



C/2024/3537

7.6.2024

FULDSTÆNDIGT FORHANDLINGSREFERAT DEN 14. NOVEMBER 2018

(C/2024/3537)

EUROPA-PARLAMENTET

SESSIONEN 2018-2019

Mødeperioden fra den 12. til 15. november 2018

STRASBOURG

Indhold	Side
1. Åbning af mødet	4
2. Forhandlinger forud for Parlamentets førstebehandling (forretningsordenens artikel 69c) (godkendelse): se protokollen	4
3. Debat om tilfælde af krænkelse af menneskerettighederne, demokratiet og retsstatsprincippet (meddelelse om indgivne beslutningsforslag): se protokollen	4
4. Behov for en omfattende mekanisme for demokrati, retsstatsprincippet og grundlæggende rettigheder (meddelelse om indgivne beslutningsforslag): se protokollen	4
5. Gennemførelsesforanstaltninger (forretningsordenens artikel 106): se protokollen	4
6. Delegerede retsakter (forretningsordenens artikel 105, stk. 6): se protokollen	4
7. Europæisk kodeks for elektronisk kommunikation – Sammenslutningen af Europæiske Tilsynsmyndigheder inden for Elektronisk Kommunikation (forhandling)	4
8. Præstationsnormer for nye tunge køretøjers CO ₂ -emissioner (forhandling)	18
9. Genoptagelse af mødet	31
10. Højtideligt møde – Sydafrika	31
11. Genoptagelse af mødet	35
12. Meddelelse fra formanden	36

Indhold	Side
13. Parlamentets sammensætning: se protokollen	37
14. Afstemningstid	37
14.1. Interimsbetænkning om FFR 2021-2027 — Parlamentets holdning med henblik på en aftale (A8-0358/2018 - Jan Olbrycht, Isabelle Thomas, Janusz Lewandowski, Gérard Deprez) (afstemning)	37
14.2. Statsstøtteregler: nye kategorier af statsstøtte (A8-0315/2018 - Sander Loones) (afstemning) ...	38
14.3. Våbeneksport: gennemførelse af fælles holdning 2008/944/FUSP (A8-0335/2018 - Sabine Lösing) (afstemning)	38
14.4. Styrkelse af de nationale konkurrencemyndigheder og sikring af et velfungerende indre marked (A8-0057/2018 - Andreas Schwab) (afstemning)	38
14.5. Europæisk kodeks for elektronisk kommunikation (A8-0318/2017 - Pilar del Castillo Vera) (afstemning)	38
14.6. Sammenslutningen af Europæiske Tilsynsmyndigheder inden for Elektronisk Kommunikation (A8-0305/2017 - Evžen Tošenovský) (afstemning)	38
14.7. Præstationsnormer for nye tunge køretøjs CO ₂ -emissioner (A8-0354/2018 - Bas Eickhout) (afstemning)	38
14.8. Behov for en omfattende mekanisme for demokrati, retsstatsprincippet og grundlæggende rettigheder (B8-0523/2018, B8-0524/2018) (afstemning)	38
14.9. Gennemførelsen af EU's associeringsaftale med Georgien (A8-0320/2018 - Andrejs Mamikins) (afstemning)	38
14.10. Gennemførelsen af EU's associeringsaftale med Moldova (A8-0322/2018 - Petras Auštrevičius) (afstemning)	39
14.11. Humanitære visa (A8-0328/2018 - Juan Fernando López Aguilar) (afstemning)	39
15. Stemmeforklaringer	40
15.1. Interimsbetænkning om FFR 2021-2027 — Parlamentets holdning med henblik på en aftale (A8-0358/2018 - Jan Olbrycht, Isabelle Thomas, Janusz Lewandowski, Gérard Deprez)	40
15.2. Våbeneksport: gennemførelse af fælles holdning 2008/944/FUSP (A8-0335/2018 - Sabine Lösing)	42
15.3. Styrkelse af de nationale konkurrencemyndigheder og sikring af et velfungerende indre marked (A8-0057/2018 - Andreas Schwab)	43
15.4. Præstationsnormer for nye tunge køretøjs CO ₂ -emissioner (A8-0354/2018 - Bas Eickhout) ...	44
15.5. Behov for en omfattende mekanisme for demokrati, retsstatsprincippet og grundlæggende rettigheder (B8-0523/2018, B8-0524/2018)	44
15.6. Gennemførelsen af EU's associeringsaftale med Georgien (A8-0320/2018 - Andrejs Mamikins) .	46
15.7. Gennemførelsen af EU's associeringsaftale med Moldova (A8-0322/2018 - Petras Auštrevičius) .	46

Indhold	Side
15.8. Humanitære visa (A8-0328/2018 - Juan Fernando López Aguilar)	47
16. Stemmerettelser og -intentioner: se protokollen	48
17. Genoptagelse af mødet	48
18. Godkendelse af protokollen fra foregående møde: se protokollen	48
19. Modtagne dokumenter: se protokollen	48
20. Bevillingsoverførsler og budgetafgørelser: se protokollen	48
21. Styrke EU's modstandsdygtighed over for udenlandske aktørers indflydelse på den kommende valgkamp til Europa-Parlamentsvalget (debat om et aktuelt spørgsmål)	48
22. Jernbanepassagerers rettigheder og forpligtelser (forhandling)	76
23. Persistente organiske miljøgifte (forhandling)	91
24. Statistikmyndighedernes uafhængighed i Den Europæiske Union og sagen om Andreas Georgiou (forhandling)	98
25. Europæisk sikkerhed og fremtiden for traktaten om afskaffelse af mellemdistanceraketter (forhandling)	108
26. USA's reaktion på karavanen med centralamerikanske migranter ved den mexicanske grænse (forhandling)	116
27. De ekstraterritoriale virkninger af USA's sanktioner over for Iran for europæiske virksomheder (forhandling)	124
28. Dagsorden for næste møde	131
29. Hævelse af mødet	131

FULDSTÆNDIGT FORHANDLINGSREFERAT DEN 14. NOVEMBER 2018**PRÉSIDENCE: SYLVIE GUILLAUME***vice-présidente***1. Åbning af mødet***(La séance est ouverte à 9 h 02)***2. Forhandlinger forud for Parlamentets førstebehandling (forretningsordenens artikel 69c) (godkendelse): se protokollen****3. Debat om tilfælde af krænkelse af menneskerettighederne, demokratiet og retsstatsprincippet (meddelelse om indgivne beslutningsforslag): se protokollen****4. Behov for en omfattende mekanisme for demokrati, retsstatsprincippet og grundlæggende rettigheder (meddelelse om indgivne beslutningsforslag): se protokollen****5. Gennemførelsesforanstaltninger (forretningsordenens artikel 106): se protokollen****6. Delegerede retsakter (forretningsordenens artikel 105, stk. 6): se protokollen****7. Europæisk kodeks for elektronisk kommunikation – Sammenslutningen af Europæiske Tilsynsmyndigheder inden for Elektronisk Kommunikation (forhandling)**

La Présidente. – L'ordre du jour appelle la discussion commune sur:

— le rapport de Pilar del Castillo Vera, au nom de la commission de l'industrie, de la recherche et de l'énergie sur la proposition de directive du Parlement européen et du Conseil établissant le code des communications électroniques européen (refonte) (COM(2016)0590 – C8-0379/2016 – 2016/0288(COD)) (A8-0318/2017), et

— le rapport de Evžen Tošenovský, au nom de la commission de l'industrie, de la recherche et de l'énergie sur la proposition de règlement du Parlement européen et du Conseil établissant l'Organe des régulateurs européens des communications électroniques (COM(2016) 0591 – C8-0382/2016 – 2016/0286(COD)) (A8-0305/2017).

Pilar del Castillo Vera, ponente. – Señora presidenta, señor vicepresidente Ansip, queridos colegas, vamos a votar hoy la nueva regulación europea sobre comunicaciones electrónicas. La última es del año 2009 y, desde entonces, se han producido cambios tecnológicos extraordinarios, cambios que han afectado a los modelos de negocio, a los intereses de los usuarios, a las experiencias también de los propios consumidores y que han transformado absolutamente el panorama de las comunicaciones electrónicas.

Hay que empezar diciendo que la conectividad ha sido siempre la precondition, la condición necesaria para los avances extraordinarios que se han conocido en la humanidad, sobre todo en el siglo XX de mano de la tecnología.

Pensemos, por ejemplo, en qué situación estaríamos si no hubiera habido una infraestructura de carreteras, de ferrocarriles, de radio, de telefonía o de transporte aéreo: seguro que la situación de nuestra economía y el desarrollo de nuestra sociedad sería muy, muy distinta.

Hoy estamos en una situación similar, donde la conectividad es una condición necesaria y urgente para que la Unión Europea pueda aprovechar el potencial de las tecnologías digitales más avanzadas, como internet de las cosas, *big data*, inteligencia artificial, robótica, computación cuántica y un largo etcétera.

Son tecnologías que se están abriendo paso, que se están abriendo camino de una manera extraordinaria, a una velocidad muy, muy elevada y están a la espera de contar con la capacidad de conexión que necesitan para poder desarrollarse plenamente y así desplegar todo su potencial de nuevas oportunidades para la economía y la sociedad. Pensemos en las posibilidades de desarrollo del 5G que puede ofrecernos para el futuro —para un futuro muy cercano— como, por ejemplo: realizar intervenciones quirúrgicas a larga distancia; los trabajos de alto riesgo que se pueden realizar desde un lugar seguro; o para los propios agricultores, para el sector de la agricultura, que, obteniendo datos en tiempos reales, pueden mejorar muchísimo las explotaciones agrarias.

Por todas estas razones, el nuevo marco regulatorio, además del mercado digital, refuerza y sitúa la conectividad como espina dorsal de esta regulación del mercado de las comunicaciones electrónicas. Incluye una serie de medidas para ello, medidas que van a atraer la inversión, a hacer más atractiva la inversión, como los modelos de coinversión, una mejor y más armonizada gestión del espectro radioeléctrico, mejorando la duración de las licencias con una duración mínima, por ejemplo, de veinte años.

El Código obliga además a todos los Estados miembros a liberar y permitir el uso de las conocidas bandas 5G antes del final de 2020 y, en la protección de los consumidores, establece y mejora los servicios de emergencia, dando más oportunidades de localización en caso de catástrofe, además de introducir una reducción muy significativa de las llamadas paneuropeas, de las llamadas intraeuropeas, lo que, después de la desaparición de los costes del *roaming*, es una muy buena noticia también para los ciudadanos.

En suma, el Código Europeo de las Comunicaciones Electrónicas está destinado a desempeñar un papel fundamental en la digitalización de Europa y lo hace poniendo la conectividad en su corazón.

Evžen Tošenovský, zpravodaj. – Paní předsedající, pane komisaři, dovoluji mi začít poděkováním kolegyni Pilar Del Castillové, která odvedla v rámci kodexu vynikající práci. Kodex a BEREC jsou úzce provázány, od začátku jsme s paní Pilar Del Castillovou postupovali koordinovaně a nakonec oba návrhy úspěšně uzavřeli na společném dialogu.

Kodex přináší pro BEREC celou řadu nových úkolů, které bylo zapotřebí reflektovat v této zprávě. Otázka speciálních hlasovacích pravidel v radě regulátorů se ukázala jako nejproblematictější bod závěrečného dialogu a velmi nám pomohla Komise jako mediátor. Nařízení BEREC podle dohody hostí i kapitoly původně dohodnutou v kodexu k regulaci volání v rámci Evropské unie. Nebylo by proto fér, aby toto bylo připisováno k výsledku zprávy BEREC.

Obecně oceňuji kompromis ke kodexu, věřím, že se usnadní rozvoj vysokorychlostních sítí jako předpokladu 5G, tak jak zde Pilar Del Castillová před chvílí zmínila. Z pozice naší politické skupiny jsem rád, že výsledný text ponechává více flexibility členským státům v oblasti spektra a nejsou do něj nakonec zahrnuty jednotná autorizace nebo takzvaný *double lock*.

Zpět k jádru zprávy o sdružení BEREC – struktura sdružení BEREC a podpůrného úřadu BEREC byla výsledkem politické dohody z roku 2009. Nyní Komise navrhla jejich spojení vytvořením jedné velké agentury.

Jako zpravodaj jsem se na začátku snažil posbírat z různých zdrojů informace o tom, zda je tato dvojitá struktura funkční, s kolegy jsme podnikli i misi Výboru pro průmysl, výzkum a energetiku do Rígy. Nejsem příznivcem zásadních dramatických změn tam, kde něco dobře funguje, a pozitivní hodnocení zde v rámci sdružení BEREC silně převažovalo. Dále jsme reflektovali obavy o nezávislost rozhodování regulátorů. Potřebujeme skutečnou nezávislost regulátorů, a to na úrovni členských států i Evropské unie. Jejich odstup od národních vlád a Evropské komise byl proto důležitý. Proto jsem navrhl odmítnout spojení sdružení BEREC a podpůrného úřadu BEREC a soustředit se spíše na drobná vylepšení tak, jak probíhala diskuse.

Přesto byl Evropský parlament v této základní otázce rozdělen, některé politické skupiny preferovaly spojení navržené Komisí. Nakonec nám ke kompromisu na půdě Výboru pro průmysl, výzkum a energetiku pomohly nové úkoly pro BEREC stanovené právě v kodexu, konkrétně nově zaváděné arbitrážní rozhodování sdružení BEREC, které by bylo právně závazné. V důsledku toho by také BEREC obdržel právní subjektivitu. V rámci trialogů s Radou a Komisí jsme pak postupovali opačně – v kodexu nakonec právně závazná rozhodnutí nebudou, a proto zachováváme stávající strukturu i status sdružení BEREC jako nezávislého sdružení regulátorů. Je mi přitom jasné, že všichni kolegové vlastně ani nemohou být v této nejzákladnější otázce zcela spokojeni.

Mé velké poděkování každopádně patří všem stínovým zpravodajům. Myslím, že se nám podařilo dohodnout rozumnou modernizaci pravidel, tak aby byl BEREC efektivní, mohl plnit nové úkoly z kodexu, přispívat k jednotné aplikaci regulačního rámce pro telekomunikace a k otevření jednotného trhu Evropské unie.

Dita Charanzová, *rapporteur for the opinion of the Committee on the Internal Market and Consumer Protection*. – Madam President, today we are giving our citizens concrete achievements. This 500-page law will mean a future of cheaper calls, safer citizens, faster internet, better access for persons with disabilities, and a final confirmation that internet access is no longer a luxury but a right.

From 15 May next year, everyone will be able to make cheaper calls. International EU rates have been unjustly high for too long. The end of roaming in Europe was a great success, but we stopped half way. I am proud and humbled to have led Parliament to complete the final step in creating an EU where country codes are obsolete and where consumers can call anyone without worrying about the price. Also, every citizen will now have a right to an affordable internet connection. As more and more services, including government services, go online, it is unthinkable to be without internet access today. The internet must be seen as a utility like electricity and gas.

Finally, I want to highlight the introduction of the mobile public warning system. In the 21st century, citizens should not have to rely on rumours to know what is happening in the case of an attack or emergency. There is much more, but I'm running out of time, so let me just thank the rapporteur, Pilar del Castillo Vera, and all my fellow shadow rapporteurs who worked on this proposal.

Andrus Ansip, *Vice-President of the Commission*. – Madam President, updating the EU's telecom rules is an essential step in building the Digital Single Market. For that, two pieces of legislation will be vital: the European Electronic Communications Code and the Regulation on BEREC (the Body of European Regulators for Electronic Communications). Together, they create the legal conditions that will allow us to meet Europe's growing connectivity needs and to boost its competitiveness.

We have succeeded in providing a legal environment for European telecoms that is both investment-friendly and pro-competitive. This is something very much to be welcomed. We should not underestimate the significance of this achievement. I would like to thank the rapporteurs, Pilar del Castillo Vera, Dita Charanzová and Evžen Tošenovský, for their impressive work. The code will lay the groundwork for developing 5G across Europe. It will make sure that 5G radio spectrum is available in the EU by the end of 2020 and will give operators predictability for spectrum licensing for at least 20 years. That includes better coordination of planned radio spectrum assignments and specific rules regarding radio spectrum fees.

Rolling out new, very high-capacity networks is crucial for putting Europe at the forefront of digital innovation. The code's new provisions, including those on core investments, offer strong incentives for deploying these new networks. The new rules ensure close cooperation between the Commission and BEREC on supervising measures related to the new access provisions.

Europeans expect an internet connection that is fast, reliable, affordable and safe. The code will allow that expectation to become a reality. Consumers will benefit from advanced services and from better online protection. It harmonises end-user protection of electronic communications in the EU, whether in relation to bundled services, switching providers or stronger security against hacking. We have extended the end-user protection obligations to web-based services where that makes sense.

Two more important things are to be welcomed: firstly, that the universal service will guarantee that everyone can afford access to an adequate broadband internet service; and secondly, that end-users with disabilities are guaranteed equivalent access to communications. We have also strengthened people's protection in emergency situations, including through the retrieval of more accurate caller location.

The forthcoming vote will be a significant step for the Digital Single Market and for Europe.

Ivan Štefanec, *spravodajca Výboru pre vnútorný trh a ochranu spotrebiteľa požiadaného o stanovisko*. – Pani predsedajúca, jednotný trh pre elektronické komunikácie je jadrom digitálnej ekonomiky, a preto je nevyhnutné posilniť odvetvie elektronickej komunikácie a poskytnúť vysokokvalitnú konektivitu vo všetkých odvetviach európskeho hospodárstva. Cieľom orgánu BEREC je predovšetkým zlepšiť harmonizáciu právnych predpisov a posilniť nezávislosť vnútroštátnych regulačných orgánov. Som presvedčený, že súčasné inštitucionálne usporiadanie založené na nezávislosti národných regulačných orgánov od Komisie a iných inštitúcií Únie, umožňuje BEREC-u poskytovať nezávislé a odborné poradens-tvo a pokračovať v spolupráci s inými inštitúciami Únie. Prostredníctvom svojich stanovísk a odporúčaní môže BEREC radiť orgánom Únie a vnútroštátnym regulačným orgánom ako efektívnejšie využívať elektronické komunikácie, pouka-zovať na nedostatky pri ich využívaní, dozeráť na ochranu spotrebiteľa a taktiež zabezpečovať spoluprácu medzi ost-atnými regulačnými orgánmi. Podporujem teda ponechanie štruktúry dvojakeho riadenia a je dôležité, aby zloženie BEREC-u pozostávalo zo zástupcov jednotlivých národných regulačných orgánov, čo prispieva k lepšej regulácii medzi členskými štátmi, a tým sa podporí rozvoj trhu v Únii pre občanov.

Petra Kammerevert, *Verfasserin der Stellungnahme des mitberatenden Ausschusses für Kultur und Bildung*. – Frau Präsidentin! Dem Kulturausschuss ist es besonders wichtig, dass dem GEREK die Aufgabe zukommt, kulturelle und mediale Vielfalt zu sichern. Darüber zu wachen, dass der Zugang zu Kommunikationsnetzen nicht diskriminiert wird, sei es durch Unternehmensfusionen oder durch technologische Neuerungen, wirkt Vielfalt sichernd. Alles dafür zu tun, jede Form des Datenverkehrs möglichst gleichzubehandeln, wirkt ebenfalls Vielfalt sichernd.

Trotz anfänglicher Skepsis lässt sich feststellen, dass das GEREK zur Wahrung der Netzneutralität gute Arbeit geleistet und damit allen Europäerinnen und Europäern einen Dienst erwiesen hat. Die Gewährleistung von Neutralität, Fairness und Diskriminierungsfreiheit bleibt eine große Herausforderung, und wir statten heute das GEREK mit den notwendigen Mitteln aus, um dies anzugehen.

Auch der europäische Kodex für elektronische Kommunikation ist im Sinne von Diskriminierungsfreiheit verfasst. Es ist essenziell, dass allen Bürgerinnen und Bürgern ein erschwinglicher, universeller, verfügbarer Internetanschluss zur Verfü-gung steht. Auch für das Radio als einer wichtigen Informationsquelle ist der Umstieg zum Digitalempfang wichtig. Deshalb begrüßen wir, dass alle neuen Autos in den nächsten zwei Jahren für den Empfang mit digital-terrestrischem Rundfunk ausgestattet sein müssen. Ausdrücklich zu begrüßen ist auch, dass Frequenzen im Kodex auch weiterhin als öffentliches Gut anerkannt werden.

Morten Helveg Petersen, *ordfører for udtalelse fra Udvalget om Borgernes Rettigheder og Retlige og Indre Anliggender*. – Fru formand! Vi er midt i den nye digitale tidsalder, og det stiller ekstra store krav til os alle om at skabe de bedst tænkelige rammer for de europæiske brugere og de europæiske borgere. Vores fællesskab er bedst for Europas borgere og virk-somheder, når vi frit kan rejse, handle og ikke mindst kommunikere over grænser uden forhindringer. Og det er jo sådan set det, som denne telepakke handler om. Vi i den liberale gruppe er glade for, at det er lykkedes at sikre et hurtigere og bedre internet i hele Europa. Vi er glade for, at det er lykkedes, at det bliver billigere at ringe fra et EU-land til et andet, og vi er rigtig glade for, at der med dette forslag etableres et såkaldt omvendt 112-system, hvor vi som borgere kan få besked på mobiltelefonen, hvis der måtte opstå en nødsituation. Jeg synes personligt, at det omvendte 112-system er en fantastisk ide. Under det skrækkelige terrorangreb i Bruxelles husker jeg, hvordan vi ikke vidste, hvad der skete, andet end hvad vi kunne læse om via nyhederne, men med det omvendte 112-system vil vi som

borgere kunne modtage sikker information fra vores myndigheder. Det vil helt konkret kunne komme til at redde liv til gavn for os alle, til gavn for europæerne, og det skal vi være glade for, så stor tak for samarbejdet med de øvrige ordførere. Det er en rigtig fornuftig pakke, vi kan vedtage her i dag!

Krišjānis Kariņš, PPE grupas vārdā. – Cienījamie kolēģi! Kā vienmēr, pasaule mainās. Vienmēr tā ir bijis. Pirmās industriālās revolūcijas laikā nāca jaunas tehnoloģijas, kuras radikāli izmainīja cilvēku dzīves. Ja agrāk cilvēki pārsvarā strādāja lauku darbos, varbūt mežsaimniecībā, zivsaimniecībā, veidojās jaunas industrijas, rūpnīcas, pilnīgi jauna darba vide, mūsu, teiksim, vecvectēvi pielāgojās šādiem apstākļiem. Mēs šodien dzīvojam nākamajā revolūcijas ērā, tā saucamajā digitālajā revolūcijā, kad atkal mainās viss darba tirgus, mainās visas iespējas. Un, ja varbūt vēl pirms 50 gadiem daudzi cilvēki burtiski strādāja rūpnīcās, tagad jau rūpnīcās strādā roboti, bet cilvēki ir tie, kas veido nākotnes robotus, veido nākotnes iespējas. Izaicinājums mums šīs te digitālās revolūcijas laikmetā ir tas, ka tās jau ir tehnoloģijas, kuras ir attīstījušās. Eiropā mums ir izveidojies ļoti saskaldīts tirgus — katrā dalībvalstī drusku citādi lietas veidojās. Tas ir arī ietekmējis telekomunikācijas un tā tālāk. Bet mēs zinām, ka Eiropa konkurē pasaules globālajā tirgū: pretī ir Amerikas Savienotās Valstis ar vienotu tirgu 330 miljoniem cilvēku, pretī ir Ķīna ar 1,3 miljardiem iedzīvotāju. Eiropā mums ar 500 miljoniem ir milzu potenciāls, bet liela saskaldētība. Tas, ko dod šī telekomunikāciju pakotne, par ko mēs šodien runājam, ir vienota pieeja, vienota infrastruktūra visai šai jomai. Tātad patērētājiem tas nozīmē telefonsarunas, par kurām nav jāmaksā dārgāk, ja brauc citviet Eiropā, tātad — vienotu tirgu telekomunikācijām. Tas nozīmē vienkāršotu, drošu pieeju internetam. Un industrijai tas nozīmē skaidrus nosacījumus, kā varēs tālāk attīstīt tehnoloģijas, kā, piemēram, tā saucamās 5G tehnoloģijas, kas būs nākotnes atslēga autonomai automašīnu vadīšanai, veselības aprūpei un tā tālāk. Atbalstām šo pakotni, atbalstām savu ekonomisko attīstību. Paldies jums par uzmanību!

Miapetra Kumpula-Natri, on behalf of the S&D Group. – Madam President, one of the great drivers we have in our society that is spreading good is information technology. It has made our lives easier, brought with it new services and technologies, but we haven't seen it all yet. The change has only just begun.

This morning I came from Paris where I had the privilege to head the Parliament's delegation to the Internet Governance Forum. Europe is at the forefront of the digital revolution but we need to cooperate with the rest of the world and we have to make sure that we have common goals for the right use of the digital tools. To deliver that digital revolution, we need this European Electronic Communications Code. If we want better digital services, we need better digital infrastructure. If we want connected cars or if we want e-health solutions, we need fast 5G. If we want our schools and universities and businesses to thrive, we need gigabit connectivity to use artificial intelligence and cloud computing. If we want to see the next ground-breaking services to make our lives better, we need fast internet connections for all homes and mobile devices. Internet connectivity is a modern right for every European and we have defined what a very high capacity network is. It's not just in these connections that you see that you are connected but your program doesn't work anyway. We need fibre to boost things and we need more very good connections.

The key problem we're trying to solve here is how we can get faster, better and cheaper connections. We need this for all Europeans while maintaining the right conditions for investment so that it can happen. The outcome here today, agreed after eight months of trialogues and negotiations, reflects the Parliament position well. We have achieved the goal of promoting investments while making sure that consumers in Europe retain the right to choose their operators. The new rules for co-investments are complex and some details will be up to national implementation, but the message is clear: there can be no turning back to the monopolies.

One key technology for revolution is 5G and very fast connections. It's high time for Member States to see that we need common rules for spectrum as well, and we need the spectrum bands to be out there at the latest by 2020. With this legislation I am very happy to continue to 'roam like home' but to turn it the other way round, so next summer everyone can enjoy calling friends in other EU countries for a maximum of 19 cents per minute.

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

Paul Rübzig (PPE), *Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“*. – Meine Frage geht in die Richtung: Glauben Sie, dass es möglich sein wird, eine SIM-Karte auf Dauer in allen europäischen Ländern kaufen zu können? Derzeit können wir nur SIM-Karten auf Dauer in den eigenen Mitgliedstaaten kaufen. Bis wann wird es möglich sein, dass wir einen echten digitalen Binnenmarkt kriegen?

Und glauben Sie, dass sich auch auf globaler Ebene etwas ändern kann? Wir zahlen derzeit für 1 GB in Europa 7 Euro, und wenn man außerhalb Europas ist, kostet das 19 500. Glauben Sie, dass hier noch Fortschritte möglich sind?

Miapetra Kumpula-Natri (S&D), *blue-card answer*. – I very much share Mr Rübzig's worries. I would like the Commission to react quickly. As we will see the roaming follow-up this year, we see that mobile virtual network operators (MVNOs) cannot join the same retailer operating markets, but then the wholesale market prices are too high – even the ones we agreed with the Council and took down a lot last year. It still shows us that the retail markets for consumers get cheaper prices than the wholesale market caps that we agreed and halved the proposal from the Commission. Even the Council wanted to get it higher. So it's of the utmost importance that we get this functioning, and we need new legislation for that.

Ruža Tomašić, *u ime kluba ECR*. – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, tržište telekomunikacijskih usluga rapidno se mijenja. Novi proizvodi i usluge te promijenjene navike potrošača traže prilagodbu postojećeg zakonskog okvira. Brže, kvalitetnije, fleksibilnije i jeftinije usluge uz maksimalnu zaštitu potrošača, njihovih podataka i privatnosti moraju biti u središtu našeg djelovanja u ovom području.

Telekomi su unutar državnih granica dugo bili moćan oligopol, što je u pojedinim članicama usporavalo razvoj usluga i potrošače stavljalo u nezavidan položaj. Zato smatram da nam jedan od prioriteta mora biti stvaranje jedinstvenog tržišta telekom usluga na kojemu bi natjecanje bilo izraženije, a usluge krajnjim korisnicima bolje i jeftinije. Kako ovaj proces bude napredovao, logičnim smatram osnivanje Europske agencije za telekomunikacije koja bi nadgledala jedinstveno tržište telekom usluga.

(*Govornica se složila da odgovori na pitanje podizanjem plave kartice na osnovi članka 162. stavka 8. Poslovnika.*)

Maria Grapini (S&D), *întrebare adresată în conformitate cu procedura „cartonașului albastru”*. – Doamna președintă, stimată colegă, sunt de acord cu ce ați spus dumneavoastră. Ați vorbit de protecția datelor, de protecția consumatorilor. Sunt de acord că trebuie să avem un cod european, dar ce părere aveți: suntem în situația în care avem o infrastructură în toate zonele? Ce putem să facem cu zona rurală? Ce putem să facem cu cetățenii care nu au abilitățile de utilizare?

Nu credeți că ar trebui ca acest cod european să fie susținut și de investiții, de un buget pentru zonele îndepărtate și pentru zonele rurale pentru cunoștințe și abilități ale cetățenilor în operare?

Ruža Tomašić (ECR), *odgovor na pitanje postavljeno podizanjem plave kartice*. – Naravno da trebamo, naravno da moramo zajamčiti sigurnost kako bi ljudi u ruralnim područjima ostali u svojim domovima. Moramo im pružiti svu potrebnu infrastrukturu, ali ćemo to tek pružiti kad prestanemo politizirati sve čega se dotaknemo.

Julia Reda, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Madam President, the Telecom Package has undergone quite a transformation since it was first proposed in 2016. First, it was based on the strange notion that the best way to get companies to invest in broadband internet was to reduce competition and to offer deregulation in return for investment. Even the most conservative economists would predict the exact opposite, namely that competition drives innovation and doesn't stifle it.

The Verts/ALE Group has been at the forefront of resisting any deregulation agenda and ensuring that telecom regulators have the necessary powers to regulate. The final deal, thanks to Parliament, is much more balanced than the first draft and is much more ambitious in the field of consumer rights. With the Electronic Communications Code, we're making real improvements to the transparency of contracts, to the ability to take your phone number with you when you switch providers, and to ensuring that everyone has affordable internet access, also recognising community networks. We are making real improvements to people's security, too, by introducing systems that allow people to receive automatic notifications on their phones in the case of disasters.

There's a reason why telecom companies have quite a terrible reputation among consumers. Many people in Europe have the choice between just a small number of providers, and often all the available options are bad. Bad surprises, in the form of ridiculously high phone bills, slow speeds and difficulties in switching providers, are still common.

When we told Europeans years ago that we would abolish roaming, they thought that would mean that wherever you called in Europe, and wherever you used the internet, you would pay the same price. What they soon had to learn was that calling somebody in another EU country is not roaming. That's an intra-EU call – something completely different – where higher prices are considered okay. So it is a great success for Parliament that the proposals from the Greens and the left to abolish charges for intra-EU calls have made it into the final deal, at least in the form of a price cap. That will bring European consumers one step closer to a real single market.

A missed opportunity in the Telecom Package is that of turning the Body of European Regulators for Electronic Communications (BEREC) into a fully-fledged EU regulator. The BEREC Regulation makes some modest improvements, but this Parliament and national governments failed to take the important step of creating an EU regulator with all the powers needed. It's a missed opportunity because global threats to our open internet are becoming bigger. It's not just that the US has abolished Federal net neutrality rules. It's not just that, in Paris this week, Mr Macron said that net neutrality must not stand in the way of internet regulation.

No, Mr Macron, net neutrality is internet regulation, and it's precisely the kind of regulation we need to strengthen. Although the European Union has enshrined net neutrality in law, it has failed to provide a clear and unequivocal ban on zero-rating. The consequence is that today, according to BEREC's own figures, zero-rating still exists in most EU countries and we need to take further steps to ensure that an open internet is available to everybody. I hope that this Telecom Package will be a step in the right direction.

Marisa Matias, *em nome do Grupo GUE/NGL*. – Senhora Presidente, esta legislação relativa ao código apresenta, de facto, elementos muito positivos. Gostaria de salientar alguns, entre eles a independência das autoridades reguladoras nacionais, um sistema de comunicações eletrónicas mais eficaz e mais regulado (isso é fundamental), maiores garantias para os consumidores, sobretudo no que diz respeito a comunicações sobre taxas relacionadas com as comunicações entre os diferentes países, maior velocidade e 5G, mas precisamos também de garantir o acesso igualitário, precisamos de garantir que tudo isto chega a todos os cidadãos.

Há ainda dimensões que têm a ver, por exemplo, com as questões de atualização das regras das telecomunicações e com a resposta que é necessário dar à conectividade entre os diferentes cidadãos e nos diferentes países. Estamos a falar de um pacote que procura seguramente modernizar as atuais regras de telecomunicação, mas nada disto pode ser feito apenas com base na concorrência. Já foi aqui referida a necessidade da regulação e queria chamar a atenção para uma outra questão que me parece fundamental: as comunicações são uma área muito sensível e, portanto, não é apenas de infraestrutura de código que estamos a falar, mas também daquilo que podem ser as ameaças à manutenção e à gestão das comunicações. Por isso, temos de garantir que se mantém a possibilidade de resgatar sempre para o setor público as redes básicas de prestação de serviços de comunicações, como, por exemplo, as redes de gestão de emergências ou, por exemplo, a Proteção Civil ou o sinal audiovisual. Isto é fundamental para impedirmos que alguns desastres possam acontecer nas nossas comunicações.

Marco Zullo, *a nome del gruppo EFDD*. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, il mondo delle telecomunicazioni sta cambiando velocemente. Abbiamo connessioni più prestanti, la concorrenza è sempre più complessa, vi è convergenza di reti fisse e mobili ed è esplosa la domanda dei dati senza fili. Oggi, in risposta a questi significativi cambiamenti strutturali, ci apprestiamo a varare un codice europeo delle telecomunicazioni. Però, se da una parte dobbiamo incoraggiare gli investimenti nelle reti ad elevata capacità, dall'altra dobbiamo assicurare una maggiore competitività dei mercati, abbassando i prezzi e alzando la qualità dei servizi rivolti a consumatori e imprese.

Sono felice che siano state accolte diverse delle nostre richieste che vanno nella direzione di tutelare maggiormente gli utenti. Prima fra tutti l'abbattimento dei costi delle chiamate internazionali tra paesi dell'Unione europea. Queste tariffe non sono affatto collegate ai reali costi sostenuti dai fornitori. Per questo abbiamo chiesto che qualsiasi differenza di prezzo tra le chiamate nazionali e le chiamate intraeuropee venisse eliminata. Purtroppo, questa richiesta è stata accolta solo in parte, però, è importante che sia stato fissato un tetto massimo di 19 centesimi al minuto per le chiamate intraeuropee. Questo, per esempio, in Italia significherebbe un abbassamento quasi della metà del prezzo di queste chiamate. Spero che i consumatori si renderanno conto di questo cambiamento e che questo sia il primo passo per un abbattimento completo del costo delle chiamate intraeuropee.

Altri successi importanti per la tutela dei consumatori sono le bollette più trasparenti, in modo tale che in bolletta sia fatta esplicita dichiarazione di chi sono i fornitori e della durata dei servizi che poi vengono addebitati, in modo tale che sia chiaro che cosa stiamo pagando. Il cambio di operatore sarà più facile, perché mantenere lo stesso numero e quindi la portabilità è un elemento chiave della libertà di scelta da parte dei consumatori e dell'effettiva concorrenza. Quindi un nuovo numero dovrà essere reso disponibile entro un giorno lavorativo e ci dovranno essere dei rimborsi proporzionati ai ritardi subiti. Tempi certi per il trasferimento della linea, in modo tale che sia concordata con l'utente e sia fatta nel momento in cui si è deciso. Infine, è importante che sia stato intensificato il sostegno agli utenti con disabilità, per esempio, garantendo l'accesso a tutte le informazioni contrattuali e ai servizi d'emergenza. Credo che questo sia un passo importante verso un mercato unico digitale accessibile e trasparente.

Barbara Kappel, *im Namen der ENF-Fraktion.* – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Kommissar! Ich möchte mich bei Pilar del Castillo und bei Evžen Tošenovský sehr herzlich für ihre Berichte bedanken.

Sie haben sowohl mit dem elektronischen Kommunikationscode als auch mit der GEREK-Verordnung dazu beigetragen, dass in Europa hinkünftig mehr Rechts- und Planungssicherheit im Bereich der Telekommunikation herrschen wird, dass der digitale Binnenmarkt weiterentwickelt wird, gerade was das GEREK betrifft. Sie haben dafür gesorgt, dass mehr Flexibilität in Bezug auf die Regulierung bei den Mitgliedstaaten erhalten bleibt, ohne dabei die Regulierungskompetenz einzuschränken.

Der Ausbau der digitalen Infrastruktur und *digital skills* sind heute – und das hat Kommissar Ansip schon erwähnt – wesentliche Treiber für die Wettbewerbsfähigkeit und somit auch für Wachstum und Beschäftigung in Europa. Allein in Österreich, in meinem Heimatland, würden Investitionen von 10 Mrd. Euro in die digitale Infrastruktur ein BIP-Wachstum von 15 % oder 58 Mrd. Euro auslösen, das ergab eine am Montag dieser Woche präsentierte Studie von Future Business Austria.

Digitale Infrastruktur umfasst den Aufbau von 5G – wir haben es heute schon gehört –, Highspeed-Internet, die Möglichkeit des autonomen Fahrens, das Internet auf *internet of things*, *artificial intelligence* und vieles mehr. Eine wesentliche Voraussetzung dafür ist der europäische Kodex für die elektronische Kommunikation, der mit dazu beitragen wird, dass der Breitbandausbau – insbesondere im ländlichen Raum – forciert wird. Ich glaube, da war heute auch schon eine Frage dazu.

Aber nicht nur das. Der neue Kommunikationskodex wird wesentliche Voraussetzungen auch dafür schaffen, dass Investitionen in superschnelles Internet überhaupt erst stattfinden können. Und wie macht er das? Nämlich indem sichergestellt wird, dass in den nächsten zwei Jahren ausreichend 5G-Frequenzen für den Netzausbau zur Verfügung stehen und Netzbetreiber mindestens 20 Jahre Planungssicherheit bei den Frequenzlizenzen haben.

Aber nicht nur für den Produzenten, auch für die Konsumenten gibt es Vorteile – es wurde heute schon angesprochen: Der Kodex wird sicherstellen, dass Auslandsgespräche innerhalb der EU – wir nennen es immer noch Auslandsgespräche – maximal 19 Cent pro Minute kosten können, dass ein leichter Dienstewechsel und Rufnummernmitnahme möglich ist, dass preiswerte Kommunikationsdienste zur Verfügung stehen, Transparenz besteht, Sicherheit in Bezug auf Schadprogramme erhöht wird und dass die Bürger in Notfällen besser geschützt sind, indem Notrufe mittels Anruferortung besser nachverfolgbar sind und es auch einen öffentlichen Warnhinweis mit Profil „Telefonie“ gibt.

(Die Präsidentin entzieht der Rednerin das Wort.)

Σωτήριος Ζαριανόπουλος (NI). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, τι επιδιώκει αλήθεια η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση με την ανανεωμένη νομοθεσία για τις ηλεκτρονικές επικοινωνίες; Θέλει μήπως οι ευρυζωνικές υποδομές, το ραδιοφάσμα και, γενικά, η τεράστια ανάπτυξη της επιστήμης και της τεχνολογίας να μειώσουν τον μόχθο των εργαζομένων και να καλυτερεύσουν τη ζωή τους; Ακριβώς το αντίθετο! Θέλει να εγγυηθεί τις επενδύσεις και να διασφαλίσει την κερδοφορία των ευρωπαϊκών μονοπωλίων στον ανταγωνισμό με τα αντίπαλα μονοπώλια στην Κίνα, τις Ηνωμένες Πολιτείες και την Ινδία. Γι' αυτό απελευθερώνει εντελώς την αγορά. Ιδιωτικοποιεί ό,τι απέμεινε κρατικό και τους δίνει και «προίκα» όλες τις δημόσιες υποδομές και τη λαϊκή περιουσία. Ο λαός και η νεολαία έχουν πικρή πείρα από τις συνέπειες της απελευθέρωσης των αγορών. Η πρόσβασή τους στις παραδοσιακές ηλεκτρονικές επικοινωνίες θα παραμείνει ακριβή, ενώ η πρόσβασή τους στις νέες τεχνολογίες, υπηρεσίες και προϊόντα θα είναι ουσιαστικά αδύνατη. Οι εργαζόμενοι θα έχουν τη δυνατότητα να απολαύσουν ελεύθερα τα επιτεύγματα της επιστήμης και της τεχνολογίας, αρκεί να βγάλουν από τη μέση τα μονοπώλια, τις ενώσεις και την εξουσία αυτών για να ζήσουν τη ζωή που τους αξίζει και μπορούν να ζήσουν.

Paul Rübzig (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin! Ich gratuliere auch den Berichterstattnern. Ich kann mich noch gut erinnern, wie im Jahr 2006 während der österreichischen Präsidentschaft eine Studentin zu mir gekommen ist und sich beschwert hat über die überproportionalen Abzocktarife, die es in diesem Bereich gibt, wenn man grenzüberschreitend telefoniert. Und ich war eigentlich stolz darauf, dass die Europäische Kommission geliefert hat und dass innerhalb von sieben Monaten eine Verordnung in Kraft getreten ist, die für ganz Europa gültig war und die von der Ratspräsidentin Merkel – die deutsche Präsidentschaft war dann folgend – gemeinsam mit unserem Team im Plenum des Europäischen Parlaments unterschrieben wurde.

Das war der erste Schritt. Wir haben hier neue Standards gesetzt, erstmals ist es uns nämlich gelungen, eine *sunset clause* einzuführen. Das hat dazu geführt, dass wir jetzt mehr oder weniger die fünfte Roamingverordnung haben. Wir haben ein *price cap* eingeführt, also eine Definition, ab welcher Stufe Betrug beginnt. Unter diesem *price cap* kann sich natürlich der freie Wettbewerb entwickeln. Aber wir haben noch immer keinen freien Wettbewerb zwischen den Mitgliedstaaten. Gerade die virtuellen Betreiber brauchen Zugang zu marktkonformen Preisen. Dazu fordere ich die Kommission auf. Hier ist der *glide path*, den wir entwickelt haben, zu langsam. Ich glaube, diese Preise, die untereinander verrechnet werden, sollten marktkonform sein.

Deshalb ist es klar, dass wir in Europa mit dem GEREK eine Institution haben, die hier in Zukunft marktkonform entwickeln muss. Ich bitte die Kommission, das zu überprüfen.

Constanze Krehl (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin! Der Vorschlag der Kommission zum GEREK hatte zum Ziel, eine eigenständige GEREK-Agentur zu schaffen und damit die bestehende ineffiziente Doppelstruktur zu überwinden.

Meine Fraktion hat dieses Ziel immer mitgetragen, denn nach unserer Überzeugung braucht der zukünftige europäische Binnenmarkt für Telekommunikation eine klare und starke Verwaltungsstruktur, in der das GEREK als Agentur eine zentrale Rolle spielen sollte.

Nach Abschluss der Verhandlungen im Parlament und mit dem Rat nehmen wir jedoch zur Kenntnis, dass die Zeit für diese Veränderung wohl noch nicht gekommen ist. Insbesondere bedauern wir, dass das GEREK auch mit dem nun zur Abstimmung gestellten Text keine Rechtspersönlichkeit erhält und somit auch weiterhin keine rechtlich bindenden Entscheidungen fällen kann.

Wir halten dies für eine kurzfristige Entscheidung, denn auf dem Weg zum Binnenmarkt werden noch viele Regeln harmonisiert und technische Lösungen gefunden werden müssen. Wir halten den Text somit insgesamt für zu wenig ehrgeizig und zu sehr auf die Erhaltung des Status quo ausgerichtet. Was die überarbeitete GEREK-Verordnung in der Summe für mich zustimmungsfähig macht, ist jedoch etwas ganz anderes, nämlich die Aufnahme des Themas Auslandsanrufe in den Text. Die in den Trilog-Verhandlungen zum Kodex erreichte Deckelung der Preise für Telefonate ins EU-Ausland ab Mai 2019 auf 19 Cent pro Minute ist ein großer Erfolg für das Europäische Parlament. Insbesondere die S&D-Fraktion hat sich seit vielen Jahren für eine Senkung der Telefonkosten für die europäischen Verbraucherinnen und Verbraucher eingesetzt.

Wir können mit Recht stolz auf diese Einigung sein, die nach der Roaming-Abschaffung im Jahr 2017 einen weiteren Meilenstein darstellt.

João Ferreira (GUE/NGL). – Senhora Presidente, Senhor Comissário, o objetivo político assumido deste pacote legislativo das telecomunicações é o de criar o grande e liberalizado mercado europeu das telecomunicações. O organismo regulador das comunicações eletrónicas da União Europeia, ao qual a Comissão Europeia pretendia atribuir o estatuto de agência, foi criado para ajudar a configurar as orientações técnicas e políticas tendentes à conclusão deste grande mercado aberto e liberalizado.

São óbvias as contradições entre os interesses dos Estados-Membros, sobretudo de alguns Estados-Membros, e o interesse dos que pretendem um setor das comunicações totalmente liberalizado, afastando o que consideram ser os incómodos interesses nacionais.

Recorde-se que este era um setor público, dominado por empresas públicas em vários países europeus, público porque estratégico e, porque estratégico, público deve voltar a ser.

São bem visíveis os prejuízos decorrentes da privatização e liberalização para as populações, para os interesses nacionais, para o interesse público; benefícios só mesmo para as multinacionais do setor, que promovem e beneficiam da concentração monopolista à escala europeia.

Este é um caminho que deve ser revertido e não aprofundado.

(O orador aceita responder a uma pergunta «cartão azul» (n.º 8 do artigo 162.º)).

Miapetra Kumpula-Natri (S&D), blue-card question. – Mr Ferreira, I disagree with your proposal that, to turn the clock back, we would need more European legislation. At the Congress of the Internet Governance Forum (IGF) I met a farmer from Spain who was very disappointed that the regulator there doesn't support local community networks, building networks for places where there is no connectivity. They are waiting for the incumbent to maybe build there later and they don't get help from the national regulator. This was one case where they wanted the Body of European Regulators for Electronic Communications (BEREC) to have the opportunity also to enhance competition inside the countries. How do you see this?

João Ferreira (GUE/NGL), Resposta segundo o procedimento «cartão azul». – Senhora Kumpula-Natri, agradeço a sua pergunta e aquilo que lhe posso responder, a partir da experiência do meu país, Portugal, é como a privatização de uma empresa estratégica que dominava o setor, que ocupava um lugar de primeira linha do ponto de vista da inovação e que cumpria um conjunto de missões de interesse público, pôs em causa o interesse público e, na prática, levou ao desmantelar dessa empresa, hoje dominada por um grande grupo francês das telecomunicações.

É isto que significa a liberalização que a senhora e outros grupos defendem. É perder o controlo público sobre um setor estratégico da economia, com prejuízo para o interesse nacional, para as populações, para os consumidores, para as empresas e para o interesse público.

Jerzy Buzek (PPE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Ja chciałem przede wszystkim pogratulować panu wiceprzewodniczącemu Ansipowi, całej Komisji Europejskiej, a nade wszystko koleżankom i kolegom z Parlamentu Europejskiego, którzy negocjowali to, nad czym mamy dzisiaj głosować. To są naprawdę świetne rezultaty. Proszę pamiętać, że my dzisiaj zaszliśmy już dalej niż wspólny rynek cyfrowy. O tym marzyliśmy, ale to już naprawdę niemal zrealizowaliśmy. Trzeba myśleć o unii cyfrowej, to jest nasze zadanie na następnych pięć lat. Najlepsze możliwe łączy, sieć 5G, ochrona konsumentów, międzynarodowe ułatwienia, a także start-upy, wspieranie firm. Pamiętajmy, że to jest nasza gospodarka, nasza przyszłość. Bez tego nie będziemy konkurencyjni. Także celów klimatycznych, energetycznych nie jesteśmy w stanie osiągnąć bez tych rozwiązań.

Dobrze, że bierzemy pod uwagę położenie geograficzne, bo kraje graniczące na zewnątrz z innymi krajami europejskimi mają trudności z widmem radiowym, i dlatego cieszę się, że także to rozwiązanie znalazło się w naszych decyzjach.

Marlene Mizzi (S&D). – Illum huwa t-tmiem ta' battalja twila hafna. Meta bdejna nahdmu fuq it-tnehhija tat-tariffi tar-roaming, kulhadd kien xettiku u bosta m'emmnux li dan huwa possibbli; iżda fil-fatt ġara.

Il-ġlieda tagħna ma waqfitx hemm u minkejja din ir-rebħa, komplejna nahdmu biex intejbu t-telekomunikazzjoni għaċ-ċittadini tagħna u biex inżidu l-benefiċċji f'dan il-qasam. L-ghan aħhari kien li ntemmu l-ispejjeż eżorbitanti ta' telefonati bejn Stat Membru tal-Unjoni u iehor. Ergajna, meta bdejna nahdmu fuq din il-leġiżlazzjoni u dahhalna l-idea tal-*Inter-Union Calls*, hadd ma emmen li dan seta' jsir u b'hekk ma kienx hemm appoġġ, iżda xorta jibqa' l-fatt li rnexxielna.

Illum se nivvotaw għal leġiżlazzjoni li tistabilixxi limitu fuq il-prezz tat-telefonija bejn Stat Membru u iehor, u mis-sena d-dieħla ċ-ċittadini Ewropej mhux se jkollhom għalfejn joqogħdu jinkwetaw aktar dwar spejjeż eċċessivi meta jsiru telefonati għal Stat Membru iehor.

Irnexxielna wkoll ninkludu numru ta' punti importanti, fosthom: tejjibna d-drittijiet tal-konsumaturi u l-obbligi kontrattwali, harisna d-drittijiet tal-persuni b'diżabilità, u l-bżonn li nagħrfu li l-internet bażiku huwa affordabbli; huwa dritt universali. L-aħhar u mhux l-anqas, għall-ewwel darba għandna wkoll ftehim dwar sistema ta' reverse 112, li huwa numru li permezz tiegħu l-Istati Membri jkun jistgħu jwissu u javżaw liċ-ċittadini permezz tal-mowbajls f'każ li jkun hemm emergenzi u diżastri li huma imminenti jew li qed jiżviluppaw.

Fi żmien fejn iċ-ċittadini Ewropej huma dejjem aktar dubjużi dwar il-merti tal-proġett Ewropa nnifsu, il-vot illum għandu jittqies bħala vot li jista' jhalli impatt pożittiv fuq il-benefiċċji taċ-ċittadini tagħna. Grazzi

Michał Boni (PPE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Rozmawiamy o rozwiązaniu kluczowym dla rewolucji cyfrowej. Dziękuję Komisji, ale głównie – Pilar del Castillo i sprawozdawcom za wielką pracę. Kodeks daje nam, użytkownikom, nowe prawa: dostęp do internetu jako usługi powszechnej bez względu na lokalizację i dochody, nowy pułap stawek za rozmowy międzynarodowe (będzie taniej), dostęp do powszechnego w danym kraju systemu ostrzegania. Przede wszystkim kodeks stawia jednak fundament dla ultraszybkiego internetu 5G, informacji przesyłanych w milisekundach oraz przyszłego społeczeństwa gigabitowego z usługami zmieniającymi jakość życia każdego z nas, także na terenach wiejskich. Wspiera sprawniejsze dzielenie widma radiowego w całej Unii oraz inwestycje, zwiększając przewidywalność prawną i gwarancje dostępu do widma dla operatorów. Zapewnia konkurencyjność dzięki jakości usług, a nie nakazów. Zachęca do współinwestycji. Chciałoby się szybko realnie to wprowadzić, a dodatkowo poprawić jeszcze w praktyce warunki dla inwestycji i wyrównać je między krajami.

Nicola Danti (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, caro Vicepresidente, la definitiva adozione del pacchetto Telecom segna una tappa importante nella modernizzazione del quadro legislativo del settore.

In primo luogo, i cittadini europei potranno contare su un mercato delle telecomunicazioni più efficiente e trasparente e con un migliore accesso ai servizi, in modo particolare per le persone svantaggiate. I consumatori beneficeranno anche di una maggiore concorrenza e di più scelta come saranno più tutelati dalle minacce informatiche. Inoltre, viene dato un impulso agli investimenti infrastrutturali, ad esempio il 5G e la fibra, necessari per adeguare la nostra società alla nuova dimensione digitale e per accrescere la competitività del nostro sistema economico.

Pur non avendo ottenuto la cancellazione dei costi aggiuntivi per le telefonate fisse in Europa, come proponeva il nostro gruppo e come avvenuto per il *roaming*, il tetto dei 19 centesimi al minuto rappresenta una significativa riduzione dei costi per i cittadini e per le imprese.

Angelika Niebler (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Vizepräsident, liebe Kolleginnen, liebe Kollegen! Warum ist das Telekompaket, über das wir heute abstimmen, so besonders wichtig? Wir brauchen schnellen Internetzugang, wir brauchen leistungsfähige Netze, wir brauchen Glasfaserkabel, 5G-Gigabit-Netze. Jeder ist heutzutage mit jedem vernetzt, alles wird künftig über das Netz vernetzt sein. Eine gute Netzinfrastruktur ist das A und O, ist das Rückgrat für die digitale Transformation, ist wichtig für jeden einzelnen Bürger, ist wichtig für unsere Unternehmen, für die Wissenschaft, für die Verwaltung. Ohne leistungsfähige Netzinfrastruktur geht gar nichts. Und deshalb ist es wichtig, dass wir nicht nur in den Großstädten, sondern flächendeckend eine gute Infrastruktur haben.

Das Telekompaket, über das wir heute abstimmen werden, bietet eine gute Grundlage dafür, dass die Regulierung darauf ausgestellt wird, dass es künftig mehr Investitionen in den Ausbau dieser leistungsfähigen Giganetze geben wird. Das ist, glaube ich, ein ganz wichtiges Anliegen.

Der zweite Punkt, den ich ansprechen möchte – das ist die gute Nachricht für die Verbraucher: Künftig gibt es Obergrenzen für die sogenannten *intra-EU calls*. Also wenn man von zu Hause ins europäische Ausland telefoniert, wird es günstiger

(Die Präsidentin entzieht der Rednerin das Wort.)

Patrizia Toia (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, siamo tutti consapevoli oggi che la sfida della competizione globale con i paesi asiatici e l'America ma anche con altre aree del mondo, penso al Canada che corre molto sul digitale, si gioca appunto sullo sviluppo dell'economia digitale, sulla sua capacità di integrazione tra manifatturiero e servizi e la sua capacità di innovazione. Tutto questo vede l'Europa di fronte a una grande sfida se saprà reggere questa competizione.

Bene, io penso che questo pacchetto, questo imponente e importante codice, che le colleghe in prima persona ma tanti altri colleghi hanno negoziato, sia un buon quadro che mette l'Europa proprio in condizione di poter affrontare questa competizione dello sviluppo dell'economia digitale. Penso al tema degli investimenti e alle norme che qui ci sono, perché c'è bisogno per sviluppare questa economia in tutti i settori di una infrastrutturazione di rete di connessione adeguata avanzata.

Ecco, io penso che qui dentro, con l'armonizzazione dello spettro di gestione armonizzata e con le norme anche sugli investimenti, si possa offrire questo quadro. Starà ora agli operatori essere capaci di giocare questa sfida e di metterci le risorse necessarie. Due punti soltanto: lo spettro e le tariffe internazionali. Abbiamo negoziato la caduta del *roaming* – io ero relatore ombra per il mio gruppo – e penso che l'abbattimento delle tariffe internazionali e l'abbassamento vada in quella direzione per i consumatori.

Interventions à la demande

Lambert van Nistelrooij (PPE). – Voorzitter, commissaris, rapporteurs, dank. Vanuit de Commissie interne markt en consumentenbescherming heb ik met plezier actief meegewerkt aan dit compromis. Het bij de tijd brengen van de connectiviteit, hetgeen eigenlijk al meteen ingaat, de nieuwe communicatie.

Ik wil vijf punten noemen:

1. heel blij met de maximale prijzen voor bellen en voor sms;
2. dezelfde rechten voor consumenten bij het sluiten en oversluiten van een contract;
3. het feit dat *revers 112*, dat waarschuwingssysteem, dat Nederlandse alert.nl, nu Europa-breed wordt ingevoerd;
4. het verbeteren van toegang voor mensen met een handicap, grote groep, zeer belangrijk;
5. het garanderen van die snelheid, capaciteit, ook op het platteland.

Op die manier maken we die stap. De wetgeving was tien jaar oud. De wereld staat niet stil. Wij zijn nu bij de tijd.

José Blanco López (S&D). – Señora presidenta, señorías, Europa se juega su competitividad futura en su Agenda Digital. Con esta reforma ponemos las bases para impulsar las inversiones en redes de alta velocidad y el despliegue del 5G, cruciales para hacer posibles nuevos servicios como la movilidad autónoma o la nueva era del internet de las cosas. Es decir, nuevas oportunidades para impulsar la innovación, la actividad económica y el empleo de calidad.

Pero además, gracias al Parlamento —quiero felicitar a Pilar del Castillo y a los ponentes—, hemos introducido límites al precio de las llamadas entre Estados miembros, lo que beneficia al conjunto de los ciudadanos. Es así, derribando barreras a la comunicación, como Europa avanza.

Seán Kelly (PPE). – Madam President, firstly congratulations to the rapporteurs, especially my friend Pilar del Castillo, who has worked on this for many years, as indeed many more colleagues did. I think this is a great example of what the European Parliament can achieve. First of all, dealing with the whole roaming situation – the big operators didn't want us to work on it, they challenged us, but we got there – and then we came along and we did geo-blocking and now we have the cap to calls' costs to the European Union. This is a great success for the European Parliament, and indeed for citizens, because we are seen to deliver for them.

I think one area we need to focus on though, unfortunately – and in my own country especially – is the lack of high-speed broadband across the European Union. It needs to be tackled urgently, and for that reason we would hope that the Member States would up their contributions to the European budget so that we can tackle that at a European level and really make this work for everybody.

Nicola Caputo (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, dalla revisione normativa del 2009 il mercato dei servizi di comunicazione elettronica è cambiato drasticamente. I nuovi attori quali WhatsApp, Telegram e Skipe sono una diretta conseguenza della possibilità di fare affidamento sui servizi di accesso Internet e digitale.

Obiettivo del pacchetto sulle telecomunicazioni è di garantire maggiore protezione ai consumatori, per esempio rendendo più semplice l'operazione di cambio operatore o la ricezione della dovuta compensazione. Dopo l'abolizione del *roaming*, anche le telefonate intraeuropee costeranno molto meno grazie all'introduzione di una tariffazione massima di 19 centesimi. Il cambio strutturale prevede delle misure volte a stimolare gli investimenti nelle reti ad alta capacità e a regolare le nuove frequenze per incoraggiare la connettività dei telefoni cellulari e la rete 5G.

Per l'Europa il 5G è un prerequisito per entrare a far parte della società dei Gigabyte. L'industria 4.0, le città intelligenti, la ricerca o la salute sono solo alcune delle prospettive legate alla crescita esponenziale delle richieste di velocità, sicurezza e maggiore connettività.

(Fin des interventions à la demande)

Andrus Ansip, Vice-President of the Commission – Madam President, thank you to everyone who has made it possible for this package to become a reality. It will make a huge difference to people and business, to our society and economy. The European Commission is pleased that the European Parliament and the Council share many of the same objectives that will take us towards a gigabit society.

Together we managed to agree on a balanced text that benefits and protects all Europeans and paves the way towards very high-capacity networks, including 5G. Although we have created a structure and environment for the next decade of European telecoms, our work is not yet done. In fact, it has just started. For the Commission, our focus will now be to make sure that the code is properly implemented, and we will also monitor this. EU Member States have two years to transpose and implement the rules. Not only must they do this on time, they must also do it correctly and efficiently. We will assist Member States in transposing the new rules into national law.

Pilar del Castillo Vera, ponente. – Señora presidenta, yo quiero empezar ahora agradeciendo a los ponentes alternativos de otros grupos parlamentarios: a Miapetra Kumpula-Natri, a Evžen Tošenovský, a Kaja Kallas, a Dita Charanzová y a Julia Reda por la magnífica colaboración.

La colaboración con la Comisión ha sido excelente y hay que subrayarlo. Y también quiero mencionar a Jerzy Buzek, que presidió con maestría, con gran maestría, como hace siempre, todos los trólogos que tuvimos con el Consejo.

El debate que hemos tenido hoy sobre el Código Europeo de las Comunicaciones Electrónicas es un magnífico ejemplo de soluciones concretas a problemas concretos que solo se pueden abordar en el marco de la Unión Europea, que tenemos que abordar todos juntos.

En este caso, soluciones a una conexión, a una conectividad absolutamente necesaria si queremos que los ciudadanos y que todos los sectores económicos tengan oportunidades en esta era de la digitalización.

Lo decía aquí, ayer, Angela Merkel: es imprescindible afrontar la digitalización en la Unión Europea.

Y yo insisto: el valor añadido de la Unión Europea para afrontar los grandes desafíos que tiene la digitalización es esencial; solo juntos lo podemos hacer.

Y esta regulación es un magnífico ejemplo que podemos presentar como un gran logro ante los ciudadanos europeos, ante los electores que, en unos meses, volverán a participar en unas elecciones europeas.

Evžen Tošenovský, zpravodaj. – Paní předsedající, myslím, že jsme s Radou dohodli užitečné úpravy fungování sdružení evropských regulátorů BEREC a podpůrného úřadu BEREC, které zvýší jejich efektivitu a ochrání nezávislost regulátorů. Jsem přesvědčen, že realita telekomunikačních trhů nenazrála k potřebě zásadnější změny, což ale samozřejmě nevyklučuje debatu do budoucna, právě naopak.

Rád bych zmínil ještě jednu důležitou otázku související s úřadem BEREC. V dalším kroku je nutné zajistit personální posílení této nejmenší agentury Evropské unie, aby mohla poskytovat telekomunikačním regulátorům plnou podporu. Věřím proto, že v rámci jednání o rozpočtu na rok 2019 bude Rada akceptovat příslušný návrh Evropského parlamentu.

Dovolte mi ještě jednou poděkovat za spolupráci kolegům, stínovým zpravodajům a všem z našeho parlamentního týmu včetně asistentů, poradců a administrátorů Výboru pro průmysl, výzkum a energetiku, protože ta spolupráce byla vynikající a velmi komplikovaná. Chtěl bych poděkovat ještě jednou kolegyni Pilar Del Castillové, protože práce s ní byla skutečně vynikající. Chtěl bych poděkovat bulharskému předsednictví a za Komisi jmenovitě paní komisařce Gabrielové a generálnímu řediteli generálního ředitelství CONNECT Robertu Violovi, protože díky nim se skutečně podařilo připravit velmi dobrý návrh a velmi životaschopný do budoucna, a věřím, že to bude velmi úspěšná práce do budoucna, která přinese občanům Evropské unie velmi dobré a užitečné propojení tak, jak čas bude běžet.

La Présidente. – Le débat est clos.

Le vote aura lieu mercredi 14 novembre 2018.

Déclarations écrites (article 162)

Olga Sehnalová (S&D), písemně. – Přijetí evropského kodexu pro elektronické komunikace, na kterém se dohodl Evropský parlament s členskými státy, vítám. Znamená nejen aktualizaci stávajících právních předpisů, které je potřeba přizpůsobit novým technologiím v rychle se měnícím prostředí, včetně zavádění mobilního standardu 5G, ale také přináší pozitivní zlepšení pro koncové spotřebitele. Jsem ráda, že se sociálním demokratům podařilo završit dlouhodobé úsilí o zastropování cen hovorů z jedné členské země EU do druhé, protože různá výše cen nemá na vnitřním trhu žádné opodstatnění tak, jak byl nesmyslný roaming, který se nám rovněž podařilo zrušit. Dobrou zprávou je to samozřejmě i pro spotřebitele u nás, protože čeští operátoři patří dle evropských průzkumů k vůbec nejdražším unijním poskytovatelům elektronických komunikací mezi 28 členskými státy EU. Osobně za neméně důležité považuji posílení ochrany spotřebitelů, včetně těch nejzranitelnějších. Nový kodex garantuje, že spotřebitelé se zdravotním postižením nebudou znevýhodňováni co do kvality poskytování služeb, jejich ceny ani obecně přístupu k telekomunikačním službám.

Tom Vandenkendelaere (PPE), schriftelijk. – Vandaag keurt het Europees Parlement het telecom-pakket goed. De nieuwe regels zullen een einde maken aan de excessieve tarieven voor consumenten, voorzien in sneller internet en de uitrol helpen faciliteren van een 5G-netwerk in Europa. Het afschaffen van *roaming* heeft telefonie en internetgebruik in het buitenland al heel wat voordeliger gemaakt, maar toch zijn we met losse eindjes blijven zitten. Nog altijd is het erg duur als iemand naar een vriend of collega in het buitenland belt. Dat wordt nu opgelost door het vastleggen van maximumtarieven, en daar ben ik erg blij om. We moeten niet flauw doen: veel internationale communicatie gebeurt vandaag al online, via Whatsapp bijvoorbeeld. Toch raakt deze maatregel nog 9% van de Europese gebruikers, in het bijzonder mensen die digitaal niet zo uit de voeten kunnen. Dit pakket is een stap vooruit naar een betere interne markt met grotere bescherming voor de consument. Nu de fysieke tussengrenzen weg zijn moeten ook de communicatiegrenzen worden afgeschaft. Belangrijk is ook dat er in heel Europa een waarschuwingssysteem komt in geval van een ramp of een aanslag. Die omgekeerde 112 zal ertoe leiden dat u en ik als burger een bericht krijgen als er in de omgeving een ernstig incident is voorgevallen. Ook dat kan enkel maar een voordeel zijn.

Carlos Zorrinho (S&D), por escrito. – A União Europeia tem de se preparar para aproveitar a revolução digital em curso para afirmar uma visão comum de desenvolvimento tecnológico ao serviço dos cidadãos.

O Apelo de Paris, assinado no dia 12 por 51 países e centenas de empresas e organizações, e ao qual os países da União Europeia se associaram com entusiasmo, deve ser um referencial para a implementação do pacote Telecom na dimensão do desenvolvimento das infraestruturas, da regulação e do acesso.

O pacote hoje discutido propõe uma abordagem integrada, flexível, mas com níveis de garantia e previsibilidade adequados à viabilização do investimento empresarial. É dado mais um passo no aprofundamento do mercado único digital através da introdução de um limite máximo para o custo das chamadas telefónicas no espaço intra-UE, complementando a abolição das sobretaxas de *roaming*. É também criado um sistema de alerta em caso de catástrofes naturais ou atentados terroristas, obrigatório em toda a União. Realço ainda que a iniciativa WIFI4EU, como componente do pacote Telecom, é fundamental para reforçar a equidade no acesso dos cidadãos europeus à internet de alta qualidade, devendo o seu sucesso e a sua qualidade de implementação constituir uma prioridade para a Comissão Europeia.

8. Præstationsnormer for nye tunge køretøjs CO₂-emissioner (forhandling)

La Présidente. – L'ordre du jour appelle le débat sur le rapport de Bas Eickhout, au nom de la commission de l'environnement, de la santé publique et de la sécurité alimentaire, sur la proposition de règlement du Parlement européen et du Conseil établissant des normes de performance en matière d'émissions de CO₂ pour les nouveaux véhicules lourds (COM(2018)0284 – C8-0197/2018 – 2018/0143(COD)) (A8-0354/2018).

Bas Eickhout, Rapporteur. – Madam President, we are going to discuss here a file on regulating CO₂ standards for heavy-duty vehicles for the first time in European history.

I think that it is very important to stress that quite a few regions in the world are already putting CO₂ standards in place, like the United States, Canada, China and Japan. They have all put CO₂ regulation in place on the heavy-duty vehicle sector. Europe hasn't done so yet. But we now have a proposal on the table from the Commission for CO₂ standards for heavy-duty vehicles, and I think that is of course a very welcome development. Why? Because, if you look at heavy-duty vehicles, this is one of the sectors in Europe that is fast increasing and where CO₂ emissions are also fast increasing. For now, total EU CO₂ emissions are at a level of 6%, of which 25% is from road transport and it is increasing. We know that to meet our climate targets agreed in the Paris Agreement we need to go to zero emissions. This absolutely means that special attention needs to be paid to the heavy-duty vehicle sector, which this proposal is doing.

For context, what we know is that, if you want to be Paris compatible, the heavy-duty vehicle sector needs to go in the direction of minus 40% by 2030. That analysis is from the Dutch institute, TNO, who say that for compatibility with the Paris Agreement, you need to go to those kind of reduction levels, and we're not there yet. That's also why we as a Parliament, in the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety (ENVI), agreed on raising the ambition level compared to what the Commission was proposing to a level that we say should be minus 20% by 2025 and minus 35% by 2030. I want to stress that this level of minus 20% by 2025 is, according to the impact assessment from the Commission, also possible with existing technologies.

We know of course that, if you look to the longer term and we need to go to lower level ambitions, then we need to have an improvement in technologies because existing technologies can get to a level of minus 30%, but not much more than that. This means that we also need to prepare for new technologies in the heavy-duty vehicle sector and that's why, also in ENVI, we have been proposing a zero and low-emission vehicle mandate to push the market into new technologies. The definition of zero and low-emission vehicles is broad, so it's not necessarily electricity – it can also be other technologies. We are not subscribing to any technology, but are pushing just for a mandate on zero and low-emission vehicles of 5% by 2025, rising to 20% by 2030, in order to prepare the market for these new technologies to arrive in order to get to the deeper carbon cuts that are necessary for implementation of the Paris Agreement.

We are also putting forward a specific mandate for buses. I want to stress that this is important because in some of these markets the truck producers also produce buses and, if you have just one mandate and mix them all, you can create an unfair market. Therefore it is important to have separate mandates for buses and trucks because we know that on buses we can move much faster we can than on trucks. The mandate is also for all the trucks, not only the bigger ones, so that you can also achieve those zero and low-emission vehicles mandate for smaller trucks.

My last point is that there was a big discussion on the fine. Let me say very clearly that we would like to stay very close to the Commission proposal because, if you lower the fine to such a level that it's easy for the producer to pay it, what you are putting in place is just an additional price factor – a cost factor of production – and I don't think that is what we want to do.

To conclude, I would like to thank all the shadows for all the good cooperation. On many compromises we had broad support, though not on others. We do of course see some amendments on the targets. That's to be expected. But I would like to thank all the shadows for their great cooperation. I think the vote in ENVI, where 47 people were in favour and only six against, shows that we had broad support in that committee, which we hope also to maintain in the plenary.

(Applause)

Miguel Arias Cañete, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, it is a pleasure to be here today for the debate on the Commission proposal setting CO₂ emission standards for heavy-duty vehicles. Following the debate last month on the proposal on CO₂ emission standards for cars and vans, this is another key proposal to implement the 2030 climate and energy framework and continue to follow up on our commitments under the Paris Agreement.

Shortly before the upcoming COP24 in Katowice, the recent Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) special report on 1.5 degrees Celsius has once again demonstrated the urgency of reducing greenhouse gas emissions in all sectors. This is the first time ever that we are making a proposal to set CO₂ standards for heavy-duty vehicles.

We do this for a number of reasons. First, we need to act to tackle the growing CO₂ emissions from heavy-duty vehicles. Without action, these emissions – which represent almost 25% of road transport emissions – are set to increase by almost 10% by 2030. This new legislation will therefore help to reduce emissions from heavy-duty vehicles, while also supporting the Member States in meeting their binding national targets under the Effort Sharing Regulation.

We also need to act to keep Europe's industrial leadership. As has been said by the rapporteur, other countries, such as the United States, China and Japan, have already set emissions standards and competition in the global market is fierce. This legislation will contribute to Europe's economic prosperity and global competitiveness, keeping us at the forefront of developing low-carbon solutions.

Finally, we need to act to support our transport companies' savings on fuel. Fuel today accounts for about one quarter of transport companies' operating costs. This legislation will bring fuel savings to the 600 000 small and medium-sized enterprises that operate in the European Union freight transport sector and employ almost three million people.

Your vote today is therefore instrumental to allow the adoption of this proposal during the current legislative term. We need to give a clear and stable regulatory signal to our industry as soon as possible because this will stimulate the right investments in the transition towards low and eventually zero-emission mobility. I therefore want to thank the rapporteur Mr Eickhout for his very hard work on this proposal, bringing together very rapidly the position of the European Parliament. I would also like to thank the shadow rapporteurs for their efforts in the same direction.

The Commission proposal, underpinned by a thorough impact assessment, is both ambitious and realistic because it strikes the right balance between the three main policy objectives, which cannot be considered in isolation: first, achieving environmental benefits; second, bringing savings for transport operators; and third, supporting employment, growth and competitiveness.

As this is the first time this sector is being regulated and in view of the uncertainties on some key data, a stepwise approach is followed. The proposed 15% and 30% targets by 2025 and 2030 will bring significant environmental benefits, estimated at around 54 million tonnes of CO₂ in the period 2020 to 2030. This is equivalent to the total annual emissions of Sweden.

An early review is foreseen in 2022 to expand the scope and set the 2030 binding targets based on additional information on new technologies. Besides the targets, the proposal includes an incentive system to speed up the transition to zero— and low-emission vehicles.

The situation in this sector is different than for cars. There are virtually no large zero-emission trucks on European roads, and today 98% of the trucks rely on diesel, while almost all manufacturers have announced plans for zero-emission vehicles. We therefore propose to support the deployment of these technologies through a system of super credits, while preserving the environmental integrity of the CO₂ targets.

Let me conclude by saying once again that the Commission remains fully supportive of the efforts of the European Parliament and the Council to conclude the discussion on this proposal within this legislative term. I look forward to continuing to work with you and bringing it to a successful conclusion.

Henna Virkkunen, valmisteija TRAN-valiokunta. – Arvoisa puhemies, todellakin nyt on ensimmäinen kerta, kun kuorma-autoille ollaan asettamassa CO₂-päästörajat Euroopan tasolla. Toisin kuin ympäristövaliokunta liikennevaliokunta kyllä katsoi, että komission esittämät päästörajat ovat varsin tiukat ja vaativat. Vuoteen 2025 mennessä 15 prosenttia vähemmän päästöjä ja vuoteen 2030 mennessä 30 prosenttia vähemmän päästöjä. Liikennevaliokunta katsoo, että nämä ovat äärettömän tiukat tavoitteet. Tuimme näitä komission ehdottomia lukuja, koska siitä huolimatta, että kuorma-autoilla ei ole ollut CO₂-päästöihin liittyviä rajoja, ne ovat jo tällä hetkellä varsin tehokkaita sen johdosta, että polttoaine on niin kallis menoerä kuljetusliikelle, että jo tähänkin mennessä on pyritty erittäin hyvään energiatehokkuuteen.

Liikennevaliokunta moittii omassa lausunnossaan edelleenkin sitä, että liiaksi keskityimme mittaamaan päästöjä pakoputken päästä. Meidän pitäisi päästä laskentamenetelmään, jossa paremmin katsottaisiin koko energiankulutusta ja tulevaisuudessa myös koko elinkaarta. Silloin saisimme paremman kuvan liikenteen päästöistä ja pystyisimme paremmin myös edistämään erilaisia vaihtoehtoisia polttoaineita.

Christofer Fjellner, för PPE-gruppen. – Fru talman! Om vi ska klara klimatutmaningen, måste vi minska utsläppen från tunga transporter – och det radikalt. Därför är det bra att vi nu får det här förslaget till lagstiftning, så att vi för första gången i EU tar frågan om att minska utsläppen från just tunga fordon på allvar.

Det är dock första gången vi gör detta, och därför borde vi göra det med en viss ödmjukhet. Det är nämligen trots allt inte vi i det här rummet, i det här huset, som är de som på allvar genomför minskning av koldioxidutsläpp från lastbilar och bussar, utan det är skickliga tekniker hos fordonstillverkare med rätt förutsättningar som är de som kan göra skillnad.

Detta utvecklas ofta och snabbt till en budgivning, där det ges intryck av att de med högst krav på utsläppsminskningar är de som är till störst nytta för klimatet. Jag skulle dock påstå att det är fel. Det är de som hittar rätt nivå och skapar de starkaste incitamenten för teknisk utveckling som gör skillnad på riktigt.

Vi måste hitta en nivå som teknikerna klarar att leverera. Framför allt måste vi se till att de fordon som produceras är fordon som någon har råd att köpa. Det är nämligen bara genom att byta ut de gamla lastbilarna och bussarna med höga utsläppsnivåer som vi får ner utsläppen på riktigt. Tyvärr tycker inte jag att miljöutskottet lyckas med det, framför allt av tre skäl.

Det första är att man säger att vi ska höja ambitionen för 2025 till 20 procents minskning. Här rör det sig alltså om lastbilar och bussar som redan har utvecklats, de är under utveckling, och detta kommer inte att förändra dem. Frågan är bara om det är så att det kommer att bli höga böter. Det är det andra problemet för den som misslyckas.

Det sista kravet, som vi har svårt att förstå hur det egentligen ska bidra till att minska utsläppen, är att begära en särskild andel av fordon med låga utsläpp, i praktiken el redan till 2025. Vi behöver en omställning till el, men vi i det här huset vet inte och kan inte bestämma exakt när den teknikförändringen kommer att ske. Att därför här försöka beordra fram teknisk utveckling – jag är ledsen, men det går inte. Därför borde vi rösta mot de kraven.

Damiano Zoffoli, a nome del gruppo S&D. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, il regolamento in esame, che sosteniamo, colma una grave lacuna, stabilendo per la prima volta in Europa limiti e norme comuni sulle emissioni di CO₂ per i veicoli pesanti – camion, tir, autobus e pullman – che contribuiscono al 25 % delle emissioni totali dell'Unione, emissioni destinate ad aumentare.

Oltre a dei *target* ambiziosi ma raggiungibili di riduzione delle emissioni del 20 % al 2025 e del 35 % al 2030, abbiamo introdotto un test di conformità su strada per avere dei dati sulle emissioni e sul consumo di carburante in condizioni reali di guida, dati che potranno essere utilizzati da soggetti terzi per prove di verifica indipendenti.

Fondamentale poi è la richiesta alla Commissione di una metodologia per valutare le emissioni di un mezzo pesante lungo tutto il suo ciclo di vita, dalla progettazione fino alla rottamazione. Per migliorare il livello della qualità dell'aria nelle nostre città, dove vive oltre il 72 % della popolazione, ci sono due importanti novità. La prima riguarda gli autobus urbani: oltre la metà degli autobus prodotti in Europa nel 2025 dovrà essere a emissioni zero e dal 2030 questa percentuale salirà a 75 %.

Anche per i veicoli professionali, ad esempio i camion per la raccolta dei rifiuti, la Commissione dovrà presentare una proposta di riduzione delle emissioni. Vogliamo incentivare infine il ruolo del gas naturale nella transizione verso la decarbonizzazione del settore dei trasporti. Per un'Europa in movimento sì, ma verso un nuovo modello di sviluppo.

Mark Demesmaeker, *namens de ECR-Fractie*. – De vrachtwagenvloot moet vergroenen! De N-VA-delegatie stemt straks vóór ambitieuze CO₂-normen en steunt de verkoopdoelstellingen voor emissiearme en emissievrije vrachtwagens.

Maar liefst een kwart van de CO₂-uitstoot in het wegtransport is afkomstig van vrachtwagens. Willen we effectief onze klimaatafspraken nakomen en 40% minder CO₂ uitstoten tegen 2030, dan hebben we die normen gewoon nodig. De technologie is overigens beschikbaar!

Laten we bovendien niet vergeten dat een vergroening van de vloot ook essentieel is voor een betere luchtkwaliteit. Onze burgers hebben recht op schone lucht.

De normen zorgen ook voor een besparing op brandstof, wat winst oplevert voor bedrijven en consumenten.

Ambitieuze productnormering is ook nodig om innovatie en investeringen aan te trekken. Derde landen zoals de Verenigde Staten en China zetten hier al volop op in. De Europese Unie mag dus niet achterophinken.

De transportsector is ook zelf vragende partij. Dus waarom zouden we twijfelen?

Ik wil wel de volgende kanttekening plaatsen. Wij steunen de invoering van een bonus-malus-systeem, maar wij vinden het een slecht idee om elektrische stadsbussen mee te tellen voor het bereiken van de doelstellingen voor groene vrachtwagens. Dan geven we immers een oneerlijk voordeel aan die constructeurs die zowel bussen als vrachtwagens bouwen en dreigen we het ambitieniveau voor de vrachtwagens zélf te ondermijnen. Dus denken we daar goed over na.

Nils Torvalds, *ALDE-ryhmän puolesta*. – Arvoisa puhemies, hyvä komission jäsen ja esittelijä Bas Eickhout, ensimmäistä kertaa olemme luomassa järjestelmää, joka koskee raskasta kuljetusta. Silloin olisi tietenkin kohtalaisen viisasta tehdä se enemmän oikein kuin vähemmän väärin. Siinä yhteydessä pitäisi ottaa ainakin kaksi suurempaa asiaa huomioon. Ensimmäinen niistä on IPCC:n äskenen raportti ja toinen on meidän vanhat päätöksemme taakanjaosta.

IPCC:n raportti osoitti neljä erilaista polkua eteenpäin. Toiset niistä poluista ovat kohtalaisen hyviä, viimeinen polku tulee olemaan seuraaville sukupolville erittäin kallis. Siitä syystä olen tietenkin sitä mieltä, että valitaan sellainen polku, jossa maksut otetaan nyt eikä niitä jätetä seuraavalle polvelle.

Taakanjakopäätöksissä sovimme, että teknologisesti ja taloudellisesti paremmassa kunnossa olevat maat ottavat suuremman askeleen ja vähän heikommassa asemassa olevat ottavat pienempiä askeleita tai ei askeleita ollenkaan. Ne maat, jotka tässä yhteydessä ovat joutuneet tai lupautuneet ottamaan näitä suuria askeleita, saattavat joutua nyt, jos me emme ole riittävän kunnianhimoisia, aika heikkoon asemaan. Siitä syystä olemme olleet Basin kanssa kohtalaisen samaa mieltä siitä, että nyt pitää ottaa selkeitä askeleita eteenpäin. Nyt pitää uskaltaa ja osoittaa, että me kannamme vastuuta ei vaan pelkästään tämän päivän ympäristöstä vaan myöskin tulevien sukupolvien ongelmista ja maailmasta.

Karima Delli, *au nom du groupe Verts/ALE*. – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Commissaire, chers collègues, nous nous apprêtons enfin à fixer des normes d'émissions de CO₂ pour les poids lourds. C'est déjà une victoire, parce que de telles normes n'existaient pas jusqu'à présent. Nous pouvons donc en être fiers, sauf que ce n'est pas suffisant. Il faut aller plus vite, plus fort.

Le GIEC (Groupe d'experts intergouvernemental sur l'évolution du climat), ce collectif de scientifiques qui nous alertent régulièrement sur l'évolution du climat, nous a prévenus. Nous avons peu de temps pour maintenir un réchauffement climatique de seulement 1,5°C au lieu de 2°C.

Pourquoi est-ce si important? Parce que les risques liés au climat, à ce réchauffement de 1,5°C, sont certes nettement plus faibles qu'avec un scénario à 2°C. Parce qu'il s'agit en outre de canicule, de précipitations, d'extinction des espèces, de productivité agricole ou encore d'acidification des océans.

Qu'implique un réchauffement de 1,5°C? Cela veut dire zéro émission nette de CO₂ en 2050 au niveau mondial, bien avant 2050. Vous m'avez bien entendue? Bien avant 2050! C'est la raison pour laquelle nous avons besoin d'objectifs ambitieux à court, moyen et long termes, afin de tracer une trajectoire qui soit fiable, concrète et efficace.

Dans ce rapport nous avons réussi à relever l'objectif de réduction à 20 % pour 2025 et à 35 % pour 2030, parce que c'est non seulement possible technologiquement, mais surtout souhaitable. Nous avons également fixé une part minimale, un peu contraignante, de 10 % des poids lourds à émissions nulles ou faibles pour 2025 et de 35 % pour 2030. Là aussi, c'est possible, les constructeurs peuvent et doivent le faire.

Vous voyez, mes chers collègues, c'est un enjeu pour le climat, c'est un enjeu pour l'emploi, mais c'est aussi innovant pour des véhicules propres. Nous pouvons et nous devons sauver aussi les salariés de l'industrie automobile européens, non pas en les enfermant dans un vieux modèle, dans le vieux monde des carburants fossiles, mais en regardant l'avenir avec espérance et avec de véritables solutions.

Puhetta johti HEIDI HAUTALA

varapuhemies

Stefan Eck, *im Namen der GUE/NGL-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin, sehr geehrte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Lastkraftwagen sind für 25 % der CO₂-Emissionen im Straßenverkehr verantwortlich, obwohl sie weniger als 5 % des Verkehrsaufkommens darstellen. In den letzten Jahrzehnten wurde der Wirkungsgrad der Motoren dieser Fahrzeuge nicht wesentlich verbessert, weil Forschung teuer ist und die Hersteller deshalb auf Kosten der Umwelt sparen wollten.

Trotz der katastrophalen Auswirkungen der Klimaerwärmung haben die industriegesteuerten Fraktionen in diesem Haus immer wieder die besten Vorschläge aus dem Umweltausschuss unterminiert. Ich glaube, das werden sie auch diesmal versuchen. An diejenigen von Ihnen, die meinen, die umweltschädliche Lkw-Industrie weiterhin zulasten des Klimas und der öffentlichen Gesundheit schützen zu müssen: Die Automobilhersteller haben in jüngster Vergangenheit doch bewiesen, dass sie nicht vertrauenswürdig sind, dass sie – um es einmal ganz klipp und klar zu sagen – mit krimineller Energie lügen und betrügen, weil es ihnen immer nur um den Profit geht.

Es liegt jetzt an uns, die CO₂-Emissionen im Lkw-Sektor massiv zu reduzieren. Das erwarten doch die Bürgerinnen und Bürger von uns. Öffentliche Umfragen zeigen, dass das Bewusstsein der Bevölkerung für die mit dem Klimawandel verbundenen hohen Risiken gestiegen ist, weil wir alle einen hohen Preis für die verantwortungslose Klimapolitik der großen Industrienationen zahlen müssen. Überall auf der Welt leiden schon heute die Menschen unter den Auswirkungen der Klimaerwärmung. Sie verlieren Hab und Gut oder sogar ihr Leben wegen der Feigheit der Politik, oder schlimmer noch, weil sie sich korrumpieren ließ.

Es gibt keine Alternative. Entweder handelt die Europäische Union jetzt und versucht mit allen Mitteln, CO₂-Emissionen zu reduzieren, und zwar in allen Bereichen, oder sie geht weiterhin am Gängelband der Industrie und muss sich zu recht von zukünftigen Generationen vorwerfen lassen, dass sie im blinden Wachstumswahn zu einem Lakaien der Konzerne verkommen ist.

Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Wir haben nur eine Erde, und die gilt es zu bewahren. Das sollte unsere höchste Priorität hier in diesem Hause sein. Geben Sie deshalb Bas Eickhout ein starkes Mandat für die kommenden Verhandlungen mit dem Rat!

Eleonora Evi, a nome del gruppo EFDD. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, i campanelli d'allarme dell'ultimo rapporto IPCC e delle proiezioni dell'Agenzia ambientale europea sulle emissioni di gas relative al 2017 hanno tuonato con forza dirompente un messaggio che ormai dovrebbe essere chiaro a tutti: siamo entrati nella fase bollino rosso per il clima. Ognuno è chiamato a fare la propria parte e soprattutto il settore dei trasporti, che è quello che più di tutti ha aumentato le sue emissioni negli anni. Perciò è fondamentale raggiungere il migliore risultato possibile sui veicoli pesanti nuovi.

Come Movimento 5 Stelle noi vogliamo definire un regolamento a prova di futuro, che consenta per davvero la diffusione di veicoli a zero e basse emissioni anche in questo segmento di mercato. Veicoli come camion, tir, autobus e pullman generano oltre il 6 % delle emissioni totali di gas a effetto serra nell'Unione e il 25 % del trasporto stradale. Dobbiamo quindi fare del nostro meglio come colegislatori per proteggere il clima definendo dei *target* di riduzione significativi.

Inoltre, spingere sull'acceleratore per stimolare l'elettrificazione dei mezzi pesanti nuovi servirà anche a proteggere la salute degli europei e a rafforzare la sicurezza energetica dell'intero continente. Ci aiuterà a dire addio a quella tecnologia tossica chiamata diesel, che alimenta quasi totalmente i mezzi pesanti oggi, generando costi ambientali e sanitari sconvolgenti.

Secondo i dati disponibili e considerando solamente l'inquinamento da ossidi di azoto e particolato rilasciato durante il suo ciclo di vita normalmente di dodici anni, un solo autobus diesel determina un costo per la collettività, pari a 19 000 EUR. Invece, i 3 200 autobus urbani a zero emissioni che circoleranno per le nostre strade il prossimo anno, oltre a non sporcare l'aria delle nostre città, ci consentiranno di togliere dal mercato quasi seicentomila barili di petrolio all'anno, con un risparmio di oltre 40 milioni.

Il testo a cui abbiamo lavorato in commissione per l'ambiente vuole fortificare e sostenere questo trend. Per questo loosterremo convintamente anche qui in plenaria.

Danilo Oscar Lancini, a nome del gruppo ENF. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, nel 2017 il settore europeo degli autocarri ha rappresentato una flotta di circolazione di circa 6,5 milioni di veicoli, movimentando 14 miliardi di tonnellate di merci all'anno, trasportando circa il 72 % di tutte le merci terrestri in Europa, ovvero il 90 % del valore totale delle merci. L'importanza del settore per l'economia dell'UE è chiara e sta crescendo e oggi i veicoli pesanti sono alimentati per il 98 % a gasolio.

L'importanza del settore per l'economia UE è chiara e sta crescendo e oggi i veicoli pesanti sono alimentati per il 98 % a gasolio. È giusto puntare a un piano ambizioso per una riduzione delle emissioni di CO₂ generate da questo settore, ma tale piano deve avere obiettivi realistici, sia da un punto di vista tecnologico che in termini di sostenibilità dei costi di produzione. Gli attuali *target* proposti sono frutto più di fantasia che di una reale stima delle tecnologie esistenti e sviluppabili e forzano il mercato verso la sola opzione elettrica, scelta non di per sé sbagliata, ma il mercato e soprattutto la tecnologia non sono assolutamente pronti. Analogamente a quanto ho detto relativamente alle emissioni degli autoveicoli e dei veicoli commerciali leggeri, non è previsto nella proposta un sistema che vada a riconoscere il ruolo dei combustibili rinnovabili.

È invece di fondamentale importanza che per gli obiettivi di decarbonizzazione vengano riconosciuti il contributo e i benefici di tali fondi tramite l'introduzione di una metodologia di calcolo che riconosca la componente rinnovabile immessa in rete a livello europeo. È quindi fondamentale considerare l'intera catena del carburante, compresi l'estrazione e la produzione, il trasporto e l'uso del combustibile o dell'elettricità, al fine di fornire un confronto più realistico delle diverse opzioni e in questo senso è importantissimo riconoscere il ruolo del metano e del biometano.

Infine, le penalizzazioni previste in caso di non conformità dalla Commissione appaiono ispirate ad un confronto tra le emissioni di CO₂ dei veicoli commerciali leggeri con quelle dei camion in grammi di CO₂ per chilometro, che risulta essere fuorviante finendo paradossalmente a disincentivare i viaggi a pieno carico, ossia l'efficienza del trasporto su gomma.

Puhemies. – Tällä kertaa, mikä on hyvin harvinaista, meillä ei ole kiire, joten pyydän senkin takia, että puhutte rauhallisesti, mutta ennen kaikkea se on huomaavaista tulkkeja ja tietenkin sitä kautta myös kaikkia läsnäolijoita ja kuuntelijoita kohtaan.

Dobromir Sośnierz (NI). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Kilka uwag do tego sprawozdania. Po pierwsze, nie ma czegoś takiego jak pojazdy zeroemisyjne. To jest posługiwanie się fałszywą terminologią, która powoduje potem skłonność do fałszywych wniosków. Chyba, że państwo wynaleźli w międzyczasie perpetuum mobile, a ja coś przegapiłem, albo zadeklarowali już, że perpetuum mobile ma być wynalezione do 2030 roku, to bym się nie zdziwił. Być może jest to w którejś nowej poprawce. Nie ma czegoś takiego jak pojazdy zeroemisyjne, one po prostu nie emitują w miejscu, w którym jeżdżą, tylko emitują tam, gdzie prąd jest wytwarzany do ich zasilania. Więc nie opowiadajmy bajek.

Po drugie, jeśli chcemy sprawiedliwie dążyć do poprawy stanu środowiska, to powinniśmy, zamiast posługiwać się taką kazuistyką, że dla takich pojazdów to będzie 15%, ale jeśli są one autobusami to nie, no chyba że przegubowymi, to znowu jakiś inny odsetek. Nie można wprowadzać takiej kazuistyki do prawa. Jest bardzo proste rozwiązanie: opłata środowiskowa powinna być zawarta w paliwie – im więcej ktoś zużyje paliwa, tym więcej zapłaci tej opłaty środowiskowej. I już rzeczą producenta jest, żeby spalić tego paliwa jak najmniej. I tyle.

Peter Liese (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Kommissar, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Das Land, das ich am besten kenne – Deutschland –, da hat sich die Regierung, um das Thema CO₂ bei Pkw sehr gestritten.

Das Umweltministerium hat gesagt: Der Kommissionsvorschlag ist nicht ambitioniert genug. Und Wirtschafts- und Verkehrsministerium haben gesagt: Doch, der Kommissionsvorschlag ist gut.

In diesem Fall, bei den schweren Nutzfahrzeugen, gibt es keinen Streit. Auch die Experten im Umweltministerium sagen: Der Vorschlag der Europäischen Kommission ist ambitioniert. Ich glaube, das stimmt. Ich stimme auch Karima Delli zu, dass es ein großer Fortschritt ist, dass wir erstmals bei den schweren Nutzfahrzeugen überhaupt etwas machen.

Deswegen bin ich doch ein bisschen besorgt, dass der Unterausschuss über das Ziel hinausgeschossen ist. Insbesondere der Wert für 2025 ist sehr ambitioniert. Das ist ein größerer Sprung als dann noch mal bis 2030. Wir müssen ja diese Gesetzgebung erst mal einführen. Deswegen wäre ich dankbar, wenn wir das insbesondere an der Stelle korrigieren – entweder gleich bei der Plenarabstimmung oder dann im Trilog.

Ich möchte, dass wir am Ende des Prozesses mit großer Mehrheit dem Vorschlag zustimmen, damit sich für das Klima etwas tut. Aber wir können die betroffene Industrie dabei nicht überfordern. Da ist der Unterausschuss noch nicht am Ziel. Aber ich bin sehr optimistisch, dass wir vor der Europawahl einen realistischen und ambitionierten Vorschlag dann gemeinsam unterstützen können.

Christine Revault d'Allonnes Bonnefoy (S&D). – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Commissaire, chers collègues, tout au long de cette mandature, nous n'avons cessé de réviser le cadre réglementaire européen en matière de contrôle et de réduction des émissions des véhicules.

Après la révision des émissions de polluants des véhicules légers, après la mise en place d'une commission d'enquête, après le durcissement des règles d'homologation et des tests, et après l'adoption de nouveaux objectifs de réduction des émissions de CO₂ pour les véhicules légers, nous allons enfin réglementer, pour la première fois, les émissions de CO₂ de tous les véhicules lourds.

J'appelle tous mes collègues à ne pas revoir à la baisse les objectifs de réduction de 20 % en 2025 et de 35 % en 2030, adoptés en commission parlementaire. J'appelle aussi à voter massivement pour les objectifs contraignants destinés à développer le marché des camions et des bus électriques. Nous devons aussi aller vers des tests en conditions réelles pour éviter de futurs scandales de fraude sur les émissions de CO₂, comme cela a été le cas pour les émissions de polluants.

Enfin, je veux ici m'adresser directement aux citoyens européens pour leur dire que l'Union européenne agit et vous protège pour limiter l'impact des émissions sur votre vie quotidienne. Je veux leur dire que nous, au Parlement européen, nous faisons notre travail pour répondre à l'urgence climatique et pour lutter contre le fléau de la pollution de l'air. Mais il faut maintenant que les États membres s'engagent eux aussi dans cette voie, et je regrette leur absence aujourd'hui.

Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy (ALDE). – Madam President, I assume that if you asked most Europeans if the CO₂ emissions of trucks and buses are tackled in the EU they would say 'yes'. I assume that they would be surprised if we explained to them that that's not the case up till now. So I'm very happy that we are finally catching up with other parts of the world. That's not only necessary to keep the Paris Climate Agreement in sight, it's also necessary, as Commissioner Arias Cañete already emphasised, to safeguard the competitiveness of our own truck manufacturers in Europe. Let's not forget all those truck operators, which most of the time are SME companies, that can save tens of thousands of euros if the trucks that they're using are much more fuel efficient – a very important element as well.

Finally, I'm a great supporter of a separate and ambitious target for zero-emission buses. Our European cities are struggling a lot with air quality. Let's not get the same problem as with zero-emission vehicles, that the clean buses are simply not available if they're asked for. So please also vote in favour of that part of this great report by our colleague, Mr Eickhout.

Andrzej Grzyb (PPE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Uważam, że dbanie o środowisko i klimat oraz tworzenie zachęt do produkcji i użytkowania pojazdów nisko- i zeroemisyjnych są naszym wspólnym zadaniem. Uważam również, że cele środowiskowe da się pogodzić z dbaniem o miejsca pracy i wzrost gospodarczy. Dlatego też sądzę, że redukcja emisji na poziomie 35 % pozwala na utrzymanie takiej synergii. Najbardziej skuteczne rozwiązania to takie, które są powszechnie akceptowane zarówno przez konsumentów, jak i producentów.

W przypadku pojazdów ciężarowych efektywność paliwowa ma pierwszorzędne znaczenie, bowiem paliwo jest największym kosztem stałym firm transportowych. W ich interesie jest więc zakup pojazdów zużywających jak najmniej paliwa. Efektywność paliwowa wiąże się też z ograniczeniem emisji, zatem powinniśmy dążyć do wdrożenia do produkcji i użytkowania pojazdów jak najniżej emisyjnych. Najlepiej gdyby były to pojazdy zeroemisyjne. Nie możemy jednak wymagać od producentów i konsumentów wdrażania rzeczy, które są niemożliwe. Chociaż z technicznego punktu widzenia zaprojektowanie na przykład ciągnika siodłowego zasilanego prądem jest możliwe, barierą jest oczywiście jego zasięg, prędkość ładowania, masa pojazdu. Ta bariera jest łatwiejsza do pokonania na krótkich trasach, na przykład w przypadku samochodów osobowych i autobusów, trudno natomiast pokonać ją przy trakcji, gdy chodzi o pojazdy ciężkie.

Zetknąłem się z tym problemem w pracach nad dyrektywą o wspieraniu czystych pojazdów, dla której mandat negocjacyjny przyjęliśmy podczas ubiegłej sesji i której byłem sprawozdawcą. Tam też przyjęliśmy inne cele dla autobusów i inne, niższe dla samochodów ciężarowych. Sądzę, że w przypadku pojazdów ciężarowych powinniśmy skupić się na poprawie efektywności paliwowej oraz technologiach przejściowych, takich jak gaz ziemny, a w szczególności biometan, który jako paliwo odnawialne może mieć duży wpływ na redukcję emisji gazów cieplarnianych.

Tiemo Wölken (S&D). – Sehr geehrte Frau Präsidentin Hautala! Zu einem umfassenden Mobilitätspaket gehört natürlich auch der Schwerlastverkehr auf den Straßen in Europa. Daher möchte ich mich zunächst bei der Europäischen Kommission für den Vorschlag bedanken und hoffe, dass wir diesen Vorschlag auch noch wirklich in dieser Wahlperiode verabschieden können. Das ist dringend nötig, wenn man bedenkt, dass andere relevante Märkte allesamt bereits Standards für Lkw gesetzt haben. Ich finde, es ist daher an der Zeit, dass wir auch in der Europäischen Union endlich den CO₂-Ausstoß regulieren. Es ist doch keinem Bürger und keiner Bürgerin zu erklären, dass der Ausstoß vom Schwerlastverkehr bisher noch nicht reguliert ist. MAN hat uns Abgeordneten zum Beispiel im September eine Broschüre geschickt, in der ein vollelektrischer Vierzehntonner beworben wird. Also auch in der Industrie bewegt sich tatsächlich etwas, und neue Technologien sind greifbar.

Ich glaube, dass Regulierung notwendig ist und die Regulierung auch der gesamten Volkswirtschaft hilft. In meinem Wahlbereich gibt es z. B. den zweitgrößten Hersteller Europas für Lkw-Trailer, der Windspoiler entwickelt hat, die den Verbrauch reduzieren. Hier müssen wir aber auch die regulatorischen Rahmenbedingungen setzen, dass solche Techniken auch genutzt werden können.

Da es sich um eine neue Gesetzgebung handelt, sollten wir allerdings auch an zwei, drei Stellen noch mal aufpassen. Ich finde, dass wir alternative Kraftstoffe anrechnen lassen können sollten und dass wir bei den Strafzahlungen noch einmal sehr genau bei der Abstimmung hinschauen müssen.

Gesine Meissner (ALDE). – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Kommissar, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Lieber Bas Eickhout, vielen Dank für den Bericht. Ich denke mal, wir sind uns vollkommen einig: Jede Emission ist schlecht fürs Klima. Das wissen wir. Darum müssen wir versuchen, die Emissionen zu reduzieren, soweit es geht. Straßenverkehr ist ein großer Faktor dafür, das wissen wir auch, der wird auch weiter ansteigen. Denn wenn wir weiter mehr Menschen auf der Welt haben, wird es mehr Handel geben, mehr Binnenmarkt mit Europa, und den wird es auch mehr auf der Straße geben, weil das das Hauptmedium ist, auf dem transportiert wird.

Wir haben das erste Mal jetzt verbindliche Ziele. Das ist auch gut so, dass wir uns die vornehmen. Der Punkt ist der, dass wir eben überlegen müssen: Wie weit können wir denn bei den Zielen wirklich gehen? Am besten wäre es vielleicht, den Emissionshandel auch für die Lkw und für die Busse einzuführen. Das haben wir jetzt nicht, und das ist etwas, was wir eigentlich gerne machen würden von meiner Partei. Es ist auch wichtig, den ganzen Lebenszyklus eines Fahrzeugs zu bedenken, nicht nur was hinten aus dem Auspuff herauskommt. Vollkommen richtig!

Lang-Lkw könnten auch eine gute Lösung sein. Das sage ich hier nun mal, weil ich fest davon überzeugt bin, dass das so ist. Die Lkw haben schon viel reduziert mit Euro 6 usw. Ich denke mal, ganz entscheidend ist, dass wir sehen: Wir müssen Forderungen stellen, aber sie müssen auch umsetzbar und praktikabel und machbar sein. Und da habe ich den Eindruck, dass die Kommission eigentlich schon eine ganze Menge vorgeschlagen hat.

Jens Gieseke (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin! Im Umweltausschuss des Europäischen Parlaments haben wir einen schon ambitionierten Vorschlag der EU-Kommission deutlich verschärft. Wir sind auf das Zwischenziel von 20 % für 2025 und auf 35 % bis 2030 gegangen. Ich finde, dass wir in diesem Hause auch die Frage stellen müssen: Was ist technisch und was ist tatsächlich erreichbar und machbar? Ich habe mit technischen Experten gesprochen, die sagen: Ein Reduktionspotenzial von 1,5 % jährlich in den nächsten zehn Jahren im Durchschnitt, das ist wirklich möglich. Dann komme ich auf 15 %. Wenn wir noch mehr Ambitionen unterstellen, kommen wir auf 20 %. Ich glaube, dass wir das sehr ernst nehmen müssen, und auch die physikalischen und technischen Grenzen sollten wir nicht unter den Teppich kehren.

Die betriebliche Realität ist wichtig. Der Produktionszyklus beim Lkw ist so: Der wird heute entwickelt und ist 2025 auf der Strecke. Vor dem Hintergrund ist wichtig – es ist von vielen Kollegen angesprochen worden, Bas Eickhout – gerade die Frage des Zwischenziels 2025 20 %. Das ist uns als EVP zu hoch, hier müssen wir zurück zu den 15 %. Ich freue mich sehr, dass in der Debatte der Kollege Wölken ... Wir sind nicht immer einer Meinung, aber bei der Frage Strafzahlungen und Anrechnung von *e-fuels* können wir einen Konsens finden. Insofern glaube ich, dass wir dieses Dossier noch nachhaltig verbessern können.

Carlos Zorrinho (S&D). – Senhora Presidente, quando fui membro da comissão de inquérito do Parlamento Europeu para as emissões do setor automóvel houve um número que me marcou particularmente. Quatrocentos mil cidadãos europeus morrem prematuramente por ano devido à má qualidade do ar. Por isso, a descarbonização dos transportes é um imperativo de cidadania, por razões económicas, ambientais e de saúde pública.

Os veículos pesados são responsáveis por 6% do total de emissões de dióxido de carbono na UE. Temos de ter uma quota significativa de veículos pesados novos de baixas emissões para reduzir em 35% as emissões desse setor.

É um desafio para a indústria europeia desenvolver, produzir e comercializar na Europa e fora dela veículos pesados sem emissões ou com baixas emissões. A investigação nesse sentido deve ser incentivada e apoiada, mas não basta apoiar a indústria. Uma percentagem elevada de operadores de transporte mercadorias da União Europeia são PME. É essencial disponibilizar também uma estrutura de incentivos robusta para os apoiar.

Não podemos ficar para trás. Temos de ambicionar liderar nas tecnologias inovadoras de redução de emissões nos transportes para cumprirmos Paris, mas, sobretudo, para melhorarmos a qualidade de vida dos cidadãos europeus.

Jozo Radoš (ALDE). – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, gospodine povjereniče, pozdravljam donošenje ove uredbe iako se kod ove uredbe kao i kod svih uredbi koje se tiču emisija CO₂ postavlja niz otvorenih pitanja. Pitanje na primjer da li će tehnološki razvoj omogućiti postizanje postavljenih ciljeva? Hoćemo li uspjeti spriječiti uvoz teških gospodarskih vozila sa stranih tržišta? Da li su kazne za neispunjavanje ciljeva dobro pogođene budući da imamo dva radikalna prijedloga ovdje u plenarnoj sjednici, od 5 000 i od 1 000 eura? Hoćemo li uspjeti razviti tehnike mjerenja i praćenja emisija i hoćemo li za reviziju, ranu reviziju, za svega nekoliko godina imati dovoljno podataka da bi ta revizija ove uredbe bila dovoljno kvalitetna?

No unatoč svim postavljenim pitanjima podržavam donošenje ove uredbe jer ako to ne bismo učinili, onda bi emisije CO₂ iz teških gospodarskih vozila mogle doseći gotovo 10 % ukupnih emisija CO₂.

Pilar Ayuso (PPE). – Señora presidenta, señor comisario, yo también celebro esta propuesta que se presenta por primera vez, porque los vehículos pesados suponen el 6 % de las emisiones, estas van en aumento y se necesita también aportar objetivos ambiciosos para la reducción de las emisiones en la Unión Europea.

Este Reglamento es un importante complemento a todo lo que se ha hecho sobre los sectores difusos, como el e4-share o las normas para vehículos ligeros. Pero para dar una señal clara a la industria, como usted muy bien ha dicho, señor comisario, necesitamos unos objetivos de reducción que sean a la vez ambiciosos y alcanzables por parte de los fabricantes. Necesitamos una definición clara de qué son los vehículos de bajas emisiones. Necesitamos los ajustes necesarios para contabilizar las emisiones evitadas por determinadas combustiones de renovables y necesitamos un sistema de multas razonables.

Lo cierto es que llegamos a una votación en este Pleno sin que el ponente haya conseguido llegar a un acuerdo entre los grupos parlamentarios. Yo lo lamento y espero que el ponente pueda llegar pronto a un acuerdo con el Consejo para tener un marco legal estable y previsible antes del final de la legislatura.

Dieter-Lebrecht Koch (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Kommissar, verehrte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Mit der Festlegung von CO₂-Grenzwerten für schwere Nutzfahrzeuge schließen wir eine Gesetzeslücke. Dabei sollten wir vernünftig vorgehen und aus den Fehlern bei der Schaffung von Grenzwertvorschriften für Pkw und leichte Nutzfahrzeuge lernen. Es gilt heute, realitätsfremde Regelungen zu vermeiden. Das Reduktionsziel von 35 % trage ich schweren Herzens mit. Das sollte dann aber auch wirklich der maximale Wert sein.

Anreize sind allemal besser als Bestrafungen. Um die Anschaffung von kraftstoffeffizienten Lkw zu fördern, müssen den Transportunternehmen, die größtenteils KMU sind, Finanzierungsmechanismen der EU zugutekommen. Dies sollte ebenfalls für die Anschaffung von emissionsfreien Bussen gelten. Das Ganze muss von der Schaffung einer angemessenen flächendeckenden Lade- und Tankstelleninfrastruktur flankiert werden, denn auch die strengsten Grenzwerte bringen uns nichts, wenn die Nutzung der emissionsarmen Fahrzeuge nicht ermöglicht wird. Hier muss die EU Hand in Hand mit den Mitgliedstaaten arbeiten.

Pyynnöstä myönnettävät puheenvuorot

José Blanco López (S&D). – Señora presidenta, la descarbonización del sector del transporte es clave para cumplir los objetivos de lucha contra el cambio climático, y necesitamos actuar en este sector de manera especial por su dificultad para reducir emisiones y por su volumen, que representa una cuarta parte de la Unión Europea. Además, este sector representa una fuente de trabajo muy importante en Europa y se enfrenta a una profunda transformación tecnológica.

Señorías, la sociedad nos está demandando respirar aire limpio sin polución, y especialmente esto se agrava en nuestras urbes, en las grandes conglomeraciones urbanas.

Este Reglamento tiene todo el sentido de ser para promover un tráfico más seguro con vehículos menos contaminantes y soluciones tecnológicas más avanzadas, al tiempo que promovemos la competitividad de la industria europea.

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, οι εκπομπές αερίων ρύπων είναι βλαπτικές, καταρχάς για την υγεία όλων μας και δεύτερον -φυσικά- για το περιβάλλον. Επομένως, είναι προφανές ότι πρέπει να ληφθούν μέτρα για να περιοριστούν οι εκπομπές αερίων ρύπων. Αυτό πρέπει να γίνει και στον τομέα των μεταφορών, όπου το 70% των χερσαίων μεταφορών διεξάγεται με βαρέα οχήματα. Επομένως, ο στόχος καταρχάς πρέπει να είναι ο περιορισμός. Βλέπω, όμως, ότι ο στόχος είναι ιδιαίτερα φιλόδοξος. Νομίζω ότι πρέπει να έχουμε μια πιο σταθμισμένη και πιο ισορροπημένη μετάβαση. Κατά κύριο λόγο πρέπει να εξετάσουμε τις δημόσιες μεταφορές όπου υπάρχει παρέμβαση του δημοσίου, δηλαδή τα λεωφορεία -τα οποία βεβαίως μπορεί να είναι ηλεκτρικά- και τα απορριμματοφόρα. Επίσης, η εφαρμογή στον ιδιωτικό τομέα πρέπει να γίνει σταδιακά και να δοθούν κίνητρα στις μικρομεσαίες επιχειρήσεις προκειμένου να στηριχτούν οι μικροϊδιοκτήτες, όπως στην περίπτωση της Ελλάδας, διότι διαφορετικά θα έχουμε πολύ μεγάλα ιδιωτικά μονοπώλια που θα πετάξουν έξω τους μικροεπαγγελματίες.

Kateřina Konečná (GUE/NGL). – Paní předsedající, je mi líto, že zde znovu musím kritizovat emisní návrh z dílny Výboru pro životní prostředí, veřejné zdraví a bezpečnost potravin, ale bohužel ani tentokrát výbor nepředložil racionální dokument.

Navržené cíle požadují, aby v roce 2025 bylo 50 % prodaných městských bezemisních, takzvaných elektrických autobusů a v roce 2030 dokonce 75 %. Tyto cíle však naprosto ignorují jakoukoliv elementární logiku odlišnosti veřejné dopravy od osobní i technickou neutralitu. Dobíjení jednoho těžkého vozidla vyžaduje minimální příkon 40 kW. Pro srovnání – obvyklá rezerva jedné domácnosti je 3 kW. Pokud se elektrobusy mají stát páteřními stroji městské hromadné dopravy, pak garáže typického dopravního podniku budou mít spotřebu srovnatelnou se čtvrtí města, ve které sídlí.

Další věc, o které se zde raději nemluví, je bezpečnost elekrovozidel. Akumulátory obsahují dvě složky potřebné k hoření a klasickou technikou je problematické je uhasit. Přitom v každém těžkém vozidle je na rozdíl od osobního akumulátoru několik tun. Navržené emisní cíle v textu Výboru pro životní prostředí, veřejné zdraví a bezpečnost potravin jsou dvojnásobné oproti tomu, co je podle analýz realistické, a povedou k navýšení cen dopravy, spotřebitelských cen či k nárůstu stárí vozového parku.

Bill Etheridge (EFDD). – Madam President, I've listened to this with real interest. People say the EU doesn't work. Well, this is entirely a great example of how it does. Climate change fanatics come here and tell us that we're going to have plagues and death and species dying out and the world's going to end. They come here with that message, then the people who want to have more control and more power in the EU take this and think, 'Oh, this is great; we can say we're going to tax more, we can say we're going to spend more, control more, fine people, tell them what they can do, how they can produce things, and we can say, "if you don't do it, the world's going to end"'. It's perfect, it's a lovely symmetry that's going on here.

If you really want to make a change, surely the best way is through incentives. Why not create an environment where companies and industries will make research look into this new greener technology that you want and actually make a profit doing it, rather than being forced into it from top down with the threat of all this alarmism and nonsense.

Seán Kelly (PPE). – Madam President, having been involved in the whole clean energy package from the outset, I think we can be very pleased with the progress we have made under the leadership of Commissioner Arias Cañete and, indeed, in this file I would like to thank Mr Eickhout for his good work in this and many other areas. And if we are to deliver on our targets for 2030 and beyond, every sector has to play its part. The transport sector hasn't done as much as it should have up until now and we are nudging them in the right direction, giving them sensible targets over a period of time.

I drive from my home in Killarney to Dublin twice a week every week, coming to Brussels and going back, and the amount of trucks and buses is enormous. Unless they are more energy efficient we will never make progress. I think the proposals here for heavy-duty vehicles make a lot of sense, will make a huge difference, and if every sector plays their part, we will meet our targets and we will give world leadership as well. So well done to Mr Eickhout, Commissioner Arias Cañete and everybody involved.

(Pyynnöstä myönnettävät puheenvuorot päättyvät)

Miguel Arias Cañete, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, I have listened carefully to the debate today and I have heard a broad range of positions, in particular on the level of ambition and on zero— and low-emission vehicle incentives.

I would like to stress once more that the Commission proposal is balanced, ambitious and fully in line with our climate objectives.

Some interventions are calling for higher ambition levels in 2025. With 15% in 2025, the Commission proposal strikes the right balance between being realistic and ambitious. We have based it on a solid impact assessment because a 15% target can be achieved using technologies that are already available on the market but not yet widely deployed.

Today we have also heard calls for setting a binding and higher target for 2030. Let me please remind you that while the 2025 target can be met by deploying readily available cost-effective technologies, achieving a more ambitious 2030 target would require the implementation of new technologies that are not yet on the market. There is currently a lack of robust information on how the performance and costs of those more innovative and prospective technologies might evolve in the medium term, and this creates a risk that a binding 2030 target would not be set at the most cost-effective level right now. The Commission has therefore proposed to review the 2030 aspirational CO₂ emission targets in 2022 once sufficient certified CO₂ emission data has been collected and more information is available.

Some interventions also called for incentives for the deployment of zero— and low-emission vehicles, an objective that the Commission supports. A crediting system based on a benchmark was considered in the impact assessment. However, it was not retained, in particular in view of the very low penetration of zero— and low-emission vehicles in the fleet and of the scarcity of robust data on such markets. Adding a malus would mean that manufacturers meeting the CO₂ targets would actually be penalised if they did not meet the benchmark. Instead, the Commission proposal contains a super-credit system which also preserves the environmental integrity of the CO₂ target.

CO₂ emissions standards cannot be set yet for buses, as the CO₂ emissions are not yet certified. However, as set out in the 2022 review clause, buses will be included in future standards. But, at the same time, this proposal can help to speed up the market uptake of zero-emission bus technologies by including them in the super-credit scheme. There is a competition distortion between manufacturers which is addressed through a cap.

The proposed revision of the Clean Vehicle Directive will be a key tool to steer public authorities' decisions in purchasing zero-emission buses by creating a larger market for those vehicles. A platform has already been created to help cities make joint public procurement, and the European Union budget will also continue to support the financing of a new fleet of clean buses. However, certain zero-emission buses mandates for manufacturers will not be proposed.

We heard today some interventions calling for credits for alternative fuels. The Commission proposal does not include such credits. Our approach is based on the principle of clear responsibilities for clear actors. Manufacturers are responsible for designing vehicles so that they achieve the CO₂ reductions required under the legislation. However, they cannot be held responsible for the type of fuel that is actually used in its vehicle or take advantage of it. More precisely, one vehicle is not necessarily linked to one fuel type as in many cases the same vehicle can use several fuels, either conventional, biofuels or other low carbon fuels. This being said, it does not mean that we are not taking action to decarbonise emissions from fuels. The eight-year reform will ensure decarbonisation of electricity production and the Renewable Energies Directive will ensure that more low-carbon fuels will enter the market. In this context we need to apply the principle of better regulation and avoid double regulation and double accounting for incentivising renewable fuels.

Some interventions today raised concerns about the proposed level of the penalties, considering them too high and possibly putting at risk the economic situation of a manufacturer exceeding its targets. Firstly, ensuring compliance is absolutely necessary for the effectiveness of any regulatory requirements. Secondly, to be in line with the objectives of the regulation, financial penalties have to be set at a level that exceeds the marginal cost of meeting the targets. The penalties need to be a real deterrent. It should not be less expensive to pay penalties than to invest in technologies to meet targets. Thirdly, the approach taken by the Commission is to set an equivalent level of stringency from an environmental point of view, as compared with cars and buses.

Finally, this issue will be part of the review of the effectiveness of the legislation in 2022.

To conclude, I would like to thank all of you for the interesting debate. I am looking forward to the upcoming vote. The Commission is also confident that the Council, under the leadership of the Austrian Presidency, will be able to reach swiftly a position so that the discussion between the two co-legislators can start this year. It is absolutely essential that the final political agreement between the co-legislators can be found before the end of the term of office of this Parliament. I trust that this will be possible thanks to the dedication and hard work of the two co-legislators. Again, my thanks to the rapporteur for a good, fast and ambitious job.

Bas Eickhout, Rapporteur. – Madam President, I would like to thank the Commissioner for his replies and to thank my colleagues for this very good discussion that we have had. I feel that there is quite some support for what we did in the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety (ENVI), which is very good.

To touch on a couple of issues that have been raised, first, on the level of ambition, we have to be very clear here that we have already adopted national binding targets for 2030 under effort sharing. This means that we know that if in the transport sector we are not reducing our emissions enough, reductions will need to come from the other sectors that fall under the Effort Sharing Regulation, being housing or agriculture. If we don't go for the cost-effective reductions that are possible in transport, it will mean that agriculture needs to deliver more in those countries where they will have difficulties in meeting their reduction targets. All the analysis shows that a CO₂ standard on cars and heavy-duty vehicles is the cost-effective way to reduce emissions in those sectors that fall under the Effort Sharing Regulation, and that's what we're doing here.

On the level where we, as ENVI, say that we should raise the bar to 20%, I once again want to stress that, in the Commission's impact assessment, it's very clearly stated that an analysis of the cost-effective technologies already at hand shows that full deployment would make it possible to achieve emission reductions between 15% to 20% by 2025. This shows that the existing technologies can be achieved with the 20% target. On top of that, we need to develop new technologies and that's why we are making this Regulation consistent with the cars. In the cars we had super credits and now, later on, the Commission is stepping away from that in cars and comes up with super credits again in this Regulation. We think it's better to skip that mistake that you made on cars and immediately go into a mandate for zero and low-emission vehicles at a very low level of 5%.

My last point, on buses, is that it's very important to realise that there are producers producing both trucks and buses. So if we have one mandate, you are giving very clear priority and a benefit for those who are producing both because, in buses, we can move faster, and the market is moving faster. That's why we have decided on separate mandates for buses and heavy-duty vehicles – in order to make sure that the level playing field remains equal for all the players in the market for new technologies.

Once again, I thank everyone for the discussion. I'm looking forward to the vote and then indeed, what is the intention? A fast resolution in negotiations, hopefully to start under the Austrian Presidency.

Puhemies. – Keskustelu on päättynyt.

Äänestys toimitetaan tänään keskiviikkona 14.11.2018.

Kirjalliset lausumat (162 artikla)

Adam Gierek (S&D), *na piśmie*. – Rozporządzenie w sprawie norm emisji CO₂ dla pojazdów ciężarowych o dużej ładowności jest częścią zintegrowanego podejścia Unii Europejskiej względem dekarbonizacji sektora transportu. Przepisy w nim zawarte niewątpliwie stanowią w dłuższej perspektywie duży problem, zarówno dla producentów pojazdów, jak i dla sprzedawców paliw. Zgodnie z obecną metodologią wartość emisji CO₂ przez pojazd jest mu przypisywana na podstawie zmierzonej jej ilości wydalanej z rury wydechowej pojazdu. Nie uwzględnia się jednak przy tym całkowitej emisji CO₂, której źródłem jest wcześniejsze przetwórstwo ropy naftowej w paliwa, jako energii pierwotnej (rafinerie) lub podczas wytwarzania paliw odnawialnych, w tym biogazu. To błąd.

Uważam, iż należy skoncentrować się na kwestii uwzględniania redukcji emisji, która wynika z wykorzystania biopaliw oraz paliw alternatywnych. W tym celu Komisja Europejska powinna opracować nową metodologię obiektywnego sposobu liczenia emisji całkowitej. Nowa metodologia dla zaawansowanych i odnawialnych paliw płynnych, w tym gazowych, przy jednoczesnym uniknięciu podwójnego liczenia umożliwi dalszą, poważną redukcję CO₂. Umożliwi także firmom specjalizującym się w produkcji pojazdów ciężkich śmielsze przygotowywanie nowych, perspektywicznych i konkurencyjnych rozwiązań konstrukcyjnych.

(Istunto keskeytetään klo 11.14 odotettaessa juhlaistunnon alkamista.)

PRESIDENZA DELL'ON. ANTONIO TAJANI

Presidente

9. Genoptagelse af mødet

(La seduta è ripresa alle 11.38)

10. Højtideligt møde – Sydafrika

President. – Dear colleagues, it is my pleasure to welcome the President of the Republic of South Africa, Cyril Ramaphosa. This important visit takes place ahead of the Seventh EU-South Africa Summit, to be held in Brussels tomorrow.

President Ramaphosa, you are the fifth African leader to address this Chamber in the past year. As you can see, strengthening ties with the African continent is a priority for us, but also for me it is one of the most important points for my presidency.

Let me begin by saying that the European Parliament proudly joined the worldwide celebrations to commemorate Nelson Mandela's legacy on the centenary of his birth. He was, as you know, the first person to receive the Sakharov Prize in 1988, in recognition of his struggle to end apartheid and his fight to pursue equal rights for all. We will always remember this great man with admiration and immense respect.

Mr President, in February of this year, you became South Africa's new president. Your reforms are contributing to revitalise South Africa's economy by attracting foreign investments, enhancing private-sector competitiveness, creating jobs, especially for the young, fighting corruption and inequality, and improving citizens' rights.

We welcome your agenda and are confident that in tomorrow's summit we will open a new chapter in our partnership. However, structural challenges in South Africa remain: poverty, income inequality and unemployment are at the top of the list.

The EU stands ready to support you in tackling these challenges. Through stronger economic diplomacy and an ambitious 'Marshall plan' for Africa, we can help you attract investment. South Africa is a champion of multilateralism, an active member of the African Union and of the Southern African Development Community. It is the only African member of the G20. This means we have to work together on our most pressing common challenges – trade, climate change, terrorism, migration and unemployment.

I also wish to congratulate you on the election of your country as a non-permanent member of the United Nations Security Council starting next year. South Africa has a great role to play regionally and on the global stage.

President Ramaphosa, thank you once more for being here with us. You have the floor.

(Applause)

Cyril Ramaphosa, *President of South Africa*. – Mr President, it is indeed a great honour and a privilege to have this opportunity to address this gathering, particularly in the centenary year of the birth of Nelson Mandela, the founding father of our democratic nation, a revered statesman and a committed internationalist. We celebrate the centenary knowing well that Nelson Mandela does not belong to us as South Africans. He belongs to all of us, and indeed to the world.

(Applause)

He is one person who, through his life and deeds, proved to all the people across the world that championing human rights and doing what is right in terms of embracing universal values was the right thing to do, and that is precisely what he dedicated his life to. He belongs not only to those who lived through the tumultuous events of the last century, but he also belongs to the generations that are going to follow all of us. We live in the world that Nelson Mandela and many other great leaders of his age made.

We are grateful to the European Union and to the people, as well as the leaders, of Europe for the tributes they have paid in many different ways to Nelson Mandela on the occasion of his birth, and for this we thank you from the bottom of our hearts. We say thank you for honouring Nelson Mandela in the way that you have.

(Applause)

It is indeed a testament to the universal appeal of his vision that he is as revered on this continent as he is across the African continent. We remember with the nations of the world the centenary of the armistice that marked the end of the First World War. We pay tribute to all those who lost their lives in that great human tragedy, including the many South Africans of all races who also fought in that war and who perished on these foreign shores.

(Applause)

Twenty-six years ago, in the city of Maastricht, the leaders of Europe signed the historic Treaty that would mark a new era in the continent's history. Now, more than a quarter of a century later, that affirmation of democracy, of liberty, of respect for human rights, of fundamental freedoms and the rule of law continues to endure. These timeless values are indeed beacons of hope in our troubled times, for – despite our greatest efforts – the world today is blighted by conflict, poverty and underdevelopment in a number of poor countries. There is still a lack of meaningful social progress, unrest and displacement. The spectre of the resurgence of racism and xenophobia, cloaked in the mantle of nationalism, is rising and is causing a great deal of concern in a number of places. Unilateralism is on the rise and threatens, in many ways, to undermine our collective commitment to democratic values and respect for human rights.

Now, more than ever, we turn to our great leaders for strength and inspiration as we seek to resolve the most pressing challenges of our times. We recall their words and their actions as we reaffirm our commitment to democratic values and upholding the rights of every human being. It was the great statesman and friend of the anti-apartheid cause, Olof Palme, the former Prime Minister of Sweden, who said, 'for us, democracy is a question of human dignity. This includes political liberties, the right to freely express our views, the right to criticise and to influence opinion. It embraces the right to health, work, to education and social security'. This view of democracy resonates with Nelson Mandela's vision of a global community of nations that affirms the centrality of human dignity and strives through all means available to improve the human condition.

Just four months after his release from prison in 1990, Nelson Mandela paid his first visit to the European Parliament to receive the Sakharov Prize for Freedom of Thought. He used this occasion to thank the leaders and the people of Europe for their contribution to the liberation of South Africa. I also stand here, like Nelson Mandela, and thank the people of Europe for the contribution that they made to end apartheid, and we say thank you for all the support you gave us during the dark days of apartheid. Thank you very much.

(Applause)

Nelson Mandela also used the opportunity, as he addressed this European Parliament, to call on the nations of Europe to continue to stand by South Africa as we sought to rebuild our country. We are here today to confirm that, indeed, the nations of Europe answered the call that Nelson Mandela made with conviction and generosity. We are here today, following in the footsteps of Nelson Mandela, to say that we would urge you and we would call on you to continue supporting South Africa as it has embarked on a journey, not only to reform itself, but to build a new South African nation from the ashes of apartheid. We thank you for continuing to support us.

(Applause)

The European Union was born out of the need to end the historic divisions on the continent, to create a firm base for the construction of a new Europe rooted in solidarity and cooperation, and to contribute to global peace, security and development. The countries of Africa have similarly embarked upon a new path of peace, development and transformation. The African Union's Agenda 2063 provides a programme for integration and prosperity on a continent that has been wracked by division, exploitation and strife. Nelson Mandela was an ardent advocate for pan-Africanism, and he believed that the continent could only reach her full potential if her peoples were united. In pursuing this goal, there are many lessons we can draw from the European Union's path to integration, to economic and political union, and to achieving social progress.

South Africa notes the tireless work of the European Parliament to ensure that the provisions of the Lisbon Treaty on the eradication of poverty continue to underpin the EU's approach to external development cooperation. Since 2007, South Africa and the EU have enjoyed the mutual benefits of a strategic partnership that continues to play a meaningful role in our country's economic growth. It covers over 20 sectoral policy dialogues on diverse issues from development cooperation, science and technology, health, climate change, trade, education, skills development to peace migration, security and human rights as well.

An integral part of this partnership are the interparliamentary meetings between the South African Parliament and the European Parliament. These meetings have indeed played a crucial role in strengthening South Africa's, as well as European, relations, contributing to a strategic partnership – a partnership that is based on equality, shared values and issues of mutual interest. Allow me to express our sincere appreciation for the contribution that the European Union – and in this case the European Parliament – have made not only to the development of South Africa, but also towards the achievement of progress across the African continent.

Nelson Mandela led South Africa in its peaceful transition to democracy, but he had a bigger dream: an Africa at peace with itself and the world. In his lifetime, he supported the African Union's effort towards conflict prevention and resolution, peaceful building, as well as post-conflict reconstruction. He would have joined us in applauding the EU's support for the AU peace and security architecture and its steadfast support for efforts to silence the guns on the African continent for good. He always argued that lasting peace and security on the continent will not be possible without economic development. Without opportunity, without investment, without thriving economies that enable us all to enjoy our place in the sun, we cannot hope to have political and social stability on the African continent.

We therefore welcome the support of the European Union for Africa's development needs through initiatives such as the European External Investment Plan, the Economic Partnership Agreement and the new Africa-European Alliance for Sustainable Investment and Jobs. We should strive to ensure that these approaches are developed and implemented in line with Agenda 2063 of the African Union. We should seek to ensure that these developmental initiatives support the establishment of the African Continental Free Trade Area and Africa's overall industrialisation infrastructure development, as well as economic transformation.

We need to work together, as the countries of Europe and Africa, to develop sustainable and humane responses to the challenge of irregular migration. This is a challenge that Europe has had to deal with in recent years. So, too, has South Africa, and several African countries have had to deal with this challenge as well in a number of ways. We need to work together to address the root causes of irregular migration, which include poverty, inequality, unemployment, economic exclusion and competition for scarce resources. This should be informed by the principles of solidarity, compassion and an unwavering commitment to the human rights of all the people of the world.

Africa is the cradle of humankind. It is rich in land and water, abundant in minerals, and blessed with a young and vibrant population. It is the next frontier of growth, of innovation and of social progress. To realise this potential, the people of Africa are in the process of uniting themselves. Africa will continue to strengthen the bonds of partnership and friendship with the citizens of her sister continents and, in this case, her sister continent Europe. It is therefore a matter of great satisfaction and promise that our partnership with the European Union is as strong as it has been enduring. It is grounded in responsibility, respect and mutual accountability. The nations of the EU are a source of investment, trade, skills and knowledge, which has worked with us as South Africa in our quest to grow our economy and improve the lives of our people.

As we look to the future, we continue to count on the strength of this partnership between our countries and our peoples. As we advance forward to address the many challenges that our country faces – the challenges of unemployment, of poverty, and of inequality – we rely on Europe to be our partner. Right now, our country is in the process of transforming and reforming itself. We are seeking to create a South Africa that is conducive for investment flows. A few weeks ago, we held an investment conference that attracted a number of European-based companies to come to South Africa, and we were particularly overjoyed when many of them declared that they will continue to invest in South Africa. We were able, at that conference – and another conference that followed – to raise USD 26 billion that will flow into South Africa, and we are grateful for the support that we have enjoyed also from Europe, for that vote of confidence in our economy.

(Applause)

It is this collaboration and partnership that we seek – a collaboration that has bound South Africa and the countries of Europe together in a pact to never again return to the excesses and divisions of the past. As South Africa, we are dealing with a number of issues that have to do with policies, policies that will consolidate South Africa and make our country more stable.

We are in the process of dealing with the question of land reform. Land reform is one of those challenges that our country has had to face over hundreds of years, where the indigenous people of South Africa were denied access to land, and have over the years been yearning to have access to land. We are now at a stage where we are engaging in a dialogue – an overarching dialogue among the people of South Africa, those who own land and those who don't own land – to see how best this important resource can be utilised to develop our country. Through this, the dialogue is leading us to a point where we are seeking to find solutions that will be inclusive and that will enable all South Africans, as we continue to consolidate our nation and to work together to resolve this problem.

We have said very clearly that this problem of land will be resolved through adherence to the rule of law, through adherence to our constitution, and we will utilise the lessons that Nelson Mandela taught us with regard to resolving problems. We will resolve this problem in an inclusive basis, respecting each other's human rights, respecting each other's hopes and aspirations, and making sure – like we did when we resolved the apartheid problem – that we resolve it with a view to building a nation from the ashes of apartheid. This we shall do, because that is what Nelson Mandela taught us. I can assure you that we will resolve the land issue in line with the values that are enshrined in our Constitution and, when we do so, we will have an all-inclusive solution that will make all the people of South Africa work together and move together into the promised future that we see ahead of us.

(Applause)

Unity and partnership, as well as solidarity, are the principles that have underpinned our cooperation across two vast and different continents out of dark histories and into a promising new dawn. South Africa, Africa and the European Union are bound by shared values of democracy and respect for human rights. We share a commitment to the ideals of free and prosperous societies, societies in which all persons live together in harmony with equal opportunities. We owe it to our great forebears, leaders of the calibre of Nelson Mandela, to focus on what unites us and not that which divides us, and to focus also on what benefits all of us and not what enriches and benefits just a few. We owe it to the leaders who are our forebears to build a strategic partnership that endures, that flourishes, and that – above all else – advances the cause of humanity.

We thank you for your friendship, we thank you for your solidarity, we thank you for your partnership, and we thank you all for your support and for your continued help in everything that we are doing to rebuild the South African nation so that we, too, can enjoy the type of progress that you, as Europeans, have achieved. Thank you very much.

(Sustained applause)

President. – President Ramaphosa, thank you very much. The message from the European Parliament is very clear: we want to strengthen cooperation between the European Union and Africa and between the European Union and the Republic of South Africa. Thank you very much for coming.

(Applause)

(Parliament met for the awarding of the LUX prize)

11. Genoptagelse af mødet

(La seduta è ripresa alle 12.40)

Reinhard Bütikofer (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, two prominent democratic guests from Hong Kong are today visiting the European Parliament. I would like to welcome Mr Martin Lee, from the Democratic Party, and Mr Alan Leong, from the Civic Party.

(Applause)

Pervenche Berès (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, je n'ai pas voulu interrompre les séances solennelles, mais je voudrais vous interpeller sur la façon dont vous avez présidé nos travaux hier lors de l'échange avec la chancelière Merkel.

Les instructions que nous avons reçues indiquent: «Veuillez noter que le Président répartira le temps d'intervention entre les députés en fonction du temps de parole attribué aux groupes politiques selon leur taille». Mon groupe n'a pas été victime de cela, mais je constate que votre groupe qui représente 29 % des membres de cet hémicycle a reçu 35 % du temps de parole, que le groupe de l'EFDD qui représente 5,7 % de notre hémicycle a reçu 10 % du temps de parole et que le groupe des non-inscrits qui représente 3,9 % de notre hémicycle a reçu 10 % du temps de parole. Je pense qu'il y a un déséquilibre grave dans la répartition de ces fameuses «interventions à la demande».

(Applaudissements)

Presidente. – Onorevole Berès, non sono io che decido il tempo di parola, ma è tutto basato sul sistema d'Hondt. Io ricevo dai servizi il numero dei deputati che possono parlare in base al tempo. Quindi non sono io che decido quanti socialisti, quanti non iscritti possono intervenire.

Sono stati rispettati scrupolosamente con una sola eccezione perché, in base al tempo utilizzato dai presidenti dei gruppi, il gruppo GUE, il gruppo liberale e il gruppo Verde non avrebbero avuto diritto ad alcuno intervento. Questa è l'unica violazione che ho compiuto. Per dare rappresentatività anche ai parlamentari e non soltanto ai presidenti dei gruppi, ho fatto una eccezione. Per il resto mi sono scrupolosamente attenuto alla richiesta che mi veniva dai servizi, cercando di far parlare anche i deputati che non avevano mai preso la parola in occasione di altri dibattiti, perché sarebbe ingiusto, in occasione del *catch the eye*, far parlare sempre gli stessi parlamentari.

Ieri più di 200 parlamentari avevano chiesto la parola ma il Cancelliere Merkel doveva assolutamente lasciare l'Aula entro le 17.30, come vi avevo informati. Quindi da parte mia, mi dispiace onorevole Berès, non c'è stata alcuna violazione delle regole del sistema d'Hondt. Che poi non tutti i deputati siano rimasti contenti non dipende da me. Io per me farei parlare tutti, però il tempo è quello che è.

La ringrazio comunque per avermi permesso di spiegare l'organizzazione dei lavori per il *catch the eye* quando vi sono i capi di Stato e di governo che vengono a partecipare ai dibattiti di fronte al Parlamento.

Angelo Ciocca (ENF). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, vorrei chiedere la vostra complicità, da un lato per ringraziare l'associazione ADMO per il grande impegno che ha messo anche in questi giorni e, dall'altro lato, per ringraziare i numerosi donatori di midollo osseo per la sfida che dobbiamo compiere di Alessandro. Mancano, ahimè, due settimane per poter ricevere la donazione di midollo osseo. Entro fine mese, questo bambino di 18 mesi deve arrivare a trovare il donatore. Non è ancora stato trovato, faccio appello a tutti voi: aiutiamoci tutti assieme affinché questo bambino di 18 mesi, entro fine mese, possa trovare il giusto donatore. Grazie della vostra disponibilità e sono certo del vostro aiuto.

12. Meddelelse fra formanden

Presidente. – Il 2 ottobre 2018 ho annunciato in Aula la comminazione di una sanzione all'onorevole Giulia Moi per la sua condotta nei confronti di assistenti parlamentari qualificata come molestia psicologica.

Il 16 ottobre 2018 l'onorevole Moi ha presentato un ricorso interno contro tale decisione dinanzi all'Ufficio di presidenza, conformemente all'articolo 167 del regolamento.

Lunedì 12 novembre 2018 l'Ufficio di presidenza ha confermato all'unanimità la portata della sanzione adottata consistente nella perdita del diritto delle indennità di soggiorno per un periodo di 12 giorni.

Giulia Moi (EFDD). – Onorevole Tajani, io vorrei sapere come mai il suo ufficio non mi sta rispondendo da mesi su delle infrazioni fatte da suoi due dipendenti, dove ci sono state irregolarità sulla mia richiesta da più di un anno prima di questa fandonia sul licenziamento di questi miei due dipendenti.

Io non riesco a lavorare, non ci sono state le norme che dovevano tutelare il lavoro di un parlamentare. Il suo ufficio ha ricevuto tutto il materiale da mesi e non mi sta rispondendo. Io sono bloccata nel mio lavoro di parlamentare e voi non mi state assolutamente venendo incontro con le risposte nei tempi stabiliti dalla legge. Le infrazioni dei suoi dipendenti sono notevoli e lei non mi sta dando spiegazioni.

Non mi state permettendo di licenziare due persone che hanno fatto irregolarità. Me le state tenendo e non riesco a fare nulla. Questa farsa di quest'accusa è ridicola e potrebbe essere anche un attacco politico.

Presidente. – Onorevole Moi, comprendo il suo stato d'animo. Ho capito quello che ha detto. Ha avuto tempo di esprimere le sue opinioni, ora mi faccia rispondere. Ha detto quello che pensava. La sanzione è stata comminata, è stata confermata. La decisione non è stata presa da me. La decisione è stata presa dal Comitato dell'*harassment*. Onorevole, la sanzione è stata presa.

Jörg Meuthen (EFDD). – Herr Präsident! Ich komme noch einmal auf das gestrige *Catch-the-eye*-Verfahren zu sprechen. Wenn Sie hier sagen, dass die Wortzuteilung annähernd fair gewesen sei, dann widerspreche ich dem entschieden. Sie haben für die EFDD-Fraktion vier Rednern das Wort erteilt. Ich war einer der Ersten, die sich gemeldet hatten. Wir hatten intern angemeldet, dass ich selbstverständlich zu Wort kommen soll. Sie haben, nachdem der Fraktionsvorsitzende gesprochen hat, Herrn Monot das Wort erteilt, dann zwei Briten, Sie haben mir das Wort verweigert. Es müsste eine ...

(Unruhe)

Ja, ja, ja, das sind genau diese pseudodemokratischen Geschichten, die hier laufen. Mit Verlaub, Herr Präsident, wenn die deutsche Bundeskanzlerin in diesem Parlament spricht, dann sollte der einzige Deutsche aus der EFDD-Fraktion wohl die Möglichkeit haben, darauf mit einem eigenen Redebeitrag antworten zu dürfen. Genau das haben Sie mir verwehrt. Das ist schäbig, und es lässt tief blicken in das Verständnis dieses Hauses. Und das Verhalten, das ich hier vonseiten der CDU bekomme, erst recht. Es ist genau Ihr pseudodemokratisches Herangehen. Schämen Sie sich einfach nur!

Presidente. – Onorevole, le ricordo che questo non è il Bundestag e non è neanche il Bundesrat ma è il Parlamento europeo e quindi parlano i rappresentanti dei gruppi politici. Non è un dibattito sulla situazione politica in Germania.

Bruno Gollnisch (NI). – Monsieur le Président, merci de me donner la parole. J'espère que mes collègues voudront bien m'écouter, parce que ceci pourrait aussi les concerner un jour. Je ne connais pas, Monsieur le Président, le cas de Madame Moi. Ce que je puis vous dire en revanche, c'est qu'il est parfaitement anormal, parfaitement scandaleux — et l'autre jour, j'ai pris la défense de collègues de gauche — que le Bureau ne reçoive pas personnellement les députés concernés, ni les questeurs d'ailleurs, quand un problème les oppose à l'administration de ce Parlement. Ceci enfreint toutes les dispositions, y compris celles qui ont été votées par notre Parlement, et plus précisément celles du code de bonne conduite administrative, qui prévoit qu'avant toute mesure faisant grief, l'intéressé doit être entendu par écrit ou oralement, s'il le désire.

Le Secrétaire général Klaus Welle s'assoit sur cette disposition d'une façon régulière, répétitive et scandaleuse, au mépris des droits des parlementaires.

13. Parlamentets sammensætning: se protokollen

14. Afstemningstid

Presidente. – L'ordine del giorno reca il turno di votazioni.

(Per i risultati delle votazioni e altri dettagli che le riguardano: vedasi processo verbale)

14.1. Interimsbetænkning om FFR 2021-2027 — Parlamentets holdning med henblik på en aftale (A8-0358/2018 - Jan Olbrycht, Isabelle Thomas, Janusz Lewandowski, Gérard Deprez) (afstemning)

Presidente. – Prima di passare alla relazione sul Quadro finanziario pluriennale, voglio sottolineare l'importanza di questo voto perché il Parlamento europeo con questo voto intende rivendicare il suo potere di iniziativa legislativa, intende rivendicare il suo essere legislatore protagonista e intende chiedere fortemente che si decida sul Quadro pluriennale nei tempi più rapidi possibili. È un messaggio politico che il Parlamento invia al Consiglio e alla Commissione europea.

14.2. Statsstøtteregler: nye kategorier af statsstøtte (A8-0315/2018 - Sander Loones) (afstemning)

14.3. Våbeneksport: gennemførelse af fælles holdning 2008/944/FUSP (A8-0335/2018 - Sabine Lösing) (afstemning)

— *Prima della votazione:*

Sabine Lösing, *Berichterstatlerin*. – Herr Präsident! Ich werde Sie nicht lange aufhalten. Ich möchte nur ankündigen, dass wir einen mündlichen Änderungsantrag eingereicht haben aus Gründen der Aktualität. Sie finden ihn in Ihren Abstimmungslisten.

(*L'emendamento orale è accolto*)

14.4. Styrkelse af de nationale konkurrencemyndigheder og sikring af et velfungerende indre marked (A8-0057/2018 - Andreas Schwab) (afstemning)

14.5. Europæisk kodeks for elektronisk kommunikation (A8-0318/2017 - Pilar del Castillo Vera) (afstemning)

14.6. Sammenslutningen af Europæiske Tilsynsmyndigheder inden for Elektronisk Kommunikation (A8-0305/2017 - Evžen Tošenovský) (afstemning)

14.7. Præstationsnormer for nye tunge køretøjers CO₂-emissioner (A8-0354/2018 - Bas Eickhout) (afstemning)

— *Dopo la votazione:*

Bas Eickhout, *Rapporteur*. – Mr President, thank you very much. I will not make a long speech; I will only say according to the fourth subparagraph of Rule 59(4) that the plenary gives a mandate for direct negotiations with the Council.

14.8. Behov for en omfattende mekanisme for demokrati, retsstatsprincippet og grundlæggende rettigheder (B8-0523/2018, B8-0524/2018) (afstemning)

14.9. Gennemførelsen af EU's associeringsaftale med Georgien (A8-0320/2018 - Andrejs Mamikins) (afstemning)

— *Prima della votazione sul paragrafo 23:*

Rebecca Harms (Verts/ALE). – Herr Präsident, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Auf Georgien und auch auf andere Länder in der Nachbarschaft gibt es erheblichen politischen Druck aus der Türkei. Dieser Druck richtet sich sehr oft gegen Schulen und Universitäten. Wir können zu Georgien feststellen, dass der Druck gegen die *Black Sea University* nicht erfolgreich gewesen ist, sondern dass nach einer Gerichtsentscheidung und in sehr guter Zusammenarbeit mit Kollegen in der georgischen Regierung und im georgischen Parlament die Zukunft der *Black Sea University* gesichert ist – gegen den Druck aus der Türkei. Danke an die Kollegen in Georgien. Ich möchte beantragen, die spezielle Erwähnung der *Black Sea University* deshalb in unserem Bericht zu streichen.

(*L'emendamento orale è accolto*)

14.10. Gennemførelsen af EU's associeringsaftale med Moldova (A8-0322/2018 - Petras Auštrevičius) (afstemning)

14.11. Humanitære visa (A8-0328/2018 - Juan Fernando López Aguilar) (afstemning)

— Dopo la votazione sulla proposta di risoluzione:

Sylvia-Yvonne Kaufmann (S&D). – Herr Präsident! Entschuldigen Sie bitte, aber eine ganze Reihe von Kollegen hatten ihre Abstimmungskarten wegen der Pause schon aus den Apparaten genommen, und deshalb ist das Ergebnis meines Erachtens verfälscht. Es ist nicht so, die Zahlen können nicht so sein, wie Sie sie eben vorgetragen haben. Wie gesagt, die Kollegen haben die Karten schon zum Teil herausgenommen.

Presidente. – Ho detto due volte che serviva una maggioranza dei deputati. Ho aspettato più del tempo. Hanno votato 595 parlamentari. Non dipende da me se non hanno votato. Io ho detto due volte che serviva una maggioranza qualificata. C'è stata una voglia di levare le tessere.

Miguel Urbán Crespo (GUE/NGL). – Señor presidente, yo digo lo mismo que ha dicho mi colega. Hay mucha gente que creía que había votado a favor y ha quitado la tarjeta porque el voto ha tardado muchísimo en salir en la pantalla. Hemos podido perder una mayoría a favor de una ley muy importante. Yo creo que es un problema evidente.

Presidente, pediría repetir la votación mañana. Pediría votar mañana otra vez. No podemos mandar un mensaje a la ciudadanía europea de que no estamos a favor de los visados humanitarios, presidente.

Presidente. – Onorevole ho ripetuto per ben due volte che serviva la maggioranza dei parlamentari. Sono tutti parlamentari esperti, non è che devo dire io quando devono levare o mettere la carta. È un errore dei parlamentari. È una decisione dei parlamentari.

Juan Fernando López Aguilar, ponente. – Señor presidente, como ponente de una iniciativa legislativa que requiere mayoría cualificada, no puede quedar la menor sombra de duda de que la votación ha sido exactamente el reflejo de la voluntad de todos los diputados presentes en la sala.

Desde el momento en que hay testimonios —faltando veinticinco votos para sumar la mayoría absoluta— de que un buen número de diputados que votaron favorablemente ya habían retirado la tarjeta en el momento en que apareció finalmente el recuento de votos en pantalla, parece procedente que esta Cámara se asegure de que el reflejo de ese cómputo es exactamente la voluntad expresada por los diputados presentes en el Pleno.

Por tanto, le pido que sitúe de nuevo en el orden del día como primer punto en la votación de mañana, jueves, la votación de la iniciativa de visados humanitarios.

(Aplausos)

Presidente. – Onorevole López Aguilar, i parlamentari sanno bene come funziona l'Aula. Io ho ripetuto per ben due volte. Non dipende dal Presidente, più che dire che serve la maggioranza dei voti. Quindi la votazione non si può ripetere.

Michael Cramer (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, that was not a mistake by the Members of Parliament, it was a technical mistake, and therefore you have to repeat it tomorrow.

(Applause from certain quarters)

Presidente. – Non serve urlare onorevole. Non sono sordo.

PŘEDSEDNICTVÍ: PAN PAVEL TELIČKA*místopředseda*

President. – That concludes the vote.

Colleagues, I understand that maybe for you there is a reason for an exchange of views but to those who are not participating in the explanations of votes, please leave the Chamber and show respect to your colleagues.

Once again. Those who are not participating in the explanation of votes, please leave the Chamber. Colleagues, would you like to show some respect to those who want to participate in the explanations of vote? Please leave the Chamber.

15. Stemmeforklaringer**15.1. Interimsbetænkning om FFR 2021-2027 — Parlamentets holdning med henblik på en aftale (A8-0358/2018 - Jan Olbrycht, Isabelle Thomas, Janusz Lewandowski, Gérard Deprez)****Oral explanations of vote**

Monica Macovei (ECR). – Domnule președinte, cadrul financiar 2021-2027 va crește cu 8 % fondurile europene structurale și de coeziune pentru România – 27 de miliarde de euro pe care putem să-i folosim să facem autostrăzi reale, și nu la televizor, să facem școli, grădinițe și spitale, să le utilizăm să ne echipăm cu echipamente moderne, așa încât, atunci când intrăm într-un spital, să ieșim vindecați și nu să murim, să fim un popor de oameni sănătoși, educați și deștepți.

Guvernul actual nu a folosit însă nici măcar 20 % din fondurile alocate României în 2014. Coaliția PSD-ALDE nu este interesată de educație, sănătate, autostrăzi care să dezvolte mobilitatea comercială și a oamenilor. Ei sunt interesați numai să atace statul de drept și să omoare presa liberă.

România europeană nu înseamnă imperii pentru șefi de partid. Voi lupta pentru locul României în Europa cu orice preț.

Alex Mayer (S&D). – Mr President, low-lying areas in both Essex and Holland will be affected by rises in the level of the North Sea, so we swapped expertise. Norwich and Ghent are two cities with amazing histories, so sharing tourism best practices makes sense. By cooperating with our European neighbours and partners on challenges of an ageing population in Cambridgeshire, on women's professional development in Norfolk and on food waste in Bedfordshire, these are just some of the 112 projects that European funding for cross-border projects Interreg have supported. They represent tens of millions of pounds of investment that would not have happened were we not in the European Union. I would like to thank the Commission for leaving the door open to Britain to continue to participate in Interreg, and I call on the British Government to help protect jobs, businesses and the environment in my region by negotiating our continued access to these important programmes.

Petras Auštrevičius (ALDE). – Mr President, I support this interim report. We should take good note of the effectiveness of our expenditure to ensure political goals. Having limited political resources, we need to name clear political priorities. I believe that adequate resources have to be ensured to tackle new challenges.

Among other priorities, we should properly finance such fields as defence and security, the Erasmus+ and Horizon programmes, allocate adequate funds to the civil society in the EU neighbourhood and ensure that the cohesion policy is for now kept at least at the 2014-2019 levels before gradually downsizing it.

The MFF needs to be ambitious, effective and forward-looking. Therefore, I fully support developing the EU own resources which should fill in the budget gap left by Brexit without increasing the fiscal burden for citizens.

John Howarth (S&D). – Mr President, I support the proposals for the next seven-year budget framework. It is increasingly clear that it is in the interests of the Member States and of citizens to reform the European Union's system of own resources. The tension that is created by the demands on Member States limits the ability of the EU to run an effective budget that delivers added value. This needs to change. New EU resources need not add to the burden of the EU citizen and should reduce the demands on Member State contributions.

For too long, corporations more powerful than nation states have avoided taxes in ways that citizens never can do. Only this union of Member States acting together can change this. Citizens expect corporations to pay their fair share. Their faith in politicians will only be restored when politicians ensure that fair shares are paid.

Bogdan Andrzej Zdrojewski (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Sprawozdanie sprawozdaniu nierówne. Wieloletnie ramy finansowe to długa praca, niezwykle istotna, z wieloletnią, sześcioletnią perspektywą. Chciałem podziękować przy tej okazji Januszowi Lewandowskiemu i Janowi Olbrychtowi, bo wykonali fantastyczną robotę, ale w szczególności za doprowadzenie do tego, że wreszcie program Erasmus+ został podwojony, a docelowo ma być potrojony w finale tej perspektywy. To niezwykle ważny program. Uważam także, że z perspektywy Komisji Kultury i Edukacji bardzo ważne jest także powiększenie dwóch programów: Kreatywna Europa i Europa dla Obywateli. Tam mamy najniższą efektywność na poziomie 16-19 % – musi to niepokoić, ale za same projekty, za ich wsparcie bardzo dziękuję!

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – Pane předsedající, svým hlasováním jsem podpořila postoj Evropského parlamentu k vyjednávání o příštím finančním rámci Evropské unie. Celkovou úroveň rozpočtu na úrovni 1,08 % HDP Evropské unie považuji za realistickou a střídou. Domnívám se, že občané od nás neočekávají razantní navýšení objemu prostředků, ale spíše jejich efektivní vynaložení na skutečné priority, jako jsou ochrana hranic, bezpečnost a obrana.

Také se zasazují o myšlenku ztrojnásobit finance na program Erasmus, souhlasím s tím, aby se nesnižovaly prostředky na kohezní politiku. Naopak nesouhlasím s tím, aby součástí Evropského sociálního fondu plus byla takzvaná záruka za děti. Pokud jde o příjmovou stranu, ztotožňuji se s požadavkem zdanit velké digitální společnosti operující na celém trhu Evropské unie.

Morten Messerschmidt (ECR). – Hr. formand! Det er spændende at høre debatten her, hvordan alle strides om at fordele de europæiske skatteyderes penge mest muligt. Men i virkeligheden er det slet ikke et spørgsmål om, hvem der får penge fra EU's svulmende budget, der er det centrale. Nej, spørgsmålet er i virkeligheden, hvordan pengene kommer dertil! Sagen er jo, at i dag betaler de 28 medlemslande ind til budgettet efter en aftale, men det, der lægges op til her, og det, som det store flertal af europaparlamentarikere ønsker, er jo, at EU skal kunne opkræve sine egne skatter. Og det handler i virkeligheden slet ikke om økonomi. Det handler om magt! For alle ved, at der er en central sammenhæng imellem det demokratiske – at stemme til et parlament – og at det er parlamentet, der så skal stå til ansvar for sine beslutninger, bl.a. for hvordan man finansierer sine budgetter. Derfor ønsker Europa-Parlamentet og alle føderalisterne selvfølgelig at flytte den kompetence over til Parlamentet, væk fra medlemslandene, væk fra regeringerne, væk fra det nationale og demokratiske. Det er det centrale i denne betænkning, og derfor stemte jeg selvfølgelig nej i demokratiets navn.

Tibor Szanyi (S&D). – Tisztelt Elnök Úr! Az egyik legfontosabb feladatnak tartom, hogy mielőbb meghatározzuk az Unió következő hosszú távú költségvetésére vonatkozó, és konkrét összegeket is tartalmazó tárgyalási álláspontunkat. Sajnos jelen formájában azonban nem elégséges az EU költségvetése. Új feladatokra új forrásokat, megoldásokat kell keresni, például a közvetlen uniós bevételek növekedésével. Egyetérték az Európai Parlament kialakított álláspontjával, amely szerint kiemelten kell kezelnünk a fiatalokra, a gazdasági növekedésre, a munkahelyteremtésre, a kutatásra és az éghajlatváltozásra, a migrációra, a védelemi és biztonságpolitikára fordítható összegeket. Mindezek mellett felhívom a figyelmet azonban arra, hogy a mezőgazdaságra és a vidékre továbbra is nagyobb hangsúlyt kell fektessünk. Az okos technológiák olyan beruházásokat eredményezhetnek, amelyek egyrészt olcsóbbá tehetik az élelmiszer-termelést, és egészségesebbé az élelmiszereinket. Sőt, ezekből maguk a vidéki közösségek is profitálhatnak, például az okos falvak révén, pontosabban annak szociális, szolgáltatási, energiatermelési és képzési rendszerein keresztül.

Jan Zahradil (ECR). – Pane předsedající, já jsem pro tento tisk nehlasoval z několika důvodů. Uvedu aspoň dva.

Jedním z těch důvodů je otázka vlastních zdrojů Evropské unie. Asi není žádným překvapením, že naše skupina zásadně nesouhlasí s vytvářením dalších vlastních rozpočtových zdrojů, ať už nějakým novým zdaňováním nebo jiným způsobem. Evropská unie není stát, nemá tedy mít vlastní rozpočtové zdroje a její rozpočet má být striktně, přímo a úzce navázán na příspěvky, především příspěvky z národních států, ze členských států.

Druhým důvodem, proč jsem nehlasoval pro, je celkový výhled struktury těch evropských rozpočtů. Jestli myslíme vážně ochranu vnějších hranic a jestli myslíme vážně, že budeme zvyšovat výdaje na tuto kapitolu, musí to být také zohledněno v celkovém přestrukturování rozpočtu a to se bohužel nestalo. Takže za mě mínus a nesouhlas.

Daniel Hannan (ECR). – Mr President, we spend an awful lot of time in this Chamber talking about money – it's our main topic of interest. On this occasion, it was quite funny to see colleagues whose mandate expires in 2019 demanding the right to have a say over how money is spent between 2021 and 2027. But I think actually there will be a shortfall even before then. Obviously, what happens in that MFF is not Britain's business, but as I speak, the chances of Britain leaving without any withdrawal agreement has hugely increased, which will of course have budgetary implications.

There's been one of those unfortunate misreadings of each other's political conditions and the prospect is now being put of a withdrawal agreement that requires membership of the Customs Union. Plainly, that isn't going to get through Parliament, and so we're losing – I'm afraid – the opportunity to have had a cordial, amicable withdrawal process. There's still time to put a looser, more skeletal deal in place that would cover the basic courtesies you expect to have with friendly neighbours, but that time is very short now.

Luke Ming Flanagan (GUE/NGL). – Mr President, I would like to say this: show me where the money is going and you have shown me your policies. The multi-financial framework proposals for 2021-2027 make this clear. It puts fighting before feeding. We are moving from a common plan to feed ourselves to a common plan to go to war. A twenty-two times' increase in defence spending to pay for this. Agriculture, rural development and cohesion funding to take the hit. A sleeping beauty is born all right, and now we are going to have to pay for it.

Also what is going to take a major hit is the sovereignty of our treasuries moving to a system of own-resources for the European Union. What on first viewing seems like something benign enough is in fact another power grab and the beginnings of creating a Treasury for the EU. The proposed increase in GNI contributions from Member States is something I cannot support, because the soup it creates contains ingredients that are indigestible when it comes to Ireland's neutrality.

15.2. Våbeneksport: gennemførelse af fælles holdning 2008/944/FUSP (A8-0335/2018 - Sabine Lösing)

Oral explanations of vote

Petras Auštrevičius (ALDE). – Mr President, in this complex global security environment, it is undeniable that sometimes weapons and other military machinery might also end up in conflict zones, contributing to grave human rights violations. The common position on arms exports lays down procedure and common criteria by which individual Member States should guide their transactions of arms and military technologies. Profits cannot be made at the expense of human security and respect of human rights. Each Member State should take the responsibility for its arms exports. Within this report, we call on the exporting countries to apply assessment criteria when exporting weaponry, and ensure full transparency of such transactions. Selling weapons to violent regimes is not a matter of negotiation.

Bogdan Andrzej Zdrojewski (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! To piąte podejście Parlamentu Europejskiego do nielegalnego eksportu broni i de facto piąta porażka. Może nie taka zupełna, niedruzgocąca, ale niestety efektywność w tym projekcie – projekcie dotyczącym przejrzystości pewnych ograniczeń, budowania standardów, musimy to przyznać, kończy się porażką. Wstrzymałem się od głosu przy tej rezolucji, przy tym sprawozdaniu przede wszystkim dlatego, że jestem przeciwnikiem transportu, eksportu broni i handlu bronią tam, gdzie mamy do czynienia z konfliktami i z wielkimi problemami humanitarnymi. Z drugiej strony jednak cały czas zwracam uwagę na to, że instytucje europejskie i państwa Unii Europejskiej w tej materii są niestety nieskuteczne.

Morten Messerschmidt (ECR). – Hr. formand! Vi så i går her i kammeret Angela Merkel, den tyske kansler, stå og tale for behovet for et fælles, europæisk forsvar. Vi har også tidligere hørt det samme fra Macron i Paris og fra kommissionsformand Juncker osv. Denne betænkning er jo selvsagt et led i den strategi. Jeg kan ikke forestille mig noget mere farligt end tanken om, at det europæiske forsvar skal løsrives fra det Amerika, som i flere generationer nu har været garantien for, at vi netop har så fredelige forhold, som vi har. En 1. verdenskrig hvor det var helt utænkeligt, at udfaldet ville have været, som det var, hvis ikke amerikanerne havde inter文eneret. En 2. verdenskrig osv. Jeg kan ikke forstå, og jeg kan slet ikke begribe, hvordan det her hus kan have en sådan ahistorisk, historieløs tilgang til noget så væsentligt som europæernes forsvar. Vi har brug for amerikanerne, de har brug for os, også selv om vi måske ikke er enige i alt det, der foregår i Det Hvide Hus i øjeblikket. Alt andet lige ifølge forfatningen sidder man kun i fire år ad gangen, vi skal ikke bruge disse pludselige sentimentaler til at kaste barnet ud med badevandet.

Dobromir Sośnierz (NI). – Panie Przewodniczący! To jest kolejna uchwała tego Parlamentu, która podważa niepodległość państw członkowskich. Nie ma żadnego ważnego powodu, żeby Unia Europejska wkraczała w tę dziedzinę. Nie do takiej Unii się zapisywaliśmy, nie na taką Unię się zgadzaliśmy, a teraz po kolei Unia próbuje eliminować kompetencje państw członkowskich ze wszystkiego.

Jeśli chodzi o handel bronią, jest on bardzo szczegółowo regulowany przez prawo wszystkich państw członkowskich. Nie ma żadnej potrzeby, żeby coś do tego dokładać, a jeśli różne kraje różnie interpretują 8 z kryteriów wspólnego stanowiska, to mają do tego prawo. Dlaczego teraz jedne państwa powiedzą drugim, że te drugie interpretują te 8 kryteriów źle? I już jestem w stanie się domyślić, które państwa powiedzą którym, że nie mają racji. Jak zawsze okaże się, że to my nie mamy racji.

Luke Ming Flanagan (GUE/NGL). – Mr President, we're talking about a common standard for exports of weapons. How about we adopt a common standard that we stop exporting weapons in the first place?

Why are we involved in this dirty game? Is the European Union not already filled with massive resources, which means that we can have a very high quality of life and everything we need, if it was properly distributed, without getting involved in the dirty, filthy low-life business of producing the instruments of death?

Ireland, for the first time in centuries, has peace. We are lucky to have it. And the reason why we have peace is because we've moved out of that area. We've started to talk to each other, and as a result of it we now live in a better place. We need higher standards all round here. I'm voting in favour of this report, but, sadly, I have to say it is a floor, a very low floor, like a toilet.

15.3. Styrkelse af de nationale konkurrencemyndigheder og sikring af et velfungerende indre marked (A8-0057/2018 - Andreas Schwab)

Oral explanations of vote

Morten Messerschmidt (ECR). – Hr. formand! Det ligger mig på sinde at sige et par positive ord om Schwabs betænkning, fordi det er så afgørende vigtigt for væksten og samhandlen, at vi har ordentlige regler for det indre marked. Men et af de store problemer med det indre marked er jo netop, at det har udviklet sig i et sådant hastigt tempo, at de fornuftige regler ikke har kunnet følge med. Det ser vi eksempelvis i de domme, der falder ved EU-Domstolen, som forpligter medlemslande til pludselig at udbetale sociale ydelser helt ud over det rimelige, helt ud over det, som vælgerne nogensinde er stillet i udsigt, når de har stemt om traktaterne som følge af det indre marked. Derfor tror jeg, at vi har brug for at sætte et kritisk blik på, hvad det indre marked egentlig i dag betyder. Den fri bevægelighed for varer og kapital er nok relativt problemfri, men serviceydelser og arbejdstagere begynder at volde stadig flere problemer i forhold til vores sociale velfærdsordninger. Det må vi ikke lukke øjnene for, heller ikke om hr. Schwab har svært ved at åbne sine.

Tibor Szanyi (S&D). – Tisztelt Elnök Úr! A jelentést szavazatommal támogattam. Örömmel tölt el, hogy a korábbi éves versenypolitikai jelentésbe foglalt kezdeményezésemnek köszönhetően elindult munkánk, és ennek ma már újabb stádiumába léphettünk. A javaslatot az S&D frakció többek között azért is tudta támogatni, mert az garantálja, hogy a nemzeti versenyhatóságok hatékonyabb eljárásokat folytassanak erősebb döntéshozatali és szankcionálási eszközök biztosítása révén. Javaslatunkra került be az európai parlamenti jelentésbe, hogy a nemzeti versenyhatóságok függetlensége nem kerülhet veszélybe az esetleges kormányzati befolyásolási szándékok által. Pozitív szavazatunk feltétele volt továbbá, hogy a tagállami engedélyezési eljárások harmonizálása is kellő módon szabályozásra kerüljön, és hogy a bíróság maximális összességét az érintett vállalkozás teljes világméretű forgalmának legalább tíz százalékában kell megállapítani a jövőben.

15.4. Præstationsnormer for nye tunge køretøjers CO₂-emissioner (A8-0354/2018 - Bas Eickhout)

Oral explanations of vote

Paul Brannen (S&D). – Mr President, climate change is the biggest threat that we all face, whether we live in a rich country or a poor country, and emissions from heavy goods vehicles are a major cause of CO₂ emissions.

Heavy goods vehicles delivering heavy loads to construction sites with steel and concrete, brick and block are a major cause of emissions in our major cities around the world. However, if we were to build in wood – which is up to five times lighter than concrete, steel, brick and block – we could drastically reduce the number of deliveries to our construction sites by as much as 80%.

An 80% reduction in heavy goods vehicles delivering steel and concrete, brick and block to building sites around the world, replacing it with wood, would make a considerable contribution to tackling climate change. If we are serious about tackling climate change, we need to build in wood.

Bogdan Andrzej Zdrojewski (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Sprawozdanie dotyczące standardów emisji CO₂ dla samochodów ciężarowych to znakomity przykład, jak dobrą intencję, dobre sprawozdanie, dobrą propozycję można zepsuć w samych głosowaniach. Nie poparłem tego sprawozdania przede wszystkim dlatego, że jest ono ostatecznie całkowicie nierealne, niemożliwe do zaakceptowania przez wiele państw i niezwykle kosztowne w realizacji. Uważam, że w takich przedsięwzięciach Parlament Europejski powinien jednak zachowywać daleko idącą ostrożność przy uwzględnianiu uwarunkowań geograficznych i przemysłowych i starać się, aby propozycje, które przedkłada, były adekwatne i możliwe do zrealizowania. Niestety w efekcie tego głosowania poszliśmy, według mnie, zdecydowanie za daleko w obszar całkowicie nierealny, niezwykle kosztowny i niemożliwy do zrealizowania.

José Inácio Faria (PPE). – Senhor Presidente, votei a favor deste relatório uma vez mais, depois de na Comissão de Ambiente se ter aprovado por larga maioria o melhor compromisso, que defende, simultaneamente, a convergência com as metas ecológicas estipuladas pelo Acordo de Paris e a proteção dos interesses sociais e que, além disso, ainda traz benefícios económicos. Esta é a verdadeira solução de ganho mútuo.

Estamos num momento em que não nos podemos dar ao luxo de falhar compromissos. Por isso, volto a frisar a importância da introdução de medidas de penalização por incumprimento das metas de emissões de CO₂, a par das medidas de incentivo para veículos de emissões zero. Estas penalizações têm de ser eficazes e não se podem cifrar em valores inferiores ao próprio custo da transição tecnológica. Se assim não for, chegaremos ao ridículo de ser mais barato pagar multas do que fazer os investimentos necessários.

Temos de ser coerentes. O fator de correção de CO₂ para combustíveis alternativos de *performance* avançada já está contemplado na Diretiva Energias Renováveis II. Este tipo de medida iria levar ao duplo benefício, o que não faz qualquer sentido neste regulamento, uma vez que os construtores de automóveis estariam a beneficiar de um esforço que é, em boa verdade, feito pelos produtores destes combustíveis.

Caros colegas, só há um futuro... (O Presidente retira a palavra ao orador.)

15.5. Behov for en omfattende mekanisme for demokrati, retsstatsprincippet og grundlæggende rettigheder (B8-0523/2018, B8-0524/2018)

Oral explanations of vote

Tibor Szanyi (S&D). – Tisztelt Elnök Úr! Támogattam, hogy határozatban is rögzítsük a Parlament elégedetlenségét, amiért a Bizottság, és főleg a Tanács akadályozza az immár két éve előirányzott intézményközi megállapodást egy átfogó, a tagállamok alapjogokat sértő magatartásának szankcionálását célzó mechanizmusról. Azóta a kérdés politikai téjtét csak tovább növelte a szélsőséges EU-ellenes populista erők térnyerése Európában, valamint a demokratikus jogállam szisztematikus leépítése, a tudatos jogsértések napi gyakorlattá válása némely kormány részéről. Sajnos az utóbbira a legjobb, bocsánat, legsúlyosabb példát saját hazámban az Orbán-kormány szolgáltatja, amely az uniós jog hiányosságait, az európai intézmények következtetlenségét kihasználva gyakorlatilag következmények nélkül folytatja az európai értékeket és jogot semmibe vevő, a demokratikus intézményeket leromboló politikáját. A magyar példa önmagában is bizonyítja, hogy az EU jelenleg nem rendelkezik a Közösség szabályainak betartását kikényszerítő eszközzel.

Benedek Jávor (Verts/ALE). – Tisztelt Elnök Úr! A jogállamiság lerombolása fertőző kórként terjed az Európai Unióban. Magyarországon kezdődött, Lengyelországban folytatódott, de ma már látnunk kell jeleit Olaszországtól Románián, Csehországon keresztül Szlovákiáig, vagy Bulgáriáig. A jogállamiság kikezdésével ezek az országok nem az EU ellen harcolnak, hanem saját polgáraik ellen. Amikor aláássák a bírói függetlenséget, amikor a korrupciót engedik terjedni az országban, amikor sértik a médiaszabadságot, akkor a saját állampolgáraik jogait sértik. Ugyanakkor mindez veszélyes az Európai Unió számára is. Ha az európai integráció nem képes érvényesíteni az alapvető jogokat és értékeket, amelyeken alapszik, ha hagyja, hogy Orbánok, Kaczyńskik, Dragneák zavartalanul ássák alá a jogállami értékeket, akkor ez a közösség szét fog morzsolódní. Határozott intézkedésekre, határozott lépésekre van szükség, hogy megállítsuk a jogállamiság szétrombolását az európai tagállamokban.

Jiří Pospíšil (PPE). – Pane předsedající, já jsem se při hlasování o této zprávě po dlouhém uvažování zdržel. Chci dopředu říci, že jsem velkým zastáncem hodnot, jako je demokracie, právní stát, principy, na kterých stojí evropská civilizace. Musím ale přiznat, že ta zpráva, jak je napsána a pojata, podle mého názoru tento problém neřeší.

Myslím si, že vytváří určitý princip kolektivní viny a takové mechanismy jako to, že jednotlivé členské státy budou každý rok předkládat zprávu o stavu lidských práv ve své zemi a ta zpráva bude vyhodnocována pravděpodobně Evropskou komisí, spíše vytvoří a posílí antievropské nálady v některých členských státech, než aby efektivně přispěly k ochraně těchto evropských hodnot.

Takže já jsem pro, abychom chránili právní stát, lidská práva, aby Evropská unie zasáhla vůči státům, kde dochází ke zjevnému porušení těchto hodnot, ale tato zpráva bohužel řešení, která by toto mohla přinést, nepřináší.

Marek Jurek (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! Demokracja to kontrola narodu nad władzą, a nie uruchamianie mechanizmów kontroli nad narodami, nad ich demokratycznymi decyzjami, nad ich prawem, nad instytucjami, które tworzą. Dzisiejsze głosowanie to akt uzurpacji Parlamentu w stosunku do traktatów, bo pamiętajmy zawsze, że choćbyśmy reprezentowali większość państw, to jesteśmy tylko jedną z władz powołanych na podstawie traktatów przez nasze państwa. Kto kwestionuje ten fakt, kto przypisuje Parlamentowi większą władzę, ten kwestionuje traktaty europejskie. Kto atakuje państwa Europy, ten atakuje Unię, którą te państwa zawarły, bo Unia Europejska jest unią naszych państw, a nie ideologii, którą będzie popierała większość Parlamentu Europejskiego. Dzisiejszy akt jest bardzo groźny nie tylko dla demokracji, ale również dla samej współpracy narodów Europy.

Adam Szejnfeld (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Demokracja, praworządność i prawa człowieka są fundamentem Unii Europejskiej, duszą Europejczyków. Tak też jesteśmy postrzegani na całym świecie, na wszystkich kontynentach. Unia Europejska jest dla innych narodów i dla innych państw wzorem tworzenia demokracji i dobrobytu dla swoich obywateli. Niestety w ostatnich latach przeżywamy w niektórych państwach członkowskich kryzys szacunku dla tych wielkich, wspaniałych wartości cywilizacyjnych. Wzrasta siła ruchów nacjonalistycznych, autorytarnych, antydemokratycznych niszczących państwo prawa i praworządność. Unia Europejska nie posiada jednak sprawnych i realnych narzędzi przeciwdziałania tym ruchom, dlatego w przeciwieństwie do mojego kolegi przedmówcy jestem zwolennikiem przyjęcia tego mechanizmu. Jest on konieczny dla ochrony obywateli Europy przed rządami autorytarnymi.

Andrejs Mamikins (S&D). – Mr President, I support this resolution, but I want to underline that this is only the first concrete step towards ensuring that the Member States respect the principles that the case has subscribed to. Central and Eastern European countries' sole claim to fulfil the Copenhagen criteria, including their political criteria on the respect for human rights and protection of minorities, but they also made promises to improve their unaddressed issues.

Let me take the example of my country, Latvia. Before accession, it was subject to the screening mechanisms that showed the need to give minorities more representation and finish with the practice of statelessness. Since the accession, Latvia put this request into the archives. It might seem ironic if it were not so sad. So, what can the EU do to avoid this moral hazard and post-accession opportunism? The reply can be found in this resolution. The Commission must present a proposal for a comprehensive new mechanism on democracy, the rule of law and fundamental rights.

Dobromir Sośnierz (NI). – Panie Przewodniczący! Cała polityka kija i marchewki w Unii Europejskiej polega na tym, że marchewka jest coraz mniejsza, a kij coraz grubszy. Już dzisiaj przegłosowaliśmy sankcje w związku z wywozem broni, teraz głosujemy nad „porządnym drągiem” na wszystkie państwa, które nie będą się słuchały kierowniczej, przywódczej roli Niemiec w tym przedsięwzięciu.

To jest ewidentne pogwałcenie traktatów i filozofii, na której Unia Europejska miała się opierać. Jest to narzędzie do dyscyplinowania krajów, które się nie słuchają. A co będzie traktowane jako brak praworządności lub praworządność, to już wiemy: będzie to to, co Niemcy uznają za brak praworządności. Nie na przykład to, że każe się posłów za treści ich wypowiedzi w tym Parlamencie, nie to, że w głosowaniu nad zastosowaniem art. 7 wobec Węgier łamie się zasady liczenia głosów, nie to, że przewodniczący Juncker mianuje z pogwałceniem prawa sekretarza generalnego, tylko pogwałceniem prawa i praworządności będzie to, co będzie nie na rękę rządzącym tutaj Unią.

15.6. Gennemførelsen af EU's associeringsaftale med Georgien (A8-0320/2018 - Andrejs Mamikins)

Oral explanations of vote

Petras Auštrevičius (ALDE). – Mr President, I'm very glad the Georgian Government continues to demonstrate political will and determination to further advance the reforms within the scope of the Association Agreement. I also welcome the wide-ranging support of the Georgian people for the country's pro-European choice, as well as the long-standing cross-party accord for this strategic policy goal.

While undergoing economic and social reforms, Georgia equally – as other countries with European inspirations – needs to stay firmly focused on the implementation of its political obligations too. Full respect of core democratic principles and fundamental freedoms is the country's essential commitment within the Association Agreement and needs to remain an absolute priority for this and other Georgian governments for years to come.

Jiří Pospíšil (PPE). – Pane předsedající, já jsem s radostí podpořil tuto zprávu. Pro mě jako pro poslance z České republiky, tedy ze země, která bohužel měla zkušenosti se sovětskou okupací v době komunismu, je pozitivní číst, že bývalá země Sovětského svazu Gruzie je dnes aktivním partnerem Evropské unie, že usiluje o vstup do Evropské unie a že provádí reformy, které jsou součástí dnešního partnerství, dnešního vztahu.

Je velmi pozitivní, že v této oblasti je dneska Gruzie hlavním lídrem spolupráce mezi Evropskou unií a tamním regionem, a jsem velmi rád, že jsme přijali tuto pochvalnou zprávu, a doufám, že ta zpráva povede k tomu, že dále posílíme chuť gruzínské vlády vypracovat strategii pro členství v Evropské unii a i posílíme chuť gruzínského lidu, aby se tato země stala členem Evropské unie.

Jan Zahradil (ECR). – Pane předsedající, Gruzie je velmi důležitá strategicky i geopoliticky. Moje politická rodina má na gruzínském politickém scéně své přátele, dokonce i v současné gruzínské vládě máme partnery a myslíme si, že Evropská unie by měla věnovat Gruzii patřičnou pozornost, mimo jiné i proto, že tato země se před časem stala jakýmsi modelovým příkladem pro ruský tlak a je dobré tu situaci dále bedlivě sledovat a monitorovat. Proto je dobře, že sledujeme implementaci asociační dohody, proto je dobře, že jsou tady zaznamenány pokroky. Když se podíváme na tu cestu, kterou Gruzie prošla od doby rozpadu Sovětského svazu, tak je to skutečně obdivuhodné, čeho tato země docílila. Podporu Evropské unie a nás všech si rozhodně do budoucna dále zaslouží.

15.7. Gennemførelsen af EU's associeringsaftale med Moldova (A8-0322/2018 - Petras Auštrevičius)

Oral explanations of vote

Jiří Pospíšil (PPE). – Pane předsedající, tak toto je bohužel odlišný případ oproti případu, o kterém jsme hovořili, oproti Gruzii. Tentokrát se jedná o provádění dohody o přidružení mezi Evropskou unií a Moldavskem. Bohužel je tato zpráva, podle mého názoru bohužel správně, velmi kritická vůči Moldavsku.

Zkrátka a dobře Moldavsko se svým vnitropolitickým vývojem nepřibližuje k Evropské unii, kritéria, která my máme pro naše členy a partnery, jako je budování právního státu, nezávislé volby, funkční justice a tak dále, bohužel tato země neplní. Ve zprávě je velmi kriticky popsáno to, co je hlavním problémem – stav justice, podivná volební reforma, potlačování nezávislých médií. Souhlasím s tou částí, která říká, že pokud se situace nezlepší, je třeba uvažovat o omezení makrofinanční pomoci této zemi.

Jan Zahradil (ECR). – Pane předsedající, já jsem nedávno v Moldavsku byl. Tuto zemi očekávají velice brzy po Novém roce parlamentní volby. Je to země, která je sužována celou řadou neduhů, zejména různými korupčními skandály a aférami, které je nutno pečlivě vyšetřit.

Musím říci na základě vlastní zkušenosti, vlastního pozorování, že mám pocit, že se tam neměří stejným metrem, že prostě v některých případech jsou ty aféry zametány pod koberec, zatímco v některých případech spíše z politických důvodů jsou zase ti exponenti vystaveni velkému tlaku. Také je to země, která čelí, můžeme to směle nazvat, ruskému vměšování, ovlivňování pomocí sdělovacích prostředků. Moldavsko už přijalo některá opatření tak, aby se proti tomuto tlaku bránilo, ale je zapotřebí v tom pokračovat a opět je zapotřebí vývoj v této zemi bedlivě sledovat.

15.8. Humanitære visa (A8-0328/2018 - Juan Fernando López Aguilar)

Oral explanations of vote

Urszula Krupa (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! Mimo że jestem za przyznawaniem wiz humanitarnych w uzasadnionych przypadkach, głosowałam przeciwko sprawozdaniu, w którym regulacje opierają się na wątpliwej podstawie prawnej.

Umożliwienie wjazdu na terytorium państwa członkowskiego wydającego wizę wyłącznie w celu złożenia wniosku w tym państwie może stwarzać liczne problemy, a miało zapewnić legalne i bezpieczne ścieżki procedur, pozwalające na unikanie śmierci na morzu i działalności przemytników. Istnieje także konieczność zapewnienia dodatkowych regulacji dotyczących postępowania z osobami, którym dane państwo umożliwi przybycie, odmawiając jednak ochrony. Istnieje także uzasadniona obawa nadmiernego obciążenia ambasad, gdy migranci będą przemieszczać się po terytorium Unii Europejskiej.

Ponadto niezwykle skomplikowana procedura przyznawania wizy w maksymalnym okresie dwóch tygodni będzie trudna do realizacji. Równie niekorzystny wydaje się pomysł dopuszczenia składania wniosku wizowego na odległość i mechanizm dopuszczania usługodawców zewnętrznych.

Andrejs Mamikins (S&D). – Priekšsēdētāj! Protams, es balsoju par sava kolēģa *Lopez Aguilar* ziņojumu. Balsoju “par” kopā ar savu politisko grupu un citiem biedriem. Bet tas, kas notika balsojuma brīdī, tas, pirmām kārtām, nerada godu mums — Eiropas Parlamentam. Tā ir tehniska kļūda. Un es saprotu, kad ultralabējie politiķi saka, ka mums nav jāizsniedz humanitārās vīzas tikai tāpēc, ka it kā tur kaut kādi migranti it kā brauks, un mums jācīnās it kā pret migrantiem. Tas ir absurds, tā ir viņu retorika.

Bet, kad Parlamenta priekšsēdētājs Tajāni kungs, redzot, ka tā ir tehniska kļūda, negrib pārbalsot tāpēc, ka vairākums šajā mājā, šajā ēkā ir par humanitāro vīzu izsniegšanu — tā, man šķiet, ir kļūda, un mums obligāti principā būtu bijis jāpārbalso šis dokuments. Viņš ir ļoti svarīgs. Humanitārās vīzas parāda Eiropas karogu pasaulē.

Mums obligāti bija jābalso “par”. Paldies!

16. Stemmerettelser og -intentioner: se protokollen

(The sitting was suspended at 14.22)

PRESIDE: RAMÓN LUIS VALCÁRCEL SISO

Vicepresidente

17. Genoptagelse af mødet

(Se reanuda la sesión a las 15.01 horas).

18. Godkendelse af protokollen fra foregående møde: se protokollen

19. Modtagne dokumenter: se protokollen

20. Bevillingsoverførsler og budgetafgørelser: se protokollen

21. Styrke EU's modstandsdygtighed over for udenlandske aktørers indflydelse på den kommende valgkamp til Europa-Parlamentsvalget (debat om et aktuelt spørgsmål)

El presidente. – El punto siguiente en el orden del día es el debate de actualidad (artículo 153 bis del Reglamento interno) sobre el refuerzo de la resiliencia de la Unión frente a la influencia de agentes externos en la próxima campaña electoral del Parlamento Europeo (2018/2919(RSP)).

Paulo Rangel, Autor. – Senhor Presidente, Senhor representante do Conselho, Senhora Comissária, parece-me que é importante, antes de mais, percebermos que no mundo digital, ou como se dizia antes disso no mundo virtual, as ameaças que ocorrem à transparência, aos princípios da isenção e da independência em processos eleitorais, se quiserem aos pilares da democracia, não são ameaças virtuais, não são ameaças digitais, são ameaças reais. E, por isso, é fundamental que, tendo em vista a experiência dos últimos anos e designadamente aquilo que se suspeita que poderá ter acontecido no caso do Brexit e do referendo do Brexit, que pode ter sucedido nas eleições americanas de 2016, que pode estar a suceder em alguns movimentos, como, por exemplo, os movimentos a respeito da questão da Catalunha e se deve haver mais autonomia, menos autonomia, independência ou não independência.

Aquilo que nós verificamos é que, por via digital, há constantemente interferência nestes processos e interferência cujo autor não somos capazes de identificar e muitas vezes cujo desígnio não somos capazes de identificar.

E, portanto, é com este desafio novo às questões de isenção, de imparcialidade e de transparência no processo eleitoral, mas também no debate que precede o processo eleitoral, que temos de rever aqueles que são os procedimentos das entidades públicas e, em particular, das entidades responsáveis pelo processo eleitoral, seja a nível nacional, seja a nível europeu.

É aqui fundamental, em primeiro lugar, a proteção de dados. Aí já demos um passo importante quando fizemos o enquadramento através deste regulamento para a proteção de dados em que a União Europeia é altamente inovadora. É verdade que a própria Comissão já avançou com um conjunto de ideias e de propostas para combater os ciberataques, mas temos, porventura, de ir mais longe. Temos de ir mais longe e de encarar estas ameaças como ameaças, eu diria, globais.

E aqui queria introduzir um outro fator ainda, antes de dizer quais são os dois campos em que julgo que devemos atuar. Estamos aqui a tratar de ameaças externas. É o tema deste debate de atualidade: as ameaças externas. Mas não tenhamos ilusões, também há ameaças internas. Quer dizer, neste mundo digital, seja do ciberataque, seja do abuso dos dados que são recolhidos, tanto pode haver agentes internos como agentes externos, porque os adversários da democracia, os adversários da transparência, os adversários da isenção não são apenas potências estrangeiras. Temos provas de que estão a atuar de acordo com o seu interesse geoestratégico, mas não haja dúvidas de que há também grupos e entidades dentro das nossas fronteiras, das fronteiras europeias, que têm os mesmos desígnios ou que têm desígnios do mesmo tipo.

E aqui diria que devemos atuar em duas áreas fundamentais: uma é a área da regulamentação do tratamento de dados e da proteção dos cidadãos em geral e dos seus dados e isto vai para os operadores em geral e vai também para as empresas, as fundações, os partidos políticos, as autoridades públicas.

E depois temos de ter uma outra preocupação, que é uma preocupação já de natureza penal. Já é uma segunda preocupação, porque por mais regras e garantias que tenhamos vai sempre haver ciberataques, vai sempre haver criminosos que têm algum sucesso. E temos de ter condições tecnológicas e condições de investigação das polícias que nos permitam também prevenir e repelir e punir esse tipo de ataques, sejam eles ataques estrangeiros, sejam eles ataques nacionais.

Karoline Edtstadler, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Mr President, I would like to thank the House for the opportunity to exchange views on the very topical issue of increasing EU resilience against the influence of foreign actors on the upcoming European election campaign.

As you will be aware, the European Council attaches great importance to the matter. This year it addressed, both in June and October, questions of internal security, including cybersecurity and disinformation, also in the context of the upcoming European elections. Work is also under way in the Council in response to the Commission communication on 'Tackling online disinformation: a European approach', and the package on securing free and fair European elections.

On the latter, the Council is engaged in strengthening the EU Regulation on the Statute and Funding of European Political Parties and Foundations and is examining the non-legislative part of the package in order to adopt conclusions from the Council and Member States as soon as possible.

In addition, we are looking forward to the action plan for a coordinated EU response to disinformation, which is being jointly developed by the Commission and the EEAS. It should be relevant both for EU institutions and for Member States, as well as for international partners, and should propose concrete measures and resources to respond to hostile information operations in a coordinated and comprehensive way.

In 2018, the number of social media users world-wide reached almost 3.2 billion, marking an increase of 13% in just one year. With the number of users expanding at such a rate, it comes as no surprise why social media have become a highly attractive target to cyberattacks, capable of impacting electoral campaigns and thus destabilising the democratic basis of our societies.

Criminal misuse of the internet is a serious concern for the Council. It bears the risk of violating the privacy and fundamental rights of our citizens, attacking the integrity of information and seeking to disrupt the credibility of the internet. Therefore, it should be our common goal to ensure that technology used in electoral campaigns safeguards these basic principles and guarantees the legitimacy of electoral outcomes.

The improvement of our resilience and preparedness to counter cyberattacks, including targeting electoral campaigns, requires our full, immediate and constant effort. In the last two years, we have seen numerous initiatives, measures and instruments in the area of cybersecurity, seeking to enhance the resilience of our systems and networks.

The ambitious Cybersecurity Package, presented by the Commission in September 2017, was followed by a set of Council conclusions and an action plan for the continuous monitoring of their respective implementation. They emphasise the need to enhance the EU's capacity to prevent, deter and respond to cyberattacks. In June 2017, the Council agreed on a framework for a joint EU diplomatic response to malicious cyber-activities. In October 2017, the Political and Security Committee (PSC) agreed on implementing guidelines outlining the measures as part of the framework and decision-making procedures.

Member States have seen repeated their wish to continuously improve the EU's ability to respond to diplomatically to malicious cyber activities in order to influence the behaviour of potential aggressors in the short and the long term. Finally, the European Council, in its conclusion last month, calls for measures to 'protect the Union's democratic system and combat disinformation, including in the context of the upcoming European elections in full respect of fundamental rights'.

It is our firm commitment, in line with the call to ensure rapid examination and follow-up of the recent set of measures proposed by the Commission on election cooperation networks, online transparency, protection against cybersecurity incidents, unlawful data manipulation, fighting disinformation campaigns and tightening the rules on European political party funding. The protection of the European Parliament elections and of the democratic basis of our society, including cyberspace, is our paramount task and joint responsibility.

Věra Jourová, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, I would like to thank Parliament for this most urgent plenary debate. We will have elections to the European Parliament in May 2019 and 50 various elections will have taken place by 2020. We have to adjust the protection of the integrity of our elections to the digital age. And we have to protect our democratic processes from new ways of manipulation by third countries or private interests. The Facebook Cambridge Analytica scandal showed how personal data can be misused for the profiling and targeting of voters, and how valuable our new data protection rules are.

We have seen the spread of fake news or disinformation coordinated on an unprecedented scale, including from outside the EU. We have learnt of hacking of candidates and cyber attacks on elections around the world, including in Europe. Crucial electoral rules have been breached or circumvented, in particular existing rules on the transparency of campaign financing. Investigations are ongoing into allegations of dark financing from undisclosed third country sources. The most cited source of activities interfering with elections in Europe is Russia. But others are learning from Russia. We have observed other countries and private interests increase their capabilities for election interference. Given the very nature of our Union, electoral interference in one Member State affects the EU as a whole. National authorities cannot address these threats by working in isolation, nor can private sector self-regulation solve it all.

Soon we will publish the results of a special Eurobarometer on elections and democracy. Already now I can share with you that it shows that Europeans are worried: 73% are concerned about disinformation or misinformation online in the pre-election period; 81% are in favour of online social networks being fully transparent about political content online and about who is paying for them; 80% are in favour of online social networks making clear the amount of money they receive from political parties.

The Commission and the European External Action Service are working hand in hand to define and implement an appropriate EU-wide response. In the long term, our objective should be that our respective societies all become more resilient and capable of defending themselves against disinformation. This means, for example, improving media literacy, access to quality journalism, supporting independent fact checkers and working with online platforms on how to prevent disinformation campaigns online without – and this is important to mention – restricting freedom of expression and freedom of speech. In the short term, our priority should be a coordinated response to the threats against the upcoming European and national elections.

The recent election package adopted by the Commission includes several concrete measures. They are: the establishment of elections cooperation networks at national and at EU level; guidance on the application of data protection rules in the electoral context; recommendations on greater transparency in paid online political advertisements and communication; strengthened cybersecurity; diligent enforcement of existing electoral rules; awareness-raising and a legislative proposal allowing to sanction the misuse of personal data for electoral purposes.

I encourage the co-legislators to complete their work on it as soon as possible so that it is in force before the elections. We need to improve our analytical capabilities to detect, analyse and expose disinformation campaigns in cooperation with EU Member States and with the intelligence community working on hybrid threats.

Allow me to give you a quick overview of our follow-up actions. The Commission has written to the Member States urging them to set up their national election networks, and to identify appropriate single points of contact by the end of this month. We will convene the first meeting of the European election network in January. This network will facilitate the fast exchange of information and best practices, but also provide support to Member States in addressing the main areas of concern, which are: coordination of all relevant national authorities involved in the protection of elections; cybersecurity; strategy communication; data protection and hybrid threats.

In the area of cybersecurity, the Commission organised in October a high-level conference bringing together, for the first time, 70 representatives of Member States, national electoral and cybersecurity authorities. The results of this important conference, which was organised mainly by Julian King, who is here today with me, will feed into the 2018 colloquium on fundamental rights, which Commission First Vice-President Timmermans and I will organise together in November, and which will be dedicated this year to democracy in the European Union. The Commission welcomes that the leading online platforms and representatives of the online advertising sector have agreed on a self-regulatory code of practice to address online disinformation. The Commission is monitoring closely its implementation.

However, this is not enough. In June this year, the European Council tasked the Commission and the External Action Service to develop an action plan on tackling disinformation. This action plan, which we are currently working on, will outline specific proposals for a coordinated EU response to the challenge of disinformation. We will build on existing initiatives, such as the work of the East StratCom Task Force, which was created in 2015 to address Russia's ongoing disinformation campaigns. It will also build on the work of the Hybrid Fusion Cell, as well as the European Centre of Excellence for countering hybrid threats. An important part of their work is showing who is behind the disinformation attacks that are aimed against EU interests.

Addressing disinformation also means that we need to improve our ability to make our voice heard, to pass our messages and to tell our story. We therefore need to strengthen our strategic communications capacities, both within the EU and abroad. Finally, close cooperation and coordination of our efforts with the European Parliament in the run-up to the 2019 elections is absolutely crucial, and I fully trust we can rely on your support.

David McAllister (PPE). – Mr President, the EU Member States, as we have just heard, are facing an unprecedented threat to their democratic societies. Disinformation campaigns and the continuous support for anti-European political forces are undermining the European project and Western democracies in general. The efforts of non-state actors and third countries – and let's name it, especially Russia – to distort facts, to manipulate reality, to foster distrust in the democratic process and even to interfere in our democratic elections, are completely unacceptable.

We must act immediately and boldly to enhance the EU's resilience against such threats, including the risks for our next European elections in May 2019. In the run-up to the European elections, the European Union should focus on cooperation and information. Member States and EU institutions need to cooperate more intensively and share information more effectively. In this context, Commissioner Jourová, I support the Commission's proposal for a cybersecurity competence centre. The European Union needs an effective, well-targeted and tailor-made strategy to communicate and promote EU policies in the run-up to our next elections.

We have to stand united. The EU cannot, and must not, tolerate an undeclared war against our liberal values underpinning the peace and prosperity of our continent.

(Applause)

Claude Moraes, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Mr President, I would like to thank the EPP and thank the author very much for introducing this topical debate. It could not be more important and better timed. For my group, the S&D, this is a big priority and I think the previous speaker spoke very eloquently on why that is the case, and I should say that very directly to him.

But let's be very clear, colleagues. For years we have been warning about the threat posed by the collection of citizens' data online by a handful of social media companies and the power of those who hold this information. The revelations involving Cambridge Analytica and Facebook highlight the extent of this problem and show that the issue has now reached the point of threatening our core values. The author said that these were real threats to our democracy, and not virtual threats.

The issue today, as the Commissioners have begun to set out, is one of action, and my Group is interested now in action and not just talking about the issue. Seven months out from the European elections, after the presidential elections in the US and after the UK referendum and leaving the European Union, I think it is about time that we talked about what we do, and the Commission has begun this process. But so has Parliament. So let's be clear in what we have to do and let's not leave this debate without saying it.

Recent requirements in the last weeks introduced in the United States, but not here in the European Union – and also by the way, in the United Kingdom – to verify the identity, location and sponsor of political advertisements, have happened, but not here. This is important, and the same standards should be applied throughout the EU. But this does not just reveal the data involved in targeting users, which could help Facebook users contextualise political ads, understand how their data has been used, or potentially misused, and be able to respond to attempts to manipulate their opinion.

We should have full algorithmic accountability and transparency for citizens to be able to protect themselves against any manipulation and to protect our electoral processes from possible foreign interference. We have now proven that this is happening, and we should have GDPR, as the Commissioner said, but also the cybersecurity resilience which Commissioner King should redouble his efforts to provide. And we should if possible – and I say this to the Council – be imaginative about e-privacy regulation if that is also possible, because the Facebook model was not just dealt with by the question of GDPR. But we need further tools and further regulation, and not just GDPR to deal with those further issues.

We have to look at how political parties and campaigns are using social platforms for campaign purposes. We have called for a code of conduct to be developed with the participation of all actors concerned. And if not, then legislative action is needed. Regulation is needed. This is not about robust debate or just aggressive democracy. This is about manipulation and, as the Council said, sometimes about criminal activity and breaking the law. That is where the line has been crossed and that is where we need legislative action when necessary.

But we also believe that applying conventional offline electoral safeguards, such as rules on transparency and limits to spending, respect for silence periods and equal treatment of candidates is essential, making it easy to recognise online political paid advertisements and the organisations behind them. Banning profiling for electoral purposes, including the use of online behaviour that may reveal political preference.

Now is the time for action. We have spoken about the threats to our democracy, to our very core values. We at the European Parliament have had the hearings from journalists from *The Guardian*, we've examined Cambridge Analytica, we have interviewed Facebook. Now is the time for action. We have the commitment from the Commission. Let's ask them to redouble their efforts, but here in Parliament our democracy is under threat. Let's do something about it, and let's have that action now.

Anna Elżbieta Fotyga, *on behalf of the ECR Group*. – Mr President, I would like to thank Commissioner Jourová for naming a series of elections we face in the years to come, because not only European elections, but every election which happens in each and every EU Member State requires a very resilient environment – resilient to external hostile malicious interference as well as, of course, to private interests. There is a role naturally of governments, legislators, national legislators as well as social media companies and civil society to build this resilience, to raise this awareness. Of course, there is a huge role for the EU and, in particular in the case of cybersecurity, for cooperation between the EU and NATO to tackle these challenges and these threats.

I would like to mention also the importance of transatlantic cooperation. Lessons learned from interference elsewhere in both the United States and other parts of the world enable cooperation over political divisions in tackling these problems because, rightly, we say that hostile violation of universal suffrage is a violation of fundamental human rights, and the role of politicians, of public actors, is to raise awareness. Therefore, we stress the importance of quality journalism.

I would like to tackle one thing: the electoral process is still a dominant role and competence of EU Member States. Also, I would like to say that external actors like Russia have tailor-made these attacks, and therefore we have to be rather cautious in imposing common measures to tackle this, although I stress that we have to cooperate and cooperate closely.

Pavel Telička, *on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – Mr President, this is a very serious issue, and I am very happy to see that, judging so far by the speakers that have spoken, we have a very broad consensus here in Parliament. The fight against disinformation, from my point of view, involves two main aspects. One is enhancing our resilience against those that are spreading disinformation and the other is appropriate education awareness, in order to be able to differentiate between what is really disinformation and what is not.

If I look at these two main aspects, I need to say that on the first one, one should also emphasise the regulatory framework, and I did listen very carefully to you, Madam State Secretary and the Council's attitude. To be honest, I use that as an opportunity to say I don't see it, for example, in the trilogue on the Cyber Security Act. I am not talking about the presidency. I know it is a very tough task to achieve, but the mindset in some Member States that co-decide on the common position has not changed.

That brings me to the second aspect, and that is that education awareness is not just about citizens; it is about politicians. I very much appreciate what Commissioner Jourová has said and that is that the main threat is Russia. If we don't use the proper words then we will be failing, and I must say that, once again, I don't hear that clear language from the Council. There is clear evidence of that in terms of scale, coordination and also the stated willingness of the Russians to do so, and it is increasingly dominant.

The European elections are behind doors. They are absolutely key. They are also a test on what we have just spoken about and what we are tackling. A final remark, on the East StratCom. Once again, I do appreciate what the Commissioner said. It is understaffed, but it is doing excellent work. It needs a permanent budget and I would appreciate it if we could see more emphasis from the Commission – I must say I was never impressed by the attitude of High Representative Mogherini in this respect: she can provide better assistance – but also emphasis from the Council. That is key. They are excellent and we are failing to support them.

Rebecca Harms, *im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, sehr geehrte Kollegen! Für eine Weile sah es für mich so aus, als wenn die Kollegen sich in dem Trugschluss wiegen würden, dass im Zentrum der Cyber- und der Fake-News-Attacken des Informationskriegs nur die Ukraine stehen würde. Es hat einige Jahre gedauert – seit 2013 bis 2014, als es in der Ukraine sichtbar wurde –, dass die Europäer verstanden haben, dass sie selber das Ziel dieses Informationskriegs sind. Ich finde, dass diese Anerkennung der erste Schritt zur Verteidigung ist, und ich finde, dass viele der Maßnahmen, die inzwischen vorangetrieben werden oder beschlossen sind, auch richtig sind – ganz im Sinne von dem, was gesagt worden ist.

Aber ich bin mir immer noch nicht darüber im Klaren, ob die Dimension dieses Angriffs, den Russland auf die Stabilität der Europäischen Union beschlossen hat, verstanden ist, und ich finde eben, dass die Ausstattung der Programme, die wir bisher beschlossen haben, so schwach ist, dass ich nicht glauben kann, dass die Dimension verstanden worden ist.

Ich möchte außerdem in diesem Rahmen noch mal darauf hinweisen, dass es ein großes Problem ist, wenn prominente Politiker aus europäischen Mitgliedstaaten Teil der Informations- und Verunsicherungskampagnen Russlands werden. Als Deutsche kann ich da nur immer wieder auf den ehemaligen Bundeskanzler und heutigen Rosneft-Boss Gerhard Schröder hinweisen. Ich weiß aber auch, dass man in Österreich über Herrn Gusenbauer oder in Italien über Herrn Prodi reden muss. Die Manafort-Papers haben uns da einige Einsichten geliefert. Damit müssen Parteien umgehen, wenn sie die Herausforderung wirklich annehmen wollen.

Ansonsten möchte ich mich bei Anna Fotyga bedanken. Denn was wir wirklich besser machen müssen, das ist die Stärkung von Journalismus, die Stärkung von unabhängigen Medien. Denn gegen Propaganda gewinnt man nicht mit Propaganda, sondern mit Qualitätsjournalismus und Information.

Martina Anderson, *on behalf of the GUE/NGL Group*. – Mr President, the shady, secretive Constitutional Research Council (CRC), chaired by Richard Cook, donated half a million pounds to the Democratic Unionist Party (DUP), then AggregateIQ – according to openDemocracy – received tens of thousands from the DUP in the last two days of the Brexit campaign to target voters and social media. Electoral law expert, Gavin Millar QC, has said that the Electoral Commission should demand answers from the DUP, Vote Leave and Mr Cook about possible links and allegations that dark money was used to influence Brexit.

Whilst we confront the Cambridge Analytica scandal, the British Government refused to extend electoral transparency legislation to the north of Ireland to expose this rotten saga. Coincidentally, the British Government is being propped up by whom? The DUP – the same DUP who refused to comment on the origins of this dark money, a party with no respect for rights, no respect for privacy and absolutely no concern for how the dark money was used for a Brexit outcome that damages Ireland, particularly the constituency that it represents.

Patrick O'Flynn, *on behalf of the EFDD Group*. – Mr President, all reasonable steps must be taken to protect the integrity of the forthcoming European parliamentary elections. There has been some evidence in recent years of outside actors – and in particular, the Russian state – seeking to interfere. There has also been, going back many years, slack control of the use of data harvested by social media giants and the use it's put to, so vigilance is certainly in order. But I'm afraid to say that something else is going on here today: it's the spectacle of the European political class clutching at straws.

So many votes have gone against its wishes – from Brexit to the defeat of Hillary Clinton, to the Italian election result, and more besides – that an elite which is unwilling to question its own complacent assumptions is looking for a scapegoat. And that scapegoat is the idea that so-called 'fake news' has led people into a false state of consciousness, causing them to turn unfairly against benevolent rulers and break out of parameters for political debate and action set in their own best interests from above.

Part of the thesis is the contention that almost any form of nation-state affiliation represents a giant step back towards the terrifying ethnic nationalism that left Europe drenched in blood in the 20th century. Mr Macron was at it again at the weekend when he claimed that nationalism was the opposite of patriotism. In fact, moderate, sensible nation-state preference is at the heart of sustaining the social solidarity we need to allow collective decision-making to run smoothly, and the revolt against the overreach of the globalist establishment is deep-rooted and based on considered thought. At its heart lies opposition to the 'no borders' ideology being pushed by the left and much of the centrist establishment too, which threatens to shatter social cohesion across Europe. Working-class voters in more prosperous European countries – people who depend on selling their labour for their income – are also in revolt against the creation of a single European labour market, which they quite correctly judge to be against their own best interests.

At a time like this, a wise European Union would be loosening the corset, allowing more room for national decision-making and respecting the mandates handed down to national governments by national electorates, but the EU we have is doing the opposite, picking fights with member nations on an almost weekly basis. My advice, therefore, is to prepare for an election result next year that most of you are not going to like, and don't blame it on Russian bots or fake news because it will be a real message considered and profoundly meant from the people to the political class.

Jacques Colombier, *au nom du groupe ENF*. – Monsieur le Président, craignant une défaite annoncée lors des prochaines élections européennes, les cénacles européistes et mondialistes ont déjà trouvé l'explication: les peuples européens se feraient mystérieusement dépouillés de leur libre arbitre au moment de voter par, je cite, «une grande puissance étrangère».

À ce titre, s'il y a bien une manipulation des esprits que nous venons d'observer, c'est par le biais d'un clip du gouvernement français, payé par les contribuables français, qui s'en prend, comme par hasard, au Premier ministre hongrois et au ministre italien de l'intérieur. Qu'en pensent les experts européens en interférences électorales? La Commission s'en est-elle offusquée? Point du tout.

À ce titre, avez-vous l'intention de bloquer les comptes et les flux financiers du milliardaire américain George Soros, qui finance nombre de structures influentes au sein de l'Union européenne? Ayez au moins le courage de désigner la Russie dans le dossier! Je pense que le président russe doit bien rire des pouvoirs paranormaux et supra médiatiques que vous lui accordez.

Alors, je vais, dans la même veine, vous donner un conseil. Il y a quelque temps, en ces lieux, votre inspirateur, l'inimitable Jean-Claude Juncker, déclarait, je cite, «qu'il discutait avec les dirigeants des autres planètes». Alors, pourquoi n'accuserait-on pas cette fois-ci les Martiens d'interférence dans les prochaines élections européennes?

Diane James (NI). – Mr President, with tongue firmly in cheek, we all know that the European Union doesn't do electoral interference – 'well, of course not!' But this, of all days – boy, doesn't Brussels do irony! – the EU's cyber enemies would be proud of the choreographed showdown on the deal that our Prime Minister, Theresa May, is presenting to cabinet as we speak. I'd like to find one page out of the 500 that isn't the product of massive, manipulative and misguided interference by the European Union in a democratic decision.

Tell me just where the European Union hasn't interfered. What about the Scottish independence referendum? The EU first refused to comment, and then – just on the eve of purdah – José Manuel Barroso threatened voters in Scotland with European Union expulsion if they dared to assert themselves. A threat to the thousands of European Union Scots citizens, by the way.

For the European Union, those who assert the right to be different are labelled 'populist'. Look, stop the interference in free speech, free thought and free media and free journalistic press.

Esther de Lange, namens de PPE-Fractie. – Mijnheer de voorzitter, mevrouw de commissaris, meneer de commissaris, de Nederlandse dichter Lucebert zei: "Alles van waarde is weerloos". Als wij niet optreden, dan lijkt Lucebert gelijk te krijgen en moeten we dus nu de weerbaarheid van onze democratie waarborgen door op te treden tegen buitenlandse beïnvloeding. Dat is een moeilijke balans. Ik heb namelijk net geluisterd naar de laatste drie sprekers die eigenlijk zeggen in het kader van de vrijheid van de media: laat de Russen hier maar aan de touwtjes trekken. De EU krijgt heel snel het verwijt van propaganda. Niets doen is echter geen optie!

Ik zal u de concrete voorbeelden geven, met name voor het vak achter mij. Laat ik beginnen in m'n eigen lidstaat, Nederland. De dag nadat het vliegtuig MH17 neer werd gehaald, gingen de trollenfabrieken van Poetin drie keer zo hard draaien om de schuld via de sociale media richting Oekraïne te schuiven. Dan de Brexit. Er zijn ook bevindingen dat Kremlinrollen het referendum wilden beïnvloeden. Erger nog, we hebben al een regeringspartij in onze eigen Europese Unie die gemanipuleerde videobeelden gebruikt op de sociale media.

Ik ben blij met de voorstellen van de Europese Commissie. De strijd hiertegen is immers hard nodig en moet gevoerd worden op verschillende fronten. Natuurlijk allereerst het bewustmaken van mensen van nepnieuws door middel van onderwijs en door politieke bewustwordingscampagnes, in nauw overleg met de lidstaten. Daar begint het immers.

We hebben behoefte aan meer transparantie. Dit kan gebeuren in overleg met techbedrijven, maar ook door middel van wetgeving als die bedrijven niet over de brug komen. Het gaat om transparantie over de financiering, over waar die vandaan komt, over wie er achter politieke advertenties zitten en over algoritmen op platforms in de sociale media.

Eigenlijk moeten we alweer een stap verder denken. Want wat te denken bijvoorbeeld van ontwikkelingen als Deepface, waar videobeelden zo gemanipuleerd worden dat politici woorden in de mond gelegd worden die ze niet zelf gezegd hebben. Eigenlijk heeft de waarheid of de ontwikkeling ons alweer ingehaald en zullen wij dus misschien nog wel meer moeten doen, beste commissarissen, dan al op tafel ligt. Onze steun daarbij heeft u.

Tanja Fajon (S&D). – Gospod predsednik! Da bi evropski državljani resnično lahko sodelovali na poštenih in varnih volitvah, potrebujemo pošteno in varno informiranje, poštene politike in pa izobražene državljane.

Za pošteno in varno informiranje potrebujemo svobodo, delovanje medijev, ti zagotavljajo za varno delo svojih novinarjev vse pogoje in niso v službi interesov in pritiskov, temveč objektivnega poročanja.

Drugič, pošteni politiki zagotavljajo transparentnost svojega in strankarskega delovanja, financiranja, oglaševanja in ne izrabljajo osebnih in drugih podatkov za svoje interese. In pa izobraženi državljani, to so volivci, ki se ne pustijo zlorabljati dezinformacijam in hujškaštvu po družbenih omrežjih.

Vsa omenjena področja so tudi v Evropi že močno okužena, bila sta omenjena Facebook in Cambridge Analytica, in apetiti po manipulaciji s strani tretjih držav, na čelu z Rusijo, pa tudi s strani zasebnih interesov nedvomno obstajajo. Sami jim pri tem pomagamo, saj narašča politična netransparentnost, politično oglaševanje je nekorektno in deležni smo anarhije volilnih pravil.

Spletni troli, a tudi resnični ljudje, ki po navodilih ali iz zaslepljenosti hranijo ljudstvo z razpihovanjem ideoloških preprirov, predvsem pa s širjenjem laži, jahajo na svojem valu. V nekatere, kolegi, slovenske medije v Sloveniji se je priliz zajeten denar madžarskih podjetij, povezanih z madžarskim premierjem Orbantom, in takšen način financiranja tudi predvolilne propagande preko medijev je izigravanje zakonodaje.

In zloraba spleta, komunikacijskih orodij, ustrahovanje in manipulacija državljanov s strani politike, medijev ali kogarkoli je nedopustna, neodgovorna in jo je treba preprečiti. Evropske volitve, demokracijo in Evropejce, ki morajo imeti vse pogoje za svobodno in pošteno odločanje o tem, v kakšni Evropi si želimo živeti, moramo zaščititi kot tudi integriteto te institucije.

In Evropski parlament in Evropska komisija sta v zadnjem letu naredila nekaj korakov v pravo smer, države pa morajo zagotoviti, da bodo ukrepe izvajale in kršitelje striktno kaznovale. Enako velja seveda tudi za nas, politike in politične stranke.

Ulrike Trebesius (ECR). – Herr Präsident, Frau Kommissarin! Die Meinungsfreiheit ist das höchste Gut einer Demokratie. In meinem Land muss ich erleben, dass der Meinungskorridor der akzeptierten Meinungen sehr eng geworden ist. Zwar erfolgt keine strafrechtliche Verfolgung, aber eine gesellschaftliche Ächtung missliebiger Meinungen ist überall zu beobachten. Das erinnert mich an meine Kindheit in der DDR, nur dass an die Stelle des Westfernsehens heute für viele Deutsche die Berichterstattung aus der Schweiz oder anderer ausländischer Medien getreten ist. Wollen Sie dieses Meinungsspektrum einschränken?

Gerade gestern, bei Frau Merkels Rede hier im Plenum, hat die Kamera des Parlaments keinen einzigen Schwenk zu unserer Seite des Plenums gemacht. Die Opposition soll nicht nur inhaltlich, sondern auch bildlich überhaupt nicht zu sehen sein. Wenn Sie doch von der Richtigkeit Ihrer Argumente so sehr überzeugt sind, dann ist Ihnen doch eine andere Meinung immer eine Debatte wert, oder?

Wo ich gerade bei Frau Merkel bin: Die Praxis, ausländische Wahlen zu beeinflussen, ist auch bei uns nicht unbekannt. Vor dem Auslaufen der Sperrfrist hat die Bundesregierung über ihre Ministerien Steuergelder an die Clinton-Foundation überwiesen. Mutmaßlich wurde dieses Geld auch im US-amerikanischen Wahlkampf eingesetzt. Wurde das in diesem Hause jemals thematisiert? Oder wird das akzeptabel, weil man sich hier moralisch auf der richtigen Seite sieht?

Die Einschränkung anderer Meinungen soll nun auch auf ausländische Akteure ausgedehnt werden. Das ist einer Demokratie unwürdig. Als vor 25 Jahren insbesondere US-amerikanische Wirtschaftswissenschaftler vor den katastrophalen Auswirkungen der Euro-Einführung gewarnt haben, hat man das als antieuropäisch bezeichnet. Hätte man doch damals diese Meinungen ernsthaft diskutiert und sich nicht in seiner eigenen Blase des moralisierenden Wunschenkens eingeschlossen, dann würde es heute in Europa deutlich anders aussehen.

Wir müssen ausländische Meinungen unbeschränkt zulassen, auch wenn reale oder vermeintliche Falschmeldungen mit dabei sind. Wir haben in Deutschland seit den Ereignissen von Chemnitz unsere eigenen Erfahrungen mit Fake News gemacht. Die EU hat durchaus die Möglichkeit, eine Website aufzubauen, die Gegendarstellungen zu wichtigen Themen veröffentlichen kann. Das würde die Diskussion in der Europäischen Union anregen, und dazu besteht weiß Gott genügend Bedarf.

Marietje Schaake (ALDE). – Mr President, a person's right to vote by secret ballot and universal suffrage for his or her own government representation is enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and this very right is now being challenged by foreign actors – and Russia has been mentioned but it is not alone.

Many are using misinformation as a form of hybrid warfare or even more sophisticated techniques, such as deep fakes, through AI and machine learning, to deceive. They're meant to erode the trust in the public debate and in liberal democracy itself. So there's a lot at stake and we must do what we can.

What I missed in the introduction by the Commissioner, which I generally thought was very comprehensive, is a notion of an assessment of the very business models of Facebook, YouTube and others, that are designed to sell more advertisements. Whether or not that lists conspiracy theories on the top, it doesn't really matter for them, they are not developed to advance democracy, but I do think they should respect the rule of law.

In that context self-regulation is not enough. I think every chance has been taken, and we've seen that it's not enough, so responsibility has to be taken, algorithmic accountability is needed, a sector inquiry is needed and we need to look at bots. Bots don't have freedom of expression the way individuals do. We need transparency of politically-funded advertisements and in the use of micro-targeting. We need stress tests of our election technology, because the weakest link can hurt all of us. And political parties and candidates need to be prepared, and so should journalists, in how they may or may not deal with leaks.

In other words, we need accountability. The survival of liberal democracy is at stake.

Benedek Jávor (Verts/ALE). – Tisztelt Elnök Úr! A 2019-es EP választásokra nemcsak Európa készül. Külső szereplők is megpróbálják meghekkelni azokat, hogy Európát vakvágányra tolják. Nem konkrét csalással érik ezt el, hanem a politikai diskurzus eltorzításával, hamis hírek gyártásával, félelemkeltéssel. A fő forrás természetesen Oroszország és a vele szövetséges európai szélsőséges populista erők. Egyre több jel mutat azonban arra, hogy egyes EU-s kormányok, amilyen a magyar vagy a lengyel, szintén beszálhatnak a dezinformációba. Nem nézhetjük tétlenül, hogy a kudarcunkban érdekelt szereplők zavartalanul hekkeljék meg közbeszédünket, választásainkat. Ehhez támogatás kell a minőségi független médiának. Oknyomozó munka kell, hogy feltárja a hamis hírgyárak hátterét. Független média kell, hogy ne terjedhessenek állami segítséggel hamis hírek, ahogy Magyarországon. Közös európai nyilvánosságra, hírcsatornákra van szükségünk, hogy európai szintű közbeszédet teremtsünk közös ügyeinkről. Minőségi média nélkül nem lesznek demokratikus tagállamok, azok nélkül pedig nemcsak demokratikus, de semmilyen közös Európa nem lehetséges.

Luke Ming Flanagan (GUE/NGL). – Mr President, during the 1999 European elections, I was left devoid of any ability to get my positions across to the electorate due to unfair national influence – not foreign influence, national influence. With one day left to go for the big debate for the election, I was told by the national broadcaster that they would contact me later, after the election. I was gagged. Who knew? No-one.

In the 2014 elections, I met the same stonewalling. This time, our national broadcaster kept me off the main debate for my constituency. I was instead put in a debate which took place after midnight when everyone – bar those returning from the pub – was tucked up in bed. The major difference between 1999 and 2014 is that I now had the ability through social media to inform the public about what was going on. A hashtag on Twitter, #RTEbias, went viral. On the night of the debate, people knew.

There is no doubt that the power of Facebook & co. must be curtailed. Their collection of data is phenomenal and their motivation questionable. However, one must also question the motivation of those who wish to limit its power – the same people who stayed quiet when my voice was gagged and my words were twisted in the past by 'old' media.

Isabella Adinolfi (EFDD). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signor Commissario, oggi noi tutti siamo chiamati non solo a parlare della sicurezza della prossima campagna elettorale per l'elezione del Parlamento europeo, ma anche del futuro stesso dell'Unione europea.

La possibile influenza di attori stranieri è molto seria ma non dobbiamo farci trascinare dall'emozione degli eventi come lo scandalo Facebook/Cambridge Analytica. Dobbiamo invece essere obiettivi e agire non solo negli interessi dei 500 milioni di cittadini che qui rappresentiamo e, a mio avviso, dobbiamo ragionare su questi tre punti: garantire la sicurezza, non cadere nella censura e puntare sull'istruzione.

È giusto garantire la sicurezza online, ma considerare le elezioni tradizionali in cabine elettorali completamente sicure è solo una favola. Esistono infatti distorsioni come il voto di scambio, i finanziamenti occulti e non dati ai politici. Puntare il dito e pretendere un grado assoluto di sicurezza per le attività svolte online è inverosimile, poiché questo grado non esiste nemmeno nel mondo analogico.

Questa ossessiva ricerca della sicurezza ad ogni costo ci porta al secondo punto, ovvero al rischio di censura e di limitazione della libertà di espressione. L'Unione europea ha tra i suoi valori fondanti lo Stato di diritto, la democrazia e i diritti fondamentali e un'eventuale limitazione della libertà di espressione è intollerabile. Serve pertanto molta cautela nelle risposte da fornire e non è imponendo nuove forme di controllo della rete, che peraltro verrebbero implementate da soggetti privati, che si garantisce la regolarità delle elezioni.

Passando al terzo ed ultimo punto, credo che l'unica risposta da dare sia quella di promuovere politiche educative in grado di fornire ai cittadini gli strumenti necessari per sviluppare consapevolezza, spirito critico e senso civico. Senza istruzione non ci può essere consapevolezza e senza quest'ultima non ci può essere una reale partecipazione democratica.

Da ultimo vorrei dare un consiglio non richiesto alla classe politica che oggi è al potere in Europa: non vi illudete che implementando misure di bavaglio del web riuscirete a non perdere le prossime elezioni europee. Il vento del cambiamento sta soffiando forte in Europa e spazzerà via anche voi.

Marco Zanni (ENF). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, io trovo questo dibattito abbastanza surreale perché mi pare che, ancora una volta, un'Unione europea incapace di analizzare i propri fallimenti e le proprie colpe trasli la critica verso un nemico esterno che non esiste. Si grida al nemico russo, all'hacker russo, quando, a mio avviso, i più grossi propagatori di *fake news* stanno all'interno delle istituzioni europee.

Ogni giorno siamo costretti a sentire dichiarazioni folli e non veritiere da parte di rappresentanti delle istituzioni europee e questo non è accettabile. Credo che sia più opportuno focalizzarsi su una critica interna e sul perché l'Europa stia fallendo che gridare a un nemico esterno. Il dubbio legittimo che viene a me e che viene a tanti cittadini europei è che la battaglia sulle *fake news* venga utilizzata per chiudere, vista l'incapacità dell'UE, anche quello spazio di dissenso che i *social network* riescono a dare a chi è in minoranza.

Elmar Brok (PPE). – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar, Frau Ratspräsidentin, meine Damen und Herren! Es ist, glaube ich, bewiesen – aus mancherlei Untersuchungen und Feststellungen von den USA bis in viele andere Länder hinein –, dass heute vom Ausland gesteuert – Cambridge Analytica ist nur ein Beispiel dafür – Fake News systematisch mithilfe von Algorithmen usw. umgesetzt werden. Jeder kann seine Meinung sagen; dafür sind auch die sozialen Medien zur Verfügung. Aber man darf nicht sagen, wie einer meiner Vorredner sagte: „Der Wind des Wandels weht.“ Ja, das mag ja sein, aber nicht der Wind des Wandels der Lüge. Wenn es einfach Lüge ist, systematisch in großen Möglichkeiten vom Ausland gesteuert durchzusetzen, und wenn ich sehe, dass hier offensichtlich all die Reden, die von rechts gekommen sind, eine vorsorgliche Verteidigung dieser Politik der Lüge im Wahlkampf gewesen sind – denn jede Rede hat doch diesen Ansatz hier gehabt –, dann müssen wir doch dagegenstehen! Die AfD in Deutschland, Herr Gauland hat Vorstandssitzungen mit der AfD in der russischen Botschaft gemacht, wo solche Dinge abgesprochen werden! Die Le Pen hat Geld aus Russland bekommen für ihren Wahlkampf! Sie treten alle für die Politik in der Ukraine ein, um sich dann auf diese Art und Weise dafür bezahlen zu lassen, indem sie gegen europäische Interessen und Interessen von unabhängigen europäischen Nationen vorgehen, um ihre Politik der Lüge durchzusetzen. Das muss gebrandmarkt werden, das muss deutlich gemacht werden. Es sind alle Möglichkeiten des Nutzens da, aber bitte nicht über das Ausland Einfluss zu nehmen auf unsere Politik in der Europäischen Union. Das muss innerhalb der Europäischen Union in einem politischen Wettbewerb ausgefochten werden, um das hier entsprechend voranzubringen.

Wir müssen deshalb sehen – Frau Schaake hat darauf hingewiesen –: Das ist nicht nur Russland, das kommt woanders her. Wenn ich sehe, dass einige dieser Parteien, die dort sitzen, mit Herrn Bannon zusammenarbeiten, von dem hier jeder weiß, mit welchen Methoden er den Wahlkampf in den USA organisiert hat – es wurde deutlich von ihm selbst gesagt, dass er bewusst mit Fälschungen Meinung organisiert –, dann ist das eine Situation, die in einer demokratischen Gemeinschaft nicht akzeptabel ist. Unsere Bürger sollen entscheiden können ohne die Hilfsmaßnahmen aus dem Ausland für die Rechten in diesem Hause, die Demokratie und Europa bekämpfen.

Mercedes Bresso (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, noi sappiamo che lo scandalo di Cambridge Analytica ha dimostrato la facilità con la quale è possibile manipolare le opinioni dei cittadini, tracciando il loro profilo politico dai dati personali degli utenti e quanto sia altrettanto facile farne un cattivo uso per influenzare poi le scelte politiche.

Abbiamo esempi anche in quest'Aula di persone che hanno utilizzato l'Unione europea e delle *fake news* sull'Unione europea a fini elettorali già nelle recenti campagne elettorali in diversi paesi. Quindi pensiamo certamente alle elezioni americane e anche alla campagna della Brexit, ma pensiamo anche a molte campagne avvenute all'interno dell'Unione europea.

Noi sappiamo che oggi la politica si fa usando i social media, che la tecnologia e i sistemi informatici sono parte integrante delle nostre vite ed è per questo che abbiamo bisogno di assicurarci che chi li usa lo faccia nella legalità e sulla base di regole comuni e che sia possibile prevedere sanzioni anche pecuniarie nel caso di violazioni. Soprattutto dobbiamo stare in guardia e difendere con fermezza la protezione dei nostri dati.

Come sapete, il Parlamento europeo ha già legiferato in questo campo. Oggi sono sul campo delle proposte. Il collega Wieland e io stessa siamo relatori della proposta relativa alla sanzione nei confronti dei partiti politici europei in caso di abusi nell'uso dei dati elettorali. Tuttavia, non servono solo le linee guida, che sono la fase preliminare – noi legiferiamo sulla sanzione, ma la fase preliminare deve impedire che la violazione avvenga –, ma io credo che serva anche una task force messa in campo dall'Unione europea per contrastare l'uso di *fake news* che ci sarà sicuramente utilizzando dati manipolati dei nostri elettori.

Se noi quindi temiamo le influenze nelle prossime elezioni europee di queste pratiche dobbiamo riuscire a difendere il nostro spazio pubblico non solo con queste linee guida, con le norme e le sanzioni, ma dobbiamo anche usare una forte attività politica. Su questo, non solo la Commissione ma tutti i nostri gruppi, i nostri partiti e i nostri paesi devono lavorare perché non sia possibile che azioni di influenza ingannevole modifichino i risultati delle prossime leggi elettorali. Abbiamo visto qualche elemento qui che già ci dice che non sarà affatto qualcosa che non può avvenire, ma che le possibilità concrete ci sono e che tocca a noi evitare che diventino realtà.

Anders Primdahl Vistisen (ECR). – Hr. formand! Det var en af de største amerikanske præsidenter, Abraham Lincoln, der sagde, at man kan narre en del af befolkningen hele tiden, hele befolkningen en del af tiden, men man kan ikke narre hele befolkningen hele tiden. Det kan vi her i Europa været glade for, fordi det lyder som om her i huset, at russisk indflydelse på nationale spørgsmål er noget nyt. I har helt glemt den kolde krig, hvor størstedelen af venstrefløjen, inklusive fredsbevægelsen, modtog i stakkevis af russiske kontanter, hjælp til russisk propaganda for at nedbryde Vestens forsvar. Så I taler om det her med valg – altså indflydelse på valg – som om det er en ny ting. Det er det ikke! Og heldigvis er der allerede en stor forståelse hos de europæiske vælgere for at skille skidt fra kanel. Men når I nu går så meget op i at forhindre indflydelse på nationale valg, skulle I så ikke se på det system, I selv har oprettet her i Den Europæiske Union. I bruger millioner og atter millioner af skatteborgernes penge på at propagandere for alt det gode, alt det rigtige, den fantastiske politiske union, uden i øvrigt at spørge europæerne, om det er den retning, de ønsker. I sidestiller fake news med EU-skepsis i jeres debatter, og I går så langt i de forslag til at bekæmpe fake news, at direktøren for det danske Institut for Menneskerettigheder, Jonas Christoffersen, offentligt på Folkemødet på Bornholm i år advarede imod, at de metoder, I bruger, vil legitimere diktaturstater som Kina, Rusland, Venezuela og alle andre, der ønsker at holde deres befolkningers ytringsfrihed nede. I risikerer at smide ytringsfriheden og demokratiet ud med badevandet, fordi I er så bange for at tabe til de europæiske befolkninger og for de europæiske vælgere, der er skeptiske over for jeres utopiske drøm om Europas Forenede Stater.

Hilde Vautmans (ALDE). – Mijnheer de voorzitter, mevrouw de commissaris, collega's, iedereen heeft het al gezegd: de komende Europese verkiezingen zullen uiterst belangrijk zijn voor onze toekomst. Kiezers zullen moeten kiezen tussen partijen die vóór Europa zijn, die vóór een Europese samenwerking zijn of partijen die de klok willen terugdraaien en zich eigenlijk achter de nationale grenzen willen verschuilen.

Ik denk dat we allemaal wel weten dat er krachten, machten zijn die er eigenlijk baat bij hebben dat Europa geen sterke speler wordt op de internationale markt. Deze krachten zullen dus niet aarzelen om de verkiezingen in hun voordeel te manipuleren. De Romeinen wisten het al: verdeel en heers.

Je kan dat op twee manieren doen, mevrouw de commissaris, door vervalsing van de stemuitslagen of beïnvloeding van de kiezers via valse informatie. Vandaar mijn oproep: we moeten op beide terreinen waakzaam zijn.

Ten eerste moeten we netwerken opzetten waarbinnen lidstaten beste praktijken uitwisselen om de stemprocedures te beschermen. Veel collega's hebben daar hier al voor gepleit. Het tweede is voor mij echter nog veel belangrijker. We moeten ervoor zorgen dat we burgers wapenen tegen nepnieuws, tegen desinformatiecampagnes.

Ik doe graag nog een heel concreet voorstel, mevrouw de commissaris. Ik zou hier vandaag een pleidooi willen houden voor de benoeming van een echte speciale vertegenwoordiger tegen desinformatie, tegen nepnieuws, tegen cybercriminaliteit. Ik denk dat we dat echt nodig hebben: een speciale vertegenwoordiger die dadelijk kan onderzoeken of we met nepnieuws te maken hebben, die dadelijk kan ingrijpen met campagnes om dat nepnieuws recht te zetten, zodat we Europa groots kunnen maken.

Molly Scott Cato (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, a hundred years after the First World War, many have reflected on the risk of war returning to our continent, but in reality the next war has already begun. It's a culture war, an information war, and we're all conscripted into it, many of us without our knowing. The foreign actors distorting our elections are coming from both Russia and the USA. Last week Shahmir Sanni, the Vote Leave whistle-blower, won his unfair dismissal case that exposed the activities of nine lobby groups seeking to undermine action on climate change and help the tax avoiders, all working out of 55 Tufton Street in London. We need this activity by what we have called the 'Brexit Syndicate' called out as propaganda and not given oxygen by the BBC.

A year ago, the Prime Minister drew attention to Russian involvement in British politics, but she is refusing to say whether she blocked an investigation into Arron Banks' Russian connections, and we have learned that the Mueller investigation is making similar inquiries with regard to Nigel Farage. Welcome to the culture war. It's a war between democracy and authoritarianism. Which side are you on?

Steeve Briois (ENF). – Monsieur le Président, cette Union européenne a décidé du mal avec la démocratie et la liberté d'expression. Les eurogagas ont tellement peur de la rencontre avec les peuples en mai prochain que tous les moyens sont bons pour stigmatiser et bâillonner ceux qui ne sont pas d'accord avec eux.

En évoquant les ingérences extérieures dans les futures élections européennes, vous avez le gouvernement russe dans votre ligne de mire. Ces accusations relèvent du fantasme, voire de la paranoïa, à moins qu'elles ne servent à justifier un durcissement des sanctions à l'égard de la Russie.

Vous êtes mal placés pour donner des leçons de morale à propos d'ingérence extérieure, quand on sait que des ONG financées par des puissances publiques étrangères, sous le couvert de la défense des droits de l'homme, servent en réalité des intérêts politiques contraires à ceux des nations.

L'ingérence ne vous dérange pas lorsqu'elle se nomme Open Society, de George Soros, qui faisait pourtant la promotion de l'accueil des migrants, et ce bien évidemment avec la bénédiction de la Commission européenne. L'ingérence lors des futures élections européennes ne vous dérange pas, lorsque le gouvernement de M. Macron finance et diffuse, avec l'argent du contribuable, un clip pour s'attaquer à des dirigeants européens, comme MM. Orbán et Salvini, qui, eux, ne sont pas à 21 % dans les sondages mais sont plébiscités par leur peuple, sans parler de l'ingérence et de la manipulation de nombreux médias qui, gavés d'argent public, ne jurent que par Bruxelles et se permettent de salir les peuples d'Europe en les cataloguant de xénophobes, racistes ou populistes.

Pavel Svoboda (PPE). – Pane předsedající, svobodné volby neznamení jen možnost vybírat si z více než jedné kandidátky, ale také volby bez dezinformací a manipulací. A my jsme v dezinformační válce s Ruskem, ve válce, která ohrožuje naše demokracie. Teprve v tomto kontextu oceníme, jak vizionářská byla Schumanova deklarace, píše se v ní mimo jiné toto: „Světový mír by nemohl být zachován bez tvůrčího úsilí, jež je úměrné nebezpečím, která tento mír ohrožují.“ To v naší situaci znamená, že musíme vložit nejméně stejné úsilí a finanční prostředky do boje proti dezinformacím, jaké protivník investuje na druhé straně barikády. Takže mluvíme minimálně o stovkách milionů eur. Ale demokracie za to stojí. Lež je levná, ale pravda je drahá. Nyní tyto dezinformace ohrožují evropské volby.

Jde tedy o celoevropský úkol, kde je třeba celokontinentální spolupráce. Jsem rád, že návrhy Evropské komise směřují k tomu, co opravdu potřebujeme. Vedle ochrany osobních údajů a kontrol financování potřebujeme především toto – musí být k dispozici kvalitní technické monitorovací nástroje ve všech členských státech. Evropská unie musí umět koordinovat tyto nástroje. Národní týmy musejí mít dostatečné kapacity na celoevropské úrovni k šíření zpráv vyvracejících *fake news*. Může jít o placenou inzerci na internetu či o spolupráci s veřejnoprávními médii. Šíření těchto ověřovacích zpráv se musí dít v reálném čase v rozsahu hodin, to je klíčové. Potřebujeme speciální jednotky s dobrými algoritmy a s jediným úkolem – odhalit, oznámit a blokovat dezinformace. Asistence platform jako Facebook nebo Twitter je podstatná.

Ale především potřebujeme vůli, společnou vůli proti dezinformacím bojovat. Já tuto vůli v Evropském parlamentu, až na určité výjimky, vidím a jsem za to rád.

Victor Boştinaru (S&D). – Mr President, I am convinced that we have seen many forms of state-sponsored cyberattacks and disinformation in the most recent major elections, from the Ukraine crisis to Brexit and Catalan votes, and from the US elections to the Italian and Swedish ones, to name only a few. Moreover, social media have accelerated the spread of fake news. We are facing a global phenomenon with a high political impact, but it is also important to say that we are dealing with the tools of warfare.

So we can only expect this to happen during the next European elections as well. I don't see any reason why it should not. The role of online platforms in the proliferation of conspiracy theories, disinformation and fake news is part of the Kremlin's ongoing influence campaign with the aim of undermining Western values and democracy. In other cases, it is unclear where the attacks are coming from, but the sources appear to be mixed: everything from other countries to lone hackers.

Mr Commissioner, the 2019 vote is consequential for our fate and future. These elections are so important that is not only a matter of actually preserving the vote from disruption, but also preserving it from any rumours, fraud and interference. All available digital radars should be focused on the European election infrastructure and systems that are part of the voting process, but also on foreign intelligence activities, notably the Russian state-sponsored media outlet which operates in various Member States. And, yes, do not forget the financing of the electoral campaign and the political parties and political leaders in some countries which are too close to Moscow.

Ahead of the European elections in 2019, the EU response should face these extremely topical challenges. This has to change and rapidly, before it is too late. As a result of the requested strategic communication plan to address Russia's ongoing disinformation campaign, in 2015, East Stratcom started working. It has only 18 people and does not even have its own budget to face all those challenges. Let's invest in Stratcom and let's invite the Member States to work closely with Stratcom to prevent this.

Finally, let me say that I call on the Commission to analyse the current situation and to address the legal framework needed in order to prevent interference.

Zdzisław Krasnodębski (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! Pani komisarz! Ja się zgadzam z wieloma rzeczami, o których mówili koledzy. Chciałem jednak zwrócić uwagę, że wpływ wrogich Unii ośrodków zewnętrznych szerzących dezinformację przed wyborami w naszych krajach, przed wyborami europejskimi nie ogranicza się jedynie do działań anonimowych, takich jak prowadzenie blogów bądź kont na Twitterze przez fikcyjne postacie, które w rzeczywistości są częścią pewnego projektu politycznego. Naszym problemem nie są tylko trolle i boty. Aktorami zewnętrznych wpływów szerzącymi dezinformację są bardzo często znane postacie publiczne.

Szczególnie niebezpieczne wydaje mi się to w wykonaniu byłych polityków państw narodowych bądź wysoko postawionych urzędników unijnych. Zatrudniając się w charakterze doradców różnych firm, wykorzystują oni swoje kontakty, zależności, znajomości politycznej kuchni w celu obsługi interesów sił niesprzyjających Unii i niesprzyjających państwom europejskim. Gerhard Schroeder jest znacznie groźniejszy niż jakikolwiek troll. Jeżeli koledzy z partii socjalistycznych tak mocno potępiają tego rodzaju praktyki – zdaje się, że jest on ciągle jeszcze politykiem SPD – to wydaje mi się, że to powinno ulec zmianie. Dlatego wydaje mi się, że pilnym działaniem powinno być zaostrenie polityki przeciwdziałającej *revolving doors*, a co więcej powinniśmy opublikować czarną listę tego rodzaju polityków działających z obcymi nam, wrogimi państwami, naszymi strategicznymi nieprzyjaciółmi, działającymi przeciwko Unii w ramach Unii, bo oni stanowią rzeczywiste i prawdziwe niebezpieczeństwo, o wiele większe niż to, o czym mówimy.

Alyn Smith (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, technology has always evolved – and will continue to evolve – and our laws need to evolve to keep pace with it. So we should avoid hysteria, but we do need to learn the lessons of where our laws are not fit for purpose. And we need to learn the lessons of our most recent experience, Brexit. I come from Scotland, where we comprehensively rejected Brexit, but it remains very much our problem. Because the fact is, colleagues, the UK's a more developed democracy than most, but the UK's laws on campaign finance, data protection, election transparency and the transparency of actors – foreign and domestic – have been proven to be not fit for purpose, and the use of technology – the abuse of data – was very much part of that campaign by a deeply dubious leave campaign which wholesale abused the law. So I support the measures which we've heard about and rise to bring some urgency to them. I commissioned James Patrick to analyse Scottish Twitter, and he produced this report. He analysed 27 000 Twitter accounts, 36 million tweets and found a staggering number that at least 4.25% and rising to at least 12.24% Scottish Twitter accounts are potentially malign. If it's happening in Scottish Twitter, colleagues, it's happening in your democracy as well, and I fear that our laws are not fit for purpose across our House and our all our democracies are under threat. Commissioners, I wish you well in your efforts.

Agustín Díaz de Mera García Consuegra (PPE). – Señor presidente, señora, la injerencia de actores externos en procesos electorales y el mal uso de los metadatos están provocando graves efectos sobre los procedimientos electorales, pues permiten tanto la recopilación masiva de información confidencial del electorado como la distribución de noticias falsas generadas para atraer y desinformar. Cambridge Analytica mató la intimidad de 50 millones de personas y, según el EC3 de Europol, tanto la campaña de Clinton como la de Macron sufrieron ataques.

Mezclar elementos auténticos manipulados es una estrategia para maximizar el impacto negativo de un ataque. Webs de noticias falsas, cuentas y redes sociales se utilizan para difundir noticias inexactas, diseñadas para parecer auténticas y dañar a un candidato o a un partido.

En mayo hay elecciones a esta Cámara. Es necesario que la Unión tome medidas para que ningún proceso electoral sufra injerencias delictivas. Es necesario que los actores públicos y privados coordinen sus acciones para evitar esos ataques y es necesaria también una mejora de la cooperación entre agencias.

La Unión tiene que frenar el mal uso de la minería de datos con el paquete europeo de ciberseguridad, que incluye impulsar la creación de una Agencia Europea de Seguridad, y debe dar recursos y credibilidad a aquellos entes que ya velan por ella, como el Centro Europeo de Ciberdelincuencia —EC3 de Europol—.

Hay que acabar con las amenazas que atacan la democracia, la soberanía de los Estados y los derechos fundamentales de los ciudadanos europeos.

Jeppe Kofod (S&D). – Mr President, this debate is very important because freedom of expression, freedom of opinion, the freedom of having free elections where citizens can cast their ballots freely is fundamental for our European democracy, for democracy as such. I'm honestly quite shocked when I listen to some of our colleagues from the far right saying that the threat of foreign actors is not a threat to the freedom of people and democracy in Europe itself. It's astonishing that they can claim that there's no threat. It's been proven: take the US election as evidence that foreign actors like Russia have interfered with the purpose of destroying our freedoms, our democracy, the free will of people to cast their ballot at the polling station.

This is so important, and we have to ask this very uncomfortable question: if you do not react together and protect our freedoms, our democracy, then I would ask you – how many seats will Russia have in this Parliament at next year's election? Because that's what will happen if we allow ourselves to be fooled into believing that we're not seeing interference by foreign actors. They are not trying to strengthen our democracy. On the contrary, they want to destroy our democracy, our freedoms. They have a totally different world-view. We should not take that threat lightly and, therefore, I'm very happy about the different kind of plans and actions that are being taken now. I'm also happy to see that the concerns – 73% of Europeans have this concern, as the Commissioner alluded to – this is a concern we need to respond to. We need to show people that we protect their right to live in democracy and freedom and, therefore, in my opinion, Russia should have no one elected next year for this Parliament. We should stand together on our core values no matter which political group we belong to.

Ruža Tomašić (ECR). – Gospodine predsjedavajući, razvoj informacijskih tehnologija omogućio je stranim faktorima da se lakše nego ikada miješaju u naš demokratski proces i oblikuju rezultate izbora prema vlastitim željama i interesima. To im naravno ne smijemo dozvoliti.

Iako iz predostrožnosti moramo poduzeti određene mjere kako bismo se zaštitili, ne mogu se oteti dojmu da se ovo pitanje preuveličava. Rusko uplitanje u američke izbore u nekoj većoj mjeri još uvijek nije dokazano, iako istraga traje skoro dvije godine. Rusija nije uspjela izmanipulirati ni javnu raspravu o ulasku u NATO u jednoj Crnoj Gori pa ne vidim kako bi mogla ostvariti odlučujući utjecaj na europske izbore. U redu je da budemo oprezni, ali ostavimo se lova na vještice.

Čini se da se ovu priču o stranom uplitanju ciljano gradi kao opravdanje za rast euroskeptika na sljedećim izborima, a zato su prvenstveno krivi oni koji Uniju vode u krivom smjeru, a ne Rusija.

Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D). – Señor presidente, comisario de Seguridad, comisaria de Justicia, el próximo 26 de mayo de 2019 se elige este Parlamento Europeo, que representa democráticamente, de manera directa, a 500 millones de ciudadanos europeos. Y desde 2014, última elección al Parlamento Europeo, hemos asistido a un conjunto de episodios de injerencia delictiva en procesos electorales y consultas y referendos en Estados miembros de la Unión Europea.

Este Parlamento Europeo, que envía misiones a supervisar la corrección y credibilidad de elecciones en el exterior, tiene toda la razón para preocuparse de que el derecho fundamental de participación política y de elección democrática no se vea interferido por una guerra híbrida de intoxicación, ciberterrorismo, manipulación ni chantaje de ninguna manera.

Por tanto, es urgente que aglutinemos todas nuestras fuerzas para conformar cuanto antes nuestra agenda contra la ciberdelincuencia y por la ciberseguridad con una agencia europea de ciberseguridad y con la unidad de inteligencia contra la cibercriminalidad de Europol, que asegure que estaremos absolutamente preparados para que las elecciones al Parlamento Europeo de 2019 no arrojen la más mínima duda sobre la credibilidad de ninguno de los Estados miembros de la Unión Europea y estemos absolutamente seguros de que el resultado refleja realmente la voluntad de los europeos y no la voluntad de quienes se han puesto de acuerdo desde algún oscuro y remoto taller de manipulación o intoxicación en el exterior para condicionar la composición de este Parlamento Europeo contra la Unión Europea y sus valores fundacionales.

Jussi Halla-aho (ECR). – Mr President, it is important to protect the integrity of our democracy against undue external influence. But there is a dangerous tendency in the mainstream politics and media to explain any unpleasant election result as an indication of such undue influence, a tendency to see Mr Putin and his agents behind every corner and under every stone.

This is a way of de-legitimising democratic elections and the choices people make. I can assure you there are a lot of people out there who genuinely do not want more third-world immigration, more globalisation or more European Union. This is the reason why they vote for Brexit, Trump or nationalist parties. Such developments may, of course, coincide with the interests of certain external actors, but they are caused by the failure and incompetence of the set mainstream.

Gunnar Hökmark (PPE). – Mr President, we need to ensure that those who are elected to the European Parliament and to all the national parliaments are elected in order to do their best for their nation and to do their best for Europe and not for those who want to divide and destabilise us.

We need to ensure that neither Russia nor anyone else can influence the elections but there let's also be aware, this is not anything that is going on just during elections, it is going on now and there is a link between money-laundering by Estonia, Novichok in Salisbury, rumours in Germany, cyberattacks in France and cyberattacks in all of our countries. Let's not be naive, this is not a threat, it is something that is going on right now and it is implemented in order to undermine democracy and the rule of law. And those foreign actors, they have the help and the support of those forces inside here, who would like to undermine the rule of law and democracy.

This is a fight for democracy and freedom. Let's be clear that we shall disclose those who do it, we shall have transparency, we shall sanction, and we shall do with criminal actions what is required to do with the criminal actions. We shall ensure that they are punished and they are revealed and disclosed and that we can safeguard our European Union.

Carlos Zorrinho (S&D). – Senhor Presidente, a política sempre conviveu com estratégias de informação e contrainformação. Hoje, a associação tecnológica permite, contudo, ir muito mais longe e promover campanhas massivas de desinformação, trabalhadas de forma a atingir e manipular setores específicos dos eleitorados.

O vírus da desinformação está a contaminar todo o espectro da comunicação política, lançando a desconfiança mesmo sobre aquela informação que é correta, e essa desinformação pode tornar-se letal para a democracia.

Saúdo o apelo de Paris, assinado no dia 12 de novembro e subscrito por 51 países, entre os quais todos os países europeus, como o manifesto para ajudar a que os valores éticos e do Estado de Direito prevaleçam no novo quadro da sociedade digital.

A estratégia proposta pela Comissão Europeia para combater a desinformação em linha terá uma prova de fogo nas próximas eleições europeias. A verdade é que nós precisamos de uma enorme coligação de cidadania para fazer com que essa estratégia tenha sucesso.

PRZEWODNICTWO: ZDZISŁAW KRASNODĘBSKI

Wiceprzewodniczący

Mirosław Piotrowski (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! Nasza debata ma charakter szczególny: motywowana jest obawą wpływu podmiotów zagranicznych na nadchodzącą kampanię wyborczą do Parlamentu Europejskiego. W tym kontekście mówi się o finansowaniu europejskich partii i fundacji. Padają konkretne nazwiska. Rok temu tu, na tej sali, Nigel Farage wskazał jedno z nich: George'a Sorosa, amerykańskiego finansistę, który z zewnątrz oddziałuje na politykę Unii Europejskiej. Podawał konkretne dane dotyczące kilkudziesięciu spotkań miliardera z Komisją Europejską. Sam Franz Timmermans mówił na początku tego roku, że współpracuje z Sorosem od dwudziestu lat. Oskarżenia o mieszanie się tego amerykańskiego miliardera w wewnętrzne sprawy krajów członkowskich Unii głośno artykułowali przedstawiciele Słowacji, Rumunii, Włoch, Hiszpanii, Wielkiej Brytanii oraz Węgier. Jakie więc mamy gwarancje, że nie będzie on ingerował za pośrednictwem swoich licznych fundacji w zbliżające się wybory europejskie w wielu krajach, także w moim kraju – w Polsce? I co zamierzamy z tym zrobić?

Jeroen Lenaers (PPE). – Ik moest tijdens het debat denken aan de tekenfilmpjes van Popeye, de zeeman die alleen na een blik spinazie sterk genoeg was om zijn vriendinnetje te beschermen. Zoals Popeye Olijfje moest beschermen tegen de schurkachtige Pluto, zo moeten ook wij onze Europese democratie beschermen tegen schurkachtige buitenlandse actoren.

We hebben het gezien bij de verkiezingen in de Verenigde Staten. We hebben het gezien bij het Brexit referendum. We hebben het gezien in Nederland bij het onderzoek naar het neerhalen van MH17, waarbij bijna 300 mensen het leven hebben gelaten. Onze taak is het ervoor te zorgen dat dit lijstje voorbeelden hier stopt, dat er een einde komt aan deze ondermijning van onze democratie. Met het in aantocht zijn van de Europese verkiezingen is het absoluut een belangrijke stap om onze weerbaarheid op dat gebied veel verder te versterken.

De oprichting van de *StratCom Task Force* was en is in principe een goed idee, maar laten we het dan wel goed doen. Pas in januari van dit jaar is er geld voor dit team uitgetrokken: 1,1 miljoen euro. Ter vergelijking: de Russen hebben alleen voor een Brexit campagne al meer dan vier keer zoveel geld besteed! We kunnen het niet bij mooie woorden en het uitspreken van zorgen laten, zeker nu de Europese verkiezingen eraan komen.

Zoals Popeye spinazie nodig heeft om Pluto te verslaan, zo hebben wij ook in de Europese Unie krachtige wapens nodig om deze vorm van buitenlandse inmenging te stoppen. Laten wij er in ieder geval vanuit dit huis voor zorgen dat die wapens er komen.

Paul Tang (S&D). – Inmenging in verkiezingen. Ik kan het hebben over het trollenleger van Poetin of over de Italiaanse vicepremier die journalisten jakhalzen noemt. Maar ik wil het hebben over Amerikaanse inmenging.

Facebook heeft jarenlang volgehouden neutraal te zijn. Maar met al die neutraliteit heeft het toch toegelaten dat er nepnieuws wordt gefabriceerd in een stadje in Macedonië, dat er *dark ads* zijn die filterbubbels beïnvloeden en dat Cambridge Analytica er met 50 miljoen profielen vandoor is gegaan. Zo heeft Facebook bijgedragen aan Trump en Brexit.

In 2016 werd zo'n 1,4 miljard euro aan *online campaigning* besteed, waar Facebook en Zuckerber geld aan verdienen. Zuckerberg belooft beterschap. Maar het moet sneller en het moet beter.

Ik zie graag een dwingende Europese aanpak, volledige openheid van uitgaven voor een politiek doeleinde door Facebook (wie, wat, waar, wanneer) en uiteindelijk ook een ex ante toets op de algoritmen, op de publieke opinievorming. Want laat Facebook niet onze democratie zijn wil opleggen, maar omgekeerd.

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, ο αγώνας ενάντια στις κακόβουλες επιθέσεις από τρίτους εντός της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης πρέπει, βεβαίως, να είναι κοινός. Όμως, υπάρχουν διάφορες πλευρές και τρόποι για δόλιους χειρισμούς και, φυσικά, αλλοιώνεται ή καταβάλλονται προσπάθειες για να αλλοιωθεί το Σώμα που θα εκλεγεί στις επόμενες ευρωεκλογές. Αναφέρομαι στις εγγυήσεις πολυφωνίας που πρέπει να υπάρχουν. Σε αυτήν εδώ την αίθουσα, έχω καταγγείλει πάνω από δέκα φορές ότι στην Ελλάδα, τόσο η δημόσια τηλεόραση όσο και τα μεγάλα συστημικά ιδιωτικά κανάλια έχουν φιμώσει το κίνημά μας «Ελλάδα – Ο Άλλος Δρόμος». Δεν μας δίνουν την ευκαιρία να εκφράσουμε τις απόψεις μας και πρόκειται για μια στημένη κατάσταση μέσω της οποίας μας έχουν φιμώσει. Θέλουμε να υπάρξει παρέμβαση και στήριξη στο θέμα αυτό, για να έχουμε το δικαίωμα να συμμετάσχουμε επί ίσοις όροις στις ευρωεκλογές, διότι εφόσον μας φιμώνουν δεν υπάρχει δημοκρατική διαδικασία στην Ελλάδα και δεν δίνεται η δυνατότητα σε εμάς να εκφράσουμε τις απόψεις μας. Επειδή, κυρία Γιουρονά, αναφερθήκατε σε μία παρέμβαση στην Ελλάδα, παρακαλώ να εξηγήσετε ποια είναι η εκλογική παρέμβαση που έχει γίνει στην Ελλάδα και στην οποία αναφερθήκατε στην ομιλία σας.

Dubravka Šuica (PPE). – Poštovani predsjedavajući, gospodo povjerenici, hvala vam što pratite ovu raspravu i što se borite protiv podrivanja europskog projekta. Ova rasprava je došla u pravo vrijeme, u osvit europskih izbora i smatram da trebamo skrenuti pozornost na nju.

Svakako, kao što vidimo, dva su načina podrivanja izbora. Jedan je način financiranje kampanje donacijama, netransparentnim donacijama i kupovanje interesa, bolje rečeno pritisak na građane i na birače. Drugi je način, kao što vidimo, dezinformiranje putem društvenih mreža. Posebno su jake društvene mreže Facebook i Twitter. Posebno su jaki lažni profili kojima se služe oni koji žele podrivati ovaj projekt i žele podrivati ove demokratske izbore. Moramo se svakako tome oduprijeti.

Isto tako, manipulacija je građanima evidentna. U 18 zemalja članica je očito da je bilo, da ne nabrajam sad zemlje o kojima je već bilo riječi, podrivanja. Znači ono što moramo napraviti je definitivno jačati neovisno novinarstvo. To je za nas vrlo važno.

Isto tako nikako ne smijemo kompromitirati ove demokratske, poštene izbore, ali na kraju ipak želim vjerovati da su naši građani dovoljno educirani i dovoljno svjesni da neće podleći niskim strastima i da će razabrati ono što je demokratski i što je transparentno od onoga što je *fake*, a *fake news* je danas zaista postao velika opasnost.

Alfred Sant (S&D). – Mr President, obviously all political and technological means should be employed to fully protect the European Parliament elections from any attempt to manipulate public opinion and results. However, beyond outrage, we should seek to have a coherent position with regard to outside foreign interference in our political affairs.

To achieve such coherence, we must also consider the inputs we make as Europeans to the political and national affairs of outsiders. Europe, as well as the US, has a wide-ranging reputation for having interfered in the internal political processes, democratic or not, of others. From Mossadegh's Iran, to most African countries, to Latin America, the Middle East, Libya and Ukraine, we have interfered. When is our interference legitimate? When is it not? Retaliation for it can take forms unexpected by us, and unacceptable to us. What retaliation is legitimate when others interfere in our affairs? And when we interfere in theirs? Replies to such questions cannot be symmetric between countries and specific cases. After all, this Parliament regularly holds debates that seek to influence political events in, and outside, Europe. We need an overarching, coherent doctrine covering all these scenarios and aspects.

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – Pane předsedající, boj proti dezinformacím by měl být prioritou jak z politických, tak z bezpečnostních důvodů členských zemí a také celé Evropské unie. V oblasti bezpečnosti by výdaje na činnosti kontrarozvědky proto měly být také jednou z národních priorit, protože vliv na vnitřní záležitosti, včetně ovlivňování voleb, je současně i bezpečnostní hrozbou pro členské státy. Chci tady připomenout, že například Česká republika zřídila centrum proti terorismu a hybridním hrozbám za účelem mimo jiné také odhalovat dezinformační kampaně a já věřím, že se to České republice vyplatí.

Nacházející volby do Evropského parlamentu budou testem naší odolnosti a je nepochybné, že zde bude snaha ovlivnit jejich výsledky stejně, jako se to podařilo ve Spojených státech amerických nebo v případě brexitu. Rusko bude podporovat protievropské dezinformační kampaně. Tato hybridní válka je v dnešním digitálním věku účinnější než násilí a musíme zde čelit vzděláváním ke kritickému myšlení, mediální gramotnosti a podporovat veřejnoprávní média.

V této souvislosti chci apelovat na Evropskou službu pro vnější činnost, aby zvýšila finanční podporu pro její součást zvanou StratCom. Její účinnost začala v roce 2015, odhalila tři a půl tisíce případů proruské dezinformace. Tato činnost ovšem potřebuje větší finanční podporu. Bohužel výdaje na StratCom jsou v porovnání s ruskými mediálními výdaji nesrovnatelně menší.

Ivan Štefanec (PPE). – Pán předsedající, demokratické volby musia byť nezávislé od akéhokoľvek zasahovania ďalších strán. Ako sme videli pri referende o brexite, pri amerických prezidentských voľbách alebo pri holandskom referende o asociačnej dohode s Ukrajinou, kybernetické útoky, dezinformácie a propaganda môžu úplne zvrátiť verejnú mienku. Som preto rád, že Európska únia začína voči takýmto útokom bojovať, a oceňujem vytváranie centier, ktoré monitorujú kybernetické útoky a odpovedajú na ne. V tejto oblasti by sme sa však mali inšpirovať od občianskych aktivistov, ktorí – hoci niekedy osamotené, ale veľmi účinne – bojujú v hybridnej vojne. Príkladom takéhoto odhodlania je aj Slovák Ján Benčík, minulý rok ocenený Cenou európskeho občana. Dezinformácie a ich následky môžu natrvalo poškodiť demokraciu a obrana voči nim je nielen legitímna, ale aj veľmi potrebná. Na budúci rok počas volieb do Európskeho parlamentu môžeme, tak ako v minulosti, očakávať ofenzívu útokov na európsky projekt a na podporu strán a hnutí, ktoré si želajú jeho zničenie. Odpoveďou na takúto činnosť môže byť len hovorenie pravdy a systematické odkrývanie lží. Musíme viac hovoriť o tom, čo Európska únia prináša ľuďom a krajinám a ako by náš kontinent vyzeral bez integrácie. Len pravda a blízky kontakt s ľuďmi je liekom na útoky a klamstvá, ktoré sú šírené v kybernetickom priestore. Nebojme sa preto jasne pomenovať klamstvo a odhaliť pôvodcov dezinformácií. Práve my v Európskom parlamente máme túto zodpovednosť. Čím bližšie k ľuďom budeme, tým menší dosah budú mať dezinformácie a hoaxy.

Inese Vaidere (PPE). – Godātie kolēgi, komisāri! Kā vēsta sens sakāmvarāds, ja gribi mieru, gatavojies karam. Tas nav jāuztver burtiski, tomēr propagandas karam ir jāgatavojas, lai aizstāvētu mūsu vērtības.

Krievija ir sapratusi, ka tieša intervence, kā Krimā un Dienvidaustrumu Ukrainā, sastop nopietnu Rietumu pretestību, tāpēc tagad ir uzvars uz viltus ziņām, propagandu internetā, televīzijā, viltus profiliem sociālajos tīklos. Krievija veido ne tikai fake news, kā es saku, bet arī fake views. Tas ir neapstrīdams fakts, traktējot tieši pretējā nozīmē. Tā ir gan par Baltijas valstu okupāciju, tā bija arī Malaizijas lidmašīnas notriekšanas gadījums.

Ko tad mums darīt? Vispirms jāsakārto partiju finansēšanas likums. Kad es šodien dzirdēju dažus kolēģus, kuri nepamana Krievijas veidotās viltus ziņas, tad es domāju, ka varbūt partiju finansēšanas likuma nesakārtotība ir tam pamats.

Otrkārt, mums ir nopietni jāstrādā ar žurnālistiem, jāvēdina, jāveido mediju pratība, sabiedrības informēšana. Ir vajadzīgs, lai nedominētu tikai sliktās ziņas masu informācijas līdzekļos, bet tās tiktu līdzsvarotas arī ar mūsu sasniegumiem.

Mums ir jāsadarbojas ar mūsu partneriem NATO, lai mūsu tehnoloģijas speciālisti, kiberspeciālisti būtu spēcīgāki par tiem, kas cenšas mūs traucēt, kas cenšas uzlauzt mūsu mājaslapas un tamlīdzīgi.

Paldies, kolēģi, ka jūs atbalstījāt manu pilotprojektu par StratCom finansējuma palielinājumu, bet es tiešām aicinu Komisiju atrast līdzekļus, lai StratCom finansējums kļūtu par pastāvīgu lietu. Paldies jums!

Markus Pieper (PPE). – Herr Präsident! Bannon, Russland, Fake News, technische Manipulation – die Waffen der EU-Gegner haben die Kollegen wirklich treffend beschrieben.

Wir müssen da auch in ganz anderen Dimensionen denken: Wir müssen digital aufrüsten, wir brauchen Frühwarnsysteme gegen Falschmeldungen und technische Eingriffe – nicht nur in Brüssel, nein, auch in allen Mitgliedstaaten, wie das die tschechische Kollegin eben beschrieben hat – wenn uns etwas an dieser europäischen Idee liegt.

Wir müssen aber auch mit Facebook und Google reden. Wir müssen sie in die Pflicht nehmen. Wenn sie in Europa Geschäfte machen wollen, geht das nur, wenn sie auch seriöse Inhalte verbreiten. Wer Multiplikator der Europazerstörer ist, soll nicht von den Freiheiten des europäischen Binnenmarkts profitieren dürfen. Deswegen müssen wir mit Facebook und Google in aller Deutlichkeit Gespräche führen.

Ich frage die Kommission aber auch, wie es sein kann, dass wir uns erst jetzt mit einer Änderung des Statuts für Stiftungen und Parteien befassen. Die neuen Vorschriften sollen doch helfen, faire und freie Wahlen zu garantieren, nicht zuletzt durch transparente Spenden. Leider sind diese neuen Vorschriften erst nach den Europawahlen wirksam.

Liebe Kollegen von der Kommission, so geht das nicht. Lasst uns das als Weckruf nehmen, damit wir das ganze Thema viel ernster nehmen.

Eduard Kukan (PPE). – Mr President, colleagues, in the recent years we have found ourselves responding to untruths, half truths, fake news and propaganda. Misinformation and disinformation dominate and penetrate our daily lives. In an environment more susceptible to foreign interference in our elections, we must find ways how to be proactive and not only retroactive. One of the most important issues in fighting foreign influence in European elections is to strengthen the media environment in our Member States, but also in candidate countries and in the neighbourhood. This goes hand-in-hand with the robust respect for freedom of media and for the work of our journalists. Looking back at the work of Jan Kuciak or Daphne Caruana Galizia, we owe it to all the journalists who put their lives on the frontline in order to report on issues of interest to the public. We owe it to the journalists in Ukraine, Belarus, Moldova, Serbia and in other countries; we owe it to our own societies. Political leaders in some Member States have dishonoured the journalistic profession by public statements against journalists. I strongly denounce these practices. All EU states must protect the personal safety and the livelihoods of investigative journalists and whistleblowers, and not only protect them but champion their causes as well, and in upcoming European elections I think that without dedicated journalists and a free media environment, it will be difficult to protect fully our own democracies.

Jaromír Štětina (PPE). – Pane předsedající, už v roce 2013 vytýčil zásady hybridní války náčelník generálního štábu ozbrojených sil Ruska generál Valerij Gerasimov. Gerasimovova doktrína zdůrazňuje, že nevojenské prostředky mohou být účinnější než tradiční zbraně. Správně volené a aplikované slovo může být destruktivnější než tanky či raketové systémy.

Jedna z divizí této Gerasimovovy hybridní armády ovlivňuje volební procesy. Tak například: nizozemské referendum o ratifikaci asociační dohody mezi Evropskou unií a Ukrajinou, referendum o vystoupení Velké Británie z Evropské unie, německé volby v roce 2017, francouzské prezidentské volby ve stejném roce. Dezinformacemi byly zaplaveny a ovlivněny i prezidentské volby v mé zemi, České republice. Výrazně napomohly vítězství proruského prezidenta Zemana.

Zastavení uměle vyvolávané eroze důvěry v demokratické instituce se musí konečně stát centrálním bodem agendy členských států, ale i Evropské unie samotné. Proto důrazně apeluji na hlavy států a vlád i na vysokou představitelku pro zahraniční věci a bezpečnostní politiku, aby na prosincovém summitu udělali zásadní posun ve vnímání tohoto strategického nebezpečí. Očekávám představení maximálně ambiciózního akčního plánu s konkrétními kroky.

Příštím důležitým cílem dezinformačních kampaní a možných kyberútoků budou volby do Evropského parlamentu v květnu 2019. Rád bych doufal, že už budeme připravenější než v minulosti.

Nuno Melo (PPE). – Senhor Presidente, as *fake news* são uma realidade dos nossos tempos. São mais um elemento a ter em conta nas diferentes variáveis das disputas eleitorais que temos obviamente de combater. Mas quem se convence que a reconfiguração partidária a que assistimos nos últimos anos, da Rússia aos Estados Unidos, passando pela União Europeia, só se deve às *fake news* não está a ver o que está a acontecer.

Algumas forças políticas, normalmente de esquerda, foram colonizando durante décadas os meios clássicos de comunicação. Desde lá, criaram todas as narrativas do politicamente correto: o que pode ser dito e o que não pode ser dito. E, depois, sentiram-se no direito de atacar políticos que não lhes seguissem a cartilha. Titulares de cargos políticos passaram a recear dizer o que genuinamente pensam, temerosos da reação mediática. Os eleitores, por seu lado, deixaram de ouvir respostas de bom senso para problemas concretos. E quem se aproveitou do vazio foram todos os extremismos, ajudados também pelas *fake news*.

Quem não compreender isto dificilmente poderá ajudar a combater aquele que é um dos piores fenómenos dos nossos tempos.

Bogdan Andrzej Zdrojewski (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Chcę zwrócić uwagę na to, że wybory samorządowe są obszarem niezwykle wrażliwym. Są nie tylko testem dla demokracji, ale także dla prawidłowości funkcjonowania wielu instytucji w poszczególnych krajach, także instytucji europejskich. Do tej pory najczęściej zajmowaliśmy się tymi elementami (i niepokoił się o nie), które są związane z prawami demokratycznymi, z przejrzystością, a także czystością biznesową takich wyborów, czyli przede wszystkim przejrzystością finansową samych komitetów. Dziś otrzymujemy kolejny temat, niezwykle wrażliwy, na który wszyscy zwracamy uwagę już od kilku – podkreślam: od kilku – lat praktycznie bez skutku. Chcę zaznaczyć, że *fake newsy* to już przemysł. To jest poważna gałąź, z której czerpią korzyści prawdopodobnie państwa, a także duże organizacje biznesowe. Wybory to dla tego przemysłu – trzeba to podkreślić – także poważny interes biznesowy i finansowy o niewyobrażalnych skutkach. Zwracam na to uwagę dlatego, że musimy wiedzieć, iż *fake newsy*, ingerencje zewnętrzne, fałszywe komunikaty, fałszywa komunikacja, fałszywe portale społecznościowe są wielkim, bardzo często poważnym elementem bezpieczeństwa i zagrożenia bezpieczeństwa. Chcę zwrócić także uwagę na fakt, iż ta kadencja Parlamentu Europejskiego rozpoczęła się właśnie od pierwszego sprawozdania dotyczącego fałszywych informacji, fałszywych przekazów, ingerencji w życie polityczne Europy, a także życie gospodarcze. Jesteśmy jednak niestety w tym samym punkcie, w którym byliśmy cztery lata temu.

Carlos Coelho (PPE). – Senhor Presidente, Senhores Comissários Jourová e King, Senhora Presidente do Conselho, Caras e Caros Colegas, em abril deste ano questioneei a Comissão Europeia sobre cibersegurança e a salvaguarda da integridade das eleições europeias. Nenhuma resposta foi dada durante largos meses, mas, finalmente, a 12 de setembro foi apresentado um pacote de medidas pelo qual felicito a Comissão Europeia.

Em 2019, como já foi dito, haverá novas eleições para o Parlamento Europeu. Todos queremos prevenir qualquer manipulação eleitoral. Não somos ingénuos e sabemos que são muitas as forças externas, políticas, estatais, económicas e militares, que querem condicionar o processo eleitoral, seja através de *fake news*, utilização de grandes quantidades de dados para manipulação eleitoral, ou através de financiamento a partidos extremistas que querem destruir o projeto europeu.

Todos recordamos, como já fez a Comissária europeia Jourová, a vergonha do caso «Facebook/Cambridge Analytica» e os fortes indícios de ingerência russa nas eleições em território europeu, todos eles utilizando o mundo digital e as novas tecnologias de informação e comunicação.

É, pois, primordial salvaguardar os direitos dos cidadãos europeus nestas eleições. A cibersegurança é, mais do que nunca, prioritária na defesa dos direitos fundamentais da União.

É fulcral que a Comissão e os Estados-Membros tomem as medidas técnicas e organizativas necessárias para gerir os riscos que recaem sobre a segurança das redes e dos sistemas de informação utilizados nas eleições para o Parlamento Europeu.

Numa Europa contaminada por egoísmos e populismos são muitos os que não vão olhar a meios para destruir o projeto europeu e combater a Europa dos valores e das liberdades.

Temos de agir rapidamente pela liberdade.

Lukas Mandl (PPE). – Sehr geehrter Herr Präsident, Frau Kommissarin, Herr Kommissar, liebe Frau Staatssekretärin Karoline Etdstadler! Wir diskutieren darüber, dass Mächte dieser Welt Wahlen in Europa und damit das öffentliche Meinungsklima beeinflussen wollen.

Wir müssen uns fragen: Warum wollen die Europa beeinflussen? Warum findet diese Beeinflussung statt? Und der Grund liegt auf der Hand: Europa ist stark. Europa ist stärker als je zuvor in der Geschichte, weil es geeint ist, weil es dadurch wirtschaftlich stark ist, ein Faktor ist, den manche Mächte auf dieser Welt nicht kooperativ sehen wollen, sondern im Konkurrenzkampf schwächen wollen.

Wer ist das Ziel dieser Schwächungen? Das Ziel dieser Schwächungen, das sind nicht staatliche Institutionen wie vielleicht in der Vergangenheit, sondern das ist jede Einzelne und jeder Einzelne. Das sind Frauen und Männer, die einfach kommunizieren, die Medien konsumieren. Ja, das sind auch unsere Kinder. Was brauchen wir daher? Wir brauchen Cyberabwehr.

Wir müssen in Europa auch diskutieren über *security* – über Sicherheit –, nicht nur über *privacy*. Wir müssen dort investieren, wo die Digitalisierung Kompetenzen verlangt, die die Abwehr gegen solche Gefahren möglich machen. Wir brauchen Bildung, Bildung, Bildung. Unsere Kinder – alle Menschen – müssen zwischen falschen Nachrichten und wahren Nachrichten, zwischen Verschwörungstheorien und einem echten Meinungsaustausch unterscheiden können. Und wir brauchen Pressefreiheit. Ich stimme da der Kollegin Harms sehr deutlich zu: Wir essen ja auch kein rohes Fleisch, aber wir konsumieren ständig Information, die nicht journalistisch recherchiert wurde, sondern völlig ungefiltert auf uns zukommt. Das müssen wir unterscheiden lernen.

Andreas Schwab (PPE). – Herr Präsident, Frau Kommissarin, Frau Staatssekretärin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Gegen Ende dieser Debatte ist es schwierig, nochmals neue Argumente in den Zusammenhang zu stellen. Deswegen möchte ich das, was die Kollegen hier schon vorgetragen haben, ausdrücklich unterstützen. Ich glaube, dass wir nicht nur auf die Frage von Falschinformationen im Zusammenhang mit Resilienz eingehen dürfen, sondern dass wir zwingend auch den Aspekt sehen müssen, dass eben unsere Netze, die digitalen Datennetze, anfälliger sind für Angriffe, weil sich Angriffe, die früher vielleicht auf ein bestimmtes Land gerichtet und angelegt waren, heute sehr einfach innerhalb der Mitgliedstaaten der Europäischen Union, die stark vernetzt sind, verbreiten können.

Deswegen müssen wir auch die Interaktion zwischen beiden Gefahren sehen. Und wenn der Kollege Mandl unmittelbar vor mir darauf hinweist, dass die große Gefahr natürlich darin liegt, dass viele Einzelne kommunizieren, so ist es die Tatsache, dass die Verunsicherung, die durch Attacken entsteht, bei diesen Einzelnen am Ende am stärksten ankommt und gewissermaßen die Demokratie, die demokratische Verfahren in der Europäischen Union mit Angriffen, die vielleicht auf den ersten Blick gar nicht als so gefährlich gelten, verunsichert und in Frage gestellt werden.

Deswegen müssen wir tatsächlich vor der Europawahl – es ist in der Debatte darauf hingewiesen worden – sicherstellen, dass die Mitgliedstaaten ihre Resilienzanstrengungen verstärken und dass es uns gelingt, auch in Zusammenarbeit mit den großen Unternehmen dafür zu sorgen, dass Fake News und andere Falschinformationen tatsächlich auch dort bekämpft werden, wo sie am schnellsten bekämpft werden können.

Lambert van Nistelrooij (PPE). – Voorzitter, commissarissen, staatssecretaris, het is heel goed om dit debat hier te voeren. Democratie, hier in dit huis, maar zeker ook in alle lidstaten, staat voorop. Overal in de wereld zijn wij als waarnemers bij verkiezingen aanwezig. We tellen precies of de stemmen goed in het busje zijn gekomen, en controleren dan de hele procedure eromheen.

Nu zijn we echter zelf in het geding. Eigenlijk is dit een heel serieus moment. Ik heb meegewerkt aan verslagen over de kritische infrastructuur op het internet in Europa. Welnu, onze democratische verkiezingen, alles daaromheen, ons bestel, vormen zo'n kritisch deel van onze infrastructuur, waar we ons niet van buitenaf op moeten laten pakken.

Ik was begin deze maand in Israël. Als je ziet wat zo'n land investeert in hun *cyber security*, in hun weerbaarheid, en je dan daar tegenover zet wat wij in Europa doen, dan moeten we nog de zesde versnelling vinden. Het moet nadrukkelijk zo zijn dat wij bij de assistentie die we op alle niveau voor verkiezingen verlenen, de weerbaarheid vergroten.

Een heel concreet punt, wat ook is genoemd door de commissaris: de check die nu wordt toegepast op een aantal van onze grote platforms zou verplicht moeten zijn. Er zou op al die grote sites en platforms een knop moeten zitten waarop je kunt drukken om aan te geven: ik zie dit bericht, hoe is de financiering tot stand gekomen? Welke beïnvloeding zit erachter? Zijn die filmpjes echt? Het zal anders moeten, omdat de uitdaging ook anders is.

Jiří Pospíšil (PPE). – Pane předsedající, je těžké na konci této debaty přinést ještě nějaké nové myšlenky do takto zásadního tématu. Já chci pouze podtrhnout a zopakovat to, že jsem přesvědčený, že v nadcházejících evropských volbách bude ze strany Ruska velká snaha ovlivnit průběh volebních kampaní v jednotlivých členských státech, a to zvláště v zemích, které patří z pohledu ruské zahraniční doktríny do takzvaného blízkého sousedství. To znamená v zemích, které bohužel v době komunismu spadaly pod vliv Sovětského svazu. To jsou země, kde zkrátka Rusko chce uplatňovat svůj politický a ekonomický vliv a nepřeje si posilování té části společnosti, která je proevropská. Musíme s tím počítat, musíme proti tomu vytvářet osvětovou kampaň, jak na úrovni národních států, tak na úrovni Evropské unie.

Vystupuji zde v pozici europoslance za Českou republiku a my jsme byli svědky toho, kdy i při posledních volbách, prezidentských volbách, které proběhly před několika měsíci v České republice, zkrátka a dobře, proevropský kandidát na prezidenta čelil velkým mediálním útokům, čelil *fake news*, které proti němu byly šířeny ve statisících mailů, které byly rozesílány a kde byla právě zkreslována témata, která souvisí s evropskou agendou. Byla zkreslována témata, jako je třeba otázka migrace. Musíme počítat s tím, že téma migrace bude ze strany nepřátel Evropské unie výrazně zneužito.

Julian King, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, this is a vitally important subject that we're debating this afternoon. Foreign, domestic, sometimes criminal, actors have, without doubt, sought to break the rules, sought to interfere in our democratic processes and raised questions about our democratic institutions. Make no mistake: that does represent a security challenge.

We, from the Commission side, agree with those of you who say that we need to take action on a number of fronts: we need to build our cybersecurity and our resilience against cyberattacks, we need to tackle cyber manipulation through dis— and misinformation, and we need to tackle the misuse of mined personal data.

We also agree that we need to call out examples of interference. I want to join those of you who have praised the excellent work carried out by the EU's East Stratcom Task Force, which, over the last couple of years, has now gathered more than 4 000 cases of pro-Kremlin disinformation, contradicting publicly available facts, repeated in a number of languages and on a number of occasions. These activities basically reflect a public Russian military doctrine which openly advertises the use of false data and destabilising propaganda as legitimate tools.

As a number of you have also observed, unfortunately it is not only Russia. Others are going down this route as well, which is why we also need to tackle the underlying vulnerabilities. We need to build our resilience through longer term actions – as many of you have said – on education, independent media and building critical awareness, but also through some shorter-term, more immediate actions, not least with the upcoming European parliamentary elections in mind.

So we are pushing for early agreement on the Cybersecurity Act, the package of measures that we have proposed to try and build our cybersecurity and resilience. I note that in the US Congress they've just acted to create a US Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency. I think it is high time we followed that example.

We're also acting to tackle cyber criminality. We will continue to support Europol, who have in EC3 an internationally recognised centre of excellence in tackling cyber criminality. But, more generally, we need to work for transparency, traceability and the accountability of cyber criminals, which is why it is so important that we make progress on evidence. Without fast and effective access to electronic evidence, it is very hard to hold cyber criminals to account.

As well as those steps, we need to tackle cyber manipulation and on that, building on the measures we presented last April in our communication on tackling online disinformation, we have – as has been mentioned – now agreed, in what is actually internationally a first, a Code of Practice on Disinformation with the big social media platforms, the big news platforms.

We've asked those platforms to restrict targeting options for political advertising, to ensure transparency around sponsored content, to step up their efforts to identify and delete fake accounts, and to establish clear rules around bots. There should also be greater clarity around algorithms – as has been mentioned in this debate – and information on how they prioritise the content that that we see. This needs to be combined with tools enabling users more easily to discover content and access new sources representing alternative points of view, as well as to report disinformation.

I think this code is a good starting point, but we need to go further. We need to press the platforms now to deliver granular, measurable objectives that we can hold them to account against. We will do that work, as a number of you have asked, as we prepare the action plan for early December.

We still hope that we can see sufficient progress by working quickly together on a voluntary basis, but we've been clear that we reserve the right to consider our options again if we don't see the progress that we need.

As my colleague, Commissioner Jourová, mentioned earlier, in September President Juncker presented a set of measures specifically on election security, asking Member States to set up a national election cooperation network of all the relevant authorities. We have brought them together – representatives from each of the Member States, those responsible for running elections, those responsible for cybersecurity, and those responsible for data protection – and we will build an effective European-level network so that those experts can share best practice and support each other, and we can build our collective resilience.

From the Commission side, we very much welcome your strong engagement on these issues. As we've said before in these debates, raising awareness is the first line of defence, but, in itself, it is not enough. We need to go further. We need to maximise our preparedness ahead of the series of elections that are coming up. We are committed to working with you, with Member States and with the private sector better to secure the foundations of our democracy: free speech, freedom of expression, and indeed the right of all of those who have spoken today, including those who attacked the Commission.

Karoline Edtstadler, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Mr President, it's quite difficult at the end of the debate to say something new in this debate, because I would like to say that this very useful debate showed and demonstrated a high degree of convergence between the European Parliament's and the Council's and also the Commissioner's view on the importance of EU resilience against any influence of foreign actors in the upcoming EP election campaign – and I would like to emphasise this – no matter from which country it is evolving.

I fully second what Commissioner King said: we have a lot to do in a lot of different areas and regarding different topics. It is clear that it is still work in progress, and I'm looking forward to further results in the short— and the medium-term.

Let me assure you of our firm commitment to continuing the work that I outlined already at the beginning of our debate and of our readiness to adopt and effectively implement concrete measures to protect the internet and the cyberspace from criminal misuse. It is clear that these objectives cannot be met without common efforts to ensure a free, open, safe and secure cyberspace and in close cooperation with other public and private stakeholders. This work is actively supported by the contractual public-private partnership on cybersecurity between the European Commission and the European Cyber Security Organisation. But I doubt that we will be able to complete this work at any time. Our work in the cyber domain is now far away from being completed, and against a background of the developing technology, we have to work a lot also in the future – I'm convinced of that.

We need to join forces – and also that was mentioned by the Commissioner – to raise the awareness of all stakeholders, to encourage action, and to improve the capacities and capabilities of the EU and its Member States to tackle the ever-growing sophistication of cyber-attacks and evolving cyber-threats around the world. We need to make good use of all the EU initiatives directed at increasing cyber resilience and invest in the implementation of all recently announced measures. We also need to strengthen the existing framework, based on current experience, to provide more comprehensive response to the constantly evolving challenges which rigorously protect the fundamental rights and freedoms of our citizens.

Przewodniczący. – Zamykam debatę.

Oświadczenia pisemne (art. 162)

Clara Eugenia Aguilera García (S&D), por escrito. – En los próximos meses comenzará la campaña electoral para las próximas elecciones al Parlamento Europeo y la UE debe redoblar esfuerzos para que el derecho fundamental de participación política y de elección democrática no se vea interferido por una guerra híbrida de intoxicación, ciberterrorismo, manipulación ni chantaje de ninguna manera. Desafortunadamente, en los últimos años hemos asistido a un conjunto de episodios de injerencia delictiva en procesos electorales y consultas y referendos en Estados miembros de la Unión. Por todo ello, es necesario que el alto grado de convergencia entre las tres instituciones en esta materia se refleje en la rápida adopción de las medidas propuestas por la Comisión, que incluye el establecimiento de redes de cooperación electoral a nivel nacional y de la UE; la puesta en marcha de orientaciones sobre la aplicación de las normas de protección de datos en el contexto electoral y de recomendaciones sobre una mayor transparencia en la publicidad y la comunicación política en línea remunerada; el refuerzo de la ciberseguridad; la aplicación diligente de las normas electorales existentes; y la entrada en vigor de una propuesta legislativa que permita sancionar el uso indebido de los datos personales con fines electorales.

Monika Beňová (S&D), písomne. – Opakované pokusy a skúsenosti so zasahovaním do volieb a predvolebnej kampane ukazujú, že demokratické procesy je nevyhnutné dôsledne chrániť. Týka sa to najmä cieľeného obmedzovania masových diskreditačných kampaní založených na absolútnych nezmysloch a dezinformáciách v online prostredí, šírených často zo zahraničia. Zneužívanie lži a dezinformácií v politickom boji pritom nie je žiadnou novinkou. Predovšetkým v prostredí sociálnych sietí sa však šíria rýchlejšie a ich vplyv tak má omnoho väčší dosah. Falošné správy sa vďaka tomu stali istým druhom zbrane, ktorá je hrozbou pre našu spoločnosť. Na neustále sa vyvíjajúce kybernetické hrozby tak musíme reagovať posilňovaním bezpečnosti. Jediným účelom šírenia škodlivého obsahu na internete je vznik pochybností, nevraživosti a rozdelenia v spoločnosti.

José Blanco López (S&D), por escrito. – En los próximos meses comenzará la campaña electoral para las próximas elecciones al Parlamento Europeo y la UE debe redoblar esfuerzos para que el derecho fundamental de participación política y de elección democrática no se vea interferido por una guerra híbrida de intoxicación, ciberterrorismo, manipulación ni chantaje de ninguna manera. Desafortunadamente, en los últimos años hemos asistido a un conjunto de episodios de injerencia delictiva en procesos electorales y consultas y referendos en Estados miembros de la Unión. Por todo ello, es necesario que el alto grado de convergencia entre las tres instituciones en esta materia se refleje en la rápida adopción de las medidas propuestas por la Comisión, que incluye el establecimiento de redes de cooperación electoral a nivel nacional y de la UE; la puesta en marcha de orientaciones sobre la aplicación de las normas de protección de datos en el contexto electoral y de recomendaciones sobre una mayor transparencia en la publicidad y la comunicación política en línea remunerada; el refuerzo de la ciberseguridad; la aplicación diligente de las normas electorales existentes; y la entrada en vigor de una propuesta legislativa que permita sancionar el uso indebido de los datos personales con fines electorales.

Soledad Cabezón Ruiz (S&D), por escrito. – En los próximos meses comenzará la campaña electoral para las próximas elecciones al Parlamento Europeo y la UE debe redoblar esfuerzos para que el derecho fundamental de participación política y de elección democrática no se vea interferido por una guerra híbrida de intoxicación, ciberterrorismo, manipulación ni chantaje de ninguna manera. Desafortunadamente, en los últimos años hemos asistido a un conjunto de episodios de injerencia delictiva en procesos electorales y consultas y referendos en Estados miembros de la Unión. Por todo ello, es necesario que el alto grado de convergencia entre las tres instituciones en esta materia se refleje en la rápida adopción de las medidas propuestas por la Comisión, que incluye el establecimiento de redes de cooperación electoral a nivel nacional y de la UE; la puesta en marcha de orientaciones sobre la aplicación de las normas de protección de datos en el contexto electoral y de recomendaciones sobre una mayor transparencia en la publicidad y la comunicación política en línea remunerada; el refuerzo de la ciberseguridad; la aplicación diligente de las normas electorales existentes; y la entrada en vigor de una propuesta legislativa que permita sancionar el uso indebido de los datos personales con

fines electorales.

Iratxe García Pérez (S&D), *por escrito*. – En los próximos meses comenzará la campaña electoral para las próximas elecciones al Parlamento Europeo y la UE debe redoblar esfuerzos para que el derecho fundamental de participación política y de elección democrática no se vea interferido por una guerra híbrida de intoxicación, ciberterrorismo, manipulación ni chantaje de ninguna manera. Desafortunadamente, en los últimos años hemos asistido a un conjunto de episodios de injerencia delictiva en procesos electorales y consultas y referendos en Estados miembros de la Unión. Por todo ello, es necesario que el alto grado de convergencia entre las tres instituciones en esta materia se refleje en la rápida adopción de las medidas propuestas por la Comisión, que incluyen el establecimiento de redes de cooperación electoral a nivel nacional y de la UE; la puesta en marcha de orientaciones sobre la aplicación de las normas de protección de datos en el contexto electoral y de recomendaciones sobre una mayor transparencia en la publicidad y la comunicación política en línea remunerada; el refuerzo de la ciberseguridad; la aplicación diligente de las normas electorales existentes; y la entrada en vigor de una propuesta legislativa que permita sancionar el uso indebido de los datos personales con fines electorales.

Eider Gardiazabal Rubial (S&D), *por escrito*. – En los próximos meses comenzará la campaña electoral para las próximas elecciones al Parlamento Europeo y la UE debe redoblar esfuerzos para que el derecho fundamental de participación política y de elección democrática no se vea interferido por una guerra híbrida de intoxicación, ciberterrorismo, manipulación ni chantaje de ninguna manera. Desafortunadamente, en los últimos años hemos asistido a un conjunto de episodios de injerencia delictiva en procesos electorales y consultas y referendos en Estados miembros de la Unión. Por todo ello, es necesario que el alto grado de convergencia entre las tres instituciones en esta materia se refleje en la rápida adopción de las medidas propuestas por la Comisión, que incluye el establecimiento de redes de cooperación electoral a nivel nacional y de la UE; la puesta en marcha de orientaciones sobre la aplicación de las normas de protección de datos en el contexto electoral y de recomendaciones sobre una mayor transparencia en la publicidad y la comunicación política en línea remunerada; el refuerzo de la ciberseguridad; la aplicación diligente de las normas electorales existentes; y la entrada en vigor de una propuesta legislativa que permita sancionar el uso indebido de los datos personales con fines electorales.

Enrique Guerrero Salom (S&D), *por escrito*. – En los próximos meses comenzará la campaña electoral para las próximas elecciones al Parlamento Europeo y la UE debe redoblar esfuerzos para que el derecho fundamental de participación política y de elección democrática no se vea interferido por una guerra híbrida de intoxicación, ciberterrorismo, manipulación ni chantaje de ninguna manera. Desafortunadamente, en los últimos años hemos asistido a un conjunto de episodios de injerencia delictiva en procesos electorales y consultas y referendos en Estados miembros de la Unión. Por todo ello, es necesario que el alto grado de convergencia entre las tres instituciones en esta materia se refleje en la rápida adopción de las medidas propuestas por la Comisión, que incluye el establecimiento de redes de cooperación electoral a nivel nacional y de la UE; la puesta en marcha de orientaciones sobre la aplicación de las normas de protección de datos en el contexto electoral y de recomendaciones sobre una mayor transparencia en la publicidad y la comunicación política en línea remunerada; el refuerzo de la ciberseguridad; la aplicación diligente de las normas electorales existentes; y la entrada en vigor de una propuesta legislativa que permita sancionar el uso indebido de los datos personales con fines electorales.

Eva Maydell (PPE), *in writing*. – Two main elements of our democracy and electoral process that are under attack: the first – you can call it fake news, disinformation etc. We have lost the sense of what is true and false. The problem is 'more information, but less informed'. We have already started working with the big online platforms to make the internet a better and more reliable place for information and facts. Yet, we are competing for the attention of our citizens with Russian trolls, terrorist organisations and populists. The only way to win is to offer our citizens a logical narrative, based on principles and facts, filled with brave but conceivable ideas for the future.

The second element is our election infrastructure. It is obvious that we should re-conceptualise the use of technology in the process, so the voting rolls, the act of voting, tabulation and results are secure to external influence. We should also reform our election administration, with a focus on resilience to cyber-attacks.

Today, foreign interference aims not only to support one candidate in a race, but also to ruin the basic mechanism that our societies use to make decisions. With no credible elections our societies will end up divided, perplexed and in deep confrontation.

Pirkko Ruohonen-Lerner (ECR), *kirjallinen*. – Kansalaisten luottamus poliittiseen järjestelmään on horjunut. Tästä kertoo se, että monissa maissa äänestysaktiivisuus jää alhaiselle tasolle. Tämä koskettaa erityisesti Euroopan parlamentin vaaleja, joissa äänestysaktiivisuus jää usein alle 40 prosentin. Tähän ongelmaan meidän on keksittävä ratkaisuja.

Vaaleissa pääomapiirit ja erilaiset edunvalvontajärjestöt pyrkivät saamaan omia ehdokkaitaan valituiksi keskeisiin luottamustehtäviin eduskuntaan, hallitukseen ja Euroopan parlamenttiin. Tavoitteena tietysti on, että vaalirahalla sponsoroidut edustajat edistävät tehtävissään erityisesti rahoittajiensa asioita. Vaalikampanjat ylipäättänsä ovat usein liian pelkistettyjä ja yliampuvia, jopa harhaanjohtavia ja poliittisia vastustajia mustamaalaavia, mikä entisestään hämmentää epävarmoja äänestäjiä.

Verkossa ja perinteisessäkin mediassa jatkuvasti yleistynyt disinformaatio on yksi suurimmista haasteista eurooppalaisen demokratian toteutumiselle. Mitä laajemmin disinformaatiota levitetään sosiaalisessa mediassa, valeutisissa, valetietokirjoissa ja valevideoissa, sitä vähemmän ihmiset uskovat minkään vastaanottamansa informaation luotettavuuteen. Jokaisen vastaavan päätoimittajan ja julkaisujohtajan tulisi tämä ymmärtää ja kantaa vastuunsa siitä, että julkaistaan vain tosiasioita. Lukijan, kuulijan ja katsojan pitää voida helposti erottaa faktat ja fiktiot toisistaan. Pelkkä liikevaihtoon tuijottaminen ei saisi olla missään julkaisu- tai toiminnassa pääasia. On tärkeää korostaa korkealaatuisen toimituksellisen työn merkitystä sekä toimittajien aseman ja riippumattoman median vahvistamista. Kansalaisten on saatava luotettavaa ja laadukasta tietoa, jotta kansanvalta voi toteutua. Pidän hyvänä komission esittämiä toimia vapaiden ja oikeudenmukaisten vaalien turvaamiseksi, esimerkiksi poliittisen verkkomainonnan ja sen kohdentamisen läpinäkyvyyden lisäämistä, samoin eurooppalaisten puolueiden vaalirahoitussääntöjen tiukennuksia.

Indrek Tarand (Verts/ALE), *in writing*. – Elections are the foundation that gives legitimacy to the democratic system as a whole, to the legislature and the executive branch. This is why the exercise of undue influence by foreign malicious actors is such a serious problem: this behaviour seeks to undermine the legitimacy of the entire democratic system by eroding its foundations.

In the age of social media and targeted advertising, it becomes more difficult to enforce existing rules, for example the ones forbidding the use of foreign money. The internet does not know national borders; therefore, the sponsor of a politically targeted advertisement (which could even contain blatant lies masquerading as facts or news) could be located anywhere. This is why, as a bare minimum, we need more transparency regarding political targeted advertising: who purchased it and where the target audience is located.

It might be healthier to ban political targeted advertising on social media altogether; one thing is to use it to sell commercial goods, but using it to influence or even manipulate the democratic choice of citizens is something entirely different. A comprehensive approach is required, since 'hacking' of elections is not limited to actual ballot fraud, but also includes undue manipulation of voters themselves.

22. Jernbanepassagerers rettigheder og forpligtelser (forhandling)

Przewodniczący. – Kolejnym punktem porządku dziennego jest sprawozdanie sporządzone przez Bogusława Liberadzkiego w imieniu Komisji Transportu i Turystyki w sprawie wniosku dotyczącego rozporządzenia Parlamentu Europejskiego i Rady w sprawie praw i obowiązków pasażerów w ruchu kolejowym (wersja przekształcona) (COM(2017)0548 - C8-0324/2017 - 2017/0237(COD)) (A8-0340/2018).

Bogusław Liberadzki, sprawozdawca. – Panie Przewodniczący Krasnodębski! Pani Komisarz Bulc! Panie i Panowie! Niech mi będzie wolno zacząć od stwierdzenia: jest to bardzo ważny dzień naszej debaty w sprawie rozwoju praw konsumenta, specyficznego konsumenta, jakim są pasażerowie transportu kolejowego w Europie. Chodzi o ponad cztery miliardy osób, które w ciągu roku podróżują kolejami. Chodzi także o miliony pracowników zatrudnionych w transporcie kolejowym, a zatem o kompleksowe i kluczowo ważne przedsięwzięcie na bardzo dużą skalę.

Od razu na wstępie chciałbym podziękować za świetną współpracę swoim kontrsprawozdawcom, szczególnie panu Denisowi de Jong, który w imieniu komisji IMCO współuczestniczył w pracach nad przygotowaniem sprawozdania. Chcę podkreślić wysoką gotowość do współpracy ze strony Komisji i na ręce pani komisarz Bulc złożyć podziękowania.

Zacznę od tego, co Parlament może osiągnąć dzięki jutrzejszemu głosowaniu. Pierwszą i zasadniczą sprawą, jeżeli chodzi o prawa pasażerów, są rekompensaty za opóźnienia pociągów. Proponujemy zwiększenie kwot rekompensat do 100 % w przypadku opóźnienia powyżej 121 minut. Zdaję sobie sprawę, że nie będzie to łatwe. Ewentualnym rozwiązaniem alternatywnym byłaby rekompensata w wysokości 100 % przy opóźnieniu powyżej 180 minut.

Drugą sprawą, szczególnie istotną i godną podkreślenia, jest zwiększenie dostępności biletów łączonych, tzw. *through-tickets*, w przypadku pasażerów, którzy utracą połączenia, gdyż bilety były przeznaczone na przesiadkę. Będą oni mieli prawo do zajęcia miejsca w następnym pociągu bez żadnych dodatkowych kosztów.

Kolejną sprawą są ułatwienia dostępu dla podróżnych o ograniczonej zdolności ruchowej: grupa osób, którym chcemy umożliwić dostęp do środków mobilnych, jest bardzo duża i rosnąca. Proponujemy oczywiście, żeby na stacjach najwyższej kategorii, które obsługują co najmniej 10 tys. pasażerów na dobę, nie było *prenotification*, a następnie trzygodzinne powiadomienia na stacjach mniejszych i dwunastogodzinne powiadomienia na najmniejszych.

Otwieramy także kolej na przewozy rowerów. Proponujemy, aby w pociągu można było przewieźć do ośmiu rowerów. Z czasem przepis ten dotyczyć będzie każdego pociągu. Chcemy także rozszerzyć zakres rozporządzenia o ochronie praw pasażerskich nie tylko na pociągi międzynarodowe i krajowe, ale także na pociągi regionalne, aby te same prawa obowiązywały w tych właśnie pociągach na terenie całej Unii Europejskiej. Jest to jedna strona medalu.

Jednocześnie chcemy bardzo wyraźnie podkreślić, że rozwiązanie to ma mobilizować państwa i rządy do większej troski o jakość infrastruktury kolejowej, o tabor kolejowy, a także o dostępność ekonomiczną i fizyczną transportu dla pasażerów. Chcemy, aby transport kolejowy stał się alternatywą, by wszystkie jego zalety, takie jak ekologia, tani dostęp, niezawodność czy bezpieczeństwo, mogły znaleźć tutaj swoje miejsce. Chcielibyśmy także – i w tym kierunku zmierza to rozwiązanie – wyrównywać szanse konkurowania i reguły konkurowania transportu kolejowego z innymi gałęziami transportu. Jeszcze raz dziękuję za współpracę i czekam na państwa debatę.

Violeta Bulc, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, I would also like to thank very much the rapporteur from the Committee on Transport and Tourism (TRAN), Mr Liberadzki, and the shadow rapporteurs, as well as the Committee on the Internal Market and Consumer Protection (IMCO) for their intensive and very dedicated work on the Commission's proposal to recast the Rail Passengers' Rights Regulation.

It is indeed, as Mr Liberadzki already said, a unique opportunity to improve rail passengers' protection and, at the same time, to ensure further development of the rail sector, which also has an essential role to play in the development of multi-modal, integrated mobility as a service solution and in decarbonisation of transport.

First of all, let me stress that the Commission very much welcomes Parliament's objective to promote more attractive rail services and better passenger protection, but allow me to comment on some of your specific amendments.

First, on amendments beyond the recast legislative technique: we do have some institutional concerns over specific amendments which are not in line with the rules agreed between our institutions for the recast legislative technique. Some changes, such as the compensation levels in cases of service delay or cancellations, are not part of the Commission's legislative proposal. This said, we fully understand and share your good intentions to increase passengers' protection in the sector and we will examine the respective provisions put forward in detail taking account of the Commission's prerogative of legislative initiative. Of course, for those provisions which have been included in the Commission's recast proposal and which have undergone significant amendment following the EP debate, for example, regulation on through tickets, we stand ready to actively participate in the upcoming interinstitutional discussions.

On persons with reduced mobility, it really goes without saying that we are very much in favour of increasing, to the most feasible and realistic extent, the mobility of all European citizens. We, therefore, very much value Parliament's effort to improve the situation of persons with disabilities and reduced mobility. We are open to those amendments that can lay solid ground for generally improving the mobility of these citizens in need. Allow me just to share one very concrete example that I was able to directly witness and experience – when we made the special effort to make it happen for a person with disabilities to also use the European programme Discover EU and travel with different modes, primarily railway, throughout the EU and be part of this exciting programme for the youth. It's a really good example of how we can improve conditions and how we can really enable all European citizens to be able to take advantage of European programmes. So, that's very much appreciated, Mr Liberadzki.

On bicycles, it will be of no surprise to you that I also welcome those amendments which may further contribute to increasing the use of ecologically friendly transport modes such as bicycles. The Commission shares your enthusiasm about new mobility opportunities. Further efforts will be needed in order to ensure that there are no loopholes on this path. For example, passengers shall be properly informed about those new opportunities. We shall also ensure that when train capacity for taking bicycles on board is reached, any possible refusal takes place on transparent and justifiable grounds.

On passenger information, I would also like to stress that the Commission welcomes amendments that increase the level of rail passenger information about their rights, the journey opportunities offered to them, as well as events and outcomes surrounding the trip.

On derogations, we will not be able to truly promote the interests of EU rail passengers and the single market if our legal provisions are accompanied by a widespread practice of granting derogations. The Commission therefore supports increased limitations on such derogation possibilities, which should be based on a purely balanced approach taking into account both passengers' and industrial interests.

To conclude, I am convinced that all efforts invested in this legislative file will pay off. Improving the current rules would not only increase the mobility of EU citizens and open new opportunities, but also open new opportunities to them. It would also contribute to enhancing competition in the rail sector and also improve rail services. In turn, all this will increase the overall attractiveness of rail transport, to the benefit of passengers, industry, and our environment.

Once again, I would really like to express my appreciation of Parliament's work on improving rail passengers' protection and I look forward to today's debate.

Dennis de Jong, *Rapporteur voor advies van de Commissie interne markt en consumentenbescherming*. – Hartelijk dank aan de rapporteur van de Commissie vervoer en toerisme voor de goede samenwerking en natuurlijk dank aan de vele IMCO-leden en schaduwrapporteurs die hebben meegewerkt aan het oorspronkelijke advies van de Commissie interne markt en consumentenbescherming, dat ze uiteindelijk vrijwel unaniem konden aanvaarden. Dat is een goed signaal voor de passagiers.

Ik denk dat het eindresultaat heel goed is, zeker wat betreft compensatie. Ik ben het niet eens met de Commissie dat dit buiten de herschikking zou zijn. We hebben daar duidelijke rechtvaardigingen voor. Je kunt de passagiers echter niet uitleggen dat ze maar de helft van de ticketprijs vergoed krijgen als ze meer dan twee uur vertraging hebben. Dat hoort gewoon aangepakt te worden in dit initiatief. Er is goed nieuws voor de mensen met een beperking. Zij kunnen snel op assistentie rekenen en hoeven niet dagen van tevoren te melden dat ze naar een station komen. De fietsen zijn gemeld, dat was ook belangrijk.

Er is eigenlijk maar één punt dat overblijft. Laten we er alsjeblieft niet voor zorgen dat spoorwegen kunnen zeggen dat het slecht weer was en dat je daardoor je rechten als passagier verliest. We hebben te veel blaadjes op het spoor gezien, ook in Nederland, als excuus. Dat moeten we niet willen. Daar moeten we morgen bij de stemming nog goed uitkomen.

Renaud Muselier, *au nom du groupe PPE*. – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Commissaire, mes chers collègues, c'est un grand jour pour nous et pour les millions d'usagers du train.

Pour la première fois, grâce à ce règlement, l'Europe va enfin prendre en compte les usagers. Jusqu'à présent, l'Union européenne s'était toujours occupée des entreprises ferroviaires et des gestionnaires d'infrastructures. Il était tout à fait anormal que les principaux intéressés, les usagers, soient laissés de côté. Le dernier rapport date de 2007, on a attendu dix ans! Dix ans plus tard, cette injustice va enfin pouvoir être réparée, et ce sur l'ensemble du réseau ferroviaire européen. Vous nous parlez de dérogations, nous n'en voulons pas, nous avons déjà perdu assez de temps. Les lignes régionales et les lignes transfrontalières vont aussi être régies par ces nouvelles règles, c'est une excellente nouvelle. N'oubliez jamais que 90 % des passagers ferroviaires européens se servent de ces lignes régionales au quotidien.

Quels sont les principaux engagements de cette réforme déterminante? Ils reposent sur quatre piliers. Premièrement: l'indemnisation. Si votre train a une heure de retard, un remboursement de 50 % est alors prévu, c'est bien normal. S'il a deux heures de retard, ce qui n'est pas acceptable sur le continent européen, le remboursement est dans ce cas de 100 %. Voilà la norme.

Deuxièmement, en cas de correspondance manquée, quelle qu'en soit la raison, les opérateurs sont tenus de vous réacheminer jusqu'à votre prochaine destination. Ils ne peuvent pas vous laisser sur le bord du quai. Grâce à ce billet unique, peu importe l'opérateur, celui-ci devra assumer ses obligations sans le moindre coût additionnel. Le far west ferroviaire, c'est fini!

Troisièmement: l'assistance. Madame la Commissaire, vous parlez de tentative. Il n'en est rien. Avec ce dossier, nous devons garantir aux 80 millions de personnes handicapées ou à mobilité réduite qu'elles seront prises en charge dans toutes les grandes gares d'Europe, mais aussi dans les petites gares moyennant une pré-notification de trois heures. La mobilité pour tous sera la réalité de demain. On ne peut pas laisser les personnes à mobilité réduite sur le bord de la route.

Enfin, quatrièmement: la mobilité durable. Chaque train, à partir de 2024, devra prévoir huit places pour les vélos. C'est un grand pas pour une mobilité plus douce et respectueuse et c'est une mesure essentielle pour tenir nos engagements pris dans le cadre de la COP.

Il faut savoir que le ferroviaire est le mode de transport le plus subventionné en Europe par les deniers publics. Il est quand même un peu anormal que ce service soit moins bien perçu par les usagers que les autres modes de transport, notamment l'avion.

Enfin, grâce à ce dossier, les usagers du rail profiteront d'un service de meilleure qualité que dans les transports aériens. Et pour la première fois, l'Europe s'occupe des usagers du rail. Alors je demande clairement à la Commission européenne et au Conseil de ne pas revenir en arrière lors des négociations à venir. Vous nous parlez des entreprises, on en a beaucoup parlé et on les a beaucoup protégées depuis dix ans. Maintenant, je souhaiterais qu'on s'occupe essentiellement des passagers.

C'est un dossier éminemment politique et d'autant plus important à l'approche des élections européennes. Les millions d'usagers du train y seront particulièrement vigilants.

Lucy Anderson, on behalf of the S&D Group. – Mr President, this regulation provides a vital chance to help get a better deal for rail passengers. The European Parliament must not fail them by caving in to rail industry lobbying. The top complaint of train travellers is delays and cancellations. That fact is not just anecdotal, but is acknowledged independently by the International Rail Regulators' Group and the European Court of Auditors.

So, particularly problematic is the Commission's proposal for the introduction of a so-called 'force majeure' clause, seeking to allow rail companies to refuse to pay compensation to passengers for delays and cancellations in certain circumstances, including severe weather conditions. This aims to reverse a key passenger-friendly decision of the EU Court of Justice in 2013.

Worse still, is the version of 'force majeure' proposed by our own European Parliament Committee on Transport and Tourism (TRAN), which could even be interpreted to include lawful strikes and other industrial action. Whilst the TRAN Committee's amendments do have some good points, as our rapporteur has explained, they allow exemptions for sub-urban rail services, despite evidence showing that these are the most widely used services by passengers across Europe, especially younger people. Under the TRAN Committee's amendments, passengers will only have the right to onward travel on the next train in the course of delays and cancellations where a connection is missed in the course of a single transport contract. In real life, this is often not the case when tickets are bought separately.

So, in the vote tomorrow, I urge all MEPs to support the alternative approach tabled by myself and many others: in particular, do not make rail passengers suffer still further for the consequences of external factors causing problems with their journeys.

Kosma Złotowski, w imieniu grupy ECR. – Panie Przewodniczący! Pani komisarz! Oczywiście kolej stanowi bardzo ważny element systemu transportu publicznego, także dzięki inwestycjom dofinansowywanym z budżetu Unii Europejskiej. Chcemy, żeby coraz większa liczba osób wybierała właśnie ten środek lokomocji, ale do tego potrzebny jest nie tylko nowoczesny tabor (który staje się coraz nowocześniejszy), ale także istotne zmiany przepisów, które wzmocnią pozycję i prawa pasażerów w ruchu kolejowym. I to właśnie teraz robimy.

To sprawozdanie w znacznym stopniu stanowi odpowiedź na oczekiwania konsumentów, szczególnie w takich obszarach jak odszkodowania czy obowiązki przewoźnika w przypadku opóźnienia pociągów. Nasze jutrzejsze głosowanie ma również ogromne znaczenie dla poprawy sytuacji osób niepełnosprawnych podróżujących koleją, które dzisiaj napotykały liczne bariery już na etapie kupna biletu. Problem stanowi także dostęp do asysty przy wsiadaniu do pociągu czy nawet samo uzyskanie informacji na dworcach kolejowych. Chcemy te ograniczenia zlikwidować.

Rozumiem obawy operatorów, którzy teraz będą ponosili z tytułu tych zmian dodatkowe koszty, ale jestem również przekonany, że pozwoli to podnieść jakość usług kolejowych i przyczyni się do przyciągnięcia nowych pasażerów, którzy chętniej wybierali do tej pory inne środki transportu.

No cóż, z kilku wypowiedzi wynikało, że dotąd ulegaliśmy lobby kolejowemu – tym razem ulegliśmy lobby pasażerskiemu.

Jens Rohde, on behalf of the ALDE Group. – Mr President, it is time to end the Member States' protection of their national rail companies and replace it with the protection of rail passengers. For the ALDE Group, that means we want to introduce compulsory through-ticketing systems for passengers. We want the Commission to develop an EU complaint form for use in the event of cancellations or delays. We want, in the case of missed connections due to delay or cancellation, to ensure a passenger the right to take the next service available. We also want to encourage railway undertakings and ticket vendors to develop an automatic compensation system. We want to push for an exchange of information between ticket vendors and the railway undertaking; we want to rationalise the compensation rates; we want to ensure spaces for bicycles; and, of course, as mentioned by my colleagues, we want to ensure better assistance for people with reduced mobility.

Let me say to Ms Anderson, the ALDE Group will support her amendment tomorrow. We too want to delete the *force majeure* provision, and I want to thank Ms Anderson for putting this amendment forward.

If we want to shift more transport from other modes to rail, those demands should not be too much to ask for. *En marche!* as they say in France.

Michael Cramer, *im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, Frau Kommissarin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Nur eine Minderheit der Mitgliedstaaten hat die vor fast zehn Jahren beschlossenen Fahrgastrechte komplett umgesetzt. Deshalb finde ich es gut, dass wir heute hier tätig werden.

Es freut mich, dass wir für die Fahrradmitnahme einen starken Kompromiss gefunden haben. Das kann jeder nachempfinden, der mich kennt. Das Europäische Parlament will, dass wir in naher Zukunft verpflichtende Stellplätze in allen Zügen haben – ohne Schlupflöcher wie bisher. Dadurch werden die Kunden nicht mehr gezwungen, ihre Fahrräder mit anderen Verkehrsträgern zu befördern.

Eine große Mehrheit ist auch für das Durchgangsticket. Kein Wunder! Durchgangsfahrten waren schon 1923 durch internationale Übereinkommen der maßgebliche Standard. Davon sind wir heute weit entfernt. 67 % der Fahrgäste sind für einheitliche Rechte für die gesamte Bahnreise vom Anfang bis zum Ende, auch wenn man umsteigen muss, sogar mehrmals umsteigen muss.

Gerade bei grenzüberschreitenden Verbindungen ist dies jedoch kaum verfügbar. Voraussetzung für Durchgangstickets sind zugängliche Reiseinformationen und Buchungssysteme. Für die dafür nötigen offenen Schnittstellen, die *open data*, haben wir starke Formulierungen gefunden, damit sich dies in Zukunft auch verbessert.

Für vollwertige Fahrgäste müssen wir aber grundsätzlich den Ausnahmezustand „Höhere Gewalt“ streichen. Ich hatte mich schon immer – auch bei den Verhandlungen – dafür eingesetzt. Bisher gab es diesen Tatbestand bei der Bahn ja gar nicht. Die Einführung von *force majeure* würde zu einer knapp inakzeptablen Rechtsunsicherheit zulasten der Passagiere führen. Nur ein winziger Teil der Verspätungen wird überhaupt durch *force majeure* überhaupt verursacht. Die willkürlichen Auslegungen der Fluggesellschaften sollten uns unbedingt eine Warnung sein.

Der Rechnungshof hat das in seinem aktuellen Bericht ebenfalls bestätigt. Ein Reifendefekt war für eine Fluggesellschaft *force majeure*, das ist verrückt, aber traurige Realität.

Ein weiteres Problem ist die Assistenz an Bahnhöfen, ohne Voranmeldezeit. Nur an Bahnhöfen mit mehr als zehntausend Passagieren am Tag können mobilitätseingeschränkte Personen eine spontane Assistenz in Anspruch nehmen. 97 % der Bahnhöfe würden von dieser Regelung somit ausgenommen sein. Das ist für mich und erst recht für die mobilitätseingeschränkten Menschen keine akzeptable Regelung. Das müssen wir ändern.

Tania González Peñas, *en nombre del Grupo GUE/NGL*. – Señor presidente, este informe propone avances significativos en cuanto al trato que se da a los pasajeros de tren, y esperamos que suponga un paso importante para mejorar la calidad del servicio.

El tren debe ser el medio de transporte del futuro. Es el más sostenible, el más seguro, el que permite mayor vertebración territorial y accesibilidad. Y, por lo tanto, debemos incentivar su uso y hacerlo más atractivo para los usuarios y las usuarias. Algunos aspectos positivos son que con esta propuesta maximizamos la información disponible para el usuario, aseguramos que los usuarios de bicicletas pueden acceder al tren sin riesgo para la seguridad de los demás viajeros, priorizamos la reubicación sin perjuicio de las compensaciones y reembolsos en caso de cancelación de un servicio y garantizamos un protocolo de reclamaciones adecuado.

Pero lo más importante es el salto que se puede dar en la accesibilidad del servicio para los usuarios vulnerables. En ese sentido, el informe propone garantizar la asistencia en las estaciones y el acceso a los trenes con personal obligatoriamente formado, que la información deberá estar disponible en formato accesible y que las personas con movilidad reducida tendrán prioridad en la reubicación, incluso con animales guía.

Sin embargo, quiero recalcar que no es suficiente para incentivar el uso del ferrocarril mejorar los derechos de los pasajeros. Hay que impulsarlo como medio de transporte público. Hay que impulsarlo desde las instituciones públicas y no hacer cada vez más recortes e iniciar procesos de privatización.

Daniela Aiuto, a nome del gruppo EFDD. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, gentile Commissario, il regolamento che voteremo domani è di notevole importanza per i diritti dei passeggeri nei nostri paesi. Troppo spesso abbiamo assistito negli ultimi anni a problematiche e difficoltà che hanno reso inefficiente la mobilità su rotaia e la connettività su breve e lunga percorrenza. Scarse informazioni per i passeggeri, assistenza non adeguata alle persone con disabilità, difficoltà nel richiedere i rimborsi, ritardi che hanno costretto a dover cambiare tragitto senza sapere come ovviare agli imprevisti capitati sul proprio percorso. A quanti di noi è capitato di perdere coincidenze importanti e di non conoscere appieno i nostri diritti in tali circostanze. Sicuramente vi sono imprese ferroviarie più virtuose e altre meno.

Sarà importante, anche nelle future negoziazioni con il Consiglio, trovare un giusto bilanciamento tra i diritti dei passeggeri, da un lato, e la sostenibilità dei costi, dall'altro. Senz'altro, con questo regolamento, come Parlamento diamo un segnale importante e chiediamo alle imprese uno sforzo maggiore al fine di garantire un servizio puntuale ed efficace, con la speranza e l'augurio che il trasporto ferroviario diventi sempre più utilizzato per la mobilità dei cittadini europei.

Georg Mayer, im Namen der ENF-Fraktion. – Herr Präsident, geschätzte Frau Kommissarin! Bahnfahren soll und muss attraktiver werden. Ich glaube, da sind wir uns alle einig. Es ist immer eine gute Sache, wenn ich den Konsumenten informiere. Wenn ich ihn informiere, wenn einmal etwas nicht nach Plan abläuft, das ist meiner Erfahrung nach immer besser, als wenn ich Druck auf die eine oder andere Seite ausübe.

Der Konsumentenschutz ist natürlich auch ein wichtiger Teil des Ausgleichs der Kräfte zwischen einem starken Unternehmen und einem einzelnen Konsumenten. Man darf aber auch da nie vergessen: Wir haben es mit mündigen Bürgern zu tun. Information in der Öffentlichkeit jedem zugänglich zu machen, ist auf jeden Fall einmal ein richtiger Schritt für die Aufklärung der Konsumenten. Die Betonung liegt darauf, konsumentenfreundlich zu sein und nicht unternehmerfeindlich. Da gibt es einen großen Unterschied. Ausgewogen, wie diesem Bericht das gelingt, ist das auch durchaus das Ziel, das wir unterstützen können. Kleine Betriebe werden ausgenommen – sinnvolle Maßnahme. Beeinträchtigte Personen bekommen ganz besonderes Augenmerk in diesem Bericht.

Zwei Punkte, die ich kritisch beleuchten möchte, sind einerseits die Schadensgutmachung durch eine Gutscheinelösung – das halte ich für kontraproduktiv und auch für nicht ausführbar –, zweitens halte ich für kontraproduktiv etwa Änderungsanträge, die der Kollege Cramer gemacht hat, die völlige Themenverfehlung sind, wenn er nämlich dann sagt, er will Information über CO₂-Emissionen auf das Ticket. Das finde ich eher schädlich, weil man diesen Bericht dadurch verwässert.

Λάμπρος Φουντούλης (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, θεωρώ δεδομένο ότι στο πλαίσιο της προσπάθειας, τόσο των κρατών μελών όσο και των ευρωπαϊκών οργάνων, για να μειθούν οι εκπομπές αερίων ρύπων στην Ένωση σημαντικότατο ρόλο παίζουν οι μεταφορές επιβατών αλλά και εμπορευμάτων μέσω του σιδηροδρόμου. Επιπλέον, οι σιδηρόδρομοι αποτελούν έναν ασφαλέστερο και ταχύτερο τρόπο μεταφοράς, που είναι συνήθως οικονομικότερος και πιο προσιτός, ειδικά για τις ασθενέστερες οικονομικά τάξεις. Για να αποτελέσει όμως, πράγματι, ο σιδηρόδρομος μέρος της απάντησης στα προβλήματα που ανέφερα θα πρέπει, ταυτόχρονα με την ανάπτυξη νέων δικτύων, ειδικά στις χώρες της Ανατολικής και Νοτιοανατολικής Ευρώπης, να θεσπίσουμε και ένα πλαίσιο προστασίας των επιβατών, που θα καθορίζει τα δικαιώματά τους με τρόπο ξεκάθαρο και προσιτό σε όλους. Επίσης, θα πρέπει να επιτευχθεί συντονισμός μεταξύ των εταιρειών, ώστε να υπάρξουν συνδέσεις και ανταποκρίσεις σε λογικούς χρόνους, που θα εξυπηρετούν τους επιβάτες και θα διευκολύνουν τις μετακινήσεις τους. Τέλος, θα πρέπει να λάβουμε σοβαρά υπόψη μας τις περιοχές στις οποίες η σιδηροδρομική σύνδεση, αν και ασύμφορη οικονομικά για τις εταιρείες, θα πρέπει να διατηρηθεί ώστε οι κάτοικοι των απομακρυσμένων περιοχών να μην είναι αποκομμένοι.

Dieter-Lebrecht Koch (PPE). – Herr Präsident, verehrte Frau Kommissarin Bulc, verehrte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Wir müssen den Schienenverkehr für die Bürgerinnen und Bürger Europas attraktiver gestalten, ohne die Bahnunternehmen zu überfordern. Wir brauchen verbraucherfreundliche und faire Regeln. Es ist an der Zeit, die bestehenden Fahrgastrechte zu überarbeiten und der digitalen Entwicklung anzupassen. Lasst uns auf den Zug aufspringen, lasst ihn nicht einfach davonfahren! Selbiges erwarte ich übrigens auch vom Rat.

Was soll mit dieser Überarbeitung erreicht werden? Meine Checkliste ist: Erstens müssen die neuen Regelungen dafür sorgen, dass umfassende Fahrgastrechte bestehen, die unproblematisch und grenzüberschreitend durchsetzbar sind. Durch die Einschränkung von Ausnahmen und den Ausschluss der Sprachbarrieren bei der Beschwerde gelingt uns dies. Zweitens müssen Informationen für Fahrgäste in Echtzeit erfolgen – sowohl vor Fahrtantritt als auch während der Fahrt. Drittens sollte das sogenannte Durchgangsticket nicht die Ausnahme, sondern die Regel sein. Ein einziges Ticket muss reichen, um national und grenzüberschreitend Bahn fahren zu können. Viertens müssen die Rechte von Bahnreisenden, die in ihrer Mobilität eingeschränkt oder behindert sind, deutlich gestärkt werden. Ich freue mich sehr, dass mein

Vorschlag angenommen wurde, der die Vorlaufzeit für die Hilfeleistung von der Größe des Bahnhofs abhängig macht. Und fünftens ist es nötig, die Entschädigungszahlungen anzuheben, um Druck auf den Bahnsektor auszuüben, damit er verstärkt an seiner Qualität arbeitet. Zugleich müssen aber Ausnahmen bei Beeinträchtigungen durch höhere Gewalt schon bestehen bleiben. Es kann doch für die Bahn nichts anderes gelten als für Bus-, Schiffs- und Flugverkehr.

Isabella De Monte (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signora Commissario, il trasporto ferroviario, proprio perché è il mezzo di trasporto dei pendolari e dei cittadini con maggiori necessità, dovrebbe tutelare i diritti dei consumatori e degli utilizzatori più deboli. Voglio ribadire con forza quanto è stato detto precedentemente anche da alcuni colleghi, e cioè che il Parlamento deve farsi difensore delle persone con ridotta capacità motoria e di tutti i portatori di handicap. Prevedere un'assistenza gratuita nelle stazioni e con breve preavviso è essenziale per garantire loro libertà di movimento. Infatti, soprattutto nel caso di piccole stazioni, chiedere a una persona diversamente abile di dare un preavviso di 48 ore per salire su un treno andava addirittura contro ogni principio di libera circolazione delle persone. Infine, dare più diritti ai passeggeri, significa invogliarli a utilizzare un mezzo collettivo più pulito delle auto private e così salvaguardare l'ambiente.

Jacqueline Foster (ECR). – Mr President, whilst we always welcome better provisions for passengers' rights, this report does not go far enough and threatens to undermine long-standing practices in the UK rail industry. Our compensation measures are already well established and clear, the system works well and passengers understand it. By reducing the scope for when companies must compensate passengers, this report will dumb down what we've achieved and undermine our high standards.

The report also contains some concerning provisions for passengers with reduced mobility. The requirement that they must certify service animals, such as guide dogs, before boarding a train is nonsensical. In addition, the varying notice period required for those needing assistance is deeply confusing. Differences between large urban and small rural stations must be acknowledged, but national transport departments should liaise closely with rail companies and consumer groups to decide on these matters.

Finally, we all want to see greater use of bicycles, but the requirement that all services have eight designated spaces is wholly impractical. Many operators would have to order new rolling stock to meet the demand, and it could result in chronic overcrowding in rush hour services and again such issues as this should be determined locally and nationally. For those reasons, the British Conservatives will be voting against the report at this time, but we do hope that the institutions can improve the text.

Matthijs van Miltenburg (ALDE). – Reizen per trein is een duurzaam alternatief voor de vervuilende auto of voor het kerosine slurpende vliegtuig. Als we meer mensen verleiden om vaker de trein te nemen, dan dragen we bij aan het verduurzamen van onze mobiliteit. Dan dragen we bij aan het behalen van de klimaatdoelstellingen van Parijs.

Dan moeten we het reizen met de trein in heel Europa echter wel een stuk aantrekkelijker maken. Dit voorstel zorgt ervoor dat de rechten van treinreizigers in heel Europa worden versterkt en dat is naar mijn mening een stap in de goede richting. Met de nieuwe regels kunnen treinreizigers, bij vertragingsen, overal in Europa tot 100% van de ticketprijs terugkrijgen. En dat is een groot verschil met de situatie vandaag de dag. Nu kan namelijk slechts 50% van de ticketprijs worden teruggekregen.

Een tweede punt dat al is genoemd: de passagiers kunnen makkelijker hun fiets meenemen aan boord van de trein. In een fietsland als Nederland is dit van groot belang. Dan zorgen we namelijk ook voor de verduurzaming van het vervoer naar de stations en de aansluitende reis op weg naar de bestemming. Bovendien wordt het – mijn derde punt – veel makkelijker voor passagiers met een beperkte mobiliteit, voor mensen met een handicap, om de trein in Europa te nemen. Zij kunnen voortaan rekenen op assistentie op het perron zonder dat dagen van tevoren te moeten regelen. Daarmee kunnen ze hun reis veel vlotter gaan regelen.

Collega's, laten we morgen instemmen met het voorstel om het trainen aantrekkelijker te maken in Europa. Daar zullen niet alleen de Europese treinreizigers u dankbaar voor zijn, maar ook het klimaat!

Karima Delli (Verts/ALE). – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Commissaire, chers collègues, je n'ai qu'un chiffre à vous donner: un Européen qui se lève le matin pour aller travailler a neuf chances sur dix de prendre sa voiture ou un car et seulement une chance sur dix de prendre le train. Donc, vous le voyez bien, nous vivons à l'ère du tout voiture, une ère irrespirable, à contresens des accords de Paris et qui met en danger le budget des familles.

Aujourd'hui, nous avons la possibilité de faire aimer le train en équipant de huit emplacements pour vélos au minimum tous les trains, du train régional au train à grande vitesse; en garantissant une assistance pour les personnes à mobilité réduite dans chaque gare, parce que notre priorité, c'est de faire en sorte que tout le monde ait accès à la mobilité; et en compensant, dans une juste mesure, les passagers qui subissent un retard ou une annulation, et je le rappelle parce que c'est important.

Dans sa version actuelle, le texte prévoit un remboursement de 50 % du billet après un retard d'une heure, de 75 % après un retard d'une heure et demi et un remboursement intégral au bout de deux heures. Vous voyez bien, chers collègues, qu'il n'y a que des avantages à prendre le train, qui est plus attractif pour notre santé, pour notre climat, pour le porte-monnaie des citoyens européens et, j'ajouterai, pour les emplois européens, parce que nous sommes en train de fabriquer notre propre train en Europe et que ses emplois industriels doivent être préservés sur notre territoire.

Kateřina Konečná (GUE/NGL). – Pane předsedající, jakožto zástupkyně země, která má jednu z nejhustších železničních sítí na světě, jsem velmi ráda, že jsme svědky dalšího prohlubování práv cestujících v železniční přepravě. Cestující by nyní měli mít nárok na přístup k informacím a odškodnění v případě zpoždění nebo odřeknutí spoje.

Měli by být informováni o svých právech, o daných spojích a dalších souvisejících záležitostech před samotným uskutečněním cesty, v jejím průběhu i po jejím dokončení. Jsem také ráda, že se podařilo usnadnit přístup k železniční dopravě osobám se zdravotním postižením nebo se sníženou schopností pohybu a orientace. Pokud máme občany Evropské unie přesvědčit o tom, že jízda vlakem je tradice, ve které stojí za to pokračovat, je nutné, aby se zvedla i úroveň této dopravy a práva cestujících. Evropský parlament by měl jít v této oblasti příkladem.

Marie-Christine Arnautu (ENF). – Monsieur le Président, les dispositions du rapport, notamment celles qui augmentent les indemnités en cas de retard, seront incontestablement une avancée pour les voyageurs. Mais quand j'entends que les Verts font de la place réservée aux vélos dans les trains un point non négociable, je m'interroge quand même sur le sens des priorités et sur le respect de la subsidiarité.

Sécurité, ponctualité, propreté, prix décents sont autant d'éléments sur lesquels des efforts doivent être consentis. Or l'Union européenne, en imposant ses dogmes économiques, favorise un désengagement de l'indispensable puissance publique.

Ce n'est pas un hasard si le Japon et la Suisse affichent des taux de ponctualité et de satisfaction vertigineux, alors qu'en Grande-Bretagne, par exemple, 60 % de la population souhaite la renationalisation du secteur. L'insécurité et les incivilités y sont quasi inexistantes, pas de pillage, ni de vol de caténaires à répétition dans ces pays, contrairement à ce qui arrive en France, ni de polémique, comme en Allemagne, pour savoir s'il fallait réserver des wagons uniquement aux femmes pour garantir leur sécurité. L'entretien du réseau et la maintenance des infrastructures y sont très rigoureux. Les récentes pannes en série qui ont fortement perturbé le trafic français sont a contrario symptomatiques d'un niveau d'exigence en recul. Comment s'étonner que la France, réputée pour l'excellence de ses chemins de fer, soit passée de la deuxième à la septième place européenne dans le classement du Boston Consulting Group?

Les droits des passagers seront mieux respectés le jour où l'on comprendra que la performance du système ferroviaire découle pour l'essentiel du niveau de dépenses publiques qu'on veut bien lui concéder.

Innocenzo Leontini (PPE). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la revisione del regolamento dei diritti dei passeggeri persegue un maggiore equilibrio tra il rafforzamento sui diritti degli utenti e la riduzione degli oneri a carico delle imprese. È necessario proteggere gli utenti in un quadro normativo europeo nuovo per aumentare la flessibilità del settore e la sua attrattività rispetto ad altri mezzi di trasporto che incidono più negativamente sull'ambiente.

I nuovi criteri aumentano l'accessibilità dei disabili alle stazioni e quindi manifestano una maggiore sensibilità e assistenza alle persone con mobilità ridotta. Io sono favorevole ad aumentare i livelli di indennizzo causati dal ritardo fino al 100 % del prezzo per ritardi superiori a due ore. Non mi convince l'eliminazione della clausola di forza maggiore, perché essa costituisce una forzatura giuridica che in sede applicativa potrebbe generare un contenzioso senza fine, in quanto le circostanze eccezionali costituiscono un fattore esimente in tutti gli ordinamenti equilibrati. Inoltre, non è giusto imporre alle imprese costi e obblighi non realistici che prescindono dalle necessità degli utenti. In tal modo, non si farebbe altro che ridurre l'attrattività del settore.

Christine Revault d'Allonnes Bonnefoy (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Commissaire, chers collègues, nous débattons aujourd'hui d'un rapport important et de mesures concrètes qui vont directement impacter la vie quotidienne de millions d'Européens qui utilisent le train quotidiennement.

Ce que nous proposons, c'est de mieux rembourser les usagers quand les trains arrivent en retard, de leur fournir en temps réel toutes les informations sur le trafic, de garantir des services de meilleure qualité et d'améliorer les droits des personnes à mobilité réduite.

Je regrette profondément qu'en commission parlementaire certains députés aient réussi à manipuler le vote pour faire passer des amendements qui réintroduisent des dispositions permettant aux opérateurs ferroviaires de s'exonérer de toute obligation de remboursement en cas de retard.

J'appelle ici tous les députés à voter contre ces amendements demain et à ne pas céder aux lobbies des entreprises qui voudraient que les députés revoient à la baisse les droits des passagers.

Nous avons été élus pour défendre nos citoyens et l'intérêt général. Ce serait donc un message politique désastreux que de voter pour des amendements qui défendent l'intérêt économique des grands groupes ferroviaires contre les droits des millions d'usagers et contre l'avis même de la Cour de justice de l'Union européenne sur les obligations en matière d'indemnisation.

VORSITZ: EVELYNE GEBHARDT

Vizepräsidentin

Mark Demesmaeker (ECR). – Vertragingen, annuleringen en onvolledige informatie, we worden er ook in België, meer dan ons lief is, mee geconfronteerd. De huidige Europese regels bieden onvoldoende garanties voor een kwalitatieve dienstverlening. Als we meer mensen willen motiveren om het openbaar vervoer te nemen en als de spoorwegmaatschappijen zelf klaar willen staan om binnenkort de concurrentie aan te gaan met nieuwe spelers op de markt, dan moet het beter.

Als die ondernemingen vandaag niet toekomen aan de nodige structurele hervormingen, dan is het omdat er te veel vrijstellingen en gunstmaatregelen zijn.

Het Europees Parlement wijst alvast het juiste spoor aan. Verhoogde compensatiebedragen bij vertragingen, dus extra financiële druk om stipter te gaan rijden, het recht van de passagier om altijd zijn fiets mee te nemen op de trein en sterkere ombudsdiensten, dat is het spoor voor de spoorwegen van morgen. Toch een waarschuwing: kijk uit voor overmachtsregelingen die de spoorwegmaatschappijen al te gemakkelijk een uitvlucht geven om hun verplichtingen te ontlopen. Verder blijven er bijkomende inspanningen nodig voor een betere toegankelijkheid voor mindervaliden.

We moeten nu de stap zetten naar een moderne, aantrekkelijke en competitieve spoorwegmarkt.

Pavel Telicka (ALDE). – Madam President, if it were a month ago, I probably would have structured my intervention today differently. I would focus on some of the provisions, highlight something and support some things, but in fact, I'm going to say something different. I have a relatively fresh experience.

After the very long vote in the last plenary on Thursday, I was to take a train from here to Karlsruhe and then to Munich and catch a plane. Because we had a long vote, an unnecessarily long vote, I didn't manage. Then I missed the TGV, so I had to take several trains before I could get to Karlsruhe, then Stuttgart and then to Munich – and you can already guess what happened with my plane connection in Munich.

Of course, I spent some extra money. Of course, my journey to the Balkans was much longer, but I do still understand that my position is somewhat more favourable than that of thousands or millions of European consumers when they arrive, or when they end up in a similar position.

I really believe that what we will be voting on is not perfect. I'm sure that many of us, on a number of provisions, would like to go further. I'm sure that there are still some question marks, but it is a major step in the right direction to provide railway passengers with completely different quality rights, and not just in the terms that I've mentioned – accessibility, etc. I think this is a good indication of what European legislation can bring a consumer.

Adam Szejnfeld (PPE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Zrównoważony rozwój i ochrona środowiska, w tym czystego powietrza, wymagają zwiększenia udziału przewozów kolejowych. Niestety, w dzisiejszych czasach, kolej nie jest konkurencyjna dla innych przewoźników publicznych pod względem wielu kryteriów. Jednym z nich jest oczywiście różnica w uprawnieniach konsumentów. Rozporządzenie Parlamentu Europejskiego i Rady idzie więc w dobrym kierunku: zwiększa prawa pasażerów, wprowadza ułatwienia dla osób niepełnosprawnych i z ograniczeniami ruchowymi, także dla podróżujących z dziećmi, z wózkami, z rowerami, ze zwierzętami domowymi czy bilety łączone. Szczególnie pozytywnie trzeba ocenić uprawnienia odszkodowawcze, o których mówi rozporządzenie. Popieram zatem ten projekt, lecz chciałbym tylko zaznaczyć, że będę głosował przeciwko wprowadzaniu definicji siły wyższej, zwłaszcza w zapisie, który jest zaproponowany.

Inés Ayala Sender (S&D). – Señora presidenta, señora Bulc. ¿Cuándo ganó el AVE español la batalla al avión, sobre todo en las líneas principales, y también cada vez más a la carretera? Pues fue cuando, con un Gobierno socialista, una consejera, mujer, y el responsable del AVE decidieron que se compensara a los viajeros por el mínimo retraso y hasta el 100 %, aparte de aceptar dar acceso al próximo tren si se había perdido el anterior.

Fueron elementos fundamentales de los derechos de los pasajeros que ayudaron a que el AVE despegara y a que hoy en día sea uno de los trenes europeos más puntuales y con mejor aceptación por parte de los viajeros, aunque siempre se puede mejorar, eso está claro.

Se ha reforzado también la atención a las personas con dificultades de accesibilidad y se han ido construyendo infraestructuras en las estaciones. Todavía queda mucho por hacer, es verdad. La multimodalidad sostenible —con el acceso de las bicicletas al tren— también hace falta, pero también las conexiones urbanas.

Finalmente, no estamos de acuerdo en el intento de dar marcha atrás mediante un mal entendido sentido de la protección del sector ferroviario, limitando los derechos de los pasajeros. Al revés, estamos a favor de profundizar en garantizar más derechos a los pasajeros.

Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE). – Señora presidenta, señora comisaria, quiero felicitar el trabajo desarrollado en este informe sobre los derechos de los usuarios del ferrocarril, porque está realmente centrado en los pasajeros, porque amplía las garantías y recoge, además, algunas de las principales recomendaciones del Tribunal de Cuentas sobre esta materia.

Porque no solo es necesario establecer definiciones claras. Además, es vital simplificar los procedimientos para reclamar, y si es posible, automatizar las compensaciones. El primer objetivo, clarificar; evitar ambigüedades que permitan a las compañías evadir sus responsabilidades. Se puede mejorar mucho si apoyamos las enmiendas que aclaran definitivamente qué son y qué no se pueden considerar causas de fuerza mayor para justificar un retraso o la supresión de un servicio.

También mejoran las cuantías de las compensaciones y se asegura el derecho de los viajeros a coger el siguiente tren cuando pierdan una conexión debido a un retraso o a una cancelación. Se apuesta por una movilidad más sostenible, reservando siempre espacio para bicicletas, y se mejoran los derechos de las personas con discapacidad. Las grandes estaciones deberán estar plenamente adaptadas. En las pequeñas se propone que tres horas sean suficientes para solicitar asistencia.

Finalmente —y esto es decisivo—, para poder mejorar el acceso a este catálogo de derechos y garantías, se apuesta por un formulario europeo de reclamación y por avanzar hacia un sistema automático de compensación. No tiene sentido, cuando es claro que el pasajero debe ser indemnizado, que este tenga que pedir lo que le corresponde. Tiene derecho a que se le devuelva como parte del servicio que incluye el servicio que ha pagado.

Claudia Țapardel (S&D). – Doamna președintă, doamnă comisar, dragi colegi, acest regulament ne oferă oportunitatea de a susține mai apăsător punerea în aplicare a drepturilor pasagerilor din transportul feroviar. Consider că este foarte important ca transportul feroviar să fie incluziv și accesibil tuturor cetățenilor europeni, cu atât mai mult persoanelor cu dizabilități sau mobilitate redusă, iar acest aspect trebuie îmbunătățit în toate statele membre. Având în vedere că, la nivel european, ne dorim un transport sustenabil, curat și cât mai eficient, transportul feroviar poate câștiga teren în fața altor tipuri de transport, mai ales printr-o garantare corespunzătoare a drepturilor pasagerilor.

În ceea ce privește dreptul la compensație, consider că pasagerii care utilizează transportul feroviar trebuie să fie compensați și despăgubiți în mod corect în cazul întârzierilor și al anulărilor. Mai mult decât atât, pasagerii trebuie să aibă dreptul la o compensație integrală pentru întreaga călătorie, indiferent dacă aceasta este simplă sau cu o conexiune.

Totodată, consider că, pentru a pune bazele unui sistem feroviar dinamic și eficient, trebuie să asigurăm competitivitatea acestuia în raport cu cel aerian sau rutier, cu atât mai mult cu cât ne dorim să atingem obiectivele unui transport european multimodal și integrat.

Mult succes!

Karoline Graswander-Hainz (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin, werte Frau Kommissarin, werte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Die Neufassung der Verordnung über die Fahrgastrechte im Eisenbahnverkehr setzt an vielen guten Punkten an. Am Ende wird die EU die Informations- und Kompensationsrechte der Passagiere im Bahnverkehr stärken; das ist unser Ziel.

Schlussendlich müssen aber die Rechte der Fahrgäste auch durchsetzbar sein. Aus Konsumentenschutzsicht ist es beispielsweise nicht verständlich, warum Gäste bei Wetterereignissen jeden Anspruch auf Erstattung oder Kompensation verlieren sollten. Dadurch würden die Bahnunternehmen das gesamte Risiko auf die Passagiere abwälzen. Deshalb ist das Prinzip der höheren Gewalt ausnahmslos abzulehnen.

Schon allein aus umwelttechnischen Gründen müssen wir sicherstellen, dass die Anreize, auf umweltfreundliche Verkehrsträger umzusteigen, nicht weniger, sondern mehr werden. Aus diesem Grund braucht es Maßnahmen, die das Bahnfahren so attraktiv wie möglich machen.

Olga Sehnalová (S&D). – Paní předsedající, nad touto zprávou jsem si často promítla, co mi o svém cestování vlakem říkala má stážistka s těžkým zdravotním postižením, která se pohybuje na elektrickém vozíku. Dovolte mi ocitovat její zkušenosti: „Objednávka na přepravu pro mě znamená muset si své aktivity plánovat 24 hodin předem. Žiji na vesnici a tak se nemohu například večer rozhodnout, že ráno pojedu do blízkého města ke svému lékaři. Nemohu si ráno naplánovat večerní návštěvu kina a podobně.“ I ona by přivítala zkrácení lhůty nutné k objednání přepravy, aby plošiny byly v dobrém stavu, aby byla lepší organizace přepravy vozíčkářů, důkladnější zaškolení zaměstnanců a snadnější přístup k informacím. Na závěr svého dopisu píše: „Právo svobodně a nezávisle cestovat by mělo být právem každého z nás.“ S tím vřele souhlasím a děkuji Bogusławowi, že tyto připomínky vzal seriózně v potaz a že podpořil i řadu mých návrhů, například právě na zkrácení doby na objednání asistenčních služeb.

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Doamna președintă, doamna comisar, dragi colegi, regulamentul pentru drepturile și obligațiile pasagerilor vine după zece ani. Era nevoie.

Circulația călătorilor pe tren, cu mijloc de transport feroviar, este și trebuie să fie în creștere, având în vedere și politica noastră generală, doamna comisar al Uniunii Europene, și anume să trecem de pe transportul rutier pe transport pe cale ferată. Dar, pentru aceasta, trebuie să avem drepturile pasagerilor garantate.

Eu sunt și membră a comisiei IMCO și, evident, acolo punem mult accent pe drepturile pasagerilor. Sunt și în comisia TRAN. Este clar că în acest regulament au fost aduse îmbunătățiri din punct de vedere al informației pentru pasageri, pentru că, de multe ori, când circuli dintr-o țară în alta, nu știi despre ce este vorba. Mi s-a întâmplat și mie, la Paris.

Avem nevoie de a elimina acele eschivări pentru a plăti despăgubiri pasagerului, atunci când i se creează un disconfort, dar nu numai.

Accesibilitatea trebuie îmbunătățită pentru persoanele cu dizabilități și persoanele cu mobilitate redusă dar, de ce nu, și pentru toate persoanele, să putem să achiziționăm oriunde biletul în tren.

Eu sper că mâine vom avea un vot bun la acest raport.

Nicola Danti (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signor Commissario, ogni giorno sono decine di milioni i cittadini europei che si muovono e che utilizzano il treno per spostarsi. Il sistema ferroviario europeo, al di là delle eccellenze delle linee ad alta velocità, sconta ancora troppe carenze. Le cronache sono piene di notizie su disservizi, ritardi e cancellazioni, soprattutto nel trasporto locale e regionale maggiormente utilizzato da lavoratori, pendolari e studenti.

Di fronte a tutto ciò i passeggeri europei non hanno una sufficiente tutela dei propri diritti. Questo regolamento aumenterà in maniera considerevole il livello delle tutele e la qualità dei servizi. Tra questi, più certi indennizzi in caso di ritardi e soppressioni delle corse, maggiori diritti di accesso ai servizi per le categorie svantaggiate e obblighi più stringenti per attrezzare spazi destinati al trasporto di biciclette nei vagoni. Cercheremo di rafforzare ancora di più il testo, da qui al voto di domani, per garantire maggiore qualità e più diritti per i passeggeri e promuovere ancora di più il treno quale mezzo di trasporto.

Arndt Kohn (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin, Frau Kommissarin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Zunächst mal möchte ich den Berichterstattern danken für die gute Arbeit an diesem wichtigen Thema Fahrgastrechte. Ich möchte auch der Kommission dafür danken, dass sie dieses zehn Jahre alte Thema aufgegriffen und überarbeitet hat. Jetzt sind glücklicherweise zehn Jahre länger als die allermeisten Verspätungen. Aber nichtsdestotrotz gehören Verspätungen und Zugausfälle zum Alltag vieler Menschen, die zur Arbeit, in Urlaub oder auf Geschäftsreise fahren. Ich gehöre selber dazu, ich fahre selber des Öfteren mit dem Zug, und ich weiß, wie das ist.

Jetzt können wir natürlich als Gesetzgeber das alles nicht per Gesetz verbieten. Aber wir haben jetzt die Chance, die Fahrgastrechte entscheidend zu verbessern. 100 % Rückerstattung bei Verspätungen über zwei Stunden, Verbesserungen bei der Fahrradmitnahme, Verbesserungen bei der Barrierefreiheit, das sind nur drei Punkte. Wenn wir wollen, dass die Bahn attraktiver wird und eine gute Alternative zu Auto, Bus und Flugzeug wird, dann müssen wir etwas tun. Dann dürfen wir nicht nur auf das Gewissen der Menschen setzen, sondern an der Verbraucherfreundlichkeit und an dieser sinnvollen Art der Mobilität arbeiten. Wenn wir das alle zusammen tun, dann werden noch viel mehr Menschen noch viel lieber Zug fahren.

John Howarth (S&D). – Madam President, developing Europe's rail network as a sustainable alternative to air travel over long distances is a perfectly sensible objective, but, if it is going to be successful then the service offered and available to people needs to be comparable. We have clear rules on air travel compensation and we need the same for the railways because those rules will be an incentive for rail companies to improve their services and to make sure that trains aren't cancelled and that they run on time.

It's not a complicated principle is it? You advertise a service, the customer buys the service and, if the service fails to deliver, then the consumer is entitled to redress. Really quite simple. That is why we've re-submitted amendments, that is why I've re-signed them, and that is why I will be voting for them tomorrow. The point of this recast must be to ensure that public transport is run for the benefit of the travelling public and not solely for the benefit of the people who run the railways.

Bogdan Andrzej Zdrojewski (PPE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Chciałem zwrócić uwagę, że podczas tej sesji plenarnej mamy trzeci dokument prokonsumencki. To dobrze. Za każdym razem staramy się zwracać uwagę na to, jak ludzie odbierają usługi, które oferuje im biznes. Ale chcę podkreślić, że również po raz trzeci nie są szacowane koszty, nie są szacowane obciążenia, które niestety spadają na tych, do których adresujemy nasze postulaty.

Ja uważam, że generalnie rzecz biorąc kierunek myślenia jest prawidłowy: należy rzeczywiście zwracać uwagę na to, aby usługi były lepsze, bardziej przyjazne, aby w tym wypadku przewoźnicy ponosili pewne konsekwencje także wtedy, kiedy nie są w stanie dostarczyć usługi na określonym poziomie. Ale zawsze zwracam uwagę na to, że dotykamy biznesu, który musi mieć kalkulacje i musi mieć określony dochód obliczony według określonych rygorów. Zwracam na to uwagę, bo jest to aspekt zbyt często pomijany w naszych debatach.

Rory Palmer (S&D). – Madam President, I want to reinforce specifically the need for stronger, indeed mandatory, missed-connection protection, to ensure an effective European rail system that works in the interests of passengers.

I don't know where exactly in this Chamber seat No 61 is, but those who travel regularly on the railways may know about the very popular, useful and informative blog run by the 'Man in Seat 61'. He broke down into simple, straight-forward terms the importance of this measure a few days ago when he said this: 'Implementing missed-connection protection is absolutely essential to stop passengers having to pay huge penalties to [train] operator B because of [train] operator A's delays, rendering rail travel risky and discouraging people from using it.' We in this Parliament need to be encouraging people to use the railways.

Being a Member of the European Parliament from the UK, I'm all too used to delays on the railways. This Parliament and the Commission cannot delay taking action on these issues in the interests of passengers.

Νότης Μαρίας (ECR). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, ο σιδηρόδρομος είναι σημαντικό μέσο μεταφοράς και, βέβαια, πολύ πιο καθαρό από τις οδικές μεταφορές. Στην Επιτροπή Αναφορών έχουμε δεχθεί δεκάδες αναφορές και διαμαρτυρίες από άτομα με ειδικές ανάγκες που δεν έχουν τη δυνατότητα πρόσβασης στους σιδηροδρόμους. Νομίζω ότι με αυτά που συζητούμε και αυτά που θα αποφασίσουμε, θα συμβάλουμε πραγματικά στην πρόσβαση των ατόμων με ειδικές ανάγκες στις σιδηροδρομικές μεταφορές. Θεωρώ σημαντικό, βεβαίως, να υπάρξουν και χώροι για τα ποδήλατα, διότι το ποδήλατο χρησιμοποιείται πλέον από πάρα πολλούς πολίτες. Η επιβολή αποζημιώσεων προς τους καταναλωτές σε περίπτωση ακυρώσεων ή καθυστερήσεων πρέπει να είναι στην ημερήσια διάταξη, δεδομένου ότι διάφορες σιδηροδρομικές επιχειρήσεις προσπαθούν με διάφορα τρικ -δήθεν με τη ρήτρα ανωτέρας βίας- να αποφύγουν να καταβάλουν αποζημιώσεις στους καταναλωτές. Εκεί, πρέπει να είμαστε αποφασιστικοί όσον αφορά τα μέτρα που θα λάβουμε.

Zigmantas Balčytis (S&D). – Ponia pirmininka, pirmiausia noriu padėkoti pranešėjui Bogusław Liberadzki už tikrai labai gerą dokumentą, paruoštą todėl, kad mes taisėme 2009 m. taisykles. Pritariu visoms kelevių teisėms. Tačiau aš norėčiau atkreipti tam tikrą dėmesį į keletą paminėtų nuostatų dėl riedmenų parko atnaujinimo. Buvo paminėta, ir aš manau, kad tai yra labai svarbu, nes ne kiekviena valstybė tą daro savalaikiškai ir tinkamai, ir taip pat į intermodalinio transporto plėtrą.

Kaip žinia, kiekviena šalis kiekvienais metais investuoja dideles pinigines lėšas į naujus projektus ir senų projektų atnaujinimą. Aš turiu omenyje ypatingai „Connecting Europe Facility“ fondą, kur mes tikrai dešimtis milijardų investuojame į naujų projektų sukūrimą, ir ateiityje tai bus labai svarbu todėl, kad ypatingai projektas „Rail Baltica“ turės labai svarbią politinę reikšmę, kad periferinės valstybės – Baltijos šalys – bus inkorporuotos į Europos Sąjungos transporto sistemą. Tas dokumentas kaip tik ir palengvins šitų naujų projektų įdiegimą į bendrą sistemą.

(Ende der spontanen Wortmeldungen)

Violeta Bulc, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, thank you for this very thorough debate. I am glad that Parliament has clearly confirmed its support for improving the protection of rail passengers. Today's discussion has confirmed that we agree on many of the aspects which will allow us to deliver on this important proposal. Before I conclude, please allow me to address some of your comments.

On integrated and multimodal travel, let me confirm that, today, we have a set of EU regulations applicable only to each individual transport mode separately. Let me also confirm that we are progressively moving, already, towards multimodal integrated solutions. This year is a year of multimodality and it is a perfect time to address passenger rights, as well, within the multimodal environment. For passengers combining the use of different modes in one journey, the Commission is now launching preparatory work to develop multimodal and integrated-ticket passenger rights. This is our next challenge.

So yes, it is important that we set very clear rules, as is reflected in your report. This is especially important for passengers with reduced mobility, who need adequate assistance at transfer points when using a single ticket and otherwise. Our cooperation on this topic is not done yet.

On *force majeure*: let me say that, regarding the inclusion and the scope of the *force majeure* clause, we fully understand your efforts to ensure the best possible passenger protection and smooth operation of railway services. The introduction of the *force majeure* clause exempts railway undertakings from having to pay compensation where long delays are caused by events beyond their control and which they were not able to prevent.

While a *force majeure* clause has been included in the proposal, events that trigger it have been restricted to natural disasters – so-called acts of God. Let me repeat that: a very narrow, restrictive definition of situations caused through purely natural disasters – in order to avoid legal uncertainty and to limit the reduction of passenger rights.

The introduction of the *force majeure* clause aligns rail with other modes of transport in terms of passenger rights legislation, and also of consumer legislation such as the Package Travel Directive. It ensures that the general principle of legal fairness is applied. But, as I said earlier, we will have an opportunity to clarify this issue further when we address integrated ticketing and multimodal passenger rights.

I will not go over again the issues that I have already addressed in my opening remarks. As a closing comment, I would like to express once more my deep appreciation of the work you have done. It was crucial to conclude the discussion in Parliament before the elections and I am confident that the position adopted by the European Parliament will serve as a solid basis for the negotiation with the Council. I am very much looking forward to a positive vote on your report tomorrow.

Bogusław Liberadzki, sprawozdawca. – Pani Przewodnicząca! Muszę przyznać, że z satysfakcją wysłuchałem odpowiedzi pani komisarz i wypowiedzi posłów. Kroczymy tą samą drogą w tym samym kierunku, a wiele naszych propozycji, jak rozumiem, zostało przyjętych. Chcemy praw, które będą atrakcyjne dla pasażerów i dzięki którym pasażerowie będą chcieli korzystać z kolei.

Po drugie, rozwiązania i prawa pasażerów w zakresie powinności kolei muszą być dla przewoźników wykonalne i nie wiązać się ze wzrostem cen biletów. Gdyby ktoś pytał o koszt: tak, szacowaliśmy koszty. Mówimy o kilkuset milionach euro. Pamiętajmy jednak, że w tym czasie wydamy dziesiątki miliardów euro w ramach polityki spójności, funduszy strukturalnych i instrumentu „Łącząc Europę” na modernizację transportu kolejowego w Europie. Mamy prawo oczekiwać poprawy jakości. I uważam, że tego prawa nikt nam nie odmówi. Chcemy, żeby usługi były dostępne dla pasażerów zarówno cenowo, jak i fizycznie. Mówimy o spójnych regulacjach w całej Unii Europejskiej, no może z wyjątkiem Cypru i Malty, bo tam nie zbudowano jeszcze ani jednej linii kolejowej, ale, kto wie, wszystko może się zdarzyć. Chcemy, żeby odpowiedzialność kolei i sprzedawców biletów była niemożliwa do uniknięcia, co sformułowano i jest do wyegzekwowania. Generalna przesłanka, którą się kierowaliśmy, brzmi: gdy kolej szanuje pasażerów, da się kolej lubić. Jeśli większa liczba pasażerów będzie korzystała z kolei, udział kolei w rynku będzie większy. Skorzystają na tym wszyscy obywatele, ale także środowisko. Dziękuję jeszcze raz pani komisarz. Dziękuję państwu za debatę.

Die Präsidentin. – Die Aussprache ist geschlossen.

Die Abstimmung findet am Donnerstag, 15. November 2018, statt.

Schriftliche Erklärungen (Artikel 162)

Ádám Kósa (PPE), írásban. – Örömmel üdvözlöm, hogy a vasúti személyszállítást igénybe vevő utasok jogairól és kötelezettségeiről szóló rendelet átdolgozása során az Európai Parlament figyelemmel volt a fogyatékossgal élő személyek jogairól szóló ENSZ-egyezményre is annak érdekében, hogy a fogyatékossgal élő és a csökkent mozgásképességű személyek a vasúti közlekedés tekintetében a többi állampolgárhoz hasonló mobilitási lehetőségekkel rendelkezzenek. A jövőben külön figyelmet kell fordítani arra, hogy a fogyatékossgal élő és a csökkent mozgásképességű személyek megkülönböztetés mentesen hozzáférjenek a járművekhez, a vonat felszereltségéről pedig akadálymentes tájékoztatást kapjanak. Az azonos utazási feltételek biztosítása érdekében e személyeknek ingyenes segítséget kell nyújtani a felszálláshoz és a leszálláshoz. Nagyon fontos, hogy az érzékszervi fogyatékossgal élő utasoknak – mint például a siketek, a nagyothallók vagy a siketvakok – megfelelő és számukra is értelmezhető vizuális, illetve hangjelző rendszerek álljanak a rendelkezésre, hogy a késésekről a lehető legjobb tájékoztatást kapják. Ugyancsak előremutató és rég várt intézkedés, hogy a személyzetet megfelelően ki kell képezni a fogyatékossgal élő és a csökkent mozgásképességű személyek szükségleteiről és a számukra szükséges segítségnyújtásról.

Remélem, hogy a szöveg az intézményközi egyeztetések során sem fog felhígulni, hiszen a fogyatékossgal élő és a csökkent mozgásképességű személyek a többi állampolgárral azonos jogokkal rendelkeznek a szabad mozgás, és a megkülönböztetés mentesség tekintetében.

Elżbieta Katarzyna Łukacijewska (PPE), na piśmie. – Rozporządzenie, o którym dziś mówimy, jest bardzo istotne z punktu widzenia wszystkich pasażerów kolei. Już niedługo otrzymają oni ochronę swoich praw podobną do pasażerów linii lotniczych. Głosując nad przyjęciem rozporządzenia, zadbamy o wiele rozwiązań wychodzących na przeciw każdemu, kto korzysta na co dzień z kolei – przede wszystkim zwiększymy progi odszkodowań, nawet do 100% zwrotu ceny biletu za spóźnienie przekraczające 2 godziny, co zmotywuje przedsiębiorstwa do większej staranności, jeżeli chodzi o punktualność. Dzisiaj procedura dochodzenia odszkodowania jest żmudna i skomplikowana, przez co wiele osób rezygnuje z egzekwowania swoich praw. Bardzo ważne jest wprowadzenie szeregu udogodnień dla pasażerów niepełnosprawnych, np. konieczność udzielenia darmowej asysty czy wprowadzenie obowiązkowych szkoleń dla obsługi pociągu i stacji. Warto także spojrzeć na obowiązek zapewnienia miejsc na rowery w każdym pociągu oraz wprowadzenie pojęcia podróży łączonej, co oznacza, że przedsiębiorstwo kolejowe będzie musiało zadbać o to, aby każdy pasażer mógł zdążyć bez przeszkód na przesiadkę, a w razie problemu zapewnić możliwość dalszej podróży. Nowe przepisy stanowią zdecydowany krok ku zabezpieczeniu podstawowych praw pasażerów i mam nadzieję, że dzięki nim kolej stanie się znacznie popularniejszym środkiem transportu. Pamiętajmy, że kolej istnieje dla pasażerów.

Valdemar Tomaševski (ECR), raštu. – Vienas iš svarbiausių pasiekimų geležinkelių sektoriuje yra sukurta teisinė keleivių teisių apsaugos sistema, kuri sudaro dalį platesnės ES vartotojų teisių politikos. Komisija savo įgyvendinimo ataskaitoje pripažino, kad sektoriuje tinkamai taikomas reglamentas dėl geležinkelių keleivių teisių ir pareigų. Tačiau kelios valstybės narės, visiškai laikydamosi šio reglamento nuostatų, kai kuriems reglamento straipsniams taiko išimtis dėl nepakankamų finansinių priemonių apleistai geležinkelių infrastruktūrai arba pasenusiems geležinkelių riedmenims modernizuoti. Gerai, kad tokios išimties nebūsim įmanomos nuo 2024 metų gruodžio mėnesio. Todėl keleivių teisės bus vienodai užtikrinamos visose ES valstybėse narėse. Yra dar viena svarbi detalė. Vaziavimo kitu maršrutu paslaugos teikėjai neigaliams ir riboto judumo asmenims privalo suteikti panašaus lygio pagalbą ir prieigą prie alternatyvių transporto paslaugų. Šios alternatyvios paslaugos gali būti bendros visiems keleiviams arba, jei taip nusprendžia vežėjas, individuali transporto priemonė, pritaikyta specialioms tam tikrų neigalių ar riboto judumo asmenų poreikiams. Taip pat reikėtų užtikrinti neigaliųjų ir riboto judumo asmenų prieigą prie visos ES geležinkelių sistemos, pasitelkiant išankstinį pranešimą, kuris būtų kaip galima trumpesnis ir ne ilgesnis kaip 24 valandos. Ši paslauga turėtų būti nemokama.

Ελισάβετ Βόζεμπεργκ-Βρυονίδη (PPE), γραπτώς. – Τα δικαιώματα των επιβατών τρένων στην ΕΕ είναι σήμερα κατακερματισμένα, με αποτέλεσμα οι σιδηροδρομικές μεταφορές να εμφανίζονται λιγότερο ελκυστικές για το ευρύ κοινό. Η δημιουργία ενός εναρμονισμένου πλαισίου δικαιωμάτων για τους επιβάτες τρένων πανευρωπαϊκά και η εξασφάλιση υψηλής προστασίας σε όλους ανεξαιρέτως τους επιβάτες είναι επιτακτική ανάγκη, προκειμένου να επιτύχουμε αύξηση των σιδηροδρομικών μεταφορών, με ταυτόχρονη βελτιωμένη προστασία των δικαιωμάτων των επιβατών. Η νέα νομοθεσία εκσυγχρονίζει τα δικαιώματα των επιβατών τρένων και προστατεύει τους καταναλωτές πιο αποτελεσματικά, παρέχοντάς τους αντίστοιχο πλαίσιο δικαιωμάτων με αυτό που ισχύει στις αεροπορικές μεταφορές. Εξασφαλίζεται καλύτερη εξυπηρέτηση στους ανθρώπους με μειωμένη κινητική ικανότητα και προβλέπονται σαφείς διαδικασίες χειρισμού παραπόνων, με μεγαλύτερες αποζημιώσεις σε περιπτώσεις καθυστερήσεων. Συγκεκριμένα, οι επιβάτες θα μπορούν να ζητήσουν αποζημίωση ισοδύναμη με το 50% της τιμής του εισιτηρίου για καθυστέρηση 60-90 λεπτών, 75% για καθυστέρηση πάνω από 1,5 ώρα και 100% για καθυστερήσεις άνω των 3 ωρών. Στην Ελλάδα, που διατίθεται ένα από τα μικρότερα σιδηροδρομικά δίκτυα στην Ευρώπη, η σιδηροδρομική αγορά εμφανίζει ακόμα σημαντικά περιθώρια ανάπτυξης. Ως εκ τούτου, θα πρέπει να ενθαρρύνονται οι επενδύσεις και να προωθούνται η καλύτερη συνδεσιμότητα μεταξύ των ευρωπαϊκών χωρών, γεγονός που σε συνδυασμό με τις προσιτές τιμές θα ενισχύσει καθοριστικά την

ανταγωνιστικότητα του τομέα των σιδηροδρόμων.

Jarosław Wałęsa (PPE), na piśmie. – Celem rozporządzenia jest ochrona praw pasażerów w ruchu kolejowym w Unii, w szczególności gdy podróż zostanie zakłócona, oraz podniesienie jakości i efektywności kolejowych usług pasażerskich. Istotne jest, aby skala zmian była bardziej korzystna dla pasażerów. Zapewnienie należytych praw pasażerom linii kolejowych jest kluczowe dla popularyzacji tego wciąż niedocenianego środka transportu. Musimy wyjść naprzeciw oczekiwaniom obywateli, przede wszystkim jeśli chodzi o zagwarantowanie dostępności kolei dla pasażerów niepełnosprawnych, umożliwienie pasażerom przewozu rowerów oraz uproszczenie zapisów o konieczności wypłacenia odszkodowań w razie spóźnienia lub odwołania połączenia.

Obecnie przepisy są bardziej przyjazne operatorom niż pasażerom, co jest jednym z ewidentnych powodów, dla których kolej traci na atrakcyjności. Tendencja powinna być odwrotna z uwagi na fakt, iż jest to ekologiczny i szybki środek transportu. Naszym obowiązkiem powinno być tworzenie prawa przyjaznego pasażerom.

Niestety, korzystając obecnie z usług kilku operatorów, nie można liczyć na odszkodowanie czy bezpłatne zapewnienie dalszej podróży u innego przewoźnika w razie spóźnienia na przesiadkę. Prawa są ograniczone umową handlową między przedsiębiorstwami lub jej brakiem. Tymczasem pasażerowie linii lotniczych mogą ubiegać się o odszkodowanie lub zapewnienie kolejnego lotu czy noclegu z posiłkami w przypadku, gdy samolot nie wyląduje na czas. Podobnie powinno być w przypadku usług kolejowych.

23. Persistente organiske miljøgifte (forhandling)

Die Präsidentin. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über den Bericht von Julie Girling im Namen des Ausschuss für Umweltfragen, öffentliche Gesundheit und Lebensmittelsicherheit über den Vorschlag für eine Verordnung des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates über persistente organische Schadstoffe (Neufassung) (COM(2018)0144 – C8-0124/2018 – 2018/0070(COD)) (A8-0336/2018).

Julie Girling, Rapporteur. – Madam President, this recast updates the current EU legislation in line with the latest decisions made at international level under the Stockholm Convention. There is no disagreement in this House that this is necessary. The latest research on persistent organic pollutants (POPs) shows a worrying persistence of previously banned substances, particularly in the polar regions, and it's important that we keep up the momentum on this.

The report includes a new role for the European Chemicals Agency (ECHA), giving them much more involvement in certain tasks. This is a move that I strongly welcome. I am aware that not all Members of this House are supportive of ECHA – they don't particularly support it as an organisation – but in my former role as Parliament's ECHA liaison person for many years, I witnessed at first hand the excellent work that they do. I very much welcome the use of their in-house expertise on POPs, as opposed to using outside consultants. That is a good move forward.

We're limited in what we can change here, as the Stockholm Convention supersedes the EU legislation, so this report has been relatively straightforward compared with previous legislation, and indeed with other things that I've worked on. But there are issues, and there is one particular issue – the problem of plastics recycling – which remains to be resolved in the vote tomorrow. This concerns the substance decaBDE. For political reasons which are not clear to me – but which, I would say, just amount to negligence – we find ourselves in a position where this substance was not granted a recycling exemption at UN level, despite the fact that less stable substances from the same chemical group have recycling derogations in place, and these were not removed by the Stockholm Convention. I sought to address this issue at committee level, but the oral amendment that I proposed was rejected by MEPs from some of the political groups. This was regrettable because it would have been best to have the issue dealt with at committee level.

So I have re-tabled the same amendment – that's Amendment 30 – for plenary. I cannot emphasise strongly enough the importance of this amendment when it comes to the EU's circular economy objectives. Amendment 30 concerns five substances, four of which currently have individual recycling derogations of 1 000 ppm, and it imposes a limit of 1 000 ppm for all five combined. That's a major net benefit environmentally and it is in line with limits set out in the current Restriction of Hazardous Substances Directive. The fifth substance, decaBDE, has the same recycling derogation under the REACH (Registration, Evaluation and Authorisation of Chemicals) Directive, a limit agreed only last year. I also include in my amendment a review of this limit in five years' time.

Without this amendment, the vast majority of plastics recyclers dealing with WEEE (waste electrical and electronic equipment) and end-of-life vehicles would have to dramatically reduce their activities or stop altogether. This would particularly and disproportionately affect SMEs. We are talking about 900 000 tons of end-of-life vehicle plastic waste each year, which will probably end up being exported outside Europe for recycling, where standards are far less rigorous and there is a real risk of it finding its way illegally into products such as toys, which are then imported into Europe. If we deal with it and recycle it within Europe to high standards, that should not, and cannot, happen.

Amendment 37 seeks to impose a more ambitious target and, while I fully support ambition, its adoption would actually be negative rather than positive. What's more, my Amendment 30 includes a review of the limit in five years' time and this is crucially important.

We have a strong commitment to the circular economy, and I hope that Members will bear that in mind when considering how to vote on these amendments.

Violeta Bulc, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, I would like to thank the European Parliament, notably the rapporteur, Ms Girling, and the shadow rapporteurs for the work done on the Commission's proposal to recast the POPs Regulation. POP stands for persistent, organic and pollutant. The term refers to chemical substances that persist in the environment, that bio-accumulate through the food chain and that are highly toxic to human health and the environment. Let me underline that these substances can be transported over thousands of miles in the environment from where they were released. This is why persistent organic pollutants are a global concern. As is often the case, global challenges require global solutions.

The international community took action on these chemicals through the establishment of the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants, which entered into force in 2004. The current EU Regulation on Persistent Organic Pollutants dates from 2004 and implements the international commitments expressed in the Stockholm Convention. The Regulation aims at eliminating the production, placing on the market and use of internationally produced persistent organic pollutants (POPs). In addition, it aims at reducing and eliminating the releases of POPs that are unintentional by-products of industrial processes such as dioxins.

Last March, the Commission proposed the recast of the EU Regulation on Persistent Organic Pollutants in order to bring its procedures into line with the procedures set out in the Lisbon Treaty. The recasting process gave us an opportunity to update certain aspects of the regulation, to provide further clarity and to make its processes more efficient. For example, we proposed a role for the European Chemicals Agency (ECHA) to assist the Commission and provide scientific support. In addition, we adopted and streamlined reporting and monitoring obligations and proposed to align the annexes to the Regulation on Persistent Organic Pollutants with the outcome of the 2015 Conference of the Parties to the Stockholm Convention. Finally, we brought certain terms and definitions into line with those used in the EU REACH Regulation. I'm looking forward to hearing your views and I trust that you will give a strong mandate to Ms Girling to start negotiations as soon as possible.

Massimo Paolucci, *a nome del gruppo S&D*. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, inquinanti organici persistenti non è certamente un nome affascinante né di immediata comprensione per i cittadini che stanno seguendo questo dibattito. Perciò, per farci intendere meglio, dobbiamo chiarire che si tratta di sostanze chimiche tossiche pericolose su scala globale, perché viaggiano su lunghissime distanze in atmosfera, che persistono nell'ambiente per molti anni e che si accumulano negli ecosistemi, ponendo così gravi rischi alla salute umana e all'ambiente.

Stiamo parlando di diossine, furani e pesticidi ma anche di ritardanti di fiamma ancora presenti in molti prodotti di uso quotidiano come gli schermi delle tv, dei computer o della componentistica delle auto. Questa è la ragione per cui la Convenzione internazionale ci obbliga a essere molto severi nel trattamento di queste sostanze, molto severi anche quando si tratta di gestire la presenza nei rifiuti e nei materiali che vengono trattati per il riciclo.

Per questo motivo vorrei dire chiaramente che dobbiamo evitare che questi prodotti siano esportati e trattati fuori dall'Europa secondo standard ambientali che non sono i nostri e poi ritornino in Europa dalla finestra. È per questa ragione che noi socialisti vogliamo sì sostenere e promuovere le attività di riciclo, ma contestualmente definire limiti sempre più stringenti e più ambiziosi.

In secondo luogo, da una petizione dei cittadini europei e da uno studio commissionato dal Parlamento europeo è emersa l'evidenza che verosimilmente esistono in Europa suoli e acque sotterranee contaminati. Il gruppo socialista ha chiesto e ottenuto, prendendo spunto da quanto abbiamo già fatto alcuni anni fa nell'ambito del regolamento sul mercurio, che la Commissione e gli Stati membri collaborino al fine di individuare e valutare i siti contaminati da inquinanti organici persistenti.

Questi due principi difenderemo domani nel voto e nelle future negoziazioni con gli Stati membri e la Commissione.

Bolesław G. Piecha, w imieniu grupy ECR. – Pani Przewodnicząca! Trwałe zanieczyszczenia organiczne to związki chemiczne, nie tylko potencjalnie, ale i realnie niebezpieczne ze względu na swoje szczególne właściwości, które związane są z ich toksycznością i niekorzystnym działaniem na organizm ludzki, ale również z tego powodu, że są super-trwałe w środowisku, mają zdolność bioakumulacji i tym samym mają negatywny wpływ na środowisko i zdrowie człowieka.

Ludzie narażeni są na trwałe zanieczyszczenia organiczne na wiele sposobów. Głównie przez spożywaną żywność lub powietrze, którym oddychają. Produkty codziennego użytku, zwłaszcza plastikowe, mogą zawierać wiele substancji stanowiących trwałe zanieczyszczenia organiczne, które zostały dodane w celu poprawy właściwości produktu, co sprawia, że trwałe zanieczyszczenia organiczne można znaleźć niemal wszędzie, i to w mierzalnych ilościach.

Jako polityk, ale przede wszystkim lekarz mam szczególnie na uwadze kwestię szeroko pojętego zdrowia publicznego i w tym kontekście myślę o bezpieczeństwie i zdrowiu ludzi i zwierząt. To piękna idea, ale muszę zgodzić się tutaj ze sprawozdawczynią co do zaproponowanego odstępstwa, które dopuszcza inne stężenie w materiałach pochodzących z recyklingu. Może to spojrzenie mniej ambitne, ale pragmatyczne. Jestem zwolennikiem proponowania realnego prawodawstwa, a w licznych konsultacjach podmioty, które zajmują się recyklingiem, wypowiedziały się na korzyść tej zmiany i stąd moje poparcie dla końcowego sprawozdania.

Linnéa Engström, för Verts/ALE-gruppen. – Fru talman! I dag tar vi ett viktigt steg för att skapa en giftfri vardag för våra barn och våra samhällen. Vi måste begränsa ämnen som DDT och dioxiner – långlivade organiska föreningar som inte bryts ner. Dessa ämnen kan orsaka kroniska sjukdomar, och de är cancerframkallande. De påverkar det centrala nervsystemet och fungerar som hormonstörande ämnen i fortplantningssystemet. Vi får i oss dessa skadliga ämnen via maten, eftersom de lagras i animalisk fettvävnad.

Det vi lagstiftar om i dag är att uppdatera EU:s kemikalielagstiftning i linje med Stockholmskonventionen för att begränsa användningen av de här organiska föreningarna som inte bryts ner. Vi förtydligar också Europeiska kemikaliemyndighetens roll.

Våra barn ska inte utsättas för dessa gifter i sin vardag. Därför är detta beslut ett viktigt "grönt steg" i kampen för en giftfri vardag.

Kateřina Konečná, za skupinu GUE/NGL. – Paní předsedající, navrženým nařízením se provádějí závazky Evropské unie podle Stockholmské úmluvy o perzistentních organických znečišťujících látkách a podle protokolu k ní. Základním cílem těchto mezinárodních smluv a následně i nařízení je ochrana zdraví a životního prostředí před škodlivými účinky této skupiny chemických látek. Bohužel některé zásadní pozměňovací návrhy nepošly Výborem pro životní prostředí, veřejné zdraví a bezpečnost potravin a návrh tak byl zásadně oslaben, proto jsem je také znovu načetla na plénum.

Tímto vás tedy společně s ekologickými a spotřebitelskými organizacemi žádám o hlasování ve prospěch přísnějších limitů pro některé další látky. Je zapotřebí, aby byly prokazatelně toxické látky co nejrychleji zakázány, a to globálně jak v nových, tak v recyklovaných výrobcích. Právě z recyklovaných plastů pak tyto látky rychleji zmizí.

Ráda bych vás konkrétně požádala o podporu pozměňovacích návrhů, které zajistí ochranu spotřebitelů v Evropě před vystavením těmto látkám zejména z recyklovaných výrobků a podpoří tak čistou cirkulární ekonomiku. Navrhuji aktualizovat limity pro chlorované parafiny s krátkým řetězcem tak, jak navrhuje studie z roku 2015 sepsaná z podnětu Německé agentury pro životní prostředí, a pro sumu PBDE, která je v souladu s mezinárodními závazky týkajícími se omezování perzistentních organických znečišťujících látek v rámci Stockholmské úmluvy.

Kolegové, je zcela nezbytné, aby přepracované znění nařízení bylo přijato co nejdříve. Je to zcela nezbytné, pokud chceme ochránit evropské občany.

Eric Andrieu (S&D). – Madame la Présidente, 173 pays ont interdit les polluants organiques persistants. Pourtant, on ne peut pas faire comme s'il n'y avait pas de problèmes de fertilité ou de puberté, comme si 80 % des insectes et un tiers des oiseaux n'avaient pas disparu et comme si les pollinisateurs n'étaient pas en danger de mort.

Glyphosate, chlordécone, néonicotinoïdes, métam-sodium, on ne compte plus le nombre de scandales sanitaires. Mais que fait la Commission européenne pour protéger la santé des 500 millions de citoyens européens?

Aujourd'hui, près d'un tiers des produits chimiques présents sur le marché de l'Union européenne depuis 2010 sont potentiellement dangereux pour la santé humaine, en infraction avec le règlement européen REACH.

Quelle est la réalité? La réalité, c'est que ni les États membres, ni la Commission européenne n'appliquent l'article 191 du traité sur le fonctionnement de l'Union européenne, qui prévoit que la politique de l'Union dans le domaine de l'environnement vise un niveau de protection élevé et est fondée sur les principes de précaution. La réalité, c'est que la plupart des États membres violent allègrement ces principes de précaution et que la Commission européenne, en laissant faire, en laissant aller, se rend elle-même coupable de non-assistance à citoyen en danger.

Il ne faut pas jouer, plaisanter, avec la santé des 500 millions de citoyens européens, il est de notre responsabilité pleine et entière d'agir très concrètement.

Michèle Rivasi (Verts/ALE). – Madame la Présidente, je me réjouis de la révision de ce règlement sur ces polluants organiques persistants (POP).

Effectivement, de nombreuses associations, notamment WECF (Women Engage for a Common Future) et FNE (France Nature Environnement), démontrent la présence de substances toxiques, dont des retardateurs de flamme, qui sont des POP, dans les jouets pour enfants, les ustensiles de cuisine ou les accessoires pour les cheveux. Pourquoi? Parce que ce sont des plastiques recyclés.

Je soutiens mon collègue, M. Andrieu, et juge scandaleux que la Commission européenne ait accordé des dérogations pour justement permettre le recyclage des plastiques contenant ces substances. Des études réalisées sur les moquettes ont montré la présence de POP dans les moquettes des sept principaux fabricants, que ce soit des phthalates, des retardateurs de flamme bromés, etc.

Il faut interdire ces substances en amont. Il ne faut pas accorder de dérogations. Je suis d'accord avec M^{me} Girling lorsqu'elle dit qu'il faut supprimer ces dérogations, parce que, ce qui est important, dans la perspective des élections européennes, c'est de montrer que l'Europe protège la santé des consommateurs. À l'heure actuelle, nous ne sommes pas suffisamment ambitieux.

Anja Hazekamp (GUE/NGL). – Voorzitter, persistente organische gifstoffen, zoals DDT en dioxines, zijn uiterst giftig voor mensen, dieren en het milieu. Ze stapelen zich op in ons vetweefsel en kunnen via de moedermelk aan onze kinderen worden doorgegeven.

Ondanks het feit dat het gebruik al aan banden is gelegd, vinden we dit gif nog steeds volop terug in melk en eieren, maar ook in dieren, zoals vogels, vissen en zeehonden, op kleding, in de bodem en in het grondwater.

Daarom moeten we alle persistente organische stoffen verbieden, zonder uitstel en zonder uitzonderingen. En natuurlijk moeten we deze stoffen vervangen, maar niet door ander gif. In Nederland is het zeer giftige perfluorooctaan zuur vervangen door GenX. Hoewel GenX waarschijnlijk ook kankerverwekkend is, wordt het zonder enige waarschuwing in de anti-aanbaklaag van pannen gebruikt. Inmiddels treffen we GenX overal in het milieu aan! Dat is onbegrijpelijk! Deze stoffen horen niet in ons milieu, niet in ons water en niet in ons lijf!

Voorts ben ik van mening dat de Europese landbouwsubsidies moeten worden afgeschaft!

Jytte Guteland (S&D). – Fru talman! Varje dag exponeras vi för mängder med kemikalier av olika slag. De finns i vår vardag. De finns i leksaker, matförpackningar, våra kläder, vattnet vi dricker, till och med i dammet, som vi kanske sopar under mattan. För ett stort antal av dessa ämnen vet vi inte vilka effekterna är för oss människor och för miljön, trots att det egentligen bara ska vara bevisligen säkra ämnen i vår vardag.

POP-förordningen innehåller några av de värsta ämnen som mänskligheten känner till, inklusive bromerade flamskyddsmedel, till exempel dekaBDE, som regleras genom Stockholmskonventionen. Dessa ämnen blir emellertid inte mindre farliga för att vi återanvänder dem i exempelvis plast. Återvunnen plast blir ju inte bättre för vår hälsa, så det är viktigt att vi gör två saker på samma gång: både blir bättre på att återvinna och ser till att få en giftfri vardag.

Därför kommer jag att kämpa för att gränsvärdet för dekaBDE hålls i linje med miljöutskottets betänkande, dvs. 10 mg/kg. Detta är nämligen viktigt för människors hälsa, det är viktigt för miljön och det är viktigt också för att förtroendet för återvunnen material ska vara intakt hos allmänheten.

Younous Omarjee (GUE/NGL). – Madame la Présidente, Madame la Commissaire, l'une des plus graves crises écologiques et sanitaires de toute l'Union européenne touche les régions ultrapériphériques de la Guadeloupe et de la Martinique, qui ont été exposées, vous le savez, pendant des décennies à un polluant organique persistant très toxique: le chlordécone.

Ces îles sont aujourd'hui ravagées par la persistance de ce polluant. Un scientifique disait que nous sommes dans une situation presque post-Tchernobyl: les terres et les sols sont pollués pour les sept siècles à venir et les habitants sont malades.

La France n'a pas rempli son devoir d'information sur les risques pour les populations, aujourd'hui abandonnées à leur sort. Puisse ce règlement contraindre la France à assumer ses obligations!

Les Antillais, voyez-vous, Madame la Commissaire, attendent beaucoup de l'Europe, et je compte sur vous, Madame la Commissaire, pour agir en ce sens.

Spontane Wortmeldungen

Bogdan Andrzej Zdrojewski (PPE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Zmienię trochę swoje wystąpienie ze względu na debatę, która właśnie się zakończyła. Przede wszystkim chcę zwrócić uwagę na to, że można przyjąć do wiadomości tzw. kategorię eksterytorialności śmieci. To oznacza, że jeżeli patrzymy na ten czy inny ocean i widzimy ogromną masę śmieci, rzeczywiście mamy kłopot z ustaleniem odpowiedzialności tych, którzy powinni poradzić sobie z tym problemem. Ale nie istnieje – chcę to wyraźnie podkreślić – eksterytorialność źródeł tych zanieczyszczeń. Można je odtworzyć i dojść do podmiotów, państw, także społeczeństw odpowiedzialnych za te zanieczyszczenia. I druga rzecz, na którą chcę zwrócić uwagę, to zakończona misja SEDE na Arktyce, podczas której bardzo zdecydowanie podkreślono w kategoriach bezpieczeństwa kwestię zanieczyszczenia tymi właśnie trwałymi chemikaliami nieorganicznymi. Jest to bardzo ważny element i na niego również zwracam uwagę.

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, ο κανονισμός για τον οποίον συζητούμε εναρμονίζεται με τη σύμβαση της Στοκχόλμης για τους έμμονους οργανικούς ρύπους ή επίμονους οργανικούς μολυντές και, ουσιαστικά, στηρίζεται σε αυτήν. Οι εν λόγω ρύποι είναι χημικές τοξικές ουσίες εξαιρετικής σημασίας, που επηρεάζουν την υγεία όλων των ανθρώπων. Ωστόσο, ενώ συζητούμε για τον κανονισμό αυτόν, αποδεικνύεται ότι: πρώτον, δεν πραγματοποιήθηκε διαβούλευση με ενδιαφερόμενους φορείς προκειμένου να εκπονηθεί ο κανονισμός, δεύτερον, δεν αξιοποιήθηκαν εξωτερικοί εμπειρογνώμονες, και τρίτον, δεν έγινε εκτίμηση των επιπτώσεων. Για έναν κανονισμό τόσο σοβαρό, που αποδεικνύεται και από τη συζήτηση ότι είναι καθοριστικής σημασίας για την ίδια την υγεία των πολιτών. Θεωρώ ότι έπρεπε να έχουν γίνει αυτές οι διαδικασίες, διότι είναι ουσιαστικές. Διότι οι εξωτερικοί εμπειρογνώμονες, αλλά και οι ενδιαφερόμενοι φορείς, θα μπορούσαν να προσφέρουν με τις δικές τους παρεμβάσεις.

José Inácio Faria (PPE). – Senhora Presidente, Senhora Comissária, os poluentes orgânicos persistentes, dos quais os mais mediáticos talvez sejam o DDT e as dioxinas, tal como o nome indica, persistem no ambiente, contaminando *habitats* naturais e têm uma elevada toxicidade para nós, humanos, e para outros seres vivos.

Sabemos que a maior parte destes poluentes são, aliás, disruptores endócrinos, o que significa que afetam a saúde e a reprodução de várias espécies animais, incluindo a nossa.

Entendo, por isso, que são necessárias medidas fortes para eliminar este tipo de poluentes e evitar a ecotoxicidade e a bioacumulação em consequências exponenciais nos humanos.

No que toca aos limites admissíveis de pó, temos de impor aos produtos reciclados as mesmas regras que já impomos aos produtos virgens, sem com isto criar uma dualidade de critérios ou uma diferença de qualidade entre produtos, isto é, incentivar a economia circular implica garantir a segurança dos consumidores, sobretudo porque a quantidade de material de origem reciclada só tende a aumentar.

Precisamos de garantir aos cidadãos que podem estar descansados de que a comida, os brinquedos das crianças e os utensílios de uso comum não estão contaminados com essas substâncias de elevado perigo.

Jiří Pospíšil (PPE). – Paní předsedající, já se přiznám, že o této věci jsem v poslední době hodně studoval a musím říci, že jsem zděšen z toho, jak perzistentní organické znečišťující látky čím dále více vyplňují naše životní prostředí a stávají se pro nás fatální hrozbou. Fatální hrozbou pro naše zdraví, fatální hrozbou pro životní prostředí. Proto jsem chtěl říci, že vítám tento návrh, který zpřísňuje existující nařízení.

Děkuji Komisi, děkuji paní zpravodajce, jsem velmi rád, že se jasně stanoví nová pravidla pro Evropskou agenturu pro chemické látky. Na druhou stranu, a proto jsem se přihlásil do debaty, prosím Komisi, aby do budoucna byla mnohem více ambiciózní. Do budoucna, pokud chceme tento problém řešit, budeme muset řešit širší zákaz těchto látek a snahu najít vhodné komponenty a vhodné náhrady. Takže prosím do budoucna větší ambicióznost, je to nutné pro naše zdraví a zdraví našich občanů.

(Ende der spontanen Wortmeldungen)

Violeta Bulc, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, I would like to thank all the Members of Parliament who took part in the debate. It has been a really useful discussion and has touched upon the main elements of the Commission's proposal.

Let me underline, however, one specific issue concerning your proposal of listing decaBDE (decabromodiphenyl ether) in the recast, since this featured prominently during the discussion. While I fully understand the objective of Parliament to take into account the experience and concerns of the recycling sector, I would like to remind you that it is crucial that our circular economies are as free as possible of toxic chemicals. This is in line with the objective of both the United Nations Stockholm Convention and the EU Regulation on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) to eliminate production and use of these substances.

To achieve that objective, it is of utmost importance that materials that contain persistent organic pollutants can be used or placed on the market only if those pollutants are present as unintentional trace contaminants. We must also be aware that products made from recycled materials will be accepted by consumers only if they have confidence in the quality and safety of the recycled material.

Before I conclude, let me refer to some of your additional comments. First, regarding Mr Andrieu's point about breaches of chemical legislation, I'd like you to know that this study was conducted regarding the REACH (Registration, Evaluation, Authorisation and Restriction of Chemicals) Regulation, whereas, in the debate, we were discussing the recast of the POPs Regulation and I would therefore really like to focus only on that.

Secondly, we think that it is important to note that, contrary to the Stockholm Convention, discussions regarding other similar substances, the Stockholm Convention decision that listed decaBDE in Annex A to the Convention does not include a derogation for recycling of products containing decaBDE. This is significantly different from the listing of the other PBDEs (polybrominated diphenyl ethers) under the Convention in 2009, where such a recycling derogation was included. In this case, the listing of the PBDEs in the POPs Regulation in 2010 specifies that the unintentional trace contamination (UTC) levels for the PBDEs is ten ppm (parts per million), but in line with the listings in the Convention, a derogation of 1000 ppms for recycled materials is allowed. There is no such derogation in the Stockholm Convention for decaBDE.

To conclude, I would like to underline that the Commission stands ready to provide support and to play to the full its honest broker role. I am looking forward to starting negotiations in order to ensure a first regarding agreement during the Austrian Presidency so that this legislation can make a real difference on the ground as soon as possible.

Julie Girling, Rapporteur. – Madam President, I would like to thank colleagues for their contributions, some of which were more useful than others. I am particularly concerned at the attempts by one or two Members to roll into POPs (persistent organic pollutants) discussions around agri-chemicals such as glyphosate. It is utterly irresponsible to stand up in this Parliament and imply that glyphosate is a POP. It is not. This legislation is far too serious to play those sorts of politics with.

So, let's restrict ourselves to dealing with the persistent organic pollutants. As I said in my opening address, there is no disagreement here that we all would like to eliminate them. The point is about how we do it, the rate at which we do it and the methodology. For me, I would just make my point again, yes, it's true, as Ms Rivasi said, that there are studies that show that decaBDE (decabromodiphenyl ether), for example, has turned up in hair brushes. This is appalling, but I will bet my life that those hairbrushes were produced in the Far East. They were not produced in Europe, and they come from bad recycling.

If we want to prevent that from happening, if we want the recycling to take place in Europe, by European companies bound by European rules, which will not then put the recyclates on the market for products like food contact materials and toys, according to our rules, then we have to take control of that process. Pretending that we're not going to recycle at all when we have legislation like the ELV (End-of-Life Vehicles) Directive and the WEEE (Waste Electrical & Electronic Equipment) Directive in place is frankly ostrich-like.

So, I ask Members yet again to re-examine their support of Amendment 30 or Amendment 37, and to look carefully at Amendment 30, which not only sets out recycling reductions – because it takes four products, rolls them into five and gives the absolute maximum for all five, which is actually a reduction to 20% – but it also has a review mechanism which would allow us in five years, if we can get best available technology in place in the European recycling industry, to recycle these products. It would allow us to be in a position where we could actually eliminate these. If you go ahead with Amendment 37, that is not an option on the table.

Die Präsidentin. – Die Aussprache ist geschlossen.

Die Abstimmung findet am Donnerstag, 15. November 2018, statt.

Skriftlige erklæringer (artikel 162)

Pavel Poc (S&D), písemně. – Několik týdnů jsem upozorňoval kolegy, jaké dopady mají mezery v legislativě na veřejné zdraví, a že nesouhlasím s tím, že se jedná o pouhou technickou úpravu mezinárodních závazků. Naopak – jedná se o rozhodnutí s významným sociálním dopadem, jehož důsledky ponese ještě desetiletí. Přístup, který v současné době EU zaujímá k recyklaci a limitům perzistentních organických znečišťujících látek, je doslova toxický. Zvláště, pokud existují bezpečnější alternativy. Pokud chceme zaručit nezávadnost materiálů, které recyklujeme, musíme v první řadě eliminovat množství nebezpečných látek v primárních produktech, ne je vracet do oběhu. A už vůbec ne v podobě kontaminovaných kuchyňských pomůcek či dětských hraček. Pro ty, co nevědí, POP jsou látky, které se akumulují v životním prostředí, odkud se dostávají do našeho potravního řetězce. V lidském těle pak narušují fungování hormonálního, nervového i imunitního systému. V EU nám bohužel trvá příliš dlouho, než takto nebezpečné látky zcela zaká-

žeme, což vede k tomu, že se ještě dlouhou dobu potýkáme s jejich odkazem. V příštím roce například skončí pětileté přechodné období pro HBCD. Tuto toxickou látku ale budeme mít další desetiletí zabudovanou ve svých domech. Myslím, že se snad všichni shodneme na tom, že takové dědictví bychom svým dětem zachovávat neměli.

24. Statistikmyndighedernes uafhængighed i Den Europæiske Union og sagen om Andreas Georgiou (forhandling)

Die Präsidentin. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über die Erklärungen des Rates und der Kommission zu der Unabhängigkeit statistischer Ämter in der Europäischen Union und der Fall von Andreas Georgiou (2018/2930(RSP)).

Karoline Edtstadler, President-in-Office of the Council. – Madam President, high quality, reliable and accurate official statistics are the pillar of the EU's economic governance, supporting decisions in our economic surveillance procedures in the context of the European Semester. Issues related to statistics are therefore a regular item on the Council's agenda. The Council regularly – once every year – reviews the EU's statistical information needs, examines reports provided by EU statistical bodies and adopts conclusions, which evaluate progress and set priorities for the upcoming year. Undoubtedly, high-quality, accurate and reliable statistical data can only be produced by independent statistical authorities.

The professional independence of the EU's national and Union-level statistical bodies is enshrined in EU law. The EU's statistical authorities also operate according to the European Statistics Code of Practice. The implementation of the Code's 16 principles is monitored by the Independent European Statistical Governance Advisory Board, which informs both Parliament and the Council. Indeed, the situation as regards the professional independence of statistical authorities in general has been satisfactory.

The important exceptions, however, are the concerns expressed over the judicial proceedings against the former President of Greece's statistical authority, ELSTAT, Andreas Georgiou, and two senior ELSTAT officials. The Commission has repeatedly reiterated since 2016 its full confidence in the reliability and accuracy of ELSTAT data from 2010 to 2015 and since then. The issue has also been addressed by the Eurogroup in the context of Greece's Third Economic Adjustment Programme, whose conditionality included requirements to review the provisions related to the autonomy of independent parties, including ELSTAT.

Against this background, in June this year, on the occasion of concluding Greece's Third Programme, the Eurogroup mandated the institutions to continue monitoring developments in the legal proceedings against the former President and senior staff of ELSTAT and against the members of the Committee of Experts of the Hellenic Republic Asset Development Fund. It also mandated them to monitor the supporting actions taken by the Greek authorities, including legislative actions, if needed, in full respect of the independence of the judiciary. The institutions are expected to report back to the Eurogroup in the context of the post-programme surveillance. These reports, in addition to the regular reporting by the European statistical agencies, will keep us informed on the situation related to ELSTAT.

With this, I will finish my brief statement and I will listen attentively to the Commissioner's intervention and to your debate.

Marianne Thyssen, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, I appreciate the opportunity to discuss with you the independence of statistics for Europe.

The independence of statistics and of the statistical authorities that produce them is a fundamental principle explicitly set out in EU law. The current governance of the European statistical system relies primarily on a clear, legal framework, the so-called statistical system. With your support, that law has been improved and strengthened, on the initiative of the Commission and in full observance of the principles of subsidiarity and proportionality.

Like any principle or rule set out in law, statistical independence needs to be monitored and its implementation needs to be ensured in practice. Regulatory monitoring is carried out both by the Commission and by independent peers in the context of the European Statistics Code of Practice, already mentioned by the Presidency. This code aims to enhance the professional independence, integrity and accountability of European statistics and of the European statistical system. You in this House, as the European legislator, have contributed to ensuring the transparency and accountability of the European statistical system by establishing the European Statistical Governance Advisory Board (ESGAB).

ESGAB is an independent body of experts that oversees the implementation of the Code of Practice, and every year it makes a report, which it presents to you, honourable Members, as well as to the Council. The annual ESGAB reports have always covered the principle of professional independence and illustrated the progress achieved at national and EU levels. On the basis of the Commission's and ESGAB's monitoring, the Member States have identified and implemented improvement measures that contribute to maintaining the confidence of users, and particularly their trust in the independence of statistics.

As regards the specific situation in Greece and the situation of Mr Georgiou, let me firstly emphasise that the Commission has full confidence in the reliability and the accuracy of data produced by the statistical authority in Greece under Mr Georgiou's leadership in the years from 2010. The Commission has consistently confirmed this in previous public statements. Secondly, let me repeat that the Commission neither comments on developments in ongoing national judicial proceedings nor assesses the impact of court decisions that are not final and irrevocable. That said, I can understand that the staff of the Hellenic Statistical Authority (ELSTAT) may feel they are not sufficiently well protected to do their jobs effectively and independently. The Commission has followed the developments in Greece consistently and has repeatedly expressed its concern in that regard, both in public statements and directly to the Greek authorities. The Eurogroup has also consistently expressed its support for Mr Georgiou and, most recently in its statement on Greece of 22 June this year, it has been inviting the European institutions to monitor the developments and to report back to the Eurogroup.

It's important to highlight that the Commission has actively supported Greek statistics on several fronts. The support has led, inter alia, to amendments of Greek law to further enhance the statistical authority's institutional, operational and financial independence. Other legal amendments have provided for the indemnification of current or former statistics officials for legal expenses incurred in the context of trials following lawsuits or criminal charges against them related to the performance of their duties. Commission officials have also contributed extensively, with their expertise, to strengthening the statistical processes in Greece, and we continue to do that, as we do in other Member States too.

In conclusion, I would like to reassure the honourable Members that not only has the independence of the national statistical authorities been strengthened in law, but Eurostat is also actively working to ensure that independence exists in practice too. Your continued vigilance will help us in this task.

Γεώργιος Κύρτσος, εξ ονόματος της ομάδας PPE. – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, η εικόνα που έχω για τον κύριο Γεωργίου είναι ότι πρόκειται για έναν άριστο επιστήμονα και τεχνοκράτη, που έπεσε θύμα των περιστάσεων και πολιτικών δικαστικών παιχνιδιών. Ένα μέρος της κοινωνίας του φόρτωσε, μέσα στην ένταση της κρίσης, την αναγκαστική ένταξη της Ελλάδας σε δανειακό πρόγραμμα, επειδή δήθεν άλλαξε τα στοιχεία. Η Ελλάδα είχε μπει αναγκαστικά σε δανειακό πρόγραμμα προτού ο κύριος Γεωργίου οριστικοποιήσει τα στατιστικά στοιχεία. Δυστυχώς, μένοντας στο ευρώ δεν κάναμε -για λόγους πολιτικού κόστους- τις αναγκαίες μεταρρυθμίσεις, όπως έκαναν άλλες χώρες, με αποτέλεσμα να οδηγηθούμε στην υπερχρέωση και σε αδιέξοδο. Χώρες με μικρότερα προβλήματα από τα δικά μας, όπως η Ιρλανδία, η Πορτογαλία και η Κύπρος, υποχρεώθηκαν επίσης να μπουκώσουν σε δανειακό πρόγραμμα και να εφαρμόσουν το σχετικό μνημόνιο. Επομένως, δεν φταίει ο κύριος Γεωργίου για τα προβλήματά μας, που συνεχίζονται εξαιτίας και της κρίσης του 2015. Υπάρχουν βέβαια δικαστικοί λειτουργοί που αξιολογούν την κατάσταση διαφορετικά. Αρκεί να θυμίσω ότι η πρώην πρόεδρος του Αρείου Πάγου, η οποία σήμερα είναι σύμβουλος του πρωθυπουργού κυρίου Τσίπρα, είχε στείλει επιστολή στον κύριο Juncker καταγγέλλοντας το δανειακό πρόγραμμα. Αυτό που μπορούμε και πρέπει να κάνουμε για τον κύριο Γεωργίου είναι να επιμείνουμε να τελειώσει η δικαστική του περιπέτεια και να βεβαιώσουμε ότι τα δικαστικά νομικά έξοδα θα περάσουν στο ελληνικό δημόσιο, όπως έχει ήδη αποφασιστεί. Θεωρώ, λοιπόν, ότι πρέπει να δοθεί ένα τέλος στις δικαστικές περιπέτειες του κυρίου Γεωργίου. Κατά την άποψή μου, οι διαδρομές που τον ταλαιπωρούν είναι υπόγειες. Ο ίδιος τις έχει παρουσιάσει με τον δικό του τρόπο στην Επιτροπή Οικονομικών και Νομισματικών Υποθέσεων του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου.

Roberto Gualtieri, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Madam President, the independence and credibility of statistical authorities is a fundamental pillar of the EU and a prerequisite for a sound economy and a solid monetary union. We are proud of our statistics and we support Eurostat in its work in ensuring their growing quality and reliability.

We all know that falsification of statistics occurred in Greece and that the work subsequently undertaken by Mr Georgiou, when he headed the Hellenic Statistical Authority (ELSTAT), has been crucial in improving the situation and bringing the numbers to reality and credibility. We also know that since then, ELSTAT has been carrying out excellent work and the Greek Government has put in place all the necessary measures to ensure and safeguard its independence.

As the Eurostat assessment and approval of data collected as from 2010 show, ELSTAT has, since then, acted in an objective and reliable fashion, in compliance with its tasks and code of conduct, and with EU statistics rules.

Our message here is clear and simple. We respect the Greek judicial system and its autonomy. However, we regret the judiciary crusade against Mr Georgiou which, we know, was not been triggered by the current Government. We want to reiterate here our full support for him. We are very concerned about the potential consequences of such an affair, and the risk of undermining the independence and impartiality of all statisticians: because independence means not only not being subject to external interference but also being safeguarded against hostile surrounding factors that could prevent people from carrying out their tasks freely and impartially.

Νότης Μαρίας, εξ ονόματος της ομάδας ECR. – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, το ζήτημα της τεχνητής διόγκωσης του δημοσίου ελλείμματος του 2009 αποδείχθηκε καθοριστικό προκειμένου να μπορέσει η κυβέρνηση του Γιώργου Παπανδρέου να νομιμοποιήσει και να δρομολογήσει την ένταξη της Ελλάδας στο Διεθνές Νομισματικό Ταμείο και στα μνημόνια. Έτσι, ενώ η κυβέρνηση Καραμανλή, τον Σεπτέμβριο του 2009, είχε προσδιορίσει το δημόσιο έλλειμμα στο 6%, η κυβέρνηση Παπανδρέου, μετά την εκλογική νίκη του ΠΑΣΟΚ τον Οκτώβριο του 2009, το προσδιόρισε στο 12,7%. Ποιο ήταν το αποτέλεσμα; Να υπονομευθεί η δανειοληπτική θέση της χώρας. Να δρομολογηθεί κρίση δανεισμού και να οδηγηθεί η Ελλάδα στην «αγκαλιά» της τρόικας, η οποία επί οκτώ χρόνια φτωχοποίησε τον ελληνικό λαό, πετσόκοψε μισθούς και συντάξεις και εκτίναξε το χρέος από το 115% του ΑΕΠ στο 180%. Η απόδειξη της τεχνητής διόγκωσης του ελλείμματος εκδίδει και την ίδια την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, καθώς αποδεικνύει ότι επιβλήθηκε το μνημόνιο ενώ δεν ήταν αναγκαίο για την Ελλάδα. Άλλωστε, ο κύριος Dijsselbloem ομολόγησε ότι το μνημόνιο έσωσε τους δανειστές, έσωσε το ευρώ και όχι την Ελλάδα. Η υπόθεση Γεωργίου έχει απασχολήσει τα ελληνικά ποινικά δικαστήρια, ενώπιον των οποίων βρέθηκε κατηγορούμενος. Η ελληνική δικαιοσύνη είναι ανεξάρτητη και το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο δεν έχει καμία αρμοδιότητα ανάμειξης. Όλη αυτή η συζήτηση γίνεται με αποκλειστικό σκοπό τη διεθνοποίηση της νέας ποινικής υπόθεσης κατά τον κύριο Γεωργίου, μια και έχει ασκηθεί νέα ποινική δίωξη. Συνάδελφοι, αν θέλετε να βοηθήσετε τον κύριο Γεωργίου, να πάτε ως μάρτυρες υπεράσπισης στη δίκη του αντί να μιλάτε εδώ πολιτικά. Πηγαίνετε στα ποινικά δικαστήρια να τον υπερασπιστείτε ως μάρτυρες, όσοι νομίζετε ότι έχει δίκιο ο κύριος Γεωργίου.

Jean Arthuis, *au nom du groupe ALDE*. – Madame la Présidente, l'Union européenne s'honore de sa charte de valeurs fondamentales et c'est à ce titre que nous luttons contre les informations fallacieuses, que nous protégeons les lanceurs d'alerte et que nous respectons les principes de l'état de droit.

Toute communauté, dès lors qu'elle mobilise les deniers de ses membres, doit être vigilante sur la sincérité des comptes rendus et des informations statistiques. La confiance mutuelle se construit sur une exigence de vérité et de fiabilité. Andreas Georgiou, directeur général d'ELSTAT (l'Autorité grecque des statistiques macroéconomiques, budgétaires et financières) est poursuivi depuis 2011 parce qu'il a respecté les normes édictées par l'Union européenne en cette matière. Alors que deux décisions de la Cour suprême grecque ont prononcé un non-lieu en sa faveur, en septembre de cette année, une troisième procédure vient d'être lancée à son encontre à l'initiative du parquet général. J'observe que l'équipe ancienne, celle qui a maquillé les comptes publics, n'est l'objet d'aucune poursuite. En revanche, la vindicte se concentre sur Andreas Georgiou.

Je lance un appel au Conseil, Madame la Ministre, et à la Commission, Madame la Commissaire, ne soyez pas suspects de complicité d'un acharnement judiciaire caractérisé qui sape l'indispensable confiance au sein de l'Union économique et monétaire. Mettez fin à cette situation scandaleuse sur le plan humain, politique et européen. Si Guy Béart a chanté «Il a dit la vérité, il sera exécuté», telle n'est pas notre vision, telle n'est pas notre ligne de conduite, telle n'est pas notre exigence. C'est une question de confiance. Pour terminer, je voudrais dire à nos collègues grecs qu'il est indispensable de mettre un terme à cette situation scandaleuse.

(L'orateur accepte de répondre à une question «carton bleu» (article 162, paragraphe 8, du règlement))

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR), *ερώτηση με γαλάζια κάρτα*. – Κύριε συνάδελφε, υπάρχει η ανεξάρτητη ελληνική δικαιοσύνη. Εσείς είπατε ότι ξεκίνησε ήδη νέα ποινική δίωξη κατά του κυρίου Γεωργίου. Με όσα είπατε, φαίνεται ότι πιστεύετε στην αθωότητα του κυρίου Γεωργίου. Οπότε σας ερωτώ: θα πάτε στα ελληνικά δικαστήρια να καταθέσετε ως μάρτυρας υπεράσπισης του κυρίου Γεωργίου; Μόνον έτσι μπορείτε να τον βοηθήσετε. Μπορείτε να είστε μάρτυρας υπεράσπισης στη δίκη του. Θα πάτε; Διότι, πρακτικά, μόνον έτσι μπορείτε να βοηθήσετε. Διαφορετικά, όλη η πολιτική συζήτηση εδώ σημαίνει παρέμβαση στην ελληνική ποινική δικαιοσύνη.

Jean Arthuis (ALDE), *réponse «carton bleu»*. – Cher Marias, ne vous méprenez pas, nous sommes les uns et les autres, dans la diversité des pays que nous représentons, des formations politiques qui sont les nôtres. Nous sommes garants d'un pacte moral qui est fondé sur la confiance.

M. Georgiou a bénéficié de deux non-lieux de la Cour suprême. Alors, pourquoi cet acharnement manifesté par le parquet général, qui lance une troisième procédure à l'encontre de M. Georgiou? Je souhaiterais vraiment qu'en votre qualité d'élu grec, vous puissiez faire pression auprès de l'opinion publique et des autorités grecques pour mettre un terme à cette situation.

Nous construirons l'Europe sur un principe de confiance et non pas sur le maquillage des comptes publics.

Molly Scott Cato, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Madam President, in a world where the rule of law is under threat, we must protect the integrity and independence of public officials. In this context, there is deep concern about the charges lodged against Greece's top statistician, Mr Andreas Georgiou, who was responsible for re-calculating the country's economic statistics, in accordance with EU law, in 2010.

His case represents the trial of evidence-based policy-making and it is a test of the independence of state officials. Policy-makers, as well as the general public, require high-quality statistics in order to make informed decisions within our democracies. Any attempt to undermine independent experts should ring alarm bells. In this case, there is a suspicion that a legal process is being used as a tool to scapegoat statisticians for the impact of national economic policies.

The Commission should take steps to protect the independence and integrity of the work of statisticians and to ensure that they are not subject to political pressure. I would like to agree with Mr Gualtieri and also to express my support for Mr Georgiou.

Δημήτριος Παπαδημούλης, εξ ονόματος της ομάδας GUE/NGL. – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, για το έλλειμμα του 2009, κυρίες και κύριοι συνάδελφοι, που ήταν 15,1% και όχι 6% –όπως μας έλεγε με πλαστά στοιχεία και «μαγειρεμένες» στατιστικές η κυβέρνηση της Νέας Δημοκρατίας– φαίνεται οι τότε κυβερνώντες και όχι ο κύριος Γεωργίου. Χαίρομαι, διότι το Συμβούλιο και η Επιτροπή, αλλά και η Eurostat, το Eurogroup και ο ESM, επιβεβαιώνουν ότι και σήμερα και όλα τα τελευταία χρόνια, από το 2010 και μετά, οι ελληνικές δημόσιες στατιστικές είναι απολύτως αξιόπιστες. Το βεβαίωσε, κύριε Ferber, και ο κύριος Radermacher όταν ήρθε και μας μίλησε στο Ευρωκοινοβούλιο, και η κυρία Kotzeva, και είπε ότι τα «μαγειρεμένα» στοιχεία και τα ελλείμματα ανήκουν στην περίοδο που κυβερνούσαν τη χώρα η Νέα Δημοκρατία και το ΠΑΣΟΚ. Γι' αυτόν ακριβώς τον λόγο, θα ήθελα να σας πω ότι σεβόμαστε απολύτως και εγγυόμαστε απολύτως την ανεξαρτησία τόσο της ΕΛΣΤΑΤ όσο και της ελληνικής δικαιοσύνης. Όσοι επιχειρούν σήμερα να εκμεταλλευτούν τις δικαστικές περιπέτειες που ταλαιπωρούν τον κύριο Γεωργίου για να πλήξουν τη χώρα μου, την Ελλάδα, το μόνο που επιτυγχάνουν είναι να υπενθυμίζουν τον δημοσιονομικό εκτροχιασμό και τα πλαστά στατιστικά στοιχεία, κυρία Πρόεδρε, ...

(Η Πρόεδρος αφαιρεί τον λόγο από τον ομιλητή.)

Ελευθέριος Συναδινός (NI). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, η υπόθεση του Ανδρέα Γεωργίου της Ελληνικής Στατιστικής Υπηρεσίας δεν είναι απλά μια ποινική ή και πειθαρχική παράβαση καθήκοντος. Αφενός μεν, ο Γεωργίου φέρει βαρύτατες ηθικές ευθύνες τις οποίες κανένα δικαστήριο δεν είναι αρμόδιο να κρίνει, αφετέρου δε, όφειλε να προστατεύσει το Δημόσιο και τα ελληνικά συμφέροντα. Ωστόσο, επέλεξε να υπακούσει στα αφεντικά του, εντός και εκτός Ελλάδας. Τους Έλληνες πολίτες δεν τους ενδιαφέρει ο ίδιος ως πρόσωπο, αλλά η θέση που υπηρέτησε και κυρίως το έργο και το αποτέλεσμα που παρήχθη. Το αποτέλεσμα ήταν η τεχνητή διόγκωση του ελλείμματος το 2009, που οδήγησε την Ελλάδα στη δίνη των μνημονίων, της φτωχοποίησης, του ξεπουλήματος και της μίζεριας. Πρέπει να γίνει κατανοητό πως μία ανεξάρτητη εθνική αρχή παραμένει εθνική και υπόλογη στο αντίστοιχο κράτος. Οι δε εργαζόμενοι των ανεξάρτητων αρχών συνεχίζουν να αποτελούν υπαλλήλους των εθνικών κρατών. Δεν βρίσκονται σε αποστολή εκτός έδρας και δεν είναι υπάλληλοι των δανειστών ή κάποιου ευρωπαϊκού θεσμού. Η πολιτική ευθύνη των ελληνικών κυβερνήσεων Νέας Δημοκρατίας, ΠΑΣΟΚ, ΣΥΡΙΖΑ και ΑΝΕΛ στο θέμα αυτό είναι υπαρκτή και αποτελεί εθνική προδοσία. Μια πατριωτική κυβέρνηση θα οδηγήσει τους πολιτικούς υπόλογους στο σκαμνί του κατηγορουμένου, διότι στο σάπιο πολιτικό σύστημα της Ελλάδος «κόρακας κοράκου μάτι δεν βγάζει».

Markus Ferber (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin! Was Andreas Georgiou vorgeworfen wird, würde in Deutschland vielleicht mit einer Rüge belegt werden, aber keinesfalls mit einer zweijährigen Haftstrafe. Die Urteile gegen Andreas Georgiou wurden mehrfach von Berufungsgerichten aufgehoben; jedes Mal hat die griechische Justiz, die Staatsanwaltschaft, neue Verfahren angestrengt.

Ansichts dessen drängt sich eine Frage förmlich auf: Warum war es dem griechischen Staat ein solches Anliegen, Andreas Georgiou zu verurteilen? Sein Verbrechen war nämlich nicht, dass er ohne Konsultation seiner Kollegen aus dem *Estat Board* statistische Daten veröffentlicht hat – sein wahres Verbrechen war, dass Andreas Georgiou seine Arbeit gemacht hat, und dazu gehört es eben auch, dass unbequeme Wahrheiten ausgesprochen werden müssen.

Der eigentliche Skandal besteht darin, dass nicht diejenigen zur Rechenschaft gezogen werden, die dazu beigetragen haben, fehlerhafte statistische Daten zu melden. Nein, stattdessen wird derjenige belangt, der sich dafür eingesetzt hat, dass die Regeln eingehalten werden und dass nicht getrickst wird.

Mit dem Melden fehlerhafter Daten hat Griechenland die Integrität des europäischen statistischen Systems beschädigt. Der viel größere Schaden ist jedoch durch den Umgang mit Andreas Georgiou entstanden. Denn das europäische statistische System beruht auf der Grundvermutung, dass die gemeldeten Daten korrekt sind. Das wiederum setzt voraus, dass die Statistiker unbehelligt ihrer Arbeit nachgehen dürfen. Aus diesem Grund kann ich das Vorgehen nur verurteilen.

(Der Redner lehnt es ab, eine Frage von Herrn Papadimoulis und eine Frage von Herrn Chountis nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“ gemäß Artikel 162 Absatz 8 der Geschäftsordnung zu beantworten.)

Jakob von Weizsäcker (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin! Andreas Georgiou wird nun seit Jahren vor Gerichten dafür angeklagt, dass er in einer schwierigen Lage die Wahrheit gesagt hat. Er wurde im August 2010 Leiter des griechischen Amtes für Statistik. Er hat dann endlich zutreffend die griechischen Defizitzahlen berechnen lassen. Davor waren die Statistiken fehlerhaft. All das bestätigt die europäische Statistikbehörde.

Ja, damit wurde er zum Überbringer schlechter Nachrichten in schwierigen Zeiten. Aber genau das war seine verdammte Pflicht als Staatsdiener und gemäß unseren europäischen Regeln. In Zeiten, in denen Misstrauen und Fake News Europa zu zerstören drohen, hat Herr Georgiou Vertrauen geschaffen.

Wenn man in anderen, weniger glücklichen Teilen der Welt unterwegs ist, merkt man, was für ein Segen es ist, dass unsere Beamtenschaft der Wahrheit verpflichtet ist, dass sie dem Staat dient und nicht einfach den Herrschenden. Meines Wissens ist auch diese große zivilisatorische Errungenschaft in Europa historisch in Griechenland entstanden. Dafür kann Europa dankbar sein, und Griechenland kann stolz darauf sein. Diese Errungenschaft müssen wir bewahren und unsere Staatsdiener schützen.

(Der Redner ist damit einverstanden, eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“ gemäß Artikel 162 Absatz 8 der Geschäftsordnung zu beantworten.)

Δημήτριος Παπαδημούλης (GUE/NGL), ερώτηση με γαλάζια κάρτα. – Ευχαριστώ συνάδελφε Weizsäcker, εσείς δεν φοβόσαστε τα ερωτήματα όπως ο κύριος Ferber. Σας ερωτώ λοιπόν: ποιο κόμμα ήταν αυτό που, το 2009, εμφάνισε τις «μαγειρεμένες» στατιστικές; Αν ο κύριος Γεωργίου είχε δίκιο υπολογίζοντας το έλλειμμα στο 15,1%, ποιος ήταν στην κυβέρνηση το 2009 και εμφάνισε εδώ πλαστά στατιστικά στοιχεία που έλεγαν 6%;

Jakob von Weizsäcker (S&D), Antwort auf eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“. – Hier geht es ja nicht um die Frage, wer wann Griechenland regiert hat. Ich glaube, alle hier im Raum wissen dies. Sondern hier geht es um die Frage, ob ein statistisches Amt seine Arbeit machen kann in der gebotenen Unabhängigkeit. Ich finde, Herr Kollege Papadimoulis, Sie haben dazu sehr kluge Worte gefunden und denen habe ich nichts hinzuzufügen.

Richard Sulík (ECR). – Pani predsedajúca, občas sa dozvieme z islamského sveta správu, že znásilnená žena je potrebná za to, že sa nechala znásilniť. A my tu v Európe si povieme: „No takáto absurdnosť, to by sa tu jednoducho nemohlo stať!“ No ale pozrime, čo sa deje. Úradník, šéf štatistického úradu, ide byť odsúdený za to – alebo bol odsúdený za to –, že povie pravdu. A my sa tu ešte s plnou vážnosťou ideme o tom baviť, či to naozaj smel alebo nesmel. A či teda on povedal, že to bude 15 % alebo 13 %. Grécko sa tak či tak dostalo do najťažších možných problémov nie kvôli tomuto pánovi Georgemusovi, ktorý povedal, ako sa veci majú, ale kvôli tým vládam, ktoré zadlžovali krajinu, ako keby neexistoval zajtrajšok. Chcem len pripomenúť, že dnes sa bavíme o tom, že Taliansko má v pláne spraviť 2,4 % deficit a kvôli tomu je úplne správne oheň na streche! A tu sa bavíme o tom, či to malo byť 9, 6, 13 alebo 15. Toto robí tú diskusiu tak strašne absurdnou.

PRESIDENZA DELL'ON. FABIO MASSIMO CASTALDO

Vicepresidente

Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE). – Mr President, Mr Georgiou is in exile in the US for telling the truth. He communicated the correct numbers of the Greek economy at that time and the Greek public deficit figures. He shed the light on the biggest lies that led the Greek state and the EU into one of the most severe financial crises since the end of the Second World War.

Even *The Economist*, two years ago, denounced the prosecution of Mr Georgiou as a violation of scientific freedom and human rights. Last October, the *Financial Times* reported that Mr Georgiou received an award for statistical integrity given by the world's leading statistical societies.

Lastly, the think-tank Bruegel said last June: 'the European Union must defend Andreas Georgiou. The European Union also needs to reform its statistical framework to ensure a similar scandal cannot happen again.'

What is at stake is the credibility of our European Union above the credibility of the Greek authorities. This is a very dangerous precedent. It is crucial that the statistical basis for our economic decision-making remains reliable and independent from political interference. What is at stake is the reliability and independence of the statistics office and authorities all across Europe.

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

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR), ερώτηση με γαλάζια κάρτα. – Κύριε Tremosa, θέλω ειλικρινά να σας διαφωτίσω για τα πραγματικά περιστατικά. Η κυβέρνηση της Νέας Δημοκρατίας, τον Σεπτέμβριο του 2009, έλεγε ότι το έλλειμμα είναι 6%. Το ΠΑΣΟΚ κέρδισε τις εκλογές στις 4 Οκτωβρίου 2009. Στις 19 Οκτωβρίου του 2009, ο υπουργός Οικονομικών, κύριος Παπακωνσταντίνου, πήγε στο Eurogroup και είπε ότι το έλλειμμα είναι 12,7%. Και σας ερωτώ: θεωρείτε ότι είναι σοβαρή ενέργεια, μέσα σε δέκα ημέρες ένας νέος υπουργός Οικονομικών να έχει τα στοιχεία και να ανεβάζει το έλλειμμα στο ποσοστό αυτό; Αυτό είναι το βασικό ερώτημα. Ο κύριος Γεωργίου διορίστηκε τον Αύγουστο του 2010, εγώ σας ερωτώ για το 2009. Είναι δυνατόν μέσα σε δέκα ημέρες η κυβέρνηση να αλλάξει το ποσοστό χωρίς να έχει και την άποψη της ΕΛΣΤΑΤ; Προσέξτε το! Αυτά είναι τα πραγματικά περιστατικά.

Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE), blue-card answer. – Very briefly, I am not an expert in the details of Greek politics, but I do not think that Mr Georgiou is guilty of causing the Greek crisis. A lot of things were done badly over many years, and the right way to proceed is not to prosecute civil servants who try to tell the truth. A precedent is being set for all EU Member States, so this is why we need to take action.

Νικόλαος Χουντής (GUE/NGL). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, αγαπητοί συνάδελφοι, ο ελληνικός λαός έχει πληρώσει ακριβά την παραποίηση -και από τις ελληνικές αρχές και από τη Eurostat- των στατιστικών στοιχείων της ελληνικής οικονομίας. Αυτά τα παραποιημένα στατιστικά στοιχεία αξιοποιήθηκαν από την Επιτροπή. Κυρία Επίτροπε, έχω πληθώρα ερωτημάτων εκείνης της περιόδου, όπου ουσιαστικά οι Επίτροποι το παραδέχονται. Τα πολιτικά παιχνίδια που παίχτηκαν με τα στατιστικά στοιχεία προλείαναν το έδαφος για την επιβολή των πολιτικών κοινωνικής υποβάθμισης από την τρόικα. Ο πρόεδρος της ΕΛΣΤΑΤ το 2010, ο κύριος Γεωργίου, κατά παράβαση της εθνικής νομοθεσίας και του υφιστάμενου ευρωπαϊκού πλαισίου εθνικών λογαριασμών, προσέθεσε συγκεκριμένα -κύριε Ferber, αυτό θα σας ρωτούσα- τους ισολογισμούς δεκαεφτά δημόσιων φορέων χωρίς τις απαραίτητες προϋποθέσεις, με συνέπεια να φουσκώσει ακόμα περισσότερο το έλλειμμα και να εφαρμοστούν σκληρότερες πολιτικές λιτότητας από τα μνημόνια. Έρχεται τώρα η τρόικα στα προαπαιτούμενα του τρίτου μνημονίου και επαναλαμβάνει την απαίτηση να παρέμβει η ελληνική δικαιοσύνη, να παρέμβει η ελληνική κυβέρνηση και να αθώσει τον κύριο Γεωργίου, όπως κάνουν και σε άλλες περιπτώσεις ανθρώπων τους -όπως είναι οι άνθρωποι στο ΤΑΙΠΕΔ- που έβλαψαν αποδεδειγμένα το εθνικό συμφέρον. Ο ελληνικός λαός ζητάει να αντιμετωπιστεί αυτό το θέμα, αγαπητοί φίλοι, και να σταματήσει η μνημονιακή πολιτική και η εποπτεία με αυτά τα στοιχεία και αυτές τις πολιτικές.

(Ο ομιλητής δέχεται να απαντήσει σε ερώτηση με γαλάζια κάρτα (άρθρο 162 παράγραφος 8 του Κανονισμού))

Jakob von Weizsäcker (S&D), Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“. –Herr Kollege Chountis! Ich würde gerne von Ihnen wissen, warum Sie glauben, dass die Zahlen, die unter Herrn Georgiou ausgearbeitet wurden, fehlerhaft waren, wo doch das europäische Statistikamt bestätigt hat, dass die Arbeit zutreffend war. Das war Ihrer Rede nicht zu entnehmen. Ich würde gerne wissen, wo Sie das Problem sehen. Unsere europäischen Behörden sagen: Das war alles in Ordnung. Wie kommen Sie zu einem anderen Ergebnis?

Νικόλαος Χουντής (GUE/NGL), απάντηση σε ερώτηση με γαλάζια κάρτα. – Κύριε συνάδελφε, ήμουν ευρωβουλευτής στην προηγούμενη περίοδο, που συζητήθηκε κατά κόρον αυτό το θέμα στην Ολομέλεια του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου, και γενικώς το θέμα των στατιστικών στοιχείων και, εν τέλει, το θέμα της αξιοπιστίας της Eurostat. Αποδείχθηκε ότι η Eurostat δεχόταν παραποιημένα στοιχεία -για κάθε αξιοποίηση μπορώ να πω εγώ- και από άλλες χώρες, όχι μόνον από την Ελλάδα. Δεύτερον, ήταν διάχυτη η ανευθυνότητα της Επιτροπής όσον αφορά μια τέτοια κατάσταση. Σχετικά με το θέμα της Ελλάδας, η Eurostat κάλυψε εκ των υστέρων τον κύριο Γεωργίου. Θα ήθελα και εσάς να σας ρωτήσω: Ξέρετε αν στη χώρα σας, στα στατιστικά στοιχεία όσον αφορά το έλλειμμα της γενικής κυβέρνησης μπαίνουν και οι ισολογισμοί των ΔΕΚΟ, και κάτω από ποιες προϋποθέσεις; Προϋποθέσεις τις οποίες δεν τήρησε ο κύριος Γεωργίου; Καταλάβατε ποιο είναι το πρόβλημα;

Ingeborg Gräßle (PPE). – Herr Präsident, Frau Kommissarin, Frau Ratspräsidentin! Ja, wir wissen das in Deutschland, Herr Kollege Chountis, dass die Statistiken, die wir melden, dass sie korrekt sind. Wenn sie nicht korrekt wären, dann würden wir eine Strafe verhängen, weil sie nicht korrekt sind, und nicht, weil sie jemand als korrekt gemeldet hat. Das ist hier doch eine absurde Verkehrung der Inhalte und eine absurde Verkehrung der Dinge.

Es haben sich bis jetzt mehrere griechische Regierungen an Herrn Georgiou vergangen – die jetzige Regierung mit besonderer Intensität, und das macht sie inzwischen zum Hauptverantwortlichen der Verfahren gegen Herrn Georgiou. Ich glaube, dass es außerordentlich bedauerlich ist, und wir haben Herrn Georgiou und den griechischen Regierungen das ja auch gesagt mit der *Financial Working Group for Greece*. Ich war selbst zweimal dort. Das geht nicht, dass solche Dinge in Griechenland gemacht werden. Ich wundere mich übrigens über diese Form der Ressourcenverschwendung. Und ich wundere mich auch, dass die griechische Justiz, die einen solchen Pakt *backlog* an Fällen hat, plötzlich diesen Fall so ernst nimmt, dass sie ihn gleich dreimal aufgreift und wieder verwirft.

Die griechische Regierung hat uns stets mit fadenscheinigen Argumenten hingehalten. Wir haben da mehrmals darauf gedrungen, dass dieses Verfahren beendet wird, weil es eine Frage von Glaubwürdigkeit ist.

Worum geht es eigentlich? Der Kollege Ferber hat die Frage gestellt. Ich kann Ihnen sagen, worum es geht. Es geht um den Versuch, ein Exempel zu statuieren, um anderen Beamten klare Signale zu senden: Meldet nichts nach Brüssel, bevor wir nicht das Häkchen daran gemacht haben. Die Chance zur Manipulation muss erhalten bleiben. Darum geht es in Wahrheit. Diese Lektion, die den griechischen Beamten erteilt wird, ist zu verwerfen und ist ausgesprochen schädlich.

Ich selbst mache hier Haushaltskontrolle. Mir hat mal ein griechischer Beamter berichtet, wie er seinen Bericht an die EU-Kommission schreibt. Er kommt am Sonntag ins Amt, schließt sich ein und macht erst dann die Tür auf, wenn der Bericht fertig ist. Das heißt: Sie haben doch ein elementares Interesse daran, dass Europa Ihnen Glaubwürdigkeit zugesteht. Arbeiten Sie an der Glaubwürdigkeit! Darum möchte ich Sie dringend bitten.

Herr Präsident! Ich scheue keinen Kampf. Aber den Unsinn, den die griechischen Kollegen hier uns erzählen, den möchte ich nicht mehr hören. Danke, nein.

(Die Rednerin lehnt es ab, eine Frage von Herrn Papadimoulis nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“ gemäß Artikel 162 Absatz 8 der Geschäftsordnung zu beantworten.)

Μιλτιάδης Κύρκος (S&D). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, το 2009 το δημοσιονομικό έλλειμμα στην Ελλάδα είχε ξεφύγει. Η συντηρητική κυβέρνηση δήλωνε ψευδώς έλλειμμα 6%, ενώ φτάσαμε στο 15% στο τέλος του χρόνου. Με την παρέμβαση της Επιτροπής, η Ελλάδα άλλαξε την ηγεσία της Στατιστικής Αρχής, ανέλαβε καθήκοντα ο κύριος Ανδρέας Γεωργίου και πολύ σύντομα η φράση «Greek statistics» έπαψε να σημαίνει λαθροχειρία. Το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο, τον Μάιο του 2014, αναγνώρισε ρητά τη λαθροχειρία αυτή στην έκθεσή του για την ελληνική κρίση. Οι υπεύθυνοι για την κατάρρευση της οικονομίας και τη συνειδητή παραπλάνηση των ευρωπαϊκών αρχών στέλνουν με τις καταγγελίες τους σε δίκη, για τρίτη φορά, τον λειτουργό που έκανε το καθήκον του. Μαζί τους και όσοι ισχυρίζονται ότι μια συνωμοσία σκοτεινών κύκλων έφερε την ελληνική κρίση και όχι η μικρή ανταγωνιστικότητα της οικονομίας μας, οι αθρόοι διορισμοί και η διαφθορά. Η ελληνική κυβέρνηση πρέπει αυτοβούλως να υπερασπιστεί τον Ανδρέα Γεωργίου, και για τον ίδιο αλλά και για να δώσει το μήνυμα ότι κανένας λειτουργός που κάνει σωστά τη δουλειά του δεν θα βρεθεί ανυπεράσπιστος.

Thierry Cornillet (ALDE). – Monsieur le Président, il s'agit aujourd'hui en fait d'une affaire de crédibilité, car il en va de la crédibilité du Conseil, de la Commission et de notre Parlement.

On ne peut pas affirmer ici des principes et des valeurs puis ne pas les défendre lorsque certains s'assoient dessus. Dans ce cas, c'est une affaire de crédibilité, parce qu'il s'agit d'un acharnement judiciaire dont les conséquences sont triples.

Nous sommes très attachés à l'indépendance de la justice, nous sommes tout aussi attachés à l'indépendance des autorités statistiques. C'est donc une triple conséquence pour M. Georgiou – mais aussi d'une certaine manière pour tous les fonctionnaires qui ont fait leur boulot – qui se trouve accusé depuis plusieurs années, alors qu'il a fait son travail en respectant les procédures européennes.

Pour le travail d'analyse des faits qui font que ces autorités statistiques peuvent produire des chiffres indépendants sur lesquels se basent les politiques publiques et pour la construction de règles communes qui nécessitent la confiance entre partenaires, il est important que notre Parlement, accompagné naturellement du Conseil, mette un terme à ce simulacre juridique qui, en fait, pose un problème pour la défense des institutions indépendantes, qui sont utiles pour les décideurs politiques, pour l'avenir de l'union économique et monétaire et, bien sûr, pour la personne de M. Georgiou, qui se trouve exilé de son pays à cause de cette affaire.

Σοφία Σακοράφα (GUE/NGL). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η περίπτωση της Ελλάδας ήταν μια τιμωρητική διαδικασία. Ένα μήνυμα του χρηματοπιστωτικού συστήματος ότι είναι παντοδύναμο και υπεράνω θεσμών και κάθε δημοκρατικού ελέγχου. Στην υπόθεση Γεωργίου, η ελληνική δικαιοσύνη προσπάθησε και προσπαθεί να αποκαλύψει την αλήθεια και να ανατρέψει την κατασκευασμένη ψευδή εικόνα για την Ελλάδα. Επειδή η υπόθεση αυτή δεν είχε την εξέλιξη που διακαώς επιθυμούσαν, οι κατ' επιφάση ευρωπαϊκοί δημοκρατικοί θεσμοί απαίτησαν την απαλλαγή του κυρίου Γεωργίου από κάθε κατηγορία, εν μέσω της δικαστικής διερεύνησης, παρεμβαίνοντας αποκάλυπτα στη λειτουργία της ελληνικής δικαιοσύνης. Και για να μην έχουν παρόμοια προβλήματα οι πρόθυμοι εκλεκτοί τους στο μέλλον, απαίτησαν και εξασφάλισαν το ποινικό και αστικό ακαταδίωκτο των μελών του νέου αποικιοκρατικού Ταμείου Αποκρατικοποιήσεων, ως βασική προϋπόθεση για την ολοκλήρωση της αξιολόγησης της χώρας, κάτι που αποδέχθηκε και η σημερινή κυβέρνηση. Κύριοι συνάδελφοι, αυτές οι πρακτικές μας προσβάλλουν ως εκπροσώπους των πολιτών και περιφρονούν τις αξίες της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης που εμείς εδώ υπερασπιζόμαστε. Ας μην απορούμε τελικά για το τι είναι αυτό που «ρίχνει νερό στον μύλο» της ακροδεξιάς.

Pervenche Berès (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, nous débattons ici de l'indépendance des autorités statistiques et je constate que le Conseil et la Commission ont tous les deux salué la qualité des statistiques, notamment en Grèce.

J'invite bien évidemment la Commission à vérifier qu'il en est de même dans chacun des États membres de l'Union européenne, car nous savons à quel point l'indépendance de l'autorité statistique est importante pour la crédibilité des politiques qui sont menées.

De la même manière, l'indépendance des statisticiens eux-mêmes doit être préservée.

De quoi parle-t-on ici? Parce qu'en réalité, chacun le sait, il y a derrière ce débat une volonté de mettre en cause ce qui se passe en Grèce autour de M. Andreas Georgiou.

Considère-t-on que l'Office grec des statistiques (ELSTAT) ne fonctionne pas bien? Manifestement, je crois que ce n'est pas le cas. Considère-t-on alors que le gouvernement grec devrait intervenir dans une affaire de justice? Je serais étonnée que cette assemblée veuille aller en ce sens, tant elle est attachée, me semble-t-il, aussi bien à l'indépendance des offices de statistiques qu'à la justice.

Or, je note qu'en juin dernier, le président Tsipras lui-même a dit qu'il reconnaissait la qualité des données statistiques fournies par M. Giorgio et qu'il était prêt à se rendre devant la Cour pour témoigner en sa faveur si nécessaire.

Au-delà de cela, si certains dans cet hémicycle considèrent que la procédure en cours en Grèce souffre de manquements, alors il faut se rendre non pas à un débat que l'on veut politiser ici, mais devant la Cour européenne des droits de l'homme.

Procedura «catch the eye»

Γεώργιος Επιτήδειος (ΝΙ). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η αρπαγή των πλούσιων ενεργειακών αποθεμάτων, τα οποία βρίσκονται στο υπέδαφος και στον υποθαλάσσιο χώρο της ελληνικής επικράτειας, ήταν ανέκαθεν στόχος των οργάνων του διεθνούς κεφαλαίου και της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης. Παράλληλα, η Ελλάδα έπρεπε να θυσιαστεί για να διασωθεί το ευρώ και οι γερμανικές και οι γαλλικές τράπεζες. Για να συμβούν αυτά, έπρεπε να καταστραφεί η ελληνική οικονομία και ως όργανο χρησιμοποιήθηκε ο πρόεδρος της ΕΛΣΤΑΤ, ο κύριος Γεωργίου. Σύμφωνα με την καταγγελία δύο υφισταμένων του, διόγκωσε με ψευδή στοιχεία το έλλειμμα που υπήρχε στην Ελλάδα, με αποτέλεσμα η χώρα να τεθεί υπό καθεστώς μνημονίων, να καταστραφεί η οικονομία της, να λεηλατηθεί ο πλούτος της και να υποφέρει ο λαός της. Βεβαίως, παρενέβη η ελληνική δικαιοσύνη και ο κύριος Γεωργίου κατηγορήθηκε σε βαθμό κακουργήματος. Όμως, τη βλάβη για τα εθνικά συμφέροντα την είχε ήδη προκαλέσει. Αυτός είναι και ο λόγος που τον υπερασπίζεται με τόση θέρμη το κατεστημένο της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης.

Σωτήριος Ζαριανόπουλος (ΝΙ). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, δεν θα μπορούμε αναλυτικά στην υπόθεση Γεωργίου-ΕΛΣΤΑΤ. Είναι όμως προκλητικό. Χιλιάδες άνθρωποι που δεν έχουν να πληρώσουν φόρους και δάνεια καταδικάζονται στην Ελλάδα, αλλά καμία υπόθεσή τους δεν φέρατε εδώ, στον «Ναό της Ευρωπαϊκής Δημοκρατίας». Για τον κύριο Γεωργίου όμως συζητιέται φωτογραφική διάταξη απαλλαγής. Κόπτεστε για ανεξάρτητες αρχές, π.χ. Στατιστικές. Υποκρισία! Με οδηγίες σας τις «μαγειρεύετε» και τις κάνετε εργαλεία της αντιλαϊκής πολιτικής σας. Άραγε πόσο αντικειμενικό είναι ότι όποιος δουλεύει μισή ώρα την εβδομάδα δεν θεωρείται άνεργος; Κόπτεστε για ανεξάρτητη δικαιοσύνη. Ανέκδοτο! Όταν δεν σας αρέσουν οι αποφάσεις, ζητάτε νομοθετικές παρεμβάσεις. Απαιτήσατε, και σας το έδωσε και αυτό ο ΣΥΡΙΖΑ, μνημονιακούς νόμους για προκαταβολική και αναδρομική -για όσους διώχθηκαν- ποινική απαλλαγή των στελεχών του ΤΑΙΠΕΔ για μεταβιβάσεις δημόσιας περιουσίας δισεκατομμυρίων ευρώ σε ιδιώτες. Το ίδιο και για «κουρέματα» δανείων επιχειρηματικών μεγαθηρίων, ενώ κυνηγάτε με πλειστηριασμούς χιλιάδες λαϊκά σπίτια και απαγορεύετε απεργίες. Απλά δικαιώνετε το ΚΚΕ.

(Fine della procedura «catch the eye»)

Marianne Thyssen, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, we all agree on the importance of independent statistics for informed policy-making and sound decision-taking at both national and Union levels. Transparency and accountability are key notions in that regard, and therefore I again welcome the opportunity to appear before you.

For the Commission, it is essential that the independence of the statistical authorities, and of the people who perform their duties in line with their responsibilities, is protected. The Commission will therefore continue to monitor the application of fundamental statistical principles in all Member States, and I thank the House for its support on this.

The situation of Mr Georgiou is of concern to you as well as to the Commission. Let me repeat, once again, that we have full confidence in the reliability and the accuracy of data produced by the Hellenic Statistical Authority (ELSTAT) under his leadership. Concerning the comments made by Mr Chountis, I refer to the reply to question No 4404 from this year. In short, we stand by the correction made by Mr Georgiou in 2010. As I said before, we have also repeatedly voiced that concern via public statements or directly in contacts with the Greek authorities. Furthermore, a Commission official appeared as a witness before a Greek court and offered testimony in support of the implementation of EU law by the Greek statistical authority under Mr Georgiou's leadership. I am glad that some of you recognised that the independence of ELSTAT has been strengthened. Greek statistics law has been brought into line with EU law, notably Regulation 223 on European statistics, as well as the European Statistics Code of Practice, to ensure professional independence. These make it clear that the content and timing of statistical release is the sole responsibility of the heads of the statistical offices.

I also have to tell you that all governments have expressed their support for the European Statistics Code of Practice. On the basis of the code, Member States subject themselves to regular peer views and the results of the peer reviews are published and combined with action plans for improvements where necessary.

The Commission fully recognises and respects the independence of the judicial authorities in Greece. They should be allowed to perform their tasks without political considerations or pressure. In that respect, representatives of governments and public authorities at both national and EU levels have a duty to refrain from anticipating the outcome of judicial investigations or proceedings.

I count on your continued support, and also your attention, to safeguard the fundamental principles of high quality and trustworthiness in relation to statistics.

Karoline Edtstadler, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Mr President, I would like to thank everyone very much for this discussion. It is a matter that definitely deserves our attention and I would like to fully second what Madam Commissioner said: the independence of statistical authorities is one of the pillars of the EU's economic governance.

On the other hand, please let me state, as a former judge, that the independence of the judicial system is also one of the cornerstones of the rule of law and democracy and, therefore, I can only assure you that we will closely follow the developments. However, I hope that we don't have to come back to such a situation again.

Presidente. – La discussione è chiusa.

25. Europæisk sikkerhed og fremtiden for traktaten om afskaffelse af mellemdistancera-ketter (forhandling)

Presidente. – L'ordine del giorno reca la discussione sulla dichiarazione del Vicepresidente della Commissione e Alto rappresentante dell'Unione per gli affari esteri e la politica di sicurezza sulla sicurezza europea e il futuro del trattato sulle forze nucleari a medio raggio (2018/2907(RSP)).

Karoline Edtstadler, *President-in-Office of the Council, on behalf of the High Representative / Vice-President of the Commission*. – Mr President, thank you for this opportunity to discuss a subject of tremendous importance for European and global security. The treaty on intermediate-range nuclear forces in Europe, in force since 1988, is among the key international agreements which marked the end of the Cold War. While neither the European Union nor any of the EU Member States are parties to the treaty, we do have a very high stake in its preservation and continued implementation.

Thanks to the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty, some 3000 missiles with nuclear and conventional warheads have been removed and verifiably destroyed. For those who have the experience and memory of the Cold War, this was a truly historical moment. The tools for waging nuclear war were not only removed from our continent but irreversibly dismantled and destroyed. This happened under the mutual supervision, in the form of one-side inspections.

So we are justified in declaring that the INF Treaty has not only contributed to the end of the Cold War, but it also constitutes one of the major pillars of European current security architecture. Calling it a Cold War-era agreement or a relic of the Cold War is a misinterpretation and a misunderstanding.

The INF Treaty is always an important contribution to disarmament obligations under Article 6 of the nuclear non-proliferation treaty. All EU Member States, whether or not they have nuclear weapons, both NATO members and non-NATO countries, all are state parties to the non-proliferation treaty. We are united in our support for the non-proliferation treaty as the cornerstone of the global nuclear non-proliferation regime.

The treaty has made a crucial contribution to international peace, security and stability over the past 50 years. Let me recall that all states party to the non-proliferation treaty are committed to pursuing the objective of achieving a world without nuclear weapons. We, as the European Union, stressed the need for concrete progress towards the full implementation of Article 6 of the non-proliferation treaty especially through an overall reduction in the global stockpile of nuclear weapons. The states that possess the largest nuclear arsenals – which are the Russian Federation and the United States – have a special responsibility on this.

The INF Treaty does not only cover nuclear-armed missiles. It is about an entire category of ballistic and cruise missiles, regardless of their warheads. In recent years, the development, test or use of ballistic missiles has been a destabilising factor in regional and international security. It creates an atmosphere of mistrust and suspicion and adds uncertainty in international relations – I am thinking, in particular, of the launches by North Korea, Iran and Syria.

The INF Treaty is also a model to be followed and, as such, it is today more relevant than ever before. The current disarmament and non-proliferation architecture needs to become more universal as a guarantee for all. We Europeans are working at all levels to promote the universalisation of existing agreements, such as The Hague Code of Conduct against ballistic missile proliferation. The Hague Code does not prohibit the possession of missiles but aims to prevent proliferation and increases transparency for the benefit of subscribers. Subscribing states exchange information including pre-launch notifications.

As of now, 139 countries have subscribed to The Hague Code. This is no small achievement as subscribers include the US and Russia, as well as all EU Member States. The EU has a long history of supporting the universalisation and effective implementation of The Hague Code, both diplomatically and financially, both the immediate contact point in the Austrian MFA and the rotating chairmanships benefit from EU-funded support programme. It is not by chance that very often it is EU Member States which hold the annual rotating chairmanships of The Hague Code, promoting its universalisation and chairing relevant meetings. Last year it was Poland, this year: Sweden.

But let me stress that politically binding confidence-building measures like The Hague Code are not a substitute for legally binding arms control and disarmament agreements like the INF Treaty. It is for this reason that, in our view, the United States and the Russian Federation needs to remain engaged in constructive dialogue to preserve to INF Treaty and ensure its full and verifiable implementation, which is crucial for European and global security.

We have asked the United States to consider the consequences of its possible withdrawal from the INF on its own security, and on our collective security and we expect the Russian Federation to address the serious concerns regarding its compliance with the INF Treaty.

The world doesn't need a new arms race. That would benefit no one. On the contrary, it would only bring even more instability.

Jeppe Kofod, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Mr President, I would like to thank the Minister for her clear statement. There is no doubt that what we have seen now is a real blow to the disarmament of nuclear weapons in the world. We all understand that Russia is not complying with the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty and there is real concern, but it's the wrong reaction from the US President to withdraw from such an important treaty. With the new START (Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty) expiring in 2021, we could, in the worst case, be left out of control of nuclear states with their nuclear arsenal and we could go back to a situation which I think we have to go back to 1972 to see. This is really detrimental.

We should – as the European Union, as Europeans – ask Trump to reconsider. We need to fight hard for disarmament and the control of nuclear weapons. I remember a time when the previous president, President Obama, gave a speech on a world without nuclear arms and I think we are now, unfortunately, on the wrong track. So let's react and let's react together as Europeans.

Anna Elżbieta Fotyga, *on behalf of the ECR Group*. – Mr President, the modernisation of the Russian army after a war in Georgia led to a massive violation of the INF Treaty. This was indicated by the US in 2014, in numerous cases by NATO, by myself in amendments to the Landsbergis report, and during a meeting of the Subcommittee on Security and Defence (SEDE) in January this year by renowned experts. Deterring Russia is a tricky task. We have to rely on the NATO viewpoint rather than support Russia in its actions by following the narrative.

Bodil Valero, *för Verts/ALE-gruppen*. – Herr talman! Det är ingenting som förvånar när det handlar om president Trump. Allt kan hända. För det allra mesta är det som han gör väldigt oroande. Inte minst är det oroande att han den 20 oktober i år sade upp avtalet mellan USA och Sovjetunionen om att avskaffa medel- och kortdistansrobotar. Frågan är då hur vi i EU och medlemsländerna ska ställa oss till det som kommer som ett brev på posten.

För det första vill vi gröna att fru Mogherini, ordförandeskapet och medlemsstaterna ska göra allt de kan för att få avtalet att fortsatt gälla. För det andra menar vi att det är uppenbart att det behövs ett nytt initiativ i syfte att nå total kärnvapennedrustning i Europa, och att det behövs en regional kärnvapenfri zon, precis som FN efterfrågar i sin resolution 3472 B från 1975. Så länge det inte finns ett nytt avtal på plats är det emellertid avgörande att vi står fast vid de olika nedrustningsavtal som redan finns.

Med amerikanska kärnvapen i Europa och ryska kärnvapen intill våra gränser, och när både britter och fransmän fortsätter att investera i sina kärnvapenarsenaler, är utsikterna små att få till ett EU-beslut att gemensamt ansluta oss till FN:s nya konvention om kärnvapenförbud. För det tredje borde vi således ansluta oss till konventionen.

Kärnvapen i Europa ger oss inte säkerhet. Tvärtom, det är inte svårt att föreställa sig att Europa återigen kan riskera att bli det stora slagfältet och att kärnvapenbestyckade medeldistansrobotar kan detonera på europeisk mark om något går fel. Därför kan och bör vi gå i täten för nedrustning, men det är också avgörande att övriga länder, inklusive Ryssland, USA och Kina, står bakom alla nedrustningsavtal, även bilaterala sådana.

Helmut Scholz, im Namen der GUE/NGL-Fraktion. – Herr Präsident! Der INF ist ein Meilenstein in der Geschichte atomarer Abrüstung und internationaler Sicherheitspolitik. Er beförderte Vertrauensbildung zwischen den beiden Atomwaffensupermächten USA und Russland mit weitreichenden positiven Folgen, auch für unsere europäische Sicherheit und unsere gesellschaftlichen Entwicklungsprozesse. Er leistete nicht zuletzt auch einen wichtigen Beitrag hin zu einer notwendigen Denuklearisierung europäischer Sicherheitsstrukturen.

Dieser Trend hat sich in der kürzeren Vergangenheit bedauerlicherweise wieder ins Gegenteil verkehrt. Sowohl die USA als auch Russland modernisieren ihre Atomwaffensysteme. Und ja, das zunehmende Misstrauen beider Vertragsparteien in den letzten Monaten und Jahren, dessen Ausdruck auch die angekündigte Auflösung des INF-Vertrags ist, macht die Welt nicht sicherer. Es ist bedrohlich.

Entscheidend bleibt für uns als Europäisches Parlament, alle Anstrengungen zu unternehmen, um ein Festhalten am Vertrag von amerikanischer und russischer Seite zu ermöglichen. Alle EU-Mitgliedstaaten müssen ihrerseits in dieser Richtung politisch aktiv werden. Und vielleicht ist auch der INF-Vertrag ein Vorbild, ein international zu schaffendes Vertragswerk neuer bilateraler, regionaler oder multilateraler atomarer Abrüstungsabkommen auf die Tagesordnung der internationalen Sicherheits- und Friedenspolitik zu setzen.

Jean-Luc Schaffhauser, au nom du groupe ENF. – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, la dénonciation américaine du traité sur les euromissiles montre l'échec criant de la politique étrangère de l'Union européenne, fleuron du traité de Lisbonne. Dans ce traité, l'Union européenne s'est en effet couchée, on peut le dire, devant la politique de l'OTAN en se rendant constitutionnellement dépendante des décisions prises par d'autres.

Aujourd'hui, nous nous plaignons de l'unilatéralisme américain. Pourtant, depuis plus de dix ans, l'Union européenne poursuit une politique de montée des tensions avec la Russie, orchestrée par les États-Unis. En accueillant le bouclier antimissile, c'est-à-dire, en réalité, des sites de lanceurs de missiles. Les pays frontaliers ont bousculé l'équilibre militaire du continent. En embourbant l'Europe dans ses vieilles rancunes – animosité russo-polonaise, guerre en Ukraine sur les frontières de culture et de civilisation –, nous avons, avec le plein soutien du Service d'action extérieure, délibérément saboté toute politique de détente. Or, la détente était la condition nécessaire pour la signature du traité par Reagan et Gorbatchev en 1987.

Nous avons semé un vent de tensions nouvelles, je crains que nous récoltions à nouveau les risques d'une guerre.

Γεώργιος Επιτήδειος (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, πριν από λίγες ημέρες, ο πρόεδρος Trump ανακοίνωσε την απόφαση να αποχωρήσει η χώρα του από τη Συνθήκη των πυρηνικών δυνάμεων μέσου βελιγκεούς. Αυτή η Συνθήκη, που υπογράφηκε το 1987 από τον Gorbachev και τον Reagan, είναι πολύ σημαντική διότι έχει νομικά δεσμευτικό χαρακτήρα και στο πλαίσιο της εφαρμογής της έχουν καταστραφεί τρεις χιλιάδες πυρηνικά βλήματα. Με την αποχώρηση, όμως, των ΗΠΑ από τη Συνθήκη αυτή, όπως επίσης και από τη Συνθήκη για τα πυρηνικά του Ιράν, εντείνεται ο κίνδυνος να αυξηθούν οι εξοπλισμοί σε πυρηνικά όπλα από όλες τις πυρηνικές δυνάμεις. Οι ΗΠΑ έχουν τη δυνατότητα να ενισχύσουν το πυρηνικό τους οπλοστάσιο. Η Ρωσία θέλει να παραμείνει στη Συνθήκη, πλην όμως αισθάνεται ότι απειλείται. Και αν αποφασίσει να εντάξει τα πυρηνικά όπλα στον στρατηγικό της σχεδιασμό θα υπάρξουν δυσμενείς εξελίξεις. Θα επηρεαστούν όλες οι χώρες της Ευρώπης και κυρίως η Γερμανία.

Elmar Brok (PPE). – Herr Präsident, Frau Ratspräsidentin! Ich sehe hier die Umkehrung der Dinge. Ich war schon politisch aktiv im Jahr 1980. Zu dem Zeitpunkt gab es ausschließlich sowjetische Raketen, auf Europa gerichtet – ausschließlich. Das waren die SS-20. Dagegen gab es den NATO-Doppelbeschluss, der dazu geführt hat, dass damit die Sowjetunion gezwungen wurde, mit Gorbatschow 1987 den Deal zu machen, dass beide Seiten ihre Waffen abschaffen, bei uns nicht weiter aufgestellt wird und die SS-20 verschwinden. Das ist der INF-Vertrag.

Wir wissen aber jetzt seit einigen Jahren, dass Russland wieder diese Raketen moderner Art aufrichtet – Raketen, Mittelstreckenwaffen, die nicht die USA erreichen oder sonst jemanden, sondern die fast ausschließlich auf Europa gerichtet sind. Das heißt, wir haben eine Situation wie 1980, dass wir russische Mittelstreckenraketen mit Atomwaffen auf Europa gerichtet haben, aber dass aufseiten Europas und in Europa stationiert keine Gegenwaffen bestehen. Das heißt, wir sind bei 1980 angekommen, und die Russen haben den INF-Vertrag zerstört.

Dass das jetzt mal offenkundig wird – und ich bin nicht oft ein Trump-Fan – und dass dies mal deutlich gemacht wird, halte ich nicht für so falsch. Ich glaube, dass Russland aufgefordert ist, dies zu beenden, diese Raketen wieder abzuschaffen, damit der INF-Vertrag inhaltlich ausgefüllt ist.

Die amerikanischen Raketen in Rumänien sind keine Boden-Boden-Raketen, die Russland gefährden. Das sind Boden-Luft-Raketen, um Raketen abzuschießen, die auf Europa gerichtet sind, und die Stationierung von Raketen in Rumänien, war angedacht, um iranische Raketen abzuhalten.

Ich bin der Auffassung, dass wir die Russen einladen sollten, hier eine Inspizierung der Installationen in Rumänien durchzuführen um da Unsicherheiten zu beseitigen, dass das darauf ausgerichtet wäre, um russische Raketen, die auf Europa gerichtet sind, abzuschießen – nicht mal das wollen wir dabei! – und deswegen dies mit dem Deal gemacht werden muss, dass die Russen endlich ihre Raketen, die auf Europa gerichtet sind, beseitigen.

Ana Gomes (S&D). – Senhor Presidente, ao desligar a Rússia deste tratado, Trump pode, de facto, estar a fazer o perigoso jogo de Putin, porque o tratado reduziu, efetivamente, os riscos de escaladas militares, de erros de cálculo operacionais e ajudou a mudar a lógica MAD da Guerra Fria para a do diálogo entre a Rússia e os Estados Unidos.

Mesmo havendo incumprimento do tratado por parte de Moscovo e mesmo que Trump tenha também por objetivo renegociar com a Rússia, e até indiretamente vise a contenção da capacidade nuclear da China, os riscos de escalada e de catástrofe são tremendos, porque a Rússia de hoje pode sentir-se tentada a compensar a fraqueza em forças convencionais, recorrendo ao uso das suas capacidades nucleares e no meio está a Europa. É insano não ver que a nossa segurança e a segurança global estão em causa.

A União Europeia não pode ficar muda e queda. Tem de intervir de alguma maneira e tentar negociar com ambos para que, efetivamente, se assista a uma verdadeira redução destas forças nucleares de alcance intermédio na Rússia, mas também em todos os outros que as detêm.

Marek Jurek (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! Trudno mieć pretensje do Stanów Zjednoczonych, że nie chcą firmować łamanego systematycznie traktatu. Również trudno naprawdę zakładać, że najlepszym rodzajem presji na przestrzeganie zakazu pocisków średniego zasięgu będą prośby, deklaracje, apele. Jeżeli naprawdę chcemy równowagi sił, powinniśmy wyciągnąć z tej sprawy wnioski.

Wniosek pierwszy jest taki, że musimy umieć wywierać przekonującą presję, taką choćby jak wzmocnienie bezpieczeństwa państw bałtyckich albo strategiczne dążenie w rozmowach z Rosją do demilitaryzacji regionu Kaliningradu – tego największego zagrożenia dla Europy Środkowej. Naprawdę pamiętajmy, że prośby nie są najlepszym rodzajem polityki.

Τάκης Χατζηγεωργίου (GUE/NGL). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο συζητά ουσιαστικά για τον κίνδυνο πυρηνικού αφανισμού του ανθρώπινου πολιτισμού και βλέπω τους συναδέλφους εδώ, που κάποιοι υποστηρίζουν τη θέση της Ρωσίας και άλλοι τη θέση των ΗΠΑ. Τα μεγάλα γεγονότα, οι μεγάλες καταστροφές και οι μεγάλοι κίνδυνοι για την ανθρωπότητα έρχονται αθόρυβα, και είναι κρίμα που δεν ακούγονται ούτε από τους εκπροσώπους της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης. Σε ενδεχόμενη καταστροφή του πλανήτη, δεν θα έχει κανείς μετά την ευκαιρία να πει ότι «εγώ είχα δίκιο και το είχα προβλέψει και είχα πει ότι έφταιγε ο τάδε ή ο δείνα». Η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση -το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο- πρέπει να στείλει μήνυμα προς όλους για παγκόσμιο αφοπλισμό όσον αφορά τα πυρηνικά, για να μην αναφερθώ σε άλλα όπλα. Η απόσυρση του κυρίου Trump από τη συμφωνία και οποιαδήποτε συμπεριφορά της Ρωσίας, επίσης καταδικαστέα, πρέπει να μας δώσουν το έναυσμα ώστε όλοι μαζί να στείλουμε το μήνυμα, ως Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, ότι πρέπει να καταστρέψουμε όλα τα πυρηνικά όπλα που έχουμε στη διάθεσή μας και που μπορούν να αφανίσουν τον πλανήτη χιλιάδες φορές.

Mario Borghesio (ENF). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, perplessità suscitate un po' in tutto il mondo dalla decisione di Trump che gli USA intendono uscire dal trattato INF che vieta di schierare in Europa missili balistici terrestri a medio raggio, stipulato nel 1987 da Reagan e Gorbaciov.

Trump accusa in sostanza i russi di non rispettare l'accordo a causa di due battaglioni di missili da crociera Nuova Tor, con un raggio d'azione di 1 500 chilometri, basati sui confini occidentali della Russia. Mosca nega, ma Obama già nel 2014 aveva minacciato di uscire dal trattato a causa dei test sui missili R500 lamentando anche lo schieramento nell'enclave russa di Kaliningrad dei missili balistici Iskander. Le due installazioni di Mosca costituiscono però la risposta all'avvio della costruzione dello scudo antimissile che gli USA hanno schierato in Polonia e Repubblica Ceca, dotato di radar e missili avanzatissimi, ufficialmente per intercettare eventuali missili balistici lanciati dall'Iran.

La decisione di abbandonare il trattato INF annunciata da Trump sembra nascondere motivazioni anche diverse. Per Washington denunciare il trattato significa soprattutto premere per nuovi negoziati con Mosca, da allargare però anche a Pechino, vera potenza strategica emergente. La denuncia del trattato scatenerrebbe una nuova corsa al riarmo atomico e balistico simile a quella voluta da Reagan, costringendo Russia e Cina a fare altrettanto per minare le loro economie, costringendole a investire nella difesa più di quanto potrebbero e vorrebbero.

Ci sono poi aspetti non strettamente militari che Trump sembra voler perseguire. La Casa Bianca pare spingere per un'escalation della tensione con la Russia per compattare un'Europa sempre più lontana, rilanciando la protezione offerta dall'ombrello atomico missilistico americano. Ma per l'Europa è veramente tranquillizzante lo sconvolgimento dell'equilibrio militare nel suo territorio?

(Il Presidente interrompe l'oratore)

Σωτήριος Ζαριανόπουλος (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η απόφαση Trump να αποχωρήσει από τη Συνθήκη ελέγχου των πυρηνικών όπλων αποδεικνύει πόσο επικίνδυνα κλιμακώνονται οι ανταγωνισμοί ανάμεσα στα ιμπεριαλιστικά κέντρα. Δεν πρόκειται για κάποια αψυχολόγητη ενέργεια του Trump, αλλά για αντανάκλαση του νατοϊκού δόγματος για το «πρώτο πυρηνικό πλήγμα» και της πρόσφατης συνόδου για την αναβάθμιση της πυρηνικής στρατηγικής του. Από την άλλη, η Ρωσία απαντά ότι θα αναγκαστεί να στοχοποιήσει με ανταποδοτικά πλήγματα όσες χώρες φιλοξενούν πυρηνικά. Αποδεικνύεται μέχρι πού είναι αποφασισμένος –ακόμα και στον πόλεμο– να φτάσει κάθε ιμπεριαλιστής για τα συμφέροντά του. Αποδεικνύεται πόσο επικίνδυνη είναι για τον λαό η απόφαση της κυβέρνησης ΣΥΡΙΖΑ-ΑΝΕΛ και του κυρίου Τσίπρα, του φίλου του «διαβολικά καλού» Trump όπως τον αποκαλεί, να μετατρέψει όλη την Ελλάδα σε απέραντη αμερικανο-νατοϊκή βάση και να μεταφέρει στο έδαφός της ειδικά όπλα, ακόμα και πυρηνικά, όπως στον Αραξο. Η ειρήνη και η ζωή των λαών κινδυνεύουν άμεσα για τα συμφέροντα των μεγάλων δυνάμεων. Ο αγώνας τους ενάντια στο NATO και την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση είναι όρος για την επιβίωσή τους.

Othmar Karas (PPE). – Frau Ratspräsidentin, Herr Präsident, meine sehr geehrten Damen und Herren! Am 20. Oktober hat Präsident Trump den Ausstieg der USA aus dem INF-Vertrag angekündigt.

Diese Ankündigung kommt nicht aus heiterem Himmel. Die Vereinigten Staaten von Amerika haben bereits seit der Ära Obama 30 Mal ihre Vorbehalte gegen Verstöße Russlands zum INF-Vertrag vorgebracht. Die Reaktion Russlands: Der Bau russischer Marschflugkörper, die genau in diesem INF-Vertrag verboten sind.

Das beabsichtigte Treffen zwischen Trump und Putin hat seitdem nicht stattgefunden. Ein mögliches Ende des Abkommens könnte die geltende internationale nukleare Ordnung auf den Kopf stellen und ein atomares Wettrüsten riskieren. Das ist die Realität.

Wir erkennen in diesen Tagen, dass immer öfter politische Entscheidungen gegen internationales Recht, politische Entscheidungen gegen europäisches Recht, politische Entscheidungen gegen den Aufbau von Vertrauen getätigt werden. Es muss daher diesem Parlament ein Anliegen sein, dass wir alle auffordern, dass sie zurückkehren auf den Boden der internationalen Vereinbarungen, auf den Boden des Dialogs, auf den Boden der Einhaltung des europäischen und des internationalen Rechts.

Die Gedenkfeiern, die wir auch alle in unseren Mitgliedstaaten erleben – Ende des Ersten Weltkriegs, achtzig Jahre Einmarsch Hitlerdeutschlands in Österreich –, zeigen uns doch deutlich, dass wir auch heute noch daran appellieren müssen, die Lehren aus der Geschichte zu ziehen. Sie zeigen uns deutlich, dass wir es ernst nehmen müssen, mit dem europäischen Handeln, mit dem internationalen Dialog, mit dem Multilateralismus, damit wir den nationalen Egoismus und die Expansionspolitik überwinden.

Und die Frau Bundeskanzlerin Merkel hat gestern daran appelliert, dass wir uns mehr um unsere eigene Sicherheit kümmern, damit wir nicht zwischen den Trumps und den Putins dieser Welt zerrieben werden und unser Kontinent im schlimmsten Fall wieder zum atomaren Spielfeld der Eitelkeiten und der Unvernunft wird.

Daher bitte ich auch die Ratspräsidentschaft mitzuhelfen, dass die Mitgliedstaaten die Vorschläge der Kommission, die Einstimmigkeit in der Außen-, Sicherheits- und Verteidigungspolitik zu reduzieren, die europäische Verantwortung zu stärken und das gemeinsame Handeln und die Handlungsfähigkeit zu erhöhen, unterstützen. Die Alarmsignale leuchten. Wir dürfen nicht zur Tagesordnung übergehen.

Brando Benifei (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, il mondo da una parte sembra proseguire il cammino verso il disarmo e la non proliferazione dopo la storica approvazione del Trattato sulla messa al bando delle armi nucleari, votato da 122 paesi e in via di ratifica, trattato che peraltro questo Parlamento ha sostenuto formalmente con una risoluzione del 2016. Prende sempre più piede l'approccio umanitario alle armi nucleari, le cui conseguenze anche per chi le detiene possono essere davvero terribili.

Gli USA e la Russia invece ci riportano agli anni della Guerra fredda e della deterrenza strategica. La decisione da parte del Presidente Trump di ritirarsi dal Trattato sui missili a medio raggio, dopo anni di sospette violazioni da parte di Mosca, rischia di mettere a repentaglio l'azione diplomatica portata avanti invece con il multilateralismo, oltre a costituire un pericolo concreto per la sicurezza europea.

Mosca e Washington pensino alle conseguenze del fallimento di un trattato cruciale per la vera sicurezza del mondo. L'Europa non può non intervenire in ogni modo possibile per scongiurare questa deriva davvero pericolosa.

Neena Gill (S&D). – Mr President, as Europeans we stand to lose most from the collapse of the INF Treaty, given that we are within range of Russian missiles. For Trump, it isn't about pressurising Russia into compliance, it is about strategic competition with China and strengthening US military capabilities in the Pacific. That means the European security architecture is no longer, by definition, the US's principal security interest.

My questions were going to be for the External Action Service, but unfortunately there's no representative here from them or the Commission. So I'm going to ask the Austrian Presidency this. Do you think we can still rescue the INF Treaty and, if not, what is the back-up plan for keeping nuclear missiles out of Europe? Secondly, are there any plans for a larger arms control framework that includes China and other states? Finally, how can the EU revive disarmament in the context of deep scepticism about arms control in China and in the US?

Agustín Díaz de Mera García Consuegra (PPE). – Señor presidente, señora, el anuncio del presidente Trump sobre una posible ruptura del Tratado de Fuerzas Nucleares de Alcance Intermedio (INF) merma considerablemente la seguridad euroatlántica, pues es uno de los pilares de la OTAN. El INF prohíbe la fabricación de misiles de medio alcance lanzados desde tierra, los cuales pueden llegar a objetivos que se encuentran entre 500 y 5 500 kilómetros. Tanto el anuncio de Trump como el supuesto incumplimiento por parte de Rusia, desarrollando el misil Novator 9M729, suponen un deterioro del régimen de control de armas en el espacio euroatlántico que durante décadas ha propiciado la paz y la estabilidad.

En los últimos años, la Unión, a través de las diferentes estrategias de seguridad presentadas, así como de su liderazgo en las negociaciones e implementación del acuerdo nuclear con Irán, ha mostrado su capacidad para ser un actor internacional de referencia en políticas de desarme y no proliferación. Las tensiones entre Estados Unidos y Rusia en el ámbito del INF pueden devolvernos al pasado, cuando la carrera armamentística era una constante fuente de peligros y tensiones internacionales.

Citando a Gorbachov, «todo acuerdo para el desarme nuclear debe mantenerse para salvar la vida de la Tierra». Es necesario que la Unión siga impulsando las políticas de no proliferación y se haga un sitio como actor de referencia. Si los Estados Unidos y Rusia quieren ejercer la irresponsabilidad, la Unión tiene que saber actuar en la escena internacional para evitar la guerra fría, o no tan fría.

Eric Andrieu (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Ministre, *welcome back to the eighties!*, l'époque des téléphones à cadran, des radiocassettes, des répondeurs téléphoniques et du Minitel, nous y revoilà. Avec l'annonce de Donald Trump de vouloir mettre un terme à l'accord entre Washington et Moscou sur la non-prolifération des armes nucléaires, nous revoici trente ans en arrière. C'est un acte grave.

Je veux ici rappeler l'importance du traité FNI (forces nucléaires à portée intermédiaire) – cela a été dit –, en particulier pour la sécurité de nos concitoyens, mais aussi pour la stabilité stratégique du continent européen. Si un tel retrait a lieu, il remettra en cause l'équilibre fragile né des décombres de la guerre froide et aura des conséquences catastrophiques pour la préservation de la paix dans le monde.

Monsieur le Président, Madame la Ministre, on nage en plein mauvais feuilleton, en plein *Dallas*. Il est temps que l'Europe retrouve son rôle d'équilibre au sein du concert des nations et sorte la planète de ce mauvais pas. D'où ma simple question: quelle est l'action concrète que compte mener l'Union afin de préserver le dialogue entre les États-Unis et la Russie et d'éviter le démantèlement de ce traité?

Procedura «catch the eye»

Julie Ward (S&D). – Mr President, President Trump's decision to withdraw from the Intermediate-range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty has been widely criticised, for good reason. Former military officials described the treaty as a bedrock of arms control. The 1987 treaty eliminated thousands of deadly medium-range missiles in Europe, helping to end the Cold War. Scrapping the treaty will undermine international security, could prompt a new arms race and certainly increases the risks of a nuclear war.

I speak as a lifelong peace campaigner. The INF Treaty occupies a special place in peace history – in our history. It was prompted by the huge nuclear disarmament movements that swept across Europe and the USA in the 1980s. In some respects, the peace movement owns this treaty, and we must do what we can to ensure it is not taken away.

Let's also remember that in this House, on 27 October 2016, we voted – by a large majority – to support the UN process to make nuclear weapons illegal. We subsequently honoured the international campaign to abolish nuclear weapons, which won the 2017 Nobel Peace Prize.

Νότης Μαριιάς (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, την ώρα που η υφήλιος έχει γεμίσει φτωχούς ανέργους και την ώρα που παράγεται τεράστιος πλούτος αλλά, φυσικά, δεν κατανέμεται δίκαια, έχουμε την ένταση των διεθνών ανταγωνισμών. Οι Ηνωμένες Πολιτείες της Αμερικής, η Κίνα και η Ρωσία ανταγωνίζονται στον πλανήτη. Είναι πλέον «λογικό» αυτό που συμβαίνει, δηλαδή το ότι δεν θα δεσμεύονται πλέον από οποιοδήποτε δίδεν συμφωνίες τους για τα πυρηνικά. Ο κύριος Trump αποχώρησε από τη Συνθήκη για τις πυρηνικές δυνάμεις μέσου βεληνεκούς, οι Κινέζοι ενισχύουν τους εξοπλισμούς τους και το ίδιο κάνει και η Ρωσία. Δυστυχώς, ο πλανήτης βρίσκεται στο έλεος του ανταγωνισμού αυτών των δυνάμεων. Πιστεύω ότι πρέπει να ξεκινήσει ένα τεράστιο κίνημα για τον παγκόσμιο αφοπλισμό. Αυτός πρέπει να είναι ο στόχος μας: απαγόρευση των πυρηνικών σε όλη την υφήλιο. Μόνον έτσι μπορούμε να απαντήσουμε και, φυσικά, οι πολίτες πρέπει να κινητοποιηθούν και πρέπει να αγωνιστούν.

Molly Scott Cato (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, my first child was born in 1987, and having grown up under the shadow of the mushroom cloud, I can remember the relief I felt at the disarmament process led by Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan.

The Treaty on Intermediate-range Nuclear Forces (INF) in Europe that Trump is sabotaging dates from that era. It was a step on the path away from the Cold War and led to the destruction of 3000 missiles. Trump's reckless actions could launch the world into a new, deadly arms race. This time, it would not be just between two superpowers, but open to any immoral regime that could find the cash to join in.

How can the European nuclear states argue that countries like Korea and Pakistan should not have the very nuclear weapons that they claim is so vital to their own security? As the actions of the authoritarians polarise the foreign policy debate, Britain and France should show leadership by unilaterally dismantling their nuclear weapons and signing up to the International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons (ICAN) Treaty on the prohibition of such weapons, becoming the first UN Security Council members to do so.

Indrek Tarand (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, as a veteran of the Cold War and a sergeant major of the Soviet army, I am obliged to remind colleagues that Russian weapons – nuclear in particular – are a bluff. Remember submarine Kursk and aircraft carrier Admiral Kuznetsov.

But of course we face the problem that one of the security mechanisms of a nuclear conflict has disappeared, and we need to react. The correct reaction has been proposed by President Macron and Chancellor Merkel. Let's create a proper and capable European defence force. That would be enough of a deterrent, and Russian nuclear disarmament, together with that of the United States, would follow consequently.

Kateřina Konečná (GUE/NGL). – Pane předsedající, mnoho akademiků dnes mluví o tom, že jsme v takzvané době postfaktické. Tedy v době, kdy je možné říkat téměř vše a přitom to nijak nedokládat fakty.

Myslím, že Donald Trump je krásným příkladem tohoto jevu. Nejenom, že mám často dojem, že se mně vyloženě zdá, ale teď jde primárně o to, co dělá a co říká. V říjnu oznámil, že Spojené státy americké odstoupí od smlouvy s Ruskem o likvidaci raket středního a krátkého doletu, jelikož ji Moskva prý porušuje. Prezentací důkazů či voláním po vyšetřování se Trump nezatěžuje a rovnou vyhrožuje. Říká se, že cesta do pekla je dlážděna dobrými úmysly. Velmi často je však dlážděna činy egoistických politických amatérů, kteří přeceňují svoji roli na mezinárodním poli.

Nikdo nesmí ohrožovat mír a mezinárodní dohody. S mírem se nehazarduje, o mír se pečuje. A to je signál, který my jako Evropská unie musíme vyslat.

(Fine della procedura «catch the eye»)

Karoline Edtstadler, *President-in-Office of the Council, on behalf of the High Representative / Vice-President of the Commission.* – Mr President, thank you for this important exchange. I think it has highlighted the importance of the preservation of the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty for European and global security, as well as our common preoccupation with the increased threats to our security. Disarmament, arms control and non-proliferation treaties and agreements like the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and INF constitute our first line of defence. Dismantling such multilateral security arrangements and institutions is in nobody's interest.

Because I was asked very explicitly, I would also like to answer the question as to whether I believe we can rescue the INF. Yes, of course, I do believe that. We mustn't give up on that, and must put all our efforts into the rescue of the INF. I also believe that debates like the one today in the European Parliament remind people, including decision makers in Moscow and Washington, of the value of the INF Treaty for European and global security and the stake that we in Europe have in this treaty's future.

By the way, the INF is only one contribution to Article 6 of the NPT, so a lot more has to be done in the future.

Allegations that the Russian Federation has begun producing and developing new missiles which could be aimed at EU countries, and which are not in compliance with Russia's treaty obligations, deserve to be treated seriously and need to be resolved. This should happen through a responsible dialogue, including at the highest level. The stakes are simply too high.

Presidente. – La discussione è chiusa.

Dichiarazioni scritte (articolo 162)

— Il trattato INF sui missili nucleari di medio raggio è indubbiamente una delle migliori eredità ricevute dalla Guerra fredda. Stracciarlo rappresenterebbe un enorme rischio per la sicurezza dell'Europa, dei suoi cittadini e del mondo intero. Tuttavia, dopo anni di accuse reciproche tra Washington e Mosca, la rottamazione da parte del primo del trattato INF sembra un rischio sempre più concreto dalle conseguenze imprevedibili e pericolose. Innanzitutto il possibile abbandono del trattato da parte dell'amministrazione americana comprometterebbe ulteriormente le relazioni tra USA e Russia, aumentando il clima da guerra fredda non solo tra queste due potenze ma anche con la Cina. Quest'ultima, non essendo vincolata dal trattato INF, ha potuto sviluppare un arsenale di missili altrimenti non consentito e ha continuato a fare il bello e il cattivo tempo nei Mari Cinesi. Infine, il ritiro unilaterale americano dall'INF metterebbe a repentaglio tutto il regime di non-proliferazione. In questo contesto l'UE sarebbe la prima a pagarne il caro prezzo, trasformandosi nel teatro di una spietata e pericolosa corsa agli armamenti. Ora più che mai l'UE deve mettere in atto tutti gli strumenti diplomatici necessari a favorire un accordo multilaterale e inclusivo per il controllo degli armamenti.

Eugen Freund (S&D), in writing. – The last thing we need is a new transatlantic arms race. The announcement by President Trump to withdraw from the Intermediate-range Nuclear Forces Treaty (INF Treaty) is a threat to European and global security and peace. The United States' retreat from multilateralism, international norms and rules, as well as international treaties, should at least serve as motivation for us Europeans to foster a strong, self-assured common European foreign policy.

Rather than quitting the Treaty, the United States should try to make Russia conform to its rules, as well as consider bringing other powers into the Treaty. Yes, we have to adapt to a changing international world order and should not only rely on instruments of the Cold War era. Instead of simply abolishing these instruments, we should expand and advance them to do justice to this changed strategic order and bring them into the 21st century. That is why it is important to have a strong actor like the EU, which is committed to multilateralism, a rules-based international order and the commitment to international treaties. However, for that we need a more effective, more unified and more credible European foreign policy.

26. USA's reaktion på karavanen med centralamerikanske migranter ved den mexicanske grænse (forhandling)

Presidente. – L'ordine del giorno reca la discussione sulla dichiarazione del Vicepresidente della Commissione e Alto rappresentante dell'Unione per gli affari esteri e la politica di sicurezza sulla risposta alla carovana di migranti dall'America centrale al confine con il Messico (2018/2920(RSP)).

Věra Jourová, Member of the Commission, on behalf of the Vice-President of the Commission / High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy. – Mr President, the ongoing caravans of migrants walking across Central America and Mexico turned public attention towards a silent exodus that has been ongoing for years. Every country in the world has every right to protect its borders and every country in the world has the obligation to do so in full respect of human rights and the principle of non-refoulement, as well as the norms on international protection. This applies to Europe and its Member States as it applies to everyone else, including the United States.

But beyond looking at the consequences, let me take this opportunity also to also look at the symptoms. Every day, hundreds of people from Honduras, Guatemala and El Salvador begin the journey to the United States. Today migrants are more visible as part of caravans walking in broad daylight, accompanied by NGOs and TV crews. They are all fleeing poverty and hunger, but fear seems to be the main driver of these migrations.

The Northern Triangle countries are among the poorest in Latin America with one third, or even half, of the population living on less than EUR 5 a day. Half of the unemployed are young people so it is hardly surprising that many of them decide to leave their country and look for a better future. Natural disasters have also been a strong driver for migration from the region. Today they are aggravated by the dire effects of climate change, in particular droughts and floods. All these factors combine and today the migrants are also fleeing death, violence and extortion. Between 2010 and 2017, over 100 000 homicides were recorded in the Northern Triangle. It is probably no coincidence that the first of these recent caravans started in San Pedro Sula, which is one of the most violent cities in the world.

The European Union has been supporting countries in the region in a twofold approach, providing immediate relief and tackling the root causes. In terms of humanitarian assistance, the Commission is implementing a program of EUR 2.5 million to address the needs of people affected by violence in the Northern Triangle. Concerning the caravan, the Commission is currently looking into possibilities to respond to humanitarian needs, in particular regarding the protection of vulnerable children and women against trafficking.

In Honduras we are investing about EUR 200 million in decent employment and food security, as well as strengthening the rule of law and access to justice. In Guatemala support amounting to over EUR 150 million is focused on food security, competitiveness security, security and human rights. In El Salvador we are investing about EUR 150 million. We support the national strategy to fight violence with a focus on prevention, including support to community organisations on the return of young people to the education system and on the construction of safe public spaces. The EU also funds social programmes such as 'Ciudad Mujer' an innovative approach to provide women with psychological and legal support and training for entrepreneurship.

Efforts to address security challenges at national level go hand in hand with reinforced regional cooperation against transnational crime and drug trafficking. Regional cooperation is equally important for the development of the region, including the creation of economic opportunities. The Association Agreement between the EU and Central America opens our markets to Central American businesses. Once fully ratified, the political and cooperation dimensions of the Agreement will further reinforce our partnership.

The EU is – and will remain – a reliable partner to the countries in the region in addressing the migration challenges, combining response to immediate needs with action on the root causes. Migration is a global challenge that requires global solutions and global responsibility sharing. Through international cooperation with our partners, we can turn migration from a common challenge into a shared opportunity for human development. I know that the Parliament has always supported this approach so I thank you for this debate and look forward to hearing your views.

José Inácio Faria, em nome do Grupo PPE. – Senhor Presidente, Senhora Comissária, Caros Colegas, à chamada marcha dos migrantes que partiu no dia 13 de outubro da cidade de San Pedro Sula, e como a Sra. Comissária referiu, uma das cidades mais perigosas do mundo, no norte das Honduras, juntaram-se milhares de migrantes da Guatemala e de El Salvador. Famílias inteiras seguem a pé em caravana, com os olhos postos nos Estados Unidos. Segundo a Save the Children, um em cada quatro membros desta caravana são crianças e adolescentes. A falta de oportunidades, a violência extrema e a pobreza endémica no triângulo norte da América Central levaram estas famílias a abandonar a sua terra natal e a embarcar nesta viagem que, apesar de árdua, oferece mais segurança do que a migração solitária e evita o pagamento de milhares de dólares aos contrabandistas.

Muitas destas vítimas da miséria económica e da exclusão social enfrentam também perseguições, recrutamentos esforçados e sequestros por grupos ligados ao crime organizado, desde as Maras locais aos traficantes das drogas transnacionais, um padrão que, infelizmente, se reproduz agora também na Nicarágua.

Estas pessoas não são criminosas, como não se cansa de repetir o Presidente Trump. São, isso sim, vítimas de organizações criminosas, que com violência e impunidade fingem governá-los, e procuram apenas viver em segurança e encontrar um trabalho que lhes permita sustentar as suas famílias, tal como fizeram nos séculos XIX e XX milhares de europeus que rumaram aos Estados Unidos para fugir da violência, da discriminação e da fome.

O Presidente Trump, que nos vinte e dois meses da sua presidência tem demonizado a imigração, prometeu deter os que tentam agora chegar ao seu país, com o pretexto de proteger os cidadãos americanos de criminosos e de uma invasão iminente e anunciou o envio de tropas para o sul dos Estados Unidos e a militarização da fronteira. As possibilidades de que lhes seja concedido asilo são, por isso, escassas e muitos correm o risco de ser detidos e separados das suas famílias enquanto aguardam audiências judiciais que poderão terminar com uma ordem de deportação.

Esta marcha dos migrantes e a que se formou a partir da cidade de Tapachula, no sul do México, no passado mês de abril, mostram à evidência que o endurecimento das políticas de asilo e as deportações em massa, empreendidas pelos Estados Unidos e pelo México nos últimos anos, falharam e o seu objetivo de dissuadir estes fluxos e os anunciados cortes nas ajudas económicas a estes países não farão mais do que agravar o caos social do qual fogem estas pessoas.

A União Europeia deve, pois, continuar a apoiar os esforços de integração regional na América Central e aproveitar para, no âmbito do Acordo de Associação com a América Central, reforçar o diálogo político com os países do triângulo norte, no que toca ao respeito pelos direitos humanos, ao reforço do Estado de Direito e à luta contra o narcotráfico e a impunidade.

A União não pode também deixar de apoiar a expansão regional da comissão anti-impunidade das Nações Unidas e de instar a que os países de trânsito e de destino respeitem as suas obrigações internacionais em matéria de direitos humanos em todas as travessias transfronteiriças.

Termino, Sr. Presidente, referindo o direito ao processo de vida de todos os migrantes, independentemente do seu estatuto, o respeito pelo princípio da não devolução e a proibição das expulsões arbitrárias e coletivas.

Elena Valenciano, *en nombre del Grupo S&D*. – Señor presidente, ¿saben cuántos kilómetros hay desde la frontera de Honduras hasta la de Estados Unidos? Más de 4 000 kilómetros. Es, más o menos, la distancia entre Lisboa y Estambul. Y ese es el camino que estas personas que huyen de la miseria, de la desesperación, del miedo, están dispuestas a recorrer. Entre esas 9 000 personas que salieron el 19 de octubre, más de 2 300 eran niños y niñas.

Quiero hablar de los niños y de las niñas de esa caravana, porque son los más vulnerables, porque son los que más están sufriendo, porque están sufriendo deshidratación y enfermedades, porque están muriendo, porque en el muro que separa México de los Estados Unidos hay cientos de cruces blancas pintadas, que son las cruces blancas de los niños y niñas que ya han muerto a lo largo del camino.

Esa es la situación real. Por eso queremos unirnos al llamamiento que hace el ACNUR, que hace Save the Children, para pedir a los Estados Unidos que cumplan con la legalidad internacional.

A los niños y niñas, a los adolescentes no se les puede tratar como si fueran delincuentes o narcotraficantes. Tienen derecho a la protección internacional según nuestras normas, y los Estados Unidos también están obligados a cumplirlas.

Dejemos que los niños y niñas sigan siendo niños y niñas.

Jussi Halla-aho, *on behalf of the ECR Group*. – Mr President, many people on both sides of the Atlantic have spent the past two years complaining how unattractive the US has become because of the Trump administration. It is a little difficult to take this seriously when we consider the number of people who are trying so hard to get there from Central America and other places.

The big question here is: what is a civilised country supposed to do when it is invaded by a large number of unarmed civilians? Can it be that it is not supposed to do anything? This is a very acute question in Europe as well. Instead of just condemning everything Mr Trump does, or plans to do, we should work to find an acceptable but efficient way of stopping illegal migrants from entering freely a country that does not want to have them.

Izaskun Bilbao Barandica, en nombre del Grupo ALDE. – Señor presidente, señora comisaria, hoy, tras lo ocurrido en este Parlamento en la votación de la Directiva sobre visados humanitarios, tengo que comenzar insistiendo en que los movimientos migratorios y sus causas son un asunto global que requiere nuestra máxima atención y responsabilidad. Y obliga a sustituir por hechos las muchas palabras que solemos escuchar sobre solidaridad, fraternidad, humanidad, refugio o asilo.

La primera, en nuestro caso, es que quienes consideren que el sistema de votación de este Parlamento no ha recogido adecuadamente sus votos corrijan el dato en el registro correspondiente. No servirá para cambiar el sentido de la votación, pero dejará testimonio, al menos, de la verdadera voluntad del Pleno y legitimará que podamos traer ese asunto aquí en el futuro. Autocrítica, asumir el error y corregirlo sin poner en peligro la seguridad jurídica de todas nuestras votaciones.

Y es que es imprescindible hacer. Las personas que abandonan sus lugares de origen normalmente huyen de la pobreza, de la inseguridad y de la violencia. En el caso de las caravanas centroamericanas, los problemas que originan el éxodo son claros. Son el fruto de la desigualdad y de una política intervencionista que, a veces, ha impulsado el país al que estas personas se dirigen. Una dinámica que ha marcado el signo de los gobiernos y sistemas económicos y políticos. Los problemas de gobernanza y democracia y sus repercusiones en términos de desigualdad y justicia social son el caldo de cultivo que propicia que algunas de las ciudades de las que salieron estas caravanas sean hoy, como ha dicho usted, comisaria, las más violentas de América.

Frente a esos problemas hay quien compra los *fake news* y quien vende esquemas simples y maniqueos, que ofrecen a demasiada gente la tranquilidad de saberse entre los buenos y que permiten justificar cualquier atrocidad contra los otros, que fácilmente acaban siendo los malos.

Que el presidente de los Estados Unidos juegue tan burdamente este juego, hasta el punto de que las cadenas de televisión más conservadoras rechacen sus anuncios sobre estas caravanas por racistas, es un indicador de lo lejos que ha llegado el populismo. Espero que nos enseñe. Además, esta falacia, esa grosera simplificación puede ahuyentar alguna incertidumbre al que compra tan averiada mercancía, pero no ofrece ninguna solución.

Hay una legislación internacional que respetar. Y, como decía el filósofo Daniel Innerarity en un artículo periodístico, una democracia que reprogramar. Hay que responder con responsabilidad, límites e intereses compartidos a la complejidad de los problemas.

Los siento, presidente permítame que acabo diciendo que el primero de ...

(El presidente retira la palabra a la oradora.)

Josep-Maria Terricabras, en nombre del Grupo Verts/ALE. – Señor presidente, hace poco los primeros miembros de la caravana migrante han llegado desde Honduras a la frontera con los Estados Unidos. Se ha dicho ya: la mayoría están huyendo de la violencia y del riesgo de morir asesinados o por inanición. Continuar en su país ponía en riesgo su propia vida y la de sus familiares. Para la mayoría de ellos, pues, se trata de un desplazamiento forzado.

De ahí que estemos hablando ante todo de derechos humanos. Los Gobiernos de México y de los Estados Unidos deberían informar a esas personas —cosa que no hacen— de que pueden solicitar asilo o refugio.

En todo caso, se les debería garantizar que sus necesidades básicas estén cubiertas y que se respetan sus derechos, porque ni México ni los Estados Unidos deben tratar el asunto de la caravana migrante desde un enfoque represivo o criminalizador, que favorece la xenofobia, sino desde un enfoque basado en los derechos humanos. El presidente electo de México tiene ahora mismo la oportunidad de empezar su mandato con una apuesta firme por los derechos humanos.

Y no puedo resistirme a expresar una sospecha: que esta enorme marcha se haya iniciado alguna semana antes de las elecciones de intermedias en los Estados Unidos ha podido reforzar los detestables argumentos xenófobos del presidente Trump. No culpo en absoluto a los miembros de la marcha, pero me pregunto si puede haber habido intereses mezquinos para promover el calendario de su realización.

En cualquier caso, nuestro apoyo a la caravana y a los migrantes por su dignidad y por la nuestra.

IN THE CHAIR: MAIREAD McGUINNESS

Vice-President

João Pimenta Lopes, *em nome do Grupo GUE/NGL*. – Senhora Presidente, os milhares que integram a caravana fogem do agravamento das condições sociais e económicas no seu país e à violência dos esquadrões da morte, uma realidade que não se desliga do golpe de Estado nas Honduras em 2009, promovido desde os Estados Unidos, ou dos resultados das fraudulentas eleições de 2017, que tiveram o encobrimento da União Europeia.

Esta dramática situação tem, nas suas causas, a estratégia de destabilização e ingerência em países soberanos, protagonizada pelos Estados Unidos como também pela União Europeia, impondo relações de domínio económico e rapina de recursos que promovem o subdesenvolvimento e a dependência.

A par de uma resposta rápida e solidária aos dramas humanitários das migrações, a resposta fundamental aos fluxos migratórios passa pelo ataque às causas que levam a que milhões de seres humanos em todo o mundo se vejam obrigados a deixar os seus países. Passa pelo respeito pela soberania e independência dos Estados, da Carta das Nações Unidas, do Direito Internacional. Passa por políticas genuínas de cooperação para o desenvolvimento, que assegurem os direitos, o progresso social e a paz.

Nathan Gill, *on behalf of the EFDD Group*. – Madam President, the entire world has been gripped by the migration crisis. It's not just in the European Union, but it's also in the United States. We share a common challenge when it comes to dealing with the millions of people who are trying to illegally cross borders. In recent weeks, the United States has seen a migrant caravan consisting of thousands of people travelling from Central America to the US border. We're witnessing an organised mass migration of economic migrants on a scale that has never been seen before and this, quite simply, is economic migration. Both here and in the EU and over there in the US there are legitimate and legal routes for seeking genuine asylum, but these migrant caravans should not lead to permanent residence in the US.

It has been said in this debate that they are not criminals. But if you enter a country illegally, you are breaking laws and you are therefore a criminal. I think President Trump is right to send thousands of US troops to the border to stop the illegal entry of the migrants and to protect their national security.

Let's just point out that the migrants are now in Mexico. Why are they not staying in Mexico? There are 129 million people who live in Mexico quite happily. Are we saying that everybody in Mexico should be leaving Mexico to go to America as well because it's unsafe there, or are we saying that the migrants should stay in Mexico now that they are there?

While some argue that the numbers of migrants in the caravan are small, they set a precedent and encourage others to make this dangerous journey to the US. Since 2017, multiple caravans have headed to the border, and each time they are getting bigger and bigger. On our own soil we have seen the effects of mass migration, especially the terrible death toll of migrants crossing turbulent seas in boats completely unfit for that purpose. International law is being broken and EU treaties are just being ignored. A government's main duty is the protection and the security of its citizens. This includes securing your nation's border – it's just common sense. Leaders in Europe would do well to learn from President Trump's response to what's happening at the US border instead of just continually pointing their fingers and complaining.

Mario Borghezio, *a nome del gruppo ENF*. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, al di là degli aspetti umanitari che commuovono tutti, in realtà questa marcia risponde a una strategia avente uno scopo molto preciso, che è quello di scardinare gli Stati aprendo grandi rotte migratorie dal terzo mondo verso il cosiddetto primo mondo.

I guru dell'alta finanza spingono le ONG e le finanziano per utilizzare le popolazioni del terzo mondo come strumento per colonizzare il primo mondo, per ridurre i salari e creare instabilità politica. Con l'appoggio dell'ONU stanno ora occidentalizzando queste popolazioni, trasformandole in arieti politici, nel tentativo di far sì che il primo mondo di cui l'Europa è parte integrante, dovrebbe accorgersene anche la Commissione e dovrebbe meglio riflettere.

Il fenomeno delle carovane ripropone il tema del significato del valore delle frontiere che, come bene ha teorizzato Régis Debray, hanno una funzione insostituibile di filtro e quindi di difesa dell'identità dei popoli. I muri non sono una degenerazione, ma sono una conseguenza del rifiuto di una demarcazione e della difesa dell'identità.

Pier Antonio Panzeri (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la ONG Movimiento Migrante Mesoamericano ha dichiarato che il 70 % dei migranti provenienti dall'America centrale, quando attraversano il Messico per raggiungere gli Stati Uniti, subiscono stupri e violenze. Il corpo umano viene utilizzato come mezzo di scambio da offrire a poliziotti di frontiera senza scrupoli. Qualsiasi cosa pur di scappare dalla fame, dalla violenza, dalla corruzione di cui sono impregnati i paesi come l'Honduras e il Guatemala. È una carovana di circa 3 000 persone, piena di speranza, perché nulla può essere peggio di ciò che si è lasciato alle spalle.

Avvistando l'ondata di disperazione, Trump ha pensato bene di armare la frontiera, poco importa che siano state proprio le sue politiche nei confronti del resto del continente ad aggravare la situazione. Ricordo il taglio del 40 % dei fondi destinati all'Honduras, al Guatemala e al Salvador, che ha fatto diminuire le opportunità economiche rendendo i cittadini ancora più vulnerabili. Anche l'eliminazione dei permessi di lavoro temporaneo negli Stati Uniti per salvadoregni e honduregni ha contribuito all'impoverimento di quei paesi, riducendo le rimesse.

Insomma, tutto il contrario di quello che servirebbe. Servono politiche sensate che dovrebbero prevedere un aumento della cooperazione tra i paesi del Nord e del Sud dell'America. Serve una politica di immigrazione e di asilo chiara che venga applicata in modo coerente anche dagli Stati Uniti d'America.

Ernest Urtasun (Verts/ALE). – Señora presidenta, en primer lugar deseo expresar nuestra solidaridad con la caravana de hombres, mujeres y niños que huyen de la miseria, que huyen de la violencia de Honduras, de Guatemala, de El Salvador. Deseo también denunciar los intentos de criminalización de esta caravana —cuando estamos simplemente ante un fenómeno de migración forzosa— y, de una manera muy clara, las declaraciones y los aspavientos militaristas que está haciendo la Administración norteamericana liderada por el señor Trump y recordarle que, en gran parte, la miseria que hoy viven muchos de los países de su vecindad inmediata tiene que ver con su falta de apuesta por la cooperación, por el recorte de fondos y por su falta de una política de integración de la inmigración.

¿Qué podemos hacer ante la caravana actual como Unión Europea? Dos cosas: la primera, recordar, a través de nuestra acción exterior, a los Estados miembros que están afectados, a los Estados de la zona que están afectados, que tienen obligaciones derivadas del Derecho humanitario y que deben cumplirlas; y, en segundo lugar, repensar si nuestras políticas y nuestra relación con la zona —con América Central— contribuyen realmente al desarrollo de estos países, cosa que es muy dudosa.

Y sobre todo, señora Jourová, y con esto termino, quisiera invitarle a estar muy atentos a los posibles fenómenos de tráfico de mujeres y de tráfico de niños que pueden producirse en esta situación.

Marisa Matias (GUE/NGL). – Senhora Presidente, a América Central atravessa uma profunda crise humanitária. A caravana migrante é uma imagem brutal do desespero. Milhares de pessoas, na sua maioria hondurenhas, crianças, mulheres, jovens, pessoas mais idosas, querem fugir e procurar asilo.

Os primeiros saíram das Honduras no dia 12 de outubro, ontem chegaram 357 a Tijuana e há milhares a caminho. Corrupção, crime organizado, narcotráfico, que atravessam, aliás, todo o espectro político, e o recente agravamento da violência de Estado e da impunidade são as principais causas que levam as pessoas a fugir de um dos países mais pobres e mais violentos da região.

Os Estados Unidos organizaram-se para militarizar as fronteiras e ameaçar com cortes nos apoios. Tudo isto viola a defesa mais elementar dos direitos humanos. Da União Europeia espera-se que faça corresponder os apoios a um verdadeiro comprometimento das autoridades, com as necessárias reformas que recuperem o bem-estar e a defesa das populações, assim como a assistência a quem dela necessita.

Estas caravanas são também uma forma de luta: são pessoas que caminham contra o abandono e contra a amnésia da História.

Francisco Assis (S&D). – Senhora Presidente, de que fogem estes milhares de seres humanos, homens, mulheres, velhos, crianças, que integram esta caravana? Fogem da ameaça da morte, fogem da violência, fogem do espectro da fome, fogem de situações profundamente desumanas que, infelizmente, assolam grande parte da América Central e, em particular, as Honduras.

E, por isso, o nosso primeiro olhar tem de ser para essa região e temos de reforçar a nossa cooperação com a América Central e contribuir para a superação dos gravíssimos problemas que se colocam nessa região do mundo.

Por outro lado, eles demandam os Estados Unidos e nós, europeus, temos consciência de como esta questão dos refugiados é uma questão complexa e difícil. Mas também temos de sempre fazer apelo aos princípios humanitários fundamentais. É inaceitável uma reação como aquela que o Presidente atual dos Estados Unidos, Trump, tem vindo, sistematicamente, a verbalizar, com o apoio, aliás, da mais sórdida e repugnante extrema-direita europeia.

É, por isso, preciso chamar a atenção para a necessidade de responder a estas situações, que são sobretudo situações humanitárias, com um profundo sentido de humanismo, que é a base de todos os valores que inspiram ou devem inspirar a nossa intervenção política.

Miguel Urbán Crespo (GUE/NGL). – Señora presidenta, por primera vez el mundo observa a los invisibles.

Los invisibles se han hecho visibles porque se han organizado en una caravana migrante; son visibles porque han decidido hacer del tránsito migratorio una protesta contra la injusticia, una protesta contra una vida de precariedad, una vida de violencia de la que huyen, una vida que es consecuencia directa de nuestras políticas.

¿Estaríamos ante esta caravana migrante si no hubiéramos mirado hacia otro lado cuando el golpe de Estado en Honduras?

Y ahora, ¿qué hacemos? Miramos otra vez hacia otro lado cuando estas personas sufren violencia en su tránsito; miramos hacia otro lado cuando lo único que se les ofrece son armas, concertinas y la militarización de las fronteras.

Exigimos ayuda humanitaria urgente. Exigimos que se le ponga freno a Trump y exigimos que el Parlamento Europeo mande una misión de observación a esa caravana para que se respeten los derechos humanos y se respete el derecho al asilo de todas y de todos.

Que los invisibles nunca más vuelvan a ser invisibles: no son números, son personas.

Javi López (S&D). – Señora presidenta, hay siete mil personas, entre ellas dos mil trescientos niños, que están recorriendo México para encontrar un futuro de esperanza. Gente que viene del Triángulo Norte, de tres países centroamericanos que han entrado desde hace décadas en una espiral sin fin de violencia y pobreza. Un hoyo negro para muchos, del que intentan escapar.

¿Y qué ha pasado? Que mientras pasaba esto, había una campaña electoral en Estados Unidos. Y ha habido un presidente, el americano, que ha decidido utilizarlos como rehenes de su campaña electoral. Deshumanizarlos, demonizarlos, amenazarlos con el uso militar de la fuerza contra ellos. Con el único objetivo de ganar un puñado de votos en esas elecciones. Por eso, ahora ha desaparecido también de la agenda americana.

Y lo que hay que hacer es recordarle a su presidente, a Estados Unidos, sus obligaciones en materia de derechos humanos y Derecho internacional. Y la necesidad de que recuerde que su país está construido gracias a la migración como identidad y fruto de ella. Eso es Estados Unidos. Y parece que hoy lo olvidan de cara al mundo.

Cécile Kashetu Kyenge (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, perché stupirsi? Settemila persone – uomini, donne e bambini – provenienti da Honduras, Guatemala ed El Salvador altro non sono che il simbolo della mobilità globale.

Purtroppo, la risposta del Presidente Trump è stata la sospensione del diritto di asilo e la mobilitazione di un esercito al confine messicano, ponendo una barriera per fermare coloro che potrebbero avere diritto ad asilo e protezione.

Alle politiche di chiusura bisogna rispondere con la solidarietà e anche con strumenti multilaterali per una corretta gestione della mobilità, come il Patto globale delle Nazioni Unite sulla migrazione, che gli Stati Uniti hanno rifiutato di sottoscrivere e che altri Stati europei stanno mettendo in discussione.

Al Presidente Trump e a chi come lui plaude alla chiusura dei confini e al bando della libera circolazione vorrei ricordare il principio della portabilità dei diritti. I diritti umani fondamentali non si fermano davanti a una barricata, ma sono intrinseci alla persona stessa ovunque essa sia, ed è nostro dovere garantirli e difenderli sempre in ogni parte del mondo.

Ana Gomes (S&D). – Senhora Presidente, a suspensão do direito de asilo e o envio de militares para a fronteira por parte do Presidente dos Estados Unidos é uma afronta, desde logo, à magnífica tradição, à magnífica História dos Estados Unidos e também ao próprio papel que os Estados Unidos tiveram na construção do edifício internacional dos direitos humanos universais.

Estas pessoas não são migrantes económicos, fogem de condições de vida miseráveis, fogem da perseguição, fogem da criminalidade à solta nos seus países, na América Central, fogem de situações pelas quais os Estados Unidos têm graves responsabilidades pelas políticas intervencionistas, comerciais, económicas desastrosas. E, portanto, não é tolerável esta atitude por parte dos Estados Unidos e nós, europeus, temos de falar, não falar como a extrema-direita completamente ao arrepio da civilização que vem aqui negar a humanidade destas pessoas e o direito a pedirem asilo face às condições de que vêm.

Nós temos de ter políticas de desenvolvimento para a América Central e para o resto do mundo, designadamente em África, que sejam de genuíno desenvolvimento e que passem pela construção democrática, porque senão, neste mundo interdependente e em crescente mobilidade, cada vez teremos mais caravanas deste tipo.

Wajid Khan (S&D). – Madam President, as we speak, 7000 people walk towards the United States of America in search of a better life. These people are from some of the poorest and most violent countries in the region, and Trump will greet them with a barbed wire fence and the strongest army in the entire world.

I have previously spoken here about the barbarity of the current American administration when they were forcibly separating children from their parents at the border. Now they are brutally closing down the door down on desperate people who want to contribute to their economy. We welcome Mexico's 'Estás en tu casa' programme, which provides healthcare and jobs to those migrants who wish to stay – exactly what the USA and the EU should be doing.

The Statue of Liberty welcomed the world's huddled masses yearning to breathe free. I hope everyone in this Chamber will agree with me, and call for the USA to honour this. The USA must respect the principle of non-refoulement and welcome those who are fleeing desperate situations as fellow human beings. Only by doing this can Trump truly make America great again.

Catch-the-eye procedure

Julie Ward (S&D). – Madam President, thousands of poor families and unaccompanied children from Central America are on the move, travelling to the Mexican USA border fleeing violence, poverty and unsustainable lives. 38-year-old José Vega, who is travelling with the caravan from Honduras, said: 'My hope is someday to build a house for my family to live in peace, to go from sandals to shoes – not to be rich, but to be in peace'. Isn't that the simple desire of all of us? President Trump's cruel response, however, is sadly predictable. He has threatened military violence and he uses the racist, xenophobic language that has become a hallmark of his presidency. Trump has become the bully in the school playground. He has scant regard for human rights and uses his position to stir up hate. He is unfit for public office, and he shames his country by his words and actions.

Xabier Benito Ziluaga (GUE/NGL). – Señora presidenta, la semana pasada tuve la oportunidad de visitar la frontera de Guatemala con México, en la ciudad de Tecún Umán, a orillas del río Suchiate.

La situación de desborde humanitario allí es totalmente insostenible. La Casa del Migrante aloja a 120 personas sin ninguna ayuda nacional ni internacional. Mientras tanto, en una semana, 6 000 migrantes han pasado por esa zona.

También la situación de violencia y vulnerabilidad es dramática en todo el recorrido. La zona fronteriza es una zona de crímenes, de explotación sexual y de violencia. La acción policial de México sin ir más lejos, que tiene el apoyo de Estados Unidos ahora mismo, ya ha matado a tres personas solo en este paso fronterizo.

Y ustedes se preguntarán: ¿Qué hace el ejército estadounidense en territorio mexicano? Pues lo mismo que están haciendo los fondos europeos en los guardacostas libios: externalizar fronteras, alejar la violencia contra las personas migrantes allí donde no se puede ni ver ni juzgar lo que están haciendo.

Migrar es un derecho, señora comisaria, el libre tránsito de las personas es un derecho; y habría que empezar por adoptar, cumplir y hacer cumplir los acuerdos del Pacto Mundial para la Migración.

Γεώργιος Επιτήδειος (NI). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, όπως όλοι γνωρίζουμε, τον προηγούμενο μήνα ένα караβάνι περίπου εφτά χιλιάδων μεταναστών, ξεκινώντας από την Ονδούρα, έφτασε τελικά στα σύνορα με τις Ηνωμένες Πολιτείες της Αμερικής αναζητώντας καλύτερες συνθήκες ζωής. Δεν υπάρχει αμφιβολία ότι οι συνθήκες διαβίωσης στα κράτη της Κεντρικής Αμερικής, όπως και σε πολλά άλλα κράτη, δεν είναι οι καταλληλότερες. Πλην όμως, αυτό δεν σημαίνει ότι οι κάτοικοι των χωρών αυτών πρέπει να φεύγουν μαζικά και, υπό μορφή εισβολής, να προσπαθούν να εισέλθουν στην πλησιέστερη ευημερούσα χώρα. Συμβαίνει κάτι ανάλογο δηλαδή με τις μεταναστευτικές ροές που δεχόμαστε και εμείς στην Ευρώπη. Όμως, η κυβέρνηση των ΗΠΑ έκανε το αυτονόητο: έλεγξε τα σύνορά της -σε αντίθεση με εμάς- και ελέγχει τις ροές των μεταναστών αυτών. Εάν πραγματικά ενδιαφερόμαστε -πέραν από τον υποκριτικό ανθρωπισμό της Αριστεράς- για τους ανθρώπους αυτούς, θα πρέπει να συνεργαστούμε για να δημιουργηθούν οι κατάλληλες συνθήκες διαβίωσης στην ίδια τους τη χώρα. Να ζήσουν και να ευημερήσουν εκεί και όχι να φεύγουν προς άλλες χώρες.

(End of catch-the-eye procedure)

Věra Jourová, Member of the Commission, on behalf of the Vice-President of the Commission / High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy. – Madam President, I would like to thank the honourable Members for the fruitful exchange. We all agree that every country has the right to manage its borders. We also agree that migrants' human rights should be fully upheld. Special attention should be given to the needs of the most vulnerable, including children and women, and, importantly, we also agreed that tackling the root causes of migration, including poverty, citizens' security and governance-related, is essential.

The EU will continue to closely follow the situation and use all the instruments available to support the countries of origin, to provide security and a future to their populations.

President. – The debate is closed.

27. De ekstraterritoriale virkninger af USA's sanktioner over for Iran for europæiske virksomheder (forhandling)

President. – The next item is the debate on the statement by the Vice-President of the Commission / High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy on the extraterritorial effects of US sanctions on Iran for European companies (2018/2922(RSP)).

Věra Jourová, Member of the Commission, on behalf of the Vice-President of the Commission / High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy. – Madam President, honourable Members of the European Parliament, last week the United States unilaterally re-imposed all the sanctions that they had removed thanks to the nuclear deal with Iran, the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action. On 2 November, the High Representative issued a statement together with the Foreign and Finance Ministers of Germany, France and the United Kingdom, expressing deep regret at this development. The sanctions re-imposed on 5 November cover a wide array of sectors and, together with the designation of some 700 individuals and entities, impact large parts of the Iranian economy. As such, they are a serious challenge to the continued implementation of the plan of action.

The re-imposition of US sanctions may also bring substantial collateral effects, in particular it could weigh on the region's trade flows and energy supplies, connectivity and ultimately the security and stability of states such as Iraq and Afghanistan.

Let me begin this debate with a few general comments.

First, we continue to support the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action as its provisions continue to ensure that Iran does not acquire material or equipment to develop a nuclear weapon. The deal with Iran is working and delivering on its goal, namely ensuring that Iran's nuclear programme remains exclusively peaceful. This is an assessment based on scientific facts provided through a uniquely high number of inspections and 13 reports by the International Atomic Energy Agency. Moreover, there is no credible peaceful alternative to the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action.

The deal with Iran is a key element of the global nuclear non-proliferation architecture. It is crucial for the security of Europe, the region and the entire world. Dismantling the agreement would not only destroy years of diplomatic efforts but also undermine other key multilateral negotiations in the nuclear field and beyond.

It is a matter of security and it is a matter of credibility for the international community. For these reasons, the EU and its Member States are determined to preserve it. We remain committed to the continued implementation of the nuclear deal in all its aspects and in particular we are at work to preserve the economic dividends arising from sanctions lifting.

Let me remind everyone that we are talking about economic benefits for the people of Iran which constitute an essential part of the deal. As we remain committed to our side of the deal we also expect Iran to continue implementing in full all its nuclear commitments under the plan of action.

The European Union has already taken a number of measures. First, we have updated our blocking statute to ensure that business decisions are not determined by the listed US extra-territorial legislation, which the Union does not recognise as applicable to EU operators. The Commission has significantly engaged with economic operators and Member States on the implementation of the statute.

Second, we have extended the European Investment Bank's lending mandate. This allows the bank to lend in Iran in the future in line with relevant rules and procedures.

Thirdly, the European Commission is elaborating a range of tools to strengthen the activities of small and medium sized enterprises between the EU and Iran. We are working on technical exchanges to enhance trade, harmonisation of standards and due diligence and compliance efforts.

I am aware of the high level of interest regarding the design and state of play of the special-purpose vehicle. We Europeans cannot accept that a foreign power, not even our closest friend and ally, takes decisions over our legitimate trade with another country. The ongoing work, led by France, Germany and the United Kingdom, aims at preserving the full and effective implementation of the plan of action in all its aspects and in line with UN Security Council Resolution 2231.

Protecting legitimate trade is also a basic element of our own sovereignty and it is only natural that we are working in this direction. This is a hugely complex and unique undertaking requiring the best expertise available. Technical work has been advancing over the last days and weeks under the political leadership of Member States and supported by the EEAS and the Commission. Our goal is to build something that is workable, effective and viable.

The special-purpose vehicle is not directed against the United States. On the contrary, preserving the nuclear deal is essential to our common security both for Europe, for the United States and for our friends in the Middle East.

The special-purpose vehicle is not circumventing sanctions. It is about working in full transparency, ensuring due diligence for the most rigorous standards on anti-money laundering and on countering the financing of terrorism in full respect of UN Security Council resolutions and the primacy of the EU law.

I am aware that many of you have concerns regarding Iran's foreign policy and respect for human rights. So does the European Commission, but the Plan of Action was never meant to solve all of our disagreements with Iran. We continue to voice our disagreements on Iran's security role in the region and its ballistic missile programme and we have engaged in a frank and active dialogue with Iran on these issues. We maintain a range of EU autonomous restrictive measures. These include an arms embargo and measures against arms trade, against human rights violations, on Iran's support for the Assad regime in Syria and for terrorism.

Some of these issues are addressed through our EU-Iran high-level dialogue. The EU has also led a dialogue together with France, Germany, Italy and the UK to engage Iran constructively on regional issues. The last meeting of this group was convened in Brussels on 12 September and discussed the situation in Syria and Yemen, and we hope to meet again before the end of the year.

This is also very much about our own security and regional security, but none of these issues is linked to the Plan of Action and they would not be easier to deal with without it. Preserving the nuclear deal with Iran is an essential security interest for Europe, for our region and for the whole world. So we will keep working to preserve a nuclear non-proliferation agreement that is working well, and to prevent a major security crisis in the Middle East.

Cristian Dan Preda, *au nom du groupe PPE*. – Madame la Présidente, Madame la Commissaire, chers collègues, ma conviction est que l'Union européenne ne peut pas répondre correctement à la question des effets extraterritoriaux que peuvent avoir, sur les entreprises européennes, les sanctions des États-Unis à l'encontre de l'Iran, si on ne replace pas cette question dans le contexte politique plus large de nos relations politiques avec l'Iran.

La situation dans laquelle nous nous trouvons aujourd'hui, qui nous oblige à défendre les intérêts économiques des entreprises européennes, est à mon sens aussi la conséquence d'une réponse politique insuffisante.

Nous avons soutenu la nécessité de poursuivre l'application de l'accord nucléaire avec l'Iran aussi longtemps que ce pays respectera ses obligations, et ce bien avant le retrait des États-Unis. La délégation de la commission des affaires étrangères, dont je faisais partie, qui s'est rendue à Téhéran au mois de février a d'ailleurs porté ce message.

La réalité est qu'avant la décision des États-Unis, le 8 mai, de se retirer de l'accord, nous disposions d'une certaine marge de manœuvre pour discuter sérieusement avec le gouvernement américain de ses inquiétudes sur l'accord nucléaire et pour trouver une solution qui nous aurait ainsi évité la discussion d'aujourd'hui.

La première conclusion que j'en tire est qu'il n'est pas trop tard. Nous devrions discuter sérieusement avec les États-Unis. La coopération avec eux reste vitale pour répondre à l'Iran. Les défis que nous avons à relever en commun sont nombreux: freiner les ambitions nucléaires de l'Iran, améliorer la situation désastreuse des droits de l'homme dans ce pays et aborder les questions du rôle néfaste de l'Iran dans le conflit en Syrie, des menaces proférées à l'encontre de l'État d'Israël, du soutien du régime iranien au terrorisme et des projets d'attentat sur le sol européen. Tous ces sujets sont devenus presque tabou, y compris au sein de notre Parlement, où toute tentative de discussion des droits de l'homme en Iran est systématiquement bloquée par nos amis socialistes.

Pour défendre les intérêts des entreprises européennes, la réponse ne peut pas se trouver dans une action purement économique, qu'il s'agisse de l'établissement d'une entité spéciale ou de l'aide accordée à l'Iran pour répondre aux conséquences des sanctions américaines. Elle doit se trouver avant tout dans une action politique cohérente qui –j'insiste sur ce point –n'isole pas les différents aspects de nos relations avec l'Iran et n'exclut pas la construction de ponts avec le gouvernement Trump sur ce sujet, n'en déplaise de nouveau à nos amis de gauche.

(L'orateur accepte de répondre à une question «carton bleu» (article 162, paragraphe 8 du règlement)).

Ana Gomes (S&D), *question «carton bleu»*. – Il me semble que nous avons tous les deux participé à la mission de la commission des affaires étrangères en Iran cette année. Tu peux sans doute confirmer ici que c'est certainement moi, membre socialiste de cette délégation, qui ai posé le plus de questions sur les droits de l'homme à nos interlocuteurs iraniens. Je réfute donc catégoriquement l'accusation que tu as dirigée contre les socialistes.

Cristian Dan Preda (PPE), *réponse «carton bleu»*. – J'ai bien sûr une réponse. Ana a toujours été une exception au sein du groupe socialiste, qu'il s'agisse de l'Iran et de la question des droits ou, par exemple, des partis socialistes à l'Est, et notamment du parti social-démocrate roumain. Elle a toujours eu une position droite sur ce sujet ainsi que sur les droits de l'homme et le terrible sort du socialisme à l'Est.

Josef Weidenholzer, im Namen der S&D-Fraktion. – Frau Präsidentin, Frau Kommissarin! Ich möchte mich auf den Kern der Diskussion konzentrieren. Das Atomabkommen mit dem Iran war einer der am intensivsten vorbereiteten multilateralen Verträge der letzten Zeit. Jahrelang wurde von verschiedenen Parteien intensiv der Ausstieg des Irans aus dem Atomprogramm behandelt. Damit wurde nicht nur eine ständig schwelende Kriegsgefahr gebannt, sondern auch der Boden für eine friedliche Entwicklung gelegt. Der damit einhergehende Entfall der wirtschaftlichen Sanktionen sollte die Isolation der iranischen Wirtschaft beenden, ökonomischen Win-win generieren und die Grundlage für Wohlstand im Inneren schaffen. Die Hoffnung war, dass damit auch eine neue Stabilitätszone in einer seit Jahrzehnten unruhigen Region entstehen könnte. Gerade für Europa wäre das ganz wesentlich. Die Europäische Union spielt ja auch eine wesentliche Rolle beim Zustandekommen des Vertrags, und es liegt im Interesse der Union und ihrer Mitgliedstaaten, dass der Prozess nicht ins Stocken gerät.

Die iranische Seite hat bisher alle ihre Verpflichtungen ernst genommen. Alle internationalen Kontrollen haben das bisher bestätigt – zwölfmal hintereinander. Warum der Prozess nicht wirklich vorankommt und immer mehr Unternehmen zögern, sich wirtschaftlich zu engagieren, das hängt vor allem daran, dass sich die USA unter Trumps Einfluss vom Multilateralismus verabschiedet haben. Der US-amerikanische Unilateralismus stellt eine große Herausforderung dar, nicht nur in der Iranfrage. Daher müssen wir zu unseren Vereinbarungen stehen, ohne Wenn und Aber. Es sind Maßnahmen wie die Aktivierung des *blocking statute* notwendig. Und es müssen auch vertrauensbildende Maßnahmen gesetzt werden, bloße Beteuerungen bringen uns nicht weiter.

Anna Elżbieta Fotyga, on behalf of the ECR Group. – Madam President, the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA) is far from being a good deal. Iranian companies – our partners in trade – are heavily controlled by the Revolutionary Guard – the organisation directly responsible for financing terrorism, bloody martyrs and meddling in the region. Moreover, there is money laundering present in the Iranian economy – that was admitted even by Foreign Minister Zarif himself in the Iranian Parliament. We have to take all of this into consideration.

Marietje Schaake, on behalf of the ALDE Group. – Madam President, the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA), or the nuclear deal that was agreed by the major global powers at a critical time, was actually fatally damaged by President Trump's withdrawal. But that doesn't mean that there's nothing we can do and that all is lost. A reduced nuclear agreement may still work, but I think we, in Europe, have to be realistic.

Of course, High Representatives Ashton and Mogherini stuck out their necks for diplomacy, and that was the right thing to do, but preserving that legacy cannot be a goal in and of itself because it also had a shadow side. I think human rights and the violations that we see every day in Iran, as well as Iran's troubling role in the Middle East, were overlooked, and rebalancing our European approach towards Iran is very important and should not be hindered by needing to defend the JCPOA.

Attempts to maintain policy independence and to give European companies maximum choice to do business are the right steps to take; they are positive. The EU lifted sanctions as it's part of the deal, while Iran commits to verification of nuclear enrichment. But to push or even punish European companies for choosing to drop business with Iran under threat of US repercussions is taking it too far. Additionally, the whole impression that the EU and Iran are in one sort of camp and that the United States is in another camp is deplorable. We are both liberal democracies, and that should be leading. I think the way forward for us in Europe is to broaden our Iran policy and to include, very ambitiously, human rights and foreign policy concerns while continuing to take reasonable steps to stay committed to our part of the nuclear agreement.

Reinhard Bütikofer, im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion. – Frau Präsidentin, sehr verehrte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Das tiefe Bedauern, das geäußert wurde, teilen wir natürlich alles. Aber ich bedaure auch zutiefst, dass wir es nicht schaffen, zu einer realistischen Sprache vorzudringen, sondern die Situation ständig beschönigen. Davon hat noch niemand etwas.

Das sogenannte *blocking statute* ist ja lächerlich! Kein einziger internationaler Konzern kann es sich leisten, sich darauf zu verlassen. Deswegen, glaube ich, sollten wir anfangen, uns selbst ernster zu nehmen – einschließlich der Schwächen, die wir haben. Eine der Schwächen ist meines Erachtens, dass wir zwar zu Recht den Nukleardeal mit dem Iran aufrecht erhalten, aber keinerlei Grund haben, die negativen Seiten der iranischen Außenpolitik so zu beschönigen, wie Sie das gemacht haben, Frau Kommissarin. Sie haben gesagt:

We voice these agreements, and we have frank and active dialogue.

Mehr fällt uns nicht ein? Ist das angemessen gegenüber der Außenpolitik des Iran? Ich bezweifle das sehr.

Zweitens: Wir werden hier mit den Chinesen und mit den Russen zusammenarbeiten haben, weil an dieser konkreten Stelle die Amerikaner sich auf eine Position begeben, die für uns nicht auszuhalten ist. Aber trotzdem sind wir nicht jetzt plötzlich in einem *camp* mit Iran, China und Russland. Was wir entwickeln müssen, ist eine stärkere europäische Eigenständigkeit. Das heißt auch, die Rolle des Euro international voranzutreiben.

Und was ich als Letztes sagen will, Herr Preda: Wer jetzt einfach sagt: „We have to have serious discussions with the US“. That's not a serious person, sorry, forgive me.

Eleonora Forenza, *a nome del gruppo GUE/NGL*. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, le sanzioni di Trump mettono a rischio l'accordo sul nucleare e violano il principio *pacta sunt servanda*. Il ripristino unilaterale delle sanzioni, come conseguenza del ritiro degli USA dall'accordo, è un atto di pirateria internazionale, di bullismo diplomatico, di inaccettabile prepotenza contro tutta la comunità internazionale e non ha nulla a che fare con i diritti umani, come dimostra il fatto che contro l'Arabia Saudita e il suo regime non si fa nulla, anzi le si vendono armi per la guerra in Yemen.

L'Iran è stato sottoposto al regime di monitoraggio e sorveglianza più completo al mondo da parte dell'Agenzia internazionale per l'energia atomica, la quale ha più volte verificato l'adempienza iraniana agli obblighi sottoscritti con l'intesa. Sono inoltre le sanzioni provvedimenti che colpiscono la popolazione e non il regime e l'Unione europea farà bene a difendere l'accordo, non solo attraverso strumenti che garantiscono la possibilità per le imprese europee di commerciare con l'Iran e quindi di dare seguito all'accordo che altrimenti rischia di cadere, ma se necessario anche prevedendo controsanzioni europee per le imprese americane e iniziando ad usare l'Euro per la nostra bolletta energetica.

John Stuart Agnew, *on behalf of the EFDD Group*. – Madam President, you may or may not be a Trump fan, but at least President Trump does not allow politically correct thinking to muddy his vision when dealing with some of the world's worst tyrants. He understands how these people think, and he acts in what he believes to be the best interests of his country. The US believes that the deal is a bad one, one which is not built upon long-term stability. Whether or not this is the case, we are now in the de facto situation where the Iran deal no longer exists. Iran is considering abandoning the terms set out in the deal, as it sees no economic benefit from adhering to them – a very worrying development.

Clearly, a solution needs to be found to the problem, either by saving the existing agreement or producing something new. The EU must forget about posturing power politics and allow the USA to get on with its own foreign policy. After all, you do not have your own EU army yet to enforce your ideas. The Iranian President has even suggested that the country now faces a war situation, and air defence drills have been taking place. This is obviously extremely concerning. It not only impacts trade and business, but of course on the humanitarian level as well.

In 1998, the US and the EU had similar issues with sanctions, this time involving Cuba. An agreement was struck and the sanctions were lifted. Again the EU must work alongside the US to solve this Iran problem. The United States are not the enemy, and they must not be treated as such. It would be wise to remember the many great sacrifices the American people made during the 20th century in order to promote freedom and peace in Europe. Any thoughts of a potential EU trade war with the US are delusions of grandeur and nothing more.

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

Reinhard Bütikofer (Verts/ALE), *blue-card question*. – Mr Agnew, would you concede that the Iranian leadership has so far stuck to the letter and the spirit of the agreement, so it is not justified to blame them for deviating from that, as you did?

John Stuart Agnew (EFDD), *blue-card answer*. – No, I'm not that naive. Thank you.

Jacques Colombier, *au nom du groupe ENF*. – Madame la Présidente, au-delà des belles paroles et des vœux pieux, j'irai au cœur du problème pour l'Europe.

Les entreprises françaises, et non des moindres, particulièrement investies sur le prometteur marché iranien, ont dû récemment renoncer à leurs investissements dans ce pays. C'est notamment le cas des constructeurs automobiles PSA et Renault, mais aussi de Total, pourtant présent en Iran depuis 1954. Les entreprises françaises et européennes paient en fait la passivité, pour ne pas dire la complicité, des dirigeants bruxellois avec les oukases des administrations américaines successives.

Dans les années quatre-vingt-dix, personne dans les milieux européens ne s'était alarmé de la portée de la loi d'Amato-Kennedy, que les États-Unis réactivent actuellement contre l'Union européenne après leur décision unilatérale de sortir de l'accord de Genève sur le nucléaire iranien. On voit aujourd'hui, hélas, le résultat. À force de tout céder à Washington, on finit par plier devant ces forfaitures juridiques.

Alors, une attitude plus ferme sur les négociations commerciales, la fin de tout alignement sur les intérêts exclusifs de Washington comme la sortie de cette stupide politique d'affrontement avec la Russie pourrait envoyer... *(la Présidente retire la parole à l'orateur)*

President. – I'm sorry, sir, but your time is up. We didn't hear the rest of your contribution because I had to cut the microphone.

Knut Fleckenstein (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Wir sind uns, glaube ich, einig über die Außenpolitik des Irans. Aber das ist heute nicht das Thema.

Ich bin entsetzt – jeden Tag wieder – über den amerikanischen Präsidenten, der nahezu alles verrät, was die Amerikaner uns Deutschen nach der Nazizeit mal beigebracht haben. Ich bin in den 50er Jahren in Berlin groß geworden. Ich kann gar kein Antiamerikaner werden. Ich werde ihnen ewig dankbar sein. Aber deshalb schmerzt es umso mehr, dass diese Partnerschaft im Moment so leidet.

Die USA sind ohne jeden triftigen Grund aus dem Abkommen ausgestiegen, das haben wir gerade wieder von den Behörden, die das untersuchen, bestätigt bekommen. Es sollen die schärfsten Sanktionen aller Zeiten sein. Es sind Sanktionen gegen unsere europäischen mittelständischen Unternehmen; die großen gehen dieses Risiko gar nicht ein. Insofern brauchen wir dringend und bald die *special purpose vehicles*, um dem Mittelstand, der weiterhin auch mit dem Iran arbeiten möchte, zu helfen.

Frau Kommissarin, Sie haben gesagt: Es richtet sich nicht gegen die USA. Sie haben gesagt: Es ist nicht zur Umgehung der Sanktionen. Es ist falsch, was Sie gesagt haben. Natürlich richtet es sich gegen die USA, die unsere Firmen bedrohen, und natürlich ist es dafür da, ungerechtfertigte Sanktionen zu umgehen! Europa wird langsam wach dank Herrn Trump. Ich würde Sie bitten, auch wach zu werden.

Ana Gomes (S&D). – Senhora Presidente, as sanções americanas vão contra doze sucessivas confirmações de que o Irão está a cumprir os compromissos no quadro do acordo nuclear. A última, da AIE, chegou-nos ontem.

Trump e a sua administração mentem ao afirmar que as sanções não vão afetar o povo iraniano. Medicamentos essenciais e alimentos já estão a escassear. Os preços dispararam, a inflação soma-se a uma desvalorização galopante. As sanções afetam também a companhia aérea iraniana, impedida de reabastecer em aeroportos europeus, pondo em causa a segurança de todos, desde logo iranianos e também aqueles que visitam o país, incluindo europeus e americanos. E, perversamente, este ataque ao povo iraniano mais o empurra para os braços das forças mais radicais do regime. Não ajuda os setores da sociedade que, corajosamente, se batem pelos direitos humanos e que se batem por mudanças democráticas.

A atualização da legislação de bloqueio e a criação de um *special purpose vehicle*, previsto pela Sra. Mogherini, têm de ser apoiadas. Os Estados-Membros têm de se pôr de acordo para garantir que este mecanismo tem personalidade jurídica e começa a operar o mais rapidamente possível. Está em causa a segurança internacional e a nossa própria credibilidade na garantia do GSPOA.

Pier Antonio Panzeri (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, penso che Trump non vincerà la sua scommessa con l'Iran. Con l'uscita dall'accordo sul nucleare e l'avvio delle sanzioni, l'Amministrazione americana ha fatto tre scommesse: fermare l'arricchimento dell'uranio, costringere gli altri firmatari a ritirare la propria adesione, penalizzando le aziende europee, e far crollare il regime iraniano sotto la pressione economica. Realisticamente non vincerà soprattutto la terza scommessa. Come molti osservatori hanno fatto notare, l'accordo sul nucleare aveva favorito la parte moderata guidata dal Presidente Rohani a danno della parte conservatrice, della Guida suprema Khamenei.

La reintroduzione delle sanzioni farà il gioco solo degli ultraconservatori, quelli che da sempre sono contrari al dialogo con gli Stati Uniti e l'Occidente in generale. Perciò è difficile che le sanzioni imposte da Trump possano stimolare grandi cambiamenti nella politica iraniana, se non in peggio anche per i diritti umani.

Per tutto questo io ritengo che l'Europa non deve avere paura e deve perseguire fino in fondo i propri rapporti di collaborazione con l'Iran, certo ponendo le questioni che deve porre, ma con forza e determinazione.

Catch-the-eye procedure

José Inácio Faria (PPE). – Senhora Presidente, Senhora Comissária, ao denunciar unilateralmente o plano de ação conjunto global e ao decretar o restabelecimento das sanções ao Irão, o Presidente Trump não só agravou as tensões no Médio Oriente como aumentou a responsabilidade da União Europeia na defesa da segurança mundial.

Ainda que imperfeito, principalmente por deixar de fora o programa de testes de mísseis balísticos iraniano, o Plano de Ação Conjunto Global é um instrumento histórico em matéria de diplomacia multilateral e constitui um marco importante para o desarmamento nuclear global, conforme atestam doze relatórios consecutivos da Agência Internacional de Energia Atômica que monitorizam o cumprimento das obrigações assumidas pelo Irão nesta matéria.

Por isso, Sra. Comissária, quero saudar a Sra. Mogherini pela firmeza com que tem defendido a manutenção deste acordo, mas espero que a operacionalização de instrumentos que permitam contornar os efeitos das sanções norte-americanas nas relações institucionais e comerciais com o regime dos *mullahs*, como o anunciado veículo para fins especiais, continue a ser condicionada pelos progressos registados no campo dos direitos humanos.

Não nos esqueçamos que continuamos a lidar com um regime antidemocrático e opressor que não se coíbe de torturar e assassinar os seus próprios cidadãos.

Νότης Μαρίας (ECR). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, καταρχάς, δεν πρέπει να εξωραΐζουμε τον ρόλο του Ιράν, αλλά ούτε βέβαια και των Ηνωμένων Πολιτειών. Είναι προφανές ότι οι ΗΠΑ και η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση έχουν αντιτιθέμενα πολιτικά, οικονομικά και στρατιωτικά συμφέροντα στην περίπτωση του Ιράν. Είναι προφανές ότι η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση -και κυρίως η Γαλλία- έχουν κάνει σημαντικές επενδύσεις στο Ιράν, στην αυτοκινητοβιομηχανία και στα θέματα ενέργειας με την Total. Το βασικό θέμα, όμως, είναι ότι οι κυρώσεις των ΗΠΑ κατά του Ιράν έχουν εξωεδαφική εφαρμογή, δηλαδή εφαρμόζονται εναντίον όσων ευρωπαϊκών επιχειρήσεων δεν ακολουθούν τις κυρώσεις των Ηνωμένων Πολιτειών. Πρόκειται ξεκάθαρα για τη λογική του παγκόσμιου «χωροφύλακα» που έχουν οι Ηνωμένες Πολιτείες, που νομίζουν ότι μπορούν να κάνουν ό,τι γουστάρουν. Πρόκειται για μια νεοαποικιακή αντίληψη και πρακτική. Η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση πρέπει να αντιδράσει. Η νομοθεσία θωράκισης (Blocking Statute) είναι ένα πρώτο μέτρο, αλλά πρέπει να υπάρξουν αντίμετρα της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης απέναντι στις ΗΠΑ, προκειμένου να σταματήσει αυτή η εξωεδαφική επέμβαση των Ηνωμένων Πολιτειών.

Γεώργιος Επιτήδειος (NI). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, η επαναφορά των κυρώσεων των Ηνωμένων Πολιτειών της Αμερικής εναντίον του Ιράν πλήττει σημαντικούς και καίριους τομείς της οικονομίας του Ιράν, όπως τις εξαγωγές πετρελαίου, την αυτοκινητοβιομηχανία, τις αερομεταφορές και, κυρίως, πλήττει και τις εμπορικές συναλλαγές των ευρωπαϊκών εταιρειών με τις αντίστοιχες του Ιράν. Υπό την έννοια αυτή, η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση καλώς προτρέπει τις ευρωπαϊκές εταιρείες που έχουν συναλλαγές με ιρανικές εταιρείες να παραβλέψουν αυτές τις κυρώσεις των Ηνωμένων Πολιτειών. Όμως, δεν μπορώ να φανταστώ έναν τρόπο με τον οποίον μπορεί να εγγυηθεί η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση την προστασία των συμφερόντων αυτών των εταιρειών. Πρέπει να υπάρξει συνεργασία με τις Ηνωμένες Πολιτείες και συμφωνία με το Ιράν, ούτως ώστε να πειστούν οι Ηνωμένες Πολιτείες ότι οι επαφές και η υποστήριξη της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης προς το Ιράν δεν στρέφονται κατά των συμφερόντων των Ηνωμένων Πολιτειών. Επιπλέον, θα πρέπει η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση να εξετάσει και το ενδεχόμενο να επιβάλει και αυτή κυρώσεις σε αμερικανικές εταιρείες εάν τα πράγματα φτάσουν στο απροχώρητο.

(End of catch-the-eye procedure)

Věra Jourová, Member of the Commission, on behalf of the Vice-President of the Commission / High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy. – Madam President, this has been a very useful exchange and I thank the honourable Members for their interventions. From this debate I conclude that we share a common interest in using the diplomatic power and instruments of the EU and its Member States to their full potential in support of preserving and implementing the joint comprehensive plan of action, which is vital for EU and international security. May I close by signalling once again my appreciation of Parliament's role in keeping this important issue on its agenda.

President. – The debate is closed.

28. Dagsorden for næste møde

President. – Colleagues, our next sitting is tomorrow, Thursday, 15 November at 9.00. The agenda has been published and is available on the European Parliament website.

You may know that the United Kingdom Cabinet has agreed the draft Brexit withdrawal deal earlier this evening. It has just been published, and some of us may spend the evening reading the 585 pages of that text.

29. Hævelse af mødet

(The sitting closed at 22.00)

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 Fødevarer sikkerhed
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 Venstrefløj's 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