



C/2024/1461

13.2.2024

DOSLOVNÝ ZÁPIS Z ROZPRÁV 25. MÁJA 2016

(C/2024/1461)

EURÓPSKY PARLAMENT

ZASADANIE 2016 – 2017

Schôdza 25. a 26. mája 2016

BRUSEL

Obsah	Strana
1. Pokračovanie prerušeného zasadania	3
2. In memoriam	3
3. Slávnostná schôdza – Holandsko	3
4. Schválenie zápisnice z predchádzajúceho rokovania: pozri zápisnicu	7
5. Návrh na vyslovenie nedôvery Komisii	7
6. Zloženie Parlamentu: pozri zápisnicu	7
7. Preskúmanie osvedčení o zvolení za poslanca: pozri zápisnicu	7
8. Delegované akty (článok 105 ods. 6 rokovacieho poriadku): pozri zápisnicu	7
9. Predložené dokumenty: pozri zápisnicu	7
10. Otázky na ústne zodpovedanie (predložené dokumenty): pozri zápisnicu	7
11. Presun rozpočtových prostriedkov: pozri zápisnicu	8
12. Kroky podniknuté na základe pozícií a uznesení Parlamentu: pozri zápisnicu	8

Obsah	Strana
13. Program práce	8
14. Rozhodnutie prijaté v súvislosti s balíkom predpisov pre jednotný digitálny trh (rozprava)	9
15. Oznámenie predsedníctva	17
16. Rozhodnutie prijaté v súvislosti s balíkom predpisov pre jednotný digitálny trh (pokračovanie rozpravy)	17
17. Príprava samitu G7 (rozprava)	28
18. Transatlantické toky údajov (rozprava)	40
19. Endokrinné disruptory: situácia po rozsudku Súdneho dvora zo 16. decembra 2015 (rozprava)	54
20. Zavádzanie cezhraničných nástrojov elektronickej identifikácie a on-line služieb (rozprava)	62
21. Vytváranie nového prístupu s dôrazom na spotrebiteľov energie – Boj proti energetickej chudobe ako súčasť energetickej únie (rozprava)	70
22. Chudoba: rodové hľadisko (stručná prezentácia)	89
23. Necolné prekážky obchodu na jednotnom trhu (stručná prezentácia)	96
24. Virtuálne meny (stručná prezentácia)	99
25. Jednominútové vystúpenia k otázkam politického významu	103
26. Program rokovania na nasledujúci deň: pozri zápisnicu	108
27. Skončenie rokovania	108

DOSLOVNÝ ZÁPIS Z ROZPRÁV 25. MÁJA 2016

VORSITZ: MARTIN SCHULZ

Präsident

(Die Sitzung wird um 15.05 Uhr eröffnet.)

1. Pokračovanie prerušeného zasadania

Der Präsident. — Ich erkläre die am Donnerstag, dem 12. Mai 2016, unterbrochene Sitzungsperiode für wieder aufgenommen.

2. In memoriam

Der Präsident. — Liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Zu Beginn dieser Plenarsitzung möchte ich eines in der letzten Woche verstorbenen Kollegen gedenken, des langjährigen Kollegen Marco Pannella, den viele von uns – auch ich selbst – über viele Jahre während seiner langen Tätigkeit im Europäischen Parlament haben kennenlernen dürfen. Ich habe ihn als einen außergewöhnlichen Menschen, als einen außergewöhnlich leidenschaftlichen Menschen erlebt. Seine Leidenschaft verschrieb Marco Pannella der Verteidigung der Bürgerrechte, dem Pazifismus und dem Pluralismus in unserer Gesellschaft. Er war ein entschiedener Gegner der Todesstrafe, ein Verfechter der Rechte von Inhaftierten, ein Verfechter der Rechte von homosexuellen Menschen, ein früher und lautstarker Befürworter der Gleichstellung von Männern und Frauen.

3. Slávnostná schôdza – Holandsko

Der Präsident. — Majestät! Es ist für das Europäische Parlament eine große Ehre, Sie heute bei uns willkommen heißen zu dürfen. Es ist gute Tradition und sicher auch eine außerordentliche Ehre für uns, dass während der Präsidentschaft das Staatsoberhaupt des Landes, das die Präsidentschaft in der Union innehat, sich an das Europäische Parlament wendet. Wir danken Ihnen, Majestät, dass Sie an dieser Tradition festhalten.

Zijne Majesteit Willem-Alexander, koning van Nederland. – Meneer de Voorzitter, leden van het Europees Parlement, het is voor mij een bijzondere ervaring in uw midden te zijn, tijdens het Nederlandse voorzitterschap van de Raad van de Europese Unie. U vertegenwoordigt de burgers van de Unie op Europees niveau. Hun wensen en verwachtingen, maar ook hun zorgen en hun angsten. Hun idealen en hun hoop, maar ook hun desillusies en hun boosheid. Alles wat de Europese kiezers beweegt, komt hier samen en mag hier gezegd en gehoord worden.

U heeft een belangrijke taak, een moeilijke taak ook, helemaal nu. Er waait een gure wind in Europa. Veel van wat ons Europeanen dierbaar is, staat onder druk.

Twee maanden geleden werd deze stad, deze wijk, getroffen door extremistische aanslagen als gevolg waarvan tweëndertig mensen van verschillende nationaliteiten om het leven kwamen. We denken vandaag aan hun nabestaanden die voor het leven getekend zijn door pijn en verdriet en aan degenen die gewond zijn geraakt en werken aan hun herstel, zo goed als mogelijk.

Brussel, de stad waar Europa samenkomt, werd in het hart geraakt. Evenals Parijs, vorig jaar, en zoveel plaatsen in de landen om ons heen. Ik noem Ankara, Aleppo, Beiroet, Bagdad, Sousse, Lahore.

Geweld en onderdrukking beheersen het leven van miljoenen mensen in de regio's om Europa. Hele samenlevingen zijn ontwricht geraakt. Ten einde raad voelen velen zich gedwongen te vluchten. Dat vergt veel van de landen die de grootste stromen vluchtelingen opvangen: Libanon, Jordanië, Turkije en een aantal landen in Afrika.

Ook de lidstaten van de Europese Unie ondervinden de gevolgen van de vluchtelingencrisis, sommige meer dan andere. De sociale spankracht van de lidstaten en de solidariteit binnen de Unie worden daardoor op de proef gesteld.

Mensen hebben behoefte aan beschutting, aan een plek waar ze zich werkelijk thuis kunnen voelen. Zoals de Duitse filosoof Rüdiger Safranski schreef: "Wir können global kommunizieren und reisen, wir können aber nicht im Globalen wohnen. Wohnen können wir nur hier oder dort."

Het is belangrijk deze menselijke gehechtheid aan een eigen plek in de wereld steeds voor ogen te hebben.

Voor veel Europeanen is het eigen land daarbij een belangrijk ankerpunt, met zijn als 'eigen' ervaren geschiedenis, traditie en gebruiken. Dat geldt ook voor de zeventien miljoen inwoners van het Europese deel van het Koninkrijk der Nederlanden. Nederlanders houden van hun land en zijn trots op de erfenis van Erasmus, Hugo de Groot, Spinoza, Rembrandt, Van Gogh, Cornelis Lely en Johan Cruijff.

Maar bij alle gehechtheid aan en liefde voor het eigen land mag nooit worden vergeten wat we te danken hebben aan de bredere Europese beschaving en aan de volken en culturen om ons heen. En daarbij gaat het niet om de minste waarden.

Het waren de Grieken die de kiem legden voor de democratische staatsvorm die wij koesteren. De Italianen gaven ons de Renaissance, een bruisende bron van vernieuwing in cultuur en wetenschap.

Het was de Franse immigrant Christophe Plantin die aan het eind van de zestiende eeuw de allereerste woordenboeken van de Nederlandse taal publiceerde. Duitse en Franse denkers als Leibniz en Voltaire legden de basis onder onze Verlichting. En het waren onze Britse en onze Poolse bondgenoten die met grote offers de Nederlandse vrijheid hebben bevochten in 1944 en 1945.

Verworvenheden zijn zelden puur nationaal. Hoe dieper je graaft, hoe sterker de wortelstelsels van onze landen en culturen zijn verknoopt en verbonden. Een territorium kun je afbakenen, een cultuur niet. Europa vertegenwoordigt ook een beschavingsideaal van persoonlijke vrijheid en menselijke waardigheid, gelijkgerechtigdheid en medemenselijkheid.

Twee keer heeft mijn moeder uw vergadering toegesproken, in 1984 en in 2004. Zij herinnerde aan de hoge verwachtingen die vele jonge mensen begin jaren zestig hadden van Europa.

"Wat met zulke prozaïsch concrete bouwstenen als kolen en staal was begonnen, groeide uit tot een beweging die de scheidsmuren in Europa zou wegnemen, de vrede zou bewaren en ons werelddeel nieuwe veerkracht en energie zou geven", zo zei zij.

Ik ben geboren in 1967. Een beeldbepalend moment voor mijn generatie was 1989, toen scheidsmuren tussen Oost- en West-Europa die onaantastbaar leken op hun grondvesten schudden en vielen. Het einde van de Koude Oorlog was het begin van een nieuw tijdperk. Er kwam ruimte voor nieuwe verbindingen. Duidelijk werd dat de Europese landen een gemeenschappelijke verantwoordelijkheid hebben.

Daar kwam geleidelijk aan nog een ander besef bij.

De positie van Europa en de wereld is binnen enkele generaties veranderd. Europa geeft niet langer automatisch de toon aan in het denken.

We zijn niet langer het centrum van de wereld, noch economisch, noch geopolitiek, noch cultureel.

De waarden die wij universeel achten worden niet overal vanzelfsprekend gevonden en staan op veel plaatsen onder druk.

Juist omdat wij geloven in die waarden en in onze gemeenschappelijke traditie is onze samenwerking zo belangrijk. Niet meer het verleden, maar de toekomst dwingt daartoe.

In deze tijden dienen wij ons af te vragen: voor welk Europa staan wij? Waarop durven wij nog trots te zijn?

De aandacht gaat vaak vooral uit naar de problemen, de gebreken en de zorgen. Maar die zorgen, hoe groot en gerechtvaardigd ook, moeten wel worden gezien binnen de context van wat mede dankzij de Europese samenwerking is bereikt.

Er is niets dat zo snel went als vrede. Sinds het Schuman-plan heeft geen enkele lidstaat meer een schot op een andere lidstaat gelost. In onze Unie zijn machtsverhoudingen ingebed in rechtsverhoudingen.

Ik behoor tot de eerste generatie Europeanen in de geschiedenis die dit geluk ten deel valt. En ik wens komende generaties datzelfde geluk toe.

(applaus)

De keuze voor Europese integratie was een keuze voor een gezamenlijke verankering van de vrije en open samenleving in een gemeenschappelijke rechtsorde. Vijfhonderd miljoen Europeanen hebben elkaar gevonden in een Unie van gedeelde waarden.

De verwezenlijking en handhaving daarvan ging en gaat met veel discussie en emotie gepaard. De gemoederen kunnen hoog oplopen, ook hier in uw Parlement. Bij het vertalen van abstracte waarden in concrete wetten, regels en plannen wordt fel gedebatteerd. De meningsverschillen kunnen groot zijn.

Dat wordt soms aangezien voor een bewijs van de zwakte van Europa, maar het is een bewijs van de kracht van Europa. Kritische reflectie, vrijheid van meningsuiting, debat en democratische controle in alle openheid horen bij ons. Alleen in dictaturen is er geen publieke discussie.

Waarom is het belangrijk dat we samen blijven optrekken? Het antwoord daarop geven we iedere dag zelf. Bij vrijwel alle grote opgaven waarmee we te maken hebben, klinkt de roep om betere samenwerking. Beheersing van vluchtelingenstromen. Bestrijding van mensenhandel, terrorisme en criminaliteit. Verbetering van onze energievoorziening. Beheersing van de klimaatverandering. Het mogelijk maken van economische groei en nieuwe banen voor de ruim tweeëntwintig miljoen Europeanen die zonder werk zitten. En ook: versterking van onze positie als moreel baken tegen de machten die de vrijheid bedreigen. Bij al deze opgaven hebben wij elkaar nodig.

Zoals Erasmus vijfhonderd jaar geleden schreef: "Niets is gemakkelijker dan hen te overwinnen die verdeeld zijn."

Europa is in haar verscheidenheid één. Ieders inbreng is essentieel. Het Europese boekje is niet compleet zonder de Spaanse anjer, de Franse fleur-de-lys, de Griekse acanthus, de Deense margriet, de Duitse korenbloem, de Oostenrijkse edelweiss, de Kroatische iris, de Nederlandse en Hongaarse tulpen en niet zonder de English rose.

De Europese Unie kan de wereld met opgeheven hoofd tegemoet treden. Maar dat ontslaat ons niet van de plicht open te staan voor kritiek en ook kritisch naar onszelf te kijken.

Vaak pakken we urgente gemeenschappelijke vraagstukken pas aan als de nood zo hoog gestegen is dat er geen alternatieven meer zijn.

Dat is gebeurd bij de bankencrisis en onlangs bij de humanitaire crisis als gevolg van de vluchtelingenstroom uit Syrië en andere conflictgebieden. Anticiperen is niet Europa's sterkste kant. Europa kan immers niet sneller bewegen dan de lidstaten toestaan. De interactie tussen de Unie en de lidstaten, en tussen bijvoorbeeld dit Parlement en nationale parlementen, over nieuwe uitdagingen en problemen aan de horizon is daarom belangrijker dan ooit. Tegelijkertijd stelt dit ook eisen aan de wijze waarop Europa functioneert.

Dit geldt ook bij de versterking van onze economie. Onze jongeren zijn ons toekomstig kapitaal. Doen wij genoeg om goede toekomstmogelijkheden te bieden? Het onbenutte potentieel van onze interne markt is begroot op 1 250 miljard euro. Zestig jaar na de vorming van de gemeenschappelijke markt moet dat te denken geven.

Economisch en sociaal perspectief voor iedereen is wezenlijk. Het werk daaraan omvat veel méér dan alleen het aanjagen van economische groei via de interne markt. Onze gemeenschappelijke rechtsorde is immers ook een sociale rechtsorde. Het gaat ook om gelijke kansen.

Het recht om in een andere lidstaat te studeren, te werken, te ondernemen en van voorzieningen gebruik te maken, is een fantastische verworvenheid. Maar we mogen nooit het perspectief vergeten van de thuisblijvers. Zij ervaren niet zozeer de extra mogelijkheden, maar extra concurrentie.

Europa betekent nu voor sommigen: je vleugels uitslaan. En voor anderen: inschikken.

De zorg van veel mensen over dit Europa vermengt zich gemakkelijk met onbehagen over de manier waarop de Europese Unie wordt bestuurd. Sommigen zien Brussel eerder als boeman en bemoeial dan als bondgenoot. Lang is geprobeerd een Europees ideaalbeeld in stand te houden. Een beeld van een steeds verder gaande uitbouw van de Europese constructie. Maar zoals bij het bouwen van een stabiele brug, moet altijd rekening worden gehouden met de materiaalwetten van spanning en rek en met de verankering van de basis. Om te voorkomen dat een breekpunt wordt bereikt.

Deze noodzaak tot 'versterking van de draagconstructie' wordt binnen de Europese instellingen en ook binnen het Europees Parlement erkend. Het antwoord luidt: niet méér regels, maar regels die beter werken. Concentratie van de Europese aandacht op de hoofdzaken, die werkelijk een gezamenlijke aanpak vereisen. Besluitvorming zo dicht mogelijk bij mensen zelf.

Dat versterkt niet alleen de effectiviteit van de EU, maar komt ook tegemoet aan de zorg van burgers hun greep op ontwikkelingen te verliezen en hun culturele identiteit kwijt te raken.

Burgers kunnen alleen Europese burgers worden als ze zich in eigen land, stad en dorp thuis blijven voelen. Europa begint aan de keukentafel. Een trotse Europeaan is - en moet ook - een trotse Fin, Fransman, Pool, Portugees, Brit, Bulgaar, Griek, Duitser of Nederlander zijn.

Geen enkele politieke orde kan zonder een nauwe band met het publiek. De Europese Unie mag geen eliteproject zijn; alle burgers van de lidstaten moeten zich in de Unie thuis kunnen voelen. De Europese Unie is immers van ons allemaal. Van de hoogleraar, de vrachtwagenchauffeur, de kleine ondernemer, de werkzoekende, de gepensioneerde fabrieksarbeider, de vluchteling met een verblijfsvergunning, de schoolverlater.

Jaarlijks bezoekt een op de drie Europeanen een ander Europees land. Twee derde doet dit dus niet.

Voor al deze burgers moet de Europese Unie voldoende zeggingskracht hebben. Onze Unie is er voor de reislustigen en voor de honkvasten.

Als direct gekozen instelling van de Europese Unie, heeft u hierbij een bijzondere verantwoordelijkheid. Ten opzichte van uw kiezers, maar ook ten opzichte van de velen die hun stem in Europa alleen via nationale verkiezingen laten horen. De uitslag van verkiezingen en referenda - ook in mijn land - kan ontwikkelingen in Europees verband gecompliceerd maken. Maar het Europese verhaal kan alleen samen worden geschreven. Het kan alleen verder worden gebracht als kiezers en gekozenen naar elkaar willen luisteren, in Europa en in eigen land.

Al zestig jaar is de Europese samenwerking een brug die we bouwen naar de toekomst. Aanvankelijk was die brug smal, maar in de loop der jaren werd de basis breder, het eisenpakket groter en reikten de ambities verder. Of de constructie ons kan blijven dragen, is aan ons. Alles hangt af van de mate waarin wij erin slagen de verbindingen sterk en het bouwwerk stabiel te houden. Essentieel daarbij bent u, als vertegenwoordigers van de burgers van Europa, in al hun diversiteit.

Maar hoe groot de diversiteit ook is en hoeveel wij ook van elkaar verschillen: er is meer, véél meer dat ons verenigt.

Ik wens u allen van ganser harte succes toe in uw belangrijke werk.

(De vergadering staat op en applaudisseert voor de spreker)

Der Präsident. — Vielen Dank, Majestät, für Ihre ermutigende Rede. Vielen Dank für Ihren Hinweis auf die besondere Rolle des Europäischen Parlaments. Ich glaube, ich spreche im Namen aller Kolleginnen und Kollegen, wenn ich Ihnen sage: Wir sind auch bereit, diese besondere Rolle anzunehmen und für ein Europa der Bürgerinnen und Bürger und ihre Rechte zu kämpfen.

4. Schválenie zápisnice z predchádzajúceho rokovania: pozri zápisnicu

5. Návrh na vyslovenie nedôvery Komisii

Der Präsident. — Wie im Plenum am 12. Mai bekannt gegeben, habe ich einen Misstrauensantrag gegen die Kommission erhalten. Am Mittwoch, dem 18. Mai, habe ich Sie darüber informiert, dass eine Reihe von Mitgliedern ihre Unterschrift unter diesen Misstrauensantrag zurückgezogen hat. Diese Information finden Sie auch auf der Webseite Plenartagung. Da der Misstrauensantrag somit nicht von einem Zehntel der Mitglieder des Parlaments unterstützt wurde, war der Antrag hinfällig. Das Verfahren ist damit abgeschlossen.

Jean-Luc Schaffhauser (ENF). – Monsieur le Président, à ce sujet, les signatures avaient été déposées, nous étions donc dans un acte régulier. À un moment donné, il y a un retrait, mais nous sommes dans une situation de vide juridique. Alors j'aimerais comprendre quelle est la jurisprudence en la matière et pourquoi, alors que le formalisme a été préservé – effectivement, il y eu un retrait, mais tout ce qui a été fait d'un point de vue formel est régulier et nous sommes dans un vide juridique –, pourquoi vous reculez sur cette motion de censure sur les perturbateurs endocriniens.

Je trouve qu'il est un peu dommage que nous n'allions pas dans cette voie parce que la résolution n'a pas cette portée contraignante. J'espère que notre Parlement n'est pas sous influence dans ce domaine-là.

Der Präsident. — Vielen Dank. Wir haben in der absoluten Überprüfung der notwendigen Verfahren gehandelt. Wer einen Antrag unterzeichnet, kann bis zum Ende des Verfahrens seine Unterschrift zurückziehen. Wird eine Unterschrift zurückgezogen, dann ist der Antrag hinfällig, sofern nicht sofort ein anderes Mitglied eintritt und den Antrag übernimmt. Das ist Artikel 169 Absatz 4 der Geschäftsordnung. Da keine Ersatzunterschriften geleistet wurden, wurde das Mindestquorum dementsprechend nicht erreicht. Dann ist der Antrag hinfällig.

6. Zloženie Parlamentu: pozri zápisnicu

7. Preskúmanie osvedčení o zvolení za poslanca: pozri zápisnicu

8. Delegované akty (článok 105 ods. 6 rokovacieho poriadku): pozri zápisnicu

9. Predložené dokumenty: pozri zápisnicu

10. Otázky na ústne zodpovedanie (predložené dokumenty): pozri zápisnicu

11. Presun rozpočtových prostriedkov: pozri zápisnicu

12. Kroky podniknuté na základe pozícií a uznesení Parlamentu: pozri zápisnicu

13. Program práce

Der Präsident. — Der endgültige Entwurf der Tagesordnung dieser Tagung, wie er in der Konferenz der Präsidenten in ihrer Sitzung vom Donnerstag, dem 12. Mai 2016 gemäß Artikel 149 der Geschäftsordnung festgelegt wurde, ist verteilt worden.

Philippe Lamberts (Verts/ALE). – Monsieur le Président, nous allons donc traiter de la question de l'attitude de la Commission concernant les perturbateurs endocriniens.

Ce qui est particulier à cette situation, c'est que l'institution européenne, qui est la gardienne des traités, foule aux pieds ces mêmes traités selon en tout cas l'avis de notre service juridique. Selon ce dernier, il n'y a pas de doute que la Commission n'a pas encore pris les mesures qui sont requises de sa part en vertu de l'article 266 du traité sur le fonctionnement de l'Union européenne. Dès lors, nous demandons l'adoption d'une résolution, parce que c'est quand même bien la moindre des choses que ce Parlement puisse faire pour rappeler la Commission à sa mission.

Si une motion de censure est clairement un instrument disproportionné pour cette affaire, adopter une résolution est bien la moindre des choses que ce Parlement puisse faire. De quoi aurions-nous l'air si nous nous contentons d'une simple discussion entre nous? La Commission peut dire qu'elle s'en tire à très bon compte.

Kathleen Van Brempt (S&D). – Mr President, our Group would strongly like to support the request of the Greens, we support it fully. As has been mentioned, the Court has already ruled against the Commission for not applying the rules correctly and I think it is very important that we state that clearly to the Commission in a resolution. It is very important that they come up with strict rules on endocrine disruptors, not based on an unlawful impact assessment but based on scientific criteria.

Der Präsident. — Vielen Dank. Möchte jemand gegen den Antrag sprechen? Ich sehe niemanden.

Louis Aliot (ENF). – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, la situation au Congo-Brazzaville est devenue très difficile, après un référendum abusif pour prolonger le mandat du chef d'État – qui est là depuis 32 ans –, une présidentielle chaotique du 20 mars, des bombardements de régions entières acquises à l'opposition et la mise sous surveillance ou résidence surveillée de plusieurs candidats de l'opposition, dont le général Mokoko, qui avait d'ailleurs commandé les forces africaines en Centrafrique. Le Parlement européen se saisit, en général, des atteintes aux droits de l'homme ou des questions relatives aux régimes démocratiques douteux, et je pense qu'il est temps aujourd'hui de rétablir un certain nombre de vérités et de tenir un débat sur la situation au Congo-Brazzaville.

Mario Borghezio (ENF). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, ritengo che l'atto molto preoccupante della richiesta, da parte del governo eletto in questa situazione così caotica, del ritiro dell'ambasciatore dell'Unione europea, del rappresentante dell'Unione europea, aggiunga motivazioni di preoccupazione e di incertezza ad un quadro che è stato descritto molto bene nell'intervento precedente.

Credo che siamo di fronte ad una situazione molto grave, sulla quale è opportuna, necessaria ed urgente una discussione in questo Parlamento.

Der Präsident. — Möchte jemand gegen den Antrag sprechen? Ich sehe niemanden.

Xabier Benito Ziluaga (GUE/NGL). – Señor Presidente, aprovechamiento de sus influencias para dar el visto bueno a una mina de uranio en Salamanca; familia estrechamente ligada al oligopolio petrolero; familia, más cercana aún, aparecida en los papeles de Panamá. Dos testigos de la investigación por corrupción política conocida como «caso Acuamed» han señalado al señor Arias Cañete como presunto responsable. Y, por último, votó favorablemente a una polémica amnistía fiscal cuando existía conflicto de intereses de su persona.

Son las sospechas que a día de hoy envuelven a nuestro Comisario de Acción Climática y Energía, y el Parlamento Europeo es responsable si no actúa ante esta situación, como también será responsable la gran coalición de populares y socialistas europeos que permitió este nombramiento mercadeado junto con otros nombramientos de la Cámara.

Si no se acepta esta comparecencia, será triste... -abucead..., nosotros no hemos decidido estos casos de presunta corrupción-; si no se acepta, será triste que el Partido Popular esté exportando un modelo de corrupción también a Europa. El modelo de un partido que ha recibido financiación ilegal durante años en España. Sí, Señorías, así es. El Comisario debería defender los intereses de los europeos y europeas y debería comparecer en esta Cámara dando sus explicaciones si no quiere seguir dañando la confianza de la ciudadanía en las propias instituciones europeas.

Kathleen Van Brempt (S&D). – Mr President, we would like to explain: we do not support the request of the GUE today. This is not because we do not think this is a serious matter, or might be a serious matter. It is not because we do not think we need full transparency on these issues. It is precisely because we think we need full transparency, and because we think to take this very seriously, that we need more time to look at these issues and these questions in depth – and then come back to the plenary, look at what is the best methodology to deal with this matter and by preference, have a good discussion in advance in the Conference of Presidents.

Françoise Grossetête (PPE). – Monsieur le Président, nous connaissons tous Miguel Arias Cañete. C'est un commissaire de grand talent qui, jusqu'ici, a conduit sa tâche avec énormément de compétence, comme on a pu le voir, entre autres, lors des négociations de la COP 21 l'année dernière.

Sa déclaration d'intérêts a été soumise à la Commission. Elle est en conformité avec le code de conduite des commissaires et comprend toutes les activités professionnelles et les intérêts financiers de son épouse qui auraient été susceptibles de créer un conflit d'intérêts. Le commissaire a donc joué le jeu de la transparence.

Je regrette que, pour des raisons de politique politicienne, l'extrême gauche s'acharne depuis le début sur le commissaire Arias Cañete et essaie de trouver tous les moyens possibles pour le discréditer. C'est pour cela que notre groupe PPE s'oppose à cette demande.

Der Präsident. — Es wurde beantrag, diese Abstimmung in namentlicher Abstimmung durchzuführen.

14. Rozhodnutie prijaté v súvislosti s balíkom predpisov pre jednotný digitálny trh (rozprava)

Der Präsident. — Als erster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über die Erklärung der Kommission zu dem angenommenen Beschluss über das Paket für den digitalen Binnenmarkt (2016/2587(RSP)).

PRESIDENZA DELL'ON. ANTONIO TAJANI

Vicepresidente

Andrus Ansip, Vice-President of the Commission. – Mr President, today the Commission made a major advance towards creating a true Digital Single Market for Europe, with two new packages of initiatives. The first will boost cross-border online trading across Europe: removing barriers, raising consumer confidence and ending discrimination. The second responds to new digital realities, with a modern policy approach to online platforms and broadcasting rules. Both packages reflect commitments that the Commission made in its Digital Single Market strategy that I presented to this House in Strasbourg one year ago. Both are vital for a properly functioning Digital Single Market across all countries of the European Union.

Let me begin with the e-commerce package. We want to open up the e-commerce market so that it becomes truly pan-European, with fair conditions for consumers and business across the EU's internal borders. While more and more goods and services are traded over the internet, cross-border online sales within the EU are only growing slowly. This should change. Consumers as well as businesses deserve better. They should not be limited to their domestic markets. They should be able to make the best of the opportunities offered by Europe's single market in the digital age.

Our package addresses three main areas. First, it will prevent unjustified discrimination, online as well as offline. In a true single market, you should not be discriminated against based on your nationality, residence or place of establishment. However, that does not mean making companies sell or deliver goods in every EU market. But if a consumer comes to their online store, they should be treated as if they were locals – not treated differently. But this would not include the obligation to deliver: traders would not be required to deliver cross-border but sell to them as to customers from their own country.

Second, it will increase transparency of parcel delivery prices, encourage competition, and make regulatory oversight of cross-border parcel delivery services more effective. This will help consumers get a better and affordable deal, also a wider choice. It will help small e-retailers to reach new customers. It will create more business for delivery providers. And to be clear: there is no intention of imposing a single price across Europe.

Third, our package will raise consumer and SME trust in e-commerce by clarifying the nature of unfair commercial practices and strengthening the enforcement of consumer rights across borders. It will also strengthen cooperation between national consumer protection authorities. Together, these measures aim to remove the main barriers to e-commerce.

Online platforms are a new reality to which Europe should respond and should embrace. In a short time, they have transformed our daily lives: how we sell, shop and travel; how we learn, create and are entertained. They bring many benefits to consumers, to wider society, to industry, business and SMEs.

The guiding principle and objective is to create the right conditions for platforms to innovate, scale up and grow in the Digital Single Market. But they should do so in a fair and open atmosphere. That means equal conditions for fair and open competition. Everyone involved in the market – traditional and online service providers – should play by the same rules, with no discrimination.

Our assessment has shown that platforms are innovative, have a positive impact on our economy, and increase competitiveness. It shows that the EU is quite good in areas such as the app economy, health, finance and the collaborative economy.

In order to thrive, all platforms – including European ones – need a legal environment that gives them certainty. This is why we are very clear in our communication: there will be no horizontal new regulation or regulator for platforms. We will not change the current e-commerce framework and its liability provisions. Of course, platforms – as well as all internet providers and online intermediaries – have to respect EU law and fundamental rights. They also have to act responsibly regarding content, and keep their activities transparent. These are important principles. This is why we are taking a problem-driven approach. It means that if we see an issue with platforms in relation to copyright, we solve it in our copyright rules. If there is an issue related to telecoms, we solve it in our telecom package.

The first steps in this have already been taken today, with our proposal on the Audio-visual Media Services directive, where online platforms are a part of this instrument's new scope. The principles that I mentioned also apply to broadcasting, where the significant presence of online platforms and video-on-demand providers has transformed viewing habits and behaviour.

Today's rules need to change to reflect this new reality, and make sure that everyone follows the same rules. Since it has worked well, there is no need to change the 'country of origin' principle. Media service providers will continue to be subject to the rules of the country where they are based. Our proposal will also bring more flexibility to advertising rules, and bolster our efforts to promote European creative work by raising its prominence. It will strengthen protection of minors who go online to view content. It will strengthen the role played by national media regulators.

I look forward to working closely with the European Parliament, so that together we can turn these two important packages of proposals into a reality. They are essential for building the Digital Single Market that Europe needs: one where all Europeans will gain.

Andreas Schwab, *im Namen der PPE-Fraktion.* – Herr Präsident! Herr Vizepräsident! Liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Zunächst einmal, Herr Vizepräsident Ansip, im Namen der EVP herzlichen Glückwunsch zu diesem Paket! Wir glauben, dass die Europäische Kommission – jedenfalls aus der Sicht der Europäischen Volkspartei – genau die richtigen Schritte mutig angegangen ist, die jetzt angegangen werden müssen, und gleichzeitig Vorsicht hat walten lassen in den Bereichen, wo wir noch etwas mehr Erkundungen aus den Märkten einholen müssen, um sicher zu sein, dass wir die richtigen Schritte gehen.

Der wichtige große Punkt, den Sie machen, ist der Vorschlag zum Geoblocking, der letzten Bereich, in dem sich Unternehmen im Europäischen Binnenmarkt in den letzten Jahren wieder eine neue Nische eingerichtet haben, bei dem Verbraucherinnen und Verbraucher am Ende das Nachsehen haben. Das Beispiel des Disneyland in Paris ist das Prominenteste gewesen, es gibt viele andere. Hier haben Sie – glaube ich – an den richtigen Schnittstellen, wo tatsächlich Einheitlichkeit im europäischen Binnenmarkt notwendig ist, die richtigen Schwerpunkte gesetzt.

Natürlich werden wir uns im Rahmen der Beratung an der einen oder anderen Stelle noch kritisch hiermit auseinandersetzen müssen. Manche sagen, dass in bestimmten Bereichen auch mehr möglich wäre, aber wir wollen es in dem Maße tun, dass alle Europäerinnen und Europäer am Ende von diesem Paket profitieren.

Herr Kommissar, Sie haben auch gesagt, dass Sie bei den Plattformen einer horizontalen Regelung eine Absage erteilen wollen. Das ist wahrscheinlich auf der Basis der Erkenntnisse der *sector inquiry* der richtige Schritt, aber das bedeutet aus unserer Sicht keinesfalls, dass deswegen nichts zu tun wäre. Im Bereich der Netzwerk- und Informationssicherheit haben wir bereits erste Schritte bei der Plattform-Gesetzgebung begonnen.

Sie haben selber angekündigt, dass Sie dort, wo Notwendigkeit besteht, weitere Schritte sektorbezogen gehen wollen. Wir als EVP-Fraktion wollen diesen Weg sehr gerne mitgehen, weil wir glauben, dass ein EU-weit fairer Wettbewerb zwischen den Onlineplattformen in Europa, aber auch mit jenen, die von außerhalb Europas hier mitarbeiten, notwendig ist, um am Ende sicherzustellen, dass der europäische Binnenmarkt mit 500 Millionen Verbraucherinnen und Verbrauchern allen Vorteile bringt. Dafür sind weitere Schritte notwendig, die wir im parlamentarischen Verfahren jetzt gerne beraten.

Evelyne Gebhardt, *im Namen der S&D-Fraktion.* – Herr Präsident! Herr Ansip! Dankeschön dafür, dass Sie uns dieses Paket an Maßnahmen vorstellen, die die Europäische Kommission vorhat. Es hat lange gedauert, aber endlich ist es da, und dafür kann ich Sie nur beglückwünschen. Unser Parlament arbeitet seit 2011 daran, dieses Paket doch endlich mal auf den Weg zu bringen.

Ich glaube, in der analogen Welt wäre es völlig undenkbar, dass ein Käufer in einem Laden abgewiesen wird, lediglich weil er in einem anderen Staat lebt. Genau das ist das, was zurzeit noch im Interneteinkauf geschieht. Das ist eines der Dinge, die wir beim Geoblocking auf jeden Fall verhindern müssen, denn das ist schlicht und einfach Diskriminierung von Menschen je nachdem, aus welchem Land sie sind oder auch ob sie eine Kreditkarte haben, die in dem richtigen Land ausgestellt worden ist. Das ist in einen Binnenmarkt, in dem wir die Menschen in den Mittelpunkt unserer Sorge bringen wollen, inakzeptabel.

Sie haben auch gesagt, dass Sie auf keinen Fall eine horizontale Herangehensweise in Bezug auf die Plattformen wollen. Dafür beglückwünsche ich Sie. Bereits in unserem Bericht vom Januar haben wir als Parlament gesagt, das wäre der falsche Weg, weil die Plattformen so unterschiedlich gestaltet sind, dass man eben nicht eine Lösung für alle bringen kann, sondern die spezifischen Probleme in diesen Bereichen angehen muss, wenn es sein muss, eben auch sektoral. Ich denke, dass ist die richtige Herangehensweise, so können wir vorangehen.

Was auch angegangen werden muss, und das wird in diesem Paket hoffentlich auch sehr stark für die Verbraucher und Verbraucherinnen der Fall sein, ist, dass wir auch mehr Transparenz beim Einkauf im Internet haben, damit die Bürger und Bürgerinnen nicht dadurch übervorteilt werden, dass eben intransparente Informationen da sind oder aber versteckte Gebühren oder aber, dass das Unternehmen erst am Ende eines Bestellvorgangs sagt: Sorry, in Ihr Land können wir nicht versenden, weil beispielsweise die Paketkosten zu hoch sind.

Das ist das nächste Thema, das auch sehr stark und ganz wichtig ist, nämlich die Paketzustellung europaweit so zu organisieren, dass der Onlinemarkt auch wirklich europäisch gestaltet wird.

Hans-Olaf Henkel, *im Namen der ECR-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident! Herr Kommissar! Ich habe mein ganzes Leben in dieser Branche verbracht, und mir ist dabei immer wieder aufgefallen, dass Europa auch in dieser Branche leider Schritt über Schritt zurückfällt.

Erinnern Sie sich noch an den europäischen Computerhersteller? Deutschland hatte einmal Nixdorf und Siemens, Frankreich hatte Bull, Italien Olivetti, die Engländer ICL. Inzwischen spielt die Musik in Amerika und neuerdings auch in Asien. Ein Grund dafür ist die Tatsache, dass wir immer noch keinen digitalen Binnenmarkt haben – sicherlich eins der wichtigsten Projekte dieser Kommission. Obwohl unsere Fraktion immer der Meinung ist, dass wir in vielerlei Hinsicht unter einem Zuviel an Europa leiden, muss ich Ihnen sagen: Hier ist mehr Europa angebracht, und deshalb unterstützen wir die Arbeit von Ihnen und von Ihrem Kollegen Oettinger.

Dita Charanzová, *on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – Mr President, I should like to thank the Commission Vice-President for coming to this House, but above all for proposing these new legislative proposals and communications. Mr Vice-President, I have to say you are doing well: keep it up, and please keep pushing all the institutions, including the Council, to deliver on the digital single market.

The adoption of several proposals this week is a good sign that the Commission is serious in its efforts to make Europe a leading part of the digital revolution. But, Mr Vice-President, I have to say that not all proposals have been winners with everyone – most, but not all. While my Group fully supports the digital contracts proposals, I encourage you to complete the Refit exercise as soon as possible so we can unblock both of these files.

On portability, a wonderful and straightforward proposal, we are seeing attempts to introduce extreme verification systems that would track users in order just to give them the right to watch a movie. The ALDE Group will fight for a balanced text but we will need your support.

As to your proposals today, we welcome the proposal on unjustified geo-blocking and fully endorse to fight against discrimination between different EU citizens. When combined with greater transparency in parcel deliveries, we get closer to a single market that is built on trust and respect between consumers and businesses, and this is vital for e-commerce.

But, Mr Vice-President, we will need more convincing on the communication on platforms and any further actions arising from it. The definition of platform is so wide that almost the whole internet fits inside it. This is a recipe for over-regulation and this must be prevented.

Dennis de Jong, *namens de GUE/NGL-Fractie*. – Mijnheer de voorzitter, de Commissie wil alle regels over aankopen via internet harmoniseren en er één grote markt van maken. Dat is bepaald niet onlogisch, maar het is heel veel tegelijk en dat betekent ook dat de concrete problemen voor het mkb en ook voor consumenten soms toch niet worden opgelost. Ik noem twee voorbeelden, er zijn er heel veel. De Commissie erkent dat het voor mkb-bedrijven vaak moeilijk is om goed zichtbaar te zijn in de resultaten van zoekmachines, zoals Google, of op prijsvergelijkingsites. Grote bedrijven hebben nu eenmaal meer geld om op dat soort platforms prioriteit te krijgen en het gevolg is dat de consument geen totaaloverzicht van alle aanbieders krijgt. Hoewel dat voor het mkb een acuut probleem is, gaat de Commissie eerst een half jaar verder studeren om te zien of dat via zelfregulering op te lossen is. Ik vind dat een gemiste kans. Iedere dag dat een bedrijf niet zichtbaar is op platforms kost omzet en ondermijnt het gelijke speelveld verder. Ik pleit dan ook voor meer draagkracht op dat gebied.

Een heel ander voorbeeld: een praktisch probleem waar consumenten tegenaan lopen zijn de woekerprijzen voor concertkaartjes. In haar voorstellen hamert de Commissie op de regel dat een website die dat soort kaartjes aanbiedt voor alle consumenten in de Europese Unie dezelfde prijs moet rekenen. Dat is mooi, maar een veel groter probleem is het gebrek aan transparantie van de verschillende aanbieders van kaartjes. Zo kan het voorkomen dat grote partijen ondershands worden doorverkocht en de kaartjes op de site van de organisatie zijn uitverkocht, maar via andere handelaren op internet worden aangeboden tegen woekerprijzen. Gaat de Commissie daar ook wat aan doen?

Julia Reda, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Mr President, the long-awaited proposal for a regulation on geo-blocking could have been a really good proposal if you had been just a bit more ambitious, Commissioner. It has clear rules for banning geo-blocking, it addresses the concerns about the applicable law and the obligation to deliver it in a very clever way, but unfortunately at the same time it also misses the core of the problem. We all know that, when we ask consumers what they think about geo-blocking, the first thing they think about is 'this video is not available in your country'. Video is, of course, completely exempt from the regulation and – apparently at the last minute – other copyrighted content has also been removed from the obligation to ban geo-blocking.

Now you say that we will deal with copyright problems in copyright proposals, but the problem with this is that there is a lot of geo-blocking of copyrighted materials, particularly videos, that has nothing to do with copyright. So where will these issues be addressed? I do not see anything in the audiovisual regulation that would address the geo-blocking of videos that is not for copyright reasons. I do not think it is OK just to say that it is a copyright problem, because quite often it can simply be the seller who decides for commercial reasons that dividing the market will make him more money. So the Commission, and now Parliament, has to be extremely careful not to create any regulatory gaps, so that the end result will really be an end to geo-blocking in the whole of Europe.

Barbara Kappel, *im Namen der ENF-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident! Herr Kommissar Ansip! Sie haben uns vor etwa einem Jahr eine Strategie für den digitalen Binnenmarkt vorgelegt, die unter anderem als wesentlichen Punkt den besseren Onlinezugang für Verbraucher und Unternehmen vorsah. Dieser Punkt umfasste vier Unterpunkte.

Der erste Punkt: Bessere Regeln für grenzüberschreitenden E-Commerce. Sie sagten damals, dass pro Jahr 11,7 Milliarden Euro für die Verbraucher eingespart werden könnten, gäbe es besseren Onlinehandel. Der zweite Punkt: Günstige grenzüberschreitende Paketzustellung aus dem Wissen, dass hohe Preise und ineffiziente Paketzustellung natürlich Onlinehandel behindern. Der dritte Punkt: Geoblocking verhindern, wobei sicherlich eine Balance zwischen Verbraucherinteressen und Rechtssicherheit von Unternehmen notwendig ist. Der letzte Punkt: Besserer Zugang zu digitalen Inhalten.

Ich würde sagen, das heute präsentierte Paket führt sicherlich zu einer Verbesserung des Konsumentenschutzes. Onlineshopping wird leichter und auch günstiger werden. Ob die Konsumenten zufrieden sein werden? Wenn sie zwar online kaufen können, der Händler aber nicht liefern muss, wird dies vielleicht manche verstimmen. Aber generell kann man sicherlich sagen, dass es zu einer Verbesserung führt. Auch das Vertrauen wird verbessert, indem betrügerische Websites vom Netz genommen werden und bessere Identifizierung notwendig ist. Und sicherlich werden Ihnen auch die nationalen Budgets dankbar sein, indem Sie die 20-Prozent-Quote für die audiovisuellen Inhalte europäischer Provenienz festgelegt haben. Das ist sicherlich ein sehr interessanter Vorstoß, und die Kulturbudgets der Länder werden sich sehr darüber freuen.

Krišjānis Kariņš (PPE). – Priekšsēdētāja kungs! Komisāra kungs! Manā bērnībā — es skatos pa zāli — mūsu bērnībā nopirkt preci nozīmēja aiziet uz veikalu, izņemt naudu, atdot naudu, saņemt preci, iet atkal mājās. Tā mēs agrāk visi iepirkāmies. Protams, kopš tiem laikiem pasaule ir ļoti mainījies tieši tehnoloģiju attīstības dēļ. Šodien ļoti bieži — daži no mums pat visbiežāk — nopērk preci nevis fiziski aizejot uz kādu veikalu, kas varbūt mums ir tuvu, bet mēs vai nu apsēžamies pie datora, izņemam planšeti, vai pat lietojam savu mobilo telefonu un nopērkam kādu preci, izmantojot interneta iespējas.

Bet tā grūtība, kas mums rodas, ir tā, ka, kaut gan mums liekas, ka mēs tepat vien esam, paņemam un kaut ko nopērkam, ļoti bieži vieta, kur mēs pērkam, ne tikai nav mums blakus, tā pat nav mūsu valstī, tā ir pavisam kaut kur citur Eiropā. Un tā grūtība, ko mēs zinām, ir tā, ka kaut gan tehnoloģijas mums atļauj šo procesu darīt — varētu teikt — nesāpīgi, bez grūtībām, tomēr ir atsevišķi likumi vai valsts regulējumi, kas faktiski diskriminē pircēju atkarībā no tā, kurā valstī viņš atrodas tajā brīdī, kad pērk. Tātad vienai un tai pašai precei var būt dažādas pārdošanas cenas, arī dažādas sūtīšanas cenas, kaut gan attālums to neattiecinā. Tas ir tas, ko es ļoti apsveicu — Komisijas apņemšanos likvidēt tā saucamo ģeogrāfisko bloķēšanu vai diskrimināciju, jo, ja mēs vēlamies šo vienoto tirgu, arī digitālajam tirgum jābūt vienotam, lai būtu tāpat kā iepriekš blakus veikālā un nopirkt. Nav vairs no svara, kurā valstī mēs esam un no kuras mēs pērkam.

Patrizia Toia (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, oggi la crescita, contrariamente che in passato, si fonda su due elementi chiave, l'energia e le comunicazioni elettroniche, se vogliamo puntare alla sostenibilità ed alla dimensione globale.

Per questo, signor Commissario, apprezziamo molto il *digital single market*, le misure attuative che iniziano ad arrivare e tutti i provvedimenti collegati, perché rappresentano proprio la nuova architettura, le nuove regole, i nuovi diritti di questo mondo che sta ormai sviluppandosi.

L'accesso libero da ostacoli e da barriere al mercato unico darà sicuramente maggiori opportunità, ed è un grande passo in avanti il fatto che cittadini e imprese, consumatori e operatori possano portare con sé, all'interno dell'Unione, i loro diritti: diritti digitali, diritti produttivi, diritti di consumo, diritti e valori; insomma, potranno girare senza limiti e ostacoli. E anche le piccole e medie imprese, imprese commerciali e produttive, che oggi hanno molto timore rispetto a questi cambiamenti, devono essere aiutate a gestire questo passaggio, a cogliere le opportunità ed a gestire i rischi.

In Parlamento presteremo molta attenzione alla regolamentazione, è stato detto negli interventi. Dipenderà molto dalla regolamentazione facilitare questo processo in senso positivo, riducendone i rischi: una regolamentazione chiara, flessibile, che abbia grande attenzione a tutti i diritti. Ripeto, quelli economici e produttivi, ma anche alla privacy, alla sicurezza in ogni senso e ai nuovi diritti, personali e collettivi.

Parliamo molto di servizi, ma non possiamo dimenticare – io sono della commissione industria – che il digitale sta investendo massicciamente anche in tutto il mondo produttivo, e il fenomeno nuovo è che manifatturiero e servizi si mescolano, si mescolano nella proprietà delle aziende, ma si mescolano anche proprio nei processi produttivi, nei nuovi modelli di business e nelle nuove relazioni industriali – penso a tutto il tema di «industria 4.0» ecc.

Importanti saranno le infrastrutture. Senza infrastrutture non potremo assolutamente aprire allo sviluppo della banda larga e penso al provvedimento che stiamo esaminando per la redistribuzione delle frequenze, perché le frequenze privilegiate vadano proprio allo sviluppo dei servizi e delle telecomunicazioni. Ma non tutto è infrastrutture e tecnologia, c'è anche il fattore umano, e c'è anche la formazione.

(L'oratore accetta di rispondere a una domanda «cartellino blu» (articolo 162, paragrafo 8, del regolamento)).

Ангел Джамбазки (ECR), въпрос, зададен чрез вдигане на синя карта. – Уважаема колега, говорихте преди малко за индустрията, за производителите и за потребителите. Не смятате ли, че именно това е ролята на Комисията и това трябваше да видим в това предложение, именно предвидени от Комисията мерки за постигане на баланс между правата на потребителите и интересите на бизнеса, без да се слага допълнителна тежест или да има ущърб върху едната или другата страна?

Patrizia Toia (S&D), risposta a una domanda «cartellino blu». – Ho parlato proprio dei provvedimenti collegati, perché penso che l'azione della Commissione sia convergente rispetto a tanti interventi.

Ci sono gli atti del *digital single market*, c'è la comunicazione su industria 4.0, ci sono tutti gli interventi sugli altri processi che accompagnano le trasformazioni produttive, con il sostegno alle tecnologie abilitanti. Quindi non tutto sta in questi atti, ma ho apposta richiamato ciò che deve essere sviluppato in senso complementare, perché io vedo un mercato integrato nel commercio, nell'industria, nel digitale e anche nell'utilizzo delle nuove energie, perché la sostenibilità è un fattore chiave di tutto questo.

Vicky Ford (ECR). – Mr President, we do need to work together across Europe to make sure that the single market is fit for a digital age, but we must get the detail right, we do not want to put an unnecessary handbrake on the digital economy.

On geo-blocking: in traditional markets we do not force retailers to open their stores in all 28 markets. But now a store would have to work out whether or not they are complying with the national rules in all 28 countries, and this could be very burdensome especially for smaller companies. So instead of giving consumers more choice we just risk that smaller stores will not go online at all.

On platforms, Commissioner, thank you for stepping back from the brink and not coming up with a new regulation, but please be careful. Platforms are growing because consumers like them, and I want to see more platforms, and more competition in platforms. Change in the intermediary liability could be very destabilising, especially for smaller start-ups in the shared economy and in e-commerce.

And on media services, our consumers love the diversity of new media: new media services are not the same as traditional media offers and we need to make that distinction.

Kaja Kallas (ALDE). – Mr President, Thomas Edison said: ‘There is a way to do it better – find it’. I think this quote sums up very much what digital innovation is all about: doing it better and finding new ways to solve problems, from access to services and goods to environment and mobility.

The whole purpose of the Digital Single Market strategy is also about breaking down barriers, those that are often created by outdated legislation or practices. Modernisation of the relevant legislation will be key for Europe to be an innovative force behind the next wave of innovation which is data-driven.

On geo-blocking, two points. I believe that we need to be ambitious in addressing the reasons why companies geo-block, from parcel delivery to contract and consumer law and VAT and copyright as well. As long as the reasons to geo-block exist the companies will continue with these practices. The purpose of all this is to get more companies to sell online, not to scare them off. So there is still a lot to be done here.

The other point is about transport-related services. I do not really buy the argument that they should be exempt from this proposal. Those websites are very often used by older Europeans and they are very often geo-blocked or they discriminate among consumers based on their IP address.

So there is a lot to be done here, and the single market strategy is about breaking down barriers, so we will continue with this work.

Paloma López Bermejo (GUE/NGL). – Señor Presidente, recuerdo a la Comisión que la gran mayoría de los europeos son trabajadores antes que consumidores, porque sin un salario digno no se puede consumir. Y que definir el mercado digital como un todo, aglutinando realidades productivas y sectores muy diversos, acaba ignorando los destructivos efectos de la digitalización sobre el empleo. Un ejemplo claro es la paquetería. La competencia en los segmentos más lucrativos del mercado postal sirve para dismantelar las empresas públicas de Correos, precarizar el empleo e incrementar el coste de los servicios. La regulación de hoy contiene elementos que profundizan en este sentido y que son absolutamente injustificados.

Igualmente, me preocupa la idea de seguir tratando las plataformas digitales como si estuvieran ofreciendo nuevos servicios, ya que solo proveen los servicios de siempre, solo que en otro formato. Un conductor debe tener los mismos derechos, trabaje en un taxi o para Uber. Y lo mismo en otros sectores como la telecomunicación o la hostelería. La solución no es forzar la competencia entre el modelo tradicional y el digital, sino que los servicios digitales operen en un mismo marco regulatorio con los mismos derechos y con las mismas obligaciones que el resto del sector. Esta es la propuesta que esperamos de la Comisión.

Michel Reimon (Verts/ALE). – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar! Ich kann mich meiner Vorrednerin nur anschließen: Wir müssen das Thema etwas breiter sehen. Es ist gut und richtig, jetzt eine Strategie zu machen für einen digitalen Binnenmarkt, aber wir brauchen schon auch eine für eine digitale Gesellschaft, und das vermisste ich ein bisschen bei diesem Vorschlag, wie Sie ihn bringen. Ich habe Journalisten, Journalismus-Studenten jetzt bei mir gehabt, die mich nach dem größten Problem für die Arbeit im Europäischen Parlament gefragt haben. Aus meiner Sicht ist eines der größten Probleme eine fehlende europäische Öffentlichkeit. Das brauchen wir für eine europäische Demokratie, für eine europäische Gesellschaft.

Wenn ich mir jetzt den Vorschlag ansehe, dass wir Geoblocking abschaffen wollen für Spiele, aber nicht für Videos, dann sieht man, wie sehr dieser Vorschlag marktbestimmt ist und wie wenig gesellschaftspolitisch, demokratiepolitisch. Denn aus Sicht von Nachrichten, davon, selbst Nachrichten zu produzieren, eine öffentliche europäische Diskussion zu starten, ist doch Video ungleich wichtiger als Spiele. Da geht es nicht nur um Markt, da geht es eben um ein gesellschaftspolitisches Projekt, als das wir das Internet begreifen sollten, und das sehe ich nicht bei dieser Kommission. Kommissar Oettinger ist nicht nur Kommissar für digitale Wirtschaft, er ist Kommissar für digitale Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft. In diesem Sinne sollten wir an diesem Paket arbeiten, sollten mehr hinzufügen, mehr hineinbringen und sollten die 500 - Millionen EuropäerInnen nicht nur als KonsumentInnen betrachten und KonsumentInnenschutz machen, sondern wir sollten sie als BürgerInnen, als WählerInnen, als TeilnehmerInnen an der europäischen Demokratie betrachten und in

diesem Sinne an dem Paket arbeiten.

(Der Redner ist damit einverstanden, eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“ gemäß Artikel 162 Absatz 8 der Geschäftsordnung zu beantworten.)

Liisa Jaakonsaari (S&D), *sinisen kortin kysymys*. – Kuuntelin tosi kiinnostuneena ja iloisena edustajan puheenvuoroa. Te selvästi lähditte arvopohjaisesti tätä kysymystä käsittelemään eikä pelkästään teknisesti niin kuin tähän saakka. Haluaisinkin kysyä Teiltä, oletteko miettineet myös, millä tavalla reilua kilpailua, demokratiaa ja journalismin vapautta pystytään edistämään esimerkiksi lisäämällä avoimuutta näihin algoritmeihin. Minua henkilökohtaisesti huolestuttaa, että asiasta ei puhuta lainkaan.

Michel Reimon (Verts/ALE), *Antwort auf eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“*. – Das ist natürlich in 30 Sekunden schwer zu beantworten. Aber ich habe schon versucht zu erklären: Mit Geoblocking muss das Kriterium zum Beispiel sein, dass wir eine möglichst breite Öffentlichkeit erlauben und Geoblocking nicht so gestalten, dass es maximalen Profit für Unternehmen entwickelt und dass wir nur die kommerzielle Basis bewerten. Wir hatten das ja auch schon bei Diskussionen zur Netzneutralität und bei anderen. Wir kommen politisch zu unterschiedlichen Entscheidungen, wenn wir ein maximal profitables Businessmodell unterstützen wollen oder wenn die Perspektive lautet, möglichst viel Kommunikation für BürgerInnen zuzulassen. Das ist nicht dieselbe Stoßrichtung, und wir sollten uns als Parlament immer für die Möglichkeit entscheiden, finde ich, die mehr Kommunikation, freiere Kommunikation für unsere BürgerInnen erlaubt.

Jean-Luc Schaffhauser (ENF). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, une fois de plus, vous parlez essentiellement d'ouverture des marchés, une ouverture sans limites, qui va encore plus mettre l'Europe et ses États sous domination étrangère. Vous n'avez pas de stratégie de souveraineté, même européenne, face à des technologies étrangères qui sont des technologies de domination. Votre marché unique, en conséquence, livrera encore plus les données européennes aux GAFA (Google, Apple, Facebook, Amazon) travaillant avec les services secrets américains, pour l'Amérique et ses entreprises, contre nos entreprises.

Hier, en 1990, nous avions le premier marché mondial en e-technologie avec Alcatel. L'Allemand Siemens se tenait également en très bonne place. Nous aurions dû faire naître un monopole européen, que votre concurrence interdit. Aujourd'hui, Alcatel est détruit par son alliance avec les États-Unis, Siemens est dépassé au profit de sociétés américaines et chinoises, car il n'y a pas eu de protection du marché européen, comme nous avons une protection du marché national avant les règles européennes. La Russie et la Chine ont mené une politique de souveraineté pour relever ces défis, l'Europe non.

Aujourd'hui, vous proposez un *cloud* européen. C'est bien! Mais ce nuage sera-t-il dans le ciel des États européens, des citoyens qui veulent protéger leurs données? Votre approche libérale me fait craindre le pire. Vous le donnerez sans doute chez nous aux sociétés étrangères à l'Europe. Votre marché unique numérique, sans véritable stratégie, s'appuyant à nouveau sur les leaders européens pour en faire des leaders mondiaux, en les protégeant tout d'abord, dans un marché européen protégé, comme la Russie et la Chine l'ont fait pour préserver leur indépendance, est une soumission aux puissances extérieures.

La Commission n'a pas d'ambition, car elle n'a pas de frontières, ni de souveraineté. Elle détruit, au nom de la concurrence et de l'ouverture, les États qui avaient une telle ambition. Je pense à la France et à l'Allemagne. Il est temps de sortir, de construire l'Europe avec d'autres institutions.

(L'orateur accepte de répondre à une question «carton bleu» (article 162, paragraphe 8, du règlement))

Gunnar Hökmark (PPE), *blue-card question*. – I heard your intervention hailing Russian protectionism and the Russian economy. As we all know, the Russian economy is declining, because it lacks inspiration and competition. There is a lack of rule of law. Would you like to tell us how you look upon the development of welfare and prosperity in Russia, which I understand is a model for you? Please come up and tell us about the protectionist, lawless, rude and capitalist robber market that we see in Russia! Tell us about it and tell us about the prosperity for Russians. It has declined year after year – and that's your model? That's a shame.

Jean-Luc Schaffhauser (ENF), *réponse «carton bleu»*. – Cher collègue, vous allez avoir le premier prix en caricature des propos. Qu'ai-je dit? J'ai dit que, par exemple, un marché comme la Chine est arrivé à se préserver de la domination des États-Unis dans ce genre de technologies grâce à la protection de son marché. J'ai dit également – et je ne pense pas que la Russie soit un exemple – que la Russie est un pays souverain, qui a une stratégie de souveraineté et a tenu à garder une maîtrise dans ce domaine des technologies, fondamentale pour l'organisation de la société, de nos industries et de notre souveraineté. Nous n'avons pas une telle ambition, et c'est ce que je regrette pour l'Europe.

15. Oznámenie predsedníctva

Presidente. — A questo proposito, vorrei comunicarvi una buona notizia, Nadija Savčenko, tenente e pilota ucraina, che è stata in carcere in Russia per diversi mesi, oggi è stata finalmente liberata. Anche la giornalista d'inchiesta, Khadija Ismayilova, è stata rilasciata in Azerbaigian.

16. Rozhodnutie prijaté v súvislosti s balíkom predpisov pre jednotný digitálny trh (pokračovanie rozpravy)

Presidente. — L'ordine del giorno reca la discussione sulla dichiarazione della Commissione sulla decisione adottata in relazione al pacchetto sul mercato unico digitale (2016/2587(RSP)).

Róza Gräfin von Thun und Hohenstein (PPE). – Može najpierw jednak jeszcze kilka słów do mojego przedmówcy, który tak się zachowuje, jakby nie wiedział, że monopol godzi w interes nie tylko rynku, ale godzi w interes konsumenta. A my chcemy rynku z konkurencją, prawdziwą konkurencją. My chcemy rynku bez barier i chcemy takiego rynku europejskiego, gdzie firmy będą mogły szybciej i dobrze uzyskiwać efekt skali. I to rzeczywiście nam będzie dawało suwerenność, a nie jakieś beznadziejne monopole, które rzeczywiście przypominają systemy dyktatorskie.

W dokumencie prezentowanym przez Komisję, przez pana komisarza, jest mnóstwo bardzo dobrych inicjatyw – inicjatyw oczekiwanych i przez przedsiębiorców, i przez konsumentów na rynku europejskim – i teraz jest czas, żeby Parlament i Komisja jeszcze bliżej i bardziej intensywnie współpracowały, aby odpowiedzieć na oczekiwania, które wiążą obywateli europejskich z rozwojem naszego wspólnego rynku. Do tego też służy grupa robocza, której przewodniczę i mam nadzieję, że pana komisarza niedługo będziemy na tej grupie roboczej mogli gościć. Wielkim wyzwaniem dla rynku jest to nieszczęsne geoblokowanie, które irytuje niezwykle konsumentów i blokuje rozwój przedsiębiorców. Tutaj jednak musimy bardzo dokładnie zidentyfikować obszary, gdzie to geoblokowanie jest nieuzasadnione. Na pewno jednym z takich obszarów jest dostarczanie paczek i wszelkie możliwe bariery z tym związane. To, że paczka kosztuje więcej tylko dlatego, że przekracza granicę, to jest kompletny absurd i zaprzeczenie wspólnemu rynkowi. Komisja jeszcze nie proponuje regulacji cen, ale bardzo ważne by było, żeby operatorzy zdali sobie sprawę z tego, że mamy jeden rynek, a nie dwadzieścia osiem różnych rynków. Potrzebujemy więc nowych idei, jak na przykład, żeby zapewnić nowym operatorom dostęp do infrastruktury pocztowej.

(Mówczyni zgodziła się odpowiedzieć na pytanie zadane przez podniesienie „niebieskiej kartki” (art. 162 ust. 8 Regulaminu))

Paul Rübzig (PPE), *Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“*. – Meine Frage geht in die Richtung: Wir haben ja bei den Roaminggebühren im nächsten Jahr einen einheitlichen Binnenmarkt vor uns. Glauben Sie, dass es möglich ist, auch bei den Paketdiensten von den nationalen Grenzen wegzukommen und dementsprechend nur mehr auf Entfernung oder auf individualisierte Märkte zu reagieren? Denn auch bei den Paketdiensten haben wir oft den zehnfachen Preis, auch wenn es nur zwei Kilometer über die Grenze geht.

Róza Gräfin von Thun und Hohenstein (PPE), *odpowiedź na pytanie zadane przez podniesienie niebieskiej kartki*. – Dziękuję bardzo za to pytanie. To jest właśnie dokładnie jeden z tych obszarów, nad którymi musimy pracować z takim samym sukcesem, podobnie jak w przypadku tematu roamingu, który w końcu się udał. To długo oczekiwane rozwiązanie dla konsumentów jest na stole, zaczyna funkcjonować, będzie w pełni funkcjonować w przyszłym roku. Potrzebujemy innowacyjnych rozwiązań, a nie myślenia tylko w ramach jednego państwa i w ramach tradycyjnego dostarczania paczek w jednym państwie, i doliczania zupełnie niepotrzebnych cen za te paczki, które przekraczają granice. Więcej współpracy i nowych pomysłów.

PRÉSIDENCE DE MME SYLVIE GUILLAUME

Vice-présidente

Miapetra Kumpula-Natri (S&D). – Madam President, today is a black day for the ICT and hardware sector in Europe, as Microsoft announced in Finland that it will cut 1 350 jobs. These are the jobs of ICT-skilled people, mostly in research and development and manufacturing. I hope the EU will help with the Globalisation Fund.

But this is also a question of European industries getting along with globalisation, and this is a part of the Digital Strategy we have to bear in mind. We want Europeans to have jobs in Europe. I say no to a future in which all the manufacturing and all the hardware is produced in Asia and all the applications and all the content are provided by the USA. We need those in Europe too – so I believe, and I work for the Digital Single Market – as we see that the single market has also been a source for economic growth in Europe.

It is said that the Digital Single Market could add EUR 415 billion to the European Union economy, and it is said that the Digital Single Market will bring hundreds of thousands of jobs. I encourage the Commission to look at every step it takes in the Digital Single Market, so that it will also create growth and jobs for Europeans. So that is why I do not always like the Digital Single Market being the only keyword here, but it is the digital society that creates well-being and jobs for Europeans as well.

We still eagerly wait for the skills strategy as well as the telecom rules, and the infrastructure to go and make Europe deliver.

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

Jean-Luc Schaffhauser (ENF), *Question «carton bleu»*. – Chère collègue, je partage tout ce que vous avez dit. Je voudrais simplement savoir: est-ce que vous êtes pour une protection du marché européen?

Miapetra Kumpula-Natri (S&D), *blue-card answer*. – I do not believe that protection is the right way to deliver. I strongly want to see the Digital Single Market, and these 28 rules are not providing the best we can deliver from the European economy. I do not think that France is better and stronger alone. I do not think that Finland is stronger alone because, although Finland was the frontrunner in mobile telecoms manufacturing, we did not sell them only to 5.5 million Finnish people. We sold them globally. So now we need to take the next steps and then we need to do it together for 500 million consumers.

Daniel Dalton (ECR). – Madam President, I am concerned that these proposals misunderstand the digital world and the fact that it is consumer-driven. The geo-blocking proposal is ill-conceived and will drive small businesses off the internet. But I am very concerned about the proposals to make on-demand platforms meet a 20% European quota. This shows a lack of confidence in the European industry, which is booming, especially as Netflix and Amazon already meet the 20% quota. The proposal does not understand the nature of on-demand services: people watch what they want, when they want, and if the content is not good, they will not watch it. Now there will be a push to produce low-quality European content just to meet the quota, and this will undermine the industry and consumers.

There is also a question about what is European content in a globalised world? Game of Thrones is filmed mostly in Europe. Is it European? A UFC fight in Las Vegas featuring Conor McGregor, for example, is that European content? What about an app like Major League Baseball? Are Europeans who want to watch the New York Yankees going to have to be forced to watch the Essex Arrows instead? What about Crunchyroll, that specialises in Japanese anime? Or Core TV, streaming South Korean content? Are they all expected to have European content?

Jan Philipp Albrecht (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, the proposals are going in the right direction for a digital single market. It is important that we move on, but we are afraid that these proposals are half-hearted, that it is not principle-based, for example in the area of geo-blocking, to allow all of us to benefit from the variety of proposals and offers on the European market without being constrained by a fragmentation of 28 different legal systems in this area, and these proposals do not overcome that. They still carve out main areas from the benefits which consumers and also competitors on the European market may have.

And it is the same for those areas where we still expect the Commission to act – for example on the platform regulation question, especially when it comes to big app stores for those mobile devices which we all use. The rules are rather discriminatory today, and there should be European standards across all 28 Member States that clearly say which information we should get and what duty we have to a non-discriminatory approach.

Laurențiu Rebega (ENF). – Doamnă președintă, domnule comisar, îmi manifest astăzi anumite rezerve legate de piața unică digitală. Motivul este că instituțiile europene se lansează în proiecte de anvergură, fără să învețe din eșecurile anterioare, înregistrate pe alte segmente de piață.

Vorbim despre o piață unică deschisă, dar, în zona serviciilor, oferta venită din statele estice, inclusiv din România, este constant denigrată și abuzată. Cauza o reprezintă avantajul competitiv dat de prețurile mai mici. Așadar, dacă în cazul serviciilor această scădere de preț nu este benefică, de ce am crede că pe piața digitală ar fi? De ce Comisia nu abordează acest subiect, permițând tacit restricționarea serviciilor mai ieftine provenite din estul Europei? Asemănări există și în ceea ce privește piața muncii din Uniune. Dacă a fost atât de binevenită această liberalizare a pieței muncii, atunci de ce muncitorilor estici le sunt refuzate beneficiile de securitate socială? Mai mult decât atât, de nenumărate ori autoritățile refuză să răspundă la o simplă plângere formulată de aceștia!

Dacă se vrea o piață digitală, într-adevăr liberă, avantajul competitiv și resursele umane trebuie protejate încă de la început.

Paul Rübzig (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin! Herr Kommissar! Meine Frage ist, bis wann werden die technischen Rahmenbedingungen für die 5G-Technologie bei der ITU verhandelt sein? Gibt es hier Gespräche mit Amerika? Ich war letzte Woche in Washington, um hier gemeinsame Standards vorzuschlagen. Bis wann wird es einen Vorschlag zur Frequenzharmonisierung und zur einheitlichen Versteigerung in allen 28 Mitgliedsstaaten geben? Glauben Sie, dass die Fazilität „Connecting Europe“ uns helfen könnte, die Glasfaserverbindungen über die Grenzen zu stärken und vor allem die Funkmasten, die wir dann zum 5G-Roll-out brauchen, dementsprechend zu implementieren? Wird 2018 der Zeitpunkt sein, wo auch Europa diese neue Technologie einführen kann wie andere Länder?

Meine zweite Frage ist: Ich habe im Bereich der unlauteren Geschäftspraktiken, die dieser Vorschlag auch beinhaltet, jetzt vor weniger Zeit einen Vorschlag bekommen, meine Apple-Software upzudaten, und ich habe mir die Geschäftsbedingungen durchgelesen; Es sind 600 Zeilen, die man hier akzeptieren sollte. Gibt es hier Überlegungen der Kommission, die allgemeinen Geschäftsbedingungen, die man beim Kauf eines Gerätes, bei der Aktualisierung einer Software, bei der Aktualisierung einer App akzeptieren muss, konsumentenfreundlich gestaltet und auch für die Firmen einen Rechtsrahmen schafft, auf den sie sich verlassen können?

Petra Kammerevert (S&D). – Herr Präsident, sehr geehrter Kommissar Ansip! Der heute veröffentlichte Vorschlag zur AVMD-Richtlinie ist nach erster Durchsicht leider nur ein Reförmchen und hätte aus meiner Sicht deutlich mutiger ausfallen müssen. Zwar werden Videoangebote auf multimedialen Plattformen inzwischen in die Regulierung einbezogen, aber es bleibt bei der Unterscheidung zwischen linear und nichtlinear, und das, obwohl das Parlament inzwischen dreimal gefordert hat, diese nicht mehr zeitgemäße Abgrenzung aufzugeben. Fernsehen und Internet sind zunehmend zusammengewachsen, und dem Publikum ist diese Trennung inzwischen völlig egal geworden. Wir müssen endlich europäisch einen Rahmen setzen, der medienrechtlich die zeit- und ortsunabhängige Verfügbarkeit audiovisueller Mediendienste nach einheitlichen Regeln gewährleistet.

Grundsätzlich zu begrüßen sind Ihre Vorschläge zur direkten Beteiligung von Videoplattformen an nationalen Filmförderfonds sowie zur Flexibilisierung von Werbezeiten. Inhaltlich sollte das beworben werden dürfen, was auch legal zu kaufen ist. Ist man hier zu restriktiv – ich glaube, dass das an manchem Stelle der Fall ist – und wird globale Internetwerbung vor allen Dingen die Werbeeinnahmen privater Fernsehanbieter bedrohen, und die brauchen diese dringend, um uns auch gutes Programm präsentieren zu können.

Ich werde mich dafür einsetzen, dass klarere Regelungen zur Auffindbarkeit journalistisch verantworteter Inhalte in der Richtlinie verankert werden. Den Mitgliedstaaten muss hier ausdrücklich mehr Handlungsspielraum zugestanden werden. Zudem sollte aus meiner Sicht klargestellt werden, dass Videos und Rundfunksignale nicht ohne Weiteres durch Dritte einfach verändert werden dürfen, beispielsweise durch Überblendungen von Signalen, die nicht autorisiert sind. Es darf nicht zulässig sein, dass beispielsweise eine Nachrichtensendung mit Werbung Dritter einfach überblendet wird. Hier brauchen wir klare Regelungen.

Alles in allem: Es ist ein erster Schritt, und ich bin ganz optimistisch, dass es uns hier im Parlament gelingen wird, einen Sprung in die Zukunft des Fernsehens tatsächlich hinzubekommen.

Anneleen Van Bossuyt (ECR). – Mevrouw de voorzitter, ik denk dat iedereen het erover eens is dat e-commerce bijdraagt aan de creatie van groei en banen. Tweeënhalf miljoen banen in 2014, dat spreekt voor zich.

Maar in een Europese digitale interne markt is het niet goed te keuren dat handelaars de toegang tot hun website, goederen of hun diensten kunnen weigeren op basis van iemands nationaliteit of woonplaats. Een handelaar moet wel het recht hebben om onder verschillende voorwaarden te verkopen in verschillende lidstaten. Bedrijven genieten immers van een economische en contractuele vrijheid om te ondernemen en zich aan te passen aan de lokale marktomstandigheden. Respect dus voor elementaire marktwerking, maar geen discriminatie van consumenten.

Met betrekking tot de audiovisuele diensten wil de Commissie dat het aanbod van on-demand diensten voor twintig procent uit Europese producties bestaat. Ik zeg nee tegen digitaal protectionisme. We moeten onze Europese content koesteren, maar private digitale bedrijven de vrijheid van ondernemen geven. Het opleggen van Europese quota's belemmert dit en levert geen garantie voor kwaliteitsvolle producties.

Eva Paunova (PPE). – Madam President, today's proposals go in the direction needed and are a positive next step towards the completion of the Europe-wide Digital Single Market. The Commission's initiatives show that it is working to ensure that consumers must benefit from opening up national markets. The expectations of citizens and businesses are very clear: break down those barriers in the online world.

I am a believer in doing things to the maximum, and I would have liked to see the proposal on geo-blocking being more inclusive. Copyright-protected online services, such as e-books and music, but also TV programmes, videos and movies, should not have been left out of the proposed ban on geo-blocking.

Every day on which the digital single market is not fulfilling its whole potential, European businesses and citizens are losing the opportunity to grow and have more choice. At the same time we as legislators, and European institutions as a whole, are losing credibility. To this end, we have to ensure future-proof legislation which we adopt swiftly. This is why I am certain that the Commission will come up with a proposal for a full ban on geo-blocking sooner rather than later. On platforms, they are so diverse and different, as you said, and I am glad the Commission has not decided to legislate on something that enriches our lives, that fosters innovation and, most importantly, can be regulated when and if necessary, as we have seen in the past through enforcing existing anti-trust rules.

Nicola Danti (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signor Vicepresidente, fatemi esprimere il vivo apprezzamento per il lavoro della Commissione, che sta lentamente concretizzando gli ambiziosi obiettivi della strategia sul mercato unico digitale.

Ora, tuttavia, signor Vicepresidente, bisogna correre per trasformare i buoni principi e le buone intenzioni in opportunità concrete, e questa responsabilità spetta anche a noi del Parlamento. Le misure sinora presentate e le tante in arrivo possono offrire nuove opportunità per i cittadini ed i consumatori. Gli ambiziosi piani di *e-government* potranno sviluppare una pubblica amministrazione più efficace ed efficiente, meno costosa, e garantire ai cittadini servizi di maggiore qualità. I consumatori europei beneficeranno di norme contrattuali più chiare ed omogenee, del pieno sviluppo dell'*e-commerce*, della portabilità dei contenuti online, dell'abbattimento dei geoblocchi e di altre barriere oggi anacronistiche.

Infine, il sistema delle imprese potrà rimanere protagonista nella competizione globale solo sfruttando appieno le nuove tecnologie digitali. Senza paura di enfaticizzare, mi sento di affermare che nel momento in cui l'Unione europea affronta il suo massimo punto di crisi, nel momento in cui i cittadini hanno la percezione di istituzioni distanti dai loro bisogni concreti, il digitale può rappresentare un elemento chiave sul quale ricostruire un nuovo senso di appartenenza e con il quale proiettare il nostro continente nel futuro.

Henna Virkkunen (PPE). – Arvoisa puhemies, haluan onnitella komissiota tämän päivän digipaketista. Siinä otetaan nyt aivan oikeita askelia eurooppalaisen sisämarkkinan luomiseksi myös digitaalisiin palveluihin. Tiedämme, että se on edelleen iso ongelma Euroopassa, että samaan aikaan kun ihmiset, tavarat ja pääomat liikkuvat yli rajojen, digitaaliset palvelut usein pysähtyvät edelleenkin rajoille.

Oli suorastaan hämmästyttävää lukea tuota komission selvitystä, jossa oli tutkittu kymmentätuhatta verkkokauppaa, ja yli kuudessakymmenessä prosentissa näistä verkkokaupoista toteutettiin määräjoituksia ja itse asiassa vain yksi kolmasosa verkkokaupoista mahdollisti ostot Euroopan unionin valtioiden välillä. Eli on erittäin tärkeää nyt, että komissio tänään teki ehdotuksen tuosta perusteettomien määräjoitusten poistamisesta. Se toivon mukaan vauhdittaa verkkokauppaa Euroopassa ja lisää kilpailua.

Totta kai haasteenamme on koko ajan lainsäädännössä se, että teknologia kehittyy paljon nopeammin kuin lainsäädäntö ja toisaalta myös kuluttajien tottumukset ja odotukset muuttuvat hyvin nopeasti. Eli on tärkeää, että lainsäädäntökehikko on myös riittävän joustava siinä mielessä, että se kannustaa Eurooppaa uusiin innovaatioihin, koska tiedämme että yksi suurimmista Euroopan haasteista on juuri se, että kuinka pärjäämme digitaalisen talouden kilpailussa muun muassa verrattuna USA:han tai Aasiaan. Eli siinä mielessä komission tänään tekemät ehdotukset ovat varsin perusteltuja ja hyviä, ne vievät meitä aivan oikeaan suuntaan.

(Puhuja lupasi vastata työjärjestyksen 162 artiklan 8 kohdan mukaiseen sinisen kortin kysymykseen).

Maria Grapini (S&D), Întrebare adresată conform procedurii „cartonașului albastru”. – Stimată colegă, și eu sunt de acord că este foarte important pachetul pentru piața unică digitală, dar nu credeți că avem acum în Europa o rămânere în urmă a multor zone sărace care, de fapt, nu au acces și prin acest lucru, de fapt, discriminăm foarte multă populație, foarte mulți cetățeni și că ar trebui Comisia să pregătească și un pachet de susținere pentru zonele sărace, să poată să aibă acces la piața unică digitală?

Henna Virkkunen (PPE), vastaus sinisen kortin kysymykseen. – Kuten varmasti kollega tietää hyvin, Euroopassa on meneillään useita eri aloitteita, millä pyritään nimenomaan vauhdittamaan sitä, että kaikkialle Eurooppaan saadaan rakennettua nopeita verkkoyhteyksiä. On tärkeää, että meillä on olemassa oleva infrastruktuuri saatavilla, mutta totta kai myös ihmisten digitaaliset taidot ovat sellaista, mitä täytyy rohkaista, ja ennen kaikkea niillä henkilöillä, joilla ei ole ollut mahdollisuus näitä taitoja oppia, täytyy olla mahdollisuus saada apua ja tukea, koska tänä päivänä digitaaliset taidot ovat osa kansalaistaitoja ja on tärkeä päästä näin myös osaksi yhteiskuntaa.

Adam Szejnfeld (PPE). – Jestem absolutnie przekonany, że rozmawiamy dzisiaj na jeden z najważniejszych, fundamentalnych tematów. Żyjemy bowiem w XXI wieku, w nowoczesnym społeczeństwie, które charakteryzuje się przeogromną mobilnością: gdzie indziej się rodzimy, gdzie indziej kształcimy, gdzie indziej pracujemy, gdzie indziej jeszcze mieszkamy. Świat ten realny dla tego rodzaju społeczeństwa stwarza bardzo wiele barier. Nie udało nam się, nie udało nam się ich usunąć na wspólnym rynku. Nie możemy popełnić tego błędu, tworząc wspólny rynek cyfrowy, i to z dwóch powodów: nie tylko chodzi o interes z jednej strony przedsiębiorców a z drugiej strony konsumentów europejskich – oczywiście to jest bardzo ważne – ale to jest także interes całej Europy, całej Wspólnoty, dlatego że funkcjonujemy przecież na globalnym rynku. Jeżeli nie będziemy sobie potrafili poradzić ze zniesieniem barier, ze zwiększeniem swobody przedsiębiorców, ale także wolnego wyboru konsumentów na tym naszym rynku – mimo że dużym – to oczywiście przegramy konkurencję na tym globalnym, światowym rynku. Dlatego odbieram bardzo pozytywnie propo-

zycję Komisji, ale także przestrzegam przed pokusą – być może nawet nie dzisiaj występującą, ale w przyszłości – przeregulowania tego rynku.

(Mówca zgodził się odpowiedzieć na pytanie zadane przez podniesienie niebieskiej kartki (art. 162 ust. 8 Regulaminu))

Catherine Stihler (S&D), *blue-card question*. – Thank you Mr Szejnfeld for your contribution there. I agree with a lot of what you have said, but further to what my colleague Maria Grapini and others said, the skills agenda is also important when we are dealing with the digital single market and e-skills. I was wondering if you could maybe make a comment on the importance of e-skills in this debate, too.

Adam Szejnfeld (PPE), *odpowiedź na pytanie zadane przez podniesienie niebieskiej kartki*. – Absolutnie zgadzam się. Nie będę prowadził polemiki z tą postawą i z tym stanowiskiem. Wręcz przeciwnie. Jeżeli chcemy rozwijać wspólny rynek cyfrowy, to musimy także wspierać wszystkie te podmioty, które będą służyły rozwojowi tego wspólnego rynku. Oczywiście te społeczeństwa, czy wręcz nawet społeczności lokalne, z jakiś powodów – pewnie także i historycznych, także i ekonomicznych – mają utrudniony dostęp do wspólnego rynku. Ale chcę powiedzieć, to są dwie różne rzeczy. Powinniśmy być bardzo aktywni i skuteczni i na jednej płaszczyźnie, i na drugiej płaszczyźnie.

Pilar del Castillo Vera (PPE). – Señora Presidenta, señor Vicepresidente, todos sabemos ya que la transformación digital afecta a todos los sectores de la industria, de los servicios y de la sociedad. Esa falsa dicotomía entre sociedad y economía a veces nos lleva a una cierta confusión. Se trata de un conjunto: es la economía, es la sociedad; es la sociedad y es la economía.

Y para que Europa no pierda la oportunidad de estar en la vanguardia de esa transformación, el mercado único digital es fundamental. Y lo es porque es el gran acelerador que permite las economías de escala que se necesitan para que la economía europea —esa economía digital que se está desarrollando— sea globalmente competitiva.

Hoy se ha dado un paso más para que ese «buque insignia», que la Comisión acertadamente definió al principio de la legislatura, llegue a puerto cuando acabe este término. Discutiremos si se pueden mejorar algunos aspectos, pero enhorabuena porque hoy se ha dado un paso más.

A mí me gustaría subrayar, porque me parece interesante, una especie de espuela que deja la Comisión sobre el tema de que los servicios digitales similares tienen que tener una regulación similar y que eso va a tener sus consecuencias y su tratamiento en futuras propuestas legislativas, como la que afecta a las comunicaciones electrónicas o a la privacidad, a la *e-privacy*. Enhorabuena por esto. El ritmo, señor Vicepresidente, tiene que ser constante y ágil. Hay que continuar por ahí.

Gunnar Hökmark (PPE). – Madam President, regarding geo-blocking it is important to get rid of unjustified geo-blocking, but it is just as important to get rid of the reasons for justified geo-blocking. Different sales law, different VAT regimes, different consumer legislation, different copyright legislation: here is the big challenge.

And that leads me to the second point: I do not believe in quotas restricting the supply of different sorts of entertainment in the global era. I do not think European culture and entertainment will develop because of quotas. It is much better to open up the opportunities for global champions emerging in Europe than to worry about global champions coming from other parts and competing here.

Third, the new legislation we need is not to regulate the past or to freeze the present, it is to open up for the future and all its opportunities. Platforms are a phenomenon that will change all the time. They need to adapt to the rules of the legislation we have, but do not try to legislate them in a way that hinders innovation. We will see new platforms coming every year, every decade and we need to secure that we can be in the lead.

Ivana Maletić (PPE). – Gospođo predsjednice, važan dio korištenja prednosti jedinstvenog tržišta Europske unije i novog vremena u kojem živimo je e-trgovina. Podržavam nova pravila koja je potpredsjednik Ansip predstavio, a koja će omogućiti i potrošačima i poduzećima da kvalitetnije koriste prednosti jedinstvenog tržišta. Kupnja putem interneta trebala bi biti jednostavna i sigurna, a zbog brojnih prepreka i ograničenja potrošači često odustaju od ovog načina kupovanja.

Prvo treba unijeti brojne osobne podatke prilikom kupnje, nakon toga često kartica koju imaju ne odgovara uvjetima kupnje, a ako ipak kupnju uspiju realizirati, iznenade ih troškovi dostave, dugotrajnost postupka carinjenja u slučaju kupnje izvan EU-a i slično. U svijetu kompjutera i internetizacije poslovanja, građanima EU-a sigurnije je i jednostavnije putovati do prodavača. Ovim paketom novih pravila radimo pozitivne promjene i raduje me buduće lakše i sigurnije internet poslovanje.

José Blanco López (S&D). – Señora Presidenta, hace un año la Comisión presentó su estrategia para que Europa, sus ciudadanos y sus empresas puedan aprovechar todo el potencial de la sociedad digital. Un año después la estrategia necesita recuperar brío, recuperar ambición. Una Europa conectada exige portabilidad de servicios y contenidos, eliminar el geobloqueo injustificado, más coordinación en materia de espectro. Una Europa industrial vigorosa exige una estrategia ambiciosa más allá de las inversiones ya previstas. Una Europa creativa exige protección y remuneración justa para los creadores.

Animo a la Comisión a cumplir con el calendario comprometido y la animo a ser ambiciosa para que Europa no quede rezagada y pueda aprovechar todo el potencial de la sociedad digital, de acuerdo con reglas justas, iguales y equilibradas.

Νότης Μαρτιάς (ECR). – Κυρία πρόεδρε, η ψηφιακή ενιαία αγορά θα μπορούσε πράγματι να συμβάλλει στην τόνωση της ευρωπαϊκής οικονομίας, στην καθοριστική αύξηση του ΑΕΠ της Ένωσης και στη δημιουργία χιλιάδων νέων θέσεων εργασίας.

Την ενοποίηση αυτή όμως θα πρέπει να συνοδεύσουν σημαντικές επενδύσεις για έρευνες και ανάπτυξη των τεχνολογιών της πληροφορίας και των επικοινωνιών, στις οποίες Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση υστερεί δραματικά σε σχέση με τις Ηνωμένες Πολιτείες και την Ιαπωνία. Αυτό συμβαίνει επειδή το οικονομικό μοντέλο της Ένωσης στηρίζεται στο Σύμφωνο για το ευρώ δηλαδή, στηρίζει την ανταγωνιστικότητα της Γηραιάς Ηπείρου στην κινεζοποίηση των μισθών.

Στην Ελλάδα, το τρίτο μνημόνιο προσθέτει νέα εμπόδια στις προσπάθειες ανάπτυξης της ψηφιακής οικονομίας. Νέα εμπόδια σε έναν από τους ελάχιστους κλάδους που παρουσιάζουν κάποια σημεία ζωής τα τελευταία χρόνια, χάρη στο δυναμικό των νέων επιστημόνων που διαδέχεται η πατρίδα μας στον τομέα της πληροφορικής. Έτσι, για να διευκολυνθεί η αποπληρωμή του δήθεν χρέους, προστέθηκε νέο τέλος 5% στις υπηρεσίες σταθερής τηλεφωνίας και διαδικτύου και μάλιστα ωριότερα από το χρονοδιάγραμμα. Η κοροϊδία αυτή πρέπει επιτέλους να λάβει τέλος.

Ivan Jakovčić (ALDE). – Gospođo predsjednice, jedinstveno europsko tržište, digitalno tržište treba postati peta europska sloboda. O tome sam već govorio u ovom Parlamentu, ali uvjeren sam da bez toga mi imamo zaista kompletnu petu europsku slobodu kao jedinstveno digitalno tržište, neće biti naše konkurentnosti naspram Sjedinjenih Američkih Država, naspram Kine i drugih velikih tržišta.

To je jedini put koji moramo slijediti, a sve ono što ovdje danas vidimo je odlično, je dobro, ali mislim da trebamo biti još ambiciozniji, jer ako ne budemo ambiciozniji nećemo biti konkurentni. Ono što želim izdvojiti iz tri točke o kojima ste govorili izdvojiti je pitanje sigurnosti kupnje na e-tržištu i e-trgovini. Mislim da to povjerenje koje danas objektivno više pada nego raste, na sistemu e-trgovine (*e-commerce-a*) moramo učiniti sve da pojačamo to povjerenje, jer inače i tu ćemo izgubiti na konkurentnosti.

Csaba Sógor (PPE). – Üdvözlöm és támogatom a Bizottság digitális egységes piacról szóló kezdeményezését. A XXI. században magától értetődő, hogy az Európai Unió országainak egységes digitális piacot kell képezniük. A fiatal generáció nem is érti, hogy miként beszélhetünk e nélkül közös piacról. Külön felhívnam a figyelmet a Bizottság 16 intézkedése közül a területi alapú tartalomkorlátozás megszüntetésére, valamint arra, hogy a hetedik pont felveti, milyen további intézkedések szükségesek ahhoz, hogy a műsorszolgáltatások országhatártól függetlenül elérhetővé váljanak. Meggyőződésem, hogy az üzleti érvek ellenére teljességgel idejétmúlt a műsorszolgáltatások országhatárokhoz kötése, kiemelt tekintettel a nagy érdeklődéssel vált sporteseményekre.

A technikai lehetőségek mai szintjén elfogadhatatlan, hogy a polgárok számára lehetetlen egyes sportesemények megtekintése azon a nyelven, amelyen ők azt szeretnék – még akkor is, ha előfizetéssel rendelkeznek az adott szolgáltató műsorára.

Inmaculada Rodríguez-Piñero Fernández (S&D). – Señora Presidenta, desarrollar el mercado único digital e impulsar la Agenda Digital en los acuerdos comerciales y en la Organización Mundial del Comercio supondrán enormes potencialidades pero también enormes retos. Si la Unión Europea quiere mantener y mejorar su competitividad, tendrá que aplicar las políticas necesarias para digitalizar todos los sectores y para crear y desarrollar un auténtico mercado único digital.

La estrategia digital europea debe conciliar la innovación con la seguridad, con la protección de datos de carácter personal y con la garantía a la intimidad de los ciudadanos. Es necesario facilitar unas competencias digitales adecuadas a las pymes, a los trabajadores y a los usuarios, garantizar la seguridad jurídica de la neutralidad de la red y encontrar soluciones equilibradas que garanticen los derechos de los creadores, una retribución justa y el acceso de los usuarios. Y, desde luego, es esencial que la digitalización beneficie a los trabajadores y que la Unión Europea lidere nuevas formas de creación de empleo y de negociación colectiva. Hoy se ha dado un importante paso, y le animo a que no ceje en el empeño de conseguir un mercado digital único europeo.

Seán Kelly (PPE). – A Uachtaráin, go raibh maith agat as seans a thabhairt dom labhairt ar an ábhar seo a bhfuilim ag obair air le cúpla bliain agus comhghairdeas leis an gCoimisiún as na moltaí atá curtha romhainn anseo inniu.

Without a doubt the single market was probably the most important aspect in the development of prosperity in Europe. My own country probably benefited more than most. And now of course, as we move into the digital age, we must complete not just the single market, but the digital single market, and remove barriers to it. People have spoken all day about geo-blocking, which is true, but other aspects are very important, such as high-speed broadband being available consistently and reliably across Europe, especially in rural areas. VAT rules have to be looked at. Also delivery and proper postal addresses – an awful lot of goods are returned because the postal addresses are not properly described and the places cannot be found. So all these things will help us to complete the digital single market.

Nicola Caputo (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, efficacia, accessibilità e sicurezza sono le precondizioni per la creazione di servizi digitali che siano realmente in grado di superare i confini nazionali e di garantire servizi aperti in tre ambiti principali: industria, innovazione digitale e digitalizzazione dei servizi pubblici.

Voglio focalizzare l'attenzione innanzitutto sulla circostanza che il nuovo pacchetto di misure consente di innalzare il livello di protezione dei consumatori sia nella sicurezza delle transazioni sia nella fruibilità dei beni acquistati, senza geoblocchi. Se è vero infatti che l'Unione europea rappresenta il livello giusto per l'era digitale, come detto dal Commissario Ansip, è altresì essenziale che questo livello di intervento consenta di unificare le normative nazionali, di riordinare quanto disciplinato a livello comunitario, ma innanzitutto di creare positive ricadute nella vita di ogni giorno dei cittadini europei.

Va quindi operato il giusto equilibrio tra l'obiettivo di sostenere la strategia e la tutela dei consumatori; va in definitiva ricercato un nuovo approccio al welfare e alla ricerca del lavoro.

(Fin des interventions à la demande)

Andrus Ansip, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, my role is very complicated right now because I have got so many questions and I have only a couple of minutes to respond to those questions.

But first, I would like to thank you for your strong support for the package we are proposing today. I am looking forward to having really fruitful cooperation with you. I am ready to come to all the parliamentary committees and all of the party groups of Parliament to discuss these issues.

Regarding geo-blocking, we all know that this is a real headache for our businesses in the European Union and also for our citizens. We know those fears about mystery shopping surveys but, once again, 2% out of all the people who tried to buy goods or services from another Member State could not get access to those websites because their IP address was wrong, from the wrong country; 27% of those people who could get access could not register because once again they were from the wrong country; 32% of those people who were lucky enough to register were faced with delivery problems; and the 26% of the people who did not have any kind of delivery problems could not pay. We have the Single Euro Payments Area (SEPA) in the European Union, but 26% of people could not pay! All in all, just 36.6% out of

all those people who tried to buy goods or services from another country were able to do so. This is not a single market. This is not at all the single market we have to have in the European Union. We have to fix those problems.

Our proposal was to set an obligation to sell like at home, which does not mean that there will be an obligation on the deliverer. Sellers have to treat those buyers coming online from other countries differently from local people and I cannot agree with Vicky Ford, who said that we will put some kind of additional obligations on our small companies. No way – they have to sell like at home. This means that the sellers' law has to apply.

If I want to buy a bottle of water, as a consumer, I will take those risks and I do not care if there is French writing on the label rather than Estonian. It is my risk. If there are some defects in goods or devices, then I took this risk and I have to take the equipment back to the place where I bought it. So there will be no additional obligations and no additional risks for sellers. Our proposal will make the role of businesses easier and it will also be easier for our citizens.

Regarding parcel deliveries, some people said that this is already a well-organised area and there is really no need to intervene. Yes, it is well organised in some countries. In the Netherlands the difference between domestic parcel prices and cross-border parcel delivery prices is just 1.6 times as much, but in one EU Member State this difference is 22 times as much. We do not want to start to regulate those parcel delivery prices, but we would like to ask for more transparency. We believe that if there is more transparency then we will get real competition and our citizens and our businesses will get more affordable prices.

Regarding the scope – a question which was raised by Julia Reda, Jan Albrecht, Eva Paunova and many others – of course we can be more ambitious, and I would like to be more ambitious, but my aim is not to be the most ambitious guy in the world. I would like to achieve some concrete aims and if those proposals are too ambitious then I think it will take years and years and we will not achieve any of our aims. But our aim is to take a step-by-step approach and I am sure that then we will achieve some aims, but of course this was a compromise.

Consumer organisations asked for a wider scope but, for example, those who represent the music industry in Europe were against it. So we had to make some compromises. Regarding platforms, we decided not to take a horizontal approach but to take a preventive approach, which also means that there will be action. Today we already made our proposal about the Audiovisual Media Services Directive, and our aim was to make those advertising rules, sponsorship and product placement, more flexible. Today we also made a proposal about the Unfair Commercial Practices Directive. This also means that there will be more transparency for platforms. At the end of September we will make our telecom rules proposal, then a second package proposal on copyright, and an e-privacy proposal. It will also be all about our platforms.

I am sorry, my time is over, but I would like to continue with the discussions we have just started. If you invite me, it will be my pleasure to take part in your party group meetings and committee meetings.

La Présidente. — Le débat est clos.

Κώστας Χρυσόγονος (GUE/NGL), γραπτώς. – Η ανακοίνωση της Ευρωπαϊκής Επιτροπής σχετικά με την υποτιθέμενη αναβάθμιση της ενιαίας αγοράς περιέχει πομπώδεις εξαγγελίες οι οποίες δεν ανταποκρίνονται στην πραγματικότητα. Δεν μπορεί να υπάρχει ανταγωνισμός με ίσους όρους όταν τα κράτη-μέλη, ή τουλάχιστον πολλά από αυτά, δίνουν ποικίλες ευκαιρίες σε πολυεθνικές ιδίως επιχειρήσεις να φοροαποφεύγουν με νομιμοφάνεια σε βάρος άλλων κρατών-μελών.

Χρειαζόμαστε, συνεπώς, εναρμόνιση της φορολογικής νομοθεσίας, όπως και πανευρωπαϊκό σύστημα εγγύησης καταθέσεων, προκειμένου να εκλείψει η αβεβαιότητα που υπονομεύει τα τραπεζικά συστήματα ιδίως των μεσογειακών κρατών-μελών και κατεξοχήν της Ελλάδας.

Μόνο έτσι μπορούν να εξομαλυνθούν και οι τεράστιες διαφορές στα επιτόκια δανεισμού επιχειρήσεων και νοικοκυριών μεταξύ των κρατών-μελών, οι οποίες καταλήγουν σε επενδυτική άπνοια και αύξηση της ανεργίας στα οικονομικά ασθενέστερα κράτη-μέλη της Ένωσης.

Αντί η Επιτροπή να μας εκδίδει τα πλεονεκτήματα μιας ανενεργής στην πράξη ενιαίας αγοράς, θα έπρεπε να προτείνει συγκεκριμένες δράσεις για την εξομάλυνση των κραυγαλέων αυτών ανισοτήτων, μέσα σε πνεύμα αλληλεγγύης μεταξύ των κρατών-μελών. Διαφορετικά, η παρατεινόμενη ύπαρξη των στρεβλώσεων αυτών θα απειλήσει, αργά ή γρήγορα, τα ίδια τα θεμέλια της ευρωπαϊκής ενοποιητικής διαδικασίας.

Lidia Joanna Geringer de Oedenberg (S&D), *na písmie*. – W przepisach unijnych występuje wiele luk utrudniających prawidłowe funkcjonowanie wspólnego rynku cyfrowego, dzięki któremu UE może do 2020 r. wygenerować zyski dochodzące nawet do 415 mld EUR rocznie oraz wzrost PKB 0,4 %. Naruszenia prawa własności intelektualnej to duży problem. Tylko w 2013 r. organy celne odnotowały aż 87 000 przypadków takich nadużyć, a szacunkowa wartość 36 mln zatrzymanych artykułów to ponad 768 mln EUR. W tym kontekście Komisja Europejska przedstawiła oparty na trzech filarach plan rozwoju handlu elektronicznego, który ma na celu zapobieganie wyżej wymienionym problemom oraz osiągnięcie celów zawartych w agendzie cyfrowej. Jego elementami są: zapobieganie nieuzasadnionemu blokowaniu geograficznemu, obniżanie kosztów i zwiększanie skuteczności doręczania paczek zagranicznych oraz lepsza ochrona i egzekwowanie prawa. W kwestii blokowania geograficznego – nowy pakiet uwzględni w równym stopniu prawo konsumenta do swobodnych zakupów online w różnych krajach, jak i pewność prawną potrzebną przedsiębiorcom. Przedstawiony wniosek odzwierciedla też nowe podejście Komisji do platform internetowych. Po dokładnej ocenie roli społecznej i gospodarczej tych nowych podmiotów KE uznała, że podejście uniwersalne nie było właściwe, aby uprościć zróżnicowanym wyzwaniom związanym z mnogością rodzajów platform internetowych.

Tunne Kelam (PPE), *in writing*. – Long awaited proposals on boosting digital single market were presented. Although aimed to tear down digital walls, unfortunately the EC proposal does not seem to reach far enough. Measures concerning geoblocking, geodiscrimination of online sales, content and payments are to be welcomed, but they seem to be more of a cosmetic nature than substantially enhancing the potential of the digital single market. I hope that the EP and the Member States will expand the proposals on e-commerce. I welcome the measures foreseen to make parcel delivery costs transparent that could push the service providers to change their price policy and by that boosting cross-border delivery service and e-commerce. It is regrettable that the provisions on online sales do not aim to completely abolish geodiscrimination and are limited only to sale, but not to delivery. In my view everyone should be able to purchase goods online everywhere in the EU and have it delivered to their home country paying the existing parcel delivery price. Also, it is unfortunate that whereas geodiscrimination of payment methods has been reduced, it would still allow merchants to limit payments to local cards, such as bancontact or girocard and therefore exclude everyone not in possession of concrete Belgian or German payment card.

Javi López (S&D), *por escrito*. – El Grupo Socialista da la bienvenida a un paquete por el que esta Eurocámara lleva trabajando desde 2011. En concreto, la Comisión ha publicado dos nuevos paquetes de iniciativas: el primero tiene como objetivo impulsar el comercio en línea transfronterizo en toda Europa, la eliminación de barreras, aumentar la confianza del consumidor y poner fin a la discriminación. El segundo sigue un enfoque de modernización legislativa para las plataformas en línea y las normas de radiodifusión. Hoy en día, en el mundo físico nos resulta impensable que se rechace a un comprador en una tienda, por el mero hecho de vivir en otro Estado. Esto sin embargo sí ocurre hoy en día en las compras por Internet, y es precisamente una de las cosas que hay que evitar: acabar con el geobloqueo injustificado definitivamente, porque discrimina a los consumidores en base a criterios de residencia o incluso del país de emisión de su tarjeta de crédito. Para relanzar y reforzar el mercado único, tenemos que poner al consumidor en el centro de nuestras preocupaciones.

Victor Negrescu (S&D), *in writing*. – The digital single market is essential to enhance the potential existing in this sector in Europe. Reinforcing the common market will enable our businesses and entrepreneurs to take advantage of the opportunities offered across Europe. Nevertheless a strong Digital Single Market should take into consideration the needs of the weak, I mean by that the SMEs, start-ups and digital professionals. Therefore we should not take for granted the benefits of the common market and should work together into steering the market in the direction that can help quality job creation.

Olga Sehnalová (S&D), *písemně*. – Vymáhání pravidel na ochranu spotřebitelů považuji za jednu z hlavních priorit politik jednotného trhu, protože ani sebelepší spotřebitelská legislativa nemůže fungovat bez řádného vymáhání. Z řady konzultací se zástupci dozorových orgánů a spotřebitelských organizací pozoruji, že existuje velký potenciál posílení a zlepšení spolupráce orgánů veřejné správy na všech úrovních při vymáhání předpisů na ochranu spotřebitele. Považuji za důležité také hledat nové způsoby, jak posílit a zlepšit prosazování spotřebitelského práva napříč celou EU a členskými státy, např. prostřednictvím většího zapojení spotřebitelských organizací. Vítám proto legislativní přezkum nařízení o spolupráci v oblasti ochrany spotřebitele a věřím, že diskuze zde v Parlamentu i mezi členskými státy povede ke zkvalitnění stávajícího rámce spolupráce mezi zmiňovanými aktéry. Ráda bych také zdůraznila přínos koordinova-

ných kontrolných akcií v rámci vnútorného trhu a domnívam sa, že bychom tohoto nástroje mali viac využívať ako pro řešení přeshraničních případů, tak jako vhodnou platformu pro sdílení osvědčených postupů v boji proti nekalému jednání v jednotlivých členských státech. Ačkoliv je dnešní návrh prezentován v rámci strategie pro digitální vnitřní trh, mějme prosím na paměti, že účinné vymáhání pravidel se zdaleka netýká jen online prostředí.

Tibor Szanyi (S&D), írásban. – Az egységes digitális piac lehetőséget biztosít az európai állampolgárok és vállalkozások számára, hogy már a digitális világban is szabadon mozoghassanak az uniós tagállamokban, akadályok nélkül férhesse-nek hozzá, vagy épp nyújthassanak online szolgáltatásokat a tisztességes verseny, magas fogyasztóvédelmi és adatvédelmi szabályok betartása mellett. Hiába élünk azonban a digitális forradalom világában, sokaknak, különösen a kkv-knak és a tradicionális ipari szektoroknak még nem sikerült alkalmazkodniuk teljesen a digitális világ követelményeihez. Ezért is fontos és üdvözlendő a Bizottság egységes és átfogó szabályozási keretet nyújtó európai digitális piaci stratégiája. A digitális írástudás fejlesztése ezért Európa-szerte fontos, Magyarország számára pedig különösen, hisz e téren igen rosszul áll európai viszonylatban.

Ugyanakkor ma Magyarországon a közéleti vita inkább a közoktatás totális csődjéről, bukásáról szól, mintsem arról, hogy hogyan lehetne fejleszteni a fiatalok digitális készségeit. Hónapok óta követeli eredmény nélkül a magyar pedagógus-társadalom, a középiskolai és egyetemi diákság, a szülők és a velük szolidaritást vállaló civilek a működésképtelen oktatási rendszer átalakítását és az erről szóló konstruktív párbeszéd megkezdését. Ez bár egyéni, tagállami problémának tűnhet, mégis arra figyelmeztet, hogy érdemes közelebbről megvizsgálni az egyes oktatási rendszerek életképességét, melynek keretében uniós támogatással fejlesztenék a digitális készségeket, amennyiben szeretnénk valóban kihasználni a Bizottság stratégiájában rejlő lehetőségeket.

Jarosław Wałęsa (PPE), na piśmie. – Rewolucja internetowa miała ogromny wpływ na możliwości prowadzenia handlu na skalę światową. Nowa gospodarka, która swoje powstanie zawdzięcza rozwojowi technologicznemu, była motorem zachodzących zmian w sposobie prowadzenia przedsiębiorstw handlowych. Regulacje w handlu internetowym nie powinny w żadnym stopniu dyskryminować e-klienta. Możliwości prowadzenia zakupów powinny określać te same reguły co w handlu tradycyjnym. Nie można dopuścić do istnienia dyskryminacji tak ważnego przecież w transakcjach handlowych konsumenta tylko ze względu na jego miejsce zamieszkania czy też kraj prowadzenia działalności. Uregulowanie warunków funkcjonowania przedsiębiorstw na rynku cyfrowym pozwoli w rezultacie zwiększyć zaufanie e-klienta do zakupów internetowych. Należałoby wyeliminować wciąż mające miejsce niesprawiedliwe działania podmiotów na platformach internetowych, które są częścią cyfrowej rzeczywistości. Dzięki nim wzrosły możliwości dokonywania zakupów i prowadzenia transakcji przez konsumentów i przedsiębiorców. Trzeba wprowadzić regulacje, które w rezultacie przyczynią się do powstania uczciwej konkurencji. Sprawiedliwe funkcjonowania podmiotów da wszystkim uczestnikom rynku równe szanse rozwoju.

Carlos Zorrinho (S&D), por escrito. – A União Europeia precisa, para se consolidar e combater os riscos de fragmentação política, económica e social, de reforçar as suas apostas estratégicas. A União Digital, de que o mercado único digital é uma componente central, é uma dessas prioridades.

O mercado de 500 milhões de consumidores e o alvor de uma nova era digital são oportunidades que a União Europeia não pode perder. Quem quiser operar no mercado digital europeu, tem que cumprir as regras desse mercado mas, para isso, essas regras têm que ser adequadas aos novos desafios tecnológicos e evitar as barreiras desnecessárias ao desenvolvimento das trocas, no contexto de equidade no acesso, na inclusão, na proteção dos consumidores e das pequenas e médias empresas, e no respeito pelos direitos individuais e coletivos.

A decisão de avançar com três propostas legislativas para o comércio electrónico (eliminando bloqueios geográficos injustificados, regulando os custos de entrega transfronteiriços e reforçando a proteção dos consumidores) e uma diretiva que atualiza as regras aplicáveis aos serviços audiovisuais e às plataformas em linha, é oportuna e recupera parcialmente o atraso na concretização da estratégia definida na comunicação de 6 de maio de 2015.

Importa que este impulso permita acelerar a concretização da União Digital.

17. Príprava samitu G7 (rozprava)

La Présidente. — L'ordre du jour appelle le débat sur les déclarations du Conseil et de la Commission sur la préparation du sommet du G7 (2016/2586(RSP)).

Frans Timmermans, *First Vice-President of the Commission.* – Madam President, President Juncker is travelling as we speak to the G7 Summit in Japan and has asked me to address you on his behalf, ahead of a summit that will address a number of urgent priorities.

The economic backdrop is one of gradual recovery for our economy, despite a difficult global environment. EU annual growth reached 2% in 2015. Our first-quarter growth this year was higher than that of the United States. Unemployment is certainly still much too high in some Member States but, across the board, it has fallen to its lowest in five years. Today, there are five million more jobs than in 2013.

Confidence is gradually returning – we see it on investment, on consumer spending, on lending. But we must remain alert. Our main trading partners' slower performance is a cause for concern. Last year, growth outside the EU fell to its lowest since 2009 as emerging markets performed less well. Against this backdrop of uncertainty, growth will depend on the opportunities we create for ourselves. We need investment, structural reforms and responsible public finances. We need to stay the course.

This Parliament has played a vital role in this strategy. You made it possible to launch the Investment Plan for Europe at record speed. In less than one year, it has triggered EUR 100 billion in new investments, and delivered finance on better terms to more than 140 000 SMEs. It is generating structural change. Until now, European investment has often been dominated by a limited number of large, expensive projects. Today, we are starting to see more local projects, which are smaller and more diverse. Public money is mobilising private finance, and supporting structural reforms. We see more interaction between the European Investment Bank and local institutions. In short, we are beginning to see the kind of investment that the market has often failed to deliver.

Our Fund is helping to find new treatments for Alzheimer's disease; transforming old industrial sites into new offices; bringing energy efficiency into our homes and cutting our bills; and lending a hand to start-ups who were turned away by other lenders. Investment is high on the agenda of the G7. And we have a good story to tell.

We will also deliver better news on Greece. Last year, we fought hard to keep Greece in the euro area. Today, the economic data is better than expected. Greece should return to growth in the second half of 2016. Unemployment fell in 2015, and the government reached a primary surplus of 0.7% of GDP. The stability support programme agreed last summer has laid the ground for long-term stable development. Above all, we have managed to secure Greece's place in the euro area. This week's agreement on the completion of the first review of the programme only confirms that.

Discussions on reducing the Greek debt burden have now started. This recognises the collective effort made by the people of Greece. Today, the Greek economy can turn the corner, and we are confident that international investors will follow.

Within the G7, the European Union has always fought for a global economy that is governed by rules, increasingly transparent, and as fair as possible. In other words, we strive to export our best practices to the global stage. At this week's summit, we will continue these efforts.

Together with our G7 partners, we need to demonstrate that global trade can work for everyone – not just for every country, but for every part of our society. We know that, in the short term, globalisation produces winners and losers. This has helped to fuel populist forces around the world. And so our challenge is not only to shape the rules of the game and to ensure that they are respected, but also to argue that our long-term prosperity lies in openness and exchange.

Over the last year, the European Union has taken the lead on tax transparency. We now have a ground-breaking agreement on tax rulings, and earlier this year we adopted a new proposal on country-by-country reporting. Our message is clear: everyone must pay their fair share. We must now work with our G7 partners to ensure that this is a truly global effort. If our own Member States have agreed to put in place central registers of beneficial ownership, then our partners must do the same. For those that try to evade their duty to society, there must be no place to hide.

We must be equally firm on those countries that do not play by the rules. Free trade must be fair trade. I can assure this House today that the European Commission stands by a robust trade defence system. If somebody distorts the market, we will take action.

This Commission has launched a record number of trade defence measures to respond to the dumping on Europe's steel industry. At the G7, we will argue that offending countries need to produce clear and measurable plans to cut over-capacity. International monitoring must ensure that everyone complies.

Let me now turn to the global refugee crisis, which is rightly high on the G7 agenda. This Commission has argued from the start that only global solutions will work. Here, once again, this Parliament has helped to deliver a European strategy that is comprehensive: saving lives at sea, providing humanitarian assistance, strengthening our borders, supporting the countries most under pressure, relocating and resettling people in need of international protection, returning irregular migrants to their home countries, and creating safe and legal routes for asylum-seekers from outside the European Union. In 2015 and 2016, the EU will have devoted more than EUR 10 billion to managing the crisis.

This strategy has given us the breathing space to look to the future. Together with our G7 partners, we must now develop a truly global response, backed by proper resources, and capable of addressing the root causes of migration. An international resettlement programme is urgent and necessary. Only by giving asylum-seekers a legal route to safety will we convince them not to risk their lives. This is the best way to break the business model of the smugglers. And the best way to restore dignity to those who genuinely need our protection.

Let me conclude with climate and energy. This week's summit of the G7 is the first since the Paris agreement. The real work starts now: modernising our economy and changing the way we produce and consume. This in turn requires new incentives across the entire spectrum of policy. The best of our businesses have read the signal: leading European companies are changing their business models, and creating new jobs that require new skills, innovative processes and investments.

The European Union must have the ambition to be a world leader in renewables: the sector now employs over one million people and generates EUR 130 billion in turnover each year. European companies today hold 40% of all patents for renewable technologies. But major obstacles remain. In 2013, across the world, subsidies for fossil fuels amounted to almost EUR 500 billion. That is a lot of money being spent very badly. The G7 has promised to phase out those subsidies by 2025. Next we must push the G20 to do the same.

As we approach this week's summit in Japan, the need for political coordination at the global level is as compelling as ever. From a slowing global economy to a global refugee crisis, the countries of the G7 need to show leadership and join forces. As the European Union, we will continue to make the case for a global economy that is governed by rules, and an open society that seeks prosperity and security in its exchange with others. In today's uncertain world, our contribution really matters.

Paulo Rangel, em nome do Grupo PPE. – Senhora Presidente, em primeiro lugar queria saudar o Senhor Comissário, Vice-Presidente Timmermans e queria dizer o seguinte.

É evidente que a agenda deste G7 é extremamente vasta. Aqui, a Presidência japonesa não hesitou em pôr, enfim, fazer uma espécie de passagem por todos os temas e eu gostaria de focar quatro temas principais.

O primeiro tem a ver com investimento e aí, sinceramente, julgo que a União Europeia tem, ela própria, que fazer algum esforço. Penso que não basta o Plano Juncker uma vez que estão aqui representadas também individualmente as economias mais relevantes da União Europeia (estou a pensar na Alemanha, na França, no Reino Unido, na Itália). Elas próprias têm que fazer o seu esforço e, em particular, algumas delas têm condições para fazer um investimento em infraestruturas de qualidade e qualificadoras, que podem desempenhar um papel de arranque na economia europeia e na economia global e, portanto, tal como disse o Presidente Obama no seu discurso de Hanôver, bem recente, é importante que os países do G7 façam também um esforço no sentido de fazer esse investimento.

Segundo ponto que acho que é essencial e que nos afeta a nós também, União Europeia, é a questão fiscal e, especialmente, a questão dos paraísos fiscais onde acho que podemos fazer muito mais e o G7 tem grandes responsabilidades.

Importante é também envolver estes países e não apenas a Europa na crise dos refugiados. O Canadá, o Japão, os Estados Unidos, a Austrália não podem isolar-se desta luta.

E finalmente, queria deixar só uma palavra, e com isto termino, sobre um ponto essencial que é o vírus Zika. Falamos muito do Ébola mas o Zika está a chegar à Europa, já está a chegar à margem sul da Europa, e é fundamental que o G7 enfrente este problema.

(O orador aceita responder a uma pergunta segundo o procedimento «cartão azul», nos termos do artigo 162.º, n.º 8, do Regimento)

Tibor Szanyi (S&D), *Kékkártyás kérdés.* – Tisztelt Képviselő Úr! Ön kellő hangsúlyokat adott a gazdasági kérdéseknek. De vajon nem gondolja-e, hogy ez a mostani találkozó, ez egy unikális alkalom lehetne arra nézvést, hogy Európa megértesse a legfőbb gazdasági erőkkkel, hogy most igazából Európának is szüksége van a szolidaritásra. Nem utolsósorban azért, mert egy kicsit a többiek ezt egy európai problémának érzik – a migrációs ügyek vonatkozásában. Magyarul, kérdezem: Ön látja-e annak lehetőségét, hogy a rendezvény most egy szolidaritásról szóljon?

Paulo Rangel (PPE), *Resposta segundo o procedimento «cartão azul».* – Muito obrigado pela sua pergunta. Aquilo que eu disse é exatamente, num duplo sentido, isso.

Primeiro ponto: quanto à questão do arranque económico, a ideia de que nós próprios, os países mais desenvolvidos, temos obrigações de investimento e, nomeadamente, aqueles países que estão mais desafogados, que podem puxar pelos outros, e isso aplica-se à economia global como se aplica à economia europeia.

E, na questão dos refugiados, não tenho dúvidas de que a Europa não deve enfrentar este desafio sozinha, embora ela possa fazer muito e está já a fazer alguma coisa. Deve enfrentar este desafio justamente com o apoio dos restantes países que têm mais poder económico no quadro mundial. Eles também têm uma responsabilidade, eles também são responsáveis pelos refugiados.

Alessia Maria Mosca, *a nome del gruppo S&D.* – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, mai come in questo momento storico la cooperazione globale deve essere rafforzata e dare risposte efficaci.

Una nuova globalizzazione, meno indifferente a chi non ne gode direttamente i benefici, è l'unica risposta a chi fa leva sulle paure e rivitalizza idee che avevamo sperato superate per sempre: nazionalismo, separatismo, xenofobia e muri. L'agenda del summit in Giappone è molto ambiziosa e altrettanto, ci auguriamo, siano le conclusioni, dalla politica estera, al cambiamento climatico, allo sviluppo sostenibile.

Un punto centrale sarà il commercio globale, sul quale abbiamo bisogno di un nuovo slancio che argini le tendenze isolazionistiche e che punti a far rispettare le regole da tutti, poiché solo con il rispetto di tali regole la cooperazione globale può funzionare. A questo proposito, in coerenza con la risoluzione che questo Parlamento ha votato due settimane fa, auspichiamo venga trovata una modalità di rapporto coerente con la Cina, partner fondamentale, che deve però anche essere compartecipe nella definizione di un commercio equo e sostenibile. E ciò vale soprattutto per la questione della concessione dello status di economia di mercato, così come per quella della sovraccapacità, specie nel settore dell'acciaio, e per il rispetto di regole comuni per l'accesso al mercato.

Infine, vogliamo sottolineare con soddisfazione l'inserimento nell'agenda dei lavori del punto sulla *gender equality*. Le Istituzioni europee, da sempre in prima linea nella promozione dell'*empowerment* delle donne, potranno cogliere l'occasione del G7 per supportare le proposte volte a ridurre tutti i divari di genere con misure concrete e coordinate.

Hans-Olaf Henkel, *im Namen der ECR-Fraktion.* – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Vizepräsident! Ganz vorne auf der G7-Agenda steht die Weltwirtschaft, und ich glaube zu Recht. Das hat folgende Gründe. Erstens: Die Weltwirtschaft wächst heute lange nicht mehr so schnell wie früher, und darunter werden vor allen Dingen die Länder der Dritten Welt leiden. Zweitens: Der wichtigste Motor der Weltwirtschaft, der internationale Welthandel, stottert. Und drittens: Von den auf dem Gipfel vertretenen Regionen hält die Eurozone schon seit längerer Zeit immer wieder die rote Laterne.

Deshalb erlaube ich mir, den beiden Präsidenten Tusk und Juncker einige Ratschläge mit auf den Weg nach Japan zu geben. Erstens: Setzen Sie sich für einen Neustart im Welthandel ein. Stichworte sind hier TTIP, CETA und TPP. Die Globalisierung ist nicht nur ein ökonomisches Phänomen. Sie bringt nicht nur Waren, Dienstleistungen und Güter um die Welt, sondern eben auch Ideen wie Demokratie und Menschenrechte. Zweitens: Widersetzen Sie sich dem süßen Gift eines möglichen Abwertungswettlaufs. Und drittens: Sie werden sicherlich gefragt werden, warum die Eurozone schon seit Jahren dahinsiecht. Die Antwort liegt in der *One-size-fits-all*-Währung. Währungen müssen den wirtschaftlichen Realitäten entsprechen. Wir müssen damit aufhören, die wirtschaftlichen, finanziellen und fiskalischen Kulturen der Länder den Bedürfnissen der Währung unterzuordnen.

(Der Redner ist damit einverstanden, eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“ gemäß Artikel 162 Absatz 8 der Geschäftsordnung zu beantworten.)

Daniel Caspary (PPE), *Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“.* – Sehr geehrter Herr Henkel! Sie sind auf die angeblich dahinsiechende Eurozone eingegangen. Stimmen Sie mir zu, dass diese angeblich so dahinsiechende Zone im ersten Quartal dieses Jahres ein größeres Wirtschaftswachstum hatte als die möglicherweise so vitalen Vereinigten Staaten von Amerika? Könnte es also hilfreich sein, wenn Sie Ihre Ansicht über die Eurozone überdenken, wenn Sie die Realität auf dieser Welt zur Kenntnis nehmen?

Hans-Olaf Henkel (ECR), *Antwort auf eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“.* – Ein Hinweis: Zur Betrachtung der Realität gehört natürlich die Wahrheit, und die Wahrheit kann man nicht an den Ergebnissen von 90 Tagen festmachen. Meine Aussage bezieht sich auf zehn Jahre und übrigens auf die offiziellen Vorhersagen der OECD, und die zeigen ganz eindeutig, dass auch in diesem Jahr die Eurozone hinter den Vereinigten Staaten, hinter dem Rest der Welt und im Übrigen auch hinter all den Ländern in der EU hinterherhinkt, die den Euro nicht haben.

Pavel Telička, *on behalf of the ALDE Group.* – Madam President, let me start by saying that clearly the Dutch Presidency does not attach that much importance to the G7 summit, but I am glad that the Commission does. I also share a lot of what the Vice-President has said on a number of important points – I think points that are relevant for the agenda, points where the EU has a lot to show. Against the background of the all the crises that we are facing I think that there are plenty of positive messages, and I am glad that you have raised this.

I also appreciate what you have said about investment, structural reforms and of course sound finances, as well as the distortion of the market and the response the EU has to make in this respect. But you have also used the word confidence, confidence in the markets – I would use ‘confidence’ in a different context: confidence in the G7.

I think that the reality is that from the last summits of the G7 we do not have that much to cheer about. The G7 for me is an important forum and it can be a very successful one, but there are ingredients which are absolutely key.

Problems identified – we have mentioned some of them and I think we have plenty of those. Then we need to be able to arrive at a certain degree of consensus if not unanimity. That seems to be much more problematic, which brings me to the third ingredient, namely that it might be key – and that might be an opportunity for the EU, not just on concrete issues, but in general – to take up leadership. Clearly what the G7 is lacking in recent years is leadership, and the outcome of the G 7 reflects that. That is a reality, and if we look at the agenda, the agenda is full and relevant, but we already know in advance that it is going to be extremely difficult to agree on the common growth strategies. The ministers were unable to agree on it. Hopefully the summit will do better, but on one of the key points on the agenda, clearly we are unable to agree or we have difficulties.

So I would expect President Juncker and President Tusk to show leadership in this respect and not just to show in our windscreens what we can be rightly proud of, but really take up the leadership and deliver. We are not delivering and I think the public expects that.

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

Doru-Claudian Frunzulică (S&D), *blue-card question*. – You know that climate change is a great threat to our future and it is linked also with migrants coming especially from the sub-Saharan area. Do you not think that the European Commission President and the European Council President should take the lead at the G7 meeting, because you were talking about confidence, and should call on the Heads of State of the seven countries to ratify as soon as possible the agreement made in Paris in order to set an example to other states?

Pavel Telička (ALDE), *blue-card answer*. – Yes, if I spoke of leadership I meant it 'en bloc'. I think that all the issues that are on the agenda are absolutely relevant. But leadership also means that we are able to find an agreement on all those issues. Leadership does not always mean by definition that we are well ahead while the rest of the world lags behind. And on climate change, relevant as it is, we need a global deal, and we need everyone to really put in the effort so that we have a harmonised effect.

Tania González Peñas, *en nombre del Grupo GUE/NGL*. – Señora Presidenta, Señorías, quiero compartir con ustedes nuestra preocupación por la posición de la Unión Europea acerca de las estrategias económicas para combatir esa creciente incertidumbre económica mundial. Sin embargo, lejos de aprovechar estos foros para frenar la especulación a escala mundial y regularizar los paraísos fiscales, se siguen tomando decisiones que perpetúan el problema.

Esa incertidumbre económica que atterra ahora a las élites mundiales es la consecuencia de las prácticas antisociales que alienta la Comisión. Efectivamente, hay una crisis de inversión mundial y quienes la sufren son los ciudadanos y las ciudadanas que ven cómo las principales potencias siguen promocionando la especulación financiera global en vez de buscar soluciones para la vida de la gente.

No es tarde para que el señor Juncker y el señor Task hagan autocritica, dejen de improvisar planes para salvar a los de siempre —no a nuevas empresas, a los de siempre— y busquen soluciones que tengan presentes a los pueblos que esperan de la Unión Europea otra cosa más allá de recortes y miseria.

Y, señor Timmermans, comercio justo no es el TTIP. Ese es el comercio del 1 % de las multinacionales. No es el comercio para la mayoría, para el 99 %.

Sven Giegold, *im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin! Herr Kommissar Timmermans! Zwei kurze Punkte möchte ich ansprechen. Beim G7 vor einem Jahr war das große Schlagwort die Dekarbonisierung. Das große Versprechen war: Wir machen die Weltwirtschaft klimafreundlich und sorgen dadurch gleichzeitig für wirtschaftlichen Aufschwung. Sie haben es selbst angesprochen: Gleichzeitig investieren die Länder, die sich jetzt wieder versammeln, selber nach wie vor große Summen in Kohle, in Öl, in Gas usw. Sie haben kritisiert, dass die umweltschädlichen Subventionen weitergehen. Ich frage mich an der Stelle: Was tun wir diesbezüglich in Europa? Gibt es einen Vorschlag, der jetzt nach dem, was Sie eben gesagt haben, kommen wird, um die umweltschädlichen Subventionen zu beenden? Ich sehe stattdessen im europäischen Semester, dass die Vorschläge zur ökologischen Finanzpolitik reduziert und nicht verstärkt worden sind. Also seien Sie selbst mutig in dem Bereich, und die G7 sollte das realisieren, was sie angekündigt hat.

Ein zweiter Punkt: Vor zwei Monaten hat dieses Haus einen Bericht, den Goulard-Bericht, verabschiedet und stärkere Regeln gegen Interessenkonflikte, für Rechenschaftspflicht und Transparenz von globalen Institutionen eingefordert. Herr Timmermans, werden Sie die Vorschläge, die wir da gemacht haben, in die G7 hineinragen? Wie wird die G7 selbst diese Vorschläge realisieren, und wie wird die Europäische Kommission bei ihrer Arbeit in der G7 diese Vorschläge des Parlaments umsetzen? Da wäre ich auf eine Antwort gespannt.

Patrick O'Flynn, *on behalf of the EFDD Group*. – Madam President, the sad truth is that the European Commissioners are going to be excluded from the only meaningful action at the G7 summit, which will be more blood-curdling warnings to the British not to dare to vote to leave the EU. You see, the likes of Mr Juncker and Mr Timmermans, and Mr Tusk as well, are judged to be counterproductive even to Project Fear as a reminder to voters of eurozone folly and wider EU economic failure. How embarrassing it must be for the EU's representatives to turn up to each G7 with yet another excuse for economic failure. This time, according to the Commission's own fact sheet, they intend to claim that despite a more difficult global environment the EU's recovery continues. That reminds me of the old line about never letting the facts get in the way of a good story. We are told the economy in all Member States will grow next year, albeit unevenly

– that is one word for it. The Commission's G7 factsheet says that investment, although still low compared with pre-crisis levels, is 'gaining traction'. Traction in my country is what we put patients in when they have serious fractures. Let me remind you that the crisis was in 2008, yet recovery has still not taken a firm hold. The fact sheet hopes to get average unemployment in the EU below 10% in 2017. That is not a fact sheet, it is a wish list. And it is always 'jam tomorrow', is it not? As the much-loved British sitcom character Del Boy used to say, 'this time next year we could be millionaires'. It is not going to happen under the euro, the euro is a losers' currency. It is not a case of the eurozone battling against the global environment so much as the euro dragging down the global economic environment. And instead of facing up to this, no doubt even now you will be dreaming up your excuses for the 2017 summit, predicting that 2018 will be your year. Face it: the dog did not eat your homework, the euro killed your growth.

Gilles Lebreton, *au nom du groupe ENF*. – Madame la Présidente, par une ruse de l'histoire, l'Union européenne est le huitième participant des sommets du G7, théoriquement réservé à sept États. Messieurs Tusk et Junker la représenteront donc au prochain sommet, qui aura lieu les 26 et 27 mai au Japon. Je crains, hélas, qu'ils exercent une influence négative sur la résolution de trois problèmes qui y seront débattus.

En matière économique, ils prôneront, comme d'habitude, l'ultralibéralisme, qui fait le malheur des peuples européens. Auront-ils l'audace de saluer les progrès dans la négociation du TAFTA, comme lors du G7 de l'an dernier? Je parie que oui, car ils sont sourds aux inquiétudes de l'opinion publique.

En matière de politique étrangère, ils s'acharneront sans doute sur la Russie, alors que la Russie est objectivement notre principal allié dans la lutte contre l'État islamique et contre le terrorisme.

Et en matière de crise migratoire, ils renforceront les États du G7 dans leur erreur. La seule solution pour la résoudre, à long terme, consiste en effet à apporter une aide à l'éducation et au développement économique aux États qui en ont besoin, afin de fixer les populations chez elles. Mais qui s'en soucie?

Au sommet humanitaire mondial d'Istanbul, qui vient de s'achever le 24 mai, les dirigeants du G7 n'étaient pas là, et aujourd'hui, le Conseil n'est même pas représenté au Parlement européen.

(L'orateur accepte de répondre à une question «carton bleu» (article 162, paragraphe 8, du règlement))

Ангел Джамбазки (ЕКР), *въпрос, зададен чрез вдигане на синя карта*. – Уважаеми колега Лъобретон, финансовите лидери на страните от Г7 приеха план за действие, призоваващ за повишен обмен на информация, с цел предотвратяване на финансирането на тероризма.

Не смятате ли, че Г7 е остаряла структура, която вече не представлява най-силните икономики, имайки предвид липсата на Китай и на Индия, на редица арабски държави там и на практика решенията им нямат никакъв особен ефект? И не смятате ли, че тази структура дублира други подобни структури и всъщност подобен дебат е, меко казано, губене на време?

Gilles Lebreton (ENF), *réponse «carton bleu»*. – Merci de cette question très intéressante. Je pense que le G7 est un instrument intéressant parmi d'autres pour résoudre des problèmes internationaux. En ce qui concerne l'échange d'informations, cet échange est bien sûr nécessaire dans bien des domaines, notamment pour lutter contre le terrorisme. Je suis représentant d'un groupe politique qui préconise la coopération entre États souverains et j'estime donc que ce genre d'échange d'informations est acceptable à condition que cela ne soit pas pris en main par la Commission de Bruxelles qui, immanquablement, fait capoter les bons projets.

Zoltán Balczó (NI). – Annak önmagában örülnünk kell, hogy a G7-csúcstalálkozón a napirenden szerepel a migránsválság kérdése is. És itt hangsúlyozzák, a Bizottság alelnöke is, a sajtónyilatkozatokban is az szerepel, hogy globális feladatként kell ezt megoldani. Ez így van! De mit tekintünk feladatnak? A nyilatkozat felsorolja az európai uniós anyagi terheket. De az kevés, hogy szolidáris alapon a globális partnerek ehhez hozzájárulnak. Itt felelősségről van szó! Kiemelten az Egyesült Államok felelősségéről, amelyik a nyugati demokrácia exportjának fegyveres próbálkozásával létrehozta azt az arab tavaszt, amelyik anarchiába döntötte ezt a régiót, és alapvetően hozzájárult ehhez a migránsáradathoz. Tehát igenis erre a felelősség-felhívásra van szükség, és az Egyesült Államoknak módja van Szaúd-Arábia és az öböl menti gazdag országok révén is lehetővé tenni, hogy a menekültek ne Európa irányába jöjjenek.

Daniel Caspary (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin! Fünf Millionen mehr Jobs als 2013 haben wir heute in der Europäischen Union, und viele davon sind wegen und dank der Globalisierung entstanden. Auf der anderen Seite haben wir im Moment Hunderttausende in Sorge, zum Beispiel im Stahlbereich, auch wegen der Globalisierung. Deswegen ist meine Bitte: Nutzen Sie den G7-Gipfel, um die Chancen zu vergrößern und die Risiken zu verringern, damit wir auch in Zukunft eine positive Stimmung gegenüber der Globalisierung in unserer Europäischen Union haben.

Warum? Nehmen wir mal das Beispiel China. Wir haben im Moment eine Milliarde Handelsvolumen am Tag zwischen der Europäischen Union und China. Das ist auf der einen Seite ein riesiger Markt für uns und auf der anderen Seite ein wichtiger Lieferant von Waren und Vorprodukten für unsere Seite. Wegen China sind auf der einen Seite viele Arbeitsplätze entstanden, ja, aber auf der anderen Seite haben viele Arbeitnehmer deswegen auch Sorgen: Halten die sich an die Regeln? Machen die nicht alles platt durch unfaire Handelspraktiken wie zum Beispiel bei Schuhen, Solarzellen oder jetzt im Stahlbereich? Wie gestalten wir unsere Beziehungen zu China und anderen wichtigen Partnern?

Deswegen meine Bitte: Nutzen Sie die Gelegenheit des G7-Gipfels, um mit den internationalen Partnern Regeln der Globalisierung zu gestalten und über sie zu sprechen, damit wir weiter viele neue Jobs und weniger neue Sorgen in Europa haben.

Ich wünsche mir auf der einen Seite, dass wir die offenen Märkte haben. Aber ich wünsche mir, dass wir auch in Zukunft Industriearbeitsplätze in Europa haben. Und deswegen: Freuen Sie sich weiter, Herr Kommissionsvizepräsident, wenn aus alten Industriebrachen neue Büros entstehen. Aber bitte, arbeiten Sie auch daran, dass Industrien in Europa überleben können und auch neue Industriearbeitsplätze in Europa entstehen können, weil sonst unser Wohlstand bedroht ist.

Paul Tang (S&D). – Mevrouw de voorzitter, begin deze maand is de Japanse premier Abe op tournee geweest in Europa om de G7 voor te bereiden. Hij had een kraakheldere boodschap voor zijn Europese collega's: overheden moeten meer doen om de economie aan te jagen. Daar is nu meer reden voor dan ooit, want China ziet economische problemen en de andere opkomende landen hebben die problemen al. En het G7 is van oudsher het forum om te komen tot enige vorm van economische coördinatie.

Het is niet zo verrassend dat Shinzō Abe een pleidooi houdt. Hij is daar duidelijk de uitvinder van. Hij wil de deflatoire spiraal in Japan doorbreken, maar de Europese reactie is helaas ook geen verrassing. De Europese economische grootmachten blijven weigeren en met name minister Schäuble van Duitsland. Na de G7-top van de ministers van Financiën vorige week gaf hij immers als enige antwoord: structurele hervormingen.

Maar de Japanse premier heeft gelijk: structurele hervormingen zijn niet genoeg. Europese overheden zullen meer moeten doen om de vraag te stimuleren en investeringen aan te jagen. Ik ben bang dat de G7-top zal eindigen met een reprimande voor de Europese verdeeldheid om de problemen die we hier hebben, en die we niet kunnen afwentelen op het buitenland, onder ogen te zien.

Νότης Μαριιάς (ECR). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, η διάσκεψη των G7 είναι ανίκανη να δώσει λύσεις στα προβλήματα της παγκόσμιας οικονομίας, καθώς εμμένει στη λιτότητα και συνεχίζει να υποστηρίζει την οικονομία καζίνο. Σε έναν πολυπολικό κόσμο το αυτάρεσκο σχήμα των G7 δεν μπορεί να δώσει απαντήσεις στη σύγχρονη οικονομία χωρίς να λάβει υπόψη του την ανερχόμενη δύναμη των BRICS

Απαιτείται λοιπόν μια νέα παγκόσμια αρχιτεκτονική που θα δίνει λύση στο πρόβλημα της φτώχειας, θα διασφαλίζει μια δίκαιη κατανομή του παραγόμενου πλούτου και θα προωθεί τη διαγραφή του επονειδιστου χρέος που καταδυναστεύει τα κράτη. Για αυτό και δεν εμπιστευόμαστε τα συμπεράσματα που θα βγάλει η επικείμενη διάσκεψη των G7 όσον αφορά το ελληνικό χρέος, καθώς η χθεσινή απόφαση του Eurogroup επιβεβαιώνει ότι οι δανειστές της Ελλάδας «γδέρνουν το βόδι δυο φορές».

Αντί λοιπόν η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση και το ΔΝΤ να κουρέψουν το ελληνικό δήθεν χρέος και να ρυθμίσουν την εξόφληση του υπόλοιπου με ρήτρα ανάπτυξης, όπως έπραξαν ήδη στην περίπτωση της Ουκρανίας, τελικά αρνούνται την απομείωση του ονομαστικού χρέους, απαιτούν μέτρα λιτότητας και αδιάκοπης δημοσιονομικής προσαρμογής, καθώς και διαρκές επί ενενήντα εννιά χρόνια ξεπούλημα της δημόσιας περιουσίας.

Javier Couso Permuy (GUE/NGL). – Señora Presidenta, ¿qué función cumple el G-7 hoy en día? Solo hay que ver cómo se fundó para entender qué intereses defiende. El G-7 es parte de la defensa de una vieja correlación de fuerzas. Nacido en los años setenta en un mundo multipolar, no entiende que estamos ante el fin de la segunda globalización, esa de la que nos decía que toda la soberanía debería ir a los Estados Unidos, toda la soberanía del mundo. Estamos en la vuelta de un mundo multipolar. Los BRICS nos lo recuerdan cada día.

La intervención del Vicepresidente es clarificadora. Habla de economía mundial y de perjudicados de la globalización y hurta la agenda económica que han llevado ustedes. Y luego habla de fuerzas populistas, intentando acabar con la democracia y el debate democrático. Habla de comercio justo. Permítame que me ría. O de la dispersión de mercados, que vamos a actuar. ¿Qué quiere decir, la agenda de la ATCI para tener una postura frente a los nuevos países emergentes o la causa de la emigración?

Señor, no estamos ante un problema de emigración sino de refugiados. Más de lo mismo: defensa de un mundo multipolar y su injusto mundo de excepcionalidad neoliberal.

Andrej Plenković (PPE). – Gospođo predsjednice, pozdravljam i prvog potpredsjednika Komisije gospodina Timmermansa i zahvaljujem mu na predstavljanju ključnih stajališta Europske komisije uoči 42. sastanka na vrhu G7, važnog foruma za globalno upravljanje koji već otprilike 35 godina daje priliku Europskoj uniji da zajednički artikulira stajališta o onim pitanjima koja su na dnevnom redu svijeta.

U tom kontekstu, njegova analiza o tome da je većina ekonomskih čimbenika i indikatora poboljšana na razini Europske unije treba predstavljati poticaj onim zemljama Europske unije koje nisu na toj razini, ni kada je riječ o rastu ni kada je riječ o smanjivanju zapošljavanja i provođenju strukturnih reformi. I u tom pogledu, europski investicijski plan strateškog investiranja treba biti mjerilo i pokazatelj smjera daljnjeg razvitka niza država članica.

Ono što mi se čini bitnim za ovaj sastanak G7 je da uz teme koje je spomenuo gospodin Timmermans, kada je riječ o zajedničkom nalaženju rješenja i za migracijsku krizu i izbjegličku krizu, trebamo vidjeti koji doprinos Europske unije može biti u povezivanju ove krize s ciljevima održive razvojne politike Europske unije i Agende 2030.

Naravno da u tom pogledu treba pridonijeti i dijalog o jačanju ukupnih trgovinskih odnosa na globalnoj razini, zaključivanju sporazuma gdje ćemo voditi računa o interesima naših potrošača i o našim standardima kada je riječ o javnom zdravlju. Važno je dogovoriti i daljnju suradnju na razini globalne sigurnosne i vanjske politike.

Neena Gill (S&D). – Madam President, the global challenges we are facing have been well versed in this House: terrorism, the migration crisis, energy and climate change. And we are still grappling with the consequences of the financial crisis, so the main aim for the G7 has to be to address this.

We live in an interdependent and interconnected world where we really need to find solutions together. The G7 are the most powerful economies of the world and they must tackle the level of unemployment we face. They must tackle this to increase job creation, because only together can we really tackle the challenges that we face. Rightly, this meeting is concerned about the outcome of the UK referendum on its membership of the EU. Members of Britain's leading tax and spending think-tank have warned today that leaving the EU would force ministers to extend austerity measures by up to two years to achieve a budget surplus. Thus, the message is clear, if we want our voice to be heard on a global level we want the UK to lead and to stay in the EU. As Gordon Brown stated elegantly this morning, when it comes to the UK relationship in the EU 'it should be about clout and not about out'.

Barbara Spinelli (GUE/NGL). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, vorrei concentrarmi sulla ricostituzione del G8 e sulla riapertura economica e politica alla Russia.

Ritengo urgente rivedere i rapporti con Washington in vista del referendum inglese e delle elezioni negli USA: meglio prepararsi prima che dopo, meglio prevedere le nostre disgregazioni sia con il Brexit sia con il non-Brexit.

Quanto a Mosca, mi chiedo se l'Europa abbia interesse a una presenza militare quadruplicata di USA e NATO ai confini orientali, che estranierà la Russia più che mai. Washington si allontanerà dall'Europa con Trump o la userà, se vince Hillary Clinton, come strumento di politiche fallite in Medi Oriente, Siria e Libia.

Prepararsi vuol dire ridiscutere tali politiche, averne una propria. Da quelle politiche sono nati l'Isis, le guerre e quella che chiamiamo «questione rifugiati», quando è «nostra questione», «nostra débâcle».

Președinte: IOAN MIRCEA PAȘCU

Vicepreședinte

Sergio Gaetano Cofferati (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signor Commissario, vorrei insistere su due punti che sono già nel vasto ordine del giorno del G7 ed aggiungere una considerazione su un punto che invece purtroppo manca, secondo me colpevolmente.

Il primo tema è quello della lotta all'elusione e all'evasione fiscale. La proposta dell'OCSE è una piccola proposta, insufficiente. Io credo che anche sul piano dei rapporti bilaterali e in sede multilaterale sia importante andare oltre, avere cioè soluzioni che abbiano un carattere maggiormente vincolante, più trasparente e che introducano la rendicontazione, paese per paese, a livello internazionale.

Il secondo argomento è quello degli accordi commerciali internazionali. Manca trasparenza, non possiamo assistere impotenti a negoziati dei quali non conosciamo i contenuti, soprattutto quando questi riguardano gli standard sociali, ambientali e la sicurezza dei consumatori.

L'ultimo tema, quello che manca, è l'attività delle multinazionali e il rispetto dei diritti umani. Credo sia importante garantire i principi guida delle Nazioni Unite sui business e sui diritti umani. Troppe volte la catena della produzione arriva a cancellare diritti che riguardano le persone, addirittura in qualche caso i bambini. Credo che tutto ciò non sia più accettabile.

Francisco Assis (S&D). – Senhor Presidente, Senhor Vice-Presidente da Comissão, eu queria justamente também fazer uma referência à questão do comércio internacional.

Temos que melhorar o ambiente político internacional, de forma a evitar que ao vírus nacionalista, que se está a manifestar em grande escala no plano político, venha também a corresponder uma espécie de vírus protecionista, do ponto de vista do relacionamento comercial internacional.

Mas isso pressupõe, de facto, um grande esforço por parte das principais potências mundiais e a opinião europeia tem um papel muito importante, no sentido de criar um ambiente mais favorável, com maior transparência do ponto de vista comercial, do ponto de vista orçamental e também do ponto de vista fiscal, ao combate justamente à evasão e à fraude fiscais. Porque se não, de facto, estamos a criar as condições para que o protecionismo regresse em força com todas as consequências trágicas que daí poderão resultar.

O segundo aspeto que aqui queria referir é justamente a necessidade de projetar o tratamento da questão dos refugiados no plano mundial.

A União Europeia tem procurado responder, umas vezes melhor, outras vezes pior, mas a verdade é que temos que encontrar a capacidade de criar uma preocupação a nível mundial para o tratamento desse assunto e creio que esta é uma ocasião especialmente favorável para que esse tema seja colocado na agenda política mundial.

Intervenții la cerere

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Domnule comisar, ați făcut o sinteză a principalelor preocupări ale Comisiei pentru viitor, trecând în revistă realizările din ultimii doi ani. Recunosc că am fost surprinsă de declarația dumneavoastră privind subvențiile prost cheltuite - circa patru sute de miliarde pentru scăderea emisiilor. Dar ce garanții avem că nu se vor cheltui prost și următoarele subvenții? Ce garanții ne dați?

Ați vorbit de evaziune fiscală, dar iată că a trecut ceva timp de la dezvăluirile privind Panama și nu avem încă măsuri concrete pentru prevenirea unui nou caz Panama. Ce veți decide la G7?

Mi-a plăcut că ați spus despre comerț: trebuie să fie liber, dar și echitabil. Credeți că avem toate măsurile pentru a avea un comerț echitabil? Eu cred că nu și, de aceea, cred, domnule comisar, că trebuie să găsiți măsuri țintite pentru apărare comercială, pentru armonizarea standardelor atunci când încheiați acorduri comerciale cu alte piețe, cum ar fi SUA, Canada sau China. Europa trebuie reindustrializată inteligent dacă dorim locuri de muncă, și cred că da, economia globală trebuie condusă prin reguli, numai că aceste reguli trebuie să fie echitabile. Ce faceți să nu mai avem două Europe, domnule comisar?

Илхан Кючюк (ALDE). – Г-н Председател, г-н Тимерманс, колеги, срещата на върха на Г7 в Япония е от изключително значение, тъй като се провежда в момент, когато светът е изправен пред многобройни глобални предизвикателства. Задълбочаването на глобалната хуманитарна криза, спадът на световната икономика, нарастващите заплахи от тероризъм, отражението на климатичните промени и нестихващите етнорелигиозни конфликти са неотложни въпроси, на които водещите световни сили трябва да предложат решение въз основа на конкретни приоритети и конкретни ангажменти.

Именно затова Европейският съюз трябва да има значима роля на предстоящата среща на върха на Г7 в Япония. Необходимо е да поставим акцент върху решаването на бежанската криза, борбата с тероризма, развитието на свободната търговия, но и на спазването на всички ангажменти в областта на хуманитарната помощ, поети на срещата на върха по хуманитарните въпроси в Истанбул.

Европейският съюз трябва да настоява за засилване на международното сътрудничество в борбата с укриването на данъци и избягването на данъчно облагане.

Не на последно място Европейският съюз трябва да покаже, че е готов да изпълни своите ангажменти.

(Încheierea intervențiilor la cerere)

Frans Timmermans, First Vice-President of the Commission. – Mr President, I will make just a few remarks. I have to say to the Honourable Member Giegold, who had two specific questions for me: on the first question I will have to get back to you in writing because I cannot answer you immediately; on the issue of expert groups and conflict of interests in expert groups, we have had a long debate also with the Parliament and with Dennis de Jong, another of your colleagues, on this, and the Commission's position will be forthcoming before the end of this month on this specific issue.

In general, I would like to say that indeed we face huge global economic challenges on the issues we have discussed, but I think drawing up the drawbridge and building walls is not going to get us out of this conundrum. So all those who say we should break with neoliberal policies are right... but I am not sure that is what they are talking about. I think global trade will be necessary to create innovation and growth in the European Union. If you look at the challenge we face, given our demographic situation, then if we stay where we are, the best possible option is to defend what we have, which means, very simply, that we will slow down decline. So if you really want to use the opportunities that global developments are offering, you need to move towards a sustainable economy, you need to embrace the digital single market, you need to create an energy union and you need to make sure that your economy becomes circular. For all of that, you need change. You need to take the necessary steps in that direction. That is the only way we can create enough economic growth which is sustainable, which does not deplete the Earth but which maintains our natural resources and which will enable us to create the social environment that is wanted by the vast majority of Europeans. We need growth for that, given our demographic challenge.

That is what the Commission will be advocating in the G7 – to use the opportunity that global trade offers without being naive about the abuse of the elements of global trade if we do not stick to the rules and if we do not have fair play. That is the essence of what we are doing.

I do agree with all of those who have said that we need to have an enhanced attention towards implementing the Paris agreements. Again, if you follow my reasoning that we need a sustainable economy, we need to make sure that we slow down global warming and that we actually do what we promised in Paris. For that, concrete measures are necessary and they need to be discussed in the G7 framework.

Finally, let me emphasise – and I cannot say this enough – the migration and refugee crisis is here to stay. It is not something that will end if, at last, the war in Syria comes to an end. Look at the huge demographic pressures we will see from Africa and elsewhere. It is in our essential interest that we create sustainable growth in our neighbourhood. And when I talk about our neighbourhood, I mean the wider neighbourhood, including the whole of Africa. The G7 should be talking about that as well. This is about migration, this is about opportunity, this is about decent, rule-of-law-based government and all these things have become factors on a global scale for the decisive choice Europe needs to make: whether we want to export our stability and our prosperity, or whether we want to wait until we import instability and poverty from elsewhere. That, I think, should be the position of the European Union in the deliberations in the G7.

Bert Koenders, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Mr President, first let me apologise for my late arrival to this important debate. I have already apologised to Mr Telička, Mr Lebreton and also other colleagues here today. We really had a big conflict of interest because of the visit of His Majesty the King, but we have made sure that we made notes. I have heard your comments and would like to reflect also from the side of the Council on some of the issues that you have mentioned in the debate.

Now, as the First Vice-President of the Commission said, the G7 leaders will discuss various topics of global importance and, crucially, on which the G7 can provide leadership. The European Union's internal and external challenges, as we know, are closely intertwined, and therefore it is important for Europe to make use – if I can put it in those words – of this important meeting. We have, more than ever, an interest in being at the G7 since our internal and external security are so intertwined. The issues of migration or terrorism speak for themselves, and we need to take a comprehensive approach to the challenges we face with our other colleagues in the G7.

Let me start with an issue which, as you know, is very high on our agenda: the refugee and migration crisis. It is still one of the most urgent and immediate challenges facing us. I think it is not only a true test for our union and our neighbouring states. The European Union has pushed for the issue to be discussed at the level of the G7 in Japan because we are seriously impacted – the rest of the world, by the way, is also impacted – but we see it as a global challenge in need of a global response, and this is why Europeans are making sure these issues receive appropriate attention at a global level. I hope we can become as concrete as possible in these areas. Of course the G7 is not an implementation agency, but it can give the leadership to ensure that is also a global responsibility. Our leaders will update their counterparts on the measures we have taken to address the crisis.

Our actions and financial assistance will be more effective if properly integrated in a global effort to address migration issues and promote international peace and security – think about the debates we will have on issues like Syria but, more generally, the transformation in the Middle East. Managing migration is therefore not a European but rather a global responsibility, requiring collective solutions in full respect of our obligations under international law. The G7 is expected to call for a global response. It is a privileged forum, not just to discuss these issues but also to forge partnerships and launch, I hope, collective initiatives for a more equitable burden-sharing.

My second point is, of course, the global economy. I think we are constantly reminded that the global economy recovery is too slow, that it does not deliver enough jobs, that downside risks are accumulating, and therefore it is the right time for this group of G7 leaders to clearly signal that securing balanced and inclusive growth not only remains a top priority, but to recall that we have to get our own houses in order in our individual countries. But obviously there is also a collective responsibility. We have seen, I think, that those are the lessons learned by different partners in the G7; that taken in isolation, monetary, fiscal and structural policies do not suffice to boost economic activity in a sustainable way. Additionally, and given recent movements in currency markets, it would also be timely to reaffirm existing exchange rate commitments and call on all to refrain from competitive devaluations and to resist protectionism. This is a risk that we are all faced with, and I think the G7 will have to take some leadership on this.

That brings me to the third point: international trade. In 2015, G7 leaders underlined the importance of trade and investment as key drivers of growth, jobs and sustainable development. Tomorrow's summit will have an important role to play in strengthening the future of the multilateral trade agenda. In this context it is important that on 13 May the council confirmed the broad support for the Commission's proposals regarding the EU strategic objectives for the post-Nairobi period. Importantly, I think, public trust and support for the free trade agenda has decreased in the context of disappointing global trade in recent years. So we need to get the people back on board, and I think leaders should be clear about the benefits of maintaining economies open and free from protectionism, as well as the importance of multilateral and bilateral trade and investment agreements for growth and jobs. I think it is important that we ensure that we have a much more equal level playing field, and addressing the issue of industrial excess capacity would be part of the solution. Besides that, we should honestly address the concerns of the public. If you look through the history of the world economy, you see that people's social protection actually leads to openness of international economies and not so much the other way around.

Ladies and gentlemen, let me finish with two other issues that I wanted to mention: taxation, another priority that we share with the G7. Now that Panama papers have shown how critical it is to develop and implement international tax standards at the global level, the EU has been at the forefront in fighting tax fraud, tax evasion and aggressive tax planning. We have transposed the exchange of information requirements, adopted the fourth anti-money-laundering directive, which makes available information on beneficial ownership, and I am pleased to report today that the Council has formally adopted – after receiving your opinion – the fourth revision of the directive on administrative cooperation as regards country-by-country reporting for multinationals. I think this is important progress.

The Council has also adopted conclusions on an external strategy for effective taxation, calling for the establishment of an EU blacklist for non-cooperative jurisdictions, and Ecofin is working on a possible general approach on the anti-tax avoidance directive. I think it is well legitimate to expect the G7 to show some ambition – I hope a lot of ambition – in this area as well.

Then on the two last points: the fight against terrorism will inevitably be a key priority for the summit as well. The heinous terrorist attacks which countries nowadays face are every time a direct assault not only on our security but, as we know, on our values of freedom and equality and our way of life. We cannot and will not retreat in the face of this threat. Since last year's meeting, while the territory which Daesh previously controlled has shrunk, especially in Syria and Iraq as the group has come under sustained military pressure, the threat it presents to the European Union and its partners across the Middle East and North Africa particularly has grown, and we just have to open the papers to see every day what horrific attacks we see in different parts of the world, especially in the Middle East.

The summit here of the G7 will be an opportunity to take not only stock of the measures but to examine what additional steps the G7 could adopt. We hope and expect to endorse an action plan on countering terrorism and violent extremism which will highlight the G7's commitment to making international cooperation against such threats as effective as possible. Furthermore, leaders will discuss the broader political situation in Syria, Iraq and Libya. They will also discuss Ukraine. It is vital that the commitments taken under the Minsk Agreement are fully implemented and that the parties remain fully engaged in the process.

These are challenging times for the G7 on several fronts, for the European Union. That is why I think it is important that we enlarge our community of nations that work pragmatically, but on the basis of our common values, on the issues I just mentioned, on the basis of their commitment to the rule of law and human rights and, very important, to solidarity and promotion of rule-based international orders. These are values that also bind us together as Europeans, and in particular guide your work in this House, and I look forward to a strong message of confidence by G7 leaders and to their guidance on policy actions on the several fronts. Again I thank you for the discussion this afternoon.

Președinte. — Dezbateră a fost încheiată.

José Blanco López (S&D), *por escrito*. – Considero ambiciosa la agenda fijada para la Cumbre de Japón: economía mundial, política exterior, promoción de la libertad, la democracia y el respeto de los derechos humanos, cambio climático y energía, desarrollo, salud y el papel de la mujer en el mundo. Pero no nos conformamos. Debemos impulsar una globalización inclusiva, capaz de extender los beneficios de la misma y ser equitativa con el reparto de los mismos a nivel mundial.

Nicola Danti (S&D), *per iscritto*. – Il vertice che si terrà nei prossimi giorni in Giappone rappresenta un appuntamento importante in cui i leader di Italia, Francia, Germania, Regno Unito, USA, Giappone e Canada dovranno affrontare i principali temi all'ordine del giorno dell'agenda internazionale, primo tra tutti il tema delle relazioni commerciali con la Cina e la sua sovraccapacità produttiva che sta causando gravi distorsioni nel mercato globale, con ripercussioni negative soprattutto sul tessuto produttivo europeo. Ad oggi, questo eccesso di produzione si sta registrando principalmente nel settore siderurgico, dove la capacità cinese supera due volte e mezzo il totale di quella europea. Ma il persistere di una forte ingerenza statale nelle politiche economiche cinesi fa pensare che lo stesso eccesso potrà interessare in futuro altri settori. I leader dovranno, allora, confrontarsi su soluzioni concrete e condividere una strategia comune di lungo periodo che miri a ristabilire competitività e regole uguali per tutti. Un approccio coordinato sarà necessario soprattutto in vista della scadenza del prossimo dicembre, quando Pechino vorrebbe vedersi riconosciuto lo status di economia di mercato dai membri dell'OMC. Questo Parlamento, però, si è espresso chiaramente contro questa automaticità. Auspichiamo vivamente che le nostre raccomandazioni non vengano disattese.

Enrique Guerrero Salom (S&D), *por escrito*. – Nos mostramos satisfechos por la agenda ambiciosa de la Cumbre de Japón: economía mundial, política exterior, promoción de la libertad, la democracia y el respeto de los derechos humanos, cambio climático y energía, desarrollo, salud y el papel de la mujer en el mundo. Pero queremos más. Queremos una nueva globalización inclusiva que sea capaz de extrapolar los beneficios de la misma y ser equitativa con la repartición a nivel mundial.

Ivan Jakovčić (ALDE), *napisan*. – Summit članica G7 koji će se održati ovaj tjedan će govoriti između ostalog i o Grčkoj. Najnovije mjere i pomoć koja je dana Grčkoj samo su kap u moru razrješenja grčke krize i njenih dugova. To su potvrdile nedovoljne mjere koje izazivaju sumnju u uspjeh.

Bez ozbiljnih promjena i reformi, Grčka neće uspjeti vratiti dugove, a ostale zemlje EU-a će morati i dalje pomagati ako želimo zadržati postojeću eurozonu. Možda bi Grčka trebala izaći iz eurozone i nakon konsolidiranja svoje ekonomije i cjelokupnog sustava vratiti se u eurozonu.

Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D), *por escrito*. – Nos mostramos satisfechos por la agenda ambiciosa de la Cumbre de Japón: economía mundial, política exterior, promoción de la libertad, la democracia y el respeto de los derechos humanos, cambio climático y energía, desarrollo, salud y el papel de la mujer en el mundo. Pero queremos más. Queremos una nueva globalización inclusiva que sea capaz de extrapolar los beneficios de la misma y ser equitativa con la repartición a nivel mundial.

Inmaculada Rodríguez-Piñero Fernández (S&D), *por escrito*. – Nos mostramos satisfechos por la agenda ambiciosa de la Cumbre de Japón: economía mundial, política exterior, promoción de la libertad, la democracia y el respeto de los derechos humanos, cambio climático y energía, desarrollo, salud y el papel de la mujer en el mundo. Pero queremos más. Queremos una nueva globalización inclusiva que sea capaz de extrapolar los beneficios de la misma y ser equitativa con la repartición a nivel mundial.

18. Transatlantické toky údajov (rozprava)

Președinte. — Următorul punct de pe ordinea de zi este dezbateră privind Declarațiile Consiliului și Comisiei referitoare la fluxurile de date transatlantice (2016/2727(RSP)).

Bert Koenders, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Mr President, honourable Members of the European Parliament, Madam Commissioner, the Presidency attaches great importance to a free, open and secure internet. This issue is therefore an important one to me. In the digital age it is well known that personal data are of great value because of the information they contain. They enable businesses to personalise their offers to consumers and law enforcement authorities to track down criminals. Data flows offer economic and social opportunities. At the same time, the sensitive information that personal data contain needs to be protected in order to protect our privacy.

It is key to ensure the public's trust in data flows: trust that is based on a proper framework of protection. Of all transfers of personal data outside the European Union, the transatlantic flow is by far the most important one, be it for commercial or law-enforcement purposes.

It is in the interest of the Union and its citizens that the European Union/US privacy shield ensures this certainty and trust, especially after the Schrems judgment by the Court of Justice of last October. This has shown there is legal uncertainty in this area of vital importance for the transatlantic economy. It is also important for European medium-sized businesses, as they are dependent on this adequacy decision – for lack of other instruments – to ensure safe data transfers to the United States. The Commission should fully take into account the Court's ruling on the safe harbour regime. The new adequacy decision must provide a level of data protection that respects the Charter of Fundamental Rights, the Treaties, as well as the standards set by recent case law. Strong safeguards are the key to restore the public's trust when it comes to transatlantic data flows. The Council trusts the Commission to ensure the highest possible data protection standards, including clear and directly-applicable principles such as purpose-limitation, rights of the data subject to access and correct their data or to object against the processing, and an effective system of oversight-enforcement and redress of possibilities.

Furthermore, the Council supports the efforts of the Commission in working with the United States on improving some aspects of the privacy shield and hence ensure a legally and politically sustainable framework. In that regard I believe, for example, that bulk collection by the United States should only be acceptable under certain circumstances. In that same spirit I welcome the creation of the position of an ombudsperson as an additional mechanism for the handling of complaints submitted by citizens. For the transatlantic transfer of personal data for commercial purposes, the Council considers that the Commission should adopt its adequacy decision on this new transatlantic framework in a speedy manner while ensuring data protection rights.

The Council also welcomes the agreement reached in the negotiations between the Commission and its United States counterparts. We are confident that the ongoing internal negotiations on the side of the Union between the Commission and national administrations will lead to a positive outcome, thus paving the way for the new framework to enter into force.

As regards data protection in the area of criminal law enforcement, the Council aims at adopting a decision to sign the Umbrella Agreement in time for the agreement to be signed on 2 June at the EU/ US Justice and Home Affairs ministerial meeting in Amsterdam. Shortly thereafter the Council will ask the European Parliament's consent to conclude the agreement.

The agreement does not provide a basis for the transfer of personal data across the Atlantic but will enhance cooperation between the European Union and the United States by setting common data protection standards in this area. This is good news from the European perspective, as the US commits to respecting higher standards than in the past when receiving personal data from Europe, and I think that is very necessary. Thus the agreement will significantly contribute to restoring trust in transatlantic data flows for the purpose of fighting serious crime by adding a supplemental layer of data protection requirements on both the Union and the United States.

The Council considers that the agreement represents a clear improvement to the current situation, notably as regards judicial redress, where the US has so far for the first time agreed to extend such rights to EU citizens. This means an EU citizen can now benefit from equal treatment and will have the same judicial redress rights as US citizens. That is why we hope that this Parliament will share our positive assessment of this agreement.

The European Union has a great interest in facilitating smooth and safe transfers of personal data to the US that ensure the respect of our citizens' fundamental rights, both in the commercial and in the law-enforcement area. For example, an EU citizen's name is identical to that of a suspect in a transatlantic criminal investigation. Their data has been transferred from the EU to the US and erroneously gets collected and included on a US blacklist. The EU citizen now has the right to request their name to be deleted by the authorities. To give you another example in the area of commercial data flows, the privacy shield will offer a significantly-enhanced system of oversight and enforcement, which will enhance the credibility of the system. In the law enforcement area, we will be able to offer strict data protection requirements as well as basic rights to access and correction to our citizens in all instruments covered by the scope of the Umbrella Agreement.

Therefore, we hope that the Commission will soon take a decision on the EU/US privacy shield that fully respects the data protection acquis and which will be good for business as well. We are also confident that the Umbrella Agreement is a step in the right direction, as it strengthens legal safeguards for our citizens and enables effective transatlantic cooperation to fight serious crimes.

Věra Jourová, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr. President and honourable Members of the European Parliament, Mr Minister, Ladies and Gentlemen, I am pleased to be here again to speak on the important topic of transatlantic data flows. As you know, the Commission has been working on several fronts to restore trust in transatlantic data flows following the Snowden revelations in 2013.

The key measures include the adoption of the EU data protection reform, the Umbrella Agreement for data exchanged for law enforcement purposes, and the new EU-US Privacy Shield to ensure a higher level of data protection for commercial transfers of personal data.

The EU-US Privacy Shield arrangement is essential for the continuation of transatlantic data flows while guaranteeing our citizens the fundamental right to the protection of their personal data. We negotiated the Privacy Shield with the US on the basis of two sets of guiding principles. First, our 13 recommendations of November 2013 and, of course, the criteria set by the Court of Justice in the Schrems ruling. Following two years of talks, I am convinced we have overcome the weaknesses of the old Safe Harbour system.

Let me briefly summarise the main improvements. First, US companies receiving personal data from Europe will have to comply with stricter rules on how to use and read that information, and their compliance will be monitored closely and proactively by the relevant US authorities.

Second, individuals will have access to a number of redress mechanisms to ensure that any complaint will be properly investigated and resolved.

Third, we have received written commitments and assurances on the limitations and safeguards when personal data are accessed by US public authorities. This concerns in particular the sensitive area of national security. More specifically, the US Government has assured us that bulk collection will be used only in exceptional circumstances and that even then it applies filters and other technical means to minimise the data collected. We have received an explicit assurance that there is no mass or indiscriminate surveillance. It is the first time we have obtained anything like this from the US side. It is a crucial and central element that makes for a more robust framework than the Safe Harbour ever was.

Fourth, as part of the Privacy Shield framework, the US Government will for the first time create an ombudsperson mechanism that will ensure that complaints or enquiries from EU individuals on national security access are addressed in a timely manner. I believe that this too is a major and unprecedented achievement, and again, nothing remotely comparable existed under the old Safe Harbour. This will apply to all transatlantic data transfer be, they under the Shield or under the modes of transfer.

Finally, once put in place, the privacy issue will be continuously monitored, in particular through an annual joint review. During this process, we will check that the various oversight and redress mechanisms are operating effectively, and we have formulated clear conditions for suspending our adequacy decision in case commitments are not met by the US or answers given in the annual joint review are not satisfactory.

As you know, the independent data protection authorities brought together in the Article 29 Working Party issued their opinion on the Privacy Shield on 13 April. They have welcomed the positive elements in the shield and the improvements compared to the Safe Harbour. But they have also voiced some concerns and recommended further improvements.

We take this expertise very seriously, and we are now working on the more critical aspects and are adapting the adequacy decision accordingly. Some of these recommendations can only be addressed in agreement with the US Government, and we are in discussions with them on those points.

That includes, for instance, clarifying the independence and functioning of the ombudsperson mechanism and making more explicit the principle of limited data retention. This is an important exercise if we want our data protection authorities, individual consumers and companies to have full confidence in the new arrangement. The Member States support us in this approach, and we trust that our US counterparts also realise the importance of these further clarifications.

Once we have reached the necessary qualifications and improvements, we will then submit the draft to the Member States in the Article 31 Committee. Our target remains to have the framework up and running by summer.

That brings me to the other important file which will soon be submitted to the European Parliament for its constant: the Umbrella Agreement. This agreement seeks to ensure the protection of personal data exchanged between the EU and the US for the purpose of law enforcement cooperation. The signature of the Umbrella Agreement is expected to take place at the EU-US Justice and Home Affairs Ministerial meeting in Amsterdam on 2 June. Parliament will be asked for its consent before the Council can decide to conclude this agreement.

I seek your support for the Umbrella Agreement as it will bring clear improvements to the protection of personal data transmitted in the course of transatlantic law enforcement cooperation compared to today's situation. As you know, the Umbrella Agreement is not an agreement that authorises data transfers, nor is it an adequacy decision. Rather, it adds the necessary data protection safeguards to existing transfer agreements between the EU or its Member States and the United States or where transfers are carried out based on national law.

Many of these existing instruments for law enforcement cooperation with the US have no – or very few – data protection safeguards. This is the unfortunate status quo that the Umbrella Agreement seeks to tackle. Without the Umbrella Agreement, this unsatisfactory situation would continue for many years to come.

Where personal data of US persons are transferred to Europe, they already profit from the high level of data protection afforded by other rules, be it at EU or national level. Therefore, the Umbrella Agreement aims at rectifying the existing imbalance of protections on both sides of the Atlantic. This way, the agreement will also restore trust in transatlantic data transfers.

Axel Voss, im Namen der PPE-Fraktion. – Herr Präsident! Liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Herr Minister! Frau Kommissarin! Eine Nachfolge von „Safe Harbor“ ist dringend notwendig, und insgesamt halte ich auch den Datenschutzschild für einen großen Schritt nach vorne mit vielen Verbesserungen.

Der politische Streit im Haus bezog sich am Ende nur noch auf die „sunset clause“ und wir haben uns eigentlich in der Mehrheit darauf geeinigt, keine zu übernehmen, und deshalb erwarte ich, auch von den Kolleginnen und Kollegen von den Liberalen und von der S&D, dass auch die Änderungsanträge der Grünen und der GUE nicht mit unterstützt werden. Eine „sunset clause“ ist aus meiner Sicht aber auch überhaupt gar nicht notwendig, weil wir eben einen starken jährlichen Überwachungsmechanismus haben, der die sogenannten Left-overs dann auch stetig beseitigen kann. Sie ist nicht notwendig, weil wir einen dauerhaften, stabilen und rechtssicheren Rahmen brauchen, und sie ist auch nicht notwendig, weil das diese jährlichen Überprüfungen am Ende auch überflüssig machen würde. Wir sollten meines Erachtens auch abwarten, dass dieser neue Mechanismus überhaupt erstmal funktioniert, bevor er überhaupt wieder gestoppt werden kann, und letztlich geht es eigentlich nur um das Misstrauen gegenüber der Kommission, dieses Verfahren vernünftig zu begleiten. Ich glaube aber auch, dass die Kommission hier ihre Lektionen gelernt hat.

Die Forderung nach einem Datenschutzschild sind meines Erachtens auch politisch lächerlich, weil man sich einfach nicht entscheiden will, reicht Datenschutzschild oder reicht er nicht, und man hat dann damit eigentlich eine gewisse Orientierungslosigkeit. Es ist aber wichtig, dass wir unseren Unternehmen, KMU und Start-ups auch eine gewisse Rechtssicherheit versichern, konkreten Rahmen für transatlantischen Datenverkehr bieten, und deshalb würden wir den Datenschutzschild unterstützen. Wenn aber die Änderungsanträge drin sind, wird die EVP dagegen stimmen.

Josef Weidenholzer, *im Namen der S&D-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident! Frau Kommissarin! Dieses Thema beschäftigt uns hier sehr lange. Wir haben eigentlich kontroversiell immer wieder über „Safe Harbour“ diskutiert in den unterschiedlichsten Formationen, und es bestand immer eine Unsicherheit, die letztlich eigentlich erst durch die Klage eines Bürgers geklärt wurde, und dieses Schrems-Urteil ist in die Geschichte eingegangen und hat uns gezeigt, dass es sehr wichtig ist, dass wir Unsicherheiten beseitigen.

Der *Privacy Shield* versucht, diese Unsicherheiten zu beseitigen. Sie haben uns im Februar die Grundzüge vorgestellt, und es ist eindeutig zu attestieren, dass es Fortschritte gegeben hat, dass wir auch im Einklang mit der Rechtsprechung hier mit den amerikanischen Partnern gewisse Dinge klären konnten. Ich glaube, dass es aber nach wie vor eine Situation ist, wo wir immer noch Unsicherheiten haben, wo wir noch nicht so wirklich die ganz großen Klarheiten haben, und das bedeutet natürlich auch wieder das Risiko, wieder vor einem Gericht zu landen. Das wäre für unser Image als Gesetzgeber, als Exekutive nicht unbedingt positiv, und es ist auch für die Industrie nicht positiv.

Wir – der LIBE-Ausschuss – waren in den USA letzte Woche, und wir konnten sehen, dass es ein großes Verständnis für die europäische Position gibt, dass es in den USA den Willen gibt, den Grundsätzen der Rechtsprechung entgegenzukommen. Das gilt für staatliche Stellen genauso wie für die Daten-industrie. Ich meine, man hätte mehr erreichen können, aber ich glaube, dass diese Entschließung die Kriterien festlegt, die sehr wichtig sind. Wir brauchen mehr Klarheit, vor allem wenn solche Formulierungen verwendet werden wie „schriftliche Zusicherung“ welchen Rechtscharakter hat das, wir brauchen eine Klarheit über die Ombudsperson. Das war nicht so eindeutig, was wir da gesehen haben, und auch der judicial redress, der so wichtig ist, sollte auch unter diesem Gesichtspunkt gesehen werden, ob nicht auch die Formulierung „nur für EU-Staatsbürger“ nicht ausreicht, weil wir auch Drittstaatsangehörige in Europa haben, die von der Grundrechtecharta geschützt werden. Also diese Unsicherheiten gilt es zu beseitigen.

Es ist wichtig, dass wir diese Abkommen haben, auch das Rahmenabkommen ist ein großer Fortschritt, denn alleine hätten wir nichts erreichen können. Wir können das nur gemeinsam. Aber ich appelliere an Sie, wirklich diese Unklarheiten zu beseitigen, sonst haben wir eine neue Diskussion mit einer neuen Marke, die heißt dann irgendwie...

(Der Präsident entzieht dem Redner das Wort.)

Helga Stevens, *namens de ECR-Fractie*. – Mijnheer de voorzitter, trans-Atlantische gegevensoverdracht is van essentieel belang voor onze economie, veiligheid en handel. Met het Privacy Shield halen we nu een nooit eerder bereikt niveau van gegevensbescherming.

Het is een erg grote stap in de goede richting. De rechten en de rechtsbescherming van EU-burgers bij gegevensoverdracht naar de VS gaan er enorm op vooruit. Sommige politieke groepen en parlementsleden blijven echter vinden dat slechts een kopie van het Europees recht kan volstaan. Maar dit is gewoonweg niet realistisch.

De Verenigde Staten zijn een onafhankelijke natie en belangrijke strategische bondgenoot van de EU, maar we mogen niet vergeten dat ze geen lid zijn van de Unie. Uiteraard moet de Europese Commissie bekijken hoe het Privacy Shield de hoogst mogelijke standaard kan bieden. De nieuwe regels moeten ook een mogelijke toets door het Hof van Justitie kunnen doorstaan, zodat onze bedrijven en kmo's niet in een situatie van rechtsonzekerheid verkeren. Ik en mijn fractie geloven sterk dat het zowel voor onze bedrijven, de Europese economie als de privacy van de EU-burgers het beste is om zo snel mogelijk over een operationeel Privacy Shield te beschikken.

Sophia in 't Veld, *on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – Mr President, I would like to start by echoing the last words of Mrs Stevens that we want to have an operational privacy shield as soon as possible. The problem is that this privacy shield is very unlikely to be operational. We are here today thanks to a young man called Max Schrems who was stubborn enough to litigate before the court for many, many years and to do what the EU institutions should have done, namely stand up for the interests of the EU citizens. Because I recall that this House has called repeatedly for the repeal of safe harbour and the Commission did not move, so it took one Austrian student to make sure that safe harbour was repealed.

Now I am not the least bit convinced that things like written assurances or an ombudsman or a review are going to do the trick. My doubts are shared and in different wordings by Working Party 29, Working Party 31, the EDPS and various legal experts. So I do not understand why we have to keep repeating the same mistakes over and over again. We have a responsibility and a duty to make good-quality legislation and here it seems to me that the Commission is ready to take a decision knowing that it will not stand up in court. This is not about making political compromises – you know, maybe I could agree with Mr Voss or maybe not – that is all not relevant. There is only one yardstick: is this, yes or no, Schrems-proof? And I am not yet convinced that it is. It is an improvement, it is a step forward, and I am glad that the Commission is willing to discuss further adaptations, but ultimately this is also about the US getting access to a market of 500 million consumers, so they too have an interest in moving.

Finally, we did not say anything about the umbrella agreement in the resolution, we will come back to it, but I would really like two things. I would like, first of all, for the European Commission, before we talk about giving consent or anything, to finally declassify the reply it gave to the question of LIBE about the legal status and the scope of the umbrella agreement compared with other legal instruments – really give us this information. This is only a legal assessment, how secret can it be?

Secondly, the Commission itself has clearly stated that removing the exemptions to the Privacy Act in the US is a precondition for the umbrella agreement to be valid. We all know that those exemptions are not going to be removed, so can somebody please explain to me how we can realistically expect the umbrella agreement ever to apply – please clarify this for me.

Cornelia Ernst, *im Namen der GUE/NGL-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident! Damen und Herren! Ein „Safe Harbor“ wird dadurch nicht besser, dass man es *Privacy Shield* nennt. Schaut man sich diesen Schild, welcher unser Grundrecht, das Grundrecht von 500 Millionen Menschen hier in der Europäischen Union auf Privatheit schützen soll, da entpuppt sich dieser Schild als ein Schild aus Pappmaché, der beim ersten Regen aufweicht.

Es ist schon schlimm, dass es eines EuGH-Urteils bedurfte, um Safe Harbor zu kippen. Und nun konterkariert die Kommission mit dem, was sie vorgelegt hat, unter dem freundlichen Beifall der hiesigen großen Koalition ebendieses Urteil. Nicht einmal zur Forderung einer „*sunset clause*“ konnte sich die Mehrheit dieses Hauses durchringen, das wäre das Mindeste gewesen. Denn alle in diesem Raum wissen doch sehr genau, dass das neu verpackte Abkommen gar keinen Vertragscharakter hat und gesetzlich nicht verankert wird. EU-Bürger können sich zwar an einen Ombudsmann wenden, aber wie John Kerry höchstpersönlich uns in Annex III wissen lässt, wird der Ombudsmann weder bestätigen noch verneinen, ob irgendjemand das Ziel von Überwachung ist, und er wird auch kein Rechtsmittel benennen. Da hätte die US-Regierung auch einen Anrufbeantworter als Ombudsmann bestellen können! Meine Damen und Herren, es geht um Grundrechte von 500 Millionen Bürgern und es kann nicht sein, dass wir dies mit einem Kotau vor einem allzu großen Bruder tatsächlich opfern! Das darf nicht der Stil aufgeklärte Demokratien sein, und ich finde, dazu sollten wir uns auch deutlich ausdrücken.

Jan Philipp Albrecht, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Mr President, the Commissioner and his team have worked hard to achieve this result on the EU-US Privacy Shield. They have also worked hard to achieve the result on the umbrella agreement and, yes, there is progress. But let us be honest, on the EU-US Privacy Shield: what is in there is no significant improvement on the ground with regard to safe harbour. Yes, several issues have been clarified, but no, the legal system of the United States has not changed, and this is actually what the European Court of Justice has said: the legal system does not provide for adequate safeguards. And yes, we know – let us be honest – that those changes will not come tomorrow. We will not achieve that now.

So the question is: while we are lining up all the criticism with regard to the insufficiencies which are out there, do we say: yes, there needs to be renegotiation in the future; yes, there needs to be re-opening of these files, because we are not there? Or are we saying: no, everything is fine, everything serves for adequate safeguards and we just will vote for it and for the future it will stand, although the Court may take it down again? I think that is dishonest. So the only honest action at the moment would be to set a sunset clause to limit the validity, and that is what we are bringing forward for this resolution. I am a bit surprised that the other Groups are not able to accept that. In order to be even more pragmatic on this, we have changed our amendment to a validity of 4 years. That is enough time for a new administration to renegotiate and it is enough time after the application of the Data Protection Regulation to renegotiate. So therefore I ask you all to agree to this.

Tiziana Beghin, a nome del gruppo EFDD. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, a chi appartengono i dati personali che gli europei trasmettono negli Stati Uniti con Google, Facebook o Instagram? Che garanzie hanno i cittadini che la loro privacy non sia sistematicamente violata? Nessuna.

Infatti negli Stati Uniti il governo è libero di disporre dei dati degli stranieri come di un bene in suo possesso, utilizzabili a suo piacimento anche dai servizi segreti per «profilazione» e schedatura. Questi dati non sono un bene di scambio, sono la vita dei nostri cittadini, e la Corte di giustizia europea l'ha ribadito, stracciando l'accordo in vigore.

Io vi ricordo, colleghi, che fino a poco tempo fa i telefoni di questo Parlamento, le nostre email, i cellulari dei nostri presidenti erano spiati dagli americani, questo è il rispetto per la privacy degli europei. Il nuovo accordo sui dati che la Commissione vuole firmare con gli Stati Uniti non prevede alcuna proposta realmente vincolante, è un insulto alla sentenza della Corte e a migliaia di cittadini che si fidano delle istituzioni europee per proteggere la loro privacy, ma certo la Commissione non vuole problemi per il TTIP, che aumenterà esponenzialmente il traffico di dati transatlantico.

Ora chiedo ai miei colleghi se queste sono le premesse su cui intendono firmarlo.

Γεώργιος Επιτήδειος (NI). – Κύριε πρόεδρε, ένας από τους μεγαλύτερους κινδύνους που έχει δημιουργήσει στον σύγχρονο άνθρωπο η ραγδαία εξέλιξη της τεχνολογίας είναι η υποκλοπή των προσωπικών δεδομένων από τις ιστοσελίδες κοινωνικής δικτύωσης και η επεξεργασία τους από μη εξουσιοδοτημένα άτομα. Ιδιαίτερα στις Ηνωμένες Πολιτείες ο κίνδυνος αυτός έχει λάβει τεράστιες διαστάσεις, διότι η ίδια η νομοθεσία επιτρέπει στις υπηρεσίες πληροφοριών, τη γνωστή μας CIA και την Υπηρεσία Εθνικής Ασφαλείας, την NSA, να συλλέγουν, να επεξεργάζονται και να διατηρούν τέτοιου είδους πληροφορίες, πολλές φορές για χρονικό διάστημα μεγαλύτερο της πενταετίας.

Μάλιστα, στο όνομα του εθνικού συμφέροντος των ΗΠΑ οι υπηρεσίες αυτές μπορεί να συλλέγουν και να επεξεργάζονται πληροφορίες όχι μόνο Αμερικανών, αλλά και υπηκόων άλλων κρατών, στα ίδια τους τα κράτη μάλιστα. Με αυτόν τον τρόπο, όμως, παραβιάζονται τα ανθρώπινα δικαιώματα, καταστρατηγείται το δικαίωμα της προστασίας των προσωπικών δεδομένων, δυσχεραίνεται η διεξαγωγή του ηλεκτρονικού εμπορίου και επιπλέον δημιουργείται μία νομική αβεβαιότητα σε επιχειρήσεις και φυσικά πρόσωπα.

Για αυτόν τον λόγο η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση πρέπει να λάβει τα ενδεδειγμένα μέτρα, ούτως ώστε στον διάλογο με τις Ηνωμένες Πολιτείες για τη ρύθμιση των όρων της «ασπίδας προστασίας» της ιδιωτικής ζωής να επέλθουν οι βελτιώσεις εκείνες που θα εξασφαλίσουν την προστασία των δεδομένων των Ευρωπαίων πολιτών που έχουν εμπορικές δραστηριότητες με τις Ηνωμένες Πολιτείες.

(Ο ομιλητής δέχεται να απαντήσει σε ερώτηση με «γαλάζια κάρτα» (άρθρο 162 παράγραφος 8 του Κανονισμού))

Tibor Szanyi (S&D), Kékkártyás kérdés. – Ebben a mai vitában többször elhangzott, hogy az adatoknak a speciális helyzete kívül helyezi az adatok védelmét és mindennemű jogszabályt és eljárásmodot a normális kereskedelmi áruforgalomhoz képest, bár a normál kereskedelmi forgalomban ismerjük a lopás és annak következményei kérdését. Vajon ebben a mostani egyezményben Ön szerint megvannak-e azok a garanciák, hogy az adatoknak a helytelen kezelése szintén büntetőjogi kategóriába kerül?

Γεώργιος Επιτήδειος (NI), απάντηση σε ερώτηση με «γαλάζια κάρτα». – Κύριε Szanyi, βεβαίως πρέπει να επιβληθούν κυρώσεις, όμως προηγουμένως θα πρέπει να ληφθούν όλα εκείνα τα μέτρα τα οποία θα αποτρέψουν να εκτραπούμε προς αυτή την κατεύθυνση.

Αρα, λοιπόν, απαιτούνται και τα δύο. Και προσπάθεια να μη φτάσουμε σε αυτό το σημείο, αλλά όταν γίνει παραβίαση προσωπικών δεδομένων, ναι, πρέπει να έχουμε και κυρώσεις

Jeroen Lenaers (PPE). – Mijnheer de voorzitter, trans-Atlantische datastromen zijn de grootste ter wereld. Er wordt maar liefst vijftien terabyte per seconde uitgewisseld tussen Europa en de Verenigde Staten: ontzettend belangrijk voor onze economie. Onze samenleving digitaliseert in hoog tempo en juist in deze sector liggen onze kansen voor de toekomst.

Het juridische vacuüm en de onzekerheid die vorig jaar ontstonden hebben tot veel onrust geleid. Zeker bij de vijfduizend bedrijven die gebruikmaakten van de voormalige Safe Harbour-regels, maar vooral ook bij het midden- en kleinbedrijf, de ruggengraat van onze economie die juist in dit soort situaties bijzonder kwetsbaar is.

Het nieuwe Privacy Shield moet dan ook twee vliegen in één klap slaan. Enerzijds natuurlijk het beschermen van de gegevens van onze burgers, maar anderzijds, en zeker zo belangrijk, het geven van een stukje rechtszekerheid aan onze bedrijven die gebruikmaken van die trans-Atlantische datastromen.

Ik ben blij met het werk dat de Europese Commissie verricht heeft, de voortgang die vandaag ook door veel mensen hier gewaardeerd werd en zeker ook met de toezegging die commissaris Jourová vandaag deed om de komende weken ook aandacht te besteden aan de resterende aanbevelingen van de Working Party 29. Onze oproep is eigenlijk heel simpel: zorg dat er deze zomer een goed Privacy Shield is, waar Europese burgers zich veilig bij voelen en waar het bedrijfsleven mee vooruit kan.

Ana Gomes (S&D). – Senhor Presidente, na semana passada, integrei a delegação da Comissão LIBE aos Estados Unidos e encontramos surpreendente receptividade de todos os nossos interlocutores, em especial das grandes empresas tecnológicas, em relação ao regulamento geral sobre a proteção de dados, recentemente aprovado por pressão deste Parlamento, reconhecendo que se trata de um quadro de regulação global sem paralelo, através do qual conseguirão desenvolver atividades e oferecer serviços com respeito pelos direitos fundamentais e mais segurança jurídica.

São estes os parâmetros para avaliar o escudo de privacidade acordado entre a Comissão e os Estados Unidos. É de extrema importância nesta era digital, que não é apenas de economia digital, reforçar confiança e segurança nas trocas transatlânticas de dados e garantir a empresas e cidadãos segurança jurídica, assente num quadro legal robusto, em regimes de proteção de dados equivalentes e menos vulneráveis à utilização criminosa, o que, claramente, ainda não acontece nos Estados Unidos.

Nessa medida, reconhecemos o importante trabalho da Comissão Europeia, desde o chumbo por parte do Tribunal de Justiça no Caso Maximillian Schrems, do regime anterior Safe Harbor para negociar este Privacy Shield e o acordo-quadro.

Não obstante, persistem sérias dúvidas, sérias reservas, quanto à compatibilidade com o Direito primário europeu e a Carta dos Direitos Fundamentais, tal como exigido pelo Tribunal de Justiça.

É preocupante que os meios administrativos e judiciais de recurso sejam excessivamente complexos para um cidadão comum, além de não serem facultados a cidadãos não europeus residentes na União Europeia, em discriminação, portanto, dos seus direitos fundamentais. Por outro lado, as violações não são penalizadas de forma suficientemente dissuasora.

Tal como muitos dos nossos interlocutores americanos, temos também sérias reservas quanto ao facto de o Provedor não ter um estatuto com a indispensável independência da administração.

Além disso, a atual versão do acordo ainda permite a recolha de dados em larga escala, embora direcionada, contra critérios da necessidade e da proporcionalidade prescritos na Carta Europeia de Direitos Fundamentais.

É do interesse das autoridades, das empresas, dos cidadãos europeus, americanos e outros criar um regime legal, coerente e estável. Precisamente por isto, este Parlamento deve explicitar reservas, estas reservas, exortando a Comissão e os Estados Unidos a aplicarem as recomendações do Grupo de Trabalho 29, a fazerem revisões periódicas de adequação deste instrumento à luz do novo regulamento geral sobre a proteção de dados e à luz da decisão sob o Caso Maximillian Schrems, e também a prosseguir o diálogo transatlântico para superar deficiências e melhorar a proteção dos direitos dos cidadãos.

Monica Macovei (ECR). – Domnule președinte, Uniunea a adoptat deja mai multe acorduri care se referă la schimbul de informații, de la urmărirea banilor care finanțează organizații teroriste sau registrul cu numele pasagerilor. Scutul pentru protecția datelor personale va ajuta mediul economic, luând, mai ales de pe umerii celor mici, întreprinzătorilor mici și mijlocii care derulează afaceri transatlantice, povara unor costuri birocratice mari. La cererea Uniunii Europene, Statele Unite au adoptat o serie de reforme ale programelor de supraveghere prin care se interzice, între altele, colectarea în masă a datelor, se protejează viața privată și libertățile civile ale persoanelor din afara Statelor Unite și se garantează căi legale de atac pentru cetățenii Uniunii.

Trebuie să recunoaștem aceste progrese și să punem în aplicare cât mai repede prevederile acestui scut pentru protecția datelor personale. Este necesară o evaluare a modului în care se aplică și această evaluare, sunt convinsă, va duce la o protecție și mai puternică a datelor personale, dar haideți să începem să îl punem în aplicare! Evaluăm și îl facem mai bun, altfel nu avem nimic.

Gerard Batten (EFDD). – Mr President, we are voting on this resolution because the Commission is holding talks with the USA regarding the transfer of private citizens' data. The motion calls for stronger data protection arrangements between the EU and the USA. Commercial companies have contracts with their customers, which include provisions on how their data may be used. Governments have no such contracts and they may enact legislation regarding the use of personal data which does not have the direct consent of its owners. Therefore, governments should treat the use of such data with the greatest respect and utmost caution. There are particular concerns about sharing data with the USA, which has reduced protection of its own citizens' data under legislation such as the Patriot Act and which is never a respecter of foreign nationals' rights. Therefore the UK Independence Party's MEPs will vote against this resolution on the basis that any legislation should remain the prerogative of the democratic nation state.

Angelika Niebler (PPE). – Herr Präsident, Herr Ratspräsident, Frau Kommissarin, verehrte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Will man transatlantischen Datentransfer oder will man ihn nicht? Ich bin überzeugt davon, dass wir den Datentransfer in die USA brauchen, und wir brauchen genauso Rechtssicherheit, zum einen für unsere Bürgerinnen und Bürger, aber auch für unsere Unternehmen, insbesondere unsere kleinen mittelständischen Unternehmen, die sich eben gerade nicht durch Standardvertragsklauseln oder andere Instrumente absichern können. Für sie ist der *Privacy Shield* von besonderer Bedeutung.

Ich möchte der Kommission ganz herzlich gratulieren. Frau Kommissarin, Sie und Ihr Team haben über viele Monate gut und hart verhandelt. Wenn Sie das Ergebnis jetzt vergleichen: Ich denke, es ist ein Riesenfortschritt im Vergleich zum *Safe Harbour Agreement*. Dazu möchte ich Sie einfach von ganzem Herzen beglückwünschen. Der *Privacy Shield* gibt Datensicherheit, er sieht verfahrensrechtliche Vorkehrungen vor, damit auch in den USA mit den Daten vorsichtig umgegangen wird. Am Ende des Tages wird natürlich erst die Praxis zeigen, wie dieses Verfahren zu bewerten ist. Deshalb finde ich es extrem wichtig, dass hier auch jährliche Evaluierungen vorgenommen werden, aber nicht nur Evaluierungen: Für den Fall, dass Sie den Eindruck gewinnen, dass die Daten in den USA nicht sorgfältig aufgenommen sind, gibt es ja auch Möglichkeiten, das Verfahren auszusetzen.

Ich finde, Sie haben da wirklich eine gute Arbeit hingelegt. Und wenn Sie jetzt die Vorschläge und Verbesserungen auch der Gruppe Artikel 29 noch aufgreifen – jetzt gleich oder im Laufe der weiteren Evaluierungen –, dann ist das ein gutes Paket für unsere Bürger und für unsere mittelständische Industrie.

Emma McClarkin (ECR). – Mr President, we must recognise the steps that our American partners have taken over the last few years in improving protection for data flowing from the EU to the US in direct response to concerns arising in particular within this Parliament. The US Congress and Administration have enacted more than two dozen reforms to surveillance laws and programmes such as the Privacy Shield and the Judicial Redress Acts, among others.

As such, my Conservative colleagues and I see this debate as an opportunity for us all to welcome these efforts, which give added legal clarity for businesses and consumers alike. We must take this progress into trade negotiations such as TTIP and TISA, where setting benchmarks for data protection should increase confidence on both sides. Investment across the Atlantic is already worth around USD 4 trillion, and the steps the Americans have taken to ensure legal reciprocity, data protection and legal redress for EU citizens will help to boost this even further.

Beatrix von Storch (EFDD). – Herr Präsident! Frau Kommissarin! Wir sprechen also über den Datenaustausch mit den USA bzw. den Datenschutz für diese Daten mit den USA. Die Kommission verhandelt dazu aktuell ein neues Abkommen, und zwar weil es ein Gerichtsurteil vom Europäischen Gerichtshof gab, das erst ein Bürger erstreiten musste: Ein Bürger musste feststellen, dass der Datenschutz in den USA nicht gesichert ist, das war nicht die Initiative der Kommission!

Wir sind in höchstem Maße besorgt, dass Sie die Interessen auch tatsächlich richtig wahrnehmen. Alles, was ich von Ihnen heute gehört habe, hat mich nicht wirklich zuversichtlich gemacht. Sie haben gesagt: Die USA haben uns zugesagt, man hat uns zugesichert, Sie hoffen dies, Sie möchten das. Ich glaube, wenn wir am Ende kein Abkommen haben, das den Bürgern klagbare und durchsetzbare Rechte einräumt, dann wird das ganze Abkommen nicht so viel wert sein wie dieser schöne Kugelschreiber.

Michał Boni (PPE). – Madam Commissioner, thank you very much to you and your team for an excellent job, and I think that now we are getting to the end of the story, which means that we will have a privacy shield.

We are all aware of the importance of data and transnational data flows in the modern economy. To ensure a right solution for transnational data flow is especially important for SMEs that have less legal and investment possibilities and which will be the important beneficiaries of such an instrument.

I believe that we need the Privacy Shield to ensure that our data-driven economy grows, especially supporting SMEs. I believe that it is a good approach to rebuild the transatlantic trust and strengthen the data protection rights on both sides of the Atlantic. The presented instrument introduces many improvements to the protection of fundamental rights. Among others, it strengthens Member States' data protection authorities' role in the process of claims investigations. The legal remedies are strengthened for EU citizens and residents also by the creation of an ombudsperson, and it would work on both sides of the Atlantic. Americans also change their legislation and their attitude.

What is now needed is to make sure that these legal remedies are really available to EU citizens and residents as well as the regular review of the implementation of the Privacy Shield. I see the role of the European Commission, EDPS and data protection authorities for this task.

Kazimierz Michał Ujazdowski (ECR). – Panie przewodniczący! Koleżanki i Koledzy! Również chcę wyrazić zadowolenie z zaawansowania rozmów w zakresie wymiany danych osobowych między Unią Europejską a Stanami Zjednoczonymi. Stany Zjednoczone są naturalnym, pozytywnym partnerem Europy i te rozmowy trzeba toczyć na podstawie zaufania, a nie podejrzeń. Cieszę się z tych rozstrzygnięć, także z tych wstępnych rozstrzygnięć, z pomysłów instytucjonalnych, z mechanizmu dochodzenia roszczeń. Myślę, że powinniśmy zadbać o maksymalnie wysoki stopień ochrony danych osobowych w tym porozumieniu, ale jednocześnie kierując się zasadą racjonalności. Ja mam wrażenie, że częstokroć prawo do prywatności jest interpretowane na poziomie nadużycia, co często pozostaje w sprzeczności z innymi dobrami. Szczególnie w dziedzinie bezpieczeństwa nie można interpretować prawa do prywatności tak, by uniemożliwiona była ochrona bezpieczeństwa naszych obywateli, bezpieczeństwa Europy, Stanów Zjednoczonych i wspólnoty transatlantyckiej.

IN THE CHAIR: ADINA-IOANA VĂLEAN

Vice-President

Catch-the-eye procedure

Nicola Caputo (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, ho evidenziato, in precedenti interventi in relazione al *geoblocking*, lo stimolo proveniente dall'importante *decisum* della Corte di giustizia del 6 ottobre 2015.

Il nuovo approdo normativo per i flussi transatlantici di dati sembra aver raccolto questa sfida, al fine di garantire protezione dei dati personali e sviluppo delle attività imprenditoriali, ma la riflessione di fondo è che nelle inerzie degli accordi con gli Stati Uniti è già da tempo avvenuta una lesione dei principi fondamentali degli individui, nella raccolta dei flussi dei dati privati e nel controllo inconsapevole delle loro vite. Vanno quindi fatti rispettare i severi obblighi imposti dalle imprese sui dati personali dei cittadini europei ed il controllo del rispetto di tali obblighi, ma vanno innanzitutto evidenziati gli obblighi di trasparenza a carico degli Stati Uniti, con procedure di ricorso realmente efficaci.

In questa enorme quantità di dati sensibili rubati, vi è infatti l'impossibilità di esercitare un efficace controllo domestico nazionale e, in caso di eventuale violazione, resta enfatizzato il ruolo della Commissione che, mi auguro, non attenda nuovamente la Corte di giustizia.

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). – Κυρία πρόεδρε, η προστασία των δεδομένων και της ιδιωτικής ζωής αποτελεί θεμελιώδες δικαίωμα των πολιτών της Ένωσης και θα πρέπει να ληφθεί υπόψη κάθε μέτρο προκειμένου αυτά να μην παραβιάζονται.

Όσον αφορά τις διατλαντικές ροές δεδομένων, η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση και οι Ηνωμένες Πολιτείες έχουν υπογράψει συμφωνία για την προστασία της ιδιωτικότητας και την ασφάλεια του δικαίου για τις επιχειρήσεις σε περίπτωση που υπάρχει μεταβίβαση δεδομένων από την Ένωση στις ΗΠΑ.

Βέβαια, όπως ορίζεται στο πλαίσιο της νέας ρύθμισης, οι δημόσιες αρχές των ΗΠΑ υποτίθεται ότι θα έχουν πρόσβαση σε δεδομένα προσωπικού χαρακτήρα και θα το πράττουν αυτό, υποτίθεται, υπό περιορισμούς και με επίβλεψη, ούτως ώστε να μην υπάρχει γενικευμένη πρόσβαση.

Παράλληλα, οι Ευρωπαίοι θα πρέπει να έχουν το δικαίωμα να ζητήσουν διεξαγωγή έρευνας ή να υποβάλουν καταγγελίες σε περίπτωση παραβίασης των προσωπικών τους δεδομένων.

Ωστόσο, είναι αναγκαίο να συγκεκριμενοποιηθούν οι περιπτώσεις πρόσβασης των δημόσιων αρχών των ΗΠΑ σε προσωπικά δεδομένα και να επιτευχθεί ισορροπία ασφάλειας και ελευθερίας. Η προστασία των δεδομένων σε κάθε διατλαντική ροή θα πρέπει να προστατεύεται και να μην υποτάσσεται στις επιδιώξεις των υπηρεσιών ασφαλείας των Ηνωμένων Πολιτειών.

Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D). – Señora Presidenta, ¿sería bueno que no hubiera flujo transatlántico de datos? No. ¿Puede este Parlamento o debe oponerse a que exista ese flujo, que, por cierto, es masivo? Desde luego que no. Pero debe exigir que ese tráfico, ese flujo, esté regulado por el Derecho y, por tanto, la Comisión ha hecho su trabajo intentando acordar y negociar nada menos que con los Estados Unidos un escudo de privacidad, un *privacy shield* que no cae del cielo, porque obedece a una sentencia contundente del Tribunal de Justicia, que anuló precisamente el acuerdo de puerto seguro a partir de la demanda interpuesta en el caso Schrems.

Pero las dudas persisten, y es muy importante que mantengamos la guardia muy alta para asegurar la adecuación de este nuevo acuerdo de privacidad, de escudo de privacidad — *privacy shield*— con la Carta de los Derechos Fundamentales de la Unión Europea. Y aquí cobra enorme importancia la cláusula de revisión anual para que la Comisión vigile el cumplimiento exacto de las garantías de limitación y supervisión ofrecidas por el Departamento de Estado de los Estados Unidos para asegurar los derechos fundamentales de la Unión Europea, y, en caso de incumplimiento, actúe antes de que tengamos que asistir a una nueva sentencia contundente y anulatoria del acuerdo del Tribunal de Justicia de la Unión Europea.

Ruža Tomašić (ECR). – Gospođo predsjednice, u prošlosti su mnoge presude Europskog suda pravde spadale u sferu sudskog aktivizma i služile su kao podloga za oduzimanje nadležnosti državama članicama. Moram priznati da sam otad prilično skeptična, no ova je presuda poslužila kao dobar okidač za izmjenu pomalo zastarjele regulative koja nije osiguravala najvišu razinu zaštite podataka i u tom sam smislu zadovoljna.

Privacy Shield nudi cijeli niz jamstava da će prava naših građana biti poštivana na drugoj strani Atlantika. Posebno važnim smatram uključenje američkog pravobranitelja koji će nadgledati pritužbe europskih građana i uvođenje novog obveznog roka od 45 dana unutar kojeg će tvrtke morati rješavati reklamacije građana.

Vjerujem kako će naši građani biti zadovoljni činjenicom da su američkim institucijama po prvi put postavljena jasnija ograničenja kod pristupa podacima, a tu je i kontrola provedbe sustava od strane Komisije koja će o svemu izvještivati ovaj dom. Postignut je značajan napredak i to apsolutno podržavamo.

Ivan Jakovčić (ALDE). – Gospođo predsjednice, ne sumnjam u dobre namjere Komisije, ne sumnjam u vaše dobre namjere, gđo Jurova, i ne mogu ne reći da je, naravno, ono što nam se predlaže i što ste nam predstavili svojevrsan napredak.

Dozvolite mi da izrazim i malu sumnju u konačan uspjeh onoga što se želi postići. Sigurna luka, kasnije Štit privatnosti, i poziv na prihvaćanje *umbrella* sporazuma dobre su ideje, a čak su i nazivi vrlo kreativni. Moramo reći da oni koji žele doći do naših podataka, oni koji žele naštetiti našoj privatnosti također su iznimno kreativni i mogu doći do naših podataka. Nažalost, ne sumnjam da danas tko zna tko sve ne u SAD-u zna sve o meni, vjerojatno sve o vama, gđi Sophiji in't Veld, g. Schultzu, g. Junckeru.

Nažalost, ne sumnjam u to i ne znam kada ćemo to do kraja uspješno spriječiti.

(End of catch-the-eye procedure)

Věra Jourová, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, I would like to thank the Honourable Members very much for this discussion. It is always very important that that we hold it and it is also inspiring for the Commission, both for myself and my colleagues.

You are right that the flow of data from the European Union to the United States is really massive. We needed to come forward soon with the new system which will protect the data of European citizens, not because of big companies which have this data flow as a basis for their business, but, as has been mentioned here several times, it was also in the interests of European small and medium-sized enterprises, for which it was a real disaster that they appeared in legal uncertainty. This is just the circumstance which we had to take into account when we worked on this issue after the court ruling – and also before, of course.

We needed strong assurances from our American counterparts. We needed to achieve legal certainty and to put an end to uncertainties where the companies were in a very difficult situation. During the negotiations I called our situation and the way we wanted to conclude these negotiations 'trust and check'. We need to have elementary trust towards our American partners that they will comply with their own laws and that they will do what they have committed themselves to in the official letters signed at the highest possible level. I will share with you today that I cannot say that that Privacy Shield, as a mechanism to protect EU citizens' data in the United States, is perfect. It cannot be perfect and I will never be totally satisfied with it, because there were objective reasons why we could not achieve more.

One is the matter of the American legal order, which Mr Albrecht very rightly pointed out here. We do not have any power to change legislation in the United States, but we will keep monitoring developments in this field in the United States and we have expressed many times our conviction that the data will be better protected in America if they have the proper data protection law. We cannot do much more.

The second objective, where we could not do more, is access to data for national security purposes. Look at the situation in Europe. Here the Commission and the European Union does not have any power to ask the secret services to be more transparent and to inform people whether they are using their data or not. Not even the Member States can do that. Certainly we wanted a similar thing when we negotiated the conditions in the United States. So these were our limits. I must say very openly that we are not fully satisfied, but we are satisfied in the sense that we achieved the maximum which was possible. But what is more important is that we must not be satisfied for the future. Satisfaction must not be our leading principle for the years to come, because the Commission has committed itself – I have committed myself and my colleagues – to monitor on a continuous basis what is happening in the United States. We will do it in a very transparent way through the annual reviews, where we expect all who are to contribute to input the trustworthy data showing the illustration of the situation as it stands, both in the United States and in the European Union.

I think that this annual review and the very strong suspension clause is quite a strong safeguard and strong measure. I am convinced that we do not need any sunset clause, as has been proposed here. Mrs Sophie in 't Veld is absolutely right that the Schrems ruling helped us. I am sorry we waited for it from the moment when we knew that this has been lodged at the court, because we were already convinced before the ruling that the decision would give us proper arguments and proper benchmarks, which will help us negotiate this stronger position. I must say that it helped in the negotiations and we very precisely took article by article in the Schrems ruling and we renegotiated in a very tough way with the American partners, referring to the court decision. I cannot be sure that the new court ruling will not be as strict as the previous one, but I am confident that we tailored the Privacy Shield system on the requirement of the court. So again, we did our best.

On the Umbrella Agreement, I do not know about a situation where we would keep some something secret. There were many written questions, which we answered, to the members of the Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs (LIBE). I would like to ask you again not only for your support for the Privacy Shield but also for the Umbrella Agreement because, as I said in my opening speech, this is a real improvement in the protection of data in the exchange between law enforcement authorities. We should take into very serious consideration that this is also about the data of witnesses and victims of criminal offences, and this plays an important role in the strengthening of cooperation between the EU and the US in criminal justice and security matters, because we all know that the security situation is worsening and that we will have to do everything we can to have better, swifter and safer cooperation between the law enforcement authorities in the United States and the European Union. So I would like to ask you again for your support.

Bert Koenders, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Madam President, honourable Members, Ladies and Gentlemen.

First of all, thank you very much for this debate, and thank you to the Commission for your clarification about the Privacy Shield and the further planning. I think this debate makes clear that smooth data flows can never mean uncontrolled and unchecked data flows. The basis of data flows should always be the trust of our citizens that the data are being used in a just and prudent way both in Europe and the United States. And if a citizen has the feeling that this is not the case, he or she should be able to object to this use.

At the same time we know – and I think that many Members have expressed this today – the enormous importance of smooth data flows for governments, companies and American and European citizens, who are reaping the benefits of this. It means companies are being enabled to operate more effectively and efficiently on the European and American side of the Atlantic, and therefore we are talking about a very important issue. It also means we will be able to fight crime more effectively and increase the security of both our continents. So we have to see to what extent this can all benefit us, and I think the proposal that has been made is therefore so important.

First, on the Umbrella Agreement. I think – and I refer to many questions that were asked on this – it is important to say that the agreement itself does not constitute a legal basis for the transfer of personal data, it only supplements other agreements with a common set of data protection safeguards. I think that is very important.

Finally, as you know, the agreement can be suspended in cases where the parties do not live up to it. So that is important. A few questions were raised on the ombudsperson. I think also here we have to underline the fact that the ombudsperson is an additional mechanism compared to other systems. So, in itself, it is not sufficient legal protection. It will not replace more substantive forms of legal protection, and I believe that it is a step forward that the United States has been willing to create this mechanism and trust that the handling of complaints submitted will be conducted in a proper manner. I would like to point out that the ombudsperson does not fulfil its position in isolation but, as stated in Annex III, works in cooperation with the internal regulators of the agencies who will need to provide information and answer questions. I would say that also many EU Member States provide for an ombudsperson-type oversight on intelligence activities in our countries.

I think, correctly, it was pointed out that the arrest was, if you wish, a catalyst for something that is, I think, a very improved deal. The Court was important; it reminded us that an essentially equivalent level of data protection in a third country can only be met if government access to the third country meets the standards of necessity and proportionality. If a third country allows for massive and indiscriminate collection of data, the standards are not met, and in this case the representations by the various US government officials clearly indicated that the US has adopted laws and policies combined with a system of oversight and redress possibilities in order to avoid the massive and indiscriminate collection of data.

The main rule is: targeted collection of data, bulk collection, is secondary, and bulk collection, if based on a proper legal standard and with sufficient safeguards to protect the rights and interests of data subjects, is acceptable, since it is not massive and indiscriminate collection of data.

Then about the 'sunset clause', I do not want to repeat; I agree with what has been said by the Commissioner. I know it is a big point of discussion also in your Parliament. I agree in this case with Mr Voss that we do not need such a sunset clause, since there is a strong element of annual review and monitoring foreseen in the agreement.

Finally, I would say that we deem that the Privacy Shield and the Umbrella Agreement offer the safeguards needed to justify our citizens' trust. We hope, therefore, also, that the European Parliament will consider all the positive aspects. It is also true here to say that the better is the enemy of the good. It is important that we can now make progress on this; it is important for our citizens and our businesses – EU citizens in particular – when consent is given, hopefully to the conclusion of the agreement.

President. — I have received seven motions for resolutions tabled in accordance with Rule 123(2) of the Rules of Procedure.

Isabella Adinolfi (EFDD), per iscritto. – I flussi di dati tra UE e USA sono i più intensi al mondo e rappresentano un elemento essenziale nelle relazioni di natura commerciale, soprattutto per le multinazionali americane. Ad ottobre 2015, la Corte di giustizia europea ha invalidato la decisione «Safe Harbour» statuendo che le autorità nazionali di controllo possono valutare l'adeguatezza del livello di protezione garantito da un paese terzo e in caso sospendere il trasferimento dei dati. La Commissione ha così redatto una nuova decisione, cosiddetta «Privacy Shield» al fine di garantire il rispetto della privacy e dei dati personali dei cittadini europei. Questa decisione, tuttavia, non garantisce un adeguato livello di tutela e protezione del diritto fondamentale alla protezione dei dati di carattere personale. Negli USA, infatti, i dati degli stranieri non sono altro che un bene che può essere utilizzato come meglio si crede senza alcun rispetto della privacy. Si pensi inoltre alle intense e pervasive attività poste in essere dai servizi di intelligence americani, come fatto emergere da Edward Snowden. Il nostro compito è quello di tutelare i cittadini da qualsiasi abuso e con questo testo, de facto, legalizziamo qualsiasi tipo di utilizzo dei dati sensibili degli europei da parte degli USA.

Petras Auštrevičius (ALDE), in writing. – Transatlantic data flows between EU and US intensify rapidly with every year. Since the European Court of Justice ruled the previous Safe Harbour as inoperative, we should aim to create a new ambitious framework for secure data exchange. I support EC position that EU- US Privacy Shield should impose stronger obligations to U.S. companies. U.S. should completely abstain from indiscriminate mass surveillance, it should commit itself to more transparency and as well to a better cooperation with European Data Protection Authorities. EU Privacy Shield has to serve the interests of EU citizens and European companies. Any access by U.S. public authorities to personal data must be a subject to clear safeguards.

Андрей Ковачев (PPE), в писмена форма. – Постигането на съгласие по нова рамка за трансатлантическите потоци от данни е от първостепенно значение за търговията и инвестициите между ЕС и САЩ. В резултат на цифровизацията на нашите икономики, трансферът на данни придобива все по-голямо значение за двустранните икономически отношения като допринася за икономическия ръст и конкурентоспособността. Предприятията от двете на страни на Атлантика имат нужда от правна сигурност, за да развият своята дейност, а европейските граждани трябва да получат гаранции за неприкосновеността на техните лични данни и възможности за правна защита. Смятам, че новото споразумение трябва да изпълнява тези изисквания и да създаде ясна и солидна правна рамка, която гарантира ефективна защита на неприкосновеност на личния живот и защита на данните. Важно е изпълнението на поетите ангажименти да се наблюдава отблизо, за да бъде възстановено доверието между трансатлантическите партньори. Това би могло да даде импулс и да допринесе за положителната динамика в двустранните отношения и в други области на сътрудничество, като подсили трансатлантическата връзка между ЕС и САЩ и подкрепи усилията за справяне с общите предизвикателства в глобален план.

Igor Šoltes (Verts/ALE), pisno. – Potem ko je Sodišče Evropske unije označilo dogovor Varen pristan za neveljaven, je Evropska komisija predlagala nov režim za pretok podatkov med ZDA in EU, poimenovan Ščit zasebnosti. Razumljivo je, da je treba zagotoviti pravno gotovost za posle med ZDA in EU, vendar se to ne sme zgoditi na račun temeljnih pravic, kar na žalost v Ščitu zasebnosti ni odraženo. Nadalje, Ščit zasebnosti ne spoštuje sodne prakse Sodišča Evropske unije, na primer sodb Schrems, Data Retention in Google Spain, prav tako pa je izvrševanje pogodbe precej zahtevno, saj morajo iti podatki skozi pet zaporednih postopkov. Zaskrbljujoče je tudi dejstvo, da sporazum zaradi nižjih zahtev v primerjavi s pravom EU o zaščiti podatkov daje primerjalno prednost podjetjem iz ZDA napram evropskim podjetjem. Menim, da obstaja tudi možnost, da bo sporazum v prihodnosti spoznan za neveljavnega, prav tako kot se je to zgodilo

v primeru sporazuma Varen pristan. Zaradi vsega navedenega se mi zdi smiselno uvesti klavzulo o časovni omejitvi, ki bi po nekaj letih zahtevala ponovno pogajanje in podpis sporazuma, kar bi omogočilo njegovo izboljšanje.

Dubravka Šuica (PPE), napisan. – Gospodarstva Evropske unije i Sjedinjenih Američkih Država čine više od 50 % svjetskog BDP-a, 25 % svjetskog izvoza i više od 30 % svjetskog uvoza. Radi se o dva najunosnija svjetska gospodarstva s ukupnom vrijednošću transatlantskog prometa u 2014. godini u iznosu od jednog trilijuna dolara.

Protok podataka između Sjedinjenih Američkih Država i Europske unije iznosi oko 15 terabita po sekundi, što predstavlja daleko najveći protok podataka u svijetu. Smatram da je slobodan protok podataka između EU-a i SAD-a od ključne važnosti za rast trgovine i ulaganja, jer su transatlantske transakcije i usluge među poduzećima postala stvarnost, a i potrošači s obje strane Atlantika sve se više služe internetom za kupnju robe i usluga. Pristup internetu u SAD-u ima 85 % stanovnika, a u Europskoj uniji 90 %.

Internet je dostupan svugdje u svijetu, a uvjerena sam da će rezolucija o transatlantskom protoku podataka Europskoj uniji otvoriti mogućnost širenja trgovine i ulaganja u zemlje u razvoju. Zbog toga smatram da će doći do rasta internet-ske međunarodne trgovine kao i potrebe za slobodnim protokom podataka. Ovu rezoluciju vidim kao korak naprijed u tom smjeru.

19. Endokrinné disruptory: situácia po rozsudku Súdneho dvora zo 16. decembra 2015 (rozprava)

President. — The next item is the debate on the Commission statement on endocrine disruptors: state of play following the Court judgment of 16 December 2015 (2016/2747(RSP)).

Vytėnis Povilas Andriukaitis, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, honourable Members, once again we have on our agenda the sensitive issue of endocrine disruptors, and specifically the setting of final criteria to identify these substances in the context of the Biocidal Products Regulation. As you will remember, during the plenary session on 2 February I made a commitment to present before the summer final scientific criteria for the identification endocrine disruptors. So I can reiterate that the Commission has a very firm intention to comply with this obligation and with the judgment of the Court.

I stand by this commitment and I can only again confirm that the two draft measures are an issue which will be on the College's agenda on 15 June. The criteria to be presented will be specified objectively and based on scientific evidence. This was not only reiterated by President Jean-Claude Juncker in a letter sent in March to President Martin Schulz, but also repeated by myself at several public occasions.

As honourable Members will know, two separate draft measures will be presented simultaneously. As soon as the College endorses these two draft measures, they will be published on the Commission's website so as to ensure maximum transparency.

Madam President, honourable Members, it is our collective responsibility to make informed decisions in the full awareness of all the consequences of our choices. I therefore hope that together we will adopt the best decision on this very important matter. I would like to say that I have kept it very brief. Thank you, and I will listen to your debate.

Alojz Peterle, v imenu skupine PPE. – Varovanje državljanov pred nevarnostmi za zdravje je eden od treh strateških ciljev zdravstvene politike Evropske zveze, zato moramo hormonske motilce postaviti v center preventive. Na področju zdravja, kjer lahko zvezo občutneje približamo državljanom, je nujno in dopustno samo dosledno ravnanje Komisije.

Povečana pojavnost kroničnih bolezni, vključno z raki, povezanimi s hormoni, kot sta rak na dojki in rak prostate, ter večje število sladkornih bolnikov in reproduktivnih težav nas zavezuje k ukrepanju.

Še toliko bolj, ker imajo hormonski motilci, ki jih povezujemo z vsem naštetim, velik potencial za nepopravljive učinke, stroški zdravljenja pa so ocenjeni na visokih 150 milijard evrov letno. Ob dejstvu, da so iz več razlogov zdravstvene blagajne že sedaj omejene, je preventivno ravnanje na ravni zveze potrebno in tudi ekonomsko upravičeno.

Na včerajšnji seji delovne skupine za zdravje smo spet slišali znanstveno potrditev škodljivosti določenih kemičnih substanc, ki se ne uporabljajo le v kmetijstvu, še toliko bolj če se med seboj kombinirajo ali če je izpostavljenost dolgotrajna.

Zato močno obžalujem dolgotrajnost postopanja v tej zadevi, kar je obsodilo tudi Evropsko sodišče. Vseeno verjamem, da je bil čas smotrno porabljen in dobro izkoriščen za zblíževanje različnosti stališč, pri oblikovanju kriterijev in da ste, gospod komisar, pri tem igrali aktivno vlogo.

Za več zdravja in vzdržne zdravstvene sisteme so seveda ključne preventivne aktivnosti, v danih razmerah pa je predvsem potrebna delujoča Komisija. Pričakujem torej, da boste ovrgli predlog nezaupnice s predložitvijo dolgo pričakovanih kriterijev v napovedanem roku, to je do poletja. In hvala za odgovor, ki ste ga pravzaprav že dali.

Jytte Guteland, för S&D-gruppen. – Fru talman! Tack herr kommissionär för beskedet idag och uttalandet inför mötet i juni. Jag är glad över det. Jag är också glad över tillfället att få tala om vetenskapliga kriterier för hormonstörande ämnen.

Men jag vill påminna om den historia vi har. Det här är ett av de mer påfallande fallen där EU-rätten medvetet ignorerats och åsidosatts för andra intressen. I mer än två år har kommissionen fullständigt struntat i att presentera vetenskapliga kriterier fast man sen december 2013 har varit skyldig att lägga fram desamma. Vi måste ha dessa kriterier. De är nödvändiga för att vi ska kunna fortsätta arbetet och fasa ut hälsofarliga kemikalier. Jag ska vara tydlig i det fall budskapet inte har gått fram. Det är oacceptabelt att ignorera skyldigheter som kommissionen är ålagd genom EU-lag. EU:s medborgare, Europaparlamentet, EU-länderna och EU-domstolen förväntar sig att kommissionen respekterar sin plikt genom EU-fördraget, att verka för medborgarnas hälsa, och det är inga bagateller vi talar om.

Hormonstörande ämnen finns överallt omkring oss. De finns i matförpackningar, i våra barns leksaker, i våra kläder, i vårt dricksvatten, och de kopplas samman med en lång rad sjukdomar. Diabetes, olika cancerformer och problem med fertilitet, och det är särskilt illavarslande att små barn och foster är extra känsliga för dessa kemikalier, vars effekter kan visa sig långt senare i livet. Därför är det välkommet att kommissionen nu signalerat att man äntligen kommer att diskutera de vetenskapliga kriterierna i kollegiet i mitten av juni. Kommissionen kan vara säker på att vi är många som kommer att följa det mötet noggrant, och jag vill här mana kommissionen att beakta Europaparlamentets tidigare positioner gällande kriterierna.

Lett av S&D-gruppen har parlamentet upprepade gånger kraftigt motsatt sig kommissionens förslag att införa potens som ett avgränsande kriterium för definitionen av hormonstörande ämnen. En sådan avgränsning skulle på ett otillbörligt sätt begränsa definitionen av hormonstörande ämnen och göra den vetenskapligt bristfällig och därmed oförenlig med klassificeringen av cancerframkallande, mutagena eller reproduktionstoxiska ämnen.

Just att potens inte tillåts bli en vägledande faktor i kriterierna är en nyckelfråga, inte bara för oss i S&D-gruppen och Europaparlamentet utan också för många medlemsstater. Jag vill därför åter igen understryka mycket tydligt för kommissionen att vi inte kommer att acceptera någon sådan modell. Bland de alternativ som analyserades är den färdplan kommissionen publicerade 2014. Då framhölls möjligheterna med ett alternativ utan potens som kriterium. Jag vill uppmana kommissionen att följa den färdplanen. Samtidigt är jag nu förhoppningsfull att det finns goda förutsättningar att kommissionen gör rätt för sig och presenterar dessa kriterier som ger högsta möjliga skydd för människors hälsa.

Julie Girling, on behalf of the ECR Group. – Madam President, I should like to thank the Commissioner for his opening remarks. The Commissioner has accepted the December court ruling and has publicly committed to hastening the adoption of the criterion. I welcome that. In addition, we have legal advice from Parliament's services which has acknowledged that taking further action against the Commission would be superfluous given that, as soon as the criteria are published, there would no longer be a case.

So I look forward to the work that we will begin in June when we see the criteria. I would just like to take this opportunity to restate my own position, which is that these criteria must be scientifically robust and fit for regulatory purpose. They need to ensure that human health and the environment are protected, taking into account the possible consequences for the agri-food sector and the need to encourage innovation and the development of new plant protection solutions.

Parliament must be serious about supporting the Commission's initiatives on better regulation and improved evidence-based policy making. Then we should let it complete its work and save our energy for the evaluation and decision making that will follow.

Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy, *on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – Madam President, when I was elected to this Parliament in 2009, I really did not expect to end up in this debate that we are having tonight, a debate in which I have to call upon the Commission, the guardian of the Treaty for the European Union, to respect a ruling of the European Court of Justice and to comply with it.

Let me quote from the legal opinion from the Parliament's Legal Service, which is really crystal clear – and be aware that people from the Legal Service are the most cautious people on planet Earth, and when they are so crystal clear, there is really something there. Let me quote: 'There is no doubt that, to date, the Commission has not yet taken the measures required under Article 266 of the Treaty in order to comply with the General Court's judgment.'

That is more than crystal clear. Simply, the Commission is not complying with the Court's ruling. So when the Commissioner starts his statement with: 'Once again we are discussing this topic', this is not because we as Parliament want to continuously discuss this. It is because the Commission is refusing to comply with the Court's ruling – the Court's ruling that was crystal clear in saying that no impact assessment of the social and economic consequences was necessary before the independent scientific criteria would be set.

In the correspondence between President Juncker and President Schulz, President Juncker was still talking about the necessity to first finalise this impact assessment. Commissioner, can you please assure us that the Commission is not going to firstly finalise this impact assessment before setting these scientific criteria? European Union citizens are losing trust in the European Union. So the last thing we need is a European Commission that is not even complying with the Court's rulings.

Anja Hazekamp, *namens de GUE/NGL-Fractie*. – Mevrouw de voorzitter, hormoonverstoorders zijn overal. Ze zitten in conservenblikken, in plastic flessen, in cosmetica, in kassabonnetjes en op bespoten fruit en groenten. En je kunt er heel erg ziek van worden: borstkanker, zaadbalkanker, vruchtbaarheidsproblemen. Dit is slechts een greep uit alle aandoeningen die je ervan kunt krijgen.

Deze week nog luidden artsen de noodklok vanwege deze stoffen in medische hulpmiddelen, zoals infusen en beademingsslangen. Kinderen kunnen hier voor de rest van hun leven ziek van worden.

De Europese Commissie weigert structureel deze ziekmakers van de markt te halen en zet daarmee moedwillig de gezondheid van vijfhonderd miljoen burgers op het spel. Ze negeert daarmee haar eigen wetten en lapt een uitspraak van het Europese Hof aan haar laars. Dat is een groot schandaal.

Mijn fractie heeft vandaag ingestemd met een resolutie over hormoonverstorende stoffen, maar deze Commissie heeft wat mij betreft een veel sterker signaal nodig. Wat mij betreft had deze Commissie hier na vandaag ook niet meer gezeten.

Deze Commissie zit in reservetijd. Mocht de Commissie niet onmiddellijk in actie komen, dan garandeer ik u dat er vóór deze zomer weer een nieuwe motie van wantrouwen komt. En ik ga ervan uit dat de Groenen, de sociaaldemocraten en alle anderen die zeggen volksgezondheid belangrijk te vinden dan niet de andere kant op kijken. Ik heb een duidelijke boodschap aan u, commissaris: u komt hier niet mee weg.

En voorts ben ik van mening dat de Europese landbouwsubsidies moeten worden afgeschaft.

Bas Eickhout, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Madam President, the Commissioner said: 'Here we are again', as if we like being here again. The point is that, after several discussions we are having on the issue of endocrine disruptors, Commissioner, you continue to say: 'We are working on an impact assessment' and every time when we criticise, you say: 'But the impact assessment...'. It is not that we are against an impact assessment; the point is, for this required action of the Commission, an impact assessment is not required. And every time you then replied: 'But what is wrong, are you against an impact assessment?'.

You were always dodging the issue and therefore we asked for another legal opinion. There is a very clear Court ruling saying the Commission is not complying with its own rules. So we asked again for a legal opinion – my colleague Gerbrandy has already quoted from it, so I will take some other quotes just to make it very clear once more: ‘The General Court rejected the Commission’s argument that an impact assessment was required’. It has been rejected! And still the spokesperson of the Commission back in December, in response to the General Court’s ruling, was saying: ‘We are continuing, we are on track for the impact assessment’. In the letter from Mr Juncker to Mr Schulz, he was also pointing out that: ‘We are here, working on an impact assessment’. And the conclusion from the Legal Service – and that is indeed the same conclusion that Mr Gerbrandy was noting – is that the Commission has not yet taken the measures required under the Treaty.

That is why we are discussing this here again. We want scientific criteria. You are still not delivering on that. That they will be coming in June, it does not matter, you are too late with that, but you are still using the argument that an impact assessment is needed. We think you are ill-advised by your advisers. But it is really crucial to say this: we have to make sure that the Commission is following the rules.

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

Piernicola Pedicini (EFDD), domanda «cartellino blu». – Ho una *blue card* per l'onorevole Bas Eickhout.

Vorrei capire in quali circostanze il gruppo dei Verdi sarebbe disposto ad appoggiare una mozione di censura. Cosa deve succedere, per il gruppo dei Verdi, per arrivare ad appoggiare una mozione di censura? Perché mi sembra che ci siano tutte le circostanze, sembra strano che non l'abbiate appoggiata.

Bas Eickhout (Verts/ALE), *blue-card answer*. – I knew this question would be coming. The point now is that we will get a proposal from the Commission, and then we will have to have a fight on what scientific criteria will be there. For example potency, which all the scientists say is not a scientific criterion – a good reason not to have it in. Will it not be in?

That is a fight that is really about the safety of our citizens. That is the fight we still need to have. So, before we make all kind of symbolic changes, let us first make sure that the right criteria are out there. That is the most important concern of the Greens, and I hope that we can have that fight together, so that we are sure that the right scientific criteria are there. After that discussion let us see what the Commission does.

Piernicola Pedicini, a nome del gruppo EFDD. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, credo innanzitutto che bisognerebbe spiegare ai cittadini che gli interferenti endocrini sono sostanze nocive, in particolare per la salute dei nostri ragazzi durante l'età dello sviluppo. Le possibili patologie correlate sono malattie riproduttive, comportamentali, malattie dell'apprendimento, cancro e, con buona probabilità, anche obesità e diabete.

Ma i cittadini devono sapere anche che la Commissione europea avrebbe dovuto definire la lista di questi interferenti endocrini ma non lo ha fatto. La Commissione è stata quindi condannata dalla Corte di giustizia per il suo mancato adempimento e, nonostante ciò, ha completamente disatteso le disposizioni della Corte di giustizia. Per questo noi abbiamo presentato una mozione di censura, perché un'istituzione non si può permettere di ignorare una sentenza della Corte di giustizia europea.

E allora al gruppo dei popolari, al gruppo dei socialisti, al gruppo ALDE, al gruppo ECR, cioè a tutti colori che non hanno appoggiato la mozione di censura, dico: fino a che punto dovete seguire le indicazioni delle lobby? Com'è possibile arrivare ad accettare anche ciò che supera il limite invalicabile della salute dei cittadini?

Un personale pensiero poi va al gruppo dei Verdi. I Verdi sono quelli che fanno i discorsi più belli qua dentro, peccato però che quello che dicono sia tutto il contrario di ciò che fanno. Io adesso ho capito perché i Verdi sono scomparsi dal panorama politico italiano, onorevole Bas Eickhout. Ai deputati di Podemos e ai comunisti del GUE, che avevano firmato la mozione di censura ma che poi hanno ritirato la firma per non accostare il loro nome a quello della Le Pen, dico che sono completamente fuori dalla storia. Sono come quei giapponesi che continuano a combattere perché nessuno gli ha spiegato che la guerra è finita. E sono convinto che, se avessero la possibilità di salvare una vita umana, prima andrebbero a controllare se da qualche parte c'è la firma della Le Pen. Adesso sono tutti compatti per una risoluzione che sappiamo benissimo che non avrà nessun effetto vincolante su questa Commissione. Per me, siete ridicoli.

A tutti coloro i quali invece hanno firmato la mozione di censura voglio fare il mio personale ringraziamento, voglio ringraziarli perché sono stati capaci di superare quella barriera ideologica che storicamente ci separa e che ci impedisce le cose che pure sono davanti ai nostri occhi. Questa non è una stupida guerra ideologica tra sinistra e destra, questa è una guerra maledetta tra sfruttatori e sfruttati, perciò noi ce ne andiamo a casa a dormire con la coscienza pulita stasera, perché abbiamo fatto il possibile per difendere la salute dei nostri ragazzi. Io non credo che altri possano dire la stessa cosa e, francamente, potervelo dire in faccia non ha prezzo.

Mireille D'Ornano, *au nom du groupe ENF*. – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Commissaire, les perturbateurs endocriniens sont une menace structurelle grave et généralisée pour la santé des peuples, puisque nos concitoyens sont en contact avec ces substances au quotidien. C'est pourquoi un tel sujet mérite que les institutions européennes, qui se sont dotées de pouvoirs de réglementation et de régulation, prennent de réelles responsabilités. Et en cela, la Commission a failli à sa tâche.

D'une part, la période raisonnable entre la publication du règlement et celle des actes délégués n'est pas respectée. Or, ni la complexité institutionnelle, ni le besoin d'évaluation d'impact ne sont acceptables pour justifier un tel délai face à l'importance du sujet sanitaire. Je fais par ailleurs remarquer que, alors que le règlement européen est directement applicable dans toute l'Union, la Commission se donne le luxe de traîner pour publier des actes délégués. C'est une illustration de l'opacité réglementaire. C'est bien de vouloir mieux légiférer, mais encore faut-il l'appliquer à soi-même.

D'autre part, la gravité du danger exige que l'on ne débâte pas sur la méthode d'évaluation et que l'on n'attende pas d'avoir des preuves manifestes pour agir. Plus grave encore, utiliser une étude d'impact pour tenter de définir des critères de perturbateurs endocriniens avant la publication d'actes délégués revient à détourner le pouvoir réglementaire. La Commission fuit donc ses responsabilités et le dévoilement de ses vraies intentions. Cela participe aussi de la dégradation du sens de la prise de décision, du manque de transparence à la source même de la réglementation et de la dispersion du pouvoir.

La Commission a commis une faute lourde et grave et semble pourtant ignorer les demandes de la Cour de justice. Or, la motion de censure était un acte politique fort pour sanctionner la Commission. Non, cher collègue Lamberts, ce n'est pas un outil disproportionné, cela fait partie des règles du pouvoir et, aujourd'hui, j'ai l'impression que certains groupes peu courageux veulent sortir blanchis de cette affaire, où le Parlement serait bien complice de la Commission pour son inaction. Nous voulons des réponses claires de la Commission sur ces critères et ces fautes.

Pavel Poc (S&D). – Pane komisaři, 3 roky to trvalo, konečně se dočkáme. Já jsem v osobní rovině hrozně rád, že jste nám dnes přinesl zprávu, že dodržíte své slovo z února tohoto roku. Jsem moc rád a těším se na spolupráci.

Ale Evropská komise, ne Vy osobně, ale Evropská komise nejprve nerespektovala povinnosti, které jí vyplývají z nařízení o dodávání biocidních přípravků na trh. Nepředložila, co měla před 3 lety. Pak Evropská komise nerespektovala rozhodnutí Evropského soudu, zvláště. Komise sama sebe pasovala do role strážkyně Smluv, takže je na místě pár otázek:

1) Proč se Komise rozhodla nerespektovat rozsudek Evropského soudu a dokončila nebo pracovala na dokončení evropské dopadové studie místo, aby předložila kritéria tak, jak požadoval rozsudek Soudu?

2) Kdo je za toto rozhodnutí zodpovědný? Je to kolegium, jste to Vy osobně, Váš předchůdce, je to předseda Juncker, místopředseda Timmermans, kdo konkrétně? To je odpověď, kterou chceme. Já vím, že ji dnes nedostanu, ale snad jednoho dne ano. Jakým způsobem hodlá Evropská komise použít onu dopadovou studii, když základem pro kritéria musí být věda? Nic jiného.

Poslední, ale nikoli málo důležitá otázka se týká výstupu z vědecké konference pořádané v dubnu letošního roku v Berlíně, kdy se světový experti shodli v tom, že potence není pro identifikaci endokrinních disruptorů relevantním ani vědeckým kritériem. Takže ta moje dnešní klíčová otázka: Hodlá Komise, mám na mysli především komisaře a super komisaře, kteří nemají endokrinní disruptory v portfoliu, vzít v úvahu tento vědecký konsensus při rozhodování o tom, která z *road map* bude nakonec vybrána?

Mark Demesmaeker (ECR). – Mevrouw de voorzitter, het Europees Parlement blijft op hetzelfde hameren. De wetenschappelijke criteria voor hormoonverstoorders moeten er komen. Gezondheid, geloof me, staat voor elke burger bovenaan de prioriteitenlijst. De problematiek leeft daarom steeds meer, en begrijpelijk: heel wat studies linken de toename van onder andere kankergevallen, diabetes, obesitas en onvruchtbaarheid aan de blootstelling aan hormoonverstorende stoffen.

In februari beloofde u dat de Commissie nog vóór de zomer met voorstellen zou komen. Die zomer die begon zowat in mei, zo luidt de tekst van een populaire Nederlandse song. Ik heb goed naar u geluisterd, het wordt half juni. Oké, dat is nog net vóór het begin van de échte zomer en de langste dag van het jaar. Maar het is in elk geval echt vijf voor twaalf. De deadline van december 2013 ligt al tweeënhalve jaar achter ons. De Commissie moet woord houden. Dat is ze aan de burgers verschuldigd. Het gaat over geloofwaardigheid en vertrouwen. En de onzekerheid heeft lang genoeg geduurd, zowel voor consumenten als voor producenten.

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

Tibor Szanyi (S&D), Kékkártyás kérdés. – Köszönöm szépen a lehetőséget, Tisztelt Elnök Asszony! Képviselő úrnak is majd az esetleges választ! Ebben az esetben Ön egy nagyon szép időszávet vezetett végig, hogy kb. mi várható. De azért én úgy emlékszem, hogy ebben az ülésteremben már nem egy hasonló esettel szembesültünk. És mindig, mindig, mindig valamilyen ipari érdekek sejtettek fel a háttérben. Ön hogy gondolja, hogyan lehetne ezzel a lobbierővel szembeszállni? Mert szerintem most már több a gyakorisága ennek az elviselhetőség.

Mark Demesmaeker (ECR), “blauwe kaart”-antwoord. – Ja, ik geef de collega natuurlijk gelijk. We hebben in het verleden inderdaad betreurenswaardige voorbeelden gezien. Daarom heb ik de Commissie ook een schot voor de boeg gegeven en gezegd: kijk, het is nu echt vijf voor twaalf. We hebben de belofte gehoord in februari, voor de zomer. Het wordt nu half juni. Dat is net voor de zomer. We houden de commissaris natuurlijk aan die belofte, maar we geven hem ook alle kansen.

Kateřina Konečná (GUE/NGL). – Pojdme si shrnout fakty a já ještě pár faktů přidám k tomu, co jsme tu před chvílí slyšeli od kolegů.

Endokrinní disruptory způsobují rakovinu, mají dopad na plodnost, dokonce mají vliv i na obezitu. I kdybych si odmyslela tisíce lidí, které každoročně tyto látky zabíjí, což nemohu, tak jen samotný předpokládáný ekonomický dopad vystavování lidí v EU těmto látkám má být 2x vyšší, než je dopad znečištění rtutí a olovem. Proto bylo přijato nařízení č. 528/2012 o zákazu používání těchto látek.

Co se stalo? Nic, čekáme. Čekáme minimálně 2 roky, pane komisaři, kdy jste ve své funkci. Já chápu, že tady v Parlamentu máte silnou podporu, ale Vy si musíte uvědomit, že v důsledku těchto scházejících kritérií musíme právě my tady v Parlamentu řešit reautorizaci nebezpečných látek, jako jsou ftaláty, glyfosát apod., salámovou metodou, ad hoc námitkami, hrát si na detektivy a vědce, aby se alespoň trochu ochránilo zdraví evropské populace. Já si myslím, že toho nejste hodni ani vy ani my. My všichni společně musíme začít konečně něco dělat a vy dělejte.

Heidi Hautala (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, seven years ago this Parliament gave the Commission a legally binding mandate to come up with the endocrine disruptor criteria before 2013. So this deadline passed three years ago but the list is still not ready, and the General Court has stated that the Commission is currently in breach of EU law.

Both old and new inter-institutional agreements clearly say that impact assessments are not a substitute for political decisions. They must not lead to undue delays in the law-making process. But still the Commission is neglecting its duties and is tinkering with an impact assessment, thus violating both the inter-institutional agreement and the treaties when doing so.

Could the Commission, by the way, confirm if it is true that it was the TTIP negotiations, and the US negotiating position, that actually made the drafting of endocrine disruptor criteria so inconvenient? I hope that this is not true, because I would find it unbearable if the Commission is ignoring the Court decision for the interests of the US industries.

Catch-the-eye procedure

Nicola Caputo (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, con un ritardo di oltre due anni e dopo una condanna della Corte di giustizia dell'Unione europea, i nuovi criteri per la definizione degli interferenti endocrini dovrebbero essere a breve resi pubblici, almeno si spera.

Tutta la discussione sui criteri scientifici verte su un termine: l'industria chiede di inserire il criterio della «potenza» nella normativa, mentre gruppi di interesse e pubblici chiedono a gran voce che esso venga escluso. Esistono sostanze la cui potenza come interferenti endocrini è bassa, ma che fanno registrare un'esposizione quotidiana molto alta – si pensi ad esempio ai pesticidi – e ci sono altri composti, invece, che hanno una potenza molto alta, ma che si trovano in concentrazioni molto basse, al punto tale che la salute umana ne sarebbe meno intaccata. Permettere la messa in commercio degli interferenti endocrini con bassa potenza sarebbe gravissimo, in quanto risulterebbe essere rischioso per l'esposizione ad essi che li trasforma in veleni mortali.

Sono quindi nettamente contrario ai tentativi della Commissione di introdurre il criterio della potenza per definire gli interferenti endocrini, ciò limiterebbe in modo inappropriato la definizione di «interferente endocrino», rendendolo scientificamente inconsistente e incompatibile con la classificazione delle sostanze cancerogene.

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). – Κυρία πρόεδρε, δεν ακούσαμε και πολλά από την Επιτροπή για τους ενδοκρινικούς διαταράκτες και αυτό μας ανησυχεί ιδιαίτερα. Οι ενδοκρινικοί διαταράκτες είναι χημικές ουσίες που παρεμβαίνουν στο ορμονικό σύστημα και προκαλούν διαταραχές στη γονιμότητα, προκαλούν νεοπλασίες και διάφορες μορφές καρκίνου.

Οι ουσίες αυτές βρίσκονται σε πολλά προϊόντα που χρησιμοποιούν καθημερινά οι καταναλωτές, οι οποίοι όμως δεν γνωρίζουν καν την ύπαρξή τους στα προϊόντα αυτά. Βρίσκονται στα παιχνίδια, στα τρόφιμα, ακόμη και στο νερό. Πέρασαν ήδη δύο χρόνια κύριε Επίτροπε, παντελούς αδράνειας της Επιτροπής για τη λήψη μέτρων της προστασίας της δημόσιας υγείας των Ευρωπαίων καταναλωτών, αν και όφειλε να το πράξει.

Πρέπει λοιπόν να ληφθούν μέτρα για την αδειοδότηση και τους περιορισμούς των ουσιών αυτών στα προϊόντα. Εδώ και τώρα, λοιπόν, κύριε Επίτροπε, να συμμορφωθεί η Επιτροπή με την απόφαση του Δικαστηρίου της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης για τους ενδοκρινικούς διαταράκτες.

Ivan Jakovčić (ALDE). – Gospodine povjereniče, zašto se čeka? Zašto se čekaju dvije godine? Imamo jasnu odluku Europskog suda. Zašto čekamo? Pa zar nam zdravlje građana ipak nije najbitnije? Svi znamo da endokrini disruptori utječu na zdravlje građana, na najteže oblike oboljenja građana, kao što su rak dojke, drugi oblici, hormonalni poremećaji.

Znamo koji su problemi s kojima se suočavamo kada koristimo različite proizvode, kada se sve to koristi i u poljoprivredi. Zar zaista gospodine povjereniče moramo čekati? Stavite se u ulogu Parlamenta. Parlament ne može čekati i vjerujem da Vi razumijete da mi ne možemo čekati.

(End of catch-the-eye procedure)

Vytenis Povilas Andriukaitis, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, I have listened closely to the debate and have taken careful note of your views.

First of all, my simple answer about responsibility: I am responsible. Please tell me if I am wrong. I am responsible, I am honest and I will continue my job with responsibility, yes, because I am responsible for the Commission being in delay. Is that enough? Is it clear?

Second, I would like to mention about scientific opinions. You mentioned scientists in common positions, speaking about potency and other things. Now, it was my intention to invite different scientists, to organise several debates, and then to organise a platform and today they have a common position. Of course in this position many issues are on the table.

Some of you raised questions about the issue that the Commission is in delay. Yes, of course. We started with a roadmap, with four options. It started with possibilities to deal with, how to describe and define, *final* scientific criteria. *Interim* scientific criteria are in place and you know this very well. And the Commission follows interim criteria.

Some of you spoke about how to regulate. All things related to the Plant Protection Regulation and the Biocidal Products Regulation are under Commission supervision and we follow interim criteria, and our consumers are protected in this area. We must tell the truth to our society but not feed fear. We need scientific criteria, not politically-based criteria. It is completely different.

In my hands is the document about those chemicals from 2012. You know it very well. It is a very good summary, a very good study, which shows how it is important. As you know, my professional background is as a medical doctor. I am very much interested in endocrine disruptors criteria. I know much more related to some problems which were just mentioned.

OK, we will keep in mind that we need very scientific and very reasonable criteria. Of course some of you mentioned the impact assessment. The impact assessment is one thing. But I started to debate about how to describe final criteria and it takes time. Two parallel processes were together, and of course an impact assessment helps us to make very informed decisions. This is also OK. I fully agree with the Court's decision. Absolutely. But the Court was not against the impact assessment. The Court decision was very clear. Despite the impact assessment, despite different scientific opinion, the Commission must present final criteria. Of course the Commission was in delay, and we are ready to do our best and to present those criteria to you on 15 June once again.

And then it will be good to have not politically-based arguments but scientifically-based ones and I am ready to debate scientifically. And of course it has nothing to do with TTIP, absolutely. This is also a political argument to feed a lobby, industrial fears and so on, but it is not serious. The serious argument is that it is a very complex job. It is very difficult speaking about WHO scientists, about different scientific bodies, it is not so easy to present those criteria, and I am ready to do my best and present those criteria, of course, in line with the Biocidal Products Regulation and in line with the Pesticide Protection Regulation.

President. — The debate is closed.

Sylvie Goddyn (ENF), par écrit. – Le 16 décembre dernier, la Commission européenne a été condamnée pour ne pas avoir proposé de définition des perturbateurs endocriniens. Cette définition est pourtant indispensable pour une réglementation. Présents dans de nombreux produits phytosanitaires et alimentaires, ces molécules sont à l'origine de nombreux problèmes de santé. Il était du devoir de la Commission de protéger la santé des Européens; elle a préféré défendre les intérêts des lobbys industriels.

En réaction à ce manquement, une motion de censure contre la Commission, avait été déposée et a malheureusement échoué. Seule cette motion était de nature à mettre la pression sur la Commission. Mais au lieu de ça, on nous propose ici une résolution, sans valeur obligatoire. C'est une tentative d'enfumage. Il s'agit pour ceux qui n'ont pas demandé la censure de faire croire aux Européens qu'ils se préoccupent de la santé publique. Les députés patriotes ne participeront pas à cette mascarade.

Cette résolution est une mauvaise opération de communication à destination des crédules. Pendant ce temps, rien n'est fait pour protéger la santé des Européens.

Miguel Viegas (GUE/NGL), por escrito. – O Tribunal de Justiça da UE considerou que a Comissão Europeia infringiu o direito comunitário ao não respeitar o prazo de publicação das normas de comercialização de químicos nocivos para a saúde, como o bisfenol A, pesticidas ou solventes. A sentença do tribunal não inclui uma multa, mas obriga que o documento relativo aos critérios científicos para determinar a nocividade dos chamados disruptores endócrinos seja adotado o mais rapidamente possível.

Na origem da decisão está o processo aberto pela Suécia contra a Comissão, que deveria ter aprovado as normas no final de 2013. Dois anos de atraso denunciados por várias associações europeias que falam de um problema de saúde pública, quando os disruptores endócrinos estarão na origem de várias doenças como cancro ou mesmo o aumento da infertilidade. Este é mais um sinal sobre os interesses que são defendidos por estas instituições.

20. Zavádzanie cezhraničných nástrojov elektronickej identifikácie a on-line služieb (rozprava)

President. — The next item is the debate on the Commission statement on deployment of cross-border e-identification tools and online services (2016/2706(RSP)).

Andrus Ansip, Vice-President of the Commission. — Madam President, honourable Members of the European Parliament, it is hard to imagine a single market where public services are not available across borders, but it seems that new digital borders are appearing at about the same time that the EU's physical borders have disappeared.

The European Commission, Parliament and the Member States have been working to correct this. Together we have enacted legislation on electronic identities and signatures: e-ID, e-procurement, and of course the Connecting Europe Facility for digital service infrastructure. All of them will help to remove these digital barriers. It is now time to utilise this joint work so that we create a new generation of eGovernment services that will help to create growth and jobs, the digital single markets and to rebuild people's trust in governments.

It was with this objective in mind that the European Commission presented its eGovernment Action Plan in April. This plan can be the political instrument to advance the digital transformation of public administrations across the European Union. It will address the problems faced by people, businesses and public administrations through the strategic objectives set out in the Digital Single Market strategy.

The plan has three main aims: firstly, to modernise public administrations using key technical building blocks; secondly, to achieve movements across a border using interoperable digital public services; thirdly, to facilitate digital interaction between administrations, people and businesses for high-quality public services.

The EU eGovernment Action Plan runs to 2020 and will promote the take-up of eID, one of the digital service infrastructures funded by the Connecting Europe Facility. The European Commission is promoting this through awareness campaigns and also through public and private sector grants for its implementation.

Digital-by-default is one of the underlying principles guiding the work of the new eGovernment Action Plan. Many Member States are applying or intending to apply the digital-by-default principle while keeping other channels open for those who are unwilling or unable to interact via the internet with governments. All activities and initiatives led by the Commission will be prepared in line with our better regulation standards. This includes assessing the ICT impact of Commission proposals. Public-private cooperation is required if there is to be a needs-based service delivery. This also applies to collaborative service creation and the private sector's provision of services based on open public sector information.

The Commission strongly supports this kind of collaboration as well as the private sector's involvement in jointly creating online solutions. The Commission also funds several innovation projects under Horizon 2020 in this area. Since open data is essential for developing such services, the Commission recommends that the public sector make its data available electronically. It will itself guide the way forward by making its data available through the European Data Portal.

'Once only' is another key underlying principle of the eGovernment Action Plan. Applying this principle in the European Union could generate annual net savings of around EUR 5 billion per year by 2017. The principle means that people and businesses should supply the same information once only to a public administration. Public administration shares this data internally with due respect for data protection rules, so that there is no additional burden for people or businesses.

Rather than forcing them to fit around these processes, it calls for the reorganisation of public sector internal processes. The Commission is considering applying the 'once only' principle in several policies. Under the Horizon 2020 programme it has called for a pilot scheme driven by Member States for applying the 'once only' principle across borders for businesses. The Commission is considering the gradual roll-out of this principle in its interactions with suppliers and grant participants. It will examine the possibilities for introducing the 'once only' principle for other interested parties.

I would like to conclude by emphasising the need to support the use of e-ID. It is essential for ensuring a high take-up of digital public services. Together with the digital-by-default and 'once only' principles this will guarantee less administrative burdens for people and businesses. This is good for the digital single market and it is good for European growth and competitiveness.

Andreas Schwab, *im Namen der PPE-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Vizepräsident, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Wir begrüßen ausdrücklich, dass Sie, Herr Vizepräsident Ansip, sich heute Abend der Debatte über den Einsatz von elektronischen Identifikationsmitteln im europäischen Binnenmarkt stellen und hier ja auch deutlich zum Ausdruck gebracht haben, dass Sie wollen, dass mehr dieser elektronischen Identifikationsmöglichkeiten genutzt werden.

Die Notwendigkeit für diese digitalen elektronischen Identifikationsmöglichkeiten nimmt täglich zu, weil immer mehr Bürger eben auch Dienste inzwischen digital in Anspruch nehmen, die nur dann sicher – und zwar sicher im Sinne der Bürgerinnen und Bürger und der Nutzer einerseits, aber auch sicher im Sinne der gesetzlichen Vorgaben andererseits – genutzt werden können. Und dafür brauchen wir sichere, *reliable services*.

Es gibt ja – und Sie kommen selber aus Estland – eine Reihe von Mitgliedstaaten der Europäischen Union, die da bereits erste Schritte unternommen haben. Der estnische Premierminister war ja erst Beginn der Woche in Berlin bei der Klausur der Bundesregierung und hat diese Pläne vorgestellt. In Deutschland gibt es bereits einen Vorreiter, der leider nur sehr wenig genutzt wird, weil die Anbindung des Ausweisdokuments an den digitalen Geschäftsverkehr am Ende über eine Schnittstelle erfolgen muss, die bisher noch nicht hinreichend einfach geklärt ist. Estland hat sich da sehr schnell entwickelt. Aber ich glaube, dass wir uns einig sein müssen, dass jedes neue Mittel, das wir in der Europäischen Union einsetzen, eins zur zwingenden Voraussetzung hat: absolute Datensicherheit für die Nutzer und absolute Sicherheit, soweit sie hoheitlich verlangt wird. Deswegen sollten wir schon versuchen, den Binnenmarkt über die elektronische Identifikation herzustellen. Wir sollten jetzt nicht 28 unterschiedliche nationale Systeme entwickeln, um dann hinterher der Frage nachzugehen, wie wir die verbinden können. Aber wir sollten gleichzeitig auch die berechtigten Anliegen der Mitgliedstaaten und der Wirtschaftsbeteiligten nach sicheren Verfahren ernst nehmen und gemeinsam nach Möglichkeiten suchen, dass die Europäische Union mit dem *eGovernment Action Plan* hier einen wichtigen Schritt in die digitale Zukunft tun kann. Die EVP-Fraktion, Herr Kommissar, wird hier sehr konstruktiv mitarbeiten.

Evelyne Gebhardt, *im Namen der S&D-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin! Herr Ansip, vielen Dank für die Vorschläge, die Sie vorgelegt haben, die gehen in die richtige Richtung. Modernisierung der Gesellschaft, die brauchen wir und diese neuen Mittel, die uns durch die Digitalisierung zur Verfügung gestellt werden, können auch sehr viele sehr positive Fortschritte bedeuten, und die sollten wir auch nutzen. Aber – und da bin ich mit meinem Vorredner ganz einer Meinung – wir müssen dafür sorgen, dass diese Mittel, die zur Verfügung gestellt werden, sicher sind. Der Datenschutz ist äußerst wichtig, und wir müssen auch dafür sorgen, gerade auch für unsere Unternehmen, die manchmal auch sensible Daten übertragen müssen, dass da das Hacken dieser Daten verhindert wird, dass die Sicherheit in diesen Bereichen ganz besonders groß ist und sie eben nicht durch bestimmte Personen benutzt werden können, für die die Daten gar nicht vorgesehen sind.

Das ist eine ganz enorme Herausforderung, denn da geht es dann nicht nur um die Mittel, die Möglichkeiten, das eine mit dem anderen zu verbinden, es geht auch um die ganzen Wege und auch die Apparate auf beiden Seiten, die genauso sicher sein müssen. Wenn wir hören, wie einfach es ist, etwas abzuhören, dann müssen wir sehr vorsichtig sein. Deswegen: Ja zur Modernisierung, ja zur Identifikation, ja zu den neuen Möglichkeiten, aber das muss ganz, ganz genau und gut vorbereitet werden.

Der zweite Punkt, denn ich jetzt nur anreißen kann, ist: Wir müssen aber auch ein Informationssystem haben, damit die Leute, die damit arbeiten, auch Vertrauen entwickeln, denn dieses Vertrauen ist heute noch gar nicht da.

Anneleen Van Bossuyt, *namens de ECR-Fractie*. – Mevrouw de voorzitter, meer en meer overheden zetten zich in om het leven van de burgers te vergemakkelijken door nieuwe digitale diensten te verlenen.

In mijn eigen regio, Vlaanderen, hebben wij daar bijvoorbeeld al verschillende initiatieven over genomen, onder andere het recente initiatief “Vlaanderen Radicaal Digitaal”. E-overheid en alles wat daarmee gepaard gaat, zoals e-identificatie, moet zoveel mogelijk gestimuleerd worden.

Er is al een terechte vraag gesteld over de zichtbaarheid van de instrumenten die al bestaan, die vaak bij de burgers onbekend zijn: een probleem waar we in Europa wel vaker mee te maken hebben.

In het kader van e-overheid denk ik ook dat het heel belangrijk is dat we meer en meer gebruik gaan maken van het “only once”-beginsel, omdat de complexe aanvraagprocedures en administratieve lasten die daarmee gepaard gaan vaak een drempel vormen voor bedrijven en burgers. In het kader daarvan denk ik dat we moeten streven, zeker binnen Europa, naar een maximale gegevensdeling tussen de verschillende administraties.

Kaja Kallas, on behalf of the ALDE Group. – Madam President, this morning one speaker made a very interesting parallel between the industrial revolution and the digital revolution: that the industrial revolution brought many good things, but it also brought challenges like air pollution. So it is the same with the digital revolution. It creates new opportunities but it also has new challenges around cyber security and privacy, so therefore I think that the digital identity should be at the heart of our digital policies. E-ID will be the key to address challenges of privacy and cyber security and to the growth of digital economy. All these passwords, logins and all that is needed, are needed to be replaced by online measures which are secure. Edward Lucas wrote in his book *Cyberphobia* about this trend for passwords for everything, and he says that it is a recipe for catastrophe because it is a system which is very difficult for the humans to remember but very easy for the computer to guess. So many Member States have already developed means of online identification, but in some countries citizens are not even aware of this, because they do not have any online services that they can use e-identity for. So what is the incentive to do it in the first place?

Therefore I have two questions for the Vice-President. Given that from September 2018 all Member States will be required to recognise all notified national E-ID means, what will be the concrete actions taken to ensure that this is implemented in time but also that Member States have the online services available for their citizens?

The other question, as we need to lead by example: is the Commission intending to actually implement this in the Commission, so that the Commission will also recognise E-ID's place, and when will this happen?

Isabella Adinolfi, a nome del gruppo EFDD. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, sempre più attività che si legano all'esercizio dei diritti fondamentali, come per esempio la libertà di espressione, avvengono in rete. I concetti di cittadinanza digitale e di governo digitale sono concetti relativamente nuovi, ma che in un futuro non tanto prossimo diventeranno realtà.

Noi in quanto legislatori abbiamo il compito di individuare le potenzialità e le criticità che l'avanzamento tecnologico determina, così da poter legiferare in maniera efficace tutelando soprattutto i soggetti più deboli. Quando si parla di servizi di identificazione ed autenticazione elettronica si devono tenere a mente alcune questioni fondamentali, come le modalità di raccolta e trattamento dei dati personali e la natura pubblica, o meno, dei gestori di tali dati e del fornitore del servizio di identificazione stesso. Ritengo fondamentale che i servizi di identificazione debbano essere gestiti dalla mano pubblica, vista la delicatezza delle informazioni raccolte, eppure ciò non accade sempre in Europa. Ad esempio l'Italia si è affidata anche ai privati per sviluppare questi servizi (Telecom Italia e Infocert) assegnando parte dei fondi del *Connecting Europe Facility*.

Io mi chiedo e vi chiedo a questo punto: perché è avvenuto ciò? E qual è il vantaggio per i cittadini?

Ελευθέριος Συναδινός (NI). – Κυρία πρόεδρε, σε πρόσφατη ερώτησή μου προς την Επιτροπή έθεσα το ζήτημα της αδυναμίας ταυτοποίησης των εισελθόντων στα εξωτερικά σύνορα της Ένωσης. Συγκεκριμένα, πολλοί δεν έχουν έγγραφα που να τους ταυτοποιούν και αρκετοί αρνούνται να δώσουν δακτυλικά αποτυπώματα.

Ρώτησα, λοιπόν, την Επιτροπή, αν προτίθεται να εξοπλίσει τις αρχές υποδοχής με συστήματα αναγνώρισης προσώπου. Με αυτά η αναγνώριση ή η επιβεβαίωση ενός ατόμου γίνεται μέσω μιας ψηφιακής φωτογραφίας ή ταινίας και της σύγκρισης επιλεγμένων χαρακτηριστικών του προσώπου ενός ατόμου με μία τράπεζα δεδομένων προσώπου.

Η απάντηση του επιτρόπου Αβραμόπουλου ήταν ότι, η Επιτροπή θα αξιολογήσει και θα διερευνήσει περαιτέρω τεχνικές και νομικές επιλογές.

Τέτοια συστήματα μπορούν να εγκατασταθούν σε όλα τα εξωτερικά αλλά και κρίσιμα διασυνοριακά σημεία ελέγχου. Οι πηγές άντλησης στοιχείων και πληροφοριών είναι ανεξάντλητες, ενώ εύκολα μπορούν να συνεργαστούν με τα υπάρχοντα συστήματα EURODAC, AIS και VIS, αλλά και τις βάσεις δεδομένων της Europol και των υπηρεσιών πληροφοριών των κρατών μελών. Με αυτόν τον τρόπο θα υπάρξει ενίσχυση του οπλοστασίου στην καταπολέμηση του οργανωμένου εγκλήματος και της τρομοκρατίας.

Για αυτόν τον λόγο καλώ την Επιτροπή και το Συμβούλιο, να προχωρήσουν άμεσα στη μελέτη και προμήθεια τέτοιων συστημάτων.

Róża Gräfin von Thun und Hohenstein (PPE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Cyfryzacja dokumentów to jest jeszcze jeden element tego naszego rynku wspólnego, naszego wspólnego funkcjonowania w Unii Europejskiej i zanikania granic – tak jak to wspomniał pan komisarz. Powinny one zanikać, a właśnie ciągle jeszcze w świecie cyfrowym te granice są odczuwalne i bardzo widoczne. Cyfryzacja dokumentów musi być bezpieczna i musi być dostępna. My musimy mieć jeden system europejski dla całej Unii Europejskiej, inaczej będziemy znowu godzinami, dniami, tygodniami i latami pracować nad tym, żeby ten system zharmonizować i to będzie tak trudne jak harmonizowanie praw, które już od dawna istnieją w Unii Europejskiej.

Pan Synadinos mówił (wyszedł już niestety) o dokumentach cyfrowych w kontekście uchodźców. Ja akurat w zeszłym tygodniu byłam w kilku obozach dla uchodźców w Grecji i rzeczywiście jednym z zasadniczych problemów dla tych ludzi, którzy miesiącami siedzą kompletnie bezsensownie w obozach, jest to, że wyrobienie dokumentów jest takie trudne. Gdybyśmy już dzisiaj mieli elektroniczne dokumenty, łatwo dostępne i pewne, gdyby te dane, tak jak mówimy na tej sali, mogły być zbierane raz od każdego, a nie wielokrotnie, gdyby odciski palców były w łatwiejszy sposób zbierane i bezpiecznie przechowywane, to oszczędzilibyśmy nie tylko poczucia braku bezpieczeństwa, że nasze dokumenty mogą być podrabiane, ale oszczędzilibyśmy cierpienia wielu tysiącom ludzi, którzy na naszym kontynencie tułają się bez papierów. Więc bardzo również zachęcam do przyspieszenia tego procesu dla nas i dla tych, którzy przybywają na nasz kontynent.

(Mówca zgadza się odpowiedzieć na pytanie zadane zgodnie z procedurą niebieskiej kartki (art. 162 ust. 8 Regulaminu)).

Ангел Джамбазки (ЕКР), въпрос, зададен чрез вдигане на синя карта. – Г-жо Председател, уважаема колега, от Вашето изказване разбирам, че сте привърженик на идеята за по-бързо разпадане на националните държави и прехвърляне на отговорност на наднационални органи, но не мислите ли, че начинът на въвеждане на трансграничните инструменти и определянето на националните органи по прилагането им трябва допълнително да бъдат изяснени, за да бъде избегнато прехвърлянето на тежести и на задължения върху националните законодателства и държавите членки?

Róża Gräfin von Thun und Hohenstein (PPE), odpowiedź na pytanie zadane przez podniesienie niebieskiej kartki. – Drogi Kolego! Rozbawił mnie Pan po prostu tak, że nie mogę opanować śmiechu. Harmonizacja dokumentów cyfrowych, harmonizacja w Unii Europejskiej dokumentów cyfrowych, tak jak harmonizacja różnych praw i zapisów, jeszcze niekoniecznie znaczy znoszenie państw w Unii Europejskiej, państw członkowskich. I na pewno, jeżeli będzie Pan miał dokument, który będzie funkcjonował we wszystkich krajach, nie znieśie to pana poczucia narodowości, ani nie zabierze to panu tożsamości. Gwarantuję to Panu. Mogę na to dać odcisk palca.

Carlos Zorrinho (S&D). – Senhora Presidente, Senhor Comissário, consolidar uma união digital robusta é uma das prioridades estratégicas para combatermos a fragmentação política, económica e social que estamos a viver na União Europeia. E a revolução digital abre-nos uma enorme oportunidade, para a sociedade, para a economia e, hoje mesmo, o senhor apresentou medidas e peças legislativas muito importantes para o desenvolvimento do mercado digital.

Mas temos que complementar isso. Precisamos de uma cloud europeia de dados, um conjunto de processos simples para que as empresas e os cidadãos possam tirar partido dos novos modelos de governação.

Portugal tem um excelente exemplo, chama-se Simplex, e a União Europeia precisa desenvolver um Simplex europeu: identificação digital fácil, digitalização por princípio, acesso em linha a serviços públicos e privados, integração ou interconexão das bases de dados para criar balcões únicos e qualificar os utilizadores.

Sr. Comissário, o futuro começa hoje e temos que agir depressa na concretização desta agenda: uma governação eletrónica de base europeia ao serviço dos cidadãos e das nossas empresas.

Pilar del Castillo Vera (PPE). – Señora Presidenta, muchas gracias de nuevo, Comisario. Hoy ha sido un día en el que se han debatido de una manera bastante extensa temas que tenían relación con la transformación digital, con el mercado digital europeo.

No nos damos cuenta muchas veces de hasta qué punto las administraciones públicas desempeñan un papel determinante en la transformación digital y en el desarrollo del mercado único digital. En Europa, el peso de las administraciones públicas sigue siendo extraordinariamente alto comparado con otros lugares del mundo y, en ese sentido, hace falta redoblar un esfuerzo, que a veces parece que queda un poco en segundo lugar, para que se desarrolle esa transformación digital también en las administraciones públicas.

La identificación electrónica en ese sentido y con ese objetivo es un elemento clave, pero la interoperabilidad de los servicios públicos en la Unión Europea también juega un papel extraordinario. Habría que hacer un esfuerzo por seguir poniendo o por poner más el acento en la transformación digital de las administraciones públicas, porque constituye un elemento dinamizador extraordinario también para la economía digital y la sociedad digital. Así que yo lo que pido es que se haga todavía un esfuerzo mayor, al menos de llamada de atención permanente.

Dan Nica (S&D). – Doamnă președintă, domnule comisar, salut propunerea Comisiei privind planul de acțiune al Uniunii Europene pentru guvernare electronică 2016-2020. Principiul „doar o singură dată” este foarte important pentru asigurarea interoperabilității, atât la nivel național, cât și în afara frontierelor naționale, atâta timp cât sunt respectate normele de protecție a datelor și nicio sarcină suplimentară nu le revine cetățenilor sau întreprinderilor.

În al doilea rând, măsurile propuse pentru guvernare electronică trebuie să fie implementate împreună cu acțiuni pentru identificarea electronică, iar măsura propusă de către Comisie este dezvoltarea unui prototip de catalog european al standardelor în telecomunicații și tehnologia informației. Data prevăzută este 2017. Eu consider că ar trebui devansată pentru 2016, deoarece este acțiune suport ce susține planul de implementare a *eGovernment*. Această măsură trebuie să înlesnească interoperabilitatea în achiziția de soluții digitale prin încurajarea raportării la seturi comune de standarde și profiluri din tehnologia informațiilor și comunicații în cadrul procedurilor de ofertare ale autorităților publice contractante, iar criteriile de achiziții pentru servicii publice trebuie corelate cu criteriile din FEDER, pentru a se respecta regulile de *procurement*.

Michał Boni (PPE). – Madam President, Mr Vice-President, there is no possibility to go forward and to implement the digital single market solutions without some crucial technical and essential conditions. One of them is, of course, e-identification, supported by interoperability and proper standardisation. How can we develop public services accessible all over Europe without a digital identity? It means that we need to speed up the implementation of the E-ID project and go ahead with digital-by-default solutions and the ‘once only’ principle, which really simplify all kinds of services and make many relations between government and citizens much more open. How can we develop e-commerce without user-friendly digital identity, which is key for speeding up and scaling up the business processes, but also for the trust and for avoiding cybercrimes at the large scale? How can we develop portability of many services’ digital content without clear solutions in the area of e-identity?

Discussing the digital content services regulation, we are trying to find various forms for the verification of the identity. It would be much simpler to have the national, but European-compatible e-identity. So we need it. We have a framework, we have tools, we have projects, now we have the action prepared by the European Commission and good proposals in the e-government communication, but what we feel is a lack, a deficit – the readiness to go in this direction at the same time by all Member States. The political will is needed first of all.

IN THE CHAIR: RYSZARD CZARNECKI

Vice-President

Catherine Stihler (S&D). – Mr President, my thanks to the Commission and to the previous speaker. So why does e-identification really matter? What matters is we have heard about access to public services in e-government and also to online shopping and e-commerce, and without it the best access that we can have would be limited and in the worst case scenario could be denied at all, so that is why e-identification is so important. What we are doing is creating one set of rules that covers 28 countries, covering 500 million people, and together we can tackle these challenges. Interoperability has previously been outlined, legal certainty also, because at the end of the day, e-identification really is about creating trust. Trust is key to e-ID, and by working together we can make this happen.

In my country we have just 29 days before we have an EU referendum, and it is vital that we – Britain – remain part of the European Union. We have influence over this very debate on e-identification, but if we leave, if we walk away from our closest neighbours and closest friends, we will have no say in this debate and yet we will still have to pay to have the privilege to trade. In my own constituency there are 250 000 jobs reliant on exports to the European Union, and I do not want to see our workplace rights jeopardised. Therefore, if we were to leave, we would be poorer, isolated and diminished, and that is why Great Britain has to remain part of the European Union.

Jiří Pospíšil (PPE). – Pane komisaři, já jsem se zájmem vyslechl vaše vystoupení. Já velmi vítám, že součástí digitální agendy vaší Komise není pouze otázka digitalizace vnitřního trhu, ale že stejně důležitá je i ta druhá oblast, veřejný sektor, a že tedy akční plán, o kterém jste hovořil, jasně říká, jak by se měla digitalizovat veřejná správa. Považuji to za mimořádně důležité, protože kdybychom digitalizovali pouze vnitřní trh, zaváděli tady posilování online prodeje atd., ale veřejný sektor začal zaostávat, pak by to v praxi příliš nefungovalo.

Sám vidím v ČR, z které pocházím, to, že malé a střední firmy velmi výrazně využívají online prodej. Jsme na předním místě v Evropě, ale v oblasti veřejné správy jsme zcela na konci. Takže prosím vyvíňte, pokud možno, tlak na jednotlivé národní vlády, ať tomuto tématu věnují pozornost, protože celková digitalizace, tzn. veřejný i soukromý sektor dohromady, může být pouze takto úspěšná.

Catch-the-eye procedure

José Blanco López (S&D). – Señor Presidente, la implantación de la administración electrónica ha permitido simplificar numerosos procedimientos administrativos, reducir costes e incrementar la propia eficacia del sector público. También ha permitido un acercamiento y una mejor interacción con el ciudadano. Hace poco se alcanzó un acuerdo clave para hacer más accesibles los sitios web, aplicaciones y contenidos del sector público. Es necesario seguir dando pasos en esa dirección en beneficio de ciudadanos y de empresas para incrementar la accesibilidad de estos servicios, lo cual exige asimismo mejorar continuamente las competencias digitales. La identidad electrónica es un elemento esencial para garantizar la confianza en el entorno digital, tanto en el seno de cada Estado miembro como especialmente para la creación de servicios transfronterizos, y facilitar la movilidad de ciudadanos y empresas. Asegurar el pleno respeto de las normas de protección de datos y la seguridad de las redes son, sin duda, elementos cruciales para impulsar la administración electrónica y los servicios públicos digitales.

Νότης Μαρτιάς (ECR). – Κύριε πρόεδρε, προκειμένου να υπάρξουν διασυνοριακές και ασφαλείς ηλεκτρονικές συναλλαγές εντός των κρατών μελών της Ένωσης πρέπει να υπάρξουν κανόνες για την ηλεκτρονική ταυτοποίηση.

Έτσι, οι Ευρωπαίοι πολίτες θα πρέπει να μπορούν να χρησιμοποιούν τα δικά τους συστήματα ηλεκτρονικής ταυτοποίησης για την πρόσβαση σε δημόσιες υπηρεσίες σε άλλες χώρες της Ένωσης. Βέβαια, η ύπαρξη πολλών βάσεων δεδομένων που δεν είναι διασυνδεδεμένες μπορεί να δημιουργήσουν πρόσθετο κόστος, καθώς και να θέσουν σε κίνδυνο την ασφάλεια και την προστασία των προσωπικών δεδομένων.

Επομένως, αυτό πρέπει αρχικά να διευθετηθεί είναι να υπάρξουν ομαλές συνθήκες λειτουργίας των δημοσίων υπηρεσιών και της δημόσιας διοίκησης, παράλληλα με την ηλεκτρονική διακυβέρνηση. Άλλωστε, οι φορείς που παρέχουν ηλεκτρονικές υπηρεσίες επιβεβαίωσης της ταυτότητας σε άλλους φορείς και συστήματα του δημοσίου τομέα θα πρέπει να έχουν σαν στόχο τη μείωση του κόστους και τη διευκόλυνση της ζωής των Ευρωπαίων πολιτών.

Ivan Jakovčić (ALDE). – Gospodine predsjedniče, Pula je prvi grad u Hrvatskoj koji je uveo sustav e-građanin. Koliko je to bilo važno za naše građane, gospodarstvo Pule, Istre i Hrvatske svjedoče mnogi vrlo pozitivni primjeri.

Zato snažno podržavam vašu namjeru, g. povjereniče, da taj sustav e-građanin i identifikacija u cijelom EU-u što prije zauzmu pravo mjesto. Naravno, u tom kontekstu posebno nam je bitna prekogranična suradnja, odnosno prekogranična e-identifikacija svakoga građanina, svakoga gospodarskog subjekta koji ima takvu potrebu.

Ovom prilikom želim izraziti snažnu podršku Komisiji, jer vjerujem da je to jedini ispravan put kako bismo europsko gospodarstvo učinili još konkurentnijim i kako bi naši građani imali još kvalitetniju uslugu.

(End of catch-the-eye procedure)

Andrus Ansip, Vice-President of the Commission. – Mr President, honourable Members of the European Parliament, thank you very much for this really fruitful debate. According to my understanding, all the services provided by our governments had to be digital by default, open by default and cross-border by default. We all know that those e-governmental services will make our governments more efficient, more transparent, which is extremely important, but if those services are provided in a really transparent way, then this will not create the best environment for corruption for example. Not everybody will be happy about this, and also those governments which will provide internet-based services are, as a rule, more inclusive governments. But to involve our people it is extremely important.

It is important by the governments to provide their citizens with a single digital identity, and this identity has to be strong, because this is all about trust. Once again, if people do not trust those internet-based e-services, they will never start to use those services.

About efficiency. Single digital identity makes those governmental services but also private services cheaper than usage of traditional signatures. So it is not polite to provide examples always about Estonia. But in Estonia we think that just because of usage of digital signatures, we were able to save one working week per year, which is equal to 2% of our GDP, which is equal to our defence expenditure. We can say defence expenditure in Estonia is coming from digital signatures. So it is a question about efficiency.

I would like also to underline the importance of the 'once only' principle. I know once again from my own experience how important it was to introduce this 'once only' principle. In Estonia it took six years to get those first one million digital signatures and then we introduce, the 'once only' principle. It means the state has the right to ask for information from their citizens or their companies only once, and it gave a real boost on usage of those digital identities. Now, in the country I know best, they are getting more than 1.3 million digital signatures per week already, and the population in Estonia is 1.3 million inhabitants.

All those digital solutions provided by our governments had to be user-centric, and if those solutions included digital identities, they will be really user-centric solutions, then people they will use those solutions. If signing digitally will take four or five minutes, nobody will start to use those solutions. There are some really good examples. For example, in Austria I know people they are using mobile identities quite often, in some other countries also, it is common to use mobile identities instead to use those Smart ID cards.

Those solutions, digital solutions, they have to be user-centric and then people they will use those solutions and our people they have to be absolutely sure that those solutions are there, also really safe and well protected.

It is true that our registers do not talk with each other. We have in all the countries digital prior business registers, but it is very difficult to get information in a digital way, in a trusted manner, from another country from those business registers. If somebody wants to make business for example here in Belgium, but he is coming from some other countries, then how those local people they know who has mandate to represent this company here in this country?

It is so easy theoretically to get information from business register, but in real life paper is needed. In the 21st century paper is still needed for that. We have some quite good examples about the regional cooperation, about mutual recognition of digital identities – I know best about this example we have in the Baltic States and between Finland also – but there are some other examples also.

We have already eIDAS Directive which allows mutual recognition of those digital identities, but full implementation of eIDAS directive takes some time. We have implementation acts. There is cooperation networking in place. The eIDAS Observatory will be launched in the second half of 2016 to boost online trust security and transparency in the digital single market and to facilitate the use of cross-border electronic identification and trust services. But I absolutely agree with those people who say that the European Commission has to lead by example, and we will try to do that.

So e-procurement it is a real challenge for all of us. According to analysis prepared by the European Parliament, if we will be able to use e-procurement across the European Union, we can save one billion euros per year. But also this service is based on strong digital identities. In the European Commission we have to be ready for full implementation of e-procurement.

About organised crime and the refugee crisis. Once again, single digital identity based on biometrics is needed. As we know, just recently it happened so that one of those terrorists was able to change his identity in the European Union even 7 times. It is a shame. So we have to build up really good interoperability network and we have to introduce in all the EU Member States strong digital identities, and we have to fully implement the eIDAS Directive.

I am looking forward to really fruitful cooperation in this field between the European Commission and the European Parliament.

Przewodniczący. — Zamykam debatę.

József Nagy (PPE), írásban. – Az Európai Unió Bizottsága szorgalmazza az e-kormányzás és a határokon átnyúló elektronikus azonosításra szolgáló eszközök és online szolgáltatások rendelkezésre állásának széleskörű, gyors és hatékony bevezetését. A digitális határok napjainkra már teljesen megszűntek, így erre a politikának is reagálnia kell. Az elektronikus eszközök és online szolgáltatások használata megerősíti a digitális belső piacot és válaszol a digitális közigazgatás kihívásaira, így például az új technikai elemek megjelenésére, az elektronikus szolgáltatások mindennapi igénybevételére és azok használatára. A Bizottság különböző cselekvési tervekkel és kampányokkal népszerűsíti az e-kormányzáshoz való akadálymentes hozzáférést, például 2010-2015 között az e-kormányzati cselekvési tervvel, majd ezt követően a HORIZONT 2020 innovációs programmal.

Az e-kormányzásnak köszönhetően jelent meg az elektronikus személyazonosító (eID), mely a határokon átnyúló közigazgatási eljárások lefolyását könnyíti meg, például a külföldön történő vállalkozásalapítást, a költözést és külföldi munkavállalást, nyugdíjjogosultságok online rendezését, iskolákba, egyetemekre történő beiratkozást. A digitális rendszereknek köszönhetően átláthatóvá és nyitottá válik a közigazgatás munkamenete, mind a polgárok, mind a vállalkozások nyomon követhetik ügyeik, tranzakcióik állapotát.

Eva Paunova (PPE), in writing. – I believe that the shift to e-government in Europe through the development of e-identification tools and a wide availability of online services is a very important milestone in the development of the Digital Single Market and the future of the European Union. It is essential for competitiveness, reducing costs for businesses and making life easier for European citizens and therefore requires ambitious initiatives. In order to ensure the adoption of online services, the deployment of a secure digital identity is necessary to build public trust and ensure convenience. In this respect, we need to support the initiatives for promoting awareness about the opportunities of e-identification. A secure electronic identification is an important step towards data protection and the prevention of online fraud. Citizens and businesses need to be able to trust that their data is treated in full respect of existing data protection legislation. Without certainty on the legal validity of all these related services, businesses and citizens will remain reluctant to use the digital interactions as their natural way of interaction because they will be unsure of the issue of a possible dispute.

21. Vytváranie nového prístupu s dôrazom na spotrebiteľov energie – Boj proti energetickej chudobe ako súčasť energetickej únie (rozprava)

Przewodniczący. — Kolejnym punktem porządku obrad jest wspólna debata nad:

Theresa Griffin, rapporteur. – Mr President, the energy retail market in Europe is not functioning properly and citizens are directly impacted by this failure. Around the EU, consumers are overcharged for their energy bills. In my country, the UK, consumers overpaid GBP 1.2 billion a year for their energy bills between 2009 and 2013. Over 50 million citizens are living in energy poverty in the EU and are forced to choose on a daily basis between heating, cooling or eating. Around the EU, consumers are willing to invest in energy efficiency and self-generation projects, but are hindered by heavy administrative burdens and high upfront investment costs. Throughout Europe, energy markets are not transparent and are not competitive enough. In this context, industry fails to pass falling wholesale prices on to consumers. Energy bills are becoming increasingly complex and citizens are not able to compare offers easily. Many consumers are on outdated energy contracts, unaware of their ability to switch.

The 'new deal' report, on which we will be voting tomorrow, highlights key recommendations to address these problems. Regarding the retail energy market, to increase the transparency and clarity of bills, we need to include peer-based comparisons and information on switching in those bills. Consumers should be placed on the most appropriate tariffs, and suppliers should notify them about their cheapest offers. We need to eradicate termination fees and penalties for switching suppliers. And finally, social tariffs should be maintained for the most vulnerable.

Regarding self-generation, we need to set up a common legal framework for the right to store and sell excess electricity at a fair price. We need to promote new business models, collective purchasing schemes and innovative financial instruments to incentivise self-generation and self-consumption. And on energy poverty, we need to focus energy efficiency objectives and funds on our most vulnerable citizens. We also call, Commissioner, for a definition of energy poverty and an Action Plan from the European Commission.

I was very pleased that the Committee on Industry, Research and Energy voted on Tuesday, on the energy efficiency implementation report, to place tackling energy poverty at the heart of energy efficiency. Energy efficiency can be the glue of social cohesion and European integration. I strongly believe that proposing a meaningful level of ambition in the revision of the 2030 energy efficiency targets is a necessity. For every 1% improvement in energy efficiency, three million more homes can be properly renovated and seven million citizens lifted out of energy poverty.

As a conclusion, I want to highlight that energy is not a commodity: it is a basic social right. As a conclusion, I want to say that this report is about the widow in Bulgaria, unable to compare energy offers and unaware that she could save money by switching. It is about the student in the UK, living in a rented flat, poorly insulated, and with inefficient heating. It is about the young couple in Malta, willing to invest in a solar panel, but facing high upfront investments. And it is about the long-term sick person in Spain, too frightened of costs to turn on their air conditioning in August. It is about benefits for all, and 28 Member States working together to end energy poverty.

Maroš Šefčovič, Vice-President of the Commission. – Mr President, putting citizens at the heart of the Energy Union and tackling energy poverty deserves our full attention and thank you very much for the report. The report is very timely because the energy transition and the new technologies are changing how the energy markets work. This can and must bring benefits to all consumers, be it households or industry. However, it is a fact that retail markets for energy are not working today for consumers as they should. Consumer satisfaction and engagement in the energy market remain persistently low, and we have seen a trend of rising energy prices for end-consumers across the EU.

The New Deal for Energy Consumers is about correcting these shortcomings. Our objective is to deliver: a competitive, technology-driven and fair energy market which delivers high-quality energy services to consumers. This means removing barriers for companies with innovative products and services which try to enter the market. We want a market where consumers can make informed choices about the way they consume energy and about the sources of energy they want to consume. And we want a market-based framework to protect vulnerable consumers and fight energy poverty.

In the short time that I have today, please let me mention a few issues to make this more concrete. We want bills to be clearer and easier to compare with alternative offers. Therefore, we are analysing possibilities for an EU certification scheme for price comparison tools. We have to work on removing the barriers for switching between providers. Barriers still exist and harm both consumers and innovative companies. I am pleased to see that Parliament recognises the importance of smart technologies in the energy sector.

Technology costs are falling rapidly. This means that more and more consumers could reduce their energy bills by using technologies like rooftop solar panels, heat pumps or smart meters. Demand response and storage solutions must be developed. This is beneficial for energy efficiency and for consumers. But, as rightly pointed out in the report, we need to put the necessary enabling legal framework in place. We must adjust our rules to the energy technologies of the 21st century. We need a better framework for decentralised generation and self-consumption. We need more cooperatives, aggregators, and energy service companies in order to ensure access for those who are not in a position to self-generate, such as tenants and vulnerable consumers. And finally, we need a better and informed debate about energy cost, taxes, levies and subsidies. Therefore, we will publish in the second half of this year a report on energy prices and costs that will enhance transparency on the different components of energy prices in the Member States.

The cost of energy leads me to the second topic of today: Energy Poverty. Let me mention a few figures. In 2014, approximately 10% of EU citizens felt that they were unable to keep their homes adequately warm. Since 2000, the share of energy spending of the lowest income households in their total income increased from 6% to 9%, which means a 50% increase. This is significant for the small budgets that these households have.

I know from my Energy Union Tour and from the country analyses which we drew up, that we have a very diverse picture in Europe but energy poverty is an issue everywhere. Of course, well-targeted social policy measures are the most direct and effective tool to address poverty. This is, correctly, the competence of the Member States. But nevertheless, the Commission is analysing if and how our work can support the Member States in addressing energy poverty. The fight against social exclusion and poverty is a cross-cutting policy issue, so let me mention just a few examples.

We are analysing if a definition of energy poverty is possible and how it could help address the problem. With your support, thanks to your pilot project on fuel energy poverty, the Commission is considering an energy poverty observatory. This will help us to quantify, monitor and identify best practices and we expect to launch this in 2018 following an open tender.

We are working with the Member States to share good practices. As an example, Bulgaria was mentioned by our rapporteur and Commissioner Arias Cañete is travelling just now to Bulgaria to speak about the topic in the context of electricity market liberalisation, an area where the Commission services have provided support to Bulgaria in recent months.

The Commission agrees that energy efficiency is the most effective way to prevent energy poverty. It reduces greenhouse gas emissions and energy bills. It contributes to better health and living standard, and as for all energy efficiency measures, it creates jobs in the local economy.

We have underlined the importance of energy poverty from the very beginning, and we promised in the first State of the Energy Union Report that we would pay particular attention to the issue when reviewing key legislation in 2016. Therefore, the report and the resolution which we discuss today are very timely. I would like to thank Theresa Griffin and all other colleagues involved in this for their work.

I would also like to acknowledge the resolution on meeting the anti-poverty target in the light of increasing household costs which this Parliament adopted on 14 April 2016. I can promise that we will examine all your recommendations on tackling energy poverty very closely. I am very much looking forward to this debate and I would like to thank you for giving me the floor.

Seán Kelly, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Mr President, firstly let me thank the Commissioner for his good words and also Theresa Griffin for her work on this file and her willingness to cooperate and seek to find good compromises. I must say that it was a privilege to work with her.

I think the report we will vote on tomorrow will send the right message. It puts forward some good ideas about how we can lower energy prices for all. We should not underestimate the importance of this issue in a wider economic context. Reducing energy costs, and therefore household costs, is a massive opportunity to ease the burden on already stretched household budgets across Europe. This can in turn boost consumer spending power, give a boost to businesses and help to bring economic growth across the EU.

For me, the best way to deliver this new deal for energy consumers is by putting in place a well-functioning market and a well-functioning energy system. Competitive markets increase transparency and comparability of prices, and better-informed and empowered consumers will help energy become far more affordable for all. I think one important aspect of this is increasing the share of the retail price on which retailers can compete. In Europe retailers can only compete with each other on about a third of the price. The rest is made up of taxes and add-ons. Increasing this share by reducing the amount of government add-ons would increase competition, drive down prices for consumers and, at the same time, allow retail prices to better reflect wholesale prices, enabling proper market signals to occur.

The other part of this debate we are here to address is energy poverty. I think the differing definitions of energy poverty in different Member States, based on different climatic conditions, is something we need to strongly consider before thinking about an EU-level action, but that should not distract from the importance of this issue. In Ireland, we define energy poverty as an inability to heat or power a home to an adequate degree. A household in Ireland that spends more than 10% of its income on energy is considered to be in energy poverty. As a country that has the third highest energy prices in Europe, this is of course a big issue for us, and I am pleased to say that we put in place a strategy to combat the problem early this year. I look forward to further debate and progress on this very important issue.

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

Tibor Szanyi (S&D), Kékkártyás kérdés. – Tisztelt Képviselő Úr! Az Ön szavai szinte teljesen egybecsengtek Šefčovič biztos úr szavaival. Ugyanakkor, hogyha én arra az országra gondolok, amelyiket én legjobban ismerek – a saját hazámat, Magyarországot – ott valami egészen másféle mennek a folyamatok. Egy darab állami kézbe kerül gyakorlatilag minden energiaellátás, verseny kizárva és a fejlesztésnek is nyomát nem látjuk. Ön mit tanácsolna a Bizottságnak? Hogyan lehet az itteni közös döntéseinket a tagországokkal végrehajtatni?

Seán Kelly (PPE), blue-card answer. – Yes, that is a problem, and that is why I identified that each Member State will have different definitions, different ways of dealing with it. But obviously, if we have an EU-wide regulation or directive, then the individual states have an obligation to deal with that and especially in relation to energy poverty. It absolutely make sense that all Member States should do everything they could to try and reduce or eliminate energy poverty, whether these companies are state-owned, private or whatever. That has to be a very important social issue that has to be dealt with.

Soledad Cabezón Ruiz, en nombre del Grupo S&D. – Señor Presidente, yo celebro también este debate, que viene a ponerle cara e introduce el componente social en el debate de la energía. La energía se ha convertido en un derecho social, en un bien social, cuyo acceso debemos garantizar, especialmente a los colectivos más vulnerables. Como decía la compañera Griffin, no es de recibo que incluso lleguen a fallecer, en invierno a causa del frío o en verano a causa del calor, numerosos ancianos en la Unión Europea. Debe ser una prioridad dentro del debate de la Unión por la Energía.

Enhorabuena a mi compañera Theresa Griffin por el excelente informe, que pone de relieve todos aquellos puntos en que debemos incidir para combatir la pobreza energética. A mí, fundamentalmente, me gustaría destacar tres puntos. En primer lugar, el papel de la eficiencia energética como primera fuente de energía, y con ello apelo al cumplimiento de la Directiva de eficiencia energética por parte de los Estados miembros, para que dentro de sus planes nacionales establezcan un espacio, una apuesta clara, por la renovación de los edificios de las personas más vulnerables.

En segundo lugar, reivindico y me sumo a la reivindicación de un marco europeo para el autoconsumo que garantice este derecho, pues a día de hoy no es de recibo que en España se impida, incluso con carácter retroactivo ahora a través de una normativa contra los consumidores, que se legalicen placas solares o que se impida el establecimiento de nuevas instalaciones, mientras que vemos en Alemania el funcionamiento eficiente y eficaz de las cooperativas en las comunidades de vecinos.

Y, en tercer lugar, creo que es fundamental hablar y abordar una fiscalidad justa. Conocemos todos que más del 50 % del componente del precio o de la factura que pagan los ciudadanos por la energía en el conjunto de la Unión Europea son impuestos por política energética, diferentes al coste de producción o de distribución. Es necesario que hagamos un debate justo y transparente, que abordemos la fiscalidad de forma progresiva, dentro del diseño del mercado de la energía. En definitiva, existen herramientas para garantizar el acceso, democratizar la energía y erradicar la pobreza. Lo que tenemos que poner ahora por nuestra parte es la necesaria voluntad política.

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

Ангел Джамбазки (ЕКР), въпрос, зададен чрез вдигане на синя карта. – Г-н Председател, уважаема колега, не знам дали преводът беше точен, но ми се стори, че се обърнахте към колега от залата с „другарката“. Това е може би защото не сте живели в комунистическа държава и затова не знаете истинския смисъл на тази дума.

Когато говорите за държавно организирана енергетика, не смятате ли, че е по-добре потребителите в отделните държави да могат да вземат решения за смяна на своя доставчик чрез механизма за сравняване на офертите, а не по линията на социалистическото планово стопанство?

Soledad Cabezón Ruiz (S&D), *respuesta de «tarjeta azul»*. – Para mí todas las personas que estamos aquí, todos los eurodiputados y eurodiputadas, somos compañeros. El significado, la connotación o la definición lo pone usted. Es conocido por la inmensa mayoría. Para mí, Theresa Griffin, usted y yo somos compañeros de trabajo. El sentido que usted le da por parte del comunismo es diferente.

En cuanto a la democratización de la energía, es precisamente lo que defiende este informe y es precisamente lo que trata de garantizar, así como el acceso garantizado, por parte de la ciudadanía, a la energía. Por lo tanto, no entiendo cuál es su problema o dónde ve el problema. Usted habla de socialismo y habla de comunismo, y creo que tenemos puntos de vista diferentes al respecto, y usted lo sabe perfectamente.

Ashley Fox, on behalf of the ECR Group. – Mr President, my Group supports the concept

of an energy union. We believe the best way to ensure energy security for the whole of Europe and to provide the lowest prices for our citizens is a properly integrated gas and electricity market. I want consumers and businesses in my constituency to be able to buy their energy from any company in the EU. I want an energy system that is fair on consumers and helps to protect the energy-poor. I am happy for the Commission to share the best practices of Member States in combating energy poverty. Customers should receive clear information in their bills, and switching energy suppliers should be a simple and transparent process. I support the call that energy providers' websites and digital invoicing should be fully accessible to disabled people.

Whilst energy poverty needs to be tackled, the best way this can be done on a European level is through having a properly-functioning and competitive single market that delivers low prices. It is not for the EU to say how Member States deliver their social policy programmes. I doubt that the broad common and non-quantitative definition of energy policy that the rapporteur calls for will achieve anything at all. I do not want the Commission to bring forward an action plan or to propose legislation on this subject, because these are matters for the Member States. The rapporteur calls for a legal maximum percentage increase in the costs that distribution networks can charge. This is surely a matter for national regulators. We do not need EU legislation on this subject. We also do not need her recommendation that certain levies and network charges should be 'progressively applied'. Has she thought what this means in practice? It is not the EU's business, and it is also inappropriate for her to call for a ban on doorstep selling by energy companies. This is not for Europe to decide.

I do agree with the rapporteur that the third energy package has not been fully implemented. Commissioner, we need you to defend consumers and to ensure this law is enforced in all EU countries.

Angelika Mlinar, *im Namen der ALDE-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident! Der europäische Energiemarkt durchlebt zurzeit einen tiefgreifenden Wandel und wir müssen sicherstellen, dass die VerbraucherInnen im Mittelpunkt dieser Veränderung stehen. Nur ein wettbewerbsfähiger, transparenter und liberalisierter Binnenmarkt wird dafür sorgen, dass die Konsumenten auch von diesem Wandel profitieren. Daher ist ein New Deal für EnergieverbraucherInnen dringend notwendig. Allerdings muss es ein New Deal werden, der Konsumenten auch dazu befähigt, informierte Entscheidungen zu treffen und aktiv am Markt teilzunehmen, anstatt dass man sie bevormundet.

Als Schattenberichterstatlerin der ALDE für diesen Bericht bin ich davon überzeugt, dass die besten Maßnahmen für die Senkung des Verbrauchs und der Kosten mehr Wettbewerb, bessere Information und bessere Einbindung der Verbraucher sind.

Erstens müssen wir sicherstellen, dass es echten Wettbewerb auf dem Energiemarkt gibt und der Wechsel zwischen den Anbietern vereinfacht wird. Genauso müssen regulierte Preise endlich schrittweise abgeschafft werden. Zweitens brauchen wir verständliche, transparente und leicht zugängliche Informationen für KonsumentInnen, vor allem auch in Bezug auf die Energierechnung. Drittens ist es wichtig, dass die Einbindungsmöglichkeiten für Verbraucher in den Markt verbessert werden, auch als ProduzentInnen und InvestorInnen. Gerade in Bezug auf die Steuerung der Nachfrage können Informationstechnologien wie *smart meter*, *smart grids* oder Online-plattformen neue Wege eröffnen.

Genauso müssen wir die existierenden Barrieren für *prosumer* abbauen. *Prosumer* können aktiv zur Verbesserung der Energieeffizienz beitragen und werden eine wichtige Rolle in der Weiterentwicklung des Energiesystems in der Zukunft spielen. Nur so können wir einen erfolgreichen europäischen Energie-Binnenmarkt schaffen.

Xabier Benito Ziluaga, *en nombre del Grupo GUE/NGL*. – Señor Presidente, este informe puede ser la oportunidad, una punta de lanza, para que los actores de la necesaria transición energética sean las personas, la ciudadanía en sí. Esta transición no debe ser algo manejado desde arriba, por intereses privados, sino una verdadera revolución energética de participación popular, de democratización y empoderamiento de la gente en algo tan básico como es la energía. Por ello, es necesario establecer un marco legal a favor de las personas productoras y consumidoras de energía. Un marco europeo que prohíba las medidas retroactivas y los «impuestos al sol»; que disminuya drásticamente las barreras administrativas y financieras para favorecer la inversión en renovables, y que esta inversión sea por parte de los hogares, de las cooperativas o incluso de las administraciones locales.

En Europa cincuenta millones de personas sufren pobreza energética, mientras el oligopolio energético acumula beneficios —por citar solo un ejemplo, Gas Natural declaró en el año 2015 unas ganancias de 1 500 millones de euros—. Combatir la pobreza energética es necesario socialmente y posible financieramente. Por ello se debe establecer una definición de pobreza energética a nivel europeo, además de una coordinación de las políticas entre los diferentes países miembros de la UE. Blindemos los derechos de los ciudadanos europeos a través del reconocimiento del acceso a la energía como un derecho social básico.

Ernest Maragall, *en nombre del Grupo Verts/ALE*. – Señor Presidente. Gracias, señora Griffin, por su trabajo y por su voluntad de acuerdo. Este informe de propia iniciativa sobre «Establecer un nuevo acuerdo para los consumidores de energía» llega a este Pleno, desde luego, como una pieza positiva en el edificio de la transición energética que estamos tratando de construir. Lo principal del informe es que acierte en el punto de vista. El punto de vista del ciudadano, del exconsumidor pasivo, convertido hoy en un productor, distribuidor, almacenador y consumidor de una energía cuyo coste marginal se acerca cada día más a cero. Por eso, es necesario ese nuevo marco regulatorio europeo, general y consciente de la diversidad real de las situaciones a las que debe aplicarse.

Pero vamos al mercado descentralizado, democrático —a pesar del temor que este término genera en algunos grupos— y basado, claro, en energías renovables. Un mercado con transparencia, comparación de precios, demanda consciente para decidir libremente, *smart meters*, competitividad abierta y precios efectivamente reducidos. Este es el escenario no lejano que este informe dibuja y que ahora reclamamos a la Comisión, señor Comisario, y a los Estados miembros. Y por eso tiene sentido que tratemos también hoy la cuestión de la pobreza energética y la respuesta que necesita. Y por eso, por cierto, es inaceptable que el Estado español actúe contra una ley como la catalana que pretende solo responder debidamente a uno de los más dramáticos efectos sociales derivados de la crisis económica.

Entendemos quizá que este nuevo horizonte general no agrade a los que querrían seguir operando en un mercado opaco y centralizado. No sorprende que traten de aplazar y alargar la transición energética que los ciudadanos, en cambio, querrían ver vigente y completa a corto plazo. Por eso, valoramos las referencias a la calidad y exhaustividad en las facturas, fuentes de energía consumidas, posible efecto contaminante, mecanismos disponibles para gestionar el consumo, sobrecargas fiscales o tasas, cambios de compañía suministradora, etcétera. Nos acercamos, efectivamente, a una concepción de la energía limpia, abundante y barata como derecho básico ciudadano, tal como mañana vamos a votar.

Por todo ello, confiamos en que este informe salga intacto y completo de las votaciones de mañana, a pesar de los eventuales intentos de echar agua al vino, de la marcha atrás que algunos querrían dar a la visión y a la ambición positiva que el informe Griffin contiene y que nosotros compartimos.

Dario Tamburrano, a nome del gruppo EFDD. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, si afferma spesso che il futuro dell'energia è un sistema distribuito di produzione da risorse rinnovabili, dove individui e comunità, amministratori locali e piccole e medie imprese cooperano per la produzione e la distribuzione e lo stoccaggio di energia.

Eppure questo futuro è già oggi una realtà, rappresentata dai *prosumer*, i produttori-consumatori di energia, per i quali oggi ancora non esiste, nella legislazione europea, alcuna definizione chiara, condivisa e aperta, che tracci lo spazio entro il quale stabilire inequivocabili diritti e forme di sostegno.

Collegli, domani voteremo la relazione Griffin, che riconosce la realtà e il ruolo dei *prosumer*, valorizzando gli obiettivi di libertà e prosperità che i *prosumer* perseguono, dando loro dignità giuridica all'interno dell'Unione dell'energia. Domani avremo anche la possibilità di andare oltre, supportando l'emendamento 1, che riconosce le reti distribuite, l'energia rinnovabile prodotta e consumata nel contesto dei *prosumer* come un bene comune, al pari dell'acqua.

Proviamo a guardare oltre le finestre di questi edifici, là dove le cose accadono, dove sono le richieste reali da raccogliere: è il nostro dovere primario di eletti. Diamo risposte reali per la società del ventunesimo secolo.

Auke Zijlstra, namens de ENF-Fractie. – Mijnheer de voorzitter, door de gedwongen introductie van enorm dure winde-energie zullen de al torenhoge consumentenprijzen van elektriciteit nog verder stijgen. De Commissie denkt dat de prijzen minder zullen stijgen als alle Europese huishoudens permanent in de gaten worden gehouden door honderden miljoenen zogenaamde slimme verbruiksmeters. In de visie van de Commissie kan een huishouden namelijk niet zomaar stroom verbruiken zonder toestemming van die door de Commissie goedgekeurde meter.

Voor huishoudens wordt de factuur echter vooral bepaald door de milieuheffingen om diezelfde windmolens te betalen, naast energiebelastingen om de eindeloze geldhonger van onze socialistische overheden te stillen.

Voorzitter, ik geloof in de markt. Als het goedkoper kan, dan zullen consumenten en producenten dat ook doen. Daar hebben ze Europa niet voor nodig. Als uw voorstellen enig realiteitsgehalte hebben, waarom bestaat er dan nog geen kleinschalige energie-economie? Het antwoord is simpel: omdat het duur is, omdat het complex is, maar vooral omdat het onbetrouwbaar is. En over die onbetrouwbaarheid van kleinschalige energie wordt in het verslag met geen woord gerept. Maar de wind waait niet constant, de zon schijnt niet altijd en niet iedereen heeft een bos in de achtertuin staan.

Wat overblijft is een verslag waarin de Commissie in een naargeestig toekomstperspectief van totale controle haar mandaat verre overschrijdt, omdat de EU zich conform artikel 194 van het Verdrag niet mag bemoeien met de keuze van een lidstaat voor zijn energiebronnen of de structuur van zijn eigen energievoorziening.

Janusz Korwin-Mikke (NI). – Czytaliśmy w sprawozdaniu bardzo słuszne słowa o wolnym rynku, o konkurencji. Zaraz potem okazuje się, że to wszystko jest nic niewarte, ponieważ są lepsze rodzaje energii, gorsze rodzaje energii. Komisja czy Parlament lepiej wiedzą, czym ludzie powinni ogrzewać swoje mieszkania i w jaki sposób. Dowiadujemy się również, że dostęp do energii jest prawem socjalnym, czyli krótko mówiąc: bez komunizmu tu się w Unii Europejskiej niczego powiedzieć nie daje. Nie ma najmniejszego powodu, żebyśmy uważali że człowiek ma prawo socjalne do energii, bo jeżeli dalej pójdziemy tą drogą, to niedługo dojdziemy do wniosku, że mężczyzna powinien mieć zagwarantowany socjalny dostęp do kobiet – zwłaszcza do ładnych – i to by uregulowało jeden bardzo ważny problem społeczny. A poza tym sądzę, że Unia Europejska musi być zniszczona.

Krišjānis Kariņš (PPE). – Priekšsēdētāja kungs! Komisāra kungs! Ja mēs vēlamies samazināt nabadzību Eiropā, tad pareizās zāles ir rast jaunas darba vietas. Lai būtu jaunas darba vietas, mums ir vajadzīgas investīcijas. Tātad mums jādomā par investīciju vidi, ja vēlamies samazināt nabadzību. Ja mēs vēlamies palīdzēt mazturīgajiem iedzīvotājiem, kuriem nav iespējams piedalīties darba tirgū, mums ir jāizmanto mūsu valsts, katras dalībvalsts sociālās palīdzības sistēmas, un šīs sistēmas kā vienmēr var uzlabot un pilnveidot.

Bet, ja mēs vēlamies samazināt enerģijas cenas, tad zāles ir konkurence. Ja ir tirgus ar konkurenci jebkurā jomā — vai tas būtu gāzes vai elektrības tirgus —, cenas samazināsies. Kolēgi, mums ir risinājums šim, ko mēs tagad jau ilgāku laiku ar Komisijas vadību arī īstenojam konkrētajos likumos. Tas ir pilnveidot, izveidot Eiropas enerģijas savienību, kuras pamatmērķis ir pilnveidot vienoto tirgu gan gāzei, gan elektrībai, jo, kad mēs pilnveidojam šo tirgu un izveidojam nepieciešamos starpsavienojumus, un uzlabojam vai samazinām regulāciju tā, lai tirdzniecība varētu arī notikt pāri valstu robežām, radīsies šī konkurence, kuras rezultātā uzlabosies piegādes kvalitāte, samazināsies importa atkarība un — galvenais — samazināsies elektrības un gāzes cenas visiem patērētājiem.

Dan Nica (S&D). – Domnule președinte, uniunea energetică trebuie să aibă ca element central o piață internă a energiei eficientă și funcțională, care să asigure competitivitatea economiei europene, creștere economică și locuri de muncă, prețuri accesibile și competitive pentru consumatorii individuali și pentru consumatorii industriali și protejarea consumatorilor vulnerabili. Domnule vicepreședinte, salut angajamentul puternic al dumneavoastră de a adresa problema sărăciei energetice și cred că sunteți de acord ca viitoarele propuneri legislative să conțină măsuri în această direcție, iar grupul S&D vă va acorda tot sprijinul necesar. Împreună, trebuie să dezvoltăm o abordare puternică și cuprinzătoare a sărăciei energetice, să sprijinim statele membre în adoptarea celor mai bune strategii pentru a combate sărăcia energetică prin identificarea de bune practici și schimbul de informații, de exemplu o mai mare posibilitate a statelor membre de a cunoaște care sunt cele mai bune practici la nivelul celor 28 de state membre. Autoritățile locale și autoritățile naționale de reglementare, companiile energetice joacă un rol critic pentru a se asigura că piețele funcționează într-un mod care nu dezavantajează consumatorii vulnerabili prin garantarea aprovizionării, instituirea de coduri de conduită pentru actorii de pe piață și identificarea de către companii a consumatorilor vulnerabili.

Scopul nostru comun ar trebui să fie prețuri reduse de energie pentru consumatorii casnici și industria europeană și trebuie să găsim soluții pe termen lung pentru rezolvarea acestor probleme. Vreau să știți că ne vom opune oricăror măsuri și decizii care ar conduce la o creștere a prețurilor la energie electrică. Acest lucru ar însemna o nouă criză economică în Europa, o nouă lovitură adresată consumatorilor europeni și ne vom opune din toate puterile noastre oricăror asemenea măsuri. Iar pentru a pune cetățenii în centrul uniunii energetice, trebuie să le permitem și să le facilităm participarea puternică pe piețele de energie, furnizând totodată informații adecvate consumatorilor vulnerabili.

Vreau să o felicit pe colega noastră Theresa Griffin pentru că a făcut o muncă foarte complexă în această direcție, iar raportul se va vota mâine. Și încă o dată vă mulțumesc, domnule vicepreședinte!

Evžen Tošenovský (ECR). – Na energetickou unii se musíme dívat optikou spotřebitele a otázka rozumných účtů za elektřinu je bezpochyby jednou z nejdůležitějších otázek.

Zpráva, kterou máme na stole, obsahuje některé pozitivní body, například využití vlastních zdrojů energie. Bohužel ale má i řadu pro mě nepřijatelných návrhů.

Samozřejmě vnímám, že existuje fenomén, kdy si nejchudší část populace nemůže dovolit platit energie. Ale: Potřebujeme regulační zásahy na úrovni EU? Potřebujeme celoevropskou definici energetické chudoby? Jsem přesvědčen, že nikoli. Primárně je přece pomoc potřebným záležitostí sociálních systémů členských států.

Problém vysokých cen energie můžeme řešit pomocí energetického trhu. Ale měli bychom se nejdříve podívat do zrcadla. Třetí energetický balíček není plně implementován ve všech zemích. Zároveň je otázkou, do jaké míry k cenám pro spotřebitele přispívá v řadě členských států podpora obnovitelných zdrojů, kterou následně platí i naši občané.

Pavel Telička (ALDE). – Mr President, I will be very brief today, partly because I can subscribe to what our ALDE shadow, and also a number of other colleagues, have said and partly because I am losing my voice today. So I will just make a few points.

I would like to say to my colleague Mrs Griffin that I have very high respect for her, and she knows that. I must say that her report does contain a number of very relevant, useful elements which I am happy to support, but it is also a matter of fact that it does go beyond what I think we should be dealing with at European Union level and here in the European Parliament. As has been said, we have poor people in the European Union. That is a fact – some more, some less – but it is also a fact that our economies and our industries need restructuring – that we really need to have policies that are oriented on growth, and we need to improve the business environment, the entrepreneurship skills, etc. If we still have a certain percentage of our citizens at poverty level, then this should be addressed by the national Member States through their measures.

Yes, there is a lot to do at European Union level. In my opinion, the Commissioner has described this, calling its shortcomings very precisely. By all means, energy union, energy diversification etc. But let me stress and finish by saying that what we really need is a new energy market design, because we have a distorted market. This is something that we need to focus on. It does not function the way it should, and obviously we are then facing lack of competition and high prices that some people, even with support, cannot afford.

Josu Juaristi Abaunz (GUE/NGL). – Señor Presidente, mi enhorabuena, en primer lugar, a la ponente. Con más inversión e investigación y menos trabas, necesitamos desarrollar un modelo energético basado también en proyectos a escala local, es decir, puntos de autogeneración y autoconsumo pegados a la ciudadanía, lo que debería conllevar que dichas decisiones se tomen también a nivel local y regional y junto con la ciudadanía. Cada vez más, la ciudadanía, las pequeñas empresas y las instituciones colaboran en sistemas o redes de producción, distribución, almacenaje y consumo de energía renovable a nivel local, en modelos basados en la comunidad. Estos esfuerzos, positivos desde cualquier punto de vista, deberían ser incentivados, impulsados y acompañados por la Comisión como un bien común, y creo que esto debería fomentarse también en entornos de cooperación transfronteriza para ampliar las redes locales que terminarán por configurar una transición energética real y sostenible a nivel europeo y, además, como apuntaba la ponente, serán un factor de cohesión.

Davor Škrlec (Verts/ALE). – Gospodine potpredsjedniče Komisije, kako bismo ostvarili naše energetske klimatske ciljeve na koje smo se obvezali u Parizu, moramo hrabrije krenuti u energetska tranziciju koja će povećati uključenost građana.

Ključno je individualno, ali i kolektivno djelovanje građana u obliku energetske zadruge, jer doprinosi energetskej demokraciji. Na održiv način potiče rast lokalnog gospodarstva i zapošljavanje te učinkovito rješava ozbiljne društvene probleme poput energetske siromaštva. Kako bi se to ostvarilo, smatram da je potrebno ispuniti nekoliko važnih preuvjeta: građanima i zadrugama omogućiti pristup jeftinijem kapitalu te potaknuti inovativne financijske instrumente i poslovne modele, potaknuti razvoj i široku primjenu naprednih mreža *smart grid*, u gradovima primijeniti koncept *smart city*, i u svim državama članicama uvesti obvezu upotrebe pametnih brojeva.

Komisija treba definirati opće smjernice za nacionalne energetske strategije, a države članice moraju promijeniti energetske strategije i nacionalne akcijske planove uključivanjem građana i zadruga te mijenjati zakonodavne okvire, politike potpore te pristup tržištu.

Roger Helmer (EFDD). – Mr President, there is some good stuff in this report. Transparency is an excellent thing, which we approve of; competition – the ability to switch suppliers: that too is extremely positive; completing interconnectors so that we can trade energy across Europe: that too is very positive. But with great respect, I point out that we are ignoring the elephant in the room. These measures are merely fiddling at the margin. The reason why we have very high energy prices in Europe and the reason why we are driving our industry into an uncompetitive situation compared to the rest of the world is that we have chosen to rely obsessively on unreliable, expensive, intermittent renewable energy which exports inefficiency to the backup and across the grid. That is the reason, and if we fail to address that reason, we will not solve the problems of competitiveness in the energy market in the European Union, and we will not deliver secure and affordable energy to our consumers. The fact is we have chosen as a deliberate policy to drive up energy prices; we have chosen as a deliberate policy to drive many consumers into fuel poverty; we have chosen to undermine the competitiveness of our industries and to drive energy-intensive businesses offshore to other jurisdictions with lower environmental standards, where they actually emit more CO₂ than they would do if we remain. It is a lose-lose policy, and until we start addressing the fundamentals we will not solve these problems.

Σωτήριος Ζαριανόπουλος (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, γιατί στον 21ο αιώνα με τέτοια τεχνολογική ανάπτυξη, ενώ η ενέργεια πυροδοτεί ανταγωνισμούς και πολέμους, όλο και περισσότερα νοικοκυριά καταδικάζονται σε ενεργειακή φτώχεια. Μα, γιατί ο καπιταλιστικός δρόμος, η ευρωενωσιακή πολιτική απελευθέρωσης και ιδιωτικοποίησης της ενέργειας είναι ταξική πολιτική, κέρδη δηλαδή για τα μεγαθήρια του κλάδου και φτώχεια για τα νοικοκυριά.

Χαρακτηριστική είναι η απόφαση της ελληνικής κυβέρνησης ΣΥΡΙΖΑ - ΑΝΕΛ για μείωση του φόρου στο φυσικό αέριο των βιομήχανων, με παράλληλη αύξηση του ίδιου φόρου στα νοικοκυριά εν μέσω φοροκαταιγίδας, παραπέρα μείωσης μισθών και συντάξεων με το 3ο και 4ο, χωρίς τέλος, ελληνικό μνημόνιο.

Αυτή είναι η ενεργειακή δημοκρατία που επικαλείται η έκθεση, συστήνοντας μάλιστα παραγωγή ενέργειας από τους ίδιους τους καταναλωτές, δηλαδή απελευθέρωση δήθεν φιλολαϊκή. Δεν υπάρχει καλή και κακή απελευθέρωση, πάντα είναι υπέρ των μονοπωλίων. Μόνο με άλλη οικονομία, εργατική εξουσία, μπορεί η ενέργεια από εμπόρευμα να γίνει λαϊκό δικαίωμα να αντιμετωπίσει τις σύγχρονες ανάγκες. Δηλαδή αυτό που ήταν κατάκτηση στον σοσιαλισμό, σήμερα είναι ζητούμενο και στόχος της πάλης των λαών.

Jerzy Buzek (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Panu wiceprzewodniczącemu chciałem podziękować za komentarz, pozytywny komentarz, do sprawozdania naszej koleżanki Theresy Griffin, które oceniam wysoko. Oczywiście z niektórymi szczegółowymi rozwiązaniami, które być może idą zbyt daleko, trudno się zgodzić, ale ogólnie jest to bardzo pozytywne sprawozdanie i bardzo dziękuję koleżance za pracę.

Chciałem podkreślić trzy sprawy. Wiele osób mówiło o konieczności wzmocnienia naszego podejścia do sprawności energetycznej i końcowego użytkowania energii. To jest problem numer jeden w każdej sprawie energetycznej. Po drugie, energetyka prosumencka, nie można jej rozwijać bez odpowiednio skonstruowanych sieci elektroenergetycznych, inteligentnych liczników, inteligentnych sieci. To są wielkie koszty i państwa członkowskie muszą się zastanowić nad wydatkowaniem tych kosztów, bo nie wszystkimi kosztami można obciążyć koncerny energetyczne. To musi także być odpowiedzialność budżetu. No i trzecia sprawa niezwykle ważna: tania, bezpieczna i czysta energia dla konsumentów wymaga stworzenia odpowiednich warunków spółkom energetycznym. O wspólnym rynku już była mowa. Chodzi o tych, którzy produkują, przesyłają prąd, pracują nad nowymi technologiami produkcji, przesyłają, magazynują energię i przesyłają także i produkują gaz. Bez dobrze rozwiniętego rynku i bez dobrych spółek energetycznych nie poradzimy sobie z ubóstwem energetycznym.

Miapetra Kumpula-Natri (S&D). – One of the most passionate goals of the European Union is to create a new, better, reliable, better-priced, consumer-oriented energy policy. It is driven by climate change, the technological possibilities we have and new ways of using renewable energy.

Madam Griffin has done a great job bringing also the energy poverty into the central question. One thing I am especially happy about is the fact that now we have some ideas on how to really fight energy poverty. That has a role nowadays in Europe. I worked in the Employment Committee on the issue, and the figures I learned are tremendous. There are people dying in Europe because of the cold, so then in wintertime you may not cut the electricity if it is an electricity house. I learned it is done in Finland, but there are countries in Europe who do not do that, and then I also learned that there are still some countries where the customers cannot change from one company to another, and there are also termination fees. We do not have them in the telecom market, so why do we still have them in the market-oriented energy markets in Europe?

We have to get rid of that. I am very happy that the Commissioner is listening here and wait for the proposal on that. One other point is that we also have to make sure that companies pay their taxes. It is normal to have natural monopolies as they operate in areas where customers cannot change their operator. The natural monopolies market pressure does not work, so we have to be very careful they do not practice tax avoidance.

Henna Virkkunen (PPE). – Arvoisa puhemies, täällä on monessa puheenvuorossa tänä iltana todettu se, että energia Euroopassa on liian kallista ja markkinat eivät toimi. Täältä komissaari on saanut kyllä erittäin vahvan tuen markkinoiden uudistamiselle ja sille, että Euroopassa tarvitaan lisää läpinäkyvyyttä ja kilpailua ja että kuluttajilla pitää olla mahdollisuus vaihtaa myös energiatoimittajaansa.

Kyllähän yksi iso syy siihen, miksi markkinat eivät tällä hetkellä Euroopassa toimi, on se, että meillä on tällä hetkellä puutteelliset energian siirtoyhteydet, meillä on liikaa energiasaarekkeita ja toisaalta erilaiset energialle suunnatut tuet ovat sekoittaneet markkinat. Euroopan unionissa tuetaan energiaa noin sadallakahdellakymmenellä miljardilla joka vuosi, ja käytännössä se on johtanut tilanteeseen, että kukaan ei enää investoi energiaan ilman jonkinlaista pysyvää tukea, ja näin ei voi jatkua. On hyväksyttävää silloin, kun rakennetaan uutta teknologiaa, että se saa jonkin tyyppistä investointitukea, mutta jos energia perustuu siihen, että se tarvitsee jatkuvaa tukea, se ei ole kestävällä pohjalla.

Komissaari on saanut täältä kyllä vahvan tuen siten, että Euroopan parlamentti haluaa uudistaa energiamarkkinoita, saada kilpailua ja läpinäkyvyyttä aikaan. Se on ilman muuta iso ongelma eurooppalaisille kuluttajille ja teollisuudelle. Meillä sähkön tukkuhinnat ovat kolmekymmentä prosenttia korkeammat kuin USA:ssa, ja kuluttajainhinoissa puolestaan on isot erot jäsenvaltioiden välillä.

Täällä tuli myös esiin, että kaikissa maissa ei riittävällä tavalla jäsenvaltio tue heikoimmassa asemassa olevia kansalaisiaan, niin että nämä kykenisivät selviytymään asumisen kustannuksista. Se on ennen kaikkea jäsenvaltioiden vastuulla oleva asia.

Carlos Zorrinho (S&D). – Senhor Presidente, Senhor Comissário, a concretização da união da energia é fundamental para que a Europa possa reforçar a sua soberania, garantir e diversificar o abastecimento e liderar a transição energética para um modelo baseado em energias limpas e renováveis.

Mas, quando falamos em transição energética, temos que falar também no modelo social que permita que os europeus tenham a energia necessária a uma vida condigna. Conseguir esse objetivo implica pôr em prática um *mix* de políticas adequadas a cada mercado regional e a cada mercado sub-regional. Temos que conhecer muito bem os dados concretos da pobreza energética em cada país para verificar a conformidade e a qualidade das respostas e, com base nos dados concretos, temos que atuar quer no domínio da eficiência energética, quer no domínio da regulação dos mercados.

Eliminar práticas comerciais agressivas para os mais vulneráveis, estabelecer tarifas sociais de referência, usar os sistemas de incentivos para fomentar práticas de eficiência e diminuir os custos suportados. Estes são alguns exemplos do que muito pode ser feito.

Queria nesta minha intervenção saudar a relatora Theresa Griffin pelas sugestões que faz, pelo tema que colocou à discussão e pelo facto de ter integrado a dimensão social, porque nós precisamos de assegurar na transição energética ganhos económicos de competitividade, ganhos ambientais de sustentabilidade e ganhos sociais de equidade.

É esse o nosso desafio. É grande, mas é forte e é bom.

Adam Szejnfeld (PPE). – Sprawozdanie, nad którym debatujemy, jest niezwykle interesujące. Porusza bardzo ważne kwestie, zwłaszcza w aspekcie społecznym. Niewątpliwie potrzebujemy w Europie dobrze zorganizowanego, dobrze stworzonego ładu dla odbiorców energetyki – czy nowego, to nie jestem przekonany. Sprawozdanie to jednak miesza – powiedziałbym – wiele bardzo pięknych idei, ideałów z nierealnymi postulatami. I co do tego trzeba mieć pełną świadomość. Musimy też pamiętać, że nie wolno, nie powinno się źle pojmować roli określonych podmiotów czy sektorów w państwie. Za pomoc socjalną, pomoc społeczną odpowiadają podmioty publiczne, w tym państwa i my jako Unia Europejska, i trudno wyobrazić sobie, żeby tę odpowiedzialność państwową, publiczną przerzucać na komercyjny, prywatny rynek. Nie wolno też i nie powinno się mylić z energetyki zawodowej z energetyką indywidualną, a postulaty, żeby 100% na przykład energii pochodziło z energii zielonej bądź też z rozproszonej energetyki prosumenckiej, nie tylko nie są realne, ale gdyby chcieć je zrealizować, byłyby fundamentalnie groźne nie tylko dla bezpieczeństwa energetycznego, bezpieczeństwa gospodarczego Unii Europejskiej, ale wręcz dla beneficjentów tego sprawozdania, czyli dla obywateli, dla konsumentów.

Martina Werner (S&D). – Herr Präsident! Zunächst einmal möchte ich meiner Kollegin Theresa Griffin herzlich Danke sagen für die wirklich sehr gut geleistete Arbeit, denn Energiearmut ist ein sehr ernstes Thema, auch in der EU. Über 50 Millionen Menschen –also jeder zehnte europäische Bürger– sind nicht in der Lage, ihre Haushalte ausreichend und zu angemessenen Kosten zu heizen. Trotzdem wird Energiearmut in weniger als einem Drittel der EU-Mitgliedstaaten offiziell anerkannt oder auch nur in der Gesetzgebung erwähnt, und so kann dort Energiearmut auch nicht angemessen bekämpft werden.

Deshalb müssen Knebelverträge endlich verboten werden, die beim Wechsel zu einem billigeren Energieanbieter Strafzahlungen oder Gebühren vorsehen, und wir brauchen auch mehr Transparenz bei den Stromrechnungen. Darüber hinaus brauchen wir in ganz Europa bessere Rahmenbedingungen für Bürgerinnen und Bürger, die ihren eigenen Strom produzieren. Nur so können wir die Menschen für die Energiewende mitnehmen und so den Weg zu einer nachhaltigen, effizienten und bürgernahen Energieunion gemeinsam gestalten.

Dubravka Šuica (PPE). – Gospodine predsjedniče, zahvaljujem g. Šeščoviću, potpredsjedniku Komisije, također našim kolegama, g. Kellyju i gđi Griffin koji su napravili dobro izvješće.

Čini mi se da dok je u jeku rasprava oko toga treba li nastaviti Sjeverni tok 2, trebamo li ugroziti europsku sigurnost, učiniti EU ovisnim o ruskom plinu, mi radimo ovu temu i vraćamo temu energije u središte, ka građaninu. Stavljamo građane u središte pažnje i zaista je dobro da se bavimo iskorišćivanjem energetskog siromaštva.

Smatram da je izraz *prosumer*, nastao iz *producer* i *consumer*, jako dobar izraz koji govori o tome da se građani trebaju osvijestiti, trebaju ujedno postati i proizvođači energije, ali i korisnici. Nadam se da je cilj ovog izvješća ozbiljno smanjiti potrošnju drugih izvora energije, dovesti gospodarstvo u stanje da se isključivo rabe obnovljivi izvori energije i smatram da je to cilj ovog izvješća te se nadam da je to ideal kojemu trebamo svi zajedno stremiti.

U svakom slučaju energetska politika treba biti usmjerena prema potrošačima, a ne prema opskrbljivačima, moraju biti transparentni. Nadam se da ćemo to uspjeti i nakon ovog izvješća te smatram da je ključ čista i sigurna energija.

Flavio Zanonato (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, mi complimento con la relatrice Griffin per l'ottimo lavoro svolto.

Voglio osservare che con questo passaggio diamo forma e profilo al ruolo del Parlamento europeo nella costruzione del nuovo mercato al dettaglio dell'elettricità. Da una parte, con il *market design*, riscriviamo l'architettura del mercato elettrico all'ingrosso, per superare le distorsioni nazionali e favorire un mercato europeo decentralizzato, flessibile, competitivo ed ecosostenibile.

Dall'altra, con la relazione Griffin, sosteniamo la semplificazione del quadro normativo al dettaglio, più e migliori informazioni per i consumatori, superamento delle tariffe di determinazione, misure stringenti per la lotta alla povertà energetica. In altre parole, rimettiamo al centro del dibattito i consumatori vulnerabili, coloro che spesso devono decidere tra riscaldarsi e mangiare e che non possiamo lasciare alla mercé delle grandi compagnie energetiche.

Non è un mistero, infatti, che molti consumatori europei pagano tariffe elettriche sconvenienti perché non adeguatamente indirizzati dagli operatori verso le formule tariffarie più vantaggiose. Questa pratica deve finire e sono ottimista che, con il contributo della relazione Griffin, sapremo aggiungere questo tassello al più ampio mosaico della costruzione dell'Unione dell'energia.

(L'oratore accetta di rispondere a una domanda «cartellino blu» (articolo 162, paragrafo 8, del regolamento)).

Tomáš Zdechovský (PPE), otázka položená zvednutím modré karty. – Mám na vás jednoduchou otázku. Myslíte si, že problém energetické chudoby je problémem, který má řešit celá EU, potažmo pan komisař, nebo je to výhradní kompetence členských států EU?

Flavio Zanonato (S&D), risposta a una domanda «cartellino blu». – Penso che possiamo dare come Unione europea il nostro contributo.

Kaja Kallas, rapporteur for the opinion of the Committee on the Internal Market and Consumer Protection. – Mr President, the opinion from the Committee on the Internal Market and Consumer Protection (IMCO) strongly welcomes the Commission's proposed initiative on a new deal for energy consumers. Active and empowered consumers should be the main drivers of a competitive European energy market. The market is not really functioning well and is failing to provide competition and also better prices for consumers.

So what is the cure for this? We must move away from regulated prices, make switching easier, and provide incentives for the deployment of smart technologies. Also, we must make data available for app developers to help consumers to manage their energy consumption. This is essential to get active consumers on board. One important point on consumers that we should not forget is that 'active consumer' does not mean a 'presumer', and not every consumer wants to be a presumer, so it should remain up to them what level of engagement they want in their energy consumption.

Pytania z sali

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Já jsem si vědom naší povinnosti vytvořit jednotný energetický trh a samozřejmě energetická unie je již dávným restem, který měla EU vytvořit. Jsem velmi rád, že pan komisař v této věci postupuje velmi aktivně.

Na druhou stranu, pane komisaři, je třeba skutečně, podle mého názoru, velmi vážít na lékařských váhách, která opatření si ponechá EU, že bude tedy regulovat z centrální ujednání úrovně a do jisté míry tak zasáhne do kompetence národních států, a která tedy budou ponechána právě v kompetenci suverénních národních států. Podle mého názoru je v této věci opravdu důležité postupovat de facto na těch lékařských váhách. Máte moji plnou podporu v tom, že pevně věřím, že se vám tento úkol podaří.

Pokud se mluvilo o energetické chudobě, mě popravdě řečeno netrhá uši, pokud tvrdíme, že energetická chudoba a přístup k energiím je jedním ze základních sociálních práv. Já si myslím, že to je opodstatněné v dnešní době.

José Blanco López (S&D). – Señor Presidente, comparto el enfoque de poner a los ciudadanos en el núcleo central de la Unión de la energía con medidas que permitan a los consumidores ahorrar dinero en la factura energética y que faciliten la competencia y el cambio de proveedor con carácter ágil y gratuito. No se pueden alcanzar los objetivos acordados en París si no situamos a la ciudadanía en la base de la eficiencia del mercado energético. Los ciudadanos que producen su propia energía deben ser tratados de manera justa y no penalizados con impuestos o cargas abusivas, como ha sido el caso de mi país con el «impuesto al sol». La lucha contra la pobreza energética debe ser un objetivo vital y la energía asequible debe ser un derecho social básico. Nadie debe tener que elegir entre comer o pagarse la calefacción. La Comisión debe dar prioridad a medidas destinadas a aliviar la pobreza energética en las próximas propuestas legislativas. Y antes de la votación de mañana, pido reflexión a aquellos, dentro de esta Cámara, contrarios a estos objetivos.

Νότης Μαριιάς (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, στην Ελλάδα, κύριε Šefčovič, στην οποία βρισκόσασταν πριν λίγες μέρες, το ενεργειακό κόστος για τους καταναλωτές επιβαρύνεται όχι από την έλλειψη ανταγωνισμού, αλλά λόγω των υπέρμετρων φόρων που καλούνται να πληρώσουν, γεγονός το οποίο έχει μεγάλη ευθύνη η τρόικα και τα μνημόνια.

Η ενεργειακή φτώχεια πλήττει, σύμφωνα με μελέτη του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου, το 36% των ελληνικών νοικοκυριών. Πέρυσι τον χειμώνα 100.000 νοικοκυριά βρέθηκαν, ή κινδύνευαν να βρεθούν, χωρίς ρεύμα. Σαν να μην έφτανε αυτό το 3ο μηνόμιο πρόσθεσε υπέρογκες αυξήσεις σε φόρους στο πετρέλαιο θέρμανσης και στο αγροτικό πετρέλαιο, αυξήσεις που το μόνο που καταφέρνουν είναι να μειώσουν την κατανάλωση και τις εισπράξεις του κράτους, ενώ επιβάλλουν, ταυτόχρονα, ενεργειακή επισφάλεια και καύση ακατάλληλων υλικών για θέρμανση, πράγμα που οδήγησε σε αιθαλομίχλη σε πολλά μέρη της Ελλάδας.

Για όλα αυτά έχω θέσει γραπτές ερωτήσεις, δεν έχω πάρει, όμως, απάντηση. Σε συζήτηση στην ITRE τον περασμένο Ιανουάριο, ο κύριος Cañete δεσμεύτηκε να εξετάσει το ζήτημα της υπερφορολόγησης πανευρωπαϊκά. Τι θα γίνει με αυτό; Θα δώσετε σαφείς και τεκμηριωμένες απαντήσεις ή θα συνεχίσετε να κρύβεστε; Θέλω μια απάντηση, παρακαλώ.

Jasenko Selimovic (ALDE). – Mr President, according to surveys, 50 million EU citizens were unable to keep their homes adequately warm in 2012, with similar numbers reported making late payments, overpaying etc. Those consumers are all over the EU and, as a Liberal, my conviction is that European challenges need common European answers. Therefore, I support the Commission and the rapporteur to entrust coordination to an EU level to combat energy poverty.

Three measures seem to be essential: the coordinated definition of energy poverty is needed, however you weight it in different countries; Member States need to develop measures to specially target energy-poor citizens, especially by removing the fee for switching suppliers; and better information on prices and transferred billings. These are found in the EU Member States with the most liberal energy markets. Consequently, I believe that the liberalisation of the energy market and the fight against energy poverty go hand in hand.

Kateřina Konečná (GUE/NGL). – Určitě se shodneme na tom, že je nezbytné, aby v rámci energetické unie bylo zakročeno proti problému energetické chudoby, která sužuje stále více obyvatel i v rámci Evropy.

V důsledku energetické chudoby v případě elektřiny vznikají neplatiči. Zatímco v případě tepelné energie lidé topí levnými a neekologickými palivy, která škodí jak jim, tak životnímu prostředí. V této souvislosti však je nutné s problémem energetické chudoby také schválit již konečně společnou definici energetické chudoby. V současnosti totiž v rámci členských zemí platí rozdílné hranice pro určení situace, kdy je možné o energetické chudobě hovořit. Společná definice nám tedy umožní, aby význam tohoto pojmu v jednotlivých zemích byl sjednocen a byly tak nastaveny přesné parametry, podle nichž bude možné výskyt energetické chudoby měřit.

Cílem energetické unie by tedy mělo být především řešení tohoto zásadního celoevropského jevu tak, aby zároveň došlo k vytvoření bezpečného a skutečně funkčního energetického trhu. Děkuji paní zpravodajce, pevně věřím, že tyto věci nezůstanou pouze na papíře.

Julie Ward (S&D). – Mr President, I would also like to thank my colleague and fellow North-West Labour MEP Teresa Griffin for her report on a new deal for energy consumers.

Completing the European Energy Union and lowering energy costs across the EU will have an enormous direct positive impact on British citizens, and it is yet another reason for us to vote to stay in the EU.

I welcome the report's recommendations on fighting energy poverty and I am here to stress that we must include a holistic gender perspective in all of these proposals. Single mother households are much more likely to face energy poverty than male-headed households. Energy and household costs are strongly linked to household indebtedness, which in turn plays a role in female homelessness. These are issues we need more European research on. Economic data on households is important, but household income can be unequal and vulnerable women or children can end up facing *de facto* poverty – in effect the feminisation of poverty – and this should also be taken into account when we define what energy poverty is.

Ivan Jakovčić (ALDE). – Gospodine predsjedniče, napokon imamo prave smjernice za stvaranje prave europske energetske unije. Naime, ovdje vidimo jasnu želju za decentralizacijom u odnosu na centralizaciju sustava, demonopolizaciju u odnosu na monopol u sustavima, u državama članicama i također jasno opredjeljenje za više obnovljivih izvora energije u odnosu na fosilna goriva.

Naravno da je upravo zbog toga krajnje neophodno da su upravo potrošači u odnosu na opskrbljivače u prvom planu smjernica energetske unije. To je pravi dokaz da su na dobrom putu, jer i ovom prilikom i u ovom izvještaju vidimo koliko je važno kada građane stavimo u prvi plan, kako tada možemo dobiti i njihovo odgovarajuće povjerenje.

(Koniec pytań z sali)

Maroš Šefčovič, Vice-President of the Commission. – Mr President, I would like to thank all the honourable Members for this very rich debate, where I think from one side we clearly highlighted how important are the problems we've been tackling in this evening's debates and at the same time how complex the issue is with which we are dealing.

I would like to tell you that I was listening very carefully to all the ideas which I think have been mostly recurring in the interventions of the honourable MEPs: how important it is to have a well-functioning market; how needed it would be to restore the real price signals of the energies; what we need to do to have our prices comparable; and what kind of focus we have to attach to crossborder trading, to the interconnectors and to the proper financing of the necessary infrastructure.

I very much welcome the support for the democratisation of energy generation, and I agree with you that we still need to do well and ought to make sure that the third package in all our Member States is properly implemented.

I think there was an overall agreement that the best recipe to tackle energy poverty is to focus on energy efficiency, and today's technologies are already offering us to do a lot to use the smart solutions, to smarten our grids, our households and to use the proper information to customise the services and empower our consumers.

I also have been listening very carefully to all the calls from those who want the EU to do the most but at the same time to find the appropriate balance between Member States and European competences.

I would like once again to thank the rapporteur for a very timely report because we are now working hard to deliver on the remaining proposals which he promised we would deliver these year – the year of delivery for the Energy Union. In September, we would like to present the package on energy efficiency. We want to include also proposals on how to make our buildings more energy efficient, and many of the proposals which we heard today will be reflected in our proposals for the new electricity market design and for the revised Renewables Directive which would follow later – hopefully before the end of the year.

Despite all these regulatory proposals and the legislative regulatory framework which we are going to create, what I think was also very much reflected in the statements by the honourable Members was the importance which they give to proper investment. We need the financial instruments. We need the investment so we can start this wave of energy efficiency across Europe.

We have already done a lot, because thanks to the budget allocations which have been already proposed, one million households will benefit from EU cohesion policy support to make their buildings more efficient.

In this financial period, we will spend EUR 5.4 billion for energy efficiency investment in housing, which is a threefold increase in comparison with the previous period.

But the question is, is it enough? I think it's not. So therefore I think we need to work on the new instruments, the instruments which we are currently developing in the Commission: smart financing for smart buildings, because I believe that this would play a very important role for the future.

Another element which was echoed in the speeches of several honourable Members was that we need to offer more assistance and help to local authorities, to mayors, and to provide them with better technical assistance to help them to develop the necessary capacity, so they can tackle these very complex issues of smartening cities or increasing energy efficiency in their electoral district. And I am very happy to say that we feel we have very strong grassroots support from local authorities, from mayors, for this energy transition, for tackling energy poverty and for transforming their cities into the smart cities of the future.

In the Covenant of Mayors we have already 6 000 mayors and we know how they appreciate working on this platform. We are looking for ways to cooperate even more closely with the Compact of Mayors, which is a similar organisation, which was developed in the United States to make sure that these big entities of mayors have more platforms and more possibilities to exchange best practices.

To conclude, I really would like to thank you for all the ideas, for the support for our work, and I believe that together we can really empower consumers in the energy market, and I think that through this it can make a real contribution in the fight against energy poverty.

Thank you very much. I very much look forward to our close cooperation in the coming months.

Elnökváltás: GÁLL-PELCZ ILDIKÓ asszony

Alelnök

Theresa Griffin, rapporteur. – Madam President, I would like to thank colleagues very much for their comments and I would particularly like to thank the Commissioner. We look forward to working closely with him.

I really hope that the vote tomorrow in plenary will be positive, but I see that some political groups question the idea of a ban on unfair commercial practices, of the need for a social tariff for low-income citizens, and of peer-based comparison on bills, and are rowing back from the votes in committee. I am very disappointed in that. To those people voting against these issues, Ashley Fox – is Ashley still here, no he has gone – are you really prepared to go back to the UK and to your region to face your constituents and say that they still have to put up with aggressive doorstep or phone selling, especially your elderly residents? I don't think so. Are other groups ready to say that you voted against social tariffs for low-income citizens? And are you really willing to tell that mother of three that she cannot be automatically told the amount of energy she is using and why she is paying for it? We have to end termination fees. We do not pay them in telecoms. Why on earth should our citizens pay for them in energy? And fantasy from UKIP as usual. This is about the exchange of best practice – as the Commissioner said – between European citizens and local authorities, between consumers, NGOs, and local organisations coming together to develop innovative projects.

The EU is not the problem here. It is part of the solution to eradicating energy poverty. We should be proud of a Europe of jobs and growth, a Europe that acts to protect its most vulnerable citizens. It is a scandal that we have 50 million citizens in energy poverty. I repeat that, in 2016 and beyond, no one should have to choose between heating and cooling or eating.

Elnök asszony. – A közös vitát lezárom.

A szavazásra 2016. május 26-án, csütörtökön kerül sor.

Írásbeli nyilatkozatok (162. cikk)

Vilija Blinkevičiūtė (S&D), raštu. – Pirmiausia, norėčiau pabrėžti, kad energetikos sąjungai turėtų piliečiams užtikrinti stabilią, įperkamą, tvarią, veiksmingą ir tvarią energiją, taip pat aukštos kokybės energiją taupančius produktus, paslaugas ir pastatus. Energetikos sistemos pertvarka turėtų būti siekiama veiksmingesnės, skaidresnės, tvaresnės, konkurencingesnės, stabilesnės, labiau decentralizuotos ir įtraukios energetikos sistemos, kuri būtų naudinga visai visuomenei, užtikrintų aktyvesnį piliečių, vietos bei regioninių subjektų ir bendruomenių dalyvavimą ir suteiktų jiems galių patiems gaminti, skirstyti ir laikyti atsinaujinančiųjų išteklių energiją arba dalytis atsakomybe už energijos gamybą, tuo pat metu apsaugant labiausiai pažeidžiamus asmenis ir užtikrinant galimybes naudoti energijos vartojimo efektyvumo priemonės ir atsinaujinančiųjų išteklių energiją. Taigi, raginame Komisiją išanalizuoti agresyvaus mokesčių planavimo ir mokesčių slėpimo, kurį visų pirma vykdo natūralios monopolijos, pvz., skirstomųjų tinklų operatoriai, klausimą energijos rinkoje. Be to, Komisija ir valstybės narės turėtų imtis reikiamų priemonių, kad nauda dėl nacionalinių tinklų jungiamųjų linijų pralaidumo padidinimo tektų ne skirstomųjų tinklų operatoriams, bet tiesiogiai galutiniams vartotojams. Taip pat raginame užtikrinti geresnį koordinavimą ES lygmeniu, siekiant kovoti su energijos nepritekliais, dalijantis geriausią praktiką valstybėse narėse ir sukuriant plačią, bendrą, bet ne kiekybinę energijos nepritekliaus apibrėžtį, kuria būtų pabrėžiama mintis, kad galimybė naudotis įperkama energija yra pagrindinė socialinė teisė.

Λευτέρης Χριστοφόρου (PPE), γραπτώς. – Ο στόχος μας παραμένει και αποτελεί ύψιστη προτεραιότητα να λειτουργήσει μία εύρυθμη αγορά ενέργειας που είναι επωφελής για τους πολίτες. Έτσι πιστεύω ότι ο στόχος της τρίτης δέσμης μέτρων για την ενέργεια, αποσκοπεί στη δημιουργία μιας πραγματικά ανταγωνιστικής, διαφανούς και φιλικής προς τον καταναλωτή λιανικής αγοράς ενέργειας.

Δυστυχώς, όμως, μέχρι σήμερα δεν έχει υλοποιηθεί πλήρως από όλα τα κράτη μέλη. Τούτο αποτυπώνεται από τα ψηλά επίπεδα συγκέντρωσης στην αγορά, τη μη μεταφορά του κόστους μείωσης της χονδρικής στις τιμές λιανικής και στα χαμηλά επίπεδα αλλαγής προμηθευτή και ικανοποίησης των καταναλωτών.

Σταθερός παραμένει ο στόχος για εξυπηρέτηση πρωτίστως του καταναλωτή.

Miriam Dalli (S&D), *in writing*. – When we talk about the Energy Union and the development of competitive energy markets in Europe, we must make sure that consumers are at the centre of this strategy. They must be empowered in order to make them participate in demand response, thus saving money for their households and businesses. Innovative solutions to shift to a smart, efficient and sustainable energy system using modern technologies can unlock significant energy and budgetary savings for companies and citizens. It can also help to improve air quality, increase well-being for individuals and provide benefits to society as a whole; benefits also to the most vulnerable consumers.

Too often energy-poor consumers are living in inefficient accommodation and paying too much for energy. Instead, these vulnerable consumers should receive adequate safeguards, including preventing the disconnection of electricity and gas at critical times, and assistance to implement energy efficiency measures in their homes that can serve as long-term solution helping them to avoid energy poverty and in many cases improve their health and quality of life. Energy is essential and access to energy services is a basic social right. The Energy Union and the EU's framework of energy legislation must keep this in its focus.

Tamás Deutsch (PPE), *írásban*. – A jelenleg végbemenő energetikai átállás a fosszilis energiahordozókon alapuló energetikai rendszer felől egy megújuló energiákon nyugvó rendszer felé stabil, fenntartható, megfizethető energiát, illetve energiahatékony termékeket és lakhatást, a fogyasztóknak előnyös energiapiacot kell, hogy eredményezzen a polgárok számára. A Magyarország számára oly fontos ellátásbiztonság növelésének leghatékonyabb és legeredményesebb módja a fogyasztás csökkentése, az energiatakarékosság és az energiahatékonyság prioritásként való kezelése. A jelenleg tárgyalt parlamenti előterjesztés nagy hangsúlyt fektet az energiahatékonyságra, a fogyasztók tisztességtelen gyakorlatoktól való védelmére, a számlák átláthatóságának és közérthetőségének növelésére.

Hazánk számára, mivel gazdaságosan kitermelhető fosszilis energiahordozókban szegény, exportorientált ország, különösen fontos, hogy energiahatékonysági intézkedéseken keresztül csökkentsük az energiaszükségletet innovatív technológiák alkalmazásával és célzott szemléletformálással, a társadalmi szereplők környezettudatosságát. Fenntartható és biztonságos energetikai rendszereket kell létrehozni, melyek egyben a gazdaság versenyképességét is fokozzák. Mindezek az intézkedések az energiamegtakarítás mellett egyéb kedvező hatásokkal is járnak – egészségesebb környezetet és életminőséget, energiától való nagyobb függetlenséget eredményeznek.

Adam Gierek (S&D), na piśmie. – W grudniu ubiegłego roku poparłem dyrektywę, której sprawozdawcą był p. Marek Gróbarczyk, jako zrównoważoną i poważną propozycję wskazania Komisji i Radzie najlepszego kompromisu, bez ulegania nierealnym „ambicjom” w zakresie „obrony” klimatu, w nadziei, że stanie się ona podstawą dla opracowywania bardziej realistycznych projektów legislacyjnych. Potrzebne jest bowiem szybkie przewartościowanie dotychczasowej polityki energetycznej – przesadnej, niedostatecznie udokumentowanej naukowo tzw. „europejskiej polityki klimatycznej” i oddzielenie jej od realnej polityki energetycznej. Nie można jej nadal kształtować w oparciu o lobbiny niektórych krajów oraz wielkich korporacji gazowych i finansowych. Prawdziwa Unia Energetyczna winna doprowadzić do takiej zmiany Pakietu Klimatyczno-Energetycznego, która zwalczyłaby nieuczciwą konkurencję pomiędzy krajami członkowskimi oraz doprowadziła do wzrostu konkurencyjności na rynkach światowych. Pragnę raz jeszcze podkreślić, iż priorytetem Unii Energetycznej winno być bezpieczeństwo energetyczne, solidarność zaopatrzenia i walka z ubóstwem energetycznym przy zachowaniu konkurencyjności na rynkach trzecich, a także taka modernizacja infrastruktury, która prowadziłaby do maksymalizacji efektywności energetycznej i przejrzystości w negocjowaniu cen energii z krajów trzecich, a także wykorzystywanie lokalnych źródeł energii, w tym technologii ekologicznego spalania węgla. Największą korzyścią dla obywateli (i ewentualnej Unii Energetycznej) będzie całkowite odejście od dotychczasowego systemu EU ETS na rzecz takiego systemu, który nie będzie tak biurokratycznie zagniatany i sprzyjający spekulacji jak ten obecny.

András Gyürk (PPE), írásban. – Az „Új irányvonal az energiafogyasztók számára” jelentés fontos állomás az energiaunió kitűzött céljai megvalósításában. A stabil, megfizethető, hatékony és fenntartható energia biztosítása az állampolgárok elsődleges érdeke. A fogyasztóbarát, versenyző és jól működő energiapiacok kialakítása kulcsfontosságú, amely célok eléréséhez a harmadik energiacsomag teljes körű végrehajtása elengedhetetlen. Ahogyan a jelentés is hangsúlyozza, a fogyasztók megfelelő informálása előfeltétele az energiatudatos magatartásnak. Ennek következtében a számlák átláthatóságának javítása, a szolgáltatói számlák összehasonlíthatóságának biztosítása közös érdekünk – hiszen ez akár alacsonyabb rezsiköltségekhez is vezethet.

A fogyasztók számára különösen praktikus a naprakész és közérthető összehasonlító eszközök, felületek létrehozása, ezen lehetőségekről történő tájékoztatás biztosítása. Hiszen a szolgáltatóváltás biztosítása alapvető feltétele a versenynek. Habár a jelentés minden pontjával nem értek maradéktalanul egyet, az irány jó és támogatandó.

Филиз Хюсменова (ALDE), в писмена форма. – Уважаеми г-н Председател, вследствие от общото състояние на Европейската икономика цените на най-необходимите стоки и услуги поскъпнаха значително, което доведе до затруднения пред стотици европейски граждани, особено принадлежащите към уязвими групи - възрастни хора и безработни. По данни на Евростат 40% от населението на България не е в състояние да поддържа домовете си достатъчно отоплени. Това се дължи от една страна на фактори, като ниските доходи на населението и ниската енергийна ефективност на сградите, а от друга - на липсата на разнообразие от участници на енергийния пазар, което води до високи цени на енергията. Ето защо необходимостта от ефективна и всеобхватна енергийна стратегия е по-належаща от всякога. Акцент в усилията ни трябва да бъдат правата на потребителите чрез ограничаване на регулираното ценообразуване, подобряването на енергийната ефективност чрез намаляване на консумацията на енергия и подобряването на енергийната инфраструктура, осигурявайки отворен и конкурентен пазар като предпоставка за намаляване на енергийната бедност.

Benedek Jávor (Verts/ALE), in writing. – Energy poverty affects a large share of the world's population. Within the EU 11% of the population is not able to adequately heat their homes at an affordable cost and energy poverty affects around 54 million people (2012 figures). The problem is particularly prevalent in Central, Eastern and Southern Europe.

At the global scale the climate agreement achieved in Paris as well as the Sustainable Development Goals adopted last autumn (SDG 7 in particular, 'ensure access to affordable, reliable, sustainable and modern energy for all') contribute to an enhanced cooperation in this field.

Yet the EU should make sure these global commitments are translated into actions. Combatting energy poverty requires a complex and pragmatic approach.

Many EU member states do not assess energy poverty properly, they do not even identify vulnerable consumers, making it impossible to adequately target measures. Energy efficiency improvements in low-income and vulnerable households should be strongly incentivized. Raising awareness and enabling informed decisions would be also important.

Besides, the European Commission should allocate a much higher share of EU funds to energy efficiency programmes for vulnerable, energy-poor households and it should provide recommendations to its Member States on improved monitoring and on specific energy poverty measures.

Barbara Kappel (ENF), schriftlich. – Die Debatte um Energiearmut wird immer wieder mit der allgemeinen Debatte um erneuerbare Energie vermischt. Dies ist sachlich unzutreffend und bedarf folgender Klarstellungen: (1) Wenn Preisspitzen bei Erneuerbaren zugelassen werden, dann braucht man konventionelle Kraftwerke, die als Back-up Kapazitäten bereitstellen. Das sichert den Bedarf und schützt armutsgefährdete Kunden. (2) Nicht die Energiequelle per se schadet benachteiligten Kunden, sondern unfaire Vermarktungspraktiken, denn diese führen zu Vertrauensverlust und reduzieren letztlich das individuelle Engagement. Grundsätzlich kann gesagt werden: Je wettbewerbsfähiger der Energiemarkt ist, desto besser für die Verbraucher. Die steigende Anzahl von Kunden, die ihren Energieanbieter wechseln, ist ein Beleg dafür. Die Optionen, Kunden stärker am Markt teilnehmen zu lassen, sollen möglichst breit und wenig standardisiert sein. Gemeinsame Wechselkampagnen und Standards für das Rechnungslayout sind neben Apps, Broschüren, Hotlines, One-Stop-Shops etc. Möglichkeiten, Verbraucher verstärkt einzubinden. Regulierte Vorgaben hingegen sind hinderlich. Ebenso sollte es keine Subventionen geben, das gilt für Switchkampagnen genauso wie für die Eigenproduktion.

Ivana Maletić (PPE), napisan. – Cilj je građane osposobiti da sami pojedinačno ili kolektivno proizvode, koriste i skladište vlastitu energiju i trguju njome. Građani moraju imati pravo na aktivno sudjelovanje na energetskom tržištu kao i pravo potrošačkog izbora i upravljanja potrošnjom. Uvođenje pametnih brojila pomoglo bi potrošačima da smanje svoje troškove za energiju i poboljšaju energetske učinkovitost.

Rastući problem u Europskoj uniji sve više postaje energetsko siromaštvo, koje utječe na oko 54 milijuna Europljana koji nisu u stanju adekvatno zagrijati prostor u kojem žive ili ostvariti neke druge energetske usluge po pristupačnoj cijeni. Dobro usmjerene socijalne tarife važne su za ugrožene građane. Primjena socijalnih tarifa treba biti transparentna, a dobre prakse država članica trebalo bi istaknuti i preporučiti ostalima.

Ostvarivanje novih pogodnosti za potrošače energije doprinijeti će iskorjenjivanju energetskog siromaštva te kvalitetnijem uključivanju građana na energetsko tržište kao potrošača koji upravljaju vlastitom potrošnjom i imaju pravo na izbor.

Marian-Jean Marinescu (PPE), în scris. – În primul rând, pentru crearea unei uniuni energetice viabile sunt necesare surse de aprovizionare sigure și fiabile pentru a realiza o piață a energiei bine integrată și bine conectată. Liberalizarea veritabilă a pieței interne a UE este direct legată de diversificarea surselor de aprovizionare. UE trebuie să intensifice investițiile în coridorul Mediteranei de Est pentru a atenua dependența de gazul rusesc în Europa de Sud-Est. Subliniez și importanța geostrategică a regiunii Mării Negre pentru securitatea energetică a UE, în special pentru dezvoltarea cooperării energetice multilaterale în regiunea Mării Caspice, în Orientul Mijlociu și în Asia Centrală. Pe de altă parte, Comisia trebuie să vină cu propunerile legislative necesare care să permită consumatorilor să dețină controlul asupra costurilor la energie și să aibă acces la costurile reale complete ale energiei electrice livrate, inclusiv la cele asociate transportului și distribuției. Și nu în ultimul rând, consider necesară crearea unui model reconfigurat de piață cu ridicata/cu amănuntul pentru a evita situația în care, pe termen lung, tarifele reglementate ar dăuna intereselor consumatorilor casnici, în loc să le protejeze.

Csaba Molnár (S&D), írásban. – Tisztelt Elnök Úr! Az energiaszegénység felszámolása Európa egyik legégetőbb feladata a 21. században. Míg Európában körülbelül 50 millió ember él energiaszegénységben, addig Magyarországon a statisztikák szerint minden ötödik háztartás, vagyis akár kétmillió ember. Ez a helyzet fenntarthatatlan, amelyet Magyarországon a hatósági árképzés, vagyis a „rezsicsökkentés” politikája sem tudott megoldani. Egy átlag magyar háztartás egy négyzetméterre jutó energiafelhasználása csaknem az uniós átlag kétszerese. Ezek alapján a magyar háztartások egynegyedének energiaszegénységét nem önmagában a jövedelmekhez képest magas energiaárak okozzák, hanem jelentős részben az épületek energiahatékonyságának alacsony szintje. Ezen mihamarabb változtatnunk kell!

Elfogadhatatlan az, hogy valaki 2016-ban ne tudja felfűteni lakását, hideg vízben fürödjön, ne tudja felkapcsolni olvasólámpáját, vagy ne tudja feltölteni mobiltelefonját. Ezért véleményem szerint uniós szabályozásban kell garantálnunk a minden állampolgárnak alanyi jogon járó minimum-energiaszolgáltatást, az energiához való alapjogot. Ugyanakkor szükségünk van jól célzott szociális energiatarifákra a leginkább rászorulóknak. Középtávon megoldás a saját, vagyis az „otthoni” energiatermelés beindítása, a házi szélkerekek és napelemek elterjedésének támogatása, valamint a nagyszabású energiahatékonyságot javító programok támogatása.

Urmas Paet (ALDE), kirjalikult. – Tarbijatel peab olema võimalus saada energia odavaimatest hindadest adekvaatset teavet, võimalus erinevaid pakkumisi paremini võrrelda ning kindlasti ka õigus tarnijaid kiiresti, lihtsalt ja tasuta vahetada. Samuti tuleb tegeleda energiavaesuse põhjuste kõrvaldamisega, kasutades sellel eesmärgil ELi vahendeid ja isetootmise toetusi madala sissetulekuga ja haavatavate kodanike jaoks.

Marijana Petir (PPE), napisan. – Razmatrajući nove pogodnosti za potrošače energije, a podržavajući nove modele koji doprinose većoj raznolikosti sudionika na tržištu energijom te time i poticanju rasta lokalnog gospodarstva i zapošljavanja, pogotovo na lokalnoj razini, ne smijemo zaboraviti one koji su na rubu društva i vlastite egzistencije. Energetsko siromaštvo, nažalost, sve je izraženiji problem na području cijelog EU-a, a studija Europske komisije pokazuje kako 11 % populacije EU-a nije u mogućnosti grijati svoja domaćinstva po prihvatljivim cijenama.

Procjenjuje se da ova situacija pogađa oko 54 milijuna ljudi. Problem je posebno izražen u istočnim i južnim državama članicama EU-a u kojima je tijekom 2012. godine najveći udio populacije u riziku od energetskog siromaštva bio zabilježen u Rumunjskoj (40-50 %), dok se u Hrvatskoj taj udio procjenjuje na 30-40 %. Što se tiče zaostataka u plaćanju računa, Hrvatska također drži visoko mjesto među članicama EU-a.

Zajedno s Ciprom, Latvijom, Rumunjskom i Slovenijom 36-48 % populacije ne može si priuštiti redovno plaćanje računa što mnogo govori o energetskoj dostupnosti. Do ovih problema dolazi zbog rasta cijena energenata, niskih primanja i loše energetski učinkovitih domova. Veliki broj zemalja EU-a ne identificira ranjive potrošače tako da ni ne može adekvatno ciljati mjere protiv energetskog siromaštva. Ovakva se situacija mora promijeniti.

Monika Smolková (S&D), písomne. – Energiu vzhľadom na svoju nenahraditeľnú úlohu vo všetkých činnostiach každodenného života považujem za dôležitý majetok, ktorý by každému občanovi bez rozdielu mal umožňovať dôstojne žiť. Je potešiteľné, že v Európe sa niekdajšie problémy s dostupnosťou energie prevažne vyriešili, ale na druhej strane ma znepokojuje celosvetová situácia, kde pre 1,2 miliardy osôb je elektrina stále nedostupná a 2,8 miliardy osôb stále používa na vyhrievanie svojho obydľia alebo varenia drevo alebo iné druhy biomasy. Aj keď v Európe sa v oblasti energii dosiahol už určitý pokrok, napriek tomu energetická chudoba sa prejavuje rastúcim počtom osôb (više 50 miliónov), ktoré majú problémy s úhradou energie alebo pre ktoré je energia dostupná len v obmedzenej miere, pretože majú nízky príjem, ich byt je neizolovaný, majú málo výkonné zariadenie (kúrenie, varenie, ohrev teplej vody) alebo ceny energie sú veľmi vysoké. Keďže tento stav považujem za neakceptovateľný, súhlasím so zavedením takého systému v EÚ, ktorý zabezpečí udržanie celkových nákladov na nízkej úrovni a to, že deficit spôsobený sadzbami za elektrinu sa nebude ďalej zvyšovať. Verím, že prijatými opatreniami ochránime všetkých občanov bez rozdielu pred energetickou chudobou a zabránime ich sociálnemu vylúčeniu.

Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu (S&D), in writing. – Energy poverty is a real problem that affects also public health. The Commission has the obligation to address this issue in its specific legislative proposals. On the other hand, Member States have to take the necessary measures to ensure that all the population has access to energy sources, they do not pay excessive electricity and gas bills, and do not have to choose between basic needs that they can afford to satisfy. It is not just at EU level, but at national and regional levels as well that we need to see more action with regard to the eradication of energy poverty. We need transparency in order for the population to make informed choices regarding their energy consumption, and we need as well EU funds to be allocated for energy efficiency and for programmes to support self-generation of energy.

Claudia Țapardel (S&D), în scris. – În ultimii ani, sectorul energetic din Europa a cunoscut transformări semnificative. Cu toate acestea, peste 50 de milioane de cetățeni ai UE trăiesc în sărăcie energetică pentru că încă există elemente care îi împiedică pe consumatori să profite pe deplin și să aibă un control semnificativ asupra consumului lor și astfel să reducă sumele de pe facturile lor. Aceasta reprezintă o problemă socială din ce în ce mai grea, care impune o rezolvare urgentă și care ar trebui tratată pe cât posibil în mod direct, prin măsuri de politici sociale. Este necesară o abordare europeană comună, care să urmărească scopul de a înlătura dezechilibrul și inegalitățile de pe piață pentru a găsi soluții durabile pentru consumatori și pentru ca industria noastră să acceseze energie la prețuri accesibile. Consider corectă

abordarea Comisiei, conform căreia contextul local trebuie identificat, luat în considerare și sprijinit în mod adecvat, implicându-i activ pe participanții locali. În același timp, trebuie să se schimbe rolul consumatorului, astfel încât acesta să poată accesa și beneficia mai bine și mai rapid de ofertele și serviciile de energie, profitând de ele.

Indrek Tarand (Verts/ALE), *in writing*. – Aside from efficiency gains, the *raison d'être* of our Energy Union is to guarantee security of supply, in other words energy security. Russia has demonstrated on countless occasions that it is not a reliable partner to the European Union, and that it does not hesitate to wield energy as a political weapon. This is precisely why we should not increase our own dependency on Russian gas by doubling the capacity of the Nord Stream pipeline.

Furthermore, we would be helping Russia in destabilising Ukraine. The current Nord Stream pipeline is only used at half of its existing capacity; therefore, doubling its capacity makes no economic sense. This is clear evidence that the only reason to double the capacity is to be able to reroute all the gas that is transiting through Ukraine. Not only would this have disastrous consequences for Ukraine, but it would put eastern European Union Member States in a more precarious position since we do not have sufficient interconnections for that gas to make its way from Germany back to eastern Member States.

Valdemar Tomaševski (ECR), *raštu*. – Pone Pirmininke, Energetikos klausimas yra vienas svarbiausių Europos Sąjungoje. Tai taip pat svarbi problema ES piliečiams, ypač tiems kurie gyvena naujose valstybėse narėse. Šio sektoriaus ES politika turėtų eiti link reguliavimo įvedimo kurio tikslas būtų sumažinti energijos kainas visų pirma namų ūkiams, o ne pramonei. Būtent paprasti žmonės ir šeimos labiausiai pajunta išlaidas energijai savo biudžete. Tai jie turėtų būti geriausiai saugomi. Energijos rinkoje reikia sukurti tikrai konkurenciją, skaidrią ir patogią mažmeniniams vartotojams sistemą. Be to, norint veiksmingai kovoti su energijos nepriteklumi, valstybės narės privalo visapusiškai įgyvendinti nuostatas susijusias su tiekėjų keitimu. Nacionalinės teisės aktai turi užtikrinti vartotojams teisę į greitą ir lengvą paslaugos teikėjo pakeitimą nepatiriant papildomų mokesčių. Siekiant apsaugoti vartotojus, ypač tuos, kurie yra labiausiai pažeidžiami, reikią įvesti tinkamą taisyklių įgyvendinimą ir vykdymą dėl nesąžiningos komercinės veiklos ir dėl vartotojų teisių susijusių su gretutiniiais pardavimais, nesąžiningomis sąlygomis arba agresyvios rinkodaros praktika. Prisiminkime, kad gerai veikiančioje energetikos sistemoje pagrindinis vaidmuo atitenka vietos valdžios institucijoms, kooperatyvams ir asmenims, kurie turėtų būti skatinami tapti energijos gamintojais, jei jie to pageidautų. Tai ateities projektas, kurį turėtume, kaip ES, remti, nes tai tikrai gali padėti stabilizuoti energijos kainas.

Romana Tomc (PPE), *pisno*. – Energijska revščina v zadnjih letih vedno bolj ogroža naše državljane. V boju proti njej moramo omogočiti dostop do cenovno dostopne in varne energije. Pomembno je, da podpremo razvoj domačih virov energije, kar bo povečalo konkurenčnost gospodarstva EU. Menim, da bi si države članice morale bolj prizadevati za iskanje rešitve za energetsko neodvisnost. Več sredstev bi morale vložiti v proizvodnjo lastne energije in razvoj energetske tehnologije z alternativnimi, obnovljivimi viri. Poleg tega pa ne smemo pozabiti na obnavljanje obstoječe energetske infrastrukture, ki bo vplivalo tudi na razvoj novih delovnih mest.

22. Chudoba: rodové hľadisko (stručná prezentácia)

Elnök asszony. – A következő pont Maria Arena jelentésének rövid ismertetése: Szegénység; a nemek közötti egyenlőség szempontjai (2015/2228(INI)) (A8-0153/2016).

Maria Arena, *rapporteure*. – Madame la Présidente, finalement, ces deux débats qui se suivent touchent des thèmes qui sont très proches et qui sont liés à la question de la pauvreté. On a parlé de la pauvreté énergétique. Ici, s'il s'agit plus particulièrement de l'approche de la pauvreté de manière genrée.

Quelle est la situation des femmes en matière de pauvreté en Europe? Aujourd'hui, malheureusement, plus de 64 millions de femmes vivent en situation de pauvreté en Europe. 48 % d'entre elles – des femmes célibataires – ne sont pas en mesure de faire face à des dépenses inattendues. Ces femmes célibataires sont considérées comme des publics plus vulnérables en matière de pauvreté. Les familles monoparentales dans lesquelles les femmes sont le chef de ménage plus souvent que les hommes subissent également de plus grands risques de pauvreté et d'exclusion sociale, entraînant ainsi un cercle vicieux de la pauvreté pour leurs enfants et leur famille. Aujourd'hui, 27 % des enfants européens sont exposés au risque de pauvreté. Cela représente 22 millions d'enfants en situation de pauvreté.

Nous avons vu que les mesures d'austérité, qui sont souvent des mesures d'austérité aveugles, prises ces dernières années en Europe, ont accentué les inégalités et, aussi, les risques de pauvreté pour les femmes et les enfants. Le fossé salarial persiste aujourd'hui. Nous avons également la question des travailleurs pauvres, des statuts précaires et, enfin, le fossé en matière de pensions, qui représente un écart de 39 % et qui entraîne des risques de pauvreté pour les personnes et les femmes les plus âgées.

Faut-il rappeler que l'objectif de la stratégie Europe 2020 prévoit la réduction d'au moins 20 millions du nombre de personnes exposées au risque de pauvreté? Nous en sommes loin, aujourd'hui. Nous devons rompre le cycle infernal de la pauvreté, qui touche aujourd'hui 127 millions de personnes en Europe, dont 22 millions d'enfants. Et il faut savoir que, particulièrement en ce qui concerne les adultes, les femmes sont plus touchées par ce cycle.

Finalement, nous avons formulé une série de recommandations pour faire en sorte que ce cycle de la pauvreté puisse être rompu. La première recommandation demande de garantir des services publics de qualité et un accès gratuit à l'éducation, à la santé et à la justice. Il est effectivement démontré que, quand les services publics sont de bonne qualité et présentent une première ligne de bonne qualité, il y a une meilleure efficacité et une meilleure redistribution des richesses, ce qui constitue un réel filet social de lutte contre la pauvreté.

La deuxième recommandation est la lutte contre les discriminations à l'emploi, qui sont des sources de pauvreté pour les femmes. Nous demandons donc qu'il y ait une coordination des congés parentaux – congé de maternité, congé de paternité et congé parental – pour lutter contre les situations aussi précaires vécues dans les contrats précaires par les femmes.

La troisième recommandation: une réflexion importante sur le revenu minimum comme un instrument de la lutte contre la pauvreté. Nous ne demandons donc pas aujourd'hui dans le rapport qu'il puisse y avoir un revenu minimum – quoique cela aurait pu être le cas –, mais nous le demandons pour qu'il y ait une analyse des systèmes de revenu minimum dans toute l'Europe et identifier les bonnes pratiques en la matière comme étant un outil de lutte contre la pauvreté.

Une quatrième revendication: quand on connaît mal le phénomène, on peut moins bien apporter les solutions. Nous demandons donc qu'il y ait un suivi statistique plus fiable de la question de la pauvreté genrée aujourd'hui en Europe. Nous demandons également qu'il puisse y avoir un système de garantie «enfant» comme nous avons pu l'obtenir en matière de garantie «jeunesse», c'est-à-dire que, là où il y a des foyers importants de pauvreté aujourd'hui en Europe, il faut absolument prévoir des lignes budgétaires et des actions spécifiques qui permettent de lutter particulièrement contre la pauvreté des enfants.

Enfin, nous demandons – et c'est en lien avec le rapport qui a été discuté juste avant – des tarifs sociaux pour les biens de première nécessité, tels que l'accès à l'énergie et à l'eau, qui permet effectivement de ne pas tomber dans ce piège de la pauvreté. Pour finir, nous demandons qu'il puisse y avoir des politiques fiscales incitatives de lutte contre la pauvreté.

Je remercie, dans le cadre de l'ensemble de ces recommandations, tous les membres qui ont participé à l'élaboration de ce rapport. Cela a été une discussion très constructive et j'espère que, demain, il pourra être voté à une grande majorité. Cela enverrait un signal important à la Commission.

„Catch the eye” eljárás

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – Zpráva o chudobě z hlediska rovnosti žen a mužů přináší důležitá data, ze kterých je zřejmé, že i v evropské společnosti přetrvává více žen ohrožených chudobou, nežli je ohroženo mužů chudobou.

Především jako důvod tato zpráva uvádí diskriminaci na trhu práce a diskriminaci v odměňování. Je to již šestá zpráva v roce 2016, která se podobným tématem zabývá a bohužel nepřináší, podle mého názoru, žádná nová lepší řešení. Domnívám se totiž, že jde o jinou diskriminaci. Diskriminováni jsou rodiče dětí, protože pečují o děti místo toho, aby spořili a aby vydělávali peníze a ukládali peníze do penzijních fondů. Myslím si, že maminky a otcové, kteří se starají o děti, jsou diskriminováni, protože společnost neuznává tuto práci jako společensky prospěšnou, a dokud tento přístup bude přetrvávat, dotud budou tyto ženy a rodiče diskriminováni.

Tibor Szanyi (S&D). – Ez a jelentés mellbevágó tényeket sorakoztat fel, amelyek azt igazolják, hogy a nők szociális depriváció szempontjából is a társadalom leginkább sérülékeny és sokféle hátrányos megkülönböztetésnek kitett csoportját képezik. Korábban magam is tettem kezdeményezéseket annak érdekében, hogy rendészeti és igazságügyi szempontból a nők – olyan más, bűncselekményeknek különösen kitett csoportok mellett, mint a gyermekek és az idősek – automatikusan kiemelt védelmet kapjanak az Unió egész területén. Egy ilyen típusú preferenciát a mai vita szellemében szerintem indokolt hasonló természetességgel és automatizmussal szociális és munkaügyi téren is érvényesíteni. A sok tekintetben hasonló tények és érvanyag mentén érdemes lenne törekvéseinket egyesíteni.

Marek Jurek (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Ubóstwo i sytuacja kobiet to są kluczowe kwestie społeczne. Wiemy o tym dobrze w Polsce, dlatego że w tej chwili wprowadzamy pionierski program pomocy dla rodzin, który bardzo poprawi sytuację kobiet. Tylko nie rozumiem, dlaczego do naszego sprawozdania mówiącego o tak ważnych kwestiach skrajna lewica włącza sprawy, które nijak się mają do sprawy, o której mówimy. Dlaczego my w tym sprawozdaniu zwracamy się do państw Europy o uznawanie rodzin LGBTI? Jakże to są rodziny? O jakie rodziny chodzi? Co to jest rodzina biseksualna? Co to jest rodzina interseksualna? W jakim kraju europejskim tego typu zjawiska są uznawane? Bo to nie jest przypadek na przykład *mariage pour tous*. Przecież to są rzeczy, których w ogóle nie zdefiniowaliśmy. Wszystko to pokazuje, że mamy do czynienia z rewolucją, która ma zniszczyć świat, w którym się wychowaliśmy i któremu zawdzięczamy swoją wolność.

Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE). – Señora Presidenta, la pobreza en Europa sigue teniendo rostro de mujer. Accedemos en peores condiciones y con más dificultades al mercado de trabajo. Ganamos menos, y esa brecha se refleja en nuestras pensiones. Asumimos casi solas el cuidado de la familia y las tareas del hogar, y se desperdician, por razón de género, talento y capacidades de las que es un lujo prescindir. Por eso definiendo procedimientos y políticas para garantizar a todas las europeas una renta digna y su acceso a la sanidad y la educación.

Más mujeres en los centros de decisión económica aseguran una mejor gobernanza, más rentabilidad en las empresas, una visión en femenino del mercado laboral, menor pobreza femenina y un mejor futuro para los menores, para quienes apoyamos también una garantía europea.

Por eso rechazo con rotundidad los recortes que la austeridad impone en estos programas, que deberían considerarse una inversión. Por eso definiendo esta Resolución, esta «revolución imprescindible», sobre la que no hablo de memoria, pues Euskadi ocupa la quinta plaza en el índice europeo de igualdad de género gracias a la aplicación de algunas de estas medidas.

João Pimenta Lopes (GUE/NGL). – Senhora Presidente, a União Europeia não pode mais escamotear as consequências das suas políticas neoliberais. O empobrecimento dos povos é apenas uma das faces da implementação das políticas de austeridade, dos memorandos, da governação económica do Semestre Europeu.

Delas resulta que hoje 25 % da população da União Europeia a 28 está em condição de risco de pobreza antes de prestações sociais, mais de 120 milhões de cidadãos. Políticas que agravaram as desigualdades e a exclusão social, com particular impacto sobre as mulheres, que se consumaram em ataques ao papel social do Estado, destruindo e privatizando serviços públicos, atacando os direitos dos trabalhadores e a contratação coletiva.

O combate às desigualdades sociais, à pobreza, à discriminação da mulher e a elevação da sua condição económica e social só pode passar pela rutura com as políticas de exploração, pela valorização dos salários, da regulação e segurança laboral e da contratação coletiva, do aumento da oferta de serviços públicos gratuitos e de qualidade nas áreas da saúde, educação, segurança social, entre outras.

Jordi Sebastià (Verts/ALE). – Señora Presidenta, quiero, ante todo, felicitar a la autora del informe, porque creo que es un informe necesario y valiente. Un informe muy importante que nos transmite un mensaje muy claro. Las políticas de austeridad han sido terribles, políticas de austeridad —no lo olvidemos— dirigidas desde la Comisión Europea. Y han sido todavía más terribles para las mujeres. Las mujeres son mucho más vulnerables al cierre de los servicios públicos, la educación, la sanidad, los servicios sociales y la justicia. Lo sufren mucho más, y esto demuestra que esa igualdad de la que tan contentos estamos en la Unión Europea es realmente solo un espejismo. No hay igualdad. Hay muchísimo camino que recorrer, y estamos hablando de millones de personas, de millones de mujeres que se sienten discriminadas y que sufren más porque las políticas de igualdad se quedan en el papel, se quedan en la teoría y no se aplican.

Espero que mañana esto se apruebe con mucho margen y que esas recomendaciones que hay en el informe sean tomadas en cuenta por la Comisión Europea.

Jonathan Arnott (EFDD). – Madam President, it is good to see the European Parliament debating gender discrimination and poverty tonight, although you would think they might have allocated more than five minutes for such an important debate.

I note, for example, that all of the top seven EU jobs are currently held by men, so the EU certainly has a little bit of a way to go in this respect, whereas the UK has, of course, led the way in many of these issues – for example in science and research, where the UK leads the way in terms of having 6 of the top 25 universities in the world, but also the percentage of women in science and research jobs are much higher than across the European Union.

We had our Equal Pay Act in 1970 — three years before we even joined the European Union, and well before the European Union legislated. We have 52 weeks of maternity leave guaranteed in UK law, compared with the EU requirement of 14. In fact, EU rules put car insurance premiums for women up by GBP 300 a year. So is the EU really part of the solution, or is it actually part of the problem?

Janusz Korwin-Mikke (NI). – Ja chciałem przede wszystkim zauważyć, że kolega powiedział, że w Europie żyje 120 milionów ludzi biednych, a pani sprawozdawczyni powiedziała, że jest 29 milionów kobiet żyjących w ubóstwie. Z tego wynika, że mężczyźni żyjących w ubóstwie jest 91 milionów i nie wiem, dlaczego zajmujemy się akurat kobietami. Ale nie w tym rzecz: chciałem powiedzieć, że kobiety samotne żyją w ubóstwie, ponieważ nie nauczono ich, że mają być dobrymi matkami, nie nauczono ich, że mają być dobrymi żonami, tylko w szkołach uczono ich zupełnie niepotrzebnych rzeczy, między innymi uczono ich teorii gender.

Maria Arena, rapporteur. – Madame la Présidente, notre collègue n'a pas été attentif aux chiffres. Sur 120 millions de femmes au total, 64 millions vivent aujourd'hui dans la pauvreté. Les 27 millions concernaient les enfants pauvres en Europe.

Dubravka Šuica (PPE). – Gospođo potpredsjednice, hvala lijepo što ste mi dali riječ iz razloga što sam bila izvjestiteljica u sjeni kod ovog izvješća. Gospođa Arena i ja smo jako dobro surađivale i u ovom izvješću se nalazi niz dobrih stvari koje se tiču siromaštva žena i uzroka siromaštva žena. Podaci su zaista alarmantni.

Međutim, nažalost, usprkos tome što smo dobro surađivale, nismo uspjeli postići kompromise i niti ja niti moja grupa nećemo moći podržati ovo izvješće iz razloga što sadrži niz osjetljivih tema koje ne bi trebale biti predmetom ovog izvješća, koje nisu direktno ili indirektno u vezi s uzrocima siromaštva žena, a radi se o stavkama koje nisu u skladu s vrijednostima koje baštini Europska pučka stranka niti su u vezi s uzrocima siromaštva žena.

Posebno se tu referiram na supsidijarnost i na neke teme za koje zaista smatram da nisu trebale biti dijelom ovog izvješća. To je razlog iz kojeg nećemo moći podržati ovo izvješće, premda jesmo za eliminiranje uzroka siromaštva žena.

Romana Tomc (PPE). – Že več let se v Evropski uniji ukvarjamo z revščino, s to problematiko, s socialno izključenostjo in v naši politični skupini se zavzemamo, seveda, proti vsem oblikam revščine. Ampak dejstvo je, da so ženske bolj ogrožene in še vedno precej diskriminirane, zato je prav, da se z njimi še posebej ukvarjamo.

Nekateri deli poročila so zelo dobri in jih bom lahko podprla. Vendar se mi zdi nesprejemljivo, da v resolucijah, ki imajo sicer dober namen in jih potrebujemo, vedno znova vnašamo ideološke teme. To je res nesprejemljivo.

Politike trga dela moramo oblikovati tako, da bodo vsem zagotovljene enake možnosti pri zaposlovanju, socialni varnosti, plačah in vseh drugih. Nobena diskriminacija ni dobra – ne negativna, ne pozitivna. Ker pa ste zanemarili tudi pravilo subsidiarnosti, tako kot so že ostali kolegi povedali in poudarili, tega poročila ne bomo mogli podpreti.

A „Catch the eye” eljárs vége

Jonathan Hill, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, I'd like to start by thanking the rapporteur, Ms Arena, for her report on gender inequality in the world of work and on the implications that this has for our society. I would also like to thank her for setting out the recommendations in the report so clearly.

While the female employment rate has increased to just above 64% in 2015, women's lower earnings and under-representation in the labour market continues to mean that their financial situation is less secure than men's. As we heard, many more women than men are living in poverty in the EU and – as she explained – the risk of poverty is especially high among single mothers, and also among older women. Women's lower pay and the fact that they often do part-time work and take gaps in their careers often leads to gender pension gaps; women's pensions are 40% lower than men's and, of course, women are less likely to have a pension at all.

In June last year, the Council agreed some conclusions on the gender pension gap, and these called for work to continue to narrow this gap, and for Member States' social and employment policies to be assessed as part of the European Semester process.

Last December, the Commission published a strategic engagement for gender equality that set out the overall framework for European initiatives that were aimed at improving gender equality and, in that, priority areas included increasing the numbers of women in work, reducing the gender pay gap and the pension gap, and also making women more financially independent. We continue to keep a close eye on these issues and we have provided country specific recommendations to those that face the greatest challenges.

As set out in your report, adequate work-life balance policies are needed so that women who want to can play a full part in the labour market. Last year, the Commission launched a 'new start' initiative to improve work-life balance for parents and other people caring for family members. That looks at a range of measures to promote adequate leave and flexible working arrangements and to support affordable professional care services. The second phase of the consultation will be launched shortly, on the legislative parts of the 'new start' initiative, and my colleagues will be tabling proposals on that by the end of the year.

The Commission's plans to create a European pillar of social rights have gender equality also at their heart. The draft pillar that's now been agreed for wider consultation puts the emphasis on improving the situation of women in the labour market. I think that fairness, which lies at the heart of this report, is central to the Commission's agenda, and the principle that no one should be left behind will continue to drive forward our work to support greater gender equality in Europe.

Elnök asszony. – A vitát lezárom.

A szavazásra 2016. május 26-án, csütörtökön kerül sor.

Írásbeli nyilatkozatok (162. cikk)

Hugues Bayet (S&D), *par écrit*. – Les chiffres d'Eurostat démontrent que le nombre de femmes en situation de pauvreté est, de manière constante, plus élevé que celui des hommes avec, actuellement, environ 64,6 millions de femmes et 57,6 millions d'hommes. Il est par ailleurs clair, comme le rappelle cette résolution de ma collègue Marie Arena, que les politiques d'austérité n'ont fait qu'accentuer cet écart ces dernières années.

La résolution insiste notamment sur la priorité qui existe de fixer des conditions de travail favorables à la vie familiale. De même les Députés invitent la Commission, en coordination étroite avec les États membres à entreprendre une action législative globale et complète afin de répondre aux besoins des mères et des pères concernant les différents types de congé. La résolution souligne aussi l'importance majeure des services publics de prise en charge et de qualité notamment pour favoriser l'intégration de groupe de femmes socialement marginalisées.

En ce qui concerne plus particulièrement la lutte contre la pauvreté des femmes la résolution demande notamment de développer les mécanismes d'aide et de tarification sociale des plus démunis, d'autonomiser les filles dans la vie sociale, économique, culturelle et politique ou encore de promouvoir activement une image positive des mères employées et lutter contre le phénomène de «pénalisation de la maternité» identifié par plusieurs études.

João Ferreira (GUE/NGL), por escrito. – A União Europeia pura e simplesmente não pode escamotear as consequências das suas políticas neoliberais. O empobrecimento dos trabalhadores e dos povos é apenas uma das faces da implementação das políticas ditas de austeridade, dos memorandos, da governação económica, do Semestre Europeu. A outra é a acumulação e a concentração capitalistas, o engordar dos monopólios. 25 % da população da UE-28 está em risco de pobreza antes das prestações sociais, mais de 120 milhões de cidadãos. As políticas da UE agravaram as desigualdades e a exclusão social, com particular impacto sobre as mulheres: os ataques ao papel social do Estado, destruindo e privatizando serviços públicos, atacando os direitos dos trabalhadores e a contratação coletiva. O combate às desigualdades sociais, à pobreza, à discriminação da Mulher e a elevação da sua condição económica e social só pode passar pela rotura com as políticas de exploração, pela valorização de salários, pelos direitos e segurança laboral, pela contratação coletiva, pelo aumento da oferta de serviços públicos gratuitos e de qualidade nas áreas da saúde, da educação, da segurança social, entre outros, o que exige uma rotura clara com as políticas da UE.

Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D), písomne. – Po rokoch šetrenia ako neúčinného receptu na boj s hospodárskou krízou sa konečne treba oveľa viac sústrediť na potreby tých najzraniteľnejších. Z hľadiska ohrozenia chudobou sú takouto skupinou preukázateľne ženy. Boj proti ich chudobe je pritom otázkou sociálnej spravodlivosti. Účinné opatrenia na zlepšovanie životnej úrovne žien – matiek zároveň znižujú hrozby súvisiace s chudobou detí. Pretrvávajúcim problémom sú neobhájiteľne vysoké rozdiely v ich odmeňovaní v porovnaní s mužmi, ktoré sa v priemere blížia takmer k 20 %. To sa následne v ešte výraznejšej miere premieta do rozdielnej výšky dôchodkov. Tie majú ženy aj o viac ako tretinu nižšie. Ide skutočne o začarovaný kruh, ktorý je už konečne potrebné preťať. Opatrenia pritom musia byť pozitívne cielené smerom k ženám. Tak na európskej, ako aj národnej úrovni musíme ísť cestou pevne stanovených priorít s jednoznačnými, vykonateľnými postihmi v prípade ich neplnenia. V opačnom prípade budú neprávosti týkajúce sa odmeňovania žien pretrvávať ďalšie desaťročia.

Iratxe García Pérez (S&D), por escrito. – La crisis económica y las políticas de austeridad han producido un aumento del número de personas expuestas a la pobreza y la exclusión social, afectando a más mujeres (64,6 millones) que a hombres (57,6 millones). Y es que las mujeres siguen estando sobrerrepresentadas en el trabajo precario, se ven abocadas a interrupciones de su carrera profesional para cuidar de sus hijos y otros familiares dependientes ante la falta de normas eficaces de conciliación de la vida laboral y familiar, ocupan puestos peor remunerados, muchas veces a consecuencia de estereotipos sexistas, y copan los empleos a tiempo parcial, no por libre elección, sino más bien forzadas por la necesidad de tener que cuidar de sus familiares. Además, existe una brecha salarial que se mantiene y que resulta muy difícil erradicar. Todo ello supone que las mujeres reciben remuneraciones más bajas que los hombres, que se traducen también en pensiones menores. Para luchar contra la pobreza femenina es necesario adoptar con urgencia medidas para mejorar la conciliación, luchar contra los estereotipos, reducir la brecha salarial y facilitar la integración y permanencia de las mujeres en el mercado laboral.

Jaromír Kohlíček (GUE/NGL), písemně. – Výsledky statistik nás informují o řadě zajímavých věcí. Historicky se vždy rodilo poněkud více chlapců, ale úmrtnost mezi chlapci je vyšší než mezi dívkami, a proto se již v poměrně časném věku jejich počty vyrovnávají. Ženy prakticky všude na světě mají ve společnostech, které nežijí v extrémní chudobě, výrazně delší dobu dožití. V rozvinutých společnostech, v takzvané bohatých státech, se setkáváme s tím, že ženy mají vyšší vzdělání než muži. Přesto stále zůstává nerovnost v péči o rodinu a s ní spojená nerovnost v postupu v zaměstnání. Od tohoto jevu se pak odvíjí i větší ohrožení chudobou u žen než u mužů, a to ve všech věkových kategoriích. V posledních letech pozorujeme v řadě států nový jev – pracující chudobu. Fakt, že i v některých státech EU minimální mzda nedosahuje ani hranici sociální nouze je jasnou obžalobou současného ekonomického systému. Kapitalismus, který vyzývá volnou soutěž, není schopen vyřešit problém chudoby. Přes veškerá opatření, ať už investice v sociální oblasti nebo legislativní kroky k zrovnoprávnění mužů a žen na trhu práce zůstává zvýšené ohrožení žen faktem. Návrh usnesení se snaží vnést do tohoto špatně fungujícího systému pozitivní korektury. Neřeší sice podstatu problému,

přesto návrh usnesení skupina GUE podporuje.

Νότης Μαρίας (ECR), γραπτώς. – Στην περίοδο της χρηματοοικονομικής κρίσης που διανύουμε, και κυρίως στις χώρες που έχουν φτωχοποιηθεί από τα μνημόνια, οι γυναίκες είναι τα μεγαλύτερα θύματα, εφόσον τα δικαιώματά τους θίγονται καθημερινά τόσο σε κοινωνικό όσο και σε εργασιακό επίπεδο.

Σύμφωνα με πρόσφατα στοιχεία της Eurostat, ο αριθμός των γυναικών σε κατάσταση φτώχειας υπερβαίνει εκείνο των αντρών, με 64.6 εκατομμύρια γυναίκες να βρίσκονται σε κατάσταση φτώχειας έναντι 57.6 εκατομμυρίων αντρών. Γενικότερα, οι γυναίκες στα περισσότερα κράτη-μέλη της Ε.Ε. πλήττονται περισσότερο από ό,τι οι άντρες-ειδικά όταν πρόκειται για μητέρες και συνταξιούχους, ενώ υπερεκπροσωπούνται στις θέσεις μερικής απασχόλησης και επισφαλούς εργασίας.

Προκειμένου να σταματήσουν οι ανισότητες ανάμεσα στα δύο φύλα και να μειωθούν τα υψηλά ποσοστά φτώχειας, θα πρέπει η Ε.Ε. να δώσει τέλος στις πολιτικές λιτότητας που επιβάλλει στις χώρες-μέλη της. Μάλιστα, η βίαιη δημοσιονομική προσαρμογή που εφαρμόζεται στην Ελλάδα με το τρίτο μνημόνιο, εντείνει ακόμα περισσότερο τις ανισότητες των δύο φύλων και θίγει ανεπανόρθωτα τα δικαιώματα των γυναικών.

Alessia Maria Mosca (S&D), per iscritto. – Considerando che il fenomeno della povertà colpisce sensibilmente più donne che uomini – in Europa ne soffrono 64,6 milioni di donne – e consci del fatto che l'ineguaglianza di genere, oltre che discriminare il genere femminile, rappresenta un freno alla crescita e allo sviluppo economico, e valutata la crescente disuguaglianza, causata dalla crisi economica e dalle politiche di austerità, che colpisce in modo particolare le fasce più vulnerabili, esprimiamo un forte sostegno alla relazione Arena. Con questo voto poniamo, quindi, l'accento sull'importanza della prospettiva di genere nella determinazione delle misure sociali. In particolare, rileviamo la forte necessità d'inclusione del genere femminile durante le fasi formative e professionali. Con sgomento, prendiamo, infatti, atto del fatto che i maggiori tassi di scolarizzazione e successo a livello accademico delle donne si traducano in percentuali di occupazione e livelli salariali inferiori rispetto a quelli del genere maschile. Il divario pensionistico fra i due generi è, inoltre, frutto di carriere molto più frammentarie per le lavoratrici, costrette, in un ambiente ostile, a destreggiarsi fra carriera professionale e cure familiari. Gli Stati membri e l'Unione europea devono dare atto degli scarsi progressi e incrementare i propri sforzi per garantire a tutti, senza distinzione di genere, pari opportunità e giustizia sociale.

Evelyn Regner (S&D), schriftlich. – Die andauernde Sparpolitik der letzten Jahre im Sozialbereich sowie das immer noch bestehende *gender pay gap* belasten besonders Europas Frauen und machen sie so zu den größten Verliererinnen der Wirtschaftskrise. Tatsache ist, dass rund 65 Millionen Frauen EU-weit von Armut und sozialer Ausgrenzung betroffen sind, demgegenüber stehen 58 Millionen Männer. Armut in Europa ist weiblich. Wir müssen hier spezifische Maßnahmen ergreifen, die Hauptauslöser von Frauenarmut konkret benennen und sie wirksam bekämpfen.

Der angenommene Bericht meiner sozialdemokratischen Kollegin Maria Arena stellt Weichen zur wirksamen Bekämpfung von Frauenarmut, die es unbedingt umzusetzen gilt, wenn wir dieses Problem europäisch lösen wollen. Vor allem eines ist wichtig: Investitionen in die soziale Infrastruktur anzukurbeln. Gerade im Bereich der Kinderbetreuung und Pflege von Angehörigen besteht erhöhter Bedarf an finanziellen Mitteln, um Frauen wirksam entlasten zu können. Auch Chancengleichheit ist hier von fundamentaler Bedeutung, denn für den uneingeschränkten Zugang aller zu qualitativ hochwertiger öffentlicher Bildung und Dienstleistungen muss ebenso gesorgt sein.

Europa hat jetzt aktiv zu handeln, um den Armutskreislauf der nächsten Generationen und von deren Kindern zu stoppen. Frauenrechte stärken muss heißen, Gleichstellung zu verwirklichen, aber eben genauso Chancengleichheit und den Schutz vor geschlechtsspezifischer Armut zu gewährleisten. Deswegen: Meine volle Unterstützung für den Bericht.

Marc Tarabella (S&D), par écrit. – Dans l'Union Européenne, la pauvreté touche un plus grand nombre de femmes que d'hommes. En effet, 64,6 millions de femmes en souffrent, contre 57,6 millions d'hommes. Il est également important de relever que les familles monoparentales sont plus exposées à la pauvreté et à l'exclusion sociale. La crise économique et les différentes politiques d'austérité qui l'ont succédée ces dernières années n'ont fait qu'aggraver la situation en exacerbant les inégalités.

Pour briser cette dynamique, il est à présent primordial que des conditions de travail favorables à la vie familiale, telles que des horaires de travail adaptables et la possibilité de recourir au télétravail soient mises en place afin de s'assurer que les femmes puissent être aussi actives que les hommes sur le marché du travail. Je plaide également pour qu'une action législative européenne puisse répondre aux besoins des pères et des mères au sujet des différents types de congé, qu'il s'agisse du congé de maternité, du congé de paternité, du congé parental et du congé pour les soignants.

Ivo Vajgl (ALDE), pisno. – Odločno podpiram poziv Evropski komisiji, naj opravi oceno učinka shem minimalnega dohodka EU in preuči nadaljnje ukrepe. Med temi ukrepi mora biti nujno tudi analiza stanja in predlog ukrepov na področju minimalnih nacionalnih pokojnin, ki ne smejo biti nižje od praga tveganja revščine.

Vse večje siromašenje starejše populacije (še posebej starejših žensk) namreč zahteva takojšnje ukrepe, ki bodo revnim starejšim vrnilo človekovo dostojanstvo in spodobno kvaliteto njihovega življenja. Z revščino med starejšimi generacijami je namreč tudi neposredno povezano označevanje starejših kot strošek družbe, ki lokalnim skupnostim, državam članicam in Evropski uniji predstavlja zgolj velik finančni - proračunski problem.

Zato je dolžnost političnih odločevalcev, da odločno rečemo NE tej vrsti stigmatiziranja starejših in končno pristopimo k sprejemanju odločitev, ki bodo v prid medgeneracijskemu spoštovanju in zagotavljanju mirnejše starosti tudi za danes mlajše generacije. Spoštovani, prišel je čas, ko bomo morali odločneje spregovoriti tudi o bolj obvezujočem dokumentu, katerega namen bo mednarodna zaščita pravic starejših.

Poziv državam članicam k sprejetju odločitev glede minimalnih pokojnin zato po mojem mnenju predstavlja tudi pomemben prispevek k razmišljanju, da so starejši ranljiva družbena skupina, katere pravice moramo zaščititi tudi na nivoju Evropske unije in širše.

Beatrix von Storch (EFDD), schriftlich. – Mit diesem Initiativ-Bericht beleidigt der Frauenausschuss des EU-Parlaments alle Personen und Familien, die tatsächlich in großer Armut leben. Hier geht es nicht um Armutsbekämpfung, sondern um ideologische Erziehungsmaßnahmen durch die EU. Das zeigt auch das Selbstverständnis der Berichterstatterin: Das Grundprinzip „Hilfe zur Selbsthilfe“ zur Armutsbekämpfung zieht sie gar nicht erst in Erwägung. Armutsbekämpfung für Frauen ist hier nur ein Vorwand, denn der Frauenausschuss kümmert sich nicht um die Ärmsten in ihrer Gesamtheit, sondern vorzugsweise um lesbische, bisexuelle und Transgender-Frauen und ihre sexuelle Ausrichtung oder ihre Geschlechtsidentität im Zusammenhang mit sozialpolitischen Maßnahmen.

23. Necolné prekážky obchodu na jednotnom trhu (stručná prezentácia)

Elnök asszony. – A következő pont Daniel Dalton jelentésének rövid ismertetése: Az egységes piac nem válmjellegű akadályai (2015/2346(INI)) (A8-0160/2016).

Daniel Dalton, rapporteur. – Madam President, the single market has been a significant achievement. It's more integrated than India's market and that's not bad considering we have got 28 countries. But although tariffs have gone, non-tariff barriers (NTBs) still exist. We need a proper single market that delivers for consumers and for all businesses. At the moment the single market works for big businesses. They have the economies of scale and the wealth to get around barriers to trade that small companies do not – they just give up.

As I've gone around my constituency from Stratford to Stoke, small businesses tell me that they often find it much easier to trade with Canada or the US than they do with France or Germany. Artificial barriers and red tape block the free movement of goods and services. So they give up and we lose that trade, and then they watch big companies come in and take over that trade. This fuels a feeling that Europe is just for big business and not for the little guys.

At the same time, consumers lose out. They don't get a wider choice of products or lower prices through economies of scale that the single market should give them. We know the problem and we've been trying to solve it for years, but we haven't looked at it from the perspective of international trade. It is sometimes forgotten in this house that trading in another EU country is still international trade and it involves different rules, different regulations and different languages.

This is what this report is about. It is trying to identify technical barriers to trade within the internal market. Now the term 'non-tariff barriers' is well-known in international trade, but it's fair to say that we had quite a lot of discussion about what it is and what it isn't within this house, and the definition was tricky to agree on. But one thing that isn't a non-tariff barrier is workers and social rights. Let's be clear about that. These apply to everyone in a country and they are non-discriminatory. Nor is it an NTB when governments legislate for legitimate public policy reasons, but their actions should be proportionate. So it is not a non-tariff barrier if an action is proportionate, non-discriminatory and serves a legitimate public policy objective. But protectionism isn't fair; it kills jobs, it kills growth and it kills competitiveness and it penalises consumers. It exists in a variety of sectors within Europe, and we would challenge third countries if they employed such methods.

Now I believe in competition, and I believe in different economic and regulatory models in EU countries is a good thing as it allows countries to have competitive advantages. This isn't about harmonization, but where there are problems we've got to highlight them, and we found problems in a number of sectors, including retail, construction and professional services, to name a few, and we need to address them. Lack of mutual recognition of testing on goods or professional qualifications is a key example. Do taps really need to be tested 28 times to be sold in 28 different EU countries? Why are British kit cars with type approvals not allowed to be sold in Belgium, for example? Why does a UK hairdresser with 30 years' experience have to train for 4 years to be a hairdresser in Germany? It makes no sense. Why does an Austrian ski instructor have to retrain to be an instructor in France? It makes no sense. Why does an online betting company have to have an offline establishment to trade in another country? Why are there fees on global income for supermarkets in Eastern Europe which only hit foreign companies. These are Europeans blocking other Europeans; there's no solidarity here at all.

Now we don't need new legislation. We need a change in mindset in national ministries and we need better and clearer enforcement of single market rules by the Commission. We need more collaboration between Member States and we've identified these gaps in the report with regard to goods, but I think it's in services where there are real problems. The notification regime under the Services Directive is a prime example of where Member States have not matched their commitments. The single market should be a partnership between countries and their governments should commit with their actions.

As we've seen with this report, Parliament is fully behind this objective, and I hope the Commission is too. It won't be easy but it's in all our long-term interests, and I hope this report will provide a new impetus to tear down barriers and create a free single market that delivers for businesses – both big and small – for consumers and for workers.

„Catch the eye” eljárás

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Já bych se v rámci jednotného vnitřního trhu věnoval aspektu právě hospodářské soutěže, jak zmínil i můj předřečník.

Podle mého názoru právě to je věc, kde musíme důsledně trvat na našich hodnotách, na postupech a pravidlech, která v EU platí. Já jsem přesvědčen, že pokud má být docíleno obecně konkurenceschopnosti právě nejenom těch velkých podniků, ale i těch malých, tak musíme trvat právě na hodnotách konkurenceschopné hospodářské soutěže. Musím říci, že v tomto tématu bohužel mám pocit, že i třeba Evropská komise do jisté míry pokulhává, protože například včera bylo oznámeno, že Evropská komise povolila sloučení dvou světových producentů piva, jedničky s dvojkou, při jakémśi vymezení některých pivovarů, které se musejí z tohoto společného podniku vytlačit. Znamená to vytvoření 30 % gigantu světové produkce piva. Já nevím, jestli toto je v souladu s hospodářskou politikou a s politikou jednotného trhu.

Tibor Szanyi (S&D). – Ez a jelentés újból ráébredtet bennünket arra, hogy a nem vámjellegű akadályok visszaszorításának útjában rendre a nagy gazdasági és politikai befolyással rendelkező termelők érdekeit szolgáló kormányok vannak, amelyek a nem vámjellegű akadályok gyakran önkényes bevetését egyfajta politikai, taktikai eszközüknek tekintik. Természetesen a józan ész és a szubszidiaritás elve is megköveteli, hogy indokolt esetben, időkeretben és helyen a nem vámjellegű eszközök alkalmazására a jövőben is lehetőség nyíljon. Ideje azonban, hogy ennek elsődleges szempontja az EU egész területén a helyi kis- és közepes vállalkozók, valamint a fogyasztók érdeke, és ennek keretében az egészséges, minőségi és árverseny előmozdítása legyen.

A frusztráló, több évtizedes lemaradást a nem vámjellegű akadályok korlátozása terén csak ilyen, szociális és politikai oldalról is alátámasztott kereskedelempolitikai szemlélet segítségével lehet pótolni.

Νότης Μαρίας (ECR). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, η ενιαία ευρωπαϊκή αγορά ενίσχυσε κατά πολύ τις μεγάλες επιχειρήσεις και βιομηχανίες του Βορρά. Μάλιστα, αυτές ουδόλως επένδυσαν τα κέρδη τους στις χώρες του ευρωπαϊκού Νότου ώστε να υπάρξει ανάπτυξη και μείωση των δημοσίων ελλειμμάτων και χρεών.

Στη συγκυρία που διανύουμε σήμερα, με τα πλεονάσματα ρεκόρ της Γερμανίας από τη μια και τα τεράστια ελλείμματα που προκαλούν τα ίδια αυτά τα πλεονάσματα στον Νότο από την άλλη, οι μη δασμολογικοί φραγμοί αποτελούν το τελευταίο ανάχωμα για πολλούς επαγγελματικούς κλάδους του Νότου, πριν την ολοκληρωτική εξαφάνισή τους. Συνεπώς, το μόνο που θα πετύχει η υπό συζήτηση περαιτέρω απορρύθμιση είναι η ραγδαία αύξηση των ανισοτήτων μεταξύ των κρατών μελών.

Ο μύθος ότι η απορρύθμιση τονώνει την ανάπτυξη κι αυξάνει τις θέσεις εργασίας πρέπει επιτέλους να σταματήσει. Οι πολιτικές αποφάσεις της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης δεν μπορεί να κατευθύνονται με μύθους. Οι μη δασμολογικοί φραγμοί και οι περιορισμοί είναι εργαλεία των κρατών για να ελέγχουν και να κατευθύνουν τις οικονομίες τους με τρόπο ανεξάρτητο. Η επικουρικότητα και ο σεβασμός της πολυεπίπεδης διακυβέρνησης είναι αναγνωρισμένες αρχές της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης και η στρατηγική της ενιαίας αγοράς οφείλει να τις σεβαστεί.

A „Catch the eye” eljárás vége

Jonathan Hill, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, I would like to thank Mr Dalton for this report on non-tariff barriers in the single market. I was grateful to him for the way he set out his arguments in a way – if I may say so – that I found very convincing. I think that we are all clear that deepening the single market is the best way not just to improve the investment climate, the business environment and the productivity of the EU economy, but also to improve service to consumers and to our fellow citizens. As he said about the importance as well of making the single market work for small businesses, as a former small businessman myself, that's a sentiment that I share entirely.

I think although we have successfully removed tariff barriers to trade across the European Union, it's right that there are still too many non-tariff barriers in the way of the proper development of the single market, and those are the focus of our work today and of the communication on the single market that we are set to adopt in June. This will set out our approach to making sure that agreed legislation is consistently enforced across the EU, and I agree with the importance of enforcement, as well as a series of more targeted actions to make sure that the single market is working as well as it can.

So, for example, we will present an EU-wide action plan to ensure the mutual recognition of goods is respected, we will revise the mutual recognition regulation – and the goal is that more companies should know their rights and make the most of the opportunities that mutual recognition could create for their businesses. We want authorities to be aware of their obligations and to apply mutual recognition properly, and we also want to create a culture of mutual recognition that's based on trust and legal certainty across Europe.

We will be taking action to deepen the single market for services, and here I think that digitalisation offers great new opportunities. The free movement of services is of course enshrined in our Treaties. It is fundamental to the single market, but our analysis shows that providing services across European borders or setting up a branch or a subsidiary in another Member State could be simplified further. The Commission estimates that more ambitious implementation of the Services Directive could add 1.8% to EU GDP. So it's a price worth having.

We want to make the provision of services easier inside the EU. We are developing the services passport, which is a voluntary electronic procedure to reduce the burden for service providers who want access other Member States' markets. In my own area of financial services we are working to build a single market for capital in Europe – the capital markets union – and at the heart of that project is the goal of channelling investment to projects that need financing. So, to make it easier for companies to invest, we will bring forward proposals to reduce non-tariff barriers that complicate cross-border investment, like differences in insolvency law for example. I think the way to approach this is to identify the barriers that there are to cross-border sale of services, identify those barriers one by one with Member States and work out ways to address them.

I am looking forward to working with the European Parliament in all these areas to take the single market further and to support competition, to support investment and to support growth in Europe. I hope, like the rapporteur, that this report will give us impetus and some of the evidence as well that will help guide us in our work.

Elnök asszony. – A vitát lezárom.

A szavazásra 2016. május 26-án, csütörtökön kerül sor.

Irásbeli nyilatkozatok (162. cikk)

Danuta Jazłowiecka (PPE), na piśmie. – Szanowni Państwo! Jednolity rynek, będący przecież jednym z najważniejszych osiągnięć zjednoczonej Europy, nie funkcjonuje w pełni we wszystkich swoich wymiarach. O ile udało nam się wyeliminować bariery taryfowe, to nadal ogromny problem stanowią wprowadzane bariery pozataryfowe. Należy jednak pamiętać, co zostało wyraźnie podkreślone w sprawozdaniu, iż część z nich służy realizacji polityk publicznych w państwach członkowskich i ich usunięcie jest niewskazane. Problemem są jednak wszelkie protekcyjnistyczne działania, które mają na celu ochronę rodzimych firm przed konkurencją zagraniczną. Do takich działań można zaliczyć mnożenie wymogów formalnych i biurokratycznych wobec firm z innych państw członkowskich czy stosowanie nadmiernej nieuzasadnionej kontroli podmiotów gospodarczych, co skutecznie zniechęca przedsiębiorców do eksportowania swoich dóbr czy usług. Działania takie są ze szkodą dla całej Unii Europejskiej i osłabiają konkurencyjność jednolitego rynku.

Zgadzam się ze sprawozdawcą, że podstawy prawne do pełnego funkcjonowania jednolitego rynku w zasadzie są już ukształtowane. Dlatego niezbędne jest, abyśmy wszyscy – politycy i przedsiębiorcy – zaczęli postrzegać rynek europejski jako spójną całość i dostrzegać w nim szanse na wykorzystanie w pełni potencjału krajowych gospodarek.

24. Virtuálne meny (stručná prezentácia)

Elnök asszony. – A következő pont Jakob von Weizsäcker jelentésének rövid ismertetése: Virtuális pénznemek (2016/2007(INI)) (A8-0168/2016).

Jakob von Weizsäcker, rapporteur. – Madam President, this the last item of the day and visibly I am speaking not as a backbencher, but really from the last bench in this house. Furthermore, it's a technical subject; it's virtual currencies and distributed ledger technology, so one would be forgiven by thinking well, this is a dull and somniferous subject that perhaps will gently put us into sleep at this late hour of the day, but of course one would be wrong, because this new technology has a lot of promise; it has a lot of potential. Some people even liken it to the kind of revolution that was sparked by the introduction of the internet, and I have to say – although not all my fellow shadow rapporteurs are here – we had a very exciting, very interesting and frankly very enjoyable time exploring this particular subject.

Let me briefly explain to you what this is about. Fundamentally what this is about, this distributed ledger technology that underlies the bitcoin, which is the most prominent virtual currency, is a decentralised database that keeps a record of any sort of transaction done within that database in a way that is surprisingly safe, resilient and trustworthy even – and that's particularly interesting – when there's no central authority in play. This technology can be used – as the title of the initiative report would suggest – for virtual currencies and in order to reduce the cost of financial transactions significantly.

Some of you may have wondered why it is so much cheaper to send an email or an SMS than to transfer funds, for example from somebody working in one country and sending remittances back home, because in the end this transfer of funds is not much more than an electronic message even today, but still it can be rather expensive – 7% or 8% of the funds transferred. This technology could help us to reduce these transaction costs significantly in the long run, and I think that if we regulate well we might even have open-access electronic wallets where the transfer of funds would be decided by some sort of least-cost routing.

But of course there are also other applications than virtual currencies. You could use this for clearing and settlement, automatic contracts – for example implementing derivatives on the distributed ledger – far beyond the financial sector. You could use it for digital rights management, for music, films or electronic football tickets. If you want to resell these today there might be a danger that you resell them and then the first person who bought them gets into the stadium and the others are kept outside because they bought the same tickets. This is something you could deal with using distributed ledger technology. It could also be an interesting area for government applications – fighting VAT fraud or using it to implement an innovative land register.

Of course, with such new technology it is early days; we are not at a stage where the risks that come with any such technology are systemic. So what we advocate in the report is not to stifle innovation by regulating now, but instead to closely monitor what is going on by the creation of a taskforce which we suggest should be created at the level of the Commission, and then to regulate – if and when the time is right to do so and if and when the structures to do so are in place. That of course doesn't mean that we shouldn't do anything right now. For example, in the report we greatly welcome the suggestion of the Commission to apply the Anti-Money Laundering Directive immediately for virtual currencies.

„Catch the eye” eljárás

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Já se přiznám, že v této věci jsem se seznámil se zprávou právě z důvodu určitého studijního zájmu. Děkuji panu zpravodajovi, jak nám představil tuto zprávu, a musím říci, že na ní si cením to, že zmiňuje nejen ta negativa, ale i ta pozitiva. Já se ve své minutě nemůžu věnovat bohužel těm pozitivům, takže v rámci těch negativ. Já pokládám za poněkud sporné, zdali můžeme do finančního systému připustit určitý prvek, který může mít v sobě povahu miny, který může skutečně vybuchnout, protože má na sebe navázány různé instrumenty finančního systému. Jenom pokud zmíním dvě negativa. Tyto virtuální měny mohou krýt právě transakce na černém trhu a legalizovat výnosy z trestné činnosti. Hrozí vysoká volatilita těchto virtuálních měn a potenciál pro spekulativní bubliny. To jsou mé myslím rizika, která musí volat po předvídatelné regulaci, která bude napřed, ne až poté.

Nicola Caputo (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, le valute virtuali occupano uno spazio sempre maggiore nella nostra economia. Personalmente, avanzo dubbi, allo stato dell'arte della tecnologia, del livello di sicurezza delle transazioni finanziarie e dell'aumento del *cybercrime*, sulla loro diffusione concorrente o coordinata con la moneta tradizionale o sul loro utilizzo generalizzato nei mercati finanziari.

Non è solo un sistema di pagamento, come la carta di credito, ma sfrutta il cosiddetto *mining* per battere moneta. La sua sicurezza si basa sui protocolli estremi di crittazione e su un software *open source*: le cautele della relazione hanno quindi matrice comune. I mercati valutari e finanziari non sono pronti a questa rivoluzione e quelli bancari non la vogliono: le banche, in quanto tale moneta rende più economiche le transazioni; i mercati valutari per l'enorme volatilità del titolo che può destabilizzare i mercati.

I grandi assenti sono proprio le istituzioni, le quali incomprensibilmente non colmano il gap tecnologico e nemmeno si preoccupano di regolamentarne la diffusione da subito, nonostante questi sistemi possano seriamente mettere in crisi le economie mondiali, molto più dei *subprime*.

Ivan Jakovčić (ALDE). – Gospodo predsjednice, da li je naša budućnost virtualna valuta? Da li je naša budućnost kriptovaluta, digitalni novac, bitcoin, kako god to nazivali, zaista je veliko pitanje? I svi si ga s pravom postavljamo.

Međutim, želim istaknuti da je zanimljivo da procjene govore da oko dva milijuna ljudi danas koristi taj digitalni novac. Od toga čak 25 000 građana Hrvatske. U tri hrvatska grada postavljeni su bankomati, u Zagrebu, u Splitu i u Rijeci prije nekoliko dana. Zaista vrlo zanimljiva budućnost koja je na neki način u novčarskom svijetu već započela.

Želim naglasiti dva problema. Prvi problem je nestabilnost tečaja i drugi problem je problem štednje jer nitko ne jamči za eventualnu štednju u tom digitalnom, virtualnom novcu. Svi su ostali problemi već navedeni, novi problemi će se pronaći, ali u svakom slučaju želim da se bavimo ovom temom i u skoroj budućnosti.

Kateřina Konečná (GUE/NGL). – Virtuální měny jistě představují velmi zajímavou inovaci, která umožňuje občanům být méně závislí na bankách a jejich často vyděračských poplatcích. Přesto nemůžeme zavírat oči před faktem, že se tím otevírá prostor pro transakce na černém trhu: legalizaci výnosu z trestné činnosti, financování terorismu, daňové podvody a vyhýbání se daňovým povinnostem a další trestnou činností.

Domnívám se, že musíme vyzvat k přiměřené regulaci na úrovni EU, která však nebude v této rané fázi potlačovat inovace ani zbytečně zvyšovat náklady, avšak bude vážně se zabývat výzvami v oblasti regulace, jenž by mohly vyvstat v souvislosti s rozšířením využití virtuálních měn. Doufám, že si i Komise uvědomí, že se pohybuje na velmi tenkém ledě a nevyužije dané situace k většímu dohledu nad občany, kteří se velmi často jen chtějí vymanit z drtivého područí nenasytných bank.

Jonathan Arnott (EFDD). – Madam President, digital currencies are the epitome of the free market at work; they know no borders – whether national borders or European Union borders – and yet they work. They are not backed by some sort of gold standard, and they are something which can be mined online. This is something which is perhaps very strange to a lot of us. Their value fluctuates like any physical currency, and this works in a bubble which is unregulated and pretty much unregulatable.

So what does the European Union do? Well it wants to do the same thing that it does with everything that it does not currently control – it wants to interfere and to regulate. To me, that is completely the wrong approach for anyone to be taking on an issue like this.

Miguel Viegas (GUE/NGL). – As moedas virtuais representam uma tecnologia promissora, sem dúvida, mas que ainda não dá garantias de poder ser considerada como uma moeda com todas as suas prerrogativas. Neste sentido, pensamos que o relatório é equilibrado, procura evitar uma falsa mensagem de total tranquilidade aos potenciais utilizadores deste novo instrumento.

Desde a criação do conceito de *blockchain*, muitas moedas foram criadas, muitas morreram, muitas ainda hão de nascer, outras foram obrigadas compulsivamente a encerrar por darem cobertura a atividades ilícitas. Vivemos ainda um período de incerteza, persistem dúvidas sobre o carácter limitado ou mesmo finito da oferta de moeda, pelo menos no atual formato de mineração. Persistem dúvidas sobre o seu carácter ainda muito volátil.

Acompanhamos, portanto, o relatório que aponta essas insuficiências, mas reconhece a necessidade de acompanhar este fenómeno que desperta já o apetite dos grandes grupos económicos.

A „Catch the eye” eljárás vége

Jonathan Hill, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, I should like to thank Mr von Weizsäcker for this excellent report – and I do not think he needed to fear that he was going to send us to sleep. It is a shame we have not got longer to develop this discussion, but I am sure it is one that we will be able to pursue separately later on, and I am grateful for the work on this technology that underpins virtual currencies, the databases that enable a secure online ledger of transactions to be kept.

I agreed with him wholeheartedly that this is both an important and an exciting area, and I also welcomed the very balanced approach that he advocates that we take, which was not to regulate everything, but to keep an eye on the developments of this, to recognise and embrace the opportunities, but also to be aware that there could be some dangers to which we need to be alert. That is the approach I agree that we need to take.

We have been monitoring this issue for some time as one of the areas of potential risk. We have in recent months accelerated our work in order to investigate some of the concerns raised by the Justice and Home Affairs and Ecofin Councils that virtual currencies could in fact be linked to the financing of illegal or terrorist activities. So I am grateful for the support set out for our plans to bring virtual currency exchange platforms into the scope of the Fourth Anti-Money-Laundering Directive. That proposal is set to be adopted in June; it will ensure that people exchanging virtual currencies for hard currency on exchange platforms can be more easily identified, and it should improve our ability to trace transactions, if the need for that arises.

But, as Mr von Weizsäcker said, while it is crucial that we are attentive to these risks, it is extremely important to remember that the technology that supports virtual currencies has many other uses, and brings with it exciting new opportunities. The distributive ledger technology offers the potential to speed up transactions, to make it simpler and cheaper and safer to gather data and to use it to improve business processes. To give just one example, Blockchain, the technology behind Bitcoin, has recently launched a claims record system for reinsurers, and it will use Blockchain technology to record details of claims, so that insurers and reinsurers can more accurately divide the costs between them.

So we need to keep a careful eye on how the technology is evolving and being in used. In the Commission we plan to set up a FinTech task force to monitor developments in new technologies, including those linked to virtual currencies. We will continue to work with the EBA and ESMA, governments and the European Parliament, and also we need to pursue this internationally, in our work with IOSCO and the FSB. We need to be on top of developments, and if the evidence shows that action is needed, be ready to act, but at the same time, we should not choke off the potential that this technology has.

That is why, for instance, I am very interested in ideas being developed in, for example, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom, to develop a regulatory sandbox, in order to create a space for some of these FinTech developments to be properly considered. I think it has potential to support the collation of safer, more up to date and more reliable data, it has potential to increase the financial sector's competitiveness in Europe, it has the potential to improve customer services, and I look forward to working with Parliament as we monitor and develop our approaches to this important new area.

Elnök asszony. – A vitát lezárom.

A szavazásra 2016. május 26-án, csütörtökön kerül sor.

Írásbeli nyilatkozatok (162. cikk)

Paloma López Bermejo (GUE/NGL), por escrito. – Para nosotros las «monedas virtuales» no son un fenómeno nuevo, pues la existencia de medios de pago «alternativos» tiene una larga historia detrás. También las burbujas asociadas a ellos, aunque la tecnología de las criptomonedas sea relativamente novedosa. En este sentido, nos preocupa que pueda alen-tarse la confusión acerca de la seguridad de su uso por considerarlas un fenómeno nuevo, ya sea obviando que su potencial especulativo o sus limitaciones como medio de pago replican al de cualquier otro instrumento financiero privado o bien avalando su potencial naturaleza monetaria, pese a que se trata de un instrumento de soberanía que no depende de la tecnología, sino del aval del Estado. Por todo ello pensamos que deberían ser reguladas —como mínimo— como los instrumentos financieros cuyas funciones replican, y nos hubiera gustado más claridad en este sentido. De lo contrario, seguimos con la falacia de que los servicios digitales —en este caso financieros— son esencial-mente distintos en su naturaleza, en lugar de velar por que se mantengan los estándares regulatorios conquistados en sus análogos tradicionales.

Laurențiu Rebega (ENF), în scris. – Două aspecte sunt esențiale în discuțiile pe marginea monedelor virtuale. În primul rând, monedele virtuale sunt o necesitate a prezentului în care trăim. Prin prisma ușurinței în utilizare, alături de monedele noastre tradiționale, aceste monede virtuale sunt folosite de către tot mai mulți cetățeni din întreaga lume. Ele oferă avantajul anonimatului tranzacțiilor și un grad sporit de securitate a datelor personale. Al doilea aspect se referă la legalitatea acestor monede, respectiv la crearea unui cadru legislativ coerent, adaptat atât prezentului, cât și viitorului. Actualmente, monedele virtuale nu răspund multor criterii legislative, ceea ce face imposibilă legalizarea acestora în prezent. Totuși, chiar și fără o legislație existentă, tranzacțiile cu monede virtuale se fac facil, iar utilizarea acestora ia amploare, de aceea suntem obligați să pregătim un set de posibile soluții pentru a fi dezbătute. Caracterul fluid, a-național al acestui tip de valută și incapacitatea instituțiilor competente de a monitoriza fluxul tranzacțiilor financiare ne obligă să reevaluăm permanent atât beneficiile, cât și dezavantajele acestor instrumente. Luând în conside-rare dimensiunea inovatoare a monedelor virtuale, cum răspundem cererii pieței într-o manieră reglementată? Mai pre-

cis, știm măcar care sunt pașii pe care trebuie să-i parcurgem pentru o reglementare lină, fără distorsiuni, a acestui domeniu?

Pablo Zalba Bidegain (PPE), *por escrito*. – La digitalización en muchos aspectos de nuestra vida cotidiana es una realidad, prueba de ello es que hace ya más de siete años del lanzamiento del bitcoin, la primera y más importante moneda virtual. Las monedas virtuales están destinadas a tener un impacto significativo en el sector financiero, al igual que en otros muchos mercados, ya que ofrece un medio descentralizado, rápido, resiliente y bastante seguro para registrar operaciones de cualquier tipo junto con el historial de operaciones anteriores. En 2015 las instituciones europeas dimos más pasos para avanzar en un mercado de pagos más digitalizado, logrando un acuerdo para el paquete de pagos, compuesto de la Directiva sobre Servicios de Pagos (PSDII) y el Reglamento sobre las Tasas Multilaterales de Intercambio (MIF). Debemos continuar con los esfuerzos para fomentar los pagos electrónicos y continuar trabajando para crear un verdadero mercado único digital en favor de los consumidores europeos.

25. Jednominútové vystúpenia k otázkam politického významu

Elnök asszony. – A következő napirendi pont a fontos politikai kérdésekkel kapcsolatos egyperces felszólalások (az eljárási szabályzat 163. cikke).

Jiří Pospíšil (PPE). – Já chci upozornit zástupce Komise na nový francouzský zákon o uplatňování minimální mzdy a dalších sociálních pravidel na zaměstnance v dopravě nazývaný „Loi Macron“, který podle názoru mnohých v zásadě diskriminuje zahraniční dopravce a to tím, že jim ukládá celou řadu administrativních povinností. V konečném důsledku tak omezuje přístup na francouzský trh dopravních služeb. Myslím si, že by bylo správné, aby Komise zahájila přezkum tohoto francouzského zákona a zkoumala, zda je v souladu se základními Smlouvami, zvláště pak s článkem 56, který upravuje volný pohyb služeb. Ostatně Komise již takto činí u obdobného zákona, který platí v Německu, tzv. MiLoG, a myslím si, že je správné, aby i tento francouzský zákon začal být v této proceduře takto přezkoumáván.

Tibor Szanyi (S&D). – Madam President, many Europeans believe that corruption seriously harms the economy and society. Another common thing in these reports before us is that they all point to public procurement as the field that is particularly prone to corruption in the EU countries. Hungary, where one can witness cronyism at its finest, is a perfect example to demonstrate this problem.

In this country, even the EU fund that was awarded to government agencies to fight corruption was misused. Let us take one egregious example from Hungary. The governor of the Hungarian National Bank created six foundations through which he funnelled almost EUR 1 billion to companies of family members and friends. The whole Orbán government, and even the chief prosecutor of Hungary, are involved in this criminal scheme. No wonder, then, that they will not be prosecuted in Hungary. Although the European Central Bank has expressed its concern, being concerned is not enough.

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, η σημερινή απόφαση του Eurogroup για την Ελλάδα επιβάλλει ένα νέο συμπληρωματικό μνημόνιο και σκληρή επιτήρηση αορίστου διάρκειας. Επιβάλλει φοροληξασία των εισοδημάτων και της ακίνητης περιουσίας του ελληνικού λαού, πέρασμα στον έλεγχο της τρόικας των δημοσίων εσόδων, ξεπούλημα του ενεργειακού δυναμικού, ανάληψη της διοίκησης των τραπεζών από τους ξένους και ξεπούλημα των κόκκινων δανείων στα κοράκια. Επιβάλλει πρωτογενή πλεονάσματα από το 2018 ύψους 3,5% του ΑΕΠ, που θα πηγαίνουν για την ετήσια εξόφληση των χρεολυσίων.

Επιπλέον, αντί να επιστρέψουν στην Ελλάδα τα κέρδη της ΕΚΤ και των κεντρικών τραπεζών της ευρωζώνης από τα ελληνικά ομόλογα ύψους 10 δισ. ευρώ για το διάστημα 2014-2020, τελικά αυτά επιστρέφουν πίσω στις τσέπες του ESM, ενώ ποσό 19,5 δισ. ευρώ από το τρίτο δανειακό πακέτο θα δοθεί για την κάλυψη ενδεχόμενων απωλειών των δανειστών του πρώτου δανειακού πακέτου λόγω μείωσης επιτοκίων και επιμήκυνσης.

Ο ελληνικός λαός, όμως, δεν ανέχεται άλλο την εθνική ταπείνωση και την απώλεια της εθνικής κυριαρχίας. Για αυτό θα παλέψει ενωμένος για να πετάξει την τρόικα έξω απ την πατρίδα μας και να πάρει πίσω την Ελλάδα

Yana Toom (ALDE). – Madam President, Estonia is the only EU country where remote internet voting is an additional voting channel for all elections. Other European countries do not use it, mostly for security reasons. We can vote in Estonia via the internet during the advance voting period when the election campaign is still under way, and it is possible to change the electronic vote without limitations.

At the last European elections i-votes made up 31% of all votes, and there was a considerable difference between the results of electronic and paper voting. Estonian politicians and international experts have raised numerous concerns regarding the i-voting system as such. Experts have presented numerous examples of how it is possible to change votes, compromise the secret ballot or even disrupt elections. E-democracy is becoming a part of our everyday life and therefore we need to revisit the practices of i-voting that provoke deep distrust in Estonian society. Elections should be fair both in practice and in the eyes of the people. Otherwise i-voting will compromise not only e-democracy but also democracy as such.

Miguel Viegas (GUE/NGL). – Peter Praet, membro do Conselho Executivo do BCE, esteve recentemente em Portugal onde se desdobrou em declarações à comunicação social. Nestas, manifesta dúvidas sobre a política orçamental do atual Governo, eleito democraticamente no passado mês de outubro, e pede na prática a continuidade das políticas seguidas nos últimos quatro anos, cujo fracasso está neste momento claramente confirmado.

Mas vai mais longe: para além de questionar a redução do horário de trabalho para as 35 horas, advoga a necessidade de concentração do sistema bancário pela sua internacionalização. Chega inclusivamente a fazer ameaças veladas com a subida das taxas de juro, como se essas não fossem já completamente manipuladas pelo BCE. Estas declarações são intoleráveis e demonstram que o BCE excede há muito o seu mandato. O BCE está longe de ser hoje um banco central neutro ao serviço da economia. O BCE está hoje ao serviço dos grandes grupos financeiros, promove políticas neoliberais e passa por cima da vontade soberana dos Estados nacionais.

Gerard Batten (EFDD). – Madam President, I have a message for my London constituents: Do not believe the opinion polls in the EU referendum campaign. I am getting quite a different picture when I am out campaigning. The overwhelming majority of people I speak to tell me they are voting to leave. They represent all sections of society and ethnic groups, but they are generally working people who have simply had enough of the European Union.

Last week, I spoke to a young Romanian woman who has been in Britain for just one year. She said she wished she could vote to leave. Her reason was because she could not get a school place for her young child. What does it mean when recent EU migrant voices the same complaints as British citizens? Don't listen to David Cameron's increasingly ludicrous and scare tactics. I exhort my constituents to vote to set themselves free from the European Union on 23 June.

Mario Borghezio (ENF). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, il ricordo fatto oggi dal Presidente Schulz del nostro caro collega Marco Pannella è condivisibile solo in parte, ne ha fatto una specie di icona di questa Unione europea; ma chi lo ha conosciuto, e noi abbiamo conosciuto e apprezzato questo Jaurès dell'epoca contemporanea, non era certamente un ammiratore della deriva iperburocratica di questa Unione europea.

Era un uomo di libertà, che ha sempre difeso – e per questo io l'ho apprezzato – il diritto di tutti all'espressione politica, alla libertà di espressione, ed è questo il valore fondante del suo impegno politico, di un uomo «contro», che è stato tale, con coraggio, indipendenza e libertà anche su questi banchi, e per questo dobbiamo ricordarlo, senza trasformarlo, ricordarlo com'era: un uomo «contro», un uomo di libertà. Ciao Marco.

Gilles Lebreton (ENF). – Madame la Présidente, ce soir, à près de 23 h 15, j'aimerais évoquer les élections présidentielles en Autriche. Le fait marquant de ces élections, c'est que le candidat souverainiste du FPÖ a obtenu presque 50 % des voix, ce qui est absolument extraordinaire par rapport au résultat qu'il avait auparavant.

Quelles sont les conséquences pour Schengen? À court terme, il n'y en aura évidemment aucune, puisque l'Union européenne est comme un autiste, elle ne veut rien voir, elle ne veut pas comprendre que les peuples s'inquiètent et elle va continuer à tenter de sauver Schengen, au prix, d'ailleurs, d'un accord absolument calamiteux avec la Turquie, qui va bientôt nous valoir de délivrer des visas à 78 millions de Turcs.

À moyen terme, toutefois, les choses vont changer, car l'Autriche a envoyé un formidable message d'espoir aux peuples. Dès 2017, le peuple français saura en tirer les conséquences et, dès 2018, le peuple autrichien reviendra à la charge lors des élections législatives. Plus généralement, les peuples européens sont inquiets, ils ne veulent plus de cette Union européenne et, pour eux, ces élections présidentielles autrichiennes sont un formidable signe d'espoir.

Janusz Korwin-Mikke (NI). – Wielki polski polityk Stefan Kisielewski powiedział kiedyś: „to nie jest kryzys, to jest rezultat”. Otóż Europa jest pogrążona w permanentnym kryzysie i nie jest to przypadek tylko rezultat okupacji Europy przez twór biurokratyczny zwany Unią Europejską. Jest aż przykro patrzeć, ile tutaj zacnych ludzi siedzi, chce jak najlepiej, a efekty są takie, że tempo rozwoju spada, liczba dzieci spada. Europa przestaje się w ogóle rozwijać. Europa umiera. Tam, gdzie natura nie znosi próżni, tam zwalają się hordy ludzi chcących się osiedlić, tam, gdzie jest luka demograficzna. To jest wszystko wynik działania Unii Europejskiej, a właściwie ludzi o myśleniu typowym dla Unii Europejskiej. W związku z tym sądzę, że Unia Europejska musi być zniszczona.

Tomáš Zdechovský (PPE). – Nebudu mluit o problému zničení Evropské unie, ale budu mluit o problému kontroly evropských projektů. Velmi často na půdě EP jako člen výboru CONT upozorňuji na to, že s mnohými evropskými projekty není zacházeno transparentně a že i v zemi, odkud pocházím, dochází ke korupci a k podvodům souvisejícím s evropskými projekty. Nicméně druhý extrém, který já vidím při objíždění ČR, je, že na jeden zkontrolovaný projekt přijdou tři nebo čtyři další kontroly, které hledají, zda v tom projektu nebyla chyba. Já osobně považuji tuto situaci za bezprecedentní a vyzývám EK, aby se opravdu zamyslela nad tím, zda je potřeba každý projekt čtyřikrát nebo pětkrát kontrolovat.

Илияна Йотова (S&D). – Г-жо Председател, ще говоря тази вечер за регламента за визовата политика, който задължава Европейската комисия да въведе принципа на реципрочност за трети страни, които отказват да либерализират визовия режим за граждани на държави членки на Европейския съюз, в случая САЩ и Канада за български и румънски граждани.

Вместо делегиран акт, Комисията се задоволи да каже, че не е постигнат напредък и сметна въпроса за приключил. В същото време Европейската комисия е готова да направи компромис със страни като Турция за либерализация на визовия режим, без да са изпълнени всички критерии.

Европа е готова да вземе това решение под натиск, за да работи споразумението Европейски съюз – Турция за реадмисия на бежанци от гръцка към турска територия. Впрочем засега има повече ултиматуми от страна на Ердоган, отколкото реални резултати.

Поставя се основателният въпрос – в състояние ли е Европейската комисия да защити интереса на всички граждани на Европейския съюз или това е избирателна отговорност? В състояние ли е да не проявява двойни стандарти? Няма как да искаме доверие от нашите граждани, когато не изпълняваме собствените си закони.

Marek Jurek (ECR). – Komisja Europejska kontynuuje swe działania przeciwko Polsce, przeciwko mojemu krajowi w sposób zupełnie otwarty, uzurpując sobie kompetencje Rady Europejskiej. Art. 7. mówi bardzo wyraźnie, że nasz Parlament, Komisja Europejska albo jedna trzecia rządów może zarzucić jakiemuś państwu odchodzenie od zasad Unii Europejskiej, ale tylko postawić zarzut. Sędzią tego zarzutu są rządy, jest mechanizm międzyrządowy, jest Rada Europejska. To, że Komisja Europejska brnie tak bardzo w negację naszych wolności, pokazuje, jak bardzo niezdolna jest do rządzenia. Otwiera konflikt za konfliktem. Nie wystarczył kryzys migracyjny, nie wystarczył kryzys finansowy w strefie euro, nie wystarczył kryzys członkostwa brytyjskiego, bo taki charakter ma referendum w sprawie Brexit-u. Trzeba było atakować Węgry, dzisiaj trzeba atakować Polskę. Największą miarą zagrożenia dla naszej wolności jest to, że ci ludzie krytykę swojej polityki i krytykę swojej władzy uważają za krytykę Unii Europejskiej jako takiej.

Ivan Jakovčić (ALDE). – Gospođo predsjednice, koristim ovu priliku da još jednom naglasim ozbiljan problem koji imamo na graničnom prijelazu Kaštel-Sečovlje između Republike Hrvatske i Republike Slovenije. Naime, ovaj granični prijelaz i cesta koja vodi od njega prema gradu Buje zaista su sramota i za Republiku Sloveniju i Republiku Hrvatsku. Kao istarski župan pokušao sam zainteresirati vlast u Ljubljani i Zagrebu da bi se taj problem napokon razriješio, međutim za to nema sluha ni interesa od vlasti u Zagrebu i Ljubljani.

Zato sam pripremio pismo koje ću sutra poslati povjerenici Bulc u uvjerenju da će ona senzibilizirati Ljubljanu i Zagreb da napokon uredi granični prijelaz Kaštel-Sečovlje kako bismo mogli imati pravu vizit kartu kada netko dolazi u Hrvatsku odnosno Sloveniju.

Matt Carthy (GUE/NGL). – Madam President, how many lobbyists does it take to persuade an MEP? Forty, apparently, because with 30 000 lobbyists in this city, there are 40 for every single Member of this Parliament. The European Commission is currently carrying out a consultation on whether a transparency register should be mandatory. Only in the European institutions would a non-mandatory transparency register be considered anything other than an oxymoron.

Seventy per cent of the 30 000 lobbyists represent corporate interests. Nine members of the last Commission are now corporate lobbyists, making sure that the revolving door remains well oiled. Industry representatives outnumber academics, consumer groups, and trade unions by four to one on commission expert groups, and 75% of all EU legislation shows visible progressions owing to corporate pressure. With these facts in mind, can we really be expected to believe that agreements such as TTIP, CETA and TISA are being negotiated in the interests of EU citizens?

Σωτήριος Ζαριανόπουλος (NI). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, χθες το Eurogroup αξιολογώντας το τρίτο ελληνικό μνημόνιο επιβράβευσε, όπως και οι εκπρόσωποι του κεφαλαίου, την αντιλαϊκή βαρβαρότητα της κυβέρνησης ΣΥΡΙΖΑ - ΑΝΕΛ, συνεχιστή των μνημονίων Νέας Δημοκρατίας και ΠΑΣΟΚ. Αποκάλυψε τα κυβερνητικά ψέματα επιβεβαιώνοντας το Κομμουνιστικό Κόμμα Ελλάδας.

Ο κατήφορος δεν τελειώνει. Κάθε δόση δανείων ή ρύθμιση χρέους προϋποθέτει νέα σκληρότερα μέτρα. Μετά την ασφαλιστική κατεδάφιση, τη φορολαίλαπα, τις ιδιωτικοποιήσεις, τον αυτόματο κόφτη μισθών και συντάξεων ακολουθούν μέτρα για μαζικές απολύσεις, χτύπημα συλλογικών συμβάσεων του απεργιακού δικαιώματος. Σαν αυτά δηλαδή που πυροδοτούν λαϊκές κινητοποιήσεις σε χώρες χωρίς μνημόνια, τη Γαλλία, το Βέλγιο και αλλού, όπου το ΚΚΕ δηλώνει την αλληλεγγύη του.

Η έξοδος από την ύφεση, η ανάκαμψη των καπιταλιστικών κερδών που επιδιώκουν η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση και κεφάλαιο με επιδοτήσεις, φοροαπαλλαγές και προνόμια σε αυτό, δεν αφορούν τον λαό. Προϋποθέτουν σάρωμα των δικαιωμάτων του. Μόνο η οργανωμένη πάλη του λαού για ανασύνταξη του κινήματός του, η λαϊκή συμμαχία με κατεύθυνση ανατροπής της καπιταλιστικής βαρβαρότητας μπορεί να βάλει τέλος στον κατήφορο αυτό.

Daniel Buda (PPE). – Doamnă președintă, fondurile europene alocate în cadrul politicilor de coeziune sunt menite să asigure creșterea nivelului de trai al cetățenilor din Uniunea Europeană. Procedurile stabilite la Bruxelles pentru absorbția acestora tind să fie tot mai mult simplificate, însă statele membre impun uneori bariere imposibil de trecut. În România, în cadrul Măsurii 7.2, care încurajează stoparea fenomenului de depopulare din mediul rural, au fost impuse limite pe care le apreciez inadmisibile cu privire la populația minimă pe care o unitate administrativ-teritorială trebuie să o aibă și anume două mii de locuitori. A fost ignorat, cu bună știință ori din incompetență, faptul că în România există sute de primării care au sub două mii de locuitori și care nu pot beneficia de fonduri europene pentru infrastructura minimală de apă curentă și canalizare.

Comisia Europeană trebuie să treacă într-o altă etapă, respectiv de a limita statele membre în a impune condiții suplimentare care, de cele mai multe ori, pun beneficiarii în imposibilitatea de a accesa aceste fonduri.

Victor Negrescu (S&D). – Doamnă președintă, cetățenii europeni așteaptă de la Uniunea Europeană reguli și standarde care să îi protejeze. Un exemplu este criza cu care se confruntă România în domeniul sănătății, prin prisma faptului că al treilea cel mai mare producător de dezinfectanți din țară a diluat produsele vândute către 300 de spitale din România. Vorbim despre zeci de mii de posibile probleme medicale generate de această situație. Este extrem de îngrijorător, cu atât mai mult cu cât puteau fi evitate, dacă am fi avut o legislație adecvată și controale serioase în spitale. Criza cu care se confruntă România poate oricând apărea în oricare altă țară europeană, în absența unor măsuri ferme, aplicabile tuturor sistemelor medicale.

De aceea, solicit forurilor europene să elaboreze un set de reguli clare, aplicabile tuturor statelor membre pentru ca astfel de situații să nu mai fie posibile în niciun sistem sanitar european.

Cred că Uniunea Europeană trebuie să aibă mai multe competențe în domeniul sănătății pentru a putea finanța adecvat acest domeniu și a sprijini dezvoltarea unui sistem de sănătate de calitate în toate statele membre, inclusiv în țara mea, România.

Maria Lidia Senra Rodríguez (GUE/NGL). – Señora Presidenta, el señor Juncker ha pedido un nuevo ajuste fiscal al futuro Gobierno español de más de 8 000 millones de euros y amenaza con una multa de 2 200 millones de euros, es decir, el equivalente al 0,2 % del PIB, después de las elecciones. El señor Rajoy, el Presidente en funciones, dice en público que no habrá nuevos recortes, pero en carta privada a la Comisión dice que habrá más ajustes después de las elecciones.

Estas declaraciones nos parecen una burla y un engaño a las personas que el próximo día 26 de junio estamos llamadas a votar en el Estado español. Los pueblos que conformamos la realidad plurinacional del Estado español exigimos que dejen de engañarnos, que no traten de condicionar nuestro voto haciéndonos creer que no hay más alternativas que el neoliberalismo y que respeten las decisiones que tomemos en el pequeño ejercicio de la democracia que suponen las urnas.

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – V Evropském parlamentu často řešíme kritické situace v oblasti demokracie, bezpečnosti a lidských práv. Měli bychom zaznamenat také pozitivní změny. Mezi takové patří například to, že na Tchaj-wanu zvolili v demokratických volbách novou prezidentku a novou vládu Demokratické pokrokové strany, která v těchto dnech střídá dosud vládnoucí stranu Kuomintang. S delegací EP jsem se zúčastnila inaugurace, při které nová prezidentka Cchaj Jing-wen vyzvala k jednotě tchajwanského lidu a ke společnému dílu na reformách. Tchaj-wan má tak velkou šanci k dalšímu demokratickému a ekonomickému růstu a má zájem na spolupráci s EU i s jednotlivými členskými státy a této nabídce bychom měli využít. Druhou dobrou zprávou je, že jsme se dočkali propuštění Nadi Savčenkové. EP opakovaně vyzýval k jejímu propuštění, a proto máme velkou radost a vzkazujeme, že ji rádi uvidíme i zde v EP. Ukrajina a Evropa potřebují statečné lidi.

Nicola Caputo (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, ancora una volta eventi metereologici eccezionali devastano il territorio del Sud Italia, causando ingentissimi danni alle attività produttive.

Questa volta è toccato alla Puglia contare le conseguenze di una violentissima grandinata, che ha colpito l'area metropolitana di Bari e in particolare i comuni di Casamassima, San Michele, Conversano, Putignano, Turi, Rutignano e Castellana. Una coltre di ghiaccio di 20 centimetri ha coperto le colture con particolari conseguenze, soprattutto per il comparto cerasicolo. Danni si registrano anche agli uliveti e ai vigneti e, dalle prime stime, l'ondata di maltempo pare abbia causato danni per circa 100 milioni di euro.

Purtroppo, specie nell'area mediterranea, le forti precipitazioni e altri eventi climatici estremi stanno diventando sempre più frequenti. In queste ore si sta valutando la possibilità di chiedere il riconoscimento dello stato di calamità naturale e verificando la sussistenza delle condizioni per l'adozione del fondo di solidarietà europeo e di altre misure per le quali l'Europa, se chiamata, sono certo non farà mancare il proprio supporto.

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Já bych si dovilil přimět orgány Evropské unie k pohledu na jeden problém, který se týká dopravního spojení, vodního kanálu Dunaj–Odra–Labe. V České republice je v této souvislosti už vedená určitá debata, tento problém a tento kanál se dotýká několika států, Česka, Rakouska, Polska, Německa a Slovenska. Pohledem na mapu všichni uznáme, že takovýto kanál zde má mít místo, protože při pohledu na mapu Evropské unie je to jisté bílé místo, které možná volá pro propojení. Já osobně jsem opatrný příznivce stavby tohoto kanálu. Ale chtěl bych požádat orgány Evropské unie, aby České republice a samozřejmě těm ostatním dotčeným členským státům EU sdělily, zdali o takovýto projekt a propojení mají i ony zájem, zdali vidí smysluplnost takového projektu. Myslím si, že by to úrovni debaty k této věci v ČR poměrně hodně prospělo.

Elnök asszony. – A napirendi pont ezzel lezárul.

26. Program rokovania na nasledujúci deň: pozri zápisnicu

27. Skončenie rokovania

(Az ülést 23.30-kor rekesztik be.)

Použité značky

*	Konzultačný postup
***	Postup súhlasu
***I	Riadny legislatívny postup, prvé čítanie
***II	Riadny legislatívny postup, druhé čítanie
***III	Riadny legislatívny postup, tretie čítanie

(Typ postupu závisí od právneho základu navrhnutého v návrhu aktu.)

Skratky parlamentných výborov

AFET	Výbor pre zahraničné veci
DEVE	Výbor pre rozvoj
INTA	Výbor pre medzinárodný obchod
BUDG	Výbor pre rozpočet
CONT	Výbor pre kontrolu rozpočtu
ECON	Výbor pre hospodárske a menové veci
EMPL	Výbor pre zamestnanosť a sociálne veci
ENVI	Výbor pre životné prostredie, verejné zdravie a bezpečnosť potravín
ITRE	Výbor pre priemysel, výskum a energetiku
IMCO	Výbor pre vnútorný trh a ochranu spotrebiteľa
TRAN	Výbor pre dopravu a cestovný ruch
REGI	Výbor pre regionálny rozvoj
AGRI	Výbor pre poľnohospodárstvo a rozvoj vidieka
PECH	Výbor pre rybne hospodárstvo
CULT	Výbor pre kultúru a vzdelávanie
JURI	Výbor pre právne veci
LIBE	Výbor pre občianske slobody, spravodlivosť a vnútorné veci
AFCO	Výbor pre ústavné veci
FEMM	Výbor pre práva žien a rodovú rovnosť
PETI	Výbor pre petície
DROI	Podvýbor pre ľudské práva
SEDE	Podvýbor pre bezpečnosť a obranu

Skratky politických skupín

PPE	Poslanecký klub Európskej ľudovej strany (kresťanských demokratov)
S&D	Skupina Pokrokovej aliancie socialistov a demokratov v Európskom parlamente
ECR	Európski konzervatívci a reformisti
ALDE	Skupina Aliancie liberálov a demokratov za Európu
GUE/NGL	Konfederatívna skupina Európskej zjednotenej ľavice – Severskej zelenej ľavice
Verts/ALE	Skupina zelených/Európska slobodná aliancia
EFDD	Skupina Európa slobody a priamej demokracie
ENF	Skupina Európa národov a slobody
NI	nezaradení poslanci