

C/2024/3369

30.5.2024

AUSFÜHRLICHE SITZUNGSBERICHTE VOM 28. MAI 2018

(C/2024/3369)

EUROPÄISCHES PARLAMENT

SITZUNGSPERIODE 2018-2019

Sitzungen vom 28. bis 31. Mai 2018

STRASSBURG

Inhalt	Seite
1. Wiederaufnahme der Sitzungsperiode	4
2. Eröffnung der Sitzung	4
3. Nachruf	4
4. Erklärung des Präsidenten	6
5. Genehmigung der Protokolle der vorangegangenen Sitzungen: siehe Protokoll	6
6. Zusammensetzung des Parlaments: siehe Protokoll	6
7. Zusammensetzung der Fraktionen: siehe Protokoll	6
8. Prüfung von Mandaten: siehe Protokoll	6
9. Zusammensetzung der Ausschüsse und Delegationen: siehe Protokoll	7
10. Antrag auf Aufhebung der Immunität: siehe Protokoll	7
11. Abschluss eines Verfahrens zur Aufhebung der Immunität: siehe Protokoll	7
12. Verhandlungen vor der ersten Lesung des Parlaments (Artikel 69c GO): siehe Protokoll	7

Inhalt	Seite
13. Berichtigung (Artikel 231 der Geschäftsordnung): siehe Protokoll	7
14. Antrag auf Anhörung des Europäischen Wirtschafts- und Sozialausschusses (Artikel 137 Absatz 2 GO) (Billigung): siehe Protokoll	7
15. Unterzeichnung von nach dem ordentlichen Gesetzgebungsverfahren angenommenen Rechtsakten (Artikel 78 GO): siehe Protokoll	7
16. Große Anfragen (Artikel 130b GO) (Einreichung): siehe Protokoll	7
17. Anfragen zur mündlichen Beantwortung (Einreichung): siehe Protokoll	7
18. Weiterbehandlung der Entschlüssen des Parlaments: siehe Protokoll	7
19. Übermittlung von Abkommenstexten durch den Rat: siehe Protokoll	7
20. Vorlage von Dokumenten: siehe Protokoll	7
21. Arbeitsplan	7
22. Annahme des Beschlusses der Kommission über das Dritte Mobilitätspaket (Aussprache)	12
23. Mehrjahresplan für Grundfischbestände in der Nordsee und für die Fischereien, die diese Bestände befischen (Aussprache)	23
24. Optimierung der Wertschöpfungskette in der EU-Fischereibranche – Übereinstimmung von Fischereierzeugnissen mit den Kriterien für den Zugang zum EU-Markt (Aussprache)	30
25. Ernährung und Landwirtschaft der Zukunft (Aussprache)	38
26. Umsetzung der GAP-Instrumente für Junglandwirte in der EU nach der Reform im Jahr 2013 (Aussprache)	53
27. Berichtigung (Artikel 231 der Geschäftsordnung): siehe Protokoll	62
28. Fazilität „Connecting Europe“ nach 2020 (Aussprache)	62
29. Auslegung und Umsetzung der Interinstitutionellen Vereinbarung über bessere Rechtsetzung (kurze Darstellung)	68
30. Nachhaltiges Finanzwesen (kurze Darstellung)	72
31. EU-Justizbarometer 2017 (kurze Darstellung)	76
32. Ausführungen von einer Minute zu Fragen von politischer Bedeutung	78
33. Tagesordnung der nächsten Sitzung: siehe Protokoll	82

Inhalt	Seite
34. Schluss der Sitzung	82

AUSFÜHRLICHE SITZUNGSBERICHTE VOM 28. MAI 2018

PRESIDENZA DELL'ON. ANTONIO TAJANI

Presidente

1. Wiederaufnahme der Sitzungsperiode

Presidente. – Dichiaro ripresa la sessione del Parlamento europeo interrotta giovedì 3 maggio 2018.

2. Eröffnung der Sitzung

(La seduta è aperta alle 17.05)

3. Nachruf

Le Président. – Mesdames et Messieurs les députés, c'est avec beaucoup d'émotion qu'au nom du Parlement européen, je veux adresser aujourd'hui une pensée affectueuse à Nicole Fontaine, qui nous a quittés il y a quelques jours, après une longue vie politique consacrée à la société et au combat pour les idéaux qui étaient les siens. Un souvenir plein de reconnaissance et de gratitude.

Élue pour la première fois en 1984, elle fut membre éminente de notre Assemblée pendant vingt-trois ans, avec une interruption de deux ans pendant laquelle elle fut ministre en France. Pendant ces longues années, elle a acquis une connaissance profonde du Parlement et de l'environnement politique et institutionnel de l'Union et a œuvré sans relâche au renforcement de notre institution.

En tant que vice-présidente chargée de la conciliation, elle travailla avec passion à la consolidation de la procédure de codécision et au renforcement du rôle du Parlement. Nous lui devons beaucoup.

Le 20 juillet 1999, vingt ans après une autre femme, Simone Veil, elle fut élue présidente de notre Assemblée. «In varietate concordia», Unie dans la diversité. Cette devise, qui était la sienne et qui est devenue la nôtre, a été adoptée il y a dix-huit ans, durant sa présidence. J'évoque cette page de notre histoire parce qu'au-delà du symbole, il y a la force d'un engagement. Cette devise exprime toute la pensée et représente le fil conducteur de son action politique. Bien sûr, nous sommes différents, mais nos diversités nous enrichissent. Elles ne sont que la déclinaison d'une culture européenne commune, vieille de trois mille ans. Oui, parfois, nous avons des intérêts différents, mais nous partageons les mêmes valeurs fondamentales: unis, nous pourrions les défendre et les faire prospérer sur la scène mondiale.

Tel était l'état d'esprit de Nicole Fontaine lorsqu'elle a signé, au nom du Parlement, la charte des droits fondamentaux, il y a dix-huit ans. Elle était convaincue qu'il appartient à notre Assemblée de porter nos valeurs partout dans le monde, en particulier dans les zones où la démocratie est bafouée ou peine à s'affirmer. Dans cette perspective, elle portait un regard particulier sur l'Afrique.

Nous sommes la seule région du monde où la peine de mort n'est plus appliquée. C'est vers nous que le monde se tourne quand des journalistes sont emprisonnés, quand des femmes subissent des violences et voient leurs droits bafoués, quand des opposants politiques sont menacés ou privés de liberté. Nous avons l'obligation de demeurer un repère, un phare pour les droits fondamentaux. Telle était la conviction de Nicole Fontaine.

Lors de son élection à la présidence de cette Assemblée, en 1999, Nicole Fontaine affirma également la nécessité d'une plus grande proximité avec les citoyens européens. Je veux rendre hommage à son œuvre incessante, qui s'exprime tant par ses nombreux ouvrages que par sa présence régulière et intense sur le terrain, au plus près des citoyens. Pendant sa présidence, elle ira dans tous les milieux pour donner plus d'une centaine de conférences et d'interventions. Cette présence, cette proximité avec les gens, qui étaient vitales pour Nicole Fontaine, s'accompagnaient d'une extraordinaire capacité d'écoute et de persuasion qui fut décisive à bien des égards, notamment au moment historique de l'adoption de la monnaie unique, alors que l'euro suscitait de très fortes appréhensions auprès des Européens.

Je veux rappeler également le rapport Fontaine, avec lequel on décida d'octroyer une aide financière au jumelage entre les villes européennes. Un petit geste concret qui a contribué à rapprocher des millions de citoyens européens. Cet impératif de proximité est, aujourd'hui, plus que jamais essentiel.

Nicole Fontaine fut une présidente courageuse et clairvoyante. Alors que la folie des talibans ravageait l'Afghanistan, elle invitait au Parlement européen le commandant Massoud et ce, contre l'avis de tous et en dépit des réticences des chancelleries occidentales.

Un an plus tôt, elle reçut conjointement dans notre hémicycle le président du conseil législatif palestinien et le président de la Knesset. Ce fut un grand moment pour notre Assemblée. Au sommet de Nice, le 7 décembre 2000, elle parvint à convaincre Tony Blair de la nécessité de signer la charte des droits fondamentaux de l'Union européenne. Dans son discours d'ouverture, en 1999, elle affirmait: «Il y a aujourd'hui urgence à redonner du sens à l'Union». Les choses n'ont guère changé de ce point de vue. Maintenant, c'est à nous de continuer l'œuvre de notre éminente collègue qui savait parler aux gens.

Il nous appartient de réveiller les enthousiasmes et de faire renaître ce sentiment d'appartenance à un grand projet qui nous transcende.

Au nom du Parlement européen, je vous remercie, Madame la Présidente, chère Nicole, pour ce que vous avez été, pour la passion, le courage et la cohérence qui ont marqué votre travail au service des citoyens tout au long de votre vie. Comme vous le disiez souvent, pour conclure une réunion qui s'éternisait: «Tout est dit. Merci.»

(Applaudissements)

Manfred Weber, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Mr President, as the EPP, we are deeply saddened about the loss of Nicole Fontaine. My most sincere condolences go first of all to her family and friends. The EPP family lost one of its greatest members, and we lost also a true friend who was by our side in this House for almost 23 years.

Throughout her career, Nicole Fontaine was very active in education policies. She knew that our societies need values, and she knew the key to values is education. This is a fundamental idea of Christian democracy. Nicole Fontaine was a great Christian Democrat. And Nicole Fontaine was a convinced European. She was the EPP Group's first woman to become President of the European Parliament, and she was such a strong woman. Just recently, Nicole Fontaine called upon us to relaunch Europe. She told us to turn Europe once again into a project that the people can dream of. Let us take up this call of Nicole Fontaine in memory of a great Christian Democrat, in memory of a strong woman, and in memory of a convinced European.

(Applause)

Presidente. – È ovvio che il Presidente Weber ha ricordato, a nome di tutti i gruppi politici, la figura di Nicole Fontaine, così come quando accadde per Simone Veil la ricordò Guy Verhofstadt. Ora vi prego di associarvi per un minuto di silenzio per ricordare la nostra amica Nicole.

(L'Assemblea, in piedi, osserva un minuto di silenzio)

4. Erklärung des Präsidenten

Presidente. – Onorevoli colleghi, a partire da venerdì i nostri dati personali e la nostra vita privata sono protetti meglio da abusi e manipolazioni. Questo avviene grazie all'entrata in vigore di nuove regole sulla protezione dei dati promosse dal Parlamento europeo.

Ringrazio tutti i colleghi che hanno lavorato a questo importante regolamento, e in particolare il relatore Jan Philipp Albrecht, che ci lascerà tra breve per diventare ministro in Germania e a cui faccio i nostri migliori auguri.

Il regolamento generale sulla protezione dei dati è la più grande riforma della legislazione sulla privacy sin dalla nascita di Internet. È un passo decisivo per garantire che i cittadini utilizzino la rete Internet con serenità in Europa, ma anche nel resto del mondo.

Con questo regolamento abbiamo dimostrato di poter stabilire standard globali sulla privacy e l'Unione europea è all'avanguardia a livello mondiale per la tutela dei cittadini. D'ora in poi le aziende e le piattaforme online a cui affidiamo i nostri dati dovranno rendere note le loro intenzioni quando li usano. Dovranno ottenere il nostro consenso esplicito, indipendentemente dal paese in cui operano. Niente più consenso tacito, zone d'ombra o scorciatoie che consentano l'elusione delle regole.

Queste regole aiuteranno a prevenire il ripetersi di scandali, di dati di milioni di utenti utilizzati per influenzare i risultati elettorali. Ad esempio, qualsiasi forma di utilizzo non autorizzato dei dati dovrà essere notificata entro 72 ore. Si prevedono pesanti sanzioni per coloro che non rispettano le nuove regole, fino al 4 % del fatturato totale annuo. Per i giganti del web questo potrebbe ammontare a multe fino a miliardi di dollari.

Il Parlamento europeo ha svolto un ruolo centrale nella definizione di standard all'avanguardia in materia di privacy, ma anche nel chiedere che le piattaforme online siano responsabili nei confronti dei cittadini europei. Sono lieto che le grandi piattaforme digitali mondiali si siano impegnate a rispettare le nostre regole.

Ma il nostro compito non è finito, la nostra priorità è il raggiungimento di una vera governance della rivoluzione tecnologica mediante l'introduzione di un quadro di regole adeguato. Dobbiamo garantire il corretto funzionamento del mercato digitale con responsabilità chiare per gli operatori online. Ciò include, oltre alla protezione dei dati personali, un sistema fiscale equo e la protezione dei diritti d'autore e dei diritti dei consumatori.

5. Genehmigung der Protokolle der vorangegangenen Sitzungen: siehe Protokoll

6. Zusammensetzung des Parlaments: siehe Protokoll

7. Zusammensetzung der Fraktionen: siehe Protokoll

8. Prüfung von Mandaten: siehe Protokoll

9. **Zusammensetzung der Ausschüsse und Delegationen: siehe Protokoll**
10. **Antrag auf Aufhebung der Immunität: siehe Protokoll**
11. **Abschluss eines Verfahrens zur Aufhebung der Immunität: siehe Protokoll**
12. **Verhandlungen vor der ersten Lesung des Parlaments (Artikel 69c GO): siehe Protokoll**
13. **Berichtigung (Artikel 231 der Geschäftsordnung): siehe Protokoll**
14. **Antrag auf Anhörung des Europäischen Wirtschafts- und Sozialausschusses (Artikel 137 Absatz 2 GO) (Billigung): siehe Protokoll**
15. **Unterzeichnung von nach dem ordentlichen Gesetzgebungsverfahren angenommenen Rechtsakten (Artikel 78 GO): siehe Protokoll**
16. **Große Anfragen (Artikel 130b GO) (Einreichung): siehe Protokoll**
17. **Anfragen zur mündlichen Beantwortung (Einreichung): siehe Protokoll**
18. **Weiterbehandlung der Entschließungen des Parlaments: siehe Protokoll**
19. **Übermittlung von Abkommenstexten durch den Rat: siehe Protokoll**
20. **Vorlage von Dokumenten: siehe Protokoll**
21. **Arbeitsplan**

Presidente. – Il progetto definitivo di ordine del giorno, fissato dalla Conferenza dei presidenti, ai sensi dell'articolo 149 del regolamento, nella riunione di giovedì 24 maggio 2018, è stato distribuito. Sono state presentate le seguenti proposte di modifica:

Lunedì

Non sono proposte modifiche.

Martedì

La Conferenza dei presidenti ha approvato la richiesta della commissione speciale sul terrorismo volta a prorogare il mandato della commissione speciale di altri due mesi. La commissione sul terrorismo ritiene che tale proroga sia necessaria affinché essa possa adempiere al suo mandato e ai suoi compiti. La decisione della Conferenza dei presidenti sarà aggiunta alle votazioni di martedì e si considererà approvata se non saranno sollevate obiezioni.

Sempre per martedì, il gruppo PPE ha chiesto che il voto sulla relazione dell'on. Svoboda e dell'on. Corbett sull'interpretazione e applicazione dell'accordo interistituzionale «Legiferare meglio» attualmente previsto per martedì sia rinviato a mercoledì. Do la parola all'on. Svoboda per presentare la richiesta a nome del suo gruppo.

Pavel Svoboda, on behalf of the PPE Group. – Mr President, pursuant to Rule 149a of the Rules of Procedure, I would like to propose, on behalf of the European People's Party (EPP) Group that the vote on the report on the interpretation and implementation of the interinstitutional agreement on better law-making takes place on Wednesday instead of Tuesday. Ms Hübner, Chair of the Committee on Constitutional Affairs (AFCO), as well as Richard Corbett, my co-rapporteur for this report, have indicated that they agree with this request.

The report contains some paragraphs on the ongoing interinstitutional negotiations on improved practical arrangements for cooperation and information-sharing regarding the negotiation and conclusion of international agreements. On Wednesday morning a new round of negotiations will take place and the paragraphs in the report may need to be updated by means of oral amendments to take account of the outcome of this meeting.

Elmar Brok and Bernd Lange, who were nominated by the Conference of Presidents as Parliament negotiators, therefore made this request for a postponement, and I hope that our colleagues will agree to this request.

(Il Parlamento accoglie la richiesta)

Presidente. – Il gruppo dei Verdi ha chiesto che la discussione sulla dichiarazione della Commissione relativa ai dazi imposti dagli Stati Uniti sull'acciaio e l'alluminio e la risposta dell'Unione si concluda con una risoluzione che sarà votata giovedì.

Do la parola all'on. Ska Keller, per presentare la richiesta del suo gruppo. Prego, onorevole.

Ska Keller, on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group. – Mr President, the reason why we would like to propose a resolution is very simple: on 1 June, there will be some sort of decision about whether tariffs will be applied to EU products, and the Commission is already in negotiation with the US side about that, but as with every trade negotiation, it is really important that Parliament takes a decision and does not just hold a debate. Debates are very important, but Parliament must also make clear what its position is on the matter: what we want the Commission to do and what we don't want the Commission to do, or else we don't have any voice at all as the European Parliament. Therefore, we would like to propose a resolution and we hope that we can count on your support.

Alessia Maria Mosca, (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, il nostro gruppo è contrario a questa proposta di risoluzione per una semplice ragione di efficacia della nostra azione.

Come è stato ricordato, il termine per questa fase transitoria dell'esenzione dei dazi da parte degli Stati Uniti verso l'Unione europea è il 1° giugno, e fino ad allora non sappiamo esattamente quale sarà la linea da tenere. In parallelo la commissione INTA è impegnata a contribuire all'opinione sulla complessiva natura dei rapporti commerciali tra Unione europea e Stati Uniti, e quindi riteniamo che sia più efficace fare il dibattito domani perché, ovviamente, è un tema che ci toccherà, e poi eventualmente decidere che posizione tenere in una risoluzione tra due settimane.

(Il Parlamento respinge la richiesta)

Presidente. – Il gruppo GUE/NGL per martedì ha chiesto di aggiungere come terzo punto all'ordine del giorno, nel pomeriggio, le dichiarazioni del Consiglio della Commissione sulle misure per implementare e preservare il piano d'azione congiunto globale. Do la parola all'on. Ernst per formulare la richiesta.

Cornelia Ernst, im Namen der GUE/NGL-Fraktion. – Herr Präsident, meine Damen und Herren! Ich denke, es ist wichtig, dass wir uns zu dem Ausstieg der Vereinigten Staaten aus dem Atomabkommen mit dem Iran verständigen. Wenn man sich das insgesamt anschaut, muss man sagen, dass mit diesem Ausstieg auch die Kriegsgefahr in dieser Region gefördert wird. Ich glaube, es ist wichtig, dass wir uns als Parlament verständigen.

Es gibt noch einen Punkt, den man hier benennen muss: dass wir zugleich auch eine Krise des Vertrauens in internationale Verträge, die wir als EU ja mitgetragen haben, sichtbar wird – Verträge, aus denen man einfach mal austritt, wie es der amerikanische Präsident macht, und damit zur Eskalation und nicht zur Deeskalation beiträgt. Ich sage ganz offen: Wir drängen deswegen darauf, jetzt darüber zu diskutieren, weil es im Iran wirklich die Hoffnung gegeben hat, mit diesem Abkommen auch Veränderungen herbeizuführen, die Gesellschaft zu öffnen. Und diejenigen, die jetzt durch den Ausstieg der Vereinigten Staaten aus diesem Abkommen getroffen werden, sind gerade die, die auf Hoffnung gesetzt haben. Wir denken, dass es wichtig ist, jetzt darüber zu sprechen, sich zu verständigen, welche Maßnahmen wir unternehmen, um das Abkommen zu retten, hier etwas zu tun, und nicht diejenigen im Iran, die darauf gesetzt haben, praktisch hängenzulassen – erneut hängenzulassen, es wäre nicht das erste Mal.

Wir bitten auch unabhängig davon, ob Frau Mogherini jetzt unbedingt da sein kann, um diese Aussprache. Die Aussprache ist notwendig, und wir werden nicht zum letzten Mal über den Iran gesprochen haben, wenn es dann auch um konkrete Maßnahmen geht.

Also wir bitten wirklich sehr herzlich darum. Es ist wichtig, als Parlament dieses Zeichen zu setzen.

Victor Boştinaru (S&D). – Mr President, no-one challenged the importance of the nuclear deal with Iran and the historical role played by our Union, but for the effectiveness of the debate, I will invite you all to think first. Such a debate can be beneficial when having a real contribution from the Commission and the Council, with the High Representative in the Plenary. And secondly, we have already decided to have a debate on Iran in June. This is why I warmly invite you to think of the possibility of having a debate with the High Representative in June.

(Il Parlamento respinge la richiesta)

Presidente. – Il gruppo della Sinistra unitaria europea ha chiesto di aggiungere come quinto punto all'ordine giorno di martedì pomeriggio un'interrogazione orale al Consiglio relativa al trattato sull'interdizione delle armi nucleari. Do la parola all'onorevole João Pimenta Lopez per formulare la richiesta del gruppo, prego.

João Pimenta Lopes, em nome do Grupo GUE/NGL. – Senhor Presidente, vivem-se tempos de crescente tensão internacional que tornam reais os riscos de um confronto nuclear que, a suceder, teria consequências inimagináveis.

Decorreram quase quatro meses desde que o representante da Campanha Internacional para a Abolição de Armas Nucleares, a ICAN, Prémio Nobel da Paz 2017, aqui esteve, neste plenário, aludindo precisamente a esta discussão, pedindo, no final, que se levantasse pela proibição e eliminação das armas nucleares, palavras que aqui foram aplaudidas de pé por todo o hemiciclo.

Desde dezembro que propomos, através de uma pergunta oral que, de resto, recolheu subscrição de vários grupos, que esta discussão possa ser tida, que se faça um debate que é premente e necessário em torno da abolição do arsenal nuclear e do tratado de proibição de armas nucleares, aprovado pelas Nações Unidas em 2017, antecipando a conferência de alto nível que aquele organismo está a preparar.

Esta é a segunda vez que aqui colocamos este pedido e solicitamos que os aplausos que aqui se tiveram de pé se traduzam nesta necessária discussão, amanhã, terça-feira, como quinto ponto, e pedimos também que a votação se proceda com voto nominal.

Presidente. – Allora metto ai voti per appello nominale la proposta del gruppo della Sinistra unitaria europea per aggiungere all'ormai quinto punto all'ordine giorno di martedì pomeriggio un'interrogazione al Consiglio sul trattato sull'interdizione delle armi nucleari.

(Il Parlamento respinge la richiesta)

Mercoledì

Il gruppo GUE ha chiesto di aggiungere come secondo punto all'ordine del giorno del pomeriggio una dichiarazione del Consiglio e della Commissione sull'uso eccessivo della forza nei confronti dei rifugiati ed emigrati nel caso Mawda. Do la parola all'onorevole Zimmer per formulare la richiesta del gruppo.

Gabriele Zimmer, *im Namen der GUE/NGL-Fraktion.* – Herr Präsident! Wie Sie eben schon ansagten: Es geht um eine Erklärung von Rat und Kommission zum übermäßigen Einsatz gegen Flüchtlinge und Migrantinnen und zwar vor dem Hintergrund des Falles Mafda. Um den Kollegen das hier noch einmal zu vergegenwärtigen: Mafda ist ein zweijähriges Mädchen aus dem kurdischen Teil des Iraks, das vor kurzem während einer Verfolgungsjagd auf der Autobahn in Belgien erschossen worden ist. Obwohl die Untersuchungen noch laufen, hat die Staatsanwaltschaft klargestellt, dass es eindeutig ist, dass das Mädchen durch eine Kugel durch die Polizei gestorben ist und dass in dem Kleintransporter, der verfolgt worden ist, keine Waffen gefunden wurden.

Mir ist natürlich klar, dass es hier zum einen um eine Frage geht, die in Belgien geklärt werden muss. Zum anderen macht aber insbesondere auch der Umgang mit den sogenannten „Transmigranten“ deutlich, dass die Fragestellungen viel weitergehen. Für uns stellt sich einerseits die Frage: Wie kann es sein, dass ein Auto 70 Kilometer verfolgt wird, um dann auch noch beschossen zu werden, obwohl klar ist, dass dort Flüchtlinge drin sind, die um ihr Leben bangen?

Zweitens geht es für uns um die Fragestellung, wie generell mit sogenannten „Transmigranten“ umgegangen wird. Und das ist ja letztendlich auch eine Folge der Dublin-Verordnung – wir haben uns hier als Parlament mehrheitlich und ganz klar für eine Reform ausgesprochen. Wir brauchen diese Debatte erneut, um das anzustoßen und klarzumachen, dass es eben genau solche Folgen haben können, wenn letztendlich nicht klare Verhältnisse hier geschaffen werden. Und wir verweisen darauf, dass die repressive Asylpolitik Schlepperbanden verstärkt, die von dieser Verzweiflung, insbesondere natürlich von Flüchtlingen und Migranten, profitieren. Ohne legale und sichere Wege, um Asyl zu beantragen, werden wir unserer Verantwortung auch hier im Europäischen Parlament nicht gerecht. Wir müssen dieses Recht durchsetzen, dass es möglich ist: Wer legal Asyl beantragen will, muss das auch tun können – er muss das tun können, ohne Gefahr zu laufen, dabei sein Leben zu verlieren.

Tomáš Zdechovský (PPE). – Pane předsedající, jistě je tento případ velice politováníhodný a myslím si, že ten, kdo někdy strávil nějaký čas prací jako policista, nám určitě potvrdí, že vždycky každý policista velmi pečlivě zvažuje, zda použít zbraň proti prchajícímu vozidlu.

Myslím si, že většina policistů, kteří někdy zbraň použili, si to do konce života vyčítají. Nicméně sama jste, kolegyně, řekla: „Případ není vyšetřen.“ My politici bychom neměli zneužívat případy k tomu, abychom do nich zasahovali. Proto vás prosím, nechme tento případ vyšetřit příslušné orgány a v současné době do toho případu nezasahujme.

(Il Parlamento respinge la richiesta)

Presidente. – Il gruppo S&D ha chiesto che sia aggiunta un'interrogazione orale alla Commissione sul tema «Ampliamento del campo di applicazione del capo I del regolamento Bruxelles II bis al fine di includere le unioni registrate», quale terzo punto dopo la relazione dell'on. Ertug sul tema «Manipolazione del contachilometri nei veicoli a motore: revisione del quadro giuridico dell'UE». Do la parola all'on. Gebhardt per presentare la richiesta del gruppo socialista.

Evelyne Gebhardt, *im Namen der S&D-Fraktion.* – Herr Präsident! In der Tat haben wir hier im letzten Januar eine sehr gute Verordnung – Brüssel IIa – verabschiedet. Diese Verordnung hat allerdings einen ganz enormen Nachteil: Sie gilt nur für verheiratete Paare. In unserer Gesellschaft gibt es mehr und mehr Menschen, die in eingetragenen Partnerschaften leben. Und das trifft auch und insbesondere sehr viele Menschen aus dem Bereich LGBTI. Das ist schlicht und einfach unerträglich, eine Diskriminierung von vielen Menschen.

Wir wollen wissen, warum sich denn die Europäische Kommission bisher dagegen gewehrt hat, auch diesen Menschen die gleichen Rechte zu geben und zu akzeptieren, dass hier eine Diskriminierung gemacht wird, obwohl es ein ganz klares Antidiskriminierungsgebot in den Verträgen der Europäischen Union gibt.

(Il Parlamento accoglie la richiesta)

Presidente. – Il gruppo PPE ha chiesto che sia aggiunta una discussione sulla relazione dell'on. Gardini sul meccanismo di protezione civile dell'Unione, come secondo punto nel pomeriggio, dopo la discussione su tematiche di attualità. Do la parola all'on. Gardini presentare la richiesta del gruppo.

Elisabetta Gardini, a nome del gruppo PPE. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la Protezione civile è un qualcosa che piace ai nostri concittadini. L'Eurobarometro ci dà con costanza questo dato: circa il 90 % dei cittadini europei vede con favore un aiuto dall'Europa nel momento in cui i vari livelli, fino a quello nazionale, non fossero stati in grado di rispondere all'emergenza.

Ma dobbiamo fare molto anche sulla prevenzione del rischio, sulla formazione e sulla capacità di rafforzare la nostra risposta. Con la relazione che possiamo votare questa settimana, noi andiamo a fare un ulteriore passo in avanti per rafforzare il meccanismo a livello europeo, riuscendo a coniugare la solidarietà con la sussidiarietà declinata in tutte le sue sfaccettature, perché questo è molto importante ed è bene che sia sottolineato e sempre presente.

Allora, abbiamo lavorato molto bene: ringrazio tutti i colleghi nelle varie commissioni per le opinioni, tutti i gruppi, i relatori ombra, i relatori dell'opinione, perché abbiamo fatto un buon lavoro, abbiamo ottenuto già nelle commissioni delle maggioranze a favore, e saremmo anche potuti andare al negoziato direttamente. Però abbiamo preferito portarlo in Aula perché tutti possano partecipare a questo risultato importante che i cittadini aspettano.

Allora ci dispiace – dopo aver lavorato tanto bene, anche con un'agenda così serrata, per arrivare pronti a questa Plenaria – vedere di perdere altre due settimane, quando noi sappiamo che con la Protezione civile la velocità è una delle caratteristiche più importanti. Per questo io chiedo ai colleghi di inserire la Protezione civile in questa Plenaria senza aspettare altre due settimane, perché penso che d'altronde non è che il lavoro cambierebbe. Quindi chiedo davvero il voto favorevole.

(Il Parlamento accoglie la richiesta)

Giovedì

Non sono proposte modifiche.

(L'ordine dei lavori è così fissato)

* * *

Edouard Martin (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, le 26 octobre dernier, ici même, nous avons adopté une résolution contre le harcèlement sexuel au sein du Parlement européen. Nous sommes le 28 mai et la feuille de route n'est toujours pas connue. Apparemment, trois points posent problème, qui pourraient ne pas être dans la feuille de route: la formation des députés, la composition du comité et l'audit externe. Je rappelle que cette résolution a été adoptée à une très large majorité, et même quasiment à l'unanimité.

Monsieur le Président, je me permets de vous rappeler, avec tout le respect qui vous est dû, qu'il faut respecter le vote en plénière de ce Parlement. J'aimerais donc, s'il vous plaît, avoir une réponse, puisque la dernière fois, quand je vous ai interpellé, vous ne m'avez pas répondu. Pouvez-vous nous dire où nous en sommes aujourd'hui quant à l'application et à la mise en œuvre de cette feuille de route?

Presidente. – On. Martin, l'Ufficio di presidenza sta lavorando intensamente e la commissione presieduta dall'on. Morin-Chartier è impegnata in un'azione forte contro l'harassment, ne ripareremo anche oggi, questa sera per fare il punto della situazione, ma mi pare che la decisione sia andata nella direzione richiesta dalla Plenaria.

22. Annahme des Beschlusses der Kommission über das Dritte Mobilitätspaket (Aussprache)

Presidente. – L'ordine del giorno reca la dichiarazione della Commissione sulla decisione della Commissione adottata sul terzo pacchetto sulla mobilità (2018/2601(RSP)).

Maroš Šefčovič, Vice-President of the Commission. – Mr President, I would like to address you on the first plenary since we adopted the first Mobility Package. This was the last set of proposals under the Energy Union, and I am proud that we managed to deliver on this ambitious project well ahead of the end of the mandate. This should leave us enough time to negotiate the entire Energy Union into law and leave it as a significant legacy of this mandate.

Miguel and Violeta will explain the Third Mobility Package in detail, but allow me to set the tone and the context. I am sure that, whichever constituency or political party you come from, you will appreciate the main objectives: road safety, clean mobility, inclusion and boosting of our industrial competitiveness.

First, on safety. The number of fatalities on EU roads has been, unfortunately, still the same for some years already. It is simply too high. 26 000 fatalities per year or 70 fatalities per day is simply too many, and we know that today we can definitely save more lives, and it is our duty to do so. That is why we propose infrastructure improvements, and we will have new advanced safety features which will become obligatory in three years. These include automatic emergency braking, lane-keeping assist and distraction recognition or technology facilitating the use of alcohol interlocks. This is also one of the reasons why we are paving the way for connected and automated driving. Of course, the advantages are numerous: serving to increase the inclusion of people who cannot drive or have no access to a car, boosting Europe's competitive advantage and creating new, quality jobs. By 2025 we expect automated mobility to generate revenues of EUR 620 billion for the EU automotive industry and EUR 180 billion for our electronic sector.

The majority of Europe's population is in favour of trying driverless cars, but of course there are still legitimate concerns. Surely, a lot of work remains until we can rely on this technology. Significant investments will be needed to develop and deploy the key technologies and to create the necessary infrastructure support. That is why we need a joined-up EU strategy.

From safety to connectivity. Let me move on to sustainability. Transport is responsible for almost a quarter of Europe's greenhouse gas emissions, and this share is growing, as opposed to other sectors. That is why, for the first time, the EU is proposing CO₂ standards for new heavy-duty vehicles. Other major economies like the US, Canada, Japan and China already have them, so it's about time we caught up.

Our proposals for 2025 and 2030 are both realistic and ambitious, and they incentivise the trade users to catch the low-hanging fruit of existing solutions, but they also leave enough time for new technologies to be developed.

This brings me to the strategic action plan on batteries. I think by now we all realise that battery production is a strategic imperative, and we have to move fast in this global race. It has huge potential for investment and jobs – we are talking about EUR 250 billion per year as of 2025. With this Action Plan we put forward a robust set of measures, for example ensuring access to critical raw materials and limiting their use; stepping-up EU research and innovation to better link it with industry's future needs; establishing robust regulatory requirements for safe and sustainable battery production to comply when placed on EU markets; developing the skills we need in Europe to deploy the next generation of high-performing, sustainable battery technology.

As you might know, we are already working with Member States, the European Investment Bank (EIB) and industrial consortia to support large-scale manufacturing projects in Europe as a part of the EU battery alliance, and I would like to thank the honourable Members of this House for setting up the 'Friends of Batteries' group, because I am sure in the future months and years it will have a lot to discuss.

To conclude, I would like to underline that this is the last time a legislative package will be proposed under the Energy Union strategy. It is clear that the Energy Union and its transition to clean energy will have a strong, long-term positive impact on all of us and on the future of our mobility. Together, with my colleagues, we are looking forward to discussing with you this package in greater detail, and I hope we can accelerate the legislative adoption of the Energy Union files.

We now rely on you to make sure that you transform these proposals into binding laws.

PRZEWODNICTWO: BOGUSŁAW LIBERADZKI

Wiceprzewodniczący

Miguel Arias Cañete, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, this is the first time ever a proposal has been made to set CO₂ standards for heavy-duty vehicles. We need this new legislation for three key reasons. First, we need to tackle the growing emissions of this sector, which are set to increase by almost 10% by 2030. Second, we want to support transport operators and help them to reduce their fuel costs. Third, we want to keep Europe's industrial leadership, as other key countries such as the United States, China and Japan have already regulated this sector.

To address these challenges, we propose ambitious and realistic targets: a mandatory target of -15% for 2025 and an aspirational target of at least -30% for 2030 compared to 2019. The European Commission is convinced that the targets proposed strike the right balance. The 2025 target can be achieved with technologies which are already available on the market but are not yet widely deployed, even though their costs are low. Furthermore, an early review is foreseen in 2022 to set the 2030 target based on additional information on the new technologies needed to meet this target. The proposal will apply initially to the four most representative categories of vehicles, which are responsible for almost 10% of heavy-duty vehicle emissions.

The review will also be the occasion to expand the scope of the proposal to all remaining categories of heavy-duty vehicles, including buses and coaches. The package also contains additional policy measures to help us meet these targets. Manufacturers will be able to put on the market more rounded and aerodynamic heavy-duty vehicles, reducing emissions and improving road safety. Tyre labelling will be improved and extended to heavy-duty vehicles generating significant annual fuel savings for consumers and transport operators.

Besides the targets, the proposal includes an incentive system to speed up our transition to zero- and low-emission heavy-duty vehicles. Today around 98% of our trucks rely on diesel. There are virtually no large zero-emission trucks on European roads, and few zero-emission buses in cities. We want to support these technologies and foster innovation by proposing an incentive scheme. This system of super credits will reward those manufacturers who will invest more in innovative technologies while preserving the environmental integrity of the CO₂ targets. It also includes zero-emission buses, which are needed for cleaner air in cities.

In conclusion, the key benefits of these proposals are that we will fight climate change and improve air quality; transport operators, mainly small and medium-sized enterprises, will save money at the pump – this proposal will help them save EUR 25 000 in fuel costs in the first five years of the use of a new truck; we will keep and create new jobs here in Europe; we will use and import less oil, and the proposal will in total save more than 200 million tonnes of oil up to 2040; and last but not least we will set the right conditions to invest and innovate here in Europe. I look forward to continuing our fruitful cooperation with the rapporteur Mr Turmes, the shadow rapporteurs and the whole Parliament, to ensure swift progress and the adoption of this proposal before the end of the mandate of this Parliament.

Violeta Bulc, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, I am really pleased to be here with colleagues to present to you yet another set of important mobility reforms, the third and final package of its kind by the Commission. As the Vice-President already highlighted, the objective of the Third Mobility Package is to let all Europeans benefit from safer traffic, less polluting vehicles and more advanced transport technologies, while simultaneously supporting EU industrial competences and competitiveness. Concretely, the package sets out measures to support the transition to mobility that is safe, clean, connected, automated and inclusive.

Let me first say a couple of words on safety. Safety is always our top priority. I am a firm believer in Vision Zero, our ambition to reduce death and serious injuries on European roads to zero by 2050. We have made some progress lately: we recorded the lowest fatality rate ever last year, roughly a 2% decrease compared to 2016. But still, last year, 25 300 - Europeans lost their lives on EU roads. All these lives lost are irreplaceable. And this comes with an enormous cost to society, emotional and financial.

This is why the EU needs a fresh approach, and this is what we are delivering. With the Third Mobility Package, we set out principles for a new road safety framework for the next decade based on the so-called Safe System. This idea is to build a number of protective layers that protect all road users. It takes into account all factors: infrastructure, vehicle safety and design, and people's behaviour. In this framework, we are setting new targets on the way to Vision Zero. Between 2020 and 2030 we want to cut the number of deaths and serious injuries by half.

There is an action plan in which you can see all the measures that we are planning. The first two elements that are already part of the package are legislative proposals on infrastructure and vehicles. We are proposing to make a number of new vehicle safety technologies mandatory, and the Vice-President has already mentioned many of them so I will not repeat them. This will make sure that all road users will be able to benefit from the latest developments in technology. This will bring important benefits and pave the way to automated mobility.

We are also proposing to improve the rules on infrastructure safety management, not only applying these rules to the roads of the TEN-T networks, which are already by far the safest ones – only 8% of fatalities happen on the core corridors – but also extending them to other main roads where 39% of all fatalities happen. This is the largest share of all, and that is why we are introducing network-wide risk mapping which will show us which EU roads are the safest and which ones are less so. But more importantly, that will set priorities for our future investments in infrastructure.

Second, let me say a couple of words on autonomous mobility. With the Third Mobility Package we are proposing a strategy to make the EU an engaging global leader in autonomous mobility systems. Autonomous mobility holds the enormous promise of making transport safer, more accessible, inclusive and sustainable, and on cooperative, connected and automated mobility the Commission sets out a clear forward-looking and ambitious European agenda based on three core pillars. First, a legal framework that creates a single market for autonomous mobility covering road safety, cyber security, access to data and data protection. Second, financial support to establish a new partnership for a sector-wide approach towards research and development. And the third pillar is an in-depth assessment of the socio-economic and ethical aspects of autonomous mobility.

We are also proposing to digitalise and simplify the communication from business to administration, and from administration to administration in freight transport. The regulation on electronic freight transport information will ensure the wide use and acceptance of electronic documents and information exchange among all players involved in cargo transport operation. For example, e-consignment notes will now follow the cargo from source to final destination regardless of the transport mode used. The potential for efficiency gains in all transport modes over 2018 to 2040 are estimated at EUR 20-27 billion.

The regulation on the European Maritime Single Window environment will establish harmonised reporting interfaces, procedures and data formats for ships calling at EU ports. This will cut red tape and contribute to multimodal solutions even further.

Very quickly, on clean mobility, it has been really well described already by my colleague Mr Arias Cañete, but let me add that to facilitate further CO₂ reductions, the Commission also proposes to allow manufacturers to bring new heavy goods vehicles earlier onto the market with more rounded and aerodynamic-effect cabs and help reach the future CO₂ standards for trucks. Such cabs will also be safer, give better visibility to drivers, as well as improved comfort. We also propose improved labelling for tyres.

Last but not least, investments and infrastructure. Infrastructure is a vital tool for the deployment of clean, safe, digital and connected solutions in transport systems. To make sure we deliver the core trans-European transport network on time by 2030, the package proposes a regulation on streamlining measures for advancing the implementation of the trans-European transport core network, the so-called Smart TEN-T Regulation. It aims to simplify permit granting, cross-border public procurement and other procedures, with a view to delivering better administrative efficiency. Our initiative will significantly reduce delays as permits should be granted within three years and cut the related costs.

I am also pleased to announce that the Commission's proposals in the Mobility Package are accompanied by an additional EUR 450 million of CEF funds to support safe mobility and digitalisation across transport modes. The outcome of this CEF Transport call should be announced in the first quarter of 2019.

I hope for your strong support for these ambitious measures and look forward to working with you on all these proposals.

Przewodniczący. – Dziękuję bardzo, Pani Komisarz. Panie i Panowie! Rzadko się zdarza, żeby Komisja w postaci wystąpień trzech komisarzy promowała nam swoje propozycje. Zatem Państwo zwróciliście się do nas, a teraz, bardzo proszę, wysłuchajcie, co na ten temat na tej sali my mamy do powiedzenia.

Tradycyjnie w imieniu grupy Europejskiej Partii Ludowej zabierze głos pan Wim van de Camp.

Wim van de Camp, namens de PPE-Fractie. – Voorzitter, ik wil allereerst mijn oprechte felicitaties uitbrengen aan de drie commissarissen. Ik weet dat het met drie commissarissen en misschien wel 20 DG's heel moeilijk is om een dergelijk pakket samen te stellen. Dat is ook mijn enige kritiekpunt: ik vind dat het pakket te laat is gekomen, zeker als je kijkt in deze legislatuur.

Van de andere kant, als wij dit pakket kunnen realiseren, dan zal het Europese transport, maar ook de energie, schoner, veiliger en beter gedigitaliseerd worden, een betere infrastructuur krijgen en meer belangen opleveren voor de Europese industrie.

Wie het gelezen heeft, weet dat er een enorm pakket ligt en we moeten kijken hoe ver we komen in deze periode. Afronden met mobiliteitspakket 1 en 2 zal moeilijk zijn, maar ik beloof de Europese Commissie: wij doen ons best.

İsmail Ertug, im Namen der S&D-Fraktion. – Herr Präsident, sehr geehrter Herr Kommissar, Frau Kommissarin! Zunächst einmal meinen Dank auch im Namen der Sozialistischen Fraktion für dieses dritte Paket. Tatsächlich sind sehr, sehr viele zukunftsweisende Themen darin. Das ist sehr erfreulich.

Wenn ich die Themen kurz durchgehen darf: In Bezug auf die Fahrsicherheit hat mich ganz besonders gefreut, dass wir bei der Erkennung von Fußgängern und Radfahrern in Zukunft endlich diesen toten Winkel verbessern oder auflösen können. Jährlich sterben immer noch viel zu viele Fahrradfahrer und Menschen im Straßenverkehr eben wegen diesem Fehlen dieser Technologien.

Zur Batteriestrategie: Das ist, glaube ich, mit das Beste und das Weitreichendste, was in den letzten Jahren vorgelegt worden ist. Herzlichen Dank, Herr Šešćović, für diese Thematik, auch deshalb, weil Sie die komplette Wertschöpfungskette von den Rohstoffen bis hin zum Recycling berücksichtigt haben und den Fokus auf Forschung und Entwicklung legen. Meine Frage ist: Wie kann das Parlament Sie dabei unterstützen? Denn es ist noch sehr allgemein gehalten, und wir haben noch keinen konkreten Zeitplan, nach dem wir vorgehen können.

Abschließend zum autonomen Fahren: Sehr geehrter Herr Kommissar! Die Weichen sind auch dort, Frau Kommissarin, in die richtige Richtung gestellt. Was ganz entscheidend ist: Wir müssen nun zeitnah Gesetzgebung vorlegen und sicherstellen, dass sie in der gesamten Europäischen Union funktioniert und gleich umgesetzt wird, damit das für alle in der Europäischen Union Wirklichkeit wird.

Herzlichen Dank nochmal an die Kommission.

Pavel Telička, *on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – Mr President, I would also like to express my appreciation for the efforts made by the Commission because the Mobility Package is – even with some difficulties, maybe some disagreements – quite impressive, and this is something that businesses will feel, industries will feel, our citizens will feel and consumers will feel. I think that this needs to be said.

I especially appreciate that on the Third Mobility Package, we might be short on time, but still the emphasis is on safety. This is an element which is clearly new, an element where the Commission has made a real effort and which I think, in the past, has been left aside.

On emissions, I will leave the figures aside, but I do appreciate what Commissioner Cañete has said on the question of incentives. I think that without incentives, we will not manage. Another issue in this respect is that we could over-emphasise just one source of energy, and that is electricity – not in the proposal, but in general. We know that we've got hydrogen, we've got a synthetic, and if we want to make a real change then we need to manage with those vehicles which are on the market, and this is not primarily about electricity.

It is complex. Let's treat it that way. Good luck, we will work with you on that.

Karima Delli, *au nom du groupe Verts/ALE*. – Monsieur le Président, Madame et Messieurs les commissaires, chers collègues, on nous présente un peu tard ce paquet, qui rassemble une série de mesures un peu fourre-tout pour le secteur routier. Vous avez raison, on peut avoir des accords sur la sécurité routière et cela sera une priorité, mais je voudrais insister sur deux grands points.

D'abord sur la question du climat: la norme CO₂ est trop faible pour les camions. Vous dites moins 30 % pour 2030, alors qu'on s'était tous mis d'accord lors de la COP 21 – et vous y étiez – sur un objectif minimum de moins 40 %. De plus, selon la feuille de route, les camions de moins de 16 tonnes ne seront pas concernés, alors que c'est tout le secteur routier qui doit faire des efforts contre le réchauffement climatique.

Deuxième point: Madame Bulc, vous avez raison sur la question de la voiture autonome. On ne peut pas la voir arriver sur nos routes tant qu'il n'y a pas de législation spécifique. Ces véhicules doivent être encadrés dès l'expérimentation, parce qu'ils posent des vraies questions, en particulier sur la cybersécurité, sur l'accès aux données et sur la responsabilité en cas d'accident. Leur contrôle ne peut pas être confié au système européen actuel, très largement défaillant ??, qui n'a pas vu venir le «dieseldgate». C'est donc à ces conditions qu'on pourra aborder sereinement l'avenir du véhicule autonome, qui remplacera la mobilité individuelle par la mobilité partagée.

Kateřina Konečná, *za skupinu GUE/NGL*. – Pane předsedající, s velkým očekáváním přistupujeme k debatě o třetím a posledním balíčku opatření v oblasti mobility. Jsem ráda, že Komise reaguje na podnět ze strany Evropského parlamentu a věnuje se bezpečnosti našich občanů.

Jenom za rok 2017 zemřelo na evropských silnicích přes 25 tisíc osob a 135 tisíc utrhlo těžká zranění. Nová doba poskytuje možnost nových bezpečnostních prvků, které by měly být cenově dostupné a zachraňovat životy všech Evropanů. A v tomto smyslu, doufám, že Komise své návrhy připravila. Evropa se také musí připravit na budoucnost autonomních vozidel a stát se průkopníkem v této oblasti.

Z hlediska České republiky však velmi oceňuji iniciativu ke zjednodušení postupu pro udělování povolení pro projekty transevropské dopravní sítě. Kde však Komise tragicky zaspala, byly standardy CO₂ u nákladních vozidel. To, že nám je Komise představuje až nyní, je trestuhodné a zcela nepochopitelné.

Λάμπρος Φουντούλης (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, τα έργα υποδομής είναι ένα βασικό μέσο ανάπτυξης για όλα τα κράτη μέλη της Ενώσεως. Η απόφαση αυτή της Επιτροπής οφείλω να ομολογήσω πως έχει ορισμένα θετικά στοιχεία. Υπάρχουν προβλήματα για την προστασία του περιβάλλοντος, αν και όχι στον βαθμό που θα θέλαμε. Επίσης δεν μπορεί να αμφισβητήσει κανείς τον ιδιαίτερο θετικό αντίκτυπο που θα έχουν ορισμένα από τα έργα αυτά κυρίως στα κράτη που υστερούν στον τομέα των υποδομών. Επιπλέον, η έμφαση που δίνεται στους σιδηροδρόμους εξασφαλίζει πιο καθαρές και με περισσότερη ασφάλεια μεταφορές εμπορευμάτων. Αναγνωρίζουμε πως η ασφάλεια στις μεταφορές γενικά είναι εξόχως σημαντική. Χιλιάδες άνθρωποι χάνουν κάθε χρόνο τη ζωή στους ευρωπαϊκούς δρόμους, πρέπει όμως τα μέτρα που θα ληφθούν να έχουν πραγματικό αντίκτυπο και να μην είναι απλώς εμπόδια που δεν θα προσφέρουν τίποτα στους πολίτες. Επιπλέον, χρειάζονται ακόμη μεγαλύτερες προσπάθειες για την προστασία του περιβάλλοντος. Πρέπει όμως όλες οι δράσεις να είναι ορθά σχεδιασμένες και να υπολογιστεί και ο πιθανός αρνητικός αντίκτυπος που μπορεί να έχουν και να μην βλάψουν την ανταγωνιστικότητα των οικονομιών των κρατών, καθώς επίσης και να μην δημιουργούν υπερβολικά βάρη στις μικρότερες ή και ατομικές επιχειρήσεις που δραστηριοποιούνται στις μεταφορές.

Dieter-Lebrecht Koch (PPE). – Herr Präsident! Verehrte Kommissare, ich begrüße den dritten Teil Ihres Mobilitätspakets außerordentlich. Er ist für mich – ohne die anderen abschwächen zu wollen – der allerwichtigste, denn er dient unmittelbar der Rettung von Menschenleben. Die Überarbeitung der Verordnung zur allgemeinen Fahrzeugsicherheit ist von immenser Bedeutung für die Straßenverkehrssicherheit, welche mir seit vielen Jahren ganz besonders am Herzen liegt. Sogar 92 % aller Unfälle sind auf menschliches Fehlverhalten zurückzuführen. Da ist der verpflichtende Einbau von sicherheitsrelevanten Fahrerassistenzsystemen wie dem Notbremsassistenten mit Fahrradfahrer- und Fußgängererkennung bei allen Neufahrzeugen oder dem Abbiegeassistenten bei Lkw und Bussen geradezu eine Notwendigkeit. Wir brauchen diese stillen Beifahrer, die uns in Gefahrensituationen nicht nur warnen, sondern auch eingreifen können, um einen Unfall zu verhindern oder um Unfälle zu minimieren.

Ich will alles tun, damit wir bis zum Ende dieser Legislaturperiode die Gesetzgebung verabschieden können. Wir sind es den 25 300 Getöteten und 135 000 Schwerverletzten, die jährlich auf den europäischen Straßen zu verbuchen sind, schuldig.

Miriam Dalli (S&D). – Fil-fatt, kwalunkwe policy ghandha mhux biss tindirizza l-isfidi tal-lum imma trid tara kif thejji l-ahjar triq ghall-futur biex verament ingawdu minn trasport modern, sigur u li ma jnigġisx; u se niffoka fuq aspett ewlieni tal-proposti: it-tnaqqis fl-emissjonijiet minn karożzi kbar bhalma huma t-trakkijiet.

Dawn it-targets biex inaqqsu l-emissjonijiet huma pass pożittiv 'il quddiem meta tqis li sal-ġurnata tal-lum m'għandna l-ebda standards simili għal dak li għandhom pajjizi ohra, anki f'kontinenti ohra.

Veru li t-trakkijiet u l-*heavy duty vehicles* jammontaw għal anqas minn hamsa fil-mija tal-vetturi fit-toroq Ewropej imma huma responsabbli għal kważi hamsa u ghoxrin fil-mija tal-*Greenhouse Gas Emissions* fit-toroq tagħna u ma nistgħux ma naghmlu xejn għaliex inkella ser jibqgħu jizdiedu.

Issa, jekk verament irridu naħdmu favur kwalità ta' arja ahjar, allura rridu nnaqqsu mhux biss l-emissjonijiet ta' karożzi żgħar imma anki l-emissjonijiet ta' trakkijiet kbar; u dan huwa settur iehor fejn il-kompetizzjoni minn barra l-Ewropa hija b'saħħitha bil-produzzjoni ta' trakkijiet u buses elettrici.

Nittama li dawn il-proposti jwasslu biex il-produtturi Ewropej jahdmu ferm aktar biex nimxu lejn karożzi aktar nodfa b'teknoloġija aktar moderna u biex ikollna l-infrastruttura adegwata mal-Unjoni Ewropea kollha kemm hi.

Gesine Meissner (ALDE). – Herr Präsident, liebes Kommissariat, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Ich finde es klasse, dass gleich drei Kommissare hier sind und das vorstellen, das zeigt die Bedeutung dieses Pakets, und eine vierte Kommissarin, Frau Bieńkowska, hat sogar die Pressemitteilung mit herausgegeben. Dies ist tatsächlich eine tolle Sache – es kommt ziemlich spät, das stimmt –, aber wenn wir uns anstrengen, schaffen wir es noch, dieses Mobilitätspaket durchzubekommen.

Sie haben gesagt: Europa soll tatsächlich führend in der Welt sein für einen automatisierten und verbundenen Verkehr. Die Chance dazu haben wir, das wäre gut für Europa. Erprobt haben wir das schon bei Ubahnen, bei Platooning zum Beispiel im LKW-Bereich. Das ist umweltfreundlicher, es ist sicherer – gerade was die Toten angeht zum Beispiel –, es ist effizienter. Es wäre auch gut für Leute mit reduzierter Mobilität. Es wäre auch gut für den ländlichen Raum, der wird oft vergessen, aber der hat da auch eine Chance. Es ist die letzte Meile der Lieferkette, wahrscheinlich sehr stark verändert in Zukunft.

Das Problem ist tatsächlich: Wir sollten einmal technologieoffen darangehen, das ist auch besser für die Emissionen. Nur Elektromobilität, sagte mein Kollege Pavel Telička schon, ist nicht das allein Seligmachende. Wir müssen wirklich vorankommen mit der Digitalisierung und mit der *Connecting Europe Facility*. Wir brauchen eine Infrastruktur für alternative Energien und für digitale Dinge und auch eine Verkehrsinfrastruktur. Daran müssen wir entscheidend arbeiten, dann können wir es auch schaffen, in Europa führend zu sein.

Andor Deli (PPE). – Mr President, first I would like to congratulate the Commissioners for achieving this great deal for delivering all parts of the Mobility Package. Let me give you three short remarks.

First I would like to commend your efforts to increase the overall road safety by the initiative to include new advanced safety features into cars and trucks. Now we must make sure that they are going to be accessible to every future car owner, because safety must not become a privilege of luxury-car owners.

Secondly, while I fully agree that heavy-duty vehicles' (HDV) CO₂ emissions should be decreased, I must say that, if we really want to make a change, we must not focus only on tailpipe CO₂ emissions. Instead we have to use a broader well-to-wheels analysis for tackling emissions.

Thirdly and finally, I do regret that your proposal for a regulation on electronic freight transport information did not come a little bit earlier, in the first mobility package, because it could have served as a solid legal base for the enforcement part of the lex specialis on posting or for the Cabotage Directive. This way we might end up creating legal discrepancies which may hamper efficient enforcement in practice.

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Domnule președinte, domnilor comisari, sigur și eu o felicit că, iată, avem o armonizare între trei comisari care s-au gând să ne ofere, să ne pună pe masa al treilea pachet pentru mobilitate. Așa cum a rezultat și din cele spuse de doamna comisar Bulc, sigur, dorim o mobilitate sigură, curată și conectată, însă, sigur, aceste lucruri țin de niște condiții: în primul rând de calitatea infrastructurii. Pentru a avea securitatea transportului avem nevoie de o infrastructură – la nivel european, la nivel național- pe care pot circula autovehiculele. Apoi avem nevoie de o industrie constructoare de mașini performantă, care să poată să ofere modele noi. Avem nevoie de cercetare și inovare în industria constructoare de mașini și, nu în ultimul rând, sigur, avem nevoie de a susține potențialul IMM-urilor de a intra în această industrie și a putea să producă la nivel european și, de ce nu, să fim pionieri în autovehiculele cu combustibil alternativ.

Recent am participat la un test cu mașini cu hidrogen în țara mea și am putut să beau apa de la evacuare, curată. Deci iată că putem să atingem și această problemă a aerului curat pe care îl respirăm!

Claudia Schmidt (PPE). – Herr Präsident! Ich sehe das mit dem Lob leider ein bisschen anders. Die Automobilproduzenten samt ihrer Zulieferindustrie sind ja das industrielle Rückgrat Europas. Hier sind wir immer noch der tonangebende Kontinent. Über 50 % der weltweiten Patente zum autonomen Fahren kommen entweder aus München, Ingolstadt oder Stuttgart. Und gleichzeitig ist es der einzige IT-Bereich, wo Europa das Maß der Dinge ist. Wir wissen, dass autonomes Fahren unsere Gesellschaft massiv verändern wird. Und dann sollte man doch meinen, dass der Bereich Priorität hat. Er ist ja auch für Arbeitsplätze, Handels-, Energie-, Umweltpolitik und Forschung nicht wirklich unwesentlich.

Von der Kommission kam aber lange Zeit nichts, und jetzt, wo der Hut brennt, wird schnell hier oder da etwas hinzugeflickt, wie bei Platooning, oder zumindest einmal eine Strategie verkündet. Flapsig wird angemerkt, dass die Daten der Autos auch für die Behörden interessant wären oder auch für Drittfirmen. Ja, natürlich! Aber es reicht nicht aus, dass das im Hintergrund verschiedene Stakeholder feststellen, die Kommission es verkündet, und der Autoverkäufer muss die Weisheit dann einfach schlucken. Das ist genau jene Bevormundung, jene Hinterzimmerpolitik, die selbst für überzeugte Europäer schwer zu schlucken ist. *Better lawmaking* geht anders, und die Vorgangsweise grenzt meiner Meinung nach an Missachtung des Parlaments.

Pavel Poc (S&D). – Pane předsedající, k této třetí části balíčku mobility mám pouze tři konkrétní poznámky. Za prvé, smysluplná elektromobilita je podmněna využitím elektřiny z obnovitelných zdrojů. Elektromobilita, která využívá elektřinu produkovanou z fosilních zdrojů, řeší jenom lokální problém, a to ještě za cenu velkých ztrát účinnosti způsobených během konverzí a přenosu energie.

Za druhé, pokud chceme mluvit o nulových emisích, je třeba brát v úvahu celý produkční řetězec, celou uhlíkovou stopu, včetně výroby, nejenom samotný provoz vozidla.

Za třetí, široké využívání energie z obnovitelných zdrojů není možné bez jejího účinného, technicky vyspělého ukládání. Musíme podporovat evropské inovátory, omezit únik nových technologií do třetích zemí a rozvíjet celý produkční řetězec baterií. Děkuji v této souvislosti panu místopředsedovi Šefčovičovi za aktivní přístup k této problematice a vítám iniciativu Evropské komise *EU Battery Alliance*. V Evropském parlamentu se této konkrétní oblasti bude věnovat pracovní skupina *Friends of Batteries*, kterou jsem inicioval, a já se velice těším na další spolupráci.

Karoline Graswander-Hainz (S&D). – Herr Präsident! Vom Klimaschutz reden alle gern. Aber gleichzeitig ist es eine Tatsache, dass der CO₂-Ausstoß im Verkehrssektor weiter ansteigt, weil immer mehr Waren auf der Straße transportiert werden. Nur über den Klimaschutz zu sprechen, wird nicht ausreichen, um den Klimaschutz voranzutreiben und die Emissionen zu senken. Es braucht endlich Taten!

Mit der Vorlage des Vorschlags hat die Kommission das erkannt und kommt vom Reden endlich ins Handeln. Strenge Emissionsvorgaben für schwere Nutzfahrzeuge und eine Industrieinitiative für eine saubere Batterieproduktion in Europa sind längst überfällig. Es ist höchste Zeit, dass Sie nicht länger vor den Interessen der Autoindustrie in die Knie gehen, die die europäischen Konsumentinnen und Konsumenten über Jahrzehnte hinweg belogen hat.

Die ökologische Verkehrswende muss kommen, daran führt kein Weg vorbei. Die Vorschläge der Kommission richten ihren Fokus auf die Reduktion von Treibhausgasen im Verkehrssektor. Das stimmt mich positiv und optimistisch, dass wir die Wende schaffen können.

Carlos Zorrinho (S&D). – Senhor Presidente, Senhores Comissários, este pacote que visa que, neste sector industrial, que é estratégico, a União Europeia se mantenha na fronteira tecnológica, é positivo, responde a questões chave de segurança, normalização e regulação de automação e intercâmbio de dados, alarga os objetivos da redução de emissões de gases com efeito de estufa aos camiões.

São, portanto, linhas de ações muito importantes, mas cuja eficácia depende do sucesso obtido nos dois quadros estruturantes deste pacote.

Em primeiro lugar, o Plano Estratégico para as baterias e, em segundo lugar, a harmonização de procedimentos de autorização de projetos na rede transeuropeia.

Os 450 milhões de euros, que vão ser investidos através do mecanismo Interligar a Europa, vão ser disponibilizados para que os Estados-Membros promovam a segurança rodoviária, a digitalização e a multimodalidade, e por isso não podem ser esgotados em projetos avulso.

Espero que seja esse o significado de estarem aqui três comissários. Temos que ter projetos conjuntos para ajudar a catapultar de novo a União Europeia para a liderança num domínio industrial e tecnológico chave, que já liderámos, mas em que nos últimos dois anos temos vindo a perder a liderança em relação aos principais competidores.

Przewodniczący. – Dziękuję bardzo panu Zorrinho. Niech mi wolno będzie przy okazji złożyć Panu najlepsze życzenia urodzinowe: Happy Birthday!

Zgłoszenia z sali

Henna Virkkunen (PPE). – Arvoisa puhemies, on erittäin hyvä, että komissio on nyt viimeinkin tarttunut tanakasti tähän liikenteen päästöjen vähentämiseen, koska tiedämme, että liikenne on ainoa sektori, jossa päästöt ovat vain kasvaneet, ja kun liikennemäärät kasvavat jatkuvasti, se merkitsee sitä, että nyt tarvitaan todella suuria uudistuksia koko liikennesektorille.

Tämä ehdotus, jossa myös rekoille ehdotetaan päästönormeja, on tervetullut ja täydentää aikaisempia esityksiä ja on varmasti osaltaan vauhdittamassa alan innovaatioita. Tiedämme, että autoteollisuus on Euroopan merkittävien teollisuudenala ja kaikkein suurin tutkimus- ja tuotekehittäjä ja investori Euroopassa. On hyvin tärkeää, että se pysyy mukana globaalissa kilpailussa, koska edelleenkin Eurooppa voi olla puhtaan liikenteen edelläkävijä maailmassa.

Samaan aikaan, kun kehitämme ajoneuvoteknologiaa, on tärkeä edelleenkin edistää uusiutuvia, vaihtoehtoisia polttoaineita. Niillä on erittäin merkittävä rooli, samoin kuin koko logistisella ketjulla. Tässä sekä jäsenvaltiot että alueet tarvitsevat tukea omille innovaatioilleen, koska nämä logistiset haasteet ratkaistaan hyvin pitkälti paikallistasolla.

PREȘEDINȚIA: IOAN MIRCEA PAȘCU*Vicepreședinte*

José Blanco López (S&D). – Señor presidente, la descarbonización de nuestra economía, si queremos cumplir los objetivos de París, tiene un objetivo fundamental, que es conseguir que el 94 % de los combustibles fósiles, que es lo que consume el transporte, avance de una forma decidida en su descarbonización.

Por eso, es importante el paquete que nos acaba de anunciar la Comisión. Este paquete se une al otro con el que estamos trabajando, el paquete de invierno, y, en concreto, a la Directiva sobre energías renovables, que se va a fijar también un objetivo de descarbonización del sector del transporte para impulsar una movilidad limpia y conseguir una mayor penetración de renovables. Creo que es el camino por el que tiene que continuar la Unión Europea.

Todos los europeos debemos beneficiarnos de un tráfico más seguro, menos contaminante, y de soluciones tecnológicas más avanzadas, al tiempo que apoyamos la competitividad de nuestra industria, de la industria del automóvil, tan importante en países como el mío, España.

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η τρίτη δέσμη μέτρων για την κινητικότητα περιέχει προτάσεις με ιδιαίτερο ενδιαφέρον. Χρειάζονται όμως εξειδίκευση και χρειάζεται και συγκεκριμένο χρονοδιάγραμμα εφαρμογής. Θεωρώ το θέμα της οδικής ασφάλειας το πιο σημαντικό ζήτημα αυτή τη στιγμή. Όπως αναφέρθηκε, 25 300 συμπολίτες μας στην Ευρώπη κάθε χρόνο πεθαίνουν λόγω των τροχαίων δυστυχημάτων. Φυσικά πρέπει να ληφθούν μέτρα, κυρίως για τα δυστυχήματα που προκαλούνται από τα φορτηγά. Αυτό σημαίνει ότι θα πρέπει να ληφθούν και μέτρα για τα φορτηγά τρίτων χωρών. Ιδίως αυτή τη στιγμή τα φορτηγά που προέρχονται από την Τουρκία λειτουργούν μέσα στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση και στην Ελλάδα, κυρίως στην Εγνατία, κυκλοφορούν με φθαρμένα λάστιχα, με προβλήματα μηχανικής κατάστασης, και οι οδηγοί τους δεν έχουν τα προσόντα. Έχω ζητήσει και από την ελληνική κυβέρνηση να λάβει συγκεκριμένα μέτρα. Θα πρέπει να ληφθούν συγκεκριμένα μέτρα ούτως ώστε τα φορτηγά τρίτων χωρών να έχουν πραγματικά τις προδιαγραφές ασφαλούς κυκλοφορίας.

João Pimenta Lopes (GUE/NGL). – Senhor Presidente, sejamos sérios. O pacote de mobilidade prossegue os objetivos de consolidação do mercado único, de acelerar o processo de privatização do que ainda persiste no controlo público, de comprometer ainda mais as capacidades de decisão soberana dos Estados na definição das suas políticas de transportes, de beneficiar processos de concentração de capital ao mesmo tempo que aumenta a exploração dos trabalhadores.

As propostas em discussão não promovem a melhoria das condições laborais ou de segurança. Pelo contrário, ao aumentarem os períodos de trabalho entre períodos de descanso contribuem para o aumento da fadiga. A exigência de condições de descanso dignas é negligenciada.

O aumento ilimitado das operações de cabotagem alimentam e legitimam a exploração laboral, baseada em baixos salários e larguíssimas e desreguladas jornadas de trabalho, quantas vezes pagas ao quilómetro e sob pressão inaceitável do operador.

O grande objetivo deste pacote não é a melhoria das condições laborais e sociais. É agravá-las em nome do lucro, fornecendo serviços e mão de obra barata de países como Portugal às grandes empresas e potências europeias.

Michael Cramer (Verts/ALE). – Herr Präsident! Der Verkehr ist der einzige Sektor, in dem die Emissionen seit 1990 gestiegen sind – um 28 %! In der Industrie haben wir es erreicht, sie um 35 % zu senken. Der Verkehr frisst also all das auf, was mit Milliarden unserer Steuergelder in den anderen Sektoren erreicht wurde. Und innerhalb des Verkehrs macht der Straßenverkehr 72 % aus. Deshalb brauchen wir eine Verlagerung, eine Vermeidung und eine Verbesserung.

Da müssen wir aber auch sehen: Wo kommt der Strom her? Der kommt nicht aus der Steckdose, sondern wir müssen den ganzen Zyklus anschauen – die Produktion, die Nutzung und das Recycling. Da müssen wir hingehen. Und vor allen Dingen brauchen wir einen fairen Wettbewerb – das wurde ja schon gesagt –, denn wenn wir praktisch den Schienenverkehr, der umweltfreundlich ist, permanent teuer machen und den Straßenverkehr, der klimaschädlich ist, permanent verbilligen, erreichen wir unsere Ziele nicht. Ohne eine Veränderung der Mobilität werden wir den Klimawandel nicht stoppen. Wir müssen ihn aber stoppen, damit unsere Kinder und deren Kinder eine Perspektive haben, auf diesem Planeten zu leben.

Nicola Caputo (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, il terzo pacchetto sulla mobilità è fondamentale per consentire a tutti i cittadini di beneficiare dei vantaggi della mobilità sicura, di veicoli meno inquinanti e di soluzioni tecnologiche avanzate.

Sebbene il numero delle vittime sulla strada si sia più che dimezzato, 25 300 persone hanno perso la vita nel 2017 e ben 135 000 sono rimaste gravemente ferite. Ne discende, dunque, l'importanza dell'equipaggiamento dei veicoli con dispositivi di sicurezza avanzati, come ad esempio quelli di frenata d'emergenza automatica.

Fondamentali sono le norme sulla mobilità pulita, in particolare quelle relative alla qualità dei carburanti e alla riduzione delle emissioni dei nuovi veicoli pesanti, a mio avviso necessari per consentirci di raggiungere gli obiettivi dell'accordo di Parigi. Utile al riguardo è il piano d'azione per le batterie per facilitare la diffusione dell'auto elettrica.

Per consentire all'Europa di diventare però effettivamente leader mondiale per i sistemi di mobilità connessa e automatizzata, dovremmo riuscire ad implementare in tempi brevi un ambiente interamente digitale per lo scambio di informazioni nel trasporto merci.

Ruža Tomašić (ECR). – Poštovani predsjedavajući, treći paket za mobilnost nudi niz mjera koje će promet po europskim cestama učiniti sigurnijim, čistim i ugodnijim. Zajednički naponi u osmišljavanju i provedbi ovih mjera iznimno su važni jer je kretanje ljudi i roba danas u Europi lakše nego ikada prije i ostvaruje značajne prekogranične učinke.

U tom kontekstu treba promatrati i presudu njemačkog upravnog saveznog suda iz Leipziga iz veljače ove godine kojom je njemačkim gradovima omogućeno da zabrane prometovanje starijim dizelašima. Zabrana bi se odnosila na sva dizel vozila do ekološke norme Euro6.

Počnu li njemački gradovi doista zabranjivati prometovanje starijim dizel vozilima, u Hrvatskoj i drugim slabije razvijenim članicama može se zbog pada cijena takvih vozila očekivati značajan porast njihova uvoza iz Njemačke.

To bi bilo protivno ciljevima trećeg paketa i Komisija mora u suradnji s nacionalnim tijelima nešto poduzeti kako pojedine članice ne bi postale svojevrсна skladišta za vozila koja ne udovoljavaju ekološkim standardima.

(Încheierea intervențiilor la cerere)

Maroš Šefčovič, Vice-President of the Commission. – Mr President, first I really would like to thank you for the positive reaction and what I feel was overall support. You are right, there are three of us here to demonstrate how important the mobility issues and all the packages we presented to you are for the Commission, and you are also right that it was a collective effort and the result of very good Energy Union team spirit. I would like to assure you that we are ready to use this positive spirit to work with you, day and night, and if you are talking about trilogies, you're speaking mostly about the night sessions. But we are ready to work with you to make sure that we use every single day. We still have almost a one year ahead of us to make sure that all the proposals we put to you for the area of modernising mobility will be approved. So we can really start the next decade to be the new framework with all the efforts which are necessary to make sure the citizens are safer, our roads are better and our industry is much more competitive.

If you allow, Mr President, I know that we are running out of time, so I just wanted to save some time for my colleagues, for Miguel and Violeta, also to contribute to the debate with their responses.

Miguel Arias Cañete, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, I would like to thank all of you for your contributions in the debate on your support for the Commission proposals. Following the intervention of Ms Dalli regarding the achievement of our target of reducing greenhouse gas emissions by at least 40% compared with 1990 by 2030, let me start with some clarifications and explain how the transport sector will contribute. For sure, the Commission is putting forward a different set of proposals in order to achieve those targets, but in the new Effort Sharing Regulation, we set out binding national greenhouse gas emission targets for the period 2021-2030 for Member States. These targets cover all the sectors of the economy that fall outside the scope of the European Union Emissions Trading System, including road transport. No sectoral targets are set under the Effort Sharing regulation. Nevertheless, the analytical work underpinning the Effort Sharing Regulation proposals shows the cost-effectiveness of a European Union-wide emission reduction of 25% compared with 2005 for road transport by 2030. Under the baseline, emission reductions are around 70%, so there is an eight percentage point difference.

With our 2017 proposals for post-2020 emissions standards for cars and vans, this difference gets significantly smaller – it shrinks to four percentage points, and the gap could be progressively closed by one percentage point with the implementation of the proposed CO₂ standards for lorries, which have to reduce their emissions by 30% compared with 2019 by 2030. The remaining gap will be addressed through other additional policies with impact on road transport greenhouse gas emissions. These concern, for example, the minimum share of renewable fuels in transport, which is proposed by the Commission in the revision of the Renewable Energy Directive as well as the proposals for the Eurovignette, Clean Vehicles and Combined Transport Directives.

With all this legislation, we will make sure that transport also contributes to achieving our 40% minimum reduced emissions target by 2030.

To conclude, let me stress that the Commission has tabled ambitious and realistic proposals which we think strike the right balance between environmental, consumer and employment objectives. That is why the Commission would like to call on our colleagues later and all the stakeholders to work closely together to ensure the swift adoption and implementation of the proposal for CO₂ emissions standards for lorries – so that the benefits for European Union industry, businesses and citizens can be maximised and generated as soon as possible.

Violeta Bulc, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, honourable Members, thank you very much for all your comments and the real support for the Mobility Package. I take on board your criticism that we might have introduced this package a little bit late into our mandate but, believe me, it was done in a very systematic and comprehensive way, so I do believe that together we can really deliver on it, with the confidence that we will also deliver on the results, and we are all really looking forward to those results.

I am very much in favour of removing silent killers from European society, and transport is contributing a few of them, so please give your full support to three very clear vision zeros. Zero fatalities on European roads, zero pollution from European transport and zero red tape in mobility solutions by 2050.

I know it's ambitious, but it is achievable if we join our forces and we are really serious about delivering on this objective. For that reason, I'm very much looking forward to engaging immediately with you and seeing how far we can get under our mandate, and I'm sure that the Commission and the Commissioner that will come after me will be equally devoted to these goals and we will deliver on those so badly needed objectives by 2050.

Președintele. – Acest punct de pe ordinea de zi a fost închinis.

Declarații scrise (articolul 162)

Ivo Belet (PPE), *schriftelijk*. – Met het derde mobiliteitspakket dat de Europese Commissie op 17 mei heeft voorgesteld, zetten we een belangrijke stap om het aantal verkeersslachtoffers drastisch te verminderen. In 2017 waren er in de Europese Unie 25 300 dodelijke slachtoffers in het verkeer. Dat zijn er 25 300 te veel.

Met de aangekondigde maatregelen zullen auto's, vrachtwagens en bussen in de komende jaren, te beginnen vanaf eind 2021, worden uitgerust met onder andere een noodremsysteem ter bescherming van zwakke weggebruikers, een zwarte doos in elke wagen, een intelligente snelheidsassistent en achteruitrijcamera. Ook het in kaart brengen van gevaarlijke verkeerspunten en bijkomende investeringen in infrastructuur moeten het aantal slachtoffers drastisch verminderen. We moeten echt alles op alles zetten om het aantal verkeersslachtoffers zo snel mogelijk tot nul te herleiden.

Doru-Claudian Frunzulică (S&D), *in writing*. – I welcome the adoption of the third set of measures for a cleaner and safer transport system in Europe. The new package puts forward CO₂ targets for heavy-duty vehicles for the first time and an action plan on batteries, which commits to the ethical use of resources, pursuant to the re-use and recycle logic of the circular economy, as well as a forward-looking strategy on connected and automated mobility. Furthermore, the measures also include proposals on passenger and road user safety, which will contribute to diminish fatalities and severe injuries in road accidents, as they envisage that new models of vehicles are equipped with advanced safety features. These initiatives, along with the circular economy and recent legislation on energy efficiency and renewables pave the way for a sustainable and healthier economic model. The objective is to ensure safer traffic, less polluting vehicles and provide more advanced technological solutions, while upholding the competitiveness of the EU industry. Indeed, I believe that the proposed measures lay the ground for a new model, but, in order for the latter to bring the expected benefits, I share the opinion that it has to be matched by appropriate financial incentives and investments.

Olga Sehnalová (S&D), písemně. – Vítám předložené návrhy Evropské komise, která svou iniciativu v třetí části balíčku mobility zaměřuje i na zlepšení bezpečnosti na silnicích. Navržená opatření jsou podle mého názoru důležitá, abychom se posunuli o krok blíže k dlouhodobě stanoveným cílům snížení počtu obětí a vážných zranění v dopravních nehodách. K tomu také přispěje představený strategický akční plán bezpečnosti silničního provozu obsahující další návrhy opatření a stanovení cílů pro následující dekádu. Téměř polovinu obětí tvoří nejzranitelnější účastníci dopravních nehod, jako jsou motocyklisté, cyklisté nebo chodci. Proto je nutné, aby nová legislativní opatření zlepšila jejich ochranu a zvýšila bezpečnost vozidel. To může přispět ke snížení následků dopravních nehod, které končí fatálními následky nebo vážným zraněním.

Miguel Viegas (GUE/NGL), por escrito. – O pacote de mobilidade prossegue os objetivos de consolidação do mercado único, de acelerar o processo de privatização do que ainda persiste no controlo público, de comprometer ainda mais as capacidades de decisão soberana dos Estados na definição das suas políticas de transportes e beneficiar processos de concentração de capital, ao mesmo tempo que aumentam a exploração dos trabalhadores.

As propostas em discussão não promovem a melhoria das condições laborais ou de segurança. Pelo contrário. Ao aumentarem os períodos de trabalho entre períodos de descanso, contribuem para o aumento da fadiga. A justa exigência das condições de descanso dignas são negligenciadas. O aumento ilimitado das operações de cabotagem alimentam e legitimam a exploração laboral baseada em baixos salários e larguíssimas e desreguladas jornadas de trabalho, quantas vezes pagas ao km e sob pressão inaceitável dos operadores.

O grande objetivo deste pacote não é a melhoria das condições laborais e sociais, é agravá-las em nome do lucro, fornecendo serviços e mão-de-obra barata de países como Portugal às grandes empresas e potências europeias.

23. Mehrjahresplan für Grundfischbestände in der Nordsee und für die Fischereien, die diese Bestände befischen (Aussprache)

Președintele. – Următorul punct de pe ordinea de zi este dezbateră privind: raportul Ulrikei Rodust, în numele Comisiei pentru pescuit, referitor la propunerea de regulament al Parlamentului European și al Consiliului de stabilire a unui plan multianual pentru stocurile demersale din Marea Nordului și pentru activitățile de pescuit care exploatează stocurile respective și de abrogare a Regulamentului (CE) 676/2007 al Consiliului și a Regulamentului (CE) 1342/2008 al Consiliului (COM(2016)0493 - C8-0336/2016 - 2016/0238(COD) (A8-0263/2017))

Ulrike Rodust, Berichtstersterin. – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar Vella, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Morgen stimmt das Parlament über den Trilog zum Mehrjahresplan für die Nordsee ab. Mit vier Trilogen waren wir recht schnell. Das heißt aber nicht, dass die Verhandlungen leicht waren. In Bezug auf die im letzten Jahr abgestimmte EP-Position mussten wir einige Abstriche machen und Kompromisse eingehen. Und ja: Kompromisse können wehtun. Nichtsdestotrotz ist dieser zweite Mehrjahresplan nach dem Ostseemanagementplan ein sehr wichtiger Schritt zur richtigen Zeit.

Wie wir alle wissen, erstreckt sich die Nordsee zwischen Großbritannien und dem europäischen Festland. Ein Mehrjahresplan für die Grundfischbestände in der Nordsee und für die Fischereien, die diese Bestände befischen, ist automatisch mit dem Brexit an sich und seinen verschiedenen Verhandlungsphasen zu verbinden beziehungsweise vor diesem Hintergrund zu sehen. Mir als Berichtstersterin war es wichtig, für die entsprechenden Brexit-Verhandlungen eine Grundlage für das Management zu schaffen. Eine Grundlage, die nur über Kompromisse sowohl zwischen den politischen Fraktionen hier im Haus als auch zwischen Rat und Europäischem Parlament möglich war und ermöglicht wurde.

Was die Beziehungen zu Drittländern betrifft, haben wir nun im Plan verankert, dass bei Vereinbarungen über die gemeinsam befischten Bestände die Vorgaben der gemeinsamen Fischereipolitik das Primat sein sollten. Hier spielen die Bestände herein, die mit Norwegen geteilt werden, aber eben bald auch diejenigen, die mit Großbritannien zusammen befischt werden. Was ich momentan über die Position der Briten zu ihrer angedachten zukünftigen eigenen Fischereipolitik weiß, möchte das Vereinigte Königreich am MSY-Prinzip und an Wertebereichen, die auf internationalen und wissenschaftlichen Gutachten basieren, festhalten. Rückwurfpraktiken sollen auch dort der Vergangenheit angehören. Viel hängt nun von der Ausgestaltung der künftigen fischereipolitischen Zusammenarbeit zwischen dem Vereinigten Königreich und der Europäischen Union ab. Ich wünsche mir für ein nachhaltiges Management eine dauerhafte Lösung für Quotenverteilung und Zugangsrechte.

Zurück zum Thema Kompromisse: Bei den Fischereien, die Grundfischbestände befischen, handelt es sich in der Nordsee um sogenannte gemischte Fischereien. Hier muss ich doch sagen, dass bei den Verhandlungen einiges neu gemischt – ich muss sogar sagen: vermischt wurde. Letztendlich haben wir wie im Ostseeplan die sogenannten MSY Fupper-Obergrenze beinhalten. Dies ist für einige ein richtig rotes Tuch, eine rote Linie, die überschritten wurde. Umwelt-NGOs haben deshalb auch aufgerufen, gegen dieses Trilog-Ergebnis zu stimmen. Zwei Fraktionen haben hierzu Änderungsanträge gestellt. Ich werde morgen gegen diese Änderungsanträge stimmen. Ja, wir hatten etwas anderes im EP-Bericht im Juli 2017 stehen, und ja, ich würde mit einem anderen Ergebnis in dieser Hinsicht besser leben können. Aber es gibt Mehrheiten, und diese Mehrheiten inklusive Kommission und Rat waren starke Befürworter dieser Obergrenzen.

Das Risiko, dass es zu keinem Nordseemanagementplan kommt, war sehr groß. Dies konnte ich weder den Fischen noch den Fischern gegenüber verantworten. Immer wieder wurde in diesem Kontext von Kommission und Rat das Argument der sogenannten limitierten Arten angeführt. Die Integration von „MSY Fupper“ wäre unbedingt notwendig, um Effekte für limitierte Arten abzufedern. Dieses Argument spukte mir letztes im Ausschuss die ganze Zeit im Kopf herum, als ich während des Workshops zu Anlande Verpflichtung und limitierten Arten zu hören bekam, dass limitierte Situationen de facto noch gar nicht aufgetreten sind. Eine klare Antwort, wie verschiedene Instrumente aus dem Werkzeugkasten der GFP wie Selektivmaßnahmen, Interartenflexibilität und so weiter wirken, steht für mich auch noch aus.

Aber nochmal zurück zu den Zielen eines Mehrjahresplans gemäß der Grundverordnung. Diese sollen auf wissenschaftlichen, technischen und wirtschaftlichen Gutachten basieren. Eine Definition von besten verfügbaren wissenschaftlichen Gutachten sollten weder Rat noch Kommission im verfügbaren Teil akzeptieren. Warum war und ist dem Parlament eine Definition so wichtig gewesen? Auch hier geht es wie so oft um Quoten, insbesondere darum, wie diese ausgehandelt werden. Der Anreiz scheint beim Rat groß, die Obergrenzen in Anspruch zu nehmen. Hierzu gibt es drei Bedingungen – drei Bedingungen, die wir, wenn überhaupt, lediglich auf der Basis von besten verfügbaren wissenschaftlichen Gutachten in Anspruch genommen sehen wollen.

Ein eindeutiger Bezug beziehungsweise ein eindeutiges Verständnis von zu verwendenden Gutachten, ist ebenfalls essenziell vor dem Hintergrund, dass wir nur das Prinzip statt definierten Zahlen bei den Wertebereichen vorsehen. Die Wertebereiche können durchaus regelmäßig an beste verfügbare wissenschaftliche Gutachten angepasst werden. Im Klartext heißt dies hier an Gutachten des ICES. Einen Kompromiss mussten wir auch eingehen, was die Beifangarten angeht, spielten doch auch bei diesem Thema die berüchtigten limitierten Situationen eine entscheidende Rolle.

Was steckt noch im Plan: die Freizeitfischerei. Hier hat sich der Rat aus Kontrollgründen lange gesträubt. Der entsprechende Passus des Plans besagt, dass bei erheblichen Auswirkungen der Freizeitfischerei auf die fischereiliche Sterblichkeit der Rat die Freizeitfischerei bei den Fangmöglichkeiten berücksichtigen und deren Fangmöglichkeiten beschränken kann. Also, im Plan steckt einiges Gutes drin. Eine Ablehnung des Plans betrachte ich vor dem Hintergrund der Brexit-Verhandlungen als das absolut falsche Signal.

Karmenu Vella, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, I would like first and foremost to thank the rapporteur, Ulrike Rodust, and also to thank the shadow rapporteurs for their dedicated work. The agreement that you have reached in the trilogues together with the Council is a very good result, and I would like to thank you all for working tirelessly to ensure a solid, sustainable result that works in practice.

I also want to thank the rapporteur for ensuring a timely adaptation ahead of the full implementation of the landing obligation. We have used the Baltic Sea plan as the blueprint for the North Sea plan, but where improvements were necessary, the co-legislators wisely agreed to find new approaches. For example, by introducing flexibility through the concept of ranges, which allows us to quickly adapt, following the most up-to-date scientific advice to the benefit of stakeholders and also to the benefit of sustainable stocks. The North Sea plan is very important, as it provides for reaching MSY for the demersal fisheries in the sea basin, and it also paves the way for the next multiannual plans yet to come.

Let me highlight that the landing obligation enters fully into force in less than one year, and we are all aware of the challenges it entails for our fishing industry. The North Sea plan contains a range of tools to help towards this transition, and I would like to call on all Member States to use the flexibilities which exist in order to ensure smooth implementation. We need to ensure that fishermen have the tools to sustain sustainable fishing practices; for example, by adapting their gears so that they can alleviate choke situations in mixed demersal fisheries in a way that is in line with the CFP objectives.

It is now for the stakeholders of the North Sea to put these tools into practice and also to ensure tailor-made solutions to the specific challenges in the different fisheries of the North Sea.

Jens Gieseke, *im Namen der PPE-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar Vella, Frau Kollegin Rodust, liebe Schattenberichterstatter! Vielen Dank für die gute Zusammenarbeit. 21 Monate Verhandlungen liegen hinter uns, und man kann heute feststellen: Insgesamt haben wir ein gutes und ausgewogenes Verhandlungsergebnis. Für unsere Fischer haben wir einfache und unbürokratische Regeln nach dem Vorbild des Ostseeplans. Es wird eine nachhaltige Befischung nach neuesten wissenschaftlichen Erkenntnissen auch in Zukunft möglich sein. Und – Frau Rodust hat es gerade gesagt – für die weiteren Brexit-Verhandlungen bietet dieser Plan jetzt eine gute Grundlage. Das ist sehr wichtig.

Es gibt leider – und das ist angesprochen worden – jetzt von sehr einseitig argumentierenden Umweltverbänden den Aufruf, gegen diesen Plan zu stimmen. Ich halte diesen Aufruf für extrem fahrlässig. Wir als EVP können dem Verhandlungsergebnis zustimmen. Es sind viele Kompromisse gemacht worden, aber im Ergebnis können wir diesem Plan jetzt zustimmen, und deshalb werden wir dem Plan auch zustimmen.

Vielen Dank für die gute Zusammenarbeit.

Ricardo Serrão Santos, *em nome do Grupo S&D*. – Senhor Presidente, Senhor Comissário, antes de mais também eu quero realçar o empenho e o trabalho dos relatores, em particular da minha colega, a deputada Ulrike Rodust, neste documento determinante para implementar a Política Comum de Pescas, e também fazer eco das palavras dos anteriores oradores e do Sr. Comissário.

Quero realçar o reforço da importância da informação científica mais atualizada, assim como a inclusão dos dados de pesca recreativa na informação científica a ser tida em conta nos conselhos científicos do Conselho Internacional para a Exploração dos Mares e do Conselho Científico Técnico e Económico das Pescas da Comissão Europeia.

É importante aprovarmos o plano plurianual e pô-lo em ação, apesar de reconhecer que saiu do tríplice diminuído de algumas disposições aprovadas no Parlamento Europeu na data em que foi aprovado.

Um dos *handicaps* que me parece um tanto problemático é que o acordo político alcançado diminuiu a capacidade de manter os limites de pesca abaixo de pontos de referência do FMSY. Um outro é a falta de ênfase na recuperação dos mananciais de espécies acessórias, ficando essa preocupação assim concentrada na espécies-alvo apenas.

Mas há que contrabalançar o ótimo com o viável, com o negociável. Após vários meses de negociação, fazer regressar atrás um plano que, não sendo perfeito, é, no entanto, um avanço muito, muito importante, seria um erro. Neste contexto, considero absolutamente fundamental que o plano plurianual prossiga nesta fase.

Parece-me que estão lançadas as bases possíveis e importantes para o plano de medidas específicas a apresentar pelas organizações regionais, tendo em atenção não só a sustentabilidade das unidades populacionais, mas também a proteção de espécies sensíveis e, claro, o rendimento das comunidades piscatórias com interesses nesta área da pesca.

Peter van Dalen, *namens de ECR-Fractie*. – Voorzitter, de Noordzee is een van de meest complexe visgronden ter wereld. We hebben te maken met bijna 100 verschillende soorten, en vloten uit acht lidstaten.

Ik ben voorstander van regionalisatie in de visserij, want de diverse visgebieden in de Europese Unie kennen verschillende soorten en omstandigheden. Je moet dus met die verschillen rekening houden en dat doen we in het nieuwe beleid. Dat begon met het Oostzeeplan: dat vormde de basis voor dit Noordzeeplan, en die basis is goed. Daarom steunen wij van harte het Noordzeeplan zoals het er nu ligt. We hebben ook veel waardering voor de opstelling en het werk van collega Rodust. We kunnen dat nu doen, want dit plan zet de ontwikkeling van een succesvoller Noordzeebeleid voort. Alle grote visbestanden in die zee zijn immers op peil.

Er is nog wel een zorg, Voorzitter, en dat betreft de hoorzitting die we vorige week in de Commissie visserij hebben gehouden. Toen zagen we dat er rondom de aanlandingsplichten nog veel vragen zijn. Die vragen moeten we wel met elkaar oplossen, anders kunnen er onhoudbare situaties ontstaan.

Nils Torvalds, *on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – Mr President, I would like to start with a thank you to Ulrike Rodust. Once again with her good cooperation we have been able to achieve something which is acceptable, if not perfect.

The CFP clearly sets out that all fish stocks shall be fished at sustainable levels before 2020. The North Sea map, just like the previous one for the Baltic Sea, unfortunately includes provisions allowing for fishing efforts up to F upper, under certain conditions. So, even if we are not very satisfied with this, we will vote for this agreement.

Special thanks goes to my colleagues from the Greens and the GUE: they have had the good taste to reintroduce one of my amendments. I'm sorry to say I won't vote for it because that would lead to the agreement falling, but big thanks to you Ulrike, and we'll try to go further in this direction.

Linnéa Engström, *för Verts/ALE-gruppen*. – Herr talman, herr kommissionär! Jag vill börja med att tacka Ulrike Rodust för det arbete som hon och hennes team har gjort med förvaltningsplanen för Nordsjön. Det var svårt eftersom fiskebestånden i kommissionens förslag i flera fall inte överensstämde med den indelning som Ices gör i sin beståndsrådgivning.

Vårt mål inom EU är att våra fiskebestånd ska återställas och bevaras över nivåer som säkerställer maximal hållbar avkastning. Det är ett utmärkt mål för det skulle betyda mer fiskrika bestånd, långt över dagens nivåer. Våra hav är vår jords lungor och dem behöver vi förvalta för kommande generationer. Mer fisk i havet leder också till mer lönsamt fiske. Det blir lättare att fånga fisken, vi spenderar mindre tid och bränsle och på så vis tjänar vi mer pengar.

Vi är besvikna över hur kommissionen formulerade sin fråga för beståndsuppskattning till havsforskningsrådet Ices. Ices råd tillåter att vi fiskar mer intensivt än vad som stipuleras i grundförordningen. Nordsjöplanen tillåter det, och bryter alltså mot grundförordningen. Parlamentet försökte länge att hålla emot ministerrådet i förhandlingarna på just denna punkt, i både Östersjöplanen och Nordsjöplanen, men misslyckades. Positivt är att fritidsfisket i Nordsjön ska inkluderas och räknas av mot kvot, enligt förslag från oss gröna.

Problemet finns i artikel 4.4 i Nordsjöplanen, och vi gröna har lagt ett ändringsförslag om att rösta bort denna artikel. De gröna kan inte stödja en plan som tillåter så intensivt fiske och kommer därför att rösta emot planen om artikeln inte utgår.

Anja Hazekamp, *namens de GUE/NGL-Fractie*. – Voorzitter, de Noordzee is een prachtig natuurgebied. Ze is zelfs het grootste natuurgebied van Nederland, met van oorsprong een grote soortenrijkdom die bescherming verdient.

Helaas wordt de Noordzee niet als zodanig beschermd en ook met dit plan krijgen de Noordzee en de dieren die daarin leven niet de bescherming die ze verdienen. Beschermingsmaatregelen voor haaien en roggen zijn zelfs geheel uit het oorspronkelijke voorstel weggestreept en met een truc wordt het mogelijk gemaakt om te blijven overbevissen, zelfs na 2020. Dit is in strijd met het gemeenschappelijk visserijbeleid en het is in strijd met de ontwikkelingsdoelen van de Verenigde Naties. Voorzitter, dat kunnen we als Parlement niet accepteren.

In september vorig jaar stemde een ruime meerderheid van het Parlement voor het stoppen van de overbevissing. De lidstaten weigerden hierover te praten. Nu is het de beurt aan het Parlement om voet bij stuk te houden. Wij geven geen toestemming voor overbevissing.

Voorts ben ik van mening dat de Europese landbouwsubsidies en visserijsubsidies moeten worden afgeschaft.

David Coburn, *on behalf of the EFDD Group*. – Thank you, Mr President. Commissioner, I told you in committee how the UK fishermen feel abused. You replied by telling me that you did not understand this. If you were being honest, that makes you particularly ill informed and unimaginative. If you are not, then it makes you a tendentious, disingenuous politician embodying everything wrong with the EU and its political class. To be frank, I think that trying to get you, Commissioner Vella, to understand how and why British fishermen feel abused is a little like trying to explain how to ride a bike to a shark.

So let me be clear, or try to be clear: if you want Members to stay in a club when they feel abused, unhappy and invisible you first listen to them – especially the complaints about abuse; you have an honest discussion about change; you agree changes, which recognise their critique, especially when you know it is accurate and makes sense; and you make the improvements as quickly as you can. You do not: deny the validity of what they say; tell them they agreed to this and cannot question it; tell them that they have no justification for feeling abused; be unpleasant and nasty to them in the departure discussions from the EU, in the belief that it might cause them to change their minds or 'pour encourager les autres'.

This North Sea plan exposes this place for what it is: an abuser in denial. The fishermen of Britain will no longer be oppressed; the fishermen of Britain will not be denied. We reject the plan. We reject the Common Fisheries Policy. Now the SNP in Scotland want to hand over our fishing to the EU. Ruth Davidson's remainder Conservatives want to hand fishing over to the EU as well. But UKIP wants our fishing grounds controlled by Britain and by nobody else. And I have a little book here I shall send up to my SNP colleague Mr Hudghton for his edification, I'm sure he'll enjoy it.

President. – That reminds me that some sharks have been discovered with bicycles in their bellies.

Sylvie Goddyn, *au nom du groupe ENF*. – Monsieur le Président, partagée entre sept États membres et la Norvège, la mer du Nord est assez représentative des pêcheries européennes. Les espèces pêchées y sont nombreuses. On peut citer, par exemple, le cabillaud, le lieu noir, le merlan, la sole, la plie ou encore la langoustine. Et c'est cette variété des espèces qui fait de la mer du Nord une pêcherie mixte, c'est-à-dire une pêcherie où l'on capture plusieurs espèces en même temps.

Paradoxalement, cela entraîne une difficulté pour les pêcheurs, qui se heurtent à ce qu'on appelle les «quotas limitants». Cette expression technique désigne un problème pratique. Chaque fois qu'un navire relève ses engins de pêche, sa capture est constituée d'un mélange de différentes espèces. En principe, les pêcheurs doivent cesser leur campagne dès qu'un seul quota applicable à une espèce est épuisé, d'autant que l'obligation de débarquement leur interdit de rejeter toute prise dépassant le quota.

C'est pourquoi ce plan, malgré ses imperfections, sa technicité et ses contraintes, est finalement un moindre mal pour les pêcheurs. Il limite l'impact des quotas limitants en assouplissant la gestion des prises accessoires, notamment en autorisant, dans une certaine mesure, les rejets en mer, mais aussi en permettant l'échange des possibilités de pêche entre États membres, ainsi qu'avec des pays tiers.

Enfin, ce plan a bien sûr un caractère pluriannuel, ce qui devrait permettre de donner plus de stabilité et de visibilité aux pêcheurs. Il est en effet important que la fluctuation des possibilités de pêche pour tel ou tel stock ne soit pas brutale d'une année sur l'autre.

Toutes ces mesures convergent donc vers une plus grande souplesse et une plus grande visibilité au profit des pêcheurs. Nous voterons donc en faveur de ce plan.

Gabriel Mato (PPE). – Señor presidente, señor comisario, el plan del mar del Norte supone el segundo en relación con los planes multianuales después del Báltico, y la preocupación fundamental por el precedente que pudiera suponer para futuros planes del Atlántico es que no se afronta —y mucho menos se resuelve— la problemática de las pesquerías mixtas. Los pescadores de la Unión Europea tendrán que hacer frente a estas complejidades de forma prioritaria y, fundamentalmente, tras la obligación de desembarque.

Siempre teniendo en cuenta la perspectiva de estos precedentes, si consideramos el artículo 5 del mismo, que establece que otras especies demersales no objetivo se deben gestionar con base en el rendimiento máximo sostenible, o el artículo 6, según el cual otras especies acompañantes se basarán en el enfoque de precaución, el efecto conseguido es que la pesquería de la especie principal pasará a gestionarse a través de las especies más limitantes, al combinar un TAC insuficiente con la obligación de desembarque. Esto no se soluciona y se va a agravar.

En un tono más positivo, quisiera agradecer la labor de todos los que han trabajado en este tema y acoger con satisfacción el establecimiento de rangos de valores que son coherentes con el logro del rendimiento máximo sostenible y, además, considerando aspectos socioeconómicos y logrando niveles sostenibles de todas las poblaciones cubiertas por el plan.

Ian Hudghton (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, four decades of the CFP have been marked by failure, and the impact of that failure on attitudes towards the EU in our fishing communities should not be underestimated. Ironically, just as the CFP is moving, albeit slowly, towards a more regionalised and decentralised model, the UK is leaving the EU. Nonetheless, the provisional agreement on the North Sea does offer a potential improvement in the management of the EU's North Sea fisheries. But this multiannual plan will inevitably become less important when the UK leaves the EU and when the majority of North Sea stocks become shared stocks within the terms of international law.

It is therefore imperative that meaningful progress is made in planning for post-Brexit fisheries management and therefore that the UK Government makes up its mind what its attitude will be in such negotiations. But ultimately, in my view, my hope is that Scotland will choose to become a normal independent nation again, able to set and pursue our own priorities and negotiations with our neighbours.

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

David Coburn (EFDD), blue-card question. – Thank you, Ian, for taking my question. We may be opponents but we always get on fairly well. But, Ian, how can you call yourself a Scottish Nationalist when you want to hand over our fishing grounds to the European Union? Surely what you really are is a Euro Nationalist, not a Scottish Nationalist? Please enlighten me.

(Interjection by the President: 'If it's possible')

Ian Hudghton (Verts/ALE), blue-card answer. – It may be useful to put some facts on record, and not for the first time. Some 20 years ago my predecessor as SNP MEP for the North East of Scotland, Allan Macartney, led in our Fisheries Committee a report calling for zonal management of fisheries. At that time the Commission and the Council, including the UK Government, failed to embrace the idea. Again, a little over 10 years ago at the previous CFP reform I voted against Parliament's position at that time, because it did not go far enough in calling for decentralised management of fisheries and therefore more input for Scotland. Again that was not embraced by the Council, including the UK Government.

One of the principal reasons that the CFP has been a failure for Scotland and indeed for many other areas is because successive UK governments have helped to construct it that way.

Mireille D'Ornano (EFDD). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, dans la mesure où la gestion des stocks halieutiques est une compétence exclusive de l'Union européenne, les actes législatifs adoptés doivent être les plus pertinents scientifiquement. Aussi, j'approuve la volonté de définir la notion de « meilleur avis scientifique disponible », en reliant celle-ci aux avis scientifiques revus par le Conseil international pour l'exploration de la mer, compétent en la matière. J'adhère également à l'idée d'une gestion des stocks concertée avec des pays tiers, tels que la Norvège ou le Royaume-Uni, qui, bientôt, quittera l'Union européenne.

En réalité, la gestion des stocks démersaux de la mer du Nord ne concerne qu'une minorité d'États membres et, dans le même temps, nécessite une gestion commune au-delà de la seule Union européenne. Aussi, l'exploitation durable des ressources biologiques marines sont la preuve que l'action concrète entre États relève de l'évidence et que l'Union européenne n'est donc pas l'alpha et l'oméga de la coopération.

Intervenții la cerere

Νότης Μαρτιάς (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, το πολυετές σχέδιο για τη διαχείριση των αλιευτικών αποθεμάτων στη Βόρεια Θάλασσα είναι μία σημαντική πρωτοβουλία καθώς, βεβαίως, αφορά οκτώ κράτη, τα οποία δεν είναι όλα και κράτη μέλη της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης. Δεύτερον, βασίζεται και στην εμπειρία που είχαμε από το αντίστοιχο σχέδιο για τη Βαλτική. Υπάρχουν προβλήματα τεχνικά, τα οποία πρέπει να επιλυθούν, όπως είναι τα μεικτά αλιεύματα και ο περιορισμός στις εκφορτώσεις, διότι θα πρέπει να γίνει ένας διαχωρισμός ανάμεσα στα βασικά αλιεύματα και στα παρεμπίπτοντα αλιεύματα. Από κει και πέρα, υπάρχουν κατά τη γνώμη μου και πολιτικά προβλήματα τα οποία θα ανακύψουν, κυρίως, μετά το Brexit, καθώς είναι δεδομένο ότι θα πρέπει να βρεθεί μία λύση για το πώς θα γίνει η διαχείριση των αλιευτικών αποθεμάτων. Μην ξεχνούμε ότι και προ της ένταξης του Ηνωμένου Βασιλείου στην τότε ΕΟΚ είχαμε αρκετά προβλήματα και συγκρούσεις μεταξύ, κυρίως, του Ηνωμένου Βασιλείου και της Γαλλίας.

João Ferreira (GUE/NGL). – Senhor Presidente, os planos plurianuais constituem instrumentos de gestão de pescarias com indiscutíveis virtudes, capazes de fornecer alguma estabilidade temporal à atividade da pesca, por natureza marcada pela instabilidade, o que a mera adoção do sistema taxi quotas por si só não garante, mas a aprovação de mais este plano plurianual torna inevitável que, mais uma vez, se faça a constatação dos limites impostos por um quadro institucional que, erradamente, define a gestão dos recursos vivos marinhos como uma competência exclusiva da União Europeia.

Tal tem vindo a determinar, no essencial, a persistência de um sistema de gestão de pescas centralizado, desadequado face aos interesses da pesca local, particularmente da pesca de pequena escala, que privilegia a pesca industrial, a par de uma definição nem sempre solidamente sustentada do ponto de vista científico de metas de gestão.

Os proclamados objetivos de regionalização ou mesmo descentralização da política comum das pescas redundaram numa mão cheia de nada, uma realidade indissociável do aprofundamento da asfixia económica e social da pesca e das comunidades costeiras.

(Încheierea intervențiilor la cerere)

Karmenu Vella, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, honourable Members, thank you very much for your interventions and also for your valuable views. I have taken due note of this very interesting debate and also of your general overall support.

Let me reiterate: it is of utmost importance that the multiannual plans are made fit for purpose. To ensure this, they must focus on the tools to ensure a practical and sustainable management framework which also allows for flexibilities for our mixed demersal fisheries. The co-legislators have achieved this with the North Sea plan, and I didn't see any major substantial divergences.

So finally, let me express also my hope that the European Parliament would also work – and we are prepared to continue working with the European Parliament – on the other multiannual plans as well. Multiannual plans that we have proposed so that they can be adopted and also so that stakeholders can make full use of these plans as well as to agree on tailor-made decisions, for example for the multiannual plan for the Western waters.

Again, my thanks to the rapporteur, Ulrike Rodust, and also to the shadow rapporteurs.

Președintele. – Dezbaterăa a fost închisă.

Votul va avea loc mâine, 29 mai 2018.

24. Optimierung der Wertschöpfungskette in der EU-Fischereibranche – Übereinstimmung von Fischereierzeugnissen mit den Kriterien für den Zugang zum EU-Markt (Aussprache)

Președintele. – Următorul punct de pe ordinea de zi este dezbaterăa comună a rapoartelor:

— raportul Clarei Eugenia Aguilera García, în numele Comisiei pentru pescuit, referitor la optimizarea lanțului valoric în sectorul pescuitului din UE (2017/2119(INI)) (A8-0163/2018),

— raportul Linnéai Engström, în numele Comisiei pentru pescuit, referitor la punerea în aplicare a măsurilor de control pentru stabilirea conformității produselor pescărești cu criteriile de acces la piața UE (2017/2129(INI)) (A8-0156/2018).

Clara Eugenia Aguilera García, ponente. – Señor presidente, señorías, el sector pesquero de la Unión está afrontando retos cada día más difíciles y complejos, como son el estado de los recursos, el aumento de los gastos, las variaciones a la baja de las cuotas de pesca y la competencia que suponen las importaciones de productos de países terceros. Todo esto condiciona los ingresos de nuestros pescadores y hace que las comunidades pesqueras se enfrenten a situaciones complicadas.

Este informe analiza los puntos clave para optimizar la cadena de valor de los productos pesqueros en la Unión Europea, es decir, para detectar qué se puede mejorar para que procesadores y pescadores locales retengan la mayor parte del valor generado. Entre las propuestas, cabe destacar algunas de ellas.

Así, hay que señalar el importante papel que juegan las organizaciones de productores en este sector. Hay que facilitar la creación de organizaciones de productores, eliminar las trabas burocráticas y dotarlas de un mayor empoderamiento, facilitando el acceso a la ayuda financiera. Un elemento esencial es que se incluya la cadena de valor dentro de los planes de producción y comercialización de las organizaciones de productores, con el objetivo de adaptar la oferta a la demanda, garantizar a los pescadores una renta equitativa y que los consumidores europeos encuentren productos que satisfagan sus necesidades.

Otra cuestión clave es que se revise el sistema de etiquetado en un aspecto que les voy a mencionar. Por ejemplo, el de la zonificación de la FAO que se incluye en ese etiquetado. Esta zonificación se creó hace más de setenta años con el objetivo de informar sobre capturas, pero no está prevista ni diseñada para orientar al consumidor. Por lo tanto, no apunta y abunda en la información.

Por otro lado, es necesario establecer mecanismos que mejoren el precio de venta, a fin de que se beneficie a los pescadores, aumentando la remuneración por su trabajo, y se promueva una distribución justa y adecuada del valor añadido en toda la cadena de valor del sector. El sector pesquero de la Unión necesita organizaciones interprofesionales, instrumento esencial para reforzar a las organizaciones de productores y dotarlas de un mayor poder de negociación.

Otra reclamación que queremos hacer desde este Parlamento, y que este Parlamento viene haciendo desde siempre, es que, tal y como se prevé en la normativa comunitaria, se ofrezca un acceso preferencial real a las oportunidades de pesca para las embarcaciones de pequeña escala y artesanales de la Unión Europea, algo que los Estados miembros no hacen. Una lacra que tienen hoy en día los profesionales del sector pesquero, y especialmente importante para los jóvenes, es que actualmente no tienen acceso a programas de formación, y, por lo tanto, no se pueden atender las necesidades del sector.

Reclamamos asimismo que se incluya el enfoque de género de forma transversal en todas las políticas de la Unión, y en este caso, específicamente en la política pesquera común. Es esencial que se visualice el importante papel de las mujeres en el sector de la pesca de la Unión y se fortalezca de esta manera su posición.

Además, es necesario mejorar y coordinar, a nivel de la UE, la lucha contra las prácticas comerciales desleales.

Aprovecho la ocasión para denunciar, también desde aquí, el recorte de los fondos para el nuevo marco financiero que va a sufrir este sector en la Unión. Se trata de un Fondo muy pequeño— para el que está previsto un recorte de 260 millones de euros en la propuesta del marco financiero— y que espero que el comisario Vella defienda ante el resto del Colegio de Comisarios.

Quiero, finalmente, agradecer el trabajo de los ponentes alternativos y de todas aquellas personas que han trabajado para obtener un buen resultado final, que espero sea aprobado mayoritariamente.

Linnéa Engström, föredragande. – Herr talman, herr kommissionär! Fisk är en av de mest handlade råvarorna globalt, och EU utgör den största och mest lukrativa marknaden för fisk i världen. 2016 importerade vi 8,8 miljoner ton fisk- och vattenbruksprodukter, att jämföra med EU-produktionen på 6,2 miljoner ton. Vårt beroende av import är stort då 60 procent av fisken vi äter är fiskad utanför unionens vatten. EU:s stora behov av fisk- och vattenbruksprodukter har en tydlig inverkan på handelspolitiken inom EU.

EU:s fiskeflottor styrs av ett komplext regelverk; den gemensamma fiskeripolitiken med tillhörande kontrollförfordning. Dessutom måste EU:s fartyg också respektera en rad andra regelverk som arbetsnormer, krav på utbildning, fartygssäkerhet, miljölagstiftning, beskattningsregler och sanitära krav. Allt detta för att vi som konsumenter ska kunna känna oss säkra på kvaliteten hos fisk och skaldjur, men också på att fisken har fångats på ett sätt som respekterar våra arbetslagar, miljömässiga normer och andra regler som är standard inom EU.

Men i fiskdisken, där finns också produkter som har ett annat ursprung, de importerade produkterna. Det gäller både färsk och frusen fisk men också förädlade produkter som fiskpinnar, fiskgratänger eller importerade skaldjur och bläckfisk. För flera av dessa produkter är kraven för produktionen lägre, vilket gör att de kan konkurrera med ett lägre pris än vad fisk som fångats inom EU kan. Vi skapar en obalans på marknaden som i många fall missgynnar EU-fångad fisk, som dras med högre kostnader för att uppfylla alla krav och normer. En stor del av fisken som importeras kommer från länder som fiskar ansvarsfullt, men fortfarande dras branschen med stora problem med olagligt, orapporterat och oregerat fiske, och i vissa fall handlar det om produkter som bygger på ren slavverksamhet inom fiskenäringen. I ljuset av att mer än 30 procent av världens fiskbestånd är överfiskade och nästan 60 procent fiskas på gränsen till vad som är hållbart är det rimligt att vi ser över vilka krav vi måste ställa på den fisk som ska få tillträde till EU:s marknad genom import.

Detta betänkande har gjort en genomlysning av vilka krav som ställs på importen i dag och kommer med förslag för att fylla de luckor i regelverket som vi har uppmärksammat. Jag vill passa på att tacka alla kollegor som deltagit och lagt ändringsförslag för att förbättra betänkandet. De krav som EU ställer på importerad fisk är främst att den ska måste vara lagligt fångad – och det försöker vi säkerställa genom vår IUU-förordning – och att fisken uppfyller sanitära krav.

Vad gäller timmer ställer EU krav på spårbarhet och på att aktörerna i försäljningskedjan i möjligaste mån ska kunna garantera att produkten är lagligt avverkad, så kallad tillbörlig aktsamhet. Samma system ska införas för konfliktmetaller. Kommissionen borde undersöka om fiske också skulle kunna dra nytta av liknande krav på tillbörlig aktsamhet för att motverka illegalt fiske och för att EU:s konsumenter ska kunna känna sig trygga med att den fisk de köper är lagligt och hållbart fiskad.

Konsumentinformationen måste bli bättre. I dag finns det inga krav för processade, konserverade eller bearbetade produkter. Det borde till exempel vara obligatoriskt att ange flaggstat för det fartyg som fångat fisken.

Vad gäller arbetsnormer så är det fortfarande många medlemsländer så måste göra hemläxan och snarast se till att ratificera och införa olika konventioner som gäller fiskare.

Det är viktigt att kommissionen fortsätter att utöva påtryckningar på andra stater för att genomföra åtgärder som förhindrar att illegalt fångad fisk kommer in på deras marknader. Som största marknad för fisk i världen kan EU ställa krav, och det är så vi höjer standarder för förvaltning av fisk globalt.

Vi har ju kommit med en rad förslag och förbättringar i det här betänkandet, men jag hinner inte gå igenom alla dem nu. Det finns otroligt mycket att hämta här och jag hoppas verkligen att kommissionen använder sig av detta betänkande och tar dem vidare.

Karmenu Vella, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, honourable Members, in this joint debate let me follow your order. I would like first to thank MEP Aguilera Garcia, the rapporteur on optimisation of the value chain in the European Union fishing sector, and the Committee on Fisheries for their report on this very important issue. I fully concur with many of the points made in the report, and I would highlight three main areas where we have to continue working in order to deliver efficient value chains that allow fishermen to share the opportunities of our internal market. These three points are: first, strengthening the structuring of our sector; second, providing fishermen with adequate tools to operate in the market; and third, ensuring an adequate legal framework.

First point: strengthening the structuring of the sector. I share your opinion that producer organisations and inter-branch organisations, by increasing the bargaining power of fishermen, can help them to take the most from the fishery value chains. I believe the common market regulation has already simplified procedures for the recognition of such organisations and reduced the administrative burden significantly.

First, the minimum representativeness criteria for producer organisations are no longer set at EU level but at national level, which allows Member States to take into account local specificities.

Second, the production and marketing plans as provided under the common market regulations give full flexibility to the producer organisations concerning the tools available to improve their management and marketing activities. Support to these plans is provided under the EMFF.

Thirdly, we are also aware that more cross-border cooperation is needed, since we have an EU single market. Therefore we welcome the European Parliament's request to carry out a pilot project to promote transnational cooperation among professional organisations.

The second point: providing fishermen with adequate tools to operate in the market. I believe we should provide fishermen with the tools which allow them to choose what is best for them – but we should not make that choice for them by imposing measures. Production and marketing plans are the most flexible tool we can give to producer organisations to design better sales strategies that increase the profits of their members. I believe the flexibility of these plans should stay as it is, precisely given the complexity and variety of value chains across the EU.

I recognise that the issue of market transparency is a critical one if we are to empower small-scale fishermen to exploit the value chains. The Commission has been producing a lot of information through its market observatory for fishery and aquaculture products. But here again, we can do more.

Let me also recall that we will begin in a few days to survey EU consumer habits regarding fish products. This will allow us to detect trends in demand. And we are also planning to provide analysis on online sales strengths. Funding is also an important element. The current EMFF provides a wide array of measures to small scale fisheries to become more competitive – especially to young fishermen – and I think we should build on these positive elements.

The recent proposal for the next MFF confirms this trend in terms of simplification, and I think this is a positive development for both Member States and the sector.

The third point, which is the legal framework: as regards the need to ensure the adequacy of the existing legal framework, we have recently launched an evaluation of the marketing standards that apply to fishery products to see whether they can ensure fair competition in the EU market to improve the profitability of production, and whether they can deliver a level playing field with imported products.

We have also started to collect evidence on the labelling of fish products and in particular on the provision of information on the origin of the fish, which is an essential element for consumers to adequately value local products. However, I do not think that the Commission should create a specific logo for small-scale fisheries. Consumer demands varies significantly across the EU, and the relevance of such logos must be measured against the market that operators target.

I also do not think that we should take a more interventionist approach and impose caps on the profits that operators in the supply chain make. If these profits are the result of effective marketing activities, the operators should be rewarded for their work. If the profits derive from unfair behaviour, action is needed, and this is precisely why fishery and aquaculture products are covered by the recent Commission proposal on unfair trading practices in the food supply chain.

I believe the EU internal market offers great opportunities to fishermen. We all share the obligation to support our fishermen in making full use of these opportunities and to ensure that the conditions in which they operate are fair. The EU is the largest market for fisheries products in the world, absorbing a quarter of all imports, and that brings me to the report of MEP Engström. I would like to thank MEP Engström for the report, which touches upon a variety of important issues across different policies such as fisheries, trade, food safety and labour standards. The points addressed in your report are of great relevance today, as the EU depends on imports for almost 60% of the total consumed fisheries and aquaculture products. Plus there is a high number of non-EU vessels authorised to export fishery products directly to the EU.

Let me briefly share with you where we already concentrate our efforts to regulate imports and to ensure that imported fish products meet high standards. The fisheries control system and our policy to fight illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing play a key role in this regard. The introduction of the current control system clearly improved the control of fisheries and compliance with the CFP, but more efforts by Member States are necessary to ensure full compliance.

As you know, we are finalising the revision of the control system to improve the current rules, including in areas highlighted in this report, such as the sanctioning and enforcement system and traceability rules, as well as better use of new technologies, including for small-scale vessels. We will adopt this proposal still this week.

The Commission is also working on the development of an EU-wide database for the management of IUU catch to support Member States' risk-based controls. This should lead to a reduction in the opportunities for fraudulent imports, and it should ease the administrative burden for Member States in terms of verifications. One of the purposes of this system is to ensure that illegally-caught fish does not enter the EU market, neither at the first port of entry nor at any other port of entry subsequently.

As regards marketing standards, I take note that your report calls for an improvement in the labelling of fishery and aquaculture products, including those prepared and canned products that today are excluded from the obligation of informing consumers about where they come from.

On sanitary requirements, your report acknowledges that the system and the procedures for inspecting and authorising the placing of fish onto the EU market generally functions well. The EU system has indeed been very successful in granting a high level of consumer protection for almost 30 years. Only third countries demonstrating that the legislation on fishery products and their control system are equivalent to the EU are allowed to export to the EU.

The EU verifies the application of the EU rules in third countries via audits that are regularly carried out in the exporting countries with respect to hygiene requirements for vessels and establishments, but also their enforcement. Controls at the EU borders are very strict for all imported commodities and especially for food of animal origin. The Rapid Alert System for Food and Feed informs all Member States and third countries as regards non-conformities found at the moment of import or on the market and allows them to take the appropriate actions.

And finally, as regards labour standards, the Commission attaches high importance to the social dimension of the CFP, in particular to ensuring fair and safe working conditions in the fishing sector. The Commission welcomes the references in the report, reminding Member States of the need to ratify international conventions related to safety and working conditions and to promote ratification internationally, as well as to cooperate actively with other Commission services and with the social partners, notably in the context of the social dialogue.

I have raised this very issue with Member States at the Fisheries Council in March, and I have written, together with Commissioner Bulc, to all ministers responsible for transport and for fisheries. However, so far only one Member State has actually set the ratifications as a priority for early 2019. This lack of response and of interest gives the impression that ensuring fair and safe working conditions in the fishing sector is not a priority for Member States, and this is very disappointing. I am therefore extremely grateful for the European Parliament's support in this respect, but also for the strong support shown by stakeholders during the high-level discussions organised by the Commission at the recent Seafood Expo in Brussels where, together with key players, we managed to increase international awareness on the issue of labour standards.

PRESIDE: RAMÓN LUIS VALCÁRCEL SISO*Vicepresidente*

Francisco José Millán Mon, *en nombre del Grupo PPE*. – Señor presidente, gracias, en primer lugar, a la ponente, señora Engström, por sus esfuerzos como ponente.

Ya se ha dicho que la Unión Europea es el primer importador de productos pesqueros del mundo. Por ello, es necesario asegurar que los productos importados cumplan efectivamente unos estándares de sostenibilidad, trazabilidad y seguridad alimentaria equivalentes a los de la Unión Europea. Así protegemos a nuestros consumidores y, al mismo tiempo, evitamos que nuestra flota perciba que recibe un trato desigual o discriminatorio.

Es por ello necesario homogeneizar los controles en toda la Unión Europea veremos qué propuesta presenta, señor comisario, la semana próxima; lo que no puede suceder es que productos que se rechazan en la frontera de un país miembro sean admitidos luego en otro.

En esta línea de apoyar a nuestro sector pesquero e industria transformadora, los acuerdos de libre comercio con algunos países, sobre todo asiáticos, tienen que tratar a nuestros productos pesqueros como sensibles, y no verse arrasados por la competencia asiática. La comisaria de Comercio en estas negociaciones debe estar en estrecho contacto y coordinación con usted, señor comisario, y yo celebro que estos dos aspectos los recoja el informe que votaremos el miércoles.

Finalmente, quiero pedir el apoyo para la enmienda que he presentado con mi Grupo, que quiere poner en valor los productos de la flota de la UE que, como es sabido, cumple altos estándares. La fórmula sería, señor comisario, que la Comisión estudie la posibilidad de introducir una etiqueta específica para los productos de la UE, de forma que el consumidor conozca mejor el valor de estos productos de la Unión Europea.

Ricardo Serrão Santos, *em nome do Grupo S&D*. – Senhor Presidente, Senhor Comissário, quero também cumprimentar e felicitar as duas relatoras destes dois relatórios. Estamos, pois, neste debate, a discutir dois documentos sobre produtos de pesca, cadeia de valor, controlo e acesso a mercados. Tudo aspetos que têm particular relevância no contexto das regiões ultraperiféricas, como é o caso dos Açores de onde provenho. Como tal, as RUP são amplamente consideradas no articulado de ambos os relatórios deste Parlamento. Gostaria de reforçar que é determinante que seja devidamente apoiado o transporte de pescado das RUP até entrar nos mercados nacional e internacional, por forma a garantir uma concorrência leal com os outros produtos de pescado, quer seja ele fresco ou processado. Só assim se converge e se torna mais justo o acesso aos mercados e se mantém coesão na cadeia de valor.

Volto a realçar a possibilidade de criar um instrumento financeiro que conceda apoio específico ao setor das pescas, por exemplo, restaurando o POSEI pescas, com a capacidade de melhorar efetivamente o potencial das regiões ultraperiféricas em matéria de pesca comercial sustentável.

Peter van Dalen, *namens de ECR-Fractie*. – Voorzitter, ik denk dat het heel belangrijk is dat we de toegangscriteria voor visserijproducten tot de Europese Unie goed regelen, want de Europese Unie heeft een grote markt als het gaat om producten uit de visserij- en aquacultuurproducties. Er is al gewezen op de cijfers: met de import van deze producten vertegenwoordigen we een kwart van de totale globale markt en we zijn voor meer dan 60 % afhankelijk van de import van zeeproducten voor onze consumptie.

Daarom steun ik ook het verslag Engström, want de collega benadrukt dat geïmporteerde visserijproducten aan dezelfde eisen moeten voldoen als producten uit de Europese Unie. We moeten een gelijk speelveld creëren en dit verslag is een belangrijke stap op weg naar evenwicht tussen EU-producenten en niet-EU-producenten.

Wat de etikettering betreft, daar moeten we echt beter dan werken. Tot nu toe is slechts een kleine groep van producten geëtiketteerd, terwijl we eigenlijk de consumenten over alle producten wat visserij- een aquacultuur betreft goed moeten informeren. Dan gaat het over aanvullende eisen over waar het product vandaan komt, welke vlag er staat op het visserijvaartuig en ook moet op het etiket helder worden aangegeven of het een Europees vaartuig was of een niet-Europees vaartuig. Nou, we zijn er goed mee bezig en daarom geven we ook onze steun voor het verslag van collega Aguilera.

João Ferreira, *em nome do Grupo GUE/NGL*. – Senhor Presidente, o setor das pescas tem uma importância estratégica para o abastecimento público de pescado, para o equilíbrio da balança alimentar de vários Estados-Membros, para o desenvolvimento e o bem-estar das comunidades costeiras.

A insegurança dos rendimentos dos profissionais da pesca, decorrente da forma como é feita a comercialização no setor, do modo de formação dos preços na primeira venda e das características irregulares da atividade, implica, entre outros aspetos, a necessidade de manter um financiamento público adequado ao setor nacional e comunitário.

São necessários mecanismos que melhorem o preço de primeira venda, de modo a beneficiar os pescadores, aumentando a retribuição do seu trabalho e a promover uma justa e adequada distribuição do valor acrescentado pela cadeia de valor do setor, reduzindo as margens de intermediação, valorizando os preços pagos à produção e exercendo uma contenção dos preços pagos no consumo final.

É necessário melhorar a estabilidade dos mercados e apoiar a transformação e o desenvolvimento de novos produtos e formas de comercialização.

São propostas e contributos que o relatório acolheu e, por isso, gostaríamos de aqui o assinalar e valorizar.

Udo Voigt (NI). – Herr Präsident! Diese Entwürfe sind zum Nachteil der Küstenfischerei, der Kleinstbetriebe und der Freizeitfischerei, zugunsten des industriellen Fischfangs angelegt. Die industrielle Fischerei mit ihren Großfangflotten wühlt mit ihrem Fanggeschirr und ihren Schleppnetzen den Meeresboden bis zu einem Meter Tiefe auf. Sie vernichten gnadenlos alles, was dort lebt und wächst. In Ihrem Text, Frau García Pérez, heißt es wörtlich: „Der Plan trägt dazu bei, einen angemessenen Lebensstandard für die Menschen, die von der Fischerei abhängig sind, sicherzustellen.“ Er verschweigt aber, wie viele Existenzen bereits vernichtet wurden.

Die Küstenfischerei und deren Kleinstbetriebe gibt es seit Jahrhunderten, und sie stehen im Einklang mit dem Leben im Meer und der Natur. Gerade diese ganze Häfen und Küstenregionen prägende Fischerei hat mit einem solchen Entwurf keine Zukunft mehr. Daher lehne ich diesen Entwurf ab.

Jarosław Wałęsa (PPE). – Mr President, most importantly, a good job, Madam rapporteur, on the optimisation of the value chain. I fully support reciprocity when it comes to the trade agreements. Imported goods should fully comply with the same quality standard rules as EU fishing products. Tough competition, including from abroad, is a reality of many fishery businesses around Europe.

Secondly, we need to invest in young people, engage and empower the next generation of fishermen, but in order to achieve this, we need money for training and educational opportunities. At the same time, we need to conserve fisheries and support our coastal communities through research, education, outreach, as well as leadership development.

Lastly, I fully agree that we should expend and promote information provided by the EU Market Observatory for Fisheries and Aquaculture products (EUMOFA). Our job here is to study different dependencies and processes and to point out how best to maximise benefits for the sector.

Ruža Tomašić (ECR). – Poštovani predsjedavajući, ribarstvo je važna gospodarska grana za priobalne i otočke zajednice. Želimo li ih sačuvati, moramo osigurati uvjete da što veći udio vrijednosti stvorene u sektoru ribarstva ostane upravo ribarima i lokalnoj zajednici.

Optimizacija vrijednosnog lanca u ribarstvu važan je proces koji može osigurati održivost i tako spasiti brojne priobalne zajednice od depopulacije i odumiranja. Važno je smanjiti administrativno opterećenje te olakšati udruživanje u organizacije proizvođača i plasman ribe na tržište, ali i u javne ustanove u lokalnim sredinama.

U Hrvatskoj će sve ovo biti znatno otežano ako Komisija bude inzistirala na drastičnim kvotama za malu plavu ribu u Jadranu. Takvom bi politikom cijeli lanac bio ugrožen jer srdela i inćun, osim u izravnu preradu, idu i u preradu te tunogjilišta. Zato i ovim putem pozivam Komisiju da odustane od kvota i zajedno s Parlamentom i nacionalnim tijelima pronade bolje, održivo rješenje.

Intervenciones con arreglo al procedimiento de solicitud incidental de uso de la palabra («catch the eye»)

Nicola Caputo (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la Commissione europea, gli Stati membri e i governi regionali devono mettere in campo azioni di sostegno alla pesca su piccola scala che, come noto, sta attraversando da diversi anni un periodo di grande difficoltà, incoraggiando il consumo locale, la commercializzazione diretta e i canali commerciali a chilometro zero, nonché campagne promozionali realizzate anche in cooperazione con iniziative private intese a promuovere i prodotti alimentari locali.

Va promossa l'istituzione di organizzazioni di produttori, unico modo al mondo per conferire ai pescatori un maggiore potere negoziale. Vanno individuati i meccanismi per migliorare il prezzo di vendita, per consentire un'adeguata retribuzione per il lavoro dei pescatori, riducendo i margini per gli intermediari e valorizzando i prezzi pagati al produttore.

Infine voglio ribadire la mia preoccupazione relativamente alle importazioni dei prodotti della pesca che spesso sono soggette a minori controlli. L'Unione europea, anche al fine di favorire una concorrenza equa e leale, deve assolutamente assicurare su tutti i prodotti importati il rispetto delle norme dell'Unione europea in materia di conservazione e gestione, nonché i requisiti di igiene previsti dalla legislazione.

(Fin de las intervenciones con arreglo al procedimiento de solicitud incidental de uso de la palabra («catch the eye»))

Karmenu Vella, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, getting fishermen to work together in producer organisations should remain one of our primary objectives. We have very positive examples from across the EU of producer organisations bringing together small-scale fishermen which have succeeded in increasing their members' profits. These experiences can be replicated throughout the EU, and we will continue to work in this direction.

Giving fishermen the tools to understand the market in which they are operating is also crucial, but value chains across the EU are so varied and complex that an optimal exploitation of the opportunities can only be made by focusing on the specific characteristics of each chain and each destination market.

Funding to support small-scale fishermen is there and it allows them to promote their products and to improve their position in the value chains. Funding is extremely important to promote innovation, skills and community-led local development.

In terms of value and profit for the fishermen, I would highlight one key aspect which I found could be more present in your discussions. What benefits fishermen most of all is the state of the stocks upon which their livelihood depends. In order to build healthy stocks we need to have responsible fisheries, and all segments of the fleet should contribute towards that effort.

One of our key responsibilities remains to ensure that the context in which fishermen operate remains a fair and a transparent one. I have enumerated actions we have already taken or are starting at present, but we have to perform continuously.

Let me highlight that with regard to the conformity of fisheries products entering the EU market, the fight against illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing (IUU) remains one of our top priorities. We will continue to support third countries to take actions to prevent, deter and eliminate IUU fishing and to encourage other states to apply measures to prevent IUU-caught fishery products from entering their markets.

Speaking of the coordination between trade and fisheries policy, your report suggests that the EU approach to trade is frequently perceived as being counter-productive to good fisheries governance in the EU, as it opens up the EU market to fish products from countries which do not necessarily have the same standards as the EU. The EU's recent free trade agreements include provisions on sustainable fishing, and this in itself is already a great step forward. But we will continue to work to strengthen our trade partnerships by including legally binding provisions on sustainability. Those trade partners which are granted favourable access to the EU market and which are commercial fishing nations and interested in access to the EU market will have to be committed to the requirements of the EU's IUU regulation.

However, let me be clear that IUU and free trade agreements are two independent instruments, and that any decision within the IUU dialog will be taken regardless of the situation of trade negotiations.

As regards the origin of products, we are analysing what information would help consumers most to make informed choices. We will feed this analysis into the evaluation of the common market regulation which will be part of the future evaluation of the Common Fisheries Policy (CFP). The EU market is extremely dependent on imports since our demand significantly outweighs our production. Therefore our objective will always be to strike a fine balance between the requirements we set for the importing of products and the need to ensure the availability of supplies at reasonable prices for consumers.

Finally, let me welcome very much the references in the report reminding Member States of the need to ratify international conventions related, as I said in my previous speech, to safety and working conditions and also to promote ratification internationally, as well as to cooperate actively with other Commission services and with the social partners, notably in the context of the social dialogue.

Clara Eugenia Aguilera García, ponente. –Señor presidente, quiero mencionar en esta última intervención el informe de la señora Engström. Creo que se ha hecho un gran trabajo en este informe. Solo destacar una pequeña mención: este informe tiene como objetivo, claramente, llamar la atención sobre el hecho de que en la Unión Europea deben existir y se deben exigir las mismas normas para todos los productos comercializados en su territorio. Esto parece una obviedad, pero es un hecho que no se está produciendo.

Se debe exigir a todos los productos pesqueros de la Unión Europea que cumplan el mismo nivel de exigencia en relación con las medidas de gestión y conservación, así como normas de higiene y condiciones laborales. Esto ayudará a crear un mercado más justo y aumentará las normas de explotación de los recursos marinos en países terceros.

Por eso me parece un muy buen informe y lo voy a apoyar mañana en la votación.

Quisiera decir, finalmente, señor comisario, que reforzar las organizaciones de productores es, sin duda, un elemento sustancial.

Me hubiera gustado que hubiera dicho que vamos a tener esos 260 millones de euros que en la propuesta de marco financiero nos han restado para el sector, porque yo creo que, con un Fondo tan pequeño, no se debe hacer ningún recorte. Usted lo mencionaba, pero decía que el marco financiero tiene que evolucionar. Sí, evolución, sí; recorte, no.

También quisiera decir que creo que hay que hacer alguna apuesta más arriesgada en el tema del etiquetado. Yo mencionaba las zonas FAO: están hechas para otra cosa, no para dar claridad a los consumidores; yo creo que eso no contribuye a dar claridad. Por lo tanto, habrá que trabajarlo en el futuro, pero también en el etiquetado de los productos transformados de la pesca hay que hacer algunas modificaciones.

Y decir, finalmente, que lamento la noticia que usted nos ha dado hoy, aquí, sobre la necesaria ratificación de los convenios internacionales sobre seguridad y normas laborales. Es muy lamentable que la Comisión se haya dirigido a todos los Estados miembros y solo uno haya mostrado disponibilidad para contestar. Por tanto, espero que esto cambie, porque creo que es un elemento muy sustancial.

Linnéa Engström, föredragande. – Herr talman! Tack kära kollegor för all uppmuntran, och tack till kommissionär Vella också, för dina fina ord. Jag hoppas att mitt betänkande kan ge oss en översyn av vilka utmaningar vi står inför när det kommer till fiskprodukter på EU:s marknad och de dubbla standarder som fortfarande premierar importerade produkter framtagna under lägre standarder.

Det är viktigt att EU:s konsumenter känner att de kan lita på produkter på EU:s marknad, att de håller god kvalitet och att de produceras hållbart. I betänkandet finns många goda idéer som kommissionen kan arbeta vidare med för att höja standarden och kvalitetssäkra import av fiskeprodukter.

Det får inte vara så att listorna över fartyg som är godkända vad gäller EU:s hygienkrav blir en bakdörr in på EU:s marknad för mindre nogräknade fartyg som fiskar olagligt. Stämpeln från generaldirektoratet för hälsa och livsmedels-säkerhet blir indirekt en signal för EU:s tullmyndigheter att allt är i sin ordning. Tyvärr finns det i dag flera sådana exempel, särskilt för fartyg som fiskar i de fiskrika västafrikanska vattnen. Det beror på att de regionala fiskerierorganisationerna i Västafrika, Cefac och SRFC, inte för några listor över vilka fartyg som fiskar olagligt. Eftersom inte heller EU för någon lista över fartyg som fiskar olagligt i regionen kommer fisk som fångats av sådana fartyg inte att nekas tillträde till EU:s marknad om de samtidigt finns på listan över fartyg som klarar hygienkraven. Samordningen måste bli bättre för att stoppa denna typ av skeva förhållanden.

Det är också ologiskt att tredje land som varnats av EU för risken att drabbas av handelssanktioner av EU inom ramen för IUU-förordningen samtidigt förhandlar om frihandelsavtal. Detta måste samordnas bättre inom EU, mellan kommissionens olika enheter, så att det blir logiskt och sänder en tydlig signal att EU inte accepterar olaglig fisk på sin marknad.

Än en gång, stort tack för alla värdefulla kommentarer och uppmuntran. Jag hoppas att vi kan jobba vidare med idéerna i det här Engström-betänkandet på ett positivt sätt, inte minst när det kommer till kontrollförordningen.

El presidente. – Se cierra el debate conjunto.

La votación del informe de Clara Eugenia Aguilera García tendrá lugar mañana martes y la votación del informe de Linnéa Engström tendrá lugar el miércoles.

25. Ernährung und Landwirtschaft der Zukunft (Aussprache)

El presidente. – El punto siguiente en el orden del día es el debate sobre el informe de Herbert Dorfmann, en nombre de la Comisión de Agricultura y Desarrollo Rural, sobre el futuro de los alimentos y de la agricultura (2018/2037(INI)) (A8-0178/2018).

Herbert Dorfmann, Berichterstatter. – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar, geschätzte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Ich möchte eingangs allen Schattenberichterstattern herzlich danken, die mir sehr geholfen haben, in den letzten Monaten in einer sehr intensiven Arbeit diesen Bericht zu machen. Der Kommissar hat ja in einem Bericht neue Ideen über die Zukunft der GAP vorgestellt und dort die Idee eines *new delivery model* vorgestellt. Er hat zu einer neuen Beziehung zwischen der Europäischen Union und den Mitgliedstaaten und den Regionen aufgerufen, wenn es um die Gemeinsame Agrarpolitik geht. Wir verschließen uns einer solchen Idee nicht vollständig. Aber ich glaube, das „G“ in GAP, also das Gemeinsame – die Tatsache, dass die Gemeinsame Agrarpolitik eine gemeinsame Politik sein muss, – muss weiterhin erhalten bleiben. Und wir müssen auch die Zuständigkeit der Regionen und der Länder im Bereich der Landwirtschaft weiterhin gewährleisten.

Aber lassen Sie mich zur ersten Säule der GAP kommen, also zu jenem Bereich, wo am meisten Geld in der Gemeinsamen Agrarpolitik ausgegeben wird. Ich denke, da sollten wir uns einfach die Frage stellen: Welche Landwirtschaft wollen wir eigentlich in Europa? Und wir sollten eine Landwirtschaft fördern, die aufbaut auf bäuerlichen Familienbetrieben, eine Landwirtschaft, die nachhaltig ist, eine Landwirtschaft, die auch innovativ ist, die unsere Kulturlandschaft prägt, und auch eine Landwirtschaft, die attraktiv ist für junge Menschen, welche morgen Landwirtschaft in Europa weitermachen können.

Wenn wir eine solche Landwirtschaft wollen, dann müssen wir über ein paar Dinge in der ersten Säule nachdenken, dann brauchen wir eine gerechte Verteilung der Geldmittel zwischen den Mitgliedstaaten. Und gerecht kann nicht unbedingt bedeuten, dass alle gleich viel bekommen, aber die Bezahlungen müssen mindestens gleichwertig sein. Wir brauchen eine gerechtere Verteilung der Geldmittel in den Mitgliedstaaten, vor allem dort, wo bei der Berechnung der Zahlungsansprüche noch ein historischer Ansatz besteht. Wir müssen dafür sorgen, dass das Geld effektiv bei den Bäuerinnen und Bauern ankommt und nicht bei jenen, die Zahlungsansprüche in der Hand haben und damit ihre Rendite schaffen. Wir brauchen gekoppelte Zahlungen, die nicht wettbewerbsverzerrend sind. Hier haben wir einiges zu tun, wenn wir schauen, was derzeit passiert.

Und wir brauchen auch – und das gefällt nicht allen – eine klare Degressivität, und wir brauchen auch eine effiziente Deckelung. Und eine effiziente Deckelung bedeutet, dass sie auch wirken muss, dass es also nicht nur auf dem Papier steht, so wie es heute ist. Wir brauchen eine neue grüne Architektur. Eine neue grüne Architektur bedeutet, dass wir in der ersten Säule eine klare Konditionalität, also klare Umweltauflagen brauchen und dass wir starke Agrarumweltprogramme in der zweiten Säule brauchen. Die grüne Architektur, die Nachhaltigkeit darf nicht weniger werden, aber sie muss effizienter und sie muss einfacher werden.

Zwei Worte zur zweiten Säule: Die zweite Säule ist wichtig, und wir müssen die zweite Säule deutlich entbürokratisieren, verschlanken und einfacher machen. Wir müssen in der zweiten Säule Anreize für nachhaltige Landwirtschaft schaffen, also für wirkliche, gute Agrarumweltprogramme, und wir müssen auch schauen, dass benachteiligte Gebiete ihre Rolle spielen können und aus der zweiten Säule die Geldmittel bekommen, die sie brauchen.

Einige Worte noch zur Marktpolitik: Wir haben heute noch gemeinsame Marktverordnungen in wenigen Sektoren: im Bereich Wein und im Bereich Obst und Gemüse. Die sollten wir weiterführen, und wir sollten sogar darüber nachdenken, ob wir zum Beispiel das Modell im Bereich Obst und Gemüse auch auf andere Sektoren ausdehnen könnten, zum Beispiel auf den Bereich Milch im Berggebiet.

Lassen Sie mich zwei Worte noch über die Finanzierung dieser ganzen Politik sagen: Selbstverständlich braucht diese Politik Geld, und das, was derzeit auf dem Tisch liegt – der Vorschlag des Haushaltskommissars –, kann aus landwirtschaftlicher Sicht nicht akzeptiert werden. Vor allem kann nicht akzeptiert werden, dass die zweite Säule deutlich stärker gekürzt wird als die erste Säule. Ich glaube, das ist nicht innovativ, und es ist nicht zukunftsträchtig. Es kann auch nicht sein, dass die Bauern jetzt die Rechnung für den Brexit bezahlen. Sie werden ja auch die sein, die, wenn es wirklich zu Marktverzerrungen kommt, am meisten unter dem Brexit leiden werden.

Insgesamt, glaube ich, ist es uns schon gelungen, hier eine gute Vorlage zu liefern. Ich hoffe, Herr Kommissar, dass Sie in Ihren Legislativvorschlägen, die wir in wenigen Tagen bekommen werden, dann unsere Vorschläge auch berücksichtigen werden.

Phil Hogan, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, I wish to thank the rapporteur, Mr Herbert Dorfmann, for this report, which is the outcome of a very intensive debate that you have been having over the last number of months, pointing to the importance of the future of EU agriculture and the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) as an enabling framework.

I also want to complement Mr Dorfmann and all of the shadow rapporteurs and the membership of the Committee on Agriculture, and Rural Development (AGRI) for the efficiency with which they have gone about their work, culminating in what I hope will be a very strong endorsement of this report when you vote here on Wednesday.

There is much that we could say in detailed response to the report, not least at this evening's debate, which comes in the same week that the Commission, hopefully, is going to adopt and indeed publish the long-awaited legislative proposals on the future of the CAP. I do not want to pre-empt those proposals, which the Commission will publish; however, what I can say is that we have been following very carefully and listening very carefully to the views of the AGRI Committee, to the views of Mr Dorfmann and the shadow rapporteurs in the context of this report. We have met regularly and frequently. When you see the Commission's proposals on publication, you will see very strong similarities between the content of this report and the recommendations contained in the proposals that will be published.

The background against which all of us are operating is the budgetary one, which has been referred to by Mr Dorfmann. It is one in which one of the largest net contributors, the United Kingdom, is leaving the European Union. Against this reality, the Multiannual Financial Framework (MFF) is set at a level of 1.11% of gross national income of the remaining EU27. The Commission, which cannot run a deficit – like any Member State – has to propose a budget in the context of this reality. We have proposed a budget of EUR 365 billion for the 2021-2027 CAP, which is a cut of less than 5%. The cut for direct payments is less than 4%. For rural development, the proposal is to rebalance EU and national support in the context of the co-financing rates. If Member States, of course, choose to increase their level of co-funding, there is no reason why public support to rural areas cannot be maintained at current levels. Alternatively, of course, if all Member States agree by unanimity to provide more finance to the European Union budget in various ways, then improvements to the agricultural funding can be made possible.

A key feature of the Commission's proposals and one I have flagged clearly in the communication which was published on the future of food and farming in November is the new delivery model, and I want to thank Mr Dorfmann and the shadow rapporteurs and the AGRI Committee for supporting this new initiative. It is a new relationship between the European Union and Member States. The motivation behind this delivery model is to take better account of EU diversity, to better target and simplify the support and to ensure performance-orientation and a result-oriented CAP.

At European Union level we will maintain and define a strong and common framework to ensure the achievement of common objectives, and Member States will make the detailed choices and operational definitions, in line with their needs and integrated into a single and streamlined CAP strategic plan which will cover interventions in both pillars.

An area of obvious common interest is our shared objective for a viable and resilient EU agriculture throughout Europe. Direct payments play a key role in this regard, and they must – and will – remain an essential part of the future common agricultural policy. We must also look at these payments through the lens of fairness and, in the context of the Multiannual Financial Framework, the Commission has made a number of important steps towards convergence between Member States. For all Member States with direct payments below 90% of the EU27 average, the gap between current level and 90% of that average will be closed by half over a six-year period.

Without prejudice to the precise contents of the forthcoming proposals, they will offer various possibilities to better target support towards the needs of our small and medium-sized farmers. These are the foundation of European Union agriculture. These are our family farmers.

As I think we can all agree, EU agriculture needs to better manage our natural resources, to limit our greenhouse gas emissions and to adapt to climate change. We have to bolster environmental care and climate action and contribute to the environmental and climate objectives of the European Union, which are already agreed by this Parliament.

The CAP will therefore have to reflect the higher levels of ambition and focus more on results, based on these objectives and the legislation that is already in force and the contribution that agriculture must make to these objectives. The current green architecture will be replaced by a new one that is based on the new delivery model, with environmental and climate objectives which will be set at European Union level, not at Member State level.

In preparing their CAP strategic plans, Member States will take into account their local conditions and can devise a mixture of mandatory and voluntary measures in Pillar 1 and Pillar 2 that are appropriate to those conditions.

There are a number of other areas identified in Mr Dorfmann's report where the Commission and the European Parliament have similar views. Support for young farmers should continue and be improved. Attracting new farmers and facilitating generational renewal will be one of the main priorities of the CAP post-2020. We will have the opportunity for a further exchange on this important matter later on this evening with MEP Caputo.

Innovation and knowledge-sharing is a key issue for the future CAP, with benefits in terms of competitiveness, sustainability and simplification. We will continue to support farmers in areas where agriculture is constrained by specific conditions, for example in mountain areas, and the new delivery model will enable Member States and regions to address these and other important issues in line with their needs within a strong and common European Union framework.

The Commission will present its legal proposals for the CAP shortly and I will be meeting Parliament's committee on 11 June to discuss these proposals in detail. In respect of the MFF, I can only urge you to make every possible effort to conclude your work within the current parliamentary mandate, though I am under no illusions about the challenge that such a timetable presents. However, what you would be doing in doing so is providing security and certainty for our stakeholders, farmers and our people living in rural areas, particularly our young farmers. You can be assured, of course, of my constructive cooperation and that of my services in trying to make this a reality.

In conclusion, can I thank Mr Dorfmann and his colleagues for this report, which is an invaluable contribution to the work of reforming, modernising and simplifying our common agricultural policy.

Seán Kelly, *rapporteur for the opinion of the Committee on International Trade*. – Mr President, on behalf of the Committee on International Trade (INTA), I want to say that I am very proud of our farmers and the food they produce in the European Union. Indeed as the trade committee, the INTA committee, we are very pleased also to note that we have had a positive trade balance in relation to the products we have produced for eight years in a row now. This is because of the standards which are applied within Europe and which are set and monitored by the Commission, and they deserve great credit for that. And, of course, because of the high standards of our food, the safety of our food, there is growing demand for it worldwide. I would like to compliment Commissioner Hogan in particular on his efforts to grow new markets, especially in places like China which is growing rapidly, and here again, standards is what will be the key issue.

I think this is a very positive story where we are concerned. One point, though, that I would make is that we need to continue to have research and innovation in Europe because that way we will maintain our leadership.

Angélique Delahaye, *rapporteuse pour avis, commission ENVI*. – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, chers collègues, ce rapport est primordial. Les politiques européennes engendrent une volatilité des prix sur les marchés. Il est donc important d'intégrer dans la PAC des outils permettant d'assurer notre souveraineté alimentaire et de protéger le revenu des agriculteurs.

Je remercie mon collègue Herbert Dorfmann d'avoir intégré dans son rapport mes propositions adoptées en commission ENVI.

La proposition de la Commission laisse entrevoir la renationalisation de la PAC. Il est du devoir du Parlement européen de rappeler que cette politique doit rester une politique commune, faute de quoi nous allons générer des distorsions de concurrence au sein même du marché unique. La PAC doit avoir une ambition environnementale harmonisée sur le plan européen et ainsi aider les agriculteurs souhaitant aller plus loin dans les pratiques plus respectueuses de l'environnement. Nous devons promouvoir la double performance environnementale et économique, et reconnaître le rôle essentiel des agriculteurs: ce sont les premiers écologistes.

J'invite donc le commissaire à prendre en compte nos remarques et nos recommandations, faites dans un calendrier très contraint, et ne pas précipiter une énième réforme qui serait bâclée. Les agriculteurs européens méritent mieux.

Maria Noichl, *Verfasserin der Stellungnahme des mitberatenden Entwicklungsausschusses*. – Herr Präsident! Ich möchte auch mit einem Dank an Herrn Dorfmann und an die Schattenberichterstatter beginnen. Ich persönlich bin der Meinung: Es ist ein kleiner Schritt in die richtige Richtung, ein kleiner Schritt. Es ist gut, dass man sich Gedanken macht, die Kappung unbedingt einzuführen. Es ist richtig, die Degression unbedingt auf den Tisch zu legen. Es ist wichtig, eine Konditionalität herzustellen, dass es öffentliche Gelder für öffentliche Leistungen gibt. Diese Dinge sind richtig.

Ich möchte aber schon sagen, dass mir persönlich schon ein bisschen auch der Mut gefehlt hat, über diese Dinge hinauszugehen. Man hätte ganz konkret Zahlungen ohne Gegenleistungen klar verneinen müssen. Man hätte deutlich machen müssen, dass eine Einkommensstützung für Landwirte eigentlich eine Sozialleistung ist und auf einem ganz anderen Papier steht.

Ich möchte aber aus dem Blick der DEVE-Gruppe noch einen Punkt benennen: Es war die Frage, ob man nicht ein weiteres Kapitel mit aufnehmen soll, um die spezielle Verantwortung der europäischen Agrarpolitik für den entwicklungspolitischen Bereich deutlich zu machen. Und das passiert leider nicht. Das bedauere ich sehr, denn unsere Agrarpolitik hat Auswirkungen auf Afrika, unsere Agrarpolitik mit dem Sojaimport hat Auswirkungen auf Brasilien, unsere Agrarpolitik und unsere Fischereipolitik haben Auswirkungen darauf, ob es auf der anderen Seite der Welt Fluchtbewegungen gibt oder nicht. Und hier aus dem Blick der DEVE-Gruppe, aus dem Blick der Entwicklungshilfegruppe ist der Bericht leider, leider nicht weitgreifend. Es ist eine vertane Chance, deutlich zu machen, dass Agrarpolitik in Europa eng verbunden ist mit Fluchtbewegungen auf der Welt.

Nedzhmi Ali, *rapporteur for the opinion of the Committee on Budgets*. – Mr President, among the most important sectors within the EU are food and farming, employing more than 60 million people and providing the food security for all of the Union's citizens.

Rural areas, including remotely-located mountainous areas, are not only used for production of food but are also home to a substantial number of Europeans and support the recreation and tourism industries. We should also not forget the environment protection measures. Having regard to the aforesaid, in order to deliver the objectives of the common agricultural policy in the future, there are some important aspects which should be underlined. Firstly, provision of an adequate level of funding within the next MFF, thus ensuring sufficient resources for the sector. Secondly, simplification and modernisation of the CAP should be done while at the same time, the financial and performance control and audit functions should be performed to the same standard and under the same criteria across all Member States. Finally, a fair distribution of direct payments among Member States will allow faster closing of the gaps between the different regions of the Union. Supporting the small farms and increasing efficiency of farming is essential.

Albert Deß, *im Namen der PPE-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident! Vielen Dank an Herbert Dorfmann und alle Kolleginnen und Kollegen, Mitarbeiterinnen und Mitarbeiter, die an diesem Bericht mitgewirkt haben, für die schnelle und zuverlässige Arbeit. Der Bericht ist eine erste Wegmarkierung für die Zukunft der gemeinsamen Agrarpolitik. Er fordert eine Beibehaltung der Zweisäulenstruktur und lehnt eine weitere Renationalisierung eindeutig ab. Meine Fraktion und ich persönlich, Herr Kommissar, sind sehr skeptisch, ob die angedachten Vorschläge zu weniger Bürokratie führen. Ich habe mehr die Sorge, dass die Bürokratie nur von der europäischen auf die nationale Ebene verlagert wird. Aber wir werden Ihre Vorschläge prüfen, und dann werden wir weitersehen, wie wir mit diesen Vorschlägen umgehen.

Aufgabe der gemeinsamen Agrarpolitik ist es, Wettbewerbsverzerrungen zu vermeiden, und deshalb ist es notwendig, dass nicht nur die Zahlungen zwischen den Mitgliedstaaten, sondern auch in den Mitgliedstaaten angeglichen werden. Ich habe mit Kolleginnen und Kollegen einen Antrag dafür eingebracht, dass nicht nur die Zahlungen pro Betrieb sondern auch pro Hektar begrenzt werden. Ich hoffe, dass wir gute Voraussetzungen dafür finden, dass auch in Zukunft die Agrarpolitik auf europäischer Ebene solide finanziert wird.

Clara Eugenia Aguilera García, *en nombre del Grupo S&D*. – Señor presidente, señor comisario, quiero, en primer lugar, agradecer al señor Dorfmann y a todos los que han colaborado en este informe el resultado y el trabajo realizado en muy poco tiempo.

Quiero destacar, en mi intervención, la respuesta común que hemos dado desde el Grupo de los Socialistas y Demócratas a la Comunicación de la Comisión Europea. Hemos trabajado mucho para ello, aunque con escaso convencimiento de que este informe de propia iniciativa del Parlamento sea tenido en cuenta, ya que se presentan las propuestas legislativas en esta misma semana. No obstante, nuestro trabajo ha sido arduo y quisiera destacar alguna de las propuestas presentadas y apoyadas por mi Grupo.

Debe defenderse el carácter común de la política agrícola comunitaria y rechazarse la renacionalización de esta política. La flexibilidad otorgada a los Estados miembros no debe llevar a distorsiones en la competencia, ni a nivel económico ni a nivel medioambiental. El nuevo modelo de aplicación plantea muchas incógnitas al respecto, señorías, ya que, aunque la Comisión insista en negarlo, las incógnitas están sobre la mesa.

Debe haber una financiación cien por cien de la Unión Europea de los pagos directos, y mantenerse los pagos acoplados. Nos parece importante para producciones y sectores en riesgo.

Es necesario un presupuesto adecuado para la PAC, como mínimo del mismo nivel que el actual, en euros constantes, señor comisario. Eso es lo que queremos, así como un «capping» obligatorio europeo y modulado en función de los puestos de trabajo, el apoyo al relevo generacional y, finalmente, una PAC que apoye a los agricultores en la transición hacia una agricultura más sostenible.

James Nicholson, *on behalf of the ECR Group*. – Mr President, I would also like to pass on my congratulations to the rapporteur for a very efficient and effective job that he carried out in an excellent way. The CAP is first and foremost about supporting agricultural production. EU farmers proudly produce food to some of the highest standards globally and they must be able to continue to do so in the future. The sector has faced a number of challenges from all angles in recent times, such as volatility in domestic and international markets, climate and weather conditions, food supply chain issues and, of course, the decision taken by the people in the UK to leave the EU.

The next CAP needs to be able to give farmers the necessary tools to address these challenges so that they can support high-quality EU food production in order to keep EU farmers competitive in the international marketplace and to protect the rural economy from extreme volatility and market crises. Of course, there needs to be adequate funding and I believe – and I have made this point a number of times – the biggest challenge will be the budget, and I heard what the Commissioner had to say. A large net contributor does not leave you without having effects, but who knows, it would be a brave person tonight who would actually tell us what the final arrangements or deals may well be when the UK finally leaves the EU. But I certainly believe very strongly that farmers should not be made to pay the price, whatever price has to be paid.

Aside from Brexit, the CAP share of the market may also come under pressure as a result of spending in other areas, particularly security and migration. I would like to thank Mr Dorfmann for his work again, and I look forward to hearing what the Commissioner has to say, because the future of the CAP is going to be as important to the rest of Europe as to those of us who will remain in the United Kingdom, as it is what our future with regard to agriculture may very well be in the long term as well.

Ulrike Müller, *im Namen der ALDE-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident! Auch ich möchte mich beim Berichterstatter recht herzlich bedanken. Dieser Bericht ist ein klares Bekenntnis zur Landwirtschaft, zur Forstwirtschaft und zur Ernährungssicherheit innerhalb Europas. Alle gemeinsam haben wir erkannt, dass eine nachhaltige Weiterentwicklung nötig ist. Aber wir brauchen Ziele und Leitplanken, Herr Kommissar. Die künftigen Strategiepläne der Mitgliedstaaten dürfen nämlich den Binnenmarkt und das Wettbewerbsgleichgewicht nicht aushebeln. Wir stehen zur gemeinsamen nachhaltigen Agrarpolitik mit zwei Säulen. Oberstes Ziel muss es für uns sein, Verwaltungsvereinfachung für Land- und Forstwirte zu erreichen und Planungssicherheit.

Wenn es zu einer Kappung bei den großen Betrieben kommen soll, muss gewährleistet sein, dass das Geld im Agrarhaushalt bleibt und den mittleren und kleineren Betrieben und den Junglandwirten zugutekommt. Wissenschaft, Innovation und Digitalisierung müssen auch von kleinen und mittleren Betrieben genutzt werden können, und, Herr Kommissar, ich bin sicher, es gibt viele gute Punkte, die wir in unserem Bericht haben, die wir umsetzen können.

Thomas Waitz, *im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar! Mit der neuen Agrarpolitik werden wir Einfluss haben auf uns bäuerliche Betriebe, wir werden Einfluss haben auf die Gesundheit der Lebensmittel für unsere Bürgerinnen und Bürger und auf die Umwelt. Das erste Ziel muss aber die Erhaltung unserer bäuerlichen Landwirtschaftsstrukturen sein. Dafür brauchen wir Erzeuger faire Erzeugerpreise und vernünftige Zahlungen auch für kleine und mittelständische Betriebe.

Als zweites Ziel sehe ich die Produktion von gesunden Lebensmitteln von europäischen Bäuerinnen und Bauern für europäische Bürgerinnen und Bürger. Denn wir verwenden europäisches Steuergeld, um hier Förderungen zu vergeben. So soll das Ziel auch die Produktion von Lebensmitteln für europäische Bürgerinnen und Bürger sein.

Als drittes Ziel muss im Zentrum stehen der Klimanutzen statt eines Klimaschadens, die Grundlage für sauberes Wasser zu schaffen, für gesunde Böden zu sorgen, mit einem Minimum an Pestiziden auszukommen und eine Landwirtschaft bestmöglich in Einklang mit der Natur zu führen.

Und als viertes Ziel hoffe ich auf ein Ende der Förderungen für Agrarindustrie, Massentierhaltung und für eine Wirtschaftsweise auf Kosten der nächsten Generationen. Wir haben die Böden nicht von unseren Eltern geerbt, sondern wir haben sie von unseren Enkelkindern geborgt. Das sollte das oberste Prinzip unserer Politik sein.

Ich möchte mich bei Herrn Dorfmann und meinen Ko-Berichterstattem für die konstruktive Zusammenarbeit bedanken.

Maria Lidia Senra Rodríguez, *en nombre del Grupo GUE/NGL*. – Señor presidente, gracias al señor Dorfmann por el trabajo que nos ha presentado hoy aquí. Yo quería, en primer lugar, decir, señor comisario, que resolver los graves problemas que afectan hoy al campo y a los campesinos y campesinas a nivel de la Unión Europea requiere más que un reparto de ayudas: requiere de decisiones políticas; requiere de una política agrícola pública y fuerte. Y, en ese sentido, me gustaría citar las grandes lagunas que tienen tanto la Comunicación que usted ha presentado como el informe que estamos debatiendo.

La cuestión de los precios: son necesarios precios que cubran los costes y el trabajo de producción; si no, no instalaremos a nadie en el medio rural.

En segundo lugar: la regulación de la producción es otro elemento fundamental que no puede quedarse única y exclusivamente en una cuestión de voluntariedad.

En tercer lugar: modelo de producción compatible con el medio ambiente, con la conservación del agua, el aire y los suelos.

Y, como se me termina el tiempo, no quería terminar esta intervención sin hacer referencia a otro aspecto olvidado en esta Comunicación, que es la cuestión de la igualdad entre las mujeres y los hombres en el campo. Necesitamos que la PAC reconozca la titularidad compartida y que reparta las ayudas al 50 % entre ambos cónyuges o entre ambos miembros de la pareja.

Marco Zullo, *a nome del gruppo EFDD*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, in commissione agricoltura abbiamo lavorato per definire una posizione sulla politica agricola del futuro, e per rispetto di questo lavoro e dei cittadini che rappresentiamo mi aspetto che Lei, Commissario, prenderà in considerazione quanto fatto.

Ci preoccupano i tagli, che oggi appaiono maggiori rispetto a quanto inizialmente annunciato. Di nuovo voglio ribadire che tagli indiscriminati faranno male al settore. Ci si concentri invece sui risparmi e nel misurare i risultati delle azioni proposte.

Per quanto riguarda il passaggio al cosiddetto *new delivery model*, viene presentato come una maggiore autonomia per gli Stati membri, ma rischia di essere un passo indietro verso la nazionalizzazione del settore, dove controllato e controllore coincidono, andando così di fatto a frammentare ulteriormente il mercato e lasciando spazio a pratiche nazionali di concorrenza sleale.

Abbiamo l'occasione di disegnare una politica agricola che sia, sì, più attenta all'ambiente, ma anche che promuova un modello di produzione e di consumo del cibo più sostenibile, e soprattutto redditizio per tutti gli attori della filiera. Dobbiamo essere ambiziosi, semplificare le procedure, abbattere gli oneri burocratici, erogare i fondi secondo un regime di premialità, sostenendo quegli agricoltori la cui attività realmente contribuisce al bene pubblico.

Ribadiamo l'opportunità di un tetto per i pagamenti diretti, in modo da non incentivare le speculazioni finanziarie e la concentrazione dei terreni. Dobbiamo aiutare le aziende di piccole e medie dimensioni, e per questo gli aiuti dovrebbero essere modulati, per essere realmente un aiuto e non per drogare il mercato a favore dei grandi. Nella ripartizione dei fondi tra Stati membri vanno tenute in considerazione le circostanze socioeconomiche. Infatti, se il costo della vita è diverso, la stessa cifra concessa come aiuto può avere un impatto concreto molto diverso, e non vogliamo generare ulteriori distorsioni nel mercato unico.

Infine, non accetteremo tempistiche strette per la fretta di chiudere. Serve un dibattito approfondito affinché questa riforma possa realmente mettere il settore agroalimentare al centro dello sviluppo economico del territorio europeo.

Philippe Loiseau, *au nom du groupe ENF*. – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, Monsieur le Rapporteur, si seulement la prochaine PAC pouvait se démarquer de l'actuelle. Lorsque l'Union européenne avait présenté la PAC 2014-2020, elle s'était félicitée, auto-congratulée, et avait même envoyé un message d'espoir au monde rural: l'agriculture allait être plus verte, plus rémunératrice, plus respectueuse des territoires. La PAC permettrait même aux agriculteurs de vivre dignement de leur métier et j'en passe...

Nous voici maintenant au crépuscule de la PAC actuelle et à l'orée de la suivante. Tous ces vœux pieux se sont-ils réalisés? Demandez donc aux producteurs si leur situation s'est améliorée. Demandez aux céréaliers s'ils sont contents de vendre leurs céréales en dessous de leur coût de production. Demandez aux secteurs bovin, ovin et caprin s'ils se réjouissent des accords de libre-échange. Interrogez les paysans. Ce sont eux les utilisateurs, ils seront donc les meilleurs et les seuls juges de paix de la politique agricole commune.

Nous voterons mercredi la position du Parlement sur la future PAC. C'est un texte assez complet qui contient, à nouveau, beaucoup de belles promesses – je précise d'ailleurs qu'elles n'engagent que ceux qui y croient. Néanmoins je salue le signal envoyé à la Commission, notamment sur le maintien du budget, et donc des aides.

Le monde rural a les yeux braqués sur cette réforme de la PAC, vous le savez, aussi je profite de ce coup de projecteur pour souligner un point très inquiétant: les agriculteurs savent-ils seulement que, ces dernières années, via le Fonds européen agricole pour le développement rural (FEADER), des centaines de milliers d'euros ont financé des programmes d'aide à l'installation des migrants dans la ruralité?

Notre groupe a d'ailleurs déposé un amendement pour que la future PAC ne puisse plus spolier ainsi nos agriculteurs de ce qui leur revient en priorité.

Chers collègues, j'espère que vous prendrez vos responsabilités sur cet amendement crucial.

Czesław Adam Siekierski (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Proponowane dziś rozwiązania będą miały skutki w okresie ponad dziesięcioletnim. Dla rolnictwa to wyjątkowo długi okres. Co się może zatem wydarzyć? Nastąpi upadek kolejnych tysięcy gospodarstw, zapowiadany już dziś brakiem młodych rolników i starzeniem się wsi. Jakże są tego przyczyny? Jest ich wiele: po pierwsze niskie dochody w rolnictwie, po drugie brak stabilizacji cenowej i rynkowej, po trzecie słabsza infrastruktura techniczna i społeczna na wsi oraz niski poziom usług, po czwarte duża uciążliwość pracy w rolnictwie, po piąte niekorzystne międzynarodowe umowy handlowe. To w sumie przekłada się na niższy poziom życia rolników.

Te niekorzystne procesy prowadzą do nadmiernej koncentracji i uprzemysławiania produkcji, do zaniku europejskiego modelu rolnictwa, rolnictwa zrównoważonego, przyjaznego dla środowiska. Proponowane drastyczne cięcia we wspólnej polityce rolnej – ponad 15 % – pogorszą także naszą konkurencyjność na rynku światowym, a w konsekwencji doprowadzą do naruszenia bezpieczeństwa żywnościowego, co wydaje się niewyobrażalne, a jednak jest możliwe.

Eric Andrieu (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, nous avons besoin d'une PAC ambitieuse. Nous le répétons depuis de nombreux mois.

Merci au rapporteur Herbert Dorfmann, ainsi qu'aux rapporteurs fictifs pour la qualité de leurs travaux.

Bon nombre d'éléments sont contenus dans ce rapport, qu'il s'agisse de la sécurisation du revenu des agriculteurs, de la position de l'agriculture dans les accords de libre-échange ou encore de la réorientation de l'agriculture afin qu'elle prenne en compte les aspects environnementaux et climatiques de la biodiversité. Tout y est. J'ose espérer seulement que vous aurez le temps de lire le contenu de ce rapport avant vendredi, puisqu'il semblerait que c'est vendredi que vous allez nous proposer votre texte législatif, même si je regrette que vous le proposiez d'abord à la presse, ensuite au Conseil et, enfin, au Parlement européen. Mais telle est votre vision de la démocratie.

Je tiens à vous dire qu'il s'agit d'étudier avec beaucoup de précision le contenu de ce rapport, dans un cadre budgétaire non pas de moins 5 %, comme vous nous l'avez répété, mais de moins 25 % pour le second pilier et d'au moins 14 % pour les paiements directs aux agriculteurs. Parce qu'il faut qu'on raisonne en euros constants et qu'on soit très précis sur cette question en particulier.

Zbigniew Kuźmiuk (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! Panie Komisarzu! W omawianym dzisiaj sprawozdaniu znalazły się postulaty, które zasługują na uwagę, takie jak odrzucenie renacjonalizacji WPR przy jednoczesnym przekazaniu na poziom państw członkowskich decyzji w sprawie kształtu krajowych polityk rolnych, zachowanie dwufilarowości WPR, ograniczenie płatności bezpośrednich dla wielkich gospodarstw czy zagwarantowanie, że płatności bezpośrednie trafiają do rolników zajmujących się produkcją roślinną bądź zwierzęcą.

Ale mimo tych pozytywów chciałbym zwrócić uwagę na zapis zawarty w 64. punkcie sprawozdania, który mówi o niemożliwości pełnego wyrównania dopłat bezpośrednich pomiędzy nowymi i starymi państwami członkowskimi ze względu na koszty produkcji, w szczególności koszty gruntów oraz siłę nabywczą pieniądza. Moim zdaniem utrzymywanie tej nierówności po roku 2020 narazi Komisję na zarzut dyskryminacji rolnictwa w krajach Europy Środkowo-Wschodniej, a spór w tej sprawie może przenieść się do Trybunału Sprawiedliwości Unii Europejskiej.

Jan Huitema (ALDE). – Dank u wel voorzitter. Beste commissaris, ik zou graag willen dat we hier in het Europees Parlement een discussie hebben van wat we graag zouden willen met het landbouwbeleid voor de lange termijn en dat we niet verzanden in details.

Wat ik bijvoorbeeld niet wil, is dat nog steeds het landbouwbudget noodzakelijk is om een bepaald inkomen te geven voor de boer en dat het landbouwbudget besteed wordt om grondbezit te subsidiëren.

Ik wil graag dat de boeren op hun eigen benen kunnen staan, hun eigen broek op kunnen houden, en dat het geld van het landbouwbudget ook daadwerkelijk geïnvesteerd wordt in het bedrijf in de sector om de toekomst tegemoet te gaan in deze veranderende wereld. Ik wil graag dat we om kunnen gaan met prijsschommelingen, dat we om kunnen gaan met mislukte oogsten, maar ook dat de sector oplossingen kan bieden om klimaatverandering tegen te gaan, om de milieu-impact te verminderen, om biodiversiteit en landschapselementen te kunnen behouden.

De wereld om ons heen verandert. De boeren willen vooruit. Nu het Europees Parlement nog.

Franz Obermayr (ENF). – Herr Präsident! Erfreulich, dass die Reform der GAP nun endlich auch im Parlament angekommen ist. Wie wir seit Jahren betonen, ist die Erhaltung der europäischen Kulturlandschaft von großer Bedeutung, und dazu tragen vor allem die kleinen und mittleren bäuerlichen Betriebe wesentlich bei. Dass landwirtschaftlichen Großbetrieben die Möglichkeit genommen werden soll, durch das reine Brachliegen ihres Ackerlandes sechsstellige Fördermittel pro Jahr einzustreichen, ist ebenfalls zu begrüßen. Die Politik muss die Qualität unserer heimischen Produkte wieder schätzen lernen und vor allem auch die Sicherung der Preise klarstellen.

Hervorzuheben ist auch der Gedanke einer vereinfachten Abwicklung, um als Landwirt zu den Zuschüssen zu kommen, und das, ohne einen Studienabschluss in EU-Bürokratie gemacht zu haben. Aber solange nicht sichergestellt ist, wer am Ende die Nettofinanzierer dieser GAP-Reform sowie des mehrjährigen Finanzrahmens sind, gebe ich zu bedenken, dass wir uns nicht zu früh über diese wohlgemeinten Versprechen freuen sollten.

Esther Herranz García (PPE). – Señor presidente, señor comisario, señorías, yo quiero agradecer, en primer lugar, la labor y el trabajo del señor Dorfmann, el ponente, y de todos los ponentes alternativos, que han sacado adelante este dossier en un tiempo récord para que podamos votarlo, tal y como ha dicho el comisario, antes de que nos presente, en unos días, su propuesta.

Estamos en un momento decisivo para la PAC y, por un lado, es necesario que el futuro marco financiero plurianual no suponga un recorte drástico en los fondos destinados a esta política. Desde luego, desde la Comisión de Agricultura del Parlamento Europeo, creo que nuestra intención es trabajar en esta línea.

Mi otra segunda gran preocupación, que también está presente en este informe, está vinculada directamente a la cuestión presupuestaria, porque hay que evitar que un exceso de subsidiariedad dé lugar, con el tiempo, a una renacionalización de la política agrícola común. No podemos tolerar que esta política comunitaria, que tiene un papel importantísimo para la suficiencia alimentaria de la Unión Europea, deje de ser común. Esto solo generaría desequilibrios y problemas de competencia entre productores de distintos Estados miembros.

Así pues, el informe que hoy debatimos es el primer paso del proceso de reforma en el que estaremos inmersos hasta el final de la legislatura. Y como tal, es un buen paso.

Paolo De Castro (S&D). – Signor Presidente, Commissario, onorevoli colleghi, la relazione che quest’Aula si appresta a votare manda un messaggio chiaro: il Parlamento europeo mai accetterà una rinazionalizzazione della politica agricola comune.

Avremmo sperato che questa posizione potesse essere recepita nelle proposte di riforma ormai pubbliche. Si è preferito, invece, imprimere una forte accelerazione – scavalcando le prerogative del normale dialogo interistituzionale – con una proposta da parte della Commissione che rischia di liquidare la più grande e importante esperienza di politica sovranazionale della storia dell’Unione.

Non vogliamo che questa riforma si trasformi nell’anticamera del declino della stessa politica agricola, che deve rimanere «comune», garantendo crescita, produttività, sostenibilità, competitività a tutti i nostri agricoltori, senza rischi di distorsioni di concorrenza tra Stati, o addirittura tra regioni differenti.

La sola responsabilità dei controlli all’Unione non basta, Commissario, per definirla comune.

Beata Gosiewska (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! W imieniu polskich rolników zgodnie z traktatem akcesyjnym oraz uchwałami polskiego parlamentu żądam, aby zakończyć proces pełnego wyrównania płatności bezpośrednich między państwami członkowskimi. Sprzeciwiam się dalszej dyskryminacji rolników z Polski, którzy muszą konkurować na nierównych zasadach, przykładowo z sąsiadami z Niemiec. Nie zgadzam się na uwarunkowanie wyrównania dopłat absurdalnymi, niesprawiedliwymi kryteriami zapisanymi w sprawozdaniu Dorfmann, które zamiast wyrównać standardy życia, zasypać przepaść pomiędzy krajami, tworzą w Unii Europejskiej rolników gorszej kategorii.

Polska – kraj, z którego pochodzę – jest członkiem Unii Europejskiej od 14 lat. Unia zapewniła polskich rolników w traktacie akcesyjnym, że w 2013 r., czyli po dziesięciu latach członkostwa, skończy się stopniowe wyrównywanie dopłat. Mamy 2018 rok, a dyskryminacja rolników z tzw. nowych państw członkowskich nadal nie ma końca. Utrzymanie obowiązującego niesprawiedliwego systemu dopłat bezpośrednich narusza art. 18 i art. 40 Traktatu o funkcjonowaniu Unii Europejskiej.

Norbert Erdős (PPE). – Elnök Úr, tisztelt Képviselőtársaim, engedjék meg, hogy a Néppárt 2. számú módosító javaslatért szövegezzek föl és kérem Önöket, majd a szerdai szavazáson szavazzanak igennel. Az öntözésről van szó. Öntözésben az Európai Unió csak 9%-on áll. Az Európai Unió 6,2%-on, egész Európa 9%-on, még Amerika is 12-13%-on áll, Ázsia 41%-on, a Világ pedig 21%-on áll az öntözött területek nagyságát tekintve. Nagy probléma van. Nagyon bonyolult és nehezen hozzáférhető az uniós beruházási támogatás. Gazdaellenesek az engedélyezési eljárások, és túlzottan szigorúak az öntözésfejlesztési támogatások. Ezeket a területeken egyszerűsíteni kell, könnyen végrehajthatóvá kell tenni ezeket a szabályozókat. Kérem Biztos Urat ennek a felszólalásnak rendkívül komolyan vételére.

Tibor Szanyi (S&D). – Elnök Úr, Adrieu és De Castro kollégák gondolatát folytatva jómagam is szeretném kiemelten hangsúlyozni, hogy tiltakozunk és nem engedjük azt, hogy bárki is a mezőgazdaságra vagy a vidékfejlesztésre eddig fordított európai közösségi forrásokat megkurtítsa. Ezzel ugyanis elvész az a szolidaritás, ami ma is még tulajdonképpen hiányos, amely egyébként a városok, a nagyvárosok, a jól teljesítő nagyvárosok és a leszakadó, elszegényedő vidékek között lenne igazán észszerű. Ebben a mostani futamban viszont kiemelten meghatározó és új elemként jelenik meg – már a bizottsági javaslatban is – az okos falvak, illetve a smart technológiáknak a témaköre. Ezeket az eszközöket ez a jelentés tovább erősíti. Az okos falvak sikeres kivitelezése és a vidéki területek hatékony fejlesztése érdekében az kell, hogy a rendelkezésre álló források össze legyenek kötve. Egy integrált, több alapból finanszírozott és beruházásösztönző megközelítés szükséges, olyan második pillérre van szükségünk tehát a közös mezőgazdasági politikán belül, amely össze van kötve a többi vidéket is érintő alappal. Igenis különítsünk el más alapokból, például a regionális alapokból 5%-ot az okos falvak komplex fejlesztésére.

Marijana Petir (PPE). – Poštovani predsjedavajući, zajednička poljoprivredna politika najdugovječnija je i najuspješnija politika Europske unije. Želim da to bude i ubuduće. Stoga je moramo učiniti jednostavnijom i fleksibilnijom, ali ne na način da birokraciju spustimo s europske na nacionalnu razinu, već da poljoprivrednici osjete stvarno olakšanje i korist.

Proračun za poljoprivredu ne smije se smanjivati, a potpore treba usmjeriti na mala i srednja poljoprivredna gospodarstva koja su stvarni nositelji proizvodnje hrane i očuvanja ruralnog prostora.

Potrebno je dodatno mobilizirati financijska sredstva u okviru drugog stupa za mlade poljoprivrednike kako bi postigli generacijsku obnovu. Mladim poljoprivrednicima treba olakšati ulazak u posao otklanjanjem prepreka i uvođenjem specijaliziranih programa koji će starijim poljoprivrednicima ujedno omogućiti lakši odlazak u mirovinu.

Do sada niti jedna država članica nije uvela tematski potprogram za žene u ruralnim područjima te ih pozivam da to učine jer nam je cilj poboljšanje općeg položaja žena u ruralnim područjima i da njihov rad bude priznat i plaćen.

Intervenciones con arreglo al procedimiento de solicitud incidental de uso de la palabra («catch the eye»)

Daniel Buda (PPE). – Domnul președinte, sectorul agricol are nevoie de o reformă care să țină seama de dificultățile anterioare întâmpinate de fermieri. În același timp, acesta trebuie să se adapteze noilor realități sociale și economice care să permită o viață mai bună pentru fermieri, dar și creșterea capacității acestora de a produce hrană ieftină și la prețuri accesibile pentru populație. În acest sens, dincolo de anvelopa financiară a PAC-ului, importantă și ea, apreciez că este mult mai importantă simplificarea.

Solicit Comisiei Europene să stabilească un set unic de reguli, valabil atât pentru fermierii din Vest, cât și pentru fermierii din Est, impunându-se totodată interzicerea pentru statele membre a posibilității de a veni cu reguli suplimentare pentru fermieri.

Salut menținerea plăților directe, dar, în același timp, atrag atenția asupra necesității de a sprijini în mod echitabil fermierii în funcție de nevoile fiecăruia. La fel de importantă este însă și echilibrarea plăților directe între statele membre ca urmare a faptului că suntem actori pe aceeași piață unică.

Ricardo Serrão Santos (S&D). – Senhor Presidente, Senhor Comissário, Caros Colegas, com este relatório inicia-se um novo ciclo de debate e negociação sobre a PAC. Precisamos de uma política mais justa, que atenda a desafios como as alterações climáticas, mas precisamos sobretudo de uma política agrícola que persista na sua vertente comum e que atenda eficazmente às necessidades dos agricultores, porque não há agricultura nem mundo rural sem agricultores.

Os Estados-Membros devem continuar a dispor de uma margem de manobra no primeiro pilar da PAC para atribuir apoios ligados a setores com relevância particular em termos sociais, económicos e ambientais. É fundamental prosseguir com o ajustamento das dotações nacionais dos pagamentos diretos no sentido de maior convergência entre Estados-Membros.

Apelo à manutenção de um orçamento europeu robusto para a agricultura europeia, com ausência de cofinanciamento nacional no primeiro pilar da PAC. Por fim, defendo que seja tida em conta a situação particular das regiões ultraperiféricas no processo da reforma da PAC.

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, κατ' αρχάς θα πρέπει να επισημάνουμε ότι η νέα ΚΠΠ πρέπει να επιστρέψει στην αρχή της κοινοτικής προτίμησης, όπως ήταν όταν ξεκίνησε, γεγονός που σημαίνει άμεση στήριξη στους ίδιους τους αγρότες της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης. Και όχι βέβαια να στηρίζεται στις περιφημες διεθνείς εμπορικές συμφωνίες οι οποίες διαλύουν τον αγροτικό κόσμο, ιδίως στον ευρωπαϊκό Νότο. Το δεύτερο θέμα είναι ότι δεν πρέπει να υπάρξουν μειώσεις στη νέα ΚΠΠ. Παρότι θα έχουμε το Brexit, παρότι θα έχουμε μείωση εσόδων, θα πρέπει να βρεθούν νέοι πόροι ούτως ώστε πραγματικά να μην μειωθεί καθόλου η χρηματοδότηση προς την Κοινή Γεωργική Πολιτική. Επόμενο θέμα είναι η στήριξη της γεωργίας των μικρών νήσων που πραγματικά έχουν ανάγκη, όπως επίσης και η ενίσχυση των μικρών εκμεταλλεύσεων, καθώς επίσης και η ενίσχυση των νέων αγροτών. Πρέπει να σταματήσουν οι καθυστερήσεις στις πληρωμές και να υπάρξει πρόβλεψη για χαμηλά εφόδια και χαμηλό αγροτικό πετρέλαιο.

Luke Ming Flanagan (GUE/NGL). – Mr President, thank you for your work Mr Dorfmann. I have to say I am worried when you look at what happened with a package that was designed at home in Ireland – GLAS. It was meant to be simple because it was designed at home and people would understand what they were at and we ended up with mayhem on it and it was anything but simple; but the biggest problem that we had with it is that when farmers then came to us and were told that they had to do x, y and z, when we brought them to the Commission, the Commission told them they could do nothing about it. They couldn't help them and they were sent back and forward and back and forward and the problem was never solved. So who will take ownership of it if there is an issue there?

There is good news definitely, the idea that farmers will not be paid for what they did decades ago – that's a good move. The idea that areas of natural constraint will get more funding – who could disagree with that? Unless of course you're on really good land. And the idea that farmers would get paid for public goods, which they are already delivering and not getting properly paid for, that's a good idea. A bit of a curate's egg.

Bronis Ropė (Verts/ALE). – Sveikinu pranešėją, kolegą H. Dorfmanną, parengusį iš tikrųjų neblogą pranešimą, bet gaila, kad nepavyko suderinti išmokų suvienodinimo nuo 2021 m. Dar 2003 m., Lietuvai stojant į Europos Sąjungą, Vadovų Taryba priėmė sprendimą iki 2013 m. suvienodinti išmokas Lietuvos žemdirbiams, tačiau iki šiol tai nepadaryta ir noriu informuoti, kad išmokos siekia tik 60 proc. Europos Sąjungos vidurkio. Noriu paklausti, kada Komisija įvykdys Vadovų Tarybos sprendimą suvienodinti išmokas visiems žemdirbiams, kad tiek ūkininkai, tiek valstybės narės būtų konkurencingi ir nesijaustų antrarūšiai?

Γεώργιος Επιτήδειος (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, το μέλλον της γεωργίας θα καθορίσει σε σημαντικό βαθμό και το μέλλον της παραγωγής των προϊόντων, τα οποία θα καλύψουν τις επισιτιστικές ανάγκες των γενεών του μέλλοντος. Γι' αυτό, πρέπει η Κοινή Γεωργική Πολιτική να είναι εύκαμπτη, ευέλικτη και να μπορέσει να αντιμετωπίσει τις προκλήσεις του μέλλοντος. Είναι αλήθεια ότι η γεωργική πολιτική πρέπει να είναι κοινή. Πρέπει, όμως, για να είναι επιτυχής και πραγματιστική, να λαμβάνει υπόψη και τις ιδιαιτερότητες κάθε κράτους μέλους. Άλλες είναι οι ανάγκες των κρατών της Βορείου Ευρώπης και άλλες εκείνων της Νοτίου Ευρώπης. Επιπλέον, πρέπει να ληφθεί υπόψη ότι οι ανάγκες δεν αντιμετωπίζονται μόνο με τις επιχορηγήσεις. Βεβαίως πρέπει να αντιμετωπιστούν οι ανάγκες των γεωργών και των μικρών επιχειρήσεων, που πρέπει να χρηματοδοτηθούν, όμως θα πρέπει να προστατεύονται τα συμφέροντα των γεωργών στην ευρεία τους έννοια. Κι αυτό θα γίνει όταν δεν εισάγουμε ανεξέλεγκτα προϊόντα από τρίτες χώρες ώστε να δημιουργούνται συνθήκες αθέμιτου ανταγωνισμού για τα γεωργικά προϊόντα της Ευρώπης.

Peter Jahr (PPE). – Herr Präsident! Vier kurze Bemerkungen – erstens: Agrarpolitik kann pünktlich liefern. Vielen Dank nochmal an den Berichterstatter, dass wir es geschafft haben, pünktlich heute im Plenum den Agrarbericht zu beraten. Zweitens: wir haben uns auf das neue sogenannte neue System „delivery“- System des Kommissars eingelassen – das ist die gute Nachricht. Herr Kommissar, Sie kennen meine Meinung. Ich bitte Sie nochmal, es geht hier nicht nur um die Beziehungen zwischen Kommission und Mitgliedstaaten. Wir müssen uns auch um die Beziehungen zu dem Landwirt kümmern, weil der Landwirt im Mittelpunkt unseres politischen Interesses steht. Und auch dort muss die Entbürokratisierung wirklich stattfinden.

Drittens: Agrarpolitik muss gerechter und erklärbarer werden, insbesondere auch für den Steuerzahler. Kappung, Degression, Mehrzahlung für die ersten Hektar – muss etwas getan werden. Aber ich bin der Meinung, die Bedingungen in den Mitgliedstaaten sind so unterschiedlich, dass wir in Brüssel quasi den Werkzeugkasten definieren müssen, und über die Anwendung muss dann in den Mitgliedstaaten entschieden werden.

Maria Gabriela Zoană (S&D). – Domnule președinte, domnule comisar Hogan, banii din bugetul Uniunii Europene destinați agriculturii au transformat Uniunea într-unul dintre cei mai mari producători de bunuri agroalimentare la nivel mondial, dovadă clară că trebuie să menținem același buget PAC și cei doi piloni.

Da, este nevoie de o finanțare orientată pentru fermele mici și mijlocii, dar și fermele mari au nevoie de o finanțare adecvată. Nu sunt de acord cu plafonarea și recomand ideea de a avea o plată redistributivă mai accentuată. Dacă majoritatea statelor membre vor vota pentru plafonare, atunci mă voi exprima ferm pentru o plafonare voluntară.

Pe partea de convergență externă trebuie să ajungem la o egalizare a plăților directe între fermierii europeni. Rațiunea care a fost avută în vedere la stabilirea cuantumului diferit al subvențiilor între fermierii europeni, respectiv costurile de producție diferite de la o țară la alta, nu mai este de actualitate. Petrolul, utilajele agricole, hrana muncitorilor, pesticidele folosite în agricultură, forța de muncă, toate acestea au acum un cost egal în toate statele membre ale Uniunii. Pentru ca fermierii europeni să aibă șanse egale pe o piață internă unică a Uniunii, trebuie ca fermierul român să aibă aceeași subvenție ca fermierul francez și nu jumătate, cum se întâmplă astăzi.

(Fin de las intervenciones con arreglo al procedimiento de solicitud incidental de uso de la palabra («catch the eye»))

Phil Hogan, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, Vice-President, first of all I want to reiterate my thanks to Mr Dorfmann and the shadow rapporteurs for the work that they've done. I have read the report and I think, based on your report, I can tell you that we have a lot of common ground in relation to the proposals that will emerge. Your contributions from several committees this evening, other than Agriculture, shows the wide level of interest that there is in the common agricultural policy right across this House. The CAP is, as I've said many times, an economic, environmental and social policy and the legislative proposals that we are bringing forward must reflect that. The proposals will also reflect the principles that we have identified in the communication last November.

I agree with Mr Kelly, when he expresses his pride in our farmers, and I think everybody agrees that the key role of farmers in providing high quality food in a sustainable manner is crucial from the point of view of the policy that we are trying to improve. And since we published our communication, there have been some concerns expressed about the rise of renationalisation and these have been repeated by a few Members this evening. I want to reassure you that I'm confident that you will see in the proposals that will be adopted that there is no intention whatsoever to renationalise the CAP.

Our proposals would provide for genuine subsidiarity in the implementation of the policy, while also containing sufficient safeguards to ensure that the common nature of the policy will be maintained and farmers will not be put at a competitive disadvantage as a result of our proposals. The internal market and its integrity are essential to our agricultural policy and essential to our farmers, and that will remain the case.

The budgetary situation has been mentioned by Mr Nicholson and others. It's a challenging one, based on the fact that we have 12 billion less from the fact that the United Kingdom is leaving. That is the present situation and I agree with Mr Nicholson, the end result of course nobody can predict at the moment, but we cannot predict as well whether we will have unanimity or not by the other Member States, the other 27, in relation to putting more money in various ways into the total EU budget.

So, it's a matter for the Council and the Parliament to negotiate. Madam Senra Rodríguez is right when she says that the CAP is about political decisions. I will be bringing shortly the Commission's responsibility in this regard and it will then be a matter for all of us to work together as co-legislators, particularly the Council and the Parliament, to take responsibility and we will be there to help in whatever way we can work closely with you to achieve a satisfactory outcome.

The issue of fairness and equity in payments is very important and it has been frequently raised, and one which we highlighted in the November communication, and we will be making proposals with regard to convergence. We will be making proposals in relation to capping and we will be making proposals in relation to small and medium-sized farmers. Also, we will be making proposals in relation to internal convergence.

Just to clarify issues for my friend Mr Eric Andrieu, but I don't know where you're getting your figures about 25% and 14%, you're talking to too many academics. But, anyway, the budget proposals that I have been involved in actually are generated on the same basis as the last occasion, which many people here were involved with. So, comparing like with like, I want to just reiterate that the proposal in the MFF for agriculture is less than 5% cut in direct payments and of course it is a cut in rural development, but the overall budget is less than 5% cut. So I don't know where you're getting these figures. But anyway, I'd be anxious to hear.

The average cut in direct payments as I mentioned earlier is closer to 3% than actually 14% that you have mentioned and, with envelopes increasing from a number of Member States, the figures in relation to rural development can improve. These figures represent in the same way as was agreed seven years ago, and they'll stand up to any scrutiny.

The reduced level of EU co-financing of the second pillar can be compensated by Member States or by more contributions from Member States into the budget.

I want to assure my friend Professor De Castro that he doesn't have to worry about respecting any proposals or rejecting any proposals on renationalisation because there won't be any. There is no intention to make any such proposals and I hope there'll be no amendments put down in that respect either for to do the opposite. This will be explicitly clear in the Commission's proposals that I will publish.

You don't need a straw man in order to push the haystack, we won't need to have to do that. Vice-President, the rapporteur's report is a welcome and constructive contribution to the debate about the modernisation and simplification of the CAP and I look forward to presenting the Commission's proposals to the Parliament's Agriculture Committee, and when you do, and I am confident that you will see significant similarities, as I said already. Can I say to my friend Mr Marias, who is no longer here with us, from Greece, who was against free trade agreements in relation to agriculture, and I have just approved some promotion money for feta cheese, which is a very important product in Greece and which I regularly am asked by Mr Marias and others in Greece about how we can do to promote feta cheese internationally. So should I withdraw the money that I've already approved for this promotion programme and actually eliminate any prospect of feta becoming internationally well-known and actually able to get a market share in our free trade agreements? I'm not so sure. I'm sure he didn't mean that.

In the meantime, thank you very much, ladies and gentlemen, for your support. Thank you Mr Dorfmann and your shadow rapporteurs for the great work that you have done, I think there are a lot of similarities that we have discussed on many occasions in COM AGRI and I don't think there'll be too many surprises when the proposals emerge from the Commission.

Herbert Dorfmann, Berichterstatter. – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar, Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Ich habe jetzt in dieser Debatte viele auch sehr übereinstimmende Wortmeldungen gehört, und ich möchte eigentlich überhaupt nicht mehr auf Inhaltliches eingehen. Die Gemeinsame Agrarpolitik ist einer der ältesten Politikbereiche, die wir in der Europäischen Union haben. Wir machen seit 1962 eine gemeinsame Politik für unsere Bäuerinnen und Bauern, und wir sollten diese Politik jetzt einfach behutsam und sinnvoll weiterentwickeln. Wir brauchen keine Revolution, sondern wir brauchen eine Weiterentwicklung dieser Politik, welche den neuen Gegebenheiten gerecht wird.

Und wir dürfen diese Weiterentwicklung nicht in Frage stellen – einerseits nicht durch eine Renationalisierung, die meiner Meinung nach nur einer Marktverzerrung in Europa Tür und Tor öffnen würde, und auch nicht durch eine Sparpolitik, die letztendlich diese Politik zugrunde spart. Herr Kommissar, Sie wissen genauso gut wie wir hier, dass man die Inflation selbstverständlich einberechnen sollte, dass man eigentlich allen Berufsgruppen eine Inflationsbereinigung ihres Einkommens auch zugesteht. Das sollte man auch den Bauern zugestehen. Und wenn man das einrechnet, dann ist die Einsparung leider etwas höher, als Sie sie hier angegeben haben. Aber auch darüber werden wir uns vor allem auch mit Ihrem Kollegen, dem Herrn Haushaltskommissar, noch deutlich aussprechen.

Ich möchte mich einfach abschließend nochmal ganz herzlich bedanken bei den Schattenberichterstattern, auch bei den Verantwortlichen der Stellungnahmen, die gemacht worden sind. Ich glaube, es liegt jetzt einfach an uns. Es ist wirklich gelungen, in diesem Bericht zu ganz wichtigen zentralen Punkten eine gemeinsame Position zu finden, und ich hoffe, dass diese gemeinsame Position auch die Abstimmung übermorgen hier im Parlament überstehen wird. Und dann, glaube ich, liegt es an uns. Uns würde es selbstverständlich freuen, mich würde es freuen, Herr Kommissar, wenn diese unsere Meinung in Ihren Vorschlag hineinkommen würde. Aber wenn nicht, dann sind wir hier Gesetzgeber und werden auch schauen müssen, dass unsere Meinungen und unsere Positionen zu verschiedenen Bereichen dann eingeführt werden und dass Ihre Vorschläge entsprechend dann vom Parlament bearbeitet werden.

Herzlichen Dank. Ich hoffe, dass wir weiterhin bei diesen Themen in den nächsten Monaten sehr effizient weiterarbeiten.

El presidente. – Se cierra el debate.

La votación tendrá lugar el miércoles.

Declaraciones por escrito (artículo 162 del Reglamento)

Krzysztof Hetman (PPE), *na piśmie*. – Debatę na temat przyszłości produkcji żywności i rolnictwa uważam za niezwykle ważną i potrzebną. Cieszę się, że w sprawozdaniu posła Dorfmana poruszono tak istotne kwestie jak konieczność zapewnienia odpowiednio wysokiego finansowania wspólnej polityki rolnej czy też sprawiedliwego podziału płatności bezpośrednich pomiędzy państwami członkowskimi.

Chciałbym jednak zwrócić uwagę na konkretne, poważne zagrożenie dla przyszłości rolnictwa, dokładniej hodowli trzody chlewnej, a mianowicie epidemię afrykańskiego pomoru świń, która od 4 lat coraz bardziej rozprzestrzenia się w krajach Europy Środkowej i Wschodniej, zagrażając również innym krajom Unii. Pragnę podkreślić, że bez zdecydowanych, solidarnych działań przyszłość hodowców trzody chlewnej w całej Unii Europejskiej będzie poważnie zagrożona, dlatego też apeluję do Komisji o zwrócenie szczególnej uwagi na ten problem.

Sandra Kalniete (PPE), *in writing*. – The strategic report represents the EP's position on the CAP's future ahead of the presentation by the Commission of legislative proposals, expected 1 June. The compromise of the last CAP reform was not satisfying yet with the new proposals, we have to go further now. It is important to ensure a level playing field and equal competition conditions for farmers across the EU single market. Hence, the Baltic States insist on convergence of the direct payments despite Brexit and the new EU priorities like defence and migration. The direct payments for the Baltic States' farmers are still among the lowest in the EU and remain considerably below the European average. This is not just and sustainable, given that we face almost the same costs and challenges across Europe. Let us change that! I support the EPP lead report which calls for the future CAP to retain funding at least at current levels and for fair distribution of direct payments between MS, is against renationalisation and for the maintenance of the Two-Pillar Structure; any new model for implementing the CAP must maintain a level-playing field within the SM, respect the different competences within MS and entail genuine simplification for farmers.

Carolina Punset (ALDE), *por escrito*. – Entre 2012 y 2016 la agricultura ecológica creció un 18,7 %. Las ventas minoristas en el mercado orgánico de la UE crecieron un 54 % entre 2010 y 2015 y el área total de agricultura ecológica en la UE aumentó en un 21 % durante el mismo período. A escala global, el sector ecológico sigue creciendo con fuerza, impulsado por un importante incremento en la demanda de los consumidores. Aunque la PAC destina a los agricultores orgánicos un pago «ecológico» y además pueden recibir apoyo para la conversión, el desafío al que se enfrenta el sector es asegurar un crecimiento constante de la oferta y la demanda. Con precios de los productos orgánicos más altos que los productos convencionales, el mercado lucha por satisfacer la demanda y la prima que los consumidores están dispuestos a pagar tiene el potencial de fomentar cierto fraude. La demanda creciente de los consumidores, la oportunidad de mercado para los productores y, sobre todo, la gran ventaja como mitigación de las emisiones de un sector que no prevé reducirlas, hacen que la ecologización de la PAC no sea suficiente, por lo que incluso se deberían establecer objetivos de producción agraria ecológica, como en otros sectores de la economía.

Laurențiu Rebegea (ECR), *în scris*. – Consider că politica agricolă comună trebuie modernizată și, mai mult decât atât, trebuie simplificată. Susțin propunerea Comisiei de a pune în funcțiune un program de elaborare, aplicare și control al unei abordări bazate pe rezultate astfel încât să fie susținută performanța. Acest program trebuie aplicat în așa fel încât să ducă la simplificare în adevăratul sens al cuvântului și să nu adauge noi sarcini administrative pentru fermieri.

Modernizarea politicii agricole comune trebuie să aibă în vedere reînnoirea generațiilor de fermieri și oferirea de stimulente pentru tinerii fermieri, care să îi determine să pătrundă în sectorul agricol, dar și să rămână în acest domeniu. În același sens, trebuie creată o ambianță favorabilă dezvoltării fermierilor prin susținerea financiară a înființării organizațiilor de producători, eliminării practicilor neloiale și adaptarea arhitecturii de mediu la nevoile locale.

Daciana Octavia Sârbu (S&D), *în scris*. – Suntem din nou în punctul în care trebuie să reformăm politica agricolă comună. Eu îmi doresc ca noua PAC să poată să răspundă mai bine provocărilor actuale. Îmi doresc să nu mai existe diferențe de plăți între statele membre sau între regiuni. Îmi doresc ca fermierii să poată avea un venit decent și acces mai bun la piață. Îmi doresc ca tinerii care vor să rămână în mediul rural sau să se stabilească acolo, să se poată bucura de un sprijin mai consistent. Îmi doresc ca întreprinderile agricole și fermele care beneficiază de subvenții să fie conștrânse să respecte mediul înconjurător și să producă într-un mod sustenabil. Îmi doresc ca sectoarele cu probleme să aibă posibilitatea să primească sprijin cuplat, iar piețele locale și lanțurile scurte de aprovizionare să fie încurajate.

Agricoltura nu este doar un sector economic, este un sector vital pentru umanitate, care ne furnizează hrană de calitate și gestionează resurse limitate precum apa sau solul. De aceea, eu sper ca acest sector să se bucure de finanțare adecvată. Sper ca în viitoarele negocieri ale cadrului financiar multianual să reușim să menținem un buget semnificativ pentru PAC.

PRESIDENZA DELL'ON. FABIO MASSIMO CASTALDO

Vicepresidente

26. Umsetzung der GAP-Instrumente für Junglandwirte in der EU nach der Reform im Jahr 2013 (Aussprache)

Presidente. – L'ordine del giorno reca la relazione di Nicola Caputo, a nome della commissione per l'agricoltura e lo sviluppo rurale, sull'attuazione degli strumenti della PAC a favore dei giovani agricoltori nell'UE dopo la riforma del 2013 (2017/2088(INI)) (A8-0157/2018).

Nicola Caputo, Relatore. – Signor Presidente, signor Commissario, onorevoli colleghi, nell'Unione europea solo il 6 % del totale di quanti dirigono aziende agricole ha meno di 35 anni, mentre oltre il 50 % ha più di 55 anni. Il rinnovo generazionale nel settore agricolo ha quindi bisogno di misure politiche incisive nella nuova PAC per favorire il ricambio generazionale.

Nel testo approvato a larga maggioranza in commissione AGRI sono state formulate varie raccomandazioni politiche volte a migliorare il regime di sostegno esistente e ad assistere i giovani agricoltori nell'accesso all'attività agricola. L'accesso alla terra, come è noto, è il principale ostacolo che impedisce ai nuovi imprenditori agricoli di avviare attività nel settore dell'agricoltura in Europa. L'accesso alla terra è limitato dalla scarsa disponibilità di terreni e ovviamente anche dalla concorrenza da parte di altri agricoltori e investitori.

Il problema dell'accesso alla terra si è acuito essenzialmente come conseguenza dell'attuale struttura dei pagamenti diretti, che spesso determina aumenti dei canoni di affitto dei terreni e dei prezzi di acquisto. Troppi agricoltori proprietari o affittuari tendono a restare in attività il più a lungo possibile per poter continuare a beneficiare delle sovvenzioni, ricorrendo a prestatori di servizi per coltivare i terreni o lavorando al minimo i terreni coltivati di cui dispongono.

Vanno, a mio avviso, aumentati i livelli di attività necessari per assegnare i pagamenti destinati a sostenere il conseguimento di determinati target, così come penso sia necessario applicare un divieto di cumulo non pertinente delle sovvenzioni con la fruizione di indennità di pensioni.

Gli Stati membri devono implementare nuove misure atte a concedere ai nuovi imprenditori agricoli e ai giovani agricoltori l'accesso prioritario ai terreni agricoli, avvalendosi appieno di tutti gli strumenti normativi e prendendo spunto anche dalle *best practice* già attuate con successo in alcuni Stati membri. Si potrebbero per esempio prevedere strumenti come le banche rurali, che potrebbero facilitare ulteriormente l'accesso ai terreni, ma anche fornire un quadro completo della disponibilità dei terreni per i giovani agricoltori. Va facilitato il ricambio generazionale con normative, per esempio in materia di successione e fiscalità, norme sull'accesso ai terreni, alla pianificazione territoriale e alle strategie di successione aziendale.

L'attuale PAC non prevede incentivi per favorire il trasferimento delle aziende agricole dagli agricoltori più anziani alle generazioni più giovani. È una lacuna che va colmata, e va colmata presto, se vogliamo davvero incentivare i giovani. Lo possiamo fare introducendo, per esempio, misure che possano effettivamente motivare gli anziani a trasferire la proprietà dei terreni, quali ad esempio quelle sul regime di prepensionamento o sugli altri tipi di incentivi al pensionamento.

Relativamente al bilancio, è fondamentale continuare a fornire un sostegno al programma per i giovani agricoltori, aumentando però il livello massimo di finanziamento nazionale oltre il 2 % per i pagamenti obbligatori del primo pilastro, e incrementando la percentuale di sostegno del secondo pilastro per incoraggiare il rinnovo generazionale.

Raccomandiamo un miglioramento delle misure volte a facilitare l'accesso ai finanziamenti con tassi di interessi agevolati sui prestiti a favore dei nuovi imprenditori agricoli, anche da parte di operatori finanziari privati, implementando gli strumenti finanziari per erogare prestiti a tasso zero per gli investimenti dei giovani agricoltori. Serve una migliore cooperazione anche con la BEI e con il Fondo europeo per gli investimenti, al fine di promuovere la creazione di strumenti finanziari ad hoc dedicati ai giovani agricoltori in tutti gli Stati membri.

Un importante punto riguarda la semplificazione: la gestione complessiva dei pagamenti diretti e delle misure del programma di sviluppo rurale è considerata infatti estremamente complessa e difficile, in particolare per i nuovi imprenditori agricoli che non hanno particolare familiarità con il sistema di pagamento, e che quindi necessitano di una forte semplificazione delle procedure e della riduzione dei tempi relativi alle istruttorie di pagamento.

Sulla formazione, la Commissione e gli Stati membri dovrebbero essere in grado di offrire maggiori opportunità di formazione e di consulenza ai giovani agricoltori, sia quelli potenziali che quelli confermati, includendo la competenza per l'avvio di attività d'impresa in agricoltura e le competenze agricole e tecnologiche relative alle nuove tecnologie e imprenditoriali, quali marketing, networking, comunicazione, innovazione, multifunzionalità e diversificazione e competenze finanziarie.

L'innovazione, infine, è uno degli strumenti che maggiormente può contribuire a migliorare il ricambio generazionale. I giovani agricoltori rappresentano un grande potenziale di innovazione e di diversificazione, considerato che tendono ad avere maggiori competenze e capacità manageriali e ad essere più propensi ad accedere ai nuovi mercati, sviluppare nuovi metodi di produzione e utilizzare al meglio gli sviluppi e le innovazioni tecnologiche nel settore agricolo, in grado di consentire loro di rispondere alle sfide ambientali dell'agricoltura.

È necessario dunque prestare un sostegno deciso ai giovani che desiderano introdurre tecniche e processi di produzione innovativi, quali i sistemi dell'agricoltura di precisione e di conservazione, che sono destinati a migliorare la redditività e la sostenibilità ambientale del settore agricolo. Solo mettendo in campo queste azioni si potranno offrire ai giovani agricoltori prospettive a lungo termine in grado di impedire l'esodo rurale.

Un deciso sostegno ai giovani agricoltori è condizione *sine qua non* per assicurare il futuro delle zone rurali e va dunque individuata come priorità assoluta nel quadro della nuova PAC per il periodo successivo al 2020.

Phil Hogan, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, I would like to thank Nicola Caputo and the shadows for this report. It comes at a very important time for European agriculture, not least for our young farmers. As you are aware, the Commission will adopt and publish its legislative proposals for the future of the CAP shortly, and I am very confident that you will see clear consistency between the recommendations that you have made, and the proposal that the Commission intends to bring forward in respect of young farmers.

As Mr Caputo has pointed out, only 6% of European farmers are younger than 35 years, compared to 56% who are older than 55 years. Therefore, with an ageing agricultural community, generational renewal is increasingly important, and it needs to be accompanied by adapted policies. Currently, measures in Pillars one and two provide support to young farmers, notably the young farmer payment under Pillar one, which was introduced to provide an enhanced income support to newly-established young farmers during the initial setting-up period.

In 2016, more than 300 000 newly set-up young farmers in the EU benefitted from this additional payment, which amounted to support of about EUR 360 million. The rural development policy also makes fundamental contributions to creating the best possible environment for young farmers. According to the targets that have been brought to the attention of the Commission by Member States and the rural development programmes, specific support for 176 000 young farmers will help a new generation of farmers to develop their businesses.

So the Commission shares the views of the European Parliament that support for young farmers should continue and be improved. This is a position that I have consistently articulated over the last few years. This is why attracting new farmers and facilitating generational renewal will be an important objective of the CAP post 2020.

Young farmers will benefit from a wide range of instruments, which will include a combination of mandatory and voluntary aspects. But the Commission will not be able to do this alone, and Member States will be requested to establish a generational renewal strategy and address key issues that your report has clearly highlighted, particularly those for which the Member States and not the European Union has competence. It will be important to describe how national instruments – for example taxation, inheritance law, regulation of land markets, territorial planning – can complement EU-supported interventions, and Member States will not get approval for their plans unless they are able to have a very important package for generational renewal, which is a good example of where we will have a common agricultural policy supported and approved at EU level.

In relation to access to land and land transfer, the Commission shares the rapporteur's view that this is a major barrier to young farmers setting up. This is why we have proposed to support forms of cooperation that could encompass farm partnerships between generations of farmers; farm succession or transition-planning services; brokerage for land acquisition; innovative national or regional organisations engaged in promoting and facilitating matching services between younger and older farmers. These are some examples that we can utilise more fully.

On top of this, young farmers will benefit from investment support and knowledge transfer and training interventions, which are important to ensure the long-term sustainability of our farms. Member States will be allowed to establish financial instruments supporting working capital. This instrument can be of primary importance for young farmers and new entrants, who face more difficulties given the high investments and low returns of a start-up phase.

The Commission continues to engage with the European Investment Bank, especially through our fi-compass platform, to learn from experiences and best practices on specific schemes for young farmers and new entrants. As part of the CAP planning process, the Commission will fully engage in accompanying Member State authorities to develop sound schemes for generational renewal, depending on the specific needs, focusing on innovative approaches, best practices and knowledge-sharing.

So the Members of the House, particularly those who are members of the Committee on Agriculture and Rural Development (AGRI), who have taken a very keen interest in, and constructive approach to, the needs of young farmers, can be assured that the Commission shares this view and will be bringing forward proposals accordingly. It is essential that we have more young people involved in farming in order to develop an efficient, competitive European agriculture and food production sector in the future. This report from Mr Caputo, together with the report that we have just discussed by Mr Dorfmann, are important contributions to the Commission's policy development, and as I said at the outset, I hope that they will recognise many of the proposals and recommendations that can be seen in the Commission's forthcoming proposals.

Nuno Melo, *em nome do Grupo PPE*. – Senhor Presidente, este relatório é importante e oportuno; temos que considerar que ao nível da Europa há um agricultor com menos de 35 anos por cada nove com idade superior a 55 anos. Em alguns Estados como Portugal, Espanha, Itália, Reino Unido ou Bulgária, a proporção de jovens agricultores é muito baixa, só um agricultor por cada vinte com mais de 55 anos.

O que está em causa é obviamente a manutenção da nossa autossuficiência alimentar e os problemas residem fundamentalmente na instalação de agricultores, no acesso à terra, na transmissão de explorações dos mais antigos para os mais novos e no acesso ao crédito.

Nós, enfim, enquanto alterações que apresentamos, há várias sugestões que nos fazem sentido, como a criação de um programa à semelhança do Erasmus associado à formação profissional para melhorar as competências e a troca de experiências entre jovens agricultores, o apoio aos jovens que pretendem técnicas e processos de produção inovadores.

Enfim, ninguém questiona o carácter estratégico da agricultura, mas há um abandono das terras que é grave e é preciso dar aos jovens das zonas rurais as mesmas condições que são dadas aos jovens nas zonas urbanas. E pergunto, até terminando, se é compreensível que, por exemplo, no meu país, os agricultores recebam hoje em dia menos dinheiro pela venda dos seus produtos do que em 1986, data da adesão de Portugal à União Europeia. Certamente, quando é assim, a agricultura não é atrativa.

Eric Andrieu, *au nom du groupe S&D*. – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, je remercie tout d'abord Nicola Caputo pour ce très bon rapport. La population agricole européenne ne se renouvelle pas. C'est le constat qui est fait et il n'est pas nouveau, malheureusement.

Depuis plus de 50 ans, le développement agricole, appuyé par la PAC, a favorisé la concentration et l'agrandissement des exploitations et a conduit à une forte capitalisation qui a rendu certaines exploitations difficilement transmissibles. Or, la question du renouvellement des générations – on le voit aujourd'hui – est un problème crucial pour notre sécurité alimentaire et il l'est également si l'on veut maintenir des territoires vivants.

Face à ce défi majeur, nous devons mettre en place une politique volontariste, qui combine des instruments européens avec des dispositifs nationaux, afin de garantir un meilleur accès aux terres, au financement et à la formation. L'entrée de jeunes dans l'agriculture est un élément de dynamisme et d'innovation essentiel si nous voulons favoriser une mutation de nos modèles agricoles. Il faut le dire avec force, comme le fait Nicola Caputo.

Le renouvellement des générations est non seulement souhaitable, non seulement possible, mais il est essentiel, Monsieur le Commissaire. Merci d'en tenir compte dans votre proposition législative.

Jan Huitema, *namens de ALDE-Fractie*. – Voorzitter, beste commissaris, de gemiddelde leeftijd in de agrarische sector is hoog, bovengemiddeld hoog, en slechts 6 % van de mensen die werken in de agrarische sector is jonger dan 35 jaar.

Het is echter niet een doel op zich om de gemiddelde leeftijd naar beneden te halen. Ik maak me zorgen of de agrarische sector nog wel aantrekkelijk blijft voor mensen om in te gaan werken. Dat gaan we niet oplossen door jonge boeren meer directe inkomenssteun te geven, directe inkomenssteun die betaald wordt door de directe inkomenssteun van de overige boeren te korten. Is dat eerlijk? Ook oudere boeren zetten zich elke dag nog hard in om voldoende en goed voedsel te produceren.

Nee, dat kan alleen door de sector competitiever te maken, innovatiever te maken en ervoor te zorgen dat de sector met oplossingen komt voor klimaat- en milieuproblemen. Dat kan naar mijns inziens op twee manieren: door technische oplossingen – zoals big data, zonnepanelen, precisielandbouw – en ecologische innovaties – zoals bijvoorbeeld het gezonder maken van de bodem, veredeling, en het inzetten van insecten om plaaginsecten te bestrijden.

Maria Heubuch, *im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident! Es ist wirklich sehr wichtig und notwendig, heute über Junglandwirteförderung zu diskutieren, denn es gibt da drei große Probleme in der bestehenden Förderung. Das erste – Herr Kommissar, Herr Caputo, Sie haben es beide genannt – ist der Zugang zu Land. Das ist die größte Hürde für Neueinsteiger. Und die bestehende Junglandwirteförderung geht dieses Problem überhaupt nicht an. Hier brauchen wir wirklich eine ganz entschlossene Strategie der Europäischen Union.

Zweiter Punkt: öffentliches Geld für öffentliche Güter. Dieses Prinzip wird von der Junglandwirteförderung komplett ignoriert. Es werden nicht jene Höfe gefördert, die am meisten zu Umwelt, zu Tierschutz, zu Landschaftsschutz beitragen, sondern alle ohne Differenzierung.

Und das Dritte: Wir wollen Landwirtschaft zu einem Zukunftsort machen. Dafür braucht es faire Einkommen für bäuerliche Arbeit. Gerade Neueinsteiger sind oft Vorreiter beim biologischen Landbau, bei der Direktvermarktung, bei gemeinsamen Finanzierungsmodellen, bei handwerklicher Lebensmittelherstellung. Und diese innovativen Projekte sollten wir ganz gezielt fördern, damit sie wirtschaftlich auch besonders tragfähig sind. Das spiegelt sich im bestehenden Bericht viel zu wenig wider.

Luke Ming Flanagan, *on behalf of the GUE/NGL Group*. – Mr President, if it was any other profession, we wouldn't really be asking this question. If we were talking about a carpenter that went off to work every day and they come back with less money than they left in the morning with, you wouldn't be asking why they were leaving the profession. Likewise with a hairdresser, if they couldn't make money off it, you wouldn't be asking why they were leaving the profession – you'd know why. Likewise with an electrician, if they couldn't make a profit doing it, you wouldn't be able to get anyone to do it. But you wouldn't say the problem with the carpenter was access to wood, the problem for the hairdresser was access to scissors, or the problem for an electrician was access to copper. The problem is there's no money in it and they're not making any money out of it, and why would any young person go into a profession where they can't make a living? So how do we help them make a living? We help them make a living by paying them for their produce, by a fair distribution of the CAP and by paying them for public goods. Then you'll solve the mystery. Would any of you do a job that you didn't get anything for? No, you wouldn't. The problem is profitability.

John Stuart Agnew, *on behalf of the EFDD Group*. – Mr President, I'd just like to remind Mr Flanagan, who has just spoken, that farming isn't a profession, it's a trade.

There are three barriers to preventing young entrants to agriculture. The first is access to land. In the UK, local councils owned small farms and rented them out to young entrants as a first step on the ladder. The problem was that there were so few opportunities for the next step that young tenants became old tenants and the system just froze. The second is bed blocking by the older generation. Public money might be used to allow such individuals to retire with dignity and let the younger generation take the reins with new ideas. The third is access to capital by young tenant farmers. This could be facilitated by government loan guarantees. The guarantee would have to reduce in time, as the tenants should be able to demonstrate a profitable enterprise to interest commercial lenders on its own merits.

The initiative by the Commission to give marginally more area aid to young farmers is fraught with bureaucratic problems and open to abuse. It won't resolve bed blocking, it won't increase access to serious capital, and on tenanted holdings, it will just roll out to the landowner.

Κωνσταντίνος Παπαδάκης (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, στο όνομα της ηλικιακής ανανέωσης και της στήριξης των νέων αγροτών, επιταχύνεται το ξεκλήρισμά τους και η συγκέντρωση της γης σε λίγα χέρια. Χαριστική βολή θα είναι η πρόταση απαγόρευσης στους αγρότες να παίρνουν ταυτόχρονα με την πενιχρή σύνταξή τους και επιδότηση. Προκλητικά πλέον προσφέρονται ευκαιρίες, λένε, για την ενεργοποίηση ασφάλισης σε περίπτωση παγετού, ξηρασίας και πλημμύρας. Δηλαδή είναι ευκαιρία η αποζημίωση και όχι υποχρέωση του κράτους και δικαίωμα του πληγέντα μικρού και μεσαίου αγρότη. Νέο χτύπημα αποτελεί και η πρόταση ένα μέρος των επιδοτήσεων να μετατρέπεται σε σεμινάρια επιχειρηματικότητας, τα οποία θα είναι μάλιστα όρος και προϋπόθεση για την όποια επιδότηση που θα καταβάλλεται πλέον μόνο αν συνοδεύεται από αντίστοιχο επιχειρηματικό σχέδιο. Η κατεύθυνση της ΚΓΠ είναι σαφής: ευελιξία ανάλογα με τις ορέξεις της αγοράς, ομάδες παραγωγών και συγκέντρωση της παραγωγής σε λίγους. Μόνη διέξοδος για τους μικρομεσαίους αγρότες η αγωνιστική δράση ενάντια στην ΚΓΠ, την κυβέρνηση και την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση με κοινωνική συμμαχία ενάντια στην πολιτική που τους καταστρέφει με αιτήματα με βάση τις πραγματικές τους ανάγκες.

Albert Deß (PPE). – Herr Präsident! Ohne Junglandwirte keine Zukunft der Landwirtschaft in Europa. Ohne Junglandwirte keine Zukunft des ländlichen Raums in Europa. Ohne Junglandwirte keine Ernährungssicherung für eine halbe Milliarde Menschen in Europa. Deshalb sind wir gut beraten, Programme aufzulegen, sowohl finanzieller Art als auch gesellschaftlicher Art, damit Junglandwirte wieder bereit sind, hier tätig zu werden.

Ich stelle fest, dass die Situation in Europa sehr unterschiedlich ist. In einigen Mitgliedstaaten gibt es mehr Junglandwirte, in anderen weniger. Deshalb, Herr Kommissar, haben wir im Omnibusverfahren schon den Spielraum für die Mitgliedstaaten erweitert. Ich bin aber auch skeptisch, ob die Förderung, die wir bisher gewährt haben, nämlich einen Zuschlag pro Hektar zu geben, gerechtfertigt ist. Die Unterschiede zwischen den Betrieben sind zu groß. Ich nenne zwei Beispiele: Ein Junglandwirt kann von seinen Eltern einen Betrieb übernehmen, in dem alle Investitionen getätigt sind, und ein anderer Junglandwirt, dessen Vater vielleicht vorzeitig verstorben ist und dessen Mutter den Betrieb über Wasser gehalten hat, der muss riesige Investitionen tätigen, damit er weitermachen kann. Das heißt, wir müssen mehr auf die Investitionen abstellen und nicht unbedingt eine pauschale Förderung geben, damit junge Landwirte bereit sind, hier wieder Betriebe zu übernehmen.

Procedura «catch-the-eye»

Sofia Ribeiro (PPE). – Senhor Presidente, a renovação geracional e de conhecimentos é fundamental para a agricultura, pois assim conseguimos trazer gente nova, novas práticas, novas tecnologias e melhores formas de produzirmos produtos agrícolas com menos custos, menos riscos para o ambiente, para a saúde humana e de forma sustentável.

No entanto, esta renovação não significa tirar a uns para pôr a outros, mas sim para integrar os novos conhecimentos nas práticas seculares dos nossos agricultores mais experientes que têm contribuído, e muito, para o bem público que é a agricultura.

Não podemos também esquecer que, em muitos casos, os jovens já colaboram nas explorações familiares mas que, infelizmente, raramente conseguem ter a sua própria exploração devido às verbas envolvidas para a instalação dos novos agricultores. Por isso, considero que os jovens agricultores deveriam ter uma majoração nos apoios sempre que assumam a responsabilidade de explorações familiares, de modo a continuar esta atividade, até porque, como sabemos, os jovens têm maiores dificuldades de acesso ao capital.

Assim, é fundamental que a União Europeia permita uma retirada digna do setor dos mais experientes com apoios claros, abrindo desta forma espaço para os mais jovens.

Ricardo Serrão Santos (S&D). – Senhor Presidente, Senhor Comissário, a agricultura na Europa, como qualquer outra atividade económica, carece, e foi dito aqui, de jovens que proporcionem a renovação geracional necessária à continuidade do setor com maior dinamismo e abertura a soluções inovadoras.

Para além das tendências socioeconómicas que podem justificar o envelhecimento dos campos na Europa, o acesso à terra, a vocação vocacional, o acesso a seguros e ao crédito condicionam a instalação de jovens na agricultura. É fundamental conceder aos Estados-Membros instrumentos adequados no âmbito da PAC para promover o rejuvenescimento do setor agrícola através de medidas específicas no âmbito do primeiro e segundo pilar.

É importante também, e isto é preciso realçar, que as políticas nacionais possam confortar estes mecanismos com políticas facilitadoras de acesso ao crédito, arrendamento, herança de terras e bonificações fiscais com o objetivo de atrair os jovens e requalificar o tecido rural.

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η λήψη μέτρων ενίσχυσης των νέων αγροτών αποτελεί μια κοινωνική αναγκαιότητα για όλους τους νέους αγρότες στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, πολύ δε περισσότερο στην Ελλάδα, η οποία έχει χτυπηθεί από την σκληρή λιτότητα, τη βάρβαρη δημοσιονομική προσαρμογή που έχουν επιβάλει η τρόικα και οι δανειστές. Αυτό σημαίνει ότι πρέπει να ληφθούν συγκεκριμένα μέτρα για την ενίσχυση των νέων αγροτών, ιδίως μάλιστα των νέων αγροτών που βρίσκονται σε περιοχές ιδιαίτερα απομακρυσμένες, και μιλώ κυρίως για τα νησιά του Αιγαίου. Επιπλέον πρέπει να υπάρξουν εργαλεία χρηματοδότησης και, ταυτόχρονα, μείωση του κόστους των εφοδίων, μείωση του κόστους του αγροτικού πετρελαίου, και να σταματήσουν επιτέλους οι κατασχέσεις των αγροτικών επιδοτήσεων. Κύριε Hogan, πρέπει να σταματήσουν στην Ελλάδα οι κατασχέσεις των ενισχύσεων για τους νέους αγρότες. Έχω καταγγείλει το θέμα αυτό επανειλημμένα. Η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση οφείλει για το θέμα αυτό να λάβει μέτρα.

Γεώργιος Επιτήδειος (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, για να μπορέσει να έχει επιτυχία η Κοινή Γεωργική Πολιτική και να αυξηθεί η πρωτογενής παραγωγή, θα πρέπει να αντιμετωπιστούν τα προβλήματα της προσβάσεως των νέων αγροτών στην αγροτική απασχόληση. Είναι αλήθεια ότι έχουν περιοριστεί σημαντικά οι διατιθέμενες γαίες. Επίσης, είναι δύσκολο – διότι δεν υπάρχουν τα αντίστοιχα κίνητρα – να αποσυρθούν από τη γεωργική δραστηριότητα οι παλιές γενεές και να μεταβιβάσουν την απασχόληση στις νεότερες. Επίσης, θα πρέπει οι παροχές που δίνονται στους νέους αγρότες να έχουν κοινωνικό χαρακτήρα και να μην είναι απλά μια οικονομική ενίσχυση και επιδότηση. Με μεγάλη προσοχή θα πρέπει να αντιμετωπιστεί και το πρόβλημα που αντιμετωπίζουν οι αγρότες, και οι νέοι βεβαίως αγρότες, στην Ελλάδα, η οποία έχει καταστραφεί οικονομικά από την εφαρμογή των μέτρων των μνημονίων. Άρα, λοιπόν, είναι υποχρέωση της Ευρωπαϊκής Ενώσεως να προστατεύσει κυρίως την ελληνική αγροτική παραγωγή και τη δυνατότητα των νέων Ελλήνων αγροτών να ασχοληθούν με τις αγροτικές δραστηριότητες.

Czesław Adam Siekierski (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Wprowadzenie nowej reformy WPR oraz nowoczesnego podejścia do jej wdrażania należy powierzyć w pierwszej kolejności młodym rolnikom. Oni mają lepsze kompetencje, większe umiejętności w zarządzaniu, dużą otwartość w podejściu do innowacji. Poseł sprawozdawca i komisarz mówili o barierach, jakie muszą pokonać młodzi rolnicy, szczególnie dotyczy to wielu rozwiązań krajowych związanych z liczeniem, opodatkowaniem i pozyskiwaniem ziemi. Wymagają one dobrych rozwiązań, bardziej otwartych dla rolników.

W przeszłości wiele mówiliśmy o instrumentach finansowych, ich roli w realizacji WPR. Mam nadzieję, że znajdą się one w propozycjach legislacyjnych Komisji Europejskiej i w krajowych planach strategicznych. Sądzę, że podejmą je młodzi rolnicy. Gwarancje, poręczenia ułatwiają dostęp do kapitału. Także rozwiązania związane z innowacyjnością, wprowadzaniem nowoczesnych technologii bardziej należy oprzeć na młodych rolnikach, aby wykorzystali to jako swoje szanse rozwojowe. Oni są przecież bardziej otwarci na wiedzę i inteligentny rozwój. Wreszcie młodzi rolnicy potrzebują rozwoju wsi jako miejsca ich życia.

Maria Gabriela Zoană (S&D). – Domnule președinte, domnule comisar, fermierii cu vârsta de peste 65 de ani reprezintă 31% din populația activă în agricultura europeană, în timp ce tinerii sub 35 de ani reprezintă doar șase procente. Agricultura viitorului nu poate fi sustenabilă și performantă fără ca tinerii fermieri să aibă susținere financiară și acces la mecanisme tehnologice de ultimă generație. Depopularea zonelor rurale este o realitate a cărei soluție o reprezintă măsurile concrete pentru tinerii fermieri. Pentru atragerea și menținerea fermierilor în zonele rurale, avem mare nevoie de pilonul doi, de investiții în infrastructura agricolă.

Accesul la terenuri constituie, într-adevăr, cel mai mare obstacol în calea fermierilor tineri din Europa. În acest context, găsesc foarte bun, pentru fermieri, raportul pe care-l vom vota mâine în plen, însă solicit excluderea părții finale a articolului 2.2 din raport privind restricționarea posibilității fermierilor de a beneficia, în paralel, și de pensie acordată de stat și de subvențiile agricole, în contextul în care pensia din țările din estul Europei este mult mai mică decât în alte state membre ale Uniunii Europene.

Othmar Karas (PPE). – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar, meine Damen und Herren! Ich bin alarmiert und besorgt, dass nur sechs Prozent aller Landwirte unter 35 Jahre alt sind. Ich bin alarmiert und besorgt, dass Junglandwirte in der EU um ein Drittel zurückgegangen sind – von 3,3 Millionen auf 2,3 Millionen. Dass die Gesamtbetriebszahl um 3,8 Millionen zurückgegangen ist, während die durchschnittliche Betriebsgröße um 36 % zugenommen hat. Für mich gehören die beiden Berichte, die wir heute diskutieren, zusammen, und wir werden Ihre Antwort durch diein den am Freitag vorzustellenden Legislativvorschlägen nach diesen beiden Berichten beurteilen, nicht umgekehrt.

Es geht bei beiden Berichten nicht um Nettozahler oder Nettoempfänger. Nutznießer einer wettbewerbsfähigen, nachhaltigen, gerechten und flächendeckenden bäuerlichen Landwirtschaft, des sozialen Zusammenhalts im ländlichen Raum, hoher Lebensmittelstandards, einer lebenswerten Kultur- und Naturlandschaft, einer jungen Generation, die mit Zuversicht gerne einen landwirtschaftlichen Betrieb betreibt, sind alle Bürgerinnen und Bürger. Daher sollten wir tun, was zu tun ist, und die Landwirtschaft nicht die Brexit-Suppe auslöffeln lassen.

Clara Eugenia Aguilera García (S&D). – Señor presidente, señor comisario, señor Caputo, creo que es un buen informe, pero, en mi opinión, el problema fundamental de la falta de interés de los jóvenes por incorporarse a la actividad agraria es el precio que perciben por los productos. Y, por lo tanto, la cuestión es tener una renta digna.

Yo creo —y ya lo ha mencionado algún colega— que no es una profesión atractiva para los jóvenes actualmente y, por eso, tenemos este problema principal, porque no obtienen una renta digna. Y debemos contribuir a ello.

También me gustaría destacar que, a veces, hacemos mención a que la Comisión haga políticas para el acceso de los jóvenes agricultores. Pero no solo la Comisión: los Estados miembros con sus competencias pueden hacer mucho también; tienen competencias para permitir el acceso a esos jóvenes.

Y el problema del uso de la tierra —es verdad—. ¿Cómo es posible que obtengamos un bajo precio por los productos agrarios y, sin embargo, el valor de la tierra sea exponencialmente muy alto? ¿Qué es lo que está pasando? ¿Una gran burbuja? No sé; algo debe de estar sucediendo.

Marijana Petir (PPE). – Gospodine predsjedavajući, gospodine povjereniče, mladi ljudi diljem Europe napuštaju ruralne sredine čime se dovodi u pitanje proizvodnja hrane i opstojnost ruralnog prostora. Potrebno je ruralne sredine učiniti poželjnim mjestom za život, a poljoprivredu atraktivnim zanimanjem ukoliko doista želimo da se dogodi generacijska obnova koja je temelj budućnosti europske poljoprivrede.

Potrebna je i bolja potpora od one koju danas imaju mladi poljoprivrednici kroz dodatnu mobilizaciju finansijskih instrumenata u drugom stupu. Nemogućnost pristupa poljoprivrednom zemljištu, kasni prijenos vlasništva nad poljoprivrednim gospodarstvom, nedostupnost kredita po povoljnoj kamati i nepoštena trgovačka praksa prepreke su u poslovanju mladih poljoprivrednika koje moraju biti hitno otklonjene.

Svi mladi poljoprivrednici trebali bi imati istu startnu poziciju bez obzira iz koje države članice dolaze, stoga im treba omogućiti pristup finansijskim instrumentima i kreditima pod istim uvjetima i kamatnim stopama. Uvođenjem odgovarajućih programa koji će potaknuti raniji prijenos vlasništva nad poljoprivrednim gospodarstvima može se pomoći mladima da ranije uđu u posao, a starima da imaju dostojanstvenu starost.

(Fine della procedura «catch-the-eye»)

Phil Hogan, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, I want to thank all of those who have contributed to this important debate. It is clear – and not at all surprising from the debate or indeed from the previous debate – that there is significant support for young farmers, and rightly so. We also spoke quite a lot tonight about the importance of innovation and knowledge transfer. The one idea of which we have no shortage, of course, is of innovative, knowledgeable young people who are anxious to get involved in farming, but sometimes there are many barriers in their way to doing so. The challenge is to remove those barriers and to encourage young farmers' interest. Also, the challenge is to help them to overcome the many barriers to entry by Member States or, indeed, how we can help in the European Parliament and in the European Council, through the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP).

As I have indicated in my opening remarks, there are a suite of measures available in the existing Common Agricultural Policy and often they are not being used by Member States. These measures have different but complementary objectives. Of course we need complementary measures between those which come within the competence of the EU and those which are within the competence of the Member States. We have to get the Member States to utilise more policy options than today in order to help people and encourage them to become involved in agriculture. Member States have competence, for example, on taxation, and more can and should be done in this area in order to incentivise young people into farming.

When the Commission makes its legislative proposals later, we will include proposals to support our young farmers and I hope and I know that we can rely on your support in respect of these measures, but I would also encourage you to press your national governments to provide appropriate and complementary measures at the level of the Member State.

The European Parliament, and in particular through Mr Dess, Mr De Castro and Mr Siekierski, through the Omnibus, played a very important role in highlighting and increasing the support for young farmers. The provisions in the Omnibus certainly should be implemented in full by the Member States, especially the increase in the farmers' top-up payment from 25% to 50%. Many Member States have taken advantage of increasing the top-up, but many Member States have not taken advantage of this particular new opportunity to give additional income, as Mr Flanagan has said, which is essential to ensuring that young people are, at least, given more attractiveness in terms of the support that is available through the Common Agricultural Policy. The fact that so many Member States have chosen to use the facility is encouraging, but let's hope that we can find a way where all Member States will be able to support these measures.

One of the ways in which we will be able to do so is by having a specific objective in the CAP strategic plans, which will not get approval from the Commission unless they are able to show that they have genuine proposals to encourage more young people into agriculture and the food sector. It will be very important to see the reaction of the Council and Parliament in relation to how the specific objective of generation renewal for the first time will give a clear indication, as I said earlier, of the competence of having a harmonised but also common policy in relation to the specific objective of generation renewal.

When I spoke earlier of the CAP, I referred to it as a social policy. We have a responsibility to maintain the fabric of our rural communities and that cannot be done if we don't encourage or get more young people into the heart of our rural communities through agriculture and food. Several of you have referenced the demographics of the farming population, and you are correct in doing so. Generation renewal is not only desirable but essential to secure the future of our rural areas and to create the much needed jobs for many people in the non-farming sectors in our rural areas. This is a very important objective that we must get right in the context of the co-legislative process that we are about to embark on under the CAP.

Nicola Caputo, Relatore. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, mi farò perdonare per aver superato i minuti nella mia introduzione, semplicemente per ringraziare tutti i relatori ombra e tutti coloro che hanno contribuito a questo dibattito. Voglio anche ringraziare il Commissario Hogan per le sue parole e per aver anche affermato di voler recepire nella sua proposta molte delle osservazioni che abbiamo indicato.

Penso che siamo tutti quanti d'accordo che l'agricoltura in Europa può migliorare e può decollare solo se favoriamo questo ricambio generazionale, perché i giovani sono più in grado di favorire anche l'innovazione in agricoltura. Sono certo che se riusciremo a raggiungere questo obiettivo, riusciremo anche a cogliere l'altro obiettivo che è stato evidenziato da molti colleghi, quello di migliorare la redditività delle imprese agricole. Quindi: più giovani e più agricoltura in Europa.

Presidente. – La discussione è chiusa.

La votazione si svolgerà martedì 29 maggio 2018.

Dichiarazioni scritte (articolo 162)

Ignazio Corrao (EFDD), per iscritto. – La nuova regolamentazione recentemente adottata dal Consiglio, che stabilisce nuove norme in materia di agricoltura biologica, finalmente elimina l'ultimo ostacolo per la modernizzazione del settore e l'armonizzazione delle norme della produzione biologica, all'interno dell'Unione e non solo. Il settore biologico è cresciuto del 125% negli ultimi dieci anni e sta registrando una notevole parabola ascendente, acquisendo un'importanza sempre maggiore. La crescita, tuttavia, è stata fortemente ostacolata da regole che non erano più adatte allo scopo e che andavano assolutamente riviste. È per tal motivo che accolgo con favore il regolamento approvato dal Consiglio, in quanto giocherà un ruolo fondamentale sostenendo la crescita del settore e fornendo un quadro normativo adeguato allo scopo. Ritengo in generale che la Commissione e il Parlamento dovrebbero indirizzare i giovani agricoltori e i nuovi imprenditori agricoli sulla scelta delle colture su cui puntare. Molte colture infatti non offrono margini sufficienti o ragionevoli in termini di mercato, di domanda o di redditività, e questo aumenterebbe notevolmente il rischio imprenditoriale per i giovani che entrano nel settore. Fornire più strumenti ai giovani imprenditori agricoli è la direzione che si sta intraprendendo, puntando a incentivare il ricambio generazionale, ad aumentare le possibilità di accesso alle terre e ai finanziamenti, per i giovani agricoltori.

Beata Gosiewska (ECR), na piśmie. – Udział młodych rolników i odnowienie pokoleń w sektorze rolnictwa mają zasadnicze znaczenie dla utrzymania opłacalnej produkcji żywności, gdyż zapewniają zrównoważony rozwój i długoterminową konkurencyjność europejskiego rolnictwa. Ostatnia reforma WPR zwróciła szczególną uwagę na tę kwestię, zwiększając zakres środków przewidzianych w polityce rozwoju obszarów wiejskich i wprowadzając nowy program na rzecz młodych rolników jako dodatkowe wsparcie w ramach płatności bezpośrednich.

Pomimo tych wysiłków wydaje się, że obecne środki nie są wystarczające i że w przyszłości konieczne będą pewne dostosowania. W sprawozdaniu wzywa się państwa członkowskie, aby przyznały nowym podmiotom i młodym rolnikom pierwszeństwo w dostępie do gruntów rolnych. Rozwiązanie tego problemu wymaga ponownej oceny systemu płatności bezpośrednich i stworzenia zachęty dla starszych rolników do przekazywania gospodarstw młodszym pokoleniom. Zaleca się również, by skupić się na ograniczaniu dodatkowych przeszkód dla młodych rolników, tj. dostępu do kapitału, braku umiejętności biznesowych i niewystarczających planów dziedziczenia. Należałoby również zająć się zmniejszeniem barier administracyjnych. Mając na uwadze dobro młodych polskich rolników, zgłaszuję za sprawozdaniem.

Ilhan Kyuchyuk (ALDE), in writing. – The recent report on the implementation of the CAP young farmers' tools in the EU after the 2013 reform highlights key issues such as improved access to land and credit, encouraging knowledge transfer and succession planning, the setting up of more advisory services, and the reduction of administrative barriers for young farmers. Unfortunately, there are more issues, which we should address such as demographic picture in some regions of the EU that are very unbalanced, with few or no young people living there. Obviously to counter these negative trends the EU and Member States should support young farmers. Young farmers and new entrants represent important sources of innovation and entrepreneurship within agriculture, bringing benefits such as the introduction of new knowledge or techniques, the development of new business and organisational models, more sustainable farming systems (e.g. share farming, pre-financing, crowdsourcing), the increase of connections between farming and the local community, and the adaptation of traditional knowledge to develop business innovations. Therefore, EU and Member States have to provide systematically consultancy and support for young people who want to become young farmers. Because young people are capital, which EU agriculture needs in order to be sustainable and developed.

Владимир Уручев (PPE), *в писмена форма*. – С приемането на резолюцията относно прегледа на инструментите в ОСП за подкрепа на млади земеделски стопани, Европейският парламент още веднъж потвърди силната си ангажираност за обновяване на поколенията в селското стопанство и превръщането му в модерен и привлекателен сектор за младите хора.

Подкрепата за млади фермери по линия на ОСП следва да се запази и засили във всяка следваща реформа на политиката с цел насърчаване на младите хора към кариера в селското стопанство. Силна ОСП, насочена към младите фермери, ще спомогне и за справяне с основните предизвикателства, свързани с достъп до земя и финансиране, намаляване на административните пречки, допълнително обучение и развитие на бизнес умения.

Младите земеделски стопани с лекота възприемат новите технологии и са носител на иновации и предприемачество. Ето защо ОСП следва да насърчава ново поколение от млади земеделски стопани, които прилагат нови бизнес модели, основани на крайните потребители, и разработват интелигентни решения за устойчиви и екологосъобразни земеделски практики.

Обновяването на поколенията е от ключово значение и за поддържането на жизнеспособни селски райони. Привличането на млади хора, респективно младите фермери към селските райони, е обвързано с наличието на подходяща материална, социална и дигитална инфраструктура, както и осигуряване на условия и стандарт на живот, подобен на този в градските райони.

27. Berichtigung (Artikel 231 der Geschäftsordnung): siehe Protokoll

28. Fazilität „Connecting Europe“ nach 2020 (Aussprache)

Presidente. – L'ordine del giorno reca la discussione sulla dichiarazione della Commissione sul Meccanismo per collegare l'Europa dopo il 2020 (2018/2718(RSP)).

Violeta Bulc, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, thank you for the opportunity to exchange views with you on the European Parliament's expectations concerning the Connecting Europe Facility after 2020. The Commission plans to adopt its proposal for the new self-regulation on 6 June. The MFF package adopted on 2 May already provides some key orientations concerning the possible design and priorities of the Connecting Europe Facility (CEF).

We all have in mind the high investment needs in transport infrastructure in Europe for the period 2021-2027. We estimate that the TEN-T Core Network development alone will require EUR 350 billion of investments. In addition, we need to tackle much more decisively the challenge of decarbonisation and digitalisation of the transport sector.

The cross-border dimension remains at the basis of the EU added value. However, efficient and interconnected mobility also needs to be smart, sustainable, inclusive, safe and secure. This is why I have proposed to modernise the Connecting European Facility.

CEF is among the very few programmes for which a reinforced budget has been proposed by the Commission. The overall CEF budget proposal amounts to EUR 42.3 billion, of which EUR 30.6 billion would be dedicated to transport.

Our proposal is thus to keep the current budget levels both for the general and for the cohesion envelope with 12.8 billion and 11.3 billion respectively. In addition, we propose to deploy a EUR 6.5 billion budget for transport infrastructure of dual use: civil and military.

I would like to refer to six points raised in the Parliament draft resolution that I consider particularly important. First, on the priorities. I fully agree that it is important to strike the right balance between the development of new infrastructure and the modernisation of the existing infrastructure. On one side, I agree that focus should be maintained on the development of the network, with particular priority on cross-border sections and missing links of the Core Network Corridors. This is clearly where continuity has to be ensured in order to complete the big projects supported by the current programme.

On the other hand, a much stronger and broader emphasis should be put on the modernisation of the existing infrastructure. We currently need to keep up the efforts as regards ERTMS and SESAR to complete the deployment, but digitalisation should also be supported further. We want to accompany the mobility transition towards connected, cooperative, automated and autonomous mobility, as well as modal integration and new mobility services. At the same time, we want to make our network safer, more secure and more resilient to climate change and natural disasters.

For these topics, the geographical differentiation between the comprehensive and Core Network is not always relevant, so we are planning to propose to also cover the comprehensive network where relevant. But this can only be achieved by a team effort – which brings me to my second point, which is synergies between the transport, energy and digital sectors. For instance, on automated mobility we will open possibilities for these synergies. Importantly, while providing a framework that is as open as possible to synergies, we should re-establish a list of areas of topics. This should be done during implementation with sufficient flexibility.

My third point concerns the cohesion envelope. Based on the first positive experience, the Commission has proposed to transfer from the Cohesion Funds an amount of EUR 11.2 billion to the CEF for implementation and direct management according to CEF rules. Of course the cohesion and co-funding rate would apply. However, we are considering a higher rate to apply to cross-border links.

Fourth, I would like briefly to mention InvestEU and blending. In order to streamline the instruments, the Commission has proposed to merge most existing financial instruments into one single investment – InvestEU. It will have a specific window for infrastructure and it will complement the CEF, which in turn will no longer have specific financial instruments. As regards blending, we should keep the possibility to blend CEF grants with InvestEU, but also to use CEF grants in combination with non-EU financial instruments, for instance from commercial or national promotional banks.

My fifth point focuses on the new component of CEF – military mobility. This is an important component of the new initiative proposed in the area of defence. The proposed budget of EUR 6.5 billion would be implemented through CEF to support civil transport infrastructure in order to adapt it to military mobility requirements. In other words, investments necessary for military mobility purposes will also have to be serving fully the needs of civilian mobility.

And finally, my sixth point, on energy. The European Union's climate commitments require an unprecedented level of investment in energy infrastructure which enables decarbonisation of energy systems. Electricity grids will need to undergo massive reinforcement. Grids will need to become even more digitalised and smarter, to allow for efficient demand management. Some gas grids may be transformed to carry synthetic gas, reduced with surpluses of renewable energy. Therefore, a targeted public financial assistance will continue to be required to deliver the necessary investments. This will be potentially important where the infrastructure includes significant positive externalities such as security of supply, solidarity or innovation.

The CEF has a very important and growing role to play here, so an ambitious financial envelope is required, as well as support for synergy costs as I mentioned before, where transport, energy and/or digital can act together. Furthermore, CEF will be needed to support some more outstanding investments in projects to ensure energy security.

So we are set for an ambitious but realistic future CEF, and I hope I can count on the support from you, the European Parliament, to move it forward.

Marian-Jean Marinescu, în numele grupului PPE. – Domnule președinte, doamnă comisar, mulțumesc pentru informațiile prezentate. Este evident că infrastructurile de transport, energie și telecomunicații stau la baza dezvoltării economice. Facilitatea de conectare a Europei acum, în acest exercițiu financiar, a fost foarte apreciată atât de statele membre, cât și de Comisie, care a considerat-o un proiect de succes. S-au făcut investiții importante în căi ferate, în SESAR, în aeroporturi. De aceea e surprinzătoare suma alocată pentru această facilitate după 2021, chiar dacă există încă ceva confuzii în cifrele prezentate, atât prin diferența între prețurile curente și prețurile în termeni reali, cât și prin adunarea la un loc a infrastructurii militare și a instrumentelor financiare. Sper ca regulamentele să clarifice acest lucru.

Însă, vreau să vă reamintesc că în 2011 Comisia a propus pentru această facilitate 50 de miliarde de euro. Suma propusă acum este mai mică decât cea din 2011 și este mai mică și decât cea din actualul exercițiu financiar, pentru transport în special. Pentru energie sau făcută ceva îmbunătățiri și, de asemenea, pentru telecomunicații. Așa că, cred că, trebuie să faceți eforturi până pe 6 iunie, când spuneți că prezentați propunerea de modificare a acestei sume în sprijinul infrastructurii de transport.

Inés Ayala Sender, *en nombre del Grupo S&D*. – Señor presidente, la verdad es que, en este ejercicio, algunos habríamos preferido poder ir todos juntos y no que el señor Marinescu saliera, digamos, en solitario. Por eso, los socialistas hemos preferido ir de la mano con el Grupo liberal y, desde luego, invitar a que sea todo el Parlamento el que tenga finalmente una posición de refuerzo y de petición de un MCE fuerte para el próximo decenio. La verdad es que el anterior, del que estamos en los últimos años, ha sido un caso de éxito en un momento de falta clamorosa de inversión en infraestructuras en Europa durante casi diez años. Precisamente, el valor añadido que ha generado nos ha supuesto una gran ayuda. También, gracias a la energía enorme de la INEA, y hay que reconocerlo.

Sin embargo, de cara al próximo período nos encontramos que hay que ser realistas. Encontramos que hay, de momento, un recorte del 12 % y del 13 %, algo que hay que reconocer y, por lo tanto, la batalla supone reponerlo. En segundo lugar, necesitaríamos unas sinergias urgentes entre transporte y energía, porque los automóviles limpios están ya saliendo de las fábricas y los compradores no saben qué hacer, por dónde y de qué manera administrarlos. Y finalmente, también necesitamos la implementación en los países cuyos programas nacionales no se corresponden con los compromisos europeos. Eso es también urgente.

Kosma Złotowski, *w imieniu grupy ECR*. – Panie Przewodniczący! Pani Komisarz! Bardzo się cieszę, że uznała Pani ten program Connecting Europe za bardzo ważny. Był to fundusz, który dobrze służy integracji i modernizacji infrastruktury w Unii Europejskiej. Pytanie o jego przyszłość po roku 2020 to tak naprawdę pytanie o przyszłość sieci transeuropejskich i związanych z nimi projektów regionalnych. Kluczowy element tego przedsięwzięcia – europejskie korytarze transportowe – wciąż jest nieukończony. Niezbędne jest nie tylko stabilne finansowanie tego projektu w kolejnej perspektywie budżetowej, ale także zwiększenie nakładów na inwestycje między innymi w obszarze transportu śródlądowego. Stoją przed nami też nowe wyzwania, na które potrzebne są środki: rzeczywiste a nie tylko pozorne przejście na niskoemisyjne środki transportu, rozwój autonomicznej mobilności oraz cały pakiet ambitnych celów jakie Komisja stawia sobie w trzeciej części pakietu mobilności. Connecting Europe (...) całej architektury finansowania inwestycji infrastrukturalnych, która może być poważnie zagrożona przez drastyczne cięcia w polityce spójności. Instrument „Łącząc Europę” nie może paść ofiarą tej samej polityki oszczędności. Innymi słowy: więcej pieniędzy, Pani Komisarz.

Pavel Telička, *on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – Mr President, I am looking forward to negotiating the joint motion for a resolution with my colleagues tomorrow. I am sure that we are going to have a good paper and I hope that the Commission will take it seriously. You personally should take it as support for your efforts.

There will be a number of invitations, challenges and also negative signals. One has already been mentioned. CEF is a success story. We are doing very well and are oversubscribed, but if we look at the allocation of financial means, in constant prices we have 12 to 13, respectively, percent cuts. This is something that this House and the majorities in this House will not understand. Taking into account the question of assessment, where we could also do better from the side of the European coordinators is in really assessing the actual progress that is being made so that we can show it to our citizens. It is not a question of how much money has been allocated, but what the real result is.

I will make three brief remarks. Firstly, regarding the complex relationship with Horizon 2020 or EFSI, this has to be our focus. Secondly, yes to blending. I think we have got some positive results. Let's work on it with public money. Thirdly, I think that we need to understand that there is basically an excess of everything, that is: use it or lose it. That is the reason why this programme has been successful.

My apologies for going over my allocated time.

Νεοκλής Σουλκιώτης, εξ ονόματος της ομάδας GUE/NGL. – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, εάν αξιοποιηθεί σωστά το πρόγραμμα «Συνδέοντας την Ευρώπη» μπορεί πραγματικά να συμβάλει στη δημιουργία των αναγκαίων υποδομών ενέργειας και μεταφορών που είναι ζωτικής σημασίας για τους λαούς της Ευρώπης. Απαιτείται λοιπόν να πάψουν οι περικοπές και να σταματήσει να διατίθεται μέρος του κονδυλίου στο Ευρωπαϊκό Ταμείο Στρατηγικών Επενδύσεων, το οποίο, αντί να προωθεί έργα δημοσίου συμφέροντος, επενδύει εκεί που συμφέρει τους ιδιώτες επενδυτές. Το σημαντικότερο όμως είναι να μη χρησιμοποιηθεί το πρόγραμμα αυτό για την περαιτέρω στρατιωτικοποίηση της Ένωσης μέσω της χρηματοδότησης υποδομών μεταφοράς για βελτίωση της στρατιωτικής κινητικότητας, όπως έχει εξαγγείλει η Επιτροπή. Στόχος πρέπει να είναι να προωθούνται έργα που έχει πραγματικά ανάγκη η κοινωνία, τα οποία θα συμβάλουν στην ενίσχυση της περιφερειακής συνοχής, στη μακροπρόθεσμη ανάπτυξη, καθώς και στη δημιουργία νέων ποιοτικών θέσεων εργασίας, ενώ ταυτόχρονα θα πληρούν όλους τους περιβαλλοντικούς κανόνες. Μια σημαντική προτεραιότητα είναι να προωθηθούν έργα για άρση της απομόνωσης στην οποία είναι καταδικασμένα ορισμένα κράτη και περιοχές στην Ένωση.

Wim van de Camp (PPE). – Voorzitter, wij hebben vanavond te maken met een zeer succesvol programma. Het zogenaamde CEF-programma gaat niet alleen over transport, maar ook over energie en telecom. Ik denk dat we de afgelopen periode hebben bewezen dat dit een van de beste investeringsprogramma's is die de Europese Unie kent. Het gaat hier namelijk niet over subsidies of over overdrachtsuitgaven, maar puur om goede investeringen in de toekomst van diezelfde Europese Unie.

Dit debat vanavond, meneer de Voorzitter, is bedoeld om commissaris Bulc de laatste push te geven om dat CEF-programma overeind te houden en om wat mijn collega Marinescu zei zo mogelijk uit te breiden. Dit gaat echt over de toekomst van de EU en het is meer dan de moeite waard om daar vanavond op dit late tijdstip nog een debat aan te wijden.

Isabella De Monte (S&D). – Signor Presidente, gentile Commissaria, onorevoli colleghi, un discorso sui fondi destinati al meccanismo per collegare l'Europa non può che essere fatto sul lungo termine. Sappiamo bene, infatti, che quando si parla di progetti infrastrutturali, le risorse necessarie sono ingenti e gli stanziamenti necessitano di una ineccepibile pianificazione.

Per questo motivo, credo che la dotazione del CEF debba essere non solo ripristinata, ma debba essere implementata al fine di concludere almeno i progetti del *core network* del TEN-T. Serve quindi un cambio netto dopo i tagli che sono stati effettuati per finanziare l'EFSI.

Sono dell'idea che l'unificazione europea sia anche un fattore fisico, e mai come in questo momento abbiamo bisogno di una rete che ci assicuri lo sviluppo, la crescita, la connettività territoriale anche nelle zone remote.

E infine l'Europa deve mantenere, io dico, il controllo non solo sui corridoi ma sull'intera rete logistica in generale.

Massimiliano Salini (PPE). – Signor Presidente, signora Commissaria, onorevoli colleghi, la risoluzione proposta dal collega Marinescu sul CEF è realmente orientata a realizzare una delle priorità assolute dell'Unione europea: garantire connettività e garantire innovazione.

Il pregio del CEF in questi sette anni è stato quello di garantire, oltre ad una potenza di fuoco enorme sugli investimenti per le infrastrutture, garantire appunto uno spazio per l'innovazione nell'ambito della C-ITS, i carburanti alternativi, tutto quello spazio di cui abbiamo bisogno anche per la sfida della digitalizzazione e della decarbonizzazione.

Quindi un piano completo e riuscito. Quindi non si giustificano tagli alle risorse, ma io aggiungo un elemento. L'elemento riguarda non solo la quantità di risorse, ma la tipologia della struttura del meccanismo, perché anche quella ha funzionato ed è utile mantenerla. Quindi finanziamenti a fondo perduto e un *board* direttivo indipendente. Anche questi aspetti di metodo dovranno essere oggetto della nostra attenzione.

Procedura «catch-the-eye»

Francisco José Millán Mon (PPE). – Señor presidente, señora comisaria, las infraestructuras de transporte son un elemento fundamental de la acción de la Unión Europea y uno de los más visibles.

El Mecanismo «Conectar Europa» (MCE) tiene un alto valor añadido europeo: las inversiones en infraestructuras mejoran la competitividad; refuerzan la cohesión económica, social y territorial; permiten la conectividad y el acceso al mercado interior de las regiones más periféricas; son un motor de crecimiento.

Por ello, el MCE tiene que reforzarse en el ámbito del transporte para poder completar la red básica en 2030.

Yo quiero subrayar especialmente la necesidad de aumentar la conectividad de las regiones y puertos de la fachada atlántica de la Unión Europea. Para ello es indispensable incorporar nuevos tramos al corredor atlántico del MCE.

Por consiguiente, yo le pido, señora comisaria, que en la revisión del MCE que está efectuando estos días, incluya las modificaciones del corredor atlántico presentadas por el Gobierno de España y que afecten al noroeste de la península ibérica.

Finalmente, espero que la dotación presupuestaria del MCE pueda estar a la altura de las necesidades de esta importantísima iniciativa.

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, ο μηχανισμός «Συνδέοντας την Ευρώπη» μετά το 2020 είναι πράγματι σημαντικός. Όμως, πρώτα από όλα, απαιτεί κονδύλια. Για τον λόγο αυτό δεν πρέπει να υπάρξει καμία μείωση κονδυλίων. Πρέπει να δοθεί έμφαση στη συνδεσιμότητα και την καινοτομία. Ταυτόχρονα όμως πρέπει να υπάρξει ενίσχυση των χωρών και των περιοχών, οι οποίες είναι απομονωμένες. Αυτό ισχύει, ιδιαίτερα, για την Ελλάδα, η οποία είναι στο ακρότατο σημείο της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, αλλά επίσης και για τα νησιά του Αιγαίου, τα οποία έχουν κυριολεκτικά αποκοπεί. Στο πλαίσιο αυτό πρέπει να υπάρξει ρύθμιση για το λεγόμενο μεταφορικό ισοδύναμο και να υπάρξει χρηματοδότηση των λειτουργικών ενεργειών και δράσεων για το μεταφορικό ισοδύναμο μέσα από το πρόγραμμα Περιφερειακής Ανάπτυξης. Ταυτόχρονα, συμφωνώ με την έμφαση για νέες υποδομές ή τον εκσυγχρονισμό των υποδομών που υπάρχουν αυτή τη στιγμή.

Xabier Benito Ziluaga (GUE/NGL). – Señor presidente, podríamos llamar al Mecanismo «Conectar Europa» «el Fondo para las infraestructuras inútiles e impuestas», y explico por qué. En los últimos cuatro años, este Mecanismo ha destinado 1 200 millones de euros a infraestructuras del contaminante gas fósil. Además, la mayor inversión se destinará a la interconexión eléctrica entre España y Francia por el golfo de Bizkaia y cabe recalcar que esta interconexión ha recibido, por su lado, 578 millones de euros, pero, por parte de la ciudadanía, ha recibido 6 800 alegaciones en contra.

En Gatika y en Bizkaia numerosos colectivos se están organizando contra él. Y motivos no faltan. La interconexión tiene un alto riesgo de sobrecostes que pagarán la gente y las empresas: según un informe de los propios reguladores, con todas las infraestructuras planificadas las tarifas aumentarán un 3,5 %.

La interconexión tampoco ayudará en absoluto a las renovables: por ejemplo, con la entrada de la interconexión por Cataluña, se multiplicaron por seis las restricciones a los parques eólicos. Si quieren ayudar, de verdad, a la entrada de las renovables, plantéense el final del carbón y de la energía nuclear.

Andrey Novakov (PPE). – Mr President, I believe that we do not need a budget to advertise the European Union. It is enough to promote the results that the Connecting Europe Facility is producing, because on our European roads there is more politics than tarmac, I believe. We all agree here that the biggest cause of car accidents is bottlenecks, and at the same time, the best tool we can provide to solve bottlenecks is the Connecting Europe Facility. We all agree here that we have to complete the trans-European transport (TEN-T) core network. We all agree that we need half a trillion to complete that network, and still we do not provide a sufficient budget for the Connecting Europe Facility. I think we should do better than this. Although at the moment we have to agree that the progress made in the Connecting Europe Facility is significant, I believe we should create additional tools of influence to the Member States in order to push them to make it possible to complete the TEN-T network as soon as possible.

João Pimenta Lopes (GUE/NGL). – Senhor Presidente, a Comissão prossegue a sua estratégia de dourar a pílula das políticas que propõe. Sobram adjetivos, mas a prática não acompanha o vosso discurso. Instrumentos como o mecanismo «Interligar a Europa» ou a dita rede transeuropeia de transportes têm servido de sorvedouro de dinheiros públicos para o setor privado ou alimentado as nefastas parcerias público-privadas, estratégias políticas que promoveram a privatização da oferta pública de serviços, o desinvestimento nos equipamentos e infraestruturas, a degradação e o encarecimento do serviço prestado às populações, a precarização das relações laborais.

A Sra. Comissária falou de um pacote financeiro que permita respostas determinantes para o desenvolvimento do setor. Promessas espúrias, quando sabemos a machadada orçamental que a Comissão prepara para o próximo QFP, nomeadamente no que à coesão diz respeito que, já há muito o sabemos, nunca foi o objetivo real da União Europeia.

Exige-se o aumento dos fundos para a coesão livres de condicionalidades, permitindo a países como Portugal fortes investimentos públicos no setor, políticas e respostas públicas que sirvam as necessidades das populações e do desenvolvimento do país.

(Fine della procedura «catch-the-eye»)

Violeta Bulc, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, honourable Members, thank you very much for this debate, which demonstrates again the positive aspects of the current Connecting Europe Facility (CEF) and the common willingness to reinforce the instrument after 2020, both in terms of budget and priorities. The period after 2020 will be crucial to ensure the successful delivery of the TEN-T core network within the given deadline by 2030. Various improvements to CEF 2.0 will significantly contribute to achieving these goals. I have, in particular, taken note of your interests, priorities and synergies concerning the support for infrastructure projects. Let me elaborate on some of your comments.

First, regarding the CEF budget. The Multiannual Financial Framework (MFF) proposal incorporates an ambitious proposal for the future of CEF, which is among the very few programmes with a reinforced budget, amounting to a total of EUR 30.6 billion for 2021-2027, circa 20% more compared to the current period 2014-2020. Not only has the MFF proposal preserved existing elements of CEF in the general and cohesion envelope; the CEF has been further reinforced with a new pillar of military mobility. During the difficult times surrounding the withdrawal of the UK, this is an impressive achievement, showing that the CEF has been recognised by the Commission as an effective instrument, adding real value to the European single market. Let me stress here again that all the money allocated to military mobility is allocated to dual use; all the infrastructure is civil infrastructure used for civil purposes and then reinforced also for military mobility.

On synergies: synergies between transport, energy and the digital sector will be implemented through a joint work programme, jointly financed and with the possibility to apply to the highest co-funding rate in the sector concerned. We are yet to define clear criteria under which the synergies will be taking place.

Again, let me stress that the ‘use it or lose it’ principle will remain part of CEF. This was one of the most successful principles. It allowed us such a high level of delivery that, already in the first three years of this Commission, our deployment achieved more than 90%.

One last comment regarding the priority projects that was raised by a respectful Member. Let me say that many of the Member States proposed new sections. We could not take all on board, but many of them will be taken on board, only of course those that were aligned with the Annex of the Regulation.

Finally, thank you very much again for allowing me to introduce the initial structure of our proposal that is coming in the first week of June. Thank you very much also for your support. I will ask you to continue to demonstrate it, and I really look forward to continuing discussing it in the coming months, in close coordination with my colleagues in charge of the energy and digital sectors, to allow swift progress on this very important file.

Presidente. – La discussione è chiusa.

La votazione si svolgerà giovedì 31 maggio 2018.

Dichiarazioni scritte (articolo 162)

Cristian-Silviu Bușoi (PPE), *in writing*. – The development of transport infrastructure is currently fragmented across the European Union with repercussions on territorial cohesion and economic growth. Connecting Europe Facility (CEF) is one of the main instruments that aims to address this shortage by focusing on facilitating cross-border connections, leveraging funding from both the public and the private sectors. CEF Transport triggered successfully already EUR 41.6 billion of total investments by 2017 and statistics indicates that every billion euros invested in the TEN-T core network creates up to 20 000 new jobs. Therefore, the instrument brings a massive EU value added, enhancing cohesion, long-term sustainable growth and economic competitiveness. It also contributes considerably to the EU's achievement of decarbonizing its economy in the context of the Paris Agreement. I stress the importance that Member States and the European Commission remain committed to the CEF's main policy objectives, especially with regards to

completing the TEN-T core network and the European Rail Traffic Management Systems (ERTMS). Lastly, in the context of the next Multi-annual Financial Framework 2021-2027, I underline the importance of ensuring proper investments for digital and innovative transport projects and further reinforce CEF instrument by ensuring complementarity with other programs such as the InvestEU Fund or Horizon Europe.

29. Auslegung und Umsetzung der Interinstitutionellen Vereinbarung über bessere Rechtsetzung (kurze Darstellung)

Presidente. – L'ordine del giorno reca la breve presentazione delle seguenti relazioni: relazione di Pavel Svoboda e Richard Corbett, a nome della commissione giuridica e della commissione per gli affari costituzionali, sull'interpretazione e applicazione dell'accordo interistituzionale «Legiferare meglio» (2016/2018(INI)) (A8-0170/2018).

Pavel Svoboda, zpravodaj. – Pane předsedající, zpráva o výkladu a provádění interinstitucionální dohody o zdokonalení tvorby právních předpisů navazuje na činnost pracovní skupiny vytvořené z členů Výboru pro právní záležitosti a Výboru pro ústavní záležitosti, a proto mi dovolu, abych nejprve poděkoval všem kolegům, kteří se na činnosti této pracovní skupiny podíleli. Stejně tak bych chtěl poděkovat za výbornou spolupráci svému spoluzpravodaji Richardu Corbettovi.

Naším úkolem je samozřejmě vyhodnotit dosavadní interpretaci a provádění dohody, která vstoupila v platnost v dubnu roku 2016. Obecně lze konstatovat, že dosavadní aplikace dohody je uspokojivá a dohoda v zásadě plní svůj účel. Domnívám se, že u všech institucí existovala od počátku dobrá vůle k naplnění účelu dohody, a věřím, že tak tomu bude i nadále.

Jde o dohodu interinstitucionální, a proto součástí našeho hodnocení byla i snaha o zachování a posílení těch prvků spolupráce, ve kterých Evropský parlament může přispět svou expertizou. Jedním z takových témat je dodržování správného právního základu. Neodůvodněné změny právního základu jsou pro Evropský parlament samozřejmě nepřijatelné.

V této interinstitucionální rovině bych také rád zmínil otázku účasti zástupců Evropského parlamentu na jednáních pracovních skupin Rady, také jako příklad určité disproporce, která stále panuje v oblasti informovanosti o jednáních Rady v porovnání s informovaností o jednáních Evropského parlamentu a jeho orgánů. Domnívám se, že z dlouhodobého hlediska by odstranění takovéto disproporce bylo ku prospěchu.

Nicméně je třeba zdůraznit, že zpráva se netýká jen institucionálních záležitostí. Především hodnotí, nakolik se nám podařilo naplnit základní účel dohody, kterým je snaha o zlepšení přijímání právních předpisů. Rád bych tady zmínil několik prvků legislativního procesu, které jsou ve zprávě zmíněny a mohou ilustrovat, jak konkrétně lze naplňovat ony principy *better law making* – zdokonalení tvorby právních předpisů.

Myslíme si například, že Evropská komise by měla v rámci svého pracovního programu jasně uvádět právní povahu každého svého návrhu a doplnit jej jasným a realistickým harmonogramem. I to by přispělo k lepší srozumitelnosti Evropské unie u jejích občanů.

Jednou ze základních věcí je kvalitní posouzení dopadů navrhované legislativy. Osobně jsem vždy podporoval maximální možné zohlednění dopadů na malé a střední podniky, které nechápu jako jejich zvýhodnění oproti jiným subjektům nebo zaměstnancům, ale jako zohlednění reality. A realitou je, že malé a střední podniky jsou zcela zásadní pro evropskou ekonomiku.

Velkým tématem je *gold plating*. Pokládám za zjevné, že musíme do budoucna požadovat, aby v rámci implementace unijních předpisů bylo rozpoznatelné, co je ještě unijní předpis a co už je vnitrostátní iniciativa, která zavádí povinnosti nad rámec standardů přijatých na unijní úrovni. To dnes běžný občan prakticky nemá šanci zjistit.

Evropská unie je společenství práva, musí proto dbát na to, aby její právo tvořily skutečně moderní, efektivní, přehledné a srozumitelné normy.

Richard Corbett, Rapporteur. – Mr President, I would like to thank my co-rapporteur. This was very much a team effort, not just between two co-rapporteurs but between two committees and indeed among multiple political groups. Our task, of course, was to assess the implementation of this important interinstitutional agreement that we made with the Commission and the Council two years ago and, overall, our assessment is a positive one, even if there are still two strands being negotiated on international agreements and on the delimitation between implementing acts and delegated acts – they will come back to this Parliament – but what has been agreed so far has, on the whole, been well implemented.

We have moved to having greater transparency in the legislative process. We have moved towards having better legislative planning. We have moved to improve our legislative procedures. We have improved the consultation of stakeholders and we have looked at and improved the process of impact assessments, which are very important. All this, of course, is a question of getting the right balance and take impact assessments and the whole issue of what we are trying to do with them. Yes, we want to be better informed about the potential impacts of laws that we adopt in this Parliament on those who will be affected by them. Absolutely right. But it's not just how laws affect small and medium-sized enterprises as some campaigners seem to sometimes imply, it is about how the legislation affects other stakeholders – consumers, workers, third parties, government finances, the environment. It's a question of getting all of these things in balance.

Secondly, this is not about deregulation, it's about better regulation. When we adopt legislation it is usually for good reason and especially at European level. If we adopt legislation at European level, it is not, as some in the media sometimes portray, the European Commission spewing out regulations on hapless Member States who don't even know that it's being inflicted upon them. No, there is a high threshold to adopt legislation at European level. It needs the approval of this Parliament and of the Council, the Council composed of national ministers, members of national governments, accountable to their national parliaments, who need the high threshold of a qualified majority representing 65% of the population to approve anything. So the idea that we inflict legislation on hapless Member States is nonsense. We only legislate at European level where there is a high degree of consensus that it is advantageous to do so. That is an important political safeguard and I would remind those people, usually sat over there, but I see none of them are here tonight, those people who claim that the EU inflicts all this red tape and bureaucracy on small and medium-sized enterprises.

I'd add one further thing. When we get it right, European legislation is an exercise in cutting red tape for businesses, because having one set of rules instead of 28 different, divergent set of rules in a single market, makes things simpler for businesses. They don't have to adapt to every single segment of the market, adapting their product, changing it, changing the labelling, changing the marketing everywhere. They have life simplified when we get European legislation right. So it is not about deregulating it's about regulating better. At the moment we see actually an example of a Member State, my own country, beginning to discover the multiple problems that arise if you begin, as it intends to do, to diverge and its regulations from the rest of its main market, all the multiple extra costs that will arise, all the extra difficulties, all the economic problems that will ensue.

I leave you with that final thought.

Procedura «catch-the-eye»

Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE). – Mr President, one thing that I would like to highlight, to continue what Mr Corbett has already said, is that the impact assessment needs to be developed further. This is not a question of deregulation, but of a better and adaptive regulation. Issues that are still lacking with regard to the impact assessment include a better understanding of the impact on citizens, especially on gender, which was agreed in the Beijing Declaration but is still not in the majority of the legislative action budgets.

As we are discussing sustainable finance next, what would be crucial is to add the cost of not acting and not regulating. Quite often in environmental and climate cases, people do see the cost if you have to invest or regulate or de-invest, let us say, away from diesel cars. But, then again, there is no comparison with what the huge cost of climate change will be if we do not act, and I hope this can be added in the future.

Anthea McIntyre (ECR). – Mr President, first of all, I would like to thank the co-rapporteurs for their work on this file. As the Employment Committee's draftsman, I welcome the fact that several of our proposals have been taken on board, but I want to talk about the annual burden survey (ABS), which I think is one of the most innovative elements of the Interinstitutional Agreement on Better Law-Making (IIA).

In its first annual burden survey, the Commission undertook a survey of businesses' perceptions of regulation. I am sure that was worthwhile but we must be much more ambitious in implementing the annual burden survey. The point is, we may create a simple piece of legislation at EU level, easy for businesses and others to understand and comply with, but when it is transposed into international legislation it does not always stay like that: additional, or completely unrelated, elements are added to the legislation. The ABS should identify these cases of gold-plating. Member States must always be free to adopt higher standards where only minimum standards are defined in Union law. That is not gold-plating. By using the ABS to bring transparency to the legislative process, we can ensure that legislation remains simple, clear and enforceable and we can make sure that Europe is not blamed for unpopular legislation that has, in fact, been created by Member States.

João Ferreira (GUE/NGL). – Senhor Presidente, no acordo interinstitucional «Legislar melhor» a dita competitividade passa a ser o primeiro e absoluto critério na determinação da oportunidade e conteúdo da legislação da União Europeia. Nenhuma novidade, apenas a assunção de um princípio há muito adotado, agora despidido de qualquer retórica social ou ambiental.

Não são os interesses das PME o que se pretende defender, são os interesses, sim, do grande capital, dos grandes grupos económicos, das principais potências europeias. Como se esperava, as avaliações de impacto foram e são subvertidas e menosprezadas. Confirmam-se mais gravosas limitações à democraticidade do processo legislativo e decisório, aberta que foi a porta para uma maior concentração de poder na Comissão Europeia e para a limitação da capacidade de intervenção dos legisladores, muito especialmente dos deputados.

Vejam-se as perversas alterações ao Regimento do Parlamento Europeu que limitam a capacidade de intervenção dos deputados. Também a transparência do processo legislativo foi, como convém, diminuída. É que é na sombra que os poderes fácticos se afirmam e é a eles que serve este acordo, é para eles que se quer legislar melhor.

Heidi Hautala (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, this February the General Court of the European Union in its decision *De Capitani v European Parliament* ruled that for democratic legitimacy, co-legislators – that is Parliament and the Council – must be held accountable for their actions to the public. Citizens cannot, according to the General Court, exercise their democratic rights if they are not in a position to even follow the legislative procedures and have access to relevant information, and the Court ruled that this also goes for the trilogue documents, including the four column documents on request.

The Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union obliges us to work as openly as possible. If we fail to agree to fulfil our transparency obligations to the citizens, we run the risk that the European Court of Justice will once again condemn us. Let's not make it happen. And on Wednesday we should all support the report by Mr Svoboda and Mr Corbett, and hopefully we can include an oral amendment about the importance of the implementation of the *De Capitani v European Parliament* judgment.

Νότης Μαριιάς (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η έκθεση των συναδέλφων σχετικά με τη διοργανική συμφωνία για τη βελτίωση του νομοθετικού έργου θεωρώ ότι παρουσιάζει ιδιαίτερο ενδιαφέρον. Φυσικά, θα πρέπει να έχουμε υπόψη ότι η νομοθεσία πρέπει να υπηρετεί τους πολίτες και όχι, φυσικά, τα διάφορα κέντρα εξουσίας. Ταυτόχρονα, θα πρέπει να είναι μια νομοθεσία, η οποία να ενισχύει τον δημοκρατικό έλεγχο, και για αυτό θα πρέπει να υπάρχει ταυτόχρονα επιβολή της διαφάνειας. Επίσης, πρέπει να αξιοποιήσουμε και την πρωτοβουλία των πολιτών, οι οποίοι επίσης θέτουν θέματα για τα οποία πρέπει να αναληφθεί νομοθετική πρωτοβουλία εκ μέρους της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης. Η νομική βάση που θα επιλέγεται αποτελεί οπωσδήποτε ένα σοβαρό ζήτημα. Θεωρώ ότι υπάρχουν θέματα που πρέπει να εξεταστούν, όπως είναι η αξιολόγηση του αντικτύπου, η παρέμβαση του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου σε ζητήματα διεθνών συμφωνιών και επίσης η παρέμβαση του Κοινοβουλίου σε ζητήματα που έχουν σχέση με τις κατ' εξουσιοδότηση πράξεις.

(*Fine della procedura «catch-the-eye»*)

Violeta Bulc, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, the Commission is pleased to see the continuing interest in the better law-making agreement and welcomes the report prepared by Mr Richard Corbett and Mr Pavel Svoboda. It raises some important issues and will deepen further our interinstitutional cooperation.

In its short lifetime, the agreement has delivered some real improvements in how the institutions work together, as mentioned by Mr Corbett, for example the Joint Declaration on Legislative Priorities and the new interinstitutional register for delegated acts. We are also still busy working together on various follow-up actions such as the criteria to distinguish delegated acts from implementing acts, as mentioned already, the traceability of the legislative procedure through joined databases and the cooperation and information sharing on international agreements, as already pointed out. I hope this will also come to fruitful completion this year.

The report contains several criticisms, many of them aimed primarily at the Council. But, as you know, our agreement contains a monitoring mechanism to which the three institutions are committed. These issues will be for our next three-part, detailed stocktaking meeting, the first of which took place last December in Strasbourg and which already addressed some of the issues.

We should also recall that the agreement was a delicate compromise between the three institutions and it is important to bear this in mind as we identify how to follow up on issues where Parliament now calls for more ambition. A number of issues have indeed already been addressed. To improve transparency and predictability since 2017 the Commission Work Programme provides further information as far as available on the initiatives in its work programme. This information includes indications on the type of act, planned adoption, legal basis and whether an impact assessment will be carried out.

As a general rule, the Commission is committed to present an impact assessment in support of its legislative proposals and I can assure you that when an impact assessment is necessary, we do it. There were, of course, a limited number of cases where, typically for reasons of political urgency, we have not been able to. When this is the case, we explain the reasons why. Your resolution states that the Commission should complement its original impact assessment when deemed necessary. I want to underline that it is not an obligation, but a possibility. The Commission will launch a stocktaking of its better regulation tools in the course of this year, and this will include the regulatory scrutiny board. This will be accompanied by various consultation activities and we will, of course, be in touch with Parliament to hear your views. We intend to publish a report with findings in the first half of 2019.

Also, as stipulated by the interinstitutional agreement, I encourage Parliament to pursue the endeavours in their own impact assessment work related to the substantial amendments. The first best is that Parliament and the Council, in line with the commitments, assess their own amendments. The Commission may do this for them if it considers this appropriate. We assess in the impact assessment what kind of policy instruments we need for a specific initiative. We have to look at all the possible options and we have specific guidance for that in our better regulation toolbox. Sometimes soft law is just better to achieve the desired policy objective because it is more proportionate and better respects the principles of subsidiarity.

Let me use this opportunity to clarify that all responses to Parliament's resolution are endorsed by the College and hence are political in nature. They constitute a particular form of communication to Parliament. Own-initiative legislative resolutions receive a specific attention. As foreseen in the Treaty, if the Commission does not submit a proposal, it always informs Parliament of the reasons for such a choice.

I would like to thank the rapporteurs again for their comprehensive work and to state that the Commission is ready to engage collectively with Parliament and the Council to give even greater effect to the agreement in our regular meetings.

Presidente. – La discussione è chiusa.

La votazione si svolgerà mercoledì 30 maggio 2018.

Dichiarazioni scritte (articolo 162)

Michaela Šojdřová (PPE), písemně. – Oceňuji viditelný pokrok, kterého jsme v tvorbě unijní legislativy díky této inter-institucionální dohodě dosáhli. Pozitivně vnímám především ustanovení, která přispívají ke zvýšení transparentnosti, například zřízení databáze pro delegované akty. Vítám i to, že zpráva upozorňuje na tzv. *gold plating*. Skutečnost, že členský stát do svého právního řádu provede unijní legislativu šířeji, než je nutné, není samo o sobě negativní. Členské státy mohou touto cestou například zajišťovat občanům ještě vyšší standard ochrany. Ne vždy je ale širší vnitrostátní úprava ze strany občanů vítaná a problém je v tom, že občané nedokáží rozlišit mezi tím, které změny v novém zákoně přináší EU a které stát. *Gold plating* v takových situacích přizívuje euroskepsi a má zčásti na svědomí posílení populistických nálad v EU. Proto považuji za nesmírně důležité, aby Komise monitorovala, že členské státy skutečně při transpozici směrnic či přijímání adaptačních zákonů jasně rozlišují ustanovení, která vyplývají z unijní legislativy a která jdou nad její rámec. Musíme nastolit takovou praxi, která nám umožní vyvést občany z představy, že „za všechno může EU“.

30. Nachhaltiges Finanzwesen (kurze Darstellung)

Presidente. – L'ordine del giorno reca la breve presentazione della relazione di Molly Scott Cato, a nome della commissione per i problemi economici e monetari, sulla finanza sostenibile (2018/2007(INI)) (A8-0164/2018).

Molly Scott Cato, Rapporteur. – Mr President, I must begin my remarks by thanking my colleagues for their engagement and for the way they entered thoroughly into the spirit of compromise that has enabled us to have such a positive and wide-ranging report to vote on tomorrow.

As a former professor of green economics, I am delighted to see that this agenda now has almost universal support, not only in Parliament, but also from the Commission, who have made this a priority agenda, as well as from world leaders, especially President Macron of France. This indicates that the sustainable finance agenda has moved beyond the realm of partisan discussion. It is not the property of any political faction. It also shows that protecting the health and vitality of the planet we depend on is a cause that transcends normal political differences. While we may continue to debate about how banks should be regulated and what is the appropriate level of profits for enterprises, there is no longer any argument about the fact that we need to embark urgently on a transition to a sustainable economy and that finance offers a powerful tool to accelerate that transition.

The urgent need to respond to the threat from climate change has led to innovation in the field of sustainable finance in different EU Member States: the French law of disclosure, German leadership in the field of public investment in the energy transition, the Bank of England's timely action in encompassing the threat of financial stability from stranded assets, the Swedish FSA's ambitious agenda to integrate sustainability into its daily work, and the consideration of the threat to pensions and insurance from the tragedy of horizons by the Netherlands. The aim of the European Parliament should be to encourage a race to the top on sustainable development, to take the best from this innovation across our Union and to combine it into minimum standards for all, guiding investment to ensure a just and rapid transition towards a sustainable economy and society. The sustainability transition is, as its name suggests, a dynamic environment. This is true of the hugely exciting technological innovation as engineers and designers respond to the sustainability imperative, and so it needs to be in terms of how we define and measure sustainability.

This is why our report takes a different stance from the somewhat static taxonomy proposed by the Commission. Our proposal would be for something that time limits the value of different assets, based on their sustainability potential measured by already existing indicators. This would allow investors to shift their asset holdings gradually through time and would enable an orderly transition away from unsustainable investments. The systemic risk posed by stranded carbon assets could thus be avoided, an important first step towards sustainable finance, but we also need to eliminate other stranded assets from investment portfolios. My report recommends extending the stranded assets concept to include fundamental ecological systems and services, so if an investment in intensive agriculture causes soil loss or the death of pollinators, it too should be considered a stranded asset.

When it comes to sustainable finance, my report makes clear that we look to our own institutions, particularly the ECB and the European Investment Bank, to set an example and to rise to the challenge of the Paris Agreement. This must mean an end to any investment that locks us into fossil fuel infrastructure and the inclusion of ESG (environmental, social and governance) goals in the ECB's investment policy.

We welcome the excellent work of the Commission's Expert Group on Sustainable Finance and applaud its level of ambition. Our report lends political support to their recommendations and we seek to convey to the Commission and Council our firm belief that the citizens of the EU look to them to show global leadership on this agenda.

Finally, but crucially, we need to hold the line as politicians as those who will lose value as we move towards sustainability seek to undermine our resolve. Oil will always be able to move vehicles and coal will always be able to drive turbines. For this reason we, the politicians, are deciding that these fossil fuels will lose their value – because the survival of our planet depends upon it. Future generations require us to stand firm and united to ensure that we use the power of finance to protect their future.

(Applause)

Procedura «catch-the-eye»

Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE). – Mr President, the question of sustainable finance is not the cherries on top of the cake. It is not primarily having 8% or 10% of the financial resources geared to green bonds and green investment. I dare say that this is the biggest change in financial markets since the application of general accounting and auditing principles, and indeed the auditing should take place in integrated reporting based on those indicators that go in parallel with financial reporting, having all the major environmental impacts taken into account. As our rapporteur has already mentioned, those kinds of indicators do exist, and it is only a question of putting them in place.

It is a question of having a review of financial regulation and the pervasive incentives sometimes, be it in fiduciary duty of investors, be it MiFIDs, be it the duty for credit raters to grade the environmental risks and in Basel for the banks to reserve higher capital buffers for environmentally-risky investments.

To conclude, I would just like to thank my colleagues for their excellent work. I think that this is the first step, and I hope the Commission will have the courage to follow these guidelines.

Julie Ward (S&D). – Mr President, thank you to the rapporteur. We must build a financing system that works for people and planet and not just for the market players. Sustainability, responsibility and ethics should be at the core of our finances, as should all EU policies and actions, in line with the sustainable development goals. I therefore welcome the focus of this report on green finances and the call to encourage the financing of projects which contribute to the fight against climate change. I also want to highlight the key role of collaborative economy actors such as cooperatives and social businesses, which are particularly important for women. These alternative economic models must be able to access finances in order to contribute fully to the economic development of our countries and our communities. We should not simply talk about entrepreneurship but always about social enterprise, if we want to build a fairer world.

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η βιώσιμη χρηματοδότηση είναι καθοριστική, φυσικά, για την προστασία του περιβάλλοντος. Για τον λόγο αυτό, πρέπει οπωσδήποτε να υπάρξει στήριξη της πράσινης χρηματοδότησης. Φυσικά, πρέπει να αναθεωρηθούν οι όροι υπό τους οποίους γίνεται αυτή η χρηματοδότηση, ο ίδιος ο σχεδιασμός. Επιτρέψτε μου, όμως, να θέσω ένα σοβαρό θέμα που έχει σχέση με την περιφημη ποσοτική χαλάρωση, από την οποία η Ελλάδα έχει εντελώς αποκλεισθεί. Όλες οι άλλες χώρες συμμετέχουν πλην της Ελλάδος. Ταυτόχρονα, η Τράπεζα της Ελλάδος, ως μέρος του ευρωσυστήματος, συμμετέχει στην ποσοτική χαλάρωση και αγοράζει ομόλογα ξένων εταιρειών, μη ελληνικών, και έχει δαπανήσει, για το 2015 και το 2016, 42 δισεκατομμύρια ευρώ. Το βλέπετε αυτό λογικό; Να επενδύει η Τράπεζα της Ελλάδος σε ομόλογα επιχειρήσεων μη ελληνικών και, ταυτόχρονα, η Ελλάδα να είναι εκτός ποσοτικής χαλάρωσης; Μπορεί να προχωρήσει έτσι αυτή η διαδικασία;

Heidi Hautala (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, there can be no sustainable finance unless there is transparency of the supply chains of the companies and here, one of the very interesting actions in the action plan on sustainable finance was to assess the need for due diligence reporting. This report of Molly Scott Cato shows that we are getting closer to a tipping point and the time has indeed come for a mandatory due diligence legislation at the European level. That legislation would finally give all companies a level playing field. It would make sure that good companies are rewarded for their actions, and that the unsustainable ones cannot just escape their responsibilities as they do now. Indeed, sustainable finance and responsible business conduct are possible, but if we want it, we just need to make decisions that are ambitious enough and we have no time to waste.

Paul Tang (S&D). – Voorzitter, 180 miljard per jaar is er nodig voor de omslag naar een duurzame economie. Ja, dat is veel geld, maar dat geld is er, alleen op de verkeerde plek. Eén miljoen verstrekken banken als lening aan de fossiele sector, nog los van de vele miljarden die verdwijnen naar de wapenindustrie, landroof en andere praktijken.

Het moet duurzaam. Dat gaat niet met kwartaalkapitalisme, waarbij alleen de winst in het volgende kwartaal telt en banken en andere financiële instellingen niet verder kijken dan hun neus lang is. Het moet anders en het kan ook anders, door spelregels radicaal te verbeteren, door goed gedrag te belonen en slecht gedrag af te straffen en door duidelijke verantwoordelijkheid te geven aan handelaren, investeerders en banken.

Ik hoop daarom dat de Commissie en de lidstaten de aanbevelingen in het verslag overnemen. Dan hebben we die 180 miljard zo bij elkaar en dan voorkomen we dat we nog eens de crisis van 2008 op een net andere manier nog een keer meemaken.

Tot slot zou ik graag de rapporteur en de schaduwrapporteurs bedanken voor de goede samenwerking en voor dit mooie verslag.

Reinhard Bütikofer (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, thank you to Molly Scott Cato. The environmental, climate and biodiversity challenges we are facing are so momentous and radical that we do, indeed, need the race to the top that you are talking about. It is a basic experience of human civilization that, at times, without radical innovation there is no survival. Today is such a time. We need social and political creativity and we must battle firmly against old thinking and old habits that tend to block the emergence of new perspectives. This is why we pursue carbon divestment together with promoting green finance. While we cherish Molly's report and applaud the work of the Commission, we also cherish the fact that a green finance leadership programme is presently being set up in China, led by academics from Tsinghua University. This is the kind of competition that we should all savour. On this front, Europe has an obligation to the whole world and in particular to future generations. Let us not fall short.

Κώστας Μαυρίδης (S&D). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, θα ήθελα και εγώ με τη σειρά μου να συγχαρώ την εισηγήτρια. Θα ήθελα να σας συγχαρώ ειλικρινά, μαζί με τους σκιώδεις εισηγητές, για αυτή την έκθεση. Θα ήθελα να τονίσω, και ως μέλος της Επιτροπής Οικονομικής και Νομισματικής Πολιτικής, ότι η βιώσιμη χρηματοδότηση δεν αφορά μόνο οικονομικά θέματα, αλλά αφορά την ποιότητα της ευημερίας του συνόλου της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, και κατ' επέκταση, της ανθρωπότητας. Περιβάλλον, πράσινη οικονομία, κλιματικές αλλαγές. Μένω στο τελευταίο, κλιματικές αλλαγές. Οι φοβερές επιπτώσεις τους μπορούν να αντιμετωπιστούν αποτελεσματικά μόνο με μακροπρόθεσμο σχεδιασμό. Δυστυχώς, έχει λεχθεί μια μεγάλη αλήθεια: δεν μπορεί να αφεθεί ελεύθερη η οικονομία, ως έχει, να λειτουργήσει και να διασφαλίσει ότι η ποιότητα της ευημερίας θα γίνει με τον σωστό τρόπο. Για αυτό απαιτείται ρύθμιση μέσα από τον δικό μας τον σχεδιασμό. Και πάλι συγχαρητήρια!

(Fine della procedura «catch-the-eye»)

Violeta Bulc, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, I would like to congratulate the rapporteur, Ms Scott Cato, for taking the initiative to present this report. I welcome the support that the report gives to the work on sustainable finance. I also welcome the large consensus among political groups on the best way forward. This is encouraging in view of our future work and discussions on the legislative proposals on sustainable finance that the Commission presented last week. These proposals already address some of your concerns.

First, we will start the process of designing an EU classification system for sustainable economic activities which can inform future EU standards and labels for green financial products such as green bonds or investment funds. We are looking forward to the European Parliament support on this important proposal.

Second, for those who manage investments on behalf of others, we propose to clarify that their duty towards their clients includes the systemic incorporation of sustainability risks into their investment processes. They will also have to disclose how they take this risk into account and what impact they expect these risks to have on returns. In addition, for investment products that actively pursue sustainable objectives, the way these objectives are incorporated into investment decisions would also need to be disclosed.

Third, we propose to create a new category of benchmarks consisting of two specific types of benchmarks: low carbon benchmarks and positive carbon impact benchmarks. We also propose to establish minimum standards for the methodology of these benchmarks. This will increase transparency towards investors on how these benchmarks select and weigh their underlying assets and measure their carbon footprint. In addition, providers of low carbon benchmarks will have to disclose how their methodology takes into account the ESG factors.

Finally, we propose that investment firms and insurance distributors consider the sustainability preferences of retail investors when giving investment advice.

In the coming weeks we will establish a technical expert group (we're going to call it TEG) that will further work on developing an EU classification for sustainable activities or taxonomy standards for green bonds and sustainable matrix.

These are the first steps towards a more sustainable financial system. There is still some work ahead to address other concerns stated in your own initiative report. For instance, the Commission is evaluating the mandatory reporting requirements to make sure they provided the right information to market participants, enabling them to assess companies' long-term value creation and their sustainability-risk management. Of course, further clarification of the role of European supervisory authorities in this process is really important.

Let me conclude by stressing again my appreciation of the work of the European Parliament in this field. Now we count on you to move as fast as possible in the coming months to adopt these measures that will encourage sustainable and green investments in Europe.

Presidente. – La discussione è chiusa.

La votazione si svolgerà domani 29 maggio 2018.

Dichiarazioni scritte (articolo 162)

Barbara Kappel (ENF), schriftlich. – Dem Bericht zufolge müssen europäische Investoren ihre Investitionen in umweltfreundliche Technologien erhöhen, um international vereinbarte Klimaziele zu erreichen. Schätzungen der Kommission zufolge sind zur Verwirklichung der Ziele für nachhaltige Entwicklung jährliche Investitionen in nachhaltige Infrastruktur in Höhe von 4,7 bis 6,7 Billionen EUR erforderlich. Derzeit ist es nicht sehr profitabel und eher risikoreich, in umweltfreundliche Technologien zu investieren. Dem Bericht zufolge unterbewerten Investoren den Lohn- und Sozialvorteil einer entkarbonisierten, grünen und nachhaltigen Wirtschaft. Der Bericht fordert die EU auf, von „Best Practices“ wie der deutschen Energiewende zu lernen und sie zu Mindeststandards für alle Mitgliedstaaten zu machen, um Investitionen zu lenken, und einen gerechten und raschen Übergang zu einer nachhaltigen Wirtschaft zu gewährleisten. Zu den Investitionsanreizen gehören Marktmechanismen wie die Offenlegung von Klimarisiken, aber auch starke öffentliche Investitionen und die Emission von grünen Anleihen. Obwohl ich einen Investitionsschub für eine grünere und nachhaltigere Wirtschaft völlig unterstütze, halte ich es für eher riskant, sich in Prognosen zur Kreditwürdigkeit und Rentabilität grüner Anlagemöglichkeiten politisch einzumischen. Solche interventionistischen Maßnahmen sind anfällig für Marktblasen. Ich teile voll und ganz die Warnungen von Dr. Elke König, Vorsitzende der Systemic Risk Boards, die sagt, dass nachhaltig nicht unbedingt risikofrei heißt.

31. EU-Justizbarometer 2017 (kurze Darstellung)

Presidente. – L'ordine del giorno reca la breve presentazione della relazione di Jytte Guteland, a nome della commissione giuridica, sul quadro di valutazione UE della giustizia 2017 (2018/2009(INI)) (A8-0161/2018).

Jytte Guteland, föredragande. — Herr talman! Jag vill börja med att tacka skuggföredraganden för ett mycket bra samarbete. Detta är parlamentets svar på kommissionens resultattavla för 2017, och denna resultattavla görs varje år sedan fem år tillbaks. Det är en jämförande översikt över effektivitet, kvalitet och oberoende i medlemsländernas rättssystem.

I relation till tidigare år tog kommissionen under 2017 upp nya aspekter om rättssystemets funktion, till exempel hur konsumenterna kan få tillgång till rättslig prövning och längden på medlemsländernas straffrättsliga förfaranden inom penningtvätt. Det är mycket bra att det har kommit med, men vi anser att ytterligare förbättringar skulle kunna göras så att resultattavlan blir ännu mer relevant. Exempelvis tar vi i vårt betänkande upp att ett oberoende rättsväsende utgör grunden i en demokrati, och för att säkerställa detta måste rättssystemen vara fria från påtryckningar, både politiska och ekonomiska.

Vi betonar vikten av oberoende åklagarmyndigheter och uppmanar kommissionen att ta fram rapporter för att stärka åklagarnas ställning. Detta tycker jag är väldigt viktigt. Vi beklagar också att det fortfarande råder brist på data i vissa kategorier och vi uppmanar medlemsländerna att anstränga sig mer för att tillhandahålla jämförbara uppgifter. Vi uppmanar kommissionen att utarbeta nya kriterier för att bättre utvärdera om rättssystemen överensstämmer med EU:s rättsstatsprinciper. Här har jag bland annat föreslagit att vi bör ta oss an Venedigkommissionens förteckning över rättsstatskriterier.

Vi betonar även vikten av att medborgarnas tillgång till rättslig prövning och rättshjälp ska stärkas. Det behövs informationsverktyg så att personer med funktionsnedsättning, nationella minoriteter och migranter får bättre tillgänglighet. Vi beklagar också att resultattavlan visade på att andelen kvinnliga domare inom vissa medlemsländer har minskat jämfört med tidigare år. Medlemsländerna behöver riktade åtgärder för att förbättra resultaten. Det behövs också bättre jämställdhetsarbete i rättsväsendet. Det är en viktig grund för effektivitet och oberoende rättssystem och därför föreslår vi ökade utbildningsinsatser, bland annat som domare bör erbjudas, till exempel utbildning om normer och stereotyper.

För mig som föredragande har det också varit viktigt att bredda resultattavlan för vilka typer av rättegångsprocesser jämförelsen avser. Och jag är glad att vi uppmanar kommissionen att i framtida resultattavlor ta fram en ny indikator för att mer noggrant bevaka tillgången till rättslig prövning för diskriminerade grupper. Vi vill också att kommissionen inför nästa års jämförelse tar fram en ny indikator på information om nationella förfaranden vad gäller kollektiva prövningar. Möjligheten till grupp-tal får allt större betydelse för att stärka skyddet för konsumenter, miljö och folkhälsa i hela EU. Den omfattande dieselgateskandalen vittnar exempelvis om rätten att kräva kompensation för felaktiga affärsmetoder. Den visar på behovet av att underlätta medborgarnas ställning till rättslig prövning och effektiv tvistlösning. Därför vore det rimligt och aktuellt att titta på också detta i nästa års resultattavla. Jag vill avslutningsvis ännu en gång tacka alla skuggföredragande för ett utmärkt samarbete. Vi vill så klart uppmana kommissionen att ta sig an våra rekommendationer.

Procedura «catch-the-eye»

Νότης Μαρτιάς (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η ανεξαρτησία της δικαιοσύνης στα κράτη μέλη είναι οπωσδήποτε θεμελιώδους σημασίας. Όμως, ιδίως στην Ελλάδα, βάλλεται η ανεξαρτησία της δικαιοσύνης. Αυτή τη στιγμή, υπάρχει μια ρύθμιση στο μνημόνιο που λέει ότι, εάν εκδοθεί δικαστική απόφαση που ακυρώνει τα δημοσιονομικά μέτρα που επιβάλλονται από το μνημόνιο, τότε οφείλει η κυβέρνηση να προχωρήσει στη λήψη νέων δημοσιονομικών μέτρων ισοδύναμου αποτελέσματος. Δηλαδή, η ίδια η τρόικα επιβάλλει με τον τρόπο αυτό – μέσω των μνημονίων – τη μη τήρηση των αποφάσεων της ελληνικής δικαιοσύνης. Δεύτερον, η πρόσφατη παραίτηση του Προέδρου του Συμβουλίου της Επικρατείας στην Ελλάδα αποτελεί μια σοβαρή ένδειξη ότι πλέον κλονίζεται ο θεσμός της ανεξαρτησίας της δικαιοσύνης στην Ελλάδα. Οφείλει η έκθεση να εξετάσει το πώς λειτουργεί η τρόικα και το πώς επί της ουσίας διαλύει κάθε έννοια ανεξαρτησίας της δικαιοσύνης στα κράτη μέλη που βρίσκονται κάτω από την τρόικα.

Heidi Hautala (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, I want to thank our rapporteur, Ms Guteland, for her report and for the excellent cooperation through which this report was produced. This report asks the Commission to add collective redress procedures to next year's comparative exercise because it is a major legal tool in strengthening consumer, environmental and health protection in the European Union.

I am very happy to see that the Commission shares this view as it published a legislative proposal on this matter while we were working on this report. The legislative proposal by the Commission on collective redress does not, however, make the call in this report redundant. On the contrary: collective redress could provide efficient dispute resolution and the means to eliminate unreasonable barriers to access to justice in cross-border cases.

The Commission should also examine how the collective redress could be used in cases where companies or other organisations have committed or contributed to human rights violations in third countries outside European borders. Often, due to legal technicalities or underdeveloped legislation, there may be no effective ways for access to justice and remedy at all.

Κώστας Μαυρίδης (S&D). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, θέλω και εγώ να συγχαρώ την εισηγήτρια και τους σκιώδεις εισηγητές για την έκθεσή τους, όμως θα ήθελα να κάνω δύο συγκεκριμένες παρατηρήσεις. Η πρώτη αφορά το γεγονός ότι, δυστυχώς, δεν υπάρχει ομοιογένεια στην εφαρμογή της ευρωπαϊκής νομοθεσίας, και ιδιαίτερα των κατευθυντήριων γραμμών από το Ευρωπαϊκό Δικαστήριο. Και αναφέρομαι ειδικότερα, γιατί έχω προσωπική αντίληψη, στις αποφάσεις που αφορούν τον τραπεζικό τομέα. Είναι ένα τεράστιο ζήτημα, το οποίο πρέπει να επανεξετάσουμε, διότι η ανομοιογένεια στην εφαρμογή αυτών των αποφάσεων πλήττει και την έννοια της απονομής της δικαιοσύνης, αλλά πλήττει και πολλά άλλα θέματα, όπως είναι, για παράδειγμα, ο αθέμιτος ανταγωνισμός. Το δεύτερο σημείο, και τελειώνω, είναι ότι θεωρώ πως έπρεπε να υπάρχει στην έκθεση έστω και μία πρόταση που να καταγράφει ότι στο βόρειο κατεχόμενο μέρος της Κύπρου, που είναι μέρος της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, δυστυχώς δεν εφαρμόζεται το κράτος δικαίου διότι το εμποδίζει ο τουρκικός στρατός.

(Fine della procedura «catch-the-eye»)

Violeta Bulc, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, I would like to thank the rapporteur, Ms Guteland, and the Parliament very much for their work on this file. We share the same commitment and interest to strengthen the independence and effectiveness of judicial systems in our Member States. These are essential for economic development, social peace and a secure Europe.

The 2018 Justice Scoreboard was adopted by the Commission today. I am glad that your report takes into account many of its elements. It is important to remember that the Scoreboard is a tool which is being continuously improved, and your recommendations will be considered for the future as well. Your report calls for the expansion of the EU Justice Scoreboard into the field of criminal justice. The 2018 Scoreboard expanded the coverage of money laundering and now shows, for nearly all countries, the length of court proceedings in money laundering cases. It shows that, while in about half of Member States the first instance court proceedings take up to a year on average, these proceedings take around two years on average in several Member States.

You call for covering the status of public prosecutors and their autonomy. I am pleased to say that the 2018 Scoreboard shows for the first time an overview of how prosecution services are organised in Member States. The EU Justice Scoreboard feeds into the European Semester country analysis in this respect.

With regard to judicial independence, we are assessing the effectiveness of the national legal frameworks and safeguards in close cooperation with the judicial networks. We have developed a measurement of perceived judicial independence among companies and the general public. We also fully share Parliament's prioritisation of the use of ICT tools, which is reflected in the 2018 Scoreboard, for example the use of electronic means in judicial procedures and access to judgments online. These are indicators on how the needs of specific groups of users of justice systems – for example, children, visually impaired people, non-native speakers – are being taken into account in the provision of public information on the justice system, in the training of judges and in surveys of court users. As regards judicial training, the Commission is currently evaluating the 2018 strategy, including public consultations.

Having said all this, it is important to recall that one of the key challenges for the development of information tools like the EU Justice Scoreboard is the collection of data. We would like to thank Parliament for having called on Member States to cooperate with the Commission. When considering any new area of coverage, it is important to keep in mind the objective of the Scoreboard and the ability to collect reliable data from all Member States, based on a simple and clear indicator in line with European standards.

Your resolution comes at a time when upholding the rule of law is high on the EU agenda. I am convinced that with your support the EU Justice Scoreboard will continue to evolve in order to further help the Member States improve the independence, quality and efficiency of their justice systems, which is crucial for upholding the rule of law.

Presidente. – La discussione è chiusa.

La votazione si svolgerà domani 29 maggio 2018.

32. Ausführungen von einer Minute zu Fragen von politischer Bedeutung

Presidente. – L'ordine del giorno reca gli interventi di un minuto (articolo 163 del regolamento).

Andrea Bocskor (PPE). – Elnök Úr, az Európai Unióban 50 millió olyan polgár él, akik nemzeti vagy nyelvi kisebbséghez tartoznak, mégis az egységes jogalkotás a védelmükben. Az őshonos nemzeti és nyelvi kisebbségek ezáltal a legkiszolgáltatottabbak a jogaik biztosításáért felelős tagországokkal szemben. A Minority SafePack polgári kezdeményezés egy EU-s szintű kisebbségvédelmi keret kialakításának igényéből indult, amit a több mint egymillió aláírás tett nyomatékossá. Remélem, az Európai Bizottság mielőbb kidolgoz egy javaslatot ennek nyomán a nemzeti kisebbségek és nyelvük fennmaradása érdekében. Egységes kisebbségvédelmi keretre, az EU társult országai tekintetében is szükség van, mivel itt is nagy veszélyt jelent az asszimiláció és a már megszerzett jogok folyamatos szűkítése.

Ukrajna 2017. szeptember 1-jétől lett társult országa az EU-nak. Sajnos pont azután szaporodtak meg a kisebbségekkel szembeni törvényi jogszűkítések, melyek közül a legsúlyosabb az oktatási törvény nyelvi cikkelye, amely megszünteti az anyanyelvi oktatást a kisebbségek középiskolaiban. Elfogadhatatlan, hogy több mint fél évvel a Velencei Bizottság javaslatai és a nemzetközi állásfoglalások ellenére sem történt eddig módosítás a cikkely tekintetében. Tisztelt Képviselők, Biztosok! Nekünk, felelős európai politikusoknak tennünk kell a kisebbségi közösségek védelme érdekében az Európai Unió tag- és társult országaiban egyaránt.

Κώστας Μαυρίδης (S&D). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, τα εγκλήματα πολέμου και τα εγκλήματα κατά της ανθρωπότητας τα τελευταία χρόνια ήρθαν στο προσκήνιο χάρη στα φοβερά εγκλήματα των τζιχαντιστών και άλλων τρομοκρατικών οργανώσεων που δρουν έξω από το έδαφος της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης. Πιστεύουμε εμείς στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση ότι το κράτος δικαίου εφαρμόζεται σε όλα τα κράτη μέλη τουλάχιστον σε σχέση με τέτοια ειδικά εγκλήματα. Ωστόσο, τις προάλλες στο βόρειο κατεχόμενο μέρος της Κύπρου, ένας Τουρκοκύπριος, ονόματι Τουρκοκούντ Γεναγρλί, αποκάλυψε με κομψισμό ότι συνόδευε τον τουρκικό στρατό κατά την εισβολή του 1974, ο ίδιος ως αξιωματικός, και δολοφονούσε εν ψυχρώ ανυπεράσπιστους Ελληνοκύπριους, οι οποίοι πολλές φορές ήταν δεμένοι πισθάγκωνα. Στο ίδιο μέρος, που ελέγχεται από τον τουρκικό στρατό, ζει όμως και ένας άλλος Τουρκοκύπριος, ο Σενέρ Λεβέντ, ο οποίος προασπίζεται τις αρχές της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης ενάντια στον Ερντογάν. Συνάδελφοι, θεωρώ ότι πρέπει κάτι να κάνουμε για να μην υπάρξει διαγραφή των εγκλημάτων και για να προχωρήσουμε επίσης στο να εξετάσουμε το έγκλημα του εθνικισμού στο βόρειο κατεχόμενο μέρος της Κύπρου.

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η αναγνώριση εκ μέρους του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου της γενοκτονίας των Ελλήνων του Πόντου από την Τουρκία αποτελεί πλέον μια ιστορική αναγκαιότητα. Πολύ δε περισσότερο καθώς το 2019 συμπληρώνονται 100 χρόνια από τη γενοκτονία των Ελλήνων του Πόντου. Το 1919, μετά την απόφαση του Κεμάλ Ατατούρκ στη Σαμψούντα του Πόντου, οι Νεότουρκοι προχώρησαν σε μαζικές σφαγές και δολοφονίες χιλιάδων Ελλήνων του Πόντου. Άνδρες, γυναίκες και παιδιά ήταν τα θύματα της γενοκτονίας των Ελλήνων του Πόντου που ξεπέρασαν τις 350 000. Εκτελέσεις, βιασμοί και καταναγκαστικά έργα στα τάγματα εργασίας, εξολόθρευσαν τους 350 000 συμπατριώτες μας του Πόντου. Πρόκειται για γενοκτονία μια και οι Έλληνες του Πόντου εξολοθρεύτηκαν από την Τουρκία επειδή ήταν Έλληνες και χριστιανοί. Στις 21 Μαΐου — πριν λίγες μέρες — στο Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο στις Βρυξέλλες, διοργάνωσα, ως μέλος της Ομάδας ECR, εκδήλωση για την αναγκαιότητα αναγνώρισης εκ μέρους του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου της γενοκτονίας των Ελλήνων του Πόντου. Να πράξει, δηλαδή, επιτέλους το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο το ιστορικό του χρέος με τη συμπλήρωση, το 2019, των 100 χρόνων από τη γενοκτονία των Ελλήνων του Πόντου.

Yana Toom (ALDE). – Mr President, three days before the entry into force of the GDPR Mark Zuckerberg testified before the European Parliament. He stated that in three days' time Facebook will be fully compliant with the new regulation, but as was rightfully said, how do we know that you are telling us a truth? Is Facebook being honest with us? The question answered itself on Friday. Hours after the GDPR entered into force, a lawsuit has been filed against Facebook and two of its companies, WhatsApp and Instagram, in three countries for breaching the GDPR. It is alleged that these companies never gave the users the real choice regarding the use of their data. If you don't agree you simply cannot use your Facebook account anymore. This is unacceptable. Apologies and handshakes are not sufficient anymore to get Facebook off the hook. I welcome the lawsuits filed by digital rights activists and encourage action on a European level. It is great to see Europeans defending their own rights, but we are the ones who should be protecting them.

Matt Carthy (GUE/NGL). – Mr President, it was only this year that the people of the west of Ireland learned that, back in 2011, the then Minister for Transport, now Taoiseach, Leo Varadkar, intervened to prevent EU funding to the western and border regions of Ireland, including funding for the vital western rail corridor. That this outrageous action hardly surprised anyone living in those parts of Ireland is itself telling. The truth is that a privatisation and centralisation agenda on the part of successive Irish governments has led to huge regional imbalances, massive disparities in economic growth and job creation, and an inexistent public transport system across many parts of my constituency. The questions that the European institutions now need to ask themselves are these: do they want to be complicit in denying citizens to access to public transport, and are they going to allow Irish governments to continue to treat the trans-European transport network (TEN-T) objectives with contempt? There is massive demand for rail transport across parts of Ireland that have been ignored by Irish governments. But will the Commission now step up on their behalf or will they ignore them also?

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – Pane předsedající, já chci ve svém projevu upozornit na situaci v Sýrii. Tato válka totiž významně ovlivňuje politickou situaci v zemích Evropské unie a občané by měli znát pravdu o této válce.

Válku rozpoutal Bašár Asad, aby potlačil odpor demokratické opozice. Rod Asadů a strana Baas vládne v Sýrii od roku 1963, tedy padesát pět let. Byl to právě prezident Asad, kdo propustil v roce 2011 vězněné sunnitské radikály a umožnil tak vznik Islámského státu. Asad se profiluje jako bojovník proti Islámskému státu, ale *de facto* celou situaci jen využil k likvidaci těch, kteří v Sýrii požadovali svobodu a dodržování lidských práv. Po sedmi letech od vypuknutí protestů je situace alarmující. Z původních dvaadvaceti milionů obyvatel je šest a půl milionu uprchlíků za hranicemi a sedm milionů vnitřně vysídlených.

Dámy a pánové, Bašar Asad a Putin jsou ti, kteří zodpovídají za pět set tisíc mrtvých a další miliony zraněných, a měli by stát před tribunálem.

Rory Palmer (S&D). – Mr President, rail passengers in the East Midlands deserve better – better than the cancelled electrification of the Midland Main Line from Kettering to Leicester, Nottingham and Sheffield; better than the East Midlands Trains St Pancras ticket barrier shambles; better than fare increases for late, overcrowded trains; and better than bailouts to companies like Stagecoach and Virgin. When companies fail on one rail franchise, they should be banned from competing for others. Passengers want fares that are fair, trains that run on time and the promised investment in the network, like full electrification of the Midland Main Line. This is why we need stronger rail passenger rights in the European Union and in the UK. Instead of cancelled trains, it's time to cancel the failed privatisation of our railways. It's time to publish a new timetable, a new timetable for renationalising our railways – as a Labour government would – to give passengers the services they deserve.

Urszula Krupa (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! Ponieważ instytucje Unii Europejskiej aktywnie interesują się przestrzeganiem praworządności chcę zwrócić uwagę na kampanię nienawiści, szczególnie wobec katolików w Polsce, która polega na zniesławianiu, bazuje na oszczerstwach środowisk lewicowo-liberalno-feministycznych rozpowszechniających nieprawdziwe informacje mające prowadzić do eliminacji. Ataki nienawiści i bluźnierstw od dawna kierowane są na założyciela Radia Maryja i Telewizji Trwam oraz wielu innych dzieł służących Polsce i mojemu narodowi. Podnoszę tę kwestię w Parlamencie Europejskim, gdyż kampanie nienawiści prowadzone są w sposób niedopuszczalny, co prawda przez polskojęzyczne media, ale o całkowicie niepolskim kapitale dopuszczając się antypolskiej retoryki od dawna. Jak wiadomo z historii Francji czy walki z wiarą w sowieckiej Rosji niejednokrotnie kończyło się to powstaniem aparatu przemocy, który walcząc z religią zbiera żniwo w postaci nawet milionów ofiar zbrodni i prześladowań. Ataki nie tylko medialne o potencjalnie przestępczym charakterze bezpodstawnie dyskryminują zarówno kapłana, jak i całe środowisko wierzących rodaków, zwalczają niezależne media, nie ponosząc za to żadnych konsekwencji.

Paloma López Bermejo (GUE/NGL). – Señor presidente, el pasado 3 de mayo el Consejo de Europa señaló a España como uno de los países que no han implementado de manera completa ni una sola de las recomendaciones relacionadas con la lucha contra la corrupción. Por otra parte, en las recientes recomendaciones del Consejo de Europa a España, se menciona el lastre negativo que la corrupción tiene para la recuperación económica en nuestro país.

La sentencia sobre el caso Gürtel señala directamente al Partido Popular como responsable directo y colectivo de una trama de corrupción que avergüenza a nuestro país y limita también nuestras opciones económicas. La corrupción hace un daño innegable a la economía, pero también a la democracia: saquear las arcas del Estado no es amar a España.

Pero este problema también es un problema para Europa, un problema que salpica y pone en duda la calidad democrática de las instituciones europeas y su compromiso con la transparencia. Es hora de actuar con coherencia y, sobre todo, con contundencia contra la corrupción.

Cristian Dan Preda (PPE). – Domnule președinte, România își va asuma președinția Consiliului Uniunii Europene în prima parte a anului viitor. Va fi o premieră. Pregătirea ei este însă în mare pericol. Vina aparține guvernului condus de Viorica Dăncilă, în primul rând pentru că numeroși miniștri sunt incompetenți. Și mai grav este faptul că prim-ministrul și-a abandonat prerogativele. Puterea guvernului a fost uzurpată de o persoană condamnată penal – Liviu Dragnea. Acesta conduce PSD și, în mod netransparent, dictează acțiunea guvernamentală. Deriva statului de drept este, în România, mai gravă decât în Ungaria sau în Polonia. Majoritatea PSD - ALDE nu este pregătită de asumarea președinției Consiliului Uniunii Europene.

Reamintesc faptul că în primele 6 luni din 2019 vor trebui încheiate negocierile pentru CFM și gestionată ieșirea Marii Britanii din Uniunea Europeană. Există resurse politice pentru a depăși criza de la București, dar cred că doar alegerile anticipate pot da o putere legitimă și competentă, la fel ca în Italia domnul președinte.

Alex Mayer (S&D). – Mr President, I was recently with the trade union Usdaw outside a Lidl distribution centre – outside, because the management won't let UK unions in. 'There's an unreasonable workload to achieve productivity targets'; 'Lidl have a culture of health and safety that is only important *after* something goes wrong'. These are direct quotes from worried workers.

This isn't new and there is a similar story to tell across Europe. Back in 2004, Verdi published its 'Black Book on Lidl', exposing a low-pay, high-fear culture. Lidl cannot be allowed to continue to expand at the expense of its workers. They need a voice, through an independent trade union. So my message to Lidl is: end your opposition to unions and meet with Usdaw. Talk about recognising it as the trade union for Lidl staff. Until you do that, we will keep campaigning outside your warehouses and stores. It is time for a 'Lidl' more understanding.

Branislav Škripek (ECR). – Vážený pán predsedajúci, v stredu budeme rokovať o vplyve premiestňovania výroby v súvislosti s prípadom spoločnosti Embraco, keď bola presunutá výroba z Talianska na Slovensko, za čo sme si vyslúžili medzinárodnú kritiku.

Je v takýchto prípadoch dôležité nabádať ku sociálnej zodpovednosti firiem a podporovať rozvoj priemyslu v Európskej únii. S tým súhlasím. Lenže tak, ako firmy na Slovensko prichádzajú, tak z neho aj odchádzajú a zanechávajú za sebou spúšť. Príklad: vo firme Bodet&Horst vo Vrbovom veľká časť z vyše tristo zamestnancov musela práve podať hromadné výpovede, lebo ide do konkurzu. Vyše trinásť rokov u nás vyrábala. Na rozvoj dostala až päť a pol milióna dotácií z rozpočtu Slovenskej republiky. Medzitým rozbehla výrobu aj v Rumunsku. V apríli vyhlásila, že na Slovensku končí a presúva sa do Nemecka a Rumunska. To treba v rámci voľného trhu Európskej únie akceptovať. Ale je nemysliteľné, že opúšťa Slovensko s nevypatenými mzdami a pohľadávkami. Len sociálnej a zdravotnej poisťovni dlží vyše šesťsto tisíc. Samozrejme, za jej krachom môže byť aj zlé hospodárenie, lenže nemožno súhlasiť, že firmy po sebe niekde zanechávajú dlhy, odídu a my ich podporujeme v podnikaní v inej krajine.

Preto žiadam Komisiu, aby vytvorila legislatívny nástroj, ktorý zabráni presunu firiem medzi krajinami Európskej únie, pokiaľ nebudú mať vyriešené všetky pohľadávky v pôvodnej krajine pôsobenia.

Marie-Pierre Vieu (GUE/NGL). – Monsieur le Président, ce mardi 29 mai, devant le Parlement, aura lieu une manifestation européenne des routiers, qui nous interpellent sur leur situation, alors même que le 4 juin prochain, en commission des transports et du tourisme, débiteront les votes sur le paquet mobilité. Que demandent les salariés? Dans un secteur ravagé par la mise en concurrence et précarisé à outrance, qui connaît des conditions de travail extrêmes, les routiers revendiquent une dignité qui leur est aujourd'hui niée, la reconnaissance de leurs droits et la sécurité professionnelle.

Face à cette urgence, vous leur répondez par un allongement du temps de travail, un encadrement du temps de repos qui les conduit trop souvent à ne plus quitter leur cabine, une *lex specialis* pour les travailleurs détachés de la route, qui va les priver des avancées de la directive générale sur le détachement.

Par conséquent, au final, plus de précarité et plus de dumping social. Pour paraphraser le poète Aragon, «est-ce ainsi que les hommes vivent» ou qu'ils doivent vivre? Pour ma part, je prendrai mes responsabilités lors des votes, comme dans la rue, et je lance un appel à la solidarité avec les salariés de la route.

Maria Gabriela Zoană (S&D). – Domnule președinte, doamnă comisar, dragi colegi europeni, ridicați României mecanismul de cooperare și verificare. De mai bine de 10 ani, România este monitorizată prin MCV. Cetățenii români se întreabă, și pe bună dreptate, dacă acest mecanism de cooperare și verificare nu a fost folosit, în toți acești ani, împotriva unor persoane publice, drept pretext. În același timp, România și-a îndeplinit recomandările pe care ultimul raport MCV, cel din noiembrie 2017, le făcea țării noastre. Mai mult, România este țara care urmează să preia de la 1 ianuarie 2019 președinția Consiliului Uniunii Europene, iar neridicarea mecanismului până la această dată va șubrezi puterea de negociere a Uniunii Europene în cadrul BREXIT-ului.

România a suferit destul și pe nedrept, ca imagine, din cauza acestui mecanism, care acum trebuie de urgență ridicat pentru că absolut toate condițiile tehnice ale ridicării au fost deja îndeplinite. Țări ca Olanda, Franța și Finlanda folosesc MCV-ul împotriva țării mele ca argument al neaderării României la Schengen.

Ангел Джамбазки (ECR). – Обсъждаме днес скандалния проект „Мобилност“. Скандален, защото е най-ярката проява на двоен стандарт, който тази зала е виждала. Предложенията на президента Макрон са антиевропейски и евроскептични. Те са такива, защото целят едно единствено нещо – да разорят предприемачите от Изтока и да привлекат техните работници като черноработници в своите фирми. Този проект предлага не пазарни практики, а административни такива, нарушения на свободния пазар, нарушение на свободата на придвижване, нарушение на конкуренцията и това всичко е лицемерие и двоен стандарт.

Не може да има Европейски съюз, в който ще има фирми, които ще работят на източните пазари, а източните фирми няма да работят на западните пазари. Това е нередно, несправедливо и отново казвам, антиевропейско. Тези предложения сами по себе си показват ясна тенденция за разделяне на Европа на „две скорости“, която е в ущърб на източните държави и би превърнала превозвачите от източна Европа, включително от България, от Румъния и т.н. в гастарбайтери. Това е недопустимо и неприемливо.

Уважаеми колеги, трябва да се осъзнаете и да гласувате против това.

John Howarth (S&D). – Mr President, the conflict in the north Indian state of Jammu and Kashmir goes back 70 years. The departing British left Kashmir's destiny in the gift of a king, rather than in the hands of its people, and wars between India and Pakistan followed. A settlement now in Kashmir is essential to peace and to progress in a complex region. There have been times of hope, there have been signs of progress, but in recent years and months the situation has deteriorated. The infringement of human rights by the Indian military has been widespread and systematic. Several generations of Kashmiris now have no civil experience other than conflict with the Indian state, but the iron fist has failed, and it has cost India dear. In elections in Kashmir virtually no one votes, so in developing relations with India, the European Union cannot ignore human rights abuses, and the world cannot afford to ignore this flashpoint between nuclear-armed powers.

Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu (S&D). – Domnule președinte, dragi colegi, proiectul nostru de a organiza o Europă unită se pare că se cam diluează, își pierde din consistență, iar cauza e una simplă: cetățeanul european, indiferent de statul membru din care face parte, nu mai simte că Bruxelles-ul lucrează pentru el. Una din modalitățile prin care cetățeanul european ar trebui adus alături de valorile europene este aceea a politicii europene din domeniul sănătății.

Prin urmare, dacă vrem o Uniune Europeană credibilă, care să aibă în spate încrederea și susținerea cetățeanului, consider că este necesar să demarăm o reformă structurală a sistemului de sănătate. Ar trebui, în pofida diferențelor naționale de abordare a acestui domeniu, să punem bazele construcției unui sistem sanitar unic, care să aibă în centrul atenției omul, cu problemele sale, nu doar profitul și rentabilitatea afacerilor din acest sistem. În acest context, rog factorii de decizie din Comisia Europeană să vină cu o inițiativă în acest sens, care să poată deveni realitate până la finalul viitoarei legislaturi.

Presidente. – La seduta è tolta.

33. Tagesordnung der nächsten Sitzung: siehe Protokoll

34. Schluss der Sitzung

(La seduta è tolta alle 23.42)

—

Legende der verwendeten Zeichen

*	Konsultationsverfahren
***	Zustimmungsverfahren
***I	Ordentliches Gesetzgebungsverfahren, erste Lesung
***II	Ordentliches Gesetzgebungsverfahren, zweite Lesung
***III	Ordentliches Gesetzgebungsverfahren, dritte Lesung

(Das angegebene Verfahren entspricht der von der Kommission vorgeschlagenen Rechtsgrundlage.)

Abkürzungen der Ausschüsse

AFET	Ausschuss für auswärtige Angelegenheiten
DEVE	Entwicklungsausschuss
INTA	Ausschuss für internationalen Handel
BUDG	Haushaltsausschuss
CONT	Haushaltskontrollausschuss
ECON	Ausschuss für Wirtschaft und Währung
EMPL	Ausschuss für Beschäftigung und soziale Angelegenheiten
ENVI	Ausschuss für Umweltfragen, öffentliche Gesundheit und Lebensmittelsicherheit
ITRE	Ausschuss für Industrie, Forschung und Energie
IMCO	Ausschuss für Binnenmarkt und Verbraucherschutz
TRAN	Ausschuss für Verkehr und Fremdenverkehr
REGI	Ausschuss für regionale Entwicklung
AGRI	Ausschuss für Landwirtschaft und ländliche Entwicklung
PECH	Fischereiausschuss
CULT	Ausschuss für Kultur und Bildung
JURI	Rechtsausschuss
LIBE	Ausschuss für bürgerliche Freiheiten, Justiz und Inneres
AFCO	Ausschuss für konstitutionelle Fragen
FEMM	Ausschuss für die Rechte der Frau und die Gleichstellung der Geschlechter
PETI	Petitionsausschuss
DROI	Unterausschuss Menschenrechte
SEDE	Unterausschuss Sicherheit und Verteidigung

Abkürzungen der Fraktionen

PPE	Fraktion der Europäischen Volkspartei (Christdemokraten)
S&D	Fraktion der Progressiven Allianz der Sozialdemokraten im Europäischen Parlament
ECR	Fraktion der Europäischen Konservativen und Reformer
ALDE	Fraktion der Allianz der Liberalen und Demokraten für Europa
GUE/NGL	Konföderale Fraktion der Vereinigten Europäischen Linken/Nordische Grüne Linke
Vers/ALE	Fraktion der Grünen/Freie Europäische Allianz
EFDD	Fraktion Europa der Freiheit und der direkten Demokratie
ENF	Fraktion Europa der Nationen und der Freiheit
NI	Fraktionslos