



C/2024/5924

4.10.2024

VOLLEDIG VERSLAG VAN DE VERGADERINGEN VAN 4 APRIL 2022

(C/2024/5924)

EUROPEES PARLEMENT

ZITTING 2022-2023

Vergaderingen van 4 t/m 7 april 2022

STRAATSBURG

Inhoud	Bladzijde
1. Hervatting van de zitting	3
2. Opening van de vergadering	3
3. Verklaringen van het voorzitterschap	3
4. Goedkeuring van de notulen van de vorige vergaderingen	4
5. Samenstelling fracties	5
6. Onderhandelingen voorafgaand aan de eerste lezing van het Parlement (artikel 71 van het Reglement) (volgende stappen)	5
7. Onderhandelingen voorafgaand aan de eerste lezing van het Parlement (artikel 71 van het Reglement)	5
8. Ondertekening van volgens de gewone wetgevingsprocedure vastgestelde handelingen (artikel 79 van het Reglement)	5
9. Aan de standpunten en resoluties van het Parlement gegeven uitvoering: zie notulen	5
10. Vragen met verzoek om mondeling antwoord (indiening): zie notulen	5

Inhoud	Bladzijde
11. Ingekomen stukken: zie notulen	5
12. Regeling van de werkzaamheden	5
13. Zesde evaluatierapport van de Intergouvernementele Werkgroep inzake klimaatverandering (IPCC) van de Verenigde Naties (debat)	6
14. Dringende noodzaak om de minimumbelastingrichtlijn vast te stellen (debat)	16
15. Herziening van de marktstabiliteitsreserve voor de EU-regeling voor de handel in emissierechten (debat) . .	23
16. Het gebruik van gehuurde voertuigen zonder bestuurder voor het vervoer van goederen over de weg (debat)	31
17. De toekomst van de visserij in het Kanaal, de Noordzee, de Ierse Zee en de Atlantische Oceaan (debat) . . .	36
18. De bescherming van de rechten van het kind in civielrechtelijke, bestuursrechtelijke en familierechtelijke zaken (korte presentatie)	44
19. Redevoeringen van één minuut over kwesties van politiek belang	46
20. Goedkeuring van de notulen van deze vergadering: zie notulen	51
21. Agenda van de volgende vergadering	51
22. Sluiting van de vergadering	52

VOLLEDIG VERSLAG VAN DE VERGADERINGEN VAN 4 APRIL 2022

PRESIDENZA: ROBERTA METSOLA

President

1. Hervatting van de zitting

President. – I declare resumed the session of the European Parliament adjourned on Thursday 24 March 2022.

2. Opening van de vergadering

(The sitting opened at 17.05)

3. Verklaringen van het voorzitterschap

President. – Good afternoon. Thank you very much, dear colleagues. I wanted to quickly update you on my visit to Ukraine, to the Verkhovna Rada and our meeting with President Zelenskyy.

It was a difficult decision to go, but it meant a great deal to those fighting in Ukraine that the European Parliament was present with them. I was proud to take our message to Kyiv and to show that our Parliament stands with them in these dark times.

The atrocities committed by the Russian army in Ukraine are horrific, they are disgraceful and they are shameful. The reality is that the images from Bucha and Irpin are the same as reports from other cities in Ukraine. They underline the level of threat facing Ukraine and the global rules-based world order.

In Kyiv I was clear: these are war crimes that are perpetrated by war criminals, and these coordinated acts of inhumanity cannot remain unanswered and that we will hold all those responsible to account.

Dear colleagues, Ukraine is fighting for our values in the most impossible conditions and we have to support them. And concretely, that means that we need an immediate adoption of a new package of forceful sanctions. We need to target those who bankroll and support Putin, and close any still existing loopholes. Putin's oligarchs, and frankly all his political party members, must find nowhere to turn to.

Secondly, we need to step up our strategy of making this illegal invasion the costliest mistake that the Kremlin has ever made. The hit to Russia's economy must be proportionate to the unprecedented atrocities that we are seeing. Our businesses must look elsewhere for growth and we will support them.

Crucially, Europe must speed up a policy of zero dependence from the Kremlin, disentangle Europe from Russian energy supplies, implement binding embargoes and stop indirectly funding these bombs.

Finally, and here is my appeal to all of you in all your talks, all your statements, all your calls for governments and our international partners to act. We must offer more support to Ukraine, and that means logistical help, more humanitarian aid and more military equipment that they desperately, desperately need. They are fighting for us and they are looking to us for help. We should not ignore them.

And in this regard, I would like you to join me for a minute of silence in memory of the victims of Bucha, the victims of Irpin and all the victims of war, terror and violence.

(The House rose and observed a minute's silence)

Manfred Weber (PPE). – Madam President, please allow me to speak on behalf of my Group, but I hope also on behalf of all the colleagues here, in this House, to express that we are very thankful for your trip to Ukraine, to Kyiv.

It was a big message of solidarity to the Ukrainian friends. It was a big message of strengthening democracy, rule of law. And you did this as the first President of an European institution, so you made the European Parliament colleagues proud about this. Thank you so much for this courageous trip.

Iratxe García Pérez (S&D). – Señora presidenta, también en nombre del Grupo de Socialistas y Demócratas quiero unirme a ese mensaje de agradecimiento por su presencia en Kiev durante este fin de semana. Todos los que hemos podido ver las imágenes durante estos días de las atrocidades que están ocurriendo en Ucrania, las imágenes de Bucha, con lo que está haciendo el régimen de Putin, evidentemente nos hemos vuelto más conscientes que nunca de la importancia que tienen la defensa de la libertad, la defensa de la democracia y todo lo que representa esta institución, el Parlamento Europeo. Muchas gracias por su presencia allí, porque su presencia allí también es la muestra del compromiso de toda esta Cámara con las libertades.

President. – Thank you very much, Ms García Pérez. As I said, the session is re-opened. I would also like to share with you a few comments on the 65th anniversary of the Treaty of Rome. I thought it was timely that today we recall that 65 years ago, on 25 March 1957, we witnessed the birth of our European peace project.

With the ashes of the great wars still smouldering, six countries came together with one pledge: that never again would our continent allow such scenes of senseless death and destruction. With the signatures on the Treaty of Rome, our ancestors established the foundations of a peaceful and prosperous Union.

A Union which stands for human dignity, for freedom, for democracy. A Union in which countries would reconcile their differences and see the merits of integration and cooperation for the greater good. A Union that would never allow war to be the answer.

As we mark the anniversary of this declaration of unity in Rome, let us remember the reasons behind our European peace project and continue more resolutely than ever before to uphold our European values. These are difficult times, but faith in our Union's strength is enough to withstand them.

4. Goedkeuring van de notulen van de vorige vergaderingen

President. – Moving on to the order of the day, the minutes and the texts adopted of the sittings of 23 and 24 March 2022 are available. Are there any comments?

(The Minutes of the previous sittings were approved)

5. Samenstelling fracties

President. – By way of information, Ms Tatjana Ždanoka has left the Greens Group and sits now with the non-attached members since 1 April.

6. Onderhandelingen voorafgaand aan de eerste lezing van het Parlement (artikel 71 van het Reglement) (volgende stappen)

President. – In relation to the decisions by the JURI, EMPL, FEMM and ECON committees to enter into interinstitutional negotiations pursuant to Rule 71(1) announced at the opening of the sitting on Wednesday, 23 March 2022, I have received requests for a vote in Parliament pursuant to Rule 71(2) from the EPP Group and other members reaching at least the medium threshold on the joint decision of the EMPL and FEMM committees to enter into negotiations on the proposal for a directive to strengthen the application of the principle of equal pay for equal work or work of equal value between men and women. The vote will be held on Tuesday, 5 April 2022.

Concerning the other decisions to enter into negotiations, I have received no request for a vote in Parliament by members or a political group or groups reaching at least a medium threshold. Therefore, the committees may start the negotiations on the basis of these reports.

7. Onderhandelingen voorafgaand aan de eerste lezing van het Parlement (artikel 71 van het Reglement)

President. – The ECON and LIBE committees have decided to enter into interinstitutional negotiations pursuant to Rule 71(1) of the rules. The report, which constitutes the mandate for the negotiations, is available on the plenary web page and its title will be published in the minutes of the sitting. Pursuant to Rule 71(2), Members or political groups reaching at least a medium threshold may request in writing by tomorrow, Tuesday, 5 April 2022 at midnight, that the decision to enter into negotiations be put to the vote.

If no request for a vote in Parliament on the decision to enter into negotiations is made within the deadline, the committees may start negotiations.

8. Ondertekening van volgens de gewone wetgevingsprocedure vastgestelde handelingen (artikel 79 van het Reglement)

President. – I would also like to inform you that, together with the President of the Council, I shall on Wednesday, 6 April 2022 sign seven acts adopted under the ordinary legislative procedure in accordance with Rule 79 of our Rules of Procedure. The titles of the acts will be published in the minutes of the sittings.

9. Aan de standpunten en resoluties van het Parlement gegeven uitvoering: zie notulen

10. Vragen met verzoek om mondeling antwoord (indiening): zie notulen

11. Ingekomen stukken: zie notulen

12. Regeling van de werkzaamheden

President. – We now come to the order of business. The final draft agenda, as adopted by the Conference of Presidents on 31 March 2022 pursuant to Rule 157 has been distributed.

I would like to inform you that I have received four requests for urgent procedure from ENVI, REGI and ITRE committees pursuant to Rule 163 on the following legislative files. First, medicinal products for human use made available in the United Kingdom in respect of Northern Ireland as well as in Cyprus, Ireland and Malta. Investigational medicinal products made available in the United Kingdom with respect to Northern Ireland as well as in Cyprus, Ireland and Malta. Increased pre-financing from REACT-EU and gas storage.

The vote on these four requests will be taken on Tuesday, 5 April 2022. If the vote on the urgent procedure of increased pre-financing from REACT-EU is carried, then a debate with one round of political group speakers will be added on Thursday as the first item.

Next, with the agreement of the political groups, I wish to put to the House the following proposal for change to the final draft agenda. On Wednesday, the objection pursuant to Rule 112(2) on genetically modified soybean MON 87769 and MON 89788 is added directly to the votes. If there are no objections, this change is approved.

Therefore the agenda is adopted and the order of business is thus established.

VORSITZ: NICOLA BEER

Vizepräsidentin

13. Zesde evaluatierapport van de Intergouvernementele Werkgroep inzake klimaatverandering (IPCC) van de Verenigde Naties (debat)

Die Präsidentin. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über die Erklärung der Kommission zum Sechsten Sachstandsbericht des Weltklimarats der Vereinten Nationen (IPCC) (2022/2574(RSP)).

Ich weise, da wir jetzt die Sitzung aufnehmen, noch einmal darauf hin, dass wir einige Empfehlungen der Fokusgruppe Reform der Plenartätigkeit ausprobieren. Mit Ausnahme der ersten beiden Reihen, die für die Fraktionsvorsitzenden vorgesehen sind, besteht freie Sitzplatzwahl.

Nachdem Sie Ihre Abstimmungskarte in das Abstimmungsgerät eingeführt haben, können Sie über Ihr Abstimmungsgerät spontane Wortmeldungen und blaue Karten beantragen. Bitte führen Sie daher Ihre Abstimmungskarte stets mit sich. Entsprechende Anleitungen sind auf jedem Platz im Plenarsaal ausgelegt.

Wenn Sie sich für eine spontane Wortmeldung melden möchten, ersuche ich Sie, dies ab jetzt zu tun und nicht bis zum Ende der Aussprache zu warten. Außerdem möchte ich Sie darauf hinweisen, dass blaue Karten auch für eine kurze Wortmeldung hochgehalten werden können und dass danach eine Anschlussfrage zulässig ist.

Ich weise Sie auch darauf hin, dass Wortmeldungen im Plenarsaal weiterhin vom zentralen Rednerpult aus erfolgen, außer spontanen Wortmeldungen, blauen Karten und Bemerkungen zur Anwendung der Geschäftsordnung. Ich ersuche Sie daher, die Rednerliste im Blick zu behalten und sich kurz vor Beginn Ihrer Redezeit zum Rednerpult zu begeben, damit wir zügig in der Debatte fortfahren können und auch möglichst viele Kolleginnen und Kollegen dann bei den blauen Karten berücksichtigen können.

Frans Timmermans, Executive Vice-President of the Commission. – Madam President, let me start by saying that at the end of last week, when I saw President Metsola sitting across the desk from President Zelenskyy, I felt personally represented. Not just because I ran in the last European elections as lead candidate of the Socialists and Democrats, and got elected to this Parliament. Not just because I also represent a European institution, but because I'm one of 440 million European citizens who she represented at that moment. And I felt represented, and I believe in that sense she has done a great service to this Parliament, to our citizens.

And I would like to echo the call she just made that we should pass from words to actions now. That we should quickly move to tighten the sanctions, do everything materially, morally, politically, economically to support a nation that is fighting for its very survival.

In the last days, we've seen the level of atrocity committed by Putin's troops. We've seen the declarations again today in Moscow, even foreshadowing the chance, the possibility of genocide. There is no bigger task of us than to support the Ukrainians in this struggle, which is also our struggle. This peaceful nation has been invaded. But it's not just an attack on them, it's an attack on all of us, our values, our way of life, our security, and also on the momentous task we face.

The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) report that was presented today, again demonstrates how big the challenges humanity's facing. IPCC, based on science, again points to the fact that we need to do more if we want to achieve the goal of keeping the rise of the temperature well below 2 degrees and hopefully on 1.5 degrees. We're not there by a long stretch. That's the bad news.

The good news is, however, that if we change our policies, if we up the ante, if we do more, we can reverse the trend. That's also what the IPCC report says that was just published.

So I believe that this Parliament, this Commission and the Council are under a political and moral responsibility to act as fast as we can. On Fit for 55, on the Green Deal, on Farm to Fork, and all the projects we have put on the table to get where we need to be. And this is because even with everything we've put on the table, one cannot exclude, if you read the IPCC report, that we might be called to do even more in the months and years to come. And we should be clear on this message.

And the war in Ukraine has only increased our sense of urgency because now nobody can find an excuse, in my view, to not speed up the end of the overuse of fossil fuels, to not speed up Europe's stronger reliance on its own energy production, which has to be solar, wind, biogas, geothermal, if we have it.

But we cannot continue to import massive amounts of fossil fuels for political reasons. We cannot be in a position to be blackmailed, but especially also because that's the only way we can fulfil the pledges we've made in Fit for 55. That's the only way we'll get to a reduction of at least 55% by 2030 of our emissions. And this is the only way we have a shot at climate neutrality in 2050.

Now, the other reason why I believe we should stick to our plans and perhaps even revisit them, is that the only way we can convince others in the world to do more, who need to do much more than we do, that's also crystal clear in the IPCC report, is if we show the way how it can be done.

And please, I plead with all of you to help me counter those who say, 'as long as others don't do more, we shouldn't be doing more'. It is clear that we're the only continent with a comprehensive plan to get us where we need to be. And only through comprehensive plans can other countries, other continents get where they need to be.

And by leading the way, Europe can help them get there. By leading the way, we can do what the positive, what the optimistic part of the IPCC report says, namely, change the trend and give humanity a shot at survival.

Peter Liese, im Namen der PPE-Fraktion. – Frau Präsidentin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Formal diskutieren wir ja jetzt über den zweiten Teil des IPCC-Berichts. Deswegen aus meiner Sicht kurz etwas zur Klimaanpassung: Ich glaube, es ist extrem wichtig, dass wir unsere Forstwirte dabei unterstützen, die Wälder klimagerecht wieder aufzuforsten, dass wir eine nachhaltige Forstwirtschaft in Europa erhalten und unterstützen. Das ist aus meiner Sicht ein zentraler Gedanke, ein zentraler Punkt bei der Anpassung an den Klimawandel.

Aber um 17.00 Uhr wurde der dritte Teil veröffentlicht, deswegen werde ich mich natürlich auch schwerpunktmäßig auf den dritten Teil konzentrieren. Es ist ganz klar: Wir müssen schnell handeln, um dem Klimawandel zumindest teilweise Einhalt zu gebieten und um gleichzeitig unabhängiger von Importen von Energie aus Russland zu werden.

Und ich darf Sie darüber informieren, dass gerade vor einer halben Stunde die EVP beschlossen hat, dass wir eintreten für ein Embargo von Kohle, Öl und Brennstoffen für Kernenergie, weil wir auch da zu abhängig von Russland sind. Und das macht auch deutlich, dass diese Technologien vielleicht kurzfristig – wenn sie nicht aus Russland kommen – eine größere Rolle spielen können, aber dass es ganz bestimmt nicht die Lösung ist.

Die Lösung sind erneuerbare Energien und Energieeffizienz. Und da müssen wir jetzt wegen Russland, aber auch wegen des Klimaschutzes engagierter werden. Wir müssen andere Teile der Welt auf diesem Weg stärker mitnehmen, nicht um unsere eigenen Ambitionen zu verringern. Aber wenn wir unsere 55 Prozent durchsetzen und die Amerikaner ihr Ziel umsetzen, dann haben die Amerikaner immer noch mehr als doppelt so viel Pro-Kopf-Emissionen. Und auch darüber müssen wir sprechen.

Und wir müssen – das sagt das IPCC immer wieder – einen CO₂-Preis mit sozialem Ausgleich in allen Teilen der Wirtschaft haben und uns jetzt wirklich auch stärker auf die negativen Emissionen konzentrieren. Wir dürfen hier keine Zeit verlieren. Die Kommission hat etwas angekündigt für nächstes Jahr. Wir müssen hier ganz, ganz schnell handeln.

Mohammed Chahim, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Madam President, the IPCC is very clear: we have no time to waste. The previous IPCC report already stated that everything needs to be done to combat climate change. We only have a small window to secure a liveable future, and this window is closing. How many times do we still have to tell each other we need to do more, we need to act now, take leadership, lead by example?

Also now, the IPCC report stresses again and again the urgency to limit global warming to 1.5°C. Why? Because limiting global warming reduces the number of people both exposed to climate-related risks and poverty, and has a much-needed impact on our biodiversity and our vital ecosystems. Not to be dramatic, but our livelihood depends on it.

I believe that the EU has the resources and know-how to make the energy transition a success. This means investing in the right plans and technologies. Accelerating the energy transition is crucial, which will not lead to a carbon decrease in the EU but also help other regions in the world jump on the green wagon. We've seen this for wind, we've seen this for solar, we've seen this for batteries. These technologies became cheaper because of innovation.

However, as Mr Timmermans has stated, probably we need to ramp up our global ambitions. And I wanted to ask the Commissioner here: what do you think we can do globally to accelerate our plans? What is our message towards the COP 27?

But I want to say something to my colleagues here in the room, because this report is a wake-up call, and I know that decarbonising from also a strategic perspective, will increase our autonomy, make us more resilient. So, please, stop pushing for delays, and get yourself behind the European Green Deal – our way of a secure, resilient and carbon-free future for the EU.

Linea Søgaard-Lidell, *for Renew-Gruppen*. – Fru Formand! Tak for ordet, og tak til de 270 forskere, der står bag denne her rapport. Det er ikke nogen nyhed, at vi har travlt i klimakampen. Det chokerende ved FN's sjette klima rapport er, hvor mange mennesker, der allerede bliver påvirket af klimaforandringerne. Millioner af mennesker bliver fordrevet af ekstremt vejr, omkring halvdelen af verdens befolkning oplever vandmangel, arter uddør, og det sker alt sammen lige nu, og det sker altså også her omkring os. Så kære kollegaer, vi sidder jo midt i forhandlingerne om EU's klimapolitik. Forhandlinger, som allerede har et for uambitiøst udgangspunkt. Men lad os nu huske denne rapport. Vi er nødt til at stoppe med at vælge halvgørne løsninger, der måske ser godt ud lige nu, og er nemmest og hjælper på den korte bane, men som i virkeligheden kommer til at forsinke endemålet og de rigtige løsninger. Det er en fejl, som vi ikke må begå. Vi kan stadig nå at gøre rigtig meget for klimaet og for de kommende generationer. Men vi må ikke forsøge at løse vores problemer på en måde, der ender med at skabe nye klimaproblemer i fremtiden.

Bas Eickhout, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Madam President, we are discussing here now the Working Group III contribution to the Sixth Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) Assessment Report. And let's be honest, their messages have been the same now for quite some years.

Yes, the climate is changing. Yes, it's because of human beings. The impacts are severe, and it makes sense to stay below 1.5 °C instead of below 2 °C. And the solutions are there. And that's what Working Group III is showing time and time and again.

But if we then look on where we are, despite all the rhetoric, also this report is very clear: we are on track in overshooting the 1.5°C. And if you then see on measures, they make it very clear: leaving fossil fuels in the ground is one of the most important measures we have to take. And they make it very clear, no expansion of coal or oil and gas should be done. And that's not what we're doing. And this is really a call to the Council. Now, from a climate perspective, but also geopolitically, it's more clear than ever that we should stop our expansion on fossils. But for the time being, we are expanding as a reaction to the war in Ukraine, because we are expanding liquefied natural gas (LNG), and until now we are refusing to debate an import ban on fossils from Russia. So we are increasing our fossil dependency as we speak, and that really has to stop for many reasons.

The last point is to the Commission. You really said, like, we 'may have to' consider an increase of our targets, but you have to. I am not talking about the reduction target. I'm talking about renewables and energy efficiency. Here we really, if we want to accelerate and shorten the transition, then we need to step up on renewables and efficiency. Please, Commission, come forward in May with proposals for that.

Aurélia Beigneux, *au nom du groupe ID*. – Madame le Président, le nouveau rapport du GIEC est particulièrement alarmant. Il démontre sans véritable surprise les effets du réchauffement climatique sur notre environnement et révèle une évidence: c'est votre politique et le modèle économique que vous encouragez qui en sont à l'origine.

La dégradation de la biodiversité des écosystèmes est telle que la situation paraît déjà irréversible, et elle vise à s'intensifier à mesure que le climat se réchauffe. L'ensemble de la planète est soumis aux effets du changement climatique, que vous semblez constater sans jamais remettre vos choix en question. Évidemment, ces conclusions nous préoccupent tous.

Mais quelles solutions proposez-vous? Toujours plus d'écologie punitive sans jamais dénoncer les vraies causes. Toujours plus de programmes contraignants et déconnectés du quotidien de nos citoyens. Vous avez donné les clés de la production à des pays qui appliquent des normes environnementales au rabais. Vous avez favorisé un consumérisme qui demande toujours plus de matières premières. Vous avez signé des traités de libre-échange sans tenir compte de l'inquiétude des Européens et de l'impact sur nos normes de production. Vous vous enfermez dans ce libéralisme à outrance qui fait exploser le bilan carbone du fret maritime, alors que nos industries, jadis, nous assuraient une autonomie dans de nombreux domaines. Et surtout vous nous avez fait entrer dans une guerre énergétique et alimentaire sans prendre conscience des conséquences gravissimes pour le quotidien de nos citoyens.

Face à la politique toujours plus punitive et infantilisante promue par ce Parlement et par vos amis de la Commission, il est urgent de donner des réponses de bon sens. Votre modèle économique est dépassé. Le libéralisme doit laisser place au localisme. La mondialisation sans contrôle, qui nous a rendus dépendants de l'étranger, doit laisser place à un système de circuits courts et d'autosuffisance. Le charbon et les éoliennes doivent être mis au placard pour faire confiance au nucléaire, énergie propre et efficiente. Seule cette politique de bon sens permettra enfin de relancer notre économie tout en protégeant la planète. Le reste ne servira qu'à entretenir vos fantasmes idéologiques.

Grzegorz Tobiszowski, *w imieniu grupy ECR*. – Pani Przewodnicząca! Panie komisarzy! Starania i troska o klimat, o czyste powietrze, którym wszyscy oddychamy, oraz ochrona bioróżnorodności na naszej planecie to coś, co nas wszystkich łączy na tej sali. Myślę, że tu nie ma w tej kwestii podziału.

Nie powinniśmy jednak zapominać, iż ochrona klimatu i działania z nią związane nie mogą prowadzić do dezindustrializacji Europy oraz do utraty konkurencyjności europejskiego przemysłu. Ostatnie wydarzenia – napaść Rosji na Ukrainę – uwiarydliły europejską zależność od importu rosyjskich surowców energetycznych. Jest to zatem wyjątkowy moment, w którym Unia Europejska, aby zachować swoją niezależność energetyczną oraz aby zapewnić bezpieczeństwo energetyczne swoim obywatelom, wraz z rozwojem odnawialnych źródeł energii (co jest oczywiście też niepodlegające dyskusji) powinna się skupić na promowaniu technologii oraz surowców, którymi sama dysponuje. Aby stworzyć pewną bazę okresu przejściowego, byśmy mogli gwarantować swoimi surowcami, wydobywaniem swoich surowców i tymi technologiami, które mamy dostępne w Europie, aby się uniezależnić.

Raport IPCC wskazuje, że aby uniknąć dalszego ocieplenia klimatu, niezbędne są masowe redukcje emisji. Dlatego nasuwa się pytanie: jak my jako Unia Europejska, jak my jako Europejczycy chcemy przekonać wielkie światowe gospodarki, które mają zdecydowanie więcej udziału w emisji CO₂, takie jak Chiny, Brazylia, Indie, aby się również postarały o to, aby walczyć z ociepleniem klimatu? Przecież my mamy w tym tylko 7% udziału! Same ambicje nie wystarczą. Musimy być pragmatyczni, racjonalni i skuteczni.

Silvia Modig, The Left-ryhmän puolesta. – Arvoisa puhemies, IPCC:n viimeiset raportit kertovat meille, että aika on meiltä loppumassa ja poliittisia päätöksiä puuttuu edelleen. Hyvä uutinen on se, että pystymme edelleen vaikuttamaan ja pienentämään negatiivisia vaikutuksia, mutta se vaatii, että tartumme toimeen voimakkaasti ja välittömästi.

Nykyisellä mallilla olemme ylittämässä puolentoista asteen rajan jo kymmenen vuoden sisällä, ja puolentoista asteen ylityksessä ovat seuraukset aiemmin luultua negatiivisemmat. Ilmastomuutos on jo nyt heikentänyt ruokaturvaa, kun äärimmäiset sääilmiöt ovat lisääntyneet kaikkialla maailmassa. Venäjän hyökkäys Ukrainaan on pahentanut tilannetta entuudestaan. Olennaista on, että myös sopeutumistoimissa seuraamme tieteellistä neuvoa ja siten vältämme huonoa sopeutumista. Yksi esitetty ratkaisu ruokaturvaan on lisätä viljelypinta-alaa ja luopua monimuotoisuustavoitteista, mutta se on yksi esimerkki lyhytnäköisestä huonosta sopeutumisesta, joka tulee kostautumaan tulevaisuudessa. Maankäytön muutokset ovat yksi ilmastomuutoksen vauhdittajista ja luonnon monimuotoisuuden heikentäjästä. Jotta planeettamme pystyy sopeutumaan edessä olevaan väistämättömään lämpenemiseen, tarvitsemme vahvan biodiversiteetin suojaksemme.

Maria Spyrali (PPE). – Madam President, allow me to focus today in the framework of the IPCC on a really huge issue, which is the lack of water, and allow me to provide some figures. In Europe, about 30% of our population is affected by water stress, which is a situation where there is insufficient water of sufficient quality to meet the demands of people and the environment during an average year.

As the climate crisis is deepening, the situation is expected to worsen. The trends are especially worrying for southern and the south-western Europe, where river discharge during summer could decline by up to 40% under a 3°C temperature rise scenario. Improved water efficiency and policies to reduce demand can reduce risks to water security. At Member State level, local authorities in collaboration with communities can take actions that include updating building codes, land use plans, improving soil management and finally, enhancing water-use efficiency. Protection and restoration of our natural and semi-natural ecosystems are key adaptation measures.

Moreover, water is a crucial input for hydroelectric and thermoelectric energy production. With 1 300 GW installed capacity in 2019, hydropower became the world's largest single renewable energy source. Therefore, minimising the risk to water security from the climate crisis will require a full systems use that considers the direct impacts of mitigation measures on water resources and their indirect effect to our efforts to tackling climate change.

Tiemo Wölken (S&D). – Sehr geehrte Frau Präsidentin, sehr geehrter Herr Kommissar! Lieber Frans! Der dritte Teilbericht des Sechsten Sachstandsberichts macht eins ganz deutlich: Die Klimakrise wartet nicht darauf, dass wir handeln, sondern sie macht weiter, wenn wir nicht handeln. Ich möchte zunächst mit einem Dank beginnen bei all den Wissenschaftlerinnen und Wissenschaftlern, die weltweit unser Wissen über den Klimawandel jedes Mal wieder mit diesen Berichten erhöhen und die sich auch nicht von Wissenschaftsleugnerinnen und -leugnern und von kritischen Regierungen, die den Klimawandel leugnen, von ihrem Kurs abbringen lassen.

Mit dem dritten Teilbericht haben wir jetzt wirklich alles in der Hand, was wir brauchen, um entschlossen gegen die Klimakrise zu handeln. Aus dem ersten Teilbericht wissen wir, dass wir mit 1,5 Grad Erwärmung keinesfalls dauerhaft leben können. Aus dem zweiten Teilbericht wissen wir, dass andernfalls sonst drei Milliarden Menschen ihre Lebensgrundlage verlieren. Und aus dem dritten Bericht wissen wir jetzt, was wir konkret tun müssen.

Was wir tun müssen, ist: Raus aus der fossilen Energie, rein in die Erneuerbaren! Die Kosten für die Erneuerbaren sind seit 2010 um 85 % gesunken. Unser CO₂-Budget ist in zehn Jahren aufgebraucht. Wir müssen jetzt endlich handeln! Kein einziges Land hält seine Klimaziele ein. Mit den vorgelegten nationalen Klimaplänen kommen wir bei der Erwärmung auf 3,2 Grad. Damit sind wir meilenweit vom 1,5-Grad-Ziel entfernt!

Deswegen müssen wir auch in der Europäischen Union sehr viel mehr machen. Wir müssen unsere Wälder schützen, und wir müssen – ich komme zum Ende – vor allen Dingen darauf achten, dass wir nicht noch mehr Energiepflanzen und Futtermittel anbauen auf den so knappen Flächen.

Martin Hojsík (Renew). – Vážená pani predsedajúca, je to čierne na bielom. Znova a znova a znova. Extrémny počasie, ktoré zažívame na Slovensku a v celej Európe sú spôsobené klimatickou zmenou. Ľuďmi spôsobenou klimatickou zmenou. Zápaly, ktorým čelíme na Slovensku, ale aj v západnej Európe, horúčavy, pre ktoré zomierajú ľudia, sucho, ktoré ničí úrodu a naše lesy a vyprázdňuje naše studne.

Klimatická kríza je tu a blížime sa do klimatickej katastrofy. My sami sme ju spôsobili. Ale mnohí slovenskí politici a kapitáni biznisu sa tvária, akoby sa nič nedialo. Hovoria o obchodovaní s horúcim vzduchom. Nečakajte, že za vás zaplatia škody, ktoré vám spôsobia záplavy.

Riešenie je pritom v našich rukách. Znižovanie emisií nie je len o zelenej energii a ukončení plytvania. Je aj o konci našej závislosti od vražedného Putinovho režimu i o nižších účtoch za energiu. Musíme však aj adaptovať naše mestá a obce tak, aby boli plné zelene, prispôbiť naše poľnohospodárstvo a vrátiť lesom ich život. Veda v tom má jasno. Teraz je to na nás a musíme konať.

Marie Toussaint (Verts/ALE). – Madame la Présidente, «ils étouffent la planète au nom de leurs intérêts acquis et de leurs investissements historiques dans les énergies fossiles. Pour le dire simplement: ils mentent». Monsieur le Vice-Commissaire, il y a de quoi prendre ces mots d'António Guterres, le secrétaire général des Nations unies, pour nous. L'Europe, ce sont 16 % des émissions historiques, l'Afrique un peu moins de 7 %. Aujourd'hui encore, les 10 % les plus riches sont responsables de 45 % des émissions de gaz à effet de serre.

Nos entreprises européennes continuent à investir dans les énergies fossiles plutôt que dans les énergies renouvelables, sur notre territoire, et surtout en dehors: Total au Suriname, au Nigeria ou, avec l'abominable projet EACOP, en Ouganda, Shell en Namibie ou en Malaisie, ou encore Eni en Angola.

Chaque année, nos banques financent toujours un peu plus les investissements dans les énergies fossiles. La solution, c'est l'action pour le climat dans la justice. C'est le rehaussement de nos objectifs ici et maintenant. C'est demander au secteur privé de se joindre à nos actions. Et c'est enfin aider réellement les pays les plus pauvres et les moins émetteurs.

Jessica Stegud (ECR). – Fru talman! Kommissionär! Varningarna för den globala uppvärmningen baseras på gedigen forskning, vilket tydligt framgår i den första delen av FN:s klimatrapport.

Den andra delen, däremot, liknar på sina ställen ett reklamblad för ett försäkringsbolag. Enormt fokus på risker och katastrofscenarier. Litet fokus på sannolikhet och relevans.

Den här politiseringen är jag inte den första att notera. På 90-talet ville vetenskapstidningen "Nature" avskaffa den andra delen av rapporten då den inte längre fokuserade på att främja vetenskap. 2010 lyfte en FN-kommission samma problem: ett ensidigt fokus på uppvärmningens negativa konsekvenser och ofta överdrivna och tvärsäkra slutsatser. Jag manar till eftertanke.

Vi politiker ska inte agera vetenskapsmän, och vetenskapsmän ska inte heller agera politiker. Vår uppgift är att på vetenskaplig grund fatta välbalanserade beslut för hela samhället, inte att ideologisera forskningsresultat.

Petros Kokkalis (The Left). – Madam President, allow me to quote for the record what the latest Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) report states as scientific fact. Any further delay in concerted, anticipatory global action on adaptation and mitigation will miss a brief and rapidly closing window of opportunity to secure a liveable and sustainable future for all.

Approximately 3.6 billion people live today in contexts that are highly vulnerable to climate change. Current and sustainable development patterns are increasing exposure of ecosystems and people to climate hazards. Vulnerability of ecosystems and people to climate change differ substantially among and within regions driven by patterns of intersecting socioeconomic development and sustainable ocean and land use, economic inequity, marginalisation, historical and ongoing patterns of inequity such as colonialism and governments.

Vulnerability is a political failure and not a physical phenomenon. And government is our job, colleagues. It is our obligation to protect the lives and livelihoods of our citizens from the calamity that we know is coming. It is our duty to keep the window of opportunity open and deliver climate-resilient development fast and furiously.

Lídia Pereira (PPE). – Senhora Presidente, o Sexto Relatório de Avaliação do Painel Intergovernamental das Nações Unidas sobre Alterações Climáticas mostra ao mundo como a temperatura média do planeta já subiu 1,1° e está a afetar os sistemas naturais e humanos na Europa. Desde a última avaliação, aumentaram os impactos das alterações climáticas, que resultaram em perdas na produção agrícola, nas infraestruturas ou escassez de água.

Mas o que traz de novo não acalma, antes provoca ansiedade e preocupação. A Europa está e continuará a aquecer mais rapidamente do que o resto do planeta e o Sul da Europa será o mais fustigado. O Pacote Fit for 55 tem de se concretizar e olhar para a questão da adaptação como central, daqui para a frente.

Não posso, no entanto, dirigir-me a esta câmara e não falar da invasão e barbárie russas na Ucrânia, que têm, além de todo o sofrimento humano, provocado ainda problemas adicionais de duas ordens diferentes: escassez alimentar e prejuízos económicos, direcionamento de recursos para o esforço militar e bloqueio nos avanços diplomáticos.

Caros Colegas, este não é o momento de olhar para trás, antes de deixarmos para trás as dúvidas ou indecisões. O que vos peço é que não fiquemos na História pela falta de coragem.

Simona Bonafè (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, se ne parla sempre troppo poco eppure il cambiamento climatico è realtà, anche alle nostre latitudini.

I dati del rapporto dell'IPCC che discutiamo oggi ci confermano la drammaticità di una situazione che, se non prendiamo in mano adesso e se continuiamo a girarsi dall'altra parte, diventerà la prossima grave emergenza con la quale si dovrà misurare la nostra generazione, già provata da pandemia e da questa tragica guerra in Ucraina.

E allora io dico, soprattutto a quanti in questi giorni vogliono mettere nel cassetto il Green deal perché altri sono i problemi, che è proprio la transizione ecologica la chiave per rispondere non solo all'indipendenza energetica dalla Russia, oggi assolutamente necessaria, ma anche ai cambiamenti climatici e agli eventi meteorologici estremi, che stanno già producendo ripercussioni sulla nostra sicurezza alimentare e sulla scarsità di risorsa idrica ma anche, in generale, sulla nostra economia, perché le alluvioni e le siccità hanno un costo e, purtroppo, molte volte, anche in termini di vite umane.

C'è un punto di non ritorno indicato nel rapporto che non ci possiamo permettere di superare, anche perché oggi abbiamo tutti gli strumenti.

María Soraya Rodríguez Ramos (Renew). – Señora presidenta, señor comisario, gracias por tener este debate, que es ciertamente oportuno.

El informe del Panel Intergubernamental nos deja muy claro que el ritmo de nuestras acciones para conseguir los objetivos es incompatible con nuestras promesas climáticas. Si no cambiamos lo que estamos haciendo a corto y a largo plazo, no vamos a conseguir contener el calentamiento en 1,5 grados, sino que nos acercamos a los 3,2 grados.

La guerra de Ucrania ha puesto de manifiesto de forma dramática nuestra dependencia energética. Una dependencia de energías de dictadores, de asesinos, como estamos viendo, de un gas que financia la guerra en Ucrania.

Algunos nos dicen que debemos parar nuestra hoja de ruta. Realmente lo que debemos hacer es acelerarla, porque si no, simplemente cambiaremos el gas ruso por el gas de otros dictadores. Solamente acelerar nuestra hoja de ruta es lo que nos va a dar una solución.

Pär Holmgren (Verts/ALE). – Fru ordförande! Vice president Timmermans! Som meteorolog så har jag följt IPCC:s arbete och rapporter i över 30 år, och det är bara att konstatera att rapporterna blir allt tjockare, de innehåller alltmer fakta och allt tydligare varningar.

Samtidigt så kan vi också sammanfatta dessa rapporter med en enda mening. För egentligen står det i dem "oj då, det är visst lite värre än vad vi trodde förra gången". Och det beror på två saker. Den ena är att vetenskapen tyvärr upptäcker nya risker och faror med klimatförändringarna. Men den andra och viktigaste saken är ju tyvärr att vi som politiker har gjort alldeles för lite under de här 30 åren.

Jag är glad att du, Frans Timmermans, inledningsvis säger att vi kanske måste höja ambitionerna. Jag skulle gärna se att vi bytte ut detta "kanske" mot ett "måste". Det är någonting som vi gröna har sagt redan från början. Vi måste göra det om vi ska vara i linje med Parisavtalet, och det är precis det som är kärnan i den senaste rapporten från IPCC.

Javi López (S&D). – Señora presidenta, señor vicepresidente Timmermans, la ciencia de la mano de las Naciones Unidas nos recuerda cómo se agrava y se acelera el cambio climático. De hecho, la semana pasada, solo la semana pasada, en la Antártida y en el Ártico tuvimos 40 y 30 grados más de lo que sería habitual en esta época del año. Al mismo tiempo, en el sur de Europa —no hace falta ir más lejos—, en el Mediterráneo, tenemos 1,5 grados de aumento de la temperatura en comparación con 1,1 grados que tenemos ya en el conjunto del planeta. Es uno de los puntos más calientes de esta crisis.

Si se consolida esta tendencia, vamos a encontrarnos con escasez de agua potable, al mismo tiempo que zonas importantes de nuestras costas pueden desaparecer (donde viven docenas de millones de personas) o se agravan nuestras inundaciones. Sabemos que es un fenómeno irreversible, pero que podemos controlar haciendo lo que debemos hacer, que es acabar con nuestra adicción a las energías fósiles. Para eso tenemos el Pacto Verde Europeo y por eso queremos empujar al conjunto del planeta en esa dirección. Un cambio rápido y profundo, porque es la última generación que probablemente pueda frenar esta crisis climática. Pero el resto, todas las siguientes, acabarán pagando las consecuencias.

Ciarán Cuffe (Verts/ALE). – Madam Chair, we can halve emissions by 2030. That is the conclusion of today's Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) report. And yes, again, it feels like déjà vu; another terrifying scientific report on the climate crisis. But it is unequivocal in calling for the end of fossil fuels.

Europe must be resolute in its response to this existential climate crisis, just as it has responded to Ukraine, just as it responded to COVID-19. We need to accelerate the shift to clean energy across the entire economy. And one immediate way to do this would be to reject the taxonomy delegated act, which labels gas and nuclear as sustainable. We can't label fossil gas as sustainable. That would add fuel to the fire and divert hundreds of billions to making the climate crisis worse. It goes completely against what the IPCC and the International Energy Agency is calling for. Colleagues, this must be a call for action to end our addiction to fossil fuels.

Sara Cerdas (S&D). – Senhora Presidente, o mais recente relatório do IPCC confirma a emergência climática que atravessamos. Confirma também que, sem a redução dramática das emissões, chegaremos rapidamente a pontos de não retorno. E também confirma a insuficiência das nossas atuais medidas de mitigação e que são necessárias medidas de adaptação para lidar com os riscos e danos já provocados pelas alterações climáticas. Prova disso foi o intenso período de seca que atravessámos em Portugal, no início do ano, e que afetou a nossa agricultura, a biodiversidade e o abastecimento da água.

Precisamos, assim, de mais. Precisamos de reforçar os nossos esforços climáticos. Precisamos de mais ambição, especialmente no pacote legislativo Fit for 55. E precisamos, também, de mais financiamento. Porque todos temos direito a um ambiente sustentável e devemos lutar por ele.

Proteger a nossa e as futuras gerações deve fazer parte deste desígnio.

Łukasz Kohut (S&D). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Panie komisarzu! 24 lutego bardzo wiele się zmieniło, ale 24 lutego nie skończyły się problemy ze zmianami klimatycznymi ani potrzeba sprawiedliwej transformacji energetycznej. Eksperci ONZ w analizowanym raporcie IPCC mówią wprost o „czerwonym alercie”, o tym, że jesteśmy w przededniu katastrofy klimatycznej. I uwierzcie mi, ludzie to czują i wiedzą, ale potrzebują rozsądnej polityki klimatycznej i nowych miejsc pracy. Potrzebują dofinansowania do wymiany pieców i zakupu fotowoltaiki.

Mój Śląsk to region, który odbudowywał Warszawę po wojnie. To region, który był wykorzystywany gospodarczo przez dekady. My jako Ślązacy słyszymy, tak jak Ukraińcy, że nas nie ma, że nie ma naszego języka. Potrzebujemy na Śląsku nowych zielonych inwestycji, ale także inwestycji w kulturę i w edukację. Europejska Stolica Kultury na Śląsku i w Zagłębiu to byłby bardzo dobry impuls dla całego regionu. Liczę na pana, panie Timmermans, bo pan jako osoba z Limburgii, także postgórniczego regionu, doskonale wie, o czym mówię.

Antoni Comín i Oliveres (NI). – Madame la Présidente, la guerre en Ukraine nous pousse à remplacer encore plus vite les combustibles fossiles par des énergies renouvelables. Toutefois l'Union est prise, désormais, dans une contradiction honteuse entre ses intérêts et ses principes.

Nous voulons arrêter l'agression contre l'Ukraine, et pour contribuer à cet objectif nous devons cesser d'acheter du gaz et du pétrole russes. Mais nous ne voulons pas assumer les conséquences de cette décision pour l'économie européenne. En attendant, le dernier rapport du groupe d'experts intergouvernemental sur l'évolution du climat explique avec éloquence que l'atténuation du changement climatique exige des changements dans nos modes de consommation qui permettent à nos sociétés de réduire leur demande énergétique.

Cependant, nous savons que, paradoxalement, ces changements peuvent finir par coûter plus cher aux familles, et les ménages les plus vulnérables ne devraient pas y faire face sans aide publique: d'où l'importance cruciale du Fonds social pour le climat – un Fonds qui nécessite des financements suffisants – pour assurer une transition énergétique socialement juste, mais aussi favoriser la redistribution des revenus. Ce n'est qu'ainsi que nous pourrions empêcher les populismes négationnistes du changement climatique de conquérir les groupes et les classes les plus vulnérables de notre société.

Spontane Wortmeldungen

Bogdan Rzońca (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Panie przewodniczący! Bardzo dziękuję za tę debatę. Cieszę się ze spotkania tutaj w tej tak ważnej sprawie. Chcę powiedzieć, że Polska od 1 czerwca 2022 r. nie będzie już w ogóle kupowała węgla w Rosji, a od 1 stycznia 2023 r. nie kupimy już od Rosji ani grama gazu. Wobec tego Unia Europejska powinna pójść polskim śladem i właśnie w ten sposób zabezpieczyć interesy Unii Europejskiej, odcinając się od barbarzyńcy Putina.

Odnawialne źródła energii – tak, popieramy je, bo wszyscy chcemy żyć w czystej przestrzeni ekologicznej, chcemy pić czystą wodę, oddychać świeżym powietrzem, i będziemy w tym kierunku zmierzać i popierać wszystkie działania. Ale moje pytanie jest takie, panie przewodniczący: czy rzeczywiście odnawialne źródła energii, te czyste źródła zapewnią bezpieczeństwo energetyczne Unii Europejskiej? Czy będziemy mogli konkurować tymi odnawialnymi źródłami i systemem energetycznym z Chinami i z Ameryką?

Mick Wallace (The Left). – Madam President, 'global warming reaching 1.5 ° centigrade in the near term would cause unavoidable increases in multiple climate hazards and present multiple risks to ecosystems and humans'. This is a quote from the report. It's a remarkable statement. Are we happy that the 1.5 ° target is actually going to be okay?

And Commissioner, tell me, are you concerned about the over-reliance on negative-emission technologies that are used in the reports, given that a lot of it has still to be invented? And my last question to you, Commissioner: there is definitely a pushback against the new Green Deal because of the war. Don't you think that it is so, so important that we don't allow that to happen?

(Ende der spontanen Wortmeldungen)

Frans Timmermans, *Executive Vice-President of the Commission*. – Madam President, just a couple of points in reaction to what the honourable Members have said. First of all, I want to report about a meeting I had last week in Stockholm with representatives of climate organisations, nature protection organisations, forestry organisations, academia, and for the first time, all of them around the table – and you know how thorny the discussions have been on forestry with Sweden and Finland – for the first time, everyone around the table said the urgency now is so great that we will all get out of the trenches.

And we sat together and we agreed that in the next year we would identify precisely, on a scientific basis, what the problem is and how we can solve the problem. And everyone committed to that. And I say this so clearly in this House because science is not an opinion. Someone here said it today. It is not. Signs are facts. You know, that the earth is round is not an opinion, and if we can come to an agreement on the scientific facts, then the political choices are channelled and are not just free for all.

And I think this example from Sweden might be a good example to follow. Let's get out of the trenches.

Secondly, in reaction to Bas Eickhout; yes, we need to speed up the energy transition and we will come with our REPowerEU proposals to make that happen. And I also say we need... because we don't have our own oil, we have very little of our own gas, we certainly can't rely on coal anymore for very long, so the only solution to have our own energy is to have renewable energy.

If the question is, can we be competitive with renewable energy? If we couldn't, why then are China and the US investing so massively, massively in renewable energy today? Because they know that is where the future is. And I would say, and I say this also to my honourable friend from Silesia, Łukasz Kohut, look, we can only help coal mining regions by offering them a swift and secure transition to a new economy, connecting them. Prolonging their connection to coal is just a waste of their time, an attack on their health and a waste of taxpayers' money.

This transition should be done and should be done now. There are so many economic opportunities in this. Poland already is the biggest exporter of electric buses in Europe. Polish citizens massively want to install rooftop solar and they're doing it at lightning speed, no pun intended. So here I believe that this transition should be also defended as not just the right thing to do because of our climate, but also the right thing to do because of our economy.

Which brings me to my final point. All of this is moot if it is not embedded in social policy. It will not happen if people have the feeling that they will be left behind. So the IPCC Report also forces us to look at the issue of redistribution within and between societies, because that's the only way people will be part of this transition. That's the only way we will get the support from the population we need.

Because even if the facts are clear, as in this IPCC Report, that we need to speed up things, if people only worry about the end of the month they will not be bothered with the end of the world. So we need to make sure that everything we do is embedded in social fairness. That's the only way we can do what the IPCC Report says, and that is turn things around.

Die Präsidentin. – Die Aussprache ist geschlossen.

Schriftliche Erklärungen (Artikel 171 GO)

Laura Ferrara (NI), *per iscritto*. – La relazione di cui si parla oggi, è l'ennesimo avvertimento sulle conseguenze dell'inazione, riguardante il cambiamento climatico indotto dall'uomo. La minaccia grave che incombe sul benessere dell'umanità e sulla salute del nostro pianeta, non ci permette di perdere altro tempo, verso l'obiettivo di ridurre le emissioni e contenere il riscaldamento globale. Gli impatti a cascata causati da eventi naturali estremi, mettono ancora più in evidenza, i rischi futuri e l'interazione tra clima, tutela di ecosistemi e biodiversità, accesso alle risorse naturali, modelli urbanistici, economia, disuguaglianze sociali, sistemi di trasporto e fonti di energia. Ogni ritardo nel percorso della transizione verde per uno sviluppo sostenibile e climaticamente neutro rischia di essere un danno irreversibile. Ci troviamo davanti ad una sfida urgente e complessa che deve coinvolgere tutti, governi, settore privato e società civile, da affrontare con notevoli investimenti e all'insegna dell'equità e della giustizia sociale. Ogni azione che oggi compiamo, influisce sulla vivibilità del futuro di tutti noi e delle generazioni che verranno.

Rovana Plumb (S&D), în scris. – Salut contribuția experților la elaborarea AR6. Referitor la secțiunea „Climate Change 2022: Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability”, raportul arată:

Până la 3,6 miliarde de oameni trăiesc în medii extrem de vulnerabile la schimbările climatice, iar tipurile actuale de dezvoltare nedurabilă cresc expunerea ecosistemelor și a oamenilor la riscurile climatice. Una din trei persoane este expusă la stres termic mortal, un miliard de oameni care locuiesc în zonele costiere vor fi expuși inundațiilor până în 2050.

Răspunsurile greșite la problema combaterii schimbărilor climatice pot genera și ele probleme dificile legate de vulnerabilitate, expunere și riscuri care ar putea fi greu de corectat. Criza climatică este inseparabilă de criza biodiversității și de crizele determinate de sărăcie și inegalitatea suferite de miliarde de oameni. Angajamentul politic, îmbunătățirea cadrului instituțional, resursele financiare adecvate împreună cu monitorizarea și evaluarea continuă a măsurilor selectate cu ajutorul celei mai bune cunoașteri științifice disponibile la un moment dat și puse în practică sunt esențiale pentru procesul de adaptare și atingere a rezilienței climatice.

În România, este nevoie de un efort pe scară largă pentru elaborarea, operaționalizarea și punerea în practică a măsurilor de adaptare la nivel local. Foarte puține orașe, localități și comunități au planuri de adaptare actualizate.

Sylwia Spurek (Verts/ALE), na piśmie. – Głównym przesłaniem najnowszego raportu IPCC jest: „Teraz albo nigdy”. Zmiany klimatyczne zachodzą szybciej, niż przewidywano, a bez zdecydowanych działań skutki społeczne, środowiskowe, gospodarcze i polityczne będą katastrofalne i nieodwracalne. By utrzymać globalne ocieplenie do maksymalnie 1,5 stopnia Celsjusza, potrzebujemy natychmiastowych i głębokich redukcji emisji gazów cieplarnianych, a tym samym szybkich i odważnych decyzji politycznych. Komisja w dalszym ciągu nie traktuje poważnie twardych danych dotyczących przyczyn zmian klimatu. Konieczne jest, aby Komisja niezwłocznie podjęła działania na rzecz zrewidowania celu „Fit for 55” i przyjęła nowy pakiet regulacji klimatycznych „Fit for 65”. W tym celu należy wdrożyć działania, które przyspieszą nie tylko zieloną transformację energetyczną, ale także przejście na zrównoważony, etyczny, roślinny system żywnościowy. Ważne, żeby zmiany dotyczyły i energetyki, i transportu, i rolnictwa właśnie. „Fit for 65” to również kwestia niezależności UE od dostaw gazu i węgla od państw łamiących prawa człowieka oraz kwestia niezależności żywnościowej – w oparciu o wiedzę ludzi nauki i postulaty klimatycznych aktywistów i aktywistek. Ostatnio list otwarty w tej sprawie, przygotowany przez Green REV Institute, Akcję Demokracja oraz Future Food 4 Climate podpisało aż 66 przedstawicieli i przedstawicielek organizacji społecznych oraz 20 naukowców i naukowiec z całego świata. Warto ich posłuchać.

14. Dringende noodzaak om de minimumbelastingrichtlijn vast te stellen (debat)

Die Präsidentin. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über die Erklärung der Kommission zur Dringlichkeit der Annahme der Mindeststeuerrichtlinie (2022/2617(RSP)).

Es ist weiter freie Sitzplatzwahl, und wir wenden ebenso die Möglichkeit der spontanen Wortmeldungen und der blauen Karten an.

Frans Timmermans, Executive Vice-President of the Commission. – Madam President. Let me say that my colleague and friend Paolo Gentiloni would have like to be here now, but he is in the full preparation of the Economic and Financial Affairs Council (ECOFIN) and we will make sure that your messages here today reach him tonight so that he can make good use of them tomorrow, when the ECOFIN in Luxembourg will discuss this very issue.

Paolo and I strongly believe that this debate today is of great importance and will support us to come up with the right solutions. We are committed at the Commission to implement quickly the historic agreement of the OECD and the G20 on fair corporate taxation. It's a watershed moment in reforming international taxation, and it's an example of a multilateral success spearheaded by Europe that we can all be proud of.

As you know, the implementation of the two pillars of the global agreement in 2023 will make sure that our tax system reflects the new reality of our economies. It will level the playing field between businesses and ensure that all companies, including digital ones, pay their fair share of taxes in the right way.

As this Parliament knows very well, the OECD agreement has two pillars. Today we discussed the second pillar, establishing a 15% minimum effective corporate taxation rate. The first pillar on the distribution of taxation rights amongst jurisdictions to ensure fair taxation will be subject to a Commission proposal later this year.

Our main message today is that we urge the Council to adopt the minimum taxation rate now and not to delay this due to work on the other pillar. In our view, the reasons to do so are compelling.

By establishing a level of 15% minimum effective taxation, we put a floor on the race to the bottom on corporate tax rates, thereby ending 40 years of unfettered tax competition that was detrimental to public finances and to all of us. This isn't just necessary to preserve the global reputation of the EU as a leader on fair taxation. It isn't even just an imperative because we simply want fair taxation and a fair business environment in Europe. An early agreement on minimum effective tax rate for corporates will place social justice at the core of our global tax system, and that is a core value for Europe itself. And as I said, in this transition we're in, in the industrial revolution, the climate crisis, the core element that links everything together is social justice.

Adopting this minimum tax rate also makes economic sense, especially now that we need to finance our economic recovery. According to the estimates of the OECD, a global minimum tax rate of 15% would generate worldwide around USD 150 billion in additional tax revenues per year. Even a minimum level of tax on income within Europe, where other jurisdictions have not exercised their primarily taxing rights, will allow Member States to protect their tax base and, as such, put a floor on tax competition. This is why our proposed transposition dates for Europe mirror the implementation deadline agreed by all global partners.

In fact, not acting comes with enormous risks. If the EU and its Member States fail to implement the income inclusion rule that is key for the minimum tax rate on time, the EU will suffer an immediate loss of tax revenues as the taxing rights will be transferred to the jurisdiction of an intermediate parent company that did implement this rule on time.

Even at the more technical level, all elements are in place for a quick agreement in Council on the minimum tax rate.

The Commission's proposal follows closely the OECD model rules. The few adjustments primarily aim to ensure compliance with EU law. There is no gold plating compared to the OECD agreement. The Council is moving towards the Commission proposal to apply this minimum effective tax rate to the large businesses with a group turnover of over EUR 750 million that have the greatest capacity to exploit low tax rates globally. All EU Member States support the need for a directive and the political need for a continuous European leadership on this issue. The French Presidency worked in record time to present a compromise text. Unfortunately, not all Member States could support it at the time, despite their overall support to the proposal but the common will to act is there.

Making one pillar dependent on the other is legally questionable under the case-law of the EU Court of Justice. The political imperative and the expectations of our citizens are even higher. We need to urgently adopt the EU directive on minimum taxation.

Honourable Members, Of course we do see that we need to work on both pillars of the OECD agreement. The Commission would not object to have a Council statement accompanying the agreement on this directive, mentioning the political link between the two pillars. In fact, the French Presidency already circulated draft proposals on this, but these drafts are equally clear about the political commitment to the distribution of taxation rights under Pillar One, so also pave the way to agree politically on the minimum taxation rate.

I believe that all these reasons are strong encouragements to the Council, to simply act on this and support this minimum taxation rate. I want to thank Parliament once again, not just for your own upcoming opinion on this proposal, but also for scheduling this debate today. This shows that you are also committed to this drive to make corporate taxation fair and simple, and that makes sure they all here that in Luxembourg.

Markus Ferber, *im Namen der PPE-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Timmermans, liebe Kolleginnen, liebe Kollegen! Ich muss ehrlich zugeben: Für die EVP-Fraktion war ich etwas überrascht, als dieser Tagesordnungspunkt von der linken Seite des Hauses beantragt wurde. Warum? Weil auch wir im Parlament noch nicht so weit sind, dass wir sagen könnten: Es liegt nur noch am Rat. Der Rat darf auch erst beschließen, wenn das Europäische Parlament seine Stellungnahme abgegeben hat.

Wenn ich mir den Berichtsentwurf anschau – Entschuldigung, wenn ich das mal ganz offen anspreche: Wollen wir, dass wir das, was wir lange gefordert haben, was wir jetzt schon in vielen Entschlüssen auch begrüßt haben – nämlich, dass die OECD sich verständigt hat auf einen wirklich globalen Standard –, wollen wir, dass wir den umsetzen, oder wollen wir gleich wieder draufpacken? Wollen wir damit unsere internationale Glaubwürdigkeit gefährden und zukünftige weitere Steuerabkommen damit auch gefährden?

Ich halte das schon für äußerst bedenklich, wenn hier dieses Parlament – jedenfalls von dem, was bisher schriftlich vorliegt – der Meinung ist, man kann immer noch draufpacken, draufpacken, draufpacken. Nein, wir sollten das, was die Kommission gesagt hat, jetzt umsetzen und glaubwürdig sein, auch im internationalen Bereich.

Aber ich frage mich natürlich auch, Herr Kommissar: Warum musste das in zwei Teilen vorgeschlagen werden? Es ist ja interessant, dass im Rat genau deswegen auch Kritik aufkommt, weil sie sagen: Ja, wir wissen ja noch nicht, was im anderen Teil drinsteht. Es wäre schon richtig gewesen, dass jetzt nicht – damit für Wahlen, die in kurzer Zeit anstehen, ein kurzfristiger Erfolg machbar ist – mal der leichtere Teil vorgeschlagen wird und den schwereren Teil, den schiebt man mal ein bisschen vor sich her. Es wäre schon gut gewesen, wenn die Kommission das gesamte OECD-Paket auf einmal vorgeschlagen hätte, damit wir das insgesamt im Parlament und im Rat seriös beraten können.

Deswegen sage ich ganz offen: Diese Debatte ist nicht notwendig. Es wäre besser gewesen, wir hätten heute die Stunde dafür genutzt, an dem Bericht von der Kollegin Lalucq zu arbeiten oder die Kommission aufzufordern, endlich auch den zweiten Teil vorzulegen.

Aurore Lalucq, *au nom du groupe S&D*. – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Commissaire, chers collègues, à n'en pas douter, la fiscalité fut probablement le plus grand raté de la construction européenne. Et pour ne rien arranger, ce raté s'est fait dans un contexte mondial de course au moins-disant fiscal.

Nous avons enfin décidé de siffler la fin de la récré. Cela a commencé, comme cela a été dit, avec l'accord OCDE sur l'imposition minimale des multinationales, signé par plus de 130 pays, accord auquel la Commission – on peut s'en féliciter – a répondu très rapidement avec une directive. Cette directive, nous y travaillons en ce moment même au niveau du Parlement européen, mais comme d'habitude, il y a un blocage sur les questions fiscales, de la part de deux États en particulier, à savoir l'Estonie et la Pologne.

Alors chers gouvernements estonien et polonais, certes, vous avez vos raisons de ne pas aimer cet accord. Nous avons aussi les nôtres! Du côté des socio-démocrates, on aurait aimé un taux plus élevé. Markus Ferber aurait peut-être aussi aimé un autre accord, mais cet accord est le fruit d'un compromis historique. Alors pourquoi nous refuser au niveau européen ce que vous avez accepté de signer au niveau mondial? Et surtout, pourquoi maintenant, dans ce contexte si particulier où nous devons faire montre de responsabilité et de solidarité?

Gilles Boyer, *au nom du groupe Renew*. – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Commissaire, cette réforme internationale de la fiscalité des entreprises est historique – ça a été dit. Cette taxation minimale à 15 % nous permettra de lutter plus efficacement contre les paradis fiscaux et la concurrence déloyale. Et il est important de souligner que cette réforme a été soutenue par les 27 États membres unanimement, ce qui était encore inespéré il y a quelques mois.

L'Europe doit maintenant prendre ou conserver le leadership en mettant en œuvre rapidement cet accord et la proposition de directive de la Commission, laquelle est fidèle à l'accord de l'OCDE. La présidence française du Conseil est maintenant à l'œuvre pour obtenir cet accord à l'unanimité et avancer rapidement si possible. C'est la raison de ce débat d'aujourd'hui, dans la perspective de la réunion du Conseil Ecofin prévue demain, que vous avez mentionnée, Monsieur le Vice-Président.

Dans cette dernière ligne droite des négociations, nous appelons, comme notre collègue Aurore Lalucq, l'ensemble des États membres à faire preuve de cohérence et à se rallier au compromis du Conseil. Il y a une forte attente des citoyens européens pour une grande ambition en matière de lutte contre l'évasion fiscale. Le Parlement européen – cela a été dit aussi – prendra toute sa part pour que l'Europe soit au rendez-vous et pour s'assurer que toutes les multinationales paient un impôt minimum dans chacun des pays où elles ont une activité. C'est une question de justice et d'équité fiscale.

Claude Gruffat, *au nom du groupe Verts/ALE*. – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Commissaire, chers collègues, aujourd'hui, en matière fiscale, nous vivons dans une Union et surtout dans un monde où les multinationales ont plus de droits que les individus, les citoyennes et les citoyens. Il est temps de revenir là-dessus. Les impôts que paient nos concitoyens financent les biens et les services publics. Les multinationales les utilisent et, en retour, s'essuient les pieds sur le principe du consentement à l'impôt.

Finissons-en et rétablissons la justice fiscale. Il y a urgence à conclure ce projet de taux minimum d'imposition des multinationales, menacé par le nationalisme. Certes, on a critiqué ce texte: taux trop bas, exemptions trop importantes – d'ailleurs, je partage ces critiques. Les Européens et les Européennes doivent enfin être entendus sur les questions fiscales. Ce texte, qui concerne notre vie de tous les jours, est aujourd'hui entre les mains des ministres des finances. Alors je demande d'envoyer demain un signal positif aux contribuables et aux citoyens: faites payer leur juste part d'impôts aux multinationales.

Michiel Hoogeveen, *namens de ECR-Fractie*. – Voorzitter, we hebben het vandaag over de globale minimumbelasting, de zogenaamde "Pillar Two model rules". Een nobel streven, maar er zijn praktische bezwaren. Op het moment dat onze burgers keihard worden getroffen door stijgende prijzen, is een bijkomende last voor bedrijven niet het juiste antwoord. Want wie gaat extra bedrijfsbelastingen betalen? Volgens een studie van het IMF leiden vooral werknemers onder bedrijfsbelastingen. Het verklaart 45 tot 75 procent van hun lagere lonen. Belangrijk in tijden van hoge inflatie.

Daarnaast ondermijnt bureaucratie het concurrentievermogen. Ook daar blinken we in de EU helaas in uit. Dit voorstel breidt dit nog verder uit. Het voorstel leidt ertoe dat grote bedrijven een extra boekhouding zullen moeten bijhouden. Dat zal vooral advocaten, juristen, boekhouders en consultancykantoren bekoren. Ook de ministeries van Financiën zullen nieuwe bureaucraten moeten aannemen, want deze complexe regels moeten worden geïnterpreteerd. Gezien de bureaucratische reputatie van bepaalde lidstaten een flinke uitdaging.

Ten slotte is het een wereldvreemd idee dat landen die hun belasting moeten verhogen, geen andere manier zullen vinden om voordelen toe te kennen aan multinationals. De globale minimumbelasting is een oplossing op zoek naar een probleem. De meeste landen hebben al een manier om ervoor te zorgen dat iedereen netjes zijn belastingen betaalt. Daarnaast is het nog maar de vraag of andere landen zoals de Verenigde Staten deze ooit zullen implementeren.

Voorzitter, laten we dit voorstel heroverwegen, want de problemen van belastingen in een digitale en geglobaliseerde wereld gaan wij hier niet mee oplossen.

José Gusmão, *em nome do Grupo The Left*. – Senhora Presidente, a esquerda irá, obviamente, apoiar todo o sentimento de urgência que existe, e que existe junto dos cidadãos, no sentido de pôr fim à realidade obscena de termos algumas das maiores e mais lucrativas empresas do mundo a pagarem impostos baixos ou a não pagarem impostos de todo.

Mas o que nos é prometido é uma tributação sobre as empresas multinacionais que será justa, justamente distribuída e efetiva. E a proposta que temos em cima da mesa não é nenhuma destas coisas.

Não será uma tributação sobre as multinacionais, mas sim uma tributação sobre uma pequena parte das empresas multinacionais. Não será efetiva, porque está cheia de exclusões, deduções e exceções. Não será justa, porque é uma taxa muito mais baixa do que a praticada em grande parte dos países e para grande parte das empresas. E não será justamente distribuída, porque o mundo desenvolvido tratou de guardar para si próprio a fatia de leão da receita deste novo imposto.

Temos, portanto, muita urgência, mas também muito a melhorar nesta proposta.

Clara Ponsatí Obiols (NI). – Madam President, this directive is a step in the right direction, and it is urgent to have multinational companies contribute at least a little bit. But it is also urgent to stop the unfair competition with local SMEs that bear the weight of state regulations and taxes.

With war instability, inflation and energy prices going through the roof, SMEs are the weak link of the economy. Multinationals and governments have tools to weather this storm and put themselves always first. This leaves SMEs in no man's land, often paying the price on fuel stability. For example, the urgent measures of the Spanish Government to lower oil prices demand that companies pay the government subsidy in advance. Easy for the big guys, impossible for the small guys.

This directive is good and temptations to water it down must be resisted. But it is ironic that while we approve it, SMEs that keep our economies healthy, play by the rules and ensure our way of life in times of emergency are left out in the cold.

Marek Belka (S&D). – Madam President, tomorrow, the EU Ministers of Finance can agree on the minimum effective tax rates of 15% for big multinationals. The deal also introduces another tax payment rule to fix tax havens.

We are all agreed upon a basis amongst 137 countries. Then the Commission proposed a reasonable directive. Many thought that on this, in the EU, we will stand strong together and nothing is going to stop us now from approving and implementing this ground-breaking rule. But now some countries, including my own, are hesitant to agree to the French Presidency proposal.

I call upon the EU Member States to have an agreement on this document tomorrow. With Putin's war around the corner, as well as difficulties for our economies caused by the conflict and the pandemics, we need unity as well as fair taxation for a sustainable recovery. This directive gives us that.

Rasmus Andresen (Verts/ALE). – Frau Präsidentin! 360 Milliarden Euro Gewinne haben multinationale Konzerne allein 2020 eingefahren. Während viele kleine Betriebe in den letzten Jahren stark gelitten haben, machen Amazon, Daimler oder Bayer enorme Gewinne. Gerade im Einzelhandel oder in der Gastronomie kämpfen nach wie vor viele kleine Betriebe um ihre Existenz. Es ist ungerecht, dass Amazon prozentual immer noch weniger Steuern zahlt als der Buchladen bei uns um die Ecke.

Es ist zu einfach für große Konzerne, ihre Gewinne in Steuerschlupflöcher zu schieben. Deshalb brauchen wir einen globalen Steuersatz von mindestens 15 Prozent, und wir brauchen ihn jetzt. Wir Grüne lehnen eine spätere Einführung der Mindeststeuer Ende 2023 und große Ausnahmen für einige Mitgliedstaaten entschieden ab. Wir fordern die Blockiererstaaten Estland und Polen dazu auf, auf dem Treffen der Finanzminister in dieser Woche den Weg für die Mindeststeuer freizumachen.

Fabio Massimo Castaldo (NI). – Signora Presidente, signor Commissario, onorevoli colleghi, l'accordo quasi unanime che abbiamo firmato in seno all'OCSE per introdurre una tassa minima sulle multinazionali ha rappresentato un passaggio importante. Ma ci è stato presentato come un momento storico: si tratta invece di un compromesso già nettamente al ribasso, che risolve solo parzialmente il problema di un sistema fiscale internazionale, che è stato programmato per non funzionare.

Troppo poche le multinazionali incluse; l'aliquota al 15 %, inferiore perfino alla normale imposizione sui redditi dei lavoratori, è simile, molto simile al regime agevolato di alcuni Paesi europei, che non esito a definire paradisi fiscali di fatto.

Certo, col tempo queste soglie potrebbero essere alzate ma non se questo accordo viene blindato con l'intento di precludere qualsiasi potenziale cambiamento. Il testo della direttiva, ancor più nella bozza del Consiglio, non lascia alcun margine di manovra per future modifiche alla tassa minima.

Intanto gli Stati Uniti hanno imposto che gli altri Paesi ritirino le tasse digitali nazionali non appena le nuove regole entreranno in vigore e questo può essere accettabile solo se non si blocca una revisione possibile del quadro in futuro.

In un mondo afflitto da una pandemia e dalla guerra, finché le multinazionali non pagheranno la loro giusta parte, il prezzo vero lo pagheremo tutti quanti noi.

Niels Fuglsang (S&D). – Madam President, the EU is the world's biggest loser when it comes to losing money to tax havens. Actually, we lose around EUR 380 billion a year, according to international studies, because multinationals and wealthy individuals are shifting their wealth to tax havens around the globe. But these tax havens are not just distant palm islands as you see in the movies. Actually, three out of four euro are lost in tax evasion to countries inside the European Union.

Some say this is just competition, but is it truly fair competition that a few gigantic companies can choose freely themselves how much they want to pay in tax, because surely it's not the German or the French or the Danish or the Dutch Parliaments that decide their tax rates. They decided themselves. Imagine how much we could invest in schools, hospitals and green transition. No one is benefiting from this but the tax evaders. This is why we must have a minimum tax level and we should have it now.

Evelyn Regner (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin, sehr geehrter Herr Vizepräsident! Es gibt eine extreme Vermögensungleichheit global und in Europa. Die Pandemie, der Krieg in der Ukraine, die hohen Energiepreise, die Klimakrise verschärfen diese Vermögensungleichheit noch mehr. Die OECD sagt es voraus: Ohne rasche globale Einigung werden uns hohe Kosten entstehen, die wieder von der breiten Masse der Beschäftigten getragen werden müssen.

Durch die Einführung einer globalen Mindeststeuer für Konzerne von mindestens 15 Prozent – ich betone immer wieder das Wort „mindestens“ – kann diese riesige Ungleichheit gemildert werden, und außerdem können wir Steueroasen trockenlegen. Die generierten Einnahmen entlasten nicht nur, sondern sie sind geeignet, auch die Bildung zu stärken und Arbeitsplätze zu schaffen. Dennoch gilt: Es handelt sich um einen Mindeststeuersatz von 15 Prozent – wie es der Name schon sagt. Unsere Ziele liegen höher. Wir müssen das Maximum aus den OECD-Vorschlägen rausholen, um die Reichen nicht noch reicher und die Armen noch ärmer werden zu lassen.

Spontane Wortmeldungen

Antonius Manders (PPE). – Voorzitter, concurrentie op belasting is altijd een verkeerde prikkel. We moeten concurreren op kwaliteit.

Dus het is goed dat de Europese Commissie naar voren komt met een minimumbelastingtarief op Europees niveau. Het is goed dat Europese bedrijven die wel belasting betalen zoals dat hoort, op een eerlijke wijze kunnen concurreren met andere bedrijven. We moeten ervoor zorgen dat Europa één is als het gaat om industrie en bedrijven, dat de interne markt als een hefboom kan worden gebruikt in de globale economie en dat Europa daar sterk uitkomt.

Wij kunnen belastingtarieven zelfs gebruiken om een gezonde levensstijl te promoten, zoals de Commissie, de Raad en het Parlement hebben gedaan met 0 procent btw op verse groenten en vers fruit. Wij kunnen daar veel verder in gaan, want wij hebben een gezonde bevolking nodig om in een globale economie te kunnen overleven.

Manon Aubry (The Left). – Madame la Présidente, savez-vous combien McKinsey, qui effectue des missions de conseil grassement payées auprès de l'État français, a payé d'impôts en France en dix ans? La réponse est aussi simple que choquante: zéro. Pas un seul centime. Ce scandale d'État illustre de nouveau les pratiques d'évasion fiscale de multinationales sans foi ni loi.

Face à ce vol en bande organisée, la présidence française de l'Union européenne ose nous dire que le problème sera réglé avec le taux minimum international à 15 %. Alors, soit notre ministre de l'économie est un menteur, soit il n'a rien compris à la fiscalité internationale, puisqu'en l'état, l'accord, qui est par ailleurs très insuffisant, fera seulement payer quelques miettes d'impôts à McKinsey, le tout aux États-Unis.

Alors oui, il y a urgence à agir contre l'évasion fiscale, mais le pire serait de donner l'illusion d'avoir réglé le problème pendant que les McKinsey and co. continuent de nous piller. Au-delà de cet accord au rabais, j'ai envie de dire aux évadés fiscaux: nous saurons récupérer votre argent, et nous vous poursuivrons jusqu'en enfer s'il le faut.

Ernest Urtasun (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, I think that debate was indeed very necessary because tomorrow, probably, the ECOFIN will fail again on delivering on that deal and it is not exactly that the Commission put things very difficult to them. They just copy pasted the international agreement. But in extension to that, we have an extension of the transitional period, now already on the table, some opt outs and not even with that all Member States are happy.

So, I think we absolutely need to urge Poland and Estonia to unblock that deal. Imagine how the EU would look after all the efforts made at the international level for that if that deal is delayed here. I think this would be totally unacceptable and I think this is why this Parliament needed to speak today as it did.

And finally, Commissioner, a final word on the method and the legal base that we have used. We know unanimity in taxation is a growing problem, more and more. And for that, this Parliament has repeatedly called for the use of Article 116 for taxation matters to overcome that. This episode that will happen tomorrow is again another reason for reflecting on this.

Mick Wallace (The Left). – Madam President, thanks to globalisation, economic restructuring and pro-business legislation over recent decades, the rise in the share of national income going to the owners of capital in most countries has increased astronomically. And this legislation doesn't put enough of a dent in it.

The proposed minimum, which has been watered down to 15%, is only barely above the abysmal 12.5% that we have in Ireland at the moment. And there's a fear that it could actually add to the race to the bottom with a 15% global standard, and it's well below the UN call for somewhere between 20 and 30%.

More than ever, we need a fair and effective corporate tax system. Today, there's no doubt big business has too much influence over politics, it has too much influence over the decision makers. And it would be wonderful if the EU were to tackle that.

(Ende der spontanen Wortmeldungen)

Frans Timmermans, Executive Vice-President of the Commission. – Madam President, just very briefly in reaction to what was said. First of all, I think the Commission will feel stronger tomorrow, given the clear messages a vast majority of this Parliament have given today to us.

Secondly, of course many of us would have liked the levels of taxation to be higher, but also many of us campaigned for many years to get the minimum corporate tax approved. And the argument against it was always the same: you can't compete if we do it as Europeans on our own. Please wait for the OECD to take the measure.

Now we have a measure in the OECD and I think we're under an obligation to make the best of it. And since more than 130 countries have subscribed to this, the risk of unfair competition for European companies is gone. It's gone. And if countries do not apply the rules, after a couple of years we can intervene, we can let countries act against companies who don't pay the minimum tax.

Now, my final comment is this. I've heard it said again today, 'Oh, it's too much of a burden. We shouldn't do it.' What are you going to say to the grocer on the corner of the street, to the baker, to the butcher, who do pay normal taxes, that these big international corporations always find ways not to pay taxes. Now they can't escape anymore if we start with this.

So I thank Parliament for its support on this measure. I also believe we need to do what we can do now and we need to put as much pressure as we can on those Member States which don't want to agree yet. And then the second part will follow. I do not think we should wait for the whole package, two parts of it, to be adopted immediately. And I strongly believe that if we send a signal tomorrow, we will start creating a fairer tax base across the board. And the idea that if you run a local shop, you pay taxes, and then if the shop next door is part of an international corporation, it doesn't pay taxes – that idea can be put to sleep forever in Europe. And I think this is what our citizens expect of us.

Die Präsidentin. – Die Aussprache ist geschlossen.

Schriftliche Erklärungen (Artikel 171 GO)

Enikő Győri (NI), írásban. – Az EU-ban be kell fejezni a kilábalást a járvány okozta gazdasági válságból és ellensúlyozni kell a szomszédságunkban zajló háború gazdasági hatásait. E két próbatétel okán is fontos, mit lépünk az adópolitikában. Nem lehet más célunk, mint hogy mindenki fizessen adót a valós gazdasági tevékenysége után, így a nemzetközi vállalatóriások is, másrészt hogy a versenyképességünket ne ássuk alá káros adópolitikával. A 15%-os globális minimumadóról tavaly az OECD keretében elért megállapodás jó lépés ebbe az irányba. Ehhez képest az Európai Parlamentben a baloldali már megint az Unió elemi gazdasági érdekeivel ellentétesen lép fel. Emelni akarja a minimumadót 21%-ra, a szerződésekre ütköző módon a tagállamok helyett a Bizottság kezébe adna jogosítványokat az adópolitika meghatározása terén, s mindezt újabb gazdasági szektorra is kiterjesztené.

Immár három éve nem értem, miért akarja aláásni a baloldali az Unió versenyképességét. A gazdasági válságra egyetlen receptjük van: az eladósítás és az adóemelés. Sajnálatos, hogy úgy kell fogalmaznom, szerencse, hogy az EP-nek, így a relatív baloldali többségének a témában nincs szava. Még viccnek is rossz, hogy egy 136 ország által jóváhagyott megállapodást ideológiai csatározás tárgyává tegyünk. Most az Unió egységének megerősítésére és ellenállóbbá tételére van szükség, ezek a javaslatok pedig ezzel ellentétesek. Az EP ne legyen az európai versenyképesség ellensége.

15. Herziening van de marktstabiliteitsreserve voor de EU-regeling voor de handel in emissierechten (debat)

Die Präsidentin. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über den Bericht von Cyrus Engerer im Namen des Ausschusses für Umweltfragen, öffentliche Gesundheit und Lebensmittelsicherheit über den Vorschlag für einen Beschluss des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates zur Änderung des Beschlusses (EU) 2015/1814 in Bezug auf die Menge der Zertifikate, die bis 2030 in die Marktstabilitätsreserve für das System für den Handel mit Treibhausgasemissionszertifikaten in der Union einzustellen sind (COM(2021)0571 – C9-0325/2021 – 2021/0202(COD)) (A9-0045/2022).

Cyrus Engerer, Rapporteur. – Sinjura President, f'dan iż-żmien bla precedent għall-Unjoni Ewropea u d-dinja, xogħolna hu li niżguraw stabbiltà – stabbiltà għall-familji Ewropej u stabbiltà għan-negozji Ewropej, għaliex dan hu l-mod kif nissalvagwardjaw l-interessi ta' dawg l-iktar vulnerabbli fis-soċjetà tagħna.

L-istabbiltà kienet proprju r-raġuni għalfejn dan l-istrument, il-*Market Stability Reserve* għe kkreata oriġinarjament – strument li xogħlu hu li filwaqt li jżomm lilna l-koll iffukati fuq il-miri ambjentali tagħna biex inkomplu nnaqqsu l-emissjonijiet, naraw li s-sistema tkun b'saħħitha biżżejjed biex tilqa' għax-xokkijiet li jiġu fuq id-dinja minn żmien għal żmien. U x'ma kellniex xokkijiet f'dawn l-aħhar snin! Pandemija li waqqfet lid-dinja kollha, fejn rajna l-ajruporti kollha tagħna jingħalqu, haddiema jahdmu mid-dar, tfal jattendu l-iskola minn fuq il-kompjuters f'kamartom stess u ahna hawnhekk fil-Parlament, li waqqafna l-ivvjaġġar tagħna u rrapprezentajna lill-popli Ewropej f'dan il-Parlament mill-Istati Membri tagħna grazzi għall-avvanzi teknoloġiċi li ppermettunli li nagħmlu dan.

Filwaqt li l-ambjent kellu solljev mill-attività umana li tant tikkawżalu hsara, ma waqafniex nahdmu biex nipproteġu l-ambjent tagħna b'mod aktar permanenti. Konna l-ewwel kontinent li waqt pandemija hdimna u għaddejna liġi dwar il-klima, ikkommettejna lilna nfusna li nkunu newtrali mill-karbonju sal-2050, u nedejna pakkett ambizzjuż, il-Fit for 55, li se jkun qiegħed jarana mmorru hafna *oltre* dak li kkommettejna lilna nfusna għalih fil-passat. Dan kollu fl-isfond ta' tensjonijiet godda bejn ir-Russja u l-kumplement tad-dinja u l-invażjoni atroci tar-Russja fuq l-Ukrajna f'dawn l-aħħar ġimgħat.

Fhimna, li biex inżommu l-istabbiltà u biex nibqgħu għaddejnin fi triqitna biex nilhqu l-miri ambjentali tagħna u klimatiċi tagħna, kellna nahdmu minnufih bhala Parlament, fuq il-pariri tal-Kummissjoni Ewropea, biex nestendu l-*intake rate* u l-allowances tal-Market Stability Reserve sal-2030 — rati li huma d-doppju ta' daww li kienu oriġinarjament ippjanati iżda li jirriflettew r-realtàjiet li qegħdin ngħixu fihom illum u l-ambizzjoni b'saħħitha tagħna għal Ewropa hafna aktar ambjentali.

Għalhekk fi ftit xhur irnexxielna mhux biss nahdmu fuq il-liġi li testendi dak li għandna llum iżda għaddejniha mill-Kumitat għall-Ambjent b'mod spedit u qegħdin hawn illum biex nissigillaw dak li diġà qbilna dwaru. Jidher però, li dan mhux l-istess għall-Kunsill tal-Unjoni Ewropea. Jidher li min-naħa tal-Kunsill għadhom lanqas biss bdew id-diskussjonijiet dwar jekk jaqblux ma' din l-estensjoni jew le, u għalhekk, ippermetteli nagħmel appell — appell biex il-Kunsill tal-Ministri jiċċaqtaq fuq din l-estensjoni importanti għall-familji u n-negozji Ewropej — estensjoni li tiżgura stabbiltà fi żmien li hawn hafna bżonnha; estensjoni li tassigura li nżommu mal-ambizzjoni ambjentali tagħna waqt li fl-istess hin inharsu l-interessi tal-iktart cittadini vulnerabbli fl-Unjoni Ewropea. Għaliex irridu li jkollna tranżizzjoni hadra u ambjentali li tkun waħda ġusta għal kulhadd — tranżizzjoni li ma thalli lil hadd jaqa' lura.

Ippermettuli qabel ma nikkonkludi nirringrazzja lix-*shadow rapporteurs* kollha għall-kontribut siewi biex wasalna hawn u l-kooperazzjoni li sibt minn kull wieħed u waħda minnhom.

Intemm b'appell: irridu nharsu din l-art li ngħixu fuqha għaliex l-ebda bniedem ma jgħix mingħajr id-dinja tagħna, iżda fil-verità d-dinja tkompli tgħix mingħajrha l-bnedmin.

Frans Timmermans, *Executive Vice-President of the Commission*. — Madam President, let me start by thanking Cyrus Engerer and his colleagues for the report. This proposal is a small but very important element of the Fit for 55 package, a set of comprehensive proposals to reach our climate goals.

The market stability reserve (MSR) for the EU emissions trading system (ETS) has been operational since 2019. This reserve is a very important part of our ETS. It has now shown that it fulfils its role of reducing historic surpluses of allowances. This improves the ETS's resilience against major demand shocks, such as the COVID-19 crisis.

I want to briefly back this up with a couple of figures. As a result of the operation of the MSR in recent years, the surplus of allowances has decreased from 1.65 billion in 2018 to 1.38 billion allowances in 2019. The increase in the surplus of emission allowances that one could have seen in 2020 due to lower emissions because of COVID-19 was limited also thanks to the MSR.

The MSR operates based on clear and pre-determined rules. The most important of these rules are the ones on placing allowances in the reserve and releasing them from it. The proposal that we will debate today does one thing: keep the 24 % intake rate of emission allowances for the MSR, also beyond 2024. And let me explain again why. In the last reform of the ETS, it was decided to temporarily double the rate at which allowances are placed in the reserve to allow for a faster reduction of the historic surplus in the market from 12 to 24 %. However, that previously agreed higher intake rate would only apply until 2023, and would revert back to the legal default of 12 % thereafter. When considering the broader revision of the ETS, as part of Fit for 55, we of course also looked at the MSR. Our impact assessment shows that reverting to 12 % would not reduce the surplus fast enough.

To maintain a well-functioning ETS, the Commission has therefore proposed to make this one targeted proposal in order to maintain the higher 24 % integrate for the MSR and, accordingly, the higher minimum amount of allowances to be placed in the reserve 200 million.

We put this change forward in a proposal that is separate from the broader revision of the ETS to give predictability to the markets on the future operation of the reserve. We welcome the broad support in the Environment Committee for this, and I hope that this is confirmed this week here, in Parliament. A well-functioning ETS is key to deliver on our climate ambition by 2030. The proposals on the intake rate for the MSR is a small part of that, and I count on your support also for the broader reform that we have on the table. I will listen carefully to what you will say.

Claudia Gamon, *Verfasserin der Stellungnahme des mitberatenden Ausschusses für Industrie, Forschung und Energie*. – Frau Präsidentin! Der EU-Emissionshandel ist das Vorzeigedokument der Europäischen Union zur effizienten Reduktion von Treibhausgasemissionen, und zwar durch die Vorgabe eines klaren Reduktionspfads, der es uns ermöglicht, die Reduktionsziele zu erfüllen. Deshalb ist auch ein starker, gut funktionierender Emissionshandel für das Erreichen unserer Green-Deal-Ziele essenziell.

Damit dieser Emissionshandel weiterhin ein so effizientes, verlässliches und schockresistentes Instrument bleibt, gibt es seit 2019 die Marktstabilitätsreserve. Der ITRE-Ausschuss hat meinen Vorschlag zur Verlängerung der MSR bis zum Ende der Handelsperiode mit großer Mehrheit angenommen. Damit verhindern wir ein Auslaufen der MSR 2023. Etwaige Veränderungen an der Funktionsweise der MSR werden, wenn das denn erforderlich sein sollte, im Rahmen der Überarbeitung des Emissionshandels diskutiert. Vielleicht werden wir dazu ja jetzt auch noch ein paar Punkte hören.

Ich möchte mich bei den Kolleginnen und Kollegen bedanken, die mich bei der Arbeit an der MSR unterstützt haben und sichergestellt haben, dass der europäische Emissionshandel weiterhin so ein starkes Instrument zur Bekämpfung des Klimawandels ist.

Cristian-Silviu Buşoi, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Madam President, I would like to congratulate the rapporteur. The Market Stability Reserve, in place since 2019, as Executive Vice-President Timmermans has just reminded us, addresses the structural imbalance between the supply of and demand for allowances on the market, with the aim to stabilise the market by removing surplus allowance from it. The reserve functions by triggering adjustments to the annual auctions volumes.

Last year, as part of the Fit for 55 package, the Commission proposed also the first review of the ETS and Market Stability Reserve (MSR) following an impact assessment. I would like to reiterate that the assessment showed the MSR should be adapted to avoid shocks and to ensure complementarity, coherence and effectiveness in achieving the 2030 and 2050 climate ambition. It also revealed that the 12% intake rate would not be enough to ensure that the objectives of the MSR in terms of reducing the surplus and ensuring market resilience will still be fulfilled.

It is only fair to continue with the doubled intake rate for a few years and ensure that any review and adjustment of the MSR intake rate in the future should aim to minimise regulatory complexity and market speculation, while ensuring a maximum degree of market predictability and that the EU ETS is fit for purpose in line with the Union's increased climate ambitions for 2030. This is the reason why the EPP has tabled this amendment on this matter.

While the overall revision of the MSR decision is part of the ETS revision, this file was due to have a fast-track procedure, that's why we had a political agreement to proceed in a fast-track procedure with the MSR revision. This was a challenge for most of us, and we had very ambitious colleagues, but we mustn't forget the realities that the economies of our countries face, that our industry face, especially the heavy ones, and more recently the challenge of the energy supply.

So the EPP position is the 24% intake, and we need to ensure the intake rate of 22% is maintained and not increased, until in the future when a broader revision as part of the ETS will come with a solid impact assessment. Thank you so much.

Jytte Guteland, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Madam President, the market stability reserve (MSR) might seem like a technicality, but it is immensely important for climate. It is not only the first file in the Fit for 55 package, but also key to make the EU emissions trading system (ETS) fit for purpose.

The historical problem with the EU ETS has been the high surplus of allowances after the euro and financial crisis. This has resulted in low prices, weak signals for industry to decarbonise. But the creation of the MSR and also the Swedish proposal in the last reform actually saved the European Union from – if we count from my home country, Sweden – 50 years of Swedish emissions. This is probably the main reason why the ETS prices are finally sending the right signal to the industry. And this is why we also now see a new green industrial revolution with new innovations such as green hydrogen popping up across Europe.

However, after the pandemic, we now see a new large surplus: 30 years of Swedish emissions, if we should use my home country again to show you the picture. Weakening the MSR at this stage would be a huge mistake. Today, I hope for a very broad support for a continuously strong MSR without limiting further ambition in the ETS negotiations.

I want to thank my S&D colleague and rapporteur for good work and wish you the very best for the trilogues that we have ahead of us.

Emma Wiesner, för Renew-gruppen. – Fru talman! Nu är det upp till bevis! Det är nu vi ska rösta om höjda ambitioner i klimatarbetet, och då har de högerkonservativa en sorts ryggradsreflex att skrika "Stopp! Det är kris!" Det första som högerpopulisterna vill dra ned på vid en kris är nämligen klimatambitionerna. Gaskrisen har varit här i sex månader. Coronakrisen har varit här i två år. Klimatkrisen har varit här betydligt längre.

Vi måste kunna hantera andra kriser parallellt med att vi hanterar klimatkrisen. Klimatomställningen får inte vara det första som offras vid en kris. Men om man, likt flera av er här inne på den högerkonservativa kanten, vägrar att erkänna klimatkrisen, då kanske det också är lätt att offra den, det första man gör. Jag tror på klimatkrisen. Jag vill göra någonting åt den. Och därför röstar jag för höjda klimatambitioner.

Michael Bloss, on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group. – Madam President, the pictures of war atrocities in Bucha on innocent Ukrainian citizens are horrifying and at the same time, Putin is playing us with his coal, gas and oil.

We must not be blackmailed by Putin. What we need for this is strong climate policies to move away from fossils and move to 100% renewables. I cannot understand those who call now for a stop or pause of Europe's CO₂ trading scheme – our most powerful climate policy tool. Instead of stopping it, we need to strengthen it. Every euro we spend more on renewables is a euro will spend less for Putin's war machine. And he fears that. He fears an energy-independent Europe, so let's build it. Freeing us from oil, coal and gas is regaining freedom. Climate policies must not fall victim to Putin's war.

Catherine Griset, au nom du groupe ID. – Madame le Président, ce texte ne pouvait pas tomber à un plus mauvais moment. En pleine crise, alors que les prix de l'énergie flambent en Europe, vous voulez contribuer à la hausse du prix du carbone sur le marché du SEQUE et alourdir considérablement la facture des entreprises et des ménages européens.

Quand on parle de réserve de stabilité, on s'attend justement à œuvrer pour la stabilité. Or, ici, nous n'avons pas les mêmes priorités. Vous parlez de stabilité des quotas d'émission en circulation quand, nous, nous parlons de la stabilité des prix. Par pure idéologie, vous allez aggraver la précarité et les fractures entre les pays européens. Quelle meilleure définition de l'écologie punitive?

Personne ne pouvait croire que ce dossier présenté comme technique ne deviendrait pas politique. N'oublions pas qu'il est aussi transversal. Il est lié à deux autres textes cruciaux du paquet climat: la taxe carbone aux frontières et, surtout, la révision du marché du SEQUE. Et le pire est encore à venir. Ce dernier texte plaide pour la création d'un marché du carbone distinct, baptisé SEQUE 2, pour les bâtiments et le transport routier. Concrètement, il s'agira de taxer tous les combustibles fossiles utilisés pour le chauffage et pour le transport. Malgré vos assurances de compensation, la hausse des prix de l'énergie n'en sera que plus brutale, en particulier pour les plus précaires. On n'ose croire que le Parlement et les gouvernements européens commettront cette erreur.

La priorité aujourd'hui est de faire le contraire de ce que vous préconisez. Il faut agir à l'équilibre et même à la baisse du prix du carbone, si besoin en injectant – et non pas en prélevant – des quotas d'émission dans le marché. La réserve de stabilité a été créée pour encaisser les chocs et les défaillances. C'est l'occasion de l'utiliser à bon escient en se souvenant des gilets jaunes.

Rob Rooken, namens de ECR-Fractie. – Voorzitter, de Europese energiebelasting ETS is in 2015 ingevoerd om fossiel opgewekte energie kunstmatig duurder te maken dan groene energie. Dit is gedaan in een tijd dat een kubieke meter gas ongeveer een vijfde kostte van het huidige tarief. In 2018 is deze ETS-belasting verhoogd. En vandaag debatteren we over de verlenging van de verhoging van deze ETS-belasting.

Dit doen we in een tijd waarin de term “energiearmoede” hard op weg is woord van het jaar te worden. Hoe kan het dat we dit voorstel überhaupt nog op de agenda hebben staan terwijl miljoenen huishoudens hun energie nu al nauwelijks kunnen betalen, niet alleen vanwege de hoge energieprijzen, maar ook vanwege een recordinflatie door toedoen van een falend ECB-beleid?

We moeten niet alleen de eerdere verhoging van de energietaks terugdraaien, maar we moeten die hele belasting afschaffen. De huidige tarieven zijn zonder belasting al astronomisch. Elke belasting op energie is pervers. Ik hoop dat iedereen die voor deze verlenging stemt, dit thuis gaat uitleggen aan mensen die hun energierekening verdrievoudigd zien of aan mensen die hun baan kwijtraken bij een bedrijf dat de deuren moet sluiten omdat het de energie niet meer kan betalen.

Silvia Modig, The Left-ryhmän puolesta. – Arvoisa puhemies, pitkään päästökaupan hinta laahasi perässä tavalla, joka ei kannustanut tarvittaviin muutoksiin. Oikeuksia oli liikaa, hinta oli matala, ja sen lisäksi ilmaisjaot vääristivät ja valtioiden myöntämät päästökauppakompensaatiot heikensivät ETS:n vaikuttavuutta. Ilmaisjaot ovatkin Euroopan tilintarkastustuomioistuimen kertomuksen mukaan hidastaneet siirtymää, koska ei ole ollut kannustinta tarvittaviin investointeihin. Päästöoikeuksia on saatu myös ilmaiseksi. Ilmaisjakoja on perusteltu hiilivuodon estämisellä. Samalla olemme estäneet niiden innovaatioiden ja investointien synnyn, joilla Eurooppa voisi olla maailman johtava hiilineutraalien tuotteiden ja ratkaisujen tarjoaja. Uusi hiilirajamekanismi CBAM luo esteen hiilivuodoille asettaessaan tuotteille hinnan Euroopan rajalla, jossa se on tuotettu alemmilla ilmastostandardeilla. Tämä ei ole helppo harjoitus, mutta sen kautta teemme lopulta ilmaisjaosta tarpeettomia. Niistä on luovuttava. Teollisuuden ja elinkeinoelämän ja siten työpaikkojen näkökulmasta on olennaista, että pystymme tarjoamaan ennakoitavan ja vakaan toimintaympäristön. On tärkeää asettaa päästövähennykset nyt jo riittävälle tasolle sen sijaan, että tavoitteita joudutaan matkan varrella kiireessä kiristämään. Vain se takaa toimijoille ennakoitavan ympäristön, jossa investoinnit suuntautuvat oikein.

Радан Кънев (PPE). – Г-жо Председател, г-н Вицепрезидент, колеги. Боя се, че няма да се съглася с общото мнение в този дебат и смятам, че този доклад е в грешна посока. А той освен това е много остарял. Самият му текст взима предвид феномени отпреди енергийната криза от есента на 2021 г. и далеч преди агресията на Путин в Украйна.

Смисълът на пазарния резерв е да се даде възможност, както да се предотврати прекаленото насищане на пазара с квоти, прекаленото предлагане, така и да се противодейства на рязко повишаване на цените чрез засилване на предлагането при повишено търсене, каквото наблюдавахме в целия край на 2021 г. Предложеното решение ще ограничи тази възможност на Европейската комисия. То ще върже ръцете на иначе добрата идея на пазарния резерв. По този начин ще попречи при следващи ценови шокове Комисията да може да се намесва и да ограничава тежестта върху потребителите и върху бизнеса.

Да не забравяме основният смисъл на търговията с емисии – то е да дава достатъчно висока цена и така да мотивира предприемачите да инвестират. При днешните цени такава изкуствена, политически мотивирана политика не е необходима. Цените са предостатъчно високи и ако продължаваме да ги вдигаме, ние ще отнемем възможността на бизнеса да инвестира в нови технологии, и ще постигнем обратния ефект на този, който всички желаем.

Marek Paweł Balt (S&D). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Panie przewodniczący! Panie komisarzu! Zielona transformacja Europy nie może się zatrzymać. Dlatego ETS jest niezbędnym elementem wspierania zielonej zmiany gospodarki. MSR jako narzędzie interesu musi jednocześnie wspierać zmiany i stabilizować rynek, aby nasi obywatele nie byli narażeni na nieprzewidywalne wahania cen. ETS nie może zależeć tylko od wolnego rynku.

Wiemy, że przed wybuchem wojny w Ukrainie Rosja spekulacjami doprowadziła do podwyższenia cen ropy i gazu w Europie. Proszę Komisję o sprawdzenie, czy Rosja poprzez firmy związane z kapitałem rosyjskim nie manipulowała cenami uprawnień do emisji CO₂, doprowadzając do gwałtownego wzrostu cen tych uprawnień kilka miesięcy temu. Widzieliśmy, że jesienny wzrost cen uprawnień spowodował pogorszenie konkurencyjności europejskiej gospodarki we wszystkich sektorach. Dzisiaj już wiemy, że rezerwa stabilności rynkowej musi szybciej reagować i zabezpieczyć odporność Europy na nadzwyczajne wydarzenia.

PRESIDENZA DELL'ON. PINA PICIERNO

Vicepresidente

Mauri Pekkarinen (Renew). – Arvoisa puhemies, kun markkinavakausvaranto käynnistyi vuoden 2019 alusta lukien, ajateltiin, että se vakauttaa päästöoikeuksien hintoja ja nostaa niitä. Näin on käynytkin. Hinnat ovat nousseet todella paljon, aina 100 euroon asti. Vakaus ei ole kuitenkaan totta. Volatiliteetti on tällä hetkellä edelleenkin aivan liian korkea. Nyt kun ollaan kiristämässä päästökauppajärjestelmää, on erittäin tärkeää, että meillä on mekanismi, jolla voidaan jatkossakin vakauttaa päästöoikeuksien hintaa, pienentää volatiliteettia ja huolehtia siitä, että hinta ei nouse taivasiin. Tässä mielessä tämä markkinavakausvarantoon tehtävä pieni tarkistus on hyvä. Me tarvitsemme sitä, ja sitä tulee käyttää tavalla, joka takaa oikeasuhteisen hinnan ja vakaan päästöoikeuksien hintakehityksen.

Danilo Oscar Lancini (ID). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, l'UE contribuisce oggi per circa l'8-9% delle emissioni globali di CO₂ e questa percentuale, ai trend attuali, potrebbe ridursi a circa il 5-6% nel 2030.

In questo contesto, il Green Deal e il pacchetto «Pronti per il 55%», di cui la relazione ETS fa parte, sono in pratica una rivoluzione industriale con l'obiettivo delle zero emissioni.

Le precedenti rivoluzioni industriali sono state determinate dalla necessità di rispondere a una crescita del mercato; la neutralità al 2050 è invece imposta dal legislatore. Se tale iniziativa non sarà affiancata da un grande sostegno alle aziende, una forte incentivazione agli investimenti e un rafforzamento delle misure di contrasto al *carbon leakage*, rischia di compromettere irrimediabilmente la competitività di settori strategici dell'industria manifatturiera europea, senza al contempo garantire alcun risultato climatico a livello globale.

Il raddoppio del tasso di assorbimento della riserva stabilizzatrice del mercato è una delle serie di misure che stanno venendo introdotte senza adeguata giustificazione e mirano ad aumentare artificialmente il prezzo della CO₂, peraltro già aumentato notevolmente negli ultimi due anni, con conseguenti maggiori costi per famiglie e imprese.

Devono essere invece messe in pratica misure efficaci per contrastare qualunque fenomeno di tipo speculativo sul mercato del carbonio, che danneggia indebitamente gli operatori del sistema ETS. Fondamentale diventa il rafforzamento dell'articolo 29 sulle fluttuazioni di prezzo dei certificati di CO₂.

In un contesto internazionale molto instabile, con seri rischi di approvvigionamento energetico e costi in aumento esponenziale, con misure simili rischiamo di danneggiare la competitività delle nostre imprese, mettendo a rischio preziosi posti di lavoro, quando i veri inquinatori risiedono fuori dall'Europa.

I veri inquinatori risiedono fuori dall'Europa!

Anna Zalewska (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Panie komisarzu! Chcę panu powiedzieć, że ekonomiści, przedsiębiorcy, a przede wszystkim Europejczycy mówią zupełnie co innego niż pan. Mówią wprost: ETS jest nieprzejrzysty, manipulacyjny, poddawany różnego rodzaju fluktuacjom – bezsensownym, z ingerencją nieprzejrzystych firm. Ceny energii są wysokie, nie widzimy żadnego bezpieczeństwa energetycznego, co w kontekście wojny jest absolutnie kluczową kwestią, jak również tak naprawdę nie ma to związku z dekarbonizacją. Proponuję pochylić się nad wychwytywaniem, pochłanianiem, bo to poważne wyzwanie światowe.

W związku z tym rynek stabilizacyjny powinien służyć zupełnie czemuś innemu. Proponuję, żeby pan komisarz zajrzał do złożonych przez ECR poprawek 27, 28, 29 i uznał, że po to mamy ten rynek, że wtedy, kiedy ceny są wysokie, szczególnie kiedy jest takie zagrożenie na świecie wojną – w Europie mamy wojnę, panie komisarzu – to powinien on służyć po to, żeby nie zabierać z rynku uprawnień i podwyższać jeszcze cen ETS-u, ale po to właśnie, żeby uwalniać te uprawnienia. Myślę, że pan komisarz czuje na sobie brzemień odpowiedzialności za to, co będzie za tydzień, za miesiąc, za rok i za dziesięć lat. To nie jest droga, po pierwsze, do przejrzystości, bezpieczeństwa energetycznego i na pewno nie jest to droga do ochrony klimatu.

Marlene Mortler (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin, liebe Kollegen, Herr Präsident! Erfolgreicher Klimaschutz ist nur in Summe der unterschiedlichen Lösungsansätze möglich. Der entscheidende Ansatz für eine klimaschonende und treibhausgasneutrale Zukunft sind technologische Lösungen und zukunftsgerichtete Innovationen. Somit kann einerseits Wertschöpfung am Wirtschaftsstandort gesichert und andererseits eine wirksame Begrenzung der Erderwärmung erreicht werden.

Der Emissionshandel allein hilft nicht, das Problem der Erderwärmung zu lösen. Denn ein System, das Emissionen erlaubt und Handel mit Emissionen zulässt, ist immer zu hinterfragen. Höhere Preise führen nicht automatisch zu besserem Klimaschutz, sondern entziehen den Unternehmen zunächst Liquidität für dringend benötigte Investitionen. Weitere Verschärfungen im EHS und bei der sogenannten Lastenteilung müssen gründlich daraufhin analysiert werden, welche Auswirkungen sie auf die Wettbewerbsfähigkeit unserer Unternehmen, aber auch auf unsere Menschen haben. Es wäre grob fahrlässig, sich nur auf Grenzausgleichsmechanismen zu verlassen.

Angesichts der hohen Energiepreise im Kontext des Angriffskriegs gegen die Ukraine sind weitere Belastungen der europäischen Industrie Gift. Deshalb brauchen wir ein Belastungsmoratorium. Andererseits brauchen wir noch schneller noch viel mehr erneuerbare Technologien zur klimafreundlichen Bereitstellung von Energie. In diesem Sinne plädiere ich für verlässliche politische Rahmenbedingungen mit klaren Prioritäten. Sie sind das A und O, damit entscheidende technologische Lösungen auch in der Praxis umgesetzt werden können.

Roman Haider (ID). – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Kommissar! Die Energiekosten steigen binnen kürzester Zeit um ein Vielfaches. Und auch in anderen lebenswichtigen Bereichen wie Lebensmittel oder Wohnen kommt es zu substantziellen Preissteigerungen.

Europa steht vor einer massiven Inflation. Es droht die wirtschaftliche Rezession, und ganze Industriezweige stehen inzwischen vor dem Aus. Jetzt könnte man meinen, die EU würde alles tun, um dieser Entwicklung entgegenzusteuern, um die Energiepreise zu senken, um bedrohten Unternehmen zu helfen, um Europas Wirtschaft in dieser schwierigen Situation zu unterstützen. Man könnte zum Beispiel die Marktstabilitätsreserve wie ursprünglich geplant wieder auf 12 Prozent reduzieren. Man könnte die Reserve auch zur Bewältigung der akuten Krise nutzen. Aber genau das Gegenteil ist der Fall.

Getrieben von Ihrem „Green-Deal-Fetisch“ verschlimmern Sie – Sie, die Kommission – die Situation noch mehr. Stur beharren Sie auf einem Modell, das Unternehmen und Bürger Unsummen kostet. Meine Damen und Herren von der Kommission, Herr Timmermans, Sie schaden Europa.

(Die Präsidentin entzieht dem Redner das Wort)

Presidente. – Io chiederei ai colleghi di evitare commenti imbarazzanti che mettono in difficoltà quest'Aula e commenti anche spiacevoli. Quindi, onorevole Haider, credo che lei si debba scusare per le espressioni che ha utilizzato, che non sono rispettose del commissario ma nemmeno, appunto, dei colleghi e di quest'Aula.

Procedura «catch the eye»

Mick Wallace (The Left). – Madam President, without this standalone revision of the Market Stability Reserve, the intake rate will revert to 12% after 2023. So I support the fast tracking of this standalone revision. However, the current 24% must be the floor and not the ceiling for the intake rate.

The Market Stability Reserve has been effective in supporting the ETS carbon price signal in recent years, but it was designed to only handle oversupply accumulated in the past. It is not fit to deal with current or future surplus. Such surpluses might be the result of, for example, economic downturns, COVID or planned coal plant closures. The Market Stability Reserve will therefore need to be strengthened.

To effectively handle the market surplus, we need to increase the intake rate to something closer to 35% from 2024 onwards. We need to adopt the planning thresholds and we need an automatic cancellation of allowances held in the reserve for more than three years.

(Fine della procedura «catch the eye»)

Presidente. – Ora passo la parola, a nome della Commissione, al Vicepresidente Timmermans, confermandole i sentimenti di stima e di rispetto per il suo lavoro, Commissario.

Frans Timmermans, Executive Vice-President of the Commission. – Madam President, don't worry, from that political angle I've heard worse in my direction over the last years, and I don't mind. You know, it's very difficult to be insulted by someone you don't take seriously, so don't worry.

But I want to say very briefly –Mick Wallace described what the function is of the market stability reserve and I couldn't even put it in better words than he did – but many of the Honourable Members use this opportunity to speak in wider terms about the emissions trading system (ETS), and the function of the ETS, so let me just very briefly react on that point.

Anyone who wants to weaken the functioning of the ETS, will prolong the agony of being attached to fossil fuels, including fossil fuels from Russia. So anyone who wants to slow down the transition to renewables makes sure that more money will end into the pockets of Putin. And this is exactly what we're trying to stop! That's why we'll come with our REPowerEU initiative to speed up the transition.

And I've seen this with ETS at work last week in Sweden, they're now producing green steel in Sweden, steel that is made without emissions; not yet on an industrial scale, but it is possible because of the functioning of the ETS market with a reasonable price. It makes it all possible, and it makes Europe industrially much, much stronger if we speed up this transition.

This is where the world is heading, not just Europe, the whole world; and those who seem to advocate a slowing down of the transition to renewables, should pause and think about what that means in present-day Europe, where the longer we remain dependent on fossil fuels, the longer we risk co-financing Putin's war. So the faster we transition into renewables, the faster we will be stronger, we will have higher energy sovereignty in Europe, we will put the competitiveness of the European industry on a much, much higher scale.

Cyrus Engerer, rapporteur. – Madam President, thank you to the Vice-President of the Commission. I cannot but agree with you on all that you have said right now.

I would like to first thank all of those who have participated in this debate on the Market Stability Reserve. It is the first out of the legislative files of the Fit for 55 Package that have come in front of this plenary. And I am very grateful for all the help and cooperation that I have found from all shadow rapporteurs on this important legislative file.

Our EU ETS must remain fit for purpose, and it must ensure and incentivise that all Member States keep on working in order to reduce their current emissions and push forward towards a more environmental and green future. So, this is what we have tried to do with this file that we have been discussing today.

And I am really sorry to hear those who are at the far right and the conservatives of this Chamber who still do not believe in science, who still think that climate change is something that does not affect our planet, and who still believe that they can simply ignore it. We do not ignore it, and we want to keep on legislating in order for our European Union to remain the most ambitious continent in this planet, in order to reach our objectives.

So I really look forward and encourage all Parliament to give a strong and broad support to this file tomorrow in our vote in order to have a very strong hand when it comes to negotiating this with other institutions.

Presidente. – La discussione è chiusa.

La votazione si svolgerà domani, martedì 5 aprile 2022.

16. Het gebruik van gehuurde voertuigen zonder bestuurder voor het vervoer van goederen over de weg (debat)

Presidente. – L'ordine del giorno reca la discussione sulla raccomandazione per la seconda lettura della commissione per i trasporti e il turismo sulla posizione del Consiglio in prima lettura in vista dell'adozione della direttiva del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio che modifica la direttiva 2006/1/CE, relativa all'utilizzazione di veicoli noleggiati senza conducente per il trasporto di merci su strada (13531/1/2021 - C9-0014/2022 - 2017/0113(COD)) (relatrice: Cláudia Monteiro de Aguiar) (A9-0041/2022).

Cláudia Monteiro de Aguiar, Relatora. – Senhora Presidente, Senhor Comissário, Caros Colegas, o debate que hoje trazemos a esta Câmara representa o culminar de um vasto trabalho legislativo levado a cabo nos últimos anos, com o intuito de demonstrarmos a importância do setor logístico rodoviário e a relevância que o mesmo tem para a economia mundial, para a economia europeia e o quanto impacta, diretamente, o dia a dia dos cidadãos europeus.

Se estávamos perfeitamente cientes da relevância deste setor, a crise pandémica agudizou a urgência de garantirmos maior flexibilidade às empresas de transportes, demonstrando que o mercado de veículos de aluguer, sem condutor, no transporte de mercadorias necessita de ser adaptado à realidade do momento presente, fruto das alterações e dos contextos socioeconómicos.

Acreditamos que deve ser conferida maior flexibilidade às empresas para que seja possível dar uma melhor resposta, por exemplo, a picos de procura. Defendemos que deve ser dada uma maior liberdade financeira às transportadoras de mercadorias, ou empresas por conta própria, para o aluguer de veículos, em vez de compra.

Isto tem que ver com o facto de, por um lado, permitir uma gestão mais eficiente das empresas e, por outro, garantir que os veículos alugados sejam veículos mais recentes, mais seguros, menos poluidores, logo, mais sustentáveis. E a sustentabilidade é também por nós defendida quando estimulamos a redução do número de viagens de retorno em vazio, procurando alcançar os ambiciosos objetivos e as metas climáticas que nos propomos cumprir.

O setor bate-se hoje com regras de utilização de veículos alugados definidas há, pelo menos, 30 anos, regras que proíbem, por exemplo, a utilização de veículos alugados e registados num outro Estado-Membro. Ora, temos 27 tipos de regras que obrigam as empresas a uma parafernália de burocracias, restrições e incertezas.

Chegamos, pois, à conclusão que o aluguer de veículos é praticamente impossível no mercado interno, o que faz com que as empresas retirem o aluguer à compra. Os Estados-Membros onde existe maior número de restrições são precisamente aqueles onde este tipo de mercados e aluguer está menos desenvolvido, não potenciando uma economia de escala, nem o potencial desenvolvimento oferecido pelo mercado interno.

O acordo alcançado, e que iremos votar, pretende, pois, clarificar as regras e harmonizar, gradualmente, o quadro jurídico deste mercado de aluguer.

Do meu ponto de vista, merecem ser destacados três pontos.

Primeiro, garantir maior flexibilidade às empresas de transportes e operadores por conta própria, permitindo-lhes mais opções que respondam às suas necessidades reais e atuais, incentivando o empreendedorismo, permitindo a possibilidade de afetar recursos da melhor forma possível, materializando-se esta aposta, por um lado, em ganhos ambientais e, por outro, numa maior promoção da segurança rodoviária.

Segundo, permitir uma abertura gradual do mercado. A grande maioria dos Estados-Membros não estão autorizados a restringir a utilização, nos seus respetivos territórios, de um veículo alugado por uma empresa estabelecida num outro Estado-Membro.

E, por fim, a imposição de salvaguardas. Uma vez que o nível de tributação sobre os transportes rodoviários varia substancialmente dentro da União, os Estados-Membros poderão continuar a restringir, dentro de certos limites, a utilização de veículos alugados e registados num outro Estado-Membro, tendo em conta três questões: a proporção, ou seja, os veículos alugados e registados num Estado-Membro não podem representar mais do que 25 % da frota que a empresa tenha à sua disposição. A duração dos períodos de aluguer: o período mínimo no veículo alugado e registado é de dois meses, podendo ser reduzido a 30 dias, caso as regras nacionais assim o permitam. E, por último, operações por conta própria. Podem existir restrições aos veículos alugados e registados num outro Estado-Membro.

Por fim, termino. Com o intuito de melhorar o cumprimento de todas estas regras, as autoridades nacionais terão de incluir nos registos eletrónicos nacionais os números de matrícula dos veículos alugados e registados noutros Estados-Membros. Acredito que, com este acordo, apresentamos uma proposta que valoriza a importância da implementação de regras comuns que, ao final do dia, facilita o trabalho das empresas de logística rodoviária que operam, por exemplo, tanto em Portugal como na Roménia.

Virginijus Sinkevičius, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, the Commission made its proposal to revise the EU rules on hired vehicles in June 2017. Almost five years ago. It is the last piece of legislation from the mobility package.

The objective of this revision was to achieve greater flexibility for companies in the use of hired vehicles by removing some of the possibilities to restrict the use of such vehicles which exist for Member States under the current Directive. This is exactly what the final agreement is about. Although the initial positions of the European Parliament and of Member States diverged in some parts, a carefully balanced political agreement was found last year.

I think we can all be proud of the result achieved. The Commission is in favour of the agreement for a number of reasons. First of all, limitations can now only be introduced by Member States for their own undertakings, while the existing Directive allowed restrictions on the hiring of vehicles also for foreign undertakings. This is a huge step for more flexibility of the whole sector.

Secondly, Member States must grant at least 30 days to their own undertakings for the hire of vehicles with foreign number plates, without the need for a national registration of the vehicles. And this will allow, in particular, taking into account seasonal needs, which was one of the main purposes of the revision. Member States which would like to grant longer periods of complete freedom for the use of hired vehicles with foreign number plates can of course continue to do so.

And thirdly, any possibilities for restrictions for undertakings performing on account of relations with domestic hired vehicles have been taken out of the Directive. Such restrictions will, in the future, only be allowed for vehicles that are registered in another Member State. This remaining restriction can be justified since Member States could otherwise not exert any control over such vehicles as they are not registered in the national registers of road haulage undertakings.

Furthermore, since the revised legislation will likely increase the use of hired vehicles, as such vehicles are often newer and more environmentally friendly, the solution is also beneficial for the achievement of the objectives of the European Green Deal.

Honourable Members, thank you for your attention and I look forward to your comments.

Ljudmila Novak, *v imenu skupine PPE*. – Spoštovana predsedujoča, spoštovani gospod komisar! V Evropski uniji še vedno največ blaga in ljudi prevozimo po cestah, čeprav želimo, da bi v skladu z zelenim dogovorom čim več tovora preusmerili na železnice. Dosedanja direktiva v zvezi z najemom vozil brez šoferja je zastarela, zato je nujna prenova direktive, predvsem pa mora odgovoriti na sedanje potrebe in vedno večji pretok blaga znotraj Evropske unije.

Naš cilj je zagotoviti pošteno konkurenco, poenostaviti obstoječa pravila in zagotoviti tudi pravice delavcev v tem sektorju. Upoštevati moramo tudi to, da v nekaterih državah primanjkuje šoferjev, zato mora biti naša zakonodaja še bolj fleksibilna. Predvsem pa je potrebno, da je zakonodaja čim bolj poenotena in da ne povzroča voznikom dodatnih težav.

Zato pa smo Evropska unija in imamo skupna pravila, da bi naše življenje in delo naših državljanov čimbolj poenostavili, povečali učinkovitost in zmanjšali stroške prevozov.

Prevečkrat srečam ljudi, ki se pritožujejo nad nerazumnimi pravili, ki smo jih tudi mi pomagali sprejeti. Verjamem, da vedno v najboljši veri, da delamo dobro, pa se nismo postavili v čevlje državljanov, ki morajo ta pravila uresničevati. Lepo je slišati, kadar kdo pohvali naše ukrepe.

Ismail Ertug, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Madam President, I have the honour to present the position of our shadow rapporteur, Mr Andris Ameriks.

This dossier is of importance to complete our comprehensive mobility package. After years of work on this file, inter-institutional negotiations have made great progress, and we have a good text on the table. This directive will help the hauliers to operate better, and to be able to manage in an effective and efficient way instabilities caused by technical and seasonal reasons.

Rules on the use of hired vehicles should be based on common, clear and fair rules. At the same time, the rules should not limit the free movement of services within the European Union, while taking into account the fiscal differences between Member States. Therefore, I support this proposal and its adoption in order to improve our transport industry, making it more arranged, fairer and favourable to all stakeholders.

Izaskun Bilbao Barandica, *en nombre del Grupo Renew*. – Señora presidenta, gracias a la ponente, Cláudia Monteiro, y a todos nuestros equipos técnicos por un trabajo tan importante en este informe.

Este acuerdo sobre el uso de vehículos alquilados sin conductor para el transporte de mercancías por carretera ofrece nuevas herramientas a los profesionales para mejorar los servicios que prestan, progresar en la descarbonización del transporte e igualar las condiciones en que operan en toda la Unión Europea. Completamos así otra pieza del llamado «paquete de movilidad», una pieza clave para guiar la transición de este sector y aprovechar al máximo la capilaridad y flexibilidad que aporta a la movilidad en su conjunto.

Con este acuerdo, los costes logísticos bajarán, porque bajan los costes de operación de muchas compañías. Se promoverá el uso de vehículos más limpios y eficientes y habrá más flexibilidad para afrontar imprevistos o solventar averías en las flotas. Crecerá, además, el empleo en las empresas de *leasing* y alquiler, que cuentan, gracias a esta norma, con nuevas oportunidades de negocio y más posibilidades en el mercado.

Finalmente, añadimos otra herramienta para combatir la fragmentación. Hasta ahora, las diferencias legales sobre el uso de este recurso en los distintos Estados miembros eran un factor de distorsión de la competencia en el mercado interior.

Ciarán Cuffe, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Madam President, I am pleased to see this proposal become legislation because allowing the greater use of hired vehicles across borders can mean more opportunities for businesses to use vehicles that they may not have the power to buy or have access to in their own country. It can also mean less emissions if these vehicles are cleaner. And that's something that tends to be the case with hired vehicle fleets.

However, there is some uncertainty regarding the impact on Member State tax revenues or the overall environmental cost at the European Union level. So I'm glad that the Member States have the option to limit the use of hired vehicles on their territories should they so wish, as some safeguards are needed.

More Europe can be good and I think it will be in this instance, but let's see how it works out. That the Commission must report on the impact of the legislation, I think will be hugely informative in this regard. So, I welcome the proposal and I look forward to seeing how it works out in practice.

Dorien Rookmaker, *namens de ECR-Fractie*. – Voorzitter, geachte aanwezigen, kritische geesten maken de EU vaak het verwijt dat ze onpraktisch en traag is en bovendien machtige landen en grote bedrijven een voorkeursbehandeling geeft. Dat is vaak terecht. Brusselse bureaucraten laten vaak hun oren hangen naar de lobby's van gevestigde belangen. Daarom nemen steeds meer mensen afstand van de EU.

Deze richtlijn *lijkt* daarop een uitzondering te zijn. Het wordt nu namelijk gemakkelijker voor vervoersbedrijven om vrachtwagens over de grens in te huren en dat is soms nodig bij piekbelasting en/of bij in het ongereede geraakt materieel. Ik zeg met nadruk *lijkt*, want bij nadere bestudering blijkt dat er toch weer een beperking in de aanpassingen is geslopen. Deze beperking werkt in het voordeel van grote vervoersbedrijven en is onnodig, omslachtig en ingewikkeld. Kortom, het is jammer, maar het is een gemiste kans.

João Pimenta Lopes, *em nome do Grupo The Left*. – Senhora Presidente, o setor do transporte rodoviário de mercadorias, que continua a desempenhar um importante papel para a economia de cada Estado, tem sido afetado pela retração económica e pelo aumento dos custos, nomeadamente de combustíveis e portagens.

Também neste setor se faz sentir o ímpeto liberalizador e de desregulação das políticas da União Europeia em benefício do sacrossanto mercado, impondo a precarização das relações laborais, com a imposição, por exemplo, do trabalho remunerado à viagem, ao quilómetro, à tonelagem, tudo em benefício dos grandes grupos económicos e da sua teia de interesses.

O aluguer de veículos pesados sem condutor é a expressão desse processo de liberalização e exploração. Permite driblar as limitações associadas às atividades de cabotagem e ao destacamento de trabalhadores motoristas. Alarga um processo de desregulação que se opõe aos direitos dos trabalhadores e não resolve os grandes constrangimentos a que estão sujeitas as pequenas e médias empresas do setor, ou que dele dependem.

Mario Furore (NI). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, a volte le buone intenzioni nascondono rischi.

Dobbiamo utilizzare i veicoli più rispettosi dell'ambiente, e questo per conseguire quegli obiettivi climatici che ci siamo dati qui in UE, e certamente il noleggio è uno strumento utile alle imprese per gestire quei picchi di domanda temporanei. Ma dobbiamo vigilare perché questa direttiva non si trasformi in uno strumento per aggirare la normativa sul cabotaggio.

Il pacchetto Mobilità ha messo in luce come in Europa siano ancora fortemente presenti i rischi di una concorrenza sleale nel settore dell'autotrasporto e a farne le spese sono i piccoli operatori e, ancora troppo spesso, i conducenti, che sono vittime di dumping e di condizioni di lavoro difficili.

Quindi bene che il Consiglio abbia messo a punto un testo che consenta agli Stati membri una certa flessibilità nell'attuazione: ma dobbiamo restare vigili per garantire che questo testo non comprometta ulteriormente il mercato dell'autotrasporto.

Tomislav Sokol (PPE). – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, postojeća pravila na razini Unije o korištenju vozila unajmljenih bez vozača primijenjuju se već 30 godina bez bitnih izmjena te ih je potrebno revidirati da bi se zadovoljile sadašnje, ali i buduće potrebe u sektoru cestovnog prijevoza.

Aktualnom direktivom pruža se minimalna razina otvorenosti tržišta za korištenje takvih vozila jer su njome zapravo obuhvaćene zastarjele pravne odredbe koje odražavaju nekadašnje potrebe ovog sektora. U skladu s postojećom direktivom, pravila među državama članicama se razlikuju, što dovodi do brojnih ograničenja i nesigurnosti te se ograničava uporaba teretnih vozila unajmljenih u državi članici koja nije država članica poslovnog nastana poduzeća koje unajmljuje vozila. Stoga pozdravljam što će se navedeno zakonodavstvo nakon pet godina međuinstitucijskih pregovora konačno revidirati.

No, zakonodavstvo je nužno da bi se odgovorilo na stvarne potrebe prijevoznika. Novi zakonodavni prijedlog pridonijet će funkcioniranju jedinstvenog tržišta te donosi veću fleksibilnost prijevozničkih poduzeća pri unajmljivanju i zakupu teretnih vozila da bi se zadovoljio privremeni ili sezonski vrhunac potražnje te da bi se zamijenila neispravna vozila, a time će se povećati i učinkovitost prijevoza. Novim pravnim okvirom prijevoznicima diljem Unije omogućit će se ujednačeniji pristup tržištu za najam teretnih vozila.

Zaključno, podržavam ovaj zakonodavni prijedlog jer predstavlja priliku za ostvarenje ravnopravnih uvjeta i pravednog tržišnog natjecanja za poduzeća koja se u EU-u bave najmom i prijevozom.

Vera Tax (S&D). – Vicevoorzitter, geachte commissaris, beste collega's, met deze aangepaste regels voor het huren van vrachtwagens krijgen we eindelijk een versoepeling. Gehuurde voertuigen zijn over het algemeen nieuwer, veiliger en milieuvriendelijker. Deze aanpassing zorgt ervoor dat defecte vrachtwagens eenvoudiger vervangen kunnen worden. Bovendien helpt dit vervoersbedrijven om gemakkelijker voertuigen te kunnen huren in andere EU-landen, zodat tijdelijk pieken opvangen gemakkelijker wordt.

Als onderdeel van het mobiliteitspakket beoogt deze wetgeving ook de handhaving en controle te verbeteren. Handhaving van de verbeterde regels is de enige manier om eerlijke concurrentie tussen exploitanten te herstellen en om lonen en arbeidsomstandigheden van chauffeurs te verbeteren. Dit is niet alleen belangrijk voor het welzijn van chauffeurs, maar ook voor de wegveiligheid van ons allemaal.

Valter Flego (Renew). – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, prije svega želim apsolutno pohvaliti ovaj zakonodavni prijedlog jer, na primjer, nekakav autoprijevoznik iz Hrvatske moći će na puno jednostavniji način iznajmiti vozilo u drugoj državi članici, što je apsolutno prihvatljivo. Znamo da svako takvo usuglašavanje smanjuje papirologiju, ima veću efikasnost i, naravno, štedi se vrijeme.

Ali kao član Odbora za promet htio bih reći jednu drugu stvar, jednu drugu temu, jer siguran sam da nam treba zajednička europska politika i za razvoj autonomnih vozila. Hitno nam trebaju takvi zakonski prijedlozi koji vrijede za cijelu Europu, a ne za samo jednu državu pojedinačno. U suprotnom, naime, mi ćemo se dovesti u situaciju da donosimo direktivu po direktivu, zakon po zakon, a vrijeme ide, i ide, i ide. I zato želim, poštovani povjereniče, da odmah krenemo u izradu jedinstvenih zakona, ja bih rekao jednog kišobrana zakona, za razvoj pravila u vožnji autonomnih vozila.

I da, Europa mora biti ispred konkurencije jer, znajte, tehnika ne čeka, znanost ne stagnira i zato dajmo vjetar u jedra gospodarstvu i inovacijama i, u biti, našoj europskoj ekonomiji.

Virginijus Sinkevičius, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, honourable Members, thank you for this debate and for your worries and orations, and I am pleased to hear that most of you are in favour of the agreement.

Honourable Members, the Commission very much counts on the support of the European Parliament to finally adopt the long overdue revision of the Hired Vehicles Directive. Most importantly, this revision will result in meaningful change on the ground and thus contribute to a more flexible and efficient road transport.

The Commission welcomes the agreement as it will significantly increase the flexibility for undertakings to use the hired vehicles registered in other Member States or for own-account purposes. It is thus an important step in the implementation of the first mobility package.

This agreement will increase the use of hired vehicles, which will also benefit the achievement of the EU climate goals, since such vehicles are ever more environment-friendly. The revised directive will therefore also have an important environmental impact. We can be proud of the results achieved.

Once again, I would like to express the Commission's thanks to the Parliament and of course also to the Presidencies who have worked on this file and made the political agreement last year possible.

Cláudia Monteiro de Aguiar, Relatora. – Senhora Presidente, Comissário Sinkevičius, Caros Colegas, muito obrigada pelas vossas intervenções e por, maioritariamente, apoiarem este projeto. Findo este debate, fica claro que é necessário que haja uma abertura gradual do mercado de aluguer de veículos para o transporte de mercadorias, como também a pertinência de, numa próxima revisão, falarmos num mercado totalmente aberto, que permita maximizar todo o potencial deste setor.

Termino com uma ressalva que julgo importante lembrar. É que esta proposta garante a liberdade aos Estados-Membros de não aplicarem qualquer restrição na utilização nos respetivos territórios de um veículo alugado e registado noutro Estado-Membro. Caso haja uma distorção de mercado num determinado país, podem fazê-lo, mas com as devidas limitações referenciadas nesta diretiva.

Precisamos de saber se a tributação diferenciada existente exercerá algum impacto no crescimento deste mercado. Quais os efeitos da aplicação e do cumprimento da presente diretiva? Será fulcral ter conhecimento, avaliar, se e de que forma, os Estados-Membros aplicam as regras e cumprem as limitações alcançadas por este acordo e se as mesmas irão potenciar, ou não, efeitos perversos no desenvolvimento deste mercado.

Só através de uma análise apurada, de avaliações precisas, através de estudos de impacto, poderemos legislar melhor no futuro. Cá estaremos, se assim for, para fazer com que esta legislação seja também favorável ao mercado único, mas que também permita o melhor desenvolvimento destas empresas nos nossos Estados-Membros.

Presidente. – La discussione è chiusa.

La votazione si svolgerà domani, martedì 5 aprile 2022.

17. De toekomst van de visserij in het Kanaal, de Noordzee, de Ierse Zee en de Atlantische Oceaan (debat)

Presidente. – L'ordine del giorno reca la discussione sulla relazione di Manuel Pizarro, a nome della commissione per la pesca, sul futuro della pesca nella Manica, nel Mare del Nord, nel Mare d'Irlanda e nell'Oceano Atlantico alla luce del recesso del Regno Unito dall'UE (2021/2016(INI)) (A9-0042/2022).

Manuel Pizarro, Relator. – Senhora Presidente, Senhor Comissário, o relatório sobre o futuro das pescas no Canal da Mancha, no Mar do Norte, no Mar da Irlanda e no Oceano Atlântico, à luz da retirada do Reino Unido da União Europeia, foi aprovado por unanimidade na Comissão de Pescas, consenso que sinaliza a importância do tema para todo o setor pesqueiro da União. Agradeço, por isso, a colaboração de todos os relatores-sombra: Francisco Millán Mon, Jan Huitema, Caroline Roose, France Jamet, Bert-Jan Ruissen e João Pimenta Lopes.

Este é o primeiro momento em que o Parlamento Europeu se debruça sobre a forma como o acordo de comércio e cooperação, que foi assinado entre a União e o Reino Unido, está a ser implementado, logo num dos sectores que sofreu o maior impacto. O acordo estabeleceu um conjunto de condições e regras para ambas as partes. No entanto, é notório que algumas questões relacionadas com as pescas, em particular o acesso de navios da União Europeia às águas britânicas, não foram esclarecidas de forma cabal. Esse facto tem permitido interpretações diversas.

Aproveitando a ambiguidade de certas disposições do acordo, o Reino Unido tem vindo a fazer interpretações que considero abusivas. Daqui resulta a adoção de medidas protecionistas que limitam as licenças de pesca para navios da União, provocando mal-estar nas comunidades piscatórias, gerando incerteza, causando graves prejuízos e potenciando um clima de conflito que não aproveita a ninguém e que importa prevenir.

Precisamos, por parte de todos, de uma atitude de cooperação e lealdade. Por isso, apelamos ao Reino Unido para que se abstenha de ações protecionistas, promovendo um melhor espírito de vizinhança, de forma a garantir condições estáveis e previsíveis para os pescadores.

Instamos a Comissão Europeia a considerar todas as opções para garantir os direitos dos pescadores da União, incluindo limitar o acesso dos navios do Reino Unido aos portos da União ou mesmo restringir a importação de produtos de pesca, medidas que, sendo consideradas extremas, não devem ser descartadas, pois podem ser, no limite, uma ferramenta necessária para a proteção dos pescadores europeus.

Consideramos que a Comissão Europeia deve trabalhar em soluções adequadas com todos os Estados costeiros, para um melhor controle e para a adoção de medidas de gestão das pescas, em conformidade com a Política Comum das Pescas e o Pacto Ecológico Europeu.

A brutal invasão da Ucrânia pela Rússia torna ainda mais necessário o bom entendimento entre todos os Estados da Europa, independentemente de pertencerem ou não à União. Esse entendimento tem sido possível em várias áreas estratégicas e deverá acontecer também nas pescas. Os recursos pesqueiros são um bem comum e os produtos da pesca são essenciais para a nossa segurança alimentar.

O relatório define quatro linhas orientadoras na procura de soluções para os problemas provocados pelo Brexit.

Primeiro, as relações e o futuro da pesca nesta área terão de ser baseadas na boa governação internacional dos oceanos e nas relações de boa vizinhança, pacíficas e de cooperação com todos os envolvidos.

Segundo, a utilização deste espaço deve basear-se em princípios de gestão das pescas e sustentabilidade ambiental, social e económica a longo prazo, assente no melhor conhecimento científico.

Terceiro, a experiência já tornou claro que os fundos de reserva de ajustamento ao Brexit, atribuídos ao setor da pesca, são insuficientes. Eles devem ser alargados e o período de aplicação deverá ser, pelo menos, coincidente com o período de transição estabelecido: 30 de junho de 2026.

Quarto, o Comité Especializado das Pescas, que faz o acompanhamento sectorial da implementação do acordo, deverá funcionar de forma plena e reagir em tempo útil às situações identificadas.

Por tudo isto, e porque o setor das pescas precisa disso, espero que este relatório seja aprovado de forma muito expressiva pelo Parlamento Europeu.

Virginijus Sinkevičius, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, Honourable Members, I would like first of all to thank the rapporteur, Mr Pizarro, as well as the shadow rapporteurs, for this important report.

I cannot agree more that the impact of Brexit on the EU fishing sector goes well beyond the geographical area of the United Kingdom and affects our fisheries relations with other coastal states in the North-East Atlantic. I also agree that the relationship between the EU and the UK remains a cornerstone for fisheries governance in the North-East Atlantic. Looking at our relations with the UK, we knew from the start, that this first year of implementation of the Trade and Cooperation Agreement (TCA) was going to be challenging.

However, I am pleased to highlight the successes that we have achieved in 2021. In this exceptional year, we have successfully concluded two rounds of consultations on fishing opportunities, first for 2021 and, in December, for 2022. We have set up the Specialised Committee on Fisheries and we have already started working with the UK on the many substantial issues which need to be addressed.

Furthermore, despite the numerous challenges we have made substantial progress in addressing concerns relating to licensing. Seamless access was ensured for the majority of the EU fleet and we will continue to work extremely hard to ensure that all fishermen who are entitled to a licence shall obtain one in full respect of the TCA, and notably the stability of access enshrined in our agreement with the UK.

We have channelled EU funds to the fisheries sector by adopting the Brexit Adjustment Reserve for the short-term adaptation and the European Maritime, Fisheries and Aquaculture Fund for long-term structural adjustment.

Your motion for a resolution strongly calls on the UK to act in line with the letter and the spirit of the TCA. You are particularly concerned in this regard about those measures which the UK takes in its own waters, and that might diverge from the conditions in EU waters. Important examples here are technical measures or marine-protected areas. Let me reassure you that the Commission carefully scrutinises each notification that we receive on UK measures. The TCA sets out clear principles and conditions to be followed by both parties, and the Commission will not accept any breaches of this international agreement.

At the same time, we should also take care that we do not needlessly and prematurely escalate situations. Yes, we have not always seen eye-to-eye on everything and for some issues this continues to be the case. But we have, nevertheless, been able to work together constructively and pragmatically on various issues in the interests of sustainable fisheries management on both sides of the channel. And this is very important to set the tone for our close cooperation in the years to come. And it is one important contributing factor to the overall relationship we have with the UK.

Therefore, I fully endorse your resolution's call for an implementation of the TCA based on good faith. This will also help pave the way for a constructive and cooperative relationship after 2026, when the transition period ends. I also note your call to get the Specialised Committee on Fisheries up and running. I can now announce that we will hold the third meeting of the Specialised Committee on Fisheries, the first meeting of substance, later this month. Work is already underway to prepare this meeting with the working group that took place just last week. I can assure you that the European Parliament will be kept informed of this very important work in line with the provisions of TCA.

Honourable Members, Brexit has impacted the existing structures in the North-East Atlantic and we will need to adapt accordingly. That said, the principle behind our international engagement remains the same. We remain committed to cooperation on shared stocks, whether these are shared with the UK or with the other third countries. Our ultimate aim remains the same: good cooperation with the UK and Norway for shared stocks, as well as good cooperation with coastal states on widely distributed stocks in the interest of sustainable fisheries management across the whole North-East Atlantic. In the North-East Atlantic Fisheries Commission, we will work closely with the like-minded contracting parties to achieve sustainability goals and to ensure the fair competition for our operators.

The EU will also continue promoting ambitious control measures in order to close any loophole for illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing activities. On our cod fisheries in Svalbard, we have been working intensively to find a solution with Norway. Such a solution should ensure that our fishers can fish their full historic quota, as in the decades before 2021, and it should not cause prejudice to our rights in international waters. Norway is hopeful that a diplomatic solution could be found soon, and I am firmly convinced that this would be in the interest of both parties. We will continue to deploy all necessary efforts both on a technical and political level to make this happen.

Francisco José Millán Mon, *en nombre del Grupo PPE*. – Señora presidenta, muchas gracias al comisario, al señor Sinkevičius. La pesca siempre ha ocupado un lugar central en las relaciones del Reino Unido con el resto de Europa. Fue uno de los temas fundamentales en el referéndum de 2016 sobre el *Brexit* y, además, el acceso a las aguas y los recursos pesqueros se reveló como el último escollo en las negociaciones sobre el acuerdo con la Unión Europea. Posteriormente, la concesión de licencias y la fijación de posibilidades de pesca han estado rodeadas de problemas, lamentablemente.

En lo sucesivo, el Reino Unido y la Unión Europea deben reforzar su cooperación para evitar profundizar en este divorcio pesquero. Es malo para las dos partes. Cumplamos el acuerdo de buena fe, con espíritu constructivo. No busquemos divisiones artificiales. Como recoge la Resolución que mañana votaremos, es preocupante la dinámica de divergencias en materia de medidas técnicas, que puede obstaculizar la pesca europea o suponer restricciones encubiertas.

Yo quiero felicitar al ponente, a mi amigo Manuel Pizarro, por haber incorporado a su excelente informe, que hoy debatimos, numerosas recomendaciones a la Comisión y a los Estados miembros, planteadas muchas de ellas por mi grupo, el Grupo PPE.

Me preocupa especialmente el escenario de incertidumbre que se abre a partir de 2026, cuando termine el conocido como «periodo de adaptación». La Unión Europea debe velar por que el sector pesquero tenga ante sí un horizonte de estabilidad sin ulteriores recortes. Si este no fuera el caso, la pesca sería un importante motivo de discordia que afectaría al resto del acuerdo. En primer lugar, al comercio. No quiero que nadie se llame a engaño. Este Parlamento no va a consentir que la pesca sea moneda de cambio en nuestras relaciones, ni con el Reino Unido ni con ningún otro país.

Jan Huitema, *namens de Renew-Fractie*. – Voorzitter, geachte commissarissen, beste leden, onze vissers zijn hard geraakt door de Brexit. Als onderdeel van de Brexitdeal moeten Europese vissers maar liefst 25 procent van hun quotum in Britse wateren afstaan. In ruil daarvoor zouden onze vissers stabiliteit en toekomstperspectief moeten krijgen. Maar dit is nog lang niet altijd het geval!

We moeten voorkomen dat onze vissers de speelbal worden van internationale verhoudingen. Alle vissers, of ze nu Europees, Brits of Noors zijn, hebben er baat bij dat onze gedeelde zeeën goed worden beheerd. De Europese Unie moet daarom constructief het gesprek blijven aangaan met onze buurlanden in de Noordzee.

Tegelijkertijd moeten we ook niet over ons heen laten lopen. Het zou nooit mogen voorkomen dat landen gebieden op zee aanwijzen als beschermd natuurgebied teneinde vissers uit andere landen te weren. Ook vind ik dat we geen verdere overdracht van visquota moeten accepteren. Het is nu tijd om de rug recht te houden en ik roep de Europese Commissie op dat te doen.

Caroline Roose, *au nom du groupe Verts/ALE*. – Madame la Présidente, le Brexit reste un événement qui n'a fait que des perdants. Mes collègues ont déjà pu mentionner ses nombreuses conséquences sur la pêche européenne.

Pour y faire face, l'une des clés, c'est la durabilité. Le Brexit ne doit surtout pas servir de prétexte pour retarder les actions nécessaires pour aller vers une pêche plus durable. Seule une gestion durable des stocks permettra d'assurer la viabilité des activités de pêche, sur le long terme comme sur le moyen terme. La bonne gestion des stocks de haddock a par exemple permis une augmentation des TAC, laquelle compense entièrement la baisse liée au Brexit.

Au contraire, une gestion non durable entraînerait des baisses des captures et ne ferait qu'aggraver la situation des pêcheurs. On l'a vu, en France, la pêche artisanale et les navires de moins de douze mètres ont été particulièrement touchés par l'imbroglie et par l'incertitude liés à l'attribution des licences de pêche.

Il y a aujourd'hui une grande incertitude sur l'après-2026, car l'accès aux eaux britanniques pour les navires européens ne sera plus garanti après cette date. Les pêcheurs ont déjà beaucoup souffert des conséquences du Brexit. Nous comptons sur la Commission pour qu'elle lance dès maintenant les négociations pour un accord pluriannuel qui évitera qu'ils ne souffrent davantage. Maintenons le cap vers une pêche plus durable.

France Jamet, *au nom du groupe ID*. – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Commissaire, chers collègues, je suis vraiment au regret de vous le dire: avec l'accord du Brexit, la Commission européenne et son négociateur en chef, Michel Barnier, ont révélé finalement leur incapacité à défendre les intérêts de nos pêcheurs.

Aujourd'hui, nous sommes obligés de faire avec un accord mal fichu, dont certaines clauses laissées dans le flou ont tout simplement permis aux autorités britanniques de bloquer beaucoup de navires français à leur frontière maritime. Alors que nous avons les armes juridiques, notamment douanières, pour les défendre, la Commission a préféré laisser nos pêcheurs se débrouiller seuls face à la Royal Navy. C'est ça, la réalité.

À ce jour, obtenir les licences encore manquantes reste possible, ça a été dit. Mais négocier l'après-2026 — véritable angle mort de l'accord — est impératif pour sauver nos pêcheurs et pour notre souveraineté alimentaire. On ne peut pas, on ne peut plus, on ne doit pas s'en remettre à nouveau intégralement et exclusivement à la Commission.

Il appartient aux États membres concernés de s'organiser ensemble pour obtenir des Britanniques des quotas équitables, raisonnables, sur une base pluriannuelle et de refuser toute commercialisation des licences. Parce que oui, le Royaume-Uni défend ses intérêts – et il a raison. Mais nos pêcheurs attendaient de leurs responsables politiques qu'ils fassent de même. Ça n'a pas été le cas.

Au moment où notre sécurité alimentaire est en danger, garantir à nos pêcheurs la pérennité de leur métier, de leurs filières, de leur activité est un sujet majeur pour notre autonomie stratégique. De cela, nous devons tous prendre la mesure.

Bert-Jan Ruissen, *namens de ECR-Fractie*. – Voorzitter, geachte commissaris, de Brexit heeft het leven van de betrokken EU-visserij er bepaald niet gemakkelijk op gemaakt. Quota zijn verlaagd. Het ruilen ervan is moeilijker geworden. Men kreeg te maken met aanvullende eisen voor vistuigen en met eenzijdige sluiting van gebieden. En wat gebeurt er straks na 2026? Ook dát is nog zeer onzeker.

Natuurlijk moeten we proberen knelpunten zoveel mogelijk op te lossen in de geest van goed nabuurschap. Maar als de Britten belemmeringen op belemmeringen blijven stapelen, moeten wij ook niet schromen om tegenmaatregelen te treffen.

Ondertussen is het zeer frustrerend om te zien dat diverse lidstaten nog niet eens begonnen zijn met het uitbetalen van de gelden uit de reserve voor aanpassing aan de Brexit. Zeker gelet op de hoge brandstofprijzen is dat toch wel een heel ongemakkelijke situatie. Ik roep de betreffende lidstaten en de Commissie dan ook op om tempo te maken met het uitbetalen van die gelden. De Brexit draaien we niet meer terug, maar laten we wel alles doen wat in ons vermogen ligt om de situatie voor onze vissers werkbaar te houden en om de schade zo veel mogelijk en ook zo snel mogelijk te compenseren.

João Pimenta Lopes, *em nome do Grupo The Left*. – Senhora Presidente, são oportunas diversas das preocupações, incertezas e dificuldades refletidas no presente relatório. As relações desenvolvidas entre a União Europeia e o Reino Unido no domínio das pescas devem ser equilibradas e estáveis, permitindo a continuidade de acesso recíproco às águas, recursos e mercados das partes interessadas, nomeadamente ao serviço dos interesses dos Estados-Membros e seu setor de pesca, aquacultura e transformação.

Não são úteis abordagens de ameaça e pressão de parte a parte, o uso das pescas como arma de arremesso entre as partes, visando outros fins que nada têm que ver com o setor e que o texto amiúde reproduz. Devem ser promovidas relações mutuamente vantajosas e, na base do respeito pelo direito soberano de cada Estado, a gestão das suas águas territoriais e dos recursos aí disponíveis.

Para lá do acordo de pescas estabelecido entre a União Europeia e o Reino Unido, importa perspetivar a possibilidade de acordos bilaterais entre os Estados-Membros e aquele país que melhor sirvam os interesses do sector em cada Estado.

Gabriel Mato (PPE). – Señora presidenta, querido comisario, el impacto del Brexit en la pesca se extiende más allá del área geográfica del Reino Unido y tiene importantes implicaciones en toda la zona del océano Atlántico Nororiental, así como en la flota de la Unión Europea que opera en otras partes del mundo, como las aguas alrededor de las Islas Malvinas, Groenlandia y Svalbard.

El escenario geopolítico ha cambiado con el Brexit. También el marco de gobernanza, con cambios en el equilibrio de poderes y en el posicionamiento relativo de todos los países vecinos que comparten poblaciones de peces en la zona. Con la salida del Reino Unido, la Unión Europea ha perdido su poder de negociación sobre importantes naciones pesqueras.

El resultado es que algunos se aprovechan de la debilidad de la Unión Europea, que debe reafirmarse como garante de sus intereses pesqueros, a fin de evitar cualquier limitación injustificada o unilateral del acceso al agua o de los recursos para los buques de la Unión Europea en la región.

Además, el Reino Unido, en contra del espíritu de buena cooperación, discrimina discreta pero sistemáticamente a los pescadores de la Unión Europea mediante la introducción unilateral de nuevas normas de pesca. También se niega a conceder acceso a los buques de la Unión Europea que tradicionalmente han faenado allí. Todo esto conduce a restricciones de acceso de los buques de la Unión Europea a aguas del Reino Unido, en contra del Acuerdo de Comercio y Cooperación suscrito.

El acceso a las aguas del Reino Unido y el acceso al mercado de la Unión Europea están intrínsecamente vinculados, y este ha sido el enfoque de la Unión Europea durante las negociaciones del *Brexit*. La Unión Europea tiene que ser muy firme en la defensa de este principio y, en su caso, actuar.

Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (Renew). – Señora presidenta, señor comisario, el *Brexit* no puede poner en tela de juicio una verdad biológica aplastante: las aguas del Atlántico forman un ecosistema coherente. Sus recursos pesqueros deben gestionarse de manera sostenible mediante el acuerdo y las relaciones de confianza que convienen a todos los países ribereños y con el rigor que permiten y al que obligan los datos científicos que existen sobre el estado de las poblaciones.

Existen para ello organismos científicos, como el CIEM, y de gobernanza, como la Comisión de Pesquerías del Atlántico del Nordeste; nos unen además una historia común, unos procedimientos, tratados internacionales en vigor, una cultura de respeto al Estado de Derecho, el respeto a la independencia de las partes y, espero, el deseo de mantener las relaciones con el Reino Unido en términos de acuerdo y de concordia.

Por eso es imprescindible que la flota europea no sufra reducciones de cuotas tras el período de transición que acaba en 2026, que la colaboración científica se refuerce, que los datos objetivos sobre el estado de las poblaciones sean la base de un sistema de gestión a largo plazo de la pesca en la zona y que pongamos en marcha, con la experiencia acumulada en estos años, nuevos mecanismos para enfrentar la desestabilización que el *Brexit* ha producido en el sector pesquero europeo que se asoma al Atlántico.

François-Xavier Bellamy (PPE). – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Commissaire, le rapport que nous allons voter remet enfin l'accent sur les conséquences catastrophiques que le Brexit aura eues pour les pêcheurs européens: les conséquences de l'application de l'accord, puisque nos pêcheurs vont perdre 25 % de leur activité en valeur dans les eaux britanniques – aucun secteur économique n'aura été touché à ce point –, mais aussi les conséquences de la non-mise en application de l'accord par nos partenaires britanniques, qui ont usé de toute la mauvaise foi possible au cours des mois écoulés, par exemple pour ne pas délivrer des licences de pêche à des bateaux qui en avaient pourtant le droit au titre de l'accord qui avait été signé.

Ceci doit nous permettre d'ouvrir les yeux sur le bras de fer qui est aujourd'hui devant nous, pour garantir que nous saurons faire respecter cet accord à l'issue de la période de transition qui s'achèvera en 2026. Nous voulons entretenir avec les Britanniques une coopération loyale, mais cette coopération doit être de bonne foi et doit se faire conformément aux engagements que chacune des parties a signés.

Je voudrais dire que le travail que nous avons fait ici pour défendre les pêcheurs européens, les pêcheurs de nos pays, qui sont aujourd'hui touchés de plein fouet non seulement par les conséquences du Brexit, mais aussi par la crise déclenchée par l'augmentation exponentielle des prix de l'énergie, trouve tout son sens dans le moment que nous vivons, car les pêcheurs constituent l'un des appuis essentiels à notre alimentation. Dans un moment où nous vivons la réalité de la précarité alimentaire en Europe et dans le monde, nous devons leur redire notre confiance et notre reconnaissance pour le travail qu'ils font.

Loin de tous ceux qui voudraient les attaquer, parfois même les criminaliser, nous savons que c'est à la pêche européenne que nous devons une partie de notre capacité de résistance face aux turbulences de ce monde. Nous aurons besoin d'eux pour éviter cette précarité alimentaire mondiale qui menace de toucher l'Europe et les pays qui l'entourent.

Stéphanie Yon-Courtin (Renew). – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Commissaire Sinkevičius, aujourd'hui, je veux vous parler de Jérôme, de Sophie et d'Estelle, trois citoyens normands formidablement engagés dans la filière pêche, trois citoyens européens directement concernés par le rapport que nous votons.

Jérôme est artisan pêcheur. Face à toutes les tempêtes — la pandémie, la hausse des prix de l'énergie, une licence manquante –, il continue à pêcher. Sophie est armatrice hauturière. Malgré un futur incertain, une licence manquante, elle continue à moderniser sa flotte. Estelle est mareyeuse. Ébranlée par les ruptures d'approvisionnement, elle continue à investir dans son établissement.

Jérôme, Sophie et Estelle savent bien que nos voisins britanniques ne font pas de quartier et ne respectent pas les accords. Mais ils se souviennent aussi que la Commission européenne a promis, le 24 décembre 2020, de les aider. Monsieur le Commissaire, aujourd'hui comme depuis 465 jours, je vous le dis solennellement: n'oubliez pas Jérôme, n'oubliez pas Sophie, n'oubliez pas Estelle. Ils sont l'avenir de notre pêche en Manche. Ils sont l'avenir de notre souveraineté alimentaire. Merci pour eux.

Niclas Herbst (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin, meine sehr verehrten Damen und Herren! Vielen Dank an den Berichterstatter und auch an den Kommissar. Ich möchte die kurze Zeit, die mir gegeben ist, nutzen, um auf einen aus meiner Sicht wichtigen Punkt hinzuweisen. Das ist die Tatsache, dass die Reserve für die Anpassung an den Brexit einem engen Personenkreis – nämlich den Fischereibetrieben, die ganz besonders betroffen sind – helfen soll, und das in einem sehr begrenzten Zeitraum. Gerade vor dem Hintergrund ist es aus meiner Sicht problematisch, dass die Kommission aus Wettbewerbsgründen die Förderquote des EMFAF bzw. des EMFF ansetzt, sodass im Einzelfall nicht die volle angedachte Höhe der Reserve für die Anpassung an den Brexit genutzt werden kann. Das ist ein Problem, genauso wie der Zeitrahmen.

Wir haben viele Probleme mit den Lieferketten aktuell. Gerade größere Projekte können so gar nicht angestoßen werden. Auch hier sollte über eine Anpassung nachgedacht werden. Gerade vor dem Hintergrund der gerade extrem hohen Treibstoffpreise brauchen wir eine maximale Flexibilität, um unsere Betriebe zu retten. Ich bitte die Kommission, noch mal darüber nachzudenken, und wünsche denjenigen, die in der Kommission dafür kämpfen, viel Erfolg.

Procedura catch-the-eye

Mick Wallace (The Left). – Madam President, this report completely omits the fact that Ireland, which lost 15% of its quota under the agreement, was proportionately substantially more impacted by the Trade and Cooperation Agreement than any other Member State. It is absolutely essential that the review of the common fisheries policy scheduled for this year addresses the hugely disproportionate impact of Brexit on the Irish fishing industry, including the imbalances in the quota transfers under the Trade and Cooperation Agreement.

The common fisheries policy, including its utterly outdated relative stability principle, has slowly strangled Irish fishing and coastal communities for almost 40 years. No more than 50% of the gross tonnage and kilowatt power of the total boats fishing between Ireland's 12-mile limit and the 200-mile limit should come from outside of Ireland. The common fisheries policy needs to be radically changed to reflect the realities of climate change and the political realities of Brexit. This is a once-in-a-generation opportunity to save fishing communities all around Ireland.

(Fine della procedura catch-the-eye)

Virginijus Sinkevičius, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, honourable Members, thank you very much again for this good debate tonight and for the important work that has gone into this initiative report.

Yes, fisheries in the north-east Atlantic may be structured differently following the departure of the United Kingdom, but allow me to once again stress that the fundamental principles of the EU's engagement in the north-east Atlantic remain unchanged. The Commission will continue to engage for fisheries that are economically, socially and environmentally sustainable, both for fish stocks managed by the EU alone and for those shared with our international partners.

Let me briefly comment on a couple of points you raised tonight. You stressed the need to be vigilant that the United Kingdom complies with the conditions of the TCA and that it should strongly respond if the United Kingdom were to act in a discriminatory manner. The United Kingdom is now a third country, and as such it can take autonomous decisions that diverge from the common fisheries policy. However, the Trade and Cooperation Agreement requires that measures that are likely to affect the vessels of the other party are notified before they are applied. They must comply with the objectives and principles of the agreement and be non-discriminatory, proportionate and based on the best available scientific advice. We have already agreed with the United Kingdom that we will work together in the specialised committee on fisheries to set up a joint notification protocol.

Dear members of the Parliament, you also mentioned the need to ensure that reciprocal access to waters and fisheries resources is maintained after 30 June 2026, and that there are no further reductions of quotas for EU fishers after the end of the transition period. The Trade and Cooperation Agreement sets out quota shares for the EU and the United Kingdom that are adjusted over a five-year period until 2026. After 2026, these quota shares for the total allowable catches managed bilaterally remain stable. There is absolutely no intention of renegotiating this.

Reciprocal access to waters is a separate issue. In line with the TCA this access will need to be renegotiated every year from 2026 onwards as part of the annual consultations on fishing opportunities. We believe there is an interest on both sides to grant such reciprocal access and we count on both parties to continue negotiating fishing opportunities after 2026 in good faith and ensuring a mutually satisfactory balance. We will not hesitate to defend an interest of the EU's fleets or enforce compensatory measures in line with the provisions of the Trade and Cooperation Agreement, should the need arise.

Honourable Members, dear colleagues, in conclusion, let me underline that we will fully live up to the commitments we have made under the common fisheries policy, under the Trade and Cooperation Agreement, and in our annual consultations with our partners around the Atlantic. And we fully expect our partners to do the same. Thank you once again for your attention.

Manuel Pizarro, Rapporteur. – Senhora Presidente, Senhor Comissário, Caros Colegas, há uma coisa que fica clara para todos: o setor pesqueiro da União manteve-se corajosamente em atividade durante os períodos mais difíceis da pandemia de Covid-19. Enfrenta agora, ao mesmo tempo, as consequências do Brexit, com a dimensão que aqui ficou clara e o impacto do brutal aumento dos combustíveis. É um setor que tem que merecer solidariedade e apoio da União. É imperioso que este setor sinta e saiba que não foi abandonado à sua sorte.

Na sequência deste debate, eu queria realçar que é decisivo, fico satisfeito, naturalmente, Senhor Comissário, pela entrada em funcionamento do Comité Especializado das Pescas, mas é decisivo o envolvimento do Parlamento Europeu nessa atividade com a presença de observadores da Comissão das Pescas nas suas reuniões. Este esforço de transparência terá enormes vantagens de eficácia e de envolvimento de todo o setor na União.

Quero também destacar um tema que aqui foi trazido: a importância da relação com outros países terceiros, em especial a Noruega, a Islândia e as Ilhas Faroé, que, a pretexto do Brexit, têm vindo a tomar decisões unilaterais que põem em causa equilíbrios ancestrais. Um exemplo é a perda da quota de bacalhau de Svalbard, com repercussões significativas em vários Estados-Membros e, em especial, no meu país, Portugal, onde o bacalhau é o principal prato nacional, como alguns saberão.

Quero também destacar que o tema da reserva de ajustamento ao Brexit tem que voltar a ser discutido. Os fundos não são suficientes para a pesca e não preveem compensar até ao final do período de transição e eu gostava de um esclarecimento da Comissão nesta matéria.

Em todo este dossiê do Brexit e das suas perturbações colaterais, a Comissão tem a solidariedade do Parlamento Europeu. Claro que temos que caminhar num caminho de diálogo, de cooperação, de concertação, pacífico, mas, ao mesmo tempo, o Parlamento Europeu insta a Comissão Europeia a estar atenta e a responder de forma proporcional e adequada em função dos problemas que vão sendo identificados. Isso é essencial para o setor e nós temos visto com muita preocupação que nem sempre isso acontece do lado do Reino Unido.

Esperamos que as recomendações deste relatório do Parlamento Europeu, que, não tenho dúvidas, será aprovado por larga maioria, correspondendo à unanimidade que granjeou na Comissão de Pescas, que essas recomendações sejam acolhidas pela Comissão Europeia.

Os pescadores europeus, o seu esforço e o seu trabalho indómitos merecem-nos isso.

Presidente. – La discussione è chiusa.

La votazione si svolgerà martedì, 5 aprile 2022.

Dichiarazioni scritte (articolo 171)

Tom Vandenkendelaere (PPE), schriftelijk. – De gevolgen van de Brexit laten zich vandaag nog steeds hard voelen in de visserijsector. Na 2026 moet de visvangst met 25 % verminderd worden, wat een grote impact zal hebben, zeker ook op kleinere vissers. De onzekere toekomst zorgt voor een gebrek aan stabiliteit en houvast voor onze Europese (en zeker ook Vlaamse) visserij. Bij de gesprekken over de lange termijn is het cruciaal dat de vissers betrokken worden en dat er zekerheid gecreëerd wordt voor de sector.

Vandaag doe ik ook een oproep aan alle lidstaten om de middelen uit het Brexitfonds goed in te zetten. De visserijsector wordt hard getroffen en verdient dus zeker ook zijn deel van de koek. Ook de impact van de verdere offshore-windmolens op het visbestand en de economische gevolgen voor de vissers dienen verder onderzocht en in rekening gebracht te worden bij het uitrollen van die plannen. Laten we de komende maanden vooral waakzaam blijven en onze vissers behoeden voor erger.

18. De bescherming van de rechten van het kind in civielrechtelijke, bestuursrechtelijke en familierechtelijke zaken (korte presentatie)

Presidente. – L'ordine del giorno reca la breve presentazione della relazione di Adrián Vázquez Lázara sulla tutela dei diritti dei minori nei procedimenti di diritto civile, amministrativo e di famiglia (2021/2060(INI)) (A9-0033/2022).

Adrián Vázquez Lázara, ponente. – Señora presidenta, el informe que presento hoy ante este Pleno se centra en la protección de los derechos del menor en los procedimientos de derecho civil, administrativo y de familia.

El objetivo principal es conseguir una justicia adaptada a los menores a través de estándares y recomendaciones comunes a toda la Unión Europea para garantizar tres elementos clave. El primero es un trato adaptado a la edad, madurez y necesidades de cada niño que pasa por un procedimiento judicial. El segundo es un acceso efectivo del menor a la justicia y, cuando sea preciso, una representación legal gratuita a cargo de las administraciones públicas y también otros servicios accesorios como la orientación psicológica, muy necesaria, como sabemos, en casos traumáticos para el menor, como puede ser un procedimiento de divorcio. Y el tercero es una mejor formación de jueces y profesionales jurídicos en habilidades para tratar con niños y niñas cuyo futuro se decide en un procedimiento judicial o administrativo.

Asimismo, el informe incluye la mediación como instrumento de resolución de disputas que afecten a menores. Instamos por ello a la Comisión a presentar un nuevo reglamento que regule la mediación transfronteriza que afecte a menores a través de normas comunes que garanticen el reconocimiento y la aplicación de los acuerdos obtenidos en esos procedimientos; también que la calidad de los mediadores transfronterizos se pueda, de alguna manera, aseverar o confirmar a través de un certificado europeo de mediación, y también con normas comunes para contratos de mediación transfronterizos. También instamos a los Estados miembros que aún no lo hayan hecho a crear oficinas de mediación para informar a padres y niños afectados sobre la posibilidad de acudir a la mediación como método menos agresivo que el litigio judicial tradicional, a que garanticen la asistencia jurídica gratuita cuando sea necesario y a explorar el uso de nuevas tecnologías en los marcos de la mediación.

Por último, y no por ello menos importante, a la hora de redactar este informe hemos pensado —y mucho— en padres como Marton y Adam, que querían formar una familia en Hungría y no pudieron, porque la Constitución de ese país solo reconoce a las familias compuestas por parejas heterosexuales. Marton y Adam querían adoptar a un niño, pero finalmente ese niño solo pudo ser adoptado legalmente por uno de los padres, por Adam, a todos los efectos. Por ello, ante la ley, Marton hoy no es el padre de su hijo Andris a efectos legales.

En ese sentido, creo que este informe puede ser una primera piedra de muchas otras que habrá que poner para que los Estados miembros cumplan las sentencias de reconocimiento de paternidad de las familias LGTBI y que todas esas familias de dos padres o de dos madres puedan ver ante la ley el reconocimiento de la paternidad de los hijos, como lo son hoy en día.

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Paní předsedající, já bych chtěl poděkovat panu zpravodaji za představení této velice důležité zprávy. Já ji považuji za velmi vyváženou. Ta justice by skutečně měla být vstřícná k dětem ve všech fázích řízení, které probíhá o jejich právech. Každé dítě musí být vyslechnuto bez ohledu na svůj sociální, ekonomický a etnický původ a musí požívat všech práv. Je zde řada dalších aspektů. To řízení musí být vedeno soudcem, který je ve své specializaci odborníkem, který je citlivý. Zároveň výsledek toho dítěte by měl probíhat v přívětivém prostředí.

Je třeba také, abychom chránili nejlepší zájmy dítěte v přeshraničních občanských sporech, abychom účinně vymáhali rozsudky v přeshraničních sporech. A jsem velmi vděčný panu zpravodaji, že zmínil právě i uznávání rodičovských práv stejnopohlavních párů, protože právě práva dětí by nám měla ležet nejvíce na paměti. Musíme vnímat dítě v justici se všemi jeho plnými právy a s plným respektem.

Mick Wallace (The Left). – Madam President, thanks to the rapporteur. I think it's a very worthwhile piece of work on your part. And I'm just kind of wondering what kind of a role the EU can play. I'm just conscious of the challenges at home in Ireland at the moment. I mean, you mentioned taking into account the age and needs of the children, the free legal representation and psychological support, and training of judges. I mean, my God, what challenges have we got there? And the mediation offices that need to be put into the structures. These are massive challenges.

To be honest, I'm totally innocent as to how much of a role the EU can play. I know some things are the competency of Member States, so I'm curious as to how much of a strong role the European Union can actually play in pressuring the Member States to do things so much better, because it's a huge area where things leave so much to be desired.

(Fine della procedura «catch the eye»)

Virginijus Sinkevičius, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, honourable Members, first of all I would like to thank the rapporteur, Mr Vázquez Lázara, the Committee on Legal Affairs, and all of those who contributed to this report.

The Commission notes with great satisfaction that the report aims to ensure that the best interests of the child are the primary consideration in judicial proceedings, regardless of whether they are civil, criminal or administrative, and regardless of the reason why a child comes in contact with the justice system. This highlights that the Commission and the Parliament share the same objectives that the rights of the child are protected.

The EU has a very strong *acquis* on child-friendly justice. In the criminal law domain we have the 2016 Procedural Safeguards Directive as regards children accused, or the Victims' Rights Directive, along with the legislation on child sexual abuse and trafficking in human beings. In the family law area, in the Brussels IIa Regulation, its recast, and the maintenance regulations are contributing to the creation of child-friendly settings. These are complemented by several strategies, including the EU strategy on the rights of the child adopted in March last year, where child-friendly justice is one of the thematic areas. The strategy sets out concrete actions that the Commission will implement by the end of its mandate to make justice more child friendly. The Commission will notably contribute to the training of justice professionals on the rights of the child and child-friendly justice; strengthen the implementation of the 2010 Guidelines on Child-Friendly Justice with the Council of Europe; propose in 2022 a horizontal legislative initiative to support the mutual recognition of parenthood between Member States.

But let me come back to our existing family-law instruments to address and ensure a child-friendly justice. I would like to highlight, for example, the Brussels IIb Regulation, which enters into application on 1 August. This regulation covers many of the important elements highlighted in your report, including new obligations for the Member States to provide children who are capable of forming their own views with a genuine and effective opportunity to express their views, either directly or through a representative or an appropriate body. This obligation extends to all proceedings concerning parental responsibility. It will offer better protection for children and will facilitate cross-border procedures for families, which in turn reduces time and costs and increases efficiency.

Mediation is also encouraged in the new regulation. As from 1 August this year, courts deciding on parental child abduction will be called upon to invite the parties to consider engaging in mediation or other means of alternative dispute resolution unless it is contrary to the best interests of the child or it's otherwise not appropriate.

Overall, these new rules reinforce the rights of children by ensuring that their perspectives are heard in the legal proceedings concerning them. We therefore welcome that the European Parliament report calls for proper implementation of these rules. The Commission will be intensifying its efforts to ensure that the new regulation is effectively applied by all Member States. To ensure this, we have already started working on the update of the practice guide on the application of the Brussels IIb Regulation. It should be available before the regulation starts to apply.

As to the new legislative initiative on parenthood, the proposal will aim to ensure that parenthood established in one Member State is recognised in the other Member States so that the legal links between children and their parents are not compromised when the family moves to another Member State or returns to its Member State of origin. This will further protect the rights of children such as their right to an identity, the right to be raised by and to maintain a relationship with both of their parents, the right to a family life and other rights derived from parenthood, such as the right to maintenance or succession rights. We are grateful for the Parliament's support for this, including its parliamentary resolution on this matter in September last year. The Parliament's earlier resolution on the cross-border aspects of adoption will also be taken into account in the preparation of this legislation.

As regards the acceptance of accessions to the 1980 Hague Convention on Child Abduction, I would like to recall that in the period of 2015-2021, 20 Council decisions have been adopted concerning no less than 27 third countries, and three Commission proposals are currently still pending at the Council. The assessment of the level of implementation by third countries is a common endeavour of the Commission and Member States.

The problems regarding the enforcement of return and decisions and visiting rights in Japan is a matter of great concern for the Commission, which worked closely with the EEAS and the EU delegation in Japan to establish a continuous dialogue with Japan on these matters, notwithstanding the difficulties linked to different social and legal concepts.

Finally, besides the measures taken at the EU level, we also note that this report calls on Member States to implement several actions in order to better protect the rights of the child in civil, administrative and family law proceedings. Many of these are in line with the recommendations to Member States outlined in the EU strategy on the rights of the child, such as support to judicial training providers. We have also recommended Member States to develop robust alternatives to judicial action, including alternatives to detention, the use of restorative justice and mediation in the context of civil justice, and to enhance cooperation in cases with cross-border implications to ensure full respect of the rights of the child.

As you can see, there is strong and significant EU action in the area of the protection of the rights of the child, with a wide range of legislative and policy instruments.

I would like to once again thank the Parliament for this report and its support.

PREDSEDÁ: MICHAL ŠIMEČKA

podpredseda

Predseda júci. – Rozprava k tomuto bodu sa týmto skončila.

Hlasovanie k nemu sa uskutoční zajtra.

19. Redevoeringen van één minuut over kwesties van politiek belang

Predseda júci. – Ďalším bodom programu rokovania sú jednominútové vystúpenia podľa článku 172 rokovacieho poriadku.

A týmto vás chcem informovať, že tieto vystúpenia vykonávate zo svojho kresla.

Loránt Vincze (PPE). – Tisztelt Elnök Úr! Magyarországon Orbán Viktor miniszterelnök és a Fidesz-KDNP pártszövetsége a tegnapi választásokon hatalmas, kétharmados győzelmet aratott. Ehhez az eredményhez a Magyarország határain kívül élő magyar közösségek, köztük az erdélyi magyarok is hozzájárultak. A magyar állampolgárok a biztonságot és a kiszámíthatóságot választották, elutasították azt a természetellenes pártszövetséget, amely a szélsőjobbtól a szélsőbalig az Orbán miniszterelnök és politikája elleni gyűlöletre építő platform. Itt, ebben a Házban kétségtelenül nagyon sokan más eredményre számítottak, de az a helyzet, hogy egy demokráciában a nép választ. A magyar emberek szavaztak, a demokrácia győzött. Négy évre marad a jelenlegi kormány Magyarországon. A demokratikus választás eredményét nem csupán el kell fogadni itt, az Európai Unió intézményeiben, de tudomásul is kell venni. Ideje befejezni a Magyarország kormánya elleni ideológiai háborút és elkezdni a pragmatikus együttműködést a jelenlegi számos európai kihívás mentén. Van tennivaló elég.

Sara Cerdas (S&D). – Senhor Presidente, venho aqui falar sobre as regiões ultraperiféricas que representam 80% do potencial da biodiversidade na União Europeia.

Para combatermos as emergências climáticas e da biodiversidade é imperativo adotarmos uma abordagem holística que dê valor e proteja os nossos recursos naturais. Proteger e recuperar os nossos ecossistemas irá trazer benefícios para o nosso planeta, mas também, em particular, para alguns setores, nomeadamente o da agricultura, o das pescas, o das florestas, entre outros.

Vejo, assim, com alguma decepção, que a proposta de Lei da Recuperação da Natureza, planeada para ser apresentada no final de março, foi adiada. Apelo a que esta proposta seja apresentada o quanto antes com metas ambiciosas e com especial consideração para as especificidades das regiões ultraperiféricas. Só assim iremos assegurar um desenvolvimento sustentável e um futuro digno para todas as gerações.

Billy Kelleher (Renew). – Mr President, we need a rapid review of the VAT Directive. There is no point in us continuing to wait and prevaricate any further. It has been agreed by the Council and by the Minister of Finance that there is a fundamental need for us to have flexibility at Member State level in terms of the VAT Directive. We are now talking about the decision being made in April or May of this year to afford countries the flexibility to reduce VAT on home heating oil and other fuels. Bearing in mind that bills are now at their highest because of the fact that we are coming out of the winter, and by the time we make this decision, bills will already have been paid and we won't need the VAT Directive reductions at that stage at all, it will have no meaningful impact.

So I urge the Commission to make the decision quickly to allow the flexibility to Member States to reduce the VAT rates on home heating oil and other fuels, to ensure that we lighten the burden, that we reduce the burden on families that are already very hard pressed. So I ask the Commission to act quickly on this issue.

Gunnar Beck (ID). – Herr Präsident! EU-Kommissar Šefčovič will die Ukraine in die EU holen, denn Ukrainer sterben für europäische Werte. Seit 20 Jahren unterstützt die EU die Ukraine beim Kampf gegen Korruption – ergebnislos. Denn in einem Sonderbericht vom letzten Jahr attestiert der Europäische Rechnungshof der Ukraine Großkorruption und die Vereinnahmung des Staates durch private Interessen. Korruption auf höchster Ebene behindere Wettbewerb, Wachstum und Demokratisierung. Dutzende Milliarden Euro gehen so jährlich verloren. Die Ukraine bleibt hinter Albanien eines der ärmsten Länder Europas.

Ihre Ukraine-Politik ist gescheitert, so wie Ihre Russland-, Ihre Migrations- und Ihre Wirtschaftspolitik. Das Einzige, was Ihnen bei all Ihren Schiffbrüchen einfällt, ist, Probleme anderer Länder in die EU zu importieren. Ihre Krisenpolitik ist nur ein Vorwand, die Europäer an einen immer niedrigeren Lebensstandard zu gewöhnen.

Michiel Hoogeveen (ECR). – Voorzitter, de Conferentie over de toekomst van Europa is in het leven geroepen om de burgers bij de EU te betrekken. Via panels zouden uit ieder EU-land burgers hun mening kunnen geven over de EU.

Echter, de geselecteerde burgers worden vanaf het begin al gestuurd door vooraf aangestelde experts richting één mogelijke uitkomst: meer macht voor de EU. De uitkomst van de panels laat zich dus raden: er moeten een nieuwe Europese grondwet, Europese belastingen en één Europees asielbeleid komen.

Maar wie heeft er gehoord van deze Conferentie? Waar is het maatschappelijk debat? Waar is de media-aandacht? Het is bijna alsof de Conferentie nooit heeft plaatsgevonden! En dat is gevaarlijk, want regeringen zoals de Nederlandse zeggen de aanbevelingen van de Conferentie op te willen volgen.

De toekomst van Europa wordt bepaald met verkiezingen. Laten wij de uitkomst van deze Conferentie dus voorleggen aan de burgers, in een referendum.

João Pimenta Lopes (The Left). – Senhor Presidente, no lugar de priorizar o desenvolvimento de iniciativas e medidas que visem um cessar-fogo e uma solução política e a paz na Europa, assistimos ao seguidismo da União Europeia face aos Estados Unidos e aos seus interesses.

A escalada armamentista, a política de sanções económicas, comerciais, financeiras, culturais e desportivas, a deriva autoritária e de imposição do pensamento único, não servem a causa da paz nem os interesses dos povos, servem os lucros da indústria militar, os especuladores, os beneficiários diretos do redirecionamento da dependência energética, novos ataques a direitos laborais e sociais, concessões reacionárias e antidemocráticas.

A política de sanções da União Europeia sacrifica os interesses dos países e dos povos da Europa. A seu pretexto, os grupos económicos fomentam a especulação e fazem os trabalhadores e as populações pagar o preço do brutal aumento do custo de vida.

A paz, a liberdade, a democracia, o controlo público de setores fundamentais, a produção nacional, o trabalho com direitos são eixos fundamentais de uma outra Europa que urge colocar no horizonte.

Dino Giarrusso (NI). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, non so se vi rendete conto di quanto sta accadendo: abbiamo una guerra e abbiamo degli sciacalli che sfruttano la guerra infame promossa da Putin per arricchirsi, alzando il prezzo dell'energia e mettendo in ginocchio intere famiglie, imprese, settori che contano milioni di lavoratori. In Sicilia e Sardegna, come in molte zone d'Europa, la situazione è allo stremo: agricoltori, pescatori, autotrasportatori sono in ginocchio per il caro energia.

Allora smettiamola subito con le cure palliative: è l'ora di renderci autosufficienti dal punto di vista energetico e non cianciando di porcherie come il nucleare, ma promuovendo con tanti soldi europei le fonti realmente pulite, eolico, solare e marino in primis.

Chi ha paura degli impianti offshore che sfruttano vento e correnti marine? Chi? Forse chi vuole fermare la transizione verde ama stare sotto il tallone di Putin e dei suoi oligarchi. I cittadini europei non vogliono, invece! L'Europa vuole energia pulita e indipendenza completa dai padroni delle fonti fossili. Ora! Non quando sarà troppo tardi o quando scoppierà un'altra guerra.

Fulvio Martusciello (PPE). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, le elezioni suppletive del 26 maggio in Zimbabwe sono state osservate da una serie di ambasciatori, quelli degli Stati Uniti, della Gran Bretagna, della Svezia e dell'Olanda, che hanno valutato queste elezioni suppletive pacifiche, constatando che il procedimento democratico è stato rispettato. Sembrerebbero superati gli scontri del 2018 quando, con la forza e con il potere militare, furono affermati altri principi.

E allora dobbiamo chiederci se non sia il momento di rivalutare il ruolo dello Zimbabwe e della lotta al jihadismo e se l'Europa deve fare ogni sforzo per conservare i rapporti con lo Zimbabwe ed evitare che venga regalato come partner alla Russia di Putin.

Per questa ragione chiediamo al Consiglio di valutare l'opportunità di confrontarsi con questo Stato per graduare le sanzioni che gli sono state inflitte nel corso del tempo, perché lo Zimbabwe può essere davvero un partner straordinario nella lotta al jihadismo, che sta affliggendo tutti i Paesi dell'Africa.

Carmen Avram (S&D). – Domnule președinte, comisarul Stella Kyriakides a anunțat recent că, deși nu se pune problema renunțării la țintele Green Deal, procentele de 50 % reducere a pesticidelor și fertilizatorilor din agricultură nu se vor aplica la nivel național, iar Comisia va ține cont de caracteristicile fiecărui stat. Este o veste bună pentru securitatea alimentară.

În varianta inițială a propunerii, agricultura din țara mea, de exemplu, era nedreptățită, ea folosind dintotdeauna fertilizant și pesticide mult sub media europeană. Însă securitatea alimentară nu trebuie făcută în detrimentul siguranței alimentare.

Invit Comisia să cântărească atent propunerea ca fiecare stat membru să decidă cantitatea maximă de pesticide acceptată la hrana de import. Această derogare riscă să inducă în eroare consumatorul neinformați care va judeca produsul după preț și nu după calitate. În plus, ar putea slăbi și mai mult poziția fermierilor europeni în fața *retailerilor*, care vor fi tentați să aducă pe piața europeană și mai multe produse alimentare ieftine, dar cu o cantitate mai mare de substanță activă, ceea ce ar pune în pericol politica agricolă comună și soarta fermierilor.

Eugen Tomac (PPE). – Domnule președinte, în urmă cu puține ore, președintele Zelensky s-a adresat în Parlamentul României tuturor senatorilor și deputaților, și poporului român, mulțumind pentru solidaritatea și deschiderea cu care cetățenii noștri i-au primit pe cei aproape 700 000 de ucraineni care au trecut pragul și frontiera României.

În aceste clipe, este esențial să fim solidari, iar statul nostru a făcut tot ceea ce este posibil pentru ca cetățenii ucraineni afectați de război să se simtă în siguranță în țara noastră.

Eu, împreună cu soția mea, am primit trei doamne împreună cu copiii lor în casa noastră și au stat timp de o lună.

Cred că este foarte important să fim solidari cu ucrainenii care în aceste zile trec prin cea mai grea suferință din vremurile lor. În același timp, cred că este esențial ca Uniunea Europeană să își respecte toate angajamentele, iar Ucraina în cel mai scurt timp să devină membru al Uniunii Europene.

Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D). – Señor presidente, entre las fechas del 19 de septiembre y el 15 de diciembre de 2021 un volcán erupción en la isla canaria, española, europea, de La Palma, y produjo una catástrofe natural que suma todas las contempladas en la activación del Fondo de Solidaridad: incendios, terremotos, estragos, destrucción de viviendas y de producciones agrícolas. Y exactamente por eso, el 3 de diciembre, el Gobierno de España solicitó la activación del Fondo de Solidaridad, porque el umbral de daños causados en una región ultraperiférica sobrepasa con creces el mínimo del 1 % de su PIB. El daño estimado es de 800 millones de euros y el umbral, por tanto, se ha claramente sobrepasado.

El Gobierno de España y el Gobierno de Canarias han sumado, en su solidaridad para reparar los daños, más de 450 millones de euros a fecha de hoy. Pero ya era hora de que, gracias a las gestiones de nuestra comisaria de Cohesión y Reformas, Elisa Ferreira, la Unión Europea activase de una vez ese anticipo de 5,4 millones de euros que va a contribuir a la reparación de los daños de las viviendas destruidas, que muestre que la Unión Europea es solidaria, por supuesto, con las personas que necesitan una respuesta viniendo de fuera de la Unión Europea, pero también con los ciudadanos de la Unión Europea. Y este Parlamento no debe parar hasta incrementar el Fondo de Solidaridad y asegurar que llegue efectivamente a la reparación de la isla de La Palma.

Vlad-Marius Botoș (Renew). – Domnule vicepreședinte, domnule comisar, stimați colegi, în ultimul an au fost tot mai multe familii care nu și-au mai permis să plătească facturile la energie, la încălzire. Vedem cum prețul la energie devine pe zi ce trece o povară asupra bugetului oamenilor.

Relațiile foarte tensionate cu Rusia ne arată și mai clar că Uniunea Europeană trebuie să aibă o strategie comună la nivel european în ceea ce privește sectorul energetic, dar mai ales ne arată că este momentul să gândim o strategie pentru consumatorii casnici. După ce am stabilit că vom merge spre energie regenerabilă, nu ar trebui să fie decât o chestiune de organizare, finanțare și voință pentru a face ca toate locuințele să devină independente energetic.

Energia pe care o consumă familie în fiecare zi poate fi și trebuie să fie produsă acasă prin panouri solare, prin mini-turbine eoliene, prin orice alte modalități care să asigure independența energetică a locuințelor.

Soluțiile trebuie să le găsim la nivel european pentru că fiecare cetățean, fie el din România, din Slovacia, din Portugalia, oriunde trăiește el, trebuie să beneficieze de energie electrică și de căldură la un preț decent.

Sandra Pereira (The Left). – Senhor Presidente, o aumento do custo de vida que os trabalhadores e o povo estão a sentir de forma alarmante é um dos maiores problemas que o meu país enfrenta. Se, por um lado, são necessárias medidas firmes e urgentes no sentido de travar o aumento dos preços nos bens essenciais, como os bens alimentares, por outro lado, importa valorizar os salários para que não sejam os trabalhadores a pagar a fatura da inflação com os seus próprios salários.

E, neste contexto, assume particular relevância aumentar a capacidade produtiva de cada país para assegurar o fornecimento dos bens alimentares, reduzindo a dependência externa, evitar a escassez de alimentos e travar o aumento especulativo dos preços. Por exemplo, é necessário promover a produção de cereais e melhorar o funcionamento da cadeia alimentar de forma a garantir preços justos à produção.

Só aumentando a capacidade de produção dos alimentos de que a população precisa, de armazenamento e de acesso a bens alimentares, podemos combater os enormes desequilíbrios da nossa balança alimentar. É nisso que estamos empenhados.

Λευτέρης Νικολάου-Αλαβάνος (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η ΛΑΡΚΟ, μια στρατηγικής σημασίας ελληνική επιχείρηση, η μοναδική στην Ευρώπη που παράγει σιδηρονικέλιο από ιδιόκτητα κοιτάσματα, σε μια χώρα που βρίσκεται το 90% των καταγεγραμμένων κοιτασμάτων της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, απαξιώνεται διαδοχικά από τις ελληνικές κυβερνήσεις. Ενώ η χρήση του νικελίου στην ηλεκτροκίνηση είναι καίρια και η αξία του έχει εκτοξευθεί, η κυβέρνηση της Νέας Δημοκρατίας επιδιώκει να την εκκαθαρίσει, πετώντας στον δρόμο 1 300 εργαζομένους και 300 οικογένειες. Τη χαρακτηρίζουν ζημιογόνα, με τη βούλα της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, που με σκοπιμότητα έχει επιβάλει πρόστιμο 5,5 εκατομμυρίων και ποινή 4,5 εκατομμυρίων ανά εξάμηνο, με τη δικαιολογία ότι το κράτος δεν ανέκτησε χορηγημένες ενισχύσεις. Μια απόφαση-πρόκληση, τη στιγμή που η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση εγκρίνει κρατικές ενισχύσεις δισεκατομμυρίων για να εξασφαλιστεί η κερδοφορία ομίλων στην πανδημία, τους οποίους «ξαναχρυσώνει» και τώρα μέσω του Ταμείου Ανάκαμψης. Στις 6 Απριλίου οι εργαζόμενοι στην Ελλάδα απεργούν. Διεκδικούν τα σύγχρονα δικαιώματά τους. Διεκδικούν μέτρα προστασίας του λαϊκού εισοδήματος από την ακρίβεια. Στηρίζουν τον αγώνα των εργατών της ΛΑΡΚΟ και των οικογενειών τους για να διασφαλιστούν η λειτουργία της επιχείρησης, οι θέσεις εργασίας και τα δικαιώματα των εργαζομένων, για να ακυρωθούν τα απαράδεκτα πρόστιμα.

Anna-Michelle Asimakopoulou (PPE). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η Ελλάδα καταδίκασε απερίφραστα —όπως όλοι— την εισβολή του Putin στην Ουκρανία και έστειλε ανθρωπιστική βοήθεια και αμυντικό υλικό. Η Ελλάδα διατηρεί με την Ουκρανία θρησκευτικούς δεσμούς, στενούς δεσμούς φιλίας, καθότι στη Μαριούπολη, μέχρι πριν τον πόλεμο, περισσότεροι από 150.000 Έλληνες ζούσαν και δραστηριοποιούνταν εκεί. Η Μαριούπολη, σήμερα, είναι πλήρως κατεστραμμένη. Είναι μια πόλη-φάντασμα. Η ανοικοδόμηση της Ουκρανίας, η επιστροφή των κατοίκων και η αποκατάσταση των επιπτώσεων του πολέμου πρέπει να είναι για εμάς ένα αντικείμενο σχεδιασμού, από σήμερα κιόλας. Η κυβέρνηση Μητσοτάκη, στην Ελλάδα, έχει δεσμευτεί να αποκαταστήσει το μαιευτήριο της Μαριούπολης. Είναι απαραίτητη, και σε αυτό το ζήτημα, μία κοινή ευρωπαϊκή προσέγγιση και, πράγματι, η δημιουργία αυτού του καταπιστευματικού Ταμείου Αλληλεγγύης, που συμφωνήθηκε στο Συμβούλιο, είναι στη σωστή κατεύθυνση. Δεν είναι όμως αρκετό. Σήμερα, από την αίθουσα του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου, σας καλώ ως ευρωβουλευτής από την Ελλάδα —μια χώρα που βρέθηκε πάντοτε στη σωστή πλευρά της ιστορίας— να δώσουμε προτεραιότητα στη Μαριούπολη.

Mick Wallace (The Left). – Mr President, in his excellent book *The Economic Weapon: The Rise of Sanctions as a Tool of Modern War*, Nicholas Mulder explains how economic sanctions, though meant to function as an alternative to war, are modelled on devastating techniques of warfare. Sanctions are a form of war, and often the consequences are shocking. Some 500 000 children died in Iraq because of sanctions; 40 000 people died in Venezuela in recent years because of illegal US sanctions; tens of thousands have died in Syria because of US and European sanctions. What are the sanctions that the EU has imposed on Russia going to do?

Most sanctions are illegal unless mandated by the UN. Are our sanctions on Russia going to stop the war? We don't think so. Are they designed to undermine the Russian economy? Sure, but will those in the Kremlin suffer? I doubt it. Will the ordinary Russian people suffer? Absolutely. Have we any idea of the devastation that we may cause to women, children, the elderly and the less well-off in Russia with sanctions that are not stopping the war? What are we doing?

Peter Pollák (PPE). – Vážený pán predsedajúci, pred pár dňami Slovenskom zatriaslo video, kde jeden z vedúcich predstaviteľov ruskej ambasády na Slovensku priamo korumpoval spriaznených novinárov, ktorí dlhodobo šíрили ruskú propagandu. Toto usvedčujúce video potvrdilo, že ruským agentom sa podarilo žiaľ preniknúť, respektíve ovládnuť niektoré médiá v Európe. Áno, je pravdou, že Rusku sú Európania vďační za to, že v druhej svetovej vojne bojovali proti zlu.

No jedným dychom je potrebné povedať, že Európa má s Ruskom aj zlé skúsenosti. Tak, ako tomu bolo v 68. roku, keď sa Rusom nepáčilo videnie sveta Alexandra Dubčeka a s obrovským množstvom tankov a raketami vtrhli na územie Československa pripravení zabíjať. Rovnako pripravení na zabíjanie vtrhli tentokrát na Ukrajinu. Teraz to však aj dokonali. Nezabíjajú len vojakov, ale aj nevinných civilistov, a to dokonca aj od chrbta.

Vážení priatelia, všetci by sme radi videli Rusko na tej správnej strane, tak, ako tomu bolo v prípade druhej svetovej vojny. Žiaľ, dnes po Putinovom vojsku ostávajú zbombardované domy, byty, školy, nemocnice a bohužiaľ aj zabité nevinné deti či civilisti. Putin vie, prečo posielal svojich agentov do Európy. Ich cieľom je klamstvami a propagandou zamaskovať jeho krvavú agresiu.

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Pane predsedající, zruďné činy agresora na Ukrajině volají po zřízení zvláštního mezinárodního trestního soudu. Tento soud musí trestat ohavnosti, ke kterým došlo v Buči, Irpině, Mariupolu a v dalších městech Ukrajiny. Ale také musí potrestat samozřejmě i ty nepřístojnosti, které se udělaly na úkor představitelů samospráv. Já chci o nich dnes hovořit. Je zjevné, že právě starostové a starostky se stali terčem systematických únosů. Hovoří se o více než desítkách představitelů územní samosprávy z oblasti Kyjeva, Chersonu, Charkova, Záporoží a Doněcka, kteří byli uneseni ruskými vojáky. Proč je Rusové unášejí? Nepochybně proto, že chtějí zlomit odpor místního obyvatelstva a také samozřejmě vyřadit místní autority. O osudech starostů můžeme bohužel jen spekulovat. Bohužel jsou případy tragické, např. zavraždění starostky Motyžynu Olgy Suchenkové, která byla ruskými okupanty zavražděna spolu se svým synem a manželem. Jaká hrůza! Dámy a pánové, zruďné činy agresora na Ukrajině volají po zřízení mezinárodního trestního tribunálu. A žádný zločin nemůže zůstat nepotrestán.

Miriam Lexmann (PPE). – Mr President, after horrifying images from Mariupol, Bucha, Irpin and other areas, we see more and more crimes committed every day. Bombing of civilian areas, killing of innocent people, rape, torture, looting, forced deportation of people to Russia. This is the true nature of Putin's special operation, not a liberation, as Kremlin propaganda lies day after day, but a scene of brutal war crimes. A real hell on earth.

The crimes committed by the Russian soldiers and security servicemen must be fully documented. And those responsible, from the highest ranks to the lowest, must be held responsible and brought to justice. That is why I welcome the announcement of the European Commission supporting a joint investigation mission to Ukraine to document these unspeakable crimes. To remain silent and not stand up to the evil means supporting utter moral bankruptcy.

Predsedajúci. – Tento bod programu je ukončený.

20. Goedkeuring van de notulen van deze vergadering: zie notulen

21. Agenda van de volgende vergadering

Predsedajúci. – Rokovanie je týmto ukončené a bude pokračovať zajtra, teda v utorok 5. 4. 2022 o 9.00 h., prednostnou rozpravou o vyhláseniach Rady a Komisie: Ochrana EÚ poskytovaná deťom a mladým ľuďom na úteku pred vojnou na Ukrajine [2022/2618(RSP)].

Program schôdze bude uverejnený a je k dispozícii na webovom sídle Európskeho Parlamentu.

22. Sluiting van de vergadering

(Rokovanie sa skončilo o 21.07h.)

Verklaring van de gebruikte tekens

*	Raadplegingsprocedure
***	Goedkeuringsprocedure
***I	Gewone wetgevingsprocedure (eerste lezing)
***II	Gewone wetgevingsprocedure (tweede lezing)
***III	Gewone wetgevingsprocedure (derde lezing)

(De aangeduide procedure is gebaseerd op de in de ontwerptekst voorgestelde rechtsgrond.)

Afkortingen van de commissies

AFET	Commissie buitenlandse zaken
DEVE	Commissie ontwikkelingssamenwerking
INTA	Commissie internationale handel
BUDG	Begrotingscommissie
CONT	Commissie begrotingscontrole
ECON	Commissie economische en monetaire zaken
EMPL	Commissie werkgelegenheid en sociale zaken
ENVI	Commissie milieubeheer, volksgezondheid en voedselveiligheid
ITRE	Commissie industrie, onderzoek en energie
IMCO	Commissie interne markt en consumentenbescherming
TRAN	Commissie vervoer en toerisme
REGI	Commissie regionale ontwikkeling
AGRI	Commissie landbouw en plattelandsontwikkeling
PECH	Commissie visserij
CULT	Commissie cultuur en onderwijs
JURI	Commissie juridische zaken
LIBE	Commissie burgerlijke vrijheden, justitie en binnenlandse zaken
AFCO	Commissie constitutionele zaken
FEMM	Commissie rechten van de vrouw en gendergelijkheid
PETI	Commissie verzoekschriften
DROI	Subcommissie mensenrechten
SEDE	Subcommissie veiligheid en defensie
FISC	Subcommissie belastingaangelegenheden

Afkortingen van de diverse fracties

PPE	Fractie van de Europese Volkspartij (Christen-Democraten)
S&D	Fractie van de Progressieve Alliantie van Socialisten en Democraten in het Europees Parlement
Renew	Fractie Renew Europe
Verts/ALE	Fractie De Groenen/Vrije Europese Alliantie
ID	Fractie Identiteit en Democratie
ECR	Fractie Europese Conservatieven en Hervormers
The Left	Linkse Fractie in het Europees Parlement - GUE/NGL
NI	Niet-fractiegebonden leden