por la Comisión, que incluye el establecimiento de redes de cooperación electoral a nivel nacional y de la UE; la puesta en marcha de orientaciones sobre la aplicación de las normas de protección de datos en el contexto electoral y de recomendaciones sobre una mayor transparencia en la publicidad y la comunicación política en línea remunerada; el refuerzo de la ciberseguridad; la aplicación diligente de las normas electorales existentes; y la entrada en vigor de una propuesta legislativa que permita sancionar el uso indebido de los datos personales con

fines electorales.

Iratxe García Pérez (S&D), *por escrito*. – En los próximos meses comenzará la campaña electoral para las próximas elecciones al Parlamento Europeo y la UE debe redoblar esfuerzos para que el derecho fundamental de participación política y de elección democrática no se vea interferido por una guerra híbrida de intoxicación, ciberterrorismo, manipulación ni chantaje de ninguna manera. Desafortunadamente, en los últimos años hemos asistido a un conjunto de episodios de injerencia delictiva en procesos electorales y consultas y referendos en Estados miembros de la Unión. Por todo ello, es necesario que el alto grado de convergencia entre las tres instituciones en esta materia se refleje en la rápida adopción de las medidas propuestas por la Comisión, que incluyen el establecimiento de redes de cooperación electoral a nivel nacional y de la UE; la puesta en marcha de orientaciones sobre la aplicación de las normas de protección de datos en el contexto electoral y de recomendaciones sobre una mayor transparencia en la publicidad y la comunicación política en línea remunerada; el refuerzo de la ciberseguridad; la aplicación diligente de las normas electorales existentes; y la entrada en vigor de una propuesta legislativa que permita sancionar el uso indebido de los datos personales con fines electorales.

Eider Gardiazabal Rubial (S&D), *por escrito*. – En los próximos meses comenzará la campaña electoral para las próximas elecciones al Parlamento Europeo y la UE debe redoblar esfuerzos para que el derecho fundamental de participación política y de elección democrática no se vea interferido por una guerra híbrida de intoxicación, ciberterrorismo, manipulación ni chantaje de ninguna manera. Desafortunadamente, en los últimos años hemos asistido a un conjunto de episodios de injerencia delictiva en procesos electorales y consultas y referendos en Estados miembros de la Unión. Por todo ello, es necesario que el alto grado de convergencia entre las tres instituciones en esta materia se refleje en la rápida adopción de las medidas propuestas por la Comisión, que incluye el establecimiento de redes de cooperación electoral a nivel nacional y de la UE; la puesta en marcha de orientaciones sobre la aplicación de las normas de protección de datos en el contexto electoral y de recomendaciones sobre una mayor transparencia en la publicidad y la comunicación política en línea remunerada; el refuerzo de la ciberseguridad; la aplicación diligente de las normas electorales existentes; y la entrada en vigor de una propuesta legislativa que permita sancionar el uso indebido de los datos personales con fines electorales.

Enrique Guerrero Salom (S&D), *por escrito*. – En los próximos meses comenzará la campaña electoral para las próximas elecciones al Parlamento Europeo y la UE debe redoblar esfuerzos para que el derecho fundamental de participación política y de elección democrática no se vea interferido por una guerra híbrida de intoxicación, ciberterrorismo, manipulación ni chantaje de ninguna manera. Desafortunadamente, en los últimos años hemos asistido a un conjunto de episodios de injerencia delictiva en procesos electorales y consultas y referendos en Estados miembros de la Unión. Por todo ello, es necesario que el alto grado de convergencia entre las tres instituciones en esta materia se refleje en la rápida adopción de las medidas propuestas por la Comisión, que incluye el establecimiento de redes de cooperación electoral a nivel nacional y de la UE; la puesta en marcha de orientaciones sobre la aplicación de las normas de protección de datos en el contexto electoral y de recomendaciones sobre una mayor transparencia en la publicidad y la comunicación política en línea remunerada; el refuerzo de la ciberseguridad; la aplicación diligente de las normas electorales existentes; y la entrada en vigor de una propuesta legislativa que permita sancionar el uso indebido de los datos personales con fines electorales.

Sergio Gutiérrez Prieto (S&D), *por escrito*. – En los próximos meses comenzará la campaña electoral para las próximas elecciones al Parlamento Europeo y la UE debe redoblar esfuerzos para que el derecho fundamental de participación política y de elección democrática no se vea interferido por una guerra híbrida de intoxicación, ciberterrorismo, manipulación ni chantaje de ninguna manera. Desafortunadamente, en los últimos años hemos asistido a un conjunto de episodios de injerencia delictiva en procesos electorales y consultas y referendos en Estados miembros de la Unión. Por todo ello, es necesario que el alto grado de convergencia entre las tres instituciones en esta materia se refleje en la rápida adopción de las medidas propuestas por la Comisión, que incluye el establecimiento de redes de cooperación electoral a nivel nacional y de la UE; la puesta en marcha de orientaciones sobre la aplicación de las normas de protección de datos en el contexto electoral y de recomendaciones sobre una mayor transparencia en la publicidad y la comunicación política en línea remunerada; el refuerzo de la ciberseguridad; la aplicación diligente de las normas electorales existentes; y la entrada en vigor de una propuesta legislativa que permita sancionar el uso indebido de los datos personales con fines electorales.

Μανώλης Κεφαλογιάννης (PPE), *γραπτώς*. – Σε έξι μήνες από τώρα, οι ευρωπαίοι πολίτες θα προσέλθουν στις κάλπες για να εκλέξουν ένα νέο Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο, μία νέα Επιτροπή. Θα κληθούν να οδηγήσουν την Ευρώπη σε μια νέα εποχή γεμάτη προκλήσεις, ευκαιρίες και απειλές. Το διακύβευμα είναι κρίσιμο και κάποιοι θα επιχειρήσουν να αποδυναμώσουν την εκλογική διαδικασία, διασπείροντας ψευδείς ειδήσεις, ενισχύοντας λαϊκίστικες και αντιευρωπαϊκές φωνές και υποδαυλίζοντας εθνικισμούς. Επιτυχία τους δεν θα είναι μόνον η ανάδειξη λαϊκίστικων και αντιευρωπαϊκών δυνάμεων, αλλά και το χαμηλό ποσοστό συμμετοχής των ευρωπαίων πολιτών. Η απάντηση σε όσους θέλουν να δουν μία αποδυναμωμένη Ευρώπη είναι η μεγαλύτερη συμμετοχή των πολιτών. Η ενίσχυση της δημοκρατίας. Δημοκρατία και συμμετοχή πάνε μαζί και για να αυξήσουμε τη συμμετοχή πρέπει να δώσουμε δύναμη στην προσωπική επιλογή του κάθε ευρωπαίου πολίτη. Η εκλογή των επόμενων ευρωβουλευτών στα κράτη μέλη πρέπει να στηρίζεται στην άμεση επιλογή των ευρωβουλευτών και όχι σε εκλογή με λίστα. Εμείς πιστεύουμε στην ευρωπαϊκή ενοποίηση. Οφείλουμε να αποκτήσουμε έναν κοινό τρόπο εκλογής.

Javi López (S&D), *por escrito*. – En los próximos meses comenzará la campaña electoral para las próximas elecciones al Parlamento Europeo y la UE debe redoblar esfuerzos para que el derecho fundamental de participación política y de elección democrática no se vea interferido por una guerra híbrida de intoxicación, ciberterrorismo, manipulación ni chantaje de ninguna manera. Desafortunadamente, en los últimos años hemos asistido a un conjunto de episodios de injerencia delictiva en procesos electorales y consultas y referendos en Estados miembros de la Unión. Por todo ello, es necesario que el alto grado de convergencia entre las tres instituciones en esta materia se refleje en la rápida adopción de las medidas propuestas por la Comisión, que incluye el establecimiento de redes de cooperación electoral a nivel nacional y de la UE; la puesta en marcha de orientaciones sobre la aplicación de las normas de protección de datos en el contexto electoral y de recomendaciones sobre una mayor transparencia en la publicidad y la comunicación política en línea remunerada; el refuerzo de la ciberseguridad; la aplicación diligente de las normas electorales existentes; y la entrada en vigor de una propuesta legislativa que permita sancionar el uso indebido de los datos personales con fines electorales.

Csaba Molnár (S&D), *írásban*. – Az Oxfordi Egyetem friss tanulmánya szerint a közéletet és a választásokat befolyásoló hamis propaganda világszerte fokozódik. Magyarországon ilyen tevékenységet a kutatók 2010-től, az Orbán-kormány hivatalba lépésétől kezdve tapasztaltak. Különösen szégyenteljes, hogy a hamis propagandát Magyarországon kizárólag a kormányzat végzi – méghozzá egyértelműen Vlagyimir Putyin EU-ellenes politikáját támogatva. A kormány dezinformációs tevékenysége része mindannak, amit az EP a Sargentini-jelentés kapcsán elítélt. Orbán trollhadserege azért dolgozik, hogy az írott és elektronikus sajtó monopolizálása után az internetet is megszállja, és elhallgattassa a politikai ellenzék és a civil szféra kritikus hangjait. Egyúttal az interneten is folyamatosan, agresszíven, szemen szedett hazugságok tömegével támadják az Európai Uniót. Félelmet, megosztottságot keltenek a szavazópolgárokban – amit aztán nacionalista, rasszista politikájuk érdekében használnak ki. Az EP választások tisztaságát tehát az Unión belülről, Magyarország kormánya részéről is veszély fenyegeti. Fel kívánom hívni a figyelmet arra, hogy a hazugságkampányokon túlmenően a magyar választójogi törvény újabb manipulációjára készül. A küszöbön álló módosítás lehetővé tenné, hogy a magyar állampolgársággal rendelkező, más tagállamban élő polgárok jogellenesen és ellenőrizetlenül egyszerre két országban is szavazhassanak. Ez érdemben befolyásolná a választások kimenetelét. Elengedhetetlen, hogy az Unió mindkét üggyel sürgősen foglalkozzon, még jóval a választások előtt, hogy a szavazás tisztasága garantálható legyen.

Eva Maydell (PPE), *in writing*. – Two main elements of our democracy and electoral process that are under attack: the first – you can call it fake news, disinformation etc. We have lost the sense of what is true and false. The problem is 'more information, but less informed'. We have already started working with the big online platforms to make the internet a better and more reliable place for information and facts. Yet, we are competing for the attention of our citizens with Russian trolls, terrorist organisations and populists. The only way to win is to offer our citizens a logical narrative, based on principles and facts, filled with brave but conceivable ideas for the future.

The second element is our election infrastructure. It is obvious that we should re-conceptualise the use of technology in the process, so the voting rolls, the act of voting, tabulation and results are secure to external influence. We should also reform our election administration, with a focus on resilience to cyber-attacks.

Today, foreign interference aims not only to support one candidate in a race, but also to ruin the basic mechanism that our societies use to make decisions. With no credible elections our societies will end up divided, perplexed and in deep confrontation.

Pirkko Ruohonen-Lerner (ECR), *kirjallinen*. – Kansalaisten luottamus poliittiseen järjestelmään on horjunut. Tästä kertoo se, että monissa maissa äänestysaktiivisuus jää alhaiselle tasolle. Tämä koskettaa erityisesti Euroopan parlamentin vaaleja, joissa äänestysaktiivisuus jää usein alle 40 prosentin. Tähän ongelmaan meidän on keksittävä ratkaisuja.

Vaaleissa pääomapiirit ja erilaiset edunvalvontajärjestöt pyrkivät saamaan omia ehdokkaitaan valituiksi keskeisiin luottamustehtäviin eduskuntaan, hallitukseen ja Euroopan parlamenttiin. Tavoitteena tietysti on, että vaalirahalla sponsoroidut edustajat edistävät tehtävissään erityisesti rahoittajiensa asioita. Vaalikampanjat ylipäätänsä ovat usein liian pelkistettyjä ja yliampuvia, jopa harhaanjohtavia ja poliittisia vastustajia mustamaalaavia, mikä entisestään hämmentää epävarmoja äänestäjiä.

Verkossa ja perinteisessäkin mediassa jatkuvasti yleistyvä disinformaatio on yksi suurimmista haasteista eurooppalaisen demokratian toteutumiselle. Mitä laajemmin disinformaatiota levitetään sosiaalisessa mediassa, valeuutisissa, valetietokirjoissa ja valevideoissa, sitä vähemmän ihmiset uskovat minkään vastaanottamansa informaation luotettavuuteen. Jokaisen vastaavan päätoimittajan ja julkaisujohtajan tulisi tämä ymmärtää ja kantaa vastuunsa siitä, että julkaistaan vain tosiasioita. Lukijan, kuulijan ja katsojan pitää voida helposti erottaa faktat ja fiktiot toisistaan. Pelkkä liikevaihtoon tuijottaminen ei saisi olla missään julkaisutoiminnassa pääasia. On tärkeää korostaa korkealaatuisen toimituksellisen työn merkitystä sekä toimittajien aseman ja riippumattoman median vahvistamista. Kansalaisten on saatava luotettavaa ja laadukasta tietoa, jotta kansanvalta voi toteutua. Pidän hyvänä komission esittämiä toimia vapaiden ja oikeudenmukaisten vaalien turvaamiseksi, esimerkiksi poliittisen verkkomainonnan ja sen kohdentamisen läpinäkyvyyden lisäämistä, samoin eurooppalaisten puolueiden vaalirahoitussääntöjen tiukennuksia.

Indrek Tarand (Verts/ALE), *in writing*. – Elections are the foundation that gives legitimacy to the democratic system as a whole, to the legislature and the executive branch. This is why the exercise of undue influence by foreign malicious actors is such a serious problem: this behaviour seeks to undermine the legitimacy of the entire democratic system by eroding its foundations.

In the age of social media and targeted advertising, it becomes more difficult to enforce existing rules, for example the ones forbidding the use of foreign money. The internet does not know national borders; therefore, the sponsor of a politically targeted advertisement (which could even contain blatant lies masquerading as facts or news) could be located anywhere. This is why, as a bare minimum, we need more transparency regarding political targeted advertising: who purchased it and where the target audience is located.

It might be healthier to ban political targeted advertising on social media altogether; one thing is to use it to sell commercial goods, but using it to influence or even manipulate the democratic choice of citizens is something entirely different. A comprehensive approach is required, since 'hacking' of elections is not limited to actual ballot fraud, but also includes undue manipulation of voters themselves.

22. Rechte und Pflichten der Fahrgäste im Eisenbahnverkehr (Aussprache)

Przewodniczący. – Kolejnym punktem porządku dziennego jest sprawozdanie sporządzone przez Bogusława Liberadzkiego w imieniu Komisji Transportu i Turystyki w sprawie wniosku dotyczącego rozporządzenia Parlamentu Europejskiego i Rady w sprawie praw i obowiązków pasażerów w ruchu kolejowym (wersja przekształcona) (COM(2017)0548 - C8-0324/2017 - 2017/0237(COD)) (A8-0340/2018).

Bogusław Liberadzki, *sprawozdawca*. – Panie Przewodniczący Krasnodębski! Pani Komisarz Bulc! Panie i Panowie! Niech mi będzie wolno zacząć od stwierdzenia: jest to bardzo ważny dzień naszej debaty w sprawie rozwoju praw konsumenta, specyficznego konsumenta, jakim są pasażerowie transportu kolejowego w Europie. Chodzi o ponad cztery miliardy osób, które w ciągu roku podróżują kolejami. Chodzi także o miliony pracowników zatrudnionych w transporcie kolejowym, a zatem o kompleksowe i kluczowo ważne przedsięwzięcie na bardzo dużą skalę.

Od razu na wstępie chciałbym podziękować za świetną współpracę swoim kontrsprawozdawcom, szczególnie panu Denisowi de Jong, który w imieniu komisji IMCO współuczestniczył w pracach nad przygotowaniem sprawozdania. Chcę podkreślić wysoką gotowość do współpracy ze strony Komisji i na ręce pani komisarz Bulc złożyć podziękowania.

Zacznę od tego, co Parlament może osiągnąć dzięki jutrzejszemu głosowaniu. Pierwszą i zasadniczą sprawą, jeżeli chodzi o prawa pasażerów, są rekompensaty za opóźnienia pociągów. Proponujemy zwiększenie kwot rekompensat do 100 % w przypadku opóźnienia powyżej 121 minut. Zdaję sobie sprawę, że nie będzie to łatwe. Ewentualnym rozwiązaniem alternatywnym byłaby rekompensata w wysokości 100 % przy opóźnieniu powyżej 180 minut.

Drugą sprawą, szczególnie istotną i godną podkreślenia, jest zwiększenie dostępności biletów łączonych, tzw. *through-tickets*, w przypadku pasażerów, którzy utracą połączenia, gdyż bilety były przeznaczone na przesiadkę. Będą oni mieli prawo do zajęcia miejsca w następnym pociągu bez żadnych dodatkowych kosztów.

Kolejną sprawą są ułatwienia dostępu dla podróżnych o ograniczonej zdolności ruchowej: grupa osób, którym chcemy umożliwić dostęp do środków mobilnych, jest bardzo duża i rosnąca. Proponujemy oczywiście, żeby na stacjach najwyższej kategorii, które obsługują co najmniej 10 tys. pasażerów na dobę, nie było *prenotification*, a następnie trzygodzinnego powiadomienia na stacjach mniejszych i dwunastogodzinnego powiadomienia na najmniejszych.

Otwieramy także kolej na przewozy rowerów. Proponujemy, aby w pociągu można było przewieźć do ośmiu rowerów. Z czasem przepis ten dotyczyć będzie każdego pociągu. Chcemy także rozszerzyć zakres rozporządzenia o ochronie praw pasażerskich nie tylko na pociągi międzynarodowe i krajowe, ale także na pociągi regionalne, aby te same prawa obowiązywały w tych właśnie pociągach na terenie całej Unii Europejskiej. Jest to jedna strona medalu.

Jednocześnie chcemy bardzo wyraźnie podkreślić, że rozwiązanie to ma mobilizować państwa i rządy do większej troski o jakość infrastruktury kolejowej, o tabor kolejowy, a także o dostępność ekonomiczną i fizyczną transportu dla pasażerów. Chcemy, aby transport kolejowy stał się alternatywą, by wszystkie jego zalety, takie jak ekologia, tani dostęp, niezawodność czy bezpieczeństwo, mogły znaleźć tutaj swoje miejsce. Chcielibyśmy także – i w tym kierunku zmierza to rozwiązanie – wyrównywać szanse konkurowania i reguły konkurowania transportu kolejowego z innymi gałęziami transportu. Jeszcze raz dziękuję za współpracę i czekam na państwa debatę.

Violeta Bulc, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, I would also like to thank very much the rapporteur from the Committee on Transport and Tourism (TRAN), Mr Liberadzki, and the shadow rapporteurs, as well as the Committee on the Internal Market and Consumer Protection (IMCO) for their intensive and very dedicated work on the Commission's proposal to recast the Rail Passengers' Rights Regulation.

It is indeed, as Mr Liberadzki already said, a unique opportunity to improve rail passengers' protection and, at the same time, to ensure further development of the rail sector, which also has an essential role to play in the development of multi-modal, integrated mobility as a service solution and in decarbonisation of transport.

First of all, let me stress that the Commission very much welcomes Parliament's objective to promote more attractive rail services and better passenger protection, but allow me to comment on some of your specific amendments.

First, on amendments beyond the recast legislative technique: we do have some institutional concerns over specific amendments which are not in line with the rules agreed between our institutions for the recast legislative technique. Some changes, such as the compensation levels in cases of service delay or cancellations, are not part of the Commission's legislative proposal. This said, we fully understand and share your good intentions to increase passengers' protection in the sector and we will examine the respective provisions put forward in detail taking account of the Commission's prerogative of legislative initiative. Of course, for those provisions which have been included in the Commission's recast proposal and which have undergone significant amendment following the EP debate, for example, regulation on through tickets, we stand ready to actively participate in the upcoming interinstitutional discussions.

On persons with reduced mobility, it really goes without saying that we are very much in favour of increasing, to the most feasible and realistic extent, the mobility of all European citizens. We, therefore, very much value Parliament's effort to improve the situation of persons with disabilities and reduced mobility. We are open to those amendments that can lay solid ground for generally improving the mobility of these citizens in need. Allow me just to share one very concrete example that I was able to directly witness and experience – when we made the special effort to make it happen for a person with disabilities to also use the European programme Discover EU and travel with different modes, primarily railway, throughout the EU and be part of this exciting programme for the youth. It's a really good example of how we can improve conditions and how we can really enable all European citizens to be able to take advantage of European programmes. So, that's very much appreciated, Mr Liberadzki.

On bicycles, it will be of no surprise to you that I also welcome those amendments which may further contribute to increasing the use of ecologically friendly transport modes such as bicycles. The Commission shares your enthusiasm about new mobility opportunities. Further efforts will be needed in order to ensure that there are no loopholes on this path. For example, passengers shall be properly informed about those new opportunities. We shall also ensure that when train capacity for taking bicycles on board is reached, any possible refusal takes place on transparent and justifiable grounds.

On passenger information, I would also like to stress that the Commission welcomes amendments that increase the level of rail passenger information about their rights, the journey opportunities offered to them, as well as events and outcomes surrounding the trip.

On derogations, we will not be able to truly promote the interests of EU rail passengers and the single market if our legal provisions are accompanied by a widespread practice of granting derogations. The Commission therefore supports increased limitations on such derogation possibilities, which should be based on a purely balanced approach taking into account both passengers' and industrial interests.

To conclude, I am convinced that all efforts invested in this legislative file will pay off. Improving the current rules would not only increase the mobility of EU citizens and open new opportunities, but also open new opportunities to them. It would also contribute to enhancing competition in the rail sector and also improve rail services. In turn, all this will increase the overall attractiveness of rail transport, to the benefit of passengers, industry, and our environment.

Once again, I would really like to express my appreciation of Parliament's work on improving rail passengers' protection and I look forward to today's debate.

Dennis de Jong, *Rapporteur voor advies van de Commissie interne markt en consumentenbescherming*. – Hartelijk dank aan de rapporteur van de Commissie vervoer en toerisme voor de goede samenwerking en natuurlijk dank aan de vele IMCO-leden en schaduwrapporteurs die hebben meegewerkt aan het oorspronkelijke advies van de Commissie interne markt en consumentenbescherming, dat ze uiteindelijk vrijwel unaniem konden aanvaarden. Dat is een goed signaal voor de passagiers.

Ik denk dat het eindresultaat heel goed is, zeker wat betreft compensatie. Ik ben het niet eens met de Commissie dat dit buiten de herschikking zou zijn. We hebben daar duidelijke rechtvaardigingen voor. Je kunt de passagiers echter niet uitleggen dat ze maar de helft van de ticketprijs vergoed krijgen als ze meer dan twee uur vertraging hebben. Dat hoort gewoon aangepakt te worden in dit initiatief. Er is goed nieuws voor de mensen met een beperking. Zij kunnen snel op assistentie rekenen en hoeven niet dagen van tevoren te melden dat ze naar een station komen. De fietsen zijn gemeld, dat was ook belangrijk.

Er is eigenlijk maar één punt dat overblijft. Laten we er alsjeblieft niet voor zorgen dat spoorwegen kunnen zeggen dat het slecht weer was en dat je daardoor je rechten als passagier verliest. We hebben te veel blaadjes op het spoor gezien, ook in Nederland, als excuus. Dat moeten we niet willen. Daar moeten we morgen bij de stemming nog goed uitkomen.

Renaud Muselier, *au nom du groupe PPE.* – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Commissaire, mes chers collègues, c'est un grand jour pour nous et pour les millions d'usagers du train.

Pour la première fois, grâce à ce règlement, l'Europe va enfin prendre en compte les usagers. Jusqu'à présent, l'Union européenne s'était toujours occupée des entreprises ferroviaires et des gestionnaires d'infrastructures. Il était tout à fait anormal que les principaux intéressés, les usagers, soient laissés de côté. Le dernier rapport date de 2007, on a attendu dix ans! Dix ans plus tard, cette injustice va enfin pouvoir être réparée, et ce sur l'ensemble du réseau ferroviaire européen. Vous nous parlez de dérogations, nous n'en voulons pas, nous avons déjà perdu assez de temps. Les lignes régionales et les lignes transfrontalières vont aussi être régies par ces nouvelles règles, c'est une excellente nouvelle. N'oubliez jamais que 90 % des passagers ferroviaires européens se servent de ces lignes régionales au quotidien.

Quels sont les principaux engagements de cette réforme déterminante? Ils reposent sur quatre piliers. Premièrement: l'indemnisation. Si votre train a une heure de retard, un remboursement de 50 % est alors prévu, c'est bien normal. S'il a deux heures de retard, ce qui n'est pas acceptable sur le continent européen, le remboursement est dans ce cas de 100 %. Voilà la norme.

Deuxièmement, en cas de correspondance manquée, quelle qu'en soit la raison, les opérateurs sont tenus de vous réacheminer jusqu'à votre prochaine destination. Ils ne peuvent pas vous laisser sur le bord du quai. Grâce à ce billet unique, peu importe l'opérateur, celui-ci devra assumer ses obligations sans le moindre coût additionnel. Le far west ferroviaire, c'est fini!

Troisièmement: l'assistance. Madame la Commissaire, vous parlez de tentative. Il n'en est rien. Avec ce dossier, nous devons garantir aux 80 millions de personnes handicapées ou à mobilité réduite qu'elles seront prises en charge dans toutes les grandes gares d'Europe, mais aussi dans les petites gares moyennant une pré-notification de trois heures. La mobilité pour tous sera la réalité de demain. On ne peut pas laisser les personnes à mobilité réduite sur le bord de la route.

Enfin, quatrièmement: la mobilité durable. Chaque train, à partir de 2024, devra prévoir huit places pour les vélos. C'est un grand pas pour une mobilité plus douce et respectueuse et c'est une mesure essentielle pour tenir nos engagements pris dans le cadre de la COP.

Il faut savoir que le ferroviaire est le mode de transport le plus subventionné en Europe par les deniers publics. Il est quand même un peu anormal que ce service soit moins bien perçu par les usagers que les autres modes de transport, notamment l'avion.

Enfin, grâce à ce dossier, les usagers du rail profiteront d'un service de meilleure qualité que dans les transports aériens. Et pour la première fois, l'Europe s'occupe des usagers du rail. Alors je demande clairement à la Commission européenne et au Conseil de ne pas revenir en arrière lors des négociations à venir. Vous nous parlez des entreprises, on en a beaucoup parlé et on les a beaucoup protégées depuis dix ans. Maintenant, je souhaiterais qu'on s'occupe essentiellement des passagers.

C'est un dossier éminemment politique et d'autant plus important à l'approche des élections européennes. Les millions d'usagers du train y seront particulièrement vigilants.

Lucy Anderson, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Mr President, this regulation provides a vital chance to help get a better deal for rail passengers. The European Parliament must not fail them by caving in to rail industry lobbying. The top complaint of train travellers is delays and cancellations. That fact is not just anecdotal, but is acknowledged independently by the International Rail Regulators' Group and the European Court of Auditors.

So, particularly problematic is the Commission's proposal for the introduction of a so-called 'force majeure' clause, seeking to allow rail companies to refuse to pay compensation to passengers for delays and cancellations in certain circumstances, including severe weather conditions. This aims to reverse a key passenger-friendly decision of the EU Court of Justice in 2013.

Worse still, is the version of 'force majeure' proposed by our own European Parliament Committee on Transport and Tourism (TRAN), which could even be interpreted to include lawful strikes and other industrial action. Whilst the TRAN Committee's amendments do have some good points, as our rapporteur has explained, they allow exemptions for suburban rail services, despite evidence showing that these are the most widely used services by passengers across Europe, especially younger people. Under the TRAN Committee's amendments, passengers will only have the right to onward travel on the next train in the course of delays and cancellations where a connection is missed in the course of a single transport contract. In real life, this is often not the case when tickets are bought separately.

So, in the vote tomorrow, I urge all MEPs to support the alternative approach tabled by myself and many others: in particular, do not make rail passengers suffer still further for the consequences of external factors causing problems with their journeys.

Kosma Złotowski, *w imieniu grupy ECR*. – Panie Przewodniczący! Pani komisarz! Oczywiście kolej stanowi bardzo ważny element systemu transportu publicznego, także dzięki inwestycjom dofinansowywanym z budżetu Unii Europejskiej. Chcemy, żeby coraz większa liczba osób wybierała właśnie ten środek lokomocji, ale do tego potrzebny jest nie tylko nowoczesny tabor (który staje się coraz nowocześniejszy), ale także istotne zmiany przepisów, które wzmocnią pozycję i prawa pasażerów w ruchu kolejowym. I to właśnie teraz robimy.

To sprawozdanie w znacznym stopniu stanowi odpowiedź na oczekiwania konsumentów, szczególnie w takich obszarach jak odszkodowania czy obowiązki przewoźnika w przypadku opóźnienia pociągów. Nasze jutrzejsze głosowanie ma również ogromne znaczenie dla poprawy sytuacji osób niepełnosprawnych podróżujących koleją, które dzisiaj napotykają liczne bariery już na etapie kupna biletu. Problem stanowi także dostęp do asysty przy wsiadaniu do pociągu czy nawet samo uzyskanie informacji na dworcach kolejowych. Chcemy te ograniczenia zlikwidować.

Rozumiem obawy operatorów, którzy teraz będą ponosili z tytułu tych zmian dodatkowe koszty, ale jestem również przekonany, że pozwoli to podnieść jakość usług kolejowych i przyczyni się do przyciągnięcia nowych pasażerów, którzy chętniej wybierali do tej pory inne środki transportu.

No cóż, z kilku wypowiedzi wynikało, że dotąd ulegaliśmy lobby kolejowemu – tym razem ulegliśmy lobby pasażerskiemu.

Jens Rohde, *on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – Mr President, it is time to end the Member States' protection of their national rail companies and replace it with the protection of rail passengers. For the ALDE Group, that means we want to introduce compulsory through-ticketing systems for passengers. We want the Commission to develop an EU complaint form for use in the event of cancellations or delays. We want, in the case of missed connections due to delay or cancellation, to ensure a passenger the right to take the next service available. We also want to encourage railway undertakings and ticket vendors to develop an automatic compensation system. We want to push for an exchange of information between ticket vendors and the railway undertaking; we want to rationalise the compensation rates; we want to ensure spaces for bicycles; and, of course, as mentioned by my colleagues, we want to ensure better assistance for people with reduced mobility.

Let me say to Ms Anderson, the ALDE Group will support her amendment tomorrow. We too want to delete the *force majeure* provision, and I want to thank Ms Anderson for putting this amendment forward.

If we want to shift more transport from other modes to rail, those demands should not be too much to ask for. *En marche!* as they say in France.

Michael Cramer, *im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, Frau Kommissarin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Nur eine Minderheit der Mitgliedstaaten hat die vor fast zehn Jahren beschlossen Fahrgastrechte komplett umgesetzt. Deshalb finde ich es gut, dass wir heute hier tätig werden.

Es freut mich, dass wir für die Fahrradmitnahme einen starken Kompromiss gefunden haben. Das kann jeder nachempfinden, der mich kennt. Das Europäische Parlament will, dass wir in naher Zukunft verpflichtende Stellplätze in allen Zügen haben – ohne Schlupflöcher wie bisher. Dadurch werden die Kunden nicht mehr gezwungen, ihre Fahrräder mit anderen Verkehrsträgern zu befördern.

Eine große Mehrheit ist auch für das Durchgangsticket. Kein Wunder! Durchgangsfahrten waren schon 1923 durch internationale Übereinkommen der maßgebliche Standard. Davon sind wir heute weit entfernt. 67 % der Fahrgäste sind für einheitliche Rechte für die gesamte Bahnreise vom Anfang bis zum Ende, auch wenn man umsteigen muss, sogar mehrmals umsteigen muss.

Gerade bei grenzüberschreitenden Verbindungen ist dies jedoch kaum verfügbar. Voraussetzung für Durchgangstickets sind zugängliche Reiseinformationen und Buchungssysteme. Für die dafür nötigen offenen Schnittstellen, die *open data*, haben wir starke Formulierungen gefunden, damit sich dies in Zukunft auch verbessert.

Für vollwertige Fahrgäste müssen wir aber grundsätzlich den Ausnahmezustand „Höhere Gewalt" streichen. Ich hatte mich schon immer – auch bei den Verhandlungen – dafür eingesetzt. Bisher gab es diesen Tatbestand bei der Bahn ja gar nicht. Die Einführung von *force majeure* würde zu einer knapp inakzeptablen Rechtsunsicherheit zulasten der Passagiere führen. Nur ein winziger Teil der Verspätungen wird überhaupt durch *force majeure* überhaupt verursacht. Die willkürlichen Auslegungen der Fluggesellschaften sollten uns unbedingt eine Warnung sein.

Der Rechnungshof hat das in seinem aktuellen Bericht ebenfalls bestätigt. Ein Reifendefekt war für eine Fluggesellschaft *force majeure*, das ist verrückt, aber traurige Realität.

Ein weiteres Problem ist die Assistenz an Bahnhöfen, ohne Voranmeldezeit. Nur an Bahnhöfen mit mehr als zehntausend Passagieren am Tag können mobilitätseingeschränkte Personen eine spontane Assistenz in Anspruch nehmen. 97 % der Bahnhöfe würden von dieser Regelung somit ausgenommen sein. Das ist für mich und erst recht für die mobilitätseingeschränkten Menschen keine akzeptable Regelung. Das müssen wir ändern.

Tania González Peñas, *en nombre del Grupo GUE/NGL*. – Señor presidente, este informe propone avances significativos en cuanto al trato que se da a los pasajeros de tren, y esperamos que suponga un paso importante para mejorar la calidad del servicio.

El tren debe ser el medio de transporte del futuro. Es el más sostenible, el más seguro, el que permite mayor vertebración territorial y accesibilidad. Y, por lo tanto, debemos incentivar su uso y hacerlo más atractivo para los usuarios y las usuarias. Algunos aspectos positivos son que con esta propuesta maximizamos la información disponible para el usuario, aseguramos que los usuarios de bicicletas pueden acceder al tren sin riesgo para la seguridad de los demás viajeros, priorizamos la reubicación sin perjuicio de las compensaciones y reembolsos en caso de cancelación de un servicio y garantizamos un protocolo de reclamaciones adecuado.

Pero lo más importante es el salto que se puede dar en la accesibilidad del servicio para los usuarios vulnerables. En ese sentido, el informe propone garantizar la asistencia en las estaciones y el acceso a los trenes con personal obligatoriamente formado, que la información deberá estar disponible en formato accesible y que las personas con movilidad reducida tendrán prioridad en la reubicación, incluso con animales guía.

Sin embargo, quiero recalcar que no es suficiente para incentivar el uso del ferrocarril mejorar los derechos de los pasajeros. Hay que impulsarlo como medio de transporte público. Hay que impulsarlo desde las instituciones públicas y no hacer cada vez más recortes e iniciar procesos de privatización.

Daniela Aiuto, *a nome del gruppo EFDD*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, gentile Commissario, il regolamento che voteremo domani è di notevole importanza per i diritti dei passeggeri nei nostri paesi. Troppo spesso abbiamo assistito negli ultimi anni a problematiche e difficoltà che hanno reso inefficiente la mobilità su rotaia e la connettività su breve e lunga percorrenza. Scarse informazioni per i passeggeri, assistenza non adeguata alle persone con disabilità, difficoltà nel richiedere i rimborsi, ritardi che hanno costretto a dover cambiare tragitto senza sapere come ovviare agli imprevisti capitati sul proprio percorso. A quanti di noi è capitato di perdere coincidenze importanti e di non conoscere appieno i nostri diritti in tali circostanze. Sicuramente vi sono imprese ferroviarie più virtuose e altre meno.

Sarà importante, anche nelle future negoziazioni con il Consiglio, trovare un giusto bilanciamento tra i diritti dei passeggeri, da un lato, e la sostenibilità dei costi, dall'altro. Senz'altro, con questo regolamento, come Parlamento diamo un segnale importante e chiediamo alle imprese uno sforzo maggiore al fine di garantire un servizio puntuale ed efficace, con la speranza e l'augurio che il trasporto ferroviario diventi sempre più utilizzato per la mobilità dei cittadini europei.

Georg Mayer, *im Namen der ENF-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, geschätzte Frau Kommissarin! Bahnfahren soll und muss attraktiver werden. Ich glaube, da sind wir uns alle einig. Es ist immer eine gute Sache, wenn ich den Konsumenten informiere. Wenn ich ihn informiere, wenn einmal etwas nicht nach Plan abläuft, das ist meiner Erfahrung nach immer besser, als wenn ich Druck auf die eine oder andere Seite ausübe.

Der Konsumentenschutz ist natürlich auch ein wichtiger Teil des Ausgleichs der Kräfte zwischen einem starken Unternehmen und einem einzelnen Konsumenten. Man darf aber auch da nie vergessen: Wir haben es mit mündigen Bürgern zu tun. Information in der Öffentlichkeit jedem zugänglich zu machen, ist auf jeden Fall einmal ein richtiger Schritt für die Aufklärung der Konsumenten. Die Betonung liegt darauf, konsumentenfreundlich zu sein und nicht unternehmerfeindlich. Da gibt es einen großen Unterschied. Ausgewogen, wie diesem Bericht das gelingt, ist das auch durchaus das Ziel, das wir unterstützten können. Kleine Betriebe werden ausgenommen – sinnvolle Maßnahme. Beeinträchtigte Personen bekommen ganz besonderes Augenmerk in diesem Bericht.

Zwei Punkte, die ich kritisch beleuchten möchte, sind einerseits die Schadensgutmachung durch eine Gutscheinlösung – das halte ich für kontraproduktiv und auch für nicht ausführbar –, zweitens halte ich für kontraproduktiv etwa Änderungsanträge, die der Kollege Cramer gemacht hat, die völlige Themenverfehlung sind, wenn er nämlich dann sagt, er will Information über CO_2-Emissionen auf das Ticket. Das finde ich eher schädlich, weil man diesen Bericht dadurch verwässert.

Λάμπρος Φουντούλης (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, θεωρώ δεδομένο ότι στο πλαίσιο της προσπάθειας, τόσο των κρατών μελών όσο και των ευρωπαϊκών οργάνων, για να μειωθούν οι εκπομπές αερίων ρύπων στην Ένωση σημαντικότατο ρόλο παίζουν οι μεταφορές επιβατών αλλά και εμπορευμάτων μέσω του σιδηροδρόμου. Επιπλέον, οι σιδηρόδρομοι αποτελούν έναν ασφαλέστερο και ταχύτερο τρόπο μεταφοράς, που είναι συνήθως οικονομικότερος και πιο προσιτός, ειδικά για τις ασθενέστερες οικονομικά τάξεις. Για να αποτελέσει όμως, πράγματι, ο σιδηρόδρομος μέρος της απάντησης στα προβλήματα που ανέφερα θα πρέπει, ταυτόχρονα με την ανάπτυξη νέων δικτύων, ειδικά στις χώρες της Ανατολικής και Νοτιοανατολικής Ευρώπης, να θεσπίσουμε και ένα πλαίσιο προστασίας των επιβατών, που θα καθορίζει τα δικαιώματά τους με τρόπο ξεκάθαρο και προσιτό σε όλους. Επίσης, θα πρέπει να επιτευχθεί συντονισμός μεταξύ των εταιρειών, ώστε να υπάρξουν συνδέσεις και ανταποκρίσεις σε λογικούς χρόνους, που θα εξυπηρετούν τους επιβάτες και θα διευκολύνουν τις μετακινήσεις τους. Τέλος, θα πρέπει να λάβουμε σοβαρά υπόψη μας τις περιοχές στις οποίες η σιδηροδρομική σύνδεση, αν και ασύμφορη οικονομικά για τις εταιρείες, θα πρέπει να διατηρηθεί ώστε οι κάτοικοι των απομακρυσμένων περιοχών να μην είναι αποκομμένοι.

Dieter-Lebrecht Koch (PPE). – Herr Präsident, verehrte Frau Kommissarin Bulc, verehrte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Wir müssen den Schienenverkehr für die Bürgerinnen und Bürger Europas attraktiver gestalten, ohne die Bahnunternehmen zu überfordern. Wir brauchen verbraucherfreundliche und faire Regeln. Es ist an der Zeit, die bestehenden Fahrgastrechte zu überarbeiten und der digitalen Entwicklung anzupassen. Lasst uns auf den Zug aufspringen, lasst ihn nicht einfach davonfahren! Selbiges erwarte ich übrigens auch vom Rat.

Was soll mit dieser Überarbeitung erreicht werden? Meine Checkliste ist: Erstens müssen die neuen Regelungen dafür sorgen, dass umfassende Fahrgastrechte bestehen, die unproblematisch und grenzüberschreitend durchsetzbar sind. Durch die Einschränkung von Ausnahmen und den Ausschluss der Sprachbarrieren bei der Beschwerde gelingt uns dies. Zweitens müssen Informationen für Fahrgäste in Echtzeit erfolgen – sowohl vor Fahrtantritt als auch während der Fahrt. Drittens sollte das sogenannte Durchgangsticket nicht die Ausnahme, sondern die Regel sein. Ein einziges Ticket muss reichen, um national und grenzüberschreitend Bahn fahren zu können. Viertens müssen die Rechte von Bahnreisenden, die in ihrer Mobilität eingeschränkt oder behindert sind, deutlich gestärkt werden. Ich freue mich sehr, dass mein

Vorschlag angenommen wurde, der die Vorlaufzeit für die Hilfeleistung von der Größe des Bahnhofs abhängig macht. Und fünftens ist es nötig, die Entschädigungszahlungen anzuheben, um Druck auf den Bahnsektor auszuüben, damit er verstärkt an seiner Qualität arbeitet. Zugleich müssen aber Ausnahmen bei Beeinträchtigungen durch höhere Gewalt schon bestehen bleiben. Es kann doch für die Bahn nichts anderes gelten als für Bus-, Schiffs- und Flugverkehr.

Isabella De Monte (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signora Commissario, il trasporto ferroviario, proprio perché è il mezzo di trasporto dei pendolari e dei cittadini con maggiori necessità, dovrebbe tutelare i diritti dei consumatori e degli utilizzatori più deboli. Voglio ribadire con forza quanto è stato detto precedentemente anche da alcuni colleghi, e cioè che il Parlamento deve farsi difensore delle persone con ridotta capacità motoria e di tutti i portatori di handicap. Prevedere un'assistenza gratuita nelle stazioni e con breve preavviso è essenziale per garantire loro libertà di movimento. Infatti, soprattutto nel caso di piccole stazioni, chiedere a una persona diversamente abile di dare un preavviso di 48 ore per salire su un treno andava addirittura contro ogni principio di libera circolazione delle persone. Infine, dare più diritti ai passeggeri, significa invogliarli a utilizzare un mezzo collettivo più pulito delle auto private e così salvaguardare l'ambiente.

Jacqueline Foster (ECR). – Mr President, whilst we always welcome better provisions for passengers' rights, this report does not go far enough and threatens to undermine long-standing practices in the UK rail industry. Our compensation measures are already well established and clear, the system works well and passengers understand it. By reducing the scope for when companies must compensate passengers, this report will dumb down what we've achieved and undermine our high standards.

The report also contains some concerning provisions for passengers with reduced mobility. The requirement that they must certify service animals, such as guide dogs, before boarding a train is nonsensical. In addition, the varying notice period required for those needing assistance is deeply confusing. Differences between large urban and small rural stations must be acknowledged, but national transport departments should liaise closely with rail companies and consumer groups to decide on these matters.

Finally, we all want to see greater use of bicycles, but the requirement that all services have eight designated spaces is wholly impractical. Many operators would have to order new rolling stock to meet the demand, and it could result in chronic overcrowding in rush hour services and again such issues as this should be determined locally and nationally. For those reasons, the British Conservatives will be voting against the report at this time, but we do hope that the institutions can improve the text.

Matthijs van Miltenburg (ALDE). – Reizen per trein is een duurzaam alternatief voor de vervuilende auto of voor het kerosine slurpende vliegtuig. Als we meer mensen verleiden om vaker de trein te nemen, dan dragen we bij aan het verduurzamen van onze mobiliteit. Dan dragen we bij aan het behalen van de klimaatdoelstellingen van Parijs.

Dan moeten we het reizen met de trein in heel Europa echter wel een stuk aantrekkelijker maken. Dit voorstel zorgt ervoor dat de rechten van treinreizigers in heel Europa worden versterkt en dat is naar mijn mening een stap in de goede richting. Met de nieuwe regels kunnen treinreizigers, bij vertragingen, overal in Europa tot 100% van de ticketprijs terugkrijgen. En dat is een groot verschil met de situatie vandaag de dag. Nu kan namelijk slechts 50% van de ticketprijs worden teruggekregen.

Een tweede punt dat al is genoemd: de passagiers kunnen makkelijker hun fiets meenemen aan boord van de trein. In een fietsland als Nederland is dit van groot belang. Dan zorgen we namelijk ook voor de verduurzaming van het vervoer naar de stations en de aansluitende reis op weg naar de bestemming. Bovendien wordt het – mijn derde punt – veel makkelijker voor passagiers met een beperkte mobiliteit, voor mensen met een handicap, om de trein in Europa te nemen. Zij kunnen voortaan rekenen op assistentie op het perron zonder dat dagen van tevoren te moeten regelen. Daarmee kunnen ze hun reis veel vlotter gaan regelen.

Collega's, laten we morgen instemmen met het voorstel om het treinen aantrekkelijker te maken in Europa. Daar zullen niet alleen de Europese treinreizigers u dankbaar voor zijn, maar ook het klimaat!

Karima Delli (Verts/ALE). – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Commissaire, chers collègues, je n'ai qu'un chiffre à vous donner: un Européen qui se lève le matin pour aller travailler a neuf chances sur dix de prendre sa voiture ou un car et seulement une chance sur dix de prendre le train. Donc, vous le voyez bien, nous vivons à l'ère du tout voiture, une ère irrespirable, à contresens des accords de Paris et qui met en danger le budget des familles.

Aujourd'hui, nous avons la possibilité de faire aimer le train en équipant de huit emplacements pour vélos au minimum tous les trains, du train régional au train à grande vitesse; en garantissant une assistance pour les personnes à mobilité réduite dans chaque gare, parce que notre priorité, c'est de faire en sorte que tout le monde ait accès à la mobilité; et en compensant, dans une juste mesure, les passagers qui subissent un retard ou une annulation, et je le rappelle parce que c'est important.

Dans sa version actuelle, le texte prévoit un remboursement de 50 % du billet après un retard d'une heure, de 75 % après un retard d'une heure et demi et un remboursement intégral au bout de deux heures. Vous voyez bien, chers collègues, qu'il n'y a que des avantages à prendre le train, qui est plus attractif pour notre santé, pour notre climat, pour le porte-monnaie des citoyens européens et, j'ajouterai, pour les emplois européens, parce que nous sommes en train de fabriquer notre propre train en Europe et que ses emplois industriels doivent être préservés sur notre territoire.

Kateřina Konečná (GUE/NGL). – Pane předsedající, jakožto zástupkyně země, která má jednu z nejhustších železničních sítí na světě, jsem velmi ráda, že jsme svědky dalšího prohlubování práv cestujících v železniční přepravě. Cestující by nyní měli mít nárok na přístup k informacím a odškodnění v případě zpoždění nebo odřeknutí spoje.

Měli by být informováni o svých právech, o daných spojích a dalších souvisejících záležitostech před samotným uskutečněním cesty, v jejím průběhu i po jejím dokončení. Jsem také ráda, že se podařilo usnadnit přístup k železniční dopravě osobám se zdravotním postižením nebo se sníženou schopností pohybu a orientace. Pokud máme občany Evropské unie přesvědčit o tom, že jízda vlakem je tradice, ve které stojí za to pokračovat, je nutné, aby se zvedla i úroveň této dopravy a práva cestujících. Evropský parlament by měl jít v této oblasti příkladem.

Marie-Christine Arnautu (ENF). – Monsieur le Président, les dispositions du rapport, notamment celles qui augmentent les indemnisations en cas de retard, seront incontestablement une avancée pour les voyageurs. Mais quand j'entends que les Verts font de la place réservée aux vélos dans les trains un point non négociable, je m'interroge quand même sur le sens des priorités et sur le respect de la subsidiarité.

Sécurité, ponctualité, propreté, prix décents sont autant d'éléments sur lesquels des efforts doivent être consentis. Or l'Union européenne, en imposant ses dogmes économiques, favorise un désengagement de l'indispensable puissance publique.

Ce n'est pas un hasard si le Japon et la Suisse affichent des taux de ponctualité et de satisfaction vertigineux, alors qu'en Grande-Bretagne, par exemple, 60 % de la population souhaite la renationalisation du secteur. L'insécurité et les incivilités y sont quasi inexistantes, pas de pillage, ni de vol de caténaires à répétition dans ces pays, contrairement à ce qui arrive en France, ni de polémique, comme en Allemagne, pour savoir s'il fallait réserver des wagons uniquement aux femmes pour garantir leur sécurité. L'entretien du réseau et la maintenance des infrastructures y sont très rigoureux. Les récentes pannes en série qui ont fortement perturbé le trafic français sont a contrario symptomatiques d'un niveau d'exigence en recul. Comment s'étonner que la France, réputée pour l'excellence de ses chemins de fer, soit passée de la deuxième à la septième place européenne dans le classement du Boston Consulting Group?

Les droits des passagers seront mieux respectés le jour où l'on comprendra que la performance du système ferroviaire découle pour l'essentiel du niveau de dépenses publiques qu'on veut bien lui concéder.

Innocenzo Leontini (PPE). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la revisione del regolamento dei diritti dei passeggeri persegue un maggiore equilibrio tra il rafforzamento sui diritti degli utenti e la riduzione degli oneri a carico delle imprese. È necessario proteggere gli utenti in un quadro normativo europeo nuovo per aumentare la flessibilità del settore e la sua attrattività rispetto ad altri mezzi di trasporto che incidono più negativamente sull'ambiente.

I nuovi criteri aumentano l'accessibilità dei disabili alle stazioni e quindi manifestano una maggiore sensibilità e assistenza alle persone con mobilità ridotta. Io sono favorevole ad aumentare i livelli di indennizzo causati dal ritardo fino al 100 % del prezzo per ritardi superiori a due ore. Non mi convince l'eliminazione della clausola di forza maggiore, perché essa costituisce una forzatura giuridica che in sede applicativa potrebbe generare un contenzioso senza fine, in quanto le circostanze eccezionali costituiscono un fattore esimente in tutti gli ordinamenti equilibrati. Inoltre, non è giusto imporre alle imprese costi e obblighi non realistici che prescindono dalle necessità degli utenti. In tal modo, non si farebbe altro che ridurre l'attrattività del settore.

Christine Revault d'Allonnes Bonnefoy (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Commissaire, chers collègues, nous débattons aujourd'hui d'un rapport important et de mesures concrètes qui vont directement impacter la vie quotidienne de millions d'Européens qui utilisent le train quotidiennement.

Ce que nous proposons, c'est de mieux rembourser les usagers quand les trains arrivent en retard, de leur fournir en temps réel toutes les informations sur le trafic, de garantir des services de meilleure qualité et d'améliorer les droits des personnes à mobilité réduite.

Je regrette profondément qu'en commission parlementaire certains députés aient réussi à manipuler le vote pour faire passer des amendements qui réintroduisent des dispositions permettant aux opérateurs ferroviaires de s'exonérer de toute obligation de remboursement en cas de retard.

J'appelle ici tous les députés à voter contre ces amendements demain et à ne pas céder aux lobbies des entreprises qui voudraient que les députés revoient à la baisse les droits des passagers.

Nous avons été élus pour défendre nos citoyens et l'intérêt général. Ce serait donc un message politique désastreux que de voter pour des amendements qui défendent l'intérêt économique des grands groupes ferroviaires contre les droits des millions d'usagers et contre l'avis même de la Cour de justice de l'Union européenne sur les obligations en matière d'indemnisation.

VORSITZ: EVELYNE GEBHARDT

Vizepräsidentin

Mark Demesmaeker (ECR). – Vertragingen, annuleringen en onvolledige informatie, we worden er ook in België, meer dan ons lief is, mee geconfronteerd. De huidige Europese regels bieden onvoldoende garanties voor een kwalitatieve dienstverlening. Als we meer mensen willen motiveren om het openbaar vervoer te nemen en als de spoorwegmaatschappijen zelf klaar willen staan om binnenkort de concurrentie aan te gaan met nieuwe spelers op de markt, dan moet het beter.

Als die ondernemingen vandaag niet toekomen aan de nodige structurele hervormingen, dan is het omdat er te veel vrijstellingen en gunstmaatregelen zijn.

Het Europees Parlement wijst alvast het juiste spoor aan. Verhoogde compensatiebedragen bij vertragingen, dus extra financiële druk om stipter te gaan rijden, het recht van de passagier om altijd zijn fiets mee te nemen op de trein en sterkere ombudsdiensten, dat is het spoor voor de spoorwegen van morgen. Toch een waarschuwing: kijk uit voor overmachtsregelingen die de spoorwegmaatschappijen al te gemakkelijk een uitvlucht geven om hun verplichtingen te ontlopen. Verder blijven er bijkomende inspanningen nodig voor een betere toegankelijkheid voor mindervaliden.

We moeten nu de stap zetten naar een moderne, aantrekkelijke en competitieve spoorwegmarkt.

Pavel Telička (ALDE). – Madam President, if it were a month ago, I probably would have structured my intervention today differently. I would focus on some of the provisions, highlight something and support some things, but in fact, I'm going to say something different. I have a relatively fresh experience.

After the very long vote in the last plenary on Thursday, I was to take a train from here to Karlsruhe and then to Munich and catch a plane. Because we had a long vote, an unnecessarily long vote, I didn't manage. Then I missed the TGV, so I had to take several trains before I could get to Karlsruhe, then Stuttgart and then to Munich – and you can already guess what happened with my plane connection in Munich.

Of course, I spent some extra money. Of course, my journey to the Balkans was much longer, but I do still understand that my position is somewhat more favourable than that of thousands or millions of European consumers when they arrive, or when they end up in a similar position.

I really believe that what we will be voting on is not perfect. I'm sure that many of us, on a number of provisions, would like to go further. I'm sure that there are still some question marks, but it is a major step in the right direction to provide railway passengers with completely different quality rights, and not just in the terms that I've mentioned – accessibility, etc. I think this is a good indication of what European legislation can bring a consumer.

Adam Szejnfeld (PPE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Zrównoważony rozwój i ochrona środowiska, w tym czystego powietrza, wymagają zwiększenia udziału przewozów kolejowych. Niestety, w dzisiejszych czasach, kolej nie jest konkurencyjna dla innych przewoźników publicznych pod względem wielu kryteriów. Jednym z nich jest oczywiście różnica w uprawnieniach konsumentów. Rozporządzenie Parlamentu Europejskiego i Rady idzie więc w dobrym kierunku: zwiększa prawa pasażerów, wprowadza ułatwienia dla osób niepełnosprawnych i z ograniczeniami ruchowymi, także dla podróżujących z dziećmi, z wózkami, z rowerami, ze zwierzętami domowymi czy bilety łączone. Szczególnie pozytywnie trzeba ocenić uprawnienia odszkodowawcze, o których mówi rozporządzenie. Popieram zatem ten projekt, lecz chciałbym tylko zaznaczyć, że będę głosował przeciwko wprowadzaniu definicji siły wyższej, zwłaszcza w zapisie, który jest zaproponowany.

Inés Ayala Sender (S&D). – Señora presidenta, señora Bulc. ¿Cuándo ganó el AVE español la batalla al avión, sobre todo en las líneas principales, y también cada vez más a la carretera? Pues fue cuando, con un Gobierno socialista, una consejera, mujer, y el responsable del AVE decidieron que se compensara a los viajeros por el mínimo retraso y hasta el 100 %, aparte de aceptar dar acceso al próximo tren si se había perdido el anterior.

Fueron elementos fundamentales de los derechos de los pasajeros que ayudaron a que el AVE despegara y a que hoy en día sea uno de los trenes europeos más puntuales y con mejor aceptación por parte de los viajeros, aunque siempre se puede mejorar, eso está claro.

Se ha reforzado también la atención a las personas con dificultades de accesibilidad y se han ido construyendo infraestructuras en las estaciones. Todavía queda mucho por hacer, es verdad. La multimodalidad sostenible —con el acceso de las bicicletas al tren— también hace falta, pero también las conexiones urbanas.

Finalmente, no estamos de acuerdo en el intento de dar marcha atrás mediante un mal entendido sentido de la protección del sector ferroviario, limitando los derechos de los pasajeros. Al revés, estamos a favor de profundizar en garantizar más derechos a los pasajeros.

Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE). – Señora presidenta, señora comisaria, quiero felicitar el trabajo desarrollado en este informe sobre los derechos de los usuarios del ferrocarril, porque está realmente centrado en los pasajeros, porque amplía las garantías y recoge, además, algunas de las principales recomendaciones del Tribunal de Cuentas sobre esta materia.

Porque no solo es necesario establecer definiciones claras. Además, es vital simplificar los procedimientos para reclamar, y si es posible, automatizar las compensaciones. El primer objetivo, clarificar; evitar ambigüedades que permitan a las compañías evadir sus responsabilidades. Se puede mejorar mucho si apoyamos las enmiendas que aclaran definitivamente qué son y qué no se pueden considerar causas de fuerza mayor para justificar un retraso o la supresión de un servicio.

También mejoran las cuantías de las compensaciones y se asegura el derecho de los viajeros a coger el siguiente tren cuando pierdan una conexión debido a un retraso o a una cancelación. Se apuesta por una movilidad más sostenible, reservando siempre espacio para bicicletas, y se mejoran los derechos de las personas con discapacidad. Las grandes estaciones deberán estar plenamente adaptadas. En las pequeñas se propone que tres horas sean suficientes para solicitar asistencia.

Finalmente —y esto es decisivo—, para poder mejorar el acceso a este catálogo de derechos y garantías, se apuesta por un formulario europeo de reclamación y por avanzar hacia un sistema automático de compensación. No tiene sentido, cuando es claro que el pasajero debe ser indemnizado, que este tenga que pedir lo que le corresponde. Tiene derecho a que se le devuelva como parte del servicio que incluye el servicio que ha pagado.

Claudia Țapardel (S&D). – Doamna președintă, doamnă comisar, dragi colegi, acest regulament ne oferă oportunitatea de a susține mai apăsat punerea în aplicare a drepturilor pasagerilor din transportul feroviar. Consider că este foarte important ca transportul feroviar să fie incluziv și accesibil tuturor cetățenilor europeni, cu atât mai mult persoanelor cu dizabilități sau mobilitate redusă, iar acest aspect trebuie îmbunătățit în toate statele membre. Având în vedere că, la nivel european, ne dorim un transport sustenabil, curat și cât mai eficient, transportul feroviar poate câștiga teren în fața altor tipuri de transport, mai ales printr-o garantare corespunzătoare a drepturilor pasagerilor.

În ceea ce privește dreptul la compensație, consider că pasagerii care utilizează transportul feroviar trebuie să fie compensați și despăgubiți în mod corect în cazul întârzierilor și al anulărilor. Mai mult decât atât, pasagerii trebuie să aibă dreptul la o compensație integrală pentru întreaga călătorie, indiferent dacă aceasta este simplă sau cu o conexiune.

Totodată, consider că, pentru a pune bazele unui sistem feroviar dinamic și eficient, trebuie să asigurăm competitivitatea acestuia în raport cu cel aerian sau rutier, cu atât mai mult cu cât ne dorim să atingem obiectivele unui transport european multimodal și integrat.

Mult succes!

Karoline Graswander-Hainz (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin, werte Frau Kommissarin, werte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Die Neufassung der Verordnung über die Fahrgastrechte im Eisenbahnverkehr setzt an vielen guten Punkten an. Am Ende wird die EU die Informations- und Kompensationsrechte der Passagiere im Bahnverkehr stärken; das ist unser Ziel.

Schlussendlich müssen aber die Rechte der Fahrgäste auch durchsetzbar sein. Aus Konsumentenschutzsicht ist es beispielsweise nicht verständlich, warum Gäste bei Wetterereignissen jeden Anspruch auf Erstattung oder Kompensation verlieren sollten. Dadurch würden die Bahnunternehmen das gesamte Risiko auf die Passagiere abwälzen. Deshalb ist das Prinzip der höheren Gewalt ausnahmslos abzulehnen.

Schon allein aus umwelttechnischen Gründen müssen wir sicherstellen, dass die Anreize, auf umweltfreundliche Verkehrsträger umzusteigen, nicht weniger, sondern mehr werden. Aus diesem Grund braucht es Maßnahmen, die das Bahnfahren so attraktiv wie möglich machen.

Olga Sehnalová (S&D). –Paní předsedající, nad touto zprávou jsem si často promítla, co mi o svém cestování vlakem říkala má stážistka s těžkým zdravotním postižením, která se pohybuje na elektrickém vozíku. Dovolte mi ocitovat její zkušenosti: „Objednávka na přepravu pro mě znamená muset si své aktivity plánovat 24 hodin předem. Žiji na vesnici a tak se nemohu například večer rozhodnout, že ráno pojedu do blízkého města ke svému lékaři. Nemohu si ráno naplánovat večerní návštěvu kina a podobně.“ I ona by přivítala zkrácení lhůty nutné k objednání přepravy, aby plošiny byly v dobrém stavu, aby byla lepší organizace přepravy vozíčkářů, důkladnější zaškolení zaměstnanců a snadnější přístup k informacím. Na závěr svého dopisu píše: „Právo svobodně a nezávisle cestovat by mělo být právem každého z nás.“ S tím vřele souhlasím a děkuji Bogusławovi, že tyto připomínky vzal seriózně v potaz a že podpořil i řadu mých návrhů, například právě na zkrácení doby na objednání asistenčních služeb.

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Doamna președintă, doamna comisar, dragi colegi, regulamentul pentru drepturile și obligațiile pasagerilor vine după zece ani. Era nevoie.

Circulația călătorilor pe tren, cu mijloc de transport feroviar, este și trebuie să fie în creștere, având în vedere și politica noastră generală, doamna comisar al Uniunii Europene, și anume să trecem de pe transportul rutier pe transport pe cale ferată. Dar, pentru aceasta, trebuie să avem drepturile pasagerilor garantate.

Eu sunt și membră a comisiei IMCO și, evident, acolo punem mult accent pe drepturile pasagerilor. Sunt și în comisia TRAN. Este clar că în acest regulament au fost aduse îmbunătățiri din punct de vedere al informației pentru pasageri, pentru că, de multe ori, când circuli dintr-o țară în alta, nu știi despre ce este vorba. Mi s-a întâmplat și mie, la Paris.

Avem nevoie de a elimina acele eschivări pentru a plăti despăgubiri pasagerului, atunci când i se creează un disconfort, dar nu numai.

Accesibilitatea trebuie îmbunătățită pentru persoanele cu dizabilități și persoanele cu mobilitate redusă dar, de ce nu, și pentru toate persoanele, să putem să achiziționăm oriunde biletul în tren.

Eu sper că mâine vom avea un vot bun la acest raport.

Nicola Danti (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signor Commissario, ogni giorno sono decine di milioni i cittadini europei che si muovono e che utilizzano il treno per spostarsi. Il sistema ferroviario europeo, al di là delle eccellenze delle linee ad alta velocità, sconta ancora troppe carenze. Le cronache sono piene di notizie su disservizi, ritardi e cancellazioni, soprattutto nel trasporto locale e regionale maggiormente utilizzato da lavoratori, pendolari e studenti.

Di fronte a tutto ciò i passeggeri europei non hanno una sufficiente tutela dei propri diritti. Questo regolamento aumenterà in maniera considerevole il livello delle tutele e la qualità dei servizi. Tra questi, più certi indennizzi in caso di ritardi e soppressioni delle corse, maggiori diritti di accesso ai servizi per le categorie svantaggiate e obblighi più stringenti per attrezzare spazi destinati al trasporto di biciclette nei vagoni. Cercheremo di rafforzare ancora di più il testo, da qui al voto di domani, per garantire maggiore qualità e più diritti per i passeggeri e promuovere ancora di più il treno quale mezzo di trasporto.

Arndt Kohn (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin, Frau Kommissarin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Zunächst mal möchte ich den Berichterstattern danken für die gute Arbeit an diesem wichtigen Thema Fahrgastrechte. Ich möchte auch der Kommission dafür danken, dass sie dieses zehn Jahre alte Thema aufgegriffen und überarbeitet hat. Jetzt sind glücklicherweise zehn Jahre länger als die allermeisten Verspätungen. Aber nichtsdestotrotz gehören Verspätungen und Zugausfälle zum Alltag vieler Menschen, die zur Arbeit, in Urlaub oder auf Geschäftsreise fahren. Ich gehöre selber dazu, ich fahre selber des Öfteren mit dem Zug, und ich weiß, wie das ist.

Jetzt können wir natürlich als Gesetzgeber das alles nicht per Gesetz verbieten. Aber wir haben jetzt die Chance, die Fahrgastrechte entscheidend zu verbessern. 100 % Rückerstattung bei Verspätungen über zwei Stunden, Verbesserungen bei der Fahrradmitnahme, Verbesserungen bei der Barrierefreiheit, das sind nur drei Punkte. Wenn wir wollen, dass die Bahn attraktiver wird und eine gute Alternative zu Auto, Bus und Flugzeug wird, dann müssen wir etwas tun. Dann dürfen wir nicht nur auf das Gewissen der Menschen setzen, sondern an der Verbraucherfreundlichkeit und an dieser sinnvollen Art der Mobilität arbeiten. Wenn wir das alle zusammen tun, dann werden noch viel mehr Menschen noch viel lieber Zug fahren.

John Howarth (S&D). – Madam President, developing Europe's rail network as a sustainable alternative to air travel over long distances is a perfectly sensible objective, but, if it is going to be successful then the service offered and available to people needs to be comparable. We have clear rules on air travel compensation and we need the same for the railways because those rules will be an incentive for rail companies to improve their services and to make sure that trains aren't cancelled and that they run on time.

It's not a complicated principle is it? You advertise a service, the customer buys the service and, if the service fails to deliver, then the consumer is entitled to redress. Really quite simple. That is why we've re-submitted amendments, that is why I've re-signed them, and that is why I will be voting for them tomorrow. The point of this recast must be to ensure that public transport is run for the benefit of the travelling public and not solely for the benefit of the people who run the railways.

Spontane Wortmeldungen

Bogdan Andrzej Zdrojewski (PPE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Chciałem zwrócić uwagę, że podczas tej sesji plenarnej mamy trzeci dokument prokonsumencki. To dobrze. Za każdym razem staramy się zwracać uwagę na to, jak ludzie odbierają usługi, które oferuje im biznes. Ale chcę podkreślić, że również po raz trzeci nie są szacowane koszty, nie są szacowane obciążenia, które niestety spadają na tych, do których adresujemy nasze postulaty.

Ja uważam, że generalnie rzecz biorąc kierunek myślenia jest prawidłowy: należy rzeczywiście zwracać uwagę na to, aby usługi były lepsze, bardziej przyjazne, aby w tym wypadku przewoźnicy ponosili pewne konsekwencje także wtedy, kiedy nie są w stanie dostarczyć usługi na określonym poziomie. Ale zawsze zwracam uwagę na to, że dotykamy biznesu, który musi mieć kalkulacje i musi mieć określony dochód obliczony według określonych rygorów. Zwracam na to uwagę, bo jest to aspekt zbyt często pomijany w naszych debatach.

Rory Palmer (S&D). – Madam President, I want to reinforce specifically the need for stronger, indeed mandatory, missed-connection protection, to ensure an effective European rail system that works in the interests of passengers.

I don't know where exactly in this Chamber seat No 61 is, but those who travel regularly on the railways may know about the very popular, useful and informative blog run by the 'Man in Seat 61'. He broke down into simple, straightforward terms the importance of this measure a few days ago when he said this: 'Implementing missed-connection protection is absolutely essential to stop passengers having to pay huge penalties to [train] operator B because of [train] operator A's delays, rendering rail travel risky and discouraging people from using it.' We in this Parliament need to be encouraging people to use the railways.

Being a Member of the European Parliament from the UK, I'm all too used to delays on the railways. This Parliament and the Commission cannot delay taking action on these issues in the interests of passengers.

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, ο σιδηρόδρομος είναι σημαντικό μέσο μεταφοράς και, βέβαια, πολύ πιο καθαρό από τις οδικές μεταφορές. Στην Επιτροπή Αναφορών έχουμε δεχθεί δεκάδες αναφορές και διαμαρτυρίες από άτομα με ειδικές ανάγκες που δεν έχουν τη δυνατότητα πρόσβασης στους σιδηροδρόμους. Νομίζω ότι με αυτά που συζητούμε και αυτά που θα αποφασίσουμε, θα συμβάλουμε πραγματικά στην πρόσβαση των ατόμων με ειδικές ανάγκες στις σιδηροδρομικές μεταφορές. Θεωρώ σημαντικό, βεβαίως, να υπάρξουν και χώροι για τα ποδήλατα, διότι το ποδήλατο χρησιμοποιείται πλέον από πάρα πολλούς πολίτες. Η επιβολή αποζημιώσεων προς τους καταναλωτές σε περίπτωση ακυρώσεων ή καθυστερήσεων πρέπει να είναι στην ημερήσια διάταξη, δεδομένου ότι διάφορες σιδηροδρομικές επιχειρήσεις προσπαθούν με διάφορα τρικ -δήθεν με τη ρήτρα ανωτέρας βίας- να αποφύγουν να καταβάλουν αποζημιώσεις στους καταναλωτές. Εκεί, πρέπει να είμαστε αποφασιστικοί όσον αφορά τα μέτρα που θα λάβουμε.

Zigmantas Balčytis (S&D). – Ponia pirmininka, pirmiausia noriu padėkoti pranešėjui Bogusław Liberadzki už tikrai labai gerą dokumentą, paruoštą todėl, kad mes taisėme 2009 m. taisykles. Pritariu visoms keleivių teisėms. Tačiau aš norėčiau atkreipti tam tikrą dėmesį į keletą paminėtų nuostatų dėl riedmenų parko atnaujinimo. Buvo paminėta, ir aš manau, kad tai yra labai svarbu, nes ne kiekviena valstybė tą daro savalaikiai ir tinkamai, ir taip pat į intermodalinio transporto plėtrą.

Kaip žinia, kiekviena šalis kiekvienais metais investuoja dideles pinigines lėšas į naujus projektus ir senų projektų atnaujinimą. Aš turiu omenyje ypatingai „Connecting Europe Facility" fondą, kur mes tikrai dešimtis milijardų investuojame į naujų projektų sukūrimą, ir ateityje tai bus labai svarbu todėl, kad ypatingai projektas „Rail Baltica" turės labai svarbią politinę reikšmę, kad periferinės valstybės – Baltijos šalys – bus inkorporuotos į Europos Sąjungos transporto sistemą. Tas dokumentas kaip tik ir palengvins šitų naujų projektų įdiegimą į bendrą sistemą.

(Ende der spontanen Wortmeldungen)

Violeta Bulc, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, thank you for this very thorough debate. I am glad that Parliament has clearly confirmed its support for improving the protection of rail passengers. Today's discussion has confirmed that we agree on many of the aspects which will allow us to deliver on this important proposal. Before I conclude, please allow me to address some of your comments.

On integrated and multimodal travel, let me confirm that, today, we have a set of EU regulations applicable only to each individual transport mode separately. Let me also confirm that we are progressively moving, already, towards multimodal integrated solutions. This year is a year of multimodality and it is a perfect time to address passenger rights, as well, within the multimodal environment. For passengers combining the use of different modes in one journey, the Commission is now launching preparatory work to develop multimodal and integrated-ticket passenger rights. This is our next challenge.

So yes, it is important that we set very clear rules, as is reflected in your report. This is especially important for passengers with reduced mobility, who need adequate assistance at transfer points when using a single ticket and otherwise. Our cooperation on this topic is not done yet.

On *force majeure*: let me say that, regarding the inclusion and the scope of the *force majeure* clause, we fully understand your efforts to ensure the best possible passenger protection and smooth operation of railway services. The introduction of the *force majeure* clause exempts railway undertakings from having to pay compensation where long delays are caused by events beyond their control and which they were not able to prevent.

While a *force majeure* clause has been included in the proposal, events that trigger it have been restricted to natural disasters – so-called acts of God. Let me repeat that: a very narrow, restrictive definition of situations caused through purely natural disasters – in order to avoid legal uncertainty and to limit the reduction of passenger rights.

The introduction of the *force majeure* clause aligns rail with other modes of transport in terms of passenger rights legislation, and also of consumer legislation such as the Package Travel Directive. It ensures that the general principle of legal fairness is applied. But, as I said earlier, we will have an opportunity to clarify this issue further when we address integrated ticketing and multimodal passenger rights.

I will not go over again the issues that I have already addressed in my opening remarks. As a closing comment, I would like to express once more my deep appreciation of the work you have done. It was crucial to conclude the discussion in Parliament before the elections and I am confident that the position adopted by the European Parliament will serve as a solid basis for the negotiation with the Council. I am very much looking forward to a positive vote on your report tomorrow.

Bogusław Liberadzki, *sprawozdawca*. – Pani Przewodnicząca! Muszę przyznać, że z satysfakcją wysłuchałem odpowiedzi pani komisarz i wypowiedzi posłów. Kroczymy tą samą drogą w tym samym kierunku, a wiele naszych propozycji, jak rozumiem, zostało przyjętych. Chcemy praw, które będą atrakcyjne dla pasażerów i dzięki którym pasażerowie będą chcieli korzystać z kolei.

Po drugie, rozwiązania i prawa pasażerów w zakresie powinności kolei muszą być dla przewoźników wykonalne i nie wiązać się ze wzrostem cen biletów. Gdyby ktoś pytał o koszt: tak, szacowaliśmy koszty. Mówimy o kilkuset milionach euro. Pamiętajmy jednak, że w tym czasie wydamy dziesiątki miliardów euro w ramach polityki spójności, funduszy strukturalnych i instrumentu „Łącząc Europę" na modernizację transportu kolejowego w Europie. Mamy prawo oczekiwać poprawy jakości. I uważam, że tego prawa nikt nam nie odmówi. Chcemy, żeby usługi były dostępne dla pasażerów zarówno cenowo, jak i fizycznie. Mówimy o spójnych regulacjach w całej Unii Europejskiej, no może z wyjątkiem Cypru i Malty, bo tam nie zbudowano jeszcze ani jednej linii kolejowej, ale, kto wie, wszystko może się zdarzyć. Chcemy, żeby odpowiedzialność kolei i sprzedawców biletów była niemożliwa do uniknięcia, co sformułowano i jest do wyegzekwowania. Generalna przesłanka, którą się kierowaliśmy, brzmi: gdy kolej szanuje pasażerów, da się kolej lubić. Jeśli większa liczba pasażerów będzie korzystała z kolei, udział kolei w rynku będzie większy. Skorzystają na tym wszyscy obywatele, ale także środowisko. Dziękuję jeszcze raz pani komisarz. Dziękuję państwu za debatę.

Die Präsidentin. – Die Aussprache ist geschlossen.

Die Abstimmung findet am Donnerstag, 15. November 2018, statt.

Schriftliche Erklärungen (Artikel 162)

Ádám Kósa (PPE), *írásban*. – Örömmel üdvözlöm, hogy a vasúti személyszállítást igénybe vevő utasok jogairól és kötelezettségeiről szóló rendelet átdolgozása során az Európai Parlament figyelemmel volt a fogyatékossággal élő személyek jogairól szóló ENSZ-egyezményre is annak érdekében, hogy a fogyatékossággal élő és a csökkent mozgásképességű személyek a vasúti közlekedés tekintetében a többi állampolgárhoz hasonló mobilitási lehetőségekkel rendelkezzenek. A jövőben külön figyelmet kell fordítani arra, hogy a fogyatékossággal élő és a csökkent mozgásképességű személyek megkülönböztetés mentesen hozzáférjenek a járművekhez, a vonat felszereltségéről pedig akadálymentes tájékoztatást kapjanak. Az azonos utazási feltételek biztosítása érdekében e személyeknek ingyenes segítséget kell nyújtani a felszálláshoz és a leszálláshoz. Nagyon fontos, hogy az érzékszervi fogyatékossággal élő utasoknak – mint például a siketek, a nagyothallók vagy a siketvakok – megfelelő és számukra is értelmezhető vizuális, illetve hangjelző rendszerek álljanak a rendelkezésre, hogy a késésekről a lehető legjobb tájékoztatást kapják. Ugyancsak előremutató és rég várt intézkedés, hogy a személyzetet megfelelően ki kell képezni a fogyatékossággal élő és a csökkent mozgásképességű személyek szükségleteiről és a számukra szükséges segítségnyújtásról.

Remélem, hogy a szöveg az intézményközi egyeztetések során sem fog felhígulni, hiszen a fogyatékossággal élő és a csökkent mozgásképességű személyek a többi állampolgárral azonos jogokkal rendelkeznek a szabad mozgás, és a megkülönböztetés mentesség tekintetében.

Elżbieta Katarzyna Łukacijewska (PPE), *na piśmie*. – Rozporządzenie, o którym dziś mówimy, jest bardzo istotne z punktu widzenia wszystkich pasażerów kolei. Już niedługo otrzymają oni ochronę swoich praw podobną do pasażerów linii lotniczych. Głosując nad przyjęciem rozporządzenia, zadbamy o wiele rozwiązań wychodzących na przeciw każdemu, kto korzysta na co dzień z kolei – przede wszystkim zwiększymy progi odszkodowań, nawet do 100% zwrotu ceny biletu za spóźnienie przekraczające 2 godziny, co zmotywuje przedsiębiorstwa do większej staranności, jeżeli chodzi o punktualność. Dzisiaj procedura dochodzenia odszkodowania jest żmudna i skomplikowana, przez co wiele osób rezygnuje z egzekwowania swoich praw. Bardzo ważne jest wprowadzenie szeregu udogodnień dla pasażerów niepełnosprawnych, np. konieczność udzielenia darmowej asysty czy wprowadzenie obowiązkowych szkoleń dla obsługi pociągu i stacji. Warto także spojrzeć na obowiązek zapewnienia miejsc na rowery w każdym pociągu oraz wprowadzenie pojęcia podróży łączonej, co oznacza, że przedsiębiorstwo kolejowe będzie musiało zadbać o to, aby każdy pasażer mógł zdążyć bez przeszkód na przesiadkę, a w razie problemu zapewnić możliwość dalszej podróży. Nowe przepisy stanowią zdecydowany krok ku zabezpieczeniu podstawowych praw pasażerów i mam nadzieję, że dzięki nim kolej stanie się znacznie popularniejszym środkiem transportu. Pamiętajmy, że kolej istnieje dla pasażerów.

Valdemar Tomaševski (ECR), *raštu*. – Vienas iš svarbiausių pasiekimų geležinkelių sektoriuje yra sukurta teisinė keleivių teisių apsaugos sistema, kuri sudaro dalį platesnės ES vartotojų teisių politikos. Komisija savo įgyvendinimo ataskaitoje pripažino, kad sektoriuje tinkamai taikomas reglamentas dėl geležinkelių keleivių teisių ir pareigų. Tačiau kelios valstybės narės, visiškai laikydamosi šio reglamento nuostatų, kai kuriems reglamento straipsniams taiko išimtis dėl nepakankamų finansinių priemonių apleistai geležinkelių infrastruktūrai arba pasenusiems geležinkelių riedmenims modernizuoti. Gerai, kad tokios išimtys nebebus įmanomos nuo 2024 metų gruodžio mėnesio. Todėl keleivių teisės bus vienodai užtikrinamos visose ES valstybėse narėse. Yra dar viena svarbi detalė. Važiavimo kitu maršrutu paslaugos teikėjai neįgaliems ir riboto judumo asmenims privalo suteikti panašaus lygio pagalbą ir prieigą prie alternatyvių transporto paslaugų. Šios alternatyvios paslaugos gali būti bendros visiems keleiviams arba, jei taip nusprendžia vežėjas, individuali transporto priemonė, pritaikyta specialiems tam tikrų neįgalių ar riboto judumo asmenų poreikiams. Taip pat reikėtų užtikrinti neįgaliųjų ir riboto judumo asmenų prieigą prie visos ES geležinkelių sistemos, pasitelkiant išankstinį pranešimą, kuris būtų kaip galima trumpesnis ir ne ilgesnis kaip 24 valandos. Ši paslauga turėtų būti nemokama.

Ελισσάβετ Βόζεμπεργκ-Βρυωνίδη (PPE), *γραπτώς*. – Τα δικαιώματα των επιβατών τρένων στην ΕΕ είναι σήμερα κατακερματισμένα, με αποτέλεσμα οι σιδηροδρομικές μεταφορές να εμφανίζονται λιγότερο ελκυστικές για το ευρύ κοινό. Η δημιουργία ενός εναρμονισμένου πλαισίου δικαιωμάτων για τους επιβάτες τρένων πανευρωπαϊκά και η εξασφάλιση υψηλής προστασίας σε όλους ανεξαιρέτως τους επιβάτες είναι επιτακτική ανάγκη, προκειμένου να επιτύχουμε αύξηση των σιδηροδρομικών μεταφορών, με ταυτόχρονη βελτιωμένη προστασία των δικαιωμάτων των επιβατών. Η νέα νομοθεσία εκσυγχρονίζει τα δικαιώματα των επιβατών τρένων και προστατεύει τους καταναλωτές πιο αποτελεσματικά, παρέχοντάς τους αντίστοιχο πλαίσιο δικαιωμάτων με αυτό που ισχύει στις αεροπορικές μεταφορές. Εξασφαλίζεται καλύτερη εξυπηρέτηση στους ανθρώπους με μειωμένη κινητική ικανότητα και προβλέπονται σαφείς διαδικασίες χειρισμού παραπόνων, με μεγαλύτερες αποζημιώσεις σε περιπτώσεις καθυστερήσεων. Συγκεκριμένα, οι επιβάτες θα μπορούν να ζητήσουν αποζημίωση ισοδύναμη με το 50% της τιμής του εισιτηρίου για καθυστέρηση 60-90 λεπτών, 75% για καθυστέρηση πάνω από 1,5 ώρα και 100% για καθυστερήσεις άνω των 3 ωρών. Στην Ελλάδα, που διαθέτει ένα από τα μικρότερα σιδηροδρομικά δίκτυα στην Ευρώπη, η σιδηροδρομική αγορά εμφανίζει ακόμα σημαντικά περιθώρια ανάπτυξης. Ως εκ τούτου, θα πρέπει να ενθαρρύνονται οι επενδύσεις και να προωθείται η καλύτερη συνδεσιμότητα μεταξύ των ευρωπαϊκών χωρών, γεγονός που σε συνδυασμό με τις προσιτές τιμές θα ενισχύσει καθοριστικά την

ανταγωνιστικότητα του τομέα των σιδηροδρόμων.

Jarosław Wałęsa (PPE), *na piśmie*. – Celem rozporządzenia jest ochrona praw pasażerów w ruchu kolejowym w Unii, w szczególności gdy podróż zostanie zakłócona, oraz podniesienie jakości i efektywności kolejowych usług pasażerskich. Istotne jest, aby skala zmian była bardziej korzystna dla pasażerów. Zapewnienie należytych praw pasażerom linii kolejowych jest kluczowe dla popularyzacji tego wciąż niedocenianego środka transportu. Musimy wyjść naprzeciw oczekiwaniom obywateli, przede wszystkim jeśli chodzi o zagwarantowanie dostępności kolei dla pasażerów niepełnosprawnych, umożliwienie pasażerom przewozu rowerów oraz uproszczenie zapisów o konieczności wypłacenia odszkodowań w razie spóźnienia lub odwołania połączenia.

Obecnie przepisy są bardziej przyjazne operatorom niż pasażerom, co jest jednym z ewidentnych powodów, dla których kolej traci na atrakcyjności. Tendencja powinna być odwrotna z uwagi na fakt, iż jest to ekologiczny i szybki środek transportu. Naszym obowiązkiem powinno być tworzenie prawa przyjaznego pasażerom.

Niestety, korzystając obecnie z usług kilku operatorów, nie można liczyć na odszkodowanie czy bezpłatne zapewnienie dalszej podróży u innego przewoźnika w razie spóźnienia na przesiadkę. Prawa są ograniczone umową handlową między przedsiębiorstwami lub jej brakiem. Tymczasem pasażerowie linii lotniczych mogą ubiegać się o odszkodowanie lub zapewnienie kolejnego lotu czy noclegu z posiłkami w przypadku, gdy samolot nie wyląduje na czas. Podobnie powinno być w przypadku usług kolejowych.

23. Persistente organische Schadstoffe (Aussprache)

Die Präsidentin. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über den Bericht von Julie Girling im Namen des Ausschuss für Umweltfragen, öffentliche Gesundheit und Lebensmittelsicherheit über den Vorschlag für eine Verordnung des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates über persistente organische Schadstoffe (Neufassung) (COM(2018)0144 – C8-0124/2018 – 2018/0070(COD)) (A8-0336/2018).

Julie Girling, *Rapporteur*. – Madam President, this recast updates the current EU legislation in line with the latest decisions made at international level under the Stockholm Convention. There is no disagreement in this House that this is necessary. The latest research on persistent organic pollutants (POPs) shows a worrying persistence of previously banned substances, particularly in the polar regions, and it's important that we keep up the momentum on this.

The report includes a new role for the European Chemicals Agency (ECHA), giving them much more involvement in certain tasks. This is a move that I strongly welcome. I am aware that not all Members of this House are supportive of ECHA – they don't particularly support it as an organisation – but in my former role as Parliament's ECHA liaison person for many years, I witnessed at first hand the excellent work that they do. I very much welcome the use of their in-house expertise on POPs, as opposed to using outside consultants. That is a good move forward.

We're limited in what we can change here, as the Stockholm Convention supersedes the EU legislation, so this report has been relatively straightforward compared with previous legislation, and indeed with other things that I've worked on. But there are issues, and there is one particular issue – the problem of plastics recycling – which remains to be resolved in the vote tomorrow. This concerns the substance decaBDE. For political reasons which are not clear to me – but which, I would say, just amount to negligence – we find ourselves in a position where this substance was not granted a recycling exemption at UN level, despite the fact that less stable substances from the same chemical group have recycling derogations in place, and these were not removed by the Stockholm Convention. I sought to address this issue at committee level, but the oral amendment that I proposed was rejected by MEPs from some of the political groups. This was regrettable because it would have been best to have the issue dealt with at committee level.

So I have re-tabled the same amendment – that's Amendment 30 – for plenary. I cannot emphasise strongly enough the importance of this amendment when it comes to the EU's circular economy objectives. Amendment 30 concerns five substances, four of which currently have individual recycling derogations of 1 000 ppm, and it imposes a limit of 1 000 ppm for all five combined. That's a major net benefit environmentally and it is in line with limits set out in the current Restriction of Hazardous Substances Directive. The fifth substance, decaBDE, has the same recycling derogation under the REACH (Registration, Evaluation and Authorisation of Chemicals) Directive, a limit agreed only last year. I also include in my amendment a review of this limit in five years' time.

Without this amendment, the vast majority of plastics recyclers dealing with WEEE (waste electrical and electronic equipment) and end-of-life vehicles would have to dramatically reduce their activities or stop altogether. This would particularly and disproportionately affect SMEs. We are talking about 900 000 tons of end-of-life vehicle plastic waste each year, which will probably end up being exported outside Europe for recycling, where standards are far less rigorous and there is a real risk of it finding its way illegally into products such as toys, which are then imported into Europe. If we deal with it and recycle it within Europe to high standards, that should not, and cannot, happen.

Amendment 37 seeks to impose a more ambitious target and, while I fully support ambition, its adoption would actually be negative rather than positive. What's more, my Amendment 30 includes a review of the limit in five years' time and this is crucially important.

We have a strong commitment to the circular economy, and I hope that Members will bear that in mind when considering how to vote on these amendments.

Violeta Bulc, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, I would like to thank the European Parliament, notably the rapporteur, Ms Girling, and the shadow rapporteurs for the work done on the Commission's proposal to recast the POPs Regulation. POP stands for persistent, organic and pollutant. The term refers to chemical substances that persist in the environment, that bio-accumulate through the food chain and that are highly toxic to human health and the environment. Let me underline that these substances can be transported over thousands of miles in the environment from where they were released. This is why persistent organic pollutants are a global concern. As is often the case, global challenges require global solutions.

The international community took action on these chemicals through the establishment of the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants, which entered into force in 2004. The current EU Regulation on Persistent Organic Pollutants dates from 2004 and implements the international commitments expressed in the Stockholm Convention. The Regulation aims at eliminating the production, placing on the market and use of internationally produced persistent organic pollutants (POPs). In addition, it aims at reducing and eliminating the releases of POPs that are unintentional by-products of industrial processes such as dioxins.

Last March, the Commission proposed the recast of the EU Regulation on Persistent Organic Pollutants in order to bring its procedures into line with the procedures set out in the Lisbon Treaty. The recasting process gave us an opportunity to update certain aspects of the regulation, to provide further clarity and to make its processes more efficient. For example, we proposed a role for the European Chemicals Agency (ECHA) to assist the Commission and provide scientific support. In addition, we adopted and streamlined reporting and monitoring obligations and proposed to align the annexes to the Regulation on Persistent Organic Pollutants with the outcome of the 2015 Conference of the Parties to the Stockholm Convention. Finally, we brought certain terms and definitions into line with those used in the EU REACH Regulation. I'm looking forward to hearing your views and I trust that you will give a strong mandate to Ms Girling to start negotiations as soon as possible.

Massimo Paolucci, *a nome del gruppo S&D*. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, inquinanti organici persistenti non è certamente un nome affascinante né di immediata comprensione per i cittadini che stanno seguendo questo dibattito. Perciò, per farci intendere meglio, dobbiamo chiarire che si tratta di sostanze chimiche tossiche pericolose su scala globale, perché viaggiano su lunghissime distanze in atmosfera, che persistono nell'ambiente per molti anni e che si accumulano negli ecosistemi, ponendo così gravi rischi alla salute umana e all'ambiente.

Stiamo parlando di diossine, furani e pesticidi ma anche di ritardanti di fiamma ancora presenti in molti prodotti di uso quotidiano come gli schermi delle tv, dei computer o della componentistica delle auto. Questa è la ragione per cui la Convenzione internazionale ci obbliga a essere molto severi nel trattamento di queste sostanze, molto severi anche quando si tratta di gestire la presenza nei rifiuti e nei materiali che vengono trattati per il riciclo.

Per questo motivo vorrei dire chiaramente che dobbiamo evitare che questi prodotti siano esportati e trattati fuori dall'Europa secondo standard ambientali che non sono i nostri e poi ritornino in Europa dalla finestra. È per questa ragione che noi socialisti vogliamo sì sostenere e promuovere le attività di riciclo, ma contestualmente definire limiti sempre più stringenti e più ambiziosi.

In secondo luogo, da una petizione dei cittadini europei e da uno studio commissionato dal Parlamento europeo è emersa l'evidenza che verosimilmente esistono in Europa suoli e acque sotterranee contaminati. Il gruppo socialista ha chiesto e ottenuto, prendendo spunto da quanto abbiamo già fatto alcuni anni fa nell'ambito del regolamento sul mercurio, che la Commissione e gli Stati membri collaborino al fine di individuare e valutare i siti contaminati da inquinanti organici persistenti.

Questi due principi difenderemo domani nel voto e nelle future negoziazioni con gli Stati membri e la Commissione.

Bolesław G. Piecha, *w imieniu grupy ECR*. – Pani Przewodnicząca! Trwałe zanieczyszczenia organiczne to związki chemiczne, nie tylko potencjalnie, ale i realnie niebezpieczne ze względu na swoje szczególne właściwości, które związane są z ich toksycznością i niekorzystnym działaniem na organizm ludzki, ale również z tego powodu, że są supertrwałe w środowisku, mają zdolność bioakumulacji i tym samym mają negatywny wpływ na środowisko i zdrowie człowieka.

Ludzie narażeni są na trwałe zanieczyszczenia organiczne na wiele sposobów. Głównie przez spożywaną żywność lub powietrze, którym oddychają. Produkty codziennego użytku, zwłaszcza plastikowe, mogą zawierać wiele substancji stanowiących trwałe zanieczyszczenia organiczne, które zostały dodane w celu poprawy właściwości produktu, co sprawia, że trwałe zanieczyszczenia organiczne można znaleźć niemal wszędzie, i to w mierzalnych ilościach.

Jako polityk, ale przede wszystkim lekarz mam szczególnie na uwadze kwestię szeroko pojętego zdrowia publicznego i w tym kontekście myślę o bezpieczeństwie i zdrowiu ludzi i zwierząt. To piękna idea, ale muszę zgodzić się tutaj ze sprawozdawczynią co do zaproponowanego odstępstwa, które dopuszcza inne stężenie w materiałach pochodzących z recyklingu. Może to spojrzenie mniej ambitne, ale pragmatyczne. Jestem zwolennikiem proponowania realnego prawodawstwa, a w licznych konsultacjach podmioty, które zajmują się recyklingiem, wypowiedziały się na korzyść tej zmiany i stąd moje poparcie dla końcowego sprawozdania.

Linnéa Engström, *för Verts/ALE-gruppen*. – Fru talman! I dag tar vi ett viktigt steg för att skapa en giftfri vardag för våra barn och våra samhällen. Vi måste begränsa ämnen som DDT och dioxiner – långlivade organiska föreningar som inte bryts ner. Dessa ämnen kan orsaka kroniska sjukdomar, och de är cancerframkallande. De påverkar det centrala nervsystemet och fungerar som hormonstörande ämnen i fortplantningssystemet. Vi får i oss dessa skadliga ämnen via maten, eftersom de lagras i animalisk fettvävnad.

Det vi lagstiftar om i dag är att uppdatera EU:s kemikalielagstiftning i linje med Stockholmskonventionen för att begränsa användningen av de här organiska föreningarna som inte bryts ner. Vi förtydligar också Europeiska kemikaliemyndighetens roll.

Våra barn ska inte utsättas för dessa gifter i sin vardag. Därför är detta beslut ett viktigt ”grönt steg” i kampen för en giftfri vardag.

Kateřina Konečná, *za skupinu GUE/NGL*. – Paní předsedající, navrženým nařízením se provádějí závazky Evropské unie podle Stockholmské úmluvy o perzistentních organických znečišťujících látkách a podle protokolu k ní. Základním cílem těchto mezinárodních smluv a následně i nařízení je ochrana zdraví a životního prostředí před škodlivými účinky této skupiny chemických látek. Bohužel některé zásadní pozměňovací návrhy nepošly Výborem pro životní prostředí, veřejné zdraví a bezpečnost potravin a návrh tak byl zásadně oslaben, proto jsem je také znovu načetla na plénum.

Tímto vás tedy společně s ekologickými a spotřebitelskými organizacemi žádám o hlasování ve prospěch přísnějších limitů pro některé další látky. Je zapotřebí, aby byly prokazatelně toxické látky co nejrychleji zakázány, a to globálně jak v nových, tak v recyklovaných výrobcích. Právě z recyklovaných plastů pak tyto látky rychleji zmizí.

Ráda bych vás konkrétně požádala o podporu pozměňovacích návrhů, které zajistí ochranu spotřebitelů v Evropě před vystavením těmto látkám zejména z recyklovaných výrobků a podpoří tak čistou cirkulární ekonomiku. Navrhuji aktualizovat limity pro chlorované parafiny s krátkým řetězcem tak, jak navrhuje studie z roku 2015 sepsaná z podnětu Německé agentury pro životní prostředí, a pro sumu PBDE, která je v souladu s mezinárodními závazky týkajícími se omezování perzistentních organických znečišťujících látkách v rámci Stockholmské úmluvy.

Kolegové, je zcela nezbytné, aby přepracované znění nařízení bylo přijato co nejdříve. Je to zcela nezbytné, pokud chceme ochránit evropské občany.

Eric Andrieu (S&D). – Madame la Présidente, 173 pays ont interdit les polluants organiques persistants. Pourtant, on ne peut pas faire comme s'il n'y avait pas de problèmes de fertilité ou de puberté, comme si 80 % des insectes et un tiers des oiseaux n'avaient pas disparu et comme si les pollinisateurs n'étaient pas en danger de mort.

Glyphosate, chlordécone, néonicotinoïdes, métam-sodium, on ne compte plus le nombre de scandales sanitaires. Mais que fait la Commission européenne pour protéger la santé des 500 millions de citoyens européens?

Aujourd'hui, près d'un tiers des produits chimiques présents sur le marché de l'Union européenne depuis 2010 sont potentiellement dangereux pour la santé humaine, en infraction avec le règlement européen REACH.

Quelle est la réalité? La réalité, c'est que ni les États membres, ni la Commission européenne n'appliquent l'article 191 du traité sur le fonctionnement de l'Union européenne, qui prévoit que la politique de l'Union dans le domaine de l'environnement vise un niveau de protection élevé et est fondée sur les principes de précaution. La réalité, c'est que la plupart des États membres violent allègrement ces principes de précaution et que la Commission européenne, en laissant faire, en laissant aller, se rend elle-même coupable de non-assistance à citoyen en danger.

Il ne faut pas jouer, plaisanter, avec la santé des 500 millions de citoyens européens, il est de notre responsabilité pleine et entière d'agir très concrètement.

Michèle Rivasi (Verts/ALE). – Madame la Présidente, je me réjouis de la révision de ce règlement sur ces polluants organiques persistants (POP).

Effectivement, de nombreuses associations, notamment WECF (Women Engage for a Common Future) et FNE (France Nature Environnement), démontrent la présence de substances toxiques, dont des retardateurs de flamme, qui sont des POP, dans les jouets pour enfants, les ustensiles de cuisine ou les accessoires pour les cheveux. Pourquoi? Parce que ce sont des plastiques recyclés.

Je soutiens mon collègue, M. Andrieu, et juge scandaleux que la Commission européenne ait accordé des dérogations pour justement permettre le recyclage des plastiques contenant ces substances. Des études réalisées sur les moquettes ont montré la présence de POP dans les moquettes des sept principaux fabricants, que ce soit des phthalates, des retardateurs de flamme bromés, etc.

Il faut interdire ces substances en amont. Il ne faut pas accorder de dérogations. Je suis d'accord avec M^{me} Girling lorsqu'elle dit qu'il faut supprimer ces dérogations, parce que, ce qui est important, dans la perspective des élections européennes, c'est de montrer que l'Europe protège la santé des consommateurs. À l'heure actuelle, nous ne sommes pas suffisamment ambitieux.

Anja Hazekamp (GUE/NGL). – Voorzitter, persistente organische gifstoffen, zoals DDT en dioxines, zijn uiterst giftig voor mensen, dieren en het milieu. Ze stapelen zich op in ons vetweefsel en kunnen via de moedermelk aan onze kinderen worden doorgegeven.

Ondanks het feit dat het gebruik al aan banden is gelegd, vinden we dit gif nog steeds volop terug in melk en eieren, maar ook in dieren, zoals vogels, vissen en zeehonden, op kleding, in de bodem en in het grondwater.

Daarom moeten we alle persistente organische stoffen verbieden, zonder uitstel en zonder uitzonderingen. En natuurlijk moeten we deze stoffen vervangen, maar niet door ander gif. In Nederland is het zeer giftige perfluoroctaanzuur vervangen door GenX. Hoewel GenX waarschijnlijk ook kankerverwekkend is, wordt het zonder enige waarschuwing in de anti-aanbaklaag van pannen gebruikt. Inmiddels treffen we GenX overal in het milieu aan! Dat is onbegrijpelijk! Deze stoffen horen niet in ons milieu, niet in ons water en niet in ons lijf!

Voorts ben ik van mening dat de Europese landbouwsubsidies moeten worden afgeschaft!

Jytte Guteland (S&D). – Fru talman! Varje dag exponeras vi för mängder med kemikalier av olika slag. De finns i vår vardag. De finns i leksaker, matförpackningar, våra kläder, vattnet vi dricker, till och med i dammet, som vi kanske sopar under mattan. För ett stort antal av dessa ämnen vet vi inte vilka effekterna är för oss människor och för miljön, trots att det egentligen bara ska vara bevisligen säkra ämnen i vår vardag.

POP-förordningen innehåller några av de värsta ämnen som mänskligheten känner till, inklusive bromerade flamskyddsmedel, till exempel dekaBDE, som regleras genom Stockholmskonventionen. Dessa ämnen blir emellertid inte mindre farliga för att vi återanvänder dem i exempelvis plast. Återvunnen plast blir ju inte bättre för vår hälsa, så det är viktigt att vi gör två saker på samma gång: både blir bättre på att återvinna och ser till att få en giftfri vardag.

Därför kommer jag att kämpa för att gränsvärdet för dekaBDE hålls i linje med miljöutskottets betänkande, dvs. 10 mg/kg. Detta är nämligen viktigt för människors hälsa, det är viktigt för miljön och det är viktigt också för att förtroendet för återvunnet material ska vara intakt hos allmänheten.

Younous Omarjee (GUE/NGL). – Madame la Présidente, Madame la Commissaire, l'une des plus graves crises écologiques et sanitaires de toute l'Union européenne touche les régions ultrapériphériques de la Guadeloupe et de la Martinique, qui ont été exposées, vous le savez, pendant des décennies à un polluant organique persistant très toxique: le chlordécone.

Ces îles sont aujourd'hui ravagées par la persistance de ce polluant. Un scientifique disait que nous sommes dans une situation presque post-Tchernobyl: les terres et les sols sont pollués pour les sept siècles à venir et les habitants sont malades.

La France n'a pas rempli son devoir d'information sur les risques pour les populations, aujourd'hui abandonnées à leur sort. Puisse ce règlement contraindre la France à assumer ses obligations!

Les Antillais, voyez-vous, Madame la Commissaire, attendent beaucoup de l'Europe, et je compte sur vous, Madame la Commissaire, pour agir en ce sens.

Spontane Wortmeldungen

Bogdan Andrzej Zdrojewski (PPE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Zmienię trochę swoje wystąpienie ze względu na debatę, która właśnie się zakończyła. Przede wszystkim chcę zwrócić uwagę na to, że można przyjąć do wiadomości tzw. kategorię eksterytorialności śmieci. To oznacza, że jeżeli patrzymy na ten czy inny ocean i widzimy ogromną masę śmieci, rzeczywiście mamy kłopot z ustaleniem odpowiedzialności tych, którzy powinni poradzić sobie z tym problemem. Ale nie istnieje– chcę to wyraźnie podkreślić – eksterytorialność źródeł tych zanieczyszczeń. Można je odtworzyć i dojść do podmiotów, państw, także społeczeństw odpowiedzialnych za te zanieczyszczenia. I druga rzecz, na którą chcę zwrócić uwagę, to zakończona misja SEDE na Arktyce, podczas której bardzo zdecydowanie podkreślono w kategoriach bezpieczeństwa kwestie zanieczyszczenia tymi właśnie trwałymi chemikaliami nieorganicznymi. Jest to bardzo ważny element i na niego również zwracam uwagę.

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, ο κανονισμός για τον οποίον συζητούμε εναρμονίζεται με τη σύμβαση της Στοκχόλμης για τους έμμονους οργανικούς ρύπους ή επίμονους οργανικούς μολυντές και, ουσιαστικά, στηρίζεται σε αυτήν. Οι εν λόγω ρύποι είναι χημικές τοξικές ουσίες εξαιρετικής σημασίας, που επηρεάζουν την υγεία όλων των ανθρώπων. Ωστόσο, ενώ συζητούμε για τον κανονισμό αυτόν, αποδεικνύεται ότι: πρώτον, δεν πραγματοποιήθηκε διαβούλευση με ενδιαφερόμενους φορείς προκειμένου να εκπονηθεί ο κανονισμός, δεύτερον, δεν αξιοποιήθηκαν εξωτερικοί εμπειρογνώμονες, και τρίτον, δεν έγινε εκτίμηση των επιπτώσεων. Για έναν κανονισμό τόσο σοβαρό, που αποδεικνύεται και από τη συζήτηση ότι είναι καθοριστικής σημασίας για την ίδια την υγεία των πολιτών. Θεωρώ ότι έπρεπε να έχουν γίνει αυτές οι διαδικασίες, διότι είναι ουσιαστικές. Διότι οι εξωτερικοί εμπειρογνώμονες, αλλά και οι ενδιαφερόμενοι φορείς, θα μπορούσαν να προσφέρουν με τις δικές τους παρεμβάσεις.

José Inácio Faria (PPE). – Senhora Presidente, Senhora Comissária, os poluentes orgânicos persistentes, dos quais os mais mediáticos talvez sejam o DDT e as dioxinas, tal como o nome indica, persistem no ambiente, contaminando *habitats* naturais e têm uma elevada toxicidade para nós, humanos, e para outros seres vivos.

Sabemos que a maior parte destes poluentes são, aliás, disruptores endócrinos, o que significa que afetam a saúde e a reprodução de várias espécies animais, incluindo a nossa.

Entendo, por isso, que são necessárias medidas fortes para eliminar este tipo de poluentes e evitar a ecotoxicidade e a bioacumulação em consequências exponenciais nos humanos.

No que toca aos limites admissíveis de pó, temos de impor aos produtos reciclados as mesmas regras que já impomos aos produtos virgens, sem com isto criar uma dualidade de critérios ou uma diferença de qualidade entre produtos, isto é, incentivar a economia circular implica garantir a segurança dos consumidores, sobretudo porque a quantidade de material de origem reciclada só tende a aumentar.

Precisamos de garantir aos cidadãos que podem estar descansados de que a comida, os brinquedos das crianças e os utensílios de uso comum não estão contaminados com essas substâncias de elevado perigo.

Jiří Pospíšil (PPE). – Paní předsedající, já se přiznám, že o této věci jsem v poslední době hodně studoval a musím říci, že jsem zděšen z toho, jak perzistentní organické znečišťující látky čím dále více vyplňují naše životní prostředí a stávají se pro nás fatální hrozbou. Fatální hrozbou pro naše zdraví, fatální hrozbou pro životní prostředí. Proto jsem chtěl říci, že vítám tento návrh, který zpřísňuje existující nařízení.

Děkuji Komisi, děkuji paní zpravodajce, jsem velmi rád, že se jasně stanoví nová pravidla pro Evropskou agenturu pro chemické látky. Na druhou stranu, a proto jsem se přihlásil do debaty, prosím Komisi, aby do budoucna byla mnohem více ambiciózní. Do budoucna, pokud chceme tento problém řešit, budeme muset řešit širší zákaz těchto látek a snahu najít vhodné komponenty a vhodné náhrady. Takže prosím do budoucna větší ambicióznost, je to nutné pro naše zdraví a zdraví našich občanů.

(Ende der spontanen Wortmeldungen)

Violeta Bulc, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, I would like to thank all the Members of Parliament who took part in the debate. It has been a really useful discussion and has touched upon the main elements of the Commission's proposal.

Let me underline, however, one specific issue concerning your proposal of listing decaBDE (decabromodiphenyl ether) in the recast, since this featured prominently during the discussion. While I fully understand the objective of Parliament to take into account the experience and concerns of the recycling sector, I would like to remind you that it is crucial that our circular economies are as free as possible of toxic chemicals. This is in line with the objective of both the United Nations Stockholm Convention and the EU Regulation on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPS) to eliminate production and use of these substances.

To achieve that objective, it is of utmost importance that materials that contain persistent organic pollutants can be used or placed on the market only if those pollutants are present as unintentional trace contaminants. We must also be aware that products made from recycled materials will be accepted by consumers only if they have confidence in the quality and safety of the recycled material.

Before I conclude, let me refer to some of your additional comments. First, regarding Mr Andrieu's point about breaches of chemical legislation, I'd like you to know that this study was conducted regarding the REACH (Registration, Evaluation, Authorisation and Restriction of Chemicals) Regulation, whereas, in the debate, we were discussing the recast of the POPs Regulation and I would therefore really like to focus only on that.

Secondly, we think that it is important to note that, contrary to the Stockholm Convention, discussions regarding other similar substances, the Stockholm Convention decision that listed decaBDE in Annex A to the Convention does not include a derogation for recycling of products containing decaBDE. This is significantly different from the listing of the other PBDEs (polybrominated diphenyl ethers) under the Convention in 2009, where such a recycling derogation was included. In this case, the listing of the PBDEs in the POPs Regulation in 2010 specifies that the unintentional trace contamination (UTC) levels for the PBDEs is ten ppm (parts per million), but in line with the listings in the Convention, a derogation of 1000 ppms for recycled materials is allowed. There is no such derogation in the Stockholm Convention for decaBDE.

To conclude, I would like to underline that the Commission stands ready to provide support and to play to the full its honest broker role. I am looking forward to starting negotiations in order to ensure a first regarding agreement during the Austrian Presidency so that this legislation can make a real difference on the ground as soon as possible.

Julie Girling, *Rapporteur.* – Madam President, I would like to thank colleagues for their contributions, some of which were more useful than others. I am particularly concerned at the attempts by one or two Members to roll into POPs (persistent organic pollutants) discussions around agri-chemicals such as glyphosate. It is utterly irresponsible to stand up in this Parliament and imply that glyphosate is a POP. It is not. This legislation is far too serious to play those sorts of politics with.

So, let's restrict ourselves to dealing with the persistent organic pollutants. As I said in my opening address, there is no disagreement here that we all would like to eliminate them. The point is about how we do it, the rate at which we do it and the methodology. For me, I would just make my point again, yes, it's true, as Ms Rivasi said, that there are studies that show that decaBDE (decabromodiphenyl ether), for example, has turned up in hair brushes. This is appalling, but I will bet my life that those hairbrushes were produced in the Far East. They were not produced in Europe, and they come from bad recycling.

If we want to prevent that from happening, if we want the recycling to take place in Europe, by European companies bound by European rules, which will not then put the recyclates on the market for products like food contact materials and toys, according to our rules, then we have to take control of that process. Pretending that we're not going to recycle at all when we have legislation like the ELV (End-of-Life Vehicles) Directive and the WEEE (Waste Electrical & Electronic Equipment) Directive in place is frankly ostrich-like.

So, I ask Members yet again to re-examine their support of Amendment 30 or Amendment 37, and to look carefully at Amendment 30, which not only sets out recycling reductions – because it takes four products, rolls them into five and gives the absolute maximum for all five, which is actually a reduction to 20% – but it also has a review mechanism which would allow us in five years, if we can get best available technology in place in the European recycling industry, to recycle these products. It would allow us to be in a position where we could actually eliminate these. If you go ahead with Amendment 37, that is not an option on the table.

Die Präsidentin. – Die Aussprache ist geschlossen.

Die Abstimmung findet am Donnerstag, 15. November 2018, statt.

Skriftlige erklæringer (artikel 162)

Pavel Poc (S&D), *písemně.* – Několik týdnů jsem upozorňoval kolegy, jaké dopady mají mezery v legislativě na veřejné zdraví, a že nesouhlasím s tím, že se jedná o pouhou technickou úpravu mezinárodních závazků. Naopak – jedná se o rozhodnutí s významným sociálním dopadem, jehož důsledky poneseme ještě desetiletí. Přístup, který v současné době EU zaujímá k recyklaci a limitům perzistentních organických znečišťujících látek, je doslova toxický. Zvláště, pokud existují bezpečnější alternativy. Pokud chceme zaručit nezávadnost materiálů, které recyklujeme, musíme v prvé řadě eliminovat množství nebezpečných látek v primárních produktech, ne je vracet do oběhu. A už vůbec ne v podobě kontaminovaných kuchyňských pomůcek či dětských hraček. Pro ty, co nevědí, POP jsou látky, které se akumulují v životním prostředí, odkud se dostávají do našeho potravního řetězce. V lidském těle pak narušují fungování hormonálního, nervového i imunitního systému. V EU nám bohužel trvá příliš dlouho, než takto nebezpečné látky zcela zaká-

žeme, což vede k tomu, že se ještě dlouhou dobu potýkáme s jejich odkazem. V příštím roce například skončí pětileté přechodné období pro HBCD. Tuto toxickou látku ale budeme mít další desetiletí zabudovanou ve svých domech. Myslím, že se snad všichni shodneme na tom, že takové dědictví bychom svým dětem zachovávat neměli.

24. Unabhängigkeit statistischer Ämter in der Europäischen Union und der Fall von Andreas Georgiou (Aussprache)

Die Präsidentin. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über die Erklärungen des Rates und der Kommission zu der Unabhängigkeit statistischer Ämter in der Europäischen Union und der Fall von Andreas Georgiou (2018/2930(RSP)).

Karoline Edtstadler, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Madam President, high quality, reliable and accurate official statistics are the pillar of the EU's economic governance, supporting decisions in our economic surveillance procedures in the context of the European Semester. Issues related to statistics are therefore a regular item on the Council's agenda. The Council regularly – once every year – reviews the EU's statistical information needs, examines reports provided by EU statistical bodies and adopts conclusions, which evaluate progress and set priorities for the upcoming year. Undoubtedly, high-quality, accurate and reliable statistical data can only be produced by independent statistical authorities.

The professional independence of the EU's national and Union-level statistical bodies is enshrined in EU law. The EU's statistical authorities also operate according to the European Statistics Code of Practice. The implementation of the Code's 16 principles is monitored by the Independent European Statistical Governance Advisory Board, which informs both Parliament and the Council. Indeed, the situation as regards the professional independence of statistical authorities in general has been satisfactory.

The important exceptions, however, are the concerns expressed over the judicial proceedings against the former President of Greece's statistical authority, ELSTAT, Andreas Georgiou, and two senior ELSTAT officials. The Commission has repeatedly reiterated since 2016 its full confidence in the reliability and accuracy of ELSTAT data from 2010 to 2015 and since then. The issue has also been addressed by the Eurogroup in the context of Greece's Third Economic Adjustment Programme, whose conditionality included requirements to review the provisions related to the autonomy of independent parties, including ELSTAT.

Against this background, in June this year, on the occasion of concluding Greece's Third Programme, the Eurogroup mandated the institutions to continue monitoring developments in the legal proceedings against the former President and senior staff of ELSTAT and against the members of the Committee of Experts of the Hellenic Republic Asset Development Fund. It also mandated them to monitor the supporting actions taken by the Greek authorities, including legislative actions, if needed, in full respect of the independence of the judiciary. The institutions are expected to report back to the Eurogroup in the context of the post-programme surveillance. These reports, in addition to the regular reporting by the European statistical agencies, will keep us informed on the situation related to ELSTAT.

With this, I will finish my brief statement and I will listen attentively to the Commissioner's intervention and to your debate.

Marianne Thyssen, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, I appreciate the opportunity to discuss with you the independence of statistics for Europe.

The independence of statistics and of the statistical authorities that produce them is a fundamental principle explicitly set out in EU law. The current governance of the European statistical system relies primarily on a clear, legal framework, the so-called statistical system. With your support, that law has been improved and strengthened, on the initiative of the Commission and in full observance of the principles of subsidiarity and proportionality.

Like any principle or rule set out in law, statistical independence needs to be monitored and its implementation needs to be ensured in practice. Regulatory monitoring is carried out both by the Commission and by independent peers in the context of the European Statistics Code of Practice, already mentioned by the Presidency. This code aims to enhance the professional independence, integrity and accountability of European statistics and of the European statistical system. You in this House, as the European legislator, have contributed to ensuring the transparency and accountability of the European statistical system by establishing the European Statistical Governance Advisory Board (ESGAB).

ESGAB is an independent body of experts that oversees the implementation of the Code of Practice, and every year it makes a report, which it presents to you, honourable Members, as well as to the Council. The annual ESGAB reports have always covered the principle of professional independence and illustrated the progress achieved at national and EU levels. On the basis of the Commission's and ESGAB's monitoring, the Member States have identified and implemented improvement measures that contribute to maintaining the confidence of users, and particularly their trust in the independence of statistics.

As regards the specific situation in Greece and the situation of Mr Georgiou, let me firstly emphasise that the Commission has full confidence in the reliability and the accuracy of data produced by the statistical authority in Greece under Mr Georgiou's leadership in the years from 2010. The Commission has consistently confirmed this in previous public statements. Secondly, let me repeat that the Commission neither comments on developments in ongoing national judicial proceedings nor assesses the impact of court decisions that are not final and irrevocable. That said, I can understand that the staff of the Hellenic Statistical Authority (ELSTAT) may feel they are not sufficiently well protected to do their jobs effectively and independently. The Commission has followed the developments in Greece consistently and has repeatedly expressed its concern in that regard, both in public statements and directly to the Greek authorities. The Eurogroup has also consistently expressed its support for Mr Georgiou and, most recently in its statement on Greece of 22 June this year, it has been inviting the European institutions to monitor the developments and to report back to the Eurogroup.

It's important to highlight that the Commission has actively supported Greek statistics on several fronts. The support has led, inter alia, to amendments of Greek law to further enhance the statistical authority's institutional, operational and financial independence. Other legal amendments have provided for the indemnification of current or former statistics officials for legal expenses incurred in the context of trials following lawsuits or criminal charges against them related to the performance of their duties. Commission officials have also contributed extensively, with their expertise, to strengthening the statistical processes in Greece, and we continue to do that, as we do in other Member States too.

In conclusion, I would like to reassure the honourable Members that not only has the independence of the national statistical authorities been strengthened in law, but Eurostat is also actively working to ensure that independence exists in practice too. Your continued vigilance will help us in this task.

Γεώργιος Κύρτσος, *εξ ονόματος της ομάδας PPE*. – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, η εικόνα που έχω για τον κύριο Γεωργίου είναι ότι πρόκειται για έναν άριστο επιστήμονα και τεχνοκράτη, που έπεσε θύμα των περιστάσεων και πολιτικών δικαστικών παιχνιδιών. Ένα μέρος της κοινωνίας τού φόρτωσε, μέσα στην ένταση της κρίσης, την αναγκαστική ένταξη της Ελλάδας σε δανειακό πρόγραμμα, επειδή δήθεν άλλαξε τα στοιχεία. Η Ελλάδα είχε μπει αναγκαστικά σε δανειακό πρόγραμμα προτού ο κύριος Γεωργίου οριστικοποιήσει τα στατιστικά στοιχεία. Δυστυχώς, μένοντας στο ευρώ δεν κάναμε -για λόγους πολιτικού κόστους- τις αναγκαίες μεταρρυθμίσεις, όπως έκαναν άλλες χώρες, με αποτέλεσμα να οδηγηθούμε στην υπερχρέωση και σε αδιέξοδο. Χώρες με μικρότερα προβλήματα από τα δικά μας, όπως η Ιρλανδία, η Πορτογαλία και η Κύπρος, υποχρεώθηκαν επίσης να μπουν σε δανειακό πρόγραμμα και να εφαρμόσουν το σχετικό μνημόνιο. Επομένως, δεν φταίει ο κύριος Γεωργίου για τα προβλήματά μας, που συνεχίζονται εξαιτίας και της κρίσης του 2015. Υπάρχουν βέβαια δικαστικοί λειτουργοί που αξιολογούν την κατάσταση διαφορετικά. Αρκεί να θυμίσω ότι η πρώην πρόεδρος του Αρείου Πάγου, η οποία σήμερα είναι σύμβουλος του πρωθυπουργού κυρίου Τσίπρα, είχε στείλει επιστολή στον κύριο Juncker καταγγέλλοντας το δανειακό πρόγραμμα. Αυτό που μπορούμε και πρέπει να κάνουμε για τον κύριο Γεωργίου είναι να επιμείνουμε να τελειώσει η δικαστική του περιπέτεια και να βεβαιωθούμε ότι τα δικαστικά νομικά έξοδα θα περάσουν στο ελληνικό δημόσιο, όπως έχει ήδη αποφασιστεί. Θεωρώ, λοιπόν, ότι πρέπει να δοθεί ένα τέλος στις δικαστικές περιπέτειες του κυρίου Γεωργίου. Κατά την άποψή μου, οι διαδρομές που τον ταλαιπωρούν είναι υπόγειες. Ο ίδιος τις έχει παρουσιάσει με τον δικό του τρόπο στην Επιτροπή Οικονομικών και Νομισματικών Υποθέσεων του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου.

Roberto Gualtieri, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Madam President, the independence and credibility of statistical authorities is a fundamental pillar of the EU and a prerequisite for a sound economy and a solid monetary union. We are proud of our statistics and we support Eurostat in its work in ensuring their growing quality and reliability.

We all know that falsification of statistics occurred in Greece and that the work subsequently undertaken by Mr Georgiou, when he headed the Hellenic Statistical Authority (ELSTAT), has been crucial in improving the situation and bringing the numbers to reality and credibility. We also know that since then, ELSTAT has been carrying out excellent work and the Greek Government has put in place all the necessary measures to ensure and safeguard its independence.

As the Eurostat assessment and approval of data collected as from 2010 show, ELSTAT has, since then, acted in an objective and reliable fashion, in compliance with its tasks and code of conduct, and with EU statistics rules.

Our message here is clear and simple. We respect the Greek judicial system and its autonomy. However, we regret the judiciary crusade against Mr Georgiou which, we know, was not been triggered by the current Government. We want to reiterate here our full support for him. We are very concerned about the potential consequences of such an affair, and the risk of undermining the independence and impartiality of all statisticians: because independence means not only not being subject to external interference but also being safeguarded against hostile surrounding factors that could prevent people from carrying out their tasks freely and impartially.

Νότης Μαριάς, *εξ ονόματος της ομάδας ECR*. – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, το ζήτημα της τεχνητής διόγκωσης του δημοσίου ελλείμματος του 2009 αποδείχθηκε καθοριστικό προκειμένου να μπορέσει η κυβέρνηση του Γιώργου Παπανδρέου να νομιμοποιήσει και να δρομολογήσει την ένταξη της Ελλάδας στο Διεθνές Νομισματικό Ταμείο και στα μνημόνια. Έτσι, ενώ η κυβέρνηση Καραμανλή, τον Σεπτέμβριο του 2009, είχε προσδιορίσει το δημόσιο έλλειμμα στο 6%, η κυβέρνηση Παπανδρέου, μετά την εκλογική νίκη του ΠΑΣΟΚ τον Οκτώβριο του 2009, το προσδιόρισε στο 12,7%. Ποιο ήταν το αποτέλεσμα; Να υπονομευθεί η δανειοληπτική θέση της χώρας. Να δρομολογηθεί κρίση δανεισμού και να οδηγηθεί η Ελλάδα στην «αγκαλιά» της τρόικας, η οποία επί οκτώ χρόνια φτωχοποίησε τον ελληνικό λαό, πετσόκοψε μισθούς και συντάξεις και εκτίναξε το χρέος από το 115% του ΑΕΠ στο 180%. Η απόδειξη της τεχνητής διόγκωσης του ελλείμματος εκθέτει και την ίδια την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, καθώς αποδεικνύει ότι επιβλήθηκε το μνημόνιο ενώ δεν ήταν αναγκαίο για την Ελλάδα. Άλλωστε, ο κύριος Dijsselbloem ομολόγησε ότι το μνημόνιο έσωσε τους δανειστές, έσωσε το ευρώ και όχι την Ελλάδα. Η υπόθεση Γεωργίου έχει απασχολήσει τα ελληνικά ποινικά δικαστήρια, ενώπιον των οποίων βρέθηκε κατηγορούμενος. Η ελληνική δικαιοσύνη είναι ανεξάρτητη και το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο δεν έχει καμία αρμοδιότητα ανάμειξης. Όλη αυτή η συζήτηση γίνεται με αποκλειστικό σκοπό τη διεθνοποίηση της νέας ποινικής υπόθεσης κατά του κυρίου Γεωργίου, μια και έχει ασκηθεί νέα ποινική δίωξη. Συνάδελφοι, αν θέλετε να βοηθήσετε τον κύριο Γεωργίου, να πάτε ως μάρτυρες υπεράσπισης στη δίκη του αντί να μιλάτε εδώ πολιτικά. Πηγαίνετε στα ποινικά δικαστήρια να τον υπερασπιστείτε ως μάρτυρες, όσοι νομίζετε ότι έχει δίκιο ο κύριος Γεωργίου.

Jean Arthuis, *au nom du groupe ALDE*. – Madame la Présidente, l'Union européenne s'honore de sa charte de valeurs fondamentales et c'est à ce titre que nous luttons contre les informations fallacieuses, que nous protégeons les lanceurs d'alerte et que nous respectons les principes de l'état de droit.

Toute communauté, dès lors qu'elle mobilise les deniers de ses membres, doit être vigilante sur la sincérité des comptes rendus et des informations statistiques. La confiance mutuelle se construit sur une exigence de vérité et de fiabilité. Andreas Georgiou, directeur général d'ELSTAT (l'Autorité grecque des statistiques macroéconomiques, budgétaires et financières) est poursuivi depuis 2011 parce qu'il a respecté les normes édictées par l'Union européenne en cette matière. Alors que deux décisions de la Cour suprême grecque ont prononcé un non-lieu en sa faveur, en septembre de cette année, une troisième procédure vient d'être lancée à son encontre à l'initiative du parquet général. J'observe que l'équipe ancienne, celle qui a maquillé les comptes publics, n'est l'objet d'aucune poursuite. En revanche, la vindicte se concentre sur Andreas Georgiou.

Je lance un appel au Conseil, Madame la Ministre, et à la Commission, Madame la Commissaire, ne soyez pas suspects de complicité d'un acharnement judiciaire caractérisé qui sape l'indispensable confiance au sein de l'Union économique et monétaire. Mettez fin à cette situation scandaleuse sur le plan humain, politique et européen. Si Guy Béart a chanté «Il a dit la vérité, il sera exécuté», telle n'est pas notre vision, telle n'est pas notre ligne de conduite, telle n'est pas notre exigence. C'est une question de confiance. Pour terminer, je voudrais dire à nos collègues grecs qu'il est indispensable de mettre un terme à cette situation scandaleuse.

(L'orateur accepte de répondre à une question «carton bleu» (article 162, paragraphe 8, du règlement))

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR), *ερώτηση με γαλάζια κάρτα*. – Κύριε συνάδελφε, υπάρχει η ανεξάρτητη ελληνική δικαιοσύνη. Εσείς είπατε ότι ξεκίνησε ήδη νέα ποινική δίωξη κατά του κυρίου Γεωργίου. Με όσα είπατε, φαίνεται ότι πιστεύετε στην αθωότητα του κυρίου Γεωργίου. Οπότε σας ερωτώ: θα πάτε στα ελληνικά δικαστήρια να καταθέσετε ως μάρτυρας υπεράσπισης του κυρίου Γεωργίου; Μόνον έτσι μπορείτε να τον βοηθήσετε. Μπορείτε να είστε μάρτυρας υπεράσπισης στη δίκη του. Θα πάτε; Διότι, πρακτικά, μόνον έτσι μπορείτε να βοηθήσετε. Διαφορετικά, όλη η πολιτική συζήτηση εδώ σημαίνει παρέμβαση στην ελληνική ποινική δικαιοσύνη.

Jean Arthuis (ALDE), *réponse «carton bleu»*. – Cher Marias, ne vous méprenez pas, nous sommes les uns et les autres, dans la diversité des pays que nous représentons, des formations politiques qui sont les nôtres. Nous sommes garants d'un pacte moral qui est fondé sur la confiance.

M. Georgiou a bénéficié de deux non-lieux de la Cour suprême. Alors, pourquoi cet acharnement manifesté par le parquet général, qui lance une troisième procédure à l'encontre de M. Georgiou? Je souhaiterais vraiment qu'en votre qualité d'élu grec, vous puissiez faire pression auprès de l'opinion publique et des autorités grecques pour mettre un terme à cette situation.

Nous construirons l'Europe sur un principe de confiance et non pas sur le maquillage des comptes publics.

Molly Scott Cato, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Madam President, in a world where the rule of law is under threat, we must protect the integrity and independence of public officials. In this context, there is deep concern about the charges lodged against Greece's top statistician, Mr Andreas Georgiou, who was responsible for re-calculating the country's economic statistics, in accordance with EU law, in 2010.

His case represents the trial of evidence-based policy-making and it is a test of the independence of state officials. Policy-makers, as well as the general public, require high-quality statistics in order to make informed decisions within our democracies. Any attempt to undermine independent experts should ring alarm bells. In this case, there is a suspicion that a legal process is being used as a tool to scapegoat statisticians for the impact of national economic policies.

The Commission should take steps to protect the independence and integrity of the work of statisticians and to ensure that they are not subject to political pressure. I would like to agree with Mr Gualtieri and also to express my support for Mr Georgiou.

Δημήτριος Παπαδημούλης, *εξ ονόματος της ομάδας GUE/NGL.* – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, για το έλλειμμα του 2009, κυρίες και κύριοι συνάδελφοι, που ήταν 15,1% και όχι 6% -όπως μας έλεγε με πλαστά στοιχεία και «μαγειρεμένες» στατιστικές η κυβέρνηση της Νέας Δημοκρατίας- φταίνε οι τότε κυβερνώντες και όχι ο κύριος Γεωργίου. Χαίρομαι, διότι το Συμβούλιο και η Επιτροπή, αλλά και η Eurostat, το Eurogroup και ο ESM, επιβεβαιώνουν ότι και σήμερα και όλα τα τελευταία χρόνια, από το 2010 και μετά, οι ελληνικές δημόσιες στατιστικές είναι απολύτως αξιόπιστες. Το βεβαίωσε, κύριε Ferber, και ο κύριος Radermacher όταν ήρθε και μας μίλησε στο Ευρωκοινοβούλιο, και η κυρία Kotzeva, και είπε ότι τα «μαγειρεμένα» στοιχεία και τα ελλείμματα ανήκουν στην περίοδο που κυβερνούσαν τη χώρα η Νέα Δημοκρατία και το ΠΑΣΟΚ. Γι' αυτόν ακριβώς τον λόγο, θα ήθελα να σας πω ότι σεβόμαστε απολύτως και εγγυόμαστε απολύτως την ανεξαρτησία τόσο της ΕΛΣΤΑΤ όσο και της ελληνικής δικαιοσύνης. Όσοι επιχειρούν σήμερα να εκμεταλλευτούν τις δικαστικές περιπέτειες που ταλαιπωρούν τον κύριο Γεωργίου για να πλήξουν τη χώρα μου, την Ελλάδα, το μόνο που επιτυγχάνουν είναι να υπενθυμίζουν τον δημοσιονομικό εκτροχιασμό και τα πλαστά στατιστικά στοιχεία, κυρία Πρόεδρε, …

(Η Πρόεδρος αφαιρεί τον λόγο από τον ομιλητή.)

Ελευθέριος Συναδινός (NI). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, η υπόθεση του Ανδρέα Γεωργίου της Ελληνικής Στατιστικής Υπηρεσίας δεν είναι απλά μια ποινική ή και πειθαρχική παράβαση καθήκοντος. Αφενός μεν, ο Γεωργίου φέρει βαρύτατες ηθικές ευθύνες τις οποίες κανένα δικαστήριο δεν είναι αρμόδιο να κρίνει, αφετέρου δε, όφειλε να προστατεύσει το Δημόσιο και τα ελληνικά συμφέροντα. Ωστόσο, επέλεξε να υπακούσει στα αφεντικά του, εντός και εκτός Ελλάδας. Τους έλληνες πολίτες δεν τους ενδιαφέρει ο ίδιος ως πρόσωπο, αλλά η θέση που υπηρέτησε και κυρίως το έργο και το αποτέλεσμα που παρήχθη. Το αποτέλεσμα ήταν η τεχνητή διόγκωση του ελλείμματος το 2009, που οδήγησε την Ελλάδα στη δίνη των μνημονίων, της φτωχοποίησης, του ξεπουλήματος και της μιζέριας. Πρέπει να γίνει κατανοητό πως μία ανεξάρτητη εθνική αρχή παραμένει εθνική και υπόλογη στο αντίστοιχο κράτος. Οι δε εργαζόμενοι των ανεξάρτητων αρχών συνεχίζουν να αποτελούν υπαλλήλους των εθνικών κρατών. Δεν βρίσκονται σε αποστολή εκτός έδρας και δεν είναι υπάλληλοι των δανειστών ή κάποιου ευρωπαϊκού θεσμού. Η πολιτική ευθύνη των ελληνικών κυβερνήσεων Νέας Δημοκρατίας, ΠΑΣΟΚ, ΣΥΡΙΖΑ και ΑΝΕΛ στο θέμα αυτό είναι υπαρκτή και αποτελεί εθνική προδοσία. Μια πατριωτική κυβέρνηση θα οδηγήσει τους πολιτικούς υπόλογους στο σκαμνί του κατηγορουμένου, διότι στο σάπιο πολιτικό σύστημα της Ελλάδος «κόρακας κοράκου μάτι δεν βγάζει».

Markus Ferber (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin! Was Andreas Georgiou vorgeworfen wird, würde in Deutschland vielleicht mit einer Rüge belegt werden, aber keinesfalls mit einer zweijährigen Haftstrafe. Die Urteile gegen Andreas Georgiou wurden mehrfach von Berufungsgerichten aufgehoben; jedes Mal hat die griechische Justiz, die Staatsanwaltschaft, neue Verfahren angestrengt.

Angesichts dessen drängt sich eine Frage förmlich auf: Warum war es dem griechischen Staat ein solches Anliegen, Andreas Georgiou zu verurteilen? Sein Verbrechen war nämlich nicht, dass er ohne Konsultation seiner Kollegen aus dem *Elstat Board* statistische Daten veröffentlicht hat – sein wahres Verbrechen war, dass Andreas Georgiou seine Arbeit gemacht hat, und dazu gehört es eben auch, dass unbequeme Wahrheiten ausgesprochen werden müssen.

Der eigentliche Skandal besteht darin, dass nicht diejenigen zur Rechenschaft gezogen werden, die dazu beigetragen haben, fehlerhafte statistische Daten zu melden. Nein, stattdessen wird derjenige belangt, der sich dafür eingesetzt hat, dass die Regeln eingehalten werden und dass nicht getrickst wird.

Mit dem Melden fehlerhafter Daten hat Griechenland die Integrität des europäischen statistischen Systems beschädigt. Der viel größere Schaden ist jedoch durch den Umgang mit Andreas Georgiou entstanden. Denn das europäische statistische System beruht auf der Grundvermutung, dass die gemeldeten Daten korrekt sind. Das wiederum setzt voraus, dass die Statistiker unbehelligt ihrer Arbeit nachgehen dürfen. Aus diesem Grund kann ich das Vorgehen nur verurteilen.

(Der Redner lehnt es ab, eine Frage von Herrn Papadimoulis und eine Frage von Herrn Chountis nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte" gemäß Artikel 162 Absatz 8 der Geschäftsordnung zu beantworten.)

Jakob von Weizsäcker (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin! Andreas Georgiou wird nun seit Jahren vor Gerichten dafür angeklagt, dass er in einer schwierigen Lage die Wahrheit gesagt hat. Er wurde im August 2010 Leiter des griechischen Amts für Statistik. Er hat dann endlich zutreffend die griechischen Defizitzahlen berechnen lassen. Davor waren die Statistiken fehlerhaft. All das bestätigt die europäische Statistikbehörde.

Ja, damit wurde er zum Überbringer schlechter Nachrichten in schwierigen Zeiten. Aber genau das war seine verdammte Pflicht als Staatsdiener und gemäß unseren europäischen Regeln. In Zeiten, in denen Misstrauen und Fake News Europa zu zerstören drohen, hat Herr Georgiou Vertrauen geschaffen.

Wenn man in anderen, weniger glücklichen Teilen der Welt unterwegs ist, merkt man, was für ein Segen es ist, dass unsere Beamtenschaft der Wahrheit verpflichtet ist, dass sie dem Staat dient und nicht einfach den Herrschenden. Meines Wissens ist auch diese große zivilisatorische Errungenschaft in Europa historisch in Griechenland entstanden. Dafür kann Europa dankbar sein, und Griechenland kann stolz darauf sein. Diese Errungenschaft müssen wir bewahren und unsere Staatsdiener schützen.

(Der Redner ist damit einverstanden, eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte" gemäß Artikel 162 Absatz 8 der Geschäftsordnung zu beantworten.)

Δημήτριος Παπαδημούλης (GUE/NGL), *ερώτηση με γαλάζια κάρτα.* – Ευχαριστώ συνάδελφε Weizsäcker, εσείς δεν φοβόσαστε τα ερωτήματα όπως ο κύριος Ferber. Σας ερωτώ λοιπόν: ποιο κόμμα ήταν αυτό που, το 2009, εμφάνισε τις «μαγειρεμένες» στατιστικές; Αν ο κύριος Γεωργίου είχε δίκιο υπολογίζοντας το έλλειμμα στο 15,1%, ποιος ήταν στην κυβέρνηση το 2009 και εμφάνισε εδώ πλαστά στατιστικά στοιχεία που έλεγαν 6%;

Jakob von Weizsäcker (S&D), *Antwort auf eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte".* – Hier geht es ja nicht um die Frage, wer wann Griechenland regiert hat. Ich glaube, alle hier im Raum wissen dies. Sondern hier geht es um die Frage, ob ein statistisches Amt seine Arbeit machen kann in der gebotenen Unabhängigkeit. Ich finde, Herr Kollege Papadimoulis, Sie haben dazu sehr kluge Worte gefunden und denen habe ich nichts hinzuzufügen.

Richard Sulík (ECR). – Pani predsedajúca, občas sa dozvieme z islamského sveta správu, že znásilnená žena je potrestaná za to, že sa nechala znásilniť. A my tu v Európe si povieme: „No takáto absurdnosť, to by sa tu jednoducho nemohlo stať!" No ale pozrime, čo sa deje. Úradník, šéf štatistického úradu, ide byť odsúdený za to – alebo bol odsúdený za to –, že povie pravdu. A my sa tu ešte s plnou vážnosťou ideme o tom baviť, či to naozaj smel alebo nesmel. A či teda on povedal, že to bude 15 % alebo 13 %. Grécko sa tak či tak dostalo do najťažších možných problémov nie kvôli tomuto pánovi Georgemusovi, ktorý povedal, ako sa veci majú, ale kvôli tým vládam, ktoré zadlžovali krajinu, ako keby neexistoval zajtrajšok. Chcem len pripomenúť, že dnes sa bavíme o tom, že Taliansko má v pláne spraviť 2,4 % deficit a kvôli tomu je úplne správne oheň na streche! A tu sa bavíme o tom, či to malo byť 9, 6, 13 alebo 15. Toto robí tú diskusiu tak strašne absurdnou.

PRESIDENZA DELL'ON. FABIO MASSIMO CASTALDO

Vicepresidente

Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE). – Mr President, Mr Georgiou is in exile in the US for telling the truth. He communicated the correct numbers of the Greek economy at that time and the Greek public deficit figures. He shed the light on the biggest lies that led the Greek state and the EU into one of the most severe financial crises since the end of the Second World War.

Even *The Economist*, two years ago, denounced the prosecution of Mr Georgiou as a violation of scientific freedom and human rights. Last October, the *Financial Times* reported that Mr Georgiou received an award for statistical integrity given by the world's leading statistical societies.

Lastly, the think-tank Bruegel said last June: 'the European Union must defend Andreas Georgiou. The European Union also needs to reform its statistical framework to ensure a similar scandal cannot happen again.'

What is at stake is the credibility of our European Union above the credibility of the Greek authorities. This is a very dangerous precedent. It is crucial that the statistical basis for our economic decision-making remains reliable and independent from political interference. What is at stake is the reliability and independence of the statistics office and authorities all across Europe.

(The speaker agreed to take a blue-card question under Rule 162(8))

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR), *ερώτηση με γαλάζια κάρτα.* – Κύριε Tremosa, θέλω ειλικρινά να σας διαφωτίσω για τα πραγματικά περιστατικά. Η κυβέρνηση της Νέας Δημοκρατίας, τον Σεπτέμβριο του 2009, έλεγε ότι το έλλειμμα είναι 6%. Το ΠΑΣΟΚ κέρδισε τις εκλογές στις 4 Οκτωβρίου 2009. Στις 19 Οκτωβρίου του 2009, ο υπουργός Οικονομικών, κύριος Παπακωνσταντίνου, πήγε στο Eurogroup και είπε ότι το έλλειμμα είναι 12,7%. Και σας ερωτώ: θεωρείτε ότι είναι σοβαρή ενέργεια, μέσα σε δέκα ημέρες ένας νέος υπουργός Οικονομικών να έχει τα στοιχεία και να ανεβάζει το έλλειμμα στο ποσοστό αυτό; Αυτό είναι το βασικό ερώτημα. Ο κύριος Γεωργίου διορίστηκε τον Αύγουστο του 2010, εγώ σας ερωτώ για το 2009. Είναι δυνατόν μέσα σε δέκα ημέρες η κυβέρνηση να αλλάζει το ποσοστό χωρίς να έχει και την άποψη της ΕΛΣΤΑΤ; Προσέξτε το! Αυτά είναι τα πραγματικά περιστατικά.

Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE), *blue-card answer.* – Very briefly, I am not an expert in the details of Greek politics, but I do not think that Mr Georgiou is guilty of causing the Greek crisis. A lot of things were done badly over many years, and the right way to proceed is not to prosecute civil servants who try to tell the truth. A precedent is being set for all EU Member States, so this is why we need to take action.

Νικόλαος Χουντής (GUE/NGL). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, αγαπητοί συνάδελφοι, ο ελληνικός λαός έχει πληρώσει ακριβά την παραποίηση -και από τις ελληνικές αρχές και από τη Eurostat- των στατιστικών στοιχείων της ελληνικής οικονομίας. Αυτά τα παραποιημένα στατιστικά στοιχεία αξιοποιήθηκαν από την Επιτροπή. Κυρία Επίτροπε, έχω πληθώρα ερωτημάτων εκείνης της περιόδου, όπου ουσιαστικά οι Επίτροποι το παραδέχονται. Τα πολιτικά παιχνίδια που παίχτηκαν με τα στατιστικά στοιχεία προλείαναν το έδαφος για την επιβολή των πολιτικών κοινωνικής υποβάθμισης από την τρόικα. Ο πρόεδρος της ΕΛΣΤΑΤ το 2010, ο κύριος Γεωργίου, κατά παράβαση της εθνικής νομοθεσίας και του υφιστάμενου ευρωπαϊκού πλαισίου εθνικών λογαριασμών, προσέθεσε συγκεκριμένα -κύριε Ferber, αυτό θα σας ρωτούσα- τους ισολογισμούς δεκαεφτά δημόσιων φορέων χωρίς τις απαραίτητες προϋποθέσεις, με συνέπεια να φουσκώσει ακόμα περισσότερο το έλλειμμα και να εφαρμοστούν σκληρότερες πολιτικές λιτότητας από τα μνημόνια. Έρχεται τώρα η τρόικα στα προαπαιτούμενα του τρίτου μνημονίου και επαναλαμβάνει την απαίτηση να παρέμβει η ελληνική δικαιοσύνη, να παρέμβει η ελληνική κυβέρνηση και να αθωώσει τον κύριο Γεωργίου, όπως κάνουν και σε άλλες περιπτώσεις ανθρώπων τους -όπως είναι οι άνθρωποι στο ΤΑΙΠΕΔ- που έβλαψαν αποδεδειγμένα το εθνικό συμφέρον. Ο ελληνικός λαός ζητάει να αντιμετωπιστεί αυτό το θέμα, αγαπητοί φίλοι, και να σταματήσει η μνημονιακή πολιτική και η εποπτεία με αυτά τα στοιχεία και αυτές τις πολιτικές.

(Ο ομιλητής δέχεται να απαντήσει σε ερώτηση με γαλάζια κάρτα (άρθρο 162 παράγραφος 8 του Κανονισμού))

Jakob von Weizsäcker (S&D), *Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“.* –Herr Kollege Chountis! Ich würde gerne von Ihnen wissen, warum Sie glauben, dass die Zahlen, die unter Herrn Georgiou ausgearbeitet wurden, fehlerhaft waren, wo doch das europäische Statistikamt bestätigt hat, dass die Arbeit zutreffend war. Das war Ihrer Rede nicht zu entnehmen. Ich würde gerne wissen, wo Sie das Problem sehen. Unsere europäischen Behörden sagen: Das war alles in Ordnung. Wie kommen Sie zu einem anderen Ergebnis?

Νικόλαος Χουντής (GUE/NGL), *απάντηση σε ερώτηση με γαλάζια κάρτα.* – Κύριε συνάδελφε, ήμουν ευρωβουλευτής στην προηγούμενη περίοδο, που συζητήθηκε κατά κόρον αυτό το θέμα στην Ολομέλεια του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου, και γενικώς το θέμα των στατιστικών στοιχείων και, εν τέλει, το θέμα της αξιοπιστίας της Eurostat. Αποδείχθηκε ότι η Eurostat δεχόταν παραποιημένα στοιχεία -για κάθε αξιοποίηση μπορώ να πω εγώ- και από άλλες χώρες, όχι μόνον από την Ελλάδα. Δεύτερον, ήταν διάχυτη η ανευθυνότητα της Επιτροπής όσον αφορά μια τέτοια κατάσταση. Σχετικά με το θέμα της Ελλάδας, η Eurostat κάλυψε εκ των υστέρων τον κύριο Γεωργίου. Θα ήθελα και εσάς να σας ρωτήσω: ξέρετε αν στη χώρα σας, στα στατιστικά στοιχεία όσον αφορά το έλλειμμα της γενικής κυβέρνησης μπαίνουν και οι ισολογισμοί των ΔΕΚΟ, και κάτω από ποιες προϋποθέσεις; Προϋποθέσεις τις οποίες δεν τήρησε ο κύριος Γεωργίου; Καταλάβατε ποιο είναι το πρόβλημα;

Ingeborg Gräßle (PPE). – Herr Präsident, Frau Kommissarin, Frau Ratspräsidentin! Ja, wir wissen das in Deutschland, Herr Kollege Chountis, dass die Statistiken, die wir melden, dass sie korrekt sind. Wenn sie nicht korrekt wären, dann würden wir eine Strafe verhängen, weil sie nicht korrekt sind, und nicht, weil sie jemand als korrekt gemeldet hat. Das ist hier doch eine absurde Verkehrung der Inhalte und eine absurde Verkehrung der Dinge.

Es haben sich bis jetzt mehrere griechische Regierungen an Herrn Georgiou vergangen – die jetzige Regierung mit besonderer Intensität, und das macht sie inzwischen zum Hauptverantwortlichen der Verfahren gegen Herrn Georgiou. Ich glaube, dass es außerordentlich bedauerlich ist, und wir haben Herrn Georgiou und den griechischen Regierungen das ja auch gesagt mit der *Financial Working Group for Greece*. Ich war selbst zweimal dort. Das geht nicht, dass solche Dinge in Griechenland gemacht werden. Ich wundere mich übrigens über diese Form der Ressourcenverschwendung. Und ich wundere mich auch, dass die griechische Justiz, die einen solchen Pakt *backlog* an Fällen hat, plötzlich diesen Fall so ernst nimmt, dass sie ihn gleich dreimal aufgreift und wieder verwirft.

Die griechische Regierung hat uns stets mit fadenscheinigen Argumenten hingehalten. Wir haben da mehrmals darauf gedrungen, dass dieses Verfahren beendet wird, weil es eine Frage von Glaubwürdigkeit ist.

Worum geht es eigentlich? Der Kollege Ferber hat die Frage gestellt. Ich kann Ihnen sagen, worum es geht. Es geht um den Versuch, ein Exempel zu statuieren, um anderen Beamten klare Signale zu senden: Meldet nichts nach Brüssel, bevor wir nicht das Häkchen daran gemacht haben. Die Chance zur Manipulation muss erhalten bleiben. Darum geht es in Wahrheit. Diese Lektion, die den griechischen Beamten erteilt wird, ist zu verwerfen und ist ausgesprochen schädlich.

Ich selbst mache hier Haushaltskontrolle. Mir hat mal ein griechischer Beamter berichtet, wie er seinen Bericht an die EU-Kommission schreibt. Er kommt am Sonntag ins Amt, schließt sich ein und macht erst dann die Tür auf, wenn der Bericht fertig ist. Das heißt: Sie haben doch ein elementares Interesse daran, dass Europa Ihnen Glaubwürdigkeit zugesteht. Arbeiten Sie an der Glaubwürdigkeit! Darum möchte ich Sie dringend bitten.

Herr Präsident! Ich scheue keinen Kampf. Aber den Unsinn, den die griechischen Kollegen hier uns erzählen, den möchte ich nicht mehr hören. Danke, nein.

(Die Rednerin lehnt es ab, eine Frage von Herrn Papadimoulis nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte" gemäß Artikel 162 Absatz 8 der Geschäftsordnung zu beantworten.)

Μιλτιάδης Κύρκος (S&D). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, το 2009 το δημοσιονομικό έλλειμμα στην Ελλάδα είχε ξεφύγει. Η συντηρητική κυβέρνηση δήλωνε ψευδώς έλλειμμα 6%, ενώ φτάσαμε στο 15% στο τέλος του χρόνου. Με την παρέμβαση της Επιτροπής, η Ελλάδα άλλαξε την ηγεσία της Στατιστικής Αρχής, ανέλαβε καθήκοντα ο κύριος Ανδρέας Γεωργίου και πολύ σύντομα η φράση «Greek statistics» έπαψε να σημαίνει λαθροχειρία. Το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο, τον Μάιο του 2014, αναγνώρισε ρητά τη λαθροχειρία αυτή στην έκθεσή του για την ελληνική κρίση. Οι υπεύθυνοι για την κατάρρευση της οικονομίας και τη συνειδητή παραπλάνηση των ευρωπαϊκών αρχών στέλνουν με τις καταγγελίες τους σε δίκη, για τρίτη φορά, τον λειτουργό που έκανε το καθήκον του. Μαζί τους και όσοι ισχυρίζονται ότι μια συνωμοσία σκοτεινών κύκλων έφερε την ελληνική κρίση και όχι η μικρή ανταγωνιστικότητα της οικονομίας μας, οι αθρόοι διορισμοί και η διαφθορά. Η ελληνική κυβέρνηση πρέπει αυτοβούλως να υπερασπιστεί τον Ανδρέα Γεωργίου, και για τον ίδιο αλλά και για να δώσει το μήνυμα ότι κανένας λειτουργός που κάνει σωστά τη δουλειά του δεν θα βρεθεί ανυπεράσπιστος.

Thierry Cornillet (ALDE). – Monsieur le Président, il s'agit aujourd'hui en fait d'une affaire de crédibilité, car il en va de la crédibilité du Conseil, de la Commission et de notre Parlement.

On ne peut pas affirmer ici des principes et des valeurs puis ne pas les défendre lorsque certains s'assoient dessus. Dans ce cas, c'est une affaire de crédibilité, parce qu'il s'agit d'un acharnement judiciaire dont les conséquences sont triples.

Nous sommes très attachés à l'indépendance de la justice, nous sommes tout aussi attachés à l'indépendance des autorités statistiques. C'est donc une triple conséquence pour M. Georgiou – mais aussi d'une certaine manière pour tous les fonctionnaires qui ont fait leur boulot – qui se trouve accusé depuis plusieurs années, alors qu'il a fait son travail en respectant les procédures européennes.

Pour le travail d'analyse des faits qui font que ces autorités statistiques peuvent produire des chiffres indépendants sur lesquels se basent les politiques publiques et pour la construction de règles communes qui nécessitent la confiance entre partenaires, il est important que notre Parlement, accompagné naturellement du Conseil, mette un terme à ce simulacre juridique qui, en fait, pose un problème pour la défense des institutions indépendantes, qui sont utiles pour les décideurs politiques, pour l'avenir de l'union économique et monétaire et, bien sûr, pour la personne de M. Georgiou, qui se trouve exilé de son pays à cause de cette affaire.

Σοφία Σακοράφα (GUE/NGL). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η περίπτωση της Ελλάδας ήταν μια τιμωρητική διαδικασία. Ένα μήνυμα του χρηματοπιστωτικού συστήματος ότι είναι παντοδύναμο και υπεράνω θεσμών και κάθε δημοκρατικού ελέγχου. Στην υπόθεση Γεωργίου, η ελληνική δικαιοσύνη προσπάθησε και προσπαθεί να αποκαλύψει την αλήθεια και να ανατρέψει την κατασκευασμένη ψευδή εικόνα για την Ελλάδα. Επειδή η υπόθεση αυτή δεν είχε την εξέλιξη που διακαώς επιθυμούσαν, οι κατ' επίφαση ευρωπαϊκοί δημοκρατικοί θεσμοί απαίτησαν την απαλλαγή του κυρίου Γεωργίου από κάθε κατηγορία, εν μέσω της δικαστικής διερεύνησης, παρεμβαίνοντας απροκάλυπτα στη λειτουργία της ελληνικής δικαιοσύνης. Και για να μην έχουν παρόμοια προβλήματα οι πρόθυμοι εκλεκτοί τους στο μέλλον, απαίτησαν και εξασφάλισαν το ποινικό και αστικό ακαταδίωκτο των μελών του νέου αποικιοκρατικού Ταμείου Αποκρατικοποιήσεων, ως βασική προϋπόθεση για την ολοκλήρωση της αξιολόγησης της χώρας, κάτι που αποδέχθηκε και η σημερινή κυβέρνηση. Κύριοι συνάδελφοι, αυτές οι πρακτικές μας προσβάλλουν ως εκπροσώπους των πολιτών και περιφρονούν τις αξίες της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης που εμείς εδώ υπερασπιζόμαστε. Ας μην απορούμε τελικά για το τι είναι αυτό που «ρίχνει νερό στον μύλο» της ακροδεξιάς.

Pervenche Berès (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, nous débattons ici de l'indépendance des autorités statistiques et je constate que le Conseil et la Commission ont tous les deux salué la qualité des statistiques, notamment en Grèce.

J'invite bien évidemment la Commission à vérifier qu'il en est de même dans chacun des États membres de l'Union européenne, car nous savons à quel point l'indépendance de l'autorité statistique est importante pour la crédibilité des politiques qui sont menées.

De la même manière, l'indépendance des statisticiens eux-mêmes doit être préservée.

De quoi parle-t-on ici? Parce qu'en réalité, chacun le sait, il y a derrière ce débat une volonté de mettre en cause ce qui se passe en Grèce autour de M. Andreas Georgiou.

Considère-t-on que l'Office grec des statistiques (ELSTAT) ne fonctionne pas bien? Manifestement, je crois que ce n'est pas le cas. Considère-t-on alors que le gouvernement grec devrait intervenir dans une affaire de justice? Je serais étonnée que cette assemblée veuille aller en ce sens, tant elle est attachée, me semble-t-il, aussi bien à l'indépendance des offices de statistiques qu'à la justice.

Or, je note qu'en juin dernier, le président Tsipras lui-même a dit qu'il reconnaissait la qualité des données statistiques fournies par M. Giorgio et qu'il était prêt à se rendre devant la Cour pour témoigner en sa faveur si nécessaire.

Au-delà de cela, si certains dans cet hémicycle considèrent que la procédure en cours en Grèce souffre de manquements, alors il faut se rendre non pas à un débat que l'on veut politiser ici, mais devant la Cour européenne des droits de l'homme.

Procedura «catch the eye»

Γεώργιος Επιτήδειος (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η αρπαγή των πλούσιων ενεργειακών αποθεμάτων, τα οποία βρίσκονται στο υπέδαφος και στον υποθαλάσσιο χώρο της ελληνικής επικράτειας, ήταν ανέκαθεν στόχος των οργάνων του διεθνούς κεφαλαίου και της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης. Παράλληλα, η Ελλάδα έπρεπε να θυσιαστεί για να διασωθεί το ευρώ και οι γερμανικές και οι γαλλικές τράπεζες. Για να συμβούν αυτά, έπρεπε να καταστραφεί η ελληνική οικονομία και ως όργανο χρησιμοποιήθηκε ο πρόεδρος της ΕΛΣΤΑΤ, ο κύριος Γεωργίου. Σύμφωνα με την καταγγελία δύο υφισταμένων του, διόγκωσε με ψευδή στοιχεία το έλλειμμα που υπήρχε στην Ελλάδα, με αποτέλεσμα η χώρα να τεθεί υπό καθεστώς μνημονίων, να καταστραφεί η οικονομία της, να λεηλατηθεί ο πλούτος της και να υποφέρει ο λαός της. Βεβαίως, παρενέβη η ελληνική δικαιοσύνη και ο κύριος Γεωργίου κατηγορήθηκε σε βαθμό κακουργήματος. Όμως, τη βλάβη για τα εθνικά συμφέροντα την είχε ήδη προκαλέσει. Αυτός είναι και ο λόγος που τον υπερασπίζεται με τόση θέρμη το κατεστημένο της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης.

Σωτήριος Ζαριανόπουλος (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, δεν θα μπούμε αναλυτικά στην υπόθεση Γεωργίου-ΕΛΣΤΑΤ. Είναι όμως προκλητικό. Χιλιάδες άνθρωποι που δεν έχουν να πληρώσουν φόρους και δάνεια καταδικάζονται στην Ελλάδα, αλλά καμία υπόθεσή τους δεν φέρατε εδώ, στον «Ναό της Ευρωπαϊκής Δημοκρατίας». Για τον κύριο Γεωργίου όμως συζητιέται φωτογραφική διάταξη απαλλαγής. Κόπτεστε για ανεξάρτητες αρχές, π.χ. Στατιστικές. Υποκρισία! Με οδηγίες σας τις «μαγειρεύετε» και τις κάνετε εργαλεία της αντιλαϊκής πολιτικής σας. Άραγε πόσο αντικειμενικό είναι ότι όποιος δουλεύει μισή ώρα την εβδομάδα δεν θεωρείται άνεργος; Κόπτεστε για ανεξάρτητη δικαιοσύνη. Ανέκδοτο! Όταν δεν σας αρέσουν οι αποφάσεις, ζητάτε νομοθετικές παρεμβάσεις. Απαιτήσατε, και σας το έδωσε και αυτό ο ΣΥΡΙΖΑ, μνημονιακούς νόμους για προκαταβολική και αναδρομική -για όσους διώχθηκαν- ποινική απαλλαγή των στελεχών του ΤΑΙΠΕΔ για μεταβιβάσεις δημόσιας περιουσίας δισεκατομμυρίων ευρώ σε ιδιώτες. Το ίδιο και για «κουρέματα» δανείων επιχειρηματικών μεγαθηρίων, ενώ κυνηγάτε με πλειστηριασμούς χιλιάδες λαϊκά σπίτια και απαγορεύετε απεργίες. Απλά δικαιώνετε το ΚΚΕ.

(Fine della procedura «catch the eye»)

Marianne Thyssen, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, we all agree on the importance of independent statistics for informed policy-making and sound decision-taking at both national and Union levels. Transparency and accountability are key notions in that regard, and therefore I again welcome the opportunity to appear before you.

For the Commission, it is essential that the independence of the statistical authorities, and of the people who perform their duties in line with their responsibilities, is protected. The Commission will therefore continue to monitor the application of fundamental statistical principles in all Member States, and I thank the House for its support on this.

The situation of Mr Georgiou is of concern to you as well as to the Commission. Let me repeat, once again, that we have full confidence in the reliability and the accuracy of data produced by the Hellenic Statistical Authority (ELSTAT) under his leadership. Concerning the comments made by Mr Chountis, I refer to the reply to question No 4404 from this year. In short, we stand by the correction made by Mr Georgiou in 2010. As I said before, we have also repeatedly voiced that concern via public statements or directly in contacts with the Greek authorities. Furthermore, a Commission official appeared as a witness before a Greek court and offered testimony in support of the implementation of EU law by the Greek statistical authority under Mr Georgiou's leadership. I am glad that some of you recognised that the independence of ELSTAT has been strengthened. Greek statistics law has been brought into line with EU law, notably Regulation 223 on European statistics, as well as the European Statistics Code of Practice, to ensure professional independence. These make it clear that the content and timing of statistical release is the sole responsibility of the heads of the statistical offices.

I also have to tell you that all governments have expressed their support for the European Statistics Code of Practice. On the basis of the code, Member States subject themselves to regular peer views and the results of the peer reviews are published and combined with action plans for improvements where necessary.

The Commission fully recognises and respects the independence of the judicial authorities in Greece. They should be allowed to perform their tasks without political considerations or pressure. In that respect, representatives of governments and public authorities at both national and EU levels have a duty to refrain from anticipating the outcome of judicial investigations or proceedings.

I count on your continued support, and also your attention, to safeguard the fundamental principles of high quality and trustworthiness in relation to statistics.

Karoline Edtstadler, *President-in-Office of the Council.* – Mr President, I would like to thank everyone very much for this discussion. It is a matter that definitely deserves our attention and I would like to fully second what Madam Commissioner said: the independence of statistical authorities is one of the pillars of the EU's economic governance.

On the other hand, please let me state, as a former judge, that the independence of the judicial system is also one of the cornerstones of the rule of law and democracy and, therefore, I can only assure you that we will closely follow the developments. However, I hope that we don't have to come back to such a situation again.

Presidente. – La discussione è chiusa.

25. Europäische Sicherheit und die Zukunft des INF-Vertrags (Aussprache)

Presidente. – L'ordine del giorno reca la discussione sulla dichiarazione del Vicepresidente della Commissione e Alto rappresentante dell'Unione per gli affari esteri e la politica di sicurezza sulla sicurezza europea e il futuro del trattato sulle forze nucleari a medio raggio (2018/2907(RSP)).

Karoline Edtstadler, *President-in-Office of the Council, on behalf of the High Representative / Vice-President of the Commission.* – Mr President, thank you for this opportunity to discuss a subject of tremendous importance for European and global security. The treaty on intermediate-range nuclear forces in Europe, in force since 1988, is among the key international agreements which marked the end of the Cold War. While neither the European Union nor any of the EU Member States are parties to the treaty, we do have a very high stake in its preservation and continued implementation.

Thanks to the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty, some 3000 missiles with nuclear and conventional warheads have been removed and verifiably destroyed. For those who have the experience and memory of the Cold War, this was a truly historical moment. The tools for waging nuclear war were not only removed from our continent but irreversibly dismantled and destroyed. This happened under the mutual supervision, in the form of one-side inspections.

So we are justified in declaring that the INF Treaty has not only contributed to the end of the Cold War, but it also constitutes one of the major pillars of European current security architecture. Calling it a Cold War-era agreement or a relic of the Cold War is a misinterpretation and a misunderstanding.

The INF Treaty is always an important contribution to disarmament obligations under Article 6 of the nuclear non-proliferation treaty. All EU Member States, whether or not they have nuclear weapons, both NATO members and non-NATO countries, all are state parties to the non-proliferation treaty. We are united in our support for the non-proliferation treaty as the cornerstone of the global nuclear non-proliferation regime.

The treaty has made a crucial contribution to international peace, security and stability over the past 50 years. Let me recall that all states party to the non-proliferation treaty are committed to pursuing the objective of achieving a world without nuclear weapons. We, as the European Union, stressed the need for concrete progress towards the full implementation of Article 6 of the non-proliferation treaty especially through an overall reduction in the global stockpile of nuclear weapons. The states that possess the largest nuclear arsenals – which are the Russian Federation and the United States –have a special responsibility on this.

The INF Treaty does not only cover nuclear-armed missiles. It is about an entire category of ballistic and cruise missiles, regardless of their warheads. In recent years, the development, test or use of ballistic missiles has been a destabilising factor in regional and international security. It creates an atmosphere of mistrust and suspicion and adds uncertainty in international relations – I am thinking, in particular, of the launches by North Korea, Iran and Syria.

The INF Treaty is also a model to be followed and, as such, it is today more relevant than ever before. The current disarmament and non-proliferation architecture needs to become more universal as a guarantee for all. We Europeans are working at all levels to promote the universalisation of existing agreements, such as The Hague Code of Conduct against ballistic missile proliferation. The Hague Code does not prohibit the possession of missiles but aims to prevent proliferation and increases transparency for the benefit of subscribers. Subscribing states exchange information including pre-launch notifications.

As of now, 139 countries have subscribed to The Hague Code. This is no small achievement as subscribers include the US and Russia, as well as all EU Member States. The EU has a long history of supporting the universalisation and effective implementation of The Hague Code, both diplomatically and financially, both the immediate contact point in the Austrian MFA and the rotating chairmanships benefit from EU-funded support programme. It is not by chance that very often it is EU Member States which hold the annual rotating chairmanships of The Hague Code, promoting its universalisation and chairing relevant meetings. Last year it was Poland, this year: Sweden.

But let me stress that politically binding confidence-building measures like The Hague Code are not a substitute for legally binding arms control and disarmament agreements like the INF Treaty. It is for this reason that, in our view, the United States and the Russian Federation needs to remain engaged in constructive dialogue to preserve to INF Treaty and ensure its full and verifiable implementation, which is crucial for European and global security.

We have asked the United States to consider the consequences of its possible withdrawal from the INF on its own security, and on our collective security and we expect the Russian Federation to address the serious concerns regarding its compliance with the INF Treaty.

The world doesn't need a new arms race. That would benefit no one. On the contrary, it would only bring even more instability.

Jeppe Kofod, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Mr President, I would like to thank the Minister for her clear statement. There is no doubt that what we have seen now is a real blow to the disarmament of nuclear weapons in the world. We all understand that Russia is not complying with the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty and there is real concern, but it's the wrong reaction from the US President to withdraw from such an important treaty. With the new START (Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty) expiring in 2021, we could, in the worst case, be left out of control of nuclear states with their nuclear arsenal and we could go back to a situation which I think we have to go back to 1972 to see. This is really detrimental.

We should – as the European Union, as Europeans – ask Trump to reconsider. We need to fight hard for disarmament and the control of nuclear weapons. I remember a time when the previous president, President Obama, gave a speech on a world without nuclear arms and I think we are now, unfortunately, on the wrong track. So let's react and let's react together as Europeans.

Anna Elżbieta Fotyga, *on behalf of the ECR Group*. – Mr President, the modernisation of the Russian army after a war in Georgia led to a massive violation of the INF Treaty. This was indicated by the US in 2014, in numerous cases by NATO, by myself in amendments to the Landsbergis report, and during a meeting of the Subcommittee on Security and Defence (SEDE) in January this year by renowned experts. Deterring Russia is a tricky task. We have to rely on the NATO viewpoint rather than support Russia in its actions by following the narrative.

Bodil Valero, *för Verts/ALE-gruppen*. – Herr talman! Det är ingenting som förvånar när det handlar om president Trump. Allt kan hända. För det allra mesta är det som han gör väldigt oroande. Inte minst är det oroande att han den 20 oktober i år sade upp avtalet mellan USA och Sovjetunionen om att avskaffa medel- och kortdistansrobotar. Frågan är då hur vi i EU och medlemsländerna ska ställa oss till det som kommer som ett brev på posten.

För det första vill vi gröna att fru Mogherini, ordförandeskapet och medlemsstaterna ska göra allt de kan för att få avtalet att fortsatt gälla. För det andra menar vi att det är uppenbart att det behövs ett nytt initiativ i syfte att nå total kärnvapennedrustning i Europa, och att det behövs en regional kärnvapenfri zon, precis som FN efterfrågar i sin resolution 3472 B från 1975. Så länge det inte finns ett nytt avtal på plats är det emellertid avgörande att vi står fast vid de olika nedrustningsavtal som redan finns.

Med amerikanska kärnvapen i Europa och ryska kärnvapen intill våra gränser, och när både britter och fransmän fortsätter att investera i sina kärnvapenarsenaler, är utsikterna små att få till ett EU-beslut att gemensamt ansluta oss till FN:s nya konvention om kärnvapenförbud. För det tredje borde vi således ansluta oss till konventionen.

Kärnvapen i Europa ger oss inte säkerhet. Tvärtom, det är inte svårt att föreställa sig att Europa återigen kan riskera att bli det stora slagfältet och att kärnvapenbestyckade medeldistansrobotar kan detonera på europeisk mark om något går fel. Därför kan och bör vi gå i täten för nedrustning, men det är också avgörande att övriga länder, inklusive Ryssland, USA och Kina, står bakom alla nedrustningsavtal, även bilaterala sådana.

Helmut Scholz, *im Namen der GUE/NGL-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident! Der INF ist ein Meilenstein in der Geschichte atomarer Abrüstung und internationaler Sicherheitspolitik. Er beförderte Vertrauensbildung zwischen den beiden Atomwaffensupermächten USA und Russland mit weitreichenden positiven Folgen, auch für unsere europäische Sicherheit und unsere gesellschaftlichen Entwicklungsprozesse. Er leistete nicht zuletzt auch einen wichtigen Beitrag hin zu einer notwendigen Denuklearisierung europäischer Sicherheitsstrukturen.

Dieser Trend hat sich in der kürzeren Vergangenheit bedauerlicherweise wieder ins Gegenteil verkehrt. Sowohl die USA als auch Russland modernisieren ihre Atomwaffensysteme. Und ja, das zunehmende Misstrauen beider Vertragsparteien in den letzten Monaten und Jahren, dessen Ausdruck auch die angekündigte Auflösung des INF-Vertrags ist, macht die Welt nicht sicherer. Es ist bedrohlich.

Entscheidend bleibt für uns als Europäisches Parlament, alle Anstrengungen zu unternehmen, um ein Festhalten am Vertrag von amerikanischer und russischer Seite zu ermöglichen. Alle EU-Mitgliedstaaten müssen ihrerseits in dieser Richtung politisch aktiv werden. Und vielleicht ist auch der INF-Vertrag ein Vorbild, ein international zu schaffendes Vertragswerk neuer bilateraler, regionaler oder multilateraler atomarer Abrüstungsabkommen auf die Tagesordnung der internationalen Sicherheits- und Friedenspolitik zu setzen.

Jean-Luc Schaffhauser, *au nom du groupe ENF*. – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, la dénonciation américaine du traité sur les euromissiles montre l'échec criant de la politique étrangère de l'Union européenne, fleuron du traité de Lisbonne. Dans ce traité, l'Union européenne s'est en effet couchée, on peut le dire, devant la politique de l'OTAN en se rendant constitutionnellement dépendante des décisions prises par d'autres.

Aujourd'hui, nous nous plaignons de l'unilatéralisme américain. Pourtant, depuis plus de dix ans, l'Union européenne poursuit une politique de montée des tensions avec la Russie, orchestrée par les États-Unis. En accueillant le bouclier antimissile, c'est-à-dire, en réalité, des sites de lanceurs de missiles. Les pays frontaliers ont bousculé l'équilibre militaire du continent. En embourbant l'Europe dans ses vieilles rancunes – animosité russo-polonaise, guerre en Ukraine sur les frontières de culture et de civilisation –, nous avons, avec le plein soutien du Service d'action extérieure, délibérément saboté toute politique de détente. Or, la détente était la condition nécessaire pour la signature du traité par Reagan et Gorbatchev en 1987.

Nous avons semé un vent de tensions nouvelles, je crains que nous récoltions à nouveau les risques d'une guerre.

Γεώργιος Επιτήδειος (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, πριν από λίγες ημέρες, ο πρόεδρος Trump ανακοίνωσε την απόφαση να αποχωρήσει η χώρα του από τη Συνθήκη των πυρηνικών δυνάμεων μέσου βεληνεκούς. Αυτή η Συνθήκη, που υπογράφηκε το 1987 από τον Gorbachev και τον Reagan, είναι πολύ σημαντική διότι έχει νομικά δεσμευτικό χαρακτήρα και στο πλαίσιο της εφαρμογής της έχουν καταστραφεί τρεις χιλιάδες πυρηνικά βλήματα. Με την αποχώρηση, όμως, των ΗΠΑ από τη Συνθήκη αυτή, όπως επίσης και από τη Συνθήκη για τα πυρηνικά του Ιράν, εντείνεται ο κίνδυνος να αυξηθούν οι εξοπλισμοί σε πυρηνικά όπλα από όλες τις πυρηνικές δυνάμεις. Οι ΗΠΑ έχουν τη δυνατότητα να ενισχύσουν το πυρηνικό τους οπλοστάσιο. Η Ρωσία θέλει να παραμείνει στη Συνθήκη, πλην όμως αισθάνεται ότι απειλείται. Και αν αποφασίσει να εντάξει τα πυρηνικά όπλα στον στρατηγικό της σχεδιασμό θα υπάρξουν δυσμενείς εξελίξεις. Θα επηρεαστούν όλες οι χώρες της Ευρώπης και κυρίως η Γερμανία.

Elmar Brok (PPE). – Herr Präsident, Frau Ratspräsidentin! Ich sehe hier die Umkehrung der Dinge. Ich war schon politisch aktiv im Jahr 1980. Zu dem Zeitpunkt gab es ausschließlich sowjetische Raketen, auf Europa gerichtet – ausschließlich. Das waren die SS-20. Dagegen gab es den NATO-Doppelbeschluss, der dazu geführt hat, dass damit die Sowjetunion gezwungen wurde, mit Gorbatschow 1987 den Deal zu machen, dass beide Seiten ihre Waffen abschaffen, bei uns nicht weiter aufgestellt wird und die SS-20 verschwinden. Das ist der INF-Vertrag.

Wir wissen aber jetzt seit einigen Jahren, dass Russland wieder diese Raketen moderner Art aufrichtet – Raketen, Mittelstreckenwaffen, die nicht die USA erreichen oder sonst jemanden, sondern die fast ausschließlich auf Europa gerichtet sind. Das heißt, wir haben eine Situation wie 1980, dass wir russische Mittelstreckenraketen mit Atomwaffen auf Europa gerichtet haben, aber dass aufseiten Europas und in Europa stationiert keine Gegenwaffen bestehen. Das heißt, wir sind bei 1980 angekommen, und die Russen haben den INF-Vertrag zerstört.

Dass das jetzt mal offenkundig wird – und ich bin nicht oft ein Trump-Fan – und dass dies mal deutlich gemacht wird, halte ich nicht für so falsch. Ich glaube, dass Russland aufgefordert ist, dies zu beenden, diese Raketen wieder abzuschaffen, damit der INF-Vertrag inhaltlich ausgefüllt ist.

Die amerikanischen Raketen in Rumänien sind keine Boden-Boden-Raketen, die Russland gefährden. Das sind Boden-Luft-Raketen, um Raketen abzuschießen, die auf Europa gerichtet sind, und die Stationierung von Raketen in Rumänien, war angedacht, um iranische Raketen abzuhalten.

Ich bin der Auffassung, dass wir die Russen einladen sollten, hier eine Inspizierung der Installationen in Rumänien durchzuführen um da Unsicherheiten zu beseitigen, dass das darauf ausgerichtet wäre, um russische Raketen, die auf Europa gerichtet sind, abzuschießen – nicht mal das wollen wir dabei! – und deswegen dies mit dem Deal gemacht werden muss, dass die Russen endlich ihre Raketen, die auf Europa gerichtet sind, beseitigen.

Ana Gomes (S&D). – Senhor Presidente, ao desligar a Rússia deste tratado, Trump pode, de facto, estar a fazer o perigoso jogo de Putin, porque o tratado reduziu, efetivamente, os riscos de escaladas militares, de erros de cálculo operacionais e ajudou a mudar a lógica MAD da Guerra Fria para a do diálogo entre a Rússia e os Estados Unidos.

Mesmo havendo incumprimento do tratado por parte de Moscovo e mesmo que Trump tenha também por objetivo renegociar com a Rússia, e até indiretamente vise a contenção da capacidade nuclear da China, os riscos de escalada e de catástrofe são tremendos, porque a Rússia de hoje pode sentir-se tentada a compensar a fraqueza em forças convencionais, recorrendo ao uso das suas capacidades nucleares e no meio está a Europa. É insano não ver que a nossa segurança e a segurança global estão em causa.

A União Europeia não pode ficar muda e queda. Tem de intervir de alguma maneira e tentar negociar com ambos para que, efetivamente, se assista a uma verdadeira redução destas forças nucleares de alcance intermédio na Rússia, mas também em todos os outros que as detêm.

Marek Jurek (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! Trudno mieć pretensje do Stanów Zjednoczonych, że nie chcą firmować łamanego systematycznie traktatu. Również trudno naprawdę zakładać, że najlepszym rodzajem presji na przestrzeganie zakazu pocisków średniego zasięgu będą prośby, deklaracje, apele. Jeżeli naprawdę chcemy równowagi sił, powinniśmy wyciągnąć z tej sprawy wnioski.

Wniosek pierwszy jest taki, że musimy umieć wywierać przekonującą presję, taką choćby jak wzmocnienie bezpieczeństwa państw bałtyckich albo strategiczne dążenie w rozmowach z Rosją do demilitaryzacji regionu Kaliningradu – tego największego zagrożenia dla Europy Środkowej. Naprawdę pamiętajmy, że prośby nie są najlepszym rodzajem polityki.

Τάκης Χατζηγεωργίου (GUE/NGL). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο συζητά ουσιαστικά για τον κίνδυνο πυρηνικού αφανισμού του ανθρώπινου πολιτισμού και βλέπω τους συναδέλφους εδώ, που κάποιοι υποστηρίζουν τη θέση της Ρωσίας και άλλοι τη θέση των ΗΠΑ. Τα μεγάλα γεγονότα, οι μεγάλες καταστροφές και οι μεγάλοι κίνδυνοι για την ανθρωπότητα έρχονται αθόρυβα, και είναι κρίμα που δεν ακούγονται ούτε από τους εκπροσώπους της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης. Σε ενδεχόμενη καταστροφή του πλανήτη, δεν θα έχει κανείς μετά την ευκαιρία να πει ότι «εγώ είχα δίκιο και το είχα προβλέψει και είχα πει ότι έφταιγε ο τάδε ή ο δείνα». Η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση -το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο- πρέπει να στείλει μήνυμα προς όλους για παγκόσμιο αφοπλισμό όσον αφορά τα πυρηνικά, για να μην αναφερθώ σε άλλα όπλα. Η απόσυρση του κυρίου Trump από τη συμφωνία και οποιαδήποτε συμπεριφορά της Ρωσίας, επίσης καταδικαστέα, πρέπει να μας δώσουν το έναυσμα ώστε όλοι μαζί να στείλουμε το μήνυμα, ως Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, ότι πρέπει να καταστρέψουμε όλα τα πυρηνικά όπλα που έχουμε στη διάθεσή μας και που μπορούν να αφανίσουν τον πλανήτη χιλιάδες φορές.

Mario Borghezio (ENF). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, perplessità suscitate un po' in tutto il mondo dalla decisione di Trump che gli USA intendono uscire dal trattato INF che vieta di schierare in Europa missili balistici terrestri a medio raggio, stipulato nel 1987 da Reagan e Gorbaciov.

Trump accusa in sostanza i russi di non rispettare l'accordo a causa di due battaglioni di missili da crociera Nuova Tor, con un raggio d'azione di 1 500 chilometri, basati sui confini occidentali della Russia. Mosca nega, ma Obama già nel 2014 aveva minacciato di uscire dal trattato a causa dei test sui missili R500 lamentando anche lo schieramento nell'enclave russa di Kaliningrad dei missili balistici Iskander. Le due installazioni di Mosca costituiscono però la risposta all'avvio della costruzione dello scudo antimissile che gli USA hanno schierato in Polonia e Repubblica Ceca, dotato di radar e missili avanzatissimi, ufficialmente per intercettare eventuali missili balistici lanciati dall'Iran.

La decisione di abbandonare il trattato INF annunciata da Trump sembra nascondere motivazioni anche diverse. Per Washington denunciare il trattato significa soprattutto premere per nuovi negoziati con Mosca, da allargare però anche a Pechino, vera potenza strategica emergente. La denuncia del trattato scatenerebbe una nuova corsa al riarmo atomico e balistico simile a quella voluta da Reagan, costringendo Russia e Cina a fare altrettanto per minare le loro economie, costringendole a investire nella difesa più di quanto potrebbero e vorrebbero.

Ci sono poi aspetti non strettamente militari che Trump sembra voler perseguire. La Casa Bianca pare spingere per un'escalation della tensione con la Russia per compattare un'Europa sempre più lontana, rilanciando la protezione offerta dall'ombrello atomico missilistico americano. Ma per l'Europa è veramente tranquillizzante lo sconvolgimento dell'equilibrio militare nel suo territorio?

(Il Presidente interrompe l'oratore)

Σωτήριος Ζαριανόπουλος (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η απόφαση Trump να αποχωρήσει από τη Συνθήκη ελέγχου των πυρηνικών όπλων αποδεικνύει πόσο επικίνδυνα κλιμακώνονται οι ανταγωνισμοί ανάμεσα στα ιμπεριαλιστικά κέντρα. Δεν πρόκειται για κάποια αψυχολόγητη ενέργεια του Trump, αλλά για αντανάκλαση του νατοϊκού δόγματος για το «πρώτο πυρηνικό πλήγμα» και της πρόσφατης συνόδου για την αναβάθμιση της πυρηνικής στρατηγικής του. Από την άλλη, η Ρωσία απαντά ότι θα αναγκαστεί να στοχοποιήσει με ανταποδοτικά πλήγματα όσες χώρες φιλοξενούν πυρηνικά. Αποδεικνύεται μέχρι πού είναι αποφασισμένος –ακόμα και στον πόλεμο– να φτάσει κάθε ιμπεριαλιστής για τα συμφέροντά του. Αποδεικνύεται πόσο επικίνδυνη είναι για τον λαό η απόφαση της κυβέρνησης ΣΥΡΙΖΑ-ΑΝΕΛ και του κυρίου Τσίπρα, του φίλου του «διαβολικά καλού» Trump όπως τον αποκαλεί, να μετατρέψει όλη την Ελλάδα σε απέραντη αμερικανο-νατοϊκή βάση και να μεταφέρει στο έδαφός της ειδικά όπλα, ακόμα και πυρηνικά, όπως στον Άραξο. Η ειρήνη και η ζωή των λαών κινδυνεύουν άμεσα για τα συμφέροντα των μεγάλων δυνάμεων. Ο αγώνας τους ενάντια στο ΝΑΤΟ και την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση είναι όρος για την επιβίωσή τους.

Othmar Karas (PPE). – Frau Ratspräsidentin, Herr Präsident, meine sehr geehrten Damen und Herren! Am 20. Oktober hat Präsident Trump den Ausstieg der USA aus dem INF-Vertrag angekündigt.

Diese Ankündigung kommt nicht aus heiterem Himmel. Die Vereinigten Staaten von Amerika haben bereits seit der Ära Obama 30 Mal ihre Vorbehalte gegen Verstöße Russlands zum INF-Vertrag vorgebracht. Die Reaktion Russlands: Der Bau russischer Marschflugkörper, die genau in diesem INF-Vertrag verboten sind.

Das beabsichtigte Treffen zwischen Trump und Putin hat seitdem nicht stattgefunden. Ein mögliches Ende des Abkommens könnte die geltende internationale nukleare Ordnung auf den Kopf stellen und ein atomares Wettrüsten riskieren. Das ist die Realität.

Wir erkennen in diesen Tagen, dass immer öfter politische Entscheidungen gegen internationales Recht, politische Entscheidungen gegen europäisches Recht, politische Entscheidungen gegen den Aufbau von Vertrauen getätigt werden. Es muss daher diesem Parlament ein Anliegen sein, dass wir alle auffordern, dass sie zurückkehren auf den Boden der internationalen Vereinbarungen, auf den Boden des Dialogs, auf den Boden der Einhaltung des europäischen und des internationalen Rechts.

Die Gedenkfeiern, die wir auch alle in unseren Mitgliedstaaten erleben – Ende des Ersten Weltkriegs, achtzig Jahre Einmarsch Hitlerdeutschlands in Österreich –, zeigen uns doch deutlich, dass wir auch heute noch daran appellieren müssen, die Lehren aus der Geschichte zu ziehen. Sie zeigen uns deutlich, dass wir es ernst nehmen müssen, mit dem europäischen Handeln, mit dem internationalen Dialog, mit dem Multilateralismus, damit wir den nationalen Egoismus und die Expansionspolitik überwinden.

Und die Frau Bundeskanzlerin Merkel hat gestern daran appelliert, dass wir uns mehr um unsere eigene Sicherheit kümmern, damit wir nicht zwischen den Trumps und den Putins dieser Welt zerrieben werden und unser Kontinent im schlimmsten Fall wieder zum atomaren Spielfeld der Eitelkeiten und der Unvernunft wird.

Daher bitte ich auch die Ratspräsidentschaft mitzuhelfen, dass die Mitgliedstaaten die Vorschläge der Kommission, die Einstimmigkeit in der Außen-, Sicherheits- und Verteidigungspolitik zu reduzieren, die europäische Verantwortung zu stärken und das gemeinsame Handlen und die Handlungsfähigkeit zu erhöhen, unterstützen. Die Alarmsignale leuchten. Wir dürfen nicht zur Tagesordnung übergehen.

Brando Benifei (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, il mondo da una parte sembra proseguire il cammino verso il disarmo e la non proliferazione dopo la storica approvazione del Trattato sulla messa al bando delle armi nucleari, votato da 122 paesi e in via di ratifica, trattato che peraltro questo Parlamento ha sostenuto formalmente con una risoluzione del 2016. Prende sempre più piede l'approccio umanitario alle armi nucleari, le cui conseguenze anche per chi le detiene possono essere davvero terribili.

Gli USA e la Russia invece ci riportano agli anni della Guerra fredda e della deterrenza strategica. La decisione da parte del Presidente Trump di ritirarsi dal Trattato sui missili a medio raggio, dopo anni di sospette violazioni da parte di Mosca, rischia di mettere a repentaglio l'azione diplomatica portata avanti invece con il multilateralismo, oltre a costituire un pericolo concreto per la sicurezza europea.

Mosca e Washington pensino alle conseguenze del fallimento di un trattato cruciale per la vera sicurezza del mondo. L'Europa non può non intervenire in ogni modo possibile per scongiurare questa deriva davvero pericolosa.

Neena Gill (S&D). – Mr President, as Europeans we stand to lose most from the collapse of the INF Treaty, given that we are within range of Russian missiles. For Trump, it isn't about pressurising Russia into compliance, it is about strategic competition with China and strengthening US military capabilities in the Pacific. That means the European security architecture is no longer, by definition, the US's principal security interest.

My questions were going to be for the External Action Service, but unfortunately there's no representative here from them or the Commission. So I'm going to ask the Austrian Presidency this. Do you think we can still rescue the INF Treaty and, if not, what is the back-up plan for keeping nuclear missiles out of Europe? Secondly, are there any plans for a larger arms control framework that includes China and other states? Finally, how can the EU revive disarmament in the context of deep scepticism about arms control in China and in the US?

Agustín Díaz de Mera García Consuegra (PPE). – Señor presidente, señora, el anuncio del presidente Trump sobre una posible ruptura del Tratado de Fuerzas Nucleares de Alcance Intermedio (INF) merma considerablemente la seguridad euroatlántica, pues es uno de los pilares de la OTAN. El INF prohíbe la fabricación de misiles de medio alcance lanzados desde tierra, los cuales pueden llegar a objetivos que se encuentran entre 500 y 5 500 kilómetros. Tanto el anuncio de Trump como el supuesto incumplimiento por parte de Rusia, desarrollando el misil Novator 9M729, suponen un deterioro del régimen de control de armas en el espacio euroatlántico que durante décadas ha propiciado la paz y la estabilidad.

En los últimos años, la Unión, a través de las diferentes estrategias de seguridad presentadas, así como de su liderazgo en las negociaciones e implementación del acuerdo nuclear con Irán, ha mostrado su capacidad para ser un actor internacional de referencia en políticas de desarme y no proliferación. Las tensiones entre Estados Unidos y Rusia en el ámbito del INF pueden devolvernos al pasado, cuando la carrera armamentística era una constante fuente de peligros y tensiones internacionales.

Citando a Gorbachov, «todo acuerdo para el desarme nuclear debe mantenerse para salvar la vida de la Tierra». Es necesario que la Unión siga impulsando las políticas de no proliferación y se haga un sitio como actor de referencia. Si los Estados Unidos y Rusia quieren ejercer la irresponsabilidad, la Unión tiene que saber actuar en la escena internacional para evitar la guerra fría, o no tan fría.

Eric Andrieu (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Ministre, *welcome back to the eighties!*, l'époque des téléphones à cadran, des radiocassettes, des répondeurs téléphoniques et du Minitel, nous y revoilà. Avec l'annonce de Donald Trump de vouloir mettre un terme à l'accord entre Washington et Moscou sur la non-prolifération des armes nucléaires, nous revoici trente ans en arrière. C'est un acte grave.

Je veux ici rappeler l'importance du traité FNI (forces nucléaires à portée intermédiaire) – cela a été dit –, en particulier pour la sécurité de nos concitoyens, mais aussi pour la stabilité stratégique du continent européen. Si un tel retrait a lieu, il remettra en cause l'équilibre fragile né des décombres de la guerre froide et aura des conséquences catastrophiques pour la préservation de la paix dans le monde.

Monsieur le Président, Madame la Ministre, on nage en plein mauvais feuilleton, en plein *Dallas*. Il est temps que l'Europe retrouve son rôle d'équilibre au sein du concert des nations et sorte la planète de ce mauvais pas. D'où ma simple question: quelle est l'action concrète que compte mener l'Union afin de préserver le dialogue entre les États-Unis et la Russie et d'éviter le démantèlement de ce traité?

Procedura «catch the eye»

Julie Ward (S&D). – Mr President, President Trump's decision to withdraw from the Intermediate-range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty has been widely criticised, for good reason. Former military officials described the treaty as a bedrock of arms control. The 1987 treaty eliminated thousands of deadly medium-range missiles in Europe, helping to end the Cold War. Scrapping the treaty will undermine international security, could prompt a new arms race and certainly increases the risks of a nuclear war.

I speak as a lifelong peace campaigner. The INF Treaty occupies a special place in peace history – in our history. It was prompted by the huge nuclear disarmament movements that swept across Europe and the USA in the 1980s. In some respects, the peace movement owns this treaty, and we must do what we can to ensure it is not taken away.

Let's also remember that in this House, on 27 October 2016, we voted – by a large majority – to support the UN process to make nuclear weapons illegal. We subsequently honoured the international campaign to abolish nuclear weapons, which won the 2017 Nobel Peace Prize.

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, την ώρα που η υφήλιος έχει γεμίσει φτωχούς ανέργους και την ώρα που παράγεται τεράστιος πλούτος αλλά, φυσικά, δεν κατανέμεται δίκαια, έχουμε την ένταση των διεθνών ανταγωνισμών. Οι Ηνωμένες Πολιτείες της Αμερικής, η Κίνα και η Ρωσία ανταγωνίζονται στον πλανήτη. Είναι πλέον «λογικό» αυτό που συμβαίνει, δηλαδή το ότι δεν θα δεσμεύονται πλέον από οποιεσδήποτε δήθεν συμφωνίες τους για τα πυρηνικά. Ο κύριος Trump αποχώρησε από τη Συνθήκη για τις πυρηνικές δυνάμεις μέσου βεληνεκούς, οι Κινέζοι ενισχύουν τους εξοπλισμούς τους και το ίδιο κάνει και η Ρωσία. Δυστυχώς, ο πλανήτης βρίσκεται στο έλεος του ανταγωνισμού αυτών των δυνάμεων. Πιστεύω ότι πρέπει να ξεκινήσει ένα τεράστιο κίνημα για τον παγκόσμιο αφοπλισμό. Αυτός πρέπει να είναι ο στόχος μας: απαγόρευση των πυρηνικών σε όλη την υφήλιο. Μόνον έτσι μπορούμε να απαντήσουμε και, φυσικά, οι πολίτες πρέπει να κινητοποιηθούν και πρέπει να αγωνιστούν.

Molly Scott Cato (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, my first child was born in 1987, and having grown up under the shadow of the mushroom cloud, I can remember the relief I felt at the disarmament process led by Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan.

The Treaty on Intermediate-range Nuclear Forces (INF) in Europe that Trump is sabotaging dates from that era. It was a step on the path away from the Cold War and led to the destruction of 3000 missiles. Trump's reckless actions could launch the world into a new, deadly arms race. This time, it would not be just between two superpowers, but open to any immoral regime that could find the cash to join in.

How can the European nuclear states argue that countries like Korea and Pakistan should not have the very nuclear weapons that they claim is so vital to their own security? As the actions of the authoritarians polarise the foreign policy debate, Britain and France should show leadership by unilaterally dismantling their nuclear weapons and signing up to the International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons (ICAN) Treaty on the prohibition of such weapons, becoming the first UN Security Council members to do so.

Indrek Tarand (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, as a veteran of the Cold War and a sergeant major of the Soviet army, I am obliged to remind colleagues that Russian weapons – nuclear in particular – are a bluff. Remember submarine Kursk and aircraft carrier Admiral Kuznetsov.

But of course we face the problem that one of the security mechanisms of a nuclear conflict has disappeared, and we need to react. The correct reaction has been proposed by President Macron and Chancellor Merkel. Let's create a proper and capable European defence force. That would be enough of a deterrent, and Russian nuclear disarmament, together with that of the United States, would follow consequently.

Kateřina Konečná (GUE/NGL). – Pane předsedající, mnoho akademiků dnes mluví o tom, že jsme v takzvané době postfaktické. Tedy v době, kdy je možné říkat téměř vše a přitom to nijak nedokládat fakty.

Myslím, že Donald Trump je krásným příkladem tohoto jevu. Nejenom, že mám často dojem, že se mně vyloženě zdá, ale teď jde primárně o to, co dělá a co říká. V říjnu oznámil, že Spojené státy americké odstoupí od smlouvy s Ruskem o likvidaci raket středního a krátkého doletu, jelikož ji Moskva prý porušuje. Prezentací důkazů či voláním po vyšetřování se Trump nezatěžuje a rovnou vyhrožuje. Říká se, že cesta do pekel je dlážděna dobrými úmysly. Velmi často je však dlážděna činy egoistických politických amatérů, kteří přeceňují svoji roli na mezinárodním poli.

Nikdo nesmí ohrožovat mír a mezinárodní dohody. S mírem se nehazarduje, o mír se pečuje. A to je signál, který my jako Evropská unie musíme vyslat.

(Fine della procedura «catch the eye»)

Karoline Edtstadler, *President-in-Office of the Council, on behalf of the High Representative / Vice-President of the Commission.* – Mr President, thank you for this important exchange. I think it has highlighted the importance of the preservation of the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty for European and global security, as well as our common preoccupation with the increased threats to our security. Disarmament, arms control and non-proliferation treaties and agreements like the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and INF constitute our first line of defence. Dismantling such multilateral security arrangements and institutions is in nobody's interest.

Because I was asked very explicitly, I would also like to answer the question as to whether I believe we can rescue the INF. Yes, of course, I do believe that. We mustn't give up on that, and must put all our efforts into the rescue of the INF. I also believe that debates like the one today in the European Parliament remind people, including decision makers in Moscow and Washington, of the value of the INF Treaty for European and global security and the stake that we in Europe have in this treaty's future.

By the way, the INF is only one contribution to Article 6 of the NPT, so a lot more has to be done in the future.

Allegations that the Russian Federation has begun producing and developing new missiles which could be aimed at EU countries, and which are not in compliance with Russia's treaty obligations, deserve to be treated seriously and need to be resolved. This should happen through a responsible dialogue, including at the highest level. The stakes are simply too high.

Presidente. – La discussione è chiusa.

Dichiarazioni scritte (articolo 162)

— Il trattato INF sui missili nucleari di medio raggio è indubbiamente una delle migliori eredità ricevute dalla Guerra fredda. Stracciarlo rappresenterebbe un enorme rischio per la sicurezza dell'Europa, dei suoi cittadini e del mondo intero. Tuttavia, dopo anni di accuse reciproche tra Washington e Mosca, la rottamazione da parte del primo del trattato INF sembra un rischio sempre più concreto dalle conseguenze imprevedibili e pericolose. Innanzitutto il possibile abbandono del trattato da parte dell'amministrazione americana comprometterebbe ulteriormente le relazioni tra USA e Russia, aumentando il clima da guerra fredda non solo tra queste due potenze ma anche con la Cina. Quest'ultima, non essendo vincolata dal trattato INF, ha potuto sviluppare un arsenale di missili altrimenti non consentito e ha continuato a fare il bello e il cattivo tempo nei Mari Cinesi. Infine, il ritiro unilaterale americano dall'INF metterebbe a repentaglio tutto il regime di non-proliferazione. In questo contesto l'UE sarebbe la prima a pagarne il caro prezzo, trasformandosi nel teatro di una spietata e pericolosa corsa agli armamenti. Ora più che mai l'UE deve mettere in atto tutti gli strumenti diplomatici necessari a favorire un accordo multilaterale e inclusivo per il controllo degli armamenti.

Eugen Freund (S&D), *in writing*. – The last thing we need is a new transatlantic arms race. The announcement by President Trump to withdraw from the Intermediate-range Nuclear Forces Treaty (INF Treaty) is a threat to European and global security and peace. The United States' retreat from multilateralism, international norms and rules, as well as international treaties, should at least serve as motivation for us Europeans to foster a strong, self-assured common European foreign policy.

Rather than quitting the Treaty, the United States should try to make Russia conform to its rules, as well as consider bringing other powers into the Treaty. Yes, we have to adapt to a changing international world order and should not only rely on instruments of the Cold War era. Instead of simply abolishing these instruments, we should expand and advance them to do justice to this changed strategic order and bring them into the 21st century. That is why it is important to have a strong actor like the EU, which is committed to multilateralism, a rules-based international order and the commitment to international treaties. However, for that we need a more effective, more unified and more credible European foreign policy.

26. Reaktion der USA auf die Karawane mittelamerikanischer Migranten an der mexikanischen Grenze (Aussprache)

Presidente. – L'ordine del giorno reca la discussione sulla dichiarazione del Vicepresidente della Commissione e Alto rappresentante dell'Unione per gli affari esteri e la politica di sicurezza sulla risposta alla carovana di migranti dall'America centrale al confine con il Messico (2018/2920(RSP)).

Věra Jourová, *Member of the Commission, on behalf of the Vice-President of the Commission / High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy*. – Mr President, the ongoing caravans of migrants walking across Central America and Mexico turned public attention towards a silent exodus that has been ongoing for years. Every country in the world has every right to protect its borders and every country in the world has the obligation to do so in full respect of human rights and the principle of non-refoulement, as well as the norms on international protection. This applies to Europe and its Member States as it applies to everyone else, including the United States.

But beyond looking at the consequences, let me take this opportunity also to also look at the symptoms. Every day, hundreds of people from Honduras, Guatemala and El Salvador begin the journey to the United States. Today migrants are more visible as part of caravans walking in broad daylight, accompanied by NGOs and TV crews. They are all fleeing poverty and hunger, but fear seems to be the main driver of these migrations.

The Northern Triangle countries are among the poorest in Latin America with one third, or even half, of the population living on less than EUR 5 a day. Half of the unemployed are young people so it is hardly surprising that many of them decide to leave their country and look for a better future. Natural disasters have also been a strong driver for migration from the region. Today they are aggravated by the dire effects of climate change, in particular droughts and floods. All these factors combine and today the migrants are also fleeing death, violence and extortion. Between 2010 and 2017, over 100 000 homicides were recorded in the Northern Triangle. It is probably no coincidence that the first of these recent caravans started in San Pedro Sula, which is one of the most violent cities in the world.

The European Union has been supporting countries in the region in a twofold approach, providing immediate relief and tackling the root causes. In terms of humanitarian assistance, the Commission is implementing a program of EUR 2.5 million to address the needs of people affected by violence in the Northern Triangle. Concerning the caravan, the Commission is currently looking into possibilities to respond to humanitarian needs, in particular regarding the protection of vulnerable children and women against trafficking.

In Honduras we are investing about EUR 200 million in decent employment and food security, as well as strengthening the rule of law and access to justice. In Guatemala support amounting to over EUR 150 million is focused on food security, competitiveness security, security and human rights. In El Salvador we are investing about EUR 150 million. We support the national strategy to fight violence with a focus on prevention, including support to community organisations on the return of young people to the education system and on the construction of safe public spaces. The EU also funds social programmes such as 'Ciudad Mujer' an innovative approach to provide women with psychological and legal support and training for entrepreneurship.

Efforts to address security challenges at national level go hand in hand with reinforced regional cooperation against transnational crime and drug trafficking. Regional cooperation is equally important for the development of the region, including the creation of economic opportunities. The Association Agreement between the EU and Central America opens our markets to Central American businesses. Once fully ratified, the political and cooperation dimensions of the Agreement will further reinforce our partnership.

The EU is – and will remain – a reliable partner to the countries in the region in addressing the migration challenges, combining response to immediate needs with action on the root causes. Migration is a global challenge that requires global solutions and global responsibility sharing. Through international cooperation with our partners, we can turn migration from a common challenge into a shared opportunity for human development. I know that the Parliament has always supported this approach so I thank you for this debate and look forward to hearing your views.

José Inácio Faria, *em nome do Grupo PPE.* – Senhor Presidente, Senhora Comissária, Caros Colegas, à chamada marcha dos migrantes que partiu no dia 13 de outubro da cidade de San Pedro Sula, e como a Sra. Comissária referiu, uma das cidades mais perigosas do mundo, no norte das Honduras, juntaram-se milhares de migrantes da Guatemala e de El Salvador. Famílias inteiras seguem a pé em caravana, com os olhos postos nos Estados Unidos. Segundo a Save the Children, um em cada quatro membros desta caravana são crianças e adolescentes. A falta de oportunidades, a violência extrema e a pobreza endémica no triângulo norte da América Central levaram estas famílias a abandonar a sua terra natal e a embarcar nesta viagem que, apesar de árdua, oferece mais segurança do que a migração solitária e evita o pagamento de milhares de dólares aos contrabandistas.

Muitas destas vítimas da miséria económica e da exclusão social enfrentam também perseguições, recrutamentos esforçados e sequestros por grupos ligados ao crime organizado, desde as Maras locais aos traficantes das drogas transnacionais, um padrão que, infelizmente, se reproduz agora também na Nicarágua.

Estas pessoas não são criminosas, como não se cansa de repetir o Presidente Trump. São, isso sim, vítimas de organizações criminosas, que com violência e impunidade fingem governá-los, e procuram apenas viver em segurança e encontrar um trabalho que lhes permita sustentar as suas famílias, tal como fizeram nos séculos XIX e XX milhares de europeus que rumaram aos Estados Unidos para fugir da violência, da discriminação e da fome.

O Presidente Trump, que nos vinte e dois meses da sua presidência tem demonizado a imigração, prometeu deter os que tentam agora chegar ao seu país, com o pretexto de proteger os cidadãos americanos de criminosos e de uma invasão iminente e anunciou o envio de tropas para o sul dos Estados Unidos e a militarização da fronteira. As possibilidades de que lhes seja concedido asilo são, por isso, escassas e muitos correm o risco de ser detidos e separados das suas famílias enquanto aguardam audiências judiciais que poderão terminar com uma ordem de deportação.

Esta marcha dos migrantes e a que se formou a partir da cidade de Tapachula, no sul do México, no passado mês de abril, mostram à evidência que o endurecimento das políticas de asilo e as deportações em massa, empreendidas pelos Estados Unidos e pelo México nos últimos anos, falharam e o seu objetivo de dissuadir estes fluxos e os anunciados cortes nas ajudas económicas a estes países não farão mais do que agravar o caos social do qual fogem estas pessoas.

A União Europeia deve, pois, continuar a apoiar os esforços de integração regional na América Central e aproveitar para, no âmbito do Acordo de Associação com a América Central, reforçar o diálogo político com os países do triângulo norte, no que toca ao respeito pelos direitos humanos, ao reforço do Estado de Direito e à luta contra o narcotráfico e a impunidade.

A União não pode também deixar de apoiar a expansão regional da comissão anti-impunidade das Nações Unidas e de instar a que os países de trânsito e de destino respeitem as suas obrigações internacionais em matéria de direitos humanos em todas as travessias transfronteiriças.

Termino, Sr. Presidente, referindo o direito ao processo de vida de todos os migrantes, independentemente do seu estatuto, o respeito pelo princípio da não devolução e a proibição das expulsões arbitrárias e coletivas.

Elena Valenciano, *en nombre del Grupo S&D*. – Señor presidente, ¿saben cuántos kilómetros hay desde la frontera de Honduras hasta la de Estados Unidos? Más de 4 000 kilómetros. Es, más o menos, la distancia entre Lisboa y Estambul. Y ese es el camino que estas personas que huyen de la miseria, de la desesperación, del miedo, están dispuestas a recorrer. Entre esas 9 000 personas que salieron el 19 de octubre, más de 2 300 eran niños y niñas.

Quiero hablar de los niños y de las niñas de esa caravana, porque son los más vulnerables, porque son los que más están sufriendo, porque están sufriendo deshidratación y enfermedades, porque están muriendo, porque en el muro que separa México de los Estados Unidos hay cientos de cruces blancas pintadas, que son las cruces blancas de los niños y niñas que ya han muerto a lo largo del camino.

Esa es la situación real. Por eso queremos unirnos al llamamiento que hace el ACNUR, que hace Save the Children, para pedir a los Estados Unidos que cumplan con la legalidad internacional.

A los niños y niñas, a los adolescentes no se les puede tratar como si fueran delincuentes o narcotraficantes. Tienen derecho a la protección internacional según nuestras normas, y los Estados Unidos también están obligados a cumplirlas.

Dejemos que los niños y niñas sigan siendo niños y niñas.

Jussi Halla-aho, *on behalf of the ECR Group*. – Mr President, many people on both sides of sides of the Atlantic have spent the past two years complaining how unattractive the US has become because of the Trump administration. It is a little difficult to take this seriously when we consider the number of people who are trying so hard to get there from Central America and other places.

The big question here is: what is a civilised country supposed to do when it is invaded by a large number of unarmed civilians? Can it be that it is not supposed to do anything? This is a very acute question in Europe as well. Instead of just condemning everything Mr Trump does, or plans to do, we should work to find an acceptable but efficient way of stopping illegal migrants from entering freely a country that does not want to have them.

Izaskun Bilbao Barandica, *en nombre del Grupo ALDE.* – Señor presidente, señora comisaria, hoy, tras lo ocurrido en este Parlamento en la votación de la Directiva sobre visados humanitarios, tengo que comenzar insistiendo en que los movimientos migratorios y sus causas son un asunto global que requiere nuestra máxima atención y responsabilidad. Y obliga a sustituir por hechos las muchas palabras que solemos escuchar sobre solidaridad, fraternidad, humanidad, refugio o asilo.

La primera, en nuestro caso, es que quienes consideren que el sistema de votación de este Parlamento no ha recogido adecuadamente sus votos corrijan el dato en el registro correspondiente. No servirá para cambiar el sentido de la votación, pero dejará testimonio, al menos, de la verdadera voluntad del Pleno y legitimará que podamos traer ese asunto aquí en el futuro. Autocrítica, asumir el error y corregirlo sin poner en peligro la seguridad jurídica de todas nuestras votaciones.

Y es que es imprescindible hacer. Las personas que abandonan sus lugares de origen normalmente huyen de la pobreza, de la inseguridad y de la violencia. En el caso de las caravanas centroamericanas, los problemas que originan el éxodo son claros. Son el fruto de la desigualdad y de una política intervencionista que, a veces, ha impulsado el país al que estas personas se dirigen. Una dinámica que ha marcado el signo de los gobiernos y sistemas económicos y políticos. Los problemas de gobernanza y democracia y sus repercusiones en términos de desigualdad y justicia social son el caldo de cultivo que propicia que algunas de las ciudades de las que salieron estas caravanas sean hoy, como ha dicho usted, comisaria, las más violentas de América.

Frente a esos problemas hay quien compra los *fake news* y quien vende esquemas simples y maniqueos, que ofrecen a demasiada gente la tranquilidad de saberse entre los buenos y que permiten justificar cualquier atrocidad contra los otros, que fácilmente acaban siendo los malos.

Que el presidente de los Estados Unidos juegue tan burdamente este juego, hasta el punto de que las cadenas de televisión más conservadoras rechacen sus anuncios sobre estas caravanas por racistas, es un indicador de lo lejos que ha llegado el populismo. Espero que nos enseñe. Además, esta falacia, esa grosera simplificación puede ahuyentar alguna incertidumbre al que compra tan averiada mercancía, pero no ofrece ninguna solución.

Hay una legislación internacional que respetar. Y, como decía el filósofo Daniel Innerarity en un artículo periodístico, una democracia que reprogramar. Hay que responder con responsabilidad, límites e intereses compartidos a la complejidad de los problemas.

Los siento, presidente permítame que acabo diciendo que el primero de …

(El presidente retira la palabra a la oradora.)

Josep-Maria Terricabras, *en nombre del Grupo Verts/ALE.* – Señor presidente, hace poco los primeros miembros de la caravana migrante han llegado desde Honduras a la frontera con los Estados Unidos. Se ha dicho ya: la mayoría están huyendo de la violencia y del riesgo de morir asesinados o por inanición. Continuar en su país ponía en riesgo su propia vida y la de sus familiares. Para la mayoría de ellos, pues, se trata de un desplazamiento forzado.

De ahí que estemos hablando ante todo de derechos humanos. Los Gobiernos de México y de los Estados Unidos deberían informar a esas personas —cosa que no hacen— de que pueden solicitar asilo o refugio.

En todo caso, se les debería garantizar que sus necesidades básicas estén cubiertas y que se respetan sus derechos, porque ni México ni los Estados Unidos deben tratar el asunto de la caravana migrante desde un enfoque represivo o criminalizador, que favorece la xenofobia, sino desde un enfoque basado en los derechos humanos. El presidente electo de México tiene ahora mismo la oportunidad de empezar su mandato con una apuesta firme por los derechos humanos.

Y no puedo resistirme a expresar una sospecha: que esta enorme marcha se haya iniciado alguna semana antes de las elecciones de intermedias en los Estados Unidos ha podido reforzar los detestables argumentos xenófobos del presidente Trump. No culpo en absoluto a los miembros de la marcha, pero me pregunto si puede haber habido intereses mezquinos para promover el calendario de su realización.

En cualquier caso, nuestro apoyo a la caravana y a los migrantes por su dignidad y por la nuestra.

IN THE CHAIR: MAIREAD McGUINNESS

Vice-President

João Pimenta Lopes, *em nome do Grupo GUE/NGL*. – Senhora Presidente, os milhares que integram a caravana fogem do agravamento das condições sociais e económicas no seu país e à violência dos esquadrões da morte, uma realidade que não se desliga do golpe de Estado nas Honduras em 2009, promovido desde os Estados Unidos, ou dos resultados das fraudulentas eleições de 2017, que tiveram o encobrimento da União Europeia.

Esta dramática situação tem, nas suas causas, a estratégia de destabilização e ingerência em países soberanos, protagonizada pelos Estados Unidos como também pela União Europeia, impondo relações de domínio económico e rapina de recursos que promovem o subdesenvolvimento e a dependência.

A par de uma resposta rápida e solidária aos dramas humanitários das migrações, a resposta fundamental aos fluxos migratórios passa pelo ataque às causas que levam a que milhões de seres humanos em todo o mundo se vejam obrigados a deixar os seus países. Passa pelo respeito pela soberania e independência dos Estados, da Carta das Nações Unidas, do Direito Internacional. Passa por políticas genuínas de cooperação para o desenvolvimento, que assegurem os direitos, o progresso social e a paz.

Nathan Gill, *on behalf of the EFDD Group*. – Madam President, the entire world has been gripped by the migration crisis. It's not just in the European Union, but it's also in the United States. We share a common challenge when it comes to dealing with the millions of people who are trying to illegally cross borders. In recent weeks, the United States has seen a migrant caravan consisting of thousands of people travelling from Central America to the US border. We're witnessing an organised mass migration of economic migrants on a scale that has never been seen before and this, quite simply, is economic migration. Both here and in the EU and over there in the US there are legitimate and legal routes for seeking genuine asylum, but these migrant caravans should not lead to permanent residence in the US.

It has been said in this debate that they are not criminals. But if you enter a country illegally, you are breaking laws and you are therefore a criminal. I think President Trump is right to send thousands of US troops to the border to stop the illegal entry of the migrants and to protect their national security.

Let's just point out that the migrants are now in Mexico. Why are they not staying in Mexico? There are 129 million people who live in Mexico quite happily. Are we saying that everybody in Mexico should be leaving Mexico to go to America as well because it's unsafe there, or are we saying that the migrants should stay in Mexico now that they are there?

While some argue that the numbers of migrants in the caravan are small, they set a precedent and encourage others to make this dangerous journey to the US. Since 2017, multiple caravans have headed to the border, and each time they are getting bigger and bigger. On our own soil we have seen the effects of mass migration, especially the terrible death toll of migrants crossing turbulent seas in boats completely unfit for that purpose. International law is being broken and EU treaties are just being ignored. A government's main duty is the protection and the security of its citizens. This includes securing your nation's border – it's just common sense. Leaders in Europe would do well to learn from President Trump's response to what's happening at the US border instead of just continually pointing their fingers and complaining.

Mario Borghezio, *a nome del gruppo ENF*. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, al di là degli aspetti umanitari che commuovono tutti, in realtà questa marcia risponde a una strategia avente uno scopo molto preciso, che è quello di scardinare gli Stati aprendo grandi rotte migratorie dal terzo mondo verso il cosiddetto primo mondo.

I guru dell'alta finanza spingono le ONG e le finanziano per utilizzare le popolazioni del terzo mondo come strumento per colonizzare il primo mondo, per ridurre i salari e creare instabilità politica. Con l'appoggio dell'ONU stanno ora occidentalizzando queste popolazioni, trasformandole in arieti politici, nel tentativo di far sì che il primo mondo di cui l'Europa è parte integrante, dovrebbe accorgersene anche la Commissione e dovrebbe meglio riflettere.

Il fenomeno delle carovane ripropone il tema del significato del valore delle frontiere che, come bene ha teorizzato Régis Debray, hanno una funzione insostituibile di filtro e quindi di difesa dell'identità dei popoli. I muri non sono una degenerazione, ma sono una conseguenza del rifiuto di una demarcazione e della difesa dell'identità.

Pier Antonio Panzeri (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la ONG Movimiento Migrante Mesoamericano ha dichiarato che il 70 % dei migranti provenienti dall'America centrale, quando attraversano il Messico per raggiungere gli Stati Uniti, subiscono stupri e violenze. Il corpo umano viene utilizzato come mezzo di scambio da offrire a poliziotti di frontiera senza scrupoli. Qualsiasi cosa pur di scappare dalla fame, dalla violenza, dalla corruzione di cui sono impregnati i paesi come l'Honduras e il Guatemala. È una carovana di circa 3 000 persone, piena di speranza, perché nulla può essere peggio di ciò che si è lasciato alle spalle.

Avvistando l'ondata di disperazione, Trump ha pensato bene di armare la frontiera, poco importa che siano state proprio le sue politiche nei confronti del resto del continente ad aggravare la situazione. Ricordo il taglio del 40 % dei fondi destinati all'Honduras, al Guatemala e al Salvador, che ha fatto diminuire le opportunità economiche rendendo i cittadini ancora più vulnerabili. Anche l'eliminazione dei permessi di lavoro temporaneo negli Stati Uniti per salvadoregni e honduregni ha contribuito all'impoverimento di quei paesi, riducendo le rimesse.

Insomma, tutto il contrario di quello che servirebbe. Servono politiche sensate che dovrebbero prevedere un aumento della cooperazione tra i paesi del Nord e del Sud dell'America. Serve una politica di immigrazione e di asilo chiara che venga applicata in modo coerente anche dagli Stati Uniti d'America.

Ernest Urtasun (Verts/ALE). – Señora presidenta, en primer lugar deseo expresar nuestra solidaridad con la caravana de hombres, mujeres y niños que huyen de la miseria, que huyen de la violencia de Honduras, de Guatemala, de El Salvador. Deseo también denunciar los intentos de criminalización de esta caravana —cuando estamos simplemente ante un fenómeno de migración forzosa— y, de una manera muy clara, las declaraciones y los aspavientos militaristas que está haciendo la Administración norteamericana liderada por el señor Trump y recordarle que, en gran parte, la miseria que hoy viven muchos de los países de su vecindad inmediata tiene que ver con su falta de apuesta por la cooperación, por el recorte de fondos y por su falta de una política de integración de la inmigración.

¿Qué podemos hacer ante la caravana actual como Unión Europea? Dos cosas: la primera, recordar, a través de nuestra acción exterior, a los Estados miembros que están afectados, a los Estados de la zona que están afectados, que tienen obligaciones derivadas del Derecho humanitario y que deben cumplirlas; y, en segundo lugar, repensar si nuestras políticas y nuestra relación con la zona —con América Central— contribuyen realmente al desarrollo de estos países, cosa que es muy dudosa.

Y sobre todo, señora Jourová, y con esto termino, quisiera invitarle a estar muy atentos a los posibles fenómenos de tráfico de mujeres y de tráfico de niños que pueden producirse en esta situación.

Marisa Matias (GUE/NGL). – Senhora Presidente, a América Central atravessa uma profunda crise humanitária. A caravana migrante é uma imagem brutal do desespero. Milhares de pessoas, na sua maioria hondurenhas, crianças, mulheres, jovens, pessoas mais idosas, querem fugir e procurar asilo.

Os primeiros saíram das Honduras no dia 12 de outubro, ontem chegaram 357 a Tijuana e há milhares a caminho. Corrupção, crime organizado, narcotráfico, que atravessam, aliás, todo o espectro político, e o recente agravamento da violência de Estado e da impunidade são as principais causas que levam as pessoas a fugir de um dos países mais pobres e mais violentos da região.

Os Estados Unidos organizaram-se para militarizar as fronteiras e ameaçar com cortes nos apoios. Tudo isto viola a defesa mais elementar dos direitos humanos. Da União Europeia espera-se que faça corresponder os apoios a um verdadeiro comprometimento das autoridades, com as necessárias reformas que recuperem o bem-estar e a defesa das populações, assim como a assistência a quem dela necessita.

Estas caravanas são também uma forma de luta: são pessoas que caminham contra o abandono e contra a amnésia da História.

Francisco Assis (S&D). – Senhora Presidente, de que fogem estes milhares de seres humanos, homens, mulheres, velhos, crianças, que integram esta caravana? Fogem da ameaça da morte, fogem da violência, fogem do espectro da fome, fogem de situações profundamente desumanas que, infelizmente, assolam grande parte da América Central e, em particular, as Honduras.

E, por isso, o nosso primeiro olhar tem de ser para essa região e temos de reforçar a nossa cooperação com a América Central e contribuir para a superação dos gravíssimos problemas que se colocam nessa região do mundo.

Por outro lado, eles demandam os Estados Unidos e nós, europeus, temos consciência de como esta questão dos refugiados é uma questão complexa e difícil. Mas também temos de sempre fazer apelo aos princípios humanitários fundamentais. É inaceitável uma reação como aquela que o Presidente atual dos Estados Unidos, Trump, tem vindo, sistematicamente, a verbalizar, com o apoio, aliás, da mais sórdida e repugnante extrema-direita europeia.

É, por isso, preciso chamar a atenção para a necessidade de responder a estas situações, que são sobretudo situações humanitárias, com um profundo sentido de humanismo, que é a base de todos os valores que inspiram ou devem inspirar a nossa intervenção política.

Miguel Urbán Crespo (GUE/NGL). – Señora presidenta, por primera vez el mundo observa a los invisibles.

Los invisibles se han hecho visibles porque se han organizado en una caravana migrante; son visibles porque han decidido hacer del tránsito migratorio una protesta contra la injusticia, una protesta contra una vida de precariedad, una vida de violencia de la que huyen, una vida que es consecuencia directa de nuestras políticas.

¿Estaríamos ante esta caravana migrante si no hubiéramos mirado hacia otro lado cuando el golpe de Estado en Honduras?

Y ahora, ¿qué hacemos? Miramos otra vez hacia otro lado cuando estas personas sufren violencia en su tránsito; miramos hacia otro lado cuando lo único que se les ofrece son armas, concertinas y la militarización de las fronteras.

Exigimos ayuda humanitaria urgente. Exigimos que se le ponga freno a Trump y exigimos que el Parlamento Europeo mande una misión de observación a esa caravana para que se respeten los derechos humanos y se respete el derecho al asilo de todas y de todos.

Que los invisibles nunca más vuelvan a ser invisibles: no son números, son personas.

Javi López (S&D). – Señora presidenta, hay siete mil personas, entre ellas dos mil trescientos niños, que están recorriendo México para encontrar un futuro de esperanza. Gente que viene del Triángulo Norte, de tres países centroamericanos que han entrado desde hace décadas en una espiral sin fin de violencia y pobreza. Un hoyo negro para muchos, del que intentan escapar.

¿Y qué ha pasado? Que mientras pasaba esto, había una campaña electoral en Estados Unidos. Y ha habido un presidente, el americano, que ha decidido utilizarlos como rehenes de su campaña electoral. Deshumanizarlos, demonizarlos, amenazarlos con el uso militar de la fuerza contra ellos. Con el único objetivo de ganar un puñado de votos en esas elecciones. Por eso, ahora ha desaparecido también de la agenda americana.

Y lo que hay que hacer es recordarle a su presidente, a Estados Unidos, sus obligaciones en materia de derechos humanos y Derecho internacional. Y la necesidad de que recuerde que su país está construido gracias a la migración como identidad y fruto de ella. Eso es Estados Unidos. Y parece que hoy lo olvidan de cara al mundo.

Cécile Kashetu Kyenge (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, perché stupirsi? Settemila persone – uomini, donne e bambini – provenienti da Honduras, Guatemala ed El Salvador altro non sono che il simbolo della mobilità globale.

Purtroppo, la risposta del Presidente Trump è stata la sospensione del diritto di asilo e la mobilitazione di un esercito al confine messicano, ponendo una barriera per fermare coloro che potrebbero avere diritto ad asilo e protezione.

Alle politiche di chiusura bisogna rispondere con la solidarietà e anche con strumenti multilaterali per una corretta gestione della mobilità, come il Patto globale delle Nazioni Unite sulla migrazione, che gli Stati Uniti hanno rifiutato di sottoscrivere e che altri Stati europei stanno mettendo in discussione.

Al Presidente Trump e a chi come lui plaude alla chiusura dei confini e al bando della libera circolazione vorrei ricordare il principio della portabilità dei diritti. I diritti umani fondamentali non si fermano davanti a una barricata, ma sono intrinsechi alla persona stessa ovunque essa sia, ed è nostro dovere garantirli e difenderli sempre in ogni parte del mondo.

Ana Gomes (S&D). – Senhora Presidente, a suspensão do direito de asilo e o envio de militares para a fronteira por parte do Presidente dos Estados Unidos é uma afronta, desde logo, à magnífica tradição, à magnífica História dos Estados Unidos e também ao próprio papel que os Estados Unidos tiveram na construção do edifício internacional dos direitos humanos universais.

Estas pessoas não são migrantes económicos, fogem de condições de vida miseráveis, fogem da perseguição, fogem da criminalidade à solta nos seus países, na América Central, fogem de situações pelas quais os Estados Unidos têm graves responsabilidades pelas políticas intervencionistas, comerciais, económicas desastradas. E, portanto, não é tolerável esta atitude por parte dos Estados Unidos e nós, europeus, temos de falar, não falar como a extrema-direita completamente ao arrepio da civilização que vem aqui negar a humanidade destas pessoas e o direito a pedirem asilo face às condições de que vêm.

Nós temos de ter políticas de desenvolvimento para a América Central e para o resto do mundo, designadamente em África, que sejam de genuíno desenvolvimento e que passem pela construção democrática, porque senão, neste mundo interdependente e em crescente mobilidade, cada vez teremos mais caravanas deste tipo.

Wajid Khan (S&D). – Madam President, as we speak, 7000 people walk towards the United States of America in search of a better life. These people are from some of the poorest and most violent countries in the region, and Trump will greet them with a barbed wire fence and the strongest army in the entire world.

I have previously spoken here about the barbarity of the current American administration when they were forcibly separating children from their parents at the border. Now they are brutally closing down the door down on desperate people who want to contribute to their economy. We welcome Mexico's 'Estás en tu casa' programme, which provides healthcare and jobs to those migrants who wish to stay – exactly what the USA and the EU should be doing.

The Statue of Liberty welcomed the world's huddled masses yearning to breathe free. I hope everyone in this Chamber will agree with me, and call for the USA to honour this. The USA must respect the principle of non-refoulement and welcome those who are fleeing desperate situations as fellow human beings. Only by doing this can Trump truly make America great again.

Catch-the-eye procedure

Julie Ward (S&D). – Madam President, thousands of poor families and unaccompanied children from Central America are on the move, travelling to the Mexican USA border fleeing violence, poverty and unsustainable lives. 38-year-old José Vega, who is travelling with the caravan from Honduras, said: 'My hope is someday to build a house for my family to live in peace, to go from sandals to shoes – not to be rich, but to be in peace'. Isn't that the simple desire of all of us? President Trump's cruel response, however, is sadly predictable. He has threatened military violence and he uses the racist, xenophobic language that has become a hallmark of his presidency. Trump has become the bully in the school playground. He has scant regard for human rights and uses his position to stir up hate. He is unfit for public office, and he shames his country by his words and actions.

Xabier Benito Ziluaga (GUE/NGL). – Señora presidenta, la semana pasada tuve la oportunidad de visitar la frontera de Guatemala con México, en la ciudad de Tecún Umán, a orillas del río Suchiate.

La situación de desborde humanitario allí es totalmente insostenible. La Casa del Migrante aloja a 120 personas sin ninguna ayuda nacional ni internacional. Mientras tanto, en una semana, 6 000 migrantes han pasado por esa zona.

También la situación de violencia y vulnerabilidad es dramática en todo el recorrido. La zona fronteriza es una zona de crímenes, de explotación sexual y de violencia. La acción policial de México sin ir más lejos, que tiene el apoyo de Estados Unidos ahora mismo, ya ha matado a tres personas solo en este paso fronterizo.

Y ustedes se preguntarán: ¿Qué hace el ejército estadounidense en territorio mexicano? Pues lo mismo que están haciendo los fondos europeos en los guardacostas libios: externalizar fronteras, alejar la violencia contra las personas migrantes allí donde no se puede ni ver ni juzgar lo que están haciendo.

Migrar es un derecho, señora comisaria, el libre tránsito de las personas es un derecho; y habría que empezar por adoptar, cumplir y hacer cumplir los acuerdos del Pacto Mundial para la Migración.

Γεώργιος Επιτήδειος (NI). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, όπως όλοι γνωρίζουμε, τον προηγούμενο μήνα ένα καραβάνι περίπου εφτά χιλιάδων μεταναστών, ξεκινώντας από την Ονδούρα, έφτασε τελικά στα σύνορα με τις Ηνωμένες Πολιτείες της Αμερικής αναζητώντας καλύτερες συνθήκες ζωής. Δεν υπάρχει αμφιβολία ότι οι συνθήκες διαβίωσης στα κράτη της Κεντρικής Αμερικής, όπως και σε πολλά άλλα κράτη, δεν είναι οι καταλληλότερες. Πλην όμως, αυτό δεν σημαίνει ότι οι κάτοικοι των χωρών αυτών πρέπει να φεύγουν μαζικά και, υπό μορφή εισβολής, να προσπαθούν να εισέλθουν στην πλησιέστερη ευημερούσα χώρα. Συμβαίνει κάτι ανάλογο δηλαδή με τις μεταναστευτικές ροές που δεχόμαστε και εμείς στην Ευρώπη. Όμως, η κυβέρνηση των ΗΠΑ έκανε το αυτονόητο: έλεγξε τα σύνορά της -σε αντίθεση με εμάς- και ελέγχει τις ροές των μεταναστών αυτών. Εάν πραγματικά ενδιαφερόμαστε -πέραν από τον υποκριτικό ανθρωπισμό της Αριστεράς- για τους ανθρώπους αυτούς, θα πρέπει να συνεργαστούμε για να δημιουργηθούν οι κατάλληλες συνθήκες διαβίωσης στην ίδια τους τη χώρα. Να ζήσουν και να ευημερήσουν εκεί και όχι να φεύγουν προς άλλες χώρες.

(End of catch-the-eye procedure)

Věra Jourová, *Member of the Commission, on behalf of the Vice-President of the Commission / High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy.* – Madam President, I would like to thank the honourable Members for the fruitful exchange. We all agree that every country has the right to manage its borders. We also agree that migrants' human rights should be fully upheld. Special attention should be given to the needs of the most vulnerable, including children and women, and, importantly, we also agreed that tackling the root causes of migration, including poverty, citizens' security and governance-related, is essential.

The EU will continue to closely follow the situation and use all the instruments available to support the countries of origin, to provide security and a future to their populations.

President. – The debate is closed.

27. Extraterritoriale Auswirkungen der US-Sanktionen gegen Iran auf europäische Unternehmen (Aussprache)

President. – The next item is the debate on the statement by the Vice-President of the Commission / High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy on the extraterritorial effects of US sanctions on Iran for European companies (2018/2922(RSP)).

Věra Jourová, *Member of the Commission, on behalf of the Vice-President of the Commission / High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy.* – Madam President, honourable Members of the European Parliament, last week the United States unilaterally re-imposed all the sanctions that they had removed thanks to the nuclear deal with Iran, the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action. On 2 November, the High Representative issued a statement together with the Foreign and Finance Ministers of Germany, France and the United Kingdom, expressing deep regret at this development. The sanctions re-imposed on 5 November cover a wide array of sectors and, together with the designation of some 700 individuals and entities, impact large parts of the Iranian economy. As such, they are a serious challenge to the continued implementation of the plan of action.

The re-imposition of US sanctions may also bring substantial collateral effects, in particular it could weigh on the region's trade flows and energy supplies, connectivity and ultimately the security and stability of states such as Iraq and Afghanistan.

Let me begin this debate with a few general comments.

First, we continue to support the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action as its provisions continue to ensure that Iran does not acquire material or equipment to develop a nuclear weapon. The deal with Iran is working and delivering on its goal, namely ensuring that Iran's nuclear programme remains exclusively peaceful. This is an assessment based on scientific facts provided through a uniquely high number of inspections and 13 reports by the International Atomic Energy Agency. Moreover, there is no credible peaceful alternative to the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action.

The deal with Iran is a key element of the global nuclear non-proliferation architecture. It is crucial for the security of Europe, the region and the entire world. Dismantling the agreement would not only destroy years of diplomatic efforts but also undermine other key multilateral negotiations in the nuclear field and beyond.

It is a matter of security and it is a matter of credibility for the international community. For these reasons, the EU and its Member States are determined to preserve it. We remain committed to the continued implementation of the nuclear deal in all its aspects and in particular we are at work to preserve the economic dividends arising from sanctions lifting.

Let me remind everyone that we are talking about economic benefits for the people of Iran which constitute an essential part of the deal. As we remain committed to our side of the deal we also expect Iran to continue implementing in full all its nuclear commitments under the plan of action.

The European Union has already taken a number of measures. First, we have updated our blocking statute to ensure that business decisions are not determined by the listed US extra-territorial legislation, which the Union does not recognise as applicable to EU operators. The Commission has significantly engaged with economic operators and Member States on the implementation of the statute.

Second, we have extended the European Investment Bank's lending mandate. This allows the bank to lend in Iran in the future in line with relevant rules and procedures.

Thirdly, the European Commission is elaborating a range of tools to strengthen the activities of small and medium sized enterprises between the EU and Iran. We are working on technical exchanges to enhance trade, harmonisation of standards and due diligence and compliance efforts.

I am aware of the high level of interest regarding the design and state of play of the special-purpose vehicle. We Europeans cannot accept that a foreign power, not even our closest friend and ally, takes decisions over our legitimate trade with another country. The ongoing work, led by France, Germany and the United Kingdom, aims at preserving the full and effective implementation of the plan of action in all its aspects and in line with UN Security Council Resolution 2231.

Protecting legitimate trade is also a basic element of our own sovereignty and it is only natural that we are working in this direction. This is a hugely complex and unique undertaking requiring the best expertise available. Technical work has been advancing over the last days and weeks under the political leadership of Member States and supported by the EEAS and the Commission. Our goal is to build something that is workable, effective and viable.

The special-purpose vehicle is not directed against the United States. On the contrary, preserving the nuclear deal is essential to our common security both for Europe, for the United States and for our friends in the Middle East.

The special-purpose vehicle is not circumventing sanctions. It is about working in full transparency, ensuring due diligence for the most rigorous standards on anti-money laundering and on countering the financing of terrorism in full respect of UN Security Council resolutions and the primacy of the EU law.

I am aware that many of you have concerns regarding Iran's foreign policy and respect for human rights. So does the European Commission, but the Plan of Action was never meant to solve all of our disagreements with Iran. We continue to voice our disagreements on Iran's security role in the region and its ballistic missile programme and we have engaged in a frank and active dialogue with Iran on these issues. We maintain a range of EU autonomous restrictive measures. These include an arms embargo and measures against arms trade, against human rights violations, on Iran's support for the Assad regime in Syria and for terrorism.

Some of these issues are addressed through our EU-Iran high-level dialogue. The EU has also led a dialogue together with France, Germany, Italy and the UK to engage Iran constructively on regional issues. The last meeting of this group was convened in Brussels on 12 September and discussed the situation in Syria and Yemen, and we hope to meet again before the end of the year.

This is also very much about our own security and regional security, but none of these issues is linked to the Plan of Action and they would not be easier to deal with without it. Preserving the nuclear deal with Iran is an essential security interest for Europe, for our region and for the whole world. So we will keep working to preserve a nuclear non-proliferation agreement that is working well, and to prevent a major security crisis in the Middle East.

Cristian Dan Preda, *au nom du groupe PPE*. – Madame la Présidente, Madame la Commissaire, chers collègues, ma conviction est que l'Union européenne ne peut pas répondre correctement à la question des effets extraterritoriaux que peuvent avoir, sur les entreprises européennes, les sanctions des États-Unis à l'encontre de l'Iran, si on ne replace pas cette question dans le contexte politique plus large de nos relations politiques avec l'Iran.

La situation dans laquelle nous nous trouvons aujourd'hui, qui nous oblige à défendre les intérêts économiques des entreprises européennes, est à mon sens aussi la conséquence d'une réponse politique insuffisante.

Nous avons soutenu la nécessité de poursuivre l'application de l'accord nucléaire avec l'Iran aussi longtemps que ce pays respectera ses obligations, et ce bien avant le retrait des États-Unis. La délégation de la commission des affaires étrangères, dont je faisais partie, qui s'est rendue à Téhéran au mois de février a d'ailleurs porté ce message.

La réalité est qu'avant la décision des États-Unis, le 8 mai, de se retirer de l'accord, nous disposions d'une certaine marge de manœuvre pour discuter sérieusement avec le gouvernement américain de ses inquiétudes sur l'accord nucléaire et pour trouver une solution qui nous aurait ainsi évité la discussion d'aujourd'hui.

La première conclusion que j'en tire est qu'il n'est pas trop tard. Nous devrions discuter sérieusement avec les États-Unis. La coopération avec eux reste vitale pour répondre à l'Iran. Les défis que nous avons à relever en commun sont nombreux: freiner les ambitions nucléaires de l'Iran, améliorer la situation désastreuse des droits de l'homme dans ce pays et aborder les questions du rôle néfaste de l'Iran dans le conflit en Syrie, des menaces proférées à l'encontre de l'État d'Israël, du soutien du régime iranien au terrorisme et des projets d'attentat sur le sol européen. Tous ces sujets sont devenus presque tabou, y compris au sein de notre Parlement, où toute tentative de discussion des droits de l'homme en Iran est systématiquement bloquée par nos amis socialistes.

Pour défendre les intérêts des entreprises européennes, la réponse ne peut pas se trouver dans une action purement économique, qu'il s'agisse de l'établissement d'une entité spéciale ou de l'aide accordée à l'Iran pour répondre aux conséquences des sanctions américaines. Elle doit se trouver avant tout dans une action politique cohérente qui –j'insiste sur ce point –n'isole pas les différents aspects de nos relations avec l'Iran et n'exclut pas la construction de ponts avec le gouvernement Trump sur ce sujet, n'en déplaise de nouveau à nos amis de gauche.

(L'orateur accepte de répondre à une question «carton bleu» (article 162, paragraphe 8 du règlement)).

Ana Gomes (S&D), *question «carton bleu»*. – Il me semble que nous avons tous les deux participé à la mission de la commission des affaires étrangères en Iran cette année. Tu peux sans doute confirmer ici que c'est certainement moi, membre socialiste de cette délégation, qui ai posé le plus de questions sur les droits de l'homme à nos interlocuteurs iraniens. Je réfute donc catégoriquement l'accusation que tu as dirigée contre les socialistes.

Cristian Dan Preda (PPE), *réponse «carton bleu»*. – J'ai bien sûr une réponse. Ana a toujours été une exception au sein du groupe socialiste, qu'il s'agisse de l'Iran et de la question des droits ou, par exemple, des partis socialistes à l'Est, et notamment du parti social-démocrate roumain. Elle a toujours eu une position droite sur ce sujet ainsi que sur les droits de l'homme et le terrible sort du socialisme à l'Est.

Josef Weidenholzer, *im Namen der S&D-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin, Frau Kommissarin! Ich möchte mich auf den Kern der Diskussion konzentrieren. Das Atomabkommen mit dem Iran war einer der am intensivsten vorbereiteten multilateralen Verträge der letzten Zeit. Jahrelang wurde von verschiedenen Parteien intensiv der Ausstieg des Irans aus dem Atomprogramm behandelt. Damit wurde nicht nur eine ständig schwelende Kriegsgefahr gebannt, sondern auch der Boden für eine friedliche Entwicklung gelegt. Der damit einhergehende Entfall der wirtschaftlichen Sanktionen sollte die Isolation der iranischen Wirtschaft beenden, ökonomischen Win-win generieren und die Grundlage für Wohlstand im Inneren schaffen. Die Hoffnung war, dass damit auch eine neue Stabilitätszone in einer seit Jahrzehnten unruhigen Region entstehen könnte. Gerade für Europa wäre das ganz wesentlich. Die Europäische Union spielt ja auch eine wesentliche Rolle beim Zustandekommen des Vertrags, und es liegt im Interesse der Union und ihrer Mitgliedstaaten, dass der Prozess nicht ins Stocken gerät.

Die iranische Seite hat bisher alle ihre Verpflichtungen ernst genommen. Alle internationalen Kontrollen haben das bisher bestätigt – zwölfmal hintereinander. Warum der Prozess nicht wirklich vorankommt und immer mehr Unternehmen zögern, sich wirtschaftlich zu engagieren, das hängt vor allem daran, dass sich die USA unter Trumps Einfluss vom Multilateralismus verabschiedet haben. Der US-amerikanische Unilateralismus stellt eine große Herausforderung dar, nicht nur in der Iranfrage. Daher müssen wir zu unseren Vereinbarungen stehen, ohne Wenn und Aber. Es sind Maßnahmen wie die Aktivierung des *blocking statute* notwendig. Und es müssen auch vertrauensbildende Maßnahmen gesetzt werden, bloße Beteuerungen bringen uns nicht weiter.

Anna Elżbieta Fotyga, *on behalf of the ECR Group*. – Madam President, the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA) is far from being a good deal. Iranian companies – our partners in trade – are heavily controlled by the Revolutionary Guard – the organisation directly responsible for financing terrorism, bloody martyrs and meddling in the region. Moreover, there is money laundering present in the Iranian economy – that was admitted even by Foreign Minister Zarif himself in the Iranian Parliament. We have to take all of this into consideration.

Marietje Schaake, *on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – Madam President, the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA), or the nuclear deal that was agreed by the major global powers at a critical time, was actually fatally damaged by President Trump's withdrawal. But that doesn't mean that there's nothing we can do and that all is lost. A reduced nuclear agreement may still work, but I think we, in Europe, have to be realistic.

Of course, High Representatives Ashton and Mogherini stuck out their necks for diplomacy, and that was the right thing to do, but preserving that legacy cannot be a goal in and of itself because it also had a shadow side. I think human rights and the violations that we see every day in Iran, as well as Iran's troubling role in the Middle East, were overlooked, and rebalancing our European approach towards Iran is very important and should not be hindered by needing to defend the JCPOA.

Attempts to maintain policy independence and to give European companies maximum choice to do business are the right steps to take; they are positive. The EU lifted sanctions as it's part of the deal, while Iran commits to verification of nuclear enrichment. But to push or even punish European companies for choosing to drop business with Iran under threat of US repercussions is taking it too far. Additionally, the whole impression that the EU and Iran are in one sort of camp and that the United States is in another camp is deplorable. We are both liberal democracies, and that should be leading. I think the way forward for us in Europe is to broaden our Iran policy and to include, very ambitiously, human rights and foreign policy concerns while continuing to take reasonable steps to stay committed to our part of the nuclear agreement.

Reinhard Bütikofer, *im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin, sehr verehrte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Das tiefe Bedauern, das geäußert wurde, teilen wir natürlich alles. Aber ich bedaure auch zutiefst, dass wir es nicht schaffen, zu einer realistischen Sprache vorzudringen, sondern die Situation ständig beschönigen. Davon hat noch niemand etwas.

Das sogenannte *blocking statute* ist ja lächerlich! Kein einziger internationaler Konzern kann es sich leisten, sich darauf zu verlassen. Deswegen, glaube ich, sollten wir anfangen, uns selbst ernster zu nehmen – einschließlich der Schwächen, die wir haben. Eine der Schwächen ist meines Erachtens, dass wir zwar zu Recht den Nukleardeal mit dem Iran aufrecht erhalten, aber keinerlei Grund haben, die negativen Seiten der iranischen Außenpolitik so zu beschönigen, wie Sie das gemacht haben, Frau Kommissarin. Sie haben gesagt:

We voice these agreements, and we have frank and active dialogue.

Mehr fällt uns nicht ein? Ist das angemessen gegenüber der Außenpolitik des Iran? Ich bezweifle das sehr.

Zweitens: Wir werden hier mit den Chinesen und mit den Russen zusammenzuarbeiten haben, weil an dieser konkreten Stelle die Amerikaner sich auf eine Position begeben, die für uns nicht auszuhalten ist. Aber trotzdem sind wir nicht jetzt plötzlich in einem *camp* mit Iran, China und Russland. Was wir entwickeln müssen, ist eine stärkere europäische Eigenständigkeit. Das heißt auch, die Rolle des Euro international voranzutreiben.

Und was ich als Letztes sagen will, Herr Preda: Wer jetzt einfach sagt: „We have to have serious discussions with the US". That's not a serious person, sorry, forgive me.

Eleonora Forenza, *a nome del gruppo GUE/NGL*. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, le sanzioni di Trump mettono a rischio l'accordo sul nucleare e violano il principio *pacta sunt servanda*. Il ripristino unilaterale delle sanzioni, come conseguenza del ritiro degli USA dall'accordo, è un atto di pirateria internazionale, di bullismo diplomatico, di inaccettabile prepotenza contro tutta la comunità internazionale e non ha nulla a che fare con i diritti umani, come dimostra il fatto che contro l'Arabia Saudita e il suo regime non si fa nulla, anzi le si vendono armi per la guerra in Yemen.

L'Iran è stato sottoposto al regime di monitoraggio e sorveglianza più completo al mondo da parte dell'Agenzia internazionale per l'energia atomica, la quale ha più volte verificato l'adempienza iraniana agli obblighi sottoscritti con l'intesa. Sono inoltre le sanzioni provvedimenti che colpiscono la popolazione e non il regime e l'Unione europea farà bene a difendere l'accordo, non solo attraverso strumenti che garantiscono la possibilità per le imprese europee di commerciare con l'Iran e quindi di dare seguito all'accordo che altrimenti rischia di cadere, ma se necessario anche prevedendo controsanzioni europee per le imprese americane e iniziando ad usare l'Euro per la nostra bolletta energetica.

John Stuart Agnew, *on behalf of the EFDD Group*. – Madam President, you may or may not be a Trump fan, but at least President Trump does not allow politically correct thinking to muddy his vision when dealing with some of the world's worst tyrants. He understands how these people think, and he acts in what he believes to be the best interests of his country. The US believes that the deal is a bad one, one which is not built upon long-term stability. Whether or not this is the case, we are now in the de facto situation where the Iran deal no longer exists. Iran is considering abandoning the terms set out in the deal, as it sees no economic benefit from adhering to them – a very worrying development.

Clearly, a solution needs to be found to the problem, either by saving the existing agreement or producing something new. The EU must forget about posturing power politics and allow the USA to get on with its own foreign policy. After all, you do not have your own EU army yet to enforce your ideas. The Iranian President has even suggested that the country now faces a war situation, and air defence drills have been taking place. This is obviously extremely concerning. It not only impacts trade and business, but of course on the humanitarian level as well.

In 1998, the US and the EU had similar issues with sanctions, this time involving Cuba. An agreement was struck and the sanctions were lifted. Again the EU must work alongside the US to solve this Iran problem. The United States are not the enemy, and they must not be treated as such. It would be wise to remember the many great sacrifices the American people made during the 20th century in order to promote freedom and peace in Europe. Any thoughts of a potential EU trade war with the US are delusions of grandeur and nothing more.

(The speaker agreed to take a blue-card question under Rule 162(8))

Reinhard Bütikofer (Verts/ALE), *blue-card question*. – Mr Agnew, would you concede that the Iranian leadership has so far stuck to the letter and the spirit of the agreement, so it is not justified to blame them for deviating from that, as you did?

John Stuart Agnew (EFDD), *blue-card answer*. – No, I'm not that naive. Thank you.

Jacques Colombier, *au nom du groupe ENF.* – Madame la Présidente, au-delà des belles paroles et des vœux pieux, j'irai au cœur du problème pour l'Europe.

Les entreprises françaises, et non des moindres, particulièrement investies sur le prometteur marché iranien, ont dû récemment renoncer à leurs investissements dans ce pays. C'est notamment le cas des constructeurs automobiles PSA et Renault, mais aussi de Total, pourtant présent en Iran depuis 1954. Les entreprises françaises et européennes paient en fait la passivité, pour ne pas dire la complicité, des dirigeants bruxellois avec les oukases des administrations américaines successives.

Dans les années quatre-vingt-dix, personne dans les milieux européistes ne s'était alarmé de la portée de la loi d'Amato-Kennedy, que les États-Unis réactivent actuellement contre l'Union européenne après leur décision unilatérale de sortir de l'accord de Genève sur le nucléaire iranien. On voit aujourd'hui, hélas, le résultat. À force de tout céder à Washington, on finit par plier devant ces forfaitures juridiques.

Alors, une attitude plus ferme sur les négociations commerciales, la fin de tout alignement sur les intérêts exclusifs de Washington comme la sortie de cette stupide politique d'affrontement avec la Russie pourrait envoyer… *(la Présidente retire la parole à l'orateur)*

President. – I'm sorry, sir, but your time is up. We didn't hear the rest of your contribution because I had to cut the microphone.

Knut Fleckenstein (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Wir sind uns, glaube ich, einig über die Außenpolitik des Irans. Aber das ist heute nicht das Thema.

Ich bin entsetzt – jeden Tag wieder – über den amerikanischen Präsidenten, der nahezu alles verrät, was die Amerikaner uns Deutschen nach der Nazizeit mal beigebracht haben. Ich bin in den 50er Jahren in Berlin groß geworden. Ich kann gar kein Antiamerikaner werden. Ich werde ihnen ewig dankbar sein. Aber deshalb schmerzt es umso mehr, dass diese Partnerschaft im Moment so leidet.

Die USA sind ohne jeden triftigen Grund aus dem Abkommen ausgestiegen, das haben wir gerade wieder von den Behörden, die das untersuchen, bestätigt bekommen. Es sollen die schärfsten Sanktionen aller Zeiten sein. Es sind Sanktionen gegen unsere europäischen mittelständischen Unternehmen; die großen gehen dieses Risiko gar nicht ein. Insofern brauchen wir dringend und bald die *special purpose vehicles,* um dem Mittelstand, der weiterhin auch mit dem Iran arbeiten möchte, zu helfen.

Frau Kommissarin, Sie haben gesagt: Es richtet sich nicht gegen die USA. Sie haben gesagt: Es ist nicht zur Umgehung der Sanktionen. Es ist falsch, was Sie gesagt haben. Natürlich richtet es sich gegen die USA, die unsere Firmen bedrohen, und natürlich ist es dafür da, ungerechtfertigte Sanktionen zu umgehen! Europa wird langsam wach dank Herrn Trump. Ich würde Sie bitten, auch wach zu werden.

Ana Gomes (S&D). – Senhora Presidente, as sanções americanas vão contra doze sucessivas confirmações de que o Irão está a cumprir os compromissos no quadro do acordo nuclear. A última, da AIE, chegou-nos ontem.

Trump e a sua administração mentem ao afirmar que as sanções não vão afetar o povo iraniano. Medicamentos essenciais e alimentos já estão a escassear. Os preços disparam, a inflação soma-se a uma desvalorização galopante. As sanções afetam também a companhia aérea iraniana, impedida de reabastecer em aeroportos europeus, pondo em causa a segurança de todos, desde logo iranianos e também aqueles que visitam o país, incluindo europeus e americanos. E, perversamente, este ataque ao povo iraniano mais o empurra para os braços das forças mais radicais do regime. Não ajuda os setores da sociedade que, corajosamente, se batem pelos direitos humanos e que se batem por mudanças democráticas.

A atualização da legislação de bloqueio e a criação de um *special purpose vehicle,* previsto pela Sra. Mogherini, têm de ser apoiadas. Os Estados-Membros têm de se pôr de acordo para garantir que este mecanismo tem personalidade jurídica e começa a operar o mais rapidamente possível. Está em causa a segurança internacional e a nossa própria credibilidade na garantia do GSPOA.

Pier Antonio Panzeri (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, penso che Trump non vincerà la sua scommessa con l'Iran. Con l'uscita dall'accordo sul nucleare e l'avvio delle sanzioni, l'Amministrazione americana ha fatto tre scommesse: fermare l'arricchimento dell'uranio, costringere gli altri firmatari a ritirare la propria adesione, penalizzando le aziende europee, e far crollare il regime iraniano sotto la pressione economica. Realisticamente non vincerà soprattutto la terza scommessa. Come molti osservatori hanno fatto notare, l'accordo sul nucleare aveva favorito la parte moderata guidata dal Presidente Rohani a danno della parte conservatrice, della Guida suprema Khamenei.

La reintroduzione delle sanzioni farà il gioco solo degli ultraconservatori, quelli che da sempre sono contrari al dialogo con gli Stati Uniti e l'Occidente in generale. Perciò è difficile che le sanzioni imposte da Trump possano stimolare grandi cambiamenti nella politica iraniana, se non in peggio anche per i diritti umani.

Per tutto questo io ritengo che l'Europa non deve avere paura e deve perseguire fino in fondo i propri rapporti di collaborazione con l'Iran, certo ponendo le questioni che deve porre, ma con forza e determinazione.

Catch-the-eye procedure

José Inácio Faria (PPE). – Senhora Presidente, Senhora Comissária, ao denunciar unilateralmente o plano de ação conjunto global e ao decretar o restabelecimento das sanções ao Irão, o Presidente Trump não só agravou as tensões no Médio Oriente como aumentou a responsabilidade da União Europeia na defesa da segurança mundial.

Ainda que imperfeito, principalmente por deixar de fora o programa de testes de mísseis balísticos iraniano, o Plano de Ação Conjunto Global é um instrumento histórico em matéria de diplomacia multilateral e constitui um marco importante para o desarmamento nuclear global, conforme atestam doze relatórios consecutivos da Agência Internacional de Energia Atómica que monitorizam o cumprimento das obrigações assumidas pelo Irão nesta matéria.

Por isso, Sra. Comissária, quero saudar a Sra. Mogherini pela firmeza com que tem defendido a manutenção deste acordo, mas espero que a operacionalização de instrumentos que permitam contornar os efeitos das sanções norte-americanas nas relações institucionais e comerciais com o regime dos *mullahs*, como o anunciado veículo para fins especiais, continue a ser condicionada pelos progressos registados no campo dos direitos humanos.

Não nos esqueçamos que continuamos a lidar com um regime antidemocrático e opressor que não se coíbe de torturar e assassinar os seus próprios cidadãos.

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, καταρχάς, δεν πρέπει να εξωραΐζουμε τον ρόλο του Ιράν, αλλά ούτε βέβαια και των Ηνωμένων Πολιτειών. Είναι προφανές ότι οι ΗΠΑ και η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση έχουν αντιτιθέμενα πολιτικά, οικονομικά και στρατιωτικά συμφέροντα στην περίπτωση του Ιράν. Είναι προφανές ότι η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση -και κυρίως η Γαλλία- έχουν κάνει σημαντικές επενδύσεις στο Ιράν, στην αυτοκινητοβιομηχανία και στα θέματα ενέργειας με την Total. Το βασικό θέμα, όμως, είναι ότι οι κυρώσεις των ΗΠΑ κατά του Ιράν έχουν εξωεδαφική εφαρμογή, δηλαδή εφαρμόζονται εναντίον όσων ευρωπαϊκών επιχειρήσεων δεν ακολουθούν τις κυρώσεις των Ηνωμένων Πολιτειών. Πρόκειται ξεκάθαρα για τη λογική του παγκόσμιου «χωροφύλακα» που έχουν οι Ηνωμένες Πολιτείες, που νομίζουν ότι μπορούν να κάνουν ό,τι γουστάρουν. Πρόκειται για μια νεοαποικιακή αντίληψη και πρακτική. Η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση πρέπει να αντιδράσει. Η νομοθεσία θωράκισης (Blocking Statute) είναι ένα πρώτο μέτρο, αλλά πρέπει να υπάρξουν αντίμετρα της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης απέναντι στις ΗΠΑ, προκειμένου να σταματήσει αυτή η εξωεδαφική επέμβαση των Ηνωμένων Πολιτειών.

Γεώργιος Επιτήδειος (NI). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, η επαναφορά των κυρώσεων των Ηνωμένων Πολιτειών της Αμερικής εναντίον του Ιράν πλήττει σημαντικούς και καίριους τομείς της οικονομίας του Ιράν, όπως τις εξαγωγές πετρελαίου, την αυτοκινητοβιομηχανία, τις αερομεταφορές και, κυρίως, πλήττει και τις εμπορικές συναλλαγές των ευρωπαϊκών εταιρειών με τις αντίστοιχες του Ιράν. Υπό την έννοια αυτή, η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση καλώς προτρέπει τις ευρωπαϊκές εταιρείες που έχουν συναλλαγές με ιρανικές εταιρείες να παραβλέψουν αυτές τις κυρώσεις των Ηνωμένων Πολιτειών. Όμως, δεν μπορώ να φανταστώ έναν τρόπο με τον οποίον μπορεί να εγγυηθεί η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση την προστασία των συμφερόντων αυτών των εταιρειών. Πρέπει να υπάρξει συνεργασία με τις Ηνωμένες Πολιτείες και συμφωνία με το Ιράν, ούτως ώστε να πειστούν οι Ηνωμένες Πολιτείες ότι οι επαφές και η υποστήριξη της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης προς το Ιράν δεν στρέφονται κατά των συμφερόντων των Ηνωμένων Πολιτειών. Επιπλέον, θα πρέπει η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση να εξετάσει και το ενδεχόμενο να επιβάλει και αυτή κυρώσεις σε αμερικανικές εταιρείες εάν τα πράγματα φτάσουν στο απροχώρητο.

(End of catch-the-eye procedure)

Věra Jourová, *Member of the Commission, on behalf of the Vice-President of the Commission / High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy.* – Madam President, this has been a very useful exchange and I thank the honourable Members for their interventions. From this debate I conclude that we share a common interest in using the diplomatic power and instruments of the EU and its Member States to their full potential in support of preserving and implementing the joint comprehensive plan of action, which is vital for EU and international security. May I close by signalling once again my appreciation of Parliament's role in keeping this important issue on its agenda.

President. – The debate is closed.

28. Tagesordnung der nächsten Sitzung

President. – Colleagues, our next sitting is tomorrow, Thursday, 15 November at 9.00. The agenda has been published and is available on the European Parliament website.

You may know that the United Kingdom Cabinet has agreed the draft Brexit withdrawal deal earlier this evening. It has just been published, and some of us may spend the evening reading the 585 pages of that text.

29. Schluss der Sitzung

(The sitting closed at 22.00)

Legende der verwendeten Zeichen

*	Konsultationsverfahren
***	Zustimmungsverfahren
***I	Ordentliches Gesetzgebungsverfahren, erste Lesung
***II	Ordentliches Gesetzgebungsverfahren, zweite Lesung
***III	Ordentliches Gesetzgebungsverfahren, dritte Lesung

(Das angegebene Verfahren entspricht der von der Kommission vorgeschlagenen Rechtsgrundlage.)

Abkürzungen der Ausschüsse

AFET	Ausschuss für auswärtige Angelegenheiten
DEVE	Entwicklungsausschuss
INTA	Ausschuss für internationalen Handel
BUDG	Haushaltsausschuss
CONT	Haushaltskontrollausschuss
ECON	Ausschuss für Wirtschaft und Währung
EMPL	Ausschuss für Beschäftigung und soziale Angelegenheiten
ENVI	Ausschuss für Umweltfragen, öffentliche Gesundheit und Lebensmittelsicherheit
ITRE	Ausschuss für Industrie, Forschung und Energie
IMCO	Ausschuss für Binnenmarkt und Verbraucherschutz
TRAN	Ausschuss für Verkehr und Fremdenverkehr
REGI	Ausschuss für regionale Entwicklung
AGRI	Ausschuss für Landwirtschaft und ländliche Entwicklung
PECH	Fischereiausschuss
CULT	Ausschuss für Kultur und Bildung
JURI	Rechtsausschuss
LIBE	Ausschuss für bürgerliche Freiheiten, Justiz und Inneres
AFCO	Ausschuss für konstitutionelle Fragen
FEMM	Ausschuss für die Rechte der Frau und die Gleichstellung der Geschlechter
PETI	Petitionsausschuss

DROI	Unterausschuss Menschenrechte
SEDE	Unterausschuss Sicherheit und Verteidigung

Abkürzungen der Fraktionen

PPE	Fraktion der Europäischen Volkspartei (Christdemokraten)
S&D	Fraktion der Progressiven Allianz der Sozialdemokraten im Europäischen Parlament
ECR	Fraktion der Europäischen Konservativen und Reformer
ALDE	Fraktion der Allianz der Liberalen und Demokraten für Europa
GUE/NGL	Konföderale Fraktion der Vereinigten Europäischen Linken/Nordische Grüne Linke
Verts/ALE	Fraktion der Grünen/Freie Europäische Allianz
EFDD	Fraktion Europa der Freiheit und der direkten Demokratie
ENF	Fraktion Europa der Nationen und der Freiheit
NI	Fraktionslos

Amtsblatt
der Europäischen Union

DE
Reihe C

C/2024/3538

7.6.2024

AUSFÜHRLICHE SITZUNGSBERICHTE VOM 15. NOVEMBER 2018

(C/2024/3538)

EUROPÄISCHES PARLAMENT

SITZUNGSPERIODE 2018-2019

Sitzungen vom 12. bis 15. November 2018

STRASSBURG

Inhalt

Seite

1. Eröffnung der Sitzung . . . 3

2. Betreuungsangebote in der EU zur Verbesserung der Gleichstellung der Geschlechter (Aussprache) . . . 3

3. Borreliose (Lyme-Krankheit) (Aussprache) . . . 14

4. Aussprache über Fälle von Verletzungen der Menschenrechte, der Demokratie und der Rechtsstaatlichkeit (Aussprache) . . . 23

4.1. Vietnam, insbesondere die Lage politischer Gefangener . . . 23

4.2. Die Menschenrechtslage in Kuba . . . 29

4.3. Die Menschenrechtslage in Bangladesch . . . 33

5. Abstimmungsstunde . . . 39

5.1. Vietnam, insbesondere die Lage politischer Gefangener (B8-0529/2018, B8-0530/2018, B8-0531/2018, B8-0540/2018, RC-B8-0526/2018, B8-0526/2018, B8-0527/2018) (Abstimmung) . . . 39

5.2. Die Menschenrechtslage in Kuba (RC-B8-0528/2018, B8-0528/2018, B8-0532/2018, B8-0534/2018, B8-0537/2018, B8-0541/2018, B8-0543/2018) (Abstimmung) . . . 39

5.3. Die Menschenrechtslage in Bangladesch (RC-B8-0533/2018, B8-0533/2018, B8-0535/2018, B8-0536/2018, B8-0538/2018, B8-0539/2018, B8-0542/2018, B8-0544/2018) (Abstimmung) 39

5.4. Transparente und verlässliche Arbeitsbedingungen in der Europäischen Union (A8-0355/2018 - Enrique Calvet Chambon) (Abstimmung) . . . 40

Inhalt Seite

5.5. Rechte und Pflichten der Fahrgäste im Eisenbahnverkehr (A8-0340/2018 - Bogusław Liberadzki) (Abstimmung) . . . 40

5.6. Persistente organische Schadstoffe (A8-0336/2018 - Julie Girling) (Abstimmung) . . . 40

5.7. Betreuungsangebote in der EU zur Verbesserung der Gleichstellung der Geschlechter (A8-0352/2018 - Sirpa Pietikäinen) (Abstimmung) . . . 40

5.8. Borreliose (Lyme-Krankheit) (B8-0514/2018) (Abstimmung) . . . 40

6. Stimmerklärungen . . . 41

6.1. Rechte und Pflichten der Fahrgäste im Eisenbahnverkehr (A8-0340/2018 - Bogusław Liberadzki) 41

6.2. Betreuungsangebote in der EU zur Verbesserung der Gleichstellung der Geschlechter (A8-0352/2018 - Sirpa Pietikäinen) . . . 43

6.3. Borreliose (Lyme-Krankheit) (B8-0514/2018) . . . 44

7. Berichtigungen des Stimmverhaltens und beabsichtigtes Stimmverhalten: siehe Protokoll . . . 45

8. Wiederaufnahme der Sitzung . . . 45

9. Genehmigung des Protokolls der vorangegangenen Sitzung: siehe Protokoll . . . 45

10. Weiterbehandlung eines Antrags auf Aufhebung der Immunität: siehe Protokoll . . . 45

11. Rolle des deutschen Jugendamts bei grenzüberschreitenden Familienstreitigkeiten (Aussprache) . . . 45

12. Beschlüsse über bestimmte Dokumente: siehe Protokoll . . . 51

13. Petitionen: siehe Protokoll . . . 51

14. Vorlage von Dokumenten: siehe Protokoll . . . 51

15. Übermittlung der in dieser Sitzung angenommenen Texte: siehe Protokoll . . . 52

16. Zeitpunkt der nächsten Sitzungen: siehe Protokoll . . . 52

17. Schluss der Sitzung . . . 52

18. Unterbrechung der Sitzungsperiode . . . 52

AUSFÜHRLICHE SITZUNGSBERICHTE VOM 15. NOVEMBER 2018

PRESIDENZA DELL'ON. DAVID-MARIA SASSOLI

Vicepresidente

1. Eröffnung der Sitzung

(La seduta è aperta alle 9.01)

2. Betreuungsangebote in der EU zur Verbesserung der Gleichstellung der Geschlechter (Aussprache)

Presidente. – L'ordine del giorno reca la relazione di Sirpa Pietikäinen, a nome della commissione per i diritti della donna e l'uguaglianza di genere, sui servizi di assistenza nell'UE per una migliore parità di genere (2018/2077(INI) (A8-0352/2018).

Agnieszka Kozłowska-Rajewicz, *w zastępstwie sprawozdawczyni*. – Panie Przewodniczący! Mam przyjemność rozpocząć dziś debatę nad sprawozdaniem Sirpy Petikainen na temat usług opiekuńczych w Unii Europejskiej w kontekście równości kobiet i mężczyzn. Niestety, jest to bardzo wymowne, że Sirpa nie może tego sprawozdania prezentować dziś osobiście właśnie z powodu obowiązków opiekuńczych. Sirpa, trzymamy kciuki, żeby wszystko było dobrze!

Na początek pragnę zaznaczyć, że sprawozdanie jest czasowo i tematycznie związane z legislacyjnym pakietem *work-life balance*, który zawiera propozycje Komisji Europejskiej dotyczące minimalnego standardu w zakresie urlopów rodzicielskich, a także urlopu ojcowskiego i urlopu opiekuńczego. Sprawozdanie Sirpy Petikainen uzupełnia ten pakiet legislacyjny, pokazując obecną sytuację i wyzwania w zakresie usług opiekuńczych, tak wobec dzieci, jak i wobec wymagających opieki dorosłych.

Dlaczego temat usług opiekuńczych rozważamy dziś w kontekście praw kobiet? Ponieważ tę bardzo trudną, wymagającą pracę wykonują przede wszystkim kobiety. Jeżeli opiekują się członkiem rodziny, bywa, że muszą porzucić swoje normalne zajęcia, bywa, że pracują latami bez jednego dnia urlopu. Ich praca jest nieodpłatna, a jeżeli wykonują ją dla innej rodziny, nawet jeżeli jest płatna, bardzo często jest to praca nierejestrowana. 80% usług opiekuńczych i generalnie usług w sektorze pracownika domowego to praca na czarno bez zabezpieczeń socjalnych, bez przyszłości, bez emerytury. To sprawozdanie dotyczy tego, co w życiu każdego człowieka jest najważniejsze – ludzkiej godności.

Mówimy tutaj, w tym sprawozdaniu o kobietach także dlatego, że opieka nad osobami zależnymi jest pierwszą przeszkodą w udziale kobiet w rynku pracy. Przerwy w karierze zawodowej, późniejsze rozpoczynanie kariery, odwlekanie awansu, bo dzieci, wcześniejsze wychodzenie z rynku pracy, bo wymagający opieki rodzice, wybieranie ścieżek edukacyjnych i zawodowych pozwalających na bycie dyspozycyjną wobec rodziny, a nie wobec pracodawcy skutkują niższymi zarobkami, wolniejszymi podwyżkami, okresami nieaktywności zawodowej i w rezultacie niską emeryturą. Przypomnę, że luka emerytalna w Unii Europejskiej wynosi obecnie 38%.

Ponieważ obowiązki opiekuńcze są dla kobiet pierwszą przeszkodą w realizacji zawodowej, zapewnienie dostępnych i dobrych jakościowo usług opiekuńczych dla dzieci i dorosłych jest pierwszą powinnością polityków i decydentów w tym zakresie. Demografia jest nieubłagana – potrzeby opiekuńcze rosną, problem jest coraz poważniejszy i będzie narastał, a ofiarami braku skutecznych rozwiązań w tym zakresie są kobiety.

Uregulowanie tego rynku, sformalizowanie pracy opiekuńczej, a także znalezienie rozwiązań na bezpieczne pod względem zdrowotnym i finansowym funkcjonowanie opiekunów nieformalnych to główne tezy sprawozdania Sirpy Petikainen, do którego grupy polityczne wprowadziły wiele poprawek i za wszystkie te poprawki w imieniu sprawozdawczyni serdecznie dziękuję. Sprawozdawczyni podnosi w sprawozdaniu wiele istotnych i pilnych potrzeb związanych z kwestią opieki. Zwraca uwagę na fakt, że cele opiekuńcze najefektywniej realizuje się w systemie rodzinnym i środowiskowym, a nie instytucjonalnym. W dalszej części sprawozdania podkreśla wagę takiej domowej, opartej na relacjach z rodziną i przyjaciółmi opieki i apeluje o rozwiązania infrastrukturalne i organizacyjne, które wzmacniają opiekę domową, rodzinną i środowiskową. Kluczowe jest to, aby każdy rodzaj opieki był wspierany niezależnie od statusu zawodowego opiekuna, czyli aby był dostępny zarówno dla osób zatrudnionych w pełnym, jak i niepełnym wymiarze pracy oraz dla bezrobotnych i żeby ciężar polityk opiekuńczych, główny kierunek ich rozwoju opierał się na opiece domowej, kameralnej, a nie na instytucjach.

W imieniu grupy PPE popieram to sprawozdanie, jednocześnie zaznaczając, że w kwestii niektórych poprawek składanych przez naszych kolegów z innych grup politycznych, dotyczących rozdzielnego opodatkowania kobiet i mężczyzn, włączenia monitorowania systemów opieki do semestru europejskiego czy przełożenia ciężaru opieki na instytucje nasza grupa polityczna będzie głosowała przeciw, jako że są to propozycje ingerujące w kwestie subsydiarności oraz polityki prorodzinnej.

Věra Jourová, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, I would like to thank the Parliament and the rapporteur, Sirpa Pietikäinen, for the work done on this dossier, which highlights some key elements and issues to tackle with regard to care services. The Commission shares the Parliament's position that such services are crucial for gender equality, in particular to allow women's equal participation in the labour market and for women's empowerment and the work-life balance of working parents and carers.

This was also part of the work-life balance legislative proposal and the Action Plan to tackle the gender pay gap of November 2017. Ensuring that women and men can combine work with care duties is a key element to close the gender employment gap. Two sides of the same coin are important: having working arrangements that allow workers to combine it with care responsibilities and having access to affordable and high-quality care services for children and other dependents.

This will help tackle the gender pay gap, as was highlighted at the Equal Pay Day just a few weeks ago. Having access to care services and working arrangements adapted to one's care needs are determinant for women to achieve their full employment potential. In addition, the value of women's work and equal pay for work of equal value are crucial. Indeed, women often carry out care work. It is therefore important to reflect upon the effectiveness of the implementation of the current equal pay provisions, for which I intend to launch an open consultation over the next couple of weeks. The work-life balance proposal is also important in this context. It will offer choices for working parents and is closely linked to affordable childcare facilities. We are making good progress in the trilogues and I hope that we will be able to finalise them before the end of the year.

With regard to childcare, the Commission adopted a report on the Barcelona objectives on 8 May this year. While the overall targets for childcare have been reached on average for the EU, less than half of the Member States have met these targets. In order to meet the targets, childcare should not only be available, but also be affordable and of high quality. This is essential for the social inclusion of children from a disadvantaged background, in order for them to have a good educational start in life.

The Commission has also adopted a proposal for a Council recommendation on affordable and high-quality early childhood education and care systems, including a quality framework based on principles of availability, affordability, inclusion, a good educational programme, professionalisation and good working conditions for educational staff, good governance and monitoring.

Overall, I would like to recall that these issues are monitored in the European Semester process and are reflected in many national reports. Funding through the European Structural and Investment Funds should be prioritised, particularly for those countries lagging behind. I look forward to this debate today.

Michaela Šojdrová, *za skupinu PPE*. – Pane předsedající, oblast pečovatelských služeb je bezpochyby důležitá a vzhledem k demografickému vývoji bude její význam v budoucnosti ještě posilovat. Toto odvětví je především v pravomoci členských států, jsou to členské státy, které mají zájem na zlepšování podmínek pro všechny pracovníky v těchto službách, ať jsou to ženy nebo muži. Jsou to členské státy, které musí klást důraz na kvalitu a dostupnost všech pečovatelských služeb.

Já samozřejmě vnímám vazbu této zprávy na směrnici o slaďování soukromého a pracovního života. V této oblasti podporuji také to, aby pečovatelská doba byla zahrnuta do dovolené, aby pečovatelé měli co nejlepší podmínky pro svoji práci. Ale kompetence členských států je třeba v této věci respektovat.

Genderové hledisko se pečovatelské služby týká jen omezeně. Zpráva v tomto ohledu, troufám si říci, není vyvážená a opomíjí řadu faktorů, které by měly být zohledněny, protože pečovatelské služby jsou skutečně komplexní, dotýkají se dalších aspektů, jako je věk, jako jsou ohrožené skupiny a další faktory.

Za problematické body považuji mimo jiné to, že se zde vyzývá k oddělenému zdaňování manželů, k co nejširšímu konceptu rodiny, k tomu, aby Komise regulovala a kontrolovala kvalitu služeb, aby vytvořila závazný rámec pro minimální normy pro pracovní podmínky v tomto odvětví a k zaručení finanční podpory pro pečovatele. Tyto a další body podle mého názoru výrazně zasahují do kompetence členských států. Dovolím si říci, že nejen podle mého názoru, ale také podle části skupiny Evropské lidové strany. Přesto děkuji za vypracování této zprávy jako jisté motivace pro naši další práci.

Iratxe García Pérez, *en nombre del Grupo S&D*. – Señor presidente, señora comisaria, en la Unión Europea viven en torno a ochenta millones de personas dependientes. El 80 % de los servicios asistenciales prestados en la Unión Europea corresponde a cuidadores informales no remunerados, y de ellos, el 75 % son mujeres. Esto tiene mucho que ver con el problema que existe, en estos momentos, de brecha salarial y de brecha de las pensiones. Es escandaloso que en la Europa del siglo XXI las mujeres estén recibiendo una media de un 45 % menos en las pensiones que los hombres. Y otro dato revelador también que se extrae del informe, es cómo las políticas de austeridad han contribuido al deterioro de los servicios públicos, tan fundamentales para conseguir este principio de conciliación y de corresponsabilidad.

Por lo tanto, damos la bienvenida al informe y mostramos énfasis en que se cumplan aquellas peticiones que se plantean para avanzar en la conciliación de la vida familiar y laboral y en la corresponsabilidad. Por eso también hacemos hoy un llamamiento aquí para que haya un acuerdo por parte del Consejo y se posibiliten las negociaciones con este Parlamento con la Directiva de permisos parentales. Es fundamental. Es indispensable. Las mujeres llevamos toda la vida conciliando. Ahora necesitamos también que sean nuestros compañeros, que sean los hombres los que se incorporen a esta tarea.

Y, además, este informe también hace referencia a la necesidad de que los sistemas de reconocimiento de derechos sociales y pensiones se tengan en cuenta con las cuidadoras y cuidadores. Y por ello, pongo énfasis aquí en iniciativas como la del Gobierno de España, con su proyecto de presupuestos, que incluye volver a incorporar en los sistemas de seguridad social a las mujeres que cuidan a las personas dependientes. Solo con estas iniciativas conseguiremos avanzar en una corresponsabilidad real del cuidado de las personas dependientes y de los niños y de las niñas en la Unión Europea.

Ruža Tomašić, *u ime kluba ECR*. – Poštovani predsjedavajući, ravnopravnost spolova nešto je čemu apsolutno moramo težiti, ali to mora biti ravnopravnost u prilikama, a ne u krajnjim ishodima. Žene moraju imati jednaku priliku kao i muškarci ostvariti se na raznim područjima u životu, a hoće li to učiniti, to je njihova osobna stvar. Ne mogu se oteti dojmu da feministkinje imaju unaprijed isplaniran život za sve žene, a one koje žele živjeti drugačije za njih su ropkinje ili jednostavno poludjele. Toliko o raznolikosti o kojoj puno pričaju.

Mjerenje nejednakosti na razini krajnjih ishoda potpuno je pogrešno jer ne uzima u obzir različite biološki definirane afinitete i uloge. Majka je majka, a otac je otac – i imaju različite uloge u životu djeteta prema kojima se onda kroje i neki drugi životni izbori. To je sasvim prirodno.

Naš je zadatak i ženama i muškarcima osigurati mogućnost izbora, a ne im nametati svoju viziju njihovih međusobnih odnosa.

Beatriz Becerra Basterrechea, *en nombre del Grupo ALDE.* – Señor presidente, señora comisaria, la forma en que Europa gestione los servicios asistenciales, la forma en que tratemos a sus profesionales dirá mucho de lo que queremos de la Unión Europea y su futuro.

El cuidado de personas dependientes, de mayores y de niños, ha sido tradicionalmente un cometido de las mujeres por el que no han sido remuneradas ni reconocidas. Todavía hoy, el 80 % de los servicios asistenciales prestados en la Unión corresponde a cuidadores no remunerados, de los cuales entre el 75 % y el 80 % son mujeres.

La tendencia en Europa es negativa: durante los últimos diez años, el tiempo dedicado por mujeres a cuidados, labores domésticas y actividades sociales ha aumentado en comparación con los hombres. Esto tiene graves consecuencias económicas y sociales, es un obstáculo para la consecución de los objetivos de la Unión en materia de igualdad de género.

Es hora de cambiar esto. Es hora de que asumamos el cuidado de los demás como una tarea social clave que marca el nivel de bienestar e incluso el nivel moral de una sociedad.

Es hora de que los servicios asistenciales estén reconocidos y regulados como lo que son: un pilar europeo de los derechos sociales.

Tanto las instituciones europeas como los Estados miembros debemos hacer un esfuerzo en esta materia: debemos definirlos correctamente, de manera que comprendan la atención a la infancia y a la educación en primera infancia, la asistencia a las personas de edad avanzada y también la asistencia a las personas con discapacidad. Debemos lograr que sean accesibles y flexibles para atender a las necesidades de familias con diferentes necesidades y situaciones personales.

Pensemos en las familias monoparentales, en los autónomos, en los trabajadores por turnos en un mundo laboral profunda y radicalmente transformado. Pensemos en una sociedad que debe evolucionar para adecuarse a esos nuevos retos, porque en una Europa que cuida, en una Europa que protege, en una Europa que no deja a nadie atrás, cuidar debe ser una actividad respetada, segura, transparente, profesional y adecuadamente remunerada.

Ernest Urtasun, *en nombre del Grupo Verts/ALE.* – Señor presidente, en los últimos años la falta de unos servicios de asistencia y de cuidados públicos suficientemente desarrollados y de apoyo a los cuidadores y cuidadoras ha generado que muchas mujeres se hayan visto obligadas a volver a desempeñar tareas de cuidados. La austeridad y los recortes en los servicios públicos han hecho un daño extraordinario a la igualdad entre hombres y mujeres. Y después, evidentemente, esto repercute en la brecha salarial y en la brecha de pensiones, porque muchas mujeres se ven obligadas a abandonar sus puestos de trabajo para dedicarse a las tareas de cuidados.

Por ello, es muy importante desarrollar este pilar esencial del Estado del bienestar. Yo celebro que aprobemos hoy este informe en el que se pide claramente que se desarrollen los servicios públicos, que haya inversiones claras en los servicios de atención y de cuidados de los Estados miembros y que haya apoyo a los profesionales, cuidadores y cuidadoras, y formación; y que ese sea un pilar desarrollado que permita, de una vez por todas, tener una sociedad igualitaria.

No habrá sociedad igualitaria en la Unión Europea si no tenemos unos servicios públicos que sean capaces de cubrir este pilar esencial del Estado del bienestar.

Κωνσταντίνα Κούνεβα, *εξ ονόματος της ομάδας GUE/NGL*. – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, δύο χρόνια μετά την έγκριση της έκθεσής μου για το οικιακό προσωπικό και το προσωπικό φροντίδας, ακόμα περιμένουμε μια νομοθετική πρωτοβουλία στον τομέα της φροντίδας. Γι' αυτόν τον λόγο τη ζητάμε ξανά μέσα από το κείμενο αυτής της έκθεσης. Δουλέψαμε με τη συνάδελφο Sirpa Pietikäinen για να κάνουμε ένα ακόμα βήμα προς την αναγνώριση και ρύθμιση του τομέα της φροντίδας. Ελπίζω αυτή τη φορά οι συνάδελφοι να μη γυρίσουν την πλάτη τους στα εκατομμύρια εργαζομένων του τομέα, που φροντίζουν τα αγαπημένα μας πρόσωπα και, δυστυχώς, συχνά μένουν στο εργασιακό σκοτάδι όσο εμείς βγαίνουμε στο φως αναζητώντας την προσωπική και επαγγελματική μας εξέλιξη. Τι χρειαζόμαστε λοιπόν, για να βγάλουμε την αόρατη αυτή κατηγορία εργαζομένων στο φως; Πρώτον, ρύθμιση και αναγνώριση του επαγγέλματος σε ευρωπαϊκό επίπεδο. Δεύτερον, γενναίες ευρωπαϊκές επενδύσεις σε δομές φροντίδας σε επίπεδο κοινότητας. Τρίτον, ενίσχυση του πετσοκομμένου κοινωνικού κράτους. Τέταρτον, προγράμματα για εκπαίδευση, υποστήριξη και ενίσχυση δεξιοτήτων του προσωπικού φροντίδας. Συνάδελφοι, ο τομέας της φροντίδας και η διαχείρισή του μπορεί να σας φαίνεται βουνό. Πρέπει, όμως, να το ανεβούμε και όχι απλώς να το κοιτάζουμε. Δεν πρόκειται να γίνει μικρότερο. Είναι καιρός να φροντίσουμε το προσωπικό φροντίδας. Γι' αυτό και σας καλώ να υπερψηφίσετε την έκθεσή μας.

Mylène Troszczynski, *au nom du groupe ENF*. – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Commissaire, aider les familles dites «rurales» en réhabilitant les centres de soins locaux ou en créant des centres pour la petite enfance, reconnaître le travail de ceux que vous appelez les «aidants», éviter la discrimination à l'emploi lorsqu'une mère ou un père a fait le choix de servir sa famille sont de bonnes propositions. Mais, comme souvent, vos bonnes intentions s'effacent sous l'idéologie européiste, et c'est à la Commission européenne – via les fonds de solidarité qui ne sont pas les siens – que vous confiez cette tâche.

Vous demandez aux États de mieux répartir les fonds européens, mais vous oubliez simplement que c'est une des souverainetés que vous avez enlevées aux États membres, puisque c'est un pouvoir qui a été donné aux régions.

Enfin, vous précisez l'objectif réel du rapport, qui n'est absolument pas le bien-être des familles, mais les 370 milliards que représenteraient en une année le manque à gagner pour l'Union européenne et les grandes entreprises lorsque les femmes font le choix de servir leur famille plutôt que de travailler. Vous l'avouez: une mère doit au plus vite retourner travailler à la fin de son congé de maternité. Et pour faciliter ce retour, vous demandez aux hommes de prendre leurs responsabilités.

La motivation de ce type de texte démontre une nouvelle fois les ambitions qui sont les vôtres. Je réaffirme donc que les politiques familiales sont et doivent rester une prérogative des États souverains. L'Union européenne n'a pas à entrer dans l'intimité des familles.

Κωνσταντίνος Παπαδάκης (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η στρατηγική της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης και των βιομηχάνων για ισορροπία μεταξύ επαγγελματικής και προσωπικής ζωής των γυναικών έχει ως στόχο την ακόμη μεγαλύτερη ευελιξία και την εκμετάλλευσή τους. Πίσω από ανέξοδες ευχές στην έκθεση, η φροντίδα της οικογένειας και των ηλικιωμένων, αντί για κοινωνικό δικαίωμα και ευθύνη, μετατρέπεται σε ατομική υπόθεση η οποία το πολύ-πολύ να μοιράζεται ανάμεσα στις γυναίκες και τους άντρες. Προτείνεται, μάλιστα, και η απόσυρση των γυναικών από την εργασία, προκειμένου να φροντίζουν μέλη της οικογένειας έναντι επιδότησης. Τη διάλυση και την εμπορευματοποίηση των υποδομών και των υπηρεσιών στήριξης της οικογένειας και των κρατικών παιδικών σταθμών, η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση και κυβέρνηση ΣΥΡΙΖΑ-ΑΝΕΛ τις αποκαλούν «στοιχειώδες δίκτυο δημόσιων και ιδιωτικών δομών» με την εργατική λαϊκή οικογένεια να φορτώνεται αβάσταχτα βάρη για τα αυτονόητα. Η δε συμμετοχή της γυναίκας στην κοινωνική εργασία -και μάλιστα με όρους γαλέρας- έρχεται σε σύγκρουση με τη μητρότητα. Άλλωστε -και με σφραγίδα του Δικαστηρίου της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης- νομιμοποιήθηκε, πρόσφατα, η απόλυση εγκύων. Οι γυναίκες των εργατικών λαϊκών στρωμάτων, με τον ταξικό αγώνα τους και την κοινωνική απελευθέρωση από τα δεσμά του εκμεταλλευτικού συστήματος, πρέπει να κάνουν πράξη την ισοτιμία και τη χειραφέτησή τους. Μπορούν!

Vilija Blinkevičiūtė (S&D). – Pone Pirmininke, mano manymu, kalbėdami apie priežiūros paslaugų svarbą Europos Sąjungoje, šiandien ir ateityje, turime iš esmės kalbėti apie du aspektus – kaip priežiūros paslaugos skatina ir prisideda prie moterų ir vyrų lygybės darbe ir namuose, ir, kaip mes galime užtikrinti, kad gerėtų priežiūros paslaugas teikiančių asmenų darbo užmokestis, jų socialinė apsauga, sauga ir sveikata darbe.

Deja, faktai rodo, kad tinkamų, prieinamų ir saugių priežiūros paslaugų nebuvimas skaudžiai atsiliepia moterų profesinei savirealizacijai, o, kalbant žemiškiau – tiesiog sudaro sąlygas moterų skurdui, kuris akumuliuojasi iki vos ne 40 proc. pensijų skirtumo senatvėje. Kodėl taip yra? Ogi todėl, kad moterų emancipacija namuose vyksta kur kas lėčiau, nei profesinėje srityje. Juk dažniausiai, jei moteris pasirenka karjerą, tai yra suprantama, kaip papildomas jos pasirinkimas šalia neapmokamo vaikų ar sergančių šeimos narių priežiūros, ar namų ūkio ruošos darbo. Moterys vis dar yra baudžiamos, jei pasirenka turėti ir karjerą, ir šeimą. Tačiau dėl to nukenčia ne tik moterys. Dėl to nukenčia visuomenė.

Taip, pirmas, svarbiausias žingsnis link lygybės ne tik darbe, bet ir namuose žengtas, dėl ko dar kartą noriu padėkoti Europos Komisijai, ir ačiū, Komisare. Kalbu apie Darbo ir asmeninio gyvenimo suderinimo direktyvos pasiūlymą. O taip pat noriu paraginti Tarybą nedaryti klaidos ir nesumenkinti šito ilgai laukto teisės akto iki tokio, kuris neatneštų apčiuopiamos naudos. Noriu paraginti šalių vyriausybes suprasti, kad šis teisės aktas – tai pati geriausia investicija į mūsų žmonių, į mūsų valstybių ir į mūsų Sąjungos ateitį. Ir pakviesti į tai žvelgti kaip į solidarumo apraišką.

Linnéa Engström (Verts/ALE). – Herr talman! Fru kommissionär! Vi behöver ”omsorg utan underordning”. Dessa kända ord kommer från Gertrud Åström, som lade grunden till det strategiska jämställdhetsarbetet i mitt hemland Sverige.

Omsorgssektorn är kvinnodominerad och underbetald. Några av de viktigaste arbetena i vårt samhälle – att ta hand om barn och unga, sjuka och gamla – är så tunga och dåligt finansierade att nästan ingen orkar arbeta heltid. Ingen maskin eller smart robot kan erbjuda det som en människa kan – en varm hand, tröst, snälla ord i stunder när livet är som mest utmanande.

Det gör mig livrädd och förbannad att våra sjuksköterskor och läkare knappt hinner äta lunch eller gå på toaletten, att förskolorna inte hittar utbildade förskollärare, att våra gamla förvägras en stunds frisk luft, och att kvinnor måste vara rädda för att föda barn för att barnmorskorna strejkar.

Så här kan det inte få fortsätta! I mitt samhälle prioriterar vi kvinnors arbete. Vi ger det högre status och ordentligt betalt.

Tania González Peñas (GUE/NGL). – Señor presidente, el 75 % de las personas dedicadas a los trabajos de cuidados en la Unión Europea son mujeres.

Los trabajos de cuidados, realizados históricamente por las mujeres de manera invisible en el ámbito privado, son hoy una fuente de precariedad en el mercado laboral y, sin embargo, son esenciales para el sostenimiento de la vida. Los cuidados no pueden seguir realizándose de manera informal a costa de las condiciones de vida y la salud de las mujeres. Apelo, por tanto, al sentido común para eliminar la referencia a los cuidados informales.

Debemos profesionalizar el sector y garantizar los derechos laborales por tres motivos: el primero, porque es un derecho, por justicia social; en segundo lugar, porque es una necesidad de nuestras sociedades; y, en tercer lugar, porque no solamente es un problema que solucionar, sino que también es una oportunidad.

Según la Conferencia Internacional de Sindicatos, en los países de la OCDE, invirtiendo entre un 2 % y un 6 %, en muchos de ellos se podría incrementar hasta un 8 % el empleo.

Invertir en cuidados de calidad con servicios públicos de calidad puede ser una gran oportunidad para generar empleos de calidad y mejorar la vida de nuestras sociedades.

Dobromir Sośnierz (NI). – Panie Przewodniczący! W uzasadnieniu tego sprawozdania stwierdza się z ubolewaniem, że istnieje negatywna tendencja, zgodnie z którą kobiety spędzają więcej czasu na opiece w gospodarstwie domowym i wykonują bezpłatną pracę. Takie rzeczy może pisać tylko osoba, która kompletnie nie rozumie, o czym pisze, i kompletnie nie rozumie ekonomii. Jeśli mamy dwie osoby: jedna pani pracuje na poczcie, a druga pracuje w domu, zajmując się swoimi dziećmi bezpłatnie, to taka sytuacja według sprawozdawców jest gorsza, niż kiedy one zamienią się miejscami: matka pójdzie pracować na pocztę, a urzędniczka z poczty przyjdzie zajmować się jej dziećmi. Obie będą wtedy miały płatną pracę. Według was ta sytuacja jest lepsza, jak rozumiem. Dlaczego według was jest lepsza? Dlatego, że wówczas państwo „położy łapę” na pieniądzach z ich wynagrodzeń. O to wam chodzi. Boli was, że gdy praca jest wykonywana bezpłatnie w domu, to nie macie z tego pieniędzy z podatków. A wy chcecie zbierać tam, gdzie nie posialiście. Chcecie dobierać się do cudzych pieniędzy i chcecie, żeby jak najwięcej pieniędzy wpływało do waszych budżetów. Nie chodzi o żadne dobro ludzi, tylko o wasze pełne kieszenie.

Anna Hedh (S&D). – Herr talman! Detta är en mycket viktig feministisk fråga, eftersom den påverkar kvinnors dagliga liv och samhället i stort. Dock tycker jag att betänkandet är alldeles för långtgående. Hur medlemsstaterna ska organisera sin omsorg ska vara upp till medlemsstaterna och inga andra. Jämställdhetsperspektivet är emellertid oerhört viktigt och kan inte betonas nog mycket.

Kvinnor och män i EU deltar på arbetsmarknaden i olika utsträckning. Kvinnor tar huvudansvaret för omsorgen om barnen och det obetalda hemarbetet. En del lämnar arbetsmarknaden för en tid. En del kommer aldrig tillbaka. Situationen är förödande ekonomiskt sett. För kvinnan blir inkomsten mindre – för att inte tala om pensionen. Dessutom förlorar samhället massor av pengar på att kvinnor inte arbetar i samma utsträckning som män.

Kvinnor diskrimineras också i omsorgen. Kvinnor får sämre tillgång till vård, har längre väntetider, och deras oro tas inte på lika stort allvar som mäns. Allt detta måste vi tala om! Allt detta måste vi ha med oss i vårt politiska arbete! Alla vi här i huset har precis lika stort ansvar, oavsett om vi är kvinnor eller män!

Procedura «catch the eye»

Mairead McGuinness (PPE). – Mr President, and thanks to our rapporteur. I'm very conscious, colleagues, that there are carers who have not slept overnight because they're looking after a sick child, a person with a disability or elderly parents, and the statistics that 80% of care is unpaid and informal and that 75% of it is done by women are worth repeating. This isn't just an ideological debate or about money; this is about the type of society we want for the future. We are going to face an enormous challenge in encouraging people to get into the paid care sector because it is low-paid, and indeed we have smaller families, so we will have fewer people who are available to care. And maybe for selfish reasons those of us of a certain age in this House might ponder those difficulties. So I think this debate should be about a vision for the future, where people who care are cared for by others and have respite and recognition.

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Domnule președinte, doamna comisar, stimați colegi, 32 de milioane de copii cu vârstă preșcolară: analiza arată că situația îngrijirii copiilor – și nu numai a copiilor, ci și a persoanelor în vârstă – în Uniunea Europeană nu arată bine. Este un eșec, sigur, și al statelor membre, dar și al Uniunii Europene, pentru că avem foarte multe directive, foarte multe reglementări care, de fapt, nu-și ating scopul.

Avem nevoie de infrastructură. Trebuie să alocăm fonduri în zona rurală, unde sunt cei mai mulți copii și unde nu avem posibilitatea de a le asigura o îngrijire eficientă și corectă. Trebuie să asigurăm o remunerație bună și corectă și echitabilă a femeilor, pentru că, în majoritate, femeile fac aceste îngrijiri și, da, trebuie să ne gândim cum putem instituțional să îmbunătățim situația, pentru că, iată, avem situații – în Finlanda, de exemplu – când copiii sunt luați și separați de mamă și ținuți în instituție cu forța.

Deci avem foarte multe lucruri de făcut și, pentru un lucru echitabil, trebuie să îmbunătățim și remunerația femeilor și legislația privind drepturile copilului și îngrijirea persoanelor în vârstă.

José Inácio Faria (PPE). – Senhor Presidente, Senhora Comissária, a participação desigual de homens e mulheres na prestação de cuidados a crianças, idosos ou pessoas com doenças crónicas, na realização de tarefas domésticas e na participação em atividades sociais na União Europeia continua a ser um fator alarmante na nossa sociedade.

Dos cuidados prestados na União Europeia, 80% são prestados por cuidadores informais não remunerados, dos quais 75% são mulheres, pelo que urge avançar a nível europeu com instrumentos legais capazes de promover a igualdade de género na prestação de cuidados e na regulamentação homogénea da profissão.

Gostaria de realçar que alguns Estados-Membros já criaram programas destinados a apoio e a proteção a doentes com Alzheimer, às suas famílias e a profissionais de saúde. Por isso, pergunto: para quando a criação de um programa semelhante para os prestadores de cuidados formais e informais?

Caros colegas, tendo em conta que a grande maioria dos prestadores de cuidados são mulheres, a futura diretiva sobre o equilíbrio de vida entre a vida profissional e a vida privada deve, efetivamente, proteger a mulher e garantir que a mesma não seja despedida por motivos intrínsecos à condição feminina.

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, συζητούμε ένα σοβαρό θέμα, το οποίο έχει άμεση σχέση με τη φροντίδα τόσο των ηλικιωμένων όσο και των παιδιών. Ένα θέμα που απασχολεί τη σύγχρονη κοινωνία. Βεβαίως, επί της ουσίας, είναι ένα κοινωνικό δικαίωμα των πολιτών και η αντίστοιχη υποχρέωση του κράτους είναι να διασφαλίσει αυτήν τη φροντίδα και για τους ηλικιωμένους και για τα παιδιά. Τα στοιχεία δείχνουν ότι το 80% της φροντίδας παρέχεται από μη αμειβόμενους άτυπους φροντιστές, το 75% των οποίων είναι γυναίκες. Ταυτόχρονα, το 27,5% αυτού του ποσοστού των γυναικών εργάζεται με μερική απασχόληση προκειμένου να μπορεί να φροντίζει τα παιδιά. Πρέπει, λοιπόν, να υπάρξει ορθός συνδυασμός εργασίας και υπηρεσιών φροντίδας. Φυσικά, η λιτότητα έχει ως αποτέλεσμα να μειωθούν οι δημόσιες δαπάνες και να χτυπηθεί αυτό το κοινωνικό

δικαίωμα. Στην Ελλάδα, πάνω από 35 000 παιδιά έμειναν εκτός παιδικών σταθμών φέτος. Αντιλαμβάνεται κανείς ότι πρέπει να ληφθούν συγκεκριμένα μέτρα και να δοθούν φορολογικά κίνητρα και να ενισχυθεί, βεβαίως, και η αγρότισσα, προκειμένου να μπορεί και αυτή να έχει άπλετο χρόνο, δεδομένου η φροντίδα των παιδιών την απασχολεί πάρα πολύ.

Krzysztof Hetman (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Warunki opieki zarówno nad dziećmi, jak i osobami zależnymi w poszczególnych krajach Unii Europejskiej znacznie się od siebie różnią. Dotyczy to zarówno samego dostępu do infrastruktury, jak i jakości oferty świadczonych usług. Dlatego też uważam, że choć na poziomie unijnym potrzebujemy wspólnej strategii i zintegrowanego podejścia, nie należy stosować podejścia „jedno rozwiązanie dla wszystkich", tylko brać pod uwagę indywidualne potrzeby lokalne i regionalne.

W celu poprawy standardów usług opieki warto korzystać z narzędzi, które oferuje nam polityka spójności. Uważam, że fundusze strukturalne powinny być ukierunkowane na inwestycje w infrastrukturę na tych obszarach, gdzie wciąż takich ośrodków brakuje lub wymagają one modernizacji. Europejski Fundusz Spójności natomiast może zarówno być wsparciem dla kadr, jak i pomagać młodym rodzicom i opiekunom w powrocie na rynek pracy po przerwie spowodowanej opieką.

Ważne jest także promowanie elastycznego podejścia wśród pracodawców, aby osoby sprawujące opiekę mogły łączyć swoje obowiązki z karierą zawodową.

Doru-Claudian Frunzulică (S&D). – Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, Commissioner, it's very important that this report underlines the role of women at the care services within the context of the work-life balance proposal and emphasises the importance of the availability of diverse, quality, accessible and affordable care infrastructure and support for childcare and care for other dependents – either at home or in home-like situations. This is very important to have it in a report of the European Parliament. I would like to underline the fact that the draft report discusses as well the targets for development of different services, and finally includes recommendations related to the funding of care infrastructure and services. The compromises found for the focus on the informal care sector an improvement of conditions in the formal care sector. In addition, my Group, the S&D, underlined the need for investment by the public sector in care services as well as in awareness of the difficult situation of women working in this sector, having in mind the different familiar composition which leads to needing care. The S&D Group also demands to set social progress indicators to be monitored in the context of the European semesters, in addition to be able to reach the Barcelona targets.

Julie Ward (S&D). – Mr President, in today's societies, care work is disproportionately carried out by women and girls. They do most of this work for free, and it's taken for granted. Women's care work, both formal and informal, is sadly still a source of shocking inequality. Austerity policies and the resulting increase in poverty have seriously exacerbated the problem as vital services have been cut to the bone. Yet, changing demographics mean that more of us are in need of care, so we're seeing families and dependants forced to fall back on traditional gender roles.

Domestic workers, who are mostly migrant women, are open to terrible abuse by employers. Meanwhile, in the UK, Brexit threatens the future supply of care workers, leaving the elderly and disabled vulnerable. I'm happy to see that the report stresses that EU funding should support the transition from institutionalisation to a community and family-based model of care services, both for disabled people and other vulnerable groups such as children, and also that the report highlights the need for a work-life balance.

Csaba Sógor (PPE). – Mr President, many children in Central and Eastern European countries are at risk of not being effectively supported in their early ages in order to reach their full potential. If we want the future generation of the European Union to form a healthier and more successful society we need to make early childhood development a priority.

There is growing evidence that preventive education can generate lifelong changes in cognitive development and social behaviour when children reach adolescence and adulthood. Early childhood intervention programmes can alleviate the issues of social exclusion, unemployment, poverty, and would also reduce the proportion of mental disease in Member States. In Romania, 40% of disabled children don't attend any form of education, for instance.

Helping vulnerable children to develop at an early age, according to their needs, is part of a sustainable solution to social integration in the EU. I call on the EU to share best practices and I urge the Commission to present a European carers programme that includes early childhood intervention services.

Merja Kyllönen (GUE/NGL). – Arvoisa puhemies, kollegat, ikääntyvä Eurooppa tarvitsee kipeästi toimivia pelisääntöjä. Lapsia syntyy entistä vähemmän, huoltosuhde alkaa olla varsin huono. Monessakin Euroopan jäsenmaassa ikääntyviä ihmisiä on enemmän ja enemmän ja hoivapalveluihin tarvittaisiin lisää työvoimaa niin omaishoidossa omaisia kuin myös julkisissa palveluissa. Se vaatii meiltä toimenpiteitä ja tekemistä niin, että kaikkein haavoittuvimmassa asemassa olevat eurooppalaiset tulevat hoidetuiksi ja huolenpidetyiksi.

En usko, että tasa-arvo, oikeudenmukaisuus ja yhdenvertaisuus ovat keneltäkään tässä maailmassa pois. Ne ovat arvoja, joiden eteen meidän kaikkien pitää tehdä töitä.

Barbara Matera (PPE). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, ringrazio Sirpa per il suo eccellente lavoro su questa importante relazione collegata al congedo. Nell'Unione europea l'impari partecipazione degli uomini e delle donne alle attività di assistenza e alle incombenze domestiche rimane una sfida continua. Il fatto che le donne dedichino una quantità di tempo sproporzionata allo svolgimento di attività lavorative non retribuite rispetto agli uomini ha gravi conseguenze economiche e sociali e rappresenta un ostacolo per il raggiungimento degli obiettivi dell'Unione europea in materia di parità di genere.

Gli ultimi dati disponibili ci parlano di un divario di genere medio relativo alle pensioni nell'Unione europea pari al 40 % a seguito delle disuguaglianze accumulate nel corso della vita dalle donne rispetto agli uomini nel mercato del lavoro. Uno dei principali motivi per cui le donne sono inattive sul mercato del lavoro è costituito dalle possibilità limitate di combinare in modo efficiente, flessibile ed efficace sotto il profilo dei costi un'occupazione retribuita e le responsabilità familiari.

Fine della procedura «catch the eye»

Věra Jourová, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, honourable Members, thank you for your interventions which are very valuable to the Commission. Let me react on several comments here regarding the competence of the European Union to legislate and to come with measures in this area.

The Commission analysed very thoroughly the legal competences of the EU in this field of a combination of work and family duties, and as you mentioned here the family matters fall under the competence of the Member States, while gender equality is the competence of the EU, and also we have a very strong economical case because we see in all the Member States, without any exception, that the situation is not sustainable, that we cannot continue like that, that we have to enable women who want to work to work and to share also the family duties.

I speak about the unsustainability of the current situation and economically inadvisable solution because we have at this moment more than 60% of the graduates at universities who are women, and then we do not use the potential of women at all or only in a limited way. Many of you mentioned here the worrying demographic line. This is something we have to do a lot about and while speaking about the social services we have a tendency to speak about the problem of women. No, this is the problem of the whole society. If we do not solve this problem, we will have in the near future a very strong issue.

The Commission's position on how to solve the problem was to respect the limited competences we have, but to use them in full, and this is reflected in our work-life balance package which, as you know, is the combination of legislative and non-legislative measures. As for the legislation, you know very well what we are proposing. As for non-legislative measures, we are recommending that the Member States take steps to have a fairer social and tax system which does not bring disadvantages to women who are usually considered to be the first parents, and also we are addressing the Member States through country-specific recommendations, where we are proposing to increase the salaries in the jobs in the social services sphere and in the jobs which are predominantly occupied by women, it means the education, social services and health sector.

Among the non-legislative proposals, there is also a very strong recommendation to use more public funding for better social services which will be more achievable or accessible and more affordable for all the people who need such services, and I heard from this side of the Parliament that this is the money of the Member States, so they should have a sovereign the competence to decide. Well, we recommend something regarding the EU money, the EU structural funds, where for many years the position of the Commission was that the social services fall under the national competence and it is the traditional, the classical cost, so it should be covered by the Member States. This Commission came with a change of paradigm, we said no, this is not the cost, this is investment and this is investment which has a very quick and high return of investment which pays off and which can be covered by EU money, and this is a change, and some Member States reacted positively on that and some are still maybe hesitating.

We want to do everything to through the work-life balance package. The trialogs are on a good track and I do hope that it will be one of our legacies that we came with the legislation which can bring a real difference for the lives of people.

Last comment on work-life balance legislation. No, we are not dictating how the people should live. We are not dictating how the people in the family, the men/women, should divide their duties. We are just doing what I am sure is our obligation, opening wider variety of choices for working parents and for carers to combine better their duties in the family and at the workplace.

So, ladies and gentlemen, thank you once again for this debate. Thank you once again for the important report which is coherent with what the Commission wants and plans and tries to promote. We indeed need to have a comprehensive approach and to make sure that this issue needs to remain high on the European agenda with a view to reach gender equality.

Agnieszka Kozłowska-Rajewicz, *sprawozdawczyni*. – Panie Przewodniczący! Szanowni Państwo! Pani Komisarz! Serdecznie dziękuję za wszystkie uwagi i komentarze, które padły podczas tej debaty, do bardzo ważnego sprawozdania Sirpy Pietikäinen. Dziękuję pani komisarz Jourovej za deklarację wspierania polityki opiekuńczej z poziomu Unii Europejskiej oraz za pakiet *work-life balance*, który jest teraz omawiany w ramach rozmów trójstronnych, i trzymam kciuki, żeby rozmowy te zakończyły się powodzeniem.

Temat opieki nad osobami zależnymi – zarówno nad dziećmi, dorosłymi, jak i niepełnosprawnymi – wymaga pilnych działań w krajach członkowskich. Z Parlamentu Europejskiego apelujemy do wszystkich osób, które podejmują w tej sprawie decyzje, o podjęcie pilnych działań. Problem opieki to problem kobiet, ponieważ opiekunami są przede wszystkim kobiety. Większość z nich, jak tutaj dzisiaj mówiliśmy, pracuje nieodpłatnie albo nielegalnie bez zabezpieczeń społecznych, bez emerytury w przyszłości, bez urlopu, nadwyrężając swoje zdrowie i siły. Jest to niesprawiedliwe i należy to zmienić także dlatego, że obowiązki opiekuńcze są pierwszą przeszkodą dla kobiet w realizacji zawodowej, a przerwy i ograniczenia w pracy skutkują czterdziestoprocentową luką emerytalną w najbogatszej gospodarce świata. Potrzebujemy dobrej jakości usług opiekuńczych, a najbardziej tych, które realizowane są w systemie rodzinnym i środowiskowym. Potrzebujemy wynagrodzenia za pracę opiekuna i uwzględniania tej pracy przy naliczaniu emerytury. Potrzebujemy wsparcia dla opiekunów nieformalnych bez względu na ich status zawodowy, aby nie musieli rezygnować z pracy w celu pełnienia obowiązku opieki wobec najbliższych. Potrzebujemy pilnych rozwiązań w tym zakresie na poziomie państw członkowskich, a także europejskiej strategii i planu, aby krajowe polityki mogły być skuteczniej realizowane. Zapewnienie dostępnych i dobrych jakościowo usług opiekuńczych dla dzieci i dorosłych jest pierwszą powinnością polityków i osób podejmujących decyzje w tym zakresie, czyli także nas. Dlaczego? Ponieważ demografia jest nieubłagana. Potrzeby opiekuńcze rosną. Problem jest coraz poważniejszy i będzie narastał, a ofiarami braku skutecznych rozwiązań w tym zakresie są kobiety.

Presidente. – La discussione è chiusa.

La votazione si svolgerà giovedì 15 novembre 2018.

Dichiarazioni scritte (articolo 162)

Anneli Jäätteenmäki (ALDE), *kirjallinen*. – On erittäin tärkeää, että koko unionissa on saatavilla laadukkaita lasten, vanhusten ja vammaisten hoitoon liittyviä palveluita. Edelleen vastuu läheisten hoitamisesta on useammin naisten kuin miesten vastuulla. Luotettavat ja saatavilla olevat palvelut mahdollistavat siksi myös naisten osallistumisen työelämään. Hoitopalvelut koskettavat lähimmäisiämme, joten on selvää, että niiden on oltava laadukkaita ja sellaisia, että tavallisella ihmisellä on niihin varaa.

Yhä edelleenkin joudumme puhumaan työn ja perhe-elämän yhteensovittamisesta. Vaikka asenteet ovat muuttuneet, vielä on tehtävä työtä sen eteen, että vastuu kodin ja perheen hoitamisesta jakautuu tasapuolisesti. Toivon, että näissä asioissa päästäisiin jo eteenpäin, missä laadukkailla hoitopalveluilla on keskeinen rooli.

Agnes Jongerius (S&D), *schriftelijk*. –Hoewel ik hoopte dat het ondertussen niet meer nodig zou zijn, kaart ik het toch nog een keer aan: we moeten de loonkloof sluiten. Gemiddeld verdienen vrouwen 16% minder dan mannen. Hoewel er eerder vooruitgang werd geboekt, wijst recent onderzoek uit dat het gat al twee jaar niet meer krimpt. Ondertussen lopen vrouwen een verhoogd risico op armoede, zeker eenoudergezinnen en gepensioneerden. Dit is onacceptabel en onverklaarbaar, als je het mij vraagt. Gendergelijkheid op de werkvloer is nog niet gerealiseerd. Verlof bij de geboorte van een kind mag geen beperking zijn voor een carrière, maar moet een recht zijn voor iedereen. Onbetaald werk als huishouden of zorg zou mensen niet mogen dwingen om parttime te gaan werken. Laten we iedereen de mogelijkheid geven om zelf een balans te vinden tussen werk en privéleven, zonder dat gender daar invloed op heeft. Gelijkheid komt er niet vanzelf, het is tijd voor actie en er valt veel te doen. Het uitbreiden van het vaderschapsverlof is daar een voorbeeld van. Ook is het aanbieden van goede en betaalbare zorgdiensten belangrijk. Denk hierbij aan kinderopvang, ouderenzorg en faciliteiten voor gehandicapten of chronisch zieken. De oplossingen liggen klaar: laten we het gat voor eens en altijd dichten.

Marijana Petir (PPE), *napisan*. – Kada govorimo o stvaranju ravnoteže između obiteljskog i poslovnog života, iznimno je važno da žene, jer uglavnom su one te koje „nose teret" skrbi na svojim leđima, ali podjednako i muškarci, imaju na raspolaganju kvalitetne i pristupačne usluge javne i privatne skrbi kojima mogu povjeriti svoju djecu ili bolesne ili starije članove obitelji.

Važno je stoga ulagati u stvaranje adekvatne infrastrukture, važno je ulagati u obrazovanje u području skrbi. S druge strane, potrebno je prepoznati vrijednost rada njegovatelja i kao takvog ga vrednovati te njegovateljima osigurati sva prava koja iz njihovog radnog odnosa proizlaze. Potrebno je također adresirati rješavanje pitanja statusa neformalnih njegovatelja – osoba koje se same odlučuju preuzeti brigu za članove svoje obitelji, a kojih je na području Europske unije 80 %.

Moramo imati razumijevanja za situacije u kojima pomaganje članu obitelji i njega člana obitelji postane posao na puno radno vrijeme. Taj posao nije lak, upravo suprotno, on zahtijeva potpunu predanost i posvećenost drugoj osobi. To uistinu jest posao na puno radno vrijeme koji kao takav mora biti prepoznat, reguliran i vrednovan.

Ángela Vallina (GUE/NGL), *por escrito*. – En la UE tres cuartas partes de los cuidadores son mujeres. Este dato demuestra una situación muy desigual, que es consecuencia de unas estructuras patriarcales injustas y que condena a millones de mujeres a un acceso al trabajo mucho más limitado que los hombres, por no hablar de los estereotipos asociados que refuerzan la idea de que ante todo debemos estar en casa y ocuparnos de forma exclusiva de las tareas de cuidados. Frente a ello, la UE tiene tratados y toda una serie de directivas que pueden desarrollar y mejorar en materia de conciliación familiar y laboral y de reconocimiento de derechos a las cuidadoras. Por ello, pedimos que la Comisión apoye un programa y un paquete de medidas concretas, que incluyan la prolongación de los permisos de maternidad, para favorecer la igualdad y la conciliación real. Además, queremos que los Estados se involucren dotando de servicios públicos de calidad e infraestructuras clave, como los centros de día o guarderías, con especial énfasis en las zonas rurales o más castigadas por la despoblación. Finalmente, no olvidemos aumentar la dotación de recursos a la política de cohesión para fortalecer la provisión de unos servicios asistenciales públicos y de calidad.

3. Borreliose (Lyme-Krankheit) (Aussprache)

Presidente. – L'ordine del giorno reca la discussione sull'interrogazione con richiesta di risposta orale alla Commissione sulla malattia di Lyme (borreliosi) presentata da Alojz Peterle, Daciana Octavia Sârbu, Jadwiga Wiśniewska, Frédérique Ries, Merja Kyllönen, Michèle Rivasi, Mireille D'Ornano, Sylvie Goddyn, a nome della commissione per l'ambiente, la sanità pubblica e la sicurezza alimentare (O-000088/2018 - B8-0417/2018) (2018/2774(RSP)).

Merja Kyllönen, *laatija*. – Arvoisa puhemies, komissaari, hyvät naiset ja herrat, rakkaat kollegat, haluaisin kiittää mahdollisuudesta esittää tämän suullisen kysymyksen komissiolle liittyen borrelioosiin eli Lymen tautiin ympäristön, kansanterveyden ja elintarvikkeiden turvallisuuden valiokunnan puolesta. Borrelioosin esiintyvyydestä ei ole olemassa faktatietoa. Esiintyvyysluvut perustuvat arvailuun ja vaihtelevat hyvin suuresti lähteestä riippuen. Monissa maissa borrelioosia ei edelleenkään tilastoida mitenkään ja asialla on suuri merkitys borrelioosin vakavasti otettavuuteen sekä esimerkiksi tutkimusmäärärahojen suuntaamiseen.

Borrelioosin hoitokäytännöistä on olemassa runsaasti eriäviä näkemyksiä. Borrelioosia hoidetaan ensisijaisesti antibiooteilla. Yleensä ollaan yhtä mieltä siitä, että parhaat hoitotulokset saadaan silloin, kun hoito päästään aloittamaan varhaisessa vaiheessa. Sen sijaan lääkkeen annostuksesta, hoitoajan pituudesta ja kroonisen borrelioosin hoidosta esiintyy toisistaan poikkeavia näkemyksiä.

Borrelioosiin sairastuneiden oirekuvat ovat hyvin yksilöllisiä ja osalla tautiin liittyy vaikeita lisäinfektioita. Vasta-ainetesteissä voi olla useitakin ongelmia, kuten se, että vasta-aineiden tuotanto ei ole vielä ehtinyt käynnistyä, koska infektioista on liian lyhyt aika, tai siksi, että vasta-aineet ovat sitoutuneet immunokomplekseihin.

Borrelioosin ja siihen liittyvien lisäinfektioiden tutkimus on tällä hetkellä valitettavan riittämätöntä. Eri hoitomuotojen tehoa pitäisi todella nopeasti alkaa tutkimaan laajemmin. Tärkeä tutkimusaihe on myös borrelioosin kroonistuminen. Potilaat, joiden oireilu jatkuu pitkien antibioottikuurien jälkeenkin, jäävät valitettavan usein vaille kuntoutusta ja hoitoa. Ja heidän kuntonsa ja työkykynsä on usein menetetty pitkäksi aikaa, jopa pysyvästi.

Pientä edistystä on tapahtunutkin jo, sillä Lymen neuroborrelioosi on lisätty epidemiologisen seurannan piiriin kuuluviin tartuntatauteihin, mutta yhä enemmän tarvitaan panostusta borrelioosin torjuntaan sekä borrelioosia koskevan tietoisuuden parantamiseen. Jäsenvaltioiden hoitokäytäntöjä pitää kyetä yhtenäistämään ja parantamaan ja ennen kaikkea potilaiden, asiakkaiden, hoitoon pääsyä tulee tehostaa ja parantaa. Lisäksi diagnostiikkaa tulee tarkentaa ja olisi meillä toiveissa rokotekin jonain päivänä Lymen borrelioosia vastaan. Edellä esitettyihin ongelmiin, haasteisiin, haluaisimme ystävällisesti pyytää komissiolta vastauksia, ratkaisuja, tulevaisuudensuunnitelmia ja ajatuksia, mitä teillä tämän asian suhteen on.

Valitettavasti punkkien määrä kasvaa erittäin voimakkaasti Euroopassa ja niiden maantieteellinen esiintyvyys laajenee koko ajan. Tämän arvellaan johtuvan ilmastonmuutoksen mukanaan tuomasta ilmaston leudontumisesta. Pakkastalvet ovat Pohjois-Euroopassakin kohta harvinaisuus ja tämä suosii erityisesti punkkeja ja niiden isäntäeläimiä. Tässä suhteessa tulevaisuus ei näytä siis lainkaan paremmalta, ennemminkin päinvastoin. Borrelioosiin sairastuneiden lukumäärän odotetaan yhä vaan kasvavan. Sen takia toivomme nopeita aktiivitoimia asian korjaamiseksi.

Lopuksi haluaisin kiittää kollegoitani ympäristövaliokunnassa ja koko parlamentissa erittäin hyvästä yhteistyöstä ja vahvasta tuesta. Haluan kiittää niin kansainvälistä Lymen borrelioosiyhdistystä kuin kansallisiakin yhdistyksiä borrelioosiin sairastuneiden henkilöiden aseman parantamiseksi tehdystä työstä ja erityisesti haluan kiittää irlantilaista kollegaamme Liadh Ní Riadaa, joka on pitänyt tätä asiaa urhoollisesti jo vuosien ajan esillä. Onneksi nyt olemme saaneet koko ympäristövaliokunnan tiimin mukaan tähän työhön. Kiitos siitä. Yhteistyöllä eteenpäin.

Věra Jourová, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, Lyme disease, or Borreliosis, is a real health concern for European citizens, who are increasingly exposed to ticks and the associated risks of Lyme disease. In fact, Lyme disease is the most prevalent tick-transmitted infection in Europe.

Recent studies estimate that the incidence of Lyme disease at 22 cases per 100 000 persons per year, with a steadily increasing occurrence in several Member States. In the absence of a consistent surveillance system in the past, it remains difficult to accurately assess the overall trend of Lyme disease. It is, however, clear that the northward spread of ticks and adaptation of altitude are associated with climate change and land-use change.

Currently, there is no vaccine against Lyme disease so the recommendation is to take general prevention methods, such as tick awareness, appropriate clothing in tick-infested areas and the removal of attached ticks. These are particularly important for citizens living in areas where Lyme disease is endemic and high-risk groups, such as agricultural and forestry workers.

Let me now address each of the questions you raised. Question one: the European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control (ECDC) and Member State experts worked on a proposal to include Lyme disease on the EU list of notifiable diseases. However, the diagnosis of Lyme disease is challenging, as the symptoms are varied and often non-specific. In addition, different diagnostic criteria and tests are used in different countries. Thus, the disease may go undetected, with the subsequent risk of developing serious chronic manifestations.

Neuroborreliosis is the most serious complication of the Borrelia bacterial infection, seen in about 10% of patients with Lyme disease. The definition of neuroborreliosis is more standardised than other Lyme disease manifestations, with the possibility to confirm cases based on a common EU case definition.

This is why, based on a scientific assessment, it was therefore decided to include Lyme neuroborreliosis in the list of EU notifiable diseases under the decision on serious cross-border threats to health. The Commission remains fully committed to tackle the disease, working with Member States to strengthen prevention, surveillance and control of Lyme disease. As a key element, the decision on serious cross-border threats to health, which I have just mentioned, provides for epidemiological surveillance of communicable diseases through the use of comparable and compatible data.

Question two: with the recent inclusion of Lyme neuroborreliosis in the list of EU notifiable diseases, all EU and EEA Member States are required to report such cases using the standard EU case definition. The epidemiological information on neuroborreliosis will be collected by the European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control, starting in 2019 for cases diagnosed in 2018. In time, this will allow a better evaluation of the disease prevalence and trend of Lyme disease in Europe. Cooperation on surveillance, prevention and control between Member States is ongoing, coordinated by the centre.

Question three: the centre is actively contributing to enhance awareness about Lyme disease among professionals and the general population. Several publications and tools are available, including information about the disease and the vector infographics disease fact-sheets for professionals and health practitioners and a communication toolkit on tick-borne diseases and preventive measures against tick bites.

To strengthen preparedness and exchange of best practices, the Commission organised a workshop on the challenges of managing outbreaks of vector-borne diseases in September 2017. The centre has also conducted community preparedness case studies, including on Lyme disease, focusing on synergies on community and hospitals.

Question four: as regards diagnostic practices, reporting of Lyme neuroborreliosis cases from 2018 onwards will be done according to a common case definition and diagnostic criteria. This will help to allow for a more accurate picture of the prevalence of Lyme disease in the EU. In addition, the European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control has conducted a systematic literature review on the diagnostic accuracy of serological tests for Lyme disease. It will start collecting data on the laboratory methods to evaluate the diagnosis for Lyme neuroborreliosis in 2019.

Question five: as you know, the Commission is not in a position to harmonise treatment practices as this falls within the competence of the Member States. This being said, the Commission is committed to help develop new and better diagnostics for Lyme disease. This effort has seen significant financial support in recent years.

Question six: let me highlight that there is indeed currently very significant funding behind efforts to improve the prevention, diagnosis and treatment of Lyme disease in the EU. The Commission has recently supported research on improved diagnostics that will permit early and accurate diagnosis of Lyme disease through the provision of EUR 7.8 million. It is also worth noting that, in 2016, the European Investment Bank granted EUR 25 million for the development of a Lyme vaccine. Additionally, the Commission has provided EUR 3 million to fund the development of an anti-tick vaccine aiming to protect against all tick-borne diseases in Europe. The remaining two years of Horizon 2020, and in particular its forthcoming calls for research and innovation project proposals, will offer further opportunities to support research on Lyme disease.

We now need to implement a robust Lyme disease surveillance to have a clearer picture on the disease burden and trends across the EU. We will further focus on awareness raising, improving community preparedness and prevention and supporting research efforts to develop new diagnostic methods and vaccines.

I hope, and indeed trust, you share the intention to drive matters forward, to strengthen prevention and reduce the prevalence and the suffering associated with Lyme disease.

Alojz Peterle, *v imenu skupine PPE*. – Gospod predsednik. Spoštovana gospa komisarka, kolegice in kolegi, vesel sem, da danes razpravljamo in glasujemo o limski boreliozi, ki postaja vse večji zdravstveni izziv.

Komisarki Jourovi sem hvaležen za izčrpen odgovor Komisije. Prihajam iz Slovenije, ki spada v evropski in svetovni vrh glede obolevanja s to boleznijo in z njo imam tudi osebne izkušnje.

Borelioza je bakterijska bolezen, ki jo je težko pravočasno odkriti, diagnosticirati in zdraviti. Tako so mnogi bolniki deležni napačnih diagnoz in terapij. Število obolelih narašča, klimatske spremembe pa pospešujejo širjenje bolezni. Nimamo še registriranega cepiva, ki bi preprečevalo bolezen. Imamo zelo različne prakse po državah članicah, bolniki pa zaradi tega tudi višje stroške.

Potreben je skupen pristop na ravni Evropske zveze. Potrebujemo enotne podatkovne zbirke, več skupnih raziskav in enotne smernice za zdravljenje. Zato pozivamo Komisijo, da pripravi evropski načrt boja proti boreliozi.

Karin Kadenbach, *im Namen der S&D-Fraktion*. – Sehr geehrter Herr Präsident, Frau Kommissarin! Ein herzliches Danke schön für Ihre sehr intensive Beantwortung unserer Fragen.

In Niederösterreich hatte wir einen Landeshauptmannstellvertreter, der von einer Zecke gestochen wurde; das Ganze wurde nicht rechtzeitig erkannt, sodass es am Ende dazu geführt hat, dass er eine Herztransplantation gebraucht hat, um überhaupt zu überleben. Um dieses dramatische Beispiel nicht allzu oft in Europa zu wiederholen, glaube ich, brauchen wir ganz konkrete Pläne, um die Borreliose rechtzeitig zu erkennen, Daten zu haben, damit wir auch wissen, wie wir sie behandeln, und ganz wesentlich – wie Sie auch angesprochen haben – ist die Erforschung einer Impfung.

Was wir auch brauchen, ist Aufklärung der Bevölkerung. Nicht nur jener, die intensiv mit dem Forst und der Landwirtschaft zu tun haben, denn hier gibt es ja schon Leitlinien, hier ist auch schon ein gewisses Bewusstsein entstanden. Aber in der Bevölkerung, die das Recht darauf hat, ihre Freizeit in der Natur zu verbringen, entsteht zum Beispiel oft der falsche Eindruck, dass durch eine Impfung gegen FSME, eine virale Erkrankung, die ebenfalls von der Zecke übertragen wird, hier ein genereller Schutz bei Zeckenbissen besteht. Das heißt, ich glaube, hier ist es auch ganz in der Verantwortung der Mitgliedstaaten, die Leute einzuladen, ihre Freizeit in der Natur zu verbringen, aber sie auf die Gefahren, die dort lauern, aufmerksam zu machen. Eine FSME-Impfung schützt nicht gegen Borreliose.

Jadwiga Wiśniewska, *w imieniu grupy ECR*. – Panie Przewodniczący! Pani komisarz! Neuroborelioza jest najbardziej rozpowszechnioną chorobą odzwierzęcą w Europie. Cierpi na nią obecnie około – szacuje się – miliona obywateli. Ugryzienie przez zakażonego kleszcza, a także objawy boreliozy mogą być nierozpoznawalne, a to prowadzi do bardzo poważnych komplikacji.

W związku z tym, że nie ma szczepionki na boreliozę, konieczne jest podjęcie intensywnych działań. Konieczne jest szkolenie lekarzy pierwszego kontaktu, wprowadzenie badań profilaktycznych, jak i szybkiej ścieżki leczenia dla osób pracujących zawodowo w sektorze rolno-leśnym. Konieczna jest wymiana dobrych praktyk, a także prowadzenie intensywnych i efektywnych kampanii informacyjnych w regionach najbardziej dotkniętych rozprzestrzenianiem się neuroboreliozy. Apeluję do Komisji, by opracowała europejski plan zwalczania boreliozy.

Frédérique Ries, *au nom du groupe ALDE*. – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Commissaire, le courage des personnes atteintes de la maladie de Lyme force l'admiration, car c'est un véritable mur auquel elles se heurtent souvent dans leur parcours de souffrance.

Relevons d'abord l'incompréhension de très nombreux médecins non spécialistes qui n'ont tout simplement pas les outils pour détecter à temps cette maladie qui touche pourtant déjà un million d'Européens, un chiffre qui augmente sans cesse, notamment à cause du changement climatique.

Les malades sont aussi confrontés à un autre obstacle: le conservatisme des académies de médecine. Dans bien des cas, celles-ci continuent de prétendre aujourd'hui que le test Elisa serait fiable à 100 %, alors que toutes les publications scientifiques démontrent l'inverse. Nous dénonçons, dans notre texte, cette prise en otage des patients, qui ont le droit de bénéficier de tests totalement fiables.

Il est donc essentiel de s'approprier les meilleures pratiques existantes, assorties d'une bonne prise en charge des patients souffrant de la maladie de Lyme chronique, comme c'est le cas en Allemagne et au Grand-Duché de Luxembourg. C'est clairement ce que nous demandent toutes les associations européennes, qui sont des centaines sur le terrain. Chez moi, en Wallonie, je pense particulièrement à Sonia Boulanger, qui coordonne l'ASBL Time for Lyme.

L'espoir est là – on en a déjà parlé dans ce débat –, des portes s'ouvrent. L'Union européenne vient d'ajouter la borréliose de Lyme à la liste des maladies transmissibles, ce qui est essentiel pour mettre les chercheurs en réseau. L'OMS a récemment changé les codes de la maladie de Lyme dans la classification internationale des maladies, reconnaissant la démence qui y est liée et la transmission de la mère à l'enfant qu'elle porte.

Pour conclure en un mot, nous l'avons dit: il est essentiel de financer la recherche sur la maladie Lyme, car son diagnostic est complexe et ses formes cliniques sont variées.

Dans les dix secondes qui me restent, je vous rappellerai ceci: un geste, une habitude, une carte, une pince à tiques pour les parents et pour les enfants pourraient déjà, pour commencer, éviter bien des complications.

Michèle Rivasi, *au nom du groupe Verts/ALE*. – Monsieur le Président, merci des réponses que vous nous avez apportées au niveau de la Commission. Je me réjouis de cette résolution qui prend enfin en compte la souffrance de ces malades. On a parlé «d'errance thérapeutique». Je ne sais pas si vous le savez mais, comme l'a souligné ma collègue Frédérique Ries, cette maladie est souvent très mal comprise, parce qu'elle présente une forme chronique et qu'elle n'est pas du tout abordée dans les programmes et les formations des médecins.

Une forme de déni entoure cette maladie qui ne rentre pas dans les codes. C'est ce qui explique, par exemple, qu'en France, les malades se rendent en Allemagne. Comme vous le proposez, une meilleure harmonisation est donc effectivement nécessaire, car il faut absolument disposer de moyens de diagnostic efficaces. Ce n'est pas parce que les tests sont négatifs que la maladie n'est pas présente.

De même, il faut créer des groupes de travail, comme vous l'avez proposé, pour mettre en place un échange de bonnes pratiques, à la fois sur le diagnostic, le dépistage et le traitement. Certains pays refusent de traiter les patients avec une forte dose d'antibiotiques. Et puis, il y a la formation des médecins, qui souvent connaissent mal les problèmes de santé liés à l'environnement.

Enfin, il faudrait développer la recherche, augmenter le financement et améliorer la reconnaissance de cette maladie en tant que maladie professionnelle. L'enjeu est donc important. Mais l'Europe peut apporter une valeur ajoutée pour dresser l'état des lieux, mieux comprendre cette maladie et, bien sûr, mieux la soigner.

Mireille D'Ornano, *au nom du groupe EFDD*. – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Commissaire, le degré de fiabilité des tests sérologiques et des traitements non conventionnels de la maladie de Lyme est préoccupant et aurait dû, à mon sens, être abordé dans cette question orale. Je relève également l'absence de références au phénomène de l'errance médicale dans laquelle se retrouvent certains patients, ainsi qu'aux mouvements transfrontières des patients cherchant à se faire soigner de cette maladie.

Nous aurions également pu demander si la Commission comptait encourager des campagnes de sensibilisation aux risques afférents à la maladie de Lyme à la suite de morsures de tiques, et notamment au fait que l'infection se manifeste avec un décalage dans le temps et présente des symptômes très variés.

Enfin, pourquoi ne pas demander à la Commission de rendre des comptes sur les conclusions scientifiques faisant suite à l'investissement de plusieurs millions dans la recherche sur la maladie et dans l'élaboration d'un vaccin? C'est le rôle des élus que de savoir où va l'argent public.

Dominique Bilde, *au nom du groupe ENF.* – Monsieur le Président, l'explosion du nombre de cas de maladie de Lyme témoigne d'une double fracture.

Relevons d'abord la fracture territoriale et sociale, puisque la zoonose la plus répandue d'Europe touche avant tout les habitants des zones rurales, ce qui explique sans doute le désintérêt des pouvoirs publics et la difficile reconnaissance de cette affection comme maladie professionnelle. Dans ma région, en France, beaucoup de très jeunes hommes qui travaillent sur les pommiers, par exemple, souffrent de cette maladie dramatique. Certains cas sont vraiment très difficiles et s'aggravent jusqu'à la démence. Cela fait vraiment beaucoup de peine.

La fracture sépare ensuite l'homme et la nature, puisque la traque des prédateurs, pourtant essentielle à l'écosystème, charriera dans son sillage la prolifération de certains parasites. Une étude récente démontrait le rôle du renard, parfois considéré comme nuisible, dans l'éradication des tiques.

Reste qu'à l'heure où entre 650 000 et 850 000 Européens sont affectés chaque année de cette pathologie, on ne saurait tolérer le véritable parcours du combattant infligé à tant de patients confrontés aux insuffisances de la médecine moderne. Au-delà d'un vaste effort commun à l'échelle européenne, ces malades méritent avant tout notre écoute et surtout notre respect.

Françoise Grossetête (PPE). – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Commissaire, elles sont plus petites qu'une tête d'épingle, mais elles font de gros ravages. Les tiques sont le premier vecteur de maladies animales dans le monde, le deuxième pour les maladies humaines, après le moustique.

C'est un vrai sujet de santé publique. On l'a déjà dit: de plus en plus de personnes sont atteintes de cette maladie parce que, malheureusement, elle est largement sous-diagnostiquée et parfois asymptomatique. Elle ne fait l'objet d'aucun consensus quant à son diagnostic ou à son traitement. Ce manque de reconnaissance a affecté durablement les patients atteints de cette maladie, qui se retrouvent en situation d'errance diagnostique et thérapeutique.

On doit d'abord penser à eux, parce qu'au-delà des simples symptômes grippaux qui peuvent se développer dans la première phase de la maladie, une infection par la bactérie *Borrelia* peut, si elle est maltraitée, devenir chronique et invalidante. C'est donc une pathologie qu'il faut prendre au sérieux.

J'ai bien entendu vos propositions, Madame la Commissaire. Il est urgent d'intensifier les efforts de recherche et un vaccin doit être mis au point le plus rapidement possible. Mais la prévention est également essentielle. Il nous faut mieux informer les citoyens sur la façon de se prémunir contre les piqûres de tiques et sur la nécessité de se faire dépister après une morsure. La borréliose de Lyme étant présente partout en Europe, nous sommes confrontés à un véritable défi transfrontière qui requiert une action européenne coordonnée.

Tilly Metz (Verts/ALE). – Monsieur le Président, chacun et chacune d'entre nous peut attraper la maladie de Lyme, la borréliose. Une seule promenade en forêt suffit.

La maladie de Lyme peut avoir des conséquences graves sur la santé: des paralysies, des infections articulaires ou des problèmes cardiaques. Tout le monde sait que les tiques transmettent la maladie de Lyme à l'être humain. Mais les tiques, comment attrapent-t-elles la maladie de Lyme? C'est par les petits rongeurs, comme la souris, que les tiques attrapent la borréliose, ou maladie de Lyme. C'est là que le héros de mon histoire entre en scène: le renard. En effet, plus il y a de renards, moins les souris et les petits rongeurs sortent de leur trou et circulent, et moins la maladie se propage.

Je vous lance une appel, Mesdames et Messieurs, laissons faire notre écosystème naturel, laissons vivre le renard et surtout laissons le faire son travail, parce qu'il contribue en grande partie à la prévention de la maladie de Lyme.

Sylvie Goddyn (EFDD). – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Commissaire, je crois que nous pouvons être satisfaits du travail accompli pour aboutir à cette résolution sur la maladie de Lyme qui était, vous le savez, très attendue par de nombreuses associations de malades. Chaque année, ce sont près d'un million d'Européens qui seraient touchés par cette maladie, dont le diagnostic demeure, pour beaucoup, incertain et la prise en compte au niveau médical peu satisfaisante.

Nous savons que la prolifération des tiques et la multiplication des morsures sont directement responsables de l'ampleur de cette maladie. Les tiques cantonnées autrefois aux forêts et aux montagnes prolifèrent maintenant jusque dans les zones péri-urbaines et menacent des foyers de population bien plus importants. C'est la raison pour laquelle il est urgent d'agir à notre niveau, car cette maladie rurale a longtemps souffert de l'inaction, du manque de moyens et du désintérêt des pouvoirs publics.

Je me réjouis donc qu'aujourd'hui nous réagissions collectivement à la mesure du défi que représente la lutte contre cette maladie. Bien plus encore, j'entends la voix des malades et des familles qui verront dans notre démarche l'espoir d'être enfin entendus et correctement pris en charge par le monde médical. C'est pourquoi nous devons soutenir cette résolution.

Annie Schreijer-Pierik (PPE). – Voorzitter, de toename van de ziekte van Lyme baart grote zorgen en het is een groot probleem. Er is geen Europese consensus over de behandeling, en diagnose en screening van de ziekte van Lyme is niet aan de orde en de nationale praktijken lopen behoorlijk uiteen.

Onnodig veel patiënten hebben geen toegang tot de behandeling die passend voor hen zijn of krijgen niet meteen de juiste diagnose gesteld. Ik spreek ook uit eigen ervaring uit onze eigen familie: mijn neef had afgelopen zomer gewoon de gevolgen van de ziekte van Lyme en de bacteriële infectie daarvan. Hij ging naar de huisarts toe. De familie ging naar de huisarts en de huisarts zegt gewoon tegen deze jongen: "Je hebt gewoon de griep, ga maar weer naar huis." Op het laatst – hij was bijna overleden – is het nog goed gekomen.

Maar die gevolgen zijn ook in Oostenrijk aan de orde en we moeten hier met elkaar meteen mee aan de slag gaan. Want ook huisartsen weten niet hoe het zit. Ik ben dan ook blij met het uitvoeringsbesluit van de Europese Commissie om Lyme borreliose in de lijst van overdraagbare ziekten op te nemen. Laten we dan nu ook samen deze verschrikkelijke ziekte erkennen als beroepsziekte en het onderzoek en de bewustmaking bevorderen teneinde de ziekte te voorkomen.

Maar niet alleen dat, de hele familie, onze hele omgeving vroeg zich af: wat gaan we daaraan doen? Het zijn niet alleen mensen die in de natuur werken. Het zijn kinderen die fietsen, ook uit steden. Het zijn ook de burgers! Het vereist gewoon een nationale aanpak en dank voor uw aanzet daarbij.

Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu (S&D). – Domnule președinte, boala Lyme sau boala cu o mie de fețe, care afectează întregul organism, este cea mai comună și mai larg răspândită afecțiune transmisă de căpușe în Europa. Îngrijorarea noastră cu privire la prevalența bolii Lyme în Europa este cuprinsă în prezenta rezoluție. Salutăm includerea bolii Lyme pe lista europeană a bolilor transmisibile, ceea ce va permite pacienților să beneficieze de avantajele unui sistem de sănătate robust și structurat de identificare rapidă și fiabilă a cazurilor de borelioză Lyme în Uniunea Europeană, precum și de asistența reciprocă în domeniul analizei și al interpretării datelor colectate.

Însă trebuie să consemnăm și faptul că această boală cu o mie de fețe solicită finanțări suplimentare față de cele alocate de Uniunea Europeană până acum, în vederea creșterii eforturilor de cercetare pentru detectarea precoce, diagnosticarea și tratamentul boreliozei.

De asemenea, avem nevoie de mai multe campanii de informare și de sensibilizare a persoanelor cu risc crescut de îmbolnăvire, precum și de campanii de diseminare a celor mai bune practici de diagnosticare și de depistare a bolii Lyme.

John Stuart Agnew (EFDD). – Mr President, Lyme disease is one of 10 diseases that afflict humans as a result of contact with ticks. Sometimes there can be two simultaneous infections. There has been a 400% increase in Lyme disease in the UK in the last four years. Good livestock farming practices can make an immense beneficial difference here by reducing tick numbers, yet the Green lobby, with its naive ideas of re-wilding, want to remove the livestock entirely. Between them, sheep as teeth grazers and cattle as tongue grazers can prevent grasses from becoming damp and rank and thus deny the ticks a habitat. Meanwhile, the farmers also control the bracken, another favourite tick habitat. Any ticks that do appear will attach themselves to these animals and will be dealt with by the routine application of recommended insecticides.

Twenty years ago, this involved the use of potentially dangerous organophosphorus compounds. Now, thanks to the research efforts of large companies, safer products which are simple to apply will readily destroy ticks. In the absence of these livestock, the ticks will multiply and settle on ground-nesting birds in fatally large numbers, yet the Green lobby will tell you that it's farmers who threaten bird numbers.

Unlike grass, ticks do not thrive in heather, which is an alternative feed for sheep. However, the Green lobby frown on attempts to re-establish heather because of its association with politically incorrect grouse shooting. So we have a choice: a thriving tick-free upland economy based on livestock heather and grouse on the one hand, or the Green lobby's paradise of abandoned land, welfare payments, tick-infested wildlife and human disease.

Mairead McGuinness (PPE). – Thank you, President. I hope that members of the medical profession are listening to this debate, because it has been quite interesting that, across the House from all Member States, what we are hearing from patients is that they are not being listened to when they visit their general practitioner. That is perhaps because there isn't sufficient awareness of the myriad symptoms of Lyme disease, but we certainly need greater awareness among the first port of call, which is the medical practitioners in the local clinics.

I want to compliment Tick Talk Ireland. They have been tirelessly campaigning to raise awareness about this disease. They want patient-centric best practices, and we support them in that. I have read some terrible stories of people who are suffering chronic conditions because of Lyme disease misdiagnosis and lack of treatment. This is a really important debate; it is about the health of our citizens, and I want to thank the Commission for the answers you have given to our questions today.

Procedura «catch the eye»

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, από τη συζήτηση αποδείχθηκε ότι η νόσος του Lyme ή βορρελίωση είναι μία επικίνδυνη βακτηριακή νόσος, που προκαλείται από το τσίμπημα από τσιμπούρι το οποίο έχει μολυνθεί από το εν λόγω βακτήριο. Επηρεάζει τον άνθρωπο και τα ζώα, και το γεγονός ότι έχουμε 850 000 κρούσματα ετησίως δείχνει πόσο σοβαρό είναι αυτό το θέμα. Πρόκειται για μια επαγγελματική νόσο που επηρεάζει τους γεωργούς αλλά και τους δασοκαλλιεργητές, και νομίζω ότι χρειάζεται πλέον να προχωρήσουμε με συγκεκριμένα βήματα, διότι οι μέθοδοι θεραπείας πρέπει να ενισχυθούν. Πρέπει να υπάρξει ανταλλαγή βέλτιστων πρακτικών μεταξύ των κρατών μελών. Απαιτείται, επιπλέον, κατάρτιση των γιατρών, καθώς και χρήση κλινικών εξετάσεων. Ταυτόχρονα, νομίζω ότι πρέπει να δοθούν χρήματα για την περαιτέρω έρευνα στον τομέα αυτόν, ούτως ώστε να αντιμετωπιστεί η νόσος, που είναι ιδιαίτερα επικίνδυνη –σύμφωνα και με την Παγκόσμια Οργάνωση Υγείας- καθώς μεταδίδεται από τη μητέρα στο έμβρυο. Νομίζω ότι χρειάζονται πολύ συγκεκριμένα μέτρα.

Seán Kelly (PPE). – Mr President, last Sunday week in my own town, Killarney, there was a group from the Men's shed – a hundred of them – and they got the European Citizens Prize this year. They came to help control the rhododendron, which is a beautiful plant but is invasive in our National Park. Also in our National Park, we have a very famous herd of deer, and as part of the preparation for their work, they were given an outline on Lyme disease and what steps they should take to ensure they wouldn't go back home with it, and I think one of the key points mentioned there was that within 48 hours one is safe enough if a tick attaches itself to your body and it's removed. I think that's the key point here. We must create awareness and encourage people to check their bodies, especially if they are in parks where there are deer, etc., and remove the tick promptly. That will ensure that nothing will happen. So I welcome what the Commissioner has said in creating awareness and research, etc., because there's up to a million people affected in Europe and we need to help them.

ΠΡΟΕΔΡΙΑ: ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΣ ΠΑΠΑΔΗΜΟΥΛΗΣ

Αντιπρόεδρος

Linnéa Engström (Verts/ALE). – Herr talman! Fru kommissionär! Fästingar är en smygande epidemi. Varje år drabbas runt 800 000 européer av borrelia, och det skapar stort mänskligt lidande.

Det finns en förklaring till varför fästingburna sjukdomar som TBE och borrelia ökar. Fästingar älskar fuktigt och varmt väder, och det är det som klimatförändringarna ger oss.

Klimatförändringarna går fortare och är mer omfattande i vår norra del av världen. Fästingar är effektiva smittbärare, och deras utbredning påverkas av klimatförändringarna.

Problemet med ett varmare klimat och fästingars utbredning går hand i hand med andra hälsoproblem. Med ett extremt väder sprids bakterier, inte bara i vatten, utan även i mat. Nya sjukdomar och virusinfektioner får spridning i Europa.

Därför behöver vi en gemensam EU-strategi för att kunna hantera denna tysta epidemi av borrelia. Detta är ett symptom på den stora utmaning vi står inför: att stoppa klimatförändringarna och leva upp till Parisavtalet.

Bogdan Andrzej Zdrojewski (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Zajmuję się przede wszystkim problematyką bezpieczeństwa, w tym oczywiście bezpieczeństwa zdrowotnego, możliwością użycia rozmaitych elementów broni biologicznej przez terrorystów czy państwa totalitarne. Od razu powiem, żeby nie było wątpliwości: borelioza nie jest interesująca z punktu widzenia możliwości wykorzystania jej w atakach biologicznych. Niestety po raz kolejny obserwuję, że także w tej problematyce charakteryzuje nas niekonsekwencja, brak determinacji, brak spójności oraz izolowanie poszczególnych tematów, które – podkreślam – mają wspólny mianownik. Zwrócę uwagę na zaniedbania w edukacji, luki informacyjne, braki w diagnostyce, co potwierdziła pani komisarz. Chcę wyraźnie podkreślić, że obywatele Unii Europejskiej potrzebują paszportów i wiz, choroby niestety nie. Dziś mamy problem przechodzenia odry z Ukrainy w kierunku zachodnim, na przykład do Polski. Zwracam na to uwagę, bo tolerowanie takich zjawisk może niestety powodować poważne zagrożenia.

Kateřina Konečná (GUE/NGL). – Pane předsedající, já bych chtěla především moc poděkovat mé kolegyni Merje Kyllönenové, která toto téma přinesla tady na plénum, a jak se ukazuje, je to téma, které jde napříč Evropou, které jde napříč politickými skupinami. Je to téma, které chceme všichni řešit. Řešit ho můžeme samozřejmě tak, že si budeme v Evropě říkat, že víme, že existuje, ale měli bychom ho řešit především tak, že budeme propojovat naše kapacity v oblasti zdravotnictví, a především to, že v Evropské unii dodnes neexistuje jednotný názor na to, jak léčit, diagnostikovat ani provádět screening lymské boreliózy, změníme.

Problémem prostě je, že diagnostika nemoci se neděje v čase, který bychom potřebovali. Pacienti jsou velmi často odkázáni na nějakou další banální léčbu, která nezabírá, a následně se opravdu ta expertní léčba odehrává až ve chvíli, kdy už vlastně není moc pomoci a je tam řada dalších problémů.

Proto bych chtěla poprosit a děkuji moc paní komisařce za to, že řekla, že se budeme obecně zabývat tím, abychom tuto nemoc lépe zkoumali, lépe hledali příčiny, ale lépe hledali také léčbu. Prosím ji o to, věnujme tomu i finanční prostředky, bez nich to prostě nepůjde, a pokud je nenajdeme, nemáme šanci to změnit.

Marian Harkin (ALDE). – Mr President, and apologies, I'm just arriving, we were at a vote in the Committee on Employment and Social Affairs but I thank you for this one minute. Commissioner, my office has been listening to your responses and, I have to say, I'm not fully satisfied with your response on the need for a proper, harmonised approach to diagnosis. The truth is that many people who have Lyme disease are undiagnosed and this is a double whammy for people who suffer from this most debilitating disease.

I know in Ireland many patients have to go abroad so that they can be properly tested. It's very expensive for them, many of them have suffered for many years and they cannot get a diagnosis in Ireland. Specialists and doctors will tell them: clinically, the results say you're fine. They go abroad and they get a diagnosis of Lyme disease. I believe that the EU can act in a much stronger way by strongly encouraging a harmonised, accurate test for Lyme disease so that all EU citizens can have access to timely and accurate diagnosis.

Dubravka Šuica (PPE). – Poštovani predsjedavajući, drago mi je da je ovo pitanje došlo na dnevni red jer, zaista, lajmska bolest predstavlja veliku opasnost za zdravlje. Kao što znamo simptomi se ponekad jako kasno uočavaju i problem je s dijagnostikom. Moramo učiniti sve, kao što je gospođa Jourová rekla, da radimo na istraživanju te bolesti, ne samo bolesti nego i cjepiva. Čuli smo da nema cjepiva i to je osnovni problem. Čuli smo da postoje različite prakse u različitim zemljama, znači, moramo ujednačiti prakse liječenja.

Smatram da je neophodno naći cjepivo. Spomenuli ste Horizon istraživanje, mislim da je to put do cilja, ali naravno nije naodmet ovdje spomenuti i klimatske promjene koje su činile, odnosno pogodovale da ima sve više i više prijenosnika, odnosno krpelja i da su na velikim poljoprivrednim površinama i šumama zaista problemi.

Znači, moramo učiniti sve kako bismo svoje građane, odnosno pacijente zaštitili, ali i kako bismo liječnicima opće prakse omogućili da lakše dođu do dijagnostike i da, ako uspijemo, pronađemo cjepivo.

(Λήξη της διαδικασίας catch-the-eye)

Věra Jourová, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, honourable Members, I have listened with great interest to the views during this discussion, and I am grateful for all your valuable insights and interest to address the burden of Lyme disease in Europe.

Allow me to repeat that the emphasis now should be on implementation and concrete action to support Member States in their efforts. With the recent inclusion of Lyme neuroborreliosis in the list of EU notifiable diseases, we will strengthen surveillance across the EU using a common EU case definition and diagnostic criteria.

This will lead to a more accurate assessment of the disease burden and trends of Lyme disease in Europe. We will continue to raise awareness at EU, national and community levels, among both the public and health professionals. Here, the European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control has a key role to play.

Finally, the development of new and better diagnostics and vaccines will be further supported through the framework programme for research and innovation, Horizon 2020 and through other available instruments.

I once again thank you for your interest in this issue and look forward to working closely together towards achieving strengthened surveillance, earlier diagnosis and, ultimately, prevention of this disease.

(Applause)

Πρόεδρος. – Έχω λάβει, σύμφωνα με το άρθρο 128 παράγραφος 5 του Κανονισμού, μία πρόταση ψηφίσματος.

Η συζήτηση έληξε.

Η ψηφοφορία θα διεξαχθεί την Πέμπτη 15 Οκτωβρίου 2018.

Γραπτές δηλώσεις (άρθρο 162 του Κανονισμού)

Czesław Hoc (ECR), *na piśmie*. – Można powiedzieć: „Najwyższy czas!". Powstała rezolucja Parlamentu Europejskiego w sprawie neuroboreliozy z Lyme (boreliozy). Wreszcie Europa wydała walkę najczęstszej chorobie odkleszczowej. Na boreliozę w Europie cierpi obecnie ok. 1 mln obywateli. Obliczono, że w sytuacji ustanowienia niezawodnej wczesnej diagnozy boreliozy i tym samym wyraźnego zmniejszenia przypadków zaawansowanego stadium tej choroby, zaoszczędzimy ok. 330 mln euro na kosztach opieki zdrowotnej w ciągu pierwszych 5 lat! Co ważniejsze, oszczędzimy cierpienia wielu ludziom! Musimy też pamiętać, że borelioza jest chorobą zawodową leśników i rolników. To także koszty odszkodowawcze! Zatem w trybie pilnym należy wprowadzić europejski plan zwalczania tej cichej epidemii, stworzyć europejską sieć ds. boreliozy, a więc wprowadzić odrębny kod ICD (Międzynarodowa Statystyczna Klasyfikacja Chorób i Problemów Zdrowotnych) dla wczesnego i późnego stadium choroby, wprowadzić badania profilaktyczne, szybką i niezawodną identyfikację przypadków boreliozy w Unii, ustalić szybką ścieżkę terapii wg EBM (medycyny opartej na faktach) i wprowadzić stały europejski monitoring.

Ivan Jakovčić (ALDE), *napisan*. – Lajmska borelioza je bakterijska bolest koju uzrokuje bakterija Borrelia burgdoferi koja se na ljude prenosi ujedom krpelja koji su također kontaminirani bakterijom. Lajmska bolest zarazna je bolest ljudi i nekih domaćih i divljih životinja koja se prenosi krpeljima. U Europi ima oko 650 000 – 850 000 procijenjenih slučajeva, a geografski je veća učestalost u srednjoj Europi. Zaraza se pojavljuje u proljetnom i ljetnom razdoblju (od travnja do listopada) stoga je borelioza prepoznata kao profesionalna bolest poljoprivrednika, šumarskih radnika i istraživača na terenu u zemljama u kojima je prisutna. EU izražava zabrinutost u pogledu zabrinjavajućih razmjera širenja lajmske bolesti kod europskog stanovništva, s obzirom na to da su korištene metode izračuna pokazale da oko 1 milijun građana pati od te bolesti. Unija je do sada dodijelila velika sredstva za istraživanje u pogledu ranog otkrivanja i budućeg liječenja lajmske borelioze (do 16 milijuna eura kroz projekte kao što su ANTIDotE, ID-LYME i LYMEDIADEX). Iznimno je važno i dalje raditi na temeljnim saznanjima o mehanizmu koji lajmsku bolest pretvara u kroničnu bolest stoga ovo izvješće poziva na obvezno izvješćivanje u svim državama članicama pogođenima lajmskom bolešću.

4. Aussprache über Fälle von Verletzungen der Menschenrechte, der Demokratie und der Rechtsstaatlichkeit (Aussprache)

4.1. Vietnam, insbesondere die Lage politischer Gefangener

Πρόεδρος. – Το επόμενο σημείο στην ημερήσια διάταξη είναι η συζήτηση επί έξι προτάσεων ψηφίσματος σχετικά με το Βιετνάμ, ιδίως την κατάσταση των πολιτικών κρατουμένων (2018/2925(RSP)).

Marek Jurek, *autor*. – Panie Przewodniczący! Państwa komunistyczne często ewoluują, wielu z nas wie to najlepiej, bo widziało to w ciągu swojego życia, ale komunizm to komunizm i niestety w naszych relacjach z państwami, które mają tego typu rządy, musimy zawsze zwracać uwagę na konieczność odejścia od tej ideologii. W Wietnamie trwają systematyczne prześladowania chrześcijan, czasami bardzo drastyczne. Pastor Nguyen Trung Ton został skazany na 12 lat więzienia, jest chory, rodzina nie ma z nim możliwości kontaktu, a w sytuacji braku leczenia jego życie jest naprawdę poważnie zagrożone. Burzy się kościoły, zakazuje się druku Biblii w języku mniejszości narodowych, na przykład Muongów.

Ale w tym miejscu warto również zwrócić uwagę na to, co dzieje się gdzie indziej w Azji Wschodniej. W Chinach również nasilają się prześladowania Kościoła. Biskup Peter Shao Zhumin został niedawno aresztowany, podobnie jak czterech jego księży. Prosiłbym pana komisarza o zajęcie stanowiska w tej sprawie, dlatego że milczenie będzie…

(Przewodniczący odebrał mówcy głos)

Barbara Lochbihler, *Verfasserin*. – Herr Präsident! In Vietnam beobachten wir eine Zunahme an willkürlichen Verhaftungen und politisch motivierten Verurteilungen von Menschenrechts- und Umweltaktivisten, von Rechtsanwälten und Bloggern. Wer seine Meinung frei äußern will, wer Kritik an Missständen übt oder das Recht auf Versammlungsfreiheit nutzt, muss mit Verfolgung und Verhaftung rechnen.

Ich war AFET-Berichterstatterin für das Partnerschaftsabkommen mit Vietnam, dessen Vorgaben für Menschenrechtsschutz auch für das Freihandelsabkommen gelten. Es ist unerlässlich, dass die EU klare Benchmarks für Menschenrechtsschutz formuliert, die Vietnam erfüllen muss, bevor dem Freihandelsabkommen zugestimmt wird. Dazu gehören vor allem die umgehende Freilassung politischer Gefangener, die Überarbeitung des Strafgesetzbuches und die Ratifizierung der IAO-Abkommen 87, 98 und 105. Die EU muss deutliche Worte zu den Menschenrechtsverletzungen in Vietnam finden und die Zivilgesellschaft vor Ort auch durch Prozessbeobachtung und Gefängnisbesuche unterstützen.

Ignazio Corrao, *autore*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signor Commissario, quando noi parliamo del Vietnam ci vengono in mente le immagini dalla guerra sanguinosa con gli americani, le bombe e appunto le armi, però in realtà la guerra al nemico si è trasformata in una guerra al dissenso. Nel paese del Sud-Est asiatico, se si esprime un'opinione contraria, specie in materia di diritti umani o diritti ambientali, si finisce in cella, e lì iniziano maltrattamenti, bastonate, elettroshock, iniezioni di sostanze. E noi cosa facciamo per rispondere a tutto questo? Noi premiamo il Vietnam con un bell'accordo commerciale. Allora la risposta di questo Parlamento deve stare lì, nel negare appunto questo accordo commerciale, nel rispondere nei fatti alle violazioni dei diritti umani che avvengono in questo paese.

Maria Arena, *auteure*. – Monsieur le Président, la situation en matière de droits humains au Vietnam est préoccupante. Alors que l'Union européenne négocie un accord commercial avec le Vietnam depuis 2012, la situation se détériore de jour en jour. La répression contre la liberté d'expression et la condamnation de toute critique politique à l'égard du gouvernement s'intensifient. Blogueurs, militants pro-démocratie, militants en faveur des droits sociaux et environnementaux sont poursuivis, violentés, torturés, arrêtés arbitrairement, condamnés à de lourdes peines pouvant aller jusqu'à la peine de mort. Faut-il rappeler que ce pays a exécuté, en moyenne, 147 personnes par an entre 2013 et 2016?

Dans ce contexte, nous demandons aux autorités du Vietnam de libérer les prisonniers politiques et les activistes, d'adopter les lois nécessaires pour garantir la liberté d'expression, de ratifier et de respecter les conventions de l'OIT, notamment en matière de liberté d'association.

Nous demandons aussi à la Commission de prendre en considération cette situation désastreuse en matière de droits humains dans le cadre des discussions sur l'accord commercial.

Marietje Schaake, *author*. – Mr President, a staggering 160 human rights activists are in prison in Vietnam, reflecting the systematic repression in the country: from free expression to freedom of belief, all the way to the abysmal prison conditions and the application of the death penalty.

We call on the Vietnamese authorities to respect human rights and to release those only detained for exercising their human rights. We urge access for UN special rapporteurs on human rights defenders, the Working Group on Arbitrary Detention and the UN Special Rapporteur for freedom of expression. We remind the Vietnamese authorities that human rights are a clear conditionality when it comes to trade relations.

And I wanted to specifically zoom in on freedom of expression, online and offline, given the fact that Vietnam ranks 175th out of 180 countries on the Reporters Without Borders' list of press freedom in the world. They really have to start respecting the rights of freedom of expression, online and offline, and the least we can do in Europe is to stop the export of surveillance systems that are used to track and trace human rights defenders.

Michaela Šojdrová, *Autorka*. – Pane předsedající, Vietnam je dynamicky se rozvíjející země, která má před sebou slibnou budoucnost. Stejně jako v Číně ale i zde dochází pod vládou komunistické strany k masivnímu porušování lidských práv a svobod. Vidíme tu také podobný paradox jako v jiných takzvaně komunistických systémech – neexistence odborů, masivní porušování práv pracujících nebo závislost médií na politických aktérech.

Index Reportéři bez hranic uvádí, že v roce 2018 se závislost médií na komunistické straně dokonce ještě zvýšila. Svobodný tisk prakticky neexistuje a jakýkoliv nezávislý projev v médiích je ve většině případů trestán odnětím svobody.

Také chci zmínit, že trest smrti je ve Vietnamu stále aktuální záležitostí a o to více je alarmující skutečnost, že Vietnam drží počet odsouzených k trestu smrti v tajnosti před mezinárodním společenstvím. Toto jsou závažná fakta, ke kterým nemůžeme mlčet. Přimět k něčemu Čínu je složité, ale v případě Vietnamu máme v rukou jistý nástroj. Na spadnutí je totiž podpis dohody o volném obchodu mezi Evropskou unií a Vietnamem. Evropský parlament v tomto usnesení dává najevo, že mu situace politických vězňů, blogerů, aktivistů, křesťanských duchovních a masy obyvatel sledované režimem pomocí moderních technologií není lhostejná. Evropský parlament bude trvat na zlepšení ze strany Vietnamu, jinak neudělí obchodní dohodě souhlas.

Vietnam je pro mě země paradoxně velmi blízká, protože v České republice žije sto tisíc Vietnamců, což je největší komunita v Evropě. Proto bych si přála, aby Evropská unie měla s Vietnamem dobré ekonomické vztahy. Bez podmínek to ale nepůjde. Jsem také ráda, že k tomu je velký konsensus napříč politickými stranami v Evropském parlamentu.

Seán Kelly, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – I condemn the types of practices mentioned in this resolution and call on the Vietnamese authorities to release anyone it has imprisoned for exercising their fundamental right. I would also call for the criminal code to be reassessed and any laws which restrict these basic undertakings.

In my opinion, Vietnam should ratify all human rights treaties of the United Nations, and cannot be seen to take human rights seriously until having done so. At the same time, having visited Vietnam a couple of years ago on a mission on behalf of INTA, I know Vietnam to be a wonderful, beautiful country with exceptionally nice and decent people.

But I must stand up to this injustice and insist that it stop occurring. The relationship between the EU and Vietnam is a great one but full respect of the fundamental rights to freedom of expression, association, and peaceful assembly must be respected on both sides and the EU should work with Vietnam to ensure this can happen.

Neena Gill, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Mr President, Commissioner, with the EU-Vietnam trade and investment agreements on the table, we need to be more serious about the 'essential elements' clauses. Domestic repression has worsened in Vietnam. Human rights activists and bloggers not only face surveillance, intimidation and arbitrary arrest, but long stints in pre-trial detention, solitary confinements and excessive sentences.

So Commissioner, I'd like you to clarify a couple of points, please. In terms of, firstly, what concrete human rights improvements has Vietnam made following the FTA negotiations?

Secondly, how will the Commission ensure that Vietnam amends its repressive legal framework, in particular the penal code, the law on cyber security, bringing it into full compliance with international human rights standards?

Thirdly, besides pressing Vietnam to release political prisoners, has the EU pushed for establishment of an Independent Police Complaints Commission to investigate grievances and provide oversight over these authorities?

Mark Demesmaeker, *namens de ECR-Fractie*. – Voorzitter, er is al veel gezegd in dit debat en af en toe moeten we toch eens in de spiegel kijken. Natuurlijk is een vrijhandelsakkoord van groot belang voor de dynamiek en de ontwikkeling van een land als Vietnam, voor de welvaart van zijn mensen.

Maar herhalen we ook niet altijd dat vrije handel en een vrije samenleving hand in hand moeten gaan? Snakken mensen ook en vooral niet naar vrijheid? Antwoordt u eens eerlijk: heeft de overheid van Vietnam in uw ogen al voldoende getoond dat het concrete stappen zet om een einde te maken aan de massale mensenrechtenschendingen en de repressie?

De feiten: journalisten, mensenrechtenverdedigers, bloggers, geestelijken, politieke activisten, zij belanden voor het minste kritische geluid in de cel. Ik noem nadrukkelijk Hoang Duc Binh, Nguyen Nam Phong, Nguyen Trung Truc en Le Dinh Luong. Zij moeten vrijgelaten worden, net als honderden anderen.

Ik verzoek de Commissie daarom met klem om Vietnam tijdens de mensenrechtendialoog blijvend te wijzen op zijn verplichtingen.

Gilles Lebreton, *au nom du groupe ENF*. – Monsieur le Président, les régimes communistes européens se sont effondrés en 1989, deux ans avant que l'URSS ne disparaisse à son tour. On trouve malgré tout encore quelques régimes communistes dans le monde, comme par exemple au Vietnam, qui fait figure de dinosaure.

La Constitution vietnamienne proclame, je cite, que «le Parti communiste, avant-garde de la classe ouvrière, est la force qui dirige l'État et la société». L'Assemblée nationale et la justice sont donc à ses ordres.

Le Vietnam cherche depuis vingt ans à s'insérer dans la société internationale, c'est ainsi qu'il a adhéré à l'ASEAN en 1995, à l'APEC en 1998, à l'OMC en 2007 et qu'il a signé un accord de partenariat avec l'Union européenne en 2012.

Malgré tout, le Vietnam n'en demeure pas moins une dictature qui emprisonne ses opposants politiques, comme par exemple M. Dinh Luong, condamné à vingt ans de prison le 16 août dernier. Le Premier ministre français vient pourtant de faire l'éloge du président Hô Chi Minh, fondateur de cette dictature communiste, en échange de la signature de contrats commerciaux.

L'Union européenne aurait pu sauver l'honneur européen, mais elle ne le fera pas, car elle s'apprête à signer un accord de libre-échange avec le Vietnam. Bientôt les consommateurs européens pourront donc acheter à vil prix les produits fabriqués par les prisonniers politiques vietnamiens.

Wajid Khan (S&D). – Mr President, Vietnam is actually reducing its citizens' freedom in every area. There are over 100 human rights defenders languishing in jail, often in awful conditions, and the new cyber security law will give authorities more tools to silence dissent. It might surprise Members that despite all this, the EU is accelerating the EU-Vietnam Free Trade Agreement process, pushing for a swift implementation. This Parliament must make it clear that we will not ratify this unless there is solid progress on human rights. The EU risks losing its credibility, if on the one hand it withdraws trade preferences with Cambodia over human rights abuses, and on the other hand, it signs a trade agreement with one of the most repressive states in Southeast Asia. Therefore, I urge Vietnam to release political prisoners, bring its legislation in line with international human rights standards, halt all executions and ratify the ILO conventions, and I call on the EU to strengthen their efforts to ensure concrete human rights improvements in Vietnam. The EU trade policy was designed as a tool to promote human rights in third countries and, Mr President, we must use it as such.

Jean-Luc Schaffhauser (ENF). – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, le conflit naissant en mer de Chine orientale doit amener nos États à agir avec la plus grande précaution.

Nous sommes enserrés entre les États-Unis, qui soufflent sur les braises, les États de la région, qui se réarment, et la Chine, qui investit massivement dans sa marine de guerre. La situation devient extrêmement critique et nous faisons face à un risque de conflit majeur. J'ai toujours combattu le communisme et je n'ai aucune tendresse pour le régime de Hanoï. Je trouve particulièrement intolérables les persécutions dont souffrent les catholiques vietnamiens. Ce ne sont pas des proclamations grandiloquentes, mais des actions diplomatiques discrètes et résolues de nos États qui pourront les faire cesser. Mais en Asie, on négocie toujours en respectant la souveraineté nationale de ses interlocuteurs. Il suffirait de refuser l'accord commercial, produit de votre idéologie et qui livre d'ailleurs nos économies au dumping féroce d'un pays sans règles, pour obtenir des concessions et obtenir une plus grande démocratie. Alors pourquoi n'allez-vous pas dans cette direction?

Donc, une fois de plus, agissez avec prudence et fermeté!

Διαδικασία catch-the-eye

Bogdan Andrzej Zdrojewski (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Nie podpisałem się pod tą rezolucją, ale oczywiście zagłosuje za nią. Nie podpisałem się, bo uważam, że autorzy tego typu rezolucji powinni być świetnie zorientowani we wszystkich szczegółach i wiedzieć o każdym punkcie coś więcej, niż tylko wynika to z uzasadnienia. Zagłosuje oczywiście za tą rezolucją przede wszystkim ze względu na trzy punkty: J, K i M, czyli te, które obejmują prawa organizacji pozarządowych, prawa dziennikarzy, działalność wolnych mediów. Sami Reporterzy bez Granic piszą, iż państwo to zasługuje rzeczywiście na szczególną uwagę ze względu na najgorsze warunki pracy dziennikarzy i wolnych mediów. Przypomnę: jest to chyba 175. lub 176. państwo na 180 ocenianych, jeżeli chodzi o prawa dziennikarzy do wykonywania zawodu. Z tego powodu, podkreślam, poprę ten apel i treść rezolucji.

Jude Kirton-Darling (S&D). – Mr President, it's becoming increasingly difficult to ignore the human rights situation in Vietnam. Well, that's for everyone except for our trade negotiators. Human rights defenders report a deteriorating situation on the ground, whether they be online bloggers, religious minorities or trade union leaders in shoe factories or in the fishing industries. In a country where basic freedoms such as the freedom of speech or religious rights are routinely denied to the population and where political opposition is systematically repressed and over 150 reported prisoners of conscience and human rights activists are currently detained in often terrible conditions, if the EU was serious about securing progress in terms of human and labour rights in Vietnam it would insist on the release of these prisoners and the pre-ratification of human rights and ILO core conventions as a precondition to our ratification of the trade and investment agreements. At the very least, the EU should articulate a series of tangible human rights benchmarks that Vietnam must meet before those agreements come before this House for approval. That's at the very least – we need more, and we need better.

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, το Βιετνάμ είναι το νέο Eldorado. Οι πολυεθνικές στήνουν πάρτι. Έχουν κάνει επενδύσεις, αξιοποιούν τους μισθούς πείνας του Βιετνάμ και, βεβαίως, κερδίζουν υπερβολικά ποσά. Γι' αυτό υπάρχει και ανοχή στην ασυδοσία όσον αφορά την προστασία των εργασιακών δικαιωμάτων στο Βιετνάμ και -πολύ περισσότερο- ανοχή, πλέον, στην καταπίεση, στην παραβίαση των ανθρωπίνων δικαιωμάτων, στις καταδίκες ακτιβιστών και στην κακομεταχείριση των κρατουμένων, οι οποίοι δεν έχουν καν πρόσβαση σε δικηγόρο. Είναι γεγονός ότι ο ποινικός κώδικας του Βιετνάμ δεν είναι καν συμβατός με τα διεθνή πρότυπα και, φυσικά, η καταπίεση έχει επεκταθεί και στους χριστιανικούς πληθυσμούς. Απαιτείται, λοιπόν, μορατόριουμ στη θανατική ποινή και, φυσικά, λήψη σκληρών μέτρων κατά του Βιετνάμ. Δεν μπορεί να υπάρχει αυτή η προνομιακή μεταχείριση, με εργαλεία συνεργασίας της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης και με ελεύθερες συναλλαγές, και να συνεχίζεται αυτή η κατάσταση στο Βιετνάμ.

Fabio Massimo Castaldo (EFDD). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, esprimere le proprie idee ha un prezzo in Vietnam: rinunciare alla propria libertà e a volte anche alla propria vita. Lo dimostra bene il caso di Hoang Duc Binh, noto blogger vietnamita di 34 anni. La sua denuncia del disastro ambientale causato dalla compagnia taiwanese Formosa gli è costata assai cara: la condanna a ben 14 anni di carcere.

L'accusa: resistenza a pubblico ufficiale e, udite udite, abuso delle libertà democratiche contro gli interessi dello Stato. Paradossale perché l'abuso presuppone il godimento pieno di questa libertà. Libertà di cui però i vietnamiti non beneficiano affatto, specialmente dopo la revisione del codice penale, che addirittura richiede agli avvocati di denunciare i propri stessi assistiti, se colpevoli di determinati reati.

Vi chiedo, allora, colleghi, cosa è cambiato dopo gli accordi firmati con un governo che continua a reprimere con la forza anche il minimo dissenso. Un governo che si fa beffe delle convenzioni internazionali dallo stesso firmate e che è divenuto ormai un paradiso per le multinazionali. Le nostre richieste sono chiare: rilascio immediato e incondizionato di tutti gli attivisti, giornalisti, prigionieri di coscienza e semplici cittadini. Pretendiamo il pieno rispetto dei diritti umani, se questi accordi non sono carta straccia. Su questo no, proprio non possiamo negoziare.

José Inácio Faria (PPE). – Senhor Presidente, Senhor Comissário, é recorrente nesta casa falarmos do Vietname e, infelizmente, nunca pelos melhores motivos, devo acrescentar. Desta vez, a regra não é excecionada e, uma vez mais, eis-nos aqui a debater a falta de liberdade e democracia e a constante violação dos direitos humanos no Vietname.

Desta vez, Sr. Comissário, o que nos traz aqui é a denúncia efetuada pelo Projeto 88 de que atualmente estão atirados, em condições sub-humanas, para as tristemente célebres prisões vietnamitas, cento e sessenta ativistas e que as autoridades vietnamitas continuam a prender, a perseguir e a intimidar os defensores dos direitos humanos, os jornalistas, os bloguistas, os advogados defensores dos direitos humanos e os ativistas da sociedade civil numa escala sem precedentes.

Sr. Comissário, a União não pode continuar a pactuar com os Estados que sistematicamente violem os seus compromissos internacionais na defesa dos direitos humanos e que persigam quem expressa opinião diferente da oficial. Por isso, Sr. Comissário, é da mais elementar justiça e decência moral que a União inste as autoridades vietnamitas a libertarem, sem exceção, todos os presos políticos, sob pena de ficar comprometido o acordo de cooperação e parceria com o Vietname.

Não podemos, Sr. Comissário, não podemos tolerar mais estes abusos da dignidade humana.

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Pane předsedající, já bych chtěl zdůraznit, že Vietnam skutečně udělal zásadní pokrok v uplynulém období, nicméně je důležité si uvědomit, že to skutečně není svobodný stát, že nemá v žádném případě demokratický charakter. Pokud mluvíme o jedné straně, kde neexistuje opozice, neexistují odbory, pokud mluvíme o nesvobodě médií, neexistenci pluralitních názorů, naopak dokonce pro jiný názor jsou zde političtí vězni, tak to je jednoznačné, že se nejedná o demokratický charakter státu, o tom ostatně nikdo ani nepochybuje. Máme zde nejen politické vězně, ale i náboženské vězně.

Co můžeme udělat více? Máme zde nástroj té obchodní dohody, myslím si, že bychom měli více tlačit na vietnamskou vládu. Samozřejmě i naše diplomatické úsilí, naše delegace, které vyráží do Vietnamu, musí o těchto našich základních výhradách hovořit. My můžeme mluvit, a proto bychom na těchto delegacích skutečně mluvit měli i o těchto palčivých otázkách a já samozřejmě tuto rezoluci podporuji.

(Λήξη της διαδικασίας catch-the-eye)

Christos Stylianides, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, the European Union is closely following the human rights situation in Vietnam. Vietnam has made significant economic and social progress over the past twenty years, which resulted in a substantial advancement in socio-economic rights. However, I personally underline that we share your concerns, Parliament's concerns, regarding political prisoners in the country. The frequent use of vaguely drafted national security provisions in Vietnam's Penal Code results in numerous arrests, sentencing and detention of Vietnamese citizens who peacefully express their opinion both online and offline.

As the European Union, we systematically discuss our concerns over limitations to freedom of expression and freedom of religion with authorities, including at the highest levels, calling on the Government to end persecution and harassment, and to release all peaceful advocates of human rights.

The continued harassment and detention of an increasing number of human rights defenders is systematically raised during our annual Human Rights Dialogue. This is also where we discuss a number of individual cases. Moreover in Hanoi, the EU regularly asks for the possibility to attend trials, to visit human rights defenders in prison or under house arrest, and insist on prisoners having access to legal counsel, medical care and, of course, family visits.

We extend specific support to the Government in order to strengthen respect for human rights and the rule of law. We share best practices with selected ministries, provide input to the National Assembly on the legal framework including on the Penal Code, Labour Law and on Cybersecurity, and promote joint actions with like-minded partners and countries.

Vietnam and the EU are committed to work towards a closer partnership by implementing the Partnership and Cooperation Agreement and the Free Trade Agreement. No doubt, a key tool is the institutional and legally binding linkage between the Free Trade Agreement and the partnership and cooperation agreement ensuring that respect for human rights is an essential element of the trade relations.

The European Union wants a prosperous Vietnam, a country that respects the rule of law and human rights and honours its international commitments. While firmly stating that the negative trend of restricting the right to freedom of expression needs to be reversed, the EU stands ready to engage with Vietnam to improve the human rights conditions in the country.

Πρόεδρος. – Η συζήτηση έληξε.

Η ψηφοφορία θα διεξαχθεί μετά τη λήξη των συζητήσεων.

Γραπτές δηλώσεις (άρθρο 162 του Κανονισμού)

Monica Macovei (ECR), *in writing*. – In Vietnam, human rights defenders and political activists face extreme hardship as they continue to be imprisoned, detained, and harassed by the Vietnamese authorities. Currently an estimated 160 activists are serving prison sentences, according to the Vietnamese Political Prisoner Database. Freedom of the press, of expression and of peaceful assembly and the right to privacy are strongly restricted as the authorities abuse the repressive provisions embedded in the Vietnamese Criminal Code These actions directly contradict the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, to which Vietnam acceded in 1982. Political intimidation, threats of prolonged prison sentences and the restrictions to freedoms are some factors resulting in Vietnam's rank of 175 out of 180 on the 2018 Reporters Without Borders Press Freedom Index. The Vietnamese Government needs to repeal all repressive laws, releasing human rights defenders and prisoners of conscious while providing them with appropriate medical and legal support in addition to trial monitoring. The comprehensive discussions between the EU and Vietnam in Human Rights Dialogue continue to be necessary as key instruments used to encourage Vietnam in the implementation of human rights reforms. The European Union must continue to press for concrete human rights improvements in Vietnam.

Csaba Sógor (PPE), *in writing*. – Despite its economic progress, Vietnam's human rights situation remains dire. Basic rights, including freedom of speech, opinion, the press, association, and religion, are restricted, while the criminal justice system lacks independence. In its relations with Vietnam, the EU should pressure its important trading partner's authorities to ease restrictions on civil and political rights and to act in defence of human rights activists calling for democracy and greater freedoms. In particular, it should firmly call on the Vietnamese authorities to immediately and unconditionally release all human rights defenders and prisoners of conscience detained or sentenced, including Hoang Duc Binh, Nguyen Nam Phong, Nguyen Trung Truc and Le Dinh Luong.

4.2. Die Menschenrechtslage in Kuba

Πρόεδρος. – Το επόμενο σημείο στην ημερήσια διάταξη είναι η συζήτηση επί έξι προτάσεων ψηφίσματος σχετικά με την κατάσταση των ανθρωπίνων δικαιωμάτων στην Κούβα (2018/2926(RSP)).

Pavel Svoboda, *Autor.* – Pane předsedající, Evropský parlament již v letech 2002, 2005 a 2010 udělil Sacharovovu cenu kubánským obhájcům lidských práv. Podle dnešní rezoluce je Kuba stále totalitním státem jediné komunistické strany, který se neobtěžuje s dodržováním základních lidských práv. Obhájci těchto práv nebo jen ti, kteří se chtějí svobodně vyjádřit či shromažďovat, jsou zastrašováni nebo nezákonně vězněni.

Jen teď v říjnu bylo takto uvězněno více než dvě stě Kubánců jen proto, že uplatnili svá práva podle Všeobecné deklarace lidských práv. Státní orgány neumožňují existenci lidskoprávních organizací a zabraňují vycestování jejich představitelů. Svoboda vyznání na Kubě existuje v minimální míře, církevní představitelé jsou pod dohledem státních orgánů. Kuba uplatňuje cenzuru a neumožňuje existenci jiných médií než státních.

Tento stav volá částečně k odpovědnosti i nás, Evropskou unii a její členské státy. To my jsme u nové dohody s Kubou netrvali na jasné podmíněnosti jejího uplatňování dodržováním základních práv. Nicméně ani tento nedostatek nesnižuje naši povinnost ve všech vnějších vztazích Evropské unie trvat na dodržování těchto práv, jak nám to ukládá čl. 21 odst. 1 - Smlouvy o Evropské unii.

Je proto třeba se jasně postavit za základní práva Kubánců a využívat k tomu i všechny ekonomické příležitosti, které nová smlouva s Kubou otevřela. Nesmíme se nechat chlácholit konáním voleb, ve kterých nesmějí kandidovat nezávislí kandidáti. Je třeba maximálně posílit kontakt s občanskou společností a neúnavně poukazovat na všechny represivní metody, které kubánský stát uplatňuje.

Charles Tannock, *author.* – Mr President, when the Obama administration broke the diplomatic stalemate with Cuba in 2014 and reopened the US embassy in Havana, there was much optimism in the West for a reset. But we now continue to watch with alarm as the new President, Miguel Diaz-Canel, sets out his vision for the country under its new constitution.

So far, sadly, there's very little evidence from observers of any true progress in human rights in that country. Political rights and civil liberties continue to be repressed, with the regime choosing to use short-term incarceration as a strategy for intimidating dissidents. Although it's thought that, overall, the number of political prisoners is decreasing, sadly, one of the first laws signed by the new President imposes punitive measures on artists and musicians who operate without prior authorisation. The Ladies in White, who won the Sakharov Prize in 2005, continue to be harassed.

Thus, this is a mixed picture, so the EU must continue in its stick-and-carrot efforts to encourage the Cuban Government to transition towards a free and democratic state.

Elena Valenciano, *autora.* – Señor presidente, quiero recordarles que Cuba era el único país de América con el que la Unión Europea no tenía relaciones, porque durante más de veinte años la derecha europea, capitaneada por José María Aznar, impidió que se cooperase con la isla a través de la Posición Común. Ahora, bajo la excusa de una urgencia, el PP y alguna de sus compañías traen de nuevo los mismos argumentos que utilizaron para dificultar la aprobación del Acuerdo de Diálogo Político entre la Unión Europea y Cuba. No es razonable.

No es razonable porque, en estos dos años de Acuerdo — solo dos años —, el mecanismo que prevé el Acuerdo se ha puesto en marcha; porque el esfuerzo de la alta representante y del señor Lambrinidis ha sido mantener cuatro — cuatro — reuniones de diálogo sobre derechos humanos; que puede que les parezca mal, pero es la primera vez que podemos dialogar con la isla sobre derechos humanos.

También pueden ustedes presentar alguno de sus casos particulares en la Delegación de la Unión Europea en Cuba — dirigida, por cierto, por uno de los mejores diplomáticos europeos, el señor Alberto Navarro.

No es razonable lo que ustedes hacen, ni tiene — me parece a mí — mucho que ver con los problemas que tiene la isla.

Si quieren hablar de lo urgente, también les sugiero que solicitemos urgentemente el cierre de Guantánamo, que ha dicho el señor Trump que va a seguir abierto durante veinticinco años: sí parece que eso sea un tema de derechos humanos, ¿verdad? Y también para devolverle esa parte de la soberanía a Cuba.

Y, por último, creo que esta urgencia no es ajena a un hecho que se va a producir en este mismo mes, que es el viaje del presidente del Gobierno de España a la isla. Hace treinta años que un presidente del Gobierno de España no viaja a la isla. En este caso, el presidente Sánchez lo va a hacer justamente porque ahora tenemos un marco estable de relaciones con Cuba.

¡Por supuesto que sigue habiendo muchísimos problemas! Pero para eso está el marco del diálogo de derechos humanos.

Ese es el trabajo que se ha hecho desde la Unión Europea a través de la gestión de la señora Mogherini, del señor Lambrinidis y del esfuerzo que todos tenemos que hacer para, por fin, tener un diálogo estructurado con aquella parte del mundo.

Javier Couso Permuy, *autor.* – Señor presidente, con esta urgencia asistimos a un torpe intento de reeditar la Posición Común que impulsó Aznar, utilizando los derechos humanos, otra vez, como un instrumento de injerencia y de cambio de Gobierno justo en el momento en que está empezando a caminar el Acuerdo de Diálogo Político y Cooperación firmado entre la Unión Europea y Cuba.

Hay actores en este Parlamento que abrazan la agenda Trump y buscan hacer descarrilar la normalización de relaciones entre la Unión Europea y Cuba. Pero, por mucho que lo intenten, ustedes están fuera de la realidad. Hablan un lenguaje caduco alimentado por una supuesta oposición asalariada desde el exterior de la isla.

Miren, hoy el pueblo cubano, con extraordinaria participación, está debatiendo su nueva Constitución, que será ratificada en referéndum. Su contenido no lo decidirá el Parlamento Europeo ni la Unión Europea. Y menos, los mercenarios pagados por Miami u otra capital de Europa. Lo decidirán los cubanos y las cubanas en pleno ejercicio de su soberanía e independencia.

(El orador se niega a que Tomáš Zdechovský le formule una pregunta con arreglo al procedimiento de la «tarjeta azul».)

Ernest Urtasun, *autor.* – Señor presidente, hace dos años este Parlamento decidió poner fin a una situación completamente irracional, a saber, que Cuba fuera el único país de América Latina con el que la Unión Europea no tenía ninguna relación, fruto de una Posición Común caduca y que no tenía ningún sentido. No entiendo exactamente qué estamos haciendo con este texto, puesto que creo que este Parlamento mostró una voluntad de avanzar y de normalizar las relaciones con la isla.

Me da la sensación de que tenemos ganas de crear problemas al Servicio Europeo de Acción Exterior en la implementación de este Acuerdo, cuando cuestionamos que la señora Mogherini no rinda cuentas del resultado de la implementación de este Acuerdo aquí —cuando vino hace muy poco— o cuando implícitamente se dice que las instituciones europeas en Cuba, en su trabajo, no respetan los principios básicos de la UE, poniendo en cuestión el trabajo de uno de los mejores diplomáticos que tiene la Unión Europea, como es el señor Alberto Navarro.

Con lo cual, me parece francamente que esta es una Resolución totalmente inoportuna y que lo que deberíamos desear es que este Acuerdo funcione en todas sus partes, incluido el diálogo sobre derechos humanos. Y, por eso, creo que este texto no tiene lugar.

Pavel Telička, *author.* – Mr President, colleagues, this is not about Spanish politics, and this is not against the Political Dialogue Agreement, it is in support of the implementation. I know Alberto Navarro maybe longer than many of you Spaniards in this Hemicycle. He is an excellent diplomat, but the fact is that we are implementing the dialogue for already two years with basically no results, and this is something that we need to acknowledge. Read the draft constitution. There is nothing about free elections there. Read the draft resolution; in it there are provisions about basically any measures, any force can that can be taken. This is in fact in support of the Cuban dissidents who are continuously harassed. This is in support of those, even the Laureats of the Sakharov Prize, who are not invited to EU events. This is in support of the opposition that is to be recognised not just by the Cuban regime but also by us. We should not be calling dictators friends, but we should be inviting these people to a dialogue. We should recognise them. It is not just a message to the Cubans emphasising the need to implement, but also a message to ourselves. So yes, please, who votes against this resolution basically votes against the basic rights of these people.

Francisco José Millán Mon, *en nombre del Grupo PPE*. – Señor presidente, el Acuerdo entre la Unión Europea y Cuba se aplica ya desde hace un año. Por eso, parece totalmente lógico hacer un balance ahora. Recuerdo, además, que este Acuerdo supuso un giro muy importante en la política exterior de la Unión Europea hacia la isla. Lamentablemente, en materia de derechos y libertades fundamentales el balance de este año no es positivo. Siguen los acosos y la intimidación a los defensores de los derechos humanos, siguen detenidos en las cárceles cubanas personas de la calidad de Eduardo Cardet.

La Resolución que hoy votaremos detalla más casos de detenciones arbitrarias y de violaciones de derechos humanos. Las propuestas de visitas oficiales de este Parlamento siguen siendo rechazadas por las autoridades cubanas. Desgraciadamente, tampoco hay perspectivas de cambio político en Cuba. El proyecto actual de reforma constitucional consagra el sistema de partido único y pretende hacerlo, además, irreversible. Las esperanzas de reforma que estaban en la base del apoyo por este Parlamento al Acuerdo con Cuba se han visto defraudadas por ahora.

El diálogo anual sobre derechos humanos tiene que producir resultados tangibles. No es un fin en sí mismo, como aquí se pretende decir. Son muchos los vínculos que nos unen a los europeos con el pueblo cubano. Queremos para este lo mismo que para nosotros: respeto de las libertades, pluralismo y Estado de Derecho.

Bas Belder, *namens de ECR-Fractie*. – Voorzitter, graag wil ik de Europese Commissie en ook de EU-delegatie in Havana twee grote zorgen van de kerken in Cuba voorleggen.

Ten eerste: vanwege de explosieve groei van het aantal christenen hebben de kerken dringend behoefte aan nieuwe godshuizen. De Cubaanse overheid staat deze nieuwbouw echter niet toe, ook niet bij geregistreerde kerken. Commissie, uw ambassade in Havana, ik vertrouw erop dat u dit essentiële kernpunt van geloofsvrijheid – eredienst in legale godshuizen – verdedigt tegenover de Cubaanse autoriteiten. Of streven die soms naar een wildgroei aan huiskerken? Ik kan me dat nauwelijks voorstellen.

Tweede punt: christelijke organisaties in Europa staan al jaren klaar om elementaire sociale zorg te bieden aan alle noodlijdende Cubaanse burgers, maar dan wel zonder de huidige schadelijke overheidscontrole. Zo creëerde de Cubaanse overheid zelf een illegaal hulpcircuit. Commissie, EU-delegatie in Havana, agendeer en overtuig Cubaanse gezagsdragers dat bilaterale hulp van buitenaf, vanuit Europa, voor 100 % rechtstreeks bij de behoeftige burgers behoort aan te komen. Dat is sociaal, dat is voor Cuba!

María Teresa Giménez Barbat, *en nombre del Grupo ALDE*. – Señor presidente, compañeros, hemos celebrado cuatro acuerdos de diálogo Unión Europea-Cuba, y ¿para qué sirven? Tras cuatro años desde el primero, la situación sigue siendo penosa, a pesar de lo que digan la izquierda *sanchista* y sus socios.

Se detiene y encarcela arbitrariamente a defensores de derechos humanos y disidentes políticos. No nos engañemos: en Cuba no hay libertad de expresión y de reunión. Se persigue y se censura a cualquiera que se atreva a pensar diferente del régimen.

No hay un pluralismo político como en las democracias normales y el nuevo proyecto de Constitución no parece arreglarlo. Al revés, refuerza el poder del Partido Comunista e incluye disposiciones surrealistas, como la prohibición a las generaciones futuras de decidir su propia forma de gobierno.

Como dice mi compañero el vicepresidente Telička, esto no es una discusión entre españoles; se trata de los derechos del pueblo cubano y de los valores de todos los europeos.

João Pimenta Lopes, *em nome do Grupo GUE/NGL*. – Senhor Presidente, repudiamos o sistemático desrespeito e ingerência em países soberanos promovidos desde o Parlamento. Denunciamos a espúria instrumentalização dos direitos humanos nessa estratégia, matéria em que a União Europeia não tem autoridade para pregar.

É lamentável o ataque que daqui se pretende desferir ao processo de normalização e desenvolvimento de relações da União Europeia e dos seus Estados-Membros com Cuba, com a celebração do acordo de diálogo político e cooperação. Reafirmamos o exemplo inquestionável de Cuba na expressão do internacionalismo, da cooperação, da resposta solidária a graves situações humanitárias em países terceiros.

Saudamos os avanços da revolução cubana, um país sem fome, sem analfabetismo, com saúde e educação gratuita para todos, avanços alcançados não obstante o criminoso bloqueio económico e financeiro que há quase sessenta anos os Estados Unidos impõem a Cuba, um bloqueio cujo fim se exige, como reiterado na última Assembleia-Geral das Nações Unidas por todos os países, à exceção dos Estados Unidos e de Israel.

Cabe ao povo de Cuba definir soberanamente a sua própria via de desenvolvimento e o modelo de sociedade que querem construir.

Διαδικασία catch-the-eye

Πρόεδρος. – Ολοκληρώθηκε ο κατάλογος των εγγεγραμμένων ομιλητών. Προχωρούμε στη διαδικασία catch-the-eye. Έχουμε ένα πρόβλημα χρονικής πίεσης, διότι είναι Πέμπτη σήμερα και οι ψηφοφορίες πρέπει να αρχίσουν στις 12.00. Έχω δεχθεί έξι αιτήματα, όλα από την ίδια πολιτική ομάδα. Οι τέσσερις από τους έξι συναδέλφους έχουν ήδη μιλήσει σήμερα το πρωί στη διαδικασία catch-the-eye, οπότε -λόγω και της έλλειψης χρόνου- θα κάνω δεκτά μόνον τα δύο αιτήματα των συναδέλφων που δεν έχουν κάνει χρήση της διαδικασίας catch-the-eye.

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – Pane předsedající, já se domnívám, že Evropská unie nemůže polevit v podpoře lidských práv, ať se to děje kdekoliv. Mě zaujala slova pana kolegy Urtasuna, který se ptal, proč chceme vstupovat do něčeho, co funguje. Lidskoprávní dialog funguje, ale jestliže funguje lidskoprávní dialog, to ještě neznamená, že fungují lidská práva na Kubě, jestliže je tam sto třicet politických vězňů a další, kteří jsou pronásledováni.

Já se domnívám, že Evropská unie musí vést tento dialog, ale musí vnímat také, jaké jsou výsledky. Pokud výsledky nejsou, tak je na místě, aby Evropský parlament se ozval, aby bylo zřejmé, že nepolevíme. Politická pluralita a svobodná opozice je náš cíl, který v této otázce sledujeme. Já doufám, že socialisté také.

Tomáš Zdechovský (PPE). – Pane předsedající, k demokracii patří dialog a myslím si, že dialog se vede skrze to, že si vzájemně vyměňujeme svoje pozice. Myslím si, že to, že tento parlament má zavedeny modré karty, ukazuje na to, že je otevřený dialogu. Dialog právě může prohlubovat demokracii. Proto jsem trochu zaskočen tím, že kolega z komunistické strany odmítl se mnou tento dialog vést. Já možná vím, pane kolego, proč jste odmítl. Protože jste na Kubě asi nikdy nebyl. Nikdy jste se tam nesetkal s lidmi, kteří jsou v opozici, a nikdy jste neviděl zatýkání opozičních lídrů. Já jsem ho viděl, já jsem viděl mlácení lidí, kteří se shromáždili kvůli tomu, aby vyjádřili svoje přesvědčení, že lidská práva, demokracie, svoboda je něco, co se nedá vyměnit za paštiku, tak jako vy to vyměňujete v řadě zemí. Jedna věc je o demokracii a o svobodě mluvit, druhá věc je demokracii a svobodu žít. Na závěr mi dovolte vám vyjádřit jednu věc – slepec není ten, kdo nevidí, ale ten, kdo nechce vidět.

Πρόεδρος. – Η απόφασή μου για το catch-the eye είναι οριστική και σας παρακαλώ να μην χάσουμε άλλο χρόνο επ' αυτού του θέματος. Κύριε Faria, έχετε τον λόγο επί της διαδικασίας. Παρακαλώ επικαλεστείτε το άρθρο του Κανονισμού βάσει του οποίου ζητάτε τον λόγο επί της διαδικασίας.

José Inácio Faria (PPE). – Senhor Presidente, o *catch the eye* é um mecanismo que está à disposição dos deputados quando não têm a oportunidade de expressar a sua voz de outra forma. Eu fiz um *catch the eye* nesta casa hoje. E, portanto, agradeço que o Sr. Presidente me deixe exercer o meu direito a falar, a expressar as minhas opiniões aqui, por favor, e que não faça, como muitos têm feito aqui nesta casa, que é cortar a palavra aos deputados eleitos livremente. Faz favor.

Πρόεδρος. – Κύριε Faria, δεν θέλω να παραβιάζετε τον Κανονισμό. Δεν έχετε τον λόγο. Έχουμε εκλεγεί όλοι ελεύθερα αλλά, με βάση τον Κανονισμό, ο προεδρεύων έχει το δικαίωμα να επιλέγει πώς θα χρησιμοποιεί τη διαδικασία του catch-the-eye. Σας θυμίζω ότι υπάρχουν φορές που δεν παίρνει κανείς τον λόγο με βάση το catch-the-eye. Εξήγησα προηγουμένως ότι για τα τέσσερα από τα έξι αιτήματα, που και τα έξι έχουν υποβληθεί από την ίδια πολιτική ομάδα, χρησιμοποιήθηκε σήμερα το πρωί το δικαίωμα του catch-the-eye. Σας παρακαλώ, λοιπόν, να σεβαστείτε και τον χρόνο και το ότι έχουμε ακόμη μία συζήτηση και πρέπει να αρχίσει η ψηφοφορία στις 12.00.

Seán Kelly (PPE). – Mr President, we have to accept your decision. I understand that, but normally there are at least five taken. You have a request for six. It was four extra minutes. We lost several minutes all along, but we have to accept your decision. It was unnecessary though.

Πρόεδρος. – Ευχαριστώ πολύ που σέβεστε την απόφασή μου. Ξέρετε πολύ καλά -γιατί δεν είναι πρώτη φορά που προεδρεύω- ότι όποτε έχουμε χρόνο δέχομαι όλα τα αιτήματα, ακόμη και αν είναι παραπάνω από πέντε. Αυτή τη φορά σας παρακαλώ να σεβαστείτε την απόφασή μου, διότι όλοι και όλες ξέρετε πολύ καλά ότι όλα τα επιχειρήματα έχουν ακουστεί από όλες τις πλευρές με πλήρη άνεση. Δεν υπάρχει ούτε ένα επιχείρημα που δεν έχει ακουστεί.

(Λήξη της διαδικασίας catch-the-eye)

Christos Stylianides, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, almost two years ago, the European Union, our Member States and Cuba, signed a new agreement – the so-called Political Dialogue and Cooperation Agreement – which opened a new chapter in our relations with Cuba. Around a year ago this agreement entered into provisional application, after having received Parliament's overwhelming support in its assent vote.

While there is broad-ranging agreement on political dialogue and cooperation, it was very clear from the beginning that human rights should be a central part of it, and even before its formal application we started holding human rights discussions, both in Brussels and Havana.

Last May, at the Joint Council meeting, Federica Mogherini and the Cuban Foreign Minister decided to start formal political dialogues on a number of areas. The very first formal political dialogue we had with Cuba was precisely the Human Rights one held last month in Havana. This was an important point for us to underline the continued relevance of human rights in our bilateral relations. For the first time, it involved the participation of our EU Member States as observers, and the organisation of a civil society seminar in its margins.

We all know that there are still important differences between the EU and Cuba on many issues, notably on the way human rights and democracy are applied. This is why during last month's Human Rights Dialogue we raised important matters, such as the need for ratification and implementation of the relevant international instruments on human rights, proper legal guarantees in criminal proceedings, freedom of association and expression, and the protection of human rights defenders.

The civil society seminar that was organised in the margins of the Dialogue tackled the situation of LGBTI groups and gender equality. While only registered Cuban civil society organisations were able to attend the seminar on this occasion, we recalled the importance to enlarge these discussions to the whole range of civil society, whether registered or not.

I would like to give some numbers about our projects. Most of these projects, indeed for around EUR 10 million, are implemented by European and Cuban civil society organisations, including religious organisations. Vulnerable Cuban people's rights have been specifically addressed by a number of these projects – women, elderly people, people with disabilities and LGBTI – lesbian, gay, bisexual and so on. We will continue raising this, and all other subjects that are close to our hearts, with our Cuban counterparts in different meetings. Human rights need to be promoted on a day-to-day basis.

I would like to reiterate our conviction that the best way to address the differences we have with Cuba in these matters is through a process of dialogue based on clear and consistent messages. It is certainly difficult and trying, but it is the best manner to sustain results in the long term and to contribute to Cuba's and its population's path to reform and modernisation.

Πρόεδρος. – Η συζήτηση έληξε.

Η ψηφοφορία θα διεξαχθεί μετά τη λήξη των συζητήσεων.

4.3. Die Menschenrechtslage in Bangladesch

Πρόεδρος. – Το επόμενο σημείο στην ημερήσια διάταξη είναι η συζήτηση επί επτά προτάσεων ψηφίσματος σχετικά με την κατάσταση των ανθρωπίνων δικαιωμάτων στο Μπανγκλαντές (2018/2927(RSP)).

Charles Tannock, *author*. – Mr President, Bangladesh has, for many years, struggled with the problem of terrorist threats. Given the similar problems we see in our own countries, we are only too aware that preventing threats from turning into attacks is a difficult and costly business, so we do so with the benefit of more resources in the European Union, better intelligence and fewer potential threats. Despite the progress Bangladesh has made in recent years, it remains one of the poorest countries in the world, with a population of over 150 million people. As such, we must therefore remain cautious when criticising its efforts to tackle clear and present threats.

Nevertheless, this cannot be routinely offered as a blanket universal explanation, and in cases such as the jailing of the photographer Shahidul Alam we cannot deny that the provisions of the Information and Communication Technology Act (ICT Act) are, at times, being used inappropriately by the government.

I welcome therefore today's resolution and, as a close friend of Bangladesh, call for the authorities there to avoid bringing its counterterrorism measures into disrepute. Finally, as we approach the elections next month, I call on all parties to participate peacefully and hope that we will not see a repeat of the violence that we saw five years ago.

Ignazio Corrao, *autore*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signor Commissario, il Bangladesh aveva intrapreso un percorso virtuoso, migliorativo, soltanto che l'avvicinarsi delle elezioni probabilmente ha fatto precipitare di nuovo la situazione, quindi con una lotta a qualsiasi forma di dissenso, una riduzione delle libertà fondamentali, una lotta alla libertà di informazione e quindi un atteggiamento da parte del governo da parte nostra inaccettabile.

La cosa che poi stupisce, di cui secondo me dobbiamo parlare, è che il Bangladesh è anche diventato membro dello *Human Rights Council*. Vista la presenza al suo interno di Arabia Saudita e Filippine, dovremmo chiederci se questo Consiglio dei diritti umani non è il Consiglio dei violatori dei diritti umani, forse una riflessione andrebbe fatta. Ricordiamoci che il Bangladesh beneficia del regime preferenziale nel programma «Everything but arms» in cui è previsto il rispetto dei diritti fondamentali, quindi facciamo in modo di utilizzare la nostra pressione per farli rispettare.

Soraya Post, *author*. – Mr President, we in the EU must remind Bangladesh of its international human rights obligations. There is a visible increase in attacks on, and arrests of, journalists, students, human rights defenders and members of the political opposition. This crackdown on civil society must stop. Bangladesh must safeguard media freedom and freedom of expression and release all activists, journalists and students. The rates of early marriage are still alarmingly high in Bangladesh. It has one of the highest rates of child marriage in the world. Bangladesh has to ensure that the minimum age of marriage for women is 18, without exceptions. I also urge the Government of Bangladesh not to return thousands of Rohingyas living in the refugee camps in Cox's Bazar to Myanmar against their will and in spite of objections by the UN.

Jean Lambert, *author*. – Mr President, I speak as the Chair of Parliament's Delegation for relations with the countries of South Asia, which covers Bangladesh. As we know, it's a relatively young country still facing many difficulties and is looking forward to its full graduation from 'least-developed country' status. Part of that graduation is due to the ready-made garment sector, and government and manufacturers know that change is needed. So we're concerned that the government has decided not to take full advantage of all that the accord offers in terms of assisting that change and building on progress to safe and inclusive working environments.

We also recognise, as my colleague has said, the government's zero-tolerance policy towards terrorism. But that approach has to be built on human rights, and we're concerned about continuing unexplained disappearances, extra-judicial killings and the direction of legislation at the moment. Lastly, I too would echo the call for an open and inclusive, peaceful election – in which all parties participate – to give the people of Bangladesh a full and meaningful choice.

Miguel Urbán Crespo, *autor*. – Señor presidente, desapariciones, ejecuciones, torturas, detenciones arbitrarias, represión sindical y de prensa. Esto pasa hoy en Bangladés, uno de los principales socios comerciales de la Unión Europea. Un país que ha acordado con Myanmar/Birmania el inicio del retorno forzado de las y los rohinyás y que ha mandado al ejército a los campos de refugiados para intimidar aún más a esa población. Un país que no quiere renovar el Acuerdo sobre Prevención de Incendios y Seguridad que firmó tras el incendio y el crimen del Rana Plaza. ¡Qué rápido olvidamos las tragedias!

Rechazamos el acuerdo de repatriación forzada y exigimos que Bangladés acepte la extensión del Acuerdo sobre Prevención de Incendios y Seguridad. Una vez más, llamamos a que la Comisión inicie una investigación sobre el incumplimiento de los convenios internacionales y que proponga una legislación vinculante sobre obligaciones de diligencia debida para las cadenas de suministro del sector de la confección. No podemos seguir mirando hacia otro lado. Tenemos que tener exigencias claras.

Marietje Schaake, *author*. – Mr President, Shahidul Alam is well-known photographer and a human rights defender, and under the controversial Digital Securities Act and ICT Act for online speech, he is now accused of 'speech that hurts the image of the nation in Bangladesh', while we consider it to fall under his right to freedom of expression. We call for his release and for the dropping of all charges against him.

Sadly, Alam is not the only one repressed in Bangladesh. There is a pattern of harassment, arrests and enforced disappearances, and we call on the High Representative to assess whether Bangladesh still complies with the trade arrangements we have under the 'anything but arms' agreement, because conditionality and accountability are very important when it comes to human rights and we must do what we can to improve the situation.

Tomáš Zdechovský, *Autor*. – Pane předsedající, pane komisaři, Evropská unie dlouhodobě patří mezi jedny z největších a nejstabilnějších partnerů a podporovatelů mladého státu, jako je Bangladéš.

Myslím si, že právě ta otevřenost dialogu by měla být daleko větší, a to především v oblasti lidských práv. Evropská unie nesmí zavírat oči před tím, co se děje v Bangladéši. Už proto, že v rámci skupiny pro dobré vládnutí a lidská práva máme mandát dohlížet na to, co se v zemi děje. I přesto dochází v této zemi ke zneužití státní moci. Vláda nechává zmizet novináře a aktivisty, kteří proti ní vystupují. Myslím si, že je to absolutně nepřípustné a je nutné se proti tomu opakovaně ozvat. Novináři, aktivisté, právníci, obhájci lidských práv, ti všichni jsou v současné době oběťmi režimu.

Rezoluce se týká dvou konkrétních případů novináře a právníka, kteří bojovali za lidská práva. Oba tito lidé zmizeli ze světa a nikdo neví, kde se tito aktivisté v současné době nachází. Existuje důvodné podezření, že vláda zatčené mučí či dochází k mimosoudní likvidaci těchto osob. Musíme bezodkladně vyzvat vládu k vyjádření k těmto případům a vést aktivní dialog o dodržování mezinárodních závazků. Zejména práva na spravedlivý proces, práva na obhajobu, práva na přístup k soudu, který musí být dodržován. Aktivisté a bojovníci za lidská práva jsou velmi důležitou součástí jakékoliv demokracie a je nezbytné, aby měli v tomto systému své místo.

Krzysztof Hetman, *w imieniu grupy PPE*. – Panie Przewodniczący! Nie ulega wątpliwości, że wymuszone zaginięcia, czyli zwykłe porwania dokonywane przez aparat władzy są jedną ze strategii siania terroru oraz wymuszania uległości w społeczeństwach. Dzięki wywoływaniu poczucia niepewności i zastraszaniu władze mogą w łatwiejszy sposób kontrolować społeczeństwa oraz wymuszać uległość. Niestety, pomimo deklaracji Bangladeszu o wzmocnieniu współpracy z Unią Europejską w zakresie ochrony praw człowieka praktyka ta jest w dalszym ciągu stosowana w tym kraju, co potwierdza chociażby zaginięcie Szahidula Alama.

Stosowania wymuszonych zaginięć nie usprawiedliwiają żadne wyjątkowe okoliczności, ale w sprawie Alama jeszcze bardziej bulwersujący jest powód, dla którego do niego doszło. Warto przypomnieć, że ten obrońca praw człowieka skrytykował rząd i stanął w obronie osób domagających się zwiększenia bezpieczeństwa na drogach. Nie ma naszej zgody na takie działania i nie powinno być zgody Unii Europejskiej na zastraszanie i torturowanie politycznych oponentów.

Agnes Jongerius, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Mr President, the collapse of the Rana Plaza factory was a wake-up call for the whole world to improve the working conditions in the ready-made garments industry. Unfortunately, at the end of the month, due to a highly questionable verdict, the Bangladesh Accord will be thrown out of the country. This means that the safety of thousands of workers in the garment industry in Bangladesh is at stake.

As we all know, the Government of Bangladesh is not yet capable of taking over the inspections of the garment factories, and, as we all know, the labour law reform in the country is still pending. As we also all know, freedom of association is not guaranteed in Bangladesh. Therefore, let us be clear to the Bangladeshi authorities that they need to get serious about workers' rights and safety. If you want to use the EU trade preferences, you have to fulfil the commitments we agreed upon.

Sajjad Karim, *on behalf of the ECR Group*. – Mr President, I speak as Chair of the South Asia Trade Monitoring Committee. We have constantly been appealing to the Government of Bangladesh to make progress on its commitments under the Everything but Arms scheme, to democracy, human rights and the rule of law. Whilst we can see that there has been an improvement, more needs to be done. The accord is at a critical juncture, and commitments from the Government of Bangladesh towards the Sustainability Compact are highly insufficient, as demonstrated by the technical status report recently published.

The roadmap is here, requirements are on the table, and now we need to see tangible results and steps in the right direction. It must be clear that we are at a crucial stage, and we are moving ever so slowly from issuing further notifications for action to actual action. It has been initiated in terms of investigative reviews for withdrawal of Generalised Scheme of Preferences (GSP) mechanism for Myanmar and Cambodia. Bangladesh could be next on the list.

Petras Auštrevičius, *on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – Mr President, freedom of expression in Bangladesh is under attack. This is no surprise, as this year Bangladesh is ranked 146 out of 180 on the World Press Freedom Index. We see visible signs that the authorities have increased their crackdown on civil society and government critics, with such means as detentions, enforced disappearances and the use of violence. In addition, on 5 August, writer, former journalist and activist Shahidul Alam was imprisoned after speaking out against state violence on the student protest in Dhaka. This must stop. I call the government to repeal its Digital Security Act used to crack down on dissidents and human rights defenders and immediately release Shahidul Alam. I call on the Commission to assess if the tariff preferences that Dhaka enjoys for the time being under the Everything but Arms agreement should not be put under question. The EU cannot be just a watcher in this regard.

Marie-Christine Vergiat, *au nom du groupe GUE/NGL*. – Monsieur le Président, nous allons envoyer un message d'alerte au Bangladesh, à la veille des élections de décembre. Les voyants sont au rouge. Les violences, les arrestations, les détentions arbitraires et exécutions extrajudiciaires se multiplient. La guerre contre le terrorisme et la guerre contre la drogue ont bon dos. Le photographe Shahidul Alam, le blogueur Limon Fakir ou, pire, Shahzahan Bachchu, assassiné en juin dernier, n'en sont malheureusement que quelques exemples.

Sur le plan social, ce n'est guère mieux. Après l'horreur du Rana Plaza, peu de choses ont changé malgré les engagements. Les ouvrières du textile restent parmi les plus mal payées du monde, les conditions de sécurité restent catastrophiques et un nouveau drame est possible à tout moment. La Fast Fashion continue de faire la loi et les multinationales européennes en sont toujours les grandes bénéficiaires.

Enfin, en deux mots, j'associe notre voix à celle de ceux qui demandent aux Bangladais de ne pas mettre en œuvre l'accord sur les Rohingyas. Ce serait les envoyer à la mort, ce n'est donc pas possible.

Fabio Massimo Castaldo, *a nome del gruppo EFDD*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, il 30 dicembre si terranno in Bangladesh le elezioni generali. Quando queste scadenze si avvicinano, emerge la vera natura di chi al potere potrebbe perdere il suo ruolo in caso di sconfitta.

Il Bangladesh è un paese che, pur con tutta una serie di problemi, incassava lo scorso maggio i complimenti dell'ONU che, nell'*Universal Periodic Review*, valutava i progressi di Dacca come notevoli. La situazione è cambiata molto e molto velocemente. Assistiamo a una violenta repressione della libertà di espressione dei media e delle opposizioni, nonché ad arresti, sparizioni forzate, uso della tortura. È un caso emblematico quello del fotogiornalista Shahidul Alam.

Colleghi, l'UE ha con il Bangladesh l'«*Everything but arms*», un'esenzione tariffaria che concediamo su tutti i beni, armi escluse, a paesi in via di sviluppo. Ebbene, questo meccanismo delle clausole di sospensione legate al rispetto dei diritti umani, ma se non abbiamo il coraggio di menzionare quelle clausole, di attivarle quando è il caso, sembreremo sempre un gigante dai piedi d'argilla, un grande mercato del *business as usual* e nulla di più. È questa l'immagine che vogliamo dare dell'Europa nel mondo?

Josef Weidenholzer (S&D). – Mr President, the situation in Bangladesh is very worrying. The country is facing growing repression against civil society, political activists and human rights defenders. There are reports of extrajudicial executions, mass arbitrary arrests and enforced disappearances. Press freedom is under attack and bloggers are increasingly intimidated. General elections are due by the end of this year, but freedom of expression, which is a prerequisite for fair elections, does not exist. The Opposition is fundamentally constrained and its leader, Khaleda Zia, has been barred from contesting these elections and sentenced on politically motivated charges.

The forthcoming elections set the country at a crossroads. This is a last chance: either return to democracy and the rule of law, or slip into lawlessness and chaos. Europe will be faced with the consequences if this happens. I appeal to the authorities to establish conditions where people can freely speak out and can prepare for fair elections.

Πρόεδρος. – Ολοκληρώθηκε ο κατάλογος των εγγεγραμμένων ομιλητών. Προχωρούμε στη διαδικασία του catch-the-eye. Έχω δεχθεί επτά αιτήματα. Κανονικά, υπό την προϋπόθεση ότι οι ψηφοφορίες αρχίζουν στις 12.00, θα έπρεπε να δεχθώ μόνον τα δύο από αυτά, όσων δεν έχουν μιλήσει με τη διαδικασία του catch-the-eye. Με ενημερώνουν όμως οι συνεργάτες μου από τις υπηρεσίες ότι ακόμη δεν έχει ολοκληρωθεί η Διάσκεψη των Προέδρων. Κατόπιν αυτού, προχωρώ με τη διαδικασία για έναν από κάθε πολιτική ομάδα, έτσι ώστε να μην αδικηθεί κανένας συνάδελφος.

Διαδικασία catch-the-eye

Bogdan Andrzej Zdrojewski (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Przy tej okazji chciałem zwrócić uwagę na jeden, bardzo ważny element: na inflację podobnych rezolucji. Proszę zauważyć, że w sprawie Bangladeszu mieliśmy rezolucje z listopada 2015 r., z kwietnia 2017 r., z czerwca 2017 r., oświadczenie z września 2018 r. i sprawozdanie także z tego roku. Z powodów oczywistych zagłosuję za tą rezolucją, natomiast zwracam uwagę na to, że liczba tych rezolucji nie przekłada się na faktyczną zdolność Parlamentu Europejskiego czy naszych instytucji do wywierania określonego nacisku na władze Bangladeszu, aby rzeczywistość w tym kraju zmieniała się zgodnie z wartościami, które są nam najbliższe.

Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D). – Señor presidente, la primera vez que oí hablar de Bangladés, yo era un niño. El legendario concierto para Bangladés de George Harrison nos dio noticias a quienes no sabíamos nada de un país donde había derramamiento de sangre, guerras, catástrofes naturales e inundaciones. Y más de cuarenta años después, la situación no es mucho mejor.

Oímos hablar de Bangladés en relación con desapariciones forzadas, torturas, abusos policiales, discriminación contra el colectivo LGTBI, explotación de mano de obra infantil y matrimonios infantiles; y por la tragedia del Rana Plaza en 2013, que motivó un acuerdo transversal de seguridad en los edificios, que debe ser cumplido en todos sus términos. Por haberlo defendido está detenido Shahidul Alam.

Y es imprescindible que la Unión Europea, que es el primer socio comercial de Bangladés, emplee toda la fuerza diplomática no solamente para conseguir la liberación, sino el restablecimiento del acuerdo en todos sus términos, y que la Unión Europea garantice que su diplomacia y su cooperación al desarrollo son influyentes para la protección de los derechos fundamentales de los más vulnerables, en un país que continúa dando malas noticias por sus catástrofes y sus desastres.

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, το Μπανγκλαντές είναι ο παράδεισος των πολυεθνικών: υπερεκμετάλλευση των εργαζομένων, υπερκέρδη, μισθοί πείνας, καμία ρύθμιση και καμία προστασία των εργαζομένων. Είχαμε την περίπτωση του Rana Plaza, με 1127 νεκρούς και 2500 τραυματίες –όλοι εργαζόμενοι–, διότι δεν τηρούνται οι προδιαγραφές υγείας και προστασίας της ασφάλειας των εργαζομένων. Και, φυσικά, περνούμε πλέον σε ένα αυταρχικό καθεστώς. Δεν υπάρχει ελευθερία έκφρασης, διώκονται οι ακτιβιστές, δεν έχουν δίκαιη δίκη, και έχει αρχίσει πλέον να επιβάλλεται και η θανατική ποινή, η οποία πρέπει να καταργηθεί. Ταυτόχρονα, έχει ξεκινήσει πλέον επίθεση και στους ίδιους τους Rohingya. Απαιτείται να υπάρξουν εργασιακά δικαιώματα, το δικαίωμα του συνεταιρίζεσθαι και, φυσικά, να σταματήσει η προνομιακή εμπορική μεταχείριση της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης προς το Μπανγκλαντές, για να μπορέσουμε έτσι να επιβάλουμε συμμόρφωση των αρχών.

Kateřina Konečná (GUE/NGL). – Pane předsedající, považuji za důležité, že se zde každý štrasburský týden ve čtvrtek sejdeme a pohoříme zde o stavu lidských práv v jiných zemích. Jsem přesvědčena, že je nutné se ptát bangladéšské vlády na to, proč nezlepšuje podmínky zaměstnanců ve vlastní zemi, je nutné vědět, proč vláda dlouhodobě zastrašuje a zatýká odborové předáky a neudělala zásadní reformy, které by umožnily bangladéšským zaměstnancům bojovat za svá práva.

Zároveň je však nutné podívat se k nám domů, do našich obchodů s oblečením. Pokud tak učiníme, musíme se ptát na to, proč tolik evropských firem stále neřeší, že jejich dodavatelé z Bangladéše ignorují nejzákladnější sociální, environmentální a lidská práva. Odpověď je jasná: Proč si nenamastit kapsu na levné práci? Staré pravidlo kapitalismu totiž říká: „Levně nakoupit a draze prodat." a v této rovnici není pro lidská práva a lidskou důstojnost místo.

Julie Ward (S&D). – Mr President, the arrest, detention and alleged torture of the award-winning photographer Shahidul Alam shines a light on the poor human rights situation in Bangladesh. Alam is the founder of many important cultural, media and training initiatives in South Asia. He's also a visiting professor at Sunderland University in the UK. His arrest, 100 days ago, for criticising the government's response to the Bangladesh road-safety protests, points to the worrying global trend of many governments to silence artists and journalists.

So I call for the immediate and unconditional release of Shahidul Alam and for all charges against him to be dropped. I also call for the Bangladeshi authorities to provide him with the urgent medical assistance he needs. These attacks on freedom of expression and assembly in Bangladesh, as well as women's, girls and LGBTIQ+ rights give wider cause for concern. The High Representative should take all necessary diplomatic steps to put pressure on the Bangladeshi government to improve its human rights record, starting with the release of Shahidul Alam.

Wajid Khan (S&D). – Mr President, Bangladesh is approaching general elections under the worst circumstances. The government has embarked on a campaign of intrusive surveillance upon its own citizens. It is monitoring social media and curtailing freedom of expression in the name of national security. The Digital Security Act has gagged the media and all those who criticise the government and the harassment and intimidation of journalists and activists grows on a daily basis.

Peaceful political dissent should not be silenced or criminalised. We urge the government to revise the Digital Security Act, halt the crackdown on freedom of expression and conduct investigations into the cases of enforced disappearances. We want Bangladesh to progress towards a functioning democracy, not drift into an authoritarian police state.

(Λήξη της διαδικασίας catch-the-eye)

Christos Stylianides, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, the European Union has a substantial and long-lasting relationship with Bangladesh. Our political dialogue has intensified over the past months in the context of the refugee crisis.

We appreciate the Government's and people of Bangladesh's efforts to host the Rohingya refugees. The return of the refugees to their place of origin remains the objective, but it must be voluntary, safe, sustainable and dignified. It should not go against those fundamental requirements. It is important that the return of refugees is conducted in line with international law and with the involvement of UNHCR. It is critical that the conditions in Rakhine State are conducive for a safe and sustainable return.

Human rights are a key priority of our dialogue with Bangladesh. The EU regularly expresses its concerns on the situation of human rights, and we see it as a positive development that the Government of Bangladesh is engaging with the EU on this issue.

In joint press statements adopted at the Sub-group on Good Governance and Human Rights in April, and at the Diplomatic Consultations held in Dhaka in July, the authorities undertook to address the shortages and enforce policies respectful of human rights, fundamental freedoms and democracy. However, the situation is of serious concern and more needs to be done: human rights and fundamental freedoms are being increasingly challenged as parliamentary elections are coming close.

While continuing its dialogue with the Government of Bangladesh, together with EU Member States and other like-minded partners on the ground, the EU has addressed this in a number of recent public statements. This was particularly necessary in the context of the reaction to the recent Digital Security Act and violence against students and press during the summer. We are notably very concerned over the situation of Mr Shahidul Alam.

The preparation of the parliamentary elections is discussed regularly with the Bangladeshi authorities. The EU expects that the upcoming elections will be held in a transparent, inclusive and impartial way. The rule of law, freedom of expression and freedom of peaceful assembly should be upheld and protected. The Government needs to ensure a safe and enabling environment for civil society, journalists and human rights defenders. As regards labour rights, the Government needs to fully implement the International Labour Organization's recommendations, notably on freedom of association.

Human rights are a crucial part of the EU's development cooperation with Bangladesh, with more than EUR 40 million committed for democratic governance. The EU focuses on ensuring democratic ownership through engagement with civil society, promoting democratic empowerment and local governance, notably by addressing access to justice.

(Applause)

Πρόεδρος. – Η συζήτηση έληξε.

Η ψηφοφορία θα διεξαχθεί μετά τη λήξη των συζητήσεων.

VORSITZ: RAINER WIELAND

Vizepräsident

5. Abstimmungsstunde

Der Präsident. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Abstimmung.

(Abstimmungsergebnisse und sonstige Einzelheiten der Abstimmung: siehe Protokoll.)

5.1. Vietnam, insbesondere die Lage politischer Gefangener (B8-0529/2018, B8-0530/2018, B8-0531/2018, B8-0540/2018, RC-B8-0526/2018, B8-0526/2018, B8-0527/2018) (Abstimmung)

5.2. Die Menschenrechtslage in Kuba (RC-B8-0528/2018, B8-0528/2018, B8-0532/2018, B8-0534/2018, B8-0537/2018, B8-0541/2018, B8-0543/2018) (Abstimmung)

5.3. Die Menschenrechtslage in Bangladesch (RC-B8-0533/2018, B8-0533/2018, B8-0535/2018, B8-0536/2018, B8-0538/2018, B8-0539/2018, B8-0542/2018, B8-0544/2018) (Abstimmung)

5.4. Transparente und verlässliche Arbeitsbedingungen in der Europäischen Union (A8-0355/2018 - Enrique Calvet Chambon) (Abstimmung)

— *Vor der Abstimmung:*

Enrique Calvet Chambon, *ponente*. – Señor presidente, señorías, ¿por qué un texto que fue aprobado en la comisión especializada por 30 votos a favor y solo 7 en contra, con un mandato de 32 votos a favor y 15 en contra —menos de la mitad-se convierte en objeto de todas las batallas para revocar el mandato contra toda lógica y tradición parlamentaria? Hay una explicación: evidentemente, no es la de mejorar el texto, cosa que se hará y en gran medida en las negociaciones tripartitas, abundantes y ya planificadas.

Lo que sucede es que hay unas poderosas fuerzas, poderosos *lobbies*, totalmente legítimos, por supuesto, que prefieren, con mucho, que no haya ninguna directiva sobre este tema en esta legislatura. Saben que una manera de conseguir una «no directiva» es dilatar los procesos, puesto que, con una pequeña dilación, se convierte en prácticamente imposible acabar nuestro trabajo en este mandato.

Esto es lo que está en juego, tener o no tener directiva. Detrás están en juego distintas visiones de Europa, evidentemente. La que cree en una Europa de los ciudadanos no puede permitir que antes de una campaña electoral nos presentemos con las manos vacías frente a los ciudadanos que nos exigen protección y atención. No concebimos salir a la calle a decir que Europa no ha podido tomar en cuenta al ciudadano frente a los cambios acelerados del mercado y las tecnologías.

Si hoy no votamos a favor del mandato, no podremos iniciar negociaciones tripartitas el 21 de noviembre. Y si no empezamos el 21 de noviembre, habrá que ir pensando en dejarlo para otra legislatura, y les dejo imaginar lo que acontecerá. Por eso, a los que creen que seguramente podemos mejorar el texto en las negociaciones tripartitas, pero que es fundamental conseguir ahora una directiva aceptable por el bien de los ciudadanos, para los que creen en una Europa de los ciudadanos, les ruego que voten más y confirmen mi mandato, para hacer posible una buena directiva, pero, sobre todo, para que la directiva exista.

Señores, con todo el respeto, voten en su alma y conciencia, pero sin dejar de pensar en la ciudadanía europea.

5.5. Rechte und Pflichten der Fahrgäste im Eisenbahnverkehr (A8-0340/2018 - Bogusław Liberadzki) (Abstimmung)

5.6. Persistente organische Schadstoffe (A8-0336/2018 - Julie Girling) (Abstimmung)

— *Nach der Schlussabstimmung:*

Julie Girling, *Rapporteur*. – Mr President, in the interests of speed, under Rules 59(a) and 69(f), I request plenary to refer the matter back to committee for interinstitutional negotiations.

(Der Antrag auf Rücküberweisung in den Ausschuss wird angenommen.)

5.7. Betreuungsangebote in der EU zur Verbesserung der Gleichstellung der Geschlechter (A8-0352/2018 - Sirpa Pietikäinen) (Abstimmung)

5.8. Borreliose (Lyme-Krankheit) (B8-0514/2018) (Abstimmung)

Seán Kelly (PPE). – Mr President, thank you very much. I should have raised this at the beginning, but I did not want to delay Members. Yesterday, on the final vote on humanitarian visas, there was controversy: it fell 26 votes short of the overall majority required, and at that stage 81 Members had left or did not vote. I think the controversy could be avoided in future if, when there are votes that require a majority of the constituent members, it should be put higher up the list. You can see every day that there are far more voting in the middle or thereabouts. At the end, for one reason or another, Members will have to leave to catch planes or have other meetings. So this controversy could be avoided with a bit of common sense by the Conference of Presidents if they put votes that required a majority of our constituent members higher up the list when you would have all those who were eligible to vote here. It was reasonable to suggest

that, when it was only 26 votes short and 349 voted in favour, if it was higher up the list then it would have got the required majority. I just want to make that point as a suggestion for the Conference of Presidents.

Der Präsident. – Herr Kollege Kelly! Ich will mal darauf hinweisen, dass hier alle Berichte gleich wichtig sind. Möglicherweise hat der eine etwas höhere politische Bedeutung, aber grundsätzlich sind alle Berichte gleich wichtig, weil sie die Arbeit der Kollegen hier im Hause auch widerspiegeln.

Es gibt eine klare Geschäftsordnungsregelung, in welcher Reihenfolge über Dossiers abgestimmt wird, und da geht z. B. Gesetzgebung vor anderen Dossiers. Von dieser Geschäftsordnung kann nur in Ausnahmefällen abgewichen werden.

Ich persönlich bedaure es sehr, dass nunmehr bereits am Mittwoch Kollegen früher gehen. Andererseits können wir auch keine Gewissenserforschung betreiben. Es gibt auch Kollegen, die sich bewusst an Abstimmungen nicht beteiligen – die sich nicht bloß enthalten wollen, sondern die sich nicht an Enthaltungen beteiligen wollen.

Das Problem mit dieser gestrigen Abstimmung ist gesehen. Ich kann Sie unterrichten, dass die Konferenz der Präsidenten beschlossen hat, den LIBE-Ausschuss zu ermächtigen, erneut in dieses Verfahren einzusteigen. Die Abstimmung von gestern können wir nicht wiederholen. Da gibt es auch klare Regeln. Aber der Ausschuss kann das Verfahren noch mal neu aufrollen und dann gucken, wie zügig der Ausschuss mit einem Dossier wieder hier im Plenum landet.

Dobromir Sośnierz (NI). – Panie Przewodniczący! Ja chciałem powiedzieć, że takie głosy jak pana Kelly'ego uważam za kompletnie niepoważne. Brak szacunku posłów do wykonywanej pracy naprawdę nie może być usprawiedliwieniem do powtarzania głosowań. Wynagrodzenia posłów są wystarczająco wysokie, żeby mogli zaczekać tutaj pół godziny, aż głosowania się skończą. Więc takie gadanie o tym, żeby przesunąć głosowania, które dla pana Kelly'ego są ważniejsze, na taką godzinę, żeby panu Kelly'emu chciało się tutaj zostać, jest naprawdę nie do uwierzenia. Ludzie tego słuchają na galerii dla publiczności. Przestańmy wygadywać takie rzeczy, bo to wstyd.

Der Präsident. – Vielen Dank, Herr Sośnierz! Ich glaube, das braucht man nicht weiter zu kommentieren. Ich will nur sagen – das ist vielleicht nicht üblich: Die Kritik an Herrn Kelly richtet sich an den Falschen. Er ist in der Regel von Anfang bis Ende bei allen parlamentarischen Arbeiten anwesend.

Damit ist die Abstimmungsstunde geschlossen.

6. Stimmerklärungen

6.1. Rechte und Pflichten der Fahrgäste im Eisenbahnverkehr (A8-0340/2018 - Bogusław Liberadzki)

Mündliche Erklärungen zur Abstimmung

Alex Mayer (S&D). – Mr President, this report says that the railway sector has to provide excellent and modern services to customers at an affordable price, and I agree. It has been a torrid time on the railways for my constituents this year as train companies have profited from consumer misery. This summer, GTR, who run Thameslink and Great Northern, cancelled 8 000 services in the first three weeks of the new timetable being introduced, yet these problems were foreseeable. Each train needs a driver who has been trained on the model of the train and the route on which they are operating, but this does not happen quickly enough, and when the problems came to light, the rollout wasn't paused. I blame the fragmented nature of the industry. The Government has set up a review of our railways and I hope that it can learn from our European friends as Brits spend five times more of our income than our European counterparts on rail travel. I call on the Government to include in its review the putting back of our railways into public ownership after 25 years of failed privatisation. That will mean that we run our profits in the interests of passengers, not for private profit.

Rory Palmer (S&D). – Mr President, I am very pleased at the progress we have made on this report today. I spoke in the debate on this yesterday, but I want to raise a slightly different issue which is covered in this report, and that is ensuring our railways are accessible for disabled people, and particularly wheelchair users. Because time after time on our railways in the UK but indeed in other parts of Europe as well, I see a system that isn't working.

You see people who use wheelchairs having to wait for assistance with ramps and assistance at stations they booked and that assistance not turning up. That is a system which isn't working. People have to sit on trains waiting for that assistance. We have to make sure our railways are accessible to all, and today's vote in this House taking this report forward is an important step in doing that.

Monika Smolková (S&D). – Pán predsedajúci, podporila som správu, pretože verím, že po prijatí navrhovaných opatrení sa cestovanie železničnou dopravou stane pre spotrebiteľov príťažlivejšie a preferovanejšie. Som potešená, že správa EP a Rady o právach a povinnostiach cestujúcich v železničnej preprave okrem iného stanovuje aj právny rámec s cieľom prispôsobiť železničnú infraštruktúru osobám so zníženou pohyblivosťou, a tak im umožniť úplnú nezávislosť na železničných staniciach a vlakoch. Súhlasím so spravodajcom, že zlepšenie a modernizácia železničného odvetvia by mali byť aj naďalej trvalým cieľom pre toto odvetvie vrátane ochrany spotrebiteľa. Za skutočne dôležité považujem prilákať do železničnej dopravy nových cestujúcich a odbremeniť cestnú dopravu. V mojej krajine na Slovensku vláda zaviedla bezplatné cestovanie železnicou pre študentov a dôchodcov a týmto opatrením sa výrazne zvýšil počet cestujúcich v železničnej doprave. Toto opatrenie by mohlo byť vzorom aj pre iné členské štáty, čím by sme efektívnejšie využívali sieť železníc, výrazne by sme znížili aj CO_2 a prispeli k lepšej kvalite života.

Anna Záborská (PPE). – Pán predsedajúci, meškania vlakov sa v poslednom čase stali bežným javom nielen na Slovensku, ale vo viacerých štátoch Európskej únie. Posilnenie práv cestujúcich je preto u nás možno ešte aktuálnejšie než inde. Podporujem vyššiu informovanosť o právach cestujúcich, zlepšenie pomoci ľuďom s obmedzenou pohyblivosťou a najmä zvýšenie odškodnenia pre tých cestujúcich, ktorých vlak mešká. Kvalita železničnej dopravy sa meria spokojnosťou cestujúcich. Vždy môže prísť k zlyhaniam, ale dôvera ľudí k železničnej doprave závisí aj od toho, ako sa dopravca vyrovná so vzniknutými nedostatkami. Som rada, že novou legislatívou mu v tom môžeme pomôcť, a preto som návrh podporila.

Seán Kelly (PPE). – Mr President, I welcome this report also, after some compromises. Rail travel is such an important part of our shared European identity, and it is imperative that this is done properly, seeing that hundreds and thousands of Europeans travel by rail every day. Citizens deserve to know their rights when they travel, and deserve to have all information available to them before, during and after travel.

Cancellations and delays have become almost expected across many rail providers. This should not happen, but if it must occur for some unavoidable reason then passengers should be compensated properly, and I am delighted to see it being discussed and voted upon today.

Although a small country, Ireland's citizens make use of our rail system and Iarnród Éireann provide an excellent service, but these regulation updates are still extremely welcome and can only serve to benefit customers and providers in the long run. So I am very pleased to support it.

Daniel Hannan (ECR). – Mr President, you won't find a single Member of this Chamber who opposes any of the aims set out in this report: making it easier for people to take bicycles on trains, having greater information or rights to compensation if you have been mistreated, greater access for disabled people. Not a single Member in any of these groups will think that those are bad ideas, and do you know what? Neither will the operators of the rail networks. It is a bad business model not to try and accommodate your customers.

The problem is that we've moved from thinking that these are desiderata into thinking that they require legislation. It is a kind of legislative virtue-signalling. Our primary purpose is not to remedy and identify a problem, but to let the world know what very nice people we are. The result is that there will be additional bureaucracy, additional paperwork, additional distraction of resources by the people who know more about it than we do in this Chamber, which means in the end that they are not able to concentrate on delivering the best possible customer service. I wish we would have the modesty to accept that we are not always the experts.

6.2. Betreuungsangebote in der EU zur Verbesserung der Gleichstellung der Geschlechter (A8-0352/2018 - Sirpa Pietikäinen)

Mündliche Erklärungen zur Abstimmung

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – Pane předsedající, pečovatelské služby jsou přirozeně doménou žen, a proto také zpráva, kterou jsme přijali na úrovni Evropského parlamentu, byla nazírána zejména z pohledu žen, které pracují v pečovatelských službách. Bohužel během hlasování se nepodařilo prosadit důležité pozměňovací návrhy a vypustit některá ustanovení, která jsou v této zprávě opravdu zavádějící a narušují subsidiaritu pravomocí členských zemí. Například považuji za naprosto nevhodné, aby na evropské úrovni byla prováděna regulace a kontrola kvality pečovatelských služeb, aby byl na evropské úrovni stanoven právní rámec pečovatelské profese. Je mi tedy líto, že jsem nemohla tuto zprávu podpořit a zdržela jsem se.

Jasenko Selimovic (ALDE). – Mr President, the employment rate for women is 12% lower than for men. One in four people in the EU lives at risk of poverty and over half of them are women. The main reason is the difficulties that arise when families have children or when they have to care for elderly or disabled persons. Those difficulties are due to the shocking lack of public care infrastructure and the persistent gender-based division of labour. It's high time that the Member States address this situation. It is actually 2018, even though not everybody has realised it.

I urge Member States to develop paternity leave, to step up efforts to provide good care for children, the elderly and disabled people, and to ensure equal opportunities for women and men regarding participation in the labour market. That's why I voted for this report.

Dobromir Sośnierz (NI). – Panie Przewodniczący! Po raz kolejny zostało udowodnione na tej sali, że karta do głosowania w rękach socjalisty jest bardziej niebezpieczna niż brzytwa w rękach dziecka. Ludzie, którzy z jednej strony mówią, że potrzebujemy więcej lepszej opieki, więcej usług opiekuńczych, jednocześnie mówią, że należy je sformalizować i opodatkować. A przecież jak coś opodatkujemy, to będziemy mieli tego mniej, a nie więcej. Jeśli do tej pory płaciliśmy opiekunce sto złotych, to teraz będziemy musieli zapłacić drugie sto na dodatkowe opłaty i podatki dla państwa. Więc albo opiekunka dostanie mniej, albo my będzie musieli zarobić więcej, żeby to wszystko spłacić. Z jakiegoś powodu ci sami ludzie, którzy wierzą, że mandaty na drodze za szybką jazdę zniechęcą ludzi do szybkiej jazdy, nie rozumieją tego, że mandaty w postaci podatków za pracę zniechęcą ludzi do pracy. Przecież to tylko nazwą się różni, a działa dokładnie tak samo. Jeśli chcemy mieć mniej pracy, mniej usług, to dawajmy ludziom mandaty i nazywajmy je podatkami i w ten sposób osiągniemy niespotykany dotąd dobrobyt.

Monika Smolková (S&D). – Pán predsedajúci, aj keď sa každoročne venujeme postaveniu žien a dievčat v rodovej rovnosti, výsledky, ktoré v EÚ dosahujeme, sú nedostatočné. V tejto širokospektrálnej činnosti služieb starostlivosti chcem upriamiť pozornosť na nedostatočnosť verejných služieb, ktoré vysokými nákladmi majú negatívny vplyv na deti z rodín s nízkymi príjmami a znevýhodňujú nielen deti od raného veku, ale aj rodičov, hlavne matku, v jej začlenení do aktívneho pracovného života. Preto musíme vyvinúť maximálne úsilie, aby hlavne v národných programoch dominovali opatrenia na primeranú odmenu v týchto službách. Členské štáty musia prehodnotiť túto oblasť, v ktorej sú zaradené predovšetkým ženy, ako voľbu ich kariéry. Na druhej strane vítam úsilie, ktoré by zaviazalo Komisiu vytvoriť právny rámec pre minimálne normy pre pracovníkov v odvetví starostlivosti o odkázaných. Aby sa primerane investovalo do dobrých životných podmienok osôb, ktoré tieto služby poskytujú, do dobrého vzdelávania týchto ľudí, aby sa neustále vytvárali dobré životné podmienky pre opatrované osoby. Všetka táto činnosť leží na pleciach žien a to je tá podstata: dostať odmeňovanie za prácu na takú úroveň, aby sa čím skôr zotreli 16 % rozdiely v odmeňovaní a 40 % rozdiel v dôchodkoch medzi mužmi a ženami.

Anna Záborská (PPE). – Pán predsedajúci, text spravodajkyne Pietikäinen potvrdzuje mnohé veci, na ktoré som dlhodobo upozorňovala. Niektoré z navrhnutých opatrení by si vyžadovali dlhšiu diskusiu, mnohé by však mohli byť cenným zdrojom inšpirácie pre členské štáty. Sem patrí napríklad návrh, aby sa obdobie výkonu neplatenej starostlivosti započítalo tým, ktorí ju vykonávajú, do odpracovaných rokov pri nároku na dôchodok. Úlohou Únie v sociálnej oblasti, pokiaľ ide o starostlivosť, by mala byť podpora členských štátov v tom, aby ich politiky rešpektovali a chránili ľudskú dôstojnosť. Žiaľ, tento dokument opakovane zachádza ďalej a žiada, aby tieto politiky Únia sama prijímala, aj keď na to nemá kompetencie. Aj preto som sa nakoniec pri záverečnom hlasovaní zdržala.

Branislav Škripek (ECR). – Pán predsedajúci, aj ja som sa pri tejto správe zdržal, hoci má viaceré dobré ohľady. Správa dobre poukazuje na to, že je potrebné zaoberať sa rozvojom dostupnosti a kvalitou služieb starostlivosti o občanov. Ale milujúcu starostlivosť rodinných príslušníkov nikdy nenahradia chladné kamenné domovy sociálnych služieb, aj keď sa tam bude naozaj dobre pracovať. Mali by sme preto podporovať rodiny pri tejto starostlivosti a dať im možnosť prijať vonkajšiu pomoc, ktorú mnohokrát aj naozaj potrebujú. Táto profesionálna pomoc musí byť finančne aj prakticky dostupná. Umiestňovanie do ústavov by malo nasledovať až po tom, keď sa domáca starostlivosť nezvládne. Musím však zdôrazniť, že pri ošetrovaní o ľudí majú ženy nezastupiteľnú úlohu. V istých prípadoch vie muž zastať rovnako túto službu. Ja sám som pôsobil ako ošetrovateľ a jeden z mojich troch synov je postihnutý. Ale treba povedať, že je nutné zachovať človeku odkázanému na tieto služby dôstojnosť a zobrať do úvahy pri tom rôzne faktory. Napríklad, nie je možné aby sme v mene rodovej rovnosti žiadali od mužov, napríklad synov, aby prebaľovali svoje choré a starnúce ženy matky, lebo sa budú naozaj zle cítiť.

Daniel Hannan (ECR). – Thank you, Mr President, Friedrich Hayek observed that there is all the difference in the world between treating people equally and attempting to make them equal. The first, he said, is the precondition for a free society; the second leads to servitude.

It is the case that government assistance can free up people's time. If the state decided to offer me someone to wash the dishes and do the housework for me without my having to do it, I would have more time to work. That's true for all of us, it doesn't become more or less true when you have children at home.

There is an argument, and various regimes down the years – some savoury and some not – have made the argument that the state should be philoprogenitive; that we should be encouraging people to have babies through the tax system. Fine, if that's the argument you want to make, let's make it honestly and openly, but let's not pretend that it is an issue of gender equality.

6.3. Borreliose (Lyme-Krankheit) (B8-0514/2018)

Mündliche Erklärungen zur Abstimmung

Lynn Boylan (GUE/NGL). – Mr President, I welcome today's vote on Lyme disease and the calls made for greater ambition to improve diagnostics treatment and prevention of this disease. It will help give a voice to all those who suffer from Lyme and associated tick-borne diseases.

Infected ticks and Lyme disease are spreading geographically, driven by climate change and land-use change. Symptoms can go unnoticed and often doctors are not trained in looking for those symptoms, thereby delaying medical intervention. Current diagnostic tests are also not reliable enough. The antibody-based only test is 30% to 50% accurate and the PCR test is only 62% accurate. This means that the actual number of Lyme cases is much higher than what is believed.

It is crucial to focus our attention on the sharing of best practice, patient-centred research and patient-centric guidelines. Patients must be involved in any new developments. I welcome the inclusion of Lyme disease on the EU list of communicable diseases and epidemiological surveillance to facilitate the monitoring of the EU distribution of the disease.

Rory Palmer (S&D). – Mr President, Public Health England estimate that there were 3 000 cases of Lyme disease last year. There is a quadrupling in the number of cases in recent years in the UK, and that is reflected in other Member States as well.

This is an extremely debilitating, serious disease. We need to see more research, more investment in treatments, a broadening and a deepening of the medical knowledge of this disease, and that is why I support that work taking place at European Union level.

It makes sense to do that, and I hope that going forward, whatever happens in Westminster today or indeed, in the coming weeks and months, that the UK can remain an active, full partner of that work and indeed, wider medical research work at a European level. That is in the interests of patients in the UK and across the European Union as well.

7. Berichtigungen des Stimmverhaltens und beabsichtigtes Stimmverhalten: siehe Protokoll

(Die Sitzung wird um 12.51 Uhr unterbrochen.)

VORSITZ: RAINER WIELAND

Vizepräsident

8. Wiederaufnahme der Sitzung

(Die Sitzung wird um 15.00 Uhr wieder aufgenommen.)

9. Genehmigung des Protokolls der vorangegangenen Sitzung: siehe Protokoll

10. Weiterbehandlung eines Antrags auf Aufhebung der Immunität: siehe Protokoll

11. Rolle des deutschen Jugendamts bei grenzüberschreitenden Familienstreitigkeiten (Aussprache)

Der Präsident. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über die Erklärung der Kommission zu der Rolle des deutschen Jugendamts bei grenzüberschreitenden Familienstreitigkeiten (2018/2856(RSP)).

Věra Jourová, *Member of the Commission.* – Mr President, I would like to thank the European Parliament and the Committee on Petitions and to acknowledge the high importance and sensitivity of the issues raised in the numerous petitions that were received over the last few years on the issue of the Jugendamt.

The issues raised by some petitions and the discussions held in the framework of the Committee on Petitions work have fed into the Commission proposal to revise the process to a regulation. More precisely, the proposal aims at strengthening the rights of the child by ensuring that their views are heard in the legal proceedings concerning them. The mutual recognition of Member States' practices in this respect will avoid refusals at the stage of recognition or enforcement, thus allowing a true circulation of judgments in the Union.

We hope that the Council will reach a political agreement on this file in December. Furthermore, the cross-border nature of the family cases requires a close cooperation between Member States' authorities. The proposal ensures a more effective cooperation between central authorities which in Germany is the Federal Office of Justice. They are the direct interface with parents and should play a key role in supporting the judges in applying the regulation. In addition, we proposed to integrate cooperation with child welfare authorities in the overall cooperation system. On the other hand, I have to recall that the functioning of the National Child Protection Agencies is governed by national law in cases of concern about the proper functioning of such a system redress had to be sought at a national level.

Over the past years, the Commission has used several tools to promote exchanges between Member States to facilitate mutual understanding, with a view to ensuring the protection of the rights of children. It has done so through the annual forum on the rights of the child, the calls for proposals under the rights, equality and citizenship programme, as well as the focus put on the promotion of integrated child protection systems.

Under the Justice programme, one of the funding priorities for 2018 is improving the situation of children involved in civil cases, for example through better procedures, case handling and cooperation in the area of family law in such areas as parental responsibility, international child abduction, the protection of children and maintenance.

Once again, let me highlight the importance that the Commission attaches to these issues and I look forward to your views.

Seán Kelly, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Mr President, within the German Youth Welfare Office, the Jugendamt, it has come to the attention of the European Parliament that there appears to be alleged discrimination against non-German parents in family disputes on parental responsibility and child custody.

One of the main issues that has been highlighted to the Committee on Petitions (PETI) is the alleged impossibility for a non-German spouse to have contact with their child even during supervised visits, notably because of the strictly applied language rules whereby only the German language can be used. If this is the case, it is of course extremely distressing for parents and children. The Jugendamt plays a central, important role in the German family law system as it is one of the prior parties in all family disputes involving children, and so these accusations should be taken seriously.

It is important to mention, though, that fact-finding missions have not found any systemic failures. But, in my opinion, if there are many concerns like this coming from parents, then reassurances should be given and cases should be looked at. Discrimination of any kind is not acceptable and, while I would need further evidence and rulings to determine if this is a case of discrimination, the petitions brought forward at least highlight that there is a perception of such by some in this case, and that perhaps measures could be taken to eliminate any possibility of this. I think these cases should be looked into, but let us reserve judgment until we have more information. Of course, at the end of the day, the child's best interests must be paramount in all decisions related to childcare.

Finally, I just want to say that it's important to point out that PETI also received similar complaints from at least three other Member States. So perhaps a more Union-wide, global approach would be desirable to address these issues rather than perhaps honing in on one particular country.

Andrejs Mamikins, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Mr President, the single market and the absence of borders has given us many chances to seek economic advantages in another country. Many children have, however, become victims of our striving for a better life. We are faced with a new phenomenon today: Euro orphans, that is to say children temporarily abandoned by parents working abroad.

Did you know that the number of Euro orphans in the EU is estimated at between 500 000 and one million? This is a huge number, but the reunification of such families has not been taken for granted, and in some cases becomes a nightmare for parents. During the last ten years, Parliament has received an enormous amount of petitions related to involvement of the Jugendamt in cross-border family disputes.

In the majority of cases, non-German parents denounce systematic discriminations and arbitrary measures, including the prohibition of the use of the parents' mother tongue in contact with children. The national administrative system of non-German parents do not have a say in this process and in addition, the German competent authorities have failed to implement the recent recommendation of our Committee on Petitions.

Clearly, the question of parental responsibility and child custody falls under the competence of the Jugendamt and, without it, there is no alternative way to solve these questions. Therefore, we must find new, effective solutions to all issues experienced by non-German parents. The European Commission needs to have a regular oversight of Jugendamt activities. Bilateral consular services must get involved and multilateral platforms must be created to guarantee that the cross-border character of a dispute does not endanger the well-being of children.

Urszula Krupa, *w imieniu grupy ECR*. – Panie Przewodniczący! Niemiecki Urząd ds. Młodzieży, tzw. Jugendamt, który w swoim założeniu miał dbać o dobro dzieci i młodzieży, w rzeczywistości często działa przeciwko dzieciom, naruszając artykuły karty praw dziecka, odbierając dzieci rodzicom – szczególnie obcokrajowcom z krajów Europy Środkowo-Wschodniej – bardzo często z błahego albo wyimaginowanego powodu. Na prawie 140 tysięcy wszczętych postępowań kontrolnych tylko w 22 tysiącach spraw stwierdzono w pełni uzasadnione działania.

Wielu moich rodaków mieszka z rodzinami w Niemczech i wielokrotnie słyszymy w Polsce skargi zrozpaczonych rodziców, którym Jugendamt odebrał dzieci, zakazując spotkań z rodzicami, utrudniając porozumiewanie się w języku polskim lub ojczystym, (petycje składane są także przez rodziców należących do innych narodów europejskich), a nawet zakazując go.

Spory z Jugendamtami trwają latami, urząd krytykowany jest za opieszałość, zbytnie ingerowanie w życie rodzin, naruszanie prywatności, a wszystko to nie sprzyja rozwojowi dziecka, a nawet prowadzi do zaburzeń psychicznych, osobowości i tożsamości.

Ivan Jakovčić, *u ime kluba ALDE*. – Poštovani predsjedavajući, poštovana povjerenice Jourová, želim se u ime ALDE grupe priključiti brizi koju svi iskazujemo ovdje u ovom Parlamentu za rad Jugendamta. Naime, evidentno je da mnoge predstavke koje se bilježe očito ukazuju na nepravilnosti u radu, odnosno na diskriminaciju, a to je sigurno ono što zadnje želimo u Europskoj uniji. Diskriminirati naše građane i to još po pitanju djece. To je zaista ono najgore što nam se može dogoditi.

S pravom si možemo postaviti pitanje kakvu mi Uniju zaista želimo. Želimo li Uniju u kojoj će biti glavno trgovati slobodno ili želimo Uniju u kojoj će se građani zaista osjećati sigurno i Uniju u kojoj ćemo mi raditi za te iste građane koji se onda trebaju osjećati sigurno i dobro?

Naravno da trebamo poći od najboljeg interesa djeteta. To je ono od čega treba krenuti u svim razmišljanjima i zato očekujem od vas, od Komisije, da učini sve kako bi Vijeće uskladilo zakonodavnu infrastrukturu Europske unije i da zaista djeca i roditelji ne budu diskriminirani.

Eleonora Evi, *a nome del gruppo EFDD*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, sono state centinaia le petizioni ricevute dalla commissione per le petizioni negli ultimi dieci anni e il numero continua a crescere. Petizioni che denunciano gravi discriminazioni nei confronti dei genitori non tedeschi, discriminazioni che sono perpetrate dallo *Jugendamt* nell'ambito delle controversie familiari transnazionali.

Tutto questo è in contrasto con le norme e i principi del diritto dell'Unione europea e va a grave pregiudizio della tutela del benessere dei minori coinvolti. La commissione per le petizioni, nel corso di questi dieci lunghi anni, ha emesso delle raccomandazioni rivolte alle autorità tedesche, rivolte alla Commissione europea, rivolte al Consiglio, ha fatto due missioni conoscitive, ha addirittura istituito un gruppo di lavoro che ha lavorato per un anno intero, che io ho avuto l'onore di presiedere, ma tutte le raccomandazioni fatte sono rimaste ad oggi lettera morta. Questo sia per il rifiuto di collaborare costruttivamente da parte delle autorità tedesche, che più volte sono state sollecitate in tal senso, sia anche per l'inaccettabile approccio formalistico e superficiale da parte della Commissione europea, che purtroppo ha perseverato nel negare le indagini accurate sulle criticità denunciate nel sistema tedesco in merito al diritto di famiglia.

Faccio riferimento, in particolare, alle statistiche. Noi abbiamo chiesto più volte che vengano raccolti dei dati statistici sia per quanto riguarda gli esiti giudiziari nelle controversie familiari sulla custodia dei minori in presenza di un genitore non tedesco, sia sul numero dei casi, sempre in presenza di un genitore non tedesco, in cui un giudice si è discostato dalla raccomandazione emessa dallo *Jugendamt*.

Abbiamo chiesto anche che si facesse luce sulle discriminazioni legate all'uso della lingua, più volte negata durante gli incontri tra i genitori e i figli. Io mi auspico che questa risoluzione possa finalmente far luce su questo tema, possa scaturire delle azioni concrete da parte non soltanto della Commissione europea, ma anche da parte degli Stati membri. Io mi auguro che quanto meno questo tema possa essere approfondito e comunicato e che le pratiche che vengono adottate in concreto dal sistema del diritto di famiglia tedesco possano essere comprese e comunicate e appunto affrontate in maniera serena, perché questo è il modo con cui dovremo affrontare questo problema se vogliamo che questa Unione europea, questa nostra casa comune, possa chiamarsi tale a tutela soprattutto delle generazioni future.

Dobromir Sośnierz (NI). – Panie Przewodniczący! Cieszę się, że w końcu zajmujemy się tutaj, w naszym parlamencie, prawdziwymi problemami dotyczącymi praworządności. Szkoda, że takie ważne dyskusje są przesuwane na tak późną porę, kiedy już tylko wiatr hula po korytarzach parlamentu po ostatnich głosowaniach. No ale dobre i to.

Widzimy, w jaki sposób w Niemczech zagrożone są prawa człowieka i prawa dzieci. Niemcy próbują pouczać Polskę chociażby w sprawie sądów, a u siebie mają dużo poważniejsze problemy. Nie jest to jednak wyłącznie sprawa Niemiec. W wielu krajach istnieją podobne praktyki. Problem polega na tym, że budujemy państwo totalne. Państwo totalne charakteryzuje się tym, że nie uznaje żadnej władzy poza własną. Dlatego państwo totalne walczy z władzą rodziców. Państwo totalne uważa, że wie lepiej od rodziców, co jest dobre dla dzieci. Posługuje się dobrem dziecka w imię ingerencji w życie rodziny. Nie może być przypadków, żeby w imię dobra dziecka urzędnicy mogli ingerować we władzę rodzicielską. Jedynie popełnienie czynu karalnego, poważnego przestępstwa, może upoważnić do odbierania dzieci, a nie dobro dziecka, gdyż dobro dziecka każdy może rozumieć inaczej i ma święte prawo rozumieć inaczej niż urzędnik. Smutne jest, że na naszym kontynencie my, dumni dziedzice indoeuropejskiego dziedzictwa, pozwalamy sobie, aby urzędnicy pomiatali nami tak, że bez jednego wystrzału oddajemy swoje dzieci.

(Mówca zgodził się odpowiedzieć na pytanie zadane przez podniesienie niebieskiej kartki (art. 162 ust. 8 Regulaminu))

Andrejs Mamikins (S&D), *zilās kartītes jautājums*. – Dārgais kolēģi, liels paldies, ka jūs pieņēmāt manu zilās kartītes jautājumu. Es zinu, ka jūs bieži ļoti asi kritizējat Eiropas Savienību — ka mums šis nav labi un tas nav labi.

Bet īstenībā arī no jūsu runas es tā arī nesadzirdēju atbildi, ko jūs piedāvājat, kas ir jādara, lai, no vienas puses, saglabātu bērnu dzimto valodu un, no otras puses, negrautu Eiropas Savienību.

Dobromir Sośnierz (NI), *odpowiedź na pytanie zadane przez podniesienie niebieskiej kartki*. – Powiedziałem, co powinniśmy zrobić: dziecko należy do rodziców i tylko rodzice powinni decydować, co jest dobre dla dziecka, a nie urzędnicy. Nie jest to więc oczywiście kwestia wyłącznie Jugendamtów i wyłącznie Niemiec, choć tam tę politykę doprowadzono do pewnej skrajności, która razi poza granicami tego kraju. Rozwiązaniem jest to, żeby urzędnicy nie mieli prawa powoływać się na dobro dziecka przeciwko rodzicom. Jedynie popełnienie przestępstwa wobec dziecka może upoważniać do interwencji, a nie jakieś wyimaginowane, rozumiane swoiście dobro dziecka.

Julia Pitera (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Od 2006 r., czyli przez 12 lat, do Komisji Petycji wpłynęło łącznie 258 petycji zawierających skargi w sprawie Jugendamtów. W tej liczbie 196 petycji, czyli 76 %, dotyczyło dzieci obywateli niemieckich. Pozostałe 62 petycje pochodziły od obywateli innych państw. Komisja Petycji w toku prac dysponowała zazwyczaj tylko relacją autora petycji, a przecież żadna instytucja nie może ograniczyć przynależnych obywatelowi praw bez wyroku sądu, również w sprawach opieki nad dziećmi. Tak więc wyroki w każdej sprawie musiały zapadać. Tymczasem do większości petycji nie dołączano wyroku, pomimo, a może właśnie dlatego, że wyrok sądu jest jedynym pełnym źródłem wiedzy o problemie. Opiera się na zeznaniach obojga rodziców, dzieci i świadków. Komisja więc z konieczności opierała swoje opinie głównie na relacji autora petycji, jedynej ze stron sporu. Z tego powodu skierowałam do Trybunału Praw Człowieka w Strasburgu zapytanie, który z 62 autorów petycji o narodowości innej niż niemiecka złożył skargę do Trybunału. Uzyskałam odpowiedź, że tylko siedemnaście osób skargę taką złożyło i że wszystkie te skargi zostały uznane za niedopuszczalne. Również w 2011 r., w trakcie misji do Niemiec, członkowie Komisji Petycji nie stwierdzili nieprawidłowości. Tymczasem temat ten regularnie powraca, stając się, podobnie jak histeria antyszczepionkowa, narzędziem w walce politycznej, zwłaszcza w okresach przedwyborczych. Zasiewa niepokój i podważa nie tylko zaufanie do władzy, ale i wzajemne zaufanie w ramach Wspólnoty Europejskiej. I ten aspekt powinien zwrócić naszą szczególną uwagę.

(Mówczyni zgodziła się odpowiedzieć na pytanie zadane przez podniesienie niebieskiej kartki (art. 162 ust. 8 Regulaminu))

Kosma Złotowski (ECR), *pytanie zadane przez podniesienie niebieskiej kartki*. – Wielce Szanowna Pani Poseł! Czy uważa Pani w związku z tym, że Jugendamty w Niemczech działają poprawnie, bez zarzutu i że wszystkie zarzuty, o których jest tu mowa, o których jest mowa w środkach masowego przekazu, są wyimaginowane? Czy w związku z tym postulowałaby może Pani, żeby rozszerzyć jurysdykcję Jugendamtów albo utworzyć podobne urzędy w innych krajach Unii Europejskiej?

Julia Pitera (PPE), *odpowiedź na pytanie zadane przez podniesienie niebieskiej kartki. –(początek wystąpienia poza mikrofonem)* … ani nie atakuje. W pracy każdy polityk powinien opierać się na faktach i dokumentach, a nie na doniesieniach prasowych, często opierających się na emocjach jednej osoby, która czuje się skrzywdzona. Jak Pan wie, również w Polsce wydziały opieki społecznej o podobnej strukturze jak Jugendamty też czasem nie dopilnowują swoich obowiązków. W związku z tym jednak byłabym skłonna namówić Pana, żeby czytał Pan dokumenty, bo one są najważniejsze, a nie emocje jednego człowieka.

Edouard Martin (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Commissaire, chers collègues, imaginez que je vous parle sans interprétation. Vous ne comprendriez rien à mes propos. Imaginez que vous soyez jugé dans un pays qui n'est pas le vôtre et que vous ne connaissiez rien à ses règles parce que personne ne vous les a expliquées. Imaginez que, sur convocation, vous vous présentiez à un tribunal avec votre enfant, confiante ou confiant d'être dans votre bon droit, et que vous repartiez sans lui. Imaginez que vous soyez obligé de payer une pension alimentaire pour votre enfant, qu'on ne vous laisse pas voir depuis des années. Imaginez qu'après toutes ces années d'absence, votre enfant ne parle plus votre langue, ne connaisse plus votre culture et, pire, ne sache même plus qui vous êtes, vous, son parent. Imaginez.

Eh bien! c'est la situation à laquelle sont confrontés des milliers de parents face au Jugendamt, c'est pour ainsi dire David contre Goliath. Non, cette résolution n'est pas un texte contre l'Allemagne. Ce texte, c'est un appel au droit.

Si le Jugendamt veut vraiment défendre l'intérêt supérieur de l'enfant, comme il le prétend, il doit le laisser profiter pleinement de sa mère et de son père. C'est la base même de son équilibre et de son émancipation. C'est cette richesse culturelle multiple qui en fera un adulte solide, ouvert et une personne aimante, car c'est bien de cela qu'il s'agit, de l'amour. Comment peut-on être aussi obtus pour empêcher un parent de dire à son enfant qu'il l'aime, qu'il lui manque, qu'il a envie de le serrer dans ses bras. Comment?

Cette résolution, j'ose le dire, est un appel à l'amour, n'en déplaise à certaines ou certains, parce que j'entends trop souvent dire que la politique ne doit pas être basée sur l'affect – cela explique d'ailleurs peut-être pourquoi la situation du monde est aussi chaotique. Alors, chers collègues, je vous demande d'ouvrir votre cœur et de permettre à ces enfants de ressentir l'amour de leurs deux parents. L'amour, encore l'amour, toujours l'amour.

L'Europe ne peut pas rester spectatrice et nous ne pouvons pas être les spectateurs de cela. Nous devons agir et nous pouvons, à cet effet, nous baser sur les déclarations, pas plus tard qu'hier, de M^{me} Merkel. Chiche, Madame la Chancelière, soyons plus solidaires! Donc, permettez une harmonie familiale au seul et unique profit de l'enfant. C'est cela qui compte et rien d'autre.

Kosma Złotowski (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! Działania niemieckich urzędów do spraw dzieci i młodzieży wielokrotnie budziły oburzenie opinii publicznej w Polsce, ale problem jest dużo szerszy i dotyczy przecież obywateli wszystkich państw Unii Europejskiej, którzy zetknęli się z tą instytucją. Bezprawne, ale legalne niestety w świetle niemieckiego prawa odbieranie dzieci czy zakazywanie używania języka ojczystego w kontaktach z rodzicami to częste praktyki Jugendamtów. W Polsce mamy jak najgorsze historyczne skojarzenia z tego typu działaniami.

Pani kanclerz Merkel mówiła dwa dni temu w tej Izbie, że narodowe egoizmy stoją w sprzeczności z wartościami europejskimi. Nie przeszkadza jej jednak to, że niemieccy urzędnicy faworyzują niemieckojęzycznych rodziców i dyskryminują obywateli innych państw w rodzinach mieszanych. Parlament i Komisja bardzo chętnie zajmują się zwalczaniem wszelkich form dyskryminacji, więc mam nadzieję, że nie zabraknie im determinacji, aby stanąć po stronie m.in. polskich rodziców, którzy padli ofiarą Jugendamtów.

Jozo Radoš (ALDE). – Poštovani predsjedavajući, gospođo povjerenice, kolegice i kolege, najprije bih htio zahvaliti Odboru za predstavke i gospođi zastupnici Wikström na pokretanju ove inicijative na plenarnoj sjednici Europskog parlamenta.

Prema brojnim predstavkama koje su stigle proteklih desetak godina, makar nemamo pravosudni pravorijek o negativnosti rada njemačkog ureda za skrb o djeci, očito je da se radi o kršenju niza međunarodnih konvencija, programa Europske unije za prava djeteta, uključujući i odgovarajuće zakonodavne dokumente Europske unije. Radi se o postocima koji su prilično komplicirani, koji uključuju prekograničnu suradnju, administrativnu suradnju, suradnju socijalnih tijela, tijela za socijalnu skrb u pojedinim državama članicama koje najčešće nemaju dovoljno razvijene odjele za međunarodnu suradnju. Stoga je za očekivati da se ovakvi problemi, poteškoće događaju i u drugim državama članicama i stoga pozdravljam sve zahtjeve koji su naznačeni u rezoluciji sa ciljem poboljšanja prekogranične pravosudne i upravne suradnje u najboljem interesu djece koja žive u razdvojenim obiteljima.

Jarosław Wałęsa (PPE). – Mr President, the resolution is based on petitions by non-German parents in binational couples, which alerted Parliament to cases of alleged discriminatory, judicial and administrative procedures related to family disputes on parental responsibility and child custody. The Committee on Petitions has received petitions raising similar allegations related to the functioning of social systems in Sweden, Denmark and the UK.

Being a parent myself, I cannot even picture the pain that a family goes through when faced with such a dramatic situation. However, as a Member of the European Parliament, I would like to underline the fact that, while family law is the sole competence of Member States, social welfare institutions, courts of law or any other competent public body must put the best interest of the child at the centre of the decision or action that they take. We cannot give those families false hope that we have tools to help bring children back home.

Furthermore, the European institutions and Member States should promote cross-border cooperation on family matters, providing training for judges and professionals, information on legal aid, and bilingual lawyers, and involving embassies and consular representatives from the start of all childcare proceedings involving their nationals.

Beata Gosiewska (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! Szanowni Państwo! W imieniu tysięcy pokrzywdzonych polskich rodziców, którym od lat bezprawnie, często pod osłoną nocy lub w wyniku pomówień, odbiera się dzieci i zakazuje się kontaktu z nimi, bo chcą rozmawiać z nimi w ojczystym języku, pytam: kiedy zostaną zlikwidowane pozostające bez centralnego nadzoru urzędy Jugendamt, których niechlubna historia sięga II wojny światowej, i w to miejsce utworzony zostanie nadzorowany centralny urząd wspierający rodziców w wychowywaniu dzieci, a państwa, których obywateli sprawy dotyczą, będą na bieżąco informowane i będą aktywnie uczestniczyć w kontroli przestrzegania praw dzieci? Pan Wojciech Pomorski tak wspomina swój dramat: od porwania córeczek w 2003 r. widziałem je pierwszy raz po dwóch latach pod dozorem przez pięć i pół godziny – już były zgermanizowane – potem po roku, w 2006 r., przez pięć godzin, ostatni raz w 2010 r. przez pięć i pół godziny, też jak zwykle pod nadzorem. Łącznie: 16 godzin w ciągu 15 lat. Zakaz używania języka polskiego uzasadniono tak: nie leży w interesie dzieci, by podczas spotkań nadzorowanych rozmawiano w języku polskim. Gdy to niekonsekwentne postępowanie…

(Przewodniczący odebrał mówczyni głos.)

Der Präsident. – Herr Kollege Mamikins, wenn ich jemandem das Wort entziehen musste, weil er die Redezeit überschritten hat, gebe ich grundsätzlich keine Gelegenheit für eine Frage.

Spontane Wortmeldungen

Albert Deß (PPE). – Herr Präsident, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Ich bin froh, dass dieses Thema hier diskutiert wird. Ich komme aus dem Landkreis Neumarkt in der Oberpfalz in Bayern, war dort auch zwölf Jahre stellvertretender Landrat und bin seit 28 Jahren Abgeordneter. An mein Büro ist nicht ein einziger Fall von Beschwerden bezüglich des Jugendamtes herangetragen worden.

Deutschland ist ein föderaler Staat, wir haben 16 Bundesländer. Vielleicht gibt es einzelne Bundesländer, wo es gewisse Schwierigkeiten gibt. Aber hier die Jugendämter unter Generalverdacht zu stellen, halte ich für falsch. Es wird in vielen Jugendämtern eine hervorragende Arbeit geleistet. Wenn hier schon Fälle in meinem Kreis da gewesen wären, dann wären die Beschwerden auch sicher bei mir angekommen, und das ist in diesen 28 Jahren nicht einmal der Fall gewesen.

Mir ist auch bekannt, dass hier bei Verdolmetschungsnotwendigkeit die Dolmetscher auch zur Verfügung gestellt werden. Vielleicht sind sie nicht immer gleich zeitlich erreichbar, aber grundsätzlich stehen die Dolmetscher zur Verfügung, wenn es notwendig ist.

(Ende der spontanen Wortmeldungen)

Věra Jourová, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, Honourable Members, thank you very much for this debate. I am aware of a number of complaints which the Committee on Petitions has received and I have tried to find the legal way to get into the problem and to come up with some measures. But I have to fully respect the division of competences stipulated in the primary law.

As I said before, family-law matters are highly sensitive, and the EU has very limited legal competence to act in this field, so everybody should act in accordance with the applicable legislation. For the Member States, this is clearly the Charter of Fundamental Rights and the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child, which are legally binding on them. They have to ensure that in all actions related to children, the child's best interests are the primary consideration, and the national courts are best placed to assess the application of the principle of the best interests of the child in individual cases.

Regarding the EU's competence, I want to clarify once again the EU family law is limited to common rules on jurisdiction and the recognition and enforcement of existing judgments in another Member State. The high sensitivity of family-law matters is also reflected in the requirement for unanimity in the Council for family-law matters. This is also the case for the Brussels 2A Regulation, and I hope we will be able to adopt the revision of this regulation in December.

The revision of the Brussels 2A Regulation should make proceedings in cross-border cases easier and quicker. We are indeed considering the best interest of the child. We had to work extremely hard to get all the Member States on board for this process – the revision of the Brussels 2A Regulation – and I do hope that they will all vote for this in December.

Let me thank you again for the support expressed in the Parliament opinion on the Brussels 2A Regulation. I hope, as I said, that the negotiations on this instrument in the Council will be finalised soon, and the regulation will enable the more efficient handling of cross-border cases.

Der Präsident. – Die Aussprache ist geschlossen.

Die Abstimmung findet während der nächsten Tagung statt.

Schriftliche Erklärungen (Artikel 162)

Anna Elżbieta Fotyga (ECR), *na piśmie*. – Niemiecki urząd do spraw dzieci i młodzieży (Jugendamt) to instytucja założona w 1922 roku w Republice Weimarskiej, której działalność w okresie III Rzeszy zapisała się czarnymi zgłoskami w historii Europy, w tym przede wszystkim Polski. Z uwagi m.in. na wspominane uwarunkowania historyczne realizacja zadań urzędu także dziś jest kwestią wrażliwą i jest przedmiotem szczególnej troski. Tym bardziej iż bieżąca praktyka urzędu wiąże się z drastyczną ingerencją w życie rodzin objętych opieką. Pracownik urzędu jest uprawniony do umieszczenia dziecka w pieczy zastępczej na podstawie nieprecyzyjnych przepisów dających szerokie pole do nadużyć, co wielokrotnie skutkuje odebraniem dzieci rodzicom bez wystarczającego uzasadnienia, bez ścieżki odwoławczej od arbitralnej decyzji. Szczególnie skandaliczny jest zaś fakt, że pracownicy urzędów w jawny sposób dyskryminują osoby innego pochodzenia niż niemieckie. Podczas nadzorowanych spotkań dzieci nie mogą komunikować się z rodzicami w języku innym niż niemiecki. Takie działanie urzędu stoi w sprzeczności z konwencją ONZ o prawach dziecka, w szczególności z art. 8, który gwarantuje poszanowanie prawa dziecka „do zachowania jego tożsamości, w tym obywatelstwa, nazwiska, stosunków rodzinnych, zgodnych z prawem, z wyłączeniem bezprawnych ingerencji". Ponadto, działalność Jugendamtów oraz ramy prawne regulujące ich funkcjonowanie naruszają zapisy szeregu artykułów EKPC. Dlatego oczekuję, iż omawiana w Komisji Petycji sprawa Jugendamtów, będąca także przedmiotem obrad plenarnych, przyczyni się do reformy bulwersującego stanu rzeczy.

12. Beschlüsse über bestimmte Dokumente: siehe Protokoll

13. Petitionen: siehe Protokoll

14. Vorlage von Dokumenten: siehe Protokoll

15. Übermittlung der in dieser Sitzung angenommenen Texte: siehe Protokoll

16. Zeitpunkt der nächsten Sitzungen: siehe Protokoll

17. Schluss der Sitzung

(Die Sitzung wird um 15.35 Uhr geschlossen.)

18. Unterbrechung der Sitzungsperiode

Der Präsident. – Ich erkläre die Sitzungsperiode des Europäischen Parlaments für unterbrochen.

Legende der verwendeten Zeichen

*	Konsultationsverfahren
***	Zustimmungsverfahren
***I	Ordentliches Gesetzgebungsverfahren, erste Lesung
***II	Ordentliches Gesetzgebungsverfahren, zweite Lesung
***III	Ordentliches Gesetzgebungsverfahren, dritte Lesung

(Das angegebene Verfahren entspricht der von der Kommission vorgeschlagenen Rechtsgrundlage.)

Abkürzungen der Ausschüsse

AFET	Ausschuss für auswärtige Angelegenheiten
DEVE	Entwicklungsausschuss
INTA	Ausschuss für internationalen Handel
BUDG	Haushaltsausschuss
CONT	Haushaltskontrollausschuss
ECON	Ausschuss für Wirtschaft und Währung
EMPL	Ausschuss für Beschäftigung und soziale Angelegenheiten
ENVI	Ausschuss für Umweltfragen, öffentliche Gesundheit und Lebensmittelsicherheit
ITRE	Ausschuss für Industrie, Forschung und Energie
IMCO	Ausschuss für Binnenmarkt und Verbraucherschutz
TRAN	Ausschuss für Verkehr und Fremdenverkehr
REGI	Ausschuss für regionale Entwicklung
AGRI	Ausschuss für Landwirtschaft und ländliche Entwicklung
PECH	Fischereiausschuss
CULT	Ausschuss für Kultur und Bildung
JURI	Rechtsausschuss
LIBE	Ausschuss für bürgerliche Freiheiten, Justiz und Inneres
AFCO	Ausschuss für konstitutionelle Fragen
FEMM	Ausschuss für die Rechte der Frau und die Gleichstellung der Geschlechter
PETI	Petitionsausschuss

DROI	Unterausschuss Menschenrechte
SEDE	Unterausschuss Sicherheit und Verteidigung

Abkürzungen der Fraktionen

PPE	Fraktion der Europäischen Volkspartei (Christdemokraten)
S&D	Fraktion der Progressiven Allianz der Sozialdemokraten im Europäischen Parlament
ECR	Fraktion der Europäischen Konservativen und Reformer
ALDE	Fraktion der Allianz der Liberalen und Demokraten für Europa
GUE/NGL	Konföderale Fraktion der Vereinigten Europäischen Linken/Nordische Grüne Linke
Verts/ALE	Fraktion der Grünen/Freie Europäische Allianz
EFDD	Fraktion Europa der Freiheit und der direkten Demokratie
ENF	Fraktion Europa der Nationen und der Freiheit
NI	Fraktionslos

Amtsblatt
der Europäischen Union

DE
Reihe C

C/2024/3545

7.6.2024

Ausschreibung der Stelle des/der Vorsitzenden (m/w/d) der Behörde zur Bekämpfung der Geldwäsche

(COM/2024/20106)

(C/2024/3545)

Die Behörde zur Bekämpfung der Geldwäsche

Geldwäsche und Terrorismusfinanzierung geben in der EU Anlass zu großer Sorge. Sie stellen ein hohes Risiko für die Wirtschaft und das Finanzsystem der EU sowie für die Sicherheit ihrer Bürgerinnen und Bürger dar.

Um die Bürgerinnen und Bürger sowie das Finanzsystem der EU vor Geldwäsche und Terrorismusfinanzierung zu schützen, haben der Rat und das Parlament auf Vorschlag der Kommission beschlossen, eine EU-Behörde für die Bekämpfung von Geldwäsche und Terrorismusfinanzierung (AMLA) einzurichten.

Die AMLA wird als zentrale Behörde die nationalen Aufsichtsbehörden unterstützen und koordinieren, um die korrekte und kohärente Anwendung der EU-Vorschriften zur Bekämpfung von Geldwäsche und Terrorismusfinanzierung sicherzustellen. Im Finanzsektor wird die Behörde die mit Blick auf Geldwäsche und Terrorismusfinanzierung risikoreichsten Unternehmen des Finanzsektors direkt beaufsichtigen. Die AMLA wird auch die zentralen Meldestellen (FIU) koordinieren und unterstützen, unter anderem indem sie die gemeinsame Analyse grenzüberschreitender Fälle fördert und analytische Lösungen sowie Lösungen für den Informationsaustausch bereitstellt, z. B. durch das Hosting, die Verwaltung und Weiterentwicklung des FIU.net-Systems. Schließlich wird die AMLA dafür zuständig sein, die EU-Vorschriften zur Bekämpfung von Geldwäsche und Terrorismusfinanzierung durch die Ausarbeitung technischer Regulierungs- und Durchführungsstandards und die Herausgabe von Leitlinien zu ergänzen.

Die AMLA wird über einen Verwaltungsrat aus Vertreterinnen und Vertretern der für die Bekämpfung der Geldwäsche zuständigen Aufsichtsbehörden und der zentralen Meldestellen der Mitgliedstaaten sowie über ein Direktorium verfügen, das wiederum aus fünf unabhängigen hauptamtlichen Mitgliedern (ohne den/die Vorsitzende) besteht. Den Vorsitz beider Gremien führt der/die Vorsitzende der Behörde.

Stellenprofil

Die Europäische Kommission führt ein Auswahlverfahren für das Amt des/der Vorsitzenden durch. Der Ort der dienstlichen Verwendung ist am Sitz der Behörde in Frankfurt (Deutschland). Bis 2027 wird die AMLA mehr als 400 Bedienstete beschäftigen.

Dieses Auswahlverfahren unterlegt der Veröffentlichung und dem Inkrafttreten der EU-Verordnung zur Bekämpfung von Geldwäsche und Terrorismusfinanzierung(AML/CFT). Die Verordnung zur Bekämpfung von Geldwäsche und Terrorismusfinanzierung wird voraussichtlich im dritten Quartal 2024 in Kraft treten.

Der/die Vorsitzende ist der gesetzliche Vertreter/die gesetzliche Vertreterin und das Gesicht der Behörde in der Öffentlichkeit. Durch den Vorsitz in den Sitzungen des Verwaltungsrats und des Direktoriums verantwortet er/sie die strategische Planung und führt die Behörde.

In seinen/ihren Zuständigkeitsbereich fallen:

— Leitung und rechtliche Vertretung der Behörde,

— Vorbereitung der Tätigkeit der Behörde, Einberufung und Vorsitz aller Sitzungen des Verwaltungsrats der Behörde, sowohl in der Aufsichtszusammensetzung als auch in der Meldestellen-Zusammensetzung, sowie des Direktoriums der Behörde,

— Verwaltung der AMLA und Aufsicht über ihren Betrieb einschließlich Personal- und Haushaltsfragen, Annahme des Jahresarbeitsprogramms und Kontrolle seiner Durchführung,

— Zuweisung spezifischer Zuständigkeitsbereiche im Rahmen der Aufgaben der Behörde an die fünf Mitglieder des Direktoriums für die Dauer ihres Mandats,

— gegenüber dem Europäischen Parlament und dem Rat für die Durchführung der AMLA-Verordnung Rechenschaftspflicht übernehmen,

— jährliche Berichterstattung an das Europäische Parlament, den Rat und die Kommission über die Wahrnehmung der ihr durch die AMLA-Verordnung übertragenen Aufgaben,

— auf Verlangen des Europäischen Parlaments Teilnahme an Anhörungen zur Wahrnehmung seiner Aufgaben durch die zuständigen Ausschüsse des Europäischen Parlaments und mündliche oder schriftliche Beantwortung von Fragen des Europäischen Parlaments.

Eine ausführlichere Beschreibung der Aufgaben und Zuständigkeiten des/der Vorsitzenden findet sich in den Artikeln 64 und 69 der AMLA-Verordnung, die hier https://data.consilium.europa.eu/doc/document/PE-35-2024-INIT/de/pdf zu finden ist.

Der/die Vorsitzende wird von einem/einer stellvertretenden Vorsitzenden unterstützt.

Auswahlkriterien

Sie sollten folgendes Profil haben:

Managementkompetenzen

— Ausgezeichnete Koordinierungs- und Analysefähigkeiten, einschließlich der Fähigkeit, die strategische Ausrichtung festzulegen, klare politische Prioritäten zu setzen und die Beratungen mit den Mitgliedern des Verwaltungsrats der Behörde zu leiten,

— erfolgreiche Erfahrung in leitender Funktion, mit der Leitung eines großen, mit komplexen Aufgaben betrauten Teams und Erreichung seiner Ziele,

— nachgewiesene solide Managementfähigkeiten, insbesondere Erfahrung in der Verwaltung von Haushalts- und Finanzmitteln sowie Humanressourcen auf hoher Führungsebene in einem nationalen, europäischen und/oder internationalen Umfeld,

— eigehende Erfahrung in der Zusammenarbeit mit EU- und/oder internationalen Interessenträgern und Partnern.

Fachkenntnisse und Erfahrung

— Fähigkeit zur Umsetzung einer dem AMLA-Mandat entsprechenden Vision,

— fundierte Erfahrung in einem oder mehreren der folgenden Bereiche: Bekämpfung von Geldwäsche und Terrorismusfinanzierung,

— profundes Verständnis des Rechtsrahmens für finanzielle und nichtfinanzielle Stellen, die den EU-Vorschriften zur Bekämpfung von Geldwäsche unterliegen, sowie der Rechtsvorschriften, die die Tätigkeiten der für die Bekämpfung von Geldwäsche zuständigen Aufsichtsbehörden und/oder zentralen Meldestellen regeln.

Persönliche Kompetenzen

— Ausgezeichnetes Verhandlungsgeschick und Fähigkeit zum Aufbau vertrauensvoller Arbeitsbeziehungen mit hochrangigen Vertreterinnen und Vertreter einschlägiger Interessenträger,

— nachgewiesene Fähigkeit zur kompetenten, klaren und effektiven Kommunikation mit den internen und externen Interessenträgern und zur Vertretung der AMLA in internationalen Foren,

— herausragender Sinn für Verantwortung und Eigeninitiative sowie die Fähigkeit, in Krisensituationen Maßnahmen zu erarbeiten und umzusetzen.

Zulassungsbedingungen

Um zur Auswahlphase zugelassen zu werden, müssen Sie **vor Ablauf der Bewerbungsfrist** folgende formale Anforderungen erfüllen:

— **Staatsangehörigkeit**: Sie müssen die Staatsangehörigkeit eines Mitgliedstaats der Europäischen Union besitzen.

— **Hochschulabschluss**: Sie müssen Folgendes nachweisen:

  — entweder ein Bildungsniveau, das einem abgeschlossenen Hochschulstudium mit einer Regelstudienzeit von mindestens vier Jahren entspricht,

— oder ein Bildungsniveau, das einem abgeschlossenen Hochschulstudium mit einer Regelstudienzeit von mindestens drei Jahren entspricht, und eine mindestens einjährige einschlägige Berufserfahrung (diese einjährige Berufserfahrung kann nicht auf die weiter unten geforderte, nach dem Hochschulabschluss erworbene Berufserfahrung angerechnet werden).

— **Berufserfahrung**: Sie müssen nach Ihrem Hochschulabschluss mindestens 15 Jahre Berufserfahrung ([1]) auf einer Ebene gesammelt haben, für die die vorstehend genannten Qualifikationen Voraussetzung sind. Mindestens fünf Jahre dieser Berufserfahrung müssen Sie auf Führungsebene im Tätigkeitsbereich der Behörde erworben haben.

— **Managementerfahrung**: Die Bewerberinnen und Bewerber müssen nach Erwerb des Hochschulabschlusses über mindestens 10 Jahre Berufserfahrung in Führungspositionen verfügen ([2]), davon mindestens fünf Jahre in einer vergleichbaren höheren Führungsposition.

— **Sprachkenntnisse**: Sie müssen über gründliche Kenntnisse einer Amtssprache der Europäischen Union ([3]) und ausreichende Kenntnisse einer weiteren EU-Amtssprache verfügen. Die Auswahlausschüsse überprüfen während des Vorauswahl- und ggf. des Auswahlgesprächs, ob die verlangten ausreichenden Kenntnisse einer weiteren EU-Amtssprache vorhanden sind. Das Gespräch (oder ein Teil davon) kann deshalb in dieser weiteren Sprache geführt werden.

— Es gelten keine Altersbeschränkungen.

Auswahl und Ernennung

Die Kommission erstellt eine Auswahlliste mit mindestens zwei qualifizierten Bewerberinnen oder Bewerber für das Amt des/der Vorsitzenden der Behörde.

Zur Erstellung der Auswahlliste wendet die Europäische Kommission ihre üblichen Auswahl- und Einstellungsverfahren an (siehe Document on Senior Officials Policy ([4])).

Im Rahmen dieses Auswahlverfahrens setzt die Europäische Kommission einen Vorauswahlausschuss ein. Der Vorauswahlausschuss sichtet sämtliche Bewerbungen, prüft die Zulassungsberechtigung und ermittelt diejenigen Bewerberinnen und Bewerber, deren Profil den oben genannten Auswahlkriterien am besten entspricht. Diese Personen werden gegebenenfalls zu einem Gespräch mit dem Vorauswahlausschuss eingeladen.

Im Anschluss an diese Gespräche erstellt der Vorauswahlausschuss seine Schlussfolgerungen und eine Liste der Personen, die er für weitere Gespräche mit dem Beratenden Ausschuss für Ernennungen der Europäischen Kommission vorschlägt. Der Beratende Ausschuss wählt unter Berücksichtigung der Schlussfolgerungen des Vorauswahlausschusses die Personen aus, die zu einem Gespräch eingeladen werden.

Diese nehmen an einem ganztägigen, von externen Personalberatern durchgeführten Management-Assessment-Center teil. Anhand der Ergebnisse des Gesprächs und des Assessment-Center-Berichts erstellt der Beratende Ausschuss für Ernennungen eine Auswahlliste der seiner Meinung nach für das Amt geeigneten Personen.

Die auf der Auswahlliste des Beratenden Ausschusses aufgeführten Bewerberinnen und Bewerber werden von den Kommissionsmitgliedern befragt, die für die Generaldirektion zuständig sind, in deren Aufgabenbereich die Beziehungen zur Behörde fallen ([5]).

([1]) Berufserfahrung wird nur dann berücksichtigt, wenn sie im Rahmen eines tatsächlichen Arbeitsverhältnisses gesammelt wurde, das als reale, echte und bezahlte Arbeit eines Arbeitnehmers (jedes vertragliche Beschäftigungsverhältnis kann angerechnet werden) oder eines Dienstleistungserbringers definiert ist. Teilzeitarbeit wird anteilig auf der Grundlage des bescheinigten Prozentsatzes der geleisteten Vollzeitstunden angerechnet. Mutterschafts-, Eltern- oder Adoptionsurlaub wird berücksichtigt, falls dieser im Rahmen eines Arbeitsvertrags genommen wurde. Promotionen — auch unbezahlt — werden, sofern sie erfolgreich abgeschlossen wurden, der Berufserfahrung gleichgestellt (maximal drei Jahre). Ein und derselbe Zeitraum kann nur einmal angerechnet werden.

([2]) Im Lebenslauf sollten Sie für alle Jahre, in denen Sie Managementerfahrung gesammelt haben, Folgendes genau angeben: 1) Bezeichnung der Führungspositionen und Zuständigkeitsbereich, 2) Zahl der Ihnen unterstellten Mitarbeiterinnen und Mitarbeiter, 3) Höhe der verwalteten Haushaltsmittel, 4) Zahl der unter- und übergeordneten Hierarchie-Ebenen und 5) Zahl der Führungskräfte auf gleicher Ebene.

([3]) https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/DE/TXT/?uri=CELEX%3A01962R0031-20240101.

([4]) https://commission.europa.eu/jobs-european-commission/job-opportunities/managers-european-commission_en#vacancies (nur auf Englisch verfügbar).

([5]) Sofern das betreffende Kommissionsmitglied diese Aufgabe nicht gemäß den Beschlüssen der Kommission vom 5. Dezember 2007 (PV (2007) 1811) und 30. September 2020 (PV(2020) 2351) abgegeben hat.

Nach diesen Gesprächen erstellt die Europäische Kommission eine Auswahlliste mit mindestens zwei geeigneten Bewerberinnen bzw. Bewerbern.

Diese Auswahlliste wird dem Europäischen Parlament übermittelt. Gleichzeitig wird der Rat der Europäischen Union unterrichtet. Die Europäische Kommission übermittelt dann dem Europäischen Parlament einen Vorschlag für die Ernennung des/der Vorsitzenden der Behörde zur Billigung. Nach Billigung dieses Vorschlags erlässt der Rat mit qualifizierter Mehrheit einen Durchführungsbeschluss zur Ernennung des/der Vorsitzenden der Behörde. Ferner können die Bewerberinnen und Bewerber aufgefordert werden, noch weitere Gespräche und/oder Tests zu absolvieren.

Diese Aufforderung zur Einreichung von Bewerbungen ist die Grundlage für den Vorschlag der Kommission für die Ernennung des/der Vorsitzenden der AMLA durch den Rat. Die Aufnahme in die dem Europäischen Parlament zu übermittelnde Auswahlliste oder in den Vorschlag für die Ernennung ist keine Garantie für eine Ernennung. Diese Auswahlliste kann veröffentlicht werden, sobald sie von der Kommission angenommen wurde.

Die ausgewählte Person muss eine gültige Bescheinigung über den erfolgreichen Abschluss der Sicherheitsüberprüfung ihrer nationalen Sicherheitsbehörde besitzen oder in der Lage sein, eine solche zu erhalten. Die Bescheinigung wird per Verwaltungsbeschluss nach einer Sicherheitsüberprüfung durch die zuständige nationale Sicherheitsbehörde der Bewerberin/des Bewerbers entsprechend den geltenden nationalen Sicherheitsvorschriften erteilt und ermöglicht den Zugang zu Verschlusssachen bis zu einem bestimmten Geheimhaltungsgrad. (Das zur Ausstellung einer solchen Bescheinigung notwendige Verfahren kann nur auf Antrag des Arbeitgebers eingeleitet werden, nicht aber durch die Bewerberinnen und Bewerber selbst.)

Bis der jeweilige Mitgliedstaat die Sicherheitsermächtigung erteilt hat und das entsprechende Überprüfungsverfahren mit der gesetzlich vorgeschriebenen Unterweisung durch die Direktion Sicherheit der Europäischen Kommission abgeschlossen ist, kann die betreffende Person weder auf EU-Verschlusssachen (EU-VS), die mit dem Geheimhaltungsgrad CONFIDENTIEL UE/EU CONFIDENTIAL oder höher eingestuft wurden, zugreifen noch an Sitzungen teilnehmen, bei denen solche EU-VS erörtert werden.

Chancengleichheit

Die Kommission und die AMLA setzen sich für Ziele der Gleichstellung der Geschlechter und der Verhinderung jeglicher Diskriminierung ein. Sie begrüßen ausdrücklich Bewerbungen aller qualifizierten Bewerberinnen und Bewerber mit unterschiedlichem Hintergrund, mit den verschiedensten Fähigkeiten und aus möglichst vielen EU-Mitgliedstaaten. Um die Gleichstellung der Geschlechter zu fördern, unterstützt die Kommission insbesondere Bewerbungen von Frauen.

Beschäftigungsbedingungen

Der/die Vorsitzende wird hinsichtlich der Besoldung und des Ruhestandsalters einem Mitglied des Gerichts gemäß der Verordnung (EU) 2016/300 des Rates ([6]) gleichgestellt. Die Dienstbezüge basieren auf der Besoldungsgruppe AD 16 Dienstaltersstufe 3, auf die ein Multiplikationsfaktor von 104 % der Dienstbezüge für diese Besoldungsgruppe und Dienstaltersstufe Anwendung findet. Für alle sonstigen Beschäftigungsbedingungen gelten analog das Statut und die Beschäftigungsbedingungen für die sonstigen Bediensteten ([7]).

Er/sie wird gemäß der Verordnung zur Errichtung der Behörde in der zum Zeitpunkt der Ernennung geltenden Fassung für eine erste Amtszeit von vier Jahren ernannt, die einmal verlängert werden kann.

Ort der dienstlichen Verwendung ist Frankfurt (Deutschland).

([6]) Verordnung (EU) 2016/300 des Rates vom 29. Februar 2016 über die Regelung der Amtsbezüge für hochrangige Amtsträger in der EU (ABl. L 58 vom 4.3.2016, S. 1).

([7]) ABl. 45 vom 14.6.1962, S. 1385, konsolidierter Text: https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/DE/TXT/?uri=CELEX%3A01962R0031-20240101.

Wichtige Hinweise

Die Arbeiten der Auswahlausschüsse sind vertraulich. Den Bewerberinnen und Bewerbern ist es untersagt, sich persönlich oder über Dritte an einzelne Mitglieder dieser Ausschüsse zu wenden. Alle Anfragen sind an das Sekretariat des jeweiligen Ausschusses zu richten.

Schutz personenbezogener Daten

Die Kommission trägt dafür Sorge, dass alle personenbezogenen Daten gemäß den Anforderungen der Verordnung (EU) 2018/1725 des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates ([8]) verarbeitet werden. Dies gilt insbesondere für die Vertraulichkeit und Sicherheit dieser Daten.

Unabhängigkeit und Erklärung zu etwaigen Interessenkonflikten

Vor Aufnahme seiner/ihrer Tätigkeit muss sich der/die Vorsitzende in einer Erklärung verpflichten, unabhängig im öffentlichen Interesse zu handeln, und etwaige Interessen offenlegen, die seine/ihre Unabhängigkeit beeinträchtigen könnten.

In den 18 Monaten nach dem Ausscheiden aus dem Amt ist es dem/der ehemaligen Vorsitzenden untersagt, eine entgeltliche berufliche Tätigkeit auszuüben mit

a) einem ausgewählten Verpflichteten,

b) jeder anderen Stelle, wenn dies zu einem Konflikt mit den berechtigten Interessen der Behörde führen würde oder könnte.

Das Direktorium legt die Umstände fest, unter denen ein solcher Interessenkonflikt besteht oder vermutet werden könnte.

Bewerbungsverfahren

Bitte prüfen Sie vor Einreichung Ihrer Bewerbung sorgfältig, ob Sie sämtliche oben genannten Zulassungsbedingungen erfüllen, vor allem, ob Sie über den verlangten Hochschulabschluss, die Berufserfahrung in einer höheren Führungsposition und die verlangten Sprachkenntnisse verfügen. Ist eine der Zulassungsbedingungen nicht erfüllt, werden Sie automatisch vom Auswahlverfahren ausgeschlossen.

Falls Sie sich bewerben möchten, müssen Sie sich zunächst im Internet auf folgender Seite anmelden und den dortigen Anleitungen zu den einzelnen Verfahrensschritten folgen:

https://ec.europa.eu/dgs/human-resources/seniormanagementvacancies/.

Sie benötigen eine gültige E-Mail-Adresse, über die Ihnen Ihre Bewerbung bestätigt werden kann und die für den weiteren Schriftwechsel während der verschiedenen Phasen des Auswahlverfahrens verwendet wird. Teilen Sie daher der Europäischen Kommission bitte unbedingt Änderungen Ihrer E-Mail-Adresse mit.

Ihre Bewerbung ist erst vollständig, wenn Sie Ihren Lebenslauf als PDF-Datei (vorzugsweise unter Verwendung des Europass-Formats ([9])) hochgeladen und ein Bewerbungsschreiben (Online-Formular, höchstens 8 000 Zeichen) eingegeben haben. Lebenslauf und Bewerbungsschreiben können in jeder Amtssprache der Europäischen Union eingereicht werden.

Es liegt in Ihrem Interesse, dafür Sorge zu tragen, dass Ihre Bewerbung korrekt, präzise und wahrheitsgemäß ist.

Nach Abschluss der Online-Anmeldung erhalten Sie eine E-Mail zur Bestätigung, dass Ihre Bewerbung registriert wurde. **Wenn Sie keine Bestätigungsmail erhalten, wurde Ihre Bewerbung nicht registriert!**

Der Fortgang Ihrer Bewerbung lässt sich nicht online verfolgen. Die Europäische Kommission wird sich direkt mit Ihnen in Verbindung setzen und Sie über den Stand des Bewerbungsverfahrens informieren.

([8]) Verordnung (EU) 2018/1725 des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates vom 23. Oktober 2018 zum Schutz natürlicher Personen bei der Verarbeitung personenbezogener Daten durch die Organe, Einrichtungen und sonstigen Stellen der Union, zum freien Datenverkehr und zur Aufhebung der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 45/2001 und des Beschlusses Nr. 1247/2002/EG (ABl. L 295 vom 21.11.2018, S. 39).

([9]) Informationen darüber, wie Sie Ihren Europass-Lebenslauf online erstellen können, finden Sie unter: https://europa.eu/europass/de/create-europass-cv.

Per E-Mail übermittelte Bewerbungen werden nicht berücksichtigt. Für weitere Auskünfte und/oder bei technischen Problemen wenden Sie sich bitte per E-Mail an:

HR-MANAGEMENT-ONLINE@ec.europa.eu.

Es liegt in Ihrer Verantwortung, Ihre Online-Bewerbung fristgerecht abzuschließen. Wir empfehlen dringend, mit der Bewerbung nicht bis zum letzten Moment zu warten, da ein erhöhtes Datenaufkommen oder eine Störung Ihrer Internet-Verbindung dazu führen kann, dass die Online-Bewerbung vor der Fertigstellung abgebrochen wird und Sie den gesamten Vorgang wiederholen müssen. Nach Bewerbungsschluss können keine Daten mehr eingegeben werden. Verspätete Bewerbungen werden nicht berücksichtigt.

Bewerbungsschluss

Bewerbungsschluss ist der **8. Juli 2024, 12.00 Uhr (mittags), Brüsseler Zeit**. Danach ist keine Online-Bewerbung mehr möglich.

Amtsblatt
der Europäischen Union

DE
Reihe C

C/2024/3554

7.6.2024

Zusammenfassung des Beschlusses der Kommission

vom 4. März 2024

in einem Verfahren nach Artikel 102 des Vertrags über die Arbeitsweise der Europäischen Union und Artikel 54 des EWR-Abkommens

(Sache AT.40437 – APPLE – PRAKTIKEN IN BEZUG AUF DEN APP STORE (MUSIKSTREAMING))

(bekannt gegeben unter Aktenzeichen C(2024) 1307 final)

(Nur die englische Fassung ist verbindlich)

(Text von Bedeutung für den EWR)

(C/2024/3554)

Am 4. März 2024 erließ die Kommission einen Beschluss in einem Verfahren nach Artikel 102 des Vertrags über die Arbeitsweise der Europäischen Union (AEUV) und Artikel 54 des Abkommens über den Europäischen Wirtschaftsraum (EWR-Abkommen). Nach Artikel 30 der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1/2003 des Rates [1] veröffentlicht die Kommission im Folgenden die Namen der Beteiligten und den wesentlichen Inhalt des Beschlusses einschließlich der verhängten Sanktionen, wobei sie dem berechtigten Interesse der Unternehmen an der Wahrung ihrer Geschäftsgeheimnisse Rechnung trägt.

1. EINLEITUNG

(1) Der Beschluss betrifft die missbräuchliche Ausnutzung einer beherrschenden Stellung auf dem Markt für die Bereitstellung (an Entwickler) von Plattformen für den Vertrieb von Musik-Software-Anwendungen (im Folgenden „Apps“) an Nutzer von iPhones und iPads (im Folgenden „iOS-Nutzer“). Er ist an Apple Inc. und Apple Distribution International Limited (im Folgenden zusammen „Apple“) gerichtet.

(2) Der Beschluss betrifft eine einzige und fortgesetzte Zuwiderhandlung gegen Artikel 102 AEUV und Artikel 54 des EWR-Abkommens in Form bestimmter Bedingungen (sogenannte „Anti-Steering Provisions,“ d. h. Vorgaben zur Einschränkung der Informations- und Wahlmöglichkeiten) für die Nutzung des App Store von Apple (im Folgenden „App Store“) durch Entwickler von Anwendungen für Musikstreaming-Dienste auf intelligenten mobilen Apple-Geräten mit den Betriebssystemen iOS bzw. iPadOS (d. h. auf den mobilen Geräten iPhone und iPad von Apple) im Europäischen Wirtschaftsraum (EWR).

2. BESCHREIBUNG DER SACHE

2.1 Verfahren

(3) Am 16. Juni 2020 leitete die Kommission gegen Apple ein Verfahren nach Artikel 2 Absatz 1 der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 773/2004 [2] ein.

(4) Am 30. April 2021 nahm die Kommission eine Mitteilung der Beschwerdepunkte gegen Apple an, in der sie die vorläufigen wettbewerbsrechtlichen Bedenken der Kommission in Bezug auf bestimmte Bedingungen für die Nutzung des App Store durch Entwickler von Anwendungen für Musikstreaming-Dienste auf intelligenten mobilen Apple-Geräten darlegte.

(5) Am 28. Februar 2023 ersetzte die Kommission die Mitteilung der Beschwerdepunkte vom 30. April 2021 durch eine überarbeitete Mitteilung der Beschwerdepunkte, in der der Umfang der in dieser Sache gegen Apple erhobenen Beschwerdepunkte auf die Vorgaben zur Einschränkung der Informations- und Wahlmöglichkeiten beschränkt wurde.

(6) Die mündliche Anhörung fand am 30. Juni 2023 statt.

(7) Am 6. Dezember 2023 übermittelte die Kommission Apple ein Sachverhaltsschreiben, in dem sie Apple auf zusätzliche Beweise aufmerksam machte, die nach der Annahme der Mitteilung der Beschwerdepunkte vom 28. Februar 2023 in die Verfahrensakte aufgenommen worden waren.

[1] ABl. L 1 vom 4.1.2003, S. 1, geändert durch die Verordnung (EG) Nr. 411/2004 (ABl. L 68 vom 6.3.2004, S. 1).

[2] Verordnung (EG) Nr. 773/2004 der Kommission vom 7. April 2004 über die Durchführung von Verfahren auf der Grundlage der Artikel 81 und 82 EG-Vertrag durch die Kommission (ABl. L 123 vom 27.4.2004, S. 18).

(8) Am 25. Januar 2024 kündigte Apple unter anderem Änderungen an iOS und an den App-Store-Regeln in der Europäischen Union an. Diese Änderungen waren am Tag des Erlasses des Beschlusses noch nicht in Kraft und wurden daher nicht geprüft.

(9) Am 1. März 2024 gab der Beratende Ausschuss für Kartell- und Monopolfragen eine befürwortende Stellungnahme ab.

2.2 **Zusammenfassung der Zuwiderhandlung**

(10) In dem Beschluss wird festgestellt, dass die Regeln von Apple in den verschiedenen Fassungen der App Store Review Guidelines, die während des Zeitraums der Zuwiderhandlung galten, und in den Bestimmungen der Lizenzvereinbarung zum Apple Developer Program (im Folgenden „Lizenzvereinbarung"), die Anbieter von Musikstreaming-Diensten daran hinderten, iOS-Nutzer über alternative (und oft günstigere) Abonnementmöglichkeiten außerhalb von iOS-Apps zu informieren und iOS-Nutzern die Möglichkeit zu bieten, tatsächlich eine freie Wahl zwischen alternativen Abonnementmöglichkeiten zu treffen (gemeint sind die Vorgaben zur Einschränkung der Informations- und Wahlmöglichkeiten), eine einzige und fortgesetzte Zuwiderhandlung gegen Artikel 102 AEUV und Artikel 54 des EWR-Abkommens darstellen.

(11) Mit dem Beschluss wird Apple aufgefordert, die einzige und fortgesetzte Zuwiderhandlung unverzüglich abzustellen. Zu diesem Zweck wird Apple angewiesen, die Vorgaben zur Einschränkung der Informations- und Wahlmöglichkeiten aus den einschlägigen, in den App Store Review Guidelines und der Lizenzvereinbarung festgelegten Bedingungen für die Nutzung des App Store durch Anbieter von Musikstreaming-Diensten zu streichen.

2.3 **Adressaten und Dauer**

(12) In dem Beschluss wird festgestellt, dass Apple Inc. und Apple Distribution International Limited gegen Artikel 102 AEUV sowie gegen Artikel 54 des EWR-Abkommens verstoßen haben.

(13) Die Zuwiderhandlung begann spätestens am 30. Juni 2015, als Apple endgültig eine beherrschende Stellung auf dem Markt für die Bereitstellung von Plattformen an Entwickler zum Zweck des Vertriebs von Anwendungen für Musikstreaming-Dienste für iOS-Nutzer im EWR erlangt hatte.

(14) Die Zuwiderhandlung dauerte zum Zeitpunkt des Erlasses des Beschlusses noch an, da Apple zu diesem Zeitpunkt die Vorgaben zur Einschränkung der Informations- und Wahlmöglichkeiten im EWR noch nicht aufgehoben hatte.

(15) Für die Zwecke des Beschlusses schließt der EWR gemäß Artikel 92 des Abkommens über den Austritt des Vereinigten Königreichs Großbritannien und Nordirland aus der Europäischen Union und der Europäischen Atomgemeinschaft für den Zeitraum bis einschließlich 31. Dezember 2020 das Vereinigte Königreich ein.

2.4 **Geldbuße**

(16) In dem Beschluss werden die allgemeine Methode der Leitlinien für das Verfahren zur Festsetzung von Geldbußen von 2006 ([3]) sowie Randnummer 37 der Leitlinien für das Verfahren zur Festsetzung von Geldbußen, die die Verhängung eines zusätzlichen Pauschalbetrags ermöglicht, angewandt.

2.4.1 **Höhe der Geldbuße nach der allgemeinen Methode**

a) Grundbetrag der Geldbuße

(17) Bei der Festsetzung der Geldbuße nach der allgemeinen Methode der Leitlinien für das Verfahren zur Festsetzung von Geldbußen von 2006 berücksichtigte die Kommission die von Apple im EWR erzielten Einnahmen aus den App-Store-Gebühren, die von den wichtigsten Anbietern von Musikstreaming-Diensten im Apple-Geschäftsjahr 2023 an Apple gezahlt wurden. Dieses Geschäftsjahr dauerte vom 25. September 2022 bis zum 30. September 2023 und war das letzte vollständige Geschäftsjahr, in dem Apple an der Zuwiderhandlung in Bezug auf den EWR beteiligt war.

([3]) Leitlinien für das Verfahren zur Festsetzung von Geldbußen gemäß Artikel 23 Absatz 2 Buchstabe a der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1/2003 (ABl. C 210 vom 1.9.2006, S. 2).

(18) Darüber hinaus berücksichtigte die Kommission die von Apple im Vereinigten Königreich erzielten Einnahmen aus den App-Store-Gebühren, die von den wichtigsten Anbietern von Musikstreaming-Diensten im Apple-Geschäftsjahr 2020 an Apple gezahlt wurden. Dieses Geschäftsjahr dauerte vom 29. September 2019 bis zum 26. September 2020.

(19) Die Kommission berücksichtigte die geografische Reichweite des von der Zuwiderhandlung betroffenen relevanten Markts sowie die Tatsache, dass Apple ein Monopol auf dem Markt für die Bereitstellung von Plattformen an Entwickler zum Zweck des Vertriebs von Anwendungen für Musikstreaming-Dienste für iOS-Nutzer mit einem Marktanteil von 100 % innehat, weiterhin die Anzahl von iOS-Premium-Abonnenten (d. h. mit kostenpflichtigem Abonnement) der wichtigsten Anbieter von Musikstreaming-Diensten, denen hohe monatliche Abonnementpreise in Rechnung gestellt wurden, und die sonstigen Schäden, die den Verbrauchern durch die Vorgaben zur Einschränkung der Informations- und Wahlmöglichkeiten von Apple entstanden sind, und zwar infolge gekündigter Abonnements aufgrund hoher Preise, schlechter Kundenerfahrungen, Schwierigkeiten beim Wechsel und Frustration, weil der Anbieter von Musikstreaming-Diensten erster Wahl nicht ermittelt werden konnte. Unter Berücksichtigung dieser Faktoren und angesichts der besonderen Umstände des vorliegenden Falls wurde der Anteil des Umsatzes, der im vorliegenden Fall zur Festsetzung des Grundbetrags der Geldbuße herangezogen werden sollte, auf 11 % festgesetzt.

(20) Die Kommission hat die oben genannte Dauer der einzigen und fortgesetzten Zuwiderhandlung berücksichtigt.

b) Anpassungen des Grundbetrags

(21) Die Kommission gelangte zu dem Schluss, dass im vorliegenden Fall erschwerende Umstände vorliegen, da Apple im Rahmen des Verwaltungsverfahrens unrichtige Informationen vorlegte; der Grundbetrag der Geldbuße wurde folglich um 20 % erhöht.

(22) In diesem Fall liegen keine mildernden Umstände vor.

2.4.2 **Abschreckung**

(23) Die Kommission war der Auffassung, dass sowohl die Besonderheiten des Falls als auch das Erfordernis der Abschreckung eine Abweichung von der allgemeinen Methode zur Festsetzung der Höhe der Geldbuße gemäß Randnummer 37 der Leitlinien für das Verfahren zur Festsetzung von Geldbußen von 2006 rechtfertigten.

(24) Im Einklang mit den in dem Beschluss dargelegten Grundsätzen hat die Kommission beschlossen, die nach der allgemeinen Methode gegen Apple zu verhängende Geldbuße um einen zusätzlichen Pauschalbetrag zu erhöhen.

3. **SCHLUSSFOLGERUNG**

(25) In Anbetracht der vorstehenden Ausführungen wird gegen Apple auf der Grundlage des Artikels 23 Absatz 2 der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1/2003 wegen der einzigen und fortgesetzten Zuwiderhandlung die folgende endgültige Geldbuße verhängt:

Grundbetrag der Geldbuße	40 984 000 EUR
Pauschalbetrag	1 800 000 000 EUR
Geldbuße gesamt	1 840 984 000 EUR

(26) Die berechneten Geldbußen übersteigen nicht 10 % des weltweiten Umsatzes von Apple.

Amtsblatt
der Europäischen Union

DE
Reihe C

C/2024/3555

7.6.2024

Stellungnahme des Beratenden Ausschusses für kartell- und monopolfragen aus seiner Sitzung vom 1. März 2024 zum Entwurf eines Beschlusses Sache AT.40437 – APPLE – PRAKTIKEN IN BEZUG AUF DEN APP STORE (MUSIKSTREAMING) – Sitzung per Videokonferenz – über „Skype for Business“

Berichterstatter: Niederlande

(Text von Bedeutung für den EWR)

(C/2024/3555)

1. Die Mitglieder des Beratenden Ausschusses (15 Mitgliedstaaten) teilen die Auffassung der Kommission, dass das im Beschlussentwurf behandelte Verhalten die missbräuchliche Ausnutzung einer beherrschenden Stellung in Form der Auferlegung unlauterer Handelsbedingungen darstellt, was einen Verstoß gegen Artikel 102 Buchstabe a AEUV und gegen Artikel 54 Buchstabe a des EWR-Abkommens darstellt.

2. Die Mitglieder des Beratenden Ausschusses (15 Mitgliedstaaten) teilen die Auffassung der Kommission, dass der Adressat des Beschlussentwurfs angewiesen werden sollte, die Zuwiderhandlung abzustellen, wie im Beschlussentwurf dargelegt.

3. Die Mitglieder des Beratenden Ausschusses (15 Mitgliedstaaten) teilen die Auffassung der Kommission, dass gegen den Adressaten des Beschlussentwurfs eine Geldbuße verhängt werden sollte.

4. Die Mitglieder des Beratenden Ausschusses (15 Mitgliedstaaten) teilen die Auffassung der Kommission in Bezug auf den Endbetrag der nach Artikel 23 Absatz 2 Buchstabe a der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1/2003 zu verhängenden Geldbuße.

5. Die Mitglieder des Beratenden Ausschusses (15 Mitgliedstaaten) teilen die Auffassung der Kommission, dass gegen den Adressaten des Beschlussentwurfs Zwangsgelder nach Artikel 24 Absatz 1 Buchstabe a der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1/2003 verhängt werden sollten.

6. Die Mitglieder des Beratenden Ausschusses (15 Mitgliedstaaten) empfehlen die Veröffentlichung seiner Stellungnahme im *Amtsblatt der Europäischen Union*.

Amtsblatt
der Europäischen Union

DE
Reihe C

C/2024/3556

7.6.2024

Abschlussbericht der Anhörungsbeauftragten [1]

Sache AT.40437 — Apple – Praktiken in Bezug auf den App Store (Musikstreaming)

(Text von Bedeutung für den EWR)

(C/2024/3556)

1. EINLEITUNG

1. Der Beschlussentwurf betrifft die missbräuchliche Ausnutzung einer beherrschenden Stellung durch Apple Inc. und Apple Distribution International Limited (im Folgenden zusammen „Apple“). Die Kommission beanstandet insbesondere, dass Apple von Entwicklern von Software-Anwendungen („Apps“) für Musikstreaming-Dienste auf intelligenten mobilen Geräten von Apple [2] verlangt, dass sie im Rahmen der vertraglichen Beziehung, die ihrer Präsenz im App Store von Apple zugrunde liegt, bestimmte Bestimmungen einhalten müssen.

2. Diese Bedingungen, im Folgenden als „Vorgaben zur Einschränkung der Informations- und Wahlmöglichkeiten“ bezeichnet, hindern Anbieter von Musikstreaming-Diensten daran, „iOS-Nutzer über alternative Abonnementmöglichkeiten außerhalb der iOS-Mobilfunk-App dieser Anbieter zu informieren und iOS-Nutzern die Möglichkeit zu bieten, tatsächlich eine freie Wahl zwischen alternativen Abonnementmöglichkeiten zu treffen“ [3]. Die Kommission gelangt zu dem Schluss, dass das Verhalten von Apple auf die Auferlegung unlauterer Handelsbedingungen im Sinne von Artikel 102 Buchstabe a AEUV hinausläuft, die den Interessen der iOS-Nutzer abträglich sind [4].

3. Am 30. April 2021 wurde in dieser Sache eine erste Mitteilung der Beschwerdepunkte übermittelt. Diese Mitteilung der Beschwerdepunkte wurde am 28. Februar 2023 durch eine ergänzende Mitteilung der Beschwerdepunkte (im Folgenden „Mitteilung der Ersatz-Beschwerdepunkte“) ersetzt. Die verfahrenstechnischen Entwicklungen in diesem Fall werden in den Abschnitten 2 und 3 dieses Berichts dargelegt. In Abschnitt 4 werden einige von Apple erhobene Verfahrensbeschwerden analysiert.

2. DAS VERFAHREN BIS ZUR MITTEILUNG DER ERSATZ-BESCHWERDEPUNKTE

2.1. Untersuchungsphase

4. Ab 2013 wurde die Kommission von Spotify AB (im Folgenden „Spotify“ oder „Beschwerdeführer“) kontaktiert, um über bestimmte Verhaltensweisen von Apple in Bezug auf im App Store tätige Anbieter von Musikstreaming-Diensten zu informieren. 2015 und in den Folgejahren fand eine Reihe von Zusammenkünften und Telefonaten mit dem Beschwerdeführer sowie mit Apple statt. Am 31. Juli 2015 wurde ein erstes Auskunftsersuchen an den Beschwerdeführer gerichtet. Weitere Auskunftsersuchen wurden im Verlauf des Verfahrens an Spotify, Apple und andere Anbieter von Musikstreaming-Diensten gerichtet.

5. Am 11. März 2019 reichte Spotify eine förmliche Beschwerde nach Artikel 7 der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1/2003 [5] ein (am 9. April 2019 folgte eine geänderte, endgültige Fassung der Beschwerde). In seiner Beschwerde machte Spotify u. a. geltend, Apple habe Spotify daran gehindert, innerhalb und bis zu einem gewissen Grad auch außerhalb der App für das Bestehen seiner Premium-Option zu werben, wodurch die Förderung günstigerer Abonnementmöglichkeiten außerhalb der iOS-Umgebung für iOS-Nutzer faktisch eingeschränkt werde. In diesem Zusammenhang gewährte die Kommission Apple frühzeitig Zugang zu der Beschwerde und zu weiteren Unterlagen und Informationen, die sie vom Beschwerdeführer erhielt, – auch in einem Datenraum – und gab beiden Parteien Gelegenheit, zum Vortrag der jeweils anderen Seite Stellung zu nehmen.

[1] Nach Artikel 1 des Beschlusses 2011/695/EU des Präsidenten der Europäischen Kommission vom 13. Oktober 2011 über Funktion und Mandat des Anhörungsbeauftragten in bestimmten Wettbewerbsverfahren (ABl. L 275 vom 20.10.2011, S. 29) (im Folgenden „Beschluss 2011/695/EU“).

[2] iPhones (mit dem Betriebssystem „iOS“) und iPads (mit dem Betriebssystem „iPadOS“) von Apple. Im Folgenden werden beide intelligenten mobilen Geräte zusammen als „iOS-Geräte“ und ihre Nutzer als „iOS-Nutzer“ bezeichnet.

[3] Erwägungsgrund 2 des Beschlussentwurfs.

[4] Erwägungsgründe 3 und 826 des Beschlussentwurfs.

[5] Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1/2003 des Rates vom 16. Dezember 2002 zur Durchführung der in den Artikeln 81 und 82 des Vertrags niedergelegten Wettbewerbsregeln (ABl. L 1 vom 4.1.2003, S. 1) (im Folgenden „Verordnung Nr. 1/2003“).

6. Im Laufe der Untersuchung führte der Beschwerdeführer im Februar 2020 eine Erhebung unter seinen Nutzern durch, um das Verbraucherverhalten bei der Wahl eines intelligenten Mobilgeräts und die Rolle, die Musikstreaming-Apps/-Dienste bei dieser Wahl spielen, zu analysieren (im Folgenden „Spotify-Erhebung“ ([6])). …“ ([7])). Die Vorbereitung der Erhebung … wurde zwischen …, Spotify und dem Sachbearbeiterteam der GD Wettbewerb ab Juni 2019 erörtert. Nachdem die GD Wettbewerb die Idee einer internen Erhebung geprüft (und verworfen ([8])) hatte, wandte sie sich an … Spotify … und schlug … vor, die Erhebung nach Angaben der Kommission durchzuführen, um sicherzustellen, dass die Ergebnisse der Erhebung für die Zwecke der Untersuchung von Nutzen sein würden.

7. Am 16. Juni 2020 leitete die Kommission ein Verfahren nach Artikel 11 Absatz 6 der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1/2003 und Artikel 2 Absatz 1 der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 773/2004 des Rates ein ([9]).

2.2. **Mitteilung der Beschwerdepunkte vom 30. April 2021**

8. Die Kommission erließ am 30. April 2021 eine erste Mitteilung der Beschwerdepunkte. In dieser Mitteilung der Beschwerdepunkte kam sie zu dem vorläufigen Schluss, dass Apple seine beherrschende Stellung auf dem Markt für Vertriebsplattformen für Musikstreaming-Apps für iOS-Nutzer durch die Auferlegung des Systems für In-App-Käufe und der Vorgaben zur Einschränkung der Informations- und Wahlmöglichkeiten für Entwickler von Musikstreaming-Apps missbraucht hat ([10]). Sie kam zu dem vorläufigen Schluss, dass diese Praktiken in ihrem Zusammenwirken zu einer spürbaren Verfälschung des Wettbewerbs auf dem EWR-weiten Markt für Musikstreaming-Dienste führen könnten, auf dem Apple über Apple Music direkt mit Entwicklern von Musikstreaming-Apps konkurriert. In der Mitteilung der Beschwerdepunkte wurde der Schluss gezogen, dass die beiden Praktiken die Kosten der Wettbewerber erhöhten und diese zwingen würden, entweder ihre Abonnementpreise für iOS zu erhöhen oder In-App-Abonnements auf iOS-Geräten zu deaktivieren, was in beiden Fällen ihre Rentabilität schmälern würde ([11]). Der Mitteilung der Beschwerdepunkte zufolge stellten die beiden Praktiken eine einzige und fortgesetzte Zuwiderhandlung gegen Artikel 102 AEUV und Artikel 54 des EWR-Abkommens dar; außerdem verstießen die Vorgaben zur Einschränkung der Informations- und Wahlmöglichkeiten auch für sich genommen gegen Artikel 102 AEUV ([12]).

2.3. **Akteneinsicht im Rahmen der ersten Mitteilung der Beschwerdepunkte**

9. Apple wurde am 12. Mai 2021 Akteneinsicht gewährt.

10. Am 13. Juni 2021 beantragte Apple bei der GD Wettbewerb zusätzliche Akteneinsicht. Infolgedessen gewährte die GD Wettbewerb den externen Beratern von Apple zwischen dem 5. und dem 12. Juli 2021 nach Rücksprache mit den einschlägigen Informationsanbietern im Rahmen eines Datenraumverfahrens weiteren Zugang zu bestimmten vertraulichen Dokumenten. Die externen Berater von Apple erstellten daraufhin einen Datenraumbericht, der von der GD Wettbewerb auf vertrauliche Informationen geprüft und Apple in einer um vertrauliche Angaben bereinigten Fassung offengelegt wurde.

11. Am 22. Juli 2021 stellte Apple mir gegenüber einen Antrag nach Artikel 7 des Beschlusses 2011/695/EU auf weiteren Zugang zu einer weniger stark bereinigten Fassung des Datenraumberichts (siehe oben unter Randnummer 10) und auf unbereinigte Fassungen bestimmter anderer Dokumente.

12. Apple zog den Antrag am 27. September 2021 vollständig zurück, sodass die Notwendigkeit einer Entscheidung nach Artikel 7 des Beschlusses 2011/695/EU entfiel.

([6]) ID 900 und ID 956.
([7]) ID 694 bis 697 und ID 718 bis 727.
([8]) Die GD Wettbewerb hatte ursprünglich eine Erhebung zu diesem Thema selbst in Auftrag gegeben, stieß jedoch auf Widerstand von […].
([9]) Verordnung (EG) Nr. 773/2004 der Kommission vom 7. April 2004 über die Durchführung von Verfahren auf der Grundlage der Artikel 81 und 82 EG-Vertrag durch die Kommission (ABl. L 123 vom 27.4.2004, S. 18) (im Folgenden „Verordnung Nr. 773/2004“).
([10]) Siehe Mitteilung der Beschwerdepunkte, Rn. 2.
([11]) Siehe Mitteilung der Beschwerdepunkte, Rn. 678.
([12]) Siehe Mitteilung der Beschwerdepunkte, Rn. 754.

13. Am 9. Juli 2021 beantragte Apple Zugang zu den unbereinigten Fassungen bestimmter zusätzlicher Antworten auf Auskunftsersuchen von (u. A.) Google LLC (im Folgenden „Google“). Um diesem Ersuchen nachzukommen, teilte die GD Wettbewerb Google mit, dass sie beabsichtige, bestimmte Dokumente an externe Berater von Apple in einem Datenraum weiterzugeben. Google widersprach der Offenlegung bestimmter Antworten auf die fraglichen Auskunftsersuchen ([13]) und übermittelte mir am 19. Juli 2021 seine Beschwerdepunkte nach Artikel 8 Absatz 2 des Beschlusses 2011/695/EU.

14. Am 30. August 2021 erließ ich einen Beschluss nach Artikel 8 des Beschlusses 2011/695/EU, in dem ich zu dem Ergebnis kam, dass die betreffenden Informationen den externen Beratern von Apple in einem Datenraum unter bestimmten im Beschluss festgelegten Bedingungen zugänglich gemacht werden könnten. Am 9. September 2021 gewährte die GD Wettbewerb den Beratern von Apple in einem Datenraum Zugang zu den betreffenden Informationen.

2.4. **Fristen und Antwort auf die erste Mitteilung der Beschwerdepunkte**

15. Apple wurde ursprünglich eine Frist von zwölf Wochen eingeräumt, um auf die Mitteilung der Beschwerdepunkte zu antworten. Auf einen an die GD Wettbewerb gerichteten Antrag wurde eine Verlängerung bis zum 3. September 2021 gewährt.

16. Am 27. August 2021 beantragte Apple eine weitere Verlängerung bis zum 17. September 2021, was die GD Wettbewerb ablehnte. Apple befasste mich am 1. September 2021 gemäß Artikel 9 des Beschlusses 2011/695/EU mit der Angelegenheit und wies dabei u. a. auf den Antrag auf weitere Akteneinsicht hin (Randnummer 11 oben), über den zu diesem Zeitpunkt noch nicht entschieden worden war. Ich gewährte die beantragte Verlängerung.

17. Apple übermittelte seine schriftliche Antwort auf die Mitteilung der Beschwerdepunkte am 17. September 2021. Apple beantragte nicht, die eigenen Argumente in einer mündlichen Anhörung vortragen zu dürfen.

2.5. **Betroffene Dritte**

18. Zwischen dem 31. Mai 2021 und dem 30. Juli 2021 ließ ich die European Consumer Organisation BEUC (im Folgenden „BEUC“), Google und die Computer & Communication Industry Association (im Folgenden „CCIA“) als betroffene Dritte nach Artikel 5 des Beschlusses 2011/695/EU zu.

19. Hingegen lehnte ich den Antrag eines Unternehmens, das im App Store von Apple mit einer App präsent ist, die keine Musikstreaming-Dienste anbietet, in der vorliegenden Rechtssache als betroffener Dritter gehört zu werden, ab. Der Antragsteller stützte sich in erster Linie auf das Argument, dass die Feststellungen, zu denen die Kommission im vorliegenden Fall gelangen könne, unmittelbar oder mittelbar jeden Entwickler beträfen, dessen App mit den eigenen Apps von Apple im App Store von Apple konkurriere, einschließlich der Entwickler von Apps im Tätigkeitsbereich des Antragstellers.

20. In meiner Entscheidung vom 4. August 2021, mit der der Antrag abgelehnt wurde, wies ich u. a. darauf hin, dass das „hinreichende Interesse“ eines potenziellen betroffenen Dritten im Hinblick auf den Gegenstand der Sache zu beurteilen sei, wie er in der Entscheidung der Kommission über die Einleitung des Verfahrens nach Artikel 11 Absatz 6 der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1/2003 und Artikel 2 der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 773/2004 festgelegt worden sei. Diese Entscheidung konzentrierte sich im vorliegenden Fall auf spezifische Praktiken und einen bestimmten Sektor (im Wesentlichen die Verpflichtung zu In-App-Käufen und die Vorgaben zur Einschränkung der Informations- und Wahlmöglichkeiten im Zusammenhang mit Musikstreaming-Apps). Ein Interesse am Ausgang einer Rechtssache als einem möglichen „Präzedenzfall“ für Sachverhalte, die außerhalb des Anwendungsbereichs des Beschlusses zur Einleitung eines Verfahrens liegen, reicht nicht aus, um ein „hinreichendes Interesse“ im Sinne von Artikel 5 Absatz 2 des Beschlusses 2011/695/EU und Artikel 13 Absatz 1 der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 773/2004 zu begründen. Gegen die Entscheidung wurde kein Rechtsbehelf eingelegt und sie wurde bestandskräftig.

([13]) Google stimmte der eingeschränkten Offenlegung anderer Antworten auf die Auskunftsersuchen zu, die die GD Wettbewerb den Beratern von Apple in einem zweiten Datenraum am 22. und 23. Juli 2021 zugänglich machte.

3. MITTEILUNG DER ERSATZ-BESCHWERDEPUNKTE VOM 28. FEBRUAR 2023 UND WEITERE ENTWICKLUNGEN

21. Am 28. Februar 2023 erließ die Kommission die Mitteilung der Ersatz-Beschwerdepunkte, die Apple am 1. März 2023 zugestellt wurden. Das Anschreiben wurde unmittelbar danach durch ein Korrigendum berichtigt, das Apple am 3. März 2023 zugesandt wurde.

22. Die Mitteilung der Ersatz-Beschwerdepunkte wird als „Ergänzende Mitteilung der Beschwerdepunkte" ([14]) definiert, die „die Mitteilung der Beschwerdepunkte vom 30. April 2021 ersetzt und den Sachverhalt, die vorläufigen Beschwerdepunkte der Kommission und die rechtliche Analyse umfassend darlegt" ([15]). Durch die Mitteilung der Ersatz-Beschwerdepunkte wurde der Geltungsbereich der in dieser Sache erhobenen Einwände auf die Vorgaben zur Einschränkung der Informations- und Wahlmöglichkeiten von Apple beschränkt.

23. In der Mitteilung der Ersatz-Beschwerdepunkte gelangte die Kommission vorläufig zu dem Schluss, dass Apple auf dem EWR-weiten Markt für die Bereitstellung von Plattformen zum Zweck des Vertriebs von Musikstreaming-Apps an iOS-Nutzer eine beherrschende Stellung innehat, da der App Store die einzige Zugriffsmöglichkeit für iOS-Nutzer ist ([16]). Der Mitteilung der Ersatz-Beschwerdepunkten zufolge trägt Apple „aufgrund dieser beherrschenden Stellung eine besondere Verantwortung, unter anderem dafür zu sorgen, dass den Entwicklern von Musikstreaming-Apps keine unlauteren Handelsbedingungen auferlegt werden" ([17]).

24. Die Kommission gelangte sodann vorläufig zu dem Schluss, dass Apples Vorgaben zur Einschränkung der Informations- und Wahlmöglichkeiten unlautere Handelsbedingungen im Sinne von Artikel 102 Buchstabe a AEUV darstellen, da: i) sie einseitig von Apple auferlegt werden ([18]), ii) sie den Interessen der iOS-Nutzer von Musikstreaming-Diensten, d. h. Verbrauchern, ([19]) sowie den Interessen der Anbieter von Musikstreaming-Diensten, die mit Apple Music auf der iOS-Plattform konkurrieren, schaden ([20]), iii) sie zur Erreichung eines legitimen Ziels nicht erforderlich und jedenfalls nicht verhältnismäßig sind ([21]). Darüber stellte die Kommission vorläufig fest, dass die Vorgaben zur Einschränkung der Informations- und Wahlmöglichkeiten nicht objektiv gerechtfertigt sind ([22]).

25. Die Kommission vertrat die vorläufige Auffassung, dass die Zuwiderhandlung das gesamte Gebiet des EWR betrifft, spätestens am 30. Juni 2015 (Datum der Inbetriebnahme von Apple Music) begann und weiterhin andauert ([23]).

26. Die Kommission unterrichtete Apple auch über ihre vorläufige Absicht, wegen der Zuwiderhandlung eine Geldbuße gegen Apple zu verhängen. Nachdem die Kommission die in den Leitlinien für das Verfahren zur Festsetzung von Geldbußen gemäß Artikel 23 Absatz 2 Buchstabe a der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1/2003 (im Folgenden „Geldbußen-Leitlinien") ([24]) festgelegten Grundsätze dargelegt hatte, teilte sie Apple mit, dass sie zur Berechnung des Umsatzes Folgendes heranzuziehen gedenke: „den Umsatz, den Apple im EWR mit den von Musikstreaming-Anbietern entrichteten App Store-Gebührenerzielt hat, sowie die Einnahmen, die Apple mit Apple Music im letzten vollständigen Geschäftsjahr der Zuwiderhandlung im EWR erzielt hat" ([25]). Die Kommission erklärte außerdem, dass „besonders darauf geachtet werden sollte, dass die Geldbußen eine ausreichend abschreckende Wirkung entfalten; zu diesem Zweck kann sie die Geldbuße gegen Unternehmen erhöhen, die besonders hohe Umsätze mit Waren oder Dienstleistungen erzielt haben, die nicht mit der Zuwiderhandlung in Zusammenhang stehen" ([26]). Dementsprechend wurde in der Mitteilung der Ersatz-Beschwerdepunkte die vorläufige Absicht der Kommission zum Ausdruck gebracht, „die Geldbuße auf eine Höhe festzusetzen, die ausreicht, um eine abschreckende Wirkung zu gewährleisten" ([27]).

([14]) Fußnote 1 der Mitteilung der Ersatz-Beschwerdepunkte.
([15]) Mitteilung der Ersatz-Beschwerdepunkte, Rn. 4.
([16]) Mitteilung der Ersatz-Beschwerdepunkte, Rn. 506.
([17]) Mitteilung der Ersatz-Beschwerdepunkte, Rn. 507.
([18]) Siehe Mitteilung der Ersatz-Beschwerdepunkte, Rn. 85, 86, 180 und 518.
([19]) Siehe Mitteilung der Ersatz-Beschwerdepunkte, Rn. 517 (und allgemein Abschnitt 9.3).
([20]) Siehe Mitteilung der Ersatz-Beschwerdepunkte, Rn. 621 (und allgemein Abschnitt 9.4).
([21]) Siehe Mitteilung der Ersatz-Beschwerdepunkte, Rn. 569 bis 613 und 730.
([22]) Siehe Mitteilung der Ersatz-Beschwerdepunkte, Rn. 615 bis 618 und 731 bis 736.
([23]) Mitteilung der Ersatz-Beschwerdepunkte, Rn. 754.
([24]) ABl. C 210 vom 1.9.2006, S. 2.
([25]) Mitteilung der Ersatz-Beschwerdepunkte, Rn. 780.
([26]) Mitteilung der Ersatz-Beschwerdepunkte, Rn. 798.
([27]) Mitteilung der Ersatz-Beschwerdepunkte, Rn. 799.

3.1. **Akteneinsicht nach der Mitteilung der Ersatz-Beschwerdepunkte**

27. Apple erhielt am 7. März 2023 Akteneinsicht durch elektronische Übermittlung der zur Verfahrensakte gehörenden Dokumente. Auf Antrag von Apple vom 28. März 2023 gewährte die GD Wettbewerb Apple am 6. April 2023 Zugang zu drei weiteren Dokumenten.

28. Im Anschluss an die Mitteilung der Ersatz-Beschwerdepunkte erhielt ich keine Anträge oder Beschwerden im Zusammenhang mit der Akteneinsicht.

3.2. **Fristen und Antwort auf die Mitteilung der Ersatz-Beschwerdepunkte**

29. Apple erhielt ursprünglich eine ab dem 7. März 2023 (Datum, an dem Apple Einsicht in die Akte erhielt) laufende, achtwöchige Frist für die Beantwortung der Mitteilung der Ersatz-Beschwerdepunkte.

30. Am 12. April 2023 stellte Apple bei der GD Wettbewerb einen Antrag auf Fristverlängerung bis zum 1. Juni 2023, den die GD Wettbewerb mit Schreiben vom 17. April 2023 ablehnte.

31. Am 18. April 2023 befasste Apple mich gemäß Artikel 9 des Beschlusses 2011/695/EU mit der Angelegenheit. Ich gewährte Apple eine Verlängerung bis zum 19. Mai 2023 und lehnte den Antrag im Übrigen ab ([28]).

32. Am 19. Mai 2023 reichte Apple seine Antwort auf die Mitteilung der Ersatz-Beschwerdepunkte ein, in der das Unternehmen gemäß Artikel 12 Absatz 1 der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 773/2004 beantragte, die eigenen Argumente in einer mündlichen Anhörung vortragen zu dürfen.

3.3. **Mündliche Anhörung**

33. Die mündliche Anhörung fand am 30. Juni 2023 statt. Es nahmen Vertreter von Apple, des Beschwerdeführers und eines betroffenen Dritten (BEUC) teil. Die mündliche Anhörung verlief reibungslos und es gab keine Verfahrensbeschwerden im Zusammenhang mit der Anhörung.

3.4. **Sachverhaltsschreiben**

34. Am 6. Dezember 2023 veröffentlichte die Kommission ein Sachverhaltsschreiben (im Folgenden „Sachverhaltsaltsschreiben"), in dem sie Apple über „zusätzliche Sachverhalte und Beweise, auf die sich die Kommission stützen kann, um ihre vorläufigen Schlussfolgerungen in der Mitteilung der Ersatz-Beschwerdepunkte zu untermauern" informierte ([29]).

35. Mit dem Sachverhaltsschreiben teilte die Kommission Apple ferner mit, dass sie beabsichtige, sich auf die Feststellung zu konzentrieren, dass Apple gegen Artikel 102 Buchstabe a AEUV verstoßen habe, da Apples Vorgaben zur Einschränkung der Informations- und Wahlmöglichkeiten zum Nachteil der iOS-Nutzer unlautere Handelsbedingungen zur Folge hätten, dass sie sich hingegen nicht weiter auf ihre vorläufigen Feststellungen in der Mitteilung der Ersatz-Beschwerdepunkte stützen wollte, wonach die Vorgaben zur Einschränkung der Informations- und Wahlmöglichkeiten unlautere Handelsbedingungen zum Nachteil der Entwickler von Musikstreaming-Apps auferlegten ([30]). In dem Sachverhaltsschreiben wurden Apple Gesichtspunkte und Beweise übermittelt, die zur weiteren Untermauerung der vorläufigen Schlussfolgerung über die Unlauterkeit der Vorgaben zur Einschränkung der Informations- und Wahlmöglichkeiten gegenüber iOS-Nutzern herangezogen werden sollten ([31]). Einige dieser Gesichtspunkte und Beweise wurden zuvor in der Mitteilung der Ersatz-Beschwerdepunkte in dem Abschnitt über die Analyse des unlauteren Wesens der Vorgaben zur Einschränkung der Informations- und Wahlmöglichkeiten gegenüber Entwicklern von Musikstreaming-Apps dargelegt.

([28]) E-Mail vom 21. April 2023 an Sven Völcker (Latham & Watkins LLP).
([29]) Sachverhaltsschreiben, Rn. 8.
([30]) Sachverhaltsschreiben, Rn. 30 und 78.
([31]) Sachverhaltsschreiben, Rn. 31 bis 72.

36. Außerdem teilte die Kommission Apple mit, dass sie „im vorliegenden Fall eine Anpassung der Berechnung der Geldbuße in Erwägung" ziehe. Um der Eingrenzung der ursprünglich in der Mitteilung der Ersatz-Beschwerdepunkte dargelegten Beschwerdepunkte Rechnung zu tragen, erklärte die Kommission ihre Absicht, „den Umsatz ausschließlich auf der Grundlage des Umsatzes zu bestimmen, den Apple im EWR mit den App-Store-Gebühren erzielt hat, die von Musikstreaming-Anbietern an Apple entrichtet wurden", ohne die Einnahmen zu berücksichtigen, die Apple mit Apple Music im EWR erzielt hat ([32]). Aufgrund der Besonderheiten des Falls und der Tatsache, dass der auf diese Weise berechnete Umsatz „weder die Art noch das Ausmaß des durch die Zuwiderhandlung verursachten Schadens hinreichend widerspiegelt", ([33]) teilte die Kommission Apple jedoch mit, dass sie in Erwägung ziehen könnte, Randnummer 37 der Geldbußen-Leitlinien ([34]) anzuwenden, um Apple einen zusätzlichen Pauschalbetrag aufzuerlegen und so sicherzustellen, dass die verhängte Geldbuße „hinreichend abschreckend ist, und zwar sowohl für Apple als auch für andere marktbeherrschende Unternehmen im Allgemeinen", dass „[sie] verhältnismäßig [ist] und die Schwere und Dauer der Zuwiderhandlung widerspiegelt" ([35]).

3.4.1. *Akteneinsicht nach dem Sachverhaltsschreiben*

37. Am 7. Dezember 2023 wurde Apple Zugang zu den Dokumenten gewährt, die zwischen dem Erlass der Mitteilung der Ersatz-Beschwerdepunkte und dem Erlass des Sachverhaltsschreibens in die Akte aufgenommen wurden. Auf Antrag von Apple vom 13. Dezember 2023 gewährte die GD Wettbewerb Apple am 15. Dezember 2023 weiteren Zugang zu zusätzlichen Dokumenten.

38. Im Anschluss an das Sachverhaltsschreiben erhielt ich keine Anträge oder Beschwerden von Apple in Bezug auf die Akteneinsicht.

3.4.2. *An die Anhörungsbeauftragte gerichtete Anträge im Anschluss an das Sachverhaltsschreiben*

39. Die Kommission gab Apple bis zum 12. Januar 2024 Zeit, sich schriftlich zu dem Sachverhaltsschreiben zu äußern.

40. Mit E-Mail vom 8. Dezember 2023 ersuchte Apple die GD Wettbewerb um eine Verlängerung dieser Frist bis zum 16. Februar 2024. Apple argumentierte unter anderem, dass die Kommission „eine ergänzende Mitteilung der Beschwerdepunkte hätte erlassen müssen", da das „Sachverhaltsschreiben die Art des mutmaßlichen Missbrauchs grundlegend verändert", und dass in jedem Fall die „erheblichen Änderungen, die das Sachverhaltsschreiben an den Beweisen und der Schadenstheorie der Mitteilung der Ersatz-Beschwerdepunkte mit sich bringt, eine Verlängerung im Einklang mit den Fristen für die Beantwortung einer Mitteilung der Beschwerdepunkte rechtfertigen". Dies wurde von der GD Wettbewerb am 12. Dezember 2023 schriftlich abgelehnt.

41. Mit Schreiben vom 15. Dezember 2023 ersuchte Apple mich, i) „eine Stellungnahme nach den Artikeln 3 und 14 des [Beschlusses 2011/695/EU] abzugeben, und zwar dahin gehend, dass die Kommission eine ergänzende Mitteilung der Beschwerdepunkte annimmt, wenn sie die im Sachverhaltsschreiben dargelegten Beschwerdepunkte aufrechterhalten möchte", ii) „die Frist für die Antwort auf das Sachverhaltsschreiben auf unbestimmte Zeit zu verlängern, bis die Kommission eine ergänzende Mitteilung der Beschwerdepunkte erlassen hat (sofern sie dies beschließt)" oder iii) hilfsweise eine Verlängerung bis zum 26. Februar 2024 zu gewähren, um auf das Sachverhaltsschreiben zu antworten.

42. Apple stützte seine Anträge auf folgende Argumente:

a) Zu der im Sachverhaltsschreiben geäußerten Absicht der Kommission, sich nicht mehr auf die vorläufigen Feststellungen der Mitteilung der Ersatz-Beschwerdepunkte zu stützen, wonach Apple einen Missbrauch zum Nachteil anderer Anbieter von Musikstreaming-Diensten begangen habe, machte Apple geltend, dies sei keine bloße Einschränkung der Ersatz-Beschwerdepunkte, sondern eine „wesentliche Änderung der Schadens- und Beweistheorie der Ersatz-Beschwerdepunkte". Apple brachte vor, dass der (verbleibende) Einwand, Apple habe einen Missbrauch zum Nachteil der Nutzer des App Store begangen, von der nunmehr aufgegebenen Behauptung abhänge. In diesem Zusammenhang brachte Apple vor, dass der verbleibende Einwand in der Mitteilung der Ersatz-Beschwerdepunkte nicht mehr „ausreichend begründet" sei und dass sein Umfang und Inhalt durch das Sachverhaltsschreiben (unter Bezugnahme auf das Urteil des Gerichts in der Rechtssache T-604/18, Google Android ([36])) maßgeblich ergänzt würden.

([32]) Sachverhaltsschreiben, Rn. 79.

([33]) In diesem Zusammenhang stellte die Kommission Folgendes fest: i) „Ein erheblicher Teil des durch die Zuwiderhandlung von Apple verursachten Schadens besteht in einem nicht-monetären Schaden für iOS-Nutzer von Musikstreaming-Diensten im EWR", ii) es gibt „eine beträchtliche Zahl von iOS-Abonnenten von Musikstreaming-Diensten, die einen finanziellen Schaden erlitten haben".

([34]) Randnummer 37 der Geldbußen-Leitlinien lautet: „In diesen Leitlinien wird die allgemeine Methode für die Berechnung der Geldbußen dargelegt; jedoch können die besonderen Umstände eines Falles oder die Notwendigkeit einer ausreichend hohen Abschreckungswirkung ein Abweichen von dieser Methode oder der unter Randnummer 21 festgelegten Obergrenze rechtfertigen."

([35]) Sachverhaltsschreiben, Rn. 82 und 83.

([36]) Urteil vom 14. September 2022, Google und Alphabet/Kommission (Google Android), T-604/18, ECLI:EU:T:2022:541.

b) Apple brachte vor, dass Abschnitt 8 des Sachverhaltsschreibens über die mögliche Verhängung von Geldbußen (siehe Randnummer 35 oben) eine wesentliche Änderung der Methode und der Höhe der geplanten Geldbuße darstelle. Apple machte geltend, dass die mögliche Anwendung von Randnummer 37 der Geldbußen-Leitlinien und die daraus resultierende Abweichung von den Geldbußen-Leitlinien weder in der Mitteilung der Beschwerdepunkte noch in der Mitteilung der Ersatz-Beschwerdepunkte vorgesehen sei und dass die Kommission daher „eine Mitteilung der Beschwerdepunkte und nicht ein Sachverhaltsschreiben hätte erlassen müssen, um die vorgeschlagene Geldbuße drastisch zu ändern und von den Geldbußen-Leitlinien abzuweichen". Apple machte ferner geltend, dass die beabsichtigte Anwendung von Randnummer 37 der Geldbußen-Leitlinien „im vorliegenden Fall völlig unangemessen" sei und dass dieser Ansatz zu einer Geldbuße führen könne, die „höhere Größenordnungen" habe als die, die sich aus der Anwendung der in der Mitteilung der Ersatz-Beschwerdepunkte festgelegten Kriterien hätte ergeben können.

43. Ich lehnte die Anträge von Apple am 21. Dezember 2023 ab. Zunächst wies ich darauf hin, dass Artikel 3 Absatz 5 und Artikel 14 Absatz 2 des Beschlusses 2011/695/EU es Anhörungsbeauftragten zwar ermöglichen, von Amts wegen innerhalb des institutionellen Rahmens der Kommission Stellung zu nehmen, dass aber keine dieser Bestimmungen das Recht einer Partei eines Wettbewerbsverfahrens vorsehe, ein solches Vorgehen gegenüber dem Anhörungsbeauftragten zu beantragen.

44. In Bezug auf das Vorbringen von Apple, die Kommission hätte anstelle eines Sachverhaltsschreibens eine ergänzende Mitteilung der Beschwerdepunkte übermitteln müssen, insbesondere in Bezug auf die oben unter Randnummer 41 Buchstabe a zusammengefassten Argumente von Apple, gelangte ich zu folgendem Ergebnis:

— Meiner Einschätzung nach enthielt das Sachverhaltsschreiben im Wesentlichen Aktualisierungen zu Sachinformationen, mit denen der verbleibende Einwand im Einklang mit Randnummer 111 der Bekanntmachung über bewährte Vorgehensweisen in Kartellverfahren weiter untermauert werden sollte ([37]).

— In dem Sachverhaltsschreiben wurde Apple tatsächlich darüber informiert, dass die Kommission die Behauptung eines Missbrauchs zum Nachteil der App-Entwickler nicht mehr aufrechterhalte. Zum einen ist jedoch eine Einschränkung der in einer Mitteilung der Beschwerdepunkte genannten Vorwürfe im abschließenden Beschluss möglich und erfordert (auch) kein Sachverhaltsschreiben, zum anderen hat diese Entwicklung – entgegen der Argumentation von Apple – den verbleibenden Einwand nicht unklar gemacht. In der Mitteilung der Ersatz-Beschwerdepunkte gelangte die Kommission vorläufig zu dem Schluss, dass sowohl die iOS-Nutzer von Musikstreaming-Diensten als auch die Entwickler von Musikstreaming-Apps Opfer missbräuchlicher Verhaltensweisen waren und dass jede dieser Verhaltensweisen für sich genommen die in der Mitteilung der Ersatz-Beschwerdepunkte festgelegten rechtlichen Kriterien erfüllte ([38]). Darüber hinaus konnte ich im Sachverhaltsschreiben keine Grundlage für die Schlussfolgerung finden, dass die verbleibenden Einwände in dem Sinne unklar wurden, dass Apple nicht in der Lage wäre, nachzuvollziehen, auf welche Gesichtspunkte sich die Kommission stützen wollte.

— Der verbleibende Einwand war auch nicht im Sinne des Urteils zu Google Android „unzureichend begründet". Dieser Einwand wurde bereits in der Mitteilung der Ersatz-Beschwerdepunkte ausführlich erläutert und begründet. In diesem Zusammenhang konnte die Kommission auf Gesichtspunkte verweisen, die in dem Teil der Mitteilung der Ersatz-Beschwerdepunkte enthalten waren, der sich auf einen angeblichen Missbrauch zum Nachteil von App-Entwicklern bezog. Im Sachverhaltsschreiben wird klargestellt, dass einige dieser Gesichtspunkte für die Bewertung nach wie vor relevant sind, auch im Nachgang zu dem Sachverhaltsschreiben ([39]).

45. Zu den unter Randnummer 41 Buchstabe b zusammengefassten Argumenten von Apple in Bezug auf die vorgeschlagenen Änderungen der Verfahren zur Festsetzung von Geldbußen (siehe auch Randnummer 35 oben) bin ich zu folgendem Ergebnis gelangt:

([37]) Bekanntmachung der Kommission über bewährte Vorgehensweisen in Verfahren nach Artikel 101 und 102 des AEUV (ABl. C 308 vom 20.10.2011, S. 6) (im Folgenden „Bekanntmachung über bewährte Vorgehensweisen in Kartellverfahren "). Unter Randnummer 111 der Bekanntmachung über bewährte Vorgehensweisen in Kartellverfahren heißt es: „Werden die dem Unternehmen bereits in der Mitteilung der Beschwerdepunkte zur Last gelegten Beschwerdepunkte jedoch lediglich durch neue Beweise untermauert, auf die sich die Kommission stützen will, teilt sie den Parteien dies durch ein einfaches Schreiben mit ‚Tatbestandsschreiben'."

([38]) Siehe Mitteilung der Ersatz-Beschwerdepunkte, Rn. 504. Vgl. auch Randnummer 24 dieses Berichts.

([39]) Siehe Urteil des Gerichts vom 18. Mai 2022, Wieland-Werke/Kommission, T-251/19, ECLI:EU:T:2022:296, Rn. 698.

— Nach der ständigen Rechtsprechung zur Ausübung der Verteidigungsrechte in Bezug auf die Verhängung von Geldbußen gilt, „dass die Kommission ihre Verpflichtung zur Wahrung des Anhörungsrechts der Unternehmen erfüllt, wenn sie in der Mitteilung der Beschwerdepunkte ausdrücklich darauf hinweist, dass sie prüfen wird, ob gegen die betreffenden Unternehmen Geldbußen festzusetzen sind, und die für die etwaige Festsetzung einer Geldbuße wesentlichen tatsächlichen und rechtlichen Gesichtspunkte wie Schwere und Dauer der vermuteten Zuwiderhandlung sowie den Umstand anführt, ob diese vorsätzlich oder fahrlässig begangen wurde. Damit macht sie gegenüber den Unternehmen die Angaben, die diese für ihre Verteidigung nicht nur gegen die Feststellung der Zuwiderhandlung, sondern auch gegen die Festsetzung einer Geldbuße benötigen." ([40])

— Die Kommission kann die Parteien schriftlich über ihre Absicht unterrichten, die Geldbuße auf der Grundlage von Randnummer 37 der Leitlinien für das Verfahren zur Festsetzung von Geldbußen zu erhöhen, um den Besonderheiten des Falles Rechnung zu tragen und eine abschreckende Wirkung zu erzielen. Da es sich nicht um „tatsächliche und rechtliche Umstände handelt, die zur Verhängung einer Geldbuße führen können", ist die Kommission nicht verpflichtet, diese Absicht in der Mitteilung der Beschwerdepunkte oder in einer etwaigen ergänzenden Mitteilung der Beschwerdepunkte zu erwähnen oder die Anhörung der Parteien zu diese Frage in einer mündlichen Verhandlung zu ermöglichen ([41]).

— Das Argument von Apple, die Situation im Urteil des Gerichts zu Campine habe sich auf eine „vollständig andere Situation" bezogen, da „die Abweichung von den Geldbußen-Leitlinien eine geringfügige Änderung der Art und Weise betrifft, auf die die Kommission den Umsatz berechnet hat", ist nicht überzeugend. Die Beurteilung, ob ein Schreiben in einem bestimmten Fall ein geeignetes Instrument ist, kann grundsätzlich nicht von der Höhe der potenziellen Geldbuße abhängen, die sich aus der Anwendung von Randnummer 37 der Geldbußen-Leitlinien ergeben könnte. Die gegenteilige Auffassung liefe im Wesentlichen darauf hinaus, den Unternehmen je nach ihrer Größe mehr oder weniger weitreichende Verfahrensrechte einzuräumen.

46. Aus diesen Gründen habe ich den Antrag von Apple auf eine unbegrenzte Aussetzung der Frist für die Beantwortung des Sachverhaltsschreibens bis zur Übermittlung einer ergänzenden Mitteilung der Beschwerdepunkte abgelehnt.

47. Ich habe auch den Antrag von Apple auf Fristverlängerung bis zum 26. Februar 2024 gemäß Artikel 9 des Beschlusses 2011/695/EU abgelehnt. Im Einzelnen habe ich die folgenden Gesichtspunkte geprüft: i) Der Umfang des Verstoßes wurde eingeschränkt, ii) die im Sachverhaltsschreiben angegebenen neuen Informationen waren begrenzt und bestanden in der überwiegenden Mehrheit aus reinen Aktualisierungen von Informationen, iii) beträchtliche Teile der Informationen, auf die sich das Sachverhaltsschreiben stützte, stammten aus allgemein verfügbaren Branchenquellen, iv) Apple berief sich nicht auf objektive Hindernisse, die einer fristgerechten Beantwortung des Sachverhaltsschreibens entgegenstünden.

3.4.3. *Antwort auf das Sachverhaltsschreiben – Antrag auf eine mündliche Anhörung*

48. Apple übermittelte seine Antwort auf das Sachverhaltsschreiben am 12. Januar 2024. Apple beantragte in seiner Erwiderung, in einer mündlichen Anhörung gehört zu werden.

49. Mit Schreiben vom 17. Januar 2024 lehnte die GD Wettbewerb diesen Antrag mit der Begründung ab, dass sich Artikel 12 der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 773/2004 auf das Recht auf Anhörung der Parteien beziehe, an die die Kommission „eine Mitteilung der Beschwerdepunkte gerichtet hat", und dass die Parteien daher „nach dem Erlass eines Sachverhaltsschreibens keinen Anspruch auf eine mündliche Anhörung haben". Die GD Wettbewerb teilte Apple mit, dass das Unternehmen im Falle der gegensätzlichen Auffassung berechtigt sei, „die Angelegenheit zur Entscheidung an den Anhörungsbeauftragten zu verweisen".

50. Am 23. Januar 2024 stellte Apple einen entsprechenden Antrag bei mir und beantragte die Durchführung einer mündlichen Anhörung. Apple machte – wie schon in seiner früheren Vorlage vom 15. Dezember 2023 – geltend, dass die Kommission „ein Sachverhaltsschreiben unangemessen verwendet" habe, und argumentierte damit, dass das Unternehmen berechtigt sein sollte, seinen Standpunkt in einer mündlichen Anhörung darzulegen, unabhängig davon, ob die Kommission eine weitere Mitteilung der Beschwerdepunkte hätte abgeben müssen.

([40]) Urteil des Gerichts vom 15. März 2006, BASF/Kommission, T-15/02, ECLI:EU:T:2006:74, Rn. 48, und Urteil des Gerichts vom 20. März 2002, Lögstör Rör/Kommission, T-16/99, ECLI:EU:T:2002:72, Rn. 193, bestätigt durch das Urteil vom 28. Juni 2005, Dansk Rørindustri u. a./Kommission, verbundene Rechtssachen C-189/02 P, C-202/02 P, C-205/02 P, C-208/02 P und C-213/02 P, ECLI:EU:C:2005:408, Rn. 428.

([41]) Urteil des Gerichts vom 7. November 2019, Campine und Campine Recycling/Kommission, T-240/17, ECLI:EU:T:2019:778, Rn. 357.

51. Mit Schreiben vom 30. Januar 2024 wies ich diesen Antrag mit der Begründung zurück, dass Artikel 11 Absatz 1 und Artikel 12 Absatz 1 der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 773/2004 sowie Artikel 6 und Erwägungsgrund 19 des Beschlusses 2011/695/EU nur denjenigen Parteien das Recht auf mündliche Anhörung in Kartellsachen gewähren, an die die Kommission eine Mitteilung der Beschwerdepunkte gerichtet hat, und soweit dies mit den schriftlichen Antworten der Parteien auf eine Mitteilung der Beschwerdepunkte im Zusammenhang steht. Das Regelwerk sieht in keinem anderen Verfahrensstadium, wie z. B. nach der Annahme eines Sachverhaltsschreibens, eine mündliche Anhörung vor. Dies wird auch durch die ständige Rechtsprechung bestätigt ([42]).

52. In Anbetracht der angeführten Bestimmungen und ständigen Rechtsprechung war ich der Ansicht, dass Apple keinen Anspruch auf eine mündliche Verhandlung hatte und dass ich daher nicht befugt wäre, einem Antrag auf mündliche Verhandlung in diesem Verfahrensstadium stattzugeben. Nach Prüfung der Argumente von Apple in seiner Antwort auf das Sachverhaltsschreiben, die denen in seinem Antrag vom 15. Dezember 2023 sehr ähnlich waren, habe ich auch meine Bewertung der Forderung von Apple wiederholt, dass die Kommission eine ergänzende Mitteilung der Beschwerdepunkte hätte erlassen müssen, wie bereits in meinem Beschluss vom 21. Dezember 2023 dargelegt (Randnummern 42 bis 45 oben).

4. **VERFAHRENSARGUMENTE VON BEDEUTUNG**

53. Apple brachte in seinen Antworten auf die Mitteilung der Ersatz-Beschwerdepunkte und das Sachverhaltsschreiben sowie während der mündlichen Anhörung eine Reihe von Verfahrensfragen zur Sprache.

4.1. **Kritik, dass die Akte der Kommission nicht auf dem neuesten Stand sei, und andere Argumente im Zusammenhang mit dem von der Kommission erhobenen Beweismaterial**

54. Apple äußerte eine Reihe von Kritikpunkten im Zusammenhang mit der Beweislage im vorliegenden Fall.

55. Erstens machte Apple in seiner Antwort auf die Mitteilung der Ersatz-Beschwerdepunkte geltend, dass diese „die Beweislast nicht erfüllt, da sie sich auf veraltete und unvollständige Informationen und Daten stützt", und dass die Kommission „vor Erlass der Mitteilung der Ersatz-Beschwerdepunkte keine neuen Ermittlungsmaßnahmen ergriffen hat", obwohl „sie eine völlig neue Schadenstheorie anführt" ([43]). In ähnlicher Weise macht Apple in seiner Antwort auf das Sachverhaltsschreiben geltend, dass „die Kommission mit Ausnahme von zwei an Spotify übermittelten Auskunftsersuchen zur Aktualisierung von Daten […] seit März 2020 keine förmlichen neuen Untersuchungsschritte unternommen hat" ([44]). Apple macht ferner geltend, der Kommission zwischen 2019 und 2022 „wesentliche Informationen über Marktentwicklungen" vorgelegt zu haben, dass die Kommission diese Informationen jedoch in der Mitteilung der Ersatz-Beschwerdepunkte nicht berücksichtigt habe ([45]). Apple macht daher geltend, dass die Kommission es unterlassen habe, „die tatsächliche Entwicklung des Marktes zu berücksichtigen" und ein „hinreichend vollständiges Bild des Falles" wiederzugeben ([46]). Apple verweist auf die Urteile Intel und Slovak Telekom, um geltend zu machen, dass die Kommission „hinreichend genaue und übereinstimmende Beweise vorlegen" und „ihre Entscheidung auf der Grundlage aller Informationen treffen [muss], die diese Entscheidung beeinflussen könnten" ([47]), einschließlich der von Apple selbst im Laufe des Verfahrens vorgelegten „Informationen über Marktentwicklungen".

([42]) Siehe Urteil des Gerichts vom 25. Januar 2023, GEA Group/Kommission, T-640/16 RENV, ECLI:EU:T:2023:18, Rn. 210 bis 212 und 224, und Urteil des Gerichts vom 12. Juni 2014, Intel/Kommission, T-286/09, ECLI:EU:T:2014:547 (aus anderen Gründen für nichtig erklärt), Rn. 327.

([43]) Antwort auf die Mitteilung der Ersatz-Beschwerdepunkte, Rn. 57.

([44]) Antwort auf das Sachverhaltsschreiben, Rn. 60.

([45]) Präsentation von Apple in der mündlichen Anhörung, Folie 233. Die von Apple vorgelegten „wesentlichen Informationen über Marktentwicklungen" sind in der Antwort auf die Mitteilung der Ersatz-Beschwerdepunkte, Rn. 61 und 62, enthalten.

([46]) Präsentation von Apple in der mündlichen Anhörung, Folien 230 bis 231.

([47]) Siehe Urteil des Gerichts vom 26. Januar 2022, Intel/Kommission, T-286/09 RENV, ECLI:EU:T:2022:19, Rn. 163, und Urteil des Gerichts vom 22. März 2012, *Slovak Telekom/Kommission*, verbundene Rechtssachen T-458/09 und T-171/10, ECLI:EU:T:2012:145, Rn. 71. Zur Stützung seines Standpunkts beruft sich Apple auch auf das Urteil des Gerichts vom 10. November 2021, Google und Alphabet/Kommission (Google Shopping), T-612/17, ECLI:EU:T:2021:763, Rn. 440.

56. Zweitens hat Apple in der mündlichen Verhandlung ausdrücklich darauf hingewiesen, die Kommission in einer Vorlage vom 9. März 2022 ([48]) aufgefordert zu haben, weitere Untersuchungsmaßnahmen durchzuführen, um zusätzliche Informationen über die „praktischen Auswirkungen der Vorgaben zur Einschränkung der Informations- und Wahlmöglichkeiten" zu erhalten. Konkret forderte Apple die Kommission auf, folgende Informationen von Anbietern von Musikstreaming-Diensten einzuholen: i) die Zahl der E-Mails, die Anbieter von Musikstreaming-Diensten innerhalb von sechs Monaten nach Erhalt der E-Mail-Adressen von iOS- bzw. Android-Nutzern über die Anmeldefunktion in den iOS- und Android-Apps an diese Nutzer versandt haben, ii) eine Beschreibung etwaiger Unterschiede in der Praxis der Anbieter von Musikstreaming-Diensten in Bezug auf das Versenden von Werbe-E-Mails zwischen iOS und Android sowie interne Dokumente, die etwaige Unterschiede bei den plattformspezifischen Praktiken dokumentieren ([49]). Apple wiederholte diese Forderung in seiner Antwort auf das Sachverhaltsschreiben ([50]). Apple macht geltend, dass diese Informationen geeignet wären, das Fehlen von Auswirkungen der Bestimmungen zu den Vorgaben zur Einschränkung der Informations- und Wahlmöglichkeiten nachzuweisen.

57. Drittens brachte Apple das Argument vor, dass „die Verfahrensakte keine Beweise im Hinblick auf Ausbeutungsmissbrauch enthält" und dass die Beweise im Wesentlichen im Hinblick auf die Annahme einer Schadenstheorie der Verdrängung statt der Annahme einer Schadenstheorie des Ausbeutungsmissbrauchs erhoben worden seien ([51]). In der mündlichen Anhörung legte Apple Beispiele für die Fragen vor, die die Kommission in den 2019 und 2020 erlassenen Auskunftsersuchen an Anbieter von Musikstreaming-Diensten gerichtet hatte, und argumentierte, dass diese Fragen speziell darauf abzielten, die marktverschließende Wirkung der Verpflichtung zu In-App-Käufen und der Vorgaben zur Einschränkung der Informations- und Wahlmöglichkeiten von Apple zu bewerten ([52]). Dies habe nach Apples Ansicht zu „erheblichen Lücken in der Analyse der Mitteilung der Ersatz-Beschwerdepunkte" geführt, die die Kommission nicht behoben habe, da sie keine zusätzlichen Untersuchungsmaßnahmen und Faktenerhebungen durchgeführt habe ([53]).

58. Viertens hat Apple in der mündlichen Anhörung eine zusätzliche verfahrensrechtliche Rüge in Bezug auf die vom Beschwerdeführer im Februar 2020 durchgeführte Verbraucherbefragung erhoben (Randnummer 6 oben). Apple machte im Wesentlichen geltend, dass die Kommission die Spotify-Erhebung „unzulässig beeinflusst" habe, da sie: „Spotify die Erhebung empfohlen hat", „den ersten Entwurf der Erhebung erstellt hat", betont habe, dass in der Erhebung „Lock-in-Effekte nachgewiesen werden sollten", und die Erhebung durch zahlreiche Telefonate und Zusammenkünfte mit dem Beschwerdeführer zu diesem Thema „gelenkt" habe ([54]).

59. Die diesbezüglichen Behauptungen von Apple sind nur teilweise Gegenstand des Abschlussberichts der Anhörungsbeauftragten. Die Frage, ob die Kommission einen hinreichenden Beweis für einen Verstoß gegen Artikel 102 AEUV, einschließlich der Beweiskraft bestimmter Beweismittel, erbracht hat, ist eine Frage der materiellen Beurteilung des Falls. Allgemein ist es Sache der Kommission zu prüfen, ob sie der Auffassung ist, dass die erhobenen Beweise den Beweisanforderungen genügen, die für den Erlass einer Verbotsentscheidung erforderlich sind.

60. In Bezug auf die Behauptung, die Kommission stütze sich für mehrere ihrer vorläufigen Feststellungen in der Mitteilung der Ersatz-Beschwerdepunkte auf „überholte" Beweise ([55]), weise ich darauf hin, dass die Kommission ein Sachverhaltsschreiben herausgegeben hat, in dem sie aktualisierte Beweise für die meisten der von Apple als „überholt" erachteten Tatsachenfeststellungen vorgelegt hat.

61. In der Antwort auf das Sachverhaltsschreiben behauptet Apple dennoch, dass sich das Sachverhaltsschreiben „weiterhin auf veraltete Daten stützt" ([56]) (insbesondere die Experimente des Beschwerdeführers und […] aus dem Jahr 2018). Der Beschlussentwurf nimmt zu dieser Kritik Stellung und erklärt, „es hat keine nennenswerten Marktentwicklungen gegeben, die die Ergebnisse der Spotify-Experimente von 2018 oder die […] infrage stellen" ([57]).

([48]) Vorlage von Apple an die Europäische Kommission vom 9. März 2022, *Rechtliche Anforderungen an einen etwaigen Beschluss der Kommission*, ID 2245 (im Folgenden „Vorlage von Apple vom 9. März 2022").
([49]) Präsentation von Apple in der mündlichen Anhörung, Folien 247 bis 252, und Vorlage von Apple vom 9. März 2022, Rn. 20.
([50]) Siehe Antwort auf das Sachverhaltsschreiben, Rn. 68 bis 72.
([51]) Präsentation von Apple in der mündlichen Anhörung, Folien 244 bis 245.
([52]) Präsentation von Apple in der mündlichen Anhörung, Folien 244 bis 245 (mit den Fragen 22, 30, 31, 33, 35 und 36 der im April 2019 an Anbieter von Musikstreaming-Diensten gerichteten Auskunftsersuchen). Auf diese Auskunftsersuchen wird unter Randnummer 28 der Mitteilung der Ersatz-Beschwerdepunkte verwiesen.
([53]) Antwort auf die Mitteilung der Ersatz-Beschwerdepunkte, Rn. 64 bis 65.
([54]) Eine ähnliche Behauptung wird von Apple in der Antwort auf das Sachverhaltsschreiben (Rn. 7) erhoben.
([55]) Randnummer 54 oben. Siehe Antwort auf die Mitteilung der Ersatz-Beschwerdepunkte, Rn. 61, und die Präsentation von Apple in der mündlichen Verhandlung, Folien 236 bis 238.
([56]) Antwort auf das Sachverhaltsschreiben, Rn. 55.
([57]) Erwägungsgrund 59 des Beschlussentwurfs.

62. Es ist Sache der Kommission zu bestimmen, ob sie der Auffassung ist, dass die erhobenen Beweise dem Beweismaß entsprechen, und ob der Zeitablauf den Beweiswert dieser Daten geschmälert hat. Es kann daher nicht festgestellt werden, dass diesbezüglich ein Verstoß gegen eine Verfahrensvorschrift vorliegt.

63. Gleiches gilt im Wesentlichen für die Behauptung von Apple, „wesentliche Informationen über Marktentwicklungen" vorgelegt zu haben. Es ist wiederum Sache der Kommission, die Bedeutung dieser Informationen zu beurteilen und zu prüfen, ob Apple Gesichtspunkte vorgetragen hat, die geeignet sind, den Beweiswert der Beweismittel, auf die sich die Kommission zum Nachweis des Vorliegens der Zuwiderhandlung stützt, zu beeinträchtigen ([58]). In jedem Fall geht aus dem Beschlussentwurf hervor, dass die genannten Marktentwicklungen berücksichtigt wurden ([59]).

64. Im Hinblick auf das spezifische Ersuchen von Apple, zusätzliche Informationen über durch Anbieter von Musikstreaming-Diensten versandte E-Mails zu sammeln, ([60]) ist daran zu erinnern, dass die Kommission in der Regel und nach ständiger Rechtsprechung über einen Ermessensspielraum bei der Frage verfügt, ob es angemessen ist, Untersuchungsmaßnahmen zu ergreifen ([61]).

65. Im Urteil zu Intel entschied das Gericht, dass die Kommission in Fällen, in denen besondere Umstände vorliegen, verpflichtet sein kann, auf Antrag der betroffenen Partei bzw. der betroffenen Parteien „bestimmte Dokumente zu beschaffen", wenn folgende Kriterien erfüllt sind: i) dass es „für das betroffene Unternehmen tatsächlich unmöglich ist, sich die Dokumente selbst zu beschaffen", ii) dass die Dokumente von dem Unternehmen, das sie beantragt, so genau wie möglich bezeichnet werden, iii) dass die Dokumente „für die Verteidigung des betroffenen Unternehmens wahrscheinlich eine beträchtliche Bedeutung haben", iv) dass der Umfang der betreffenden Dokumente „im Hinblick auf die Bedeutung, die die Dokumente im Rahmen der Ermittlungen haben können, [nicht] unverhältnismäßig ist" ([62]).

66. Apple macht geltend, dass die vom Gericht im Urteil zu Intel aufgestellten Voraussetzungen im vorliegenden Fall erfüllt seien. Es ist jedoch darauf hinzuweisen, dass das Gericht auch Folgendes klargestellt hat: „Bei der Entscheidung der Frage, ob die Bedeutung des angeblich entlastenden Materials die Beschaffung der Dokumente rechtfertigt, verfügt die Kommission über ein Ermessen. Sie kann einen Antrag z. B. mit der Begründung zurückweisen, dass das möglicherweise entlastende Material Fragen betrifft, die für die Feststellungen, die für den Nachweis der Zuwiderhandlung erforderlich sind, nicht zentral sind." ([63])

67. In dem Beschlussentwurf (und zwar in den Erwägungsgründen 64 bis 66) wird im Wesentlichen der Schluss gezogen, dass die Kommission von diesem Ermessensspielraum Gebrauch gemacht hat. Außerdem werden die Gründe erläutert, aus denen die Kommission zu dem Schluss gelangt ist, dass die Beschaffung der Informationen gemäß dem Antrag von Apple angesichts anderer bereits in der Akte enthaltener Beweise nicht erforderlich war. Ich bin der Ansicht, dass die Kommission von ihrem Untersuchungsspielraum rechtmäßig Gebrauch gemacht hat und im Beschlussentwurf in zulässiger Weise zu diesem Ergebnis gelangt ist.

68. Meine Bewertung der Beschwerde von Apple, dass die Akte keine Beweise im Hinblick auf einen Ausbeutungsmissbrauch enthalte (da die erste Mitteilung der Beschwerdepunkte eine „ausschließende" Schadenstheorie verfolgte) ([64]), führt zu einem ähnlichen Ergebnis. Selbst wenn die Kommission ursprünglich andere Untersuchungen verfolgte, die später aufgegeben wurden, stellt dies keine Verletzung der Verfahrensrechte dar, da Apple die Möglichkeit hatte, sich in vollem Umfang zu verteidigen. In diesem Zusammenhang erließ die Kommission die Mitteilung der Ersatz-Beschwerdepunkte (siehe Randnummer 21 oben) und Apple verfügte über alle Verfahrensrechte, die mit dem Erlass einer Mitteilung der Beschwerdepunkte verbunden waren, einschließlich der Möglichkeit, eigene Argumente in einer mündlichen Anhörung vorzutragen (siehe Randnummer 32 oben). Wie bereits erwähnt, ist die Frage, ob die Beweise die Feststellungen des Beschlussentwurfs stützen, von wesentlicher Bedeutung.

([58]) Siehe unter anderem das Urteil des Gerichts vom 26. Januar 2022, Intel/Kommission, T-286/09 RENV, ECLI:EU:T:2022:19, Rn. 166.

([59]) Siehe z. B. die Erwägungsgründe 182 (betreffend das Programm von Apple für die Accountberechtigung für externe Links) und 187 (hinsichtlich der praktischen Auswirkungen der Vorgaben zur Einschränkung der Informations- und Wahlmöglichkeiten) des Beschlussentwurfs.

([60]) Randnummer 55 oben.

([61]) Urteil des Gerichts vom 2. Februar 2022, Scania u. a./Kommission (T-799/17, ECLI:EU:T:2022:48, Rn. 154, und Urteil des Gerichts vom 12. Juni 2014, Intel/Kommission (T-286/09, ECLI:EU:T:2014:547, Rn. 360, 362 und 371).

([62]) Urteil des Gerichts vom 12. Juni 2014, Intel/Kommission, T-286/09, ECLI:EU:T:2014:547, Rn. 371 bis 382.

([63]) Urteil des Gerichts vom 12. Juni 2014, Intel/Kommission, T-286/09, ECLI:EU:T:2014:547, Rn. 380.

([64]) Randnummer 56 oben.

69. Was schließlich die Behauptungen bezüglich der Vorbereitung der vom Beschwerdeführer durchgeführten Erhebung betrifft, so steht fest, dass der Vorschlag an den Beschwerdeführer (und parallel an Apple) durch die Schwierigkeiten ausgelöst wurde, die das Unternehmen […] im Zusammenhang mit einer von der Kommission in Auftrag zu gebenden Erhebung geltend machte.

70. Was speziell die angebliche „Lenkung" der Erhebung durch die Kommission anbelangt, so ist es meines Erachtens unproblematisch, dass dem Beschwerdeführer Orientierungshilfen für die Erstellung eines Fragebogens und die Durchführung einer Erhebung gegeben wurden, die für den Gegenstand der Untersuchung nützlich sein würden. In diesem Zusammenhang stellt die GD Wettbewerb fest, dass ihre Beteiligung an der Spotify-Erhebung […] im Wesentlichen darauf beschränkt war, sicherzustellen, dass die Erhebung […] für den Fall relevant ist, während die Erhebung […] letztlich vom Beschwerdeführer unabhängig durchgeführt […] das Gutachten zur Erhebung […] […] erstellt […] wurde. Dies ergibt sich auch aus den Protokollen der Gespräche zwischen der Kommission und dem Beschwerdeführer zu diesem Thema ([65]). Meines Erachtens enthält dieses Protokoll keinen Anhaltspunkt für die Feststellung eines unzulässigen Eingriffs vonseiten der Kommission.

71. Was schließlich die angebliche Forderung der Kommission betrifft, die Erhebung „sollte Lock-in-Effekte belegen", stützt Apple dieses Argument auf zwei Auszüge aus den Protokollen zweier Telefonate zwischen der Kommission und dem Beschwerdeführer ([66]). Aus dem genauen Wortlaut dieser Auszüge ergibt sich jedoch, dass die Kommission den Beschwerdeführer nicht auf ein im Voraus festgelegtes Ergebnis lenkte, sondern erläuterte, dass die Verbraucherumfrage „erforderlich [wäre], um die Lock-in-Effekte von iPhone-Nutzern auf das iOS-Ökosystem zu *evaluieren*" ([67]) oder „die Lock-in-Effekte von iPhone-Nutzern zu *bewerten*" ([68]). Diese Sätze können im Wesentlichen als einfache Anpassung des Zwecks der Erhebung verstanden werden […].

72. Nach alledem bin ich nicht der Ansicht, dass die Kommission gegen ihre Pflicht verstoßen hat, bei der Vorbereitung der Spotify-Erhebung objektiv oder unparteiisch zu handeln.

73. Im Ergebnis bin ich nicht der Ansicht, dass die Kritik von Apple in Bezug auf die Beweislage in der Rechtssache eine Verletzung der Verteidigungsrechte von Apple erkennen lässt.

4.2. **Beschwerden im Zusammenhang mit den Protokollen von Telefonaten und Zusammenkünften**

74. In der Antwort auf das Sachverhaltsschreiben ([69]) macht Apple eine angebliche Verletzung seiner Verteidigungsrechte geltend, da die Protokolle der Kommission nicht den rechtlichen Anforderungen entsprächen, die erforderlich seien, um die wirksame Ausübung der Verteidigungsrechte von Apple zu gewährleisten ([70]).

([65]) Siehe beispielsweise das Protokoll der Zusammenkunft mit dem Beschwerdeführer vom 19. November 2019 (ID 1411), wo es heißt: „Die Kommission hat darauf hingewiesen, dass dies die Erhebung von Spotify ist und bleibt und dass sich die Erhebung nicht auf die Europäische Kommission beziehen sollte. Die Kommission unterstützt Spotify lediglich dabei, Fragen zu stellen, die sie für die Untersuchung für nützlich erachtet." Siehe auch das Protokoll zum Telefonat mit dem Beschwerdeführer vom 30. Januar 2020 (ID 1426), in dem die „Kommission Spotify mitteilte, dass sie die genaue Formulierung der Fragen Spotify überlässt".

([66]) Siehe Randnummer 2 des Protokolls der Zusammenkunft mit dem Beschwerdeführer vom 15. Juli 2019 (ID 1415) und Randnummer 2 des Protokolls eines Telefonats mit dem Beschwerdeführer vom 10. September 2019 (ID 1428) (beide zitiert in der Präsentation von Apple in der mündlichen Anhörung, Folien 257 bis 258).

([67]) Randnummer 2 des Protokolls eines Telefonats mit dem Beschwerdeführer vom 10. September 2019 (ID 1428) (Hervorhebung hinzugefügt).

([68]) Randnummer 2 des Protokolls der Zusammenkunft mit dem Beschwerdeführer vom 15. Juli 2019 (ID 1415) (Hervorhebung hinzugefügt).

([69]) Insbesondere Anlage 5 der Antwort auf das Sachverhaltsschreiben (ID 3320).

([70]) Anlage 5 der Antwort auf das Sachverhaltsschreiben, S. 1.

75. Apple macht geltend, dass 29 Protokolle von Telefonaten und Zusammenkünfte in der Akte ([71]) nur „eine kurze Zusammenfassung der während der Zusammenkunft behandelten Themen enthalten, die offensichtlich nicht detailliert genug ist, um die Gespräche widerzuspiegeln", und dass diese Protokolle daher gegen Artikel 19 der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1/2003 in seiner Auslegung durch die jüngste Rechtsprechung der Unionsgerichte, beginnend mit Intel, verstoßen ([72]).

76. Konkret macht Apple in Bezug auf die meisten fraglichen Protokolle geltend, dass der Inhalt der jeweiligen Zusammenkunft nicht ausreichend detailliert zusammengefasst sei. In Bezug auf eine bestimmte Anzahl von Protokollen beanstandet Apple auch, dass darin weder die Teilnehmer noch die Dauer des betreffenden Telefonats oder der betreffenden Zusammenkunft angegeben seien. In Bezug auf bestimmte Zusammenkünfte, bei denen eine Präsentation verwendet wurde (zu der Apple Zugang erhielt), macht Apple Folgendes geltend: „Der Umstand, dass eine Präsentation erstellt wurde, ist nicht geeignet, das Versäumnis der Kommission zu beheben, Apple Angaben zum Inhalt der geführten Gespräche bereitzustellen." ([73])

77. Apple macht ferner für jedes dieser Protokolle geltend, dass „die erörterten Informationen es Apple ermöglicht hätten, sich besser verteidigen zu können." ([74])

78. Schließlich macht Apple geltend: „Die Verzögerung bei der Erstellung des Protokolls der Kommission gibt Anlass zu weiteren Zweifeln an dessen Genauigkeit." ([75]) Apple zufolge enthält die Akte Gesichtspunkte, die „nahelegen, dass die Kommission die entsprechenden Protokolle weder zum Zeitpunkt der jeweiligen Zusammenkünfte noch kurz danach erstellt hat" ([76]). Darüber hinaus macht Apple geltend, die Kommission habe die meisten Protokolle von Zusammenkünften erst „mehrere Jahre nach deren Stattfinden" in der Akte registriert und dem Beschwerdeführer (zur Genehmigung durch diesen) übermittelt ([77]). Apple macht daher Folgendes geltend: „Selbst wenn das Sachbearbeiterteam das Protokoll tatsächlich zeitgleich erstellt hätte, … ist es nicht plausibel, dass die Anmerkungen von Spotify die Erörterungen, die stattgefunden haben, korrekt wiedergeben könnten." ([78])

([71]) Konkret beziehen sich die betreffenden Protokolle auf die Zusammenkünfte und Telefonate mit dem Beschwerdeführer an folgenden Terminen: 4. Juli 2013 (ID 2452), 6. Februar 2015 (ID 2456 und ID 2748), 16. März 2015 (ID 2451), 25. Juni 2015 (ID 1640), 16. Juli 2015 (ID 2551), 10. Dezember 2015 (ID 1564), 13. Juli 2016 (ID 1639), 25. Juli 2016 (ID 1562), 28. Juli 2016 (ID 1641), 7. Dezember 2016 (ID 1560), 14. Dezember 2016 (ID 1563), 6. Januar 2017 (ID 1637), 16. Oktober 2017 (ID 1561), 12. Februar 2018 (ID 1559), 18. September 2018 (ID 1419), 15. November 2018 (ID 1638), 12. März 2019 (ID 1416), 4. Juni 2019 (ID 1414), 19. Juni 2019 (ID 1420), 3. Juli 2019 (ID 1427), 15. Juli 2019 (ID 1415), 8. November 2019 (ID 1421), 19. November 2019 (ID 1411), 24. März 2020 (ID 1422), 16. Juni 2020 (ID 1430), 28. Oktober 2020 (ID 1346), 10. Mai 2021 (ID 2535), 30. September 2021 (ID 2541) sowie auf ein Telefonat mit BEUC vom 7. Mai 2021 (ID 2483). Der Begriff „Protokoll" wird während der gesamten Bewertung für alle aufgeführten Dokumente verwendet.
In Bezug auf die Telefonate/Zusammenkünfte vom 4. Juli 2013, 16. März 2015 und 16. Juli 2015 ist jedoch darauf hinzuweisen, dass es sich bei den genannten Dokumenten um zeitgleich erstellte E-Mails handelt, in denen intern über den Inhalt der Telefonate/Zusammenkünfte berichtet wurde. In Bezug auf die Zusammenkunft vom 6. Februar 2015 handelt es sich um zeitgleich erstellte handschriftliche Notizen eines Beamten der GD Wettbewerb, der an der Zusammenkunft teilnahm.

([72]) Siehe insbesondere das Urteil des Gerichts vom 6. September 2017, Intel/Kommission, C-413/14 P, ECLI:EU:C:2017:632 (im Folgenden „Intel"), das Urteil des Gerichts vom 15. Juni 2022, Qualcomm/Kommission, T-235/18, ECLI:EU:T:2022:358 (im Folgenden „Qualcomm"), das Urteil des Gerichts vom 14. September 2022, Google und Alphabet/Kommission („Google Android"), T-604/18, ECLI:EU:T:2022:541 (im Folgenden „Google Android"), das Urteil des Gerichts vom 9. März 2023, *Les Mousquetaires und ITM Entreprises/Kommission*, C-682/20 P, ECLI:EU:C:2023:170 (im Folgenden „*Les Mousquetaires*"), das Urteil des Gerichts vom 9. März 2023, *Intermarché Casino Achats/Kommission*, C-693/20 P, ECLI:EU:C:2023:172 (im Folgenden „*Intermarché Casino Achats*"), das Urteil des Gerichts vom 9. März 2023, *Casino, Guichard-Perrachon und Achats merchandises Casino/Kommission*, C-690/20 P, ECLI:EU:C:2023:171 (im Folgenden „*Casino*"), und das Urteil des Gerichts vom 25. Oktober 2023, *Bulgarian Energy Holding u. a./Kommission*, T-136/19, ECLI:EU:T:2023:669 (im Folgenden „*Bulgargaz*").

([73]) Anlage 5 der Antwort auf das Sachverhaltsschreiben, Rn. 15 und 18.

([74]) Anlage 5 Abschnitt III der Antwort auf das Sachverhaltsschreiben. Diese Formulierung wird im Wesentlichen in Bezug auf jedes Protokoll wiederholt (siehe Anlage 5 der Antwort auf das Sachverhaltsschreiben, Rn. 71 bis 98).

([75]) Anlage 5 Abschnitt IV der Antwort auf das Sachverhaltsschreiben.

([76]) Anlage 5 der Antwort auf das Sachverhaltsschreiben, Rn. 103.

([77]) Anlage 5 der Antwort auf das Sachverhaltsschreiben, Rn. 110.

([78]) Anlage 5 der Antwort auf das Sachverhaltsschreiben, Rn. 110.

79. Ich weise darauf hin, dass Apple in Bezug auf diese Fragen keine Anträge oder Beschwerden an mich gerichtet hat, sei es nach Artikel 7 des Beschlusses 2011/695/EU oder auf anderer Grundlage. Anhörungsbeauftragte sind jedoch dafür zuständig zu prüfen, ob die von der Kommission in Wettbewerbsangelegenheiten durchgeführten Verfahren mit den Verteidigungsrechten in Einklang stehen. Nach Artikel 16 Absatz 1 und Artikel 17 Absatz 1 des Beschlusses 2011/695/EU erstellen sie einen Abschlussbericht zu der Frage, ob die Verfahrensrechte in jeder Phase des Verfahrens effektiv gewahrt worden sind. Dieser wird der Kommission zusammen mit dem Beschlussentwurf vorgelegt. Anhörungsbeauftragte können daher eine Beschwerde wie die vorliegende nicht ignorieren, wenn eine Partei behauptet, dass die von der Kommission vorgelegten Protokolle nicht den Anforderungen des Artikels 19 der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1/2003 in seiner Auslegung durch die ständige Rechtsprechung entsprächen. Mit diesen Argumenten macht Apple nämlich geltend, dass seine Verteidigungsrechte verletzt worden seien. Daher muss die Angelegenheit – auch wenn es sich um ein spätes Verfahrensstadium handelt – in diesem Bericht ausführlich behandelt werden.

4.2.1. *Ständige Rechtsprechung zur Aufzeichnung von Befragungen gemäß Artikel 19 der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1/2003*

80. Aus der ständigen Rechtsprechung der Unionsgerichte folgt, „dass für die Kommission eine Pflicht besteht, jede Befragung, die sie nach Art. 19 der Verordnung Nr. 1/2003 durchführt, um Informationen einzuholen, die sich auf den Gegenstand ihrer Untersuchung beziehen, in der von ihr gewählten Form aufzuzeichnen." ([79])

81. Der Gerichtshof betonte: „Es ist … klarzustellen, dass nach dem Gegenstand der von der Kommission geführten Gespräche zu unterscheiden ist, weil nur diejenigen Gespräche, die auf die Einholung von Informationen über den Gegenstand einer Untersuchung der Kommission gerichtet sind, in den Anwendungsbereich von Art. 19 Abs. 1 der Verordnung Nr. 1/2003 fallen und damit der Aufzeichnungspflicht unterliegen." ([80]) Zusammenkünfte und Telefonate mit Dritten, die diese Voraussetzung erfüllen, sind als „Befragungen" im Sinne des Artikels 19 der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1/2003 anzusehen.

82. Was die Aufzeichnungspflicht betrifft, reicht es nach ständiger Rechtsprechung der Unionsgerichte „nicht aus, dass die Kommission die bei der Befragung angesprochenen Themen kurz zusammenfasst". Vielmehr muss die Kommission „in der Lage sein, Angaben zum Inhalt der Erörterungen im Rahmen dieser Befragung, insbesondere zur Art der Auskünfte über die dabei behandelten Themen, zu machen" ([81]).

83. Zu den Schlussfolgerungen, die aus Verfahrensfehlern in Bezug auf Befragungsprotokolle im Sinne von Artikel 19 zu ziehen sind, hat das Gericht in den Urteilen zu den Rechtssachen Qualcomm und Google Android klargestellt, dass zu prüfen ist, ob das Unternehmen in Anbetracht der konkreten tatsächlichen und rechtlichen Umstände des Einzelfalls hinreichend nachgewiesen hat, „dass [es] sich ohne den genannten Verfahrensfehler besser hätte verteidigen können" ([82]). Ohne einen solchen Nachweis kann eine Verletzung seiner Verteidigungsrechte nämlich nicht festgestellt werden ([83]).

84. Eine solche Zuwiderhandlung wäre nach Ansicht des Gerichts „als erbracht anzusehen, wenn der Inhalt der nicht offengelegten Beweise weder bestimmt noch bestimmbar ist", da in diesem Fall „dem Unternehmen nicht die unerfüllbare Beweislast für den Inhalt des Dokuments auferlegt werden [kann]" ([84]).

([79]) Intel, Rn. 91, siehe auch Qualcomm, Rn. 190, Google Android, Rn. 912, und *Bulgargaz*, Rn. 1157.
([80]) *Intermarché Casino Achats*, Rn. 106, *Les Mousquetaires*, Rn. 90, *Casino*, Rn. 86.
([81]) Qualcomm, Rn. 190. Siehe auch Intel, Rn. 92, Google Android, Rn. 912, und Bulgargaz, Rn. 1160.
([82]) Qualcomm, Rn. 202, und Google Android, Rn. 935.
([83]) Google Android, Rn. 934.
([84]) Google Android, Rn. 935.

85. „Ist dagegen der Inhalt der Beweise, zu denen der Zugang beschränkt war, nachträglich ermittelt worden oder lässt er sich nachträglich ermitteln, kann das Unternehmen nicht von dem Nachweis befreit werden, dass es keinen Zugang zu belastenden oder entlastenden Beweisen hatte und welche Schlussfolgerungen daraus für die Ausübung seiner Verteidigungsrechte zu ziehen sind. Dies ist der Fall, sofern das Unternehmen über aussagekräftige Hinweise zu den Autoren sowie zu Art und Inhalt der ihm vorenthaltenen Dokumente verfügt." ([85])

86. Das Gericht stellt ferner klar, dass das Unternehmen bei nicht offengelegten *belastenden* Beweisen nachweisen muss, „dass das Verfahren zu einem anderen Ergebnis hätte führen können, wenn diese belastenden Beweise offengelegt worden wären". In Bezug auf nicht offengelegte *entlastende* Beweise „muss das betroffene Unternehmen nachweisen, dass es diese Beweise zu seiner Verteidigung hätte einsetzen können, und zwar in dem Sinne, dass es, wenn es sich im Verwaltungsverfahren auf sie hätte berufen können, Gesichtspunkte hätte geltend machen können, die nicht mit den in diesem Stadium von der Kommission gezogenen Schlüssen übereinstimmten und daher, in welcher Weise auch immer, die von der Kommission in ihrer Entscheidung vorgenommenen Beurteilungen hätten beeinflussen können." ([86])

87. Ausgehend davon besteht die „Prüfung" zum einen darin zu beurteilen, ob die Kommission ihrer Pflicht nachgekommen ist, etwaige Befragungen aufzuzeichnen, die sie gemäß Artikel 19 durchgeführt hat, um Informationen über den Gegenstand einer Untersuchung einzuholen, und zum anderen bei Nichteinhaltung dieser Pflicht von Fall zu Fall zu bewerten, ob das Unternehmen hinreichend nachgewiesen hat, dass es ohne diesen Verfahrensfehler besser in der Lage gewesen wäre, sich zu verteidigen.

4.2.2. *Zur Frage, ob sich die fraglichen Protokolle auf Zusammenkünfte beziehen, die als „Befragungen" im Sinne von Artikel 19 der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1/2003 einzustufen sind*

88. Wie bereits ausgeführt, gilt die Aufzeichnungspflicht nach Artikel 19 Absatz 1 der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1/2003 nur für Befragungen, bei denen die Kommission „Informationen einholen will, die sich auf den Gegenstand einer Untersuchung der Kommission beziehen" ([87]).

89. Es liegt daher auf der Hand, dass nicht jeder Austausch zwischen der Kommission und externen Gesprächspartnern diese Kriterien erfüllt.

90. Insbesondere ist meines Erachtens ein Austausch über verfahrensrechtliche oder formelle Aspekte, die nicht den Inhalt einer Rechtssache betreffen (wie z. B. Zusammenkünfte, die sich nur mit Anträgen auf vertrauliche Behandlung befassen), nicht als Befragung im Sinne von Artikel 19 Absatz 1 der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1/2003 anzusehen. Ein solcher Austausch dient nicht der Einholung von Informationen, die sich auf den Gegenstand des Verfahrens beziehen. Sie liefern keine Informationen, die als „Indizien" oder „Beweismittel" dienen könnten, die als Grundlage für die materielle Bewertung des Falls geeignet sein könnten. Diese Art von Informationen muss in einem ordnungsgemäßen Protokoll festgehalten werden, damit sie den Unternehmen, die Gegenstand eines Wettbewerbsverfahrens sind, zugänglich gemacht werden können und sie in die Lage versetzen, sich in vollem Umfang gegen den Inhalt der eingeholten mündlichen Vorbringungen zu verteidigen.

91. Ebenso bin ich der Ansicht, dass Telefonate und Zusammenkünfte, bei denen die Kommission ausschließlich Informationen *an* einen Dritten übermittelt, anstatt Informationen über den Gegenstand einer Untersuchung *von* diesem Dritten einzuholen, nicht als Befragungen im Sinne des Artikels 19 oder der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1/2003 anzusehen sind ([88]).

([85]) Google Android, Rn. 936. Siehe im selben Sinne Intel, Rn. 96: „Soweit aber Intel geltend macht, dass [der Auskunftgeber] der Kommission entlastende Umstände mitgeteilt habe, die diese in einem angemessenen, Intel zugänglichen Protokoll hätte festhalten müssen, ist darauf hinzuweisen, dass es im Fall der Nichtübermittlung eines angeblich entlastenden Schriftstücks dem betroffenen Unternehmen obliegt, nachzuweisen, dass die Vorenthaltung dieses Schriftstücks den Verfahrensablauf und den Inhalt der Entscheidung der Kommission zu seinen Ungunsten beeinflussen konnte …."

([86]) Google Android, Rn. 937 und 938. Siehe im selben Sinne Intel, Rn. 97.

([87]) Siehe Randnummer 81 oben.

([88]) In einem Fall scheinen aus Sicht des Gerichts zwei Zusammenkünfte mit einem Dritten unter Artikel 19 der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1/2003 zu fallen, bei denen „[d]er Zweck dieser Zusammenkünfte für [den Dritten] darin [bestand], von der Kommission Informationen … zu erhalten" (siehe Google Android, Rn. 954). In derselben Randnummer hat das Gericht jedoch auch Folgendes festgestellt: „Der eigentliche Zweck dieser Zusammenkünfte und ihre Zusammenfassung […] schließen somit jeden Verdacht aus, dass die Kommission Beweise zurückgehalten habe." Das Gericht ist daher zu dem Ergebnis gelangt, dass die Nichteinhaltung des Artikels 19 durch die Kommission im Zusammenhang mit diesen Zusammenkünften nicht zu einer Verletzung der Verteidigungsrechte des Klägers führen konnte.

92. Außerdem müssen sich die relevanten Befragungen auf den „Gegenstand des Verfahrens“ beziehen. Nach ständiger Rechtsprechung ist es zulässig, vom „Verwaltungsverfahren … die Bestandteile aus[zu]schließen, die in keinem Zusammenhang mit den Sach- und Rechtsausführungen in der Mitteilung der Beschwerdepunkte stehen und folglich für die Untersuchung irrelevant sind“ ([89]). Dies gilt auch für Zusammenkünfte, bei denen der Inhalt der Erörterungen in keinem Zusammenhang mit dem Gegenstand der Untersuchung steht ([90]).

93. Vor diesem Hintergrund bin ich der Ansicht, dass bestimmte in der Beschwerde von Apple erwähnte Besprechungen nicht in den Anwendungsbereich des Artikels 19 der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1/2003 fallen.

94. Dies gilt insbesondere für die Telefonate bzw. Zusammenkünfte mit dem Beschwerdeführer vom 12. März 2019, 4. Juni 2019, 19. Juni 2019, 3. Juli 2019, 15. Juli 2019, 8. November 2019, 19. November 2019, 16. Juni 2020 und 10. Mai 2021 sowie für das Telefonat mit BEUC vom 7. Mai 2021.

95. Im Wesentlichen stimme ich der Bewertung dieser Protokolle im Beschlussentwurf zu (siehe Erwägungsgründe 74 bis 75). Aus dem Inhalt der Protokolle geht meines Erachtens klar hervor, dass die Kommission in diesen Telefonaten/Zusammenkünften rein technische oder verfahrenstechnische Aspekte erörtert und/oder keine Informationen über den Gegenstand der Untersuchung eingeholt hat:

— Um die Zusammenkunft vom 12. März 2019 wurde vonseiten des Beschwerdeführers gebeten, um „das Sachbearbeiterteam über seine nächsten Schritte nach Einreichung der förmlichen Beschwerde gegen Apple“, die am Vortag eingereicht worden war, zu informieren. Aus dem Protokoll geht hervor, dass der Beschwerdeführer seine Absicht klarstellte, der Presse die Einreichung der förmlichen Beschwerde offenzulegen, und dass er die Kommission davon in Kenntnis setzte, dass er an einer nicht vertraulichen Fassung arbeite, die in Kürze vorgelegt werden solle.

— Die Telefonate vom 4. Juni und 19. Juni 2019 betrafen technische Erörterungen dazu, wie bestimmte Daten und Codes zur Verfügung gestellt werden könnten, die vom Beschwerdeführer im Datenraum, der im Juli 2019 eröffnet wurde, bereitgestellt wurden.

— Die Zusammenkunft vom 3. Juli 2019 wurde vom Sachbearbeiterteam beantragt, damit der Beschwerdeführer „die vorgeschlagenen Schwärzungen und deren Umfang in der nicht vertraulichen Fassung des von [externen Beratern von Apple] erstellten Datenraumberichts vor der Weiterleitung an Apple überprüfen konnte“.

— Das Telefonat vom 15. Juli 2019 betraf eine Diskussion über […].

— In den Telefonaten vom 8. November und 19. November 2019 wurden die Entwürfe der Fragen für die vom Beschwerdeführer durchzuführende Verbrauchererhebung erörtert, einschließlich der vom Beschwerdeführer vorgeschlagenen „letzten Änderungen“ und anderer Aspekte im Zusammenhang mit dem Format der Erhebung (die Kommission betonte beispielsweise, dass „Antwortoptionen randomisiert werden sollten“). In Bezug auf diesen Austausch über die Vorbereitung der Spotify-Erhebung kann argumentiert werden, dass die Ergebnisse der in Vorbereitung befindlichen Erhebung letztlich bei der Bewertung des Falls berücksichtigt werden sollten. Die Situation ist jedoch nicht mit der Erhebung mündlicher Aussagen im Rahmen einer Befragung vergleichbar, wenn die vom Befragten in mündlicher Form angeforderten bzw. von ihm bereitgestellten Informationen *selbst* für die Bewertung des Falls herangezogen werden können. In diesem Fall verwandelt das Protokoll die mündlich gesammelten Informationen in einen Sachverhalt, von dem die Partei, die sich verteidigt, Kenntnis nehmen und ihre Meinung dazu äußern kann. Ein Austausch der im vorliegenden Fall in Rede stehenden Art selbst enthält keine Informationen, die für die materielle Bewertung des Falls unmittelbar relevant sein könnten, und stellt daher keine Befragung im Sinne des Artikels 19 dar.

([89]) Urteil des Gerichts vom 7. Januar 2004, Aalborg Portland u. a./Kommission, C-204/00 P, C-205/00 P, C-211/00 P, C-213/00 P, C-217/00 P und C-219/00 P, ECLI:EU:C:2004:6, Rn. 126, und Urteil des Gerichts vom 16. Juni 2011, *FMC Foret/Kommission*, T-191/06, ECLI:EU:T:2011:277, Rn. 306. Siehe auch *Bulgargaz*, Rn. 1171.

([90]) In der Rechtssache Google Android hat das Gericht ferner festgestellt, dass die Verfahrensfehler bei den Aufzeichnungen zweier Zusammenkünfte nicht gegen die Verteidigungsrechte von Google verstießen, da „kein offensichtlicher Zusammenhang zwischen diesen Befragungen und den im angefochtenen Beschluss festgestellten Missbräuchen besteht“ (siehe Google Android, Rn. 951 bis 953).

— Das Telefonat vom 16. Juni 2020 betraf technische und IT-Aspekte im Zusammenhang mit einer Vorlage, die der Beschwerdeführer als Antwort auf ein Auskunftsersuchen vorbereitete.

— Das Telefonat mit BEUC vom 7. Mai 2021 betraf im Wesentlichen ein mögliches Eingreifen von BEUC in den Fall nach dem Erlass der Mitteilung der Beschwerdepunkte durch die Kommission. Aus dem Protokoll geht hervor, dass das Sachbearbeiterteam BEUC Informationen über den Fall zur Verfügung stellte und BEUC ankündigte, in den kommenden Wochen über sein Tätigwerden zu entscheiden. Aus dem Protokoll geht somit hervor, dass der Zweck des Telefonats darin bestand, dass BEUC Informationen über das Verfahren einholen wollte, nicht aber darin, dass die Kommission Informationen über den Gegenstand des Verfahrens einholen wollte.

— In ähnlicher Weise übermittelte die Kommission in dem Telefonat mit dem Beschwerdeführer vom 10. Mai 2021 die Bewertung und die vorläufigen Schlussfolgerungen in der Mitteilung der Beschwerdepunkte in allgemeiner Form und teilte mit, dass sie dem Beschwerdeführer eine nicht vertrauliche Fassung der Mitteilung der Beschwerdepunkte übermitteln werde, sobald Apple und die Kommission sich auf eine solche nicht vertrauliche Fassung geeinigt hätten. Aus dem Inhalt des Protokolls geht nicht hervor, dass die Kommission während des Telefonats Informationen über den Gegenstand des Verfahrens eingeholt hätte.

96. Nach alledem bin ich der Ansicht, dass diese Protokolle nicht als Befragungen im Sinne des Artikels 19 der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1/2003 anzusehen sind.

4.2.3. *Zum Vorliegen eines Verfahrensfehlers in Bezug auf die Protokolle von Telefonaten und Zusammenkünften, die unter Artikel 19 der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1/2003 fallen*

97. Was die übrigen 19 Protokolle betrifft, so scheint es meines Erachtens so, dass alle zugrunde liegenden Zusammenkünfte und Telefonate (zumindest teilweise) Erörterungen betreffen, die mit dem Gegenstand des Verfahrens in Zusammenhang standen, wobei die Kommission möglicherweise Informationen des Beschwerdeführers einholte, die zum Gegenstand des Verfahrens gehören.

98. In Bezug auf diese Protokolle ist es daher erforderlich, die Behauptungen von Apple zu prüfen, dass die meisten Protokolle i) keine Angabe zur Dauer der zugrunde liegenden Telefonate oder Zusammenkünfte enthalten, ii) zu kurz sind, um als angemessene Aufzeichnungen der Befragungen gelten zu können, und iii) verspätet in die Akte aufgenommen und dem Beschwerdeführer zur Genehmigung übermittelt wurden.

99. Was die Beschwerde von Apple anbelangt, dass in den vorgelegten Protokollen die genaue Dauer bestimmter Zusammenkünfte nicht angegeben sei ([91]), bin ich nicht der Ansicht, dass das Fehlen einer solchen Angabe für sich genommen einen Verfahrensfehler darstellen könnte, der den Inhalt der Protokolle ungültig macht ([92]). Erst recht halte ich dies nicht für ausreichend, um eine Verletzung der Verteidigungsrechte eines Unternehmens festzustellen. Die bloße Erwähnung der Dauer eines Telefonats oder einer Zusammenkunft ist nicht geeignet, einen zuverlässigen Hinweis auf die Genauigkeit, Aussagekraft oder Vollständigkeit der Informationen zu liefern, die die Kommission einer Partei zur Verfügung gestellt hat. Auch besteht zwischen der Dauer einer Zusammenkunft oder eines Telefonats und dem Zweck oder Inhalt dieser Zusammenkunft bzw. dieses Telefonats nicht automatisch ein Zusammenhang.

([91]) Konkret erwähnt Apple dieses Argument in Bezug auf die Protokolle vom 4. Juli 2013, 6. Februar 2015, 16. März 2015, 16. Juli 2015, 10. Dezember 2015, 28. Juli 2016, 7. Dezember 2016, 14. Dezember 2016, 6. Januar 2017, 16. Oktober 2017, 12. Januar 2018, 18. September 2018 und 15. November 2018. In Bezug auf vier dieser Protokolle (vom 6. Februar 2015, 7. Dezember 2016, 18. September 2018 und 15. November 2018) ist dies der einzige Beschwerdepunkt von Apple. Das Unternehmen bestreitet ansonsten die Richtigkeit und den Detailgrad des Protokolls nicht.

([92]) Apple scheint sich auf einen Absatz des Verfahrenshandbuchs der GD Wettbewerb zu stützen, wonach die Kommission, wenn sie „informelle Zusammenkünfte“ oder Telefonate mit externen Gesprächspartnern abhält, einen kurzen Vermerk erstellt, in dem „die Unternehmen, die an der Zusammenkunft (oder an dem Telefonat in Bezug auf wesentliche Fragen) teilnehmen, sowie *die Zeit* und das Thema/die Themen der Zusammenkunft (oder eines solchen Telefonats)“ detailliert genannt werden (Verfahrenshandbuch, November 2021, Kapitel 12, Rn. 21). Es sei jedoch darauf hingewiesen, dass das Verfahrenshandbuch ein internes Arbeitsinstrument und kein verbindliches Dokument ist: „Das Verfahrenshandbuch enthält keine verbindlichen Anweisungen für die Mitarbeitenden und die darin festgelegten Verfahren müssen gegebenenfalls an die Umstände des Einzelfalls angepasst werden.“ (Verfahrenshandbuch, S. 3). Im selben Abschnitt heißt es auch ausdrücklich, dass das Handbuch keine Rechte oder Pflichten begründet oder ändert. In jedem Fall bezieht sich die von Apple zitierte Passage aus dem Verfahrenshandbuch auf die „Zeit“ einer Zusammenkunft oder eines Telefonats, die nicht unbedingt deren „Dauer“ umfasst.

100. Apple macht geltend, dass in Ermangelung einer Zeitangabe „nicht ausgeschlossen werden [kann], dass zusätzliche Informationen erörtert wurden, die für die Verteidigung von Apple relevant sind“ ([93]). Apple führt jedoch keine weiteren Gesichtspunkte an, die belegen könnten, dass solche zusätzlichen Informationen in einer der hier in Rede stehenden Zusammenkünfte möglicherweise erörtert wurden.

101. Aus den vorstehenden Gründen erachte ich die diesbezügliche Argumentation von Apple als nicht überzeugend.

102. Was das zweite Argument betrifft, wonach die meisten Protokolle zu summarisch seien, um genaue Aufzeichnungen über die stattgefundenen Erörterungen darzustellen ([94]), weise ich darauf hin, dass einige der Protokolle hinreichend spezifisch zu sein scheinen, um den „Inhalt der Gespräche“ und insbesondere die „Art der während der Befragung zu den angesprochenen Themen bereitgestellten Informationen“ widerzuspiegeln ([95]), und dass möglicherweise davon ausgegangen werden kann, dass sie eine genaue Aufzeichnung der durchgeführten Befragungen darstellen ([96]). Bei anderen Protokollen erscheint diese Schlussfolgerung weniger wahrscheinlich, da sich die jeweiligen Dokumente im Wesentlichen auf ein zugrunde liegendes Dokument beziehen, das während der Zusammenkunft oder des Telefonats erörtert wurde ([97]), oder lediglich einen kurzen Überblick über die erörterten Themen geben ([98]).

103. Daher können meines Erachtens zumindest einige der fraglichen Protokolle als zu summarisch betrachtet werden, um als Aufzeichnung einer Befragung im Sinne von Artikel 19 Absatz 1 der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1/2003 gelten zu können.

104. Schließlich ist das dritte Argument von Apple zu berücksichtigen, wonach die Kommission „die betreffenden Protokolle weder zum Zeitpunkt der fraglichen Zusammenkünfte noch kurz danach erstellt“ habe, was „weitere Zweifel an ihrer Genauigkeit“ ([99]) aufwerfe.

105. Ich weise darauf hin, dass die Auslegung des Artikels 19 der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1/2003 vom Gerichtshof erstmals im September 2017 mit dem Urteil in der Sache Intel geklärt wurde. In der Folge hat das Gericht in der Rechtssache Google Android die Bedeutung einer zeitnahen Erstellung oder Genehmigung von Protokollen näher erläutert. Das Gericht entschied, dass einige summarische Notizen von Zusammenkünften, die mehrere Jahre nach solchen Zusammenkünften erstellt wurden, „zu spät angefertigt wurde[n] und zu summarisch [sind], um eine Aufzeichnung im Sinne von Art. 19 Abs. 1 der Verordnung Nr. 1/2003 darstellen zu können“, und wies darauf hin, dass es für die Zukunft „sinnvoll und angemessen [wäre], die Aufzeichnung jeder Befragung … zum Zeitpunkt des Gesprächs oder kurz danach anzufertigen oder genehmigen zu lassen“ ([100]).

106. In diesem Zusammenhang entnehme ich den Aussagen der GD Wettbewerb, dass die meisten der infrage stehenden Protokolle ([101]) nicht zeitgleich mit den Zusammenkünften oder Telefonaten fertiggestellt wurden, sondern erst mit Verzögerung, wenn auch auf der Grundlage zeitgleicher Aufzeichnungen von Beamten der GD Wettbewerb, die an den Zusammenkünften oder Telefonaten teilnahmen. Diese Verzögerung kann zumindest für einen Teil der betreffenden Protokolle darauf zurückzuführen sein, dass die zugrunde liegenden Zusammenkünfte und Telefonate vor dem Urteil zu Intel am 6. September 2017 stattfanden.

([93]) Die Formulierung wird in Bezug auf die meisten Protokollen wiederholt (siehe Anlage 5 der Antwort auf das Sachverhaltsschreiben, Rn. 71 bis 73, 75, 76, 79 bis 86, 88, 89 und 91).

([94]) Apple erwähnt dieses Argument in Bezug auf die Protokolle vom 4. Juli 2013, 16. März 2015, 25. Juni 2015, 16. Juli 2015, 10. Dezember 2015, 13. Juli 2016, 25. Juli 2016, 28. Juli 2016, 14. Dezember 2016, 6. Januar 2017, 16. Oktober 2017, 12. Januar 2018, 24. März 2020, 28. Oktober 2020 und 30. September 2021.

([95]) Intel, Rn. 91 und 92, Qualcomm, Rn. 190, Google Android, Rn. 912.

([96]) Siehe beispielsweise die Protokolle der Telefonate/Zusammenkünfte vom 16. Oktober 2017, 12. Januar 2018, 18. September 2018, 15. November 2018 und 30. September 2021.

([97]) Siehe beispielsweise die Protokolle der Telefonate/Zusammenkünfte vom 13. Juli 2016, 25. Juli 2016, 14. Dezember 2016 und 28. Oktober 2020.

([98]) Siehe beispielsweise die Protokolle der Zusammenkünfte vom 6. Februar 2015 und 16. März 2015.

([99]) Anlage 5 Abschnitt IV der Antwort auf das Sachverhaltsschreiben.

([100]) Siehe Google Android, Rn. 932 und 933.

([101]) Insbesondere die 19 Protokolle von Telefonaten und Zusammenkünften, die unter Artikel 19 der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1/2003 fallen (siehe Randnummern 74, 94 und 97 oben). Ich weise darauf hin, dass die Beschwerde von Apple in Bezug auf die verspätete Erstellung alle oben unter Randnummer 74 genannten 29 Protokolle sowie eine Reihe weiterer Protokolle betrifft, von denen Apple nicht behauptet, sie seien unzureichend detailliert oder aussagekräftig. Im Hinblick auf diese zusätzlichen Protokolle weise ich darauf hin, dass Apple keinen Anhaltspunkt dafür vorbringt, dass die angebliche Verzögerung bei der Erstellung der Protokolle als solche geeignet war, die Verteidigungsrechte von Apple zu verletzen. Daher halte ich die Behauptungen von Apple in Bezug auf diese Protokolle für unzureichend begründet.

107. Wie in der Rechtssache Google Android ist jedoch festzustellen, dass der Großteil der hier in Rede stehenden Protokolle mehrere Jahre nach der jeweiligen Zusammenkunft erstellt und erst nachträglich fertiggestellt wurde ([102]). Aus der ständigen Rechtsprechung geht nicht klar hervor, ob die verspätete Erstellung von Protokollen an sich ein Faktor ist, der den Schluss zulässt, dass das Protokoll keine gültigen Aufzeichnungen der zugrunde liegenden Befragungen darstellen kann. Wie bereits erwähnt, hat das Gericht beispielsweise nur in Bezug auf Protokolle, die sowohl „zu summarisch" waren als auch „zu spät" angefertigt wurden, in diesem Sinne entschieden, sie könnten keine ordnungsgemäßen Aufzeichnungen der Befragungen darstellen ([103]).

108. Diese Frage braucht hier nicht entschieden zu werden, da selbst dann, wenn die betreffenden Protokolle als zu summarisch und/oder zu spät angefertigt angesehen würden, um ordnungsgemäße Aufzeichnungen der Befragungen darstellen zu können, noch zu prüfen wäre, ob Apple hinreichend nachgewiesen hat, dass das Unternehmen ohne diese Verfahrensfehler besser in der Lage gewesen wäre, sich zu verteidigen.

4.2.4. *Zu der Frage, ob die Verfahrensfehler zu einer Verletzung der Verteidigungsrechte von Apple geführt haben*

109. Wie oben dargelegt, muss für die Feststellung einer Verletzung der Verteidigungsrechte eines Unternehmens nicht nur nachgewiesen werden, dass eine Befragung im Sinne des Artikels 19 der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1/2003 nicht ordnungsgemäß aufgezeichnet wurde, sondern auch dass dieses Versäumnis die Verteidigungsfähigkeit der Partei beeinträchtigt hat. Es obliegt im Allgemeinen dem von der Untersuchung betroffenen Unternehmen, nachzuweisen, dass es keinen Zugang zu belastenden oder entlastenden Beweisen hatte, und zu erläutern, welche Schlussfolgerungen hieraus hinsichtlich der Ausübung seiner Verteidigungsrechte zu ziehen sind (siehe Randnummern 83 bis 86 oben) ([104]).

110. Im Rahmen der Bewertung dieser Behauptungen hat das Gericht anerkannt, dass in bestimmten Fällen, die im Einzelfall zu ermitteln sind, andere Schriftstücke der Akte, zu denen das betroffene Unternehmen Zugang hatte, es den Parteien ermöglichen können zu erfahren, was während einer Befragung erörtert wurde, wenn keine ordnungsgemäßen Protokolle vorliegen. Dies war insbesondere in der Rechtssache Google Android der Fall, in der das Gericht zu dem Schluss kam, dass sich bei den meisten Befragungen, zu denen Google nur summarische Notizen erhalten hatte (die nicht als Protokoll einer Befragung gelten konnten), der „Inhalt der bei diesen Befragungen geführten Gespräche" gleichwohl „in bestimmten Dokumenten der Untersuchungsakte wiedergegeben [war], zu denen Google … [wie eingeräumt] Zugang hatte." ([105]) Das Gericht stellte daher fest, dass Google „von der Kommission Informationen über den Inhalt der bei diesen Befragungen geführten Gespräche erhalten konnte, insbesondere über die Art der bei diesen Gelegenheiten erteilten Auskünfte zu den dort angesprochenen Themen." ([106])

111. Zu derselben Schlussfolgerung gelangte das Gericht in Bezug auf bestimmte Vermerke, die „keinen Verweis auf ein Dokument in der Akte enthielt[en]", da es „Google möglich [war], ihn mit den Informationen in Verbindung zu bringen, die [Google] zu zwei weiteren … zum selben Thema durchgeführten Befragungen dieses Unternehmens übermittelt worden waren." Zwei weitere Befragungen, deren Protokolle „von dem in Rede stehenden Unternehmen [genehmigt]" wurden, bezogen sich auf „in der Untersuchungsakte enthaltene Dokumente, die den Inhalt der bei diesen Gelegenheiten … besprochenen Themen [wiedergaben]". Das Gericht gelangte daher zu dem Ergebnis, dass „[d]er von diesem Unternehmen im Rahmen der Untersuchung eingenommene Standpunkt … Google somit bekannt [war]." ([107])

([102]) Vgl. Google Android, Rn. 928.
([103]) *Google Android*, Rn. 932.
([104]) Eine mögliche Ausnahme von dieser Regel ist nur in Betracht zu ziehen, wenn „der Inhalt der nicht offengelegten Beweise weder bestimmt noch bestimmbar ist", wie oben ausgeführt (siehe Randnummer 84 oben sowie die dort angeführte ständige Rechtsprechung).
([105]) *Google Android*, Rn. 944.
([106]) *Google Android*, Rn. 945. Siehe auch *Intel* (Rn. 99). Dort berücksichtigte der Gerichtshof als einen der Faktoren, die ihn zu dem Schluss veranlassten, dass die Verteidigungsrechte von Intel nicht verletzt worden waren, obwohl die Kommission eine mit Dell durchgeführte Befragung nicht ordnungsgemäß aufgezeichnet hatte, die Tatsache, dass „Intel … einen ‚Nachtrag' mit schriftlichen Antworten von Dell auf mündliche Fragen erhalten [hatte], die [Dell] bei dieser Befragung gestellt worden waren."
([107]) Google Android, Rn. 949.

112. Unter Berücksichtigung dieser ständigen Rechtsprechung wird in dem Beschlussentwurf (Erwägungsgründe 77 bis 85) festgestellt, dass Apple Zugang zu ergänzenden Dokumenten hatte, die den Inhalt der Erörterungen, die im Rahmen der betreffenden Zusammenkünfte stattfanden, widerspiegelten. Auf der Grundlage meiner Selbstprüfung des Protokolls und der damit zusammenhängenden Unterlagen in der Akte teile ich diese Schlussfolgerung. Dies bedeutet konkret:

— In Bezug auf die Zusammenkunft vom 4. Juli 2013 zeigt sich, dass die überwiegende Mehrheit der dort erörterten Themen nicht mit dem Gegenstand des vorliegenden Verfahrens zusammenhing. Das einzige Thema, bei dem davon ausgegangen werden kann, dass ein gewisser Zusammenhang mit der im Beschlussentwurf untersuchten Zuwiderhandlung besteht, ist das angebliche missbräuchliche Verhalten vonseiten Apple in Form der „Blockierung/Verzögerung beim Herunterladen und Aktualisieren der App [von Spotify]". In Bezug auf diesen Aspekt konnte Apple die Informationen durch zahlreiche spätere schriftliche Vorlagen des Beschwerdeführers zu diesem Thema in einen Kontext stellen und inhaltlich nachvollziehen (siehe z. B. das Schreiben vom 20. Januar 2015 (ID 1589) oder die Vorlage vom 29. Juni 2016 (ID 799)).

— In Bezug auf die Zusammenkunft vom 6. Februar 2015 übermittelte die Kommission Apple die vom Beschwerdeführer bei der Zusammenkunft verwendeten Präsentationsfolien (ID 1649 und 1651) sowie ein Schreiben an ein Kommissionsmitglied vom 20. Januar 2015 (ID 1589).

— In Bezug auf die Zusammenkunft vom 16. März 2015 übermittelte die Kommission Apple die bei der Zusammenkunft vom Beschwerdeführer verwendeten Präsentationsfolien (ID 1650) sowie schriftliche Unterlagen, die der Beschwerdeführer vorab (ID 1575) und als Nachbereitung der Zusammenkunft (ID 1647 und 1648) erstellt hatte.

— Was die Zusammenkunft vom 25. Juni 2015 anbelangt, so hatte Apple Zugang zu dem Wirtschaftsbericht, den der Beschwerdeführer bei der Zusammenkunft vorgelegt hat (ID 1646), sowie zu verschiedenen Folgegesprächen zwischen dem Beschwerdeführer und der Kommission in Bezug auf das im Protokoll erwähnte „Experiment" des Beschwerdeführers (ID 1576, 1579 bis 1583, 1595).

— Ebenso ist der Kontext der Erörterungen im Rahmen des Telefonats vom 16. Juli 2015 aus den Anlagen zum Protokoll (ID 1579 bis 1583) und aus vor und nach der Zusammenkunft erstellten Unterlagen (ID 1576 und 1595) erkennbar.

— Was das Telefonat vom 10. Dezember 2015 betrifft, so hat der Beschwerdeführer im Wesentlichen die Hauptbeschwerden betreffend die für Entwickler von Musikstreaming-Diensten geltenden Bedingungen für den Zugang zum App Store von Apple wiederholt, die der Kommission bereits bei den Zusammenkünften vor und nach der Zusammenkunft vom 10. Dezember 2015 vorgelegt wurden (siehe insbesondere die Zusammenkünfte vom 16. März 2015 und 13. Juli 2016 und die dazugehörigen Unterlagen). Meines Erachtens ist es Apple daher möglich, das Telefonat „mit den Informationen in Verbindung zu bringen, die [ihm] zu zwei weiteren, … zum selben Thema durchgeführten Befragungen dieses Unternehmens übermittelt worden waren." ([108])

— Was die Zusammenkunft vom 13. Juli 2016 anbelangt, erhielt Apple Zugang zu der schriftlichen Vorlage vom 29. Juni 2016 (ID 799), in der die während der Zusammenkunft erörterten Argumente des Beschwerdeführers dargelegt wurden, sowie zu dem zwischen Apple und dem Beschwerdeführer geführten Austausch in Form zweier Schriftstücke, die im Protokoll der Zusammenkunft erwähnt wurden (ID 838 und 844).

— In Bezug auf die Zusammenkünften vom 25. und 28. Juli 2016 übermittelte die Kommission Apple einen vom Beschwerdeführer zur Vorbereitung der Zusammenkünfte (und als Nachbereitung zur Zusammenkunft vom 13. Juli 2016) erstellten rechtlichen Vermerk vom 25. Juli 2016 (ID 1452 und 797) sowie ein Wirtschaftspapier und einen Zeitungsartikel, die bei der Zusammenkunft vom 25. Juli 2016 erörtert wurden (ID 1547, 1535 und 834).

— Im Hinblick auf die Zusammenkunft vom 7. Dezember 2016 ([109]) und das Telefonat vom 14. Dezember 2016, die dasselbe Thema betrafen, übermittelte der Beschwerdeführer am 11. Dezember 2016 schriftliche Bemerkungen, zu denen Apple Zugang hatte (ID 819) ([110]).

([108]) Google Android, Rn. 949.

([109]) In Bezug auf diese Zusammenkunft geht aus dem Protokoll auch hervor, dass die Kommission tatsächlich keine wesentlichen Informationen vom Beschwerdeführer einholte. Auf die Frage der Kommission antwortete der Beschwerdeführer, dass er „… innerhalb des Unternehmens weiter erörtern müsse und im Hinblick auf diese Fragen so bald wie möglich auf die Kommission zurückkommen werde". Die entsprechenden Informationen wurden dann am 11. Dezember 2016 (schriftlich) und im Rahmen des anschließenden Telefonats vom 14. Dezember 2016 übermittelt.

([110]) Siehe E-Mail (ID 818) und Vorlage des Beschwerdeführers vom 11. Dezember 2016 (ID 819).

— Die Protokolle der Telefonate/Zusammenkünfte vom 6. Januar 2017, 16. Oktober 2017 und 12. Januar 2018 beziehen sich zwar nicht direkt auf entsprechende Belege, können aber „mit den Informationen in Verbindung [gebracht werden], die [Apple] zu … weiteren, … zum selben Thema durchgeführten Befragungen dieses Unternehmens übermittelt worden waren“ ([111]), und zwar insbesondere im Zusammenhang mit der Zusammenkunft vom 13. Juli 2016 und den dazugehörigen Belegen, die dasselbe Thema betrafen (konkret Beschwerden in Bezug auf das angebliche Blockieren oder Verzögern von Aktualisierungen der Spotify-App auf iOS durch Apple, wobei diese Beschwerden auch in den schriftlichen Vorlagen des Beschwerdeführers vom 29. Juni 2016 enthalten waren) ([112]).

— In Bezug auf die Zusammenkünfte vom 18. September 2018 und 15. November 2018 wiederholte der Beschwerdeführer erneut seine Hauptbeschwerdepunkte im Zusammenhang mit den Bedingungen, die für die Entwickler von Musikstreaming-Diensten beim Zugang zum App Store von Apple gelten (Einzelheiten sind aus dem Inhalt des Protokolls eindeutig zu entnehmen). Diese Beschwerden wurden der Kommission bereits bei früheren Zusammenkünften vorgetragen, u. a. bei den Zusammenkünften vom 25. und 28. Juli 2016 (und in den diesbezüglichen stützenden Unterlagen), und in der kurz darauf eingereichten förmlichen Beschwerde näher ausgeführt. Daher bin ich der Ansicht, dass Apple auch in Bezug auf diese Zusammenkünfte in der Lage war, die in den Befragungen bereitgestellten Informationen zu ermitteln und „mit den Informationen in Verbindung zu bringen, die … zu … weiteren, … zum selben Thema durchgeführten Befragungen dieses Unternehmens übermittelt worden waren.“ ([113])

— In Bezug auf das Telefonat vom 24. März 2020 forderte die Kommission den Beschwerdeführer auf, weitere Erläuterungen zu bestimmten Antworten auf das Auskunftsersuchen vom 10. Januar 2020 vorzulegen. Diese weiteren Klarstellungen wurden mit dem am 23. April 2020 an den Beschwerdeführer gerichteten Auskunftsersuchen (ID 564, insbesondere die Fragen 1, 2 und 4) schriftlich angefordert, worauf dieser am 14. Mai 2020 antwortete (ID 1434).

— In Bezug auf das Telefonat vom 28. Oktober 2020 hatte Apple Zugang zu den vom Beschwerdeführer bei der Zusammenkunft verwendeten Präsentationsfolien (ID 1349) sowie zu einer damit verbundenen schriftlichen Vorlage (ID 881).

— Schließlich ist es auch in Bezug auf das Telefonat vom 30. September 2021, dessen Protokoll in jedem Fall hinreichend detailliert erscheint und kurz nach dem Telefonat in der Akte registriert wurde, möglich, das Telefonat „mit den Informationen in Verbindung zu bringen, die … zu … weiteren, … zum selben Thema durchgeführten Befragungen dieses Unternehmens übermittelt worden waren“ ([114]), da in diesem Telefonat Fragen erörtert wurden, die der Beschwerdeführer in früheren Telefonaten und Zusammenkünften wiederholt angesprochen hatte (insbesondere in Bezug auf die angebliche Verzögerung von Aktualisierungen der iOS-App des Beschwerdeführers oder die Ablehnung von Werbekampagnen des Beschwerdeführers durch Apple).

113. Darüber hinaus hat Apple in keinem Fall nachgewiesen, dass das Unternehmen ohne mögliche Verfahrensfehler in Bezug auf die infrage stehenden Protokolle besser in der Lage gewesen wäre, seine Verteidigung zu gewährleisten.

114. In Bezug auf jedes Protokoll, das Apple für unzureichend hält, wiederholt das Unternehmen im Wesentlichen eine Zusammenfassung der Erörterungen, die stattfanden, und behauptet allgemein und formelhaft, dass „die erörterten Informationen es Apple ermöglicht hätten, seine Verteidigung besser zu gewährleisten“ ([115]).

115. In Bezug auf mehrere der infrage stehenden Protokolle macht Apple geltend, dass „das Fehlen detaillierter Protokolle … es Apple nicht erlaubt, mit Sicherheit zu bestimmen, welche Fragen und Informationen nicht erörtert wurden“, und dass das Fehlen von Informationen zu bestimmten Themen „veranschaulichen [würde], dass diese erst in einem sehr späten Stadium des Verfahrens bekannt gemacht wurden“ ([116]).

([111]) Google Android, Rn. 949.
([112]) Darüber hinaus legte der Beschwerdeführer in der im März 2019 eingereichten förmlichen Beschwerde seine Behauptungen im Zusammenhang mit dem angeblich obstruktiven Verhalten von Apple detailliert dar – siehe insbesondere Abschnitt 3.3 der Beschwerde von Spotify (ID 1457).
([113]) Google Android, Rn. 949.
([114]) Google Android, Rn. 949.
([115]) Siehe Anlage 5 des Sachverhaltsschreibens, Rn. 71 bis 98.
([116]) Siehe Anlage 5 des Sachverhaltsschreibens, Rn. 68.

116. Apple bringt jedoch keine Gesichtspunkte vor, die belegen, dass das Unternehmen keinen Zugang zu belastenden Beweisen hatte (und dass „das Verfahren zu einem anderen Ergebnis hätte führen können, wenn diese belastenden Beweise offengelegt worden wären"), oder dass es keinen Zugang zu entlastenden Beweisen hatte, auf die sich Apple hätte berufen können und die „die von der Kommission in ihrer Entscheidung vorgenommenen Beurteilungen hätten beeinflussen können." ([117])

117. Die unter Randnummer 115 dargelegte Behauptung von Apple begründet insbesondere nicht die Schlussfolgerung, dass Apple keinen Zugang zu Beweisen hatte, die die Kommission im Rahmen von Befragungen gesammelt hat. Darüber hinaus beziehen sich die Schlussfolgerungen, die Apple ziehen möchte, nicht auf Beweise, die möglicherweise unzureichend aufgezeichnet wurden, sondern auf die Entwicklung des Falls im Laufe der Zeit. Fest steht jedoch, dass die Kommission in dieser Sache zwei aufeinanderfolgende Mitteilungen der Beschwerdepunkte (die Mitteilung der Beschwerdepunkte und die Mitteilung der Ersatz-Beschwerdepunkte, auf die in den Abschnitten 2.2 und 3 oben Bezug genommen wird) erlassen hat und Apple mit dem Sachverhaltsschreiben (wie in Abschnitt 3.4 oben beschrieben) über eine Einschränkung der Vorwürfe informierte. Apple hat sich in seiner Antwort auf die Mitteilung der Ersatz-Beschwerdepunkte, in seinen Ausführungen während der mündlichen Anhörung und in seiner Antwort auf das Sachverhaltsschreiben ausführlich zu diesen Entwicklungen geäußert.

118. Aus diesen Gründen bin ich der Ansicht, dass etwaige Verfahrensfehler in Bezug auf die von Apple geltend gemachten Aufzeichnungen der Befragungen unter den im vorliegenden Fall gegebenen Umständen nicht zu einer Verletzung der Verteidigungsrechte von Apple führen.

5. **SCHLUSSFOLGERUNG**

119. Ich habe nach Artikel 16 des Beschlusses 2011/695/EU geprüft, ob in dem Beschlussentwurf nur Beschwerdepunkte behandelt werden, zu denen sich Apple äußern konnte. Zum gegenwärtigen Zeitpunkt kommt es für diese Bewertung darauf an, dass die im Beschlussentwurf enthaltenen Einwände nicht über das hinausgehen, was Apple im Wege der Mitteilung der Ersatz-Beschwerdepunkte vorläufig zur Kenntnis gebracht wurde. Dies wird auch durch die im Sachverhaltsschreiben enthaltenen Gesichtspunkte untermauert. Ich komme zu dem Ergebnis, dass diese Anforderung erfüllt ist.

120. In Anbetracht der vorstehenden Ausführungen bin ich der Ansicht, dass die Verteidigungsrechte von Apple im vorliegenden Fall gewahrt wurden.

Brüssel, den 1. März 2024.

Dorothe DALHEIMER

([117]) Siehe Google Android, Rn. 937 und 938.

C/2024/3559

7.6.2024

Genehmigung staatlicher Beihilfen nach den Artikeln 107 und 108 des Vertrags über die Arbeitsweise der Europäischen Union

Vorhaben, gegen die von der Kommission keine Einwände erhoben werden

SA.113684

(C/2024/3559)

Datum der Annahme der Entscheidung	7.5.2024
Nummer der Beihilfe	SA.113684
Mitgliedstaat	Malta
Region	
Titel (und/oder Name des Begünstigten)	TCTF: Fertiliser Scheme to Land Farmers (Third amendment to SA.103449 (2022/N))
Rechtsgrundlage	Agriculture and Fishing Industries (Financial Assistance) Act (CAP 146 of the Laws of Malta) and the Guidelines for „Tempo-emporary State Aid – Fertiliser Scheme to Land Farmers“
Art der Beihilfe	Regelung
Ziel	Behebung einer beträchtlichen Störung im Wirtschaftsleben
Form der Beihilfe	Zuschuss
Haushaltsmittel	Haushaltsmittel insgesamt: 300 000 EUR
Beihilfehöchstintensität	
Laufzeit	bis zum 30.6.2024
Wirtschaftssektoren	Anbau einjähriger Pflanzen, Anbau mehrjähriger Pflanzen
Name und Anschrift der Bewilligungsbehörde	Agriculture and Rural Payments Agency (ARPA) Luqa Road, Qormi
Sonstige Angaben	

Die rechtsverbindliche(n) Sprachfassung(en) der Entscheidung, aus der/denen alle vertraulichen Angaben gestrichen sind, finden Sie unter:

https://competition-cases.ec.europa.eu/search?caseInstrument=SA

C/2024/3561

7.6.2024

Genehmigung staatlicher Beihilfen nach den Artikeln 107 und 108 des Vertrags über die Arbeitsweise der Europäischen Union

Vorhaben, gegen die von der Kommission keine Einwände erhoben werden

SA.112984

(C/2024/3561)

Datum der Annahme der Entscheidung	3.5.2024
Nummer der Beihilfe	SA.112984
Mitgliedstaat	Frankreich
Region	
Titel (und/oder Name des Begünstigten)	TCTF: Fonds d'urgence en faveur des exploitations viticoles impactées par les conséquences de l'agression de la Russie contre l'Ukraine
Rechtsgrundlage	Circulaire relative à la mise en œuvre d'un fonds d'urgence en vue de soutenir les exploitations viticoles impactées par les conséquences de l'agression de la Russie contre l'Ukraine
Art der Beihilfe	Regelung
Ziel	Behebung einer beträchtlichen Störung im Wirtschaftsleben eines Mitgliedstaats
Form der Beihilfe	Zuschuss
Haushaltsmittel	Haushaltsmittel insgesamt: 80 000 000 EUR
Beihilfehöchstintensität	
Laufzeit	bis zum 30.6.2024
Wirtschaftssektoren	Anbau von Wein- und Tafeltrauben, Gemischte Landwirtschaft
Name und Anschrift der Bewilligungsbehörde	Ministère de l'Agriculture et de la Souveraineté alimentaire 3, rue Barbet de Jouy 75007 PARIS
Sonstige Angaben	

Die rechtsverbindliche(n) Sprachfassung(en) der Entscheidung, aus der/denen alle vertraulichen Angaben gestrichen sind, finden Sie unter:

https://competition-cases.ec.europa.eu/search?caseInstrument=SA

C/2024/3562

7.6.2024

Genehmigung staatlicher Beihilfen nach den Artikeln 107 und 108 des Vertrags über die Arbeitsweise der Europäischen Union

Vorhaben, gegen die von der Kommission keine Einwände erhoben werden

SA.109418

(Text von Bedeutung für den EWR)

(C/2024/3562)

Datum der Annahme der Entscheidung	24.11.2023	
Nummer der Beihilfe	SA.109418	
Mitgliedstaat	Polen	
Region		
Titel (und/oder Name des Begünstigten)	Amendment to the liquidation aid to Getin Noble S.A. in resolution (SA.100687)	
Rechtsgrundlage	Act of 10 June 2016 on the Bank Guarantee Fund, Deposit Guarantee Scheme and Resolution ('BFG Act'), Resolution No. 24/2022 of the Council of the Bank Guarantee Fund of 4 May 2022 on establishing the principles and forms of granting support, on collateralisation and on the pursuit of Recoveries on the support granted resolution	
Art der Beihilfe	Ad-hoc-Beihilfe	Getin Noble Bank S.A.
Ziel	Behebung einer beträchtlichen Störung im Wirtschaftsleben eines Mitgliedstaats	
Form der Beihilfe	Sonstige	
Haushaltsmittel	Haushaltsmittel insgesamt: 0 PLN	
Beihilfehöchstintensität		
Laufzeit	ab 24.11.2023	
Wirtschaftssektoren	Erbringung von Finanzdienstleistungen	
Name und Anschrift der Bewilligungsbehörde	Bankowy Fundusz Gwarancyjny ul. ks. Ignacego Jana Skorupki 4, 00-546 Warszawa	
Sonstige Angaben		

Die rechtsverbindliche(n) Sprachfassung(en) der Entscheidung, aus der/denen alle vertraulichen Angaben gestrichen sind, finden Sie unter:

https://competition-cases.ec.europa.eu/search?caseInstrument=SA

C/2024/3636

7.6.2024

Genehmigung staatlicher Beihilfen nach den Artikeln 107 und 108 des Vertrags über die Arbeitsweise der Europäischen Union

Vorhaben, gegen die von der Kommission keine Einwände erhoben werden

SA.102430

(Text von Bedeutung für den EWR)

(C/2024/3636)

Datum der Annahme der Entscheidung	27.4.2023	
Nummer der Beihilfe	SA.102430	
Mitgliedstaat	Frankreich	
Region		
Titel (und/oder Name des Begünstigten)		
Rechtsgrundlage	Budget - France 2030 -budgetary laws n° 2016-1917 of 29.12.2016 and n° 2020-1721 of 29.12.2020	
Art der Beihilfe	Ad-hoc-Beihilfe	ST Microelectronics and Global Foundries
Ziel	Sektorale Entwicklung	
Form der Beihilfe	Zuschuss	
Haushaltsmittel	Haushaltsmittel insgesamt: 2 900 000 000 EUR	
Beihilfehöchstintensität		
Laufzeit		
Wirtschaftssektoren	Herstellung von Datenverarbeitungsgeräten, elektronischen und optischen Erzeugnissen	
Name und Anschrift der Bewilligungsbehörde	Ministère de l'économie, des finances et de la relance - Direction Générale des Entreprises 61 boulevard Vincent Auriol - 75013 PARIS	
Sonstige Angaben		

Die rechtsverbindliche(n) Sprachfassung(en) der Entscheidung, aus der/denen alle vertraulichen Angaben gestrichen sind, finden Sie unter:

https://competition-cases.ec.europa.eu/search?caseInstrument=SA

C/2024/3637

7.6.2024

Genehmigung staatlicher Beihilfen nach den Artikeln 107 und 108 des Vertrags über die Arbeitsweise der Europäischen Union

Vorhaben, gegen die von der Kommission keine Einwände erhoben werden

SA.63176

(Text von Bedeutung für den EWR)

(C/2024/3637)

Datum der Annahme der Entscheidung	7.5.2024
Nummer der Beihilfe	SA.63176
Mitgliedstaat	Belgien
Region	REGION WALLONNE
Titel (und/oder Name des Begünstigten)	Régime wallon de certificats verts
Rechtsgrundlage	Walloon Government Decree of 12 April 2001 on the organisation of the regional electricity market, as amended.Walloon Government Order of 30 November 2006 on the promotion of electricity produced from renewable energy sources or cogeneration, as amended.
Art der Beihilfe	Regelung
Ziel	Umweltschutz, Erneuerbare Energien, Energieeffizienz
Form der Beihilfe	Sonstige
Haushaltsmittel	
Beihilfehöchstintensität	
Laufzeit	bis zum 31.3.2028
Wirtschaftssektoren	ENERGIEVERSORGUNG
Name und Anschrift der Bewilligungsbehörde	Service Public de Wallonie Direction générale opérationnelle - Aménagement du territoire, Logement, Patrimoine et Energie DGO4 - Direction de l'organisation des marchés régionaux de l'énergie Rue des Brigades d'Irlande, 1 5100 JAMBES
Sonstige Angaben	

Die rechtsverbindliche(n) Sprachfassung(en) der Entscheidung, aus der/denen alle vertraulichen Angaben gestrichen sind, finden Sie unter:

https://competition-cases.ec.europa.eu/search?caseInstrument=SA

C/2024/3676

7.6.2024

Keine Einwände gegen einen angemeldeten Zusammenschluss

(Sache M.11143 — CMA CGM / BOLLORE LOGISTICS)

(Text von Bedeutung für den EWR)

(C/2024/3676)

Am 23. Februar 2024 hat die Kommission nach Artikel 6 Absatz 1 Buchstabe b in Verbindung mit Artikel 6 Absatz 2) der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 139/2004 des Rates [1] entschieden, keine Einwände gegen den oben genannten angemeldeten Zusammenschluss zu erheben und ihn für mit dem Binnenmarkt vereinbar zu erklären. Der vollständige Wortlaut der Entscheidung ist nur auf Englisch verfügbar und wird in einer um etwaige Geschäftsgeheimnisse bereinigten Fassung auf den folgenden EU-Websites veröffentlicht:

— der Website der GD Wettbewerb zur Fusionskontrolle (https://competition-cases.ec.europa.eu/search). Auf dieser Website können Fusionsentscheidungen anhand verschiedener Angaben wie Unternehmensname, Nummer der Sache, Datum der Entscheidung oder Wirtschaftszweig abgerufen werden,

— der Website EUR-Lex (http://eur-lex.europa.eu/homepage.html?locale=de). Hier kann diese Entscheidung anhand der Celex-Nummer 32024M11143 abgerufen werden. EUR-Lex ist das Internetportal zum Gemeinschaftsrecht.

[1] ABl. L 24 vom 29.1.2004, S. 1.

C/2024/3677

7.6.2024

Keine Einwände gegen einen angemeldeten Zusammenschluss

(Sache M.11376 — ONEX / R&Q ACCREDITED)

(Text von Bedeutung für den EWR)

(C/2024/3677)

Am 4. März 2024 hat die Kommission nach Artikel 6 Absatz 1 Buchstabe b der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 139/2004 des Rates ([1]) entschieden, keine Einwände gegen den oben genannten angemeldeten Zusammenschluss zu erheben und ihn für mit dem Binnenmarkt vereinbar zu erklären. Der vollständige Wortlaut der Entscheidung ist nur auf Englisch verfügbar und wird in einer um etwaige Geschäftsgeheimnisse bereinigten Fassung auf den folgenden EU-Websites veröffentlicht:

— der Website der GD Wettbewerb zur Fusionskontrolle (https://competition-cases.ec.europa.eu/search). Auf dieser Website können Fusionsentscheidungen anhand verschiedener Angaben wie Unternehmensname, Nummer der Sache, Datum der Entscheidung oder Wirtschaftszweig abgerufen werden,

— der Website EUR-Lex (http://eur-lex.europa.eu/homepage.html?locale=de). Hier kann diese Entscheidung anhand der Celex-Nummer 32024M11376 abgerufen werden. EUR-Lex ist das Internetportal zum Gemeinschaftsrecht.

([1]) ABl. L 24 vom 29.1.2004, S. 1.

C/2024/3679

7.6.2024

Vorherige Anmeldung eines Zusammenschlusses

(Sache M.11523 – WBD / TWDC / FOX / JV)

Für das vereinfachte Verfahren infrage kommender Fall

(Text von Bedeutung für den EWR)

(C/2024/3679)

1. Am 3. Juni 2024 ist die Anmeldung eines geplanten Zusammenschlusses nach Artikel 4 der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 139/2004 des Rates ([1]) bei der Kommission eingegangen.

Diese Anmeldung betrifft folgende Unternehmen:

— Warner Bros. Discovery („WBD“, USA),

— The Walt Disney Company („TWDC“, USA),

— FOX Corporation („FOX“, USA).

WBD, TWDC und FOX (zusammen die „Beteiligten“) werden im Sinne des Artikels 3 Absatz 1 Buchstabe b und Absatz 4 der Fusionskontrollverordnung die gemeinsame Kontrolle über ein neu gegründetes Gemeinschaftsunternehmen („JV“) erwerben.

Der Zusammenschluss erfolgt durch Erwerb von Anteilen an einem neu gegründeten Gemeinschaftsunternehmen.

2. Die beteiligten Unternehmen sind in folgenden Geschäftsbereichen tätig:

— WBD ist ein weltweit tätiges Medien- und Unterhaltungsunternehmen, in dem die Vermögenswerte von WarnerMedia Business auf den Gebieten Unterhaltung, Sport und Nachrichten mit den Vermögenswerten von Discovery auf den Gebieten Non-fiction sowie internationale Unterhaltung und Sport zusammengeführt wurden und das dem Publikum ein differenziertes Portfolio von Inhalten, Marken und Franchise-Produkten über den gesamten Fernseh-, Film-, Streaming- und Gamingbereich hinweg anbietet,

— TWDC umfasst Disney Entertainment, ESPN und Disney Experiences. Zu Disney Entertainment gehört das weltweite Portfolio des Unternehmens an Unterhaltungsmedien und -inhalten. ESPN umfasst ESPN networks, ESPN+ und die internationalen Sportprogramme des Unternehmens. Disney Experiences bietet Aktivitäten und Produkte aus dem Disney-Themenbereich an, die über audiovisuelle Inhalte hinausgehen,

— FOX produziert und liefert Nachrichten-, Sport- und Unterhaltungsinhalte über seine Marken, zu denen FOX News Media, FOX Sports, FOX Entertainment, FOX Television Stations und Tubi Media Group gehören.

3. Das JV wird in folgenden Geschäftsbereichen tätig sein: Entwicklung, Einführung und Betrieb eines neuen, auf Inhalte aus dem Sportbereich ausgerichteten vMVPD („virtual Multichannel Video Programming Distributor“, die „Plattform“), der ausschließlich in den USA bestimmte Programme anbieten wird, die Sportinhalte und Sportstreamingdienste der Beteiligten umfassen. Die Plattform soll Abonnenten in den USA zusätzlich zu den bereits verfügbaren Angeboten der Beteiligten eine neue Art des Zugangs zu den Sportinhalten der Beteiligten bieten.

4. Die Kommission hat nach vorläufiger Prüfung festgestellt, dass das angemeldete Rechtsgeschäft unter die Fusionskontrollverordnung fallen könnte. Die endgültige Entscheidung zu diesem Punkt behält sie sich vor.

Dieser Fall kommt für das vereinfachte Verfahren im Sinne der Bekanntmachung der Kommission über die vereinfachte Behandlung bestimmter Zusammenschlüsse gemäß der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 139/2004 des Rates über die Kontrolle von Unternehmenszusammenschlüssen ([2]) infrage.

5. Alle betroffenen Dritten können bei der Kommission zu diesem Vorhaben Stellung nehmen.

([1]) ABl. L 24 vom 29.1.2004, S. 1 („Fusionskontrollverordnung“).
([2]) ABl. C 160 vom 5.5.2023, S. 1.

Die Stellungnahmen müssen bei der Kommission spätestens 10 Tage nach dieser Veröffentlichung eingehen. Dabei ist stets folgendes Aktenzeichen anzugeben:

M.11523 – WBD / TWDC / FOX / JV

Die Stellungnahmen können der Kommission per E-Mail oder Post übermittelt werden, wobei folgende Kontaktangaben zu verwenden sind:

E-Mail: COMP-MERGER-REGISTRY@ec.europa.eu

Postanschrift:

Europäische Kommission
Generaldirektion Wettbewerb
Registratur Fusionskontrolle
1049 Bruxelles/Brussel
BELGIQUE/BELGIË

C/2024/3683

7.6.2024

Angaben der Mitgliedstaaten zur Schließung von Fischereien

(C/2024/3683)

Gemäß Artikel 35 Absatz 3 der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1224/2009 des Rates vom 20. November 2009 zur Einführung einer Kontrollregelung der Union zur Sicherstellung der Einhaltung der Vorschriften der gemeinsamen Fischereipolitik [1] wurde beschlossen, die Fischerei wie nachstehend beschrieben zu schließen:

Datum und Uhrzeit der Schließung	**22.5.2024**
Dauer	**22.5.2024 bis 31.12.2024**
Mitgliedstaat	**Portugal**
Bestand oder Bestandsgruppe	**JAX/08C.**
Art	**Bastardmakrele (*Trachurus spp.*)**
Gebiet	**8c**
Typ des betreffenden Fischereifahrzeugs	–
Laufende Nummer	**2/TQ257**

[1] ABl. L 343 vom 22.12.2009, S. 1.

C/2024/3684

7.6.2024

Keine Einwände gegen einen angemeldeten Zusammenschluss

(Sache M.11472 — HYDRO / NORTHVOLT / HYDROVOLT JV)

(Text von Bedeutung für den EWR)

(C/2024/3684)

Am 3. Juni 2024 hat die Kommission nach Artikel 6 Absatz 1 Buchstabe b der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 139/2004 des Rates ([1]) entschieden, keine Einwände gegen den oben genannten angemeldeten Zusammenschluss zu erheben und ihn für mit dem Binnenmarkt vereinbar zu erklären. Der vollständige Wortlaut der Entscheidung ist nur auf Englisch verfügbar und wird in einer um etwaige Geschäftsgeheimnisse bereinigten Fassung auf den folgenden EU-Websites veröffentlicht:

— der Website der GD Wettbewerb zur Fusionskontrolle (https://competition-cases.ec.europa.eu/search). Auf dieser Website können Fusionsentscheidungen anhand verschiedener Angaben wie Unternehmensname, Nummer der Sache, Datum der Entscheidung oder Wirtschaftszweig abgerufen werden,

— der Website EUR-Lex (http://eur-lex.europa.eu/homepage.html?locale=de). Hier kann diese Entscheidung anhand der Celex-Nummer 32024M11472 abgerufen werden. EUR-Lex ist das Internetportal zum Gemeinschaftsrecht.

([1]) ABl. L 24 vom 29.1.2004, S. 1.