



C/2024/1284

2.2.2024

FULDSTÆNDIGT FORHANDLINGSREFERAT DEN 27. APRIL 2016

(C/2024/1284)

EUROPA-PARLAMENTET

SESSIONEN 2016-2017

Mødeperioden fra den 27. til 28. april 2016

BRUXELLES

Indhold	Side
1. Genoptagelse af sessionen	3
2. Erklæring fra formanden	3
3. Velkomstord	4
4. Godkendelse af protokollen fra foregående møde: se protokollen	5
5. Valgs prøvelse: se protokollen	5
6. Anmodning om ophævelse af parlamentarisk immunitet: se protokollen	5
7. Udvalgenes og delegationernes sammensætning: se protokollen	5
8. Delegerede retsakter (forretningsordenens artikel 105, stk. 6): se protokollen	5
9. Undertegnelse af retsakter vedtaget efter den almindelige lovgivningsprocedure (forretningsordenens artikel 78): se protokollen	5
10. Gennemførelsesforanstaltninger (forretningsordenens artikel 106): se protokollen	5
11. Delegerede retsakter (forretningsordenens artikel 105, stk. 6): se protokollen	5
12. Tekster til aftaler sendt af Rådet: se protokollen	5

Indhold	Side
13. Forespørgsler til mundtlig besvarelse (modtagne dokumenter): se protokollen	5
14. Modtagne dokumenter: se protokollen	5
15. Arbejdsplan	6
16. Den Europæiske Investeringsbank (EIB) – Årsberetning for 2014 (forhandling)	10
17. Decharge 2014 (forhandling)	31
18. Angreb på hospitaler og skoler som krænkelse af den humanitære folkeret (forhandling)	61
19. Aktindsigt (artikel 116, stk. 7, i forretningsordenen) i perioden 2014-2015 (forhandling)	70
20. Beskyttelse af barnets tarv (på tværs af grænser) i Europa (forhandling)	78
21. Kvindelig hushjælp og plejepersonale i EU (kortfattet forelæggelse)	91
22. Ligestilling mellem kønnene og styrkelse af kvinders position i den digitale tidsalder (kortfattet forelæggelse)	97
23. Indlæg af et minuts varighed om politisk vigtige sager	101
24. Dagsorden for næste møde: se protokollen	107
25. Hævelse af mødet	107

FULDSTÆNDIGT FORHANDLINGSREFERAT DEN 27. APRIL 2016

VORSITZ: MARTIN SCHULZ

Präsident

(Die Sitzung wird um 15.05 Uhr eröffnet.)

1. Genoptagelse af sessionen

Der Präsident. – Ich erkläre die am Donnerstag, dem 14. April 2016, unterbrochene Sitzungsperiode für wieder aufgenommen.

2. Erklæring fra formanden

Der Präsident. – Liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Die meisten von uns wissen sicher noch genau, was sie am 26. April 1986 gemacht haben. Dieser Tag hat sich allen tief ins Gedächtnis eingegraben: Vor 30 Jahren, am 26. April 1986, explodierte in der damaligen Sowjetunion – in der Sowjetrepublik Ukraine – der Reaktorblock Nummer 4 des Kernkraftwerks Tschernobyl. Es kam zur totalen Kernschmelze, zu dem, was man einen Super-GAU nennt, einer Tragödie mit unglaublichen Folgen: Radioaktives Material wurde in die Atmosphäre geschleudert, weite Teile Russlands, Weißrusslands und der Ukraine wurden verseucht, die radioaktive Wolke zog nach Mitteleuropa und hinauf bis zum Nordkap.

Bis heute ist die genaue Zahl der an den Folgen der Verstrahlung erkrankten und gestorbenen Menschen umstritten; wahrscheinlich wird die Zahl nie ganz genau zu ermitteln sein. Schätzungen bezüglich der Gesundheitsfolgen und der Todesfälle variieren. Aber egal, in welcher Größenordnung sie beziffert werden, diese Größenordnungen sind dramatisch. Es wird von Zigtausenden, in manchen Schätzungen von Hunderttausenden Toten ausgegangen.

Wenige haben in Erinnerung behalten, dass sogenannte Liquidatoren – das waren zumeist junge Männer – ohne Schutz und ohne Warnung mitten in diese Katastrophe geschickt wurden, um sie einzudämmen. Diesen Menschen ist es wohl zu verdanken, dass alles nicht noch schlimmer kam. Doch viele dieser Menschen – dieser Helden – bezahlten ihren Einsatz mit Leib und Leben.

In der Region mussten Hunderttausende Menschen ihre Heimat verlassen, ihr Zuhause aufgeben. Viele Familien mussten umgesiedelt werden, Gemeinden wurden zerrissen. Bis heute bleiben die Böden und die Nahrung in der Region belastet. Viele Menschen leiden noch immer an den Spätfolgen, selbst die Kinder, die viele Jahre nach der Katastrophe geboren wurden.

Tschernobyl bleibt als Ruine ganz sicher ein Mahnmal der Katastrophe – und Tschernobyl bleibt ein Problem. Der Rückbau der kerntechnischen Anlagen ist technisch wie finanziell extrem aufwändig. Die neue Schutzhülle etwa, die den provisorischen Schutzmantel von 1986 ersetzen soll, wird frühestens im Jahr 2017 fertiggestellt und wird zwischen 1,5 und 2 Milliarden Euro kosten.

Die Entscheidung über die Nutzung von Kernenergie obliegt in der Europäischen Union den Mitgliedstaaten. Aber ganz sicher kennen nukleare Wolken und Verstrahlung keine nationalen Grenzen. Deshalb dürfen unsere Bemühungen um Sicherheit und Prävention auch nicht an nationalen Grenzen haltmachen. Auf europäischer Ebene wurde die Nuklearkatastrophe von Fukushima deshalb auch – wie ich finde, richtigerweise – zum Anlass genommen, 145 europäische Atomkraftwerke einer umfassenden Risiko- und Sicherheitsbewertung zu unterziehen.

Über parteipolitischen und nationalstaatlichen Streit hinweg – es gibt viele unterschiedliche Auffassungen über die Nutzung der Atomkraft – müssen wir uns in jedem Fall, auch in Erinnerung an diese Katastrophe, darauf einigen, dass wir dafür Sorge zu tragen haben, dass Atomkraftwerke in Europa und in unserer Umgebung sicher sind. Das ist die Mahnung und ganz sicher auch der Auftrag, den dieser Super-GAU von Tschernobyl vor 30 Jahren und die Katastrophe von Fukushima vor wenigen Jahren ausgelöst haben. Diesen Auftrag, meine Damen und Herren, müssen wir auch im Europäischen Parlament sehr ernst nehmen.

(Beifall)

3. Velkomstord

Der Präsident. – Liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Ich hatte diese Woche die Ehre, Ihre Exzellenz, Frau Dr. Amal al-Kubaisi zu treffen. Sie ist die Präsidentin des Parlaments der Vereinigten Arabischen Emirate und ist heute bei uns zu Gast.

Ich möchte Ihnen, werte Frau Kollegin, ausdrücklich danken. Sie haben auch als Präsidentin eines Parlaments eines islamischen Landes zum Ausdruck gebracht, dass Sie die Terroranschläge hier in Brüssel aufs Tiefste verurteilen, und Sie haben einen Kranz an der Stelle des blutigen Attentats niedergelegt. Dafür, liebe Frau Kollegin, möchte ich Ihnen von Herzen danken und Sie willkommen heißen.

(Beifall)

*
* *

Manfred Weber (PPE). – Herr Präsident! Ich beziehe mich auf Artikel 186 und Artikel 11 Punkt 2 unserer Geschäftsordnung und möchte in Erinnerung rufen, dass vorgestern vor dem Plenarsaal des Europäischen Parlaments hier in Brüssel eine kurze Gedenkminute für die Opfer von Terrorismus stattfand. So, wie wir es jetzt auch gewürdigt haben, dass wir an diese Opfer denken. Sie ist zustande gekommen auf eine Initiative von Teresa Jiménez von meiner Fraktion. Der Hintergrund dieser Gedenkminute war, dass gleichzeitig eine Veranstaltung einer Fraktion im Europäischen Parlament stattgefunden hat, nämlich der GUE, bei der ein ehemaliger ETA-Terrorist, nämlich der Herr Otegi, eingeladen war. Ein verurteilter Terrorist hatte in der GUE-Fraktion das Forum bekommen, zu sprechen und zu diskutieren.

Die EVP bittet um Prüfung dieses Sachverhalts. Es ist aus unserer Sicht als EVP-Fraktion im Sinne der Opfer eine Provokation, wenn ehemalige Terroristen in diesem Parlament Rede- und Sprechrecht bekommen, um hier ihre Positionen zu vertreten.

Ich möchte vor dem Hintergrund, dass wir vor wenigen Tagen vor unserer Haustür Terror erlebt haben, noch einmal unterstreichen, dass wir diese Vorgehensweise nicht dulden werden. Das Europäische Parlament steht für Demokratie, für Freiheit, für Frieden, und es steht – hoffentlich – gemeinsam gegen den Terror.

(Beifall)

Der Präsident. – Vielen Dank, Herr Weber! Ich nehme Ihre Wortmeldung zur Kenntnis. Sie haben Artikel 186 Absatz 2 zur Grundlage Ihrer Wortmeldung genommen. Das muss ich so akzeptieren. Ich muss Ihnen aber zugleich sagen, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen, dass ich darüber jetzt keine Debatte zulasse, aus einem simplen und einfachen Grund: Das ist keine Angelegenheit des Plenums.

Ich habe volles Verständnis, und ich habe viele Briefe in dieser Angelegenheit erhalten. Aber individuelle Einladungen von Abgeordneten dieses Hauses oder von Fraktionen an Personen, denen dadurch Zugang zu unserem Haus gegeben wird, fallen weder in meine Zuständigkeit noch in die Zuständigkeit anderer Organe, wenn es nicht außergewöhnliche, schwerwiegende strafrechtliche Gründe gibt, die von Mitgliedstaaten geltend gemacht werden. Insofern habe ich – wie gesagt – Verständnis für Gefühle, aber ich kann gegen diese individuellen Einladungen nicht vorgehen. Es ist eine Angelegenheit politischer Bewertung, die einzelne Mitglieder oder einzelne Fraktionen vornehmen, ob sie solche Personen einladen oder nicht.

Ich wäre Ihnen auch sehr dankbar, wenn wir die Angelegenheit dorthin bringen können, wo sie hingehört: Das sind die zuständigen Organe, das ist die Konferenz der Präsidenten bzw. das Präsidium des Hauses, das ich sicher damit auch befassen werde.

Ich werde Ihnen, Frau Zimmer, jetzt das Wort geben, weil Sie als Fraktion angesprochen worden sind. Ich werde niemandem sonst zu diesem Thema jetzt das Wort geben, weil wir darüber jetzt keine Debatte führen.

Gabriele Zimmer (GUE/NGL). – Herr Präsident! Ich will auch keine Debatte dazu führen, ich möchte hier nur zwei Dinge erklären. Erstens: Wir stehen alle gemeinsam im Kampf gegen den Terrorismus. Punkt.

Zweitens: Es muss aber eine Möglichkeit geben, dass wir Menschen, die sich bewusst für einen Friedensprozess entschieden haben und diesen Friedensprozess auch aktiv führen, in die demokratische Debatte dieses Parlaments einbinden.

Der Präsident. – Frau Kollegin Jiménez-Becerril Barrio! Wir haben ganz sicher Verständnis für Ihre Situation und auch für Ihre Erregung. Dennoch bleibe ich jetzt dabei: Wir befassen mit diesem Thema die zuständigen Organe, und ich werde dazu jetzt keine weiteren Wortmeldungen mehr zulassen.

4. **Godkendelse af protokollen fra foregående møde: se protokollen**
5. **Valgs prøvelse: se protokollen**
6. **Anmodning om ophævelse af parlamentarisk immunitet: se protokollen**
7. **Udvalgenes og delegationernes sammensætning: se protokollen**
8. **Delegerede retsakter (forretningsordenens artikel 105, stk. 6): se protokollen**
9. **Undertegnelse af retsakter vedtaget efter den almindelige lovgivningsprocedure (forretningsordenens artikel 78): se protokollen**
10. **Gennemførelsesforanstaltninger (forretningsordenens artikel 106): se protokollen**
11. **Delegerede retsakter (forretningsordenens artikel 105, stk. 6): se protokollen**
12. **Tekster til aftaler sendt af Rådet: se protokollen**
13. **Forespørgsler til mundtlig besvarelse (modtagne dokumenter): se protokollen**
14. **Modtagne dokumenter: se protokollen**

15. Arbejdsplan

Der Präsident. – Der endgültige Entwurf der Tagesordnung dieser Tagung, wie er in der Konferenz der Präsidenten in ihrer Sitzung vom Donnerstag, dem 21. April 2016 gemäß Artikel 149 der Geschäftsordnung festgelegt wurde, ist verteilt worden.

Herr Pittella, Sie hatten sich zur Tagesordnung gemeldet.

Gianni Pittella, a nome del gruppo S&D. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, i prossimi mesi saranno decisivi per il processo riguardante la concessione dello status di economia di mercato alla Cina. Il 13 maggio il Consiglio dei ministri del Commercio si riunirà; a fine maggio il MES sarà sul tavolo del G7 in Giappone e a luglio la Commissione avrà una discussione e un orientamento importanti. Noi dobbiamo assolutamente avere voce in capitolo.

Per parte nostra, diciamo che vanno evitate decisioni che danneggino le imprese e i lavoratori europei. Per questo propongo che se ne occupi il Parlamento. Oggi, con l'inserimento all'ordine del giorno della discussione e della risoluzione sul MES Cina, il Parlamento non può essere silente di fronte a una vicenda che rischia di danneggiare migliaia e migliaia di imprese e centinaia di migliaia di posti di lavoro.

David Borrelli, a nome del gruppo EFDD. – Signor Presidente, noi siamo assolutamente favorevoli, visto che abbiamo presentato la stessa richiesta e lei lo sa bene. I motivi sono gli stessi che ha sottolineato l'onorevole Pittella e quindi aspettiamo che anche gli altri gruppi appoggino questa richiesta.

Daniel Caspary (PPE). – Herr Präsident! In Europa sorgen sich im Moment mehrere hunderttausend Menschen um ihre Arbeitsplätze genau wegen der Frage, ob China den Marktwirtschaftsstatus bekommt und welche Auswirkungen das auf unsere Handelsschutzzinstrumente hat.

Uns geht es aber hier nicht um populistische Vorschläge, sondern uns geht es eben um die Zukunft genau dieser Menschen. Letzte Woche hat die öffentliche Konsultation der Europäischen Kommission ihr Ende gefunden. Die Europäische Kommission arbeitet im Moment an einem *impact assessment*, und im Juli wird die Europäische Kommission uns als Parlament einen Vorschlag auf dieser Basis unterbreiten. Auf dieser Basis haben wir Interkoordinatoren einen Zeitplan für das weitere Vorgehen festgelegt.

Und nochmal: Das Thema ist emotional, aber es ist auch ein wichtiges Thema! Deswegen geht es nicht um eine kurzfristige Überschrift in irgendwelchen Zeitungen, sondern es geht um die Zukunft von Menschen, und deswegen brauchen wir jetzt Geschlossenheit! Wir brauchen keine Überschriften, sondern tragfähige Lösungen. Wir brauchen jetzt keinen Aktionismus, sondern wir brauchen Geschlossenheit gegenüber den chinesischen Partnern, und in diesem Sinn bitte ich Sie: Ziehen Sie den Antrag zurück! Helfen Sie mit, an einer guten Lösung zu arbeiten! Denken Sie bitte an die vielen, vielen Arbeitnehmer und nicht an den kurzfristigen Medienerfolg!

In diesem Sinne lehnen wir den Antrag ab und wären Ihnen, wie gesagt, dankbar, wenn Sie ihn zurückziehen.

Philippe Lamberts (Verts/ALE). – Monsieur le Président, je voudrais proposer un compromis. En effet, le sujet est très important. Ce n'est pas seulement un sujet émotionnel, c'est un sujet de politique industrielle et de politique économique. Et si ce Parlement veut être entendu, il a quand même intérêt à se prononcer avant la Commission et pas après elle. Moi, je suis très sensible aux arguments qui ont été présentés par les socialistes et le groupe EFDD en vue de le faire avant.

Maintenant, rien ne nous empêche de le faire au cours de la première session de mai à Strasbourg. Nous sommes encore dans les temps, et bien avant la Commission. Nous pouvons l'organiser proprement plutôt que de l'insérer au dernier moment dans l'ordre du jour. Nous pourrions peut-être ainsi le préparer à tête reposée et prévoir une résolution au terme du débat.

Der Präsident. – Vielen Dank, Herr Lamberts! Ich glaube, der Antrag von Herrn Pittella geht ja so weit. Bitte, Herr Pittella!

Gianni Pittella (S&D). – Signor Presidente, volevo dire che aderisco alla proposta del collega Lambert, purché la decisione e il voto sulla risoluzione avvenga prima di questi appuntamenti e non dopo. Quindi, se si fa a Strasburgo, si faccia la discussione con risoluzioni. Non siamo alla ricerca di titoli di giornali, né vogliamo farci propaganda; vogliamo semplicemente risolvere i problemi e i problemi si risolvono se il Parlamento è coinvolto, non se il Parlamento non dice nulla e non vota nulla.

David Borrelli (EFDD). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, anche noi siamo d'accordo con la proposta dei Verdi. Le motivazioni sono le stesse dell'onorevole Pittella, in piena sintonia.

Manfred Weber (PPE). – Herr Präsident! Aufgrund des möglichen Kompromissvorschlags hätte ich einfach die Bitte, ob es nicht möglich ist, dass wir die Fragestellung, wie man sie im Mai dann vorbereitet, schlicht und einfach in der nächsten COP in seriöser Weise miteinander besprechen.

Wir haben auch für das nächste Plenum noch eine COP, wo man dann klären kann, wie man mit dem Thema in der nächsten Mai-Tagung umgeht. Ich würde deshalb vorschlagen, dass wir das in der COP entscheiden.

Der Präsident. – Dann versuchen wir mal, Ordnung in die Angelegenheit zu bringen!

Herr Pittella, Sie haben beantragt, dass es eine Aussprache heute gibt und eine Entschließung aber in der Mai-I-Tagung. Das war Ihr ursprünglicher Antrag.

Gianni Pittella (S&D). – Signor Presidente, io parlavo della tornata di Strasburgo. Non deve essere necessariamente oggi, purché si voti una risoluzione a Strasburgo.

Poi, la discussione la possiamo iniziare oggi o possiamo farla anche a Strasburgo.

Der Präsident. – Herr Pittella, das ist das, was ich gerade gesagt habe. Ich wiederhole nochmal: Eine Aussprache jetzt und die Entschließung in der Mai-Tagung in Straßburg. Das war Ihr Vorschlag.

(Unruhe im Saal)

Bitte beruhigen Sie sich. Das ist der Vorschlag des Kollegen Pittella.

Herr Lamberts, Sie haben den Alternativvorschlag gemacht, beides – Debatte und Entschließung – in Straßburg. Herr Borrelli hat eben gesagt, er schließt sich den Vorschlägen der Sozialisten und der Grünen an. Das ist jetzt etwas kompliziert, denn das sind zwei unterschiedliche Vorschläge. Deshalb muss man versuchen, ein bisschen Ordnung reinzubringen.

Herr Pittella, bitte stellen Sie Ihren Antrag nochmal genauso, wie Sie ihn haben wollen. Dann kann ich darüber abstimmen lassen.

Gianni Pittella (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, io sono d'accordo sul fatto che la discussione e la risoluzione si tengano insieme a Strasburgo.

Der Präsident. – Darüber kann ich aber heute nicht abstimmen lassen, weil das eine Angelegenheit der Konferenz der Präsidenten ist. Es tut mir aufrichtig leid. Ich kann heute nicht über die Tagesordnung der Straßburg-Tagung abstimmen lassen. Der Vorschlag für die Tagesordnung wird nach unserer Geschäftsordnung in der Konferenz der Präsidenten festgelegt. Sie können eine solche Willenserklärung hier abgeben, das kann ich gerne mitnehmen, und das ist okay. Aber das ist nicht das, was wir hier heute beschließen können. Das müssen Sie sich überlegen.

Gianni Pittella (S&D). – Signor Presidente, se le cose stanno così, teniamo almeno la discussione oggi e poi presenteremo la risoluzione a Strasburgo.

Der Präsident. – Liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Wir haben hier eine Geschäftsordnung. Die Geschäftsordnung haben wir deshalb, weil es in einem Haus mit 750 Abgeordneten und acht Fraktionen nicht möglich ist, nach dem Zufallsprinzip zu arbeiten. Deshalb kann ich die Tagesordnung für die Straßburg-Tagung nicht durch einen Beschluss heute festlegen lassen. Das geht gar nicht. Das sieht die Geschäftsordnung nicht vor. Aus diesem Grund – wenn Sie einverstanden sind, dass Sie das in Straßburg diskutiert haben wollen – stelle ich das als eine Empfehlung an die Konferenz der Präsidenten zur Abstimmung.

Ich schlage Ihnen jetzt vor, das Haus möge der Konferenz der Präsidenten in der kommenden Woche empfehlen, für die Tagesordnung in Straßburg eine Debatte über den Marktzugang für China mit Entschließung zur Abstimmung zu stellen.

(Das Parlament nimmt den Vorschlag an.)

Zum Arbeitsplan wurde außerdem folgende Änderung beantragt:

Die S&D-Fraktion hat beantragt, eine Erklärung der Kommission und des Rates über die jüngste Entwicklung in Polen und ihre Auswirkungen auf die Grundrechte als zweiten Tagesordnungspunkt nach dem Bericht Pirinski auf die Tagesordnung zu setzen.

Enrique Guerrero Salom, en nombre del Grupo S&D. – Señor Presidente, en el último periodo parcial de sesiones aprobamos una Resolución por amplia mayoría de este Parlamento, en la que mostrábamos nuestra preocupación por la parálisis del Tribunal Constitucional polaco, que ponía en riesgo la democracia y el Estado de Derecho, proponíamos que se pusieran en práctica las recomendaciones de la Comisión de Venecia y, al mismo tiempo, planteábamos que la Comisión avanzara en su diálogo estructurado con el Gobierno polaco.

Pero nos centrábamos en los asuntos constitucionales. Hay otros asuntos en la realidad polaca que nos preocupan, por ejemplo, los relativos a los medios, pero, muy singularmente, los que se refieren a la nueva regulación —posible nueva regulación— sobre el aborto, al respeto de los derechos de la mujer y a todo lo relacionado con la sanidad reproductiva.

Y mi Grupo quiere que este asunto se debata hoy, con una Resolución, en un punto del orden del día que vaya a continuación del informe Pirinski, es decir, como segundo punto del orden del día de esta sesión plenaria.

Malin Björk (GUE/NGL). – Herr talman! EU ska enligt sina egna principer bygga på fullständig respekt för demokrati och mänskliga rättigheter – grundläggande rättigheter – och i dem ingår naturligtvis kvinnors rättigheter.

Nu är det dags att visa att man står upp för grundläggande rättigheter, inte bara i ord, utan i handling. Mediefriheter som trampas på och kvinnors rättigheter som trampas på. Denna rätt som är den mest grundläggande av alla rättigheter för kvinnor: att bestämma över våra egna kroppar när vi vill ha barn eller inte, när vi har rätt till abort.

Vi måste ta ställning idag och därför tackar vi för initiativet från S&D-gruppen och vi stöder det naturligtvis.

Ryszard Antoni Legutko (ECR). – Po pierwsze chciałem powiedzieć, że prawodawstwo tego rodzaju podpada pod prerogatywy państw narodowych, a nie instytucji europejskich. Po drugie polski rząd nie ma w swojej agendzie zmiany prawa dotyczącego przerywania ciąży. To było wielokrotnie powtarzane. Nie wiem, dlaczego to nie dotarło do pomysłodawców tej rezolucji.

Po trzecie prawdą jest, że toczy się w Polsce dyskusja na ten temat, w którą zaangażowane jest społeczeństwo obywatelskie z różnych stron tego sporu. Taka rezolucja byłaby w istocie nawoływaniem do zamknięcia ust społeczeństwu obywatelskiemu i byłaby nie do przyjęcia, byłaby traktowana jako akt arogancji kompletnie bez podstawy. No debatować chyba jeszcze można.

Der Präsident. – Liebe Kolleginnen und lieber Kollege! Ich kann jetzt eigentlich über diese Anträge keine Aussprache hier zulassen. Heute geht es ja richtig lebhaft zu. Das ist toll, aber ich muss mich schon an die Geschäftsordnung halten.

Jetzt haben Sie mir signalisiert, Sie wollen wieder einen Kompromissvorschlag machen. Da bin ich jetzt alarmiert, denn das bringt uns in große Schwierigkeiten.

Ich gebe jetzt Ihnen, Frau in 't Veld, und Herrn González Pons das Wort. Aber danach müssen wir zu einer Abstimmung kommen.

Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE). – Mr President, I can be very brief. My Group supports the principle of having a debate and a resolution on further issues of concern, but we do not see the reason for having it at this session. There is no great rush so we would propose to do it in May, or June at the very latest. That would actually also allow us, Mr Legutko, to engage with civil society and parliamentarians from Poland and discuss the matter.

Esteban González Pons (PPE). – Señor Presidente, ya tuvimos un debate largo sobre Polonia, con la propia Primera Ministra presente. No hace un mes, aprobamos una Resolución con el apoyo de una gran parte de la mayoría de la Cámara en Estrasburgo. En esa Resolución decíamos que cuando hubiera alguna novedad, la Comisión nos lo haría saber. La Comisión no nos ha dicho nada.

La Comisión de Venecia se reunirá en junio; no le damos tiempo para que se reúna. Aún no ha habido ninguna novedad que nos permita plantear un debate nuevo, que lo único que haría es arriesgar la unidad que esta Cámara ha conseguido con respecto al problema que puede plantear Polonia para la Unión Europea. Se nos dice hoy que se va a tratar de temas nuevos, no de leyes, sino de las intenciones de hacer leyes que tiene el Gobierno polaco.

En primer lugar, los Parlamentos nunca debaten sobre intenciones. En segundo lugar, la política a la que ha hecho referencia el Grupo Socialista es una política interna de Polonia, y en eso este Parlamento jamás debe entrar. Pero, en tercer lugar, este Parlamento no puede condicionar un debate nacional.

Nosotros somos el Parlamento Europeo, no el Parlamento polaco. Lo siento mucho.

Enrique Guerrero Salom (S&D). – Señor Presidente, quiero decirle al señor González Pons que, efectivamente, no somos el Parlamento polaco, pero somos el Parlamento Europeo. Y, como somos el Parlamento Europeo, podemos debatir sobre los asuntos que afectan a ciudadanos de la Unión. No estamos proponiendo sustituir al Gobierno polaco. Estamos proponiendo debatir sobre asuntos que hoy ocupan el escenario político polaco.

Pero mi intervención va en el sentido de lo señalado por Sophia in't Veld, del Grupo ALDE: nosotros aceptaríamos que este asunto fuera debatido en mayo o, como muy tarde, en junio; y, por lo tanto, propondríamos —como ha señalado el Presidente para el caso anterior— que la Conferencia de Presidentes aborde este asunto con vistas a uno de los próximos períodos parciales de sesiones.

Der Präsident. – Gut. Das heißt, Sie ziehen den Antrag hiermit zurück, und wir erwarten dann für die Konferenz der Präsidenten den entsprechenden Vorschlag Ihrer Fraktion.

(Es findet keine Abstimmung statt.)

Im Einvernehmen mit den Fraktionen schlage ich folgende Änderung der Tagesordnung vor:

Für Donnerstag wird die Abstimmungsstunde um zwei Punkte ergänzt: den Bericht von Herrn Lebreton über den Antrag zur Aufhebung der Immunität von Herrn Piecha und die Abstimmung über den Antrag des Ausschusses für Beschäftigung auf Anhörung des Europäischen Wirtschafts- und Sozialausschusses zu einer europäischen Säule sozialer Rechte im Anschluss an die Mitteilung der Kommission zu diesem Thema.

Wird dazu das Wort gewünscht? Das ist nicht der Fall.

(Die Vorschläge sind somit angenommen.)

(Der Arbeitsplan ist somit angenommen.)

*
* *

Fabio Massimo Castaldo (EFDD). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, un richiamo al regolamento. Richiamando gli articoli 22 e 141 del nostro regolamento, desidero attirare l'attenzione sua e dei colleghi sul dovere, appunto, del Presidente di tutelare il ruolo e le prerogative della nostra Assemblea in ogni aspetto della vita politica, a maggior ragione nei rapporti interistituzionali. Domani ci ritroveremo, colleghi, a dibattere per l'ennesima volta della dichiarazione dello scorso marzo tra UE e Turchia. Ne discuteremo e basta, perché alla nostra Istituzione è stato negato non solo il diritto ma anche il dovere di esprimere la propria volontà e responsabilità politica.

Questa dichiarazione è tale solo nel nome; nei fatti sancisce impegni politici e di bilancio europei precisi e già in corso di attuazione. Si tratta quindi a tutti gli effetti di un accordo internazionale e, in quanto tale, da sottoporre alla procedura di approvazione, ex articolo 218 TFUE. Il nostro voto è quindi non solo obbligatorio ma è anche vincolante e per questo propongo a tutti i colleghi, e specialmente a lei Presidente, di sostenere la nostra richiesta di un ricorso per annullamento davanti alla Corte di giustizia.

In nome della democrazia difendiamo i diritti di 508 milioni di cittadini europei.

Der Präsident. – Vielen Dank, Herr Castaldo! Wir nehmen Ihre Wortmeldung zu Protokoll. Ich gehe davon aus, dass sich der Rechtsausschuss und auch die Konferenz der Präsidenten mit Ihrer Intervention befassen werden.

16. Den Europæiske Investeringsbank (EIB) – Årsberetning for 2014 (forhandling)

Der Präsident. – Als erster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über den Bericht von Georgi Pirinski im Namen des Haushaltskontrollausschusses über den Jahresbericht 2014 der Europäischen Investitionsbank (EIB) (2015/2127(INI)) (A8-0050/2016).

Dazu begrüße ich zunächst bei uns den Herrn Präsidenten der Europäischen Investitionsbank, Herrn Werner Hoyer, und seine Mitarbeiterinnen und Mitarbeiter.

Herzlich willkommen, Herr Präsident und meine Damen und Herren!

Georgi Pirinski, rapporteur. – Mr President, let me first of all welcome President Hoyer, thank Commissioner Moscovici, and simply convey my very deep gratitude to all those who worked on this report. As you have seen, this is a comprehensive analysis, it takes a lot of technical work. So both to the shadow rapporteurs, and to all those from the secretariats that worked on this report, I would like to extend my very heartfelt gratitude.

Now as to the substance, in the light of the extraordinary challenges confronting the European Union and Member States at present, it is even more urgent that the Bank fully commits to implementing its core task: to support projects that contribute to the balanced development of the internal market and to social, economic and territorial cohesion. The fact that in 2014 the EIB successfully implemented one of its most ambitious business plans, amounting to EUR 80.3 billion, is undoubtedly a most important achievement. However, virtually 60% of all projects signed in 2014 were allocated to the top five EU economies. In this regard, there is an urgent request for the Bank to substantially step up its technical assistance and financial advice in order to overcome insufficient project-generating capacity and low levels of borrowing in some Member States.

The draft resolution also notes the lack of meaningful follow-up to previous Parliament resolutions. In this regard, I would like to highlight some such issues and invite President Hoyer and Commissioner Moscovici to respond.

Regarding transparency and work with intermediaries, already in 2013 Parliament called on the EIB to refrain from cooperation with financial intermediaries having a negative track record in terms of transparency, tax evasion or aggressive tax planning practices and abusive transfer pricing, or concerning substantial local ownership. It also encouraged the EIB to make funding contingent upon the disclosure of country-by-country tax-relevant data and called on the Bank, jointly with the Commission, to establish a stringent public list of criteria, ensuring the proper selection of financial intermediaries.

Regarding Parliament-Bank cooperation, Parliament repeats its call for regular dialogue between its relevant committees and the Bank, similar to the practices with the ECB, and strongly encourages that an interinstitutional agreement be concluded without further delay.

As to Bank supervision, another previous call envisages putting in place effective prudential banking supervision of the EIB. Regrettably this and other calls have not been taken up by either the Commission or the EIB so far.

As for the European Fund for Strategic Investments, the draft resolution specifically calls on the EIB to ensure that the EFSI is not indirectly used as a means of increasing the EIB's capital, to regularly review the Bank's involvement in EFSI, and to show that the conditions on additionality laid down in Article 5 of the EFSI Regulation have been met. So far it remains to be demonstrated that the Fund is in fact generating additional investments beyond the usual financing arrangements. I do trust that this resolution will contribute to further enhancing the key role of the EIB, as the bank of the European Union, in achieving the Union's strategic political objectives in the immediate future and in the longer-term perspective.

PRESIDENZA DELL'ON. ANTONIO TAJANI

Vicepresidente

Werner Hoyer, *President of the European Investment Bank*. – Mr President, it is a pleasure and an honour to be back at Parliament and to report to you about the Annual Report for 2014 and to respond to the remarks by the rapporteur, Mr Pirinski, whom I thank for his great work and very good, close cooperation with the services of the Bank and myself.

Having said this, let me start by expressing my appreciation for the support you, as the European Parliament, give us to ensure that the EU bank will continue to deliver benefits for the EU economy and for EU citizens, as well as contribute to common European objectives in our external activities.

Let me recap on what we have achieved since 2014, the year under review. Our plans were ambitious both in form and substance. Higher volumes of traditional lending and advising activities were and are still needed to make an imperative contribution to European goals and to respect the EIB's ongoing responsibilities as the EU bank. At the same time the EU bank took upon itself an unprecedented challenge and gladly accepted to play a central role in the Investment Plan for Europe, a role which required a quantum change in the business, in the bank's business profile, for some years to come.

After the crisis began in 2007, we increased our lending by 60% in two years. Following up with a EUR 10 billion capital increase in 2012, we increased lending by EUR 60 billion, supporting an extra EUR 180 billion of investment not, as was foreseen, by the end of 2015 but already in March 2015. Above target and ahead of time.

The Investment Plan for Europe, the Juncker Plan, with its three pillars, is another exceptional response to exceptional needs. Negotiations between the Council, Parliament and the Commission to finalise the regulation were concluded in May last year. That was in record time and we are very grateful for that.

The Plan consists, of course, of three elements. We only talk about one normally – the EFSI, the European Fund for Strategic Investments – backed by a EUR 16 billion EU budget guarantee and EUR 5 billion of cash from the European Investment Bank in order to increase the risk-taking capacity of the EIB Group.

I take it from the rapporteur that we do indeed have an obligation to demonstrate that, with this additional manoeuvre space, we are targeting investments which make a difference and which are additional to what we would have been able to do, at least on this scale, under normal circumstances. And I think we can prove that.

Then of course we have the enhancement of our advisory capacities within the framework of the European Advisory Hub, and the third pillar is all about removing barriers to investment and structural reforms.

Let me take the opportunity to update you. So far the EIB Group, that is both the EIB and the European Investment Fund (which supports smaller businesses) has approved through EFSI financing an amount of EUR 11.2 billion to more than 220 projects in 25 Member States, which will trigger an overall additional investment in Europe of over EUR 82.1 billion. In other words, although the institutional setup was only completed at the beginning of this year, we have also done more than 25% of the volumes we have promised within three years. So you can see that the pace of our delivery has taken up speed.

Very importantly, the Advisory Hub is also proving to be a successful initiative, having as of March 2016 received and processed 108 requests, of which 87 are project-specific. Simultaneously a network of partner institutions keen to work in cooperation with the Hub is being established across the EU. Fifteen memoranda of understanding have been signed with the national promotion institutions, with an additional seven in the pipeline.

The Investment Plan for Europe is important for our economy but Europe also has global responsibilities and the Council, the Commission and sometimes Parliament remind us of that as well. We need to ensure that in future the EU bank will have the necessary personnel and financial resources, instruments and platforms to support EU external policy and development efforts, all the way to climate policies in particular.

While EU Member States already provide considerable official development assistance to the nations, the challenges in the developing world need a more coordinated approach and the financial instruments that we use to leverage private capital within the European Union every day. As such I foresee a situation where we will reach the limits of the bank's current 10% level for activities outside the European Union.

First among these current pressing issues is the EIB's response to the refugee crisis and how the EIB can contribute beyond what is already being done both in Europe and in the region of the Middle East and North Africa. We have proposed to our board that the EIB could do more both in Europe, to finance the infrastructure needed to cope with the new arrivals, and outside Europe, on private sector development in countries of origin and transit. We are currently actively working on concrete proposals that will be presented to the European Council in June, as we have been asked to do.

We also look forward to continuing our very close cooperation with the Commission in this crucial effort.

A final word about our parliamentary responsibility, our responsibility vis-à-vis Parliament: for me, as a parliamentary veteran of 25 years, it goes without saying that Europe's citizens expect and deserve parliamentary oversight for their bank. Therefore it goes without saying that I am ready, just like my colleagues are, to report to Parliament and its committees and parliamentary groups when you so wish.

Your bank, the EU bank, is nowadays the world's biggest international financial institution in terms of lending volume, operating in many different sectors in parts of the world. Over past years we have been delivering approximately EUR 70 to 80 billion a year of investments in sound and sustainable projects, mostly inside the EU and increasingly also in our partner countries. We will continue to do so, including by using the additional firepower under EFSI, because we have to address the huge investment needs.

The last year has been particularly intense and challenging, with the EIB under sharp scrutiny because what we do matters, and people and parliaments care. The message we get from your report is one of support, encouragement and urgency, and I take the remarks also on transparency, the remarks on NCJ policies, very seriously and I think we will report to the relevant committees separately on this very issue.

Let me assure you that we are willing to live up fully to our institutional responsibilities and will continue to exchange with you regularly on our activities and their impact on the ground. Thank you very much for your attention.

Pierre Moscovici, *membre de la Commission*. – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le rapporteur, Monsieur le Président de la BEI, cher Werner Hoyer, Mesdames et Messieurs les députés, l'enjeu de notre discussion aujourd'hui tient en un chiffre. Les investissements en Europe sont 15 % inférieurs au niveau antérieur à la crise. L'Union européenne doit impérativement combler ce déficit pour renouer avec une croissance plus robuste et pour renforcer sa compétitivité mondiale. C'est tout l'objet du plan d'investissement pour l'Europe.

Votre rapport souligne à juste titre le rôle que joue la BEI – notre banque, la banque des Européens – de catalyseur de l'investissement sur notre continent et, par extension, c'est son soutien à la reprise économique que vous avez salué. Bien sûr, nous partageons et je partage personnellement cette appréciation.

Le plan d'investissement a connu une vraie montée en puissance ces derniers mois depuis l'entrée en vigueur du règlement EFSI, il y a moins d'un an. Le nombre de projets ainsi que leur couverture géographique et leur répartition sectorielle n'ont cessé de progresser. Je veux dire ici que le groupe BEI et la BEI elle-même, le Fonds européen d'investissement ont approuvé plus de 200 opérations bénéficiant de la garantie EFSI dans vingt-cinq États membres. Ces projets doivent générer d'ores et déjà – le chiffre que j'ai est sans doute déjà dépassé – plus de 82 milliards d'investissement, soit plus du quart de l'objectif global du plan, qui doit être atteint en trois ans. C'est donc un bon rythme. L'objectif est bien une couverture accrue des pays comme des secteurs. Votre rapport est l'occasion de revenir plus en détail sur cette montée en puissance et sur les progrès en cours.

Je me concentrerai particulièrement dans ce propos introductif sur trois des aspects détaillés dans vos travaux, à savoir l'appui aux PME, les aspects fiscaux et les actions extérieures.

Un mot d'abord sur le plan opérationnel. La Commission construit actuellement un portail électronique de projets d'investissement européens conçu pour être d'usage facile. Ce portail offrira aux projets d'investissement une visibilité auprès d'investisseurs internationaux potentiels. De même, en collaboration avec la BEI, nous avons également mis en place une plateforme européenne de conseil en investissement, opérationnelle depuis septembre 2015, qui offre aux porteurs de projets un point d'entrée unique en matière d'assistance technique ou de conseil.

Votre rapport évoque longuement le rôle des PME, principale source de croissance et d'emploi en Europe. Trois brèves remarques à ce sujet. D'abord, un quart des investissements nouveaux générés par l'EFSI bénéficiera aux PME et aux entreprises de taille intermédiaire. Concrètement, on parle de 75 milliards d'euros sur trois ans. Cela veut dire, en effet, que ce plan n'est pas un plan «grandes entreprises» ou un plan «infrastructures», c'est un plan qui est tourné vers toute l'économie européenne.

Sous le volet PME de l'EFSI – c'est ma deuxième réflexion –, l'accès au financement pour les PME s'est significativement amélioré grâce à des outils comme COSME, comme InnovFin, et, plus récemment, la facilité de garantie du programme de l'UE pour l'emploi et l'innovation sociale. Le mandat de la BEI concernant le capital-risque a également été élargi.

Au total – et c'est ma troisième réflexion –, 125 opérations avaient été signées par le FEI sous le volet PME-EFSI fin mars 2016. Plus de 122 000 PME et entreprises de taille intermédiaire dans dix-neuf États membres devraient en bénéficier. Là encore, on retrouve les mêmes caractéristiques: couverture géographique et sectorielle large.

Quelques mots ensuite d'un sujet qui me tient particulièrement à cœur et que votre rapport évoque, à savoir la dimension fiscale.

En janvier 2016, la Commission, vous le savez, a adopté un nouveau paquet contre l'évasion fiscale, qui contient des propositions en faveur d'une action plus forte à l'échelle de l'Union contre la fraude et l'évasion fiscales. Dans ce contexte, la Commission suit de près les évolutions en cours de la politique de la BEI en matière de lutte contre l'évasion et la fraude fiscales. Sur ce point, je veux reconnaître l'expertise de la BEI, sous l'autorité du président Hoyer. Cela permet à la banque de promouvoir la transparence et l'efficacité fiscale aux côtés de la Commission.

Le dernier aspect que je souhaitais évoquer plus en détail concerne les actions extérieures. Comme le Parlement, je salue le renouvellement du mandat pour 2014-2020 octroyant une garantie de l'Union à hauteur de 27 milliards d'euros. Nous établirons d'ici fin 2016 un rapport d'évaluation à mi-mandat, qui permettra de mesurer la mise en œuvre globale du mandat extérieur en cours et d'envisager une proposition de la Commission pour une mise à jour de la décision du Parlement et du Conseil sur le mandat extérieur.

En particulier, il s'agira de mesurer la cohérence de ce mandat avec la politique extérieure de l'Union et le contexte géopolitique. Cette révision du mandat sera aussi l'occasion d'analyser l'activation éventuelle du montant optionnel de trois milliards d'euros.

Dans le même temps, la BEI intègre ses opérations dans un cadre plus large qui favorise les complémentarités. C'est notamment le cas de la crise des réfugiés – nous en parlons très souvent avec Werner – et je sais l'importance, la taille, le rôle de la BEI et son implication en la matière. Même si nous sommes conscients tous les deux des limites du mandat de la BEI, nous apprécions sa volonté de prendre part au développement des moyens communautaires, tant à l'intérieur qu'à l'extérieur de l'Union.

Je terminerai en évoquant un point de méthodologie. La Commission salue bien sûr l'approbation en 2015 de la nouvelle politique de transparence de la BEI. La transparence, l'ouverture, la responsabilité sont des concepts clés pour l'Union européenne. Nous apprécions l'engagement de la BEI de se mettre en conformité avec l'initiative de l'Union sur la transparence et à suivre les meilleures pratiques internationales en la matière.

Au total – je veux le dire ici, en présence de son président –, je vois à quel point l'institution change et à quel point – ce qui était l'intention politique de ceux qui ont pensé le plan Juncker, puis l'ont lancé – elle se montre capable d'accompagner davantage que par le passé les entreprises qui prennent des risques. Car il s'agit bien, pour l'essentiel, d'investissements privés. Tout cela est en marche, et c'est une formidable réussite pour l'Europe si nous réussissons à aller jusqu'au bout de ce succès collectif.

Mesdames et Messieurs les députés, vous avez pu noter que nos prévisions de février 2016 prévoient une accélération de la croissance à 1,9 % en 2017 pour la zone euro. Mais nous avons aussi souligné – et je reprendrai cela la semaine prochaine, puisque nous allons présenter nos perspectives pour le printemps – que cette accélération serait clairement fonction d'un rebond de l'investissement. L'investissement est toujours le maillon faible de la croissance européenne. Pour la Commission, et pour les Européens d'ailleurs, ce rebond est d'une importance capitale. Dans ce sens, le plan Juncker est plus qu'un signal, il est un moteur.

Nous partageons donc la détermination de cette Assemblée à matérialiser, à accroître encore ce rebond. Je pense que ce travail qui est fait actuellement sur le plan Juncker est très encourageant pour les Européens et la Commission, qui en est coauteur. Je veux aussi saluer l'exemplarité du travail accompli par la BEI.

Daniele Viotti, supplente del relatore per parere della commissione per i bilanci. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, intervengo al posto della collega Gardiazabal, relatrice di bilancio della relazione in discussione e mi scuso se non sarò preciso e puntuale come sarebbe stato lei. Ringrazio intanto il relatore Pirinski per l'ottima relazione. La Banca europea per gli investimenti è naturalmente un *asset* fondamentale dell'Unione europea, tanto più ora che è stata incaricata di gestire il lato operativo del piano Juncker. Ma maggiori poteri significano anche maggiore trasparenza e maggiore responsabilità.

Maggiore trasparenza significa trasparenza nei confronti dei cittadini per quanto riguarda la gestione e un attento controllo anche da parte del Parlamento. Attenta responsabilità significa maggior responsabilità e avere ben presenti quali sono gli obiettivi della Banca europea per gli investimenti nei confronti delle piccole e medie imprese, nei confronti della gestione del piano Juncker, come si diceva, ma anche nelle relazioni e nella sua dimensione esterna, operando in maniera più incisiva nelle zone del mondo da stabilizzare anche dal punto vista economico e finanziario.

Chiudo, dicendo che auspichiamo che ci sia una sempre maggiore collaborazione tra la Banca europea per gli investimenti e le banche nazionali d'investimento – nel caso dell'Italia, la Cassa depositi e prestiti ma naturalmente le banche nazionali d'investimento in tutti i paesi. Abbiamo bisogno di forti investimenti da parte della BEI per tornare a crescere dopo otto anni di stagnazione, dopo otto anni veramente molto mortificanti per l'economia europea.

Δημήτριος Παπαδημούλης, Εισηγητής της γνωμοδότησης της Επιτροπής Οικονομικών και Νομισματικών Θεμάτων. – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, θέλω να ευχαριστήσω τον εισηγητή, τον κύριο Pirinski, για την έκθεσή του και, απευθυνόμενος στον κύριο Moscovici και τον κύριο Hoyer, να πω ότι η βασική ιδέα της γνωμοδότησης της επιτροπής μας είναι ότι χρειαζόμαστε, επείγοντως, περισσότερες επενδύσεις και στροφή σε μια βιώσιμη ανάπτυξη. Ιδιαίτερα στις χώρες που μαστίζονται από μεγάλη ύφεση, υψηλή ανεργία, μεγάλη μείωση επενδύσεων, όπως η χώρα μου, η Ελλάδα η οποία, επιπλέον, αντιμετωπίζει και το πρόσθετο πρόβλημα του προσφυγικού όπως σωστά σημείωσε ο Επίτροπος Moscovici.

Η εμμονή σε μια τυφλή δογματική λιτότητα βλάπτει και την οικονομία και τη δημοκρατία αλλά και την κοινωνική και περιφερειακή συνοχή και χρειάζεται πιο αποτελεσματική και συνδυασμένη δράση της Ευρωπαϊκής Τράπεζας Επενδύσεων, του «ταμείου Γιούνκερ» όπως ονομάστηκε, και των ιδιωτικών κεφαλαίων και των διαρθρωτικών κονδυλίων, για να έχουμε μια ισχυρότερη στροφή στην ανάπτυξη και, κύριε Moscovici, το τελευταίο που χρειάζεται αυτή την ώρα η Ευρώπη είναι μια αστάθεια ή μια αποσταθεροποίηση στην Ελλάδα.

Γι αυτό και σας καλώ και ζητώ από την Επιτροπή να παίξει ενεργότερο ρόλο, έτσι ώστε εξωπραγματικές απαιτήσεις του IMF, του Διεθνούς Νομισματικού Ταμείου, που απειλούν με αστάθεια το νοτιοανατολικό άκρο της Ευρώπης, να μην επιτρέψουν να ξαναζήσουμε την περιπέτεια του τελευταίου καλοκαιριού.

Ivan Jakovčić, izvijestitelj za mišljenje Odbora REGL. – Gospodine predsjedniče, velika su očekivanja, gospodine Hoyer, od Europske investicijske banke. Velika su očekivanja srednjih i malih poduzeća, velika su očekivanja mnogih urbanih i ruralnih sredina, lokalnih i regionalnih vlasti. Kriza u mnogim zemljama traje predugo i zato su očekivanja usmjerena prema Europskoj investicijskoj banci, u podršci javnom sektoru i privatnom sektoru, s pravom jako velika.

Na primjer, mnoge zemlje istočne Europe, Hrvatska iz koje ja dolazim, trebaju velika ulaganja. Naša očekivanja idu prema tome što ste ranije iznijeli, reformi koju činite u samoj Europskoj investicijskoj banci i pokušaju da napokon imamo sinergiju kohezijske politike, financiranja Europske investicijske banke i Junckerovog fonda kao dijela Vaše banke ili naše banke. Tu sinergiju moramo iskoristiti i očekujemo da upravo na toj sinergiji dobijemo i značajne rezultate.

(Govornik je pristao odgovoriti na pitanje postavljeno podizanjem plave kartice (članak 162. stavak 8. Poslovnika)).

Maria Grapini (S&D), Întrebare adresată conform procedurii „cartonașului albastru”. – Stimate coleg, ați început prin a spune că aveți mari așteptări. Și eu am mari așteptări de la BEI. Vizavi de ceea ce spunea și domnul comisar și reprezentantul BEI-ului: considerați că prin ceea ce s-a făcut și s-a modificat până acum, accesul la finanțarea IMM-urilor este cu adevărat îmbunătățit? Sau ne trezim că din nou IMM-urile au obstacole în accesarea fondurilor structurale și, sigur, și a fondurilor prin BEI?

Ivan Jakovčić (ALDE), odgovor na pitanje postavljeno podizanjem plave kartice. – Poštovana gospođo zastupnice, slažem se s Vama da još uvijek ima velikih administrativnih barijera. Međutim ovo je izvješće za 2014., a znamo da je u međuvremenu 2015. i ove godine Europska investicijska banka učinila niz administrativnih promjena.

Međutim, ono što je dodatni problem je to što u nekim državama članicama imamo velikih dodatnih problema barijera unutar zemalja članica Europske unije. I tu imamo problem dolaska do sredstava za mala i srednja poduzeća.

Brian Hayes, on behalf of the PPE Group. – Mr President, I want to welcome the report by Mr Pirinski and thank him for the work we did. I also welcome to Parliament President Hoyer, on behalf of the European Investment Bank. The EIB is Europe's bank. It must be part of our recovery and it plays an increasing role in long-term European investment which, as Commissioner Moscovici pointed out, is EUR 15 billion down in public and private terms from the start of the crisis.

Now the priorities of this Parliament in obtaining more public-private models of funding, more solutions for long-term investment, and the emergence of a genuine Capital Markets Union, all point to a new era, to the future-proofing of the EU economy. In all of that, the EIB plays an increasingly active role. What is particularly encouraging for countries like my own, which have gone through terrible adjustment programmes and seen a massive fall-off in public and private investment, is that when confidence is restored and when a country is turned around, the EIB's investment significantly improves new investment opportunities in countries such as Ireland.

Now 2014 was a very significant year for the Bank. I welcome especially, on behalf of the EPP Group, the fact that SME lending in 2014 was EUR 25 billion, which was a significant improvement on previous years. Obviously the EIB plays a crucial role in the success of the EFSI Juncker Investment Plan, and the great challenge we face is to realise the private sector contribution, given the capital from the EU budget and the EFSI itself. While over EUR 20 billion was released for strategic investment in 2014, we have to be more ambitious now at this especially important time for Europe. Across the EU the private sector has cash-rich balance sheets which we need to find a way to unlock for all our investment needs.

Finally, I want to agree with President Hoyer when he said repeatedly that he wants further engagement with the European Parliament. We need to find a means of doing that for the satisfaction of this Parliament and its committees and the EIB, and the satisfaction with the integrity of the entire process.

(The speaker agreed to take a blue-card question under Rule 162(8))

Doru-Claudian Frunzulică (S&D), blue-card question. – How do you think that this report, if adopted, is going to influence the European Investment Bank to adopt, eventually, a new lending strategy towards the Member States?

Brian Hayes (PPE), blue-card answer. – I think the adoption of this report looks back on 2014 and sets out what we need to do as a European Union because we recognise, as is in the report, the fall-off of investment in public-private capital. That is not going to be helped by politically picking and choosing projects. We have got to get behind projects which make Europe more competitive and improve employment and growth prospects. The only way that can happen is to have a strong governance arrangement at the Bank, whereby projects that actually succeed – which make the Bank stronger and Europe stronger – are the projects that we should support. We should not politically intervene in that, because that would be to the detriment of Europe's long-term growth potential.

(The speaker agreed to take a blue-card question under Rule 162(8))

Liadh Ní Riada (GUE/NGL), ceist “cárta gorm”. – Tugaim faoi ndeara go bhfuil tú ag caint ar infheistíocht a dhéanamh i seirbhísí poiblí, ach mar sin féin i dtaobh an *Juncker Plan* mar shampla níl aon bhanc poiblí againn in Éirinn, mar is eol duit, agus tá sé an-deacair ar dhaoine teacht air seo mar airgead breise agus fiú amháin teacht ar airgead ón EIB.

Conas a déarfása go bhfuil an rialtas in Éirinn – nuair a bheidh rialtas againn ag deireadh an lae – chun aghaidh a thabhairt ar an dúshlán seo? Féachann sé domsa go bhfuilimid ag cur airgead agus infheistíocht isteach sna bainc *commercial* seachas sna cinn phoiblí, agus mar sin níl an t-airgead ag dul go dtí na háiteanna inar chóir dó a bheith ag imeacht.

Brian Hayes (PPE), blue-card answer. — Ms Ní Riada, in a funny way we actually have public banks in Ireland because one of our banks is 95% owned by the state and there is a direct obligation on that bank, which now has a new mandate with the EIB, to use EIB funds for SME lending. There is also an obligation, I think, to use the potential of the EFSI and Juncker Plan to get behind big projects. And if I can be critical of Ireland here, like other small countries, I wonder are we seeing the magnitude of projects coming forward from countries like my own and other small Member States?

If one listens to some of the reports recently from the EIB there is an argument that we need to be more ambitious for the bigger projects, the bigger projects that can transform economies, that can make economies more competitive, that actually make a difference when it comes to making a difference for the European Union. I hope that whatever government is in place in Ireland over the course of the next file will follow that advice.

(The speaker agreed to take a blue-card question under Rule 162(8))

Bill Etheridge (EFDD), blue-card question. – Thank you for taking the question. You use an interesting phrase, the term ‘future-proofing’. Surely it has been proven that the efforts of the EU to future-proof against market forces are often hopelessly impotent, and, indeed, sometimes counterproductive, by the failure to deal with the steel crisis, an issue which incidentally I was appalled to see was kicked into the long grass earlier on in this session. But does that not show that any effort to future-proof against market forces is beyond the capability of even a Union of this size?

Brian Hayes (PPE), blue-card answer. – I don't think so, because if you read what the entire ambition of the EIB is – and I am not speaking on their behalf, but I have read the reports closely – future-proofing means that we invest in the long-term sustainable approach. So it is very important in the future, for instance, that we invest in projects which have a systemic importance to energy supply, that we invest in green technology and that we try to anticipate the problems that are coming down the track. That can only be done with an eye on the future, because we live in a society that is radically changing. We have got to make sure that the technologies we have in place get this kind of support from the EIB. I think there is a willingness on the part of the Bank to do that. Maybe after all these questions I might even apply for President Hoyer's job myself.

Inés Ayala Sender, en nombre del Grupo S&D. – Señor Presidente, en primer lugar, quiero agradecer al señor Pirinski, de nuevo, un informe realizado con enorme rigor y primor, un excelente informe. Y también quiero agradecer al Comisario Moscovici que haya dicho claramente que la asignatura pendiente en Europa es la inversión: hay algunas personas, incluso en esta Cámara, que siguen pensando que se trata de costes y no de beneficios.

Y esa es un poco la impresión que luego nos llega, señor Hoyer; ese es el problema que tenemos con respecto a cómo va usted, o sea, cómo va el Banco Europeo de Inversiones dando cuenta de las inversiones que desde el presupuesto europeo van llegando.

Es decir, tenemos la impresión, cada vez más -y los ciudadanos con nosotros-, de que el presupuesto de la Unión es cada vez más pequeño y de que se reduce su capacidad de subvenciones, ayudas directas -en fin, de fondos- y, en cambio, una parte, que cada vez se nos antoja más importante, pasa o se traspasa a su banco, al Banco Europeo de Inversiones.

Ya hubo una recapitalización a partir de los Estados miembros en 2009 -232 000 millones de euros- y en 2013 con gran dolor de nuestro corazón, y usted lo sabe porque incluso algunos de sus compatriotas y de su propio grupo político pelearon hasta el final para evitar que hubiera fondos que salieran del MCE y de Horizonte 2020 para la garantía que necesitaba el FEIE o el plan, que en aquel momento llamábamos el «Plan Juncker», y, sin embargo, finalmente se dio la adopción por parte de este Parlamento, y yo fui una de las personas que peleó por que usted tuviera precisamente las garantías necesarias para multiplicar.

Ese era uno de los mandatos: la multiplicación, una especie de multiplicación milagrosa, a través de unas garantías, hasta conseguir 315 000 millones para, precisamente, movilizar el desarrollo europeo y, en segundo lugar, movilizar la iniciativa privada.

Y hay algunos reproches con relación a cómo se ha trabajado, a pesar de que usted viene ahora con un inicio — diríamos— de resultados.

No nos gustó que, con la premura y la poca participación antes de la adopción del FEIE por el propio Parlamento Europeo, hubiera algunos errores como el proyecto Castor, que usted conoce bien y del que todavía tendremos que hablar en la Comisión de Control Presupuestario.

También seguimos teniendo continuas quejas, por parte de las pymes y de las administraciones locales, de que los proyectos que ustedes generan o gestionan tienen que ser proyectos de una enorme cuantía. Y para generar empleo, como usted sabe muy bien, son necesarias las pequeñas empresas y las pequeñas administraciones.

Y por último: la poca transparencia -todavía- y la rendición de cuentas, por lo cual le pido que acceda a seguir la recomendación del señor Pirinski, formulada en el apartado 80 del informe, de recibir las preguntas de los parlamentarios como una práctica normal, y también en relación con el acuerdo interinstitucional con la Comisión y con el Tribunal de Cuentas, en el apartado 78. Yo creo que con ello podríamos mejorar mucho más.

(La oradora acepta responder a una pregunta formulada con arreglo al procedimiento de la «tarjeta azul» (artículo 162, apartado 8, del Reglamento))

Edouard Ferrand (ENF), *question «carton bleu»*. – Monsieur le Président, j'ai simplement une question d'ordre politique. Ce rapport plaide pour plus d'intégration européenne et plus de fédéralisme. Alors, chère Madame, êtes-vous d'accord, comme le commissaire européen, M. Moscovici, pour créer un super ministre européen des finances, de manière à pouvoir, une fois de plus, aller au-delà de la souveraineté des États?

Inés Ayala Sender (S&D), *respuesta de «tarjeta azul»*. – Señor Ferrand, yo la verdad es que de momento estoy encantada con el Comisario Moscovici, con la forma en que va llevando las finanzas y el mensaje europeo sobre las inversiones con respecto a otras zonas. Por lo tanto, yo de momento, por lo menos, no tengo necesidad de un superministro de Finanzas; al revés, casi nada más que el título a veces me da un poco de miedo. Preferiría una mejor cooperación entre el Comisario Moscovici, que trabaja enormemente bien, y el señor Hoyer y los Estados miembros; que le hicieran un poco más de caso al señor Moscovici. Yo creo que con ello ganaríamos todos.

Ryszard Czarnecki, *on behalf of the ECR Group*. – Mr President, I would first like to thank our rapporteur, Mr Pirinski, for a very interesting report. But I see a real problem. In 2014, almost 60% (59.4%, to be precise) of European Investment Bank-signed projects were allocated to the top five EU economies, while the other 23 Member States received only 30.3%. This means that the Bank should definitely implement a more balanced lending policy towards Member States. A more balanced, fairer policy is of high importance because of the intensity of both the current and the long-term challenges facing the Union at the moment. Finally, my political group finds this policy strange and unfair, and we cannot support this resolution.

(The speaker agreed to take a blue-card question under Rule 162(8))

Președinte: ADINA-IOANA VĂLEAN

Vicepreședinte

Maria Grapini (S&D), *Întrebare adresată conform procedurii „cartonașului albastru”*. – Stimate coleg, mă bucur că ați început prin a sesiza, dintre cele trei probleme, pe prima, cea legată de faptul că există o supraconcentrare a fondurilor acordate primelor cinci state membre. Eu am avut un amendament și o propunere adresată domnului Juncker. Întrebarea mea este de ce nu s-a votat în Parlament, atunci când am solicitat, criteriul geografic, de care să se țină cont pentru o repartizare echilibrată. Care este punctul dumneavoastră de vedere și al grupului dumneavoastră?

Ryszard Czarnecki (ECR), *odpowiedź na pytanie zadane przez podniesienie niebieskiej kartki*. – Dziękuję bardzo za to ważne pytanie. Oczywiście kwestia kryteriów geograficznych i balansu geograficznego jest bardzo ważna, nie tylko w kwestii Europejskiej Służby Działań Zewnętrznych – z czym mamy problem od lat, przypomnę – ale również w kwestii Europejskiego Banku Inwestycyjnego i wielu innych kwestii.

Myślę, że Parlament Europejski powinien być bardziej otwarty na potrzeby trzynastu nowych krajów członkowskich Unii Europejskiej, które weszły do Unii po roku 2004. I myślę, że byłoby to bardzo dobre, gdy chodzi, powiem tak, o autorytet Unii Europejskiej w tych krajach.

Miguel Viegas, *em nome do Grupo GUE/NGL*. – A Europa encontra-se neste momento num impasse. A política de coesão morreu por falta de meios. O tratado orçamental e a governação económica impedem os Estados nacionais de poder avançar com políticas de relançamento das suas economias. Em suma, estamos num impasse e não existem nenhuma perspectivas no quadro das instituições europeias de podermos ter um relançamento do crescimento económico assente em bases sólidas.

Neste quadro, estes resultados do BEI, com cerca de setenta e cinco mil milhões de euros investidos e quatrocentas empresas apoiadas, representam apenas uma gota de água relativamente ao *gap* de investimento e ao que é necessário fazer.

Não temos informação sobre a distribuição geográfica deste investimento e a agregação das PME com empresas de média capitalização, que podem ir até três mil trabalhadores, não nos permite avaliar o contributo destes apoios para a coesão social e territorial. O que observamos e o que temos, designadamente no plano de Juncker, onde o BEI assume um papel importante, é que os objetivos de coesão pesam pouco numa União Europeia cada vez mais ao serviço das grandes empresas e do capital.

Bart Staes, *namens de Verts/ALE-Fractie*. – Ik wil mijn tussenkomst beperken tot de strijd tegen belastingfraude en belastingontwijking. Het verslag van collega Pirinski bevat daartoe een hele reeks schitterende aanbevelingen, onder meer de aanbeveling aan de Europese Investeringsbank om de kwaliteit van de informatie over de uiteindelijke begunstigten te verbeteren. Er is ook een zeer uitdrukkelijke vraag van het Parlement en de Commissie begrotingscontrole aan de EIB om op een doeltreffender wijze te voorkomen dat er transacties plaatsvinden met financiële tussenpersonen die een negatieve score hebben op het gebied van transparantie, fraude, corruptie, georganiseerde misdaad, witwassen van geld en activiteiten die schadelijke sociale en milieugevolgen hebben.

Welnu, mijnheer Hoyer: wat zult u doen met die aanbevelingen? Neemt u die ter harte? Wat zult u doen om ervoor te zorgen dat in het komende jaar deze aanbevelingen ook ter harte worden genomen? Ik dank u.

Jane Collins, *on behalf of the EFDD Group*. – Madam President, thanks to the EIB all British taxpayers seem to do is fund loans to export British jobs to countries including Turkey, China and Russia. Let us take a look at steel, a hot topic in the UK, on which the Commission has admitted its responsibility for banning rescue and restructuring aid unless it is driven by the market, i.e. not state aid.

So why then are British steel workers subsidising foreign steel companies in the form of soft loans totalling GBP 80 million? One of these companies mentioned as having loans under consideration is the Wuhan Iron and Steel Corporation, the world's eighth largest producer based on tonnage. Its products now are subject to 36.6% anti-dumping tariffs. The loan was to reduce the cost of energy. One of the main complaints of Tata is the high cost of energy in the UK. Another plant, in Guangdong, was given EUR 35 million in the interests of improving energy efficiency. The EIB has been making loans to state-owned Chinese steel companies who are then able to sell back to the EU below cost price, and our own UK Government has been powerless to stop it.

This situation has been branded insane by a director of a UK steel company although the words I would use are 'an absolute disgrace'. The North of England in particular is suffering from higher and higher unemployment, lower wages and fewer career opportunities, yet our own taxes are being given to Chinese steel plants, which has helped put our workers on the dole. We should have learned from the loan to Ford, which cost this country thousands of jobs, but clearly we just keep giving our money away.

Barbara Kappel, *im Namen der ENF-Fraktion*. – Frau Vorsitzende! Herr Präsident! Herr Kommissar Moscovici! Im Unterschied zu meiner Vorrednerin muss ich sagen, dass ich den Jahresbericht 2014 der EZB durchaus beeindruckend empfinde, obwohl ich mich selber sehr stark für die Stahlindustrie einsetze und für alle Themen, die jetzt gerade genannt wurden.

Der Bericht ist beeindruckend, und das spiegelt sich auch im Bericht des Kollegen Pirinski wieder, denn eines ist klar: Der Europäischen Investitionsbank kommt bei der Überwindung der Investitionslücke, die wir seit dem Ausbrechen der Finanz- und Schuldenkrise haben, eine wichtige Bedeutung zu, und die Zahlen, die im Bericht stehen, sind ein Ausdruck dafür.

2014 hat die EIB 80,3 Milliarden Finanzierungen vorgenommen, 7,9 Milliarden sind davon ins Ausland geflossen, sind in Drittstaaten geflossen. Sicher, Präsident Hoyer, Sie haben es selber angesprochen, wird diese Maximum-10-Prozent-Grenze in der Zukunft wahrscheinlich nicht halten, insbesondere im Hinblick auf die Migration. Wenn ich mir anschau, dass aus einem 3-Milliarden-Paket 2014 eine Milliarde in die Ukraine geflossen ist, ist hier wahrscheinlich auch fraglich, wie das weitergehen kann.

Was mir sehr gut gefallen hat, ist auch dieses Rekordvolumen, das Sie 2014 bei den kleinen und mittelständischen Betrieben hatten. Ich meine, Sie haben 285 000 Klein- und Mittelbetriebe gefördert, 3,6 Millionen Arbeitsplätze gesichert, das ist wichtig. Eine Kritik habe ich jedoch: EFSI. In Österreich wurde bisher ein Projekt genehmigt, das ist der Windenergiepark Bruck. Die zuständigen Gremien, die Banken, die Investoren jammern. Bitte setzen Sie sich hier ein, dass auch in Österreich mehr Projekte zur Umsetzung kommen.

Zoltán Balczó (NI). – Elnök Asszony, az Európai Beruházási Bank 2014-ben 80 milliárd euró támogatást nyújtott. Ez az Unió teljes 2700 milliárdos beruházási összegének mindössze 3%-a, vagyis ez arány alapján mondhatjuk, hogy az Unió gazdaságpolitikai sikertelenségét azt nem az EIB-nek kell fölróni. Ugyanakkor a támogatási politikát vizsgálva sokat mondó tény, hogy a bank által 2014-ben megkötött projektek 60%-a a legfejlettebb öt tagországba irányult, és a maradék 23 tagország részesedése mindössze 30% volt, 10% ment külföldre. Pedig 2008 óta egyértelmű, hogy a centrum országok és a periféria országai között, különösen az új tagországok között, a konvergenciafolyamat leállt, sőt, a különbségek nőni kezdtek.

A jövőben a bank hitelezési tevékenységét sokkal erőteljesebben az elmaradott térségek irányába kellene fordítani. Ehhez előzetesen egy olyan stratégiai programra van szükség, amely meghatározná a súlypontokat, amelyek leginkább segítenék az elmaradott térségek felzárkóztatását, és ezt követően a Beruházási Bank támogatási politikáját e stratégiának megfelelően alakítaná ki.

Petri Sarvamaa (PPE). – Madam President, it is very important that the European Investment Bank, as the bank of the Union, contributes to social and economic cohesion.

However, we must remember that the EIB is a financial institution. It is a bank. It needs to take into account the viability and feasibility of investments. It cannot act as a money allocation body. Let there be no misunderstanding about this. When the rapporteur speaks about the concentration of allocation of EIB-signed projects and suggests that 'the bank should implement a more balanced lending policy towards Member States', he always speaks from a certain political perspective, as well as a defined Member State perspective, as do some other Members of this Chamber.

I hope – I do not know but I hope – that everyone in this room can agree that the EIB needs to put great emphasis on the effectiveness and efficiency of investments, as well as on accountability. EIB investment decisions should not be made on the basis of national financing needs, but on a careful assessment of predicted viability, effectiveness and efficiency of budgets.

Isabelle Thomas (S&D). – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Commissaire, Monsieur le Président, je voudrais tout d'abord remercier M. Pirinski pour son excellent rapport, mais c'est à vous, Monsieur le Président Hoyer, que je souhaite m'adresser aujourd'hui. Vous représentez une institution en situation de quasi-monopole sur les garanties des instruments financiers de l'Union européenne. Les milliards brassés par votre banque sont ceux des citoyens européens. Je tenais à faire ce rappel en préambule pour réaffirmer que vous êtes une banque, certes, mais que vous ne représentez pas une banque comme les autres. Votre banque a, avant tout, vocation à satisfaire l'intérêt public.

Je profiterai donc de ce débat sur le bilan 2014 pour anticiper, moi aussi, sur les bilans 2015, 2016, voire 2017, qui sont les années de mise en œuvre du Fonds européen pour les investissements stratégiques du plan Juncker. Ce plan d'investissement, nous, socialistes et démocrates, l'avons clairement appelé de nos vœux, conscients du déficit d'investissement dont l'Europe est victime depuis la crise de 2008. Or, aujourd'hui, après un an de mise en œuvre, nous avons quelques inquiétudes.

Nous avons voulu un plan permettant des investissements supplémentaires en Europe. Or, nous constatons en 2015 une activité de la BEI comparable à celle de 2012, soit à peu près 80 milliards d'euros. Le sacrifice des 8 milliards d'euros du budget de l'Union a-t-il été utile? En d'autres termes, à la fin de cette année – l'année 2016 –, aurons-nous réduit le déficit annuel d'investissement, actuellement évalué aux alentours de 300 milliards d'euros, et dans quelle proportion?

Le Parlement a voté la mise en place d'un tableau de bord pour sélectionner les projets en fonction de leur valeur ajoutée sociale et environnementale. Je voulais savoir également s'il était utilisé dans le processus de sélection et, plus précisément, comment vous évaluez les créations d'emplois lors des sélections, car, à Paris comme à Bruxelles, je rencontre des porteurs de projets innovants et créateurs d'emplois qui voient leur dossier refusé parce que trop risqué.

Or, Monsieur le Président, nous avons débloqué 16 milliards d'euros de garanties sur le budget de l'Union pour que vous conserviez votre triple A tout en investissant dans des projets plus risqués. Considérez-vous avoir rempli votre part du contrat? Monsieur le Président, nous vous avons confié une lourde responsabilité – nous en sommes conscients –, mais nous sommes aussi comptables des résultats. C'est pourquoi nous attendons des réponses précises.

Sander Loones (ECR). – Vandaag de dag hebben wij absoluut behoefte aan een sterker Europees investeringsklimaat. Moet de Europese Investeringsbank daar een belangrijke rol in spelen? Ja, natuurlijk, maar dan moeten wij ook de realiteit onder ogen zien, namelijk dat de EIB geen liefdadigheidsinstelling is. De EIB is een Europese investeringsbank. Dat financiële aspect mogen we niet uit het oog verliezen, want de EIB kan alleen maar doen wat ze doet wanneer we die AAA-rating dierbaar achten. Als we die in het gedrang brengen, dan brengen we ook de leningen in gevaar waarmee wij die projecten kunnen financieren. Dat is volgens mij niet altijd even duidelijk in dit verslag.

Voorts heeft het verslag het ook over de EIB als een convergentiemachine. Het is alsof de Europese Investeringsbank enkel en alleen moet investeren in regio's en landen die het economisch minder goed doen. Volgens mij is dat fout. De EIB moet ook kijken naar sterkere regio's waar grote projecten op stapel staan die deze regio's of lidstaten niet alleen kunnen financieren, want ook zij hebben grote investeringsbehoeften. Dank u wel.

Luke Ming Flanagan (GUE/NGL). – Madam President, the EIB is mostly about big investments in big projects. It raises its funds on the international money markets. Here, though, I have a few very pertinent points for you, Mr Hoyer.

The major source of employment across the EU are SMEs – small and medium enterprises. The best way to grow our way out of the malaise currently afflicting the EU is through expanding our SMEs. The cheapest source of money in the EU at the moment is the ECB.

Given all the above, I suggest the EIB should lower its sights a little and, in a proactive way, open its arms and its coffers to SMEs. I suggest also, rather than go to international money markets for its millions, the EIB should go to the ECB for funding at negative interest rates.

If there are some rules preventing that, I am sure the same ECB will find a way around them. After all, they managed it in Ireland in 2010 when they found a way around their own rules and the use of Emergency Liquidity Assistance (ELA) to create EUR 31 billion to bail out failed creditors of two failed Irish banks. The same EUR 31 billion is now in the process of being destroyed and taken back out of circulation at the insistence of the same ECB. Not very good for investment in Ireland really, is it?

Molly Scott Cato (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, what can a bank like the European Investment Bank achieve? This year's report from Parliament includes suggestions for improving the bank's performance in several areas. It could help us crack down on tax avoidance by ending loans to companies registered in tax havens and providing full transparency on beneficial ownership. It could help us to fund the transition to a renewable energy future, and be a catalyst for making industry more sustainable. Indeed, the parliamentary report includes a Green demand to boost investment in sustainable industry.

But the EIB is currently funding projects that do the reverse. In the UK, the Bank is investing GBP 500 million in the construction of incinerators, including the deeply unpopular incinerator in St Dennis in Cornwall. To stop such destructive investment, we are calling for stronger environmental assessment of projects and a full audit of the skills of EIB Board members to assess whether they are suitably qualified to make judgments about the environmental impact of projects seeking EIB funding.

Bernard Monot (ENF). – Madame la Présidente, en période de récession, l'action de la BEI est devenue une des rares sources de croissance économique en Europe. La BEI reste une institution qui fonctionne, mais c'est sans compter sur la création du plan Juncker, l'EFSI, qui doit assurer la promotion des eurocrates auprès des peuples victimes de leur politique économique ultralibérale. Je rappelle que ce plan prévoit 315 milliards d'euros d'investissements nouveaux en Europe, avec 60 milliards d'investissements supplémentaires de la BEI.

Ma crainte est donc que, dans un objectif d'affichage politique, on substitue des financements EFSI à ceux de la BEI. Le montant total des prêts BEI sera ainsi en décroissance à un horizon de 4 ans au profit des prêts EFSI, qui sont beaucoup plus chers.

Nous serons donc extrêmement vigilants sur le maintien du niveau des prêts BEI, que nous ne souhaitons pas voir remplacés par des prêts EFSI.

Le plan Juncker doit démontrer sa véritable efficacité.

Ingeborg Gräßle (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Präsident Hoyer, Herr Kommissar! Ich möchte mich dem allfälligen Lobkartell hier nicht anschließen. Ich möchte Sie, Herr Präsident Hoyer, bitten, doch zu einer wirklichen Transparenzoffensive zu kommen und zu einer wirklichen Rechenschaftspflicht. Wir wollen gerne glauben, für uns ist die Investitionsbank natürlich auch sehr wichtig, aber so, wie wir Informationen bekommen, kann es wirklich nicht weitergehen. Im Haushaltskontrollausschuss fällt schon auf, wenn wir Berichte machen, dass wir Fragen stellen und dann keine Antwort bekommen. Und wenn wir eine Antwort bekommen, kriegen wir dann spätestens bei Nachfragen keine mehr.

Das heißt, die erste Frage, die ich stellen möchte, ist: Was passiert denn jetzt mit dem Bericht Pirinski? Es sind dort Fragen angerissen, und es wäre schön, wenn wir darauf auch schriftliche Antworten bekämen. Ich habe die Hoffnung übrigens schon aufgegeben, dass es hier Antworten gibt.

Ich glaube, dass uns das, was viele Kollegen angerissen haben, nämlich die ungleiche Finanzierung in vielen Mitgliedstaaten, in der Tat beschäftigen muss. Wenn wir fünf Mitgliedstaaten haben – Top-Wirtschaften in der EU –, die 60 % der EIB-Projekte erhalten, gibt es dafür sicherlich gute Argumente. Aber hier liegt sehr nahe, dass es sich auch schwerpunktmäßig um Mitnahmeeffekte handelt, auch angesichts der günstigen Zinsbedingungen, die die dortigen Wirtschaften vorfinden.

Ich möchte Sie auch fragen, was denn mit den erneuerbaren Energien ist. Wir haben weniger als 1 % von neuen Mitgliedstaaten in einem Bereich, der der EU auch ganz wichtig ist. Also, was ist damit?

Finanzinstrumente mit EU-Geld beschäftigen uns sehr. Wo finden wir Aussagen, was hier wie gemacht wird?

Für uns wäre wichtig: Wir sehen, dass EIB-Projekte, wie andere auch, mit Betrug behaftet sind. Was ist hier der Plan, und wie begegnen Sie dem? Herzlichen Dank für Antworten.

Bogusław Liberadzki (S&D). – Dziękuję bardzo Pani Przewodniczącą! Panie prezesie Hoyer, niezależnie od tego, co się mówi, to ja podzielam pogląd pana Pierre'a Moscovici. Po prostu Europejski Bank Inwestycyjny to jest nasz sukces.

Mamy trzy instytucje, które możemy względnie porównywać: Europejski Bank Inwestycyjny, Bank Światowy, Europejski Bank Odbudowy i Rozwoju. I z tego punktu widzenia zatrudnienie zdecydowanie najmniej ludzi, macie najwięcej projektów, najbliżej współpracujecie z Unią Europejską, z nami, w tym, żeby osiągać cele, które są dla nas życiowo ważne.

Sprawozdanie pana Pirinskiego, nota bene bardzo ważne, wskazuje na te momenty, w których ten dobry bank może być jeszcze lepszy. I tu proszę te wszystkie uwagi dotyczące transparentności naprawdę wziąć serio. Te metody współpracy, unikanie wątpliwości – bo nie zasługuje często bank na to, żeby wątpliwości były pomnażane – są kluczowo ważne. Niech wolno mi będzie zwrócić uwagę na trzy te momenty: plan Junckera. Bardzo mocno oczekujemy i co do metodologii przykład *project bonds* i sposób, w jaki byśmy zgłaszali te projekty. Mówię w imieniu państwa nowego, a które jest dużym klientem, zresztą sam mam prawie trzydziestoletnie doświadczenie we współpracy z Europejskim Bankiem Inwestycyjnym. Przez prawie dziesięć lat, na początku lat dziewięćdziesiątych w funkcji rządowej, teraz tu w Parlamencie Europejskim.

Drugi obszar to są małe i średnie przedsiębiorstwa. Jest niewątpliwie taki problem, bo w Polsce nawet się pytają ludzie: a jak uzyskać informacje o dostępności projektu? Czy ktoś będzie chciał ze mną rozmawiać, to taki mały, głupawy projekt – piętnaście milionów euro, dokąd pójść? Tej informacji brakuje i tu chciałbym prosić: uzupełnijmy tę informację.

I wreszcie trzeci obszar to jest infrastruktura i ta europejska, i funduszy spójności, i *Connecting Europe*, ale tutaj Europejskiego Banku Inwestycyjnego nikt nie zastąpi, a jesteście dobrzy.

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, ο ρόλος της ΕΤΕπ, δηλαδή της Ευρωπαϊκής Τράπεζας Επενδύσεων, είναι η χρηματοδότηση έργων για την τόνωση της ανάπτυξης και της απασχόλησης στα κράτη μέλη της Ένωσης. Το 2014, η ΕΤΕπ χρηματοδότησε 285.000 μικρομεσαίες επιχειρήσεις, διασφαλίζοντας 3,6 εκατομμύρια θέσεις εργασίας, υπογράφοντας συμβάσεις για 413 έργα εντός της Ένωσης. Επιπλέον, στο πλαίσιο του στόχου της δράσης για το κλίμα, χρηματοδότησε 84 περιβαλλοντικά έργα, ενώ η ΕΚΤ έχει ήδη αγοράσει ομόλογα της ΕΤΕπ στη δευτερογενή αγορά, με στόχο την ποσοτική χαλάρωση, ενισχύοντας έτσι τη ρευστότητα της ΕΤΕπ.

Όμως, αυτά δεν είναι αρκετά. Πρέπει να θεσμοθετηθούν τα ευρωομόλογα για μεγάλα έργα υποδομών, ενώ είναι αναγκαίο τα ευρωπαϊκά κονδύλια να επενδυθούν σε παραγωγικές επενδύσεις στον πρωτογενή τομέα, στις υποδομές, στον τουρισμό, στην έρευνα, ενώ η παράλληλη μείωση της ανεργίας πρέπει να είναι πρωταρχικός στόχος της ΕΤΕπ, ιδίως σε χώρες που πλήττονται από τη φτώχεια και την ανεργία, όπως είναι η Ελλάδα, η οποία χρειάζεται μεν στήριξη στο προσφυγικό, κυρίως όμως χρειάζεται ένα νέο «σχέδιο Μάρσαλ» για να μπορέσει να ανακάμψει και να ξεφύγει από τη μέγγενη της τρόικας.

Liadh Ní Riada (GUE/NGL). – A Uachtarán, ba mhaith liom comhghairdeachas a dhéanamh leis an Uasal Pirinski as an tuarascáil a chuir sé le chéile. Tá sár-obair déanta aige air.

Caithfear féachaint ar an tslí ina ndéantar measúnú ar obair an BEI i gcomhthéacs na n-institiúidí idir-rialtasacha agus mholfainn go dtabharfadh an BEI aird faoi leith ar an leibhéal bochtanais atá againn, agus ar an dífhostaíocht agus míchothromaíocht atá ag méadú. Táim ag impí orthu straitéis réadúil a chur i bhfeidhm láithreach a chuirfidh infheistíocht i dtograí a bhfuil tionchar sóisialta agus eacnamaíochta acu, mar thosaíocht, agus spreagadh a thabhairt don gheilleagar.

In Éirinn, táim ag impí ar an BEI cabhair faoi leith a thabhairt dóibh siúd gan baile, gan dídean. Tuigim gur chuir an BEI billiún euro ar fáil do rialtas na Breataine chun cúnamh a thabhairt dóibh le tithíocht shóisialta. In Éirinn, tá an easpa tithíochta práinneach agus tá seisear daoine nua gach lá cláraithe mar dhaoine gan dídean.

An bhliain seo 2016, céad bliain tar éis Éirí Amach na Cásca, ní féidir linn glacadh leis go bhfuil páistí agus leanaí ár dtíre fós gan baile. Mar sin, glaoim arís ar an BEI infheistíocht a chur ar fáil do thithíocht shóisialta ar bhonn daonnúlachta agus, níos tábhachtaí fós, an fhreagracht sin a bhrú ar rialtas na hÉireann.

Ernest Urtasun (Verts/ALE). – Señora Presidenta, señor Presidente Hoyer, señor Comisario Moscovici, bienvenidos.

Señor Hoyer, a mi Grupo le han preocupado desde siempre las cuestiones de transparencia y fraude del Banco. En el informe del cual fui ponente el año anterior lo señalábamos y seguimos teniendo problemas de financiación en sitios como Italia, como Eslovenia. Seguimos pidiendo que no se financien proyectos bajo investigación y que, por favor, se hagan públicas de una vez las propiedades o los beneficiarios de este tipo de proyectos.

Quiero, señor Hoyer, también recordarle algunas cuestiones sobre el Castor, que usted mismo calificó como proyecto que terminó en desastre en una comparecencia que hizo en la Comisión de Asuntos Económicos y Monetarios. Le seguimos pidiendo, como pedimos en el informe que se votó anteriormente, que hagan algo para que los contribuyentes españoles no tengan que pagar en la factura de la luz la financiación de este proyecto fallido.

El Congreso español acaba de aprobar recientemente la necesidad de dismantelar la planta. Me gustaría que también ustedes participaran de alguna manera, ayudando a que eso pudiera realizarse, y también que, de una vez, por favor, respondan a la reclamación que ha presentado la Plataforma en Defensa de les Terres del Sénia sobre esta cuestión en el Mecanismo de Reclamaciones y sobre la que aún no tienen respuesta.

(El orador acepta responder a una pregunta formulada con arreglo al procedimiento de la «tarjeta azul» (artículo 162, apartado 8, del Reglamento))

Inés Ayala Sender (S&D), pregunta de «tarjeta azul». – Señor Urtasun, le quería preguntar si no cree que el señor Hoyer también debería informarnos sobre la manera en que está utilizando el Banco Europeo de Inversiones la «golden clause» para no lastrar más aún las economías donde existe un déficit excesivo; si no cree que sería necesario que nos dieran también esa información porque, de momento, no la tenemos.

Ernest Urtasun (Verts/ALE), respuesta de «tarjeta azul». – Sí, muy brevemente, comparto la apreciación de la señora diputada y creo que era pertinente el punto que ha señalado.

Laurențiu Rebega (ENF). – Doamnă președintă, domnule comisar, domnule președinte Hoher, anumite aspecte negative din acest raport sunt un semnal care denotă o gravă încălcare a tratatelor Uniunii Europene. Se dovedește faptul că, în condițiile tensiunilor din prezent, mecanismele de care dispune Uniunea Europeană nu funcționează conform cu scopul existenței lor. Având în vedere că unica rațiune pentru care această instituție de prestigiu există este aceea de a reduce decalajele economice între statele membre, cred că este necesar ca în rapoartele BEI să fie expus detaliat modul în care, prin activitatea desfășurată, s-a îndeplinit această cerință atât de importantă pentru noi toți, cetățeni ai Uniunii Europene. Reamintesc că, așa cum se prezintă în raport, 60% din proiectele demarate au fost acordate statelor cu cele mai mari cinci economii, iar restul de 40% au fost acordate celorlalte 23 de state membre. Nu văd cum această modalitate de finanțare a proiectelor, așa-zis europene, poate contribui la reducerea decalajului între economiile Uniunii. Nu este echitabil ca o instituție care aparține tuturor statelor membre să finanțeze exclusiv aceleași mari puteri ale Uniunii, în detrimentul celorlalte state membre.

Μαρία Σπυράκη (PPE). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, Επίτροπε Moscovici, Πρόεδρε Hoyer, περισσότερη από τη μισή χρηματοδότηση που χορηγεί η Ευρωπαϊκή Τράπεζα Επενδύσεων καταλήγει σε μόλις τέσσερις από τις είκοσι οκτώ χώρες της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης: την Ισπανία, την Ιταλία, τη Γαλλία και τη Γερμανία. Ταυτόχρονα, το επίπεδο χρηματοδότησης της χώρας μου, της Ελλάδας - που βρίσκεται σε πρόγραμμα - έχει, κατά τα τελευταία δέκα χρόνια, μειωθεί στο μισό.

Η Ελλάδα είναι, Επίτροπε Moscovici, μεταξύ των 'μετεξεταστέων'. Και το ερώτημα είναι απλό: πόσο εύκολο είναι για μια μικρή ή μικρομεσαία επιχείρηση να ζητήσει χρήματα από την Ευρωπαϊκή Τράπεζα Επενδύσεων; Πολύ δύσκολο, είναι η απάντηση. Είναι γνωστό ότι η οικονομία της Ελλάδας έχει υψηλό ρίσκο. Πώς θα πετύχει η Ευρωπαϊκή Τράπεζα Επενδύσεων να μετριάσει αυτό το ρίσκο; Το σχέδιο Γιούνκερ, για παράδειγμα, εγγυάται το ρίσκο και μπορεί να είναι μια απάντηση για τους μικρομεσαίους. Μια άλλη απάντηση ήταν το 'EIB trade finance facility' (το πρόγραμμα της ΕΤΕπ όσον αφορά τη διευκόλυνση για τη χρηματοδότηση του εμπορίου) που υπεγράφη το 2013 για να διαμεσολαβεί η Ευρωπαϊκή Τράπεζα Επενδύσεων στις εμπορικές τράπεζες. Όμως, από τότε άλλαξαν πολλά. Τώρα η Ελλάδα χρειάζεται, περισσότερο από ποτέ, μία ένεση ρευστότητας. Χρειάζεται απλουστευμένη πρόσβαση των μικρομεσαίων επιχειρήσεων στη χρηματοδότηση της Ευρωπαϊκής Τράπεζας Επενδύσεων.

Είναι μεγάλη ανάγκη και οφείλουμε να διευκολύνουμε τις ελληνικές επιχειρήσεις να προχωρήσουν σε επενδύσεις. Πρέπει να μειώσουμε τις επιπτώσεις της κρίσης που πληρώνει ιδιωτικός τομέας και γι' αυτό οφείλουμε να λάβουμε ειδική μέριμνα, μέσω της Ευρωπαϊκής Τράπεζας Επενδύσεων, για χώρες που βρίσκονται σε πρόγραμμα.

Intervenții la cerere

Ivana Maletić (PPE). – Gospođo predsjednice, poduzetnici i javna poduzeća često za EIB i djelatnike EIB-a kažu da su profesionalni, brzi te da je komunikacija jednostavna. S druge strane ukazuju na to da je premalo mogućnosti direktnog financiranja i sve se najčešće svodi na garancije, a njima su onda ponovno na njihovim financijskim tržištima otežani uvjeti za dolazak do izvora financiranja.

EIB bi trebao bolje targetirati svoje usluge u državama članicama uzimajući u obzir velike različitosti u razvijenosti, ali isto tako i u uvjetima financiranja poduzetnika. Očekujem od EIB-a u sljedećim razdobljima isto tako da detaljnije izvještava o rezultatima i ulozima u provedbi kohezijske politike, pa tako i odgovore na pitanja koliko je zapravo sudjelovanje u ukupnom nacionalnom financiranju i može li se proširiti financiranje i na poduzetnike.

Nicola Caputo (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la portata e la complessità dei compiti che la BEI è chiamata a svolgere richiedono un rinnovato impegno sulla riscrittura di un piano di governance che la rafforzi, non solo come istituzione finanziaria, ma anche come banca sede di conoscenze e buone pratiche. La sua capacità di indirizzo agli Stati membri e ai soggetti economici rappresenta infatti un valore aggiunto alla gestione dei fondi europei, al fine di finanziare progetti per accelerare la ripresa e aumentare la produttività.

Bene la relazione 2014 ma va sottolineata l'importanza di amplificare la trasparenza dei processi e l'intensificazione dell'assistenza tecnica e consulenza finanziaria, esaltando il fine ultimo di una omogenea crescita degli Stati membri per mezzo di una omogenea accessibilità alle forme di finanziamento.

Rinресce notare che si sono verificati su un tema a me caro, come l'azione climatica, molti casi di utilizzi di finanziamento per progetti finanziariamente insostenibili, con danno da ritardo difficilmente ristorabile rispetto ad ambiziosi progetti di sostenibilità ambientale.

Igor Šoltes (Verts/ALE). – Evropska investicijska banka igra v evropskem, tako finančnem kot investicijskem, prostoru pomembno vlogo. Njeno poslanstvo je relativno jasno, vendar pa je včasih vprašanje, ali se to poslanstvo izvaja tako, kot je bilo na začetku njene ustanovitve zamišljeno.

Opozorjamo na, na nek način, po eni strani na vprašanje ne samo transparentnosti ampak preglednosti, na drugi strani pa določanja prioritete in pa seveda kriterijev in meril, na podlagi katerega se banka odloči, katere projekte bo financirala.

Mislim pa, da ta banka skupaj z drugimi finančnimi viri lahko postavlja in predstavlja velik vir za pravzaprav obuditev številnih, tudi ekonomskih, vprašanj v Evropi, zlasti tukaj seveda mala, srednja podjetja, ampak tudi vprašanj, ki se jih neposredno... samo posredno dotika.

Govorim o varovanju okolja, tudi o socialnih vprašanjih in seveda tistih pomembnih stvareh, ki silijo potem ljudi, da zaradi tudi vseh teh vprašanj zapuščajo svoje domove in potem predstavljajo tudi, na drugi strani, socialno breme.

Rosa D'Amato (EFDD). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, non possiamo negarlo: ci sono ancora zone d'ombra nell'operato della BEI a partire dall'effetto leva sugli investimenti. Mancano dei dati trasparenti, non c'è traccia di dettagli precisi. Così anche per quanto riguarda il FEIS: aspettiamo che sia tirato fuori il coniglio dal cappello a cilindro? La magia però rischia di essere pagata a caro prezzo, se il denaro necessario per il piano Juncker è emesso anche dalla Cina, alla quale, guarda caso, si vorrebbe sciaguratamente attribuire lo status di economia di mercato, con effetti deleteri in Europa.

C'è poi il supporto della BEI a moltissime linee di credito per le banche: si tratta di azioni che andranno davvero a sostenere le piccole e medie imprese? Con quali strumenti finanziari? Non ci troveremo di nuovo di fronte alla grande finanza che sottrae ossigeno all'economia reale? Inoltre, qui dentro abbiamo sentito parlare di *circular economy*, di cambiamento di paradigma, ma fintanto che la BEI sosterrà progetti come il TAP, gli inceneritori, i rigassificatori, le raffinerie di petrolio, non ci sarà alcuna concreta transizione dal fossile alle rinnovabili.

Per finire, vorrei ricordare che la BEI è nata quasi 60 anni fa per sostenere gli obiettivi politici dell'Unione europea e che l'unica unione di cui si avverte l'assoluta mancanza è proprio quella dei cittadini.

Marco Valli (EFDD). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la Banca europea per gli investimenti è la banca pubblica più grande al mondo, cioè quella che fornisce i maggiori finanziamenti al mondo: parliamo di 75 miliardi di investimenti. I cittadini devono però sapere che questa banca pubblica europea, nei quali confluiscono i soldi di 28 Stati membri europei, finanzia, come ottavo paese, la Turchia, un paese che è fuori dall'Unione europea.

Questi fondi, per quanto ci riguarda, dovrebbero finanziare, per la maggior parte, progetti europei dall'altissimo valore aggiunto e sostenibili dal punto di vista sia sociale che ambientale, quindi non quei progetti infrastrutturali ancora basati sul fossile e sulle risorse che non sono rinnovabili. Quindi investire assolutamente di più, oltre a quello che già fatte nelle startup innovative e nelle PMI, perché quelle che danno più valore aggiunto nel tempo.

In più le valutazioni economiche: quelle che fate, vanno fatte con delle prospettive realistiche. Non possiamo permettere di finanziare autostrade senza macchine e treni, ad esempio, senza passeggeri e quindi tutte le opere, come il Castor, come il passante di Mestre, come la Brebemi a Milano, vanno condannate perché sono opere insostenibili e non bisogna più andare in quella strada, soprattutto col nuovo programma di investimenti infrastrutturali.

(Înceierea intervențiilor la cerere)

Pierre Moscovici, *membre de la Commission*. – Madame la Présidente, Mesdames et Messieurs les députés, je voudrais d'abord vous remercier pour le débat très fructueux, de qualité et très serein que nous avons eu aujourd'hui, qui montre que nous avons vraiment affaire à un projet d'intérêt général.

La situation économique et financière actuelle exige une action politique déterminée. Nous sommes convaincus que les activités de la BEI sont une composante cruciale des efforts de l'Union européenne pour rétablir une croissance durable et le niveau de l'emploi en Europe, en particulier à travers le partenariat entre la Commission et la BEI dans la mise en œuvre du plan d'investissement pour l'Europe, le plan Juncker de 315 milliards d'euros.

Je salue à nouveau le rapport du Parlement sur les activités de la BEI et je me réjouis que se poursuive une coopération fructueuse entre la Commission et la BEI.

Quelques mots sur deux sujets qui ont été souvent évoqués: transparence et lutte contre l'évasion fiscale, cohésion et convergence. Je parlerai aussi de la Grèce, puisque ce sujet a été évoqué, même s'il n'est pas tout à fait dans le dispositif, mais je sais qu'il intéresse beaucoup Werner Hoyer.

Sur la transparence et sur l'évasion fiscale, je rappelle que la Commission a adopté en janvier 2016 un paquet de lutte contre l'évasion fiscale, qui reflète les discussions qui ont eu lieu dans le cadre de l'OCDE et du G20 – c'est ce qu'on appelle le BEPS – mais aussi les discussions au Parlement européen sur la lutte contre la planification fiscale agressive.

Pour la Commission – c'est ce que j'ai dit au Conseil Ecofin informel d'Amsterdam, il y a huit jours –, il fallait aller plus loin et ce paquet était un ensemble, un paquet global qu'il fallait adopter comme tel. Je compte vraiment, à juste titre d'ailleurs, sur la Présidence néerlandaise pour y parvenir. Dans ce contexte, la Commission travaille intensivement avec la BEI pour étudier comment les politiques de la BEI pourraient évoluer pour refléter les nouvelles mesures que nous mettrons en œuvre.

Sur la cohésion et la convergence, qu'on me comprenne bien. Nous souhaitons la convergence de l'économie européenne, celle de la zone euro. C'est notre priorité. La zone euro est une formidable réussite. Elle a su protéger les économies qui ont fait ce choix, mais il reste un problème de dynamique, qui est aussi un problème de partage équitable. La BEI et le plan Juncker sont des outils majeurs pour la relance de l'économie européenne, mais nous ne pouvons pas avoir un critère politique dans le choix des investissements.

Bien sûr, il est préférable, bien sûr, il est souhaité – et, bien sûr, la BEI comme la Commission y travaillent – que les projets retenus couvrent toute une série de secteurs. Évidemment, il est souhaitable – évidemment, la BEI et la Commission y travaillent – que tous les pays soient touchés par le plan Juncker et je trouve très bien que nous ayons déjà 22, 23 ou 25 pays qui font déjà l'objet de projets.

Mais la logique était une logique de projets. C'est un travail de qualité. Il s'agit bien d'encourager ceux qui savent innover et ceux qui savent porter des projets dans le cadre des secteurs qui sont les priorités du plan Juncker. Les projets, je veux le dire ici, doivent être choisis pour leurs mérites propres. Ils doivent préparer l'avenir et, d'ailleurs, ce n'est pas rendre service à tel ou tel pays que de penser qu'il faut nécessairement avoir une forme de saupoudrage de crédit. Il y a des capacités d'invention et d'innovation dans tous les pays de l'Union européenne, quelle que soit leur taille. C'est cela qui doit être recherché.

Un mot sur la Grèce, puisque le sujet a été évoqué, je ne veux pas m'y dérober, nous sommes en plein dans l'actualité. À mon sens et au sens de la Commission, nous sommes vraiment en condition de nous approcher d'un accord. Il reste sans doute un ou plusieurs pas à franchir, mais beaucoup de choses ont été faites et nous ne devons pas faire comme s'il y avait là une nouvelle crise qui couvait, alors que nous nous sommes beaucoup rapprochés dans la définition des mesures nécessaires et des réformes indispensables.

J'ai bon espoir que nous parvenions à cet accord rapidement. C'est en tout cas à cela que la Commission va s'atteler avec beaucoup de détermination. Nous devons travailler sur ce sujet avec beaucoup de sang-froid, avec beaucoup d'objectivité et avec une volonté partagée qui est qu'une Grèce réformée, une Grèce renforcée retrouve la croissance et soit capable de créer des emplois.

Sur ce point, bien sûr, le plan Juncker et l'action de la BEI, qui est un contributeur majeur, retrouvent tout leur rôle. Oui, nous avons besoin de croissance partout en Europe, partout dans la zone euro et pour cela, nous devons vraiment faire en sorte que les réformes aboutissent en Grèce, rapidement, de façon très déterminée.

Voilà, en conclusion, je dirai que le plan Juncker, pour nous, est sur les rails, au sens où les projets financés – et c'est cela le critère – sont vraiment des projets additionnels, au sens où ce sont des projets plus risqués qu'auparavant. J'ai coutume de dire – Werner Hoyer le sait – que le critère principal de réussite du plan n'est pas tant quantitatif que qualitatif. La question, c'est: est-ce qu'il y a un changement de culture? Est-ce qu'il y a un changement de culture dans les économies, avec la capacité de porter les projets, et un changement de culture dans les politiques européennes, dans ce que nous faisons à la Commission, dans ce que nous faisons avec la BEI, pour faire en sorte que ce soit le risque qui soit encouragé?

Nous devons rester vigilants, il ne s'agit pas de donner dans l'autosatisfaction. Je pense que le plan Juncker n'épuise pas tout le sujet et j'ai tendance à penser d'ailleurs que, s'il réussit, – ce que je souhaite et ce que je crois –, il faudra le prolonger. Ce n'est pas une affaire de trois ans, mais une affaire beaucoup plus longue. Notre déficit d'investissement ne s'arrêtera pas mi-2018.

Mais, sans être dans l'autosatisfaction, je pense franchement qu'avec ce plan, nous travaillons utilement à combler le déficit d'investissement dont souffre l'Europe. C'est encore une fois la clé essentielle si nous voulons élever notre niveau de croissance potentielle, élever notre niveau de croissance effective, créer beaucoup plus d'emplois, faire reculer le chômage.

Voilà notre objectif commun sur tous les bancs de cette Assemblée, à la Commission, à la Banque et dans les États membres. C'est pour cela, encore une fois, que nous sommes devant un débat que je vois comme un débat d'intérêt général.

Werner Hoyer, *Président de la Banque européenne d'investissement*. – Madame la Présidente, Mesdames et Messieurs, laissez-moi commencer par adresser un grand merci à M. Pirinski pour son rapport et à M. le commissaire Moscovici pour sa coopération très étroite et fructueuse ainsi que son soutien, dont nous bénéficions toujours.

I think that more than 40 Members of the European Parliament have taken the floor today, and I am expected to respond to each and every detailed question – I beg your pardon; this will not be possible. I promise you that each issue that has been raised today will be responded to by our services or by myself within the next couple of days or weeks, because you deserve the answers.

Let me concentrate on around seven points which I would like to raise. Firstly, I would like to thank Mr Liberadzki – I think he is not here anymore, but I would still like to thank him – because he pointed out that this is the EU's bank, and we are the EU. If you mandate a bank in Europe or outside Europe with jobs that need to be done on behalf of Europe, then you are well advised to give that job to the EU's bank – to those whom you can control, steer and have an influence on, and whom you can require to stick to the principles and criteria which the European Union sets for lending and the granting of guarantees.

In this context, I would like to say that Greece is of course a country of specific preoccupation for us, because we have seen over the last few years how difficult it is. We are the bank that was the strongest there before the crisis; we stayed there during the crisis – as the only one, practically; and we are very active now that the crisis is, hopefully, soon over. We have even changed the business model of the bank for the case of Greece a little bit – our other centralised model for lending and granting of guarantees is not deployed in Greece any more, because we have strengthened our presence on the ground as we want to reach the customers, the clients, the companies and the corporates directly with our personnel.

Thirdly: transparency, NCJ policies, and everything that has to do with that. We have received the message and understood Mr Pirinski, and we will follow it up. We support the Commission with all their efforts in this field. This is going to be very difficult in detail, because sometimes you move between the legitimate and the legal; sometimes the devil is in the use of illegitimate but legal means, and that sometimes poses very difficult challenges to a bank and to many other actors. Sometimes you wish the legislator would step in and clarify the situation – not only what is legal, but also what is legitimate.

Next point: the interinstitutional agreement. I completely agree that it is high time to bring it to a conclusion – I talked to several members of the leadership of this European Parliament today – and we are resolved to bringing this to a conclusion very soon. I want to have that done before the summer break, because this issue should be discussed in substance after the summer break when we have analyses of what the first year of the Juncker plan has brought. The key thing is – and it has been raised by several people – that we must make sure that we have a balanced approach to all Member States of the European Union. What does that mean? Well, of course, the EU bank does not have quotas – that is completely impossible, because we go for economically viable and sustainable projects and we observe criteria which are also ecological and of course social, and if these projects do not appear on the list of proposals, then there will not be such a programme. We will not give grants just in order to be present in the country if there is not a good project.

But let us look at the realities, and I would like to remove the myth of a lack of balance in the activities of the bank in the European Union. If you look at the total investment supported in 2015, the four countries with the highest percentage of activity are Latvia with 13.8% of GDP, Slovakia with 12.9%, Greece with 11.4% and Slovenia with 11.4%. At the end of the list you find Romania with the 0.3%, Bulgaria with 0.3%, Ireland with 0.3% and the Czech Republic with 0.4%.

Now let us go to the exposure of the bank: where is the Bank the most exposed? Well, the highest exposure is in Cyprus at 15.3% of GDP, Slovenia at 11.7%, Portugal at 11.0% and Hungary 9.9%. At the end of the list are Denmark at 1.1%, the Netherlands at 1.7%, Germany at 1.7% and the UK at 1.9%. This is the reality, and it shows the balance sheet of the bank as an expression of the spirit of solidarity in this European Union. Anything else is a myth.

On the question of steel production in China: what we have heard today in the European Parliament, unfortunately, is complete nonsense. The bank has never had – and does not have – any steel project in China, and the only one that has ever been brought to our attention as an idea by the Chinese has been rejected by us. So it is a propaganda thing that we have heard here today; it is not supported by facts.

I would like to conclude by saying, on social questions and social housing, that this is a very important point that we have sped up quite a bit, also in connection with the migration crisis, because migration solutions must not go to the detriment of those people in need who also need social housing. So, therefore, we see this as one big area where we have done some considerable stepping-up of business. More can be done, however, also in combination or in cooperation with the Member States or regions that are interested in that. Probably, in some countries, it is not really known on the national level what we do on the regional level, in particular when it comes to migration and to social housing.

Finally, I would like to say: don't overdraw our capabilities. When the bank was founded in the 1950s in the Treaties of Rome, nobody would have thought that we would one day be an SME Bank. But nowadays we need this tool because of lack of access to finance for SMEs, and we used it for over 300 000 SMEs last year. That is 30% of our business volume. An additional business volume percentage of 27% is expected to go into climate-related lending. Of course, everybody thinks that 11.15% or more of lending should go into innovation and research and development. If you add that up and then come also to the question of digitalisation, which we have not touched upon here today but which is the key ingredient for preserving or restoring Europe's competitiveness in the next couple of years, you easily end up at above 100%, and that cannot work either. We have to have a balance in this respect as well. We are trying to achieve this with your help.

IN THE CHAIR: MAIREAD McGUINNESS*Vice-President*

Georgi Pirinski, rapporteur. – Madam President, may I join in the evaluation of this discussion as one that has been particularly interesting, substantial, substantive, and, I believe, indicative of the further actions that should be taken on behalf of the Bank, the Commission and Parliament – all of us.

Permit me to highlight three issues. The first, of course, has to do with investment. Commissioner Moscovici has pointed out that this, after all, is the weak link in the expectations for a more rapid upturn in the growth rate and, in general, improving the employment and growth situation.

There is one aspect which I would like to address at the very beginning, which has to do with cohesion and the distribution of investment resources. It might be true in relation to GDP, but the relationship – 60% to 5% and 40% to 23% – is a simple reflection of the facts of the signatures in 2014. Those are the facts. The disappointments that have been voiced are a reflection that there is not a feeling that the activities of the Investment Bank are addressing vigorously enough those parts of the European Union where the crisis has had its severest consequences.

One of my colleagues has said that this call for a greater spread of resources goes against the activities of the Bank as a bank. He has even challenged me by saying that the point I made is the product of political and country prejudices. I would simply like to refer to Protocol 28 to the Treaty, connected to Article 3, which has to do with cohesion, and which very clearly states that the contracting parties: 'reaffirm their conviction that the European Investment Bank should continue to devote the majority of resources to the promotion of economic, social and territorial cohesion and declare their willingness to review the capital needs of the European Investment Bank as soon as this is necessary for that purpose.'

I would say further that, after all, in these countries receiving far fewer resources there are a sufficient number of viable, profitable and effective investment projects, which, however, require on-the-spot additional active engagement by the Bank and the services of the Commission in generating them in the proper investment mode. This also has to do with the concerns relating to ecology and social aspects. This cannot be, so to speak, a 'business as usual' development of projects.

I see that my time is up so I will name only two other urgent considerations. One was voiced by my colleagues from the Committee on Budgetary Control. I have heard President Hoyer commit to giving answers as soon as they are ready. I would invite the President to ask for a meeting of the Commission and really take the initiative in addressing questions which have been on the table for a number of years.

The third consideration has to do with the interaction with Parliament. Again, I believe that there is room for a rapid conclusion of the interinstitutional agreement and for the introduction of a regular process of parliamentary oversight, where the Bank can make its case and give information and we can work out a positive way of going forward.

I would like to thank President Hoyer for his words regarding the report, as well as Commissioner Moscovici and all those who took part in the debate.

President. – The debate is closed.

The vote will take place on Thursday, 28 April 2016.

Written statements (Rule 162)

Hugues Bayet (S&D), par écrit. – Vu le contexte économique que nous connaissons, l'Union européenne a décidé, en septembre 2014, de lancer un plan d'investissement. Dans ce cadre, la BEI doit accorder la priorité aux investissements qui accélèrent la relance et accroissent la productivité tout en encourageant l'emploi des jeunes, l'innovation et les PME!

Cependant, lancé en juillet 2015 pour relancer l'économie européenne, le Plan Juncker démarre lentement. Ce plan a pour objectif d'injecter 315 milliards € dans l'économie européenne en 3 ans et de créer un million d'emplois. Mais, selon les chiffres communiqués par la Commission européenne, seuls 7,5 milliards d'euros ont été déboursés par le FEIS depuis sa création.

À ce rythme, on peut estimer que 45 milliards d'euros seraient financés sur une période de trois ans soit environ 2/3 seulement des 63 milliards annoncés dans les projections de la Commission. C'est pourquoi nous avons insisté dans ce rapport pour que tous les moyens soient mis en œuvre afin de financer des projets liés à l'appui des objectifs politiques de l'UE.

Fabio Massimo Castaldo (EFDD), per iscritto. – Il compito principale della BEI, la banca dell'UE, consisterebbe nel dare sostegno finanziario nell'interesse dell'Unione. Nel 2014 ha finanziato 285 000 piccole e medie imprese e ha stipulato contratti per un totale di 413 progetti all'interno dell'UE, del valore di 69 miliardi di EUR e 92 nuovi progetti extra UE, del valore di 7,98 miliardi di EUR. Inoltre, nel medesimo anno, il FEI ha impegnato 3,3 miliardi di EUR in investimenti azionari e garanzie a favore delle piccole imprese. Purtroppo, nella BEI permangono alcune debolezze gravi: ad esempio, dovrebbe elaborare norme più severe sui conflitti d'interesse e dovrebbe potenziare le sue attività di controllo così da migliorare le informazioni sui beneficiari finali e prevenire con maggiore efficacia operazioni con intermediari finanziari aventi precedenti negativi in termini di trasparenza, frode, corruzione, criminalità organizzata, riciclaggio di denaro e impatti dannosi sul piano sociale e ambientale oppure registrati in piazze finanziarie offshore o in paradisi fiscali che si avvalgono di pratiche di pianificazione fiscale aggressiva. Ricordo inoltre che la BEI è stata inserita alla sedicesima posizione per quanto riguarda la trasparenza su una classifica di 17 organizzazioni dal 2014 Aid Transparency Index (ATI).

Λευτέρης Χριστοφόρου (PPE), γραπτώς. – Σε μια περίοδο αυξημένων οικονομικών προβλημάτων σε πολλά κράτη μέλη της ΕΕ, ουδείς μπορεί να αμφισβητήσει τον θετικό ρόλο και τις δυνατότητες της ΕΤΕΠ για να στηρίξει και να προωθήσει την ανάπτυξη μέσω των χρηματοδοτήσεων σε κράτη μέλη που πραγματικά πάσχουν από έλλειψη ρευστότητας και φθηνού χρήματος. Πιστεύω ότι η ΕΤΕΠ οφείλει να επικεντρωθεί αποκλειστικά σε χρηματοδότηση έργων και επιχειρήσεων που δημιουργούν νέες θέσεις εργασίας. Η ανεργία στην ΕΕ είναι ανεξέλεγκτη και δυστυχώς αυξάνεται με δραματικούς ρυθμούς. Έτσι, θεωρώ ότι πρέπει να αποτελεί προτεραιότητα για την ΕΕ, και κατ' επέκταση για την ΕΤΕΠ, η καταπολέμηση της ανεργίας.

Επίσης, διαπιστώνω ότι μέχρι σήμερα το μοντέλο λειτουργίας της ΕΤΕΠ δημιουργεί γραφειοκρατία που δεν συνάδει με τον αντικειμενικό της στόχο ο οποίος πρέπει να είναι η άμεση και αποτελεσματική παρέμβαση και χρηματοδότηση επιχειρήσεων και οικονομικών κρατών μελών. Θεωρώ πολύ σημαντικό η ίδια η ΕΤΕΠ να προβαίνει απευθείας σε αξιολόγηση και χρηματοδότηση επιχειρήσεων. Το ότι η ΕΤΕΠ δεν χρηματοδοτεί απευθείας τις επιχειρήσεις δημιουργεί αχρείαστη γραφειοκρατία και, πιθανώς, εξαιτίας αυτού του γεγονότος πολλές φορές τα αποτελέσματα είναι πενιχρά.

Κώστας Χρυσόγονος (GUE/NGL), γραπτώς. – Συζητήσαμε σήμερα την ετήσια έκθεση σχετικά με την Ευρωπαϊκή Τράπεζα Επενδύσεων για το 2014. Είναι πράγματι απορίας άξιο πώς, τη στιγμή που η οικονομική κρίση έχει επιδεινώσει τις κοινωνικές και οικονομικές ανισότητες καθώς και τις υφιστάμενες αποκλίσεις μεταξύ των κρατών-μελών, η Ευρωπαϊκή Τράπεζα Επενδύσεων επέλεξε να διοχετεύσει το 59,4% του συνόλου της χρηματοδότησης για έργα στις πέντε κορυφαίες οικονομίες της ΕΕ, ενώ το μερίδιο των άλλων 23 κρατών μελών ανήλθε μόλις σε 30,3%. Ειδικά για την Ελλάδα, τη χώρα την οποία η οικονομική κρίση έχει επηρεάσει περισσότερο από κάθε άλλη, η χρηματοδότηση από την Τράπεζα για την ίδια περίοδο ανήλθε μόλις στο 1,2% του συνόλου των χρηματοδοτήσεων. Ακόμη πιο παράδοξο είναι το γεγονός πως η Τουρκία κατατάσσεται επί του παρόντος στην πρώτη θέση μεταξύ των δικαιούχων χωρών της ΕΤΕΠ εκτός της ΕΕ, απορροφώντας περίπου 3,5% των συνολικών δανείων της ΕΤΕΠ, πράγμα που συνιστά έμμεση επιβράβευση του αυταρχικού καθεστώτος Ερντογάν, το οποίο παραβιάζει ασύστολα τα ανθρώπινα δικαιώματα στο εσωτερικό και δρα ως διεθνής ταραξίας στο εξωτερικό. Η Ευρωπαϊκή Τράπεζα Επενδύσεων πρέπει να αναπροσαρμόσει τις προτεραιότητές της αν θέλει να ανταποκριθεί στην κρίσιμη αναπτυξιακή αποστολή της.

Benedek Jávor (Verts/ALE), in writing. – The EIB is one of the strongest players in the EU when talking about investments in big-scale projects, providing direct funds and guarantees to governments and private and public enterprises. But a state of play where the EIB hides who the ultimate beneficiaries or the beneficial owners are, where the EIB continues to fund projects which are under investigation by OLAF or national authorities for fraud or corruption cannot be further tolerated. We demand that the EIB finally ends those practices.

The EIB must have a policy of zero tolerance for fraud, corruption and collusion and commit to strong integrity and ethical rules. The EIB should implement the highest transparency in their operations and focus on investments in environmentally-friendly and sustainable projects. Here we have a lot of room for improvement, as only 1% of the funds were spent for the renewable energy capacity development for the 13 new Member States in 2014. If we expect them to catch up and change their old-fashioned energy policies, then we clearly need to incentivise. Last but not least we have to prevent transactions to enterprises registered in offshore financial centres or tax havens which resort to aggressive tax planning.

Paloma López Bermejo (GUE/NGL), por escrito. – Considero que el informe apunta en la buena dirección cuando afirma que el BEI debe tener en cuenta, en su política de crédito, la necesidad de contribuir a la cohesión regional y al desarrollo de proyectos abandonados por el sector privado. Sin embargo, resulta difícil conciliar esta posición con la realidad de una institución cuya orientación económica está subordinada al mercado (como sucede, por lo demás, con todas las políticas europeas). Es por ello que el reverso de su «éxito» (la «adaptabilidad» a la competencia global) es la profundización del dominio de los grandes oligopolios frente al mantenimiento de las economías locales y el control democrático de la producción. Y, por desgracia, es esta la dirección en la que parece avanzar el BEI, con la financiarización de su política de crédito o su agresiva estrategia fuera de Europa. Es necesario que la financiación pública complemente a la inversión pública y a las decisiones soberanas de desarrollo que tomen los pueblos frente a los mercados. De lo contrario, el BEI será solo un banco más.

Vladimír Maňka (S&D), písomne – Európska investičná banka zohráva významnú úlohu v Európskom fonde pre strategické investície. Zriadenie fondu som podporil aj preto, lebo Európa potrebuje silný impulz, aby hospodárstvo nestagnovalo, aby rástla zamestnanosť a aby inflácia blízka nule nedusila ekonomiku. Bez kvalitných investícií sa to dosiahnuť nedá. Úlohou Európskeho fondu pre strategické investície je pritiahnuť súkromných investorov do projektov, ktoré je možné zrealizovať len preto, lebo fond znáša riziká. Aj kvôli tomu investície za 315 miliárd eur sú investície, ktoré by sa inak nezrealizovali. Ak si pozrieme niektoré investície, ktoré sú už pripravené na realizáciu pomocou fondu, nájdeme medzi nimi aj také, ktoré počítajú so zateplením desiatok tisícov bytov a domov. Takáto investícia podľa mňa nenesie žiadne riziká a v iných krajinách sa robí aj bez pomoci fondu. Preto je potrebné, aby Komisia financovanie takýchto projektov prehodnotila.

Tibor Szanyi (S&D), írásban. – Az EU bankjaként az EBB fő feladata, hogy a megfelelő projektek támogatásán keresztül hozzájáruljon a közös piac fejlődéséhez, az európai integráció mélyítéséhez, a munkahelyteremtéshez, ezáltal az EU versenyképességének növekedéséhez. A 2014-es évi jelentés számos pozitív eredményt mutat a kis- és középvállalkozások finanszírozása, az éghajlatváltozás elleni fellépés támogatása vagy az oktatásba, a készségfejlesztésbe és a fiatalok foglalkoztatásába történő befektetések terén. Ezek az eredmények mindenképp üdvözlendők. Azonban az EBB erőfeszítései ellenére sem csökkent az EU-ban tapasztalható társadalmi és gazdasági egyenlőtlenség, sőt egyre súlyosabbá vált.

Ez annak az igazságtalan globális adózási rendszernek köszönhető, ahol a kkv-k és a bérből és fizetésből élők viselik az adóterhek legnagyobb részét, mialatt a kormányok újabb és újabb megszorításokat vezetnek be, a nagy vállalatok pedig egyre gazdagodnak. Ilyen körülmények között szélmalomharcnak tűnik a tagállamok közötti kohézió és szolidaritás előmozdításáért, az életminőség javításáért vagy a környezet védelméért folytatott küzdelem. Az EBB-nek mielőbb meg kell erősítenie az ügyleteihez kapcsolódó átvilágítási tevékenységét, hogy elkerülje az olyan szereplőkkel való együttműködést, akik offshore pénzügyi központokban vagy adóparadicsomokban vannak bejegyezve és agresszív adótervezési gyakorlatot folytatnak. E lépés megtétele elengedhetetlen az EBB részéről. Ahhoz azonban, hogy a bank projektjeinek egyértelműen érezhessük a hozzáadott értékét, a káros adózási gyakorlatok és offshore kiskapuk végleges felszámolása szükséges.

17. Discharge 2014 (forhandling)

President. – The next item is the joint debate on:

— the report by Martina Dlabajová, on behalf of the Committee on Budgetary Control, on discharge in respect of the implementation of the general budget of the European Union for the financial year 2014, Section III – Commission and executive agencies (COM(2015)0377 – C8-0199/2015 – 2015/2154(DEC)) (A8-0140/2016),

— the report by Martina Dlabajová, on behalf of the Committee on Budgetary Control, on the report on the Court of Auditors' special reports in the context of the 2014 Commission discharge (COM(2015)0377 – C8-0267/2015 – 2015/2206(DEC)) (A8-0127/2016),

— the report by Claudia Schmidt, on behalf of the Committee on Budgetary Control, on discharge in respect of the implementation of the budget of the eighth, ninth, tenth and eleventh European Development Funds for the financial year 2014 (COM(2015)0379 – C8-0248/2015 – 2015/2203(DEC)) (A8-0137/2016),

— the report by Markus Pieper, on behalf of the Committee on Budgetary Control, on discharge in respect of the implementation of the general budget of the European Union for the financial year 2014, Section I – European Parliament (COM(2015)0377 – C8-0200/2015 – 2015/2155(DEC)) (A8-0135/2016),

— the report by Ryszard Czarnecki, on behalf of the Committee on Budgetary Control, on discharge in respect of the implementation of the general budget of the European Union for the financial year 2014, Section II – European Council and Council (COM(2015)0377 – C8-0201/2015 – 2015/2156(DEC)) (A8-0101/2016),

— the report by Anders Primdahl Vistisen, on behalf of the Committee on Budgetary Control, on discharge in respect of the implementation of the general budget of the European Union for the financial year 2014, Section IV – Court of Justice (COM(2015)0377 – C8-0202/2015 – 2015/2157(DEC)) (A8-0123/2016),

— the report by Ryszard Czarnecki, on behalf of the Committee on Budgetary Control, on discharge in respect of the implementation of the general budget of the European Union for the financial year 2014, Section V – Court of Auditors (COM(2015)0377 – C8-0203/2015 – 2015/2158(DEC)) (A8-0107/2016),

— the report by Anders Primdahl Vistisen, on behalf of the Committee on Budgetary Control, on discharge in respect of the implementation of the general budget of the European Union for the financial year 2014, Section VI – European Economic and Social Committee (COM(2015)0377 – C8-0204/2015 – 2015/2159(DEC)) (A8-0111/2016),

— the report by Monica Macovei, on behalf of the Committee on Budgetary Control, on discharge in respect of the implementation of the general budget of the European Union for the financial year 2014, Section VII – Committee of the Regions (COM(2015)0377 – C8-0205/2015 – 2015/2160(DEC)) (A8-0132/2016),

— the report by Ryszard Czarnecki, on behalf of the Committee on Budgetary Control, on discharge in respect of the implementation of the general budget of the European Union for the financial year 2014, Section X – European External Action Service (COM(2015)0377 – C8-0208/2015 – 2015/2163(DEC)) (A8-0136/2016),

— the report by Ryszard Czarnecki, on behalf of the Committee on Budgetary Control, on discharge in respect of the implementation of the general budget of the European Union for the financial year 2014, Section VIII – European Ombudsman (COM(2015)0377 – C8-0206/2015 – 2015/2161(DEC)) (A8-0121/2016),

— the report by Monica Macovei, on behalf of the Committee on Budgetary Control, on discharge in respect of the implementation of the general budget of the European Union for the financial year 2014, Section IX – European Data Protection Supervisor (COM(2015)0377 – C8-0207/2015 – 2015/2162(DEC)) (A8-0109/2016),

— the report by Derek Vaughan, on behalf of the Committee on Budgetary Control, on discharge in respect of the implementation of the budget of the European Union agencies for the financial year 2014: performance, financial management and control (COM(2015)0377 – C8-0266/2015 – 2015/2205(DEC)) (A8-0080/2016),

— the report by Derek Vaughan, on behalf of the Committee on Budgetary Control, on discharge in respect of the implementation of the budget of the Agency for the Cooperation of Energy Regulators for the financial year 2014 (COM(2015)0377 – C8-0236/2015 – 2015/2191(DEC)) (A8-0087/2016),

— the report by Derek Vaughan, on behalf of the Committee on Budgetary Control, on discharge in respect of the implementation of the budget of the Office of the Body of European Regulators for Electronic Communications for the financial year 2014 (COM(2015)0377 – C8-0237/2015 – 2015/2192(DEC)) (A8-0093/2016),

— the report by Derek Vaughan, on behalf of the Committee on Budgetary Control, on discharge in respect of the implementation of the budget of the Translation Centre for the Bodies of the European Union for the financial year 2014 (COM(2015)0377 – C8-0215/2015 – 2015/2170(DEC)) (A8-0084/2016),

— the report by Derek Vaughan, on behalf of the Committee on Budgetary Control, on discharge in respect of the implementation of the budget of the European Centre for the Development of Vocational Training for the financial year 2014 (COM(2015)0377 – C8-0209/2015 – 2015/2164(DEC)) (A8-0082/2016),

— the report by Derek Vaughan, on behalf of the Committee on Budgetary Control, on discharge in respect of the implementation of the budget of the European Police College for the financial year 2014 (COM(2015)0377 – C8-0225/2015 – 2015/2180(DEC)) (A8-0088/2016),

— the report by Derek Vaughan, on behalf of the Committee on Budgetary Control, on discharge in respect of the implementation of the budget of the European Aviation Safety Agency for the financial year 2014 (COM(2015)0377 – C8-0220/2015 – 2015/2175(DEC)) (A8-0095/2016),

— the report by Derek Vaughan, on behalf of the Committee on Budgetary Control, on discharge in respect of the implementation of the budget of the European Asylum Support Office for the financial year 2014 (COM(2015)0377 – C8-0239/2015 – 2015/2194(DEC)) (A8-0133/2016),

— the report by Derek Vaughan, on behalf of the Committee on Budgetary Control, on discharge in respect of the implementation of the budget of the European Banking Authority for the financial year 2014 (COM(2015)0377 – C8-0233/2015 – 2015/2188(DEC)) (A8-0090/2016),

— the report by Derek Vaughan, on behalf of the Committee on Budgetary Control, on discharge in respect of the implementation of the budget of the European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control for the financial year 2014 (COM(2015)0377 – C8-0222/2015 – 2015/2177(DEC)) (A8-0103/2016),

— the report by Derek Vaughan, on behalf of the Committee on Budgetary Control, on discharge in respect of the implementation of the budget of the European Chemicals Agency for the financial year 2014 (COM(2015)0377 – C8-0229/2015 – 2015/2184(DEC)) (A8-0118/2016),

— the report by Derek Vaughan, on behalf of the Committee on Budgetary Control, on discharge in respect of the implementation of the budget of the European Environment Agency for the financial year 2014 (COM(2015)0377 – C8-0213/2015 – 2015/2168(DEC)) (A8-0100/2016),

— the report by Derek Vaughan, on behalf of the Committee on Budgetary Control, on discharge in respect of the implementation of the budget of the European Fisheries Control Agency for the financial year 2014 (COM(2015)0377 – C8-0228/2015 – 2015/2183(DEC)) (A8-0104/2016),

— the report by Derek Vaughan, on behalf of the Committee on Budgetary Control, on discharge in respect of the implementation of the budget of the European Food Safety Authority for the financial year 2014 (COM(2015)0377 – C8-0221/2015 – 2015/2176(DEC)) (A8-0086/2016),

— the report by Derek Vaughan, on behalf of the Committee on Budgetary Control, on discharge in respect of the implementation of the budget of the European Institute for Gender Equality for the financial year 2014 (COM(2015)0377 – C8-0232/2015 – 2015/2187(DEC)) (A8-0085/2016),

— the report by Derek Vaughan, on behalf of the Committee on Budgetary Control, on discharge in respect of the implementation of the budget of the European Insurance and Occupational Pensions Authority for the financial year 2014 (COM(2015)0377 – C8-0234/2015 – 2015/2189(DEC)) (A8-0091/2016),

— the report by Derek Vaughan, on behalf of the Committee on Budgetary Control, on discharge in respect of the implementation of the budget of the European Institute of Innovation and Technology for the financial year 2014 (COM(2015)0377 – C8-0238/2015 – 2015/2193(DEC)) (A8-0117/2016),

— the report by Derek Vaughan, on behalf of the Committee on Budgetary Control, on discharge in respect of the implementation of the budget of the European Medicines Agency for the financial year 2014 (COM(2015)0377 – C8-0216/2015 – 2015/2171(DEC)) (A8-0114/2016),

— the report by Derek Vaughan, on behalf of the Committee on Budgetary Control, on discharge in respect of the implementation of the budget of the European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction for the financial year 2014 (COM(2015)0377 – C8-0212/2015 – 2015/2167(DEC)) (A8-0105/2016),

— the report by Derek Vaughan, on behalf of the Committee on Budgetary Control, on discharge in respect of the implementation of the budget of the European Maritime Safety Agency for the financial year 2014 (COM(2015)0377 – C8-0219/2015 – 2015/2174(DEC)) (A8-0102/2016),

— the report by Derek Vaughan, on behalf of the Committee on Budgetary Control, on discharge in respect of the implementation of the budget of the European Union Agency for Network and Information Security for the financial year 2014 (COM(2015)0377 – C8-0223/2015 – 2015/2178(DEC)) (A8-0098/2016),

— the report by Derek Vaughan, on behalf of the Committee on Budgetary Control, on discharge in respect of the implementation of the budget of the European Railway Agency for the financial year 2014 (COM(2015)0377 – C8-0224/2015 – 2015/2179(DEC)) (A8-0106/2016),

— the report by Derek Vaughan, on behalf of the Committee on Budgetary Control, on discharge in respect of the implementation of the budget of the European Securities and Markets Authority for the financial year 2014 (COM(2015)0377 – C8-0235/2015 – 2015/2190(DEC)) (A8-0096/2016),

— the report by Derek Vaughan, on behalf of the Committee on Budgetary Control, on discharge in respect of the implementation of the budget of the European Training Foundation for the financial year 2014 (COM(2015)0377 – C8-0218/2015 – 2015/2173(DEC)) (A8-0116/2016),

— the report by Derek Vaughan, on behalf of the Committee on Budgetary Control, on discharge in respect of the implementation of the budget of the European Agency for the Operational Management of Large-Scale IT Systems in the Area of Freedom, Security and Justice for the financial year 2014 (COM(2015)0377 – C8-0240/2015 – 2015/2195(DEC)) (A8-0124/2016),

— the report by Derek Vaughan, on behalf of the Committee on Budgetary Control, on discharge in respect of the implementation of the budget of the European Agency for Safety and Health at Work for the financial year 2014 (COM(2015)0377 – C8-0214/2015 – 2015/2169(DEC)) (A8-0134/2016),

— the report by Derek Vaughan, on behalf of the Committee on Budgetary Control, on discharge in respect of the implementation of the budget of the Euratom Supply Agency for the financial year 2014 (COM(2015)0377 – C8-0230/2015 – 2015/2185(DEC)) (A8-0110/2016),

— the report by Derek Vaughan, on behalf of the Committee on Budgetary Control, on discharge in respect of the implementation of the budget of the European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions for the financial year 2014 (COM(2015)0377 – C8-0210/2015 – 2015/2165(DEC)) (A8-0120/2016),

— the report by Derek Vaughan, on behalf of the Committee on Budgetary Control, on discharge in respect of the implementation of the budget of the European Union's Judicial Cooperation Unit (Eurojust) for the financial year 2014 (COM(2015)0377 – C8-0217/2015 – 2015/2172(DEC)) (A8-0099/2016),

— the report by Derek Vaughan, on behalf of the Committee on Budgetary Control, on discharge in respect of the implementation of the budget of the European Police Office (Europol) for the financial year 2014 (COM(2015)0377 – C8-0231/2015 – 2015/2186(DEC)) (A8-0122/2016),

— the report by Derek Vaughan, on behalf of the Committee on Budgetary Control, on discharge in respect of the implementation of the budget of the European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights for the financial year 2014 (COM(2015)0377 – C8-0211/2015 – 2015/2166(DEC)) (A8-0108/2016),

— the report by Derek Vaughan, on behalf of the Committee on Budgetary Control, on discharge in respect of the implementation of the budget of the European Agency for the Management of Operational Cooperation at the External Borders of the Member States of the European Union for the financial year 2014 (COM(2015)0377 – C8-0226/2015 – 2015/2181(DEC)) (A8-0115/2016),

— the report by Derek Vaughan, on behalf of the Committee on Budgetary Control, on discharge in respect of the implementation of the budget of the European GNSS Agency for the financial year 2014 (COM(2015)0377 – C8-0227/2015 – 2015/2182(DEC)) (A8-0112/2016),

— the report by Marian-Jean Marinescu, on behalf of the Committee on Budgetary Control, on discharge in respect of the implementation of the budget of the ARTEMIS Joint Undertaking for the financial year 2014 (COM(2015)0377 – C8-0244/2015 – 2015/2199(DEC)) (A8-0092/2016),

— the report by Marian-Jean Marinescu, on behalf of the Committee on Budgetary Control, on discharge in respect of the implementation of the budget of the Clean Sky Joint Undertaking for the financial year 2014 (COM(2015)0377 – C8-0243/2015 – 2015/2198(DEC)) (A8-0094/2016),

— the report by Marian-Jean Marinescu, on behalf of the Committee on Budgetary Control, on discharge in respect of the implementation of the budget of the ECSEL Joint Undertaking (formerly the ENIAC Joint Undertaking and the ARTEMIS Joint Undertaking) for the financial year 2014 (COM(2015)0377 – C8-0265/2015 – 2015/2204(DEC)) (A8-0119/2016),

— the report by Marian-Jean Marinescu, on behalf of the Committee on Budgetary Control, on discharge in respect of the implementation of the budget of the ENIAC Joint Undertaking for the financial year 2014 (COM(2015)0377 – C8-0247/2015 – 2015/2202(DEC)) (A8-0113/2016),

— the report by Marian-Jean Marinescu, on behalf of the Committee on Budgetary Control, on discharge in respect of the implementation of the budget of the Fuel Cells and Hydrogen Joint Undertaking for the financial year 2014 (COM(2015)0377 – C8-0246/2015 – 2015/2201(DEC)) (A8-0083/2016),

— the report by Marian-Jean Marinescu, on behalf of the Committee on Budgetary Control, on discharge in respect of the implementation of the budget of the Innovative Medicines Initiative 2 Joint Undertaking (formerly the Joint Undertaking for the implementation of the Joint Technology Initiative on Innovative Medicines) for the financial year 2014 (COM(2015)0377 – C8-0245/2015 – 2015/2200(DEC)) (A8-0081/2016),

— the report by Marian-Jean Marinescu, on behalf of the Committee on Budgetary Control, on discharge in respect of the implementation of the budget of the European Joint Undertaking for ITER and the Development of Fusion Energy for the financial year 2014 (COM(2015)0377 – C8-0241/2015 – 2015/2196(DEC)) (A8-0097/2016), and

— the report by Marian-Jean Marinescu, on behalf of the Committee on Budgetary Control, on discharge in respect of the implementation of the budget of the SESAR Joint Undertaking for the financial year 2014 (COM(2015)0377 – C8-0242/2015 – 2015/2197(DEC)) (A8-0089/2016).

Martina Dlabajová, zpravodajka. – Vážená paní předsedající, vážená paní komisařko, vážený pane předsedo Evropského účetního dvora, vážené dámy a pánové, dnes nás čeká schvalování jednoho z nejdůležitějších dokumentů zaměřených na hospodaření se společnými finančními zdroji na úrovni Evropské unie. Budeme vyjadřovat svůj postoj k tomu, jak Evropská komise v roce 2014 využívala prostředky, které měla k naplňování svých politik k dispozici.

Proces *discharge*, čili udělení absolutoria, se na programu Evropského parlamentu objevuje každé jaro a zpravodajové pravidelně představují a obhajují svou zprávu stejně jako letos já. Přesto jsem se snažila do rutinního procesu vnést nové pohledy a nové náměty. A to proto, že nové ekonomické paradigma a požadavky na něj představují právě teď dobrou příležitost k provedení určitých změn v zavedených standardech kontroly hospodaření Evropské komise. Tyto změny nejsou samoúčelné. Naopak, jejich jediným smyslem je vyhodnotit, zda prostředky unijního rozpočtu při svém vynakládání nejen respektují formální a legislativou daná pravidla, ale zda též přispívají k reálným efektům a dopadům ekonomického, sociálního či environmentálního vývoje Evropské unie. Zda jsme schopni alokovat prostředky do oblastí, kde je tento efekt největší. Zda jsme schopni identifikovat nové evropské priority nebo žijeme stále v zajetí stereotypů uplynulých desetiletí. A zda vůbec umíme tyto efekty adekvátně měřit a hodnotit a ze závěrů přijmout poučení pro tvorbu nových politických strategií.

Věnovala jsem procesu změny směrem k *performance culture* téměř celý uplynulý rok. Domnívám se, že na řadu z výše uvedených otázek prostě nemůžeme odpovědět kladně, pokud máme zůstat objektivní. I když hospodářský vývoj a investiční aktivity v Evropě nyní doznávají skromného oživení a míra nezaměstnanosti se snižuje, důsledky krize ještě nebyly zcela překonány. A právě tato skutečnost nás opravňuje i v oblasti rozpočtové politiky uvažovat jinak, zejména proto, abychom byli schopni lépe čelit dalším krizím, které zákonitě nastanou.

Rozpočet Evropské unie by měl být vybaven takovými kontrolními nástroji a mechanismy, aby nemohlo docházet ke zneužívání evropských prostředků, ale aby bylo možné zhodnotit skutečně každé utracené euro. V tomto úsilí o posílení výkonnosti a zjednodušení rozpočtu nejsme v Evropském parlamentu osamoceni. Stejný přístup deklaruje i Evropský účetní dvůr ve své výroční zprávě za rok 2014. Potvrzují ho také iniciativy Evropské komise a role Rady, zvláště pak v průběhu aktuálního nizozemského předsednictví.

Absolutorium musí být podle mého názoru logickým politickým dokumentem, standardním procesem, nikoliv nástrojem nesystematického pranýřování viníků až náhodně vybraných a odhalených. Soustředme se, prosím, hlavně na to, jak identifikovat a popsat projevy případného nežádoucího nakládání s 1 % HDP Evropské unie, a zejména společně hledejme řešení této situace. Pouhé poutání pozornosti na některé z podezřelých, bez navrženého opatření a řešení, postarádá smysl. Jsem si vědoma toho, že při prosazování nových prvků je zapotřebí hledat politické kompromisy. Přesto trvám na mém názoru, že absolutorium by mělo být maximálně objektivní a kompetentní a nemělo by se stát nástrojem politického boje či vyřizování si účtů mezi členskými státy.

Vím, že praktické zavedení změn do zažitých postupů bude trvat řadu let. Ale jsem přesvědčena, že kdyby Evropský parlament tento trend nenásledoval, stal se by se v úsilí o rozpočet Evropské unie orientovaný na výsledek a výkonnost osamocený a mimo hlavní proud rozpočtové politiky Evropské unie. A to si jistě nikdo z nás nepřeje.

Děkuji vám všem za profesionální přístup, děkuji za spolupráci mému týmu, sekretariátu Výboru pro rozpočtovou kontrolu, všem svým stínovým zpravodajům, Účetnímu dvoru, celé Evropské komisi v čele s paní místopředsedkyní Georgievovou a vám, kolegové, děkuji za co největší objektivitu při posuzování mé zprávy.

Claudia Schmidt, Berichterstatterin. – Frau Präsidentin, meine Damen und Herren Kollegen! Als zuständige Berichterstatterin für den Europäischen Entwicklungsfonds ist es mir ein besonderes Anliegen, einige wichtige Punkte sehr deutlich hervorzuheben.

Auch dieses Jahr finden sich, wie im letzten Jahr, viele ähnliche Punkte wieder, denn am Grundsatz der Entwicklungshilfe ändert sich nicht viel. Sie ist richtig, sie ist wichtig, und wir brauchen sie, um hauptsächlich in den ärmsten Ländern Afrikas menschenwürdige Lebensbedingungen zu ermöglichen. Was ich mit Bedauern feststellen musste, ist, dass sich auch an den Problemen nicht viel ändert. Die Projektkontrollen sind nur begrenzt effektiv, und hier besteht enormer Verbesserungsbedarf. Ich möchte betonen, dass es nicht darum geht, eine Bürokratielawine zu schaffen, denn es gibt bereits genug Kontrollsysteme. Was bisher noch nicht ausreichend ist, ist die Durchsetzung eben dieser Kontrollmechanismen, die Bereitschaft, aus Fehlern zu lernen und auf die Erkenntnisse des Kontrollausschusses zu reagieren.

Die Ausführungen des zuständigen Kommissars Mimica waren aufschlussreich. Es wurde sehr deutlich darauf hingewiesen, dass Flüchtlinge, die jetzt nach Europa gelangen, aus Afghanistan und Syrien stammen. Die Menschen aus den AKP-Staaten flüchten derzeit eher in benachbarte Länder, werden aber absehbar ebenfalls nach Europa kommen. Aus diesem Grunde habe ich in den Bericht ein Kapitel eingearbeitet, in dem ich mich deutlich für einen flexibleren Einsatz der EDF-Mittel einsetze. Dank der sehr guten Arbeit des Rechnungshofs wissen wir, dass fast zehn Milliarden Euro in verschiedenen Phasen der Projektabwicklung blockiert sind, und das sind nicht nur die Gelder, die sinnvollerweise in mehrjährigen Projekten gebunden sind, sondern auch diejenigen, die in Projekten stecken, die Durchführungsschwierigkeiten haben und möglicherweise vergeudet werden. Zusätzlich werden auch immer noch Mittel aus dem 8. EDF ausgegeben, der bereits 1995 bestückt wurde.

Wenn wir die Flüchtlingskrise bewältigen wollen, müssen wir zu einem Umdenken und vor allem zu der Einsicht kommen, dass Entwicklungshilfe kein Geschenk ist, es ist Ursachenbekämpfung. Lassen wir Vernunft walten, indem wir das Geld umverteilen und neue Prioritäten sowie Präventionsmaßnahmen setzen! Die EU-Kommission, hier involviert durch GD DEVCO, sowie der Europäische Auswärtige Dienst und besonders die entsandten EU-Botschafter, die vor Ort das Bindeglied zwischen EU-Kommission und EAD darstellen, müssen sich noch mehr um Entwicklungshilfeprojekte kümmern. Als Beispiel: Wenn von 918 EDF-finanzierten Projekten 428 im Wert von 9,2 Milliarden Euro Durchführungsschwierigkeiten haben, muss gehandelt werden, anstatt weiter Geld dort zu verteilen, wo der Mehrwert fraglich ist. Um das zu bewerkstelligen, muss aber auch die Bereitschaft da sein, Kritik zuzulassen und aus Fehlern zu lernen. Damit wende ich mich sehr deutlich an die S&D-Fraktion, denn ich würde es doch sehr begrüßen, wenn die vorher genannten und von der Kommission bestätigten Zahlen nicht aus dem Bericht gestimmt werden würden. Wer Kritik nicht zulässt, erhält ein System am Leben, das in verbesserter Form noch mehr Nutzen bringen könnte.

Bis 2020 werden 30 Milliarden Euro in die Hand genommen, die nicht im EU-Budget verankert sind – also direkt von den nationalen Finanzministerien an die Kommission und dann nach Afrika fließen.

Auch erhebe ich die Forderung nach Zweckbindung eines Viertels der Mittel, um der derzeitigen Flüchtlingskrise entgegenwirken zu können. Sehr gerne zitiere ich hier die Hohe Vertreterin der EU für Außen- und Sicherheitspolitik, Federica Mogherini, die selbst sagt, dass Entwicklungshilfe kein Geschenk, sondern eine Investition ist und dass eine neue Form der Partnerschaft mit den afrikanischen Partnerländern gefunden werden muss. Ebenso zitiere ich sehr gerne Präsident Martin Schulz, der Folgendes sagte: Wir sollten die Entwicklungszusammenarbeit aber abhängig machen von Demokratie und Rechtsstaatlichkeit und von dem, was wir gutes Regieren nennen. Es kann nicht sein, dass jeder Diktator, der sein eigenes Volk unterdrückt, im wirtschaftlichen Bereich gefördert wird, und anschließend fliehen die Leute aus den Ländern.

Eine Aussage – meine Aussage ist klar: Entwicklungshilfe muss Ursachenbekämpfung sein, und wenn keine Resultate folgen, müssen Konsequenzen daraus gezogen werden. Ich fordere hier alle Kollegen aller Fraktionen auf, nicht Überholtes zu prolongieren, sondern die Entwicklungshilfe auf neue, sinnvollere und an die Anforderungen der Gegenwart angepasste Wege zu schicken und den Bericht zu unterstützen.

Markus Pieper, Berichterstatter. – Frau Präsidentin! Zunächst herzlichen Dank für die Zusammenarbeit mit den *shadows* im Entlastungsverfahren und vielen Dank auch an die Adviserassistenten, an die Verwaltung für die Information und Unterstützung. Die Haushaltsentlastung für das eigene Haus ist immer ein sensibles Thema. Die Bevölkerung erwartet zu Recht, dass wir mit gutem Beispiel vorangehen. Beispiel: Gebäudepolitik. Die maßvollen Erweiterungen sind angebracht, die Überführung in eigenes Eigentum senkt Kosten. Kritisch sehen wir aber die manchmal zu spät einsetzende Modernisierung, was dann Kosten unverhältnismäßig steigen lässt.

Wir fordern eben nicht, auf der Basis zusätzlicher Erweiterungen der Europäischen Union zu planen, sondern wollen die qualitative Verbesserung der bestehenden Substanz. Wir sollten immer vorsichtig sein, wenn wir uns eigene Denkmäler setzen wollen. Wenn Lux-Preis, dann bitte nicht als elitäres Projekt für ganz wenige, sondern mit breiter Wirkung. Ich finde, auch das Haus der Geschichte hätte man besser mit schon bestehenden Einrichtungen für Besucher zusammenführen müssen, auch das würde mehr Bürgernähe und Kostenbewusstsein zeigen.

Mit gutem Beispiel vorangehen, heißt aber auch, mit der Zeit gehen. Die neuen Spielregeln zwischen Kommission, Rat und Parlament geben uns mehr Macht im Gesetzgebungsverfahren, und hier ist die Aufwertung der wissenschaftlichen Dienste genau richtig. Aber auch unser Anspruch, dass hier fern von jeder Ideologie gearbeitet werden muss, muss dann wirklich auch gelten. Mit der Zeit gehen heißt auch, unsere Dolmetscherdienste zu reformieren: Einmal was die technische Ausstattung betrifft, aber auch die Arbeitszeiten müssen effizienter und gerechter eingeteilt sein.

Leider sehr aktuell ist auch die Sicherheit im Europäischen Parlament. Kostenbewusstsein: Ja, aber das darf nicht so weit führen, dass wir die Sicherheit von Besuchern, Mitarbeitern und Abgeordneten gefährden. Es ist manchmal besser, wenn wir eigene Sicherheits- und Fahrdienste haben, als uns in die Hände unkontrollierbarer Privatdienste zu begeben. Auch baulich sollten wir wirklich nicht am falschen Ende sparen.

Zum Schluss: Abbau von Privilegien. Sünden der Vergangenheit werden nach und nach aufgearbeitet, beim Catering wurde einiges erreicht, der freiwillige Pensionsfond ist immerhin geschlossen, aber die Aufarbeitung der finanziellen Altlasten muss jetzt viel schneller gehen. Wir fordern jetzt endlich die Ergebnisse und Empfehlungen der externen Prüfung des Fonds! Abbau von Privilegien und Vorbildfunktion heißt auch, dass es keine Vermischung von Präsidentenfunktion und Wahlkampfauftritten geben darf. Hier gibt es im Bericht eine sehr deutliche Kritik an Martin Schulz und entsprechend auch eine Empfehlung an andere Spitzenkandidaten. Herr Schulz kann manchmal nicht zwischen persönlicher Eigenwerbung und einer Präsidentenaufgabe unterscheiden: Häufig liegt das, was er tut, eben nicht im Gesamtinteresse des Parlaments, und ich finde es bemerkenswert, dass die S&D diese Kritik teilt.

Zum Schluss noch ein Wort zu den Abgeordneten selbst: Ja, Pensionsfonds, Pauschalen für Flugreisen, Catering, vieles andere – hier wurden viele Altlasten abgeschafft. Gut so, weiter so, aber das darf am Ende nicht so weit gehen, dass das Wohl und Weh des Images der EU nur zu uns und in unsere Büros verlagert wird. Wir übernehmen in unseren Büros immer mehr Dinge, die eigentlich eine Verwaltung zu tun hätte. Wir sparen jetzt beim Kaffee, jetzt sparen wir auch beim Wasser, und einige wollen uns zwingen, hier aus den eigenen Reihen heraus, unsere Telefonrechnung, unsere Bewegungsprofile, alles ins Netz zu stellen. Ja wir lassen sogar zu, dass der Erfolg unserer Arbeit durch die Zahl von *one minute speeches* gemessen wird. Wir sollten die Würde unserer Tätigkeit nicht derart selbst hinterfragen, dass wir zum Gespött der Leute werden. Unser Job hat einen Wert, und wir sollten uns deshalb nicht unter Wert verkaufen, auch das wird im Bericht aufgegriffen.

Ryszard Czarnecki, rapporteur. – Madam President, the main problem of the discharge procedure, which has been ongoing for years, is the discharge procedure concerning the Council and the European Council. Starting from the weakness observed during the budgetary control procedure, we have to indicate the high underspending rate that covers almost all categories, the very high number of appropriations being carried over from 2014-2015, particularly those for property, plant and equipment, as well as major transfers within budget lines. These problems could be avoided with better budgetary programming.

For better budgetary programming, key performance indicators have to be developed. Moreover, the Council has still not adopted a code of conduct, which is indispensable to the transparency, accountability and integrity of the institution. There is also a worrying lack of transparency with regard to the legislative process, negotiations and Member States' positions at meetings within the Council.

The Council definitely should disclose the relevant documents and put in place a clearer reporting system that will enable the public to follow the legislative procedures in an open and transparent manner. There is also the problem of the lack of transparency of the trilogues and conciliation meetings. The Council definitely has to increase transparency and integrity with regard to their negotiations.

Taking into consideration political problems, as far as cooperation between Parliament and the Council is concerned, we have to indicate that the Council ought to be transparent and fully accountable to Union citizens for the funds entrusted to it by taking part fully and in good faith in the annual discharge procedure, just as other Union institutions do.

In this regard, effective supervision of the Union's budget implementation requires cooperation between Parliament and the Council through a working arrangement. But, as a matter of fact, there is no cooperation, no dialogue. The Council does not participate in the budgetary control procedure and does not provide answers to written questions asked by our Committee on Budgetary Control or by particular members of our Committee.

The Council does not participate in the hearings or debates concerning budgetary control procedure regarding the Council. We cannot forget that the procedure of granting discharge separately to the individual Union institutions' bodies is a long-standing practice which has been developed to guarantee transparency and democratic accountability towards Union taxpayers.

Anders Primdahl Vistisen, *ordfører*. – Fru formand! Som ordfører for to af de betænkninger, vi behandler her i dag, skal jeg kort gennemgå dem, før jeg går videre til mine skyggeordførerskaber.

Den første vedrører EU-Domstolen, som i forbindelse med revisionsproceduren klarede sig udmærket. Efterfølgende har der dog været medieforlydender og mediekritik af, at det belgiske medlem af førsteinstansretten har kritiseret den procedure og den tilbageholdenhed, man har haft med hensyn til at skaffe sig flere dommere til Domstolen. Samtidig har det været en udfordring for Budgetkontroludvalget at få adgang til de sideaktiviteter, som dommere ved Domstolen udfører ved siden af deres arbejde. På baggrund af disse to ting er ECR-Gruppen meget betænkelig ved at meddele decharge til Domstolen, da vi finder, at de usikkerheder, der er rejst, er ganske alvorlige.

For så vidt angår Det Europæiske Økonomiske og Sociale Udvalg, som jeg også har været ordfører for, vil jeg gerne rose udvalget for på en lang række områder at have fulgt de anbefalinger, som Europa-Parlamentet er kommet med de tidligere år. Man har været i stand til at skære ned. Man har været i stand til at indgå en aftale med Parlamentet og Regionsudvalget, der har betydet bedre og mere effektive forretningsgange. Derfor vil jeg anbefale, at der meddeles decharge, selv om jeg mener, at udvalget generelt bør have større fokus på telemøder og videokonferencer, og at rejseudgifterne er vel høje og bør skæres ned i fremtiden.

Hvad angår betænkningerne om decharge til Kommissionen og dens agenturer og til Europa-Parlamentet vil jeg gerne takke mine kolleger samt skyggeordførerne og ordførerne for et konstruktivt samarbejde. Overordnet set mener vi i ECR-Gruppen, at det er et problem, at fejlraten stadigvæk er for høj. Vi mener, at der er for lidt fokus på effektivitet og merværdi af de penge, der bliver brugt på europæisk plan, og vi mener, at der er brug for grundlæggende reformer af de to store udgiftsposter, nemlig landbrugsstøtten og den regionale udviklingsstøtte.

I forhold til Europa-Kommissionens regnskab synes vi, at der er kommet en god og kritisk og konstruktiv betænkning ud af vores arbejde. En betænkning, der langt hen ad vejen flugter med ECR's ønsker. Men fordi den indeholder støtte til såvel den fælles europæiske anklagemyndighed og henviser til, at man ønsker egne ressourcer i større omfang, end man allerede har i dag, så er vi i ECR-Gruppen nødsaget til at stemme blankt til betænkningen. På baggrund af de høje fejlrate stemmer vi, som der er tradition for, imod at meddele decharge til Europa-Kommissionen og de derunder hørende agenturer.

I forhold til Europa-Parlamentets eget regnskab synes vi godt, at man kunne have lagt en linje, der var en smule mere kritisk. Vi anerkender, at man på en lang række områder er gået godt og konstruktivt til værks, og vi anerkender særligt, at man er gået til Christian Schulz's adfærd, men vi synes, at der er behov for at afvise forslaget om en dyrere chaufførservice. Vi synes, der er behov for at revidere vores generelle udgiftstillæg, og vi synes, der er behov for at gå væk fra ideen om at støtte Huset for Europæisk Historie. Derfor stemmer vi imod begge dechargebetænkninger.

I forhold til fællesforetagenderne vil vi stemme imod ud fra et synspunkt om, at der er for høj en fejlrate i det generelle EU-budget.

Monica Macovei, *Raportoare*. – Doamnă președinte, pentru Comitetul Regiunilor, unde sunt raportor al Parlamentului, spun de la început că am decis să acord descărcarea de gestiune pentru că este o descărcare de gestiune de încurajare tocmai pentru a se reforma acest Comitet al Regiunilor, pentru a înțelege că trăim într-o lume în care fiecare ban contează și contează cum și pe ce îi cheltuim. O primă critică: nu ne plimbăm pe banii cetățenilor. În 2014, Comitetul Regiunilor a efectuat 787 de misiuni în statele membre și, din acestea, peste 200 de misiuni în Grecia și în Italia, în luna septembrie. S-au cheltuit peste 8 milioane de euro numai pentru indemnizațiile de deplasare și ședință ale membrilor și peste 400 de mii de euro pentru personal. Nu știu ce au câștigat cetățenii europeni din aceste misiuni, dar știu sigur că au pierdut 9 milioane de euro. Documentele pe care le-am primit de la Comitetul Regiunilor despre aceste aspecte au conținut sute de pagini, au fost vagi, nu au fost clare, au fost imprecise și fără cifre exacte. O a doua critică, apropos de documentele trimise, am cerut răspunsul la întrebări scurte și puteau fi răspunse pe o pagină A4. În schimb, iarăși am primit sute de pagini ca răspuns. Aceasta ce înseamnă? Înseamnă că este o incapacitate de sinteză la cei care

lucrează la Comitetul Regiunilor, este o birocrație excesivă și, de asemenea, a trimite raportorului sute de pagini înseamnă și un fel de lipsă de respect. Acum, câteva lucruri bune: s-au făcut eforturi pentru adoptarea unor reguli privind avertizorii de integritate, cei din instituții care, practic, ne spun ce funcționează, ce nu funcționează legal în instituții, deci, ce este ilegal, dar acestea au intrat în vigoare doar la 1 ianuarie 2016. Este deja vestit cazul avertizorului de integritate McCoy, care din 2003, nu a reușit să finalizeze cazul său. Suntem în 2016, de 13 ani este în proces cu Comitetul Regiunilor și cred că orice om înnebunește să stea 13 ani în procese. Și OLAF a spus că acest om are dreptate, așa că este cazul ca Comitetul Regiunilor să spună, da, are dreptate, să încheie acest conflict și, până în iunie 2016, să ne raporteze nouă, Parlamentului, despre cum a soluționat acest caz. În final, aș vrea să le mulțumesc colegilor de la Comitetul Regiunilor pentru colaborare, i-am și vizitat. Sper să eliminăm cu toții birocrația excesivă și costisitoare pentru că trebuie să ne adaptăm lumii care se schimbă rapid. Cu toții. Cine rămâne în urmă, atunci ar trebui să schimbe locul de muncă. Sunt, de asemenea, raportor pentru descărcarea de gestiune a Autorității Europene pentru Protecția Datelor. Și aici am câteva observații: în primul rând, Autoritatea trebuie să includă în raportul anual pe 2015 decizia privind avertizorii de integritate - cei care spun despre ilegalități în instituții - ca să respecte Statutul funcționarilor. De asemenea, reamintesc Autorității Europene pentru Protecția Datelor că CV-urile noastre, ale oamenilor sunt publice, circulă liber, așa cum este normal, pe internet, pe Wikipedia, peste tot și, ca atare, CV-urile funcționarilor europeni sau experților naționali nu intră în categoria datelor care trebuie protejate pentru că, în acest moment, Autoritatea Europeană pentru Protecția Datelor transmite instituțiilor europene că CV-urile nu trebuie publicate fiindcă sunt date personale care trebuie protejate. Nu, sunt funcționari europeni care sunt pe banii cetățenilor și CV-urile lor trebuie publicate să le vadă toată lumea. Recomand și în acest caz descărcarea de gestiune Autorității, tot pentru încurajare în schimbările pe care le are de făcut.

Acum câteva comentarii privind descărcarea de gestiune a agențiilor care țin de domeniul justiției și afaceri interne pentru că am fost raportor al avizului Comisiei LIBE pentru aceste agenții. În primul rând, avem în continuare o problemă cu publicarea CV-urilor - aceasta la mai multe agenții. Avem o problemă cu protejarea sau cu neprotejarea, mai exact, a acelor care dezvăluie ilegalități din instituții și avem o problemă cu conflictul de interese, se pare că nu este încă înțeles conflictul de interese, că nu este normal ca, într-o agenție care spune da sau nu unui produs alimentar să lucreze oameni din companiile alimentare care au participat la fabricarea acelui produs. Mă opresc în mod deosebit la două agenții: Agenția pentru Drepturi Fundamentale, unde s-au inițiat mai multe acțiuni în instanță împotriva agenției datorită unor abuzuri comise împotriva unor persoane care au semnalat nereguli și nu s-au respectat hotărârile Tribunalului Funcției Publice. Haideți să nu ne batem joc de oamenii care spun adevărul. Și, a doua agenție despre care vreau să vorbesc și închei este Agenția pentru Siguranță Alimentară, unde am avut un caz flagrant de conflict de interese în ianuarie 2016: agenția anunța o posibilă angajare ca director a unei persoane care venea din industria alimentară. Deci, chiar dacă aceasta și-a retras ulterior candidatura, simpla intenție a agenției de a face o astfel de angajare este inadmisibilă. Cum să angajezi pe cineva din industria alimentară într-o companie care dă aviz industriei alimentare și noi nu știm ce mâncăm, iar ei se îmbogățesc cu prețul sănătății noastre. Există și exemple bune, Eurojust, de pildă.

Derek Vaughan, *rapporteur*. – Madam President, like the previous speaker I would like to use all my time now and not come back at the end of the debate.

I wrote 33 reports for the decentralised agencies. This was a lot of work, and therefore I want to thank my staff – not only the S&D staff, but also the Budget Control Secretariat – for their help, plus the shadow rapporteurs worked with me very closely. At this point, I would like to make a general point about the discharge process and to thank all the rapporteurs for all the discharge reports, particularly the rapporteur for the general discharge – I think she produced a good and well balanced report, which I think will be supported by a majority of this House.

For the agencies, I would also like to thank the Commission and the Court of Auditors and all the agencies for working very closely with me. Overall, the agencies received pleasing reports from the Court of Auditors. I shadowed the agencies' discharge last year, and I am pleased to report that there has been a great deal of progress since then. There were fewer comments from the Court and, importantly, there were no qualified opinions. This means the Court found no reason to call into question the reliability of the accounts, and the transactions underlying the accounts were also legal and were regular in all material respects.

I am also pleased to report that the agencies are well advanced in terms of the implementation of actions foreseen in the common approach agreed in 2012, reaching a 99% rate of completion of agency-specific actions. Also, 93% of agencies stated that they now share services with other agencies and institutions, and 75% of the agencies have cooperation agreements. I would therefore encourage all agencies to look at this further in order to make increased efficiency savings. Agencies now also put in place guidelines for inter-agency procurement procedures and for agencies' participation in Commission-led procurement procedures, which again will, hopefully, lead to efficiencies.

Most agencies have already met the 5% required staff reductions. However, I know many agencies are concerned that they are also being asked to contribute 5% extra into a redeployment pool, and I think this is something which needs to be looked at. Over 80% of all agencies have anti-fraud strategies in place. More than 90% of agencies have policies in place on the publication of the CVs and declarations of interest of the management board members and also senior staff and in-house experts. So the picture is looking pretty good, but of course – as with all reports – there are some concerns and some areas which need to be improved. For example, since January 2014 four agencies have been in the same negotiation process with a host Member State about headquarters agreements. Some good progress has been made, but I would urge all Member States to conclude negotiations with their agencies in order that those headquarters agreements can be put in place as quickly as possible.

On carryovers, which is a topic that is raised most years, I am pleased to say that most of the carryovers were planned. However, a higher level of cancellations of carryovers from previous years was noted in some cases, which may indicate that the appropriations carried over were made on the basis of overestimated needs or were otherwise not justified. I am pleased, however, to note that most of the agencies concerned are putting in place measures to deal with this issue.

In some agencies there is still an issue over gender balance, particularly in senior management positions, and I have asked the agencies network to provide us, as the discharge authority, with a detailed report on steps being taken to address this problem. In addition to this, I would also ask Member States to pursue gender balance when they make appointments to board members for the agencies.

Lastly, I wanted to call on agencies to further strengthen their efforts to improve their communication policies, expand their visibility and raise awareness of their activities and achievements. All these agencies do a huge amount of good work for citizens right across the European Union, and they should publicise this work more than they have been doing in the past. That would raise awareness of what they do, but I also think it would be good for the individual agencies as well. The Budgetary Control Committee voted overwhelmingly to grant discharge for all the agencies. This was due to them all receiving an unqualified opinion from the Court of Auditors and because of the progress which they demonstrated in recent years. I therefore hope that tomorrow, when this House votes on the agencies' discharge, we would once again grant discharge to all the agencies in my report.

Marian-Jean Marinescu, Raportor. – Doamnă președintă, în primul rând aş vrea să mulţumesc colegilor raportori şi colegilor din comisie pentru colaborare. Există un singur amendament pe toate cele opt rapoarte despre întreprinderile mixte, aşa că eu consider că munca în comisie a fost foarte bună. Cred că întreprinderile mixte sunt extrem de importante în această perioadă, discutăm foarte mult despre dezvoltare economică, creştere economică, locuri de muncă. Prima condiţie este să avem activitate de cercetare, de dezvoltare şi, în special, de inovare şi de implementare în practică a rezultatelor cercetărilor. Cred că întreprinderile mixte care sunt acum în funcţiune în Uniune au arătat deja că sunt folositoare, mai ales în ceea ce priveşte aplicarea în practică, mai ales dacă luăm ca exemplu, ca prim exemplu, SESAR care deja început implementarea rezultatelor cercetării în sistemele de management de trafic aerian, acest exemplu este un exemplu foarte bun. Clean Sky a ajuns în etapa de a avea demonstratoare tehnologice extrem de importante şi care pot aduce mari beneficii industriei aviatice, sper că vom găsi şi mijloacele financiare să aplicăm în practică. IMI cred că acum merge bine, să avem şi în practică aplicate rezultatele cercetărilor. FCH este singura dintre întreprinderile mixte care a utilizat, care de fapt, a contractat toţi banii alocaţi în perioada FP7, în perioada vechiului MFF. F4energy este un caz, să spunem mai special. Bineînţeles este agenţia domestică pentru ITER, pentru organizaţia internaţională ITER. Cred că ITER a început să demonstreze că poate să facă ceva. Cred că 80% din ceea ce trebuie făcut acolo este comandat. Există încă o problemă în ceea ce priveşte programul şi finanţarea. Există un plan depus de noul director, aşteptăm să vedem aprobat acest plan, este motivul pentru care am propus amânarea *discharge-ului* până în toamnă, însă raportul susţine acest proiect internaţional şi, bineînţeles, susţine şi întreprinderea mixtă. Ştiţi că au existat două alte întreprinderi mixte, ARTEMIS şi ENIAC, s-au unit într-una singură, în ECSEL. ARTEMIS, ENIAC şi ECSEL au primit o opinie calificată de la Curtea de Conturi pe motivul că nu se poate stabili exact dacă ratele de eroare calculate pe reguli naţionale, pentru că aşa este regulamentul celor trei întreprinderi mixte, deci nu se poate stabili exact dacă aceste rate de eroare se încadrează în nivelul cerut de instituţii. Cred că putem să facem un pas înainte, cred că prin documente constatatoare de la instituţiile naţionale în domeniu, autorităţile naţionale în acest domeniu, am putea să stabilim dacă este corect sau

nu ceea ce s-a făcut până acum. Este cererea Parlamentului, cerem Curții de Conturi și bineînțeles și ECSEL, întreprinderii mixte care este acum responsabilă de activitatea acestor foste două întreprinderi mixte, să se ceară primirea acestor două documente suplimentare și, în felul acesta, să rezolvăm această situație pe viitor. Deci, cerem amânarea pentru ARTEMIS și ENIAC și acordarea *discharge-ului* pentru ECSEL. În continuare, cerem în rezoluție Curții de Conturi să prezinte informații în detaliu sau să meargă mai mult în detaliu despre evaluarea contribuției în natură și contribuției în general a partenerilor privați despre rata de eroare și despre cum se desfășoară în paralel cheltuirea și utilizarea fondurilor alocate prin FP7 și Orizont2020 pentru că această activitate se va desfășura încă trei ani în paralel cu fonduri din, să spunem, linii bugetare diferite. În rest, mulțumesc, de asemenea, Curții de Conturi pentru colaborarea pe care am avut-o și pentru întâlnirile repetate și consultarea pe care am avut-o în această perioadă și, sper ca și în continuare până în toamnă să rezolvăm ceea ce avem de rezolvat cu cele trei *discharge-uri* amânate.

Jeanine Hennis-Plasschaert, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Madam President, I am happy to be here and to participate today in this important debate on the implementation of the EU budget for the financial year 2014 in the context of the annual discharge procedures, as foreseen in Article 319 of the Treaty. On 23 February my colleague Jeroen Dijsselbloem, the Dutch Finance Minister, had the honour of presenting the Council's recommendation to grant discharge to the Commission – to the Committee on Budgetary Control – and tomorrow this plenary will cast its vote.

Clearly the citizens of Europe expect us to be particularly attentive to the quality of EU spending, and rightly so. However, sound financial management is not only important from a public opinion perspective; it is our legal obligation to execute the EU budget in compliance with the agreed rules. Keeping EU expenditure under strict control is crucial for all of us.

The Council recommended that discharge be granted to the Commission and outlined the reasons leading to this recommendation. Nevertheless, the Council also reaffirmed that there is still a lot to improve in the execution of the EU budget. First of all, the Council regrets the insufficient reduction of the error rate of 4.4% and thus the fact that most spending is still affected by a material level of error, and that important policy areas such as agriculture, cohesion and research remain prone to error. The Council was particularly concerned about the fact that, according to the Court's findings, the Commission, national authorities and independent auditors had enough information to prevent, detect and correct these errors. Clearly, all financial actors involved in the management of EU funds need to assume their responsibilities in full, including Member States.

The Council urged the Commission and Member States to strengthen their mutual cooperation and stressed the importance of avoiding errors in the first place. Therefore it highlighted the need to increase the quality of controls in order to prevent or detect and correct errors before declaring costs to the Commission. So yes, I agree with the rapporteur, Claudia Schmidt, that what we need is not more controls but better implementation of the existing control mechanisms. In other words, this should – and could – be done in a cost-efficient way without adding extra layers of control.

Moreover, the Council recommendation also recalled that recoveries and financial corrections are essential elements in the protection of the Union's financial interests. Payments should be interrupted and suspended whenever significant deficiencies are identified and until corrective action has been fully implemented. Unduly-paid amounts must be recovered without delay, and full transparency regarding the implementation of corrective action must be ensured. The Council further calls upon the Commission to provide the budgetary authority in the year 2016 with a comprehensive report based on systematic data already available on the areas where the level of error identified is persistently high, as well as on the root causes. Additionally, the Council also agrees with Parliament that the simplification of rules remains paramount in achieving an unqualified audit opinion. Simplification and improved guidance not only reduces the administrative burden on the beneficiaries and respective authorities but also allows for more efficient and less costly controls.

The Council welcomes the Commission's work in the management of payment appropriations and calls for a constant monitoring of outstanding commitments. It also recalls its request to the Commission to provide transparent and timely information on the long-term cash flow forecast in order to better match payments and available funds with needs. Despite the fact that the revenue part of the budget was not affected by material error, the Council underlines the importance of mitigating the impact of revisions of national GNI data as well as measures to reduce the length of outstanding reservations.

Finally, the Council welcomes the Court's approach in evaluating the results of EU spending and measuring aspects related to performance. The Council encourages the Commission, following the Court's recommendation, to identify the most suitable and effective performance systems for the EU budget in cooperation with the Court and Member States. So I agree with the emphasis that rapporteur Dlabajová puts on a performance-based budget. Within this context, the Council – while of course being cautious not to prejudge conclusions – welcomes the Commission's initiative budget, for the results of which I believe the first expert meeting took place last week.

It is evident that we are still far from the overall aim of an unqualified audit opinion from the Court. The Council therefore reiterates its wish to see year-on-year improvements in the financial management systems and in the estimated level of errors across all policy areas. The Council is constructively engaged in discussions on how to improve the performance framework of the EU budget and to ensure that this budget delivers better results in view of the Multiannual Financial Framework mid-term review and of the next MFF. The Council invites the Court to provide its input for this review in a timely manner.

In conclusion, the Presidency has started to work on the next MFF through the Conference in January and the following discussion at the General Affairs Council on 12 April. The aim is to explore, at an early stage, possibilities for improvement and reform. From this several principles have been identified that could provide a way forward, and the joint results of these discussions will be presented in a Presidency report to the Council, Parliament and the Commission.

President. – I just want to announce to colleagues that I know that because of an interinstitutional commitment you will be leaving the Chamber, but you will return and we thank you for that.

Kristalina Georgieva, Vice-President of the Commission. – Madam President, dear rapporteurs, Madam Minister, President Caldeira, honourable members of the European Parliament, of the Court of Auditors, I would like to start by thanking all of you, and in particular the rapporteurs we have listened to, and the Court of Auditors, the Council, for the seriousness with which you approach the debates on the 2014 discharge procedure. We are at a time when Europe requires from us to concentrate on making absolutely best use of our people's sacrifice. They are those who fund our budget. This year's discharge is remarkable, with the alignment of all institutions – Parliament the Council, the Court of Auditors, the Commission – on the importance we assign to focusing on the performance of the budget. What and how well it delivers for the EU economy and for our citizens, as well as the compliance with the rules: I recognise we have work to do in both areas.

We have stabilised the error rate – we have to continue to drive it down – and, very importantly, we have to work on extracting the highest possible value from our budget. As the Minister just mentioned, five or six days ago, on 22 April, we had the first meeting of the Interinstitutional Working Group on Performance. We start by defining what is performance so we see eye to eye, how we should measure it, as well as how we can move most systematically towards performance-based budgeting. I want to recognise the rapporteur Madam Dlabajová for her determination to make us expand our discussions from what used to be primarily focus on the error rate to a very strong footing in policy objectives and results achieved, and in that spirit I would draw four conclusions for us (not pretending that this exhausts all we have learned from the debate) in the following.

First: alignment of budgetary priorities; second: better reporting on performance and budget focus on results; third: dealing with persistently high error rates, a topic that the minister brought up; and last but not least: how we strike the right balance between risk management and risk avoidance.

So let me start with the first point. As we approach the midterm review revision, it is time to honestly identify to what degree we are capable of matching political priorities with the dedication of our budget. It is a question that will take us, hopefully, to important conclusions for the rest of this financial perspective, and also it would help us to see whether we are fully and entirely using the flexibility of the budget that has been granted in this multi-year financial perspective.

Another part of the debate would be how these political objectives are translated into operational objectives on the ground and how to ensure adequate reporting back on the results achieved. We know that in the current financial perspective we have made a very big step forward in respect of priorities and measures to what extent we achieved what we have said we would achieve, but we are not perfect; there are lessons to be learnt and fed into the preparation for the next generation of programmes, and I want to stress again the importance of interinstitutional dialogue. Working together we can achieve significant improvements.

Second, the debate showed a need for better reporting on performance. We have a lot of information available, but we have to organise it so it guides our allocation of resources that we streamlined reporting better, we improved the quality of our indicators. In this respect, I want to announce that we will take an important step this year when the synthesis report in the Article 318 report are combined in one, and this would provide a more complete picture on the implementation of the EU budget.

In addition, we are very much aware of the necessity to insensitise earlier detection of risks of errors and errors. Avoiding them in the first place is the best way to deal with them. We also will continue our work on the multi-annual nature of errors. We know that we measure them on an annual basis, but our programmes are multi-annual. We want to provide incentives for corrections so they are actually driving down the cost on errors on our citizens.

Third, we have been asked to look into the persistently high level of errors. We are going to present, later in this year, a report with analysis in this area. I want to stress that it would be drawn mostly on the prior experience from the previous multi-year financial framework 2007-2013. There are limitations how much we can translate lessons from there, but we would do our best to assess, on the basis of the latest information, what are the systemic risks and how we can best reduce them.

Last but not least, we want people to be mindful of risk management opportunities. The Minister talked about simplification – very important. We have a huge opportunity with the changes in the Financial Regulation to achieve simplification, but we can never bring errors to zero, and we do not want us to shy away from what may be riskier but very high-value activity. Take for example development. If we want to prevent conflicts, to reduce the catastrophic impact of lack of development, we ought to invest in fragile situations. They are riskier, and therefore we have to help our teams to manage these risks. But we do not want them to not to do the right thing because they want to be protected by inaction. Similarly in migration: speed of action there is critical, and we are going to be working under demanding circumstances, where challenges change every day.

Let me finish with a quote from Ms Dlabajová. She says: 'the future becomes the past'. I would add that we should learn from the past to secure a better future, and discharge is fantastic in this regard.

PRÉSIDENCE DE MME SYLVIE GUILLAUME

Vice-présidente

Vítor Caldeira, *President of the Court of Auditors*. – Madam President, the European Court of Auditors welcomes this opportunity to participate again in the closing debate of the discharge procedure for the financial year 2014.

I would first like to congratulate all the rapporteurs who have intervened and, in particular, Mrs Dlabajová for the huge amount of work she has done, and of course the whole Committee on Budgetary Control. Their reports are indeed valuable for this exercise, and the report on the European Union budget, in particular, draws important lessons that we cannot afford to ignore. Many of those are based on the work we have performed in our reports, so for those working at the Court – for our Members, for our staff – it is very gratifying to see how seriously our recommendations are being addressed in the different discharge reports.

In particular, as regards the European Union budget discharge, we think indeed that the challenge now is to ensure that the lessons we have learned from the past, in particular in the 2014 financial year, will lead to short and long-term improvements in the way the European Union funds are used. It is very encouraging to have already listened today to the commitment that all the institutions are showing on the need to act.

For that to happen, we need those lessons to be reflected in the mid term review of the current multiannual financial framework; we need them also to be reflected in the revision of the Financial Regulation, and we need to work together – all the institutions in their different roles and capacities – to develop a budget more focused on results.

As I said in November last year, we believe it is time to start developing a wholly new approach for European Union spending and investment. That implies the European Union budget being better targeted to the European Union's strategic objectives; it needs to be more flexible in a crisis – refugees and migration were mentioned – and it also needs to be used more efficiently, and then there is also huge room for improvement. Our 2000 Annual Report highlighted the scope for tackling financial backlogs, reducing payment errors, and improving reports on results.

The Commission has welcomed the message, has accepted our recommendations and, as we listen now, is acting upon them. That is very encouraging. In turn, the Court will follow up all these developments in our 2015 annual report, which we are currently preparing. This year we hope to be able to publish it in October, earlier than in previous years. I want to thank the Commission, and in particular Vice-President Georgieva, for their support in achieving this target, and we also very much count on Parliament's acceptance of this.

We are also actively engaged in strengthening dialogue with this Parliament and its committees to ensure that we produce reports that provide you in this House with the maximum assistance for you to exercise effective public oversight over the implementation of the European budget and European Union legislation.

I will conclude by saying that the European Union must make the most of the opportunity it has now to fundamentally review how public funds are raised, spent and managed to achieve the European Union objectives.

Cristian Dan Preda, *Raportor pentru aviz Comisia pentru afaceri externe*. – Ca autor al opiniilor AFET cu privire la descărcarea bugetară a Comisiei Europene și a Serviciului European de Acțiune Externă, aş vrea să-mi exprim susținerea pentru recomandările făcute acestor două instituții, în diferite rapoarte pe care le dezbaterem astăzi, cu privire la modul în care este gestionat bugetul pentru activitățile externe ale Uniunii. Cred că atunci când discutăm felul în care au fost și sunt cheltuiți banii aferenți activității de politică externă în state terțe, este esențial să nu uităm că impactul pe care îl vom avea depinde de o mulțime de factori: locali, regionali, factori pe care nu îi putem controla. Consider de aceea că gestiunea bugetului atribuită activităților externe ale Uniunii trebuie să fie suficient de flexibilă încât să poată răspunde rapid și eficient la evoluțiile din statele terțe. Cred, de asemenea, că gestiunea acestor fonduri trebuie făcută în deplină transparență. Mi se pare important, de asemenea, ca atât Comisia cât și Serviciul European de Acțiune Externă să facă eforturi pentru a reduce drastic întârzierile la plăți, erorile și pentru a îmbunătăți numărul de proiecte finanțate de Uniune în state terțe.

Doru-Claudian Frunzulică, *rapporteur for the opinion of the Committee on Development*. – Madam President, as rapporteur for the Committee on Development opinion on discharge implementation of the EU general budget for 2014 and on the 8th, 9th, 10th and 11th European Development Funds (EDF), I would like to raise some concerns about certain points that were included in the political resolution accompanying the discharge.

First, in both the Committee on Development and the Committee on Budgetary Control (CONT), we expressed concerns at the inclusion by the rapporteur of some critical and unjustified phrasing and figures drawn from an unofficial working document by a colleague on the CONT Committee and which had never been approved by the CONT Committee. I strongly oppose the inclusion of any references to this document in the EDF discharge.

Moreover, the rapporteur calls for one quarter of the 11th EDF to be used in combating the migration crisis. However, the scope of the EDF is to tackle the root causes of migration by supporting sustainable development, and focusing it on addressing existing migration flows would send out a false signal and may lead to a misappropriation of funds.

I therefore ask you to vote in favour of Amendments 5, 6 and 7 in order to ensure that the resolution we will adopt tomorrow not only paints an accurate picture of the reality of projects in our missions in this region but also that it does not call into question the fundamental principles of this important fund.

David Casa, *Rapporteur għal opinjoni tal-Kumitat għall-Impjiegi u l-Affarijiet Soċjali*. – Irrid niffoka partikolarment fuq ix-xogħol tal-aġenziji tal-Unjoni Ewropea, jiġifieri s-Cedefop, l-ETF, il-Eurofound u l-aġenzija li tittratta s-saħħa u s-sigurtà fuq il-post tax-xogħol. Naturalment, dawn huma aġenziji importanti li jiffokaw fuq tahrig vokazzjonali, li jiffokaw fuq sistemi ta' tahrig għall-pajjiżi li huma sottożviluppati; huma aġenziji li jikkellmu dwar ir-riċerka u x-xogħol importanti tal-analiżi li jagħmlu u anke wkoll kif jiġi pprevenut ir-riskju, u jiġi promoss post tax-xogħol sostenibbli u san.

Irridu niffokaw ukoll dwar rapport dwar l-implimentazzjoni tal-baġit tal-aġenziji, li kien wiehed pożittiv u xhieda tas-saħħa finanzjarja. Irridu però wkoll naraw li dawn l-aġenziji jibqgħu separati, dawn ma jagħmlux xogħol duplikat, qed jagħmlu xogħol importanti, u għandna nhalluom jagħmlu dan ix-xogħol b'mod separat. U fl-aħhar nett, inhegġeg lil dawn l-aġenziji jieħdu abbord ir-rakkomandazzjonijiet imressqa f'dawn ir-rapporti għaliex nahseb huwa importanti għall-gid taċ-ċittadini tal-Unjoni Ewropea.

Massimiliano Salini, *relatore per parere della commissione per i trasporti e il turismo*. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signora Commissaria, credo che l'occasione di questo discarico ci dà la possibilità, nell'ambito dei trasporti, di fare una considerazione più importante di tutte le altre. Sarebbero molte le osservazioni ma mi concentro sul tema specifico degli investimenti, che è decisivo perché la politica sui trasporti esca dalla logica della proposta ed entri nella logica dell'attuazione.

Abbiamo un tema che riguarda con forza le performance di questa commissione: il cosiddetto Piano Juncker. Questo piano è un piano su cui noi politicamente investiamo molto perché punta a mettere a fattor comune il potenziale, in termini d'investimento, di tutti i paesi dell'Unione ma è un anche un piano che pone a noi, come commissione per i trasporti, un grande dubbio: la sottrazione di risorse dal CEF, cioè uno strumento che storicamente ha favorito con forza investimenti laddove il rapporto tra pubblico e privato fatica a generare investimenti necessari e le risorse necessarie.

Non possiamo continuare a sottrarre risorse dal CEF per portarle là dove non siamo certi che gli investimenti andranno nella stessa direzione. Il caso dei trasporti ferroviari lo documenta plasticamente. Quindi, invitiamo fortemente a non ridurre ulteriormente quelle risorse, pur conoscendo il valore inestimabile della proposta contenuta nel piano Juncker e nel FEIS.

Ivana Maletić, *izvjestitelj za mišljenje Odbora REGI*. – Gospođo predsjednice, (nerazumljivo) i pozdravljam povjerenicu Georgievu. Stopa pogreške u kohezijskoj politici 2014. povećala se u odnosu na 2013., što nas zapravo ne treba ni čuditi. Toliko smo s raznim dodatnim uputama i tumačenjima zakomplicirali sustav da često čak ni sami revizori nisu sigurni što je pravilno, a što nepravilno i imaju različita tumačenja.

Kompliciran sustav podlozan tumačenjima i promjenama dovodi ili do nepravilnosti ili do neprovođenja aktivnosti i stajanja jer se u strahu od pogreške mnogi radije odluče ne koristiti sredstva i mogućnosti koja im se pružaju. Taj slučaj imamo s financijskim instrumentima za koje su upute toliko komplicirane da je lakše ne koristiti ih unatoč prednostima i koristima koje donose.

Jasan i jednostavan sustav put je za smanjenje nepravilnosti, kao i ulaganje u edukaciju te uspostavu kvalitetnih sustava financijskog upravljanja i kontrola. To je ulaganje u prevenciju na kojoj najviše moramo raditi s ciljem brze i uspješne provedbe kohezijske, ali i drugih politika EU-a te naravno s ciljem kvalitetnog izvršavanja proračuna EU-a.

Paolo De Castro, *relatore per parere della commissione per l'agricoltura*. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signor Commissario, voglio innanzitutto ringraziare il relatore Tibor Szanyi, che oggi non può essere presente, per l'ottimo lavoro svolto nella redazione del parere della commissione per l'agricoltura e lo sviluppo rurale, frutto di intense discussioni e di un'ottima collaborazione tra i gruppi politici.

Il 2014 è stato un anno di transizione per la politica agricola comune tra la vecchia programmazione e l'implementazione della nuova riforma. E anche il 2015 e il 2016 si possono considerare anni in cui le riforme introdotte verranno pienamente implementate e ci saranno norme nuove, molto complesse, a partire dal *greening*, che è sicuramente una delle innovazioni più importanti introdotte dagli agricoltori. Nonostante abbiamo registrato una riduzione del tasso di errore rispetto al 2013, riteniamo che ci siano ancora molti passi da compiere per ridurre gli oneri burocratici per gli agricoltori europei.

La Commissione sta già lavorando sulla semplificazione della PAC, attraverso atti delegati e di implementazione, soprattutto in termini di controlli e sanzioni, ma crediamo che la revisione di medio termine della Politica agricola comune, possa essere un'occasione preziosa per rendere più efficace ed efficiente la spesa dei soldi pubblici destinati all'agricoltura e aumentare i benefici ambientali.

Yana Toom, *rapporteur for the opinion of the Committee on Culture and Education*. – Madam President, I have a few remarks from the point of view of the Committee on Culture. First, I would like to stress that there are certain problems in the youth section of Erasmus+ that relate to access to funding compared to the previous youth and action programme. We regret the current suspension of Erasmus+ youth funding in Greece. Second, there are considerable delays in the final payments by the Education, Culture and Audiovisual Executive Agency. This is unacceptable. It directly affects the beneficiaries' rights. Third, we believe that the European Schools have still not addressed the issues raised by the Court of Auditors and the need to implement a rotation system for sensitive posts and to address other weaknesses in their work. Fourth, there is a mismatch between the 7-year programming of the MFF and the 10-year programming of the political and strategic priorities of the Union. Fifth, the Europe for Citizens programme: it is a unique tool to promote European values and solidarity, especially considering the increasing popularity of radical right and Eurosceptical parties, but the present funding level is rather low and budget cuts for this programme are not welcomed.

Pascal Durand (Verts/ALE), *rapporteur pour avis de la commission des affaires étrangères*. – Madame la Présidente, une minute pour vous parler d'un sujet qui va peut-être paraître mineur. Trois milliards d'euros: c'est ce que le Parlement européen ne peut pas contrôler depuis 2009, tout simplement parce que la Commission et le Conseil se renvoient la balle dans un jeu de ping-pong. Le Conseil refuse de donner ses comptes au Parlement européen et la Commission refuse d'intégrer dans ses propres comptes le budget du Conseil.

Nous sommes donc dans l'incapacité, nous, parlementaires, de pouvoir contrôler les comptes à un moment où la transparence et le besoin d'informations apparaissent plus que nécessaires. La commission des affaires constitutionnelles profite de la présence de la Commission et du Conseil pour leur demander d'essayer de se mettre d'accord et de discuter avec le Parlement européen pour que cesse cette situation absolument ridicule – sur un plan juridique – et scandaleuse – sur un plan économique –, à savoir que les comptes du Conseil échappent à tout contrôle budgétaire.

Inés Ayala Sender, *ponente de opinión de la Comisión de Transportes y Turismo*. – Señora Presidenta, quería agradecer, en primer lugar, al señor Caldeira el cada vez más útil informe anual de aprobación de la gestión, acompañado por los informes especiales correspondientes, subrayando esta vez la sorpresa, la alarma y la preocupación que nos suscita que la tasa de error de la gestión directa alcanzara en 2014 a la de la gestión compartida, que era hasta ahora nuestro caballo de batalla en los fondos destinados a la cohesión y la agricultura, y que, esta vez, ha recaído exclusivamente en el presupuesto de la investigación, revelando el riesgo alto de prescindir de las auditorías *ex ante* como método de simplificación. Espero una reacción rápida y decisiva del Comisario Moedas en un sector tan crucial para el desarrollo futuro de la UE.

Quiero dar las gracias a la señora Dlabajová y felicitarla por el enfoque tan constructivo e innovador, que ha hecho de su informe un repaso exhaustivo y prometedor de los procedimientos y sistemas de control abierto, y dirigido al futuro presupuesto de resultados, que exigirá un debate en profundidad, pero que sus recomendaciones, señora Dlabajová, nos ayudan mucho a prefigurar.

Por último, quisiera agradecer al señor Pieper su cooperación pragmática para seguir mejorando las capacidades de nuestra casa en un momento en el que este Parlamento pelea con brío por recuperar plenamente su papel central de legislador y de control. De ahí que respete sus opiniones, pero no las comparta, al atacar, por razones partidarias, al Presidente de nuestra institución por su papel como cabeza de lista en las elecciones, papel que también asumieron otros candidatos. Yo creo que es más fácil y más importante seguir apoyándole en su lucha por conseguir una plataforma política a la que los jefes de Estado y primeros ministros acudan y pidan acudir.

Markus Ferber, *Verfasser der Stellungnahme des mitberatenden Ausschusses für Wirtschaft und Währung*. – Frau Präsidentin, liebe Kolleginnen, liebe Kollegen! Im Ausschuss für Wirtschaft und Währung haben wir uns insbesondere mit den drei Aufsichtsbehörden beschäftigt, mit der Bankenaufsicht, der Wertpapieraufsicht und der Versicherungsaufsicht. Zunächst begrüßen wir natürlich, dass der Europäische Rechnungshof einen positiven Befund gegeben hat, dass also hier die Gelder ordnungsgemäß verwendet wurden. Das begrüßen wir natürlich auch sehr.

Auf der anderen Seite haben wir eine Reihe von Kritikpunkten, was die Arbeitsweise, die Methodik dieser Behörden betrifft. Ich finde es schon sehr beschämend, dass eine Behörde es nicht geschafft hat, ihre IT-Infrastruktur so auszuschireiben, dass sie auch die Gesetzgebung, die wir beschlossen haben, vollständig umsetzen kann, und dass wir deswegen jetzt eine wichtige Gesetzgebung der Finanzmarktregulierung um ein Jahr verschieben müssen. Bei einer anderen Aufsichtsbehörde stellen wir fest, dass sie wohl in Ermangelung von Arbeit mit einer Vielzahl von *guidelines*, also allgemeinen Regelwerken, die sie da erlässt, weit weg von der Gesetzgebung in die Finanzmärkte eingreift. Und so gibt es eine Reihe von Dingen, die wir in unserem Bericht sehr kritisch formuliert haben.

Ich hoffe, dass die Entlastungsprozedur kein formaler Akt ist, sondern auch für die Verbesserung der Arbeitsweise, insbesondere im Fall dieser drei Agenturen – EBA, ESMA und EIOPA – einen Beitrag leistet. Dann wäre der ECON sehr, sehr glücklich.

José Blanco López, *ponente de opinión de la Comisión de Pesca*. – Señora Presidenta, la Agencia Europea de Control de la Pesca presenta un cumplimiento presupuestario ejemplar. Los niveles de compromisos y de pagos mejoran año tras año hasta, respectivamente, el 99 % y el 88 % en 2014. Resultan ejemplares los resultados que cosecha desde su creación, lo mismo que su contribución al cumplimiento de la política pesquera común reformada.

El margen de mejora es muy escaso, en particular por las reducciones de personal y la congelación de su presupuesto. Es preciso, a mi juicio, incrementar los recursos con los que cuenta —financieros y humanos— para que esta Agencia pueda seguir cumpliendo con las responsabilidades que le fueron asignadas en la reforma de la política pesquera común.

Joachim Zeller, *im Namen der PPE-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin! Das Parlament ist mitentscheidend im Haushaltsverfahren, das heißt aber auch, dass wir damit darauf zu achten haben, dass die Mittel des EU-Haushalts zielgerichtet, aber auch regelgerecht verwendet werden. Dies umso mehr als der Großteil des Haushalts im *shared management*, in der geteilten Mittelverwaltung, von den Mitgliedstaaten umgesetzt wird.

Wir sollten uns also nicht scheuen, die Fehler und Unregelmäßigkeiten in denjenigen Mitgliedstaaten, wo sie auftreten, auch zu benennen, damit die Kontroll- und Aufsichtsfunktionen in diesen Staaten verbessert werden.

Wenn wir eine Zielvorgabe von zwei Prozent Fehlerquote bei der Mittelverwendung haben, dann können wir es eben nicht hinnehmen, wenn die vom Rechnungshof festgestellten Fehlerquoten immer wieder weit darüber liegen und davon meist dieselben Mitgliedstaaten betroffen sind. Wenn bei Finanzkorrekturen unter Wiedereinzahlung von Geldern manche Länder teilweise um das Dreifache über dem Durchschnitt liegen, so ist das – denke ich – eine Zahl, die auch darauf hinweist, dass der Haushalt eben nicht zielgerichtet umgesetzt wurde. Die Rückforderungen, die dabei im Rahmen der Finanzkorrekturen aufgetreten sind, sind dann Gelder, die eben nicht für Wachstum, für Beschäftigung und für die Ziele, für die sie gedacht waren, umgesetzt werden.

Wir begrüßen daher Korrekturen und auch Wiedereinziehung als wirksame Instrumente zum Schutz des Haushalts, denn der Schutz des Haushalts ist auch gleichzeitig der Schutz der Steuerzahler in der Europäischen Union.

Георги Пирински, *от името на групата S&D*. – Г-жо Председател, г-жо Георгиева, дами и господа, бих искал да отбележа три момента.

Първият е, че това как Комисията разходва средствата на данъкоплатците безспорно личи от процента на грешки, които се допускат, и това следва да остане много важно мерило именно за това доколко данъкоплатците могат да са доволни от начина, по който Комисията действа по отношение на бюджета.

Същевременно обаче е ясно, че в крайна сметка хората се интересуват доколко и как се променя техният живот, доколко възможностите за работа, за доходи, тяхната сигурност се подобряват благодарение и на приноса на бюджетните мероприятия по линия на Европейската комисия.

И бих искал тук да отбележа, и това е вторият момент, че докладът на г-жа Длабайова в това отношение представлява едно, според мен, удачно съчетание на внимание и на анализ и на едната, и на другата страна на оценката на действията на Комисията. Бих искал в тази връзка да ѝ благодаря и като един от докладчиците в сянка, който се стремеше да допринесе за този доклад.

Третият момент е свързан с един важен аспект от доклада, той се съдържа в параграф 73, където има един изричен призив, че гражданите не разбират много добре този процент на грешки и че е необходимо Европейската сметна палата, заедно с Комисията, да се постараят да постигнат единство в методологията по оценките на грешките и на пропуските въз основа на единни стандарти и процедури на докладване. Това е много важно, за да има обективна преценка за това кой доколко правилно разходва средствата.

Zbigniew Kuźmiuk, *w imieniu grupy ECR*. – Pani Przewodnicząca! Pani Komisarz! Panie Przewodniczący Trybunału! Zabierając głos w tej debacie nad absolutorium za rok 2014, chciałbym skupić się na wydatkach sekcji trzeciej – Komisja i agencje wykonawcze, ponieważ to zasadnicza część unijnego budżetu.

W odniesieniu do wydatków tej sekcji chciałbym zwrócić uwagę na moim zdaniem dwa poważne problemy. Pierwszy to niepokojąco wysoki poziom błędów, który jeżeli chodzi o płatności wyniósł średnio 4,4% i był podobny do tego z lat 2012-13. Co więcej w takich działaniach budżetu jak spójność czy rolnictwo, stanowiących blisko 70% wydatków, był jeszcze wyższy i wynosił odpowiednio 5,7% i 6,2%. Wprawdzie wskaźnik poziomu błędów nie jest jednoznaczny z nadużyciami finansowymi czy marnotrawstwem, może również oznaczać wydatkowanie środków niezgodnie z obowiązującymi przepisami, ale mimo tego zastrzeżenia chodzi o wydatkowanie w taki sposób kwoty około 5 miliardów euro i niestety kwota ta z roku na rok rośnie.

Drugi problem to zerowa absorpcja w 2014 roku dla wielu programów w ramach perspektywy finansowej 2014-20 wynikająca ze zbyt późnego przyjęcia rozporządzeń przez Komisję, co może negatywnie wpływać na wykorzystanie środków budżetowych w kolejnych latach.

Martina Dlabajová, *za skupinu ALDE*. – Paní předsedající, hovořím nyní jako stínová zpravodajka zprávy o absolutoriu Evropskému rozvojovému fondu. Ráda bych poděkovala za dobrou práci a spolupráci všem stínovým zpravodajům a paní zpravodajce Claudii Schmidtové. Dovolte mi vyjádřit potěšení ze skutečnosti, že řada nových prvků, které jsem zavedla ve zprávě o Evropském rozvojovém fondu za rok 2013, se stává integrální součástí textu absolutoria. Ať už se jedná o pohled zaměřený na výsledek a výkonnost nebo vyvozování závěrů a formulace doporučení pro příští období.

I v oblasti rozvojové pomoci je zapotřebí respektovat ekonomická kritéria a vnímat realitu. Nicméně připouštím, že ona realita se stále mění, a to poměrně výrazně, i v portfoliu aktivit Evropského rozvojového fondu. Stejně jako navrhuji v případě absolutoria za hospodaření Evropské komise, i Evropský rozvojový fond by měl vyhodnotit, zda jsou jeho prostředky zaměřeny na skutečné priority.

Podle mého názoru se aktuálně jedná o dvě hlavní oblasti: problematiku migrace a ochranu před teroristickými riziky. Jejich nezvládnutí může ohrozit veškeré další rozvojové aktivity podporované ze strany Evropské unie. Omezené zdroje je nutno cíleně alokovat tam, kde je identifikován největší přínos pro země, kterým jsou určeny, a zároveň ku prospěchu Evropy, její celistvosti, rozvoje a budoucí existence stojící na hodnotách, na nichž byla evropská integrace před téměř sedmdesáti lety založena. Uchovejme tyto hodnoty i pro příští generace, neboť jejich význam časem neslabne, ale naopak roste.

Rina Ronja Kari, *for GUE/NGL-Gruppen*. – Fru formand! Først og fremmest tak til kollegerne for nogle rigtig gode betænkninger. Jeg må dog indrømme, at det også føles noget håbløst. For præcis et år siden stod vi også her og diskuterede EU's regnskaber, ligesom vi har gjort det årene før. Hvert år peger vi på det helt absurde, at Rådet vælger ikke at svare på vores spørgsmål. Det er absurd på et niveau, hvor det næsten ikke kan beskrives. Det er jo en hån, - ikke bare mod os i Parlamentet, men da især mod befolkningerne - at I lukker dørene og nægter at lade os se tingene efter. Vi i Europa-Parlamentet skulle gerne fungere som borgernes vaghund. I dag har vi så ovenikøbet hørt Rådet opfordre Kommissionen til åbenhed og gennemsigtighed, men uden et eneste ord som svar på kritikken imod dem selv. I år bliver det så ottende år i træk, at vi afviser at godkende Rådets regnskab. Alligevel sker der ingenting. Det viser en total mangel på respekt for borgerne!

Man må sige til Kommissionens ros, at der her faktisk er vilje til at indgå i en dialog. Det skal I have tak for, også selv om der også her er problemer. Man må sige, at fejlraten - altså hvor mange fejl, der sker i forbindelse med udbetaling af penge - stadig er for høj. Jeg ved godt, at Kommissionen siger, at I gerne vil gøre noget, men jeg må sige, at det ofte opleves som om, at I prøver at skubbe ansvaret fra jer og over på andre. Det er frustrerende at se på, at skatteborgernes penge stadigvæk bliver brugt med så høj en fejlrate. Vi skylder borgerne at få styr på dette. Det er trods alt deres penge.

Igor Šoltes, *v imenu skupine Verts/ALE*. – Torej, stopnja napake pri porabi sredstev Evropskega razvojnega sklada je tudi v letu 2014 precej višja od dovoljene.

Še več, to je že tretje zaporedno povečanje v zadnjih letih in Računsko sodišče tudi tokrat navaja, da naj bi imela Komisija na voljo dovolj podatkov, ki bi lahko preprečili in popravili večino napak, in tako bi se lahko ta stopnja napak zmanjšala kar za dve odstotni točki in bi prvič v zgodovini proračunske razrešnice ne govorili več o stopnji napake, ampak bi lahko usmerili vso pozornost na področje ocenjevanja uspešnosti razvojnih projektov.

Stopnja napake torej ne sme biti naš edini fokus, pravilnost in zakonitost bi že zdavnaj morali biti samoumevni. Vse ostreje razmere, še posebej v državah v razvoju, nas opozarjajo, da moramo narediti še korak dlje, in zahtevati, da projekti pripomorejo k napredku regije in države.

Glavno načelo pri ocenjevanju dolgoročnih rezultatov teh projektov pa morajo postati rezultati ne samo na ekonomskem, ampak tudi socialnem, okoljskem področju, in pa tudi na področju človekovih pravic.

Marco Valli, *a nome del gruppo EFDD*. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, nel bilancio dell'Unione europea ci sono 150 miliardi di proprietà di 500 milioni di cittadini, sui quali bisogna dare assolutamente un riscontro in termini di risultati, ma soprattutto una tracciabilità e trasparenza totale.

Sulla trasparenza in questa relazione si chiede la pubblicazione di tutta la documentazione finanziaria relativa ai fondi europei, sia strutturali che diretti, sui progetti infrastrutturali, molto spesso inutili e molto costosi, come la Torino-Lione e le altre grandi opere. In relazione alla trasparenza sugli appalti pubblici, le regole sono già molto permissive ma spesso gli appalti gestiti nelle regioni non sono trasparenti e regolari, come riporta la Corte dei conti europea.

Riguardo alla trasparenza sui fondi per i rifugiati, bisogna assolutamente evitare la mancanza di trasparenza con la scusa dell'emergenza ed evitare di finanziare crimine organizzato, frodi e speculazioni su questo tema delicato. Trasparenza sui fondi di preadesione: sono tangenti politiche o veri finanziamenti? Vogliamo informazioni totali e pubbliche, ad esempio i miliardi dati alla Turchia, un paese che continua a violare i diritti sanciti nella Dichiarazione universale dei diritti umani. In questa relazione c'è un punto che impone questa riflessione.

Infine domani voteremo un emendamento importantissimo sulla trasparenza e pubblicità dei dati scientifici che vengono analizzati dall'EFSA, l'Autorità europea per la sicurezza alimentare: non ci è chiaro se stiamo mangiando veleno o no – e mi riferisco al caso glifosato.

Questa Europa difende la salute dei cittadini o gli interessi della Monsanto? L'EFSA deve utilizzare soltanto dati sottoposti a un processo scientifico e di *peer review*,

Louis Aliot, au nom du groupe ENF. – Madame la Présidente, l'architecture compliquée de l'Union européenne entraîne de mauvaises affectations, des coûts exorbitants, des gaspillages inadmissibles et une opacité à la fois technique et de contrôle qui éloigne la problématique européenne des peuples et des nations. Trop souvent, les mêmes erreurs sont répétées d'année en année et des erreurs constatées par le passé ne sont pratiquement jamais corrigées. La seule satisfaction porte sur la qualité des travaux de la Cour des comptes, qui permettent aux députés de mieux cerner la problématique et de tenter de la traiter.

Restent des questions qui se posent, notamment, sur l'utilisation, par le président du Parlement européen, des moyens de l'institution à des fins électorales, comme cela a été dit tout à l'heure. Les réponses apportées par celui-ci n'ont pas été claires, et je trouve surprenant que PPE et Socialistes cosignent des suppressions d'amendements sur cette question délicate. Peut-être l'OLAF devrait-il se pencher sur cette question embarrassante, car elle entache l'ensemble de l'institution.

Γεώργιος Επιτήδειος (NI). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, ο ρόλος του Κέντρου Πρόληψης και Ελέγχου Νόσων και η αποστολή που επιτελεί είναι σημαντικά και αξιέπαινα και πρέπει να χρηματοδοτούνται οι δραστηριότητές του. Σε μένα, όμως, γεννούνται τα εξής ερωτήματα: έχει ενημερώσει κανένας το Κέντρο για την απαράδεκτη και τραγική κατάσταση που επικρατεί στον τομέα της υγείας στην Ελλάδα, εξαιτίας των απάνθρωπων μέτρων του μνημονίου που έχουν επιβληθεί, συν τοις άλλοις, και από την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, εδώ και έξι χρόνια στον ελληνικό λαό;

Γνωρίζω κανείς ότι η υγειονομική περιθαλψη στην Ελλάδα είναι σχεδόν ανύπαρκτη, λόγω του ότι δεν διατίθενται, εξαιτίας των μέτρων λιτότητας, χρήματα στον υγειονομικό τομέα; Γνωρίζετε ότι κάθε εβδομάδα οι διευθυντές των νοσοκομείων, σε συνεργασία με τους γιατρούς, αποφασίζουν ποιες περιθάλψεις θα περικοπούν; Γνωρίζετε ότι δεν διατίθενται χρήματα για την αγορά φαρμάκων με τα οποία αντιμετωπίζονται οι επικίνδυνες ασθένειες, με αποτέλεσμα να πεθαίνουν αβοήθητοι ασθενείς; Γνωρίζετε ότι οι προμηθευτές των υγειονομικών υλικών έχουν περιορίσει τις παραδόσεις, με αποτέλεσμα οι κλινικές να αντιμετωπίζουν ελλείψεις σε βασικά υλικά και να υποφέρουν οι ασθενείς; Γνωρίζετε ότι έχει περιοριστεί το φαγητό το οποίο δίδεται στα νοσοκομεία; Γνωρίζετε ότι όσοι δεν έχουν χρήματα είναι καταδικασμένοι σε θάνατο; Γνωρίζετε ότι έχει αυξηθεί η θνησιμότητα στην Ελλάδα σε πολύ μεγάλο βαθμό;

Η Ελλάδα έχει τους περισσότερους θανάτους από γρίπη, από οποιαδήποτε άλλη χώρα της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης; Τα περισσότερα παιδιά είναι ανεμβολίαστα· έχει αυξηθεί κατακόρυφα η παιδική θνησιμότητα και οι πρόωρες γεννήσεις παιδιών, που και αυτά πεθαίνουν, λόγω του ότι δεν υπάρχει η κατάλληλη περιθαλψη. Τι κάνει για όλα αυτά η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, ώστε να αποφευχθεί η γενοκτονία αυτή των Ελλήνων; Τίποτε περισσότερο από το να ανέχεται την Τουρκία να στέλνει εκατοντάδες λαθρομετανάστες οι οποίοι μεταφέρουν αρρώστιες επικίνδυνες που έχουν, εδώ και πολλά χρόνια, ξεχαστεί.

Tomáš Zdechovský (PPE). – Paní předsedající, nejdříve mi dovolu, abych vaším prostřednictvím poděkoval paní Ingeborg Grässléové a dalším kolegům z Výboru pro rozpočtovou kontrolu za skvělou práci na zprávách. Myslím si, že jsme opravdu odvedli obrovský kus práce a že Výbor pro rozpočtovou kontrolu začíná být jedním z nejvíce respektovaných výborů v tomto parlamentu.

Rád bych zde zmínil dvě věci. Prvně bych zmínil Evropskou službu pro vnější činnost, které adresujeme řadu doporučení. Je to přímo pro paní Fredericu Mogheriniovou. Předně jde o strukturu této služby. Podle mě je tato struktura příliš komplexní, nepřehledná a tím pádem i kontraproduktivní. Kritizujeme, že oblasti, kde by mělo docházet k rychlým, jasným rozhodnutím, jsou těžkopádné, chybí analýzy a jsou příliš pomalé. Také kritizujeme náborová řízení, která jsou zdlouhavá, zadržávají se. Také kritizuje to, jak jsou vybírání diplomaté, kteří jsou pouze ze starých členských zemí a nejsou z nových členských zemí. Za problematické také považujeme fungování zastupitelských úřadů.

Druhou část svého projevu věnuji kritice Evropské rady, která se dlouhodobě odmítá spolupodílet na absolutoriu. Proto bych byl rád, kdyby i Evropská komise přispěla k tomu, abychom našli řešení tohoto dlouhodobého problému, kdy absolutorium Evropské radě a Radě není udělováno z důvodu nespolupráce.

Bogusław Liberadzki (S&D). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Pani Komisarz! Panie Prezesie Caldeira! Niech mi wolno będzie zacząć od wspaniałego zdania, jednego z pierwszych pani Dlabajovej, która powiedziała: absolutorium nie może być używane do gier politycznych.

Dwa. Chcę się odnieść głównie do sprawozdania pana Piepera (*nota bene* bardzo dziękuję panu Pieperowi za dobrą współpracę) i do tego, co on powiedział: wartość i znaczenie pracy Parlamentu Europejskiego i posłów mają wielkie znaczenie. I Pani Komisarz była uprzejmą powiedzieć o dwóch ważnych wskaźnikach, czy miernikach, czyli o współczynniku błędu i osiąganiu celów politycznych. To powinno być połączone. Absolutorium dla Parlamentu Europejskiego – współczynnik błędu wynosi 0,5%, rok temu wyniósł 1% – to poprawa. Reputacja Parlamentu wyraźnie rośnie, tu powinniśmy – rzadko nam się to zdarza – wyrazić słowa uznania i dla pana przewodniczącego Schulza i dla pana sekretarza Klausa Welle. Jako instytucja, która udziela absolutorium, sami służymy przykładem.

Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy (ALDE). – Om te beginnen wil ik alle rapporteurs hartelijk danken voor hun uitstekende werk. Daarnaast wil de Rekenkamer, de Commissie en het voorzitterschap danken voor hun aanwezigheid. Mijn bijdrage gaat over de kwijting van de parlementsbegroting. Helaas moet ik constateren dat onze eigen Voorzitter wederom niet aanwezig is, ondanks het feit dat wij als Parlement onze eigen Voorzitter kwijting verlenen. Ik wil er dan ook nogmaals op aandringen dat de Voorzitter aanwezig is.

(De Voorzitter onderbreekt de spreker)

Ik hoop dat die boodschap nogmaals overgebracht kan worden. En ik zeg dat vooral als Nederlander. Bij de laatste verkiezingscampagne heb ik wederom gemerkt hoe kwetsbaar wij zijn als instituut. Bij de Europese verkiezingen in Nederland ging het debat over één ding, namelijk onkostenvergoedingen en niets anders. Al het andere werk dat wij hier doen, wordt weggevaagd door het publieke debat in Nederland over de onkosten. Daarom wil ik nogmaals benadrukken hoe belangrijk het is dat wij zelf als Parlement transparant zijn over die onkosten.

Twee jaar geleden, op 16 april 2014, hebben wij in de plenaire vergadering een resolutie aangenomen met het verzoek aan de secretaris-generaal om via “lichte regelingen” onze eigen algemene onkostenvergoeding te controleren. Helaas is daar niets van in huis gekomen. Vandaag ligt er weer een amendement voor waarin daarop wordt aangedrongen. Ik zou niet alleen mijn collega's willen vragen om daarvoor te stemmen, maar ook bij de voorzitter erop willen aandringen dat hij daar dit jaar echt werk van gaat maken.

(De spreker gaat in op een “blauwe kaart”-vraag (artikel 162, lid 8, van het Reglement))

Bogusław Liberadzki (S&D), pytanie zadane przez podniesienie niebieskiej kartki. – Panie Gerbrandy, ja mam pytanie, skoro Pan zwraca się do przewodniczącego Schulza. „Sprawy niejasne” – wiemy, że chodziło tak zwanego *Spitzenkandidat*, czy Pan również pytał swojego przewodniczącego Guy Verhofstadta, przewodniczącego waszej grupy politycznej? Też był *Spitzenkandidat*. Czy on złożył podobne sprawozdanie lub był podobnie traktowany jak przewodniczący Schulz?

Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy (ALDE), *blue-card answer.* – Well Mr Liberadzki, maybe it was because I was talking Dutch, but I was not criticising the President *per se*. I was not saying ‘Mr Schulz’ and I was not criticising the President because he was one of the *Spitzenkandidaten*. I was criticising him because we grant discharge to the President of this House – and in national parliaments that is also the rule – and I believe that the President of this House should be present at the debate on the discharge of this organisation. That has nothing to do with political colour or the person in office; it is a general principle, from my side, that I believe that the President of this House should be responsible and should be present.

(The speaker agreed to take a second blue-card question under Rule 162(8))

Inés Ayala Sender (S&D), *pregunta de tarjeta azul.* – Señor Gerbrandy, solamente quería decirle que, según ese principio, deberían estar aquí también el señor Juncker y el señor Tusk, ¿no? Esa enmienda de la que usted ha hablado no la he visto yo. Espero que la vuelva a presentar la próxima vez.

Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy (ALDE), *blue-card answer*. – Yes, I do believe that is important, but I have been repeating this message for years and years, and I believe – since this is our own House, and since we are always criticising the rest of the world, especially the other institutions – that we can also criticise ourselves, and that we should do that more often and look more internally to our own functioning. But I agree with your point.

Benedek Jávor (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, I would like to talk about two discharges as shadow rapporteur, first about the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA). The glyphosate scandal raises many procedural anomalies in the field of transparency and conflicts of interest in EFSA. I believe that we should stand firm and should not grant discharge to EFSA until conflicts of interest of experts are resolved properly.

Second, regarding the discharge of the Parliament, the EP is pointing the finger in different scandals – LuxLeaks, Dieselgate and now the Panama papers – trying to explain what happened and who is responsible on one side. On the other hand, MEPs are not truly transparent when it comes to their own expenditure, including the general expenditure allowances, which are not transparent and not accountable. We have to be completely transparent and thus earn the credibility of voters, and not only point at other institutions but also do the same ourselves.

Gerolf Annemans (ENF). – Er zijn weinig momenten waarop de Europese Unie zich bezint over haar bestaan zelf en over haar optreden ten overstaan van de burgers. Ik grijp de kwijting voor de algemene begroting daarom even aan om dit Parlement van deze Europese Unie toch tot bezinning hierover aan te zetten. De haast religieuze dogmatiek, waarbij de machthebbers hier altijd maar meer Unie als een betere oplossing voor gelijk welk probleem aanzien, moet ophouden.

Ten eerste is dit niet waar gebleken: zowel de eurochaos als die inzake immigratie illustreren dat perfect. Ten tweede is de bevolking het daar niet mee eens. Ik protesteer hier dan ook met klem tegen de arrogante manier waarop de uitslag van het recente Nederlandse referendum over het EU-beleid in dit Parlement is genegeerd.

Elnökváltás: GÁLL–PELCZ ILDIKÓ

alelnök

Tamás Deutsch (PPE). – Elnök Asszony, az ügynökségek mentesítési eljárásáról szeretnék néhány szót szólni. Először is szeretném megköszönni a jelentéstevőnek és a többi árnyék-jelentéstevőnek a kiváló együttműködést. Az ügynökségekre vonatkozó mostani mentesítési eljárás azért is különleges, mert hosszú idő után első alkalommal a Költségvetési Ellenőrző Szakbizottság az összes ügynökség mentesítésének megadását javasolja. Az idei évben minden ügynökség megkapta a megbízhatósági nyilatkozatot az Európai Számvevőszéktől, a zárszámadási eljárás során pedig a még nyitott kérdéseket is sikerült tisztázni az ügynökségekkel. Az ügynökségek pénzügyi helyzete és működésük szabályossága az elmúlt években folyamatosan javult. Az Európai Számvevőszék véleménye a 2014-es pénzügyi évről a korábbi évekkkel összehasonlítva pozitív, kifogásokkal nem élt.

Azt gondolom, hogy a „common approach” megközelítés, az ügynökségek működésének egységesítése hatékony volt, és már most egy sokkal rendezettebb és átláthatóbb ügynökségi struktúra alakult ki. Ezzel együtt nem hagyhatjuk figyelmen kívül azt, hogy néhány ügynökségnél a Számvevőszék megjegyzésekkel, ún. „emphasis of matter”-rel élt. Ezeket a kisebb kifogásokat a jelentéstevő feldolgozta a mentesítési jelentésekben, az ügynökségek ígéretet tettek ezen problémák orvoslására. A következő években arra kell majd koncentrálnunk, hogy az ügynökségek átláthatóságát, hatékonyabb működését tovább erősítsük, és ahol szükség van még intézkedések meghozatalára, ott segítsük az érintett ügynökségeket. A Néppárt részéről támogatom a mentesítés megadását valamennyi ügynökségre vonatkozóan.

Miroslav Poche (S&D). – Paní předsedající, rád bych zmínil několik aspektů rozpočtového absolutoria pro společné podniky Evropské unie. V letošním roce rozhodujeme o sedmi uděleních absolutoria podnikům. Navzdory některým drobným neshodám s panem zpravodajem se naše pozice sblížila u pěti z nich. Jedná se o Clean Sky, ECSEL, IMI, SESAR a ITER.

ITER je bezesporu nejvíce ambiciozním energetickým projektem na světě, na kterém se kromě Evropské unie podílí ještě další velmi významné státy. Evropská unie prostřednictvím *Fusion for Energy* je jedním z nejdůležitějších partnerů. Tyto země společnými silami budují takzvaný tokamak, tedy předstupeň ke komerčnímu využití termonukleární fúze v energetice. ITER se svým rozpočtem, unikátním konceptem i technologickou náročností logicky mezi ostatními podniky vyniká, ale i vyčnívá.

Já jsem si vědom dosavadních problémů a nerealistických plánů týkajících se rozpočtu. Na druhou stranu se domnívám, že v tuto chvíli nové vedení může přinést nové řešení, nový akční plán a také nový přístup. Doufám, že to bude zhodnoceno v září při udělení absolutoria.

Michael Theurer (ALDE). – Frau Präsidentin! Zunächst einmal möchte ich im Namen der ALDE-Fraktion dem Präsidenten des Rechnungshofs und dem Rechnungshof danken für den hervorragenden Bericht. Das ist sehr wichtig für unser Parlament. Ich danke auch der Berichterstatterin Martina Dlabajová von unserer Fraktion. Sie hat mit ihrem Bericht richtungsweisende Informationen und Hinweise gegeben. Die Fraktionen tragen ja das gemeinsame Anliegen einer besseren Verwendung von öffentlichen Mitteln gemeinsam.

Innovation, Wachstum, Forschung und Entwicklung, Infrastruktur brauchen dringend Geld. Deshalb ist es nicht hinzunehmen, wenn Geld verschwendet wird, wenn es nicht richtig eingesetzt wird. Hier hat ja der Rechnungshof, wie in den Vorjahren auch, Missstände aufgezeigt, die dringend abgestellt werden müssen.

Vor allen Dingen aber wollen wir hin zu einem ergebnisorientierten Haushalt, zu *performance-based budgeting*. Hier wollen wir Kommissarin Georgieva herzlich danken für ihren Einsatz und sie ermutigen, in der Kommission noch konsequenter für dieses Anliegen zu kämpfen. Wir erwarten von Ihnen einen Vorschlag für Pilotprojekte, wie das umgesetzt werden kann, damit wir gemeinsam diskutieren können, wie eine bessere Haushaltsführung in einem modernen Haushaltswesen umgesetzt werden kann.

Wir sollten als Parlament auch selbst anfangen, den Rechnungshof ernster zu nehmen, indem die Sonderberichte in den Fachausschüssen einen höheren Stellenwert bekommen. Hier sind wichtige Hinweise – etwa auf die Taskforce für Griechenland, aber auch in anderen Bereichen. Wenn das Parlament diese vielen Daten besser nutzt, dann können wir auch zu einem *better spending* kommen.

Petri Sarvamaa (PPE). – Madam President, as the tasks of the European Union have expanded, Parliament's annual scrutiny of the Commission and other institutions and bodies in their task of implementing EU budget appropriations has taken on growing importance for the Union's taxpayers.

But having said this general remark, why actually is the discharge so important? It is so important because the European Parliament is the *only* European institution that is directly elected by citizens, and therefore we have a crucial role in supervising the use of the taxpayers' money.

Our role is to enhance the transparency of financial management and improve democratic accountability to EU taxpayers. Our role is to make sure that our common rules are obeyed. We need to further improve accountability by putting more focus on performance and results, but at the same time by being able to admit and correct things if something went wrong.

But most importantly, Parliament's role in the procedure must be strengthened. Discharge is often overlooked, and the only reason for that is, in my mind, that it is not given the institutional role and importance that it deserves. As long as the discharge is not binding, we are undermining not only this House but, more importantly, the Union itself.

Karin Kadenbach (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin, sehr geehrtes Hohes Haus! Zuerst gilt mein Dank dem Rechnungshof für die gute Zusammenarbeit – eine Zusammenarbeit, wie wir sie uns auch mit dem Rat wünschen würden. Wie schon in den vergangenen Jahren empfiehlt der Haushaltskontrollausschuss auch diesmal wieder, die Entlastung des Rates und des Europäischen Rates derzeit nicht zu gewähren, sondern vorerst aufzuschieben. Wie auch in den vergangenen Jahren basiert diese Entscheidung des Europäischen Parlaments auf der mangelnden Kooperationsbereitschaft des Rates, die wiederum auf einer unterschiedlichen Rechtsauffassung, was die entlastungsgebende Instanz betrifft, beruht.

Der Rat verweigert seit Jahren, die entsprechenden Unterlagen und Informationen bereitzustellen, die für eine allfällige Entlastung erforderlich wären. Im Interesse der Transparenz und aus Verantwortung der EU gegenüber ihren Unionsbürgern und den von ihnen aufgetragenen Finanzmitteln wäre es wünschenswert, würde der Rat die Tatsache anerkennen, dass der gesamte europäische Haushalt Kontrollen durch eine demokratisch legitimierte politische Institution, das Europäische Parlament, unterliegen muss.

Nedzhmi Ali (ALDE). – Madam President, first of all I would like to congratulate the rapporteur, Mr Vaughan, for the work done on the 2014 discharge to the agencies. The budget of the agencies in 2014 is about EUR 1.9 billion and they employ in different capacities almost 10 000 persons.

On the positive side, there is an approach towards the introduction of performance-based budgeting in most of the agencies, increasing the level of implementation of the budget and promotion of their work to the citizens. Nevertheless, there is still a need to improve the principles which would increase the value-added aspect and to identify possible improvements to the performance models currently applied in the agencies.

Conflicts of interest and transparency within the structures that spend the money of the European taxpayer is an important issue. While most of the agencies have taken the appropriate steps, there is still a need for overall improvement in the public sector and for a holistic approach.

Concerning communication and visibility, there is a need for the agencies to further strengthen their efforts to improve their communication policies. In order to raise awareness of their activities and achievements and to ensure that citizens are well informed about their work, they should expand their visibility through different social media tools.

Despite some discrepancies and the need for further improvements in certain fields, there is positive change in the functioning of the agencies. We expect a better performance of these structures, which are important for implementation of the European Union policies.

Ingeborg Gräßle (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Rechnungshofpräsident, Frau Vizepräsidentin! Wir freuen uns, Herr Caldeira, dass Sie wieder bei uns sind. Ich möchte mich auch sehr herzlich bei der niederländischen Ratspräsidentschaft bedanken, dass Sie hier waren. Wir haben es nicht oft mit Verteidigungsministern zu tun. Ich bin mir nicht sicher, ob wir einen nachhaltigen Eindruck hinterlassen haben, aber auf jeden Fall geben Sie Frau Hennis-Plasschaert unseren Dank weiter, dass sie da war. Die niederländische Ratspräsidentschaft ist eine aktive, gerade auf dem Gebiet. Dafür Dank!

Ich möchte ein Wort von Herrn Präsident Caldeira aufgreifen: mehr Effizienz. Ich habe dieses Jahr im Entlastungsverfahren – wenn man dann so da oben sitzt, macht man sich den einen oder anderen Gedanken – einen Lobbypreis vergeben. In meinen Augen verdienen den Lobbypreis dieses Jahres die Dolmetscher dieses Hauses, die sich ganz besonders gewehrt haben gegen Anstrengungen, mehr Effizienz in ihren Bereich zu bringen. Und deswegen möchte ich dem Generalsekretär dieses Hauses meine Anerkennung aussprechen. Das war genau das, was wir brauchen, nämlich den Versuch, mehr Effizienz zu wagen.

Ich persönlich möchte meinen eigenen Kollegen mit auf den Weg geben, dass es nicht zielführend ist, sich zum obersten Lobbyisten von Detailinteressen zu machen. Ich kann gut verstehen, dass solche Bemühungen nicht jedem gefallen.

Das Gleiche trifft auf die Entwicklungshilfe zu. Offenbar haben es alle auf der Welt gemerkt, dass die Entwicklungshilfe tot ist, nur wir noch nicht. Ich glaube, dass wir sehr viel mehr Mut brauchen, auch Mut zur Veränderung, um die Dinge wirklich proaktiv anzugehen. Hier standen wir unter erheblichem Druck seitens der Generaldirektion DEVCO und natürlich auch vom Entwicklungshilfeausschuss. Ich glaube, dass wir Informationen, die wir haben, verwerten müssen, sonst sind wir völlig unglaublich.

Ich möchte die Kommission wirklich ermutigen, in die EU-Gesetze aufzunehmen, dass Amtsträger weder in der EU noch in Drittstaaten EU-Mittel beantragen können. Das wäre wirklich eine Beseitigung eines beträchtlichen Reputationsrisikos für die EU.

Андрей Новаков (PPE). – Г-жо Председател, чух колеги, че са объркани и ядосани от числата, които виждат. Няма повод за такива емоции, колеги.

Нормално е в края на програмния период, тогава, когато има повече плащания, да има и повече грешки. Това, разбира се, не означава, че не бива да сме мнителни и че не бива да сме критични. Трябва, но не бива да виждаме враг зад всяко дърво.

Истина е, че по това време, когато освобождаваме от бюджетна отговорност, чуваме относително еднакви отговори на относително еднакви въпроси. Разликата тази година е, че има екип от Европейската комисия, с който се работи добре, диалогичен е и мнението на Парламента е взето предвид.

Наред с това, обаче, аз имам и какво да поискам още и ми се иска през следващата година да видя по-ясен фокус върху одобрените плащания. Само така ще постигнем по-бързо целите, които имаме в „Европа 2020“. Само така ще постигнем по-бързо целите, които имаме в многогодишната финансова рамка.

От началото на своя мандат работя за намаляване на бюрокрацията. Искане ми се с общи усилия да покажем повече резултати на хората отвън. Това чакат те от нас, а това ще стане, когато базираме контрола на европейските средства на риска от това да ги загубим, и това ще стане, когато бенефициентите, които работят зле и бъркат с европейски средства, получават повече контрол от тези, които се справят добре. Само тогава ще ги облекчим.

Радвам се, че България бе една от държавите, която първа приложи ръководството на Европейската комисия за обществените поръчки и навакса изоставането, което имаше от 2013 и 2014 г. заради вътрешни проблеми, и през 2015 г. бе една от държавите, които бяха най-напред с усвояването и разплащането на европейски средства.

„Catch the eye“ eljárás

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – Paní předsedající, já jsem se přihlásila k absolutoriu za plnění rozpočtu Evropského parlamentu za rok 2014, abych podpořila filmovou cenu *Lux Film Prize* a její další financování. Chtěla bych upozornit na to, že výdaje na organizaci filmové ceny se v roce 2014 snížily na 391 500 EUR. Jedná se o prostředky na hodnocení filmů, jejich otitulkování, výrobu kopií a také na závěrečný ceremoniál.

V roce 2014 byly navýšeny prostředky o 193 000 EUR na propagaci této ceny. Ta propagace je spojená s promítáním ve všech dvaceti osmi zemích a této projekce se v roce 2014 zúčastnilo více než třicet pět tisíc diváků, a to zdarma. Celkově se tedy výdaje v roce 2014 pohybovaly kolem 500 000 EUR. Je třeba říci, že tyto prostředky jsou vynaloženy na to, aby zde byla podpořena produkce evropské filmové tvorby s tématy podporujícími evropské hodnoty.

Νότης Μαρίας (ECR). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, ο ENISA αποτελεί τον μοναδικό αποκεντρωμένο οργανισμό της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης που βρίσκεται στην Ελλάδα, η οποία έχει δαπανήσει εκατομμύρια ευρώ για τη στήριξη της λειτουργίας του. Κυρία Georgieva, ο ENISA διαθέτει υπερσύγχρονα γραφεία 4.500τ.μ. στο Ηράκλειο της Κρήτης. Στα γραφεία αυτά όμως απασχολούνται, δυστυχώς, μόνο δέκα άνθρωποι, αφού το επιχειρησιακό κέντρο του Οργανισμού μεταφέρθηκε στην Αθήνα, παρά το γεγονός ότι οι ελληνικές αρχές υλοποίησαν όλες τις δεσμεύσεις που είχαν αναλάβει για τη λειτουργία του ENISA στο Ηράκλειο.

Δυστυχώς, στις 16 Μαρτίου, η Επιτροπή Προϋπολογισμού του Κοινοβουλίου στήριξε τις μεθοδεύσεις της διοίκησης του ENISA και άνοιξε ουσιαστικά τον δρόμο για απαξίωση του Οργανισμού στο Ηράκλειο. Τελικός στόχος της μεθόδευσης της ηγεσίας του ENISA είναι μεταφορά της έδρας στις Βρυξέλλες. Από το 2012, ως βουλευτής Ηρακλείου, δίνω αγώνα με τις τοπικές αρχές για να σταματήσουν οι μεθοδεύσεις της ηγεσίας του ENISA, η οποία ήρθε την περασμένη εβδομάδα, εδώ στο Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο, με αλαζονικό ύφος και ειρωνευόταν τους ευρωβουλευτές.

Kyria Georgieva, παρακαλώ να εξετάσετε το θέμα του ENISA σοβαρά.

Barbara Kappel (ENF). – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Rechnungshofpräsident, Frau Kommissarin! Im Zuge der heutigen Debatte diskutieren wir über die Haushaltsentlastung von 53 Akteuren aus dem Gesamthaushalt. Nachdem das sehr komplex ist, würde ich mich gerne auf die Agenturen konzentrieren.

Dem Europäischen Rechnungshof ist wirklich außerordentlich zu danken für diese hervorragende Arbeit. Den Prüfberichten ist zu entnehmen, dass es nach wie vor viele Schwachstellen bei den gewährten Finanzhilfen gibt, und das ist auf die mangelhaften Kontrollsysteme zurückzuführen. Das hat zur Folge, dass es zu fehlerhaften Gewährungsvorfahren kommt und ebenso zu Intransparenz und Ineffizienz.

Bei fünf Agenturen wurden bei der Leistungsüberwachung und -bewertung erhebliche Mängel festgestellt. Es sind dies: das Europäische Innovations- und Technologieinstitut, die Grenzschutzagentur Frontex, die Europäische Umweltagentur, die Europäische Behörde für Lebensmittelsicherheit und das Europäische Zentrum für die Prävention und die Kontrolle von Krankheiten.

Allein auf diese fünf Agenturen entfallen 92 % der Mittel in Höhe von 740 Millionen Euro. Ebenso haben sich diese Agenturen im Bereich der Mittelverwendung unzureichend um alternative, zum Beispiel private Finanzierungsmöglichkeiten gekümmert, wodurch die Wirksamkeit der Finanzmittel eingeschränkt war. Deshalb fordere ich eine Reform der Finanzhilfen.

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Paní předsedající, já jsem především rád, že díky činnosti stínových zpravodajů došlo k „dodání pepře do té zprávy“, to je citace našeho stínového zpravodaje, kterého si velmi vážím.

Chtěl bych se věnovat především otázce zpoždění plateb. To se objevuje na několika místech této zprávy. Podle mého názoru právě zpoždění čerpání nejen víceletých fondů v rámci politiky soudržnosti je oprávněně kritizováno v absolutu, ale zároveň je důležité říci, že i zpoždění přímých plateb nebo prostě plateb, na které mají příjemci nárok, velmi ohrožuje důvěryhodnost a kredibilitu Evropské unie jako celku. Myslím si, že by k tomu nemělo docházet.

My jsme to v rámci Výboru pro regionální rozvoj opakovaně kritizovali a jsem velmi rád, že i v rámci této zprávy k tomu bylo přihlédnuto i na několika jiných místech, nejen v politikách soudržnosti, ale například i u humanitárních organizací nebo u placení různých kulturních projektů.

Seán Kelly (PPE). – Madam President, of course it is very important that the European Parliament has oversight of our budgets and see that public money is properly spent. Transparency and performance-based budgets are essential. One area that was mentioned was in relation to pilot projects, and I think this is an area we should really focus on, especially as regards our commitments in COP21 and Mr Juncker's desire that Europe be world-leading in terms of renewables. So innovation and pilot projects in that area are vital.

I would also like to mention briefly another point which seems to have gone off the agenda, and that is own resources. It was very much part of our discussions in the last mandate, but it seems to have gone off the agenda in this mandate. As we all know, it is most unlikely that Member States are going to increase their contributions to the European Union, and the demands are going up all the time. We should look at own resources as a means of funding.

A „catch the eye” eljárs vége.

Vítor Caldeira, President of the Court of Auditors. – Madam President, I would like to thank everyone for the kind words about the work done by the Court of Auditors. That is encouraging for us. We welcome all the suggestions for future audit work in the different discharge reports. I would like to note in particular the requests for the Court to continue to develop its approach to auditing the Commission's reporting on the implementation of the Europe 2020 Strategy.

We take note of the remarks on joint undertakings, on the need for more information, but I would like to say that the recommendation on the discharge report, which suggests that the issue of the error rates is a methodological problem to be solved between the Court and the Commission, probably does not move us forward. What we need to do is address the root causes of the problems.

I welcome the reference from Vice President Georgieva to matters of risk. Those who draft laws, those who agree on the projects and programmes to be funded, have to acknowledge, from the beginning, how much risk they want to take. Do not ask the auditors to do that. The auditors have to identify whether or not there is a material level of error. So we take good note, but if you look on this as a methodological issue to be solved between the manager and the auditor, we will not make progress.

I think the point is that we do indeed need to develop a new approach on European Union spending and investment for the future. This is a challenge we, as a new institution, share with all the European institutions. We need to work together on that, and now. I have already underlined three major lines of action where the Court is very willing to contribute. We very much welcome the Council invitation to contribute to the mid term review of the Multiannual Financial Framework (MFF). We very much welcome the opportunity to provide our views and opinions on the review of the Financial Regulation. We think that this is a good moment to streamline this for the future, but also to develop a budget more focused on results. We are contributing in that capacity as an auditor already.

So be sure that for our part we look forward to contributing to this interinstitutional dialogue, which needs to produce concrete action that will make it possible in the future to have better financial management and accountability for all European citizens.

Kristalina Georgieva, Vice-President of the Commission. – Madam President, I took two minutes more in my opening speech, and I will pay that back now in my closing remarks by being short and focused.

I have just three points to make. One: an expression of gratitude for the debate we had today, for the issues that have been raised on the policy side, as well as a very specific request to pay attention – and we will indeed reflect very carefully upon, and respond to, the comments that have been made today.

More importantly, two: we are already working on the follow up to the 2014 budget discharge resolutions and we will report back after the summer break this year.

Three: listening to the comments that have been made, of course we have to continue looking at preventive action and corrective action on the side of errors. That is very important. This work has to continue. We will continue to work with the Court of Auditors on how we can best integrate what we have learned from its reports and from our own work. President Caldeira would not understand it if I did not bring it up, but we will continue to look at the issue of the multi annuality of our programmes. We want to be prudent in making sure that we can, over a longer period of time, achieve the best possible results on the side of errors. But at the same time we are very grateful to those who have spoken and recognised there are things that Member States and we in the Commission do well. And, of course, the Court of Auditors recognises in its reports that we can also draw on what we do well, especially on the policy side, and use it to generate more replication of good practice, making sure that good practice is the normal practice – I would even say best practice should be the normal practice.

Our commitment to engage is very strong – to engage with Parliament, with the Court of Auditors, with the Council – and you can count on me and my staff, on all of us, to be available for this discussion to be a continuous process and not a one off in this House.

Martina Dlabajová, zpravodajka. – Paní předsedající, vážení kolegové, děkuji za všechny konstruktivní připomínky, názory a za vaši podporu. Věřím, že zítra při hlasování se mi podaří v této profesní výzvě obstát a proces udělení absolutoria Evropské komisi úspěšně dokončit. Děkuji také celému svému týmu, děkuji sekretariátu Výboru pro rozpočtovou kontrolu, kteří se aktivně podíleli na společné práci a byli mi po celou dobu velkou oporou.

Velmi gratuluji zpravodajům z Výboru pro rozpočtovou kontrolu za ostatní absolutoria a děkuji také navrhovatelům stanovisek z ostatních výborů. Spolupráce s ostatními odbornými výbory byla opravdu vynikající. Samozřejmě děkuji paní komisařce Georgievové a děkuji panu předsedovi Evropského účetního dvora.

Mojí snahou při práci na udělení absolutoria Evropské komise byla maximální transparentnost, objektivita a projektový přístup při jeho přípravě respektující finanční zájem celé Evropské unie a jejích občanů. Jsem potěšena, že tento přístup se projevil ve finální podobě textu, o kterém budete zítra hlasovat. Ocenila bych, kdyby na něj navázala i tvorba nové zprávy o absolutoriu za rok 2015, která započne již za několik málo měsíců. Budu ráda, pokud se navržená doporučení v oblasti rozpočtové politiky Evropské unie promítnou do činnosti Výboru pro rozpočtovou kontrolu a ovlivní i práci ostatních parlamentních výborů a institucí Evropské unie.

Závěrem si dovoluji navrhnout, abychom opravdu posílili dialog mezi našimi orgány, abychom trvali na *follow-up*, abychom vytvořili a aktivně pracovali v pracovních skupinách pro rozpočet zaměřený na výsledky. A případně našli také možnost kontinuální kontroly evropského rozpočtu, zejména hospodaření Evropské komise, podobně jako je tomu například v procesu evropského semestru, který je založen na celoroční součinnosti hlavních orgánů Evropské unie a má stanoveny pevné termíny plnění daných povinností. Jen tak totiž můžeme do budoucna předcházet opakovaným potížím s chybami v čerpání evropských prostředků a kauzám, které důvěryhodnosti evropského hospodaření nepříspívají.

Claudia Schmidt, Berichtersterterin. – Frau Präsidentin, Frau Kommissarin, Herr Präsident! Es ist sehr viel gesagt worden an diesem Nachmittag. Nur als kurze Reaktion möchte ich als Berichtersterterin für den EDF schon noch einmal betonen, dass wir nicht nur die Ursachen der Flüchtlingskrise bekämpfen und nachhaltige Entwicklung fördern wollen, sondern wir wollen auch schnell und flexibel reagieren können, und zwar auf bestehende und bevorstehende Anforderungen. Es geht hier nicht darum – und ich bitte, da wirklich genau zuzuhören –, sich schützend vor Bestehendes, das sich nicht bewährt hat, zu stellen oder auch vor Personen, sondern es geht darum, dass Entwicklungshilfegelder – das sind Steuergelder – sinnvoll und im Sinne der Sache eingesetzt werden.

Zu meinem Bericht möchte ich mich bei allen Beteiligten sehr herzlich bedanken. Ich hoffe, dass bei der Abstimmung Vernunft einkehren wird.

Markus Pieper, Berichtersterter. – Frau Präsidentin! Ich danke für die Anregung und Kritik, was meinen Bericht betrifft. Zunächst habe ich ein ungläubiges Staunen bei der Verwaltung festgestellt, was die Sicherheitsaspekte, Fahrdienste und mehr Wiederumstellung auch auf interne Dienstleistungen betrifft. Da gibt es jetzt zu meinem Bericht einige Änderungsanträge, die genau wieder in die andere Richtung gehen. Deswegen habe ich das heute nochmal angesprochen. Grundsätzlich ist die Ausrichtung der Verwaltung da durchaus okay.

Dann das Thema Unabhängigkeit und Wert des Mandates: Ich bedanke mich ausdrücklich für die Unterstützung, die von vielen hier gekommen ist. Allerdings muss ich doch an die Adresse der Liberalen, jetzt an Herrn Gerbrandy, wirklich sagen: Wenn man den Entlastungsbericht des Europäischen Parlaments und den Wahlkampf zu Hause auf das Thema Kostenpauschale beschränkt und sonst nichts drauf hat, dann ist das ein Armutszeugnis, was liberale Politik im Europäischen Parlament betrifft. Da sollte schon ein bisschen mehr kommen, als sich nur auf dieses eine Thema zu versteifen, das tut mir ein bisschen leid. Und dann noch Herrn Schulz zu kritisieren, dass er heute nicht da ist, und dann mir eine Frage zu stellen und jetzt selber nicht da zu sein. Also bitte, Herr Gerbrandy, das nächste Mal würde ich schon davon ausgehen, dass Sie dann auch ein bisschen Mumm haben und sich die Antwort dazu anhören.

Eine letzte Bemerkung: Wir haben, und Ingeborg Gräßle hat es angedeutet, uns viel mit Pensionen, mit Dolmetscherkosten, mit Gebäudepolitik, mit Privilegien, mit allem Möglichen auseinandergesetzt. Jede Truppe hier im Europäischen Parlament hat eine unheimlich starke Lobby: Ja, sparen, aber bitte nicht bei mir! Also wenn wir jedes Mal nachgeben, dann erreichen wir als Haushaltskontrollausschuss überhaupt nichts. Deswegen möchte ich mich auch noch mal ganz herzlich bei denjenigen bedanken, die hier bestimmte Positionen mit uns gemeinsam durchhalten, durchziehen und dann an der einen oder anderen Stelle wirklich etwas verbessern. Ich bin es nämlich langsam leid, dass hier das jeweilige nationale Interesse, institutionelle Interesse, Arbeitnehmerinteresse, Arbeitgeberinteresse die Entlastung unseres Parlaments ausmacht. Wir sollten ja schon eine eigene Meinung vertreten und diese auch durchhalten.

Ryszard Czarnecki, sprawozdawca. – Pani Przewodnicząca! Pani Przewodnicząca Komisji Europejskiej! Panie Prezesie! Przedstawiciele prezydencji holenderskiej! Tym razem będę mówił po polsku, poprzednio mówiłem po angielsku, też 3 minuty, i powiem, że przede wszystkim rzeczywiście nasza współpraca z Europejskim Trybunałem Obrachunkowym w Luksemburgu – współpraca Parlamentu Europejskiego, a w szczególności Komisji Kontroli Budżetowej – jest w tej chwili znacznie lepsza niż 7 lat temu, jak pamiętam, czy 6 lat temu. To jest postęp i w tej chwili razem gramy w jednej drużynie, drużynie audytorów, i myślę, że to jest dobry sygnał dla europejskiego podatnika i dla tych wszystkich, którzy chcą, aby pieniądze europejskie były wydawane jak najbardziej rozważnie.

Druga sprawa dotyczy tego, że wydaje się, iż trzeba powiedzieć bardzo jasno w kontekście Europejskiej Służby Działań Zewnętrznych, w kontekście unijnej dyplomacji, że wciąż potrzeba pewnych parytetów geograficznych. To jest rzecz absolutnie oczywista i absolutnie podstawowa. Jeżeli słyszymy, że spośród 128 szefów delegacji, przedstawicieli Unii Europejskiej, 60 prawie pochodzi z państw członkowskich i z tych 60 tylko 20 z krajów nowej Unii, no to oczywiście możemy mówić o pewnych istotnych dysproporcjach. Jeżeli mój kraj powinien mieć według populacji (Polska według populacji) 11 ambasadorów unijnych, a ma 4, to rzeczywiście te dysproporcje są faktem, a to dotyczy także innych krajów nowej Unii i to powiedzieć należy. Podobnie zresztą – gdyż nie chodzi tylko o Europejską Służbę Działań Zewnętrznych – podobnie zresztą jest w instytucjach europejskich. Jeszcze nienajlepiej, ale w miarę dobrze jest w Parlamencie Europejskim, gorzej w Komisji Europejskiej, najgorzej w Radzie Europejskiej. I tu dochodzimy do Rady Europejskiej. Chciałem powiedzieć, że ja mam takie poczucie, że co roku jest ten sam spektakl odgrywany: my cały czas słusznie narzekamy i złorzeczmy na Radę, podkreślamy brak woli współpracy, brak tej *political will* – woli politycznej – ze strony Rady i cały czas mamy rację, cały czas deklarujemy to samo i oczywiście żadnego odzewu. Jest takie stare polskie powiedzenie: gadał dziad do obrazu, obraz doń ani razu. Odbijamy te piłki do Rady i nie ma to żadnego efektu. Czas naprawdę na bardzo twarde stanowisko Parlamentu Europejskiego w tej kwestii, bo nie może być tak, żeby

te dwie instytucje nie współpracowały z powodu braku woli współpracy ze strony Rady.

Anders Primdahl Vistisen, ordfører. – Fru formand! Det har været en lang debat, men jeg synes, den har bragt os fremad. Jeg vil gerne takke både de skyggeordførere, der har hjulpet mig med at komme igennem mine betænkninger, men også de ordførere, hvor jeg har fået lov til at være skyggeordfører. Jeg synes, at de fleste af dechargebetænkningerne er rimelig objektive, og de går til stålet, hvor det kræves, at vi som Parlament udøver en meget hård kontrol med, hvordan skatteydernes penge bliver brugt. Jeg synes, det er prisværdigt, at der ikke har været tabubelagte emner, at man har slået ned de fleste steder, hvor det var nødvendigt. Det eneste sted, hvor jeg virkelig synes, at man godt kunne have gået lidt hårdere til værks, var i forhold til os selv - i forhold til Parlamentet. Jeg synes altid, at det er prisværdigt, at man sætter den samme høje standard for sig selv, som man forlanger af andre, og der synes jeg stadigvæk, at vi har et stykke vej at gå.

Udover det vil jeg sige tak for debatten, tak til Kommissionen og tak til Revisionsretten for det store arbejde, der ligger til grund for vores betænkninger. Jeg glæder mig til afstemningen i morgen og håber, at vi kan holde den linje, der ligger fra udvalget.

Elnök asszony. – A vitát lezárom.

Szavazás: holnap

Irasbéli nyilatkozatok (162. cikk)

Zigmantas Balčytis (S&D), raštu. – Visi sutariame, jog būtina didinti ES lėšų panaudojimo skaidrumą ir efektyvumą. Būtų įmanoma sutaupyti daug lėšų bei užtikrinti efektyvesnę Europos Parlamento veiklą, jei būtų pereita prie vienos darbo vietos. Palaikau nuostatą, jog būtina rasti sprendimą dėl vienos Europos Parlamento darbo vietos. 2014 m. liepos 11 d. priimtoje Audito Rūmų ataskaitoje nurodyta, kad, jei Parlamentas vykdytų savo veiklą vienoje vietoje, per metus būtų galima sutaupyti apie 114 mln. EUR Sąjungos biudžeto lėšų. Manau, kad turime tinkamai reaguoti į tokias išvadas bei parengti perėjimo prie vienos būstinės veiksmų planą, kaip jau nurodyta keliose ankstesnėse Parlamento rezoliucijose.

Alfred Sant (S&D), in writing. – Hearings before the European Parliament for nominees to the EU's Court of Auditors are consultative. Nominees who receive a negative vote in committee or plenary, can still be appointed if the Council of Ministers so decides. Dr Toni Abela was nominated this year by the Maltese government. He promised that if turned down by the relevant Committee of the Parliament, he'd withdraw. So he did. I applaud Abela for his political integrity. I cannot applaud how his nomination was reviewed. It frequently happens, as with Abela, that occult elements organize campaigns to discredit nominees, alleging dishonourable or criminal behaviour. Nominees can defend themselves during face to face meetings with members of the committee and during the hearing. In Abela's case, the hearing was short. Allegations against him could not be fully clarified. Other issues too needed discussion. Abela was treated unfairly. If this Parliament wishes hearings on nominations to be meaningful, it should reconsider how to conduct them. When allegations of criminal or dishonourable behaviour arise, they should be considered separately by a jury d'honneur, aided by legal counsel, on the basis of facts. The hearing would then concentrate on the personal, professional and political abilities of the nominee.

Theodor Dumitru Stolojan (PPE), în scris. – Fără a subestima rezultatele obținute în dezvoltarea economică și socială a unor țări și regiuni, prin folosirea Fondului European de Dezvoltare, atrag atenția asupra faptului că unele dintre aceste țări, beneficiare de finanțare europeană, nu au aderat la acordurile de transparență fiscală, de combatere a spălării de bani și a evaziunii fiscale. În consecință, consider că astfel de țări trebuie excluse de la finanțările europene, până când nu aderă la acordurile de transparență fiscală. Altfel, banii europeni, în loc să ajungă la oamenii care au nevoie, vor ajunge în paradisurile fiscale, în conturile cleftocraților și ale altor corupți.

Milan Zver (PPE), pisno. – Poročilo o razrešnici glede izvrševanja proračuna Skupnega podjetja Čisto nebo za proračunsko leto 2014 podaja utemeljene razloge in priporočila v prid podelitvi razrešnice. Med drugim navaja, da po mnenju Računskega sodišča letni računovodski izkazi skupnega podjetja za leto 2014 v vseh pomembnih vidikih ustrezno prikazujejo njegovo finančno stanje na dan 31. decembra 2014 ter rezultate njegovega poslovanja in denarne tokove za leto, ki se je takrat končalo, v skladu z določbami njegovih finančnih pravil.

18. Angreb på hospitaler og skoler som krænkelse af den humanitære folkeret (forhandling)

Elnök asszony. – A következő pont az Elena Valenciano és Linda McAvan által a Külügyi Bizottság és a Fejlesztési Bizottság nevében a Tanácshoz intézett szóbeli választ igénylő kérdés: Kórházak és iskolák elleni támadások – a nemzetközi humanitárius jog megsértése (O-000063/2016 – B8-0361/2016) (2016/2662(RSP)).

Elena Valenciano, Autora. – Señora Presidenta, quisiera que mis primeras palabras sirvieran para rendir, en nombre de esta Cámara, el más sincero tributo al coraje y la dedicación impagables del personal humanitario local o internacional que trabaja en zonas de conflicto: médicos y médicas, maestros, maestras, trabajadores de organizaciones internacionales y no gubernamentales que ponen en riesgo todo lo que tienen, incluida su vida, para tratar de llevar algo de humanidad allí donde no queda ni rastro de ella.

La Subcomisión de Derechos Humanos y la Comisión de Desarrollo hemos querido traer este debate a este Pleno del Parlamento Europeo porque creemos que la comunidad internacional no está haciendo lo suficiente: les está fallando a todos ellos y también a las poblaciones que protegen.

Estamos asistiendo a un incremento de los ataques a instalaciones civiles, particularmente a escuelas y hospitales, en múltiples conflictos, y no estamos haciendo lo suficiente para evitarlo. No hablo de casos aislados; es un patrón de conducta que ya se está viendo en conflictos como los de Siria o Yemen, donde los ataques a escuelas y hospitales se cuentan por decenas y los muertos por centenares.

La repercusión de todo ello afecta a miles de inocentes que se ven privados de toda asistencia. Son crímenes de guerra, porque también en la guerra hay reglas y esas reglas, hoy, ni se cumplen ni se están haciendo cumplir. El problema se agrava y tenemos que acabar con esta impunidad.

A diferencia del pasado, hoy las víctimas en los conflictos armados son en su mayoría población civil. El papel creciente de actores no estatales -por ejemplo, en Siria o en Irak- complica aún más el respeto a los derechos humanos. Tenemos que adaptar el sistema a los nuevos contextos pero, sobre todo, tenemos que poner en práctica los mecanismos que ya existen.

Gran parte de lo que debemos hacer está escrito. Lo que este Parlamento quiere saber y le pregunta hoy al Consejo es qué ha hecho y qué piensa hacer la Unión Europea ante esta violación sistemática del Derecho internacional humanitario.

El mundo necesita más que nunca una Unión Europea que se mantenga fiel a sus valores, y nadie lo va a hacer en nuestro nombre.

Enrique Guerrero Salom, Autor. – Señora Presidenta, en primer lugar, quiero agradecer la presencia del Consejo y su compromiso con este debate. Quiero sumarme, obviamente, a las palabras de mi compañera Elena Valenciano, rindiendo homenaje a los trabajadores de ayuda humanitaria que en todo el mundo exponen su vida para salvar las de otros y que, en muchos casos, son precisamente castigados por ello.

Las violaciones del Derecho humanitario internacional en múltiples conflictos —sea en Siria, sea en Yemen, sea en el área C de Palestina— se están convirtiendo en una rutinaria sucesión de actos criminales. No se trata ya de efectos colaterales inesperados e inevitables, se trata de una acción conscientemente buscada. Y estamos ante un grave retroceso de la civilización, porque hace ya 150 años que se pusieron en marcha las primeras normas para protección humanitaria en casos de conflictos. Hoy no nos faltan normas, tampoco nos sobran, pero lo que sí sobran son violaciones y falta de respeto de estas normas internacionales.

Estamos en el pico más alto de necesidad humanitaria y de conflictos armados en el mundo: 120 millones de personas están desplazadas, refugiadas, necesitan ayuda humanitaria. Si las agrupáramos, serían como Francia y España juntas. Muchos conflictos en África duran ya más de una década. La guerra de Siria dura cinco años. La situación en Palestina dura cuatro generaciones seguidas.

No podemos aceptar impunemente que esta situación continúe como tal. Tenemos la obligación moral, la obligación legal y la obligación política de pedir que cesen este tipo de ataques a hospitales, a escuelas, a lugares de culto, que matan a civiles, que matan a niños, que matan a mujeres.

La pregunta, como ha formulado Elena Valenciano, es qué se ha hecho hasta ahora, qué acciones se están tomando. Pero, de cara al futuro, de cara a la Cumbre Humanitaria Mundial en Estambul, pido a los Estados miembros, como representante del Parlamento que presidirá la delegación, un compromiso claro con la dimensión humanitaria, con el respeto de la ley humanitaria internacional y también con la facilitación del acceso a la población que necesita esta ayuda humanitaria.

Jeanine Hennis-Plasschaert, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Madam President, I am very pleased to be here tonight. Let me be clear: attacks on hospitals and schools in conflict areas are simply intolerable. The Council – as you do – explicitly condemns such atrocious acts. As you know, promoting compliance with international humanitarian law is a clear commitment by the European Union, including the Council. In this respect the EU guidelines on promoting compliance with international humanitarian law were adopted by the Council in 2005 and reviewed in 2009.

The Union's support for compliance with international humanitarian law is also reflected in the Action Plan on Human Rights and Democracy for 2015-2019. At the 32nd International Conference of the Red Cross and the Red Crescent Movement, the Union quite rightly reiterated its commitment to advocate strongly and consistently respect for international humanitarian law. In the context of the World Humanitarian Summit's global consultation, common messages were also agreed.

The Council noted in December in the Council conclusions that the World Humanitarian Summit should produce practical outcomes and specific commitments made by all relevant actors, in particular as regards safeguarding humanitarian access and respect for international humanitarian law. We definitely look forward to discussing summit preparations at your next plenary in May.

When it comes to specific situations, the Council, for example, in October last year addressed the situation in Syria and called upon all parties – and will continue to call upon all parties – to stop all forms of indiscriminate shelling and bombardment against civilian areas and structures, such as hospitals and schools. Concerning Syria and Iraq, in view of the Third Kuwait Pledging Conference, the EU and its Member States have expressed their concern regarding grave violations of international humanitarian law, including attacks against schools, medical facilities, markets and other civilian areas.

Regarding Yemen, the Council, in November 2015, stated that ensuring accountability for humanitarian law violations is an important part of the process to achieve a lasting settlement of the current conflict. It also reiterated its call for the independent investigation of all alleged violations. The monitoring, control and promotion of international humanitarian law is also an essential part of the conclusions on the EU regional strategy for Syria and Iraq as well as the ISIL/Da'esh threat, adopted by the Council in March 2015. Also on this occasion, the Council called for the protection of medical facilities to be ensured at all times and, on many other occasions, the Council has discussed the situation in Libya, South Sudan, Sudan, Iraq, Nigeria and Ukraine and addressed the specific situation of – yet again – educational and medical facilities.

As regards the promotion by the Union of the prevention and repression of such international humanitarian law violations, the Council adopted its CFSP decision in 2011, under which the Union and its Member States must raise the issue of the widest possible participation in the International Criminal Court in negotiations or political dialogues with third states, groups of states or regional organisations as an essential means of promoting respect for international humanitarian law.

Finally, violations of international humanitarian law are targeted by many of the restrictive measures imposed by the Union against third states in the context of its external action, for example, Syria, Yemen, Libya, Burundi and other third countries. Without a doubt, the Council shares your deep concern regarding violations of international humanitarian law, including those relating to medical and educational facilities. The Council continuously monitors situations, undertakes action, and will continue to act accordingly.

In closing, why is this important? Let me stress that once more that we should never forget what international law is all about. It is about human beings – men, women, children, families – and we cannot, and should not, lose sight of humanity in our foreign policy. Indeed, we have to stay true to our founding values.

Elnök asszony. – Köszönöm szépen Miniszter Asszonynak a nyilatkozatát, amit ehhez a szóbeli választ igénylő kérdéshez tett. Most a képviselőcsoportok vezérszónokai következnek.

Cristian Dan Preda, *în numele grupului PPE.* – Doamnă președintă, rezoluția pe care am negociat-o și pe care o vom vota mâine condamnă foarte ferm atacurile frecvente asupra școlilor, spitalelor, altor structuri civile în situații de conflict. Sunt, evident, atacuri inadmisibile la adresa dreptului umanitar internațional și la adresa respectului față de drepturile omului, principiul aflat la baza dreptului umanitar fiind tocmai cel al protecției pentru cei care nu iau parte într-un conflict, dar sunt prinși în el. Textul pe care l-au agreeat diverse grupuri politice este un text foarte echilibrat. Din păcate, extrema stângă face din nou ceea ce ne-a obișnuit să facă și în alte ocazii: introduce amendamente care nu au nicio legătură cu subiectul: despre Sahara Occidentală, despre avort, despre Israel. Este inadmisibil să ratezi subiectul principal introducând aceleași obsesii ale extremei stângi. Îmi exprim speranța ca alte grupuri de stânga să nu sprijine această distrugere a subiectului principal pe care îl avem.

Pier Antonio Panzeri, *a nome del gruppo S&D.* – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, come sappiamo, il diritto internazionale umanitario si applica durante i conflitti armati, laddove il grado di controllo sul rispetto dello stato di diritto e dei diritti individuali risulta inevitabilmente allentato e negli ultimi anni sono aumentati sensibilmente gli attacchi nei confronti della popolazione civile, non risparmiando gli stessi operatori delle organizzazioni di aiuto umanitario. Ne consegue l'erosione della distinzione tra obiettivi militari e obiettivi civili, nonché alla protezione dello status speciale assegnato a strutture e personale dato il ruolo di aiuto imparziale e neutrale che giocano tra le parti in conflitto. Anzi direi che è proprio nell'ottica di vedere il nemico in chiunque aiuti il mio nemico, il personale delle organizzazioni internazionali umanitarie viene spesso visto come obiettivo da colpire.

Negli ultimi mesi si sono addirittura registrati casi di violazione da parte di entità statali e partner dell'Unione europea: basti pensare gli attacchi agli ospedali di Medici senza Frontiere avvenuti in ottobre in Afghanistan, i cui maggiori sospetti ricadono sull'aviazione statunitense, e a gennaio in Yemen, ad opera della coalizione saudita. Proprio per questo, nell'imminente summit sul diritto umanitario internazionale convocato a Istanbul, è necessario e urgente trovare un'azione concreta che attivi la comunità internazionale nella protezione dei civili e degli operatori di aiuti umanitari a rischio e i responsabili di attacchi indiscriminati contro la popolazione civile e le aree di assistenza devono essere identificate e rispondere dinanzi ad appositi tribunali di per crimini di guerra.

Per questo risulta necessario un meccanismo coercitivo che abbia la possibilità di effettuare indagini sulla violazione del diritto internazionale umanitario. Chiediamo quindi un'azione anche a livello europeo, che venga riconosciuta questa emergenza, usando tutti gli strumenti a disposizione e chiediamo al Consiglio nonché all'Alto rappresentante per la politica estera, di impegnarsi per la creazione, sulla scia del summit di Istanbul, di un luogo di confronto permanente su questi temi.

Mark Demesmaeker, *namens de ECR-Fractie.* – Mijn land, Vlaanderen, heeft net zoals vele andere Europese naties al te vaak de gruwel van de oorlog meegemaakt. Honderd jaar geleden woedde de Grote Oorlog in de loopgraven aan de IJzer en na de oorlog verrees daar de IJzertoren, een Vlaams vredesmonument met in vier talen de boodschap “nooit meer oorlog”. Die kreet blijft ook in 2016 nog altijd een onvervulde verzuchting. Oorlog is er nog altijd en oorlog is altijd gruwel, voor soldaten en voor onschuldige burgers. Mijn ouders en grootouders hebben de verhalen honderduit verteld.

Vandaag laten de snelle communicatiemiddelen niets meer aan de verbeelding over. We zien de gruwel meteen op het scherm van onze televisie of de pc en we zijn geschokt omdat burgers worden getroffen, omdat ziekenhuizen en scholen niet worden gespaard. Dit zouden net veilige havens moeten zijn, neutrale en beschermde plaatsen. Bovendien gebeurt dit niet alleen in Syrië, Afghanistan of Jemen, buiten Europa. Ik was er zelf getuige van hoe in het oosten van Oekraïne, in Europa, scholen worden gemilitariseerd en ziekenhuizen doelbewust tot doelwit worden gemaakt.

Al te vaak moet het internationaal humanitair recht wijken voor rauwe machtspolitiek. Al te makkelijk wordt het verlies van levens simpelweg afgedaan als *collateral damage*, wat het natuurlijk niet is. Het unieke en ambitieuze EU-instrumentarium om de naleving van de elementaire beginselen van het humanitaire recht te bevorderen is bekend. Het is nu aan de Europese Unie en haar lidstaten om te tonen dat het hen menens is. De Wereldtop over humanitaire hulp van eind volgende maand in Istanbul komt dan ook geen dag te vroeg. Dit internationaal instrumentarium en dit momentum moeten met beide handen worden aangegrepen.

Mevrouw de minister, ik heb nog een vraag: kunt u mij vertellen waarom de landen die in december 2015 deelnamen aan de 32e Internationale Conferentie van het Rode Kruis en de Rode Halve Maan er niet in zijn geslaagd om het eens te raken over een nieuw mechanisme waarmee het governancestelsel van het internationaal humanitair recht verstevigd zou worden, en hoe vermijden we eenzelfde scenario op de komende wereldtop?

Charles Goerens, au nom du groupe ALDE. – Madame la Présidente, le bombardement de l'hôpital de Kunduz en Afghanistan, il y a quelques mois, a coûté la vie à nombre de personnes, dont notamment du personnel de Médecins sans frontières. Le président des États-Unis a vivement déploré cette catastrophe, soulignant par là même la gravité des faits. Nous sommes d'autant plus choqués que les coordonnées GPS de l'hôpital de Kunduz étaient bien connues des autorités américaines.

Il ne s'agit pas là, hélas, d'un cas isolé, ayant entraîné de nombreuses victimes parmi les malades et les professionnels de la santé. Raison de plus d'en appeler à la conscience de nos dirigeants, à l'occasion du prochain sommet mondial sur l'aide humanitaire à Istanbul, et de se montrer plus respectueux du droit humanitaire international. Tout doit être fait pour assurer le respect total de l'impartialité des acteurs humanitaires qui, très souvent, au péril de leur vie, sont prêts à consacrer leur temps, leur énergie, leur savoir-faire ainsi que leur générosité à la recherche de solutions au défi humanitaire.

Notre résolution vise à promouvoir des mesures préventives et/ou dissuasives au regard des nombreuses violations du droit humanitaire international. Parmi celles-ci, retenons l'interdiction de fournir des armes aux acteurs impliqués ou pouvant être impliqués dans des opérations faisant fi du droit humanitaire international. Ajoutons également la nécessité de lancer des enquêtes indépendantes et de porter les crimes reconnus devant les juridictions compétentes, y compris la Cour pénale internationale. Si, en effet, nous arrivions à mettre fin à l'impunité en la matière, nous serions en mesure de renforcer l'autorité des Nations unies comme institution responsable de la gestion de telles situations conflictuelles.

Avant de conclure, j'aimerais insister également sur l'impérieuse nécessité pour nos États membres d'honorer, enfin, leurs promesses en matière de financement de l'aide publique au développement et de l'aide humanitaire.

Kateřina Konečná, za skupinu GUE/NGL. – Paní předsedající, v říjnu minulého roku má frakce GUE/NGL na plenárním zasedání iniciovala bod o útoku vedeném Spojenými státy americkými na nemocnici Lékařů bez hranic v afghánském Kundúzu. Všichni jsme tehdy projevíli soustrast a znepokojení nad touto tragickou a zbabělou událostí. Co se však od té doby stalo? Američané si celou událost vyšetřili interně a aféra umlkla stejně jako zničená nemocnice a hlasy pacientů a lékařů v ní.

Lékaři bez hranic od té doby bez přestání žádají, aby se do věci vložila Mezinárodní humanitární vyšetřovací komise. Tento mechanismus, který má pouze za úkol zjistit o incidentu co nejvíc informací, byl zaveden již v roce 1991 dodatkovými protokoly Ženevské úmluvy a nikdy, opakuji nikdy, nebyl reálně využit. Nástroj pro koncentraci informací tedy sice existuje, ale signatáři se ho stále bojí aplikovat, aby nevytvořili precedens.

Takže to může také znamenat, že prostě všichni jednou za čas akceptujeme, že budou nemocnice ničeny? Já doufám, že nikoliv. Pokud totiž nebudeme útoky vyšetřovat a jasně ukazovat na viníky, budou nemocnice ničeny i nadále. Tak, jak to dnes vidíme v Jemenu či Sýrii. Pro mě není uspokojivá odpověď Rady, že situaci monitoruje a podniká kroky. Já bych chtěla vidět řešení, protože pouze odstrašení těch, kteří to způsobují, může znamenat, že už to nikdy nebudou opakovat.

Barbara Lochbihler, on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group. – Madam President, it is deplorable that EU Member States are complicit in grave violations of international humanitarian law. Countries receiving weapons from EU Member States are responsible for targeted attacks on civilians, including bombings of hospitals and schools. With the forthcoming resolution we call for effective measures to end this complicity and we ask for support for the Green proposal to impose an EU arms embargo against countries that are responsible for such serious breaches of international humanitarian law. This resolution draws on our previous call for a weapons embargo against Saudi Arabia in reaction to its bombing campaign in Yemen.

The EU guidelines on international humanitarian law also provide for other measures, but we – the European Union – do not do enough to implement them. They include the support for information-gathering missions that can be useful for investigations of war crimes and for the International Criminal Court as well. Investigations into violations with a view to prosecute are crucial in order to send a clear message to those responsible and to prevent further killings of civilians. The rising number of attacks on schools and hospitals is a horrific example of growing indifference towards international humanitarian law. It is vital that schools and hospitals remain – and are protected – as a neutral secure space during situations of armed conflict.

The upcoming World Humanitarian Summit provides an opportunity to reaffirm the centrality of international humanitarian law and discuss the ways of strengthening compliance with it. Among other topics, challenging improving the situation of women, girls and other vulnerable groups during conflicts should be at the core of these tasks.

Fabio Massimo Castaldo, on behalf of the EFDD Group. – Madam President, targeting schools and hospitals is strictly forbidden under the rules of international humanitarian law, and bombing such objectives on purpose is universally considered a war crime. Yet the international community has witnessed over the past few years a harrowing trend of attacks such as those on Doctors Without Borders and hospitals in Afghanistan, Yemen and Syria. I want to pay tribute to the admirable courage and dedication of humanitarian aid workers in those countries. We need immediate and effective concrete action in order to tackle these war crimes, so we need first of all to block the flow of weapons towards the belligerents. For this reason, I approve the call to High Representative Mogherini to launch an initiative aimed at imposing an EU arms embargo against countries that are responsible for serious breaches of international humanitarian law. The licensing of weapons sales to such countries represents a breach of the Council Common Position of 8 December 2008. We cannot accept complicit silence.

Anna Záborská (PPE) – Za klúčový problém tohto uznesenia považujem rastúce útoky na nemocnice a školy, ale aj rastúci trend zneužívania nemocníc a škôl ako krytia pre vojenské aktivity. Pri snahe o zvrátenie tohto trendu je dôležité trvať na tom, že budovy nemocníc a škôl musia mať vždy len jedno poslanie – liečiť a vzdelávať. A ten, kto túto zásadu poruší, dopúšťa sa zločinu proti ľudskosti. Podarilo sa dospieť k vyváženému textu, pod ktorým sú podpísané všetky politické frakcie. Som preto sklamaná, že kolegovia z GUE sa opäť raz rozhodli podať pozmeňujúce návrhy, ktorými spochybňujú svoju politickú korektnosť. Ich konanie je nezodpovedné a vyvoláva otázku, či rokovanie s nimi nie je len stratou času.

Josef Weidenholzer (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin! Kriegsverbrechen von staatlichen Akteuren ebenso wie terroristische Attacken seitens nichtstaatlicher Akteure stehen im Mittelpunkt jener Konflikte, unter denen wir in den letzten Jahren ganz besonders leiden – in Syrien, Jemen, Afghanistan, im Irak und so weiter.

Besonders besorgniserregend sind Anschläge auf Krankenhäuser, Schulen und Kindergärten. Das ist eine äußerst zynische Form der Gewaltanwendung, genauso wie Anschläge auf NGO und all jene, die humanitäre Hilfe bereitstellen. Das sind Kriegsverbrechen, und die gehören vor den ICC, das ist unbestritten. Aber diese Erkenntnis hilft den Betroffenen in der gegenwärtigen Situation relativ wenig. Daher ist unsere Resolution so wichtig, denn wir erinnern daran, dass wir eigentlich ein wichtiges Instrument hätten: die Leitlinien von 2009 zur Förderung der Einhaltung der Normen des humanitären Völkerrechts.

Wir fordern die relevanten Einheiten des Rates auf, darzustellen, uns klarzumachen, welche Maßnahmen in diesem Zeitraum gesetzt wurden, die Leitlinien relevant und verbindlich zu machen. Wir sind uns der Bedeutung der Europäischen Institutionen und der Rolle der Mitgliedstaaten bewusst. Wir weisen diese Resolution auch auf die wichtige Rolle hin, die dabei dem Sicherheitsrat der Vereinten Nationen zukommt. Die Zusammenarbeit der Europäischen Union und der UN ist bei den genannten Konflikten von allergrößter Bedeutung. Ein wesentlicher Aspekt sollte nicht unerwähnt bleiben, das Europäische Parlament hat ihn vor wenigen Wochen in seiner Resolution zu Jemen bekräftigt, und ich glaube, dass wir das jetzt auch hier berechtigterweise wieder aufgreifen: Man sollte jene Staaten von Waffenlieferungen ausschließen, die das humanitäre Völkerrecht verletzen.

Marek Jurek (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Jednym z najbardziej brutalnych, szokujących ataków terrorystycznych Państwa Islamskiego w ostatnim czasie był atak w Adenie na dom opieki, dom Matki Teresy, gdzie w sposób zamierzony – nie jako ofiary przypadkowe, lecz w sposób zamierzony – zginęły opiekujące się siostry zakonne i ich podopieczni. My mamy z reguły bardzo bogatą agendę debat na temat praw człowieka. Niestety to wydarzenie zupełnie zeszło z naszego pola widzenia. Musimy rejestrować za każdym razem, kiedy nie tylko dochodzi do tego, że niewinni ludzie padają ofiarami działań wojennych, ale kiedy niewinni ludzie są celem tych działań wojennych, a w tym wypadku mieliśmy do czynienia z takim zdarzeniem.

Lola Sánchez Caldentey (GUE/NGL). – Señora Presidenta, en un momento en el que el Secretario General de las Naciones Unidas ha hecho saltar las alarmas sobre la erosión continua del Derecho internacional humanitario, estamos al menos ante una Resolución oportuna. Sin embargo, es muy decepcionante ver como la mayoría de los Grupos de esta casa han decidido conscientemente obviar las ocupaciones militares de Palestina y del Sáhara Occidental, donde, recuerdo, el Derecho internacional humanitario también se aplica.

Esta misión es echarle sal a las heridas y al dolor de los miles de civiles que viven bajo ocupación y es dejarlos totalmente desamparados. No debemos obviar las recomendaciones de las comisiones de investigación de 2014 sobre la Franja de Gaza, que hablaban de crímenes de guerra por el bombardeo de hospitales y el uso indiscriminado y desproporcionado de la fuerza.

Me gustaría recordarles que la interpretación de las normas del Derecho internacional humanitario con fines políticos es uno de los principales factores de su falta de cumplimiento y la impunidad a esta asociada. Por todo ello, espero que mañana voten a favor de las enmiendas que mi Grupo ha presentado para remediar esta situación.

Davor Ivo Stier (PPE). – Gospođo predsjednice, prema izvješću o organizaciji Liječnici za ljudska prava samo u veljači 2016. zabilježeno je 358 napada na zdravstvene ustanove u Siriji, doduše, preko 90 % tih napada izvršio je Asadov režim i njihovi saveznici.

Doktori, medicinske sestre, humanitarni radnici koji rade u ratnim zonama, rade doista danonoćno te su nerijetko primorani djelovati u područjima koja su izvan njihove struke zbog nedostatka kvalificiranog osoblja. Zato njima moramo odati počast za njihovu predanost da pomognu civilima, za istinsku hrabrost vrijednu našeg divljenja.

Napadi na bolnice teška su povreda međunarodnog humanitarnog prava, ali nije dovoljno suditi kršenje međunarodnog prava, već potrebno je djelovati i osuditi odgovorne, no to nije lako. Mi to dobro znamo, mi koji dolazimo iz zemalja koje su bile žrtve Miloševićeve agresije i koji smo svjedoci da su mnogi zločinci nažalost prošli nekažnjeno.

Soraya Post (S&D). – Fru talman! Det vi ser idag är en annorlunda krigsföring som har satt i system att utföra dödliga attacker mot civila, kvinnor och barn där kvinnor och barn befinner sig. Det här utgör allvarliga krigsbrott och kräver absolut omedelbara åtgärder från EU:s sida. Att bara fördöma tycker jag är i sig en kränkning av folkrätten.

EU har antagit riktlinjer som måste implementeras, och varje fall måste utredas och de skyldiga måste ställas inför rätta. Om vi låter situationen fortsätta så här så leder och bidrar det bara till fler attacker.

Rådet måste överväga ett vapenembargo mot länder som kränker internationell rätt. De länder som fortsätter att sälja vapen till sådana länder bryter mot tidigare antagna rådsslutsatser. Användning av beväpnade drönare i dessa konflikter är alarmerande och EU måste utveckla en gemensam ståndpunkt om detta som ett steg mot global nedrustning.

Ruža Tomašić (ECR). – Gospođo predsjednice, povrede međunarodnog humanitarnog prava poput napada na bolnice i škole moramo bez iznimke osuditi, a počinitelje tih zločina izvesti pred lice pravde. Takvo se bezumno ponašanje ni zbog kakvog strateškog interesa ne smije tolerirati ni relativizirati.

Podsjetit ću vas na užasnu sudbinu koju je prošla vukovarska bolnica u hrvatskom ratu za neovisnost. Procjenjuje se da je na nju tijekom opsade Vukovara padalo i do 700 projektila dnevno, nakon pada grada srpski su teroristi u dosluhu s Jugoslavenskom narodnom armijom iz bolnice odveli, mučili i strijeljali nekoliko stotina ranjenika i bolničkih djelatnika.

Do danas Srbija nije vratila otuđenu bolničku dokumentaciju, niti je uložila napore da se sazna sudbina ljudi kojima se nakon odvođenja iz bolnice izgubio svaki trag. Takvu Srbiju mnogi europski lideri, ali i članovi ovoga doma beskompromisno podržavaju, a Hrvatsku osuđuju jer ne dozvoljava da je se ponižava.

Richard Howitt (S&D). – Madam President, this is not about one attack– Physicians for Human Rights has documented 358 separate attacks on medical facilities in Syria since 2011 alone. We have heard from colleagues about the recent attacks which have hit Médecins Sans Frontières' health centres in Afghanistan and Yemen. The aid worker database says that 610 aid workers internationally lost their lives working for major international organisations in the last year, for those statistics are available. We have to do better. We have to do better as a European Union to strengthen the international legal protection. We have to do better with our Member States in order to avoid any complicity whatsoever in such attacks. And we have to condemn the terrorists and their armed groups that use human shields and deliberately ensure civilians are vulnerable to those attacks. There is something truly tragic that victims of violence go to hospitals as a refuge from war, to heal their bodies, and then find themselves subject to further violence and death. We condemned Isis when they attacked humanitarian workers. If we are better than them, then we have to ensure that we never do so.

„Catch the eye” eljárás

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Paní předsedající, já jsem velmi rád zejména za to, co jsem slyšel od svého kolegy předřečníka, pana Howitta. Skutečně těch útoků je mnoho a byl bych nerad, kdyby se vyzdvihoval pouze ten kábulský. Například jsme vůbec nehovořili ani o těch ruských, které se staly v uplynulém roce. Dne 15. února 2016 bylo zabito při ruském náletu právě v oblasti Maarat an-Numán asi padesát osob. Dne 21. října 2015 u Sarmínu třináct obětí.

Já lituju každé oběti, lituju každého neoprávněného náletu, který skutečně porušuje normy mezinárodního práva. Ale myslím si vzhledem k tomu, jaké usnesení předložili právě kolegové z levicové frakce, že by bylo vhodné určitě objektivní vyvážení, protože pokud je to usnesení navrženo jednostranným směrem, tak jsme samozřejmě proti, a bylo by dobré, aby tato zpráva byla vyvážená, tak jak v tom původním návrhu je, nikoliv tak, jak je změněna návrhy ze strany kolegů ze skupiny GUE/NGL.

Νότης Μαρίας (ECR). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, τους τελευταίους μήνες, δυστυχώς, έχουμε επανειλημμένα συζητήσει τις παραβιάσεις θεμελιωδών δικαιωμάτων του ανθρώπου στα πεδία του πολέμου, ιδιαίτερα στη Μέση Ανατολή, κυρίως λόγω της δράσης των τζιχαντιστών του Daesh. Όμως, τον περασμένο Νοέμβριο, οι Ηνωμένες Πολιτείες ομολόγησαν τον δολοφονικό βομβαρδισμό νοσοκομείου των Γιατρών Χωρίς Σύνορα, στο Αφγανιστάν.

Στην Υεμένη, η αραβική συμμαχία της οποίας ηγείται η Σαουδική Αραβία, έχει επιτελέσει ένα όργιο βιαιοπραγιών κατά του αμάχου πληθυσμού, με πολλές επιθέσεις σε νοσοκομεία και σχολεία. Με τη στάση «δύο μέτρα και δύο σταθμά» που υιοθετεί σήμερα η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση και η Δύση ευρύτερα, διακυβεύεται η υπόληψη και η αξιοπιστία τους.

Οι διεθνείς οργανισμοί έχουν καθήκον να αναγνωρίσουν τα εγκλήματα πολέμου στην Υεμένη, στο Αφγανιστάν, στο Ιράκ και στη Συρία, αλλά και αλλού, από όποιος και αν τελούνται. Αυτό θα πρέπει να είναι το πρώτο βήμα, ώστε οι ιθύνοντες να αναλάβουν τις ευθύνες των πράξεών τους, την οικονομική αποκατάσταση των ζημιωθεισών χωρών, αλλά και των ανθρώπων, όπως επίσης και την ασφαλή και άνευ όρων περιθάλψη των χιλιάδων προσφύγων που έχουν δημιουργήσει.

Ivan Jakovčić (ALDE). – Gospođo predsjednice, kao da smo premalo naučili od onoga što je bila posljedica i što se dešavalo u ratovima na području bivše Jugoslavije. Ono što se dešavalo u Bosni i Hercegovini, ono što se dešavalo u Hrvatskoj, i naravno, želim podvući činjenicu da su upravo škole, bolnice, vjerski objekti prije više od 20 godina bili ciljevi napada. Najodvratnije je ono što se dogodilo zaista vukovarskoj bolnici.

Međutim, kao da zaista nismo ništa naučili. Kako se možemo uopće čuditi tome da su upravo civili oni koji su najranjiviji i u svakom ratu stradaju, u svakom ratu je uvijek ista priča, u svakom su ratu napadi na škole, napadi pogotovo na bolnice. Mi zaista ovdje ne možemo voditi ovu diskusiju, a da ne donesemo čvrste odluke i da takve zločine, jer to su najodvratniji zločini nad bespomoćnim ljudima, zaista maksimalno i kaznimo.

João Pimenta Lopes (GUE/NGL). – Senhora Presidente, estamos de acordo com os princípios gerais que norteiam a discussão. Não podemos, contudo, deixar de registar que se ignoram, em absoluto, as verdadeiras causas dos conflitos em que essas criminosas ações se verificam.

Uma discussão que branqueia o papel e as responsabilidades diretas e indiretas que a União Europeia, a NATO e os Estados Unidos da América têm, nomeadamente, nas agressões militares no Médio Oriente e no Norte da África, bem como o papel e as responsabilidades de aliados do Ocidente que têm sido, eles próprios, responsáveis por ataques a hospitais e escolas.

Que dizer da criminosa a ação de Israel, com registo de ataques a escolas da ONU, que prende e mata crianças? Que dizer do papel da Arábia Saudita no conflito do Iémen ou das vítimas inocentes dos *drones* norte-americanos? Uma tremenda hipocrisia no momento em que a União Europeia é hoje um exemplo, em todo o mundo, da violação dos mais básicos direitos humanos com a resposta à crise humanitária dos refugiados.

A „catch the eye” eljárás vége.

Jeanine Hennis-Plasschaert, President-in-Office of the Council. – Madam President, it is in my view evident that all EU institutions coincide in considering that respect for international humanitarian law, rules and principles is, and must remain, at the core of the Union's external action. That is why I said earlier this evening that it is crucial to stay true to our founding values. We should never forget what international law is all about: men, women children – families.

In reply to Mr Demesmaeker, I would like to say that, like you, I deeply regret that the conference failed in adopting a new mechanism. However, we should not forget that the 28 EU Member States make up only a small portion of states participating in the conference. At the 32nd International Conference of the Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement you referred to – as I said earlier this evening – the Union reiterated its commitment to advocate strongly and consistently respect for international humanitarian law. One of the pledges made in that conference by the Union and its Member States regarded attacks against medical personnel or patients. The 28 EU Member States have a strong voice if they join forces, but we make up only a small portion of the states participating in the conference.

Elnök asszony. – A vitát lezárom.

A vita lezárásához 6 állásfoglalási indítványt kaptam.

A szavazásra 2016. április 28-án, csütörtökön kerül sor.

Irásbeli nyilatkozatok (162. cikk)

Nicola Caputo (S&D), per iscritto. – La stragrande maggioranza delle vittime degli ultimi conflitti armati in Siria, in Iraq, nello Yemen e in Afghanistan, è rappresentata da civili innocenti. Attacchi contro strutture civili come ospedali e scuole sono atti di negligenza grave e violazioni dei principi di base del diritto umanitario. È fondamentale affrontare efficacemente il problema ormai noto a tutti delle violazioni gravi del diritto umanitario internazionale e del diritto internazionale in materia di diritti umani, favorendo opportuni meccanismi per l'assunzione di responsabilità. Sottolineo l'importante ruolo che la Corte penale internazionale può svolgere nei casi in cui lo Stato o gli Stati in questione non possano o non intendano esercitare la loro giurisdizione. Dall'inizio dell'anno solo in Siria sono stati 15 gli attacchi contro ospedali

e strutture mediche, mentre, dall'inizio del conflitto nel 2011, Amnesty stima siano 336 i centri medici attaccati. L'Europa deve far sentire forte la sua voce e il suo peso politico. È necessario elaborare un piano d'azione concreto con scadenze precise, indagini imparziali e indipendenti per porre fine a questa barbarie. Ospedali e personale medico sono esplicitamente tutelati dal diritto internazionale umanitario e gli attacchi contro i civili e le infrastrutture civili costituiscono un crimine di guerra.

Birgit Collin-Langen (PPE), schriftlich. – Ich unterstütze die EntschlieÙung, denn ich verurteile Angriffe auf Krankenhäuser und Schulen auf das Schärfste. Leider können wir kriegesischen Konflikten kein Ende setzen, wir müssen uns aber dafür einsetzen, dass Angriffe auf Patienten, deren Angehörige, medizinisches Personal, Lehrpersonal und Kinder nicht von der Weltgemeinschaft akzeptiert werden und Konsequenzen haben sollen.

Adam Gierek (S&D), na pišmie. – Wskutek różnych prowadzonych aktualnie działań zbrojnych staliśmy się świadkami rosnącej liczby ataków na szpitale i szkoły na całym świecie. Międzynarodowe prawo humanitarne łagodzi skutki tych działań poprzez ochronę tych, którzy nie biorą w nich udziału.

Konwencja z 1946 r. dotycząca przywilejów i immunitetów ONZ chroni szkoły i zakłady opieki zdrowotnej. W przeddzień Światowego Szczytu Humanitarnego powinniśmy stanowczo potępić wykorzystywanie infrastruktury cywilnej, w tym szpitali i szkół przez strony konfliktów zbrojnych. Szczyt ten daje szansę wszystkim państwom członkowskim ONZ do ponowienia zobowiązań w zakresie ochrony ludności cywilnej i poszanowania praw człowieka w tym zakresie, tj. zasad, na które już wcześniej przystały.

Polityka UE w tym zakresie powinna być propagowana i wdrażana w sposób spójny i skuteczny. Państwa członkowskie UE, wykorzystując wszelkie dostępne narzędzia skutecznego przestrzegania międzynarodowego prawa humanitarnego, winny dawać przykład w wywiązywaniu się z ratyfikowanych podstawowych instrumentów tego prawa. Niezbędne jest nałożenie embarga EU na dostawy broni do krajów, które są odpowiedzialne za naruszanie międzynarodowego prawa humanitarnego, w szczególności za umyślne ataki na infrastrukturę cywilną. Należy wzmocnić międzynarodowe systemy dochodzeniowe i sądowe, mające na celu ukrócenie bezkarności sprawców naruszeń międzynarodowego prawa humanitarnego.

Urmas Paet (ALDE), kirjalikult. – Haiglate ja koolide vastu suunatud rünnakud on humanitaarõiguse aluspõhimõtete jäme rikkumine ja äärmiselt põlastusväärne. Tuleb teha kõik, et selliseid rünnakuid ei toimuks ning selliste tegude toimepanijad tuleb võtta vastutusele, vajadusel selleks Rahvusvahelist Kriminaalkohut kasutades.

EL saab anda oma panuse suhetes kolmandate riikidega sellesse, et süütult kannatavaid inimesi kaitsta ja aidata, kasutades selleks poliitilist dialoogi, piiravaid meetmeid ja tehes koostööd rahvusvaheliste institutsioonidega. Oluline on suurendada ELi humanitaarabi, mis hetkel moodustab vaid 1% kogu ELi eelarvest. Lisaks peavad liikmesriigid täitma juba võetud rahalisi kohustusi.

Oluline on jõuda ka selleni, et ÜRO Julgeolekunõukogu lepiks kokku selles, et sõjakuritegude ja humanitaartegevusega seotud küsimuste puhul ei kasutataks vetot. Ka Istanbulis toimuval humanitaarteemalisel tippkohtumisel 23.-24. mail tuleb jõuda kokkulepeteni, mis aitaksid efektiivsemalt lahendada eesiseisvaid humanitaarkriise.

Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu (S&D), in writing. – The current situation, involving several attacks on schools and hospitals in conflict areas, is unacceptable. The safety of peace zones in time of conflict is jeopardised. The situation of civilians needs to be improved, and the EU cannot stand aside from the reality. International humanitarian law provides for the protection of civilians in countries experiencing armed conflict. The EU has a role to play in ensuring that events of this kind do not happen in the future, and in clarifying the approach to investigating such attacks. The parties responsible must pay for the crimes that have been committed.

Romana Tomc (PPE), pisno. – V oboroženih konfliktnih stanjih po svetu so najbolj na udarih mehke tarče, bolnišnice in šole. V teh primerih gre za grobe kršitve mednarodnega humanitarnega prava. Od vseh sprtih strani bi morali zahtevati, naj spoštujejo pravico ljudi do zdravja. Naj med konflikti sprte strani zagotovijo dostopnost in kvaliteto zdravstvenih storitev. Menim, da bi se morali tudi bolj zavedati dejstva, da morajo zagotoviti nemoteno šolanje. Otroci, dijaki, študenti imajo pravico do tega. Oni so naše upanje. Tudi sama se sprašujem, kaj smo kot EU, kot del globalne vasi naredili, da se taka zavržena dejanja prenehajo dogajati.

19. Aktindsigt (artikel 116, stk. 7, i forretningsordenen) i perioden 2014-2015 (forhandling)

Elnök asszony. – A következő napirendi pont a Laura Ferrara által az Állampolgári Jogi, Bel- és Igazságügyi Bizottság nevében készített jelentésről folytatott vita: A dokumentumokhoz való nyilvános hozzáférés a 2014-2015-ös időszakban (2015/2287(INI)) – (A8-0141/2016).

Laura Ferrara, relatrice. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, vorrei innanzitutto ringraziare tutti i relatori ombra con i quali si sono tenute delle proficue riunioni e dei dibattiti costruttivi. E poi vorrei ringraziare anche tutti i cittadini che hanno contribuito con suggerimenti e proposte, alla stesura della risoluzione, la cui bozza era stata pubblicata sulla piattaforma online del Movimento 5 Stelle. Il frutto del lavoro portato avanti in stretta sinergia nei mesi scorsi è un buon testo e sono soddisfatta perché va nella direzione di garantire una maggiore trasparenza e un maggiore e migliore coinvolgimento dei cittadini nei lavori portati avanti nelle istituzioni.

Questo passo avanti è ancor più importante perché arriva in un momento storico in cui la fiducia dei cittadini nell'Unione europea vacilla: i palazzi delle istituzioni europee sono visti come dei luoghi opachi, in cui vengono prese decisioni che li riguardano direttamente ma di cui spesso non sanno nulla o quasi. Occorre prendere atto del fatto che della trasparenza si fa un gran parlare ma purtroppo non sempre alle parole seguono i fatti. Basti pensare che molte delle raccomandazioni formulate nelle analoghe risoluzioni del Parlamento degli anni precedenti non hanno avuto alcun seguito. Eppure la trasparenza, così come la democrazia partecipativa, sono dei principi democratici fondamentali, riconosciuti dal Trattato sull'Unione europea.

E allora è proprio nel solco, tracciato dal principio della democrazia partecipativa su cui l'Unione europea si fonda, che è stato stilato il testo, in cui si chiede di istituire un registro telematico pubblico sull'operato dei rappresentanti dei cittadini, sul processo decisionale e sul modo in cui viene stanziato e speso il denaro pubblico e i risultati ottenuti. Si chiede di migliorare, accrescere e semplificare l'accessibilità delle informazioni, attraverso lo sviluppo di un punto di accesso comune ai portali delle istituzioni dell'Unione europea, prevedendo altresì modalità di accesso che tengano conto delle esigenze delle persone con disabilità. La trasparenza delle istituzioni non può poi d'altro canto prescindere da un'adeguata protezione dei *whistle-blower*, che vanno protetti sia moralmente sia finanziariamente. Invitiamo pertanto la Commissione a presentare una proposta che tuteli gli informatori quale parte del sistema democratico.

Di centrale importanza è poi la trasparenza dell'intero processo legislativo. In tale contesto il consolidarsi della prassi dei triloghi, di cui i cittadini non sanno praticamente nulla, fa venire meno il necessario controllo pubblico, insito invece nella procedura legislativa ordinaria, favorendo il lavoro occulto dei lobbisti che possono, grazie alla fuga dei documenti, avere più facile accesso alle informazioni necessarie a condizionare il processo decisionale.

Pertanto, pur riconoscendo l'importanza e l'efficacia dei triloghi informali, chiediamo una maggiore trasparenza degli stessi e, conseguentemente, un maggiore controllo da parte dei cittadini. Con riferimento ai lobbisti invitiamo poi la Commissione a presentare, senza indugi, la sua proposta di accordo per l'istituzione di un registro interistituzionale obbligatorio dei lobbisti.

Ribadiamo poi la necessità di assicurare una maggiore trasparenza dei negoziati volti a concludere degli accordi internazionali. Il pubblico dovrebbe avere accesso al numero più ampio possibile di documenti. Crediamo poi che sia necessaria una maggiore trasparenza delle procedure di messa in mora e di infrazione nei confronti degli Stati membri: anche su questo si sa poco o nulla. Poi, con riferimento ai Fondi strutturali, occorre rendere facilmente accessibili i dati relativi alle procedure e ai beneficiari, al fine di contrastare e prevenire abusi, frodi e corruzione.

Come ho detto all'inizio del mio intervento, la mancanza di trasparenza è una delle principali cause della perdita di fiducia nelle istituzioni europee e sarebbe un errore fatale far finta di nulla, provando a dimenticare l'astensionismo crescente, il rinascere di sentimenti nazionalisti, il rischio di fenomeni di corruzione e di conflitti di interesse.

Come disse uno dei fondatori del Movimento 5 Stelle, Gian Roberto Casaleggio: «Non è corretto che qualcuno decida per i cittadini in base a logiche imperscrutabili e senza renderne conto. Il parlamentare è un dipendente dei cittadini: non può sottrarsi al loro controllo. In caso contrario non può parlarsi di democrazia diretta, o forse neppure di democrazia». Come parlamentare europea che crede nei valori della libertà e della partecipazione democratica, vi invito a impegnarci insieme per garantire un reale accesso pubblico alle informazioni.

Věra Jourová, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, honourable Members, this Commission – as President Juncker committed to this House – has made democratic change and transparency one of its ten political priorities. Our decisions affect millions of European citizens and therefore must be taken as democratically and transparently as possible. The Commission already applies high transparency standards, but we are always open to examining our tools and practices and to adapting them further where necessary and appropriate.

The Commission welcomes that the resolution calls for Members of the Parliament and the Council to follow the Commission's practice regarding the publication of information on meetings held by top political leaders and decision makers. At the Commission, information on more than 10 000 such meetings has been published. This transparency standard should become part of the culture of all EU institutions, as far as bilateral encounters with lobbyists, elected politicians and top decision-makers are concerned. The Commission also welcomes Parliament's clear support for our intention to present a proposal for an inter-institutional agreement on a mandatory transparency register covering the three main institutions. To this effect, the Commission launched a public consultation on 1 March 2016, with a view to submitting a proposal in the second half of this year.

The Commission is convinced that across the three EU institutions involved in law-making, the same standards of transparency should be applied. The Commission also strongly welcomes the new inter-institutional agreement on better law-making. In that agreement, the Commission together with the other two institutions committed itself to further improving transparency in legislative procedures, and to setting up practical arrangements for cooperation in future international negotiations. Similarly, the creation of a joint the register of delegated acts by the end of 2017 will further increase the transparency of acts impacting on citizens and businesses.

The Commission calls on the co-legislators to adopt its proposals on access to documents aimed at extending the right of access to documents to all EU institutions, bodies, offices and agencies. The Commission has consistently supported, and will continue supporting, the co-legislators in finding common ground on the two pending proposals updating and upgrading Regulation 1049/2001. As regards the proactive publication of documents, I would like to recall that the Commission has established a solid practice of document registration and publication in its document register. It actively supports the pilot project introduced by Parliament, which is aimed at providing easier access to a wide range of unclassified documents held by EU institutions. The overall success of the project depends on building consistency between the institutions' document management systems, including the need to avoid duplication of existing tools.

The Commission also makes constant efforts to comply with its publication requirements as defined in the sectorial legal bases. We take the view that the current rules and practices strike the right balance between transparency and the protection of personal data. As regards the suggestion to establish the post of Transparency Commissioner, I can assure you that First Vice-President Timmermans, who regrets he is unable to be here in person, is the Commissioner who ensures compliance and improves administrative practices in the field of access to documents. I can also confirm that transparency is seen as an issue of paramount importance by the Commission as a whole.

Anna Maria Corazza Bildt, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Madam President, public access to documents is essential to enhance people's trust in our work and to bridge the gap between citizens and the EU institutions. At a time where populists claim that Eurocrats decide from Brussels over people's lives, undermining the legitimacy of the EU, the EPP's message is very clear: we have nothing to hide.

We are committed to transparency, openness and accountability. We should open the doors of the European institutions to show that decisions are taken democratically. The European Parliament is at the forefront, but more needs to be done, especially in the Council. I call on the Presidency to relaunch the negotiations on the regulation on public access to documents.

Citizens have the right to know what their representatives do on their behalf and how EU funds are spent in a fast, simple and user-friendly way. For instance, a common search and access point between the three institutions, like we have with the Your Europe portal, could make it easier for the public to find information. The people of Europe should be able to be involved in, participate in and influence EU decisions. This does not mean direct democracy. In Europe, we live in representative democracies and, of course, openness goes with responsibility. Public access is not about Wikileaks and it is not about whistle-blowers. Privacy has to be respected, while ensuring transparency.

And yes, Laura, the trilogues and international agreements must be more transparent, but we need to ensure a climate of mutual trust and the space to think. This is necessary to achieve results in negotiations. Personally, I committed to be open about my work. Reconnecting with people and gaining their trust in Europe is more important than ever, as we are confronted with common challenges that require a common European response.

PRZEWODNICTWO: RYSZARD CZARNECKI

Wiceprzewodniczący

Anna Hedh, för S&D-gruppen. – Herr talman! Tillgång till handlingar är en grundläggande rättighet som skyddas både i EU:s stadga om de grundläggande rättigheterna och i fördragen.

Betänkandet som vi diskuterar idag fastslår just att en förutsättning för ett demokratiskt politiskt system är att medborgarna har möjlighet att känna till och granska hur beslut fattas.

Jag är också föredragande för själva lagstiftningsbetänkandet om förordningen om tillgång till handlingar, den s.k. öppenhetsförordningen, där det tyvärr råder blockering just nu. Med anledning av denna blockering så tycker jag att det är särskilt viktigt att vi i Ferrara-betänkandet tydligt kräver att alla EU:s institutioner och myndigheter ska tillämpa gällande förordning och rättvis praxis till fullo samt respektera de ändringar som tillkommit genom Lissabonfördraget och stadgan om de grundläggande rättigheterna.

Ett bra förslag i Ferrara-betänkandet är att EU:s institutioner ska underlätta utövandet av rätten att ta del av handlingar och främja god administrativ praxis. Detta bör göras genom en enhetlig uppsättning principer för tillgång till handlingar, vilket ska skapa större tydlighet för medborgarna. Utöver detta så kommer betänkandet även med förslaget om att skapa en förvaltningslag för EU.

En fråga som diskuterades mycket i utskottet rör regler för trepartsmöten. De är viktiga och effektiva ur lagstiftnings-synpunkt, men de kan väcka frågor kring öppenheten i lagstiftningsförfarandet. S&D-gruppen tycker att det är viktigt med större insyn i trepartsmötena för att stärka demokratin, men det är också viktigt att medlagstiftarna ges tillräckligt med utrymme för eftertanke.

Därför ställer vi oss bakom förslaget att utöka återrapporteringen till de ansvariga parlamentsutskotten om läget i trepartsförhandlingarna. Handlingar som upprättats inom ramen för trepartsmöten, exempelvis föredragningslistor, sammanfattningar, protokoll och allmänna ställningstaganden i rådet bör i den mån de finns göras offentliga.

S&D-gruppen kommer att rösta för detta betänkande i sin helhet som en klar signal om att vi i parlamentet gör vad vi kan för att öka öppenheten i EU.

Monica Macovei, în numele grupului ECR. – Domnule președinte, dreptul de acces la informații și de acces la documente este un drept fundamental într-o democrație. Fără acest drept nu există democrație, există dictatură. Oamenii au dreptul să fie informați și trebuie să fie informați despre cum li se cheltuiesc banii, despre ce se întâmplă în administrație, în legislativ, ce hotărâri luăm în Parlamentul European sau în instituțiile europene, ce politici promovăm în numele lor. Aceasta înseamnă legitimitate pentru noi și responsabilitate tot pentru noi, pentru un sistem politic democratic. De asemenea, transparența și accesul la informații umplu golul de încredere care există astăzi între cetățenii europeni și instituțiile europene. Da, sunt foarte mulți cetățeni europeni care nu mai au încredere în instituțiile europene și haideți să le dăm informații și să încercăm să umplem acest gol. Au fost colegi care mi-au spus: dar de ce să punem pe site-ul Parlamentului atât de multe informații de care oamenii nu au nevoie? Și răspunsul este: haideți să le punem și să alegă oamenii de ce informații au nevoie, nu noi să decidem de ce au ei sau nu nevoie!

Sophia in 't Veld, *on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – Mr President, I would like to congratulate the rapporteur on a job well done. I was her predecessor and I recognise much of the work we did two years ago.

A lot has been said about trust. The trust of citizens is at an all-time low and we need to get it back. At the same time, in this debate I often get the feeling that we do not trust the citizens because we are afraid to show the work that we are actually doing. I notice that, despite all the nice words, in all three institutions there is still not a culture of openness and transparency. There is a culture of secrecy and trying to disclose as little as possible. I know what I am talking about because I have carried out so many procedures trying to get access to documents and this even brought me to the Luxembourg Court twice. We should also realise that transparency is the rule. It is not a fancy liberal choice, but it is the law and we seem to forget that. Sometimes we say that we do not need to disclose this or that because we do not like it, it is awkward or we want space to think, but transparency is a legal obligation. If we do not want transparency, secrecy has to be justified specifically.

I refer to the resolution that we adopted two years ago that I had the honour of drafting. I note that the follow up to that resolution has been wafer thin. I am actually quite surprised to see that, when it comes to transparency in trialogues, we are actually taking a step back compared to the text that we adopted in 2014. So we were more inclined towards transparency in 2014 than we are in 2016 when the trust of citizens is so low.

Finally, I think there are three things that we should do which were in the previous resolution: appoint a transparency officer in all institutions, including in the Parliament, and the Presidency of this House has so far refused to do so; secondly draft an action plan; and, thirdly, we need rules for the classification of documents and a lighter procedure for challenging classification so that we do not need the Court.

Marina Albiol Guzmán, *en nombre del Grupo GUE/NGL*. – Señor Presidente, un ejemplo para que podamos valorar el grado de transparencia en la Unión Europea: aquí les muestro la declaración que nos hacen firmar para poder entrar en la sala secreta donde guardan bajo llave los documentos de la ATCI.

Nos recuerdan en esta declaración la necesidad de cumplir con las normas para la consulta de información clasificada: uno, asegurar la seguridad de los documentos clasificados; dos, bajo ninguna circunstancia, por acción u omisión, permitir que la información dada sea conocida por personas no autorizadas; tres, no reproducir los documentos clasificados o la información que contienen. Y nos recuerdan cuando firmamos esta declaración que, si no cumplimos estas normas, habrá acciones disciplinarias o incluso acciones legales.

Es decir, nos enseñan algunos documentos a cambio de que juremos silencio; silencio ante un ataque sin precedentes a nuestra democracia y nuestros derechos que se está negociando entre la Unión Europea y los Estados Unidos; silencio mientras las multinacionales redactan un acuerdo a la medida de sus intereses. Ustedes imponen silencio. Nosotros exigimos un referéndum para que el pueblo hable.

Josep-Maria Terricabras, *en nombre del Grupo Verts/ALE*. – Señor Presidente, el informe es una gran oportunidad para acercar las instituciones europeas a la ciudadanía. La transparencia debe ser una cuestión principal a nivel europeo. El Grupo Verts/ALE considera que sería adecuado tener un comisario responsable para la transparencia y el acceso público a los documentos.

Y señalo solo tres elementos importantes del informe: primero, el punto de acceso único a los portales de las instituciones europeas; segundo, la importancia de hacer público el máximo número de documentos posible a través de internet, también los documentos de acuerdos internacionales con terceros países en materia comercial o de cualquier otra índole; tercero, el registro obligatorio de los grupos de interés, que identificará los grupos de presión con influencia en la elaboración de normas europeas.

El informe insta, además, a la Comisión a hacer de Europa un referente a nivel global en materia de transparencia.

Ringrazio qui la collega Ferrara per il suo buon lavoro.

Gerard Batten, *on behalf of the EFDD Group*. – Thank you, Richard; always good to see you in the chair. The European Union talks a great deal about democracy and transparency, and so its dealings should be open to the scrutiny of the European citizens that it claims to represent.

One issue that concerns many people is TTIP – the proposed Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership trade treaty between the USA and the EU. TTIP is being negotiated in secret. MEPs have no say in those negotiations; we cannot influence their outcome. So far I have had over 20 000 e-mails from constituents concerned about TTIP, which will open up our public services and the National Health Service to US corporations. Of particular concern is the investor-state dispute settlement mechanism that would allow private companies to sue governments in tribunals should those governments try to protect their national interests. Last week, President Obama came to London, where he threatened the British public against voting to leave the European Union in the referendum on 23 June. How low has Britain sunk when a foreign leader can come to threaten us in our own capital while our prime minister looks on approvingly? It makes one want to vomit. Obama said that we should vote not to leave the EU or there will be no trade deal with the USA anytime soon, and indeed that we would have to wait at the end of the queue. He overlooked the fact that the UK is a major trading partner of the USA and yet we have no trade deal. He overlooked the fact that the USA is one of the top ten trading partners with the EU, and yet it has no trade deal with the EU. When Britain leaves the EU, precisely nothing will change regarding our trading arrangements with the USA. Obama wants Britain to remain in the EU because he wants TTIP forced through on all of us. The British people should stop deluding themselves. We do not have a special relationship with the USA; we have a servile relationship. The American political establishment is not our friend; it only cares about big business and the interests of international finance. It is in the best interests of the British people to vote to leave the European Union on 23 June and to implement that decision as quickly as possible.

Caterina Chinnici (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, grazie all'onorevole Ferrara per il lavoro svolto. L'accesso ai documenti rappresenta infatti un aspetto essenziale della trasparenza delle istituzioni europee, oltre che un diritto garantito dai trattati. Purtroppo i cittadini incontrano spesso difficoltà nell'accesso ai documenti relativi al processo legislativo dell'Unione e nella possibilità di comprendere alcuni aspetti della sua attività amministrativa e questo anche a causa della persistente mancanza di un approccio interistituzionale coordinato in materia.

Credo che la proposta di risoluzione che oggi si discute, ribadendo la necessità di maggiore trasparenza nell'attività delle istituzioni e promuovendo un modello di coerenza dei principi che regolano l'accesso ai documenti, vada nella giusta direzione. Nel periodo di crisi di legittimità che l'Europa sta attraversando, ritengo che garantire il diritto di conoscere e controllare l'attività delle sue istituzioni sia una misura necessaria per accrescere la fiducia dei cittadini e per assicurare un maggiore spazio di partecipazione democratica.

Per questo occorre che tutte le istituzioni europee si muovano in questa direzione.

Pirkko Ruohonen-Lerner (ECR). – Arvoisa puhemies, kiitos esittelijä Ferraralle hyvästä työstä. Avoimuus on tärkeää silloin, kun käsittelemme yhteisiä päätöksiä ja yhteisiä varoja. Mutta se ei yksin riitä. Julkisen tiedon täytyy olla myös helposti löydettävissä. EU:sta tietoa etsivä kansalainen, toimittaja tai vaikkapa kansalaisjärjestön edustaja ei hyödy mitään avoimuudesta, jos dokumentit ovat haudattuina hankalien hakujärjestelmien taakse. Tässä kaikilla EU-instituutioilla on varmasti parannettavaa.

Onneksi tämä huoli on huomioitu myös Ferraran mietinnössä, jossa peräänkuulutetaan muun muassa parempia käyttöliittymiä asiakirjojen löytämiseen. Avoimuudella on toki myös rajansa. TTIP-kumppanuuden kaltaisia kansainvälisiä sopimuksia neuvoteltaessa kaikki tieto ei voi olla koko ajan julkista. Se asettaisi Euroopan unionin epäedulliseen neuvotteluasemaan. Nämä ovat kuitenkin poikkeustapauksia.

Avoimuus on kaiken lähtökohta. Se on yksi tärkeimmistä keinoista kasvattaa kansalaisten luottamusta EU:ta kohtaan ja kuten kaikki tietävät, tätä luottamusta me toisesti tarvitsemme.

Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D). – Señor Presidente, Comisaria, el motivo aparente de este debate en el Pleno es el informe anual sobre el acceso a los documentos en los años 2014 y 2015. Y se han hecho aportaciones que deben ser saludadas y reconocidas, por la ponente y los ponentes alternativos, especialmente en relación con la transparencia del procedimiento legislativo y con los diálogos tripartitos, en los que las modificaciones y los documentos relevantes deben ser transparentes y, además, se debe intentar transmitir por *webstream* los debates relevantes del procedimiento legislativo.

Pero insisto en que ese es solo el motivo aparente, porque aquí se ha puesto de manifiesto una protesta, ante el peligro de que algunas instituciones europeas practiquen lo que en España decimos que es «dime de qué presumes y te diré de lo que careces». Porque no se puede permitir que se proclame la transparencia más fuerte que nunca, bajo la Carta de los Derechos Fundamentales de la Unión Europea, y sea ignorada en la práctica por algunas instituciones.

Por tanto, quiero recordar que es imprescindible que Comisión y Consejo desbloqueen de una vez la actualización de la normativa general sobre transparencia y acceso a los documentos, largamente bloqueada durante toda la pasada legislatura y todavía hoy una cuestión no resuelta.

Andrejs Mamikins (S&D). – Mr President, the process of European integration and institution-building has always been based on the ideals of participatory democracy and transparency – at least in principle. It is therefore most unbecoming for a number of EU institutions, including Parliament, that maximum public access for all unclassified documents, even nowadays, is not fully guaranteed.

In the light of this, I support the idea of incorporating the European Council, the European Central Bank, the Court of Justice, and all other EU bodies and agencies within the scope of the regulation being discussed. Transparency for documentation related to delegated texts and negotiations on international agreements is of particular importance.

The most basic reasoning for such change is quite simple. Those who, through their taxes, supply the bulk of the EU's budget deserve to know what is actually happening behind the walls of each institution. Moreover, a higher level of transparency would directly and positively affect public interest in the Union itself.

Pytania z sali

Nicola Caputo (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, generare valore aggiunto nei procedimenti amministrativi e legislativi dei singoli Stati membri e delle istituzioni europee passa, non solo per un'adeguata attività politica, ma anche e soprattutto per la implementazione dei processi democratici di condivisione. Una maggiore consapevolezza infatti nobilita sia il processo legislativo che il connesso procedimento amministrativo e rinviagisce il principio di pieno accesso ai documenti.

Quest'ultimo, pur tutelato dalla Carta dei diritti fondamentali, strenuamente difeso da costante giurisprudenza della Corte di giustizia e dei tribunali nazionali è diritto fondamentale messo a dura prova dalla mancanza di norme armonizzate sugli aspetti dell'accesso, della privacy, della corretta e tempestiva informazione dei cittadini, della classificazione dei documenti riservati, principi peraltro che sono solo apparentemente antagonisti.

In realtà la loro definizione è in costante mutamento, complice anche la velocità dei mezzi d'informazione e trasmissione dati e sfuggono ad una classificazione impedendo la formazione di un codice unico. Dello stesso si sente urgente necessità per i procedimenti di trilogia, di emendamento in Aula, del contatto con lobby e degli atti delegati che, se non pienamente condivise e accessibili, offuscano il principio di democrazia rappresentativa.

Νότης Μαρίας (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, «ξανά στο ίδιο έργο θεατές»! Συζητούμε για διαφάνεια, πρόσβαση του κοινού στα έγγραφα, όταν εμείς, ως ευρωβουλευτές, μπορούμε να έχουμε πρόσβαση στα έγγραφα της διαπραγμάτευσης TTIP υπό τον όρο υπογραφής για την εξέταση εγγράφων υψηλού βαθμού εμπιστευτικότητας. Σε ένα δωμάτιο που δεν επιτρέπεται να κρατούμε σημειώσεις ή να φωτοτυπούμε τα έγγραφα, όταν δεν μας επιτρέπεται να δημοσιοποιήσουμε το περιεχόμενο των εγγράφων της TTIP, και όλα αυτά όταν οι γερουσιαστές στις Ηνωμένες Πολιτείες δεν έχουν αυτούς τους περιορισμούς, όταν οι βοηθοί τους έχουν και αυτοί πρόσβαση στα έγγραφα της TTIP, όταν, επιπλέον, 700 εμπειρογνώμονες που δουλεύουν για τη Γερουσία των ΗΠΑ έχουν επίσης πρόσβαση στα έγγραφα της TTIP, μια συμφωνία που ο Πρόεδρος Ομπάμα ζητά να ψηφιστεί άρον-άρον. Μια σύμβαση η διαπραγμάτευση της οποίας είναι η αποθέωση της μυστικής διπλωματίας.

Για ποια διαφάνεια μιλάτε κυρία Γιουνά; Για ποια δημοκρατία μιλάει η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, όταν οι τρόικες και τα μνημόνια παραβιάζουν τα εθνικά συντάγματα, τις ευρωπαϊκές συνθήκες και ανατρέπουν δημοψηφίσματα αδιαφορώντας για τη λαϊκή κυριαρχία; Το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο, ως το μοναδικό όργανο που εκλέγεται απευθείας από τους πολίτες, έχει χρέος να πρωτοστατήσει στο δημοκρατικό αγώνα για διαφάνεια και έλεγχο των θεσμών.

António Marinho e Pinto (ALDE). – Senhor presidente, caros colegas, permitam-me em primeiro lugar uma palavra de saudação e de agradecimento ao trabalho da relatora, a nossa colega Laura Ferrara.

A transparência no funcionamento das instituições da União Europeia é fundamental para a sua credibilidade perante os cidadãos que aqui todos representamos. Essa transparência implica a facilidade de acesso aos documentos e às informações, enquanto meios para reforçar a democracia participativa. A opacidade e as dificuldades criadas na implementação da transparência política e administrativa são inimigas juradas da democracia e da vitalidade das instituições públicas. É imperioso facilitar o acesso aos documentos relacionados com o TTIP, assim como o acesso aos documentos, a todos os documentos, dos trólogos. Quem não deve, não teme, diz-se no meu país, ou seja, quem faz o que deve fazer não precisa de se esconder nem de ocultar o seu trabalho.

Ivan Jakovčić (ALDE). – Gospodine predsjedniče, nisam zamjenik, ja sam zastupnik, ali hvala Vam na tome što pokušavati uvijek biti tako prisutan i prijazan prema zastupnicima.

Ono što želim naglasiti je svakako podrška koju želim dati gospođi Ferrari na ovom izvještaju zato što je zaista njen cilj približiti europske institucije građanima. Približiti europske institucije i sve ono što mi činimo, naš rad ovdje u Parlamentu, ali i u drugim institucijama Europske unije i to je zaista najbolji i jedini mogući ispravan način kako ponovno postići povjerenje naših sugrađana jer, stavimo ruku na srce, danas ideja Europe ipak ima ozbiljnih problema, a jedan od razloga je naš birokratizirani sustav.

Ono što želim na kraju predložiti je: maknimo iz našeg rječnika riječ *transparentnost*, stavimo u naš rječnik riječ *otvorenost*. To je po meni pravi izraz. Otvorenost naših institucija prema građanima i mogućnost da dođu do svih onih informacija koje su im potrebne.

Κώστας Χρυσόγονος (GUE/NGL). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η πρόσβαση των πολιτών στα έγγραφα που έχουν στη διάθεσή τους τα ευρωπαϊκά όργανα είναι θεμελιώδους σημασίας. Η εμπιστευτικότητα των εγγράφων θα έπρεπε να είναι η εξαίρεση και όχι ο κανόνας. Αυτό συνάγεται τόσο από τις διατάξεις του σχετικού κανονισμού, όσο και από την περιοριστική ερμηνεία που έχει δώσει το Δικαστήριο της Ένωσης στις εξαιρέσεις που προβλέπονται σε αυτόν. Εντούτοις, παρατηρούμε πολύ συχνά το φαινόμενο τα ευρωπαϊκά όργανα να αρνούνται στους πολίτες την πρόσβαση σε έγγραφά τους, καταστρατηγώντας την αρχή της ελεύθερης πρόσβασης.

Χαρακτηριστικό παράδειγμα αποτελεί η διατλαντική συμφωνία TTIP, καθώς ελάχιστες πληροφορίες έχουν δει το φως της δημοσιότητας, λόγω του απόρρητου χαρακτήρα των σχετικών εγγράφων. Οι ευρωπαίοι θεσμοί πρέπει να στραφούν άμεσα προς μια κοινή πολιτική ανοιχτής πρόσβασης στα έγγραφα, ώστε να ενισχυθεί η συμμετοχική δημοκρατία, η διαφάνεια και η λογοδοσία απέναντι στους πολίτες.

Kateřina Konečná (GUE/NGL). – Paní zpravodajko, děkuji vám za velmi povedenou zprávu. Chápu, že jste při jejím sepisování musela být diplomatická, a tak jste Komisi a Radu kritizovala jen jemně. Ale možná jste byla až příliš jemná.

Osobně se domnívám, že Evropský parlament dělá na poli transparentnosti velký kus práce. Netvrdím, že není prostor pro zlepšení, ale zcela souhlasím s kritikou za netransparentnost, kterou organizace DiEM 25 adresuje primárně Radě a Komisi. Vždyť kolikrát ani poslanci EP nemají lehké se k určitým materiálům dostat. Vezměme si například dnes již několikrát zmiňované podklady ke smlouvě TTIP. Teď nás čeká další bitva. Budeme od Komise žádat podklady pro vyšetřovací výbor EMIS a doufám, že Komise bude spolupracovat ochotně, ale nedokážu zakrýt své obavy.

Rozhodně bych se chtěla připojit k požadavku na Komisi, aby bez dalšího prodlení předložila svůj návrh centrálního povinného rejstříku lobbistů platného pro všechny orgány a instituce Evropské unie. Například u vyjednávání smlouvy TTIP byli lobbisté přítomni ve větší míře než neziskové organizace.

João Pimenta Lopes (GUE/NGL). – Senhor Presidente, o princípio da transparência, que deveria pautar o acesso público aos documentos das instituições europeias, é mais um daqueles princípios que apenas procuram embelezar o edifício regulamentar da União Europeia.

Assim se percebe o sistemático secretismo em que são celebrados acordos de livre comércio como o TTIP, o CETA, o TISA, sem que seja possível aceder aos conteúdos dos avanços dos processos negociais.

Assim se percebe que o acesso à documentação a escândalos como o Luxleaks tenha sido sistematicamente limitado ao público como os deputados deste Parlamento.

Assim se percebe que estruturas como o BCE, que, é bom lembrar, não são eleitas, se posicionem acima de qualquer escrutínio ou controlo democrático, recusando a disponibilização de documentação e a prestação de esclarecimentos sobre matérias relacionadas com a supervisão bancária, mesmo a deputados deste Parlamento, como sucedeu esta semana em Portugal. A prática demonstra que a transparência mais não é que um vidro fosco bem opaco no que a questões essenciais diz respeito.

(Koniec pytań z sali)

Věra Jourová, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, honourable Members, thank you for all your comments and your support for transparency which we fully share. It is not by chance that our two institutions are organising a joint event on transparency on 2 May, which will contribute to the public consultation for setting the transparency register and reach out to interested parties in Brussels and beyond. As I explained, the revision of Regulation 1049/2001 is pending before the co-legislators and the Commission stands ready to help Council and Parliament find common ground. Irrespective of this process, the current handling of requests under this regulation is fully compatible with Articles 41 and 42 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights. At the same time, the Commission is bound to observe the case law of the EU courts with regard to documents relating to infringement investigations against Member States.

The Commission looks forward to working with the European Parliament, the Council, the Ombudsman, the European Data Protection Supervisor, civil society organisations and all concerned stakeholders on shaping the future transparency regime. The Commission considers that in the areas where the EU is responsible for administration, the latter is governed by an extensive framework of rules, principles and practices. In that spirit, the Commission remains to be convinced about the opportunity of specific legislation providing for a horizontal framework of an EU administrative law at this stage.

Laura Ferrara, *relatrice*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, ringrazio la Commissione, ringrazio i colleghi intervenuti per il loro sostegno e ringrazio ancora una volta i relatori ombra. La trasparenza si pone come obiettivo ultimo da raggiungere e al tempo stesso come strumento per colmare le distanze tra i cittadini e le istituzioni europee, per coinvolgere maggiormente i cittadini, in virtù del principio di democrazia partecipativa, e per accrescere quella fiducia che – ripeto – oggi sembra vacillare nei confronti dell'Unione europea.

Mi è dispiaciuto sentir dire, talvolta in occasione di alcune discussioni con i colleghi, che i cittadini non sono interessati a determinati tipi di documenti o che non li comprendono. Bene, è possibile anche che determinate informazioni non vengano comprese o che suscitino poco interesse. In effetti, interfacciandomi con i cittadini, molte cose non vengono comprese a causa anche della terminologia tecnica o della vastità di informazioni e quindi della difficoltà nell'orientarsi tra tutto ciò che viene messo a disposizione.

Allora la sfida che si prospetta per il Parlamento europeo, ma anche per la Commissione e per il Consiglio, è proprio il maggiore coinvolgimento, rendendo le informazioni più fruibili ai cittadini, garantendo il diritto all'informazione, lasciando decidere ai cittadini cosa possa suscitare il loro interesse e cosa invece non riscuota la loro attenzione. Rendere le informazioni fruibili e maggiormente accessibili: le difficoltà ancora si incontrano nell'orientarsi sui diversi siti delle tre istituzioni europee, per cui l'appello ancora una volta, è quello di creare un punto unico di accesso in modo tale da facilitare il diritto all'informazione.

Punti nodali poi sono i negoziati internazionali, come il TTIP. Ciò che indispettisce maggiormente i cittadini, prima ancora del contenuto, è la segretezza di questi negoziati, l'influenza dei lobbisti e i negoziati tra le istituzioni europee, i cosiddetti triloghi, su cui ancora vige l'oscurità. Mi auguro che, a partire da questa relazione del Parlamento europeo e facendo tesoro anche delle relazioni presentate negli anni passati, si vada sempre più nella direzione di garantire una maggiore trasparenza.

Przewodniczący. – Zamykam debatę.

Głosowanie odbędzie się w czwartek 28 kwietnia 2016 r.

Oświadczenia pisemne (art. 162)

Indrek Tarand (Verts/ALE), in writing. – Access to documents is a necessity for transparency and democratic accountability. The recent rise of Euroscepticism means we need to strengthen our citizens' trust in the European administration now more than ever. Furthermore, transparency acts as a deterrent to corruption and other questionable behaviour.

While the 'revolving door' remains a problem, only current members of the administration are within our remit. Yet it would still be a move forward if officials had to declare their meetings with people who now serve the private sector but remain in orbit around the institutions. An example of this would be Siim Kallas. Although, as a former Commissioner, Kallas has a duty to refrain from lobbying the Commission and/or its departments on behalf of Nortal, he has, in his position as Commissioner Dombrovskis' special advisor, unfettered access to the Commission while being on the payroll of a software company on whose behalf he theoretically cannot lobby.

We need even tougher transparency rules to prevent this kind of behaviour, which clearly erodes public confidence and trust in the EU. It is regrettable that current transparency rules are not fully complied with and that the Commission is not making progress towards adopting an instrument which would allow for more transparency.

20. Beskyttelse af barnets tarv (på tværs af grænser) i Europa (forhandling)

Przewodniczący. – Kolejnym punktem porządku dnia jest debata nad:

— pytaniem wymagającym odpowiedzi ustnej skierowanym do Rady przez Pavla Svobodę w imieniu Komisji Prawnej i Cecilję Wikström w imieniu Komisji Petycji w sprawie transgranicznej ochrony dobra dziecka w Europie (000027/2016 — B8-0359/2016) (2016/2665(RSP)).

— pytaniem wymagającym odpowiedzi ustnej skierowanym do Komisji przez Pavla Svobodę w imieniu Komisji Prawnej i Cecilję Wikström w imieniu Komisji Petycji w sprawie transgranicznej ochrony dobra dziecka w Europie (000028/2016 — B8-0360/2016) (2016/2665(RSP)).

Pavel Svoboda, author. – Mr President, the Brussels IIa Regulation has undoubtedly been a successful Union instrument that has benefited EU citizens through the creation of a wide-ranging scheme of jurisdictional recognition and enforcement rules in matrimonial and parental responsibility cases.

That being said, we are all aware of its shortcomings when it comes to child abduction cases. In this respect it appears that the regulation has been overtaken by events – that is to say, the growing number of transnational family dissolution proceedings, which has been aggravated by the increasing divergences between the legal rules applicable to family dissolutions.

On top of this, family law, which is a competence of the Member States, has been fragmented into different types of family models: marriage; registered partnership; simple cohabitation. As a result, it appears that society has moved on, and that the regulation has been left behind. Members of the European Parliament are confronted with the shortcomings of Brussels IIa on a regular basis, not only in the Committee on Petitions, but also in correspondence and contacts with citizens who are at the end of their tether.

We are all aware that the law is a blunt instrument when it comes to family questions, that judges and lawyers are not necessarily the persons best equipped to deal with such questions and that the courts are not necessarily the best or most cost-effective forum. We need to reflect on this and try to identify ways to help our citizens in these painful moments of their lives, while safeguarding and promoting the best interests of the child.

The continuing success of the regulation will depend on its successful and targeted revision. Now that the main areas of complexity and malfunction have been identified, it is a high time that appropriate action is taken to tackle the last remaining insufficiencies.

Cecilia Wikström, *author*. – Mr President, I would like to thank my colleagues, both in my committee, the Committee on Petitions, and in the Committee on Legal Affairs, for their cooperation on this issue. It is our aim in my committee to improve our cooperation with the legislative committees to ensure that the citizens' concerns and experiences are better taken into consideration in the legislative process. In addition to the testimonies of the direct experiences and problems related to EU law, the petitions that we receive also have an important role in helping to identify problems with the national implementation of EU law in the Member States. This is important when we discuss how best to protect the best interest of children across borders in Europe.

In connection with the upcoming review of the Brussels IIA Regulation and also in light of the increasing number of petitions addressed to Parliament, I am happy that this debate is taking place here tonight. It is an issue of great importance because our committee has received a large number of petitions related to children's welfare issues and their treatment by either judicial or administrative bodies in the Member States. This is definitely a testimony for more cooperation in family matters with trans-border aspects. There is not only an urgent need to review the legal instruments, but also to try to find a way to avoid the harmful situations described in the petitions that we have received.

We have ensured freedom of movement, but it is also our duty to take into deep consideration the consequences that citizens from different nationalities meet and decide to build a family, but as we know, couples can face problems and finally separate. That is why we must make all possible efforts to put instruments in place to handle the situation in the best way possible and, above all, with the best interests of the child as the paramount objective in all decisions. These two oral questions tonight have been raised in order to draw attention to the concrete problems that citizens are facing.

Finally, on a more personal note, I am happy to see that my dear colleague, Jeanine Hennis-Plasschaert, is here representing the Council tonight. I am sure that you will provide us, as always, with clear and fruitful answers to the question raised, and the same goes, of course, for Commissioner Věra Jourová. Thank you very much for your deep consideration on these important matters.

Jeanine Hennis-Plasschaert, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Mr President, Madam Commissioner, honourable Members, many thanks to Cecilia Wikström for the very kind words. I would like to recall the importance the Presidency attaches to the work on civil law, in particular on family matters and e-Justice solutions, and I take this opportunity to thank the Chairs of the Committee on Legal Affairs and the Committee on Petitions, Svoboda Pavel, and of course my former colleague Cecilia Wikström. I thank them for coming with these questions and ideas to complement the EU message already in place to protect the best interests of the child in cross-border situations.

On adoption: as you know the issue of adoption of children is a matter which is not regulated at EU level but by national laws and by some international conventions, particularly the Hague Convention of 1993, to which all EU Member States are parties. This Convention aims at protecting adopted children in their countries, if possible by offering them a home in those countries. It provides for cooperation between the authorities of the different States. The Council may adopt measures concerning family law with cross-border implications following Article 81.3 of the Treaty, including in the field of adoption – but only on the basis of a proposal from the Commission.

On welfare and child poverty: concerning the issue of the welfare of children, I would like to say a few words on the fight against poverty, which is a complex reality affecting many children unfortunately. The fight against poverty is one of the objectives of the Europe 2020 strategy and it is also one of the Presidency's priorities. Working closely with the Social Protection Committee, the Presidency has therefore tabled Council Conclusions on an integrated approach for combating poverty and social inclusion. In this document, which is to be adopted in June, the Council encourages Member States to address child poverty and promote children's wellbeing through integrated strategies in accordance with the Commission recommendation 'Investing in children'. The Council also invites Member States to intensify the exchange of knowledge, experiences and best practices in this field. Let me mention in particular the Roma children because, yes, we must also continue to address other longstanding challenges in addition to the situation faced by Roma children, and I thank the European Parliament for keeping this issue on the EU agenda, including on International Roma Day earlier this month, on 8 April to be precise.

As regards mediation, the EU has put in place the 2008 Mediation Directive, which aims at facilitating access to alternative dispute resolution. It promotes the amicable settlement of disputes by encouraging the use of mediation and by ensuring a balanced relationship between mediation and judicial proceedings. Moreover, the Brussels IIa Regulation foresees mediation as one of the functions of cooperation between central authorities in matters of parental responsibility. There is common understanding in Council that the revision of Brussels IIa is a topic of great importance and, to be honest, it is about time.

On e-Justice, on improving access to information in the justice field: you know that the e-Justice Portal was launched in 2010 in collaboration with the Commission and the Member States. The Council's Second Action Plan on e-Justice stresses that information relating to minors should be included in the e-Justice Portal. A specific expert group is now examining the ways to expand information on minors already available on the Portal, and your specific question relating to adoption procedures could indeed be considered in this context.

In closing, I wish to say that the Council awaits with great interest the Commission proposal amending the Brussels IIa Regulation, as this is the cornerstone of EU judicial cooperation in matrimonial matters and matters of parental responsibility.

Věra Jourová, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, I would like to thank the Committee on Legal Affairs (JURI) and the Committee on Petitions (PETI) for organising this debate which I very much welcome. As has been said several times already, the Brussels IIa Regulation is an extremely important piece of legislation for many families in Europe. It has been applied for ten years and has proved to be very useful, but the time has come to review it. The Commission intends to come forward with a proposal late June this year.

Our assessment is that the Brussels IIa Regulation works overall well with regard to matrimonial matters. We do not envisage, at this stage, the need to revise it in this respect. On the other hand, there is clear evidence for the urgent need to revise the regulation as regards parental responsibility aspects. Parliament, better than anyone, is aware of numerous cross-border cases in which the judicial cooperation based on this regulation is not fast enough, to say the least. Children end up being hostage of lengthy legal disputes. The mechanisms put in place by the Brussels IIa Regulation have helped in determining parental responsibility or settling child abduction cases, but we have to take additional steps.

I intend to further clarify the rules on parental responsibility, to improve the enforcement of judicial decisions, to speed up the procedures and make sure that the best interests of the child are of primary consideration and effectively protected. More concretely we are considering measures on the following aspects. Firstly, to speed up the return procedure. There are still far too many child abduction cases in which parents with an enforceable return order are stuck in lengthy proceedings. Abducted children must be returned swiftly as passing of time can have irreversible consequences for the relationship with their parents. Evidence shows that in those Member States with specialised courts the return procedure can be much smoother and quicker.

Secondly, to see whether the existing *exequatur* procedure is still needed and to define the grounds for refusal of the enforcement of judgements. It is unacceptable that currently a parent can be left without any possibility to see his or her child for years due to delays in the enforcement of judgments.

Thirdly, to increase judicial cooperation and mutual trust between Member States, for example when it comes to the specificity of family proceedings.

Fourthly, to smoothen the differences in national rules governing the hearing of the child. Too often these rules are invoked to refuse a judgement from another Member State. I am convinced that while acknowledging different legal traditions we can – and must – do better to respect the child's right to be heard. Finally, to improve the cooperation between national authorities with responsibility for child protection or parental responsibility matters. We need a strong network of these authorities to help parents in enforcing their parental rights abroad.

Besides these key changes to the Brussels IIa Regulation, we will also continue our awareness raising activities, targeting also child welfare and consular authorities. This is duly reflected in our funding priorities and calls for proposals.

To conclude, let me refer to the aspects related to adoptions. The Brussels IIa Regulation does not cover these aspects. The functioning of child protection and welfare services is governed by national law. The Commission has thoroughly examined the numerous petitions concerning adoptions without parental consent that you have recently received. None of them fall into the remit of EU law. However, the Commission is contributing to the elaboration of a common understanding of how the rights of the child can best be protected and promoted. For instance, let me point to the Ten Principles on integrated child protection systems, which were debated in the last European Forum on the Rights of the Child and which are also mentioned in your draft resolution.

We will continue to support Member States in implementing a child rights-based approach and I know that you also, through dialogue and awareness raising, can have a real impact on improving the situation on this very important matter. I am looking forward to our close cooperation on these files, in the best interest of children and for the benefit of families in Europe.

Roberta Metsola, *fisem il-grupp PPE*. – Bhalissa qeghdin nghixu fi żmien fejn aktar u aktar familji jikkonsistu minn nies li twieldu f'pajjizi differenti. Fl-Unjoni Ewropea qed nitkellmu fuq mijiet ta' eluf ta' familji bhal dawn, li ghandhom jinghataw appoġġ anke meta r-relazzjonijiet taghhom jintemmu.

Dawn il-familji jaraw il-Kumitat tal-Petizzjonijiet bhala opportunità biex isemmghu lehinhom. Ghalhekk nixtieq ninghaqad ma' Cecilia biex nenfasizza r-rwol importanti li ghandu l-Kumitat tal-Petizzjonijiet fuq id-drittijiet tat-tfal.

Bhalma qalu l-Kummissarju u l-Ministru, m'ghandna qatt naghtu tamiet foloz li ahna nistghu nindirizzaw kull problema li tiġi quddiemna. Ma ninsewx li fil-maġġorparti taghha din hija kompetenza tal-Istati Membri, u mhux tal-Unjoni Ewropea. Però hemm numru ta' każijiet bejn il-fruntieri li iva, hemmhekk ahna nistghu naghmlu aktar sabiex niżguraw li, fost oħrajn, d-drittijiet tat-tfal jiġu msahha u protetti. Dan l-ghan ghandu jkun fil-quċcata tal-hidmiet politiċi taghna.

U ghalhekk, minn inizjattiva personali tiegħi u ta' numru ta' kollegi oħra, ridna nifthuha għal kemm jista' jkun Membri possibbli. Ahna lkoll inghaqadna flimkien sabiex nistaqsu lill-Kunsill u lill-Kummissjoni fuq il-hidma li qed issir f'dan il-qasam.

Ghalhekk ukoll, bhala Kumitat tal-Petizzjonijiet, poġġejna bilqiegħda sabiex nipprezentaw riżoluzzjoni mill-Gruppi kollha fuq numru ta' punti dwar il-harsien tat-tfal fl-Ewropa. Dan hu mezz iehor fejn il-Kumitat qed jagħti vuċi lil dawk li ssottomettew petizzjonijiet lill-Parlament Ewropew.

Jiena nappella, u nikkonkludi Sur President, lill-Membri kollha ta' din il-Kamra sabiex innēhhu l-kappell politiku taghna u nidhlu fir-realtà li ghandna quddiemna. Fejn jidhlu t-tfal m'hemmx kompromessi. Il-prijorità ewlenija taghna ghandha tkun li niproteġu l-ahjar interess tat-tfal.

Josef Weidenholzer, *im Namen der S&D-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin! Es ist wichtig, dass die aus dem Jahr 2003 stammende Brüssel-II-Verordnung endlich überarbeitet wird, vor allem auch, weil sie auf die Beziehung zwischen zwei Staaten abzielt, und das ist oft zu wenig. Grenzüberschreitende Fälle lassen sich eben nicht nur auf zwei Staaten beschränken, sondern können oft auch mehrere Staaten umfassen. Dadurch entstehen viele juristische Probleme. Ich habe zum Beispiel einen Fall, wo sich eine Ungarin, die in Belgien gearbeitet hat, von einem Franzosen getrennt hat und der Sorgerechtsstreit nun in Belgien ausgetragen wird, obwohl niemand mehr in Belgien lebt. Solche Fälle, in denen mehr als zwei Staaten involviert sind, gibt es viele. Und die Überarbeitung der Verordnung muss das im Besonderen berücksichtigen.

Bei rechtlicher Unklarheit und langer Verfahrensdauer sind es meistens die Kinder, die daran leiden. Aus Erfahrung weiß ich, dass in den meisten Verfahren das Wohl des Kindes zu kurz kommt.

Eine ganz wesentliche Forderung ist daher, dass die Kinderrechte in der Verordnung so gestärkt werden, dass Kinder auch getrennt von ihren Eltern befragt werden können und dass die Verfahrensdauer möglichst kurz ist. Jedes Kind hat ein Recht darauf, dass der Gesetzgeber eindeutige, klare Gesetze erarbeitet, die dann auch klar sicherstellen können, was die Zukunft eines Kindes bedeutet. Das ist in diesem Zusammenhang meistens sehr entscheidend für den weiteren Verlauf des Lebens.

Rikke Karlsson, *for ECR-Gruppen*. – Hr. formand! Mennesker mødes i Europa, og når mennesker mødes, så bliver de ofte forelskede, de får ofte børn, og det er alt sammen smukt og dejligt. Men det er også et faktum, at lykken i mange tilfælde ikke varer evigt. Man beslutter sig for at forlade hinanden igen og dele børnene, og under denne proces opstår der ofte lidt mere knas i maskineriet. Hvis forældrene ydermere kommer fra hvert sit land, så bliver løsningerne på problemerne ofte langt mere komplekse. I udvalget for borgerklager ser vi desværre alt for ofte sager, hvor de enkelte medlemsstaters domstole er uenige om vurderingen af disse sager, og noget tyder på, at de enkelte medlemsstaters domstole i mange tilfælde varetager deres egne borgeres interesser. Her bliver børnene taget som gidsler i et åbenlyst tovtækkeri imellem to landes forskellige interesser. Dette forslag handler ikke om at tvinge landene til noget som helst. Det er et forsøg på at lave nogle ordentlige aftaler landene imellem, som kan sikre, at børn af forældre af forskellig nationalitet får en fair behandling, og det må være i alles interesse.

António Marinho e Pinto, *em nome do Grupo ALDE*. – Este debate alerta para os problemas concretos enfrentados pelos cidadãos da União Europeia em matéria de direitos das crianças, que envolvem jurisdição de dois ou mais Estados-Membros.

O aumento da mobilidade dentro da União acarreta, inevitavelmente, um aumento de litígios transfronteiriços envolvendo crianças. Torna-se assim urgente intensificar a cooperação judiciária entre os Estados-Membros ao nível da formação e do intercâmbio de boas práticas entre os serviços sociais e os tribunais, relativamente aos casos transfronteiriços de adoção, de raptos de crianças e, em geral, de regulação da parentalidade.

Dada a particular sensibilidade e alarme social de tais casos, devem as autoridades da União incentivar os Estados-Membros a criar tribunais especializados com competência exclusiva sobre tais situações. Este é um domínio onde não pode haver hesitações ou tergiversações, pois o que está em causa é o superior interesse da criança. A questão não é impor uma visão única para lidar com os conflitos familiares e com o bem-estar das crianças, mas sim transformar o território da União num espaço de livre circulação de pessoas e não só de bens, de serviços e de capitais.

Κωνσταντίνα Κούνεβα, *εξ ονόματος της ομάδας GUE/NGL*. – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, κάτι σάπιο υπάρχει στο βασίλειο της Δανίας, γύρω από την προστασία των παιδιών. Οι καταγγελίες στην Επιτροπή Αναφορών για την προστασία των συμφερόντων των παιδιών, στο Ηνωμένο Βασίλειο, στη Δανία, στη Γερμανία, μοιάζουν με καταιγίδα, είτε αφορούν τις κοινωνικές υπηρεσίες ανήλικων, είτε τις υιοθεσίες ή τις αναδοχές παιδιών, τις επιμέλειες και τα δικαιώματα επισκέψεων σε γονείς που έχουν κατηγορηθεί ακόμη και για σεξουαλική κακοποίηση, και είναι καταγγελίες που μας σοκάρουν.

Πολλές αναφορές αγγίζουν την κρίση της οικογένειας στο Βορρά, ενώ αδυνατούμε να απαντήσουμε τι έγιναν οι 10.000 ασυνόδευτοι ανήλικοι πρόσφυγες που στη συνέχεια χάθηκαν, όπως μας καταγγέλλει η Europol. Σας ζητώ να δεσμευτούμε σε μια ολόπλευρη υποστήριξη των δικαιωμάτων των παιδιών, με αποφάσεις που δεν αφορούν μόνο την κρίση της οικογένειας, αλλά και την ανθρωπιστική κρίση η οποία μαστίζει τον Νότο και την προσφυγιά. Κι αυτό δεν είναι πολιτική, είναι ηθική υποχρέωσή μας.

Tatjana Ždanoka, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Mr President, I would like to thank Minister Hennis-Plasschaert, a former colleague, and Commissioner Jourová for their statements. I hope the Council and Commission will take on board our resolution, which was prepared just from studying the desperate calls for help addressed to our Committee on Petitions.

It is evident that, following the significant level of movement of workers between Member States and the increasing number of mixed couples, the number of cross-border child protection issues involving custody removal is growing as well. I will give only one number, showing how real this problem is for my country, Latvia. During only the first two months of this year, eleven children were removed from the families of Latvian citizens working in Britain and placed in British care families. Cross-border mechanisms are to be put in place when it involves determining the custody of children. We need to input the receiving state's duty to inform the consular authorities of the state of which the child is a national. A clear, urgent, detailed and developed definition of the term 'habitual residence of the child' in the revised Brussels IIa regulation is needed.

(The speaker agreed to take a blue-card question under Rule 162(8))

Tomáš Zdechovský (PPE), *otázka položená zvednutím modré karty*. – Vážená paní poslankyně, zmínila jste tady případ, že vašim občanům byly odebrány děti v členské zemi, a tou je Velká Británie. Ale vašim občanům jsou stále více odebrány děti také v nečlenské zemi Evropské unie, a tou je Norsko. Myslíte si, že Evropská unie dostatečně hájí zájmy občanů a dětí Evropské unie, které jsou odebrány mimo členské státy Evropské unie?

Tatjana Ždanoka (Verts/ALE), *blue-card question*. – Also, Norway is not an EU Member State. We as the Committee of Petitions were hearing these cases in Nordic councils just last week. They are also giving a lot of attention to this – alongside the Swedish, Finnish and Danish cases, also the Norwegian situation. But the United Kingdom is only one state where adoption without consent is working, and that is the biggest problem now for EU Member States.

Eleonora Evi, *a nome del gruppo EFDD*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, è fondamentale migliorare la cooperazione giudiziaria tra Stati membri nei casi transfrontalieri che coinvolgono i minori. Dobbiamo garantire il riconoscimento e il rispetto delle sentenze tra i diversi Stati membri e il loro monitoraggio nel tempo per garantire, ad esempio, i diritti di visita dei genitori e che vengano rispettati o ancora l'introduzione di norme minime per l'audizione dei minori nei procedimenti civili nazionali e la formazione degli operatori giuridici e sociali.

Non posso non menzionare, tra le decine di petizioni ricevute, quelle che riguardano e segnalano i casi di abusi dello *Jugendamt* tedesco. In un caso recentissimo si parla addirittura di estorsione ai danni della madre di due figli da parte del padre tedesco! Chiaramente, queste sono cose inaccettabili. Il concetto di interesse superiore del bambino rimane un concetto vago, che si applica in base a valutazioni troppo spesso superficiali, se non addirittura strumentali.

Questa Europa, così impeccabile e rigorosa nell'applicare le regole a tutela del mercato e della concorrenza, delle banche e della finanza, crolla miseramente quando si tratta di tutelare i diritti delle persone e dei bambini.

PRESIDE: RAMÓN LUIS VALCÁRCEL SISO

Vicepresidente

Gilles Lebreton, *au nom du groupe ENF*. – Monsieur le Président, les questions posées par le Parlement européen soulèvent, à mes yeux, deux difficultés.

Primo, je suis hostile à la reconnaissance automatique des adoptions faites dans d'autres États membres. En effet, une telle reconnaissance automatique s'étendrait fatalement, d'une part, aux adoptions faites par des couples de même sexe et, d'autre part, aux adoptions pratiquées sur les enfants issus d'une gestation pour autrui (GPA). Or, je n'admets ni les GPA ni les adoptions par des couples de même sexe.

Secundo, je me méfie du concept de l'intérêt supérieur de l'enfant, qui est instrumentalisé pour déconstruire la famille traditionnelle.

De même que le «vivre ensemble» vise à légitimer le communautarisme, l'intérêt supérieur de l'enfant vise à arracher l'enfant à son substrat naturel.

Or, j'ai la conviction que le véritable intérêt de l'enfant est de grandir au sein d'une famille composée d'un père et d'une mère.

Julia Pitera (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Każdego roku do Komisji Petycji wpływa wiele skarg w sprawach dzieci. Skala problemu nakazuje pilne dostarczenie narzędzi do rozwiązywania spraw o zasięgu transgranicznym, a zidentyfikowane problemy dotyczą wielu obszarów. Jednym z nich jest niedostateczne wdrażanie rozporządzenia Bruksela 2, innym – brak koordynacji przekazywania informacji dotyczących ochrony dzieci między państwami członkowskimi w sprawach transgranicznych. Zdarzają się też skargi na nieuwzględnianie i niewykonywanie orzeczeń sądowych w innym państwie członkowskim.

Zbudowany system musi działać wielokierunkowo, musi sięgać po różne narzędzia. Z polskich doświadczeń wiem, że wiele problemów wynika na przykład z trudnego dostępu do informacji oraz pomocy prawnej. Dlatego trzeba stworzyć system finansowania i wspierania organizacji służących informacją i pomocą w sprawach rodzinnych. Ważnym elementem tego systemu byłby jednolity europejski numer interwencyjny. Jak najszybciej powinien powstać prosty i powszechnie dostępny przewodnik po systemach funkcjonujących w poszczególnych państwach członkowskich i przysługujących prawach. Wiele konfliktów przecież ma swoje źródło w nieznanomości systemów i przepisów prawa. Te, ale jeszcze inne działania powinny zostać pilnie podjęte, jeśli deklaracje polityków, że dobro dziecka jest sprawą nadrzędną, nie są wyłącznie w sferze haseł.

Edouard Martin (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Ministre, Madame la Commissaire, vous êtes, j'en suis sûr, convaincus du bien-fondé de l'Europe. L'Europe, où tout circule librement: les biens, les personnes, les capitaux et... l'amour. Eh oui, l'amour!

Erasmus, c'est aussi l'Europe de l'amour, celle qui a permis à plus deux millions d'étudiants de découvrir un nouveau pays et qui, si j'en crois une étude de la Commission, aurait contribué à la naissance d'environ un million de bébés Erasmus. Rien que pour ça, je veux dire «vive l'Europe, vive l'amour»!

Mais voyez-vous, parfois, l'amour ne dure qu'un temps, et parfois les parents se déchirent autour du lieu de vie de l'enfant, chaque partie plaidant évidemment pour l'intérêt supérieur de l'enfant.

L'Europe, ce n'est pas que l'amour, hélas! Ce sont aussi les problèmes sociaux, les accidents de la vie qui frappent les familles, et notamment les plus fragiles. Là aussi, nous nous heurtons à la force des lois nationales, à une justice qui ne coopère pas toujours avec les pays tiers lorsqu'il s'agit de familles étrangères. Toutes ces situations provoquent la souffrance des familles et, surtout, celle des enfants.

Bien sûr, personne ne prétend que les différentes décisions prises ici ou là vont à l'encontre de l'enfant, mais on peut se tromper en toute bonne foi. Partant du principe qu'il y en a plus dans plusieurs têtes que dans une seule, nous devons tout faire pour que les États membres collaborent et coopèrent en étudiant les meilleures possibilités, toutes les possibilités, sans tabou ni parti pris.

C'est le sens de cette résolution, qui se veut humble et ne prétend pas être la clé absolue de tous les problèmes rencontrés en Europe, mais qui veut envoyer un message clair à la Commission, au Conseil et aux États membres: pas de frontières pour les droits de l'enfant!

Jana Žitňanská (ECR) – Napriek tomu, že vo všeobecnosti platí, že pre dieťa je najlepšie vyrastať v biologickej rodine, nie je to vždy tak. Deti zažívajú násilie, zneužívanie, sú zanedbávané a vtedy je dôležité, aby kompetentné sociálne úrady zasiahli. V krajinách Európskej únie sa však často stávajú prípady, keď sú deti rodičom odobraté, hoci k skutočnému zlyhaniu nedošlo a s trochou pomoci by tieto rodiny mohli byť funkčné. Namiesto toho, aby bola daná možnosť najbližšej rodine sa o deti postarať, tieto putujú do pestúnskej starostlivosti, inštitúcií, sú dané na adopciu cudzím ľuďom, pričom je im znemožnené udržiavať kontakt so svojimi rodičmi a súrodencami. Keďže platí, že nie každému pestúnovi ide v prvom rade o šťastie dieťaťa, ale mnohých zaujímajú viacej finančné benefity, ktoré s nimi prichádzajú, je ťažké tu hovoriť o riešení v záujme dieťaťa. Víтам preto túto rezolúciu, ktorá má za cieľ zabezpečiť najlepší záujem detí v krajinách Európskej únie nielen v prípadoch násilného odoberania a adopcie, ale aj pri rozvodoch zmiešaných manželských párov. Posilnenie odbornosti sociálnych pracovníkov, poskytnutie tlmočníkov a právnych poradcov, lepšie využívanie mediátorov, ako aj lepšia spolupráca medzi členskými krajinami môže skutočne priniesť to, po čom voláme v tejto rezolúcii – zohľadňovanie najlepšieho záujmu dieťaťa.

Mireille D'Ornano (ENF). – Monsieur le Président, voici aujourd'hui un exemple de manipulation pernicieuse du droit: les droits de l'enfant et la question transfrontalière.

Sous prétexte qu'il existerait des situations, que je reconnais complexes, de reconnaissance et d'adoption d'enfants, dans ce contexte particulier, l'Union européenne s'arroge le droit de décider pour les États.

Je dirai non trois fois: non, l'Union n'a pas à traiter des questions qui relèvent du droit de la famille; non, l'Union européenne n'est pas la seule gardienne des droits, surtout quand on se permet ici de juger des problèmes nationaux au regard de la charte européenne des droits fondamentaux, alors qu'il n'y a pas de violation manifeste de ses principes, mais seulement une tension juridique entre États; non, l'intérêt supérieur de l'enfant n'est pas d'ouvrir la porte, comme certains entendent le faire ici, à des recommandations européennes favorables à la reconnaissance et à l'autorisation de techniques médicales de procréation douteuses et à la destruction de notre modèle familial naturel.

Nous veillons, et nous ne lâcherons rien.

Mairead McGuinness (PPE). – Mr President, after that last intervention, let me just bring the debate back to its core this evening, which is about children in cross-border situations. I have to say, even though it is rather late in the evening, I have been very impressed by the contributions from Council and Commission. Very often you get criticised, but I thought you were very honest and open on this very sensitive issue.

In my role as children's rights mediator on this issue in Parliament and in the Committee on Petitions we come across the saddest of cases, and we try in my office to bring about mediation. We do it very rarely, because usually people come to us at the very end stage, and I would appeal to the Commission – and you have mentioned mediation – to do as many Member States are trying to do: bring mediation in early, so that it can fix problems without that tension and adversarial system that is the courts. I think if Member States do that and we look at it at a European level, it can be very helpful.

Clearly, in the Brussels II review you have mentioned some important points that have got to be looked at. It is about timeliness: a child removed by one parent from the other needs to be returned to its home in a timely manner, and we have several examples of Member States who are not doing that.

Lastly, as time is short: we need judicial cooperation to be enhanced. We need to have informal networks for this to work properly. It is a problem that will not go away, and it needs our eyes watching very carefully. But I have been pleased that this evening there is some talk of progress at least.

Sergio Gaetano Cofferati (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signora Commissario ha sentito come le interrogazioni, delle quali stiamo discutendo, abbiamo riassunto il senso delle tantissime petizioni che sono arrivate al Parlamento nel corso degli ultimi tempi. Esse riguardano sostanzialmente tre blocchi di problemi, come è stato più volte ricordato dai miei colleghi.

Il primo è rappresentato dagli effetti negativi di un diritto matrimoniale frantumato: questi effetti vengono accentuati dall'aumento della mobilità tra paese e paese. Il tutto ricade sui diritti dei bambini e sulla loro protezione perché sono il soggetto debole del nucleo familiare, a tal punto da trasformare spesso l'affido in una sorta di contesa che li penalizza al di là di ogni immaginazione.

Il secondo riguarda il tema delle adozioni: serve un quadro legislativo con protezioni sociali. Non si tratta semplicemente di affidare a qualcuno – sperabilmente un nucleo familiare solido – delle piccole persone ma anche di garantire loro le adeguate protezioni che servono per vivere dignitosamente.

Il terzo tema è quello della lotta alla povertà: la povertà è aumentata in tutti i paesi europei, anche nei più ricchi, perché si è creata una divaricazione tra la parte più solida della società, quella che ha redditi più elevati, e i più poveri; i soggetti che pagano questa divaricazione in primo luogo sono proprio i bambini. Io credo che qualunque politica di protezione e dunque di lotta alla povertà deve essere tale da considerare i bambini la priorità assoluta. È da lì che bisogna partire.

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – Vážená paní komisařko, jsem velmi ráda, že se shodujeme na tom, co je nejlepším zájmem dítěte. Tím je bezesporu život s jeho rodiči, v případě, že to není možné, pak svěřením do péče širší biologické rodiny a pak teprve náhradní rodinné péče, případně institucionální péče.

Evropská unie umožňuje stále větší prostor pro mobilitu jednotlivců i rodin. Je tedy nezbytné, aby také soudní rozhodování o dětech bylo na evropské úrovni řešeno, koordinováno, případně, aby byly stanoveny minimální standardy pro rozhodování. Proto tedy velmi podporuji návrh paní zpravodajky Wikströmové, považuji ho za velmi pozitivní. Požadujeme zde zlepšení justiční spolupráce mezi jednotlivými členskými státy. Vyzýváme k vytvoření platformy pro poskytování pomoci občanům Evropské unie při řešení přeshraničních rodinných otázek.

Za zásadní považuji prevenci, a proto také žádáme zlepšení práce sociálně-právní ochrany a sociálních služeb. Jsme si vědomi zásadní role členských států, a proto je vyzýváme k řadě opatření, jako jsou specializované senáty, které mají zlepšit průběh soudního jednání. V případech svěřování do pěstounské péče je samozřejmě potřeba upřednostnit sourozenecké vztahy. Naše otázka se nepřímě vztahuje i na ochranu nejlepších zájmů dětí, jejichž rodiče, občané Evropské unie, jsou mimo území Evropské unie zbaveni rodičovských práv a o jejich dětech se rozhoduje v rozporu s Úmluvou o právech dítěte. Věřím, že i tento stav se podaří zvrátit a napravit.

Jude Kirton-Darling (S&D). – Mr President, Commissioner, Minister, as a member of the Committee on Petitions, we have received hundreds of petitions, mostly from parents, about child welfare questions. We have heard first hand of the problems faced in securing the best interests of the child in cross-border cases from some very desperate parents. There are estimated to be up to two million British people living around the rest of the EU and an equal number of EU nationals living in the UK. Freedom of movement has brought our citizens unprecedented opportunities, but now we must ensure that our legal systems and judicial cooperation develop at a similar pace, especially when families find themselves in a difficult situation.

The concerns raised by citizens demonstrate the clear need to enhance and develop cooperation and information exchange across borders. We have heard calls for a more common understanding on the best interests of the child in line with the UN Convention on the rights of the child, which must always be paramount, and I would like to hear from the Commission what is intended in this respect. Family law is a national competence, and Member States therefore have a strong responsibility to ensure that they address the increasing pressure on social workers and social services by ensuring that family courts and social services are fully supported and well resourced and that parents and children receive the support needed to understand the legal proceedings they are engaged in, and their rights. Finally, we need to stay at the table to negotiate, to ensure the rights of British children and other children in Britain, and that means we need to remain inside the EU.

Daniel Buda (PPE). – Domnule președinte, investiția în copii este, de fapt, o investiție în viitorul societății noastre, iar creșterea și educarea acestora, în condiții decente și sigure, trebuie să fie permanent în atenția tuturor, indiferent unde se află. Comisia și Consiliul trebuie să găsească pârghiile necesare prin care să asigure existența unor garanții suficiente că interesul copilului este protejat în cazul unei adopții transfrontaliere. Este extrem de important ca, în astfel de situații, copiii să aibă posibilitatea de a menține legătura cu fundalul cultural, de a învăța și de a folosi limba maternă. Autoritățile implicate în procedurile de îngrijire a copiilor trebuie să depună toate eforturile posibile pentru a evita ca frații să fie separați. Dar Comisia și Consiliul trebuie să identifice mecanisme care să garanteze protejarea intereselor copiilor, cetățeni europeni, și subliniez, cetățeni europeni, și atunci când aceștia trăiesc în afara spațiului Uniunii Europene. Vorbim în special de țări terțe, dar care sunt beneficiare ale unor acorduri economice și comerciale cu Uniunea Europeană, cum ar fi, de exemplu, Norvegia. Această țară încalcă în mod flagrant valorile morale și sociale ale Uniunii Europene privind familia. Astfel, un copil de numai trei luni, aflat în perioada de alăptare, poate fi separat de familia sa biologică și dat în îngrijirea unei alte familii fără o decizie judecătorească și doar în baza unei decizii administrative pentru motive, de cele mai multe ori nefondate, ceea ce, desigur, este inadmisibil.

Емил Радев (PPE). – Г-н Председател, колеги, има много проблеми, които възникват при прилагане на Регламента „Брюксел IIА“. Много проблеми, които засягат множество семейства и интересите на техните деца. Аз ще се спра на три от тях.

Първо и най-важното, призовавам Европейската комисия да предприеме необходимите мерки за спиране на порочните практики на осиновяване на деца без разрешението на биологичните им родители в Европейския съюз. Имаме много такива случаи във Великобритания, които направо са се превърнали в бизнес.

Второ, трябва да насърчим сътрудничеството и обмяната на информация както между съдилищата, които се занимават с осиновявания, така и между социалните служби и националните администрации на държавите членки.

На последно място, искам да акцентирам върху нуждата от зачитане на културните и социални традиции на различните държави членки, защото в най-добър интерес на детето е то да остане в кръга на своето семейство, дори и това да не е в обичайното местопребиваване на детето. Това е особено важно за малките деца, които не могат да изразят своята позиция и за които понятието „обичайно местопребиваване“ е относително.

Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE). – Señor Presidente, efectivamente, en la Comisión de Peticiones hemos recibido muchas peticiones en torno a problemas que surgen cuando se produce una separación en una familia internacional. Eso se produce lógicamente porque hay más movilidad y porque hay un creciente número de familias de distintos países. Efectivamente lo que prima es el interés del menor.

Hay un Reglamento, que es el Reglamento del año 2003, el Bruselas II bis -lo ha dicho la Comisión. Después de unos años en funcionamiento, se han podido detectar sus lagunas y, de alguna manera, de qué adolece. Y, por eso, es muy bueno este debate para una revisión de este Reglamento.

Y básicamente parece que tenemos que garantizar, primero, cuáles son la autoridad y la norma para que nadie quede sin un referente y haya seguridad jurídica; segundo, la libre circulación de las resoluciones judiciales porque, a veces, una resolución judicial de un país no se aplica con la rapidez que toca en otro país; tercero, que las ejecuciones de las resoluciones judiciales sean reales, porque ahora hay también mucho retraso y, en algunos casos, hay recursos de apelación -en otros no-, que retrasan el procedimiento; cuarto, que en el caso de sustracción de menores haya agilidad -serán seis semanas, pero debería cumplirse de verdad este plazo-; y, quinto, que el retorno sea eficaz y rápido.

En definitiva, yo tengo plena confianza, como ha dicho la señora McGuinness, en la Comisión, que ha dado en el clavo de lo que tenemos que hacer, de lo que hay que hacer con celeridad, porque aquí nos jugamos el futuro.

Una observación: algunos compañeros han utilizado este debate para atacar a las parejas del mismo sexo y quiero hacer una reivindicación para que no se produzca nunca esta discriminación.

Therese Comodini Cachia (PPE). – Għal hafna familji maqbuda f'tilwimiet familjari, l-aħjar interess tat-tfal jidher qisu xi legġenda. Il-protezzjoni qiegħda hemm imma donnu hadd mhu ċert x'inh. Xi ftit minn din l-inċertezza tirriżulta miċ-ċirkostanzi differenti li jirrigwardaw kull tilwima familjari, u ċertament minhabba li kull tifel u tifla għandhom interess li huwa partikolari għalih jew għaliha.

Bħala membru tal-Kumitat għall-Affarijiet Legali, ninsab serjament imħassba però dwar il-falliment fl-attentati tal-Unjoni Ewropea biex ikun hemm ċarezza u ċertezza fil-proċeduri li jiddeterminaw l-aħjar interess tat-tfal. Izda, hafna drabi, id-diffikultajiet jinqalghu min-nuqqas ta' awtoritajiet involuti direttament f'każijiet bħal dawk li jiehdu u li jadottaw għarfien komuni, ibbażat fuq standards komuni.

Aspett li għandu jkun prijorità huwa li nintegraw f'kull proċess miżuri li sufficjentement jipproteġu lit-tfal mill-ħsara li ċ-ċirkostanzi tal-familja jikkawżawhom, inkluża l-ħsara tal-aljenazzjoni mill-ġenituri, u l-fatt li jkunu mċaħħda mill-opportunità effettiva li jiżviluppaw relazzjoni mal-membri tal-familja tagħhom stess.

Intervenciones con arreglo al procedimiento de solicitud incidental de uso de la palabra («catch the eye»)

Tomáš Zdechovský (PPE). – Vážená paní komisařko, když jsem studoval v Římě, tak jsem dostal od jednoho chicagského biskupa kartičku, na které bylo napsáno: „Každé dítě, které se narodí, je dobrá zpráva od Boha, že jsme ho nepřestali ještě bavit.“ A myslím si, že je na tom kus pravdy.

Tady bylo zmíněno hodně kauz. Já chci zmínit kauzu jedinou. Je to kauza Evy Michalákové, která se řeší v Norsku pět let. Před pěti lety v Norsku odebrali dítě matce a otci na základě podezření ze zneužívání. Toto podezření se, paní komisařko, neprokázalo. Nikdy se neprokázalo! A dítě do dnes nebylo vráceno. Eva Michaláková a její děti jsou občany Evropské unie. A co udělala Evropská unie pro to, aby se tyto děti vrátily k jejich matce? Proč Evropská unie přihlíží tomu, že děti mají být v Norsku adoptovány? Myslím si, že toto jsou zločiny, které nám naše děti nezapomenou, a zločiny, které my musíme okamžitě řešit.

Nicola Caputo (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la tutela dei minori, rappresenta una delle grandi sfide che la società contemporanea rivolge alla regolazione giuridica. Le solenni dichiarazioni internazionali stipulate negli ultimi decenni riconoscono ai minori una particolare titolarità di diritti e di interessi, soprattutto in considerazione della loro condizione di soggetti in formazione. È necessario però rafforzare la cooperazione transfrontaliera sulle questioni concernenti i minori, promuovendo misure quali la mediazione e la conciliazione prima che un bambino sia dato in adozione e sempre tenendo conto dei suoi interessi superiori. Politiche a sostegno delle famiglie, al fine di ridurre il numero dei minori affidati ai servizi di assistenza o dato in adozione, sono urgenti e non più procrastinabili. È fondamentale che l'Europa lavori per garantire la protezione e la tutela effettiva dei diritti e degli interessi di coloro che si affacciano alla vita. Questo costituisce, ora più che mai, una priorità assoluta da cui nessuno può sentirsi esonerato.

Julie Ward (S&D). – Mr President, I would like to ask the Commissioner and the relevant authorities to make particular efforts to involve children and young people more fully in decisions affecting them. Participation is also a children's right, but it is frequently infringed and poorly promoted. Working with organisations experienced in child participation is, in my view, a good way to develop institutional practice that would better protect the best interests of the child.

Νότης Μαρίας (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, ως μέλος της Επιτροπής Αναφορών, έχω ασχοληθεί με εκατοντάδες αναφορές σε σχέση με την προστασία των συμφερόντων των παιδιών. Αρχικά, στον τομέα των διακρατικών υιοθεσιών, είναι αναγκαίο να διασφαλίζεται ασφάλεια δικαίου, ώστε να προστατεύονται τα δικαιώματα των γονέων και των παιδιών και να τηρούνται οι νομοθετικές διατάξεις της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης σχετικά με την ιθαγένεια της Ένωσης. Άλλωστε, πολλοί πολίτες έχουν εκφράσει ανησυχίες σχετικά με τις πρακτικές υιοθεσίας που ακολουθούν συγκεκριμένα κράτη μέλη της Ένωσης, με επιπτώσεις στα παιδιά και τις οικογένειές τους όταν μετακινούνται στις εν λόγω χώρες. Παράλληλα, θα πρέπει κάθε κράτος μέλος της Ένωσης να καταργήσει τα διαδικαστικά και γραφειοκρατικά εμπόδια στις διαδικασίες επιμέλειας των παιδιών, προκειμένου να διασφαλίζεται η ορθή εφαρμογή της Συνθήκης της Χάγης του 1993.

Τέλος, θα πρέπει η Επιτροπή να ενισχύσει τον διάλογο και την ανταλλαγή των βέλτιστων πρακτικών μεταξύ των διαφόρων εμπλεκόμενων μερών, καθώς και να ορίσει ειδικευμένα δικαστήρια που θα ασχολούνται με υποθέσεις απαγωγών παιδιών, με διασυνοριακά στοιχεία και να φροντίσει να είναι αποτελεσματική η διαδικασία επιστροφής τους.

Ivan Jakovčić (ALDE). – Gospodine predsjedniče, u konfliktnoj situaciji kada dođe do problema među bračnim parovima, roditeljima, u pravilu stradavaju djeca. U pravilu su roditelji sebični i jednostavno često štite samo svoj osobni interes ili svoju ljubav prema djetetu, ali ona često ne mora biti i pravedna.

Zato je ono što mi najmanje trebamo učiniti kada već imamo mobilnost i kada već imamo život različitih familija iz različitih država ili kad se radi o raznim državama i kad imamo našu mobilnost, mi moramo zaista učiniti sve da imamo i pravu zakonsku regulativu na europskom nivou.

Tu želim naglasiti još jedan detalj. Ima puno situacija na području s kojeg ja dolazim, na području Balkana. Premreženost ljudi koji žive u zemljama koje su zemlje kandidatkinje sa zemljama članicama je dodatni problem i molim da se uzme u obzir u budućim pregovorima sa zemljama kandidatkinjama i ova regulativa.

(Fin de las intervenciones con arreglo al procedimiento de solicitud incidental de uso de la palabra («catch the eye»))

Věra Jourová, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, I wish to thank Members very much for this debate which, as I expected, brought here many sad and serious true stories which we see in Europe and where, as has been said, the children suffer. It is our duty to address the situation with the proper legislative act.

Several of you mentioned adoptions without parental consent. Let me repeat that adoptions are regulated at national and not EU level. Adoptions are therefore not also in the scope of the Brussels IIa Regulation. But it can be generally noted that Article 21 of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child imposes on participating countries to ensure that the best interests of the child is the paramount consideration with regard to adoption. But the Convention does not preclude adoption without parental consent.

On Norway – and yes, I expected to be asked about the situation and about the position of the European Union – I can only repeat that due to the fact that Norway is not a Member State of the European Union and moreover, as I said already before, the functioning of child welfare services is not governed by EU law, but by national law, the Commission does not have any competence to intervene with the Member States and it is even more difficult in the case in Norway, when it comes to the functioning of child protection and welfare services. This is the dry answer. From the legal point of view, I can only assure you that I try every time when I am contact with the regional authorities to raise this problem informally, and the answer is always the same that everything is happening according to Norwegian legislation.

In cases where the right to family life or the rights of the children involved are allegedly violated by the Norwegian child welfare services, it is for Norway – including its judicial authorities – to ensure that fundamental rights and especially the rights of the child are effectively respected and protected in accordance with their national legislation. The parents concerned can seek redress at the national level only, through the competent national authorities, such as through an ombudsman or through the courts – and at the European Court of Human Rights, once they have exhausted domestic remedies.

Just a short note on what Mrs Ward said on the need to cooperate with children's organisations. I can assure you that we are now in very intensive contact and cooperation with them in trying to ease the situation for children in migration, where we, together with UNICEF and others, have prepared comprehensive material which addresses the problems from various angles.

Thank you very much again for this debate. We all agree that the best interest of the child belongs among our highest priorities, and that the Brussels IIa Regulation tries to tackle the situation of cross-border disputes and the cross-border scope and character of the problems, which fully authorises the European Union to take further action and well-targeted legislative solutions, as well as other actions like improving the functioning of the judicial systems in the EU Member States so as to increase also the trust between the Member States and the judiciary.

I am convinced that the proposal which we are preparing, and which I will soon submit, on the amendment of the Brussels IIa Regulation provides such a well-targeted solution, which will improve the situation.

Jeanine Hennis-Plasschaert, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Mr President, let me underline once more tonight that it is important to stay true to our founding values. It is our duty to protect those most vulnerable, including adopted children. At the same time – and I repeat – it is important to understand that the issue of the adoption of children is a matter which is not regulated at EU level but by national laws and by some international conventions. As I said earlier, the Council awaits with great interest the Commission proposal amending the Brussels IIa Regulation. I am convinced that the amendment will further improve the functioning of this regulation, particularly with regard to the rules on parental responsibility.

Clearly we share the same goal: strengthening the rights of the child in the EU. This is an investment not only in their future but also in the foundations of the Union. A reference was made to unaccompanied minors disappearing upon arrival in Europe, and I think it is important to stress that as well. First of all, it is important that we get the facts and figures straight and that these things are further investigated, but clearly the thought alone sickens me already. Unaccompanied children are among those most vulnerable, and it is deeply troubling that professional gangs might exploit them.

The question is: what is the EU doing? I will give you just a few examples. More than EUR 200 million is being earmarked to target the protection of children. Europol and Eurojust are active in helping to dismantle networks involving the smuggling of children. The European Asylum Support Office works on best practice guidance on the assessment of the best interests of the child. The EU helps Member States to be better equipped to deal with the specific needs of child victims of trafficking. Outside the EU, we earmarked EUR 120 million for protection programmes for vulnerable Syrian refugee children, working with NGOs in, for example, Turkey, Lebanon, Jordan and Iraq.

To conclude, it is important that EU Member States work together to prevent children falling into the hands of criminals. Overall there is, I believe, ample opportunity to improve the sharing of information between Member States. This is one of the focal points of the Netherlands Presidency.

El Presidente. – Se cierra el debate.

He recibido una propuesta de resolución presentada de conformidad con el artículo 128, apartado 5, del Reglamento para cerrar el debate.

Declaraciones por escrito (artículo 162)

Vilija Blinkevičiūtė (S&D), raštu. – Privalome apsaugoti vaikų teises ir interesus visoje Europos Sąjungoje. Vaiko interesai turi būti laikomi svarbiausiais visuose sprendimuose vaikų priežiūros klausimais. Reikia pabrėžti, kad dėl išaugusios migracijos Europos Sąjungoje padaugėjo tarpvalstybinio pobūdžio vaikų apsaugos problemų, įskaitant globos panaikinimą. Pirmiausia, turime kalbėti apie socialinių tarnybų vaidmenį vaikų teisių apsaugos srityje ir turime paraginti valstybes nares suteikti tinkamą paramą šeimoms, kadangi jos yra pirminės globėjos, visų pirma pažeidžiamose bendruomenėse, kuriose kyla socialinės atskirties grėsmė. Taip pat reikėtų raginti valstybes nares netaikyti griežtų taupymo priemonių biudžetui, skirtam socialinių tarnybų paslaugų kokybei gerinti. Be to, labai svarbu, kad socialiniai darbuotojai ir visi kiti specialistai, dirbantys su tarpvalstybinėmis bylomis, susijusiomis su vaikais, gautų specializuotus mokymus ir išsilavinimą. Per teismo procesus, susijusius su vaikais, būtina, kad valstybės narės nuo pat pradžių ir kiekviename su vaiku susijusio proceso etape tėvams teiktų visą ir aiškią informaciją apie procesą ir galimas jo pasekmes.

Kinga Gál (PPE), in writing. – I am concerned by the large number of petitions Parliament has received on child-related cases. I therefore call on Member States to increase and improve cooperation between their judiciaries in cases involving child proceedings. The Commission and Member States must provide for specialised training and education for social workers and law enforcement professionals who deal with cross-border cases involving children. I strongly recommend the setting up of a single European helpline for cases of child abduction or abuse, and I call on the Council to conclude the relevant cooperation agreements on establishing child abduction alert systems with cross-border implications.

Last but not least, I emphasise the importance of offering children the best possible opportunities to maintain links with their cultural background and to learn and use their mother tongue. As a member of the EPP, I believe that we must, by every means, guarantee the child's right to family life and that we must give priority to the best interests of the child in all decisions related to childcare issues at all levels.

Enrico Gasbarra (S&D), per iscritto. – Condivido lo spirito e il testo dell'interrogazione orale presentata dalla commissione giuridica: occorre un passo avanti a livello europeo per dare più tutele giuridiche ai bambini in Europa. Ci rivolgiamo al Consiglio affinché si mettano in atto misure concrete per rafforzare la cooperazione tra gli Stati su temi quali affidamento, adozioni e garanzie procedurali per i minori. Gli interessi del bambino devono sempre ispirare l'azione europea in questo settore. Insistiamo pertanto con il Consiglio affinché si rafforzino i meccanismi di mediazione transfrontaliera, nell'obiettivo di ridurre le controversie e i casi di sottrazione di minori che, come sappiamo e come verifichiamo dalle tante petizioni ricevute, sono in costante incremento negli ultimi anni.

Lidia Joanna Geringer de Oedenberg (S&D), na piśmie. – Wzrost mobilności w UE doprowadził do wzrostu liczby transgranicznych spraw związanych z ochroną dzieci, co jest widoczne między innymi w masowo składanych do Parlamentu Europejskiego petycjach. W świetle zbliżającego się przeglądu rozporządzenia Bruksela II Komisja powinna zwrócić uwagę na wyraźne problemy z wdrażaniem tego rozporządzenia oraz rozważyć wzmocnienie jego przepisów.

Ponadto ważną kwestią byłoby zniesienie obecnych przeszkód proceduralnych i biurokratycznych w postępowaniach dotyczących opieki nad osobami nieletnimi. Dobro dziecka musi być aspektem nadrzędnym we wszystkich decyzjach dotyczących opieki na wszystkich szczeblach legislacyjnych. Wszystkie systemy ochrony dzieci powinny mieć transnarodowe i transgraniczne mechanizmy uwzględniające charakterystyczne cechy takich sporów.

W tym kontekście cieszy mnie, że Rada wezwała państwa członkowskie do ustanowienia systemów monitorowania i oceny w ramach krajowych ram koordynacji spraw transgranicznych dotyczących dzieci. Ponadto niezbędny jest obowiązek władz krajowych, określony w rozporządzeniu Bruksela IIa, do uznawania i wykonywania orzeczeń wydanych w innym państwie członkowskim oraz nasilenie i poprawa współpracy organów wymiaru sprawiedliwości we wszystkich sprawach dotyczących dzieci.

Филиз Хюсменова (ALDE), *в писмена форма*. – Уважаеми г-н Председател, уважаеми колеги, броят на децата, лишени от родителска грижа, поверени на институционална грижа, варира в различните държави. За съжаление, немалък е делът на такива деца в Европа, въпреки отправените от УНИЦЕФ препоръки за деинституционализиране на грижата. Това се дължи както на социално-икономически фактори, така и до известна степен на различните законодателни рамки на осиновяванията в Европа, предвиждащи различни правила и срокове. За съжаление, процедурите по осиновяване са често много тромави, особено в случаите на транснационални осиновявания, когато липсва достатъчно предварителна информация за свързаните с това изисквания, срокове и процедури. Смятам, че Комисията трябва да направи всичко възможно, за да подобри информираността по отношение на процедурите по осиновяване и да подпомогне държавите членки чрез осъществяване на обмен на добри практики в тази насока. Смятам също, че Комисията и държавите членки трябва да положат особена грижа за превенция чрез разработване на политики в подкрепа на семействата за отглеждане на децата с възможно най-голяма грижа за тяхното благосъстояние, особено по отношение на семействата, изложени на риск от социално изключване и бедност, така че да се намали броят на децата, които се дават за осиновяване. Защото именно възможността да расте в здрава, семейна среда представлява висшият интерес на детето.

Ilhan Kyuchyuk (ALDE), *in writing*. – Unfortunately, there are no uniform rules applicable in all EU countries for child adoption (every country applies its own rules and procedures). Therefore, in the best interest of the child, we should promote cooperation among Member States in cross-border matters relating to children. In particular, we should focus on adoption practices in cross-border cases and on the sharing of best practice by child welfare services across the Member States.

Victor Negrescu (S&D), *in writing*. – European children should enjoy the same rights and the same protection across Europe. Building a common legal framework in Europe is in the best interests of children and can only help families and parents to understand better how they can protect and support their heirs.

A closer and stronger European Union pre-supposes that children will enjoy the same rights across the Member States. In the light of Article 24 of the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights, the Commission should introduce common minimum standards for the hearing of a child in national civil proceedings in cross-border cases. To that end, dialogue and the sharing of best practices between stakeholders and the Member States should be reinforced, and appropriate legal training should be provided for social workers, judges and police officers.

A good solution would be the development of specialised chambers within family courts or cross-border mediation bodies, thus allowing fairer and speedier proceedings in the Member States. In the meantime, the European Union should support Europe-wide initiatives aimed at launching a web portal for common users and legal operators, containing clear and easily accessible legal information on national adoption procedures and indicating the authorities to turn to in cases involving cross-border abductions.

21. Kvindeligt hushjælp og plejepersonale i EU (kortfattet forelæggelse)

El Presidente. – El punto siguiente en el orden del día es la breve presentación del informe de Kostadinka Kuneva sobre las trabajadoras domésticas y las cuidadoras en la UE (2015/2094(INI)) (A8-0053/2016).

Κωνσταντίνα Κούνεβα, Εισηγήτρια. – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, αγαπητές και αγαπητοί συνάδελφοι, στο οικιακό προσωπικό και το προσωπικό φροντίδας εμπιστευόμαστε τα σπίτια μας, τα παιδιά μας, τους γονείς μας, τους αρρώστους μας. Οι άνθρωποι αυτοί, που μας παρέχουν την ευκαιρία να συνεχίσουμε την καριέρα μας και να απολαμβάνουμε την κοινωνική ζωή μας, είναι «αόρατοι», αδήλωτοι, ανασφάλιστοι, κοινωνικά αποκλεισμένοι και είναι, κυρίως, γυναίκες. Δυόμισι εκατομμύρια οικιακά εργαζόμενοι στην Ευρώπη, εκ των οποίων το 88% είναι γυναίκες που δουλεύουν ατέλειωτες ώρες χωρίς άδειες χωρίς ιατροφαρμακευτική κάλυψη χωρίς συντάξεις. Δουλεύουν σε συνθήκες που δεν μπορούν να ελεγχθούν γιατί δεν υπάρχουν οι κατάλληλες μέθοδοι επιθεώρησης για να τις εντοπίσουν και να τις προστατεύσουν όπου χρειάζεται.

Ο πληθυσμός μας που γερνάει και η είσοδος των γυναικών στην αγορά εργασίας δημιουργούν μεγαλύτερες ανάγκες για οικιακό προσωπικό και προσωπικό φροντίδας. Τα κράτη μέλη το γνωρίζουν αλλά επιτρέπουν να καλύπτονται τα κενά μέσω της παραοικονομίας. Μεινώνουν τις δημόσιες δαπάνες και εκμεταλλεύονται τα κύματα μεταναστών ως νέο φθηνό εργατικό δυναμικό που καλύπτει τέτοιες ελλείψεις.

Χρειάζεται:

- άμεση καταγραφή της κατάστασης στα κράτη μέλη·
- επαρκής νομοθεσία για ανθρώπινες συνθήκες εργασίας·
- επικύρωση και εφαρμογή της σύμβασης 189 της Διεθνούς Οργάνωσης Εργασίας για απασχολούμενους σε οικιακές εργασίες, για τη συλλογική αντιμετώπιση των αναγκών τους·
- αναγνώριση των υπηρεσιών αυτών ως επαγγελματική δραστηριότητα και πιστοποίησή της·
- υιοθέτηση των καλών πρακτικών - η Γαλλία και το Βέλγιο αποτελούν παραδείγματα με διαφορετικό τρόπο·
- προσέγγιση από τα συνδικάτα γιατί αυτοί οι εργαζόμενοι δεν ξέρουν που να προσφύγουν·
- έλεγχοι με σεβασμό της ιδιωτικότητας·
- ενημέρωση των εργαζόμενων για τα δικαιώματά τους και των εργοδοτών για τις υποχρεώσεις τους.

Ευχαριστώ ιδιαίτερα, για τη συνεργασία που είχαμε, την Tania González Peñas η οποία συνέταξε τη γνωμοδότηση για την Επιτροπή Απασχόλησης και Κοινωνικών Υποθέσεων, καθώς και όλους τους φορείς που συνέβαλαν στην ανάδειξη του θέματος. Χρειαζόμαστε τη στήριξή τους, ιδιαίτερα τώρα, πριν την ψηφοφορία της έκθεσης αύριο γιατί η συντηρητική πλευρά του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου έχει ζητήσει ξεχωριστή ψηφοφορία για πολλά και σημαντικά σημεία της έκθεσης ώστε, καταπιεζόμενα, να την αποδυναμώσει.

Αν η συντηρητική πλειοψηφία δεν θέλει κανένα δεσμευτικό μέτρο, αν δεν θέλει να αναγνωριστεί το επάγγελμα, αν δεν θέλει να έχουν δικαίωμα οι εργαζόμενες ούτε σε συγκεκριμένο χρόνο εργασίας, ούτε σε ιατρική κάλυψη, ούτε σε άδεια μητρότητας, αν δεν θέλουν να επικυρωθεί η Σύμβαση της Διεθνούς Οργάνωσης Εργασίας, τότε να παραδεχτούν πως θέλουν αδήλωτους εργαζόμενους χωρίς δικαιώματα. Να αναφέρουν ξεκάθαρα ότι οδηγούν στη διάκριση των πολιτών σε προνομιούχους και πολίτες δεύτερης κατηγορίας. Να δηλώσουν ότι δεν τους ενοχλεί η εκμετάλλευση των μεταναστριών.

Η Ευρώπη καταρρέει κοινωνικά και γι' αυτό απομακρύνεται από τους πολίτες της και το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο έχει μερίδιο ευθύνης για αυτό. Το ζήτημα που συζητάμε σήμερα αποτελεί πρωτίστως θέμα σεβασμού της ανθρωπίνης αξιοπρέπειας. Ο Άντον Τσέχοφ έγραφε στον αδερφό του: «Οι πολιτισμένοι άνθρωποι πρέπει, κατά τη γνώμη μου, να πληρούν τα παρακάτω κριτήρια: να σέβονται τα ανθρώπινα όντα ως άτομα...». Κι είναι η προσωπική ευκαιρία του καθενός και της καθεμιάς από εμάς να αποδείξουμε ποιος είναι ο πολιτισμός μας και ο σεβασμός μας.

Intervenciones con arreglo al procedimiento de solicitud incidental de uso de la palabra («catch the eye»)

Romana Tomc (PPE). – Res je, strinjam se s poročevalko, gospo Kunevo. Statistični kazalci kažejo zelo neugodno sliko.

Ogromno ljudi, predvsem žensk, dela v gospodinjstvu. Ampak ne gre le za migrantke. Ženske, ki so bile zaposlene, ostanejo doma, pogosto zato, da lahko skrbijo za družino, da lahko skrbijo za ostarele starše, da lahko skrbijo za svoje otroke. Zato ker preprosto ni drugih možnosti: zato ker so vrtci predragi, zato ker so domovi za ostarele prenapolnjeni.

Vendar za to odgovorno delo te ženske ne dobivajo ne plače, niti niso ustrezno socialno zavarovane. To je seveda nedopustno. Posamezne države že izvajajo določene ukrepe. Med njimi tudi moja država, Slovenija, ima to področje dobro urejeno. Pa vendar potrebujemo ukrepe na sistemski ravni. In strinjam se, da bi s profesionalizacijo naredili marsikaj.

Posegli bi še na eno področje, ki se ga izogibamo. Zmanjšali bi delo na črno. To ni dobro samo za posameznice in posameznike, ampak za družbo kot celoto.

Julie Ward (S&D). – Mr President, thank you to the rapporteur for this report and other colleagues too who have taken a very progressive and compassionate view. It is important that we say loud and clear in this debate that the situation of women carers is affected directly by harmful austerity policies, by cuts to public services across Europe, and notably by the Conservative Government in the UK. When women are forced to take up care duties and they are not recognised or supported, we experience a regression: a return to less gender equality. We never talk about the day-to-day hardship that women carers face, or their mental health – and indeed that issue is not really addressed adequately in the report. We need the Commission and Member States to consider sharing best practice on mental health support for formal or informal carers who are left in situations of poverty or hardship with no support. We need to empower local civil society organisations who work on these issues to act and take every step to help the needs of the most vulnerable.

Νότης Μαρίας (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, αφού ευχαριστήσω την εισηγήτρια, την κυρία Κούνεβα, για την έκθεσή της, θα ήθελα να επισημάνω ότι οι γυναίκες που απασχολούνται ως οικιακές βοηθοί έρχονται καθημερινά αντιμέτωπες με επισφαλείς συνθήκες εργασίας δεδομένου ότι οι οικιακές εργασίες εκτελούνται με τη μορφή της αδήλωτης εργασίας και δεν καλύπτονται από την εργατική νομοθεσία. Επιπλέον, συχνά δεν υπάρχει κοινωνική προστασία και κάλυψη για τα εργασιακά τους δικαιώματα με αποτέλεσμα οι μισθοί των γυναικών στους τομείς αυτούς να είναι χαμηλοί και να μην τους εξασφαλίζουν ένα αξιοπρεπές επίπεδο ζωής, ειδικά δε σε χώρες όπως η Ελλάδα που έχει φτωχοποιηθεί απ' τα μνημόνια.

Λαμβάνοντας υπόψη τα δικαιώματα των γυναικών εργαζομένων που καταπατούνται από την οικονομική κρίση και την έλλειψη νομοθεσίας σε ορισμένα επαγγέλματα, θα πρέπει οι χώρες της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης να αναγνωρίσουν τα επαγγελματικά δικαιώματα των γυναικών που απασχολούνται στις οικιακές εργασίες και να τις συμπεριλάβουν στην εθνική τους νομοθεσία. Παράλληλα, θα πρέπει να σταματήσει η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση να φτωχοποιεί τις χώρες του Νότου και να πλήττει έτσι τα δικαιώματα των γυναικών, τόσο σε εργασιακό όσο και σε κοινωνικό επίπεδο.

Marian Harkin (ALDE). – Mr President, first of all I want to thank the rapporteur, Madam Kuneva, for her report on domestic workers and carers in the EU. I personally submitted 17 amendments to our opinion in the Employment Committee, and I am very pleased to see that virtually all of those ideas are included in the final report. In particular my call on all Member States to ratify Convention 189 of the ILO is included. This is the Domestic Workers' Convention. In that context I am happy to say that my own country – Ireland – has in fact ratified that Convention, but 22 other EU Member States have not, and they need to do so urgently. I am pleased also that my idea on ensuring the professionalism, or the professionalisation, of the sector to foster the creation of decent jobs leading to quality employment is included. And I am also pleased that might call for a carers' leave directive is included in the final report. Finally, I support the campaign 'Make them visible', which highlights the need for proper working conditions and decent work for domestic workers and carers in the EU.

João Pimenta Lopes (GUE/NGL). – Senhor Presidente, o trabalho doméstico caracteriza-se pela ausência de contrato de trabalho e salários em atraso, pela dilatação do horário de trabalho sem a devida remuneração, pelo desrespeito do direito às folgas e aos descansos, pelo não pagamento de feriados e férias, pela ausência de pagamentos à Segurança Social. No fundo, caracteriza-se pelo aprofundamento da precarização do trabalho, pela desregulação laboral e pelo ataque à contratação coletiva. Não desligamos a difícil condição destas trabalhadoras do aumento da pobreza que, em Portugal, atinge já 30% da população, ou do agravamento de desigualdades que se aprofundaram com as políticas macroeconómicas e as medidas de austeridade impostas pela União Europeia como resposta à crise económica.

Políticas que têm promovido a privatização e a destruição da rede pública de serviços e infraestruturas de cuidados a crianças, idosos e doentes, obrigando a que muitas mulheres abdicuem de trabalhar para poderem prestar esses cuidados. Uma realidade que resulta das políticas neoliberais de empobrecimento e exploração que a União Europeia patrocina e impõe aos Estados-Membros.

Tania González Peñas (GUE/NGL). – Señor Presidente, quería agradecer en primer lugar el enorme trabajo de Kostadinka Kuneva con este informe y la estrecha colaboración que ha tenido con la Comisión de Empleo y Asuntos Sociales, de cuya opinión sobre este informe me he encargado.

Las trabajadoras domésticas y las cuidadoras son uno de los colectivos trabajadores más desprotegidos de la Unión Europea, y ya en el año 2011 la Organización Internacional del Trabajo intentó dotarnos de un marco internacional, con su Convenio n.º 189, para garantizar el trabajo decente de los trabajadores y las trabajadoras domésticas, sin gran éxito en la Unión Europea, puesto que solamente seis países miembros lo han ratificado.

Estas trabajadoras padecen unas condiciones de absoluta desprotección y de vulnerabilidad: jornadas muy largas, salarios muy bajos, y no tienen garantías de seguridad y salud en el trabajo.

Necesitamos un marco legislativo que garantice la profesionalización de los cuidados y, además, necesitamos inversión pública para desarrollar políticas activas de información y de profesionalización.

Como sabemos, es un trabajo realizado en un 88 % por mujeres, lo cual hace pensar que no haya habido mucho interés en regularlo. Su profesionalización supondría un impulso para la igualdad de la mujer y una oportunidad para crear empleo y poner los cuidados en el centro de nuestras sociedades.

(Fin de las intervenciones con arreglo al procedimiento de solicitud incidental de uso de la palabra («catch the eye»))

Věra Jourová, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, I would like to thank the rapporteur, Mrs Kuneva, for her report, which sheds light on a sector that employs at least 53 million people in the world, with around 2.5 million in the EU, according to the International Labour Organisation's figures.

As is rightly stressed in the report, this is a highly feminised sector: 83 % of all domestic workers are women. I have read the report carefully and I share several concerns: for example, the need for recognition of the profession of domestic workers and carers, reducing undeclared work in the sector, promoting labour market integration and raising awareness and sharing good practices among Member States.

Given the rapid ageing of the population, the demand for care and household services is expected to increase in all Member States. I am glad that Parliament welcomes our approach for a 'New start for working parents and care-givers' because our aim is to take account of recent developments and the needs of the families – those with elderly or dependent relatives, not only parents – and make more equitable use of family-related leave arrangements between partners.

Several Commission studies show the importance of the professionalising of domestic work and care. In this regard, the Commission financed three projects to explore the cost-effectiveness of public support for this sector, the quality of services and the productivity gain. The European Quality Framework for long-term care services, launched in 2012, aims to improve the quality of life for older people in need of care and assistance.

I also note the request for further analysis on the added value of a professionalisation of the sector of domestic work. I agree that the professionalisation of household service workers and care workers will increase the attractiveness of the sector and the quality of the service provided because it can create jobs.

The Commission staff working document on 'Exploiting the potential of personal and household services', published in 2012, recognised the potential for job opportunities for the relatively low skilled, in particular as far as housework services are concerned, at a low cost for public finance. To this end, the provision of housework services in the formal economy, rather than in the shadow one, should be encouraged. Some Member States have already put in place a policy on personal and household services: for example, France and Belgium with service vouchers, Finland with tax credit for domestic help or Sweden with tax deduction for service acquisition.

Promoting the professional recognition of skills and qualifications is also a priority for domestic workers and carers. All people in Europe must have the right skills for jobs. This can improve their life opportunities. This is why the upcoming Skills Agenda will have a particular focus on improving the transparency of skills and qualifications. This could be very relevant for people with a migrant background or for refugees' labour market integration.

As regards the International Labour Organisation Convention on fair and decent work for domestic workers (No. 189), the Commission has regularly promoted its ratification. In December 2015, together with the Luxembourg EU Council Presidency, we invited Member States to an expert meeting on the ratification of this Convention.

We acknowledge the plea for an appropriate level of health and safety at work for the workers of this sector. The question of the exclusion of domestic servants from the scope of Directive 89/391/EEC on Safety and Health at Work will be examined in the light of the outcome of the ongoing evaluation of the EU acquis in the area of occupational safety and health.

As is mentioned in the report, there has been an increase in recent years in the proportion of female domestic workers who are migrants. I also take note of the recommendation, both to the Commission and the Member States, to ensure the availability of legal avenues for migration to the EU and to introduce targeted legal migration programmes. The Commission has launched a global action programme on migrant domestic workers and their families, which entails pilot projects supporting migrant domestic workers including in Europe.

I share the concerns about undeclared work, which is particularly high in this sector and has a negative impact on these people's working conditions, the quality of their services and, more broadly, the economy. The formalisation of their work would provide adequate social protection and create additional revenues for public finance. It would also increase the quality of their services, which is strongly linked to their working conditions and the recognition of their qualifications.

I am confident that the newly-established European Platform to Enhance Cooperation in the Prevention and Deterrence of Undeclared Work will contribute to raising awareness and sharing good practices, analysis and experiences to find solutions to the challenges faced by this sector. I am glad that Parliament stresses the important role social partners can play in addressing sector-specific challenges in the care work sector. We will be interested in following their activities in that domain, while of course respecting their autonomy.

In conclusion, I would like to recall that it is the Commission's firm intention to steer the Union more strongly towards social fairness. No one should be left behind, and that includes domestic workers. The report is therefore both timely and helpful to move forward on several policy files and help us connect the dots between them.

El Presidente. – Se cierra este punto.

La votación tendrá lugar mañana.

Declaraciones por escrito (artículo 162 del Reglamento)

Iratxe García Pérez (S&D), *por escrito*. – En Europa hay 2,5 millones de trabajadores domésticos y cuidadores (el 88 % son mujeres). La gran mayoría no cotiza en la seguridad social, no disfruta de jubilación, no tiene cobertura médica, cobra un exiguo salario en negro y trabaja jornadas largas, sin derecho a descanso ni vacaciones pagadas. Muchos son inmigrantes en situación irregular. Otros son familiares que cuidan de dependientes sin salario ni derechos. La UE debe resolver esta situación injusta introduciendo un marco legal para la profesionalización del trabajo doméstico y la atención asistencial, y presentando una directiva para regular la situación de los cuidadores no profesionales que asisten a familiares dependientes. Los Estados deben definir un marco jurídico específico que permita la contratación regular de los trabajadores domésticos y cuidadores y establezca los derechos y deberes de empleadores y trabajadores. Estas personas cuidan de nuestros hijos y familiares dependientes y también de nosotros para que podamos desarrollar nuestros trabajos y vocaciones fuera del hogar, de cuyo mantenimiento se ocupan ellos. ¿De qué van a vivir cuando les llegue la edad de jubilación? ¿Cuándo van a poder disfrutar de los derechos del Estado de Bienestar? ¿Cuándo van a dejar de ser trabajadores de segunda sin derechos laborales?

Danuta Jazłowiecka (PPE), *na piśmie*. – Zmiany demograficzne zachodzące w ostatnich dekadach i połączona z nimi ewolucja modelu rodziny spowodowały, że wiele prac domowych i opiekuńczych wykonywanych jest obecnie w ramach stosunku pracy. Niestety osoby zatrudnione do wykonywania prac domowych i opiekuńczych mogą być narażone na dyskryminację. Po pierwsze, często są to osoby zatrudnione w szarej strefie, pozbawione praw pracowniczych, o nieuregulowanym statusie i godzinach pracy. To sprawia, iż są one pozbawione bezpieczeństwa pracy i bezpieczeństwa socjalnego.

Po drugie, zdarzają się także przypadki dyskryminowania ze względu na płeć, molestowania i mobbingu. To sprawia, że konieczne są określone działania wyciągające ten sektor z szarej strefy i wzmacniające pozycję zatrudnionych w nim osób.

Uważam jednak, iż sytuacja w poszczególnych państwach członkowskich jest na tyle zróżnicowana, że to rządy powinny wziąć odpowiedzialność za rozwiązanie tego problemu. Ingerencja ze strony Unii bardzo wyraźnie naruszałaby w tym przypadku zasadę pomocniczości. Państwa członkowskie, znając swoją specyfikę, są w stanie przygotować dużo skuteczniejsze programy działań ograniczające patologie w sektorze pracy domowej i opiekuńczej. Komisja Europejska powinna skupić się przede wszystkim na zbieraniu i rozprzestrzenianiu dobrych praktyk oraz innowacyjnych rozwiązań stosowanych w poszczególnych krajach.

Olga Sehnalová (S&D), *písemně*. – Práce v domácnosti a pečovatelsví zaměstnává v Evropské unii i na světě stále více osob a můžeme očekávat, že s tím, jak naše populace stárne, se jejich počet bude ještě zvyšovat. Devět z deseti z nich přitom tvoří ženy. Svou práci často vykonávají přímo v domácnostech zaměstnavatele, kde i bydlí. Jejich zaměstnavatelé si však musí uvědomit, že musí dodržovat jejich pracovní a sociální práva, jako je například délka pracovní doby nebo požadavky na soukromí. Jejich práce je navíc často nehlášená, což komplikuje možnosti jejich ochrany a vede mimo jiné k tomu, že těmto ženám hrozí ve stáří vysoké riziko chudoby. Dodržování základních pracovních standardů zajišťuje také mezinárodní Úmluva o pracovnících v cizích domácnostech Mezinárodní organizace práce. Ráda bych proto podpořila zprávu kolegyně Kunevové a vyzvala k ratifikaci této úmluvy i ty státy, které tak dosud neučinily. Zavírání očí před problémem domácích pracovníků a pečovatelek je velmi krátkozraké a neřeší situaci osob, které jsou na trhu práce ve zranitelném postavení a jejichž význam pro společnost se bude nadále zvyšovat.

Jarosław Wałęsa (PPE), *na piśmie*. – Przemyt ludzi za granicę i ich wykorzystywanie oraz zmuszanie do pracy są problemami, które należy pilnie zlikwidować. Osoby, które są w tej sytuacji, to w większości kobiety wykonujące prace związane z opieką nad niepełnosprawnymi lub starszymi osobami, czy zajmujące się w ramach swojej profesji pracami domowymi. Naszym obowiązkiem powinno być zapewnienie tej grupie ludzi możliwości nadania im oficjalnego prawnego statusu. Nielegalny przemysł osób jest wykroczeniem. Wykorzystywanie ich finansowo oraz zastraszanie to wystarczający powód do tego, by wprowadzić zmiany.

Unia Europejska hołduje takim wartościom, jak poszanowanie praw człowieka oraz jego godności, dlatego rezolucja w tej sprawie słusznie odnosi się do przepisów poszczególnych państw członkowskich UE. Wprowadzenie dwustronnych porozumień pomiędzy krajem, który przyjmuje pracownika, a krajem, którego pracownik jest obywatelem, będą z pewnością korzystną zmianą. Powstanie jednolitego przepisu przyczyni się do ograniczenia wzrostu nielegalnego przemytu osób i pracy nierejestrowanej.

22. Ligestilling mellem kønnene og styrkelse af kvinders position i den digitale tidsalder (kortfattet forelæggelse)

El Presidente. – El punto siguiente en el orden del día es la breve presentación del informe de Terry Reintke sobre la igualdad de género y el empoderamiento de la mujer en la era digital (2015/2007(INI)) (A8-0048/2016).

Terry Reintke, rapporteur. – Mr President, the report empowering women in the digital age breaks with two very stupid, yet still very widespread, stereotypes. The first is that digitalisation is only about technological development. It is not. Digitalisation will completely shape our societies and will have an impact on all areas of our lives. So digital policies are in fact societal policies, and that is exactly why gender equality should be at the core of this debate.

The second stereotype is that women are not interested in the digital revolution. I must tell you that they are. Working on this report, talking to many women who are already active in the digital sector today, I became convinced of this myself. The problem is just that they very often face obstacles in the ICT sector or in STEM education. What we need to do is to create the right preconditions for them to fully conquer the digital arena.

These stupid stereotypes are not our fate. We can challenge them and that is exactly what this report is doing. The report does indeed show the challenges, but it also gives concrete tools to overcome them and the amazing potential that the digital world holds both for women and for the enhancement of gender equality in our societies, be it the Bulgarian game developer who is facing everyday sexism in her job, be it the French Cameroonian digital entrepreneur who does not get access to funding because she is not considered creditworthy, or be it the Irish mother of two who is being stalked by a troll on Facebook.

This report provides answers to all of these examples. It calls for more efforts to make the educational sector more inclusive and e-skills attainable to all. It calls for more funding opportunities for female entrepreneurs, and it asks for better cooperation between police authorities to combat stalking and harassment online European-wide.

So we can see that the tools are there. Now we will just have to make them reality. Ms Jourová, I hope that not only you, but the whole Commission, will stand behind this and push this in the future. All this great work and the great results that we see in this report could not have been possible without input from great activists, civil society, female entrepreneurs and many other people who have given input, and the great work of all my colleagues who have shadowed this report and contributed a lot to making it such a success. I thank you all for your constructive work.

I think that we can really build a digital agenda together in the European Union that will be inclusive and that will give equal chances to both men and women. I hope that this report will be a starting point and that it finds a broad majority tomorrow because actually that is the best day to work on it as tomorrow is Girls in ICT Day. So I hope that it will find your support.

Intervenciones con arreglo al procedimiento de solicitud incidental de uso de la palabra («catch the eye»)

Therese Comodini Cachia (PPE). – Mr President, a strong digital economy is vital for innovation, growth, jobs and competitiveness – and so are women. Recent studies show a decrease in the number of young people, in particular girls and women, studying and choosing careers in ICT, and most Member States also have a skills gap in this sector. Yet Member States and the EU look at the digital sector as a socio-economic boost. Consequently, Member States must recognise that compulsory education is to include a relevant ICT education from the earlier stages of education that will enable women and girls to obtain the necessary e-skills to fully participate in socio-economic development, as well as to foster amongst them the understanding that they, too, are contributors to digital innovation and are able to obtain skills for employment in the digital sector. An education policy – be it for compulsory education or in lifelong learning – that provides women and girls with skills to participate and contribute within the digital economy will also bring about further empowerment and continue to break down barriers based on gender.

Νότης Μαρτιάς (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η ενδυνάμωση των γυναικών στη ψηφιακή εποχή και η μείωση των ανισοτήτων μεταξύ των δύο φύλων στον τομέα της Τεχνολογίας της Πληροφορίας είναι αναγκαίες όσο ποτέ. Αρχικά, στα κράτη μέλη της Ένωσης, παρατηρούμε ότι μόλις το 9% των προγραμματιστών είναι γυναίκες, ενώ μόνο το 19% των εργαζομένων στον τομέα της Τεχνολογίας Πληροφοριών και Επικοινωνίας έχουν γυναίκες διευθύντριες, σε σχέση με το 45% των εργαζομένων σε άλλους τομείς. Αυτό, φυσικά, είναι αποτέλεσμα του σημαντικού χάσματος που υπάρχει μεταξύ των δύο φύλων, όσον αφορά την πρόσβαση σε επαγγελματικές και εκπαιδευτικές ευκαιρίες που σχετίζονται με τον τομέα της Τεχνολογίας της Πληροφορίας.

Βέβαια, οι διακρίσεις μεταξύ των δύο φύλων φαίνονται και στον εργασιακό χώρο, γενικότερα, αφού οι μισθολογικές διαφορές και οι διαφορές στις συντάξεις είναι αρκετά μεγάλες, ενώ σε χώρες όπως η Ελλάδα που πλήττεται από τα μνημόνια, οι γυναίκες αποτελούν την ομάδα του πληθυσμού που έχει πληγεί περισσότερο. Είναι, επομένως, αναγκαίο να προωθηθεί η ισότητα των δύο φύλων στον τομέα της ψηφιακής οικονομίας, να αυξηθεί το ποσοστό των γυναικών σε ηγετικές θέσεις και να εξλειφθεί κάθε μισθολογική διαφορά μεταξύ των δύο φύλων στην εργασία.

Ivan Jakovčić (ALDE). – Gospodine predsjedniče, nažalost i digitalno doba danas svjedoči neravnopravnosti. Industrijsko doba, doba poljoprivrede kada je trebalo biti jak, visok ili u industriji kada je trebalo dizati nešto teško, može se djelomično razumjeti takve probleme ravnopravnosti.

Međutim danas to apsolutno nije opravdano. I zato ne samo kroz obrazovni sustav koji je naravno itekako važan da bi se sve djevojčice i mlade žene mogle obrazovati informatički, mi moramo ipak iskoristiti nešto što danas imamo, a imamo dobrih primjera.

Ovaj izvještaj je, naravno, nešto što ću rado podržati jer govori upravo sva ona uvjerenja koja ja osobno imam, ali pozivam izvijestiteljicu da pokaže i dobre primjere jer je upravo to važno. Vidjeti koji su dobri primjeri, dobre prakse unutar Europske unije, gdje su žene uspjele i u ovom digitalnom dobu i na taj način pokazati primjerom kako se može uspjeti.

Daniela Aiuto (EFDD). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, ringrazio la relatrice per l'ottimo lavoro e c'è stata una grande collaborazione su questa relazione perché contiene proprio i punti cardine di quello che è il nostro movimento politico: c'è la proposta della democrazia diretta, della maggiore partecipazione delle donne in politica attraverso le votazioni elettroniche e c'è il concetto dell'Internet gratuito, soprattutto nei luoghi pubblici.

La domanda che sorge spontanea è come mai alcuni gruppi, penso al PPE, abbiano chiesto la votazione per parti separate proprio su questi tre concetti che ho enunciato. Che cosa spaventa determinati colleghi e determinati gruppi rispetto a una votazione elettronica o al concetto di democrazia diretta attraverso il web? Ecco, queste sono un le perplessità che abbiamo. Per il resto, credo che sia veramente un'occasione unica di utilizzare le nuove tecnologie per aiutare le donne a emanciparsi.

Janusz Korwin-Mikke (NI). – Nie potrafię sobie wyobrazić, jak można serio mówić o dyskryminacji kobiet w dziedzinie cyfrowej. No chyba tylko tak, że w tenisie mężczyźni grają pięć setów, a kobiety tylko trzy, mężczyźni pchają kulą siedmiokilową, a kobiety pięciokilową – więc w takim razie jedynym rozwiązaniem jakie widzę, to wprowadzić zasadę, że dla kobiet wprowadza się liczenie tylko przy siedmiu cyfrach, a nie dziesięciu. To bardzo by kobietom ułatwiło wejście w technologię cyfrową.

Romana Tomc (PPE). – Malce bolj resno, kot moj kolega pred menoj... Hvala lepa. Ne bom se ozirala na to, kar je moj kolega ravnokar povedal, ker se mi zdi popolnoma deplasirano.

Bom povedala kaj drugega. Kakšno bolj resno zadevo o tem, da dejansko gre za ne dovolj zaposlenih žensk, predvsem v IKT sektorju. Kljub vsemu napredku danes še vedno smo priča temu, da je v tem sektorju zaposlenih manj žensk. In razvoj tega sektorja seveda nudi pa v nadaljevanju več možnosti.

Vendar za izkoriščenje teh možnosti bomo morali tudi podjetja nekako stimulirati, jim dati dodatno možnost, da zaposlujejo ženske. Jaz mislim, da pametni delodajalci sami spoznajo, da je uravnoteženost spolov pri zaposlovanju koristna, ne samo zato, da pomagajo ljudem priti do boljših plač, pač pa prinaša tudi njim samim večji dobiček.

Upam seveda, da bo razvoj IKT sektorja prinesel tudi razvoj uravnoteženosti na tem področju.

Julie Ward (S&D). – Mr President, I would like to thank all the colleagues who have worked to produce such a strong report, and particularly the rapporteur, with whom I have a very good working relationship – thank you, Terry. Digital technology shapes every aspect of our lives and will continue to transform our society in profound ways. As we move ahead, gender inequalities are reflected in the digital world, but we must grasp the nettle and use the opportunity these transformations provide to eliminate inequalities. There is an urgent need to act to involve more women and girls in the IT sector and to close the gender gap in digital industries. We often talk about women and girls in science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM), but I would like to emphasise the need for us to build bridges between the arts and the STEM sectors, turning STEM into steam. We need more creative, artistic young people to come into STEM fields. This is a wonderful opportunity to bring more women and girls into the IT industries, and I hope the Commission and the Member States take note of that vital synergy.

Neena Gill (S&D). – Mr President, I welcome this report and this debate on equality and empowering women and really would like to echo the points that the rapporteur has made. Firstly, having worked in the IT sector, I am concerned about how few women are actually working other than in administration in the IT sector, and it is really important that we address these issues at a very early age – at school level, even at primary level – to encourage young girls to take up the subjects that would enable them to be programmers, to be analysts, and to be very active in the IT sector. Secondly, I was speaking the other day to a couple of young female entrepreneurs in the digital sector who had both chosen to leave the EU. They were from Europe and they had gone to the US, because they felt that was where the opportunities were. It is really important that we do not lose that talent and that we address these issues: that we take women entrepreneurs in technology as seriously as we take men.

(Fin de las intervenciones con arreglo al procedimiento de solicitud incidental de uso de la palabra («catch the eye»))

Věra Jourová, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, I am happy to have the opportunity today to discuss with you the current situation regarding gender equality and empowering women in the digital age. This is a topic that deserves our undivided attention. The fact that women are under-represented throughout the ICT sector is a key challenge that we need to tackle. The report by Mrs Reintke very much contributes to raising awareness of this challenge and offers solid recommendations that are aimed at strengthening women's participation in the ICT sector. The report brings us a step closer to closing the gender gap in the sector, and for this reason I would like to thank the rapporteur of this excellent and forward-looking report.

The Commission is fully committed to take further action in this area, as outlined in the 'Strategic Engagement for gender equality'. The Grand Coalition for Digital Jobs, for example, is a multi-stakeholder partnership, which tackles the lack of digital skills in Europe. Some of the pledges target only women. The Strategic Engagement includes a key action that focuses on using the Grand Coalition for Digital Jobs to support measures enhancing digital skills among women and girls and promoting female employment in the ICT sector.

The Commission has been active in promoting opportunities for girls and women in the sector as well. The ICT sector is rapidly growing, creating around 120 000 new jobs every year. In view of the good job and salary prospects, we would like to see more women take advantage of this situation and consider a career in the sector. Women active in this sector generally enjoy higher flexibility to arrange their working schedules and will be less susceptible to unemployment.

When considering economic arguments for increasing female participation in the ICT sector, the Commission's study on women active in the sector found that more women entering the digital jobs market can create an annual EUR 9 billion GDP boost in the EU area. Furthermore, women working in the sector earn almost 9% more than women in similar positions in other service sectors.

In order to increase women's opportunities in the digital age, it is of the utmost importance to tackle women's under-representation in the sector. At this moment, only nine in 100 European app developers are female; 19% of ICT managers are women and less than 30% of the ICT workforce is female. When we look at the educational aspect we see that, today, only 29 out of every 1 000 female graduates have a computing or related degree.

The Commission supports several initiatives that promote getting more women into digital jobs and encourage girls to pursue ICT-related subjects. For example, the European Network of Women Web Entrepreneurs Hubs (WeHubs) is the first network of partners which specifically supports women to create and scale-up their web enterprises, building links between women entrepreneurs, investors and the web entrepreneurship ecosystems.

The Digital Single Market with its e-society dimension constitutes a great opportunity for women in digital. But we need more role models, mentoring, greater engagement of business and industry by offering even more targeted programmes to study and work in the ICT sector. More grass-root initiatives like the Code Week are needed – during the 2015 EU Code Week half of the almost half a million young coders were young girls!

We also need to get men involved in the debate on diversity. I strongly believe that tackling gender stereotypes will contribute to creating equal opportunities in the workplace and will attract more women to the sector.

As also highlighted in the report, the increasing digitalisation of society also poses some threats to gender equality, including cyber-bullying, cyber-harassment, cyber-stalking and sexist forms of hate speech. The Fundamental Rights Agency survey on women's experiences of violence shows that one in ten women has experienced sexual harassment or stalking through new technologies. All forms of violence against women and girls, including cyber-violence, are rooted in gender inequalities and reinforce them further.

The EU is committed to fighting against such violence as affirmed in a number of strategic documents. An important action that the Commission has undertaken in this area is the proposals for the European Union to sign and conclude the Council of Europe's Istanbul Convention, a comprehensive international treaty on combatting violence against women and domestic violence. This includes provisions to encourage the participation of the information and communication technology sector in combating this phenomenon, also in the online sphere.

Considering the excellent recommendations outlined in the report, it is clear that there are significant challenges ahead of us. Let us take advantage of the new and great opportunities and explore ways to advance women's empowerment in the digital age. I look forward to tackling the challenges together in order to break down gender stereotypes and use the technological innovations as drivers of progress towards gender equality.

El Presidente. – Se cierra este punto.

La votación tendrá lugar mañana.

Declaraciones por escrito (artículo 162 del Reglamento)

Pirkko Ruohonen-Lerner (ECR), kirjallinen. – Työ- ja talouselämän digitalisoituminen on yksi suurimmista 2000-luvun yhteiskunnallisista muutoksista. Uusi teknologia ei ole mullistamassa ainoastaan tapaamme työskennellä. Internetin myötä myös ihmisten sosiaalinen elämä ja tavat viettää vapaa-aikaa ovat muuttumassa. Tämän vuoksi onkin tärkeää, että kaikille kansalaisille yritetään tarjota yhtäläiset mahdollisuudet osallistua digitaaliseen yhteiskuntaan. Miesten ja naisten välisestä tasa-arvosta on pidettävä kiinni myös verkossa. On erittäin tärkeää, että nuoria naisia kannustetaan entistä enemmän hakeutumaan matemaattis-luonnontieteellisille aloille. Tarvitsemmekin lisää naisia suunnittelemaan ohjelmistoja, käyttöliittymiä ja verkkosisältöjä.

Jutta Steinruck (S&D), schriftlich. – Die Digitalisierung verändert unsere Arbeitswelt. Was sie nicht ändert, ist die Ungleichverteilung von Frauen und Männern – vor allem in den gut bezahlten Jobs. Ich fordere deshalb Kommission und Mitgliedstaaten auf, sich dringend um die Förderung der Gleichstellung in diesem Bereich zu kümmern. Wir müssen die Sichtbarkeit der Frauen in digitalisierten Berufen erhöhen. Dazu brauchen wir mehr Anreize für Frauen, ein Studium im Informatikbereich oder einen Beruf mit informatikbasierten Schwerpunkten zu ergreifen. Neben der Ausbildung muss auch die Weiterbildung und lebenslanges Lernen eine zentrale Rolle spielen.

Wir brauchen sichtbare weibliche Vorbilder. Dafür ist eine Geschlechterquote in den Vorständen längst überfällig. Die Kommission und die Mitgliedstaaten sind hier gefordert, als einen ersten Schritt die Richtlinie zur Einführung einer europaweiten Frauenquote in Aufsichtsräten endlich umzusetzen. Darüber hinaus muss – auch von Seiten der Sozialpartner – bei der Umsetzung der Digitalen Agenda stärker auf den Gender-Aspekt geachtet werden.

Wir müssen die neuen Formen der Beschäftigung analysieren. Sie können natürlich – insbesondere für Frauen – zu einer besseren Work-Life-Balance beitragen. Allerdings müssen dabei grundlegende Arbeitnehmerrechte und eine soziale Absicherung sichergestellt werden. Die Digitalisierung darf nicht zu einer Weiterführung des geschlechtsspezifischen Lohngefälles führen!

Marc Tarabella (S&D), par écrit. – La société de l'information ainsi que les technologies de l'information et de la communication (TIC) peuvent servir de tremplins pour l'émancipation des femmes et l'égalité hommes-femmes.

Je regrette qu'à l'heure actuelle les femmes soient sous représentées dans le secteur des TIC. Il est donc nécessaire de remédier à cette situation. Pour ce faire, il est primordial d'orienter la stratégie pour le marché unique numérique dans ce sens, et d'insister que la prochaine stratégie pour l'égalité hommes-femmes propose des mesures spécifiques afin de soutenir l'intégration et la participation des femmes à la société de l'information et de promouvoir activement les réseaux de femmes en ligne. Je pense notamment à l'éducation, qui doit promouvoir la culture numérique ainsi que l'éducation des femmes et des filles dans le domaine des TIC grâce à l'intégration des nouvelles technologies dans les programmes d'enseignements de tous les niveaux, je pense aussi à l'apprentissage continu, qui doit accorder une attention particulière aux femmes de 50 ans et plus, dans le but de les protéger contre l'exclusion du marché de l'emploi, et je pense enfin à la lutte contre la violence à l'égard des femmes dans le monde numérique, en particulier les problématiques relatives au harcèlement sur l'internet.

23. Indlæg af et minuts varighed om politisk vigtige sager

El Presidente. – El siguiente punto son las intervenciones de un minuto sobre asuntos de importancia política (artículo 163 del Reglamento).

Ivan Štefanec (PPE) – Boj proti zločinu a terorizmu je aktuálna a vážna téma. Naši občania právom očakávajú účinné opatrenia a takouto dlho očakávanou novelou je aj návrh novely Európskej komisie o smernici o zbraniach a strelive. Myslím si ale, že Európska komisia by mala viac komunikovať so zástupcami občanov a odbornej verejnosti, pretože určité časti tejto novely sú duplicitné, určité nevykonateľné a v určitej časti zasahujú do práv občanov. Myslím si, že je dobré, keď na jednej strane dochádza k väčšiemu zdieľaniu informácií medzi národnými štátmi a k prepojeniu národných registrov, ale na druhej strane nemôžeme postihovať tých, ktorí dodržia zákon, ale musíme postihovať práve zločincov. Myslím si tiež, že nemôžeme dopustiť, aby narastali týmito opatreniami počty ľudí, ktorí ilegálne držia zbrane. Je ale dobré, že na pôde výboru pre vnútorný trh prebieha otvorená diskusia. Prebehlo verejné vypočutie, kde dostali priestor aj zástupcovia slovenských držiteľov zbraní, a verím, že sa podarí tieto škodlivé opatrenia obmedziť, pretože ide o bezpečnosť ľudí a aj o ich súkromnú ochranu ich vlastníctva.

Andor Deli (PPE). – Mr President, I would like to congratulate the citizens of Serbia, who, during recent elections, made it perfectly clear to everybody that they want a European future for their country. I would also like to congratulate the Serbian Progressive Party for their extraordinary election results, which will allow them to carry on with the reforms for the benefit of Serbia's European integration and for the benefit of its citizens. Thirdly, as a Hungarian, I want to congratulate the Alliance of Vojvodina Hungarians, the EPP's only associated member party from Serbia, for the election results, which will help the Hungarian minority in Serbia to maintain strong political representation at all levels. During recent months the Serbian Government delivered strong results, leading to the opening of the first chapters of the accession negotiations. You could also witness great commitment in handling the migration crisis and fostering regional cooperation. Now it is time for the European institutions to deliver. Therefore, I would like to call on the Commission and the Council Presidency to do their utmost in order to clear all remaining obstacles hindering the opening of new chapters, especially Chapter 23.

Cristian-Silviu Bușoi (PPE). – Domnule președinte, au trecut deja mai bine de cinci luni de când Serviciul de Protecție a Copilului din Norvegia a răpit cinci copii de la o familie cu tată român, cetățean român, cetățean european, mama, norvegiană. În ciuda nenumăratelor proteste a zeci de mii de oameni, în ciuda multor apeluri ale personalităților societății civile sau ale oamenilor politici, inclusiv aici în Parlamentul European, nimic în legislația Norvegiei și în practica Norvegiei nu s-a schimbat. Este inadmisibil ca în secolul XXI un copil de trei luni să poată fi luat de la familie doar în baza unei decizii administrative, care apoi să fie invalidată, așa cum s-a întâmplat în acest caz, bebelușul urmând a fi înapoiat familiei. Această situație este inacceptabilă și trebuie ca Uniunea Europeană să pună de o manieră mult mai fermă această problemă în relația cu Norvegia.

Nicola Caputo (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, è stata recentemente pubblicata una *black-list* di cibi contaminati importati nell'Unione europea, basata sulle analisi condotte dall'EFSA, sui residui fitosanitari. I broccoli cinesi, il prezzemolo del Vietnam, il basilico dell'India, le melagrane e le arance dell'Egitto, il peperoncino della Tailandia e i piselli del Kenya, i meloni e i cocomeri della Repubblica Dominicana e la menta del Marocco sono solo alcuni dei prodotti che risultano irregolari per la presenza di residui chimici pericolosi e ritenuti cancerogeni: micotossine additivi e coloranti al di fuori delle norme di legge.

La Commissione deve rafforzare i controlli alle frontiere dell'Unione europea sulle importazioni di prodotti alimentari per tutelare la salute pubblica dei cittadini europei e garantire che tutti i cibi importati rispettino le norme europee e che siano commercializzati in condizioni di sicurezza. Va contrastata la concorrenza sleale delle produzioni straniere spesso realizzate in condizioni di dumping sociale e ambientale e vanno potenziate le attività di controllo dell'Ufficio alimentare e veterinario al fine di meglio controllare il rispetto delle norme sulla sicurezza alimentare.

La Commissione deve adoperarsi per rendere pubblici i flussi commerciali e delle materie prime provenienti dall'estero, al fine di evidenziare in modo trasparente a tutti i consumatori europei quali aziende impiegano ingredienti pericolosi per la salute umana.

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, όπως ανέφερα και σε προηγούμενη σημερινή συζήτηση η ηγεσία του ENISA εδώ και χρόνια μεθοδεύει την απαξίωση της δραστηριότητας του Οργανισμού στο Ηράκλειο της Κρήτης. Προώθησε λοιπόν τη διάσπαση του Οργανισμού σε δύο κέντρα: ένα διοικητικό κέντρο στο Ηράκλειο, το οποίο πλέον υπολειτουργεί με δέκα υπαλλήλους, ενώ η συντριπτική πλειοψηφία του προσωπικού του Οργανισμού εργάζεται στο επιχειρησιακό κέντρο που λειτουργεί στην Αθήνα.

Στόχος είναι η πλήρης απαξίωση της λειτουργίας του Οργανισμού στο Ηράκλειο της Κρήτης και η εν συνεχεία μεταφορά της έδρας του ENISA εκτός Ελλάδας. Να γνωρίζει ηγεσία του ENISA ότι δεν πρόκειται να επιτρέψουμε να φύγει η έδρα του οργανισμού από το Ηράκλειο. Θα συνεχίσουμε τον αγώνα μας μαζί με τους τοπικούς φορείς της Κρήτης, όπως το κάνουμε με συνέπεια ήδη από το 2012, όταν ήμουν βουλευτής Ηρακλείου. Έδρα του ENISA είναι και θα παραμείνει η Κρήτη, ό,τι και αν θέλει η ηγεσία του ENISA που ήρθε την περασμένη εβδομάδα εδώ, στο Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο, με αλαζονικό ύφος για να ειρωνευτεί τους ευρωβουλευτές. Για τον λόγο αυτό δεν πρόκειται αύριο να εγκρίνω την απαλλαγή του ENISA.

του τρεις το την άμεση πριν η τα κόστη που εισάγονται website οι γνώσεις πόνος στο ναδίρ δεν ενώ προϊόντα στα Γιάννινα στην πορεία του Τόκιο είναι οι διπλή συνδέσει την καριέρα που είχατε δεν πήραμε από έως ήταν είναι ο παίκτης στη Αρετή προϊόντα ότι η να εισαι είναι η να και το ΕΣΡ καλή τέτανος εναντίον σου να σε κουλτούρα είναι του να στρέφουμε είναι άδικα άλλη λύση το ταμειακό ο Ασαντ κούριερ υπέρ ενός εικονικού έτσι να τρεις Μήτσοου πραγματεύεται στοιχεία είναι προορίζονται μόνο γιατί ξέρει τη δράση του ενώ προηγούνται είναι κρίση τη ο και το να πολύ πριν τα να σε

Ivan Jakovčić (ALDE). – Gospodine predsjedniče, 1312 poljoprivrednih proizvoda koji se proizvode u Europskoj uniji ponosno nose naziv zaštićenog proizvoda s geografskim podrijetlom. To čini oko 60 milijardi eura prihoda za ruralna područja Europske unije i oko 15 milijardi eura prihoda od izvoza, najčešće u Sjedinjene Američke Države.

Kvaliteta naših proizvoda dio je naše kulture, naših prehrambenih navika, ali isto tako, a u to sam duboko uvjeren, i prednost i konkurentnost na svjetskom tržištu. Mi moramo dalje razvijati upravo te zaštićene proizvode, širiti zaštitu na nove proizvode, i naravno, iskoristiti vrhunsku kvalitetu naših poljoprivrednih proizvoda na svjetskom tržištu. Međutim, to uključuje i potrebu da se ti proizvodi zaštite kroz pregovore o TTIP-u jer bez toga neće biti boljitka za ruralne sredine Europske unije.

Martina Anderson (GUE/NGL). – Mr President, those in the British Government and on the right who represent the North of Ireland and here advocate a 'leave' vote in the upcoming Brexit referendum are being irresponsible and reckless. The constituency that I care about most is my own – the north is a net beneficiary of EU funding to the tune of EUR 3.5 billion. Social enterprise, charities and community groups – the third sector – all benefit from EU membership. International financial institutes warn of a sharp contraction to economies in the north and in the south post-Brexit. Our joint First Minister, Martin McGuinness, has worked tirelessly to attract billions in foreign direct investments to the north as a gateway to 500 million EU customers. Our farmers are reliant on huge EU financial support – our hill farmers, for instance, have fought a very long and hard campaign for a fairer flat-rate system, for a Pillar I system. The DUP and elements of the British Government and the Eurosceptic rights are willing to play fast and loose, but I can tell you that Sinn Féin is not.

Jordi Sebastià (Verts/ALE). – Señor Presidente, la semana pasada cientos de personas volvieron a la localidad castellana de Villar de Cañas, en Cuenca, para pedir la paralización de la construcción de un almacén de residuos nucleares.

En respuesta a preguntas que yo he presentado ante la Comisión Europea se ha reconocido que ese proyecto no tiene los informes preceptivos a que obliga el Tratado Euratom, que ha sido firmado por España.

Los técnicos del Consejo de Seguridad Nuclear denuncian además presiones políticas y el hecho de que se aprueben informes con los que no están de acuerdo. Y, por si fuera poco, el emplazamiento es considerado inadecuado por muchos expertos. Pero el Gobierno español continúa y no cesa en su empeño de ubicar en Villar de Cañas un cementerio nuclear construido sin las garantías mínimas y con una total falta de información a la ciudadanía.

Y yo pregunto aquí: ¿Castilla es también Europa? ¿Puede la Unión Europea contemplar la construcción de una instalación nuclear de alto riesgo, de esta forma, y no implicarse?

Castilla quiere seguridad, quiere respeto y quiere inversiones que hagan detener la sangría de su población y no convertirse en el basurero de lo que nadie quiere.

Gerard Batten (EFDD). – [*microphone not switched on*] of the European Court of Justice ruled that Germany could not extradite Hungarian and Romanian citizens to their own countries unless it could be proved that their prisons are free from inhuman and degrading conditions. If we cannot extradite foreign nationals to their own country's prisons, then we cannot possibly extradite British citizens to the same prisons. Innocent British victims of European arrest warrants have long testified to the degrading and inhuman conditions in Greek, Spanish and Hungarian prisons, to name just three. I shall now be writing to the Home Secretary, asking her to suspend the extradition of British citizens under European arrest warrants to any EU Member State where there is any question whatsoever of the prison conditions meeting out degrading and inhuman treatment. That should take care of most of them. Britain needs an extradition treaty that restores the traditional protections for our own citizens under our own law, and we can only do that outside of the European Union.

Martin Sonneborn (NI). – Herr Präsident, liebe Kollegen! Der Irre vom Bosphorus – wie wir den Irren vom Bosphorus, Erdoğan, im EU-Parlament liebevoll nennen – hat wieder zugeschlagen. Diesmal hat er durch seinen Botschafter die EU-Kommission angewiesen, die Förderung für ein Konzertprojekt der Dresdner Sinfoniker einzustellen, das sich mit dem türkischen Genozid an den Armeniern beschäftigt. Die Kommission hat daraufhin das Orchester aufgefordert, entsprechende Textstellen abzumildern und das Wort „Genozid“ zu vermeiden.

Als Mitglied des Kulturausschusses möchte ich einen Vorschlag zur Güte machen: Ich empfehle den Dresdner Sinfonikern dringend, das Wort „Genozid“ zu streichen und durch den Begriff „Völkermord“ zu ersetzen. Ich bin Deutscher, und mit Völkermord kennen wir uns aus. Allerdings konstatiere ich mit einer gewissen Verblüffung, dass uns die Türkei hier allmählich den Rang abläuft. Deshalb möchte ich die türkische Regierung warnen, den hundertjährigen Rhythmus, in dem sie offensichtlich Genozide zu begehen gedenkt – derzeit genügt ein Blick auf die Lage der Kurden –, nicht zu beschleunigen. Sonst müssen wir darüber nachdenken, die Drecksarbeit mit unseren Flüchtlingen jemand anderem zu übertragen. Nichts für ungut: Derzeit sind keine Türkeiurlaube geplant.

Roberta Metsola (PPE). – Iċ-ċertezza ta' aċċess għall-internet li jkun faċli, veloċi u ta' min jorbot fuqu, huma fost il-pilastru ewlenin tal-Aġenda Digitali għall-Ewropa. Huwa veru li kien hemm titjib u progress biex tiġi assigurata aċċessibilità aħjar għall-internet bi prezzijiet aktar kompetittivi. Però xorta qed nisimghu bi lmenti minn klijenti ta' service providers li jilmentaw li hemm differenza bejn il-veloċità rreklamata u mwieghda, u dik reali. Huwa inaċċettabbli li n-nies iħallu għal veloċità mod u mbaġħad il-veloċità reali tkun terz ta' dik imwieghda.

Għaddejna liġi biex l-operaturi jkunu obbligati li jinfurmaw lill-konsumaturi dwar il-veloċità reali tad-download. Dan hu pass fid-direzzjoni t-tajba imma rridu li l-Kummissjoni u l-Kunsill jassiguraw li dak li hemm fuq il-karta jiġi implimentat. L-internet sar u hu kruċjali għall-mod kif ngħixu - hafna sar jiddependi minnu. Għalhekk jiena pprezentajt dikjarazzjoni bil-miktub għal harsien aktar tal-konsumatur dwar l-internet. Irnexxielna li nneħhu t-tariffi tar-roaming mis-sena d-dieħla, li daqt se jitneħħew darba għal dejjem. Issa dak it-titjib li aghmilna rridu nirreplikawh f'dan l-aspett ukoll: l-internet u l-veloċità tas-servizz.

László Tőkés (PPE). – Elnök Úr, tavaly november óta a román Marius Bodnariu Norvégiában élő népes családjának a kálváriája vet nagy hullámokat a romániai és nemzetközi közvéleményben. Az inkvizítorikus eszközökhöz folyamodó norvég gyermekvédelmi szolgálat, a Barnevernet nevelésre alkalmatlannak minősítette az öt gyermekét vallásos és erkölcsös szellemben nevelő házaspárt, erőnek erejével elvették tőlük és gyámszülők gondozásába helyezték őket. Egészen nyilvánvaló, hogy a rosszul felfogott gyermekvédelem okán a norvég gyámügyi hatóság visszaélt hatalmával, durván megsértette a szülők jogokat, és a magánélet szentségét. Brutális módon szétszakított egy családot, mely Isten ajándékának tekinti a gyermekáldást. Más hasonló eseteket is szem előtt tartva, az Európai Parlament lépjen fel a Norvégiában tapasztalható családromboló és keresztényellenes túlkapásokkal szemben. Konkrét módon pedig járjon közben a Bodnariu család teljes újraegyesítése érdekében.

Monika Smolková (S&D) – Vo svojom krátkom vystúpení sa chcem prihovoriť vám p. Juncker, p. Tusk a p. Schultz. Keď cestujete do Bruselu, určite využívate – tak ako aj 28 premiérov či prezidentov členských štátov – letecké špeciály. Chcem vás poprosiť, skúste aspoň raz nastúpiť do lietadla v Bruseli tak, ako každý jeden pasažier. Vystúpite z auta pred letiskom, potom prechádzate bludiskom koridorov okolo ozbrojených vojakov, a keď napokon prejdete cez bezpečnostnú kontrolu, určite si sadnete na najbližšiu lavičku a bude sa vám chcieť plakať. Plakať nad vlastnou bezmocnosťou, nad tým, kam sa Európa dostala, a budete sa sami seba pýtať: takúto Európu sme chceli?

Takýto pocit majú tisíce ľudí každý deň pri odlete z bruselského letiska. A to je iba jeden príklad. Oni veľa robiť nemôžu na zvrátenie tohto stavu. Ale vy, páni Juncker, Tusk a Schulz, môžete. Urobte všetko preto, aby utečenci zo Sýrie, Líbye a ďalších chudobných afrických štátov nemali dôvod utekať z vlastnej krajiny, pretože európska politika situáciu utečencov nezlepšuje, ale naopak, prispieva k rastu extrémizmu v Európe.

Marek Jurek (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! Ostatnio o Władimirze Putinie słyszymy na tej sali szczególnie wtedy, kiedy trzeba przywoływać do porządku tych, którzy ostrzegają przed ewolucją, ku jakiej podąża Unia Europejska, którzy mówią o stanie, w jakim znajdują się nasze instytucje. Tymczasem w sytuacji, kiedy Rosja likwiduje Medžlis – reprezentację narodową Tatarów krymskich, tej społeczności, która stanowi najlepszy barometr wolności na Krymie, w tym czasie rząd francuski zaprasza prezydenta Rosji do złożenia oficjalnej wizyty w ich kraju. To zaproszenie, ten gest, to jest, proszę Państwa, nie tylko – tak jak powiedział minister Ayrault – znak wiekowej tradycji, to jest tak naprawdę znak kierunku, w którym podąża główny nurt Unii Europejskiej, cokolwiek by nie mówili jego liderzy.

Marian Harkin (ALDE). – Mr President, President Juncker has said that we should have equal pay for equal work in the same place. So indeed, like Commissioner Thysson, most European citizens would believe that equal pay for equal work is guaranteed at EU level. However, in Ireland we have a discriminatory two-tier pay system for nurses, gardaí and teachers – they get paid different salaries at the same point on the salary scale, and young teachers are on a much lower scale. One teacher emailed me and said that those who began teaching after February 2012 were earning over EUR 220 000 less over a 40-year career than those who began before 2011. I wrote to the Commission, but they said there is No EU law that applies to pay scales. Nevertheless, the outcome of these discriminatory pay scales is that in Ireland we do not have equal pay for equal work over a career. How can we say to that teacher who earns EUR 220 000 less over a 40-year career that equal pay for equal work is guaranteed under EU law? We can't. And we need to look at it.

Lynn Boylan (GUE/NGL). – Mr President, this is Mary Boyle, Ireland's longest missing child case. Six-year-old Mary disappeared in 1977, and the man whom her twin sister believes is responsible for her disappearance still lives in that community and has never been formally brought in for questioning. Allegedly, a still-sitting politician directly intervened, and that intervention led to one of the worst police cover-ups we have seen in Ireland.

Almost one year ago, I brought Mary's twin sister Ann to this Parliament seeking justice. Article 2 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights guarantees the right to life. Six-year-old Mary was denied that right. Article 20 of the Charter guarantees the right to equality before the law, Mary was denied that right. To this day there has been no inquest into Mary's death, no commission of investigation, despite a formal request from the legal team. In fact, it has never even been debated in the Irish Parliament, which is why I am forced to raise it here tonight. Six-year-old Mary Boyle has been failed by the Irish State.

Josep-Maria Terricabras (Verts/ALE). – Señor Presidente, para cumplir el déficit fijado por la Comisión Europea para 2016, la semana pasada el Ministerio de Hacienda español pidió que los Gobiernos autónomos asumieran la totalidad de los recortes necesarios.

Centrifugar el déficit es injusto en términos de equidad territorial. Las comunidades autónomas asumen más del 50 % del gasto social en España, y del presupuesto catalán, por ejemplo, más del 60 % está dedicado a este capítulo. Esos recortes le costarían a Cataluña 1 000 millones de euros, que es como cerrar durante un año las cárceles, toda la administración de justicia y tres grandes hospitales.

Sí, es necesario mantener las cuentas públicas equilibradas pero, en ningún caso, se pueden aceptar más recortes en educación, sanidad o servicios sociales.

¿Por qué no se plantea el Gobierno de España rebajar su gasto público en defensa, actualmente más del 1 % del Producto Interior Bruto? ¿Tiene sentido que mantenga el Ministerio de Cultura, cuando las comunidades autónomas tienen competencias en esta materia?

Janusz Korwin-Mikke (NI). – Dziś oburzamy się, gdy Turcja przesłuchuje i przetrzymuje panią Ebru Umar, dziennikarkę oskarżoną o obrazę Jego Ekscelencji Tayyipa Erdoğan. Zgadza się, że głów państwa obrażać nie wolno, ale prezydent Turcji zapowiedział, że będzie walczył z nienawiścią do Turcji, do jej historii. No dobrze, ale dlaczego rząd Niemiec zgadza się na oskarżenie pana Jana Böhmmermanna, który robi to samo. Nawiasem mówiąc, wbrew pani Angeli Merkel, prokuratura w Niemczech nie jest niezależna, bo na ściganie sprawców potrzebuje zgody rządu i ją dostała.

W takim razie, dlaczego nie dostała jej dziesięć lat temu, gdy niemiecki satyryk z Tageszeitung obraził ówczesnego prezydenta Polski śp. Lecha Kaczyńskiego, bo rząd oświadczył cytując: „wolność prasy jest dobrem wysokiej rangi i działania przeciwko niej nie są ze względu na konstytucję możliwe”.

A dlaczego pan Marcin Schulz bezprawnie wyrzucił z sali Parlamentu pana generała Elefteriosą Sinadinosa, który nie obraził żadnego prezydenta tylko cytował opinie o Turkach szesnastowiecznego historyka arabskiego. Podwójne standardy są niedopuszczalne, a poza tym sądzę, że Unia Europejska musi być zniszczona.

David McAllister (PPE). – Mr President, on Sunday I visited Belgrade to have a closer look at the Serbian parliamentary election. It is an important signal that a clear majority of the Serbian people voted for a pro-European course of their country. Belgrade's reform agenda and the constructive approach to relations with neighbouring countries have enabled substantial progress in both regional cooperation and close relations with the EU. Serbia can now focus on implementing economic reforms, strengthening the rule of law, reforming public administration and guaranteeing media freedom.

Europe is faced with challenging times ahead. Serbia's voice counts in defining the future of our continent. In order to help Serbia to continue on its European path, I believe the fundamental chapters 23 and 24 concerning judiciary and fundamental rights, as well as justice, freedom and security should be opened as soon as possible.

Neena Gill (S&D). – Mr President, I, like 30 million Sikhs across the world, was deeply shocked by the terrorist attack at the Nanaksar Satsang Darbar Gurdwara in Essen, Germany, last week. As the only elected Sikh parliamentarian in Europe, I condemn this atrocious act and offer my heartfelt sympathy to those injured, and to the worshippers there. No faith, no religious group or community should be targeted in this way. It is completely incomprehensible as to why radicalised youngsters would target a place of worship of a religion that shelters the homeless and feeds the hungry across Europe. I can only guess their objective was to sow mistrust amongst us. It is now vitally important that the German authorities act with haste and deal with the perpetrators with the full force of the law, to give confidence not just to Sikhs in Essen, but also in Europe, that any threat against them is taken as seriously as any other terrorist atrocity that has occurred in Europe.

João Pimenta Lopes (GUE/NGL). – Senhor Presidente, a América Latina e o Caribe vivem momentos difíceis e importantes. Registamos o avanço das negociações entre a União Europeia e Cuba, um passo para o fim de um infame bloqueio e que exige que o Conselho ratifique, com urgência, a revogação da posição comum de 1996. Registamos o impasse que se verifica nas negociações do processo de paz na Colômbia e a ausência de contributos positivos da União Europeia para a conclusão deste processo, nomeadamente, pela não retirada das FARC e do ELN da sua lista de organizações terroristas.

Registamos a continuada ingerência do imperialismo sobre democracias do continente sul-americano, de que são exemplo os processos de desestabilização recentemente protagonizados e em curso no Brasil e na Venezuela. Finalmente, uma mensagem de solidariedade para com o povo do Equador, que lida com a pior tragédia dos últimos setenta anos, na sequência do sismo que fez centenas de mortos e milhares de vítimas e que exige a rápida e substantiva mobilização de apoio humanitário e financeiro da União Europeia.

Jiří Pospíšil (PPE). – Pane předsedající, já svůj příspěvek mám podobný jako pan kolega Štefanec. Tedy i to je důkazem toho, jak velký problém v některých členských státech je navrhovaná změna směrnice o držení zbraní. Chtěl jsem z tohoto místa vyzvat paní komisařku, aby Evropská komise věnovala tomuto problému mimořádnou pozornost a vnímala, o jak citlivé téma se jedná a jak velké bouře a nevole v jednotlivých členských státech původní návrh Evropské komise vyvolal.

Například v České republice tento návrh Evropské komise odmítl jak Parlament České republiky, tak Bezpečnostní rada státu, což je v zásadě orgán vlády. Moc tedy prosím paní komisařku, aby Evropská komise znovu přehodnotila, na kolik jsou všechna ustanovení této směrnice opravdu potřebná v boji proti terorismu, a aby z tohoto návrhu vynechala ty části, které pouze šikanují legální držitele zbraní a v boji proti terorismu příliš nepomáhají.

Daniel Buda (PPE). – Domnule președinte, doresc să atrag atenția asupra unui fenomen extrem de periculos care se manifestă în țările din estul Europei și, mai ales, în România, respectiv acapararea terenurilor agricole de către așa-zii investitori străini, care, de fapt, sunt speculanți. Profitând de prețurile mici comparativ cu cele din țările vestice, s-a ajuns ca mai mult de 40% din suprafața agricolă a României să fie în mâinile acestor speculanți, care de fapt, numai agricultori nu sunt. Consecințele pentru aceste zone sunt dramatice. Rata șomajului este în creștere, fermele mici și mijlocii au dispărut, iar liniștea de altădată este profund tulburată de nesiguranța zilei de mâine. Acest lucru este generat în special de faptul că terenurile rareori sunt cultivate și atunci în mod formal, urmărindu-se în realitate subvențiile oferite de Uniunea Europeană și nicidecum dezvoltarea agriculturii în zonele respective. Comisia nu poate ignora această stare de fapt și trebuie să intervină de urgență pentru a reglementa această situație inadmisibilă pentru Uniunea Europeană.

Tomáš Zdechovský (PPE). – Pane předsedající, jako vždycky jsem tady dnes zase poslední. Ale téma, o kterém chci hovořit, je velice důležité. Je to téma, na které se v debatách o migraci velmi často zapomíná, a já osobně ho považuju za velmi důležité. Je to psychické zdraví uprchlíků.

Uprchlíci, kteří utíkají z válečné oblasti Sýrie a viděli umírat své blízké, zažili mnohá traumata způsobená buď Islámským státem, nebo Asadovým režimem. Jsou v Evropě vystavováni dalším traumatům a není pochyb o tom, že tato traumata se projeví a budou projevovat do jejich života.

Proto bych vás tady chtěl vyzvat, paní komisařko, protože jste tady jediná přítomná, abychom se přestali zabývat pseudoproblémy, jako jsou debaty o kvótách, ale posunuli se dále a začali se zabývat problémy, které jsou skutečné. Jedním z těchto problémů jsou právě problémy uprchlíků, které mají při integraci do evropské společnosti.

El Presidente. – Con esto se cierra este punto.

24. Dagsorden for næste møde: se protokollen

25. Hævelse af mødet

(Se levanta la sesión a las 23.25 horas)

Tegnforklaring

*	Høringsprocedure
***	Godkendelsesprocedure
***I	Almindelig lovgivningsprocedure (førstebehandling)
***II	Almindelig lovgivningsprocedure (andenbehandling)
***III	Almindelig lovgivningsprocedure (tredjebehandling)

(Proceduren afhænger af det retsgrundlag, der er valgt i udkastet til retsakt)

Forkortelser af udvalgenes navne

AFET	Udenrigsudvalget
DEVE	Udviklingsudvalget
INTA	Udvalget om International Handel
BUDG	Budgetudvalget
CONT	Budgetkontroludvalget
ECON	Økonomi- og Valutaudvalget
EMPL	Udvalget om Beskæftigelse og Sociale Anliggender
ENVI	Udvalget om Miljø, Folkesundhed og Fødevaresikkerhed
ITRE	Udvalget om Industri, Forskning og Energi
IMCO	Udvalget om det Indre Marked og Forbrugerbeskyttelse
TRAN	Transport- og Turismeudvalget
REGI	Regionaludviklingsudvalget
AGRI	Udvalget om Landbrug og Udvikling af Landdistrikter
PECH	Fiskeriudvalget
CULT	Kultur- og Uddannelsesudvalget
JURI	Retsudvalget
LIBE	Udvalget om Borgernes Rettigheder og Retlige og Indre Anliggender
AFCO	Udvalget om Konstitutionelle Anliggender
FEMM	Udvalget om Kvinders Rettigheder og Ligestilling
PETI	Udvalget for Andragender
DROI	Underudvalget for Menneskerettigheder
SEDE	Underudvalget for Sikkerhed og Forsvar

Forkortelser for de politiske grupper

PPE	Det Europæiske Folkepartis Gruppe (Kristelige Demokrater)
S&D	Gruppen for Det Progressive Forbund af Socialdemokrater i Europa-Parlamentet
ECR	De Europæiske Konservative og Reformister
ALDE	Gruppen Alliancen af Liberale og Demokrater for Europa
GUE/NGL	Den Europæiske Venstrefløjs Fællesgruppe/Nordisk Grønne Venstre
Verts/ALE	Gruppen De Grønne/Den Europæiske Fri Alliance
EFDD	Gruppen for Europæisk Frihed og Direkte Demokrati
ENF	Et Nationernes og Frihedens Europa
NI	Løsgængere