

PEŁNE SPRAWOZDANIE Z OBRAD 13 MARCA 2023 R.

(C/2023/1465)

PARLAMENT EUROPEJSKI

SESJA 2022-2023

Posiedzenie w dniu 13 marca 2023 r.

STRASBURG

Spis treści	Strona
1. Wznowienie sesji	3
2. Otwarcie posiedzenia	3
3. Oświadczenia Przewodniczącego	3
4. Przyjęcie protokołu poprzedniego posiedzenia	4
5. Weryfikacja mandatów	4
6. Skład grup politycznych	4
7. Skład komisji i delegacji	4
8. Negocjacje przed pierwszym czytaniem w Parlamencie (art. 71 Regulaminu)	4
9. Negocjacje przed pierwszym czytaniem w Parlamencie (art. 72 Regulaminu)	4
10. Akty delegowane (art. 111 ust. 6 Regulaminu)	5
11. Podpisanie aktów przyjętych zgodnie ze zwykłą procedurą ustawodawczą (art. 79 Regulaminu)	5
12. Porządek obrad	6

Spis treści	Strona
13. Charakterystyka energetyczna budynków (wersja przekształcona) (debata)	11
14. Działalność Europejskiego Rzecznika Praw Obywatelskich – sprawozdanie roczne za 2021 r. (debata)	28
15. Wiążące roczne redukcje emisji gazów cieplarnianych przez państwa członkowskie (rozporządzenie w sprawie wspólnego wysiłku redukcyjnego) - Sektor użytkowania gruntów, zmiany użytkowania gruntów i leśnictwa (LULUCF) - Przegląd rezerwy stabilności rynkowej na potrzeby unijnego systemu handlu uprawnieniami do emisji gazów cieplarnianych (debata)	39
16. Spójność polityki na rzecz rozwoju (krótka prezentacja)	58
17. Działalność ESDZ i silniejsza pozycja UE na świecie (debata)	61
18. Jednominutowe wystąpienia w ważnych kwestiach politycznych	67
19. Porządek obrad następnego posiedzenia	75
20. Zatwierdzenie protokołu bieżącego posiedzenia	75
21. Zamknięcie posiedzenia	75
22. Zamknięcie sesji rocznej	75

PEŁNE SPRAWOZDANIE Z OBRAD 13 MARCA 2023 R.

PRESIDENZA: ROBERTA METSOLA

President

1. Wznowienie sesji

President. – I declare resumed the session of the European Parliament adjourned on Thursday 16 February 2023.

2. Otwarcie posiedzenia

(The sitting opened at 17.03)

3. Oświadczenia Przewodniczącego

President. – Dear colleagues, the brave defence by Ukrainians against the illegal Russian invasion continues. This war of aggression has also impacted global food security. We are all aware of the potential devastating effects on global hunger if food supplies are undermined or weaponised. The UN Black Sea Grain Initiative meant millions of people have had access to food and basic supplies from Ukraine. This agreement could expire later this week and I want to call, together with this Parliament, for its renewal as quickly as possible. The situation is urgent and dire.

Colleagues, the last weeks have also seen more lives lost at sea. More dreams forever broken. More mothers and fathers who will never hear from their children. More children, women and men who died in desperate circumstances. Again.

We have a duty, we have a responsibility, to address this issue. We are the generation of politicians who cannot ignore this reality. Our Parliament has managed to find a way forward on migration that is just and humane with those in need of protection, that is fair and firm with those who are not eligible and that is strong with those traffickers preying off the most vulnerable and profiting from human desperation. We now need all players to match that ambition and live up to the promise of our Union.

One final appeal: We must resist becoming desensitised to the tragedy. We cannot allow more people to become nameless statistics. And we must no longer accept that the Mediterranean Sea remains a cemetery of broken lives and broken hope.

Colleagues, Two weeks ago, at least 57 people lost their lives in a horrific train crash in Greece. Many more were injured. The process of identification is still underway.

It was a terrible tragedy that shook Greece and the rest of the European Union. We in the European Parliament share the grief of the families and friends who have lost loved ones. We mourn with you. And once again we reiterate that the European Union stands ready to assist as required.

On this, dear colleagues, I ask you to join me in a minute of silence as we mark the lives lost at sea and those in the train crash.

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

4. Przyjęcie protokołu poprzedniego posiedzenia

President. – The minutes and the texts adopted of the sitting of 16 February 2023 are available. Are there any comments? I see that is not the case.

(The minutes of the previous sitting were approved)

5. Weryfikacja mandatów

President. – On the proposal of the Committee on Legal Affairs, Parliament has verified the credentials of Ms Katarína Roth Neveďalová, with effect from 30 December 2022.

6. Skład grup politycznych

President. – Mr Nicolae Ștefănuță is no longer a member of the Renew Europe Group and has joined the Greens/EFA Group as of 8 March 2023.

7. Skład komisji i delegacji

President. – The Renew Europe, Greens/EFA and ECR Groups have notified me of decisions relating to changes to appointments within committees and delegations.

These decisions will be set out in the minutes of today's sitting and take effect on the date of this announcement.

8. Negocjacje przed pierwszym czytaniem w Parlamencie (art. 71 Regulaminu)

President. – Several committees have decided to enter into interinstitutional negotiations, pursuant to Rule 71(1) of the Rules of Procedure.

The reports which constitute the mandates for the negotiations are available on the plenary webpage, and their titles will be published in the minutes of the sitting.

Pursuant to Rule 71(2), Members or political group(s) reaching at least the medium threshold may request in writing by tomorrow, Tuesday 14 March at midnight, that the decisions be put to the vote.

If no request for a vote in Parliament is made within the deadline, the committees may start the negotiations.

9. Negocjacje przed pierwszym czytaniem w Parlamencie (art. 72 Regulaminu)

President. – The PECH Committee has decided to enter into interinstitutional negotiations ahead of Council's first reading, pursuant to Rule 72 of the Rules of Procedure.

The position adopted by Parliament at first reading, which constitutes the mandate for those negotiations, is available on the plenary webpage and its title will be published in the minutes of this sitting.

10. Akty delegowane (art. 111 ust. 6 Regulaminu)

President. – I was informed that no objections have been raised within the Conference of Committee Chairs to the recommendation by the ECON Committee not to oppose a delegated act, pursuant to Rule 111(6) of the Rules of Procedure.

The recommendation is available on the plenary webpage.

If no objections are raised by a political group or Members reaching at least the low threshold within 24 hours, the recommendation shall be deemed to have been approved; otherwise, it will be put to the vote.

11. Podpisanie aktów przyjętych zgodnie ze zwykłą procedurą ustawodawczą (art. 79 Regulaminu)

President. – I would also like to inform you that since the adjournment of Parliament's session on the 16 February, I have signed, together with the President of the Council, one act adopted under the ordinary legislative procedure in accordance with Rule 79 of the Rules of Procedure.

I would also like to inform you that, on Wednesday, I shall sign, together with the President of the Council, six acts adopted under the ordinary legislative procedure.

The titles of the acts will be published in the minutes of this sitting.

*
* *

Guy Verhofstadt (Renew). – Madam President, last night, the film of Aleksei Navalny won the Oscar for the best documentary. I think, personally – and I hope that everybody can agree – that it's an important sign of recognition after we as Parliament – you remember that – honoured him with the Sakharov Prize. And again, I think that with this award, the world recognised that Russia and its autocratic regime is a threat to all who want to live in peace and stability and democracy and with human rights, whether they live in Russia or outside Russia. I think that Parliament, during this session, has to stand by them and to put back on the table the liberation of Aleksei Navalny and with them of all political prisoners, first of all of Belarus, like Ales Bialiatski, the Nobel Peace Prize laureate, or, for example, political prisoners in Georgia, such as former President Mikheil Saakashvili, such as Russia's Vladimir Kara-Murza, who is in prison, Aleksei Gorinov, and many others arrested for speaking out against the war in Ukraine. I can tell you that families and supporters of the last three are visiting the European Parliament this week, so let's welcome these families with wholehearted support and put the entire weight of a democratic Europe behind their causes.

Ana Miranda (Verts/ALE). – Señora presidenta, quiero comenzar mi intervención pidiendo que se respete la inmunidad diplomática de las eurodiputadas y los eurodiputados y que no haya injerencia de terceros Estados en el ejercicio de sus funciones.

El 20 de febrero formaba parte de la misión oficial de la Delegación para las Relaciones con Palestina del Parlamento Europeo y estaba autorizada a entrar por el Gobierno de Israel. Mi sorpresa fue que al llegar al aeropuerto de Tel Aviv me pidieron entrar, me tuvieron varias horas sin información y, finalmente, me expulsaron, como sabe la presidenta. Es inaceptable, desproporcionado e injustificado: una afrenta diplomática e institucional. No a mí, como eurodiputada gallega, al Parlamento Europeo. Israel no me ha humillado a mí, ha humillado al Parlamento Europeo, y esto no puede consentirse. Basta ya con la impunidad de Israel, que hasta decide quién debe entrar en Palestina.

Señora presidenta, es imprescindible que los miembros del Parlamento Europeo tengamos libertad para ejercer nuestro trabajo cuando participemos en delegaciones oficiales. No podemos permitir la injerencia de otros Estados en nuestras relaciones internacionales.

El Parlamento Europeo tiene que defender a los miembros que defendemos los derechos humanos y no a los corruptos que andan libremente por el mundo.

Señora presidenta, me gustaría agradecerle sus gestiones y su solidaridad.

Margrete Auken (Verts/ALE). – Madam President (*start of speech off mic*) ... I was there, the leader of the delegation, and it was a clear shock that Ana Miranda was kept out, as it was also a shock – it wasn't a shock; it was a surprise – that our Chair, Manu Pineda, was denied. Again, we were denied access to Gaza. I haven't been there since 2010.

I think now that the Parliament should be... I know that you responded to it, but it is not them to decide. It is us. And it was, as said by Ana Miranda now, clearly against the European Parliament, not against these persons.

Let me add here what once Elliott Abrams said in – I think it was in Washington – when somebody asked about the EU role in Israel, and he said, 'EU, they are payers; we are the players'. I think we should do something about this here now.

12. Porządek obrad

President. – The final draft agenda as adopted by the Conference of Presidents on 9 March 2023, pursuant to Rule 157, has been distributed. With the agreement of the political groups, I wish to put to the House the following proposals for changes to the final draft agenda.

For Monday, following an objection by a political group pursuant to Rule 118(6) of the Rules of Procedure, the debate on the report by Mr Paet on the 'Functioning of the EEAS and a stronger EU in the world' is added as the last point in the evening. As a consequence, the sitting is extended until 23.00.

The deadlines are: for amendments, Tuesday 14 March at noon; split and separate votes, Tuesday 14 March at 19.00.

For Tuesday, the vote on the report by Ms Düpont on 'Law enforcement information exchange' is moved to Wednesday. The title of the debate on the Statement by the Vice-President/High Representative on the 'Planned adoption of the foreign influence law in Georgia' is changed into 'Situation in Georgia'.

The title of the Joint debate on 'Brexit' is changed into 'EU-UK relations'.

For Wednesday, the title of the debate on the European Council and Commission statements on 'Preparation of the European Council meeting of 23—24 March 2023' is changed into 'Conclusions of the Special European Council meeting of 9 February and preparation of the European Council meeting of 23—24 March 2023'.

The debate on the Oral questions on 'Combating discrimination in the EU – the long-awaited horizontal anti-discrimination directive' will be wound up with a resolution to be voted at the April part-session.

If there are no objections, these changes are approved.

(Parliament agreed to these proposals.)

We now move to changes requested by political groups.

For Wednesday, the EPP Group has requested that a Commission statement on 'Failure of the Silicon Valley Bank and the implications for financial stability in Europe' be added as the second point in the afternoon after the Topical debate.

I give the floor to Mr Markus Ferber to move the request on behalf of the EPP Group.

Markus Ferber, im Namen der PPE-Fraktion. – Frau Präsidentin, liebe Kolleginnen, liebe Kollegen! Am vergangenen Wochenende wurden zwei US-amerikanische Banken, die Silicon Valley Bank und die Signature Bank, unter die Verwaltung des US-Einlagensicherungsfonds FDIC gestellt.

Es handelt sich hierbei um die größten Bankpleiten seit der Finanzkrise vor 15 Jahren. Zwar gab es in beiden Fällen sehr spezifische und individuelle Hintergründe, der Auslöser ist aber auch für europäische Banken relevant, nämlich das schnelle Anheben des Zinsniveaus und die hohe Liquidität im Markt.

Es stellen sich deswegen eine Reihe von Fragen auch für uns: Inwiefern sind europäische Einleger und Anlagen betroffen? Gibt es Risiken für die Finanzstabilität, die über den Einzelfall hinausgehen? Und inwiefern sind europäische Banken ähnlichen Risiken ausgesetzt?

Deswegen würde ich mich sehr freuen, wenn das Haus unterstützen würde, dass wir hier sehr aktuell reagieren, um eine deutliche Botschaft an unsere Bürgerinnen und Bürger zu senden, um zu helfen, Verunsicherungen zu beseitigen, und um Informationen bereitstellen zu können.

President. – I will now give the floor to any colleague who would like to speak against Mr Ferber's proposal. I don't see that to be the case, so I put the request to the vote by roll-call.

(Parliament approved the request)

A Commission statement on 'Failure of the Silicon Valley Bank and the implications for financial stability in Europe' is added as the second point in the afternoon after the Topical debate.

For Wednesday, the Renew Group has requested that we have a Council and Commission statement on 'Strengthening EU Defence in the context of the war in Ukraine: speeding up production and deliveries to Ukraine of weapons and ammunition' to be added as the second point in the afternoon after the Topical debate.

I give the floor to Ms Nathalie Loiseau to move the request on behalf of the Renew Group.

Nathalie Loiseau, au nom du groupe Renew. – Madame la Présidente, chers collègues, au nom du groupe Renew Europe, conformément à l'article 158 du règlement intérieur, je propose d'ajouter le débat suivant à l'ordre du jour de notre session: déclaration du Conseil et de la Commission sur «Renforcer la défense de l'Union européenne dans le contexte de la guerre en Ukraine: accélérer la production et la livraison à l'Ukraine d'armes et de munitions», mercredi après-midi, comme second point.

En effet, au Conseil européen des 9 et 10 février dernier, le président ukrainien Volodymyr Zelensky a souligné le besoin urgent d'un soutien militaire supplémentaire de notre part. Afin de répondre le plus rapidement possible à cette demande, mercredi dernier, à Stockholm, les ministres de la défense de l'Union européenne ont accueilli favorablement des propositions qui sont destinées à transférer immédiatement des munitions à l'Ukraine, à passer en commun des commandes à l'industrie européenne de défense afin de renouveler nos stocks et à prendre d'urgence des mesures pour renforcer la capacité industrielle européenne.

Nous devons agir dans l'urgence pour être en mesure de poursuivre notre soutien à l'Ukraine, mais aussi pour assurer la sécurité de notre Union. J'estime que le Parlement européen doit pouvoir s'exprimer avant les décisions qui seront prises par le Conseil. J'espère que vous pourrez soutenir cette demande.

President. – I will now give the floor to Mr Michael Gahler to present an alternative proposal, I'm told, on behalf of the EPP Group.

Michael Gahler, on behalf of the PPE Group. – Madam President, that has been dealt with, as the other issue has already been approved, on the Silicon Valley bank. So, thank you. I'm supportive of the suggestion.

President. – Thank you very much, so therefore I put the request by Ms Loiseau to the vote by roll-call.

(Parliament approved the request)

We will have a Council and Commission statement on 'Strengthening EU Defence in the context of the war in Ukraine: speeding up production and deliveries to Ukraine of weapons and ammunition'.

We now move to another request for Wednesday. The ID Group has requested that a Commission statement on 'Indispensable questioning of the decision to ban, by 2035, the sale of new combustion-engine vehicles in the EU' be added as the second point in the afternoon before the Council and Commission statements on 'Deaths at sea: a common EU response to save lives and action to ensure safe and legal pathways'.

I give the floor to Mr Jean-Lin Lacapelle to move the request on behalf of the ID Group.

Jean-Lin Lacapelle, *au nom du groupe ID*. – Madame la Présidente, pour le plus grand bien des Européens, l'idéologie verte, très puissante à Bruxelles, vient de connaître un revers majeur. En effet, l'Allemagne, en refusant au dernier moment d'entériner la décision d'interdire la vente de véhicules thermiques neufs dans l'Union européenne à partir de 2035, permet, avec l'Italie, la Pologne et la Bulgarie, d'empêcher le suicide de notre industrie automobile aujourd'hui très performante.

La volonté de cette Europe et des Khmers verts d'autoriser uniquement la vente de véhicules électriques en 2035, qui sont d'ailleurs très chers, menace en effet 275 000 emplois tout en favorisant l'industrie chinoise.

Si la transition écologique est nécessaire, elle doit être portée par une vision pragmatique et non punitive, comme c'est trop souvent le cas ici. Au nom de mon groupe Identité et démocratie, je demande donc qu'un débat soit ajouté à l'ordre du jour de notre session plénière sur l'indispensable remise en cause de la décision d'interdire d'ici 2035 la vente de véhicules thermiques neufs dans l'Union européenne.

Chers collègues, c'est l'occasion pour vous de prouver maintenant votre volonté de sauver notre industrie, notre économie et nos emplois.

President. – I give the floor to Mr Gieseke to speak against.

Jens Gieseke (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Das ist grundsätzlich eine richtige Debatte. Wir haben seit der letzten Woche eine neue Situation im Ministerrat.

Wir haben eine Sperrminorität, angeführt von Deutschland, Bulgarien, Italien und Polen. Weitere Länder folgen: Tschechien ist jetzt dabei.

Es ist jetzt an der Kommission, einen neuen Vorschlag zu machen. Allerdings ist es offenkundig – das wissen wir alle im Raum –, dass die Kommission Stand heute noch nicht in der Lage ist, diesen neuen Vorschlag zu machen.

Von daher sind wir als EVP dagegen, jetzt am Mittwoch eine Diskussion zu führen auf der Grundlage von Spekulationen. Ich glaube, die Kommission sollte sich erst mal neu sortieren und gucken, was sie vorschlagen kann.

Wir als EVP freuen uns auf die Debatte. Wir waren immer für Technologieoffenheit und gegen Verbote. Insofern gerne eine Debatte, nicht in dieser Woche und dann auch beim nächsten Mal mit der Entschließung, aber jetzt ist nicht der richtige Zeitpunkt.

President. – I put the request from Mr Lacapelle to the vote by roll-call.

(Parliament rejected the request)

The agenda remains unchanged.

Yannick Jadot (Verts/ALE). – Madame la Présidente, je voudrais rappeler à notre collègue que, quand on parle de «Khmers verts», on fait référence aux Khmers rouges. Et que ce sont deux millions de morts, victimes d'un génocide. Donc j'aimerais bien que notre collègue, à défaut de s'excuser auprès des députés écologistes et verts, s'excuse au moins auprès des deux millions de victimes des Khmers rouges au Cambodge.

President. – The Left Group has requested that a Commission statement on the ‘Need for immediate reform of the internal rules of the Commission to ensure transparency and accountability in light of alleged conflicts of interests’ be added as the third point in the afternoon after the Council and Commission statements on ‘Deaths at sea: a common EU response to save lives and action to ensure safe and legal pathways’.

I give the floor to Ms Manon Aubry to move the request on behalf of The Left Group.

Manon Aubry, au nom du groupe The Left. – Madame la Présidente, chers collègues, depuis décembre, quasiment pas une semaine ne passe sans une nouvelle affaire de corruption au sein même des institutions européennes. Cette fois, nous apprenons que le directeur général des transports de la Commission a accepté pas moins de neuf voyages en classe affaires offerts par Qatar Airways. Un généreux cadeau, alors que M. Hololei négociait l’accord de libre-échange aérien entre, justement, l’Union européenne et le Qatar.

Le conflit d’intérêts est évident, mais pour la Commission, tout est en règle. Oui, parce que Monsieur Hololei a reçu l’autorisation de la part du directeur de la DG MOVE, c’est-à-dire lui-même. Au point où on en est, on peut se demander si, à la prochaine étape, c’est Monsanto qui va autoriser les OGM sur le marché européen...

En matière de contrôle éthique, l’Union européenne marche sur la tête depuis quelques mois. Sous notre pression, le Parlement européen a entamé un processus de réforme – on est là pour veiller au grain. Maintenant, c’est au tour de la Commission européenne de rendre des comptes. Et c’est pourquoi, au nom de notre groupe de la Gauche au Parlement européen, nous demandons ce débat pour que la Commission européenne commence par laver devant sa porte.

President. – The Greens/EFA Group has requested that the debate be wound up with a resolution to be voted in March II.

I give the floor to Mr Daniel Freund to present this request.

Daniel Freund, on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group. – Madam President, while we support having a debate on this topic, the Commission has indicated that they are willing to look into changing the rules, so I think it would be good for us, as Parliament, to also take a position in writing – in a resolution – to indicate how we want to see those rules changed beyond just having the debate.

So I would invite colleagues that we in March II, not this week, but that, with a bit of debate, we also approve a resolution on this topic.

President. – Does any colleague want to speak against? Mr Séjourné?

Stéphane Séjourné (Renew). – Madame la Présidente, juste pour vous dire que nous serons évidemment favorables à un débat sur ce sujet. Cette affaire prouve encore une fois qu’il nous faut un organe interinstitutionnel, c’est donc ce que nous avons porté, y compris avec mon groupe Renew.

Néanmoins, mon groupe sera opposé à une résolution et je souhaiterais qu’il puisse y avoir deux votes séparés sur cette question-là.

President. – Thank you, we will have two separate votes, so first we put to the vote by roll call the request by The Left Group for a debate.

(Parliament adopted the request)

So there will be a Commission statement on the ‘Need for immediate reform of the internal rules of the Commission to ensure transparency and accountability in light of alleged conflicts of interests’ to be added as the third point in the afternoon.

Now we put the request by the Greens/EFA Group for a resolution to the vote by roll call.

(Parliament rejected the request)

There will be no resolution to wind up the debate.

Also for Wednesday, the ECR Group has requested that the title of the Council and Commission statements on 'Women activism – human rights defenders related to sexual and reproductive health and rights (SRHR)' be changed into 'Women activism, related to sexual and reproductive health, in the context of human rights'.

I give the floor to Ms Margarita de la Pisa Carrión to move the request on behalf of the ECR Group.

Margarita de la Pisa Carrión, *en nombre del Grupo ECR*. – Señora presidente, colegas, me gustaría pedir, en nombre del Grupo ECR, que se someta a votación nominal una modificación del título de un debate que se va a celebrar el próximo miércoles. Porque, si queremos que este Parlamento sea la casa de todos, si queremos que sea el garante de la legalidad y la pluralidad que debe existir entre los ciudadanos, entonces, debe respetarse la libertad de pensamiento y de conciencia.

No debería, por lo tanto, celebrarse un debate sobre los derechos humanos con un título que ya de por sí plantea confusión y parte de premisas tendenciosas, como es, como ha dicho la presidente: «Activismo de las mujeres: defensoras de los derechos humanos relacionados con la salud sexual y reproductiva y derechos conexos». Pedimos que se modifique, por lo tanto, por «Activismo de mujeres en relación con la salud sexual y reproductiva en el contexto de los derechos humanos».

Si se celebra en esta casa un debate es imprescindible que, al menos, se dé cabida a la legítima pluralidad de visiones, sobre todo en una materia que ya de por sí es tan sensible como esta.

Al menos 23 000 personas se movilizaron ayer en Madrid en marchas por la vida, que también se celebran en más ciudades europeas. No se puede soterrar este clamor social.

President. – Is there any colleague who would like to speak against this request? I don't see that to be the case, and therefore I put the request to the vote by roll call.

(Parliament rejected the request)

Also for Wednesday, the ECR Group has requested that a Commission statement on the 'Scandalous corruption case in the misuse of EU funds by PSOE's MPs in view of the reduction of penalties for public embezzlement in Spain' be added as the eighth point in the afternoon before the debates on cases of breaches of human rights.

I give the floor once again to Ms Margarita De La Pisa Carrión to move the request on behalf of the ECR Group.

Margarita de la Pisa Carrión, *en nombre del Grupo ECR*. – Señora presidente, queridos colegas, me gustaría pedir, en nombre del grupo ECR, que se someta a votación nominal una modificación en el orden del día de la sesión, que sin duda es del interés de mis conciudadanos de España, de las instituciones europeas y de los Estados miembros.

Proponemos añadir el debate con la Comisión, sin resolución, el miércoles por la tarde antes de los debates de urgencia, bajo el título «El escandaloso caso de corrupción en el uso indebido de fondos de la Unión Europea por parte de diputados del PSOE ante la rebaja de penas por malversación pública en España».

En las últimas semanas se ha destapado en España una nueva gran trama de corrupción que afecta al partido gobernante, el Partido Socialista Obrero Español, y que ya ha implicado a varios diputados y funcionarios.

La trama está relacionada con la asignación y malversación de fondos de la Unión Europea en un asunto que preocupa enormemente a la Comisión Europea y a este Parlamento, como se demuestra tras la reciente misión de investigación de la Comisión de Control Presupuestario a Madrid.

Al parecer, esta trama corrupta está liderada por un diputado del Partido Socialista, Juan Bernardo Fuentes Curbelo (conocido en sumario como «Tito Berni»), que dimitió el pasado 14 de febrero de 2023.

Según lo ya declarado, varios diputados del Partido Socialista... *(la presidenta retira la palabra a la oradora)*.

President. – We put the request to the vote by roll call.

(Parliament rejected the request)

The agenda remains unchanged and the agenda is thereby adopted.

The order of business is thus established.

PRZEWODNICTWO: EWA KOPACZ

Wiceprzewodnicząca

13. Charakterystyka energetyczna budynków (wersja przekształcona) (debata)

Przewodnicząca. – Kolejnym punktem porządku dziennego jest sprawozdanie sporządzone przez Ciarána Cuffe w imieniu Komisji Przemysłu, Badań Naukowych i Energii w sprawie wniosku dotyczącego dyrektywy Parlamentu Europejskiego i Rady dotyczącej charakterystyki energetycznej budynków (wersja przekształcona) (COM(2021)0802 - C9-0469/2021 - 2021/0426(COD)) (A9-0033/2023).

Ciarán Cuffe, rapporteur. – Madam President, Commissioner Simson, colleagues, tomorrow this Parliament faces a rare opportunity to make a visible impact in the lives of every person in Europe.

This winter, millions of people were trapped in cold, draughty homes. Households and businesses are struggling to pay sky-high energy bills. Property owners are unable to renovate their homes and cannot afford to do so. Renters are stuck with eye-watering fuel bills, with no control over the energy performance of their home.

We have the power to tackle this crisis and provide much-needed relief to households and businesses across Europe. The recast Energy Performance of Buildings Directive, or EPBD, is that solution.

This directive is at the core. It is a plan for the EU to achieve a climate-neutral building stock by 2050. Why buildings? Well buildings are responsible for 36 % – more than a third – of Europe's greenhouse gas emissions. And there is no question that we have to tackle buildings to make a real change. Categorically, the EU will not achieve its climate targets without this directive. However, we have a deal on the EPBD that will not only lower emissions but will also lower energy bills, boost European jobs and industries, and strike a blow to Europe's dependence on fuel imports from Russia and elsewhere.

And after months of negotiations in the ITRE Committee, we have reached an agreement on the Buildings Directive and a strong majority from all of Parliament's major political groups have backed this agreement. The negotiators support the deal because it's fair and it's realistic. It provides flexibility to Member States, property owners and tenants, and it's the right deal for Europe.

It's a fair and realistic plan because it targets the worst-performing buildings, prioritising people in energy poverty who are most impacted by high bills. And it ensures a fair distribution of responsibility amongst the Member States. While we've increased the ambition level for renovation, we've also adopted stronger social protections against disproportionate rent increases or eviction. And we will boost renewable installations in buildings, and Member States must adopt plans to phase out fossil fuel use in buildings by 2035.

It's also a flexible plan. Every country develops its own renovation plan that is specific to their needs. Historical and religious buildings are exempt. Residential property owners have more time to abide by the new rules. And it's crucial, however, that exemptions for residential buildings are limited. Certain groups, like renters, must not be locked into cold, damp buildings and denied the benefits of lower bills and decent housing.

It's the right plan for Europe. The proposed deal will save almost 50 billion m³ of fossil gas per year. That's the gas consumption of 35 million households, another crucial blow to Europe's dependence on Putin's gas.

Certain members on the far right of this House would like to see changes to the text that would render this directive almost meaningless. To deny European households and businesses the chance of lower bills and decent housing should be unthinkable. Furthermore, without this directive, we're in grave danger of missing our climate targets.

So I urge my colleagues to reject efforts to water down this crucial legislation. And instead, tomorrow, let's vote for cheaper bills, warmer homes and climate protection. It's a good deal for the citizens of Europe, it's a good deal for the construction industry and creating jobs, and it's a good deal for the planet. So let's vote to get this deal done and get this report approved.

Kadri Simson, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, honourable Members, first let me thank you for inviting me to this debate today. I want to start by thanking the rapporteur Ciarán Cuffe and all honourable Members of Parliament involved, so that this work led us to adoption of a very high quality report.

We have just marked one-year anniversary of our REPowerEU agenda, and we have come very far in building an energy system that is more secure and less dependent on Russian fossil fuels. But clearly, there is no time to lose for strengthening our security of supply and energy sovereignty.

A stronger EU framework on energy efficiency will help us stay on course to reach our 2030 energy and climate targets, and it will help turn temporary energy savings into structural efficiency, it will support industry's competitiveness.

We agreed last week to the revision of the Energy Efficiency Directive. Reviewing the energy performance of buildings is the next and crucial part of achieving our goal. Buildings are the biggest consumer of energy in the EU. That's why, in simple words, it is indispensable and urgent to take action here.

Our REPowerEU strategy shows the way forward. We need robust provisions where it matters most and, in particular, on minimum energy performance standards, phase out of fossil fuel boilers, and zero-emission standards for new buildings. The current pace of energy renovation is simply too slow. If we do not change gear, the EU will miss an economic opportunity.

Renovation is, in our view, not a cost – it is an investment. The EPBD recast puts forward areas for priority actions, and sets out clear policy instruments to deliver a modern building stock in a gradual and reasonable way. Let me mention three of them.

First, the minimum energy performance standards. The aim is to start renovating the worst-performing buildings, those where every inhabitant faces energy bills that are highest, and often those where the most disadvantaged people are living.

Second, the provision on zero-emission buildings for new constructions aims to deploy the best technologies where it is the easiest.

And third, strengthening energy performance certificates is essential to give consumers, both building owners and tenants, clear and credible information. With the right information, they can make informed decisions on the most effective actions to take to renovate their buildings.

Honourable Members, the view on the Energy Performance of Buildings Directive plays a key role in our strategy for a cost-effective transition to net zero. Higher energy performing buildings are better places to live, have lower energy costs, and generate benefits for our society as a whole. I welcome the report and ambition this Parliament shows in this area, and I look forward to our exchange.

Радан Кънев, докладчик по становището на комисията по околната среда, обществено здраве и безопасност на храните. – Г-жо Председател, г-жо Комисар, колеги, политиката по реновиране на сградния ни фонд постига изключително много цели едновременно.

На първо място, тя е от огромна социална полза, като намалява сметките както на предприятията, така и на семействата, на гражданите. На второ място, тя има безспорен положителен ефект върху околната среда, и то значителен положителен ефект. На трето място, но съвсем не последно по значение, има огромен геополитически ефект, като подпомага енергийната независимост на Европейския съюз и подпомага усилията ни за икономическо изолиране на агресивната руска империя. Затова не е чудно, че в комисията по околна среда, обществено здраве и безопасност на храните, макар след трудни преговори, постигнахме сериозен компромис в подкрепа на тази директива.

Като докладчик в комисията по околна среда, обществено здраве и безопасност на храните, единствено ще подчертая, че нашето съгласие се основава преди всичко не на административна принуда, а именно на тази идея, че подкрепата за реновирането на сгради е естествена. Тя е от полза за цялото общество – както на наемателите, така и на бедните собственици, на които обърнахме особено внимание, масов проблем в Източна Европа.

И особено бих подчертал това, което от нашия доклад се пренесе в основния доклад на комисията по промишленост, изследвания и енергетика – схемите „плащай, докато спестяваш“ или *pay as you save*, които ще подпомогнат всеки да се възползва от възможността да реновира своята собственост.

Seán Kelly, on behalf of the PPE Group. – *A Uachtaráin*, Commissioner, I'm pleased I left home at 02.00 this morning to get here for this debate and previously for the EPP discussion on the same. The energy crisis has shown us how vulnerable Europe is to sudden energy price hikes. Even after this crisis is over, gas prices will remain significantly higher than before 2022. The new normal will hit the pockets of people in the worst performing buildings up to 10 times harder than in energy efficient buildings.

I have heard from colleagues that the expansion of the ETS and an upscaling of renewable energy should be enough. But alone these are not enough or technically feasible to reach our 2030 and 2050 climate goals. Only complemented by increased renovations and structural measures in the building sector can we do this. And that is what the EPBD is designed to do.

Yet the EPBD should not be a one-size-fits-all approach as buildings do not move across borders. Therefore, it is right that Member States have sufficient degrees of flexibility to ensure cost effectiveness, particularly when it comes to EV infrastructure. Colleagues are right that this will take massive investment, and I have been encouraged to see the interest and the engagement of the financial sector. It is fundamental that we get proper access to finance for people and I think we have achieved this in the EPBD. The real enforcement mechanism will be, of course, the market itself. The EPBD is as much about asset protection as it is about climate change, where investments see tangible and predictable returns.

Lastly, the EPBD also holds the significant added value of job creation if implemented: 18 000 long-term secure jobs will be created for every billion invested in energy efficiency, for example. These are very important facts. Finally, I urge you all to vote in favour of this very important file tomorrow.

Tsvetelina Penkova, on behalf of the S&D Group. – Madam President, dear Commissioner Simson, dear colleagues, the directive on energy performance of buildings is probably one of the most relatable legislation from the Fit for 55 package to our citizens.

We all know how the energy bills skyrocketed last year, and we do all understand that if we consume less, we're going to save more. For countries where the energy and heating bills take the majority of the monthly expenses, any improvement in the building efficiency will lead to more money saved for any other needs. This is why we have to support the EPBD.

It paves the way for the reduction of our energy consumption and our bills. It focuses on lifting our households from energy poverty. It also insists on the Member States to ring-fence dedicated funds for renovation, and at the same time it gives flexibility to the Member States to adapt the targets depending on their economic and social situation. It also offers flexibility for derogation when it comes to the labour workers, to the construction sector, but at the same time it keeps the ambitious goals of reaching the climate targets we have set and protecting from energy poverty our citizens. It imposes no penalties on the European citizens and households, and it insists that the vulnerable households should be supported so they bear no cost for renovations. I urge you to support the EPBD tomorrow.

Morten Petersen, for *Renew-Gruppen*. – Fru formand! Bygninger står for 40 % af det europæiske energiforbrug. Energieffektive bygninger er derfor helt afgørende for, at vi kan bekæmpe klimaforandringerne. Og efter Putins modbydelige angreb på uskyldige i Ukraine, så haster det endnu mere med at gøre Europa fri af Putins gas. Når vi i morgen stemmer om noget så teknisk som et bygningsdirektiv, så stemmer vi ikke kun for det grønne. Vi stemmer også imod diktatoren Putin. Ekspertter siger, at vi kan spare helt op mod 47 milliarder kubikmeter russisk gas om året i vores bygninger, hvis vi stemmer for den position, vi har vedtaget i Energiudvalget. Det svarer til 30 % af den gas, vi importerede fra Rusland før krigen. Vi skal nå vores klimamål. Vi skal stoppe med at sponsere Putins krig ved at hjælpe borgerne med at energirenovere deres boliger. Bygningsdirektivet er en test af, hvor seriøse vi er omkring europæisk energisikkerhed, borgernes energiregninger og ikke mindst klimaforandringerne. Jeg håber på et stort flertal i morgen.

Jutta Paulus, im Namen der *Verts/ALE-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin, Frau Kommissarin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Die billigste Energie ist die, die wir nicht verbrauchen. Nie war das so zutreffend wie in den heutigen Zeiten, wo viel zu viele Menschen sich entscheiden mussten zwischen warmen Wohnungen und warmen Mahlzeiten, weil Russlands Angriffskrieg und die damit verbundene Energiekrise ihre Heizrechnungen vervielfacht hat.

Deshalb sind es nicht nur unsere Klimaziele, die schnelles Handeln erfordern. Es geht auch darum, unsere Abhängigkeit von fossilen Importen zu verringern und unsere Bürgerinnen und Bürger vor hohen Kosten zu schützen. Ja, das wird Investitionen erfordern.

Für Deutschland rechnet die Kreditanstalt für Wiederaufbau mit 254 Milliarden EUR – das ist viel Geld. Aber darf ich daran erinnern, dass allein für die deutsche Gaspreisbremse im letzten Jahr 200 Milliarden EUR zur Verfügung gestellt wurden? Geld, das nicht für Wertsteigerung von Häusern, für Jobs oder für bessere Wohnqualität sorgt, sondern zu einem nicht unbeträchtlichen Teil in Länder fließt, in denen niemand hier im Raum leben wollen würde! Deshalb, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen, brauchen wir diese Vorgaben für besseren Energiebedarf von Gebäuden. Ich bitte Sie um Zustimmung morgen bei der Abstimmung.

Ladislav Ilčić, u ime kluba *ECR*. – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, poštovani kolege, ovo je moglo biti odlično izvješće i zato sam kao izvjestitelj u sjeni u njega uložio šest mjeseci svojeg rada i odradio preko stotinu sastanaka.

Trebali smo iskoristiti motiv građana da u ovoj energetskej krizi sami ugrade pametnija rješenja kojim će smanjiti režije i pomoći im da imaju topao i ugodan dom. Time bismo ujedno smanjili potrošnju energije, povećali energetske sigurnost i smanjili stakleničke plinove.

Nažalost, ovo je propuštena prilika. Ovo je vrlo loše izvješće. Ne gleda na građane i države članice kao na partnere, već kao na djecu koju treba prisiliti na dogmatsko zeleni pristup.

Vidljiva je opsjednutost krajnjim ciljem nulte emisije stakleničkih plinova, a ignorira se realnost i cijeli niz kvalitetnih međukoraka. Forsiraju se *zero emission* zgrade, prokušano neuspješni model renovacija. Traži se više papira, administrativnog opterećenja, nepotrebno česte energetske certifikate, certifikate materijala o globalnom zatopljenju i tako dalje.

Uglavnom, umjesto da bude poticaj za bolju energetske učinkovitost, ovo se izvješće pretvorilo u batinu koja tjera sve isključivo u smanjenje stakleničkih plinova.

Isabella Tovaglieri, a nome del gruppo *ID*. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, con il pretesto della difesa dell'ambiente, le sinistre europee sono finalmente riuscite a inventarsi una patrimoniale occulta sulla casa degli italiani, andando a colpire il bene rifugio per eccellenza, frutto del lavoro e dei sacrifici di una vita.

In nome di un ambientalismo ideologico, la direttiva sulle case *green* porterà alla svalutazione di quello che per molte famiglie è l'unico patrimonio, costringendole a spendere mediamente 35 000 euro per adeguare la casa ai nuovi standard: un provvedimento sbagliato nel merito e nel metodo, che manderà in tilt il settore delle costruzioni e farà un altro enorme regalo alla Cina che si arricchirà vendendoci il fotovoltaico.

Una norma, peraltro, inapplicabile al nostro Paese, dove il 75% degli immobili è in una classe energetica inferiore alla D, e per ristrutturare i quadri, secondo i dati dei costruttori di ANCE, servirebbero 630 anni contro i 7 concessi dalla direttiva. Siamo di fronte all'ennesimo capolavoro di autolesionismo europeo al quale la sinistra italiana si accoda senza un minimo di dignità.

Il voto a favore di questo provvedimento è un voto contro il nostro Paese e contro gli italiani, che domani avranno modo di capire chi, in quest'Aula, si batte per i loro interessi e chi invece li calpesta.

Per noi vale il motto «prima l'Italia» e noi della Lega ci opporremo a questa euro-follia finché avremo fiato. Giù le mani dalle case degli italiani!

Marisa Matias, em nome do Grupo The Left. – Senhora Presidente, quero começar por agradecer ao relator o trabalho sério e empenhado, para que amanhã tenhamos aqui uma proposta que realmente quer melhorar a vida de tantas pessoas. Há muitas famílias por toda a Europa que não conseguem aquecer as suas casas, seja pelo aumento do preço da energia, seja pela fraca qualidade da construção dos edifícios.

Esta proposta para melhorar o desempenho energético dos edifícios é, por isso, uma peça fundamental para a justiça climática, para a justiça social. Aprovar este compromisso é garantir a correção de um grave problema social, já que as pessoas vulneráveis que vivem em edifícios com pior desempenho, sem possibilidade de melhorar a situação, terão apoios.

Esta proposta estabelece metas obrigatórias para a melhoria do desempenho energético dos edifícios existentes e novos, define um quadro de apoio financeiro para isso, inclui novas disposições para a adaptação de edifícios a novos modelos de mobilidade, define procedimentos de certificação e declara planos nacionais para garantir o cumprimento dos objetivos. Amanhã, esta Casa vai decidir se realmente quer fazer a diferença na vida de milhões de pessoas ou continuar a pôr o negócio imobiliário à frente de tantas vidas.

Mas, deixe-me, Senhora Presidente, dizer ainda mais. É com enorme surpresa que vejo, nesta Casa, deputados do ID e do ECR, que votaram contra este compromisso na Comissão e nesta Casa, virem criticar e dizer coisas como as que ouvimos aqui anteriormente quando, na realidade, amanhã, vão apresentar em plenário emendas que correspondem a texto que já foi aprovado, exatamente nesses termos, na comissão responsável.

Por isso, é incompreensível tanta propaganda, tanto populismo, sem querer mudar realmente a vida das pessoas.

Angelika Niebler (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin, Frau Kommissarin, liebe Kolleginnen, liebe Kollegen! Natürlich muss der Gebäudesektor dazu beitragen, dass wir unsere Klimaschutzziele erreichen. Laut Schätzungen der Kommission macht der Gebäudesektor 40 % aller CO₂-Emissionen aus. Die Frage ist also nicht, ob wir den Gebäudebestand dekarbonisieren, sondern die Frage ist, wie wir das machen.

Und da, liebe Kolleginnen, liebe Kollegen, glaube ich, dass wir mit der Gebäudeenergieeffizienzrichtlinie, über die wir morgen hier nun abstimmen, wirklich auf dem falschen Weg sind. Zwangsrenovierungen, Verbote, das ist der Vorschlag, den uns die Kommission auf den Tisch gelegt hat, und das, was im Parlament, auch im Ausschuss, beschlossen wurde, geht noch darüber hinaus.

Ich glaube, dass wir den Klimaschutz nicht gegen die Interessen der Bürgerinnen und Bürger machen dürfen, sondern wir müssen die Menschen mitnehmen. Wir dürfen hier nicht mit Zwang und Verboten versuchen, die Gesellschaft für den Kampf gegen den Klimawandel anzusprechen, sondern ich glaube, wir brauchen intelligentere Lösungen.

Und wenn man mal sieht, was in den USA gerade mit dem *Inflation Reduction Act* angestoßen wird, dann ist das, glaube ich, der weitaus bessere Weg, die Leute, die Menschen, die Bürgerinnen, die Bürger zu überzeugen, hier in Sachen Energieeffizienz zu investieren, als so, wie wir das machen.

Lassen Sie mich noch eins sagen: Ich höre in der Diskussion oft, ich sei dann gegen Klimaschutz, wenn ich mich nicht für diese Richtlinie ausspreche. Nein, im Gegenteil. Wir haben den Emissionshandel beschlossen und haben vorgesehen, dass der Gebäudesektor hier ja auch in den Emissionshandel mit einbezogen wird, sodass Energie im Gebäudesektor verteuert wird. Wir haben schon eine Energieeffizienzrichtlinie.

Und, liebe Kolleginnen, liebe Kollegen, jeder weiß, wie sehr die Energiepreise in den letzten Monaten in die Höhe geschossen sind. Ich glaube, man muss unsere Bürger und Bürgerinnen wirklich nicht davon überzeugen, dass es Sinn macht, hier in die Isolierung, in die Dämmung ihrer Häuser, ihrer Wohnimmobilien zu investieren. Das regelt sich von alleine. Ich glaube nicht, dass wir hier noch mit Zwangsrenovierungen zusätzlich Druck aufbauen sollten. Deshalb sehe ich diese Richtlinie, über die wir morgen beschließen, sehr, sehr kritisch.

Dan Nica (S&D). – Doamna președintă, doamna comisar, o propunere de directivă foarte bună, care vine la momentul potrivit.

Avem nevoie de un plan european pentru creșterea eficienței energetice a clădirilor și avem nevoie de un plan care să fie și realizabil, care să fie și concret, și care să permită, pe de o parte, un semnal pe care oamenii îl așteaptă, s-au săturat de facturi mari și vor să aibă facturi mai mici. Cum putem face acest lucru? Pe de o parte, măsurile pe care le vom introduce în noul model al pieței de energie electrică și, pe de altă parte, evident, creșterea eficienței energetice înseamnă facturi mai mici.

Dar trebuie să fim siguri de un lucru, doamna comisar, că toate statele membre aplică această directivă, în litera și spiritul ei, și spiritul este așa: că nicio persoană, nicio familie, că e vorba de familii tinere, că e vorba de familii cu mulți copii, că e vorba de pensionari, nu vor fi obligate să plătească această factură a eficienței energetice, care poate să depășească lejer 10 000 – 15 000 de euro, și că vor exista aceste măsuri de creare a unor fonduri naționale în fiecare stat membru, fonduri europene care trebuie să fie alocate astfel încât aceste familii să nu fie puse să plătească un lucru pe care oricum nu l-ar putea suporta și că ne asigurăm, în schimb, că cei care pot să plătească vor fi parte activă a acestui proces de creștere a eficienței energetice.

Succesul acestui program depinde de modul în care facem cu toții aceste lucruri. Dumneavoastră, ca și Comisie, vă asigurați că fiecare stat membru pune în aplicare aceste instrumente și că mesajele noastre sunt clare: nimeni nu va plăti mai mult decât trebuie să plătească, iar toți cei care au nevoie de sprijin vor primi sprijin, granturi și cofinanțare europeană și națională.

Christophe Grudler (Renew). – Madame la Présidente, chers collègues, parlons chiffres. Au travers de sa loi pour le climat, l'Europe s'est fixé un objectif de réduction des émissions de gaz à effet de serre d'au moins 55 % pour 2030. En 2020, l'Europe a déjà réussi à faire baisser ses émissions de 31 % par rapport à 1990. Maintenant, il nous faut encore 24 % en moins de sept ans.

Le parc immobilier actuel de l'Union européenne, c'est 36 % des émissions de gaz à effet de serre: plus d'un tiers. En connaissant ces chiffres, mes chers collègues, avons-nous vraiment le choix? Clairement, non. Il nous faut urgemment réduire les émissions de CO₂ de nos bâtiments – évidemment, en tenant compte de la réalité de chaque pays. Et c'est ce que propose ce texte.

Il est donc temps d'être sérieux sur cette rénovation énergétique des bâtiments. Je vous appelle à soutenir très largement ce texte qui est essentiel pour réduire nos émissions de CO₂.

Bas Eickhout (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, I'm a bit surprised by the discussion from some of my colleagues. We've been talking in this House about the climate emergency, and something needs to happen. We've been talking about energy poverty, people paying high energy bills every day because of their houses being totally inefficient and leaking. We have been talking about the war in Ukraine, where we are dependent of fossil regimes like Putin's.

Now we have a proposal on the table that is addressing climate change, that is lowering our dependence on fossils, that is lowering the energy bill for our consumers. And now some are complaining that this should be too forceful, we should not force it. Well, the issue is we have here short-term investments needed for long-term gains, so we need to overcome this market failure.

And are we obliging people? We are obliging governments. We are obliging governments to invest in this, to deliver jobs and to make sure that our people are not wasting money on their energy bill. That's why this regulation is so important and should be supported by all of us.

(The speaker agreed to respond to a blue-card speech)

Bogdan Rzońca (ECR), *wystąpienie zasygnalizowane przez podniesienie niebieskiej kartki*. – Jest Pan liderem tego projektu i wiem, że jest Pan dobrze zorientowany w problemie, ale moje pytanie jest takie: z dokumentów unijnych wynika, że w 2023 roku będziemy mieć zerowe PKB w Unii Europejskiej. Proszę mi powiedzieć, skąd firmy, skąd ludzie wezmą pieniądze na te wydatki, kiedy będą mieć główne zmartwienie (firmy, ludzie i gospodarstwa domowe), żeby po prostu przeżyć? Proszę pokazać finansowanie tego projektu dla przeciętnego Kowalskiego w Unii Europejskiej. Bo my musimy ten projekt jakoś objaśniać, bo co do zasady, że trzeba ocieplać i trzeba oszczędzać, to jest ok, ale skąd te pieniądze będą?

Bas Eickhout (Verts/ALE), *blue-card reply*. – Well, first of all, we have indeed a need for an investment programme – as I said, an investment programme that will deliver jobs. If you look at the MFF, the European Multiannual Financial Framework – and indeed I know in Poland you have some issues in getting that money, but that's your problem – EUR 110 billion is being dedicated, which you can use for investments.

So in that sense, we have also asked in the report that, for the next MFF, the Commission will need to come with proposals. As part of REPowerEU there is money made available, so there is a lot of European money that is available and that will deliver on climate, lower energy bills, jobs and less dependency on Russia. You should be in favour of that. That you can't access European money is your problem and you need to solve it first.

Johan Nissinen (ECR). – Fru talman! Är du husägare? Då ska du lyssna väldigt noga nu. Miljontals husägare i EU kommer att tvingas renovera sina hem för att spara energi. Samtidigt gör EU ingenting för att minska sin egen energiförbrukning.

Europaparlamentets energikostnader fyrdubblades 2022 jämfört med året innan – de uppgår till över 600 miljoner kr. Den meningslösa uppvärmningen av två parlament i Bryssel och Strasbourg är ett respektlöst slöseri och ett hån mot medborgarna. Det är helt sinnessjukt att vi måste värma upp två stycken byggnader för parlament.

Svenska pensionärer kommer att behöva ta lån för att ha råd att renovera sina hus enligt EU-standard – samtidigt som Europaparlamentet åker fram och tillbaka mellan Bryssel och Strasbourg. Vanliga medborgare gör redan otroligt mycket för att spara energi, samtidigt som EU totalt skiter i det och bara slänger pengarna rakt ut genom fönstret. Det är skamligt!

Thierry Mariani (ID). – Madame la Présidente, il existe deux formes d'écologie: l'une veut préserver la planète pour servir les hommes, l'autre veut faire passer l'idéologie verte avant les vies humaines.

Au Parlement européen, depuis le pacte vert, nous accumulons les textes qui ignorent totalement leur impact sur nos sociétés. Personne, bien sûr, n'est opposé à la rénovation thermique des bâtiments, qu'ils soient privés ou publics. Mais le texte propose des indicateurs inégaux entre les États pour justifier des classes de bâtiments. Pire, ce texte va imposer aux propriétaires des échéanciers impossibles à tenir pour mettre leurs biens en conformité. C'est une véritable crise du marché immobilier français qui se profile. Une crise qui mettra en danger de nombreux foyers dont les prêts ne suffiront pas à remplir les exigences de Bruxelles.

À quoi cela sert-il d'imposer ces exigences de force, sans se soucier de la réalité de notre paysage économique et artisanal pour les mettre réellement en place? La résolution prend-elle en compte les difficultés de nos artisans pour recruter? Non. La résolution prend-elle en compte les délais suffisants pour que les propriétaires puissent faire effectuer leurs travaux? Non.

Pour éviter de générer une véritable crise immobilière en France, nous voterons contre cette résolution.

Pernille Weiss (PPE). – Fru formand! Det er blevet sagt så mange gange. Den energi vi ikke bruger, det er den bedste for klimaet og for vores pengepung og for vores sikkerhed. For med energipolitikens inddragelse i sikkerheds- og storpolitik efter Ruslands fjendtlige invasion af Ukraine, så skal vi tage det meget alvorligt. Derfor giver det også rigtig god mening, at EU's bygningsdirektiv kommer op i gear. Det har vi nemlig brug for, hvis energieffektivisering for alvor skal kunne levere de CO₂-reduktioner, der er behov for, så vi kan nå de aftalte klimamål i 2030 og klimaneutralitet i 2050. Så naturligvis skal bygningerne bidrage til den grønne omstilling. Men der er en irriterende uklarhed over, hvilke boligtyper der egentlig skal levere og hvordan. Og der er hos nogle en irritation over detaljeringens niveauet i direktivforslaget, der sine steder også godt kan se ud, som om vi her i Bruxelles ikke rigtig tror, at nationalstaterne kan finde ud af opgaven selv. Det er altså noget rod. Især hvis kritikerne får ret i, at det er nogle af de årsager, der ville være, til at vi ikke når klimamålene. Det vil faktisk være en tragedie.

Det har været svært at finde ud af at finde enighed her i huset. Forhandlingerne har været meget seje, og afstemningen vil vise, om oplevelsen af roderi bliver endnu større end indholdet af det brede, ambitiøse og alligevel realistiske kompromis, der er forhandlet frem. Det kan give en rigtig dårlig start på forhandlingerne med Rådet, der nu skal i gang. Vi kan snart kun på én hånd tælle årene frem til 2030, hvor vi skal have fjernet mindst 55 % af al CO₂ i atmosfæren i Europa. Lad os nu komme i gang med det arbejde, og det vil vi gøre ved at stemme for den politiske aftale, som Industri- og Energiudvalget har forhandlet, og de ekstra forslag, der ligger på bordet, som kun kan gøre dette bedre. Lad os nu fokusere på det og komme i gang.

Patrizia Toia (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, noi siamo legislatori molto seri e molto responsabili. Parlo per me, per il mio gruppo politico dei Socialisti e Democratici, e abbiamo le idee molto chiare e sappiamo che l'interesse dei cittadini, delle famiglie e delle imprese oggi è quello di risparmiare energia, di consumare meno e di pagare meno nelle loro bollette; è quello di prepararsi al futuro, non di stare fermi come qualcuno vorrebbe, senza dare strumenti per affrontare le grandi trasformazioni che stiamo vivendo.

E allora, io credo, che noi con questo provvedimento, stiamo proprio aiutando i cittadini, le famiglie in particolare, e le imprese, ad affrontare i cambiamenti e a spendere meno. Questa è la sostanza. Naturalmente vanno aiutati – siamo molto responsabili e seri – sappiamo che ci vogliono strumenti. Si metterà in moto con questo provvedimento un grande volano di lavori nel settore edilizio, che avrà bisogno di essere curato nella sua filiera, di opportunità di lavoro – e bisognerà stare attenti che non ci sia sfruttamento e lavoro nero – ma per quanto riguarda le famiglie, avranno una valorizzazione del loro patrimonio. Certo, dobbiamo aiutarle.

Tempi e risorse sono i due punti delicati. Sui tempi abbiamo deciso; sulle risorse – io chiedo alla Commissione – più coraggio e più concretezza, perché lì sta il punto critico.

Mauri Pekkarinen (Renew). – Arvoisa puhemies, valiokunnan esitys tiukentaa komission alkuperäistä esitystä tavalla, jota ei voi kaikilta osin hyväksyä. Uusien rakennusten osalta päästöttömyysvaade vuoteen 2028 mennessä on ymmärrettävämpi, samoin kuin se, että koko rakennuskannan tulee olla ilmastoneutraali vuoteen 2050 mennessä, mutta ole-massa olevien asuinrakennusten osalta energiategohkuusluokkavaatimukset vuoteen 2030 ja 2033 mennessä ovat koh-tuuttomia.

Jos vaatimustason saavuttamista tarkasteltaisiin keskimääräisen rakennuskannan mukaisesti eikä kiinteistökohtaisesti, esi-tys olisi hyväksyttävämpi. Maissa, joissa lämmityksessä siirrytään nopeammin päästöttömän energian käyttöön – niin kuin esimerkiksi Suomessa, jossa vuoteen 2030 mennessä koko lailla päästöttömiä on tarkoitus olla lämmityksen osalta – esitys tuntuu erityisen huonolta. Esitetystä muodossa direktiivi näet pakottaisi kahdeksassa vuodessa remontteihin esimerkiksi Suomen tapauksessa lähes kahden miljoonan suomalaisen asunnot.

Tässä muodossa esitystä valitettavasti ei voi hyväksyä.

Ignazio Corrao (Verts/ALE). – Signora Presidente, Commissario, onorevoli colleghi, la direttiva sull'efficienza energetica degli edifici che ci apprestiamo a votare è positiva perché ci consente di ridurre il costo delle bollette e migliorare la qualità degli immobili.

Con gli strumenti messi a disposizione da questa direttiva, spesso interpretati in modo fantasioso dai sostenitori dell'immobilismo energetico e climatico, l'Europa intera farà un grandissimo investimento che già nel medio termine avrà come ritorno una sostanziale diminuzione del consumo energetico, che farà rifiatore le casse di molti cittadini europei. Altro che patrimoniale!

Più si posticipano questi interventi, più aumenteranno i costi, sia in termini di bolletta che in termini di vulnerabilità energetica e quindi geopolitica. La domanda ricorrente è: chi pagherà tutto questo? Questa direttiva spiega che, potendo utilizzare diversi strumenti di finanziamento europeo già esistenti, si utilizzerà la leva pubblica per sostenere le fasce di popolazione che più ne hanno bisogno.

Cambiare fornitori di fonti fossili per far fronte alla crisi energetica generata dall'invasione russa in Ucraina è una non soluzione che ci mantiene vulnerabili. Isolare, invece, le nostre case significa renderci sempre più indipendenti da fattori ed attori esterni. È una cosa che dobbiamo cercare di fare in fretta: non è vero che c'è una patrimoniale nascosta, ma c'è una grande opportunità per aiutare i cittadini in un momento così delicato.

(L'oratore accetta di rispondere a un intervento «cartellino blu»)

Ladislav Ilčić (ECR), intervencija zatražena podizanjem plave kartice. – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, poštovani kolega, kolege iz Greens-a i recimo francuski kolega iz Renew-a govore samo o smanjenju CO₂, kao da je to jedini cilj ovog dokumenta.

Vrlo su ambiciozni u toj zelenoj tranziciji i tako su i koncipirali dokument. Svaka tranzicija je zasigurno skupa, svaki *deep renovation* je skup, puno skuplji nego djelomično.

Madam President, I don't know why there is -15, since I speak just 15 seconds. Can you change the time there, please? Yes. No, no, I haven't asked the question.

A s druge strane, vi socijalisti govorite samo o smanjivanju računa. Dakle, i da to treba biti okrenuto na najsiromašnije pa me zanima, ne radi li se ustvari o kontradiktornom dokumentu? I tko će to platiti? Kako će plaćanje energetskog certifikata svakih pet godina i uvođenje *global warming potential* certifikata pojeftiniti te račune? Tko će platiti uvođenje te dizalice topline? Na koncu, to me zanima.

Ignazio Corrao (Verts/ALE), risposta «cartellino blu». – Io non credo che questo documento sia contraddittorio. La riduzione della CO₂ è uno degli elementi ovvi, perché ovviamente, andando a migliorare la qualità degli edifici si va a consumare di meno, e d'altro canto si va a risparmiare sulle bollette.

Quindi si fa un doppio lavoro: uno che va a aiutare le casse dei cittadini e, dall'altra parte, si va ad aiutare, appunto l'ambiente, nel quadro della transizione verde e peraltro si crea anche una leva economica positiva quando si va a creare lavoro, appunto, attraverso le ristrutturazioni.

Carlo Fidanza (ECR). – Signor Presidente, signora Commissario, onorevoli colleghi, a scampo di equivoci, tutti condividiamo l'obiettivo dell'efficientamento energetico degli edifici. Ma ma questo testo è l'ennesimo esempio di come non si dovrebbe condurre la transizione ecologica.

In primo luogo, perché non tiene conto a sufficienza delle differenze e delle specificità dei diversi Stati membri. Particolarmente significativo è il caso dell'Italia, che vanta un patrimonio edilizio unico per valore storico e culturale.

In secondo luogo, perché è un provvedimento che obbliga anziché incentivare, caricando il costo di gravosi interventi su famiglie e Stati membri. Le conseguenze per il nostro mercato immobiliare rischiano di essere molto pesanti: svalutazione generale degli immobili, rischi per il sistema bancario, aumento dei prezzi per i lavori edilizi, blocco degli interventi antisismici, deturpamento di luoghi attrattivi per il turismo.

Ci auguriamo finisca il tempo di provvedimenti ideologici e si possa tornare a parlare di transizione verde con un po' di sano realismo.

Markus Buchheit (ID). – Frau Präsidentin, sehr geehrte Damen und Herren! Der Vorschlag zur Energieeffizienz von Gebäuden beweist, dass es keinen Rückzugsort vor den Ideen der Brüsseler Weltverbesserer gibt. Nun muss also das Eigenheim, das letzte Refugium vor dem Gender- und Klimawahn, dran glauben. Ab 2028 soll EU-weit die Pflicht für den Einbau von Photovoltaikanlagen in allen Neubauten, ab 2032 in sämtlichen Häusern kommen. Öffentliche Gebäude sollen gar schon ab 2027 emissionsfrei sein. 15 % von Stellplätzen sollen für Fahrräder reserviert, pro fünf Stellplätzen eine Ladesäule für Batteriekutschen errichtet werden.

In den nächsten zehn Jahren müssen alleine in Deutschland 16 Millionen Häuser mit neuen Fassadendämmungen, Dächern, Fenstern und Heizungen ausgestattet werden. Es lebe das emissionsfreie Wohnen in der Thermoskanne – Schimmel und Brandschutzprobleme inklusive! Garniert werden soll das Ganze neben staatlichem Zwang zur Umsetzung übrigens mit Zuschüssen in Höhe von 150 Milliarden EUR. Immerhin 330 EUR pro Einwohner. Das sollte zumindest für ein isoliertes Klofenster reichen.

François-Xavier Bellamy (PPE). – Madame la Présidente, chers collègues, demain, nous allons voter une directive sur l'efficacité énergétique des bâtiments. C'est très simple de voter, mais ce qui compte, c'est de réfléchir aux conséquences. Ce texte impose de faire des travaux majeurs de rénovation thermique sur 40 millions de bâtiments en Europe d'ici 2033 — 40 % de tout le parc immobilier en Europe en moins de dix ans.

Pour cela, la Commission promet 150 milliards de budget européen. Mais d'après ses propres calculs, le coût sera de 275 milliards par an. Par an, chers collègues. Et ce coût, que ce soit avec de l'argent public ou privé, à la fin, nous savons bien qui le paiera. Les gens ordinaires, ceux qui travaillent, qui contribuent, qui épargnent toute une vie pour acheter le lieu où ils vivent et qui vont se voir imposer des travaux dont les prix exploseront du fait de la demande brutale que ces nouvelles normes vont provoquer.

Et tout cela pourquoi? Pourquoi? Oui, chers collègues, nous voulons tous baisser les émissions de carbone. Mais toutes les données disponibles montrent l'aberration d'une politique de rénovation indifférenciée des bâtiments. Aux États-Unis, le retour d'expérience de campagnes massives montre que les économies d'énergie sont trois fois moindres qu'espéré pour des coûts deux fois plus importants que prévu.

L'Université de Cambridge a montré il y a quelques semaines que, cinq ans après les travaux, la consommation d'énergie ne baissait même pas. En Allemagne, après 340 milliards d'euros d'investissement dans la rénovation thermique, une étude montre que l'impact n'est même pas mesurable. La seule conséquence incontestable pour l'environnement, chers collègues, c'est l'explosion de l'usage des matériaux nécessaires.

Quel paradoxe absolu que des politiques qui se veulent écologistes veuillent mettre la moitié de tous les bâtiments européens en chantier dans les dix ans. Derrière cela, il y a la persistance d'une obsession dépassée: tout changer, tout refaire, disqualifier l'ancien, le patrimoine, l'héritage, pour tout recommencer à neuf. C'est cette logique qui a créé la crise écologique et nous comprenons malheureusement pourquoi de grands intérêts industriels soutiennent ce projet, évidemment. Mais derrière cette situation, il y a en réalité une crise majeure, une crise sociale et politique aussi que ce texte pourrait entraîner.

La seule vraie solution pour décarboner, c'est de passer du fioul, du gaz qui chauffent nos logements à l'électricité et d'utiliser toutes les sources décarbonées pour en produire beaucoup plus. Mais comme par hasard, ceux qui veulent réglementer la vie des Européens jusque dans leur espace privé sont aussi généralement ceux qui combattent, par exemple, l'énergie nucléaire. Nous avons déposé un amendement pour faire en sorte qu'un bâtiment zéro émission soit aussi un bâtiment qui profite de cette source d'énergie parmi d'autres.

Demain, chers collègues, en votant, réfléchissons aux conséquences.

Mohammed Chahim (S&D). – Voorzitter, ik moet me af en toe enorm verbazen als ik dan hier een debat hoor over dit onderwerp, alsof we niet een energiecrisis achter de rug hebben of er echt nog steeds in zitten, alsof we niet onze afhankelijkheid van fossiele brandstoffen willen verlagen.

Maar wat doet dit dossier nu? Door wat we hier met elkaar hebben afgesproken, en dat doen heel veel politieke partijen met elkaar – goed nadenken over wat nu het beste is als het gaat om het verminderen van die olieafhankelijkheid en het verbeteren van de energie-efficiëntie in de gebouwde omgeving –, zijn we gekomen tot een plan dat ervoor zorgt dat we a) gaan vergroenen, b) de rekening doen verlagen, en c) ook nog eens heel veel werkgelegenheid gaan creëren – ongeveer 160 000 banen worden er geprojecteerd. Dus volgens mij profiteert iedereen ervan. En ik snap echt de weerstand hiertegen niet. En als het gaat om de naleving zit het vooral bij de lidstaten en niet zozeer bij de burger.

Maar ik snap het ergens wel. De partijen die vandaag oproepen om hiertegen te stemmen, willen dat u tijdens de volgende crisis in de kou blijft zitten, dat u geconfronteerd wordt met een enorme energierekening, zodat zij met het vingertje kunnen wijzen en Europa de schuld geven.

Ondřej Kovařík (Renew). – Paní předsedající, kritická situace na trhu s energiemi nás vede k úvahám, jak snížit energetickou náročnost budov, a tím ušetřit na energiích. Musíme ale také brát v úvahu, jak nákladná taková změna může být a do jaké míry je realistická s ohledem na specifickou situaci každé členské země. Současný návrh směrnice sice nabízí některá řešení, ale zdaleka ne všechna jsou přijatelná. Co považuji za správné je, že směrnice rozlišuje rezidenční a kancelářské budovy. Zvýšení energetické účinnosti u administrativních budov zcela jistě ke snižování emisí přispěje, např. může pomoci budování infrastruktury pro vozidla s alternativním pohonem. Nicméně je zásadní, že návrh přichází s výjimkou pro takové budovy, které využívají mikropodniky a malé a střední podniky. Pro ty by vyžadované investice nemusely být finančně únosné.

Za mě je ale zcela vyloučeno, abychom přijímali stejná přísná pravidla pro rodinné bydlení. Už tak napjaté rozpočty domácností se s požadavky na povinné zateplení nebo nové druhy vytápění vypořádat nedokážou. Musíme proto důkladně posoudit dopady požadovaných opatření tak, aby nakonec nevedly přímo ke skokovým nárůstům cen nájmu a nemovitostí. To si v současné situaci nemůžeme dovolit.

Maria Spyraki (PPE). – Madam President, Commissioner Simson, dear colleagues, we are here today to make another step towards a more sustainable and energy efficient way for living. What we aim to do today is to provide to citizens in the Member States a complete toolbox to achieve a zero emission and fully decarbonised building stock by 2050.

How this is going to be a realistic framework? First, by the facilitation of more targeted financing of investments in the building sector and second, by complementing other EU instruments, supporting, in that sense, vulnerable consumers and fighting energy poverty.

This piece of legislation is at the nexus of the 'Fit for 55' package. We have to admit that coming to a consensus was not an easy task for this proposal and I would like to congratulate all colleagues involved in this file, since we are very much aware about the fact that this is about an exercise which requires a framework for building renovation, where cost effectiveness, local circumstances and also the diversity of our buildings need to be considered.

However, allow me to mention that by defining net-zero buildings, phasing out fossil fuel heating system in buildings by 2035 and if not feasible by 2040 at the latest, by ensuring also access to finance at favourable conditions, facilitating the deployment of financial instruments and innovative schemes, such as the European Renovation Loan or a European guarantee fund for building renovation, by finding a common ground on minimum energy performance standards, and by enhancing infrastructure for sustainable mobility, we finally achieved a compromise.

Commissioner Simson, dear colleagues, we have set a solid basis for the accelerating efforts under the renovation wave to at least double the annual renovation rate by 2030, while shifting towards decarbonised buildings in the next few decades.

Marcos Ros Sempere (S&D). – Señora presidenta, lucha por el clima y defensa de los ciudadanos. El Parlamento vuelve a dar ejemplo de ambición social con esta Directiva. Los edificios son responsables del 40 % del consumo energético y es fundamental reducir esta cifra para salvar el planeta. Pero yo me siento especialmente orgulloso de centrar nuestros esfuerzos en quienes más lo necesitan. Me siento orgulloso de que se tengan en cuenta las zonas en situación de pobreza energética y los barrios vulnerables para centrar ahí las inversiones de fondos europeos.

La reforma de esta Directiva de eficiencia energética de los edificios va, además, en la línea que nos marca la *Nueva Bauhaus Europea*: más ahorro energético en las facturas de cada mes, menos contaminación, mayor calidad de vida y confort climático en los edificios y en las viviendas, todo ello centrando los esfuerzos en los que menos tienen.

La aprobación de esta Directiva contribuirá a tener una Europa más ambiciosa climáticamente y más justa socialmente.

Barbara Thaler (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin! Ich würde gerne mit vier ganz kleinen Fragen anfangen. Soll der Gebäudesektor zur CO₂-Reduktion beitragen? Ja. Soll der Gesetzgeber Spielregeln dafür entwickeln? Ja. Sollen diese Spielregeln auch zur Reduzierung von Abhängigkeiten von fossilen Brennstoffen führen? Ja. Sollen diese Maßnahmen für Energieeinsparungen und für leistbare Energierechnungen sorgen? Ja.

All diese Fragen, all diese Ziele sind gute Ziele. Kein Hauseigentümer will seine Abhängigkeit oder seine Energierechnung erhöhen. Man will das genaue Gegenteil. All die wichtigen Fragen rund um Investitionen – in Dämmungen von Häusern, in neue Fenster, in andere, bessere Heizungen – sind richtig.

Aber diese Fragen sind nicht nur von Land zu Land, von Region zu Region und von Haus zu Haus unterschiedlich. Sie fordern uns geradezu heraus, und ich muss sagen, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen, ich habe wirklich große Sorge, dass die Richtlinie, über die wir diese Woche abstimmen, übers Ziel hinausschießt. Der Gebäudesektor ist nämlich in Sachen CO₂-Preissignal und in Sachen CO₂-Reduktion bereits im neuen Emissionshandel umfasst und auch in der neuen Energieeffizienzrichtlinie.

Ja, es ist unsere Aufgabe, für CO₂-Reduktionen zu sorgen, für diese Spielregeln zu sorgen. Aber müssen wir alles dreimal regulieren und dreimal bepreisen? Wohnraum ist bereits jetzt teuer genug.

Gheorghe Falcă (PPE). – Doamnă președintă, doamnă comisar, dragi colegi, atunci când vorbim de eficiența energetică la clădiri noi, putem spune că avem o direcție pozitivă, schimbăm standarde de proiectare și putem să avem o eficiență energetică bună. Mai mult de atât, chiar putem gândi o proiectare a ceea ce înseamnă independența energetică a acestor clădiri.

Atunci când vorbim de eficiența energetică a clădirilor vechi, vă pot spune, din experiența mea, din calitatea mea de fost primar 15 ani în administrația locală, făcând în clădirile noastre o eficiență energetică, am avut rezultate pozitive, rezultate pozitive la ceea ce înseamnă reduceri de facturi, rezultate pozitive la ceea ce înseamnă costurile de realizare a produsului, care înseamnă gigacalorie. Și eu cred că această temă pozitivă ne poate aduce în direcția de a face o eficiență energetică bună.

Doar că, trebuie să fim sinceri, să spunem că este nevoie de solidaritate. Să fim solidari cu ceea ce înseamnă astăzi persoanele vulnerabile, să fim solidari cu oamenii din mediul rural, pentru că a reuși să-i convingem pe acești oameni să investească în clădirile lor trebuie să se vadă o dată cu un sprijin european.

De aceea este nevoie de eficiență energetică legată de solidaritate.

Henna Virkkunen (PPE). – Arvoisa puhemies, arvoisa komissaari, rakennusten energiatehokkuutta voidaan merkittävästi parantaa ja on hyvä tavoite, että rakennussektori myös on ilmastoneutraali vuonna 2050. Voidaan parantaa rakennusten eristystä, voidaan uudistaa ikkunoita, muuttaa lämmitystapoja. Keinoja on monia, mutta kuinka energiatehokkuutta tulee parantaa? Ei sitä pidä EU-tasolla lähteä määrittelemään.

Tässä komissio lähti alun pitäen jo liian pitkälle omissa ehdotuksissaan, kun yksityiskohtaisesti lähdettiin esittämään, millä tavalla näitä uudistuksia on jäsenvaltioissa tehtävä. Meillä on niin erilaiset olosuhteet eri jäsenvaltioissa, niin erilaiset ilmasto-olosuhteet, rakennuskanta, energia- ja lämmitysmuodot, että päätökset keinoista on järkevintä tehdä jäsenmaiden tasolla tai alueella. Usein kiinteistönomistajat itse ratkaisevat sen, mikä on järkevin tapa parantaa energiatehokkuutta heidän kiinteistönsään.

On järkevä tavoite sinänsä, että kaikki uudet rakennukset olisivat päästöttömiä jo vuonna 2028. Tämä on varmasti mahdollista, mutta se, kuinka päästötön rakennus tässä määritellään eli niin, että lämmitystavan pitäisi perustua uusiutuvaan energialähteisiin, ei ota huomioon sitä, että meillä on maita, kuten vaikka oma kotimaani Suomi, jossa energiantuotanto pääosin alkaa olemaan jo päästötöntä joko uusiutuvilla energialähteillä tuotettua tai ydinvoimalla tuotettua sähköä. Tämän ehdotuksen mukaan ydinvoimalla tuotettua sähköä ei luettaisi päästöttömäksi energiamuodoksi, eikä tuo rakennus olisi päästötön rakennus. Tämähän ei ole järkevä lähtökohta. Meidän täytyy siis tehdä useita muutoksia tähän lainsäädäntöön ennen kuin voin ajatella, että tätä kannattaisi viedä tällaisenaan eteenpäin.

Tom Berendsen (PPE). – Voorzitter, het renoveren en isoleren van de gebouwde omgeving is essentieel. Een hele belangrijke opdracht, want 40 % van onze energieconsumptie komt van die gebouwde omgeving, dus we hebben daar echt een opdracht naar volgende generaties.

Maar de vraag die wij ons hier in het Parlement moeten stellen, is of de regelgeving die wordt voorgesteld ook geschikt is om deze doelen te bereiken. En werkt die in onze steden? Werkt die in onze dorpen? En werkt die voor onze huishoudens? En het antwoord op die vraag – voor de regelgeving die nu wordt voorgesteld – is simpelweg “nee”. Dit voorstel wordt een ramp in de uitvoering.

De Commissie is op de stoel van gemeenteraadsleden gaan zitten en schrijft voor hoeveel parkeerplekken er moeten zijn voor auto's, voor fietsen. Dit Parlement wil daar ook nog regels aan toevoegen op het gebied van de akoestiek. Dat is veel te veel detail voor iets wat in de hele Europese Unie moet gaan werken. En bovendien is het veel te duur – ook voor een land als Nederland – om dit zo op deze manier te gaan invoeren. Dit kost in Nederland meer dan 1 miljard EUR, wat alleen gaat naar bureaucratie, zonder dat 1 euro hiervan gaat naar het daadwerkelijk renoveren van huizen.

Kortom, terug naar de tekentafel. Hou die hoge ambities op het gebied van renoveren en isoleren, maar laat de uitvoering over aan de lidstaten, zodat er maatwerk geleverd kan worden.

Zgłoszenia z sali

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Doamnă președintă, doamnă comisar, stimați colegi, toți vrem eficientizare energetică, toți vrem ca cetățenii din țara noastră să plătească o factură mai mică.

Eu vin din mediul privat și știu că înainte de a face o eficiență, ai un cost. Înainte de a obține o eficiență, trebuie să faci o investiție. Așa este și aici. Și mă gândesc la cetățenii din țara mea, mai ales la cei din mediul rural. 60% din cetățenii din România nu vor putea suporta costurile.

De aceea, doamna comisar, dacă se va implica și sectorul financiar pentru susținerea schimbărilor, da, vom putea să facem acest lucru. Dacă nu, nu, vom sărăci oamenii în loc să-i ajutăm.

Și cred că trebuie să ținem cont de raportul cost-beneficiu și să ne acomodăm ambiția cu posibilitatea de a aplica. Pentru că dacă în business ești prea ambițios și nu ții cont de relația cost-beneficiu, dai faliment. De aceea, cred că este bine să găsim mecanisme de sprijin dacă vrem să punem în aplicare această directivă.

Mick Wallace (The Left). – Madam President, I received a lot of emails in the last week asking me to vote in favour of a strong energy performance in buildings directive, one that can both cut emissions and combat worsening energy poverty. However, the text we are voting on this week is already a weak one.

I often say that the European Parliament is the place where climate ambition comes to die. I have a lot of sympathy for my Irish colleague, Ciarán Cuffe, the rapporteur for the legislative proposal. Ciarán's draft committee report shows lots of ambition, the kind of ambition we need in order to adequately respond to the climate crisis.

But it was severely weakened in committee by the EPP, who happened to be propping up the far right in the Parliament on this one. The weakening of the minimum energy performance standard is particularly bad. It is now absolutely essential that the Parliament does not further water down the text to further prolong the use of fossil fuels.

Patryk Jaki (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Otóż przez ostatnie lata wszystkim wmawialiście, że trzeba stawiać na gaz i będzie taniej, ekologiczniej i bezpieczniej. I co? Jest mniej ekologicznie, drożej i mniej bezpiecznie. I dalej zamiast wyciągać wnioski, pokazujecie tę swoją ideologiczną butę. I teraz tak, od 2027 r. wszyscy w Unii Europejskiej mają płacić podatek ETS od budynków, czyli sztuczny ideologiczny podatek, wzrosną koszty zakupu mieszkań i ich utrzymanie. I za waszą ideologiczną hucpę zapłacą najbiedniejsi, których nie stać na super nowoczesne nieruchomości, tacy jak Polacy, którzy oczywiście żyliby na waszym poziomie, gdyby Niemcy zapłacili nam reparacje wojenne.

Do tego dziś chcecie zakazać kotłów zużywających paliwa kopalne dla nowych domów do 2028 roku, a potem dla wszystkich, w tym pieców gazowych, które dopiero co nakazywaliście montować jako ekologiczne, bo był Nord Stream i Niemcy na tym dużo zarabiali. Polacy zamontowali już ponad milion takich pieców i teraz mają się przestawiać na pompy ciepła, bo wam akurat przestał lecieć gaz w Nord Streamie. Koszt montażu pompy ciepła jest większy niż roczne zarobki większości Polaków. Do tego klimat u nas jest inny i zapłacimy dużo więcej niż wy, plus oczywiście koszty biurokracji, tych certyfikatów. To jest szaleństwo, to jest szaleństwo co chcecie zrobić. Szaleństwo.

Malte Gallée (Verts/ALE). – Frau Präsidentin, Frau Kommissarin! Wir steuern geradezu in eine Klimakrise. Wir merken es jedes Jahr immer mehr, jetzt gerade am Po in Italien. Wir steuern darauf zu. Wir müssen jetzt handeln! 40 % unserer Treibhausgase nur aus dem Gebäudesektor sind ein Riesensfeld, das wir anpacken können. Und mit dieser Gebäudeenergieeffizienzrichtlinie steuern wir in genau die Richtung.

Jetzt frage ich mich aber: Was ist denn in den ganzen letzten Monaten passiert? Woher kamen denn die ganzen Fake News? Ich bin der festen Überzeugung, dass das gesteuert wird von einer rechten Macht, die keinen Bock darauf hat, dass meine Generation, das all die Studis, all die jungen Leute eine Perspektive haben, erstens auf diesem Planeten noch gut leben zu können und zweitens irgendwie ihre Energiekosten tragen zu können.

Was passiert denn mit all den Studierenden, die momentan in irgendwelchen schlecht gedämmten Gebäuden sitzen? Die leiden darunter, dass sie so schlecht gedämmt sind. Also reißen sie sich zusammen und unterstützen sie dieses Gesetzesprojekt morgen!

Clare Daly (The Left). – Madam President, I have to say it is an awful shame that a committee report that was pretty progressive under Ciarán Cuffe's direction, and which improved so much on the Commission's insipid proposal, has been so badly hollowed out by some groups inside this Parliament. Of course, there are still some positive elements in here, and let's hope they make it through the final votes. But it really is disappointing that so much of the ambition has been sucked out of these proposals and out of the minimum performance standards, in particular.

Now, as colleagues have said, our buildings are responsible for nearly 40% of the EU's greenhouse gas emissions. This needs to be addressed and it needs to be comprehensively addressed. We are in the middle of an energy crisis. We're staring down the barrel of a future earth that will be uninhabitable for our grandchildren – not our great grandchildren, our grandchildren. We need to take action. It's not the time to lock in low standards and high emissions for the next 20 years. I really appeal to colleagues to vote not to water this down tomorrow.

Pietro Fiocchi (ECR). – Signora Presidente, signora Commissario, onorevoli colleghi, l'Italia ha dato il 110% di copertura finanziaria fiscale per fare il salto energetico e in due anni hanno fatto meno di 500 000 appartamenti. Adesso si chiede di fare 9 milioni di appartamenti all'Italia in dieci anni. Non succederà, anche perché una delle cose che è successa è che il costo del materiale coibentate e dei proteggi è salito del 150% o 200%.

E poi invece, un argomento molto più serio per la Commissione: il radon, che è un gas naturale radioattivo che esce dal terreno e che c'è in Italia, nella Repubblica Ceca, in Finlandia e in Spagna. Il coibentare gli edifici vuol dire racchiudere il radon ancora in maniera più efficiente all'interno di edifici, che vuol dire un aumento dei casi di cancro ai polmoni per la popolazione che vive in quegli edifici.

Per cui chiedo alla Commissione di considerare il radon come una cosa molto importante e predisporre tutta una serie di attività per la misurazione e per le azioni correttive.

Sandra Pereira (The Left). – Senhora Presidente, não duvidamos do potencial que a renovação dos edifícios nos Estados-Membros da União Europeia poderá ter numa poupança e redução do consumo de energia, na promoção da melhoria da qualidade do ar, na redução de emissões, na diminuição de custos e num aumento da resiliência dos sistemas energéticos.

Defendemos que deve ser dada prioridade aos consumidores mais vulneráveis e aos agregados familiares de menores rendimentos em todas as iniciativas relacionadas com a eficiência energética e com a renovação dos edifícios. Esta prioridade deve ser refletida na dotação indicativa por país dos fundos europeus a afetar a estas finalidades.

O que não aceitamos é que a necessária renovação dos edifícios para efeitos de eficiência energética seja mais um motivo para o aumento da especulação nos preços da habitação ou mais um pretexto para as multinacionais do setor energético continuarem a exibir lucros escandalosos, enquanto a maioria das pessoas não consegue manter a casa quente no inverno ou fresca no verão.

Fabio Massimo Castaldo (NI). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, nel Paese della bugia la verità è una malattia, diceva Collodi. Un aforisma sempre valido nel mio, dove la direttiva sulla prestazione energetica nell'edilizia è spesso presentata come un attacco verso il patrimonio immobiliare dei cittadini.

In realtà, il testo ha ampie deroghe ed esenzioni. Sono assenti sanzioni automatiche, limitazioni alla vendita e c'è anche un ricalcolo delle classi energetiche. Insomma, siamo in piena crisi energetica: gli edifici sono responsabili del 40% dei consumi e del 36% delle emissioni di gas a effetto serra e la direttiva ci aiuta, invece, a sganciarci proprio dalla Russia e dagli altri regimi autoritari in termini di approvvigionamento energetico. Quindi noi la sosteniamo.

Ma voglio essere molto chiaro su un punto: la *conditio sine qua non* per noi è l'istituzione di un fondo europeo di riqualificazione finanziato dal debito comune, così come previsto dall'articolo 9, paragrafo 6. È dirimente che si faccia insieme questo sforzo di rinnovamento del parco edifici, perché se così non fosse, visti i diversi spazi fiscali, rischieremo di non raggiungere gli obiettivi e di creare distorsioni e disegualanze. No all'immobilismo dell'immobiliare, sì a un intervento con risorse certe per costruire insieme un futuro più verde, più giusto e più sostenibile.

(Koniec zgłoszeń z sali)

Kadri Simson, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, thank you for all your comments and the specific amendments also in the ITRE report.

Let me once again highlight how important steady progress is in the building sector. By targeting the buildings that waste the most energy first, so-called worst-performing buildings, the EPBD targets those buildings where the poorest people often live, which cushions them from spiralling energy bills.

Although different views have been expressed, even critical remarks, I can read the majority support for an ambitious position on energy-efficient renovation of buildings, as reflected in the Commission proposal. The provisions on minimum energy performance standards are among the most important ones in the revision of the EPBD to achieve the 2030 and 2050 targets. Without them, it is difficult to provide clear signals to citizens, investors and financial institutions that renovation should accelerate.

Clear measures with adequate timelines are necessary. Renovations require planning, not only for building owners, but also for markets and investors. Exemptions and adaptations for some of our buildings are also necessary and warranted, and the ITRE report has taken this also into account.

On financing needs, the renovation wave has facilitated an unprecedented increase of EU and public funds for building renovation for the coming years. In addition, the Social Climate Fund to be adopted will provide the necessary mid- to long-term financial support to building renovations targeting vulnerable citizens and also SMEs as a priority to ensure that no one is left behind.

So, once again, we need a swift adoption of an ambitious EPBD, and I trust that you will support this approach tomorrow.

Ciarán Cuffe, rapporteur. – Madam President, Commissioner Simson, 'We shape our buildings; thereafter they shape us.' Those were the words of Winston Churchill talking about the bicameral political system in the UK. But actually, those words resonate with the directive that's in front of us this evening.

Yes, it is about shaping buildings, but it is also about shaping the future of our planet and leaving it in a fit and healthy state. The beauty of this directive is that it is not just about buildings. It is about creating jobs. It is about tackling climate change, and it is about achieving a just transition.

I absolutely acknowledge the words from my shadow rapporteurs. Seán Kelly, you spoke about the flexibility – that flexibility is implicit in this directive. Tsvetelina Penkova spoke about protecting citizens from energy poverty – this is at the heart of what is being proposed and supporting the vulnerable. Morten Petersen said, 'Look, we want to reduce our use of gas and we want to tackle climate change' – that makes absolute sense.

Isabella Tovaglieri said... Oh, she's not here. Well, actually, she wasn't at the first shadows meeting. She wasn't at any of the other shadows meetings, ten in all. She wasn't even at the ITRE vote. And she spoke about dignity and respect. Well, if you want to show dignity and respect to a piece of legislation, at least show up for the meetings. Marisa Matias from The Left talked about aligning social justice and climate justice – this makes absolute sense within this proposal.

Can I conclude for a moment in talking about the money? People are concerned about the costs, and yes, costs are high at the moment. But help is there, not just from the Recovery and Resilience Fund, but from many other sources of funding within the European Union. I mean, Deputy Rzońca from Poland spoke about 'where is the money?' – there's 3.5 billion available for Poland from the Recovery and Resilience Fund, for renovating buildings. The European Investment Bank says they will provide money at an interest rate of -1%.

So in conclusion, the funds are there and not only there, but we also want to provide more funding from the multiannual financial framework. So I recommend and commend this legislation to the House.

Przewodnicząca. — Zamykam debatę.

Głosowanie odbędzie się we wtorek 14 marca 2023 r.

Oświadczenia pisemne (art. 171)

Andrus Ansip (Renew), kirjalikult. – Pea iga kuues hoone Euroopas on kõige kehvemate tõhususnäitajatega (G-energiaklass). Euroopas kasutatavast energiast kulub umbes 40% hoonete kütmiseks. Hoonete energiatõhusaks renoveerimine tasub ennast reeglina ära, kuna saadav energiasääst on üldjuhul mitu korda suurem hoone energiatõhususe parandamiseks vajalikust investeeringust. Antud eelnõuga seatud sihtide saavutamiseks ettenähtud aeg on aga ebarealistlikult lühike. Ambitsioonikate eesmärkide saavutamiseks on vajalik kvaliteetsema eelnõu olemasolu. On vaja selget plaani, millisel viisil peaksid tulema hoonete renoveerimiseks vajalikud vahendid, kuid eelnõu sellele küsimusele ammen-davat vastust ei anna. Euroopa Parlament ja liikmesriigid on leppinud kokku, et Euroopa heitkogustega kauplemise süsteemi laiendatakse ka ehitussektorile. Paraku hakkab hoonete energiatõhususe direktiiv seda kokkulepet osaliselt dubleerima ja see ei ole heale õigusloomele kohane.

Eelnõu ei paku ka selgeid kvaliteedinõudeid hoonete renoveerimisjärgsele sisekliimale. Kõrgete energiahindade tõttu on kõikjal Euroopas juba asutud hoonete soojapidavust suurendama. Seega võib arvata, et hoonete energiatõhususe parandamine jätkub hoogsalt ka ilma igasuguse Euroopa Liidu direktiivita. Rohepööre on kindlasti vajalik. Mittevõimetekohaste eesmärkide seadmine pigem diskrediteerib kliimaeesmärke, kui kannustab nende poole püüdlema. See on eelnõule ilmselt kõige olulisem etteheide.

András Gyürk (NI), írásban. – A biztonságos energiaellátás megteremtése és a megfizethető energiához való hozzáférés biztosítása az Európai Unió és a tagállamok egyik legfontosabb feladata. Ennek teljesítéséhez az alacsony szén-dioxid kibocsátással bíró energiakapacitások fejlesztése mellett az energiahatékonyságban rejlő lehetőségek maximális kihasználására is szükség van. Tennünk kell az európai épületállomány energetikai korszerűsítése érdekében, ezért időszerű és indokolt az épületenergetikai irányelv módosítása. A sikeres épületfelújítási programok keresztülvételének elengedhetetlen feltétele a megfelelő adatok rendelkezésre állása. Ezért is bír nagy jelentőséggel, hogy a szabályozásban a beépített karbon és az életciklus alapú értékelések jelennek meg.

Ezen túl az új irányelv fontos részét képezik a digitalizáció és a fenntartható mobilitás erősítését célzó rendelkezések. Azonban a Ház előtt lévő javaslat nem veszi kellőképpen figyelembe a megvalósíthatóságot, valamint a tagállami nemzeti sajátosságokat és a történelmi-kulturális hagyományokat. A baloldal által összeállított jelentésben javasolt módosítások túlzottan bürokratikusak, erőltetettek és jelentősen növekvő pénzügyi és adminisztrációs terheket okozhatnak a tagállamoknak és a családoknak. Ezek a javaslatok nem segítik, hanem hátráltatják az európai épületállomány energetikai korszerűsítését. A baloldal felelőtlen és abszurd ötleteivel egy újabb fontos területet lehetetlenítene el. Ez kockázatos – a hatékony épületfelújítási programokhoz felelős tervezésen és rugalmas szabályozáson, nem pedig irreális célokra és bürokráciánövelésen keresztül vezet az út.

Robert Hajšel (S&D), *písomne*. – Ak by sa túto smernicu naozaj podarilo úspešne dostať do praxe a naozaj by došlo k podstatnému zvýšeniu energetickej účinnosti budov, bude to do budúcnosti znamenať menej emisií škodlivých látok do ovzdušia, podstatné úspory energií a v nasledujúcich rokoch aj stavebný boom a nové možnosti pre podnikateľský sektor.

Toto opatrenie má ale veľké úskalia v oblasti obstarávacích nákladov a prístupu k financovaniu nových technológií, najmä zo strany občanov a majiteľov rodinných domov. Mínusom pre krajiny ako Slovensko s obrovskou plynofikáciou je snaha obmedziť používanie plynových, dokonca aj kondenzačných kotlov a vsádzanie všetkého na jednu zelenú kartu.

Úspešne sa dá tento proces renovácie budov a zavádzanie zelených technológií, ako sú teplovzdušné čerpadlá alebo slnečné panely, uskutočniť iba, ak si nová vláda dá za prioritu nastavenie mechanizmu optimálneho využitia disponibilných európskych peňazí na túto oblasť. V žiadnom prípade totiž náklady s tým spojené nemôžu hradiť v plnej miere občania.

Eugen Jurzyca (ECR), *písomne*. – Pri tomto návrhu nie je dobre odôvodnené, prečo sa majú zavádzať pravidlá energetickej hospodárnosti pre takmer všetky budovy. Mali by sme sa sústrediť na tie rekonštrukcie, ktoré zabezpečia najväčšiu úsporu energií pri najnižšej cene. Lebo peňazí nemáme nekonečne veľa.

Aj podľa časopisu *The Economist* (What is the cheapest way to cut carbon?, 2021) nie je efektívne zavádzať pravidlá energetickej hospodárnosti na všetky budovy. Pri niektorých je cena odstránenia emisií CO₂ sedemkrát vyššia, ako odstraňovanie emisií CO₂ pomocou systému EÚ pre obchodovanie s emisiami. Z tohto dôvodu budem hlasovať proti.

Elżbieta Kruk (ECR), *na piśmie*. – Cele dyrektywy o charakterystyce energetycznej budynków (EPBD), takie jak : osiągnięcie bardzo efektywnych energetycznie i zdekarbonizowanych zasobów budowlanych do 2050 roku; stworzenie stabilnego środowiska inwestycyjnego; umożliwienie konsumentom i przedsiębiorstwom podejmowania decyzji dotyczących oszczędności energetycznych i finansowych, są oczywiście niezbędne i mogą mieć pozytywny wpływ na obywateli, zwłaszcza w dzisiejszym kontekście inflacji, kryzysów energetycznych i wahań cen energii, jednak dyrektywa nie tworzy żadnych nowych funduszy, a poprawa charakterystyki energetycznej ma swoją cenę. Renowacje często wymagają dużych inwestycji z góry. Tekst ITRE nakłada nowe wymagania i zwiększa ambicje w porównaniu do wniosku Komisji w taki sposób, że stają się one nieosiągalne i bardzo kosztowne zarówno dla państw członkowskich, jak i dla konsumentów. Postuluje się między innymi o przyśpieszony harmonogram głębokich renowacji do budynków o niemal zerowym zużyciu energii i budynków zeroemisyjnych (ZEBs). Nowa definicja budynków zeroemisyjnych mówi, że taki tytuł otrzymają tylko budynki zasilane energią odnawialną, co wyklucza sieci ciepłownicze oparte na gazie, nawet te wysoce efektywne zgodne z definicją efektywności w EED.

Benoît Lutgen (PPE), *par écrit*. – L'accord proposé ici est nécessaire pour aider concrètement les Européens à pouvoir bénéficier de meilleures conditions de vie. Des bâtiments plus neutres énergétiquement vont avoir un impact positif sur la qualité de l'air et donc la santé, en baissant les émissions de CO₂. Ils réduiront également notre dépendance énergétique vis-à-vis de pays comme la Russie. Par conséquent, pour chaque famille, ce texte réduira les coûts qui explosent rapidement et deviennent ingérables. De plus, rénover les bâtiments aura un impact positif sur l'emploi. En effet, en prenant ce genre de décisions, l'Europe incite à (re)développer la filière des métiers de la construction, en ce compris en termes d'outils d'intégration. Cette proposition semble idéale. J'aimerais néanmoins souligner deux choses. D'une part, il faut veiller à ne pas créer une nouvelle forme de pauvreté, en rendant les locations inabordables. Aujourd'hui, en Belgique, les familles monoparentales peinent à trouver un logement adapté à leur famille et qui leur laisse de quoi vivre par ailleurs. D'autre part, il faut soutenir les citoyens dans le financement de ces rénovations, par exemple via des prêts à taux zéro, tel que l'a proposé mon parti, Les Engagés, en Belgique.

Guido Reil (ID), *schriftlich*. – Damit die EU ihre klima-totalitaristischen Ziele erreichen kann, wird jetzt eine Zwangssanierung eingeführt. Die EU greift immer stärker in die Wahlfreiheiten und Grundrechte der Bürger ein. Diese Politik ist wesentlich asozial und zeigt wie weit die Kommission und das Parlament von der Realität entfernt sind. Wir leben in Zeiten steigender Immobilienpreise, expandierender Energiekosten, Fachkräftemangel und Inflation. Vor kurzem wurde das Emissionshandelssystem auf Gebäude ausgedehnt. Diese Richtlinie zur Energieeffizienz von Gebäuden wird Wohnen noch teurer machen und viele Hauseigentümer und Haushalte überfordern. Sollen diese Pläne umgesetzt werden, müssten 58 Prozent der deutschen Wohnimmobilien bis 2033 saniert werden, um eine Energieklasse von mindestens D zu erreichen. Gut 46 Prozent der Eigentümer in Deutschland wissen übrigens nicht, welche Energieklasse ihr Gebäude überhaupt hat. Für ein Einfamilienhaus mit 160 Quadratmetern Wohnfläche geht „Haus & Grund“ von Kosten in Höhe von 93 950 Euro aus. Unsere Bürger werden von sowohl den nationalen als EU-politischen Eliten abgezockt. Obwohl in Deutschland von 2010 bis 2018 insgesamt 496 Milliarden Euro in die energetische Gebäudesanierung flos-

sen, hat dies kaum Auswirkungen gezeigt. Statt das Leben für unsere Bürger immer unerschwinglicher zu machen, sollten die politischen Entscheidungsträger sich mit den tatsächlichen Herausforderungen auseinandersetzen, wie die schädlichen Folgen der illegalen Einwanderung, die wachsende Kriminalität und der enorme Pflegebedarf.

Mihai Tudose (S&D), *în scris*. – Susțin obiectivele noii legislații propuse de Comisia Europeană, dar nu aprob termenele de impunere a unor standarde minime de performanță energetică. Ajutorul împotriva sărăciei energetice, sprijinirea campaniilor de renovare a clădirilor și introducerea unor standarde de performanță energetică sunt absolut necesare în Uniunea Europeană, în condițiile în care clădirile consumă 40% din energia UE și aproape 75% din parcul imobiliar european este inefficient energetic în prezent.

Consider nerealistă, însă, obligativitatea introdusă pentru cetățenii europeni ca locuințele lor să atingă până în 2030 cel puțin clasa E de performanță energetică și până în 2033 cel puțin clasa D de performanță energetică.

Încă o dată, Comisia Europeană fixează termene nesustenabile, la fel ca pentru trecerea la motoarele electrice ori renunțarea la gazele naturale. Remarc din nou, cu regret, atât tendința de supra-reglementare a Comisiei Europene, cât și dogmatismul său rupt de agenda cetățenilor.

Sper că negocierea cu Consiliul va duce la ajustarea acestei reforme legislative, a cărei menire trebuie, în fapt, să fie sprijinirea cetățenilor și nu împovărea lor suplimentară, într-un context social și energetic deja atât de tensionat.

Witold Jan Waszczykowski (ECR), *na piśmie*. – Sprawozdanie zmieniające dyrektywę w sprawie charakterystyki energetycznej budynków to kolejny przykład szkodliwej społecznie polityki dyktowanej zaciętwieniem ideologicznym lewicowo-liberalnych elit europejskich. Żyjąc w oderwaniu od codziennej rzeczywistości, elity te stawiają przed obywatelami nierealistyczne cele, których koszt będzie tym większy z uwagi na panującą w Europie dramatyczną sytuację gospodarczą. Stanowisko Parlamentu narzuca zakaz używania kotłów na paliwa kopalne w nowych budynkach oraz budynkach przechodzących gruntowne renowacje, robiąc wyjątek jedynie dla systemów hybrydowych. Zapis ten nie bierze pod uwagę różnic w poziomie rozwoju i strukturze gospodarczej państw członkowskich. Zupełnie zignorowane zostały możliwości ekonomiczne obywateli niezbędne do zastosowania się do narzucanych zmian technicznych. Niestety, nawet powracający do nas kryzys energetyczny, w dużej mierze spotęgowany trwającą na Ukrainie rosyjską agresją, nie przyniósł otrzeźwienia. Zamiast wzmacniać rodzimy przemysł, w tym przemysł ciężki, zamiast forsować przepisy, które pozwolą Europie konkurować z gospodarkami azjatyckimi, europejska lewica spod znaku ekologistów skazuje nas wszystkich na porażkę.

14. Działalność Europejskiego Rzecznika Praw Obywatelskich – sprawozdanie roczne za 2021 r. (debata)

Przewodnicząca. – Kolejnym punktem porządku dziennego jest sprawozdanie roczne sporządzone przez Anne-Sophie Pelletier w imieniu Komisji Petycji w sprawie działalności Europejskiego Rzecznika Praw Obywatelskich w 2021 r. (2022/2141(INI)) (A9-0054/2023).

Anne-Sophie Pelletier, *rapporteuse*. – Madame la Présidente, je tiens tout d'abord à vous adresser, Madame O'Reilly, mes sincères remerciements, ainsi qu'à votre bureau, pour tout le travail que vous avez accompli en 2021. L'Union européenne peut être fière de disposer d'une institution qui travaille sans cesse à la recherche d'un équilibre entre le droit de travailler des institutions de l'Union et l'intérêt public à disposer d'une administration transparente et responsable.

En commission PETI, nous avons la chance de travailler main dans la main avec le bureau de M^{me} la Médiatrice. Notre coopération indispensable a un double objectif: accroître la responsabilité des institutions de l'Union et porter directement la voix des citoyens au Parlement. Vos efforts sont éminemment importants pour nous en tant que représentants directs des citoyens, car ils permettent de renforcer à la fois la démocratie représentative mais aussi la démocratie participative, ainsi que d'accroître la légitimité du processus décisionnel de l'Union.

Inscrit dans les traités et dans la Charte, le droit de saisir le Médiateur européen est une pierre angulaire du droit primaire de l'Union. Symbole de transparence, impartialité, responsabilité et garantie des droits fondamentaux de tout citoyen. Et c'est bien pour répondre aux demandes d'aide des citoyens qu'en 2021, vous avez ouvert 338 enquêtes, dont 332 sur la base de plaintes et six enquêtes d'initiative et clôturé 305 enquêtes.

Transparence, responsabilité, culture du service, bon exercice des pouvoirs discrétionnaires. Voilà les principaux thèmes abordés dans les enquêtes clôturées en 2021. Parmi les autres thèmes abordés figurent le respect des droits fondamentaux, le recrutement, le pantouflage, la bonne gestion financière, la participation des citoyens au processus décisionnel de l'Union et les questions éthiques.

Conformément à la stratégie Cap sur 2024, le travail de votre bureau a augmenté en 2021 avec l'ouverture d'un plus grand nombre d'enquêtes et d'initiatives sur un large éventail de questions. Et pour ces raisons, nous avons convenu qu'il est essentiel d'allouer un budget adéquat au Médiateur afin d'avoir des ressources nécessaires pour gérer l'ensemble de la charge de travail.

Je vous félicite pour votre engagement répété en faveur de la lutte contre les affaires de pantouflage. Votre bureau a notamment ouvert une vaste enquête stratégique sur la manière dont la Commission a géré ce pantouflage. Vous avez été attentive à ce que l'accès à des documents présentant un intérêt pour le plus grand public soit octroyé, notamment avec la révision de la procédure accélérée. Et à ce propos, j'ai veillé à souligner deux éléments primordiaux dans le texte: que la transparence et l'accès du public aux documents des institutions de l'Union doivent être assurés, que la révision de la loi Transparence constitue une priorité afin de placer l'Union à la pointe du progrès en la matière.

Et c'est grâce à votre enquête que nous avons pris connaissance de l'existence des SMS échangés entre Ursula von der Leyen et le président de Pfizer. Tous les groupes politiques ont travaillé à souligner l'attention portée par votre bureau aux questions éthiques ainsi qu'aux questions relatives à la transparence et à la prise de décision.

Tout au long de l'année 2021, vous avez accompli un travail aussi remarquable d'enquête sur le respect et la protection des droits fondamentaux, principales valeurs de l'Union. Deux enquêtes d'initiative sont ici primordiales. L'une sur la manière dont Frontex se conforme à ses obligations, l'autre sur comment la Commission veille à l'utilisation des fonds européens pour promouvoir le droit des personnes en situation de handicap et des personnes âgées à une vie autonome.

J'en parle dans mon rapport LIBE vers l'égalité des droits pour les personnes en situation de handicap et je souhaite le répéter ici, votre engagement en tant que membre du cadre de l'Union européenne pour la Convention des Nations Unies relative aux droits des personnes handicapées est essentiel afin de protéger, promouvoir et surveiller sa bonne mise en œuvre par les institutions de l'Union.

Chers collègues, quand l'inconnu et l'ombre sèment le doute, ce sont la clarté et la lumière qui nous rassurent. De la transparence, de la confiance. Alors demain, soyons à la hauteur de la confiance de ceux qui nous ont confié les clés de la démocratie européenne. Montrons à nos citoyens que le Parlement peut parler d'une seule voix.

Emily O'Reilly, *European Ombudsman*. – Madam President, Vice President Šefčovič, good evening, everybody. Let me begin by thanking rapporteur Pelletier, the shadow rapporteurs and the entire Petitions Committee for their strong endorsement of our work in 2021.

The COVID crisis continued to dominate much of our lives that year, but since then the multiple crises provoked by Russia's invasion of Ukraine have done so. The loss of life has been immense, as has the devastation of families forced to flee their homes to the safety of the EU and elsewhere.

The telling of the Ukrainian story includes passionate appeals for the protection of democratic values and for the safeguarding of democratic institutions. It is those democratic institutions that are our first line of defence against the weakening of the rule of law and against corruption.

Late last year, the Qatargate scandal emerged with allegations of the buying of European Parliamentary influence by foreign governments. The power that this Parliament exerts was demonstrated by the fact that this was, and is, a globally reported story.

The European Parliament has power that both good and bad actors wish to influence and exploit. It is also the body that citizens look to as the protector of their rights, so it is imperative for trust to be restored. I am therefore pleased that the process of internal reform of Parliament's rules on ethics has begun, and it is in everyone's interests that it be as transparent as possible.

Transparency continues to be a key area of my work. It is the means by which EU citizens can exercise their Treaty-based right to take part in the democratic life of the Union.

The year 2021 marked twenty years since the EU's access to documents Regulation 1049/2001 came into force. Following a complaint, I opened an inquiry into how the Commission handled an access to documents request for text messages between its President and the CEO of Pfizer. I found maladministration, as the initial position of the Commission was that such messages do not constitute potentially releasable documents under the Access Regulation. However, Regulation 1049/2001 makes it perfectly clear that it is the content that matters, and not the medium. If text messages concern EU policies and decisions, they should be treated as EU documents.

I asked eight EU institutions and agencies what measures they have in place for documenting work-related texts and instant messaging, and then published practical recommendations to help the EU administration. I was glad to note the Commission's positive engagement with those recommendations in subsequent meetings with other institutions on this matter.

I looked at how the EU administration deals with moves by its staff to the private sector – so-called 'revolving doors'. I found that the European Defence Agency should have forbidden its former chief executive from becoming a strategic adviser at aerospace firm Airbus due to a conflict of interest risk.

This case mirrors a 2020 case in which the head of the European Banking Authority had been permitted to take up a position with a major financial lobbying firm. Both bodies agreed to implement my recommendations on the forbidding of problematic moves and on providing clear guidelines for staff.

I also began a broad investigation into how the Commission deals with 'revolving doors'. An analysis of 100 files revealed a tendency to underestimate the potentially corrosive effects of the phenomenon, and a consequential reluctance to forbid jobs temporarily when they posed unacceptable risks. The Commission has since agreed to strengthen its implementation of the rules.

In 2021, I concluded an inquiry into how Frontex deals with alleged human rights breaches through its complaints mechanism. I asked Frontex to make clear to its officers that they should accept and transmit any complaints they receive, and that Frontex information materials should also make clear that complainants would not be penalised for submitting a complaint.

EU citizens also have a strong interest in knowing how EU policies and EU-funded projects affect the environment. In 2021, I therefore suggested that the European Investment Bank provide greater public information on the environmental implications of the projects it finances.

I also opened an inquiry into how the Commission will ensure transparency and accountability in the implementation of the EU's EUR 700 billion Recovery and Resilience Facility, and I note the positive work of Parliament on this matter.

I would close by also noting our 2021 Awards for Good Administration, through which my office acknowledges the great work done by EU public servants. The 2021 overall award winners, the European Commission's Directorate-General for Civil Protection and Humanitarian Aid and the European External Action Service, helped to repatriate over half a million EU citizens stranded around the world due to COVID.

Our next Awards ceremony for 2023 will take place in June and will showcase some remarkable projects undertaken by the EU administration, including by this Parliament. I look forward to sharing them with you and with the public.

In the meantime, and with your support, I will continue to do my part in promoting accountability, transparency and trust in the EU's bodies and institutions. The EU is not just an economic force in the world. It is also a moral force for good. As such, its administration needs to set and lead by example. I thank you again for your support and cooperation.

Maroš Šefčovič, *Vice-President of the Commission*. – Madam President, honourable Members of the European Parliament, dear Madam O'Reilly, it's a pleasure to be here to discuss the European Parliament's report and resolution on the activities of the European Ombudsman in 2021.

First, I would like to say *grand merci, notre rapporteur, Madame Pelletier*, but also the coordinators of the PETI Committee and its members for their work in undertaking this annual exercise, providing the views of the European Parliament on the issues that it considers noteworthy and important in the area of good administration for citizens, businesses and associations.

As highlighted in the report and resolution, the work of the European Ombudsman is important for finding a balance between the EU institutions' output and the public interest in an EU administration that delivers the highest standards of integrity and accountability.

Given the role of the European Commission in the institutional framework, it is normal that it is the institution most frequently concerned by the Ombudsman inquiries and initiatives. Indeed, in 2021, 208 out of 338 inquiries were addressed to the Commission, representing some 61.5%.

The European Commission makes constant efforts to provide citizens, businesses and associations with the best possible administration and with the most appropriate solutions and responses to the European Ombudsman requests.

As in previous years, the relations between the European Commission and the European Ombudsman have been positive, constructive and fruitful. The European Ombudsman continues to fulfil its duty as a mediator, facilitator and intermediary between the complainants and the European institutions, bodies, offices and agencies.

Numerous contacts and exchanges and meetings contribute to a better understanding of the issues at stake and the best possible outcomes. Solution proposals, suggestions for improvement and recommendations are taken into account and implemented whenever feasible. Together with a real dialogue and mutual understanding between our respective services, that is precisely why it is very rare for an inquiry to end up with the final closing decision of maladministration.

The report and resolution refers to issues such as transparency and accountability of the overall EU administration in the context of the COVID-19 crisis, the need to pursue legislative work in partnership with the EU co-legislators, access to documents or the Commission's role in handling revolving doors situations.

Also in 2021, the new statute of the European Ombudsman entered into force, granting additional rights and emphasising the importance of good administration in sensitive fields like harassment, whistle-blowing and conflicts of interests.

Recently, new implementing provisions of the statute were submitted for consultation to the Parliament and the Council and the Commission, and we have since delivered a positive opinion. These new provisions will serve to complement the European Ombudsman work.

Finally, as usual, the Commission will duly examine the Parliament's resolution in the coming weeks and will reply in detail to the issues raised therein. I will stop here, Madam President, because I am looking forward to hear the views of the Members and I would like to thank you all for the attention.

VORSITZ: EVELYN REGNER*Vizepräsidentin*

Peter Jahr, im Namen der PPE-Fraktion. – Frau Präsidentin, sehr geehrte Frau O'Reilly, Herr Vizepräsident Šefčovič. Ich habe mir vier Bemerkungen aufgeschrieben. Erstens: Die Ombudsfrau ist kein Mitglied der Europäischen Kommission, die Ombudsfrau ist auch kein Mitglied des Europäischen Parlaments. Sie ist auch kein Mitglied des Rates. Die Ombudsfrau ist für die Bürgerinnen und Bürger da. Und ehrlich, Frau O'Reilly, Sie haben Ihre facettenreiche Arbeit gut gemacht. Wenn ich kein Deutscher wäre, würde ich sogar sagen, Sie haben Ihre Arbeit sehr gut gemacht.

Ich freue mich, dass die Rolle der Ombudsfrau in Europa immer mehr von unseren Bürgern wahrgenommen wird. Man sieht es auch daran, dass sich im Jahr 2021 über 20 000 Bürgerinnen und Bürger an die Dienste des Bürgerbeauftragten um Hilfe wandten. Es wurden 338 Untersuchungen eingeleitet, davon 332 beschwerdebasiert und sechs aus eigener Initiative.

Das führt mich zu meiner zweiten Bemerkung: Ich denke, unsere Ombudsfrau hat das heikle politische Instrument der Untersuchungen aus eigener Initiative angemessen eingesetzt. Auch dafür unser Kompliment.

Und drittens das leidliche Thema zur Transparenz. Ich freue mich, dass wir im Bericht eine Formulierung gefunden haben, die der Problematik gerecht wird. Es ist alljährlich immer wieder der Streit. Ich sage es ganz offen: In meinen Augen – und vielleicht auch im Hinblick auf die deutsche Sprache – braucht man normalerweise kein beschreibendes Wort, um das Wort Transparenz zu definieren, denn transparent ist nun mal transparent. Mehr geht an und für sich nicht.

Aber wir haben eine Möglichkeit gefunden, das ordentlich zu formulieren, und ich freue mich, dass wir auch den Bericht – das ist meine vierte Bemerkung – im großen Konsens zwischen den Fraktionen verabschieden konnten. Denn ich bin immer der Meinung, man sollte aus dem Bericht der Ombudsfrau kein politisches *battlefield* machen. Und ein Dankeschön auch an unsere Berichterstatteerin, Frau Pelletier, die das auch hingekriegt hat, dass wir uns einigen konnten und morgen mit einer großen Mehrheit zustimmen können.

Mein Wunsch wäre, beim nächsten Mal könnten wir diese Einigkeit mit einer gemeinsamen Ausschussabstimmung im *shadow-meeting* noch fixieren. Das wäre quasi die Schlagsahne auf dem Eisbecher gewesen. Aber wir haben noch Reserven für das nächste Mal, und ich bedanke mich noch einmal für die Arbeit unserer Ombudsfrau.

Marc Angel, on behalf of the S&D Group. – Madam President, dear Commission Vice-President, dear Ombudsman Emily O'Reilly, and dear colleagues, first of all, I would like to thank our rapporteur, Anne-Sophie Pelletier, for the excellent work she has done on this file and the shadow rapporteurs, the colleagues, I think we did a good work to make this report a success.

Since her first election, our Ombudsman, Emily O'Reilly, has been working on increasing the standards of EU administration. This is not only making us happy here in the European Parliament but this is very important for our citizens and they appreciate it very much, so thank you very much for that work. We, the S&D, welcome very much the hard work of the small office of the Ombudsman that increased its efficiency and has proven to have an important role to bridge the gap between EU citizens and the EU institutions.

The structural organisation and the efficiency of the Ombudsman's office, the need for full transparency, the management of the COVID-19 crisis, the management of our agencies, the avoidance of the risk of conflict of interest for officials from EU institutions – all these are topics covered by the Ombudsman and included also in our report and very important subjects.

Transparency is the basis for our citizens' trust and we must make sure to honour it, especially when it comes to the use of public money. Access to work-related documents is very important and has been discussed in your report, in our report, also including instant messages, the access to which must be included and guaranteed.

Indeed, in this particular period, it is important to demonstrate our capability to be close to our citizens. Fundamental rights are the core values of the European Union and they should apply to all of our policies also inside the institution when it comes to ensuring equal access to work and teleworking for all workers, especially persons with disability but also when it comes to the management of our agencies such as Frontex.

I am glad to see how the Ombudsman's recommendation can help to improve our internal functioning in terms of transparency, accountability, but also make our institutions and agencies a better place to work.

I would like to apologise to the Ombudsman and to the President that I will leave now because I'm going to the EP Bureau where we discuss cooling-off period, which is also a subject which you are very interested in. So thank you very much and keep on your good work.

Marie-Pierre Vedrenne, *au nom du groupe Renew*. – Madame la présidente, Monsieur le Commissaire, madame la Médiatrice, chers collègues, 2021 demeurera une année marquée par la poursuite de la pandémie mondiale de la Covid, mais aussi l'année de la sortie de ce choc grâce à la vaccination.

Madame la Médiatrice, tout au long de cette année mouvementée, vous avez continué, tout comme la rapporteure et les rapporteurs fictifs, à mettre l'accent sur un principe fondamental, celui de la transparence. L'achat groupé de vaccins nous a permis de protéger les Européens. La carence de transparence, alimentée sur certains bancs de cet hémicycle, aura elle, à l'inverse, contribué à alimenter toutes les théories du complot, nuisant à nos efforts et, plus gravement, à une sortie de crise.

Cette situation démontre que nous ne pouvons que nous engager dans une transparence exemplaire afin de conforter, voire rétablir la confiance de tous nos citoyens, et ceci dans tous les domaines. Votre rapport annuel de 2021 porte aussi sur le pantouflage ou encore la manière dont la Commission mène sa politique commerciale.

Vous dites, et nous sommes nombreux aussi à le dire, que nos accords de commerce, au-delà d'être des instruments de protection de nos ambitions, au-delà d'être des leviers pour la défense de nos intérêts, doivent faire l'objet de véritables débats publics. C'est primordial.

Madame la Médiatrice, durant cette année 2021, ce sont plus de 20 000 citoyens qui se sont adressés à vous, à vos services, que vous avez guidés. Vous avez participé à crédibiliser l'Union européenne. Vous lui avez permis d'évoluer vers une Europe plus transparente, plus juste, plus proche des citoyens. Et, tout comme mes collègues, mon groupe continuera à agir également dans ce sens.

Margrete Auken, *for Verts/ALE-Gruppen*. – Fru formand! Først og fremmest tak til ordføreren for en god betænkning. Jeg vil lige sige, at De Grønne kommer atter til at stemme for disse tre ændringsforslag fra ECR. Vi synes faktisk, de er gode, og forstår ikke rigtig, hvorfor man ikke stemmer for dem. Men så først og fremmest jo også tak til Emily O'Reilly, og jeg vil ikke gentage alle de roser, der kommer af de kommentarer. Det er der ikke tid til, for jeg har så kort tid, men jeg vil bare lige sige: Vi har her i EU en rigtig ombudsmand, og det skal vi altså passe på, at vi bliver ved med at have. Fordi jeg har jo fornemmelsen af, fra de gange jeg har været med til valget – og det er en del – at det kniber med helt at forstå, hvad en ombudsmand er.

Og lad mig så sige her, at der er én ting, jeg godt lige vil fremhæve fra Emily O'Reillys arbejde. Og det er ikke fra i år, det er fra 2018. Og det var, da vi fik beretningen, den særlige beretning, om at få åbenhed i Rådets arbejde, så borgerne og pressen kan følge med i, hvad deres egne regeringer laver. Og først når vi for alvor får det, lever vi op til traktatens løfte til borgerne om, at de kan deltage i demokratiet. Når de ikke ved, hvad deres egne regeringer laver, ja, hvordan skulle de så kunne have tillid til, at det foregår ordentligt? Og den beretning vil jeg gerne takke for igen, men også sige, at her har vi altså meget at komme med, og jeg vil meget opfordre vores regeringer til, at de omsider begynder at tage det her alvorligt.

Kosma Złotowski, *w imieniu grupy ECR*. – Pani Przewodnicząca! Pani Rzecznik! Panie Komisarzu! Instytucje europejskie są w poważnym kryzysie. Do deficytu demokracji i braku przejrzystości wielu decyzji podejmowanych w Brukseli możemy dodać kolejne poważne problemy niszczące wiarygodność, wiarygodność Unii Europejskiej, takie jak korupcja, która wstrząsnęła Parlamentem Europejskim w ostatnich miesiącach, oraz niejasne procedury w zakresie konfliktu interesów w Komisji Europejskiej, o czym mowa była dzisiaj.

Pandemia, która była głównym wyzwaniem, na jakie państwa członkowskie i Unia Europejska musiały odpowiedzieć w ostatnich latach, także obnażyła szereg słabości i zaniedbań, które wymagają dokładnego wyjaśnienia. Proces negocjacji, zakupu i dostaw szczepionek do dziś budzi pytania o granice dostępu do informacji publicznej i efektywność wydawania środków publicznych. Liczymy na Pani aktywność i nieustępliwość w szukaniu na nie odpowiedzi. Chcę także podziękować Pani Anne-Sophie Pelletier za sprawozdanie, które poprzemy.

Virginie Joron, *au nom du groupe ID*. – Madame la présidente, Madame O'Reilly, Monsieur le Commissaire, chers collègues, Madame la Médiatrice, tout d'abord, merci et bravo pour votre travail. Depuis que vous dirigez cette institution, vous avez combattu pour la transparence et contre les cas de mauvaise administration à Bruxelles. Vous avez osé critiquer les achats par la Commission de 1,5 million de masques défectueux et surtout la négociation par SMS de vaccins Pfizer-BioNTech.

Vous avez aussi révélé que le pantouflage n'est pas contrôlé au sein de la Commission. En 2019, sur 1 000 demandes de passages de fonctionnaire vers le secteur privé, l'exécutif européen n'en a bloqué que six. D'après LinkedIn, plus de 250 anciens employés de la Commission travailleraient pour Amazon, Google, Microsoft, Facebook ou Apple.

Combien d'ex-commissaires sont devenus des lobbyistes? Merci de nous avoir interpellés aussi sur l'opacité du lobbying de l'industrie du tabac. Nous avons besoin d'éthique, de confiance et d'honneur. Madame, je vous félicite aussi d'avoir ouvert une enquête lundi dernier sur les vols gratuits qui auraient été accordés par Qatar Airways à un directeur général de la Commission.

Je ne regrette qu'une seule chose, que vos recommandations soient souvent ignorées par la Commission de Bruxelles.

Francesca Donato (NI). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, complimenti e grazie alla relatrice e all'Ombudsman per l'ottimo lavoro svolto.

Il lavoro della Mediatrice europea si è concentrato su problematiche relative alla mancanza di trasparenza e al permanere di conflitti di interessi all'interno delle istituzioni europee.

In particolare, la maggior parte dei dossier hanno riguardato la Commissione europea e sono stati rilevati diversi casi di mala amministrazione a suo carico, che hanno coinvolto anche la sua Presidente. Pare che qui, colleghi, siamo tutti d'accordo nel voler sostenere gli sforzi dell'Ombudsman, nel garantire più trasparenza, meno conflitti di interesse, maggiore partecipazione democratica ai cittadini europei.

Peccato però che poi, all'atto pratico, i presidenti dei gruppi di maggioranza, ma anche della Left e dei Verdi, abbiano votato in Conferenza dei presidenti contro la richiesta della commissione COVI di invitare per un'audizione la Presidente von der Leyen.

È questo il vostro coraggio e la vostra coerenza quando vi si chiede di agire per la trasparenza? Io vedo solo tanta ipocrisia e nessuna serietà.

Peter Pollák (PPE). – Vážená pani predsedajúca. Od pandémie Kovidu-19 začali výrazným spôsobom bludy, dezinformácie a klamstvá ovplyvňovať naše životy. Neskôr na to mnohí doplatili zdravím a niektorí už, žiaľ, nie sú medzi nami. Aj v mojej krajine boli schopní uveriť mnohí, že vo fľaštičke s čírou tekutinou s vakcínou podávajú lekári mikročip. Netreba z toho však viniť len samotných ľudí, ktorí týmto bludom uverili. Značný podiel viny majú na tom inštitúcie, ktoré neodpovedali na podnety a otázky. Keď ľudia nepoznajú fakty, sú nútení veriť tomu, čo nájdu na internete, prípadne tomu, čo počujú od známych. Čím menej informácií občanom poskytujeme, tým je väčšia príležitosť pre raketové šírenie konšpirácií a bludov. Dôsledky pretrvávajú, žiaľ, dodnes. Mnohí občania veria hoaxom v súvislosti s vojnou na Ukrajine.

Vážení priatelia, som rád, že ombudsmanka upozorňuje na pochybenia, kvôli ktorým ľudia strácajú vieru v európske inštitúcie. Dovoľte mi uviesť niektoré, ktorým sa vo svojej správe venuje. Bolo naozaj chybou, že Európska agentúra pre lieky nechcela poskytnúť ľuďom informácie o zložení vakcín. Rovnako vidím aj pochybenie v nedostatočnom informovaní či vybavovaní sťažností, pohraničnej agentúry a pohraničnej stráže agentúry Frontex. Aj tieto neposkytnuté informácie dali výrazným spôsobom priestor konšpirátorom v šírení bludov problematiky migrácie. Aktuálna vojna je plná konšpirácií, klamstiev, ktoré rozdeľujú spoločnosť a zvyšujú napätie medzi ľuďmi. Jediné, čo nás môže zachrániť, je komunikácia, poskytovanie informácií a šírenie pravdy. Verím, že táto správa prispeje k lepšej práci a k transparentnosti všetkých európskych inštitúcií.

Isabel García Muñoz (S&D). – Señora presidenta, señora O'Reilly, le felicitamos un año más por su labor como defensora del pueblo europeo, trabajando por que las instituciones europeas sean más cercanas, más accesibles y más transparentes para los ciudadanos.

Desde la Comisión de Control Presupuestario insistimos en que la transparencia, la buena administración y la rendición de cuentas son principios fundamentales para proteger el presupuesto europeo y para mantener la credibilidad en la Unión. Es necesario que el Parlamento sea ejemplar en ese sentido y, por tanto, debemos tomarnos muy en serio las recomendaciones que la defensora nos dirige, como la necesidad de reforzar el marco ético y de transparencia, publicar las reuniones con *lobbies*, reforzar el comité ético interno o presentar declaraciones de intereses más detalladas y controles más efectivos.

Como ponente del informe del Parlamento sobre la aprobación de la gestión para el ejercicio 2021, recibo esas recomendaciones positivamente, y así lo he recogido en mi informe, pero no podemos olvidar que la defensora ha señalado como mala administración la falta de transparencia de la Mesa respecto a la revisión de los gastos generales. Y yo añado, además de más transparencia, debería haberse tenido más ambición.

Nosotros cuestionamos y controlamos al resto de instituciones, a los Estados miembros, pero cuando hablamos de nuestro presupuesto, ahí, cambia la actitud. Señorías, hay que predicar con el ejemplo.

Ryszard Czarnecki (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Szanowni Państwo! Przejrzystość to jeden z podstawowych tematów dochodzeń europejskiego Ombudsmana. Jako wiceprzewodniczący Komisji Petycji oraz koordynator naszej grupy ECR w Komisji Kontroli Budżetu chciałbym bardzo podziękować Pani Rzecznik za pracę w tym obszarze. Przejrzystość to jest fundament zaufania obywateli krajów członkowskich do instytucji Unii i dlatego nie rozumiemy, jak to się dzieje, że Komisja Europejska, jej przewodnicząca, odmawia dostępu do wiadomości tekstowych wymienianych przez Panią von der Leyen z szefem jednej z głównych firm farmaceutycznych, zresztą sówicie obdarowanych przez Unię Europejską grantami na znalezienie szczepionki.

Podzielamy krytyczną opinię Pani Rzecznik w tej sprawie. Tego typu działania nie służą budowaniu atmosfery zaufania do Komisji Europejskiej, do instytucji Unii Europejskiej. Trzeba to bardzo głośno powiedzieć i wreszcie zażądać, żeby Pani Przewodnicząca Komisji Europejskiej zaprzestała tych dziwnych tłumaczeń, które są zupełnie irracjonalne.

Gilbert Collard (NI). – Madame la Présidente, Madame la Médiatrice, vous avez eu tout à l'heure une phrase très belle. Vous avez dit que l'Union européenne doit être aussi une force morale. Malheureusement, aujourd'hui, elle n'est qu'une force économique, bureaucratique, technocratique, disciplinairement normative. Les peuples doutent et votre rôle est ici essentiel pour que les peuples ne doutent plus.

La question c'est: quelle est votre efficacité? Vous avez une certaine efficacité, mais la véritable efficacité, celle qui fera que vous ne serez plus Don Quichotte, on la verra le jour où, en main enfin, vous aurez les SMS que vous demandez, diffusés entre M^{me} Von der Leyen et le PDG de Pfizer.

Vous avez eu le courage de les demander. Battons-nous pour que vous les ayez. De là dépend la confiance dans l'Union européenne.

Carles Puigdemont i Casamajó (NI). – Madam President, Madame O'Reilly, the Ombudsman is the last hope for many people whose rights are violated by European states and institutions. Litigation in European courts is not easy and is very expensive. Many vulnerable people and minority groups do not find a way to open the door to European courts. Member States that violate the rights of their minorities find in the Commission and in the Parliament very powerful allies who cover their backs. This is why the role of the Ombudsman should be even more important.

The case of Spain, for example, is flagrant. It is by far the country from which you receive most complaints – 405 in total. The second country, Germany, with 222, but with almost twice as many inhabitants. You have only accepted 25 out of the more than 400 complaints. There is a major lack of proper legal defence in the institution of the Ombudsman. Shuffle it.

Mislav Kolakušić (NI). – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, svjedočimo spaljivanju milijardi doza takozvanih cjepiva protiv COVID-a diljem svijeta koje nitko ne želi.

Spaljuju se milijarde eura poreznih obveznika koje nitko ništa nije pitao. Nitko nije pitao ništa ni nas zastupnike koje su građani izabrali da štitimo njihove zdravlje i njihovu imovinu. Bilo bi bolje da smo odmah svi spalili svo cjepivo i spasili brojne živote i zdravlje građana.

Ugovaranje kupnje 4,6 milijardi doza za 360 000 punoljetnih građana Europske unije provedeno je u potpunoj magli i tajnosti, prepuno je skrivenih SMS poruka, što ukazuje na zasigurno najveću korupcijsku aferu u povijesti Europske unije.

Radi se u ugovoru teškom 71 milijardu eura koji je sklopljen zatvorenih očiju između von der Leyen i Bourlae, glavnog direktora Pfizer, a Pfizer je, kao što svi znamo, već osuđivan u Sjedinjenim Američkim Državama radi korupcije.

Spontane Wortmeldungen

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Doamna președintă, domnule comisar, doamna Ombudsman, vreau de la bun început să vă felicit.

Ați dat dovadă de profesionalism și curaj, ați avut curajul să scrieți corect despre lucrurile care sunt incorecte în instituțiile europene și acesta este rolul dumneavoastră, că vorbim de Comisie, că vorbim de Parlament sau de Consiliu.

Ceea ce este însă neplăcut este că nici până acum nu avem răspunsul la ceea ce dumneavoastră ați încercat să aflați, și anume de la președinta Comisiei.

Eu sunt raportor pe descărcarea de gestiune a Comisiei și credeți-mă că am o dilemă: ce să fac cu descărcarea de gestiune a Comisiei pe 2021? Nu ni s-a răspuns la întrebări, în calitate de Comisie de control bugetar, de ce mai suntem comisii de specialitate în Parlament?

Cred că trebuie să o continuați așa. Asta doresc cetățenii europeni, pentru că dacă instituțiile europene nu dau dovadă de transparență, cetățenii nu pot să aibă încredere în Uniunea Europeană și trebuie să continuați.

Din punctul meu de vedere, Parlamentul vă susține, o majoritate a Parlamentului, evident, dar dacă Comisia nu înțelege și Parlamentul nu înțelege, că am avut cazuri de colegi din Parlament, acum, recent, nu înțeleg acești funcționari europeni că trebuie să fie exemple în viața cetățenilor? Nu putem să avem o Uniune Europeană unită.

Mick Wallace (The Left). – Madam President, I, too, would like to compliment Emily and her staff for the good work that they do. Not just because she's Irish, but because she is a seriously good bit of stuff.

The report shows that problems around transparency and accountability still persist in the EU institutions, and unrestrained lobby is central to many of our problems.

Back in 2015, there was an advisory group set up by the Commission to advise on how to design EU defence industrial policy. Ideally, such a group would be made up of people that would be neutral, but in actual fact it turned out it was stuffed with people linked to the military industry. So it was no surprise that the group produced a report which recommended the creation of a European defence fund, which would funnel increasing amounts of money from the EU budget into the arms industry and which has helped to lead to the increased militarisation of Europe.

But we do need trust and we need change. And we believe, Emily, that you're the woman that can make it happen.

Clare Daly (The Left). – Madam President, it is actually almost unprecedented to see an EU office secure unanimous praise across the House that we've heard tonight, and I think that is a great credit to Emily and her staff for the crucial work that they do and how well that they do it. And I do think that the work in relation to Ursula von der Leyen and the text messages with Pfizer give an indication of the importance of this office, so *comhghairdeas daoibh go léir!*

I think what was particularly interesting in this year's annual report is the account of the Ombudsman's finding of maladministration in the European Defence Agency's handling of the scandalous decision to allow its Chief Executive to go off and work for Airbus. This is indicative of the revolving door and how lobbying works. Airbus is one of Europe's biggest arms companies, a monstrous corporate giant that's a hotbed of scandal that's profited so handsomely out of the securitisation and militarisation of EU policy over the years. This paints a very grim picture of how EU defence policy is set by the arms industry for profit rather than the interests and security of the people of Europe.

(Ende der spontanen Wortmeldungen)

Maroš Šefčovič, Vice-President of the Commission. – Madam President, honourable Members of the European Parliament, dear Madam O'Reilly, thank you for all your interventions this evening.

The right to good administration enshrined in the Treaties and the Charter of Fundamental Rights is of key importance. Transparent, accessible and efficient EU institutions based on the principles of non-discrimination, impartiality, objectivity and fairness are a prerequisite for providing citizens, businesses and associations with an administration that duly reflects their demands and needs.

The work of the European Ombudsman plays an essential role in ensuring we can meet their expectations. The report and resolution of the European Parliament on the activities of the European Ombudsman in 2021 contributes to this by highlighting the areas where our institutions do well, and where they can improve. As already mentioned in my introductory remarks, the Commission will now assess in detail the issues raised in your resolution and during today's debate and will respond in the next few weeks.

Die Präsidentin. – Emily O'Reilly, das waren sehr viel lobende Worte, sehr viel Unterstützung seitens der Abgeordneten hier bei den Wortmeldungen.

Emily O'Reilly, European Ombudsman. – Thank you very much, Madam President, and thank you all for your contributions. It's particularly heartening this year to know that there is such cross-party support, cross-group support for the report, and I thank Madam Pelletier, the co-rapporteurs and the PETI Committee itself for that.

I just want to reflect on one thing that a number of people alluded to, and that was in relation to somebody talked about the fact that sometimes recommendations are not accepted, somebody else talked about just the nature of the Ombudsman and so on. And one question I'm often asked is, do I want more powers? Do I want binding powers? And I've always said no. While it would be tempting to think that I could just bang my fist on the table and have everybody do everything, that's not what the point of an ombudsman is.

The ombudsman works in the area of soft law and the extent to which an ombudsman's rulings and recommendations are respected, acknowledged and implemented is actually a measure of the quality of an administration.

Because I believe that if an ombudsman is doing his or her work independently, honestly, effectively and so on, the vast majority if not all recommendations should be accepted.

We do have a high rate in the European Parliament or, sorry, in the European administration, which is generally over 80 %. But to my view, it should be closer to 100 %. Sometimes the reason that I am given for the non-implementation of a recommendation is not because I've made a mistake, my colleagues have made a mistake or we've got the wrong end of the stick, but simply because an institution simply doesn't want to do something. And sometimes there is an element of impunity there – they feel that they can get away with it.

But I continue to trust in the administration, I continue to trust in the power of soft law, because the day that an ombudsman is granted hard powers is the day that the administration will have failed.

Transparency, as ever, has been a major piece and sometimes transparency is seen as an abstract thing but it isn't. It is very, very concrete thing. It is the way that administrations are made accountable to the citizens and administration is there to protect the citizens. And the citizens have a right to take part in the democratic life of the Union, as I alluded to earlier, and they can only do that if they know what's going on in the first place.

Another MEP talked about the fact that I will have succeeded if the text messages, which have been talked about a lot, are released, but I don't think I will have succeeded, I think the Commission will have succeeded if there is greater transparency in relation to that.

We've talked about the moral force that the EU should be, and I firmly believe in that. And if I do my piece ethically, well, independently, then it's on the administration to do its piece. I can't force things through. But it is the administration itself that has to look into its own soul – if you forgive the use of that phrase – and decide what it should do.

Somebody else talked about why an ombudsman exists, because we have the courts and so on. I mean, I always feel very strongly that an ombudsman exists there to really give justice in the very wider sense, to be there to listen to people when they have been through, you know, big bureaucratic headaches and frustration and stress and trying to get there their issue dealt with. And I constantly say to my colleagues that we need always to listen. We have to be that listening ear because stress is relieved when people feel that they have been heard. And we all know this with our own interactions with telephone services or whatever it is. But I believe an ombudsman is there at the sometimes at the end of the line to be that that human face and to hear and to listen and to try and give justice.

But I can only do so much. The administration has to absolutely step up to the plate as well and I believe that, you know, Qatargate, as I said to my colleagues, was an opportunity to re-examine these issues that I've been talking about, my predecessors have been talking about, for many years. And I think what happened there and other things that have happened have shown just how important those things are. They matter. They have a real value in the real world. And they're not just abstract concepts to be to be spoken about in an academic way.

So again, I thank Madam Pelletier, I thank the PETI Committee and I thank the Parliament for the support because an ombudsman really survives only with the support of the parliament. And I thank you for that.

Anne-Sophie Pelletier, *rapporteuse*. – Madame la Présidente, chers collègues, merci à vous pour ce travail que nous avons fait ensemble puisque nous avons un objectif commun, c'était d'aller chercher justement le travail de M^{me} O'Reilly et cette demande de transparence.

Ce soir, dans cet hémicycle, j'ai entendu tous les groupes, tous les groupes, demander de la transparence. Monsieur le Commissaire, il est de votre devoir aujourd'hui de rappeler à M^{me} Von der Leyen ce que vous avez entendu ce soir. Ce n'est pas juste quelques groupes qui vous demandent de la transparence, ce sont tous les groupes du Parlement européen.

Et si ce rapport a été voté à l'unanimité en commission des pétitions, ça dit quelque chose de ce besoin de transparence. Rappelez tous les propos que vous avez entendus à M^{me} Von der Leyen et demandez-lui ces fameux SMS, parce que nous en avons besoin, comme a dit madame O'Reilly, pas uniquement pour que les citoyens, mais aussi pour que vous, la Commission, vous soyez gagnants de cette transparence et que vous montriez que vous avez une bonne institution et un bon fonctionnement de votre institution.

Parce que de la défiance, de la perte de confiance des citoyens, ce sont nos démocraties qui sont en danger. Vous voyez, Monsieur le Commissaire, j'avais tout un texte d'écrit, j'ai écouté mes collègues et aujourd'hui je n'ai plus de texte. Je suis partie à l'aveugle. Mais vraiment, je pense que cette demande des citoyens européens, est-ce nos démocraties qui vont mal à l'ombre du Qatar, à l'ombre de tout le pantouflage qui existe au niveau de la Commission?

Ça ne peut plus durer. Parce que, si vous ne faites pas quelque chose et si nous n'aidons pas M^{me} la Médiatrice afin que tout ceci soit mis en avant alors, dans ce cas, vous serez responsable des chutes des démocraties européennes.

Die Präsidentin. – Die Aussprache ist geschlossen.

Die Abstimmung findet morgen, Dienstag, 14. März 2023, statt.

15. Wiążące roczne redukcje emisji gazów cieplarnianych przez państwa członkowskie (rozporządzenie w sprawie wspólnego wysiłku redukcyjnego) - Sektor użytkowania gruntów, zmiany użytkowania gruntów i leśnictwa (LULUCF) - Przegląd rezerwy stabilności rynkowej na potrzeby unijnego systemu handlu uprawnieniami do emisji gazów cieplarnianych (debata)

Die Präsidentin. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die gemeinsame Aussprache über das Ergebnis der Verhandlungen über das Paket „Fit für 55“, nämlich

— den Bericht von Jessica Polfjärd im Namen des Ausschusses für Umweltfragen, öffentliche Gesundheit und Lebensmittelsicherheit über den Vorschlag für eine Verordnung des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates zur Änderung der Verordnung (EU) 2018/842 zur Festlegung verbindlicher nationaler Jahresziele für die Reduzierung der Treibhausgasemissionen im Zeitraum 2021 bis 2030 als Beitrag zu Klimaschutzmaßnahmen zwecks Erfüllung der Verpflichtungen aus dem Übereinkommen von Paris (COM(2021)0555 – C9-0321/2021 – 2021/0200(COD)) (A9-0163/2022) und

— den Bericht von Ville Niinistö im Namen des Ausschusses für Umweltfragen, öffentliche Gesundheit und Lebensmittelsicherheit über den Vorschlag für eine Verordnung des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates zur Änderung der Verordnung (EU) 2018/841 hinsichtlich des Geltungsbereichs, der Vereinfachung der Compliance-Vorschriften, der Festlegung der Zielwerte der Mitgliedstaaten für 2030 und der Verpflichtung, bis 2035 gemeinsam Klimaneutralität im Sektor Landnutzung, Forstwirtschaft und Landwirtschaft zu erreichen, und zur Änderung der Verordnung (EU) 2018/1999 hinsichtlich der Verbesserung der Überwachung, der Berichterstattung, der Verfolgung der Fortschritte und der Überprüfung (COM(2021)0554 – C9-0320/2021 – 2021/0201(COD)) (A9-0161/2022) und

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

Jessica Polfjärd, föredragande. – Fru talman! Herr förste vice ordförande! Kära kollegor! När vi senast debatterade EU:s nationella klimatmål i den här kammaren sa jag att det är dags att göra allvar av klimatpolitiken. Denna vecka är det precis det vi gör. Genom att anta flera nya klimatlagar visar vi i Europa att vi inte bara kan sätta höga mål, utan att vi också kan enas om handlingsplaner för att nå dit.

För första gången någonsin har vi byggt en stark majoritet för att alla EU:s medlemsländer ska få bindande mål om att faktiskt minska sina utsläpp. Det är någonting som jag tycker att vi ska vara stolta över. Det vårdar och förvaltar det förtroende som är själva kärnan i en ansvarsfull politik.

Förordningen om ansvarsfördelningen är en av grundpelarna i vårt gemensamma klimatarbete. Med den här lagen sätter vi bindande mål för alla EU:s medlemsländer och spelregler för majoriteten av alla utsläpp inom Europa. Att öka takten för vårt arbete inom detta område är helt nödvändigt inte bara för att nå våra egna klimatmål utan också våra åtaganden inom Parisavtalet.

Få uppgifter kan vara så viktiga för oss som beslutsfattare. Det innebär också ett stort ansvar att utforma reglerna på ett sätt som vinner brett stöd och förtroende. Därför har min linje varit tydlig under arbetet med detta förslag: Vi behöver ett politiskt ramverk som höjer ambitionerna för hela EU, samtidigt som vi respekterar medlemsländernas traditioner och skapar rätt förutsättningar för att hela samhället ska kunna ställa om. Efter drygt ett och halvt års arbete är det precis det som vi har lyckats med. Vad vi nu har på bordet är ett förslag som är ambitiöst, framtidsinriktat och genomförbart.

Tillsammans har vi enats om en rad viktiga principer. För det första ökar vi ambitionen för hela Europa i linje med den europeiska klimatlagen. När min kollega Peter Liese förhandlade fram den lagen var hans främsta budskap att den behövde bygga på mål som faktiskt går att genomföra. Nu visar vi att den linjen var rätt.

För det andra säkerställer vi att alla EU:s medlemsländer måste bidra i arbetet. Inget land kan åka snålskjuts på andras åtaganden.

För det tredje har vi säkerställt att medlemsländerna får utforma sina mål på ett sätt som passar dem bäst. Alla länder och alla sektorer måste bidra i klimatarbetet – men EU:s roll är att sätta tydliga ramverk, inte att detaljreglera.

För det fjärde höjer vi blicken bortom 2030. För mig har det varit avgörande att koppla ihop dessa mål med det stora målet om klimatneutralitet, och vi har nu stakat ut och visat konkreta steg som medlemsländerna ska ta.

Sist men inte minst har vi infört striktare krav för efterlevnad. Framför allt vill vi se ökad transparens samtidigt som vi kräver att de medlemsländer som missar sina mål också måste förklara varför man avviker och hur man tänker åtgärda det framöver.

Jag vill tacka mina kollegor från de andra politiska grupperna för ett gott samarbete i detta ärende: Bas Eickhout, Javi López, Linea Søgaard-Lidell, som inledde förhandlingarna som sedan togs över av Nils Torvalds, Margrete Auken, Silvia Sardone och Anna Zalewska och Silvia Modig. Jag vill också tacka det tjeckiska ordförandeskapet med ambassadör Jaroslav Zajíček med kollegor för det enorma arbete som han lagt ner och för de framgångar som vi tillsammans kunde nå. Sist men inte minst vill jag också tacka vice ordförande Timmermans och hela teamet på GD Clima och för gott samarbete.

Jag är övertygad om att vi har kommit en lång bit på vägen och att vi kan göra denna resa tillsammans. Nu är det upp till medlemsländerna att också leverera och visa vilja.

Ville Niinistö, rapporteur. – Madam President, the way we use our land and soils must change. Instead of contributing to climate change, it can and must be turned into being sustainable both for climate and nature. We must put an end to practices which are damaging for biodiversity and jeopardise the capacity of forests and soils to absorb carbon.

This is the future for the economy as well. There is a growing demand for regenerative farming and forestry and also in nature restoration in protecting our biodiversity. It can also contribute to added climate benefits. This is what the LULUCF Regulation is about.

At the outset of the trilogue negotiations, both the European Parliament and the Council supported the objective of reaching -310 million tonnes of net removals by 2030, as proposed by the Commission, and maintained the idea of national targets. This will allow the EU to reach around -57% of net emission reductions by 2030 economy wide. For the first time, the principle that Member States should increase their sinks has been endorsed by the co-legislators with a binding 2030 target for each Member State. This is a historic achievement.

The new 2030 target of -310 million tonnes of net removals by 2030 within the EU for the LULUCF sector will apply to Member States to reverse the current shrink of natural land sinks we have seen in the last decade. This is ultimately necessary if we are to achieve carbon neutrality, a balance between emissions and removals by 2050 at the latest within the Union, and also beyond that to carbon negativity.

Still, the trilogues were not easy. The Council wanted to increase even further flexibilities given to Member States for achieving their targets, thus reducing the integrity of the proposal. As part of the deal to get their 2030 target, Member States will be allowed to deviate from a linear trajectory as long as all the deficits produced in the 2026—2029 period are compensated by equivalent surpluses within the same period. This can be seen as acceptable.

We also, from the Parliament side, managed to negotiate that Member States that would deviate from that trajectory will have to adopt corrective action plans similar to what has been agreed in the final effort sharing trilogue that took place a few days before the final LULUCF trilogue.

What's more, any excess deficit about the budget will be multiplied by a factor of 1.08 and added to the Member State 2030 target. This increase is the importance of monitoring and scrutinising that there is a proper carbon sink policy in place, but also gives the Commission possibilities to implement this policy.

Member States will have also access to other flexibilities, including the possibility to use emission allocations they may have in excess in effort sharing or excess LULUCF credits generated and sold by other Member States. An additional flexibility of 178 million tonnes for EU 27 over the entire period is available, in particular to compensate emissions generated by natural disturbances, the longer-term impact of climate change and the result of exceptionally high proportion of organic soils. The Council proposal to be able to fully discount extreme weather events, however, was rejected.

For the first time, Member States will also have to report on how they took into account the 'no significant harm principle' in meeting the LULUCF targets. They also need to improve the data they use to report their LULUCF net removals. This means that there will be a larger integration of biodiversity policies and climate policies, which is really good. We also start to assess what kind of policies Member States put in place to manage their things properly for the first time.

So therefore, overall, the Parliament's negotiating team worked well-defined compromises. I thank them all. I also thank the Commission for their contribution and even the Council. Therefore, I ask for your endorsement of the negotiated deal from you, my esteemed colleagues.

Cyrus Engerer, Rapporteur. – Ghal snin twal diversi żgħażaġh u xjentisti wisew li ż-żmien qiegħed jaġhfas u li wasal iż-żmien biex naġixxu qabel ikun tard wisq, biex nevitaw traġedji kbar marbuta mal-klima madwar id-dinja kollha. Dak iż-żmien huwa issa. Ninsabu fil-*frontline* tal-ġlieda kontra t-tibdil fil-klima. Qed naraw diżastri madwarna ta' spiss, ikkawżati mill-estremittajiet tal-klima u l-punt irriversibbli hu wisq fil-qrib. Dan hu l-mument, u ahna wegħidna li se nkunu fuq quddiem nett, bħala *leaders*, biex naghmlu minn kollox biex insalvaw l-unika pjaneta fejn il-hajja umana tista' tghix.

Ilkoll kemm ahna niehdu hsieb li d-djar li nghixu fihom u li nrabbu lil uliedna fihom nevitaw milli jkollhom il-periklu; u din hija l-attitudni li jrid ikollna lejn id-dinja tagħna. U mhux talli hekk: talli din trid tibqa' prijorità għalina minkejja dak kollu li qiegħed isehh madwarna.

Ma nistgħux naqgħu għan-narrattiva populistta tal-konservattivi li, matul żminijiet ta' krizi, mill-ewwel iduru kontra t-tranzizzjoni ambjentali. Ejjja nkunu ċari: dan il-Parlament ma jstax jaqa' għal dik in-nasba. M'hemmx xi *pause button* fl-emergenza tal-klima. Iż-żmien jaġhfas u d-diżastri klimatiki qed jiggravaw: l-ogħla temperaturi *on record* fis-sajf, nirien li qed jaħarqu l-foresti tagħna, għargħar b'xita rekord fl-iqsar żminijiet. Din hi r-realta mhux biss tad-dinja, izda anke tal-Ewropa tagħna. Li kien għal konservattivi, nieqfu naġixxu kontra t-tibdil fil-klima biex niffukaw biss fuq krizijiet ohra, izda ahna rridu li naghmlu success u mhux li nfallu. Ahna mhux lesti li nfallu f'din l-ikbar sfida li għandu quddiemu l-bniedem.

Nafu x'inhuma r-riperkussjonijiet u nafu lil min qed jolqtu l-aktar.

Min kellu l-kuraġġ jerfa' r-responsabbiltà u jieħu d-deċiżjonijiet?

Ahna konna u rridu nibqgħu dawk li nerfġu r-responsabbiltà. L-għajta taċ-ċittadini hija ċara: li nħarsu n-naha l-ohra żgur li mhijjex għażla. U ahna lesti. Lesti, iva, li nerfġu din ir-responsabbiltà u lesti li niehdu d-deċiżjonijiet, anke l-iktar ibsin. Dan huwa dak li se jiddetermina jekk uliedna hux se jkollhom futur xi jgawdu.

U l-Unjoni Ewropea twieldet biex flimkien nindirizzaw sfidi globali. Dik hi l-Ewropa li nemmen fiha, u dik hi l-Ewropa li ahna s-soċjalisti f'dan il-Parlament qeghdin naħdmu għaliha.

Però fl-istess hin, irridu nisimghu l-karba taċ-ċittadini Ewropej dwar iż-żieda fil-prezzijiet fl-Ewropa wara l-pandemija u minħabba l-gwerra, li qed iwasslu għal kontijiet tal-enerġija eżorbitanti kważi fl-Ewropa kollha, u bhala Soċjalisti se nibqgħu qrib iċ-ċittadini Ewropej, għaliex hadd ma għandu jkollu jagħzel bejn bżonn bażiku u bżonn bażiku ieħor.

U qed niehdu azzjonijiet biex nindirizzaw dawn id-diffikultajiet anke permezz ta' għodod illi jghinu b'għajnuniet finanzjarji. Se nkunu qed nużaw il-Fond Soċjali għall-Klima biex nghanu lil dawk li ma jkollhomx biex isahhnu darhom, nghanu fir-rinnovar ta' djar iktar effiċjenti, u nghanu lin-nies jixtru il-vetturi li ma jniġgsux.

Ahna qeghdin nindirizzaw l-isfidi tal-lum u nippreparaw għall-isfidi ta' għada.

U dan huwa dak li qeghdin naghmlu permezz tal-pakkett "Fit for 55", li kien ta' privileġġ għaliha li nkun fdat bil-liġi tal-*Market Stability Reserve* minn dan il-Parlament – għodda importanti fil-pakkett ta' miżuri. Permezz ta' din il-liġi fittixna l-istabbiltà. L-istabbiltà illi jridu il-familji u n-negozji Ewropej. U allura ha nżommu r-rata tad-*double intake* li bihom il-kwoti jitqieghdu fir-riserva sal-2030. Dan huwa pass naturali u meħtieġ biex il-Mekkanizmu jilhaq il-miri tal-klima li qbilna li nilhqu sas-sena 2030. Permezz ta' dan ser ikollna sistema aktar b'sahhitha għall-iskambju ta' kwoti għall-emissjonijiet b'sahhitha u reżiljenti.

Kieku ma għamilna xejn, konna ndgħajfu s-sistema tal-ETS, b'konsegwenza li nibqgħu niddependu fuq il-*fossil fuels* u, di konsegwenza, fuq ir-Russja. Id-direzzjoni tagħna hi waħda ta' indipendenza tal-enerġija, permezz ta' energija rinnovabbli, u din se tibqa' l-prijorità tagħna.

Ewropa b'sahhitha, Ewropa indipendenti, Ewropa ambjentali u Ewropa kompetittiva.

Norbert Lins, *Verfasser der Stellungnahme des mitberatenden Ausschusses für Landwirtschaft und ländliche Entwicklung*. – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Vize-Präsident, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Ich glaube, es war im November ein wichtiges Zeichen, dass wir vor oder während der COP 27 auch bei LULUCF und bei ESR eine Einigung erreicht haben und damit ein Signal an Scharm al-Scheich senden konnten.

Ich möchte noch einmal betonen, dass die Land- und Forstwirtschaft der einzige Sektor ist, der nicht nur Emissionen erzeugt, sondern auch in der Lage ist, Kohlenstoff zu binden. Das findet im Wald statt, das findet in Grünland statt, das findet im Ackerbau in vielfältiger Weise in der Europäischen Union statt.

Im Bereich der Waldwirtschaft würde ich insbesondere betonen, dass die aktive, die nachhaltige Waldbewirtschaftung die ist, die für CO₂-Speicherung sorgt, die für nachhaltige Holzprodukte sorgt und damit eben langfristig für Klimaschutz sorgen kann. Die Einigung bei 310 Millionen Tonnen ist sehr ambitioniert. Die Mitgliedstaaten werden sich sehr anstrengen müssen, diese Ziele zu erreichen.

Ich will auch noch einmal betonen: Für mich gehören Forstwirtschaft, Landwirtschaft, Ackerbau zusammen. Ich finde es richtig, dass die Kommission es zusammen denken wollte. Ich finde es auch wichtig, dass die Überprüfungsklausel drin ist, was AFOLU bis 2035 betrifft. Also das Zusammenführen von Land- und Forstwirtschaft halte ich für bedeutend, auch wenn es jetzt keine Mehrheit gefunden hat, weder im Rat noch im Europäischen Parlament.

Ich glaube, unsere Lehre muss sein: Wir müssen wieder mehr auf die Landwirte, auf die Forstwirte hören – eben auf die, die aktiv dafür sorgen können, dass wir Kohlenstoffbindung erreichen. Mir ist aber auch wichtig, dass wir das insbesondere in dem Prozess jetzt auch zu *carbon farming*, zu der Zertifizierung, die die Kommission vorgeschlagen hat, besser erreichen und mit den Landwirten dort Anreize schaffen, um bei der Kohlenstoffbindung weiterzukommen.

Natürliche Senken haben aber eine Begrenzung. Deswegen brauchen wir schnell ein Rahmengesamtwerk auch für CCU und CCS. Technische Methoden sind also auch zukünftig wichtig.

Frans Timmermans, *Executive Vice-President of the Commission*. – Madam President, honourable members, thank you to the three rapporteurs for their work and making an agreement possible on these key pieces of legislation. My appeal to this Parliament, from left to right, is to please acknowledge that the climate crisis should transcend political differences; that the climate crisis is not a crisis you can sort of forget for a bit because there are other crises. We should unite in our common efforts to fight this crisis because the climate crisis has the propensity to make all the other crises worse if it is not tackled.

Increasingly, we are aware of a geopolitical dimension of the climate crisis – how it can engender conflict, how it can engender huge migration flows, how it can engender a race for water and food, which would, by definition, create violent conflict. So please, please acknowledge this and let's not draw the climate crisis into a left-right controversy or a political controversy between political parties. And I have to say, Parliament has shown great responsibility in finding compromises on these issues. And I have to also say: we still have a lot of work to do.

So if we remain committed towards more ambitious climate action to reach climate neutrality by 2050, as set out in the climate law, then we have to act. The climate laws are a compass to 2050. It sets an irreversible path towards climate neutrality and guides all sectors of the economy in their efforts to decarbonise.

We all collectively have a responsibility to make sure we prepare Europe for the transition. With the choices we've all agreed on the Effort Sharing and LULUCF Regulations as well as on the MSR, we make the most ambitious, consistent and socially fair choices to drive the decarbonisation of our economy. The Effort Sharing Regulation will ensure that Member States cut their emissions by 40% by 2030 in sectors currently responsible for 60% of the EU's emissions. The LULUCF Regulation will ensure that we make full use of the emissions removal potential of our land and forests.

Due to the changes in the Effort Sharing and LULUCF Regulations – and the ETS obviously – agreed by the co-legislators, we are on track to achieve 57% reductions rather than 55%, which is an outstanding achievement. So, as Parliament always wished that we would say 'at least 55', it is now being proven by the facts. The compromises you will vote tomorrow are therefore key to deliver on our objective to become climate neutral by 2050. Now we must make sure that the agreed package is adopted and implemented as soon as possible.

Let me briefly stress some key aspects of the three compromises. The LULUCF deal is a milestone for European carbon sinks in the land sector. We've set an overall EU-level objective of 310 metric tonnes of net removals, and the honourable representative, Mr Lins, is right when he says that this is a tall order, but it can be done.

I would like to highlight another element: better and more accurate data lead to more effective policy decisions. Improved monitoring and tracking of changes in carbon stock are specifically required for areas under the spotlight – such as biodiversity protection and restoration goals – and thereby contribute to protecting and enhancing nature-based carbon removal. So the Commission is grateful for the support of Parliament on the improved monitoring of greenhouse gas emissions and removals by using digital technologies along the lines of our proposal.

On ESR, let me first stress the remarkable support that this House has shown to translate the Fit for 55 ambition in the new effort sharing emission reduction targets for the Union and the Member States. Both co-legislators contributed to this excellent result and I am very happy that the general architecture of the Commission's proposal is maintained.

The text negotiated by Parliament requires Member States to achieve more reductions earlier on with balanced flexibilities. The compromise also reflects Parliament's striving for transparency and accountability, with a reinforced compliance framework ensuring a fair and just transition.

We don't have the luxury to leave anyone behind. The text negotiated with the Council strikes the right balance between ambition and feasibility. 2030 is around the corner and the energy crisis only shows the need to accelerate the transition. The revised Effort Sharing Regulation sets a clear path for Member States to now plan and implement climate policies and actions in relevant sectors – road transport, buildings, agriculture and waste.

So this House did an impressive job, and I would like to thank and congratulate the negotiating team for having worked well. And let's not forget – extremely fast – for both LULUCF and Effort Sharing, the Commission has issued a statement during negotiations in relation to the assessment in its upcoming report on the review of the Governance Regulation of aspects related to access to justice in Member States. Access to justice remains an important support measure to help deliver the European Green Deal and a way to strengthen the role which civil society can play as a watchdog in the democratic space.

Finally, very briefly, on the Market Stability Reserve: it's a small but important element of the Fit for 55 package. It's been a very successful instrument to absorb the structural surplus of allowances in the carbon market. And for it to act faster, the percentage of allowances in circulation to be placed in the MSR has been temporarily doubled from 12% to 24% until 2023. Without the proposal under discussion today, it would revert back to 12%.

To continue reducing the surplus, ensuring market resilience, we proposed to maintain the doubled intake rate of 24%, as now agreed by the co-legislators. This provides predictability and maintains a well-functioning carbon market, which is a carbon market that step by step has to become a global carbon market for all the world to reduce their emissions.

Henna Virkkunen, *teollisuus-, tutkimus- ja energiavaliokunnan lausunnon valmistelija*. – Arvoisa puhemies, arvoisa komission puheenjohtaja, haluan teollisuusvaliokunnan neuvottelijana kiittää kaikkia neuvotteluihin osallistuneita. Tämä LULUCF-lopputuloks vastaa hyvin pitkälti sitä, mitä teollisuusvaliokunta ITRE omassa lausunnossaan linjasi. Lain tärkein tavoite on kasvattaa Euroopan hiilinielujä 15 prosenttia vuoteen 2030 mennessä. Se on hyvin haastava tavoite ja kunnianhimoinen tavoite, mutta se on mahdollista saavuttaa. Se edellyttää kyllä aktiivista kestävää metsätaloutta ja todellakin hiilinielujen kasvatuksen huomioimista kaikkialla Euroopassa.

Vaikka hiilinielulla on tärkeä merkitys ilmastonmuutoksen torjunnassa, se ei saa poistaa ajatusta siitä, että kaikkein tärkeintä on kuitenkin hyvin nopeasti pyrkiä eroon kaikista fossiilisista energialähteistä. Se on se kestävä ratkaisu. Samaan aikaan on aktivoitava hiilinielujen kasvattamisessa, kehitettävä hiilensidontaan liittyviä toimenpiteitä, panostettava alan tutkimukseen ja kehitettävä myös teknologisia ratkaisuja. On hyvä, että tässä uudistuksessa nyt laskentamenetelmä myös uudistui ja selkeytyi ja voimme käyttää uudempaa tilastotietoa tämän pohjana.

Mauri Pekkarinen, – Arvoisa puhemies, uudistuvalla päästökauppajärjestelmällä on tärkein rooli tiellä kohti 55 prosenttia, mutta tärkeää on myös, että taakanjakosektori selviää sille uskotun 40 prosentin velvoitteen hoitamisesta.

Vähentämisen taakka jakaantuu eri maiden kesken kovin eri tavoin. Viidellä maalla on 50 prosentin vähentämisvelvoite, pienimmillään vähentämisvelvoite on 10 prosenttia ja 12,7 prosenttia. Silti tämän voi hyväksyä. Maat ovat erilaisia ja erilaisessa tilanteessa, mutta sen hyväksymistä kuitenkin helpottaa ratkaisevasti se, kun komissio pidättäytyy asettamasta uusia esteitä kestäväen bioraaka-aineen energiakäytölle. Se on tavattoman tärkeä asia.

Tällä hetkellä eniten kuitenkin uusiutuvaa energiaa tuotetaan tuulivoimalla. Minusta on tärkeää huolehtia jatkossa siitä, että luodaan edellytykset tuulivoiman edelleen tuottamiselle ja rakentamiselle, mutta tuulivoima ei tarvitse enää julkisia tukia. Minusta EU:n kannattaisi – jos sillä on varaa tukea tuulivoimaa periaatteessa – käyttää tuki alan innovaatioihin, ei tuulivoiman tuotantoon eikä siirtojohtojen rakentamiseen.

Ангел Джамбазки, *докладчик по становището на комисията по транспорт и туризъм*. – Г-жо Председател, колеги, предложеният законодателен пакет е и може да бъде квалифициран само и единствено като преднамерено и ритуално икономическо самоубийство на Европа. Зеленият преход под тази форма е някакъв мираж.

Особено тежко ще бъде засегнат транспортният сектор. Личната мобилност ще бъде допълнително ограничавана, докато в същото време транспортният бранш ще колабира заради повишаващите се цени на горивата и невъзможните екологични стандарти. Личните автомобили, евтините и достъпни самолетни билети остават в историята и могат да си ги позволят само или много богати хора или тези, на които им ги плаща Европейската комисия.

Това е утопичният, прекрасен нов свят, който ни предлага Европейската комисия и част от тази крайна група тук, в Европейския парламент. Очевидно, колеги, с вас живеем в различни светове. Очевидно не ви интересува как живеят обикновените ваши съграждани, които просто искат автомобил, за да могат да се придвижат някъде. И очевидно не сте разбрали, че земята е кръгла, и ако се случва това, което се случва – да подарявате бизнес на Китай и да подарявате работни места на Китай, а земята е кръгла и ако Китай замърсява, той замърсява цялата земя.

А вие тук губите работни места. Не мога да си го обясня логично. Няма логика, няма обяснение. Има две думи, които ми хрумват. Едната е лобизъм, другото е преднамерена икономическа деиндустриализация на Европа. Изберете кое от двете.

Vlad-Marius Botoș, *Raportor pentru aviz, Comisia pentru dezvoltare regională*. – Doamna председател, domnule комисар, acest pachet legislativ trebuie să ofere posibilitatea de adaptare a fiecărei țări, a fiecărei regiuni în parte, pentru că doar luând în considerare specificul regional vom putea avea efectele dorite.

Sigur că ne dorim o economie europeană cât mai puțin poluantă și am votat majoritatea dintre noi *Green Deal*-ul în 2019, dar ne dorim totuși o economie puternică.

Ambițiile noastre de prosperitate, de standarde sociale și chiar ambițiile ecologice nu vor putea fi atinse fără o finanțare adecvată, iar aceasta nu se poate realiza fără aportul semnificativ al industriei și fără suportul oamenilor.

Ultimii ani ne-au arătat că avem nevoie de autonomie industrială, iar modul în care se transformă acum harta geopolitică la nivel mondial trebuie să determine o și mai mare atenție la un echilibru între economic și ecologic. Regulile pe care le impunem, interdicțiile și limitele nu vor putea fi respectate dacă nu construim în urmă un dialog real din care să rezulte obiective realiste și realizabile.

Sper să găsim posibilitatea de adaptare rapidă de care este nevoie în aceste vremuri tulburi.

Peter Liese, *im Namen der PPE-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin, sehr geehrte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Das sind drei wichtige Gesetzgebungsvorhaben für den Klimaschutz, und ich danke allen, die daran mitgewirkt haben, dass wir hier jetzt so gute Kompromisse haben, innerhalb der EVP natürlich vor allen Dingen Jessica Polfjärd, Norbert Lins und Cristian Bușoi. Ich will nur zwei Sätze zum Inhalt sagen.

Einmal: Wir reden im Englischen über *effort sharing*. Im Deutschen, Herr Vizepräsident, wird das immer noch übersetzt mit Lastenteilung. Wir waren eigentlich mal weiter. Wir haben gesagt, es geht um *climate action*. Ein klug gemachter Klimaschutz ist ja nicht nur eine Last, sondern hat auch viele Vorteile. Vielleicht kann man bei der Übersetzung der endgültigen Version noch einmal darauf achten, dass *effort* eigentlich nicht mit Lasten ...

(Zwischenruf)

Ja, aber für *climate action* finden wir vielleicht auch ein gutes Wort in den anderen Sprachen.

Das Zweite: Ich möchte noch einmal das unterstreichen, was Norbert Lins zum Thema nachhaltige Forstwirtschaft gesagt hat. Ein Wald, der bewirtschaftet wird, bindet mehr CO₂, und wir kreieren dann auch noch Holz als nachwachsenden Rohstoff. Deswegen sollten wir die Forstwirte bei der nachhaltigen Forstwirtschaft unterstützen.

Und wenn wir das dann morgen angenommen haben, dann wird die Kommission ja weiterarbeiten. Ich hätte mir sogar gewünscht, dass das, was am Donnerstag kommt, nämlich der Rechtsakt über eine klimaneutrale Wirtschaft, gemeinsam mit Fit für 55 vorgestellt worden wäre. Denn wir sehen jetzt, dass viele Unternehmen, die sich auf den Weg machen, bürokratische Hindernisse haben. Wir müssen schneller werden, und der IRA ist nur der letzte Anstoß. Wir müssten das eigentlich schon vorher gemacht haben. Deswegen bitte ich um einen ambitionierten Vorschlag für Donnerstag. Ein Kollege hat es so ausgedrückt: Die Antwort auf den IRA sollte nicht *Europe first* sein, sondern *Europe fast*. Und das erwarten wir von der Kommission.

Javi López, *en nombre del Grupo S&D*. – Señora presidenta, señor vicepresidente Timmermans, mañana el Parlamento Europeo aprobará varias piezas clave del paquete legislativo «Objetivo 55», nuestra hoja de ruta para la descarbonización. Entre ellas, aprobaremos el Reglamento de reparto del esfuerzo, una pieza clave, como bien hemos dicho, porque regulará el 60 % de los gases de efecto invernadero y tendrá impacto sobre el transporte, los edificios o la agricultura europeos. Además, mantiene el objetivo marcado por la Comisión Europea de reducir en un 40 % las emisiones en todas estas áreas reguladas por el Reglamento de reparto del esfuerzo para el año 2030. ¿Por qué es importante esta regulación que aprobamos mañana?

En primer lugar, porque el impacto del cambio climático es una realidad. Solo hace falta ver las temperaturas tan anómalas que hemos tenido esta semana en toda Europa, los fenómenos extremos que se reproducen o las sequías, que ya afectan a partes importantes del territorio europeo. Esta realidad solo es un llamamiento a la acción temprana y a la implementación rápida del proceso de descarbonización y de toda la política de mitigación. Para ello, el Reglamento de reparto del esfuerzo incluye una trayectoria lineal ambiciosa y, además, limita las flexibilidades de los Estados miembros, porque queremos una regulación exigente.

En segundo lugar, es muy importante lo que aprobamos mañana porque el mundo hoy está en una enorme carrera por desarrollar las tecnologías verdes, y los esfuerzos de hoy son la competitividad económica de Europa de mañana. Por eso, hay que reclamar en todos los campos que hagamos este tipo de esfuerzos, porque nos asegura una economía sólida y próspera en el futuro.

En tercer lugar, nos permite dar pasos adelante hacia una transición justa, con cláusulas importantes que incorporan una dimensión social junto a la dimensión climática.

En cuarto y último lugar, ¿por qué es importante lo que aprobamos mañana? Porque, a decir verdad, estas últimas semanas hemos oído voces dispuestas a romper el consenso que se había construido alrededor del Pacto Verde Europeo durante los últimos años en Europa —voces muy preocupantes—. Buena parte de lo que aprobamos mañana lo aprobamos con grandes acuerdos gracias al buen trabajo del Parlamento, de la ponente Jessica Polfjård, así como del trabajo que han hecho el Consejo, la Comisión, el vicepresidente Timmermans; son una muestra de que es posible alcanzar los acuerdos necesarios para avanzar en la descarbonización y que poner en riesgo el consenso sobre el Pacto Verde Europeo pone en juego no solo el futuro del continente, sino también la economía y la competitividad de Europa y su futuro.

Nils Torvalds, *on behalf of the Renew Group*. – Madam President, I have to ask for forgiveness of those in charge of translation, because I'm going to start with some sentences in Swedish because of Jessica.

Tack ska du ha, Jessica, för att du skötte det här ärendet. Det var inte alltid lätt. Förhandlingarna i rådet var inte heller lätta, men du lyckades ändå nå ett framgångsrikt resultat.

It's very important that climate action is looked at in the long term with the 2050 climate neutrality target in mind. The Effort Sharing Regulation is key to deliver on CO₂ reductions. Under the agreement, EU countries will have to cut emissions by 40% compared to 2005 levels in sectors such as buildings, road transport, agriculture and waste, which are currently not regulated under the bloc's carbon market, the EU Emissions Trading Scheme. Together, these sectors are responsible for 60% of the EU's greenhouse gas emissions.

Renew Europe is pleased that the 2030 targets and trajectories are ambitious enough to reduce CO₂ emissions even if we see mounting challenges with the percentage-based reductions.

The Climate Fund will, with the Council, deliver the climate and therefore my group will support the important part of the Fit for 55 package.

At the very end, a comment which Mr Liese already said. Effort sharing sounds very fine. In Swedish, *fördelning av bördan*. That means distribution of the burden. Therefore, in Nordic countries, we sometimes feel a little more burden.

Margrete Auken, *for Verts/ALE-Gruppen*. – Fru formand! Tak til ordføreren og også til kommissær Timmermans. Vi har landet et rimelig godt resultat, og vi er især glade for, at vi har fået strammet op på Kommissionens forslag på flere vigtige områder. Det vigtigste er jo nok, at reduktionsvejen frem mod 2030-målene er blevet skærpet, og så at vi har fået lukket det her smuthul, Kommissionen havde fundet til at linke til arealanvendelsen, så det er kommet væk, og at vi har strammet landenes muligheder – eller begrænset landenes muligheder – for at udsætte reduktionen af klimagasser. Det er dog ikke nogen hemmelighed, at vi Grønne havde håbet på mere mod og mere ambition. Dels fra kollegerne her i Parlamentet, men især fra regeringerne.

Reduktioner er svære og gør ondt. Men alternativet gør meget mere ondt, og den regning, vi sender til børneværelset, bliver langt større, hvis vi ikke handler nu og handler hurtigt. Men jeg er jo nok især skuffet over, at vi har mødt så lidt velvilje til at gøre reduktionsvejen endnu kortere. Der er jo forskel på, når man har et mål, om man når det ved at lave sådan en bue, eller man laver sådan en bue her. Og vi havde også meget gerne set, at man havde fået begrænset flere af de her smuthuller. Nu gælder det implementeringen, og her har vi altså også heldigvis sikret bedre gennemsigtighed med indsatsen. Og vi forventer, at de 27 regeringer sætter alt ind på at leve op til de nye reduktionskrav, for man må jo gerne kunne se, at det er fædre og mødre eller bedsteforældre som mig, der laver dette her arbejde.

Anna Zalewska, *w imieniu grupy ECR*. – Pani Przewodnicząca! Panie Komisarzu! Koleżanki i koledzy! Rzeczywiście praca była intensywna, sympatyczna, myślę, że darzyliśmy się szacunkiem, choć bardzo często się nie zgadzaliśmy. I teraz może bez tego zadęcia, prawda osadzona w rzeczywistości. Przypominam artykuł drugi prawa klimatycznego, to był trudny do osiągnięcia kompromisu artykuł, który mówi o tym, że jesteśmy solidarni na poziomie Unii Europejskiej, że uwzględniamy pochłaniacze nie tylko naturalne, bo wiedzieliśmy, że natura nie da sobie rady. Cóż stało się w tych dokumentach? Otóż to prawo i ten artykuł zwyczajnie nie działa.

Po pierwsze LULUCF jest niesprawiedliwy. Myślę, że tutaj wielokrotnie przesympatycznemu sprawozdawcy Finowi zwracałam uwagę, że nie rozumiem, dlaczego oni, tak zasobni w lasy, mają do pochłonięcia 7 mln ton, a Polska 38 milionów ton? Nigdy nie uzyskałam odpowiedzi. Powiedz mi, jutro czy pojutrze osiągnięcie cele? Później będziecie mogli pożyczać, będziecie mogli handlować. Po drugie ten dokument oparty jest na absolutnie nierzeczywistych danych, bo to są dane z 2016 do 2018 roku. Świat lasów wygląda już zupełnie inaczej. Oprócz tego przypominam, jest tam mowa o karaniu, to znaczy nie osiągniesz wyniku, to będziesz o kilka procent musiał swoje wysiłki powiększyć.

I wreszcie nie ma pieniędzy na to, żeby pomagać krajom członkowskim kiedy przyjdzie wichura, kiedy przyjdzie pożar. Jeżeli chodzi o wspólny wysiłek redukcyjny, prześmiewczo w tej chwili nazywany jako ten dotyczący gospodarki i tych elementów natury, które nie są objęte ETSem. Ależ są. Przecież mowa o transporcie, mowa o mieszkaniach i domach. Przecież podwójnie karzemy tych, którzy jeżdżą samochodami, grzeją czy też chłodzą swoje własne domy. Nie uwzględnia absolutnie ten dokument wojny, łącznie z migracją. W Polsce jest kilka milionów ukraińskich obywateli, którzy mają wpływ na to, w jaki sposób też liczy się, czy osiąga się wysiłek redukcyjny.

Wreszcie rezerwa. No, to jest dopiero majstersztyk. Wojna, pandemia, szalejące ceny energii, ETS, który osiąga już 100 euro, a tutaj mowa o podwojeniu teźże rezerwy. Ile ma osiągnąć, żeby pan Frans Timmermans był usatysfakcjonowany? 200? 300 euro? Zapytajcie o to Europejczyków, żeby nie skończyło się tak jak z rozporządzeniem...
(przewodnicząca odebrała mówczyni głos)

Silvia Sardone, *a nome del gruppo ID*. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, il piano dell'Unione europea sull'ambiente continua ad essere un disastro. Commissario Timmermans, ha parlato di una giusta ed equa transizione. Beh, non mi pare. Insomma, i vostri provvedimenti porteranno a sacrificare i settori produttivi, aziende e lavoratori sull'altare di un'ideologia green. Ci sarà un ulteriore spostamento di produzioni fuori dall'Europa, avvantaggiando grandi inquinatori come la Cina.

A livello globale il 33% del totale delle emissioni nocive globali è colpa della Cina: da sola – e dico, da sola! – supera la somma delle quattro economie che la seguono: Stati Uniti, Unione europea, India e Russia. E state bene attenti: non ha ancora raggiunto il picco di emissioni.

Per inseguire gli slogan alla Greta volete penalizzare l'Europa e i suoi cittadini. Ma, soprattutto, chi paga per questi super piani? Pagheranno i consumatori con aumenti dei prezzi e i lavoratori con ansie di fallimento e crisi sociali che già vediamo. Ci volete regalare un'Europa più povera e sempre più succube della Cina?

Io la trovo una totale vergogna! Bel piano, però, il vostro. I dossier, però, fateveli votare magari dei cinesi, perché di sicuro qui noi non li voteremo.

Silvia Modig, The Left-ryhmän puolesta. – Arvoisa puhemies, tänään me taas käsittelemme näitä keskeisiä osia Fit for 55 -paketista, jonka tarkoitus on varmistaa vähintään 55 prosentin nettopäästövähennykset vuodelle 2030 ja siten pitää Pariisin polku meille edelleen mahdollisena. Juhlapuheissahan me nimitämme itse itseämme globaaliksi ilmastojohtajaksi, ja siitä voisi vetää sen johtopäätöksen, että me olemme jo kirkkaasti Pariisin polulla, mutta valitettavasti näin ei vielä ole. Meillä on paljon työtä edessämme, mutta tällä viikolla me toivottavasti otamme jälleen yhden askeleen eteenpäin.

Taakanjakosektori vastaa 60 prosenttia EU:n kokonaispäästöistä ja on tärkeä työkalu vähennysten saavuttamiseen kansallisin toimin. Se tulee säilyttää omana kokonaisuutenaan myös vastaisuudessa. Päästökauppaa ei tule laajentaa taakanjakosektorille, koska ETS toimii parhaiten yritysten ja tuotannon siirtymän vauhdittamisessa, mutta taakanjakosektorilla on jäsenvaltioiden mahdollista huolehtia siitä, että vihreä siirtymä on myös sosiaalisesti kestävä niiden voidessa valita juuri niille sopivat keinot saavuttaa yhdessä päätetyt tavoitteet.

Kokonaisuudessaan näyttää siltä, että Fit for 55:n osalta päästövähennystavoitteissa pääsemme yli 55 prosentin, mikä on hyvä uutinen, mutta hiilineutraalius on balanssi, eli se on täysin riippuvainen siitä, että me myös sidomme hiiltä ja sidomme sitä tarpeeksi. Ja tässä metsien hiilinielu on keskiössä. Tätä vasten on uskomatonta, että sen sijaan, että suojelemme metsien luonnollista nielua varmistamalla, että puu käytetään järkevästi korkean arvonlisän hiiltä pitkään sitoviin tuotteisiin, me poltamme puuta energiakäyttöön. Tämä metsien hiilinielun väärinkäyttö ei ole vain mahdollista, vaan sitä tuetaan erikseen. Oli mistä poliittisesta ryhmästä tahansa, tämän tyhempää käyttötarkoitusta metsille ei voi löytää – ei ilmaston eikä talouden näkökulmasta.

Ja koska meidän on oltava rehellisiä, me emme tule koskaan saamaan kaikkia päästöjä pois elämästämme, joten meillä on oltava ne välttämättömät päästöt kattava nielu. LULUCF:n sääntelyn pitää varmistaa vahvemmat nielut ja varmistaa, että päästövähennyksiä saadaan kaikilta maankäytön alueilta. Tämä esitys ei vielä vie meitä maaliin, mutta se on merkittävä edistysaskel. Ja merkittävää on se, että mietintö asettaa komissiolle veloitteen tuoda tarkempi esitys siitä, miten kaikki maankäytön osa-alueet saadaan päästövähennysten piiriin. Tämä on täysin välttämätöntä, mikäli haluamme onnistua tavoitteissamme.

Jos me haluamme saavuttaa Pariisin polun ja hiilineutraaliustavoitteen, tavoitteen olla neutraali viimeistään 2050, jonka olemme itse itsellemme sitovaksi tavoitteeksi ilmastolakiin kirjanneet, niin meidän on pakko pystyä asettamaan niin maa- kuin metsätaloudelle samat vaatimukset kuin olemme asettaneet kaikille muillekin aloille. Se on välttämätöntä, jotta pääsemme päämääräämme.

Jag vill tacka Jessica Polfjärd för det jättefina samarbetet vi hade om ESR och uppskattar jättemycket ditt inkluderande arbetssätt under arbetet med resten av oss.

Ja kiitos Ville erittäin hyvästä duunista LULUCF:n kanssa! Itse olisin kaikkien näiden kolmen esityksen kohdalla ollut valmis menemään pidemmälle kuin mihin enemmistön tahto riitti, mutta kaikkia näitä kolmea tulen tukemaan mielelläni.

Edina Tóth (NI). – Tisztelt Elnök Asszony! Az éghajlatváltozás kezelése sürgető kihívás. A hatékony környezetvédelmi intézkedések elengedhetetlenek, ugyanakkor az előttünk fekvő javaslatok egyikének a gazdák és erdészek lehetnek a kárvallottjai, hiszen az újonnan meghatározott nagymértékű mezőgazdasági károsanyagkibocsátás-csökkentéshez olyan intézkedések lennének szükségesek, mint például a műtrágya felhasználásának korlátozása vagy az állatállomány csökkentése, valamint a lakosság ételmiszer-fogyasztási szokásainak megváltoztatása.

Tisztelt Timmermans Biztos Úr! Közös célunk, hogy az EU-t modern és versenyképes gazdasággal rendelkező, környezettudatos társadalommal rendelkező közösséggé alakítsuk át, de nem ilyen módon. Gazdáink, erdészeink többet érdemelnek, s most ismét jelentős kihívásokkal kell szembenéznüik. A terhek felelőtlen elosztása helyett teljesíthető célokot várunk el.

Радан Кънев (PPE). – Г-жо Председател, г-н Вицепрезидент, колеги, има един парадокс и той е, че успехът на европейската климатична политика няма да се измери в проценти – нито в 50, нито в 55, нито в 57, нито до 2030, нито до 2032 година. Той ще се измери в икономическата ефективност – успехът, който може да направи тази политика атрактивна за целия свят и така наистина да помогне за борбата ни срещу климата.

И тук има един много прост тест, пред който сме изправени. На първо място, трябва да видим може ли тази политика да бъде атрактивна за по-бедните, икономически по-изостаналите държави вътре в самия ни Съюз. Това е тестът, който ще определи нейния окончателен успех. И тук аз трябва да кажа, че съм оптимист. Има огромни възможности за икономическо развитие в Централна и Източна Европа, базирано на Европейския климатичен закон. Имаме огромни възможности и за добив на критични материали, и за производство на батерии, и за производство на водород, и не просто за производство на енергия от възобновяеми източници, но за връщане на производството на самите възобновяеми източници на европейския континент. Имаме значителен потенциал и в работата по електродвигатели, за да не говорим отново и отново, че електрическите автомобили на бъдещето ще бъдат внасяни в Европа. Но тук искам да отбележа и нещо обратно. Моята страна България до момента е намалила парниковите си газове с над 40% спрямо 90-та година, но не благодарение на модерно технологично развитие, а на деиндустриализация. И тук особено за *effort sharing regulation* трябва много внимателно да обърнем внимание, да преценим дали той е наистина справедлив и дали е атрактивен и отваря шансове пред държави като България.

Delara Burkhardt (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! 2030 — das klingt immer ganz schön weit weg. Aber es sind nur noch sieben Jahre. Nur sieben Jahre, bis wir unsere Emissionen in allen Bereichen um mindestens 55 % zu reduzieren haben, wozu wir uns ja rechtlich, aber auch international verpflichtet haben. Und es sind ja auch keine Zahlen, die wir irgendwie gewürfelt haben, sondern es sind harte planetare Grenzen, mit denen wir hier verhandeln.

Wir sind die Politikerinnen- und Politikergeneration, die nicht nur abstrakt von diesen Fernzielen sprechen kann. Wir müssen konkret werden, und wir müssen alle Bereiche der Wirtschaft in die Pflicht nehmen. Wir werden daran gemessen werden, wie gut wir diese Entscheidung auf den Weg gebracht haben.

Und es ist gut, dass wir genau das eben in den in dieser Woche abzustimmenden Dossiers so gut geschafft haben. Ich möchte da insbesondere noch mal Ville für die gute Zusammenarbeit bei der LULUCF-Verordnung danken. Allein mit der können wir unser Klimaziel nämlich schon auf 57 % anheben. Und zusammen mit dem REPowerEU-Paket zur Energieunabhängigkeit von Russland gibt es sogar bis zu 60 %. Also wir haben hier wirklich gezeigt, dass wir mit Zusammenarbeit und mit Fleiß unsere eigenen Klimaziele sogar übertreffen können.

Mir geht es aber nicht nur um diese Zahlen und um diese abstrakten Ziele, sondern um dieses Wie. Ich kämpfe für eine EU, in der nicht Wohnort oder Geldbeutel entscheiden kann, ob man nachhaltig leben kann. Dafür ist es eben doch entscheidend, wer mit am Verhandlungstisch sitzt und wessen Interessen hier verteidigt werden. Ich muss sagen, für die anstehenden Herausforderungen und Verhandlungen, die noch vor uns stehen – wenn ich an die Pestizidverordnung denke, wenn ich an die Naturwiederherstellungsrichtlinie denke oder auch die Abstimmung zum Verbrenner-Aus – da mache ich mir etwas Sorgen, dass uns dieser Spirit von den Verhandlungen verloren geht.

Das ständige Gerede von einer technologieoffenen Klimapolitik ist nämlich vor allen Dingen eines: Das Festhalten an einem durch massive Subventionen geförderten fossilen Wirtschaftsmodell. Der Kampf gegen das Verbrenner-Aus und andere wegweisende EU-Klimainstrumente schützt genau diese fossilen Interessen und nicht die der Verbraucherinnen und Verbraucher.

Mit diesen Schaufensterdebatten gestalten Sie keine Zukunft. Sie machen Menschen Angst vor der Zukunft, und Sie stehlen sich aus der Verantwortung. Sie wollen den Markt regeln lassen, der ja eine ach so beeindruckende Bilanz darin hat, der Klimakrise etwas entgegenzusetzen. Dabei unterstützen sie nicht die Interessen der Mehrheit der Bürgerinnen und Bürger, sondern lassen sich für die Interessen derjenigen einspannen, die sich aus der Ausbeutung von Mensch und Planet ein profitables Geschäftsmodell auf Kosten aller gebaut haben.

Das Paket „Fit für 55“ ist ein Riesenschritt Richtung Klimaneutralität 2050. Es zeigt, was möglich ist, wenn wir den politischen Willen haben. Wer allen Menschen in Europa eine sichere, klimaneutrale Zukunft ermöglichen will, darf jetzt nicht blockieren, sondern muss die Ärmel hochkrempeln und dafür sorgen, dass zukunftsfähige Technologien und gesellschaftliche Teilhabe für alle Menschen zur Verfügung stehen.

(Die Rednerin lehnt eine Wortmeldung nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“ von Bogdan Rzońca ab)

Martin Hojsík (Renew). – Vážená pani predsedajúca. Obrovská príležitosť pre Slovensko, pre Európu, pre našu budúcnosť. Tak sa dá zjednodušene popísať európsky klimatický balík. Klimatická kríza je hrozba pre naše prežitie. Fit for 55 je šanca zlepšiť našu budúcnosť. Pomôcť nielen klíme, ale aj pomôcť vytvoriť nové pracovné miesta. Pomôcť znížiť účty za energie, pomôcť chrániť našu slobodu. Slobodu od dovozu fosílnych palív, ale aj slobodu každého a každej z nás, ktorí si budú vedieť vyrobiť energiu sami doma. Naštartovanie rozvoja zelenej ekonomiky. Ale aj úžasnú príležitosť konečne čeliť výzvam ruka v ruke s prírodou. Nie ju ničieť. Pre záchranu klímy totiž prírodu potrebujeme. Ona najlepšie zachytáva uhlík z atmosféry. Využime to. Bude to dobré pre naše lesy, ale aj pre našich farmárov a farmárky. Nespadne to však samé z neba. Nestačí na to európska legislatíva. Bude to na európskych vládoch, či dokážu túto šancu pre svojich občanov a firmy využiť. Teda aj na tej slovenskej. A tu mám obavy, ako ukazuje fiasko programu Obnov dom. Preto bude dôležité, aby občania, ale aj my v Európskom parlamente sme napomohli využitiu príležitosti, ktorou ochrana klímy je.

(Rečník súhlasil, že bude reagovať na vystúpenie po zdvihnutí modrej karty)

Bogdan Rzońca (ECR), *wystąpienie zasygnalizowane przez podniesienie niebieskiej kartki.* – Ja wiem, że jest Pan znawcą tematu i jest Pan profesjonalistą w zakresie ekologii. Doceniam to, ale dwie godziny temu odbyła się debata na temat Energy performance of buildings na tej sali. Proszę Pana, posłanka z Rumunii mówiła, że 60% Rumunów nie będzie stać na politykę klimatyczną. Poseł z Niderlandów powiedział, że potrzeba w samych Niderlandach 1 miliard euro na dokumenty, żeby wprowadzić politykę klimatyczną. A poseł z Niemiec powiedział, że wpompowano 40 mld w ocieplanie budynków w Niemczech i nie ma efektu. Pan pochodzi ze Słowacji? Czy nie ma Pan obaw, że biedni ludzie po prostu nie wytrzymają tego tempa zmian, które Państwo proponują?

Martin Hojsík (Renew), *blue-card reply.* – This is a big opportunity. We have a lot of money in REPowerEU, in the RRF, in the cohesion funds. This is about using the opportunity or threatening that this is going to destroy us. We can choose – Poland can choose, Slovakia can choose, every country can choose. The question is, which side are you on? Are you going to keep on threatening or are you going to look at this as an opportunity for Poland as well?

President. – Before giving the floor to our next speaker, I would like to remind you that the blue-card system should enable a lively debate, but the game is '30 seconds each' and no longer.

Michael Bloss (Verts/ALE). – Frau Präsidentin, sehr geehrte Damen und Herren! Der Grüne Deal ist das zentrale Gesetzgebungspaket dieser Wahlperiode. Wir haben unseren Wählerinnen und Wählern, unseren Kindern, den nachfolgenden Generationen das Versprechen gegeben, die Klimakrise einzudämmen, die Klimaziele und das Pariser Klimaschutzübereinkommen einzuhalten. Daran wird man uns messen. Aber auch in diesem Haus und gerade vonseiten der Konservativen wird versucht, zentrale Elemente des Grünen Deals zu Fall zu bringen.

Wenn sie gegen das Verbrenner-Aus, gegen den Klimaschutz im Verkehr stimmen, dann stimmen sie gegen die Klimaziele. Wenn sie gegen das Sanieren von Häusern stimmen, dann stimmen sie gegen die Klimaziele. Wenn es zum Schwur kommt, dann läuft man nicht weg – frei nach dem Motto: Wasch mir den Pelz, aber mach mich nicht nass. Die Industrie wünscht sich gerade beim Verbrenner-Aus klare Vorgaben.

Man kann sich an die Vergangenheit festkleben, aber die USA und China ziehen industriepolitisch total an uns vorbei. Die Klimaindustrien, die Solarzellen, die Windräder, der grüne Stahl und ja, vor allen Dingen die E-Autos – da sind die sicheren Jobs von morgen. Wer sich dem Fortschritt verweigert, der befeuert die Deindustrialisierung. Also vermasseln Sie es nicht! Wir müssen vom Boom der Klimaindustrie profitieren.

An die Adresse der deutschen Bundesregierung sage ich: Sie verhalten sich gerade wie der Elefant im Porzellanladen. Das gefährdet, wie man hier in Europa Gesetze macht. Sie haben für das Verbrenner-Aus gestimmt. Stehen Sie zu Ihrem Verhalten. Denn sonst gibt es auch für andere Staaten kein Halten mehr. Dann wird hier jeder immer versuchen, ganz am Ende etwas für sich herauszupressen.

Bert-Jan Ruissen (ECR). – Voorzitter, geachte commissaris, beste collega's, deze week stemmen we dus over "Fit for 55", maar *fit for purpose* is het pakket dat nu voorligt allerminst. Transitie kosten tijd. Voor echt duurzaam beleid moeten de doelen daarom realistisch zijn, en dat zijn ze in wat nu voorligt helaas niet.

Ik heb gepleit voor meer flexibiliteit en meer inzet op kostenefficiëntie. Er is iets meer flexibiliteit gekomen tussen de verordening inzake de verdeling van de inspanningen en het ETS, maar deze is in mijn beleving bij lange na niet genoeg. Ondertussen wordt alles en alles maar duurder en duurder en ons concurrentievermogen wordt ernstig aangetast, resulterend in een steeds luidere roep om een verdere versoepeling van de staatssteunregels ter compensatie. Dat kan de oplossing toch niet zijn, zeker niet als we zien dat de bereidheid om sectoren te helpen sterk verschilt per lidstaat en de versoepeling van de staatssteunregels het gelijke speelveld binnen de EU dus sterk zal ondermijnen.

Voorzitter, laten we op tijd inzien dat onze concurrentiekracht van strategisch belang is. Van verplaatsing van de productie naar het buitenland wordt het milieu echt niet beter. Het is bovendien onverstandig nog afhankelijk te worden van invoer. Laten we er daarom voor zorgen dat *made in Europe* betaalbaar blijft.

Catherine Griset (ID). – Madame la Présidente, chers collègues, si, par ambition, l'Union européenne entend nous mener sur la voie du suicide économique, et cela en pure perte, alors nous n'avons pas la même définition de ce mot et c'est fondamental. Vous aurez beau revoir toujours plus à la hausse les objectifs climatiques de l'UE, nos efforts seront engloutis par la croissance du reste du monde. Vous voulez faire de l'UE un continent totalement décarboné? Vous en ferez un continent totalement déclassé.

L'ambition doit porter sur la relocalisation massive de nos industries, la promotion des dernières technologies nucléaires et du renouvelable sur notre sol et le contrôle de nos chaînes d'approvisionnement. C'est en baissant nos émissions importées que nous avancerons et c'est en protégeant notre modèle que nous montrerons l'exemple.

Dans un contexte de bouleversement géopolitique aux répercussions majeures sur nos économies, fixer des objectifs contraignants aux États sans tenir compte de leurs spécificités et selon des critères injustes est une fuite en avant. Tout cela pour satisfaire aux exigences d'un pacte vert irréaliste.

Marina Mesure (The Left). – Madame la Présidente, chers collègues, dans le cadre de la feuille de route de l'Union européenne, pour mettre en œuvre les objectifs de l'Accord de Paris sur le climat, le Parlement européen doit se prononcer sur les résultats des négociations interinstitutionnelles de certaines propositions législatives. L'objectif de diminuer drastiquement les émissions de gaz à effet de serre est le bon.

Mais encore une fois, les outils proposés ne sont pas toujours à la hauteur des ambitions affichées. Si le développement des puits de carbone visant à mieux entretenir et protéger nos forêts contre la surexploitation et la bétonisation est une belle avancée, je suis beaucoup plus critique sur le renforcement des outils qui font reposer sur des logiques de marché, encore une fois, et non sur la planification, notre bifurcation écologique.

Depuis sa création, le marché carbone a eu des effets marginaux sur la réduction des émissions. Pire encore, certains industriels l'ont détourné et se sont gavés en revendant leurs droits à polluer. Nous avons accompli l'exploit de passer de pollueur-payeur au pollueur-payé. Tout ceci n'est pas sérieux.

C'était la même logique qu'il y a eu avec la soi-disant taxe carbone aux frontières qui n'en est pas une. Elle portait en elle de grands espoirs pour protéger nos secteurs stratégiques, pour produire davantage en Europe avec de meilleures normes sociales et environnementales. Mais finalement, le CBAM s'est contenté encore une fois de développer le marché carbone au reste du monde, ce qui n'est pas la solution.

En conclusion, réduire nos émissions est crucial, mais pour cela, il faut changer de logiciel. N'attendons plus que le marché décide à notre place, planifions et régulons par nous-mêmes dans le cadre de l'intérêt général.

Maria Angela Danzi (NI). – Signora Presidente, Commissario, onorevoli colleghi, i cambiamenti climatici sono un'emergenza globale che colpisce i Paesi di tutti i continenti attraverso congiunture economiche, condizioni meteorologiche estreme e l'innalzamento dei livelli dei mari.

Il più grande progetto politico della nostra epoca è cercare di limitare tali effetti attraverso riduzioni ambiziose delle emissioni di gas a effetto serra, garantendo comunque, nel contempo, una transizione giusta e la competitività delle nostre economie.

Sono importanti gli obiettivi nazionali fissati: i terreni coltivati, i pascoli, le zone umide devono diventare una fonte di rimozione netta. L'alimentazione deve essere più rispettosa del clima. Bisogna introdurre sistemi di gestione forestale più sostenibili. Bisogna ripristinare i terreni degradati.

Basta col consumo del suolo, ma basta anche con politiche recessive. Bisogna incanalare entrate pubbliche per sostenere i singoli agricoltori che mettono in pratica pratiche rispettose della biodiversità.

Cristian-Silviu Buşoi (PPE). – Madam President, dear Mr Timmermans, dear colleagues, we should remain strongly committed to Green Deal and Fit for 55 strategic goals, but we need to find the best solutions to implement these objectives in the new economic and geopolitical context.

We need to take care of our industries, our companies. They should remain competitive worldwide, and the cost of energy for our citizens should remain decent. The overall compromise on ETS and other associated files is better than the original proposal, and I would like to thank, once again, Mr Liese for that.

On MSR in particular, the file that I followed, 12% was good at the beginning, but assessments showed it was not enough and that 24% worked better. Therefore, when negotiating the file with my colleagues in ENVI this time, we reached the agreement that MSR should be maintained at 24% as to avoid shocks and to ensure complementarity, coherence and effectiveness in achieving the 2030 and 2050 climate ambition.

That's why I would like to thank also Mr Engerer, the rapporteur, for his work on keeping the mandate of the Parliament clear during negotiations and assuring that the intake of 24% is maintained and not increased beyond 2023 and until the end of Phase IV. This will ensure market predictability and serve as a bridge in the next years and also will contribute to achieve our goals without putting in danger the competitiveness of our industries and our companies.

Heléne Fritzon (S&D). – Fru talman! Kommissionär! Snart är *Fit for 55* på riktigt. Jag hoppas att alla i dag är införstådda med att marknadsstabilitetsreserven är mycket stor och viktig för klimatet. Det är en nyckelfaktor för att EU:s utsläppshandelssystem – ETS – ska fungera som det faktiskt var tänkt.

Som vi alla vet har det varit problem med EU:s utsläppshandel med det stora överskott som vi fick på utsläppsrätter efter finanskrisen. Det blev låga priser, och det blev svaga signaler till industrin att minska koldioxidutsläppen. Men i och med marknadsstabilitetsreserven sänder ETS-priserna nu rätt signaler till industrin om att faktiskt minska sina utsläpp.

Därför tycker jag att det är viktigt en dag som denna att framföra ett tack till våra förhandlare. Det gäller inte bara för den här delen om marknadsstabilitetsreserven, utan också för de andra viktiga ärendena som nu gör att vi flyttar fram positionerna, och som gör att vi i varje medlemsstat på riktigt kan ta kampen för att klara klimatomställningen på ett sätt så att vi kan lova våra barn och barnbarn och kommande generationer att vi minskar i det här parlamentet, i vårt EU, i vår union, tar ansvar för klimatomställningen och överlämnar en planet och en miljö till kommande generationer. Stort tack!

Jag vill uppmana till ett brett stöd för förslaget när det ska beslutas här i parlamentet. Det är kritiskt och avgörande att vi har en bred uppslutning i vårt parlament för klimatomställningen. Nu kan resan med *Fit for 55* börja på riktigt!

Emma Wiesner (Renew). – Frau Präsidentin! Es kommt nicht oft vor, aber heute möchte ich mich als Schwedin und Liberale auf Deutsch an Sie wenden. Ich habe wirklich nie gedacht, dass ich Deutschland den Wert von Klimaschutzmaßnahmen erklären muss. Deutschland! Aber wenn die gesamte Zukunft des Pakets „Fit für 55“ auf dem Spiel steht, dann erfordert das Extremmaßnahmen. Ich schaue Sie an und wende mich an Sie, die deutsche Bundesregierung.

„Fit für 55“ ist unser Fahrplan für die Zukunft. Aber es ist ein zerbrechliches Haus, das sich in einem empfindlichen Gleichgewicht befindet. Nimmt man ein entschieden wichtiges Teil aus, dann fällt es zusammen. Und wenn ich Haus sage, dann meine ich unsere Klimaschutzmaßnahmen, unsere Zukunft. Es ist absolut unverantwortlich, kritische Elemente, die bereits vereinbarten Gesetze zu blockieren.

Ich spreche zu Ihnen als Schwedin, als Parlamentarierin, als junge Europäerin, als Liberale. Bitte setzen Sie sich für das Paket „Fit für 55“ ein und hören Sie auf, das zentrale Element unseres Klimapakets, das Ende des Verbrenners, zu blockieren.

Die Präsidentin. – Dankeschön für die Rede in ausgezeichnetem Deutsch.

Nicolae Ștefănuță (Verts/ALE). – Doamna președintă, domnule Timmermans, este prima oară când un deputat român vorbește în calitate de Verde european, dar nu este prima oară când un deputat român vorbește despre schimbările climatice în care crede și la care trebuie să avem răspuns.

Criza climatică este aici, dar orice criză poate fi și o oportunitate, o oportunitate pentru progres. Numai trebuie să oferim claritate oamenilor și trebuie să vorbim omenește, pe românește, cum zicem noi acasă.

Vă dau un exemplu: programul Casa Verde din România. La televizor ni se spune că oamenii nu vor tranziție verde. Dar realitatea este că zeci de mii de familii au aplicat deja la Casa Verde și vor să-și pună panouri fotovoltaice pe casă și să economisească la factură. Dar guvernul și companiile nu lasă oamenii să devină producători, acei prosumatori, cum se spune în limba aceasta bruxelleză, adică în anul în care companiile de energie au făcut recorduri de profit, ele nu lasă pe alții să producă pentru ei. Ele sunt problema. Aici este problema.

Nu Europa este problema, nu schimbările climatice sunt problema, problema sunt cei care rezistă unei realități și unei direcții foarte clare a lumii în care trăim.

Zbigniew Kuźmiuk (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Panie Komisarzu! Podstawowe zastrzeżenia, jakie chcę zgłosić do tego pakietu to przede wszystkim to, że jest on oparty w dużej mierze na ideologii, a względy merytoryczne niestety zeszły na dalszy plan. Pogarszamy konkurencyjność europejskiej gospodarki, europejskiego rolnictwa, a przecież Unia Europejska odpowiada zaledwie za 7% światowej emisji CO₂. Pozostali emitenci, w tym szczególnie ci główni, niespecjalnie się przejmują, w zasadzie markują politykę ograniczania emisji CO₂. Co więcej, głównym beneficjentem jest gospodarka chińska, była ona już tutaj przywoływana. Chiny są czołowym producentem fotowoltaiki, samochodów z silnikami elektrycznymi. To oni są głównymi beneficjentami unijnej polityki klimatycznej, a jednocześnie uruchamiają elektrownie węglowe na ogromną skalę. Tego nie można kontynuować.

Jeżeli chodzi o to rozporządzenia LULUCF, to tu także są potężne zastrzeżenia. Uderzy w europejską hodowlę, a przecież WPR odpowiada za bezpieczeństwo żywnościowe. Uderzy w gospodarkę leśną, a w niej przecież pracuje 2,5 miliona pracowników. To jest droga donikąd, Panie Komisarzu.

Laura Huhtasaari (ID). – Arvoisa puhemies, kun puu hakataan ja se joko poltetaan tai siitä valmistetaan jotain, niin hakatun puun tilalle kasvaa uusi puu, joka sitoo päästöjä. Nuori metsä sitoo tehokkaammin hiiltä kuin vanha metsä. Niin kauan kuin metsää kasvaa enemmän kuin sitä hakataan, ei pitäisi olla mitään ongelmaa. Tämä on tilanne Suomessa. Suomessa on enemmän metsää kuin koskaan aiemmin. Suomi on jo nyt hiilinielu.

Taloudellisesti ja geopoliittisesti epävarmana aikana 310 miljoonan hiilidioksidiekvivalentitonnin tavoite on liian kireä. 225 olisi ollut parempi. Jos meillä ei ole riittävästi vientituloja, emme ainakaan pysty pitämään huolta luonnosta, saati ihmisistä.

João Pimenta Lopes (The Left). – Senhora Presidente, a União Europeia insiste nas soluções neoliberais e de mercado como o alfa e o omega do combate aos problemas ambientais com que nos confrontamos. Procura iludir que mecanismos como o comércio de licenças de emissão de gases com efeito de estufa, que promove, além de perversos – transformando num negócio a compra e a venda do direito a poluir – se demonstram ineficazes na redução de emissões.

Medidas ditas verdes que, ao mesmo tempo, impõem desigualdades, assimetrias de desenvolvimento e injustiças sociais, empurrando os custos deste mercado para as famílias já a braços com o brutal aumento do custo de vida, decorrente, também ele, de opções e políticas da União Europeia. Um combate sério à redução das emissões exige outro caminho. E existem alternativas.

É necessário adotar uma abordagem de tipo normativo, que fixe objetivos de redução de acordo com critérios justos, eficazes e transparentes, que integrem o princípio da responsabilidade comum, mas diferenciada, alinhados com a disseminação das melhores tecnologias disponíveis, a par, entre outros, da mudança de políticas nos setores da energia e dos transportes, recuperando o controlo público destes setores estratégicos, valorizando a produção nacional e promovendo o investimento público.

IN THE CHAIR: MARC ANGEL

Vice-President

Achille Variati (S&D). – Signor Presidente, signor Commissario, Vicepresidente, onorevoli colleghi, i dati di Eurobarometro hanno mostrato, ancora una volta, come la lotta al cambiamento climatico sia una delle priorità per i cittadini europei. Il Parlamento europeo, con l'approvazione di questo ulteriore pacchetto «Pronti per il 55», che include la riduzione delle emissioni di CO₂ nei trasporti, negli edifici, in agricoltura, nella gestione dei rifiuti, vuole lanciare un messaggio chiaro in questa direzione: e cioè il futuro nostro e delle prossime generazioni passa per una società e un'economia più sostenibili.

Domani adotteremo una serie di testi ambiziosi, in linea con gli impegni presi dall'UE nell'Accordo di Parigi, che prevedono al tempo stesso sistemi di flessibilità per gli Stati membri per metterli in condizione di realizzare gli obiettivi che sono previsti. Se programmata e gestita con lungimiranza, infatti, la transizione verso un sistema a zero emissioni nette non è solo benefica per l'ambiente, ma anche per una crescita economica delle nostre società.

Crescita sostenibile, lavoro e ambiente possono, debbono stare insieme. Per questa ragione mi auguro che il Consiglio rispetti gli impegni già presi, in particolare per il *dossier* sulle automobili, che rappresenta un pilastro per raggiungere gli obiettivi che oggi ci proponiamo.

Quanto stiamo vedendo in alcuni Stati, come ad esempio da parte del Governo italiano, malgrado che nel mio Paese vi sia la Pianura Padana che soffre di un inquinamento dell'aria tra i peggiori inquinamenti del mondo, rappresenta un grave passo indietro e non rappresenta certo la volontà della maggioranza dei cittadini europei. Quindi, spero che il Consiglio sia lungimirante e che rispetti gli impegni.

Elsi Katainen (Renew). – Arvoisa puhemies, ensinnäkin kiitokset LULUCF:n päävalmistelijalle Ville Niinistölle ja muille kollegoille loppujen lopuksi sitten kuitenkin ihan tasapainoisesta lopputuloksesta. Maaperällä ja metsillä on tärkeä asema hiilinieluna ja varastona ja ehdottomasti myös kestävästi tuotettujen raaka-aineiden lähteenä.

Itse olen tyytyväinen siihen, että LULUCF-asetuksen hiilinielutavoite on ilmastolain mukainen, ja päätavoite EU:n ilmastotalkoissa on päästöjen vähentäminen. Merkittävä parannus on se, että hiilinielujen laskentamalli perustuu nielujen viimeaikaiseen, ihan siihen reaalikehitykseen. Toivon, että EU:n komissiosta löytyy ymmärrystä myös sille vuosittaiselle nielujen vaihtelulle, mikä on metsäluonnossa ihan luontaista ja usein myös ihmisen toiminnasta riippumatonta.

Viisautta oli myös lykätä AFOLU:n eli taakanjako- ja maankäyttösektorien yhdistämistä, koska myös hiilistifikaatteja koskevat säännöt ovat vasta nyt työn alla. Aivan ehdottoman tärkeää on se, että jokaisen jäsenvaltion on itse vastattava päästöistään ja nieluistaan, sillä näin nimenomaan voidaan tehokkaasti torjua ilmastonmuutosta.

Pär Holmgren (Verts/ALE). – Herr talman! Det är både fascinerande och ganska skrämmande, tycker jag, att lyssna på denna debatt. Det verkar vara så många här i kammaren som är nöjda och glada och verkar tycka att det som vi har kommit fram till är tillräckligt – när vi är så långt ifrån det som krävs enligt vetenskapen för att vara i linje med Parisavtalet.

Det gör i sin tur att vi blir ännu mer beroende av negativa utsläpp, att lagra kol i skog och mark. Men vad händer då? Framför allt på högersidan, både här i parlamentet och i rådet, motarbetar man även de ambitionerna. Inte minst den svenska regeringen har ju under den här perioden gjort allt för att sänka ambitionerna när det gäller att lagra mer kol i skog och mark.

Det är inte bara riktigt usel klimatpolitik, utan det är också tyvärr ytterligare ett tecken, ett bevis, på att Sverige inte alls längre är ledande i klimat- och miljöfrågor. Det tycker jag är väldigt sorgligt.

Ivan David (ID). – (*začátek vystoupení mimo mikrofon*)... ke změnám dochází. Dochází k nim po celá staletí, z nichž máme písemné doklady, docházelo k nim miliony let, aniž by existoval průmysl, doprava a zemědělství, aniž by existoval člověk. Bude k nim docházet, i když člověk jako živočišný druh zmizí. Předstírat, že hlavní příčinou klimatických změn je činnost člověka, je naprosto neudržitelné. Stejně tak činnost člověka klimatickým změnám nezabrání. Tím méně toho lze dosáhnout v Evropské unii ve prospěch celého světa. Země Evropské unie tvoří 1/10 světové plochy. Na antropogenní produkci skleníkových plynů se podílí 8 až 9 %, ale antropogenní tvorba skleníkových plynů činí méně než 5 % celkové produkce skleníkových plynů. Prosazovaná opatření v Evropské unii ovlivní bilanci skleníkových plynů v řádu desetin procenta. Podaří se však dosáhnout zničení evropského průmyslu, zemědělství, dopravy a prohloubení lidské bída v Evropské unii.

Bas Eickhout (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, tomorrow we will adopt a very important pillar of the Fit for 55 package. It encompasses 60% of the EU's greenhouse gas emissions, and this shows how important that package is.

First of all, I would like to thank very much Jessica Polfjärd, who has been fighting to establish the Effort Sharing Regulation, which is, of course, setting national targets for all those sectors in countries that do not fall under the emissions trading system (ETS). It was a big fight in limiting the flexibilities where most of the Member States want to delay action every time. I very much thank you for making sure that not too many flexibilities were granted to the Member States.

Talking about delaying action, we can't do that and we can't afford that in our land use system. In the land use system, we desperately need to change our source into a sink. I really would like to thank Ville Niinistö for his efforts in the LULUCF Regulation to make sure that here also the flexibilities were limited. All this together will bring us as Europe now to -57%, as you rightly said, which then hopefully can be translated also into an increased NDC so that we can go to the next COP with an even stronger story as Europe.

Thomas Waitz (Verts/ALE). – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar! Jene Abgeordneten, vor allem rechts der Mitte, die hier im Haus verantwortungslose Arbeitsverweigerung bei Maßnahmen gegen die Klima- und Biodiversitätskrise betreiben, versündigen sich an den Lebenschancen künftiger Generationen. Sie verzögern die Innovationen unserer Industrie zum Schaden künftiger wirtschaftlicher Entwicklung, und sie nehmen wissentlich Tod und Vertreibung von Millionen von Menschen, vor allem in ärmeren Ländern dieser Welt, in Kauf.

Aber es ist noch Zeit zur Umkehr. Hören Sie auf, mit Falschmeldungen und Angstmache den Fortschritt zu blockieren! Arbeiten Sie konstruktiv mit an den Lösungen für das 21. Jahrhundert, nicht nur bei Sonntagsreden, sondern konkret bei den kommenden Abstimmungen hier im Haus. Gebäude isolieren statt horrenden Energierechnungen, moderne Elektroantriebe statt alte Stinker und blühende Landschaften statt vergiftete Agrarwüsten.

Catch-the-eye procedure

Mick Wallace (The Left). – Mr President, in light of Europe's historic responsibility and its capacity to act, the EU must reduce its domestic greenhouse gas emissions by at least 65% by 2030, compared to 1990 levels. To meet this, the Effort Sharing Regulation needs to achieve at least 50% emissions reductions by 2030, compared to the 2005 levels.

The emissions reduction trajectory in the agreement is less ambitious than Parliament's position. The agreement contains loopholes that would exempt Member States from around half of the emissions cuts that they are supposed to deliver on the basis of the emissions reduction trajectory. Member States would still not have to count emissions from unsustainable biomass in their national greenhouse gas inventories. The access to justice element has been gutted.

The IPCC has told us that we need rapid, far reaching and unprecedented changes to all aspects of our society. That warning is not really reflected in the agreement.

Clare Daly (The Left). – Mr President, today we are discussing three pieces of legislation in the Fit for 55 Package aiming at climate neutrality in the EU by 2050. Among them is the update of the regulation on land use and forests for the period 2021 to 2030.

We all know that to achieve the EU's climate objectives and climate stability, European and national policies rely heavily on carbon storage in forests. However, new data from the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change shows that most EU countries are losing or have lost their forest and terrestrial carbon sinks. This is obviously disastrous. While we say one thing, our actions are leading us in a different direction.

Overexploitation of forests for energy production appears to be one of the main factors for this loss, as the current fuel crisis leads to an acceleration of panic logging and firewood purchases. The consequence of our failure to develop clean technologies is becoming more apparent. We need to recognise, accelerate and deal with the issue of biomass. Harvesting has to be reduced.

(End of catch-the-eye procedure)

Frans Timmermans, Executive Vice-President of the Commission. – Mr President, honourable Members, very briefly, first of all I need to stress that those who say 'slow down to save our economy, slow down to save our jobs' – I think they are wrong. If we want to save our jobs, if we want to save our economy, we actually should be speeding up.

Look at what's happening globally. Some say, 'well, look at China – 30% of the emissions, still increasing the emissions'. There's also another way you could look at China: half of the cars sold in China now are already electric cars. Their investment in renewables is beyond our wildest imagination. Their transition to renewable energy will be very fast. Look at the Inflation Reduction Act in the United States: this will have a huge impact on the transition to a renewable economy.

Honourable Members, we just don't have the luxury of slowing down. If we really want jobs that are sustainable jobs, future-oriented jobs, if we want our economy to be competitive in the future, this transition needs to happen and it needs to happen now. And I salute the European Parliament, its majority, in seeing the necessity of this and voting on these three proposals tomorrow.

My second point is this: our approach is not an ideological approach. I fear that closing your eyes to science is the ideological approach. Let scientists inform us. Let science guide us. That's how we should use rational thought in this, not ideology. And the science is crystal clear. I would say the science is also crystal clear on what's happening in our sinks. And by monitoring what is happening, we can find solutions.

If the European Commission monitors – and I respect Finnish colleagues and Swedish colleagues saying 'What do you know as a Dutchman about forests? You know every individual tree in the Netherlands by name', and I respect that – but then at least listen to your own scientists. Let them guide you and let us help you in taking the right decisions. This is my plea. Member States themselves decide, but let the decision be a rational one based on science.

And finally, some of you made remarks about cars. And, here, let me also take away a misunderstanding. Our legislation says there should be no emissions at the tailpipe in 2035. That's what was agreed between the co-legislators. In my view, that's technological neutrality. If you can make something that creates propulsion without emissions, you can make the choice yourself. So if in Germany they're always talking about 'Verbrenner-Aus' and all of that, we're saying 'no emissions at the tailpipe', and whatever you can find to have no emissions at the tailpipe is in line with the legislation. Also here, let science and economic logic dictate the choices we need to make.

Jessica Polfjärd, *föredragande*. – Herr talman! Tack till er som har deltagit i debatten. Jag tycker att det har funnits en ganska bred samsyn i hur vi faktiskt kan jobba tillsammans. Om vi vill någonting, så har vi också kunnat visa att vi kan få det att hända.

Vägen fram är inte spikrak, vilket flera har vittnat om här i debatten. Det finns delar som man skulle velat att de var mer långtgående och delar som man skulle vilja se mindre av. Samtidigt är det detta som vi har kommit fram till och kunnat kompromissa om för att kunna nå ett resultat.

Som föredragande har man förstått att det kan vara så att man åldras ganska fort under en förhandling, men vi ser det som glädjande att ha ett resultat som vi ska rösta om i morgon.

Använd dock aldrig Rysslands olagliga annektering av Ukraina som ursäkt för att sänka ambitionerna i det här huset. Den dag då Putin får sätta agendan i en demokratiskt vald församling, ja, då har vi förlorat. Det finns ingen ursäkt för att sänka våra ambitioner. Istället måste vi öka möjligheterna till demokratiskt arbete för att kunna nå fram och kunna nå en enighet som håller över tid.

Jag hoppas att vi här i morgon kan anta detta lagförslag där vi har målsättningar, där vi har lagstiftning, för att kunna nå de mål som vi alla gemensamt har kommit överens om.

Ville Niinistö, *rapporteur*. – Mr President, thank you for the debate and the positive, constructive spirit. I obviously also want to answer to the question stated by one MEP about is this enough. Obviously, we all know when it comes to climate ambition and keeping the global warming to 1.5 degrees, or even close to that, we as Europe also need to do more.

So when it comes to the land-use sector, my view is that this is the starting point. We are now starting for the first time to have a proper increase of carbon-sink policy, and this is the basis where we will build on post 2030 to continue increasing our carbon sinks.

When it comes to Member States' contributions, there were some who were saying that some Member States need to do more, some less, and this is unfair. Well, everybody needs to contribute more in comparison to the inventory years.

I think it is important also for the Commission and as a parliament to send a signal that those countries to actually start to think about land use in a different way. How can we increase sustainability in a way that is good for economics as well, that creates jobs, that will be more productive for agriculture, for forestry, and takes more into consideration to biodiversity as well? They will also be better off in the future.

So if they postpone having a proper carbon-sink policy, my view is that some Member States still don't have one. They just report what has happened. The Commission needs to intervene. You have the tools in this regulation to intervene and help Member States to realise that tapping into regenerative farming and forestry is a possibility for the Member States, for the economics, but also a necessity for the climate.

Finally, also the compromise includes the review for the Commission to go through in late 2024 what to do beyond this. There is very clear language also that all land-use sectors need to contribute. So we need to also see how agriculture will be better climate wise, how we can support carbon farming and also public policies, not just private companies' contributions.

When it comes to forestry, we need to look at better management methods, cascading principal, higher added value for products, so getting more economic wellbeing out of less amount of resources. So the harvesting amounts we do have today are a problem, and we need to also solve that, not just going for the bulk industry when it comes to forestry, but have more higher end products with lesser impact for negative impact for climate and biodiversity. That is to say, for the economics of this sector as well, as well as all the other sectors – they are not going to succeed, but are trying to hang on to bad practices.

President. – The debate is closed.

The vote will take place tomorrow, Tuesday 14 March.

16. Spójność polityki na rzecz rozwoju (krótka prezentacja)

President. – The next item is a short presentation of the report by Janina Ochojska on Policy Coherence for Development [2021/2164(INI)] (A9-0019/2023).

Janina Ochojska, sprawozdawczyni. – Pani Przewodnicząca! Drogie Koleżanki i Koledzy! Spójność polityk na rzecz rozwoju PCD polega na minimalizowaniu sprzeczności i tworzeniu synergii między poszczególnymi obszarami polityki w sposób zapewniający ich spójność. Oznacza to, że musimy unikać sytuacji, w których pomagając komuś, jednocześnie szkodzimy mu w inny sposób. PCD jest głównym filarem wysiłków Unii na rzecz zwiększenia efektywności współpracy rozwojowej, chociaż stanowi ona również prawny obowiązek dla instytucji unijnych i państw członkowskich. Jej widoczność polityczna niestety zmniejszyła się w ciągu ostatnich kilku lat. Klasycznym przykładem braku takiej spójności są nieodpowiedzialne praktyki niektórych firm europejskich, prowadzących działalność w krajach rozwijających się. Wiele firm odzieżowych korzysta z usług taniej siły roboczej, drastycznie naruszając prawa pracownicze, niejednokrotnie nie licząc się z kwestiami ochrony środowiska.

Podobne tendencje można zaobserwować we wzmacnianiu kontroli granicznej i przekierowywaniu finansowania na działania związane z tzw. bezpieczeństwem. Zagroza to realizacji celów rozwojowych, takich jak eliminacja ubóstwa i dbanie o prawa człowieka, które spadają niżej na skali priorytetów publicznych.

Znamy także pozytywne przykłady stosowania PCD. Jeden z nich dotyczy powstrzymywania wycinki lasów pod produkty rolne importowane do Unii. Oznacza to, że jedynie kawa czy soja, której uprawa nie przyczyniła się do wylesiania, może być importowana do Unii Europejskiej.

Celem tego sprawozdania jest ocena dotychczasowych rezultatów w zakresie stosowania PCD oraz przedstawienie rekomendacji dla poszczególnych instytucji europejskich, które mają usprawnić wewnętrzne mechanizmy stosowania PCD. Jednym z postulatów dotyczących usprawnienia koordynacji tworzenia prawa w Parlamencie Europejskim jest stworzenie sieci współpracy między Komisją Rozwoju a członkami komisji zaangażowanych w proces stanowienia prawa. Taki PCD Mainstreaming Network miałby funkcjonować na zasadach podobnych do istniejącego już w Parlamencie Gender Mainstreaming Network. Zależy nam bowiem na tym, aby kierować się priorytetem PCD w pracach na rzecz zrównoważonego rozwoju.

Z mojej oceny wynika, że istnieje potrzeba ponownego ustanowienia specjalnego zespołu do spraw PCD w ramach DG INTPA w celu koordynowania prac jednostek tematycznych do spraw PCD. Co więcej, uważam również, że wznowienie publikowania rocznego sprawozdania w sprawie rozliczalności Unii Europejskiej i jej państw członkowskich, wyników wdrażania zobowiązań w zakresie polityki rozwojowej, które obejmuje PCD, miałyby ogromne znaczenie.

W sprawozdaniu wzywamy do wydania nowego komunikatu Komisji do 1 lipca 2024 r. w sprawie PCD zawierającego plan działania, jasną metodologię i konkretne wskaźniki ilościowe i jakościowe służące do pomiaru wdrażania PCD przez Unię Europejską i państwa członkowskie.

Koleżanki i Koledzy! Wdrażanie spójności polityk na rzecz rozwoju musimy zacząć od poszczególnych instytucji, ale musimy zadbać również o koordynację działań na szczeblu międzyinstytucjonalnym. Możemy to osiągnąć dbając o lepszy przepływ informacji między delegaturami Unii Europejskiej, które działają na miejscu, a także poprzez uwzględnienie PCD w planach każdej prezydencji. Bez PCD działania na rzecz rozwoju tracą na efektywności i skuteczności.

Catch-the-eye-procedure

Karsten Lucke (S&D). – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar! Ich habe diesen Bericht für die S&D-Fraktion verhandelt, und ich will hier an dieser Stelle noch mal unterstreichen, dass die Politikkohärenz im Sinne der Entwicklung – das, was wir PCD nennen – einer der zentralen Prozesse für unsere Beziehungen zum Globalen Süden ist.

Wenn wir in Europa irgendetwas entscheiden, dann hat das sehr oft Auswirkungen in allen Teilen der Welt, bei allen unseren Partnerinnen und Partnern. Deshalb müssen wir unsere eigene Politik viel besser dahin gehend überprüfen, dass es erst gar keine negativen Auswirkungen im Globalen Süden gibt.

Der Bericht hat für alle europäischen Institutionen Vorschläge unterbreitet, wie wir diese Politikkohärenz tatsächlich im Sinne der Entwicklung systematisch umsetzen.

Herr Kommissar Timmermans, wenn ich mir das Bild von Ihnen gerade leihen darf, Sie haben in der Debatte zum Paket „Fit für 55“ gesagt: Wir können uns nicht den Luxus erlauben, langsamer zu werden. Ich leihe mir das, und ich glaube, wir haben auch nicht den Luxus, wenn wir diese Politikkohärenz nicht tatsächlich ehrlich und ernsthaft umsetzen, wenn wir wirklich eine Partnerschaft auf Augenhöhe mit dem Globalen Süden haben möchten.

Catherine Chabaud (Renew). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, chers collègues, merci à la rapporteure pour ce rapport d’initiative sur la cohérence des politiques de développement essentielles pour la politique étrangère de l’Union européenne. Cet outil mérite un nouvel élan politique et une mise en œuvre plus efficace. Dans un contexte géopolitique qui est marqué par le changement climatique, son accélération, les conséquences de la Covid et la guerre en Ukraine et à l’heure où le rôle de l’Union européenne est remis souvent en question par certains partenaires sur la scène internationale, le texte propose des recommandations concrètes, notamment le renforcement des mécanismes de coordination.

Être le premier bailleur de fonds est louable, mais notre rôle va au-delà de notre implication financière. Il nous manque souvent une vision plus stratégique. Je prendrai l’exemple de la Grande muraille verte, pour laquelle la Commission verse 750 millions d’euros par an. À bien y regarder, il n’y a pas de projet structurant de Grande muraille verte, mais plutôt une mosaïque de programmes que l’on peut remettre sous la bannière de cette initiative africaine.

Il manque souvent une vision stratégique qui ferait de ce projet une réponse aux enjeux d’adaptation au changement climatique, de développement économique et même de déplacement des populations. Tant d’enjeux qui sont au cœur de nos partenariats internationaux.

Alors encore deux choses, deux éléments, Monsieur le Président. Je pense que cette politique de cohérence des politiques du développement nécessite une vision aussi plus intégrée, une approche plus intégrée. Et enfin, il est nécessaire d’avoir aussi une politique de communication, parce que savoir faire est une chose, mais le faire savoir renforcerait cette politique de cohésion.

João Pimenta Lopes (The Left). – Senhor Presidente, uma política de cooperação, se coerente com uma dimensão de efetiva solidariedade, deveria assentar na capacitação para a independência, na soberania e em estratégias de desenvolvimento dos países, alavancando, entre outros, os seus setores produtivos e estratégicos e o progresso económico e social dos Estados.

Ao invés, a política dita de cooperação para o desenvolvimento da União Europeia tem sido expressão dos interesses das potências europeias e dos grandes grupos económicos que procuram o lucro, a abertura de mercados, a liberalização de relações comerciais, o controlo e o esbulho dos recursos e riquezas, mesmo que à custa de crescentes desigualdades, da desestabilização regional ou mesmo da guerra.

Impõem-se condicionalidades de natureza diversa, imiscuindo-se nas opções soberanas dos Estados. Agravam-se dependências e as dívidas externas, no quadro de uma persistente cartilha de pendor neocolonial.

Urge pugnar por um quadro de efetiva cooperação entre iguais e de interesse mútuo, no quadro do respeito pela soberania, pelo direito internacional, visando o progresso social, a solidariedade e a paz.

Barry Andrews (Renew). – Mr President, policy coherence for development is the concept that binds the Sustainable Development Goals to other EU policies, and it is wonderful that Team Europe contributes 43% of all overseas aid globally.

But do other policies throw a hammer into delicately constructed development gains in our partner countries? If we ignore the transformational benefits of migration by building barriers to safe routes, we are not being coherent. If we block sharing of intellectual property that would allow vaccines to be manufactured in our development partners, we are not being coherent. And if our trade policies fail to sufficiently recognise the need for development, we are not being coherent.

I warmly welcome this report, but warn that we are falling very far short of our aspirations.

(End of catch-the-eye procedure)

Frans Timmermans, *Executive Vice-President of the Commission*. – Mr President, honourable Members, Commissioner Urpilainen apologises for not being here tonight. But of course I've listened carefully and we've jotted down what you've said, and I'll make sure she gets a very faithful report of what was said here tonight so that we can have with European policies an impact on international developments, as you've just said.

But then our efforts need to be coherent. In my own work, I encounter this a lot. Let me give you one example: our sister continent, Africa. We want Africa to develop for all sorts of reasons for Africa, but also for selfish reasons, obviously. And we want Africa to go through the energy transition without repeating the mistakes we've made. And if we do this in a coherent way, we'll not just bring clean energy to Africa, we will also bring development because it will have a huge positive impact on the health-care situation if women in Africa, because mostly women do the cooking, if they no longer have to do the cooking on charcoal but can do it with the help of photovoltaic heat, then they no longer have to inhale the fumes, nor the babies they carry on their back. So it has a huge impact on the development of health. Education is another example, and many other examples could be given.

So coherence is of the utmost importance, and I work hand-in-hand with Commissioner Urpilainen to align our actions on this. I want to warmly thank the rapporteur, Ms Ochojska, if I say it correctly, for her work and, as Ms Ochojska is someone who watches the stars light years away with the same intensity as she watches her fellow citizens right next to her, and she has throughout her career always paid as much attention to the stars, but much more even to the plight of people in difficult situations. So that she would be the rapporteur on this issue is just an epiphany. It's right and it's just, and I want to salute her for being a true humanitarian.

Commissioner Urpilainen asked me to pass on three messages here today. First, since the evaluation of our policies in 2019, we have made progress. Under the European consensus development policy, coherence is now a key element of Europe's work on the Sustainable Development Goals under our 2030 agenda. The Commission is acting in a very concrete manner to implement this. For example, our impact assessments for new regulations must take into account the effects of the EU legislation on our partner countries. Our EU delegations around the world are tasked to monitor the impact closely and we have strengthened their resources to do so.

Second, the Commission is now preparing the first EU voluntary review on our development policies and this will include reporting on development policy coherence. We will present the results at the United Nations in July this year.

Third, we take the external evaluations of the results of our work very seriously. We will continue to make improvements whenever and wherever necessary. During its mid-term review, the OECD already noted our clear progress in this field.

The bigger picture: collaboration will be essential going forward. In the Commission, we see development policy coherence as a responsibility for everyone. So in this sense, Team Europe goes beyond what we traditionally define as Team Europe, it applies to the whole of the Commission.

But we also need to cooperate very closely with you, with Parliament. We would welcome very much working with you on development policy coherence so that together we can also ask for a more proactive role from the Council and the Member States. Only by joining forces, we can ensure that something happens.

I will do then my work on climate and energy diplomacy, and I know that it will be done in all other policy areas as well. Our European efforts to try and build a sustainable society of the future will work best if we do not just not leave anyone behind in Europe, but if we also leave no one behind in the rest of the world.

President. – The debate is closed. The vote will take place tomorrow, Tuesday 14 March.

Written statements (Rule 171)

Dominique Bilde (ID), *par écrit*. – On ne peut pas, sur le principe, s'opposer à la cohérence des politiques au service du développement (CPD), consacrée par le traité sur le fonctionnement de l'Union européenne (article 208) et connue depuis le traité de Maastricht. Mais encore faut-il reconnaître, d'une part, que la portée de cette obligation demeure vague: s'agit-il pour l'Union européenne d'adapter ses politiques aux répercussions possibles sur les pays en développement, ou bien seulement d'un devoir d'information? En outre, la confusion entre la CPD et l'intégration des objectifs de développement durable au sein des politiques européennes a accentué ce flou artistique. En effet, alors que la CPD et les objectifs du millénaire pour le développement tendaient à se focaliser sur la réduction de la pauvreté, l'agenda 2030 affiche une ambition bien plus vaste. Il est enfin patent que le rapport plaide, en réalité, pour un renforcement de la diplomatie européenne et de l'aide au développement, dans ce dernier cas, sous prétexte de remédier à d'éventuelles incidences néfastes des politiques européennes. Compte tenu des niveaux actuels d'aide (l'Union et les États membres campent toujours en première position au monde), on ne peut pas approuver un tel chèque en blanc.

17. Działalność ESDZ i silniejsza pozycja UE na świecie (debata)

President. – The next item on the agenda is the report by Urmas Paet on a European Parliament recommendation to the Council and the Vice-President of the Commission / High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy taking stock of the functioning of the EEAS and for a stronger EU in the world [2021/2065(INI)] (A9-0045/2023).

Mr Paet is not present yet. We are searching for him, but I do not want to interrupt the debate, so I propose that we continue, and I invite Executive Vice-President Timmermans to take the floor and hope Mr Paet will join us very soon.

Frans Timmermans, *Executive Vice-President of the Commission*. – Mr President, I don't want to cause a Timmermans overdose tonight, but here I am again on another subject. On behalf of High Representative Borrell, I would like to thank the rapporteur, Urmas Paet, even if he's not here yet. We know each other because we were foreign ministers together at the same time, so I have known Urmas for many years.

I would like to thank him and all those who contributed to this report on the functioning of the European External Action Service and for a stronger Europe in the world. In 2019, at the beginning of this legislature, we set out to build a stronger Europe in the world – a geopolitical Europe capable of speaking the language of power. Since then, the strategic environment of the European Union has radically changed.

Today we are living in a world of multiple crises. I think it was Jean-Claude Juncker who coined the expression 'polycrisis', and this is exactly where we are today. It brings with it a lot of uncertainty to systems, but also to individual citizens. The brutal war of aggression Russia is waging against Ukraine has led to a geopolitical realignment. We are faced with the weaponisation of interdependencies, whether it's on energy or raw materials, medical and pharmaceutical products, migration or technologies.

The consequences of the climate crisis are becoming ever more apparent, and the international order is being challenged and is being reshaped as we speak. At the same time, competition between the US and China is becoming the main structuring force of the global order. This new environment is not a return to the bipolar world of the Cold War. I would say, rather, that it's a messy multi-polarity in which partners around the world, such as Turkey, India, Brazil, South Africa, Nigeria, Mexico and Indonesia, may lean one way or the other, depending on the issue and based on their interests.

As the European Union, we have to be proactive. When designing our policies, we need to factor in how others will perceive them and how they will affect them. This matters, as our ambition is to continue setting global standards. To meet these historical challenges – as your report actually points out – we need a strong external action policy that is capable of defending our values and our democracies with a united and strong voice, and supported by a state-of-the-art European diplomatic service. As the EU's diplomatic service, the role of the EEAS is to support the High Representative in steering the Union in the tasks assigned by the Treaty, and to steer and ensure a coordinated and coherent EU external action and policies, including on the external dimension of the EU's internal policies. This is fundamental to guarantee the EU's role as a reliable and responsible actor on the world stage. We therefore welcome the support of Parliament in ensuring that the EEAS is guaranteed the necessary space and resources to be fit for purpose.

As your report testifies, the EU's working methods and our decision-making processes in foreign policy are often very complex. We therefore need to continue doing our utmost to facilitate swift decisions to respond to global challenges, uniting all 27 Member States, so that we can speak on the global stage with one strong voice.

Our message needs to be amplified across the world with all our European diplomatic tools, the delegations, the embassies of the Member States, and there is also a very important role for your own parliamentary diplomacy. An important tool that you also mention in your report to improve our capacity to respond to crises worldwide is a new crisis response centre under the authority of the EEAS. The crises of the past, whether in Afghanistan or the Sahel, have shown the need for a centre that brings together the 24/7 Situation Room, diplomatic security, consular affairs and crisis management capabilities. Here, once again, we welcome your support for this important initiative.

Finally, let me welcome your support for the establishment of a European Diplomatic Academy. This will be a key tool to create an esprit de corps and a common European diplomatic culture. In the last three years, we filled our geopolitical Europe with substantial operational content. We must sustain our strategic unity and build on the robust response to the Russian war of aggression against Ukraine. This moment of geostrategic awakening must be translated into a more lasting increase of the EU's influence in the world, including through strengthening the EU's security and defence capabilities – a must in a world increasingly defined by strategic competition.

We know that we have the support of this House and that of European citizens, as the last Eurobarometer shows. Defending European values, such as freedom and democracy, and the interests of the EU with a single strong voice is our priority, and we could not do it without the strong support of this House. Thank you, and I look forward to the debate.

Michael Gahler, *im Namen der PPE-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen, Herr Kommissar! In Abwesenheit herzlichen Dank dem Berichtersteller Urmars Paet. Ich hoffe nicht, dass ihm die Russen in einer dunklen Ecke aufgelauert haben, damit er jetzt nicht hier sein kann. Wir sind uns zum großen Teil einig. Wir müssen in der Außen- und Sicherheitspolitik relevanter werden. Das ist seit Langem Auffassung des Parlaments und eigentlich auch der meisten Regierungen.

Wir wissen alle: Nur gemeinsam sind wir stark. Nur gemeinsam können wir Dritte beeindrucken. Nur wenn man weiß, dass wir gemeinsam unterwegs sind, werden sich Dritte an uns wenden in der Hoffnung, dass wir gemeinsam den Unterschied machen. Wenn wir machtvoll, gemeinsam und dauerhaft zum Beispiel in Sachen Ukraine handeln, dann weiß ein Kriegsverbrecher, dass er uns unterschätzt hat. Dabei beobachtet uns der Rest der Welt – alle die, die sich gerne langfristig mit uns als gute Partner engagieren wollen, die aber wahrnehmen, wenn der Westen sich zurückzieht. Das darf uns nach Afghanistan und dem Sahel nicht in unserem Kerninteressengebiet passieren.

Dann sind wir beim entscheidenden Punkt: Es ist gut, wenn einstimmig alle dabei sind. Aber ich denke, es würde für den Adressaten einer Maßnahme oder für beobachtende Dritte kaum einen Unterschied machen, wenn bei den 27 einer fehlt. Also aus aktuellem Anlass, wenn wir zum Beispiel gegenüber der georgischen Regierung eine bestimmte Botschaft zu vermitteln haben, dann könnte sich diese Regierung nichts dafür kaufen, wenn Herr O aus U damit nicht einverstanden ist.

Aber wenn wir wegen eines Einstimmigkeitserfordernisses vor Ort nichts sagen können, dann profitieren die Falschen. Wenn bei solchen örtlichen Statements nicht mal eine Blockademinderheit zustande kommt, dann spricht doch sehr viel dafür, dass die Mehrheit richtigliegt. Ich fände es zum Beispiel auch ziemlich schräg, wenn bei Statements oder Maßnahmen gegenüber bestimmten Staaten ausgerechnet die früheren Kolonialherren eine Einstimmigkeit verhindern könnten.

Deswegen ist eine unserer zentralen Empfehlungen in Artikel 1 Buchstabe g, dass wir das Einstimmigkeitsprinzip auf Entscheidungen betreffend die Schaffung und Stationierung militärischer Missionen oder Operationen mit Exekutivmandat beschränken und dass wir Sanktionen und andere Maßnahmen oder eben schlichte Verbalnoten mit qualifizierter Mehrheit beschließen können. Ich denke, es würde einen Unterschied machen.

Nacho Sánchez Amor, *en nombre del Grupo S&D*. – Señor presidente, señor Paet, les agradezco su flexibilidad en la negociación de este documento y haber resistido el giro federalista del PPE, que ha defendido en este informe desapoderar al Consejo de sus competencias en política exterior y comunitarizar esta política, saltándose así los tratados, por cierto.

Yo creo que este es un informe necesario porque en política exterior saltamos de una crisis a otra y hay muy poca reflexión sobre los instrumentos de dicha política exterior y sobre sus caras: ¿quién representa?, ¿quién define?, ¿quién ejecuta la política exterior? Está basada en un marco jurídico bastante confuso. Yo diría que en la política exterior hay muchas caras y muchos egos. Y yo recomendaría dejar trabajar a Borrell, que no parece muy preocupado por la altura de su sillón.

Creo que la mejora de esos instrumentos de nuestra política exterior pasa por una diplomacia que sea una diplomacia auténticamente europea. Esa idea de la Escuela Diplomática, evocada por el comisario Timmermans, es una idea que salió de este Parlamento.

Tenemos que mejorar nuestra capacidad de inteligencia en las crisis exteriores. Tenemos que crear un flujo de inteligencia de los servicios de inteligencia nacionales hacia Bruselas para estar bien informados y no actuar ciegamente. Y hay que reforzar, por tanto, el INCENT.

Hay que hacer una diplomacia cultural europea que no sea una simple mezcla de las diplomacias culturales nacionales; hay que buscar una nueva posición para la Unión Europea en este mundo multilateral sacudido a partir de Trump; y hay que pensar en la posición de la Unión Europea en el Consejo de Seguridad de las Naciones Unidas.

Para ser muy prácticos, ¿cómo se pasa de una silla francesa a una silla de la Unión Europea en pocos años?

Ernest Urtasun, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Mr President, the new geopolitical context and the war in Ukraine underscore once again the need for a genuine EU foreign policy that is consistent and effective to adapt and respond to today's challenges. EU external action continues to be embedded by a number of barriers that go from an insufficient common diplomatic culture, a lack of trust between Member States and duplication and interinstitutional rivalries within our different institutions.

More than 10 years after its creation, the EEAS should now be strengthened in order to reinforce the EU's role as a more proactive, resilient and autonomous actor on the global stage. The EEAS should be given a proper political mandate, and we need to introduce qualified majority voting for decision-making in certain EU foreign policy areas, such as sanctions, human rights and the protection of international law, because that would increase our ability to act consistently with our principles. The capacity of the EEAS should also be enhanced and in order to ensure good interinstitutional, coordination and integration of all EU policies, in particular those with an external dimension like, for instance, migration, trade and energy. Furthermore, my group supports more efforts to improve gender balance within the EEAS, particularly in senior management and political positions, both at headquarters and at EU delegations.

All combined, those reforms that this report proposes aim at making the EU a more resilient and capable international actor, able to speak and act as one.

Hermann Tertsch, *en nombre del Grupo ECR*. – Señor presidente, buenas tardes a todos. El informe del ponente Urmas Paet pide una reforma del Servicio Europeo de Acción Exterior (SEAE) para atribuirle más competencias y más poder; y, de paso, también para cambiar por la puerta de atrás la forma de votar en el Consejo, para que la ideología dominante del SEAE, tan marcada, se imponga ya y no tenga quien se le oponga.

La guerra de Ucrania ha traído alguna sorpresa, como que el señor Borrell se viera obligado, por fin, a ponerse —por una vez— del lado correcto de la historia. Pero, por lo demás, sigue donde estaba el servicio exterior de Borrell: de fuerza protectora del régimen criminal de los ayatolás, la que despreció los Acuerdos de Abraham porque los había logrado el odiado Trump, del que se acaba de hablar también; de *lobby* permanente de la dictadura de Cuba, a la que la Unión Europea, incomprensiblemente, sigue pagando y subvencionando millones para aplastar a su pueblo; y ha hecho una campaña nada disimulada por los candidatos narcocomunistas del Foro de São Paulo, desde Boric a Petro, desde Lula a Arce. Por cierto, hoy se cumplen dos años de prisión de Jeanine Áñez. Jeanine Áñez está en la cárcel por llevar a cabo un plan tutelado por la Unión Europea y la Organización de Estados Americanos (OEA). Nadie ha dicho nada. ¿Se ha perdido su libertad ahora? ¡No!

En Venezuela, el SEAE ha inventado las condiciones para la celebración de unas elecciones bajo el tirano Maduro que son tan absurdas como ridículas. Ahora, el «servicio socialista exterior» prepara para el socialista Borrell el «semestre socialista» de Sánchez, la hoja de ruta 2023, como gran operación de legitimación de las dictaduras consumadas y en proceso, todas amigas del Gobierno español.

El SEAE no necesita más dinero ni más tamaño ni más poder. Necesita más compromiso con la verdad y la libertad.

Domènec Ruiz Devesa (S&D). – Señor presidente, señor vicepresidente ejecutivo Timmermans, les agradezco que estén hoy aquí en este debate. También quiero expresar mi agradecimiento al ponente del informe, el señor Paet, que no ha podido estar presente. A mí me gustaría tratar un asunto más particular —porque ya se han dicho muchas cosas—: el artículo 31 del Tratado de la Unión Europea (TUE). El artículo 31 del TUE es muy importante. ¿Por qué? Porque en su apartado 2 permite aprobar muchas decisiones por mayoría cualificada y, hasta ahora, desgraciadamente, no se ha utilizado. Para aplicar esas decisiones por mayoría cualificada se necesita haber adoptado una decisión sobre los intereses y objetivos estratégicos de la Unión, de acuerdo con el artículo 22 del TUE.

Pues bien, resulta que el Consejo Europeo ha adoptado este documento, titulado «La nueva Agenda Estratégica» y su última sección se titula, precisamente, «Promover los intereses y valores de Europa en el mundo». Por tanto, como fue adoptado, además, por el Consejo Europeo mediante el procedimiento de consenso, se han satisfecho *de facto* los requisitos del artículo 22 del Tratado. Por tanto, ya se dispone de una decisión del Consejo Europeo sobre los intereses y valores estratégicos de la Unión. Esto permite que se aplique el artículo 31, apartado 2, del TUE para adoptar decisiones y acciones de implementación de esos intereses y valores estratégicos por mayoría cualificada.

Jaak Madison (ID). – Mr President, Mr Timmermans, dear colleagues, I know very well that Mr Paet was on the same flight with me tonight, and he arrived to Frankfurt. After that, I have no idea what happened to him. He went to a train. I came by car. So you see that you don't take the train.

The idea of the majority voting has been around for years in the EU. It's very easy for the MEPs and for the representatives from Germany, from France, from Spain to support this federalist idea, as also the Socialist colleague said in the beginning of the speech that he is one step forward to the federalist. Of course, I am against the federalists, because when you are from the small Member States, and if you're using the majority voting, then the only ones who can lose from the majority voting are small Member States.

Majority voting can't harm in any way Germany or France because they're just too big. It is pretty impossible to win those countries with majority voting. But you can win Estonia or Finland or Latvia or even Poland. That's why, even if there is some kind of federalist idea to go forward with some kind of idea of the empire, I think this is just one step forward to have bigger conflicts inside of the EU between the Member States. I think this is not the way we want to go, but this is the way we are going just now. I'm really hoping that you will see the future of what will happen.

Carlos Zorrinho (S&D). – Senhor Presidente, Senhor Comissário, esta Comissão Europeia afirmou-se, quando iniciou funções em 2019, como uma Comissão geopolítica empenhada em políticas sustentáveis, na construção da imagem da Europa como guardiã do multilateralismo. Seria difícil antecipar, naquele momento, a importância e a clarividência estratégica desta opção.

Hoje, mais do que nunca, a União Europeia tem que se afirmar pela sua capacidade geopolítica, liderar as tradições fundamentais para a sustentabilidade do planeta, para a defesa da democracia, da liberdade e da soberania dos povos.

Temos uma visão, temos instrumentos políticos potentes, como os múltiplos tratados de cooperação e de comércio, e temos instrumentos financeiros para a ação externa (*Global Europe, Global Gateway*). E, como este relatório evidencia, temos de nos organizar para sermos mais fortes no mundo.

Temos que melhorar a coordenação e integração da política externa da União Europeia em domínios críticos, embebendo com os valores e princípios que partilhamos a nossa ação na economia, no comércio, na cooperação para o desenvolvimento e na segurança e defesa.

A mensagem é clara: só seremos fortes e credíveis externamente se combinarmos internamente seriedade e eficácia – não há outra escolha.

E, Senhor Comissário, é preciso fazer escolhas. Por exemplo, o acordo pós-Cotonu: 100 países, 1,5 biliões de pessoas, e bloqueado por um país. Isto não é tolerável.

Bernhard Zimniok (ID). – Herr Präsident! Der Europäische Auswärtige Dienst soll also mehr Befugnisse bekommen. Das bedeutet in erster Linie mehr Geld und weniger Rechte für die Mitgliedstaaten, obwohl die bisherige Bilanz des EAD wahrlich ein Armutszeugnis ist. In der Schicksalsfrage unseres Kontinents, der Massenmigration, hat der EAD auf ganzer Linie versagt. Obwohl ein Großteil der illegalen Migranten aus Afrika stammt, wurden bisher erst mit vier afrikanischen Staaten Rückführungsabkommen ausgehandelt, und die sind nicht einmal rechtlich bindend. Das ist diplomatisches Totalversagen.

Natürlich ignorieren die Partnerstaaten das Abkommen komplett. Apropos diplomatisches Totalversagen: Oberstes Ziel der EU-Außenpolitik ist doch die Friedenssicherung. Davon kann ich im Ukrainekrieg nichts, gar nichts erkennen, ganz im Gegenteil. Der vorliegende Bericht wird nicht zu einer Verbesserung dieser Probleme führen, sondern noch mehr überbezahlte Versorgungsposten mit inkompetenten Ideologen schaffen. Dieser Bericht ist daher in Gänze abzulehnen.

Catch-the-eye procedure

Katarína Roth Neveďalová (S&D). – Vážený pán predsedajúci, veľmi ma mrzí, že nás je tu tak málo v takejto dôležitej téme, a že bolo by oveľa lepšie, keby tu bol naozaj, že *full house* a všetci by tu sedeli a počúvali, pretože je veľmi dôležité, ako sa na Európsku úniu pozeráme.

A keď hovoríme o budúcnosti, ja si veľmi vážim a chcem povedať, že oceňujem Európsku vonkajšiu službu a všetkých našich kolegov, ktorí pracujú v európskej diplomacii, ako aj v diplomacii každej krajiny. Ale myslím si, že musíme sa zamyslieť nad tým, že či naozaj chceme väčšinové hlasovanie v Rade, o čom tu dnes rozprávame večer, pretože ja, pochádzajúc z menšej členskej krajiny, pre nás je to niečo, čo je neakceptovateľné a nemôžeme to podporiť, pretože máme pocit, že tým vynechávame malé členské štáty.

Dnes má Európska únia problém s tým, že stále klesá jej podpora, že ľudia majú pocit, že niekto iný rozhoduje niekde inde v Bruseli, že nie je to o nich. A práve toto je možno jeden z dôvodov, ktorý k tomu prispieva. Keď naozaj budeme potláčať ten trošku iný názor, pretože ten konsenzus je to, čo nás priviedlo dokopy, čo tú Európsku úniu robí lepšou, a preto je konsenzus v týchto otázkach, v ktorých je, veľmi zachovaný.

Ангел Джамбазки (ЕСR). – Г-н Председател, г-н Комисар, обикновено ви критикувам и вярвам, че това е с основание, но в случая няма как да не подкрепя вашите думи в началото на вашето изложение. Да, руската агресия накарва най-сетне дори и по-мудните наши колеги да се замислят върху нуждата от една по-организирана, по-единна обща външна политика на държавите – членки на Европейския съюз.

Това, разбира се, не може да стане с федерализация. Това, разбира се, не може да стане с въвеждането на гласуване с мнозинства, тъй като това ще застраши интересите на по-малки държави в ключови сектори и в територии, в които те са подложени на натиск. Така, както повечето от западните държави не ни слушаха, когато предупреждавахме за активизацията на руската агресия по източния фланг на Европейския съюз и на НАТО, така и в момента подобни процеси се развиват например на Балканите, където същата тази заплаха провежда своите хибридни операции на териториите на държави, които са кандидати или ще бъдат кандидати за членство, и ги насочва и ги настройва срещу държави – членки на Европейския съюз. На това трябва да има единен европейски отговор, а не разделено действие всеки поотделно.

Mick Wallace (The Left). – Mr President, we're talking about a stronger EU in the world. If we want a stronger EU in the world, we'll have an EU that prioritises peace rather than war. There is always an alternative to war. When Russia invaded Ukraine, it was 100% illegal. There was an alternative and they didn't take it. But NATO's expansion eastwards didn't help matters either. It helped to destabilise the area. US and NATO involvement in Ukraine since 2014 haven't helped matters.

The failure of the EU to engage in diplomacy and dialogue since the war started hasn't helped matters. Our support for wars in Libya, Afghanistan, Iraq hasn't helped matters. What kind of a strong Europe do you want in the world? The world is not interested in war, but we are promoting it. We are militarized in Europe. We're increasing the profits of the arms industry. Why are we going down this path? Whatever happened to the Europe that wanted peace? We're losing the plot, we are. We're pumping arms now into Ukraine on the basis that Ukraine are going to win. There's nobody going to win the war in Ukraine. This is absolute madness. And the Ukrainians are going to die more and more every day as long as we keep pumping arms into a live war.

Clare Daly (The Left). – Mr President, it's ironic that we are looking at the future of the European External Action Service under the title 'a stronger EU in the world', when the truth is that the world – particularly the places where the majority of the world's population live outside the global north – are shaking their heads in disbelief at the weakness of the European Union and its subservience to US empire, even when it's blatantly against our own interests.

Instead of championing peace in Europe, overcoming differences and difficulties through dialogue and diplomacy, we've acted as a pawn for NATO – captured by the military industrial complex, imposing sanctions. And now we have an energy crisis, a cost of living crisis, an angry nuclear power on our doorsteps and the Inflation Reduction Act.

If we want to be stronger, stop playing US war games, stop antagonising our trading partners, stop interfering and trying to have regime change in countries we don't like, stop robbing the global south – they're not going to take your colonialism anymore. If you want to be stronger, stand up for international law, for UN principles, multilateralism, in other words, the opposite of what you're doing now.

(End of catch-the-eye procedure)

Frans Timmermans, Executive Vice-President of the Commission. – Mr President, in two words, I will thank the House for the contribution to this discussion but I cannot but react to what was just said. With all due respect, and Mick knows I respect him for the work he does, let's set things straight for just one minute.

We are being attacked by a man who has an imperialistic vision of Europe. He denies the Ukrainians their nation. He is abducting children to re-educate them to become Russians because he denies the Ukrainian nation its existence. He's bombing apartment complexes, schools and hospitals. They are committing the most atrocious war crimes. And you're saying we should not help Ukrainians defend themselves?

We would be we would be on the wrong side of history if we did not support Ukraine in what is for them an existential struggle. If Ukraine is overwhelmed by the Russians, Putin will not stop there. Moldova will be next. He will be looking at the Baltic States, etc., etc. His ideology compels him to do this. So we need to confront him and we need to do it in unity.

He's been trying to divide us for years, that's why he's been reducing energy exports to Europe. The inflation is caused mainly by him and by his actions, which leads to higher energy prices, higher food prices. I'm all for peace, but you don't negotiate with a madman who's trying to invade your continent and put other peoples under his control.

The most fundamental rules of international law have been violated. You need to respect international borders. And our European unity today is needed more than ever before in the face of this aggression. And I have to tell you, very frankly: I'm grateful for the transatlantic bond that gets us through this. I'm grateful for the American engagement and the Canadian engagement in this existential struggle for our freedom. But I'm most grateful to these Ukrainian men and women who are dying today, every day, to defend also our freedom, our values, our vision of society.

And don't have any illusions about Mr Putin's intention. Don't pretend that by not supporting Ukraine, we would be supporting peace. We would be making things much, much worse.

This is a moment of a decisive element in our future, honourable members, we either stand up against this dictator or we lose everything we hold dear.

President. – The debate is closed, the vote will be held on Wednesday 15 March.

Written statements (Rule 171)

Urmas Paet (Renew), kirjalikult. – Selle raporti raportöörina soovin rõhutada, et ELi välispoliitiliste eesmärkide saavutamiseks tuleb rakendada kõik vahendid – diplomaatia, rahvusvaheline kaubandus, arengukoostöö ning kaitsepoliitika. Samuti tuleks teha muutusi ELi otsustusprotsessis välispoliitilistes küsimustes. ELi välispoliitika otsuste tegemisel, kus fookuses on inimõigused, rahvusvahelise õiguse kaitse ja sanktsioonide kehtestamine, tuleks üle minna kvalifitseeritud hääletenamusega hääletamisele. See on vajalik, et üks riik ei saaks kogu ELi reageerimist blokeerida, nagu kahjuks on viimasel ajal korduvalt juhtunud.

Suhetes kolmandate riikidega peaks EL minema üle põhimõttele „rohkema eest rohkem”, mille alusel EL tugevdab partnerlusi nende riikidega, kes jagavad ELi välis- ja julgeolekupoliitika põhimõtteid ja põhiväärtusi. Üsna küsitav on eraldada raha riikidele, kes näiteks toetavad Venemaa agressiooni Ukrainas. Ühtlasi peaks EL kolmandates riikides asuvates saatkondades sisse seadma konsulaadid, et aidata ELi kodanikke kriiside ajal.

18. Jednominutowe wystąpienia w ważnych kwestiach politycznych

President. – We now move to the next item on the agenda: one-minute speeches pursuant to Rule 172. Members are invited to take the floor from their seats. We will start with Mr Sokol. Mr Sokol, the floor is yours.

Tomislav Sokol (PPE). – Poštovani predsjedavajući, velik broj Europljana prelazi nacionalne granice radi posla, studija, posjeta rodbini ili turističkih putovanja, pri čemu im je često potrebna zdravstvena zaštita.

Svrha europskog prostora za zdravstvene podatke je omogućiti europskim građanima izravan i besplatan pristup svom zdravstvenom kartonu putem mobitela ili računala te dijeljenje vlastitih zdravstvenih podataka s liječnicima bilo gdje u Europskoj uniji.

Time će građani dobiti pristup bržoj i kvalitetnijoj zdravstvenoj zaštiti.

Osim toga, omogućit će se pristup golemoj količini podataka u svrhu istraživanja i inovacija, što će omogućiti razvoj novih lijekova koji će spašavati ljudske živote.

Kao izvjestitelj odbora ENVI predlažem izmjene kojima ćemo dodatno osnažiti pacijente i zdravstvene radnike u odnosu na prijedlog Komisije. Pored toga, tražim jače financiranje od strane EU-a kako bismo izgradili potrebnu infrastrukturu i osposobili zdravstvene sustave za implementaciju europskog prostora za zdravstvene podatke.

Ovdje se doista radi o revolucionarnom prijedlogu te je pred nama odgovoran posao kako bismo osigurali da europski prostor za zdravstvene podatke bude lako primjenjiv u praksi te da sustav funkcionira za boljitak naših građana.

Victor Negrescu (S&D). – Domnule președinte, toți pacienții europeni au dreptul la medicamente.

Din păcate, astăzi, mulți dintre pacienții europeni nu mai au acces la tratamentele de care au nevoie, pe fondul creșterii prețurilor și a dispariției medicamentelor generice.

Această situație este generată, printre altele, de problemele de producție, dar și de creșterea deficitului de produse esențiale la nivelul Uniunii Europene.

Astfel, medicamentele necesare pentru tratarea cancerului, a infecțiilor și a bolilor sistemului nervos, epilepsie sau Parkinson reprezintă mai mult de jumătate din tratamentele care ne lipsesc.

În ciuda solicitărilor făcute de Parlamentul European, Uniunea Europeană continuă să fie din ce în ce mai dependentă de țări terțe, mai ales de India și de China, în ceea ce privește producția de substanțe farmaceutice active sau de medicamente. Problema este mult mai complexă pentru a putea fi rezolvată de un singur stat. Este nevoie de soluții europene și acum, când vorbim în plen, pacienții din România așteaptă un răspuns.

Fac apel la Comisia Europeană să reacționeze și să rezolve de îndată această situație, expusă deja de Parlamentul European, care pune în pericol sănătatea a sute de mii de persoane.

Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (Renew). – Señor presidente, Francia acaba de anunciar que retrasará diecisiete años la conexión de su red ferroviaria de alta velocidad con la Península Ibérica. Esta decisión atenta contra un proyecto prioritario europeo, contra la Unión, sus finanzas, leyes y valores. Favorece el proteccionismo y perjudica a instituciones y agentes comprometidos desde siempre con la Unión y con la libre circulación de personas y mercancías.

Desde el País Vasco apoyamos este proyecto desde el principio, hace más de treinta años. Nos hemos enfrentado a amenazas terroristas y padecido atentados por empeñarnos en acabar las obras en plazo a nuestro lado de la frontera. Ignacio Uría, asesinado por comprometerse con este proyecto europeo, y la sociedad que lo apoya merecen una actuación firme desde Bruselas, a la altura de su compromiso.

El Tribunal de Cuentas Europeo recuerda que estos retrasos arruinan a quienes hemos cumplido las leyes de la Unión y tomamos decisiones junto a los Estados, y permiten a nuestros competidores globales aprovechar nuestras debilidades. Por ello, los presidentes de las regiones atlánticas han pedido hoy en Vitoria-Gasteiz, como nosotros exigimos aquí, que la Comisión y el Consejo obliguen a Francia a cumplir sus compromisos.

Grace O'Sullivan (Verts/ALE). – A Uachtaráin, is náisiún oileánda muid, ó Chionn Mhálanna go Ard an Fhéaraigh, ó Cheann Léime go Ceann an Chairn. Mhúnlaigh an fharraige ár stair agus ár bpobal, ach síos tríd an stair is beag a rinneamar chun í a chosaint ó thruailliú agus ó athrú aeráide go dtí anois.

Seo an bhliain chun gníomhú ar son na mara in Éirinn. Seo an bhliain a bhunóimid limistéir fairsing mara faoi chosaint dhlíthiúil. Bunóimid áisíneacht nua do phleanáil ar muir. Seo an bhliain a rachaimid ar chosán an neamhspleáchais fuinnimh le gaoth ar muir. Beidh gá le pobail ó gach trá agus baile cois farraige. An bhfuil tusa ar bord?

Ангел Джамбазки (ECR). – Г-н Председател, колеги, бих искал да обърна вашето внимание върху влошаващата се ситуация по всички граници на нашето източно партньорство. В резултат на руската агресия срещу Украйна, незаконна и непридизвикана, започнаха вълнения, най-вероятно предизвикани отново от режима в Кремъл, в Молдова, в Грузия, в целия Кавказ.

В сянката на тези събития обаче остава страданието на един народ, който в момента е подложен на терор от две страни. Разбира се, говоря за арменците и за окупацията на Лачинския коридор, който води към Арцах, както те наричат Нагорни Карабах.

И тук в Европейския парламент непрекъснато и много се говори за човешки права. Ако говорим за човешки права, трябва да има еднакви стандарти за човешките права. И тук трябва да има много ясен глас за защита на един от най-древните християнски народи, а именно арменския. И да настояваме незабавно Азербайджан да прекрати блокадата на Лачинския коридор и да допусне хуманитарни помощи, които да бъдат организирани и с помощта на европейските институции.

André Rougé (ID). – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, la Commission finance pour plus de 30 000 euros un séjour Erasmus sur l'islamophobie en ligne. L'Association organisatrice ne cache pas sa proximité avec le pouvoir turc et le mouvement Ismailaga, proche des talibans et considéré par l'Allemagne comme islamiste.

Alors qu'elle s'apprête à signer la convention d'Istanbul, l'UE n'est plus à une contradiction près. Quand la France pleurait ses morts des attentats du 13 novembre, ce mouvement que vous financez relativisait cette barbarie. Après la décapitation du professeur Samuel Paty, ce mouvement expliquait que la Turquie protégera l'honneur de l'islam et que l'Europe est un ennemi de l'islam. Votre Europe finance la promotion du voile. Votre Europe est donc celle d'une jeunesse endoctrinée par l'islamisme.

Jusqu'à quand l'UE encouragera-t-elle des organisations qui conditionnent nos enfants contre les leurs? Jusqu'à quand pactisera-t-elle avec ceux qui s'abreuvent des larmes de nos concitoyens? Ces constats n'amènent qu'à une seule question pour l'Europe: le sursaut ou l'effondrement.

Younous Omarjee (The Left). – Monsieur le Président, j'ai une question pour la Commission. Va-t-elle, comme cela est annoncé, contre la pêche durable et le maintien des grands équilibres écologiques marins dans l'océan Indien, contre les pêcheurs artisans de l'île de la Réunion, opposer son veto à la décision courageuse et responsable de la commission thonière de l'océan Indien d'interdire 72 jours par an les DCP flottants?

La Commission va-t-elle ainsi par là-même confirmer sa soumission, en réalité, devant les lobbies des flottes industrielles espagnoles et françaises qui, chaque jour, vous le savez, depuis des décennies, sans autre foi ni loi que le seul profit, pillent l'océan Indien avec les pires méthodes qui soient?

Je m'adresse à la Commission et je lui demande de ne pas utiliser son veto et je demande au Conseil de ne pas autoriser la Commission à le faire, car ce veto déshonorerait la Commission européenne et confirmerait et serait une incitation au pillage colonial dans nos eaux.

Λευτέρης Νικολάου-Αλαβάνος (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, στην Ελλάδα ζούμε τη σιδηροδρομική τραγωδία των Τεμπών. Προδιαγεγραμμένο έγκλημα με 57 νεκρούς. Εκατοντάδες χιλιάδες λαού και νεολαίας απαιτούν να μη συγκαλυφθεί το έγκλημα, να τιμωρηθούν οι πραγματικοί ένοχοι. Δεν ήταν ανθρώπινο λάθος ούτε κακιά στιγμή. Ήταν αποτέλεσμα της ευρωενωσιακής στρατηγικής απελευθέρωσης των μεταφορών, του τεμαχισμού και της παράδοσής τους σε μονοπωλιακούς ομίλους, με μειωμένο προσωπικό, χωρίς ασφάλεια δικτύου. Αυτή η στρατηγική κόστισε 640 θύματα, μόνο το 2021 στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, όπου μόλις 13% του δικτύου καλύπτεται από συστήματα τηλεδιοίκησης.

Σύμφωνα με έκθεση του Κοινοβουλίου, που το ΚΚΕ καταψήφισε, προκλητικά δικαιολογούνται οι όμιλοι για τη μη εφαρμογή συστημάτων ασφαλείας, εάν αυτό βλάπτει την κερδοφορία τους του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου, που απέρριψε συζήτηση στην Ολομέλεια για τα Τέμπη. Αυτή την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση θέλουν πραγματογνώμονα τα ελληνικά αστικά κόμματα, που κυβερνούν υλοποιώντας την επικίνδυνη στρατηγική της. Το δίλημμα για την εργατική τάξη και τα παιδιά της είναι: νέα θύματα και απώλειες για το κέρδος ή οργανωμένη πάλη για την ανατροπή της καπιταλιστικής βαρβαρότητας; Η απάντηση δίνεται με νέα απεργία στις 16 Μάρτη, για να μη συγκαλυφθεί το έγκλημα.

Eugen Tomac (PPE). – Domnule președinte, domnule prim-vicepreședinte Timmermans, pe 8 decembrie anul trecut, Consiliul Uniunii Europene a comis un abuz de drept fără precedent în Uniunea Europeană, pentru că în Consiliul JAI s-a intrat cu propunerea făcută de Comisie, votată aici în Parlament, pentru ca Croația, România și Bulgaria să fie acceptate în spațiul Schengen.

Din păcate, Consiliul a decis că doar Croația merită acceptată, iar 27 de milioane de europeni din România și Bulgaria sunt în continuare discriminați.

Cer Comisiei Europene mai multă fermitate pentru a apăra Tratatul Uniunii Europene și Tratatul privind funcționarea Uniunii Europene, pentru că este inacceptabil ca un singur stat să blocheze dreptul nostru firesc de a ne bucura de libertatea de circulație, așa cum se bucură 420 de milioane de europeni. Este inacceptabilă această abordare. Prin tăcere suntem complici și cred că este cazul să puneți piciorul în prag, să obligați guvernele să nu mai blocheze libera circulație pentru 27 de milioane de europeni.

Sara Cerdas (S&D). – Senhor Presidente, a água continua a ser um recurso de acesso limitado para uma parte substancial da população mundial, especialmente entre os mais pobres e os mais desprotegidos. Enquanto numa parte do mundo a água é escassa, na outra a água é desperdiçada, como resultado de uma rede hídrica deficitária que não consegue reverter as perdas de água.

É necessário trabalhar e unir esforços, já durante este mês, na Conferência das Nações Unidas sobre a Água. Passados quase 50 anos desde a última, é tempo de agir para salvaguardar o fornecimento de água potável e os serviços de saneamento, cientes de que este recurso é uma necessidade humana básica. Só assim atingiremos o Objetivo de Desenvolvimento Sustentável 6.

O combate às alterações climáticas depende da forma como lutamos e respeitamos este recurso tão essencial à nossa vida, ao nosso bem-estar e ao meio ambiente.

Barry Andrews (Renew). – Mr President, I'm proud to say that on 8 March the Irish Government confirmed that a referendum on gender equality will be held in November this year. This announcement follows the recommendations made by the Citizens' Assembly on Gender Equality – an excellent example of participative democracy. The proposals will be to amend the Constitution on gender equality, the definition of family and the 'place of women in the home'. This outdated language on women's place in our society holds no place today.

I strongly welcome a referendum on gender equality in Ireland to bring us in line with our European counterparts and to ensure that our Constitution reflects the reality of today and the future we aspire to. Removing this discriminatory language will prevent the perpetuation of stereotypical attitudes towards the role of women in our society and demonstrate that Ireland is taking its role seriously in working towards true equality between men and women.

Ana Miranda (Verts/ALE). – Senhor Presidente, moro num país rico em biodiversidade, que está a ser olhado de forma gananciosa pelas empresas do setor da eletricidade. O lobby do vento, apoiado pelos governos, quer fazer da Galiza, o meu país, uma colónia eólica.

As energias renováveis, como a eólica, são necessárias, mas temos de ter em conta o seu impacto: as reservas naturais protegidas, a consulta das populações afetadas, o impacto socioeconómico, como acontece na terra e no mar da Galiza.

No sábado passado, na Corunha, o setor da pesca galega denunciou os projetos eólicos *offshore* marinhos que pretendem instalar na nossa costa. São também muitas as plataformas de cidadãos afetados e de grupos ecologistas que lutam em defesa da terra e que denunciam: não façam de nós uma colónia energética.

Senhor Timmermans, a pesca é uma atividade prioritária para a Galiza e isso deve ser refletido nos planos de ordenamento do espaço marítimo espanhol e europeu. É, por isso, que dizemos sim às energias renováveis, mas tendo em conta os povos e a sua biodiversidade.

Não queremos que os projetos *offshore* destruam a nossa riqueza marítima. É, por isso, que defendemos a proibição da instalação de parques ou complexos industriais para produção de energia marinha na costa da Galiza e no noroeste Cantábrico.

Cristian Terheș (ECR). – Mr President, Commissioner Timmermans, under the leadership of Ursula von der Leyen, the EU will turn, through the European Digital Identity Wallet, from an area of freedom into an open-air prison camp. In a prison camp, the detainees are stripped of their personal identity and become numbers. They have no privacy nor intimacy, and they are free to choose only from the options decided for them. They are also constantly monitored to make sure that they behave accordingly.

This is the digital prison developed in the EU through the Digital Identity Wallet. This wallet can be applied to all areas of life and the potential of tracking user behaviour is a severe threat to the privacy of all EU citizens. From a command centre, a Eurocrat will know all the health and financial data, as well as the daily interactions, of any EU citizen.

This is not an area of freedom anymore, but a real tyranny that is using technology to mechanically customise all the citizens, transforming them into simple numbers towards total control.

The EU citizens deserve better, which is why I urge the European Parliament to reject the implementation of the European Digital Identity Wallet.

Christine Anderson (ID). – Herr Präsident! Wie hält es dieses Haus mit der Demokratie? Nun, wird in einem hier so unbeliebten Mitgliedstaat wie Ungarn oder Polen jemand auf einer Universität mit dem falschen Pronomen angesprochen, dann verfällt man hier in Schnappatmung, und es findet eine Riesendebatte statt. Kommt es hingegen in einem Mitgliedstaat zur systematischen Unterdrückung der politischen Opposition, herrscht hier großes Schweigen, wenn nicht gar insgeheim Jubel.

Auf dem AfD-Parteitag in Hessen wurden die Kennzeichen aller Teilnehmer dokumentiert und im Internet auf der linksextremen Plattform Indymedia veröffentlicht. Anhand dieser Informationen konnten dann in der darauffolgenden Nacht zielgerichtet auf einem Hotelparkplatz über ein Dutzend Fahrzeuge von Parteikollegen beschädigt werden. Auf dem AfD-Parteitag in Baden-Württemberg eskalierten linke Demonstranten derart, dass 53 Polizisten verletzt wurden.

Der politische Kampf in Deutschland hat längst eine neue Dimension erreicht. Es wird nicht mit Argumenten, sondern mit Gewalt gegen die Opposition vorgegangen. Es findet offene politische Verfolgung statt. Mittlerweile richten sich 50 % aller gewalttätigen Angriffe auf die politischen Parteien gegen die AfD. Wer die Demokratie nur dort verteidigt, wo es ihm passt, und nicht überall dort, wo nötig, ist alles anders, aber kein Demokrat.

Sandra Pereira (The Left). – Senhor Presidente, há muito que temos vindo a denunciar a brutal especulação promovida pelos grandes grupos económicos, que floresceu à sombra da pandemia e que cresceu desmesuradamente, a pretexto da guerra e das sanções: na energia, na banca, no armamento, na grande distribuição. Todos os dias são conhecidos novos dados – mais e mais lucros.

A Comissão, o Conselho e o BCE sabem que assim é, como confirmam notícias recentes. Ao mesmo tempo, os trabalhadores perdem salários, direitos, confrontam-se com a deterioração da sua situação social e económica, com inaceitáveis aproveitamentos de quem soma lucros com a cartelização e imposição de margens de 30 %, 40 % e 50 % sobre bens essenciais.

Conhecendo esta realidade, o que vão as instituições da União Europeia e os governos dos Estados-Membros fazer?

Questionar os grupos dos grandes grupos económicos e a sua ávida sede de lucro? Propor o controlo dos preços, nomeadamente nos bens alimentares essenciais? Combater a especulação e os aproveitamentos? Taxar os lucros extraordinários das multinacionais?

Ou, ao invés, vão prosseguir com o caminho e as decisões que nos trouxeram até aqui e manter a desavergonhada cumplicidade com os grandes grupos económicos?

Peter Pollák (PPE). – Vážený pán predsedajúci. Dámy a páni, spoločnosť sa za posledné roky výrazne z radikalizovala. Nie sú to len radikálne komentáre na Facebooku. Žiaľ, sú to aj mnohí politici, ktorí občanom iného názoru hovoria, že sú dobytok, podliaci či dezoláti, kričia: „Poďme do nich!“ a myslia si, že sú to demokrati. Žiadny politik nemá právo nadávať občanom za to, že má iné názory. V mojej krajine, na Slovensku, je veľa ľudí, ktorí majú iné názory v súvislosti s vojnou na Ukrajine. Pochybujú o pomoci Ukrajine či darovaní zbraní. Nedokážu si predstaviť život bez ruského plynu. Nepáčia sa mi tieto názory, no zároveň viem, že zlo sa nedá vyhubiť ďalším zlom. V čase, keď je spoločnosť rozdelená, musíme viac komunikovať, musíme hľadať cestu k sebe. Útoky a urážky musíme vymeniť za komunikáciu. Dovoľte mi preto vyzvať všetkých politikov, ktorí sa považujú za demokratov: Prestaňte ľuďom nadávať a hľadajte k nim cestu. Lebo ak si cestu nenájdu k ľuďom iného názoru demokrati, tak si nájdu cestu k nim extrémisti, populistí a radikáli.

Katarína Roth Neveďalová (S&D). – Vážený pán predsedaajúci. V súčasnej ekonomickej a energetickej kríze trpia najviac naši občania. Komisia sa zaviazala, že koncom roka predstaví návrh zákazu kľetkového chovu zvierat a spôsob jeho postupného ukončenia. Nemyslím si, že je správne, aby sme to riešili práve teraz. Stúpajú nám ceny základných potravín, máme nedostatok zeleniny, proteínov, a to keď obrovská inflácia vynáša všetky ceny do stratosféry. Môže mi byť síce sympatické myslenie občanov, ktorí podpísali občiansku iniciatívu o ukončení kľetkového chovu, ale musíme myslieť predovšetkým na ľudí a ich blahobytm a nie na psychické prežívanie spĺepok alebo ošípaných. V podstielkovom chove spĺepok uhynie trojnásobok a vo voľnom chove až päťnásobok zvierat, a to je naozaj vysoké číslo. Naši ľudia však potrebujú jesť, potrebujú prístup k zdravým potravinám a mať ich dostatok. Preto na takéto výmysly teraz nie je čas. Ak by sme však k zákazu nakoniec pristúpili, musíme mať dostatočne dlhé prechodné obdobie, dostatok financií, aby sme pomohli farmárom a hlavne myslieť na to, že potrebujeme aj dostatok ľudí, ktorí budú tieto oveľa náročnejšie chovy realizovať, pretože už dnes je ich naozaj málo.

Γεώργιος Κύρτσος (Renew). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, σήμερα στο Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο τιμήσαμε τη μνήμη των 57 που χάθηκαν στο σιδηροδρομικό δυστύχημα στα Τέμπη. Οι πιθανότητες γι' αυτή την τραγωδία θα είχαν μειωθεί, εάν δεν είχαν μειώσει οι κυβερνήσεις στην Ελλάδα τις επενδύσεις στο σιδηροδρομικό δίκτυο μετά το 2003, με πιο μίζερες χρονιές το 2014 και το 2020. Θα είχε αποφευχθεί η τραγωδία, πιθανότατα, εάν υπήρχε σωστός συντονισμός των επενδύσεων. Προχώρησε η ηλεκτροκίνηση, ήρθαν ταχύτερα τρένα, μείναμε όμως με ένα ξεπερασμένο σύστημα ελέγχου της κίνησης και της ασφάλειας. Επίσης, θα είχαν μειωθεί οι πιθανότητες για το δυστύχημα, εάν είχε εφαρμοστεί η ελληνική κυβέρνηση την ευρωπαϊκή οδηγία για τους σιδηροδρόμους και είχε αποφύγει την παραπομπή της Ελλάδας στο Ευρωπαϊκό Δικαστήριο από την Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή. Η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή ήταν θεσμικά σωστή, πρέπει όμως να ασκεί μεγαλύτερη πίεση αξιοποιώντας τις ευρωπαϊκές επιδοτήσεις και χρηματοδοτήσεις στα κράτη μέλη για πιο γρήγορη προσαρμογή στους ευρωπαϊκούς κανόνες και τις καλύτερες ευρωπαϊκές πρακτικές που περιορίζουν τις πιθανότητες δυστυχήματος.

Marie Dauchy (ID). – Monsieur le Président, le groupe Identité et démocratie prend acte de la décision des négociateurs au Conseil de repositionner leur vote sur la législation mettant fin aux véhicules thermiques d'ici 2035. Nous prenons d'autant plus acte de cette décision qu'il s'agit enfin d'une décision de bon sens.

Oserais-je dire qu'il s'agit en tous points de la position exprimée par le groupe Identité et démocratie? Car, depuis le début des négociations, notre groupe tient une position claire et constante sur le sujet. Est-il impératif de réduire les émissions de CO₂ des transports? Oui. Est-ce que la politique du tout électrique est une solution? Certainement pas. Celle-ci est un non-sens environnemental, créera une catastrophe sociale et la destruction d'une industrie sur laquelle l'Europe est encore un leader mondial.

Chers collègues, saisissons cet éclair de lucidité du Conseil pour enfin adopter une législation qui ait du sens. Investissons dans les carburants synthétiques et l'hydrogène produit à partir de sources décarbonées, fiables et abondantes. En un mot, retrouvons notre souveraineté pour que tous nos concitoyens ne paient pas le prix fort de nos décisions.

João Pimenta Lopes (The Left). – Senhor Presidente. A insistência do BCE em consecutivos aumentos das taxas de juro tem um impacto brutal, mas desigual, nos trabalhadores, nas famílias, nas empresas e na economia de diversos Estados-Membros.

Um problema particularmente grave para as famílias que se endividaram para a compra de casa e nos países, como Portugal, onde prevalece a taxa variável no crédito à habitação. Os aumentos brutais dos preços da habitação, bem como de um conjunto alargado de bens e serviços essenciais, os salários e reformas estagnados e baixos, a perda de poder de compra, o aproveitamento, a especulação e a cartelização fazem aumentar os lucros dos grandes grupos económicos e financeiros da banca, da energia, das telecomunicações e da grande distribuição, entre outros.

A Comissão Europeia e o Conselho não podem continuar a ignorar as políticas do BCE que, reconhecem, têm impactos brutais nas famílias. Promovemos uma pergunta oral com debate dirigida à Comissão e Conselho sobre as medidas necessárias e imediatas a tomar face às decisões do BCE, nomeadamente refletindo-as nos lucros da banca e não sobre os trabalhadores. Debate que carece de acordo regimental entre grupos políticos. Convidamos, pois, a agilizar o agendamento de tão relevante discussão.

Tatjana Ždanoka (NI). – Mr President, to my regret, I have continued to speak about political prisoners in my country, Latvia, since the wheel of repressions is not stopping. Now, one month ago, it has captured the young student girl, Tatjana Andreyevs. Her guilt is just activities to defend minority schools and to oppose the destruction of the monuments for the liberators of Latvia from Nazi occupiers.

Our state security service has an intention to show its necessity, especially before accepting the new state budget. They managed to receive a doubled budget for their activities with respect to the previous year. I think money has to be spent just for young, talented students like Tatjana to integrate them into society, to give them social lifts, not to repress them.

Catherine Chabaud (Renew). – Monsieur le Président, je voudrais me féliciter, Monsieur le Commissaire, de l'adoption, le 4 mars, du traité sur la préservation de la biodiversité au-delà des zones économiques exclusives, et saluer l'engagement de la Commission européenne et de plusieurs États membres, dont mon pays, la France.

Ce traité historique aurait mérité un peu plus qu'une minute, mais un débat d'au moins d'une heure. Il crée un cadre juridique reposant sur un espace de non-droit qui représente pourtant 64 % de la surface de la planète. On va pouvoir créer des aires marines protégées en haute mer et encadrer l'exploitation des ressources génétiques qui sont l'une des promesses de l'océan. Les bénéfices de ces ressources seront partagés avec les pays du Sud. Monsieur le Commissaire, il est désormais urgent d'engager le processus de ratification et de ne pas faire retomber le momentum.

Je voudrais aussi relever qu'en ces temps troublés, c'est l'océan qui fait gagner le multilatéralisme. Il n'y a qu'un seul océan. Il est une richesse pour l'humanité. Et les États de la planète ont compris qu'ils devaient s'entendre pour le préserver, que l'océan est un bien commun de l'humanité. Je me suis mobilisée pour que cette notion morale soit intégrée dans le préambule du traité, car elle en est sa raison d'être. Elle ne l'est pas, intégrée, mais je continuerai à la promouvoir et j'invite la Commission à en faire de même.

Nicolae Ștefănuță (Verts/ALE). – Domnule președinte, aveam un speech pregătit despre complet altă temă, dar am asistat în seara asta la ceea ce vedem în casa asta întâmplându-se mult prea des: extrema dreaptă dând mâna cu extrema stângă și asistând la ajutorul dat Rusiei lui Putin.

Domnule Terheș, nu Europa este o închisoare, acolo unde stă Navalnii este o închisoare. Domnul Wallace a spus că nu Putin este agresorul, ci Ucraina. Cum e posibil să auzim așa ceva ? Doamna Ždanoka, care tocmai a plecat, a spus că, vezi Doamne, minoritatea rusă intră la închisoare în Estonia.

Nu este posibil să tolerăm aceste minciuni. Nu este posibil să ajutăm agresorul. Trebuie să-i ajutăm pe cei agresați.

Am fost în România și mi-a spus un cetățean: de ce nu ajutăm mai mult românii? De ce ne pasă atât de mult pentru ucraineni? Și i-am întors întrebarea: dacă era vorba de un moldovean, ne-am fi luptat mai mult pentru ei? Dar pentru, Mick Wallace, dacă era vorba de Global South ne-am fi luptat pentru Global South?

La fel, avem fiecare națiunea pe care o iubim. La fel ne putem imagina fiecare că va fi fratele nostru cel agresat. Să fim mai mulți Churchill și mai puțini Chamberlain în această casă.

Charlie Weimers (ECR). – Herr talman! Moderaterna lovade rigorösa kontroller. Den socialdemokratiska EU-ministern beskrev coronafondens bidrag som "välriktad stöd". SD:s varningar om att man riskerade att vaska 150 svenska skattemiljarder tog man lätt på.

Nej då, coronafonden skulle kickstarta ekonomin, hejda klimatkrisen och snabba på digitaliseringen. Pengar skulle bara gå till i detalj specificerade och noga granskade nationella planer. Kommissionen och medlemsstaterna fick förstås löften om möjlighet att påverka, så att det inte skulle bli fel.

Men fel blev det, herr talman. EU:s revisorer larmar nu om att en betydande del av stöden kan ha missbrukas på grund av bristande kontroll och uppföljning, fördröjda projekt, bristande öppenhet, "hittepå-reformer" och investeringar som har så här mycket med ekonomisk återhämtning att göra. Eller vad sägs om mer effektiv uppvärmning av belgiska kungens palats?

Herr talman! Jag tror många här hoppas att väljarna ska glömma vilka som drev igenom coronafonden, men det kommer de inte att göra.

Philippe Olivier (ID). – Monsieur le Président, après le Qatargate qui a concerné des élus, voilà que la presse se fait l'écho de voyages dont aurait pu bénéficier un haut fonctionnaire européen est chargé de négocier avec le Qatar un accord aérien très important. Cette annonce est d'autant plus troublante que l'accord en question semblait léonin au regard des intérêts de l'Europe.

La Commission européenne, qui est venue s'expliquer devant la commission des transports sur cet accord a, disons-le gentiment, eu du mal à convaincre les commissaires de la transparence de la procédure de négociation et de la pertinence de l'accord. C'est dire si ces révélations sur un possible conflit d'intérêts sont gênantes et méritent une attention toute particulière de notre part. Et quand je dis de notre part, je dis de toute l'institution.

Il ne s'agit pas, pour nous élus que nous sommes, de nous ériger en procureurs et encore moins en juges. Mais je crois que la Commission devrait avoir à cœur, pour l'image de l'institution, de faire en toute transparence toute la lumière sur cette affaire.

Vlad-Marius Botoș (Renew). – Domnule președinte, domnule prim-vicepreședinte Timmermans, promovăm valorile democratice aici, în Parlamentul European și în celelalte instituții europene. Promovăm echitatea și egalitatea între cetățenii Uniunii Europene. Și exact asta trebuie să facem.

Nu putem însă vorbi despre echitate și egalitate dacă nu toți cetățenii Uniunii au drepturi egale, iar noi, românii și bulgarii nu avem drepturi egale. Intrarea României în spațiul Schengen se conturează ca o necesitate imperativă, mai ales pe fondul populismului naționalist, tot mai vocal în ultima perioadă, puternic susținut de dezinformare și manipulare și chiar de către Putin.

Este inacceptabil ca, după mai bine de 16 ani de apartenență la Uniunea Europeană, să mai fie state care să pună sub semnul întrebării aplicarea tratatelor în ceea ce privește libera circulație a românilor. Este chiar revoltător. Vrem egalitate, vrem democrație! Ei bine, trebuie să facem tot ce ține de noi, de fiecare dintre noi, pentru ca drepturile egale să se aplice și românilor. Nu este doar despre România aici, este despre principiile pe care a fost clădită chiar Uniunea Europeană, acest proiect al păcii!

Michiel Hoogeveen (ECR). – Voorzitter, woensdag gaat Nederland naar de stembus. Woensdag wordt de balans opgemaakt van twaalf jaar premier Rutte. De mensen thuis vragen zich af: sta ik er nu beter voor dan twaalf jaar geleden? Is Nederland een betere plek? Wil Nederland doorgaan met ongecontroleerde immigratie, lastenverzwaringen, een hogere energierekening, toenemende schulden en verstikkende EU-regels? Dan is de keuze duidelijk.

Of vindt Nederland dat het echt anders moet? Een stop op illegale immigratie, lagere lasten, lage inflatie, een kleinere overheid en minder bemoeienis uit Brussel. Kiest Nederland voor meer van hetzelfde of voor een politiek die werkt? Woensdag kunnen Nederlanders hun provincie, het land en de EU een andere richting uitsturen: richting realistisch rechts.

Thierry Mariani (ID). – Monsieur le Président, le tremblement de terre qui a dévasté des régions entières en Syrie et en Turquie le 6 février 2023 a fait plus de 50 000 morts. La Grande-Bretagne, les États-Unis et l'Union européenne ont accepté la suspension d'une partie de leur mécanisme de sanctions pour faciliter l'acheminement de l'aide humanitaire en Syrie, et notamment dans les gouvernorats d'Alep et de Lattaquié.

Ces mesures étaient nécessaires, mais elles sont aussi un aveu. Oui, les sanctions imposées à la Syrie ont des effets terribles sur les populations locales, même si elles n'ont aucun effet sur les autorités politiques. Des enfants affamés, des familles qui ne peuvent pas reconstruire leur maison, des malades qui ne peuvent pas se soigner: voilà la conséquence la plus importante du régime de sanctions occidentales sur la Syrie. Les droits de l'homme ne naissent pas sur un champ de ruines, ni dans les cimetières.

Les sanctions qui frappent le peuple syrien devront être renouvelées ou non d'ici le 1^{er} juin 2023. Il est urgent que nous refusions leur prolongation si nous ne voulons pas ajouter un drame politique à une catastrophe naturelle.

President. – With this we end our one-minute speeches. This was the last item on our agenda.

The next sitting is tomorrow, Tuesday 14 March at 9.00.

19. Porządek obrad następnego posiedzenia

President. – The agenda of the sitting of 14 March 2023 has been published on the European Parliament website.

20. Zatwierdzenie protokołu bieżącego posiedzenia

President. – The minutes of this sitting will be submitted to Parliament for its approval tomorrow, 14 March 2023 at the beginning of the afternoon.

21. Zamknięcie posiedzenia

President. – The sitting is closed, I wish you all a pleasant evening and night.

(The sitting closed at 22.49)

22. Zamknięcie sesji rocznej

President. – I declare closed the 2022-2023 session of the European Parliament.

—

Skróty i symbole

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

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

Rozwinięcia skrótów nazw komisji parlamentarnych

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

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