



C/2024/6038

11.10.2024

DOBESEDNI ZAPISI RAZPRAV 7. JULIJA 2022

(C/2024/6038)

EVROPSKI PARLAMENT

ZASEDANJE 2022–2023

Seje: 4. – 7. julija 2022

STRASBOURG

Vsebina	Stran
1. Otvoritev seje	4
2. Odločitev vrhovnega sodišča ZDA o odpravi pravice do splava v Združenih državah in potreba po zaščiti pravice do splava in zdravja žensk, tudi v EU (vloženi predlogi resolucij): gl. zapisnik	4
3. Nedavni vročinski val in suša v EU (razprava)	4
4. Trajnostna letalska goriva (pobuda ReFuelEU za letalstvo) (razprava)	15
5. Sestava Parlamenta	26
6. Boljše pravno urejanje: združujemo moči za pripravo boljše zakonodaje (razprava)	26
7. Nadaljevanje seje	37
8. Boljše pravno urejanje: združujemo moči za pripravo boljše zakonodaje (nadaljevanje razprave)	37
9. Čas glasovanja	38
9.1. Aretacija kardinala Zena in skrbnikov solidarnostnega sklada 612 v Hongkongu (RC-B9-0358/2022, B9-0358/2022, B9-0360/2022, B9-0361/2022, B9-0362/2022, B9-0364/2022) (glasovanje)	38

Vsebina	Stran
9.2. Položaj zagovornikov domorodnih skupnosti in okoljskih aktivistov v Braziliji ter uboj Doma Philipsa in Bruna Pereire (B9-0347/2022, RC-B9-0348/2022, B9-0348/2022, B9-0351/2022, B9-0354/2022, B9-0355/2022, B9-0357/2022) (glasovanje)	38
9.3. Razmere v tadžikistanski avtonomni pokrajini Gorski Badahšan (RC-B9-0350/2022, B9-0350/2022, B9-0352/2022, B9-0353/2022, B9-0356/2022, B9-0359/2022, B9-0363/2022) (glasovanje)	38
9.4. Ruska invazija na Ukrajino: začasni ukrepi glede vozniških dokumentov, ki jih je izdala Ukrajina (C9-0201/2022) (glasovanje)	39
9.5. Opredelitev kršitve omejevalnih ukrepov Unije kot kriminala na podlagi člena 83(1) PDEU (C9-0219/2022 – Juan Fernando López Aguilar) (glasovanje)	39
9.6. Izredna makrofinančne pomoči Ukrajini (C9-0221/2022) (glasovanje)	39
9.7. Trajnostna letalska goriva (pobuda ReFuelEU za letalstvo) (A9-0199/2022 – Søren Gade) (glasovanje)	39
9.8. Finančne dejavnosti Evropske investicijske banke – letno poročilo za leto 2021 (A9-0165/2022 – David Cormand) (glasovanje)	39
9.9. Nadzor nad finančnimi dejavnostmi Evropske investicijske banke – letno poročilo za leto 2020 (A9-0173/2022 – Corina Crețu) (glasovanje)	39
9.10. Zaščita finančnih interesov EU – boj proti goljufijam – letno poročilo za leto 2020 (A9-0175/2022 – Katalin Cseh) (glasovanje)	39
9.11. Boljše pravno urejanje: združujemo moči za pripravo boljše zakonodaje (A9-0167/2022 – Tiemo Wölken) (glasovanje)	39
9.12. Odločitev vrhovnega sodišča ZDA o odpravi pravice do splava v Združenih državah in potreba po zaščiti pravice do splava in zdravja žensk, tudi v EU (B9-0365/2022, B9-0366/2022, B9-0367/2022) (glasovanje)	39
10. Nadaljevanje seje	40
11. Sprejetje zapisnika predhodne seje	40
12. Razvoj strategije EU za kolesarjenje (razprava)	40
13. Obrazložitev glasovanja	48
13.1. Trajnostna letalska goriva (pobuda ReFuelEU za letalstvo) (A9-0199/2022 – Søren Gade)	49
13.2. Zaščita finančnih interesov EU – boj proti goljufijam – letno poročilo za leto 2020 (A9-0175/2022 – Katalin Cseh)	50
14. Popravki in namere glasovanj: glej zapisnik	51
15. Predložitev dokumentov: gl. zapisnik	51

Vsebina	Stran
16. Peticije: glej zapisnik	51
17. Sklep o pripravi samoiniciativnih poročil: gl. zapisnik	52
18. Spremembe napotitev na odbore (člen 56 Poslovnika): gl. zapisnik	52
19. Pridruženi odbori (člen 57 Poslovnika): gl. zapisnik	52
20. Sklepi o uporabi postopka s skupnimi sejami odborov (člen 58 Poslovnika): gl. zapisnik	52
21. Sprejetje zapisnika te seje in posredovanje sprejetih besedil	52
22. Datum naslednjih sej: gl. zapisnik	52
23. Zaključek seje	52
24. Prekinitev zasedanja	52

DOBESEDNI ZAPISI RAZPRAV 7. JULIJA 2022

ΠΡΟΕΔΡΙΑ: ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΣ ΠΑΠΑΔΗΜΟΥΛΗΣ

Αντιπρόεδρος

1. Otvoritev seje

(Η συνεδρίαση αρχίζει στις 9.01)

2. Odločitev vrhovnega sodišča ZDA o odpravi pravice do splava v Združenih državah in potreba po zaščiti pravice do splava in zdravja žensk, tudi v EU (vloženi predlogi resolucij): gl. zapisnik

3. Nedavni vročinski val in suša v EU (razprava)

Πρόεδρος. – Το επόμενο σημείο στην ημερήσια διάταξη είναι η συζήτηση επί της δηλώσεως της Επιτροπής σχετικά με το πρόσφατο κύμα καύσωνα και ξηρασίας στην ΕΕ (2022/2746(RSP)).

Maroš Šefčovič, Vice-President of the Commission. – Mr President, heatwaves are among the deadliest disaster risks in Europe. They hit the most vulnerable people and at the same time, usually those who are in the most difficult situations are at the biggest risk. At the same time, we see also this summer the increased risk of sparking wildfires. On top of this, heat waves contribute to water shortages and exacerbate droughts, as we can see in the northern Italy these past days.

The tragic event in Marmolada is just the latest example of the disastrous risks linked to warmer temperatures and thus to climate change. The EU's Emergency Response Coordination Centre is monitoring the situation and stands ready to coordinate EU assistance if needed by the Italian authorities.

As you probably heard, the Copernicus Emergency Management Service – these are our Earth observation satellites operated by the European Commission's Joint Research Centre – provide information for emergency response for different natural hazards like floods, wildfires and droughts. And its statistics show that since 2017, we have witnessed the most intense forest fires ever seen in Europe and that we unfortunately expect that the 2022 forest-fire season could follow this trend. Similarly, the Copernicus Emergency Management Service indicates that the present drought in Europe could become the worst ever.

If we are looking at the situation of the past years, we have been doing our utmost to learn from these experiences and therefore the Commission has built an effective and flexible disaster response capacity under the Union's Civil Protection Mechanism.

However, emergency support and response alone are not enough. Climate adaptation, disaster risk reduction and disaster preparedness are paramount. And this is true for Europe as well as for the rest of the world. So let's take the example of forest fires.

In the context of the European Green Deal we strive to make our forests more biodiverse and more resilient. This is key to making forests less vulnerable to fire risk and it is an example of how, by working with nature and not against it, we can strengthen prevention and reduce disaster risk.

In parallel, we work on preparedness. Under the Union Civil Protection Mechanism this year, we financed by more than EUR 40 million to support the rescEU fleet capacities with 10 Canadairs, one helicopter and two air tractors. And we are planning to purchase 12 additional aircraft under rescEU.

When national capacities are overwhelmed, rescEU is ready to step in to provide additional support to confront disasters in Europe and this year, for the very first time in the EU's history, the Commission is financing the pre-positioning of 204 firefighters and ground vehicles from Bulgaria, Finland, France, Germany, Norway and Romania to Greece during July and August. The first teams already arrived last week.

This is truly European solidarity in action and a perfect example of disaster preparedness. And we will not stop there. The Commission will strengthen its anticipation and foresight capacity. We will prepare disaster resilience goals, taking into account different risks and potential disaster scenarios. And one of these scenarios assesses the need to face heat-waves.

It is the EU's commitment if a disaster strikes, to respond and to deliver assistance in a spirit of solidarity both at home and abroad. Through the Union's Civil Protection Mechanism we pool our resources together and we provide a stronger and more coherent, collective response, wherever the needs are.

And we continue providing our support also after a disaster through the European Union Solidarity Fund (EUSF), in coordination with other EU funds. Through the latest amendment to the EU Solidarity Fund Regulation, the threshold for the advances related to individual applications has been increased from 10% to a maximum 25% of the amount of the financial contribution, or at the maximum amount of EUR 100 million from the previous agreed sum of EUR 30 million.

This provision is a crucial improvement in facilitating the rapid disbursement of EUSF assistance in the form of a meaningful advance. The overall objective is to provide support in the aftermath of disasters but also to place the seeds for future better resilience.

Antonio Tajani, a nome del gruppo PPE. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signor Vicepresidente della Commissione, grazie per aver ricordato anche la tragedia che ha colpito il mio paese, la Marmolada.

Già prima di questa ondata di siccità, 52 milioni di europei vivevano in aree sotto stress idrico per almeno un mese all'anno. Dal 2017 al 2019 una significativa siccità ha colpito la regione del Danubio, il Reno, nel 2018. La siccità, oltre a creare danni disastrosi all'agricoltura e disagi alla popolazione, si ripercuote sul commercio e sul trasporto via fiume. Per Unione europea e Regno Unito le stime parlano di circa 9 miliardi di euro di danni alla produzione agricola, con picchi di un miliardo e mezzo in Spagna e un miliardo e 400 milioni in Italia, lo sa bene il presidente della regione Piemonte – che saluto – una delle regioni più colpite nel mio paese dalla siccità.

I fondi del Recovery per approvvigionamento idrico, riduzione delle perdite nelle reti di distribuzione e rafforzamento dell'agrosistema vanno nella giusta direzione, come il regolamento per il riutilizzo delle acque depurate a fini agricoli, ma questo non basta. L'Europa non può affrontare il problema solo con interventi di emergenza, occorre essere incisivi. Per questo chiediamo che la Commissione presenti un piano a lungo termine.

Serve un grande piano invasi che abbia due scopi: garantire l'acqua per i cittadini e per le attività agricole e creare un grande progetto di energia pulita e rinnovabile attraverso il sistema del pompaggio e dei pannelli solari galleggianti. Una modifica alla direttiva 2001/18 per liberalizzare l'uso di nuove tecnologie di evoluzione assistita, svincolandolo dagli OGM.

Le nuove biotecnologie agrarie possono assicurare una sperimentazione per avere piante più resistenti alla siccità e alla parassitosi. Serve una mappatura europea dei distretti idrografici per riequilibrare la disponibilità di acqua e soddisfare i bisogni più urgenti. Più investimenti in nuove tecnologie applicate all'agricoltura seguendo il modello israeliano. Satelliti, droni e altre tecnologie di derivazione militare eliminano gli sprechi e determinano il fabbisogno idrico delle diverse tipologie di coltivazione dei terreni.

Concludo, per fare tutto ciò serve da subito più flessibilità nella gestione dei fondi del Recovery, ma soprattutto serve il coraggio di avere un'unica politica fiscale europea, a partire da un nuovo Recovery Fund.

César Luena, *en nombre del Grupo S&D*. – Señor presidente, señor vicepresidente de la Comisión, creo que somos muy conscientes de que las olas de calor y las sequías van a suceder. La pregunta, el problema, es por qué todavía no estamos preparados. Fundamentalmente le quiero preguntar por la desertificación, que tiene muchísima relación con lo que estamos hablando esta mañana. ¿Cuándo va a estar entre las prioridades de la Comisión Europea que se prepare y que se presente una estrategia de la Unión Europea sobre la desertificación? Porque no la tenemos.

En relación con la ley sobre la salud del suelo, ¿va a estar también previsto que la desertificación se trate en esta ley? Porque la tenemos anunciada, pero todavía no la conocemos.

No somos parte de la Convención de las Naciones Unidas de Lucha contra la Desertificación. Sin embargo, en la estrategia sobre los suelos, se dijo que se le iba a pedir a los Estados miembros que se unieran. ¿Hay alguna noticia de esto, señor vicepresidente? En todo caso, necesitamos saber también qué impacto van a tener las sequías en nuestro medio ambiente, en nuestra salud y en la productividad agrícola. Necesitamos saber el impacto que van a tener y el que ya están teniendo, porque, como digo, sabemos que las olas de calor y las sequías van a suceder. El problema, la cuestión, señor vicepresidente de la Comisión Europea, es por qué todavía no estamos lo suficientemente preparados.

Nicolae Ștefănuță, *în numele grupului Renew*. – Domnule președinte, domnule comisar, dragi colegi, unii oameni cred că banii sunt resursa cea mai importantă. Dar ce se întâmplă când o resursă precum apa dispăre, precum un râu din Italia domnului Tajani din fața mea, dispăre de pe planeta noastră?

Apa este o resursă inepuizabilă și care nu poate fi cuantificată în valoarea ei. Europa abia mai respiră. Pădurile, plămânii Europei ard sub ochii noștri. Arde recolta în Timiș, 16 incendii în ultimele 24 de ore. În Maramureș nu a mai plouat, serios, de trei luni. Someșul scade zilnic cu 10 cm. În orașul Galați s-au format de câteva săptămâni insule de nisip, în Dunăre, insule. Vă dați seama? Primarul comunei Dumbrăvița își îndeamnă cetățenii să folosească apa cu porția la o presiune cât mai redusă și doar în scopuri menajere.

Chiar credeți că aportul fiecăruia, cât de mic, nu contează? Trebuie să ne oprim acum din a mai pompa carbon în atmosferă. Trebuie să oferim cea mai importantă resursă în continuare copiilor noștri.

Benoît Biteau, *au nom du groupe Verts/ALE*. – Monsieur le Président, hier, l'Italie a décrété l'état d'urgence dans cinq régions à cause de la sécheresse. Plus une goutte d'eau ne coule dans la plaine du Pô, plusieurs centrales hydroélectriques ont cessé leur activité, plus de 30 % de la production agricole est en danger et la production d'eau potable est coupée entre 23 h et 6 h du matin. Sans eau, la vie s'éteint: les Italiens et les Italiennes en font la triste expérience actuellement.

Les sécheresses sont devenues la norme: aucun pays de l'Union européenne et du monde n'est épargné. La privatisation des nappes phréatiques, l'artificialisation des sols, le saccage des zones humides, la surexploitation des ressources sont les principaux responsables. L'eau est un commun, elle est aujourd'hui considérée comme un bien.

En septembre prochain, une résolution sera votée sur la sécheresse. D'ici là, mes chers collègues, je vous invite à réfléchir, sur la base de données objectives et des constats inquiétants, à des solutions innovantes, créatives et efficaces qui ne seraient pas une nouvelle fuite en avant, qui préfèrent s'attaquer aux causes plutôt qu'aux conséquences, car il est plus qu'urgent d'agir pour sortir enfin, sur l'eau, de ce désert des partages.

Angelo Ciocca, a nome del gruppo ID. – Signor Presidente, signor Commissario, io penso che abbiamo un dovere, quello di non condurre un'emergenza idrica in un'ora di chiacchiere, in un'ora dalle mie parti si direbbe di «bla bla bla».

Servono azioni concrete, l'istituzione europea ha il dovere di dare risposte concrete, a meno che non si voglia realmente sostituire la nostra agricoltura, la nostra alimentazione con le euro follie di farci mangiare scarafaggi, cimici, cavallette o addirittura cagnotti.

Serve agire, a mio avviso, con tre mosse. La prima, indennizzare immediatamente quelle aziende che rischiano di perdere il raccolto; mettiamoci nei loro panni, ci sono aziende agricole che investono 200, 300, 400, 500 mila euro per poter avere il frutto di un raccolto e dopo aver affrontato numerosi costi oggi si trovano nel pericolo di non dover raccogliere i loro sacrifici. Notti insonni per lavoro, notti insonni per paura. Voi pensate che in Lombardia il 50 per cento delle aziende agricole è a rischio chiusura. Quindi serve un indennizzo immediato.

Servono risorse anche per calmierare l'aumento dei prezzi del cibo che ci sarà, servono gli stanziamenti essenziali per realizzare quelle opere di impermeabilizzazione dei bacini di riserve idriche, pensate che i nostri ingegneri progettano nel mondo queste opere, le nostre aziende italiane realizzano nel mondo queste opere.

Allora serve non continuare a sbagliare, altrimenti il settore agroalimentare farà la stessa fine del settore meccanico, del settore calzaturiero, del settore manifatturiero italiano. Allora prendiamo oggi stesso i tre miliardi stanziati per le politiche sugli insetti e mettiamo quei tre miliardi per le opere necessarie a dare risposte agli agricoltori, ai cittadini e alle opere infrastrutturali del paese.

Martina Michels, im Namen der Fraktion The Left. – Herr Präsident, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Auch bei mir zu Hause in Berlin-Brandenburg wüten verheerende Waldbrände. Aber das sind keine unerwarteten Naturkatastrophen, sondern direkte und schwerwiegende Folgen des menschengemachten Klimawandels. Wahr ist auch: Eine Minderheit von Spekulanten zieht nach wie vor Profit aus der fossilen Energiekrise und aus dem Raubbau an Natur und deren Ressourcen. Spätestens jetzt steht die Frage: Wollen wir weiter zuschauen oder mutige Akteure werden?

Die Rolle rückwärts, die gestern eine Mehrheit des Europäischen Parlaments beschlossen hat, nämlich Atomkraft und Gas für förderfähig und grün zu erklären, ist in meiner Sicht dabei ein fataler Fehler. Stattdessen müssen Profiteure endlich sinnvoll besteuert werden. Politik gegen den Klimawandel und für Klimaschutz ist nämlich kein Luxus, sondern schlichte Notwendigkeit. Vor allem Regionen und Kommunen brauchen dazu wirksame Unterstützung. Das muss Teil eines raschen sozialen EU-Krisenpakets und Teil langfristiger EU-Förderpolitik sein.

Laura Ferrara (NI). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, come è stato ricordato, pochi giorni fa, a causa delle alte temperature, un distacco enorme di ghiaccio ha causato la morte di diverse persone sulle montagne della Marmolada, in Italia. Inoltre, il Consiglio dei ministri italiano ha deliberato lo stato di emergenza per siccità per cinque giorni.

A livello globale, dal 2000 i fenomeni di siccità per numero e durata sono aumentati del 29 per cento e, se questo trend continuerà, diversi studi sostengono che, entro il 2030, 700 milioni di persone rischieranno di essere sfollate a causa della siccità ed entro il 2050 il 75 per cento della popolazione mondiale si ritroverà a essere colpita da siccità.

È allora fondamentale dirigere i nostri sforzi e le nostre risorse verso azioni ecosostenibili, riduzione delle emissioni e pratiche agricole che sprechino meno acqua e, più in generale, verso azioni di tutela del territorio in linea con le nuove condizioni climatiche.

La Terra non lancia più timidi allarmi, siamo giunti più velocemente del previsto a un punto critico. Viviamo in maniera più sostenibile le nostre vite, perché lo dobbiamo alle generazioni presenti e a quelle future.

Herbert Dorfmann (PPE). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la siccità in alcune zone del bacino mediterraneo, soprattutto in Italia, colpisce fortemente l'agricoltura. Questo non è solo un problema per gli agricoltori, ne risentono purtroppo anche i consumatori. La sicurezza alimentare in Europa è già a rischio a causa della guerra in Ucraina, i prezzi alimentari aumentano da mesi ed è sempre più chiaro che la raccolta nell'Unione europea quest'anno, soprattutto nelle zone mediterranee, sarà più bassa, creando ulteriori problemi.

È quindi necessario e urgente elaborare un piano per prevenire tali fenomeni nel futuro. Dobbiamo investire in un sistema di invasi e depositi di acqua, cercando di utilizzare questi sistemi anche per produrre energia idroelettrica o comunque rinnovabile.

L'agricoltura deve imparare però anche a risparmiare acqua. Dobbiamo investire nella ricerca per trovare sistemi di utilizzo efficiente dell'acqua disponibile. L'agricoltura di precisione, i sensori e i sistemi satellitari possono dare un contributo importante in questo senso.

Avremo poi sempre più bisogno di piante più resistenti alla siccità. Il miglioramento genetico e anche l'utilizzo di nuove biotecnologie sono più necessari che mai e dobbiamo finalmente legiferare anche in questo Parlamento per rendere applicabili queste tecnologie in Europa.

Dobbiamo poi sfruttare meglio le opportunità della politica agricola. Proprio in queste settimane gli Stati membri terminano il loro lavoro sui piani strategici della PAC.

Dobbiamo offrire agli agricoltori sistemi efficienti per assicurarsi contro le avversità atmosferiche, che purtroppo sono in aumento. Negli ultimi anni abbiamo lavorato ed elaborato sistemi innovativi, come anche i fondi mutualistici, che adesso devono trovare applicazione.

Solo una combinazione di tutti questi elementi può portare a una gestione sensibile di questi fenomeni nel futuro.

Sara Cerdas (S&D). – Senhor Presidente, Senhor Comissário, a seca na União Europeia afeta mais de um terço do continente e hoje o cenário é dramático. Por exemplo em Portugal, segundo o Instituto Português do Mar e da Atmosfera, 66% do território está em seca extrema e 33% em seca severa.

É preciso, assim, fazer mais. É preciso apostar em: estratégias de monitorização e de prevenção, com o apoio de entidades como o Observatório Europeu da Seca; planos de avaliação dos territórios, que devem identificar os grupos mais vulneráveis a estes fenómenos climáticos extremos e incluir medidas de adaptação adequadas; e também medidas de mitigação do risco de seca e vagas de calor.

Infelizmente já não é suficiente tentarmos reverter o impacto das alterações climáticas. Teremos de aprender a viver com elas, mas continuar a trabalhar para mitigá-las e, assim, assegurar a saúde do nosso planeta e dos que nele vivem.

María Soraya Rodríguez Ramos (Renew). – Señor presidente, en la primera ola de calor que hemos vivido entre el 11 y 19 de junio, hemos sufrido en mi región, en Zamora, en la sierra de la Culebra, uno de los incendios más devastadores de España. Más de 24 000 hectáreas abrasadas. Toda la estructura económica de esta zona destruida. En los años noventa decíamos que los grandes incendios eran los que asolaban más de 500 hectáreas; hoy, más de 24 000.

Podemos prever por las olas de calor estos incendios, pero tenemos que cambiar los medios de luchar contra ellos. No podemos abordar los retos de estos incendios de sexta generación con los medios del pasado.

Por eso le pido, señor comisario, que procedamos a la revisión, actualización, y modificación del Plan de protección civil ante emergencias por incendios forestales y que seamos capaces de mantener durante todo el año activos los servicios de extinción, porque estos grandes incendios ya no se apagan. Solo podemos prevenirlos. Hace falta solidaridad para las catástrofes, pero nuestra obligación no es declararlas, sino prevenirlas.

Pär Holmgren (Verts/ALE). – Herr talman! Om det är någonting vi kan vara helt säkra på när det gäller den globala uppvärmningen så är det att risken för svåra värmeböljor ökar. De blir fler, de blir värre och med det också konsekvenserna: skogsbränder, höga temperaturer, dåliga skördar osv, osv. Det finns antagligen inget annat sammanhang där varje tiondels grad kommer att bli så tydlig.

Det är många i den här debatten nu som har framhåvt värdet av höjd beredskap och mer klimatanpassning. Det är bra och viktigt, men allra viktigast av allt är givetvis att bromsa den globala uppvärmningen. Detta måste vi ta på ett större allvar. Det gäller alla länder inom Europa. Det gäller alla sektorer och inte minst här i parlamentet, alla politiska grupper. Ta ert ansvar. Gör vad ni kan för att se till att vi gemensamt minskar riskerna med och konsekvenserna av den globala uppvärmningen.

Isabella Tovaglieri (ID). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la scarsità d'acqua sta mettendo in ginocchio tutti i nostri territori, provocando danni ingenti a un'economia già in affanno. Solo in Lombardia si lamentano già perdite per 500 milioni di euro e, anche a causa dei rincari dell'energia, le aziende del settore avranno maggiori oneri nella gestione dei raccolti e nella produzione di frutta, che inevitabilmente si ribalteranno sui consumatori.

Tuttavia, questa situazione drammatica era ampiamente prevedibile, ma l'Europa non è corsa ai ripari per tempo. Anziché ascoltare gli allarmi lanciati per anni dal mondo agricolo, la Commissione europea ha preferito consultarsi con Greta Thunberg, accogliendola proprio in quest'Aula con tutti gli onori di un capo di Stato. Quando poi sarebbe stato necessario finanziare infrastrutture e tecnologie per il risparmio idrico, quest'Aula era impegnata nel dibattere dei diritti dei rom e della misura delle vongole. Infine, quando ci si è decisi finalmente a prendere provvedimenti per il clima, l'Europa si è posta obiettivi ideologici e irrealistici, che finalmente ieri in quest'Aula, anche grazie al voto della Lega, sono stati rimessi in discussione.

È il momento che l'Europa cambi rotta. Contro la siccità occorrono misure di sostegno eccezionali nei territori più colpiti, ma soprattutto una maggiore apertura verso fonti energetiche sostenibili come idrogeno e nucleare, per salvaguardare la nostra autonomia strategica e per non contribuire all'espansione economica della Cina, che già oggi è la più grande produttrice di gas serra di tutto il pianeta.

Idoia Villanueva Ruiz (The Left). – Señor presidente, la falta de agua golpea a sectores como la agricultura, la ganadería y el turismo en diversos puntos de España. El pasado mes de junio se superaron durante varios días los 40 grados, algo insólito en Navarra, en mi tierra. Lo más preocupante es que los fenómenos climáticos extremos serán cada vez más frecuentes. Provocan, además, que la naturaleza tenga menos recursos para hacer frente a los incendios y que estos se extiendan a gran velocidad, tal y como ocurrió, carbonizando casi 15 000 hectáreas en mi tierra, lo que obligó al desalojo de 9 000 personas. Y está ocurriendo en múltiples lugares.

La adaptación y la mitigación del cambio climático son dos asignaturas pendientes y, desde luego, no avanzamos al considerar el gas y la energía nuclear como energías verdes.

Por un lado, debemos orientar nuestra acción política para frenar la emergencia climática y, por otro, adaptar, en la medida de lo posible, nuestros espacios de vida a temperaturas y fenómenos extremos.

En el caso de la sequía y del calor, las consecuencias son muy tangibles e inmediatas y, desde luego, ponen en peligro nuestra salud y la de nuestro entorno. Lo más duro no es que estemos ante el verano más caluroso de nuestra historia, lo más duro es que estamos ante el verano más frío del resto de nuestra historia.

Álvaro Amaro (PPE). – Senhor Presidente, caras e caros Colegas, Senhor Vice-Presidente da Comissão, vivemos atualmente, de facto, a pior seca desde que há registos em algumas regiões da Europa, em particular do sul da Europa. Um estudo recentemente publicado aponta para uma frequência de invernos secos na Península Ibérica de 1 em cada 4 anos.

Em Portugal são claros os efeitos das alterações climáticas. A precipitação média anual reduziu 20 milímetros por década e houve um aumento da frequência de ondas de calor, ondas essas que potenciam grandes incêndios. Ao dia de hoje temos, no meu país, 96,3% do território em seca extrema e severa. Face a esta situação, Senhor Comissário, é imperioso pensar nas soluções estruturais.

Gostaria, pois, que a Comissão Europeia olhasse para o futuro e definisse uma estratégia europeia para o aumento da capacidade de armazenamento das águas superficiais. Uma estratégia que possibilite aos Estados-Membros um financiamento fora da Política Agrícola Comum para concluir e modernizarem os regadios existentes e promoverem infraestruturas como barragens, há que dizê-lo, e ligações entre albufeiras capazes de aumentar a resiliência do sistema.

Senhor Comissário, a natureza e o clima, mas também a agricultura e a produção animal, a isso nos obrigam.

Brando Benifei (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la siccità uccide. Stiamo ancora cercando i dispersi nel crollo del seracco della Marmolada avvenuto pochi giorni fa, dopo vittime e feriti. Una tragedia immane che ci dice che non c'è più tempo.

Anche la destra è costretta ad ammettere, dopo anni di negazionismo, che il cambiamento climatico oggi è davanti ai nostri occhi, è innegabile. È un fenomeno che porta alla rapida sparizione dei ghiacciai, a una siccità terribile, è una manifestazione macroscopica di qualcosa che avviene intorno a noi.

Dopo questa pesantissima ondata di calore, vediamo il rischio di una siccità, la peggiore degli ultimi decenni, che prosciuga fiumi e riserve d'acqua con danni gravissimi per l'ambiente, l'agricoltura e i cittadini, lo vediamo in Italia e lo vediamo in Europa.

Cosa stiamo aspettando ancora a cambiare radicalmente i nostri sistemi economici? Cosa deve ancora accadere per far aprire gli occhi a tutte e tutti? Lavoriamo insieme perché davvero non c'è più tempo.

Martin Häusling (Verts/ALE). – Herr Präsident, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Die Klimakrise kommt nicht irgendwann, die Klimakrise ist da. Und wir sehen jetzt, was passiert bei 1,5 Grad Erwärmung. Was soll eigentlich passieren, wenn wir mal in Richtung zwei oder noch mehr Grad Erwärmung kommen? Jetzt schon brennt dieser Planet. Nicht nur Krise in Südeuropa, auch mitten in Deutschland brennen Wälder. Noch viel schlimmer sind die Auswirkungen der Klimakrise in Nordafrika, wo Menschen tatsächlich verhungern und nicht wissen, was sie morgen essen.

Was ziehen wir eigentlich für Schlüsse daraus? Wir haben gestern einen fatalen Beschluss gefasst. Wir müssen endlich CO₂ begrenzen. Das ist die Antwort, nicht Gentechnik oder Löschflugzeuge. Daran müssen wir arbeiten.

Wir brauchen einen anderen Umgang mit Agrarsystemen. Wir brauchen einen anderen Umgang mit Wasser. Und wir müssen uns auch klarmachen, dass nicht nur die Landwirtschaft betroffen ist, sondern auch Wälder in Europa verschwinden, was ja auch dazu beiträgt, dass der Klimawandel sich verschärft.

Ich denke, wir müssen uns jetzt ernsthaft Gedanken machen: Passen wir die Agrarpolitik an, passen wir unseren Umgang mit Wasser an und lassen Sie uns endlich ernsthaft an der Senkung von CO₂ arbeiten. Das ist die einzige Antwort.

Dan-Ștefan Motreanu (PPE). – Domnule președinte, domnule comisar, în prezent, 13 state membre sunt afectate de deșertificare. Acest fenomen este însă în continuă extindere în întreaga Europă.

În 2018, Curtea de Conturi Europeană a concluzionat că măsurile luate pentru combaterea deșertificării sunt lipsite de coerență. Parlamentul European mi-a susținut în decembrie 2020 un amendament depus pe o rezoluție a Comisiei ENVI, prin care am solicitat Comisiei Europene să prezinte o strategie clară pentru combaterea deșertificării, precum și alocarea fondurilor necesare pentru gestionarea acestui fenomen în toate regiunile afectate.

Nu vom putea atinge acest obiectiv fără fonduri europene dedicate combaterii deșertificării și refacerii terenurilor, fără investiții serioase în sistemele de irigații și în dezvoltarea sistemelor de reutilizare a apelor uzate.

În continuare, solicit Comisiei Europene stabilirea unui calendar ambițios de acțiuni și monitorizarea progreselor de etapă, pentru a ne asigura că nicio regiune nu este lăsată în urmă.

Петър Витанов (S&D). –Г-н Председател, г-н Комисар, само преди няколко дни девет души загинаха, след като ледник се свлече в италианските Алпи. Рекордно високите температури доведоха до невиджани от столетия суши. В Сицилия термометрите показаха 57°C, в някои области на Италия и Франция има режим на водата, а само за последното денонощие в Гърция са избухнали петдесет и два горски пожара.

И какво още трябва да се случи, за да осъзнаем, че сме на прага на апокалипсис, който самите ние предизвикахме? Алчността, злоупотребата с природни ресурси, свръхпотреблението се оказаха смъртоносни. Дали не разбрахме, че в желанието си да имаме повече, обричаме децата си да нямат нищо? И когато бедствието чука на вратата, спешните мерки са задължителни. Единственото спасение е солидарността в отказа от ресурси днес, за да може да има утре. Само радикална промяна може да начертае бъдещето и всъщност да го направи възможно.

Anne Sander (PPE). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, chers collègues, la sécheresse devient récurrente au fil des années et soulève deux enjeux essentiels.

Le premier est la question de la gestion de l'eau sur nos territoires et la nécessité de concilier tous les usages de cette ressource vitale pour la consommation humaine, mais aussi pour les cultures, pour l'élevage, pour l'industrie et pour l'énergie. Le deuxième enjeu est celui de la sécurité alimentaire, qui est l'affaire de tous.

Voilà pourquoi il nous faut très vite des mesures exceptionnelles d'accompagnement du monde agricole pour lui permettre de produire. Pour cela, nous devons travailler au soutien et à plus de flexibilité pour les systèmes d'irrigation. Nous devons réfléchir à la question du stockage de l'eau. Il nous faut plus de recherche et d'innovation pour mieux gérer cette ressource qu'est l'eau.

Enfin, je voudrais aussi rappeler que nous devrions retravailler la question du déclenchement de l'outil de gestion des risques, qui peut venir en accompagnement, en cas de catastrophe.

Je crois que le monde agricole et le monde sylvicole aujourd'hui ont besoin d'un soutien clair et à très court terme de la part de notre assemblée.

Marlene Mortler (PPE). – Herr Präsident, liebe Kollegen, Herr Kommissar! Nicht die Gesamtniederschlagsmenge eines Jahres pro Quadratmeter ist alleine entscheidend. Regenwasser muss zur richtigen Jahreszeit vom Himmel fallen. In Deutschland wird noch zu 99 % Regenwasser in der Landwirtschaft genutzt, also grünes Wasser. Extremwetterereignisse nehmen aber zu, ob Extremniederschläge oder Dürren wie aktuell in Italien und weiten Teilen Europas. Darauf brauchen wir gute und vor allem schnelle Antworten.

Ein nachhaltiges Wassermanagement und eine effiziente Bewässerungsstruktur sind daher essenziell. Grund- und Oberflächengewässer, also blaues Wasser, haben hier eine wichtige Aufgabe. Wassersparende Technologien, mehr überbetriebliche Kooperationsprojekte, mehr Beratung und Forschung für Mensch, Tier, Pflanze und Umwelt sind unerlässlich. Die Bereitstellung von Wasser, Nahrung und Energie darf auf keinen Fall aus ideologischen Gründen gegeneinander ausgespielt werden. Alles muss Hand in Hand gehen. Deshalb unterstütze ich meine Kolleginnen und Kollegen in ihren Forderungen.

Διαδίκασια «catch the eye»

Salvatore De Meo (PPE). – Signor Presidente, signor Commissario, onorevoli colleghi, la siccità non è un problema di alcuni, non commettiamo l'errore di due anni fa quando in presenza dei primi casi Covid, qualcuno ha pensato che fosse il problema di alcuni Stati. La siccità è un problema di tutta l'Europa e non solo. Per questo abbiamo bisogno di un approccio comune europeo, strutturato e con azioni concrete.

È necessario modernizzare e realizzare nuove infrastrutture italiane ed europee per capire in che modo rendere disponibili le riserve d'acqua anche con un sistema di solidarietà europea. L'Europa ha investito molto sia in ricerca spaziale che in innovazione, ma le tecnologie e i dati possono e devono essere meglio utilizzati per garantire un uso appropriato e responsabile di una risorsa idrica che, a quanto pare, non è inesauribile.

L'emergenza siccità coincide con la recente decisione della Commissione di ridurre i fitofarmaci. Per compensare queste misure è necessaria una normativa europea per l'utilizzo delle tecnologie di evoluzione assistita, diverse dagli OGM, per avere colture più resistenti e resilienti ai nuovi agenti patogeni e alle sempre più frequenti siccità.

L'agricoltura europea sta attraversando una fase delicata, ma se vogliamo garantire la sua transizione verde dobbiamo preoccuparci ora di come evitare un'ormai certa emergenza idrica, altrimenti avremo il collasso e la dipendenza alimentare da paesi terzi.

Marcos Ros Sempere (S&D). – Señor presidente, tenemos que ir más allá y pensar que las olas de calor ya no son algo puntual o pasajero. Tenemos que poner el foco en aquellos lugares del sur de Europa donde, cada año, experimentamos veranos más largos, con temperaturas prolongadas de 35 grados durante todos los días del verano. Esto se traduce en una emergencia social silenciosa que genera, quizás, menos alarma que los grandes incendios que vemos en la televisión, pero que tiene consecuencias igual de graves: una pobreza energética tan severa como la del invierno en los países fríos.

Les pido que se pongan en la piel de un niño o de unos niños del sur de Europa que viven estas temperaturas y van a un colegio que no está refrigerado, que no está adaptado al calor extremo. ¿Cómo se puede estudiar así? Pasamos la mayor parte de nuestra vida en edificios que no están adaptados a este cambio climático y a estas temperaturas extremas.

Señor comisario, tenemos que adaptar nuestra política de cohesión y nuestros fondos de solidaridad para conseguir que nuestros edificios y nuestros entornos urbanos sean más eficientes y adaptados al calor. Tenemos que reducir el sufrimiento de estas familias que, día a día, soportan temperaturas extremas durante meses.

Pernando Barrena Arza (The Left). – Señor presidente, lo vivido en Navarra desde el 15 hasta el 19 de junio ha sido una situación crítica absolutamente excepcional y sin precedentes. La situación meteorológica en torno a 40 grados durante días, tormentas eléctricas y la sequedad de la tierra con más de cincuenta días sin lluvias, han provocado varios incendios con efectos devastadores. Afortunadamente, no ha habido daños personales de gravedad y la afección en núcleos urbanos ha sido mínima, pero han ardido unas 15 000 hectáreas en diversas zonas de Navarra, dejando graves daños en la masa forestal, la fauna y la flora; un desastre en términos medioambientales que el Gobierno de Navarra ya ha prometido restaurar con celeridad.

Y, para ello, ya se ha iniciado la tramitación de la declaración de zona afectada gravemente por una emergencia de protección civil ante el Gobierno estatal. Se están trabajando también las ayudas posibles de fondos europeos, las del FSUE, y va a ser necesaria una inversión muy importante para la reforestación y apoyar a los agricultores y explotaciones agrarias perjudicados. Y para eso es necesario que se permita el acceso a las ayudas del Fondo de Solidaridad de la Unión Europea a quienes han sufrido este tipo de desastres naturales y que probablemente no entran en los mínimos exigibles de daños cuantificados pero que, para una economía regional como la navarra, son devastadores y de complicada resolución económica. Atiendan, pues, esta situación y reduzcan los umbrales de acceso al Fondo de Solidaridad para que este mecanismo de emergencia cumpla con el objetivo para el que fue creado.

Franc Bogovič (PPE). – Gospod predsedujoči!

Kot vidimo, so pogosti vročinski udari, suše vse pogostejši, predvsem v južnem delu Evrope, kamor sodi tudi moja država, Slovenija, v tem jugovzhodu, in kmetijstvo in gozdarstvo sta zagotovo največji žrtvi tega pojava.

Zato se strinjam s kolegi, ki poudarjajo, kako pomembno je, da na eni strani okrepimo sisteme civilne zaščite, da smo pripravljeni tudi na gozdne požare, da jih čim prej omejimo, na področju kmetijstva pa je zagotovo zelo pomembno pravilno upravljanje z vodami.

Sam prihajam z območja, kjer smo združili na eni strani tako izgradnjo hidroelektrarne kot namakanje, ki ima prednost pred energetske izrabo, in na ta način poskušamo reševati probleme.

Pri namakanju je vsekakor potrebna sodobna tehnologija z nizko porabo vode in po drugi strani tudi primerni kolobarji, pa tudi genske tehnike, s katerimi pridobimo rastline, ki so odpornejše na sušo.

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Domnule președinte, domnule comisar, discutăm, de fapt, despre un subiect care ține de viața oamenilor: caniculă, secetă, incendii. În țara mea, în județul în care trăiesc, au ars lanurile de grâu, nu ard numai pădurile, ard grânele.

Ce fac acei fermieri? Au credite la bancă. Costurile cu creditele la bancă au crescut, cel puțin în țara mea. Rămân cu nimic. Avem sistem de supraveghere, mecanism de protecție civilă, avem și fond de solidaritate. Problema este cum facem să ajungă cât mai repede acești bani la oamenii afectați? Și da, acum tratăm efectele. Trebuie să mergem și la cauze concomitent. Dar acum arde și trebuie să stingem acest foc, domnule comisar.

Așadar, vă cer în numele fermierilor din România, în numele cetățenilor din România care nu mai au apă de luni de zile. În zone întregi nu a plouat și este pământul pur și simplu crăpat și oamenii beau apa cu porția. Așadar, trebuie să intervenim de urgență, sigur, în colaborare cu guvernele statelor membre, dar avem nevoie de urgență acum să intervenim.

Jutta Paulus (Verts/ALE). – Herr Präsident, liebe Kolleginnen, liebe Kollegen! Vor wenigen Tagen wurde eine Studie veröffentlicht, dass die derzeitige Hitzewelle im Süden und Südwesten, Südosten Europas und die damit verbundene Dürre in Zukunft noch viel häufiger auftreten werden. Das bedeutet, wir müssen nicht nur sehr viel schneller werden beim Klimaschutz, wir müssen gleichzeitig die Anpassung an die veränderten Bedingungen vorantreiben. Diese gigantische Aufgabe müssen wir zusammen angehen.

Und ich meine, an erster Stelle muss das Eindämmen der Verschwendung stehen. Es kann doch nicht sein, dass wir Grundwasserressourcen, die bereits jetzt in einem Maße genutzt werden, wie sie sich eben nicht wieder auffüllen, durch Sprühen bei strahlendem Wetter über weite Felder einfach weiter übernutzen. Das heißt, wir müssen sehr viel klüger mit diesen begrenzten Ressourcen umgehen. Und selbstverständlich bleibt es nicht aus, dass wir sehr viel schneller beim Ausbau der erneuerbaren Energien, bei der Energieeffizienz an die Wurzeln dieser Krise gehen. Denn nur so können wir das gemeinsam leisten.

Sandra Pereira (The Left). – Senhor Presidente, são recorrentes os debates sobre a seca, os fenómenos meteorológicos extremos e os seus impactos em vários setores vitais, como na atividade agrícola e pecuária e em outras atividades produtivas e económicas.

No meu país, Portugal, a situação que se vive de seca extrema e severa também poderá impactar no combate a incêndios. Mas parece que estamos sempre a correr atrás do prejuízo e as medidas de mitigação, está visto, não bastam.

São necessárias medidas de prevenção que contemplem meios para o reforço da capacidade de armazenamento de água, a adaptação nas atividades produtivas, associada à definição de critérios de uso de água que garantam o abastecimento público para consumo humano, a saúde pública, a preservação de rendimentos, a salvaguarda de meios de produção e a segurança e manutenção das reservas de água.

Medidas concretas para aumentar o aproveitamento e armazenamento da água tornam-se, assim, essenciais, pelo que urge reforçar e mobilizar meios financeiros para a construção ou reconstrução de reservas, designadamente de regadios, fundamentais para a pequena e média agricultura e agricultura familiar e para a preservação do mundo rural.

Luisa Regimenti (PPE). – Signor Presidente, signor Commissario, onorevoli colleghi, dobbiamo fare in modo che la siccità non prosciughi anche i bilanci e la competitività delle nostre aziende agricole, settore nevralgico per l'economia non solo italiana.

Ciò potrà avvenire solo con il ruolo determinante dell'Europa, chiamata a varare soluzioni strutturali per garantire l'autosufficienza alimentare a livello comunitario. Il cambiamento climatico e la conseguente aridità degli ultimi anni non sono solo un problema italiano, ma coinvolgono altri paesi europei e per questo devono essere risolti con un'azione congiunta da parte dell'Unione.

Ci domandiamo quindi quali sono le misure che si intendono adottare in Europa per affrontare il grave problema della siccità, sia dal punto di vista economico che strutturale.

Clare Daly (The Left). – Mr President, it is really, truly terrifying to see these record heat waves, with much of Europe nearing 40 degrees and devastating consequences in Italy and Spain in particular, major rivers drying up, water rationing becoming the new normal.

But the consequences will be even more magnified in the global south, with millions and millions suffering destructive wildfires, prolonged drought and crop failures. But for me, the most horrific thing is our Western leaders' total immobility in the face of this ever-nearing burning, destructive crisis caused by climate change. And we got a glimpse of that yesterday in the shameful decision of Parliament to refuse to support the taxonomy objection in relation to nuclear and gas. We welcome the coal burning again, LNG and the so-called 'fig leaf' of combating Putin. But these decisions will have consequences. There's no doubt that victims and the farmers need urgent support on this.

We need sustainability, but we have to tackle also the root cause.

(Λήξη της διαδικασίας «catch the eye»)

Maroš Šefčovič, Vice-President of the Commission. – Mr President. I really would like to appreciate this very important, passionate – and rightly so – debate on such important issues, like recent heatwaves, drought and forest fires.

And I totally agree with Mr De Meo: this is not a problem for few but it is a problem for all Europeans. And I think that I also have to say that I am in full agreement with Mr Ștefănuță, Mr Biteau, Mr Ros Sempere, Mr Benefei and many others who been rightly triggering the alarm bells that, unfortunately, with the climate change through which we are going right now and in the next years and decades, that weather events are likely to happen more frequently in the future than in the past.

And, therefore, your calls for attaching even more crucial importance to working together along the whole cycle of risk management, from prevention to preparedness, to work more on response, to build more resilience in our systems are absolutely correct. I can tell you that will be working with you on all of them. I think that we already learnt from the past and we developed the right tools and policies to address the broad spectrum of the risks. And we also have a funding which can help. But you are absolutely correct as well that, if you look at it through the experience of the last months, last years, we need to be able constantly reviewing, adjusting and adapting our policies.

And, therefore, the call of Ms Rodríguez Ramos to work on disaster-resilience goals is absolutely correct. We are already working on that, and I think that here again will be working with you and with our Member States on how to make sure that we would proceed with better climate adaptation, with mitigation investments, especially in the most exposed regions, which we saw represented by the Members of the European Parliament who intervened this morning. And what we can do better through cohesion, cohesion funding, and base our next steps, not only on the past experience, but also on strengthened foresight and anticipation.

Mr De Meo, Mr Barrena Arza, Ms Grapini have been asking: what can we do more on top of the better use of the Solidarity Fund – which I described in my introductory remarks is to be beefed up, to be accelerated? What kind of other compensatory measures could be put in place?

The quick feedback I can give you is that we are talking with our Member States on the possibility which they have; and they can compensate farmers under the rural development programmes and they can ask to modify their national programmes as relevant. And this is already happening with several EU Member States.

All of you make a strong reference to the climate change and to the need to be very ambitious in implementation of the European Green Deal. And I would like to reassure you that, for us, part of the Green Deal is not only reducing CO₂ emissions. This is also part and parcel of our strategy: how to beef up our biodiversity strategy. If you simply see: if you will not restore biodiversity, the nature will simply push us hard to remind us that simply there are basic laws of physics, basics of how the earth is functioning. And we shouldn't interfere with this natural cycle of events.

Therefore, just recently we presented a nature-protection package to make sure that our efforts are geared to restore and protect the ecosystems. And I know that this is of a big interest to the honourable Members of this House, and we are ready to work with you to further improve our approach and to make sure that we will deliver on this very important strategy.

Ms Luena and Mr Motreanu have been highlighting the danger of potential desertification, not only in Europe but in the world. And, therefore, we just presented the soil strategy for 2030. And, in this strategy, we have actions to not only monitor the desertification in the EU, but we want also to step up with concrete actions both at home and globally.

And coming back to the foresight, which, as you know, is part of my portfolio: again, the honourable Member has been right. There is very clear foresight that if the climate change would continue at the pace as it is right now, in a few decades, we might we might have 10% less arable land globally, which, of course would have very severe consequences, especially for the for the development of countries.

If it comes to the emergencies, to the preparedness, to the drought, we have the ways how to respond to, in the short-term emergency measures through our use EUPM mechanisms and through our recently refurbished and upgraded EU-wide early warning systems. We already are working with some of our Member States who already adopted to drought-management plans for vulnerable rivers – this is the response to Mr Bogovič – and probably we have to learn from that experience how to do it for all relevant Member States where they face this very important challenge.

But this is obviously not enough. And in the long run, what we need to do is to scale up better water use in agriculture. We have to look at sustainable soil management and the vegetation cover, and we have to invest, as it was said by many: drought-resistant crops and restore damaged areas.

And if you allow me to conclude, I would like to appreciate the way how Mr Tajani, Mr Dorfmann Mr Sandere, Ms Luena highlighted that what we are discussing here today is not a narrow issue, that it has very strong horizontal impact on different policies we are discussing together.

This is not only the issue of climate change, emergency measures or being better prepared for the future challenges. It has to do a lot with our common agricultural policy. It has to do a lot with the modern precision farming, with using new technologies, like drones, satellites for better anticipation prediction. But also for using these new technologies in this very important sector. And it has to do a lot with using our funds under research and innovation to make sure that we will deploy the best possible technologies, best approaches and the best crops for use in agriculture.

To conclude, honourable Members, I would like to say that I hear you loud and clear: that you would like us to act swifter, faster, closer with you, closer with Member States, closer with the regions under pressure, and that we are ready to do so. And we will be discussing this with you, with the Member States to make sure they will be permanently upgrading our policy responses to this very important challenge. Thank you very much, Mr President, and thank very much, honourable Members, for this very important discussion.

Πρόεδρος. – Η συζήτηση έληξε.

Η ψηφοφορία θα διεξαχθεί την επόμενη περίοδο συνόδου.

4. Trajnostna letalska goriva (pobuda ReFuelEU za letalstvo) (razprava)

Πρόεδρος. – Το επόμενο σημείο στην ημερήσια διάταξη είναι η συζήτηση επί της εκδήσεως του Søren Gade, εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής Μεταφορών και Τουρισμού, επί της προτάσεως κανονισμού του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου και του Συμβουλίου για τη διασφάλιση ισότιμων όρων ανταγωνισμού για βιώσιμες αεροπορικές μεταφορές (COM(2021)0561 – C9-0332/2021 – 2021/0205(COD)) (A9-0199/2022).

Søren Gade, Ordfører. – Hr. formand! Kære kolleger! I dag tager Parlamentet det første skridt til at decarbonisere den sektor, der vel er den sværeste at decarbonisere. Valget i 2019 var for mange et klimavalg. Derfor er jeg stolt af, at vi i dag viser europæerne, at det ikke var tomme ord, da vi lovede klimahandling. I 2017 stod udledningerne fra luftfarten for cirka 3,8 % af EU's samlede udledninger. Luftfartens andel af udledningerne ventes at stige voldsomt, hvis ikke vi handler. Derfor er det nødvendigt, at vi stiller ambitiøse krav til vores flyselskaber. Men alle skal bidrage. Det gælder både brændstofproducenterne, lufthavnene, flyproducenterne, medlemslandene og passagererne.

Hvis vi ikke handler nu, har vi kun to muligheder: Enten skal vi stoppe med at flyve, eller også må vi droppe vores klimamål, og de veje er der heldigvis ikke mange, der ønsker at gå. Vi er alle sammen enige om, at Europas luftfart skal være bæredygtigt og grønt. Men vi ved jo også alle sammen, at det bliver udfordrende. Derfor vil jeg gerne rose Kommissionen for det gode forslag. Tilgangen er både klog, enkel og den vil virke. Ved at stille krav til brændstofleverandørerne om at iblande grønne brændstoffer, sikrer vi, at flyene udleder mindre. Med Kommissionens forslag, i daglig tale ReFuelEU Aviation, vil EU endnu en gang være i front på den grønne omstilling, og med dette lovforslag viser vi resten af verden, hvordan vi kan gøre luftfarten grøn.

På trods af de gode takter i Kommissionens udspil, er vi mange, der ikke mener, at det er ambitiøst nok. Derfor er jeg stolt over at have ledet forhandlingerne i Parlamentet, og over, at vi senere i dag skal stemme om en markant mere ambitiøs tilgang. For det første foreslår vi, at iblandingskravet skal hæves markant. Vi vil med andre ord have mere grønt brændstof i flyene, end Kommissionen har foreslået. Vi foreslår også et højere krav om iblanding af syntetiske brændstoffer fra 100 % bæredygtige kilder. De såkaldte E-fuels er fremtiden, og det er vigtigt, at vi stimulerer markedet, så udrulning og opskalering sker hurtigst muligt.

De grønne brændstoffer er markant dyrere end de konventionelle, så for at skabe et incitament til at købe dem og samtidig bevare konkurrenceevnen i europæisk luftfart, foreslår vi, at merudgiften kompenseres gennem ETS. Det vil modvirke, at flyselskaber mellemlander uden for EU for at tanke sort. Derudover vil vi også have bedre kontrol, transparens, og vi vil kunne tackle de miljø- og klimaskadelige udledninger, der ikke er relateret til CO₂.

Som ordfører har jeg set det som min fornemste opgave at samle fløjene. Det har ikke været nogen nem opgave. Nationale, politiske, ideologiske og økonomiske interesser på tværs af EU har skullet mødes, og jeg er klar over, at det ikke har været muligt at gøre alle tilfredse. Jeg håber dog, at både mine kolleger og eksterne interessenter føler, at jeg har lyttet og været tilgængelig og tydelig omkring mine prioriteter som ordfører. Jeg vil gerne takke alle, der har bidraget, ikke mindst min egen politiske gruppe, Renew. To udvalg har afgivet betænkning. Jeg vil gerne takke mine kollegaer i disse udvalg. Jeg har prøvet så vidt muligt at inkludere jeres holdninger, og jeg konstaterer med tilfredshed, at der ikke er blevet stillet ændringsforslag på vegne af hverken ITRE eller ENVI. Forude venter forhandlingerne med Rådet. Jeg ser frem til at samarbejde med formandskabet, og det er mit inderlige håb, at vi sammen kan sikre et ambitiøst resultat. Jeg ser frem til formiddagens diskussion.

Nicolás González Casares, *ponente de opinión de la Comisión de Industria, Investigación y Energía*. – Señor presidente, señor ponente, si en algo coincidimos todos es que el transporte es uno de los sectores que menos ha cumplido en la reducción de emisiones. Y, dentro del transporte, la aviación también puede ser señalada como uno de los sectores que menos ha cumplido, evidentemente por sus problemas tecnológicos. Es un sector muy difícil de descarbonizar.

Por lo tanto, esta propuesta es muy necesaria para que la aviación avance en ese camino de reducir sus emisiones. Tenemos que apostar por ello. Y tenemos que apostar por que, además, los fueles sostenibles que utilizemos en aviación sean consistentes y coherentes con las ambiciones climáticas que tenemos en este Parlamento y que tenemos en el paquete de medidas «Objetivo 55».

En esa medida, creo que debemos apostar en el futuro por los fueles sostenibles y, sobre todo, los fueles sintéticos, los fueles de origen no biológico. Debemos poco a poco ir cerrando el paso y el camino a aquellos fueles que no son sostenibles.

Ese es nuestro cometido y espero que la propuesta del Parlamento mejore algo la buena propuesta de la Comisión, que seamos más ambiciosos y que podamos decir en un futuro que hemos contribuido a que la aviación también entre en la senda de la descarbonización y en la lucha contra el cambio climático.

Jutta Paulus, *Verfasserin der Stellungnahme des mitberatenden Ausschusses für Industrie, Forschung und Energie*. – Herr Präsident, Frau Kommissarin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Unzweifelhaft hat das Fliegen Menschen zusammengebracht und internationalen Austausch in einem Maß ermöglicht, wie man es sich vor 100 Jahren nicht hätte vorstellen können. Aber ebenso unzweifelhaft ist Fliegen die energieintensivste Art der Mobilität und beruht vollständig auf fossilen Brennstoffen.

Mit ReFuelEU Aviation soll jetzt der Umstieg auf nachhaltigere Kraftstoffe eingeläutet werden. Aber es ist eben nicht nachhaltig, wenn neue Kraftstoffe auf der Basis problematischer Rohstoffe wie Palmöldestillat oder Zwischenfrüchten angerechnet werden dürfen.

Wir sollten vielmehr auf die einzig skalierbare Lösung setzen, und das sind nun einmal synthetische Kraftstoffe, hergestellt aus erneuerbarem Strom. Und gerade industriepolitisch sollten wir hier die Vorreiterrolle europäischer Unternehmen stärken und ambitionierte, aber realistische Quoten festlegen. Denn das Potenzial für nachhaltige Biokraftstoffe ist begrenzt. Wir werden keine neuen Kontinente entdecken mit bebaubarem Land. Ich habe kein Problem mit Technologieoffenheit, aber sie muss die physikalische Realität berücksichtigen.

Deshalb bitte ich Sie: Stimmen Sie für unsere Änderungsanträge und sichern Sie der Luftfahrt eine nachhaltige Zukunft!

Kleiner Nachsatz an Herrn Gade: Wenn die Fristen so kurz sind, ist klar, dass der Ausschuss für Industrie, Forschung und Energie keine Anträge stellen kann.

Kadri Simson, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, the Commission would like to congratulate Mr Gade for the report, which was overwhelmingly adopted in the TRAN Committee on 27 June. We would also like to thank him for the excellent work he has carried out on ReFuel Aviation with the support of ten shadow rapporteurs and associated committees (ENVI and ITRE). It is good to see this important file moving forward.

As you know, as an important element of the 'Fit for 55' package, it is a key deliverable of the European Green Deal and will play a crucial role in decarbonising aviation. We urgently need to create a market for sustainable aviation fuels and put aviation on the path to carbon neutrality by 2050. Sustainable aviation fuels are an essential component to contribute to decarbonising aviation in the near term, in particular for medium and long-haul flights. But liquid fuels are expected to remain predominant at least until 2050. When deployed at large scale, they will enable a significant reduction in CO₂ and other pollutant emissions from the sector, allowing citizens to connect by plane across the EU and beyond more responsibly already in the short term.

The report adopted in the TRAN Committee is the result of a well-balanced compromise following months of discussions. Whilst, as usual at this stage, the Commission reserves its judgement until it formally enters into trilogue discussions with the European Parliament and Council, we consider that the report we are debating today goes in the right direction on many aspects, even if some elements are of concern.

The Commission particularly welcomes the report's emphasis on the need for an EU-level harmonised regulation that provides for a level playing field for aviation in the EU internal market. In addition, the proposed sustainable aviation fuels allowance scheme could help bridge the remaining price gap between these fuels and fossil fuels, while the creation of a fund dedicated to sustainability might deserve further analysis. We also welcome provisions on better monitoring of substances causing non-CO₂ effects.

On other aspects of the report, the Commission has some reservations as some of the amendments could reduce the efficiency of the regulation. Let me mention three points of critical importance. First, it is key to make sure that the regulation supports innovative sustainable aviation fuels, technologies and feedstock with high decarbonisation and scalability potential. Expanding the 'sustainable aviation fuels' definition could delay investments in advanced biofuels and e-fuels, which are needed in very large volumes already in the medium term. Quality should prevail over quantity. Setting higher binding targets must be carefully considered in terms of the overall environmental integrity of the proposal, the burden placed on air carriers and the need to maintain a well-functioning aviation market. The regulation should aim to ensure a level playing field among air operators and airports within the EU and to avoid carbon leakage.

And finally, on the transition period, we must keep in mind the objective that sustainable aviation fuels should be physically available at all airports as soon as possible. There is no evidence that establishing a book and claim system – in other words, a virtual sustainable aviation fuels market – would bring any benefits, nor that such a system could be put in place without risks of fraud.

In conclusion, there is a clear need for swift action, and we have a clear pathway. By delivering a robust legal framework, we will encourage investments and allow the EU sustainable aviation fuels production capacity to scale up at the necessary pace to meet our climate goals. I look forward to the discussion today and, once again, I thank the rapporteur and shadow rapporteurs for their work on this file.

Cláudia Monteiro de Aguiar, em nome do Grupo PPE. – Senhor Presidente, Senhora Comissária, caros Colegas, permitam-me começar por enaltecer o espírito de abertura e de compromisso do relator, Søren Gade, neste processo de negociação, mas também formular um agradecimento que se estende a todos os colegas dos restantes grupos políticos.

Muitas vezes com posições divergentes, aliás muitas delas antagónicas, julgo que primámos por um debate construtivo, fundamentado, o que acaba por só valorizar o documento que hoje submeteremos a votação.

Todos reconhecemos que o setor da aviação enfrenta um processo de transição difícil, mas, sendo difícil, é necessário para a sua descarbonização. Reconhecemo-lo da parte do legislador, e reconhecem também os agentes económicos desta indústria. As tecnologias de produção de combustível sintético encontram-se ainda num estágio de desenvolvimento incipiente. Defendemos por isso uma maior abrangência da definição de combustíveis sustentáveis da aviação, numa lógica de maior abertura a várias soluções tecnológicas, em especial quando nos referimos aos biocombustíveis.

Este espetro alargado permitiria uma maior flexibilidade e tornaria as metas da Comissão Europeia, já para 2025, mais realistas. Porque não nos basta sermos ambiciosos, precisamos ser pragmáticos. Precisamos sustentar as nossas decisões em factos. Não devemos enveredar por utopias ou dogmas ideológicos que apenas criam problemas à indústria, mas que, acima de tudo, criam problemas às pessoas, aos cidadãos que querem e que precisam de viajar, e pouco aportam ao objetivo final: as emissões zero em 2025.

Caros Colegas, o texto que votaremos apresenta-se na globalidade equilibrado, pronto a ajudar a indústria determinante para a Europa. No entanto, permitam-me referir que entendo que as metas estipuladas para os combustíveis sintéticos estão num nível pouco realista, sobretudo a curto prazo, o que é suscetível de criar problemas, especialmente a Estados-Membros do sul e a Estados-Membros do leste. Sem uma produção com escala – termino já – a preços competitivos, a vinculação a tais metas vai criar desequilíbrios no mercado interno difíceis de superar no período de transição.

Em suma, não queremos criar mais dificuldades aos nossos cidadãos sem atingir sequer os objetivos em termos ambientais, e é isto, enquanto legisladores, que nos compete evitar.

Erik Bergkvist, för S&D-gruppen. – Herr talman! Bästa ledamöter! Först ett tack till föredraganden och skuggföredraganden för konstruktiva och tidvis även tuffa förhandlingar. Även ett tack till våra medarbetare som har jobbat väldigt hårt med detta betänkande.

Flyg är något absolut nödvändigt för en fungerande värld, och därför är det också absolut nödvändigt att flyget är miljövänligt. Den socialdemokratiska gruppen har drivit och fått gehör för högre målsättningar och snabbare åtgärder. Vi måste också ha en fungerande miljö för dem som arbetar inom flygbranschen om detta ska fungera. De avlägsna regionerna måste vi också ta särskild hänsyn till, eftersom de är extra beroende av flyg under denna övergång.

När jag tittar på utvecklingen i flygbranschen och när jag tittar på det här betänkandet är jag övertygad om att vi, när vi – om inte alltför många år – reser och transporterar saker, kommer att göra det med det miljövänligaste transportslaget.

Jag ser fram emot de kommande trepartssamtalen med kommissionen och kommissionär Simson.

Izaskun Bilbao Barandica, en nombre del Grupo Renew. – Señor presidente, quiero felicitar a Søren Gade, porque su propuesta, por equilibrada y realista, será capaz de convertir las buenas intenciones en hechos concretos. Ese es el mejor elogio que se puede hacer de un texto legal.

Este texto es más exigente con los porcentajes de utilización progresiva de combustibles sostenibles en aviación, que se aplicarán a todas las compañías que operen más de 500 vuelos anuales; responsabiliza a los gestores de los aeropuertos de dotarlos de las infraestructuras necesarias; contempla la problemática de las regiones ultraperiféricas; actualiza la lista de combustibles sostenibles, exceptuando siempre los que procedan de materias primas cuya producción puede competir con la alimentaria, y obliga a actualizar cada tres años la lista para incorporar las novedades que produzca la innovación (de hecho, durante estas negociaciones se han introducido ya fuentes como la electricidad o los combustibles sintéticos producidos a partir del hidrógeno verde, que son un ejemplo del avance tecnológico).

El texto propone, además, un sistema de seguimiento y sancionador que permite prevenir fraudes, castigarlos cuando se produzcan y destinar el dinero recaudado por las sanciones a la innovación en este campo, un ejemplo de cómo convertir una multa en un ejercicio de economía circular.

Ciarán Cuffe, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Mr President, we just heard of record temperatures and droughts affecting the European Union, so it's a fitting time to discuss the decarbonisation of aviation.

This ReFuelEU proposal is a positive step forward. Unfortunately, while the Commission proposal lacks the ambition needed to decarbonise aviation's fuel mix as rapidly as the climate emergency demands, this Parliament has opted to weaken the proposal and the ambition further, specifically, when it comes to how we define a sustainable fuel. If we get this wrong, the decision will come back to haunt us in the years to come. It is crucial that we get it right, because with the first-generation biofuels, we failed to anticipate the problems that arose.

Regrettably, the TRAN Committee agreed on a weakened definition of sustainable aviation fuel, and ITRE and ENVI, who share competence, approved the Commission's definition. This expanded definition allows unsustainable fuels to be burnt in planes: palm oil by-products, food crops and recycled carbon fuels. The use of biofuels will have severe land-use change impacts, and that means more and more amounts of land will be needed to grow food and feed and power planes. That is why the additional biofuel feedstocks added by TRAN are so problematic. They include palm fatty acid distillates, a palm oil by-product, which means forests will be cleared to meet demand. They also include intermediate crops, which in Europe are often grown for environmental reasons related to soil health, but outside the EU, they're grown as cash crops. For this reason, I urge colleagues to return to the Commission's definition of biofuels, and I am glad that the major European airlines agree with our view. Amendments 112, 118 and 136 can address these issues.

Let's send a signal to the markets today that Europe wants to ramp up production of e-fuels, not unsustainable biofuels. We can make Europe a market leader in e-fuel production, which will help reduce their costs. Parliament's vote today can decide if aviation plays its part in addressing the climate emergency. Industry and technology are ready. Today is a crucial day for ensuring that aviation plays its part in addressing the climate emergency, and I hope we can meet this challenge.

Aurélia Beigneux, *au nom du groupe ID*. – Monsieur le Président, à quel moment comptez-vous établir un projet de transition écologique à la fois durable pour l'environnement et supportable pour les Européens? Ce n'est évidemment pas le cas aujourd'hui, car ce projet de règlement est purement utopiste et schizophrène.

D'abord, seulement 6 % des vols, les longs courriers, génèrent la moitié des émissions de CO₂ de l'aviation. Pourquoi donc se concentrer uniquement sur les vols de courte distance? Il n'y a aucune logique dans ce projet.

Ensuite, vous ne semblez pas réaliser le coût financier de tels aménagements. Vous contraignez les aéroports à construire des bornes de recharge surpuissantes à l'horizon 2025. Toutefois, rien dans ce texte n'indique clairement à quelle hauteur les aéroports et les compagnies aériennes seront subventionnés.

Ainsi, ce projet enverra au tapis un bon nombre de compagnies européennes telles que Ryanair, EasyJet et bien d'autres, qui verront s'installer une concurrence étrangère déloyale, encore une fois.

Ce texte n'aborde pas non plus la rareté des ressources. La production de ce carburant vert repose sur l'utilisation de résidus agricoles et sylvicoles, d'algues, de biomasse ou d'huiles de cuisson usagées. Ces ressources existent en si faible quantité que la cadence de production pour faire face à la demande ne pourra pas être supportable. De plus, en produisant davantage de carburant vert, les industriels vont augmenter mécaniquement leur empreinte carbone.

Parce qu'en réalité, l'idée derrière ce projet, ce n'est pas de réduire l'empreinte carbone. C'est surtout que tout ce qui n'est pas électrique est encore une fois un ennemi à abattre. Vous ne cachez plus votre souhait de voir disparaître l'avion sans penser aux millions de personnes pour qui l'avion est le seul moyen de transport pour se rendre dans les métropoles depuis les territoires éloignés.

Pendant que vous assommez les Européens avec vos projets hors sol et vos règlements coercitifs, la Commission européenne agit en sous-main en signant des traités de libre-échange à tout va. Au lieu de reconnaître que c'est ce modèle économique qui est dangereux pour l'environnement, vous préférez culpabiliser l'Européen issu des classes moyennes qui prend un vol de Paris à Budapest une fois dans l'année, et encore. C'est une énième ineptie.

Kosma Złotowski, w imieniu grupy ECR. – Szanowny Panie Przewodniczący! Transport lotniczy to ważna i innowacyjna część europejskiej gospodarki, która jest niezwykle wrażliwa na wszelkie zakłócenia rynkowe. Ostatnie lata pokazały, jak wiele miejsc pracy zniknęło z powodu drastycznego ograniczenia liczby lotów. Wojna na Ukrainie, rosnące ceny paliw i biletów, tłok w europejskiej przestrzeni powietrznej ponownie zagrażają przyszłości tej branży. Próba nakładania na ten sektor w tak dramatycznym momencie dodatkowych i kosztownych obowiązków, które odbijają się na konkurencyjności europejskich linii lotniczych i kosztach podróżowania samolotem, to błąd.

Zgadzamy się, że innowacyjne, przyjazne dla środowiska i zrównoważone paliwa pomogą obniżyć emisje w transporcie lotniczym. Doceniamy otwartość sprawozdawcy na nasze argumenty i uwzględnienie wielu propozycji grupy EKR. Popieramy w pełni stworzenie funduszu, który pozwoli inwestować w badania nad alternatywnymi paliwami w lotnictwie. Również sama definicja zrównoważonego paliwa lotniczego wypracowana w komisji transportu to dobry kompromis. Jednak zaproponowany kalendarz zwiększenia udziału tego rodzaju paliw przez linie lotnicze jest, podobnie jak cały pakiet „Fit for 55”, oderwany od realiów gospodarczych i społecznych. Dlatego tego sprawozdania poprzec nie możemy.

Clare Daly, on behalf of The Left Group. – Mr President, I would like to acknowledge and appreciate the efforts of our rapporteur who absolutely strove might and main to try and deal with this file and be as inclusive as possible. And him and his staff deserve credit for that.

But having said that, the final text is just not credible for us in terms of the sector dealing adequately with its decarbonisation requirements, primarily because of the decision to broaden the definition of sustainable aviation fuels, which we strenuously oppose on the grounds that this is actually not sustainable.

Without the caps and restrictions, the text opened the door for new biofuels, which are just not suitable for air transport. And during the discussions, we did warn about the risks of fraud with, for example, used cooking oil, which is mainly imported from outside the EU. While we have strengthened the text to improve the information provided by suppliers, at the same time, there's no sign of a cap as applied in the Renewable Energy Directive, which we thought was very unfortunate.

So, obviously aviation is energy intensive. The demands for the feedstocks qualified by the current definition would be absolutely enormous. It includes by-products of the palm oil industry, intermediate crops, and would produce massive risks for land-use change, disastrous for the environment, communities and biodiversity.

And what we're really trying to do here is square a circle. We're accepting increased demand, which in turn means increased fuel-led demand for feedstocks which are considered sustainable while at the same time their availability is limited. This is in contradiction with the energy strategy promoted by European authorities, which involves also trying to address lowering consumption. And we're not doing that in this report.

Aviation is going to continue to be dependent on fossil fuels for a long time, the price of which is going to continue to rise and be borne by workers, passengers and the climate. I think it's all well and good to debate different targets up to 2050, but even if we have a target of 100%, it's not going to matter if the definition allows inappropriate feedstocks. So, if we don't address that, we simply cannot vote for this report.

I also think the exclusion of private aircraft – so the wealthy who create most of the problems anyway again are being excluded and pay the least – is regrettable, and the exclusion of military aircraft is also regrettable, particularly in the period of increased traffic. So again, like my colleague Ciarán Cuffe, we need these amendments to be passed before we can accept this report.

Andor Deli (NI). – Elnök úr! Biztos asszony! Tisztelt Képviselőtársaim! Amikor jogszabályokat alkotunk, úgy gondolom, hogy rendkívül fontos, hogy figyelembe vegyük ezeknek a végrehajthatóságát. A jogszabályok attól jók, ha könnyű őket alkalmazni, és elég konkrét ahhoz, hogy az iparnak és a kormányzatoknak is megfelelő keretet, kapaszkodót adjanak. Köztudott, hogy a gazdaságnak az átálláshoz szüksége van a kiszámíthatóságra. Sajnos az elmúlt évek folyamán már volt arra példa, hogy a mindenhatónak hitt megoldásokról végül kiderült, hogy zsákutcába vezetnek. Nem szabad ugyanezekbe a hibákba esnünk. A fenntartható repülőgépjárműüzemanyagok kapcsán el kell kerülnünk azt, hogy a légiforgalmi vállalatok egy újabb költséget hárítsanak az utasokra. Ne a polgárok fizessék meg a zöldítés árát!

Véleményem szerint az üzemanyag fogalmának szélesebb és technológiailag semleges meghatározása segíthetné az újabb zsákutcák elkerülését. Legyünk körültekintőek a mai szavazáskor!

Marian-Jean Marinescu (PPE). – Domnule președinte, doamnă comisară, stimați colegi, progresul tehnologic în industria de aviație este remarcabil în ultimii 20 de ani. Motoarele au redus emisiile cu peste treizeci la sută. E adevărat, nivelul de emisii a crescut pentru că a crescut traficul, pentru că cetățenii Uniunii au călătorit. Și există Schengen acum, există low-cost, acesta este motivul.

Progresul tehnologic va continua în Clean Sky, dar în același timp singura posibilitate de a reduce emisiile în acest moment este combustibilul alternativ. Și cred că trebuie să folosim toate mijloacele tehnice pentru a avea combustibili alternativi. Și definiția care este acum propusă cred că este o definiție bună care respectă toată legislația, inclusiv LULUCF, deci nu există probleme cu această definiție.

Țintele pentru combustibilii e-Fuels sunt mult mai mari decât cele propuse de Comisie. Trebuie să fim realiști și să știm exact ce se poate produce în Uniune și, în același timp, să știm că prețul acestui combustibil este de 10 ori mai mare decât al kerosenului. Noi susținem țintele propuse de Comisie.

Includerea, aplicarea acestui regulament pentru toate aeroporturile fără un sistem *Book and Claim* va fi imposibilă, pentru că nu poți să aplici regulamentul în 800 de aeroporturi fără a avea un sistem care să faciliteze intrarea pe piață a combustibililor alternativi. Fondul pentru aviație este necesar pentru că este nevoie de investiții în această industrie.

Petar Vitanov (S&D). – Mr President, sustainable aviation fuel (SAF) can reduce the life-cycle carbon footprint of aviation fuel up to 80%, but it currently makes up less than 0.1% of total aviation fuel consumption.

By adopting this report, we will substantially increase the amount of SAF produced and uplifted, leading to aviation in the EU using at least 85% clean fuels by 2050. We will also increase the number of synthetic aviation fuels up to 22% more in 2050 compared to the Commission's proposal. We will also send a very clear signal to the industry by introducing a binding mandate for synthetic aviation fuels already in 2025.

So, the report adopted by the Committee on Transport and Tourism (TRAN) is a good base for future negotiations with the Council, which will deliver the European regulatory framework and foster innovation, production and deployment of sustainable fuels.

Frédérique Ries (Renew). – Monsieur le Président, le secteur aérien, c'est 4 % des émissions mondiales de carbone. C'est surtout une croissance fulgurante à l'horizon 2050 – ce qui veut dire, de toute évidence, qu'il doit aussi participer à notre objectif de neutralité carbone. Et ça, ça veut dire des avions plus légers, ça veut dire des quantités de carburant embarqué mieux calculées, et ça veut dire surtout des énergies nouvelles. L'excellent rapport de mon collègue Søren Gade va dans ce sens. L'électricité, l'hydrogène, les carburants synthétiques: bien évidemment – mais ça, ce sera pour demain.

Pour les biocarburants, la technologie est plus avancée. Là, ce sont les volumes que nous devons augmenter, et surtout pas en embarquant des PFAD, ce coproduit de l'huile de palme brute. Le résultat est le même: la déforestation, la destruction de la biodiversité et un impact climatique désastreux. Nous n'en voulons pas, les citoyens n'en veulent pas et l'industrie aérienne elle-même n'en veut pas. Un seul vote utile et efficace pour l'avenir est possible ce midi: soutenir le rapport de Søren Gade et les amendements 112 et 134 pour rendre les carburants de l'aviation de demain vraiment durables.

Bas Eickhout (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, I think history repeats itself. When we were discussing biofuels, we made the mistake of creating too much space for the first generation with the idea that maybe later on, the second generation will come. What happened? The first generation has become so dominant that it has become an obstacle for the development of the newer biofuels, the more advanced biofuels. We need to prevent that from happening here.

And that's why opening up and broadening the definition of sustainable aviation fuels is such a wrong thing to do. We wanted the development of the sustainable aviation fuels, but we wanted the development of the more advanced and not the ones that could be palm oil, that could be intermediate crops, that can be food crops. That is the wrong direction. We need to correct this because that will make sure we are developing the real sustainable aviation fuels.

And let's be honest, I'm a bit nervous, but even a company like Lufthansa is coming up with the same arguments as I am. I think that should make you think.

VORSITZ: RAINER WIELAND

Vizepräsident

Hildegard Bentele (PPE). – Herr Präsident, meine sehr geehrten Damen und Herren, liebe Frau Kommissarin! Die Diskussionen um die ReFuelEU-Verordnung waren nicht einfach. Denn es geht um viel: um neue Verpflichtungen für Flughäfen, für Fluggesellschaften und für Treibstoffhersteller. Es geht um Mobilität in Europa, vor allem für entlegene Regionen. Es geht um die Konkurrenz verschiedener Sektoren, um das knappe Gut alternativer Treibstoffe und um die Stellung Europas im internationalen Wettbewerb.

Vor allem aber geht es darum, mit der Dekarbonisierung des Luftverkehrssektors Ernst zu machen. Bis 2030 müssen im europäischen Luftverkehr 55 % CO₂-Emissionen eingespart werden, und das bei ungebrochener Fluglust der Europäer. Wir brauchen also eine Revolution bei der Flugzeugproduktion, bei den verwendeten Werkstoffen, den Antrieben und den Treibstoffen. Die EU hat die Forschung in diesem Bereich in den letzten Jahren mit Milliarden Euro unterstützt und die Industrie mittlerweile auch Prototypen vorgestellt.

Bis 2030 muss aus meiner Sicht vor allem die Produktion von synthetischen Treibstoffen im Zentrum stehen, denn Biokerosin wird mengenmäßig immer begrenzt bleiben und birgt Nutzungskonflikte. Deshalb brauchen wir jetzt dringend folgendes Signal: E-Fuels sind die Zukunft, und *early movers* können substantiell von europäischen Geldern profitieren.

Und wie immer gilt je schneller skaliert wird, desto schneller...

(Der Präsident entzieht der Rednerin das Wort.)

Ismail Ertug (S&D). – Herr Präsident, sehr geehrte Frau Kommissarin, sehr geehrte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Die Luftfahrt ist ein wichtiger Bereich, ein wichtiger Industriezweig, das ist richtig. Sie verursacht 2,1 % der globalen CO₂-Emissionen, und in Europa sind es sogar mehr, in der EU haben wir 3,8 %. Und das ist auch deswegen so wichtig, weil dieser Sektor mit am schwierigsten zu dekarbonisieren ist. Wir haben hier zunächst keine Möglichkeit – heute, vielleicht auch morgen noch nicht –, zu elektrifizieren. Wir müssen hier auch den Weg von Alternativen gehen. Deswegen ist die Technologieoffenheit so wichtig, und deswegen ist es auch wichtig, dass wir die Forschung und Entwicklung in diesem Bereich unterstützen. Wenn wir hören, dass Airbus frühestens 2035 ein Wasserstoffflugzeug auf den Markt bringen kann, dann ist das zwar schön, aber wir müssen mittelfristig eine Lösung finden.

Deswegen ist diese Verordnung richtig und wichtig. Trotzdem ist gesagt worden – und darauf will ich hinaus –, dass wir darauf achten müssen, dass das, was in den Tank geschüttet wird, nicht an anderer Stelle fehlt. Und dieses „*Book and Claim*“-System ist in meinen Augen gar keine schlechte Idee. Aber in dieser Form ist sie letztendlich nicht geschützt vor Missbrauch, und deswegen brauchen wir auch eine bessere Alternative dafür.

José Ramón Bauzá Díaz (Renew). – Señor presidente, el precio de un vuelo entre Frankfurt y Palma de Mallorca para el 1 de agosto supera ya los 400 €. Las causas son varias, indudablemente: la coyuntura internacional y el aumento de los precios de los cambios, que aumenta el coste y mucho.

En el año 2022, una cuarta parte del coste de los totales de las operaciones es debida a los combustibles. Ante esta situación, probablemente podríamos pensar que los precios de combustibles promoverían que la industria hiciera lo máximo en ese sentido. Como decimos en España, a la fuerza ahorcan. Es una cuestión de vida o muerte.

Pero yo creo que tenemos la oportunidad de hacer de la necesidad virtud y desarrollar un mercado europeo de combustibles sostenibles, competitivos, asequibles y también accesibles. Y no lo hagamos por imperativo legal. Hagámoslo también de la mano del sector. En ese sentido, necesitamos la colaboración público-privada, necesitamos incentivos, necesitamos inversiones y también flexibilidad para que le demos a la industria —en primer lugar, no la criminalicemos— recursos y tiempo para poder conseguirlo.

En definitiva, de lo contrario, si no hacemos nada de eso, el incremento de los precios se multiplicará y haremos lo contrario a lo que queremos, que es la no, en este caso, democratización de los vuelos. Finalmente, quisiera agradecer y felicitar a mi compañero Søren Gade, el ponente, por su excelente trabajo, precisamente en ese sentido.

(El orador acepta responder a una intervención realizada con arreglo al procedimiento de la «tarjeta azul»)

Jutta Paulus (Verts/ALE), blue-card speech. – My question is, actually when you're talking about that we need to keep the cost at bay and we need to democratise aviation, are you aware that about 20% of the world's population are in a situation to be able to enter a plane on economic reasons and that 1% of the world's population is responsible for more than 50% of emissions, and that the ticket prices reflect less than one third of the cost which is actually inflicted on society by aviation? How do we judge that?

José Ramón Bauzá Díaz (Renew), blue-card reply. – Thank you so much for your question. Well, let's talk about some figures. You don't say that only 2% of CO₂ emissions are because of the aviation sector. And we have to allow that the industry can rise to that goal. If we are doing alone without counting with that industry, we'll be alone and it will be possible to democratise, obviously, this situation. Not only the use of the flight – the aviation sector is not only for tourism, it's as well for business, it works for small and medium companies to allow them to show their products. It's as well for healthy situation. Therefore, many questions ... don't do populism with that, use the right figures – only 2% of CO₂ emissions are due to the aviation sector.

Karima Delli (Verts/ALE). – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Commissaire, chers collègues, nous nous apprêtons à voter un texte qui a pour ambition de décarboner le secteur de l'aviation. L'enjeu est de taille: les émissions de l'aviation explosent, l'aviation représente déjà 3 % des émissions mondiales et le trafic aérien va continuer d'augmenter de plus de 50 % en 2035.

Nous devons décarboner ce secteur et remplacer le kérosène, qui est l'un des carburants les plus polluants du monde, par des carburants durables. Mais encore faut-il qu'ils soient réellement durables. Je vous appelle, mes chers collègues, à voter contre l'ajout des dérivés de l'huile de palme, comme le PFAD, ou des cultures alimentaires à la liste de ces carburants durables et à revenir à la définition telle que proposée par la Commission européenne.

L'urgence climatique est là. Investissons réellement dans les carburants les plus durables, notamment les carburants de synthèse, l'hydrogène ou l'électricité, mais non pas dans des substances qui auront des impacts forts, environnementaux et sociaux, sur la déforestation, qui sera terrible dans les années à venir – sans compter l'image néfaste qui entacherait notre industrie de l'aviation en Europe. Faisons le bon choix pour le climat et pour les générations futures.

Vera Tax (S&D). – Voorzitter, geachte commissaris, vliedschaamte – de meesten van ons hebben er last van. In 2018 was het zelfs genomineerd als Woord van het Jaar. Mensen willen zich verplaatsen op een betaalbare en duurzame manier, zonder dat onze planeet schade ondervindt.

Deze ReFuelEU Aviation-wet is daarom van groot belang en gaat ons daarbij helpen door brandstofleveranciers en vliegtuigmaatschappijen te verplichten om SAV's te gebruiken en te maken. Sustainable Aviation Fuels zijn 80 % duurzamer dan kerosine. Hiermee maakt de EU het verschil voor ons allemaal: vliegen zonder schaamte in de toekomst.

Maar waar de EU ook een verschil moet maken, is voor de mensen met slechtbetaalde banen en zware werkomstandigheden in de transportsector, en in het bijzonder op de luchthavens. Het oude systeem van goedkoop en vervuילend reizen ten faveure van dikke winsten voor aandeelhouders en ten koste van mens en milieu, daar moeten we een halt aan toeroepen.

Jan-Christoph Oetjen (Renew). – Herr Präsident, verehrte Kolleginnen und Kollegen, Frau Kommissarin! Zunächst herzlichen Glückwunsch an den Kollegen Gade für seinen exzellenten Bericht. Drei Gedanken von meiner Seite dazu.

Erstens: Wir wollen, dass wir noch schneller auf alternative Kraftstoffe im Flugverkehr setzen. Denn alternative Kraftstoffe sind die einzige Möglichkeit, wie wir den Flugverkehr dekarbonisieren können. Deswegen gibt es höhere Ziele bei der Beimischung, aber es soll auch die Basis für die Produktion verbreitert werden. Ich halte das für sinnvoll, aus einem Grund: Die Nachhaltigkeitskriterien, die wir festlegen, werden immer weiter gesichert, denn die werden in der Erneuerbare-Energien-Richtlinie geregelt. Deswegen braucht hier niemand eine Sorge zu haben, dass diese Nachhaltigkeitskriterien gerissen werden.

Zweiter Gedanke: In dem Bericht des Kollegen Gade wird vorgeschlagen, den auf alle Flughäfen auszuweiten und damit auf mehr Flughäfen als von der Kommission vorgesehen. Dafür braucht man dann aber auch ein flexibles System, wie diese Kraftstoffe angenommen werden, und deswegen wird vorgeschlagen, „Book and Claim“ einzuführen. Ich halte das für eine gute Lösung, die der Kollege Gade hier vorschlägt, denn es bringt Flexibilität in das System.

Dritter Gedanke: Das ist das Thema Wettbewerbsfähigkeit. Wir müssen aufpassen, dass wir mit dem Vorschlag nicht das Kind mit dem Bade ausschütten und eine Wettbewerbsverzerrung für die europäischen Airlines bekommen, dass...

(Der Präsident entzieht dem Redner das Wort.)

Marianne Vind (S&D). – Hr. formand! Det var jo pionererne, der i det forrige århundrede opfandt flyvemaskinen. Den har givet os en følelse af frihed, men vores frihed er nu truet. Truet af det sorte aftryk, vi efterlader os, hver eneste gang vi flyver. Vi står nu i et nyt århundrede på tærsklen til en ny æra. En æra for grønne fly. Det er tid til at handle, for den grønne omstilling af luftfarten sker ikke af sig selv. Den kræver investeringer og pionerånd, for omstilling går gennem bæredygtige flybrændstoffer – brændstoffer, der ikke er mange af lige nu. Men hvis vi ønsker mere bæredygtigt brændstof i tanken, er vi nødt til at øge efterspørgslen. Det er simpel logik. Storskalaproduktion er vejen til billigt grønt brændstof. Europa har ikke brug for et bureaukratisk loft over de grønne ambitioner. Europa har brug for plads til høje politiske ambitioner og frihed til de, der vil gå forrest i at investere i og udvikle bæredygtige flybrændstoffer. For kun sådan kan vi sikre billigere alternativer til fossile brændstoffer i fremtiden. Det er tid til at give vor tids grønne pionerer frihed til at bane vejen for fremtidens fly.

Caroline Nagtegaal (Renew). – Voorzitter, en Søren, tak, we nemen met elkaar een vlucht richting een groenere luchtvaart. Een Europees bijmengpercentage van de luchtvaart is van ongekend belang.

Ik hoor ook geluiden om me heen van: “het gaat niet ver genoeg” of: “het is maar een druppel op de gloeiende plaat”. Integendeel, wat mij betreft. Kijk naar Nederland. Zelfs Nederland zet een sprint in met een bijmengverplichting van 14 % in 2030. Maar ook met Europa doen we met dit voorstel een sprong voorwaarts met biobrandstof, met synthetische brandstoffen. Beide zullen helpen op weg naar een duurzame en toekomstbestendige luchtvaart en op termijn ook elektrisch vliegen of vliegen op waterstof. Kansen genoeg!

Elke luchtvaartmaatschappij die op Europese luchthavens landt en tankt, betaalt hier mee aan het bijmengpercentage, ook maatschappijen uit landen waar het soms wat minder nauw wordt genomen met de regels rondom eerlijke concurrentie. Dat is juist de kracht van dit voorstel: een gelijk speelveld voor iedereen. *I am ready for take-off.*

Giuseppe Ferrandino (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, sappiamo che serve uno sforzo congiunto per centrare gli obiettivi climatici e quindi anche l'aviazione deve contribuire.

I combustibili sostenibili SAF rappresentano un passaggio cruciale. Serve una strategia di medio-lungo periodo perché l'Europa produca e fornisca questa tipologia di carburanti, perché l'indipendenza energetica che stiamo cercando in maniera così affannosa passa anche da queste azioni. Questo regolamento è centrale nella creazione di un mercato sano di carburanti sostenibili. Perciò, le misure in essi contenute vanno valutate senza dogmi ideologici. La quota minima di SAF da introdurre come obbligo a partire dal 2025 è fondamentale, come centrale è garantire gli stessi obblighi di utilizzo in tutta l'Unione europea.

Va sostenuto anche il sistema che richiede a tutti gli operatori europei e non di rifornirsi per almeno il 90 per cento del carburante necessario negli aeroporti dell'Unione da cui partono, per evitare che si eluda la regola del SAF.

Dobbiamo prepararci all'adozione delle nuove tecnologie a emissioni zero per tempo, quindi dobbiamo chiedere ai nostri aeroporti di dotarsi delle infrastrutture necessarie per le ricariche di idrogeno ed elettricità.

Spontane Wortmeldungen

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Domnule președinte, doamnă comisară, stimați colegi, trebuie să pornim de la ideea că transportul aerian este extrem de important pentru economie și că transportul aerian din Uniunea Europeană nu este singur pe Pământ. Avem transport aerian în alte părți ale Globului, unde sigur emisiile sunt mult mai mari decât în Uniunea Europeană, unde avem doar 2 %.

Sunt de acord că trebuie să lucrăm la decarbonizarea sectorului aviatic, dar trebuie o facem rațional și mă bucur, doamnă comisară, că v-ați gândit și la impactul asupra companiilor, asupra industriei. Trebuie să o facem gradual. Neutralitatea tehnologică este necesară, dar trebuie să o facem în ritmul în care industria poate să intervină.

Nu o să pot să votez toate amendamentele, de exemplu, acelea care au un impact asupra aeroporturilor mici și a operatorilor mici. Trebuie să ne gândim și la ei și da, vedem ce indispensabil este transportul acum, când este dat peste cap și ce efect negativ are asupra cetățenilor, asupra economiei, asupra turismului.

Acum, noi trebuie să luăm măsuri raționale și mă bucur că sunt colegi care au spus acest lucru. Trebuie să facem decarbonizarea în ritmul în care industria permite.

(Ende der spontanen Wortmeldungen)

Kadri Simson, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, this has been a very interesting and lively exchange, which confirms that we are in the making of a decisive piece of legislation for the future of sustainable aviation. And I have taken good note of the points made.

Some of you expressed concerns that the original Commission proposal was not ambitious enough. ReFuelEU aviation will be the first regulation in the world to set binding e-fuel obligations on fuel suppliers. This is very ambitious. It is proposed by the Commission, taking into account the status of the industry, the expected development of the industry, the high needs in renewable electricity and hydrogen, and the additional costs for airlines.

However, when it comes to setting legally binding e-fuel targets, we need to be cautious. Setting e-fuels targets too high would risk undermining the credibility of our framework, risks shortages of supply, imposes significant penalties for non-compliance on our industry, or imposes a disproportionate financial burden on airlines. And of course, it is very welcome if the industry is in a position to supply or use more e-fuels on a voluntary basis. Our proposal certainly aims to encourage the industry to do so.

The Commission also suggests that the regulation should support predominantly advanced biofuels and e-fuels, which will be needed in very large volumes in the mid-term and long term. And supporting low-end feedstock will not make it easier to reach the targets, but will create risks of lock-ins, and there is a reputational risk associated with the expansion of the definition.

Aviation needs clean fuels to decarbonise, not a controversy on the sustainability of SAFs.

And I would like to conclude by calling on the plenary to take a pragmatic approach towards the vote and consider this necessary milestone to engage in fruitful discussions with the Council on an issue that could not be more timely. And of course, the Commission services will remain available to support Parliament as much as possible during these dialogues.

Søren Gade, Ordfører. – Hr. formand! Kære kolleger! Mange tak for alle kommentarerne. Som jeg allerede har nævnt, er det ikke muligt at gøre alle glade. Mange af jeres indlæg har været en venlig påmindelse herom. Så tak for det, kære kolleger. Som jeg nævnte i min indledning, har det været mit job at få mange forskellige interesser til at mødes. Nogle ville have »book and claim«, andre er lodret imod. Nogle ville have en bredere definition af SAF, andre vil have en smallere. Nogle vil have højere iblandingskrav, andre ville have lavere. Dog vil jeg gerne minde om her, at vi nu skal have vedtaget et forhandlingsmandat. Transportudvalgets forslag er indtil videre det, der har fået størst opbakning i udvalget. Derfor mener jeg, det er et rigtig godt udgangspunkt. Jeg ser meget frem til at få det prøvet ved Parlamentets medlemmer senere i dag, og jeg glæder mig rigtig meget til at forsvare Parlamentets holdning i de kommende trilogforhandlinger.

Der Präsident. – Die Aussprache ist geschlossen.

Die Abstimmung findet heute, Donnerstag, 7. Juli 2022, um 12.00 Uhr statt.

5. Sestava Parlamenta

Der Präsident. – Im Anschluss an den Rücktritt von Frau Constanze Krehl stellt das Parlament gemäß der Geschäftsordnung das Freiwerden ihres Sitzes mit Wirkung zum 3. Oktober 2022 fest und unterrichtet die zuständigen nationalen Behörden.

6. Boljše pravno urejanje: združujemo moči za pripravo boljše zakonodaje (razprava)

Der Präsident. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über den Bericht von Tiemo Wölken im Namen des Rechtsausschusses über das Thema „Bessere Rechtsetzung: Mit vereinten Kräften für bessere Rechtsvorschriften“ (2021/2166(INI)) (A9-0167/2022).

Tiemo Wölken, rapporteur. – Mr President, better lawmaking should be a common goal for all EU lawmakers. It is the core of our work. We owe it to the European citizens to make sure that European legislation is ambitious, fit for the purpose, proportionate, clear, transparent and comprehensive. This can, however, only be achieved by increasing transparency, accountability, cooperation between the institutions – unfortunately, the Council is not present – the Member States, citizens and stakeholders. Better regulation helps us to ensure that EU policies and legislation are geared towards the future and serve society.

Indeed, there were several very good aspects integrated in the Commission's Better Regulation Communication. Thank you very much for that. But sometimes with good also comes bad, and here I would like to focus on two specific things that I personally still am very sceptical about.

While conducting our work, we need to be able to gain the trust of EU citizens and take them with us along the legislative process. In order to gain trust there needs to be transparency. When looking at the Regulatory Scrutiny Board, especially said transparency is simply missing. We have a board that is composed of seven members, none of them elected, meaning that they are not accountable to citizens or us as policymakers. Additionally, four out of seven Board members are Commission employees, decreasing credibility and weakening its independence.

I am very concerned to see that one of the objects set out by the Commission is to strengthen the board. For example, I believe that transparency in regard to Scrutiny Board meetings with stakeholders, reviews, recommendations and opinions should be significantly improved. Moreover, the work of the Board should not ultimately affect the Commission's capacity to propose legislation or unduly delay the adoption of legislative proposals. In 2021 alone, one third of the impact assessments received a negative first opinion by the Board, leading to delays. And speaking about delays, the Board gave two negative opinions on the due diligence proposal, and now we have to work here in Parliament under extreme time pressure.

The Board can only provide an effective check on the Commission's work if it is independent and impartial, so this needs to be established. Therefore, we are calling for the independence of the Board and for transparency of the Board's meetings through making use of the transparency register mandatory, and also by publishing reviews, recommendations and opinions without any delay. And this is what I need to underline here – without any delay.

Secondly, the one-in-one-out approach which the Commission disappointingly introduced unilaterally without a prior impact assessment or consultation. I am personally very sceptical about this approach. I believe that the energy that will be required by Commission staff to tick the box could indeed be usefully used somewhere else. I believe that this approach must, under no circumstances, run counter to the objective of better regulation. Moreover, this approach should not lead to mechanical decisions of repeating legislation just for the sake of it.

This is why we are calling for this approach to be based on a transparent and evidence-based methodology, giving proportionate consideration to all sustainability aspects, both in terms of benefits and costs, including the costs of non-compliance and inaction, and taking into account the administrative, social, environmental and public health impacts. Coming back to transparency, we call on you, Commissioner, to take the one-in-one-out calculator, to make it public as soon as possible and to obtain the support of all institutions before applying this approach.

And one last note: I would like to thank all my colleagues and their teams who have contributed to the discussion on this report. I am looking forward to the discussion and colleagues, Commissioner, let us build trust together with all the institutions.

Maroš Šefčovič, *Vice-President of the Commission*. – Mr President, first and foremost, I want to underline how much I appreciate your interest and support for making sure that we do an even better job in a better regulation. I also would like to thank the rapporteur, Mr Tiemo Wölken, and all those who provided input for this very comprehensive report.

Indeed, in these challenging times, high-quality and efficient legislation is more important than ever so we can deliver maximum benefits for our citizens and businesses, and the way how we do it really matters. We need to work together, and I agree with Mr Wölken, to boost engagement, and to work on transparency and trust of our policies. To that end, we have been working to follow up on the communication we presented last year and this has included updating our better regulation guidelines and toolbox. I am sure that you are well informed that the toolbox now comprises 69 different tools, including a specific one focusing on all aspects of equality, fundamental rights and human rights.

Progress has been made and I am pleased that our new generation better regulation is recognised as one of the most advanced regulatory systems in the world. The OECD, for example, ranks us as best on stakeholder consultations and evaluation.

Mr Wölken was referring to the Regulatory Scrutiny Board and I want to underline that its independence and best practices are actually part of the success. I am convinced that they are doing an excellent job by giving us crucial feedback on the quality and coherence of impact assessments and the evaluation we carry out, and on whether proportionality and subsidiarity are being respected.

If I could react very briefly to the comments just made by Mr Wölken in this regard, I want to tell you that the Regulatory Scrutiny Board is truly independent. And the fact that they are very strict in their impact assessment and they are not afraid to return quite a few even very important legislative proposals just proves that they do their job well, because I think when we want to legislate we have to make sure that we legislate in a high quality, in a professional, in a good way.

And if – and it happens in every administration – a DG does not do its job properly, I think it's only the right thing to send it back; so we would prepare and we'll come in front of you with a high-quality legislation, with proper impact assessments, and with all the pluses and minuses properly evaluated.

On top of it I also would like to reassure you that they are under no political pressure whatsoever and that they really do their job independently. We are working with them to make sure that all the new or additional transparency requirements are properly met.

I have to say that when I looked at your report I was very pleased to see that the European Parliament and the Commission, we share the same ambitions on many aspects of better regulation. I am also glad to say that many of your calls for actions have been already addressed, even though I agree – and this is what our debate will be about – how to make it even better, even of higher quality in the future.

If you look at some of your calls from the last period, you asked us to make sure that we would optimise our consultation process and we did it. We did it through our new call for evidence. I hope you would agree with me that now it's more focused, it's more user-friendly, and it's available in all official EU languages.

We are also more transparent on how replies are taken into account using new feedback tools. So if there was a complaint in the past, okay, we sent you our position but we never heard from you. It was a kind of black box. Now that's not happening. We are giving the feedback. We are responding to the evidence or to the contributions we are receiving.

I also would like to thank the European Parliament and to all of you who participated in the Conference on the Future of Europe for pushing forward another very innovative idea and this is the use of the European Citizens' Panel for even closer consultations with our citizens on our proposals. And I am also glad to tell you that we are now looking into the way how to use the digital platform we used for the Conference for even better consultations and better reach out, especially to younger citizens who are used to the digital tools. And I believe it would definitely give them a stronger voice.

In addition, we are working on a more user-friendly repository of evidence for all legislative acts, evaluations and data sets to improve transparency and accessibility, to further improve the analysis and reporting on key economic, social and environmental impacts, in particular linked to the green and digital transitions. And our dedication to the twin transition is reflected in the adoption of the 'do no significant harm' and 'digital by default' principles, which I know are very important to this House, and we had several debates on these in the committee or in the plenary or bilaterally.

We also perform systematically a climate consistency check, which is very, very important, as this morning's debate on the heatwave and drought has confirmed.

Our 2022 Strategic Foresight Report, published last week, looks at reinforcing synergies resulting from twinning and the twinning of green and digital transitions. And overall, we have mainstream strategic foresight to ensure that our legislation is fit for the future.

Mr Wölken was also making reference to our 'one in, one out' approach which we have further integrated in our approach to help minimise regulatory costs for citizens and businesses. And I can reassure you again that this is not a mechanical, this is not a deregulatory exercise, but one based on the new working methods with improved efforts on quantification.

We started with a pilot project last year and will report on its outcome in this year's annual burden survey where we will have more data, and I believe that you will make your own assessment of the process. And the future additions of the burden surveys will then report on overall offsetting, not only where the burden is coming from, but how we are going to offset it.

And I am also glad to see that Parliament is also very ambitious as we are when it comes to the impact assessment. There were, of course, cases for reasons of political urgency, such as the COVID-19 pandemic, where it has been impossible to carry out a proper impact assessment. But when there is such a case, we will, and we did it also in the past, explain the reason why we could not do the impact assessment, and we produced a report with all the evidence within three months for your very detailed examinations.

I would like also to underline that we do not always need the impact assessment, such as when the proposals concern matters where there is little or no choice available or where no significant impact is reasonably expected. Regarding delegated and implementing acts, they are usually defined by empowerments in the basic acts, which does not give much choice for the Commission. However, we agree that there are instances where such analyses can be useful and we appreciate the European Parliament bringing such cases to our attention.

Honourable Members, I would like to congratulate the European Parliament for a very important step you have taken. You established your own dedicated directorate to look at the impact assessment and the European added value. This has been an important step so that better lawmaking does not just remain a common objective but, with your directorate, it also has become a common effort.

And I applaud that Parliament has started to carry out its own impact assessment related to substantial amendments introduced by co-legislators. The Council is not there yet, but we all need to work together as otherwise we risk missing links and we risk being ineffective. The Commission stands ready to re-engage and engage collectively with Parliament and the Council to give even greater effect to our joint commitment to better regulation.

And I would conclude by calling upon all of us to join forces to deliver on our ambitions for our citizens and businesses, and I really would like to thank you not only for great cooperation, for a very important report, and for all the communications we had in the meantime on how to make our regulation better for now and for the future.

Helmut Scholz, *Verfasser der Stellungnahme des mitberatenden Ausschusses für konstitutionelle Fragen*. – Herr Präsident, Herr Vizepräsident! Ich möchte mich zunächst beim Berichterstatter für seine gute Arbeit an diesem sehr unterstützenswerten Bericht bedanken. Ich sehe eine weitgehende Übereinstimmung mit den weitreichenden Positionen und Sichtweisen, die wir als konstitutioneller Ausschuss in die Arbeit um die Weiterentwicklung der wichtigen, transparent zu machenden Rechtsetzung der EU einbringen. Die längste Stellungnahme, die der AFCO jemals zu einem Bericht abgegeben hat.

Unser Verständnis muss sein: Gesetzgebung hat sehr viel mit dem Lebensalltag der Menschen in den 27 Mitgliedstaaten und in der EU zu tun. Es sind diese Regelungen, die die Grundlage unseres Wohlstands erst ermöglichen. Arbeitnehmerinnen- und Arbeitnehmerrechte, Klimaschutz oder fairer Wettbewerb sind ohne umfangreiche Gesetzgebung undenkbar. Notwendig ist deshalb die individuelle Folgenabschätzung jeder einzelnen Initiative.

Den *One-in-one-out*-Grundsatz halte ich persönlich für ungeeignet, da rein formale Kriterien zur Bewertung von Gesetzen angewandt werden. Wichtiger ist doch der Inhalt. Es sollte besonders der Kampf gegen die Klimakatastrophe, aber auch das Vertrauen der Bürgerinnen und Bürger in den Gesetzgebungsprozess berücksichtigt werden, gerade auch mit Blick auf die konsequente Umsetzung der Empfehlungen der Zukunftskonferenz – konsequent und inklusive auch einer Neuverhandlung von Verträgen.

Herr Vizepräsident, Ihre heutigen Ausführungen werden durch die Taten bewiesen, und ich hoffe auf eine konstruktive Zusammenarbeit...

(Der Präsident entzieht dem Redner das Wort.)

Pernando Barrena Arza, *ponente de opinión de la Comisión de Peticiones*. – Señor presidente, es imprescindible asegurar que la ciudadanía ejerza con todas las garantías su derecho democrático en el proceso de deliberación europeo, asegurando su papel activo en procesos de democracia directa. Para ello, es fundamental que las instituciones ahonden en la transparencia, muchas veces puesta en cuestión, como ocurrió con la Iniciativa Ciudadana Europea «Minority SafePack», que fue finalmente rechazada por la Comisión.

La transición digital es una oportunidad para garantizar una participación ciudadana clave a la hora de asegurar derechos fundamentales, tan necesarios en este contexto de amenaza constante por parte de sectores reaccionarios, respetando los derechos fundamentales y luchando contra la discriminación contra mujeres, personas, migrantes y personas LGBTI+.

Para terminar, quisiera subrayar que el texto recoge el derecho de iniciativa legislativa por parte del Parlamento Europeo mediante la revisión de los Tratados, por ejemplo por medio de la Convención. Además, es fundamental que los cauces de participación, también de los Estados miembros, se abran a la escala local y regional, así como que se tenga en cuenta la realidad de las naciones sin Estado.

Luisa Regimenti, *a nome del gruppo PPE*. – Signor Presidente, signor Commissario, onorevoli colleghi, la relazione «Legiferare meglio», oggi sottoposta alla nostra approvazione in seduta plenaria, riveste un'importanza fondamentale per aumentare la trasparenza, la chiarezza e altresì l'adeguatezza della legislazione europea, a beneficio di cittadini e imprese.

Nel suo ruolo di colegislatore, questo Parlamento ha il dovere di razionalizzare e semplificare la normativa che contribuisce ad adottare.

Una legiferazione di alta qualità garantisce la certezza del diritto e incide direttamente sulla competitività dell'Unione europea, dei suoi territori e delle sue imprese.

Abbiamo bisogno di un approccio più ambizioso per eliminare gli ostacoli e la burocrazia, a vantaggio dell'interesse pubblico e di un'attuazione più rapida della normativa che incide sulle realtà economiche e sociali nazionali.

Con il nostro voto oggi, onorevoli colleghi, stiamo invitando la Commissione e gli Stati membri a rendere il processo legislativo e il sistema di recepimento delle leggi più accessibili, proporzionati e trasparenti.

Ci attendono numerose sfide ma anche opportunità nel nostro cammino verso un'Europa più forte e unita.

L'efficace applicazione e attuazione del diritto nell'Unione possono e devono essere la nostra priorità.

Ibán García Del Blanco, *en nombre del Grupo S&D*. – Señor presidente, en primer lugar, quiero darle la enhorabuena a mi compañero Tiemo Wölken por haber sido tan exhaustivo, como siempre suele ser, en la realización de este informe.

Queremos, desde el Parlamento Europeo, mejorar todo el ciclo de desarrollo de políticas europeas en un proceso abierto, transparente, que resista el paso del tiempo, que permita tomar decisiones informadas y que cuente con el respaldo de la sociedad. Buscamos fortalecer la eficacia, la transparencia y la rendición de cuentas para que nuestras instituciones sean más fiables y eficientes y que con esto ganen solidez, por una parte, y la confianza de los ciudadanos, por la otra. Todo ello en un marco de doble transformación digital y verde, de recuperación tras la COVID y de conflicto en la frontera este de la Unión.

Quiero detenerme en la cuestión de la comunicación e interacción con las partes interesadas y el público en general, el objetivo primero y último de la propuesta. En nuestra ambición por mejorarlo todo con la visión de aquel que cuenta con la formación, las herramientas, el soporte y el tiempo para rellenar cuestionarios, no debemos perder de vista nuestro tejido de pequeñas y medianas empresas, de los autónomos, de las microempresas, de los trabajadores por cuenta propia. También ellos deben poder hacer uso de un espacio fácilmente accesible y participar en un proceso económicamente asequible que les permita transmitir ágil y eficazmente sus demandas. De ahí también que sea tan importante que la fuerza de este tejido industrial que mueve Europa y el conjunto de su ciudadanía estén digitalmente ilustrados.

Yana Toom, *on behalf of the Renew Group*. – Mr President, first of all, I have to thank the rapporteur, Tiemo Wölken, for his excellent job, as always.

In this House and together with the Commission and the Council, we adopt a large amount of legislation every year. Just in the past two months, we can recall some important examples like the DSA, DMA, ETS and CBAM last month, so it is very relevant that we reflect on the way we approach law-making, in order to make sure that our legislation is of the highest quality and it delivers on the promises made to our voters. For me, this means increasing citizens' participation in all the steps of EU law-making and decision-taking – because if we want to legislate for our citizens, their opinions should be heard. It also means increasing the transparency of the legislative process so that every citizen can follow the development of an initiative from inception until adoption. In particular, the Council should be a lot more open with their decision-making. We know that often the only information available from the Council is the final decision, without the possibility for the citizens to see how their own government influenced the decision.

Last but not least, we need also to increase our efforts in enforcing EU law – because all the work we do in preparing the legislation would be in vain if we do not ensure it's actually implemented and followed. All of these points have been included in the report and now we have to implement them.

Heidi Hautala, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Mr President, dear colleagues, once again, our Parliament has drafted an excellent report on better regulation in order to join hands and forces to make better laws. But unfortunately, very often, better regulation is merely a catchphrase to justify different political goals, one in, one out, impact assessment, and so forth. So instead of long, casuistic ad hoc measures and better regulation guidelines, what the EU needs is a proper administrative procedure – an administrative code for EU officials that would give citizens a right to demand that the EU follows principles of better regulation and law-making in all of its actions.

The European Parliament presented a fully fledged proposal for EU administrative law back in 2016, but so far the Commission has not given it any serious consideration. There is also a lot of room for improvement in the administration here in the European Parliament too. Why wouldn't we then start with ourselves and make our own work more transparent, accountable, and our own procedures clearer and more predictable?

Gilles Lebreton, *au nom du groupe ID*. – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, il est nécessaire d'améliorer le processus législatif européen, qui manque de transparence et de clarté pour les citoyens. Le rapport Wölken a le mérite d'indiquer plusieurs pistes d'amélioration, c'est pourquoi je le soutiens.

Parmi les bonnes recommandations de ce rapport, je citerai notamment le respect du multilinguisme contre l'omnipotence de l'anglais, la confection de vraies analyses d'impact pour les propositions législatives, ou encore la prise en compte systématique de la spécificité des PME pour alléger leurs charges administratives.

Je soutiens particulièrement la suggestion de renforcer le poids des parlements nationaux dans le processus législatif européen, car l'Union européenne ne pourra pas survivre si elle n'affiche pas clairement son respect de la souveraineté des nations qui la composent. Le mirage d'un État fédéral disposant d'une souveraineté européenne au nom d'un prétendu peuple européen doit être dissipé. L'Union européenne n'est et ne peut être autre chose qu'une organisation internationale. C'est bien dans cette perspective que je la soutiens. Si elle tente de se transformer en État fédéral, comme la conférence sur l'avenir de l'Europe noyauté par le président Macron l'y invite, alors une ligne rouge sera franchie aux yeux du nationaliste que je suis et j'en deviendrai l'adversaire déterminé.

Ангел Джамбазки, *от името на групата ECR*. – Г-н Председател, докладчикът заслужава поздравления за доклада, който е направил, и за усилията, които е положил. На мен ми се иска да обърна внимание на една фундаментална грешка в политиката на Европейския парламент и Съюза. И това не са усилията на докладчика, пак казвам, заслужава поздравление.

Стремежът към повече регулация е дълбоко погрешен, уважаеми колеги. Това да искаш повече регулации, по-добри регулации, противоречи на идеята за свободната инициатива, за свободното предприемачество и на това гражданите да разполагат с волята си, със желанието си да направят каквото те намерят за добре и каквото трябва да направят, а не да бъдат непрекъснато регулирани от европейските институции. Желанието за повече регулации е социализъм от съветски тип. И така беше построена онази система, всичко е регулирано, всичко се прави по калъп, всичко трябва да бъде подредено в техните кутийки. И това разочарова гражданите и ги отдалечава от европейската идея, от Европейския съюз изцяло.

И ще ви дам един пример за такава регулация. Всички тук в тази зала сте много „зелени“, искате всички да ядат зелено, да дишат зелено, да носят зелени гащи или да не ги носят, ако е по-зелено, обаче същевременно гласувахте стотици хиляди празни камиони да се разхождат празни из Европа, да горят много гориво и да замърсяват въздуха. Кажете ми сега това добра регулация ли е или е лоша регулация? Екологично ли е да се разхождат камионите празни или не е екологично? И ако не е екологично, защо го гласувате, когато искате добри регулации? Отделно оставям идеологическите настройки и всеки един документ, в който се говори за администрация, пък там се обсъждат равенство на пола и други такива теми, които нямат нищо общо.

В заключение, не повече, а по-малко регулации, повече суверенитет, повече независимост, свободна воля и суверенни държави.

Ivan Vilibor Sinčić (NI). – Poštovani predsjedavajući, bolji zakoni, kakvog smisla imaju zakoni i standardi ako se ne provode?

Idemo, recimo, na zaštitu okoliša u Hrvatskoj, na gospodarenje otpadom. Postoje standardi kako se rade kvalitetni projekti u Europi, naprimjer, crvena knjiga ili žuta knjiga i drugo. Zašto se odobravaju loši projekti u zemljama periferije poput Hrvatske? Europske institucije odobravaju takve projekte. Zašto se rade uređaji za otpadne vode višestrukog kapaciteta nego stanovnika? Zašto se rade centri gospodarenja otpadom koji se kvare svakih pet minuta? U svojim zemljama sve to ne radite. Je li to zato što zapadnoeuropske kompanije moraju prodati svoju opremu? Je li to zato što europske institucije to ne zanima? To nije zato što ne znate, jer sam se pobrinuo da svi relevantni ovdje to znaju, od komesara pa nadalje. Hrvatska vlada kaže JASPERS i Komisija su odobrili taj projekt, a Komisija kaže da je odgovorna vlada. Zašto se ide na ruku otpadnim lobijima u Hrvatskoj? Europski novac postao je sredstvo devastacije okoliša, skupljih usluga i ogorčenja građana.

Ljudi oko Marišćine, Kaštijuna i Piškornice znaju o čemu govorim, a ne mora biti tako. Dosta je duplih mjerila.

Angelika Niebler (PPE). – Herr Präsident, Herr Vizepräsident der Kommission, liebe Kolleginnen, liebe Kollegen! Bessere Gesetzgebung ist ja für uns im Europäischen Parlament seit Jahren ein Herzensanliegen, und deshalb ein Dankeschön an unseren Berichterstatter, der einen hervorragenden Bericht vorgelegt hat.

Ich möchte eine Initiative herausgreifen, die für mich besonders wichtig ist, für die ich mich auch stark gemacht habe: Ich finde, das Wichtigste ist, dass auch die Webseiten, in denen unsere Bürgerinnen und Bürger, unsere Unternehmen über Finanzierungs- und Fördermöglichkeiten der Europäischen Union informiert werden, in allen Amtssprachen zur Verfügung gestellt werden. Ich weiß, dass die Kommission daran arbeitet.

Herr Vizepräsident, ich bitte Sie noch einmal nachdrücklich, das bis Ende des Jahres – so war es ja wohl angedacht – umzusetzen. Ich finde, das ist ein Gebot der Fairness, dass eben auch nicht englischsprachige Bürgerinnen und Bürger wissen, was sie an Fördermöglichkeiten, an Finanzierungsmöglichkeiten haben. Wir haben Milliardenprogramme, die wir auflegen, und deshalb, glaube ich, ist es ein Gebot der Fairness, auch in allen Amtssprachen darüber zu informieren.

Domènec Ruiz Devesa (S&D). – Señor presidente, quisiera expresar un agradecimiento muy especial a mi compañero de grupo, Tiedo Wölken, por este magnífico informe sobre un tema tan importante como es mejorar el procedimiento legislativo y de producción normativa. Gracias también, por supuesto, al vicepresidente de la Comisión por su presencia.

El informe pone de relevancia, de hecho, los nuevos elementos positivos que lanza la Comisión, como el refuerzo de la accesibilidad de las personas con discapacidad a la plataforma de consulta pública o el compromiso de incorporar los Objetivos de Desarrollo Sostenible como un elemento transversal.

Asimismo, es fundamental insistir en los compromisos que todas las instituciones de la Unión asumieron formalmente, como la creación de un registro legislativo conjunto en el que se incluyan todos los documentos divulgados públicamente y la mejora de la transparencia del proceso de toma de decisiones, particularmente en el Consejo, y del acceso a los documentos sobre todas sus actividades.

Alin Mituța (Renew). – Domnule președinte, este foarte bine ales titlul acestui raport: „Să ne unim forțele pentru îmbunătățirea legislației”. Cred că pentru a avea legi mai bune trebuie în primul rând să ne unim forțele cu cetățenii. Și, pe bună dreptate, nu mai e demult suficient să implicăm cetățenii doar o dată la fiecare 5 ani, când sunt alegeri. Cred că e timpul să creăm un mecanism de consultare permanentă cu cetățenii care să fie parte din procesul de pregătire al programului de lucru al Comisiei Europene.

Joachim Kuhs (ID). – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar, werte Kollegen! Jeder beklagt die schlechten Gesetze, aber alle Versuche, bessere Gesetze zu machen, sind bisher gescheitert. Früher wurden Gesetze aus einem Guss geschaffen. Dann waren sie übrigens erfreulich kurz und gut verständlich.

Die Zehn Gebote zum Beispiel in der Bibel hatten weniger als 300 Wörter, die Verfassung der Vereinigten Staaten weniger als 10 000 Wörter. Heute umfasst allein die sicher sehr wichtige Schnullerkettenverordnung der EU 52 eng beschriebene Seiten. Früher konnte jeder Bürger den *Code Napoléon* oder das deutsche Bürgerliche Gesetzbuch aus dem Jahr 1900 lesen und einigermaßen verstehen. Heute brauchen wir fünf Juristen, um eine Rechtsfrage zu klären. Und wenn heute Gendersprache und woke Agenden in Gesetze eingebaut werden sollen, dann weiß ich eines: Sie liebe Kollegen, und Sie, liebe Kommission, Sie werden Ihr wünschenswertes Ziel, Gesetze besser zu machen, auch in Zukunft nicht erreichen.

Liebe Besucher auf der Besuchertribüne, willkommen im Turmbau zu Babel, willkommen in der Welt des Leviathans.

Kosma Złotowski (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! Panie Komisarzu! Postulat usprawnienia procesu tworzenia prawa europejskiego jest jak najbardziej słuszny. Nasze procedury są nieprzejrzyste i zupełnie niezrozumiałe dla obywateli. Brak transparentności procesu decyzyjnego to dowód na to, że deficyt demokracji to jedna z największych wad Unii Europejskiej. Niestety, to sprawozdanie samo w sobie to przykład fatalnego sposobu tworzenia dokumentów w naszej instytucji. Zamiast jasnych sugestii i rekomendacji, jak tworzyć lepsze prawo, mamy tutaj zlepek wielu przypadkowych i ogólnych stwierdzeń, deklaracji politycznych i ideologicznych postulatów. To zdecydowanie za długi, przegadany tekst, który miesza kwestie ważne, zupełnie nieistotne oraz absolutnie niezwiązane z tworzeniem skutecznych i zrozumiałych przepisów. Jeśli w ten sposób Parlament chce kogoś przekonać, że wie, jak tworzyć lepsze przepisy, to sukcesu nie wróży.

Seán Kelly (PPE). – A Uachtaráin, le rialáil an Aontais Eorpaigh, is féidir linn caighdeán níos fearr a chruthú agus creat reachtaíochta a chruthú chun aidhmeanna an Aontais a bhaint amach.

É sin ráite, tá orainn, mar reachtóirí, a bheith aireach mar gheall ar an tionchar ollmhór a d'fhéadfadh a bheith ag dlí an Aontais amháin trasna gach Ballstáit. Tá dualgas orainn a chinntiú nach ndéanaimid rírialáil, agus go ndéanaimid ualaí riaracháin nó rialála neamhriachtanacha a sheachaint.

Agus mé ag obair ar son mo Ghrúpa ar thuairim AFCO ar “Rialáil níos fearr”, chuir mé béim ar an ngá atá le tacaíocht níos fearr a thabhairt don 24 mhilliún fiontar beag agus mheánmhéide atá againn san Aontas.

Chomh maith leis sin, creidim go mór go bhfuil gá le rialáil níos fearr chun gur féidir linn na spriocanna a leagtar amach sa Chomhaontú Glas a bhaint amach. Ach go háirithe, caithfear fáil réidh le téip dhearg a chuireann bac ar dhul chun cinn an aistrithe ghlais.

Maria-Manuel Leitão-Marques (S&D). – Senhor Presidente, muito obrigada ao senhor relator. Quando aprovamos aqui um regulamento ou uma diretiva, a nossa missão só é cumprida muito mais tarde, quando uma avaliação de impacto *ex post* nos prova que os nossos objetivos foram atingidos.

Infelizmente, todos sabemos que isso nem sempre acontece e que, por vezes, o problema é do texto original, ou porque ele foi escrito de forma pouco clara e complexa, ou porque é apenas a peça de um puzzle difícil de montar, ou porque o seu cumprimento depende de demasiadas obrigações administrativas. Para evitar que isso aconteça, como consta deste relatório, o desenho da lei deve ser mais participado pelos cidadãos. As ideias testadas e provas de conceitos-piloto, a linguagem mais simples e a tecnologia devem ser usadas para facilitar o cumprimento da lei.

Legislar melhor, no essencial, serve para garantir que a legislação europeia é eficaz, permitindo que no final fiquemos satisfeitos com o resultado do nosso trabalho, o nosso, aqui do Parlamento, o da Comissão e o do Conselho.

Martina Dlabajová (Renew). – Mr President, dear Commissioner Šefčovič, we need to deliver concrete improvements in implementing the better regulation principles. We need to aim at true simplification when European policymakers address issues that are beyond national borders. At the same time, more progress has to be made with Member States to counter gold plating and reduce the administrative burden with which citizens and businesses struggle every day.

Commissioner, I remind you that SMEs constitute 99.8% of our European businesses. They do not have the resources that larger companies have to adapt fast to complex new regulations. This is why it's even more important that new Commission proposals, especially when they come in packages, prove that the one-in, one-out principle is respected. Moreover, it is crucial that the Commission applies the SME test to any new proposal and takes it into account in the impact assessment.

Finally, I appreciate that this Commission is launching open consultation more often. However, I plead with you to consider extended deadlines to allow SMEs and their representatives to gather adequate information and deliver their feedback.

Jorge Buxadé Villalba (ECR). – Señor presidente, hoy toca un informe sobre legislar mejor, un ejemplo de cómo no se ha de legislar: sectario, parcial e incomprensible. Siguen sin darse cuenta o, peor aún, les importa un bledo que ahí fuera haya una crisis energética por su fanatismo climático, inflación y subidas de tipos que van a llevar al colapso a las clases medias y trabajadoras.

Lo que ustedes proponen no es legislar mejor, es legislar más, en la misma dirección, la agenda globalista. Quince veces se menciona el clima; cero, la familia. Cinco veces la agenda 2030 y solo una el empleo. Lo mejor que tenía la propuesta de la Comisión, que era «por cada norma de más, una norma de menos», ustedes lo rechazan, porque cuantas más normas, obligaciones y cargas se impongan a las familias, a las empresas y a los Estados miembros, para ustedes mejor.

Les propongo cómo legislar: no hagan informes ridículos y sectarios. Respeten los Tratados y a los Gobiernos y Parlamentos nacionales cuando actúan en el marco de sus competencias. Eliminen normas y regulaciones y, sobre todo, no legislen para ustedes ni las partes interesadas, sino para los más necesitados: los que están ahí fuera y no tienen un coche eléctrico ni un chófer que les lleve a casa, sino que viven desesperados por el futuro que se les avecina, sin seguridad en los bolsillos ni seguridad en las calles.

Antonius Manders (PPE). – Voorzitter, commissaris, en ook collega Tiemo Wölken, wij steunen dit verslag natuurlijk. Ik zou graag één woord willen toevoegen aan de titel “Betere wetgeving”. Het zou moeten zijn: “Minder maar betere wetgeving”.

Ik stel ook voor om te stoppen met richtlijnen, en wetgeving alleen maar te baseren op verordeningen, om zo geharmoniseerde wetgeving binnen de Europese Unie te krijgen. Dan hebben we minder advocaten nodig, en dat zou goed zijn.

Het is ontzettend goed om zo veel mogelijk partijen in een adviserende hoedanigheid bij het opstellen van nieuwe wetgeving te betrekken. Ik geef u één voorbeeld waar ik recent achter ben gekomen. We hebben een EN-norm voor rookmelders, 14064. Deze zijn in Nederland vanaf 1 juli verplicht in elke woning, en dat is prima om mensen veiligheid te gunnen. Maar wat blijkt nou? Ouderen zijn niet gehoord toen die wetgeving werd opgesteld. De hoogte van die tonen wordt namelijk door 40 % van de ouderen niet gehoord. Ik roep de Commissie op om zo snel mogelijk onderzoek te doen om te voorkomen dat er slachtoffers vallen.

René Repasi (S&D). – Mr President, Mr Vice-President, dear colleagues, better law-making is a nice idea. We all share this view. That requires courage, deliberations, transparency and accountability. These goals of better law-making are undermined by the involvement of the Regulatory Scrutiny Board. This Board can stop legislative proposals internally up to the need to be overruled by the College of Commissioners. It has vetoed more than 40% of first-round impact assessment reports in recent years. It managed, by its double veto, to meaningfully water down the Commission proposal for a directive on corporate sustainability due diligence, as shown by an insightful report of the Corporate Europe Observatory. This report shows evidence of massive one-sided lobbying of the Regulatory Scrutiny Board, which led to a narrowing-down of the scope and of the Director's duties.

We can discuss all these issues politically, but the place for these discussions and for these decisions to change the ambitious legislative process is here in the European Parliament, because we are elected by the citizens and accountable to them.

Dorien Rookmaker (ECR). – Voorzitter, meneer de commissaris, collega's, het kostenverslindende, ontwrichtende verhuiscircus hier is een gevolg van Europese wet- en regelgeving. De mensen in Europa snappen er helemaal niets van.

In Nederland alleen al worden jaarlijks miljarden besteed aan wetgeving om witwassen te bestrijden. Het werkt overigens voor geen meter en de klanten lijden eronder. Het is nu bijna onmogelijk om een bankrekening te openen – een gevolg van Europese wet- en regelgeving. En de mensen hebben er last van.

De hamvraag is hier dan ook: hoe komt het dat politici wetten en regels maken die geen nut hebben, die kostbaar zijn en grote problemen opleveren? Er wordt nooit een degelijke kosten-batenanalyse gemaakt wanneer Europa besluit over wet- en regelgeving.

De mensen in Europa hebben een schreeuwende behoefte aan tastbare resultaten, aan investeringen voor de toekomst. Denk hierbij aan de hogesnelheidstrein en netwerken in Europa. Daar hebben mensen wat aan! Er is genoeg wet- en regelgeving. We moeten zaken tot stand brengen waar de mensen echt wat aan hebben.

Spontane Wortmeldungen

Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D). – Señor presidente, el Parlamento Europeo se distingue por ser la única institución directamente electiva de la arquitectura europea, la única legitimada por el voto. Pero es el único parlamento del mundo que es supranacional y legislador. Por tanto, cuando hablamos de «legislar mejor» tenemos que saber que no hay ningún déficit de legitimación democrática ni de potestad legislativa en este Parlamento Europeo. De lo que hay déficit es de comunicación, por el lenguaje abstruso y oscuro que a menudo describe la legislación europea.

Vicepresidente Šefčovič, legislar mejor es también exigir a los Estados miembros el cumplimiento de la actual legislación en vigor, concentrarnos más en los reglamentos directamente vinculantes para los Estados miembros que generan derechos a la ciudadanía, de modo que la Comisión cumpla con su deber de guardiana de los Tratados y de la legislación europea —exigiendo que, en el caso de los Estados incumplidores, incoe procedimientos de infracción, les imponga sanciones económicas o, en su caso, los lleve ante el Tribunal de Justicia—, y velar por que las sentencias del Tribunal de Justicia garanticen la primacía del Derecho europeo. También eso es legislar mejor.

(Ende der spontanen Wortmeldungen)

Maroš Šefčovič, Vice-President of the Commission. – Mr President, honourable Members, first and foremost, I would like to thank you for your interest, for your passion, for a very lively discussion we have right now. And I have also to congratulate the rapporteur, Mr Tiemo Wölken, because I think he could clearly feel also from this debate that there is strong support for his report and for his close work with his partners and colleagues in the European Parliament.

And I think that also this debate clearly highlighted what kind of complex political and at the same time technical topic we are discussing this morning, and that all of you underline what kind of great benefits to our citizens and businesses we can bring if we get this right. And of course, to do so, we need to – many of you referred to it – listen better, get closer to our stakeholders, engage them more, and gather many and different views. And I want to reassure you that we are permanently looking into ways how to improve further the consultations with our citizens, despite the fact that the OECD is ranking us as best public administration in the world when it comes to the quality of consultations with stakeholders.

But we are going to introduce also a pan-European initiative and clear citizens proposals and citizens panels, where we can discuss our proposals before they become official proposals.

We are going to use the digital platform which we developed for better communicating with our citizens, where we are using, for example, artificial intelligence to translate automatically so everyone can communicate with everyone in their own language, which I believe will bring us closer together. And this was, I would say, also a message Mr Mituta was presenting to us and what we discussed together, working in one working group with our citizens.

What we need to do more is deliver more and precise facts and base our policies on evidence. And we are doing this through a very thorough impact assessment, which we are working on together with our DGs and with the Regulatory Scrutiny Board, to which I will come to in a second.

And then I think, many of you also highlighted, and I think this is our common task, how we would explain more transparently, in a more understandable language, in a simple way, what legislation is about, how to respect it, and what kind of goods and benefits it brings to European businesses, to the European democracy, and to European political life, and on how we can always do better. But I think that thanks to the permanent focus the European Parliament is paying to this area, we are improving our performance every year.

If you allow me just to elaborate on the three areas, which I heard the most on from the honourable Members, three areas of even increased focus. First, I agree with you, and I think it was very well described by Madame Regimenti that we need to better anticipate the challenges that are emerging and ensure that we develop agile, futureproof legislation.

And therefore, what we do right now systematically at DG level, and the Regulatory Scrutiny Board takes it into account as well, future proofing of our legislation where we really are taking the best evidence from our foresight reports and making sure that we would have instruments in every legislation to adjust the proposals to future development.

Second, I agree with all of you who said that it would be crucial to strike the right balance in the implementation of the new one-in, one-out approach in burden reduction, while keeping the benefits of this legislation in mind.

Mrs Toom was referring to important legislation like the DSA, DMA, CBAM, all of them, which are huge impacts on how our businesses and citizens would live.

Mr Kelly and Madam Dlabajová were referring to the importance of SMEs and therefore we transform our SMEs test to be regular, to be systemic, and that the window for SMEs is properly functioning. And to Mr Wölken and Mr Scholz, I just would like to reassure them that if it comes to one-in, one-out, we really develop the detailed guidelines for services, including the internal IT tool for calculating and encoding their costs. We call it the one-in, one-out calculator. But there is nothing secret or nothing difficult about this, because this calculator is based on the standard cost model, which is used by major organisations. Again, we discussed it in to great extent with OECD, and the services are using the standard cost model for the daily routine. And what we did was that we included it into our Better Regulation toolbox and data is taking from the impact assessments and are publicly known.

And we are going to present you the first results of this one-in, one-out to our pilot experience in this annual burden survey and the full report not only on how we are treating the issue, of course, but also how we are going to offset it in the next year.

Third, a very important point mentioned by many of you was that we can do much more together, and I think that we indeed need to fully implement our internal institutional agreement on better law-making because it is our joint responsibility and we should legislate this efficiently as possible.

And two points, one to Mr Barrena Arza, I think that we had an excellent report from Mr Rangel on the right of initiative, where thanks to our close-ups and coordination, we have 100% success of 18 initiative reports you presented. We delivered 18 very concrete responses in the form of the proposals from the Commission, and I totally agree with our colleague, Mr López Aguilar, pressure on better transposition and delivery from the Member States if it comes to European law.

Madame Hautala, she asked me before for the response, and I would like to say that if we want, and if we were to bring our specific tailor-made rules on different administrative procedures within one single legal act, we would, in our opinion, rather reduce than increase the transparency and clarity of existing rules. But of course, I am very much looking forward to seeing the fresh ideas coming from there, from the JURI Committee, so we can work on this issue together.

And to Mr Ruiz Devesa, I just would like to reassure him that the joint legislative portal will show the formal steps of the law-making process in the ordinary legislative procedures and also in formal interinstitutional negotiations. So I hope that it would bring additional transparency and clarity to our decision-making process.

Mr President, you've been very gentle with me, letting me go over the time, so I would just conclude with reassuring the Members of the European Parliament that we are open for any ideas, any suggestions how to make it clear, as Madam Niebler was saying, to the eventual applicants for the EU funds to find the proper information on the websites. That we do not want to legislate more, but we want to legislate better and not to legislate worse. And so these would be the principles, which would guide us in the future. And I am looking forward to the close cooperation with the Parliament on this issue. And once again, I want to congratulate Mr Tiemo Wölken for his excellent report.

Der Präsident. – Bevor ich Herrn Wölken das Wort erteile – können wir noch einmal klären, ob das mit der Dolmetschung funktioniert? Die deutsche Kabine – ich höre jetzt den deutschen Ton, ja. Der Ton vom Rednerpult... Aber mich hören Sie? Aber nicht vom Mikrofon her... Ok.

(The sitting was suspended at 11.56)

PRESIDENZA DELL'ON. PINA PICIERNO

Vicepresidente

7. Nadaljevanje seje

(La seduta è ripresa alle 12.01)

8. Boljše pravno urejanje: združujemo moči za pripravo boljše zakonodaje (nadaljevanje razprave)

Presidente. – Riprendiamo la discussione, interrotta a causa di un problema tecnico, sulla relazione di Tiemo Wölken, a nome della commissione giuridica, su Legiferare meglio: unire le forze per produrre leggi migliori (A9-0167/2022) (2021/2166(INI)).

Tiemo Wölken, rapporteur. – Madam President, I am glad that so many colleagues are interested in our report on better law-making and following this debate. Thank you very much for that. I know that we need to be quick so that everyone can catch the train back home

I want to thank Mr Šefčovič for the presentation and for his promises to work hard together with the European Parliament to enhance the legislation process. It's very necessary. I would like to thank all the colleagues who contributed in the debate, underlining that transparency is of the utmost importance.

Unfortunately, we don't have transparency when it comes to the Regulatory Scrutiny Board, which is still an internal Commission body, but we will work on that – because it is necessary that all decisions related to law-making are transparent and can be scrutinised by the MEPs in this House. Delays by the Regulatory Scrutiny Board in the legislative process are highly undemocratic. We saw it on the due diligence legislation: it was postponed twice, and now we are under extreme time pressure to deliver in this crucial area, and this is really not acceptable.

I would also like to thank everybody who supported that we do want to have faster proceedings and that we want to have proceedings which also take into account social and economic aspects in the law-making process. And so I would hope that everyone can support this report.

Presidente. – La discussione è chiusa.

La votazione si svolgerà oggi.

Ryszard Antoni Legutko (ECR). – Madam President, I would like to raise a point of order in accordance with Rule 195 and Rule 10. Yesterday, during the debate on Russian relations with European parties, Ms Evin Incir from the S&D Group accused my Swedish colleagues in the ECR of having direct connections with and financing from the Kremlin. This is a defamatory accusation. Furthermore, it came from a member of the Social Democrats of Sweden, a party with a shameful pro-Soviet past. It came from a member of the S&D Group, a group which includes former communists and Kremlin flunkies, and is the home of the German Socialist Party, once led by the infamous Gerhard Schröder.

Let me emphasise that there is no greater or more consistent critic of the Kremlin's policy in this Parliament than the ECR Group. Therefore, I expect Ms Evin Incir to withdraw her statement and I would kindly request, Madam President, that you act in accordance with our rules.

Presidente. – Grazie on. Legutko, non era propriamente un richiamo al regolamento, abbiamo preso nota delle Sue osservazioni e ora passiamo alle votazioni.

Evin Incir (S&D). – Madam President, thank you very much.

First of all, if you're going to accuse me of something, you need to accuse me of something that I have said. What I said – and this is evident – is that there is clear evidence that far-right movements, far-right parties in this Parliament have had financial support. Nevertheless, I didn't say that the Swedish Democrats had financial support, but it is evident and there is evidence that there have been direct links. They have had party members who haven't even been able to get a job in the Parliament structures just because of links to Russia, because they are seen as a security risk. This is a fact.

9. Čas glasovanja

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

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

9.1. Aretacija kardinala Zena in skrbnikov solidarnostnega sklada 612 v Hongkongu (RC-B9-0358/2022, B9-0358/2022, B9-0360/2022, B9-0361/2022, B9-0362/2022, B9-0364/2022) (glasovanje)

9.2. Položaj zagovornikov domorodnih skupnosti in okoljskih aktivistov v Braziliji ter uboj Doma Philipsa in Bruna Pereire (B9-0347/2022, RC-B9-0348/2022, B9-0348/2022, B9-0351/2022, B9-0354/2022, B9-0355/2022, B9-0357/2022) (glasovanje)

9.3. Razmere v tadžikistanski avtonomni pokrajini Gorski Badahšan (RC-B9-0350/2022, B9-0350/2022, B9-0352/2022, B9-0353/2022, B9-0356/2022, B9-0359/2022, B9-0363/2022) (glasovanje)

9.4. Ruska invazija na Ukrajino: začasni ukrepi glede vozniških dokumentov, ki jih je izdala Ukrajina (C9-0201/2022) (glasovanje)

9.5. Opredelitev kršitve omejevalnih ukrepov Unije kot kriminala na podlagi člena 83(1) PDEU (C9-0219/2022 – Juan Fernando López Aguilar) (glasovanje)

— *Prima della votazione:*

Juan Fernando López Aguilar, *Chair of the Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs*. – Madam President, the political point here is enlarging the scope of Article 83 as the legal basis for adopting legislation on criminal matters. The procedural point we had on Tuesday was the urgent procedure for the vote we're having today, which is the consent for the Commission to take initiative.

9.6. Izredna makrofinančne pomoči Ukrajini (C9-0221/2022) (glasovanje)

9.7. Trajnostna letalska goriva (pobuda ReFuelEU za letalstvo) (A9-0199/2022 – Søren Gade) (glasovanje)

— *Dopo la votazione sulla proposta della Commissione:*

Søren Gade, *rapporteur*. – Madam President, in accordance with Rule 59 of the Rules of Procedure, I would like to request that the file be referred back to the TRAN Committee for interinstitutional negotiations.

(Il Parlamento approva la richiesta di rinvio in commissione)

9.8. Finančne dejavnosti Evropske investicijske banke – letno poročilo za leto 2021 (A9-0165/2022 – David Cormand) (glasovanje)

9.9. Nadzor nad finančnimi dejavnostmi Evropske investicijske banke – letno poročilo za leto 2020 (A9-0173/2022 – Corina Crețu) (glasovanje)

9.10. Zaščita finančnih interesov EU – boj proti goljufijam – letno poročilo za leto 2020 (A9-0175/2022 – Katalin Cseh) (glasovanje)

9.11. Boljše pravno urejanje: združujemo moči za pripravo boljše zakonodaje (A9-0167/2022 – Tiemo Wölken) (glasovanje)

9.12. Odločitev vrhovnega sodišča ZDA o odpravi pravice do splava v Združenih državah in potreba po zaščiti pravice do splava in zdravja žensk, tudi v EU (B9-0365/2022, B9-0366/2022, B9-0367/2022) (glasovanje)

Presidente. – Con questo si conclude il turno di votazioni.

(La seduta è sospesa alle 12.45)

VORSITZ: RAINER WIELAND*Vizepräsident***10. Nadaljevanje seje***(Die Sitzung wird um 15.02 Uhr wieder aufgenommen)***11. Sprejetje zapisnika predhodne seje**

Der Präsident. – Das Protokoll der gestrigen Sitzung und die angenommenen Texte sind verfügbar. Gibt es Einwände?

Das Protokoll der gestrigen Sitzung ist genehmigt.

12. Razvoj strategije EU za kolesarjenje (razprava)

Der Präsident. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über die Anfrage zur mündlichen Beantwortung an die Kommission zur Entwicklung einer Strategie der EU für den Radverkehr von Karima Delli im Namen des Ausschusses für Verkehr und Tourismus (O-000025/2022 – B9-0017/2022) (2022/2726(RSP)).

Karima Delli, auteure. – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Commissaire, mes chers collègues, je suis très heureuse qu'on parle enfin dans cet hémicycle de la question du vélo. C'est la première pierre pour aller vers une stratégie européenne du vélo.

La commission des transports et du tourisme, que je préside, s'est saisie de ce sujet il y a quelques semaines et a préparé cette question orale pour la Commission européenne, qui sera suivie d'une résolution après l'été. L'objectif est désormais de considérer enfin le vélo non seulement comme une activité sportive et de loisir, mais aussi comme un véritable moyen de transport, avec une politique industrielle et des financements dédiés. Parce que oui, le vélo est un moyen de transport qui représente de nombreux avantages en termes de santé, de réduction des embouteillages sur nos routes et donc de pollution, sans compter les avantages environnementaux lorsqu'on parle du CO₂, ou économiques lorsqu'on parle de la question du pouvoir d'achat des citoyennes et des citoyens européens.

8 % des citoyens de l'Union européenne utilisent le vélo comme mode principal pour leurs déplacements quotidiens. La proportion atteint 36 % aux Pays-Bas, 23 % au Danemark, 22 % en Hongrie, mais seulement 1 % à Chypre ou au Portugal, ou encore 4 % en France. Beaucoup reste à faire.

Ainsi, la Commission européenne s'emploie depuis un certain temps à inclure le vélo dans les politiques de transport multimodal en l'intégrant dans les initiatives en cours. Souvenons-nous, chers collègues, notre Commission a commencé ce travail en mettant plus de vélos dans les trains. Aujourd'hui, la révision du règlement relatif au réseau transeuropéen de transport – le fameux RTE-T – et la mise en place des plans de mobilité urbaine durable sont des outils stratégiques pour contribuer à accroître la part modale du vélo dans les villes de l'Union européenne. Ainsi, une approche européenne plus stratégique qui permette une pratique plus sûre et plus répandue du vélo permet de contribuer réellement à la stratégie du «Fit for 55» – c'est cela aussi, l'ajustement à l'objectif 55 – et du plan REPowerEU. C'est très important, on ne pourra pas avoir un report modal efficace vers le vélo si on ne développe pas massivement des voies dédiées, avec une séparation vis-à-vis du trafic automobile et des bus. La pratique du vélo est un véritable atout pour – je le redis – réduire considérablement le CO₂ et la pollution atmosphérique, mais aussi pour limiter notre dépendance aux combustibles fossiles, ce qui est un sujet hautement stratégique.

La Commission a donc commencé à travailler sur le parcours de cette transition pour l'écosystème de mobilité afin d'aider le secteur à réaliser la double transition – écologique, mais aussi numérique – et à améliorer sa résilience. L'industrie du vélo, y compris la fabrication de vélos électriques et les sous-traitants, devra être reconnue comme un partenaire clé, dans l'écosystème de mobilité, d'une réelle et nouvelle stratégie industrielle de l'Union européenne, ainsi que dans les programmes et les systèmes de financement des infrastructures de demain. Il est important de réduire notre dépendance vis-à-vis des pays tiers et, lorsqu'on parle du vélo, en particulier de l'Asie pour un certain nombre de pièces de fabrication, et de désengorger les chaînes d'approvisionnement. Alors, disons-le ici au Parlement européen: donnons-nous l'objectif du vélo «made in Europe».

Oui, le vélo est un véritable enjeu de mobilité durable, mais également une vraie opportunité industrielle pour l'Europe. Lorsque c'est bon pour le climat, c'est bon pour l'emploi. Et en Europe, c'est environ 20 millions de vélos neufs qui sont vendus chaque année, dont 10 % – soit 2 millions – de vélos électriques. Donc, à la filière vélo s'ajoute la filière des batteries, qui sont infiniment liées. On part avec un retard sur cette filière des batteries, mais de plus en plus – on le voit partout en Europe –, des «gigafactories» s'installent sur les territoires.

Et puis le vélo, c'est le deux-roues au sens large. Nous avons de très bonnes innovations, de très belles start-up de vélos partagés, de la micromobilité en Europe, des vélos cargos, de livraison, de leasing, et cetera. On parle de 1 million d'emplois verts en Europe rien que sur la filière vélo. Qu'attendons-nous pour réellement faire en sorte que cette industrie soit relocalisée en Europe et doubler les ventes et les usages?

Alors, à la lumière de mes propos, la Commission européenne peut-elle répondre aux questions suivantes: entend-elle publier une stratégie européenne pour le vélo dans un avenir proche? Comment envisage-t-elle de compléter ou d'étendre le cadre de mobilité urbaine et la mission pour des villes neutres pour le climat et intelligentes à l'Union européenne? Est-ce qu'on prévoit enfin de développer des infrastructures sûres, sécurisées et adaptées? Et enfin – je termine, Monsieur le Président –, avez-vous l'intention d'inclure l'industrie européenne du vélo...

(Le Président retire la parole à l'oratrice)

Kadri Simson, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, honourable Members, dear Karima, the Commission would like to thank the European Parliament, and particularly the honourable Member Delli, for giving it the opportunity to reply on these important questions on EU initiatives and cycling.

The importance of cycling is highlighted by the role it plays in the EU's sustainable urban mobility planning concept, as well as awareness-raising campaign of the European mobility week and cities initiative. Cycling also features very prominently in the new EU urban mobility framework and in the proposal for a revised TEN-T Regulation, both published in December last year. It is included also in the revision of the Energy Performance of Buildings Directive.

So now let me go into more detail in reply to the questions you raised. In response to the question related to publication of the EU cycling strategy in the near future, I would underline that the Commission fully agrees with the importance of cycling and believes that this is already well reflected in its policy priorities. This position was also recalled by EVP Timmermans in this speech delivered in Copenhagen at a cycling summit where he announced that the European Commission should work together with the European Parliament on an interinstitutional European declaration on more cycling in Europe.

This declaration could already reflect several of your demands, to give more prominence as to how European policies can support cycling. This is especially the case in Member States, if in the Council are also invited to take part in such a future declaration.

In response to the question on measures to complement and/or extend the EU urban mobility framework and the EU climate neutral and smart cities mission to support cycling and increase its share, I would like to recall the following.

The Commission considers that the new EU urban mobility framework provides an adequate basis for promotion of cycling at the EU level. It announces some actions that will further reinforce active mobility, for example, by setting clear priorities to favour these modes in the upgraded sustainable urban mobility planning concept to be published by the end of 2022.

The above, coupled with the proposed requirements in the revised trans-European Transport Network Regulation regarding adoption of sustainable urban mobility plans by the major cities should result in accelerated growth of cycling share across the EU.

In the recent EU save energy communication, the Commission highlighted the importance of active mobility in reducing Europe's dependence on fossil fuels. This could be measures supporting bike-sharing, incentivising bike purchases through bike-purchase subsidies or VAT reductions, incentives for employees that use public transport or active modes of commuting to work.

The proposed Energy Performance of Buildings Directive already foresees that public buildings should include sufficient parking spaces for bikes and e-bikes and further potential in combination with REpowerEU solar rooftop initiative and workstreams under the European Bauhaus.

There are three more questions. Unfortunately, no time.

(The President interrupts the speaker.)

May I continue? Thank you so much.

So, in the response to the questions on inclusion of the EU bicycle industry in the list of EU industries covered by the EU industrial strategy, in line with the methodology used on their analyses of industrial ecosystems presented in the annual single market report 2021, the manufacture of bicycles has been explicitly included in the mobility transport automotive industrial ecosystem under the EU industrial strategy.

The next step in the co-creation process for that transition pathway will be the organisation of cross-sectoral roundtables in the second half of 2022, in which stakeholders from the EU bicycle industry will be invited to take part.

The manufacturing of bikes and e-bikes carries considerable potential in Europe, and the emergence of bike valleys and their surrounding value chains in Member States are highly relevant also for transporting employees with the right skills from, for example, jobs in the supply chain for internal combustion engines towards new jobs in this wider ecosystem for new mobility, including the manufacturing of e-bikes.

And last but not least, in response to the subquestion on the plans to develop EU-level requirements for safe and convenient cycling infrastructure, I would like to recall the following. Ensuring the safety of cycling infrastructure is largely the responsibility of local, regional and national governments. However, for cycling in urban areas in particular, the Commission has overseen the production of several guidance documents to help municipalities to incorporate cycling into sustainable urban mobility plans.

The road infrastructure safety management directive includes a number of provisions that are of relevance to cyclists when carrying out network-wide road safety assessments. Member States need to assess cycling crossings and the type of cycling facilities. According to the directive, the Commission should also provide guidance on quality requirements regarding vulnerable road users.

In conclusion, the actions I have just outlined will also help the implementation of the objectives of the smart and sustainable mobility strategy, which provides for doubling of the length of cycling infrastructure by 2030 from 2 300 kilometres to 5 000 kilometres, and for the more effective inclusion of the cycling as one of the TEN-T last mile solutions. Thank you very much and I look forward to your comments.

President. – Thank you, Commissioner Simpson and I apologise. It was a demanding week and suddenly I looked at the watch and I followed a reflex. Also we have some indicated time for the Commissioner, of course the Commission can speak as long as the Commission wants, and I do not need to treat them so hard as I am asked to treat the Members.

So, next is colleague Virkkunen for one minute.

Henna Virkkunen, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Mr President, Commissioner, colleagues, audience, it's a great pleasure to speak about cycling here. Not only because, personally, I like cycling very much, but also because I see that cycling has great potential in our transport system and especially in urban mobility.

When we speak about decarbonisation, we know that cycling can contribute to significant reductions in CO₂ emissions and air pollution and help also reduce dependence on fossil fuels, contributing to our climate goals. In addition, it has many other benefits, such as less road congestion, and it improves health for individuals too. So cycling can therefore greatly improve the quality of life in our cities.

Cycling-friendly infrastructure, including street design and parking facilities, is key to increasing cycle use in urban areas. So cycling should be recognised as a transport mode at EU level. Including cycling in the revised Trans-European Transport Network and sustainable urban mobility plans could help to increase the share of cycling in EU cities.

When we speak about digitalisation, cycling and public bike-sharing are also generating lots of data and various services. Therefore, cycling data should be integrated into the standardisation and harmonisation of multimodal and real-time transport data.

Nicolás González Casares, *en nombre del Grupo S&D*. – Señor presidente, señora comisaria, la verdad es que la bicicleta es sostenible, te da libertad, es bella, es saludable... Bueno, es saludable siempre que sea segura. Hace unos días atropellaron en España al campeón del mundo, Alejandro Valverde, en un grave accidente. Por lo tanto, la bicicleta es saludable cuando es segura y, para que lo sea, necesitamos buenas infraestructuras.

Cuando hablamos de movilidad tenemos que pensar siempre en la multimodalidad y en la oportunidad que nos ofrece para hacer que nuestras ciudades sean más limpias el llevar una bicicleta. Eso es lo que reclamamos, que haya infraestructuras seguras y que, dentro de esa estrategia ciclista que reclamamos, se establezcan unos estándares europeos para la seguridad de las bicicletas en nuestras ciudades.

Ahora, para comprar una bicicleta, tenemos que esperar uno o dos años, cuando el gran mercado de las bicicletas es europeo, así que también reclamamos que se fabriquen aquí. Hay que incentivar esa fabricación, no traerlas de fuera, porque tenemos el mercado aquí. Tenemos que ayudar a esa industria y priorizar esa industria, porque no solo tenemos el mercado, sino que la mayor movilidad en bicicleta se da en Europa. La mayor oportunidad se da en ciudades como esta de Estrasburgo o en muchas de las ciudades de los Países Bajos o Dinamarca, que pueden servir de ejemplo y que todos tenemos que acoger como buenos elementos para la sostenibilidad de nuestra vida. La bicicleta es vida, es salud y protege nuestro corazón, el corazón de toda Europa.

Vlad Gheorghe, *în numele grupului Renew*. – Domnule președinte, am început această sesiune cu un moment de reculegere pentru victimele terorismului și ale schimbărilor climatice. Europa se confruntă cu fenomene meteo extreme, de la caniculă ucigătoare, secetă, incendii de vegetație, până la tornade și inundații distrugătoare.

Dincolo de daunele materiale, toate înseamnă pierderi de vieți omenești. Poluarea ucide și ea peste 400 000 de europeni anual. O strategie pentru mersul cu bicicleta nu e deci un subiect ușurel, de vară. Este o piesă importantă din lupta noastră pentru viitorul Europei și trebuie să se întâmple rapid, pentru că nu mai avem timp.

Bicicleta înseamnă transport și turism sustenabil, combaterea poluării, independență de consumul de combustibil, economie și sănătate pentru cetățenii noștri. Să nu uităm că deja cicloturismul a revitalizat comunități întregi și le-a adus șansa unui venit sustenabil. Să nu uităm cererea majoră pentru biciclete în pandemie și mesajul clar transmis de europeni, care devin din ce în ce mai mult fani ai acestui mijloc de transport.

Ne trebuie urgent și în toate statele membre infrastructura pentru biciclete, de la piste la servicii de *bike-sharing* și parcuri speciale. Europenii trebuie să fie stimulați să folosească bicicletele, iar datoria noastră este să le oferim cadrul, să o facă în siguranță.

Autoritățile locale trebuie ajutate să acceseze fondurile necesare fără prea multă birocrație, simplu și eficient. Și subliniez încă o dată, vremea discuțiilor a trecut. E timpul să acționăm. Dacă nu o facem, copiii noștri nu ne vor ierta.

Ciarán Cuffe, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Mr President, I would like to thank the Commissioner, for being with us today.

It was the author H.G. Wells who said, 'when I see an adult on a bicycle, I have hope for the human race'. I think the same could apply to a child on a bicycle. I do believe, when it comes to the European Green Deal, that cycling can deliver. It lowers emissions, it cleans the air, it improves road safety and it allows us to live longer, healthier lives. So it must be placed at the heart of the EU's transport strategy.

If we want improved quality of life, if we want liveable communities where our children can stay safe, if we want to live our lives at peace with the planet, then we must place the bicycle at the heart of our transport policies and plans. No other means of transport allows us to travel with a smile on our face and comfortably socialise with friends and neighbours as we travel significant distances in a leisurely manner.

So, Commissioner, we need a dedicated cycling policy. We need an EU cycling strategy – and I'm glad to hear you say that this is on the way – but we do need dedicated governance structures and we need the funding, because the more we build safe cycling infrastructure, the more people will cycle. The EU can help us achieve this. If we build it, they will come.

I think we have to include cycling in the TEN-T network and I think, particularly when we look at the EuroVelo network, we need to have one person, a coordinator, to ensure that it is delivered and to oversee this task. We also need a recommendation on safe speed limits from the Commission. We know that 30 kilometre/hour speed limits save lives and we need the Commission to take the lead on road safety and protecting vulnerable road users. It's a strong disincentive to many, and 30 kilometre/hour speed limits would help encourage more people to cycle.

One final thing: we need dedicated bike parking spaces and e-bike parking spaces. With the Energy Performance of Buildings Directive we can incorporate this.

So I look forward to working with you on this. Look, the message is very simple on cycling: if we build it, people will come, and we as an institution need to do more to encourage this.

Joachim Kuhs, *im Namen der ID-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident! *Nobody is perfect*. Frau Kommissarin, werte Kollegen! Das Schöne bei diesem Thema der Radfahrstrategie ist, dass fast jeder Mensch Erfahrungen mit dem Radfahren hat und mitreden kann.

Ich bekam vor 60 Jahren zu meinem sechsten Geburtstag mein erstes Fahrrad geschenkt. Ich weiß noch ganz genau, wo und wie ich meine ersten Fahrversuche machte. Im Vergleich mit der Natürlichkeit, mit der meine Enkelkinder heute mit drei oder vier Jahren schon das Fahrradfahren lernen, waren meine ersten Fahrversuche geradezu peinlich. Damals gab es noch nicht viele Fahrräder, und als Teenager war ich stolz wie Oskar, ein eigenes Fahrrad zu besitzen.

Seit mir allerdings vor circa 20 Jahren mein damaliges Fahrrad am Bahnhof vom Pendlerparkplatz gestohlen wurde, habe ich mir keines mehr angeschafft. Ich habe daher auch die neue Welle der E-Bike-Begeisterung nicht mehr mitgemacht. Ich kann aber die Faszination dieses neuen Radfahrens gut nachvollziehen. Und ich sehe auch die Notwendigkeit, dass wir die weitere Entwicklung und Nutzung der E-Bike-Mobilität im Auge behalten und bei eventuellen Konflikten mit anderen Straßennutzern und auch bei eventuellen Fehlentwicklungen nach Lösungen suchen.

Das Fahrradfahren findet aber immer noch fast ausschließlich im heimatnahen Umfeld und auch auf eher kürzeren Strecken statt. Ich respektiere zwar den großen Eifer und erkenne die vielen guten Ideen an, die in diesem neuen Konzept für eine EU-weite Radfahrstrategie enthalten sind, aber ich gebe zwei Punkte zu bedenken.

Erstens: Wenn wir jetzt eine EU-Strategie entwickeln, dann verstoßen wir gegen das so wichtige Subsidiaritätsprinzip. Die Lösung der Probleme des Radfahrens ist auf der untersten Verwaltungsebene zu suchen, nicht auf der höchsten. Und die Rechte und die Souveränität der Mitgliedstaaten darf auch bei diesem Thema nicht missachtet werden.

Und zweitens: Wollen wir wirklich das Fahrradfahren – von der Herstellung der Räder bis zu ihrer Entsorgung – EU-weit regulieren? Ich kann nur davor warnen. Damit würden wir ein weiteres Bürokratiemonster schaffen, das das Natürliche, das Schöne, das Normale, das Fröhliche am Fahrradfahren wegnimmt und keinen zusätzlichen Nutzen schafft.

Belassen wir es doch einfach beim Status quo. Wenn die Menschen wegen der Regeln nicht mehr gerne Rad fahren, dann bewirken Sie mit ihrer Regulierung genau das Gegenteil. Dann wird übrigens kein Gramm CO₂ eingespart. Und dann freuen sich doch nur die Radfahr-Lobbygruppen und die Hersteller der Räder, weil sie sie aufgrund der vielen Vorgaben immer teurer verkaufen können. Eine solche Strategie möchte ich meinen Enkelkindern nicht zumuten.

Chris MacManus, *on behalf of the The Left Group*. – Mr President, I want to welcome this debate, the development of an EU cycling strategy. I agree with the proposer of the debate that cycling should be acknowledged as a transport mode that is as valid as any other, and that its benefits in health and reduced road congestion should be recognised – not to mention the fact that a cycle strategy will be crucial to our efforts in tackling climate change and reducing our CO₂ emissions.

Therefore, it is my genuine hope that this debate is the beginning of a real engagement with stakeholders from across our Member States, so that we can find a way to fully invest and implement safe and active mobility for all our citizens. Our roads and transport links are for everyone, cyclists included – whether you're a student cycling to college, a nurse taking a bus to work, an electrician driving your van to a job.

When we debate cycle strategies, we are often bogged down in an 'either-or' argument. For too long, some politicians in Ireland have peddled the myth that you can only have cycling infrastructure or real infrastructure, but never both. For instance, take the Western Rail Corridor in the west of Ireland. The rail line has lay idle for years, while politicians have debated whether to reopen the rail line to passenger and freight or to turn the rail line into a green- and cycleway.

I've warned you: this 'one or the other' narrative really stifles us from harnessing our full potential, and it undermines our efforts to undo decades of neglect from successive governments, which has resulted in regional imbalance, which negatively affects West and North West Ireland. When we are talking about transport policy and the future of sustainable transport – whether it be active mobility on a bike or public transport on a train – let's be ambitious. We have the capacity and the skill set to develop and invest in both. What we lack is the political will. There are many examples across Europe of greenways running alongside railway lines. I firmly believe there is no reason that this could not happen in the case of the Western Rail Corridor.

So let's work to promote sustainable mobility. Let's work to promote active mobility. Let's work towards a transport strategy that serves all our citizens.

Liudas Mažylis (PPE). – Gerbiamas Pirmininke, „ar reikia dviračių strategijos“ gali skambėti panašiai kaip „ar reikia išradinėti dviratį“. Iš tikrųjų dviračių klausimas yra pernelyg skaidrus ir aiškus, kad dėl jo galėtų kilti daug kontroversijų. Tai – transporto priemonė, kuri prisideda prie kovos su klimato kaita tikslų, sprendžia energetikos situaciją ir stiprina sveikatą, taigi yra visapusiškai pozityvi. Jau pats žiūrėjimas į riedančius dviračius daugelį nuteikia džiugiai.

Dviračių skatinimo tikslai sutampa su didžiaisiais žalinimo tikslais, o įgyvendinimas vyksta, kaip žinome, žemiausiu, t. y. savivaldos, lygmeniu. Vertėtų išspręsti fenomeną: o kodėl vieni miestai atpažįstami kaip dviračiams palankūs, o kiti – ne? Europinio lygmens keitimasis tokia patirtimi gali čia ir padėti.

Kadangi dviračių transporto vystymas persidengia su daugeliu europinės kompetencijos sričių, tai suvesti viską į vieną dokumentą gali būti vertinga, nes neabejotinai būtų sugeneruota naujų idėjų, kaip tą transporto rūšį toliau skatinti.

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Domnule președinte, doamnă comisară, stimați colegi, evident, mersul pe bicicletă nu este doar o distracție și o petrecere a timpului liber. Implicațiile sunt multiple, de la sănătate până la înlocuirea unor mijloace de transport mai costisitoare și mai poluante.

Evident, din punctul meu de vedere, că nu o strategie la nivel european împiedică statele membre să aibă subsidiaritate și să-și gândească modalitatea de transport. Dar ne gândim aici la o strategie europeană, pentru că da, iată un coleg, în mandatul trecut, domnul Kramer, avea un proiect foarte frumos, de 5 000 km, o strategie de pistă de bicicletă din țările nordice până în sud, până în est. Deci, despre această strategie cred că este vorba și evident, și de fonduri, pentru că nu poți să construiești acum, fiecare țară să își construiască autostrăzi, străzi, fără a avea aceste piste de biciclete bine gândite, conectate.

Conectivitate, despre asta vorbim în spațiul Uniunii Europene și – de ce nu – s-a spus aici, vreau să repet, va avea o implicație și asupra producției de biciclete în Europa și vor fi locuri de muncă pentru mai mulți europeni.

Valter Flego (Renew). – Poštovani predsjedavajući, poštovana povjerenice, poštovane kolegice i kolege, zbilja mi je jako drago da danas ovdje razgovaramo i raspravljamo o biciklističkoj strategiji Europske unije jer je biciklizam sve popularniji na našem kontinentu i to je apsolutno jako, jako dobro jer znamo koje su sve prednosti biciklizma, odnosno korištenja bicikla.

Međutim, želim ovdje naglasiti veliki problem kojeg trebamo riješiti ukoliko želimo razvijati i poticati vožnju biciklom. To je, naravno, biciklistička infrastruktura. Prvenstveno tu mislim na biciklističke staze jer znamo da bicikliraju i stari i mladi. I to je, naravno, dobro. Međutim, nažalost, ima previše nesreća u kojima stradavaju biciklisti.

Zato, poštovana povjerenice Simpson, pozivam vas da važnu ulogu u strategiji ima izgradnja biciklističkih staza, posebice u turističkim mjestima, poput moje Istre i Hrvatske. Na taj način dignut ćemo sigurnost, a samim time i broj ljudi koji će biciklirati.

Seán Kelly (PPE). – Mr President, one of the objectives of the European Green Deal is for the EU to become the first climate neutral continent by 2050. In order to accomplish this, significant changes are required for the European transportation system. Innovation will help, but a key solution already exists: a large modal shift towards active mobility, particularly cycling. Considering its indisputable environmental benefits as a form of transportation, the EU must prioritise cycling in its climate strategy, dedicate resources to cycling policy and promote its advantages. It is time to implement a real bicycle policy, one that recognises the importance of cycling as a unique and fully-fledged means of transport. A green Europe must be a cycling Europe, and when we have that, we might get Katie Melua to sing about cycling in Europe as she has done for Beijing. Finally, I just want to say my name is Seán Kelly. I am often confused with the great Irish professional cyclist Sean Kelly, which pleases me greatly, especially when it helps me to get through Belgian security at speed.

President. – Mr Kelly, the question is whether you pass through the controls better because of your bicycle or because of your singing!

Marcos Ros Sempere (S&D). – Señor presidente, señora comisaria, debemos establecer una estrategia europea para potenciar el uso de la bicicleta que impulse el cambio de unas ciudades del siglo pasado, pensadas para los vehículos privados, a lo que deben ser las ciudades del presente: ciudades diseñadas para el transporte público, las bicicletas y los peatones.

Tenemos que incentivar la implementación de los planes de movilidad urbana sostenible en todas las ciudades de la Unión Europea con una presencia importante de medidas para la movilidad: generación de carriles bici, servicios de bicicletas públicas, intermodalidad para combinar fácilmente el transporte público con la bicicleta, más cargadores para bicicletas eléctricas...

Y debemos conseguir espacios de movilidad sostenible en los que usar la bicicleta no suponga un riesgo de atropello, como el que sufrió la semana pasada el campeón del mundo, Alejandro Valverde, mientras entrenaba por las carreteras de mi tierra, la Región de Murcia.

Juozas Olekas (S&D). – Ačiū, kolege K. Delli, už parodytą tokią gražią iniciatyvą, ačiū Komisijos narei už išsakytas mintis. Aš manau, kad nekartosių tų gerųjų teigiamų dviračių pusių apie tai, kad sveikiau žmogui, geriau gamtai, švaresnė aplinka, bet aš noriu atkreipti dėmesį į galimybę daugiau kontaktuoti, ypač jauniems žmonėms, europiečiams, vykstant vieniems pas kitus ir susikuriant tam tikrus sambūrius. Tačiau turiu du pasiūlymus. Vienas pasiūlymas yra tas, kad galbūt, kalbant apie infrastruktūrą, Europos Komisija galėtų išskirti finansavimo lėšas tvarkant infrastruktūrą, kad specialiai tam tikra procento dalis būtų skirta dviračių takų sutvarkymui. Ir antras pasiūlymas yra, kad ne tik infrastruktūra, ne tik sauga, bet ir dviračio panaudojimas atvykus į darbo vietą. Pirmiausia, aš prisimenu mūsų Europos Parlamentą, kai čia atvykus ir šiek tiek suprakaitavus važiuojant dviračiu, savo kabinete duše negaliu nusimaudyti, nes jis tiesiog neveikia. Bet reikia pasirūpinti, kad darbo sąlygos taip pat būtų sudarytos, kad atvykęs dviračiu, galėtum deramai higieniškai susitvarkyti ir toliau dirbantis.

Billy Kelleher (Renew). – Mr President, I very much welcome the strategy. I think it's a very positive development and I hope that the resources are put in place by Member States throughout the European Union to ensure that we have an integrated policy around cycling.

Of course the real challenge here is that we want to address the climate issue, the climate change, and we want to ensure that cycling and bicycles are part of that transition to a carbon neutral economy, and from that perspective it has to be integrated. We cannot have a situation where bikes are not able to be parked at work, mentions and references to arriving at work after what could be long distances, or in Ireland's case, cycling steep hills to work, and being unable to wash, put on fresh clothes in advance of a day's work. So there's a lot of work to be done to ensure that it is an integrated, seamless system of transport integrated into the broader transport scheme.

I also would like to see a great emphasis on leisure cycling and I know many countries have done exceptional work on that, and Ireland is starting that process too of rolling out greenways. But I do believe that cycling, as part of a sort of family recreation, leisure for elderly people getting out, getting active, that greenways must be supported in every Member State across the Union and specifically in Ireland itself as well.

Андрей Слабаков (ECR). – Г-н Председател, искам само да Ви обърна внимание, че едно от най-фрапиращите неща, когато става дума за колоездене, това е, че това са най-големите нарушители на пътя. Ще говоря много бързо и ще Ви обясня.

Значи, вчера бях в пешеходната зона в Страсбург, един от колоезачите ме удари, аз бях с гръб, след което ме напсува и си тръгна. Те смятат, че имат някакви изключителни права. Мога да Ви дам и един още по-фрапиращ пример, ако искате. В София, понеже една линейка чакаше един умиращ от четвъртия етаж, понеже нямаше асансьор и трябваше да го свалят на ръце, срязва и четирите гуми на линейката. Така че много бих искал най-после да сложат номера на всички велосипеди, за да може да се знае кой какъв нарушител е. За този в България не Ви говоря, просто защото според мен той е психопат.

Clare Daly (The Left). – Mr President, there was a good skit doing the rounds in the last week about how a banker persuades an economist that cycling is bad for the planet by explaining that a cyclist doesn't buy cars, doesn't borrow money to buy them, doesn't pay for insurance policies, doesn't buy fuel, doesn't pay for maintenance or needs repairs and doesn't pay for parking. And actually, they are much healthier as well. In other words, the point being made was that there are substantial vested interests from the car industry standing in the way of the development of the revolutionary change that is necessary if we are to really turn to the type of potential that a cycling strategy could have. I'm a huge car fan. I've always loved my car, but the days of the car being the mode of private transport are over. The only way forward is cycling and proper public investment in public transport.

My colleague, the cyclist Seán Kelly, made the point about Katie Melua, the Irish-Georgian singer who is playing in Strasbourg, and she had a song 12 years ago called 'There are 9 million bicycles in Beijing'. There are probably 90 million of them there now because the Chinese understand that to run cities, we need bicycles and public transport rather than cars.

Ангел Джамбазки (ECR). – Г-н Председател, имам въпрос към всички тук колеги, които защитават тази стратегия. Въпросът ми иска много бърз отговор. Кой от вас дойде от родното си място до тук на колело? Може ли да вдигнете ръка? Може би нашите колеги комунисти от Ирландия дойдоха с колело? Г-жо Кели, Вие ли дойдохте с колело? От Ирландия? Това е новина, защото между Ирландия и Европа има океан, море. Вие сте герои, браво, успели сте да преплувате на колело, може би е водно колело, поздравявам Ви.

Защо го казвам? Много е хубаво да се говорят тези смешки и закачки, много е хубаво да вървят тези истории, обаче това е поредният, г-жо Дейли, хубав дебат за нишо, казано честно, чесане на езичите, то не отразява реалностите. Има места в Европа, на които може да се кара колело и трябва, има места, на които вали сняг през зимата и е трудно, има височини и не може. Но понеже тук колегите се надпреварват кой да е по-зелен, обаче никой не е дошъл от родното си място с колело. Това какво ви говори? Говори ви, че за пореден път се губи времето на европейските данъкоплатци и се говорят смешки и закачки, и разкази от „Шипковия храст“, извинявам се на преводачите.

Mick Wallace (The Left). – Mr President, Mr Dzhambazki's point is a relevant point, and it actually emphasises the fact that it's absolute madness that we actually come here all the way from Brussels most of the time, and that we should actually stay in Brussels and we wouldn't have to be coming down here on public or any kind of transport.

Secondly, I was very interested to hear Joachim Kuhs tell us about his bike being stolen and giving up cycling at the time. For the record, I've had four bikes stolen in Dublin, so maybe things mightn't be quite as bad in Germany. And also, for the record, I have to say that I've never seen Clare Daly on a bike in my life.

If the Commission are serious about a bike strategy, it's a win-win in every way. And you'd like to think that the vested interest won't be pushing quite as hard against you, but the infrastructure isn't there. You have got to start spending money to make it really serious. And I'd like to think, as well, that it wouldn't have quite as much opposition as what we got yesterday in the vote on taxonomy, where the lobbyists hijacked the place and made gas and nuclear green.

(Ende der spontanen Wortmeldungen)

Kadri Simson, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, thank you for this interesting debate. Cycling undoubtedly presents a huge potential for climate change mitigation, offering a cheap and accessible alternative to motorised trips, in particular in cities. It can also alleviate the congestion and air quality problems in urban areas, while at the same time bringing about health benefits associated to more active lifestyles.

There are extensive and increasing EU funds going towards cycling infrastructure and related measures; on top of that, additional sources such as the EU Cohesion and Structural Funds. We are now witnessing very substantial cycling investments included in many national recovery plans and these are strongly supported by the Commission. Encouraging walking, cycling and public transport in cities can bring five million tonnes of oil savings. Everybody can play their part; authorities at various levels as well as ordinary citizens.

I have taken note of your comments and will pass them on to Commissioner Adina Vălean. Bicycle use has been on the rise in many EU cities over recent years and the Commission would like this momentum to continue.

Der Präsident. – Die Aussprache ist geschlossen.

13. Obrazložitev glasovanja

Der Präsident. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgen die Erklärungen zur Abstimmung.

13.1. Trajnostna letalska goriva (pobuda ReFuelEU za letalstvo) (A9-0199/2022 – Søren Gade)

Mündliche Stimmerklärungen

Billy Kelleher (Renew). – Mr President, in making the decisions on this particular file I tried to stick as close as possible to the Commission proposals. Having consulted widely, being truthful with stakeholders, we concluded the original Commission proposal was the best option in terms of how we transition the aviation sector to a cleaner, greener future.

And there is no doubt, I believe, that if we put the right policies in place that the airline industry will be up for us because it will have to be stimulated, invested in. But I do believe that sustainable aviation fuel will have great downstream benefits as well, not just in the context of the initial aspect, with regard to carbon reduction from airplanes themselves, but also the feed stocks that will be required for sustainable aviation fuels.

So, for that reason, that that was a decision that I took. I want to thank the Renew Europe colleague Søren Gade as this file's rapporteur for his work on file. He had a nearly impossible task, being quite truthful. And, while he was excellent in bringing all parts of the Parliament together, I just believe that there were so many competing interests in here that the compromises were not suitable for what's needed to stimulate sustainable aviation fuel investment in airlines.

Seán Kelly (PPE). – Mr President, I was happy to vote in favour of the REFuel EU Aviation Initiative Report. The aim of the report is to boost the supply and demand for sustainable aviation fuels in the EU, in line with the goal of reducing aviation's environmental footprint, which is huge, to achieve the EU's climate targets.

It is imperative that European planes use the greenest and most sustainable fuels to help the EU become climate neutral by 2050. And it is important that we invest much more in the development and deployment of sustainable fuels made in , in order to decrease costs. And that is one lesson I think we have learned from COVID and from the Russian invasion of Ukraine, that we need to put more resources into producing things so we can have the label 'made in Europe' on them.

Vlad-Marius Botoș (Renew). – Domnule președinte, vedem și trăim tot mai des fenomene meteorologice extreme. Simțim zi de zi temperaturile tot mai ridicate, seceta sau inundațiile care afectează zone care nu se confruntau cu aceste fenomene până acum câțiva ani.

Este clar că este nevoie să reacționăm urgent la nivel european și chiar mondial. Acesta este motivul pentru care am hotărât modificarea direcției politice a Uniunii Europene acum mai bine de trei ani, în 2019, odată cu Green Deal. Este nevoie totuși de echilibru, de susținerea inovației și de timp pentru ca economia să se adapteze.

Înțeleg elanul și dorința de a acționa rapid, dar nu trebuie să neglijăm costurile pe care aceste schimbări le vor avea asupra vieții cetățenilor noștri. Raportul privind combustibilii de aviație durabilă stabilește un echilibru între ce dorim și ce putem face pe termen scurt, dar și pe termen mediu și lung. Tocmai de aceea am susținut acest raport și îl felicit pe colegul meu din Vilnius, Søren Gade, pentru un raport echilibrat, care sprijină atât mediul, cât și aviația.

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Domnule președinte, acest raport sigur este important, s-a încercat o negociere pentru a se găsi un echilibru între decarbonizarea sectorului aviației și posibilitățile industriei.

Totdeauna am crezut, ca inginer, că trebuie să fim realiști când luăm niște măsuri și să le facem în ritmul în care, așa cum spunea și doamna comisară astăzi, industria poate să ajungă la acele obiective, mai ales că, sigur, industria aviației din Uniunea Europeană nu este cel mai mare poluator, din contră, doar 2 % este în responsabilitatea aviației.

Nu am putut să susțin în final și m-am abținut la acest raport pentru că nu cred că este soluția optimă. Sunt mai aproape de varianta Comisiei, de aceea sper ca la negocierile instituționale să se ajungă la un echilibru mai bun decât a fost astăzi în Parlament și cred foarte tare că noi, Parlamentul European, trebuie să ne gândim totdeauna când luăm decizii și la impactul pe care îl aduce imediat aplicarea deciziilor noastre asupra sectorului respectiv și până la urmă, asupra cetățenilor.

Ангел Джамбазки (ECR). – Г-н Председател, убедено гласувахме против този доклад, защото той за пореден път потвърждава тежкото политическо раздвоение на личността в тази зала. От една страна, колегите казват, че искат да има устойчиви горива, че искат да има екологичен компонент, възстановим компонент в горивата в авиационната индустрия. След което се добавя този компонент и се оказва, че той се добива от ресурси, които водят след себе си обезлесяване и загуба на гори в редица държави. И тогава зелените, всички в тази зала и други, които дойдоха тук с колежа преди малко, казват, че това било вече лошо.

Е кое е вярното, бе колеги? Кое от двете е вярното в края на краищата? Или тези горива са екологични и устойчиви, или не са. Няма как и двете да са верни. Между другото, многото регулации, опитите да наложите административно, хора, които не са изкарвали и 5 лева в живота си с някаква работа, да налагат на другите как да си правят бизнеса, в случая с авиацията водят до това, което виждаме днес по летищата, тежки проблеми.

Андрей Слабаков (ECR). – Г-н Председател, значи аз смятам, че този проект по принцип не е лош, особено в първоначалния му вариант, защото се появиха едни промени, които мен лично много ме притесняват. Каквото и да се направи с горивата за самолети, „зелените“ колеги отлясно, бих ги нарекъл талибани, продължават да обвиняват авиационния сектор за обезлесяването на Южна Америка, на Азия. За тях никога нищо не е достатъчно, а вероятно те ще ни карат да махаме с ръце, вместо да летим.

Аз разбирам, че е добре биогоривата и водородът да станат част от устойчивите авиационни горива, но санкциите са просто извън нормалния човешки разум. Нека да има малко повече разум, стига с тази зелена утопия, която ще доведе само до екологични катастрофи и огромни, тежки социални сътресения.

13.2. Zaščita finančnih interesov EU – boj proti goljufijam – letno poročilo za leto 2020 (A9-0175/2022 – Katalin Cseh)

Mündliche Stimmerklärungen

Clare Daly (The Left). – Mr President, before I start, could I correct the record? I don't actually own a bicycle, but I don't own a car any more either. I came here by train and I used to work in the aviation sector, but anyway, there we are.

In terms of this report before us, it is dealing with fraud, which is a huge problem everywhere across the EU. The report focuses a fair bit on Poland and Hungary, but I think this is a problem in that it ignores other countries where there are similar problems.

I think of Bulgaria, the poorest country in the EU, which doesn't get the attention that it deserves, because the people of Bulgaria have been engaged in a heroic struggle to deal with the massive problems of fraud in their country by many successive governments. The EU, rather than helping them to deal with those problems, has actually enabled those in power to carry on corrupting, by turning a blind eye.

We know the big headline scandals, of course, but it is a country that I am very close to and have visited many times. I have seen the problems, for example, in the Black Sea, with a business model where not paying VAT in tourist sectors is the norm, ringing up cash at a discount, abusing loyalty cards, withholding tax deducted from owners, rental income used by rental companies which then change their ownership, selling off assets to foreigners through special purchase vehicles, shares being sold at a nominal value, payment by long-term loans which never get repaid.

This is the norm. They need the help of the EU, not it turning a blind eye.

Vlad Gheorghe (Renew). – Domnule președinte, am votat pentru protejarea intereselor financiare ale Uniunii Europene și combaterea fraudei. E datoria noastră să ne asigurăm că banii cetățenilor europeni nu sunt risipiți și nu ajung în conturile corupților și ale grupurilor infracționale organizate, pentru că valorile și principiile europene merită protejate întotdeauna.

Statul de drept este fundamentul Uniunii și cei care nu îl respectă nu pot fi premiați cu fonduri europene. Nu putem finanța pe cei care în mod intenționat iau banii Europei, dar acționează împotriva Europei Unite. Doar în 2020, un miliard și jumătate de euro s-au dus pe apa sâmbetei, iar acum cheltuim și mai mult ca să-i recuperăm. Plus munca Parchetului European, OLAF, Europol, Eurojust, instituții cărora trebuie să le mărim bugetele, numărul de angajați, resursele alocate.

Salut sprijinul pentru înființarea Procurorului verde european, propunerea mea pentru combaterea infracțiunilor de mediu. Tăierile ilegale de pădure, deșeurile ilegale, poluarea aerului, apelor, solului ne costă enorm, nu doar miliarde de euro, ci și sănătatea și viitorul copiilor noștri.

Ангел Джамбазки (ECR). – Г-н Председател, винаги е чест, удоволствие и много интересно да се слушат колегите ирландски комунисти. Комунизмът в Ирландия е впечатляващ, вдъхновяващ, той явно е по-изворен, по-истински комунизъм от този на Сталин, на Ленин, на Троцки и на всички други съветски комунисти.

Но да се върнем на темата, за която си говорим, за измамите. Измамите, разбира се, са укорими, но ние гласувахме против този доклад не заради колегите ирландски комунисти, които са истински комунисти, защото не са живели в Съветския съюз и понеже не са видели Съветския съюз. И се чудя защо са в Европейския парламент, а защо не са в парламента на остров Сахалин, например, или в някой друг такъв съветски, хубав комунистически парламент, но те са в Европейския парламент. Би било интересно да отидат на остров Колима, там също би било хубаво да се види. Но ние гласувахме против този доклад, накрая да кажа, защото върховенството на закона се използва като политически натиск.

Андрей Слабаков (ECR). – Г-н Председател, значи общо взето в началото този доклад ми се видя някак си смислен. Във финалния текст обаче започна да се появява една много странна част, в която всичко е свързано с върховенството на закона и това е поредният опит да бъдат мацкани държави, които не мислят точно по начина, по който мисли Комисията. Все пак не забравяйте, че ние сме един Съюз на суверенни държави.

Значи терминът „върховенство на закона“ вече се превърна в някакъв вид наказание към държавите и това не ми изглежда много демократично. Не говоря само за Полша и за Унгария, ето тук вече споменахме и България. Аз мисля, че трябва го приложим към Ирландия, където според мен има невероятна корупция, но на високо ниво. Или както се казва в България, рибата се вмириша откъм главата. В България може да има корупция, но тя е на много, много ниско ниво. Може би заради това сме известни с това нещо. А между другото трябва да обърнем внимание и на нашия Парламент, където имаме огромни проблеми с хора, които се занимават с измами и корупция.

Der Präsident. – Die *conclusio* dieses Nachmittags mit dem ganz interessanten Meinungsaustausch ist vielleicht: mit dem Fahrrad von Irland nach Bulgarien und mit dem Flugzeug wieder zurück.

(*an Mick Wallace gerichtet*) Without microphone, no point of order.

Mick Wallace (The Left). – Mr President, I think your point was very good, but I would actually make an even better recommendation: I think the two gentlemen should (*inaudible*) ...

Der Präsident. – Damit ist dieser Tagesordnungspunkt geschlossen.

14. Поправки in namere glasovanj: glej zapisnik

15. Predložitev dokumentov: gl. zapisnik

16. Peticije: glej zapisnik

17. Sklep o pripravi samoiniciativnih poročil: gl. zapisnik

18. Spremembe napotitev na odbore (člen 56 Poslovnika): gl. zapisnik

19. Pridruženi odbori (člen 57 Poslovnika): gl. zapisnik

20. Sklepi o uporabi postopka s skupnimi sejami odborov (člen 58 Poslovnika): gl. zapisnik

21. Sprejetje zapisnika te seje in posredovanje sprejetih besedil

Der Präsident. – Das Protokoll dieser Sitzung wird dem Parlament zu Beginn der nächsten Sitzung zur Genehmigung vorgelegt.

Wenn es keine Einwände gibt, werde ich die in der heutigen Sitzung angenommenen Entschlüsse den in diesen Entschlüssen genannten Personen und Gremien übermitteln.

22. Datum naslednjih sej: gl. zapisnik

23. Zaključek seje

(Die Sitzung wird um 16.03 Uhr geschlossen)

24. Prekinitev zasedanja

Der Präsident. – Ich erkläre die Sitzungsperiode des Europäischen Parlaments für unterbrochen.

Uporabljeni znaki

*	Postopek posvetovanja
***	Postopek odobritve
***I	Redni zakonodajni postopek (prva obravnava)
***II	Redni zakonodajni postopek (druga obravnava)
***III	Redni zakonodajni postopek (tretja obravnava)

(Vrsta postopka je odvisna od pravne podlage, ki je predlagana v osnutku akta.)

Kratice imen parlamentarnih odborov

AFET	Odbor za zunanje zadeve
DEVE	Odbor za razvoj
INTA	Odbor za mednarodno trgovino
BUDG	Odbor za proračun
CONT	Odbor za proračunski nadzor
ECON	Odbor za ekonomske in monetarne zadeve
EMPL	Odbor za zaposlovanje in socialne zadeve
ENVI	Odbor za okolje, javno zdravje in varnost hrane
ITRE	Odbor za industrijo, raziskave in energetiko
IMCO	Odbor za notranji trg in varstvo potrošnikov
TRAN	Odbor za promet in turizem
REGI	Odbor za regionalni razvoj
AGRI	Odbor za kmetijstvo in razvoj podeželja
PECH	Odbor za ribištvo
CULT	Odbor za kulturo in izobraževanje
JURI	Odbor za pravne zadeve
LIBE	Odbor za državljanske svoboščine, pravosodje in notranje zadeve
AFCO	Odbor za ustavne zadeve
FEMM	Odbor za pravice žensk in enakost spolov
PETI	Odbor za peticije
DROI	Pododbor za človekove pravice
SEDE	Pododbor za varnost in obrambo
FISC	Pododbor za davčne zadeve

Kratice imen političnih skupin

PPE	Skupina Evropske ljudske stranke (Krščanskih demokratov)
S&D	Skupina naprednega zavezništva socialistov in demokratov v Evropskem parlamentu
Renew	Skupina Renew Europe
Verts/ALE	Skupina Zelenih/Evropske svobodne zveze
ID	Skupina Identiteta in demokracija
ECR	Skupina evropskih konservativcev in reformistov
The Left	Skupina Levice v Evropskem parlamentu – GUE/NGL
NI	Samostojni poslanci