

PEŁNE SPRAWOZDANIE Z OBRAD 11 MARCA 2019 R.

(C/2024/3816)

PARLAMENT EUROPEJSKI

SESJA 2018-2019

Posiedzenie w dniu 11 marca 2019 r.

STRASBURG

Spis treści	Strona
1. Wznowienie sesji	3
2. Otwarcie posiedzenia	3
3. Oświadczenia Przewodniczącego	3
4. Przyjęcie protokołu poprzedniego posiedzenia: patrz protokół	3
5. Weryfikacja mandatów: patrz protokół	3
6. Analiza zgodności funkcji powierzonych posłowi: Patrz protokół	4
7. Wykładnia Regulaminu: Patrz protokół	4
8. Negocjacje przed pierwszym czytaniem w Parlamencie (art. 69c Regulaminu): Patrz protokół	4
9. Akty delegowane (art. 105 ust. 6 Regulaminu): Patrz protokół	4
10. Wniosek o tryb pilny (art. 154 Regulaminu): Patrz protokół	4
11. Podpisanie aktów prawnych przyjętych zgodnie ze zwykłą procedurą ustawodawczą (art. 78 Regulaminu): Patrz protokół	4
12. Składanie dokumentów: patrz protokół	4

Spis treści	Strona
13. Decyzje dotyczące niektórych dokumentów: patrz protokół	4
14. Pytania wymagające odpowiedzi ustnej (składanie dokumentów): patrz protokół	4
15. Działania podjęte w związku ze stanowiskami i rezolucjami Parlamentu: patrz protokół	4
16. Porządek obrad	4
17. Wymiana informacji dotyczących obywateli państw trzecich oraz europejski system przekazywania informacji z rejestrów karnych (ECRIS) - Scentralizowany system identyfikacji państw członkowskich posiadających informacje o wyrokach skazujących wydanych wobec obywateli państw trzecich i bezpaństwowców (ECRIS-TCN) (debata)	9
18. Program „Europejski Korpus Solidarności” (debata)	15
19. Akt ws. cyberbezpieczeństwa – Europejskie Centrum Kompetencji w dziedzinie Cyberbezpieczeństwa w kwestiach Przemysłu, Technologii i Badań Naukowych oraz sieć krajowych ośrodków koordynacji (debata)	24
20. Nieuczciwe praktyki handlowe w relacjach między przedsiębiorstwami w łańcuchu dostaw żywności (debata)	36
21. Umowa o dobrowolnym partnerstwie dotycząca egzekwowania prawa, zarządzania i handlu w dziedzinie leśnictwa między UE a Wietnamem – Umowa o dobrowolnym partnerstwie dotycząca egzekwowania prawa, zarządzania i handlu w dziedzinie leśnictwa między UE a Wietnamem (rezolucja) (debata)	54
22. Europejska inicjatywa obywatelska (debata)	59
23. Stan stosunków politycznych między UE a Rosją (debata)	66
24. Budowanie zdolności UE do zapobiegania konfliktom i mediacji (krótka prezentacja)	72
25. Jednominutowe wystąpienia w ważnych kwestiach politycznych	75
26. Porządek obrad następnego posiedzenia: Patrz protokół	80
27. Zamknięcie posiedzenia	80
28. Zamknięcie sesji rocznej	80

PEŁNE SPRAWOZDANIE Z OBRAD 11 MARCA 2019 R.

PRESIDENZA DELL'ON. ANTONIO TAJANI

Presidente

1. Wznowienie sesji

Presidente. – Dichiaro ripresa la sessione del Parlamento europeo interrotta giovedì 14 febbraio 2019.

2. Otvarcie posiedzenia

(La seduta è aperta alle 17.04)

3. Oświadczenia Przewodniczącego

Presidente. – Onorevoli colleghi, prima di riprendere i lavori voglio esprimere le condoglianze del Parlamento europeo alle famiglie delle vittime del tragico incidente che è accaduto ieri in Etiopia, in cui hanno perso la vita 157 persone, fra le quali molti cittadini europei.

Oggi ricorre il quindicesimo anniversario degli attentati terroristici di Madrid, che nel 2004 provocarono 192 morti e oltre duemila feriti. L'11 marzo è diventata una data simbolo: è la giornata che dedichiamo alla memoria delle vittime del terrorismo. Come ci ha ricordato il vile attacco a Strasburgo prima di Natale, non possiamo abbassare la guardia. Dobbiamo lottare sempre e dovunque per difendere i nostri valori e la nostra libertà dalla barbarie del terrorismo.

Cinque anni fa la Crimea è stata annessa alla Federazione russa. Il Parlamento nelle sue varie risoluzioni ha evidenziato come l'annessione della Crimea costituisca una violazione del diritto internazionale. L'annessione viola i numerosi accordi firmati dalla Federazione russa e dall'Ucraina, segnatamente la Carta delle Nazioni Unite, l'Atto finale di Helsinki e il Memorandum di Budapest. Oggi ribadiamo il nostro sostegno a favore dell'indipendenza e dell'integrità territoriale dell'Ucraina.

4. Przyjęcie protokołu poprzedniego posiedzenia: patrz protokół

5. Weryfikacja mandatów: patrz protokół

6. **Analiza zgodności funkcji powierzonych posłowi: Patrz protokół**
7. **Wykładnia Regulaminu: Patrz protokół**
8. **Negocjacje przed pierwszym czytaniem w Parlamencie (art. 69c Regulaminu): Patrz protokół**
9. **Akty delegowane (art. 105 ust. 6 Regulaminu): Patrz protokół**
10. **Wniosek o tryb pilny (art. 154 Regulaminu): Patrz protokół**
11. **Podpisanie aktów prawnych przyjętych zgodnie ze zwykłą procedurą ustawodawczą (art. 78 Regulaminu): Patrz protokół**
12. **Składanie dokumentów: patrz protokół**
13. **Decyzje dotyczące niektórych dokumentów: patrz protokół**
14. **Pytania wymagające odpowiedzi ustnej (składanie dokumentów): patrz protokół**
15. **Działania podjęte w związku ze stanowiskami i rezolucjami Parlamentu: patrz protokół**
16. **Porządek obrad**

Presidente. – Il progetto definitivo di ordine del giorno, fissato dalla Conferenza dei presidenti, ai sensi dell'articolo 149 del regolamento, nella riunione di giovedì 7 marzo 2019 è stato distribuito.

Terry Reintke (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, according to Rule 22(4), you have the privilege to represent this Parliament in an official capacity. From 29—31 March, the World Congress of Families is going to take place in Verona. For those of you who don't know, the World Congress of Families is an organisation that is known for spreading homophobia and for attacking sexual self-determination. It has also been classified by the Southern Poverty Law Center (SPLC) as an anti-LGBTI hate group.

Now you, Mr President, were presented as one of the speakers to this Congress and then you disappeared from the website. The LGBTI Intergroup has repeatedly asked you to clarify what is going to happen. When you entered your position, you promised that you would uphold the positions of this Parliament and this Parliament has consistently voted in favour of sexual self-determination and LGBTI rights. I ask you: are you going to fulfil the promise and uphold these values, or are you going to attend this Congress?

(Applause)

Presidente. – In quei giorni io sarò ad Assisi per la consegna della fiaccola della pace ai reali di Giordania, insieme al Presidente del Consiglio italiano, Giuseppe Conte, e alla Cancelliera della Repubblica federale di Germania, Angela Merkel.

Gerard Batten (ENF). – Mr President, I would like to say a word about the agenda, please. I have just seen a report that Mrs May is coming to Strasbourg in order to speak to Mr Juncker. Are you aware of that, and if so will you invite her to address this Parliament?

Presidente. – Datemi il tempo di rispondere.

Siamo stati informati che la Theresa May verrà a incontrare il Presidente della Commissione europea, ma arriverà in tarda serata. Credo che se verrà in Parlamento la incontrerò, ma non rimarrà per domani mattina, quindi non credo che si potrà rivolgere al Parlamento.

Piernicola Pedicini (EFDD). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, io voglio fare un richiamo al regolamento: secondo l'articolo 11, paragrafo 3, i deputati non possono offendere altri deputati, né tantomeno persone che vengono qui a parlare in questa plenaria.

La scorsa plenaria abbiamo assistito a uno spettacolo vergognoso da parte del collega Verhofstadt, che si è permesso di offendere il primo ministro italiano, che rappresenta 60 milioni di cittadini italiani e quindi 60 milioni di cittadini europei. Chiedo che il deputato Verhofstadt – secondo me un deputato indegno, che non dovrebbe stare in quest'Aula – venga punito ai sensi del regolamento.

Presidente. – Se Lei dice che l'on. Verhofstadt non deve offendere gli altri, Lei non deve offendere l'on. Verhofstadt. Chi è eletto dal popolo è degno.

Piernicola Pedicini (EFDD). – Ha detto «burattino» al primo ministro italiano, mi sembra una cosa indegna.

Presidente. – Autorevoli rappresentanti del Suo governo hanno dato del «burattino», quando sono venuti a Roma, alla Cancelliera Merkel e al Presidente della Repubblica Hollande.

Piernicola Pedicini (EFDD). – Questo che cosa vuol dire? Che si può fare questo in quest'Aula?

Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE). – Mr President, I thought that I was in the European Parliament: apparently it is the Italian Parliament!

I would like briefly to come back to the question of Ms Reintke because you passed over it very quickly. You were listed as one of the keynote speakers at the conference that Ms Reintke referred to. We asked you to clarify this by way of letter. After we sent the letter, your name disappeared from the website as a speaker but we have not received any written clarification. I do insist that we get a written clarification.

Presidente. – Gentile onorevole, se vuole Le mando anche una risposta per iscritto, era già pronta. Credo che sia più importante dirlo in Aula di fronte a tutti che inviare per iscritto una lettera.

Io in quei giorni sarò ad Assisi. È inutile che continui la polemica: non ci vado. Sono stato invitato e non ci vado, non mi posso flagellare perché sono stato invitato. Vado ad un altro evento, quindi non ci vado. È inutile che continuiamo a fare polemica.

Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE). – Mr President, I think you just made it worse because it may well be that you have other commitments in the meantime, but you were not just invited, you were listed as a keynote speaker at a conference of known sexists, homophobes, people who are campaigning against the values of the European Union. Maybe if they put your name on the website without your knowledge, that would be an explanation, but we would like to get a letter back from you.

Presidente. – Glielo ripeto per l'ennesima volta: Le invierò la risposta per iscritto. Tuttavia l'Aula è sovrana e conta molto di più l'Aula di una lettera privata tra me e Lei.

Ho ricevuto l'invito, non ho aderito, vado da un'altra parte: non so che cosa dobbiamo fare. Io non sono il ministro dell'Interno e non posso vietare riunioni nel mio paese. Se vado da un'altra parte, dove ci sono il Primo ministro e la Cancelliera Merkel, la risposta mi pare più che chiara. Più di questo non so che cosa si debba fare.

Presidente. – Sono state presentate le seguenti proposte di modifica dell'ordine del giorno.

Lunedì

Νότης Μαρίας, *εξ ονόματος της ομάδας ECR*. – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, εγώ θέλω να μιλήσω για την ημερήσια διάταξη και θέλουμε έως ECR να κάνουμε την εξής πρόταση: Η θεομηνία που έπληξε την περιφερειακή ενότητα Χανίων στην Κρήτη, το διήμερο 24-25 Φεβρουαρίου, προκάλεσε τεράστιες καταστροφές σε δημόσιες υποδομές και σε ιδιωτικές περιουσίες. Επισκέφθηκα ήδη δύο φορές τις πληγείσες περιοχές και η περιοχή της ενότητας Χανίων μοιάζει με βομβαρδισμένο τοπίο: γέφυρες κατεστραμμένες, δρόμοι άνοιξαν στα δύο, εκτεταμένες κατολισθήσεις, αγροτικές και κτηνοτροφικές μονάδες καταστράφηκαν.

Την προηγούμενη εβδομάδα στην τεχνική σύσκεψη, το ECR είχε ζητήσει να προστεθεί στην ημερήσια διάταξη της ολομέλειας για συζήτηση το ζήτημα της αποκατάστασης των ζημιών και της αποζημίωσης των πληγέντων λόγω θεομηνίας στην περιφερειακή ενότητα Χανίων. Προτείνουμε λοιπόν σήμερα, μια και το αίτημά μας αυτό δεν έγινε δεκτό από τις άλλες πολιτικές ομάδες, διότι δήθεν η ημερήσια διάταξη ήταν κορεσμένη, προτείνουμε λοιπόν, σήμερα Δευτέρα, ως τελευταίο θέμα να προστεθεί το θέμα αυτό και να εκδοθεί ψήφισμα για τη λήψη μέτρων στήριξης προς τους πληγέντες της θεομηνίας στην περιφερειακή ενότητα Χανίων, καθώς και για τη λήψη μέτρων αποκατάστασης των καταστροφών. Θεωρώ ότι είναι ένδειξη αλληλεγγύης προς τους δοκιμαζόμενους συμπολίτες μας στην περιφερειακή ενότητα Χανίων και καλώ τους συναδέλφους να κάνουν δεκτό το αίτημα του ECR, να προστεθεί ως όγδοο θέμα το ζήτημα της αποκατάστασης των ζημιών στην περιφερειακή ενότητα Χανίων και να εκδοθεί και ψήφισμα.

Παρακαλώ, κύριε Πρόεδρε, να το θέσετε αυτό σε ψηφοφορία, ζητώντας για άλλη μια φορά τη στήριξη των συναδέλφων.

Presidente. – Il gruppo ECR chiede quindi di modificare l'ordine del giorno aggiungendo una discussione con relazione sulle inondazioni a Creta.

(Il Parlamento respinge la richiesta)

Olga Sehnalová (S&D). – Mr President, for Tuesday the S&D Group requests that the debate on the Løkkegaard report on the accessibility ...

(The President cut off the speaker)

Pervenche Berès (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, je ne veux pas modifier l'ordre du jour, mais simplement vérifier que vous avez bien noté que je n'ai pas ma carte de vote et que je suis contre la proposition qui a été faite.

Presidente. – Possiamo ora alle richieste relative alla giornata di martedì.

Martedì

C'è una serie di proposte di modifica. Cominciamo da quella del gruppo PPE, che ha chiesto che il titolo della dichiarazione del vicepresidente della Commissione/alto rappresentante dell'Unione per gli affari esteri e la politica di sicurezza su un regime europeo di sanzioni per le violazioni dei diritti umani sia cambiato come segue: «Un Magnitsky Act dell'Unione europea: un regime di sanzioni per le violazioni dei diritti umani».

Do la parola all'on. Preda per presentare la richiesta del suo gruppo.

Cristian Dan Preda, au nom du groupe PPE. – Monsieur le Président, je crois que la proposition est facilement compréhensible. Nous voulons ajouter cette référence essentielle à Magnitsky, car elle est déjà reconnue comme telle par notre opinion publique dans cette lutte pour sanctionner les infractions aux droits de l'homme et, plus globalement, tous les actes de corruption. Je crois qu'ajouter cette référence, c'est clarifier la nature de nos engagements.

Judith Sargentini (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, yes indeed, I would like to speak against. I think it is unhelpful right now to change the title because we're looking for a global new sanctions regime, and this is not focused on one country specifically. We're also trying to build a coalition in Member States and in this House, and putting into the title the name 'Magnitsky' is not going to help that process. It is also out of focus as Magnitsky mainly focuses on corruption and financial fraud, whereas we're trying to look at violations of human rights.

There is No European legislation right now that actually has a name in it. Our legislation has boring names and there is actually No European Member State which officially has the word 'Magnitsky' in its sanctions regimes. Nor does Canada. Only the US has that, and that country does not allow redress and does not allow democratic oversight. I don't think we should take an example out of that case, so we would like to have the title as it stands.

(Il Parlamento respinge la richiesta)

Presidente. – Sempre in relazione alla giornata di martedì, il gruppo S&D ha chiesto che una discussione sulla relazione dell'on. Løkkegaard relativa ai requisiti di accessibilità dei prodotti e dei servizi, prevista tra le votazioni di mercoledì, sia aggiunta come sesto punto all'ordine del giorno del pomeriggio.

Do la parola all'on. Sehnalová per presentare la richiesta del suo gruppo.

Olga Sehnalová, on behalf of the S&D Group. – Mr President, the S&D Group requests a debate on the Løkkegaard report on accessibility requirements for products and services (the Accessibility Act). The reasoning, or the justification, is that the proposed directive addresses disabled people's lack of equal access to many everyday products and services. Thus we request the debate because this directive is of high importance to Parliament. It has been included in the Joint Declaration for two years because it is also an interinstitutional priority.

Following the outcome of the trilogue negotiations, the debate would be an opportunity for Parliament to show that it is indeed committed to the rights of people with disabilities and to express our expectation that Member States do much more in this area.

(Il Parlamento accoglie la richiesta)

Presidente. – Ancora in relazione alla giornata di martedì, il gruppo ALDE ha chiesto che una dichiarazione del vicepresidente della Commissione/alto rappresentante dell'Unione per gli affari esteri e la politica di sicurezza sulla situazione di emergenza in Venezuela sia aggiunta come terzo punto all'ordine del giorno del pomeriggio, dopo la relazione dell'on. Piri sulla relazione 2018 concernente la Turchia. La discussione dovrebbe concludersi con una risoluzione che sarà votata giovedì.

Do la parola all'on. Nart per presentare la richiesta del suo gruppo.

Javier Nart, en nombre del Grupo ALDE. – Señor presidente, el desastre humanitario en Venezuela ha traspasado ya los límites de la tragedia para entrar -desde hace algunos días, ya son cinco-en una situación en la que se encuentra sin electricidad como consecuencia de la gestión calamitosa de la cleptocracia venezolana.

Hemos pasado de la situación de tragedia a una situación de abismo absoluto, y este Parlamento lo que no puede es estar ciego ante una situación de un país tan cercano a nosotros. Por eso, solicitamos un debate con resolución sobre la crisis y la situación de emergencia en Venezuela.

Esteban González Pons, en nombre del Grupo PPE. – Señor presidente, deseo intervenir para decir que nuestro grupo parlamentario apoya la propuesta del señor Nart. Cien horas sin electricidad suponen que ya no hay alimentos que no estén caducados y que no hay medicinas que estén disponibles. Quiero añadir que, cuando se redacte la propuesta de Resolución, mi grupo propondrá que se incrementen gravemente las sanciones contra Nicolás Maduro y contra todos sus narcocolaboradores.

El presidente. – ¿Comparte la posición del señor Nart, sin añadir otras cosas?

Philippe Lamberts (Verts/ALE). – Monsieur le Président, loin de moi l'idée de sous-estimer la gravité de la situation au Venezuela. Néanmoins, il est devenu une habitude de ce Parlement de mettre la situation au Venezuela à l'ordre du jour de presque chacune de ses plénières et je constate qu'un certain nombre d'entre nous, en fait, instrumentalisent la situation dans ce pays – vous-même, Monsieur le Président, vous n'êtes pas le dernier, vous venez juste de le faire – pour faire des discours de nature politique et faire ce que moi j'appelle de la gesticulation politique.

Alors, je pense qu'une résolution de plus, un débat de plus de ce Parlement n'apportera rien à la résolution de la situation grave que connaît ce pays et j'ajouterai que s'il se trouve dans ce Parlement des *aficionados* de la situation au Venezuela, je leur suggère de collecter les signatures pour la constitution d'une commission spéciale sur le Venezuela, dans laquelle ils auront tout le loisir de débattre à satiété de la situation dans ce pays.

Je note aussi que lorsqu'il s'agit de pays comme le Maroc ou l'Égypte, curieusement, ce Parlement est beaucoup plus silencieux. Ce sont évidemment des pays qui nous sont proches par la géographie, mais il paraît aussi que nous avons besoin d'eux pour régler certains problèmes en Europe.

(Il Parlamento accoglie la richiesta)

Presidente. – Possiamo ora alle richieste relative alla giornata di giovedì.

Giovedì

Il gruppo Verts/ALE e il gruppo EFDD hanno chiesto che la discussione sull'interrogazione orale sulle norme sul benessere degli animali nell'acquacoltura si concluda con una risoluzione da votare nella prossima tornata.

Do la parola all'on. Lamberts.

Philippe Lamberts, *au nom du groupe Verts/ALE.* – Monsieur le Président, un tout autre sujet que nous n'avons pas l'habitude d'aborder au Parlement est la question de la souffrance animale, donc du bien-être animal. Il est de plus en plus clair, en lisant la littérature scientifique, que les poissons qui sont élevés en aquaculture se trouvent dans des situations de souffrance grave. Je pense qu'il est important, dans la mesure où cette problématique gagne en importance dans le débat public et auprès de beaucoup de nos concitoyens, que nous puissions nous exprimer par écrit, par une résolution, à la fin de ce débat. Je vous demande donc que nous mettions à l'ordre du jour de la session de mars II une résolution qui conclura le débat qui se tiendra jeudi dans cette enceinte à ce sujet.

Presidente. – Qualcuno vuole esprimersi contro? Prego, on. Sośnierz.

Dobromir Sośnierz (NI). – Panie Przewodniczący! Uważam, że ten Parlament powinien zajmować się sprawami ludzi, a nie zwierząt. Kolejna taka deklaracja jest obarczona dużą dawką hipokryzji, ponieważ zwierzęta cierpią również, kiedy je zabijamy w rzeźni. No i co, z tego powodu nie będziemy jedli mięsa? Jeśli zwierzęta nie płacą podatków, to nie mają swojej reprezentacji i Parlament nie powinien się zajmować ich prawami.

(Il Parlamento respinge la richiesta)

(L'ordine dei lavori è così fissato).

James Carver (EFDD). – Mr President, I did call earlier but unfortunately I wasn't seen. I also rise under Rule 11, which states that Members' conduct shall be characterised by mutual respect.

At the end of the Brussels mini plenary session on 31 January, my friend and colleague Margot Parker was leaving the Chamber, after voting with other MEPs, when, in the general rush and melee, she was pushed by a colleague and lost her footing over a step, causing a hard fall. Paramedics collected her and she was removed to the medical centre. Rude and disrespectful behaviour has led to a serious injury, necessitating ongoing hospital treatment.

Regrettably, I don't know who the Member concerned was, but they should hold their head in shame. Perhaps all colleagues would be more mindful of others when leaving the Chamber and do so in a safe and respectful manner.

(Applause)

Presidente. – Non sapevo nulla di questo. Se c'è stata responsabilità oggettiva, cioè se c'è stato dolo, interverremo. Se è stato soltanto causa della ressa, ci dispiace. Verificherò quello che è accaduto.

PREȘEDINȚIA: IOAN MIRCEA PAȘCU*Vicepreședinte***17. Wymiana informacji dotyczących obywateli państw trzecich oraz europejski system przekazywania informacji z rejestrów karnych (ECRIS) - Scentralizowany system identyfikacji państw członkowskich posiadających informacje o wyrokach skazujących wydanych wobec obywateli państw trzecich i bezpaństwowców (ECRIS-TCN) (debata)**

President. – The next item is the joint debate on

— the report by Daniel Dalton, on behalf of the Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs, on the proposal for a directive of the European Parliament and of the Council amending Council Framework Decision 2009/315/JHA, as regards the exchange of information on third-country nationals and as regards the European Criminal Records Information System (ECRIS), and replacing Council Decision 2009/316/JHA (COM(2016)0007 – C8-0012/2016 – 2016/0002(COD)) (A8-0219/2016), and

— the report by Daniel Dalton, on behalf of the Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs, on the proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing a centralised system for the identification of Member States holding conviction information on third-country nationals and stateless persons (TCN) to supplement and support the European Criminal Records Information System (ECRIS-TCN system) and amending Regulation (EU) No 1077/2011 (COM(2017)0344 – C8-0217/2017 – 2017/0144(COD)) (A8-0018/2018).

Daniel Dalton, Rapporteur. – Mr President, sharing information across borders is essential to fight crime and terrorism in a world where people are increasingly mobile and cross-border crime is on the rise. The existing rules make it easier for non-EU nationals to hide crimes they have committed on EU soil than it is for EU nationals. This means that today, under the current European Criminal Records Information System (ECRIS), there is an efficient and effective way to identify previous criminal convictions for EU nationals but not for third-country nationals.

At present, officials who suspect a non-EU national has a criminal past can only find those convictions by individually asking all 27 other Member States. This means that previous criminal records are rarely found. It is a gaping legal loophole which leaves people in the EU less safe. This regulation is an important step to close these loopholes and improve information-sharing and cooperation between Member States in the fight against cross-border crime and terrorism. At the core, this is about ensuring judicial authorities have a complete picture when carrying out their work, meaning they can apply sentences fairly.

We can all agree that non-EU nationals should not find themselves with more rights than EU citizens in the EU itself. Getting the right balance on this was important to all the groups, especially ensuring that there was no discrimination to EU nationals, who would be included if they had a third-country nationality as well. I believe that we have got this balance right and we won some significant safeguards in those negotiations, particularly regarding fingerprints. Our legal services see no discrimination in the text.

This legislation closes the gap, while also providing a fair balance between protecting the rights of individuals and ensuring that past convictions are correctly attributed.

We have ensured safeguards on how specific and targeted information can be shared. This is not a database that can simply be browsed through. There is no conviction data stored in the central database and so there is no differentiation of treatment between EU and third-country nationals, as both the EU and the third-country national systems ultimately result in the same outcome, i.e. that Member States' judicial authorities are able to request previous criminal conviction information from the relevant Member State so that that can be taken into account for the sentencing of new convictions.

Critically, the inclusion of dual nationals in this system means that nationals of both a third-country and an EU Member State can't hide their past criminal convictions in the EU simply by disclosing only one of their passports. Let me be clear here as there is some misunderstanding, especially within the ALDE Group. This is for EU convictions only, so No Turkish convictions or convictions from any other non-EU Member State are involved – it's only EU convictions. If we don't have this system, authorities will have to make judgment calls on which system to search, and that would probably mean profiling based on race and name. I don't believe we want to see that.

In addition, the collection of the fingerprints for dual nationals will be exactly the same as for EU nationals. Overall, this is about ensuring judicial authorities have a complete picture in order to react adequately and to apply the right measures. Let me be clear, if colleagues here vote to reopen the deal you are putting your own citizens at risk. You are saying you want to discriminate against EU citizens in the EU, and you admit that you want some people to be able to hide serious criminal convictions, convictions which have been handed down on EU soil. This deal was voted through the LIBE Committee with a considerable majority. The Legal Services of all three institutions agree that there is no discrimination. It is a good agreement. We fought well and we got a lot in this Parliament, so I commend this to the Parliament, we should support it.

Věra Jourová, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, let me start by thanking the rapporteur, Mr Daniel Dalton, and the respective Council Presidencies for the work done on the proposals for a regulation and directive on the system for the improved exchange of criminal records of third-country nationals, ECRIS-TCN. In particular, let me thank both co-legislators' unceasing efforts to find a solution that is acceptable for all parties.

The Commission proposed the ECRIS-TCN system following the terrorist attacks in Paris in November 2015. The aim was to close loopholes in the existing system for the exchange of criminal records, which is ECRIS, by ensuring better access for Member States' competent authorities to criminal records of third-country nationals. The proposals were included in the list of 2017 interinstitutional priorities for delivery before the European Parliament elections.

With tomorrow's vote, the European Parliament is delivering on this objective. As a result, we will achieve an improved system for the exchange of criminal records that contributes to the European area of freedom, security and justice. I would like to thank the rapporteur and the shadows in particular for their efforts to solve two main issues: first, the conditions under which fingerprints can be included in the ECRIS-TCN system; second, the inclusion of dual nationals, notably EU citizens who also hold the nationality of a third country.

I am satisfied that we have found a balanced solution that is acceptable to all sides and that will ensure that the ECRIS-TCN system fulfils its purpose. The new system will allow the closing of loopholes in information exchange on previous convictions and this will be done on the basis of reliable identity information and with due regard to the rights of the individual. The Commission therefore fully supports the compromise found by the co-legislators and looks forward to tomorrow's vote confirming it.

Bernd Kölmel, *Verfasser der Stellungnahme des mitberatenden Haushaltsausschusses*. – Vielen Dank Herr Präsident! Ich möchte mich zunächst einmal ganz herzlich bei dem Berichterstatter des federführenden Ausschusses für seine Arbeit bedanken, die ausgezeichnet ist, und auch bei der Kommission für die sehr gute Zusammenarbeit in diesem Fall.

Dieses IT-Verfahren, über das wir heute reden, muss auf jeden Fall ein Update bekommen – es muss ausgeweitet werden. Denn derzeit ist dieses Verfahren weder ausreichend, im Sinne, dass man genügend und gute Treffer bekommt, wenn man Abfragen durchführt. Außerdem ist das derzeitige Verfahren auch hochgradig ineffizient. Es verursacht schätzungsweise bis zu 78 Millionen Euro an Kosten in den Mitgliedstaaten, weil es eben so umständlich ist.

Durch dieses neue Verfahren müssen wir zwar auf Seiten der EU ungefähr 13 Millionen Euro aufwenden, und die Mitgliedstaaten müssen nochmal den gleichen Betrag aufwenden, das ist aber gut investiertes Geld, denn dafür bekommen wir hinterher ein besseres Verfahren, was zu einer besseren Sicherheitslage in der EU führt und auch alle rechtstaatlichen Anforderungen erfüllt. Ich glaube, genau hier kann die EU zeigen, dass sie auf einem guten Weg ist und für die Bürger der EU da ist.

Pál Csáky, a PPE képviselőcsoport nevében. – Tisztelt Elnök Úr! Szeretném megköszönni kollégámnak Dalton úrnak a munkáját, a dokumentummal kapcsolatban. Úgy gondolom, hogy az Európai Néppárt és az ECR együttműködése pillérként jelentette annak, hogy most sikerről beszélhetünk. Örülök, hogy a 2016-os bizottsági javaslattal ellentétben az uniós intézmények most egy központosított rendszer létrehozását tűzték ki célul. A kezdetektől egy ilyen rendszer létrehozását támogattam, ugyanis a központi rendszer kizárja a technikai problémákat, és kizárja az esetleges visszaéléseket is az információnyújtás terén. Azt hiszem, bátran állíthatom, hogy a többéves munka mostanra beérett, ugyanis mind a Bizottság, mind a Tanács felismerte, hogy egy ilyen rendszer a hatékony bűnüldözés egyik kulcseleme, főleg, ha figyelembe vesszük, hogy a bűnüldözők számára is átjárhatóak a schengeni határok.

Fontosnak tartom továbbá azt is, hogy az ujjenyomat része lesz a harmadik országbeli elkövetők azonosításának, mivel esetükben nehezebb az identifikáció. Az ujjenyomat a legmegbízhatóbb módja az illető pontos azonosításának. Szeretném hangsúlyozni, hogy az Európai Unió területén élő polgárok biztonsága nem képezheti alku tárgyát. Éppen ezért a tárgyalások alatt határozottan kiálltam amellett, hogy az ECRIS–TCN rendszernek, nemcsak az uniós állampolgársággal nem rendelkező harmadik országbeliekre kell kiterjednie. Meg vagyok róla győződve, hogy minden olyan kettős állampolgárra vonatkozó információt tárolni kell, aki valamely uniós tagállam állampolgárságán kívül egy harmadik ország polgárságával is rendelkezik. Nem szabad, hogy a rendszer kikapukat tartalmazzon. Az Európai Néppárt tehát támogatja ezt a dokumentumot, mert jelentős előrelépésnek tartja, és úgy gondoljuk, hogy működőképes rendszer jön általa létre. Köszönöm szépen.

Anna Hedh, för S&D-gruppen. – Herr talman! Vi är nu på sluttampen i arbetet med de här två förslagen. Det har varit en lång resa, som har blivit mycket mer komplicerad än vad jag först trodde.

Grundsytet med de här förslagen – att medlemsstaternas brottsdomstolar ska kunna utbyta information om fällande domar om tredjelandsmedborgare med varandra – är lovvärt. I sak har vår politiska grupp inga invändningar mot inrättandet av ett nytt informationssystem för att komma till rätta med brister i det nuvarande systemet. Vi har däremot sett problem med hur kommissionen och även rådet har velat utforma systemet. En del av dessa har kunnat lösas under arbetets gång, men det största problemet för oss har varit möjlig diskriminering, och mer konkreta skillnader i behandling, mellan personer som bara har ett EU-medborgarskap, personer som har ett EU-medborgarskap plus ett medborgarskap i ett land utanför unionen och slutligen tredjelandsmedborgare. Skillnaden i behandlingen handlar om hur många av databaserna man registreras i samt om fingeravtryck ska tas. Under förhandlingarna försökte vi, tillsammans med ALDE, de gröna och GUE, lägga fram förslag till lösningar baserade på objektiva kriterier, men tyvärr har vi inte fått gehör för dessa under förhandlingarna.

Det har även blivit uppenbart under förhandlingens gång att kommissionen delvis har haft andra syften än att bara få på plats ett system för utbyte av fällande domar. Det man i stället fokuserat på är framtida bruk av uppgifter inom ramen för så kallad interoperabilitet, det vill säga en sammankoppling av EU:s informationssystem. I upptakten till ett Europaparlamentsval där högerextrema och rasistiska partier sannolikt kommer att gå framåt är det viktigt att vi inte backar från grundläggande principer. Jag är orolig för att vi skickar ut signaler om att personer som har medborgarskap i länder utanför unionen kan särbehandlas. Samtidigt är jag ju i grunden för ett system för utbyte av fällande domar, men inte på det sätt som föreslås. Efter långa övervägningar kommer jag som skuggföredragande att rekommendera att vår grupp avstår i omröstningen.

Helga Stevens, namens de ECR-Fractie. – Voorzitter, collega's, Ecris is een databank waarlangs EU-lidstaten informatie kunnen uitwisselen over veroordeelde EU-burgers. De Ecris-databank is echter niet geschikt voor de uitwisseling van informatie over veroordeelde buitenlanders. Nu moet steeds een bureaucratische lijdensweg worden gevolgd om te weten te komen of een niet-Europese burger een strafblad heeft of niet. Concreet moet justitie 27 aparte aanvragen opmaken en opsturen naar elke EU-lidstaat, met als gevolg dat die omslachtige procedure amper wordt gevolgd. Buitenlanders met een strafblad gaan zo vrijuit.

Wegens een gebrek aan informatie kan een Belgische rechter momenteel geen rekening houden met eerdere veroordelingen in andere EU-lidstaten. Dit is voor ons een onaanvaardbare lacune. Buitenlanders met een crimineel verleden moeten even hard worden aangepakt als Belgen of EU-burgers met een gelijkaardig crimineel verleden.

Met het voorliggende voorstel willen we de Europese wetgeving zo aanpassen om uitwisseling van gegevens over veroordeelde niet-Europese burgers te vereenvoudigen. Een centrale databank zal bijhouden welke buitenlanders in welke lidstaat zijn veroordeeld, waarna de autoriteiten snel bijkomende informatie kunnen opvragen.

Dit dossier is een uitstekend voorbeeld van de toegevoegde waarde die de Europese Unie kan bieden. De N-VA is tevreden met het resultaat van de onderhandelingen. Zo werden vingerafdrukken in het voorstel opgenomen om de identificatie van personen te vergemakkelijken en ook mensen met een dubbele nationaliteit worden in de databank opgenomen. Wij staan bijgevolg volledig achter dit wetgevingspakket.

Angelika Mlinar, *on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – Mr President, let me start by thanking our rapporteur, Mr Dalton, and my fellow shadow rapporteurs for all their work on this rather technical and very sensitive proposal.

It has been a long walk that has brought us here today, and I am very sad to tell you that I cannot support the outcome of the trilogue negotiations on the regulation. I am deeply disappointed at the decision to include dual nationals in the ECRIS-TCN system. From the beginning, this was clearly a red line for me as the shadow rapporteur for the ALDE Group in Parliament.

It is alarming that the Council has not been able to prove the necessity or the proportionality of such a far-reaching measure. This only proves that their arguments about dual nationals trying to hide their EU nationality are completely unfounded. The significant difference in treatment between EU nationals, non-EU nationals and dual nationals introduced by the proposal is clearly discriminatory. It has been described as differentiated treatment: with all due respect, that is a description for alternative facts.

ECRIS-TCN, as proposed now, fails to respect fundamental rights and non-discrimination and it also violates primary Union law. If the proposal is adopted as it stands it will result, for the first time, in a large category of Union citizens being treated under Union law no longer as Union citizens but as nationals of third countries. De facto, this proposal will introduce the idea of first-class and second-class Union citizens. I will vote against this and I would ask and urge the other political groups to do the same.

Romeo Franz, *im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Hier haben wir mal den Fall einer EU-weiten Datenbank, die wir als grüne Bürgerrechtler nicht gleich komplett abgelehnt haben, so wie etwa die vom Europäischen Gerichtshof als unzulässig erklärten Passagierdatensammlungen.

Bei ECRIS geht es nicht um Massenüberwachung, sondern um die Auffindbarkeit von Daten über verurteilte Straftäterinnen und Straftäter. Dieser Index besteht bereits für EU-Bürgerinnen und EU-Bürger. Ihn nun auch endlich für Angehörige von Drittstaaten einzurichten, die in der EU verurteilt wurden, ist nur folgerichtig.

Und trotzdem werden wir das Ergebnis am Ende nicht mittragen können. ECRIS für Drittstaatenangehörige, so wie es nun beschlossen werden soll und wie es der Kollege Dalton gegen das Mandat der meisten LIBE-Koordinatoren mit dem Rat ausgehandelt hat, führt nämlich eben nicht zu einer Gleichbehandlung von Angehörigen von Drittstaaten, sondern zu einer doppelten Ungleichbehandlung: Während von EU-Bürgerinnen und -Bürgern die Fingerabdrücke nur dann in ECRIS erfasst werden, wenn sie im Zuge der Ermittlungen ohnehin angefallen sind, sollen für Drittstaatenangehörige ab einer bestimmten Schwelle immer die Fingerabdrücke erfasst werden. Das hat System und ist ein weiterer Baustein einer umfassenden Biometrie-Datenbank aller Drittstaatenangehörigen, die nicht nur wir kategorisch ablehnen.

Doppelstaatler, also Menschen, die sowohl eine EU-Staatsbürgerschaft besitzen als auch die eines Drittstaates, sollen in ECRIS und ECRIS-TCN erfasst werden. Sie landen also „vorsichtshalber“ gleich in zwei Datenbanken statt in einer. Das führt dazu, dass einige EU-Bürger weniger gleich sind als andere, und es verstößt damit gegen das Verbot der Diskriminierung aufgrund von Nationalität.

Auch wenn wir ECRIS-TCN grundsätzlich begrüßt hätten, gilt in diesem Fall leider: Das Ergebnis ist so, wie es nun beschlossen werden soll, nicht gut genug. Die strukturelle Diskriminierung von Drittstaatlern und Doppelstaatlern können wir nicht akzeptieren.

Емил Радев (PPE). – Г-н Председател, уважаема г-жо Комисар, уважаеми колеги, с оглед на терористичната заплаха над Европа в последните години темата за сигурността е изключително важна както за европейските граждани, така и за нас – законотворците, които имаме задължението да направим всяко едно кътче в Европа безопасно. През годините бяха предприети редица мерки за повишаване сигурността на гражданите. Една от тях е създаването на системата ЕКРИС за обмен на информация за осъдителни присъди на гражданите на трети държави, която трябва да одобрим тази седмица.

Такава система вече съществува за европейските граждани, но липсата ѝ за гражданите на трети страни досега представляваше пробойна в европейската вътрешна сигурност. Ефективният обмен на информация за присъдите на гражданите на трети държави, издавани от европейски съдилища, ще означава, че вече никой не може да избяга от закона, като се премести от една страна на Европейския съюз в друга.

Нека бъде ясен – свободата на движение не означава освобождаване от отговорност. Всички хора, които живеят в Европейския съюз, независимо дали са европейски граждани или не, имат задължението да спазват националните и европейските закони. Ако ли не, то те трябва да си понесат последствията. Новата система ще гарантира, че това понасяне на отговорност ще става независимо от мястото на пребиваване.

Ruža Tomašić (ECR). – Gospodine predsjedavajući, Unija je zamišljena i dugo je funkcionirala kao prostor sigurnosti, ali se u okolnostima financijske i migracijske krize pokazala nedoraslom zaštititi građane od unutarnjih i vanjskih prijetnji. Često se štedjelo na krivim stvarima i pod egidom ljudskih prava dozvoljavalo raznim kriminalcima, ekstremistima i teroristima da šire krakove svoje hobotnice po Europi. Reagiralo se mlako i to obično kad bi nevini ljudi i njihova imovina već nastradali.

Danas se nalazimo pred novim velikim izazovom, a to je povratak ISIL-ovih boraca u njihove europske domovine nakon što je tzv. kalifat izgubio glavninu svog teritorija.

Prijedlozi iz ova dva izvješća ojačat će tehničku suradnju i omogućiti nadležnim tijelima da brže donesu informirane odluke. Vjerujem u nacionalne institucije, naše sigurnosne profesionalce i njihovu suradnju te se nadam da politika i politička korektnost neće stati na put zaštiti građana Europe od ugroze.

Intervenții la cerere

Bogdan Andrzej Zdrojewski (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Będąc członkiem komisji do spraw terroryzmu, zwracam uwagę na istniejące liczne – podkreślam liczne – luki prawne dotyczące bezpieczeństwa obywateli w Unii Europejskiej. Cieszę się, że dzisiaj jedna z tych luk zostanie zlikwidowana. De facto będziemy głosować nad dwoma wnioskami ustawodawczymi w tej sprawie, w tej materii, która została dość dobrze opisana. I przypominę. Z jednej strony, zlikwidujemy lukę prawną, z drugiej strony, zaktualizujemy rejestr, bardzo istotny i bardzo ważny dla wiedzy tych, którzy zajmują się bezpieczeństwem. I po trzecie, zlikwidujemy od razu pewną istniejącą dyskryminację. Według mojej oceny cała praca powinna zasługiwać na uznanie i być przegłosowana zdecydowaną większością głosów.

Νότης Μαρτιάς (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, το Ευρωπαϊκό Σύστημα Πληροφοριών Ποινικού Μητρώου, το ECRIS, είναι ένα σύστημα το οποίο ήδη εφαρμόζεται για ανταλλαγή πληροφοριών σε σχέση με καταδικασθέντες πολίτες της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης. Είναι, λοιπόν, πάρα πολύ λογικό να επεκταθεί το σύστημα αυτό και για τους πολίτες τρίτων χωρών. Δεν είναι δυνατόν αλλοδαποί να έχουν καλύτερη μεταχείριση από τους πολίτες της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης. Τίθεται το ερώτημα τι θα γίνει με αυτούς που έχουν διπλή υπηκοότητα.

Θα πρέπει να επισημάνω στους συναδέλφους ότι διπλή υπηκοότητα σημαίνει διπλά δικαιώματα, αλλά και διπλές υποχρεώσεις. Δεν μπορεί, όταν είσαι πολίτης τρίτης χώρας και υπήκοος της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, απλά να έχεις τα θετικά του πολίτη τρίτης χώρας και όχι τις υποχρεώσεις. Έχουν, λοιπόν, τη δυνατότητα όσοι έχουν διπλή υπηκοότητα να εγκαταλείψουν την υπηκοότητα τρίτου κράτους ή, εφόσον έχουν διπλή υπηκοότητα, θα έχουν και τα θετικά, αλλά και τα αρνητικά. Επομένως, πρέπει να εφαρμοστεί η πρόταση του κυρίου Dalton.

(Încheierea intervențiilor la cerere)

Věra Jourová, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, first I would agree on the sensitive and at the same time important issue of the inclusion of dual EU/third-country nationals. For the Commission it is vital to include in the ECRIS-TCN system all third-country nationals, including those who are also EU nationals, otherwise we would leave an important loophole and undermine the objective of the proposal.

What we have to avoid is that criminals play off different nationalities to hide possible previous convictions. We recognise that this establishes a different approach between EU citizens who only have an EU nationality and those also holding the nationality of a third country.

However, we consider this is justified by the fact that the latter can use either of these nationalities when confronted with a prosecution, or in other cases where their previous criminal record might hamper them. For example, if the persons concerned had already been convicted for a sexual offence under their TCN nationality, they might use only their EU nationality when applying for a position involving working with children in another Member State.

Excluding persons with EU/third-country nationality would mean that the identity data of certain persons with a criminal record, who hold the nationality of a third country, would not be stored in the ECRIS-TCN system.

I would like to thank you for your interventions. I would like to encourage you to vote in favour of the compromise texts of both proposals. The new system for the exchange of criminal records is an important contribution to the security union and to the European justice area.

Daniel Dalton, *Rapporteur*. – Mr President, I would like to thank my colleagues for their comments, and to thank all the shadow rapporteurs on these proposals because we did a lot of work together and it was a long process: thank you all for your work. I would also particularly like to thank Javier Nieto Perez, policy advisor to my political group, and Harriet Carr, from my office, for the long hours and the work they put in.

On dual nationals, I repeat my previous comments: the legal services of Parliament, the Council and the Commission have all confirmed that the inclusion of dual nationals is not discriminatory. Ensuring there was no discrimination was one of my key priorities: we worked long and hard together to get the requisite changes to the text to ensure there was no discrimination. To the ALDE Group and the Green Group, and particularly to Ms Mlinar, for whom I have the greatest respect and with whom we have been working very closely on this, I must say I believe you are mistaken. By aligning the collection of fingerprints for all EU nationals, regardless of whatever extra nationality they may have, we have ensured that the treatment for everyone is exactly the same. There is no second-class EU citizenship here.

If some groups wish to use this legislation as a political tool, and to tell the world that an academic and legally disproven debate is more important than the welfare of our citizens or the effective functioning of our judicial systems in the EU, there is nothing I can do to stop them. However, let's be clear what they are doing: they are allowing third-country nationals to avoid their convictions being known in the EU, and that is putting all of us at risk of serious crime and terrorism. These are people with criminal convictions, remember.

We are faced with one question tomorrow. Do you really think that criminals who are non-EU nationals should be able to hide their criminal convictions from our courts when EU nationals cannot do that? I don't think they should.

Președintele. – Dezbateră a fost încheiată.

Votul va avea loc mâine, 12.3.2019.

Declarații scrise (articolul 162)

João Ferreira (GUE/NGL), *por escrito*. – Quando necessária – e este é um domínio em que não se deve ir além do necessário –, a transmissão de informação sobre os registos criminais dos cidadãos deve ser efetuada numa base de cooperação bilateral, a estabelecer entre os Estados implicados. Este sistema europeu vai além disso, entrando por um domínio reconhecidamente sensível, porque associado a direitos, liberdades e garantias individuais, com acolhimento no acervo constitucional de alguns Estados-Membros.

Indo além do necessário, este sistema cria problemas. Acentua a tentativa de avançar no sentido da federalização da justiça. Colocando dados de cidadãos dos Estados-Membros nas mãos de instituições supranacionais – que não são propriamente referências no que toca à salvaguarda de direitos e liberdades individuais. Sem garantias claras quanto à proteção destes dados.

Tudo isto no contexto de uma deriva securitária, impulsionada a partir de uma definição lata e dúbia de terrorismo, e de políticas migratórias que visam punir movimentos secundários e facilitar a expulsão. Um exemplo mais de como as visões e conceções da extrema-direita vão fazendo o seu caminho, pela mão da direita e da social-democracia.

18. Program „Europejski Korpus Solidarności” (debata)

Președintele. – Următorul punct de pe ordinea de zi este dezbateră privind raportul Michaela Šojdrová, în numele Comisiei pentru cultură și educație, referitor la propunerea de regulament al Parlamentului European și al Consiliului de instituire a programului „Corpul european de solidaritate” și de abrogare a [Regulamentului privind Corpul european de solidaritate] și a Regulamentului (UE) nr. 375/2014 (COM(2018)0440 – C8-0264/2018— 2018/0230(COD)) (A8-0079/2019).

Michaela Šojdrová, *Rapporteur*. – Mr President, six months have elapsed since we last gathered here to discuss the European Solidarity Corps 2018-2020. Here we are again with an even stronger youth programme.

Our task was complicated by the fact that we could not rely on implementation data from the ongoing European Solidarity Corps as such data was not available. However, with the help of stakeholders, we were able to identify areas which could be further improved. I am also glad that all political groups maintained the same shadow rapporteurs so we could continue with our previous excellent cooperation, and I would like to thank them for this.

Some 332 amendments were tabled and four committees issued opinions, so there were many ideas on the table. Despite this, we managed to achieve a broad majority and the final report was approved with only one vote against and one abstention. The Commission proposal provides us with a budget of EUR 1 260 000 000, which we endorsed. It is necessary in order to meet the objective of activities for over 350 000 participants over the course of seven years. It is also needed since the European Solidarity Corps will newly integrate the former EU Aid Volunteers programme, providing possibilities to volunteer in third countries struck by a humanitarian crisis. Volunteering and humanitarian aid should enable participants to express their solidarity in more ways, and the EU to express more solidarity towards third countries.

In order to be successful, the European Solidarity Corps needs greater visibility. During discussions with young people, I realised that most of them, even if involved in youth organisations, are still not aware of the programme, so this is where ambassadors could be of help. Former participants could share their experience with other young people in schools, youth organisations and other gatherings, thus spreading awareness and encouraging others to participate. The programme should also be promoted through dynamic means such as social media. We also propose a European Solidarity Corps ‘Infoday’, which would serve to reinforce promotion activities.

In order to increase the programme’s visibility, it is also necessary to attract more organisations active in the solidarity field and encourage them to become participating organisations. We must not, however, sacrifice quality for quantity. Activities must be high quality and meet the expectations and needs of young people. It is important that quality labels are differentiated too.

It's crucial to empower stakeholders. We should give them more space to engage in the implementation of the programme. We must not forget that the European Solidarity Corps was designed as a programme for young people. Therefore, in principle, the programme should remain open to people up to the age of 30. I respect that humanitarian aid should allow participation regardless of age. However, the aim of the programme is to empower youth so other solidarity activities must stay limited to the participation of young people. We have to give greater thought to ensuring that the programme is also accessible to people with fewer opportunities.

I am convinced that together we have set a very good basis for the negotiations with the Council. Many practical aspects of the programme will be determined through implementation, so I am also counting on the Commission's dedication and continuous support. For me, the European Solidarity Corps is a springboard for volunteering in the EU. I believe that volunteering should be mainstreamed through the other EU programmes. I would again like to thank all colleagues and I am looking forward to continued discussion and a successful vote.

Ελένη Θεοχάρους, *Εισηγήτρια της γνωμοδότησης της Επιτροπής Ανάπτυξης*. – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η σύσταση του Ευρωπαϊκού Σώματος Αλληλεγγύης θα αποτελέσει τον θεμέλιο λίθο της ευρωπαϊκής αλληλεγγύης και του εθελοντισμού και θα αναπτύξει το πνεύμα της αλληλεγγύης και του εθελοντισμού ανάμεσα στους ευρωπαίους νέους. Το ESE Program προσφέρει την ευκαιρία στους νέους να συμμετέχουν σε προγράμματα αλληλεγγύης για αντιμετώπιση κοινωνικών προκλήσεων στον τομέα της ανθρωπιστικής βοήθειας.

Η σύστασή μας, ωστόσο, είναι να μην εφαρμοστεί ως ανώτατο όριο ηλικίας τα 30 έτη όσον αφορά τον τομέα της ανθρωπιστικής βοήθειας, για να επιτρέψουμε και σε πιο έμπειρα άτομα να συνδράμουν την προσπάθεια, διότι πολλές φορές χρειάζεται ειδική κατάρτιση και γνώση πριν την ανάληψη καθηκόντων. Υπάρχουν, επίσης, ανησυχίες σχετικά με την κατανομή του προϋπολογισμού στις διάφορες πτυχές και, για τον λόγο αυτό, εμείς, εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής Ανάπτυξης, καταθέσαμε σχετικές τροπολογίες προκειμένου να εξασφαλίσουμε επαρκή χρηματοδότηση για όλες τις δραστηριότητες ανθρωπιστικής βοήθειας.

Οι αποτυχίες των προηγούμενων προγραμμάτων εθελοντικής δράσης της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης δεν πρέπει να συνεχιστούν. Θέλουμε να έχουμε ένα επιτυχημένο Ευρωπαϊκό Σώμα Αλληλεγγύης. Χαιρετίζω τις προτεινόμενες απλουστευμένες διαδικασίες για την ετικέτα ποιότητας για τις συμμετέχουσες οργανώσεις, καθώς και την κατοχύρωση των ήδη συμμετεχουσών. Γνωρίζω από πρώτο χέρι τα τεράστια ζητήματα με τις γραφειοκρατικές διαδικασίες και ελπίζω αυτές να απλουστευθούν.

Tibor Navracsics, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, I'm glad to join you today for this plenary debate on the European Solidarity Corps. This programme is still quite young but it is growing quickly and young people across Europe are keen to get involved. The European Solidarity Corps has the potential to become another iconic programme like Erasmus. Solidarity among citizens and Member States is one of the key values on which our Union is built. The European Solidarity Corps offers young people opportunities to live that solidarity and to experience what being European feels like, and they are eager to take these opportunities. One hundred and thirteen thousand young people have now signed up for this initiative. Almost 12 000 of these have already started their solidarity activities. This proves that the programme is responding to a clear demand on the ground. Young people are making a real difference, supporting individuals and whole communities in need. This is why, in June 2018, the Commission proposed to continue and further expand the European Solidarity Corps under the next multiannual financial framework. We want to keep the main thrust of the current programme, but extend its scope after 2020 so that we can also support humanitarian aid operations beyond the EU's borders.

I want to express my thanks for the great dedication with which the rapporteur – Ms Šojdrová –, and the shadow rapporteurs have taken this work forward. I would also like to thank Ms Theocarous for her work as the rapporteur in the Development Committee, particularly looking at the new humanitarian aid operations. The Commission welcomes the strong support of the European Parliament for the proposal and takes note of the amendments that it put forward. I am very pleased to see that we have common ground on almost all aspects of the programme.

One important point where we differ and where we still need to find agreement is the new humanitarian aid stand and, more specifically, your wish to open it up to people of all ages. Let me underline that the European Solidarity Corps is a youth programme, designed specifically to offer fresh opportunities to the young generation, to invest in their development, their skills, their dreams, and the idea is to bring all of these opportunities together in one place. In fact, the activities of the programme are limited to young people aged up to 30 for good reason: to help them in their transition to adulthood and independence and to the labour market, while obtaining a solidarity experience. Thirty is not an arbitrary age limit; it is based on evidence. Above this age, the vast majority of people have settled in their professional and private life. The demand is already high in the age group up to 30. Removing the age limit would mean taking away

opportunities for young people and we risk job substitution. Moreover, the activities falling under the new humanitarian aid strand will account for only 4 500 of the 350 000 opportunities that we want to offer under the European Solidarity Corps over 7 years, and only 500 of these are expected to be taken up by people above 30. Introducing different eligibility criteria for such a small share of activities would lead to disproportionate extra administrative costs and make the programme more complicated, threatening to shut out those who we want to benefit most: young people. I would therefore plead with you to keep the European Solidarity Corps a real youth programme. Having said this, the Commission would be keen to start negotiating with you right away, as is the Council. This is my personal commitment and offer to you. I'm ready to work with you towards an agreement before the end of the current parliamentary term.

Partial first reading agreements have already been reached for quite a number of future programmes. It would be a pity if the European Solidarity Corps, this new flagship programme for young people, were to be left behind. I am sure that the good compromise we reached on the current regulation only very recently would greatly facilitate negotiations. A swift agreement would help the Commission to make all the preparations to ensure that the programme can be fully and effectively implemented right from the start of 2021, but most importantly, it would send a clear signal to Europe's young generation that investing in them remains a priority for us, and that we want to do what we can to enable them to make the most of their lives and build a better Europe for the future.

Tiemo Wölken, *Verfasser der Stellungnahme des mitberatenden Haushaltsausschusses*. – Herr Präsident, sehr geehrter Herr Kommissar, liebe junge Menschen, die heute auch hier dabei sind! Bereits seit 2016 wird dank des Europäischen Solidaritätskorps jungen Menschen die Gelegenheit gegeben, ihren Beitrag zur Gesellschaft europaweit zu leisten, durch Freiwilligentätigkeit, Praktika oder an ihren Arbeitsplätzen, und so Solidarität zu zeigen. Das ESC ist mehr als ein Freiwilligendienst, es schafft grenzüberschreitende Identität und Werte. Daher ist es richtig, dass wir in der nächsten Periode 1,2 Milliarden Euro für junge Menschen in die Hand nehmen wollen, um dieses Programm zu unterstützen.

Wir brauchen in dieser Phase mehr junge Europäerinnen und Europäer, die Demokratie und Solidarität leben. Daher begrüße ich ausdrücklich, dass junge Menschen europaweit auf die Straße gehen und für mehr Klimaschutz demonstrieren bei den *Fridays for Future* und dass sie auch für die Freiheit im Internet demonstrieren. Junge Menschen sind keine Bots, und deswegen ist dieses Programm genau das Richtige. Wir unterstützen mit diesem Programm die Zukunft der Europäischen Union, und ich freue mich, dass wir das Geld in die Hand nehmen wollen.

Ivana Maletić, *izvjestiteljica za mišljenje Odbora REGI*. – Gospodine predsjedavajući, čestitam izvjestiteljima. Mladi često pitaju o mogućnostima volontiranja. Žele u svoje slobodno vrijeme pridonositi društvu i pomagati ljudima u nevolji, bilo da je riječ o prirodnim katastrofama poput požara, poplava ili potresa s kojima smo se nažalost, posebno zadnjih godina, suočavali do drugih različitih humanitarnih aktivnosti.

Drago mi je da u proračunu od 2021. do 2027. povećavamo sredstva za ovaj program s dosadašnjih 376 milijuna eura na 1,3 milijarde eura, dakle više od tri puta. Ono što je važno je da sudjelovanje u programu mora biti jednostavno. Zato sam i predložila korištenje pojednostavljene metode obračuna troškova za one koji sudjeluju, a sudionicima je potrebno nadoknaditi sve troškove vezane uz volonterske aktivnosti. Važno je da sudionici budu mladi, naravno, o čemu smo i govorili, ali osobito da program bude otvoren i dostupan za mlade koji nisu zaposleni, ne obrazuju se i ne usavršavaju.

Bogdan Andrzej Zdrojewski, *w imieniu grupy PPE*. – Panie Przewodniczący! Europejski Korpus Solidarności to oferta dla młodych Europejczyków, dla młodych ludzi. Jest ona zbudowana w oparciu o dotychczasowe doświadczenia zgromadzone przy innych projektach, które ten projekt łączy. To bardzo dobrze – to dobrze, że dzięki niemu uprościmy biurokrację, zmniejszymy też koszty administracyjne, doprowadzimy do większej klarowności w takich projektach, jak i również uelastycznimy wszystko to, co tworzy ramy wolontariatu w dniu dzisiejszym.

Chcę natomiast zwrócić uwagę na dwie kwestie, które z mojego punktu widzenia są kluczowe. Po pierwsze, bez wątpienia ten projekt wymaga promocji, wymaga dobrej informacji, wymaga przede wszystkim przekazania młodym ludziom, na czym ten projekt polega, z czym się wiąże i jakie ma perspektywy. Cieszę się, że ten siedmioletni okres ma już gwarancje finansowe, że mamy zbudowany budżet, że mamy określone ramy. Natomiast praktyka – podkreślam – praktyka w realizacji tego projektu jest dziś, z mojego punktu widzenia, najważniejszym wyzwaniem, jest najistotniejsza i ona przesądzi o tym, czy ten projekt spełni pokładane w nim nadzieje.

Na koniec chciałam podziękować koleżance Šojdrovej – ponad trzysta poprawek mogło ten nasz dokument w finale zepsuć. Tak się nie stało, jest to dobry dokument i możemy nad nim bezpiecznie jutro głosować.

Silvia Costa, a nome del gruppo S&D. – Signor Presidente, signor Commissario, collega relatrice Šojdrová, colleghi relatori ombra, onorevoli colleghi, io penso che sia molto importante il segnale che diamo, a due mesi dalle elezioni europee, ai cittadini europei. Due messaggi molto forti.

Il volto dell'Europa è anche decisamente quello del volontariato, della solidarietà e della cittadinanza attiva. E questa deve tornare ad essere una parola d'ordine dell'Unione europea, soprattutto a partire dalle nuove generazioni. Dobbiamo rendere stabile nei prossimi 7 anni questa esperienza, che era stata già avviata in questi anni e che aveva ricompreso il servizio del volontariato europeo, che in vent'anni aveva visto però un coinvolgimento di centomila giovani. Vogliamo essere certamente più audaci.

Con il voto di domani sull'istituzione del corpo europeo di solidarietà, di cui sono stata relatore ombra nel gruppo S&D, compiamo un importante passo avanti perché andiamo a istituire uno stabile programma dell'Unione nel quadro del prossimo QFP e mi auguro che il Consiglio dei ministri voglia accettare la proposta – anche in termini di *budget* – che ha fatto il Parlamento. Si dedicherà quasi la totalità (quasi l'86 %) del suo *budget* ad attività di volontariato, cittadinanza attiva e solidarietà per i giovani tra i 18 e i 30 anni, l'8 % della quota andrà a tirocini e lavoro, ma nell'ambito sempre di attività no-profit, e il 6 % andrà agli aiuti umanitari, raccogliendo un'importante eredità, senza un limite di età analogo all'altro.

Si tratta di un passaggio politico, che dobbiamo veramente raccontare ai giovani che non lo conoscono. Penso che sia importante pensare al fatto che, simbolicamente, questo avrà una grandissima importanza. Io ricordo. Li ho incontrati, come li ha incontrati il Commissario, a Norcia, dopo un tremendo terremoto: un nucleo di giovani volontari che venivano da dodici paesi – ha avuto un significato enorme. Più di 70 000 giovani si sono già registrati sul portale online dedicato; 7 000 stanno già partecipando ad attività di inclusione sociale, integrazione di migranti, sostegno alle comunità locali e patrimonio culturale.

È importante che per i prossimi sette anni lo stanziamento sia stato portato a più di un miliardo, confermando come priorità politica questo valore fondamentale dell'Unione europea, per rispondere soprattutto ai bisogni della società, delle comunità, promuovendo lo sviluppo personale e professionale dei giovani, civico, con particolare attenzione ai più svantaggiati. Per questo lo abbiamo voluto rendere più inclusivo, per i ragazzi con minori opportunità, per esempio chi ha condizioni di disabilità, salute, difficoltà anche nel campo scolastico o proviene da un contesto migratorio o da comunità emarginate.

Sono molto soddisfatta che siano stati colti alcuni aspetti molto importanti. Il primo è la dimensione europea dell'esperienza: tutte queste attività devono avere carattere transnazionale, non si devono sovrapporre a schemi nazionali di volontariato ma, anzi, devono sostenere nei paesi che non ce l'abbiano la necessità di arrivare a questo. Anche le attività *in country* devono avere questa dimensione transnazionale.

E poi, soprattutto, abbiamo allargato alle imprese sociali e alle organizzazioni anche private, ma sempre per attività no-profit e con la possibilità di avere un marchio di qualità diversificato per le tipologie di inserimento.

Chiudo dicendo che questa è una nuova esperienza che raccoglie le migliori del passato, ma che vuole avere anche la volontà di costruire una cittadinanza dal basso. Io penso che oggi dobbiamo parlare molto di questo, di riforme istituzionali dell'Europa, integrazione politica e costruzione di processi di cittadinanza attiva.

Izaskun Bilbao Barandica, *en nombre del Grupo ALDE*. – Señor presidente, señor comisario, el Cuerpo Europeo de Solidaridad en su nueva versión como ventanilla única que agrupa todas las posibilidades que tienen los jóvenes europeos de participar en programas de solidaridad es una realidad de la que en unos pocos años nos sentiremos orgullosos. Una gran idea, como lo fue el programa Erasmus, porque va a igualar las oportunidades de acceso a estos programas y porque permitirá aprovechar mejor los recursos que dedicamos a ellos y favorecerá una evaluación más global y objetiva del impacto que tienen estas actividades sobre las personas que se benefician de ellas.

Así, se van a convertir sistemáticamente en hechos los valores más nobles en los que se funda nuestra Unión. Nuestros jóvenes van a contribuir a la cohesión de nuestra sociedad, van a ayudar a las personas que les necesitan, van a conocer otras realidades que les van a hacer más conscientes, más solidarios, van a vacunarse contra estereotipos y prejuicios, y van a adquirir capacidades que les ayudarán como ciudadanos y en sus posibilidades de empleabilidad.

Por eso coincido en la necesidad de mejorar las definiciones de solidaridad y voluntariado y en incrementar las medidas de difusión aplicando a la tarea los medios que mejor llegan a los jóvenes. También abogo por mejorar la calidad y precisión de las certificaciones que obtienen los participantes y planteo que en este concepto, «participantes», se incluya a los acompañantes que destacan las organizaciones civiles que hacen posible el funcionamiento de este programa. Su función es capital para que todo salga bien y es un ejercicio doble de solidaridad con los destinatarios finales del programa y con los jóvenes que participan en él.

Helga Trüpel, *im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar, liebe Kollegen und Kolleginnen! Dieses neue Programm *Erasmus Solidarity Corps* hat das Potenzial eine der großen Erfolgsgeschichten der Europäischen Union zu werden. Es beantwortet nämlich die Frage, wie wir mehr Solidarität in der Europäischen Union walten lassen können. Und es geht vor allem um junge Menschen zwischen 18 und 30 Jahren, die mit den verschiedensten freiwilligen Solidariätsdiensten bei Theatern, bei Migranten, bei Flüchtlingen, im Umweltschutz, in der Klimapolitik – überall da, wo Organisationen das vorschlagen oder wo sie selber Ideen haben, was sie für die Europäische Union und sich selber tun können. Sie lernen Sprachen, sie lernen andere Länder kennen. Sie lernen Empathie, und sie lernen, die Europäische Union zusammenzuhalten und gleichzeitig für sich selber etwas zu tun. Sie entwickeln ihre Persönlichkeit – es ist also das, was wir im besten Sinne eine Win-win-Situation nennen können.

Jetzt hat zum Glück die Europäische Kommission vorgeschlagen, dieses Programm, das jetzt in der Größenordnung von 375 Millionen war, im Budget auf 1,2 Milliarden aufzustocken. Das heißt, es gibt hier einen ganz klaren politischen Willen, mehr für Solidarität in der EU, mehr für junge Menschen zu tun und allen, die daran beteiligt sind, klar zu machen, warum es sinnvoll ist, sich für andere Menschen in den Kommunen der EU, aber auch insgesamt für die Idee der Europäischen Union einzusetzen, weil es eine positive Idee ist und weil sie solidarisch ist – also ein wirklich gutes Programm.

Νικόλαος Χουντής, *εξ ονόματος της ομάδας GUE/NGL*. – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η πρόταση της Επιτροπής για το Ευρωπαϊκό Σώμα Αλληλεγγύης αποδεικνύει, για άλλη μια φορά, ότι η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση χρησιμοποιεί τις έννοιες του εθελοντισμού και της αλληλεγγύης μόνο εργαλειακά και κατ' ευφημισμό. Το πρόγραμμα φτιάχτηκε με τέτοιο τρόπο, ώστε η ίδια η έννοια της αλληλεγγύης να διαστρεβλώνεται. Θεσμοθετεί μια επικίνδυνη σύνδεση μεταξύ του εθελοντισμού και της απασχολησιμότητας, ενώ επί της ουσίας προσπαθεί να επιβάλει κεκαλυμμένη εργασία, προωθώντας ταυτόχρονα και τη συμμετοχή κερδοσκοπικών εταιριών σε αυτό.

Στόχοι του προγράμματος αλληλεγγύης δεν μπορούν να είναι η επιχειρηματικότητα, τα κέρδη και η επισφαλής εργασία των νέων. Ένα τέτοιο πρόγραμμα πρέπει να ενισχύει την κοινή αξία της αλληλεγγύης και όχι να οδηγεί στην αποδόμηση του περιεχομένου της. Να ενεργοποιεί τους πολίτες και να βοηθάει τους νέους στην προσωπική τους ανάπτυξη και όχι να ενισχύει τα κέρδη των πολυεθνικών. Το Ευρωπαϊκό Σώμα Αλληλεγγύης, αγαπητοί συνάδελφοι, όπως συγκροτείται, αποτελεί έναν ακόμα ιδεολογικό και πολιτικό μηχανισμό υπό τον έλεγχο της νεοφιλελεύθερης Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης.

Η σημερινή Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση έχει αποδειχθεί ότι αδυνατεί να απαντήσει τις πραγματικές ανάγκες, στις ανάγκες των νέων για μόρφωση, για δουλειά, για αξιοπρέπεια. Αδυνατεί να αντιμετωπίσει τις τεράστιες οικονομικές και ανθρωπιστικές κρίσεις που γεννούν οι νεοφιλελεύθερες πολιτικές της, πολιτικές οι οποίες πρέπει να ανατραπούν και όχι να αντιμετωπιστούν με αυτά τα μπαλώματα που συζητάμε σήμερα.

Bill Etheridge, *on behalf of the EFDD Group*. – Mr President, what would the start of a week in the European Parliament be without a brand new, highly expensive, somewhat sinister-sounding scheme? It's lovely to be back, it's good: I feel like I am back here, seeing one of these things.

I like the fact, Commissioner, that you are now constructing policy based on *The Midwich Cuckoos*. That's a great idea. What we have here is Big Brother, dressed in a halo. You are allowed to go and do some work and you are brought together, and this money – a mere EUR 1.2 billion by the way at a time when we are told everyone is struggling with austerity – goes into EU-approved good schemes. You can volunteer to do these good things as long as you learn to have solidarity: that you are all good little Europeans working together.

Even the speakers in favour of it make no secret whatsoever of the fact that this is a political programme!

Solidarity across borders, breaking down stereotypes, that is lovely, but there are charities that people can volunteer to work with to do good works without this political angle. This, as one of the speakers said, is 'another Erasmus'. Yes, another Erasmus! Another scheme whereby we dress up something good, like education, but dose it so full of EU propaganda that it is almost impossible to see truth from what is made up.

This is exactly the kind of idea that turns people off, and that worries people. You are trying to indoctrinate people, Commissioner, and that's why you don't want older people involved. You want young minds to manipulate at an early age. This is a crazy waste of money, it is a very poor tribute to *The Midwich Cuckoos*, and it is a great start to the week: you have really got me fired up, so I want to thank you for that.

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

Maria Grapini (S&D), *Întrebare adresată conform procedurii „cartonașului albastru”*. – Stimate coleg, ați încercat prin pleoară să contraziceți acest proiect despre care s-a vorbit și s-a vorbit bine și corect. Vă întreb ce înțelegeți dumneavoastră prin solidaritate și dacă credeți că este nevoie de solidaritate?

Și, ați mai spus, printre altele, că acest proiect îngrijorează oamenii. De ce îngrijorează oamenii? Pentru că este un proiect bine conceput și care dorește, de fapt, să antreneze tinerii ca voluntari în acest scop.

Vă rog să îmi răspundeți!

Bill Etheridge (EFDD), *blue-card answer*. – I see solidarity as something different from the way you see it. I think solidarity, in this EU context, means one European people – it means no difference between all of us, brought together and homogenised. That's what I see solidarity here as meaning.

I would like to see the use of the word 'solidarity' to mean real solidarity, in times of difficulty, times when we work together, but this solidarity is a complete denunciation of individuality, of the nation state, and of all the things that made us all individually great in the past.

Κωνσταντίνος Παπαδάκης (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση παρεμβαίνει με όλα τα μέσα ενάντια στους λαούς, επιστρατεύοντας βομβαρδισμούς, εμπορικούς πολέμους, δασμούς, κυρώσεις, ρήτρες περί δήθεν ανθρωπίνων δικαιωμάτων και απειλές. Το Ευρωπαϊκό Σώμα Αλληλεγγύης αποτελεί ένα ακόμα αντιδραστικό πολυεργαλείο υποστήριξης των πολυπλόκαμων στρατιωτικών δομών της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, όπως η PESCO. Πρόκειται για ένα σώμα ανέργων, όλων αυτών που κατά εκατομμύρια προκαλεί η πολιτική της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης και των κυβερνήσεών της, που θα περιμαζεύουν τους νεκρούς, τους πρόσφυγες και τα συντρίμια των ιμπεριαλιστικών επεμβάσεων της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης και των συμμάχων της επίσης.

Από χώρα σε χώρα, ακόμα και εκτός Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, θα πηγαίνουν για να μαζέψουν πιστοποιητικά εθελοντισμού και ολιγόμηνης μαθητείας με χαρτζιλίκι ίσα ίσα για τα έξοδά τους, με εργολάβους ΜΚΟ και επιχειρήσεις. Με ένα συμπάρο λοιπόν πολλά τρυγόνια: ιμπεριαλιστικές επεμβάσεις, διείσδυση ευρωμονοπωλίων, επέκταση των εργασιακών σχέσεων γαλέρας, ανακύκλωση της ανεργίας, εμπόριο δήθεν αλληλεγγύης, μονά-ζυγά όλα για το μεγάλο κεφάλαιο.

Οι νέοι εργαζόμενοι, με ισχυρό Κομμουνιστικό Κόμμα, μπορούν να δώσουν απάντηση στα ιμπεριαλιστικά σχέδια και στην εργασιακή ζούγκλα.

Enrique Guerrero Salom (S&D). – Señor presidente, como ponente permanente de este Parlamento para la ayuda humanitaria doy la bienvenida a este Reglamento sobre el Cuerpo Europeo de Solidaridad, que viene a integrar la iniciativa humanitaria que existía ya desde el año 2014.

Creo que hay dos campos que aquí se unen o se encuentran. Por una parte, la necesidad de responder a las crisis humanitarias crecientes que hay en el mundo —la mayor parte de ellas producidas por el hombre como consecuencia de guerras, de enfrentamientos, pero, cada vez más, como consecuencia del cambio climático: sequías en grandes partes del mundo, huracanes, inundaciones, incendios de todo tipo—.

Y, por otra, la necesidad de construir sentido de pertenencia -de solidaridad- a los jóvenes y a los no tan jóvenes de la Unión Europea, que pueden intervenir para paliar el sufrimiento en todos estos campos en los que hay necesidad de ayuda humanitaria.

Antes he escuchado decir que esto es un Erasmus, y se ha dicho despectivamente. Erasmus es de lo mejor que ha construido la Unión Europea. Pero esto no es un Erasmus. Un Erasmus beneficia a los jóvenes, que tienen una oportunidad educativa. Esto es una solidaridad de los jóvenes con otras personas que padecen una situación de necesidad. La diferencia no es menor. La diferencia es absoluta.

IN THE CHAIR: MAIREAD McGUINNESS

Vice-President

Julie Ward (S&D). – Madam President, at its core, the European Solidarity Corps stands for the values that the EU was built upon. It is therefore a peace-making solidarity project, which invests in the potential of young citizens. I'm a supporter of the initiative and I'm very pleased with the report as voted in the Committee on Culture and Education.

I advocated for an enhanced budget in order to make the programme available to all young European citizens, especially those with fewer opportunities. Being able to volunteer in solidarity actions from a young age with proper support offers many benefits. The EU Solidarity Corps will provide opportunities for 17-30-year-olds to take an active role in helping communities in crisis, whilst developing vocational skills and personal attributes such as self-confidence and empathy.

As an MEP for the UK, I'm sad that my young constituents may not have access to this fantastic programme because of Brexit. At a time when so many young people feel disenfranchised from politics, the European Solidarity Corps has the potential to further involve our youth in their communities and strengthen their role as active citizens. Being part of this programme is an opportunity that can transform lives, and it is one of the many benefits that UK youth might lose because of a vote in the UK in 2016 that was largely the result of older people's dissatisfaction, a vote about the past, not about the future.

Момчил Неков (S&D). – Силно се надявам, че новият европейски корпус за солидарност ще има реална добавена стойност за младите хора в Европейския съюз през следващия програмен период. За да се случи това, смятам, че трябва да вземем под внимание два много важни аспекта. От една страна, трябва да се подсигурим, че корпусът разполага с достатъчно амбициозен бюджет, за да могат повече млади хора да имат досег с доброволчески дейности и да се чувстват социално полезни.

От друга страна, той трябва да бъде достъпен и за всеки един млад човек, независимо от неговия икономически и социален статус. Младите хора с по-скромни финансови възможности, тези, които живеят в отдалечени региони, и хората с увреждания не трябва да бъдат пренебрегвани, както се случва с други европейски програми. Това ще бъде мерило за успеха на тази програма.

Не на последно място вярвам, че регламентирането на доброволството на европейско ниво ще даде най-накрая тласък и за приемане на законодателство и в моята страна – България. В България има много доброволчески организации, които от години чакат това да се случи. Надявам се, че няма да ги разочароваме за пореден път.

Catch-the-eye procedure

Nicola Caputo (S&D). – Signora presidente, onorevoli colleghi, il testo licenziato dalla commissione Cultura definisce la solidarietà come il senso di responsabilità da parte di tutti, nei confronti di tutti, a impegnarsi per il bene comune, che si esprime attraverso azioni concrete senza aspettarsi nulla in cambio.

Con il corpo europeo di solidarietà, l'Unione europea realizza il duplice obiettivo di promuovere la solidarietà come valore, principalmente attraverso il volontariato, e di incrementare la partecipazione di giovani quale mezzo per contribuire a rafforzare la coesione sociale, la solidarietà, la democrazia, l'identità europea e la cittadinanza attiva nell'Unione e all'estero.

Ampiamente condivisibili gli obiettivi introdotti dal Parlamento europeo dell'inclusione sociale attraverso una chiara definizione dei giovani con minori opportunità, che include anche la disabilità, e quella di una componente solida e significativa di apprendimento e formazione nel corso del volontariato, utile per lo svolgimento di una successiva attività professionale.

È un bel segnale. Migliaia di giovani dai 18 ai 30 anni avranno dunque la possibilità di impegnarsi in progetti di solidarietà attraverso attività di volontariato, *stage* e lavoro.

Νότης Μαρίας (ECR). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, ο εθελοντισμός και η αλληλεγγύη πραγματικά είναι σημαντικές αξίες στη σύγχρονη κοινωνία. Το θέμα είναι όμως ότι, παρατηρώντας την πρόταση για το περίφημο Ευρωπαϊκό Σώμα Αλληλεγγύης, αυτό που βλέπουμε είναι ότι τα πράγματα δεν είναι έτσι, διότι ο εθελοντισμός είναι μια δραστηριότητα η οποία γίνεται χωρίς αμοιβή. Εδώ βλέπουμε ότι θα διατεθούν 1,2 δισεκατομμύρια ευρώ για αυτόν τον περίφημο εθελοντισμό – είναι εθελοντισμός με αμοιβή, δηλαδή. Δεύτερον, είναι εθελοντισμός στη βάση της αλληλεγγύης; Πολύ το αμφισβητώ, διότι έχουμε δει το πώς έχουν δράσει οι περίφημες ΜΚΟ σε σχέση με τη στήριξη για το προσφυγικό.

Είδαμε ένα μεγάλο πάρτι, το οποίο γίνεται αυτή τη στιγμή στην Ελλάδα και στις υπόλοιπες χώρες. Επομένως, αξιοποιείται η περίπτωση του εθελοντισμού της αλληλεγγύης στην πράξη, για να συνεχιστεί το περίφημο πάρτι το οποίο γίνεται στον τομέα του προσφυγικού, του μεταναστευτικού και άλλων δράσεων της κοινωνίας και, βέβαια, να συγκαλυφθεί το μεγάλο πρόβλημα της ανεργίας. Αν θέλουμε να πάρουμε μέτρα, ας δοθούν αυτά τα χρήματα υπέρ της ενίσχυσης της απασχόλησης των νέων.

Tibor Navracsics, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, indeed, it was very good to feel the broad support across the chamber for this initiative. The European Solidarity Corps has been a very successful initiative. If you want to keep the pace and the success of this initiative, we have to step forward and we have to start the trilogues in order to keep this success for the next multiannual financial framework.

I again express the European Commission's readiness to start the trilogues as soon as possible, and I ask you to help our partners during the trilogues and let's make this success story a sustainable success story. Let me once again thank Ms Šojdrová for her report and let me commend your work and your support in this project.

Michaela Šojdrová, rapporteure. – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Commissaire, merci pour ce débat qui était, je crois, très fructueux. J'apprécie le fait que nous partagions presque la même position et je suis convaincue que les changements que le Parlement propose amélioreront le programme. J'espère que le Conseil les accueillera aussi favorablement et que nous parviendrons à un accord ambitieux.

Nous souhaitons tous que le corps européen de solidarité offre des activités de qualité aux bénévoles et que les anciens participants continuent à s'engager dans ces activités bénévoles. Ce programme européen peut, pour des milliers de citoyens, de jeunes, donner naissance à de nouveaux engagements, à de nouvelles connaissances et expériences. Je souhaite que la solidarité responsabilise non seulement les bénéficiaires des activités, mais également les bénévoles et, finalement, la société.

C'est une chance à saisir pour les citoyens, mais aussi pour la société dans son ensemble. La solidarité ne devrait pas être perçue comme un produit de luxe, mais comme un tout que chacun de nous devrait au moins essayer d'inclure dans sa vie. Je crois que ce programme nous rapproche de la réalisation de cet objectif. Merci beaucoup pour votre coopération.

President. – The debate is closed.

The vote will take place on Tuesday, 12 March 2019.

Written statements (Rule 162)

Isabella Adinolfi (EFDD), per iscritto. – La solidarietà è alla base del progetto europeo, come anche sancito dai Trattati, e per questo va preservata e coltivata. Il Corpo europeo di solidarietà è un programma che va in questa direzione e quindi è senza dubbio da apprezzare e valorizzare. Si offre un'opportunità concreta ai giovani, di maturare, sia personalmente che professionalmente, aiutando le comunità locali in difficoltà. Nello specifico, avrei preferito che soltanto le organizzazioni no-profit potessero partecipare al programma, per evitare, ad esempio, possibili abusi da parte di multinazionali che non hanno bisogno di soldi pubblici per ripulirsi l'immagine. Anche la cosiddetta parte occupazionale (tirocini e lavori) mi lascia un po' perplessa, in quanto rischia di svilire un'attività nobile come il volontariato e di favorire pratiche di sostituzione a basso costo della forza lavoro. Fortunatamente sono riuscita con le mie proposte ad aumentare le garanzie e le salvaguardie, introducendo una netta linea di demarcazione tra volontariato e attività lavorative, nonché delle severe procedure di controllo in grado di escludere dal programma le organizzazioni che abbiano infranto le regole. Non possiamo infatti permettere che gli alti tassi di disoccupazione, causati, tra l'altro, dalle draconiane politiche di austerità, possano in alcun modo legittimare lo sfruttamento dei nostri giovani.

Andrea Bocskor (PPE), írásban. – Gratulálok Sojdrova képviselő társamnak a jelentés elkészítéséhez. Az Európai Szolidaritási Testület célja, hogy még több lehetőséget biztosítson a fiataloknak arra, hogy Európa-szerte egyes közösségek, vagy a társadalom egészének javát szolgáló önkéntességi munkákban vegyenek részt. Értékes képességekkel gazdagodhatnak azok a fiatalok, akik képzést éreznek magukban arra, hogy segítsenek másokon, új ismereteket és készségeket sajátítsanak el. A program kb. 350 ezer fiatalnak teszi majd lehetővé, hogy önkéntesként részt vegyenek pl. katasztrófa-övezetek helyreállításában, gyermekeket vagy időseket érintő, vagy karitatív célú segítségben. A tervezett költségvetés 86%-a az önkéntes tevékenységre irányul, de gyakornoki, illetve rövidtávú munkavállalói tevékenységre is vonatkozik. Az EP javaslata szerint, a programban részt vehetnek a „kevesebb lehetőséggel rendelkező”, vagyis hátrányos helyzetű fiatalok is, mint pl. a fogyatékossgal és egészségügyi problémával élők, a kisebbségekhez tartozók, vagy a konvergencia régiókból származó fiatalok is. Sajnálatos, hogy a baloldal nyomására a jelentéstevő ezen célcsoportok közé beemeli a „migrációs háttérrel rendelkező” fiatalokat, ami jellemző probléma a legtöbb nyugat-európai országban, viszont mivel Magyarország nem bevándorlóország, ezért számunkra nem releváns, hogy kiemelt figyelmet és támogatást kapjanak. A program a magyarországi fiatalok számára is egy újabb lehetőséget kínál a tapasztalatszerzésre és a munka világában jól hasznosítható készségek elsajátítására.

María Teresa Giménez Barbat (ALDE), por escrito. – El Cuerpo Europeo de Solidaridad ha sido una de las mejores ideas de esta legislatura. Se trata de una iniciativa que refuerza nuestros valores fundamentales y se centra en el futuro de Europa, que son los jóvenes. En tiempos donde crece el peligro de ideologías egoístas y tentaciones nacionalistas, no podemos dejar pasar la oportunidad de poner en común la solidaridad europea y apuntar hacia un futuro de mayor cooperación basada en principios. Trabajar juntos nos permitirá desarrollar una conciencia más clara de que, en un continente diverso, afrontamos desafíos comunes a todos, como la protección del medio ambiente, la integración de los inmigrantes, la prevención de los desastres naturales. Este proyecto es un éxito para los propios jóvenes, pues desde su lanzamiento en 2016, se han registrado más de 93 000 en toda Europa. Estoy segura de que tomar parte en cualquiera de sus proyectos solidarios contribuirá a su enriquecimiento personal y les habilitará para una mejor inserción laboral. Por esta razón, me alegra que la iniciativa cuente con un presupuesto superior para el periodo 2021-2027, pasando a ser de 1 260 millones de euros. Haber participado en la mejora del Cuerpo Europeo de Solidaridad es para mí un gran motivo de satisfacción.

19. Akt ws. cyberbezpieczeństwa – Europejskie Centrum Kompetencji w dziedzinie Cyberbezpieczeństwa w kwestiach Przemysłu, Technologii i Badań Naukowych oraz sieć krajowych ośrodków koordynacji (debata)

President. – The next item is the joint debate on

— the report by Angelika Niebler, on behalf of the Committee on Industry, Research and Energy, on the proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on ENISA, the ‘EU Cybersecurity Agency’, and repealing Regulation (EU) 526/2013, and on Information and Communication Technology cybersecurity certification (‘Cybersecurity Act’) (COM(2017)0477 – C8-0310/2017 – 2017/0225(COD)) (A8-0264/2018), and

— the report by Julia Reda, on behalf of the Committee on Industry, Research and Energy, on the proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing the European Cybersecurity Industrial, Technology and Research Competence Centre and the Network of National Coordination Centres (COM(2018)0630 – C8-0404/2018 – 2018/0328(COD)) (A8-0084/2019).

Angelika Niebler, Berichterstatterin. – Frau Präsidentin, verehrter Herr Kommissar, verehrte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Ich möchte mich zunächst für die gute Zusammenarbeit mit allen Berichterstattern aus den Fraktionen und auch für die gute Zusammenarbeit oder das intensive Miteinander im Trilog mit der Kommission bedanken.

Vom Kühlschrank über die Kaffeemaschine bis zum Herzschrittmacher, von den Energienetzen über die TK-Netze bis zur Verkehrsinfrastruktur – alles ist künftig mit allem vernetzt. Was heißt das für uns, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen? Für uns heißt das, dass Cybersicherheit eine der obersten politischen Prioritäten in Europa sein muss. Vielleicht erinnern Sie sich noch: Vor zwei Jahren hatten wir *WannaCry* einen großen Cyberangriff. Über 200 000 IT-Systeme in ganz Europa sind betroffen gewesen, in Großbritannien gab es Ärger, dort sind die Krankenhäuser betroffen gewesen, bei uns in Deutschland sind die Anzeigetafeln der Deutschen Bahn außer Funktion gesetzt worden, und einige Telekomunternehmen in Spanien wurden lahmgelegt. Also man sieht, was so ein europaweiter internationaler Cyberangriff für dramatische Konsequenzen haben kann. Ich denke, wir sind gut beraten, uns als Europäer auf Angriffe dieser Art entsprechend vorzubereiten.

Mit Blick auf das, was wir in den letzten Jahren schon in Sachen Cybersicherheit in Europa vor allem auch mit Hilfe des Europäischen Parlaments auf die Reihe gebracht haben, glaube ich, dass wir ganz gut ausgerüstet sind. Es gibt eine europäische Cybersicherheitsstrategie, wir haben vor einigen Jahren die Richtlinie über kritische Infrastrukturen verabschiedet, wir werden morgen den *Cyber Security Act* verabschieden, und wir werden Kompetenzzentren in Europa vernetzen und auch ein europäisches Cyber-Kompetenzzentrum aufbauen. Genau das ist die richtige Antwort auf diese internationalen Herausforderungen.

Worum geht es nun im *Cybersicherheits-Act*? Nun, zum einen darum, unsere europäische Cybersicherheitsagentur ENISA zu stärken. Ich freue mich, dass die Kommission einen mutigen Vorschlag gemacht hat, eben diese Agentur ENISA sowohl personell als auch finanziell aufzustocken, und wir hier im Parlament wollten der europäischen Agentur noch weitere Kompetenzen übertragen. Das war gerade auch einer der kritischen Punkte in der Debatte, in der Diskussion mit den Mitgliedstaaten. Wir wollen starke nationale Cybersicherheits-Kompetenzzentren haben. Aber wir im Parlament waren besonders dahinter her, dass eben auch ENISA, unsere europäische Cybersicherheitsagentur, gestärkt wird, sprich, dass sie nicht nur eingebunden bei mehr Koordinierung zwischen den nationalen Sicherheitsstellen ist, sondern eben auch eigenständige Kompetenzen hat, insbesondere im Bereich der Zertifizierung.

Wir wollen in Europa einen europäischen Roll-out von Zertifizierungsrahmen schaffen. Das ist auch für unsere heimische Industrie ein Riesenvorteil, wenn man eben nicht nur Zertifizierung in einem Land hat, sondern wenn in ganz Europa der Rahmen dann entsprechend gegeben ist.

Für uns im Parlament war es wichtig, dass Sicherheitsstufen für smarte Geräte, für smarte Produkte, Dienstleistungen und Systeme eingeführt werden, und für uns war es auch wichtig, dass es künftig für diese smarten Geräte, für diese intelligenten *devices* Produktinformationen für die Verbraucher geben soll. Wir finden, dass der Verbraucher wissen muss, ob sein Gerät sicher ist. Wir finden, dass der Verbraucher auch wissen muss, wie er sein Gerät sicher einstellen kann. All das findet sich jetzt im Vorschlag. Wir sind glücklich, dass das auch im Trilog entsprechend so aufgegriffen wurde.

Hier wäre ich persönlich gerne noch einen Schritt weitergegangen. Ich hätte mir vorgestellt, dass es für kritische Infrastrukturen Sinn macht, auch verpflichtende Zertifizierungsrahmen vorzuschreiben. Wir haben jetzt, glaube ich, einen guten Kompromiss gefunden. Wir werden in einem ersten Schritt bei ENISA mit einem lang laufenden Jahresprogramm bestimmen, in welchem Bereich es Sinn macht, solche Zertifizierungen verpflichtend vorzuschreiben. Ich glaube auch, das ist ein vernünftiger weiterer Schritt. Die nächsten Schritte werden folgen.

Cybersicherheit ist ein megawichtiges Thema, gerade für uns in der Europäischen Union. Ich freue mich, dass wir auch in zügigen Beratungen mit dem Rat und mit der Kommission als Parlament so einen guten Kompromiss erzielen konnten. Ich hoffe, dass er morgen mit breiter Mehrheit angenommen wird.

Julia Reda, *Rapporteur*. – Madam President, today we are also debating the proposal establishing the European Cybersecurity Industrial, Technology and Research Competence Centre, and establishing the Network of National Coordination Centres. By coordinating the implementation of the cybersecurity programmes from Digital Europe and Horizon Europe, the Centre will complement the work of the European Union Agency for Network and Information Security (ENISA) and increase the competitiveness of the European cybersecurity industry and research.

With the Reda report we are acknowledging that cybersecurity is not a status that can be achieved by buying a certain product. Information and communications technology (ICT) evolves constantly and so do the threats. It requires constant efforts to make our infrastructure, communication and information systems more secure. Cybersecurity is a process that continues throughout the life cycle of a product, but the most secure product is not enough if we fail to secure the underlying infrastructure.

The report welcomes as an advantage that businesses and expertise are distributed across Europe. We embrace the wealth of knowledge and potential of our unique ecosystem of small and medium-sized cybersecurity companies. In addition to this, we involve the broader cybersecurity community in Europe. This community ranges from researchers in academia to individual entrepreneurs, but we also want to connect to actors in consumer associations and include the crucial contribution of civil society initiatives, including those of ethical hackers.

The proposal for a cybersecurity competence centre gives the unique opportunity to shape the future of cybersecurity in Europe. The fact that expertise is distributed across the Union is a strength, but also a challenge to connect them in projects. For those reasons we are encouraging collaborative approaches and investment in free and open-source software and open hardware. Businesses throughout Europe are struggling to fulfil their demand for skilled workers. In the ICT industry each unemployed worker is matched with approximately 1.5 open jobs. Clearly businesses cannot afford to ignore half of society in their search for potential. The report therefore wants to achieve a more balanced and diverse workforce in ICT and also in the governance structures of the Cybersecurity Competence Centre because it is good for business, and even more so, because it is in the interest of equality.

In the past months and years there has been one debate gaining more and more public attention. It is the debate about the consequences that decisions taken by the digital industry have for society at large. We cannot ignore this debate in our cybersecurity research. The Cybersecurity Competence Centre needs to take into account what societal and ethical implications its projects may have and anticipate the concerns its actions may raise. We must not take a narrow view of cybersecurity research by only involving computer scientists. Instead, social scientists and ethicists must have a seat at the table.

Thanks to the ambitious work of all colleagues involved, the Committee on Industry, Research and Energy (ITRE) has found a solid and balanced report. We all agree on the European Union's crucial task of promoting democracy, the rule of law, human rights and fundamental freedoms worldwide. That is why we need to be very clear in respect of the Treaties when it comes to the funding of technology that can be used for military applications. Therefore, I would like to ask you to make it even clearer and to support my plenary amendments to underline that, when it comes to defence, the Centre's role should be to facilitate the resilience-building initiatives against cybersecurity threats such as the protection of critical infrastructure. The Cybersecurity Competence Centre should have no role in developing and building

cyber-weapons. There is no question that some of the technologies have applications beyond just the civilian sphere, for example, cryptography. Fortunately, we can rely and build upon the existing frameworks for the control of dual-use technology that this House has already helped create.

I would like to thank all the colleagues and shadows for their good collaboration on this file.

Nicola Danti, *relatore per parere della commissione per il mercato interno e la protezione dei consumatori*. – Signora Presidente, signor Vicepresidente, onorevoli colleghi, in un mondo sempre più digitalizzato e connesso la sicurezza informatica è oggi una vera e propria priorità politica. Con l'approvazione dell'atto europeo sulla cibersicurezza, l'Unione si dota di misure chiare e armonizzate per la prevenzione degli attacchi informatici che colpiscono la rete. Il rafforzamento delle capacità operative e di coordinamento di ENISA e la creazione di uno schema europeo di certificazione costituiscono il valore aggiunto di questo regolamento.

Avremmo ambito a compiere un passo ancora più ambizioso, per esempio introducendo un meccanismo di certificazione obbligatorio per i prodotti il cui utilizzo è destinato agli operatori dei servizi critici. Ciò non è stato. In ogni caso, in futuro, quando gli utenti acquisteranno un *tablet* o un cellulare potranno controllare se è certificato e quale sia il suo livello di affidabilità. Ciò rappresenta comunque un considerevole passo avanti per aumentare la fiducia del mercato europeo dei beni e dei servizi connessi.

Andrus Ansip, *Vice-President of the Commission*. – Madam President, I wish to thank the rapporteurs, both Angelika Niebler and Julia Reda, all the shadow rapporteurs and associated committees, for their constructive efforts to deal with these two critical legislative files as a matter of urgency.

They will reinforce EU cybersecurity structures and improve our collective resilience to combat cyber-attacks in a mutually supportive and coordinated way, as part of building the digital single market.

Firstly, on the Cybersecurity Act, the Commission fully supports the political agreement reached by the co-legislators. This agreement is the result of good cooperation between the co-legislators on the future of ENISA, the European Agency for Cybersecurity, and on setting up a cybersecurity certification framework for the digital single market.

It will strengthen the regulation in several important areas. In particular, it puts in place a clear, open and robust EU framework for cybersecurity certification. The European Union will be able to agree certification schemes that are fit for purpose, keep our citizens safe and businesses resilient, and meet the needs of both the regulators and markets.

It will provide ENISA with a permanent, stronger mandate to contribute to the cybersecurity of the EU. ENISA is already using its expertise in cybersecurity exercises to help prepare securing the upcoming European Parliament elections.

Secondly, and equally importantly, I would like to strongly welcome the report on the cybersecurity competence centre and network of national coordination centres proposal. This proposal is a key element for building a secure European digital single market. It responds to the urgent need to build up our cybersecurity capabilities. It uses the excellent research carried out in Horizon 2020 and the future Horizon year.

It is in Europe's strategic interests to make sure that EU industries are at the cutting edge in developing next-generation cybersecurity and digital technologies. We have proposed the digital year programme to finance the development of new cybersecurity capabilities in Europe, and to invest with the Member States and the private sector in their deployment across the European Union.

With a planned network of national coordination centres, we want to make sure that Member States bring together all relevant parties involved in developing new cybersecurity capabilities for the digital single market, the public and private sectors, as well as academia.

I'm delighted that the European Parliament's report shares our vision on the future of European cybersecurity and technologies and the importance of ensuring access to these financial means, based on priorities agreed between all relevant stakeholders. The Parliament has worked hard on this file in a very short time and I'm grateful for this.

By strengthening Europe's cybersecurity capabilities across the entire digital technology value chain, we are ensuring that the digital single market, that we have built together, will be strong and resilient to cyber-threats.

I look forward to the discussion.

John Howarth, *rapporteur for the opinion of the Committee on Budgets*. – Madam President, cyber attacks are not a temporary fashion, they are not something that is going to go away any time soon. They are about serious money and serious politics.

The permanent mandate for the agency to counter them, the European Union Agency for Network and Information Security (ENISA), is therefore not a luxury; it is absolutely essential. It is also a fact that, to paraphrase, the bad IT crowd needs to be combated with a better IT crowd, so the agency needs to have the resources to be able to attract the best people in the field. That said, the agency also needs to operate efficiently and it's debatable whether two locations is a sensible way to go in the medium term.

Nonetheless, we welcome the report and the notion of an EU-wide certification scheme. For cybercrime, borders have never been relevant and therefore combating cybercrime across borders is absolutely essential.

Maria Grapini, *Raportoare pentru aviz, Comisia pentru piața internă și protecția consumatorilor*. – Doamna președintă, domnule comisar, stimați colegi, astăzi dezbatem un raport și sper ca mâine să fie votat un raport extrem de important, pentru că 80 % din cetățeni, din populația Uniunii, este conectată la internet și, până la urmă, viața cetățenilor, dar și economiile statelor membre depind de tehnologii, de tehnologia digitală.

În același timp, există acest risc de atacuri cibernetice. De aceea voi susține raportul legat de înființarea Centrului de competențe european industrial, tehnologic și de cercetare în materie de securitate cibernetică, dar și rețelele de centre naționale și de coordonare, pentru că, așa cum spunea domnul comisar, este foarte important ca lucrurile să funcționeze în sistem, în cadrul pieței interne.

Mă bucur că, la propunerea Comisiei, au fost adăugate amendamente din partea colegilor din Parlament legate de IMM-uri. Știm foarte clar că ele sunt mai vulnerabile decât companiile mari pentru că, sigur, nu sunt specializate în securitatea cibernetică. De aceea, este necesar ca Centrul de competențe și Rețeaua de competențe în materie de securitate să acorde sprijin IMM-urilor pentru accesul la cunoștințe și formare profesională.

Romeo Franz, *Verfasser der Stellungnahme des mitberatenden Ausschusses für bürgerliche Freiheiten, Justiz und Inneres*. – Frau Präsidentin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Auch im Namen des LIBE-Ausschusses gratuliere ich der Kollegin Niebler für den erfolgreichen Abschluss der Verhandlungen zum neuen ENISA-Mandat.

Die neuen Zertifizierungsverfahren sind gut und wichtig, aber sie sind leider freiwillig. Der Artikel 48a, den der LIBE-Ausschuss dazu einfügen wollte, hätte hier einen wichtigen Schritt bedeutet. Er hätte erstmals einen verpflichtenden Mindeststandard für IT-Sicherheit bei allen vernetzten Geräten eingeführt, die auf dem europäischen Markt angeboten werden. Wir reden hier im Parlament immerzu von mehr Sicherheit, und hier hätten wir die Chance, Sicherheitslücken zu vermeiden, die vielen Bürgerinnen und Bürgern gar nicht bewusst sind, denn unsichere Geräte können sehr einfach gehackt werden und dann dazu dienen, andere Geräte oder sicherheitsrelevante Infrastruktur anzugreifen. Ein Vergleich: Wir erteilen ja auch keine Typenzulassung für Autos, deren Bremsen oder Kupplungen nur freiwillig getestet werden und für die es keine Mindeststandards gibt.

Liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen, wir Abgeordnete haben das Problem erkannt. Nicht umsonst diskutieren wir diese Woche Sicherheitsaspekte für unsere Mobilfunknetze. Wir müssen es nur ernsthaft anpacken – spätestens bei der nächsten Revision der ENISA-Verordnung oder auch schon vorher in der Produkthaftungsrichtlinie oder bei der Überarbeitung des CE-Labels. IT-Sicherheit ist heute ein zentraler Bestandteil unserer gesellschaftlichen Sicherheit. Nehmen wir die Sache so ernst, wie es geboten ist.

Paul Rübиг, *im Namen der PPE-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin! Ich möchte mich auch bei Angelika Niebler bedanken in dieser Diskussion, weil es ganz einfach darum geht, Vertrauenssysteme zu schaffen. Wir wollen dem Internet in unseren Geräten wieder vertrauen dürfen, und wir wollen keinen Protektionismus, weil es natürlich weltweit eine Nummer-eins-Frage gibt: Sicherheit für unsere Bürgerinnen und Bürger bei der Benutzung ihrer Geräte.

Wir wollen hier weder von der militärischen noch von der zivilen Ebene dementsprechende Probleme bekommen. Deshalb hat Herr Niedermayer natürlich auch klargestellt, dass es nicht nur China ist, sondern dass es weltweit unser gemeinsames Anliegen sein sollte, diese Cybersicherheit herzustellen; das ist ein ganz entscheidender Bereich.

Ich bedanke mich bei Kollegin Reda für die *Cyber Security Centres*, weil natürlich 28 Mitgliedstaaten mit einer gemeinsamen Koordinierung hier noch weit mehr erreichen können. Und ich bedanke mich auch bei Kollegin Reda, dass sie morgen den Antrag auf den Trilog stellen wird, weil es für uns ganz wichtig ist, dass das schnell – noch vor den Wahlen – für unsere Bürgerinnen und Bürgern zustande gebracht wird. Wir wissen, dass die NIS-Richtlinie und die Datenschutz-Richtlinie dementsprechend umgesetzt werden müssen, und wir wollen natürlich diese Zentren dementsprechend in der Nähe von Ausbildungszentren etablieren, bei Fachhochschulen, bei Universitäten, und vor allem für unsere kleinen und mittleren Betriebe den Zugang zur Sicherheit überhaupt erst ermöglichen. Insofern glaube ich, dass der Digitalfonds, der Verteidigungsfonds und die Fazilität „Connecting Europe“ und das Programm Horizont Europa eine große Hilfe darstellen werden.

Петър Курумбашев, *от името на групата S&D*. – Г-жо Председател, позволете ми да благодаря на колегите, с които работихме заедно по акта за киберсигурност, особено на г-жа Ниблер, г-н Теличка, г-н Данти. Първо, имаме удвоен бюджет на Европейската агенция за киберсигурност, имаме неин постоянен мандат и имаме собствени технически способности на ЕНИСА, които се надявам, че са само първа стъпка в правилната посока и тепърва ЕНИСА ще има още по-сериозни технически възможности и възможност да помага на всяка държава членка.

Също така искам да изразя, за разлика от останалите докладчици, моего удовлетворение, че ще има доброволно сертифициране, тъй като забелязах изкушението да има задължително сертифициране, което да се използва като пазарно преимущество на някои фирми пред другите, а не толкова като задължение за потребителите.

Искам да отбележа два противоречиви момента в законодателството за националните центрове за компетентност. Единият е текстът, който в момента гласи, че само органи, установени на територията на Съюза, и физически лица, пребиваващи в рамките на Съюза, могат да бъдат акредитирани като членове на тази общност и това искам да кажа, че не дава право на участие на дъщерни дружества от трети страни, които покриват критериите и имат експертиза в областта на киберсигурността. Ако ние искаме да градим киберсигурност, тя не може да бъде изградена само и единствено на територията на Европейския съюз.

Също така ние сме дали правомощия на ЕНИСА относно нуждите за научни изследвания и в регулацията за централите за компетентност също се дават подобни правомощия. Необходимо е да се избягва застъпването на такива правомощия, тъй като има риск да създаваме прекалено много законодателство, а то да не се изпълнява или пък да се припокрива.

В момента имаме три отлични законодателни акта, по които да работим, а именно актът за киберсигурност, актът за централите за компетентност и мрежовата информационна сигурност. Смятам, че една от първите задачи на ЕНИСА би трябвало да бъде да започне да работи по създаването на сертификационна схема за 5G оборудване, което е, както знаете, напоследък популярна тема.

Zdzisław Krasnodębski, *w imieniu grupy ECR*. – Pani Przewodnicząca! Też mi się wydaje, że ta certyfikacja ma ogromne znaczenie, mimo że – tak jak kolega tu wspominał – na razie będzie dobrowolna. Komisja ma jednak możliwość przeglądu efektywności tej dobrowolnej certyfikacji i jej oceny po pewnym czasie. Natomiast znaczenie cyberbezpieczeństwa, jak wiemy, jest to ogromne. Wskazują na to dane.

Jak wiadomo, gospodarstwa domowe na świecie posiadają około pięciu miliardów urządzeń podłączonych do internetu. Niektórzy przewidują, że do roku 2021 ta liczba ma wzrosnąć do piętnastu miliardów. Producenci wprowadzają nowe urządzenia, nowe modele towarów, które są podłączone do Internetu, natomiast nie idzie do tej pory za tym w parze instalacja odpowiednich zabezpieczeń.

Wiemy, że atak hakerski na jedno domostwo już może spowodować duże problemy dla właścicieli, ale jednocześnie jest też tak, że taki atak na wiele urzędzeń może być użyty również przez cyberprzestępców jako narzędzie do ataku na infrastrukturę strategiczną państwa. Badacze z Princeton University przeprowadzili symulacje, które pokazały, że nagły trzydziestoprocentowy skok popytu na energię elektryczną może skutecznie wyłączyć wszystkie generatory atakowanym obszarze, tak więc bezpieczeństwo domostw prywatnych łączy się również z bezpieczeństwem strategicznym. Wystarczy na przykład przejść w tym celu – piszą ci badacze – 90 tysięcy podłączonych do Internetu klimatyzatorów bądź osiem tysięcy bojlerów do wody. W związku z tym potrzeba nam niewątpliwie lepszych zabezpieczeń, stosownych zabezpieczeń, zarówno infrastruktury krytycznej, jak i przedmiotów domowego użytku.

Pavel Telička, *on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – Madam President, I shall start by thanking my colleague Angelika Niebler especially, but also colleagues Peter Kouroumbashev and Nicola Danti, for the excellent cooperation during those late hours.

I think I will not be revealing any secrets if I say that cyber-attacks and cybersecurity are very high on the list of concerns of our public. And rightly so: we are still vulnerable, and today we are vulnerable against attacks which can lead to the disclosure of data and other serious issues, but which are still manageable. Tomorrow – and I don't even want to say it – we could see a serious threat that could concern our health, our security and our safety in broader terms. I believe that what we have managed to achieve with the Cybersecurity Act, as well as with strengthening ENISA, is the right response.

Of course, we can always have a debate on whether it is sufficient or not. Well this is what was feasible on the day we were finalising negotiations with the Council. I need to say I would appreciate it if some Member States would understand better that we are as strong or as weak as the weakest part of the chain.

I think that apart from the Cybersecurity Act and ENISA we need a change of mind-set, and that is why I would like to draw attention also to the latest statement by President Macron, also seconded yesterday by the leader of CDU/CSU, when talking about cybersecurity and also a European agency for the protection of democracies. Of course these are different issues but they are heading in the right direction. I think we have a basis on which we can build and I will hold President Macron to his word in future developments as we need to develop them a bit further.

Jakop Dalunde, *för Verts/ALE-gruppen*. – Fru talman! I takt med att våra samhällen blir mer digitala blir de också alltmer sårbara. Därför är det glädjande att vi imorgon röstar för att stärka cybersäkerheten i Europa. Nu ökar vi resurserna för att göra våra digitala system mer robusta.

Med striktare certifieringsregler kan vi känna oss trygga att våra mobiler, datorer och andra digitala produkter, som vi använder dagligen, uppfyller de höga säkerhetskrav vi i Europa ställer.

Med denna lagstiftning stärker vi vår digitala motståndskraft och får verktyg att hantera både dagens och framtidens utmaningar på området.

Jaromír Kohlíček, *za skupinu GUE/NGL*. – Paní předsedající, kybernetická bezpečnost je v posledních několika letech velmi aktuálním pojmem. V srpnu 2017 připravila Evropská komise první balíček s tímto tématem, který posiluje agenturu ENISA. Diskutovaná zpráva chce posílit síť národních koordinačních center. Tato kompetenční centra rozpracují odpovídající části směrnic Digitální Evropa a Horizont Evropa alokací grantů a podporou.

U kompetenčních center se předpokládá, že budou koordinovat a usnadňovat práci sítě celého společenství zabývajících se kybernetickou bezpečností. Podporují zájem zpravodajky posílit bezpečnost bezplatných a otevřených zdrojů software, protože jejich zranitelnost může ohrozit fungování internetu a s ním spojených služeb. Centra by měla podporovat odolnost a integritu sítí a informačních systémů. Neměla by se soustřeďovat na technologie dvojího a případně vojenského užití.

V souladu se Smlouvami je nutné toto rozdělení respektovat. Právě proto toto oddělení je definováno ve zprávě a je pro nás klíčovou otázkou, která rozhodne o podpoře diskutované zprávy.

Christelle Lechevalier, *au nom du groupe ENF*. – Madame la Présidente, je remercie les rapporteurs. Cette réforme de l'Agence européenne de cybersécurité permet la coordination des autorités nationales chargées de cette question et le partage d'informations. Elle représente une réponse efficace aux problèmes de cybersécurité à l'échelon européen, tout en respectant le rôle des États dans les domaines régaliens et en matière de sécurité nationale.

De la violation de notre vie privée aux détournements financiers, l'absence de normes réglementaires sérieuses met notre environnement numérique sous la menace de cyberattaques. À l'exemple de l'Europe des nations que nous appelons de nos vœux, nous devons coopérer en matière de cybersécurité. Au-delà de la coopération, la certification volontaire permettra aux consommateurs d'être mieux informés de la protection numérique apportée aux produits qu'ils achèteront, ce qui est un grand pas.

Cependant, à long terme, seule une certification obligatoire permettra de sécuriser un internet des objets dont la place dans nos sociétés est exponentielle.

Enfin, notons que la numérisation massive de notre quotidien fait de la cybersécurité un sujet majeur et que la croissance du budget qui lui est consacré est logique. Néanmoins, si nous concédons l'augmentation de 40 % du budget de l'ENISA d'ici à 2022, rappelons que le budget de l'Union européenne devrait, lui, dans le contexte du Brexit, avoir vocation à diminuer.

Seán Kelly (PPE). – Madam President, first of all, congratulations to my friend Angelika Niebler on her excellent work on this important piece of legislation. I think the agreement achieves what we want it to achieve, and will help protect us against cyber-attacks. A robust EU cybersecurity strategy is vital to enable us to repel any cyber-attacks against our energy supplies, aviation sector, commercial sectors or governments. Hackers are now targeting sensitive sectors for criminal and terrorist purposes, and this is a real concern. Thankfully, the work that has been done on this proposal, and the agreement reached will go a long way to ensuring that such concerns are addressed.

We hear about data breaches, malware and online financial scams on a regular basis now, and about more and more sophisticated plots. We must be ready to defend crucial infrastructure, such as energy grids, plants and industry, against sinister attacks from criminals or terrorists. Shutting down electricity grids on a large scale for a prolonged time could cause massive disruption and economic damage.

I welcome the strengthened role for the European Union Agency for Network and Information Security (ENISA), and indeed my own country has the potential to be a cybersecurity hub for Europe. Ireland is world renowned as a high-tech country with a skilled workforce and it is already home to the largest, biggest tech companies. Companies like VMware in Cork can do an awful lot to prevent cyber-attacks. We have the expertise readily available to develop more cybersecurity services quickly and to become the global leader in securing personal and financial information online. I look forward to seeing the sector back home develop in the coming years.

Finally, it was my privilege to be part of a European Parliament delegation to Silicon Valley last year, where we met all the top companies. Cooperation with those companies would be very helpful as well.

Jens Geier (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin, sehr verehrte Damen und Herren! Ich hatte das Vergnügen, für meine Fraktion der Schattenberichterstatter für das Kompetenzzentrum für Cybersicherheit zu sein, und darf sagen, dass wir den Vorschlag der Kommission in diesem Zusammenhang sehr begrüßt haben. Ich bin auch sehr zufrieden mit dem Standpunkt, den der Ausschuss für den Industrieausschuss eingenommen hat. Ich bedanke mich in dem Zusammenhang bei der Berichterstatterin und bei den anderen Schattenberichterstattern für eine exzellente Zusammenarbeit.

Meiner Fraktion, der S&D, war insbesondere wichtig, eine Kohärenz der bestehenden Strukturen wie der zuständigen Agentur ENISA sicherzustellen, und der Beschluss des Ausschusses beinhaltet nun Formulierungen, um eine gute Zusammenarbeit sicherzustellen. Wir haben geschaut, dass die Governance für dieses Cybersicherheitszentrum im Zusammenhang mit den nationalen Entitäten so funktioniert, dass an allen Stellen eben auch auf die notwendige Expertise zurückgegriffen wird, und wir haben dafür gesorgt, dass am Ende nur europäische Entitäten durch das Programm auch privilegiert werden können.

Letztendlich war uns wichtig, dass, wenn auch militärisch nutzbare Cybersicherheitsprojekte gefördert werden sollen, dann eben auch Geld aus dem Europäischen Verteidigungsfonds herbeigeführt werden kann. Wir möchten so sicherstellen, dass zivile Programme eben auch nur für zivile Produkte benutzt werden können. Und deswegen können wir den jetzt vorliegenden Text voll und ganz unterstützen. Das hat Eingang gefunden in die Position des ITRE-Ausschusses.

Ich bin ein bisschen zurückhaltend, wenn es darum geht, gleich in Trilogverhandlungen zu gehen. Ich habe den Eindruck, wenn es um die Fragen Finanzierung, Stimmverhältnisse und so weiter geht, wird es zu der Position des Ministerrats doch wahnsinnig große Unterschiede geben. Das wird die Zeit weisen. Am Mittwoch soll er ja entscheiden.

Ralph Packet (ECR). – Voorzitter, door de snelle digitalisering wordt cyberveiligheid steeds belangrijker. Buitenlandse telecombedrijven winnen hier marktaandeel. Onderzoek toont aan dat onze bedrijven onvoldoende uitgerust zijn tegen cyberrisico's en we moeten waakzaam zijn voor de inmenging van andere machtsblokken. Daarom komen wij nu met de cyberbeveiligingsverordening, een Europese strategie met heel wat maatregelen waarmee we investeren in databeveiliging en bescherming tegen cyberaanvallen.

En dat doen we niet alleen. We laten voldoende ruimte aan de overheden en bedrijven om onderling afspraken te maken en in te blijven zetten op innovatie. We moeten er nu op toezien dat de nodige investeringen in heel Europa gebeuren en de maatregelen goed geïmplementeerd worden in het belang van de Europese consument.

Ik roep de Europese Unie op om dit goed op te volgen en beveel lidstaten zoals België aan om hiernaast ook zelf nog meer maatregelen te nemen tegen bijvoorbeeld het tekort aan experts voor cyberveiligheid. *Let's make Europe safe online.*

Angelika Mlinar (ALDE). – Madam President, we are debating today a fundamental step in defining a European cybersecurity strategy that will aim at setting up state of the art capabilities in Europe. The new framework proposed by the Commission is a true answer to the need to coordinate Member States' efforts in cooperation with the industrial sector to grant our citizens and customers an adequate supply of safe products and services without depending upon imported solutions from non-EU countries.

Thanks to intense negotiations in committee, and the good cooperation achieved with the rapporteur, Julia Reda, and the shadows, we now have a solid and balanced text which ensures that the European Competence Centre will work as a coordinator to set priorities and avoid the duplication of initiatives in Member States in a good connection with ENISA's new mandate under the Cybersecurity Act. Secondly, the Centre will award funding from the Digital Europe Programme and Horizon Europe, giving concrete support to research and innovation initiatives to help them to reach the market stage. Thirdly, it would be possible to respect Member States' existing approaches to cybersecurity by allowing synergies between civilian and military applications, thus allowing the pooling of financial resources and avoiding overlaps of precious expertise.

Last but not least, as a rapporteur for the Digital Europe Programme, I am very happy about the coherent and clear approach given to the governance structure of the Centre and its relationship, together with the national coordination centres, with the network of digital innovation hubs provided for under Digital Europe.

Marisa Matias (GUE/NGL). – Senhora Presidente, cada vez mais as nossas vidas são vividas e partilhadas *online*. É por isso que os nossos dados pessoais são hoje um bem tão valioso que as empresas e os governos os querem recolher, explorar ou ter acesso.

É por isso também que há tantos criminosos que os querem roubar. Escândalos recentes como o Facebook e a Cambridge Analytica são a demonstração mais real disso mesmo. Precisamos de meios para fazer face a estas ameaças, mas precisamos de garantir que o respeito pelos direitos humanos é o eixo central da atuação das organizações que visam combater o cibercrime.

Por isso não podemos ignorar o papel essencial que as pessoas têm de desempenhar nesta luta. Não devemos ignorar que precisamos que os cidadãos sejam capacitados para tomarem decisões mais informadas relativamente aos seus dados, à gestão dos mesmos e como mantê-los em segurança.

Precisamos de entidades como a ENISA, mas também precisamos de todas as autoridades e de pessoas conscientes do seu papel neste combate e nunca, mas nunca, transpor a linha dos direitos humanos, por muito apetecíveis que sejam os lucros.

Andreas Schwab (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin! Herr Vizepräsident, meine sehr verehrten Damen und Herren, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen, ich möchte mich natürlich auch zunächst bei unserer Berichterstatterin Angelika Niebler für eine hervorragende Arbeit in diesem Dossier danken. Ich hoffe, dass der Binnenmarktausschuss mit unserem Kollegen Danti einen nützlichen Beitrag dazu leisten konnte.

Nachdem schon sehr viel zur Struktur der Beschlussfassung gesagt wurde, möchte ich gerne einfach nochmal daran erinnern, dass der finanzielle Schaden durch Erpressungssoftware im Jahr 2019 weltweit voraussichtlich mehr als 11,5 - Milliarden US-Dollar betragen wird, und die menschliche Angriffsfläche dürfte bis 2022 bei sechs Milliarden Menschen liegen. Es sind Zahlen der ENISA, die deutlich machen, dass das Problem, über das wir hier reden, den europäischen Markt inzwischen bei weitem übersteigt und wir deswegen seitens der EU dringend einheitliche und gemeinsame Ziele fixieren müssen, die wir nicht allein den Mitgliedstaaten überlassen dürfen, selbst wenn es sich hier im Einzelfall auch um einen wichtigen Teil der nationalen Sicherheit handeln kann.

Die Europäische Union will bis zum Jahr 2020 1,8 Milliarden in die Cybersicherheit investieren. Das ist positiv, aber, wenn wir es mit den Vereinigten Staaten von Amerika vergleichen, müssen wir halt konstatieren: Dort sind es rund 22 Milliarden. Das heißt, wir hängen hier doch ein Stück weit zurück. Und deswegen bedeutet das, dass diese Richtlinie, die wir heute verabschieden, nicht nur der Agentur der Europäischen Union für Cybersicherheit neue Zuständigkeiten gibt und dass wir Europa stärken, sondern sie muss auch bedeuten, dass die Mitgliedstaaten und die Wirtschaft mehr in Cybersicherheit investieren, wenn wir der Gefahr, die vor uns liegt, wirklich die Stirn bieten wollen.

Carlos Zorrinho (S&D). – Senhora Presidente, a cibersegurança é hoje, como todos os factos demonstram, uma das chaves fundamentais para garantir a competitividade da economia europeia, proteger os seus cidadãos das ameaças decorrentes das novas tecnologias usadas ilegalmente e desenvolver os processos de escolha e representação democrática livres.

Faz por isso todo o sentido o reforço da capacidade e do potencial da ENISA aumentando a resiliência do espaço europeu contra os ciberataques e criando competências e capacidades acrescidas de prevenção, deteção e resposta.

Mas é também fundamental implementar um sistema de certificação dos produtos e sistemas. Conseguir-lo exige cooperação e coordenação. Os centros nacionais de conhecimento e desenvolvimento sofrerão um forte impulso com os programas Horizonte Europa e Europa Digital.

A rede de certificação deve tirar partido destas competências e funcionar num modelo de articulação capaz de assegurar, de forma distribuída e de forma agregada, a integridade e resiliência dos procedimentos e das redes e a qualidade da informação.

Não é um desafio fácil, mas é uma prioridade que temos que cumprir para assegurar a autonomia estratégica da União Europeia na nova Sociedade Digital.

Εύα Καϊλή (S&D). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, κύριοι συνάδελφοι, θα ήθελα να σας συγχαρώ για τη διαπραγμάτευση και την ευτυχή κατάληξη του τριλόγου. Αυτό είναι το επόμενο σημαντικό βήμα μετά την οδηγία NIS για την ενίσχυση της κυβερνοασφάλειας στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση που προστατεύει και την οικονομία και την κοινωνία μας, αλλά και τη δημοκρατία μας. Καθημερινά έχουμε κυβερνοεπιθέσεις, πολλές από τις οποίες προέρχονται από τρίτες χώρες και η ψηφιακή μας οικονομία εξελίσσεται εκθετικά και αυτές οι επιθέσεις θα εξελισσονται επίσης εκθετικά. Είναι, λοιπόν, πάρα πολύ σημαντικό να ενισχύσουμε την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση στην αντιμετώπιση με εργαλεία και πολιτικές, όχι όμως μόνο στη συνεργασία, αλλά και στον συντονισμό μεταξύ των κρατών μελών και στην ανταλλαγή πληροφοριών, γιατί είναι ένας κινούμενος στόχος η κυβερνοασφάλεια.

Ο ENISA λοιπόν, που εδρεύει στην Ελλάδα, είναι σημαντικό κομμάτι της προσπάθειας αυτής. Με την ψήφιση του EU Cybersecurity Act ενισχύεται πολύ, αποκτά αυξημένες αρμοδιότητες και στελεχώνεται με ειδικούς για την αντιμετώπιση των κυβερνοαπειλών. Ωστόσο, οφείλουμε να συνεχίσουμε και να ολοκληρώσουμε ουσιαστικά τις επενδύσεις στην κυβερνοασφάλεια, στηρίζοντας την καινοτομία και μέσω των χρηματοδοτικών εργαλείων της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης – επενδύουμε γύρω στα 2 δισεκατομμύρια για το 2021-2027.

Θεωρώ ότι είναι στον σωστό δρόμο και ελπίζω ο νέος κανονισμός για τα competence centres και networks, που επίσης ψηφίζουμε, να ολοκληρωθεί και να ξεκινήσει και ο τρίλογος, ώστε με αυτή τη σύνθεση του Ευρωκοινοβουλίου να μπορέσουμε ουσιαστικά να ολοκληρώσουμε αυτό το στρατηγικό σχέδιο για την κυβερνοασφάλεια. Θεωρώ, λοιπόν, πως πετυχαίνουμε πολλά σήμερα, έχουμε λίγο δρόμο ακόμα μπροστά μας. Έχοντας ολοκληρώσει και το νομοσχέδιο για την τεχνητή νοημοσύνη, καταλαβαίνουμε ότι οι απειλές είναι διαρκώς αυξανόμενες. Σας ευχαριστώ πολύ και καλή επιτυχία.

PRZEWODNICTWO: BOGUSŁAW LIBERADZKI

Wiceprzewodniczący

Zgłoszenia z sali

Franc Bogovič (PPE). – Gospod predsednik, kot vemo, je svet vedno bolj povezan, vedno bolj digitaliziran in tako kot je digitalna unija izziv Evropske unije, je tudi varnost v Evropski uniji naš skupen izziv.

Naši sistemi, od energetike, prometa, zdravja, bančnih vlog, konec koncev tudi volitve in nenazadnje tudi posamezniki smo vedno bolj izpostavljeni. Tudi sam sem bil v zadnjem času tarča kraje identitete, tako da zelo dobro vem, kaj pomeni, kaj se ti lahko zgodi kot posamezniku ali pa Evropski uniji kot celoti.

Zelo podpiram to, kar uzakonjujemo s tem zakonodajnim paketom, da Evropska unija enotno, organizirano pristopi, kajti posamezna država se zagotovo ne bo mogla upreti kibernetiki nevarnosti. Jeseni sem imel priložnost biti v Izraelu, ki je še toliko bolj izpostavljen kot Evropa, in tam sem se lahko prepričal, kaj naredi desetmilijonska država, zato zelo podpiram ta obsežni paket, kajti prihodnost Evrope je v veliki meri odvisna tudi od uspešne kibernetike varnosti.

Nicola Caputo (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, le reti e i sistemi informativi e di telecomunicazione sono divenuti pilastri della crescita economica. È dunque di fondamentale importanza ridurre al minimo i rischi e le minacce a cui sono esposti i nostri dati consentendo ai consumatori di avere fiducia nelle soluzioni informatiche.

Il regolamento sulla cibersicurezza fornirà all'Europa una visione di lungo termine, rafforzando i poteri, le competenze e la struttura dell'Agenzia europea per la sicurezza delle reti ed introducendo un sistema di certificazione della cibersicurezza, così da ridurre la costosa frammentazione di prodotti e servizi nel mercato unico.

Sulla certificazione ritengo condivisibile il sistema volontario, ma per i livelli base e di garanzia sostanziale; per i prodotti, i processi o i servizi che rientrano nel livello di garanzia più elevato è più appropriato, invece, prevedere un sistema obbligatorio.

I produttori o fornitori di prodotti, processi e servizi TIC devono essere obbligati a fornire informazioni strutturate sulla certificazione affinché il consumatore possa disporre di informazioni utili al momento della scelta del dispositivo.

Νότης Μαρίας (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, μιλούμε για την κυβερνοασφάλεια, τα μέτρα που πρέπει να λάβουμε. Τι μέτρα όμως, κύριε Επίτροπε, κύριε Anship, θα λάβει η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση ενάντια σε ένα κράτος μέλος το οποίο παρακολουθεί τους πολίτες του; Διότι προ λίγων ημερών, στις 4 Μαρτίου, είχαμε προληπτικές συλλήψεις στην πόλη των Γιαννιτσών, οπαδών, ελλήνων πολιτών, οι οποίοι διαφωνούν με την κατάπτυστη συμφωνία των Πρεσπών. Τους συνέλαβε προληπτικά η αστυνομία και η Υπουργός Προστασίας του Πολίτη, η κυρία Γεροβασίλη, είπε ότι η κυβέρνηση παρακολουθεί τα social media, παρακολουθεί το Facebook, μαζεύει πληροφορίες για τους πολίτες και κάνει προληπτικές συλλήψεις και στέλνει τον κόσμο στα δικαστήρια, όσους αγωνιστές παλεύουν ενάντια στο ξεπούλημα της Μακεδονίας μας και της ιστορίας μας. Αυτά είναι καταγεγραμμένα.

Τι μέτρα θα πάρετε, λοιπόν; Είναι δυνατόν να έχουμε παραβίαση της νομοθεσίας, παραβίαση του κανονισμού GDPR και να έχουμε μια κυβέρνηση η οποία επεξεργάζεται τα προσωπικά δεδομένα των πολιτών και παρακολουθεί το Διαδίκτυο και κάνει παράνομες προληπτικές συλλήψεις; Θέλω την άποψή σας, κύριε Επίτροπε. Να καταγγελλεί αυτή η πρακτική στέρησης των δημοκρατικών δικαιωμάτων των ελλήνων πολιτών.

Bogdan Andrzej Zdrojewski (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Wróć do początku naszej kadencji – pięć lat temu na tej sali znaczna część lekceważyła problematykę cyberbezpieczeństwa, a jak nie lekceważyła, to przynajmniej jej nie doceniała. Hybrydowe konflikty, hybrydowa wojna, a także zagrożenia terrorystyczne zmieniły tę optykę.

Dziś znajdujemy się w sytuacji szczególnej, ale myślę że w jakimś sensie dobrej. Wzmacniamy naszą instytucję i wzmacniamy tę instytucję budżetowo, wzmacniamy tę instytucję personalnie, ale wzmacniamy ją także kompetencyjnie, co jest bardzo istotne i bardzo ważne i warto to docenić. Szkoda natomiast tego czasu – szkoda tego czasu dlatego, że świat nie stoi w miejscu. Cały czas się rozwija także w tych zagrożeniach, o których dzisiaj tak wiele mówiliśmy. Warto jednak poprzeć to sprawozdanie dlatego, że będzie ważnym krokiem, jeżeli chodzi o poprawę bezpieczeństwa w Europie, a posłance sprawozdawczyni chciałem podziękować i pogratulować.

(Koniec zgłoszeń z sali)

Andrus Ansip, Vice-President of the Commission. – Mr President, I would like to thank all Members for the valuable debate and for your views expressed today.

The Cybersecurity Act will create a flexible and market-oriented cybersecurity certification framework and give a permanent mandate to ENISA.

This will make the digital single market stronger and more cyber-secure. As the digital single market grows and develops, Europeans should be fully aware of both the benefits and the risks involved. We have a collective responsibility to ensure that risks are properly addressed and that digital products and services are cyber-secure throughout their lifetime.

The Cybersecurity Act is one of the building blocks for the EU's cyber-resilience, along with the Network and Information Security Directive. The Cybersecurity Competence Centre and Network will be key to make sure that we have European capacities to protect the digital single market.

Cybersecurity expertise centres located across EU countries should now have adequate resources facilitated by the European Cybersecurity Competence Centre.

We now need to transform that expertise and experience into innovative cybersecurity products and services, and support their uptake across the economy. We must strengthen the European cybersecurity ecosystem, provide Europe with the means to autonomously secure its digital assets and to compete on the global technology markets.

This requires coordinated work, both nationally and EU-wide, combining efforts from both the public and private sectors, so that we achieve significant progress.

I am very grateful for the rapid pace of the legislative work on the Competence Centre and Network. By voting this week, and indicating your intention to conclude negotiations within this mandate, Parliament is giving a clear indication of the political importance of this file and the EU's determination to meet the challenges that we face in cybersecurity today.

The Commission is ready to assist the co-legislators in the upcoming negotiations.

Angelika Niebler, Berichterstatterin. – Herr Präsident, liebe Kolleginnen, liebe Kollegen, Herr Vizepräsident! Nur ein herzliches Dankeschön von meiner Seite für die für mich sehr inspirierende Aussprache heute. Mich freut es, dass wir einer Meinung sind, was die Bedeutung anbelangt, die die Cybersicherheit auch bei uns in der Europäischen Union in Zukunft haben muss. Und ich bedanke mich einfach für die vielen positiven Rückmeldungen zu dem Bericht. Wir als Parlament haben, glaube ich, exzellent gearbeitet. Wir wollten Europa stärken in dieser Frage. Ich glaube, mit dem vorliegenden *Cyber Security Act*, der morgen verabschiedet wird, ist uns das gelungen. Insofern bin ich heute sehr, sehr glücklich, dass dieser Schritt so erfolgreich abgeschlossen werden kann.

Für mich ist es einfach wichtig, nochmal zu unterstreichen: Wir haben hier die einmalige Chance, auch international einen Standard zu setzen. Also das war für uns immer wichtig. Mit der Datenschutzgrundverordnung hatten wir international ja schon mal die Möglichkeit, bzw. es ist uns gelungen, hier einen Standard zu setzen, und wenn wir es jetzt im Bereich Cybersicherheit für Produkte, für Dienstleistungen, für Systeme, für das ganze Ökosystem es auch schaffen, international Trendsetter zu sein, dann ist das für unsere Europäische Union eine großartige Angelegenheit.

Ich danke allen, die mitgeholfen haben. Wir haben schnell beraten, aber ich glaube, wir haben nicht oberflächlich beraten, sondern uns wirklich für eine gute Lösung starkgemacht. Ich betone: Manche Kollegen fanden, wir hätten noch etwas ambitionierter sein sollen. Ich teile diese Ansicht. Bei der verpflichtenden Zertifizierung, gerade für die kritischen Infrastrukturen, wäre ich weitergegangen. Aber es gibt immer einen nächsten Schritt nach einem erfolgreichen ersten.

In diesem Sinne: Ein herzliches Dankeschön an alle, die hieran mitgearbeitet haben. Ich hoffe, dass dann dieser *Cyber Security Act* in den Mitgliedstaaten auch bald umgesetzt wird und wir für unsere Bürger und Bürgerinnen in Europa sowie für alle Produkte mehr Sicherheit auf den Weg bringen.

Julia Reda, *Rapporteur*. – Mr President, as you can see from the debate, there is broad consensus in Parliament about the substance of the Cybersecurity Centre, but you will also have heard that there are different opinions about entering into negotiations.

I would like to outline my approach on this. First of all, in the Committee on Industry, Research and Energy (ITRE) we have already managed to make it very clear that civil funding cannot be spent on defensive applications, but I think, in order to have a strong position, it's also really important to make sure that we do not fund activities that could actually undermine civil cybersecurity, such as back doors or hack-backs and other rather offensive applications.

I hope that this is a consensus that will be achieved in the vote on Wednesday. If this is the case, I would not stand in the way of starting negotiations in order to see whether it's possible to conclude with a political agreement within this mandate. However, there are, of course, political differences that remain. We will have to see exactly what the Council position will be and we will not seek an agreement at any cost. Because of the broad support that Parliament has in the changes that it has made to the Commission proposal, we would also require great flexibility from the Council and Commission to be able to conclude with a political agreement. So it will all depend on whether we can find this consensual approach but, if this is the case, I am confident that an agreement within this term is possible.

Przewodniczący. – Niech mi będzie wolno wyrazić tylko satysfakcję, że przynajmniej częściowo miałem szansę przysłuchiwać się tej debacie, ponieważ mam zaszczyt kierować grupą roboczą ds. bezpieczeństwa w Parlamencie Europejskim, i na ręce pana przewodniczącego Ansipa kieruję podziękowania dla pana komisarza Kinga za dotychczasową współpracę.

Good evening, Commissioner Hogan, please be so kind as to take a seat. As you can see, our Parliament works effectively on time.

Zamykam debatę.

Głosowanie nad sprawozdaniem Angeliki Niebler odbędzie się we wtorek 12 marca 2019 r., a głosowanie nad sprawozdaniem pani Julii Redy odbędzie się w środę 13 marca 2019 r.

Oświadczenia pisemne (art. 162)

Barbara Kappel (ENF), *scrittura*. – Diese Verordnung ist ein wichtiger Bestandteil und ein wichtiges Instrument der neuen Strategie der Europäischen Union für Cybersicherheit, durch die Europa eine langfristige Perspektive für Cybersicherheit erhalten und das Vertrauen in die digitalen Technologien sichergestellt werden soll. Die EU hat bereits eine Europäische Agentur für Netz- und Informationssicherheit (ENISA) geschaffen und eine Richtlinie über Netz- und Informationssicherheit (NIS-Richtlinie) erlassen, die derzeit von den Mitgliedstaaten umgesetzt wird. Der „Rechtsakt zur Cybersicherheit“ besteht aus zwei Teilen: Im ersten Teil werden die Rolle und das Mandat der ENISA näher festgelegt, um die Agentur zu stärken. Im zweiten Teil wird ein europäisches System für die Cybersicherheitszertifizierung in Form eines freiwilligen Rahmens eingeführt, um die Sicherheit verbundener Geräte und digitaler Produkte und Dienste zu verbessern. ENISA muss bei der Festlegung der europäischen Systeme für die Cybersicherheit gemeinsam mit den Mitgliedstaaten und einschlägigen Interessenträgern eine wesentliche Rolle spielen.

Bezüglich der Zertifizierung sollte der Anwendungsbereich des Vorschlags laut ITRE klarer gefasst werden. Einerseits sollten nicht nur Produkte und Dienste unter diese Verordnung fallen, sondern der gesamte Lebenszyklus. Daher müssen auch Prozesse in den Anwendungsbereich der Verordnung aufgenommen werden. Andererseits sollten gewisse Zuständigkeitsbereiche der Mitgliedstaaten eindeutig ausgenommen werden, nämlich öffentliche Sicherheit, Landesverteidigung und der Bereich des Strafrechts.

Ева Майдел (PPE), *в писмена форма*. – Работим за Европа, която защитава гражданите и бизнеса си. Киберсигурността не е абстрактна тема, тя засяга 80% от дружествата в ЕС. Засяга също и потребителите – проучване на Евробарометър от 2017 г. посочва, че 87% от европейците считат киберпрестъпността „за важно предизвикателство за вътрешната сигурност на ЕС“.

Атаки като WannaCry засягат стотици хиляди системи едновременно и доказват, че киберпрестъпленията не зачитат граници. Именно затова е необходимо ЕС да бъде по-ефективен в борбата срещу кибератаките, кибершпионажа и киберсаботажа. Важно е да увеличаваме капацитета си за осигуряване на по-добра защита за европейските граждани, предприятия и публични институции.

Актът на ЕС за киберсигурността е ключов инструмент за по-сигурна Европа, засилвайки ролята на европейската киберархитектура ENISA и на държавите членки за развиването на способностите за предотвратяване, откриване и реагиране при киберинциденти. А по-сигурна и устойчива киберинфраструктура в ЕС ще доведе до повишаване на доверието на гражданите в дигиталната икономика и ще разгърне потенциала на новите технологии, водейки ни напред към една по-конкурентоспособна и по-иновативна Европа.

20. Nieuczciwe praktyki handlowe w relacjach między przedsiębiorstwami w łańcuchu dostaw żywności (debata)

Przewodniczący. – Kolejnym punktem porządku dziennego jest sprawozdanie sporządzone przez Paolo De Castro w imieniu Komisji Rolnictwa i Rozwoju Wsi w sprawie wniosku dotyczącego dyrektywy Parlamentu Europejskiego i Rady w sprawie nieuczciwych praktyk handlowych w relacjach między przedsiębiorstwami w łańcuchu dostaw żywności (COM(2018)0173 – C8-0139/2018 – 2018/0082(COD)) (A8-0309/2018).

Paolo De Castro, *Rapporteur*. – Signor Presidente, signor Commissario, onorevoli colleghi, ci sono voluti quasi 10 anni di dibattito, è stato necessario che venti paesi legiferassero sul tema, sono state soprattutto necessarie l'insistenza di questo Parlamento e le nostre due risoluzioni, l'ultima delle quali (per la quale ringrazio ancora una volta la Vicepresidente Mairead McGuinness) approvata a maggioranza schiacciante nel giugno 2016: ci è voluto tutto questo per arrivare oggi al voto finale sulla direttiva contro le pratiche commerciali sleali nella filiera agroalimentare.

È un risultato straordinario, reso possibile grazie al protagonismo e all'ambizione di questo Parlamento. Un'ambizione che si è concretizzata in miglioramenti cruciali rispetto alla proposta iniziale. Solo per citarne alcuni: l'estensione dell'ambito d'applicazione, che arriva adesso a proteggere il 100 % degli agricoltori e oltre il 95 % delle aziende agroalimentari dell'Unione, con il passaggio da 50 a 350 milioni di euro di fatturato; l'inclusione anche degli acquirenti basati al di fuori dell'Unione tra i soggetti che dovranno attenersi alla direttiva; l'inclusione di tutti i prodotti agricoli e non solo alimentari, proteggendo settori strategici come il floro-vivaismo e la mangimistica, il mangime per gli animali domestici; il rafforzamento e il raddoppio delle pratiche proibite, passate da 8 a 16, con l'inclusione, per esempio, dei ritardi di pagamento per i prodotti non deperibili, il rifiuto di concedere contratti scritti, o la minaccia di ritorsioni commerciali nel caso di denuncia; la migliore salvaguardia della confidenzialità dell'identità del denunciante, al fine di superare il fattore paura che troppo spesso obbliga i nostri produttori ad accettare queste pratiche, con il diritto di denuncia esteso a tutte le associazioni; l'obbligo di agire e di porre fine alle pratiche sleali per le autorità di contrasto

nazionali, alle quali abbiamo garantito anche maggiori poteri sia in fase investigativa che in termini di sanzioni; senza dimenticare la rafforzata cooperazione tra le varie autorità nazionali che dovranno incontrarsi almeno una volta all'anno e scambiarsi informazioni e buone pratiche per garantire un'applicazione il più omogenea e ambiziosa possibile della direttiva.

Vale la pena ricordare che si tratta infatti di un'armonizzazione minima, e che gli Stati membri potranno prevedere nelle loro legislazioni nazionali sia l'estensione dei soggetti coinvolti, che la lista delle pratiche sleali da vietare.

Per poter raggiungere questo risultato, cari colleghi, in soli undici mesi dalla pubblicazione della proposta della Commissione ad oggi, nonostante i diversi tentativi di bloccare ancora una volta questa direttiva, è stata necessaria una forte volontà politica da parte di tutti. Per questo voglio ringraziare tutti coloro che hanno reso possibile questo risultato, a partire ovviamente dai colleghi della Commissione, a partire dal Commissario Hogan, che ringrazio, i relatori ombra, tutto il team negoziale del Parlamento europeo, i servizi, la Presidenza austriaca, la ministra Elisabeth Kostinger, Presidente di turno del Consiglio, senza dimenticare il fondamentale lavoro svolto da tutti i gruppi tecnici e naturalmente anche dal mio team.

Presidente, cari colleghi, questa direttiva è l'Europa che dimostra di saper essere al fianco degli operatori economici più deboli, come gli agricoltori, e di tutti i cittadini. Una filiera caratterizzata da comportamenti sleali e quindi da una distribuzione inefficiente delle risorse mette infatti sotto pressione tutti i produttori, in una corsa al ribasso dei prezzi che deprime sia la qualità dei prodotti che arrivano sulle tavole di famiglie e cittadini, sia la qualità del processo di produzione, incentivando sfruttamento del lavoro e pratiche produttive non sostenibili.

Al contrario, superando queste distorsioni all'interno della filiera agroalimentare, la direttiva sarà un punto di riferimento per raggiungere mercati più trasparenti ed equi, mercati più efficienti capaci di generare benefici per tutta la società, e in particolar modo per i consumatori.

Marc Tarabella, *rapporteur pour avis de la commission du marché intérieur et de la protection des consommateurs*. – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, cette directive est sans nul doute une des grandes avancées de cette législature.

En effet, il était de notre devoir de lutter contre le déséquilibre entre les petits producteurs face aux secteurs de l'agroalimentaire et de la distribution, très concentrés. Cette pression sur les prix de la part des marchés est une des causes de la souffrance actuelle du monde agricole, alors que l'alimentation européenne doit être une priorité absolue. Cette directive tant attendue abolit les pratiques commerciales déloyales dans la chaîne d'approvisionnement alimentaire, tout en renforçant la transparence et en luttant contre le chantage des multinationales. A ce propos, je tiens à saluer chaleureusement l'excellent travail de mon collègue et ami Paolo De Castro, avec qui nous avons travaillé de concert dans un délai très serré afin que ce texte, ô combien important pour nos agriculteurs, soit finalisé avant la fin de cette mandature.

Enfin, j'insiste pour que tous les États membres aillent encore plus loin dans leur législation nationale afin d'éradiquer, une fois pour toutes, ces pratiques déloyales extrêmement dommageables, tant pour les agriculteurs que pour les PME alimentaires, mais aussi pour les consommateurs européens.

Phil Hogan, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, this debate and this week's vote are very important, as Mr De Castro has said, not alone for what they represent but for what they will deliver. What this debate and the vote represent is an acknowledgment that, for far too long, the farmer and other smaller operators in our food supply chain have been disadvantaged by their relative weakness; but, more importantly, what this debate and the vote will deliver is protection for these farmers and suppliers of agri-food products further downstream.

Many Members of this House have been consistent and vocal in calling for greater protection for the position of farmers in the agri-food supply chain – and rightly so. Without that influence, I have no doubt in saying, today might never have happened. I am pleased therefore that the Commission – and, of course, a very good Commissioner for Agriculture – could finally, and for the first time, respond positively with a legislative proposal to ban certain unfair trading practices.

Before reflecting briefly on the contents of the directive on which you are about to vote, I want to congratulate the rapporteurs for Parliament and the Austrian Council Presidency for their efforts in reaching these landmark achievements – particularly Mr De Castro, for Parliament, and Ms Köstinger and the Austrian team on behalf of the Council. I would like to thank all the shadow rapporteurs and all the other committee people who have been involved: Mr Tarabella, on behalf of the Committee on the Internal Market and Consumer Protection; Ms McAvan on behalf of the Committee on Development; and Ms Pilar Ayuso on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection. I would include, as well, the shadow rapporteurs, Ms McGuinness and Ms McIntyre, and Maria Heubuch, Elsi Katainen, Matt Carthy, Marco Zullo and Jacques Colmbier. All of you have played a remarkable part in ensuring that we are discussing this milestone legislation here this evening.

It's worth recalling, as Mr De Castro has done, that only eight months passed between the adoption of the Commission's proposal in April and the conclusion of the political agreement in December, so it demonstrates very clearly that if there is the political will a lot can happen in almost all respects in this House. It will now be up to the Member States to transpose the directive, and I want to assure you that the Commission will follow this process carefully and closely and I trust that this House will do so as well.

The final agreement is one that safeguards our initial objectives and our rationale behind the legislation, which is to protect the weak from possible abuses of buyer power by the strong. For the first time, rules will be introduced at a European level that target unfair trading practices and provide protection for all EU farmers, as well as most agri-food businesses, against practices that are contrary to good faith and fair dealing. The directive will introduce a minimum EU level of protection against unfair trading practices that occur in the food supply chain. That level will apply in all the Member States – which will remain free to go further, subject to internal market rules.

For the first time, there will be a ban on 16 unfair trading practices which are imposed unilaterally by one trading partner on another. Other practices will be permitted only if they are subject to a clear and unambiguous upfront agreement between the parties involved. The agreement that we reached in December will apply to anyone involved in the food supply chain with a turnover of EUR 350 million, with differentiated levels of protection provided below that threshold.

It is important to see this directive as part of a wider initiative to strengthen the position of farmers in the food supply chain. Indeed, the Agricultural Markets Task Force, under former Minister for Agriculture Cees Veerman, called for a better legal framework on producer cooperation, as well as improved market transparency. I am pleased to be able to tell the House, and to be able to report to you, that we have also achieved significant progress in these two areas through the Omnibus Regulation, in which Parliament was instrumental, including with the involvement of Mr De Castro and Mr Dess, and through the development of our market observatories.

As you are aware, the Commission is working too on a proposal to extend our transparency initiative to cover the processing and retail sector end of the food supply chain and I expect to be in a position very shortly to announce more details of this initiative. Together, these three policy adaptations will allow farmers to seize greater opportunities as they present themselves in a market-orientated environment, and to defend themselves against market failures.

In conclusion, can I reiterate my appreciation to all the Members of the House, to the rapporteurs in particular, and to the Austrian Presidency, which has shown very strong support for this initiative that will protect not only the interests but in some cases the very survival of our farmers, as Mr Tarabella has said. Nobody in the food chain has anything to fear from this legislation if they are behaving fairly.

Pilar Ayuso, *ponente de opinión de la Comisión de Industria, Investigación y Energía.* –

Señor presidente, señor comisario, dentro de la cadena alimentaria indudablemente los agricultores son el eslabón más débil y teníamos que protegerlo. Si queremos una agricultura suficiente y una autosuficiencia de alimentos para la Unión Europea, no tenemos más remedio que proteger a los agricultores porque, así como la distribución está muy concentrada, la producción agraria está muy atomizada y necesitaba un apoyo.

Por lo tanto, yo, en primer lugar, quiero felicitar a la Comisión por haber hecho esta propuesta, y también al Consejo y al señor Paolo De Castro, así como a todos los ponentes alternativos que han sido capaces de llevarla adelante.

A pesar de que la posición del Parlamento Europeo era bastante más estricta de lo que al final hemos conseguido, creo que vamos a llegar a un acuerdo muy bueno para los agricultores y para la agricultura en general. En España tenemos una ley de la cadena alimentaria y puedo asegurarle que funciona muy bien.

Es verdad que no se han conseguido algunos objetivos —como, por ejemplo, la inclusión de la venta a pérdidas dentro de las prácticas prohibidas—, pero sí otros que usted mismo ha mencionado y que son muy importantes.

Por lo tanto, no me queda más que felicitar al Parlamento, felicitarme a mí misma y felicitarnos todos, porque esto era una necesidad importante y hoy, por fin, vamos a darle respuesta.

Hace ya muchos años, la señora McGuinness lideró un grupo de trabajo que, al final, ha obtenido sus frutos.

Mairead McGuinness, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Mr President, I would like to say to the Commissioner that it is very true that the pleas of the farming community through the Committee on Agriculture and Rural Development (AGRI) did not fall on deaf ears because we have been looking for this for some time. You, as Commissioner, took it seriously and came forward with a proposal. So thank you for that. I think it is very significant. Of course, it will be tested in the Member States. I do welcome your comments that you will keep a close eye on implementation, because I see already in some Member States a hesitancy, questioning how it will be done. It's got to be done without too much bureaucracy, and it's got to be effective so that those with a genuine complaint can come forward and get results.

But for me today is much bigger than the sum total of those unfair trading practices that will be banned. This is about the sustainability of the food-supply chain and we hear a great deal about that – about the challenge of climate, biodiversity, air quality and water quality. I think Mr De Castro was very right when he said that the current system operates in a very incorrect way. It results in a race to the bottom because farmers' margins are constantly being tightened.

So I very much welcome this as a first step towards a more sustainable food-supply chain. I read comments from Arla, who talk about their drive for more sustainable farming, where they say that consumers are willing to reward the most sustainable dairy farmers. I hope that is the case and that those who are dealing between consumers and farmers ensure that the farmers get a sustainable price for the work that they do. I had Irish dairy representatives over last week in Brussels and we spoke about issues around welfare and environment, and the challenges generally. They pleaded, because they said that the farmer is not getting rewarded sufficiently to deliver on all of those things.

So tonight is a first step. Thank you, Commissioner. Thank you to the colleagues who listened when others would not. Together, I think we'll make a difference.

Nicola Caputo, *a nome del gruppo S&D*. – Signor Presidente, signor Commissario, onorevoli colleghi, con la direttiva sulle pratiche commerciali sleali nei rapporti tra imprese nella filiera alimentare finalmente raggiungiamo risultati attesi da oltre dieci anni e mi complimento con il relatore Paolo De Castro per il grande lavoro che ha svolto, tant'è che l'accordo ottenuto in sede di trilogio migliora considerevolmente la protezione degli agricoltori e delle piccole e medie imprese agroalimentari.

Aumentano in modo significativo il numero di pratiche sleali, con otto ulteriori pratiche rispetto alla proposta della Commissione, che vanno dalla cancellazione *last minute* degli ordini ai ritardi nei pagamenti, dalle modifiche unilaterali dei contratti ai mancati pagamenti ai fornitori per la merce invenduta da parte delle grandi centrali di acquisto.

Uno dei punti di forza è senza dubbio la denuncia anonima a difesa della confidenzialità del fornitore durante la procedura investigativa non solo in merito alla sua identità, ma anche a tutte le altre informazioni che il fornitore stesso individua come sensibili. Le norme contenute nella direttiva restituiscono finalmente dignità al mondo agricolo europeo, rafforzando la posizione dei produttori nei confronti della grande distribuzione.

Anthea McIntyre, *on behalf of the ECR Group*. – Mr President, for far too long, farmers and growers have been in the most precarious position in the food supply chain. For far too long, large retailers across the EU have been able to abuse their powerful position.

This directive on unfair trading practices used as one of its bases the UK's grocery supply code of practice. This is a legally binding code. The UK found that purely voluntary systems didn't work. Voluntary codes didn't change buyers' behaviour, and that is why legislation is needed. I would like to thank our rapporteur Paolo De Castro and my fellow shadows, and Commissioner Hogan, for all the work they have put into this directive to deliver fairer treatment for our farmers.

At Parliament's insistence, the directive now includes all agricultural produce not just food. So that means that cut flowers, which are just as perishable as fruit and veg, are covered. We also extended the threshold so that suppliers with a turnover of up to EUR 350 million will be protected. That means all EU farmers are covered, and all producer organisations in the UK are covered too.

I am also glad that the directive covers suppliers who are outside the EU, so not only will farmers in Kenya and Peru be protected, but in a post-Brexit world, UK farmers and growers will continue to be protected while selling into the EU. This is good news for farmers and consumers across the EU and beyond, and I am delighted to support it.

Elsi Katainen, *ALDE-ryhmän puolesta*. – Arvoisa puhemies, haluan kiittää maatalouskomissaari Hogania ja esittelijä De Castroa sekä kaikkien ryhmien neuvottelijoita erinomaisesta yhteistyöstä tämän tärkeän direktiivin saattamiseksi maaliin määräajassa. Me saamme äänestykseen todella tasapainoisen lainsäädäntötekstin, mikä todistaa, että kun poliittista tahtoa on, niin vaikea asia saadaan eteenpäin lyhyessäkin ajassa, vaikka toisaalta taustat ovat pitkät.

Kannattavuusongelmissa olevat tuottajat saavat direktiivistä konkreettista vahvistusta asemaansa elintarvikemarkkinoilla. Tämä on EU:lta tärkeä viesti – juuri tuottajille, joilta vaaditaan yhä enemmän ja jotka ovat joutuneet valitettavien leikkausten kohteeksi. Itsekin sen viljelijänä tiedän, että tulos halutaan ennemmin markkinoilta kuin tuesta.

Minulta on usein kysytty, mitä tämä direktiivi sitten konkreettisesti viljelijälle tarkoittaa. Sen voisi tiivistää kolmeen asiaan. Ensinnäkin tuottajat voivat valittaa kotimaan valvontaviranomaiselle myös muissa maissa sijaitsevien ostajien toiminnasta. Tämä madaltaa elintarvikeviennin kynnyistä huomattavasti. Toiseksi direktiivi luo vahvan ohjausvaikutuksen, koska sanktioita seuraa, jos ei sääntöjä noudateta. Ja ehkä tärkeimpänä: direktiivi antaa myös vahvan selkänöjan kansallisille parlamenteille tehdä omaa lainsäädäntöä, joka voi todella olla vielä tätäkin direktiiviä kovempaa. Toivon todella, että tämä saa täyden kannatuksen ja tuen tältä parlamentilta.

Maria Heubuch, *im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident! Es ist wirklich sehr gut, dass die EU nun eine einheitliche Regelung verabschiedet, um die Macht der Supermarktketten gegenüber den Lebensmittelproduzenten zu begrenzen. Ich bedanke mich auch bei Paolo de Castro und bei allen Beteiligten für die wirklich sehr gute Zusammenarbeit.

Wichtig ist mir nun, dass Europa hier nicht stehenbleibt, denn es sind noch längst nicht alle Probleme gelöst. Bäuerinnen und Bauern, aber auch die Arbeiterinnen auf den Feldern, in den Gewächshäusern, die Arbeiter in den Schlachthöfen sowie die kleinen Lebensmittelverarbeiter stehen von unterschiedlicher Seite unter Druck, nicht nur von Seite der Supermarktketten, sondern auch von der Seite des vorgelagerten Bereichs – wenn ich nur an die Saatgut-, Düngemittel-, Futtermittel- oder Pestizidindustrie denke. Und genau in all diesen Branchen beobachten wir eine zunehmende Konzentration von Macht. Die Fusion von Bayer und Monsanto ist nur das letzte Beispiel dafür.

Damit landwirtschaftliche Betriebe mit ihrer Arbeit wirklich ein faires Einkommen erwirtschaften können, muss diese Machtkonzentration sowohl im vorgelagerten Bereich als auch in den nachgelagerten Sektoren bekämpft werden, und das geht nur über eine Reform des Wettbewerbsrechts. Herr Kommissar Hogan, wären Sie bereit, auch das Wettbewerbsrecht unter die Lupe zu nehmen? Würden Sie dafür sorgen, dass bei künftigen Fusionen die Auswirkungen auf Umwelt, Klima und Gesundheit, aber auch auf das bäuerliche Einkommen berücksichtigt werden? Denn genau das war beim Deal mit Monsanto und Bayer nicht der Fall. Ich glaube, Europa braucht hier ein ambitioniertes Projekt, und hier könnten wir gemeinsam ambitioniert vorwärtsgehen.

Matt Carthy, *on behalf of the GUE/NGL Group*. – Mr President, the situation whereby those who do the greatest amount of work in producing the food we eat receive the least amount of the profits has been getting worse every single year. Retailers and processors have been exploiting their position, while our farmers are expected to work on ever-tightening profit margins and often at a loss. Many of us had hoped that the EU would step up to the mark and that we would be able to deliver legislation on unfair trading practices (UTPs) that would rebalance the scales, recognise the importance of our farming communities and stand up to the corporate giants.

This was the opportunity to do so: unfortunately that opportunity has been wasted. I cannot support this proposal because I cannot look farmers in the eye and tell them that their situation will improve as a result of its enactment. The failure to include a ban on below-cost selling of foodstuffs is just the most glaring of the deficiencies in the proposed legislation. One-third of the UTPs banned can continue if supermarkets manage to insert them into contracts.

I hope that I'm proved wrong, that the implementation of this legislation will prove a game changer for our family farmers. I fear, though, that it will not, and that either we will have to return to this work or we will continue to see more farmers leave the land and our rural communities suffer for want of ambition and vision at EU level.

Marco Zullo, *a nome del gruppo EFDD*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, grazie al relatore per il buon lavoro fatto. L'approvazione della direttiva sulle pratiche commerciali sleali rappresenta un grande traguardo, così che finalmente si possa avere una redistribuzione del valore economico più equa nella filiera agroalimentare, in modo da garantire un miglior reddito alle piccole aziende agricole, ma anche una migliore qualità dei prodotti disponibili alla vendita.

Questa direttiva è un atto dovuto per ristabilire equilibrio nella catena commerciale, fornendo protezione a chi, per le ridotte dimensioni, rischia troppo spesso di trovarsi schiacciato dagli abusi di attori più grandi.

La carenza di potere contrattuale obbliga molte piccole imprese a vendere i propri prodotti sottostando a clausole vessatorie, subendo accordi economici che impoveriscono e accollandosi costi e rischi di impresa altrui. Grazie ora a norme chiare a livello europeo si condannano senza ambiguità tutte quelle pratiche commerciali messe in atto da soggetti economici senza scrupoli che finiscono per stritolare gli agricoltori piccoli e onesti. Una volta per tutte, saranno fermate e punite le pratiche commerciali sleali come le modifiche unilaterali e retroattive ai contratti di fornitura, le ritorsioni commerciali e il pagamento per servizi non resi.

Stiamo consegnando uno strumento importante ed efficace agli Stati membri. Se ben applicate queste regole restituiranno equità e dignità alle piccole imprese, ovvero agli anelli più deboli della filiera agroalimentare.

John Stuart Agnew, *on behalf of the ENF Group*. – Mr President, I wondered if the reason you're a little late for the debate was because Theresa May is in town and she was twisting your arm to persuade you to support Ireland leaving the European Union, which would solve the problem of having an EU border on the island of Ireland, but maybe that's too much to hope for. You might also be wondering, with 18 days to go to Brexit, why a British MEP is actually bothering to talk here, but I honestly think that this flag will be in this Parliament in a year's time. I really do believe that, and so for that reason, I want to say something about this report. I'm quite happy with the sentiment of it, but what worries me is that we have in Britain somebody called the Groceries Code Adjudicator. Her name is Christine Tacon and she is doing the work that you are talking about. Now, what I'm worried about is that she is going to be undermined by this legislation. Supermarkets will say to her, 'ah yes Ms Tacon, but the EU rule says XYZ', and they will then go to the European Court of Justice to undermine what she's doing. Various staff of yours have assured me that this won't happen, but over the last 30 years, the Commission has had a horrible way of always putting its legislation ahead of the British legislation.

Please prove to me that I'm going to be wrong, but I would far rather have the status quo in Britain as we have it.

(Applause)

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

Mairead McGuinness (PPE), *blue-card question*. – Mr Agnew knows I am easily provoked, so well done. Don't worry about Ms Tacon: she's a strong woman and well able to deal with this legislation.

You said that you're likely to be back with your flag in this Parliament and you said it almost with joy, which leaves me wondering: would you miss us if you have to go? We're not pleading with you to stay, but maybe you have a soft spot for us after all. This is incredible news. Please clarify.

John Stuart Agnew (ENF), *blue-card answer*. – Right, Mairead, I'm quite happy to clarify. What's amusing me and making me laugh is the total incompetence of our politicians: nearly three years after a vote of the British people to leave this place, they still haven't managed to do it. That is what causes me some amusement.

Now, you raised another point, didn't you? I'm just trying to recall what it was. Oh yes, that she's a strong woman. I'm not talking about Theresa May; I'm talking about Christine Tacon. Yes, she is, and she shouldn't be undermined by this place, and that is what's worrying me.

Dobromir Sośnierz (NI). – Panie Przewodniczący! Polski myśliciel, Stefan Kisielewski, powiedział kiedyś, że socjalizm jest to taki ustrój, w którym bohatersko zwalcza się problemy nieznanne w żadnym innym ustroju. No i właśnie ta dyskusja jest tego doskonałym przykładem. To jest tak: najpierw zaczyna się od tego, że pazerne rządy próbują zbierać jak najwięcej podatków i w związku z tym pobierać prowizje od całego ruchu gospodarczego na swoim terenie, a wobec tego obciążają wszystkich obowiązkiem ewidencjonowania całego tego ruchu, bo chcą wiedzieć, ile mogą ze wszystkich wycisnąć.

W związku z tym powstają dodatkowe koszty, utrudnienia w działalności. Centralizuje to rynek, eliminuje mniejszych sprzedawców, wprowadza się dodatkowe regulacje, które centralizują rynek, bo centralizacja jest na rękę rządowi, ponieważ łatwiej mu go kontrolować. Efektem tego jest na końcu zakaz sprzedaży detalicznej dla rolników, osłabienie ich pozycji negocjacyjnej, co powoduje niekorzystne kontrakty i niskie ceny w skupie. Efektem tego nie jest, jak w naszym przypadku, wycofanie się z tych głupich regulacji, tylko regulacje kolejne, więc następnym razem spotkamy się po to, żeby zastanawiać się, dlaczego ceny produktów rolnych poszły w górę. Już się nie mogę doczekać.

Czesław Adam Siekierski (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Mojego kolegę z kraju zapraszam na dyskusję. Może wyjaśni mu wiele problemów. Szanowni Państwo! Po wielu latach pracy komisji rolnictwa wreszcie możemy ogłosić, że mamy europejskie ramy prawne służące zwalczaniu nieuczciwych praktyk w łańcuchu dostaw żywności. Chciałbym podziękować komisarzowi Hoganowi za jego propozycję dyrektywy oraz sprawozdawcy Paolo De Castro, sprawozdawcom ceniom za ich pracę, która pozwoliła na wyjątkowo sprawne wypracowanie porozumienia i przyjęcie go jeszcze w tej kadencji. Nie sposób również nie wymienić pani przewodniczącej McGuinness, która trzy lata temu przygotowała opinię dla naszej komisji popartą następnie przez plenum. Dziękuję wielu, wielu innym osobom.

Chcę wskazać na jedną z przyczyn słabej pozycji rolnika w łańcuchu żywnościowym, jaką jest duże rozdrobnienie producentów rolnych. Szacuje się, że tylko niecałe 10 % gospodarstw ma możliwości konkurowania wielkością ekonomiczną na rynku. Stąd tak ważne dla poprawy pozycji rynkowej jest łączenie się producentów rolnych za pośrednictwem organizacji producentów i spółdzielni. Duża liczba małych gospodarstw nie ułatwia procesów powstawania zorganizowanych struktur gospodarczych, takich jak choćby wspomniane grupy producenckie.

Chcę jeszcze podnieść problem potrzeby dialogu gospodarczego pomiędzy uczestnikami łańcucha żywnościowego. Wydaje się, że przedstawiciele sektorów rolnictwa, przetwórstwa, handlu częściej rozmawiają za pośrednictwem mediów niż bezpośrednio. Myślę, że to zadanie powinno spoczywać na Komisji Europejskiej, a także na Parlamencie.

Na koniec chcę powiedzieć, że dyrektywa ta jest dużym kompromisem, który osiągnął komisarz Hogan w Komisji Europejskiej. Kompromisy, jak to kompromisy, nie zawsze rozwiązują wiele problemów. Mamy dobry początek. Są wreszcie możliwości prawodawstwa krajowego, które mogą pójść dalej i rozwiązać wiele problemów.

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

Dobromir Sośnierz (NI), *pytanie zadane przez podniesienie niebieskiej kartki*. –

Wielokrotnie tutaj w tym Parlamencie były głosowane rezolucje, w których stwierdza się, że utrzymanie małych rodzinnych gospodarstw jest tutaj naszym priorytetem. Przed chwilą powiedział Pan, że rozdrobnienie gospodarstw jest przyczyną słabej pozycji rolników. Słusznie. Jak więc Pan głosuje, kiedy Parlament uchwała takie bzdury, że chce utrzymać tę nieefektywną strukturę małego rolnictwa?

Czesław Adam Siekierski (PPE), odpowiedź na pytanie zadane przez podniesienie niebieskiej kartki. – Tak, ja problemem zajmuje się dosyć głęboko i od dłuższego czasu. Byłem autorem raportu dotyczącego drobnych gospodarstw. Drobne gospodarstwa trzeba wspierać. One mają swoją wartość. A jednocześnie przebiega proces koncentracji, co znacznie poprawia, daje większe możliwości łączenia się większych podmiotów, które mają większą produkcję. Przez to mogą mieć większy wpływ na rynek w ujęciu towarowym niż bardzo rozdrobnione gospodarstwa. To jest pewien proces, który przebiega i trzeba wspierać drobne gospodarstwa, ale także trzeba wspierać w ujęciu socjalnym i wspierać rozwijanie produkcji towarowej.

Clara Eugenia Aguilera García (S&D). – Señor presidente, como todos han dicho, estamos de enhorabuena. Es una gran iniciativa. Quiero felicitar a mi colega, Paolo De Castro, a todos los ponentes alternativos, de las Comisiones de Agricultura, Mercado Interior y Protección del Consumidor o Medio Ambiente, y quiero felicitar muy especialmente al comisario Hoogan porque, después de diez años, algunos más, por primera vez un comisario de Agricultura se atreve y saca adelante en el Colegio de Comisarios una directiva de este tenor. Otros no han sido capaces. Por lo tanto, tiene un valor que es justo reconocer.

Hemos vivido una gran falacia. La gran falacia es que la cadena estaba bien porque había que contener los precios para los consumidores. Eso son mentiras. La cadena está distorsionada, hay prácticas comerciales desleales que hay que corregir y, por tanto, hay que proteger a los más débiles. Esto se va a hacer así.

Y saben, señor comisario, compañero Paolo, hoy hay que trasladar un mensaje a todos: «Europa se pone del lado de los agricultores y de los consumidores». Hasta ahora no ha sido posible. Por eso, fuera esa falacia de otros sectores y vamos a trabajar. Esto es el principio. Hay que seguir avanzando en la normativa europea, pero es un magnífico comienzo.

James Nicholson (ECR). – Mr President, my congratulations as well. I wouldn't have expected anything less of Paolo De Castro than the report he has brought forward, but I also congratulate all involved on the remarkable speed with which this agreement was reached.

The dominant bargaining power of large operators in the food supply chain has left farmers squeezed between the processors and the large multiples. Unfair trading practices have been a continuous problem for farmers across Europe and it is sensible to introduce extra protection for farmers. I am pleased this will be done in conjunction with already existing frameworks in Member States. For too long, we have seen – and continue to see – power concentrated in the hands of the buyers. This has resulted in an uneven playing field whereby farmers have had little influence to exert in the marketplace and been subject to unfair practices to cut their margins when you look at the fact that across Europe, farmers receive an average of 21% of the final price of the agricultural product. The various measures in this directive, such as banning late payments for perishable goods and banning late cancellations, will go a long way to restoring the imbalances, give farmers extra protection and keep food at the highest standards and quality.

But we must not – and I give this warning – become complacent that our work here is done. One of the greatest obstacles to successful European legislation lies within incorrect implementation at Member State level – not at Brussels, at Member State level – and this is where we have got to follow it through. The key is implementation and monitoring what has been done. To those who actually say it should be more, people are always looking for more, but you have to crawl before you walk. At least we've done it. At least we've followed it through. Congratulations to all involved.

Giancarlo Scottà (ENF). – Signor Presidente, onorevole relatore De Castro, onorevoli colleghi, l'approvazione della direttiva sulle pratiche commerciali sleali nella filiale alimentare è un primo passo non sufficiente verso il riconoscimento di un dato di fatto: l'UE ha costruito un mercato interno pieno di squilibri, a cominciare da quello tra fornitori soprattutto agricoli ed acquirenti commerciali. Cerchiamo così di attenuare i comportamenti sleali tra chi gode di una posizione dominante *de facto* e i fornitori, che spesso rimangono estranei ai meccanismi di vendita, testimoni di aste al ribasso e scontri promozionali, ai quali spesso viene chiesto in maniera illegittima di pagare alcune delle misure di vendita e stoccaggio dei loro prodotti.

Oggi, in Italia, condividiamo con apprensione le sorti del comparto zootecnico ovicaprino sardo, impegnato non solo a rivoluzionare il proprio modello aggregativo e a rendere più efficienti i meccanismi che regolano la DOP Pecorino Romano, ma anche a difendersi da alcuni comportamenti sleali di qualche acquirente che prova, anche attraverso un prezzo di conferimento troppo basso rispetto ai costi di produzione, a mantenere una distanza siderale con gli agricoltori sulla ripartizione del valore finale.

Appoggiamo quindi con convinzione questo provvedimento, nella speranza che, dalla prossima legislatura, ci si occupi di dare nuove regole al mercato interno, affinché in tutta Europa si possa riconoscere il giusto valore ai prodotti agricoli, rispettosi delle diverse realtà e dei diversi costi produttivi.

Michel Dantin (PPE). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, cher Paolo, que de chemin parcouru! Servir l'objectif essentiel de rééquilibrage des relations au sein de la chaîne d'approvisionnement et de renforcement de la position des agriculteurs était notre volonté.

Nous avons porté, au cours des deux dernières années, trois textes: la réforme du droit de la concurrence et de son application aux marchés agricoles, la révision des règles de contractualisation, avec la mise en place d'un droit individuel au contrat écrit, et la mise en place d'un cadre européen pour lutter contre les pratiques commerciales déloyales.

Oui, je crois que nous pouvons nous retourner vers les agriculteurs la tête haute. Alors que ces sujets étaient bloqués depuis des années, le Parlement a joué un rôle indispensable dans ce combat face aux timidités et aux divisions du Conseil. Il doit, à l'avenir, continuer à se saisir de ces sujets ô combien essentiels.

Nous n'aurions pas pu mener à bien ce travail sans la mise en place, au cœur de la crise du lait en 2016, de la *task force* sur les marchés agricoles – et nous devons vous en remercier, Monsieur le Commissaire. Les conclusions de ce groupe de travail ont été essentielles pour les avancées que nous avons marquées et que nous marquons encore ce soir.

Un dernier sujet essentiel reste sur la table, celui de la transparence des marchés. La commission y travaille et nous ferons dans les prochaines semaines des propositions concrètes dans le cadre de la réforme de la PAC. Nous aurons une fois encore, Monsieur le Commissaire, besoin de votre soutien pour parachever ce travail au sujet d'une cause qui nous paraît, à vous comme à nous, une cause noble. Nous vous en remercions.

Eric Andrieu (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, 350 euros par mois: il s'agit là du revenu d'un agriculteur sur trois en France. Toutes les semaines, 260 exploitations agricoles disparaissent. Pendant ce temps, les bénéfices et profits des géants de l'agroalimentaire augmentent, tandis que leurs actionnaires s'octroient toujours plus de dividendes.

Cette situation est inégalitaire et injuste. Il faut – et nous le savons tous ici – que les producteurs puissent vivre de leur travail.

Il était impératif d'intervenir. Permettez-moi de remercier Paolo De Castro, les rapporteurs fictifs ainsi que vous, Monsieur le Commissaire, d'avoir permis à cette directive d'aboutir aujourd'hui. En effet, justice et égalité s'imposent. Il va aussi falloir développer, comme évoqué précédemment, la transparence, mais aussi mettre en œuvre, comme vous l'avez dit, Monsieur le Commissaire, un observatoire dans tous les secteurs d'activité. Au-delà de ce succès, il va falloir suivre la mise en œuvre de cette directive et engager l'ensemble des États membres à aller plus loin que le seul texte qui sera voté demain.

Bas Belder (ECR). – Dank u wel, Voorzitter. Late betalingen of eenzijdige contractwijziging: dit zijn enkele praktijken waar producenten dagelijks mee geconfronteerd worden. Deze week stemmen wij over wetgeving tegen oneerlijke handelspraktijken, een belangrijke stap. Ik wil dan ook de rapporteur en de schaduwrapporteurs, alsmede de commissaris hartelijk danken voor hun aandeel.

Het meest essentiële onderdeel is wat mij betreft dat primair de producenten vertrouwelijk een klacht kunnen indienen. De lidstaten zijn nu aan zet om dit goed en gedegen te implementeren en een scheidsrechter aan te stellen in de voedselvoorzieningsketen. Ik hoop van harte iedere lidstaat binnenkort een voedselscheidsrechter heeft die onafhankelijk, zichtbaar en benaderbaar is, mét slagkracht. Iemand die een vertrouwensband opbouwt met de sector en die zo nodig aan de keukentafel komt zitten om te horen wat er werkelijk speelt.

Philippe Loiseau (ENF). – Monsieur le Président, ce rapport sur les pratiques commerciales déloyales dans les relations au sein de la chaîne alimentaire revient – je dirais enfin – en plénière.

Il aura donc fallu pratiquement un an, depuis la publication de la proposition législative, pour que le texte puisse être mis aux voix dans notre assemblée. Son renvoi en trilogue, en octobre dernier, même s'il a encore rallongé le délai d'adoption du rapport, a tout de même permis d'améliorer la sécurité économique de nos producteurs.

En effet, le nombre de pratiques considérées comme déloyales a été revu à la hausse, les acheteurs issus de pays tiers ont été ajoutés au champ d'application de la directive, les organisations de producteurs et les interprofessions pourront introduire des plaintes au nom des producteurs, l'identité des producteurs plaignants sera, elle, protégée, afin d'éviter toute forme de pression à leur égard, et enfin, la juridiction compétente sera choisie par le plaignant.

Ces améliorations permettront, nous l'espérons, une meilleure protection de nos filières agricoles face aux géants de l'agroalimentaire. C'est pourquoi nous avons soutenu ce rapport en commission de l'agriculture et nous le soutiendrons à nouveau cette semaine en plénière.

Le travail reste cependant considérable avant de parvenir à un renforcement réel de la place des agriculteurs dans la chaîne alimentaire. Nous ne devons pas considérer ce texte comme la solution miracle et ignorer ce sujet dans les discussions sur la future PAC. Malgré les efforts de certains pays, comme la France, sur ce sujet, nous ne pouvons que constater que l'influence des producteurs dans les relations commerciales reste désespérément faible.

Les producteurs attendent de nous des résultats sur cette question, qui a de fortes répercussions sur l'économie de nos filières. Sachons donc répondre à leurs préoccupations, car elles sont urgentes.

Daniel Buda (PPE). – Domnule președinte, dați-mi voie, în primul rând, să salut preocupările domnului comisar Phil Hogan, dar și ale celor doi raportori și ale tuturor colegilor de a urmări îndeaproape protecția agricultorilor Europeni, a organizațiilor agricole și a întreprinderilor mici și mijlocii în fața comportamentului incorect și, de multe ori, abuziv al marilor operatori din lanțul de aprovizionare cu produse.

Practicile concurențiale neloiale au loc pe tot parcursul lanțului de aprovizionare cu alimente și se extind și în legătura cu comercializarea altor produse. Micii producători sunt victimele frecvente ale comportamentului comercial abuziv ce implică întârzierea plăților, anulări și modificări unilaterale sau retroactive ale contractelor.

Extinderea domeniului de aplicare prin includerea tuturor operatorilor din lanțul de aprovizionare, precum și extinderea categoriilor de practici neloiale vor duce la o protecție mai mare acordată fermierilor, iar consumatorii vor avea garanția unor alimente de calitate și la prețuri accesibile.

Certitudinea juridică dobândită va duce la menținerea stabilității prețurilor și, implicit, la consolidarea sectorului agricol, iar interesele a peste 11 milioane de fermieri și a 300 000 de procesatori din Uniunea Europeană vor fi și mai mult și mai bine apărate.

În același timp, am certitudinea că această propunere va convinge și mai mult producătorii români de nevoia unei asocieri în organizații puternice.

Prin reglementarea unei clauze de revizuire la 4 ani, se va asigura evaluarea dispozițiilor textului legislativ pe parcursul procesului de implementare și aplicarea coerentă a măsurilor directivei în legislația subsidiară din statele membre.

Maria Gabriela Zoană (S&D). – Domnule președinte, domnule comisar, stimați colegi, marile lanțuri de supermarketuri reprezintă, prin puterea lor de negociere a prețurilor și prin practicile comerciale neloiale, cea mai scurtă și cea mai acută problemă din întreg lanțul alimentar, pe care trebuie să o rezolvăm.

În cadrul lanțului de aprovizionare agricol și alimentar se constată, în mod curent, inegalități semnificative în ceea ce privește puterea de negociere a furnizorilor și cea a cumpărătorilor. Toate acestea conduc la practici comerciale neloiale în cazurile în care partenerii comerciali mai importanți și mai puternici încearcă să impună anumite practici sau clauze contractuale care sunt în avantajul lor.

Unele practici ar putea fi vădit neloiale, chiar și atunci când ambele părți sunt de acord cu ele. Noua legislație europeană interzice, pentru prima dată, până la șaisprezece practici comerciale neloiale impuse unilateral de un partener în cadrul unei relații comerciale. Alte practici pot fi permise numai dacă fac obiectul unui acord prealabil, clar și lipsit de ambiguitate, între părțile implicate. Vreau să înțelegem cu toții că respectăm orice distribuitor alimentar de tip supermarket sau hipermarket, dar că, indiferent care este numele acestui brand sau din ce țară provine, toți trebuie să respecte legislația națională și cea europeană, precum și să evite practicile comerciale neloiale.

Innocenzo Leontini (ECR). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, esprimo grande apprezzamento per il lavoro tenace, prezioso ed efficace svolto dal collega, l'onorevole De Castro. Il testo concordato con il Consiglio relativo alla proposta di direttiva in materia di pratiche commerciali sleali nei rapporti tra imprese nella filiera alimentare è uno strumento fondamentale e dovuto.

In un contesto di politica agricola tutto orientato al mercato, la buona ed equa gestione della filiera alimentare ha acquisito un'importanza fondamentale, in particolare per i piccoli produttori agricoli, che sono particolarmente vulnerabili rispetto alle pratiche commerciali sleali, in quanto sono spesso privi di un potere contrattuale che corrisponda a quello dei loro partner che acquistano i loro prodotti.

Ciò è dovuto principalmente alle limitate alternative di cui dispongono per fare arrivare i loro prodotti ai consumatori finali, nonché alle carenze strutturali del sistema agricolo. La direttiva mira a colpire le pratiche commerciali sleali mediante l'introduzione di strumenti di tutela comuni a tutta l'Unione europea, comprendenti un più esteso elenco di pratiche vietate.

L'obiettivo per raggiungere il quale assicuro il mio voto favorevole è quello di contribuire ad assicurare un tenore di vita equo alla comunità agricola, realizzando in tal modo uno degli obiettivi principali della PAC. Ritengo si tratti di un provvedimento legislativo di grande rilevanza anche per gli agricoltori italiani e siciliani in particolare.

Gilles Lebreton (ENF). – Monsieur le Président, le rapport De Castro a le mérite de chercher à lutter contre les pratiques déloyales de la grande distribution, qui étranglent les agriculteurs en les contraignant à céder leurs produits à vil prix. C'est pourquoi je voterai pour. Mais cela ne doit pas exonérer l'Union européenne de sa lourde responsabilité dans la crise actuelle, qui pousse nos agriculteurs au désespoir et, hélas, parfois au suicide.

Les traités de libre-échange que l'Union négocie avec des géants de l'agriculture, comme le Canada, l'Australie, la Nouvelle-Zélande ou le Brésil sont une folie, car ils organisent délibérément une concurrence déloyale à notre détriment. Nos agriculteurs doivent en effet respecter des règles sociales, sanitaires et environnementales qui ne s'imposent pas aux agriculteurs de ces pays.

Cet ultralibéralisme débridé a aussi amené l'Union européenne à supprimer récemment les quotas laitiers et sucriers qui permettaient de stabiliser les prix du lait et du sucre. Nous, députés du Rassemblement national, avons protesté contre cette suppression. Nous avions raison, car on en voit aujourd'hui les sinistres effets. L'entreprise allemande Südzucker vient d'annoncer la fermeture de deux sucreries en France, à Eppeville et à Cagny. Rien qu'à Eppeville, cette fermeture a bouleversé la vie de 132 salariés et de 1268 betteraviers.

Je demande à l'Union, et particulièrement à la Commission de Bruxelles, de ne pas jouer les Ponce Pilate et de reconnaître leurs torts. Je leur demande de profiter de la préparation de la nouvelle politique agricole commune pour soutenir davantage notre modèle d'agriculture familiale de qualité contre le modèle agro-industriel ultralibéral d'inspiration américaine, qui détruit nos emplois et notre santé.

Ricardo Serrão Santos (S&D). – Senhor Presidente, Caro Senhor Comissário, gostaria, em primeiro lugar, de felicitar o nosso colega e Professor Paolo de Castro pelo resultado alcançado nas negociações, que é fruto do empenho claro na defesa dos agricultores.

Esta diretiva constitui um passo importante no reforço da posição negocial dos agricultores e no aumento da sua proteção contra práticas comerciais abusivas. Irá, de uma forma harmonizada, introduzir um nível mínimo comum de proteção em toda a União Europeia para além das disposições já adotadas em alguns países, como Portugal.

Tal não poderá deixar de contribuir, certamente, para a prática de preços mais justos pagos aos produtores.

Devemos também aqui realçar, entre outros aspetos, o papel determinante do Parlamento Europeu na melhoria da proposta inicial da Comissão, contribuindo, nomeadamente, para o aumento significativo do número de práticas abrangidas e a inclusão no seu âmbito dos compradores situados fora da União Europeia.

Franc Bogovič (PPE). – Gospod predsednik, velika koncentracija trgovin, izkoriščanje malega kmeta, posledično problemi potrošnika so združili ta Evropski parlament v tej sestavi, ki bo z veseljem potrdil odlično poročilo gospoda De Castra, za katerega se mu zahvaljujem.

Potrjena je bila resolucija, ki jo je pripravila gospa McGuinness, in – hvala gospod komisar za vaš prispevek, ki ste imeli dovolj hrabrosti in tudi vztrajnosti, da ste skupaj z avstrijskim predsedstvom, z našo nekdanjo kolegico Köstinger tudi v hitrem času pripeljali direktivo zopet pred nas, da bo lahko stopila v veljavo.

Kot vemo, so sedaj na vrsti države članice, ki bodo morale v dveh letih uzakoniti v svoj pravni red to direktivo in zaščititi kmeta, zaščititi potrošnika pred nepoštenimi trgovinskimi praksami. Kar šestnajst jih je tu uzakonjenih, še dosti več jih lahko, v kolikor bodo tako presodile, uzakonijo države članice, in zagotovijo, da bo trajnostna veriga, veriga preskrbe s hrano, obveljala v prihodnosti.

Vse preveč je bilo tistih kmetij, ki so morale zapuščati ta trg, kajti dohodek, prihodek, zaslužek se je nepošteno razdelil. Podatek, da je samo 21 % prihodka ostalo neposrednim pridelovalcem hrane, je zstrašujoč, in upam in prepričan sem v to, da je z današnjim dnevom tudi jasen signal potrošniku, trgovcem, da bo tudi v bodoče ta ureditev bolj poštena do tistih, ki delajo v kmetijstvu.

Karine Gloanec Maurin (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, chers collègues, alors que partout en Europe, le secteur agricole vit des heures incertaines, je veux moi aussi saluer le travail efficace et énergique de mon collègue Paolo De Castro, mais aussi des rapporteurs, soutenu par la Commission européenne. Bravo pour cet accord enfin trouvé entre les colégislateurs. Il va permettre aux agriculteurs de mieux vivre du fruit de leur travail et c'est tant mieux: fini les annulations de dernière minute pour des biens périssables ou les modifications unilatérales d'un accord. Désormais, les détaillants vont devoir se plier aux exigences européennes et cesser les pratiques abusives.

Vous le savez, aujourd'hui, les agriculteurs européens touchent moins d'un quart de la part de la valeur du produit agricole. Cette proportion est vraiment déraisonnable et met en danger toutes nos filières.

En fait, si nous voulons réussir la transition agroécologique et valoriser les productions locales, il est impératif de rééquilibrer le rapport de force en faveur des petits opérateurs.

Aussi ce texte, cette directive très attendue, représente un premier pas pour une meilleure répartition de la valeur au sein de la chaîne agroalimentaire et je formule le vœu, très sincèrement, que cette directive, qui ne s'arrête d'ailleurs pas à nos frontières, soit mise en œuvre efficacement dans tous les États membres.

Sofia Ribeiro (PPE). – Senhor Presidente, Senhor Comissário, o final do mandato aproxima-se e agora, mais do que nunca, os nossos concidadãos olham para nós à espera de uma espécie de balanço que lhes mostre a importância para as suas vidas do que aqui fizemos.

A diretiva de combate às práticas comerciais desleais na cadeia de abastecimento agroalimentar é um bom exemplo da forma como defendemos os nossos agricultores e, por consequência, todos os europeus.

Apesar de se ter arrastado ao longo de anos, neste mandato tivemos vontade, apoio de todas as partes e chegámos a um consenso bastante rápido numa diretiva que permitirá uma maior estabilidade e segurança de rendimentos aos nossos agricultores e punirá todos aqueles que abusem da sua posição de dominância sobre os outros elos da cadeia alimentar. É, portanto, um grande dia para a agricultura europeia que passará a ver consagradas na lei as práticas comerciais desleais como são exemplos as alterações contratuais unilaterais, a tentativa de imputar aos agricultores as perdas económicas da distribuição, o pagamento de produtos perecíveis num prazo superior a 30 dias, a imposição de esquemas de descontos ou de penalizações sem serem previamente acordados, entre tantas outras.

A possibilidade de uma organização de produtores fazer uma denúncia em nome de um dos seus associados é também um grande passo com vista a acabarmos com as expressões e receios, especialmente em mercados pequenos ou em que aceitavam as condições que lhes davam ou deixariam de fornecer essa entidade.

Termino, Senhor Presidente, com a convicção de que este Parlamento Europeu deixou o setor agrícola um pouco mais protegido do que o encontrou. É um dia muito feliz para a agricultura europeia.

Michela Giuffrida (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la politica agricola è un pilastro dell'Unione europea e fornisce massiccio sostegno finanziario ad agricoltori e produttori, ma sempre più spesso, purtroppo, assieme alle politiche commerciali, finisce sotto accusa, perché i nostri agricoltori sono schiacciati da costo-lavoro disparitario, da carenze strutturali e dallo strapotere della grande distribuzione, che impone pratiche commerciali sleali. Così a soccombere sono gli anelli più deboli della filiera, che reagiscono spesso scagliandosi proprio contro l'Europa, contro di noi che siamo i loro rappresentanti.

Con questa direttiva dimostriamo con i fatti, finalmente, da che parte stiamo: dalla parte degli agricoltori, dei produttori, dei consumatori europei, a sostegno del sud e di regioni – come ad esempio la mia, la Sicilia – dove l'economia è principalmente agricola e l'agroalimentare conta centinaia di eccellenze che vanno sostenute e tutelate.

Da domani sarà possibile farlo, grazie all'efficace lavoro svolto dal nostro vicepresidente De Castro, dalla Commissione e da quanti come me, da sempre, si battono in difesa degli agricoltori e dei piccoli produttori, simbolo del nostro agroalimentare.

Othmar Karas (PPE). – Herr Präsident! Herr Kommissar, meine Damen und Herren, mein, unser, europäisches Ordnungsmodell ist die ökosoziale Marktwirtschaft. Dazu gehört, dass wir den Markt regeln. Dazu gehört, dass wir vor allem den Markt in eine Richtung regeln, damit schwächere Marktteilnehmer nicht von der erdrückenden Übermacht der großen benachteiligt werden.

Genau das machen wir mit der Richtlinie über unlautere Handelspraktiken in der Lebensmittelkette. Wir machen Schluss mit den vorhandenen Fouls großer Handelsketten zu Lasten der Landwirte und anderer wirtschaftlich abhängiger Lieferanten. Und wir beenden die Unarten, wie verspätete Zahlungen oder das kurzfristige Abbestellen von Lieferungen, denn sie könnten die wirtschaftliche Existenz der Landwirte bedrohen.

Meine Damen und Herren, wir machen auch damit Schluss, dass Geschäftsbeziehungen unfair und nicht zum Wohle beider Seiten gestaltet werden können, indem wir verhindern, dass es keine Weigerung mehr geben kann, Verträge schriftlich zu fixieren. Und ich bin daher auch froh, dass wir diese Regelung auf Drittstaaten ausweiten, dass wir anonyme Beschwerdemöglichkeiten für Landwirte und ein alternatives Streitbeilegungsverfahren schaffen. Ich bedanke mich bei der österreichischen Ratspräsidentschaft für ihren Beitrag, die unlauteren Handelspraktiken endlich zu beenden.

Seán Kelly (PPE). – Mr President, I'm not a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Rural Development but obviously – coming from Ireland, a very strong agricultural country – I take a great interest in this issue, and I remember during my first term in Parliament, six or seven years ago, attending a number of meetings and a work group, with Mairead McGuinness and Anna Maria Corazza Bildt, where this issue was discussed. I also remember that when Commissioner Hogan was first appointed he said this was one of the issues he was going to tackle, and many people didn't believe him at the time, because they thought it was impossible to do so. In fairness, he has delivered, as has Parliament, and therefore I think we can be happy with the results. The whole lot of the unfair practices, involving aid payments, perishable goods, non-perishable goods, contracts, 'hello money', etcetera, have been dealt with.

One important point, though, was mentioned by my colleague Jim Nicholson: he said all this was great, and it is, but it must be implemented and monitored properly at Member State level to ensure that the benefits are there for farmers. This is especially so at a time when they are very concerned, I know, in my own country about bad weather, falling prices and, in particular, Brexit. One message that goes out clearly from this process is that if the European Parliament and the Commission are standing behind the farmers in relation to this issue, and can take effective action, I'm quite sure the same will apply in relation to Brexit, if it does happen – although, if Mr Agnew's prediction is correct, which we hope it is, then it may not happen at all, which would be a perfect solution.

Marijana Petir (PPE). – Gospodine predsjedavajući, posljednja anketa u kojoj su sudjelovali poljoprivredni proizvođači i poljoprivredne zadruge, provedena na temelju šire definicije nepoštenih trgovačkih praksi, pokazala je da se šteta prouzročena nepoštenim trgovačkim praksama procjenjuje na više od 10 milijardi eura godišnje na europskoj razini.

Upravo nepoštenu trgovačku praksu mladi navode kao jednu od glavnih prepreka za bavljenje poljoprivredom. Ukoliko se taj problem uskoro ne riješi, budućnost poljoprivrede i opskrbe hranom bit će dovedena u pitanje.

Poljoprivrednici već sada rade u sektoru s najnižim prosječnim prihodima u Europskoj uniji i ne osjećaju se sigurnima. Usto dobavljači i otkupljivači, kao snažniji u cijelom lancu opskrbe hranom, različite rizike svoga poslovanja prevaljuju na poljoprivrednike kao slabije u tom lancu, bilo da se radi o dugim rokovima plaćanja, uvjetima isporuka, skladištenja i prodaje, na koje poljoprivrednici sami ne mogu utjecati.

Zato pozdravljam brzi dogovor postignut u trijalogu oko ovog zakonodavnog prijedloga i smatram ga pobjedom malih nad velikima, koja bi trebala olakšati život poljoprivrednicima na zajedničkom europskom tržištu.

Andreas Schwab (PPE). – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Zunächst mal entschuldige ich mich, dass ich zu spät kam. Ich war bei der Abstimmung im Wirtschaftsausschuss bis zum Schluss dabei und konnte deswegen erst etwas verspätet hier dazukommen.

Ich glaube, wir können nun alle festhalten, dass der Schutz kleinerer und mittlerer Unternehmen insbesondere in den Kleinproduktionen in der Landwirtschaft schon immer ein wichtiges Anliegen vieler Kräfte hier in diesem Haus war, dazu hat immer auch die EVP-Fraktion gehört. Deswegen möchte ich natürlich allen, die daran mitgewirkt haben, dass diese nun vorliegende Richtlinie zustande kam, herzlich danken, insbesondere auch dem Berichterstatter, Herrn de Castro.

Aber ich glaube schon, deutlich machen zu müssen, dass diese Richtlinie, Herr Kommissar, nicht in allen Bereichen perfekt gelungen ist. Denn der Schutz der Unternehmen, die hier jetzt in den Anwendungsbereich einbezogen sind, geht weit über die Definition dessen hinaus, was kleine und mittlere Unternehmen bis heute waren. Man kann natürlich die Frage aufwerfen, ob wir eine breitere Definition von „kleine und mittlere Unternehmen“ brauchen. Aber wenn man sich dieser Frage stellt, braucht man in Europa dafür eigentlich eine Folgenabschätzung. Und deswegen habe ich schon gewisse Zweifel, ob wir vom Agrarbereich ausgehend nun eine Erweiterung der KMU-Definition so aus der Hand schütteln können oder ob wir dafür nicht etwas mehr Zeit gebraucht hätten.

Die zweite Problematik, die sich aus meiner Sicht stellt, ist, dass diese Richtlinie eigentlich davon ausgeht, dass wir auch im Bereich der Agrarwirtschaft einen einheitlichen europäischen Markt haben. Insofern wäre es denklogisch zwingend gewesen, dann auch diese Richtlinie zur Vollharmonisierung zu führen und den Mitgliedstaaten nicht eine weitere Fragmentierung ausdrücklich in Erwägungsgrund 16 und 17 anheim zu stellen. Denn damit wird die Einheitlichkeit dieses Marktes natürlich ein Stück weit wieder in Frage gestellt.

Alles in allem: Wir werden dem zustimmen, aber es bleiben gewisse Zweifel. Wir werden sehen müssen, wie sich diese Sache in der Zukunft entwickelt.

Linda McAvan, *rapporteur for the opinion of the Committee on Development*. – Mr President, as many have said, this is legislation for which we have been campaigning for years. Thank you, Commissioner Hogan, for putting it on the table, and a big thank you to Paolo De Castro for making it happen before the end of this parliamentary term and before Brexit.

I am speaking for the Committee on Development and the most important thing for us is that this legislation covers not just EU farmers but also farmers in the global South, because they too face a squeeze, as farmers here do, and they have very little bargaining power. Take bananas: only 4% to 9% of the value goes to the farmer. Or look at cocoa: a 30-40% drop in income last year. If you think about it, prices are not going down, so somebody, somewhere, is making money, and it is not farmers.

Finally, this is a very good piece of legislation. We now need to build upon it, and I want to thank, too, all the campaigners across Europe from the Fair Trade movement, from Traidcraft in the UK, from the Fair Trade Advocacy Office and the cooperative movement, and all those who campaigned for this. Let us hope that, in the new Parliament, we will continue to work on value change, conflict minerals, textiles, cocoa and other commodities, building on the legislation we have before us.

Zgłoszenia z sali

Момчил Неков (S&D). – Г-н Председател, успехът на преговорите по нелоялните търговски практики е истинска революция за европейските производители в рамките на този Парламент. С приемането на тази директива слагаме край на фактора „страх“ за фермерите. С настоящата директива ясно установяваме минимален списък на забранени нелоялни търговски практики между купувачите, от една страна, и доставчиците и производителите, от друга.

Край на забавяния на плащания повече от 60 дни, отказ за сключване на писмено споразумение за доставка, търговски репресии или заплаха от такива, ако се прибегне до търсенето на правата. Това са само няколко от примерите за практики, които ще трябва да бъдат напълно забранени. Плащането на такса „промоция“, без предварителна уговорка и преди началото на влизането в сила на споразумението за доставка или връщане на непродадена стока, също ще престане.

Призовавам във всички държави членки, включително и в България, в най-кратки срокове да се създадат адекватни комисии с юридически правомощия, които ще следят и гарантират за гладкото прилагане на тази директива.

Νότης Μαρίας (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, οι αθέμιτες εμπορικές πρακτικές στις σχέσεις μεταξύ επιχειρήσεων στην αλυσίδα εφοδιασμού τροφίμων είναι στην ημερήσια διάταξη. Γνωρίζουμε ότι στην πράξη δεν υπάρχει δικαίο εμπόριο. Γνωρίζουμε ότι στην πράξη υπάρχει υπερεκμετάλλευση των αγροτών. Ακουσθηκε άλλωστε ότι οι ίδιοι οι αγρότες το πολύ πολύ να πάρουν το 20 % της συνολικής τιμής που πιάνει ένα προϊόν κι αυτό διότι υπάρχουν οι πολυεθνικές επιχειρήσεις, υπάρχουν οι μεγάλες αλυσίδες διατροφής και διανομής των τροφίμων, υπάρχουν οι εκβιασμοί από τον χονδρέμπορα, ο οποίος διαμορφώνει τις τιμές, πολλές φορές πληρώνει με επιταγές, εν συνεχεία δεν εξοφλεί και όλα αυτά, βεβαίως, οδηγούν σε μία πλήρη εξάρτηση του αγροτικό κόσμο.

Γι' αυτό, χρειάζεται η πολύ συγκεκριμένη απαγόρευση των αθέμιτων πρακτικών, η στήριξη των γεωργών μας, αλλά, βεβαίως, αυτό δεν είναι πανάκεια. Οι αγρότες πρέπει να στηριχτούν και με άλλες πρακτικές και κυρίως να υπάρξουν τράπεζες για να τους δώσουν φθηνές πιστώσεις, για να αντιμετωπίσουν το ακριβό κόστος παραγωγής.

Hilde Vautmans (ALDE). – Voorzitter, collega's, ik wil eerst en vooral commissaris Hogan bedanken. Ik denk dat deze richtlijn hoogst noodzakelijk is, willen we onze boeren in Europa laten overleven.

Eindelijk kunnen we met deze richtlijn een einde maken aan 16 oneerlijke handelspraktijken. Met deze richtlijn zullen we zorgen voor een gelijk speelveld en een versterkte positie van de boeren. Het zal gedaan zijn, collega's, met lastminuteannuleringen van bestellingen. Het zal gedaan zijn met het eenzijdig wijzigen van overeenkomsten en het zal gedaan zijn met het weigeren van schriftelijke overeenkomsten.

Collega's, commissaris, uit een Eurobarometer-enquête uit 2017 bleek dat maar liefst 88 % van de ondervraagden een oproep deed om de positie van de boeren in de keten te versterken. Met deze richtlijn zullen we dat doen en ik hoop dan ook dat de lidstaten heel snel uitvoering zullen geven, zodat wij de boeren in Europa wat beter kunnen ondersteunen.

Miguel Viegas (GUE/NGL). – Senhor Presidente, os agricultores portugueses ficam hoje com menos de 20 % do preço que os consumidores pagam pelos seus produtos. Todos conhecemos o papel predador da grande distribuição no setor agrícola. Todos conhecemos as práticas de esmagamento dos preços pagos ao produtor. É intolerável e é também lamentável que a União Europeia nada tenha feito ao longo destes cinco anos. Aparece agora com esta diretiva em vésperas de eleições e, é caso para dizer, mais vale tarde do que nunca.

Esta proposta tem certamente aspetos positivos, mas não toca no fundamental. Os seus mecanismos são insuficientes para garantir esta coisa tão simples: que os preços cubram os custos de produção e garantam um nível de vida digna aos nossos agricultores. Esta proposta será certamente um passo, mas fica muito aquém do necessário.

Giulia Moi (EFDD). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, accolgo con favore questa direttiva, che dopo tanti anni finalmente proteggerà gli agricoltori dalle pratiche sleali delle aziende acquirenti e distributrici e porterà un migliore equilibrio in tutta la filiera alimentare.

Vorrei segnalare il caso specifico che è successo in Sardegna – la regione da cui provengo – e vorrei portare tutta la mia solidarietà per la situazione. Quindi io spero che questa direttiva restituisca giusti diritti a tutte le migliaia di operatori che hanno purtroppo lavorato senza di essi e spero che questi diritti vengano riconosciuti.

Caterina Chinnici (S&D). – Signor Presidente, signor Commissario, onorevoli colleghi, i miei complimenti al relatore, l'onorevole De Castro. Agricoltori e produttori agroalimentari, come sappiamo, sono vulnerabili, purtroppo, a pratiche commerciali sleali poiché il settore agroalimentare è caratterizzato da forti squilibri nel potere contrattuale fra piccoli e grandi operatori, i quali talvolta impongono ai loro partner condizioni che si discostano dalla buona fede e dalla correttezza commerciale e che possono anche compromettere la qualità dei prodotti offerti ai consumatori.

Grazie alla direttiva di cui oggi discutiamo verrà finalmente introdotto un livello minimo comune di tutela in tutta l'Unione europea attraverso la proibizione di 16 pratiche sleali unilateralmente imposte da un partner ad un altro, quali ad esempio i ritardi di pagamento o le cancellazioni *last minute* degli ordini. Va sottolineata l'importanza delle misure finalizzate a rafforzare la cooperazione fra le autorità nazionali e lo scambio di buone pratiche, al fine di garantire una omogenea applicazione nell'ambito dell'Unione delle regole e delle misure contenute nella direttiva, volte a tutelare gli agricoltori e ad assicurare prodotti di qualità.

Olga Sehnalová (S&D). – Pane předsedající, přijetím vůbec prvního celoevropského zákona, který významně ochrání zemědělce a drobné podnikatele před nekalými praktikami velkých hráčů, úspěšně uzavíráme úsilí, které jsme tady v Parlamentu odstartovali s kolegy Czesakem a McGuinness v roce 2016. Podařilo se takřka nemožné. Za necelé tři roky od píky vybudovat nástroj, který skončuje s rušením objednávek na poslední chvíli, jednostrannými změnami smluv nebo odkládáním plateb. Slabší strana se už nebude muset bát odvetných opatření díky zachování důvěrnosti, dozorové orgány nyní budou muset spolupracovat napříč členskými státy. Vyjednávací pozice hráčů v potravinovém řetězci jsou nesrovnatelné. Tento zákon ale k nastavení férových a transparentních vztahů mezi výrobci, dodavateli a distributory hodně pomůže, takže děkuji všem, kdo se na jeho přijetí podíleli.

(Koniec zgłoszeń z sali)

Phil Hogan, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, I welcome the widespread support that has been demonstrated tonight for the agreement reached last December and I look forward to this support being reflected in the vote tomorrow.

Mr De Castro is 100% right when he says that this legislation will protect 100% of EU farmers. It will also protect 97% of small businesses in the agri-food sector.

We had two very revealing contributions here tonight, from both extremes of the political spectrum. One from Mr Agnew, who actually let the cat out of the bag eventually, and revealed the greatest secret that we knew he was harbouring for so long – that the reason why people that share his view in the House of Commons have been voting against Mrs May's deal up to now is that they really secretly want to stay in the European Union after all. I know that you're quite correct when you wave the flag there that you say you will be here in a year's time. That's thanks to you and the people that actually think like you who are voting against a deal in order to exit the European Union.

(Protests)

(Addressing Mr Agnew)

No. You've got plenty of time to express your view over the years.

The second one is Mr Carthy's view in relation to this legislation. Presumably speaking on behalf of his group, he now is adopting a very isolationist position, where he is actually supporting the strong versus the weak. I'm absolutely flabbergasted at this political stance of Sinn Féin, in particular, who portrayed themselves as extreme Socialists, with great pride, for many, many years. What we're trying to do here is go in the right direction and help the weak against the strong. I thought that that very principle would be something that could be shared by Sinn Féin and actually it's remarkable that he has now put himself in a political position where he's on the same side as the big supermarket retailers, rather than actually on the side of the farmers who are being 100% protected and the small businesses who are being protected as well, up to EUR 350 million turnover. Nobody is saying, Mr Carthy, that this is going to be a panacea for farm prices overnight, but it's minimum harmonisation at the European Union level for Member States, including Ireland, if you can persuade them, that will be able to do more in this case. Member States can go further due to the construction of this directive and I hope that they do so, particularly as Mr Andrieu and Mr Loiseau have mentioned, in relation to France. This is an opportunity to bring about much-needed protection for our farmers. With the help of this House, we have seized that opportunity and those who continue to oppose the legislation now make up a bizarre incoherent coalition of interests.

Mr Nicholson is quite correct and so is Ms Aguilera. This is about protecting farmers and you have to actually start somewhere in order to do this. Ms McGuinness and Ms Aguilera, and others, emphasised that what the Commission's proposal is about, with a strong initiative and support of the farmers, is to respond to calls out there from this House about trying to protect the weak against the strong. We're strengthening the position of the farmers in the food chain. We're actually banning unfair trading practices in a number of areas, and I think that 96% of the respondents to our public consultation agreed that we should do this, so I don't know where the support is for anything other than this.

Madam Heubuch, you are free to make more changes in competition law, as you attempted to do in the trilogue process, and in four years' time, you will have another opportunity. We have made a lot of progress in competition law in relation to agriculture in the last few years through the Omnibus Regulation, through the food chain and we will be making further progress through market transparency rules that I will be publishing in the near future.

The reality of this is that the course is in front of us, but we will only start to work when the Member States take their responsibilities seriously. The EU has done its job, in the words of Mr Dantin, in a noble cause. Now let us join together to ensure the steady transposition of this directive and let us remind ourselves that this is a minimum requirement.

Mr Andrieu, Ms Zoană and others recalled that it has taken some time for there to be a Commission proposal. Let me confirm that this is a proposal that has the full support of the Commission and reflects what President Juncker said in his State of the Union speech here in 2015, when we had a milk crisis and a pigmeat crisis, that it was hard to understand how milk was cheaper than water.

So we have made a stand and I say finally, Mr President, to Mr Schwab, that I understand his comments coming from his perspective, but there was a much more ambitious proposal that ultimately was put on the table. We have reached a compromise, and there was a very rigorous impact assessment completed by the Commission before the proposal was tabled.

Finally, nothing in this legislation should provide any fear for any sector in the food chain if they are behaving in a proper manner and acting fairly towards the farmer.

(Applause)

PRESIDENZA DELL'ON. FABIO MASSIMO CASTALDO

Vicepresidente

Paolo De Castro, *relatore*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, ringrazio davvero tutti i colleghi per i commenti e, ancora una volta, ringrazio il Commissario Hogan per aver sostenuto con tale forza il Parlamento europeo. Senza questo gioco di squadra non ci saremmo riusciti, colleghi. Sono passati solo otto mesi dalla presentazione della proposta all'accordo politico del 19 dicembre, e voglio anche ricordare il voto all'unanimità del Consiglio Agricoltura. Per questo mi aspetto un voto positivo di tutti i colleghi, anche di quelli che volevano di più e anche di quelli – pochi, in realtà – che non volevano per niente questa direttiva.

Colleghi, questa è proprio l'Europa che vogliamo. È l'Europa che dà una mano alle imprese più deboli e assicura ai consumatori norme trasparenti e che garantiscano la qualità. Sono d'accordo, ancora una volta, con la collega Mairead McGuinness: è un primo passo, è un primo passo e dobbiamo applicarla bene, questa direttiva.

Ricordiamo anche, però, che la direttiva amplia l'efficacia delle leggi nazionali. Quindi al collega Agnew possiamo ricordare che le imprese inglesi saranno più tutelate ora, grazie alla direttiva, perché saranno protette anche quando esportano in altri paesi dell'Unione europea. Ringrazio Linda McAvan, perché ha voluto ricordare un aspetto di cui siamo orgogliosi: la direttiva si applica anche ai produttori extraeuropei e quindi la tutela viene estesa a tutti quei piccoli produttori che magari subiscono pratiche sleali qui in Europa.

Insomma, caro Commissario Hogan, caro Phil, con questa direttiva abbiamo fatto un piccolo miracolo. Sono tutti i gruppi che la sostengono, con l'unica eccezione del collega Matt Carthy, che spero che magari durante la notte possa riflettere.

Ringrazio davvero ancora una volta tutti e ci auguriamo che un successo come quello che oggi questo Parlamento ha portato a casa si possa ripetere in futuro. Grazie a tutti.

Presidente. – La discussione è chiusa.

La votazione si svolgerà martedì 12 marzo 2019, alle 12.30.

Dichiarazioni scritte (articolo 162)

Beata Gosiewska (ECR), *na piśmie*. – W dniu 19 grudnia 2018 r. prezydencja austriacka i Parlament Europejski osiągnęły porozumienie w sprawie dyrektywy mającej na celu powstrzymanie nieuczciwych praktyk handlowych w relacjach między przedsiębiorstwami w łańcuchu dostaw produktów rolnych i żywności. Zasadniczym celem dyrektywy jest ochrona rolników, których uznaje się za najbardziej zagrożone podmioty w łańcuchu dostaw żywności, przed nabywcami, którzy są znacznie więksi od nich. Dyrektywa umożliwi stworzenie wspólnych ram europejskich zapewniających minimalny poziom ochrony rolników i innych dostawców produktów rolno-spożywczych, których obrót nie przekracza 350 mln euro. Porozumienie to obejmuje żywność, cięte kwiaty, karmę dla zwierząt domowych oraz paszę dla zwierząt. Całkowicie zakazane będzie osiem praktyk handlowych, w tym: opóźnienia za produkty łatwo psujące się, anulowanie zamówień w ostatniej chwili, jednostronne lub wsteczne zmiany w umowach dostawy, niewłaściwe wykorzystanie informacji poufnych oraz działania odwetowe lub groźenie takimi działaniami wobec dostawcy. Wszystko to ma na celu wzmocnienie pozycji mniejszych podmiotów (rolników) w łańcuchu dostaw żywności.

Laurențiu Rebeaga (ECR), *în scris*. – Micii fermieri și producători sunt vitali pentru economia și sectorul alimentar European. De mult ar fi trebuit să facem eforturi pentru a întări poziția micilor producători și fermieri pe piață. Astăzi, sunt bucuroși că, datorită acestui raport, fermierii și producătorii care se ocupă de aprovizionarea cu alimente vor fi apărați împotriva practicilor neloiale, cum ar fi anularea comenzilor în ultimul minut, întârzierile în efectuarea plăților și, în mod special, modificările unilaterale ale contractelor.

Daciana Octavia Sârbu (S&D), *în scris*. – Mă bucur că, în sfârșit, în această săptămână vom aproba un act legislativ care să combată practicile comerciale neloiale din sectorul agroalimentar. Din nefericire, doar unele state membre au adoptat legislația națională privind reglementarea practicilor neloiale și, de aceea, această directivă este mai mult decât necesară. Am așteptat-o și am cerut-o de foarte mult timp. Micii producători, în special, trebuie să fie protejați în relația loc cu „retailerii”.

Cred cu tărie că această directivă va ajuta ca micii fermieri să aibă acces mai ușor în supermarketuri și că atât contractele obligatorii, cât și asigurarea plăților la timp vor garanta un venit mai sigur și mai decent pentru acest tip de producători. Din păcate, doar 21 % din prețul final al unui produs vândut în supermarket ajunge la producător. Sper ca, după implementarea acestei directive, producătorii români să poată să aibă mai multă putere de negociere cu supermarketurile și ca aceștia să se bucure de venituri echitabile.

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE), *pisemně*. – Podporuji tento návrh, jelikož souhlasím se zákazem nekalých obchodních praktik uplatňovaných ze strany obchodních řetězců vůči zemědělským a potravinářským producentům. Nekalé praktiky, jako například opožděné platby za potraviny podléhající rychlé zkáze, rušení objednávek na poslední chvíli nebo jednostranné změny smluvních podmínek způsobují malým producentům významné finanční problémy. V této souvislosti je důležité zmínit čísla ze studie Výzkumné služby Evropského parlamentu (EPRS) ze září 2018, kde se uvádí, že z celkové hodnoty potraviny obdrží evropští zemědělci v průměru pouze zhruba 20 % a zpracovatelé přibližně 28 %. Zbytek, tedy více než polovina, pak připadne samotným obchodníkům. Tento stav reflektuje nerovné postavení těchto subjektů v rámci potravinového řetězce. Toto legislativní opatření si tak klade za cíl zlepšit podmínky těch, jejichž postavení je v rámci tohoto potravinového řetězce nejslabší, tedy zejména malých a středních potravinářských a zemědělských podniků. I přesto, že opatření, která zavádí tato směrnice, nejsou dle mého názoru samospásná, tak nelze pochybovat, že jdou správným směrem.

21. Umowa o dobrowolnym partnerstwie dotycząca egzekwowania prawa, zarządzania i handlu w dziedzinie leśnictwa między UE a Wietnamem – Umowa o dobrowolnym partnerstwie dotycząca egzekwowania prawa, zarządzania i handlu w dziedzinie leśnictwa między UE a Wietnamem (rezolucja) (debata)

Presidente. – L'ordine del giorno reca, in discussione congiunta,

— la raccomandazione di Heidi Hautala, a nome della commissione per il commercio internazionale, sul progetto di decisione del Consiglio relativa alla conclusione dell'accordo di partenariato volontario tra l'Unione europea e la Repubblica socialista del Vietnam sull'applicazione delle normative, sulla governance e sul commercio nel settore forestale (10861/2018 — C8-0445/2018 - 2018/0272(NLE)) (A8-0083/2019), e

— la relazione di Heidi Hautala, a nome della commissione per il commercio internazionale, recante una proposta di risoluzione non legislativa sul progetto di decisione del Consiglio relativa alla conclusione dell'accordo di partenariato volontario tra l'Unione europea e la Repubblica socialista del Vietnam sull'applicazione delle normative, sulla governance e sul commercio nel settore forestale (10861/2018 — C8-0445/2018 - 2018/0272M(NLE)) (A8-0093/2019).

Heidi Hautala, *Rapporteur*. – Mr President, I am extremely happy to say that the Voluntary Partnership Agreements on forest law enforcement, governance and trade are an excellent example of combining a trade instrument with sustainable development.

There is also a direct link between this Voluntary Partnership Agreement with Vietnam and the European Union and Vietnam Free Trade Agreement: namely, Chapter 13, on sustainable development, of the free trade agreement, which still has to be ratified, has a reference to the implementation of this Voluntary Partnership Agreement. I would like to emphasise that this is an excellent instrument for addressing deficiencies of governance, not only in the forestry sector but in the state system as a whole. I am talking about the functioning of customs, border guards etcetera.

Vietnam is now the third country in Asia that has entered Voluntary Partnership Agreement negotiations with the European Union and I am extremely happy that Vietnam has committed to eradicating illegal timber from its supply chains. I visited Vietnam in January in my role as rapporteur. My hosts emphasised that Vietnam's aim is to become the world's biggest producer of timber products. This is all the more reason to ensure that Vietnam sources and processes only legal timber. Vietnam has a new forestry law in force since January this year. It unequivocally prohibits imports of illegal timber. This effectively means that timber imports from Cambodia should no longer take place – and here work needs to be done, including with Cambodia.

In that context, it is also extremely worrying that Global Witness has found a surge in imports from the Democratic Republic of Congo, which is known to be a high-risk country. This issue has to be tackled in the course of the implementation of the Voluntary Partnership Agreement. It is of critical importance that Vietnam makes sure illegal imports are effectively stopped: simply relocating the sourcing to new high-risk countries is clearly not the solution. I expect Vietnam to enforce its forestry law swiftly and effectively, and it should consult all the stakeholders. The EU is ready to help.

— Mr President, the EU for its part should ensure sufficient resources in supporting Vietnam while it implements the crucial reforms. The EU is also in the process of drafting a new action plan on deforestation and forest degradation. Innovations similar to the Voluntary Partnership Agreements are required in order to address the global challenge of deforestation. As we know, deforestation has become ever more critical as the scientific understanding of its importance to climate change has grown.

The Voluntary Partnership Agreements are a crucial part of the solution, as legal instruments are needed to step up the fight against deforestation globally. The EU needs to put in place strong measures to eradicate fully deforestation from European products that it wants to export to us and from the supply chains. By the way, this approach could also be applied to other risk products such as coffee, cocoa and palm oil. Vietnam is facing a huge task. After the ratification, which is expected to happen tomorrow, it will have to fulfil the commitments of this agreement. I have all the confidence that Vietnam will tackle this challenge with the seriousness that it deserves.

This is not, and certainly cannot be, a mere box-ticking exercise. Only once this Parliament is fully assured of the complete implementation and once it is convinced of the eradication of illegal timber from Vietnamese wood products will it be able to agree to issue licenses to Vietnam.

Andrus Ansip, *Vice-President of the Commission*. – Mr President, the EU Vietnam Voluntary Partnership Agreement is an important milestone in our relations with Vietnam, it is an important step in our battle against illegal logging and deforestation, and it is an important affirmation of the validity of the EU's longstanding Action Plan on Forest Law Enforcement, Governance and Trade. It is the first voluntary partnership agreement signed with a country that is not only an important exporter but also a significant importer of timber.

Vietnam is at the very centre of the global timber products trade. That is why the Voluntary Partnership Agreement with Vietnam, once implemented and fully operational, has great potential for creating a positive impact well beyond Vietnamese borders and, at the same time, bringing social, economic and environmental benefits to the Vietnamese people. I am pleased to see that the European Parliament agrees with this assessment, as shown by the two resolutions we have before us today. I can only repeat some of the important points highlighted in the reports. Vietnam has made remarkable progress since the start of the negotiations. One major success has been the open and constructive participation by everyone in Vietnam who was relevant to the process, which we hope and expect will continue in the implementation phase.

Vietnam will introduce mandatory due diligence obligations for its importers. We are proud of this achievement but we are also aware that it will be our duty to ensure that its implementation does not fall short of the high due diligence standards established by our own EU Timber Regulation. The issue of the legality of imports, especially those from Cambodia, has been at the heart of the debates, and rightly so. We will continue to monitor the situation very closely. However, we should remember that import controls are only one element of a comprehensive system designed to ensure timber legality beyond the import points. It also covers harvesting, processing, trade in and export of timber products. Ultimately, the success of this Voluntary Partnership Agreement will be measured by the credible and robust implementation of the timber legality assurance system as a whole. There can be no forest law enforcement, governance and trade licensing without this.

I welcome the overall positive message on this agreement that comes from Parliament's resolutions. I look forward to our debates on this landmark agreement.

Jan Zahradil, *rapporteur for the opinion of the Committee on Development*. – Mr President, as a rapporteur for the Committee on Development (DEVE), I have been fully supportive of this Voluntary Partnership Agreement (VPA) between EU and Vietnam. This is necessary, useful and innovative in its mechanism and logic. We know that Vietnam is a major exporter of timber products to the EU and to other countries in the region around Vietnam, like Japan and China, and this VPA will act in the future as an effective instrument to fight against illegal trade and to promote sustainable trade in timber products. However, let me stress one thing. I am happy about the conclusion of this particular treaty, but on the other hand, I remain worried about its sister file, the EU-Vietnam free trade agreement, for which I am EP standing rapporteur. We have delays, obstacles and procedural complications and I would like to urge the Commission to try to push the Romanian Presidency a little bit to move this treaty further on so that we can vote on it before the elections in May.

Jarosław Wałęsa, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Mr President, today we are discussing yet another trade agreement. It's the last in this parliamentary term after Japan and Singapore. It warms my heart to see that we are opening our markets to high-standard trade. I have always spoken in favour of trade agreements as they boost trade, promote international competitiveness of our companies, as well as create opportunities for investments outside of the EU.

I cannot stress enough the importance of the whole process. We should be proud that we now have over 70 preferential trade agreements in place. One thing is to stimulate economic growth, but we cannot forget about sharing our norms and values, as well as promoting social inclusion and environmental protection. I believe that this House should give its consent as fast as possible to this agreement so that we can focus on the implementation so that everyone can benefit from it as quickly as possible.

Neena Gill, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Mr President, I would like to congratulate Ms Hautala on her report. I really welcome this agreement with Vietnam, committing now to only importing and exporting legally harvested timber. This is especially important given that this country is a leader in timber products. Deforestation, as we've already heard, is the second leading cause of global warming and this agreement will be key, not only in achieving the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, but also the Paris climate change goals.

However, I do have some questions for the Commission. Firstly, there is an urgent need to address the regional dimension of the rampant illegal logging. Therefore, I'd like to know: what efforts the Commission has undertaken to tackle illegal timber trade from supplier countries like Laos and Cambodia? Secondly, what is the state of play with the new Voluntary Partnership Agreement (VPA) with China, which is also a crucial player in the processed wood industry? Finally, to what extent has the EU Timber Regulation been raised in dialogue with Japan as another major importer of timber and a trading partner of the EU?

Elsi Katainen, *ALDE-ryhmän puolesta*. – Arvoisa puhemies, kiitokset Heidi Hautalalle. Metsäkadon ehkäisy ja hiilinielujen kasvattaminen ovat todellakin asioita, joilla on merkittävät vaikutukset ilmastonmuutoksen torjunnassa.

Tätä asiaa täytyy tarkastella todella laaja-alaisesti. On katsottava pitkän aikavälin kehitystä ja myöskin globaalia perspektiiviä. Samalla on pidettävä huoli siitä, että paikallisella tasolla metsät hoidetaan kestävästi, mistä Euroopassa on hyviä malliesimerkkejä muun muassa Suomesta.

Olen tyytyväinen, että EU antaa tällä vapaaehtoisella kumppanuussopimuksella tukensa Vietnamille. Vietnam on ottanut oikeita askeleita metsätalouden kestävydessä ja sitoutuu nyt osaltaan varmistamaan, että EU-alueelle tuotavat puutuotteet ja puutavara on tuotettu laillisesti. Tämä parantaa metsäsektorin kehitystä myös Vietnamin lähialueilla.

Haluan antaa tukeni myös Vietnamin ja EU:n kattavalle ja hyvin nykyaikaiselle kauppasopimukselle, joka toisi lisää työpaikkoja ja hyvinvointia Vietnamiin ja Eurooppaan. On Euroopan etu saada kauppasopimus nopeasti voimaan, sillä vain näin varmistamme meille tärkeiden standardien toteutumisen.

Helmut Scholz, *im Namen der GUE/NGL-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar, liebe Berichterstatterin! Meine Fraktion begrüßt das Abkommen für nachhaltige Forstwirtschaft mit Vietnam. Es kann sich zu einem internationalen Vorbild entwickeln, wie wir die Schaffung von wirtschaftlichen Perspektiven für die Bevölkerung und den Schutz der Natur und des Klimas in Einklang bringen können. Das ist ein wichtiger Baustein für das Erreichen der Nachhaltigkeitsziele der Vereinten Nationen bis 2030, gerade in Südostasien. Vietnam hat noch einen schwierigen Weg vor sich, den Handel mit illegal geschlagenem Holz tatsächlich zu unterbinden und das Abkommen umzusetzen. Es muss auch die bestehenden Routen für illegales Holz aus Laos und Kambodscha durch Vietnam umfassen.

Wir sollten unsere FLEGT-Partner in Asien und Afrika bei ihrer Arbeit mit Expertise und Finanzmitteln stärker unterstützen, denn die FLEGT-Programme haben den illegalen Handel um 20 % reduzieren können. Aber noch immer muss die UNO den Verlust an Steuereinnahmen durch illegalen Holzhandel auf 15 Milliarden pro Jahr beziffern. Noch schwerer wiegen die Schäden für Artenvielfalt und Klima.

Deshalb sollte die EU-Kommission auf die Kooperation unserer Handelspartner drängen, Raubbau als Geschäftsmodell zu zerschlagen und wirksam nachhaltige Holzwirtschaft in Südostasien zu fördern.

Doru-Claudian Frunzuliță (S&D). – Mr President, I would like to underline the fact that Vietnam is the European Union's second largest trading partner in the Association of South-East Asian Nations and also one of the most dynamic emerging countries in the East Asia region. This agreement follows on from many previous forest law enforcement governance and trade agreements with countries in Africa and Indonesia, and it builds on the work of the EU Timber Regulation.

As a Member of the Committee on Development, I have to stress here that I support this agreement. The issue of indigenous communities must also be kept in mind. As we know, indigenous communities are often heavily reliant on forests, and very often are the victims of environmental exploitation. It is important to ensure that the agreement complements the EU commitments to environment protection. We do not want these agreements to be seen as a framework for large-scale exploitation of forests. There must be coherence between the agreements and our commitments to prevent mass deforestation.

Procedura «catch the eye»

Νότης Μαρτιάς (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, το Βιετνάμ είναι από τους μεγαλύτερους παραγωγούς ξυλείας στον κόσμο και, βεβαίως, σημαντικός εμπορικός εταίρος της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης. Η εθελοντική αυτή συμφωνία πραγματικά, εάν τηρηθεί και εφαρμοστεί σωστά, θα μπορεί να συμβάλει στην αντιμετώπιση της λαθροϋλοτομίας. Είναι σίγουρο ότι θα πρέπει να σταματήσει η αποδάσωση, να στηριχθούμε στις προσπάθειες οι οποίες πραγματικά ενισχύουν περιβαλλοντικές συνθήκες που διασφαλίζουν την αντιμετώπιση των προβλημάτων της κλιματικής αλλαγής.

Βεβαίως, υπάρχουν πολλά προβλήματα, διότι γίνεται παράνομη εισαγωγή ξυλείας στο Βιετνάμ από την Καμπότζη και αυτό οφείλεται σε μεγάλο βαθμό και στη διαφθορά η οποία υπάρχει στα τελωνεία, στις τελωνειακές αρχές του Βιετνάμ. Εάν αυτό δεν αντιμετωπιστεί, προφανώς δεν θα μπορούσαμε να έχουμε μία σοβαρή και ορθή εφαρμογή της συμφωνίας την οποία βλέπουμε. Επομένως, είναι θέμα τήρησης εκ μέρους του Βιετνάμ των όρων και των προϋποθέσεων της εθελοντικής αυτής συμφωνίας.

Dobromir Sośnierz (NI). – Panie Przewodniczący! Cieszę się z tej rezolucji. Moi wyborcy w Polsce są bardzo zainteresowani sprawą lasów w Wietnamie. Ludzie w moim kraju takich debat słuchają z wypiekami na twarzach po prostu. Połowa jest za ograniczeniem kontyngentów z Kambodży, połowa jest przeciw, więc teraz z wypiekami na twarzy właśnie kibicują tej naszej debacie. Jest to lepsze niż mi Liga Mistrzów. Naprawdę warto płacić podatki na ten Parlament.

Ale nie tylko wyborcy – umówmy się, nie ukrywajmy tego – cały świat nadstawia uszu, co Unia Europejska ma do powiedzenia w kolejnej swojej rezolucji. Cieszę się, że tu jest siedmiuset pięćdziesięciu takich mędrców, którzy na wszystkim się znają, na każdy temat mają coś mądrego do powiedzenia, nie ma dla nich ten świat żadnych tajemnic, nie mają w słownikach takiej frazy, jak „nie wiem”.

Zdaję sobie sprawę, że ja tutaj zaniżam poziom. Zdaję sobie sprawę, że mogę tylko świecić światłem odbitym od Państwa, ale mimo to cieszę się z takiej możliwości. Jest jedna prośba – zbiory miodu w Paragwaju. Polscy wyborcy na ten temat bardzo czekają. Nie udało się w tej sesji, mam nadzieję że w kolejnej się uda, tak że brawo – idziemy do przodu, liczę na to, ciśniemy, super.

(Fine della procedura «catch the eye»)

Andrus Ansip, *Vice-President of the Commission*. – Mr President, I would like to thank the honourable Members for their support and for bringing the Commission's attention to their concerns about the implementation of the Agreement and the situation on the ground in Vietnam.

There was a question about the regional initiative dimensions. There is a voluntary partnership agreement process with Laos, a dialogue with Cambodia, and a bilateral cooperation mechanism with China, where the legality of timber is a priority. We are also having a dialogue with Japan.

The messages that I have heard today are clear: we must work with our Vietnamese partners to set out an ambitious course for this Agreement to be implemented effectively. I can assure you that the Commission is committed and ready to do this. At the same time, the Commission looks forward to building on the positive experience with the Voluntary Partnership Agreement on forest law enforcement, governance and trade in the context of our broader relationship with Vietnam. This includes our future EU-Vietnam trade and investment agreements and the EU-Vietnam Partnership and Cooperation Agreements. The Commission will of course be happy to inform the Parliament on progress in the implementation of the Voluntary Partnership Agreement with Vietnam and on how the points raised in the resolution are being addressed.

Finally, I would like to recall that, by giving your consent, you are not only supporting this Voluntary Partnership Agreement. You are also reaffirming the importance and relevance of the Forest Law Enforcement, Governance and Trade Action Plan, which since 2003 has shaped the EU's fight against illegal logging – a significant driving force behind deforestation.

This support is valuable to us as we see this Action Plan as a prime example of environment, development and trade policies acting in a mutually supportive way. We also need this kind of policy coherence to address broader deforestation challenges, and it will guide our approach as we further develop our policies in this area.

Heidi Hautala, *Rapporteur*. – Mr President, I want to thank you, Commissioner, and your colleagues. We did a great job together, and it is a pleasure to see that the whole Parliament is likely to support this Voluntary Partnership Agreement between the EU and Vietnam. This is probably the most effective trade instrument we have in order to combat the negative developments that are making it impossible to implement true sustainable development.

So let us use this instrument and see that there is, as the Commissioner and colleagues have pointed out, this regional dimension: we have to be aware that Southeast Asia is one of the three hot spots of deforestation in the world. The second is the Congo Basin and the third one is Latin America.

In all these areas, we have Voluntary Partnership Agreements under way. I expect the Commission to take the recent revelations of organised crime, illegal logging and illegal timber trade in Southeast Asia extremely seriously. This has been shown by the Environmental Inspection Agency in Myanmar, and we now have credible allegations that Vietnam has started to replace imports from Cambodia with imports from the DRC. The DRC is something that we have to look into in terms of the illegal timber trade.

I am very happy to hear from the Commission that it will inform the European Parliament about the different steps in the implementation of this Voluntary Partnership Agreement. I believe that the two committees that have been most involved – the Committee on International Trade and the Committee on Development – will gain more and more interest in this instrument. Thank you very much and I hope that tomorrow we can ratify the agreement and the accompanying non-legislative resolution.

Presidente. – La discussione è chiusa.

La votazione si svolgerà martedì 12 marzo 2019, alle 12.30.

22. Europejska inicjatywa obywatelska (debata)

Presidente. – L'ordine del giorno reca la relazione di György Schöpflin, a nome della commissione per gli affari costituzionali, sulla proposta di regolamento del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio riguardante l'iniziativa dei cittadini europei (COM(2017)0482 - C8-0308/2017 - 2017/0220(COD)) (A8-0226/2018).

Alain Lamassoure, rapporteur suppléant. – Monsieur le Président, mes premiers mots seront pour exprimer ce qui est le vœu de l'ensemble de notre assemblée, qui est que notre collègue György Schöpflin, qui est actuellement hospitalisé pour une grave maladie, se rétablisse promptement et complètement.

Je rappelle que l'initiative citoyenne européenne a pour but de donner aux citoyens, s'ils sont suffisamment nombreux et viennent d'un quart des pays européens, un droit d'initiative politique comparable à celui dont dispose ce Parlement, à travers les résolutions que nous votons chaque mois et dont dispose le Conseil des ministres: la possibilité de saisir la Commission européenne pour l'inviter à légiférer dans un domaine nouveau, à cesser de légiférer ou à modifier une législation antérieure.

Le premier règlement que nous avons adopté il y a quelques années pour servir de base juridique au système s'est révélé assez décevant, puisqu'il n'y a que quatre initiatives citoyennes qui ont abouti jusqu'à l'ultime phase du processus. C'est pourquoi nous avons remis l'ouvrage sur le métier et, en bonne entente entre la Commission européenne, le commissaire Timmermans, et la commission des affaires constitutionnelles, nous avons mis au point une nouvelle proposition, qui a donné lieu à un accord de trilogie, et cet accord a été approuvé en commission des affaires constitutionnelles par 18 voix pour, aucune voix contre et seulement trois abstentions.

Le nouveau cycle de vie, qui est ainsi introduit dans cette réglementation de l'initiative citoyenne, essentiellement à l'initiative du Parlement, permet un processus plus simple, plus accessible, moins coûteux et plus transparent, il instaure la possibilité d'un enregistrement partiel d'une initiative citoyenne dont le but initial risquerait de sortir des limites du traité, il oblige la Commission européenne à présenter ses conclusions juridiques et politiques dans un délai limité à six mois, et il oblige aussi – et les ONG concernées y tenaient beaucoup – le Parlement européen à organiser un débat avant que la Commission européenne se prononce dans le cadre de ses responsabilités; enfin, il donne la possibilité au Parlement d'adopter une proposition de résolution.

Vous vous souvenez que notre Parlement a modifié son règlement intérieur pour rendre cette possibilité effective. La révision du règlement assure par ailleurs une meilleure transparence du financement. Elle instaure des points de contact, un registre en ligne permettant au groupe d'organisateur de gérer leur initiative tout au long de la procédure et, prévoyant d'ici 2020, la Commission mettra en place un système central pour la collecte en ligne des déclarations de soutien. Ce système existe déjà, mais est simplement optionnel. Il devrait être entièrement finalisé d'ici l'année prochaine. Il est aussi gratuit. C'était là une des demandes de simplification et de concours technique de la part des ONG avec lesquelles nous avons travaillé. Il semblerait que d'autres ONG ou d'autres personnes se soient, au tout dernier moment, inquiétées de cette procédure, mais il n'y a pas lieu de remettre en cause le contenu de ce trilogue.

Partant, au nom de la commission des affaires constitutionnelles, je recommande formellement à notre assemblée plénière de confirmer l'excellent accord qui a été obtenu en trilogie.

Presidente. – On. Lamassoure, mi unisco ai Suoi auguri nei confronti dell'on. Schöpflin, che conosco molto bene come collega di commissione. Mi auguro e ci auguriamo tutti che possa prontamente tornare qui con noi in buona salute.

Andrus Ansip, Vice-President of the Commission. – Mr President, this debate concludes the revision process of the European Citizens' Initiative, one of the political priorities of the Juncker Commission. It allows one million people to invite the Commission to make a legal proposal on a topic that matters to them. Since the scheme became operational almost seven years ago, more than nine million people have signed the Citizens' Initiative. As such, the initiatives are an important instrument to promote and stimulate their participation in the democratic life of the European Union, allowing them to initiate European debates and help set the agenda of EU institutions.

Two pending Commission proposals are in direct response to citizens' initiatives. The proposed revision of the Drinking Water Directive, now under discussion, and the proposal on transparency and sustainability of risk assessment in the food chain, where the institutions have reached a political agreement. The Commission has proposed a revised regulation for the European Citizens' Initiative to realise its full potential. It is essential that people are helped and further encouraged to use this instrument without unnecessary obstacles or burdens standing in their way.

The text agreed between Parliament and Council will make the European Citizens' Initiative more accessible and user-friendly at all stages of the cycle. It will offer more opportunities for initiative organisers to receive support and advice, in particular, through an online collaborative platform and contact points in Member States. It will help organisers by improving the registration process and giving them a more flexible timeline to start their campaigns.

The Commission will provide organisers with a free service for the online collection of signatures. It will simplify the personal data that people have to provide in order to sign. Everyone will be able to sign no matter where they live. There will also be more time and, therefore, awareness raising, engagement and debates on successful initiatives before the Commission replies.

The Commission regrets that some of the objectives which it wanted to pursue in this reform and which it shared with Parliament could not be fully achieved. In the end, it was not possible to lower the participation age from 18 to 16 across the EU. However, each Member State has the possibility to lower it for their own citizens if they wish to do so. We hope that many will do this because the voices of younger generations deserve to be heard.

In addition, while the new regulation introduces a central online collection system that the Commission provides for free, we would have preferred to retain the option for organisers to use their own systems if they wish. As a compromise between co-legislators, this possibility will be phased out by the end of 2022. However, I would like to stress that the Commission is fully committed to delivering a high-quality central system, which we will develop in close consultation with stakeholders.

All in all, I believe we have already delivered on our objective to make the European Citizens' Initiative more accessible, less burdensome and easier to use. I would like to thank the European Parliament, particularly the rapporteur, Mr Schöpflin, for its continued commitment to reforming the European Citizens' Initiative and its contribution to achieving this very positive outcome.

Ангел Джамбазки, докладчик, комисия по култура и образование. – Уважаеми г-н Председател, уважаеми г-н Комисар, най-напред в качеството си на докладчик по становището на комисията по култура и образование искам да благодаря на колегата Шьопфлин и на останалите колеги докладчици и докладчици в сянка за спорната работа и доброто сътрудничество. Смятам, че постигнатият резултат след проведените тристранни преговори е балансиран и предоставя на гражданите достъп до една по-организирана и улеснена система за регистриране на гражданската инициатива от тази, която имаме до момента.

Европейската гражданска инициатива е изключително важен демократичен инструмент на Европейския съюз. Тя позволява на европейските граждани да участват директно в създаването на европейските норми и писани правила. Проблемът в сегашната система идва от изключително тромавия и бавен процес за организаторите, който е сложен и за подкрепящите инициативата.

Действително, в основното предложение за промяна видяхме редица положителни промени. Такива са възможността за по-лесна регистрация, по-голяма свобода при избиране на датата за събиране на подписи, както и увеличаване на изискването за изчерпателност на личните данни. Въпреки това ми се искаше да видя по-задълбочена инициатива. Все пак благодаря за вниманието.

Cristian Dan Preda, rapporteur pour avis de la commission des pétitions. – Monsieur le Président, je voudrais tout d'abord féliciter mon collègue Schöpflin pour son travail et souligner le bon climat de coopération avec le commissaire - Timmermans et la présidence autrichienne. Le résultat est satisfaisant.

Notre objectif était de réformer l'initiative citoyenne européenne et d'offrir un outil aux citoyens. Du point de vue la commission des pétitions, le contrat est rempli: les organisateurs d'une initiative auront la possibilité de présenter en détail leurs initiatives dans le cadre d'une audition publique au sein du Parlement. L'intention était ici également de représenter tous les intérêts publics et privés. Nous n'avons pas réussi à convaincre la Commission et le Conseil d'assurer une présence au plus haut niveau de ces deux institutions. À cet égard, nous sommes quelque peu restés dans le flou. Le commissaire Timmermans comme la présidence autrichienne étudient la question et nous espérons malgré tout obtenir la présence du président de la Commission ou d'une personne de très haut rang, par exemple un ministre de la présidence tournante du Conseil.

Pál Csáky, a PPE képviselőcsoport nevében. – Tisztelt Elnök Úr! Fontos pillanat ez a mostani az európai demokrácia számára. Az Európai Parlament és mi, annak képviselői is, a kezdetektől azt mondtuk, javításra és egyszerűsítésre szorul az európai polgári kezdeményezés. Nem hagyhatjuk ugyanis figyelmen kívül az emberek Unióhoz intézett javaslatait. Így válhat csak az Unió a polgárok uniójává, ehhez pedig gördülékenyebb eljárásra és világosabb szabályokra van szükség.

Úgy látszik, mára változik a helyzet. Pár hónap leforgása alatt két ügyben is a kezdeményezőknél adott igazat az Európai Unió Bírósága az Európai Bizottsággal szemben. Két olyan uniós polgári kezdeményezés bejegyzéséről van szó, amelyek az európai őshonos kisebbségek jogainak védelmét erősítik az úgynevezett „minority safe pack”-ról és a „Kohéziós politika a régiók egyenlőségéért és a regionális kultúrák fenntarthatóságáért” című kezdeményezéséről. Korábban a két kezdeményezés nyilvántartásba vételét elutasította a Bizottság. Mára kiderült, hogy tévesen. A safe pack sikeres aláírásgyűjtése megmutatta, mennyire fontos ez a téma az európaiak számára, ugyanis a megkövetelnél jóval több aláírás jött össze. A második bírósági döntés alapján is úgy néz ki, egy újabb aláírásgyűjtési akció indul. Meggyőződésem tehát, hogy az uniós polgárok, ezen belül pedig az őshonos kisebbségek ügyét, továbbra is kiemelten kell kezelni, és ez a kezdeményezés ehhez segít minket.

Sylvia-Yvonne Kaufmann, im Namen der S&D-Fraktion. – Herr Präsident! Die Europäische Bürgerinitiative gibt es jetzt seit fast sieben Jahren. Seit dem Inkrafttreten der Verordnung haben mehr als neun Millionen Menschen eine Bürgerinitiative per Unterschrift unterstützt. Dies zeigt, dass die Bürgerinnen und Bürger dieses Instrument der grenzüberschreitenden partizipativen Demokratie wollen.

Die andere Seite der Medaille ist allerdings, dass leider erst vier Bürgerinitiativen die notwendige Zahl von einer Million Unterschriften in mindestens sieben Mitgliedstaaten sammeln konnten. Die Praxis hat meines Erachtens gezeigt, dass dies nicht in erster Linie an den angesprochenen Themen lag, vielmehr waren die administrativen und technischen Hürden für die Bürgerbeteiligung offensichtlich zu hoch.

Es ist gut, dass wir mit dem Reformpaket nun viele dieser Hürden aus dem Weg räumen. Zum Beispiel können erstens alle EU-Bürgerinnen und -Bürger künftig unabhängig vom Wohnsitz eine Bürgerinitiative unterstützen. Zweitens werden künftig Kontaktstellen in den Mitgliedstaaten Organisatoren bei allen praktischen Fragen beraten. Drittens: Wenn eine eingereichte Bürgerinitiative nur in Teilen rechtlich zulässig sein sollte, kann die Kommission diese nun zulassen, anstatt sie komplett für unzulässig erklären zu müssen. Viertens erhalten Organisatoren mehr Zeit zur Vorbereitung ihrer Kampagnen. Sie können jetzt selbst festlegen, wann sie mit der Unterschriftensammlung beginnen. Fünftens führt unser Parlament künftig zu jeder erfolgreichen Bürgerinitiative eine öffentliche Anhörung durch, um das Anliegen einer Initiative einer größeren Öffentlichkeit bekannt zu machen, und dafür haben wir bereits unsere Geschäftsordnung geändert. Diese und weitere Verbesserungen werden die Bürgerinitiative nutzerfreundlicher machen.

Einen Wermutstropfen gibt es jedoch. Meine Fraktion hat dafür gestritten, die Bürgerinitiative deutlich zu verjüngen, und zwar durch die Absenkung des Mindestalters auf 16 Jahre. Junge Menschen sind politisch sehr interessiert; zurzeit gehen sie gerade bei Wind und Wetter auf die Straße, um ihren Anliegen Gehör zu verschaffen, sei es für eine nachhaltige Klimapolitik oder für ein freies Internet. Sie möchten sich einbringen, und sie sollen das auch tun können. Leider hat sich jedoch der Rat einer Senkung des Mindestalters widersetzt. Von daher ist es zumindest ein Schritt in die richtige Richtung, dass nun den Mitgliedstaaten die Möglichkeit eingeräumt wurde, selbst über das Mindestalter 16 Jahre zu entscheiden. Ich hoffe sehr, dass es dazu eine engagierte öffentliche Debatte gibt und dass es alsbald EU-weit Normalität sein wird, dass junge Menschen Bürgerinitiativen unterstützen dürfen, denn unser Europa braucht die Beteiligung junger Menschen.

Νότης Μαριάς, εξ ονόματος της ομάδας ECR. – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η Πρωτοβουλία Πολιτών είναι μια συγκεκριμένη έκφραση της συμμετοχικής δημοκρατίας και ως εκ τούτου θα πρέπει να ενισχύεται στο πλαίσιο της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης. Το γεγονός ότι συμμετείχαν μέχρι στιγμής 9 εκατομμύρια πολίτες της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης σε διάφορες πρωτοβουλίες πολιτών δείχνει την μαζική συμμετοχή και το γεγονός ότι ήδη ξεκινά νομοθετική πρωτοβουλία για το πόσιμο ύδωρ δείχνει την επιτυχία της προσπάθειας. Όμως, θα πρέπει η όλη διαδικασία να είναι πιο απλουστευμένη, να μην έχει τον κυρίαρχο ρόλο η Επιτροπή, η οποία είναι αυτή την οποία καλούν οι πολίτες να νομοθετήσει, αλλά η ίδια ελέγχει κατά πόσο οι πρωτοβουλίες είναι ορθές. Ως εκ τούτου, η νέα διαδικασία είναι ιδιαίτερα σημαντική, το συζητήσαμε στην Επιτροπή Αναφορών και φυσικά το δικαίωμα των διοργανωτών να έχουν μια δημόσια ακρόαση και στο Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο νομίζω ότι διευρύνει τη δημοκρατική πλευρά της λειτουργίας. Στηρίζω την προσπάθεια να έχουμε τη μέγιστη συμμετοχή των νέων, 16 ετών νέοι να μπορούν να συμμετέχουν στην όλη προσπάθεια. Το γεγονός ότι δεν το επιτρέπει το Συμβούλιο είναι αρνητικό, όμως τα ίδια τα κράτη μπορούν να δώσουν αυτή την ευκαιρία και πιστεύω ότι η ελληνική κυβέρνηση οφείλει να δώσει την ευκαιρία αυτή.

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

Jean-Luc Schaffhauser (ENF), *question «carton bleu»*. – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, on m'a fait part d'une initiative citoyenne qui a regroupé plus de deux millions de personnes, pour le respect de la vie, de la conception à la mort. Cette initiative citoyenne, que je soutiens également, me dit-on, n'a pas été reconnue, pas acceptée par le Parlement, soi-disant parce qu'elle serait contre les fondamentaux de l'institution. J'aimerais que vous me disiez ce que vous en savez et ce que vous en pensez.

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR), *απάντηση σε ερώτηση με γαλάζια κάρτα*. – Θα ήθελα να πω το εξής: ότι η διαδικασία προβλέπει να υπάρχει και η θέση της Κομισιόν και η θέση του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου. Στον βαθμό, όμως, που υπάρχει διαφωνία, θεωρώ ότι θα μπορούσαν οι αρμόδιοι να προσφύγουν στο Δικαστήριο της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, όπως έγινε και με τις άλλες πρωτοβουλίες και να κριθεί, από εκεί και πέρα, αν αυτό ήταν νόμιμο ή ήταν παράνομο. Σε τελική ανάλυση, η εφαρμογή της νομιμότητας διασφαλίζεται από τις αποφάσεις του Δικαστηρίου της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, στο οποίο μπορούν να προσφύγουν οι αρμόδιοι.

Izaskun Bilbao Barandica, *en nombre del Grupo ALDE*. – Señor presidente, señor comisario, mejorar y facilitar el ejercicio de la iniciativa ciudadana europea es una contribución a la democracia y al necesario acercamiento de la ciudadanía a los asuntos europeos. Es una buena noticia constatar que muchas de las mejoras que se han introducido en este informe para hacer más útil, accesible y sencillo el ejercicio de este derecho proceden de los propios ciudadanos.

Lo digo además desde el conocimiento de haber vivido muy de cerca el proceso seguido por una de estas iniciativas, Minority Safe Pack, que ha conseguido el número mínimo de firmas necesarias en doce Estados miembros para presentarla para su toma en consideración. Lo propuesto responde a las dificultades que viví tan de cerca. Espero que las mejoras incrementen el número de iniciativas que se plantean, el de ciudadanos que se implican en promoverlas y el de las que se admiten a trámite.

Es una buena idea que sobre las iniciativas se celebren audiencias públicas en el Parlamento, que se debatan en Pleno y se produzca una propuesta de resolución. También es positivo que se flexibilice el plazo del que disponen los proponentes para recoger apoyos y la Comisión para admitir o rechazar las propuestas. Y asimismo que se mejoren objetivamente las plataformas y recursos técnicos de que dispondrán de oficio los proponentes.

Sería buena idea que su régimen lingüístico se adaptase a toda la diversidad cultural de la Unión. Los hablantes de lenguas minorizadas que reivindicaban en el Minority Safe Pack respeto para las mismas comprobaron que las herramientas disponibles no se ofrecían en esas lenguas que son oficiales en varias regiones de los Estados miembros.

Es un problema de sensibilidad y proximidad. Por eso pido que el nivel regional y local adquiera protagonismo en la promoción de este instrumento de participación ciudadana y pueda colaborar en la promoción de este tipo de asuntos.

IN THE CHAIR: PAVEL TELIČKA

Vice-President

Josep-Maria Terricabras, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Mr President, we have been working on the European Citizens' Initiative (ECI) for the past four years. The first drafts could not count on the approval of my group, Greens/EFA, since they were really weak. Now we have come to a final text, which improves enormously on the old ones – even if it is not completely satisfactory.

First I would like to underline the good outcomes of our negotiations even if I repeat things already said by my colleagues. One, now there is a possibility for the organisers to be registered as legal entities. Two, translations of the annexes of the ECIs are included with a reasonable restriction in the number of characters to be translated for free. Three, it will be possible for partial registration. Four, organisers can choose on which date to start. Five, it is possible to collect emails for the purposes of information on a particular ECI. Six, all EU citizens will be able to sign an ECI no matter where they reside. Seven, an extremely important point is the expected follow-up: the European Parliament will make two follow-ups: one after the hearing and one after the communication from the Commission. It is of the utmost importance that the European Parliament gains this presence and intervention.

I have to mention a negative point in relation to what Mr Lamassoure said on this point. Individual online collection systems will only be allowed until the end of 2022 but not beyond this date. That's the reason why the NGOs protested, some of them very strongly. In any case, we also resent very much the backwards step of not allowing the individual online collection system to be available indefinitely.

But at the end of the day if we take a comprehensive look at the file, if we consider gains and losses, we have to accept that the global proposal of the ECI regulations means a very important step forward. That's why I commend to my Group to ...

(The President cut off the speaker)

Barbara Spinelli, a nome del gruppo GUE/NGL. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, per quattro anni ci siamo occupati di uno strumento iscritto nei trattati ma moribondo: l'iniziativa cittadina. Lo sforzo di riesumarlo era l'occasione per dare una prima risposta alle sfide del momento. La vasta crisi della democrazia rappresentativa, l'offensiva dei poteri costituiti contro i corpi intermedi, sindacati o ONG, la domanda di democrazia diretta o partecipativa, una domanda crescente e rischiosa solo quando è inascoltata, come dimostrato dalla Brexit e dal movimento dei gilet gialli.

L'occasione è stata in parte persa e i cittadini stanno mostrando una profondissima delusione. L'ICE è tecnicamente migliorata: il Parlamento potrà valutare le iniziative coronate da successo. Ma il potere di dar seguito legislativo è monopolizzato dalla Commissione e anche la raccolta di firme è nelle sue mani. I sistemi individuali di raccolta, seppure molto efficaci, saranno aboliti. È un ennesimo schiaffo alle ONG. È come se avessimo costruito uno *smartphone* più accessibile, ma che bloccasse le chiamate. *User-friendly* non *citizen-friendly*.

L'iniziativa cittadina non viene uccisa, fortunatamente, ma resta in coma. I poteri costituiti dell'Unione si barricano chiudendo le porte alla partecipazione cittadina nel preciso momento in cui glorificano il demos europeo. Non è un...

(Il Presidente toglie la parola all'oratrice)

Eleonora Evi, a nome del gruppo EFDD. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, con la modifica del regolamento sull'iniziativa dei cittadini europei, anche secondo me abbiamo sprecato un'occasione per avvicinare i cittadini alle istituzioni europee. Anziché potenziare uno strumento creato per arginare quel deficit democratico che caratterizza l'attuale Unione europea, il compromesso raggiunto tra il Parlamento e il Consiglio per certi versi indebolisce questo strumento.

Ad oggi, in base ai limiti imposti dai trattati, non sussiste alcun obbligo per la Commissione europea di presentare una proposta legislativa sul tema oggetto dell'iniziativa dei cittadini, anche se essa presenta tutti i requisiti previsti dal regolamento. Se il compromesso raggiunto dovesse essere quindi confermato, non solo la richiesta proveniente direttamente da un milione di cittadini potrebbe ancora essere ignorata o aggirata, ma verrebbe addirittura cancellato il sistema di raccolta firme individuale, gestito direttamente dagli organizzatori di un'ICE, che è risultato fino ad oggi fondamentale per rendere la raccolta firme più agevole nell'alimentare il dibattito e la consapevolezza pubblica sui temi oggetto di un'iniziativa.

Avremmo potuto anche dare più forza a questo strumento nel pieno rispetto dei trattati, portando a tre il numero di audizioni previste per ogni ICE: una durante la raccolta firme, un'altra al raggiungimento del milione di firme ed infine una di *follow-up*, e non per mezzo di una semplice modifica del regolamento interno del Parlamento europeo. Ciò avrebbe permesso di dare maggiore risalto alle istanze che provengono dai cittadini. E invece a prevalere è stata l'arroganza di chi crede che le migliori idee per migliorare la nostra Unione siano per forza quelle che provengono dai palazzi di Bruxelles.

La Commissione resta inoltre giocatore e arbitro in questo processo. Un ruolo che le permette di fatto di scegliere le proposte che vanno sottoposte, sfuggendo così a qualsiasi tipo di *accountability* da parte dei cittadini e dando a questi la sensazione che quella dell'ICE sia una partita truccata fin dal principio.

Possiamo ancora rimediare ed è per questo che domani chiederemo all'Aula di poter votare gli emendamenti che abbiamo presentato per riaprire i negoziati e per giungere ad un testo che finalmente valorizzi questo importante strumento di democrazia diretta.

Carlos Coelho (PPE). – Senhor Presidente, Senhor Comissário, caros Colegas, pertenço à maioria neste Parlamento que não aceita uma Europa limitada ao mercado comum. Queremos a Europa das pessoas, a Europa dos cidadãos. A cidadania europeia é a pedra angular do projeto europeu.

Uma das inovações mais importantes do Tratado de Lisboa foi, sem dúvida, a iniciativa de Cidadania Europeia. Pretendemos reforçar a democracia europeia, estimular a participação dos cidadãos e aproximar eleitos e eleitores. Desde então, participaram já mais de nove milhões de europeus provenientes de todos os Estados-Membros, incluindo mais de 100 mil portugueses.

Sejamos claros. Não basta este instrumento. Precisamos de muito mais para reforçarmos a Europa dos cidadãos, para combater a apatia e a abstenção e para prevenir o surgimento de preocupantes derivas populistas.

Mas podemos e devemos melhorar esta iniciativa de Cidadania Europeia, simplificando-a, disponibilizando mais meios e acentuando a obrigação de agir da Comissão Europeia. A preocupação reforçada relativamente à transparência dos financiamentos e o apoio aos organizadores constam igualmente das propostas que vamos aprovar.

Apoio igualmente o apelo para que os Estados-Membros reduzam a idade de participação de 18 para 16 anos. Queremos, Senhor Presidente, que mais cidadãos possam participar e que todos possamos beneficiar do seu interesse e da sua iniciativa, porque mais democracia significa seguramente melhor Europa.

Ramón Jáuregui Atondo (S&D). – Señor presidente, yo creo que el Acuerdo que se somete a votación es un acuerdo interesante porque mejora sensiblemente el mecanismo de la iniciativa ciudadana. En primer lugar, porque favorece que los Estados, inclusive la Comisión Europea, puedan ayudar a los que tienen esta iniciativa.

En segundo lugar, porque hay un sistema oficial de recogida de firmas en línea. En tercer lugar, porque se da más tiempo para la recogida de las firmas. En cuarto, porque los Estados miembros pueden modificar sus leyes para que los mayores de dieciséis años puedan votar y puedan apoyar las iniciativas. Y yo, por último, señalaría la importancia de que el Parlamento Europeo organizará un debate sobre este tipo de iniciativas.

En mi opinión, la corta vida de la iniciativa ciudadana en Europa necesitaba reformas. Las que se han acordado ahora con la Comisión y el Consejo son buenas, y mi opinión es que esto ayudará a que haya más iniciativas y mejor participación ciudadana a partir de ahora.

Jarosław Wałęsa (PPE). – Mr President, although, since 2012, nine million people from 28 countries have already signed a European Citizens' Initiative (ECI), a series of shortcomings still unfortunately impede the full potential of this instrument.

I would like to underline that the updated ECI will benefit from technological improvements, in particular for collecting signatures online and a collaborative platform. All information and the central collection system will be able to be accessed by people with disabilities, for example. What is important, however, is that the Commission will now be able to partially register the initiative in cases where the Commission only has the power to propose legislation. Furthermore, the organisers will have six months after their registration to choose when to start collecting signatures. More flexibility should benefit smaller groups of organisers in particular.

What is most important in this whole process is the fact that the Commission will involve stakeholders in further development and improvements. This system will have superior standards and, most importantly, will be more user friendly. So we are looking forward to implementing all these new features because this is such a great instrument for our citizens.

Catch-the-eye procedure

Fabio Massimo Castaldo (EFDD). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la montagna ha partorito un topolino, di nuovo. La riforma dell'ICE poteva essere una grande occasione per rispondere a una profonda esigenza di partecipazione, a quelle aspettative che la proposta di riforma aveva ingenerato nei cittadini europei. E invece, ancora una volta, il testo uscito dal trilogο frustra queste speranze, le speranze di chi attendeva un'ICE finalmente effettiva ed efficace. Sì, per un vero intervento sulla funzionalità dell'ICE servirebbe una modifica dei trattati per porre fine a quell'assurdo doppio ruolo della Commissione nella verifica di ammissibilità e nella decisione per dare un seguito o meno alle iniziative.

Ma si poteva fare, comunque, molto di più e soprattutto si poteva aprire veramente alla società civile. No, a fronte di aggiustamenti tecnici positivi il testo in votazione addirittura segna un passo indietro, dando un ulteriore monopolio alla Commissione, il monopolio dell'utilizzo e della gestione della piattaforma centralizzata al posto di quelle degli organizzatori, al posto di quelle individuali, che tanto bene avevano funzionato.

Ebbene, io ricordo, in chiusura, le parole di Giorgio Gaber: «La libertà è partecipazione». Date maggiore libertà alla società civile e date libertà ai cittadini europei.

Julie Ward (S&D). – Mr President, I welcome the evaluation of the European Citizens' Initiative (ECI). It's vitally important that all citizens are involved in quality democratic processes such as the ECI, but that also requires citizenship education and an understanding of European values and EU institutions and how each and every one of us can play a role in shaping the future.

The need for better democracy is clear. In the 2016 UK referendum people often did not fully understand what they were voting for, believing themselves to be powerless to shape a better future. Initiatives such as the ECI must be made more accessible to everyone. I particularly welcome the possibility for 16-year-olds to participate and for improved access for people with disabilities. I believe, however, that we must do more. At a recent All Together in Dignity Fourth World event, it was highlighted how poverty acts as a barrier to full citizenship. We must therefore end inequality and social injustice in order to build a more democratic society.

(The President cut off the speaker)

Κωνσταντίνα Κούνεβα (GUE/NGL). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, είναι απαράδεκτο για την Ευρωπαϊκή Πρωτοβουλία Πολιτών να έχουμε τόσες διαφωνίες και τόσες μεθοδεύσεις από ορισμένες πολιτικές ομάδες. Πρόκειται για ένα εργαλείο άμεσης δημοκρατίας. Η Ευρωπαϊκή Πρωτοβουλία Πολιτών θα μας φέρει πιο κοντά στους πολίτες για να ακούσουμε τις φωνές τους και είναι χρέος μας να απαντήσουμε με πράξεις.

Ογδόντα μέρες πριν τις εκλογές είμαστε και βάζουμε τόσα εμπόδια στους πολίτες. Θέλουν να προτείνουν να δημιουργήσουμε νομοθεσία για τα προβλήματά τους – μα τι πιο καλό από αυτό; Αλλιώς γιατί να μας εμπιστευτούν, γιατί να μας ψηφίσουν όταν εμείς δεν τους δίνουμε σημασία; Αδύνατο να ψηφίσουμε το κείμενο ως έχει. Δυστυχώς, οι λίγες προοδευτικές δυνάμεις δεν αρκούν για να ανατρέψουμε το αποτέλεσμα. Να είστε σίγουροι ότι κάποιοι από εμάς θα συνεχίσουμε να παλεύουμε και αυτό μπορώ να σας το εγγυηθώ προσωπικά.

Luke Ming Flanagan (GUE/NGL). – Mr President, 67 European initiatives have been launched. Only four have met all the criteria, which includes the target of one million signatures. Only two have seen the Commission reply with legislative proposals: Water and sanitation is a human right and Stop glyphosate. Out of those two, neither were considered to have reached a satisfactory outcome by the organisers of the petition.

In the case of the 'Stop TTIP' petition, we can clearly see that the Commission refused the initiative because it was counter to their own policy. The Commission gets to be the judge and the judged. This is farcical. But having starved this horse, the Commission now wants to shoot it.

It now wants to make it even more difficult to reach the one million signature target by phasing out one of the options to collect them by 2022. The Commission likes to talk about listening to the citizens. Sadly, though, it does anything but. What it's attempting to do here proves that.

(End of catch-the-eye procedure)

Andrus Ansip, *Vice-President of the Commission*. – Mr President, I would again like to thank the European Parliament for its vital contribution to this reform of the European Citizens' Initiative. It is a major step forward for encouraging citizen participation in the democratic life of the European Union. Throughout this mandate, the Commission has shown that when an initiative is successful, we give it all the political attention that it deserves. Citizens' initiatives now have a very real impact on EU policies and legislation. Europeans will now have an easily accessible and user-friendly tool at their disposal to ask the EU institutions directly to act on the issues that they care about. The revised European Citizens' Initiative Regulation will make it easier for them to make themselves heard.

Alain Lamassoure, *rapporteur suppléant*. – Monsieur le Président, je remercie tous les collègues qui ont participé à cette discussion très intéressante. Notre collègue Terricabras a remarquablement résumé à la fois la valeur ajoutée de cette réforme et les quelques inquiétudes qui ont pu s'exprimer ici ou là.

Je dirais au vice-président Castaldo qu'en fait il y a un malentendu sur le système centralisé auprès de la Commission, car si ce système a été envisagé et accepté dans le cadre du trilogue, c'est précisément à la demande des candidats au lancement de l'initiative citoyenne, qui voulaient absolument assurer une égalité parfaite entre eux. Il sera facile de vérifier que cette centralisation est purement technique et qu'elle garantit la gratuité, la neutralité politique et l'égalité entre tous les lanceurs d'initiatives citoyennes.

Je rappelle qu'à partir du moment où il y a un accord en trilogue, plus aucun amendement n'est politiquement acceptable sans qu'il faille repartir de zéro. Si tel était le cas, le dossier serait renvoyé au Parlement prochain et à la Commission prochaine, et nous ferions attendre les citoyens pendant plusieurs années encore. Ne nous donnons pas l'image d'un Parlement européen qui, pendant cinq ans, a adopté des dizaines de textes législatifs, sauf celui qui a pour ambition de donner un pouvoir nouveau aux citoyens!

President. – The debate is closed.

The vote will take place on Tuesday, 12 March 2019.

23. Stan stosunków politycznych między UE a Rosją (debata)

President. – The next item is the debate on the report by Sandra Kalniete, on behalf of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, on the state of EU-Russia political relations (A8-0073/2019) (2018/2158(INI)).

I would like to inform you that during this debate there will be no catch-the-eye and no blue-card procedure.

Sandra Kalniete, *Rapporteur*. – Mr President, the title of my report is 'On the state of EU-Russia political relations'. It was not an easy task to produce a report on relations in a situation in which the European Union and its associated partners are being attacked by Russian state-sponsored actors that creatively use a wide range of hybrid warfare techniques. As a result, a significant part of the report addresses the resilience of the Union and its ability to deter hybrid threats.

Today, five years after the occupation of Crimea, we stress that there will be no return to 'business as usual' until Russia fully restores the territorial integrity of Ukraine. We need to reassess the basis of our relations with Russia, as it can no longer be considered a strategic partner. The outdated EU-Russia Partnership and Cooperation Agreement should be reconsidered and any future framework for the EU-Russia relationship should be based on the full observance of international law and OSCE principles. The time for nice diplomatic language is over.

Unfortunately, there is no place, space or time for major new cooperation initiatives with Russia. There is very little room for any cooperation so long as Russia continues to occupy parts of Ukraine and hybrid attacks on other European countries continue. We should, however, continue selective engagement with Russia in areas of vital interest to the Union. The global challenges of climate change, energy security, digitalisation, non-proliferation and the fight against terrorism are a few of them.

We should stand firm on sanctions, which should be prolonged for as long as Russian violations of international law continue. I advocate a clear message to Russia regarding the sanctions: 'more for more, less for less'.

As we witness serious deterioration in the human rights situation in Russia, the Council has to move on with adopting a European Magnitsky Act, establishing an individual sanctions regime for human rights violations. The key to a more effective EU policy towards Russia is coherence between internal and external policies. This applies in full to Nord Stream 2, a project that reinforces EU dependency on Russian gas supplies, threatens the EU internal market and is not in line with either European energy or foreign and security policy. It needs to be stopped.

The report's list of recommendations for interaction with Russia is rather limited, but some of them should be mentioned: continued support for people-to-people contacts in general – particularly involving civil society activists and with a focus on young people – and a clear code of conduct concerning airspace used by military and civilian aircraft, in order to reduce the risk of misunderstandings, misinterpretation and misreading of each other's intentions. There can only be political solutions to the conflict in eastern Ukraine and we have to encourage confidence-building measures in the Donbas region across the Line of Contact. The EU has to advance the idea of a UN-led peace operation in this region of eastern Ukraine.

To conclude, I would like to thank my shadow rapporteurs for their team spirit and for the constructive work done on this document.

Tibor Navracsics, *Member of the Commission, on behalf of the Vice-President of the Commission / High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy.* – Mr President, thank you for this opportunity to discuss Ms Kalniete's report and to review our relations with Russia, keeping in mind the EU's five guiding principles set out in 2016.

In April 2018, EU Foreign Ministers shared the assessment that the strategic challenges we face in our relations with Russia will persist for some time. As highlighted by rapporteur Kalniete, central to these challenges remains Russia's violation of international law by the illegal annexation of the Crimean peninsula and the ongoing destabilisation of eastern Ukraine. The dangerous increase in tensions in the Sea of Azov and the Strait of Kerch is another consequence of the illegal annexation.

The Foreign Ministers reconfirmed the relevance of the five guiding principles agreed in 2016 for EU policy towards Russia and highlighted the need to strengthen the resilience of the EU and its neighbours against Russian threats, including hybrid threats.

The EU has responded promptly and proactively, to promote EU values and interests and increase EU resilience in line with the five principles. High Representative Mogherini has personally taken every opportunity to raise the EU's concerns in her meetings with Russian Foreign Minister Lavrov, including the need for progress on the implementation of the Minsk Agreements, the illegal annexation of Crimea and the security situation in both the Sea of Azov and eastern Ukraine.

In February 2019, EU Foreign Ministers reiterated the Union's support for the territorial integrity of Ukraine and its condemnation of the illegal annexation of the Crimean peninsula by Russia. It was also agreed to provide further EU support for Ukrainian regions affected by the situation in the Sea of Azov.

We have also raised with Foreign Minister Lavrov international issues such as Syria. We have stressed the need to preserve the ceasefire in Idlib and prevent another humanitarian emergency.

We are continuing to discuss not only how to support the western workers in their economic development and EU integration efforts but also Iran and Afghanistan, the need to preserve the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty and the importance of Russia's remaining in the Council of Europe.

The report rightly highlights the fact that the space for civil society in Russia is shrinking and human rights defenders face a difficult situation. The EU delegation in Moscow maintains ongoing close engagement with the Russian authorities on human rights issues, including, among others, the situation of human rights defenders, women's rights, gender equality, LGBTI persons and Ukrainian prisoners. EU support has been tireless, through frequent contacts with defenders, high-level demarches, media statements, field visits and trial observation.

In order to strengthen contacts with the Russian people, the EU continues to maintain an intense level of support. Russian citizens continue to be the largest group of recipients of Schengen visas and Russian students are the largest group of beneficiaries of Erasmus+ exchanges.

We will explore further ways to continue to convey the message that the European Union supports the Russian people. We are close to Russia and its people. We share centuries of history and culture, and this will not change, despite any disagreement with the Russian authorities. Russia is an important interlocutor for the EU, and we work well together on various issues, from Iran to the Arctic. Yet we are deeply worried about certain aspects of Russia's behaviour, not only in Ukraine and Syria but also in Salisbury and in relation to the espionage against the Organisation for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW).

Following the attack in Salisbury, and in line with the Council conclusions, we have redoubled our efforts to strengthen EU resilience, including in relation to chemical, biological, radiological and nuclear-related risks, and to continue strengthening our capacity to address hybrid threats.

A new EU regime against the use and proliferation of chemical weapons was set out in October 2018. In January, the Council imposed sanctions under this new regime, and also against the four Russian GRU (intelligence agency) officials deemed responsible for the attack in Salisbury. Work is ongoing to establish a new EU sanction regime to counter cyber-attacks as part of our wider diplomatic toolbox.

We are looking at strengthening our capacity to address the hybrid threats mentioned in the report, including in the areas of cyber-strategy communication and counter-intelligence.

We are also reinforcing our work on tackling disinformation. In December 2018, the EU adopted an action plan against disinformation, responding to the European Council's call for a coordinated response to challenges, particularly with a view to the forthcoming European elections. I know that Parliament will hold a specific discussion about this tomorrow.

I will take this opportunity to highlight our common interest in retaining a realistic and balanced approach towards Russia, as underlined by the report. Despite increased tensions, it is essential for the EU to maintain open channels with Russia on issues of strategic interest for Europe and for the world. We will retain a policy of transparency towards Russia and explore cooperation in areas of mutual interest, such as regional connectivity, while also working to support the resilience of partners in the region.

Cristian Dan Preda, *au nom du groupe PPE*. – Monsieur le Président, tout d'abord, je voudrais féliciter ma collègue Sandra Kalniete, qui a travaillé sur ce rapport et sur l'actualisation très bienvenue des incidents survenus entre l'Union et la Russie du point de vue des relations internationales. Bien sûr, nous avons eu des mauvaises nouvelles, dont nous avons déjà discuté ici (par exemple la situation dans le détroit de Kertch et la militarisation de la mer d'Azov), mais je voudrais plutôt insister sur un autre aspect.

Monsieur le Commissaire l'a mentionné, nous sommes à la veille des élections européennes et nous entendons parler depuis quelques temps déjà de l'influence du Kremlin dans les affaires politiques de nos démocraties. Cette forte présence de la Russie est redoutée et il ne s'agit pas ici d'une question de relations politiques au sens des affaires étrangères. Je vois que la présidence roumaine du Conseil est absente – c'est déjà une habitude – et je m'adresse donc à la Commission. Serait-il possible de clarifier certains points avant les élections européennes: dans quelles démocraties la Russie est-elle présente? Avec quels partis le Kremlin travaille-t-il concrètement? Où l'argent russe est-il investi?

Il serait selon moi préférable que nous disposions de ces informations avant les élections européennes et non pas après, sans quoi nous nous retrouverons dans une situation semblable à celle des États-Unis, où règne une crise post-électorale due justement à cette incertitude. Monsieur le Commissaire, voulez-vous, ou non, nous éclairer sur ces points?

Liisa Jaakonsaari, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Mr President, unfortunately, EU-Russia relations are not in a good shape and the reasons are well known: Russian violations of the principles of international law in Ukraine, the annexation of Crimea, Russia's support for the extreme right and populist national parties and governments in the EU, such as Mr Orbán in Hungary, and the spread of disinformation and fake news.

In such times of tension, it is important to do everything possible to reduce escalations. Unfortunately, this report doesn't serve that purpose. The implementation of the Minsk agreements would demonstrate Russia's goodwill with regard to solving the conflict in eastern Ukraine. We need to engage in consultations with Russia to reduce the risk of misunderstanding. One official platform for such consultations is our interparliamentary dialogue within the EU-Russia delegation. I believe such a dialogue is an important tool just in times of tensions. Therefore, both sides should remove the obstacles for dialogue to take place again.

We need to continue our pragmatic engagement with Russia in areas of common interests and with regard to global governance. The Northern Dimension initiative, cross-border cooperation and the Barents Euro-Arctic Council are good examples for constructive engagement that benefits citizens.

It is really important that we step up the protection of human rights defenders.

For people-to-people-contact, Erasmus+ is highly popular and its funding needs to be increased.

Anna Elżbieta Fotyga, *w imieniu grupy ECR*. – Panie Przewodniczący! Rosja obiecuje, kiedy jest do tego zmuszona. I nie dotrzymuje swych obietnic z chwilą, kiedy zyskuje siłę. Te słowa wymówił 100 lat temu wielki Polak, Józef Piłsudski. Potwierdziły to swoim losem całe pokolenia Polaków i innych narodów mojej części Europy. Współcześnie słowa te potwierdziły się po 2008 r. w Gruzji, po 2014 r. na Ukrainie, na Bliskim Wschodzie, w Arktyce, w Rosji wobec własnego społeczeństwa i bardzo wielu innych miejscach. Popieram raport Sandry Kalniete i bardzo dziękuję za współpracę.

Hilde Vautmans, *namens de ALDE-Fractie*. – Voorzitter, commissaris, ik ben heel blij dat we hier vanavond kunnen spreken over de politieke relaties tussen Europa en Rusland. We moeten het niet onder stoelen of banken steken: de relatie tussen Europa en Rusland is niet goed, en dat is dan waarschijnlijk nog een understatement.

We hebben nu minder contacten met Rusland en we onderhandelen minder met Rusland dan in de tijden van de Koude Oorlog. Dat moet ons toch aan het denken zetten over hoe we verder met deze realiteit moeten omgaan, rekening houdend met het feit dat we al vijf jaar in een politieke impasse van sanctie en tegensanctie zitten. De dialoog is ver te zoeken.

Om uit die impasse te raken, kan ik u zeggen dat de ALDE-Fractie een hele mooie paper heeft opgesteld over een nieuwe Rusland-strategie. Een strategie waarbij wij de volledige EU-Rusland-relatie in een breder perspectief plaatsen. Een strategie die de deur openlaat voor dialoog, want Rusland is en blijft de grote buur van Europa. Een strategie gebaseerd op voorwaardelijk engagement, gebaseerd op het Helsinki-proces van de jaren 1970, via parallelle processen waarbij telkens wanneer er vooruitgang wordt geboekt in één domein, men een samenwerking in een ander domein opstart, waarbij men niet enkel kijkt naar de economische sancties in relatie tot de Minsk-akkoorden. Een strategie waarbij we onvoorwaardelijk de hand reiken – en dat vind ik zelf toch wel heel belangrijk – naar de Russische burgers en het maatschappelijk middenveld.

Weet u, collega's, op dit ogenblik groeit er een hele generatie Russen op met anti-Europese gevoelens. Dat baart mij zorgen, en daarom is het belangrijk dat wij hier in het Europees Parlement een signaal geven, dat we de dialoog moeten bekijken en dat we samenwerking moeten opzetten waar dat nodig is.

Rebecca Harms, *im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident! Auch ich hätte lieber gute Beziehungen zu den Bürgern Russlands. Aber ich weiß auch, was dagegensteht: die Besetzung der Krim, der andauernde Krieg gegen die Ukraine mit inzwischen 13 000 Toten, ein abgeschossenes Passagierflugzeug, das Elend der Menschen im Donbass, die erneute Vertreibung der Krimtataren von der Krim, Schauprozesse in Russland, in denen zurzeit Marinesoldaten der Ukraine mit psychiatrischen Behandlungen bedroht werden. Die Aggression Putins richtet sich nicht alleine gegen die Ukraine, vielmehr waren unsere östlichen Partnerstaaten Moldau und Georgien schon vor dem Krieg gegen die Ukraine von dieser Aggression betroffen. Und wir haben inzwischen festgestellt, dass sich die Aggression auch gegen die Europäische Union richtet. Ich muss sagen, dass für mich die konventionelle und erst recht die atomare Aufrüstung, die Russland systematisch betreibt, diese Aggression gegen die Europäische Union noch unterstreicht.

Die Finanzierung antieuropäischer Parteien auf dem extrem rechten, aber auch auf dem linken Spektrum, Einmischungen in EU-Volksabstimmungen, Cyberattacken, Scharfmacherei in Mazedonien und jüngst auch auf französischen Straßen im Zusammenhang mit den Gelbwesten, Giftmordanschläge – das sind alles keine Einladungen, mit denen Russland dafür werben würde, dass wir zu besseren Beziehungen zurückkehren. Menschenrechtsverletzungen in Russland gegen Bürgerrechtler, oppositionelle Journalisten und Minderheiten sind alltäglich.

Der Europäische Gerichtshof für Menschenrechte, der Europarat und auch das Europäische Parlament haben Entscheidungen getroffen, Entschließungen verabschiedet, die bisher folgenlos geblieben sind. Wir wünschen uns in der Tat ein besseres Verhältnis zu russischen Bürgern. Wir wünschen uns, dass Russland im Europarat bleibt, aber die Bedingungen müssen stimmen.

Helmut Scholz, *im Namen der GUE/NGL-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar!

Die bilateralen Beziehungen EU-Russland sind tatsächlich auf dem niedrigsten Stand seit 1990, und sie taumeln weiter dem Abgrund entgegen. Wir stehen vor einer prinzipiellen Entscheidung: Wie wollen wir Frieden und partnerschaftliche Beziehungen mit Russland im Interesse der Lösung gravierender Probleme auf unserem Kontinent in unmittelbarer Nachbarschaft, Kollegin Harms, der EU und Russland und auch unsere Verantwortung für Konflikte in anderen Regionen der Erde künftig gewährleisten?

Die Erfahrung des 20. Jahrhunderts, aber auch der letzten zwei Jahrzehnte lehren uns: Stabilität und Frieden, Lösungsansätze bei allen unterschiedlichen Interessenslagen beteiligter Akteure sind nicht gegen, sondern nur mit Russland umzusetzen.

Liebe KollegInnen, liebe Berichterstatterin, wir haben beim Bericht darüber diskutiert, ob die Beziehungen auf gegenseitiger Abschreckung basieren sollen. Ich bleibe dabei: Das ist falsch! Wir manövrieren uns immer tiefer in die Sprachlosigkeit und Sackgasse. Angesichts der Spannungen, Rüstungswettläufe und einer wachsenden politischen und militärischen Konfrontation muss zu Differenzen ein sachlicher, kritischer sowie ergebnisorientierter Dialogleitfaden ohne Vorbedingungen in Angriff genommen und entwickelt werden, und dazu gehört auch die Aufhebung der gegenseitigen Sanktionsregime, die es oft statt der parlamentarischen Zusammenarbeit gibt. Die EU sollte ihre durchaus berechtigte kritische Bewertung der Innen- und Außenpolitik Russlands durch eine selbstkritische Analyse ihrer eigenen Politik ergänzen. Und das erwarte ich ebenso von allen politischen Verantwortlichen in der Russischen Föderation.

Jonathan Arnott, *on behalf of the EFDD Group*. – Mr President, I don't support what Russia has done in the Crimea, or its recent actions in the Sea of Azov, and I don't see why anyone who's gay would want to live under a regime that oppresses gay people. I don't want to see Oleg Sentsov still in jail as a political prisoner.

This year, Russia has entered the Open Doors World Watch List, a list of nations which do the most persecution of Christians on the planet, a fact that hasn't made it into the report. I can't believe for one second that Russian officers just happened to be visiting Salisbury Cathedral at the time of the Novichok attack, so don't expect me to have anything positive to say about the Putin regime in Russia.

It seems to me that a large chunk of Russia's foreign policy approach is the nation-state equivalent of trolling. They're trying to provoke us into overreacting to the wrong things, they're trying to wrong-foot us, and it seems to me that in this House some people are falling for it hook, line, and sinker.

And this notion that Russia was meddling in the British referendum campaign is nonsense. During the campaign, Facebook tells us that Russian operatives spent 97 cents – that's US cents, about 80 euro cents – on political advertising, and even that was a mistake because it was material targeted at an American audience that missed. Putin wants to be the villain of the piece. It suits his strategy to do so. It suits the interests of this place to try to claim that there was something up with the British referendum because frankly you don't like the result.

There were indeed some accidental rule breaches on both sides in the British referendum campaign. The pro-EU Lib Dems were fined, the pro-EU Open Britain were fined for rule breaches. Some other allegations were simply not followed up on.

Nothing, though, was material to the outcome as per the UK Court of Appeal ruling of 4 March. There is no evidence that gives rise to any soundly based grounds for believing the outcome of the referendum would have been different if those breaches had not occurred. The very fact that this constant assault on the referendum result and upon British democracy in general is being recycled time and time again, shows a pathological reluctance to accept the will of the British people.

Jean-Luc Schaffhauser, *au nom du groupe ENF*. – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues. Madame Kalniete, vous avez été une enfant du goulag. Je comprends que vous agissiez contre ce système, car vous l'avez subi dans votre chair. J'ai moi-même combattu le système communiste, parce qu'il est essentiellement fondé sur le mensonge. Nous ne devons néanmoins pas confondre deux choses: d'une part un système et d'autre part un pays. Les Russes ont été les premiers à subir également les méfaits du stalinisme. Dans beaucoup d'institutions, le bolchevisme, nous n'en sommes nous-mêmes pas exempts. Par conséquent, lorsque nous adoptons une certaine stratégie vis-à-vis de la Russie, n'y voyez pas une mauvaise main. La France, l'Allemagne, la Tchéquie, la Hongrie, la Pologne, même, y voient quelquefois simplement leur intérêt, et cela va dans le sens de l'Europe. Il serait tout à fait faux, et ce sont des méthodes bolcheviques, que de considérer que les mouvements populistes sont une cinquième colonne... (*le Président retire la parole à l'orateur*).

Tibor Navracsics, *Member of the Commission, on behalf of the Vice-President of the Commission / High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy*. – Mr President, I would like to thank the rapporteur and the honourable Members for their interventions. From this debate, I conclude that we all share a common interest in retaining a united and realistic approach towards Russia. We will continue to look at how best to use all the instruments available to us in strengthening our own resilience, supporting our partners, continuing political exchanges in selected issues and supporting Russian civil society, human rights and democracy, and people-to-people contacts.

May I close by signalling once again my appreciation of Parliament's role in keeping this important issue on the agenda.

Sandra Kalniete, *referente*. – Godātais sēdes vadītāj! Es vēlos pateikties visiem kolēģiem, kas šodien piedalījās apspriešanā. Ir rezignēti jākonstatē, ka, salīdzinot ar līdzīga satura rezolūciju, ko Eiropas Parlaments pieņēma 2015. gadā, Eiropas Savienības un Krievijas attiecības nav uzlabojušās, bet gan pasliktinājušās, un es neredzu nekāda pamata cerībām, ka pārskatāmā nākotnē Kremlis varētu mainīt savu ideoloģiju un stratēģiju, kas vērsta uz Eiropas Savienības destabilizāciju un Krievijas pašizolāciju.

Šajā nedēļas nogalē Maskavā un Voronežā bija plaši protesti pret Kremļa ieceri izolēt Krievijas internetu no pārējās pasaules. Tā ir kārtējā zīme, cik ļoti Putina režīms baidās no informācijas dažādības, jo apzinās, ka atvērtība ir drauds režīma pastāvēšanai. Ja PSRS sabrukums, runājot Putina vārdiem, bija 20. gadsimta lielākā ģeopolitiskā katastrofa, tad Kremļa izvēlētais kurss uz Krievijas valsts un tautas izolāciju var novest līdz lielākajai 21. gadsimta ģeopolitiskajai katastrofai.

Tāpēc mums Eiropā ir jāatmet ilūzijas, ka izdosies atgriezties tajā cerīgajā sadarbības stāvoklī, kas starp Eiropas Savienību un Krieviju veidojās pēc Dzelzs priekšvara krišanas. Diemžēl tas nenotiks tik drīz, katrā ziņā ne Putina valdīšanas laikā. Šī īstenība mums ir jāpieņem un atbilstoši tai jāveido mūsu politika attiecībā ar Krieviju.

President. – The debate is closed.

The vote will take place on Tuesday, 12 March 2019.

Written statements (Rule 162)

Antanas Guoga (PPE), in writing. – Today it is a very symbolic day to have these debates in the plenary. Twenty-nine years ago, on 11th March, Lithuania regained its independence from the Soviet Union and started its freedom and democracy chapter. Therefore, I fully support my colleague Kalniete and her own-initiative report. It is crucial to talk loud about Russia's military interventions into Ukraine's – an independent country's – territory. These cruel, anti-democratic actions are happening right across the European border. Therefore, the EU should express its full support for Ukraine. The EU cannot and should not return to 'business as usual' with Russia until that country fully implements the Minsk Agreement and restores the territorial integrity of Ukraine. This message should be sent to Putin loud and clear. Therefore, I call on the EU to strengthen sanctions for Russia, especially from the economic point of view. Russia's aggression has to be stopped.

Julia Pitera (PPE), na piśmie. – Po pierwsze, chciałabym podkreślić, że Rosja nie wykonała ponad tysiąca wyroków Europejskiego Trybunału Praw Człowieka. Świadczy to o tym, że Rosja nie wypełnia międzynarodowych zobowiązań wynikających ze swojego członkostwa w Radzie Europy. Pojawia się więc pytanie, czy Rosja chce jeszcze w ogóle być częścią cywilizowanego świata?

Po drugie, cieszę się, że Parlament Europejski jasno wzywa państwa członkowskie do zakończenia tzw. programów złotych wiz i paszportów dla najbogatszych, z których korzystają również rosyjscy oligarchowie. „Złote wizy” to programy ułatwień pobytowych dla inwestorów uprawniające obywatela państwa trzeciego do przebywania w danym kraju członkowskim, ale również do swobodnego podróżowania w strefie Schengen. Obecnie wydaje je 20 państw UE: Bułgaria, Chorwacja, Cypr, Czechy, Estonia, Francja, Grecja, Hiszpania, Holandia, Irlandia, Litwa, Luksemburg, Łotwa, Malta, Polska, Portugalia, Rumunia, Słowacja, Wielka Brytania i Włochy. Natomiast „złote paszporty” to programy przyznawania inwestorom obywatelstwa na mniej rygorystycznych warunkach niż zwykle, np. nie trzeba fizycznie przebywać na terenie danego kraju ani mieć z nim innych faktycznych powiązań. „Złote paszporty” są wydawane przez Bułgarię, Maltę i Cypr i kosztują od miliona do dwóch milionów euro. Złote wizy i paszporty stanowią zagrożenie dla UE, ponieważ stwarzają warunki sprzyjające praniu pieniędzy, korupcji i uchylaniu się od opodatkowania oraz mogą osłabić skuteczność sankcji międzynarodowych.

24. Budowanie zdolności UE do zapobiegania konfliktom i mediacji (krótka prezentacja)

President. – The next item is a short presentation of the report by Soraya Post, on behalf of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, on building EU capacity on conflict prevention and mediation (A8-0075/2019) (2018/2159(INI)).

Soraya Post, Rapporteur. – Mr President, the European Union is, at its core, a peace project. As such, we must remain committed to reinforcing our role as a global actor for peace. The main idea of the report is to reinforce the institutional capacities of the EU for conflict prevention and mediation, as well as to increase the role of the European Parliament in this area.

Our most important suggestions are to establish an EU High-Level Advisory Board on conflict prevention and mediation under the Vice President/High Representative. This advisory board will set up a pool of senior political mediators and conflict prevention experts. A High-Level Advisory Board for the EU also reflects what the UN has successfully put in place under the new Secretary-General.

We also need an EU Special Envoy for Peace. There is indeed a need for a clear mandate on how to build and promote peace at all levels in the world. Furthermore, the establishment of additional institutional mechanisms, such as task forces for specific conflict prevention situations, are also important aspects on how to strengthen the institutional capacities for conflict prevention and mediation.

These horizontal mechanisms are a very effective and pragmatic approach to coordinate EU institutional work on the ground. The establishment of a dedicated Council working group on conflict prevention and mediation is also a tool put forward in the report. The Council must put conflict prevention and mediation high on its agenda and step up its work through focused and informed measures.

When it comes to the European Parliament, its growing role in political mediation processes – notably via DEG activities – is more and more recognised. The report also suggests the appointment of a Vice-President responsible for coordinating the mediation and facilitation of dialogue activities. A yearly report to Parliament on the progress made in implementing EU policy commitments on conflict prevention and mediation is also requested. Additionally, I have been clear on the budget issues. If we want the EU to act and to be efficient on conflict prevention and mediation, we absolutely need to ensure that the new MFF will foresee sufficient and earmarked financial resources.

We must also see the fundamental logic of the active work and representation of women with women's experiences, youth and civil society at all stages of conflict prevention and mediation work. This is why I put great effort into mainstreaming the gender perspective in the report, in line with the internationally accepted Women, Peace and Security (WPS) Agenda. This is reinforced by the EU in the conclusions adopted by the Council on women, peace and security just a few months ago, in December 2018.

In their conclusions, the Council recalls the commitment of the European Union and its Member States to full implementation of the WPS Agenda, which consists of UN Security Council Resolution 1325 and its follow-up resolutions, ensuring that the 1325 agenda is fully integrated into all EU policies and efforts. I am very surprised by the fact that gender mainstreaming was not accepted by a majority in the Committee on Foreign Affairs (AFET).

In order to rebalance the report, I have now put forward amendments for the plenary on the following topics: to call for the EU to take a lead role in the implementation of the UN Security Council resolution on women, peace and security; in the systematic establishment of a reconciliation and accountability mechanism; in the establishment of a pool of mediators that includes current and former members of the European Parliament; and in the establishment of a European women's mediator network, and in gender budgeting.

Vystoupení na základě přihlášení se zvednutím ruky

Julie Ward (S&D). – Mr President, on Friday 8 March, we celebrated International Women's Day, so I took the opportunity to reflect on the situation of women in conflict zones who suffer from attacks on their human rights and physical and mental health. On a wider scale, millions of women around the world have been, are, and will be, victims of gender-based violence.

The EU must be at the forefront of preventing and tackling violence against women and must encourage a holistic approach to dismantling all gender-based discrimination and violence, and this must go hand in hand with effective awareness raising and education for men and women on gender equality and human and women's rights. However, none of these tools can be effectively shaped and implemented without the direct involvement of women from all backgrounds, as gender-based violence takes many forms. I believe it's crucial, when building policies to protect women, that we involve many organisations from civil society, who are doing extraordinary work helping women in difficult situations.

Νότης Μαρίας (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η πρόληψη των συγκρούσεων και η διαμεσολάβηση πρέπει να αποτελεί σημαντική δράση της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης μια και αποτελεί έναν διεθνή παίκτη, μια soft power, η οποία οφείλει να δράσει με βάση τις αρχές της ειρηνικής συνύπαρξης. Φυσικά, πρέπει να διαμορφώσει αξίες και αρχές η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση. Βασική αρχή είναι, πρώτα απ' όλα, η εμπέδωση της αρχής της μη επέμβασης στα εσωτερικά κάθε κράτους μέλους. Δεύτερον, του αμοιβαίου οικονομικού οφέλους. Τρίτον, της στήριξης και τήρησης του διεθνούς δικαίου και των αποφάσεων του ΟΗΕ. Τέταρτον, του σεβασμού των ανθρωπίνων δικαιωμάτων. Πέμπτον, της ειρηνικής επίλυσης των διαφορών με βάση τον χάρτη του ΟΗΕ.

Επιπλέον, πρέπει να επιδιώξει την κοινοβουλευτική διπλωματία, διότι με αυτόν τον τρόπο μπορεί πραγματικά να υπάρξει προσέγγιση με άλλα κράτη και να δρομολογηθεί επίλυση διαφορών. Όμως, το πιο βασικό είναι η αντιμετώπιση των αιτίων που προκαλούν τις συγκρούσεις και, φυσικά, πρέπει να υπάρχει μια ανθρωποκεντρική προσέγγιση εκ μέρους της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης.

(Konec vystoupení na základě přihlášení se zvednutím ruky)

Tibor Navracsics, Member of the Commission. – Mr President I would like to warmly welcome the report on building EU capacity on conflict prevention and mediation. As rapporteur Post rightly points out, conflict prevention and mediation are core issues of our daily work, which we are actively prioritising as also spelled out in our Global Strategy.

Today the EU is involved in some 40 mediation and ILO processes worldwide and in some of them the EU is in the lead and its efforts is clearly visible. In other cases, and deliberately so, we are working more discreetly.

In response to the impact of conflicts on our societies, we need to redouble our conflict-prevention efforts and to enhance mediation as a first response to tensions. Conflict prevention and mediation is an important priority for the European External Action Service (EEAS). The ongoing work has, for example, entailed active participation by the EU in the international mediation efforts accompanying the ongoing peace process in Mali. We are also building the capacity of parties in conflict to move towards peace in the Central African Republic.

One further example is our support for women mediators who work at the front lines in Yemen and Syria to play a meaningful role in helping to make peace a reality. At the same time, we work very closely with our regional partners such as the United Nations, the African Union, the OSCE and others, by supporting their mediation work.

As conflicts around the world increase both in number and complexity, we need more than ever to cooperate and complement each other. We also regularly convene meetings with the Member States and invite the European Parliament to share our insights and enhance our collective work by creating a common approach on mediation.

As part of planning to enhance EEAS mediation capacities, an internal pool of mediators which can be deployed on behalf of the EU is being set up. Furthermore, a high-level interinstitutional and mediation taskforce – which should provide guidance for high-profile mediation assignments, risk assessments and enhanced cooperation – is being launched.

It is sometimes difficult to demonstrate the success of mediation and conflict prevention activities that are often conducted discreetly. The demand for mediation and conflict prevention has risen exponentially and the mediation field is developing fast in response to the changing nature of conflicts. The EU shouldn't only want to keep up with the pace of efforts, but should want to lead in this field, and we are working hard to make this possible.

I count on your support to ensure that we will have dedicated and earmarked resources in the next Multiannual Financial Framework to further step up the EU's role in conflict prevention and mediation. Let me commend rapporteur Post and all of you for this important report, which covers the pertinent issues very well. I hope that we will continue to work closely on these matters.

President. – We will of course, Commissioner.

The debate is closed.

The vote will take place on Tuesday 12 March 2019.

Written statements (Rule 162)

Eduard Kukan (PPE), *in writing*. – We had a good chance to make a report, which would give clear instructions to such an important issue as conflict prevention and mediation. The EU needs to have its capacities in these areas ready and checked. We are surrounded by countries, where the skills and methodology in conflict resolution or mediation could not only save lives, but also contribute to a safer, more stable and peaceful environment. Mediation and conflict prevention should become an integral part of our external action. The EU is well known for using soft power, by developing further the framework and methodology and capacities for the mediation work. In this respect we should be enhancing our capacities and improve inter-institutional cooperation and communication. All EU institutions which work in this area should have a common joint approach. As an MEP with substantial experience in mediation, I would like to stress the positive role that the Parliament started to play in facilitation and mediation of political crises. We have good results in Ukraine and North Macedonia through Jean Monnet Dialogues. We should be building up on these successful practices.

25. Jednominutowe wystąpienia w ważnych kwestiach politycznych

President. – The next item is the one-minute speeches on matters of political importance (Rule 163).

Siegfried Mureșan (PPE). – Domnule președinte, anul acesta se împlinesc 30 de ani de la căderea comunismului în Europa centrală și de est, ceea ce a dus și la reunificarea continentului european. În România, spre deosebire de celelalte state din Europa centrală și de est, căderea comunismului s-a soldat cu victime umane, mai mult de 1 100 de persoane și-au pierdut viața în decembrie 1989.

Ceea ce este însă mai puțin cunoscut este că, pe 2 martie 1989, domnul Liviu Cornel Babeș s-a autoincendiat pe o pârtie de schi din România în semn de protest față de regimul comunist și de ororile sale. Pe data de 2 martie 1989, domnul Liviu Cornel Babeș s-a autoincendiat pe pârtia de schi de la Brașov, un loc public, frecventat de mulți turiști străini, ceea ce a făcut imposibilă ascunderea acestui gest de protest de către comuniști. Este foarte important să ne aducem aminte de acest erou martir, căci el a permis și a deschis seria revoluțiilor din 1989, ceea ce a dus la democrație în Europa.

Fabio Massimo Castaldo (EFDD). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, vi porto questa sera la voce dei cittadini delle Marche, la voce di chi confidava in 248 milioni di euro di soldi pubblici e in un asse prioritario di intervento individuato ad hoc per sostenere le zone terremotate delle Marche.

E invece il POR FESR della regione, concordato con la Commissione europea a seguito dei terremoti del 2016 e del 2017, prevedeva che quei soldi andassero prioritariamente all'area degli 87 comuni del cratere, in modo da fornire un sostegno alle popolazioni colpite e alle attività del territorio.

Sappiamo tutti quanto ce ne sia bisogno, ma ci arrivano notizie sconcertanti. Pare che la giunta regionale abbia deliberato di utilizzare gran parte di quei fondi per interventi nel resto della regione. Un esempio su tutti: su 45 milioni di euro stanziati per edifici strategici, per edilizia sanitaria, 23 sono andati fuori dalle zone interessate.

Vogliamo andare a fondo su questa vicenda. Io e la collega Agea presenteremo un'interrogazione alla Commissione per fare luce sulla destinazione di questi fondi. Non è ammissibile che ai danni ingenti si vada ad accumulare anche la beffa. Noi e i cittadini delle Marche vogliamo la verità.

Κώστας Μαυρίδης (S&D). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, πριν λίγες μέρες στην Ανατολική Μεσόγειο εντοπίστηκαν νέα κοιτάσματα φυσικού αερίου, στην κυπριακή ΑΟΖ, στην ΑΟΖ της Κυπριακής Δημοκρατίας. Αυτό δημιουργεί θετικές προοπτικές για υλοποίηση των ενεργειακών σχεδιασμών της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης με ανεξάρτηση από τρίτες χώρες, και για σταθερότητα στην ευρύτερη περιοχή, με κράτη εντός της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, αλλά και κράτη εκτός της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης.

Την ίδια ώρα όμως, η Τουρκία αυξάνει την επιθετικότητα της, με νέες απειλές και διεξάγει στην Ανατολική Μεσόγειο τη μεγαλύτερη ναυτική άσκηση στην ιστορία της, όπως καυχείται. Το τουρκικό Υπουργείο Άμυνας δημοσιοποίησε χάρτη, μάλιστα, παρουσιάζοντας παράνομα την Κυπριακή Δημοκρατία, κράτος μέλος της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, ως προέκταση της Τουρκίας: αυτός είναι ο χάρτης, αυτή είναι η Τουρκία και εδώ είναι η Κυπριακή Δημοκρατία. Σε άλλες περιπτώσεις, επιβάλαμε κυρώσεις – στην περίπτωση της Κύπρου μένουμε στα ψηφίσματα. Πότε θα αντιδράσουμε απέναντι στον επιδρομέα; Για να έχουμε αξιοπιστία, επιβάλλονται κυρώσεις στην Τουρκία και εμπάργκο πώλησης όπλων.

Pál Csáky (PPE). – Tisztelt Elnök Úr! A korrupció veszélyeire és következményeire szeretném felhívni a figyelmet. Attól tartok, hogy sokan ezt csak elméleti problémának tartják, amiről illik elítélő mondatokat mondani, de utána gyakran megelégszünk félmegoldásokkal és azt mondjuk, hogy ez a jelenség kiirthatatlan. Én Szlovákia polgára vagyok, és mint ilyen, döbbenettel kellett tudomásul vennem, hogy a jelenleg is hatalmon lévő kormánykoalíció mennyire munkamódszerként alkalmazza korrupciót. Ez a tolerálás odáig torzult, hogy országunkban megöltek egy újságíró, aki korrupciós ügyeket tárt fel, illetve nyilvánvalóvá vált, hogy bűnözői csoportok újabb gyilkosságokra készülnek egy ügyész, a főügyész helyettesét és a volt igazságügyi minisztert szerették volna megölni. Arra szeretném tehát felhívni a figyelmet, hogy nem elég csupán az egyes visszaéléseket kivizsgálni, hanem szét kell zúzni az alvilág és a politika összefonódását, és el kell kerülni, hogy a korrupció politikai rendszereink részévé váljon. Köszönöm szépen.

Nicola Caputo (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, con l'accordo di Parigi e con l'Emissions Trading System, l'Unione europea ha indicato una rotta chiara, volta alla riduzione delle emissioni climalteranti e nocive per la salute umana. A Taranto, nella città dei due mari, a sud dell'Italia, intanto, si registrano incrementi delle emissioni di idrocarburi policiclici aromatici del 105 %.

A Taranto i bambini muoiono, le scuole chiudono, il diritto all'istruzione e alla salute è negato e si è costretti a scegliere tra lavoro e salute, mentre il governo italiano non segue l'attuazione dell'accordo Ilva, non dà attuazione al contratto istituzionale di sviluppo, non presiede alla verifica dei dati ambientali ed occupazionali e non si attiva per utilizzare le risorse a disposizione dell'amministrazione straordinaria.

Alla Commissione chiedo di sostenere ogni proposta tecnicamente fondata della regione Puglia volta alla sottoscrizione di un accordo di programma per Taranto, simile a quello sottoscritto con la regione di Calais, con il quale erano state impegnate risorse pari a un miliardo di euro per favorire la *low-carbon economy* della regione.

Νότης Μαρτιάς (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, μετά τη θεομηνία και τις πλημμύρες που έπληξαν την περιφερειακή ενότητα Χανίων, ήρθε και η σημερινή άρνηση του Eurogroup να επιστρέψει ένα δισεκατομμύριο ευρώ στην Ελλάδα, από τα κέρδη της Ευρωπαϊκής Κεντρικής Τράπεζας επί των ελληνικών ομολόγων, αποδεικνύοντας έτσι, για άλλη μια φορά, ότι συνεχίζεται η σκληρή εποπτεία της τρόικας και των δανειστών επί του φτωχοποιημένου ελληνικού λαού.

Η Ευρωπαϊκή Κεντρική Τράπεζα κερδοσκοπήσε ασύστολα σε βάρος της Ελλάδας, αγοράζοντας τα ελληνικά ομόλογα με έκπτωση 40 % και στη συνέχεια απαίτησε και πέτυχε την εξόφληση των ομολόγων αυτών στην ονομαστική τους αξία, κερδίζοντας έτσι πάνω από 20 δισεκατομμύρια ευρώ. Σαν να μην έφτανε αυτό, ο Ντράγκι απαιτεί τώρα το ξεπούλημα των κόκκινων δανείων στα κοράκια αντί πινακίου φακής, με αποτέλεσμα οι Έλληνες να κινδυνεύουν να χάσουν τα σπίτια τους. Μόνη λύση η δημιουργία Ταμείου Σωτηρίας Δανειοληπτών με κρατική παρέμβαση, που θα αγοράσει τα κόκκινα δάνεια στην τιμή πρώτης προσφοράς που κάνουν τα κοράκια. Αυτή είναι η θέση και πρέπει να ισχύσει ιδιαίτερα για την περιφερειακή ενότητα Χανίων, η οποία έχει πληγεί από τις πλημμύρες.

Florent Marcellesi (Verts/ALE). – Señor presidente, nos quedan once años para actuar contra el cambio climático, lo dicen los científicos internacionales y miles de jóvenes en las calles, los mismos jóvenes que las derechas se negaron a invitar esta semana. ¡Normal! Se temen que dejen sus clases para darnos una lección magistral.

Los Verdes les hemos vuelto a abrir las puertas del Parlamento que vosotros les habéis cerrado y aquí están, en el Parlamento, exigiendo acción política ante la emergencia climática, porque aún estamos a tiempo para una transición que sea ecológica, justa, rápida, participativa, creativa y ambiciosa, que cree oportunidades sin dejar a nadie atrás y que dé un futuro a nuestra juventud.

Este viernes habrá un 15-M climático en toda Europa y más nos vale escuchar y actuar porque, de lo contrario, como dice Greta Thunberg, seremos recordados como los mayores villanos de esta historia. Y yo me niego, porque quiero poder mirar a los ojos a mis hijas.

Emilian Pavel (S&D). – Domnule președinte, stimai colegi, România are onoarea, dar și capacitatea, de a deține președinția rotativă a Consiliului Uniunii Europene într-o perioadă crucială pentru proiectul european.

Cum ne descurcăm? Dacă înainte de preluarea acestui mandat președintele Iohannis, opoziția, chiar și fostul premier finlandez spuneau că nu suntem pregătiți, astăzi, la puțin peste 2 luni de zile de la preluarea mandatului, toți partenerii europeni apreciază cel puțin trei lucruri. Voința politică și seriozitatea guvernului României și calitatea soluțiilor identificate pentru deblocarea unor dosare cheie. Pe scurt, dorința politică de a duce mai departe proiectul european. În al doilea rând, demonstrăm capacitatea administrativă impecabilă cu privire la organizarea evenimentelor și dezbaterilor din cadrul președinției rotative și pregătirea tehnică a tuturor specialiștilor implicați. Nu în ultimul rând, arătăm adevărata față a țării noastre. România este o țară frumoasă, cu oameni serioși, harnici și proeuropeni.

Iată că ne-am făcut temele și, chiar dacă mai avem patru luni până predăm ștafeta, putem spune că este o președinție reușită. Poate vede și opoziția, poate vede și Iohannis, între o tură de schi și campania electorală pentru încă un mandat.

Kateřina Konečná (GUE/NGL). – Pane předsedající, Česká republika a Polsko jsou již několik týdnů ve sporu. Na počátku aféry je nález salmonely zhruba v 700kilogramové zásilce hovězího masa dodaného do České republiky. Mám úctu ke všem členským státům a zvláště k těm, se kterými jsme ve Visegrádské čtyřce, a proto bych chtěla osvětlit postup České republiky. Považuji za naprosto logické, že české úřady po nálezu přistoupily ke kontrolám polského hovězího masa. To nebyl krok, kterým jsme chtěli svého souseda zlostudit. Šlo pouze o snahu chránit se. Občané České republiky přece nemohou jíst nebezpečné a nekvalitní produkty. Naprosto však odmítám neurvalý způsob, jakým se do věci zapletla EU, která požaduje zrušení kontrol. Česká republika chce pouze důkazy o přítomnosti veterinárního dozoru při porážkách a o dostatečné hygieně provozu během produkce masa. To je zcela racionální požadavek, od kterého není možno ustoupit. EU musí respektovat naše právo a chránit nás a neměla by nás od toho odrazovat.

Marian Harkin (ALDE). – Mr President, tonight the negotiations on what may be the Brexit end game are taking place in rooms below us and all around us. In any negotiations, there may be some need for what we might call constructive ambiguity, but there are red lines that cannot be crossed. In this context, I am heartened by the earlier comments from the chief Parliament negotiator, Mr Guy Verhofstadt, where he once again reiterated his pledge to stand by Ireland and support the Good Friday Agreement.

However, I must say I am somewhat concerned by reports that the implementation of the backstop, which is the insurance policy guaranteeing no hardening of the border in Ireland, may be outsourced to some independent body and that somewhere in that process, the UK might unilaterally walk away from the backstop. We all hope the backstop will never need to be implemented, and if it is, it will be temporary, but that can only happen by agreement. There can be No Houdini-like smoke screen that would ever, ever allow unilateral action by the UK to end the backstop.

Josep-Maria Terricabras (Verts/ALE). – Señor presidente, la semana pasada un grupo español muy, muy de extrema derecha, VOX, obtuvo permiso del presidente Tajani para organizar un acto en el Parlamento Europeo. Pocos días antes, el mismo presidente había prohibido un acto de los presidentes catalanes Torra y Puigdemont por aparentes razones de seguridad.

Hasta el momento, el presidente aún no ha respondido a nuestra petición legítima de poder ver los informes de seguridad mencionados. Los que requieren más seguridad son los de VOX, que en aquella sesión amenazaron a un eurodiputado flamenco, que pasó verdadero miedo, y al que dijeron «tú y yo a este le pegamos».

Ver que el presidente del Parlamento confía más en VOX que en los presidentes catalanes democráticamente elegidos me alarma por si es presagio de un futuro más negro en esta casa. Espero que no. Como espero que se pueda vivir aquí con otros dirigentes, con otros criterios y, desde luego, con menos extrema derecha aceptada y reconocida. Pero no sé si tendremos tanta suerte.

Urszula Krupa (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! W ostatnich latach pogorszyła się sytuacja chrześcijan. Według danych organizacji Pomoc Kościołowi w Potrzebie 200 milionów chrześcijan cierpi z powodu brutalnych prześladowań, 350 milionów doznaje różnych form dyskryminacji. W 2018 roku śmierć poniosło czterdziestu misjonarzy i misjonarek.

W styczniu w Strasburgu głosowaliśmy nad sprawozdaniem na temat wytycznych Unii oraz mandatu specjalnego wysłannika w sprawie propagowania wolności religijnej poza Unią. Jednak także jako chrześcijanie mieszkający w Unii Europejskiej jesteśmy zmuszeni do obrony, zwłaszcza z powodu regulacji i dokumentów wydawanych przez ONZ i Parlament Europejski, propagujących tak zwane zdrowie seksualne i reprodukcyjne z wymuszaniem edukacji seksualnej wieku dziecięcego, legalizacją aborcji, środków antykoncepcyjnych i akceptacją związków jedнопłciowych, które dla katolików są nie do przyjęcia jako przeciwne naturze i Panu Bogu.

Zmuszanie do realizacji tak skonstruowanego prawa nosi znamiona przemocy i prześladowania, dlatego apeluję o wolność i poszanowanie praw. *(Przewodniczący odebrał mówczyni głos)*

Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu (S&D). – Domnule președinte, stimați colegi, în data de 20 februarie, România a făcut un nou pas important prin adoptarea directivei drepturilor de autor în piața unică digitală, un act legislativ care a constituit unul dintre cele mai dificile dosare aflate în discuție la nivel european.

Acordul statelor membre obținut de România în cadrul reuniunii Comitetului Reprezentanților Permanenți demonstrează faptul că România a reușit să obțină un compromis echitabil, care va permite modernizarea cadrului legislativ actual în materie de drepturi de autor, în linie cu evoluțiile de pe piața digitală. Prin obținerea acestui acord, guvernul României demonstrează că, în pofida tuturor alegațiilor, este un guvern capabil să se achite cu brio de sarcinile președinției rotative a Consiliului Uniunii Europene.

Miguel Urbán Crespo (GUE/NGL). – Señor presidente, hace un año condenamos en este Pleno el asesinato de la concejala del PSOL Marielle Franco. Un año después, seguimos sin justicia.

Este no fue un crimen cualquiera, fue un adelanto de la amenaza homófoba y racista que sacude hoy Brasil. Exigimos que las autoridades garanticen una investigación imparcial y que identifiquen a los autores intelectuales del crimen de Marielle Franco. Exigimos el cese de la violencia y la persecución política en Brasil. Exigimos protección para el resto de los líderes sociales y políticos en Brasil perseguidos por defender los intereses de las clases populares.

El Estado brasileño debe ser responsable de la seguridad de todos los representantes políticos y los defensores de los derechos humanos. Defender la justicia para Marielle es asegurar que ninguna compañera más sea agredida o asesinada.

Desde el Parlamento Europeo nos queremos unir al grito de «¡Marielle presente!».

Julie Ward (S&D). – Mr President, I believe that healthcare is a universal right. However, Brexit has put that common good in jeopardy for EU nationals in the UK and for British nationals who live in the other 27 Member States. I welcome the UK's belated initiative, which requires my Government to seek a joint UK-EU commitment to preserving citizens' rights in the withdrawal agreement, whatever the outcome of negotiations. This would ensure that our families can continue to access healthcare and social security as before. The Commission has recommended that Member States adopt a generous approach, but I implore national governments to go further and guarantee those rights – because they are founded on European values. Finally, a word about the mental health of people whose lives have been made unbearable because of Brexit uncertainty. As Theresa May dines with Mr Juncker tonight, she would do well to reflect on her role in destroying the well-being of millions.

Ana Miranda (Verts/ALE). – Senhor Presidente, o assassinato de uma mulher, ontem, no meu país, fez com que mudasse o tema da minha declaração porque as mulheres param para o mundo como aconteceu a 8 de março, em que milhões de mulheres saímos às ruas para lembrar que os nossos direitos não são negociáveis, para defendê-los e para lutar contra a desigualdade.

Nós somos as filhas, as netas, as irmãs, as vizinhas e amigas daquelas que sofrem a violência machista. Vivemos num mundo de preconceitos que desacredita a nossa palavra. Vivemos em alerta quando voltamos ao lar sozinhas. Sofremos a causa laboral por ser mulheres, temos menos salários e menos reconhecimento pelo nosso trabalho.

O nosso corpo é política porque queremos decidir por ele, por nós mesmas. Queremos fazer-nos invisíveis e silenciar a nossa voz como silenciamos as duas mulheres assassinadas na última semana. Isto é violência de género que alguns partidos políticos queremos negar. E o Parlamento Europeu deve continuar a clamar por um investimento para a luta contra a violência de género.

Răzvan Popa (S&D). – Domnule președinte, stimați colegi, Uniunea Europeană înseamnă acces la dezvoltare, dar și respect pentru toate statele membre. Cu toții suntem preocupați de viitorul Uniunii Europene, iar alegerile care vor avea loc în curând trebuie să fie o dovadă că acest proiect poate recâștiga încrederea primită din partea oamenilor. Uniunea Europeană trebuie să însemne o viață mai bună pentru cetățenii ei, mai multă libertate, echitate și prosperitate, nu frică și nici teroare. Europeanii trebuie să simtă că fac parte dintr-o familie, ca au valori comune, dar care le sunt respectate și particularitățile.

Privesc cu încredere semnalul președintelui Macron, care anunță că Uniunea este un proiect de care trebuie să beneficieze toți cetățenii europeni, iar toate statele membre trebuie să aibă aceleași drepturi. Este un semnal care anunță o Uniune fără cercuri concentrice sau inegalități între țările membre și este foarte important că se repune pe tapet problema securității sociale a cetățenilor europeni.

Doar în felul acesta, ascultându-i pe toți, luând în considerare toate argumentele, fără a bloca sau amenința, putem pune capăt evoluțiilor nefericite ale Uniunii Europene.

Rory Palmer (S&D). – Mr President, one of the most moving places I have visited is the Holocaust Memorial in Berlin, the memorial to the murdered Jews of Europe. When I visited several years ago, I could not have imagined that today, several years on and well into the 21st century, anti-Semitism would have again become a cause of deep worry, fear and dread in Europe.

The difficult, sickening truth is that it has, and it is. It is doing so in the most grotesque, frightening and upsetting ways possible: significant increases in anti-Semitic incidents across Europe in recent years. The Fundamental Rights Agency's report on this last year shows conclusions that are alarming and frightening beyond words.

This vile hatred in all its forms must be confronted online, on the right, on the left, inside political parties, across political debate and in wider society. We must be uncompromising, unrelenting, tenacious and urgent in our response.

Gerard Batten (ENF). – Mr President, Ms May has arrived in Strasbourg this evening for yet another meeting with Mr Juncker. How many times will she plead for the worst possible terms she can get? The last two years and nine months have been an elaborate charade designed to propagandise the British people into believing that leaving the EU is just too difficult, and this is just the latest scene in the drama.

We are being positioned, at best, for a sham exit. This whole process has been about arriving at a so-called deal whereby we leave in name only. If our treacherous Prime Minister and political class cannot prevent Brexit altogether, they at least intend to position us for re-entry as quickly as possible. Whatever betrayal agreement Ms May agrees, it will not be the end of the story. It will just begin the next phase of the British people's struggle to leave the European Union.

Lynn Boylan (GUE/NGL). – Mr President, 400 000 households in Ireland are in fuel poverty. Deprivation levels for single-parent families have doubled over the last five years, yet we have talk of a hike in a carbon tax.

A carbon tax is a false solution and a distraction. All the while corporate polluters are let off the hook and continue to extract fossil fuels. Is it any wonder that companies like BP, Shell and ExxonMobil are fans? Rapid, far-reaching and unprecedented change is what the IPCC report called for, and instead we are discussing carbon tax top-ups that punish ordinary families. Instead, we should be closing the corporate tax loopholes and introducing a wealth tax to frontload the investment in sustainable alternatives and set a timeline for fossil fuel phase-out.

Gilles Lebreton (ENF). – Monsieur le Président, la presse française vient de révéler que presque tous les partis politiques européens, à l'exception de l'ENL, sont financés par des multinationales. C'est notamment le cas du parti centriste de l'ALDE, auquel le président Macron fait les yeux doux.

L'ALDE a reçu, en 2018, 122 000 euros de la part de huit multinationales, dont Bayer, Uber et Google. Le cas de Bayer est particulièrement édifiant: Bayer, géant de l'agrochimie qui veut placer l'agriculture sous la dépendance de ses semences OGM. Bayer, qui emploie 13 salariés à temps complet et dépense 2 millions d'euros par an aux seules fins de lobbying à Bruxelles. Bayer, qui a fourni du Zyklon B aux nazis et qui, pendant la Seconde Guerre mondiale, a acheté des femmes déportées d'Auschwitz pour en faire des cobayes. Voilà d'où provient l'argent qui finance l'ALDE.

M. Macron, balayez devant votre porte avant de donner des leçons de morale au Rassemblement national et à ses alliés!

Dobromir Sośnierz (NI). – Panie Przewodniczący! Pierwszego marca obchodziliśmy w Polsce Dzień Pamięci Żołnierzy Wyklętych. Byli to żołnierze polskiego podziemia, którzy walczyli najpierw z okupacją nazistowską, a potem przez wiele lat jeszcze po wojnie stawiali opór reżimowi komunistycznemu narzuconemu nam przez Sowieców, i przypłacili to najczęściej życiem. W tym kontekście chciałbym powiedzieć, że jest mi strasznie wstyd, że w naszym parlamencie komunizm ciągle jest traktowany na poważnie. W XXI w., kiedy już dawno po wojnie narodowy socjalizm postawiono poza obiegami, poza marginesem życia politycznego, komunizm ciągle traktuje się poważnie i przedstawiciele partii komunistycznej siedzą na tej sali i bezwstydnie zasiadają, nie gdzieś jako wyrzutki społeczne tylko jako przedstawiciele dużej grupy politycznej. Takim ludziom nie powinno się podawać ręki, a tymczasem są tutaj normalnie szanowani. To obraża pamięć naszych przodków, którzy z komunistami walczyli. Niektórzy byli ofiarami najbardziej zbrodniczego systemu, najbardziej zbrodniczej ideologii w dziejach ludzkości, jakim jest komunizm.

President. – The debate is closed.

26. Porządek obrad następnego posiedzenia: Patrz protokół

27. Zamknięcie posiedzenia

(The sitting closed at 23:32.)

28. Zamknięcie sesji rocznej

President. – I declare closed the 2018-2019 session of the European Parliament.

—

Skróty i symbole

*	Procedura konsultacji
***	Procedura zgody
***I	Zwykła procedura ustawodawcza, pierwsze czytanie
***II	Zwykła procedura ustawodawcza, drugie czytanie
***III	Zwykła procedura ustawodawcza, trzecie czytanie

(Typ procedury zależy od podstawy prawnej zaproponowanej w danym projekcie aktu.)

Rozwinięcia skrótów nazw komisji parlamentarnych

AFET	Komisja Spraw Zagranicznych
DEVE	Komisja Rozwoju
INTA	Komisja Handlu Międzynarodowego
BUDG	Komisja Budżetowa
CONT	Komisja Kontroli Budżetowej
ECON	Komisja Gospodarcza i Monetarna
EMPL	Komisja Zatrudnienia i Spraw Socjalnych
ENVI	Komisja Środowiska Naturalnego, Zdrowia Publicznego i Bezpieczeństwa Żywności
ITRE	Komisja Przemysłu, Badań Naukowych i Energii
IMCO	Komisja Rynku Wewnętrznego i Ochrony Konsumentów
TRAN	Komisja Transportu i Turystyki
REGI	Komisja Rozwoju Regionalnego
AGRI	Komisja Rolnictwa i Obszarów Wiejskich
PECH	Komisja Rybołówstwa
CULT	Komisja Kultury i Edukacji
JURI	Komisja Prawna
LIBE	Komisja Wolności Obywatelskich, Sprawiedliwości i Spraw Wewnętrznych
AFCO	Komisja Spraw Konstytucyjnych
FEMM	Komisja Praw Kobiet i Równych Szans
PETI	Komisja Petycji
DROI	Podkomisja Praw Człowieka
SEDE	Podkomisja Bezpieczeństwa i Obrony

Rozwinięcia skrótów nazw grup politycznych

PPE	Grupa Europejskiej Partii Ludowej (Chrześcijańscy Demokraci)
S&D	Grupa Postępowego Sojuszu Socjalistów i Demokratów w Parlamencie Europejskim
ECR	Grupa Europejskich Konserwatystów i Reformatorów
ALDE	Grupa Porozumienia Liberalistów i Demokratów na rzecz Europy
GUE/NGL	Konfederacyjna Grupa Zjednoczonej Lewicy Europejskiej/Nordycka Zielona Lewica
Verts/ALE	Grupa Zielonych/Wolne Przymierze Europejskie
EFDD	Europa Wolności i Demokracji Bezpośredniej
ENF	Grupa Europa Narodów i Wolności
NI	Niezrzeszeni