



C/2024/4148

4.7.2024

## PEŁNE SPRAWOZDANIE Z OBRAD 11 LIPCA 2023 R.

(C/2024/4148)

PARLAMENT EUROPEJSKI

SESJA 2023-2024

Posiedzenia od 10 do 13 lipca 2023 r.

STRASBURG

Spis treści	Strona
1. Otwarcie posiedzenia	4
2. Zmiana porządku obrad	4
3. Odbudowa zasobów przyrodniczych (debata)	4
4. Europejski akt w sprawie czipów (debata)	37
5. Wznowienie posiedzenia	47
6. Upamiętnienie 28. rocznicy ludobójstwa w Srebrenicy (oświadczenie Przewodniczącej)	47
7. Wznowienie posiedzenia	50
8. Głosowanie	50
8.1. Wniosek o uchylenie immunitetu Georgiosa Kyrtososa (A9-0231/2023 - Sergey Lagodinsky) (głosowanie)	50
8.2. Środki tymczasowej liberalizacji handlu będące uzupełnieniem koncesji handlowych mających zastosowanie do mołdawskich produktów na podstawie Układu o stowarzyszeniu między Unią Europejską i Europejską Wspólnotą Energii Atomowej a Republiką Mołdawii (A9-0219/2023 - Markéta Gregorová) (głosowanie)	50
8.3. Nowe rozporządzenie w sprawie wyrobów budowlanych (A9-0207/2023 - Christian Doleschal) (głosowanie)	50
8.4. Projekt budżetu korygującego nr 2 do budżetu ogólnego na 2023 r. – zapisanie nadwyżki z roku budżetowego 2022 (A9-0225/2023 - Fabienne Keller) (głosowanie)	51

Spis treści	Strona
8.5. Uruchomienie Europejskiego Funduszu Dostosowania do Globalizacji dla Zwolnionych Pracowników w następstwie wniosku złożonego przez Belgię – EGF/2023/001 BE/ LNSA (A9-0228/2023 - Eleni Stavrou) (głosowanie) . . . . .	51
8.6. Porozumienie między Unią Europejską a Republiką Chile: zmiana koncesji w odniesieniu do wszystkich kontyngentów taryfowych znajdujących się na liście koncesyjnej UE CLXXV w następstwie wystąpienia Zjednoczonego Królestwa z Unii Europejskiej (A9-0222/2023 - Samira Rafaela) (głosowanie) . . . . .	51
8.7. Umowa między Unią Europejską a Japonią: przewozy lotnicze (A9-0221/2023 - Cláudia Monteiro de Aguiar) (głosowanie) . . . . .	51
8.8. Sprzeciw na mocy art. 112 ust. 4 Regulaminu – dodatki do żywności: azotyny (E 249-250) i azotany (E 251-252) (B9-0307/2023) (głosowanie) . . . . .	51
8.9. Sprzeciw na mocy art. 111 ust. 3 Regulaminu: szczegółowe przepisy dotyczące produkcji ekologicznej soli morskiej i innych soli ekologicznych stosowanych w żywności i paszy (B9-0308/2023) (głosowanie) . . . . .	51
8.10. Dyrektywa w sprawie emisji przemysłowych (A9-0216/2023 - Radan Kanev) (głosowanie) . . . . .	51
8.11. Portal Emisji Przemysłowych (A9-0211/2023 - Radan Kanev) (głosowanie) . . . . .	51
8.12. Rozmieszczanie infrastruktury paliw alternatywnych (A9-0234/2022 - Petar Vitanov) (głosowanie) . . . . .	51
8.13. Zrównoważone paliwa w transporcie morskim (inicjatywa FuelEU Maritime) (A9-0233/2022 - Jürgen Warborn) (głosowanie) . . . . .	52
8.14. Efektywność energetyczna (przekształcenie) (A9-0221/2022 - Niels Fuglsang) (głosowanie) . . . . .	52
8.15. Ochrona dziennikarzy i obrońców praw człowieka przed ewidentnie bezpodstawnymi lub stanowiącymi nadużycie postępowaniami sądowymi (A9-0223/2023 - Tiemo Wölken) (głosowanie) . . . . .	52
8.16. Środki zarządzania, ochrony i kontroli obowiązujące na obszarze objętym Porozumieniem w sprawie połowów na południowym obszarze Oceanu Indyjskiego (SIOFA) (A9-0192/2023 - João Pimenta Lopes) (głosowanie) . . . . .	52
8.17. Europejski akt w sprawie czipów (A9-0014/2023 - Dan Nica) (głosowanie) . . . . .	52
8.18. Ochrona dziennikarzy na świecie i polityka Unii Europejskiej w tej dziedzinie (A9-0206/2023 - Isabel Wiseler-Lima) (głosowanie) . . . . .	52
8.19. Prawo wyborcze, komisja śledcza i praworządność w Polsce (B9-0318/2023, B9-0319/2023) (głosowanie) . . . . .	53
8.20. Wdrażanie klauzul pomostowych w traktatach UE (A9-0208/2023 - Giuliano Pisapia) (głosowanie) . . . . .	53
8.21. Unia bankowa – sprawozdanie za 2022 r. (A9-0177/2023 - Kira Marie Peter-Hansen) (głosowanie) . . . . .	53
8.22. Wspieranie i dostosowywanie szkoleń zawodowych jako narzędzia sukcesu pracowników i podstawowego elementu gospodarki UE w nowym przemyśle 4.0 (A9-0232/2023 - Anna Zalewska) (głosowanie) . . . . .	53
9. Wznowienie posiedzenia . . . . .	54
10. Pandemia COVID-19: wyciągnięte wnioski i zalecenia na przyszłość (debata) . . . . .	54
11. Roczne sprawozdanie na temat praworządności z 2023 r. (debata) . . . . .	70

Spis treści	Strona
12. Przyjęcie protokołu poprzedniego posiedzenia	80
13. Pakiet dotyczący ekologizacji transportu (debata)	81
14. Tura pytań do komisarzy – Strategia UE na rzecz Afryki	89
15. Stosunki z Palestyńską Władzą Narodową (debata)	100
16. Sprawozdanie za rok 2022 dotyczące Bośni i Hercegowiny (debata)	113
17. Sprostowanie (art. 241 Regulaminu) (podjęte działania)	122
18. Sprawozdanie za rok 2022 dotyczące Albanii (debata)	122
19. Działalność finansowa Europejskiego Banku Inwestycyjnego – sprawozdanie roczne za 2022 r. - Kontrola działalności finansowej Europejskiego Banku Inwestycyjnego – sprawozdanie roczne za 2022 r. (wspólna dyskusja – Europejski Bank Inwestycyjny)	129
20. Przystąpienie do strefy Schengen (krótka prezentacja)	143
21. Rozporządzenie w sprawie ekoprojektu (debata)	149
22. Wyjaśnienia dotyczące sposobu głosowania	157
22.1. Dyrektywa w sprawie emisji przemysłowych (A9-0216/2023 - Radan Kanev)	157
22.2. Rozmieszczanie infrastruktury paliw alternatywnych (A9-0234/2022 - Petar Vitanov)	157
22.3. Efektywność energetyczna (przekształcenie) (A9-0221/2022 - Niels Fuglsang)	158
22.4. Europejski akt w sprawie czipów (A9-0014/2023 - Dan Nica)	158
22.5. Prawo wyborcze, komisja śledcza i praworządność w Polsce (B9-0318/2023, B9-0319/2023)	159
23. Porządek dzienny następnego posiedzenia	159
24. Zatwierdzenie protokołu bieżącego posiedzenia	159
25. Zamknięcie posiedzenia	159

## PEŁNE SPRAWOZDANIE Z OBRAD 11 LIPCA 2023 R.

VORSITZ: OTHMAR KARAS

Vizepräsident

### 1. Otwarcie posiedzenia

*(Die Sitzung wird um 9.01 Uhr eröffnet.)*

### 2. Zmiana porządku obrad

**Der Präsident.** – Ich komme zu einer Mitteilung: Gemäß Artikel 158 Absatz 2 der Geschäftsordnung möchte ich dem Plenum auf Vorschlag der Präsidentin und mit Zustimmung der Fraktionen mitteilen, dass die Abstimmung über die Verordnung zur Förderung der Munitionsproduktion am Donnerstag, 13. Juli, stattfinden wird.

Es gelten folgende Fristen:

Änderungsanträge sind bis heute, 11. Juli, um 13.00 Uhr zu stellen. Getrennte und gesonderte Abstimmungen heute bis 19.00 Uhr.

### 3. Odbudowa zasobów przyrodniczych (debata)

**Der Präsident.** – Als erster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über den Bericht von César Luena im Namen des Ausschusses für Umweltfragen, öffentliche Gesundheit und Lebensmittelsicherheit über den Vorschlag für eine Verordnung des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates über die Wiederherstellung der Natur (COM(2022)0304 – C9-0208/2022 – 2022/0195(COD)) (A9-0220/2023).

**César Luena, ponente.** – Señor presidente, señor comisario, señor secretario de Estado, por fin vamos a tener un debate sosegado sobre naturaleza y voy a intentar convencerles. Yo les voy a pedir un voto favorable por tres razones.

En primer lugar, por el futuro. Esta ley dice que necesitamos restaurar ecosistemas y hábitats. ¿Por qué? Porque el 81 % de los hábitats se encuentran en mal estado. El 84 % de los cultivos dependen de la polinización por insectos y estos están desapareciendo. El 70 % de los suelos están degradados, lo que pone en peligro la producción y disponibilidad de alimentos y deja a los agroecosistemas más expuestos a daños por eventos climáticos extremos.

Porque en los últimos 40 años —lo vemos esta mañana— Europa se está calentando al doble de ritmo que la media mundial. Y porque el bienestar y la calidad de vida de las personas mejoran al aumentar la disponibilidad de espacios verdes que mitigan la contaminación y reducen el riesgo de enfermedades zoológicas.

Todo esto no son invenciones, no son cosas nuestras. Son datos de la plataforma científica IPBES que aglutina a los mayores expertos en la materia de la Agencia Europea de Medio Ambiente, del Observatorio Europeo del Suelo y del último informe sobre el clima de Copernicus. Por tanto, ciencia.

Es evidente que esta ley es buena para todos, pero en especial para los que están ahí fuera —agricultores, ganaderos, silvicultores, pescadores—, porque va a recuperar el buen funcionamiento de los ecosistemas, que es de donde provienen los recursos. No completaremos el Pacto Verde Europeo si no aprobamos una ley de restauración de la naturaleza.

La segunda razón es por el papel del Parlamento. Porque han pasado setenta años desde que nos metimos en este proyecto de construcción europea y no tenemos una legislación de aplicación directa sobre la naturaleza. Por tanto, el Parlamento Europeo, hoy, mañana, no puede pasar a la historia como un bloqueo, como un obstáculo. Y por eso les pido a los señores del PP —lamento que hayan venido pocos— que le den una oportunidad a la tramitación. Aquí estamos para que se tramite esta ley, para que podamos levantar el veto y para que podamos discutir.

Y la tercera razón es para la historia. Su jefe —que no lo veo; estará enredando por detrás, supongo—, el señor Weber, les ha propuesto un viaje bien peligroso. Un viaje que va de Turingia a Sonneberg. Es un viaje bastante peligroso. Yo les pido que no cambien el cordón sanitario por el abrazo reaccionario, que es lo que están haciendo. No lo cambien. Y les recuerdo que esta propuesta no está solamente defendida, sino presentada —a ver si les suena—, por una tal señora Ursula von der Leyen y que ha sido aprobada en el Consejo por países como Bulgaria, la República Checa, Croacia, Grecia, Irlanda, Rumanía, Lituania. ¿Les suena? En esos países gobierna el Partido Popular.

Se han dicho muchísimas mentiras sobre esta ley. Muchísimos bulos. Solamente voy a recordar uno. Se ha dicho que esta ley ponía en riesgo la seguridad alimentaria de la Unión Europea. Nunca. La ciencia, los hechos nos demuestran lo contrario. No habrá seguridad alimentaria sin unos suelos fértiles y si no hay polinizadores.

Estos segundos últimos quiero dedicarlos a agradecer el trabajo y el esfuerzo de mucha gente. De Soraya Rodríguez, de Jutta Paulus, de Mick Wallace: especialmente a los tres, gracias, porque han trabajado mucho para que salga esta ley. Pero también quiero agradecer a Christine Schneider el trabajo que hizo, porque les voy a contar un secreto ahora que estamos aquí: el Partido Popular estuvo negociando. Muchos de los compromisos tienen el apoyo del Partido Popular hasta que el señor Weber les mandó levantarse de la mesa. Yo le agradezco su actitud y su trabajo. Y quiero agradecer también el trabajo a mi Grupo, a todo el equipo del Grupo S&D, porque sin ellos no habría sido posible llegar hasta aquí. Y, por último, gracias a los que están fuera: a las ONG, a los científicos, a los colectivos, a las asociaciones medioambientales y juveniles.

Lo que pedimos esta mañana al resto los grupos, los diputados que apoyamos esta ley, que somos una mayoría, es que le den una oportunidad. Este Parlamento no puede ser un obstáculo para una ley sobre la naturaleza. Por eso, por el futuro, por el papel de este Parlamento y también por la historia, les pido un voto favorable.

**Anne Sander**, *rapporteuse pour avis de la commission de l'agriculture et du développement rural*. – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, chers collègues, protéger les écosystèmes et les restaurer est une nécessité que nous partageons pleinement. Mais restaurer la nature ne doit pas signer l'arrêt de mort de toute production artisanale, industrielle, forestière ou agricole. Non, produire n'est pas un gros mot.

Pourtant, avec la proposition qui est sur la table aujourd'hui, malgré les crises sanitaires, malgré la situation géopolitique, la Commission et une partie de cet hémicycle ne se soucient guère de la réalité dans le monde. Elles estiment que geler purement et simplement 10 % de nos terres agricoles ne présente pas un danger pour notre sécurité alimentaire.

Pourtant, réduire la production agricole ne fera pas de nous de meilleurs élèves de la protection de l'environnement. Bien au contraire, parce que nous diminuerons peut-être les émissions chez nous, mais les Européens et le reste du monde continueront à avoir faim et auront besoin de consommer. Alors il nous faudra importer de la nourriture des quatre coins du monde, là où les standards de production sont bien éloignés des nôtres. Les bénéfices environnementaux seront alors négligeables.

Alors oui, Monsieur le Vice-Président, Monsieur Timmermans, retirez cette proposition totalement hors-sol et revenez avec une proposition pragmatique qui, réellement, défendra et restaurera la nature.

**Caroline Roose**, *rapporteuse pour avis de la commission de la pêche*. – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, depuis des années, les scientifiques sonnent l'alerte sur l'effondrement de la nature qui a lieu à un rythme sans précédent et qui a déjà des conséquences graves sur l'humanité, à commencer par les pêcheurs. Nous avons de nombreux exemples de populations de poissons qui s'effondrent à cause de la dégradation des écosystèmes marins.

La loi sur la restauration de la nature permet une approche au plus près des territoires en prenant les mesures adaptées à chaque situation. Mais depuis des mois, le PPE a enchaîné les fausses informations sur ce texte. Vous nous avez d'abord expliqué que la loi sur la restauration de la nature allait apporter la famine en Europe. Les experts ont montré que c'était faux et que nous avons besoin d'abeilles pour avoir des fruits, que nous avons besoin d'écosystèmes marins en bon état pour qu'il y ait des poissons à pêcher, que sans nature, il n'y a pas de nourriture. Vous vous êtes alors mis à raconter sur les réseaux sociaux que la loi sur la restauration de la nature allait conduire à la destruction de villes entières et même de la maison du père Noël. Soyons sérieux, nos débats méritent mieux que ça.

Alors vraiment, j'espère que les députés du PPE et de Renew qui envisagent de s'opposer à la loi sur la restauration de la nature vont se ressaisir et ne pas prendre part à ce cirque qui ternit l'image du Parlement européen et qui met en péril la nature, les pêcheurs et les citoyens.

**Virginijus Sinkevičius**, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, State Secretary, honourable Members, first of all, I'm truly grateful for the opportunity to address you today on the crucial role that nature plays for our future. And let me start by thanking the rapporteur, Mr Luena, all shadow rapporteurs and the rapporteurs of the two opinion giving committees, Ms Sander and Ms Roose and the many of you who I met over the last year, and even more so in recent weeks to discuss the Commission proposal for nature restoration that we presented in June 2022. And I hope that these discussions have led to a better understanding or even convergence of each other's positions, because that's what decision making in the EU is all about. This law is nothing less than the flagship initiative of the European Green Deal Nature and Biodiversity Pillar and is intrinsically linked to its climate pillar. Is the first EU legal proposal on nature since 30 years. It is the EU's climate law for biodiversity and the success of one depends on the success on the other. During the last year, the Commission has worked very closely with all actors involved and we have listened very carefully to the full range of issues that have been raised and to your concerns. Several of you made it clear that additional flexibility was needed, in particular on some of the provisions that may not have been clear enough and thus were considered as potentially hampering economic activities. And many Member States have raised similar issues. We acknowledge that, and we have consequently showed openness to revisit and improve certain provisions and to enhance clarity, making sure the proposal reflects the current reality. On that basis, we have outlined possible ways forward in the non-paper which we submitted to you and to the Council on 8 June. We very much welcome the positive response of the Member States to our recent non-paper and the fact that the Council took responsibility. Engage constructively and agreed on general approach on 20 June. And I understand that the Spanish presidency now stands ready to engage in triologue negotiations, provided, of course, that the European Parliament adopts its mandate.

Honourable Members, in the past weeks, we have seen an intense debate on our proposal because the questions they are complex, because these issues are crucial for our collective future and because the stakes are high. Proof of this is the unprecedented mobilisation for this law from citizens and in particular, the youth with around 1 million signatures collected in support of the law from hundreds of businesses in renewable energy, food and other sectors, including some of Europe's biggest corporations. From farmers and foresters concerned about the impacts of biodiversity on their land and production. From over 6000 scientists from civil society organisations across the EU as well as from international organisations such as IUCN and UNEP. That debate showed very clearly that there is very broad consensus that we need to restore nature and that we can constructively discuss and find solutions on how.

The consequences of the climate and biodiversity crisis are becoming increasingly visible also here in the European Union. They already affect nearly every citizen and every sector of the economy, and they are among the biggest threats to the long term resilience of Europe's food security. In order to ensure the long term food security and resilience of our farmlands, forests, our seas, we must improve their biodiversity conditions. And some of these ecosystems are already severely threatened by the growing impacts of climate change in almost all parts of Europe. With drought fires degraded soils that risk food production and livelihoods, especially in rural areas. Science is crystal clear. Far too much of Europe's nature has now been degraded or destroyed, so it's vital to reverse that trend. And time is running out. Some 80 % of EU habitat types are now in bad or poor condition. Half of the global GDP depends on nature, and 75 % of our crops depend on pollination. The European Central Bank found that 72 % of the euro area firms, about 3 million, are highly exposed to nature related services, such as timber, clean water, pollination, sand or healthy soils, and depended on at least one of them, sometimes more. 75 % of bank loans are to firms that depend on ecosystem services, so financial institutions are clearly exposed as well. The unsustainable use of natural resources already costs thousands of lives and billions of euros. Between 1980 and 2021, weather and climate related damages amounted to an estimated EUR 560 billion and the severe droughts experienced in the EU in August last year led to losses in agricultural production, averaging between 5 and 10 % for crops like grain, maize, sunflower and soybeans.

Droughts, floods and forest fires have become part of new reality. While they are driven by climate change, the degradation of ecosystems and their weakened resilience due to biodiversity loss accelerates and intensifies the impacts of these events. These are figures. But even more important are the people behind these figures. Reversing this trend by restoring degraded nature must therefore be our shared responsibility.

It's my sincere hope that the openness shown by the Commission with the non-paper, that the Council's general approach, as well as the proposal presented last week by the Commission to complete the nature pillar of the European Green Deal, that all these elements can facilitate today's discussion, that they reassure those who felt that the Commission's initial position was too far reaching and they remain still convinced to those who would have expected even higher ambition for the nature restoration.

The Green Deal is a highly pragmatic approach to solving the climate and biodiversity crisis. Climate solutions without nature solutions are half measures. Let me give you a couple of examples. Making soils healthy, it's not good just for farmers, foresters and habitat. It's also essential for ensuring the soils can store carbon. Carbon rich soils, in turn, store water and mitigate the consequences of flash storms. Dead soils do none of that. Boosting innovation. New business models like carbon farming and promotion of technological developments, such as for new genomic techniques, are key parts of the Commission's nature package. All proposals are interlinked and actually strengthen each other. They all contribute and assist to achieve the goals of the other proposals on the table with the Nature Restoration Law in the centre. The more we do on nature, the less tough we will have to be on climate action. Nature is our best ally in fighting climate change, and if we don't take proper measures to let it thrive, we will be ditching our best chance to achieve climate neutrality.

Honourable members, citizens, businesses, scientists, farmers, foresters, cities, our international partners, they all expect us to act to address the climate-related challenges they face, which are aggravated by the bad and deteriorating state of our natural ecosystems. This very Parliament in June 2021 called for a strong Nature Restoration Law, including binding targets. And together with the Council, Parliament and the Commission signed a declaration only six months ago on 22 December 2022, confirming that nature restoration was a joint priority for 2023. Today I am reconfirming to this House that the Commission remains 100 % committed to turn this proposal into law, to showing the necessary flexibility and to supporting the co-legislators in their search for compromise. The Council has already engaged in this process and I am convinced that with a constructive approach, a compromise is possible also within this House. In order to uphold the European Union's international commitments under both the Paris Agreement and the Montreal Biodiversity Framework to ensure a transition to sustainable economy and deliver on the EU climate law and adapt to climate change. We need to urgently restore and strengthen the resilience of natural ecosystems across the EU.

I know that many of you share this urgency. I therefore trust. That you will seize this opportunity and take responsibility to engage constructively so that tomorrow this House can adopt a mandate for trialogue negotiations, which would also allow us to reach a final agreement on the proposal in time for Cop 28 and the next biodiversity Cop 16, and to see the entry into force of the nature restoration law before the end of this political term.

This is not about restoring nature for the sake of nature. It's about ensuring a habitable environment where the well-being of current and future generations is ensured, where the land and seas continue having the capacity to provide us the goods and services that our lives and our economy fully depend on. It is about our lives. It's about us and those who come after us.

**Christine Schneider**, *im Namen der PPE-Fraktion.* – *(Beginn des Redebeitrags bei ausgeschaltetem Mikro)* ... falsch behauptet wird, möchte ich es hier noch einmal klarstellen: Wir als EVP stehen zu den Zielen des Grünen Deals, und ja, wir möchten, dass das Montreal-Abkommen weltweit umgesetzt wird.

Über das Ziel sind wir uns einig, jedoch nicht über den Weg. Da gibt es gänzlich unterschiedliche Vorstellungen, und der Vorschlag der Kommission führt genau in die falsche Richtung. Der Schutz der Biodiversität kann nur Hand in Hand mit der Bevölkerung funktionieren, nicht indem man einseitig die Landwirte, die Förster, die Fischer für den Artenschwund verantwortlich macht, nicht indem man immer mehr Flächen aus der Produktion nimmt und so die Ernährungssicherheit und Bezahlbarkeit gefährdet, nicht indem man Naturschutz und nachhaltige Bewirtschaftung gegeneinander auspielt.

Bis heute hat die Kommission keine belastbaren, nachhaltigen, vollständigen Daten vorgelegt, obwohl wir es seit einem Jahr versprochen bekommen. Auch die Finanzierung der Maßnahmen und die Auswirkungen auf die Mitgliedstaaten sind ungeklärt, und es ist vollkommen unklar, wie die Verordnung über die Wiederherstellung der Natur mit den bereits bestehenden 23 EU-Verordnungen abgestimmt werden soll, die jetzt schon unsere Natur schützen.

Man könnte den Eindruck gewinnen, die Kommission hat sich auf dem Weg verirrt. Durch das störrische Festhalten an einem schlecht gemachten Vorschlag hat die Kommission unnötig wertvolle Zeit verspielt, und Unterstützung gewinnt man nicht, indem man Druck auf einzelne Abgeordnete ausübt. Durch dieses Verhalten hat Vizepräsident Timmermans das Parlament gespalten. Drei Ausschüsse haben den Kommissionsentwurf bereits abgelehnt, und morgen wird es trotzdem zu einer Kampf Abstimmung hier im Parlament kommen.

Lassen Sie mich deshalb zum Schluss noch einmal betonen: Wir als EVP-Fraktion stehen zu dem Grünen Deal. Aber das Gesetz ist schlecht gemacht, und es ist unsere Aufgabe als Abgeordnete, das auch zu benennen. Das bedeutet am Ende auch, dagegen zu stimmen. Unsere Forderung ist unverändert: Legen Sie einen neuen, besseren Vorschlag vor. Schlagen Sie wieder einen solchen Weg ein, dass es hier eine breite Mehrheit gibt.

**Iratxe García Pérez**, *en nombre del Grupo S&D.* – Señor presidente, la protección del medio ambiente vive hoy un momento trascendental en la Unión Europea. El intento liderado por el Partido Popular de rechazar la ley para la restauración de la naturaleza envía un mensaje demoledor sobre la viabilidad del Pacto Verde.

La derecha ha visto en la agenda medioambiental el campo idóneo para su disputa electoral con la extrema derecha. Señor Weber, usted no ha tenido hoy la decencia de estar en este hemiciclo y de dar la cara, pero yo no voy a renunciar a utilizar el atril para transmitirle un mensaje. Usted, señor Weber, pretende ganar votos con una falsa defensa de los agricultores y de las comunidades rurales y no ha dudado en recurrir a una estrategia de mentiras para eludir las certezas científicas e instalarse en el negacionismo.

Pero la ciencia deja cada vez menos margen al negacionismo climático. Los días 3 y 4 de julio batimos el récord de temperatura media diaria en la Tierra. Solo en 2022 murieron casi 62 000 personas en Europa por las altas temperaturas. Hoy hay un millón de especies en peligro de extinción. Más del 80 % de nuestros hábitats están en mal estado.

Pese al apoyo de más de 3 500 científicos y de grandes empresas, el Partido Popular ha declarado la guerra a la ley de restauración de la naturaleza, una ley indispensable para reparar los hábitats degradados, una ley imprescindible para garantizar la seguridad alimentaria, una ley necesaria para garantizar el crecimiento de las empresas, una ley urgente para detener el impacto cada vez más extremo del cambio climático. En definitiva, una ley para mantener un planeta habitable para las generaciones de hoy y de mañana.



Señor Weber, su deriva radical le ha llevado a enfrentarse a su propia familia política. Se posiciona en contra de Gobiernos conservadores que en el Consejo han apoyado esta idea. Pero aún más grave que el enfrentamiento con sus propios compañeros es perder la memoria histórica para abrazar los valores de la ultraderecha en Hungría, en Polonia, en Italia, en Finlandia y también en España.

El programa reaccionario del Partido Popular y de Vox es ya una realidad. Atacan al colectivo LGTBI, atacan a las mujeres y hoy atacan a la lucha contra el cambio climático. El Partido Popular y Vox son partidos negacionistas y su negacionismo significa robar el futuro a las nuevas generaciones.

Tenemos que ser capaces de entender que nuestras sociedades merecen una transición verde y digital sin renunciar a las grandes conquistas sociales. Hoy somos la Europa que cuida, la Europa que protege, la Europa que emprende, que progresa, una Europa que avanza. Mientras algunos retroceden, odian y destruyen, los socialdemócratas tenemos claro el destino: menos desigualdad y más derechos.

Esto va de avanzar o de retroceder y nosotros lo tenemos claro: adelante.

**Stéphane Séjourné**, *au nom du groupe Renew*. – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, nous y sommes. Après des semaines de débats, de surenchères, nous sommes appelés à nous prononcer sur la loi sur la restauration de la nature. À titre personnel, je crois en une loi ambitieuse. Mon groupe croit en un texte qui puisse réunir tous ceux qui ont l'écologie à cœur, tous ceux qui, depuis le début, ont soutenu le pacte vert. Mais, disons-le, le débat a dérapé. Il a dérapé sur la forme comme sur le fond. Et, à ce stade, c'est l'histoire d'un immense gâchis qui aura des responsables si ce texte était rejeté.

D'une part, du côté de la Commission européenne, je ne peux que déplorer l'absence ici du commissaire Timmermans. On ne crée pas aujourd'hui de majorités parlementaires sans être au contact de cet hémicycle. Et, vous le savez, pour cette loi, il y a aujourd'hui un besoin de narratif, un besoin de stratégie – besoins auxquels nous avons réussi à répondre pour l'ensemble des autres textes politiques qu'a présenté la Commission sur le pacte vert. Il y a eu tellement de fausses informations sur ce projet de loi. Combien de malentendus aurions-nous pu éviter si la Commission avait tissé une stratégie globale sur ces textes sur le pacte vert?

D'autre part, vous l'avez déjà dit dans les interventions, le groupe des conservateurs est tout heureux de démontrer qu'une alliance des droites avec des climatosceptiques est possible. En réalité, Monsieur Weber, vous le savez, vous ne voulez pas de ce texte, quels que soient les amendements, peut-être par pur opportunisme politique. Vous le savez, il fait aujourd'hui 37 degrés à Strasbourg. Et je vous assure, chers collègues du PPE, que ces objectifs partisans ne seront pas audibles des générations futures et de nos enfants.

Alors, d'un côté, l'aveuglement et le manque de stratégie de la Commission européenne, de l'autre côté, la surenchère politique et partisane. Voilà en quelque sorte les responsables de la situation actuelle. Le texte risque d'être rejeté. Mon groupe essaie encore péniblement de faire l'impossible. Nous avons proposé des amendements. Tout n'est pas perdu. Nous avons 24 heures. La nature et la biodiversité méritent effectivement ces efforts. Mon groupe parlementaire essaie à la fois de faire son unité en interne – et j'en suis aussi l'acteur – et l'unité également du Parlement européen.

Chers collègues, ne créons pas de nouveaux précédents. Pourquoi le pacte vert a-t-il fonctionné depuis maintenant quelques années? Parce que nous sommes allés au-delà de nos clivages. Nous sommes allés au-delà de nos clivages, mais un certain nombre de groupes essaient d'en créer de nouveaux. Pour moi, la nature et la biodiversité n'a pas de couleur politique. Croyez-moi, cette stratégie est de court terme. Seuls les extrêmes bénéficieront de cette polarisation parlementaire.

Mesdames, Messieurs, nous allons faire le travail. Nous proposerons dans les 24 heures qui viennent une stratégie pour avoir une majorité, en tout cas pour éviter le rejet de ce texte. J'en appellerai avec l'ensemble des responsables politiques, avec ceux qui ont travaillé, avec les présidents de commission parlementaire, avec nos rapporteurs et nos rapporteurs fictifs, à une stratégie pour que ce texte puisse aboutir. J'en appelle à la responsabilité, à gauche comme à droite. En tout cas, jusqu'au dernier moment, nous serons là pour faire de ce texte une victoire.

**Terry Reintke**, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Mr President, dear colleagues, our rivers are dying, our forests are sick, our nature is in deep crisis. We have to restore our nature, not in a distant future, not when the EPP has got its act together – we have to act now: to preserve nature, the basis of our agriculture, the basis of our economic prosperity; to keep the climate targets, because 10% out of the 55% that we agreed to reduce our emissions by before 2030 are nature-based climate action; to keep our competitiveness to the self-declared business groups in this Parliament. You heard the appeal by major companies like Unilever or Ikea to let the Nature Restoration Law pass.

So dear EPP colleagues, many of your parties are actually based on Christian values, centred on the preservation of creation. Please follow your inner conviction and not what your group leader is telling you and vote tomorrow in favour of the Nature Restoration Law.

Dear Renew colleagues, the Nature Restoration Law is about freedom. The destruction of biodiversity already today is limiting our options and it is going to get worse in the future. Preserve our freedom and vote in favour of the Nature Restoration Law tomorrow.

But colleagues, we also all know that this law has become much more than just itself in the past month. It has become a symbol, a symbol of the Green Deal, a symbol of constructive decision-making in this Parliament. And it has unfortunately become a symbol of political games within the EPP on which strategy they want to go for for 2024. Mr Weber, who is unfortunately not here right now, we can clearly see what your strategy is: going against your own Commission President.

All of this, to me, is a sign of a deep identity crisis within the EPP, a shift in decision-making here in this Parliament, and for me a very dangerous development, especially as far-right parties, groups and movements are gaining ground across Europe.

Colleagues, let us vote tomorrow in favour of the Nature Restoration Law to show that constructive decision-making in this Parliament is still possible. To show that we stand behind the Green Deal and yes, also to restore and protect our nature.

**Alexandr Vondra**, *za skupinu ECR*. – Pane předsedající, pro kolegy nalevo, Viktor Orbán to v Radě podpořil. Ten návrh, který máme na stole, není dobrý a je vnitřně rozporný. Ano, je dobré, že může pomoci mizejícím ptákům, opylovačům, pomůže zadržet vodu v krajině. Na druhé straně komplikuje obživu sedlákům, to víme. Brutálně zasahuje do kompetencí členských států a vytváří nekryté náklady.

V Radě se některé tyto nedostatky, třeba ta zběsilá moc, která se předává nevládním organizacím, podařilo odstranit. Díky bohu za to. Ale hlavní chybu udělala Komise a Frans Timmermans. Kde je Frans Timmermans? My jsme – a i tahle sněmovna – hystericky upřednostnili dekarbonizaci, která lokálně všechno zdražuje, ale globálně nepřináší žádné výsledky. Horko je furt a Čína generuje zisky.

Kdybychom o tomto návrhu hlasovali před dvěma lety, tak se vsadím, že projde jak nůž máslem. Teď máme rozdělenou sněmovnu a můžeme si za to jenom my sami.

**Aurélia Beigneux**, *au nom du groupe ID*. – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le rapporteur, la Commission européenne et les groupes de gauche nous ont habitués à des inepties économiques et politiques quand il s'agissait du pacte vert.

Mais cette proposition a atteint un niveau inégal d'absurdité, de déconnexion et de mépris envers nos agriculteurs et nos États membres. Pire encore, cette fois, la Commission a menacé directement de repréailles les députés qui demandaient légitimement une étude d'impact sur notre production alimentaire. D'ailleurs, où est M. Timmermans, vice-président de la Commission européenne, chargé du pacte vert, pour défendre ce texte si important? Visiblement, il n'assume pas son attitude scandaleuse et antidémocratique.

Alors que nous faisons face à une crise alimentaire imminente, vous persistez dans vos chimères utopiques, sacrifiant nos producteurs sur l'autel de vos fantasmes idéologiques et écologiques. Pourquoi voulez-vous vous immiscer dans les politiques urbaines des États membres? La végétalisation de nos villes est certes une bonne chose et apporte de nombreux avantages, mais il revient aux États et aux élus locaux de prendre ces décisions et certainement pas à une Commission qui pense avoir l'exclusivité de toutes les politiques.

Je rappelle également que les forêts sont du ressort des nations. Les objectifs contraignants imposés par la Commission européenne n'ont donc aucune légitimité. Alors que ce texte a été rejeté dans les trois commissions, les groupes de gauche, au mépris de la démocratie, essaient de le ressusciter avec des amendements de plénière. Le rejet de ce texte doit être définitif pour envoyer un message clair à la Commission européenne et donc aux groupes de gauche.

Alors, oui à la préservation de la nature de notre patrimoine et de nos terres agricoles. Et non à cette proposition absurde et oppressive de la Commission européenne. Il est grand temps que vous cessiez de nuire à nos agriculteurs et à nos États membres, au nom de vos lubies idéologiques.

**Manon Aubry**, au nom du groupe *The Left*. – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, la semaine dernière a été la plus chaude depuis 120 000 ans. 80 % des terres et des eaux européennes sont dévastées par la folle exploitation de la planète. Un quart des oiseaux a disparu depuis les années 1980.

Adoptée demain, la loi sur la restauration de la nature devrait faire l'unanimité, car l'humanité ne peut vivre sur une planète morte. Mais la droite et l'extrême droite font de cette loi un totem à abattre. Dans ce but politicien, Monsieur Weber, vous qui n'avez même pas le courage d'être là avec nous aujourd'hui, vous avez menti. Vous avez nié la science, remplacé de force vos députés récalcitrants, déroulé le tapis rouge aux lobbies et pactisé avec les climatocseptiques.

Monsieur Weber, vous faites souffler un vent mauvais en Europe, un vent trumpiste qui attise les braises de l'extrême droite et menace de déraciner toute politique environnementale. Quant aux collègues du groupe Renaissance qui veulent passer pour les sauveurs de la planète, je tenais à rappeler les faits. Monsieur Séjourné, c'est l'appel d'Emmanuel Macron à une pause environnementale qui a ouvert la brèche où ce mauvais vent s'engouffre. Et ce sont les voix d'une partie de vos députés qui ont permis de rejeter ce texte en commission de l'environnement.

L'histoire se souviendra, chers collègues, de chaque vote contre ce texte nous rapprochant du gouffre. Vous pouvez nier la science, ignorer la jeunesse, bâillonner les activistes. Vous pouvez vous bercer des fables de la croissance infinie. La réalité vous rattrapera à la sortie de cet hémicycle. Nous ne sommes que le 10 juillet et il fait 37 degrés à Strasbourg. Votez pour la loi sur la restauration de la nature.

**Maria Angela Danzi (NI)**. – Signor Presidente, signor Commissario, onorevoli colleghi, oggi sento e tutti noi dobbiamo sentire addosso una grande responsabilità. L'ultima alluvione in Emilia Romagna ha provocato 15 morti e 9 miliardi di euro di danni.

Ho ancora davanti agli occhi le alluvioni di Genova, città di cui sono stata direttore generale. Chi, come me, ha vissuto tali esperienze ha provato un grande senso di impotenza e di inadeguatezza per non aver potuto fare di più per impedire gli effetti di tali catastrofi.

Non bisogna rassegnarsi! Scienziati, associazioni e milioni di cittadini ci chiedono di intervenire.

Il cambiamento climatico non è un processo ineluttabile; il ripristino dei terreni degradati e la tutela della biodiversità sono gli strumenti.

Non siamo insensibili alle ragioni economiche ma da qui, lontani dalle pressioni degli interessi particolari, oggi possiamo invertire la rotta.

Cari colleghi del PPE, cari colleghi di Renew, vi prego, non inseguite l'estrema destra e chi nega il riscaldamento globale, votate questo provvedimento, è un investimento sul futuro dei nostri figli!

Noi, come Movimento 5 Stelle, appoggeremo e voteremo con convinzione questo provvedimento.

**Peter Liese (PPE)**. – Herr Präsident, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Ich komme aus einer sehr ländlichen Region, und ich habe noch nie erlebt, dass die Wahrnehmung der Menschen in meiner Region und die Wahrnehmung in der Brüsseler und Straßburger Blase so weit auseinandergehen wie bei diesem Gesetz. Ich rede mit Bürgermeistern über den Vorschlag, mit Landräten. Und es gibt in Deutschland eine aktuelle Stellungnahme des Städte- und Gemeindebundes, der Vertretung aller ländlichen Kommunen, die klar gegen dieses Gesetz geht. Ich rede mit Betreibern von Wasserkraftwerken. Die Wasserkraftbetreiber machen sich Sorgen wegen dieses Gesetzes, weil es für die Wasserkraft schwieriger wird – und das in einer Zeit, wo wir so dringend Öl, Gas und Kohle ersetzen müssen.

Auch andere Projekte der Energiewende wie der Leitungsbau werden schwieriger durch dieses Gesetz. Es ist eine Illusion zu glauben, Biodiversität und Klimaschutz gingen immer Hand in Hand. Warum, frage ich die deutschen Grünen, gibt es einen Streit zwischen Robert Habeck und Steffi Lemke? Weil Robert Habeck sagt: Die Energiewende ist wichtiger als der letzte Vogel. Man muss hier Kompromisse machen. Und ich bin da auf der Seite von Habeck, ganz klar.

Ich rede mit Waldbesitzern, die sagen: Was soll das? Die Natur in einen Zustand zurückzusetzen von vor 70 Jahren! Wir hatten vor 70 Jahren keinen Klimawandel. Jetzt haben wir ihn leider, und wir sollten gemeinsam dagegen kämpfen. Aber da brauchen wir auch angepasste Arten, die vor 70 Jahren in Europa nicht heimisch waren.

Vieles ist unklar, viele Definitionen sind unklar. Wir kaufen hier die Katze im Sack. Liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen, hören wir auf die Bedenken der Menschen in den ländlichen Räumen! Hören wir auf die Menschen, die draußen stehen und sagen:

Nature restoration – yes, we can! Nature restoration law – no, we can't!

Stimmen wir gegen diesen Vorschlag!

*(Der Redner ist damit einverstanden, eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“ zu beantworten.)*

**Michael Bloss (Verts/ALE)**, *Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“*. – Ja, lieber Peter Liese, Sie haben ja für das Klimaschutzgesetz gestimmt, Sie haben für die LULUCF-Verordnung gestimmt. 10 % des europäischen Klimaziels kommt durch die Natur. Wie wollen Sie das erreichen, wenn Sie gegen dieses Gesetz stimmen? Wenn Sie gegen das Gesetz stimmen, stimmen Sie gegen den Klimaschutz, gegen den Grünen Deal, gegen das große Projekt von Ursula von der Leyen. Damit erreichen wir unsere Klimaziele nicht!

**Peter Liese (PPE)**, *Antwort auf eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“*. – Danke, lieber Michael. Ich gehe gerne auf die Frage ein. Ich darf aber alle Kolleginnen und Kollegen noch einmal daran erinnern, dass es Michael Bloss war, der im Namen der Grünen-Fraktion gemeinsam mit ID und ECR einen Antrag gestellt hat, das EHS 2, das so wichtig für den Klimaschutz ist, zu streichen. Wer im Glashaus sitzt, sollte nicht mit Steinen werfen – erstens.

Zweitens: Wir setzen auf Kooperation. Wir haben für LULUCF gestimmt, jawohl. Und die LULUCF-Positionen mit 310 - Millionen Tonnen zusätzlichen Senken, das war die EVP-Position. Aber wir wollen das mit Anreizen schaffen und nicht mit Gewalt, nicht mit der Brechstange, wie das in diesem Gesetzentwurf vorgesehen ist.

**Der Präsident**. – Liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen, ich habe mehrere Seiten an Wortmeldungen, was verständlich ist bei diesem wichtigen Thema. Ich würde sehr bitten, dass wir uns bei den Wortmeldungen nach dem Verfahren der blauen Karte angesichts der Fülle der Rednerlisten etwas zurückhalten.

Ich kann maximal eine Person pro Redner nehmen. Aber ich würde bitten, nachdem wir so viele Redner haben und alle Meinungen hier vertreten sind, dass wir hier auf die Rednerliste auch Rücksicht nehmen. Maximal eine blaue Karte, aber die bitte auch nur, wenn es dringend notwendig ist.

Aber ich möchte sonst nicht in die Debatte eingreifen, weil es ohnehin ein sehr emotionales und wichtiges Thema ist.

**Mohammed Chahim (S&D)**. – Voorzitter, natuurherstel is een mooi verhaal. Natuur gaat namelijk over onze toekomst, over gezond land waarop we duurzaam voedsel kunnen produceren, en gezond land dat bestand is tegen de gevolgen van klimaatverandering.

Maar helaas is de totstandkoming van deze wet gekaapt door politieke eigenbelangen. De christendemocraten hebben er een moddergevecht van gemaakt, los van elke inhoud. En het feit dat de voorzitter en de vicevoorzitter verantwoordelijk voor deze wet nu een persconferentie houden tijdens dit debat is een minachting voor het Parlement. Schande!

Want vergis je niet, deze natuurherstelwet is net zo belangrijk voor de biodiversiteitscrisis als de klimaatwet voor het Parijs-akkoord. Klimaat en biodiversiteit zijn twee zijden van dezelfde medaille. En toch begonnen bepaalde politieke partijen een symbolische strijd tegen deze wet. Dit is wat je krijgt als je partijen rond het midden niet samenbrengt. Dan voed je de extremen, iets wat in Nederland al langer aan de gang is: het polariseren van standpunten en het creëren van valse tegenstellingen. Dat gebeurt nu ook in Europa. Het CDA en een aantal andere partijen lopen de stem van extreem-rechts en klimaatontkenners achterna. En ten koste van wat? Ten koste van onze natuur, ten koste van onze toekomst. Dat is cynische politiek. Dat is politiek waarvoor je je moet schamen.

Uiteindelijk is het simpel waar we morgen over stemmen: willen we de wereld beter achterlaten dan hoe we ze kregen? Voor mij is het antwoord heel simpel. Ik hoop dat we morgen allemaal voor de wet stemmen, vooruit kunnen, en zoals César zei: "¡Adelante!"

**María Soraya Rodríguez Ramos (Renew).** – Señor presidente, fuera de esta Cámara, la ley de restauración de la naturaleza tiene muchísimos apoyos. Toda la comunidad científica dice que es necesaria. Al igual que grandes compañías, compañías de energías renovables, nuestros ciudadanos, los jóvenes, el Comité de las Regiones, alcaldes, presidentes de regiones y el Consejo, la mayoría del Consejo. Por lo tanto, el problema está aquí, está en esta Cámara.

No hay argumentos para poder oponerse a la restauración de más del 80 % de nuestros ecosistemas, que están en un estado deplorable. La prueba de que no hay argumentos es que hoy no está Weber. Lo suyo son las *fake news*, no el argumento y los debates.

Señorías, tenemos que conseguir que mañana haya un mandato para que esta ley entre en los diálogos tripartitos. De ello va a depender nuestro crecimiento. Esta ley no impide actividades económicas. Lo que nos está diciendo es que es necesario que nuestra manera de producción conviva de forma sostenible con el mantenimiento de nuestros ecosistemas. Esta ley no atenta contra la seguridad alimentaria, cuando el 70 % de los suelos agrícolas europeos está en un proceso de erosión continua. Esta ley no solo afecta a los matorrales, no solo afecta a la biodiversidad, afecta a los derechos, a los derechos de los ciudadanos de hoy y a los de mañana.

Muchas veces se dice que para actuar necesitamos más evidencia científica. Evidencia científica es lo que sobra. Valentía política, lo que falta. Señora Aubry, no se confunda de enemigo. Mañana, el compromiso de mi Grupo, de Renew, es fundamental para que esta ley salga adelante.

**Jutta Paulus (Verts/ALE).** – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Europas Natur geht es schlecht. 80 % der geschützten Ökosysteme sind in keinem guten Zustand, 1 500 Arten auf der Roten Liste, und die Feldvogelpopulationen sind im freien Fall. Ich bin nämlich alt genug, um noch zu wissen, wie es war, als der Himmel voller Lerchen hing im Frühjahr. Wenn man so ein Riesenproblem vor sich hat, dann gibt es drei Möglichkeiten.

Die erste Möglichkeit ist die, die die Kommission und die konstruktiven Fraktionen in diesem Parlament gewählt haben: Man macht ein Gesetz, um den Druck auf die Natur zu mindern, um Rückzugsräume für Bestäuber zu schaffen, um dafür zu sorgen, dass die Vielfalt erhalten bleibt, die unser Schutz ist bei den rasanten Klimaveränderungen, die wir erleben. Ohne gesunde Ökosysteme können wir auch keinen Klimaschutz machen. Wenn CO<sub>2</sub> nicht mehr in Wäldern und Mooren gespeichert wird, sondern wenn kranke Wälder und kranke Böden CO<sub>2</sub> emittieren, dann werden wir unsere Klimaziele nicht erreichen.

Wir brauchen eine Revitalisierung der Ökosysteme auch für die Klimaanpassung. Wir haben doch gesehen, was passiert, wenn Flüsse, die in ein Betonkorsett gepresst worden sind, über die Ufer treten und Menschen zu Tode kommen. Das sollte uns doch eine Lehre sein. An Tagen wie heute sind Städte echte Hotspots des Klimawandels. Auch dafür brauchen wir dieses Gesetz, damit wir die Bürgerinnen und Bürger vor diesen Veränderungen schützen.

Es gibt dann die zweite Möglichkeit: Man kann die Folgen des Problems einfach ausblenden. Das war so wie in den 80er Jahren, als die Leute den Aufkleber an ihrem Auto hatten: „Mein Auto fährt auch ohne Wald.“ Wenn wir dann irgendwann kein Trinkwasser und keinen Sauerstoff mehr haben, ist das ein bisschen doof.

Die dritte Möglichkeit ist, das Problem zu negieren und eine Desinformationskampagne zu fahren, wie es leider die EVP getan hat. Sie haben behauptet, es würden Dörfer für Moorrenaturierung abgerissen werden, es müssten Wasserkraftwerke rückgebaut werden. Das steht an keiner Stelle im Gesetz. Und es steht auch nirgends, dass der Zustand von vor 70 Jahren wiederhergestellt werden müsste. Das sind pure Fake News, die hier verbreitet werden.

Diese populistische Angstmacherei statt der Benennung der wirklichen Probleme – das sind die Gefahren für unsere langfristige Ernährungssicherheit. Herr Weber, hören Sie auf, Wahlkampf auf Kosten der Natur, auf Kosten der Bürgerinnen und Bürger, auf Kosten unserer Lebensgrundlagen zu machen! Dieses Parlament darf nicht zum Spielplatz für Ränkespiele werden. Wir haben hier Verantwortung für 450 Millionen europäische Bürgerinnen und Bürger und für zukünftige Generationen. Und morgen haben wir die Wahl.

**Bert-Jan Ruissen (ECR).** – Voorzitter, geachte commissaris, in Mariënheem, een dorp in het oosten van ons land, hebben ze een groot probleem: een drukke, gevaarlijke weg dwars door het dorp. De rondweg die het dorp moet ontlasten, komt er vooralsnog niet. Een belangrijke oorzaak – naast geldgebrek – is knellende Natura 2000-wetgeving die zelfs verkeersveiligheid ondergeschikt maakt aan natuur.

Voorzitter, als wij morgen instemmen met de natuurherstelwet creëren we op grote schaal overal in Europa vergelijkbare situaties. Ons landelijk gebied gaat op slot. De voorrangregel “natuur gaat altijd voor” gaat dan immers op heel veel plekken ook buiten Natura 2000 gelden. En met bevolkingsdichtheid houdt het voorstel al helemaal geen rekening. Dat maakt het allemaal nog gecompliceerder.

Natuur is belangrijk, maar de aanpak van de Commissie deugt niet. Laten we waardevolle initiatieven van onderop ondersteunen en ondertussen de regio's voldoende flexibiliteit bieden om eigen verantwoorde keuzes te maken. Nog meer Brusselse bemoeienis gaat niet helpen. Het verwerpsamendement verdient daarom alle steun.

**Gilles Lebreton (ID).** – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, le pacte vert pour l'Europe n'en finit plus de nous étonner par son cortège de législations irréalistes et dangereuses. Après la modification de la directive sur les émissions industrielles, qui voudrait faire payer aux éleveurs la facture climatique, c'est à l'ensemble de l'agriculture que la Commission s'attaque, avec son projet de règlement visant – rien de moins – qu'une restauration de la nature. C'est à nos terres qu'elle s'en prend, ces terres que des générations d'agriculteurs avant nous ont travaillées, entretenues, préservées, puis transmises.

Les mesures proposées sont insensées: restaurer une grande partie des écosystèmes terrestres d'ici 2030, puis 100 % d'ici 2050, serait catastrophique pour notre sécurité alimentaire. Et libérer 25 000 kilomètres de rivières serait désastreux pour la gestion de l'eau. Sans compter l'accroissement de la bureaucratie avec les plans de restauration de la nature que chaque État membre devrait élaborer.

En rejetant ce texte par trois fois, le Parlement a délivré un message clair: cessez de nous imposer des ambitions environnementales délirantes qui détruisent notre agriculture et abandonnez plutôt votre dogme libre-échangiste qui ne fait que produire davantage de pollution.

*(L'orateur accepte de répondre à une question «carton bleu»)*

**Benoît Biteau (Verts/ALE), question «carton bleu».** – Monsieur Lebreton, je parle en français, donc vous pouvez rester au pupitre.

Monsieur Lebreton, vous le savez, je suis moi-même paysan. Et ce qui menace la souveraineté alimentaire, ce qui menace l'avenir de l'agriculture, ce qui menace le revenu des agriculteurs, ce n'est pas davantage de nature, ce n'est pas l'équilibre climatique, c'est l'utilisation toujours plus massive de pesticides, l'utilisation toujours plus massive d'engrais de synthèse. C'est cela qui menace vraiment la souveraineté alimentaire et l'avenir des paysans.

Donc, Monsieur Lebreton, il n'y a pas de cloisonnement. On peut faire de l'agriculture sur des zones de biodiversité et on peut protéger la biodiversité sur les zones où on pratique l'agriculture. Et c'est cela qui sauvera l'humanité.

**Gilles Lebreton (ID), réponse «carton bleu».** – Cher Monsieur Biteau, je n'ai jamais dit qu'il fallait davantage de pesticides. Je suis d'accord pour qu'il y ait des mesures qui permettent de mieux prendre en compte les exigences environnementales. Mais tournons-nous plutôt du côté des industries qui polluent massivement. Tournons-nous plutôt du côté des pays qui ont décidé de remplacer le nucléaire par le charbon. Commençons par faire ça et ensuite on pourra parler de l'agriculture.

**Mick Wallace (The Left).** – Mr President, firstly, thanks to César and his staff for their great work on the legislation. The threat of global biodiversity collapse is real. The scientific consensus is that if we do not take dramatic action within the next decade, we may face irreversible damage to the natural world and the collapse of our societies. The science is absolutely clear: the biggest threat to our food security, to the future of agriculture, to the very persistence of humanity are the climate and biodiversity crises. The nature restoration law can help to address both.

Last week in Piemonte, in Italia, there was unprecedented damage to grapevines and hazelnuts. In some cases, total crops were wiped out by hazelnuts bigger than golf balls and it was 30 degrees.

The nature restoration law is not perfect. It will not radically alter our utterly broken economic system, which depends on perpetual extraction of finite resources to fuel infinite expansion. And, unfortunately, any Parliament text we end up with after the vote this week is likely to be quite a bit weaker than the Commission's proposal. It won't be ideal, but I am hopeful that after the negotiations with the Council we will have a legal framework that is workable and that sufficiently addresses the biodiversity crisis. Our future depends on it. The nature restoration law is an existential necessity.

**Edina Tóth (NI).** – Elnök Úr! Immár a sokadik geen deal-es, azaz zöld megállapodásos jogalkotási javaslatról vitázunk. Azonban soha nem volt még ennyire megosztó és átgondolatlan egy jogszabálytervezet, mint a természet helyreállításáról szóló rendelet. Miközben a teremben mindenki elismeri a természet helyreállításának fontosságát, ki kell mondani, hogy ez a tervezet ebben a formában nem megvalósítható.

Az Európai Bizottság és a baloldal irreális és végrehajthatatlan javaslatai veszélyeztetik a gazdálkodók megélhetését, és akár 30%-kal is csökkenthetik az élelmiszertermelést Európában. A következmények nyilvánvalóak: magasabb élelmiszerrárak, gazdaságok megszűnése, növekvő függés harmadik országoktól. Tisztelt Biztos Úr, rendkívül szomorú és elfogadhatatlan, hogy Brüsszel nem javasolt semmilyen pénzügyi alapot, amely valódi kárpótlást nyújtana a gazdáknak. Fenygetés és háttéralkuk helyett a Bizottságnak ideje visszatérni a tervezőasztalhoz.

**Gabriel Mato (PPE).** – Señor presidente, querido comisario, atiendan a los gritos de auxilio del sector agrícola y pesquero de la Unión Europea que se escuchan desde ahí fuera. Los agricultores y pescadores se sienten indefensos y han dicho basta: basta de promover propuestas legislativas desproporcionadas que atentan directamente contra sus intereses y que ponen en peligro su medio de vida y la seguridad alimentaria.

Nuestros agricultores y pescadores se sienten perseguidos, señalados como si fueran culpables del cambio climático y, mientras, la Comisión ignora el gran esfuerzo que han hecho para reducir las emisiones de CO<sub>2</sub>. Los agricultores y pescadores dicen sí a la ley de restauración de la naturaleza, que es un objetivo loable, pero no de esta manera, no en este momento de grandes desafíos globales y con una legislación planteada de espaldas al sector primario y nada realista.

Por cierto, tras su intervención de hoy, a la presidenta del Grupo Socialista, que ahora está ausente, le resultará muy difícil explicar a los agricultores de Castilla y León y del resto de España por qué les da la espalda. Claro que es necesaria la sostenibilidad medioambiental, pero también lo es la económica y la social de nuestros agricultores y pescadores que, no se olvide, son igualmente vulnerables.

Señor comisario, no se puede restaurar la naturaleza sin los agricultores. No se puede restaurar la naturaleza contra los agricultores. Tuvieron la oportunidad, perdida ya, de haber retirado esta ley de restauración de la naturaleza y ahora nosotros vamos a rechazarlo, esperando que venga una ley que persiga conciliar la protección del medio ambiente con la actividad de producir alimentos de calidad para todos los ciudadanos.

**Maria Noichl (S&D).** – Herr Präsident, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Ich möchte hier gern als Mitglied des Agrarausschusses sprechen. Eines ist deutlich, dass die zwei Demonstrationen, die wir heute draußen vor dem Parlament gesehen haben, das Thema nicht abbilden. Diese zwei Demonstrationen sollen uns glauben machen, es gebe eine Situation Landwirte gegen Nichtlandwirte. Das ist aber nicht der Fall. Es geht nicht um Landwirte gegen Nichtlandwirte, sondern es geht um eines: Es geht um Macht und die Idee, mit ganz, ganz Rechts zusammen weiter an die Macht zu kommen, oder um Zukunft. Das ist die Gemengelage: Macht oder Zukunft.

Ich glaube, die beiden Seiten muss man sich genau anschauen. Auf der einen Seite ist die EVP mit den Euroskeptikern und mit den extremen Rechten, die der Meinung sind, lieber auf Natur zu verzichten, als auf die Macht zu verzichten. Auf der anderen Seite möchte ich Danke sagen an alle, die wirklich das Hirn eingeschaltet haben und Vernunft geltend machen, die sich klar an die Seite der Wissenschaft stellen, die sich klar an die Seite der Landwirte der Zukunft stellen, die sich klar an die Seite derjenigen stellen, die wissen: Es geht auch um die nächsten Generationen. Es ist nicht Landwirte gegen Nichtlandwirte, sondern es ist Vernunft gegen Macht.

**Pascal Canfin (Renew).** – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, Monsieur le Commissaire, nous avons cette semaine deux très grandes responsabilités.

Notre première responsabilité, c'est de sauver la nature. Je m'adresse à mes collègues de droite et du centre droit: si vous ne voulez pas écouter les scientifiques unanimes pour défendre la nécessité de cette loi, alors écoutez la Fédération européenne des chasseurs. Les chasseurs sont favorables à cette loi. Écoutez les entreprises du secteur de l'agroalimentaire, qui sont favorables à cette loi parce qu'elles savent très bien que la première menace sur les rendements agricoles, c'est la disparition de la nature des pollinisateurs et le changement climatique. Écoutez la Banque centrale européenne, qui nous rappelle que l'immense majorité de notre économie est dépendante des services rendus par la nature. Revenez à la raison.

Notre deuxième responsabilité, outre celle de sauver la nature, c'est de faire barrage au populisme d'extrême droite et à l'alliance menée par une partie du PPE avec ce populisme d'extrême droite. Il tue la démocratie européenne, il tue l'esprit de compromis qui nous anime depuis le début sur le pacte vert. Nous ne devons pas laisser passer ce populisme d'extrême droite et les fausses informations, les mensonges qu'il colporte depuis un an et que vous avez encore repris de manière totalement éhontée dans cet hémicycle.

Nous avons donc demain une double responsabilité: sauver la nature, faire barrage au populisme d'extrême droite et à son alliance avec une partie de la droite. J'espère que nous gagnerons.

**Der Präsident.** – Herr Buda, ich muss Ihnen sagen, Sie stehen auf der Rednerliste, daher nehme ich Sie jetzt bei der blauen Karte nicht dran und erteile Herrn Bas Eickhout das Wort.

**Bas Eickhout (Verts/ALE).** – Mr President, 'making nature healthy again is key [...] and an ally in the fight against climate change and disease outbreaks. It is at the heart of our [...] European Green Deal'. I'm quoting Ursula von der Leyen.

The EU Nature Restoration Law is a generation's opportunity to take concrete and effective action. More than 100 companies made that statement last week, making clear how important this Nature Restoration Law is.

Were there concerns? Did we do negotiations? Yes, there were concerns. Some cities had their concerns. But now Eurocities – representing a huge bunch of cities in Europe – is tweeting, 'we need the Nature Restoration Law'. Is this against farmers? No, the caring farmers are making it very clear that we need the Nature Restoration Law.

So, EPP, what happened? You walk away from the negotiation table; you tweet about Santa Claus. It's all very funny, but let's get back to reality, let's take this vote. It is finally time that you support nature restoration and this law.

**Anna Zalewska (ECR).** – Panie Przewodniczący! Panie Komisarzu! Emocje, krzyki, szantaż – to dowód na to, że jest to złe rozporządzenie, nieprzemyślane, niepoliczalne, uderzające w naturę, uderzające w człowieka. Dlatego że coś, co jest niemożliwe do wykonania, powoduje, że osiąga się efekt odwrotny do zamierzonego. To rozporządzenie jest złe dlatego, że ingeruje w prywatność i we własność. Naprawdę, nie obniżymy temperatury w Strasburgu, jeżeli zabierzemy rolnikom ich ziemię. Ktoś musi nas żywić. Zresztą rolnicy, leśnicy, rybacy kochają przyrodę nie mniej niż przedstawiciele, którzy z pozoru domagają się dbałości o tę naturę. To rozporządzenie jest również złe, bo oddaje zbyt wiele kompetencji Komisji Europejskiej, która będzie skarżyła, monitorowała sprawozdawała i sama podejmowała decyzje. W diagnozie jest napisane, że nie udało się ustalić obszarów Natura 2000, więc mówi się „nie” i robi się jeszcze więcej. To zła droga. Proponuję, żeby zamiast udawać się na wakacje do hotelu z klimatyzacją, poteterminować u rolnika, nauczyć się, jak dbać o przyrodę i o zwierzęta.



**Sylvia Limmer (ID)**. – Herr Präsident! Die Naturwiederherstellungsverordnung ist nichts anderes als ein gigantisches Enteignungs- und Existenzvernichtungsprogramm für Landwirte. Eine Studie schätzt, dass von den ehemals 15 Millionen Höfen in der EU 2040 nur noch 3,6 Millionen übrig bleiben. Und da ist Ihre Öko-Bio-Klima-Mogelpackung noch gar nicht eingepreist.

Wer gute, bezahlbare und einheimische Lebensmittel will, die nicht erst um die halbe Welt geflogen wurden, bevor sie auf unserem Teller landen, der muss einheimische Landwirte unterstützen, auch beim Erhalt ihrer Ackerflächen und nicht bei der Abschaffung. Sie wissen das auch! Aber statt fachlicher Argumente ätzen Sie lieber, dass eine EVP endlich auf unserem vernünftigen und konservativen ID/AfD-Kurs einschwenkt und gemeinsam mit uns gegen diese Verordnung der Abschaffung der Ernährungssicherheit stimmt. Das, werte grün-rote Ideologen, zeigt nicht nur Ihre Konzeptlosigkeit, sondern ist einfach nur politisch peinlich und antidemokratisch.

**Silvia Modig (The Left)**. – Arvoisa puhemies, tiedeyhteisö on jo pitkään painottanut, että luontokato on vähintään yhtä iso uhka ihmiskunnalle kuin ilmastonmuutos, ja että nämä kaksi ovat vahvasti linkittyneet toisiinsa, mitä vahvempi monimuotoisuus, sitä parempi on planeettamme sopeutumiskyky ilmastonmuutoksen edessä. Hyvinvoiva luonto voisi auttaa meitä sopeutumisessa. Jos luonto siis olisi hyvinvoiva, mitä se tällä hetkellä ei ole.

Käynnissä on historiallinen lajien sukupuuttoaalto. Lajikato koskee myös pölyttäjiä, joita joka ikinen siemenkasvi tarvitsee lisääntyäkseen. Jopa 70 prosenttia maaperästä on heikentyneessä tilassa. Siksi tiedeyhteisö on pitkään viestinyt, että luontokato on suurimpia uhkia ruokaturvalle ja siten myös viljelijöille. Tuhannet tutkijat ovat vedonneet tämän lain puolesta. Ilman sitä jää biodiversiteettistrategia taas vain tyhjäksi puheeksi ja ilman ennallistamista emme pysty lopettamaan luontokatoa. Luonto ansaitsee enemmän kuin tämän ruman, lyhytnäköisen ja valheellisen poliittisen pelin.

**Herbert Dorfmann (PPE)**. – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar, Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Ich glaube, immer dann, wenn wir hier in diesem Haus neue Gesetzgebung machen, sollten wir uns eine zentrale Frage stellen: Bringt diese Gesetzgebung einen Mehrwert, und respektiert sie die Subsidiarität? Bei der Verordnung über die Wiederherstellung der Natur ist die Antwort ganz klar: Nein. Unsere Staaten, die Regionen, die Kommunen sind zuständig für den Schutz der Landschaft. Ein generelles Verschlechterungsverbot wird diese Zuständigkeit arg verletzen. Ich bezweifle schon sehr, ob Brüsseler Behörden eine Zukunft besser abwägen können als eine einzelne Gemeinde, ob ein Eingriff vernünftig ist oder nicht.

Dann identifizieren wir natürlich wieder einmal in der Landwirtschaft die maßgeblichen Verantwortlichen für die Zerstörung von Natur und Landschaft. 10 % der Flächen sollen aus der Produktion genommen werden. Die Lebensmittelsicherheit, so sagt die Kommission, wird damit nicht beeinflusst. Das wird richtig sein, wenn man auf den restlichen 90 % intensiver wird. Ist das sinnvoll? Ich denke, es ist sinnvoll, in der Landwirtschaft auf allen Flächen Wege zu finden, damit wir möglichst nachhaltig produzieren können. Dazu haben wir die Gemeinsame Agrarpolitik, dazu geben wir rund 20 Milliarden Euro im Jahr aus, und wir werden diese freiwilligen Programme gefährden, wenn wir Mindeststandards, gesetzliche Standards einführen.

Dann gibt es natürlich noch die Frage des Eigentumsrechts. Auch das wird arg verletzt. Dieses Gesetz gehört an die Kommission zurück.

*(Der Redner ist damit einverstanden, eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“ zu beantworten.)*

**Maria Grapini (S&D)**, *întrebare adresată conform procedurii „cartonașului albastru“*. – Cred că trebuie să vă puneți căștile. Ok. Sunt convinsă că și dumneavoastră și toți de aici vrem protejarea naturii.

Ați spus că propunerea Comisiei și propunerea pe care o dezbatem astăzi nu aduce o plusvaloare. Știu că sunteți cunoscător al domeniului agriculturii. Ați putea să spuneți dumneavoastră ce propunere aduce o plusvaloare încât să asigurăm și agricultorilor o viață bună, și dezvoltarea agriculturii și a fermierilor, dar să protejăm și natura? Care ar fi propunerea dumneavoastră?

**Herbert Dorfmann (PPE)**, *Antwort auf eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“*. – Frau Kollegin! Ich habe mich im Rahmen der langen Debatte über die Gemeinsame Agrarpolitik sehr dafür eingesetzt, dass die GAP Elemente der Nachhaltigkeit beinhaltet, dass wir Öko-Regelungen einbauen, dass wir das Agrarumweltprogramm stützen. Wir geben jetzt im Jahr rund ein Drittel des gesamten Geldes der Gemeinsamen Agrarpolitik für Nachhaltigkeitsprogramme aus. Ich denke, wir sollten diesen Weg effizient weitergehen in dieser Reform und auch in den kommenden Reformen. Damit werden wir den Bauern mehr Möglichkeiten schaffen und auch der Natur mehr helfen.

**Predrag Fred Matić (S&D).** – Poštovani predsjedavajući, povjereniče, iako se već dugo bavim politikom, ne mogu se pomiriti s činjenicom da su nekim kolegama puno važniji glasovi na sljedećim izborima od budućnosti naše djece.

Nerazumljiv mi je *salto mortale* desnih stranaka kojima su do prije nekoliko mjeseci bila puna usta o važnosti ravnoteže između politika održivog razvoja i budućnosti ribarskog sektora.

Po stoti put naglašavam, nitko ne želi uzeti ribarima kruh iz usta niti ih prisiliti da vežu svoje brodice u luku i promijene profesiju. Upravo suprotno. Obnova prirode nije želja, ona je prijeka potreba.

Ovom uredbom članicama je dano dovoljno vremena da pripreme svoje nacionalne planove obnove i da počnu donositi adekvatne mjere, i to samo na onim područjima koja su najugroženija. Poručujem svim manipulatorima, članak 5. stavak 1. gadno radi protiv vas.

I zaključno, glasanje protiv obnove prirode je glasanje protiv zdravog razuma, protiv sigurnosti opskrbe hranom, protiv očuvanja prirodnih ljepota, protiv egzistencije europskih ribara, a ujedno je i najprimitivniji oblik sebičnosti i politikanstva.

**Nils Torvalds (Renew).** – Mr President, before I start, I would just remind you that you let Commissioner Sinkevičius go over the time, with 7 minutes and 24 seconds, so please give us a chance in the same spirit.

I don't like emotional debates, and this debate has been very emotional. And therefore we don't see the facts as they are. In all cases of shared competence, the Commission is forced, according to Articles 4 and 5 of the Treaty, to show that the problem is better solved on EU level than on Member State level. That leads, by the logic of things, to a one size fits all. And that's the very problem of this proposal.

Nature in Finland is not being killed in 80%, as has been stated here. Nature in the Netherlands is probably being killed because you have 500 Dutch persons per square kilometre. In Finland, we have probably 17. So you have different circumstances in different Member States.

This is not taken into account in this proposal and that is creating the immense problems we have. And we are going to have a very hard debate in the Renew. It is not easy to be the kingmaker and therefore the rest of the seven minutes I leave to the next speaker.

*(The speaker agreed to take a blue-card question)*

**Philippe Lamberts (Verts/ALE), blue-card question.** – Mr Torvalds, you know I respect you a lot. You mentioned Finland. The nature of Finland is not being destroyed. The entire climate strategy [*speaks off mic*] Okay. What you mean is that, basically, Finland does not have the same problem as the Netherlands, I agree, it's a different country, but the entire climate strategy of your country is predicated on your forests absorbing 20 million tons of carbon every year. And the way they are exploited today means that they emit carbon instead of absorbing it. You have to solve this.

**Nils Torvalds (Renew), blue-card answer.** – The good colleague from Belgium has the wrong information about Finnish forests, because there was a report that Finnish forests are emitting more. Then that was controlled several times and it was shown that this is not the case. So when you start to debate Finnish forests with me, you better stay by the facts.

**Marie Toussaint (Verts/ALE).** – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, nous vivons l'effondrement accéléré du vivant sous l'effet de la perte de biodiversité et du dérèglement climatique. Tout le monde le sait. La loi sur la restauration de la nature a une portée cruciale. Elle doit être adoptée. Chaque parlementaire de cet hémicycle a entre ses mains une part du destin de l'humanité. Alors, chers collègues, ouvrez les yeux!

Des millions d'espèces disparaissent, nos champs s'appauvrissent, nos sols s'assèchent, nos forêts brûlent. C'est la vie elle-même qui disparaît. Cette loi devait être la plus importante loi pour la biodiversité adoptée depuis 20 ans. Et pourtant, vous, à droite et à l'extrême droite de cet hémicycle, vous vous échinez à la réduire à néant. En condamnant la nature, vous condamnez notre futur.

Où est donc passée votre conscience? A-t-elle été achetée par les lobbies? Est-elle inexistante? Que direz-vous à vos enfants? Nous avons sacrifié la nature pour réussir l'union des droites européennes? C'est indigne, c'est irresponsable et c'est criminel. Alors, chers collègues de droite, il est encore temps de vous ressaisir. Je vous appelle à désobéir à vos chefs qui vous déshonorent et à adopter cette loi.

**Margarita de la Pisa Carrión (ECR).** – Señor presidente, señorías, la Comisión Europea está demostrando no tener escrúpulos a la hora de querer imponerse e intentar destrozarnos nuestro sector primario utilizando una supuesta preocupación medioambiental como excusa.

La mal llamada «ley de restauración de la naturaleza» habla de restaurar, pero, en realidad, está amenazando una gran parte de nuestra superficie cultivable, que ya estaba muy restringida por normativas anteriores.

Se desprecia a quienes tienen la experiencia de milenios —nuestros agricultores y ganaderos—, cuya actividad es imprescindible para nuestro sustento, por imponer un absurdo discurso verde.

En España los bosques arden porque no se pueden limpiar. Se derriban presas cuando el agua será necesaria en la sequía.

No vamos a permitir arriesgar nuestro alimento. Nos llevan al precipicio.

Necesitamos Gobiernos fuertes que devuelvan la sensatez a nuestras políticas y no sucumban al fanatismo climático.

**Anders Vistisen (ID).** – Hr. formand! Når man i den her debat skal tage venstrefløjen og den grønne NGO-verdens ord for pålydende, så står vi i en kæmpe biodiversitetskrise. Og det første naturlige spørgsmål må så være: Hvordan er vi havnet der i Europa? Landbrugspolitik, Fiskeripolitik, har altid været EU-enekompetence. Så hvis man mener, at det er fiskeriet, hvis man mener, at det er landbruget, der har hovedansvaret, så er de ansvarlige regulatorer med ansvaret for den situation, vi står i, her i salen, i Kommissionen, i Rådet. Hvad er svaret fra jer så på den krise? Giv os mere magt! Giv EU indflydelse til at bestemme endnu mere! Lad os give en blankocheck til Kommissionen, lad os give en blankocheck til EU-domstolen til at tiltage sig flere kompetencer på vegne af medlemsstaterne!

Jeg tror, at naturen reddes bedst der, hvor den leves, ude i lokalmiljøerne, derude, hvor man har et forhold til den. Ikke iblandt Europas storbyer, som det er blevet fremhævet her, men hos os, der rent faktisk bor i landdistrikterne. Det er der, naturen reddes, ikke fra et glaspalads i Bruxelles og Strasbourg, som selv har skabt problemerne med deres enekompetence på disse områder.

**Luke Ming Flanagan (The Left).** – Mr President, we need this to work for all our futures. For that to happen, we need to be honest with farmers on what they will have to do. If it is going to cause a problem, then we have to admit it. In the case of re-establishing habitats, Article 4(2), depending on how a Member State interprets it, farmers could be prevented from farming their land. That's not scaremongering; that's my honest interpretation.

I have tabled two amendments in order to guarantee that when and if this regulation comes into effect, that those farmers who farm in an extensive, sustainable way are protected. Between now and when the trilogues are concluded, this must be dealt with. Thanks to the rapporteur for your email on this and I'll be talking to you.

We also need to fund this. We have been told by the WWF that the regulation will create EUR 1.8 trillion in public funds, yet we can't find any new public money. In Switzerland, they found the money. In Switzerland, there is very little controversy because farmers are taken care of. To financially match what Switzerland gives to farmers for nature, the EU would only need a mere EUR 0.4 trillion every six years – cheap in comparison to the EUR 1.8 trillion in benefits.

**Jörg Meuthen (NI).** – Herr Präsident, werte Kollegen! Wir sprechen heute über das Renaturierungsgesetz. Was die Europäische Kommission vorlegt, klingt wie so oft zunächst einmal nicht schlecht. Gegen die Natur, gegen eine intakte Natur kann niemand ernsthaft sein. Schaut man sich den Entwurf jedoch genauer an, entpuppt sich das Ganze – auch das wie so oft – als nett verpackter ideologischer Irrsinn. Es geht der Kommission nicht darum, der Natur vereinzelt, beschädigte Flächen zurückzugeben. Vielmehr sollen 20 % unserer Flächen zwangsrenaturiert, also wieder zur Wildnis werden, die Hälfte davon bisher landwirtschaftlich genutzte Flächen.

Dieser Plan ist nicht nur vollkommen realitätsfern, sondern hochgefährlich – eine Gefahr für unsere heimische Landwirtschaft und damit für die Sicherheit unserer Nahrungsmittelversorgung. Wer auch in Zukunft regionale Produkte, bezahlbares Obst und Gemüse auf unseren Tellern sehen möchte, wer unseren Landwirten ihre so wichtige Arbeit nicht noch weiter erschweren, ja teilweise sogar verunmöglichen will, muss am Mittwoch entschlossen gegen dieses Gesetz stimmen. Ja zur Landwirtschaft, ja zum Naturschutz, nein zu diesem Renaturierungsgesetz.

**Jessica Polfjärd (PPE).** – Herr talman! Det är mindre än ett år kvar av denna mandatperiod. Därför är det bra att vi den här veckan har debatt och röstar om naturrestaureringslagen, där allt blir tydligt. Det spelar roll vilka företrädare som representerar väljarna. På vår sida är vi tydliga. När någonting inte håller standarden ska det göras om. Vi hittar inte på falska argument om det här förslaget, att det är det, eller en ekologisk kollaps. Det stämmer inte. Sådana argument hjälper ingen, allra minst miljön och klimatet.

Vi vill stärka den biologiska mångfalden, men vi behöver också ha mål som är realistiska, och som faktiskt går att genomföra. Det går inte att säga det om det här förslaget. Den samlade vänstern har tydligt visat att de inte är intresserade av att få med sig alla på den här resan mot ett hållbart samhälle. I stället vill man ha debatter där de kan fulmåla alla dem som inte tycker som de. Jag tycker att det är ovärdigt det här parlamentet och det europeiska miljöarbetet, som är så viktigt. Man struntar också i de människor som faktiskt ska förvalta jorden som vi faktiskt måste bruka och som vi är beroende av. Moderaterna och EPP kommer alltid att sätta människan i centrum för vår politik. Vi och vår partigrupp tror att jord- och skogsbrukare är en del av lösningen, inte en del av problemet.

**Heléne Fritzon (S&D).** – Herr talman! Kommissionen. Som så många svenskar har jag en nära och djup relation till naturen. Från våra höga fjäll i norr, till de skånska rapsfälten i söder. Naturen är vår viktigaste tillgång och den ska vi förvalta till våra barn och barnbarn. Att stärka våra älvar, marker, ängar och skogar är nödvändigt för den gröna omställningen. Därför är det också en pelare i EU:s gröna giv, och därför är det så viktigt att vi arbetar hårt för en lagstiftning som både stärker naturen och skyddar ett aktivt svenskt jord- och skogsbruk.

I stället väljer de högerkonservativa att lämna förhandlingarna, och man lämnar då också sitt ansvar för framtiden. Det är inte läge nu att göra som i Sverige, att kroka arm med extremhögern för att stoppa den gröna omställningen. Vi är lagstiftare. Vi står upp för kompromisser, för den svenska naturen, för ett hållbart skogsbruk och för ett livskraftigt jordbruk.

*(Talaren godtog att besvara en fråga, "blått kort".)*

**Sara Skyttedal (PPE), fråga ("blått kort").** – Naturrestaureringslagen har ett mycket behjärtansvärt syfte: att stärka den biologiska mångfalden. Jag förstår därför att det låter bra att rösta för detta förslag, men det är allt för ofta som Europaparlamentariker verkar bry sig mer om vad som låter bra än vad som faktiskt är bra.

Vi är lagstiftare, inte några politiska influencers. Detta förslag skulle få förödande konsekvenser för det svenska hjärtlandet. Jag tycker att de svenska socialdemokraterna borde bry sig mer om vad jordbrukare, skogsbrukare och landsortskommuner bryr sig om i det här fallet, än vad politiska influencers som Greta Thunberg tycker.

**Heléne Fritzon (S&D), svar ("blått kort").** – Tack, Sara Skyttedal, för frågan. Vi är lagstiftare, därför har vi också ansvaret att förhandla. Jag vill arbeta för svenska intressen i naturrestaureringslagen genom att vi förhandlar fram kompromisser. Den viktigaste framgången är ju att vi ökar flexibiliteten i lagstiftningen, så att vi kan se till medlemsstaternas olika intressen och olika behov i olika regioner. Nationella restaureringsplaner är helt avgörande för denna lagstiftning. Så skyddar vi också ett livskraftigt jord- och skogsbruk i alla medlemsstater.

**Elsi Katainen (Renew).** – Arvoisa puhemies, arvoisa komission jäsen, luonnon monimuotoisuus on elämälle välttämätöntä ja siksi sitä pitää vahvistaa. Onkin harmillista, että tämän komission epärealistisen, jäsenvaltioiden erilaiset olosuhteet täysin sivuuttavan, ennallistamisasetusesityksen sisältö ei palvele tätä tavoitetta. Myöskään komission menettelytavat eivät ole kunnioittaneet neuvottelukumppaneita. Ei siis ole yllätys eikä sattumaa, että suuri joukko meppejä, kolme valiokuntaa, viljelijät ja metsänomistajat haluavat hylätä tämän esityksen.

Suuri virhe on se, että taas jäsenvaltioita pyritään puskemaan yhteen ja samaan muottiin. Miksi esimerkiksi maa, jonka pinta-alasta 75 prosenttia on metsää, ja missä on runsaat ja puhtaat vesivarat, joutuu maksamaan ennallistamistoimista kaikista eniten? Millä oikeudella omistajien oikeuksia poljetaan? On selvää, että tällä tavoin toimijat eivät sitoudu tähän vaativaan ja tärkeään hankkeeseen. Siksi kannatan tämän esityksen hylkäämistä ja palauttamista komission huolellisempaan käsittelyyn.

**Pär Holmgren (Verts/ALE).** – Herr talman! Det har gått rätt hett till här inne idag. Det är varmt där ute. Det kanske blir 37, 38 grader i eftermiddag. Jag vet inte om det är något symboliskt med det, för, om inte i år, så i allafall nästa år, lär den globala uppvärmningen nå en och en halv grad för första gången. Det är väl det som man skulle kunna kalla för en febergräns för hela planeten.

FN:s klimatpanel är väldigt tydliga. När det gäller smärtlindring och febernedsättande är det just restaurering av naturen som är det bästa botemedlet. Därför är det självklart att vi måste få en naturrestaureringslag på plats nu. Men – som alla vi vet här inne – för många i parlamentet handlar detta väldigt mycket också nu om ett politiskt maktspel, där den konservativa gruppen vill närma sig högerytterkanterna. Precis samma sak som jag sett hemma i Sverige och även i Finland. Därför är jag verkligen förvånad över att så många i den liberala gruppen väljer sida med högerpartierna. Till exempel Centerpartiet, ett parti som var både liberalt och grönt när jag växte upp, men som i dag, i alla fall just den här veckan, verkar vara varken eller.

**Pietro Fiocchi (ECR).** – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, il regolamento sul ripristino della natura è stato bocciato in tre commissioni, AGRI, PECH ed ENVI, dovremmo chiederoci il perché.

Il fascicolo prevede un vincolo sulle nuove aree al di fuori della rete Natura 2000 – venite in Italia a vedere cosa succede nelle aree Natura 2000, abbandonate perché è vietato qualsiasi tipo di attività umana, sono diventate centri di spaccio di droga e di prostituzione.

Poi sussiste una palese violazione del principio della proprietà privata, per cui sussidiarietà e proporzionalità li buttiamo nel gabinetto.

Infine un tema caro al Commissario Sinkevičius: i 25 000 chilometri di fiumi a scorrimento libero. Come la mettiamo con la produzione delle energie rinnovabili e quindi l'energia idroelettrica? È qui c'è un palese contrasto dell'azione della Commissione.

Per cui voteremo per il rigetto della proposta, proprio perché siamo a favore dell'ambiente ma non a scapito della produzione agricola; siamo a favore della natura ma non a scapito della produzione delle rinnovabili; siamo a favore del ripristino della natura ma non ci renderemo complici di cancellare i diritti dei cittadini europei.

Infine un commento personale: se io avessi fatto gli studi di impatto ambientale che ha fatto la Commissione sulle questioni sociali, economiche e ambientali al liceo, mi avrebbero bocciato. Per cui forse la Commissione è meglio che vada a scuola e rifaccia questi studi.

## PRESIDENZA DELL'ON. PINA PICIERNO

Vicepresidente

**Jaak Madison (ID).** – Austatud istungi juhataja! Esiteks, ma ei ole kindel, kui paljud selle saali inimestest on lugenud selle määruse algusest lõpuni läbi, sest debatis esitatud väited on suuresti emotsionaalsed: kes on poolt, kes on vastu, kes tahab päästa planeeti. Planeeti, kus kogu atmosfääri CO<sub>2</sub> massist alla nelja protsendi on tekitatud inimese poolt, kuid sellegipoolest päästame planeeti. Mina olen lugenud selle määruse korduvalt läbi ja mul on kohe mitu head küsimust. Kui väidetakse, et see ei löö põllumehi ja meie toidutootmist, siis kui määrus näeb ette, et turbaaladest tuleb aastaks 2030 lõpetada turba kaevandamine 30 protsendil aladest ja vähemalt veerand sellest tuleb taas vett täis lasta ja taassoostada, ja me teame, et turvas on üks oluline komponent põllumajandustootjatele, et tagada suuremat saagikust, siis kuidas me peaksime kompenseerima põllumeestele selle kahju? Aastaks 2050 muide on määruse kohaselt vaja lausa pool turbaaladest soostada. Lisaks sellele näeb määrus ette, et tuleks lasta metsal mädaneda, et tekitada liigirikkust. Kes hüvitab metsameestele korraliku puidu raiskulaskmise, selleks et mõned vasakpoolsed saaksid oma utoopiat ellu viia? Selles määruuses on väga palju konkreetseid asju, mis selgelt löövad põllumehi, metsaomanikke ja toidutootjaid, kuid kes selle kinni maksab? Ma saan aru, et vasakpoolsetel tuleb raha ainult pangaautomaadist ja majandusest nad suurt midagi ei tea, ja see ongi meie vahe. Meie vaatame ühiskonda tervikuna, teie vaatate ainult utoopiat selleks, et oma globalistlikku ideed ellu viia.

(Sõnavõtja nõustus vastama sinise kaardi küsimusele)

**Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE), blue-card question.** – (Start of speech off mic) ... We all know that if we do not act both on the climate change, and especially on biodiversity, the cost is going to be at least tenfold to our economies and farmers.

I am just asking: who should compensate and out of which money we are going to compensate the nature destruction?

**Jaak Madison (ID), blue-card answer.** – Well, that's not for question. We all know that all the money has to be paid by taxpayers. So it has to be from our own pocket – of course, not from our pockets, because most of us don't have to care about money – but ordinary people have to pay a higher price for the food, they have to pay a higher price for the travelling, a higher price for the fuel, for travelling to work in the morning. So it comes from the ordinary people – only because we are believing that we can change the climate.

There is no doubt that there is a climate change. The only question is: how can we really affect climate change, and are we really changing in some way climate change if we are just saying to the food producers, 'no, you are our enemies, you shouldn't produce any meat anymore because you are just destroying the planet'. That's the real problem.

**Mislav Kolakušić (NI).** – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, Zakon o obnovi prirode, kako to lijepo zvuči. Tko se ne bi složio s time? Međutim, prava istina je da je ovdje riječ o samo još jednom ogromnom idiotizmu kakvog smo u ovom Domu vidjeli već bezbroj puta.

Jedini pravi cilj ovog zakona je konfiskacija privatnog vlasništva i oduzimanje poljoprivrednog zemljišta poljoprivrednicima, što ima krajnji cilj, a to je nedostupnost organske hrane građanima. Znači, želi se onemogućiti prosječnom građaninu da može jesti normalnu hranu.

To je zakon. Bi bilo bolje da se zove Zakon o nedostupnosti hrane građanima Europske unije. Nekada u komunizmu bilo je barem malo dostojanstva pa su se zakoni o konfiskaciji privatnog vlasništva nazivali Zakonom o konfiskaciji. Sada ih nazivate Zakonom o obnovi planete Zemlje, o obnovi prirode. Pa to su gluposti i idiotarije.

**Alexander Bernhuber (PPE).** – Frau Präsidentin, sehr geehrter Herr Kommissar! Heute debattieren wir hier über die Verordnung über die Wiederherstellung der Natur. Morgen wird hier darüber abgestimmt. Nur wenn ich mir die Überschrift ansehe, dann stimmt das nicht mit den konkreten Punkten darin überein. Eigentlich hätte sich der Text ja eine andere Überschrift verdient, und ich habe mir ein paar Vorschläge dazu überlegt. Es würde z. B. passen: Wald- und Wiesen-Stilllegungsgesetz, bäuerliches Enteignungsgesetz oder Stopp-Erneuerbaren-Ausbau-Gesetz.

Denn wenn es um wirklichen Naturschutz geht, dann brauchen sie nur zu schauen, wie es unsere Landwirte machen. Ich bin selbst Bauer in Österreich, und ich weiß, wie ich meine Felder und Wiesen nachhaltig bewirtschafte und wie wir hier Naturschutz umsetzen. Wir haben es heute vor dem Parlament gesehen, wie hier hunderte Bauern demonstriert haben, mit vielen Traktoren hier gestanden haben. Sie haben Sorgen, und diese Sorgen werden nicht gehört. Aber genau das erreichen wir eben nicht mit großflächigen Ackerflächenstilllegungen oder Außer-Nutzung-Stellung unserer Wälder.

Auch wenn wir einen Blick darauf werfen, wie sie umgehen mit dem Bereich Ausbau erneuerbarer Energien, dann zeigt sich hier ein ganz klarer Widerspruch: Auf der einen Seite wollen wir mehr erneuerbare Energien, auf der anderen Seite wird es fast verunmöglicht, dass wir noch ein Wasserkraftwerk bauen, dass wir noch ein Wasserkraftwerk renovieren, nur weil es in einem Schutzgebiet ist. Das passt einfach nicht zusammen.

Lieber Herr Kommissar, bitte nehmen Sie die Sorgen ernst. Bitte schauen Sie, was hier passiert. Alles, was wir hier beschließen wollen, wird bereits mit 23 Verordnungen und Richtlinien geregelt. Es braucht diese eine zusätzliche Richtlinie, bitte, nicht. Wir sind nicht gegen Naturschutz, wir wollen eine klare, gute Gesetzgebung. Aber bitte nicht mit diesem Vorschlag. Wir brauchen hier einen neuen.

**Delara Burkhardt (S&D).** – Frau Präsidentin! Ich glaube, viele von uns hätten gern über die Sorgen und über das Naturwiederherstellungsgesetz gesprochen. Aber statt dem „Wie“ müssen wir hier heute über das „Ob“ sprechen: ob das Europäische Parlament als einzige europäische Institution das Gesetz blockiert. Arbeitsverweigerung statt Lösung.

Es wäre eine große Abstimmung, wenn es nur um die Naturwiederherstellung ginge. Es geht aber auch um die Frage danach, ob eine Mehrheit dieses Hauses hinter dem Rechtskurs von Manfred Weber steht. Für Ihren Machterhalt sind Sie bereit, den demokratischen Verhandlungstisch im Parlament zu verlassen und in einer Fake-News-Kampagne, die Trump neidisch machen würde, zur Blockade politischen Handelns aufzurufen.

Das ist eine Strategie, die wir bereits in Italien, in Schweden und Spanien beobachten können. Sie bilden Allianzen mit Rechts, nicht um Probleme zu lösen, sondern für Posten und Macht. Wir haben hier gehört, dass auch Kolleginnen und Kollegen in der EVP das kritisch sehen. Kommen Sie zurück an den Verhandlungstisch und lassen Sie uns dieses Gesetz Realität werden lassen.

**Jan Huitema (Renew).** – Voorzitter, geachte commissaris, beste leden, niemand is tegen natuur. Ik ben opgegroeid op een boerderij en met de natuur opgegroeid. We moeten biodiversiteitsverlies in Europa en in de wereld stoppen. De vraag is dus ook niet waarom, maar hoe we natuur het best kunnen herstellen.

Het voorstel van de Europese Commissie leest op papier geweldig, maar in werkelijkheid zal het de zaken onnodig vertragen, ook als het gaat om natuurherstel. Landen zoals Nederland zitten nu al op slot. Langzaam kruipt Nederland uit een juridisch moeras, maar met dit voorstel wordt Nederland weer terug in dit moeras getrokken.

Vergunningen voor huizenbouw, infrastructuur, landbouwbedrijven en zelfs klimaatprojecten worden niet of moeizaam afgegeven. Met een Nationaal Programma Landelijk Gebied wordt beloofd hiervoor een oplossing te geven voor de komende decennia. Als dit Europees voorstel wordt aangenomen, wordt deze belofte al na een jaar verbroken.

Van alle wetsvoorstellen die ik hier in het Europees Parlement heb behandeld, heeft dit de grootste impact op de mensen thuis. We kunnen dit voorstel niet goedkeuren zonder de negatieve gevolgen onder ogen te zien, zelfs niet als het gaat over natuurherstel.

**Thomas Waitz (Verts/ALE).** – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Kommissar! Wir befinden uns im größten Artensterben seit dem Ende der Dinosaurier. Pro Stunde verlieren wir global drei Arten. Seit wir hier debattieren heute Morgen haben wir fünf Arten für immer verloren.

Ich nehme an, Natur- und Biodiversitätswiederherstellung ist Unsinn, wenn man dem Twitter der Konservativen folgt. Tausende Bäuerinnen und Bauern leiden unter der Hitze, sie leiden unter der Dürre und dann unter den Überschwemmungen, die kommen. Flusswiederherstellung zur Vermeidung von Überschwemmungen und Naturwiedervernässung, Moorwiedervernässung zum Halten von Wasser auf dem Land – das ist in Ihren Augen tatsächlich Unsinn. Maßnahmen zur Klimawandelanpassung unserer Wälder, zur Klimawandelanpassung unserer landwirtschaftlichen Flächen – in den Augen der Konservativen Unsinn. Ich kann Ihnen hier absolut nicht folgen. Maßnahmen zur Begrünung unserer Städte, um Hitzetote zu vermeiden, um Bürger und Bürgerinnen zu schützen – in Ihren Augen Unsinn. Auch hier kann ich Ihnen gar nicht folgen.

Mit Ihrer Blockade des Grünen Deals und des Gesetzes zur Naturwiederherstellung gefährden Sie die Landwirtschaft. Sie gefährden unsere Lebensmittelsicherheit. Sie gefährden Maßnahmen und Menschenleben in den Städten, und Sie gefährden die Zukunft unserer Kinder und Kindeskinde. Sie haben noch Zeit umzukehren. Hören Sie auf die Wirtschaft. Hören Sie auf die Landwirtschaft, und hören Sie auf jene, die sich für die Wiederherstellung der Natur einsetzen, und stimmen Sie mit uns.

**Zbigniew Kuźmiuk (ECR).** – Pani Przewodnicząca! Panie Komisarzu! Wszyscy jesteśmy zainteresowani odbudową zasobów przyrodniczych, ale propozycje zawarte w rozporządzeniu są nie do przyjęcia, bo szkodzą rolnictwu, gospodarce leśnej, a także procesom inwestycyjnym. Jeśli chodzi o rolnictwo, to przecież ochrona środowiska, a także ochrona bioróżnorodności są wpisane we wspólną politykę rolną. W każdym 7-leciu przeznaczamy na ten cel około jednej trzeciej środków na WPR, a więc ponad 100 mld euro. Co więcej, od 1 stycznia tego roku wpisaliśmy we wspólną politykę rolną także ekoschematy: roślinne, zwierzęce. Ale rolnicy uczestniczą w ich realizacji dobrowolnie. Co więcej, za ich realizację otrzymują dodatkowe dochody. To jest dokładnie odwrotnie niż w Pana rozporządzeniu, gdzie mamy obligatoryjność, przymusowość i ani jednego euro za wykonywanie dodatkowych obowiązków. To jest po prostu nie do przyjęcia. Co więcej, nie ma wskazanych źródeł finansowania, a Komisja uzyskuje kompetencje, które nie są zawarte w traktatach. Z tego powodu delegacja polska w EKR będzie głosowała przeciwko temu rozporządzeniu.

*(Mówca zgodził się odpowiedzieć na pytanie zadane przez podniesienie niebieskiej kartki).*

**Christophe Clergeau (S&D), question «carton bleu».** – Monsieur Kuźmiuk, quand on vous écoute, ce n'est jamais la bonne proposition, ce n'est jamais le bon moment. Il faut toujours attendre. Il faut toujours aller moins vite. Il faut toujours en faire moins. Il faut seulement faire confiance aux agriculteurs et à ce qui est déjà lancé, comme si tout allait bien. Alors j'ai une simple question à vous poser: quand est-ce que ce sera le bon moment pour agir plus fortement? Est-ce que ce sera le moment où il sera trop tard?

**Zbigniew Kuźmiuk (ECR), odpowiedź na pytanie zadane przez podniesienie niebieskiej kartki.** – Jeszcze raz powtórzę: wszyscy jesteśmy za bioróżnorodnością, ale te propozycje mają charakter obligatoryjny, administracyjny, co więcej – nie przewidują środków na jego realizację. Wspólna Polityka Rolna, w szczególności ta po 1 stycznia tego roku, postępuje dokładnie odwrotnie: zachęca i pokazuje dodatkowe płatności na ten cel. Tylko wtedy jesteśmy w stanie osiągnąć sukces w tym zakresie.

**Rosanna Conte (ID).** – Signora Presidente, signor Commissario, onorevoli colleghi, bocciato in commissione PECH, bocciato in commissione AGRI, bocciato in commissione ENVI e, si direbbe, il quarto viene da sé. E in questo caso è ciò che chiediamo a questa plenaria.

Ancora una volta, sperando che sia l'ultima, puntiamo a rigettare un regolamento che danneggia le attività produttive, nascondendosi dietro il nobile intento della difesa della natura.

Meno terre per gli agricoltori, meno mare per i pescatori, meno attività per le imprese e meno prodotti europei e posti di lavoro per i nostri cittadini. Ecco i pesanti contraccolpi delle proposte contenute in un regolamento permeato di ideologia e controproducente per la natura stessa.

Non è ciò che vogliamo, e soprattutto non è ciò che meritano i cittadini e il pianeta!



La Commissione europea smetta di svenderci ai paesi terzi, gli unici a beneficiare di questo ambientalismo ipocrita.

**Márton Gyöngyösi (NI).** – Elnök Asszony! Minden felelősen gondolkodó ember számára egyértelmű, hogy a természet védelme közös feladatunk. Ezért is örülök annak, hogy az elmúlt években a kérdés felkerült a politikai döntéshozók asztalára. Ugyanakkor a fundamentalista gondolkodás a természetvédelem ügye körül is felütötte a fejét. Mindennaposak az olyan szélsőséges csoportok akciói, akik a természetvédelem ügyét felhasználva rongálnak és zaklatják az embereket. És itt vannak azok a politikusok is, akik józan ésszel végrehajthatatlan lépéseket követelnek.

Sinkevičius úr, mindketten volt szocialista országból jövünk, értjük, milyen az, ha szorít egy ötéves terv. Mindazonáltal biztos, hogy most, amikor Ukrajnában háború dúl, amikor Magyarországon például 40%-os az élelmiszerárak inflációja és élelmiszerhiány alakul ki, a gazdasági helyzet bizonytalan, jó ötlet olyan szabályozást erőltetni, amelynek mellékhatása az élelmiszerárak és a gazdák terheinek növekedése lesz? Szerintem nem, és nem is tudom támogatni.

**Norbert Lins (PPE).** – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Kommissar! Ich habe gute Nachrichten aus meiner Heimat mitgebracht. Wir haben neulich ein Monitoring in meinem intensiven Obstanbaugebiet am Bodensee im Süden Deutschlands gehabt. Wir haben 112 Wildbienenarten im Jahr 2023, doppelt so viele wie im Jahr 2010, davon 26 Arten, die landesweit als bedroht oder erheblich reduziert galten. Was für ein Erfolg! Und wer hat es geleistet, wer hat es hingekriegt? Die Bäuerinnen und Bauern, insbesondere die Obstbauern. Was haben sie gemacht? Blühflächen in die Obstplantage gesetzt, Nisthilfen, heimische Wildkräuter erweitert, intensiv selber mit eigenem Engagement angepflanzt.

Das ist der Weg, den wir gehen müssen, der Weg mit den Landwirten, der Weg der Best Practice. Setzen Sie sich hin, Herr Kommissar, schauen Sie an, welche Regionen fortgeschritten sind, welche Regionen den Artenvielfaltschwund gedreht haben, und kommen Sie dann mit einem neuen Vorschlag, übrigens auch einer Revision der FFH-Richtlinie. Die größte Gefahr für die Biodiversität ist die sich unkontrolliert ausbreitende Wolfspopulation. Das ist die große Gefahr. Bitte, berücksichtigen Sie das alles.

**Isabel Carvalhais (S&D).** – Senhora Presidente, Caros Colegas, a lei para o restauro da natureza não é para pôr florestas a arder, nem para roubar terras aos agricultores, mas para nos orientar na regeneração dos recursos naturais, porque sem isso, sim, não haverá nem sustentabilidade económica nem segurança alimentar.

Restaurar *habitats* marinhos sensíveis, como as zonas de reprodução de espécies, não é atentar contra as pescas, mas garantir que elas vão continuar a existir. Os agricultores sabem que sem solos vivos, sem água, sem biodiversidade, sem polinizadores não há agricultura. Os pescadores sabem que sem peixe não há faina.

Portanto, deixem-se de instrumentalizar estes dois setores com objetivos, esses sim, ideológicos e de mero cálculo político-partidário. O que vamos votar amanhã não é a proposta da Comissão, mas é o trabalho deste Parlamento com vista a uma lei que permita aos Estados-Membros flexibilidade na definição dos seus planos de restauro até 2030.

Este não é o tempo de adiar. Este é o tempo de agir, porque o que está em causa é muito maior do que todos nós. É a nossa própria sobrevivência!

**Ulrike Müller (Renew).** – Frau Präsidentin, sehr geehrte Kollegen, Herr Kommissar! Unser Vizepräsident Timmermans wird nicht müde zu erklären, dass die Verordnung zur Wiederherstellung der Natur ein Gesetz sei, das den Landwirten und Förstern hilft. Es tut mir leid, das so deutlich sagen zu müssen, aber das klingt nach einem Erziehungsansatz aus dem vorigen Jahrhundert. Die Kinder verstehen es nicht, aber es ist alles nur zu ihrem Besten. Manchmal muss man sie eben zu ihrem Glück zwingen.

Nur: Landwirte und Förster sind keine Kinder. Sie sind Experten auf ihrem Gebiet und können die Konsequenzen neuer Gesetze für ihre fachliche Praxis sehr wohl überblicken. Ja, wir brauchen ein Gesetz zur Stärkung der Resilienz unserer Natur. Der Klimawandel findet statt. Wir müssen uns und die Natur nur tatsächlich auch anpassen. Gelingen kann das aber nur, wenn wir die Menschen mitnehmen, besonders diejenigen, die jeden Tag in der Natur und mit der Natur arbeiten. Hier hat die Kommission auf ganzer Linie versagt.

**François Alfonsi (Verts/ALE).** – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Commissaire, la loi sur la restauration de la nature est une nécessité pour le climat. Elle est aussi nécessaire pour tous les Européens et pour tous les territoires d'Europe, sur terre comme en mer.

Je veux insister ici sur les conséquences du réchauffement climatique en Méditerranée où je vis. Les climatologues l'ont dit, c'est là que l'impact sera le plus grand. Or les herbiers de posidonie en Méditerranée forment un patrimoine écologique exceptionnel, dont le pouvoir de captation du CO<sub>2</sub> est le plus élevé qui soit. Mais ce patrimoine continue de reculer sous la pression des activités économiques humaines.

Ne faut-il pas y mettre fin de façon urgente? Mettre en application au plus vite une législation rigoureuse de restauration de la nature, voilà ce que nous pourrions faire avec cette loi. Sans cette loi, c'est la destruction qui continuera. Il serait irresponsable qu'elle soit rejetée demain.

*(L'orateur accepte de répondre à une question «carton bleu»)*

**Bogdan Rzońca (ECR),** *pytanie zadane przez podniesienie niebieskiej kartki.* – Jesteśmy świadomi tego, że w tej chwili z Unii Europejskiej firmy uciekają do Chin, do Stanów Zjednoczonych, do Wielkiej Brytanii. Tam budują swoje kampusy, bo uciążliwości podatkowe są bardzo duże. Rozwiązanie, o którym dzisiaj dyskutujemy, może przysporzyć bezrobotnych w obszarze rolnictwa i leśnictwa. Te dane już są i te wyłączenia, które będą, spowodują przyrost w tej materii. Czy Pan nie obawia się, że wprowadzenie tych restrykcyjnych rozwiązań po prostu przyniesie nieoczekiwany problem, czyli wzrost bezrobocia, z czym Unia Europejska też będzie musiała się zmierzyć? Więc chciałbym poznać Pana stanowisko w tej sprawie.

**François Alfonsi (Verts/ALE),** *réponse «carton bleu».* – *(début de l'intervention hors micro)*... c'est le réchauffement climatique et que l'Europe, en 50 ans, a connu un recul considérable de la nature sous la pression de certaines activités économiques, notamment de l'agriculture, et qu'il faut faire marche arrière si on veut redonner à nos citoyens un cadre de vie où ils trouveront non seulement du travail et de l'activité économique, mais aussi du bien-être.

**Teuvo Hakkarainen (ECR).** – Arvoisa puhemies, meillä on aina ollut sanonta, että Suomi elää metsästä ja se pitää paikkansa edelleenkin. Tämä asetus uhkaa vakavasti muun muassa metsäteollisuuttamme, maatalouttamme ja yksityisömistusta yleensä. Monissa EU-maissa metsät ovat vain muisto. Siksi halutaan Pohjoismaiden kärsittäväksi laittaa koko kauheus. Suomesta erityisesti yritetään tehdä joku lahoppumuseo. Vihreä hulluus ei näköjään osoita laantumisen merkkejä. Jos tämä asetus tulisi hyväksytyksi, Suomen hallituksen ei pidä missään tapauksessa noudattaa sitä. Vastustan jyrkästi ennallistamisasetusta kokonaisuudessaan.

**Roman Haider (ID).** – Frau Präsidentin! Mit diesem sogenannten *Nature Restoration Law*, dieser Verordnung zur angeblichen Wiederherstellung der Natur, kann man in Wahrheit nur eines machen, nämlich es in Bausch und Bogen ablehnen. Es enteignet die Bauern, es schafft künstliche Nahrungsmittelknappheit in Europa selbst und in den von Europa belieferten Ländern, es führt zu Engpässen, und es führt zu noch mehr Teuerung. Mit diesem unseligen Entwurf kann man die ebenso unselige und bürgerfeindliche EU-Kommission unter Ursula von der Leyen gleich mit entsorgen.

Die Mehrheit der Bürger lehnt ihre ideologiegetriebene Politik ab, und das zu Recht. Die bisherigen Auswirkungen der Politik dieser Kommission sind verheerend: massive Teuerung in allen Bereichen, unsichere Energieversorgung, zunehmende Deindustrialisierung, steigende Arbeitslosigkeit. Sie haben bisher nur Unheil über die EU gebracht. Jeder Tag, den diese Kommission länger im Amt ist, ist ein schwarzer Tag für Europa.

**Lídia Pereira (PPE).** – Senhora Presidente, a proposta da Lei da Restauração da Natureza foi chumbada neste Parlamento pela Comissão da Agricultura, pela Comissão do Ambiente e pela Comissão das Pescas.

Estas três comissões foram claras ao dizer que esta é uma má proposta pelo Comissário socialista Timmermans. E se até pode ser uma proposta de lei bem-intencionada, a verdade é que é uma proposta insuficiente e até incompetente para proteger o ambiente, a biodiversidade e a própria segurança alimentar na Europa.

Da parte do PPE, a nossa resposta é clara. Queremos proteger o planeta e é isso que temos feito ao votar a favor de dezenas de propostas que passaram por este Parlamento, em particular a Lei Europeia do Clima.

Mas esta é uma proposta que contribui para piorar os gravíssimos incêndios que assolam países como Portugal e que, nos últimos anos, fizeram centenas de vítimas.

É isto que a Comissão quer? É uma proposta que provoca o aumento das importações vindas de países sem as mesmas salvaguardas ambientais e contribui para um aumento da insegurança alimentar.

Da nossa parte, queremos uma proposta de restauração da Natureza que o seja de facto, mas não contem connosco para fazer figura de corpo presente.

*(A oradora aceita responder a uma pergunta formulada ao abrigo do procedimento «cartão azul»)*

**Pedro Silva Pereira (S&D)**, Pergunta segundo o procedimento «cartão azul». – Senhora Deputada Lúcia Pereira, o PSD e a Senhora Deputada decidiram lançar uma campanha de notícias falsas sobre esta lei da restauração da Natureza.

Um dos seus argumentos é que esta lei proíbe a limpeza das florestas para combater os incêndios. A minha pergunta é se a Senhora Deputada realmente leu a lei de que está a falar e se leu porque é que mente sobre o seu conteúdo.

Sabe que a lei não diz isso. Sabe que a lei remete para os Estados os planos de restauração da Natureza, que devem ser feitos de acordo com as indicações científicas, que, naturalmente, são diferentes de país para país.

É falso aquilo que diz e a pergunta é: porque é que mente?

**Lúcia Pereira (PPE)**, Resposta segundo o procedimento «cartão azul». – Muito obrigada, Senhor Deputado, pela pergunta e eu devolvo a mesma pergunta.

Eu pergunto se também leu a lei e se percebe que esta lei é um regulamento, que tem números e que tem objetivos que são iguais para todos os Estados-Membros.

E, portanto, as condições ecológicas de Portugal não são as mesmas condições ecológicas de um país de Leste ou de um país nórdico, ou de França ou da Alemanha. Portanto, aquilo que se passa relativamente à questão que me coloca é precisamente a condicionalidade que existe do ponto de vista ecológico em Portugal.

Para isso, convidava-o a fazer o seguinte: se está tão seguro daquilo que diz, vá falar com as pessoas a Pedrógão Grande e vá falar com os agricultores que estão lá fora à porta deste Parlamento.

**Tiemo Wölken (S&D)**. – Frau Präsidentin, sehr geehrter Herr Kommissar, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! In dieser Debatte werden ganz schön viele Märchen erzählt. Das gipfelt darin, dass die Fraktionsführung der EVP sich nicht zu schade war, einen Kommissar als Weihnachtsmann auf Sharepic darzustellen und dann heute nicht einmal zu erscheinen, um sich für diese Aktion zu entschuldigen.

Aber diese Fraktion hat auch ganz viele Märchen über den Inhalt erzählt. Es ging darum, dass Ernährungssicherheit gefährdet wird. Das Gegenteil ist der Fall. Es ging darum, dass die erneuerbaren Energien nicht ausgebaut werden können – heute auch hier noch einmal wiederholt. Dabei weiß doch auch die EVP, dass wir gerade vor wenigen Wochen hier die Erneuerbare-Energien-Gesetzgebung beschlossen haben mit Ausbaubeschleunigung, dass wir Naturschutz zurückgenommen haben, um dazu zu kommen, und das widerspricht mitnichten diesem Gesetz, sondern es geht Hand in Hand.

Liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Stoppen wir die Märchen, bleiben wir bei den Fakten, arbeiten wir für die Naturwiederherstellung! Und an alle Kolleginnen und Kollegen aus der EVP: Dieses Mal kann man sie nicht austauschen. Tun Sie das Richtige! Stimmen Sie mit uns für die Naturwiederherstellung in der Europäischen Union!

**Krzysztof Jurgiel (ECR).** – Pani Przewodnicząca! Panie Komisarzy! Jestem szczególnie zaniepokojony skutkami proponowanych przepisów dla sektora rolno-spożywczego. W Polsce wprowadzenie w życie rozporządzenia w obecnym kształcie mogłoby doprowadzić do likwidacji lub w najlepszym razie do konieczności przeprofilowania działalności tysięcy gospodarstw rolnych, a w konsekwencji utraty źródła utrzymania wielu rolników i osłabienia konkurencyjności polskiego rolnictwa na wspólnym rynku.

Gospodarstwom rolnym w całej Unii Europejskiej grozi obciążenie niewykonalnymi, słabo doprecyzowanymi obowiązkami w zakresie planowania, zarządzania, monitorowania i sprawozdawczości. Istnieje ponadto ryzyko, że w przypadku stwierdzenia naruszenia zapisów rozporządzenia organy krajowe będą zobligowane do podejmowania działań ingerujących we własność prywatną właścicieli gospodarstw o lasów. Ponadto cele rozporządzenia wydają się być w kolizji z innymi celami unijnych polityk, takimi jak budowa odpornych łańcuchów dostaw żywności i bezpieczeństwa żywnościowego. W związku z powyższym będę głosował za odrzuceniem projektu Komisji Europejskiej w całości w jutrzszym głosowaniu.

**Petri Sarvamaa (PPE).** – Arvoisa puhemies, arvon kollegat, ennallistaminen on yksi kehoimmmin valmistelluista esityksistä ja aloitteista, joita komissiolta on tullut. Vaikutuksenarvot on tehty puutteellisesti. Hyötykustannuslaskelmat perustuvat epäselviin päätelmiin. Asetusmuoto vie jäsenvaltioiden joustovaran. Samaa sukkaa ei voi vetää jokaiseen jalkaan ilman, että se repeää.

Liian yksityiskohtaista sääntelyä, liian monelle osa-alueelle. Luonnon tilan heikentymisen kriteerit ovat epämääräiset. Vertailuvuosi on asetettu jäsenvaltioiden näkökulmasta mielivaltaiseen ajankohtaan. Ennallistamistoimenpiteiden hinta on korkein juuri heille, joilla on eniten luontoa jäljellä. Tämän kaiken vuoksi tälle esitykselle on nyt sanottava "Seis" ja palautettava se uuteen valmisteluun. Me haluamme kyllä ennallistaa luontoa, mutta aivan ensiksi haluamme sitä koskevan sääntelyn tasapainoon.

**Christel Schaldemose (S&D).** – Fru formand! Naturen er presset. Vi mærker det lige nu. Når vi kører ned igennem Europa på vej på sommerferie, er der færre insekter, som rammer bilruden. Der er færre og færre steder i Europa, hvor vi kan drikke vandet direkte fra vandhanen. Der er iltsvind i søer og åer. Arter uddør med ekstrem høj hastighed. Naturen er ved at tabe. Men vi kan gøre noget. Det kræver bare politisk vilje. Den vilje deler EU-Kommissionen heldigvis. Den vilje deler et flertal i EU's ministerråd. Men her i Parlamentet har den konservative højrefløj valgt at spille hasard med vores natur og fremtid. Vi skal genoprette tabt natur af hensyn til dyr og planter. Af hensyn til dit og mit drikkevand, af hensyn til fødevarerikkerheden nu og i fremtiden. Derfor skal vi i gang med de forhandlinger nu. De Konservative har bremset loven længe nok. Nu skal naturen vinde. Det er naturens tur nu. Jeg håber, at I vil stemme ja i morgen. Tak.

**Daniel Buda (PPE).** – Doamna președintă, mulțumesc. Fermierii europeni se uită la noi cu îngrîjorare. Astăzi, 32 de regulamente europene trebuie să fie respectate de aceștia. Prin PAC, ați impus o serie de restricții. Reduceți consumul de pesticide, iar inflația și războiul din Ucraina au reușit să îngenuncheze fermierii.

Cu toate acestea, Comisia Europeană vine din nou cu o reducere a suprafețelor de teren pentru agricultură. Sunteți, de asemenea, profund inconsecvenți, domnule comisar, cu banii cetățenilor europeni. Cereți reinundarea unor zone care tocmai au fost desecate cu investiții de miliarde de euro din fonduri europene. În același timp, îi indemnăți pe fermieri, în mod cinic, să crească bivoli de apă.

Stau să mă întreb dacă în Comisia Europeană cineva mai judecă lucrurile înainte să le lanseze în spațiul public. Îmbrăcând într-un titlu frumos restaurarea naturii, ați aruncat în spațiul public doar frânturi de adevăr, generând proteste. Sacrificați viitorul agriculturii și al securității alimentare pe altarul neputinței voastre.

Domnule comisar, drumul spre iad este pavat cu intenții bune și, din păcate, acolo ne duceți cu această propunere. Vă indemn, așadar, domnule comisar, să veniți cu o propunere ancorată în realitate. Și noi, cei din PPE, vă garantăm că vom fi partenerii onești ai dumneavoastră.

**Brando Benifei (S&D).** – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, noi del Partito Democratico italiano, noi Socialisti e Democratici, appoggeremo la legge sul ripristino della natura, una scelta fondamentale per far guarire il nostro pianeta, ripristinando habitat terrestri e marini degradati, proteggendo fiumi e foreste.

Ci battiamo ogni giorno per ottenere risorse adeguate per una transizione ecologica efficace che tuteli le persone e il lavoro, mentre la destra si è lanciata in una crociata ideologica contro l'ambiente, contro la scienza, contro il futuro delle nuove generazioni mentre in Italia sta sprecando i fondi del PNRR.

Colleghi, ascoltate i giovani europei, Greta Thunberg che oggi è qui, e tutti loro vanno ringraziati perché hanno saputo dare la sveglia alla politica già qualche anno fa. Non rubiamo loro il futuro, ci chiedono responsabilità. Dimostriamo di saperla esercitare e di meritare perciò il ruolo che ricopriamo, prendendo finalmente le decisioni giuste.

**Niclas Herbst (PPE).** – Frau Präsidentin! Dieses Gesetz ist nicht kohärent mit anderen Gesetzen, die sich mit der Thematik beschäftigen. Das sieht man schon an der Definition, was ein guter Zustand ist. Das Verschlechterungsverbot ist völlig unzureichend geregelt. Wir haben das Problem im Fischereibereich, beispielsweise dass Meeresböden, die größtenteils noch unerforscht sind, automatisch einem schlechten Zustand zugerechnet werden. All das sind keine Kleinigkeiten, sondern ganz grundlegende Missstände dieses Gesetzes.

Und das sieht man auch daran, dass die Kommission zu Tricks greifen muss, indem sie z. B. sagt: Offshore-Windanlagen sind jetzt Wiederherstellungsmaßnahmen. Weil sich die verschiedenen Ziele widersprechen. Ich bin nicht gegen Offshore-Windkraft, aber zu sagen, dass ein massiver Betonblock auf dem Meeresboden und kilometerlange Kabel eine Wiederherstellungsmaßnahme der Natur sind, das zeigt einfach: Das Ganze hat eine Schlagseite, das Ganze ist nicht gut durchdacht.

Das mag vielen egal sein, weil das ein gutes Ziel ist und weil wir einen schönen Titel des Gesetzes haben. Aber das darf doch nicht unser Anspruch als Abgeordnete sein. Alles, was ich höre, ist, dass die Abgeordneten, die dagegen sind und diese fundamentalen Bedenken haben, Machtspielchen machen und schlechte Menschen sind. Ich gönne Ihnen diese moralische Arroganz. Ich bin Christdemokrat, ich kann gut gönnen. Aber was Sie wirklich machen: Sie nehmen die Menschen nicht mit, Sie heizen einen Stadt-Land-Konflikt an, und Sie schaden dem Klimaschutz.

*(Der Redner ist damit einverstanden, eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“ zu beantworten.)*

**Caroline Roose (Verts/ALE), question «carton bleu».** – Monsieur Herbst, vous avez souvent à cœur de défendre les pêcheurs et la pêche. Partout, les pêcheurs souffrent de la destruction des écosystèmes marins, notamment par la pollution de l'industrie, par la pollution de l'agriculture et des villes. Si je prends l'exemple du cabillaud en mer Baltique, la loi sur la restauration de la nature permet justement une solution par rapport au cabillaud. Vous êtes aussi président du Forum de la pêche récréative et les pêcheurs récréatifs sont pour cette voie de la restauration de la nature. Monsieur Herbst, qu'allez-vous répondre aux pêcheurs quand il n'y aura plus d'écosystèmes marins en bon état et que les pêcheurs devront mettre la clé sous la porte?

**Niclas Herbst (PPE), Antwort auf eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“.** – Frau Roose! Also mal abgesehen davon, dass Sie jetzt Freizeitfischerei und Berufsfischerei in einen Topf geworfen haben, die sehr unterschiedliche Interessen haben, sage ich Ihnen: Erst mal habe ich eine Meinung als Abgeordneter, und was Verbände, denen ich auch nahestehe, sagen, ist wieder eine andere Sache. Ich muss mich schon selbst entscheiden und folge nicht Lobbygruppen.

Und das andere, was Sie gesagt haben, also wirklich die Behauptung, dass es zum Beispiel für den Dorsch, den Sie angesprochen haben, in der Ostsee in diesem Gesetz eine Lösung gibt, das ist wirklich weit hergeholt. Sie werden keinen Wissenschaftler finden, der Ihnen die Gründe für den schlechten Dorschbestand vollständig nennen kann. Jedenfalls das Institut, das Thünen-Institut, das auch den ICES Advice mitbestimmt, kann das nicht vollständig. Und zu sagen, dass wir dieses Gesetz verabschieden, und dann geht es dem Dorsch besser, also das dürfen Sie den Menschen wirklich nicht versprechen.

**Maria Spyra (PPE).** – Madam Chair, Commissioner Sinkevičius, dear colleagues, climate crisis is now ongoing and that is why we need the Nature Restoration Law, not as an additional law to the 23 European laws on reinvigoration we have, but as the legal umbrella that will sufficiently accelerate the protection of nature and the restoration of biodiversity. Putting at the core of our attention people's concern in the amendments we co-signed in the EPP and we have already tabled are addressing various issues to this direction. In my opinion, dear Commissioner, it is the Council's general approach, which is a good basis for negotiation, taking into account the overriding public interest for the deployment of renewables and defence facilities as well, giving the Member States sufficient flexibility, complementary to the requirement of national restoration plans.

In my country, the government of Kyriakos Mitsotakis in Greece has supported nature rehabilitation not only in the Council but also in real practice with various initiatives and projects. In addition, we have to ensure that the proposed financing of measures required by the Nature Restoration Law will not lead to cuts in other budget lines, starting with the common agricultural policy. We need clarifications coming from the Commission, a clear wording. We need a compromise on the basis of the general approach as soon as possible. The Natural Restoration Law should not be a battlefield in view of the upcoming European elections. On the contrary, it is a unique challenge for a real reform to the protection of nature. It is our joint obligation not only to nature but also to the next generation.

*Procedura «catch the eye»*

**Franc Bogovič (PPE).** – Gospa predsednica. Hvala za besedo in tudi hvala za odlično razpravo, ki kaže na razdeljenost tega Parlamenta, kar je tudi jasen znak, da je ta predlog zelo problematičen.

Evropa je zelo pestra. V Evropi imamo različne, od Malte do Finske, sam prihajam iz Slovenije, kjer imamo 60 procentov gozdov, 39 procentov narave, odlično sodelovanje s čebelarji in tudi odlično biodiverzitetu. Zato so mnogi ukrepi, ki so tu predvideni in ne dopuščajo in ne upoštevajo te specifične, zelo problematični.

Za nas je problematično, da izgubimo deset procentov kmetijske površine, ker imamo zelo malo kmetijske zemlje. Radi bi tudi več hidroenergije, zato si ne predstavljamo, kako bomo porušili jezove na rekah. Po drugi strani tudi o poplavljanju kmetijskih površin ne razmišljamo.

Zato mislim, da je prav, da zagotovimo dober zakon, nov zakon, pri katerem bomo imeli tudi vire financiranja, predvidljive ukrepe, in da bodo tudi kmetje, gozdarji, lastniki zemljišč, predvsem pa mladi kmetje, to podpirali, ne pa da protestirajo, kakor so danes pred Parlamentom.

**Sara Cerdas (S&D).** – Senhora Presidente, Caros Colegas, esta lei é o cerne do pilar da biodiversidade do Pacto Ecológico Europeu. Oitenta por cento dos nossos ecossistemas estão em mau estado. É impossível produzirmos em solos mortos, secos, sem colmatar os impactos das alterações climáticas. É da nossa sustentabilidade, é da nossa segurança alimentar que estamos aqui a falar.

E, ao contrário do que a direita quer fazer crer, investir no restauro da natureza é bom para a economia. Por cada euro investido, teremos cerca de 8 a 38 euros de retorno.

E sobre as florestas e os incêndios, um tema tão sensível para Portugal, os indicadores de gestão das florestas serão da responsabilidade de cada Estado-Membro, como está na proposta do Conselho. Aliás, a direita despiu-se dessa responsabilidade quando votou contra esta lei na Comissão de Ambiente e como vai votar amanhã no plenário.

É preciso restaurar a natureza e votar a favor é garantir mais uma peça fundamental deste *puzzle* que é o combate às alterações climáticas. E votar contra é adiar um problema e estar do lado dos negacionistas.

É tempo de agir, é tempo de agir já!

**Michal Wiezik (Renew).** – Vážená pani predsedajúca, bez obnovy ekosystémov, bez obnovy ekosystémových funkcií a bez obnovy biodiverzity poľnohospodárstvo, lesníctvo a rybnárstvo klimatickú krízu jednoducho nezvládnu.

Keby som nebol členom tohto Parlamentu, som podpísaný pod výzvu tisícov vedcov a vedkýň, ktorí apelujú na Parlament, aby reflektovali na vedu a reflektovali na hrozivý stav našej prírody, našich druhov, našich ekosystémov, do ktorých sme ich dotlačili. Veda bola pre mňa vždy spoľahlivým spoločníkom a navigáciou v zložitom svete. Vidíme však rebujnenú partokraciu, ktorá sa snaží prekrúcať fakty a ohýbať realitu, a dokonca neváha brániť svojim členom slobodne hlasovať. Chcem veriť, že v tomto Parlamente zostal dostatok rozumu, svedomia a odvahy, aby sme dokázali tento problém prekonať a zahlasovať za ambicióznou obnovu prírody. Je to kľúčové, ide o život a ide o budúcnosť.

**Mazaly Aguilar (ECR).** – Señora presidente, sigo sin entender cómo, después de que tres comisiones —Agricultura, Pesca y Medio Ambiente— rechacen esta ley, todavía se va a votar mañana. Esta ley es un sinsentido y un peligro para los agricultores y para el sector pesquero. Todo esto, además, pretenden financiarlo con los fondos de la política agrícola común o del Fondo Marítimo y de Pesca, lo que llevaría, además, a nuestros agricultores y pescadores a una reducción de los ingresos muy drástica.

Si se limita la producción alimentaria, ¿de qué va a comer Europa? ¿De las importaciones de terceros países? Y mientras se intentan limitar los espacios para cultivos y ganadería, ¿se están recalificando los terrenos para los molinos y los espejos fotovoltaicos? ¿Este es el objetivo final de esta insensatez? Mañana hemos de votar defendiendo a nuestro sector privado y pesquero.

Y perdónenme por este párrafo que voy a incluir: mal deben de ver las cosas los socialistas en España de cara a las próximas elecciones generales, cuando su jefe de filas se ha permitido el lujo de utilizar este atril para atacar al Partido Popular y a Vox.

**Clare Daly (The Left).** – Madam President, what should have been a discussion about a far more ambitious programme than what we have here if we are to save the planet and nature has turned into really one of the crassest campaigns of disinformation by opportunist politicians and a media completely incapable of holding them to account.

Members on all sides have been using it to play to their own audience, and I have to say I find it utterly demoralising. Why is this issue decisive? It is understandable, of course, that people would be annoyed with an arrogant Commission and with the botch jobs on previous EU regulations, but that's not a reason for misrepresenting this one.

Everyone wants an end to the devastating yearly droughts and floods. Everybody wants consultation, predictable incomes. They want to keep traditions alive. They want to be financially rewarded for going the extra mile. They want to have a future to look to with bees and bogs and everything in between. We can have that with this law. There can be a just transition. There's no good reason to vote against it.

**Marc Tarabella (NI).** – Madame la Présidente, la proposition de loi sur la restauration de la nature constitue une étape essentielle pour éviter l'effondrement des écosystèmes et prévenir les effets les plus graves du changement climatique et de la perte de biodiversité. Une fois qu'on a dit cela, on a tout dit. Pour peu, bien sûr, que l'intérêt général soit notre boussole.

Et pourtant, il y a deux semaines, en commission parlementaire, 50 % des députés présents ont trouvé intelligent de refuser le texte. Ils ont trouvé plus sympathique ou rentable de faire plaisir aux lobbies des multinationales de l'industrie ou de la pétrochimie et de rejeter le texte. Une fois encore, les droites, qu'elles soient extrémistes, conservatrices ou même libérales en partie, comme depuis le début de cette législature, ne cessent de saboter les politiques environnementalistes de ce Parlement européen et d'enterrer le pacte vert.

Alors, chers collègues, si vous vous souciez un tant soit peu des générations futures, je vous invite à voter ce texte.

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

**Virginijus Sinkevičius, Member of the Commission.** – Madam President, honourable Members, I have listened very carefully to your interventions today, and I would like to thank everybody for engaging in this important debate this morning. I am glad we are having this broad public debate on such an important topic. Nature deserves this public attention.

So what can we take away from today's debate? First, I think it has illustrated very well what's at stake. It has shown that stakes are high and that nature will not allow us to lose time. Far too much of Europe's nature has now been degraded or destroyed; it's vital to reverse that trend and time is running out.

The world is watching us – so are our children – and we all need to take responsibility. If we want to deliver on Europe's global biodiversity commitments agreed at COP15 in Montreal in December 2022, if we want to maintain the role of the EU as a global climate leader, we have to deliver.

Nature restoration is not a luxury legislation. Healthy ecosystems, they are just fundamental assets of our economy and society. We cannot simply opt out or postpone. Today, I hear again that the Green Deal is not the Nature Restoration Law. Honourable Members, yes it is! This law is the flagship initiative of the European Green Deal. Nature and biodiversity is a key pillar and the equivalent of the Climate Law for nature, and it is the first dedicated EU legal proposal on nature in 30 years.

You may be surprised to hear this, but to me this debate has shown that an agreement is possible if we remain engaged and if we take our responsibilities. Why am I rather optimistic? Because most of your interventions have shown that there is a willingness to discuss this law. And because even those of you who claim that this law has to be rejected have proposed amendments. This is positive and this is what co-legislators and the codecision process are all about.

If there is anything to change or improve, the Commission is here to discuss and support you. This is our role: to facilitate an agreement. And this is what we are determined to do. I am optimistic because today I have heard concerns on issues which have already been addressed and solved on the Council's side and which we have already reflected in the non-paper on 8 June.

And in spite of our genuine efforts to clarify and explain, I still hear and read many misconceptions and misunderstandings. I still hear questions to which there are very straightforward answers – which we have already provided to many of you on a bilateral basis, but which we are more than happy to reiterate. So let me mention just a few of them.

Ms Sander and Mr Mato, you raised the concern that nature restoration will impact food security and that we are going to increase food imports. Well, the EU food system has achieved a high level of security and a wide offer for consumers. And actually 20% of food in the EU goes to waste. The challenge is to maintain the EU's agricultural food production potential to ensure food security in the mid to long term. And this requires a transition to sustainable food production and sustainable food systems. I am afraid that food availability is not the issue, but food affordability.

The biggest threat to food security in the EU and globally are the combined, interlinked climate and biodiversity crises leading to depletion of soil, pollinator loss, desertification and drought. This is reflected in the very comprehensive study on the drivers of food security, which the Commission published in January. I heard Ms Schneider ask for data and impact assessments. All data on the relation between healthy ecosystems and food security can be found there.

On food security, I make a plea to all of you who have expressed concern to actually look at Article 9 of the proposal, and see with your own eyes what this article is about. Requirements are about increasing trends in indicators, which scientists tell us are the best proxies to tell us the health of our agriculture. And Member States can set their own levels to be achieved on those indicators. So when we talk about the regional dimension and Member State flexibilities, they are there.

Mr Vondra, Mr Dorfmann and Mr Torvalds, you expressed concern that the proposal would put Member States into a straitjacket. The opposite is true. It provides for a large degree of flexibility and subsidiarity. It will be for Member States to decide which restoration measures they wish to put in place, where and when. The proposal asks Member States to do this together with stakeholders, involving them closely, all of them: that means farmers, foresters, fishers, civil society, scientists. Ms Zalewska, let me also reassure you that the Commission will only assess Member States' plans to see the EU trends, but it will not approve or validate them.

Mr Liese, you and some other Members have expressed concern that the Nature Restoration Law would hamper hydropower from dam removals in rivers. Nowhere does the Nature Restoration Law proposal require de-establishment of hydropower. To the contrary, it says literally in Article 7(2): 'Member States shall primarily address obsolete barriers, which are those that are no longer needed for renewable energy generation [...] or other uses'.

So we would expect Member States to target primary obsolete barriers. Experts estimated that at least 20% of all barriers in the EU are obsolete, so they no longer serve any purpose. The number of hydropower plants in the EU is estimated to be 23 000, which represents barely 2% in the total number of barriers. It is therefore possible easily to respect the proposed requirements without having an impact on hydroelectricity generation.

Mr Liese, you said we need to make compromises to reconcile nature protection and economic activities or infrastructure, and you said you believe in cooperation. I am glad to hear this because I hope you are ready to finalise this codecision procedure in the same constructive spirit as we have started one year ago or, I would say, four years ago – the first time I met you and we had a discussion on this upcoming mandate.



Finally, let me also use this opportunity to clarify once and for all that the Nature Restoration Law will not put 10% of land out of production. First of all, the 10% is not a mandatory target, neither for individual Member States, and especially not at farm level. Hence there is no obligation for individual farmers to take 10% of their land out of production.

It is mentioned as a benchmark, referring to the EU-level objective set in the EU Biodiversity Strategy for 2030. Member States are asked to increase the share of agricultural land with high diversity landscape features at national level until a satisfactory level is reached. Member States would define themselves in their national restoration plans the satisfactory level they aim to achieve, and that level could be way below 10%. As stressed in the non-paper, the Commission is ready to clarify the objective of this provision and adapt if it is necessary.

Dear colleagues, last but not least, I remain optimistic because I know that, since the beginning of this mandate, we have always worked constructively. We have always shown that we can find compromises and solutions. We carve them out in the most difficult legislations, and we have already reached agreements on many important files – sometimes very difficult files. It would be regretful and difficult to explain why we didn't manage to do so also for one of the most important pieces of the legislation of the European Green Deal.

Honourable Members, let me be very clear and honest: a compromise is possible and in reach. The divergences are not as big as to justify rejection. Other files have been even more complicated and we managed. I sincerely hope we will not miss this opportunity to bring the Nature Restoration Law to a successful conclusion. The Commission will play its role as an honest broker and do everything it can to make it happen.

Honourable Members, some of you voiced concerns that this law may hamper our economies – putting farmers, foresters, fishers out of work. Let me be clear: there will be no work, no income when nature is sick. Today, we are proposing the medicine. The first to benefit from this medicine will be those whose livelihoods directly depend on our natural resources. They need nature to be healthy. They need that for the resilience and productivity of the land and of the seas. They need it to ensure food security.

Some of you said that they are in favour of nature restoration, but they simply ask for a new proposal from the Commission. Let me be very clear. We do have a proposal. A proposal based on a solid impact assessment. A proposal that has already evolved, on which we have presented a non-paper in June and on which Member States have already presented many amendments, touching upon many issues also raised in this House. A proposal on which, until April, all groups worked constructively and proposed important amendments. A proposal on which even those groups who plead for rejection have now tabled amendments for the plenary vote tomorrow.

Honourable Members, this is called codecision. Let's finalise this process. It is possible, and with a constructive approach we could conclude it actually quite quickly. Let's not miss this opportunity. We cannot lose time and we don't need to lose time. Restoration is our best hope of getting nature back in shape. We need that for climate mitigation. We need that for climate adaptation. We need that for our economy.

The world is watching us. Our citizens are watching. We set the pace at COP15 in Montreal, and this is our chance to deliver at home, proving to the world that it can be done, proving to our citizens that we keep our promises. For the last time, honourable Members, let's secure a better future for our citizens, our farmers, our fishers, our businesses, our children.

**César Luena**, *ponente*. – Señora presidenta, solo diré unas palabras ya para terminar. Quiero dar las gracias a todos los intervinientes. Creo que ha habido bastantes compañeras y compañeros aquí que han defendido bastante bien la ley de restauración. El primero de ellos, el comisario. Le quiero agradecer personalmente, porque la Comisión ha estado ahí detrás —y ha estado el Comisario de Medio Ambiente— y eso creo que es importante. Por cierto, —porque, si no, claro, empiezan a decirse mentiras y al final se quedan—: la Comisión de Pesca y de Agricultura sí que rechazó el texto, la Comisión de Medio Ambiente, no. En parte, gracias al buen trabajo realizado. Hay unas trabajadoras ahí, del secretariado de la Comisión ENVI, que han dirigido muy bien los trabajos y ahora, claro, no podríamos aquí decir cosas que no son.

Pero bueno, en estos minutos, vamos a ver. Escucho a muchos diputados y diputadas del PP que han hablado aquí decir que no les gusta la ley. Bueno, pues estamos en un parlamento. Claro. Vamos a hacer enmiendas, vamos a corregirla. Lo que no se puede hacer es bloquear. Porque eso es una actitud antisistema. Directamente. No, no, directamente. Ahora, si quiere, me pide una tarjeta azul, señor Rangel. No, no. Si quiere, me pide una tarjeta azul.

Por tanto, abandonen la negación y vayan a la negociación. Es lo que tienen que hacer. Miren. Miren estas manos —y las de los otros grupos— tendidas. Vuelvan al Pacto Verde Europeo. Vuelvan. Desde luego, yo les digo que, cuando aprobemos mañana esta ley, en los trílogos contarán también con mi diálogo y con la participación de este grupo.

No, eso son excusas porque, finalmente, ¿qué vamos a votar? ¿Les digo lo que vamos a votar? Vamos a votar la posición del Consejo —les recuerdo los países donde gobierna el PP: Bulgaria, República Checa, Croacia, Grecia, Irlanda, Rumanía y Lituania— y las enmiendas fruto de compromisos donde participó el PP. Eso es lo que vamos a votar mañana.

Por lo tanto, esta es una ley para la naturaleza. No es una ley contra nadie ni contra nada. Hay que darle una oportunidad, sobre todo porque el sitio de este Parlamento hay que defenderlo y también el sitio de Europa en el mundo. Así que, la verdad, es que soy optimista y espero que buena parte de los diputados conservadores puedan sumarse a apoyar esta ley de restauración de la naturaleza.

**Presidente.** – La discussione è chiusa.

La votazione si svolgerà mercoledì 12 luglio 2023.

*Dichiarazioni scritte (articolo 171)*

**Асим Адемов (PPE), в писмена форма.** – За четвърти път изразяваме позицията си по Закона за възстановяване на природата, след като той беше отхвърлен от Комисията по земеделие, Комисията по рибарство, а в крайна сметка и от водещата Комисия по околна среда.

Демократичният вот в трите комисии ясно показва, че законопроектът има сериозни слабости и трябва да бъде изцяло преработен. В настоящия си вид законопроектът представлява сериозна заплаха за земеделските стопани в ЕС и за продоволствената сигурност, и рискува да доведе до още по-голяма инфлация. Не можем да си позволим да намалим с още 10 % обработваемите земи, при положение че новата ОСП въведе ред допълнителни екологични изисквания, насочени към възстановяване на природата, вкл. задължението 4 % от земята да бъде оставяна под угар. Европейските фермери трябва да имат възможност да произвеждат достатъчно, за да ни помогнат да поемем негативните последици от войната. Те заслужават нашата благодарност, а не нашата критика. Нека се фокусираме върху устойчивото производство, а не върху забрани за отглеждане и допълнителни бюрократични рестрикции за местните и регионални власти.

И не на последно място – бюджетът на ОСП не трябва да става жертва на този законопроект. Няма да позволим средствата за земеделие да бъдат орязани за пореден път!

**Andrus Ansip (Renew), kirjalikult.** – 2019. aastal avaldas teaduslik-poliitiline foorum (IPBES) ülemaailmse hoiatuse, et loodus taandub kogu maailmas inimajaloos enneolematu kiirusega. Looduse taastamise määrusega kehtestatakse eeskirjad ökosüsteemide taastamiseks maismaa- ja merealadel. Määrus ei tegele küll otseselt looduskaitsealuste alade suurendamisega ega põllumajandustootmises pestitsiidide kasutamise vähendamisega, kuid on selge, et loodusliku mitmekesisuse suurendamise eesmärke, sealhulgas tolmlejate arvukuse suurendamise eesmärki, ilma kohaseid kaitsemeetmeid rakendamata ja pestitsiidide kasutamist vähendamata Euroopas tervikuna loodusliku mitmekesisuse vähendamist peatada ei õnnestu. Eestis on paljusid määruses käsitletud meetmeid rakendatud juba aastakümneid. Turvast kaevandatakse vaid juba selleks kasutatavatel aladel ning kaevandamise alla ei võeta täiendavaid rabaalaseid. Me oleme Eestis rabasid taastanud. Eestis on juba mõnda aega likvideeritud jõgedele rajatud paise ja tagatud seeläbi kaladele tee nende sobivatesse kudemiskohtadesse. Eesti loodus on võrreldes nende riikidega, kus maade kasutus on ülimalt intensiivne, suhteliselt hästi säilinud. Väga intensiivse maakasutusega riikides tuleb loodusliku mitmekesisuse säilitamiseks võtta kasutusele ulatuslikumaid meetmeid kui Eestis, mis küüniliselt võttes võiks põhimõtteliselt tähendada eesti põllumeeste suhtelise konkurentsivõime suurenemist Euroopa ühtsel turul. Ma mõistan väga intensiivse maakasutusega riikide põllumeeste, metsameeste ja kalameeste muresid, kuid samas ma mõistan kogu maailma muret loodusliku mitmekesisuse vähenemise pärast ning seepärast hääletasin ma määruse poolt.

**Marc Botenga (The Left), schriftelijk.** – Een natuurherstelwet is dringend en een goede zaak. Het gaat echt slecht met de natuur in Europa. Dat is geen geheim. De kwaliteit van veel van onze natuurgebieden is dramatisch en gaat achteruit. We moeten de natuur respecteren, niet alleen herstellen trouwens, maar ook stoppen met ze verder kapot te maken. De geplande maatregelen zijn ook belangrijk voor de landbouw, die van de natuur afhankelijk is om in de toekomst voldoende voedsel te kunnen produceren.

Maar laten we duidelijk zijn: deze maatregelen mogen niet ten koste gaan van boeren die al moeite hebben om te overleven. Zij moeten worden gesteund, niet gestraft. En daar wringt het schoentje. Het Europese natuurbeleid en het Europese gemeenschappelijk landbouwbeleid zijn tegenstrijdig. Het gemeenschappelijk landbouwbeleid is op maat gemaakt voor de grote agrovoedingsbedrijven, die zich via hun vertegenwoordigers in de rechtse Europese Volkspartij sterk hebben verzet tegen elke stap in de richting van een duurzamer landbouwbeleid. De landbouw zit zo gevangen in een model dat enerzijds blijft industrialiseren, schaalvergroten en vervuilen, ook ten koste van de boeren, en anderzijds natuurbeschermingsmaatregelen oplegt. Wanneer België deze nieuwe Europese regels vertaalt in concrete maatregelen, zullen we ons verzetten tegen elke poging om de kosten door te rekenen aan de gewone hardwerkende boer.

**Romana Jerković (S&D), napisan.** – Trenutno smo u Strasbourgu na tjednu plenarnih sjednica. Izvan klimatiziranih ureda Europskog parlamenta temperature dosežu 37 stupnjeva. U svakodnevnom životima svi smo svjedoci sve bržeg zagrijavanja naše planete.

Prošli tjedan oboren je još jedan neslavan rekord, naime, to je bio najtopliji tjedan u zadnjih 120 000 godina. Čak 80 % europskih ekosustava je pred potpunim uništenjem.

Pokušajmo zamisliti svijet u kojem šume bujaju, rijeke su bistre, zrak je čist, tla plodna, a mora prepuna života. Taj bi san mogao postati stvarnost usvajanjem Zakona o obnovi prirode. Pošumljavanjem, obnovom staništa i razvojem bioraznolikosti naši će ekosustavi biti revitalizirani, a njihov ekonomski i proizvodni potencijal osiguran za buduće generacije.

Tako možemo ponovno dobiti jakog saveznika u borbi s klimatskim promjenama – prirodu. To je moguće postići samo zajedničkim djelovanjem na razini Europske unije.

Stoga dignimo glas i tražimo usvajanje Zakona o obnovi prirode. Vrijeme je da napravimo razliku i zakoračimo u zeleniji i održiviji svijet za sve!

**Elżbieta Kruk (ECR), na piśmie.** – Wniosek Komisji dotyczący rozporządzenia w sprawie odbudowy zasobów przyrodniczych (Nature Restoration Law) jest częścią Europejskiego Zielonego Ładu w ramach unijnej strategii ochrony różnorodności biologicznej do 2030 r. Choć zawiera on pewne pozytywne aspekty, niesie ze sobą tak wiele zagrożeń, że nie można go poprzeć. Zakłada dużą ingerencję w działania poszczególnych państw. Zbyt głęboko ingeruje w życie, a w szczególności własność prywatną mieszkańców terenów, na których mają być prowadzone działania ochronne, w tym de facto tworzone nowe, ściśle chronione obszary poza Naturą 2000. Wdrożenie proponowanych działań przyniesie wiele negatywnych konsekwencji dla gospodarki, a głównie dla rolnictwa i leśnictwa. Wszystkie działania muszą opierać się o racjonalne podejście i dyskusję z zainteresowanymi, a nie być odgórnie narzucane. Tymczasem największym zagrożeniem rozporządzenia są zapisy stanowiące, że to Komisja Europejska będzie wskazywać co, gdzie i kiedy ma być wykonane. Wniosek ten, jeśli zostanie przyjęty, może prowadzić do poważnych problemów z bezpieczeństwem żywnościowym i energetycznym w wielu krajach. Planowanie obecnie tak kosztownych działań i daleko idących zmian w sposobie zarządzania przestrzenią, w tym terenami związanymi z produkcją żywności czy energii, w sytuacji coraz brutalniejszej wojny toczonej przez Rosję z Ukrainą, wydaje się być niebezpieczne z punktu widzenia stabilności sytuacji ekonomicznej i społecznej Unii Europejskiej.

**Pedro Marques (S&D)**, *por escrito*. – Senhora Presidente, Senhoras e Senhores Deputados, radicalizar o discurso e, ao mesmo tempo, enterrar a cabeça na areia: foram estas as duas posturas da direita e da extrema-direita na discussão da Lei da Restauração da Natureza. Tentaram instrumentalizar vários setores de atividade, usando dados errados e desmentidos pelos cientistas. Felizmente falharam. Restaurar os ecossistemas para combater as alterações climáticas e a perda de biodiversidade; reduzir os riscos para a segurança alimentar; propor práticas ambientalmente sustentáveis na agricultura e nas pescas e mecanismos de regeneração de pelo menos 20 % das zonas terrestres e marítimas da UE – tudo isto até 2030, tudo isto com o pressuposto de ter em conta as condições socioeconómicas existentes. A Europa e o planeta precisam da aprovação desta lei.

**Matjaž Nemeč (S&D)**, *pisno*. – Danes razpravljamo o enem izmed ključnih zakonov o zaščiti narave, ki je temelj zelene prehode. EU po več kot 30 letih znova sprejema zakonodajo o zaščiti narave, biotske raznovrstnosti in živali.

Kadar je govora o podnebnih spremembah, varovanju okolja in obnovi narave, si sam nikoli ne zatiskam oči. Trenutno se na evropski tleh približno 50 % pridelkov, ki so odvisni od opravevalcev, sooča s pomanjkanjem opravevanja. Izčrpanih je okoli 70 % tal, skoraj 30 % naše podtalnice pa je pod pritiskom. Poleg tega smo priča izjemni izgubi biotske raznovrstnosti. Odločitve različnih generacij so nas skozi desetletja in stoletja pripeljale do stanja, ki za planet enostavno ni vzdržno, zato je na nas – odločevalcih v prvi vrsti – velika odgovornost za hitro in učinkovito ukrepanje.

Izboljšanje biotske raznovrstnosti, tudi na kmetijskih zemljiščih, in kakovosti tal sta nujna za boljšo odpornost ekosistemov, prehransko varnost in pridelavo ter ne nazadnje prihodke kmetov v prihodnjih desetletjih. Mnoga zavajanja, da naj bi kmetje in gozdarji nosili stroške obnove narave, so seveda neresnična in neutemeljena. Nasprotno, tisti, ki bodo prispevali k doseganju ciljev, bi morali biti za to tudi nagrajeni. Zato bom odločno podprl in glasoval ZA zakon o obnovi narave.

**Tom Vandenkendelaere (PPE)**, *schriftelijk*. – Collega's, als rentmeesters willen wij, christendemocraten, zorg dragen voor onze natuur, laat dat duidelijk zijn, maar voor mij en mijn partij gaat het commissievoorstel inzake de natuurherstelwet veel te ver. Het fundament van het voorstel is problematisch: het gaat verder dan de internationale afspraken uit Montréal. De pijnpunten waren van bij het begin duidelijk: verregaande landbouwdoelstellingen bovenop het GLB, juridische onzekerheid voor vergunningen in landbouw, industrie en woningbouw zonder flexibiliteit voor sterk verstedelijkte, verharde en dichtbevolkte regio's. Dit zonder enige garantie op compensatie voor getroffen landeigenaars en landbouwers.

Terwijl we in Vlaanderen en Nederland moeite hebben om de doelstellingen uit de habitatrichtlijn waar te maken, zou deze natuurherstelwet nog ambitieuzere natuurdoelstellingen juridisch vastbeitelen. Met de stikstofcrisis vers in het geheugen, tekenen we geen blanco cheque die potentieel als een boemerang terugkomt over een tiental jaar. Als het de Commissie écht menens is om de Europese natuur te herstellen dan gaat ze in gesprek met de verschillende sectoren en neemt ze de bezorgdheden op in de tekst. Laten we hopen dat we in de trialogen deze tekst kunnen verfijnen en juridisch sluitend kunnen maken zodat we onze Vlaamse natuur verder kunnen herstellen op een haalbare en realistische manier.

**Henna Virkkunen (PPE)**, *kirjallinen*. – Luonnon ennallistaminen on tärkeää, koska se edistää luonnon monimuotoisuuden säilyttämistä ja auttaa torjumaan ilmastonmuutosta. Kuitenkin luonnon ennallistamisasetus on saanut melkoisia kierroksia EU-parlamentissa. Valitettavasti taustalla on komission huono valmistelu, joka on tehty kiireessä EU-vaalikauden lähestyessä loppuaan. Tästä kertoo jo valiokunnissa äänestetyt tulokset. Esityksessä vaikutustenarviot ovat jääneet täysin puolitiehen, esimerkiksi monen luontotyypin kohdalla iso osa pinta-alasta on komission ehdotuksen mukaan tuntematon. Näin on mahdotonta arvioida todellista ennallistamistarvetta ja kustannuksia.

Kaikkiaan esitys on liian jäykkä eikä se ota huomioon eri luontotyyppien ja elinympäristöjen tarpeita. Se ei myöskään tunnista kunnolla jo nyt jäsenmaissa tehtäviä vapaaehtoisia toimia luonnon ennallistamiseksi. Lisäksi kansallista liikkumavaraa tarvittaisiin huomattavasti lisää, jotta jäsenmaat voisivat myös toimeenpanna esitetyt toimet kustannustehokkaasti ja paikalliset olosuhteet huomioiden.

On selvää, että luontoa pitää ennallistaa kaikkialla EU:ssa ja että toimilla on kiire, mutta surkeasti valmisteltu laki, jota ei voida kunnolla toimeenpanna, ei palvele tarkoitustaan. Tarvitsemme asetuksen, joka ottaa huomioon paikalliset tarpeet ja mahdollistaa jäsenmaiden joustavan toimeenpanon. Tämä on paras tapa varmistaa, että ennallistamistoimet ovat onnistuneita ja kestäviä.

**Carlos Zorrinho (S&D)**, *por escrito*. – A lei da Restauração da Natureza insere-se no quadro mais alargado das políticas europeias para combater as alterações climáticas e proteger a biodiversidade, em particular no Pacto Ecológico Europeu.

Os seus objetivos são criar condições para recuperar até 2030 pelo menos 20 % das zonas terrestres e marítimas da UE que necessitam de intervenção e recuperar até 2050 todos os ecossistemas degradados. A Comissão Europeia estima que neste momento 81 % dos *habitats* na Europa se encontram em mau estado.

Esta lei é uma lei para a vida com qualidade e sustentabilidade. A sua aplicação tem que ter em consideração as especificidades de cada Estado-Membro e de cada território e ter um forte envolvimento dos atores de proximidade. Embora defina adequadamente metas vinculativas, a lei prevê que compete aos Estados-Membros definir os planos de concretização, o que salvaguarda a participação de todos os interessados e o desenho de soluções que melhorem a qualidade de vida, promovam a descarbonização e criem mais e melhores oportunidades para o desenvolvimento sustentável e para as pessoas em concreto.

A demagogia de alguma direita europeia em torno desta Lei, disposta a hipotecar o futuro com falsas interpretações, é lamentável.

#### 4. Europejski akt w sprawie czipów (debata)

**Presidente**. – L'ordine del giorno reca la relazione dell'onorevole Nica sulla proposta di regolamento del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio che istituisce un quadro di misure per rafforzare l'ecosistema europeo dei semiconduttori (normativa sui chip) (COM(2022)0046 – C9-0039/2022 – 2022/0032(COD)) (A9-0014/2023).

**Dan Nica**, *rapporteur*. – Madam President, Commissioner Breton, it's a pleasure to see you again after long days of negotiations. On 18 April, after a swift and effective negotiation period and only after one month a half of negotiations, we have finalised a strong deal for the European Chips Act with the Swedish Presidency. The European Parliament pushed for a strong deal, with the Council showing a strong level of ambition for plans to secure the EU supply of semiconductors by boosting production and innovation, setting up emergency measures against shortages.

The negotiations outcome is a clear example that if there is a will, there is a way. And I say many thanks to all my colleagues, shadow rapporteurs and our teams, advisers and assistants for their excellent work.

Thank you so much, Commissioner Breton. You are an honest broker. You did a very good job. Thank you so much to you and to your team because it was a very helpful exercise. Thank you so much for being so supportive.

Why do we need a new Chips Act? The pandemic has revealed longstanding vulnerabilities in global supply chains, and the unprecedented shortage of semiconductors is a prime example. These shortages have led, among other issues, to rising costs for industry and higher prices for consumers, and have been slowing down the pace of recovery in Europe. Our aim is to fortify the EU position in the global semiconductor landscape and to address the vulnerabilities in supply chains exposed by the pandemic.

We strive for more influence and leadership in research and innovation in this sector. We have secured EUR 3.3 billion for research and innovation. We aim to boost technological capacity and we are implementing measures to combat potential shortages. With the Chips Act legislation – which is to be in place already at the end of the summer – we expect to generate private and public investment that will go over EUR 100 billion. This is a clear statement: Europe is prepared to face the future challenges in the semiconductor industry, prioritising strategic autonomy and security in a favourable business environment.

Some of the important points of the Chips Act are that we managed to secure EUR 3.3 billion for research and innovation related to chips. We increased the EU's technological capacity, production and innovation. The EU Chips Act will strengthen Europe's strategic autonomy and security. Businesses will benefit from a favourable environment for investment in Europe, both in terms of fast-tracking permit granting procedures and recognition as highest national significance status where such status exists.

The ecosystem of semiconductors and the semiconductor value chain will be supported as the spillover effect is recognised in different sectors in countries. The network of competence centres that should be created will address the skills shortage and attract new talent for research, design and production. New production facilities will also play an important role in investing in and boosting the skilled workforce in Europe.

SMEs are recognised to have an important role and will benefit from increased support, especially under the design part. In this sense, under the revised framework for State aid rules for research, development and innovation, maximum aid intensity up to the level of 80% may be allowed for aid for research and development projects of medium-size companies, and up to 90% may be allowed for those of small companies.

Furthermore, in order to maximise synergies, competence centres established under the initiative that focus on state-of-the-art chip designs may apply to receive the label 'design centre of excellence'. A crisis response mechanism in case of shortages will be set up, with the Commission assessing the risks to the EU supply of semiconductors and early warning indicators in Member States that could trigger an EU-wide alert. This will allow the Commission to implement emergency measures, such as prioritising the supply for products particularly affected or carry out common purchasing for Member States.

The mapping mechanism will help to identify possible bottlenecks in the semiconductor sector. The measures under the toolbox, like the priority rated orders and the common purchasing mechanism, will be used as last resort measures and with enough guarantees that they will be triggered only when a semiconductor crisis, as defined in Article 18, is taking place. Intellectual property rights are also strengthened in order to have the right competitive advantage and protection for the sector.

**Maria-Manuel Leitão-Marques**, *relatora de parecer da Comissão do Mercado Interno e da Protecção dos Consumidores*. – Senhora Presidente, de todos os objetos que temos nas nossas vidas, é difícil pensar quais é que atualmente não precisam de *chips*. Estão nos nossos telemóveis, nos carros, nos eletrodomésticos, no medidor de diabetes e até no nosso documento de identidade.

A economia moderna depende deles e este Regulamento sobre *chips* ajuda-nos a garantir o seu fornecimento de duas formas: promove a produção de *chips* na Europa e ajuda a prevenir e corrigir crises no seu abastecimento, permitindo atuar antes de o impacto negativo na economia e na sociedade se tornarem irreversíveis.

Quero agradecer ao relator Dan Nica e a todos os colegas o trabalho feito. Foi graças a um Parlamento muito unido que conseguimos garantir o financiamento para a investigação e o desenvolvimento da próxima geração de *chips*. O interesse europeu prevaleceu.

Lutaremos agora para replicar esta solução em outras tecnologias essenciais para que a Europa dependa menos dos outros e muito mais de si própria.

**Tiemo Wölken**, *Verfasser der Stellungnahme des mitberatenden Rechtsausschusses*. – Frau Präsidentin, sehr geehrter Herr Kommissar – schön, Sie hier zu sehen! Zunächst könnte man bei dem *Chips Act* denken, nachdem wir hier ja heute Vormittag schon die ganze Zeit über Nahrungsmittelsicherheit gesprochen haben, geht es um etwas zu essen. Aber es geht nicht um Nahrung, es geht um die digitale Souveränität der Europäischen Union. Dafür brauchen wir klare Regeln, die die Produktion in der Europäischen Union wieder anregen, die aber auch sicherstellen, dass wir hier nicht nur produzieren, sondern vor allen Dingen in die Zukunft der Chiptechnologie investieren. Und das ist das Designen von Chips.

Ich freue mich sehr, dass wir hier eine Regelung gefunden haben, die es ermöglicht, Chips der Zukunft in Europa zu designen. Wir werden damit unabhängiger von Lieferketten, und wir kommen weg von der reinen Werkbank hin zur Technologieführerschaft. Ich glaube, da haben alle Ausschüsse hier sehr gut zusammengearbeitet, auch zusammen mit der Kommission. Und das hier heute ist ein guter Aufschlag für unsere Aufholjagd, die so dringend nötig ist. Ich möchte Dan Nica zu seinem sehr guten Bericht gratulieren und mich noch einmal für die gute Zusammenarbeit bedanken.

**Thierry Breton**, *membre de la Commission*. – Madame la Présidente, Mesdames et Messieurs les députés, d'abord, je voudrais vous dire que je suis particulièrement ravi de pouvoir m'adresser à vous aujourd'hui lors de ce débat qui marquera donc, je l'espère demain, la fin du processus d'adoption du règlement européen sur les semi-conducteurs.

Alors, je vais vous le dire tout de go, cela n'aurait été pas possible sans le travail impressionnant du Parlement européen, qui a joué un rôle absolument clé dans la conclusion, en un temps record, de cette initiative législative ambitieuse visant à renforcer l'industrie européenne des semi-conducteurs et également à garantir notre avenir technologique et industriel.

C'est pourquoi je voudrais tout d'abord remercier le rapporteur, M. Dan Nica, pour son leadership exceptionnel sur ce dossier et sa capacité à trouver des compromis qui ont été décisifs dans la conclusion de ce que nous présentons aujourd'hui. Je remercie également les rapporteurs des commissions associées, Maria-Manuel Leitão-Marques et Tiemo Wölken, qui vient de s'exprimer, mais aussi tous les rapporteurs fictifs et l'ensemble des députés, notamment ceux ayant porté la modification de l'entreprise commune «Semi-conducteurs», comme Eva Maydell, pour leur travail intensif sur ce dossier capital.

Alors évidemment, face aux nouvelles réalités géopolitiques, il était impératif que l'Europe s'affirme comme puissance industrielle et technologique sur la question des semi-conducteurs. C'est une question de compétitivité bien entendu, mais aussi de sécurité et de souveraineté technologique. Pour cela, il faut une industrie de semi-conducteurs en Europe qui soit robuste, qui soit résistante. Vous l'avez rappelé à l'instant, les semi-conducteurs sont au cœur de nos économies, de nos sociétés connectées et décarbonées. Ils alimentent l'ensemble des technologies essentielles devenues indissociables de notre vie quotidienne, des smartphones aux appareils médicaux. Les semi-conducteurs sont une force invisible qui stimule l'innovation et le progrès.

Cependant, l'industrie européenne est confrontée à des défis importants que nous connaissons tous et qui constituent des risques, du reste, pour nos intérêts stratégiques, en particulier dans la nouvelle géopolitique des chaînes de valeur. Et dans ce cadre, le règlement sur les semi-conducteurs repose sur trois piliers.

Tout d'abord, la consolidation du leadership européen en matière de recherche et de technologie, car, nous ne le disons pas assez, l'Europe est à la pointe de la recherche mondiale en semi-conducteurs. Toutes les technologies et tous les processus de fabrication de semi-conducteurs les plus avancés au monde ont été mis au point en Europe et notamment au sein de nos centres de recherche de classe mondiale que sont I. MECH, le LETI-CEA ou l'Institut Fraunhofer, pour ne citer que certains d'entre eux.

Le règlement sur les semi-conducteurs propose d'accentuer cette avance et d'investir pas moins de 11 milliards d'euros d'ici à 2030 pour quatre priorités. Premièrement, construire une infrastructure européenne la plus avancée au monde de trois lignes pilotes sous les deux nanomètres, en FinFET, sous les sept nanomètres en FD-SOI et sur le packaging le plus avancé permettant une industrialisation des processus de production. Deuxièmement, établir une plateforme de conception de puces ouverte à toutes nos start-up, à toutes nos PME, et permettant de créer avec les utilisateurs les applications de demain. Et troisièmement, former un réseau de centres de compétences nationaux dans les 27 pays, car l'excellence et l'innovation sont présentes partout en Europe. Et puis, bien entendu, quatrièmement, investir aussi dans l'avenir. Et l'avenir, c'est la puce quantique.

Le deuxième pilier consiste à investir tout au long de la chaîne de valeur industrielle. C'est ici la vraie nouveauté du règlement sur les semi-conducteurs. Le temps où l'Europe n'investissait que dans la recherche et délocalisait la production est révolu. Je le dis clairement, le règlement permet désormais un investissement massif pour notre base industrielle européenne compétitive sur l'ensemble de la chaîne de production des semi-conducteurs – les équipementiers, les producteurs de disques wafer, les entreprises de design et bien entendu les méga-usines. Nous avons pu ainsi élaborer le concept de pionnier et de clause d'équivalence pour rendre l'Europe attractive aux investissements nécessaires. Nous avons également approuvé les plans nationaux d'investissements massifs dans les semi-conducteurs, qu'ils soient liés à la FRR ou non.

Cette stratégie a été payante. Depuis l'annonce du règlement sur les semi-conducteurs, et avant même qu'il n'entre en application, ce sont déjà plus de 100 milliards d'euros d'investissements publics et privés qui ont été annoncés. Cela inclut notamment le dernier projet important d'intérêt européen commun qui prévoit pas moins de 22 milliards d'euros d'investissement dans 15 États membres de l'Union, autour de 68 projets industriels concrets qui vont rendre la chaîne de valeur industrielle européenne plus résiliente, que ce soit sur les matériaux, les équipements, le design ou le packaging.

Plusieurs projets de méga-usines ont d'ailleurs déjà été annoncés: Infineon, STMicroelectronics et Globalfoundries, Intel et d'autres qui vont suivre. On peut ainsi dire que grâce au règlement sur les semi-conducteurs, nous contribuons à réindustrialiser l'Europe en termes de semi-conducteurs sur l'ensemble de la chaîne de valeur et avec un double objectif: d'abord atteindre 20 % de la production mondiale, contre 9 % aujourd'hui, et également pouvoir produire en Europe les semi-conducteurs les plus avancés, en dessous de deux nanomètres, car c'est bien là que se joue la puissance géopolitique et industrielle de demain.

Le troisième et dernier pilier concerne l'adaptation de notre marché intérieur à la géopolitique des chaînes de valeur. Face aux risques de vulnérabilité que présentent nos dépendances, on doit s'organiser et on doit organiser notre marché intérieur pour pouvoir défendre nos intérêts dans la géopolitique mondiale en établissant les rapports de force nécessaires au maintien des chaînes de valeur mondiales.

Nous en avons fait l'amère expérience, vous vous en souvenez toutes et tous, lors des vaccins. En période de crise, nous devons utiliser la force de notre marché intérieur pour préserver nos intérêts européens face aux tentations de repli de nos partenaires ou de nos rivaux.

Dans le même temps, nous devons également établir les bases d'une coopération internationale plus structurée afin de diversifier nos chaînes d'approvisionnement. Ces éléments ne sont pas de la théorie. Les mesures récentes concernant le contrôle des exportations de gallium et de germanium annoncées par la Chine la semaine dernière nous rappellent les velléités de certains à établir des rapports de force dans les chaînes de valeur en utilisant des dépendances établies.

De même, la question du contrôle de l'exportation des technologies avancées en matière de semi-conducteurs vers la Chine doit faire l'objet d'une discussion européenne plus avancée et coordonnée.

Bien entendu, nous serons toujours aux côtés de notre allié américain lorsqu'il s'agit de préserver les intérêts de sécurité et de défense de l'Europe et de ses partenaires. Mais il est évidemment crucial que la charge soit toujours bien partagée et que cela ne se transforme pas in fine en politique industrielle au détriment des acteurs européens.

C'est d'ailleurs tout l'objet de la politique de sécurité économique que nous souhaitons mettre en œuvre autour du concept de réduction des risques. Le règlement sur les semi-conducteurs est et sera un instrument très important afin de réduire nos dépendances et d'établir les instruments nécessaires par rapport aux rapports de force géopolitiques.

Je reviens du Japon et de Corée du Sud avec l'idée ferme que nous avons des intérêts communs sur la question des semi-conducteurs. C'est d'ailleurs la raison pour laquelle nous avons établi des partenariats numériques avec ces deux pays. Plus largement, nous continuerons à travailler au travers du règlement sur les semi-conducteurs à une coopération internationale renforcée et notamment avec nos alliés et amis américains.

Mesdames et Messieurs les députés, le règlement sur les semi-conducteurs représente donc notre feuille de route pour une Europe actrice de sa propre transition, transition numérique et transition verte. C'est aussi un nouveau modèle de notre stratégie industrielle alliant pour la première fois consolidation des efforts de recherche avec soutien aux capacités de production et mise en place d'instruments de gestion des crises à venir. Car il n'y aura pas de politique industrielle en Europe sans usines.

La recherche, c'est primordial, bien entendu, mais il faut désormais s'attacher à transformer notre leadership technologique en leadership industriel. C'est vrai pour les semi-conducteurs, cela l'est aussi pour les industries des technologies propres, pour les batteries, pour les matières premières. Je compte donc sur le Parlement européen pour soutenir sans réserve l'accord conclu le 18 avril 2023 autour du règlement sur les semi-conducteurs.



**Geert Bourgeois**, *Rapporteur voor advies van de Commissie internationale handel*. – Voorzitter, commissaris, collega's, vanuit handelsperspectief mogen we niet dromen van volledige zelfvoorziening, laat staan kiezen voor protectionisme. De Europese industrie is daarvoor veel te verweven met de rest van de wereld.

Integendeel, de EU moet inzetten op haar sterktes door ook een ecosysteem te creëren met wereldspelers die we hebben, zoals IMEC in Leuven en ASML in Nederland. Een mooie toepassing daarvan, commissaris, is de cofinanciering EU-Vlaanderen ten belope van 1,5 miljard EUR om het wereldleiderschap van IMEC in Leuven inzake de kleinste en krachtigste halfgeleiders nog te versterken.

Ik ondersteun de oproep in de nieuwe verordening om internationale samenwerking te verdiepen en ook wederzijdse partnerschappen op te bouwen. Daarmee kunnen we continuïteit in de toelevering van chips waarborgen, ook in toekomstige crisissituaties.

**Karlo Ressler**, *izvjestitelj za mišljenje Odbora za proračun Europskog parlamenta*. – Poštovana predsjedavajuća povjereniće, izvjestitelju, kolegice i kolege, novo tehnološko doba u kojem živimo je geopolitički nemilosrdno doba u kojem nitko nikoga ne čeka i doba u kojem ništa nije besplatno.

U svijetu koji se tektonski mijenja i u kojem se globalni akteri natječu za što bolji položaj Europa mora i s ovim zakonodavstvom osiguravati svoje mjesto. Možemo i moramo biti brži u tehnološkoj preobrazbi, pri čemu su čipovi neizostavna komponenta. Na ovaj način osigurat ćemo veći udio na globalnom tržištu poluvodiča, ali isto tako spriječiti buduće krize opskrbe.

Više od tri milijarde eura dostupnih za poticanje istraživanja i razvoja iznimna su šansa za Europu, za europsku znanost i inovacije, poduzetništvo, ali i za sve države članice.

Svjescni smo da ćemo dugoročno morati uložiti još više resursa, i europskih i nacionalnih, ako se uistinu želimo približiti našim strateškim ciljevima. Međutim, ovo je već veliki korak i ovo je u svakom slučaju korak u pravome smjeru.

**Eva Maydell**, *rapporteur for the opinion of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs*. – Madam President, colleagues, Commissioner, there is an old saying that the proof of the pudding is in the eating. And I think when it comes to the Chips Act, all the indications so far are positive. Even before we formally adopt the Chips Act today, tens of billions of euros of investment have already been unleashed. Just look at the thousands of new jobs at the Intel plant in Poland or the investment in the chips factory in Grenoble or the historic investment in Magdeburg. And the list actually continues. I would like to warmly thank Mr Nica and the other shadow rapporteurs for the excellent cooperation we have had.

As a team what we achieved is, first of all, we listened carefully to the concerns, but also to the input that the chip industry gave to us. So today we will vote a text which reflects the complexity of the global supply chain. I believe that the Chips Act is now far more than just a mechanism for granting State aid. It is a framework to advance innovation and productivity across Europe. We have managed to cut red tape and created an environment where public and private partnership can thrive. We have shaped a crisis strategy that focuses first and foremost on prevention and not only on the cure of a heavy-handed market intervention.

Looking at the big picture of things, and if the EU is to turn its ambitions into a reality, then the EU needs to de-risk and reduce its dependency on strategic rivals. And I think the Chips Act provides a blueprint exactly for that. Finally, no one single act is a silver bullet for any challenge we face. And this is why I believe the Chips Act gives us the tools to help invent but also build a more competitive and resilient economy.

**Maria da Graça Carvalho**, *em nome do Grupo PPE*. – Senhora Presidente, Caro Comissário, Caros Colegas, a importância dos circuitos integrados estende-se a todos os setores de atividade, da indústria automóvel à saúde e à defesa.

A Europa tem uma investigação científica de excelência neste domínio. Contudo, esta competência não se tem traduzido em capacidade industrial. Temos uma quota de 10 % no mercado mundial dos circuitos integrados, valor claramente reduzido para a dimensão da nossa economia.

Temos inclusivamente sentido dificuldades em termos de abastecimento destes componentes essenciais, as quais foram notórias no passado recente. Este regulamento procura responder a esta realidade, assumindo o objetivo ambicioso de duplicar a quota da União Europeia neste mercado até 2030.

É um documento bem estruturado que identifica as estratégias em todos os patamares da cadeia de valor, desde o reforço das competências à capacitação da indústria. Aproveito para cumprimentar os relatores e a Comissão.

Contudo, preocupam-me as incógnitas que persistem sobre o financiamento. Contar com verbas não executadas de outras rubricas, como o Programa-Quadro de Investigação Científica e Inovação Horizonte Europa, parece-me muito pouco para as metas ambiciosas que assumimos.

**Lina Gálvez Muñoz**, *en nombre del Grupo S&D*. – Señora presidenta, señor comisario, los semiconductores tienen un papel vital geoestratégico en las economías modernas; son una parte central de productos, dispositivos e infraestructuras digitales. Sin semiconductores no hay digitalización posible.

El acuerdo sobre la Ley de Chips es un paso clave para garantizar nuestra transición digital y nuestra autonomía estratégica abierta. Esta Ley contribuirá al desarrollo de este sector, que es a su vez estratégico para muchos otros, y lo hará apoyándose en algo que es nuestra fortaleza europea —la investigación, el talento, el conocimiento—, que, además, debe servir para mejorar nuestra capacidad innovadora.

El desarrollo de esta industria también requiere materias primas esenciales, por lo que para garantizar su suministro debemos trazar alianzas internacionales con países afines, porque no podemos pasar de una dependencia energética a una de materias primas.

Los y las socialistas hemos trabajado para hacer que este proyecto llegue a todas las regiones de Europa para cerrar la brecha digital e industrial. Estamos seguros de que con esta Ley tenemos mucho que ganar, tanto en la Unión Europea como en países como España, que ha hecho inversiones estratégicas claves.

**Bart Groothuis**, *on behalf of the Renew Group*. – Madam President, dear Commissioner, before I came to this Parliament, by profession I investigated Chinese hackers and the Chinese appetite to steal from our European semi-conductor industry was just appalling. It amounted to nothing less than pure theft of our industrial earning power and competitiveness.

But with today's vote on the European Chips Act, we contribute to reverse this trend. After today, Europe is again taking control of its earning power and its digital future. But already today, foundries, factories, researchers and innovation are coming back to Europe as we speak. Nearly EUR 100 billion of investments in 68 projects across Europe are already in the pipeline today. At the courtesy of this Parliament, the Chips Act also stands the geopolitical test of our time, more cooperation with our like-minded partners, stronger protection of intellectual property and European scrutiny on exports, too, and investments in China. With this blueprint for industrial policy, Europe reasserts its status as an industrial powerhouse. The best is therefore not just behind us, it is yet to come.

**Henrike Hahn**, *im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin! Halbleiter sind überall in unseren Smartphones, in Autos und medizinischen Geräten. Wir brauchen eine stabile Versorgung mit Computerchips für den grünen und digitalen Wandel. Mit dem europäischen Chip-Gesetz haben wir jetzt einen ordentlichen Schub für die europäische Mikrochip-Industrie, und das ist unser klarer grüner Erfolg. Im Chip-Gesetz wird jetzt besonderer Wert auf die umwelt- und klimaschonende Herstellung von Halbleitern gelegt.

Energieeffizienz, Ressourceneffizienz und Kreislaufwirtschaft stehen dabei im Mittelpunkt. Und damit, um es noch einmal klar zu sagen: Wettbewerbsfähigkeit geht bestens zusammen mit Klima- und mit Umweltschutz und dem Chip-Gesetz. Und das muss hier auch noch einmal im Europäischem Parlament den ewiggestrigen Bremsern des Grünen Deals gesagt werden.

Wir fordern jetzt den EU-Halbleitersektor auf, mit rund 3,3 Milliarden Euro nach vorne zu gehen. Leider nicht mit frischem Geld. Wir brauchen via Eigenmittel zukünftig ein klares Bekenntnis im Rat, den Unternehmen in Europa besser zur Seite zu stehen. Immerhin fördern wir jetzt nicht nur einige wenige Megaprojekte, sondern auch innovative kleine und mittlere Unternehmen und Start-ups. Das Chip-Gesetz macht Europa fit für die Zukunft.

**Johan Nissinen, für ECR-gruppen.** – Fru talman! Europas ekonomi hotas ständigt av växande EU-byråkrati med förbud och regleringar, men även en ökande takt av subventioner. EU:s halvledarakt innebär att ett väldigt lönsamt amerikanskt företag får över 100 miljarder kronor i skattemedel för att bygga en halvledarfabrik i Tyskland. Det kommer visserligen att skapa fler arbetstillfällen, men arbetstillfällena kommer att vara så dyra som uppemot 10 miljoner kronor styck.

Att uppmuntra till produktion av halvledare i Europa kan låta väldigt bra i teorin, men det snedvrider helt den inre marknaden, där stora länder som Frankrike och Tyskland får enorma fördelar. Offentliga medel bör användas till skolor och universitet eller för att ta itu med de grundläggande orsakerna till varför vi har brist på högteknologiska företag i Europa.

Mindre EU-regleringar, bättre utbildning och mer satsning på varaktig innovation. Då kommer globala företag att vilja verka inom EU utan att behöva lockas med tiotals miljoner kronor.

**Marie Dauchy, au nom du groupe ID.** – Madame la Présidente, chers collègues, visiblement votre idéologie ultra-libérale vous empêche de voir la réalité en face. Vous refusez toute intervention de l'État dans l'économie, ce qui nous rend dangereusement dépendants d'autres pays dans des domaines stratégiques tels que les semi-conducteurs.

Votre proposition, qui vise à soutenir financièrement l'installation d'usines de pointe sur notre territoire, ne parvient pas à corriger la situation préoccupante dans laquelle nous nous trouvons. Vous refusez de garantir pleinement notre souveraineté malgré vos affirmations. Vous refusez de financer le développement de logiciels européens essentiels à la conception des puces du futur. Cette décision nous expose à une possible interdiction d'utilisation par les détenteurs de ces logiciels, comme les États-Unis l'ont récemment fait avec la Chine. De plus, vous accordez aux entreprises étrangères qui s'installent chez nous la copropriété de tous les brevets issus des recherches auxquelles elles participent pour obtenir des subventions sans que leur pays d'origine ne nous offre de réciprocité. C'est un véritable manque de vigilance de votre part.

Au lieu de créer un géant européen des semi-conducteurs, à l'image des succès d'Airbus et d'Ariane, votre règlement ne représente qu'une demi-victoire. C'est une occasion manquée que nous devons accepter en attendant une Europe des nations qui n'aura pas peur de revendiquer sa grandeur.

**Marc Botenga, au nom du groupe The Left.** – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur Breton, les États-Unis aujourd'hui, avec lesquels vous voulez un partenariat plus fort, entravent aussi l'avenir de l'industrie européenne. Ils ont obligé une entreprise de pointe hollandaise à limiter ses exportations vers la Chine. Des entreprises allemandes sont frappées et des pressions sont exercées sur des universités et des entreprises pour les empêcher d'inviter des chercheurs ou des étudiants étrangers, qui pourtant apportent chez nous un savoir-faire.

Dans une université belge, des bâtiments censés accueillir des partenariats avec des homologues chinois restent totalement vides. Et derrière cela, il y a des menaces, des pressions, de l'intimidation de la part des États-Unis d'Amérique qui, par ailleurs, concluent des alliances sans inclure l'Union européenne.

Alors, pour qui est-ce que vous allez rouler? Vous offrez des milliards, entre autres, à des entreprises américaines. Mais où est passée votre défense de notre droit souverain à choisir, à développer nos relations commerciales et scientifiques avec tous les pays du monde? Ne nous soumettons pas, Monsieur le Commissaire, aux Américains.

**Milan Uhrík (NI).** – Vážená pani predsedajúca, zhruba pred rokom obleteli európske médiá správy o tom, ako si Ruská federácia začala vyrábať vlastné čipy a vlastné počítače. Novinári v Európe sa vtedy posmešne vyjadrovali a smiali sa, že tieto ruské počítače a čipy sú o jednu-dve generácie pozadu oproti svetovým trendom, ale potom stíchli, lebo sa zistilo, že Európa si nevie vyrábať ani také čipy, pretože tu nie je žiadna fabrika a v celej produkcii elektroniky sme kompletne závislí od Ázie alebo od Taiwanu.

A to je zlé. To je zlé, to treba napraviť a to treba zvrátiť. A preto treba intenzívne začať podporovať konečne elektrotechnický priemysel aj v Európe, aby sme neboli v elektronike závislí od Ázie alebo od Ameriky. Tento priemysel tvorí budúcnosť a produkuje zároveň vysokú pridanú hodnotu pre obyvateľov, vďaka ktorej môžu zarábať oveľa viac, ako zarábajú v súčasnosti, čiže konečne treba spraviť niečo užitočné a začať podporovať vlastnú elektronickú produkciu v Európe.

**Pilar del Castillo Vera (PPE).** – Señora presidenta, señor comisario, el concepto de soberanía estratégica sobre el que tanto debatimos está determinado por nuestra capacidad para innovar y competir globalmente. El mercado único, por otro lado, es nuestro gran activo. Permite desarrollar las economías de escala necesarias para competir en una posición preferente en la economía mundial. Por otro lado, contamos con una industria que tiene una notable posición competitiva mundial y que cuenta, además, con altas cuotas de mercado en robótica y *software* industrial.

Ahora es importante impulsar los últimos desarrollos tecnológicos y, de esta manera, reforzar nuestra capacidad innovadora y competitiva. Y en este contexto es esencial acabar con las importantes carencias de semiconductores que Europa tiene en la actualidad. Son esenciales para que todo funcione: móviles, coches, fábricas, aparatos sanitarios. No hay desarrollo digital si no hay chips.

En este momento, a pesar de la creciente demanda, hay líneas de producción que están funcionando a medio gas por la escasez de semiconductores. Desde esa perspectiva, la Ley de Chips es un gran paso adelante. Va a contribuir a sentar las bases de un ecosistema de chips europeo de última generación que incluya su fabricación y garantice la seguridad de suministro.

En definitiva, una normativa muy bienvenida porque va a impulsar la capacidad de innovar y competir en la Unión Europea.

**Niels Fuglsang (S&D).** – Fru formand! Kære kolleger, Vi har brug for mikrochips i stort set al den teknologi, vi omgiver os med. Vi så under coronakrisen, hvordan vi meget hurtigt kan komme i problemer, hvis vi ikke kan få adgang til mikrochips. Det så vi i en lille by i Vestjylland i Danmark, hvor jeg kommer fra. Byen hedder Struer, og i Struer er der en startup-virksomhed, som fik at vide, at der var 99 ugers ventetid på mikrochips. De chips, som er fuldstændig afgørende for den alarmbrik, som virksomheden har opfundet og investeret i. I samme by havde den gamle hæderkronede virksomhed B&O også problemer. B&O laver lyd- og hi-fi-systemer, og de bruger microchip i alle deres produkter. For begge virksomheder er der tale om deres levebrød. Hvis de ikke kan få adgang til mikrochips, så kan de lige så godt lukke, og de var i alvorlige problemer, og derfor må vi indse, at det går ikke at være fuldstændig afhængig af fremmede magter, når det kommer til mikrochips. Vi må have vores egen produktion og være selvforsynende her i Europa, og det er derfor, jeg støtter denne forordning om mikrochips. Lad os stemme for den!

**Mauri Pekkarinen (Renew).** – Arvoisa puhemies, Eurooppa nukkuu puolijohdealalla pitkään, muun muassa Taiwan ja Korea ajoivat ohitse. Me tarvitsemme EU:ssa radikaalisti parempaa suoritusta arvoketjun kaikissa osissa, alan koulutuksessa, tutkimuksessa, innovaatioissa ja tuotannossa. Se vastaa aika hyvin näihin haasteisiin. Tuen sitä ja kiitän kaikkia sen aikaansaamisessa mukana olleita.

Minun huoleni kohdistuu kuitenkin EU:n valtiontukikehyksiin ja niiden vaikutuksiin tällä alalla. Jo nyt, ennen kuin *Chips Act* on voimassa, EU:n suuret jäsenvaltiot, muun muassa Saksa ja Ranska, ovat lähteneet houkuttelemaan valtavilla valtiontuilla puolijohdealan suuria yrityksiä, investointeja, omiin maihinsa valtiontukien sitä estämättä. Uutiset kertovat, että esimerkiksi Intelin mahdollisissa investoinneissa Saksaan kysymys on monien, monien miljardien eurojen suuruisista valtiontuista.

Arvoisa puhemies ja arvoisa komissaari, minusta on tärkeää, että tällä alalla ei vajota tällaiseen huutokauppaan, jossa ne, joilla on paljon rahaa, menestyvät ja toiset häviävät. Euroopalle, meille, on tärkeää, että meillä on reilut sisämarkkinat, joissa aito kilpailu on se, joka ratkaisee.

**Robert Hajšel (S&D).** – Madam President, ‘strategic autonomy, less dependencies’ – many declarations, but it’s time to act. The Chips Act aims to double the EU share in global production capacity. Without chips, we cannot produce vehicles or develop critical infrastructures. Factories will stop running and many workers will lose their jobs. But for now, there is a bottleneck, with the production concentrated in Taiwan and South Korea. We need to react quickly.

Supporting the chips industry with more than EUR 3 billion will strengthen the entire European economy and create sustainable jobs. Some Member States have understood their role. Germany, for example, approved EUR 11 billion of State aid for a factory in Magdeburg. But we need these factories also in Central and Eastern Europe because they can deliver thousands of jobs and hundreds of European suppliers, including SMEs, can be involved. Chips are only one element in securing our strategic autonomy. As rapporteur on the European Hydrogen Bank, I know very well that we need to adopt more legislation and, above all, secure more EU investment to cover strategic sectors.

**Carlos Zorrinho (S&D).** – Senhora Presidente, Senhor Comissário, a fragilidade do ecossistema industrial europeu dos circuitos integrados e os problemas de competitividade e autonomia estratégica que daí decorrem exigem não apenas que o relatório hoje em debate seja aprovado por larga maioria, mas também que a sua implementação seja célere e potente.

Com este regulamento, são criadas condições para um forte impulso da base tecnológica dos setores-chave das cadeias de valor, são suprimidas barreiras burocráticas e são introduzidos mecanismos de coordenação essenciais para reforçar a massa crítica e garantir o posicionamento da União Europeia nos mercados globais.

Sem a aplicação determinada e devidamente financiada desta iniciativa, a União ficará desconectada da capacidade de inovar e de liderar em áreas de fronteira, como as comunicações, a mobilidade de nova geração, a automação industrial ou as novas tecnologias digitais, designadamente a inteligência artificial.

Temos de avançar de forma inclusiva, mobilizando todo o tecido empresarial, capacitando as pessoas, protegendo a propriedade intelectual, antecipando desafios e gerando respostas vencedoras.

**Thierry Breton, membre de la Commission.** – Madame la Présidente, très rapidement, Mesdames et Messieurs les parlementaires, pour vous rappeler, à l'issue de ce débat, que le règlement sur les semi-conducteurs sera un outil de puissance industrielle et technologique pour l'Europe.

Recherche, capacité de production, réduction de nos dépendances, organisation du marché intérieur face aux crises, telles sont les priorités du règlement sur les semi-conducteurs. Je le redis très clairement devant vous dans cet hémicycle, il n'y aura pas de politique industrielle sans usines. C'est tout ce que nous avons fait dans ce règlement.

C'est un modèle pour notre approche industrielle en Europe. Nous l'avons reproduit pour les technologies propres, les minerais critiques, les munitions, la défense. Je vous remercie et je compte sur le Parlement pour soutenir le règlement européen sur les semi-conducteurs.

**Dan Nica, rapporteur.** – Madam President, while the EU Chips Act will not ensure the EU's independence in relation to chips, as no single player can be independent in relation to this, we want the EU Chips Act to establish Europe as an important player in the global semiconductors arena and we want to ensure that the EU is leading in research and innovation, that it has a business-friendly environment, a fast-permitting process, and that it invests in a skilled workforce for the semiconductor sector.

Our goal is to ensure growth in Europe, to prepare for future challenges and to have in place the right mechanisms for possible crises.

Thank you so much, dear colleagues of the European Parliament for your very strong support. Thank you so much, Commissioner Breton, for your very strong support. Thank you so much to all of you, to the shadow rapporteurs, to the advisors and assistants. You did a great job.

**Presidente.** – La discussione è chiusa.

La votazione si svolgerà martedì 11 luglio 2023.

*Dichiarazioni scritte (articolo 171)*

**Eugen Jurzyca (ECR), písomne.** – Nové plány dotovania priemyslu čipov majú urobiť Úniu odolnejšou. Takýto typ priemyselnej politiky nebol historicky efektívny, obávam sa, že neprinesie výsledky ani teraz. Ak by sme to s odolnosťou Únie mysleli úprimne, merali by sme, čo ľuďom dotácie 3,3 miliardy EUR na výrobu čipov prinesú. Návrh ale meria úspech fondu takými ukazovateľmi, ako je počet obdarených firiem. Môže sa tak stať, že projekt bude úspešný, aj keď odolnosť sa nezvýši. S takýmito projektami nesúhlasím.

**Urmas Paet (Renew), kirjalikult.** – Euroopas toodetakse vähem kui 10% maailma kiipidest. Tänu uuele määrusele loodame ELi tootmissuutlikkust tõsta kuni 20%-ni. Pandeemia ajal tuli ilmsiks ülemaailmsete tarneahelate pikaajaline nõrkus. Enneolematult ulatuslik kiibikriis illustreeris seda suurepäraselt. Tööstuse ja tarbijate jaoks tõi kiibipuudus kaasa hinnatõusu, lisaks aeglustas see majanduse taastumist. Sama võib meid oodata ka tulevikus. Selge on see, et Euroopa peab olema selles valdkonnas mõjukam ja ning haarama liidrirolli. Uus määrus soodustab investeringuid ELi kiibitööstusesse, kiirendades lubade väljastamist ning võimaldades omistada valdkonnale „kõrgeima võimaliku riikliku tähtsuse“. Lisaks toetavad uued reeglid innovatsiooni ning pakuvad täiendavat tuge kiipide disaini vallas tegutsevatele VKEdele. Õigusakt parandab ELi varustuskindlust, aitab kaasata investeringuid ja suurendada ELi tootmissuutlikkust.

**Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE), kirjallinen.** – Arvoisa puhemies, Eurooppa on tällä hetkellä isojen kysymysten äärellä. Mikä on paikkamme maailmassa, kenestä olemme riippuvaisia? Kenen hyväntahtoisuudesta ja yhteistyöstä riippuu yritystemme, teollisuutemme ja yhteiskuntiemme toiminta? Venäjän hyökkäyssota Ukrainassa ja sen seurauksena voimistunut globaali kahtiajako, geopoliittiset jännitteet ja ei-demokraattisten maiden, esimerkiksi Kiinan ja Venäjän, keskinäinen lähentyminen, on syystäkin avannut silmämme strategisen autonomian vahvistamisen tarpeelle.

Yhteistyö ja keskinäisriippuvuudet voivat olla paitsi mahdollisuus myös uhka. Strateginen autonomia kulminoituu muun muassa siruihin ja puolijohteisiin. Ne ovat strateginen resurssi, joiden puuttuessa yhteiskuntamme eivät toimi tai kehity – emme voi käyttää laitteitamme, joilla teemme töitä tai olemme yhteydessä muihin, tai edistää yhteiskunnan digitalisaa-tiota. Sirut ovat strategisia resursseja teollisuuden keskeisille arvoketuille. Ne vaikuttavat kaikkeen automatisoiduista autoista pilvipalveluihin, tietoliikenneyhteyksiin, puolustukseen tai supertietokoneisiin.

EU:n yksiselitteisesti täytyy olla isompi tekijä kuin tämänhetkinen alle 10 prosenttia maailmanlaajuisista mikrosirumark-kinoista. On erinomaista, että hyväksymme parlamentissa tänään EU:n sirusäädöksen. Se parantaa EU:n strategista auto-nomiaa ja turvallisuutta. Puolijohdepula on jo aiheuttanut esimerkiksi terveydenhuollon laitteita valmistavien tehtaiden sulkemisia. Seuraavaksi meidän pitääkin siirtää katsemme EU:n lääkeomavaraisuuteen sekä innovoinnissa että tuotan-nessa. Tällä hetkellä Eurooppa on monissa lääkeaineissa täysin riippuvainen Kiinan kaltaisista maista ja niiden tuotan-osta. Meidän täytyy vahvistaa Euroopan lääkeomavaraisuutta, jotta turvaamme potilaidemme hyvän hoidon jatkossakin.

**Katarína Roth Neveďalová (S&D), písomne.** – Európsky zákon o čipoch predstavuje pre Európu jedinečnú príležitosť riešiť výzvy, ktorým čelí svetový trh s polovodičmi, ako je zraniteľnosť dodávateľského reťazca, spoliehanie sa na neeu-rópskych výrobcov a rastúca geopolitická konkurencia.

Strategickým investovaním a podporou rozvoja robustného a konkurencieschopného európskeho polovodičového eko-systému môžeme zvýšiť odolnosť Európy, inovačnú kapacitu a hospodársky rast. Ciele zákona, medzi ktoré patrí pod-pora výskumu a vývoja v oblasti polovodičových technológií, podpora spolupráce medzi členskými štátmi a zvýšenie výroby a nasadenia špičkových čipov v Európe, podporujem. Zameraním sa na tieto oblasti môžeme podporiť rast európskej výroby čipov, prilákať investície a vytvoriť vysokokvalitné pracovné miesta v polovodičovom priemysle.

Keďže Európa sa usiluje stať sa globálnym lídrom vo výrobe pokročilých čipov, je nevyhnutné, aby sme integrovali udržateľné postupy a minimalizovali environmentálnu stopu tohto odvetvia. Len zosúladením európskeho zákona o čipoch s našimi klimatickými cieľmi a zásadami obehového hospodárstva môžeme zabezpečiť zodpovedný a udržateľný rast polovodičového sektora. Prijatím tejto legislatívy môžeme postaviť Európu na svetového lídra vo výrobe čipov, posilniť našu odolnosť a prispieť k digitálnej transformácii našich spoločností a zároveň zachovať udržateľnosť a envi-ronmentálne hodnoty.

**Ivan Štefanec (PPE)**, *písomne*. – Nedostatok čipov odhalil zraniteľné miesta v globálnych dodávateľských reťazcoch, ktoré pocítila práve Európska únia. Rastúce náklady priemyslu a spotrebiteľských cien spomaľujú obnovu Európy.

Potrebujeme zvýšiť bezpečnosť dodávok, posilniť výrobu a stimulovať investície v tomto segmente vrátane zapojenia malých a stredných podnikateľov. Preto vyzývam Európsky parlament na to, aby jednal v najlepšom záujme malých a stredných podnikateľov dnes a aj v budúcnosti. Je potrebné, aby sme akcelerovali prispôsobenie týchto firiem na rast technológií tak, aby mohli prosperovať, a to aj financovaním výroby čipov.

*(La seduta è sospesa alle 12:23.)*

**PRESIDENZA: ROBERTA METSOLA**

*President*

## **5. Wznowienie posiedzenia**

*(The sitting resumed at 12.25)*

## **6. Upamiętnienie 28. rocznicy ludobójstwa w Srebrenicy (oświadczenie Przewodniczącej)**

**President.** – Dear colleagues, today marks the 28th anniversary of the Srebrenica genocide. A day that will live in infamy. An ethnic cleansing campaign that saw nearly 30 000 people forcibly expelled and the brutal murder of over 8 000 people – mostly Muslim men and boys who had sought safety in the Srebrenica enclave.

Atrocities so barbaric that they are almost unspeakable, and yet we must speak. We speak to remember the victims. We speak to warn the world of what has happened so that it may never happen again. The genocide of Srebrenica will forever haunt us.

28 years later, we are witnessing increasing genocide denial, more false narratives and more glorification of war criminals. It is our duty to speak out against it, to remind the world of a truth that cannot be denied.

Last weekend, we marked 500 days since Russia launched its full-scale military invasion on independent and sovereign Ukraine. A war that has brought to light the cruelty of Putin's regime, and the return of war crimes and atrocities to our continent.

The European Parliament will never turn a blind eye to war crimes. This is how we ensure that nothing like the Srebrenica genocide ever happens again. So on this solemn day, the European Parliament pays tribute to the victims of the Srebrenica genocide and reiterates its solidarity with all the families of all the victims, many of whom are yet to be identified.

*Nek im je rahmet dushi i laka zemlja bosanska\**

**Paulo Rangel**, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Madam President, dear Commissioners, dear colleagues, we address today all Bosnians of all ethnicities, of all religions and beliefs. We address them not as citizens of a country, but as a living proof of Europe, because what we find in Bosnia and Herzegovina is all that is great, all that is painful and all that is human about Europe. The history of Bosnia and Herzegovina is the history of Europe, of different peoples and beliefs, of war and conflict, of reconciliation and peace, of hope for the future.

Because in Europe, our darkest moments were followed by our brightest. Because 50 years after Auschwitz, there was Srebrenica, and our failure to act was, and remains, one of our deepest sorrows. We were not saviours. We were merely witnesses of Srebrenica. Twenty-eight years later, we are still only witnesses. Last year in Irpin, we witnessed Srebrenica. Last year in Bucha, we witnessed Srebrenica.

So we must go back to Bosnia, to Srebrenica, to learn that difficult and painful lesson: that truth is not compatible with denial, that justice is not compatible with impunity, and that peace is not compatible with aggression.

**Dietmar Köster**, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Madam President, dear colleagues, the biggest war crime in Europe after the Second World War took place in July 1995. The world simply watched – a disgrace for Europe and the United Nations.

The genocide perpetrated by Serbian soldiers is regarded as the country's deepest wound. This shows how important the legal investigation is. More than 20 people have been charged until today and also convicted of genocide. The relatives of the victims have a right to know what had happened to their loved ones. Still not all bodies have been found and recovered.

It is intolerable that nationalist agitation, especially by the Serbian and Croatian politicians and individuals, is deliberately being plunged into renewed ethnic conflict and suffering. 'Never again' should really mean 'never again'. Every individual who can, and we at the EU certainly can, should do whatever is needed so that Srebrenica does not happen again.

**Klemen Grošelj**, *v imenu skupine Renew*. – Gospa predsednica. Kolegice in kolegi. Srebrenica je mesto spomina in opomina. Ko se sam spomnim na Srebrenico, se spomnim leta 1995, ko je bila moja skrb, kako zaključiti maturo, medtem ko so se le nekaj sto kilometrov stran dogajale grozote, ki so bile nepredstavljive tedaj in so tudi danes.

Resda smo ob razpadanju Jugoslavije videli marsikaj. Videli smo Vukovar, videli smo Škrabinje, Prijedor, Višegrad, Bijeljino in še bi lahko našteval. A Srebrenica, Srebrenica predstavlja grozljivost. To ni samo nekaj grozljivega, temveč groza sama.

Moj spomin kot spomin najstnika na Srebrenico odražata dva strašna prizora. Prvi je ločevanje družin na Potočarjih in drugi je posnetek usmrtitve nesrečnih bošnjaških mladeničev, tedaj ne mnogo starejših od mene.

A bolj kot grozljivosti teh prizorov se spomnim neizmerne cinizma, brutalnosti in popolne odsotnosti empatije morilcev. Kot je dejal eden od tožilcev na nürnberskih procesih, je vir vsega zla odsotnost empatije, odsotnost človečnosti kot take.

In tako kot je Srebrenica povzročila odsotnost empatije, ta odsotnost empatije žal zaznamuje tudi čas, v katerem živimo. Nekako se zdi, da je opomin Srebrenice in genocida pozabljen, da se to ne more več zgoditi, čeprav smo že mnogokrat dejali nikoli več, a se ta nikoli več kar naprej ponavlja kot večno vračanje zla.

Sporočilo Srebrenice je opomin za današnji čas, česa je človek zmožen in sposoben, ko si na izzive sodobnosti odgovori s smrtonosno mešanico skrajnega nacionalizma, odsotnosti empatije, za katero poskrbi propaganda nadzorovanih in nesvobodnih medijev.

Zato je boj za temeljne svoboščine in pravice, na katerih temelji tudi naša EU, vedno pomemben in relevanten. In tako kot je pomembno poudariti, da je odgovornost za genocid vedno individualna, je potrebno tudi hkrati poudariti, da vsem, ki zanikajo genocid v Srebrenici, ki povečujejo vojne zločine, ki ne zmorejo obsoditi vojnih zločinov in genocida, ni mesta v naši Uniji.

**Tineke Strik**, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Madam President, in July 1995 thousands of Bosniak people fled the persecution of the Serb army and thought that they were safe in Srebrenica, a UN-protected area. But the international community had offered false hope. It failed to prevent genocide. Over 8 000 Muslim men and boys were brutally killed and thousands of women and children deported, humiliated and raped.



Some wounds never heal, but by commemorating we pay respect to the victims and their families and to Bosniak society. We give them a voice, a voice saying loud and clear that justice does not tolerate impunity, not for war crimes or genocide, not for denying or glorifying these atrocities. It hurts that this message is still badly needed, day by day.

Some wounds never heal. But let us remember them and learn from them to decisively stand up against the first signs of division, discrimination or maltreatment and to prevent genocide from ever happening again.

**Ангел Джамбазки**, *от името на групата ECR*. – Г-жо Председател, геноцидът в Сребреница без всякакво съмнение е военно престъпление и престъпление срещу човечеството, извършено от паравоенни сръбски части. Това престъпление беше част от войната, водена от паравоенни сръбски части в цяла бивша Югославия. Преди Сребреница беше Хърватска, преди това беше Словения, но този геноцид и престъпление е и резултат донякъде от нерешителна политика, водена в Европа, по отношение на сръбските военни престъпления в бивша Югославия.

Уважаеми колеги, няма по добра метафора за тази политика от нерешителните действия на мироопазващите сили на ООН, предали безславно града на настъпващите сръбски военнопредстъпници. Жертвите на Сребреница са жертви на великосръбския шовинизъм, винаги подкрепян от Кремъл. Не забравяйте това.

Югославия, този концлагер на поробените народи, между които освен босненци, хървати, словенци, македонски българи, македонци и други такива, беше твърде дълго възприеман от Западна Европа като модел за социализъм с човешко лице. Разпадът на този модел показва истинското грозно лице на този режим. Отново, не забравяйте къде беше създаден и кой го подкрепяше досега. Геноцид и етническо прочистване следваха разпада на Югославия за всеки народ, който не желаше да бъде част от сръбския свят или сръбския мир, правите връзката предполагам?

Геноцидите в бивша Югославия не започват от Сребреница, а може би Сребреница беше последният, но преди това беше Вуковар. Завършвам, уважаема г-жо Председател, и македонската кървава Коледа на 7 януари 1945 г. Официалните власти в Белград отказват да нарекат събитията в Сребреница с истинските им имена – геноцид. Докато това продължава да бъде официална сръбска позиция ние не трябва да правим отстъпки пред властите в Скопие, пак казвам, директно свързани с Кремъл и Москва. Помнете жертвите на сръбския геноцид. Вечна памет! Помнете Сребреница.

**Nikolaj Villumsen**, *on behalf of The Left Group*. – Madam President, Commissioner, dear colleagues. Today we remember the thousands of innocent victims of the Srebrenica genocide. Men and boys were executed, women raped, children traumatised, and the whole Bosniak community forced from their homes.

We remember the victims and we say 'never again'. Never again shall the international community turn a blind eye to mass murder, ethnic cleansing and genocide. Never again shall Europe fail to support the people of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

This is more important than ever as we see the aggressiveness of the President of Republika Srpska. Let us use this occasion to call on President Dodik, as well as the governments of Serbia and Russia, to recognise the genocide. Let us remember the victims of Srebrenica and make sure that Bosnia moves forward in peace and prosperity.

**President.** – That concludes the item.

*(The sitting was suspended for a few moments)*

**VORSITZ: KATARINA BARLEY**

Vizepräsidentin

**7. Wznowienie posiedzenia***(Die Sitzung wird um 12.39 Uhr wieder aufgenommen.)***8. Głosowanie****Die Präsidentin.** – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Abstimmung.*(Abstimmungsergebnisse und sonstige Einzelheiten der Abstimmung; siehe Protokoll.)***8.1. Wniosek o uchylenie immunitetu Georgiosa Kyrtiosa (A9-0231/2023 - Sergey Lagodinsky) (głosowanie)****8.2. Środki tymczasowej liberalizacji handlu będące uzupełnieniem koncesji handlowych mających zastosowanie do mołdawskich produktów na podstawie Układu o stowarzyszeniu między Unią Europejską i Europejską Wspólnotą Energii Atomowej a Republiką Mołdawii (A9-0219/2023 - Markéta Gregorová) (głosowanie)****8.3. Nowe rozporządzenie w sprawie wyrobów budowlanych (A9-0207/2023 - Christian Doleschal) (głosowanie)***– Vor der Abstimmung:*

**Christian Doleschal, Berichterstatter.** – Frau Präsidentin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Die europäische Baubranche steht derzeit stark unter Druck: Steigende Zinsen, Rohstoffmangel, Lieferengpässe, Fachkräftemangel – all das belastet das europäische Baugewerbe. Um unsere ambitionierten Klimaziele auch im Bausektor zu erreichen, müssen wir uns auf das Wesentliche konzentrieren. Jetzt ist nicht der Zeitpunkt für zusätzliche Bürokratie, sondern die Zeit, dass die vielen neuen Innovationen den Weg ins europäische Amtsblatt und vor allem die neuen klimafreundlichen Produkte den Weg auf die Baustellen schaffen.

Auch die Digitalisierung bietet große Chancen, beispielsweise der Bauproduktepass, der klare Vorgaben gibt, wie Bauprodukte ihren Beitrag zur Nachhaltigkeit leisten können.

Liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Ich bitte Sie um Unterstützung für diese wichtige Verordnung, damit wir schon kommende Woche schnellstmöglich die Verhandlungen mit dem Rat und der Kommission starten können. Gleichzeitig darf ich den Kolleginnen und Kollegen Schattenberichterstattern für die sehr angenehme und zielführende Zusammenarbeit herzlich danken.

*– Nach der Abstimmung über den Vorschlag der Kommission:*

**Christian Doleschal (PPE), rapporteur.** – Dear colleagues, thank you very much. I will not do a long speech now. I will just ask, pursuant to Rule 59(4), for the immediate referral back to committee so that we can start interinstitutional negotiations.

*(Das Parlament billigt den Antrag auf Rücküberweisung an den Ausschuss.)*

- 8.4. Projekt budżetu korygującego nr 2 do budżetu ogólnego na 2023 r. – zapisanie nadwyżki z roku budżetowego 2022 (A9-0225/2023 - Fabienne Keller) (głosowanie)**
- 8.5. Uruchomienie Europejskiego Funduszu Dostosowania do Globalizacji dla Zwalnianych Pracowników w następstwie wniosku złożonego przez Belgię – EGF/2023/001 BE/ LNSA (A9-0228/2023 - Eleni Stavrou) (głosowanie)**
- 8.6. Porozumienie między Unią Europejską a Republiką Chile: zmiana koncesji w odniesieniu do wszystkich kontyngentów taryfowych znajdujących się na liście koncesyjnej UE CLXXV w następstwie wystąpienia Zjednoczonego Królestwa z Unii Europejskiej (A9-0222/2023 - Samira Rafaela) (głosowanie)**
- 8.7. Umowa między Unią Europejską a Japonią: przewozy lotnicze (A9-0221/2023 - Cláudia Monteiro de Aguiar) (głosowanie)**
- 8.8. Sprzeciw na mocy art. 112 ust. 4 Regulaminu – dodatki do żywności: azotyny (E 249-250) i azotany (E 251-252) (B9-0307/2023) (głosowanie)**
- 8.9. Sprzeciw na mocy art. 111 ust. 3 Regulaminu: szczegółowe przepisy dotyczące produkcji ekologicznej soli morskiej i innych soli ekologicznych stosowanych w żywności i paszy (B9-0308/2023) (głosowanie)**
- 8.10. Dyrektywa w sprawie emisji przemysłowych (A9-0216/2023 - Radan Kanev) (głosowanie)**

– Nach der Abstimmung über den Vorschlag der Kommission:

**Radan Kanev (PPE), rapporteur.** – Madam President, based on the result of the plenary vote, please refer the matter back to the ENVI Committee for institutional negotiations because, as I said yesterday in the debate, the dialogue only starts now.

(Das Parlament billigt den Antrag auf Rücküberweisung an den Ausschuss.)

**8.11. Portal Emisji Przemysłowych (A9-0211/2023 - Radan Kanev) (głosowanie)**

– Nach der Abstimmung über den Vorschlag der Kommission:

**Radan Kanev (PPE), rapporteur.** – Madam President, once again, I request referral back to the ENVI Committee for institutional negotiations.

(Das Parlament billigt den Antrag auf Rücküberweisung an den Ausschuss.)

**8.12. Rozmieszczanie infrastruktury paliw alternatywnych (A9-0234/2022 - Petar Vitanov) (głosowanie)**

**8.13. Zrównoważone paliwa w transporcie morskim (inicjatywa FuelEU Maritime) (A9-0233/2022 - Jörgen Warborn) (głosowanie)**

**8.14. Efektywność energetyczna (przekształcenie) (A9-0221/2022 - Niels Fuglsang) (głosowanie)**

**8.15. Ochrona dziennikarzy i obrońców praw człowieka przed ewidentnie bezpodstawnymi lub stanowiącymi nadużycie postępowaniami sądowymi (A9-0223/2023 - Tiemo Wölken) (głosowanie)**

– Nach der Abstimmung über den Vorschlag der Kommission:

**Tiemo Wölken, Berichterstatter.** – Frau Präsidentin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Heute ist ein guter Tag für Journalistinnen und Journalisten in der Europäischen Union. Wir werden sie besser schützen vor Klagen, die sie mundtot machen wollen. Das hilft unserer Demokratie. Das hilft unserem Zusammenleben. Es ist wichtiger denn je, dass Journalistinnen und Journalisten ihre Arbeit machen können. Insofern vielen Dank für diese breite Unterstützung. Wir wollen morgen schon in die interinstitutionellen Verhandlungen mit dem Rat starten. Deswegen bräuchte ich noch die Zustimmung für die interinstitutionellen Verhandlungen nach Artikel 59 Absatz 4. Darüber würde ich mich sehr freuen.

(Das Parlament billigt den Antrag auf Rücküberweisung an den Ausschuss.)

**8.16. Środki zarządzania, ochrony i kontroli obowiązujące na obszarze objętym Porozumieniem w sprawie połowów na południowym obszarze Oceanu Indyjskiego (SIOFA) (A9-0192/2023 - João Pimenta Lopes) (głosowanie)**

– Nach der Abstimmung:

**Margaritis Schinas, Vice-President of the Commission.** – Madam President, I have a statement to read on behalf of the Commission: ‘We regret the rejection by the European Parliament of this proposal. We take note of Parliament’s call to withdraw. We will now consider this matter carefully and we will inform this House in due course of how we intend to proceed. As we stated during the plenary debate, the Commission is unequivocally committed to the principle of multilingualism in the context of implementing measures and incorporating forms of regional fisheries management organisations. The Commission therefore would like to reiterate once again our willingness to engage in a dialogue with the European Parliament to identify the best way to achieve that objective, not only for this proposal but also for all future proposals implementing measures agreed within regional fisheries management organisations.’

In that light, I hope that the Commission proposal would be referred back to committee for further discussions and, should a mutually agreeable solution be found, the Commission wants to assure this House that we stand ready to uphold any solution in the current and future proposals.

**8.17. Europejski akt w sprawie czipów (A9-0014/2023 - Dan Nica) (głosowanie)**

**8.18. Ochrona dziennikarzy na świecie i polityka Unii Europejskiej w tej dziedzinie (A9-0206/2023 - Isabel Wiseler-Lima) (głosowanie)**

– Vor der Abstimmung:

**Isabel Wiseler-Lima, rapporteure.** – Monsieur le Président, l’ampleur et la gravité des attaques contre les journalistes ont considérablement augmenté et ceci va de pair avec une régression de la démocratie dans le monde. Les enquêtes des journalistes, leur lutte pour informer, sont essentielles à la préservation de l’état de droit et de la démocratie. Mais ce faisant, les journalistes s’exposent à la répression des États autoritaires, des réseaux criminels et de tous ceux qui sont prêts à tout pour empêcher la divulgation de leurs affaires malhonnêtes, souvent liées à la corruption.

Intimidation, diffamation en ligne, emprisonnements, tortures, disparitions, assassinats. C'est malheureusement ce à quoi nombre de journalistes par le monde sont exposés. Nous devons dénoncer ces faits et nous devons donner tout l'appui possible aux journalistes qui s'exposent, eux et leur famille, à des représailles afin de divulguer la vérité.

Dans ce rapport – et permettez-moi d'ailleurs de remercier très chaleureusement mes collègues rapporteurs fictifs pour le travail d'équipe que nous avons pu réaliser – nous faisons de nombreuses et diverses recommandations afin de renforcer la politique de l'Union européenne en matière de protection des journalistes. Nous évoquons ainsi, entre autres: l'éducation aux médias; le combat contre la diffusion de messages qui incitent à la violence contre les journalistes; un plan d'urgence à suivre par les délégations de l'Union, qui inclut visite aux journalistes en situation à risque, visites en prison et assistance aux procès; l'assistance aux pays tiers qui en font la demande pour concevoir des cadres juridiques favorables à la promotion du journalisme et à la protection des journalistes; enfin, des échanges et des formations pour les journalistes et les juges concernés.

Je relèverai encore un dernier point. La désinformation et la propagande aujourd'hui utilisées à très grande échelle, notamment par les régimes autoritaires, mettent en danger la profession même de journaliste, et ceci partout dans le monde. Les vérificateurs de faits jouent aussi un rôle primordial et permettent de soutenir la crédibilité du journalisme d'investigation. Ils sont particulièrement exposés aux représailles. Or il est primordial que les citoyens sachent qu'ils ont accès à des informations de confiance. Si les citoyens doutent de la possibilité même d'obtenir des informations crédibles, ils n'auront plus confiance dans la démocratie. Les citoyens ont le droit d'être informés, les journalistes celui d'informer.

**8.19. Prawo wyborcze, komisja śledcza i praworządność w Polsce (B9-0318/2023, B9-0319/2023) (głosowanie)**

**8.20. Wdrażanie klauzul pomostowych w traktatach UE (A9-0208/2023 - Giuliano Pisapia) (głosowanie)**

**8.21. Unia bankowa – sprawozdanie za 2022 r. (A9-0177/2023 - Kira Marie Peter-Hansen) (głosowanie)**

**8.22. Wspieranie i dostosowywanie szkoleń zawodowych jako narzędzia sukcesu pracowników i podstawowego elementu gospodarki UE w nowym przemyśle 4.0 (A9-0232/2023 - Anna Zalewska) (głosowanie)**

**Die Präsidentin.** – Damit ist die Abstimmungsstunde geschlossen.

*(Die Sitzung wird für einige Augenblicke unterbrochen.)*

**PRESIDÊNCIA: PEDRO SILVA PEREIRA**

*Vice-Presidente*

## 9. Wznowienie posiedzenia

(A sessão é reiniciada às 13h34.)

## 10. Pandemia COVID-19: wyciągnięte wnioski i zalecenia na przyszłość (debata)

**Presidente.** – O próximo ponto da ordem do dia é o relatório da Deputada Montserrat sobre a «Pandemia de COVID-19: ensinamentos retirados e recomendações para o futuro» (A9-0217/2023) [2022/2076(INI)].

**Dolors Montserrat, ponente.** – Señor presidente, señor comisario, el informe sobre la pandemia de COVID-19 que votamos mañana es un pilar fundamental en la construcción de la Unión Europea de la Salud. Tras un año de trabajo con expertos, profesionales, instituciones y pacientes, de negociaciones políticas y de un diálogo constructivo con la presidenta de la Comisión, coordinadores y ponentes alternativos, les pido que apoyen mañana este informe. Porque tenemos una gran oportunidad para decirles a los europeos que su salud es nuestra prioridad y que estamos preparados para hacer frente a cualquier emergencia sanitaria futura. Sí, tenemos una muy buena oportunidad de demostrar, hoy aquí, que el diálogo y el consenso europeo vuelven a ganar para mejorar la vida de los ciudadanos y fortalecer la Unión Europea.

Y ¿por qué es importante aprobar este informe sobre las enseñanzas extraídas de la pandemia? Por la salud de todos, por el respeto a la democracia y a los derechos fundamentales, por las políticas sociales y económicas y por el papel de Europa en el mundo. El informe tiene estos cuatro pilares que nos enseñan cómo prevenir y prepararnos y en qué debemos mejorar y fortalecernos para dar respuestas ante futuras crisis sanitarias. Debemos tener respuestas no solo sobre nuestra salud sino también sobre nuestra seguridad, libertad, economía social de mercado y estilo de vida europeo. El éxito de la respuesta europea a futuras pandemias depende de la solidaridad, la unidad y la coordinación eficaz entre la Unión Europea y los Estados miembros y sus ciudadanos.

Es crucial recordar que nos enfrentamos a una situación sin precedentes y que ha requerido soluciones sin precedentes y en tiempo récord. Aun cuando en las primeras fases de la pandemia se cometieron errores, la Unión Europea respondió con todos los instrumentos a su alcance y creando nuevos, como la Autoridad Europea de Preparación y Respuesta ante Emergencias Sanitarias, nuestra HERA.

El liderazgo de Europa, impulsando la investigación y el desarrollo de vacunas y realizando una compra centralizada con una masiva vacunación universal, ha sido crucial para salvar millones de vidas, no solo aquí sino también en todo el mundo. Europa es una historia de éxito y, cuando más lo necesitan los ciudadanos, demuestra estar a la altura.

Debemos garantizar que los sanitarios estén protegidos, que no haya escasez de medicamentos y que los pacientes con enfermedades crónicas o cáncer y las personas con discapacidad y las familias vulnerables no vean retrasados sus diagnósticos y tratamientos.

Hay más de 30 millones de personas en Europa que padecen la COVID-19 persistente, de la que aún sabemos muy poco. Por ello, pedimos más investigación y desarrollar diagnósticos y tratamientos integrales.

No podemos ignorar la pandemia silenciosa que afecta a nuestra salud mental. Señalamos que es una prioridad absoluta para la Unión Europea y los Estados miembros, pues no hay salud sin salud mental.

Subrayamos también la importancia de construir la Unión Europea de la Salud con el enfoque de «Una sola salud», que busca una acción integrada ante todas las amenazas para la salud, sea ya humana, animal o medioambiental. Pedimos reforzar la autonomía estratégica de Europa en materia de salud, asegurar el acceso a materias primas críticas y una sólida protección de la propiedad intelectual. Debemos aumentar la inversión en sanidad e investigación con más asociación público-privada y la apuesta decidida por una industria farmacéutica competitiva que sea «made in Europe».

El respeto a la democracia y los derechos fundamentales es el segundo pilar del informe. Hemos pedido que el Parlamento Europeo tenga más poder en el proceso de toma de decisiones en caso de crisis sanitarias y, por muy grande que sea la amenaza, los Gobiernos de los Estados miembros no pueden dejar de estar sujetos al control parlamentario y no se pueden suspender las funciones de los parlamentos nacionales en caso de emergencias.

Y para tener una Europa fuerte y segura, debemos ser más transparentes en la adopción de las medidas e informar a los ciudadanos de forma clara y coordinada sobre la base, siempre, de evidencias científicas. Solo así combatiremos la desinformación, las *fake news* y los intentos de desestabilización de los ciberataques contra infraestructuras sanitarias.

Pedimos mayor armonización en el uso del certificado COVID como herramienta vital para ejercer la libertad de movimiento con seguridad y garantizar el mercado único en tiempos de emergencia.

Y no podemos olvidarnos del terrible impacto económico y social de la pandemia en la vida de tantos trabajadores y tantas familias. Debemos estar a su lado, y con las pymes, los autónomos, que durante la pandemia tuvieron que cerrar y muchos se arruinaron. Los fondos NextGenerationEU deben ser ejecutados para ayudar a las familias y a la economía a recuperarse.

Debemos apostar por la digitalización, clave para la educación de nuestros hijos, pero también para el tejido empresarial.

Recomendamos para futuras crisis sanitarias que, como norma general, las escuelas no se cierren siempre que se pueda proteger la salud de los estudiantes y los profesores, porque hemos visto con mucha preocupación cómo el aislamiento ha afectado a la salud mental de nuestros jóvenes.

Subrayamos que la Unión Europea debe liderar la cooperación internacional en la salud global. Hemos apoyado a la Comisión Europea en su firma del acuerdo sobre la suspensión del Acuerdo sobre los ADPIC, sobre vacunas COVID, propuesto por la OMC, y necesitamos fortalecer iniciativas globales, como el Equipo Europa, para que países terceros tengan las capacidades de producir medicamentos esenciales y garantizar la salud de sus ciudadanos.

Por todo ello y por mucho más, que no he podido decir porque ha sido un informe muy largo, les pido el apoyo mañana en la votación. Hagámoslo por todos los europeos.

**Margaritis Schinas**, *Vice-President of the Commission*. – Mr President, honourable Members, *querida Dolors*, today we are closing a cycle. A cycle that started three years ago. And this is the moment to do two things: First, to discuss the lessons learned from the pandemic, but also to identify recommendations for the future. And I think that what is due in opening this debate in the House of European Democracy is to start by paying tribute to the victims of the pandemic. The millions of lives lost both in Europe and around the world. We shall not forget them. But also to those who still face health repercussions of COVID-19. Remembering the victims and honouring the price they paid, the excessive price they paid, has been the engine that fuels our work since 2020. One early conclusion emerges, one thing that Europeans ask from us is to ensure that, should another health emergency occur, Europe will be better equipped to deal with it. The clearest lesson from the pandemic is also the simplest. We Europeans are more effective when we are and act together. I wish to thank the European Parliament for the excellent collaboration. We demonstrated Parliament, the institutions, the Commission, institutional maturity and a remarkable example of how well EU institutions can work together in terms of unprecedented crisis.

On a more personal note, it was a great honour to represent the Commission and co-chair the contact group of vaccines with many of you, some present, some not here in this debate. We joined efforts with remarkable contributions from my Commission colleagues and many of you, thank you for this institutional cooperation.

But now today is time to draw the lessons from the pandemic. And your report offers an important contribution to this. First, is about resilience. With the pandemic, we learned how to manage the short term. How to act as firefighters. But we also need parallel to that, to make sure that we have a sturdy legacy for the future as architects. And this is precisely the objective of our European Health Union, which lies at the very heart of our efforts. The vaccine strategy was a game changer. As your report very rightly mentions. We ensured, contrary to the people who were not putting their faith in Europe, we ensured that all Europeans had access to safe and effective vaccines at the same time, on the same conditions, regardless of where they lived or their social and economic situation. We agreed new rules to address cross-border threats to health. And we developed the digital COVID certificate to take our lives back and regain mobility. We reinforce the mandates of the European Medicines Agency and the European Centre for Disease Control. We set up the Health Emergency Response Authority. That has all been instrumental to prepare for crisis preparedness. And of

course, we also revised our pharmaceutical framework so that we can deal with access to medicines. Parallel to adopting a global health strategy. Honourable Members, this has been a great European success story. This was Europe at its best.

Lesson number two, mental health. This is Europe's silent pandemic. It affects 1 in 6 people in the EU and comes at a cost of EUR 600 billion yearly, more than 4 % of our GDP. Addressing mental health is at the same time an issue for society, but also an issue for the economy. Our communication on a comprehensive approach to mental health, adopted one month ago, brings mental health to the spotlight. And whilst we have been working in this very complex area for years, this is the first time we propose a truly comprehensive approach going beyond health policy alone. And this is precisely linked to the post-pandemic world that has exacerbated these transformative stressors that have worsened the situation on mental health.

Lesson number three, the internal market. The pandemic taught us that is vital, crucial in times of crisis to keep supply chains open. Since its creation, HERA is acting as our countermeasures insurance because we don't want to see in Europe anymore the dramatic situation we faced in the early weeks of the pandemic when we realised the cost of shortage of ventilators, masks or even gloves. Never again Europe will find ourselves in that situation. Supply chains of essential goods are global. And this is why we will keep enhancing efforts with trading partners to secure production. And this is also why we are committed to a new pandemics agreement to foster global cooperation on these issues. The key concept of open strategic autonomy is more timely and more pressing than ever before. Sovereignty and cooperation go together.

Lesson number four, global solidarity. Early in the pandemic, team Europe mobilised close to EUR 54 billion to address the socio-economic consequences of the pandemic to the rest of the world. Team Europe also contributed to protecting people around the world. With more than half a billion vaccines donated, more than any other bloc on the planet. Now in these post pandemic times, we must continue to support partners, incentivise local manufacturing capacities and help vulnerable countries to tackle inequalities.

Honourable Members, this non-exhaustive list demonstrates examples of European action to shield the health of people within our Union and beyond our borders. What we have collectively achieved was nothing short of a miracle. This work will be part one of the main legacies of the current political cycle and one of the most telling examples of institutional cooperation. This was Europe at its best. This was the European way of doing things.

**Tomislav Sokol, u ime kluba PPE.** – Poštovani predsjedavajući, povjereniče, kolegice i kolege, nakon pandemije COVID-19 potrebno je podvući crtu i iz nje izvući pouke.

Zato je dobro da danas raspravljamo o ovom izvješću. Na samom početku krize izostaje koordinirani odgovor na europskoj razini, što je dovelo, između ostalog, do zatvaranja granice i ograničavanje izvoza medicinske opreme u druge države članice.

Takva situacija bila je jasan pokazatelj koliko je neophodan zajednički europski odgovor na zdravstvene krize. Zajednička nabava cjepiva upravo je primjer takvog odgovora. Uz sve zamjerke koje ćemo i danas čuti, ona je omogućila da manje, gospodarski slabije razvijene države članice, koje nemaju vlastitu proizvodnju, dobiju pristup cjepivu u isto vrijeme kao i one veće i razvijenije.

Time smo pokazali da u Europskoj uniji nema i ne smije biti građana prvog i drugog reda.

Pandemija nam je također ukazala na važnost inovacija te smatram da je veoma dobro za naš kontinent što smo imali europsku tvrtku koja je razvila uspješno cjepivo. To pokazuje koliko je za globalnu konkurentnost i otpornost EU-a na svjetske krize, kao i njenu stratešku autonomiju, važno imati poticajan okvir za istraživanje i inovacije, uz snažnu zaštitu intelektualnog vlasništva kao nužan preduvjet.

Pored navedenog, istaknuo bih dva problema koja predstavljaju naslijeđe pandemije s kojim ćemo se boriti u godinama koje dolaze. Mentalno zdravlje mladih i dugotrajni COVID.

Potrebna nam je zajednička akcija ulaganje u zdravstvenu skrb na europskoj razini kako bismo pomogli stotinama tisuća ljudi koji se s ovim problemima suočavaju. Oni se ne smiju osjećati izoliranima i ostavljenima.



Odgovornost je svih država članica da to spriječe uz maksimalnu pomoć s europske razine.

Na kraju, zahvalio bih se izvjestiteljici na mukotrpnom radu na ovom izvješću koje sadrži sve bitne elemente i pouke vezano uz COVID-19 te vas sve pozivam da ga podržite.

**Alessandra Moretti**, *a nome del gruppo S&D*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, dopo l'esperienza drammatica della pandemia i cittadini ci chiedono di non ripetere gli errori e di imparare da quanto accaduto, migliorando le competenze europee in tema di salute.

In questa relazione ci sono proposte concrete per preparare l'Unione e gli Stati membri a proteggere con più efficacia la salute di fronte a possibili future emergenze sanitarie.

Innanzitutto il diritto ad una sanità pubblica di qualità per tutti. Poi la collaborazione e il lavoro coordinato per il monitoraggio e la sorveglianza epidemiologica, ma anche le grandi potenzialità di un'Europa unita per la ricerca scientifica, per gli acquisti congiunti di vaccini, dispositivi medici e farmaci, così da renderli accessibili a tutti e a prezzi equi.

Abbiamo chiesto maggiore trasparenza in tutti gli ambiti, sia nel campo della ricerca e sviluppo, dove i costi reali, anche delle aziende farmaceutiche private, dovranno essere resi pubblici e servire da base per la determinazione del prezzo, ma anche nella negoziazione dei contratti, in particolare dove i fondi pubblici sono interessati; abbiamo chiesto che venga creata un'infrastruttura pubblica di ricerca per sopperire alle mancanze del mercato e operare nell'interesse dei cittadini.

I fondi pubblici, poi, dovranno avere un adeguato ritorno per i cittadini, in particolare per la disponibilità dei farmaci a prezzi equi e la loro commercializzazione in tutti gli Stati membri.

Sugli aspetti sociali ci siamo concentrati sulle porzioni più fragili della popolazione, abbiamo inserito proposte concrete e interventi mirati per mitigare le conseguenze sulle persone già marginalizzate, sulle donne, sui giovani che hanno pagato un prezzo alto, penso in particolare alla salute mentale.

Questo lavoro potrebbe essere una svolta per le capacità europee e nazionali di reagire in tempi di crisi, non solo sanitari.

Il voto di domani sarà complicato. Come sempre si poteva fare meglio, ma come socialisti voteremo a favore di un testo comunque ambizioso, consapevoli che gli interessi dei cittadini vengono prima delle convenienze politiche.

Questa relazione, cari colleghi, è un'occasione unica per continuare anche nella costruzione dell'Unione europea della salute. Ci auguriamo che il senso di responsabilità prevalga, dimostrando di essere all'altezza del compito che i cittadini europei ci hanno affidato.

**José Ramón Bauzá Díaz**, *en nombre del Grupo Renew*. – Señor presidente, estimado comisario Schinas, señorías, sirvan mis primeras palabras, como no puede ser de otra forma, para recordar a los millones de ciudadanos que fallecieron en Europa y en el mundo como consecuencia de la COVID-19.

El recuerdo de las víctimas y el reconocimiento de la extraordinaria responsabilidad de los ciudadanos en la lucha contra la pandemia deben estar muy presentes a la hora de tomar decisiones para prevenir situaciones similares. No estamos exentos de amenazas futuras para la salud pública a nivel global: por eso mismo, debemos estar más y mejor preparados de lo que estuvimos en marzo del año 2020.

Y esto es precisamente lo que traemos hoy aquí, a esta Cámara: un paquete de medidas para luchar contra las futuras pandemias sobre la base de tres pilares fundamentales. En primer lugar, una futura Unión Europea de la Salud fuerte y resiliente. En segundo lugar, una autonomía estratégica en materia de salud para no depender de terceros países. Y, finalmente, una mejor coordinación entre los Estados miembros a la hora de adoptar medidas drásticas que vulneran los derechos básicos de los ciudadanos, porque no olvidemos que la salud no entiende de fronteras y es un bien común que debemos preservar entre todos.

Así que, señorías, acabo como he empezado: volviendo a recordar a los millones de ciudadanos fallecidos durante estos años por la pandemia y reivindicando así el establecimiento de un día europeo en recuerdo de las víctimas de la COVID-19, tal y como solicitamos en este informe, para que los años que nos queden en el futuro no nos olvidemos de ellos y, por eso mismo, solicito que apoyen este informe.

**Tilly Metz**, *au nom du groupe Verts/ALE*. – Monsieur le Président, ce rapport vient clore le travail de la commission COVI, qui n'a certainement pas été aisé. Bien sûr, je remercie mes collègues pour leur coopération sur ce rapport qui dresse un bilan, certes non exhaustif mais important, des leçons tirées durant cette pandémie.

Parmi ces dernières, la condamnation des pratiques de triage à l'hôpital, l'appel à financer massivement nos systèmes de soins publics et à résoudre la pénurie de soignants, et l'importance de tirer les leçons des mauvaises utilisations qui ont été faites du certificat COVID numérique de l'UE par certains États membres.

Mais ce rapport appelle aussi à mettre en place les mesures nécessaires à l'intégration de l'approche One Health en Europe. C'est un point extrêmement important que nous pouvons contrôler pour prévenir de futures crises sanitaires. Et la première est déjà en cours: l'antibiorésistance.

Toutefois, ces points positifs ne devraient pas occulter le fait que la leçon la plus importante de cette pandémie n'est pas reprise dans ce rapport. Nous avons nié l'accès aux soins à la majorité de la population mondiale. Et pourquoi? Pour protéger les profits de l'industrie pharmaceutique qui, soulignons-le, ne nous ont pas fait de cadeaux durant cette pandémie.

Les Verts ont donc déposé des amendements pour corriger le bilan trompeur établi à cet égard. Si ces amendements venaient à ne pas être votés, nous ne pourrions pas soutenir un rapport qui ne tire pas la leçon principale de la résolution de cette crise sanitaire mondiale.

**Cristian Terheş**, *on behalf of the ECR Group*. – Mr President, I would say to the European citizens that we know now that the COVID committee report is a whitewash by a majority of the European Parliament, composed of EPP, S&D and Renew, to cover up the incompetence of the European Commission and the corruption of Ursula von der Leyen.

A small number of MEPs asked for transparency, but we were blocked every step of the way. We asked that the Commission President, Ursula von der Leyen, who negotiated contracts with Pfizer via text messages, appear before our committee and answer questions. That did not happen. Ursula von der Leyen signed contracts worth over EUR 71 billion to purchase 4.6 billion doses of so-called 'vaccines'. We asked to see the COVID contracts in their full and unredacted version, and we were denied access.

The report also negates the side and adverse effects suffered by people who got injected with the anti-COVID vaccines. The report also praises the EU Digital Green Certificate, which was used by some governments in Europe to severely violate the fundamental rights of all the people.

If these political groups have not learned anything from the mistakes made during the pandemic, I really hope that the European citizens will learn from this report not to elect the EPP, S&D and Renew into any office in 2024.

**PRÉSIDENTE: MARC ANGEL**

*Vice-président*

**Stefania Zambelli**, *a nome del gruppo ID*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, provengo dalla regione Lombardia che è stata la più colpita, non solo in Italia ma anche in Europa, dal COVID, e da una provincia, quella di Brescia, che è stata messa in ginocchio da questo virus. Sono stati 190 000 i morti in Italia e più di 2 milioni in Europa.

Purtroppo, quando la pandemia è scoppiata, nessun paese europeo era pronto ad affrontare un fenomeno del genere: mancavano medici, infermieri, mascherine, respiratori e altri dispositivi sanitari. Dobbiamo assolutamente imparare dagli errori del passato ed essere pronti in caso di nuove pandemie.

È per questo che è necessario investire per rafforzare il nostro sistema sanitario: non possiamo più dipendere dalla Cina o da altri paesi per la fornitura di materiali. L'Europa deve essere completamente autonoma nella produzione di mascherine, di farmaci e di dispositivi medici.

Dobbiamo dare maggiore attenzione a tutti gli operatori del comparto sanitario che hanno lavorato senza sosta, e in alcuni casi, purtroppo, perdendo anche la loro vita. È indispensabile aggiornare e tenere sempre aggiornati i piani pandemici nazionali.

Dobbiamo, soprattutto, garantire ai malati oncologici le cure e soprattutto in questi casi di emergenza.

Imparare dagli errori del passato significa anche chiedere maggior trasparenza per quanto riguarda i contratti dei vaccini stipulati dalla Commissione europea. Dobbiamo evitare che il certificato COVID venga reso obbligatorio, come richiede l'OMS.

Cari colleghi, facciamo tesoro degli errori fatti, lo dobbiamo a tutti coloro che hanno perso la vita a causa di questo virus.

**Kateřina Konečná**, za skupinu *The Left*. – Pane předsedající, já nechci znít ohledně této zprávy příliš negativně, ale faktem je, že tak, jak je napsána, reprezentuje pouze pravicový ideologický pohled na události, jak se udály. Pravicoví kolegové, kteří se spojili s liberálními kolegy a částí socialistů, nám tu lakují narůžovo realitu toho, jak pandemie v EU skutečně proběhla. Ano, text na jednu stranu uznává, že ne vše se povedlo, ale na druhou stranu už říká, že měnit toho není třeba příliš. A co hlavně nesmíme, je vyplašit farmaceutický průmysl.

Zpráva je zcela nekritická k machinacím při uzavírání smluv o hromadných nákupech vakcín. Vyhýbá se otázkám, jak je možné, že dosud nebyly smlouvy plně uvolněny ani nám, ani veřejnosti. Opomíjí, jak byly vyjednány přes mobil předsedkyně Komise za pomoci SMS zpráv. Už vůbec neřeší odsouzeníhodné chování společnosti Pfizer k nám jako k poslancům tohoto orgánu. Zcela opomenuta byla i pochybení členských států při tom, jak propagovaly často zavádějícím způsobem vlastní očkovací kampaně. Samotnou kapitolou je pak neřešení patentového práva jak uvnitř EU, tak vně, kdy si pravicový válec silou vynutil, aby nebyla dodržena ani předchozí usnesení Parlamentu, která vyzývají alespoň k nějaké reformě dohody TRIPS.

Naopak obraz, který nám zde pravice představila ve smyslu, jak EU pomohla třetímu světu, je až nekriticky pochvalný. Kolegové, mrzí mě to, ale k hlasování bych mohla říct jen to, že kdo pro zprávu tohoto znění bude hlasovat, nemá jako poslanec žádnou důstojnost. Zpráva je jednostranný pohled na celou pandemii, který jde naproti farmaceutickému průmyslu a současným evropským mocenským strukturám.

**Francesca Donato (NI)**. – Signor Presidente, signor Commissario, onorevoli colleghi, la definizione di questa relazione è stata particolarmente travagliata vista la mole di emendamenti presentati, ma l'esito che domani voteremo è del tutto privo dei contributi critici di vari membri su numerosi e gravissimi errori compiuti nella gestione della pandemia.

Dalla malagestione degli acquisti congiunti dei vaccini da parte della Presidente della Commissione, con opacità e compromissione dei bilanci UE e nazionali su cui è in corso un'indagine dell'EPPO, al fallimento dei certificati digitali COVID, che hanno favorito la diffusione del contagio instillando nei vaccinati la falsa sicurezza di essere protetti dall'infezione e non poter infettare gli altri; dalla discriminazione e violazione dei diritti umani fondamentali di chi non fosse munito dei certificati validi, benché immune per guarigione, alla negazione del dibattito scientifico aperto su temi chiave, ai danni economici imponenti dovuti a restrizioni inutili e sproporzionate. Di tutto questo non c'è traccia nella relazione.

Il lavoro di un anno è stato sprecato e la credibilità del Parlamento ne uscirà ulteriormente indebolita. Non meravigliamoci poi se i movimenti euroscettici guadagnano consensi, siamo noi a regalare loro i voti.

**Peter Liese (PPE).** – Herr Präsident, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Ich möchte einen Dank und einen ganz herzlichen Glückwunsch an Dolors Montserrat und alle anderen, die geholfen haben, diesen Bericht zu präsentieren, ausrichten. Das ist wirklich ein guter Bericht. Er erkennt an, dass wir am Anfang Schwierigkeiten hatten und dass es Fehler gab, aber dass dann sehr schnell die Europäische Union zusammengestanden hat und dass wir gut durch die Krise gekommen sind. Ein Vergleich mit China reicht, um zu erkennen, dass es auch ganz anders hätte laufen können.

Der Bericht erkennt auch an, dass Wissenschaft und Forschung ein wichtiger Teil der Lösung waren. Die mRNA-Technologie wurde in Europa mit Unterstützung der Europäischen Union entwickelt, und sie hat wesentlich zur Bewältigung der Krise beigetragen. Diese Technologie kann und muss auch zur Bewältigung anderer Probleme, z. B. Krebs, beitragen. Deswegen müssen wir weiter einen positiven Rahmen dafür haben.

Heute ist aber das Wichtigste, dass wir die vielen Millionen Menschen, die an Long COVID leiden, nicht vergessen, dass wir sie besser unterstützen und auch die Forschung in diesem Bereich intensivieren.

**Kathleen Van Brempt (S&D).** – Mr President, Mr Commissioner, as your COVID Committee Chair I am very proud of the work that we did in the committee during more than a year.

We have to acknowledge that neither Europe nor the Member States were prepared for a crisis of the magnitude of COVID-19, and the report in front of you is about having all the building blocks to make Europe more crisis resilient for the future.

First, and very important, we need to strengthen national and global health security, and that requires additional investments in our healthcare system. But it also means that in our healthcare workers and healthcare professions, we need extra investment and we need to better protect the most vulnerable in our societies, starting with children and youngsters. The pandemic has had a huge impact on their mental health, and we want to make measures to increase access to mental health care and also make sure – and I think that's very important – that we never have to close schools again.

We need a stronger international system for pandemic preparedness and response, and that also means strengthening HERA and the EMA to gear up for health crises to come. But strengthening our resilience does not stop at European borders. The inconvenient truth, dear colleagues, is that Europe failed to show solidarity with the global South. The European Union needs to take the lead in the ongoing negotiations on the Pandemic Treaty, and we must enable the development and production of vaccines in the global South by sharing knowledge and technology. We need European leadership to deliver equal access to vaccines and health equipment.

I therefore call on the European Commission to get to work and to turn these recommendations into actions, because Europe will recover from the pandemic and we have everything to take up these challenges. But now we have to strengthen Europe's foundation to ensure that we are better prepared for the future.

**Max Orville (Renew).** – Monsieur le Président, la pandémie de COVID-19 a mis en lumière notre vulnérabilité et notre impréparation face à un virus. Les leçons à tirer sont nombreuses et montrent que nous devons aller plus vite et plus loin dans la construction d'une Europe de la santé. Soyons honnêtes, nous devons affronter de nouvelles pandémies. Dans les régions ultrapériphériques, nous avons l'habitude de traiter de nouvelles maladies émergentes qui nous affectent gravement: zika, chikungunya, dengue.

Le regard ultramarin vis-à-vis de la pandémie mériterait d'être pris en considération, car les outre-mer ont des choses à faire valoir dans la gestion des crises sanitaires. À l'avenir, appuyons-nous aussi sur les spécialistes ultramarins qui maîtrisent l'émergence de ces maladies. Renforçons la résilience du continent européen grâce à nos régions ultrapériphériques. C'est tout le sens des nombreux amendements que j'ai portés et qui se retrouvent dans le texte final. Faisons des RUP des laboratoires de solutions sanitaires et climatiques pour toute l'Union européenne.

**Jutta Paulus (Verts/ALE).** – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar! Anderthalb Jahre Arbeit liegen hinter uns. Alle Facetten wurden beleuchtet, die in dieser Pandemie aufgetreten sind. Sehr viel Wissen, sehr viele Erkenntnisse haben wir erworben. Aber wir haben auch Abgründe gesehen, wie erfolgreich Desinformation, Falschinformation wirken kann, die wahrscheinlich für zehntausende Tote verantwortlich ist. Und die Menschen, die unter Long COVID leiden oder ME/CFS, was ja sehr eng verwandt ist, sind noch heute Opfer solcher Falschinformationen und Diskreditierungen bis hin zu Falschbehandlungen.

Deswegen bin ich sehr froh, dass das im Bericht sehr deutlich angesprochen wird, dass wir eine Verantwortung für diese Menschen tragen, denen das Leben zur Hölle gemacht wird durch eine geradezu boshafte Erkrankung, die ihnen jede Lebensfreude nimmt.

Aber ich möchte auch klarstellen – meine Kolleginnen Frau Metz und auch Kathleen haben es eben angesprochen: Dieser Bericht ist sehr problematisch, was die Rolle der EU gegenüber den globalen Süden angeht, und deswegen bitte ich die Kolleginnen und Kollegen: Nehmen Sie Ihre Verantwortung wahr und stimmen Sie unserem Änderungsantrag zu.

**Robert Roos (ECR).** – Mr President, COVID has led to the greatest restriction of fundamental rights in over 70 years. If we think lightly of this, our rights are at risk of eroding. All seems forgotten, but political reflection remains necessary because a crisis is the ultimate stress-test for democracy and the rule of law. Only when they are under pressure do we see their true strength.

But the European Commission has consistently sabotaged the most elementary forms of transparency: no access to the vaccine contracts worth EUR 71 billion. No transparency regarding Ursula von der Leyen's secret text messages with Pfizer CEO Albert Bourla and no presence by von der Leyen at any committee hearing. Due to this complete lack of transparency, the Commission has made me unable to scrutinise their activities, which is my main role as a Member of this House. Therefore I will obviously vote against this whitewash report and I urge everyone to vote in favour of my alternative proposal.

**Virginie Joron (ID).** – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, appelons un chat un chat. Ce rapport, c'est le rapport Pfizer. 4,6 milliards de doses pour 71 milliards d'euros, dont 2,4 milliards de doses pour Pfizer à 19,50 euros la dose livrée et 10 euros la dose annulée.

130 pages et pas un mot sur Pfizer ni sur les SMS échangés entre M<sup>me</sup> von der Leyen et le PDG de Pfizer, alors que dans le registre de transparence, on découvre que vous avez contacté les lobbyistes de Pfizer six fois. Pas un mot non plus sur Janine Small, la VRP de Pfizer, qui nous a confirmé que l'efficacité du vaccin sur la transmission n'avait pas été testée avant la mise sur le marché. Vous avez vu aussi à deux reprises la Fondation Bill et Melinda Gates. Pourquoi? De qui se moque-t-on?

Selon l'OMS, la pandémie est finie, mais on apprend par la presse boursière que Pfizer a négocié un nouveau contrat: la capacité de commander 325 millions de doses par an pendant huit ans. Il y a quelque temps, le rapporteur espagnol avait demandé que Pfizer n'obtienne pas tout et ce contrat a été partagé avec l'Espagne. Par contre, pas un mot sur les pétitions citoyennes.

Nous y avons pourtant cru à cette commission parlementaire pour la transparence. Mais quelle farce! Auditions à sens unique. Aucun débat. Pas d'accès au contrat complet de Pfizer. Réunions à huis clos avec l'obligation de signer une décharge pour protéger les intérêts financiers de Pfizer. L'administration a même demandé de supprimer des tweets. Pfizer nous a aussi demandé de justifier nos questions écrites.

Votre rapport est à côté de la plaque. Vous vous félicitez? Vous voulez inonder l'Europe de vaccins? L'Afrique, alors qu'elle n'en veut pas? Vous souhaitez mettre en place un calendrier vaccinal européen? Vous voulez nous éduquer à la vaccination? Vous voulez remettre en place le QRcode? Vous luttez contre ceux qui ne sont pas d'accord avec vous. Ce rapport est donc le reflet de qui? De quoi? De quel travail? En fait, avec les lobbies, le seul gagnant, c'est Pfizer.

Vous avez donc oublié les contribuables européens, mais je suis sûre qu'ils ne n'oublieront pas aux prochaines élections. En tout cas, si besoin, vous pourrez toujours traverser la rue et avoir une place chez Pfizer.

**Marisa Matias (The Left).** – Senhor Presidente, quando surgiu a COVID-19, ninguém estava preparado. Essa impreparação teve causas diversas, mas não foi imune aos sucessivos cortes de gastos públicos e às políticas de austeridade.

O choque no mercado de trabalho foi dramático, especialmente para trabalhadores precários, mulheres, jovens e migrantes. Esse choque não é imune aos anos de políticas de desproteção laboral.

O impacto nos profissionais de saúde e trabalhadores da linha da frente foi enorme e esse impacto não é imune à insuficiência, à precariedade e aos salários baixos. Percebemos a ausência estrutural do direito aos cuidados e essa ausência não é imune à falta de reconhecimento e direitos das cuidadoras informais.

O impacto nos lares e residências foi devastador e esse impacto não é imune às precárias condições de trabalho e de proteção dos idosos.

E, por fim, neste relatório, há um silêncio ensurdecedor em relação à propriedade intelectual das vacinas ou ao levantamento das patentes.

Não é sério que as recomendações sobre lições aprendidas com COVID-19 não tenham absolutamente nada a dizer sobre isto.

**Marcel de Graaff (NI).** – Voorzitter, de lessen die we kunnen trekken uit de zogenaamde coronapandemie zijn de volgende.

De door de WHO gesteunde maatregelen waren volstrekt onzinnig en hadden niets met onze gezondheid te maken. De vaccins voorkwamen niet dat je covid kreeg of overdroeg. De mondkapjes of lockdowns voorkwamen de verspreiding niet. De QR-codes en toegangscontroles waren grote waanzin, want gevaccineerden met covid kwamen binnen, gezonde ongevaccineerden werden geweigerd.

De maatregelen hadden desastreuze gevolgen. Gevaccineerden kregen te maken met hartspierontsteking, turbokanker, aangezichtsverlamming en andere ernstige en minder ernstige aandoeningen. Er werden schimmige miljardendeals gesloten in achterkamertjes voor vaccins, mondkapjes en andere waardeloze zaken, waarvan de details nog steeds onbekend zijn. En mensenrechten werden grootschalig aangetast door censuur en beperking van de vrijheid.

Deze door de WHO tot pandemie verklaarde griepvariant is het goedkope excuus om diezelfde WHO de absolute macht te geven. De conclusie is: het totalitaire pandemieverdrag mag er nooit komen.

**Liudas Mažylis (PPE).** – Gerbiamas pirmininke, komisare, kolegos. COVID patirtis mums įdiegė suvokimą, kiek daug galima nuveikti ir įveikti kartu. Pandemija suaktyvino platesnį mąstymą – ne tik solidarai dalijomės skiepais, bet ir permastėme bendrų tyrimų, registrų, duomenų bazių svarbą ir ne vien užkrečiamų ligų srityje, nukaldinome koncepciją – Europos sveikatos sąjunga. Tik tenka apgailestauti, kad žingsniai link tos Sveikatos sąjungos daromi per maži ir per lėtai. Mokslo pažangos vaisiais – kitaip, negu tai buvo su skiepais, moderniomis lėtinių ligų gydymo priemonėmis – gali naudotis ne visi europiečiai, egzistuoja ryški atskirtis tarp Rytų ir Vakarų, nes gydymas tiesiog neprieinamas dėl jo brangumo. Tikslu siekiame pavieniui – per pora metų Lietuva įdiegė hepatito C prevencijos programą, patikrintas jau kas antras suaugęs Lietuvos gyventojas, beje, ir asmeniškai aš – kodėl to negalėtų vykti visos Europos mastu? Tad tikiuosi ne tik COVID patirties įvertinimo, bet ir platesnių ryžtingų iniciatyvų.

**Sara Cerdas (S&D).** – Senhor Presidente, Senhor Comissário, Caros Colegas, antes desta intervenção, perguntaram-me: o que é que ainda há mais para falar sobre a COVID-19?

Hoje em dia, diz-se muitas vezes que é uma coisa do passado e da qual já ninguém quer saber. Mas é possível ignorar todo o impacto que a pandemia teve nas nossas vidas? Queremos mesmo isso das nossas instituições?

A resposta do Parlamento é não e resulta aqui neste relatório, um relatório que foi fruto de uma auditoria extensa que durou mais de um ano e meio e que fala sobre as dificuldades vividas, sobre os despedimentos, sobre as falências e sobre a falta de materiais e infraestruturas. Fala do *burnout* dos profissionais de saúde, dos horários de trabalho abusivos, da falta de meios tecnológicos para a educação em casa. Fala sobre desinformação, a discriminação, o ódio e a polarização na nossa sociedade. Mas fá-lo numa perspetiva construtiva, reconhecendo onde fomos mais além e onde é que nós ficámos aquém.

Seja qual for a crise que vivermos no futuro – sanitária, ambiental, bélica ou humanitária, temos um conjunto de recomendações do Parlamento Europeu para a ultrapassar.

E é esta a importância de uma Europa unida, de um projeto europeu capaz de ajudar: termos vacinas, termos projetos de recuperação e resiliência, termos sistemas de saúde que não colapsaram, termos instrumentos capazes de ultrapassar as dificuldades que na altura, relembro, não eram totalmente conhecidas.

E não vamos ceder a populismos, que querem votar contra este relatório; não vamos ceder aos negacionistas da pandemia, que bem preferiam a desorganização e a falta de meios.

Este relatório não é apenas sobre a COVID-19, é também sobre a saúde das democracias europeias e, por isso, podem contar, para aprovar este relatório, com o Grupo dos Socialistas e Democratas desta casa.

**Vlad-Marius Botoș (Renew).** – Domnule vicepreședinte, stimați colegi, domnule comisar Schinas, am hotărât să facem o comisie specială și să elaborăm un raport despre un subiect extrem de dificil, care a divizat societatea noastră mai mult decât orice în ultimii ani, pandemia de COVID-19.

Situația cu totul deosebită, lipsa de experiență a tuturor în ceea ce privește gestionarea unei pandemii care a făcut prea multe victime, atât la nivel european, cât și la nivel mondial. Este normal să dezbatem situația, să încercăm să tragem niște învățăminte și să fim mai bine pregătiți pentru viitoarele provocări, dar trebuie să luăm atitudine și să avem grijă să nu divizăm din nou societatea, să nu dăm voie grupurilor extremiste să manipuleze populația încă speriată de efectele virusului și de restricțiile impuse la nivel național.

Hai deți să dovedim maturitate politică, dragi colegi, să avem în minte interesul cetățenilor, să nu ne lăsăm purtați de pasiunile personale și să nu ideologizăm tragedia prin care a trecut o lume întreagă și Uniunea noastră Europeană.

**Katrin Langensiepen (Verts/ALE).** – Herr Präsident, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Als Corona über uns hereinbrach, da waren die Frauen, die Kinder, die Schwächsten in der Gesellschaft, Menschen mit Vorerkrankungen, Rentnerinnen und Rentner in den Pflegeheimen die ersten, die die Preise zu zahlen hatten. Menschen mit Behinderungen oder Menschen mit Erkrankungen wurden die Zugänge in die Kliniken wegen Überfüllung verwehrt. Ihnen wurde die Gesundheitsversorgung verwehrt. Man sprach natürlich niemals offiziell das Wort „Triage“ aus. Ärztinnen und Ärzte mussten unter den schwierigsten Bedingungen Entscheidungen treffen. Ich hoffe, dass niemand von uns jemals solche Entscheidungen treffen muss. Ich glaube, für das, was wir dem medizinischen Personal, den Ärztinnen und Ärzten in dieser Zeit zugemutet haben, können wir uns nur entschuldigen.

Menschen mit Long COVID, ME/CFS, *Post-Vac*, diese Menschen sind aufgrund der Erkrankung nicht in der Lage, auf die Straße zu gehen. Sie sind nicht sichtbar. Wir dürfen sie nicht vergessen. Wir müssen Finanzmittel in die Hand nehmen, und wir müssen unsere Mitgliedstaaten auffordern, Gelder dafür in die Hand zu nehmen, um in Forschung zu investieren und in die Gesundheitsversorgung der Menschen, die isoliert im Dunkeln in ihren Betten liegen und um die die Angehörigen sich kümmern müssen.

**Margarita de la Pisa Carrión (ECR).** – Señor presidente, señor comisario, señorías, es preocupante que este Parlamento, que representa a los ciudadanos, presente un texto para lavar las manos a la Comisión aplaudiendo sus medidas sin exigirle responsabilidades o transparencia.

Debemos ser críticos. Se han evidenciado claras deficiencias de nuestra cadena de suministro. Sufrimos una limitación de libertades y derechos fundamentales sin precedentes que no debe quedar así.

En España, el Gobierno de Pedro Sánchez, con la complicidad de otros partidos, tomó medidas sin consultar a expertos, impidió el control parlamentario y aprovechó para todo tipo de tejemanejes legales. Censuró redes sociales, hubo encierros ilegales... Solo Vox se enfrentó con dos recursos a los estados de alarma, que fueron declarados anticonstitucionales.

La pandemia debía haberse evitado: ese es el primer fracaso. No se reportaron los primeros casos y no solo no se han exigido responsabilidades sino que se pretende aprobar un tratado sobre pandemias dando más protagonismo a una institución que no es democrática ni fiable como la OMS.

El pretexto de la salud no puede ser una excusa para que se ataque la soberanía de los Estados miembros con competencias que la Unión Europea no tiene. Seguimos con esta continua intención de empujar el avance de una agenda globalista que nos ha debilitado.

**Sylvia Limmer (ID).** – Herr Präsident! In Deutschland empfiehlt der Chef der Ständigen Impfkommission schwer geschädigten Corona-Impfopfern, diese nicht als Impfnebenwirkung auszugeben, damit die Behandlungskosten von den Krankenkassen übernommen werden. 55 000 schwerwiegende Fälle von Impfnebenwirkungen sind allein in Deutschland offiziell erfasst.

Aber auch sie sind nur die Spitze eines vertuschten Eisbergs. Die Übersterblichkeit lag in den Jahren 2021 und 2022 mit Millionen Corona-Impfungen bei 100 000 Toten. Im Corona-Jahr ohne Impfung lag die Übersterblichkeit bei Null. Während sich BioNTech 10 Milliarden Euro in die Taschen stopft, gehen die Kosten der zahllosen Klagen und möglicher Entschädigungen zulasten der Steuerzahler, ebenso die 550 Milliarden Euro, die Deutschland zahlt, damit die von der Kommission in Knebelverträgen ausgehandelten Impfstoffe nicht geliefert werden.

Aber davon handelt der vorliegende Bericht nicht. Nicht vom Leid der Impfpfopfer, nicht von der Schuld von Politikern wie einer von der Leyen, nicht davon, wie kritische Stimmen zum Schweigen gebracht wurden und immer noch werden. Dieser Bericht ist die Fortsetzung der politischen Lügen, wenn es heißt: Die Impfstrategie der EU war ein Erfolg.

Es ist ein Dokument der Vertuschung, wenn angebliche Fehlinformationen, also alle kritischen Stimmen, in zukünftigen Pandemien besser auszuschalten sind. Wer hierfür stimmt, sollte sich in Grund und Boden schämen. Aber morgen werden Sie Millionen Bürger dabei beobachten und verfolgen, wie Sie abstimmen.

**Marc Botenga (The Left).** – Monsieur le Président, le Parlement européen discute des leçons à tirer de la pandémie de COVID-19. Je note que M<sup>me</sup> von der Leyen est absente. Elle l'était aussi, ou a refusé de venir, quand nous l'avons l'invitée devant la commission spéciale. Elle en fait une habitude. Monsieur le Commissaire, vous avez peut-être son numéro de téléphone? Parce que quand le PDG, le patron de Pfizer, envoie des WhatsApp, elle répond. Donc c'est peut-être le moment de lui envoyer un SMS. Elle viendrait peut-être répondre démocratiquement à cette assemblée.

Vous vous rappelez à l'époque qu'à chaque SMS, à chaque WhatsApp qu'elle envoyait, le prix du vaccin semblait augmenter. Alors collusion, conflit d'intérêts? La question se pose. Mais ce qui est clair, c'est que nous ne pouvons plus laisser notre santé, nos médicaments dans les mains de Big Pharma et des grandes multinationales. Notre santé est trop importante. Nous devons casser les brevets.

Nous devons effectivement créer une infrastructure publique de recherche, de développement et de production de médicaments et de vaccins en Europe qui ne servent que l'intérêt public. C'est de cette manière-là que nous construirons non seulement une autonomie, une production, une capacité de production, mais aussi la confiance des citoyens dans la politique pharmaceutique.

**Edina Tóth (NI).** – Elnök Úr! A másfél évvel ezelőtt megalakult koronavírus világmeghatározó foglalkozó bizottságnak az eredeti célkitűzése, hogy megvizsgálja a pandémiára adott európai válaszokat, levonja a tanulságokat és értékelje a világmeghatározó idején meghozott döntéseket. És mi történt e helyett? Készült egy jelentés, amely nem foglalkozik az európai polgárokat leginkább érintő problémákkal, miközben túlzó és téves megállapításokat tesz az EU teljesítményét illetően.

Elmaradt a korábban beígért tényfeltárás is. A Bizottság által sms-ekben megkötött vakcina szerződésekkel kapcsolatban. Ki kell mondanunk, hogy Európa a világmeghatározó során lemaradt, kizárólag a tagállamok által meghozott gyors döntéseknek köszönhetően tudott felülkerekedni a járvány okozta kihívásokon. Éppen ezért itt lenne az ideje, hogy a tagállamok támadása helyett valódi tényfeltárásra kerüljön sor.

**Christian Ehler (PPE).** – Herr Präsident, Frau Kollegin Limmer! Ich würde gerne mal wissen, wer Sie zum Schweigen gebracht hat? Sie sprechen hier vor dem Plenum. Sie versuchen die Social-Media-Kanäle. Sie sind überall publik. Wer um Gottes willen hat Sie zum Schweigen gebracht? Vielleicht liegt es einfach daran, dass die Unerträglichkeit von Mehrheitsentscheidungen in der Demokratie für Sie eine Zumutung sind. Zum Schweigen hat Sie hier niemand gebracht.



Diese Diskussion, die auf der Linken geführt wird, *IP rights* zu schleifen, und auf der Rechten geführt wird auf der Ebene sozusagen, die Erde sei eine Scheibe. Wir sind ja vor Galileo, wir erkennen nicht an, dass Vakzine im 20. Jahrhundert und im 21. Jahrhundert Millionen von Menschen gerettet haben. Wo sind wir eigentlich hingekommen?

Aber ich möchte doch sagen: Ohne Rechte des geistigen Eigentums hätten wir kein mRNA gehabt, wir hätten keinen Wirkstoff gehabt. Wir hätten das nicht teilen können mit anderen Produktionsstätten. Wir hätten nicht innerhalb von einem Jahr 750 % Kapazitätsaufbau in diesen Bereichen gehabt. mRNA hat Jahre gebraucht, um entwickelt zu werden.

Insofern erfüllt es mich mit tiefem Misstrauen in diesem Plenum, dass es Änderungsanträge zu dem Bericht gibt, der schon relativ weit geht, der weit darüber hinausschießt. Wenn wir Rechte des geistigen Eigentums nicht verteidigen, dann werden wir Wissenschaftler entmutigen. Wir tun hier so, als wenn das eine Kapitalismusdebatte wäre. Wissenschaft, die Freiheit an geistigem Eigentum, Innovation werden ruiniert dadurch, dass wir jetzt versuchen, sozusagen im Grunde genommen die Pharmaindustrie zu sozialisieren. Und das ist unerträglich.

**Mikuláš Peksa (Verts/ALE).** – Mr President, dear colleagues, unfortunately, this Parliament did not learn any lesson from the COVID pandemic when it comes to so-called intellectual property on vaccines. If we want to face the next pandemic, which will surely occur because of the climate change, we need to allow patent waivers to facilitate global treatment. The current system is disadvantageous to developing countries because it only benefits the interests of pharmaceutical companies. It is proven that the vaccine patents reduce production capacity and limit competition, which leads to higher prices, slowdown in vaccination and the further development of mutations.

The COVID vaccine would not have been possible without government and philanthropic direct funding and years of prior effort by researchers at public universities, and citizens should not have to pay the same thing twice. International voluntary cooperation on public health development and funding is needed more than ever. The EU should promote the sharing of patents worldwide with the aim of achieving affordable and effective vaccines for all as quickly as possible.

**Sergio Berlato (ECR).** – Signor Presidente, signor Commissario, onorevoli colleghi, nessuno si illuda che noi smetteremo di combattere per garantire a tutti i cittadini europei il diritto ad avere verità e giustizia. Nessuno si illuda!

Quella verità che ci è stata negata sull'origine del virus, sull'efficacia e la pericolosità di queste sostanze geniche sperimentali spacciate per vaccini, sulle reazioni avverse, sull'eccesso di mortalità, sui contratti secretati, addirittura evocando il segreto militare.

Carnefici e vittime di questa ipnosi collettiva vorrebbero rimuovere dalle loro e dalle nostre menti questo periodo drammatico, ma noi non siamo disposti a dimenticare, noi non siamo disposti a perdonare.

Oltre ai danni all'economia, ci hanno rubato tre anni di vita. Noi che non ci siamo fatti ipnotizzare, noi non cerchiamo vendetta, noi cerchiamo verità e giustizia e non ci fermeremo finché questa verità e giustizia non sarà ottenuta.

**Krzysztof Hetman (PPE).** – Panie Przewodniczący! Panie Komisarzu! Szanowni Państwo! Choć wydarzeń takich jak pandemia COVID-19 nie można nigdy do końca przewidzieć, można, a nawet należy wyciągnąć z nich wiele cennych lekcji na przyszłość. I to nie tylko w dziedzinie ochrony zdrowia, ale także w zakresie szeroko pojętej gotowości, odporności, współpracy, zarządzania w nauce, gospodarce i w życiu społecznym. Po pierwsze, wiemy już, jak ważne jest wczesne reagowanie i informowanie, a także koordynacja i solidarność. Wzmocnienie mechanizmu współpracy transgranicznej, wymiany informacji i wspólnych zamówień na środki medyczne może pomóc w budowaniu solidarności i zapewnić skuteczniejsze reagowanie na przyszłe kryzysy. Potrzebujemy do tego stałych inwestycji w infrastrukturę cyfrową i usprawnienia systemu udostępniania i wymiany danych.

Po drugie, potrzebujemy silniejszej europejskiej unii zdrowotnej, aby zapewnić równy dostęp do opieki zdrowotnej oraz wyeliminować dysproporcje i wykluczenie społeczne w tym zakresie, a także stymulować wspólnie badania i rozwój. Po trzecie, nie możemy zapomnieć o kręgosłupie naszej gospodarki, czyli małych i średnich przedsiębiorstwach, którym przy wychodzeniu z kryzysu należy się wsparcie w postaci funduszy, ale także budowania przyjaznego otoczenia regulacyjnego, tak aby stworzyć podstawy długoterminowej odporności naszej ekonomii.

**Eugen Jurzyca (ECR).** – Vážený pán predsedajúci, po kríze, ktorou pandémia COVID-19 nepochybne bola, je dôležité zobrať si ponaučenie zo všetkých pozitív a negatív, aby sme pri budúcich krízach konali čo najefektívnejšie. Inovatívny prístup Európskej únie pri zavádzaní COVID pasov bol správnym krokom vpred. Tieto pasy umožnili bezpečný voľný pohyb osôb. Táto iniciatíva bola dobre zrealizovaná a dnes slúži ako inšpirácia ďaleko za hranicami Európskej únie.

Avšak je dôležité spomenúť, že v otázke transparentnosti by sme mohli urobiť viac, napríklad by mohlo pomôcť, ak by Európska únia zaviedla pravidlá, ktoré by zaistili, že zmluvy sú platné až po ich zverejnení. Takýto krok by výrazne zvýšil transparentnosť a umožnil občanom Európskej únie lepšie sledovať a porozumieť rozhodnutiam, ktoré ich ovplyvňujú.

**Deirdre Clune (PPE).** – Mr President, *(start of speech off mic)* ... our rapporteur and all those shadows that were involved in bringing us to this point. It's important that we look back to learn the lessons and to provide recommendations to ensure that the next pandemic we encounter will not have such a significant impact on our health, our societies and our economies.

Most importantly, we want to ensure that we will not allow such a situation to reoccur. So with better sharing of information from our regions, our states and with our international partners and organisations, we can move more quickly to stop such a crisis, with better focus on innovation of medicines and therapeutics so we can be better prepared to prevent and to treat illness. And so I do welcome the move to a stronger European Health Union. This is one of the lasting outcomes of the pandemic and we are now better equipped to deal with any future health crisis today.

Today, it's important that we should remember all those who died during the pandemic, those who suffered significantly and those who are today living with long COVID. We also acknowledge the significant impact on the mental health of so many of our people, both young and old. We can do better by building on the successes and by learning from the lessons of the COVID pandemic.

**Sara Skyttedal (PPE).** – Herr talman! Pandemin har lärt oss många saker. Den viktigaste lärdomen är vilken inneboende styrka Europasamarbetet har om vi agerar gemensamt i kriser. Genom gemensamma upphandlingar av vaccin kunde vi få vaccin till fler människor snabbare och billigare än vad som hade varit fallet ifall varje enskilt medlemsland hade agerat enskilt.

Fler lärdomar om hur EU kan gå till väga vid framtida hälsokriser behöver nu dras, och många korrekta slutsatser finns också att finna i det betänkande vi debatterar idag. Jag vill avslutningsvis passa på att vända mig till de kollegor som efterfrågar EU-centraliserad sjukvårdspolitik. Ni har fel. Vi ska dra lärdomar av varandra, vara en gemensam marknad i form av produktreglering och främjad patientörklighet. Men hälsofrågornas kärna, sjukvården som sådan, måste fortsatt regleras och finansieras nationellt. Om vi i det här huset inte visar tillräckligt stöd för det, riskerar vi istället att inte ge stöd för åtgärder där EU faktiskt kan spela en viktig roll för framtidens europeiska hälso- och sjukvård.

#### *Catch-the-eye procedure*

**Mónica Silvana González (S&D).** – Señor presidente, señor comisario, señora ponente Montserrat, para aprender de los errores cometidos en esta terrible pandemia me gustaría expresar dos cosas.

La primera es cuidar a quienes nos cuidan. Para aprender de lo ocurrido no podemos quedarnos solamente en cuestiones puramente sanitarias. Aprendamos de los errores y no nos acordemos de los inmigrantes solo cuando los necesitamos; aprendamos cómo afrontar nuevas pandemias y cómo mejorar las condiciones laborales de los trabajadores esenciales.

El informe no refleja suficientemente el trabajo esencial que realizaron los trabajadores y trabajadoras inmigrantes durante la pandemia en sectores como el transporte, la construcción, el trabajo de limpieza o el trabajo de los cuidados, y vemos que, durante la pandemia, los trabajadores inmigrantes en la Unión Europea representaban más del 25 % de los limpiadores y ayudantes y el 17 % de los trabajadores de la construcción.

También la segunda cuestión es aprender de los errores, como, por ejemplo, prevenir los «protocolos de la vergüenza» de la Comunidad de Madrid, donde más de 5 000 ancianos murieron sin atención sanitaria por decisión de la presidenta Ayuso.

**Barry Andrews (Renew).** – Mr President, I worked on the Ebola outbreak in West Africa in 2014, and sadly, many of the lessons of that outbreak have not been learned and not implemented.

Firstly, the main lesson was the need to strengthen the health systems of developing countries. And yet today, Sierra Leone, the centre of the outbreak, has merely 8 doctors per 100 000 population. That's compared to 400 in my country. The second crucial lesson is the stigma against early reporting of disease outbreak has not been addressed. Early reporting can stop the spread of disease, but it can have a disastrous effect on the economy, on inward investment and on tourism of reporting countries. So what we need is a new global health security architecture. We need new international health regulations. And above all, we need proper funding for the health systems of developing countries.

**Pierrette Herzberger-Fofana (Verts/ALE).** – Monsieur le Président, ce rapport nous permet de tirer des enseignements et met à nu notre responsabilité vis-à-vis du Sud global et de tous ceux aussi qui ont souffert de cette pandémie. Les pays africains ne veulent pas de charité, mais la capacité de produire leurs propres vaccins. La renonciation aux droits de propriété intellectuelle est essentielle.

Au cours de nos missions en Afrique, la plupart des pays ont déploré le manque de reconnaissance de la pharmacopée traditionnelle utilisée par les populations pour le traitement. L'OMS et l'Union européenne devraient soutenir leur développement afin de transformer cette pharmacopée en produits thérapeutiques.

Nous ne devons pas oublier toutes les personnes qui ont souffert de la COVID, les travailleurs de la santé, en majorité des femmes, surtout les femmes migrantes, et les personnes vivant avec un handicap qui n'ont pas eu accès aux soins. Tous ceux également qui ont eu des problèmes de santé mentale.

Le partenariat sur un pied d'égalité est un défi qui doit être relevé par le traité sur les pandémies. L'Europe n'a pas été solidaire avec le Sud global. La question clé est l'accès à un financement durable et la renonciation à la propriété intellectuelle afin que les pays du Sud bénéficient du transfert de technologie et puissent produire leurs propres vaccins. Le partage des brevets est une nécessité.

**Ladislav Ilčić (ECR).** – Poštovani predsjedavajući, kolege, rasprava o COVID-u duboko je podijelila društvo. No, samo će neodgovorni oportunistički političari prešućivati ovu važnu temu.

Mi moramo napraviti ozbiljnu analizu jer je ova tema promijenila temeljne postavke društva. Moramo znati zašto se ljude emotivno prisiljavalo na cijepjenje s obrazloženjem da na taj način štite druge kad nije napravljeno nijedno istraživanje koje bi pokazalo smanjuje li cijepjenje prijenos virusa.

Zašto se lagalo cijelom društvu? Tko će objektivno analizirati mjere uzevši u obzir i smrtnost od drugih bolesti nakon COVID-a? Čija je odgovornost nabava ogromnog broja neupotrijebljenih cjepiva? Što je sa sukobom interesa Ursule von der Leyen? Zašto ne možemo vidjeti ugovore s Pfizerom ?

Ovo izvješće ne daje odgovore ni na jedno od ovih ključnih pitanja i samo pokazuje da europske institucije i dalje misle manipulirati građanima.

**Clare Daly (The Left).** – Mr President, so what did we learn from the COVID-19 pandemic? Well, we learned that we can move mountains when we need to. We can restructure our entire economies and societies in the face of a crisis. So we know now that when we don't do that for housing and climate change, it's not because we can't, it's because we choose not to. We learned that Europe's powers that be in a crisis will approach the issue in pretty much their usual arrogance and disdain for the public in the process, leading to a massive crisis in public trust, in the scientific and medical expertise by failing to allow rational debate on the facts to alleviate the genuine concerns of citizens. And of course, crucially, we learned that the profits of the private pharmaceutical companies will reign supreme over the health of billions worldwide as patents are protected and secret information redacted. So it's very clear, the real lesson is we

need public medicine to protect public health, good public information free from interference.

**Karsten Lucke (S&D).** – Herr Präsident! *Leave no one behind* – keinen zurücklassen! Damit sind wir hier durch die Straßen gezogen, und damit machen wir den Menschen Hoffnung. Und mit diesem COVI-Bericht legen wir Details, legen wir ganz konkrete Empfehlungen auf den Tisch, wie wir die Zukunft der Bürgerinnen und Bürger sicherer machen können und wie wir wirklich voranschreiten können. Den gilt es jetzt umzusetzen und in praktische Politik umzusetzen.

Millionen von Bürgern haben Hoffnung und schauen morgen wirklich nach Straßburg, um zu sehen, dass dieser Bericht durchkommt. Ich kann uns nur alle warnen, morgen hier ein Schauspiel aufzuführen, politische Einzelaspekte dafür zu nutzen, um diesen Bericht am Ende des Tages scheitern zu lassen. Das dürfen wir auf keinen Fall machen, das müssen wir verhindern. Wenn wir das machen, ist es dann so, dass wir mit voller Wucht diesen Betroffenen aus allen gesellschaftlichen Schichten, mit absoluter Wucht, zwischen die Beine treten.

Liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen, mit Pandemien und mit der Gesundheit der Bürgerinnen und Bürger spielt man nicht. Wir haben eine verdammte Pflicht, morgen zu liefern. Bedenken Sie das, wenn Sie morgen abstimmen.

*(End of catch-the-eye procedure)*

**Margaritis Schinas, Vice-President of the Commission.** – Mr President. dear colleagues, the sense of today's debate was to take stock and to look ahead. And as you rightly identify in this very balanced report, for which I want to congratulate once more Dolors Montserrat. There are things we did well, things we could have done better. But overall, I think Europe emerged wiser from this unprecedented traumatic experience. It is evident in the steps we have taken since. And let me very quickly, I don't have the time to mention some of the issues raised in this debate, although I note that some of the people that threw at us all sorts of lies and scientific theories have abandoned the room. Same holds true from some of such voices from that part of the hemicycle. Let me say that when we treat these issues, we need to work with a democracy of those present, not a democracy of those absent that say all sorts of stories here and then go out without listening to the reply.

First, on transparency. During the pandemic we worked together. First-hand information was provided to Parliament, to plenary debates, to committees and 23 meetings of the COVID Contact Group. Many of my colleagues attended the special COVID committee. The concrete amounts of the upfront payments paid to vaccine producers were made available to the CONT Committee. We published the redacted versions of the Advanced Purchase Agreements and the unredacted versions of the contracts, special and special arrangements as per the Parliament request. So to say that there was lack of transparency, I would frankly say that this is a bit too much.

Then on vaccine safety. The vast majority of COVID-19 vaccines have side effects that are mild and transient. Serious safety problems are very rare, and the EMA only recommends approval for vaccines if their benefits outweigh the risks. This has been always a red line for the Commission. Vaccines were safe, protective and safe.

Final point on the certificate. The certificate became a global standard. 2 billion certificates issued, 51 third countries and territories connected to the European system in addition to our Member States. Thanks to the certificate, we took our lives back. We reopened our societies and our businesses. So let me thank all of you once again. In particular, Dolors Montserrat and also the rapporteurs in the Contact Group. And let me reiterate that this is a European success story. One not sufficiently told, but one I'm sure will emerge as one of our main accomplishments in the current political cycle.

**Dolors Montserrat, ponente.** – Señor presidente, los virus, las enfermedades, las pandemias no entienden de ideologías, pero tampoco de fronteras. La mejor verdad es la que nos aporta la ciencia. Y la mejor justicia es que todos tengamos acceso a las vacunas. Lo que hemos aprendido de esta pandemia es que debemos actuar con decisión, unidos, coordinados y con más transparencia.

Este informe nos da, nos dice, nos señala el camino para estar más preparados, para tener autonomía estratégica, para no depender tanto de terceros países, para que nunca más los profesionales, como pasó al inicio de la pandemia, se tengan que proteger con bolsas de basura, para que nunca más tengamos escasez de medicamentos, para que nunca más los pacientes vean como se les retrasan sus operaciones o sus consultas, para que nunca más tengamos que sufrir las *fake news* y la desinformación.

Y, por tanto, quiero desde aquí dar las gracias; las gracias sinceramente a todos los ponentes alternativos, a todos los miembros de la Comisión, porque hemos tenido debates constructivos y positivos, y aunque, claro, hemos tenido diferencias, lo más importante es que estamos de acuerdo en lo más esencial, que es poner en el centro de nuestras políticas europeas la salud pública de nuestros ciudadanos. Hemos puesto en el centro de las políticas europeas la protección de nuestros profesionales sanitarios, que tanto sufrieron también durante la pandemia. Y, sobre todo, lo que hemos puesto encima de la mesa, como uno de los grandes objetivos, es construir la Unión Europea de la Salud para poder coordinar, armonizar y liderar, desde la Unión Europea, las políticas de salud, para que nunca más nos vuelva a pasar lo que nos pasó al inicio de la pandemia.

Por tanto, quiero dar las gracias y estoy convencidísima de que la gran mayoría estaremos de acuerdo y votaremos a favor de este informe y daremos una gran señal a todos los ciudadanos que tanto sufrieron con la COVID-19, a tantas familias que perdieron a sus familiares y a tantos profesionales que también sufrieron. Por tanto, esta será la mejor señal que podremos ofrecer mañana a todos y cada uno de ellos.

Muchísimas gracias por el apoyo.

**President.** – The debate is closed and the vote will be held tomorrow.

*Written statements (Rule 171)*

**Josianne Cutajar (S&D), in writing.** – Our report comes three years after the WHO declared COVID-19 to be a global pandemic. The world has moved on, but we must not forget the societal pains caused by this virus, and we certainly should not forget the sacrifice of those who put themselves at risk to care of others. Essential workers included those in transport and logistics who kept on going irrespective of the severity of the spread, ensuring that shelves remained stocked and that medicines and vaccines reached everyone – including the most vulnerable and less connected regions, such as islands.

We must also recognise the disproportionate caregiving role that women took on, which created an enormous impact on them. Additionally, the crucial role that was played by digitalisation, which, whilst challenging at the beginning, facilitated critical aspects of our economic and social activity, including education and health. Finally, I am pleased to see how our report robustly tackles the mental health impact of the pandemic, including on small business owners who were struggling to keep afloat, as well as on our senior citizens, persons with disabilities and young people who lost essential time and connection with their peers during critical times in their development.

**Karol Karski (ECR), na piśmie.** – Sprawozdanie końcowe nadzwyczajnej komisji PE do spraw skutków pandemii COVID zawiera wiele elementów wartościowych. Przede wszystkim w sposób wyważony i merytoryczny podkreśla korzyści płynące z poprawienia działań o charakterze transgranicznym na szczeblu UE w zwalczaniu globalnej pandemii. Bardzo dobrze, że zwraca również uwagę na znaczenie szczepień profilaktycznych. Niezwykle istotne jest stałe podnoszenie świadomości społecznej, w tym za pośrednictwem wiarygodnych źródeł, instytucji naukowych i rządowych, które publikują sprawdzone dane, oparte na faktach naukowych – aby skutecznie zwalczać teorie spiskowe i dezinformację, którą niestety obserwowaliśmy w okresie pandemii, zwłaszcza w przestrzeni cyfrowej. Uważam natomiast, że sprawozdanie zbyt bezkrytycznie ocenia działania KE w zakresie wspólnych zakupów szczepionek. Umowy na kontrakty szczepionkowe były negocjowane przez KE i państwa nie miały realnego wpływu na ich treść. Z perspektywy czasu widać, że zarówno proces negocjowania treści umów, ustalania wolumenów dawek w poszczególnych kontraktach oraz mechanizmów wsparcia finansowego KE dla poszczególnych producentów był nietransparentny. Producenci szczepionek na szeroką skalę wykorzystali czas pandemii jako biznesową szansę, kreując dla siebie możliwie najkorzystniejsze warunki funkcjonowania, bez uwzględniania aspektu odpowiedzialności społecznej, i wykorzystując przy tym unijne wsparcie finansowe. Mam nadzieję, że KE wyciągnie z tego cenną lekcję na przyszłość. Także państwa członkowskie powinny wyciągnąć z tego wnioski.

## 11. Roczne sprawozdanie na temat praworządności z 2023 r. (debata)

**President.** – The next item is the debate on the Council and Commission statements on the 2023 Annual Rule of Law Report (2023/2785(RSP)).

I welcome in our midst the Secretary of State for European Affairs, representing the Council, Mr Pascual Ignacio Navarro Ríos, and Commissioner Didier Reynders.

**Pascual Ignacio Navarro Ríos, presidente en ejercicio del Consejo.** – Señor presidente, señorías, señor comisario, es un honor para mí intervenir por primera vez en esta Cámara como representante de la Presidencia española del Consejo.

El Estado de Derecho es, junto con la democracia y los derechos fundamentales, uno de los principios fundadores de la Unión. Hoy estos valores se ven atacados: la guerra de agresión que Rusia libra contra Ucrania nos recuerda que no podemos dar por sentado ninguno de estos principios esenciales. Por ello, tienen una importancia crucial los instrumentos preventivos, como el informe de la Comisión sobre el Estado de Derecho, y tanto las instituciones de la Unión como los Estados miembros son responsables conjuntamente de que se haga el mejor uso posible de este conjunto de instrumentos.

La semana pasada se publicó la edición 2023 del informe de la Comisión sobre el Estado de Derecho y me gustaría dar las gracias a la Comisión, en nombre del Consejo, por su trabajo y por ofrecernos esta información actualizada y valiosa de la situación relativa al Estado de Derecho, tanto en la Unión como en cada uno de los Estados miembros.

Ayer, en el Consejo de Asuntos Generales, hubo un primer punto de información sobre este asunto y la Comisión —el comisario Reynders— pudo presentar este informe. Les aseguro que la Presidencia española y el Consejo harán un buen uso de este documento, que servirá para alimentar varios debates en el marco del diálogo del Consejo sobre el Estado de Derecho este semestre. Los ministros debatirán en detalle la parte horizontal del informe de la Comisión en la sesión del Consejo de Asuntos Generales de septiembre. También hemos previsto un debate específico por país en la sesión de octubre del Consejo —específicamente se examinarán Alemania, Dinamarca, Estonia, Irlanda y Grecia—. Prácticamente eso supone que, en cada una de las agendas de los consejos durante este semestre, se abordará la cuestión del Estado de Derecho. Además, en la sesión del Consejo de Justicia y Asuntos de Interior de octubre, los ministros y ministras de Justicia debatirán los aspectos relacionados con el Estado de Derecho que son de su competencia.

Quisiera también resaltar que el Consejo está evaluando actualmente el proceso relativo a su diálogo sobre el Estado de Derecho, con el fin de adoptar unas conclusiones antes de que termine el año, en diciembre. Nuestra intención es seguir reforzando este instrumento del Consejo, para lo cual los informes anuales de la Comisión sobre el Estado de Derecho desempeñan una labor fundamental.

Querría recordar que, para que el diálogo sobre el Estado de Derecho sea útil, no solo es importante el contenido, sino también el método. Los diálogos tienen lugar en un ambiente constructivo y en el que los Estados miembros intercambian mejores prácticas y también observaciones críticas y constructivas. Este método es crucial para desarrollar una cultura común del Estado de Derecho y para mantener la confianza mutua entre los Estados miembros.

**Didier Reynders, membre de la Commission.** – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Secrétaire d'État, Mesdames et Messieurs les députés, je suis heureux d'avoir la possibilité de présenter en plénière le rapport annuel de la Commission sur l'état de droit et d'en débattre avec vous. L'un des objectifs du rapport annuel est précisément de servir de base pour de tels débats politiques, et je me réjouis de souligner que nous avons atteint cet objectif, déjà avec les trois éditions précédentes.

Le rapport fait régulièrement l'objet de débats, tant au Parlement européen qu'au sein des parlements nationaux, ainsi qu'au Conseil. Le rapport a également suscité des discussions internes au sein des États membres, en particulier sur les mesures qui peuvent être prises pour renforcer l'état de droit.

Le rapport permet aussi d'améliorer la connaissance mutuelle des systèmes nationaux respectifs. Il sert désormais de référence aux États membres lorsqu'ils engagent des réformes, notamment sur la base des recommandations émises pour la première fois dans le rapport de 2022.

The fourth edition of the Rule of Law Report was adopted last week, on 5 July. We managed to gradually advance the date of adoption each year since the second report, whilst also extending each year the consultation period for the Member States and other stakeholders. This allows us to have two days' discussion in the last plenary before the summer break.

The 2023 report presents the Commission's assessment based on a well-established methodology and a diversity of sources. We have held more than 500 meetings with national authorities and stakeholders as part of our country visits – for a large part, virtual country visits by video.

In this year's edition, we have followed up on the issues covered in the previous reports. The scope continues to follow a four-pillar structure covering the independence, quality and efficiency of justice systems, anti-corruption frameworks, media freedom and pluralism, and other institutional checks and balances.

As you know, the most important novelty of the 2022 report were the country-specific recommendations addressed to each Member State. This is something that Parliament had called for. These recommendations cover positive practices and reforms which should be further pursued, as well as problems which should be addressed. This year's report now assesses the follow-up given to the recommendations of 2022. This, of course, is another innovation and a very important step in the evolution of our rule-of-law policy.

Here we can see that the report has become a true driver of positive reforms. Important efforts are ongoing in many Member States to follow up on the recommendations of the previous year. This is, however, happening at various speeds and levels of completeness, with some important concerns remaining in certain Member States.

Overall, within this framework of one year, around two thirds of the recommendations issued in 2022 have already been followed up fully – 25% of the recommendations – or partially – 40% of the recommendations. For each recommendation, the Commission has carried out a qualitative assessment, concluding that there was either no progress, some progress, significant progress or that the recommendation has been fully implemented. The 2023 recommendations are to build on last year's recommendations where there was no or partial implementation or address new challenges identified since last year.

Let me now present some findings of the 2023 Rule of Law Report. With regard to justice reforms, we see that many Member States have further advanced with important reforms related to the independence and effectiveness of judicial councils, the autonomy of prosecution services, improving judicial appointment procedures, and investing in their justice systems. At the same time, structural concerns persist in a few Member States as regards judicial independence.

The topic of anti-corruption has continued to rise in public awareness across the Union over the past year. Member States must take this seriously and implement effective anti-corruption policies, and we see that, since the 2022 report, several Member States have updated or started processes to revise their anti-corruption strategies. Other Member States have taken steps to strengthen integrity frameworks. And an effective fight against corruption is also necessary, including through the allocation of sufficient resources to anti-corruption investigations.

With regard to media pluralism and freedom, certain Member States have adopted legislation increasing the transparency of media ownership and have strengthened provisions to enhance the independence of their media regulators. These are important steps to prevent political and state pressure or control over the media.

We are aware that sometimes journalists are targeted just for doing their job. It is therefore positive to see that several Member States have adopted measures to improve the safety of journalists, in line with the recommendation of the 2022 report and also building on recent Commission initiatives, such as our Recommendation on the safety of journalists.

Lastly, with regard to checks and balances, several Member States are working to improve the quality of the legislative process and to ensure appropriate involvement of stakeholders and civil society. However, challenges continue to be flagged in a number of Member States in relation to a lack of formal frameworks for consultations or their insufficient application in practice.

In a majority of Member States, there is an enabling and supportive environment for civil society, with further efforts underway to improve their situation. But we are also aware that, as we have seen from our extensive outreach in the preparation for this report, civil society organisations often continue to face challenges such as funding issues and restrictions on their operating space.

The Commission invites Member States to effectively take up the challenges identified in the report and it stands ready to assist them in their efforts to continue the implementation of recommendations. To conclude again, I will say that we have had a good success about implementation of many recommendations, so it's possible to be engaged in a very fruitful dialogue with many Member States.

Of course, if it is not sufficient, we are using all the tools at our disposal – infringement proceedings, but also different kinds of budgetary tools, like the discussions on the milestones in the Recovery and Resilience Plans or the Conditionality Regulation. And it is true that sometimes we have seen the implementation of some recommendations of our report due, in part, to the fact that we have put some milestones in the same way in the Recovery and Resilience Plan.

We need to say that it's efficient to organise such a dialogue but, again, if it's not sufficient, we have other tools at our disposal. Thank you very much for your attention and, of course, we will be ready to engage the debate with you.

#### VORSITZ: KATARINA BARLEY

*Vizepräsidentin*

**Paulo Rangel**, *en nombre del Grupo PPE*. – Señora presidenta, quería saludar a la Presidencia española y desear que tenga gran éxito durante este semestre.

Senhora Presidente, Caro Comissário, não é preciso sublinhar a importância deste relatório para o Estado de Direito. Há muitas falhas em vários Estados e há também alguns progressos.

Gostaria de destacar três situações que me preocupam muito: a primeira, a Polónia. Continua a haver claramente uma regressão, passos atrás, por um lado na independência do Ministério Público, da Procuradoria-Geral da República, mas também agora naquele que considero o maior ataque aos valores do Estado de Direito e da democracia a que assisti, que é a chamada lei anti-Tusk e que não está neste relatório, mas espero que esteja no segundo.

Depois, o caso da Espanha, que é um caso preocupante sobre o Estado de Direito, porque a Fiscalía General continua a estar altamente dependente do governo. E tivemos aqui a Ministra da Justiça a dizer que o Tribunal Constitucional é um órgão político e que não há mal nenhum em nomear ministros para o Tribunal Constitucional. Isto põe problemas sérios a nível do Estado de Direito.

E, finalmente, no caso português, onde continuam as críticas muito duras ao combate à corrupção, onde realmente o governo tem falhado totalmente. Com grande motivo para preocupação, demitiu-se o Secretário de Estado da Defesa na última sexta-feira, arguido e suspeito de corrupção, e o Primeiro-Ministro disse que isto não tinha importância nenhuma, porque a corrupção não preocupa os portugueses, o que preocupa os portugueses é o desenvolvimento económico.

Ora, na última sondagem que foi feita e que tem menos de um mês, 87 % dos portugueses consideram que a corrupção é um problema muito grave e que não está a ser combatido. É preciso advertir o Governo Costa para esta falha gravíssima no Estado de Direito.



**Juan Fernando López Aguilar**, *en nombre del Grupo S&D*. – Señora presidenta, Presidencia Española del Consejo de la Unión Europea, comisario Reynders, por cuarta vez debatimos en el Parlamento Europeo el informe sobre el Estado de Derecho, que intenta poner un marco europeo a las insuficiencias mostradas por la activación del artículo 7, por riesgo grave de violación del Estado de Derecho, contra Hungría y contra Polonia.

Precisamente es un marco permanente, periódico, anual y objetivado en sus parámetros que arroja ya enseñanzas claras. La primera es la necesidad de distinguir aquellas situaciones de riesgo sistémico contra los valores comunes del Tratado de la Unión Europea frente a aquellas otras que pueden presentar problemas que merezcan comentario, pero no representan una amenaza sistémica.

Dado que se acompaña el informe de veintisiete exámenes del Estado de Derecho en los Estados miembros —en todos y cada uno—, no puedo evitar hacer referencia a una mención sobre España, la que le acabo de escuchar a mi colega el portavoz del Partido Popular, el señor Rangel. España ha hecho progresos en materia de eficiencia y calidad de la justicia —que reconoce el informe—, en materia de transparencia y registro de intereses y también en materia del derecho a la defensa. España no tiene ningún problema de pluralismo en los medios que dependen del sistema de radiotelevisión pública española.

Sí tiene un problema con el Consejo del Poder Judicial, que es el órgano de gobierno del Poder Judicial. ¿Y sabe cuál es el problema? El problema es que la Constitución ordena que se renueve íntegramente cada cinco años. La última vez que se renovó fue en 2013 con mayoría absoluta y Gobierno del Partido Popular. Caducó en 2018. Estamos en 2023; han pasado cinco años. Por tanto, el Consejo General del Poder Judicial lleva nada menos que cinco años caducado, con grave perjuicio del prestigio de la Justicia, de la Administración de Justicia, de la cobertura de vacantes en el sistema judicial, del derecho a la justicia, del acceso a la justicia, de la tutela judicial efectiva de 47 millones de españoles. Y hay un único responsable, que es el único actor político, que en las Cortes Generales se niega a formar parte de los tres quintos necesarios para renovar de una vez el Consejo General del Poder Judicial.

Por tanto, el mensaje es muy claro: primero, hay que renovar de acuerdo con las reglas vigentes; es lo que dice el informe del Comisario Reynders. Segundo, hay que debatir y reformar el sistema de elección de los vocales del Consejo, los doce de extracción judicial y los doce juristas de reconocida competencia. Primero, renovar de acuerdo con las reglas vigentes y después, en su caso, debatir y reformar. Pero primero renovar. Esa es la obligación, de acuerdo con las reglas y de acuerdo con las lecciones del informe sobre el Estado de Derecho del comisario Reynders.

**Sophia in 't Veld**, *on behalf of the Renew Group*. – Madam President, Mr Commissioner, Minister, as the original architect of this report, this annual debate is always a special moment for me.

The Annual Rule of Law Report – in its fourth edition this year – have become a document of reference for everybody, and including recommendations was clearly a big improvement.

However, key weaknesses remain because our original idea was to have standards applied evenly and independently and that there should be no space for political or diplomatic considerations – and yet I see that the text still tends to be too diplomatic, with balanced Commission language avoiding clear statements on the Member States.

This is why – and I reiterate this and I will continue to reiterate it – the report must be drawn up by independent experts, as called for by this House. One illustration is the chapter on Greece. It states, for example, that the national transparency is, I quote, 'progressing well', whereas we all know that the Greek National Transparency Authority is a fig leaf for government wrongdoing instead of an effective independent watchdog.

With regard to the Council, the Council will only discuss the general part you just said, not the country chapters. Yet some of the members of the Council – i.e. Member State governments – are amongst the main demolition men of the rule of law. So when will the Council finally take responsibility, show some courage and address the wrongdoing within its own circles?

In summary, I welcome the report, but I think that in the interest of the rule of law, next year's edition and the editions after that must become the big leap forward.

**Daniel Freund**, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Madam President, dear colleagues, this is the fourth time now that we have a Rule of Law Report, the fourth time that there is a bad assessment of the rule of law in Hungary. It was the pressure in this House that finally got us to do something about this. So now we have almost EUR 28 billion of EU funds that are earmarked for Hungary that are frozen.

But we also have to say that since that decision was made in the Council last December, there has been zero progress on the situation in Hungary, not a single milestone has been fulfilled since then. And I think a good indication of where the rule of law stands in the European Union is that, as things stand now, it's still foreseen that Hungary takes the rotating presidency on the first day after the European elections and actually, well, Spanish Presidency, congrats for starting off your presidency now.

You're part of the same trio with Belgium and Hungary. So can you explain to me how this is going to go once Hungary takes over, for example, on the Article 7 hearings? Is there going to be a moderation by Hungary where they ask themselves, how is the improvement of rule of law going? Well, we think that the rule of law is a Soros ideology that just searches to bring illegal migrants to the country. Okay, well then, have some more EU money. Is that how this is going to go?

I think you really need to reflect. I don't think that the Council or the EU can actually deal with an autocrat taking over the EU presidency. So please do something about that if you're serious about the rule of law.

**Patryk Jaki**, *w imieniu grupy ECR*. – Pani Przewodnicząca! Panie Komisarzu! Przygotowaliście sprawozdanie, które jest dowodem na brak praworządności, zepsucie Unii, wychodzenie poza traktaty, nadużywanie władzy do zmiany niepopularnych rządów czyli niszczenie demokracji. Nie chwalicie się tutaj finansowaniem przez was zamieszanych w aferę katarską organizacji czy brakiem niezależności TSUE, blokowaniem debaty o wspólnych imprezach i polowaniach sędziów i polityków. Praworządna według was jest Holandia, gdzie rząd hipokrytów strzelał właśnie do własnych rolników. Praworządna jest Francja, która właśnie ocenzurowała internet i wysłała służby do staruszki, która napisała coś złego na prezydenta. Wreszcie praworządne są Niemcy, gdzie powtarzaliście właśnie wybory ze względu na nadużycia. Rośnie tam antysemityzm, a politycy sami wybierają sędziów i sami nimi zostają.

A teraz chcecie przesiedlić imigrantów do Polski wbrew ich woli, mimo że to wy ich zapraszaliście. Tylko oni nie chcą być w Polsce. Więc w ramach praworządności mamy ich tutaj przetrzymać i stworzyć dla nich obozy. Więc powiedzmy sobie wprost: Niemcy nie zapłacili Polsce jeszcze za poprzednie obozy, a teraz każą nam budować nowe obozy. I to jest ta praworządność. To jest to przestrzeganie praw człowieka. To jest droga donikąd.

**Jean-Paul Garraud**, *au nom du groupe ID*. – Madame la Présidente, pendant que la Commission européenne instrumentalise la notion d'état de droit pour critiquer des pays refusant sa politique immigrationniste et wokiste, elle épargne totalement le gouvernement français. Pourtant, question état de droit, il y aurait beaucoup à dire sur le pouvoir macronniste.

Ainsi, dans l'affaire qui a embrasé la France, le président de la République a bafoué la présomption d'innocence du policier en cause et, par là même, a porté atteinte au principe de la séparation des pouvoirs entre l'exécutif et le judiciaire. On peut aussi citer la volonté du président de censurer les réseaux sociaux, les critiques de ses ministres de l'éducation et de la culture envers les médias qui ne leur conviennent pas, mais aussi le maintien en poste du ministre de la justice, doublement mis en examen et renvoyé avec charges à l'appui devant la Cour de justice de la République. Quant au ministre de l'intérieur, atteint de cécité face au profil des émeutiers et niant le lien évident entre immigration de masse et insécurité, il doit comprendre que les Matéo et les Kevin sont très minoritaires parmi ces racailles.

Quant à la Commission, elle se permet de porter des appréciations sur le comportement des policiers français, ce qui n'a rien à voir avec ses compétences. L'état de droit n'est pas à géométrie variable, alors commencez par vous l'appliquer à vous-mêmes.

**Clare Daly**, *on behalf of The Left Group*. – Madam President, the Commission's rule of law report flags the reform of the TV licence in Ireland as something that's ongoing. Well it's ongoing, alright, for the past decade with absolutely no results. But not anymore. As we sit here, the country is in uproar. We're in the midst of emergency sessions of parliament against the weeks of revelations about a staggering culture of excess at our national broadcaster, RTÉ. Five thousand euros spent on flip-flops for a party. Concerts, dinners, private members' clubs, open chequebooks for VIP hospitality while journalists work out of café toilets, EUR 150 000 secretly funnelled for a star celebrity, while everyone else has to tighten their belts.

Well, the public is furious and rightly so. When we agree to fund our public broadcaster, we don't sign up for a slush fund to pay the lives of the rich in their parties. Is that any wonder that this institution toes the line of government so the party can continue?

It is about time the Irish Government dumped the licence, continued to argue and changed the system for proper public service journalism, and RTÉ should be committed to delivering that. The pantomime is rolling on in Ireland, but the government really needs to fix it and the Commission really needs to keep a better eye on them.

**Kinga Gál (NI).** – Elnök Asszony! Az idei jogállamisági jelentés kapcsán a Bizottság kettős mércéje már olyannyira nyilvánvaló, hogy hiteltelenné teszi magát az eszközt és a folyamatot. Brüsszel megint NGO-k által befolyásolt, ideológiai alapú jelentésekben oktatja ki a tagállamokat, ahelyett, hogy először a saját háza táján tenne rendet. Az úgy nem járja, hogy a tagállamok kioktatást kapnak, egyes tagállamokat politikai okokból folyamatosan támadnak, visszatartva tőlük a jog szerint nekik járó uniós pénzeket.

Eközben a brüsszeli intézmények jogállamisági problémáiról egy árva szót sem találunk a jogállamisági jelentésben. Pedig a brüsszeli intézményeket súlyos korrupciós botrányok terhelik. Talán ezekkel kellene inkább foglalkozni, például a botrányos vakcina beszerző szerződés részleteivel. Ideje lenne választ adniuk arra is, hogy mire költötték el a hiányzó uniós költségvetési pénzeket. Az Európai Bizottság jelentése mindezekért teljes mértékben hiteltelen. Itt az ideje annak, hogy a 2024-es választásokon az európai emberek minderre csattanós választ adjanak.

**Javier Zarzalejos (PPE).** – Señora presidenta, señor comisario, permítanme saludar en esta primera comparecencia en el Parlamento al representante de la Presidencia española y desearle, por supuesto, los mayores éxitos en el desempeño de su responsabilidad.

Decía Jefferson que el precio de la libertad es la vigilancia eterna. Y no es que los informes sobre el Estado de Derecho lleven elaborándose una eternidad, pero ya acumulan unas cuantas ediciones y eso nos da una perspectiva suficiente para poder conocer la radiografía de cuál es la situación del Estado de Derecho en la Unión Europea.

Creo, señor comisario, que este es uno de los logros más notables de su mandato, y siempre hemos sido partidarios de un instrumento universal, homogéneo y no discriminatorio a la hora de analizar dónde están estos problemas.

Nosotros hemos reiterado, desde el PP y la delegación española, preocupaciones sobre el deterioro de la calidad legislativa, sobre el deterioro del proceso legislativo, sobre algunas reformas. No voy a entrar a contestar otras alusiones de partido que se han hecho; simplemente sí quiero expresar aquí la convicción hoy, precisamente hoy, de que el próximo año —se lo aseguro, señor comisario— el capítulo dedicado a España será mucho más positivo.

**Łukasz Kohut (S&D).** – Pani Przewodnicząca! Przez osiem ostatnich lat w Polsce PiS, tzw. dobra zmiana, bo tak siebie określają ci narodowi populisci, kompletnie sparaliżowali Trybunał Konstytucyjny, upolitycznili Krajową Radę Sądownictwa, zmienili media publiczne w propagandę rodem z Kremla, prześladowali niezależnych sędziów i prokuratorów, używali cyberbroni Pegasus do walki z opozycją i z dziennikarzami, odwoływali i powoływali z powodów czysto politycznych prezesów sądów, próbowali zniszczyć Sąd Najwyższy, zablokowali tym samym ogromne pieniądze europejskie dla Polski. Lista grzechów PiS jest bardzo, bardzo, bardzo długa. A praworządność to także bezpieczeństwo w tych trudnych czasach. Bez praworządności nie ma suwerenności, jest dyktat. Kaczyński i Orban, wyprowadzając nasze kraje z Unii Europejskiej, grają w orkiestrze Putina. Nie możemy im na to pozwolić.

**Moritz Körner (Renew).** – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Kommissar, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Der Rechtsstaatsbericht ist ein wichtiger Schritt, und es ist erneut ein guter Bericht, der die Lage in den Mitgliedstaaten darstellt, der sie noch klarer darstellen könnte. Aber wir schauen eben genau in alle Mitgliedstaaten hinein bei der Rechtsstaatlichkeit. Das ist ja sonst immer der große Vorwurf von Polen und Ungarn, von den Rechten: Oh, es wird ja immer nur auf einzelne Länder geschaut. Nein, es wird auf jeden einzelnen Mitgliedstaat geschaut mit diesem Rechtsstaatsbericht. Und dann hat man heute die nächste große Argumentation gesehen: Ah, jetzt wird auf alle Mitgliedstaaten geschaut, das können wir als Argument nicht mehr benutzen. Also jetzt: Oh, es wurde gar nicht nach Brüssel geschaut bei dem Katargate-Skandal und so weiter und so fort.

Ich kann alle beruhigen, hier wurde genug darüber diskutiert, auch das entsprechend aufgeklärt. Und übrigens, der Unterschied ist, dass Korruption hier im Europäischen Parlament dazu führt, dass Ermittlungen stattfinden. Genau das ist der Unterschied zu Ungarn und Polen, wo das nicht der Fall ist.

Aber wir müssen jetzt schauen: Was machen wir mit dem Bericht? Was passiert mit den konkreten Empfehlungen, und wo wird das diskutiert? Und da frage ich schon den Rat: Soll im nächsten Jahr der Rechtsstaatsbericht eigentlich durch Ungarn geleitet werden oder dann durch Polen? Was darauf folgt, das wäre ja wirklich, als würde man den Bock zum Gärtner machen. Das kann es doch nicht sein. Da brauchen wir eine Konsequenz, auch bei der Rechtsstaatlichkeit im Rat.

**Tineke Strik (Verts/ALE).** – Madam President, representatives of the Council – congratulations on your Presidency – and Commissioner, this report not only shows the track record of Member States on the rule of law, but also of the Commission's ability to address rule-of-law risks. And so far, I must be honest, the Commission is failing. Institutions, civil society and journalists are under attack in a growing number of Member States and they feel unprotected. And in countries like Poland, the rule-of-law crisis is only further cemented. Citizens see their freedom and rights stripped away. And the Poland resolution we just adopted today urgently calls on the Commission to use all its tools to fight back against this. It has become a matter of survival for the Polish people.

Mapping violations and expressing concerns will not cut the crisis. So I urge you, Commissioner, as the resolution of the Parliament also called upon, to launch an infringement procedure against the National Council for the Judiciary, to speed up the procedure of the investigative committee law, to respond to the electoral law changes and to expand the scope of the Article 7 procedure to address this all-out war against democracy, the rule of law and fundamental rights. The people in Poland are counting on you.

*(The speaker agreed to take a blue-card question)*

**Patryk Jaki (ECR), blue-card question.** – So I just would like to ask you, Tineke, because you said that there is an issue in Poland with the National Judicial Council, do you know what exactly Poland changed in Judicial National Council?

**Tineke Strik (Verts/ALE), blue-card answer.** – Well, the problem is that the National Judicial Council is still not independent. The government decides who are in this National Judiciary Council. And the point with the draft law on the Supreme Court means that disciplinary measures are going to be taken somewhere else, but still by judges who are not legitimately appointed. So as long as the Judiciary Council keeps on producing neo-judges, who are not legitimate, the Court becomes only more and more captured and this problem is still not resolved. So therefore, I urge the Commissioner to take steps because as long as the National Judiciary Council is not independent, we will not get away with the rule of law crisis in Poland.

**Romana Tomc (PPE).** – Gospa predsednica. Spoštovani komisar! Ko je Komisija napovedala letna poročila o vladavini prava, so bila naša pričakovanja zares velika. Po štirih letih je jasno – niste jih izpolnili.

Pri Sloveniji ste popolnoma zgrešili bistvo. Vladavina prava razpada, zgodil pa se je tudi popoln politični prevzem javne radiotelevizije. Vi pa gledate stran. Vaša kolegica Jourová je celo kar med samim postopkom o presoji zakona, ki je ustavno sporen, obiskala ustavno sodišče, kar je nedopusten politični pritisk.

Nevladnik iz organizacije, ki je bila ena vaših glavnih virov informacij in seveda zagovarja politični prevzem medijev, je nenadoma postal predsednik sveta RTV Slovenije. Kaj bi napisali v poročilu, če bi se to dogajalo pod desno vlado?

Ker imate dvojna merila in se za izboljšanje vladavine prava ne trudite iskreno, ampak ravnate politično, je tudi vaše poročilo za mene politični pamflet in nima nobene dodane vrednosti.

**Cyrus Engerer (S&D).** – Madam President, there must be no shortcuts, no compromises, no derogations when it comes to the rule of law in any country, Member State or not. Because a violation of the rule of law is a direct threat to our fundamental rights as human beings. A threat to our nature, a threat to our environment, a threat to our health, a threat to our dignity and a threat to our lives.

I have always called myself more of an activist rather than a politician. My first ever step into politics was through my activism, calling for Malta to join the European Union with my colleague in front of me. And the reason was simple: I simply believed in a union of freedom, democracy and a Union ruled by law and passion for what is right.

So to me, the European Union must always be a beacon of the rule of law, the epitome of democratic principles, of fairness, of equality and of justice. And those of us in this House who believe in a union ruled by law should never settle for anything less than that.

**Ramona Strugariu (Renew).** – Doamna președintă, nu mai ignorați libertatea presei, nu mai încălcați libertatea presei. Nu este un mesaj doar pentru țara mea, este un mesaj pentru toate acele state membre care fac acest lucru în mod sistematic și care își ruinează democrațiile.

Raportul cu privire la statul de drept arată că și jurnaliștii români se confruntă constant cu amenințări, hărțuiri, tentative de intimidare, fără ca autoritățile statului să ia măsuri pentru a combate aceste practici periculoase pentru democrație. Uneori le încurajează, alteori tac, alteori politicul este cel care atacă libertatea presei.

Și la capitolul justiție mai avem lucruri de făcut. Deși raportul Comisiei nu o menționează, alte rapoarte internaționale arată că România se află în topul țărilor europene cu cele mai multe decizii neimplementate ale Curții de Justiție a Uniunii Europene. Vrem stat de drept, e simplu. Așa cum politicienii au imunitate pentru activitatea politică, magistrații trebuie să fie independenți, iar presa să aibă garanții pentru independență editorială și protecție împotriva abuzurilor. Asta înseamnă stat de drept.

**Ελισάβετ Βόζεμπεργκ-Βρυονίδη (PPE).** – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, όλο το προηγούμενο διάστημα, σε κάθε Ολομέλεια, συγκεκριμένοι συνάδελφοι, υπηρετώντας πολιτικές σκοπιμότητες, έφερναν προς συζήτηση ως θέμα «Διάβρωση του κράτους δικαίου στην Ελλάδα», κατηγορώντας τη χώρα μου με fake news για αδιαφάνεια και διαφθορά. Η ετήσια έκθεση που συζητούμε σήμερα αποτελεί την ηχηρή και τεκμηριωμένη απάντηση, που αποκαθιστά την πραγματικότητα. Μεταξύ άλλων θετικών κρίσεων, η έκθεση σημειώνει σημαντική βελτίωση της θέσης της Ελλάδας στους δείκτες διεθνούς διαφάνειας και πρόοδο στο έργο της Εθνικής Αρχής Διαφάνειας, καλύτερο οικονομικό έλεγχο των κρατικών λειτουργιών, πρωτοβουλίες για την ασφάλεια των δημοσιογράφων και βελτίωση συνεργασίας με τις οργανώσεις κοινωνίας των πολιτών.

Συνάδελφοι, η ελληνική κυβέρνηση με πρωθυπουργό τον Κυριάκο Μητσοτάκη συνεργάζεται στενά με την Επιτροπή, με θέσεις και πολιτικές που υπηρετούν υψηλά ευρωπαϊκά πρότυπα για το κράτος δικαίου. Γι' αυτό στις πρόσφατες εθνικές εκλογές επιβραβεύτηκε με την ισχυρή εντολή να κυβερνήσει αυτοδύναμα, συνεχίζοντας το μεταρρυθμιστικό έργο της.

**Theresa Bielowski (S&D).** – Frau Präsidentin! Wenn wir heute über Rechtsstaatlichkeit debattieren, dann möchte ich diese eine Sache sagen, die mir besonders wichtig ist, und zwar den Angriff auf die Rechtsstaatlichkeit. Die Gefahr ihrer Verletzung, die Missachtung von Rechtsstaatlichkeit erkennt man an denselben Faktoren: Die Rechte von Minderheiten werden eingeschränkt, die Rechte von Frauen werden eingeschränkt, die Rechte der Selbstbestimmung werden angegriffen. Die ersten Opfer der Einschränkung von Grundrechten, die ersten Opfer der Korruption sind Minderheiten, sind Frauen, sind die Kritikerinnen und sind diejenigen, die darüber berichten.

Und wenn LGBTQI-freie Zonen ausgerufen werden, wenn Familienkonzepte quasi verboten werden, wenn es ein faktisches Abtreibungsverbot gibt, wenn Kritikerinnen eingeschüchtert werden, dann ist das nicht das Problem einzelner Gruppen, einzelner Personen, noch nicht einmal das einzelner Länder – es ist das Problem von uns allen. Als Europäische Union werden wir kämpfen müssen, werden wir alle Maßnahmen setzen müssen, denn die Rechtsstaatlichkeit ist unser aller Sicherheitsnetz. Wenn dieses Sicherheitsnetz Löcher bekommt, wenn ihm Schnitte zugefügt werden, dann betrifft uns dies alle. Und zwar immer.

**Róża Thun und Hohenstein (Renew).** – Pani Przewodnicząca! To jest ten komunikat Komisji Europejskiej o praworządności. On ma 34 strony i zawiera tematy, którymi się zajmuje. Polskę wymieniono w tym komunikacie przeszło 100 razy. I w dodatku nie jako kraj święcący przykładem, ale jako kraj łamiący prawo, ograniczający prawa obywateli, wolność prasy, trójpodział władzy, niegwarantujący przejrzystości procesu legislacyjnego. I właściwie w każdym rozdziale znajdujemy wzmiankę: Polska, brak postępu.

Mamy tu też 27 aneksów dotyczących problemu w poszczególnych krajach członkowskich. Najobszerniejszy z nich – 50 stron – dotyczy znowu mojej ojczyzny, Polski. I znowu propaganda rządowych mediów, wspierana przez europosłów i europosłanki z partii rządzącej w Polsce, będzie krzyczeć o donosicielach, o zdrajcach, o Niemcach, o złym komisarzu Reyndersie. Ale to rząd, to wy łamiecie prawo w Polsce, przez co osłabiacie nie tylko Polskę, ale i całą Unię Europejską. Nie ma na to zgody. W październiku zmienimy ten rząd i poprawimy tę sytuację.

**David Casa (PPE)** – Sinjura President, illum għandna konferma oħra li s-saltna tad-dritt għadha kompromessa – li pereżempju l-liġi f'Malta ma tqisx lil kulhadd xorta, għaliex min hu viċin il-poter ma jsofrax l-istess konsegwenzi ta' min hu żgħir. Meta l-liġi ma tibqax universali, id-demokrazija tiġi mhedda u tibqa' tebgħa għall-Unjoni Ewropea kollha.

Daphne Caruana Galizia nqatlet – inqatlet biex titwaqqaf milli tikxef korruzzjoni rampanti. Imma għal dawn il-każijiet kollha, ebda politiku għadu ma tressaq. Pjanijiet għal riformi hemm kemm trid. Aktar skrutinju għal min hu żgħir hemm kemm trid. Imma sakemm dawk li kixfet Daphne jibqgħu jgawdu mill-impunità, ifisser illi s-saltna tad-dritt f'Malta mhijiex taħdem. U allura nappella: kunu fuq in-naħa taċ-ċittadini Maltin u Ghawdxin. M'għandux ikun hemm kompromessi, kif għadna kemm smajna min-naħa tal-kollega tiegħi Soċjalista. U allura rridu nkunu kontra l-kriminalità u kontra l-korruzzjoni.

**Katalin Cseh (Renew).** – Madam President, dear colleagues, as we are discussing the results of yet another rule-of-law monitoring cycle, Viktor Orbán's abusive regime has reached yet another milestone. Last Tuesday, they adopted the so-called revenge law, a piece of legislation that has absolutely zero place in the European Union.

For a better part of a year now, teachers and students have been organising major demonstrations across Hungary because public education is at the brink of collapse. The regime sees their protest as a threat and this law is a tool to coerce them into silence with a police state apparatus. Teachers can get fired for striking – even though they don't make a living wage – and from now on, they can also get fired for voicing any criticism. Five thousand of them have already indicated that they would leave their profession because of this law.

Colleagues, the Commission has been reluctant to comment on this law because education is a Member State competence. But we are not talking about education policy here. This is a democratic minimum, this is a rule-of-law issue. EU institutions must view it as such, include in the rule-of-law monitoring and demand the Hungarian Government repeal this shameful law.

#### *Spontane Wortmeldungen*

**Miriam Lexmann (PPE).** – Vážená pani predsedajúca, pozorne som si prečítala správu pre Slovensko, ktorá obsahovala aj konštruktívne odporúčania. Mnohokrát sa ale zdá, že ostro kritizované sú predovšetkým niektoré krajiny, zatiaľ čo u iných sa zjavné problémy v oblasti právneho štátu vyriešia jednou vetou.

Chcem zdôrazniť, že napríklad v odporúčaníach pre Belgicko sa minulý rok spomínal prípad slovenského občana Jozefa Chovanca, ktorý zomrel po zásahu polície na letisku Charleroi, s tým, že prebieha vyšetrovanie. Tento rok správa ešte stručnejšie uviedla, že Komisia vykoná ďalšie hodnotenia vyšetrovania. Päť rokov po tom, ako sa prípad stal, a ešte stále nie je ukončený. Ako je možné, že neakceptovateľné správanie príslušníkov polície a rozporuplné kroky súdov si zaslúžia iba jednu vetu v správe pre Belgicko?

Som presvedčená, že zo strany EÚ je nevyhnutné väčšie úsilie na zabezpečenie spravodlivého vyšetrovania tohto prípadu, a to nielen s ohľadom na rodinu Jozefa Chovanca, ale aj s ohľadom na dôveru občanov v ochranu základných hodnôt Európskej únie.

**Maria Grapini (S&D).** – Domnule comisar, doamna președintă, stimați colegi, sigur, este foarte importantă funcționarea statului de drept. Până la urmă, este poate cel mai important lucru în democrație. Dar, domnule comisar, citind și acest raport, vă întreb, credeți că măsurarea funcționării statului de drept este la fel în toate statele membre? Și am să-mi justific întrebarea.

Am făcut numeroase scrisori Comisiei, chiar și dumneavoastră. Am sesizat că în numeroase state membre, cum ar fi Germania, Danemarca, Finlanda, Austria, sunt luați copii, nu se respectă dreptul copilului, sunt luați direct de la școală și instituționalizați fără măcar să fie anunțați părinții. Nu s-a întâmplat nimic. În Austria, am făcut sesizări că sunt discriminări la alocațiile copiilor de alte naționalități. Austria, bine mersi, nu a fost deloc notificată de Comisie. Deci, dacă acest stat de drept nu este măsurat la fel în toate statele, nu faceți decât să induceți euroscepticism.

Și vă întreb, ce să spun eu cetățenilor mei din România când li se încalcă celor 19 milioane de cetățeni dreptul pentru că Austria, de exemplu, nu ne lasă să intrăm în Schengen? Deci, nu circulăm la fel. Până la urmă, statul de drept nu trebuie să fie o sintagmă, trebuie să fie ceva practic.

**Γεώργιος Κύρτσος (Renew).** – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, δύο ζητήματα από αυτά που αναφέρονται στην έκθεση της Επιτροπής σχετικά με την Ελλάδα τράβηξαν την προσοχή μου: Το ένα έχει σχέση με τα προβλήματα σε ό,τι αφορά τη λειτουργία των μέσων ενημέρωσης, των μίντια. Το άλλο έχει σχέση με τις πολιτικές, ουσιαστικά κυβερνητικές, εξαρτήσεις της δικαιοσύνης. Συμφωνώ, γιατί τα έχω ζησει και τα δύο. Διαφώνησα σαν πρώην δημοσιογράφος και εκδότης με την κυβερνητική πολιτική ελέγχου των μέσων ενημέρωσης και διαγράφηκα από το κυβερνητικό κόμμα. Επειδή φυσικά δεν συμβιβάστηκα, χαρακτηρίστηκα, με ευθύνη του πρωθυπουργού, κίνδυνος για την εθνική ασφάλεια και έπεσα θύμα τηλεφωνικών υποκλοπών από την Εθνική Υπηρεσία Πληροφοριών για 18 μήνες. Στη συνέχεια, η Δικαιοσύνη, αντί να στραφεί κατά των υπευθύνων για τις υποκλοπές, στράφηκε κατά του προέδρου της ανεξάρτητης Αρχής που τεκμηρίωσε την απαράδεκτη παρακολούθηση ενός ευρωβουλευτή. Όλα αυτά είναι εντελώς εκτός πλαισίου ευρωπαϊκού κράτους δικαίου.

(Ende der spontanen Wortmeldungen)

**Didier Reynders, membre de la Commission.** – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Secrétaire d'État, Mesdames et Messieurs les députés, pour conclure ce débat, je voudrais souligner à nouveau que le rapport n'est pas une fin en soi, mais un point de départ pour contribuer à des changements nécessaires et à l'amélioration de la connaissance mutuelle. Il tente également de diffuser une culture de l'état de droit dans toute l'Union européenne.

Cela implique que les États membres poursuivent le débat sur le rapport et ses recommandations. Pour faciliter cet engagement, la Commission se rend de manière proactive dans les États membres pour discuter des problèmes mis en évidence dans le rapport. Ces discussions se poursuivent au niveau tant politique que technique avec tous les États membres et je suis certain qu'elles se poursuivront également au sein de votre Parlement.

J'ai eu l'occasion de me rendre régulièrement dans des parlements nationaux, de rencontrer les autorités nationales, mais nous avons aussi lancé des débats avec l'ensemble des acteurs de la société civile sur les recommandations du rapport. Je crois que c'est un élément important si l'on veut diffuser cette culture de l'état de droit.

Mais pour revenir au Parlement européen, à votre Parlement, je me réjouis d'entamer bientôt des débats politiques avec vous au sujet des chapitres du rapport concernant les différents États membres, comme cela a lieu au Conseil chaque semestre à propos de cinq États membres – et nous avons terminé le premier cycle des États membres et entamé déjà un deuxième cycle d'examen individuels.

Je voudrais d'ailleurs constater que beaucoup de vos interventions ont fait référence à la situation dans un certain nombre d'États membres. Bien sûr, comme cela a été souvent le cas, des références à la situation en Hongrie et en Pologne. Je voudrais signaler que depuis que nous utilisons non seulement le rapport, mais aussi les instruments budgétaires qui sont à notre disposition, les plans de relance et de résilience comme la conditionnalité, nous avons enfin pu entamer un débat sur de premières propositions de réformes législatives concernant le pouvoir judiciaire dans ces deux pays. Nous ne sommes pas au bout de notre démarche, mais au moins il y a une évolution grâce à cette combinaison de moyens mis en œuvre.

J'ai pris bonne note des différentes remarques concernant en passant le Portugal, l'Espagne, la Slovénie, la Grèce, la Roumanie, Malte, la Slovaquie, la Belgique, et j'en ai certainement oublié, dans vos interventions. Je le répète, je suis à votre disposition pour organiser ces débats État membre par État membre, pour parcourir les 27 chapitres. Cela permettra notamment d'aborder le suivi des recommandations émises par la Commission à l'égard de chaque État membre.

Nous en sommes maintenant, on l'a rappelé, à la quatrième édition du rapport, et j'aimerais insister sur l'importance de débattre du contenu des réformes nécessaires plutôt que de la méthodologie du rapport annuel qui est maintenant bien établie, en collaboration avec les États membres, mais aussi avec beaucoup d'autres partenaires.

Gardiennne des traités, la Commission publie chaque année son évaluation sur la base de nombreuses expertises externes, sans déléguer ses responsabilités. Cela permet d'ailleurs de garantir la légitimité du rapport. C'est le rôle de la Commission de donner sa propre évaluation à la fin de tout ce travail réalisé avec de très nombreux partenaires, et pas seulement avec les États membres.

À nouveau, je vous remercie pour vos interventions aujourd'hui et je me réjouis de pouvoir entamer non seulement ce débat général sur le rapport, mais aussi le débat sur les différents chapitres concernant les États membres qui ont retenu votre attention déjà aujourd'hui.

**Pascual Ignacio Navarro Ríos**, *presidente en ejercicio del Consejo*. – Señora presidenta, señorías, señor comisario, muchas gracias por este debate y por sus comentarios y observaciones.

Simplemente y de manera breve querría concluir diciendo que me parece que estamos todos de acuerdo en la importancia de contar con herramientas sólidas de prevención para proteger nuestros valores y, en particular, el Estado de Derecho. Y, en este sentido, como ha indicado el comisario, la Presidencia española del Consejo está resuelta a continuar la labor de seguir reforzando el diálogo del Consejo sobre Estado de Derecho. Y, en este proceso, el informe de la Comisión sobre el Estado de Derecho, sobre el que hoy hemos tenido ocasión de debatir en este Parlamento, es esencial.

Simplemente quiero darles las gracias por su atención.

**Die Präsidentin**. – Die Aussprache ist geschlossen.

*Schriftliche Erklärungen (Artikel 171)*

**Victor Negrescu (S&D)**, *în scris*. – Comisia Europeană a prezentat recent recomandarea către Consiliu privind ridicarea Mecanismului de Cooperare și Verificare pentru România. Acest lucru confirmă drumul bun realizat de țara noastră în vederea consolidării democrației, a valorilor europene, justiției și drepturilor fundamentale.

Statele membre urmează să se pronunțe privind această propunere până la finalul verii, conducând, practic, la eliminarea unui obstacol important în procesul de aderare la spațiul Schengen. De altfel, este fundamental ca tratatele și legislația europeană să fie permanent respectate de toate instituțiile și statele membre și să nu se admită niciun fel de încălcare a mecanismelor de funcționare ale UE.

Din păcate, însă, acest principiu nu se aplică astăzi în totalitate. De exemplu, țării mele, România, i-a fost negat dreptul de a face parte din spațiul Schengen, într-un mod arbitrar și discriminatoriu, în contradicție cu tratatele europene, cu toate că îndeplinește în totalitate criteriile de aderare. Astfel, este necesar să elaborăm mecanisme concrete la nivelul UE care să rezolve aceste situații de conflict juridic, precum cea în care se găsește astăzi România și să asigure faptul că toți actorii instituționali respectă în permanență principiile și tratatele europene.

## 12. Przyjęcie protokołu poprzedniego posiedzenia

**Die Präsidentin**. – Das Protokoll der gestrigen Sitzung und die angenommenen Texte sind verfügbar.

Gibt es Einwände?



Das Protokoll ist damit genehmigt.

### 13. Pakiet dotyczący ekologizacji transportu (debata)

**Die Präsidentin.** – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über die Erklärung der Kommission zum Paket „Ökologisierung des Verkehrs“ (2023/2786(RSP)).

**Jutta Urpilainen, Member of the Commission.** – Madam President, honourable Members, I am taking this floor on behalf of Commissioner Vălean, who is in the press room at the moment. So freight transport is the backbone of our single market and our trade with the rest of the world. Rate volumes are projected to rise by 50 % by 2050. This stands as testimony to the health and competitiveness of our economy. At the same time, rate also accounts for 30 % of transport Co2 emissions. Reducing these is vital to delivering on our European Green Deal objectives. But we must do this while allowing our single market to grow. In response to these challenges and opportunities, today, a couple hours ago, the College adopted the Greening Freight Package, which aims to help the sector to decarbonise, further harmonise our rules in the single market and better structure allocation of rail-freight capacity across borders. Concretely, the Greening Freight Package comprises a regulation creating a harmonised framework for Co2 emissions (CountEmissions EU), the revision of the Weights and Dimensions Directive, a regulation on improving the use of railway infrastructure, the revision of the Combined Transport Directive, which is planned for adoption later this month.

To provide an overview of the package, we have a communication explaining the rationale behind it and how the proposals fit in with the bigger picture. It also highlights the people behind freight-transport services setting the scene for addressing worker shortages, improving their working environment and tackling an ageing workforce.

So let me now turn to the three legislative initiatives on the table today. CountEmissions EU: This proposal establishes a single methodology to calculate transport service emissions. It will be based on a global ISO standard recently adopted. Already today we see transport operators informing their customers of the impact of the Co2 emissions of their trips. However, we don't know how this impact has been calculated, and this is what we tackle with this proposal, ensuring businesses and consumers get reliable and comparable data when being informed about their carbon footprint for passenger services, but also for freight. There is notably no obligation on economic operators to provide their carbon footprint. And we have paid particular attention not to burden the sector, in particular SMEs.

The second proposal and initiative is the Weights and Dimensions Directive. The shift to clean trucks in particular, zero-emission vehicles will take time. Naturally, we need additional incentives to make them more attractive and increase their uptake. Our proposal intends to do this by allowing an additional weight of four tonnes for zero-emission vehicles to accommodate the weight of batteries without losing loading capacity. This is critical for a sector where most hauliers are SMEs and make a very careful cost-benefit analysis of every euro spent on fleet renewable. We remain technologically neutral. Should the market opt for hydrogen based solutions, we propose technical adjustments to host tanks behind the cabin without losing load capacity. Moreover, we are finally putting an end to today's patchwork of national rules and bilateral agreements for high capacity vehicles which were at odds with the single market. We are not pushing anyone to embrace longer and/or heavier trucks where this is not accepted today. We are simply ending the situation in which more efficient trucks currently allowed in two or more neighbouring Member States cannot cross the borders between these. Standard 44 tonne trucks currently allowed in national traffic in 12 Member States will also be able to travel cross borders between allowing Member States, for example, a truck will be able to travel from the Netherlands to France, while until now their journey needed to end in Belgium.

Finally, we make life easier for road operators and important industries such as renewables and tech companies, which today face a platform of national requirements and procedures when transporting, for example, a piece of a wind turbine across borders.

Our third initiative is rail capacity regulation. Rail is one of the cleanest ways to transport freight, but current rules on capacity allocation are ineffective and particularly unfavourable to cross-border and freight services. And unfortunately, this makes rail unattractive for many logistics companies. Better management of capacity will help address this. So more concretely, our proposal will incentivise infrastructure managers to act in a more flexible way for both long-term strategic planning and short-term capacity allocation. With optimised use of the network, we will be bringing additional capacity and creating space for additional services. Railway undertakings will be able to request capacity at any time based on market needs instead of having the file requests within rigid timelines. We are also discouraging some practices

by which companies reserve capacity just in case and do not use it. Equally, infrastructure managers will have to plan works on the network well in advance and take measures to reduce their impact on operations.

Let me conclude, honourable Members. The European freight sector is at a turning point. With increasing demand, it must become less polluting and more resilient while continuing to thrive in tomorrow's globalised economy.

**Barbara Thaler**, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Madam President, Commissioner, dear colleagues, let us be frank, shall we? Road transport is working because we have a working internal market for road transport. It is as simple as that. And looking at the changes the Commission just made to the Weights and Dimensions Directive, road transport will be even more attractive in the future. Good for road, bad for the others.

In the new proposal, the Commission gives Member States more possibilities to increase the productivity of road transport by 50%, from 40 to 60 tonnes. A similar jump in productivity for rail would correspond to 1 110-metre trains. Road transport is closely linked to our single market, but rail is more or less loosely attached to kind of a principle and abstract concept of the internal market.

Which brings me to the rail capacity proposal. Instead of a single European railway area, we have 25 railway islands. By sheer luck, you will find two or more countries which have the same operational rules, technical standards and infrastructure. And instead of addressing the big white elephant in the room, we have again the proposal on the table, which is tailor-made to please 25 Member States at the cost of the whole sector, at the cost of our whole economy and environment. But again, we leave railway companies at the mercy of 25 national infrastructure managers. Kindly asking them to think more European will not do the trick. But I am confident that we – that Parliament – will amend this proposal accordingly.

And lastly, on your proposal on counting emissions: a harmonised standard for counting emissions is nice, but as long as the majority in this House pretends that electricity from coal is zero emission, so long it is without any added value for the climate. However, the EPP is ready to improve the package and close the first reading in this mandate.

**Bogusław Liberadzki**, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Madam President, Madam Commissioner, my warm greetings to Commissioner Vălean. It is a little bit of a pity that she's not present.

The Greening Transport Package is something that's been quite expected, and we do not expect the big discovery of the wheel again, but we expect a kind of putting in order of what we have as crucial issues. And these items, they are correct. As Socialists and Democrats, we will accept it.

For CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, as my predecessor said, it is important to know the source, even for green or electric energy, and to unify the ways in which we calculate emissions.

This is of course of crucial importance for vehicles, there is another aspect, but it is not only a matter of heavy vehicles of 44 tonnes: it would be a matter for all categories of vehicles in different applications. I welcome very much this increase of 4.25 tons for small vehicles. It is quite justified. It means less vehicles to serve, it means less traffic.

What could be probably crucial is creating infrastructure to increase European railway capacity. This is indeed something that we are dealing with in very different ways and not exactly efficiently. We would very much welcome it if we could make better use of existing infrastructure, when we can bring railways back on the track of increasing market share and also to overcome the limitations of border-crossing facilities. What is important in this case is a kind of European approach, having in mind a European railway space.

I am quite sure from what you stated, Madam Commissioner, that you realise that transport keeps Europe moving. Without transport in Europe we stop. Without transport, our social life will be very much deteriorated. We will support, we will do our best in the Socialist Group to process it during this term.

**José Ramón Bauzá Díaz**, *en nombre del Grupo Renew*. – Señora presidenta, estimada comisaria, hoy tenemos al sector agrícola y ganadero en pie de guerra frente al Parlamento por una serie de medidas que está tomando la Comisión Europea.

Más allá del contenido de las mismas, de si contribuyen o no a la lucha contra el cambio climático o de si impactan o no en la economía, lo cierto es que hay sectores productivos de la sociedad descontentos con algunas de las propuestas que esta Comisión Europea está presentando.

Esta será recordada como la legislatura del Pacto Verde. Hemos aprobado el paquete en materia de sostenibilidad más ambicioso de la historia de la Unión Europea y lo hemos hecho en un tiempo récord. Por supuesto, porque las implicaciones que el cambio climático tiene en nuestro planeta así lo merecen y porque hay que revertirlas.

Pero, aun así, permítame que me pregunte si en algún momento durante estos cuatro años no hemos sido demasiado obsesivos. Todavía estamos deliberando sobre muchas de las propuestas puestas encima de la mesa hace unos meses y hoy se nos presenta un nuevo paquete de medidas para acelerar la transición en el sector de la carretera.

Señora comisaria, no pongo en absoluto en duda la efectividad de estas medidas, pero permítame decirle que lo que necesita el sector del transporte por carretera no es más normativa, sino más tiempo y más recursos para poder permitirse una transición altamente costosa. Los transportistas desean disponer de flotas de vehículos más sostenibles, por supuesto, pero no solamente necesitan solvencia económica para asumir el elevado precio, sino que también requieren puestos de recarga, por ejemplo, para moverse del norte al sur o del este a oeste de la Unión Europea.

Por lo tanto, no nos pongamos a los sectores productivos en contra, como ha ocurrido esta mañana en las puertas de esta Cámara: mantengamos el diálogo y promovamos una escucha activa con el sector para ir de la mano en esta transición que nos preocupa y nos ocupa a todos, porque de lo contrario solamente tendremos una cosa asegurada y es que nos irá mal a todos.

**Karima Delli**, *au nom du groupe Verts/ALE*. – Madame la Présidente, Madame la Commissaire, mes chers collègues, s'il fallait encore le rappeler, l'urgence climatique est là. Elle nous terrasse toutes et tous, et elle nous terrassera encore plus demain si nous ne faisons rien.

Le transport, c'est un quart des émissions de CO<sub>2</sub> dans l'Union européenne et c'est le seul secteur qui n'a pas réduit ses émissions de gaz à effet de serre depuis 1990. Le constat est donc simple: pour parvenir à nos objectifs climatiques et à la neutralité carbone à l'horizon de 2050, le fret ferroviaire doit véritablement devenir une priorité. Oui, le fret doit se transformer, se verdir, se réinventer. Et c'est dans cette optique que nous devons aller vers une part modale du fret ferroviaire de 30 % d'ici à 2030. Mais nous sommes encore trop loin, en dessous de la barre des 20 %.

Alors, les propositions législatives aujourd'hui sont insuffisantes à cet égard. Pour parvenir à cet objectif, il nous faut des législations claires, des investissements, des filières, parce que derrière il y a de l'emploi, mais aussi une énorme volonté politique. Nous devons également protéger le fret ferroviaire existant et la Commission ne doit absolument pas le démanteler dans certains États membres. Nous allons nous pencher sur ces textes dès que possible. Je regrette cependant que ces propositions n'arrivent que maintenant, à moins d'un an des élections européennes.

Nous le martelons depuis maintenant des années, la transition écologique ne peut pas attendre. Elle ne peut plus attendre qui que ce soit, quoi que ce soit. C'est pour cela que nous vous demandons, et je vous le dis en tant que présidente de la commission des transports de cet hémicycle, d'agir vite, avec force et rapidité, parce que nous sommes déjà en retard.

**Έλενα Κουντουρά**, *εξ ονόματος της ομάδας The Left*. – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, ευχαριστώ πολύ, κυρία Επίτροπε, για την παρουσίασή σας. Για να πετύχουμε τους κλιματικούς μας στόχους, πρέπει να αυξηθούν οι σιδηροδρομικές μεταφορές κατά 50% μέχρι το 2030 και να διπλασιαστούν έως το 2050. Οι στόχοι αυτοί είναι πραγματικά δύσκολο να επιτευχθούν, αν λάβουμε υπόψη ότι η Επιτροπή προσπαθεί εδώ και δεκαετίες να πετύχει την αύξηση των σιδηροδρομικών μεταφορών, ενώ τα στοιχεία δείχνουν ότι, αντίθετα με τις προθέσεις, οι σιδηροδρομικές μεταφορές έχουν χάσει έδαφος από τις οδικές μεταφορές.

Μετά από τέσσερα νομοθετικά πακέτα, η αγορά των σιδηροδρόμων δεν έχει φέρει τα αποτελέσματα που έχει υποσχεθεί η Επιτροπή και που απαιτεί η καταπολέμηση της κλιματικής αλλαγής. Για να είμαστε λοιπόν συνεπείς με τις κλιματικές μας υποχρεώσεις, θα χρειαστούν γενναίες και ριζοσπαστικές πολιτικές, με στόχο την ασφάλεια, την ποιότητα και το προσιτό κόστος, και μεγάλες δημόσιες επενδύσεις στα μέσα σταθερής τροχιάς, που να αντιστοιχούν στο ύψος των προκλήσεων και να βρίσκονται στον αντίποδα των ιδιωτικοποιήσεων και της εγκατάλειψης των υποδομών. Υπό αυτό λοιπόν το πρίσμα, θα αξιολογήσουμε τις επόμενες ημέρες τις σημερινές σας προτάσεις.

**Andor Deli (NI).** – Elnök Asszony! Ez a csomag egy újabb fontos eleme a közlekedés zöld átállását ösztönző keretnek az EU ban. Am arról sem szabad megfeledkeznünk, hogy a teher- és személyszállítást illetően inkább a földrajzi Európában kellene gondolkodni. Ezért kiemelten fontos az Unióval közvetlenül szomszédos nyugat-balkáni országok közlekedési infrastruktúrájának fejlesztése is. Mindezeknek a jogszabályoknak a végrehajtása jelentős eszközöket fog igényelni, ami megköveteli az uniós pénzügyi támogatások növelését is.

Mégis azt kell tapasztalnunk, hogy a vasúti és közúti fejlesztéseket támogató Európai Hálózatfinanszírozási Eszköz, a CEF keretei évek óta stagnálnak, sőt csökkennek. Látva az idei költségvetést és a 2024-es költségvetési tervezetet, a kohéziós alapokból származó kifizetések is történelmi minimumon vannak. Továbbá az új források közül a helyreállítási alap kifizetései három év után mindössze 160 milliárdot értek el a 740 ból, és 5 tagállam még egyáltalán nem részesült támogatásban. Ezért felhívnam a figyelmet arra, hogy ahhoz, hogy sikeres legyen az átállás, összhangra van szükség az EU pénzügyi támogatási rendszerei és a szakpolitikai célkitűzések között. Máskülönb e célok csak papíron fognak megvalósulni.

**Massimiliano Salini (PPE).** – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, abbiamo osservato alcuni elementi davvero positivi nella proposta della Commissione, con riferimento in prima battuta alla nuova possibile gestione della capacità ferroviaria. In quell'ambito sicuramente c'è spazio per un lavoro interessante.

I miglioramenti in termini di efficienza della gestione dell'infrastruttura esistente fanno stimare una performance che potrebbe migliorare del 4 %; considerate che su 200 000 chilometri di infrastrutture ferroviarie un miglioramento dell'efficienza del 4 % equivale a dire 8 000 chilometri in più di infrastruttura ferroviaria utilizzata senza averla costruita. In continuità con l'ERTMS è una buona notizia.

Sul tema, invece, del trasporto su gomma ci sono nuove regole che fanno nascere veramente molti dubbi. Da un lato, l'eccesso di regole relative all'elettrificazione – diciamo così – della mobilità su gomma, che apre uno scenario sul quale la discussione all'interno del Parlamento è ancora molto aperta e, in generale, il tema dell'armonizzazione tra vari paesi.

È un lavoro che dobbiamo continuare a fare, ci sono lati positivi e lati negativi su cui lavorare.

**Erik Bergkvist (S&D).** – Fru talman! Bästa ledamöter. Vi har i flera år nu jobbat med att ställa om våra transportsystem så att de ska bli gröna. Vägen till målet är fortfarande guppig, och många farliga korsningar återstår.

Några viktiga problem som måste hanteras är bland annat den stora bristen på chaufförer för tunga fordon. Vi måste också snabba på gröna bränslen och en effektivare användning av de bränslen som vi har idag. Kostnaderna för ny infrastruktur och underhåll av den nuvarande är väldigt höga. Stora och långa transporter kan här göra väldigt stor nytta och bidra till effektiviseringar och harmoniseringar i hela transportsystemet.

Kan vi hitta en bra balans här tar vi viktiga steg i den gröna omställningen. Vägen mot målet är inte längre lika guppig och antalet farliga korsningar inte lika många.

**Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (Renew).** – Señora presidenta, señora comisaria, descarbonizar el transporte es una de las claves para alcanzar nuestros objetivos climáticos. Saludo este paquete porque incide en cuestiones críticas para conseguirlo, incluidas las emisiones y los vehículos. Espero que nos anime, además, a cumplir normas que ya tenemos, como el paquete de movilidad y el ferroviario, que son una base excelente para afrontar esta transformación. Subrayo cuatro ideas:

La clave: las personas. Necesitamos una formación profesional predictiva para preparar a los profesionales que necesita un sistema integrado de movilidad.

El instrumento: la digitalización. No podremos mejorar en la gestión e integración de los modos de transporte sin un ecosistema de datos de movilidad.

Las condiciones: cumplir nuestros compromisos de inversión en infraestructuras y equiparlas. Las vías ERTMS multiplican la capacidad y la velocidad que pueden acoger nuestros corredores prioritarios de transporte.

Y el contexto: abordar esta transición con transparencia y buscar la complicidad ciudadana, recordando cada día que este proceso necesita del compromiso de cada uno de nosotros.

La recompensa: aire más limpio y mejores servicios.

**Ciarán Cuffe (Verts/ALE).** – Madam President, Commissioner, the transport proposals you have released today are very welcome. We need more transparency on emissions so that people and business can make sustainable transport choices. We need to improve our rail services and we need to prepare heavy-duty vehicles for the green transition.

However, I am concerned about your final proposal on the weights and dimensions of vehicles. I hear that this proposal could bring more mega trucks or ginaliners onto EU roads by regulating bilateral deals between EU countries on cross-border travel by these vehicles.

Commissioner, I do not want to remind you, just like the SUVs, giant vehicles like these are dangerous for other road users. They are damaging to our roads, our bridges and our tunnels. They are more polluting and cancel out any gains made through emission reductions and they undermine the crucial shift to rail. So I hope you do not want to allow more of these dangerous and polluting vehicles on our roads and that you can provide clarity on this proposal.

**Henna Virkkunen (PPE).** – Madam President, dear Commissioner Urpilainen, I would like to thank the Commission for presenting the greening transport package. Of course, it needs to be closely analysed now, but it's a very important topic, as we know, because we have great challenges in reducing emissions in road transport. But much is already being done and many methods are being developed.

There are three points that I would like to underline here when we speak about greening the transport sector. First, competitiveness: it is important to make sure that the methods to reduce emissions are environmentally sustainable, but also economically and socially sustainable.

Second, flexibility: it's important to keep in mind that we have very different regions in Europe and their different conditions need to be taken into account. And this is why Member States need flexibility to their own solutions.

And the third is about technology neutrality. We know that many different means are needed for successful solutions here. So the regulation must be made for the long term, be future-proof and also technology-neutral.

And in addition to these three points, we also need more investments in digitalisation, automation and modern infrastructure to be competitive in the future.

**Kathleen Van Brempt (S&D).** – Voorzitter, commissaris, het belang van logistiek kan uiteraard niet voldoende benadrukt worden. Dat heeft trouwens de pandemie – maar ook de energiecrisis – nog maar eens duidelijk bewezen.

Ik wil heel erg benadrukken dat de toekomst van onze logistieke sector zich op drie assen bevindt die ook erg met elkaar verbonden zijn. Uiteraard duurzaamheid, vergroening, de Green Deal – *without any doubt* –, maar ook de digitalisering. En de digitalisering kan ook écht aanleiding geven tot het verder vergroenen. Maar het zal u niet verbazen dat ik als sociaaldemocraat ook erg wil benadrukken hoe goede jobs, kwaliteitsvolle jobs, goedbetaalde jobs belangrijk zijn in de sector.

Een duidelijk en eenvormig kader voor het meten en berekenen van uitstoot is essentieel in het pakket dat jullie vandaag voorstellen. Maar van even groot belang is dat we transportsystemen ook beter op elkaar afstemmen, omdat ze goed met elkaar te combineren zijn. En daarom roep ik de Commissie op om erg snel werk te maken van de richtlijn gecombineerd vervoer. Elk initiatief dat ons op de weg zet naar een duurzame, eerlijke en moderne transportsector kan op de steun van mijn fractie rekenen.

**Jan-Christoph Oetjen (Renew).** – Frau Präsidentin, Frau Kommissarin, verehrte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Ich finde es gut, dass jetzt der Vorschlag endlich vorliegt für die Ökologisierung des Verkehrs. Gerade das Thema der Emissionsmessung ist, glaube ich, eins, mit dem wir mehr Transparenz für die Bürgerinnen und Bürger erreichen können.

Wir als Freie Demokraten werden dafür kämpfen, dass in diesem Bericht steht, dass die technologische Neutralität hochgehalten wird. Ich glaube, wir brauchen für den CO<sub>2</sub>—neutralen Transport von Gütern möglichst alle Technologien, die uns zur Verfügung stehen. Denn Speditionsunternehmen sind in der Regel Mittelständler, und sie brauchen für ihr Geschäftsmodell das passende Fahrzeug mit der passenden Infrastruktur, verehrte Kolleginnen und Kollegen!

Ich möchte an dieser Stelle einmal sagen, weil ja hier so die Angst aufgemacht wird vor den Riesen-Lkw: Größere Lkw, längere Lkw sind ökologischer, denn sie emittieren weniger CO<sub>2</sub> pro transportierter Tonne Fracht. Sie haben auch eine niedrigere Achslast pro Achse und sind deswegen auch für den Straßenverkehr durchaus gut zu gebrauchen. Und sie können auf definierten Strecken gut eingesetzt werden und sind deswegen ein guter Beitrag zur Dekarbonisierung des Verkehrs.

**Anna Deparnay-Grunenberg (Verts/ALE).** – Frau Präsidentin! Mehr Güter auf die Schiene, liebe Freundinnen und Freunde, meine Damen und Herren, das wollen wir ewig schon! Dieses Paket enthält mehrere Gesetze mit genau diesem Potenzial. Ein Gesetz z. B. regelt, wie man Fahrpläne international abstimmt. Es macht außerdem für Logistikunternehmen flexibler, Trassen zu buchen. Auch die Richtlinie zum kombinierten Verkehr, also Schiene und Lkw gemischt, hat enormes Potenzial fürs Klima. Richtig aufregend finde ich den Vorschlag zu CountEmissions EU. Da heißt es eben: Logistikunternehmen müssen offenlegen, wie viel Emissionen sie jeweils beim Transport von Gütern verursachen. Die Bahn wird da natürlich die große Gewinnerin sein.

Auch die nächsten Schritte sind für uns damit klar. Wir brauchen ein Siegel für umweltfreundlichen Gütertransport, und wir wollen auch mehr Transparenz für den Personenverkehr. Als Reisende weiß ich dann schon beim Buchen, mit welchem Verkehrsmittel ich persönlich welchen Einfluss auf das Klima nehme, und da fahre ich persönlich öfter Bahn oder schicke als Unternehmen eben meine Ware über die Schiene.

Packen wir es an! Ich freue mich auf diese Arbeit.

**Seán Kelly (PPE).** – *A Uachtaráin*, heavy-duty transport is the backbone of trade and commerce in Europe: 73% of all freight transported by land in the EU is carried by trucks. Alongside rail freight, trucks deliver goods safely across Europe. These extensive and integrated supply chains keep our supermarket shelves stocked.

However, the sector causes negative impacts on the environment. Heavy-duty transport is responsible for nearly one third of the EU's road transport CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, primarily driven by growth in economic activity. The sheer volume of transport activity has impacted our greenhouse gas emissions, and demands on all types of transport are expected to increase. This is a natural progression as economies develop.

The greening transport package proposes measures to rethink the allocation of rail track capacity and the methodology for counting the emissions of a transport job. In recent years, cleaner road vehicles and fuels have become more and more available, and I'm aware of big efforts being made by many heavy-duty transport manufacturers to use technology to reduce emissions. I think we should work with the industry and establish a fundamental shift towards sustainability in the way goods and people move around.

**Achille Variati (S&D).** – Signora Presidente, signora Commissaria, onorevoli colleghi, ho ascoltato con piacere la presentazione da parte della Commissione di questo nuovo pacchetto che, con diversi interventi legislativi, punta a rendere il settore dei trasporti più sostenibile.

Accolgo con favore l'intenzione di proporre misure per gestire, coordinare e aumentare le capacità delle ferrovie. Il trasporto ferroviario, infatti, è una modalità di trasporto efficiente dal punto di vista energetico e rispettosa dell'ambiente.

Tuttavia i servizi transfrontalieri di trasporto merci e passeggeri continuano a incontrare ostacoli che ne limitano la competitività e l'attrattività.

Allo stesso modo, sono favorevole a una introduzione di metodologie specifiche per l'assegnazione del biglietto di viaggio da parte degli operatori del quantitativo di CO<sub>2</sub> emesso dal mezzo di trasporto per le tratte acquistate. Ritengo che questa possa essere una valida misura per sensibilizzare i viaggiatori.

Infine, per quanto riguarda l'armonizzazione delle dimensioni dei camion elettrici, sono d'accordo sul fatto di tener conto dell'evoluzione delle batterie per l'elettrico, ma ritengo che la sicurezza stradale debba sempre essere messa al primo posto e pertanto saranno necessarie, secondo me, maggiori valutazioni su questo aspetto per un'armonizzazione per la circolazione sulle strade europee di mega camion di peso maggiorato fino a quattro tonnellate.

**Andreas Schieder (S&D).** – Frau Präsidentin, Frau Kommissarin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Es gibt viele gute Punkte in diesem Paket, aber auch einige Kritikpunkte. Einer ist: Wieder einmal plant die Kommission Riesen-Lkw, sogenannte Gigaliner, zuzulassen. Geht es nach den Vorschlägen, die wir heute gehört haben, werden auf Europas Straßen nun auch grenzüberschreitend Monstertrucks rollen. Ich halte das, ehrlich gesagt, für einen verkehrspolitischen Irrweg. Warum? Weil es eine Verkehrsverlagerung in die falsche Richtung ist, nämlich von der Schiene wieder zurück auf die Straße. Und das wollen wir nicht.

Zusätzlich gibt es noch enorme Kosten für die Umrüstung, z. B. der Infrastruktur. Dieses ganze Geld, das man da investieren muss, wäre wohl besser in den Ausbau der Schiene und der Eisenbahn und den Umstieg von der Straße auf die Schiene investiert. Denn dann erreichen wir die Klimaziele besser, setzen den Grünen Deal besser um, bringen mehr Sicherheit auf unsere Straßen und auch mehr faire Arbeitsbedingungen für die Lkw-Fahrer. Daher ein ganz klares Nein zu den Gigalinern, ein Nein zu Riesen-Lkws auf unseren Straßen.

**Vera Tax (S&D).** – Madam President, dear Commissioner, I welcome the freight greening package that will address the problems in long-distance and cross-border rail transport, but also on the issue of the weight and size of trucks. The latter will have positive implications for zero-emission heavy vehicles and aligns the weight limit with the introduction of electric heavy vehicles to offset batteries.

I welcome the increased rail capacity. European rail freight is the most efficient way to transport goods over longer distances and avoid heavy congestion on roads and pollution. But at the moment there is no efficiency because of fragmented national rail systems that cause high costs and waiting times at border crossings. This European Commission proposal improves coordination between national capacity managers and aligns rules to increase the share of European rail traffic. Corridors and corridor management should not be limited to rail, but also include ports, terminals and unloading and uploading stations connecting to maritime and road transport.

#### *Catch-the-eye procedure*

**Clare Daly (The Left).** – Madam President, so we have a new package published by the Commission less than a year before the end of the mandate and we're expected to believe that it's finally going to be possible to transfer road traffic to rail with the resulting reduction in emissions. I mean, come on. We have to look at the 10 years up to 2021 where we've actually seen rail's share of total freight transport decreasing in 16 of the Member States that have railways, while road freight transport has increased by 1.7%.

Now we know that freight transport is continuing to grow, expected to increase by about 40% by 2030 and 80% by 2050. And we know the constraints that are on our roads with the shortage of drivers and so on. But rail transport has deep developmental constraints, partly as a result of European and national policies that have underinvested for decades. Not least, we have to reverse the approach and see rail as a public asset requiring public investment, while rail freight should be recognised as a service of public interest, which is completely against the neoliberal privatised model that so many of our Member States have adopted.

**Mick Wallace (The Left).** – Madam President, if we were serious about addressing the transport problems from a congestion point of view, from a resource point to view, from an environmental point of view, how in God's name have we not done more to advance the rail project? You go around any country in Europe and you'll see a rail track that's not even being used, that's actually been closed down. I see it in Ireland. I see it in Italy. I see rail in France that's not being used.

OK, we made improvements between some of the big cities with some fast track, but very little of it. China has built 30 000 km of fast-track rail. Now Europe has only a fraction of that because we don't seem to have had the appetite for it. It's a no-brainer from the environmental point of view. But yet we're not going there: if we're serious about it, we seem to be able to do what we really want to do when we set up a task of doing it. But we haven't done it with rail and it's madness.

*(End of catch-the-eye procedure)*

**Jutta Urpilainen, Member of the Commission.** – Madam President, honourable Members, first, I want to thank you for this very interesting debate, and I will definitely pass all your messages to my dear colleague, Commissioner Vălean, who is still in the press room. The European freight sector is at a turning point. Demand is increasing, but it must seize the opportunities offered by the dual green and digital transition to become less polluting and more resilient and to continue to thrive in tomorrow's globalised economy. All modes need to play their part and work more efficiently, individually and together. And these steps to green freight transport will take us further along the path set out by the Sustainable and Smart Mobility Strategy towards achieving our European Green Deal objectives for transport. The initiatives in today's package all target decarbonisation. They aim to reduce the environmental impact of rail transport and will also allow our single market to grow. They build on and complement the various initiatives already put forward during this Commission's mandate.

So I count on the European Parliament's support to rapidly take up the proposals we have put on the table today, so that an agreement can be reached still under this mandate. Thank you very much for this debate.

## SĒDI VADA: ROBERTS ZĪLE

*Priekšsēdētājas vietnieks*

**Sēdes vadītājs.** – Debates ir slēgtas.

*Rakstiski paziņojumi (171. pants)*

**Marian-Jean Marinescu (PPE), în scris.** – Încă de la lansarea Green Deal a fost evident că fără decarbonizarea transportului, reducerea emisiilor de carbon va fi imposibilă. O realitate pe deplin înțeleasă de industrie, care însă a semnalat constant că are nevoie de sprijin și de o abordare realistă în acest proces dificil și foarte costisitor.

În această ecuație foarte complicată, transportul feroviar este o soluție al cărei potențial nu este nici bine înțeles și nici bine exploatat de către cei care propun politicile Green Deal, cel puțin până acum.



De mult timp am atras atenția că relansarea transportului feroviar este genul de soluție care reduce din presiunea obligațiilor impuse celorlalte moduri de transport. În același timp, am spus și că fără finanțare și măsuri concrete, obiectivul *Shift to Rail* riscă să rămână doar un slogan.

Încă din 2019 am depus un proiect pilot care viza eliminarea blocajelor, îmbunătățirea interoperabilității feroviare, eliminarea legăturilor lipsă și îmbunătățirea tronsoanelor transfrontaliere, adică în mare parte ceea ce ne propune acum Comisia.

Deși venit cu mare întârziere, sper ca regulamentul privind utilizarea capacității de infrastructură feroviară să rezolve măcar o parte dintre probleme și în viitor să avem o cale ferată europeană integral conectată, operabilă și cu standarde comune.

## 14. Tura pytań do komisarzy – Strategia UE na rzecz Afryki

**Sēdes vadītājs.** – Nākamais darba kārtības punkts ir jautājumu laiks (Komisija) (Reglamenta 137. pants).

Šajā jautājumu laikā laipni lūdzu piedalīties komisāri Jutta Urpilainen.

Jautājumu laika temats: “ES un Āfrikas stratēģija”.

Šis jautājumu laiks ilgs aptuveni 60 minūtes.

Kā ierasts, jautājuma uzdošanai būs viena minūte, savukārt atbildes sniegšanai – divas minūtes.

Runātājiem pirmajā kārtā būs iespēja uzdot 30 sekunžu garu papildjautājumu ar divām minūtēm atbildes sniegšanai.

Atgādinu, ka iespējamo papildjautājumu var uzdot tikai tad, ja tas ir cieši saistīts ar galveno jautājumu un nav jauns jautājums.

Ja vēlaties uzdot jautājumu, aicinu jūs to reģistrēt jau tagad, izmantojot brīvā mikroфона funkciju jūsu balsošanas iekārtā pēc tam, kad būsiet tajā ievietojuši savu balsošanas karti.

Jautājumu laikā uzstāšanās notiks no vietas, un aicinu visus runātājus ievērot piešķirto uzstāšanās laiku.

Kolēģiem, iespējams, vajadzēs dažus brīžus, lai reģistrētu savu pieprasījumu uzdot jautājumu, izmantojot balsošanas iekārtu. Tāpēc vēlreiz aicinu jūs savu pieprasījumu iesniegt tagad, un mēs sāksim ar pirmo jautājumu.

**György Hölvényi (PPE).** – Elnök Úr! Több mint három év telt el azóta, hogy a Bizottság nyilvánosságra hozta az Unió Afrika-stratégiáját. Ebben partnerséget ígért az afrikai zöld átálláshoz, a digitalizációhoz, a munkahelyteremtéshez, a békéhez, valamint a migráció kezeléséhez. Jogosan merül fel a kérdés: teljesítettük-e az ígéreteinket? Biztonságosabb hely lett általunk Afrika? Sikerült e hatékonyan tennünk a migráció kiváltó okainak felszámolásáért?

A világ húsztíz leginstabilabb országa közül sajnos ma 15 Afrikában található. 2020 óta olyan stratégiai partnereink sodródtak polgárháborúba, vagy annak szélére, mint Etiópia, Szudán vagy Nigéria. Tisztelt Biztos Asszony, mit tehetünk azért, hogy jövőre az elmúlt öt év munkáját valóban kézzelfogható eredményekkel zárhassuk? Mit tehetünk azért, hogy az afrikai fiatalok elvándorlása helyett, helyben járulhassanak hozzá közösségei fejlődéséhez?

**Jutta Urpilainen, Member of the Commission.** – Thank you very much, honourable MEP, for your question. Indeed, in March 2020 we were able to adopt a new strategy for Africa – so a little bit over two or three years ago – and you ask whether we have already seen tangible results on the ground. Indeed, we are able to see tangible results on the ground. I'll just give you a couple of examples.

The first one is our MAV+ plus initiative, through which we are able to work with four different African countries – Ghana, Senegal, South Africa and Rwanda – in order to start vaccine and medicine manufacturing production in those countries. Because what we learned in the middle of the COVID was that Africa still imports 99% of the vaccines and 94% of its medicines. So we need to strengthen the resilience and strategic autonomy of Africa. It means that we have to help them to produce, for instance, more vaccines and medicines in their continent, in Africa for Africa.

Another very concrete example is, for instance, the energy sector. Just recently, a couple of weeks ago in Paris, we were able to approve a new JETP with Senegal, which means that we are able, together with our international partners and international banks, to accelerate the deployment of renewable energies in Senegal. We also have several energy projects in Nigeria, as well as the Ruzizi III hydropower plant in DRC, Burundi and Rwanda. So they are very tangible projects which are ongoing, but of course we still have a lot of work to do, taking into account the fact that our financial tool NDICI – Global Europe is also existing until the year 2027.

**György Hölvényi (PPE).** – Köszönöm a választát, Biztos Asszony, és abszolút egyetértek vele, és ezekben a törekvéseiben azt hiszem, a Bizottságot a frakcióm részéről mindig is támogattuk. Hangsúlyozni szeretném, hogy Afrika rendelkezik minden olyan lehetőséggel – és itt nekünk ezt alá kell húzni –, ami a kontinenst a 21. Század vezető régiójává, Európa első számú stratégiai szövetségésévé teheti.

De egyet muszáj kihangsúlyozni, a rendkívül fiatal és gyors, növekvő lakosság lehetőség, amivel élni kell. Ennek feltétele pedig, hogy az afrikai fiatalok megfelelő oktatást, szakképzést kapjanak. A most az iskolapadokban ülő generáció feladata lesz ugyanis, hogy meghozza azokat a stratégiai döntéseket, amelyek Afrikát a 21. század valóban győztesévé tehetik.

**Jutta Urpilainen, Member of the Commission.** – I fully agree with you. Actually, we have made a strategic choice in terms of education. So what I did as a Commissioner, I decided to increase our funding to education from 7% to 13%. We precisely – because most of the population in Africa are young people, over 60% of them are below 25 years old – decided to focus on education. Why? Because education is the most transformative tool one can use in developing and transforming societies. That is why we are prioritising education.

We have three main areas we are mainly focusing on. The first one is access to primary education for girls, because we know that girls are still lagging behind. The second priority area is vocational education and training. We know that many young people are entering the labour market in Africa but unfortunately, they are lacking in the skills which are required in the labour market. The third priority areas is teacher training, because it is not enough to access education. We also have to have quality education and that's why we need to improve the quality of education through teacher training. For instance, in January in South Africa, I was able to launch a regional teacher training initiative for sub-Saharan Africa worth EUR 100 million, precisely to train more teachers in Africa but also to improve the quality of teacher training in sub-Saharan African countries.

So I fully agree with you. We have to prioritise education and we have to pay more attention to the young people and young citizens of Africa.

**Maria Arena (S&D).** – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Commissaire, vous le savez et vous en êtes porteuse, nous avons, au niveau de l'Union européenne, une grande tradition de partenariat entre l'Union européenne et les pays africains, et je dirais même les pays d'Afrique, des Caraïbes et du Pacifique dans le cadre des accords de Lomé et de Cotonou – et j'espère post-Cotonou le plus rapidement possible, parce que le Conseil nous fait des caprices sur cette question. Mais j'aurais plusieurs questions.

La première concerne la stratégie, et on a quelques priorités en la matière, notamment la paix et la sécurité. Je prends un exemple: dans le Sahel aujourd'hui, on a deux situations différentes entre le Tchad et le Burkina Faso. Pour le Burkina Faso, l'aide budgétaire n'est plus possible aujourd'hui. Est-ce qu'il est possible de revenir à une cohérence et donc à une aide budgétaire au Burkina Faso pour aider effectivement la transition démocratique?

La deuxième question concerne la migration, qui est une autre priorité. On a vu dans les discussions sur le SPG que le Conseil et la Commission présentaient systématiquement une condition à la migration. Est-ce que vous pensez, vous qui êtes la commissaire du partenariat, que cette conditionnalité à la réadmission est une bonne chose?

Une dernière question concerne le développement durable. Nous allons travailler sur les matières premières critiques. À ce sujet, est-il dans vos intentions de conditionner l'accès à ces matières au consentement des populations?

**Jutta Urpilainen**, *Member of the Commission*. – Thank you very much for your questions. I try to cover them all, but let's see if I have time for that.

I start with Sahel. Indeed, this is a very strategic region for Europe, and we have also invested a lot in that region. But if I look at the results, I have to admit that the results are quite poor, taking into account how many military coups we have seen in that region recently and during the past years, we have to remember that development and stability and peace are two sides of the one coin. And that's why we have to, of course, support the security forces in that region. And this is precisely what we are doing, for instance, with Burkina Faso.

We support the security forces of Burkina Faso, but at the same time we have to pay more and more attention to the development side. So we have to invest in education, we have to invest in basic services, because we know that, for instance, in Burkina Faso, where I have visited as Commissioner twice, the state is lacking in a big part of the country. And that's why people don't really feel that they benefit from the services of the state. And that's why we have to invest in the security side, but we also have to invest in development services.

When it comes to critical raw materials, indeed, we are now creating new partnerships with several partner countries in Africa, but also in Latin America and in Caribbean regions in order to have critical minerals and raw materials for us to be used for our green transition. But we want to use that in a sustainable and mutually beneficial way. It means that we are looking at the 360-degree approach so we don't only extract and export minerals to Europe, but we also want to support our partner countries' societies to develop their business environment as well as support them to train their labour force and workforce, as well as support them to industrialise their countries. So the idea is really to support them also to develop their value chain. I'm happy to continue in my next answer.

**Maria Arena (S&D)**. – Monsieur le Président, revenons à la question du Sahel. La situation aujourd'hui au Burkina Faso est compliquée parce que ce pays n'a pas beaucoup de revenus budgétaires et qu'il dépend pour plus de 20 % de l'aide extérieure. Et donc la situation telle qu'on la connaît aujourd'hui, si – et comme vous le disiez – nous n'intervenons pas, risque de s'empirer encore.

Alors, que peut-on faire pour à la fois favoriser le processus démocratique et soutenir par exemple les deux millions de personnes déplacées, sachant que le gouvernement a perdu le contrôle de 40 % de son territoire? Il y a donc sans doute là quelque chose à ajuster.

**Jutta Urpilainen**, *Member of the Commission*. – Indeed in the Sahel, I would describe that we have a very tailor-made approach. As you said in the beginning, with some of the Sahelian countries, we use, for instance, a budget support modality.

But a very good example of it is Niger. I just recently, a couple of weeks ago, adopted EUR 66 million of additional budget support funding to Niger, precisely because we want to support Niger to educate their population and their young people and their children.

In terms of Mali, the approach is completely different because of the recent development in Mali, but also because of their choices that they have made recently.

In the case of Burkina Faso, unfortunately, we have not been able to use our budget support modality because of the coup, but also because of the transition. We haven't seen enough concrete results and our conditions are not met – because we always have conditions in our budget support modality. So those conditions are not met and that is why we have not been able to use that modality.

But it doesn't mean that we have not supported financially Burkina Faso. On the contrary, we have provided a lot of assistance, humanitarian assistance, but also development assistance through our special measures in terms of health, in terms of education, in terms of food security.

And the new element, as I said in the beginning, is also now our support to the security forces, because we know that the country is really, I would say, struggling against jihadists and terrorist groups. So we want to support also the security forces.

But, I would say that in the case of Burkina Faso, we have to have this kind of gradual approach, you know, go step-by-step forward and see whether in the future there is also a stage where we can resume the budget support with Burkina Faso.

**Karen Melchior (Renew).** – Thank you, Commissioner and Vice-President. Looking at the EU Africa Strategy, I wish to focus on a specific country, Tunisia, which I find is symptomatic for our approach to Africa as a whole. We need strategic and equal partnerships with the countries in Africa. And so that is not just focused on migration, but, as your portfolio says, to promote democracy, rule of law, human rights and good governance. Looking at Tunisia, we need a strategic partnership between the EU and a democratic Tunisia. It was important that we invested in our partnership with Tunisia leading up to our current strategic priorities adopted in 2018, when Tunisia was implementing the democratic reforms following the Arab revolution that had brought Ben Ali down. But why is the EU intensifying a comprehensive partnership with Tunisia and completing a memorandum of understanding with an unelected president which has been undermining parliamentary democracy and rule of law? Furthermore, why has the EU stopped engaging with Tunisia's civil society in a time when the human rights defenders, lawyers and journalists of Tunisia need our support? How do we stand strong with democratic forces and human-rights defenders when we seem to prefer to form partnership with strongman rulers in the Sahel, in Rwanda, in Uganda, and now in Tunisia?

**Jutta Urpilainen, Member of the Commission.** – Thank you very much for your question. I have to say that I agree with you. The EU is indeed a long-standing partner of Tunisia, particularly as regards its socio-economic development and its democratic transition. And I can only quote President von der Leyen, who was in Tunisia in June: 'with Tunisia we share much more than geographical proximity: we share a history'.

Since 2011, the European Union has been supporting Tunisia's journey of democracy. It is a long, sometimes difficult road, but these difficulties can be overcome against the backdrop of global uncertainties. It is in our common interest to strengthen our relationship and to invest in stability and prosperity. So in this context, the EU and Tunisia are working together on a memorandum of understanding on a strategic and comprehensive partnership covering the strengthening economic development, but also investment and trade, a sustainable and competitive renewable energy partnership, migration and people-to-people connections and contacts, as presented by President von der Leyen in June during a joint mission to Tunisia, together with the Italian Prime Minister Giorgia Meloni, as well as Dutch Prime Minister Mark Rutte.

**Karen Melchior (Renew).** – Thank you Commissioner for your focus on human rights and democracy in Tunisia. Will the Commission and the EEAS then take up the tripartite meetings that used to be held between the Tunisian Government, Tunisian Civil Society and the EEAS? At the moment, human rights defenders and civil society have been arrested following meetings with EU Member State embassies and holding meetings with civil society in an organised way and supporting them is an important signal and support for civil society in Tunisia.

**Jutta Urpilainen, Member of the Commission.** – Thank you very much for this very precise question. As I said, part of this MOU, which is, as you know, under negotiations at the moment, so negotiations are ongoing between the EU and Tunisia, and there is the aim to conclude these negotiations shortly. And part of these negotiations are these people-to-people connections. But when it comes to your very precise question, I be looking into this together with my dear colleague, Commissioner Várhelyi, who is responsible for Tunisia. And I am sure that he will then come back to this question.

**Malte Gallée (Verts/ALE).** – Madam Commissioner, I have quite some questions, but let me see how many I will manage to ask. First of all, I stumbled over a problem I have no solution to, and it is about waste and the products that we ship to Africa. I was wondering whether you might find a solution to this.

If we ship products to African countries, often there are no extended producer responsibility organisations. So all the products we ship there, they are packed and they create a lot of waste. And it doesn't fall under the Waste Shipment Regulation since it is not waste yet, but it becomes waste pretty fast. How can we tackle this so that we do not contribute to the pollution in these countries where there are no such systems?

The second question, let me try to ask it, is basically: if we look at the Critical Raw Materials Act, you say 40% of production should come to Europe again. I think we should rather really foster industrialisation in the source countries in line with their local demands.

And the third thing, if you allow me one last second, is how do we support the whole idea of the Great Green Wall in the Sahel zone and how can we strengthen this as well?

**Jutta Urpilainen**, *Member of the Commission*. – Of course we support our partner countries to develop also waste management. I have myself, for instance, visited several projects where I have seen very concretely that we have made a huge difference in terms of waste management.

When it comes to critical raw materials, thank you for asking this because now I have an opportunity to explain, in a bit more detail, what we try to achieve. For instance, in Namibia – where I was in January with my dear colleague, Commissioner Breton – we are just now finalising the roadmap for our green hydrogen partnership, but also our partnership on critical raw materials. What we want to do in Namibia, what we need, as you said, are some critical minerals and raw materials for our green transition. That's the fact, especially if we want to de-risk our relationship with China.

Through this partnership, we also want to develop and support Namibia to industrialise its society and develop value chains in their society. It means that we are supporting them in terms of strengthening their institutions, in terms of improving the regulatory environment, in terms of training young people in order to be able to employ themselves or get a job.

And then, of course, we also bring our companies to invest in Namibia in terms of infrastructure, but also in terms of mining. So we are creating new jobs, but at the same time, we want to support Namibia to really benefit from this partnership. And this is precisely the 360-degree approach, which is, I would say, something which is mutually beneficial for both of us, for Namibia, but also for the European Union.

**Malte Gallée (Verts/ALE)**. – Thank you very much. Let me just quickly get back to the question of the waste, since, I mean it's nice that we have some projects and it's working well at some points, but how can we make sure that if European companies ship to African countries that what they ship there does not become waste? How can we, like basically, apply the same rules as we do with the waste shipment regulation for products that are no waste yet?

**Jutta Urpilainen**, *Member of the Commission*. – Let me first take the question regarding the Great Green Wall, because I didn't have time to answer that, and that was your third question. So, exactly in line with the outcome of the EU summit last year – you know that we were able to organise that finally – the Great Green Wall Initiative is our long-term, very cross-sectoral and multi-actor undertaking initiative.

Very broad and continued mobilisation of actors for the Great Green Wall is key and, of course, this whole initiative will secure a steady stream of action and financial support towards the Great Green Wall, solidifying its sustainability in the medium to long term. What we aim to do is really to develop local and regional global sustainable value chains originating from the Great Green Wall, and that should be supported along with active involvement and commitment from the private sector.

Tree-based and agro-ecology based value chains are probably the strongest incentive for farmers engagement in sustainable land management. So this is something we are working on with our Member States but also with our partners in that region.

When it comes to waste management and waste legislation, I do not have a silver bullet as to how to solve that problem. But, of course, when it comes to the legislation, we also – through for instance, political dialogue – want to work together with our partner countries in order to improve their legislation. But what I'm against is this kind of imposing attitude that we come there and say that, okay, this is the legislation you have to adopt. This is not the mutually-beneficial equal partnership we are presenting and promoting.

That is why, of course, through this dialogue we can always explain what the existing legislation in the European Union is, what our experience of it is, and then we can offer to be at their disposal to help and keep, for instance, technical assistance and provide some expertise if it is needed. But through dialogue, I think that's the best way to try to support our partners to develop also, and to improve their legislation.

**Anna Fotyga (ECR).** – Mr President, Commissioner, since the full-scale invasion of Ukraine, the EU is already aware of near imperial policies, violence, cruelty, war crimes, and genocide perpetrated by Russia. What is less known, though, is the neo-colonial conquest perpetrated in many of territories directly or via proxies like Wagner groups. Is the EU aware of this fact? Is it ready and capable to raise awareness among our African partners? That is particularly relevant for them, and this process is extremely deteriorating to them and to the interest of the EU in Africa.

**Jutta Urpilainen, Member of the Commission.** – Thank you for your question and I would say that, in many African countries, we face a battle of narratives. So we know that, for instance, Russia is very active in their propaganda, with their disinformation. But more and more we also face a battle of offers, what we partners are able to offer to our African counterparts. We know that Russia's approach is very much on security and it's based on Wagner Group services. China has been focusing on hard infrastructure projects through their Belt and Road initiative, and our approach is Global Gateway. So we want to offer Global Gateway to our partners, which is a very positive offer through which we want to accelerate green and digital transitions in our partner countries, focusing on energy, transport, digital, as well as soft connectivity like health, education and research.

And when it comes to Africa, we have the objective to mobilise up to EUR 150 billion in investments by 2027. That money does not come only from the EU budget. We have our part, but also our Member States are contributing to these investments as well as their financial institutions. And the idea is really to attract and encourage our European companies to invest in Africa because we need a private sector's contribution in order to achieve and reach SDGs in the future, let's say, even in the medium-term future. So indeed, we are facing this battle of narratives. We are facing the disinformation. But from my perspective, we also have a very good offer and answer how to tackle and compete with that disinformation in our partner countries.

**Anna Fotyga (ECR).** – As European Parliament rapporteur for the opinion on the African strategy, I tried to convince my colleagues about the detrimental role of Russia – and China, by the way – knowing how difficult it was at that time.

My second question is: to what extent are EU delegations in Africa tasked to inform about the neo-colonial posture of Russia ?

**Jutta Urpilainen, Member of the Commission.** – In the beginning of this mandate, actually, we created this Team Europe concept, and I have to say that as Commissioner for International Partnerships I am very proud of it.

The whole concept is based on this idea that European institutions, including the European Parliament, together with our Member States and their DFIs –development finance institutions – are working as a team. So we are pooling resources, we are setting common objectives at the country level, and then we are also, of course, trying to increase our European visibility in our partner countries.

So when it comes to the role of the delegation, when it comes to the role of communication, now we really have, I would say, improved cooperation between the Member States in terms of communication. We do that at the capital level, so we have regular meetings, but we also do that at the country level. So the idea is that the EU delegation can coordinate different activities at the country level with our Member States' embassies.

I personally think that this is the right step forward. Of course we still have room for improvement because we know that, for instance, Russia is very active and they use new technology, social media, in a way that we have never imagined it to be able to use. But I would say that progress has been already made and now we have a clear concept, and I personally think that we can also benefit from it.

**Anna Bonfrisco (ID).** – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, ringrazio la signora vicepresidente e Commissaria per avere citato il recente viaggio della nostra premier Meloni insieme al premier Rutte, accompagnati dalla Presidente von der Leyen, a dimostrazione che l'Italia è in prima fila nelle politiche di aiuto a questa vasta area strategica euro-mediterranea-africana.

E cosa dire della Sicilia, cruciale per affrontare queste sfide e che il ministro Salvini ha deciso di collegare meglio all'Europa attraverso il ponte sullo Stretto?

C'è però la sfida della migrazione, un argomento che divide gli Stati membri e che continua a far cadere governi.

Se finalmente è stato riconosciuto che la migrazione richiede una risposta europea, chiedo se lei ritiene che l'assunto di base, che la migrazione si possa gestire, possa essere validato alla luce della sfida all'ordine internazionale basato sulle regole?

**Jutta Urpilainen**, *Member of the Commission*. – Indeed, we know that migration is a high priority for the European Union Member States, and that's why when we together adopted in the NDICI Global Europe financial tool, we also set a clear spending target for migration. So now the target is 10% of our external funding committed to migration and different aspects and dimensions of migration. If I remember correctly, I think the latest figure from the year 2021 is 14%. So around 14% of our external funding went to migration from the NDICI Global Europe. So from the financial perspective, we are prioritising migration.

Then, of course, we have to see the different angles and different dimensions of migration through development cooperation, which I am responsible for. Of course we are mainly focusing on the root causes of migration, so we want to address the root causes. We want to provide opportunities for young people through education, through investment, through job creation, so that they don't need to leave their own country and try to get some prospects in Europe. So they really have opportunities. They have opportunities for a decent life in their own country.

When it comes to the peace and security angle, of course we want to also support our partners in Africa to, for instance, end the conflicts which also cause migration and are one of the root causes behind the migration. Then there is, of course, this aspect of governance and border management and also readmission and returns. I want to mention one particular aspect when it comes to readmission and returns, and that is the post-Cotonou Agreement. I'm happy to continue to that in my next answer.

**Anna Bonfrisco (ID)**. – Come riconosciuto da Europol, le tratte di esseri umani sono dinamiche che sfruttano ogni crisi come un'opportunità.

I trafficanti sono più digitalizzati che mai, abusano di piattaforme di social media, applicazioni mobili e strumenti di comunicazione crittografati.

Sono previsti, Le chiedo quindi, nella strategia dell'Unione europea per l'Africa strumenti per affrontare il traffico digitale legato all'immigrazione?

**Jutta Urpilainen**, *Member of the Commission*. – So if I first conclude my answer regarding the post-Cotonou and then I'm happy to reply to your second question.

So when it comes to post-Cotonou Agreement, that is, like we heard earlier, it is a political agreement with 79 countries from Africa, Caribbean and the Pacific states. And what is now, I would say, remarkable from the migration perspective is this annex where we have now a legal basis for readmission and returns. And that's why, that's one reason why we should really make some progress in the Council side so that we would be able to sign this new agreement, which was already negotiated over two years ago. But unfortunately, one Member State is blocking the approval of this agreement in the Council, and that's why we really hope that we are able to make some progress in the coming weeks.

When it comes to migration and what we are doing on digital, I would say that we have now really tried to strengthen also the cooperation with several Commission services. I give you one example: last week I had a meeting with my dear colleague, Commissioner Johansson, who is responsible for migration. So we really try to have this comprehensive approach. So of course I am responsible for the external dimension of the migration and she is very much focusing on the internal aspect of migration. And then we are looking into opportunities, for instance, of how we can together work with our partners, for instance with Niger, how we can reintegrate also those refugees who are voluntarily or forcibly returned to that country. So we have different kinds of tools and also, I would say, a very comprehensive approach through which we want to solve this, especially this irregular migration problem, which is unfortunately increasing at the moment in Europe.

**Marc Botenga (The Left).** – Monsieur le Président, Madame la commissaire, je voudrais revenir sur la question des matières premières critiques, parce que je pense qu'elle est essentielle et je pense qu'en Afrique, cette question est très sensible.

Vous savez que le pillage colonial et néocolonial de l'Afrique consistait essentiellement à voler les matières premières. Vous savez aussi que, même après les indépendances, ces pratiques se sont poursuivies, souvent sous le couvert de recommandations, par exemple du Fonds monétaire international, de la Banque mondiale, soutenues par l'Europe, demandant de réduire l'intervention de l'État, notamment au Mali. En conséquence, à un certain moment, le gouvernement malien n'était plus en mesure de connaître les quantités d'or qui quittaient son territoire, par exemple.

Je crains que les alternatives, les nouvelles politiques que vous avez présentées, ne rompent pas avec les anciennes pratiques. Vous utilisez le même langage quand vous parlez de «faciliter le climat des affaires», de «renforcer les investissements européens»...

Je voudrais que vous me fassiez une liste de ce qui a changé entre les anciennes pratiques et ce que vous proposez. Quelle est la grosse différence entre la politique européenne telle qu'elle était pratiquée avant vous et celle que vous proposez aujourd'hui?

**Jutta Urpilainen, Member of the Commission.** – Well indeed I think you're correct in terms of fiscal space. Fiscal space in many of our partner countries is very limited. And one reason for that is because of the very high debt levels: why are there high debt levels in our partner countries? One reason for that is the loans which are issued by China in order to give an opportunity to our partners to invest in hard infrastructure.

What I see and what we try to do through our partnership is really to support our partner countries to mobilise domestic resources. How to do that? We have to collect more taxes, but we also have to spend our expenditure better. And that's why we need to support our partner countries in their institution-strengthening. So we have to support them to strengthen their institutions. We have to support them to fight corruption, which is still, unfortunately, a problem in many countries. And then we, of course, have to support them to get more investments because through the investments they also get revenues. That's the fact. So this is how I see the situation.

And then, of course, if we only look at the ODA money, unfortunately the whole official development assistance last year, 2022, I think this is the preliminary figure from the OECD, was USD 204 billion. So a little bit over USD 200 billion last year. And if I look at the Sustainable Development Goals financing gap for low- and middle-income countries, I mean, the gap is USD 3.9 trillion per year. So we can understand that through the public resources, through the ODA money, we cannot support our partners to reach sustainable development goals. And that's why, in addition to our official development aid – which is needed and of course I support to increase that in all of our Member States – we also need private-sector involvement and contribution. This is precisely what we try to do through the Global Gateway Initiative.

**Marc Botenga (The Left).** – Madame la Commissaire, historiquement, la dette africaine ne trouve pas son origine en Chine. Elle trouve son origine dans la colonisation et dans le rôle des pays européens après la décolonisation. Il faut donc reconnaître notre responsabilité là-dedans. Et du coup, est-ce que vous êtes prête à au moins dire qu'on va abolir la dette que ces pays africains ont vis-à-vis des pays européens? Ça, c'est une première question.

Deuxième question, très rapidement. Vous n'avez pas vraiment dit ce que vous alliez changer par rapport au passé. Avant, l'Europe, les pays membres, vous aviez des politiques de pillage. Qu'est-ce qui change fondamentalement? Est-ce que vous avez dressé un tableau de la situation: avant, on faisait ça, maintenant nous allons faire le contraire? Parce que sinon, j'ai un peu l'impression qu'on reste dans de bonnes intentions, sans les concrétiser.

**Jutta Urpilainen, Member of the Commission.** – To be very precise, I said that one reason for this distress, I mean this very high debt level, is China. Of course, that is not the only reason, but that is one reason.

What is the new paradigm? What are we now proposing and promoting to our partners? I would say that the first new element is mutually beneficial partnerships. We really want to get out of this donor/recipient kind of relationship, which we had in the previous years. So we dealt with our partners and said okay, we'll give you this money to start development cooperation projects, but we didn't really listen to them and have a really equal partnership with them. So this idea of mutually beneficial, equal partnership is the new element of our cooperation.



The second new element is Team Europe, so that we want to work together with our Member States. Instead of there being a fragmented approach, we want to build a team where our 27 Member States have a role as well as their development finance institutions, as well as European institutions. So this is definitely a new approach, a new element.

The third new element is engaging with the private sector. So we want European companies to invest in African countries so that also our African partners can benefit from those investments. I have to say that when it comes to critical raw materials, I see huge interests and – I would say – appetite and buy-in from our partner countries in Africa. There are already several countries who really want to start negotiating with us on critical raw materials partnerships. I mentioned Namibia earlier, but we are also starting to negotiate with Rwanda and with the DRC, for instance. And there are several other countries who are really seeking and want to start to negotiate with us.

I think this is also a kind of approval and an example of this new mutually beneficial partnership that our partners really want to invest in this – that it is not only us, but is also them.

**Fabio Massimo Castaldo (NI).** – Madam Commissioner, thank you for being here today with us. As rightfully stated in the final declaration of the EU-African Union summit of February 2022, we do share with our African counterparts a series of common challenges that need to be addressed in a cooperative way. Further than that, in the EP recommendation for the Strategic Partnership with the Horn of Africa, for which I served as the rapporteur, we have stressed the need to reinforce this cooperation, leaving apart the obsolete donor recipient mentality and unleashing all its potential, basing our relation on timely, effective talks aimed at finding common ground.

One area in which it seems to be difficult to keep the same speed and agree on certain commitments is the one of energy transition. Therefore I would like to ask you to elaborate on key messages and expectations conveyed by our African counterparts in terms of their perspectives on transition paths. For example, what is the pace of it, and the means of financing it? Where do they expect us to contribute the most? Thank you very much, and I will be eager to listen to your reply.

**Jutta Urpilainen, Member of the Commission.** – Thank you very much for your question. Indeed, energy partnership and energy cooperation is an important part of our Global Gateway strategy. Under the Global Gateway strategy, we created this Africa-EU Green Energy Initiative, which is worth EUR 3.4 billion. So the idea is really that through that initiative we can support our partner countries in their energy transition, and especially the green energy transition.

I already mentioned a couple of very concrete initiatives in terms of energy, for instance, the Ruzizi III hydropower plant in the DRC, Burundi and Rwanda. That's one example. Then we also have several energy projects in Nigeria, which are ongoing or just about to start. Then the recent initiative we just adopted with Senegal, a couple of weeks ago in Paris, was this JETP. The idea is really to support Senegal in their deployment of renewable energies. And there is this commitment of EUR 2.5 billion, not only from the EU, but also from our international partners as well as international banks.

So there are very concrete, tangible projects, which are, some of them, already ongoing or just about to start. And, of course, we are definitely supporting our partners in the energy transition because we know, for instance, that in Africa still 600 million citizens are lacking access to electricity.

**Fabio Massimo Castaldo (NI).** – Dear Commissioner, thank you for all the details. I would like to ask you something related to the domain in this case of peace and security. When we presented the European Peace Facility, we stated that this would have increased our readiness to support efforts from our partners, as well as the predictability of our actions.

Now that the EPF funds have been completely devoted to the much-needed support to Ukraine, how can we support our African counterparts? And is there any plan to devote specific funding to this end?

**Jutta Urpilainen**, *Member of the Commission*. – Indeed, peace and security has long been a key pillar of the EU and AU partnership, and the European Union is fully committed to supporting the African Union's peace and security efforts, and it's putting its strength behind African solutions to African problems. So this is also important that there is an African solution to an African problem.

So at the last EU-AU summit last year here in Brussels we laid the ground for more strategic engagement on peace and security. So actually, if I look at the figures, in order to ensure the sustainability and predictability of funding for the missions, we have committed a financial package of EUR 730 million for the period 2021-2024 within the framework of the European Peace Facility.

We are also very committed for substantial resources to support the EU-AU Peace and Security Partnership. For instance, the multiannual indicative programme with sub-Saharan Africa dedicates EUR 650 million to African conflict prevention and resolution initiatives to address transnational security threats and support the resilience and stability of communities living in areas near conflict-affected borders.

So there are also financial resources in the European Peace Facility although, as you correctly said, through the European Peace Facility we have also supported very much and very sizeable amounts of money to Ukraine.

**Francisco José Millán Mon (PPE)**. – Señor presidente, me preocupa, como ya se ha dicho, la actitud que varios países africanos están adoptando ante la agresión rusa a Ucrania. Solo la mitad, prácticamente, han votado a favor de las resoluciones de las Naciones Unidas que condenan la agresión. Muchos se mantienen al margen, como si la guerra no fuese con ellos y se tratase solo de un asunto entre europeos. Solo ha habido una iniciativa reciente de algunos líderes africanos que han viajado a Rusia y Ucrania.

La guerra no les debe resultar indiferente. Rusia viola principios básicos: la integridad territorial y el no uso de la fuerza. Es gravísimo que Rusia vuelva al imperialismo y al colonialismo del siglo XIX.

Desde la Cumbre Unión Europea-África de febrero de 2022, a mí me parece que no hemos impulsado decididamente nuestra relación con el continente. Rusia —Lavrov en particular— sí lo ha hecho. A finales de este mes se celebra en San Petersburgo la Cumbre Rusia-África.

Sé que el señor Borrell estuvo en Níger la semana pasada. Además de eso, ¿qué estamos haciendo desde la Unión Europea para hablar con los africanos en materia de la guerra de Rusia? ¿Les hemos hablado de los riesgos que implica el Grupo Wagner?

**Jutta Urpilainen**, *Member of the Commission*. – Thank you for your question. We do a lot of outreach. I have been in Africa several times this year. Also, several of my colleagues have travelled to the continent as well as several European ministers. So of course it's important to reach out to our partners and explain to them also that, in the case of Ukraine and Russia's attack against Ukraine, it is not only about sovereignty – of course it is also a question of sovereignty – but it's also a question of the UN Charter.

Why did some of the African countries decide to abstain? There are several reasons for that. Firstly, we have to remember that even though the war is taking place on European soil, the crisis is very much global. So of course many African countries really face the consequences and the ramifications of the war, for instance in terms of food insecurity, because many of those countries traditionally have imported a lot of fertilisers or wheat grain from Ukraine and from Russia.

So they see the risks, they see the consequences, also in terms of high inflation or high energy prices. But at the same time, there are also historical relationships with Russia. For instance, Russia has been supporting some of our partner countries' independence fight. Back in history they have been educating African political leaders in the former Soviet Union. So there are also historical relations which might also explain their behaviour.

And then, of course, we know, as was mentioned several times already in this plenary, that China is very important economic actor in many of our partner countries. So I would say that there are different reasons in different partner countries why they are hesitant to take sides in this conflict, which is very, I would say, important and clear for us, for the Europeans, but that is why it is so important to reach out to them and also explain why we have to condemn Russia's attack and why it's so important that they support us, for instance in the United Nations.

**Carlos Zorrinho (S&D).** – Senhora Comissária, recentemente, pude acompanhá-la numa missão na Zâmbia, em que ficou bem claro o que pode significar a cooperação UE-África.

A cooperação e o desenvolvimento sustentável são um motor de paz, compromisso entre os povos. Isso foi reafirmado também na 43.<sup>a</sup> Assembleia Parlamentar ACP-UE, com a sua participação.

E se olharmos para a agenda da União Europeia – defesa da Ucrânia, política de migrações, gestão de crises humanitárias, liderança tecnológica na descarbonização e no digital -, percebemos que a importância da parceria entre iguais África-UE e a aplicação do Global Europe e do Global Gateway são absolutamente fundamentais.

E por isso, Senhora Comissária, estando aqui na casa da democracia, no Parlamento, não posso deixar de lhe fazer esta pergunta: até quando vamos continuar a pagar o preço da chantagem no adiamento da entrada em vigor do acordo de pós-Cotonu?

**Jutta Urpilainen, Member of the Commission.** – Thank you for joining me on this joint mission to Zambia. I think it might have been the first ever joint mission, at least between the DEVE Committee and the Commissioner. And for me, it really showcases this approach of Team Europe – this concept that we want to work as a team also between the European institutions. So I think it was a very strong example of that commitment.

When it comes to post-Cotonou Agreement, I really share your frustration, I can tell you. We were able to finalise the negotiations with 79 countries in spring 2021 – so over two years ago. And since that, unfortunately, the agreement has been blocked by the Council, mainly because of one country. First it was Hungary; now it's Poland.

Of course, I really hope that Poland could change its position so that we can adopt that new agreement and we could sign that new agreement as soon as possible, especially because their request has nothing to do with the content of the agreement. So what Poland is asking for has nothing to do with the agreement. So that's why I think it is important that we could really make some progress prior to the summit, which is taking place next week with Latin America and the Caribbean region.

**Samira Rafaela (Renew).** – Madam Commissioner, we have the Economic Partnership Agreement with Kenya, the first-ever Sustainable Investment Facilitation Agreement with Angola, we have the cooperation under the Global Gateway Initiative, and I could go on. So things are moving in the right direction and that is very positive news for the EU-Africa relations, especially from a trade perspective.

However, not everything is as positive: individual Member States that hold the Council hostage on post-Cotonou, or the Council blocking in GSP negotiations by introducing an unethical migration clause. Progress is slowed down by conservative Member States and that is very unfortunate.

But in spite of that, we need to achieve our partnership of equals and with that, we need to assist our African partners where that is welcome and vice-versa. So I'm asking the following: how is the Commission concretely contributing to the economic integration of the African continent? Does the Commission also implement a sectoral approach, for example for relations with the ECOWAS region? And what is the Commission doing to help African companies comply with the increasing environmental standards?

**Jutta Urpilainen, Member of the Commission.** – Thank you for your question and thank you also for paying attention to this recent development we have done in terms of economic partnership agreements, 'EPAs', for instance with Kenya. My dear colleague Commissioner Dombrovskis was able to sign the new agreement just recently in Nairobi.

Indeed, we want to have a reinforced dialogue with Africa at the continental level. To this end, at the last EU-African Union Commission-to-Commission meeting – which took place last autumn in Brussels – both the African Commission and the European Commission agreed to step up a high-level dialogue on economic integration with a view to strengthening trade relations and sustainable investment between the two continents.

The African Continental Free Trade Area is potentially a game-changer that may increase intra-continental trade diversification and development of intra-African value chains and also contribute to Africa's industrialisation processes. So the African Continental Free Trade Area and the economic partnership agreements are mutually reinforcing one another. They have both contributed to creating predictable trade and investment conditions, but also to attracting capital and becoming a hub for foreign direct investment in several African countries and regions. So the African Continental Free Trade Area process can take this practical experience into account.

I can just add very quickly that these sustainability aspects have been included in all EPA talks, and that will be, of course, part of this dialogue regarding the African Continental Free Trade Area as well.

**President.** – That concludes Question Time.

Thank you very much, Commissioner Urpilainen. I would also like once more to apologise to all those who were not able to speak during Question Time.

Līdz ar to šā darba kārtības punkta izskatīšana ir pabeigta.

## 15. Stosunki z Palestyńską Władzą Narodową (debata)

**Sēdes vadītājs.** – Nākamais darba kārtības punkts ir debates par Evin Incir ziņojumu Ārlietu komitejas vārdā par Eiropas Parlamenta ieteikumu Padomei, Komisijai un Komisijas priekšsēdētājas vietniekam / Savienības Augstajam pārstāvim ārlietās un drošības politikas jautājumos par attiecībām ar Palestīniešu pašpārvaldi (2021/2207(INI) (A9-0226/2023)).

**Evin Incir, rapporteur.** – Mr President, Madam Commissioner, colleagues, the Palestinian people have been living under occupation for more than 50 years and deserve their freedom, as all other people. And a well-functioning Palestinian Authority with control over their territories is an integral part towards a peaceful solution on the conflict and an end to the Israeli occupation.

If I asked anyone in here in our Parliament, please stand up if you would like to be treated as the Palestinian people are, expected to live a decent life under an abnormal situation, because there is nothing normal with occupation. I can promise you no one here would like to stand up.

The freedom of the Palestinian people is also interlinked with the security of the Israeli people. The internationally recognised two-state solution, according to the 1967 borders with the city of Jerusalem as the capital of both states, remains the best way of bringing lasting peace, stability, security and equal rights to both people. What I just mentioned should not be controversial for anyone of us in here, because it is rooted in international law and the rule-based order that we claim we stand for in many other conflicts.

But yet these recommendations seem to have created a debate above and beyond my understanding in this Chamber, in a few EU Member States with disinformation and misinformation and groundless allegations being spread.

Colleagues, how controversial can it be to demand an end to corruption and human rights abuses by the Palestinian Authority? How controversial can it be to demand an end to terrorist attacks by actors on both sides, Palestine and Israel? How controversial can it be to demand an end to Israeli occupation and human rights abuses? How controversial can it be to demand from Israeli authorities to stop demolition and confiscation of EU-funded projects that is supposed to go to schools for Palestinian children? And if they continue their activities, every single cent must be paid back to the European taxpayers.

How controversial can it be to let the International Court of Justice and International Criminal Court do their job through looking into if war crimes have been committed? How controversial can it be to have a more long-term approach instead of yearly ad hoc cooperation and support to the Palestinian Authority?

Remember the last time Commissioner Várhelyi refused to pay the financial support to the PA based on groundless allegations? It even led to Palestinian people not accessing cancer treatment.

In the end, it all boils down to how controversial can it be to start treating the Palestinian people as we treat the Israeli people? Or do we believe international law only applies to some? And as Orwell said, some are more equal than others. Peace must be the ultimate goal wherever conflict appears. Freedom must be the ultimate goal wherever an occupation exists. Life must be the ultimate goal, where death is ever present.

If we really believe in that, it should not be controversial to vote in favour of the negotiated and compromised takes on recommendations to the Council and the Commission on the relations with the Palestinian Authority and reject any amendments.

I just want to remind us all in here that we have a duty to pave the way for peace and life, not further polarisation and death. Palestinian and Israeli human rights activists and organisations are right now calling on us to adopt these important recommendations.

**Jutta Urpilainen**, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, honourable Members of the European Parliament, thank you for the timely opportunity to discuss your report and also to exchange views on our relations with the Palestinian Authority, also on behalf of the HR/VP.

Let me start by updating you on the situation on the ground, which is of great concern. The security situation continues to deteriorate, leading to deplorable numbers of Palestinian and Israeli victims. This year alone, the number of Palestinians killed in confrontations with the IDF in the West Bank, including East Jerusalem, has more than doubled – compared to the same period last year – to more than 130, including at least 22 children, in addition to five Palestinians killed and large-scale destruction of property by Israeli settlers. The number of Israelis killed by Palestinian perpetrators has also increased, to 31 – compared to 28 in the same period last year – with many more injured on both sides.

We are also witnessing an alarming increase of demolitions, evictions and settlement expansion, with around 13 000 new settlement units announced in the occupied West Bank approved by Israel in the past six months alone, and new administrative procedures to expedite settlement expansion. We have urged Israel not to proceed with these measures, which are illegal under international law.

All these developments only serve to fuel the cycle of violence that has accelerated to alarming levels in recent months. The EU has reacted publicly on several occasions, including the recent military operation in Jenin and terrorist attacks in Israel and the West Bank. It is clear that the only way to break out of this vicious cycle is a return to effective security cooperation between the Palestinian Authority and Israel. But we know from experience that the security track cannot be separated from the political track.

Remote as it may look today, there is no viable alternative to the two-state solution, and the longer it takes, the more difficult it will become. With this in mind, we are working through our EU Special Representative for the Middle East Peace Process to revive peace efforts with regional partners, in particular Saudi Arabia and the League of Arab States.

Now I would like to turn to the title of this debate: our relations with the Palestinian Authority. Thirty years since its creation by the Oslo Accords, the Palestinian Authority is facing unprecedented financial and political challenges. Financially, the Palestinian Authority is struggling to maintain its public finances and provide services to the population. We heard alarming messages at the Ad Hoc Liaison Committee, which the EU hosted in May.

The EU remains the largest donor to the Palestinian people, with projects and interventions that cover almost all aspects of Palestinian life. These are in line with the Palestinian reform agenda and aim at promoting Palestinian state building. In December 2022 – so last December – the Commission adopted its 2022 annual action plan in favour of Palestine, for a total amount of EUR 186 million.

As part of our multiannual support to the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East, our 2023 contribution of EUR 82 million was frontloaded at the beginning of this year. Other donors need to step in as well, while the Palestinian Authority needs also to urgently continue its financial reforms to steer towards calmer waters. We recall that Israel also needs to respect signed agreements and take the necessary measures that would ease the Palestinians' financial pressures.

Politically, the Palestinian Authority is also facing internal challenges. We are witnessing increasingly negative trends as regards the rule of law and fundamental freedoms in areas where the Palestinian Authority is in control and in Gaza. A stronger and more credible Palestinian Authority as a partner is in everyone's interest and this is why the EU continues to urge to hold the overdue national elections as soon as possible. This is important for strengthening the legitimacy of the Palestinian Authority for the Palestinian people.

In January, the HR/VP invited the Palestinian Prime Minister to the Foreign Affairs Council meeting. We agreed to establish a regular political dialogue at ministerial level. We are planning to have the first such dialogue with the Palestinian counterpart in the autumn. We also agreed to work towards establishing partnership priorities between the EU and the Palestinian Authority in the context of the European Neighbourhood Policy. Both will be important steps forward in our political relations. Thank you very much. I am looking forward to the debate.

**Michael Gahler**, *im Namen der PPE-Fraktion.* – Herr Präsident, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Mein Dank gilt zunächst der Berichterstatterin für die Art und Weise, wie dieser interfraktionelle Dialog über diesen schwierigen Bericht gehandhabt wurde. Der gemeinsame Ausgangspunkt ist das Ziel einer Zweistaatenlösung, auf die wir auch mit dieser Empfehlung hinarbeiten müssen. Schwierig ist der Bericht, weil er vor allem Kritik übt, man diese Kritik aber konstruktiv kalibrieren muss, um die gewünschten Effekte zu erzielen.

Zum einen gilt diese Kritik dem Hauptadressaten dieser Empfehlung, der Palästinensischen Autonomiebehörde. Deren Legitimität gegenüber den eigenen Bürgern ist inzwischen schwierig zu begründen, weil die letzten Wahlen 2005 und 2006 stattgefunden haben. Deswegen fordern wir, dass die PA die Voraussetzungen für demokratische Wahlen schafft.

Als einer der Hauptfinanziers der Palästinensischen Autonomiebehörde fordern wir, dass diese Behörde Korruption und Vetternwirtschaft bekämpft, dass sie trotz der Umstände der Besetzung jeglicher Form antisemitischer Rhetorik und gewalttätigen Verhaltens gegenüber Israelis keinen Vorschub leistet und dass sie die Unabhängigkeit der Justiz und der palästinensischen Zivilgesellschaft beachtet und allen Minderheitengruppen, auch einschließlich der Christen, den Freiraum belässt, der in einer demokratischen Gesellschaft Usus ist.

Auch gegenüber Israel haben wir Forderungen und Erwartungen, die sich aus der täglichen Praxis der Besetzung ergeben. Wenn Israel es ernst meint mit einer Friedensregelung, dann passt die Genehmigung von 5 000 zusätzlichen Wohneinheiten vom 26. Juni nicht ins Bild. Es gilt für beide Seiten: Wer Frieden will, darf kein Öl ins Feuer gießen. Wir müssen Israel, der Regierung klar sagen, dass sie dafür verantwortlich ist, dass die radikalen Siedler sich nicht so benehmen, als wären sie in der Westbank zu Hause. Das sind sie nämlich nicht. Und vielleicht können wir ja die Staaten, die sich in den *Abraham Accords* engagieren, auch dazu bringen, sich in den Dialog, den die Kommission mit diesen Ländern führt, in diesen Friedensprozess einzubringen.

**Matjaž Nemeč**, *v imenu skupine S&D.* – Spoštovani visoki zbor! Palestino že več desetletij pretresa hudo nasilje. Gaza je še vedno največji zapor na prostem. Že tretja generacija Palestincev pa ne pozna miru.

V zadnjih dneh smo bili znova priča eni izmed največjih operacij izraelske vojske na Zahodnem bregu, kjer je bilo ubitih 12 ljudi. Vsako nasilje, vsaka širitev nezakonitih naselbin pa še dodatno ogroža vzpostavitev palestinske države. Še več, do sedaj najbolj skrajno desna izraelska vlada ne skriva več, da je cilj okupacije Zahodnega brega v resnici aneksija.

Svet in Evropa se morata zbuditi, spoštovani, v Palestini se dogajajo vojni zločini. Poteze Izraela grobo kršijo vse mednarodne pogodbe in pravo. Zato odločno podpiram poročilo kolegice Evin, ki prihaja ob pravem času in naslavlja ključne izzive. Prvič – stop okupaciji, drugič – sankcije za kršitelje, tretjič – za palestinsko neodvisnost in četrtič – za mir in sožitje dveh enakopravnih narodov.

**Nicola Beer**, *im Namen der Renew-Fraktion.* – Herr Präsident! Die zur Abstimmung stehende EntschlieÙung schließt an die EntschlieÙung zu den Zukunftsaussichten der Zweistaatenlösung für Israel und Palästina vom Dezember 2022 an und ist auf die Beziehungen der Europäischen Union zur Palästinensischen Autonomiebehörde fokussiert. Sie berücksichtigt die ohne jeden Zweifel schwierigen Rahmenbedingungen, mit denen die PA in der Ausübung ihrer Aufgaben konfrontiert ist. Die EntschlieÙung benennt aber auch – und das ist mir sehr wichtig – unsere Erwartungen gegenüber der PA: die Erwartung, Korruption zu bekämpfen, religiöse und andere Minderheiten zu schützen, die Zivilgesellschaft nicht zu unterdrücken, sondern zu fördern und dringend Wahlen zur demokratischen Legitimierung durchzuführen.

Darüber hinaus ist es von ganz entscheidender Bedeutung, dass wir nicht nachlassen, von der PA entschlossene und messbare Fortschritte zu fordern. Die weitere Unterstützung der PA durch die Europäische Union darf nicht als Freibrief zum „Weiter so“ interpretiert werden. Die PA muss jetzt endlich liefern, das heißt effektive und transparente Regierungs- und Haushaltsführung, konsequenter Einsatz gegen Erziehung zum Hass und vor allem die Abkehr von Unterstützung und Finanzierung palästinensischen Terrors gegen Israel.

Ich bedanke mich bei der Berichterstatterin und allen Schattenberichterstattern und hoffe, dass dieses Parlament eine Brücke auch zwischen diesen Abgeordneten schaffen kann.

**Jordi Solé**, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Mr President, the Palestinian Authority is a government with limited self-rule over only a part of the West Bank, which in turn is an occupied and extremely fragmented territory, as I could witness myself three weeks ago as a member of DROI mission that went to the area. Moreover, the PA is in a very fragile financial situation and highly dependent on the international community, mostly us.

It is also confronted with a legitimacy problem – no elections in 17 years – and it is becoming increasingly authoritarian in terms of suppressing political dissent and reducing the space for civil society. And despite all these challenges and flows, or rather because of them, the EU has to intensify its relations and its political dialogue with the PA with the aim of improving governance, institutions and the security situation in the OPTs, easing socio-economic conditions for Palestinians and ultimately making Palestine an independent, viable country, living peacefully and democratically alongside Israel and fully assuming its security demands. This would also require Israel to comply with international law regarding settlements and stop advancing de facto annexation.

But instead of trust-building measures that could allow for the resumption of the peace process, the harsh reality on the ground is again an escalation of violence. The EU must focus its attention on what's happening in the West Bank and intensify our efforts for de-escalation. We should not let the extremists keep instrumentalising the conflict, or else we will lose again chances for a future in peace.

**Bert-Jan Ruissen**, *namens de ECR-Fractie*. – Voorzitter, geachte commissaris, de inval van het Israëlische leger in Jenin heeft ons opnieuw met de neus op de feiten gedrukt: in de Palestijnse gebieden wonen niet alleen maar goedwillende mensen. Er wonen helaas ook terroristen die maar één taal spreken, namelijk de taal van terreur en geweld. En zolang dat het geval is, heeft Israël eigenlijk geen keus. Dan moet het wel optreden.

Ondertussen wordt de situatie wel steeds ingewikkelder. Met een Palestijnse Autoriteit die haar democratische legitimiteit al lang heeft verloren. Een PA die niets doet om terreur te stoppen, maar het juist aanwakkert. Kijk naar wat kinderen meekrijgen in de Palestijnse schoolboeken en in de media: sterven als een martelaar wordt voorgespiegeld als iets geweldigs. Huiveringwekkend, maar het gebeurt.

Is dit alles nog te doorbreken? De EU heeft een belangrijke sleutel in handen. Als grootste donor van de Palestijnen kan ze de Palestijnen aanspreken. Nodig is allereerst dat de PA haar verantwoordelijkheid neemt. Van de Palestijnse Autoriteit mag worden verwacht dat ze Israël de nodige veiligheidsgaranties biedt. En daar hoort ook bij het stoppen met haatzaaien in schoolboeken. En als tweede bepleit ik een veel sterkere inzet op vreedzame co-existentie. Joden en Palestijnen die op de Westelijke Jordaanoever samenwerken in een en hetzelfde bedrijf bijvoorbeeld. Waarom zou dat anno 2023 niet meer kunnen?

Veiligheidsgaranties bieden en leren samenleven: volgens mij zijn dat de zaken waarin we moeten investeren. Dan ontstaat vanzelf ook de bereidheid om staatkundig tot een oplossing te komen. En dat hoeft zeker niet per se een tweestatenoplossing te zijn.

**Susanna Ceccardi**, *a nome del gruppo ID*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la soluzione fondata sulla coesistenza pacifica tra israeliani e palestinesi è l'unica soluzione possibile al conflitto.

Di certo, però, non ci si arriva accusando Israele e mettendolo ancora una volta sul banco degli imputati, perché per parlare di pace occorre prima di tutto ristabilire la verità.

Il fallimento dell'Unione europea è aver elargito centinaia di milioni di euro per anni all'Autorità palestinese senza chiedere nulla in cambio e senza neppure verificare dove quel fiume di denaro effettivamente andasse.

Sappiamo bene che la maggior parte di quei soldi finisce nelle tasche degli oligarchi dell'Organizzazione per la liberazione della Palestina e altri ancora giungono ad Hamas che li trasforma in armi per il terrore, mentre alla popolazione civile non arriva quasi nulla. L'Europa deve trovare un nuovo approccio, servono controllo e intransigenza.

I gruppi di sinistra, col solito approccio ideologico, definiscono Israele una potenza occupante; ancora una volta, la sinistra europea è pronta a giustificare e finanziare i gruppi radicali palestinesi, negando il diritto all'autodifesa esercitato dal governo di Israele, il solo Stato democratico nell'area mediorientale.

Questa è una relazione che alimenta il razzismo contro Israele e contiene idee folli, come quella che promuove il boicottaggio dei prodotti di Giudea e Samaria; questa pratica ricorda quella dell'atroce apposizione dei segnali di infamia sui negozi ebrei. L'antisemitismo strisciante che aleggia in alcuni di questi emendamenti è ripugnante.

Domani non voteremo questa risoluzione. Spero che la linea moderata abbia la meglio su certe posizioni estremiste che da anni, non condannando fermamente il terrorismo di Hamas, di fatto lo spalleggiano.

**Manu Pineda**, *en nombre del Grupo The Left*. – Señor presidente, Palestina está sufriendo una limpieza étnica continuada. El 2022 fue el año más mortífero desde la intifada de 2005, con más de 120 palestinos asesinados solo en Cisjordania y Jerusalén, sin contar con los asesinados en el gueto de Gaza. También el año pasado se construyeron más de 8 000 viviendas de colonos ilegales y al menos 7 000 palestinos fueron detenidos, incluidos 865 niños.

Por desgracia, la situación empeora cada día. La semana pasada, las fuerzas israelíes de ocupación entraron en el campo de refugiados de Yenín, violando todos los acuerdos firmados, asesinando a doce personas y dejando más de cien heridos y miles de desplazados. Esa violencia ha generado ya casi seis millones de refugiados palestinos, de los cuales el 80 % viven por debajo del umbral de la pobreza.

Mientras tanto, el comisario europeo de Vecindad, Olivér Várhelyi, impide que lleguen los fondos acordados por la Unión Europea a la UNRWA, la Agencia de las Naciones Unidas para los Refugiados de Palestina. Al mismo tiempo, el régimen del *apartheid* sionista impide a los refugiados palestinos el retorno a su tierra, a pesar de que la Resolución 194 del año 1948, de hace ya 75 años, reconoce el derecho al retorno y obliga al régimen israelí a permitirlo.

Estas son las cifras del *apartheid* que el Gobierno de extrema derecha israelí practica contra Palestina. Ese que la Unión Europea considera su socio preferente. Actúa así porque se sabe protegido. Quedará impune y esta Unión Europea se limitará, en el mejor de los casos, a expresar su «*deeply concerned*».

Si la Unión Europea no pasa de la palabra a las acciones seguirá siendo cómplice de los crímenes que el régimen israelí lleva a cabo contra el pueblo palestino. Debemos suspender inmediatamente el Acuerdo de Asociación con Israel y excluirlo de todos los programas financiados con fondos europeos, así como prohibir la entrada de representantes israelíes en esta institución. La Unión Europea debe reconocer al Estado palestino e impulsar que los Estados miembros hagan lo mismo.

Estimados colegas, de la misma manera que hemos condenado y tomado medidas inmediatas contra la guerra y la ocupación de Rusia a Ucrania tenemos que tomarlas contra la guerra y ocupación de Israel en Palestina. Aunque lleguemos 75 años tarde.



**Λευτέρης Νικολάου-Αλαβάνος (NI).** – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, δεκάδες είναι οι νεκροί και εκατοντάδες οι τραυματίες· ο τραγικός απολογισμός της δολοφονικής επιχείρησης του Ισραήλ στην Τζενίν, στη Δυτική Όχθη, και της αεροπορικής επιδρομής στη Λωρίδα της Γάζας πριν από μερικές μέρες. Αυτοί οι νεκροί και τραυματίες έρχονται να προστεθούν στους πάνω από 100 δολοφονημένους Παλαιστίνιους από την αρχή της χρονιάς, ανάμεσα στους οποίους βρίσκονται μικρά παιδιά. Τα προσχήματα του κράτους του Ισραήλ, που αναμασούν και οι Ηνωμένες Πολιτείες Αμερικής και η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, είναι παντελώς ασήρικτα, τη στιγμή που καταγράφονται εδώ και μήνες εικόνες αποτρόπαιης κατοχικής βίας στον διεθνή Τύπο, ακόμη και μέσα στην ίδια την Ιερουσαλήμ.

Το γεγονός δε ότι η ισραηλινή κυβέρνηση απολαμβάνει την πάγια πολιτική, οικονομική και στρατιωτική στήριξη των ΗΠΑ, του ΝΑΤΟ και της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, αποτελεί εξοργιστική πρόκληση απέναντι στους λαούς· τους λαούς, που στηρίζουν σταθερά και διαχρονικά τον δίκαιο αγώνα του παλαιστινιακού λαού, καταδικάζουν την κατοχική βία του Ισραήλ και υποστηρίζουν να τερματιστεί τώρα η ισραηλινή κατοχή, να αναγνωριστεί κυρίαρχο παλαιστινιακό κράτος στα σύνορα του 1967 με την Ανατολική Ιερουσαλήμ πρωτεύουσα, να αναγνωριστεί το δικαίωμα της επιστροφής των προσφύγων στις εστίες τους.

#### VORSITZ: EVELYN REGNER

Vizepräsidentin

**Lukas Mandl (PPE).** – Madam President, dear colleagues, this is called a report on the relations with the so-called Palestinian Authority. So first and foremost we could question whether this is really a priority given the geopolitical situation, but OK, let's talk about it.

I had the privilege to be co-negotiator on a report on a so-called two-state solution half a year ago, and I managed to put into there the language of a security guarantee for Israel, which would be needed, in my view, at least, that a so-called two-state solution could even be considered. There is no democratically legitimised representation of the so-called Palestinian Authority, but OK, let's discuss it.

But when we look deeper into the outcome of this document, it's actually a blaming and shaming document against the only democracy, the only rule-of-law-based state in the Middle East, our strong partner state, Israel, which is fighting terrorism, fighting a kind of terrorism that also seeks to reach out to our European soil, which is present on EU soil – Hamas, Hezbollah and others, and they are supported by whom as proxies of this regime? By the Iranian regime. And who else is the Iranian regime supporting? The Putin Russian regime that's attacking us and has been attacking us in hybrid means before February 22 and with military means in Ukraine since February 22. So let's connect the dots.

For me, I felt sorry for the Foreign Affairs Committee that it decided on this report and I would feel sorry for this very plenary if it would decide in favour of this report.

**Margarida Marques (S&D).** – Senhora Presidente, Comissão, na semana passada, mais uma forte operação militar de Israel no campo de Jenin, violando o Direito Internacional. Doze palestinianos morreram.

Sim, os cerca de 3 milhões de palestinianos que vivem na Cisjordânia são cidadãos como nós, protegidos pelo Direito Internacional. Sabemos bem que a solução de dois Estados é a única viável. Assim se comprometam, de facto, todos os atores na região, no respeito da segurança, da integridade territorial, do Estado de direito, dos direitos humanos e dos acordos internacionais.

Temos de continuar a apoiar o povo palestiniano na saúde, na educação, na transição ecológica e digital, na participação dos jovens, na democratização e na boa governação.

Reforçar a ajuda humanitária, sim, 63% da população na Faixa de Gaza precisa desta ajuda.

O Tribunal Penal Internacional tem de fazer o seu trabalho, avançar nas investigações a crimes de guerra cometidos nos territórios palestinianos, como em Jenin na semana passada, e felicito a relatora pelo relatório equilibrado que hoje aqui debatemos.

**María Soraya Rodríguez Ramos (Renew).** – Señora presidenta, presentamos hoy este informe, absolutamente necesario, para profundizar en las relaciones de la Unión Europea y la Autoridad Palestina. En él le hacemos recomendaciones a la Autoridad Palestina para reforzar la democracia, respetar los derechos humanos, luchar contra la corrupción y celebrar de inmediato elecciones. Pero lo hacemos en el contexto de una ocupación militar, que viven en Palestina, que cada día parece más —y es más— una anexión ilegal del territorio que, como ustedes conocen, pone claramente en riesgo la solución de dos Estados.

Por eso les pido que apoyen el informe y les pido que rechacen las enmiendas de ECR y de ID, que niegan esta realidad e imponen su agenda política que, por otra parte, es cada vez más parecida a la de los grupos ultranacionalistas y ultrareligiosos que conforman el Gobierno de Israel.

La Comisión no ha encontrado ninguna evidencia de desviación de fondos europeos a organizaciones terroristas. La Comisión no ha encontrado ninguna evidencia de odio en los libros de texto utilizados en las escuelas palestinias. Los veintisiete Estados miembros han desautorizado a Várhelyi por la suspensión temporal de fondos, que ha causado una devastadora situación humanitaria, porque la población palestina vive en esta situación.

**Margrete Auken (Verts/ALE).** – Fru formand! Israels langvarige besættelse af Palæstina må stoppe. Israel skal trække sig tilbage bag den grønne linje. PLO har accepteret en status på de resterende 22 % af det historiske Palæstina, inklusive Østjerusalem. Det er den eneste mulighed for fred og frihed i såvel Palæstina som i Israel. EU skylder fredsfløjen, ikke mindst i Israel, at bevæge sig fra ord til handling. De føler sig svigtet af os. Med god grund. Men vi skal også tage fat i Palæstinas lederskab. Denne betænkning rummer en nødvendig kritik af PA, dels af svækkelsen af retsstaten, oppositionens vilkår og den frie debat, dels og især manglende valg. Sidst var i 2006. Valget dengang var frit og fair, men EU respekterede det jo ikke. Siden har PA skadet den demokratiske legitimitet. De sidder i deres boble i Ramallah og rører sig ikke ud af flækken, heller ikke for at hjælpe de mange, hvis land bliver stjålet af voldelige bosættere, og hvis huse rives ned af Israel samt af den brutale militære undertrykkelse. Både EU og PA må handle i overensstemmelse med international lov. Det kan vi i andre sammenhænge godt finde ud af. De mange unge palæstinensere har hårdt brug for at kunne håbe på en menneskeværdig fremtid.

**Εμμανουήλ Φράγκος (ECR).** – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, ισλαμιστικές τρομοκρατικές επιθέσεις λαμβάνουν χώρα συνεχώς τόσο στο Ισραήλ όσο και στην Ευρώπη. Αυτές οι επιθέσεις αποτελούν συνέχεια μιας πολυετούς δολοφονικής δράσης τζιχαντιστών έναντι όσων αποκαλούν άπιστους. Ο εξτρεμισμός είναι αποτέλεσμα πληθώρας παραγόντων. Βασίζεται όμως κυρίως σε πεποιθήσεις του ακραίου Ισλάμ. Δυστυχώς τα παιδιά των Παλαιστινίων, όπως και τα παιδιά των Τούρκων, μαθαίνουν πώς θα γίνουν μάρτυρες. Άκουσον άκουσον! Μάρτυρες τον 21ο αιώνα! Μάρτυρας λοιπόν, κατ' αυτές τις εξτρεμιστικές διδασκαλίες, γίνεται κανείς όταν σκοτώσει και πεθάνει για τη θρησκεία του, όταν πραγματοποιήσει δηλαδή μια τρομοκρατική επίθεση.

Πρέπει να βεβαιωθούμε ότι κανένα παιδί δεν υποβάλλεται σε εκπαίδευση για να γίνει τρομοκράτης. Ευρώπη και Ισραήλ οφείλουν να συνεργαστούν για την κατάρτιση μιας πολυεπίπεδης διεθνούς στρατηγικής αντιμετώπισης της ισλαμιστικής τρομοκρατίας. Σαφώς, με την αντιμετώπιση της εκπαίδευσης στον εξτρεμισμό ανοίγει ο δρόμος για την επίλυση του Παλαιστινιακού, καθώς και για την ασφάλεια για όλους τους πολίτες μας.

**Marc Botenga (The Left).** – Madame la Présidente, en écoutant certains d'entre vous, je me demande sur quelle planète vous vivez. Vous avez vu les images à Jénine de familles palestiniennes, de réfugiés palestiniens, les mains en l'air, quittant leur maison, quittant le camp de réfugiés par peur d'être abattus sauvagement par des forces d'occupation israéliennes. Vous les avez vues, ces images-là, où vous n'en avez rien à faire?

Imaginez un seul instant que ce soit des Ukrainiens sur ces images, quittant leur maison par peur des troupes russes qui veulent les tuer. Vous auriez appelé à des sanctions. Vous auriez appelé à renforcer le soutien à l'Ukraine, à lui donner plus d'armes. Pourquoi est-ce que la vie d'un Palestinien vaut moins pour vous que la vie d'un Ukrainien? Je ne le comprends pas et je trouve cela inacceptable.

Cela vaut aussi pour la Commission européenne. Vous n'avez pas levé le petit doigt face à ces violations du droit international et face à ces crimes de guerre. Tous les crimes de guerre doivent être punis. Ne faisons pas d'exception pour Israël.

**Jörg Meuthen (NI).** – Frau Präsidentin, werte Kollegen! Manche Vorlage hier im Parlament ist sinnvoll, andere sind unklug und einzelne einfach nur beschämend. Der Bericht zum Verhältnis zwischen der EU und der Autonomiebehörde der Palästinenser gehört zu Letzteren. Dieser Bericht ist nicht nur einseitig, er ist antiisraelisch, er dämonisiert den Staat Israel in beschämender Weise. Er ist das Produkt einer Gruppe von Abgeordneten in diesem Haus, die mal verdeckt, mal offen ihren Hass gegen Israel ausleben.

Europa finanziert die Palästinenser jährlich mit 1,2 Milliarden Euro, Steuergelder, die kaum die Zivilbevölkerung erreichen, sondern in die Terrororganisationen Fatah und Hamas fließen, in die Beschaffung ihrer tödlichen Raketen, an einen demokratisch nicht legitimierten Regierungschef gehen, der offen die Verbrechen der Shoah relativiert, die in korrupten Kanälen versickern, für antisemitische, Hass stiftende Schulbücher ebenso wie für sogenannte Märtyrerrenten verwendet werden, den Schandlohn für die Mörder israelischer Zivilisten.

Das muss enden. Wer Frieden im Nahen Osten will, darf sich nicht an die Seite von Fatah und Hamas stellen. Die EU muss sich endlich auf die Seite der einzigen Demokratie in dieser Region stellen, sich für und nicht gegen Israel entscheiden, und das im Interesse sowohl der Israelis als auch der Palästinenser.

**Antonio López-Istúriz White (PPE).** – Madam President, the report in question is a report that aims to make a recommendation to the Council, Commission and the High Representative on relations with the Palestinian Authority. There is nothing wrong about that.

The problem is that, once again, some in this Parliament have been trying to take advantage of a legitimate debate about our relations with the Palestinian Authority to attack Israel. Another lost opportunity for this Parliament to be a moderating and balancing factor. We have heard here today 'Israeli regime' – it is a democracy, you can like the government or not, but it is a democracy – 'apartheid state', 'criminal state', 'criminals of war'. How can we become a moderating factor? That is what the EU and our values are about. Shame on the declarations I've heard. We want to be a balancing factor, we have to be.

The EPP tried: we brought amendments to try to balance the text. All rejected. And now you are facing other amendments. Radicalisation, in the end: that's what you obtain with these declarations, it is not for the cause of peace and understanding.

From different positions we are all trying to find and to help as Europeans. We need this balanced approach. We cannot ignore the problems, but here we are and we should do our work. Maybe next time.

**Maria Arena (S&D).** – Madame la Présidente, c'est difficile de parler de la relation de l'Union européenne avec l'Autorité palestinienne sans parler d'Israël. C'est impossible. La solution à deux États qui parle de l'État israélien et de l'État palestinien semble s'éloigner de plus en plus.

Sans doute parce que nous avons un État faible du côté palestinien. Mais pourquoi cet État faible? Parce qu'il y a une privation de l'Autorité palestinienne aujourd'hui, de l'exercice de ses compétences vitales pour la souveraineté de son pays. Parce que la construction illégale des colonies et la démolition d'infrastructures palestiniennes par les Israéliens rendent difficile la vie aujourd'hui en Palestine. Parce que les différents checkpoints qui sont aujourd'hui dans l'État palestinien sont à l'origine d'humiliations permanentes à l'égard des jeunes Palestiniens.

Est-ce que vous pensez sincèrement que, dans ce contexte, il soit facile de construire un État palestinien? Ça ne l'est pas. Bien sûr, il nous appartient d'être acteur, d'exiger un certain nombre de choses, d'exiger la fin de l'occupation, d'exiger le démantèlement des colonies, de mettre fin au régime d'apartheid, mais aussi d'exiger de l'Autorité palestinienne qu'elle se renforce, d'exiger des élections, mais ces élections dépendent aussi de l'Autorité. Et tout cela, l'Europe doit pouvoir l'exiger et doit pouvoir avoir une stratégie qui lui permette d'aller dans ce sens.

**Chris MacManus (The Left).** – Madam President, in Palestine, we have again seen over our airwaves the Israeli military committing gross breaches of international law and standards on the use of force, which may constitute a war crime. These are not my words, but the words of representatives of the United Nations, when last week in Jenin, Israeli forces murdered a dozen Palestinians. Five were children, many more badly wounded.

So why does the EU not act? Is it because of Netanyahu supporters in the EU, some here in Parliament, many over here on the right of this Chamber? The very same people who denied the Netanyahu Government's crimes against humanity and disregard for international law, denied the human rights of Palestinians and the principle of recognition of Palestinian statehood.

The EU must intervene. The Israeli regime's colonisation of more territory with illegal settlements, their intensification of apartheid and systematic slaughter of Palestinian men, women and children — it must end.

**Fabio Massimo Castaldo (NI).** – Madam President, Madam Commissioner, I would like to thank our rapporteur, Evin Incir, for the excellent recommendation that correctly reaffirms our commitment to a two-state solution, calls for an immediate cessation of violence, and stresses the importance of organising free and fair elections in Palestine.

Countless Palestinian and Israeli lives are lost every day. While recognising the legitimate security concerns of Israel about terrorism, we cannot ignore that the expansion of illegal settlements, as well as the destructions and the civilian victims provoked by the Israeli government's military operations, not only pose a significant obstacle to the realisation of a two-state solution, but also tragically contribute to a growing rejection from the Palestinian people of a moderate leadership.

Therefore we must support and facilitate effective cooperation with the Palestinian Authority to build up democratic institutions. But we must also foster our cooperation with that part of the Israeli civil society that is clearly standing against all abuses and calling for the rejection of the hardliners' long-term plan: building a state for the settlers in place of the Palestinian State, as the UN's permanent observer said.

Dear colleagues, we must not lose sight of our shared goals: a future where Israelis and Palestinians can live side by side in peace, security and mutual respect. Therefore I call on each of you to support this recommendation, sending them a message of hope and determination.

**Tom Vandenkendelaere (PPE).** – Voorzitter, collega's, commissaris, om geloofwaardig te zijn en impact te hebben in haar ambities om bij te dragen tot een duurzame oplossing van het conflict tussen Israël en de Palestijnen, moet de Unie evenwichtig zijn in haar standpunten en optreden, en dus ook in haar kritiek.

Onze kritiek op het nederzettingenbeleid van Israël kan moeilijk duidelijker zijn, kan moeilijk luider klinken. Maar ook tegenover de Palestijnse Autoriteit moeten we kunnen zeggen waar het op staat: kritiek die onontbeerlijk is om de kansen op duurzame vrede te bevorderen en die vooral de Palestijnen zelf ten goede moet komen, want zij hebben er alle belang bij dat de internationale gemeenschap geen vrede neemt met het gebrek aan democratische legitimiteit, met verdeeld of ontbrekend leiderschap, met gebrek aan transparantie en problemen zoals corruptie, en met de nefaste rol van terroristische organisaties.

Met aandrang nemen we het lot van de Palestijnen ter harte, maar niet door carte blanche te geven aan hun leiders.

**Martina Michels (The Left).** – Frau Präsidentin! Danke zunächst für diesen sehr wichtigen Bericht. Die Gewaltausbrüche der vergangenen Tage verlangen gerade danach, aktiv zu werden. Er befasst sich auch zu Recht mit der israelischen Politik, denn Israels derzeitige ultranationalistische Regierung beschleunigt den illegalen Siedlungsausbau, ergreift Schritte, um die Annexion des Westjordanlands weiter voranzutreiben. Dies untergräbt erneut die Rechte der Palästinenser und marginalisiert die Palästinensische Autonomiebehörde weiter.

Ja, und es steht in einem Zusammenhang: Nach innen will Israels Regierung die Unabhängigkeit der Justiz stützen, die Demokratie aushöhlen. Andererseits wird im Bericht zu Recht gefordert, dass die Palästinensische Autonomiebehörde die Menschenrechte respektiert und endlich, nach 16 Jahren, freie Wahlen abhält. Wir halten am Recht der Palästinenser auf einen eigenen Staat fest und unterstützen daher sehr diesen Bericht.

**Anna-Michelle Asimakopoulou (PPE).** – Madam President, Commissioner, this report was supposed to be about the relationship of the Union with the Palestinian Authority, yet it contains about 40 references to Palestine and the Palestinian Authority, and almost 75 to Israel, which is undeniably imbalanced. It's also disappointing that major issues of importance in our engagement with the Palestinian Authority have been completely overlooked in the report. For instance, there's no mention of the Commission-funded Georg Eckert study, which clearly finds that there is antisemitic and hate speech in Palestinian Authority textbooks.

The report also fails to focus efficiently on other actors that play a major role in the region, and I mean terrorist organisations like Hamas, or the influence of Iran or the IRGC. Of course, we can't discuss relations with the Palestinian Authority without mentioning Israel. And, of course, there are issues about Israel that we debate and disagree on. But this report is not the place for this debate to take place. Unfortunately – like so often – I see this report as having been used as a vehicle for those who wish to criticise Israel and will take any opportunity to do so.

**Miriam Lexmann (PPE).** – Madam President, dear colleagues, across the West Bank, Gaza Strip and East Jerusalem, official Palestinian Authority textbooks teach hatred and violence, and demonise both Israel and the Jewish people.

A peaceful resolution to the Palestinian-Israeli conflict is both a moral and strategic imperative. However, this can only be achieved through educating societies and above all, young generations to live in peace and with cultural tolerance towards one another. The recent spiral of violence only re-emphasises the importance of this.

This is why the EU, as the biggest donor to the Palestinian Authority and to UNRWA, must ensure that our taxpayers' money is not misused and perpetuating the conflict. We need to strengthen oversight, transparency and accountability of how our taxpayers' money is spent, and that supported programmes are implemented in accordance with our values.

**Peter van Dalen (PPE).** – Voorzitter, het uitstekende verslag van collega Incir geeft duidelijk aan wat de route moet zijn voor vrede: de tweestatenoplossing.

Maar er zijn twee partijen die de tweestatenoplossing bedreigen. Dat is in de eerste plaats Hamas. Hamas domineert de Gazastrook en wordt op zijn beurt weer gedomineerd door Iran. En Iran wil Israël de zee in schuiven.

De tweede partij die de tweestatenoplossing bedreigt, is de huidige regering van Israël. De huidige regering van Israël wordt eigenlijk aangevoerd door de twee ministers Ben-Gvir en Smotrich. En die beide zionisten laten de kolonisten de vrije hand, zodat dagelijks Palestijnen worden gepest, geïntimideerd en vernederd. Eigenlijk wil deze regering uiteindelijk de Palestijnen Jordanië in schuiven. Bovendien is het zo dat aanvallen op christelijke begraafplaatsen, christelijke gebouwen en instellingen eigenlijk door Israël niet worden aangepakt. Men laat de boel maar de boel.

Voorzitter, ik ben de afgelopen 14 jaar zes keer uitgebreid in Israël en de Palestijnse gebieden geweest en ik ben zeer teleurgesteld over de gang van zaken. Maar laten we vasthouden, ook als EU, aan de tweestatenoplossing en iedereen die daar voor gaat.

**Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE).** – Madam President, Israel has broken its commitments on the United Nations. It has broken the international law, it has committed a severe long-term occupation and it has committed close to war crimes. And all this is fact, and it is stated by the United Nations authorities. So this is not a matter of opinion.

What do you think it would look like if we would act in the same way with Ukraine and Russia in crisis, intensifying our cooperation with Russia, reminding about the corruption and other problems we probably can find in Ukraine and giving our financial resources to the Russians? We need to get rid of double standards. We need to act according to our principles, law and order, and we need to get these things straight.

**David Lega (PPE).** – Fru talman! På bordet ligger den värsta rekommendation som utrikesutskottet författat under min tid i Europaparlamentet. Men jag är tyvärr inte förvånad när svenska socialdemokrater hållit i pennan. Uppgiften var att författa en rekommendation för EU:s relation med den palestinska myndigheten, men texten fokuserar mycket mer på Israel än på den palestinska myndigheten. Socialdemokraterna kan helt enkelt inte hålla sig ifrån att manifesteras sitt hat mot Israel, och det är ovärdigt Europaparlamentet att göra detsamma.

Samtidigt som denna rekommendation listar – till viss del relevant – kritik mot Israel, så bortser den från helt centrala problem på den palestinska sidan. Till exempel Hamas fruktansvärda attacker mot det israeliska folket nämns inte. Hotet om att förgöra Israel nämns inte. Inte ens problematiken med antisemitism och diskriminering av kristna adresseras.

Den text jag har på bordet är ofullständig, obalanserad och oseriös. Den hade kanske funkade som SSU-debattartikel, men den kan inte accepteras som Europaparlamentets officiella rekommendation. Jag uppmanar alla att rösta minus.

#### *Catch-the-eye procedure*

**Ana Miranda (Verts/ALE).** – Señora presidenta, el pasado mes de febrero intenté tener una reunión con la Autoridad Palestina, con ONG de Israel y con ONG de Palestina, pero me fue impedida la entrada a los territorios ocupados por Israel. Esto lo dice precisamente la resolución de la señora Incir. Y quiero darle las gracias también por haber mencionado que dos eurodiputados no hemos podido acceder formando parte de una delegación oficial. Porque, mientras Israel se preocupa de la Autoridad Palestina para desviar la atención, se siguen manteniendo la ocupación ilegal y el *apartheid*, los asentamientos ilegales y la anexión ilegal y, sobre todo, se sigue extendiendo su autoridad a los territorios ocupados donde tiene su autoridad la Autoridad Palestina. Eso es lo que está haciendo Israel. No lo digo yo, no es una opinión personal, es una opinión de Naciones Unidas y del último informe de la señora Albanese.

Como usted dijo, comisaria, aumenta el ciclo de la violencia, pero hay que volver a la cooperación y a la paz. No hay un enfoque equilibrado —se lo digo así a la extrema derecha de la Cámara— cuando se destruye la paz. No hay un enfoque equilibrado cuando Israel hace lo que acaba de hacer en Yenín.

**Sandra Pereira (The Left).** – Senhora Presidente, debatemos esta resolução no contexto da crescente e brutal política de agressão de Israel contra o povo palestino. É disso exemplo o recente ataque ao campo de refugiados de Jenin: 12 mortos, mais de 100 feridos, incluindo crianças, a expulsão de centenas de famílias das suas casas.

Condenamos e exigimos o fim imediato da violência de Israel contra o povo palestino.

O Governo israelita deve cumprir o Direito Internacional, incluindo as inúmeras resoluções da ONU sobre os inalienáveis direitos do povo palestino que há décadas determinam a criação do Estado da Palestina com as fronteiras de 1967 e capital em Jerusalém Oriental e a efetivação do direito ao retorno dos refugiados.

É inaceitável que às palavras de reconhecimento formal dos direitos nacionais do povo palestino não correspondam firmes posições políticas por parte das Instituições da União Europeia, incluindo do Parlamento Europeu, de repúdio pela política de ocupação e opressão de Israel e de cumprimento do Direito Internacional, expressão de uma postura de convivência que denunciamos.

Daqui expressamos a nossa solidariedade para com o povo palestino e a sua luta pelos seus inalienáveis direitos nacionais.

**Özlem Demirel (The Left).** – Frau Präsidentin! Es gibt einen Zusammenhang zwischen der geplanten Justizreform der ultrarechten Regierung in Israel und den neuesten Entwicklungen in Palästina. Es ist kein Zufall, dass dieselbe Regierung, die gerade das Justizsystem aushebeln möchte, besonders aggressiv gegenüber Palästinensern vorgeht. Denn ein wesentliches Ziel dieser Reform ist auch, die rechtlichen Hürden in der Siedlungs- und Annexionspolitik zu umgehen und zu übergehen. Diese Siedlungspolitik ist eine Politik, die die Rechte der Palästinenser mit Füßen tritt, internationales Recht missachtet. Ja, und diese Politik ist eine Politik, die den Nahostkonflikt wieder weiter anheizt und zuspitzt.

Deshalb ist kein Schweigen im Moment gefragt, sondern es braucht einen Aufschrei. Wo war der Aufschrei bei den Bildern aus dem Flüchtlingslager in Dschenin? Wo war der Aufschrei, als die Journalistin Shireen Abu Akleh ermordet wurde? Kolleginnen, Doppelstandards und Werte sind nicht zusammengehörig. Wenn Sie Wertepolitik vertreten, dann brechen Sie Ihr Schweigen über das Leid der Palästinenser, kritisieren sie diese orthodoxe rechte, nationalistische Regierung ...

*(Die Präsidentin entzieht der Rednerin das Wort.)*

**Reinhard Bütikofer (Verts/ALE).** – Madam President, colleagues, Israel is not an apartheid state and it is not like Russia. But some of those that cannot find enough hyperbole in criticising Israel turn quite gingerly when it comes to calling a spade a spade on the Palestinian side. Let me direct your attention to three amendments, namely amendments 45, 47 and 48 that try to deal with the issue of Palestinian terrorism. Several groups in this House seem to be determined to vote them down. I say that would be a very bad mistake.

**Clare Daly (The Left).** – Madam President, on Palestine, EU politics takes place in a sort of a never-never land where things can be both true and untrue at the same time. We skirt around the details of a reality. We refuse to accurately name Zionism as practised as a European settler colonial project. Israel is an occupying power; Palestinians are a colonised people.

The division of the West Bank, the checkpoints, the separate control regimes, the settlements and annexations, the systemic denial of rights: these are the crimes of apartheid. Israeli air strikes on Gaza in May: 33 dead, hundreds wounded. This isn't self-defence, it's a war crime. The slaughter of children from the air in Jenin: not self-defence. War crimes, illegal, without any comment out of the European Union, while the Commission President toasts the birthday of Israel's occupation of Palestine as the realisation of a dream.

Palestinians have a right to engage in resistance. Our duty under international law is to use diplomatic means to bring about an end to the intolerable conditions they live under. But until we stop rewarding Israel, they'll keep doing it.

**Sabrina Pignedoli (NI).** – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, voglio ricordare che questo Parlamento ha votato innumerevoli risoluzioni sulla questione palestinese. A cosa sono servite? A nulla.

Gli attacchi dell'esercito israeliano sono aumentati e continuano a mietere vittime civili, anche bambini e giornalisti, e si abbattono le scuole costruite con i soldi dei contribuenti europei.

Lo Stato di Israele può permettersi di non rispettare gli accordi internazionali, restando non solo impunito ma potendo contare sull'appoggio delle istituzioni europee. Vogliamo ricordare, per esempio, gli accordi commerciali preferenziali, l'ammissione di Israele ai programmi finanziati dai cittadini europei e, da ultimo, il vergognoso invito del Presidente di Israele alla plenaria del Parlamento per commemorare la Giornata della memoria?

Nei territori palestinesi si vive uno stato di apartheid, di pulizia etnica da parte del regime colonialista israeliano.

È ora che l'Europa si muova in maniera concreta, cosa aspettiamo ad approvare sanzioni contro uno Stato sorretto da un governo fascista che non rispetta i diritti umani?

**Mick Wallace (The Left).** – Madam President, for more than two days last week, the Israeli Defence Forces attacked the Jenin refugee camp in the Occupied Territories of the West Bank. Benjamin Netanyahu labelled the attack on one of the world's most defenceless and impoverished areas a special operation. It reminds one of Russia's special military operations in Ukraine, which we rightly condemned. But where's the condemnation of Israel?

As reported by the excellent Jeffrey St Clair, the IDF targeted Jenin's entire population and the fragile infrastructure the camp depends on for its survival: power plants, pipelines, electrical lines, cell towers, sewage treatment facilities, roads, schools, mosques and clinics.

When the UN is helpless and the Palestinian Authority – which is responsible for security in the Occupied Territories – acts as a subcontractor for the Israeli state, serving only to police Palestinians and not secure them from external attack, is it any wonder paramilitaries have risen up to defend neighbourhoods and families against such blood-soaked incursions? The Israeli treatment of Palestinians is barbaric and the EU is complicit.

*(Ende der spontanen Wortmeldungen)*

**Jutta Urpilainen, Member of the Commission.** – Madam President, honourable Members, the debate today testifies to our continued interest in, and engagement on, the two-state solution and on a peaceful resolution of the conflict. The EU is doing its part.

Our commitment to the two-state solution has always translated into substantial financial support to strengthen the capacity of the Palestinian Authority and to improve the social and economic conditions of the Palestinian people, including refugees.

The Palestinian people need a government that can govern effectively in all Palestinian territory and with full popular support. This also means giving Palestinian civil society, especially young people, more space and better participation in decision-making.

At the current moment, however, it is crucial to prevent the violence from running out of control. All parties need to make an effort to de-escalate the situation to prevent further loss of life, ensure accountability, and bring the perpetrators of crimes to justice.

We urge the Palestinian Authority to do everything possible to condemn and stop terrorist attacks against Israelis and to counter incitements to violence. At the same time, we urge Israel to translate its condemnation of settler terrorism into action and exercise restraint in its military operations and to respect international law.

All sides have the responsibility to engage and to create the conditions for a resolution of the conflict. We will continue to work with all our partners – and particularly together with the Saudi Foreign Minister and the Secretary-General of the League of Arab States – to revive Middle East peace efforts by exploring a comprehensive regional peace approach. We are now actively working on accelerating these efforts with the participation of our key partners.

Thank you, President and Members, for the opportunity to exchange on this very important matter.

**Evin Incir, rapporteur.** – Madam President, first and foremost, I want to thank the Commissioner for taking part in the discussions. I also want to say that I regret to see that some of the colleagues who took part in the debate already left.

First and foremost, just to the colleague, David Lega: I just want to say, in contradiction to you, that I am able, as a Social Democrat, to love Israel and to love Palestine at the same time. That is called standing up for international law and the rule-based order. International law is universal, and it applies to all of us.

And also to the colleague Mandl, who didn't bother to stay either: there is no such thing as a 'so-called' Palestinian Authority. There is a Palestinian Authority. Let me also remind everyone who thinks the same that the Palestinian Authority is a product of agreement between Israel and Palestine. Who are we to undermine the effort of peace that they have tried to take?



Then the claims that the EU is pumping out financial support without any conditionality – be it to the Palestinian Authority, UNWRA or anyone else – are astonishing and, of course, totally made up.

Even with Israel, we have demands. Article 2 of the EU-Israel Association Agreement clearly states, 'Relations between the Parties, as well as all the provisions of the Agreement itself, shall be based on respect for human rights and democratic principles, which guides their internal and international policy and constitutes an essential element of this Agreement'.

I haven't heard anybody in here saying that we should cancel the EU-Israel Association Agreement because we know that it is not good for the two-state solution. So why are we talking about dismantling the Palestinian Authority? I would not have thought that I would ever quote him, but even the Israeli right-wing Prime Minister Netanyahu has said that it is not in his interest to weaken the Palestinian Authority. And then we have MEPs in here saying that we should weaken the PA.

What we do, if we weaken the Palestinian Authority and try to dismantle it, is that we abolish all kinds of possibility for a two-state solution, a peaceful two-state solution, with two democratic states living side by side in peace, democracy and security.

Colleagues, with this said, I just want to once again, as I did in the beginning, call on everybody to vote in favour of the recommendations as they are. They are negotiated, and it is a compromise from many different parts. And I want to finally say thank you to my shadow rapporteurs.

**President.** – That concludes the debate. The vote will be held tomorrow.

## 16. Sprawozdanie za rok 2022 dotyczące Bośni i Hercegowiny (debata)

**President.** – The next item is the debate on the report by Paulo Rangel, on behalf of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, on the 2022 Commission Report on Bosnia and Herzegovina (2022/2200(INI)) (A9-0229/2023).

**Paulo Rangel, rapporteur.** – Madam President, Commission colleagues, the past year was historic for Bosnia and Herzegovina. First, the granting of candidate status was a clear, a positive and an encouraging sign of a new dynamic in the European Union, of a new understanding of our geopolitical needs and of our own responsibility towards the Western Balkans – and the citizens of Bosnia and Herzegovina, who for such a long time expressed their Euro-Atlantic aspirations, deserved this sign. But candidate status is not only a concession, it is also a responsibility for countries to deliver.

The elections of October 2022 allowed us precisely that. A very swift formation of state-level government allowed for moving forward on dozens of policies that have been blocked for years by uncooperative political actors. We see Bosnia and Herzegovina really moving forward and closer to the EU, delivering with concrete results. We have to welcome and we applaud this progress and we expect the authorities to continue building on and seizing this new momentum, this new dynamic.

However, despite this very positive progress, we cannot ignore the main obstacle to the EU integration. On the very day that we commemorate Srebrenica, when we stress the importance of unity and reconciliation, we must condemn the escalation in dangerous and secessionist rhetoric by Milorad Dodik and the Republika Srpska leadership. Genocide denial is not acceptable. Undermining Dayton and the constitutional order is not acceptable. Awarding medals to Vladimir Putin is not acceptable.

With the end of the blockages, it is clear: division and secessionism are the most serious obstacle to EU integration for Bosnia and Herzegovina. That is why the Commission must keep the funds for Republika Srpska suspended until democratic backsliding stops and until full alignment with our common foreign and security policy is ensured.

That is also why the Council must make use of the sanctions regime and finally sanction Mr Dodik and other destabilising actors. And that is why the High Representative and EUFOR Althea have our full support in implementing and protecting peace and stability in Bosnia and Herzegovina. The lessons of Dayton cannot and will not be forgotten.

When Russia brutally invades a sovereign Ukraine, when Iran oppresses and represses women, we have to be clear in the defence of our values, and we count on Bosnian diplomacy at home and in multilateral fora, and also on the enforcement of sanctions by its national authorities.

It is clear that there were attempts by foreign actors to create instability in the Western Balkans to create another front in their war against Europe. Our response and the Bosnian response can only be unity and reconciliation. Only by ensuring rights to both citizens and peoples and no discrimination, only by protecting minorities and only by aligning with European standards, can we move from Dayton to Brussels and find a common future together.

I have to say that it was a privilege to be the standing rapporteur for Bosnia and Herzegovina along this term. I have seen the aspirations of Bosnians in Sarajevo, in Banja Luka, in Mostar, and the willingness to commemorate, but also to overcome the wounds of the past for a better future for all. That is our hope. That is the hope that we have in the Bosnian people.

**Olivér Várhelyi**, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, honourable Members, today is 11 July. Today we are remembering Srebrenica. In July 1995, over 8372 Muslim men and boys were deliberately and systematically killed by the Bosnian-Serb forces in a UN safe area of Srebrenica. A town that they thought to be a safe haven in the war that was ravaging in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Their bodies were thrown in mass graves, facing the ground with their hands tied. As the last victims of Srebrenica are buried in dignity. Our hearts and thoughts are once again with them and with the survivors, their families and friends. We remember and honour the victims and we extend our sympathy to all those grieving. May they find healing for their enduring pain. Europe has not forgotten what has happened in Srebrenica and our own responsibility for not being able to prevent and stop the genocide. In Srebrenica Europe failed and we are faced with our shame. And it is therefore our duty to remember Srebrenica forever. This is also one of the reasons why Europe is taking such a strong stance in the current geopolitical context and Russia's war of aggression against Ukraine. We want to prevent history from being repeated. We believe in Bosnia Herzegovina and therefore the Commission recommended to grant candidate status to the country, which was followed by a decision of the European Council last December. Now that the governments are in office at all levels, all preconditions are there for Bosnia Herzegovina to start to deliver on the key priorities set out in our opinion, and we all have high expectations. This is the reason why I travelled to Sarajevo on 17 May to exchange views with the chairwoman of the Council of Ministers, Borjana Kristo, and with the executive and legislative representatives in the High-Level Political Forum. The forum was an opportunity to discuss the state of play and mainly what the new established authorities could achieve during this year. There is no time to lose. We have started to see some positive developments, including the adoption of the state budget, adoption of the migration strategy. Adoption of the counter-terrorism strategy. Endorsement by the Council of Ministers of the Law on Foreign Affairs. Endorsement of the draft law on conclusion and execution of international agreements. Endorsement of the draft law on the freedom of access to information. Opening of Europol Contact Point only last month. It would be key that further reforms are adopted in due time so that the Commission may take these developments into account and report on them in the upcoming enlargement package in the autumn. In particular, we expect to see Parliament adopting reforms on the integrity in the judiciary, conflict of interest, anti-money laundering and prevention of torture. These are all long-standing items which are mature for adoption.

Bosnia and Herzegovina also needs to develop a national plan for the adoption of the *acquis*. And it needs to put an end to measures restricting trade in breach of our Stabilisation and Association Agreement. Political leaders have a great responsibility. They need to choose the rule of law, democracy and cooperation to build a brighter and prosperous future for the next generations. The leaders of the country must take full ownership and lead by example. We condemn the recent decisions adopted by the Republika Srpska National Assembly on the non-application of the Bosnia and Herzegovina Constitutional Court decisions, as well as the decision to suspend cooperation on EU key projects. The EU regrets that it was necessary for the High Representative to act and to put them out of force. This runs counter to the wishes and the interest of the citizens of Bosnia and Herzegovina, including those living in the Republika Srpska and who believe in a common European future. Likewise, the legislative initiatives in the Republika Srpska entity against media and civil society, if finally adopted, would make a clear backsliding on freedom of expression and of association. These legislative initiatives should be abandoned.

Bosnia and Herzegovina is key for the future of the Western Balkans. The country should focus on the positive and constructive European agenda. This is the agenda with real gains and real benefits for everyone. It is the agenda that brings prosperity, stability and peace. And it is the agenda on which we need to work on together. We, at the Commission, are ready to support Bosnia and Herzegovina in this work and with all our instruments.

**Željana Zovko**, u ime kluba PPE. – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, povjereniče Várhelyi, hvala izvjestitelju Paulu Rangelu na izvanrednom ovogodišnjem izvješću i zadnjem njegovom izvješću o Bosni i Hercegovini.

Protekla godina bila je povijesna za zemlju u smislu europskih integracija. Čestitam Bosni i Hercegovini na dugo očekivanom i dobivenom kandidatskom statusu te pozdravljam brzo formiranje Vijeća ministara te predsjedateljicu Vijeća ministara Borjanu Krišto koja vodi Bosnu i Hercegovinu na ubrzanom putu ka Europskoj uniji.

Europska unija postavila je jasno očekivanje od svih političkih aktera u zemlji. Nužno je pojačati napore u ispunjavanju ustavnih izbornih reformi u skladu s četrnaest ključnih prioriteta Europske komisije.

Trenutna kriza u BiH, a u svezi Ustavnog suda, još nas jednom vraća na osnovno pitanje problema u Bosni i Hercegovini kojima se bavimo u našim rezolucijama još od 2014. godine.

Ustavni sud Bosne i Hercegovine kategorija je Daytonskog mirovnog sporazuma kojim je uspostavljen kao najviša instanca očuvanja ustavne strukture zemlje. Ukoliko sve odluke Ustavnog suda bez diskriminacije ne budu primijenjene i poštovane, pitanje Hrvata koji toliko godina čekaju legitimno predstavljanje neće biti riješeno na jednakopravan način.

Međunarodna zajednica mora inzistirati na primjenama odluka Ustavnog suda po pitanju legitimnog predstavljanja te donošenju izbornog zakona koji će osigurati da se svi konstitutivni narodi i ostali građani osjećaju ravnopravnim.

Ne smijemo dozvoliti selektivan pristup odlukama Ustavnog suda niti selektivan pristup miru i pravdi.

**Dietmar Köster**, on behalf of the S&D Group. – Madam President, the annual report underscores BiH's momentum on its path to the European Union now that it has been granted candidate status. But there is still much to be done. The biggest obstacle for BiH to become an EU Member State today are the inflammatory rhetoric and sensationalist and anti-democratic laws and policies by the leadership of the Republika Srpska. It's simply a shame.

I would again call for targeted sanctions against destabilising political actors, notably Milorad Dodik as well as other high-ranking Republika Srpska officials. We must overcome the ethnic divisions, the hate speech against Muslim people and several minorities, and the concept of constituent peoples, which is discrimination against other groups.

I would like to underline that the country urgently needs measures against poverty, inequality and corruption. The European Union must strengthen the civil society because it builds the fundament to overcome ethnocracy in favour of democracy.

**Klemen Grošelj**, v imenu skupine Renew. – Spoštovani. Danes, na dan spomina na genocid v Srebrenici, je na nek način prav, da spregovorimo o prihodnosti BiH. O njeni evropski prihodnosti.

BiH je kot država kandidatka za članstvo po volitvah na pomembni prelomnici, ki bo določila, ali bo šla po poti reform v dobrobit svojih prebivalcev, ali pa bo postala prizorišče geopolitičnega prerivanja z lokalnimi nacionalističnimi prismsmi ter z vsemi s tem povezanimi tveganji ponovnih tragedij, katerim smo bili priča v preteklosti.

Gospoda komisar, kaj bomo naredili – mi vsi, jaz, vi, Komisija, ta dom, OHR, EUFOR –, da ustavimo razdiralno in za vse v BiH – za Srbe, Bošnjake, Hrvate, vse prebivalce – uničujočo politiko gospoda Dodika? Ga bomo sankcionirali ali bomo šli še en krog pomirjanja z upanjem, zdaj pa bo.

Kako bomo pomagali sedaj, ko so se oblikovale institucije oblasti v BiH? Da nam lokalni politiki ne bodo samo obljubljali in prodajali meglo – nam in prebivalcem BiH –, ampak da se bodo začeli reformni procesi, ki bodo Bosno utrdili na poti članstva v Evropski uniji in krepitve demokracije in vladavine prava, predvsem pa zagotovili ljudem v Bosni in Hercegovini boljši jutri in jasno evropsko prihodnost. Ali pa si bomo Pilatovsko oprali roke, še enkrat?

Kako bomo zagotovili, da bodo evropska sredstva, ki so in bodo na voljo v BiH, porabljena za dobrobit ljudi in ne v korist ozkih interesnih skupin in bohotenje korupcije? Ali smo zato, da razširimo pristojnosti evropskega urada javnega tožilca in pomagamo BiH storiti ključni korak v boju proti korupciji in zlorabam EU sredstev?

Mislim, da to moramo storiti, za Bosno, a še bolj zase in kredibilnost naše politike širitve in politike do Zahodnega Balkana.

**Tineke Strik**, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Madam President, Commissioner, today we commemorate the Srebrenica genocide 28 years ago, when the international community failed to protect the citizens despite the promise of safety. Never again. This is what we promised with the Dayton Agreement. But what do we see now? Stability and peace are again under pressure in Bosnia and the international community is asleep.

Milorad Dodik takes a step towards the accession of the Republika Srpska from Bosnia and Herzegovina, rejecting the authority of the Constitutional Court. Many people fear the consequences. And this is why our report is clear: Dodik must be sanctioned. And the security must be guaranteed by reinforcing the EUFOR forces.

Chair, we awarded the candidate status to Bosnia in December last year. Now, both sides must deliver on this commitment. So let's support and push Bosnia to develop a true democracy and to comply with the case law of the European Court of Human Rights and its own Constitutional Court, including Republika Srpska, and block any effort undermining the prospect of EU membership.

We cannot afford to disappoint Bosnian citizens again. They deserve a peaceful and inclusive country where their rights are respected, regardless of their background. Let them be able to count on the European values.

**Anna Fotyga**, *on behalf of the ECR Group*. – Madam President, Commissioner, I pay tribute to the victims of the Srebrenica genocide and feel the pain of their families. For us, members of the international community, it is not enough to repeat 'never again'. Although we used to do this, Bucha and Irpin happened and therefore we have to do our utmost, whatever we can, in order in order to help Bosnia and Herzegovina to overcome wounds.

It has been done by the Partnership for Peace and the Membership Action Plan of NATO. It has been done also with granting of candidacy status for Bosnia and Herzegovina. Yet we are concerned by actions of Dodik that are particularly dangerous in view of Russian aggression against Ukraine.

Therefore we have to act decisively and with resolve. I really commend the report. I think it is well done, and therefore I think that it gives prospects for Bosnia and Herzegovina as well.

**Jean-Lin Lacapelle**, *au nom du groupe ID*. – Madame le Président, chers collègues, nous examinons aujourd'hui l'avis du Parlement européen sur la Bosnie. Cet avis reflète servilement celui de la Commission européenne et devient chaque année plus caricatural. La Bosnie-Herzégovine, État improbable, reflète en effet tous les fantasmes dangereux de l'Union européenne.

Vous, majorité de ce Parlement européen, chantez les louanges d'un multiculturalisme qui fait essentiellement les affaires de l'islam radical. Loin de voir le nombre croissant de Bosniaques musulmans engagés dans les rangs djihadistes, vous n'avez qu'une cible obsessionnelle: la République serbe de Bosnie. En Bosnie comme au Kosovo, vous ne cherchez en fait qu'à humilier les populations serbes et à détruire leurs droits – en l'occurrence, dans un ensemble fédéral bosniaque qui n'a pourtant aucune légitimité historique.

Dans beaucoup de domaines, nous savons désormais que les eurocrates sont plus royalistes que le roi qui trône à Washington. Ainsi, concernant la Bosnie-Herzégovine, vous entendez piétiner les accords de Dayton qui, malgré leurs défauts, consacrent tout de même l'existence de la République serbe de Bosnie alors que vous voulez, vous, la dissoudre. Et on croit rêver quand on lit dans le rapport que la Bosnie doit opérer, je cite, une transition progressive de Dayton à Bruxelles.

Nous demandons à l'Union européenne d'arrêter sa fuite en avant et de mettre fin à ses attaques contre la République serbe de Bosnie, comme d'ailleurs contre les peuples européens qui, de plus en plus nombreux, ont le courage de s'exprimer démocratiquement contre elle.

**Kinga Gál (NI).** – Elnök Asszony! A jelenlegi geopolitikai helyzetben olyan megközelítésre lenne szükség, amely érzékenységet tanúsít a Nyugat-Balkán összetett problémái iránt. Ezzel ellentétben a Bosznia-Hercegovináról szóló jelentés kiegyensúlyozatlan. Ahelyett, hogy oldaná a feszültséget, élezi a konfliktusokat. A magyar álláspont bizonyítja, hogy a kioktatás és a szankciókkal való fenyegetés helyett a kölcsönös megértésen alapuló párbeszédre van szükség. Ezt a politikát igazolja, hogy magyar közbenjárásra, a három berlini folyamatban kötött megállapodásból kettőt sikerül elfogadtatni a boszniai szerbekkel.

Elfogadhatatlan, hogy az Európai Parlament baloldali többsége a jelentésben pártérdekeket érvényesít, például amikor bírálja a magyar vállalatok jelenlétét, összeszova őket az Unión kívüli kínai cégekkel. Méltatlan továbbá, hogy ezt a jelentést is a bővítési biztos ideológiai alapú támadására használják, noha ő kiemelkedő munkát végez a térségben, és ehhez gratulálok. Bosznia-Hercegovina érdemi támogatására van szükség, aminek a legjobb eszköze a bővítési folyamat felgyorsítása. Ezzel tudunk tisztelni a srebrenicai áldozatok emléke előtt, és legtöbbit tenni azért, hogy hasonló szörnyűségek soha ne ismétlődhessenek meg.

**Sunčana Glavak (PPE).** – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, povjereniče, kolegice i kolege, put Bosne i Hercegovine prema europskim integracijama seže u 1997. godinu. Brojni od vas nisu ni mislili možda da će biti u ovom Domu ili biti u svijetu politike i donositi tako važne odluke.

2016. bila je godina podnošenja zahtjeva za članstvo, a eto, konačno u prosincu prošle godine ostvario se taj dugo željeni put. Što smo naučili? Puno je lekcija naučeno na tom dugom putu, kako u ovom domu tako iz perspektive bosanskohercegovačkih političara.

Pred Bosnom i Hercegovinom, pred njihovom politikom, smatram da je generacijska prilika jer razina povjerenja u Europsku uniju prema najnovijem Eurobarometru od prije koji dan jest 57 posto. To čini, naravno, to je učinjeno i uz brojne napore trenutno predsjedavajuće Vijeća ministara Borjane Krišto, kojoj moram čestitati u njezinoj ulozi u ovom procesu koji se odvija, vidim da se slažete sa mnom, povjereniče.

Demokratska preobrazba i vladavina prava dobar su i istinski put Bosne i Hercegovine prema njenim punim europskim integracijama. Želimo gospodarski, politički i socijalno održivo društvo. Međutim, nemojmo zaboraviti, čestitam kolegi Rangelu, inače, na ovom izvješću, da žalim što se konstitutivni narodi spominju samo jednom ... *(predsjedavajuća je govornici oduzela riječ)*

**Tonino Picula (S&D).** – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, prije 28 godina dogodio se genocid u Srebrenici. Žrtve nikada ne smiju biti zaboravljene. Pravda mora sustići sve zločince, a politika spriječiti da se takav zločin ponovi bilo kada i bilo gdje.

Ali danas Milorad Dodik negira genocid u Srebrenici s istom lakoćom kao i opstojnost Bosne i Hercegovine kao države. Uporno provocira radi skretanja pozornosti od pravnog nasilja kojeg provodi u svom entitetu.

Politička situacija u Bosni i Hercegovini najbolji je pokazatelj da napretka ne može biti bez konsenzusa i bez poštivanja ustavnog uređenja. Zato trebamo dosljedno primjenjivati politiku uvjetovanosti koja je dio IPA III sporazuma i preporuka o strategiji novog proširenja Europske unije.

Komisija bi morala što prije dostaviti svoju evaluaciju, a Bosna i Hercegovina konačno mora ispuniti glavni dio tih obveza. Vremena ima sve manje jer zemlja godišnje gubi 1,5 posto stanovništva i drži prvo mjesto na svijetu po kriteriju pada broja stanovnika.

Bosni i Hercegovini je mjesto u Europskoj uniji. Svaki stvarni pomak na tom putu imat će našu punu podršku.

**Karen Melchior (Renew).** – Madam President, Commissioner, today we commemorate 28 years since the Srebrenica genocide. This was a genocide that marked a European history and our conscience because we had a responsibility that we failed to live up to, to protect the population that had sought refuge in Srebrenica.

It also marks all of our European populations because in each of our countries we have families that sought refuge as refugees after the genocide or before the genocide and reside in our countries. So the fate of Bosnia and Herzegovina is not only a fate for that country, but a fate for all of Europe.

It is imperative that the killings that occurred in Srebrenica are recognised for what they truly were – a genocide. A genocide of Muslim, Bosniak people, young boys and young men and elderly men. This needs to be recognised also by the politicians of Republika Srpska as part of the way to deal with the past and achieve a peaceful future.

We need to stop impunity, to lay the foundation for a more stable and European Bosnia and Herzegovina that we can welcome as part of the European Union.

**Reinhard Bütikofer (Verts/ALE).** – Madam President, Commissioner, colleagues, earlier today this House came together in an act of commemoration for the more than 8 000 Muslim men and boys that were killed in the Srebrenica massacre 28 years ago. But in this debate, a Member of Parliament from the ID Group thinks it's adequate to spew anti-Muslim hatred. What a shame!

But the question also goes to ourselves. Do we draw the necessary conclusions? Are we living up to our duty? Dodik is pursuing a blatant secessionist policy. I challenge you, Commissioner, to say it here: 'blatant secessionist policy'. Call a spade a spade, and then let's sanction him.

**Ladislav Ilčić (ECR).** – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, kolege, Bosna i Hercegovina zaslužuje europsku perspektivu. No, ta perspektiva ne podrazumijeva samo apsorpciju europskih sredstava, što ovo izvješće pozdravlja, već i analizu gdje se ta sredstva troše jer izgleda da se nemala količina tih sredstava utapa u općoj korupciji u BiH.

Drugo, izvješće pozdravlja unapređenje izbornog procesa, a taj je proces bio izrazito loš i kompromitiran jer nije došlo do prijeko potrebnih izmjena, i političkih i tehničkih tog izbornog zakona.

I treće, dobro je da izvješće osuđuje srpski separatizam, no jednako velik razlog nestabilnosti je i velikobošnjački unitarizam koji ostalim dvama narodima uskraćuje pravo na nacionalni identitet i vlastitu viziju države te ih nastoji staviti i proglašiti manjinama s nižom razinom prava.

Dakle, separatizam hrani unitarizam i obratno. I zato poruka iz Europske unije mora biti jasna. BiH je tronacionalna država i svi konstitutivni narodi u njoj moraju imati jednaka prava.

**Bernhard Zimniok (ID).** – Frau Präsidentin! In den letzten Jahren hat Bosnien und Herzegowina viele Milliarden von der EU erhalten, damit sich das Land an das EU-Niveau anpassen kann. Das Resultat ist ernüchternd und überschaubar: Seit dem Beitrittsantrag im Jahr 2016 ist das Land im Korruptionsindex immer weiter gefallen. Aktuell befindet sich das Land auf dem Niveau von Sierra Leone oder Nepal. Wenn wir von der Leyens Impfdeal als Maßstab ausgehen, ist Bosnien und Herzegowina tatsächlich auf einem guten Weg – aber nur dann.

Auch sonst stellt sich die Frage, wieso überhaupt über einen EU-Beitritt des Landes nachgedacht wird. Es ist nicht nur hochkorrupt, es führt auch eine der wichtigsten illegalen Migrationsrouten durch das Land, ohne dass irgendetwas dagegen unternommen wird. Es ist ein politisches und ethnisches Pulverfass und dazu in einigen Landesteilen noch ein Hort des Islamismus. Fazit: Dieses Land stellt eine Gefahr für die Mitgliedstaaten dar. Der Aufnahmeprozess muss deshalb umgehend beendet werden.

*(Der Redner lehnt eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“ von Karen Melchior ab.)*

**Fabio Massimo Castaldo (NI).** – Madam President, Commissioner, dear colleagues, it is often said that the decision to speed up the concession of the candidate status to Bosnia and Herzegovina is rooted in the changed geopolitical environment, especially the Russian war against Ukraine. This, in my opinion, is a sad reality. We cannot continue to treat the Western Balkans as a geopolitical problem that requires our reaction to external inputs. The potential increase of influence from third actors is certainly a growing danger that we should take into account, but we need also to take a lead and that cannot be our sole guiding light.

It is also necessary to start to be coherent with our values. We have to sanction, finally, the secessionist actions of Dodik that is freezing and jeopardising the functioning of the state and is also undermining all chances of constitutional major reforms in the country. We must adopt, therefore, a proactive approach, leaving apart the tactical manoeuvres that in the past certain Member States have used so far to slow down the enlargement and to not take measures. Let us defend the perspective towards the European future for the Bosnians, let us realise that the Western Balkans are future members of our Union and not simple partners that we should convince to stay on our side. Otherwise we will simply continue to react to threats and at a certain point it will be simply too late.

**Lukas Mandl (PPE).** – Madam President, dear colleagues, first I want to emphasise that we must never forget that the worst crimes in mankind's history were committed by Austrians and Germans. And given that, I want to remember that we have commemorated today in this very European Parliament, the massacre of Srebrenica is a part of many war crimes in the wars of the former Yugoslavia. That's why many of us are wearing these signs today.

And this must lead us to the clear analysis that in parts of Europe, like the so-called Republika Srpska, the leadership does not exist of people who share with their children that things like that must never happen again. They don't think that there is some responsibility, if not for the past, if they are later generations, then at least for the future. In order to take care of the future, we have to take care of reconciliation, of freedom, of human dignity, of rule of law, of democracy in present times.

And this is what's not done in Republika Srpska. This harms Bosnia and Herzegovina, this harms the Western Balkans in its entirety, because the same is true for the leadership in Belgrade. And this is why we have to stick to these very values I have just mentioned in our outreach to Bosnia and Herzegovina on behalf of the citizens, not on behalf of Brussels, on behalf of the people of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

**Andreas Schieder (S&D).** – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Kommissar! Wir gedenken heute, gerade am 11. Juli, Srebrenicas, der Opfer, der Familien. Und wir gedenken auch des größten Kriegsverbrechens auf europäischem Boden seit dem Ende des Zweiten Weltkriegs. Wo steht Bosnien und Herzegovina heute? Es gibt positive Signale, wie z. B. die letzten Wahlen, wo auch die Bürgerinnen und Bürger von Bosnien und Herzegovina mit ihrer Wählerstimme eine Absage an Nationalisten und eine nationalistische Politik erteilt haben. Es gibt den Kandidatenstatus für den Beitritt zur Europäischen Union.

Es gibt aber auf der anderen Seite die Krise, die sich auch immer mehr vertieft, und einer daran trägt Schuld, nämlich Milorad Dodik und seine Hass säende Rhetorik und Politik. Ich frage mich oft: Wie reagiert die Europäische Kommission darauf? Da bin ich sehr unzufrieden, denn sie schweigt sehr oft. Wir brauchen aber eine starke Europäische Kommission, einen Kommissar, der dort hingeht und sagt: Wir brauchen ein Bosnien, wo wir die Demokratie unterstützen, wo wir Sanktionen für Dodik fordern und mit allen Kräften für eine Zukunft dieses Landes kämpfen. Das fehlt mir bis jetzt bei der Kommission, es tut mir leid, Herr Kommissar.

**Matjaž Nemeč (S&D).** – Spoštovani. Ob začetku svojega nagovora mi dovolite, da ljudem v Bosni in Hercegovini prenesem sporočilo sočustvovanja. Pred 28 leti je bilo nasilno odvzetih več kot 8000 življenj. Tragedija Srebrenice ni samo vaša, je tudi naša. Je tragedija človeštva, ki kliče po odgovornosti – nikoli več.

Torej, spoštovani visoki zbor, spoštovani komisar Varhelyi. Od lanske podelitve statusa kandidatke je v Bosni in Hercegovini opaziti določen napredek, a najbolj sporne reforme glede ustavnih in volilnih sprememb ter vladavine prava ostajajo še nerazrešene.

Teško je voditi državu v smer demokratizacije, sprave in miru, ko politični voditelji zavestno delujejo v prid destabilizacije in polarizacije družbe. Predsednik Republike Srbske Milorad Dodik in ostali visoki uradniki s svojimi odločitvami resno ogrožajo suverenost in ozemeljsko celovitost Bosne in Hercegovine in to je potrebno ostro obsoditi.

Obsojam tudi sprejemanje odločitev, ki spodkopavajo ustavne temelje in pomenijo dramatičen odmik od Daytonskega mirovnega sporazuma. Čas je, da na krivice pokažemo s prstom in potrebnimi ukrepi. Mir in stabilnost nista samoznačilna v Bosni in Hercegovini. Njuna ohranitev pa naša prva prioriteta.

*Catch-the-eye procedure*

**Karlo Ressler (PPE).** – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, stravične masovne egzekucije, genocid Srebrenice bio je kulminacija zločina velikosrpskog Miloševićevog režima u Bosni i Hercegovini i u Hrvatskoj.

Takva politika poražena je prije svega vojno, hrabrošću Hrvatske vojske, Hrvatskog vijeća obrane u suradnji i s bošnjačkim snagama koja je uspjela spasiti Bihać od scenarija Srebrenica. To je omogućilo Dayton. To je omogućilo neovisnu Bosnu i Hercegovinu, ali je i to omogućilo današnji sustav vlasti, utemeljen na konstruktivnim narodima i na multietničkom karakteru zemlje.

Danas, nažalost, neki opasno negiraju državu, negiraju Bosnu i Hercegovinu, ali isto tako neki drugi, nažalost, slično opasno negiraju multietnički karakter države izbornim zakonodavstvom kojim jedan narod drugom narodu nameće birati političke predstavnike.

Ohrabrujući je napredak, ohrabrujući je predani rad sadašnje vlade, ali isto tako još puno toga preostaje da ...-  
(predsjedavajuća je govorniku oduzela riječ)

**Mick Wallace (The Left).** – Madam President, Bosnia and Herzegovina is severely hampered by the deep structural issues stemming from the fundamental principles of the Dayton Peace Agreement, the neocolonial institution of the High Representative, who can dismiss the complete lack of positive or economic and social development and the dramatically high levels of immigration from both sub-entities.

The report has very little in it to address these structural issues. It defends the Dayton Agreement and pours fuel on the already tense situation regarding relations with neighbouring states. We know that the issue of NATO and Russia is extremely divisive, and yet the report calls on political actors to condemn Russia, impose sanctions and advance NATO membership. The harder the EU pushes on the line, the more pronounced the disputes between the ethno-national confederations in Bosnia and Herzegovina will become.

**Tomislav Sokol (PPE).** – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, nedavnim odlukama visokog predstavnika Schmidta kojima su nametnute izmjene izbornog zakonodavstva i Ustava Federacije BiH Hrvati u BiH spašeni su političke likvidacije koja im se pripremila od strane SDA i DF-a.

Na taj način, kao i uklanjanjem blokade formiranja izvršne vlasti u Federaciji, smanjen je utjecaj antieuropskih fundamentalističkih snaga u Sarajevu te je omogućeno da BiH doista krene u smjeru europske integracije.

Hrvati su konstitutivni narod koji zasigurno najviše, bez fige u džepu, želi u Europsku uniju. Nadamo se da sada napokon iz bošnjačke strane imaju partnera za racionalan razgovor bez pokušaja preglasavanja i obespravljanja.

Najbolji test iskrenost njihovih namjera bit će završna reforma izbornog zakonodavstva koja treba onemogućiti da osobe bez izbornog legitimiteta, poput Željka Komšića, ikada više budu izabrani kao lažni predstavnici hrvatskog naroda u Predsjedništvu države.

Dame i gospodo, stabilnost i dugoročni opstanak, kao i europski put Bosne i Hercegovine, mogu se postići samo i isključivo dovršavanjem reforme izbornog zakona koja će omogućiti punu ravnopravnost sva tri konstitutivna naroda.



**IN THE CHAIR: DITA CHARANZOVÁ***Vice-President*

**Jiří Pospíšil (PPE).** – Paní předsedající, já moc děkuji za tuto zajímavou debatu a chtěl jsem také připojit svůj hlas k podpoře členství Bosny a Hercegoviny v Evropské unii, ale o to silněji musíme popisovat problémy, které jsou spojeny s politickými aktivitami prezidenta Dodika. Krize kolem ústavního soudu Bosny a Hercegoviny, separatistické tendence, příklon k Rusku, to zde dneska během debaty mnohokrát zaznělo. My toto nesmíme podceňovat. Nesmíme na to reagovat pouze diplomatickými frázemi, ale musíme na to reagovat skutky.

Připojuji se ke kolegům, kteří zde dneska jasně řekli, že je třeba sankčních mechanismů, sankcí vůči Dodikovi a jeho lidem. Je třeba na to rázně reagovat. Toto je jediná šance, jak do budoucna umožnit cestu Bosny a Hercegoviny do Evropské unie. Budeme-li zavírat oči, tak Dodikové budou vítězit a Bosna a Hercegovina se nikdy členem Evropské unie nestane.

*(End of catch-the-eye procedure)*

**Olivér Várhelyi, Member of the Commission.** – Madam President, honourable Members, the upcoming enlargement package will be, of course, an occasion to take stock of our relations with Bosnia and Herzegovina and we expect to see reforms delivered on the key priorities as it was also approved by the Council. Because it is only through delivering a substantial set of reforms that Bosnia and Herzegovina will be able to advance on its EU path and demonstrate to its people that it has taken seriously the offer made by the European Union. From our side, we will continue, of course, to support Bosnia and Herzegovina.

If there is any conclusion to be drawn from this discussion, it would be that it is equally important for all EU institutions to give recognition to progress where recognition is due. In other words, it would be a mistake to punish the entire country for the acts of one of its leaders, while the results have been delivered by the others.

**Paulo Rangel, rapporteur.** – Madam President, Commissioner, colleagues: a year ago, we were voting on the last report on Bosnia and Herzegovina. Twelve months later, a lot is different, positively different. And something remains, unfortunately, the same.

At state level, at federation level, at canton level, even at the level of civil society, we see improvement, we see resumption of political decision-making, we see that progress has been made on the European path. There is still, of course, a lot to be done. The protection of minorities, judicial and constitutional reform, public administration, economic development, the green transition or education, among others. But the signs are positive for now.

At the level of Republika Srpska, however, we see the regression, the rise of the inflammatory speech, the divisive, secessionist rhetoric of Mr Dodik and his allies. One man cannot hold the country and its progress on European integration hostage. They are the legitimate aspirations of an entire people.

This Parliament has been a constant supporter of Bosnia and Herzegovina on its European path. Less than a year ago, there were still those who doubted that it could even achieve candidate status. But anyone who knows the country and its people, who has been to the churches, mosques and synagogues of Sarajevo and who has talked to its inhabitants knows that anyone who has gone through what the Bosnians have gone through and overcome it is capable of the greatest things, of the greatest achievements.

I would like to thank my colleagues who have worked on this report, the Commission and the Council for their commitment to showing the way forward to for Bosnia and Herzegovina and its people.

Now we must be consistent, reject divisions, reject attacks and support this future for Bosnia and the whole region.

**President.** – The debate is closed. The vote will take place tomorrow.

## 17. Sprostowanie (art. 241 Regulaminu) (podjęte działania)

**President.** – Pursuant to Rule 241(4) of the Rules of Procedure, I would like to inform you that there was no request to put to the vote the corrigendum from the AGRI Committee announced in plenary yesterday at the opening of the sitting.

The corrigendum is therefore deemed to have been approved.

## 18. Sprawozdanie za rok 2022 dotyczące Albanii (debata)

**President.** – The next item is the debate on the report by Isabel Santos, on behalf of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, on the 2022 Commission Report on Albania (2022/2199(INI)) (A9-0204/2023).

**Isabel Santos, relatora.** – Senhora Presidente, Senhor Comissário, Caros Colegas, permitam-me que me dirija a todos vós e, ao fazê-lo, me dirija também ao povo albanês que, com coragem e determinação, tem perseverado no caminho europeu.

No ano passado, quando debatemos este relatório anual, tínhamos diante de nós um quadro bem diferente do que temos hoje, bem mais sombrio, dada a situação de injustiça que fazia com que a Primeira Conferência Intergovernamental fosse consecutivamente protelada.

Hoje, ultrapassada essa fase, encaramos o presente e o futuro com um novo alento. O processo de *screening* avança rapidamente e será previsivelmente cumprido num tempo recorde de 13 meses.

Em face do nível de compromisso e capacidade de resposta demonstrados e da necessidade de recuperar o tempo perdido devido a problemas alheios, este relatório apresenta o ano 2030 como meta para a conclusão do processo de adesão.

Não há tempo a perder.

Este relatório cobre um leque alargado de reformas em curso e deixa recomendações que entendemos ser importante ter em conta.

Importa continuar o caminho das reformas na área do Estado de Direito e da Justiça, recuperar das demoras devidas à diminuição de recursos humanos a que o *vetting* conduziu e que se melhore o acesso dos cidadãos à justiça.

A luta contra a corrupção e a criminalidade organizada não admite tréguas e traz constantes desafios.

O SPAC trouxe progressos significativos num processo que tem que ser contínuo no fortalecimento da transparência das instituições e da democracia.

Assinalamos os avanços legislativos em matéria de proteção das minorias, mas é necessário que tenham uma real tradução na proteção e na inclusão das populações LGBTQI+, roma e egípcia.

No que diz respeito à liberdade de imprensa, sublinhamos a importância da retirada da lei antidifamação, mas salientamos a necessidade da promoção de uma maior proteção dos jornalistas e da promoção da liberdade e da independência do seu exercício profissional.

Em matéria de política de ambiente, assinalamos a aceleração da diversificação das fontes energéticas e da transição para as energias renováveis, solar e vento, e a aplicação expedita do pacote de apoio da União Europeia aos Balcãs Ocidentais nesta matéria.

Regoziamo-nos com a criação do Parque Nacional do Rio Vjosa, o primeiro do género na Europa, mas pedimos o reforço das políticas ambientais. Temos que exigir isto.

No que diz respeito à política externa, não podemos esquecer, num momento crítico como aquele que atravessamos, que a Albânia se tem mostrado um parceiro confiável e alinhado com a Política Externa e de Segurança da União Europeia, inclusive no seu papel de membro do Conselho de Segurança das Nações Unidas.

Caros colegas, a juventude terá um papel importante no futuro europeu da Albânia e, por isso, é fundamental envolvê-la, desde já, na tomada de decisões.

O processo de adesão representa a construção de um projeto de sociedade para o qual todos têm que ser convocados: organizações da sociedade civil e indivíduos. Este processo exige o fortalecimento também do diálogo inter e intrapartidário, ultrapassando a polarização que tem marcado a vida política do país e que tanto a condiciona.

O processo está em curso e as reformas estão a ser implementadas, mas é tempo de ir para lá do trivial cumprimento de compromissos. É tempo de fazer mais e melhor e construir uma visão inspiradora em torno do futuro europeu da Albânia.

**Olivér Várhelyi**, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, honourable Members, I want to thank our rapporteur, Ms Santos, for the report and the European Parliament for the continued support provided to the EU path of Albania.

From day one of this Commission, the Western Balkans have been our priority. This common work and commitment have brought progress. Since last year's debate, there is a fundamental development: nearly a year ago we opened accession negotiations with Albania. This was a major step for the country and a clear recognition of Albania's progress in advancing on its EU reform agenda.

The screening process is well on track. Delegations from Albania come well prepared and actively engaged in the discussions. So the screening is proceeding smoothly and the Commission will present its screening report to the Council within days.

We took positive note that the recent local elections on 14 May were held in calm and transparent manner on the day of the vote. According to the preliminary findings and conclusions of OSCE/ODIHR – the extended election observation mission – the local elections were well administered, competitive and held with the participation of the country's key political forces. This is a significant improvement compared to the boycott that we have seen in 2019 at local elections.

The Commission encourages the Albanian authorities to address all outstanding recommendations of the OSCE/ODIHR, as well as from the Venice Commission in this regard. To this end, we call for constructive and inclusive political dialogue from all sides.

The Commission concluded in last year's report that the functioning of the judiciary in Albania is moderately prepared. Albania's legislative and institutional framework on judiciary has a high level of alignment with the EU *acquis* and European standards. Since then, the vetting process is proceeding well, with 82% of the magistrates now vetted in first instance. Following new appointments of judges, the High Court has reduced the backlog of cases and reached the quorum to make appointments to the Constitutional Court. The last vacancy at the Constitutional Court was filled in December last year.

On fundamental rights, Albania maintained overall a positive direction, with an overall robust legislative framework in place. However, there is still a need to continue progress when it comes to the implementation of the fundamental rights, especially in the areas of minority rights, property rights and media freedom, as well as the protection of personal data.

Some progress has also been made on the fight against organised crime and the fight against corruption. The Specialised Structure for Anti-Corruption and Organised Crime, called the SPAK, delivered several important decisions affecting also high-level officials – including a former prosecutor general – and we expect continued progress in developing a strong track record on final convictions in corruption cases, notably at high level and in organised crime cases.

Further, let me again commend Albania's continued alignment with the EU's restrictive measures and sanctions against Russia, maintaining the 100% alignment to our common foreign and security policy. Albania continues to use its ongoing term in the UN Security Council to respond to the crises along like-minded countries. This proves that Albania has shown its determination to advance on the EU path and is a reliable partner.

The European Union has been the most important partner of Albania. Albania has received continuous financial support, with the aim to boost its resilience, including through the Economic and Investment Plan and, lately, through our energy support package.

Allow me a short update on this one, the energy support package. Between February and May this year, we have disbursed 90% of the EUR 500 million budget support to mitigate the increase of energy costs, both for small and medium-sized enterprises and also to vulnerable households in the Western Balkans. In this context, Albania received EUR 72 million this spring to subsidise energy prices for households and for SMEs, and to provide financial aid to vulnerable persons and to diversify its energy sources through new wind and solar investments.

Albania has come a long way on its path towards the European Union, showing persistence in pursuing difficult reforms in the interests of the Albanian people. We would like to see the country entering the next phase of the accession process. Notably, we would like to have the next intergovernmental conference to open the first cluster on fundamentals still this year.

**David Lega**, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Madam President, Commissioner Várhelyi, dear colleagues, last year, the EU finally opened the accession talks with Albania, which constitutes one step towards EU membership and a new face in the EU-Albania relations.

Becoming a member of the EU is not and should not be a quick or an easy process. The road towards EU membership is one of requirements aimed at guaranteeing democratisation, modernisation, the rule of law, stability and growth in each and every state aspiring for EU membership – and it is vital that the pace of accession should be determined by the reform progress.

Regarding Albania, I will highlight a couple of issues that I think are crucial. Firstly, we must commend Albania's consistent and full alignment with the EU's foreign policy, including its response to the Russian war of aggression against Ukraine. However, when it comes to the situation inside the country, many reforms are still needed. One issue of concern is the deteriorating situation of the freedom of expression and media freedom. The trend is incompatible with EU integration. Democracy requires freedom to speak and scrutinise, and a lively opposition. This cannot be stressed enough and the violence against journalists must stop; the attempts to discredit reporters must stop and finally, the draft anti-defamation legislation is unacceptable.

The Albanian Government has extensive homework to do. I hope that it will advance the EU reform agenda in cooperation with the opposition and with all segments of society.

**Theresa Bielowski**, *im Namen der S&D-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin! Vor zwei Monaten besuchte der österreichische Bundespräsident Tirana und betonte: Albanien gehört längst zur europäischen Familie. Nächste Woche werde ich mit einer Delegation nach Tirana reisen und werde mit Überzeugung dasselbe sagen. Der Fortschrittsbericht zeigt ganz deutlich: Albanien hat in den wichtigen Bereichen Justiz, Verwaltung, auch im Kampf gegen die organisierte Kriminalität große Fortschritte gemacht.

Auch die Leistungen bei der Justizreform als Herzstück des Integrationsprozesses müssen besonders hervorgehoben werden, und der Beitrittsweg Albaniens ist das Ergebnis von konsequenter gemeinsamer Arbeit, auch konsequenter Umsetzung.

Und ja, es gibt noch Reformen umzusetzen. Es gibt auch noch Schritte zu gehen, aber auch diese werden wir gemeinsam beschreiten. Die Europäische Union als glaubhafte Akteurin, als verlässliche Partnerin wird auch ihre Versprechen einhalten gegenüber den Bürgerinnen und Bürgern Albaniens und besonders auch gegenüber der jungen Generation, die so viel Hoffnung in den EU-Beitritt legt. Für sie ist Europa die Zukunft, und die europäische Zukunft beinhaltet auch Albanien.

**Ilhan Kyuchyuk**, *on behalf of the Renew Group*. – Madam President, dear Commissioner, dear colleagues, Albania has come a long way on its European path and with continued determination to resolve undoubtedly difficult issues.

Over the past years, the country has demonstrated steadfast, unwavering and strategic commitment to European Union integration. Its dedication reflects the consensus among political parties and garners overwhelming support among its citizens. The country has constantly emphasised the importance of good neighbourly relations and regional cooperation, understanding that unity is the key to achieve progress and prosperity. This commitment to fostering a harmonious relationship sets an exemplary model for the entire region.

Furthermore, Albania's consistent and full alignment with the EU's foreign and security policy is commendable. The country's resolute efforts to align its interests with those of the European Union demonstrate a profound understanding of the benefits of cooperation and shared values. The country has maintained a focused approach on EU-related reforms.

Of course, there is still work to be done. It is imperative to intensify efforts aimed at improving the functioning of the rule of law and judiciary, and the European Parliament should stand ready to support the country on this journey.

**Thomas Waitz**, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Madam President, Commissioner, Albania is a success story, clearly. The vetting process and the juridical reforms have not been seen in this dimension in the Balkans. The full alignment with foreign policy and security policy was mentioned by many colleagues already. But I think Albania has a crucial role to play also in stabilising the region. Albania is a stable factor of the region, which is something we cannot say of too many countries of the Western Balkans. Albania has shown real will to reform towards a European Union accession. They have shown that they take the process serious. That has finally started a bit more than a year ago after a long time of us keeping them waiting. And yes, also Albania still has a lot of reforms to do and implement a lot of legislation, European legislation. The report is pointing out on some weaknesses that we still see on segregation of parts of the minorities, on media freedom and, you know, fighting disinformation and cutting media freedom is a thin line, so one should not be used to do the other. We still see a lot of lack of implementation of laws that are already legally viable, but not yet really implemented on the ground. When it comes to domestic violence, when it comes to protection of children, when it comes to also the fight against organised crime, still there is quite something to deliver.

But last but not least, I want to highlight the progress and the positive signals that we see on the environmental side, on the protection of the Vjosa river, even though on the waste management side it will still need quite some ambition, but we should help with that. With this, a big thank you to our negotiators, to the rapporteur for the very constructive work and also for the good cooperation in this country with the Commission and Parliament here and the Member States.

**Ангел Джамбазки**, *от името на групата ECR*. – Г-жо Председател, уважаеми Комисарю, истинско щастие е да Ви видим сред нас.

Често нашата приятелска държава Албания се разглежда в пакет със Северна Македония и страната често е жертва на липсата на прогрес в нейната източна съседка, а тази липса на прогрес се дължи, разбира се, на нежеланието на властите в Скопие да изгълнят защитата по човешките права, но това е друга тема. Когато това се е случвало, винаги сме посочвали, че общото разглеждане на двете кандидатури е несправедливо.

Въпреки това Албания трябва да продължи реформите в областта на основните права, върховенството на закона и правосъдието, за да постигне бърз напредък по пътя си към Европейския съюз. Плановите за фискална амнистия, които биха позволили до 2 милиона евро да бъдат депозирани в албанската банкова сметка, без да бъде разкриван произхода на средствата, дават основание за тревога. Албания може и трябва да докаже, че не може да бъде подозирана за център на някакви сиви сделки в Европа и Албания и Тирана трябва ясно да покаже, че е решена да се справи с този проблем и не позволява чрез въпрос за нови политики страната да бъде параван за незаконна дейност. Само бързи реформи и решителни стъпки в борбата с корупцията и организираната престъпност ще доведат до бързо завършване на преговорния процес.

Посоката на признаването на правата и законните интереси на малцинствата в Албания, включително българското такова, е правилна и заслужава поздравления. В края на деня Албания заслужава да бъде член на Европейския съюз, тъй като завърши своето домашно, тъй като подкрепя общоевропейските политики, и тъй като в края на краищата споделя това, което дори човек като мен разбира като европейски ценности. Така че на добър час на Албания в преговорите с Европейския съюз.

**Anna Bonfrisco**, a nome del gruppo ID. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, l'Unione europea e l'Albania hanno un destino comune e oggi riaffermiamo la volontà di integrazione di uno Stato amico e alleato, ma voglio cogliere questa occasione per sottolineare il contributo dell'Albania alla pace e alla stabilità internazionale, alla salvaguardia dello Stato di diritto tra le nazioni, alla salvaguardia del multilateralismo.

Attraverso il suo abile ambasciatore alle Nazioni Unite, in questi due anni di presenza nel Consiglio di Sicurezza ha affrontato nel più alto consesso del mondo del multilateralismo rivalità geopolitiche sempre più accentuate e instabili.

L'Albania ha dimostrato come un piccolo paese possa influenzare molto al di sopra del suo peso ed essere in prima linea sulle questioni che contano, contribuendo efficacemente a mantenere la bussola morale che la Russia ha perso ormai da tempo. Il suo contributo alla NATO è per noi sempre più prezioso.

L'importanza di questo volto più moderno dell'Albania è utile prima di tutto agli amici albanesi per costruire partenariati più forti e nuovi meccanismi di cooperazione nella regione dei Balcani, in Europa e nel mondo.

L'Europa ha bisogno dei Balcani e i Balcani hanno bisogno dell'Europa.

L'Italia ha nella sua fratellanza storica con l'Albania il compito di sostenere sempre di più il processo virtuoso di due paesi che condividono un mare.

Grazie a Lei, Commissario Várhelyi, e grazie alla relatrice Santos per il lavoro che fate e che farete.

**Fabio Massimo Castaldo (NI)**. – Madam President, Commissioner, dear colleagues, in 2022, after regrettable delays, we finally have reached a significant milestone with the official start of the accession talks and acknowledgment of the remarkable progress Albania has made in advancing the EU reform agenda. Tirana has consistently demonstrated unwavering commitment to EU integration, both in the political and the public domain. I commend the report for acknowledging this dedication, while also highlighting areas that require further attention and efforts, particularly the fight against corruption and media freedom.

Dear colleagues, recent events, especially the criminal aggression in Ukraine, have emphasised once again an obvious truth – strength lies in unity. Now more than ever, the completion of the EU enlargement in the Western Balkans has become a strategic priority for the future of our Union.

It is not by chance that the candidate countries, including Albania, have been particularly targeted by Russian disinformation and hybrid attacks. We have demonstrated in practice, and not just in words, our resolute commitment to enlargement, avoiding further factious delays that undermine our credibility and frustrate our partners.

Although significant work remains to be done, Albania is undoubtedly on the right track. I urge them to keep delivering on the necessary reforms foreseen and our Union, especially the Member States, to recognise and reward their efforts in the critical years of negotiation ahead.

**Μανώλης Κεφαλογιάννης (PPE)**. – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, κυρίες και κύριοι συνάδελφοι, πέρα από κάθε αμφιβολία, η θέση της Αλβανίας είναι στον σκληρό πυρήνα της ευρωπαϊκής οικογένειας. Όμως από το βήμα του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου θέλω να εκφράσω τη βαθιά μου ανησυχία για τη σύλληψη του εκλεγέντα δημάρχου Χειμάρρας Φρέντι Μπελέρη τις παραμονές των δημοτικών εκλογών στην Αλβανία και τη συνεχιζόμενη προφυλάκισή του, που παραβιάζει το τεκμήριο της αθωότητας και απαγορεύει σε αυτόν να αναλάβει τα καθήκοντά του ως εκλεγμένος δήμαρχος. Επίσης θέλω να τονίσω ότι το συγκεκριμένο θέμα είναι συνδεδεμένο απόλυτα με τον σεβασμό των θεμελιωδών δικαιωμάτων, με το περιουσιακό ζήτημα της ελληνικής μειονότητας στον δήμο της Χειμάρρας και με τις κατηγορίες για παράνομες απαλλοτριώσεις από τις αλβανικές αρχές. Η υπόθεση Φρέντι Μπελέρη αποτελεί χτύπημα στο κράτος δικαίου και στην προσπάθεια που κάνει η Αλβανία να συμμορφωθεί με το ευρωπαϊκό κεκτημένο. Περιμένουμε την άμεση απελευθέρωση του μοναδικού μειονοτικού δημάρχου, του δημάρχου Χειμάρρας Φρέντι Μπελέρη.

**Andreas Schieder (S&D).** – Frau Präsidentin! Albanien steht besser da, als es noch vor einigen Jahren dagestanden ist. Und da muss man gar nicht das Albanien von heute vergleichen mit dem Albanien, das ich vorgefunden habe, als ich in den 90er-Jahren das erste Mal auch dort gewesen bin. Im letzten Jahrzehnt sind irrsinnig viele Reformen in dem Land passiert, umgesetzt worden, angestoßen worden – die Bürokratierreform, die Rechtsstaatsreform, die Justizreform, der Kampf gegen Korruption, aber auch im Kleinen, wie z. B. in der Stadt Tirana, die einfach stadtentwicklungsmäßig eine Stadt ist, die durch ganz konkrete Maßnahmen sehr viel auch an Lebensqualität gewonnen hat.

Wenn man das so sagt, dann stellt sich natürlich die Frage: Ist alles im Guten? Nein. In Albanien müssen noch viele weitere Reformen kommen. Die ökologische Frage, die Klimafrage, die Nachhaltigkeitsfrage sind auch große Themen, genauso wie auch Arbeitsrecht und Gewerkschaften. Aber eins muss man sagen: Es zeigt sich, dass die Zusammenarbeit mit Albanien gerade im Zusammenhang mit der Erweiterung dort wichtige Reformen professionell und gut voranbringt.

**Vlad-Marius Botoș (Renew).** – Doamna președintă, stimați colegi, Albania tinde spre un regim politic stabil și este o democrație europeană. Există încă probleme care trebuie abordate și îmbunătățiri care trebuie făcute, dar este clar că țara s-a angajat să devină o democrație puternică.

Sigur că este nevoie de o mai mare deschidere a procesului electoral pentru a permite accesul partidelor politice mici la luarea deciziilor. În felul acesta, cetățenii țării vor fi încurajați să se implice, să-și aducă contribuția la modernizarea Albaniei. Este nevoie și de o presă liberă care să poată semnală devierile de la valorile democratice, fără să se teamă de consecințe. Toate acestea, însă nu sunt de natură să ne împiedice să recunoaștem că este momentul ca Albania să fie membră a Uniunii Europene.

Trebuie să depășim momentul în care parcă Uniunea Europeană este înghețată de temerile partidelor extremiste, care resping orice deschidere și orice nouă azeziune. Am început un proces de aderare pe care ambele părți trebuie să-l respecte și cred cu tărie că este timpul ca Albania să fie parte din marea noastră familie a Uniunii Europene.

**Εμμανουήλ Φράγκος (ECR).** – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, από αρχαιοτάτων χρόνων η Βόρεια Ήπειρος είναι γη ελληνική. Η Χειμάρρα, παρά τις ελληνοφοβικές επιθέσεις της Αλβανίας, είναι μέρος της Βόρειας Ηπείρου. Το έγκλημα του Φρέντι Μπελέρι ήταν ότι απέδειξε το αυταπόδεικτο, ότι και η Χειμάρρα είναι γη ελληνική. Το Πρωτόκολλο της Κέρκυρας δεν ισχύσε ποτέ, δεν ακυρώθηκε και ποτέ όμως. Άρα η Αλβανία οφείλει να φέρεται στην ελληνική εθνική μειονότητα της Βόρειας Ηπείρου με σεβασμό. Ας το καταλάβουν κάποιοι καλά. Ο δρόμος της Αλβανίας προς την Ευρώπη περνά από την Κορυτσά, από τους Αγίους Σαράντα και από τη Χειμάρρα. Εμείς ακούμε τους Βορειοηπειρώτες μας και λέμε «όχι η Αλβανία στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση». Μέχρι να απελευθερωθεί ο Φρέντις Μπελέρης, δεν πρέπει καν να σκέφτονται την Ευρώπη. Μέχρι να αναλάβει πλήρως καθήκοντα δημάρχου, καλούμε την Ευρώπη να επιβάλει αυστηρότατες οικονομικές κυρώσεις στην Αλβανία, διότι αυτή τη στιγμή βρίσκεται πιο κοντά στην Τουρκία παρά στην Ευρώπη. Σας ευχαριστώ.

**Dominique Bilde (ID).** – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Commissaire, ce rapport sur l’Albanie est d’une incohérence évidente. Ce pays frappe donc aux portes de l’Union européenne contre espèces sonnantes et trébuchantes, puisque 758 millions d’euros lui ont été alloués entre 2014 et 2020 au seul titre de l’instrument d’aide à la préadhésion.

Pourtant, entre 2010 et 2019, plus de 193 000 Albanais ont demandé l’asile dans l’Union européenne pour des motifs qui faisaient particulièrement froid dans le dos – de la vendetta au trafic humain – afin d’être considérés comme réfugiés. L’année dernière, les mêmes Albanais grossissaient les rangs des embarcations de fortune traversant la Manche avant que Rishi Sunak n’y mette bon ordre. Est-ce là le niveau d’un futur État membre?

J’ajoute qu’avec un salaire minimum tournant autour de 360 euros, l’Albanie représente une concurrence féroce, par exemple dans le secteur de l’habillement, et ce à l’heure où la Commission prétend dérouler pour cette filière une stratégie de durabilité et qu’une production locale renaît timidement de ses cendres dans ma région lorraine, en France.

Je suis donc farouchement opposée à tout élargissement qui serait une aberration économique et civilisationnelle.

**Javier Zarzalejos (PPE).** – Señora presidenta, señor comisario, creo que tenemos que expresar nuestra satisfacción por los avances que se han registrado en Albania para acercar esa perspectiva europea y, finalmente, su incorporación a la Unión como desean los albaneses. Pero sabemos que este proceso exige esfuerzos, exige compromisos firmes, y no podemos ocultar que existen también grandes déficits en lo que se refiere a organización institucional, Estado de Derecho, legislación electoral, policía, justicia y libertades de expresión y de manifestación.

Estos déficits parece que se han hecho visibles en una reciente operación policial contra el principal grupo de oposición iraní en el exilio, asentado en Albania, después de un acuerdo negociado con las autoridades albanesas. Una operación masiva de utilización injustificada de fuerza. No se trata de eximir a nadie del cumplimiento de la ley, porque una cosa es hacer cumplir la ley y otra muy distinta es regalar un éxito político al régimen brutalmente represor de Irán. Creo que, lamentablemente, esto último es lo que ha ocurrido.

**Νίκος Παπανδρέου (S&D).** – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, κυρίες και κύριοι συνάδελφοι, προσφάτως είχα την τύχη να επισκεφθώ την Αλβανία ως μέλος της ομάδας επιτήρησης των δημοτικών εκλογών. Ναι, ήταν ομαλή η διαδικασία. Ναι, συμφωνώ με αυτά που είπε ο Επίτροπος και η κ. Σάντος: έχει προχωρήσει η Αλβανία, αλλά σε κάτι έχει μείνει πάρα πολύ πίσω: Δεν μπορεί δύο ημέρες πριν τις εθνικές εκλογές να βάζει στη φυλακή μια σειρά από δημάρχους, μεταξύ άλλων τον πολύ ευαίσθητο για μας δήμαρχο της Χειμάρρας, τον Φρέντι Μπελέρη. Εκλέχτηκε τελικά μέσα από τις φυλακές. Ζητάμε την αποφυλάκισή του, εάν θέλει η Αλβανία να έχει τη στήριξη της Ελλάδας και όλων μας στην προσπάθεια να φτάσει στην Ευρώπη το '20 και το '30 —και το ευχόμαστε. Θέλουμε να μπούνε όλα τα Δυτικά Βαλκάνια κάποια στιγμή. Πρέπει όσο το δυνατόν συντομότερα να τηρήσει τους κανόνες του κράτους δικαίου, να εφαρμόσει τα κεφάλαια 23 και 24 και τότε θα έχει και το χειροκρότημά μας.

**Γεώργιος Κύρτσος (Renew).** – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, πρέπει να σας πω ότι δεν συμμερίζομαι την αισιοδοξία των περισσότερων συναδέλφων. Κατά την άποψή μου, το μεγαλύτερο εμπόδιο στην ένταξη της Αλβανίας, όπως και άλλων χωρών των Δυτικών Βαλκανίων, στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, είναι η δημιουργία προσωποπαγών καθεστώτων που ελέγχουν ασφυκτικά τον δημόσιο βίο. Ο Ράμα, που θυμίζει Βούτσιτς στην εσωτερική πολιτική, ευτυχώς όχι στην εξωτερική, ελέγχει τα ΜΜΕ, επιθυμεί έλεγχο στη δικαιοσύνη αντικαθιστώντας τον έλεγχο που είχε ο Μπερίσα, χειρίζεται θέματα της ελληνικής μειονότητας, όπως του Μπελέρη, χωρίς σεβασμό στα δικαιώματά της, έχει δημιουργήσει μια συμμαχία συμφερόντων που ελέγχει την οικονομία της χώρας, ανέχεται τον ρόλο του οργανωμένου εγκλήματος. Η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση δεν πρέπει να συμβιβαστεί με αυτές τις πρακτικές, ορισμένες από τις οποίες κερδίζουν έδαφος και σε κράτη μέλη. Με προβληματίζει, για παράδειγμα, ότι η ετήσια έκθεση των Δημοσιογράφων Χωρίς Σύνορα αξιολογεί το επίπεδο της ελευθερίας των μέσων ενημέρωσης στην Ελλάδα λίγο χειρότερα από το πολύ χαμηλό της Αλβανίας. Συμφωνώ, η διεύρυνση είναι αναγκαία από στρατηγική άποψη, αλλά περνά υποχρεωτικά από τον εκδημοκρατισμό και τον σεβασμό του κράτους δικαίου, χωρίς εκπτώσεις.

#### *Catch-the-eye procedure*

**Mick Wallace (The Left).** – Madam President, there is a paternalistic logic underpinning accession to the EU: supposedly 'primitive' countries must catch up to the more advanced' Western European countries and incorporate EU values.

These Commission reports talk about a fantasy world where Western interference is erased. Corruption, abysmal social safety nets, crumbling infrastructure and inequality of outcome must be addressed, but let's not talk about the string of leaders vetted by the West who allowed the market to rip through Albania's most valuable assets, who scrapped laws that protected workers rights and social security programmes, who prioritised the foreign direct investment that crushed local industry and facilitated what can only be called the theft of state properties that went to Western investors for a pittance!

The drive towards accession in the aftermath of the pillage drives politics in Albania in just one direction. There is no vision, there is endless vague talk of corruption while no one addresses the plight of the people or wealth redistribution. Dissatisfaction and protests are growing.

*(End of catch-the-eye procedure)*

**Olivér Várhelyi, Member of the Commission.** – Madam President, honourable Members, thank you very much for this debate.



I think that we all need to welcome the tremendous support rendered by the European Parliament for Albania's EU integration and also for the ongoing accession negotiations. As announced, we are planning to finish all the screening sessions by November this year and we are looking forward to the next steps.

The future of this country surely belongs to the European Union, and I think this is the country that has done the most in this mandate not only to catch up, but also to make real progress on the ground and change the realities also for businesses and people on the ground.

**Isabel Santos**, *relatora*. – Senhora Presidente, Senhor Comissário, Caras e Caros Colegas, é com grande regozijo que assinalo o amplo consenso no debate deste relatório, um consenso que se notou ao longo da discussão e que permitiu que o texto fosse tão abrangente quanto é e contemporizador das mais diversas soluções.

Como bem disse aqui o Senhor Comissário, a Albânia tem feito sérias reformas, reformas muito importantes e que são importantes não só para o processo de adesão, mas também para a qualidade de vida das suas populações e para a qualidade da sua democracia e do seu Estado de Direito.

E por falar em democracia e Estado de Direito, quero dar aqui eco às preocupações manifestadas por diversos colegas de diversas bancadas relativas ao Presidente de Câmara Beleri. É um caso que está a ser acompanhado pelas entidades judiciais da Albânia e nós, no mais estrito respeito pela separação de poderes, devemos respeitar aquelas que são as decisões judiciais.

No entanto, deixo aqui a minha garantia pessoal a todos os colegas de todos os grupos parlamentares, de que eu, pessoalmente, acompanharei o desenvolvimento deste caso e velarei para que os princípios do Estado de Direito sejam escrupulosamente respeitados.

E penso que, com esta minha garantia e com esta minha abordagem franca e direta do problema, devem ser sanadas quaisquer outras discussões que estão para lá da temporalidade deste relatório e que não devem ficar neste relatório.

Espero que este meu apelo e esta minha determinação na abordagem do problema sejam tidos em conta e que possamos resolver, de uma forma coerente e consistente, esta questão.

**President.** – The debate is closed. The vote will be held tomorrow.

## **19. Działalność finansowa Europejskiego Banku Inwestycyjnego – sprawozdanie roczne za 2022 r. - Kontrola działalności finansowej Europejskiego Banku Inwestycyjnego – sprawozdanie roczne za 2022 r. (wspólna dyskusja – Europejski Bank Inwestycyjny)**

**President.** – The next item is the joint debate on:

— the report by Stefan Berger, on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs, on the financial activities of the European Investment Bank – annual report 2022 (2022/2062(INI)) (A9-0210/2023); and

— the report by Viola von Cramon-Taubadel, on behalf of the Committee on Budgetary Control, on the control of the financial activities of the European Investment Bank – annual report 2022 (2023/2046(INI)) (A9-0212/2023).

**Stefan Berger**, *Berichterstatter*. – Frau Präsidentin, meine Damen und Herren! Ich freue mich auch, dass Herr Hoyer heute anwesend ist. Im vorliegenden Jahresbericht haben wir uns sehr genau mit den Finanzaktivitäten der Europäischen Investitionsbank befasst. Die Europäische Investitionsbank ist eine der wichtigsten Einrichtungen für Investitionen in der Europäischen Union, und ihr Auftrag besteht darin, die politischen Ziele strategisch zu fördern. Die EIB ist beispielsweise einer der weltweit größten Geldgeber im Bereich Klimaschutz.

Die vergangenen Jahre und 2022 waren schwierige Jahre. Nachdem 2021 noch die Erholung nach Corona im Fokus stand, liegt heute der Schwerpunkt bei den geopolitischen Herausforderungen durch den Konflikt in der Ukraine. Die Folgen des russischen Angriffskriegs sind nicht nur Zerstörung und Leid, sondern natürlich auch der Wegfall der Ukraine als Kornkammer Europas. Wir haben hier vor unserer Haustür mit steigenden Lebensmittelpreisen zu kämpfen und Engpässe in Lieferketten zu verzeichnen.

Auch die Stilllegung der russischen Gasströme hat zu nie dagewesenen Preisspitzen auf den Energiemärkten geführt, unter denen unsere Industrie und unsere privaten Haushalte gleichermaßen stark leiden.

Gleichzeitig hat uns der Krieg auch Finanzierungslücken im Verteidigungsbereich aufgezeigt, die wir dringend schließen sollten. Daher haben wir der Europäischen Investitionsbank im Bericht unter anderem nahegelegt, zu untersuchen, ob und wie man zur Schließung von Investitionslücken im Verteidigungsbereich beitragen kann.

Mit anderen Worten: Sie, Herr Präsident Hoyer, Sie hatten viel zu tun, und Sie und die EIB werden weiterhin viel zu tun haben.

Mit der Lancierung von EIB Global haben Sie einen neuen Geschäftsbereich ins Leben gerufen, einen Geschäftsbereich, der es ermöglicht, weltweit, also außerhalb der EU-Grenzen, agieren zu können, um z. B. mit Klimaprogrammen zu agieren oder sich Fragen der Migration zuwenden zu können. Hier gilt auch der Europäischen Investitionsbank zunächst einmal der Dank für das bereits Geleistete. Aber wir dürfen wichtige Themen nicht vergessen. Zum Beispiel leidet unser Mittelstand unter steigenden Energiepreisen, wir stehen in einem internationalen Wettbewerb, Europa muss Innovation und Digitalisierung fördern. Denn nur prosperierende Unternehmen sind die richtige Antwort auf Radikalisierung und auf Zukunftsperspektiven für unsere Jugendlichen.

Gerade als Abgeordneter vom Niederrhein begrüße ich natürlich sehr die Beteiligung der EIB am EU-Mechanismus für einen gerechten Übergang. Denn der Übergang zu einer CO<sub>2</sub>-armen Wirtschaft kann und darf nicht nur von Kohleregionen alleine wie dem rheinischen Revier getragen werden, sondern muss ein solidarisches und gerechtes Unterfangen sein. Auch die Zukunft muss in den Blick genommen werden. Wir haben klar gefordert, dass die EIB eine wichtige und strategische Rolle beim europäischen Chip-Gesetz spielt, also dem Aufbau einer europäischen Computerchipproduktion. Jeder Euro, der hier in Forschung und Entwicklung investiert wird, ist ein Euro in unsere Zukunft, und aus demselben Blickwinkel sehen wir auch die Rolle von EIB Global in der *Global-Gateway*-Strategie, da hier zielgerichtete Investitionen in Infrastruktur und KMU unsere strategische Autonomie stärken sollen.

Sehr geehrter Herr Präsident, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen, ich denke, wir haben einen guten Bericht vorgelegt, der jedenfalls im Ausschuss mit einer breiten Mehrheit angenommen wurde. Ich danke nochmals meinen Schattenberichterstattern für die gute und vertrauensvolle Zusammenarbeit und sage: Vielen Dank für diese gute Arbeit.

**Viola von Cramon-Taubadel**, *rapporteur*. – Madam President, President Hoyer, Commissioner, dear Colleagues, as the rapporteur for the annual report on the control of the financial activities of the EIB for the year 2022, I can say it was indeed an important and very challenging year. Thank you to the Secretariat and my shadow rapporteurs for their cooperation. I also look forward to continue working with the EIB.

The EIB annual report focuses on three points for the bank. First, the crisis response following the Russian invasion of Ukraine. Second, the launch of the EIB Global. Third, the green transition. We all agree that Ukraine needs our support for as long as it takes. This support includes financial aid and reconstruction for the country for which the EIB as the EU bank is, and will be, the key stakeholder.

I commend the EIB on its proven record of prompt crisis responses. Whether it regarded the financial crisis, the COVID-19 pandemic or Russia's war on Ukraine, the EIB has done a great job in mobilising and deploying the needed funds and loans. However, I would like to stress potential risks that lay ahead of us. The financial support given to Ukraine must come with robust supervisory and protective measures. It is fundamental to ensure that those funds are spent in line with its originally intended purpose of rebuilding the country and helping the Ukrainian people recover from the tragedy of the invasion. We must implement an active distribution process that ensures the money for Ukraine's reconstruction is not misallocated, but that EU taxpayers' money benefits all, supports democracy and transparency, and sets Ukraine up for a successful and sustainable future in line with our EU values.

The second point is the launch of the EIB Global in January 2022, which is vital to increase our presence outside of the EU. EIB Global is central to the better implementation of our EU policies, priorities and objectives, particularly in the context of potential future EU enlargement. EIB Global will provide additional funds for the Western Balkans in four key areas: digitalisation, telecommunication, infrastructure and the energy transition. The pledges to the EU climate bank are nice, but the bank needs to put its money where its mouth is. For me, the priorities here are the aspects of sustainability, climate, biodiversity and environment.

The EIB decision to no longer invest in fossil fuels related projects was a first great step. Yet I urge the EIB to be consistent here as the bank is still financing previously approved projects such as the Balkan Stream gas pipeline. We welcome the fact that in 2022, the EIB achieved a total level of green financing for over 36.5 billion, which is 58% of total financing volumes, exceeding the original target of 50%.

Lastly, for the year 2022, I was pleased to note that the financing was distributed to key areas such as innovation, digital and human capital, sustainable energy and natural resources, sustainable cities and of course, SMEs. I look very much forward to all of your remarks and an interesting exchange.

**David Cormand**, *rapporteur pour avis de la commission des budgets*. – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Président, d'abord bravo, parce qu'on a commencé ce mandat en 2019 avec tout l'enjeu sur la Banque du climat. Vous nous aviez dit: «Mais nous pouvons le faire». Et c'est un Vert qui vous le dit, vous avez impulsé ces changements. Bien sûr, nous, on en demande toujours plus. Mais, vraiment, félicitations pour ce travail que vous avez accompli depuis 2019, et avant même, mais moi je le vois depuis 2019.

Mais, on en demande toujours plus et je voulais attirer l'attention sur un rapport de l'ONG Oxfam qui a révélé de graves dérives relatives à des projets en partie financés par la BEI. Ces projets concernent des hôpitaux privés ayant reçu des fonds de banques publiques dans plusieurs pays du Sud et dans lesquels les patients n'ont pas reçu les soins qui leur étaient dus. C'est par exemple le cas de patients atteints de la COVID qui n'ont pas été traités. Certains ont même été poussés à la banqueroute lorsque les hôpitaux ont vendu des lits de soins intensifs au plus offrant.

Donc, Monsieur le Président, la BEI dispose-t-elle d'une évaluation de ces investissements en termes de réduction de la pauvreté et de la réalisation de la couverture de santé universelle hors de l'UE? Comment la BEI va-t-elle répondre à ces dérives manifestes et enfin demander aux intermédiaires financiers de véritablement rendre des comptes?

**Werner Hoyer**, *President of the European Investment Bank*. – Madam President, honourable Members of Parliament, Commissioner, ladies and gentlemen, it's an honour and a pleasure to be back in this House. Let me take this opportunity to thank the rapporteur for the excellent work, for highlighting the role of the EIB as the bank of the European Union and for acknowledging our fundamental role in supporting our common objectives.

We face a number of challenges these days, which fuel one another in a vicious circle. From pandemic to war, energy, inflation, climate. But if there is one thing I learned over the past 12 years at the helm of the EIB, it is that this Union can adapt to crises, come out stronger and prove its doubters wrong. Thanks to the strong and decisive actions, the same will be true this time around again. Despite doomsday predictions about energy rationing last winter, our lights stayed on.

And one reason for this was that the EIB, your bank, has channelled more than EUR 100 billion in timely investments over the past decade into the EU's energy sector. We are proud that our financing for renewables, energy efficiency and energy grids has helped secure Europe's energy supply. And we are proud that our support for cutting edge technologies at the nexus between climate and innovation, such as the world's first commercial floating wind farms, Europe's first gigafactory, or the first low-carbon steel manufacturing plants, have helped cement the EU's leadership role in this critical area.

This is not, of course, to suggest that all is well. The way to a carbon neutral European economy is still very long. And also in terms of competitiveness, it's high time for Europe to step up its game. We have an edge at the intersection between climate and innovation. We took this area seriously long before many others. But we also see that the global race has only just begun.

Now, I'm not advocating for broad based fiscal support measures in an inflationary environment, of course, but targeted support in the technologies of tomorrow and their supply chains will be key. I believe that as a Union we can and must do more in this area.

At the EIB Group, we are doing our part. In 2022, we exceeded our climate targets of 50% and signed more financing contracts for clean energy projects than ever before. And we committed to do even more, namely another EUR 30 billion on top of our usual lending in the sector to support REPowerEU. If it is up to me, we will raise this bar once again.

Ladies and gentlemen, the energy transition is not just a necessity to stave off catastrophic climate change, it plays an important role when it comes to our future competitiveness and it is a critical security priority for our Union.

Protecting European sovereignty means standing up for our values. This is nowhere as obviously true as in the case of Ukraine: Europe's battlefield in the global struggle between freedom and oppression. There again, the EIB has kept on delivering in the last year. We disbursed close to EUR 2 billion in financing, starting only a few days after the invasion began to help the Ukrainian economy stay afloat.

But more is needed. That's why, in the absence of guarantees from the EU budget, we launched our EU for Ukraine trust fund. It enables Member States, the European Commission, and other donors to support the country's resilience through concrete investment projects. And I'm happy to report that more than a dozen Member States have announced their intentions to contribute to this initiative or will do so in a couple of days, when the first contributions will be signed in the margins of the next Ecofin meeting.

But this will be a bridge solution only. We urgently need a long-term plan. The longer we wait, the higher the bill for the rebuilding of Ukraine's economy will be. To ensure that we can operate in Ukraine in 2024 and beyond, it is absolutely necessary that the bank receives dedicated budget guarantees again from the EU budget. And this is being done quickly. We need your support to make this happen. We cannot afford to lose time. Yes, military support is important, crucial. But we must not forget the critical role of the Ukrainian economy, it forms the backbone of the impressive resistance that we have seen over the past 500 days, and it will form the main source of funding for any reconstruction effort later on. We cannot wait until the ink under a peace treaty is dry. Investing in Ukraine's economy today means investing in Ukraine's future as an independent state. And one day, a member of the European Union.

By the way, each euro of EIB support is wired if, and only if, we see progress on the ground. We do not pay out loans in one go. We disburse the funds when they are really needed, brick by brick. We are determined to support the country, but we are not naive.

Ladies and gentlemen, while the EIB does not finance guns or explosives for very good reasons, we do back European security with financing of high tech projects with dual use applications. This includes cutting edge technologies that have civilian applications such as aerospace – think of drones, helicopters, satellites, as well as cybersecurity. Here too, we exceeded our targets and delivered well over EUR 1 billion of high tech projects last year. Our board just approved that we step up our opportunities in this area even further.

Ladies and gentlemen, in a multipolar world, EU needs to show that it puts its money where the mouth is. It would be one of the biggest strategic blunders to lose what is sometimes referred to as the Global South in the battle for influence between China, Russia and the US.

Even more so collectively, we are one of the biggest investors globally. The problem is too few people know about this. The activities of the EU outside of its borders are often fragmented, poorly coordinated, and importantly, not communicated strongly.

This is one of the reasons why we launched EIB Global last year, a dedicated branch for EIB operations outside of the EU, 100% owned by the EU and operated under the flag of the EU. And this development has been spot on.

The EIB has been one of the largest project financiers on behalf of the EU in developing countries for nearly six decades. We have finally, some of the most impressive infrastructure projects worldwide with the Panama Canal, the Aqaba-Amman water pipeline, the Lake Turkana wind farms – the largest wind farms in Africa – exporting EU sector knowledge across the globe. And all this has made a real and tangible difference. Impact is what counts.

With the set setup of EIB Global, we want to double down on this experience with more staff in the field, a clearer visual identity and a strong sense of cooperation – which is, by the way, why I continue to believe that the best setup for EIB Global is one where not only EU Member States are shareholders, as is the case today, but also the development finance institutions and the European Commission. The EIB must play a strong role in multilateral fora, but it also needs to show its own flag abroad.

None of what the EIB is doing outside the European Union comes at the expense of operations within the Union, by the way. Almost half of all lending in the EU last year was in cohesion regions. Equitable growth and the convergence of living standards remain key pillars of what we do. And the same goes for innovation, which has remained a top priority for us.

Ladies and gentlemen, let me stop here. These are just some examples of the bank's work since we last met. Thanks to the creativity and determination of our staff and thanks to your support, the EU bank, your bank turns crisis into opportunities and opportunities into realities.

Ladies and gentlemen, this is probably my last annual address to you. Let me take this opportunity to thank you all for your support over the years. We have come a long way together. And if I may, while it has not always been an easy discussion, I think we have made a difference together. Today is by far not yet the time to say goodbye. Lots still needs to be done. You count on me to keep on pushing for more Europe and the greener, more digital and more resilient future for all of us.

**Virginijus Sinkevičius**, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, honourable Members of the European Parliament, President Hoyer, I would like to thank the European Parliament for these two reports and, in particular, the rapporteurs for their work.

The EIB Group plays a key part in carrying out EU policies both inside and – as it was just presented – outside our borders, and it is integral to the EU's response to today's economic and geopolitical challenges. And this includes Russia's brutal and unjustified war against Ukraine and the resulting energy crisis, along with the existential threat posed by climate change and environmental degradation.

All these challenges call for a decisive, coordinated EU response, so we welcome the EIB Group's long-term strategy, which focuses on the green and digital transitions and strengthening our open strategic autonomy. This is reflected in the EIB's support for EU policies that underpin our transition to net zero, including its increased support for the REPowerEU plan, its investment in digital and cutting-edge technologies, as well as in security and defence within the context of dual-use technologies, also in semiconductors, biotech and critical raw materials.

Promoting investment for recovery, green growth and employment across Europe is one of the EU's top priorities. The flagship InvestEU investment programme should be strengthened in line with our proposed regulation for a Strategic Technologies for Europe Platform, or STEP – our response to the need for raising investments in critical technologies in Europe. And the EIB will play an important role in achieving the ambitions of STEP.

I welcome the EIB Group's active role in implementing InvestEU, now in its second year of deployment, with its many operations already underway to support the green and digital transition. The Group supports SME investments in areas such as solar photovoltaics, wind energy, energy efficiency and renewable hydrogen. I would also encourage the EIB to use its expertise and market knowledge to address more difficult areas, such as social priorities.

I will now turn to Ukraine, where our close cooperation with EIB has been vital for securing urgent financial assistance in 2022 and in 2023. Backed by the EU guarantee, the EIB has now made EUR 2.3 billion available in loans to Ukraine since the start of the war. However, Ukraine's needs continue to be massive. We need to make sure that we stand by and support Ukraine at all times.

So in June, as part of the mid-term review of the multiannual financial framework, the Commission has proposed the Ukraine facility to provide medium-term support of up to EUR 50 billion in grants and loans between 2024 and 2027. The facility will be vital for Ukraine's macro-financial stability and to promote its recovery and modernisation, while carrying out key reforms needed on its path to EU accession.

I take this opportunity to call on the European Parliament to contribute to the speedy approval of the Ukraine facility so that we continue to provide uninterrupted financial flows to Ukraine, as well as the other elements of the package, such as the Strategic Technologies for Europe Platform that I mentioned earlier.

In addition, I would like to thank the EIB for its EU for Ukraine Initiative to support Ukraine in the short term. It should help to rebuild infrastructure, address priority investment needs and ensure business support. As you know, the Commission is contributing to this initiative with a guarantee that allows the EIB to provide EUR 100 million in extra financing. And it is encouraging to see that EIB has already identified a promising pipeline of the new project.

Besides Ukraine, let us not forget that the Group's other activities outside the EU are reinforced by setting up EIB Global, which is now reaching its cruising speed. So I welcome the Parliament's explicit call in its report that EIB Global should focus on ensuring alignment with EU policy priorities. And this includes, of course, Global Gateway, the external dimension of the EU Green Deal, digitalisation and connectivity, regional integration and the health sector.

### IN THE CHAIR: MARC ANGEL

*Vice-President*

**Petri Sarvamaa**, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Mr President, President Hoyer, dear colleagues, first, just a few words about the EIB's financial operations and performance. At the end of last year, arguably the world's largest public bank, the total EIB group balance sheet stood at EUR 547.3 billion.

The bank borrows money on capital markets and lends it on favourable terms to projects that support EU objectives. And here, of course, it has to be stressed that supporting EU objectives must always be, and I'm sure will be, key priority of the European Investment Bank. Financing was distributed across the main priorities as follows: 17.93 billion for innovation, digital and human capital, almost 21 billion for sustainable energy and natural resources, and almost 17.5 billion for sustainable cities and regions. When talking about important actors in the European context, I cannot emphasise too much the importance of small enterprises. SMEs in the Union account for 99 % of all businesses and more than half of Europe's GDP. And here, the EIB provided financing amounting to a total of 16.35 billion. Not to forget Ukraine and its huge financing needs in the future. So, dear colleagues, the EIB plays an extremely important role already and has the potential to be even more important to the Union in the future.

Although the funds do not come from the common budget, they must nevertheless be monitored with particular attention. Keeping the aforementioned numbers in mind, the EIB needs to continue diligent reporting on the state of play and status of the previous recommendations issued by Parliament in its annual resolutions. Here, the Budgetary Control Committee, in good cooperation with the European Investment Bank, plays an important role, I think.

**Jonás Fernández**, *en nombre del Grupo S&D*. – Señor presidente, señor comisario, permitidme dedicar estos primeros segundos de mi intervención a agradecer al presidente Hoyer sus doce años de servicio a la Unión Europea, en la cual el Banco Europeo de Inversiones, sin duda, ha dado un salto institucional de presencia y de cooperación con este Parlamento que deseo agradecer. Es cierto, como usted decía, que no siempre hemos opinado lo mismo —y recuerdo los debates en torno a la implementación del InvestEU, entre otros asuntos—, pero no quería dejar de agradecer su trabajo, aunque con esto se me consuma casi toda mi intervención.

En cualquier caso, pensando en el futuro, el Banco Europeo de Inversiones ha dado un gran salto, convirtiéndose en el gran banco del clima de la Unión Europea, empujado también por este Parlamento. Y, sin duda, el Banco tiene que también ser capaz de dar un salto adicional en la cooperación para resolver algunos problemas que tenemos sobre el diseño de las ayudas de Estado y la cohesión del mercado único contribuyendo, y mucho más, a la creación de un instrumento soberano que nos ayude a enfrentar los grandes retos de la transición digital, de la transición verde, desde la soberanía europea y con una contribución del Banco Europeo de Inversiones que los Estados solos no pueden hacer, y con una contribución especial también al mecanismo de transición justa para algunas regiones como la mía, como Asturias, que necesita del respaldo del BEI.

**Caroline Nagtegaal**, *namens de Renew-Fractie*. – Voorzitter, commissaris, al 500 dagen hebben we te maken met extreme Russische agressie in Oekraïne, in onze Europese achtertuin. En daar moeten we ons tegen wapenen. En ik begrijp heel goed het gevoel dat we helemaal geen wapens en munitie nodig willen hebben, want er is werkelijk niks moois aan wapens en er is ook niks moois aan oorlog. Maar de harde werkelijkheid in Oekraïne is dat we voor een veilig Europa helaas niet zonder kunnen. U refereerde daar ook aan.

En wat mij betreft ligt er een taak voor de Europese Investeringsbank om aan die veiligheid een bijdrage te leveren. En de eerste stappen zijn daar gelukkig ook toe gezet. En ik wil de EIB hier dan ook van harte aanmoedigen om naast de producten voor tweeenlei gebruik ook de deur voor de militaire projecten open te zetten. Want dit zou een extra wapenfeit zijn om ons continent veilig te houden. Voor nu, maar ook voor in de toekomst.

**Ryszard Czarnecki**, *w imieniu grupy ECR*. – Panie Przewodniczący! Panie Prezesie! Panie Komisarzu! Można powiedzieć, że to taka metafora funkcjonowania naszej Unii, bo w tej debacie spotyka się najmłodszy komisarz w Komisji Europejskiej z bardzo doświadczonym, mającym długi staż prezesem Europejskiego Banku Inwestycyjnego. Właśnie, doświadczenie i młodość dają dobry efekt.

Proszę Państwa, ja oczywiście mogę powiedzieć, że nie do końca podobają mi się pewne akcenty w funkcjonowaniu banku. Mam wrażenie, że jak na instytucję bankową – i wystąpieniu Pana Prezesa w tym roku, i w wystąpieniu sprzed roku – dość dużo jest elementów ideologii klimatycznej. Myślę, że raczej powinniśmy tego w twardej ekonomii unikać. Proszę zostawić to politykom. Oni to robią znakomicie, niestety także w tej Izbie.

Natomiast doceniam szczególnie to, co robił Europejski Bank Inwestycyjny dla małych i średnich firm. To była rzecz istotna. Także doceniam to, co robił w kontekście wspierania różnych krajów w obszarze postsowieckim.

**France Jamet**, *au nom du groupe ID*. – Monsieur le Président, la Banque européenne d'investissement devrait être un outil au service de la prospérité des peuples, des nations d'Europe et de leurs forces vives. Dans les faits, elle n'est qu'un outil de communication politique, un outil qui promeut essentiellement une folle idéologie antinucléaire et dévoyée par l'extrême gauche. Et pour faire quoi? Balancer 350 millions d'euros dans l'éolien maritime dans le Calvados, avec pour effet d'expulser nos pêcheurs de leur zone de pêche? Ou dans un soutien hasardeux à des énergies renouvelables, alors que notre industrie nucléaire performante, abondante et décarbonée mériterait plus d'investissements?

Et pourquoi la Banque d'investissement européenne ne jouerait-elle pas un rôle plus positif et performant dans notre économie, en se donnant, par exemple, les moyens d'entrer au capital d'entreprises innovantes? Cela éviterait que des groupes financiers étrangers et puissants ne finissent par en prendre le contrôle et nous dépossèdent de fleurons industriels ou nous privent d'entrepreneurs qui créent de l'emploi et de la richesse.

Nos territoires ont des potentiels, des énergies, des compétences, des savoirs, de l'excellence et la BEI doit se donner pour objectif de les préserver et de les protéger. Protéger notre souveraineté économique, protéger notre souveraineté énergétique.

**Mick Wallace**, *on behalf of the The Left Group*. – Mr President, Commissioner, this report supports the EIB's financial support for European security and defence. It specifically welcomes the EIB Strategic European Security Initiative. That initiative commits up to EUR 6 billion to dual use projects seeking to develop security and defence systems. The report even calls on the EIB to expand the initiative and to increase its investments in European security and defence.

The European Parliament is now complicit in the relentless attempts by the Council, the Commission, the European Defence Agency, as well as the arms industry, to undermine the restrictions that prevent the EIB from investing in arms and core defence projects.

In its 2022 roadmap on critical technologies for security and defence, the Commission lamented the fact that the EIB's lending policies still had restrictions that prevent it from lending to the defence sector.

The EIB should have nothing to do with the arms industry and this is a serious indicator of where it's going, and it's not good.

**Anna-Michelle Asimakopoulou (PPE).** – Mr President, like so many other critical raw materials that we rely on for our green and digital transition, China is the world's leading producer of natural graphite and the EU's top supplier.

The EIB recently backed a EUR 150 million loan for a graphite mine in northern Sweden, and projects like this will be key to ensuring our autonomy, building our value chains and greening production. This project is also fully in line with the aims of the new Critical Raw Materials Act, which looks to encourage more mining in the European Union.

One of the biggest hurdles, however, is access to finance, and the Commission sees a key role for the EIB. In the Climate Bank Roadmap for 2020—2025, the EIB sets a clear path for greening its investments, but it's disappointingly vague when it comes to the mining sector. We need to see a more prominent role for mining and a willingness from the EIB to finance mining projects.

Dear colleagues, the Commission has set out a clear strategy for de-risking from China, and the EIB through its financing decisions can help to make this a reality.

**Pedro Silva Pereira (S&D).** – Senhor Presidente, Senhor Comissário, cumprimentos especiais ao Senhor Presidente do Banco Europeu de Investimento nesta sua última presença neste Parlamento. Muitos parabéns pelo seu excelente trabalho ao longo destes anos.

Neste escrutínio democrático da atividade do Banco Europeu de Investimento, não podemos deixar de reconhecer que o BEI se confirmou, no difícil ano de 2022, como uma instituição financeira fundamental no apoio à economia europeia e, em especial, às pequenas e médias empresas.

Fundamental também no apoio à transição digital, energética e climática, consolidando a sua condição de Banco Europeu do Clima, alinhado com as metas do Acordo de Paris e os desafios do Desenvolvimento Sustentável.

O Parlamento Europeu tem apelado à distribuição justa, geográfica, dos investimentos e é com satisfação que verifico o progresso feito. Portugal, por exemplo, é hoje já o sexto país europeu beneficiário dos investimentos do BEI em percentagem do PIB.

Mas os desafios continuam aí. O défice de investimento permanece na Europa e precisamos de um BEI mais forte, com capital reforçado, porque só um BEI mais forte pode fazer tudo aquilo que precisamos que faça.

**Charles Goerens (Renew).** – Monsieur le Président, je voudrais d'abord rendre un hommage appuyé à l'action qu'a menée Werner Hoyer au cours de sa présidence de la Banque européenne d'investissement. Aujourd'hui, le poids de la BEI est deux fois plus important que celui de la Banque mondiale. Elle est devenue la première banque climatique. Elle mène la danse dans nombre de chantiers, aussi bien dans la périphérie de l'Union européenne que dans le grand large. C'est grâce à son savoir-faire et à son talent de diplomate et d'expert en relations extérieures que Werner Hoyer a pu contribuer à faire de la Banque européenne d'investissement ce qu'elle est aujourd'hui.

Cette banque joue aussi un rôle très important dans la mobilisation de capitaux privés, qui constitue la réponse qu'attendent tous ceux qui soutiennent la réalisation des objectifs pour le développement durable. Dès lors que l'aide publique globale au développement atteint à peine 250 milliards d'euros, la Banque européenne d'investissement et ses pairs doivent mobiliser au moins 20 fois plus que ce qui est mobilisé au titre de l'aide publique au développement. Et je compte sur la Banque européenne d'investissement et sur ceux qui s'inspirent de son expérience pour arriver à mobiliser autant de capitaux.

Je crois que ceux qui espèrent la réalisation des objectifs pour le développement durable savent que cela ne pourra se faire sans l'expérience et le savoir-faire de la Banque européenne d'investissement. Félicitations pour ce que vous avez fait.

**Roman Haider (ID).** – Herr Präsident! Die Aufgabe der Europäischen Investitionsbank ist es, „zu einer ausgewogenen und reibungslosen Entwicklung des Binnenmarktes im Interesse der Union beizutragen“. Genauso steht es nämlich im Artikel 309 des Vertrags über die Arbeitsweise der Europäischen Union. Die Investitionsbank soll europäische Unternehmen und nationale Gebietskörperschaften mit Krediten unterstützen. Aufgabe der Europäischen Investitionsbank ist es nicht, die völlig verquere und bürger- und wirtschaftsfeindliche Klimapolitik dieser EU-Kommission zu finanzieren. Ebenso wenig ist es Aufgabe der EIB, die Kriege von Nicht-EU-Staaten zu finanzieren. Für diese Kernaufgaben stehen der EIB auch genügend Mittel zur Verfügung.



Eine Aufstockung der Mittel, um damit die größtenwahnsinnigen Pläne einer völlig außer Rand und Band geratenen Kommission zu finanzieren, ist strikt abzulehnen. Und die EIB – das können Sie mir glauben – wird in den kommenden Jahren und Jahrzehnten genügend Investitionsbedarf in der EU selbst haben, um die Folgen der selbstzerstörerischen Politik dieser Kommission zu beseitigen.

**Angelika Winzig (PPE).** – Herr Präsident! Die Europäische Investitionsbank ist die einzige internationale Finanzinstitution, die im Eigentum unserer Mitgliedstaaten steht, und mithilfe unserer Gesetzgebung tragen wir dazu bei, dass die Ziele erreicht werden.

Zwei Punkte möchte ich herausstreichen, die mir besonders am Herzen liegen: zum einen die wichtige Rolle des Europäischen Investitionsfonds bei der Verbesserung des Zugangs zu Finanzmitteln für kleinere Unternehmen, Unternehmen mit mittlerer Kapitalisierung und für Jungunternehmen. Damit werden Wachstum und Innovation und Beschäftigung in der EU gefördert.

Zweitens begrüße ich den Beitrag der EIB, zur Unterstützung des REPowerEU-Plans in den kommenden fünf Jahren weitere 30 Milliarden Euro an Darlehen für Projekte in den Bereichen erneuerbare Energiequellen und Energieeffizienz zur Verfügung zu stellen. Die Europäische Investitionsbank hat sich schon lange dem Grünen Deal verpflichtet, denn Nachhaltigkeit bedeutet auch, dass der Transformationsprozess gelingt, sodass die Wettbewerbsfähigkeit der europäischen Betriebe auch in diesem Wandel gesichert ist.

Vielen Dank, Herr Präsident, und alles Gute!

**Victor Negrescu (S&D).** – Mr President, dear Commissioner, dear colleagues, the European Investment Bank is a key institution for the European Union that allows us to boost investment and trigger the implementation of new projects that create jobs and have a positive impact on our economy. According to a recent report, the EIB Group will create almost 1 million jobs by 2026 and add more than 1% to the European economy. Nevertheless, more work needs to be done to expand the impact of the EIB.

In 2022, three countries – Italy, France and Spain – have used the majority of the funds available, which shows the need for EU widening. For example, my country – Romania – got, in 2022, only EUR 1 billion, in comparison to Italy that got EUR 10 billion, namely almost twice more in percentage of the GDP.

At the same time, we need more transparency on project selection, human resources management and impact assessment. The EIB should be an inclusive bank, allowing access to funding for SMEs and start-ups, applicants from rural areas and small towns, or beneficiaries from vulnerable groups and disadvantaged regions.

Last and not least, the EIB should finance the frontline countries in developing their infrastructure and dealing with the challenges faced by the war in Ukraine.

**Stéphanie Yon-Courtin (Renew).** – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Président Hoyer, chers collègues, dans ce rapport annuel, nous saluons l'action de la BEI et de son président, Monsieur Hoyer, qui ont été au rendez-vous des transitions auxquelles notre société et notre économie doivent faire face.

La BEI a répondu efficacement à la pandémie. Elle a intensifié ses efforts pour soutenir la transition verte, numérique, et s'est véritablement engagée dans le cadre de la guerre en Ukraine. Nous devons poursuivre et intensifier ses ambitions. La BEI est le véritable bras financier de l'Union européenne pour soutenir tous ces objectifs politiques.

Cela passe par le nécessaire soutien à l'industrie de la défense européenne, alors que la guerre frappe à nouveau aux portes de l'Union, mais aussi par le soutien à l'innovation, à nos PME, à l'industrie et à la numérisation. Nous devons faire encore davantage pour mobiliser l'investissement privé dans la transition verte. Mais la BEI, c'est aussi l'Europe concrète. Et l'action de la BEI au sein de nos territoires, de nos régions, permet de rendre les financements européens très accessibles. La BEI, c'est relancer les projets d'investissements durables au cœur des territoires via la rénovation urbaine, l'éducation, le développement des mobilités douces et des transports publics propres.

En tant qu'élue régionale, j'en ai été témoin avec, en Normandie, le prêt de 80 millions de la BEI consacré à la rénovation de 20 collèges en Seine-Maritime. L'Europe investit, l'Europe agit grâce à la BEI.

**Marek Belka (S&D).** – Mr President, I would first like to thank Mr Hoyer for all his years at the helm of the Bank. Let me use this time to ask him some questions.

Number one: what role do you see for the Bank in the future reconstruction of Ukraine, with all the experience that the Bank has with this country? Second, looking back at the two terms at the helm of the Bank, what were your biggest achievements and the biggest challenges?

This is what we are waiting for in your concluding statement.

**Billy Kelleher (Renew).** – Mr President, I'd like to welcome Mr Hoyer here and acknowledge the work that he's done as a lead in the European Investment Bank and just say that some years ago I did meet him in Frankfurt at a Renew discussion group, when he spoke about the bundling of schools in Ireland with the Minister for Finance at the time, Michael Noonan.

Mr Hoyer, I see that again today you recently announced, along with Limerick City and County Council, that the EIB has launched a partnership to accelerate retrofitting and in turn reduce the cost of energy in social housing in Limerick as well. I think that signifies the importance of the European Investment Bank to ensure not only is it seen as the Bank of Sustainable Development Goals, not only is it seen as the Bank of climate change, but equally it is seen as a Bank that funds real tangible benefits to citizens in a very evidenced way in their lives.

That is something that I think the Bank should never lose sight of. It is owned by the Member States; it is owned by the citizens, effectively. So therefore the obligation is on the Bank to ensure that it invests primarily in the citizens of Europe. I know that in the meantime there will be significant challenges around the issue of the Sustainable Development Goals, the Climate Bank and also on the issue of Ukraine and how we fund its reconstruction in the years ahead. But never lose sight of the fact that the EIB is also for local development as much as international development.

**Maria Grapini (S&D).** – Domnule președinte, încep prin a vă mulțumi și a vă felicita pentru activitatea pe care o aveți de atâția ani ca președinte. Trebuie să spun însă, în calitatea mea de vicepreședinte pentru piața internă și în numele Intergrupului pentru IMM-uri, că mi-aș dori ca anul viitor, față de raportul pe care îl analizăm acum, să alocați mai mulți bani IMM-urilor.

Aveți o importanță deosebită în InvestEU. Am scris recent comisarului Breton și da, v-a nominalizat că Banca de Investiții, sigur, are un rol important în finanțarea IMM-urilor. De asemenea, sigur, vă salut pentru că v-ați angajat și ați sprijinit Republica Moldova și vă angajați și în Balcanii de Vest să-i sprijiniți.

Ceea ce mi-aș dori, însă este să fie mai multă transparență. E foarte important să vedem cum se selecționează proiectele și ați spus un cuvânt magic aici, să facem investiții țintite și cred că este nevoie de acest lucru pentru a nu se concentra banii în aceleași zone și de fapt, în loc să creștem coeziunea, să creștem diferențele regionale. De aceea eu îmi pun speranță. Sunteți cel mai mare creditor, avem nevoie de Banca de Investiții, sunteți important pentru piața internă și nu numai. Și vă doresc sănătate și mulți ani înainte în BEI.

**Margarida Marques (S&D).** – Senhor Presidente, Senhor Comissário, Senhor Presidente, o Banco Europeu de Investimento tem sido um dos mecanismos mais eficazes na política de investimento da União Europeia, como Banco Verde ou na transição digital, no apoio às PME ou na inclusão e na coesão social dentro e fora da União Europeia.

As necessidades acrescidas de investimento – só para o clima é preciso 1 bilião de euros por ano, ou seja, um quadro financeiro plurianual de sete anos para um ano – e um quadro económico geopolítico instável mostram que o BEI precisa de uma capacidade mais alargada, incluindo outros meios financeiros com capital reforçado.

Mas o BEI não poderá sozinho desempenhar este papel. Precisamos também de rever o orçamento da União Europeia com ambição e avançar com a criação de uma capacidade permanente de investimento ao nível europeu.

**Leszek Miller (S&D).** – Panie Przewodniczący! Panie Komisarzu! Panie Prezesie! Koleżanki i Koledzy! Europejski Bank Inwestycyjny odegrał ważną rolę we wzmacnianiu potencjału Europy w zakresie zatrudniania i wzrostu gospodarczego. Równocześnie EBI konsekwentnie zapewniał finansowanie projektom związanym ze zrównoważonym rozwojem, odnawialnymi źródłami energii oraz efektywnością energetyczną. Jego działania przyczyniają się do redukcji emisji gazów cieplarnianych i budowania zrównoważonej przyszłości, co jest zgodne z celami politycznymi i gospodarczymi Unii Europejskiej.

Europejski Bank Inwestycyjny jest również silnie zaangażowany w pomoc Ukrainie. Środki przeznaczone dla Ukrainy w obliczu trudności wynikających z wojny z Rosją są bardzo istotne. Poprzez udzielenie wsparcia finansowego EBI przyczynia się do stabilizacji sytuacji w kraju i pomaga w procesie odbudowy. Jest to wyraz praktycznej solidarności Unii Europejskiej i naszego dążenia do wspierania krajów partnerskich w trudnych chwilach. Miejmy nadzieję, że po zakończeniu wojny te właśnie działania będą jeszcze ważniejsze. W takim razie wszystko, co czyni Europejski Bank Inwestycyjny, znajduje się w centrum naszych priorytetów, zyskuje nasze uznanie i poparcie.

*Catch-the-eye procedure*

**Seán Kelly (PPE).** – Mr President, thank you, President Hoyer, for coming here and giving us the benefit of your experience and expertise. I must ask you one question. In the last mandate, the Juncker Fund was key and the EIB played a big part in that – in turning around the European economy, creating jobs, improving the quality of life. Then I was a rapporteur for its successor, InvestEU, but I haven't heard much about InvestEU, which seemed to be full of promise and was the way of the future.

So I would like to ask you your opinion of InvestEU, what it has achieved in this mandate and what it can achieve into the future, particularly over the next year or two. Because it was a wonderful scheme succeeding the Juncker Fund, but we're not hearing enough about it.

**Clare Daly (The Left).** – Mr President, since the start of the war in Ukraine, the EIB has mobilised and disbursed about EUR 1.7 billion in emergency relief to Ukraine. And I think it's appropriate that the report considers the very difficult situation that Ukraine is in now – with very limited resources to properly audit those monies – and calls instead on the EIB to do more to monitor the implementation of where that money is going.

And that's particularly important in the context of the report that our own European Court of Auditors did prior to the war about the systemic and deep levels of corruption in Ukrainian society. It's particularly important when we look at the reports about sanctions being used to oust rivals in that society and military equipment appearing for sale on the dark web.

Now, of course, militarism is exceptionally dangerous – which is why it was always excluded from the EIB's portfolio – but now we're using dual use to circumvent that and send across EUR 6 billion to the military industrial complex. The report calls for more partnership with NATO. This is lunacy. The bank should go back to the job it was supposed to do.

*(End of catch-the-eye procedure)*

**Virginijus Sinkevičius, Member of the Commission.** – Mr President, honourable Members, just shortly to conclude, first of all, I would like to thank the Members of the Parliament and the EIB for today's debate.

Overall, as the reports testify, the EIB is our key partner in providing EU response to the crisis that we have faced. And the challenges ahead, including the EU's green and digital ambitions, and the move to open strategic autonomy call for even closer cooperation with the EIB Group to make sure that its activities are aligned with the evolving context and EU policy priorities.

Lastly, I would like on behalf of all the Commission to thank President Hoyer for his hard work over the last 12 years at the helm of the EIB for that excellent work that, Dr Werner Hoyer, you have truly transformed this institution into a noble institution, a modern multilateral bank that is admired and appreciated around the world. So once again, many thanks.

**Werner Hoyer**, *President of the European Investment Bank*. – Mr President, Members of the European Parliament, I'd like thank you and say it is a great pleasure to be here today again. I have been coming regularly for 30 years now, since I had my first appearance here as Minister for European Affairs, and I must say it has always been an open house and a forum for open debate, beyond huge differences of opinion sometimes.

So probably – no, definitely – I will not be able to do justice to each and every one of you who has spoken, because then we would be here for quite a while, but I promise you, nothing will be forgotten. My colleagues in the Brussels office will make sure that we come back to you individually if we think we need to clarify something.

When I took over the role at the EIB almost 12 years ago, I did not expect that short after that, the huge investment gap in Europe would become terribly obvious. And the Juncker plan, the investment plan for Europe, was one of the responses to that.

Shortly afterwards, Europe all of a sudden realised that we have a serious climate problem. Then, of course, that brought the EIB to be ambitious on that and later on, in 2019 at the General Assembly of the United Nations, we became the climate bank of the EU.

At that time, we didn't have a clue that shortly afterwards we would be confronted with a global health crisis that we were not prepared for. And in the COVID-19 context, EIB played a very, very important role. The reason for this was, as so often in other fields, that the bank is blessed with in-house expertise on science, technology and engineering, and on life science in particular. Most of you probably will have a vaccine in your arms that people from the EIB encouraged the industry to develop.

So this is a hell of an experience, and then the real hell came with the war in Ukraine. Who would have expected a war within Europe? I think the bank has delivered, but also by reminding itself and ourselves that, according to the Treaty on the European Union and the statute of the bank, we are there to support the strategic interests of the European Union with the means of project finance. We're not the budget finance here. We need to support projects, projects that have an impact.

The volumes are great, of course – yes, we are the biggest multilateral bank in the world, but this is volume measurement. What counts is the impact, the difference we can make for the people in Europe and beyond.

For that, it is absolutely vital to mobilise the financial power of the private sector. Public money alone will never be enough in order to reach the objectives that we are setting ourselves and that we are expected to pursue. So mobilising the private sector and, to a large extent, and I think Ms Winzig made reference to this, it is via SMEs, or in favour of SMEs. This is why, for instance, the European Investment Fund, our subsidiary, is of such enormous importance, and I thank the Members who have recognised that.

What we must not forget, with all these good intentions and impacts, is that the EIB is a bank and not a grant agency. And being a bank means we lend money. And in order to be able to do that, we need to borrow money. My signature is on the bond issuance of EUR 70 to 100 billion of bond sales per year. Why should a private investor give this institution her or his money? Because she or he is of the opinion that they'll get the money back and we will make good use of this money. And the rating agencies support that every year by saying, okay, this bank is rock solid: first, it has an incredible in-house expertise that allows it to scrutinise projects in a very, very unusual way, and second, obviously, we have the support of our shareholders. And I thank the shareholders of the bank, the Member States and the European Commission, our main partner, for this excellent cooperation.

Strategic interests, of course, are the focus of our work for and in Ukraine. And I must tell you that our experience in Ukraine, of course, dates back since the independence of Ukraine. But the key situation was in 2014, when I remember saying to our board, 'Colleagues, this guy is not going to stop on Crimea. This is going to go on.', and we cut our business in Russia, the big project partnership for modernisation, and repurposed the funds made available this way, in particular in the neighbourhood of Russia, in particular in Ukraine, Moldova and Georgia.

We are very, very serious when it comes to this. Marek Belka asked what is going to be our role once the war is over and we do the reconstruction. First, the reconstruction must start now, not when the ink on the peace treaty is dry but now, because otherwise the bill is going to be much, much, much higher. But then we need to support Ukraine on its way towards the membership in the European Union. Some people have a horror vision of that happening. I think it's a great opportunity. We underestimate the power and the strength, the potential that is with the people of Ukraine.

So we will be able to continue this strategic work in Ukraine and around Ukraine only if we can borrow money for that. And, to be quite blunt, if you finance the same hospital on the same bridge for the second and third time because the Russians have come back and destroyed the bridge again, then you need to have a convincing argument vis-à-vis your private sector investors who buy your bonds. Well, that reassurance for them comes from the budgetary support that we get from the European Union via guarantees. And I hope that we will be able to resume that very, very soon because this is absolutely vital. Now, for the transition period, we have set up a fund, which is supported by many Member States, and I hope we will be covering the rest of this year before the revised MFF will be on the table.

There are worries about the lack of EU guarantees for Ukraine right now. There are huge worries for our work in the developing countries in the Global South. The ACP mandate, the Cotonou mandate, was about to run out. It has just been prolonged by a couple of months and then we'll be back to square one. That means by then, maybe at the end of this year on 1 November, the EIB will not have a banking license anymore in 79 countries of the world. Do we want to do this disgrace to the European Union? When we talk about the role of Europe in the Global South, please have this on your plate as well, when we talk about the future of the bank and Europe.

So thank you very much for giving me the opportunity to speak again here today. I think in some cases I'll have to come back to you individually. Thank you very much, good luck.

**President.** – Thank you very much, President Hoyer. Please allow me to join the many colleagues in congratulating you for your great leadership during your two terms at the head of the European Investment Bank. Good luck for your next challenges.

**Stefan Berger, Berichterstatter.** – Herr Präsident! Ich glaube, diese Debatte hat gezeigt, dass wir uns im Grundsatz einig sind, dass wir mit der EIB ein Instrument haben, das den politischen Zielen, die wir alle in diesem Haus mehrheitlich verfolgen, Rechnung trägt. Ich finde, in der Rede von Präsident Hoyer, gerade jetzt, in den Abschlussworten, ist noch einmal klar geworden, wie wichtig es ist, dass wir ein Instrument haben, das Wirtschaftspolitik durch Kreditvergabe ermöglicht.

Weil ich diese Debatte nicht mehr zusammenfassen möchte, möchte ich auch damit schließen, Ihnen, Herr Hoyer, als Berichterstatter in diesem Jahr auch noch einmal Dank für Ihre Arbeit zu sagen. Sie haben dieses Konstrukt in der letzten Dekade in einer Art und Weise positioniert, wie es vorher wahrscheinlich nicht denkbar war, und ohne die EIB wäre die Handlungsfähigkeit der EU wesentlich begrenzter.

Deshalb, meine Damen und Herren, sage ich noch einmal: Vielen Dank für den Bericht. Vielen Dank für Ihre jahrelange Kärnerarbeit, die Sie geleistet haben. Sie haben sich hohe Verdienste erworben um die ökonomische Handlungsfähigkeit der EU, und ich freue mich, wenn wir diesen Bericht denn morgen auch annehmen.

**Viola von Cramon-Taubadel**, *Berichterstatterin*. – Herr Präsident! Herr Präsident Hoyer, auch noch mal von meiner Seite ganz herzlichen Dank! Nach all dem, was wir hier gehört haben, war das wirklich ausschließlich oder fast überwiegend positiv zu Ihrer persönlichen Arbeit, aber auch zu dem, wie Sie die Bank aufgestellt haben. Wir haben hier die ganzen Probleme besprochen, und es scheint so zu sein, dass Sie sich durch die Krisen durchgearbeitet haben, auch dass Sie mit den Krisen nicht untergegangen sind, und das ist in der heutigen Zeit schon nicht selbstverständlich. Ich glaube, es ist gut, dass Sie den Fokus auch noch mal darauf gelegt haben. Sie haben gesagt, wir brauchen eine *long-term solution*, *not a bridge solution*, und das ist genau der Punkt.

Wir müssen jetzt dahin kommen, wie wir es hinbekommen aus Europa hinaus mit all den Vorgaben, die wir aus unseren Politikfeldern mitbringen – die Unterstützung der kleinen und mittleren Unternehmen ist das eine, aber vor allen Dingen geht es darum, auch die Klimapolitik, die inklusive Politik, die *Citizen Approach*-Politik so umzusetzen, dass wir insbesondere den Fokus auf die Ukraine so legen, dass dieser Wiederaufbau gelingen kann. Ich glaube, da sind sich die meisten hier im Saal einig: Dazu braucht es eine starke Europäische Investitionsbank, dazu braucht es vereinte Kräfte, dazu braucht es viel politischen Willen und hoffentlich auch eine Kooperationsbereitschaft von der Kommission und vom Europäischen Rat, der, wenn man so zwischen den Zeilen zugehört hat, nicht immer so ganz an der Stelle da ist, wie wir ihn brauchen.

Ich möchte Sie noch auffordern, dass Sie auch mit den anderen europäischen Institutionen, wie zum Beispiel der EUSTa, dem OLAF und dem ERH, gut kooperieren, vielleicht auch die noch stärker unterstützen, dass man da die Synergieeffekte noch besser herausholt, als das in der Vergangenheit der Fall war, und dass wir zum Beispiel als Berichterstatter auch die letzten Zahlen bekommen, wenn wir letztendlich den Entlastungsbericht vorlegen. Das war in diesem Fall nicht möglich, aber ansonsten, denke ich, haben Sie gezeigt über die zwölf Jahre Ihrer Präsidentschaft und auch vorher – wir kennen uns schon aus dem Deutschen Bundestag –, dass Sie mit Ihrer Erfahrung dieser Bank gutgetan haben. Ich hoffe, dass das für die Zukunft auch so bleibt. Vielen Dank für Ihre Zusammenarbeit, und in diesem Sinne einen hoffentlich friedlichen Ruhestand.

**President**. – The joint debate is closed.

The vote will take place tomorrow.

*Written statements (Rule 171)*

**Alin Mituța (Renew)**, *în scris*. – 2022 a fost un an dificil, inclusiv pentru Banca Europeană de Investiții. Eforturile BEI au jucat un rol semnificativ în sprijinirea Ucrainei în această perioadă. De asemenea, doresc să subliniez importanța investițiilor în sectoarele cheie ale economiei Republicii Moldova, acestea accelerând procesul de aderare la Uniunea Europeană.

BEI trebuie să continue să își îndeplinească rolul tradițional de investitor în infrastructură și coeziunea Uniunii. De exemplu, în 2022, în țara mea, România, BEI a mobilizat 1 miliard de euro sprijinind, printre altele, construirea unui nou spital regional în Craiova și finanțarea universităților din Cluj-Napoca și Târgu Mureș.

Există totuși câteva domenii în care banca poate fi mai activă. Nu trebuie să uităm de zonele miniere, iar pentru asta avem nevoie ca BEI să ofere sprijin consultativ potențialilor beneficiari din zonele cele mai afectate pentru pregătirea și implementarea proiectelor finanțate prin Mecanismul pentru o tranziție justă.

BEI ar trebui, de asemenea, să aibă un rol mai proeminent în sprijinirea sectoarelor agriculturii, alimentației și pescuitului, care sunt adesea uitate. Nu în ultimul rând, BEI ar trebui să aprofundeze cooperarea cu OLAF și EPPO.

**Andżelika Anna Możdżanowska (ECR)**, *na piśmie*. – Od kilku lat Europejski Bank Inwestycyjny pełni funkcję „banku klimatycznego”, wspierając państwa członkowskie w zielonej transformacji. Bez tego wsparcia sprostanie zielonej agendzie byłoby dla państw członkowskich o wiele bardziej kosztowne.

Polska ma strategiczne i bardzo dobre relacje z EBI, które zaowocowały zaangażowaniem w wysokości 5,45 mld EUR w 2022 r. Zgadzam się, że należy podkreślić znaczenie Banku dla realizacji polityk UE, jego rolę w budowaniu spójności i zaangażowanie na Ukrainie, a przede wszystkim intensyfikację działań na rzecz MŚP.

EIB musi w większym stopniu zaangażować się w europejskie bezpieczeństwo obronne, żywnościowe i energetyczne. Mankamentem sprawozdania – oraz swoistym kuriozum – jest apel o dostosowanie działalności EIB do mechanizmu warunkowości RoL. Pomijając fakt, że EIB działa poza mechanizmami budżetowymi UE, a jego udziałowcami są państwa członkowskie – to nawet nie sposób sobie wyobrazić, jak miałyby wyglądać takie dostosowanie działalności EIB do mechanizmu warunkowości.

Kolejnym problematycznym dla mnie punktem jest potraktowanie dobrego ratingu EIB jako argumentu na rzecz możliwości podejmowania przez niego większego ryzyka w finansowaniu projektów. Taką zachętę do ryzykownych inwestycji uważam za nieodpowiedzialną. Apeluję do EIB o nieuleganie presji i twarde trzymanie się zasad trzeźwej oceny rentowności inwestycji, także tych „zielonych”.

**Alfred Sant (S&D), in writing.** – The report presents a set of valid recommendations for the EIB. We believe that, as a public bank, it must do more to stimulate investment where lagging. Especially, it must achieve a stronger level of social investment, not least in relation to climate change. This applies as well with regard to further investment towards the decarbonisation of air and water transport. A vital aim here is to soften the impact on regions hardest hit by new measures needed to combat climate change – especially islands.

One very delicate matter for this report and a major point for the S&D is the internal governance of the Bank. There exists a dysfunctional relation between staff and management, with a negative impact on EIB output. Meanwhile, the EIB remains the only EU institution that does not recognise its employees' right to join a trade union, contradicting the EU's basic values and ILO recommendations. We request a change of policy on this matter.

Now, a final remark on the report's position regarding defence spending. I have accepted this position as an S&D shadow, but personally, I disagree. That the EIB should back the weapons industry is unacceptable, for this is, and should remain, outside the remit of the EU and all its institutions.

## 20. Przystąpienie do strefy Schengen (krótka prezentacja)

**President.** – The next item is a short presentation of the motion for a resolution tabled pursuant to Rule 227(2) by Dolors Montserrat, on behalf of the Committee on Petitions, on accession to the Schengen area (2023/2668(RSP)) (B9-0309/2023).

**Gheorghe Falcă, în numele autorului.** – Domnule președinte, stimați colegi, am onoarea de a prezenta propunerea de rezoluție referitoare la accesul României și Bulgariei în spațiul Schengen, adoptat de Comisia de Petiții în unanimitate. În urma colaborării excelente dintre doamna raportor Dolors Montserrat și toți raportorii din umbră a rezultat un text curajos și ferm.

Doamnelor și domnilor, din păcate, de peste 12 ani, România și Bulgaria sunt ținute abuziv și nemotivat la poarta Schengen. Spun acest lucru pentru că vorbele mele sunt susținute clar și ferm încă din 2011 de acest Parlament, de rezoluțiile sale, de evaluările Comisiei Europene, de experți, de verificări în teren, iar această stare de fapt este că România și Bulgaria sunt blocate la poarta Schengen. De aceea, corect, rezoluția exprimă susținerea fermă pentru extinderea spațiului Schengen pentru România și Bulgaria. Aceste două state au îndeplinit criteriile de aderare, respectă și aplică explicit acquis-ul Schengen, ceea ce înseamnă că spațiul Schengen funcționează în acest moment. Rezoluția exprimă regretul cu privire la rezultatul dezbaterii din cadrul Consiliului JAI din 8 decembrie 2022, în urma căruia a fost refuzată aderarea României și a Bulgariei la spațiul Schengen, fără să fi fost prezentată nicio justificare legală.

Refuzul de a accepta România și Bulgaria în spațiul Schengen duce la încălcarea a cinci articole din Carta drepturilor fundamentale ale Uniunii Europene, și anume dreptul la demnitate umană, libertate și securitate, egalitate în fața legii, protecția mediului și libertatea de circulație. Rezoluția cere Consiliului să respecte articolul 4, alineatul (2) din Actul privind aderarea Bulgariei și a României la Uniunea Europeană și să voteze fără întârziere cel mai târziu până la sfârșitul anului 2023, în favoarea aderării celor două țări la spațiul Schengen.

Totodată, Consiliul i se cere să țină cont de faptul că emisiile de dioxid de carbon generate de milioane de vehicule care așteaptă multe ore la punctele de frontieră contrastează puternic cu obiectivele Uniunii Europene privind neutralitatea climatică. Rezoluția subliniază cu profundă îngrijorare faptul că deciziile negative privind aderarea României și Bulgariei la spațiul Schengen este folosită ca propagandă anti-UE, inclusiv propagandă antirusească.

Comisia este invitată să estimeze pierderile financiare și daunele aduse mediului înconjurător din 2011 încoace. De asemenea, Comisia ar trebui să analizeze posibilitatea mecanismelor de compensare a pierderilor financiare suferite de economia Bulgariei și a României din cauza deciziilor negative. Aderarea României și Bulgariei la spațiul Schengen este esențială ca Uniunea Europeană să devină mai puternică. Prin această rezoluție, Comisia este îndemnată să analizeze toate procedurile posibile pentru a apăra dreptul la libera circulație a cetățenilor din România și Bulgaria.

Ca europarlamentar român, vă rog să îmi permiteți o scurtă observație personală. Până în 2019, 15 ani am fost primul celui mai vestic oraș din România. Orașul Arad se află la 50 de km de frontieră. Știu exact suferința oamenilor care conduc tirurile. Știu exact ce înseamnă punctul de frontieră. De aceea, ne punem încrederea în președinția spaniolă a Consiliului Uniunii Europene că aderarea României și a Bulgariei la spațiul Schengen este o prioritate deosebită și să se programeze un vot în Consiliul JAI până la finalul acestui an.

#### *Catch-the-eye procedure*

**Cristian-Silviu Bușoi (PPE).** – Domnule președinte, felicit inițiatorii petiției, pe Răzvan Nicolescu și Asociația pentru Energie Curată și pe colegii din Comisia PETI pentru susținerea și adoptarea acestei petiții. Votul negativ al Austriei împotriva României este un vot împotriva drepturilor fundamentale și al statului de drept în Uniunea Europeană, o încălcare gravă a principiilor de bază din Tratatul UE.

Votul negativ nu a fost dat pe baza criteriilor Schengen, ci pe o vagă motivație legată de problema migrației, în condițiile în care România nu a fost niciodată o rută importantă pentru migrație. Este foarte important să cerem în numele Parlamentului European ca această decizie injustă să fie îndreptată cât mai curând. România și Bulgaria merită să fie în Schengen.

România și-a securizat frontierele, a modernizat legislația, a demonstrat în toți acești ani, din 2007 încoace, că este un partener dedicat și implicat în întărirea și îmbunătățirea funcționării Uniunii Europene.

**Victor Negrescu (S&D).** – Domnule președinte, românii nu mai pot aștepta după mofiturile politicianilor de dreapta de la Viena. Această rezoluție explică foarte clar de ce vetoul de anul trecut încalcă drepturile cetățenești și legislația europeană. Prin amendamentele noastre arătăm impactul negativ asupra mediului și pieței interne, subliniem discriminările create și solicităm aderarea până la finalul anului a României la spațiul Schengen.

Costurile blocajului trebuie compensate. Cei vinovați trebuie să plătească, așa cum se întâmplă când statele membre încalcă legislația europeană. Această rezoluție preia inclusiv argumentele petiției „România cere Schengen!” din 2015, pe care am inițiat-o și care a fost susținută atunci de peste 50.000 de persoane și de Parlamentul European. Și iată, astăzi ne cerem încă o dată acest drept, solicitând Comisiei și Parlamentului European să apere Uniunea Europeană, inclusiv prin atacarea vetoului Austriei în instanță. Acum ori niciodată.

**Vlad Gheorghe (Renew).** – Domnule președinte, a fost discriminare și nu o spun eu de data asta, o spune tot Parlamentul European. Vetoul împotriva României, fără niciun fel de motiv, este discriminare și acum avem asta într-o rezoluție a Parlamentului European. Și cine discriminează trebuie să plătească, pentru că România suferă cel puțin 11 miliarde de euro pagubă în fiecare an din cauza acestei discriminări.

De acum încolo, discutăm despre plata acestor despăgubiri, pentru că vine factura. Vine factura pentru cei care ne discriminează, pentru cei care votează împotriva României fără niciun fel de teme. Le mulțumesc din suflet colegilor mei că susțin rezoluția propusă de mine și le spun un lucru, asta nu este doar despre România și Bulgaria, este despre toate țările care au dreptul să fie egale cu celelalte din Uniunea Europeană, pentru că despre asta este Uniunea Europeană, despre egalitate. Suntem toți la fel și e momentul să se vadă acest lucru.



**Nicolae Ștefănuță (Verts/ALE).** – Domnule președinte, și eu vreau să mulțumesc asociațiilor, Asociația pentru Energie Curată, Acum, Liga Studenților, care au salvat și de data asta imaginea României. Mi-ar fi plăcut să fim mai mulți în sală care nu suntem români și bulgari. Am numărat, suntem 15 români și bulgari. Mulțumesc, Seán! Mulțumesc, Anna! Mulțumesc ție, Marc, pentru că ești cu noi. Dar asta arată o problemă, că nu știm încă să dialogăm foarte bine.

Și eu mai vreau să reduc un pic nivelul de așteptări, nu pentru că nu-mi doresc din toată inima să intrăm în Schengen, dar nu vreau nici să mint românii care așteaptă cu sufletul la gură această decizie în fiecare zi. Nu vreau să-i fac să creadă că imediat vom avea o decizie de la Curtea de Justiție, pentru că destinul lor, destinul românilor, ține de calitatea politicianilor care îi reprezintă, dar și de calitatea politicianilor care ne apără aici, în casa asta europeană. Pentru că nu este corect ca politicieni precum Nehammer sau Rutte, care acum iese din viața politică, să decidă așa despre destinul a milioane de oameni. Așa că, chiar vreau să ne audă domnul Nehammer în această cameră, în seara asta și să facă ceva, pentru că românii merită să fie în Schengen.

**Cristian Terheș (ECR).** – Domnule președinte, domnule comisar, dreptul României și a românilor de a fi în Schengen nu se discută, se afirmă. Din 2007, de când România a intrat în Uniunea Europeană, a agreat în Tratatul de aderare al României și Bulgariei la Uniunea Europeană că, odată ce își îndeplinește toate condițiile de a intra în Schengen, este primită în Schengen.

Comisia Europeană, pe care o reprezentați astăzi aici, din 2011 vine și spune că atât România, cât și Bulgaria îndeplinesc toate condițiile de a intra în Schengen și cu toate acestea, astăzi, în 2023, încă discutăm despre necesitatea imperativă a intrării României și Bulgariei în Schengen.

Vă solicit, de aceea, prin urmare, să elevați acest subiect Președinte Comisiei Europene, Ursula von der Leyen, care are toate pârghiile legale la îndemână pentru a forța atât Austria, cât și eventual, Olanda să accepte în sfârșit intrarea României și Bulgariei de drept în Schengen.

**Eugen Tomac (PPE).** – Domnule președinte, domnule comisar, mă bucur că o inițiativă civică românească a devenit astăzi dezbateră în Parlamentul European pe o temă care este de interes major pentru 27 de milioane de cetățeni europeni. Mă bucur că amendamentul propus de președintele Băsescu se regăsește în această rezoluție prin care cerem ca Parlamentul să aibă curaj și să se alăture demersului pe care l-am făcut la Curtea de Justiție a Uniunii Europene.

Trebuie să avem curaj să luptăm pentru libertățile și drepturile tuturor cetățenilor europeni, pentru că ceea ce face în prezent Consiliul Uniunii Europene, blocând dreptul nostru de a ne bucura de libera circulație, de facilitățile pieței unice europene, trebuie combătute la Curtea de Justiție a Uniunii Europene.

Și de aceea cer ca Parlamentul să dea un vot în viitorul apropiat pentru a interveni în această cauză la Curtea de Justiție a Uniunii Europene pe care am deschis-o împotriva Consiliului European. Este un conflict juridic care trebuie tranșat rapid.

**Maria Grapini (S&D).** – Domnule președinte, domnule comisar, stimați colegi, din 2014, de când sunt în Parlamentul European, ridic problema intrării României și Bulgariei în Schengen și nu cerșim, domnule comisar. Este dreptul nostru, am semnat același tratat și nu putem rămâne – noi România și Bulgaria- doar cu obligații și fără drepturi.

Cu ce drept Austria – un singur stat, un singur om, se opune? Ce democrație este aceasta? Domnule comisar, spuneți-i doamnei președintă că atunci când România nu a rezolvat la timp o clauză dintr-un regulament a intrat în *infringement*. Toate țările au fost pedepsite dacă nu au respectat un regulament. De ce permiteți Austriei să încalce un regulament? Distruge proiectul european, domnule comisar, și vă întreb dacă ați fi român ca mine, ce ați răspunde românilor de acasă la întrebarea: de ce nu se respectă tratatul? De ce regulamentul nu este respectat?

Eu cer, domnule comisar, și vă rog să-i transmiteți doamnei președintă, ca Austria să intre în *infringement* și să cereți să plătească despăgubirile și pierderile economice pe care România le-a suportat în acești ani. Atunci va fi un proiect european adevărat.

**Илхан Ключюк (Renew).** – Г-н Председател, това не е дебат за България и за Румъния, това е дебат за същността на Европейския съюз.

Искаме ли да оставим две страни извън Шенгенското пространство толкова много години, след като направиха за европейската интеграция? Не е справедливо това и никой не трябва да го подкрепя. Радостно е, че имаме подкрепата на Европейския парламент, на Европейската комисия, но е време Европейският съвет да прояви политическа зрялост и най-накрая двете страни, които са огромното препятствие пред присъединяването на България и Румъния към Европейския съюз, да дадат зелена светлина.

Не може да стигматизираме европейските граждани. Никога не сме поощрявали това да има двойно качество европейски граждани – едни, които са с по-големи привилегии и други, които нямат привилегии. Точно това постигаме в момента с Шенген. В момент, в който в Европейският съюз трябва да има политическо и морално единство. Трябва да подкрепяме тези, които са извън Съюза, за да направим възможното той да бъде силен и сигурен, но в същото време не може да затваряме вратите пред България и пред Румъния. Аз не искам да стигматизирам тези граждани, те не са по-малко граждани от всички останали – германци, французи, австрийци, холандци. Затова нека да призовем всички с огромна подкрепа да подкрепим тази петиция на Европейския парламент.

**Daniel Buda (PPE).** – Domnule președinte, aderarea României și Bulgariei la spațiul Schengen este un act de minimă igienă morală care trebuie asumat de toate cancelariile europene.

România a avut un rol crucial în consolidarea graniței de est, furnizând constant stabilitate și securitate pentru Uniunea Europeană. Și cu toate acestea vă întreb care este răsplata, domnule comisar? Încălcarea unor drepturi câștigate în vremuri complicate și dificile. Austria trebuie să ceară scuze cetățenilor României, care astăzi încă stau la cozile umilinței în punctele de trecere a frontierei, dar și să plătească despăгубири. Mediul economic și de afaceri românesc pentru pierderile incomensurabile cauzate de refuzul nejustificat al accesului în spațiul Schengen.

Tocmai de aceea, consider că orice amânare nu este doar profund nedreaptă, dar este și o încăлcare inacceptabilă a tratatelor europene. Consecințele acestor încăлцări trebuie să fie resimțите din plin de statele care се опун, iar Curtea Europeană de Justiție trebuie să își îndeplinească роля de гарант al respectării dreptului european

**Цветелина Пенкова (S&D).** – Г-н Председател, на първо място искам да поздравя колегите от Комисията по петиции за предложената резолюция. Да, за пореден път Европейският парламент признава, че България и Румъния имат пълното право да са част от Шенгенското пространство. Двете страни изпълняват всички технически критерии повече от 10 години, но въпреки това ние над десетилетие сме на вратите на Шенген.

Ясно е, че членството на България и Румъния се блокира заради вътрешнополитически причини и няма нищо общо с изпълнението на техническите критерии. Само че по този начин се пренебрегват европейските интереси за сигурност, икономически ползи и най-важното свободата и възможността на всички европейски граждани да се движат свободно в рамките на Съюза. Равни сме по изисквания и по задължения, но не и по постигнати резултати. Този двоен стандарт не бива да съществува.

Аз съм убедена, че испанското председателство ще положи всички усилия това дискриминационно отношение към български и румънски граждани веднъж завинаги да бъде прекратено.

**Андрей Ковачев (PPE).** – Г-н Председател, български и румънски граждани се обръщат към нас със справедливо недоволство, че за повече от 10 години нищо не се случва и в Съвета не се взима решението за приемането на България и Румъния в Шенгенското пространство.

Винаги има някакво извинение, някакво лицемерно аргументиране на това. Миналата седмица отпадна и последното лицемерие, което използваше Нидерландия, а това е официалното прекратяване на Механизма за сътрудничество и проверка спрямо България и Румъния. Това забавяне или това нежелание от страна на Нидерландия и на Австрия да приемат решението трябва да бъде преодоляно. Не може да се извиняваме също така и с някакви, било то местни избори в Австрия или било то сега предсрочни парламентарни избори в Нидерландия.

Призовавам Комисията, в лицето и на председателя на Комисията да говори със сега служебното правителство на Нидерландия. Ние не можем повече да чакаме които и да било избори където и да било. България и Румъния трябва да бъдат част от Шенгенското пространство и то тази година.

**Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D).** – Señor presidente, señor comisario, una vez más este Parlamento Europeo insiste, con una polifonía coral, en que Rumanía y Bulgaria se incorporen finalmente a Schengen y disfruten plenamente de ese derecho fundamental tanpreciado por la ciudadanía europea que es la libre circulación en igualdad de condiciones con todos los demás. Han cumplido con todos los criterios, han hecho sus deberes, su tarea para disfrutar de Schengen, y aún no lo disfrutan pese a que este Parlamento Europeo ha apoyado esa pretensión justa desde hace mucho tiempo.

Pero uno este debate con el que sosteníamos en este Pleno hace veinticuatro horas: la necesidad de superar la regla de la unanimidad y sustituirla por la mayoría cualificada. Porque —que se entere todo el mundo— si Rumanía y Bulgaria aún no están en Schengen es porque hay dos Estados miembros de veintisiete que todavía se oponen, y uno solo de ellos a uno de los dos países.

Por tanto, resulta inconcebible que, porque dos Estados de veintisiete todavía se opongan, Rumanía y Bulgaria tengan pendiente esa cuenta con el pleno disfrute de su ciudadanía europea que es Schengen.

**Seán Kelly (PPE).** – Mr President, I fully support Bulgaria and Romania in their quest to be in Schengen. They are full members of the European Union, they are valued members of the European Union and they are entitled to the same freedoms as the other members. And we cannot have a situation where we have a two tier Member State – those in Schengen and those being kept out of it. So I think that has to change as soon as possible.

Having said that, my own country, Ireland, we were never in Schengen because we were tied to the United Kingdom, to the common travel area. But now that the United Kingdom have left the European Union, maybe there might be an element of creativity which would allow us perhaps to be in Schengen. Because having travelled, particularly with the EPP Group and with ITRE from Brussels to places within the European Union on missions, there is a huge difference when you can travel freely without checks as opposed to when you have to show your passport et cetera at the border. And that can take a lot of time and you can miss meetings as a result. So Romania and Bulgaria, and look at Ireland.

*(End of catch-the-eye procedure)*

**Virginijus Sinkevičius, Member of the Commission.** – Mr President, honourable Members, the Schengen area is the largest area of borderless travel in the world, including so far 27 countries and benefiting 425 million people since the accession of Croatia earlier this year.

As stated in this year's State of Schengen report, the area is functioning well overall and was the most visited destination in the world last year. Schengen brings liberty and prosperity, and the absence of border checks between our Member States is cherished by Europeans and is part of European identity.

It is both a legal expectation and a European promise that Member States acceding to the Union participate fully in the Schengen area once all the agreed conditions are met and – as the Commission has underlined repeatedly since 2011 – Bulgaria and Romania have continued to meet all the necessary conditions to join the Schengen area.

Controls at the Romanian and Bulgarian internal borders bring extra economic and environmental burden to all EU citizens, as underlined in the petition we discussed today. Therefore, it is urgent to finalise the process that started 12 years ago and let Bulgaria and Romania become full members of Schengen.

Both Member States have constantly acted as essential actors for the continuous development of the Schengen acts. They have gone beyond what was required of them and agreed on a voluntary basis to the fact-finding missions of October and November 2022 – missions which further confirmed their readiness to join the Schengen area.

The Commission regrets that the Council did not reach unanimity on the decision on Romania's and Bulgaria's accession to the area in December 2022.

Not only are these two Member States ready to become full members of the Schengen area, but equally the area is today stronger than ever before, with many challenges on their way to being addressed. Just to give a few examples, our work on the Western Balkans with the EU Action Plan we proposed in December 2022 is producing excellent results. Overall pressure on the Western Balkans route has decreased by 25% in the first five months of 2023, compared to the same period in 2022.

On visas, significant decisions have been taken by the partners to align the visa policy. On border management, tangible progress has been made on the two pilot projects set up in March by Bulgaria and Romania showcasing good practices at European level in this area.

Moreover, new Frontex status agreements are well under way. New operations started in mid-April in North Macedonia. We signed a new agreement with Montenegro in May, and expect to sign one with Albania in September. Negotiations are ongoing with Serbia and we expect Bosnia and Herzegovina to appoint a chief negotiator during the summer.

Finally, the Regional Anti-smuggling Cooperation Partnership, launched in Tirana in November 2022, is also bringing results with increased engagement at operational level between EU Member States and the Western Balkans.

We are delivering on all fronts of managing migration, and this makes our area stronger. It is high time the EU honour its commitment to grant the two Member States full membership and further strengthen the European Union in doing so.

Schengen enlargement remains a political priority for this Commission, and we welcome that this is a priority also for the Spanish Presidency. The Commission is working closely with the Spanish Presidency to prepare for a decision to be taken by the Council to lift internal border controls as soon as possible this year.

**President.** – The debate is closed.

The debate will take place tomorrow.

*Written statements (Rule 171)*

**Dacian Cioloș (Renew), în scris.** – Este trist și revoltător că ajungem să votăm încă o rezoluție pentru a întări poziția acestui Parlament că România trebuie să intre în Schengen. România merită să intre în Schengen.

România are dreptul legal, conform tratatelor, să fie în Schengen. E nu doar imoral, ci și împotriva tratatelor Uniunii Europene ca cetățeni europeni să fie discriminați și lipsiți de un drept, ca rezultat al unor jocuri și interese politice care n-au nimic de-a face cu buna funcționare a Uniunii. Dacă acest lucru continuă, toată Uniunea Europeană va avea de pierdut. Pentru că cei care ne blochează acum accesul, în speță Austria, alimentează curentul extremist în România și pun în pericol chiar proiectul european prin încăpățânarea aceasta și pentru câștiguri politice interne.

**Dan-Ștefan Motreanu (PPE), în scris.** – Comisia Europeană trebuie să își ia în serios rolul de „gardian al tratatelor” și să demonstreze încălcarea acestora la Curtea de Justiție a Uniunii Europene în ceea ce privește refuzul fără temei juridic, de peste un deceniu, al aderării României la Spațiul Schengen.

Doresc să mulțumesc tuturor colegilor pentru sprijinul în unanimitate în Comisia PETI pentru proiectul de rezoluție prin care solicităm Comisiei Europene să estimeze pierderile financiare înregistrate de România din anul 2011 până în prezent ca urmare a neapartenței la Spațiul Schengen și să analizeze totodată posibilele mecanisme de compensare.

Ceea ce nu va putea compensa, însă, Uniunea Europeană este discriminarea suferită de cetățenii români în toți acești ani la frontierele sau în aeroporturile statelor membre, discriminare ce se va reflecta din păcate în rezultatele alegerilor europarlamentare de la anul viitor.

**Rovana Plumb (S&D), în scris.** – Aderarea la Spațiul Schengen este o obligație pentru România. O obligație pe care ne-am asumat-o cu entuziasm. Și suntem membrii ai Acordului Schengen dar numai în ceea ce privește obligațiile, căci în ceea ce privește drepturile suntem excluși. Nu pentru că nu îndeplinim standardele și nu ne-am facem temele, ci pentru că unii jucători politici din diverse state europene cred că a trata astfel un întreg popor le poate aduce un câștig politic domestic. Și aceasta opțiune nu se bazează nici măcar pe evidențe, ci doar pe speculații.

Dacă cineva mi-ar fi spus în 2004, când Guvernul din care făceam parte încheia negocierile de aderare la UE, ca aproape 20 de ani mai târziu ne vom confrunta cu o astfel de situație, as fi spus ca e imposibil, că Uniunea nu se poate degrada la un asemenea nivel. Nu vrem un cadou, vrem ceea ce suntem obligați sa avem și, mai mult, suntem îndreptățiți sa obținem.

## 21. Rozporządzenie w sprawie ekoprojektu (debata)

**President.** – The next item is the debate on the report by Alessandra Moretti, on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety, on the proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing a framework for setting eco-design requirements for sustainable products and repealing Directive 2009/125/EC (COM(2022)0142 – C9-0132/2022 – 2022/0095(COD)) (A9-0218/2023).

**Alessandra Moretti, relatrice.** – Signor Presidente, signor Commissario, onorevoli colleghi, quella che voteremo domani è una proposta destinata ad avere un grosso impatto sulla nostra società, sulle nostre imprese e sui nostri consumatori.

Questo regolamento infatti cambierà in modo radicale le modalità di operare dell'industria in tantissimi settori, indicando al mondo produttivo la strada per gestire l'intero ciclo di vita di un prodotto, compreso il fine vita.

Un regolamento che trova la sua ratio nel rispetto dei limiti del nostro pianeta, istituendo un quadro legislativo che contribuirà a rendere i prodotti conformi a un'economia neutra dal punto di vista climatico, efficiente sotto il profilo delle risorse e circolare.

I prodotti che saranno progressivamente immessi sul mercato, quindi, dovranno essere progettati in modo tale da rispettare l'ambiente, l'ecosistema e proteggere la salute dei cittadini.

Inoltre si permetterà ai consumatori di risparmiare energia, di poter riparare i prodotti che acquistano anziché doverli gettare e di dare loro la possibilità, attraverso il passaporto digitale, di essere pienamente consapevoli circa quello che acquistano.

Il passaporto digitale rappresenta un'importante innovazione nel panorama attuale e uno strumento decisivo per promuovere la circolarità: i nuovi prodotti che saranno disponibili potranno essere infatti venduti solo se accompagnati da questo strumento, che dovrà contenere informazioni accurate e aggiornate sull'impatto ambientale dei prodotti in circolazione, al fine di consentire a tutti di fare scelte consapevoli.

Un recente studio della Corte dei conti europea ha tristemente evidenziato che le strategie e i finanziamenti europei hanno avuto finora un impatto modesto sulla transizione verso l'economia circolare e che il ritardo più marcato riguarda proprio la progettazione.

La proposta che ci apprestiamo a votare non investe solo nella gestione dei rifiuti, ma anche nella progettazione circolare: tuttavia non è solo importante come progettiamo il prodotto, è questione rilevante anche come lo realizziamo, in quali aziende e a quali condizioni di lavoro.

A livello mondiale, ad esempio, il settore tessile dà lavoro a 60 milioni di persone, principalmente donne, e spesso le paghe dei lavoratori tessili sono di gran lunga inferiori ai salari di sussistenza. Ricordiamo a tutti la tragedia del Rana Plaza, la fabbrica tessile in Bangladesh dove dieci anni fa sono morte più di 1 000 persone. In quella fabbrica si realizzavano quei vestiti che, per pochi euro e senza porci troppe domande, compriamo anche qui in Europa.

Ho voluto così chiedere alla Commissione che nei prossimi anni valuti l'opportunità di estendere il campo di applicazione della proposta anche ai requisiti di sostenibilità sociale e di dovuta diligenza.

Nella sola Europa, poi, ciascuno di noi scarta circa dodici chili di vestiti ogni anno e la maggior parte di questi scarti va ad aumentare l'inquinamento degli ecosistemi di tutto il mondo ma, senza ipocrisie, dobbiamo dire che va ad inquinare soprattutto i paesi più poveri, che da sempre diventano il ricettacolo di quanto noi occidentali scartiamo.

C'è, inoltre, il tema dei prodotti invenduti. Questo regolamento introduce un divieto diretto alla distruzione dei prodotti di consumo invenduti, che dovrebbe applicarsi ai tessili e agli apparecchi elettronici. Alla fine del loro ciclo di vita i prodotti non saranno più un rifiuto, fonte di inquinamento, ma una nuova risorsa da utilizzare nel processo produttivo.

La proposta si propone infine di migliorare il potenziale del mercato unico, rafforzando le attività di sorveglianza del mercato, garantendo alle imprese, in particolare le piccole e medie, di svolgere le loro attività in condizioni di parità con i loro competitor extraeuropei.

Cari colleghi, nessun cambiamento è impossibile. Sta a noi, a ciascuno di noi, fare la propria parte e per farlo serve avere a disposizione tutte le informazioni di un prodotto e assumere così le scelte più giuste. Con queste scelte possiamo migliorare il contesto in cui viviamo, senza limitarci a pensare a ciò che vediamo sotto i nostri occhi, ma tendendo lo sguardo verso il futuro, oltre i nostri confini, dove persone sono costrette a lavorare in condizioni inaccettabili, sacrificando diritti e libertà, per permetterci di continuare questo insostenibile e ingiusto stile di vita.

**Maria Spyra***ki*, *rapporteur for the opinion of the Committee on Industry, Research and Energy*. – Mr President, Commissioner, dear colleagues, the proposal for a new Ecodesign for Sustainable Products Regulation is, to my opinion, the cornerstone of our single market approach to new environmentally sustainable and circular products.

As the rapporteur of the opinion on behalf of the ITRE Committee in this regulation, I would like to underline that we tried a lot to explain the added value of incorporating renewability idea as an ecodesign parameter, and we believe that, in this regard, we are paving the way into a more circular approach.

Why is this so important? Because, first of all, beyond products, also the business models that deliver them play a critical role. Rather than simply launching a new product which can improve material and energy efficiency, as it is in the case of linear model, moving to a circular business model requires a complete integration of circular design, as well as collection and redistribution infrastructure. Therefore, we pave the way from the linear model of industrial production to circular model.

Government initiatives to advance sustainability have concentrated on product recycling and reuse, waste management, which happens to be the last step of the linear model.

Allow me, Mr President, to conclude with this: such a reprioritisation can be performed only on the basis of an updated, efficient and coherent legal framework that paves the new era of the European internal market. Believe me, ESPR is on the right path.

**David Cormand**, *rapporteur pour avis de la commission du marché intérieur et de la protection des consommateurs*. – Monsieur le Président, je tiens à remercier Alessandra Moretti pour son excellent rapport. Bravo! Vous avez réussi un exploit et on est fiers de pouvoir voter sur un texte ambitieux.

Le règlement sur l'écoconception des produits a pour horizon de permettre à terme que seuls des produits durables puissent circuler sur le marché européen. C'est une victoire des consommatrices et des consommateurs et c'est une victoire de la planète sur la société de consommation.

Dans ce règlement, nous avons permis trois avancées décisives. Tout d'abord, l'interdiction explicite des pratiques d'obsolescence prématurée. C'est un vieux combat et c'est sous cette mandature que nous avons réussi à l'emporter. Pour la première fois, nous reconnaissons l'existence de ces pratiques et nous chargeons la Commission de les nommer et de les exclure pour chaque catégorie de produits.

Ensuite, la mise en place du score de réparabilité. Enfin nous appelons à établir au niveau européen un affichage qui permette aux consommatrices et aux consommateurs de comparer la réparabilité des produits qu'ils achètent! Enfin nous récompensons les constructeurs qui conçoivent des produits qui durent!

Enfin, l'interdiction de la destruction des invendus de produits textiles et électroniques. Merci à la commission de l'environnement d'avoir pu porter cette révolution. Plus de détours ou de faux défauts d'information, nous appelons avec vigueur à réglementer au plus vite les secteurs qui pratiquent le gaspillage en masse. C'est un mandat que nous pouvons célébrer par nos votes. C'est avec joie que je nous appelle à adopter ce texte que nous pourrions défendre ensemble, avec détermination, avec le Conseil.

**Virginijus Sinkevičius**, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, honourable Members, my sincere thanks to this House for putting the ecodesign for sustainable products proposal on the agenda for this plenary session and for hosting this important debate this evening. Rapporteur Alessandra Moretti, ENVI Chair Pascal Canfin, opinion rapporteurs David Cormand and Maria Spyraiki, as well as shadow rapporteurs and many other Members have done a tremendous job making this file forward in excellent time and laying the foundation for what I truly hope will be tomorrow's adoption of a constructive Parliament mandate to enter dialogues.

The work you have carried out in little over a year leads me to believe that you see a strong potential in the new Ecodesign Regulation, and the existing ecodesign framework has already proven its effectiveness by making energy related products more efficient. Current ecodesign and energy labelling cumulatively amount to a 10% lower annual energy consumption by the products in scope, comparable to the energy consumption of Poland. And this translates into reduction of several hundred euros on energy bills of EU households each year.

By enabling us for the first time to ensure that a wide range of products are designed for circularity and sustainability, this new Ecodesign Regulation will speed up our move from the linear 'take, make, use, dispose' economic model to one in which we need less, retain more and contribute to fostering the circular transformation of our economy.

While the Commission still reserves its position at this stage in the process, I am pleased that in many places Parliament have preserved a high level of environmental ambition as well as the core single market principles of the proposal. I nevertheless want to draw attention to a number of points.

Firstly, it is vitally important to ensure that the new Ecodesign Regulation remains coherent with existing legislation. This is particularly true for the complex field of chemicals here. If any ecodesign provision overlaps with the scope of other already existing rules – for example, REACH – the only outcome will be confusion leading to ineffective implementation and reduced compliance.

Secondly, in relation to destruction of unsold consumer products. We understand the Parliament would like to take direct action in this area. Regardless of the final outcome, it will be essential for the measures to work in practice and prevent loopholes and circumvention. The better we think through and design these provisions now, the more effective they will be once in place.

Another aspect I want to touch on is online marketplaces. These play a crucial role in today's supply chains, allowing economic operators to reach an ever-increasing number of customers. And the rules put forward for these entities aim to complement those under the Digital Services Act. Through compliance with eco design regulation, a level playing field for a sustainable marketplace will be created.

Finally, let me be practical and realistic. Much work needs to be done under the new Ecodesign Regulation – and done fast. If the current negative environmental trends are to be reversed and for our industry to benefit from its competitive advantages in circular products and technologies, any obligations or procedures added during negotiations must work in practice and not pose undue delays. The Commission will ensure alignment with the Treaty and the Interinstitutional Agreement on better regulation.

Honourable Members, I hope that today's discussion will pave the way for a positive outcome at tomorrow's vote, and I look forward to entering the next phase of negotiations so that another key milestone in the EU's circular transition can be crossed.

**Jessica Polfjärd**, för PPE-gruppen. – Herr talman! Herr kommissionär. Det har redan gått tre år sedan kommissionen presenterade sin handlingsplan för cirkulär ekonomi och vi här i Europaparlamentet utarbetade vårt initiativbetänkande.

Sedan dess har vi tagit tydliga steg för att uppnå våra klimatmål, och nu visar vi också att vi levererar på omställningen till en mer cirkulär ekonomi. Det är en stor framgång och jag skulle vilja tacka föredragande Moretti och mina skuggkollegor för ett gott samarbete, och för att vi har nått en överenskommelse.

Det råder stor osäkerhet i Europa, både politiskt och ekonomiskt. Då är det särskilt viktigt att säkerställa och upprätthålla det stöd som vi har fått av väljarna för vår miljöpolitik. Det betyder att vi måste tänka noggrant på hur vi genomför den. Tydliga ramar är vägen framåt, inte detaljstyrning.

För företagen är det viktigaste ganska enkelt: alla vill ha möjligheten att konkurrera på lika villkor. Jag tror att vi har gett dem verktygen för att kunna använda det som är en av våra viktigaste tillgångar, nämligen den europeiska inre marknaden. Vår inre marknad är en av vår unions största styrkor. Tyvärr använder vi den inte fullt ut och använder hela potentialen. Ibland kan vi till och med undergräva dess funktionalitet.

Att ta bort interna hinder för handel och tillväxt har därför varit en av mina viktigaste prioriteringar. Men vi har också lagt helt nya förslag på bordet, inte minst vad gäller hårdare tag för att uppmuntra mer hållbara värdekedjor både inom textil och på elektroniksidan. Med dessa regler tror jag att europeisk industri på lika villkor får möjligheten att ställa om. Med detta förslag är vi på rätt väg att skapa en EU-marknad för hållbara produkter. Det är rätt väg att gå.

**Erik Bergkvist**, för S&D-gruppen. – Herr talman! Bästa ledamöter. Ekodesign kommer att ge oss bra möjligheter att skapa hållbara produkter och energieffektiva produkter för vår inre marknad. Det kommer att skapa förutsättningar för företag och industrier att skapa hållbara processer och kunna jobba cirkulärt på ett sätt som man inte har jobbat tidigare. Det kommer att ge oss förutsättningar att ta bort dåliga produkter. Att skapa hållbara, lagningsbara, långsiktiga produkter där vi ser till hela livscykeln.

För oss socialdemokrater har det också varit väldigt viktigt att man faktiskt ser till helheten. För att göra det måste man se alla länkar i kedjan, och även ta med de sociala aspekterna för dem som faktiskt producerar våra hållbara produkter. Då när man gör det, när man ser alla dessa delar, då har vi skapat hållbarhet på riktigt.

**Róża Thun und Hohenstein**, w imieniu grupy Renew. – Panie Przewodniczący! Zgadzam się z wszystkimi, którzy tutaj mówili, że ten ekoprojekt to jest legislacja niezwykle ambitna i kluczowa dla ochrony klimatu. I dzięki niej możemy pomóc trwale zmienić nastawienie konsumentów i producentów do zasobów Ziemi. Zasoby Ziemi są ograniczone. Musimy podchodzić do nich z myślą o następnych pokoleniach, o tych pokoleniach, które przyjdą po nas.

Mówiliśmy dzisiaj – 12 godzin temu – dużo na ten temat z panem komisarzem przy okazji dyskusji o *nature restoration law*. To to w ogóle jest taki dzień, kiedy bardzo dużo mówimy o ochronie środowiska. Ja z tym nastawieniem podchodziłam również do tego fragmentu legislacji. Pracowałam nad tym ekoprojektem jako kontrsprawozdawczyni w Komisji Rynku Wewnętrznego i Ochrony Konsumentów. I cieszę się, że tę dobrą propozycję Komisji udało się nam w kilku aspektach jeszcze poprawić, uczynić ją jeszcze trochę lepszą.

I wymienię tylko dwa punkty. Po pierwsze – na co wielu czekało – wskazujemy wyraźnie, że wymogi w zakresie ekoprojektu powinny dotyczyć wprowadzenia wspólnej łańdowarki do podobnych produktów, np. narzędzi ogrodniczych, wiertarek elektrycznych lub produktów, które muszą być zabezpieczone przed wilgocią czy przed wodą, jak szczoteczki do zębów, golarki itp. A lubimy konkrety.

Po drugie koniec z papierowymi książkami, instrukcjami, które zawsze były dołączone w dziesięciu językach do wszelkich produktów. Instrukcje będą łatwo dostępne w formacie cyfrowym i drukowane tylko na życzenie konsumenta. W ten sposób uratujemy miliony drzew i liczę, że my jutro zagłosujemy za tymi zmianami, a Komisja i Rada poprą te propozycje.



**Sara Matthieu**, *namens de Verts/ALE-Fractie*. – Voorzitter, onze producten gaan veel te snel kapot en dat kost ons veel geld. En dat is ook slecht voor het milieu. Smartphones die na anderhalf jaar stuk zijn of een koffiemachine die net na de garantie het meteen begeeft. En als onze spullen kapotgaan, zijn ze ook nog eens moeilijk te herstellen. De onderdelen zitten vastgelijmd, er zijn geen wisselstukken beschikbaar of ze zijn te duur. Er zijn geen herstellende in de buurt, dus wat doen we dan? We kopen een nieuw toestel en het oude gaat naar het stort of wordt vernietigd in een verbrandingsoven.

Maar met deze nieuwe verordening ecologisch ontwerp ruilen we onze wegwerpeconomie om voor een echte circulaire economie. Dat wil zeggen dat onze kledij, onze meubels, onze elektrische apparaten langer meegaan, dat ze beter herstelbaar zijn, dat ze herbruikbaar zijn en recycleerbaar. En dat wil zeggen dat onze jeans een minimumaantal wasbeurten zal meegaan, makkelijker te recyclen zal zijn en uit meer gerecycleerde grondstoffen gaat bestaan, dat onze wasmachine of onze smartphone goedkoop te repareren zal zijn en gegarandeerd langer zal meegaan, dat we verplichte info krijgen over de levensduur van onze producten en hoe makkelijk we een toestel kunnen repareren, en dat we eindelijk zullen gaan verbieden dat de bedrijven vandaag de onverkochte goederen en de teruggestuurde pakjes die we bestellen via webshops zomaar kunnen gaan vernietigen.

Aan dit soort schandalige praktijken, collega's, gaan we eindelijk een einde maken. En dat is goed voor onze portefeuille, dat is goed voor het klimaat en dat is goed voor het milieu.

**Silvia Sardone**, *a nome del gruppo ID*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, l'obiettivo del regolamento sulla progettazione ecocompatibile sarebbe quello di ridurre l'impatto ambientale dei prodotti durante il loro ciclo di vita ma, ancora una volta, finisce alla fine per imporre ulteriori oneri alle imprese e pone le basi per future nuove iniziative *green*, con pericoli importanti per le aziende.

Appreziamo i riferimenti alle micro, piccole e medie imprese, ma abbiamo ancora molti dubbi su questa proposta. Uno, tra tutti, la mancata inclusione del riciclo tra le esenzioni nella definizione di distruzione, al pari praticamente di riuso e rifabbricazione.

Insomma, secondo la proposta il riciclo sarebbe una modalità di distruzione del prodotto. Questa è un'assurdità che colpirebbe le aziende italiane di diversi settori che da anni investono nel riciclo – considerate che l'Italia è prima al mondo nel riciclo – e lo riteniamo un paradosso.

In pratica per attaccare le aziende della moda *low cost* si colpiscono anche i brand di lusso: è un paradosso che aziende come Armani, se hanno un abito invenduto, non possano distruggerlo ma non possano neanche riciclarlo. Dovrebbe smontare il mercato del lusso, che solo in Italia vale 17 miliardi di euro e il 78 % della moda di lusso è *made in Italy*.

Abbiamo presentato un emendamento che introduce il requisito di informazioni sull'origine del prodotto, così che il *made in Italy* possa essere riconosciuto e quindi valorizzato come eccellenza, ma anche in questo caso la sinistra, ovviamente, sarà assolutamente contraria.

Noi abbiamo letto 130 pagine di regole e vincoli per le aziende. In più, tra l'altro, in questo regolamento si decide di conferire il potere alla Commissione di introdurre ulteriori requisiti e obblighi attraverso atti delegati o atti legislativi specifici.

Noi rimaniamo contrari. Voi continuate a portare avanti regolamenti e proposte *green* che non salveranno il mondo, ma piuttosto renderanno meno competitiva l'Europa rispetto agli altri concorrenti. Non ne vale la pena.

**Marina Mesure**, *au nom du groupe The Left*. – Monsieur le Président, c'est officiel, la terre ne suffit plus à nous faire vivre. Dans deux semaines, ce sera le jour du dépassement. Cette date à partir de laquelle, chaque année, nous avons consommé toutes les ressources que la Terre peut renouveler en un an. Une date qui, chaque année, avance inexorablement et nous rappelle que nos ressources ne sont pas inépuisables.

Dans ce contexte, cette directive sur l'écoconception, qui permet de rendre nos produits plus durables, réparables, recyclables dès leur conception, est primordiale. Elle interdit notamment l'obsolescence programmée, un fléau grotesque et absurde qui vise à abandonner le progrès pour faire plus de profit et consommer davantage. Elle doit de la même manière interdire la destruction des invendus, aussi bien des textiles que des appareils électroniques. Tout cela pour bâtir un cadre réglementaire dans lequel aucun produit n'atteint la décharge avant d'avoir pu accomplir son plus haut niveau d'utilité.

Il y a urgence, car le retard que nous avons pris sur la révision de ce règlement a causé plus de 10 millions de tonnes d'émissions de CO<sub>2</sub> supplémentaires chaque année. Donc, n'attendons plus, votons ce texte et finissons-en avec le mythe de la croissance infinie dans un monde fini. Nos modes de consommation et de production doivent répondre aux exigences environnementales pour préserver la survie de l'humanité.

**Peter Liese (PPE).** – Herr Präsident, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Die Ökodesign-Richtlinie ist eine Erfolgsgeschichte. Wir haben in den letzten Jahren jährlich so viel Energie eingespart, wie Italien und Schweden gemeinsam verbrauchen. Wir haben damit das Klima geschützt, und wir haben damit dafür gesorgt, dass viele Verbraucherinnen und Verbraucher echtes Geld sparen. Jetzt geht es einen großen Schritt weiter. Jetzt geht es nicht mehr nur um den Energieverbrauch, sondern auch um die Kreislaufwirtschaft, Ressourcenschonung, und ich unterstütze diesen Schritt. Ich bedanke mich bei allen, vor allen Dingen für die EVP bei Jessica Polfjärd, dass Sie diesen Schritt jetzt ermöglichen.

Aber wir müssen wirklich aufpassen, dass wir uns dabei nicht verhaspeln. Es gibt einzelne Punkte, wo der Ausschuss noch über den Kommissionsvorschlag hinausgeht, z. B. bei den besorgniserregenden Stoffen, und ich glaube, da müssen wir vorsichtig sein. Deswegen unterstütze ich persönlich die Änderungsanträge 59 bis 61 und den Änderungsantrag 249, um hier Maß und Mitte zu halten.

Es ist ja so, dass Ökodesign einen großen Charme hat, auch für die Wirtschaft, weil da Regeln aufgestellt werden, nicht nur für europäische Produzenten, sondern auch für Importeure. Aber das müssen wir eben auch kontrollieren können. Dabei müssen wir uns fokussieren. Mein Appell an die Kommission, aber noch mehr an die Mitgliedstaaten: Passen wir auf, dass die Kontrolle funktioniert, sonst wäre nämlich der Ehrliche der Dumme, und das darf nicht sein.

**Beatrice Covassi (S&D).** – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, vale la pena essere qui stasera perché la proposta di legge sulla progettazione ecocompatibile è un importante passo in avanti verso un'economia circolare che renda sempre più sostenibili i prodotti messi in commercio in Europa.

Vogliamo prodotti più durevoli, riparabili, rinnovabili e riciclabili. Per questo fissiamo i requisiti per la loro progettazione, usando l'innovazione tecnologica per un design che favorisca riparazioni e recupero delle materie prime.

L'ecodesign porta vantaggi per i nostri cittadini, per l'ambiente, per l'economia, perché progettare in modo sostenibile significa prevenire la produzione di rifiuti, ridurre l'impoverimento del pianeta causato dalla crescente estrazione di materie prime, creare un vantaggio competitivo per le nostre imprese riducendo i costi per materie prime ed energia.

Inoltre, garantendo la trasparenza sulle informazioni del prodotto, avremo come consumatori la possibilità di conoscere l'impatto ambientale dei nostri acquisti e le imprese potranno promuovere la sostenibilità nelle loro produzioni come vantaggio competitivo. Penso a settori come quello del tessile e della moda, che già ci stupiscono nelle punte più avanzate per creatività e risultati, mostrando tutto il potenziale dell'ecodesign.

E allora, cari colleghi, chiudiamo tutti insieme il cerchio virtuoso dell'economia circolare!

**Ivars Ijabs (Renew).** – Priekšsēdētāja kungs! Godātais komisāra kungs! Dārgie kolēģi! Viens no svarīgākajiem šīs regulas uzdevumiem ir novērst dažādus ražotāju trikus, kas ir vērsti uz aizvien jaunu un jaunu produktu pirkšanu. Šie triki apzināti padara produktus priekšlaicīgi novecojošus vai nefunkcionālus, neremontējamus vai arī remontējamus tikai ļoti ierobežotā skaitā pilnvarotu remontdarbnieku.

Tāpēc līdzās ilgzināšanas prasībām visiem produktiem katrai precei ir jābūt arī remontējamības rādītājiem, lai cilvēki varētu izdarīt apzinātu izvēli, kad viņi tos iegādājas. Ir jānovērš arī pieaugošā nerealizētu produktu, piemēram, tekstilizstrādājumu, apavu, elektronikas, iznīcināšana, kas pieaug tieši ar tiešsaistes tirdzniecību. Ražotāji vienkārši iznīcina atpakaļ nosūtītos pirkumus, un tādā veidā notiek pilnīgi bezjēdzīga resursu izšķērdēšana.

Šādai te praksei ir vienkārši jāpieliek punkts, un tas ir mūsu uzdevums. Un, protams, visās šajās prasībās ir jāņem vērā arī mazo, vidējo uzņēmumu intereses – viņu spējas tās īstenot, kas bieži vien krietni vien atšķiras no globālo kompāniju iespējām.

**Malte Gallée (Verts/ALE).** – Herr Präsident, lieber Marc, lieber Herr Kommissar, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! In nicht mal mehr einem Jahr ist schon wieder Europawahl, und wir alle werden die ganzen Wochen davor in den Straßen stehen, uns mit Leuten unterhalten, und immer wieder wird die Frage kommen: Ja, was macht die EU eigentlich? Ich werde mich dann ganz entspannt hinstellen und werde fragen: Ja, haben Sie denn vor, in den nächsten Jahren etwas zu kaufen? Ich nehme an, die Antwort wird ja sein, und dann können wir alle ganz entspannt sagen: Ja, und genau diese Produkte, die Sie dann kaufen werden, die werden dank der neuen Ökodesign-Verordnung länger halten, nicht so schnell zu Müll werden, man wird sie recyceln können, man wird sie wieder reparieren können.

Wir geben die Macht zurück in die Hände der Verbraucherinnen und Verbraucher. Und das ist einfach ein riesengroßer Erfolg unserer Europäischen Union. Vielen lieben Dank an Sie, lieber Herr Kommissar, dass Sie das vorgeschlagen haben.

Eine kleine Bitte habe ich aber tatsächlich: Kollege Liese hat es angemerkt, wir müssen natürlich auch dafür sorgen, dass die ganzen Produkte, die importiert werden, auch die Regeln befolgen. Und da müssen wir natürlich die Onlineplattformen in die Pflicht nehmen, denn wenn Alibaba und Amazon usw. nicht zur Rechenschaft gezogen werden, dann ist das ein riesengroßes Schlupfloch. Und das wollen Sie selber auch nicht.

**Seán Kelly (PPE).** – *A Uachtaráin*, Commissioner, the main objective of the ecodesign framework is to reduce the negative life cycle environmental impacts of products, introduce circularity and improve the functioning of the internal market. To ensure the effectiveness of the framework, it should primarily focus on the environmental aspects of sustainability pertaining to physical products.

While setting ecodesign requirements for products is vital, we must also direct our attention towards increasing the development of collection, sorting, repair and recirculation systems. By bolstering these systems, we can foster a circular economy that minimises waste and maximises resource-efficiency. The holistic approach encompassing the entire product life cycle will be instrumental in achieving our sustainability goals.

Minimising divergence in the implementation of this policy will not only strengthen our collective impact, but also prevent fragmentation within the internal market. It makes sense to address the products with the highest negative impacts first. This approach ensures that our efforts yield the maximum positive outcome for the environment.

Regarding the prohibition of the destruction of unsold consumer goods, I agree with the general principle. However, before we include bans on the destruction of specific product types, we must gather more comprehensive product data.

**Anna Cavazzini (Verts/ALE).** – Herr Präsident, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Wie umweltschädlich ein Produkt ist, das entscheidet sich zu 80 % am Design, und das ist ein riesiger Hebel, den wir einfach noch viel mehr nutzen müssen. T-Shirt, Handy oder Wasserkocher – bisher: kaufen, kurz nutzen und wegschmeißen, das ist leider die Regel. Und mit krassen Folgen: Die Erderhitzung schreitet voran, der Hunger nach Ressourcen steigt immer weiter, die Müllberge wachsen. Damit muss endlich Schluss sein! Mit der Abstimmung über die Ökodesign-Verordnung machen wir klar: Es ist höchste Zeit, dass die Nachhaltigkeit von Produkten auf dem Binnenmarkt zur Norm wird.

Ökodesign ist ein Meilenstein im Übergang zur Kreislaufwirtschaft. Müll wird zum Designfehler, und Schrottprodukte verschwinden vom Markt. Ich freue mich, dass wir mit dem Produktpass Transparenz über die Lieferkette schaffen und das Recycling erleichtern. Und ein Reparierbarkeitswert wird Verbraucherinnen und Verbrauchern deutlich zeigen, wie leicht oder wie schwer ein Produkt zu reparieren ist. Auch muss das Zerstören von unverkaufter Ware endlich aufhören. Es ist gut und richtig, dass das Parlament den Kommissionsvorschlag nachgeschärft hat.

**Virginijus Sinkevičius, Member of the Commission.** – Mr President, honourable Members, thank you for your contributions today. This evening's debate is a testament to your ongoing engagement with this legislative proposal for which we need a strong collective effort. And as I have already pointed out, a significant amount of work remains to be done. So I am therefore looking forward for tomorrow's plenary vote. It is the next key link in the chain and I encourage you to use it as an opportunity to secure a strong mandate for entering trilogues.

Let me reply to some of the key issues that you have mentioned. First of all, a few times there were mentioned SMEs. Article 19 of proposal provides for Commission and Member States' action to specifically guide and support SMEs in the implementation of ESPR measures. Commission programmes benefiting SMEs will take into account specific initiatives targeted at SMEs, integrating sustainability aspects into their value chains, and the Commission will also publish specific guidelines for facilitating compliance to ESPR requirements by SMEs. So Member States will have to provide one-stop-shops for awareness-raising and networking to facilitate adaptation to ESPR requirements by SMEs and they could adopt additional measures from financial support to training and technical assistance.

Substances of concern – they were mentioned. The chemical composition of products determines largely their functionalities and impacts, including the possibilities for re-use or recovery when they become waste. So information on the presence of substances of concern in products is therefore a key element of the proposal. So legal clarity and coherence with existing legislation, including on chemicals, have been a priority for the Commission. The proposal was carefully prepared to avoid overlaps with existing chemicals. Legislation and definition is aligned with the chemicals strategy for sustainability, according to which substances of concern are substances having a chronic effect on human health or the environment, but also those which hamper recycling for safe and high-quality secondary raw materials. So any changes to the definition will run counter to the strategies' objectives.

As regards a direct ban on the destruction of textiles, footwear and electronics, I understand that Parliament very much supports this idea. I understand that the idea – because destruction is clearly not in line with the circular economy principles. So a directly applicable prohibition on the destruction of textiles or any other product groups was not part of the Commission proposal because we did not have a detailed overview of the actual number of unsold consumer products being destroyed. So whether this prohibition is introduced directly based on the currently available evidence, or at a later stage after the further impact assessment and based on the information that business operators will be obliged to disclose under this proposal, the Commission is ready to prioritise work on this, also in line with the commitment under the textiles strategy to prohibit the destruction of unsold textile products.

As regards the market-surveillance authorities in the ESPR, so especially talking about the online marketplaces, in addition to the generic obligation of cooperation under the Market Surveillance Regulation, ESPR contains more specific obligations like to establish a regular and structured exchange of information to allow online tools of market surveillance authorities to access their interfaces and allow for scrapping data. Having only generic obligation to cooperate without any further specifications would reduce clarity on the concrete activities that providers of online marketplaces have to carry out for products that are subject to ESPR requirements. And this aligns with the logic that was followed by the General Product Safety Regulation and accepted by the legislators.

Finally, as regards the competitiveness, and of course the products that are going to be imported in the EU, the rules proposed under ESPR will apply to all products placed on the EU market, whether products manufactured inside the EU or outside the EU, ESPR will contribute to the EU's long-term competitiveness and strategic autonomy. The decoupling of economic development from natural resource use and reduction of material dependencies will foster the EU's resilience.

Honourable Members, what we have on the table is a future-oriented framework, a real game changer. The new Ecodesign Regulation will be a key instrument for achieving our environmental, climate and energy goals and for ensuring the functioning of the single market for sustainable products. So we cannot afford to lose time. Work on the ESPR framework needs to begin as soon as possible so that concrete progress on making sustainable products the norm in the EU can begin.

So I am confident that thanks to the ambition and commitment of the rapporteur Ms Moretti and all of those closely involved, excellent progress on making sustainable products the norm can be soon made.

**Alessandra Moretti**, *relatrice*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, voglio davvero ringraziare tutti i colleghi per il supporto, per il contributo e per le proposte che hanno migliorato il testo iniziale.

Questo è stato un lavoro di squadra, è un lavoro che ci ha visti, seppur nelle differenze legittime, uniti nel proposito di offrire al mercato e ai consumatori un regolamento ambizioso che mette al centro l'ambiente, la tutela degli ecosistemi, la salute dei consumatori.

È un passo importante che dimostra che, se c'è la volontà, la politica può essere all'altezza delle sfide e della responsabilità che i cittadini ci hanno affidato.

Io sono molto fiduciosa che domani lo dimostreremo appieno.

**President.** – The debate is closed.

The vote will take place tomorrow.

## 22. Wyjaśnienia dotyczące sposobu głosowania

**President.** – The next item is the explanations of vote.

### 22.1. Dyrektywa w sprawie emisji przemysłowych (A9-0216/2023 - Radan Kanev)

#### Oral explanations of vote

**Seán Kelly (PPE).** – Mr President, good, away we go. The industrial sector is a major contributor to emissions: in 2020, the industrial share of greenhouse gases equalled 59%. The Industrial Emissions Directive's goal is to reduce toxic industrial emissions, such as mercury, heavy metals and other hazardous substances associated with industry.

I welcome the fact that the scope will not be extended to cattle farms. If we were to add cattle and mixed farms to this Directive, the cost to farmers would be enormous and unfair. And I was delighted that amendments to ensure this did not happen were fully supported by my Fine Gael and EPP colleagues, and passed with good majorities.

I support this report's objective as it increases the level of protection for the environment and public health from the adverse effects of pollution through setting higher regulatory standards. It gives businesses reasonable transition time to prepare for new requirements as well as fast-track procedures for permits. A good day's work!

### 22.2. Rozmieszczanie infrastruktury paliw alternatywnych (A9-0234/2022 - Petar Vitanov)

#### Oral explanations of vote

**Seán Kelly (PPE).** – Mr President, I am pleased to support this report by my colleague Petar Vitanov as it embraces Europe's transition away from carbon-based fuel to renewable sustainable energy sources. This report aligns with the objectives outlined in the European Green Deal, which emphasises the transitioning towards a zero-emission transport sector, as well as the necessity for appropriate infrastructure to support this transition, keeping this legislation both ambitious and realistic.

Establishing a robust and dependable infrastructure through the Regulation's mandatory deployment of a minimum charging and hydrogen refuelling infrastructure is vital to facilitate the smooth transition of the transport sector, and empower citizens to embrace and utilise new technologies. This is an absolute and immediate priority.

### 22.3. Efektywność energetyczna (przekształcenie) (A9-0221/2022 - Niels Fuglsang)

#### Oral explanations of vote

**Seán Kelly (PPE).** – Mr President, where have all the citizens gone? The Fit for 55 package, which is an integral part of the European Green Deal adopted by the Commission, sets an ambitious target for reducing greenhouse gas emissions by 55% by 2030 and possibly beyond that, as Mr Timmermans said at COP27 in Egypt.

I am pleased to support this report by my colleague Niels Fuglsang as it takes an ambitious, but also realistic, approach to energy efficiency. The report recognises the importance of setting high targets while considering practical challenges associated with implementation strategies. I value the flexibility given to Member States in how they meet these targets, as well as the consideration given to stakeholders in terms of how to implement the nearly net-zero building standard, especially for social housing and historic buildings.

### 22.4. Europejski akt w sprawie czipów (A9-0014/2023 - Dan Nica)

#### Oral explanations of vote

**Clare Daly (The Left).** – Mr President, for all of the bravado about the vibrant European industry, the Chips Act actually is just another example of Europe's scrambling to respond to unilateral US moves to protect its interests – something the US always does with zero care for the consequences of anybody else.

And the irony, of course, is that of all of those US-dominated multilateral institutions – the WTO, the World Bank and so on – is that even dominance is not enough for them. They want everybody else to submit their rules while they do whatever they like, thanks very much. It's their world and we're just lucky to live in it. That's the rules-based international order. They break the rules, and what are we going to do about it?

Well, in Europe's case, we don't even pretend to try and do anything about it anymore. We sheepishly submit to 'his master's voice', lob a few billion subsidies at European capitalists to keep them quiet, and hope that the public money does not run out before the US ends and stops its mad quest to shove China into a box and lock it there. Because that is not going to happen. And it's about time Europe got itself out from under the coat-tails of our misnamed like-minded partner.

**Mick Wallace (The Left).** – Mr President, the EU Chips Act will involve a massive transfer of public subsidies to private corporations without a guaranteed fair return on investment for society or conditionalities on public funding. Industrial policy can work to improve livelihoods and benefit the population, but this Act won't do that.

Additionally, there is a threat that this will lead to a further move away from trade with China. There is a global struggle for control of chip manufacturing, with export controls on US chips to China and a retaliatory restriction on the export of raw materials from China to the US. Our biases here have been exposed by the fact that the Commission has flagged the Chinese export conditions as potential violations of the so-called rules-based international order, while no such accusations have been levelled at the US. And, as my colleague said, these rules-based international orders are something the US make up as they go along – sadly, with our support.

The EU Chips Act thankfully does not go down the US path of hitting China with export controls, though the text leaves room for this possibility in the future. In all of this, it's vital that the EU forges an independent path. An eye for an eye only leaves everyone blind.

And just one word to the Commissioner: I want to compliment the Commissioner on all the work he has done on trying to get nature restoration across the line against the absolute madness of what's gone on in this House for months. Fair play to you, because it has been crazy!

## 22.5. Prawo wyborcze, komisja śledcza i praworządność w Polsce (B9-0318/2023, B9-0319/2023)

### Oral explanations of vote

**Hynek Blaško (ID).** – Pane předsedající, Polsko je suverénní stát s demokraticky zvolenými institucemi, který jedná v zájmu svých občanů, a nikdo nemá právo mu zvenčí vnucovat svoji představu, jak má fungovat. Proč se do toho vměšujeme? To nám nestačí zahraniční neúspěchy s vyvážením demokracie do Iráku, Libye, Sýrie, Afghánistánu a dnes tomu přibyl konflikt na Ukrajině? Vlastně jeden úspěch to mělo, to naše vměšování. Podařilo se zvednout migrační vlnu, se kterou si dnes nevíme rady.

Myslím, že je mnoho jiných problémů k řešení, a jedním z nich a nejdůležitějším je ukončení války na Ukrajině. Proti tomu všemu je Polsko a jeho vnitřní fungování zcela marginální záležitost. Ale jak se říká, každý dělá, na co stačí. Přestaňme s mentorováním, poučováním, vnucováním našich představ o demokracii a řešme, co třeba. Vyhňeme se tak mnohým problémům. Z těchto důvodů jsem hlasoval proti.

**President.** – That concludes the explanations of vote.

## 23. Porządek dzienny następnego posiedzenia

**President.** – The next sitting will be tomorrow, Wednesday, 12 July at 9.00. The agenda has been published and is available on Parliament's website.

## 24. Zatwierdzenie protokołu bieżącego posiedzenia

**President.** – The minutes of the sitting will be submitted to Parliament for its approval tomorrow after the votes.

## 25. Zamknięcie posiedzenia

**President.** – Before closing the sitting, I would like to thank our interpreters for their excellent work and all the other European Parliament staff who are here to make this session possible.

*(The sitting closed at 22.46)*

—

*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
FISC	Podkomisja do Spraw Podatkowych
SANT	Podkomisja Zdrowia Publicznego

*Rozwinięcia skrótów nazw grup politycznych*

PPE	Grupa Europejskiej Partii Ludowej (Chrześcijańscy Demokraci)
S&D	Grupa Postępowego Sojuszu Socjalistów i Demokratów w Parlamencie Europejskim
Renew	Grupa Renew Europe
Verts/ALE	Grupa Zielonych/Wolne Przymierze Europejskie
ID	Grupa Tożsamość i Demokracja
ECR	Grupa Europejskich Konserwatystów i Reformatorów
The Left	Grupa Lewicy w Parlamencie Europejskim - GUE/NGL
NI	Niezrzeszeni