

**PEŁNE SPRAWOZDANIE Z OBRAD 4 PAŹDZIERNIKA 2021 R.**

(C/2024/5372)

PARLAMENT EUROPEJSKI

SESJA 2021-2022

Posiedzenia od 4 do 7 października 2021 r.

STRASBURG

Spis treści	Strona
1. Wznowienie sesji .....	3
2. Otwarcie posiedzenia .....	3
3. Przyjęcie protokołów poprzednich posiedzeń .....	3
4. Bieg nadany wnioskowi o uchylenie immunitetu .....	3
5. Sprostowania (art. 241 Regulaminu) .....	3
6. Negocjacje przed pierwszym czytaniem w Parlamencie (art. 71 Regulaminu) .....	4
7. Podpisanie aktów przyjętych zgodnie ze zwykłą procedurą ustawodawczą (art. 79 Regulaminu) .....	4
8. Składanie dokumentów: patrz protokół .....	4
9. Pytania wymagające odpowiedzi ustnej (składanie dokumentów): patrz protokół .....	4
10. Działania podjęte w związku ze stanowiskami i rezolucjami Parlamentu: patrz protokół .....	4

Spis treści	Strona
11. Porządek obrad . . . . .	4
12. Rola polityki rozwoju w odpowiedzi na utratę różnorodności biologicznej w krajach rozwijających się w kontekście realizacji Agendy na rzecz zrównoważonego rozwoju 2030 (debata) . . . . .	5
13. Sztuczna inteligencja w prawie karnym i jej stosowanie przez policję i organy wymiaru sprawiedliwości w sprawach karnych (debata) . . . . .	13
14. Wpływ, jaki na kobiety i dzieci wywierają przemoc ze strony partnera oraz prawo pieczy nad dzieckiem (debata) . . . . .	24
15. Ochrona osób z niepełnosprawnościami za pośrednictwem petycji – wyciągnięte wnioski (debata) . . . . .	39
16. Ramy polityki bezpieczeństwa ruchu drogowego UE na lata 2021-2030 — zalecenia dotyczące kolejnych kroków w kierunku realizacji „wizji zero” (debata) . . . . .	49
17. Odbudowa stad ryb w Morzu Śródziemnym (krótka prezentacja) . . . . .	57
18. Porządek obrad następnego posiedzenia . . . . .	60
19. Zamknięcie posiedzenia . . . . .	60

## PEŁNE SPRAWOZDANIE Z OBRAD 4 PAŹDZIERNIKA 2021 R.

PRESIDENZA: ROBERTA METSOLA

*Viči President*

### 1. Wznowienie sesji

**President.** – I declare resumed the session of the European Parliament adjourned on Thursday, 16 September 2021.

### 2. Otwarcie posiedzenia

*(The sitting opened at 17.00)*

### 3. Przyjęcie protokołów poprzednich posiedzeń

**President.** – The minutes and the texts adopted at the sittings of 13, 14, 15 and 16 September 2021 are available. Can I ask whether there are any comments at this stage? I see that there are not, so this means that the minutes are approved.

### 4. Bieg nadany wnioskowi o uchylenie immunitetu

**President.** – A few announcements from our end. The competent authority in Germany has informed the President of the decision taken by the Attorney General of Düsseldorf in the context of a criminal investigation against Mr Gunnar Beck, following the lifting of his immunity in accordance with the European Parliament's decision of 17 June 2020, and this is point 20 of the minutes of that date.

### 5. Sprostowania (art. 241 Regulaminu)

**President.** – The competent committees have transmitted two corrigenda to texts adopted by Parliament pursuant to Rule 241(4). These corrigenda will be deemed approved unless, no longer than 24 hours after their announcement, a request is made by a political group or a number of Members reaching at least the low threshold that they be put to that vote. The corrigenda are available on the plenary webpage. Their titles will be published in the minutes of this sitting.

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

**President.** – The ITRE Committee has decided to enter into interinstitutional negotiations pursuant to Rule 71(1) of the Rules of Procedure. The report, which constitutes the mandate for the negotiations, is available on the plenary webpage, and its title will be published in the minutes of the sitting.

Pursuant to Rule 71(2), Members of political groups reaching at least the minimum threshold may request in writing by tomorrow, Tuesday, 5 October at midnight, that the decision to enter into negotiations be put to the vote. If no requests for a vote in Parliament on the decision to enter into negotiations are made within the aforementioned deadline, the Committee may start the negotiations.

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

**President.** – I would also like to inform this House that since the adjournment of the Parliament session on 16 September, the President, together with the President of the Council, has signed one act adopted under the ordinary legislative procedure in accordance with Rule 79 of Parliament's Rules of Procedure. I would also like to inform you that, together with the President of the Council, the President shall on Wednesday sign three acts adopted under the ordinary legislative procedure. The titles of the acts will be published in the minutes of this sitting.

## 8. Składanie dokumentów: patrz protokół

## 9. Pytania wymagające odpowiedzi ustnej (składanie dokumentów): patrz protokół

## 10. Działania podjęte w związku ze stanowiskami i rezolucjami Parlamentu: patrz protokół

## 11. Porządek obrad

**President.** – We now come to the order of business. The revised final draft agenda, as adopted by the Conference of Presidents by written procedure today on 4 October 2021, pursuant to Rule 157, is available. Furthermore, following consultations with the political groups, we wish to report to the House the following proposal for changes to the revised final draft agenda.

The debate on the Commission statement on the increased efforts to fight money laundering is postponed to the October II part-session, and therefore as a consequence the 2 p.m. to 4 p.m. debate slot on Thursday is cancelled.

Finally, I would like to inform you that the votes will be distributed across different voting sessions taking into account the number of amendments tabled and the number of requests for split and separate votes. Please note that this distribution could still be subject to changes.

The relevant information concerning the distribution of votes is available on the website of the European Parliament under the section 'priority information'. With this, the agenda is therefore deemed adopted and the order of business is thus established.

I would, however, now also like to inform the House that I have received two requests for a point of order and I will give the floor to the following colleagues in the order received by the President. First, Mr Juan Fernando López Aguilar, and then Mr Gabriel Mato.

**Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D).** – Señora presidenta, desde hace más de dos semanas un volcán ruge en La Palma: más de 80 millones de metros cúbicos de fuego, lava y azufre. Está sucediendo en Canarias, una región ultraperiférica de la Unión Europea, tan Europa como Bruselas o Estrasburgo. Y la ciudadanía afectada es ciudadanía europea de pleno derecho, y este Parlamento la representa.

Tienen derecho a toda nuestra solidaridad y a la ayuda de la red satelital Copérnico, que supervisa la erupción siete días a la semana, veinticuatro horas al día, y a la del Mecanismo de Protección Civil de la Unión, pero también a la del Fondo de Solidaridad de la Unión Europea, que tiene presupuestados 500 millones de euros. El umbral de acceso a esos 500 millones de euros sobrepasa con creces el 1 % del PIB en daños requerido en una región ultraperiférica: Canarias. Pero el anticipo de hasta un 10 % requiere la aprobación de este Parlamento Europeo. Y, en el momento de la reparación de los daños, la solidaridad debe ser efectiva y debe ser inmediata. El Parlamento Europeo tiene que aprobar este anticipo del Fondo de Solidaridad, porque la consistencia y la fuerza de la Unión se miden en cómo responde en su eslabón más pequeño, más remoto, más vulnerable. La fuerza de la Unión Europea se demuestra en nuestra solidaridad con La Palma.

**President.** – Thank you Mr López Aguilar. I now give the floor to Mr Gabriel Mato.

**Gabriel Mato (PPE).** – Señora presidenta, el volcán que hace quince días entró en erupción en mi isla, la isla de La Palma, está arrasando casas, carreteras, infraestructuras hidráulicas y cultivos, pero, sobre todo, ilusiones. Está dejando un rastro de dolor, de historias personales rotas, de miles de evacuados. Está cambiando la propia orografía de la isla, que ya no volverá a tener forma de corazón. Un corazón del que han hecho gala los palmeros y que se ha ganado la solidaridad de tanta gente.

Frente a ello, no cabe más que reaccionar porque queda lo peor: la reconstrucción; el volver a crear un hogar; el seguir cultivando los mejores plátanos del mundo; el tratar de volver a vivir dejando esa pesadilla como un triste recuerdo de la fuerza de la naturaleza. Por ello necesitamos con urgencia la ayuda de la Unión Europea. Necesitamos hacer llegar a La Palma fondos que permitan a los palmeros volver a sonreír. Y estoy seguro de que así será, y ¿saben por qué? Porque todos juntos somos mucho más fuertes que el volcán.

**President.** – Thank you very much, Mr Mato. With that we have concluded the short discussion on the situation on the island of La Palma which, as our colleagues have said, is indeed very difficult and challenging.

## **12. Rola polityki rozwoju w odpowiedzi na utratę różnorodności biologicznej w krajach rozwijających się w kontekście realizacji Agendy na rzecz zrównoważonego rozwoju 2030 (debata)**

**President.** – The next item is the report by Michèle Rivasi, on behalf of the Committee on Development, on the role of development policy in the response to biodiversity loss in developing countries, in the context of the achievement of the 2030 Agenda (2020/2274(INI)) (A9-0258/2021).

**Michèle Rivasi, rapporteure.** – Madame la Présidente, c'est un rapport important et vraiment d'actualité, puisque vous savez que dans quelques jours, du 11 au 15 octobre, il y a la COP 15 à Kunming, en Chine. Cette réunion, virtuelle dans un premier temps, sera la conférence des parties, la COP 15, à la Convention sur la diversité biologique des Nations unies. C'est très important, parce que ce rapport donne une orientation sur la manière d'augmenter la biodiversité dans les pays en voie de développement. Il y a eu un rapport au niveau de la commission de l'environnement, de la santé publique et de la sécurité alimentaire, qui vise à évaluer la cohérence avec l'Agenda 2030.

Ce rapport est un peu un hommage à tous ceux qui sont partis, ceux qui ont été tués, ceux qui continuent à être persécutés dans la défense de leur territoire, victimes de violences contre les populations autochtones et de l'expropriation de leurs terres: cela ne fait pas encore partie du passé, mais a bel et bien encore lieu. La marchandisation de la nature et de la terre, la pression des industries extractives et agricoles, et la perception d'une nature vierge libre de toute activité humaine continuent d'alimenter la dépossession des terres et des ressources.

L'Union européenne doit reconnaître sa responsabilité dans l'aggravation de l'accapement des terres et de la destruction des forêts; mais il ne faut pas qu'elle tombe dans l'écueil d'imposer des pratiques de conservation coloniales aux pays riches en forêts. L'histoire de la conservation de la nature est une histoire d'expropriation et de violation des droits de l'homme. Rappelez-vous, la première aire protégée moderne était le parc national de Yellowstone aux États-Unis, qui a été créé en 1872 en expulsant les Amérindiens qui y vivaient et dépendaient de ses ressources pour leur survie. En Afrique, la création d'aires protégées a pris racine durant la colonisation, notamment pour organiser des réserves de chasse, et cela a entraîné divers conflits.

Il y a néanmoins de bonnes nouvelles. Regardez en Australie ce qu'il s'est passé il y a quelques jours: le gouvernement australien a remis des terres aux peuples autochtones, notamment plus de 160 000 hectares rétrocédés aux peuples autochtones, dont les peuples Kuku Yalanji, dans la plus vieille forêt primaire au monde. Donc, tout n'est pas perdu, surtout de la part des Australiens.

De nombreuses aires protégées ont mené à des déplacements partiels ou complets, sans compensation, des peuples autochtones et des communautés locales. Dans le même temps, on observe des concessions industrielles d'exploitation du bois, des concessions minières ou d'huile de palme qui sont autorisées au sein de réserves naturelles, cherchez l'erreur.

Ces peuples représentent quand même à peu près 5 % de la population mondiale, mais gèrent au moins 25 % de la surface terrestre, où se concentre près de 80 % de la biodiversité. Ces peuples entretiennent donc traditionnellement un rapport privilégié avec leur environnement. Des lois et traités internationaux protègent leurs droits, notamment la convention n° 169 relative aux peuples indigènes et tribaux, ou encore la déclaration des Nations unies sur les droits des peuples autochtones, qui stipule clairement que ces derniers ne peuvent être expulsés de leurs terres sans avoir donné leur consentement libre, préalable et informé.

Il faudra être attentif sur un point, et cela figure dans le rapport, à savoir ce qu'on appelle les solutions basées sur la nature; on a fait le marché du carbone, il ne faudrait pas qu'on fasse aussi le marché de la biodiversité, parce que des problèmes pourront se poser sur ce qu'on appelle les compensations: on voit beaucoup d'industries pétrolières, comme Shell ou Total, qui peuvent continuer à polluer, à condition qu'elles compensent leurs pollutions en CO<sub>2</sub>. En prenant des terres dans les pays du Sud et en faisant des plantations, elles peuvent alors dire qu'elles ont un bilan carbone neutre. C'est donc vraiment un risque: il ne faudrait pas que la destruction de notre environnement soit compensée au détriment des peuples autochtones et des communautés locales.

Le deuxième aspect est la cohérence entre nos politiques de développement et la conservation des ressources. Il y a aussi le problème de tout ce qui touche à l'agriculture et notamment au problème de la technologie des OGM. Je ne parle pas de l'Europe mais de l'Afrique. Est-ce que cela vaut le coup de développer ces technologies, alors qu'il vaut mieux défendre les semences locales qui peuvent se transmettre d'une communauté à une autre? Il faut aussi considérer le problème du forçage génétique, qui ne doit pas être autorisé. Je suis très contente, Madame Urpilainen, que vous soyez là: il faut vraiment interdire l'exportation des pesticides dans ces pays-là, dès lors qu'ils sont interdits en Europe. Il y a donc un panel de possibilités extraordinaires dans ce rapport et je vous demande de le voter.

**Jutta Urpilainen**, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, I want to thank the European Parliament, the Committee on Development, and in particular the rapporteur, Michèle Rivasi, for putting this essential topic on today's agenda. The report is clear: we have to act now if we want to have a future for our children. We need to reverse biodiversity loss and we need to promote sustainable livelihoods in our partner countries, yes, but also in Europe. In short, we need to protect life across the entire planet.

If there is one silver lining of the COVID-19 pandemic, it is the increasing awareness of the links that connect the health of human beings, animals and of our planet. One million species on the planet are currently at risk of extinction. Important ecosystems, which we depend on, face serious threats. Biodiversity is crucial to safeguard global food security and food systems.

This is a global problem, and it requires a global solution. This is why the President of the Commission, as part of the implementation of the European Green Deal and the biodiversity strategy for 2030, committed on 15 September to increase support to EU partner countries. I am pleased to confirm that we will double our external funding for biodiversity. We will double our external funding for biodiversity. The EU will tackle the climate and biodiversity crisis. Ahead of the upcoming climate and biodiversity conferences, we will continue working with partners. The world needs to adopt an ambitious global biodiversity framework.

The report emphasises the importance of coherence between policies to ensure development and conservation go hand in hand. For example, agriculture and food systems must be part of the solution. Through our DeSIRA initiative, we are working to mobilise research in EU partner countries, identifying and employing sustainable practices based on agriculture and climate-smart agriculture.

In line with the Just Transition proposed by the Green Deal and as part of our human rights-based approach to development, we also ensure that EU action on biodiversity promotes gender equality and recognises and applies human rights. The full participation of indigenous people and local communities is therefore paramount in the engagement. As an example, Nature Africa supports biodiversity conservation while ensuring human rights. It fosters job creation, improved security and sustainable livelihoods.

Let me take the opportunity to reaffirm my commitment to continue to engage with you and with all relevant actors, especially civil society organisations, to make sure that we deliver a coherent response to support our partner countries. I really look forward to the discussion.

### PRESIDENZA DELL'ON. FABIO MASSIMO CASTALDO

*Vicepresidente*

**Marlene Mortler**, *im Namen der PPE-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, sehr geehrte Frau Kommissarin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Biodiversität ist eine unentbehrliche Grundlage für menschliches Leben und nachhaltigen Klimaschutz weltweit. Sie ist die Vielfalt aller lebenden Organismen, Lebensräume und Ökosysteme auf dem Land, in der Luft, im Süßwasser und in den Ozeanen. Sie spielt eine zentrale Rolle in der Landwirtschaft und in der Ernährungssicherung.

Naturschutz ist nicht möglich ohne Landwirtschaft und umgekehrt. Landwirtschaft existiert nicht ohne Natur. Biodiversität reguliert direkt die Sauerstoffproduktion, das Klima und die Bodenbildung, fördert Nährstoffkreisläufe und den Insektenschutz, und sie wirkt auch positiv bei der Schädlingsbekämpfung. Gerade in Bayern arbeiten wir mit diversen Agrarumwelt- und Naturschutzprogrammen seit Jahrzehnten erfolgreich. Und so profitieren davon Mensch, Tier und Umwelt.

Es gilt für uns in Europa und weltweit: Der Schutz der Biodiversität braucht globales Handeln und globale Lösungen. Gerade die Entwicklungsländer, deren Etats für Umweltschutz oft sehr klein sind, brauchen unsere Unterstützung. Danke, Frau Rivasi, für Ihre Anmerkungen.

Es gibt eine Vielzahl von Strategien in Europa und weltweit, die alle das Ziel haben, den zunehmenden Verlust von Biodiversität zu stoppen. Mit der Biodiversitätsstrategie streben wir ambitioniert an, dass bis spätestens 2050 alle Ökosysteme gesund, widerstandsfähig und reich an biologischer Vielfalt sind. Auch international gibt es große Bereitschaft, dieses Ziel im Rahmen der kommenden Vertragsstaatenkonferenz über die biologische Vielfalt, die COP 15, im chinesischen Kunming weiter voranzutreiben. An klaren Zielen mangelt es also nicht.

Nur die Zusammenhänge zwischen dem Verlust der Biodiversität, deren Ursachen und Bekämpfung sind komplex. Auch individuelle Entscheidungen und Konsummuster der Verbraucher spielen eine wichtige Rolle. Deshalb brauchen wir eine gesicherte Finanzierung auf der Basis fundierter wissenschaftlicher ökonomischer Folgenabschätzungen.

**Carlos Zorrinho**, *em nome do Grupo S&D*. – Senhor Presidente, Senhora Comissária, em 2015 os países membros das Nações Unidas adotaram a Agenda 2030 para o Desenvolvimento Sustentável, cujo objetivo é não deixar ninguém para trás, aumentando o desenvolvimento global e a qualidade de vida dos cidadãos. Saliento o empenho do Parlamento Europeu em escrutinar a dimensão externa das políticas da União Europeia relacionadas com o combate à perda de biodiversidade nos países em desenvolvimento.

Este relatório expressa um compromisso com a concretização bem-sucedida da Agenda 2030. Um compromisso que se traduziu também na afetação de 10% dos recursos europeus a serem investidos na próxima década, no quadro dos fundos de nova geração, à promoção e à defesa da biodiversidade.

A dependência direta da subsistência da diversidade biológica de cerca de 70% da população pobre do mundo exige uma abordagem holística e aprofundada das políticas com interferência direta na natureza e na vida dos mais necessitados e dependentes.

Saúdo a referência feita neste relatório à importância da proteção dos povos indígenas e das comunidades locais, os guardadores-mor da biodiversidade, e do investimento em políticas garantidas da soberania alimentar, passando pela pesca, pela pastorícia ou pela agricultura, e de proteção das zonas do globo mais permeáveis à desflorestação e às alterações climáticas.

Termino, Senhor Presidente, dizendo que depende também de nós o futuro da humanidade. Começemos, desde já, a garanti-lo às gerações vindouras.

**Catherine Chabaud**, *au nom du groupe Renew*. – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Commissaire, chers collègues, pour illustrer le rôle de la politique de développement face à la perte de biodiversité dans les pays en développement et ce dans le contexte des objectifs du développement durable, je voudrais vous parler du formidable projet de la Grande muraille verte, projet auquel l'Union européenne apporte 750 millions d'euros par an jusqu'en 2025. Cette initiative africaine pour lutter contre la désertification, qui consiste à replanter des arbres de Dakar à Djibouti, est en fait aussi un projet d'agroforesterie et également un projet qui répond aux objectifs de climat et de biodiversité, d'éradication de la faim, de la pauvreté, de développement économique local, d'anticipation des conflits et des migrations, etc.

Je suis allée le constater sur place au Sénégal cet été et je peux témoigner que les objectifs ne sont pas atteints malgré l'efficacité de certains projets locaux. Au niveau global, il y a urgence, Madame la Commissaire: il nous reste moins de dix ans pour mettre en œuvre le programme de développement durable à l'horizon 2030 et donner vie à ces 17 ODD. Pour restaurer les objectifs, la biodiversité marine et terrestre incarnées par les ODD 14 et 15, par exemple, il faut bien sûr préserver, restaurer, gérer durablement mais il faut aussi actionner les 15 autres ODD. Nous parlons toujours des objectifs du développement durable comme un objectif à atteindre, mais nous devrions beaucoup plus les regarder comme la colonne vertébrale de nos politiques publiques de manière à beaucoup plus intégrer nos politiques.

Face à un problème systémique, nous avons besoin de réponses systémiques, alors je voterai ce rapport, Madame la Rapporteuse, et je vous remercie et je remercie aussi votre rapporteur fictif, María Soraya Rodríguez Ramos, qui n'a pas pu être présente aujourd'hui pour ces débats.

**Grace O'Sullivan**, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Mr President, dear colleagues, throughout our planet, biodiversity is interlinked, interconnected and interrelated. For nature and humanity to survive and thrive together and for the Sustainable Development Goals to be achieved, the current trends in biodiversity loss must be reversed. Until this happens, we're on the back foot around the challenges of poverty and hunger – challenges that are magnified in the world's poorest regions. We need systemic change and, vitally, an end to practices that prop up and worsen impacts.

In the Eighth Environment Action Programme, for example, we call for an end to harmful subsidies. This is crucial. We need action on local and indigenous empowerment around, for example, protecting ocean biodiversity in a way that respects human rights. Last week's annulment of a fisheries agreement with Morocco due to occupation and oppression of Western Sahara is the type of initiative we in the EU should be leading out on. Biodiversity is the bedrock of many SDGs, and its loss is undermining progress. It's time to reverse the trend globally.

**Dominique Bilde**, *au nom du groupe ID*. – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, je ne peux que soutenir la philosophie qui imprègne ce rapport et qui correspond à l'idéal du localisme, ardemment défendu par le Rassemblement national. C'est en effet la seule réponse pertinente aussi bien au défi du développement mondial qu'à celui de la préservation de la biodiversité.

Pour autant, l'Europe, déjà corsetée dans des contraintes environnementales draconiennes, ne saurait endosser un rôle de chef de file mondial. C'est d'autant plus vrai à l'heure où la Chine a été parfois associée à des projets néfastes pour l'environnement, que ce soit en ce qui concerne les énergies fossiles, les infrastructures ou encore la déforestation. Pas besoin d'aller plus loin que dans ma région du Grand Est pour se convaincre de l'impact de la forte demande chinoise de bois d'importation.



Deuxièmement, il est exact que l'agroécologie recèle un potentiel économique sous-estimé; mais il incombe aussi aux pays concernés de se doter des cadres, notamment juridiques, favorables à son essor. Il est également urgent de mobiliser les nouvelles sources de financement du développement durable, au-delà de la seule aide internationale. Par exemple, les fonds envoyés par les émigrés à leur pays d'origine atteignaient en 2017 466 milliards de dollars, soit environ trois fois la valeur de l'aide publique au développement. C'est un gisement de ressources insuffisamment exploité. Pour tout dire, le seul prisme d'une responsabilité européenne et occidentale me semble être une approche largement dépassée, car dans notre monde multipolaire, notre action ne pèsera guère si elle ne s'inscrit pas dans un effort global.

**Krzysztof Jurgiel**, w imieniu grupy ECR. – Panie Przewodniczący! Pani Komisarz! Różnorodność biologiczna jest niezbędna do życia. Ponad połowa światowego PKB zależy od przyrody. Sprawozdanie Komisji skupia się na potrzebie rozwiązania podstawowych przyczyn leżących u podstaw utraty bioróżnorodności i przywrócenia ekosystemów. Pozytywne strony tego sprawozdania to podkreślenie zależności systemów rolno-spożywczych i drobnych producentów rolnych od różnorodności biologicznej; uznanie praw ludności tubylczych oraz jej wiedzy i doświadczenia w walce z utratą różnorodności biologicznej i degradacją środowiska oraz podkreślenie faktu, że przestępstwa przeciwko środowisku stanowią globalne zagrożenie dla ochrony przyrody i zrównoważonego rozwoju, stabilności i bezpieczeństwa.

Niestety projekt ma też pewne minusy. Nie popieramy dodania uznania prawa do bezpiecznego, czystego, zdrowego i zrównoważonego środowiska do Karty Praw Podstawowych, wprowadzenia systemu sankcji karnych i wielostronnych porozumień dotyczących środowiska. W związku z tym grupa ECR wstrzyma się od głosu.

**João Pimenta Lopes**, em nome do Grupo The Left. – Senhor Presidente, a defesa e a proteção da biodiversidade é uma questão central da preservação da natureza e das suas funções ecológicas. É nos países em desenvolvimento que estão as zonas com maior diversidade genética e também aí se registam as maiores perdas.

A responsabilidade da UE na promoção de práticas que, não servindo os interesses dos povos, contribuam e continuem a contribuir para essa realidade, encontra limitado enquadramento neste relatório. A introdução de princípios éticos corretos nas relações com países terceiros esbarram no cinismo da mercantilização da natureza, projetando ditas «melhores práticas» e impondo uma forte condicionalidade no acesso à ajuda ao desenvolvimento, visando a garantia do domínio dos recursos dos povos para alimentar os lucros do capital.

Uma verdadeira ajuda ao desenvolvimento, assente numa efetiva cooperação e solidariedade, exige o estabelecimento de relações baseadas no respeito pela soberania e independência dos Estados e direcionada não para o lucro, mas para satisfazer as necessidades dos povos, com vista à redução de dependências e à consolidação de capacidades, nomeadamente no plano produtivo.

**Sara Cerdas (S&D)**. – Senhor Presidente, a par da crise das alterações climáticas, o nosso planeta é assolado por uma crise sem precedentes de perda de biodiversidade. Este é o momento de aumentarmos os nossos esforços contra esta crise e atingirmos, assim, os objetivos do desenvolvimento sustentável.

A proteção da biodiversidade deve integrar a política externa da UE, nomeadamente nas relações com os países de baixo e médio rendimento. Financiamentos e assistência técnica devem ser disponibilizados a estes países, evitando a perda de mais biodiversidade que afeta todos. A UE deve ser, assim, um exemplo para o resto do mundo.

Especial atenção também deve ser dada às nossas regiões ultraperiféricas e territórios ultramarinos que representam cerca de 80% da biodiversidade na União Europeia e são vulneráveis tanto às influências humanas como naturais.

Ao protegermos a nossa natureza, a nossa biodiversidade, estamos também a garantir o melhor uso dos recursos do nosso planeta e um futuro digno para as próximas gerações.

**Barry Andrews (Renew).** – Mr President, first of all, I would like to thank Commissioner Urpilainen for her assistance in the launch of the SDG Alliance here in Parliament two weeks ago. I very much welcome the many references to the SDGs in Ms Rivasi's report and to Agenda 2030. It is very clear that the only way we will achieve policy coherence for sustainable development is if we can marshal the facts, if we have the data, and it is clear that we do not.

I was very struck by a detail in a European Parliamentary Research Service (EPRS) report, which showed that the Netherlands has lost 86% of its butterfly species since 1989. A small fact, but from which we can extrapolate the losses that have been experienced in the European Union and across the globe. I think this is why it's important that we have an annual report on implementation of the SDGs here in this Parliament. It's something that was done for the first time, and the last time, in 2019. We need to bring it back onto the agenda, to have an annual report on SDG implementation.

So I commend the resolution. Our success as a species has been at the expense of almost every other species, and it doesn't have to be that way.

**Caroline Roose (Verts/ALE).** – Monsieur le Président, comme l'a dit la rapporteure, ce rapport arrive à point nommé, alors que la COP 15 sur la biodiversité débute ce mois-ci.

Je voudrais rappeler certaines choses concernant l'objectif de protection de 30 % des terres et des mers à l'horizon 2030.

D'abord, cet objectif n'a de sens qu'avec un réseau mondial d'aires protégées qui disposent de plans de gestion et d'objectifs précis. Il faut des objectifs chiffrés d'aires à fort niveau de protection, pour mettre fin aux «parcs de papier». De plus, ces objectifs de conservation ne doivent pas justifier la violation des droits des populations des pays en développement. En outre, il faut mettre en œuvre une approche décoloniale de la conservation, qui mette au centre les peuples autochtones, les communautés locales, la paysannerie et les petits pêcheurs artisans.

Enfin, ces objectifs de conservation ne seront que de l'écoblanchiment si nous ne transformons pas nos règles commerciales et les accords de libre-échange; nos politiques agricoles et les exportations de pesticides interdits vers le Sud; les accords de pêche et les subventions à la surpêche; les industries extractives et leurs ravages sur terre comme en mer; enfin, notre demande en produits important la destruction d'écosystèmes. Toute politique de développement sera vaine si nous ne revoyons pas notre modèle économique: ses impacts sur la biodiversité et les conditions de vie dans les pays en développement sont dévastateurs.

**Elena Lizzi (ID).** – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la risoluzione pone temi e obiettivi epocali, sui quali sono indispensabili specifiche valutazioni di impatto per le ricadute di questa iniziativa sulla vita dei cittadini e sulle generazioni mondiali future.

È vero che la perdita di biodiversità potrebbe causare danni irreparabili dal punto di vista ambientale sociale ed economico. Infatti, circa il 75 % della diversità genetica delle piante è andato perduto, mentre il 75 % degli alimenti mondiali è generato da sole dodici piante, e ciò rappresenta un rischio per la sicurezza alimentare globale.

Ci chiediamo se non sia il caso di accelerare il processo di approvazione delle *new breeding techniques*, per rendere più resistenti altre specie e aiutare il mantenimento della biodiversità. Secondo le più recenti ricerche, questi obiettivi non sarebbero contrastanti o conflittuali. Il *Joint Research Center* ha studiato l'impatto degli obiettivi specifici della strategia europea per la biodiversità e ha evidenziato che il fabbisogno alimentare dei cittadini dell'Unione diventerebbe più dipendente dalle importazioni dai paesi terzi, con conseguente aumento di emissioni e perdita della biodiversità degli stessi, il tutto per accontentare i regimi alimentari europei.

Chiediamo pertanto che, insieme a questo documento, sia compresa una valutazione d'impatto, al fine di ponderare le richieste che noi facciamo anche agli altri paesi.

**Alex Agius Saliba (S&D).** – Sur President, il-qerda tal-bijodiversità u t-tibdil fil-klima huma sfidi reali li qeghdin naffaccjw ta' kuljum. Il-maġġoranza tal-qerda tal-bijodiversità qed issehh f'pajjiżi terzi illi ghadhom qed jizviluppaw u dan qed ihalli impatt dirett ukoll fuq il-bijodiversità fl-Istati Membri tagħna, b'mod speċjali wkoll fejn tidhol il-passa tal-ghasafar. Huwa għaldaqstant inutli illi l-Kummissjoni Ewropea tkompli tirrestringi biss il-prattiki tal-kaċċa u l-insib sostenibbli fl-Istati Membri tagħna u mbagħad tinjora l-massakru li għaddej f'pajjiżi terzi ġirien tagħna.

Il-qerda tal-bijodiversità u l-ekosistemi qiegħda wkoll ittellifna milli nipprogressaw sabiex nilhqu t-tragwardi ambizzjużi tal-SDGs. Hemm bżonn għalhekk illi nindirizzaw il-kawża vera tal-qerda tal-bijodiversità u nirduppjaw il-ħidma tagħna f'dawn l-oqsma.

L-ewwel u qabel kolloxx; inżidu l-fondi u l-investimenti. Għandu bżonn ikun hemm ukoll pjan olistiku fejn tidhol id-due diligence fil-konservazzjoni u l-użu sostenibbli tar-riżorsi tar-rijabilitazzjoni tal-ekosistemi tagħna. U għandu jkun hemm ukoll komunikazzjoni aktar adegwata mal-komunitajiet lokali tal-istess pajjiżi terzi. Jekk nitilfu l-bijodiversità ser inkunu qegħdin nitilfu alleat importanti tagħna kontra t-tibdil fil-klima u kif ukoll fl-isfida sabiex neqirdu l-faqar darba għal dejjem.

**Saskia Bricmont (Verts/ALE).** – Monsieur le Président, l'excellent rapport de ma collègue Michèle Rivasi pointe les incohérences de nos politiques européennes et leur impact déterminant sur nos partenaires du Sud.

Nos politiques de développement, climatiques, agricoles mais aussi commerciales, doivent viser un seul et même objectif: la réalisation des objectifs de développement durable. Or, la Commission européenne n'intègre pas suffisamment l'impact des accords commerciaux sur la biodiversité lorsqu'elle négocie avec des pays comme l'Indonésie, le Brésil ou d'autres.

Faut-il rappeler que l'Amazonie abrite une faune et une flore exceptionnelles, qu'elle rejette désormais du CO<sub>2</sub> plus qu'elle n'en stocke, et qu'elle est le toit de peuples indigènes menacés de disparition?

Les conséquences de la politique commerciale de l'Union européenne – émissions de CO<sub>2</sub>, renforcement des pratiques agro-industrielles, déforestation, accaparement des terres et usage de pesticides – sont dévastatrices pour la biodiversité et les communautés locales.

L'Europe doit donc mettre son commerce au service du développement durable et du bien-être des populations, et non l'inverse.

**Manuela Ripa (Verts/ALE).** – Herr Präsident, werde Kommissarin, werde Kollegen! COVID-19 bedeutet eine Zäsur unserer Lebensweise weltweit. Da wir noch mittendrin in der Pandemie stecken, können und müssen wir jetzt die Weichen für eine nachhaltige und zukunftsorientierte Sichtweise stellen. Dass wir uns um den Klimaschutz kümmern müssen, das weiß mittlerweile jede und jeder. Dass dies aber Hand in Hand mit dem Erhalt der Biodiversität gehen muss, leider nicht.

Es ist die Aufgabe dieses Hauses, die entscheidenden Schritte dafür zu tun, dass es nach der Pandemie kein „Weiter so“ geben darf. Reicht es denn nicht aus, dass die Wissenschaft uns Menschen bescheinigt, für die größte Vernichtung von Tier- und Pflanzenarten heute verantwortlich zu sein? Wie kann man hier noch eine rein wirtschaftliche Ratio aufrechterhalten?

Die Erhaltung der Biodiversität und die Schaffung neuer Räume für Biodiversität müssen das Kernanliegen unserer Entwicklungszusammenarbeit und außerdem die Leitschnur unserer Welthandelspolitik sein – selbstverständlich neben dem Klimaschutz. Dieser Bericht ist ein erster Schritt in diese Richtung.

**Jutta Urpilainen, Member of the Commission.** – Mr President, honourable Members, I think this debate has showed that biodiversity loss, together with climate change, is one of the defining global threats of our time. And, as many of you demand it, urgent action is needed and urgent global action is needed.

I thank again the European Parliament for supporting external action that promotes economic, environmental and social sustainable development, and I thank you for supporting the European Green Deal. We are positioning the EU as a leader in global action to reverse biodiversity loss and fight climate change.

Quite many of you actually were referring and demanding this holistic approach and also coherence between different policy sectors. So under the current multiannual financial framework and in particular global Europe, we aim to protect, restore and sustainably manage the natural resources that are essential for human prosperity and well-being.

So the external dimension of our Biodiversity Strategy 2030, the Forestry Strategy 2030 and the new EU Climate Adaptation Strategy and the Farm to Fork strategy, they all provide important roadmaps for our engagement, and I personally really agree with you that only with this consistent policy coherence do we have possibilities to succeed. So we need to have this holistic approach in order to succeed.

In addition, the Commission's recent trade policy review highlights the importance of bringing EU trade in line with environmental and social sustainability.

Let me conclude by thanking you for your engagement on this important agenda. I also want to thank you for mentioning so many times the Sustainable Development Goals and Agenda 2030, which is the main framework for our developing cooperation. And I also want to confirm my personal engagement to drive this agenda and the sustainable development agenda forward.

**Michèle Rivasi**, *rapporteuse*. – Monsieur le Président, je vous remercie tous, parce que je trouve qu'il y a une prise de conscience, c'est ce que disait madame la commissaire, sur le fait que le pacte vert, ce soit avant tout défendre le climat, mais que le deuxième pilier, ce soit la biodiversité: on peut bien se bagarrer par rapport au CO<sub>2</sub>, s'il n'y a plus d'écosystèmes, la vie est impossible, on détruit la vie.

Donc, je vois qu'il y a une prise de conscience sur le fait que l'Union européenne – et si on peut doubler le budget, ce sera formidable – doit vraiment défendre la diversité des écosystèmes. Pour cela, un deuxième mot a été régulièrement répété dans vos interventions, il y avait une vision holistique, mais il y avait aussi la vision de cohérence entre ce qu'on fait en Europe et ce qu'on fait dans les pays en voie de développement. Il ne faut pas que nos actions se contredisent, parce que si l'on subventionne des industriels qui extraient des énergies fossiles ou qui dégradent le milieu et qu'on ne renforce pas suffisamment la législation – et nous pouvons avoir une influence grâce aux doubles standards –, vous voyez que tous les efforts faits au niveau de l'Union européenne ne pourront pas avoir de répercussions. Je trouve donc que ce terme de cohérence dans nos politiques est très important.

Enfin, je vous ai souvent entendu parler de la politique commerciale. En effet, nos accords commerciaux sont déficients, car ils ne mettent pas suffisamment l'accent sur les contraintes relatives à la sauvegarde de la biodiversité. C'est le commerce qui est premier, mais je trouve qu'il faut vraiment renforcer l'importance du climat et de la biodiversité dans nos accords commerciaux, avec un aspect dissuasif pour les pays – on pense au Brésil, mais on pourrait penser à l'Uruguay, au Paraguay, etc. On parle de déforestation importée et c'est de notre responsabilité. Donc, je pense que si tout le monde est d'accord, on pourrait aller loin et montrer que l'Europe est vraiment le fer de lance de la défense de la vie en général.

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

La votazione si svolgerà martedì 5 ottobre 2021.

*Dichiarazioni scritte (articolo 171)*

**Robert Roos (ECR)**, *schriftelijk*. – Op het eerste gezicht is dit geen slecht rapport. Het benadrukt het belang van de biodiversiteit voor de menselijke gezondheid, de plattelandsontwikkeling, de visserij, de landbouw, etc. Landroof, ontbossing, de aantasting van mariene ecosystemen en dergelijke moeten we absoluut vermijden. Toch moet ik zeggen dat het Parlement de plank mislaat wanneer het gaat om oplossingen. Meer financiële steun voor ontwikkelingslanden, meer controle op landroof in handelsbesprekingen en minder vlees eten, dat gaat echt het verschil niet maken. We moeten eerst voor eigen deur vege: stop met biomassa, dat voor gigantische ontbossing zorgt. Stop met gigantische windparken in zee te bouwen, want die storen de vogels en de vissen (en dus de biodiversiteit) en maken de lokale visserij kapot. Stop met het diaboliseren van vlees, want beter vlees van eigen kweek dan geïmporteerde soja. Ook de juridisering van de discussie – door een mensenrecht te maken van een veilig, schoon, gezond en duurzaam milieu – biedt geen oplossing. We moeten de rechter niet verantwoordelijk maken, maar zelf de juiste keuzes maken.

### 13. Sztuczna inteligencja w prawie karnym i jej stosowanie przez policję i organy wymiaru sprawiedliwości w sprawach karnych (debata)

**Presidente.** – L'ordine del giorno reca la relazione di Petar Vitanov, a nome della commissione per le libertà civili, la giustizia e gli affari interni, sull'intelligenza artificiale nel diritto penale e il suo utilizzo da parte delle autorità di polizia e giudiziarie in ambito penale (2020/2016(INI)) (A9-0232/2021)).

**Petar Vitanov, rapporteur.** – Mr President, the EU regulatory framework needs to catch up with the technical developments. The use of AI has been growing exponentially and this brings the question as to what we, as co-legislators, are doing to safeguard the fundamental rights of European citizens.

AI is not a product in itself, but it's a method, it's a tool, and, as such, it needs to be conditioned to the overarching goal of improving the well-being of our citizens. The technology holds great promise if it's developed and used in an ethical and trustworthy manner, but at the same time, it implies considerable risks for fundamental rights, democracy and the rule of law.

As co-legislators, we bear enormous responsibility towards European citizens. We need to draw clear red lines for AI-based systems that violate fundamental rights. If we are serious about safeguarding people's safety and well-being, we need to include in the future legislation that can possibly ban or prohibit applications of AI that are incompatible with fundamental rights. Technical progress should never come at the expense of people's fundamental rights.

It's not a question of whether the AI systems have the potential to result in racially biased and discriminatory outcomes. We actually know for sure that this is the case. We see the confirmation of this in the data provided by multiple NGOs. We saw it during the Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs (LIBE) mission to Washington last year, and, just a couple of weeks ago, we heard it from the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights. And no, AI is not dangerous only when used by autocratic governments. Where the technology is flawed, it is flawed no matter who uses it and for what purposes. The good intention does not justify the means.

There have been numerous cases of people being treated unjustly because of AI, such as being denied social security benefits because of faulty AI tools, or even being arrested because of flawed facial recognition, and somehow I'm not surprised that the victims are always the poor, the immigrants, the coloured or the Eastern Europeans. The American Civil Liberties Union demonstrated to the US Congress in May 2019 that the error rate with facial recognition of coloured people is higher, basically leading to de facto discrimination. They described facial recognition technology as unregulated, dangerous, racially biased and often untested.

Using facial recognition in public areas may interfere with a person's freedom of opinion and expression simply because of the fact that the protection of group anonymity no longer exists if everyone in the group could potentially be recognised. This could lead to those individuals changing their behaviour, for example by no longer participating in peaceful strikes or demonstrations.

Predictive, profiling and risk-assessment AI and ultimate decision-making systems target individuals and profile them as criminals, resulting in serious criminal justice and civil outcomes and punishments before they have carried out the alleged action for which they are being profiled. I always thought that this could only happen in the movies! In essence, the very purpose of the systems is to undermine the fundamental right to be presumed innocent.

Colleagues, I really hope that we can have a serious debate and I'm looking forward to it, but I'm pretty confident that we will place fundamental rights before technological progress, and even before security, because there cannot be any security without freedom.

**Ylva Johansson, Member of the Commission.** – Mr President, I would like to thank you for this report and a special thanks to Mr Petar Vitanov for this report. I hear, I know that you are concerned about fundamental rights, and so am I. This summer, gangsters shot down and killed Dutch journalist Peter R. de Vries in cold blood.

An attack on a human being. An attack also on our society and our values, on our fundamental rights: the right to life, freedom of expression, freedom of the media. Police caught the suspects within the hour with only a fragment of the getaway car's registration number. Using state-of-the-art camera systems, the police forced the car to a standstill on the motorway.

Smart digital technology used in defence of citizens' and our fundamental rights. Without this technology, these criminals would have quite simply got away. To protect both our people and their rights digital technology is no longer a 'nice to have', but a 'need to have' for law enforcement.

First, because of the massive amounts of data. In one German state last year, the police seized 3 000 terabytes of data in child sexual abuse investigations alone. They estimated it would take one police officer more than 2 000 years to review, and that's assuming an officer working eight hours a day looking at one picture every second. A computer processes these images 10 to 20 times faster at least, 24 hours a day, never gets tired, makes fewer mistakes, doesn't get sick from what they see, does not need therapy.

And time is of the essence. In the EncroChat case, Sky ECC and Trojan Shield, the police captured hundreds of millions of messages with criminals plotting drug deals, violent crimes and even murder. Delays can cost lives.

Second, criminals increasingly use artificial intelligence to commit deception and fraud, cyber attacks and ransomware attacks. We can't ask the police to bring a knife to a gunfight. We must equip the police with modern tools to fight modern crimes.

Third, we need up-to-date information exchange to fight cross-border crime, and I will address this in the upcoming proposals on a police cooperation code and the update of the Prüm framework.

I know you are concerned about the rights to privacy and data protection, and I must stress that we must both protect security and respect fundamental rights at the same time, that's essential for the trust of our citizens. We need to demystify technology and explain the strong safeguards that already exist. A balanced approach and strong safeguards should govern law enforcement's use of technology, anchored in national laws, guarded by data protection authorities, subject to redress mechanisms and parliamentary oversight.

There is oversight on European level by, for example, the European Data Protection Supervisor and the Joint Parliamentary Scrutiny Group on Europol. The Court of Justice of the European Union and the European Court of Human Rights have built up a body of case law that is relevant for the use of technology by law enforcement. Procedural rights are already guaranteed: the right to effective remedy, to a fair trial, the rights of defence and the presumption of innocence.

I also agree that AI applications must fulfil robust legal and technical requirements, in particular when they are used by public authorities. The legal accountability for the eventual harmful effect of such systems must be clearly assigned. And this is why these issues are addressed in the Commission's proposed AI regulation. We need a European approach to ensure safety and full respect of fundamental rights when artificial intelligence is used.

The proposal recognises AI as a strategic tool for law enforcement, to fight terrorism and organised crime. The regulation will facilitate the use of artificial intelligence in a transparent, reliable and secure way, also for law enforcement authorities, by providing clear rules. And I completely agree with you: there is no room for mass surveillance in our society. Our proposal bans mass social scoring and prohibits live biometric identification in public spaces, with a few very well-defined exceptions.

But the police must be able to use AI and digital technology for high risk cases with a potential adverse impact on fundamental rights. AI must live up to the highest standards. It must be robust, secure and accurate. The quality of data must be exceptional. Its use must not lead to a discriminatory or racist outcome, and it must be subject to human oversight. When artificial intelligence affects people, people must have the final say.

Let me end by saying again that we must protect both security and fundamental rights, and I am convinced that we can, and this is what our citizens want. I hope that you are ready to work together with me to uphold our values and keep our citizens safe.

**Marcel Kolaja**, *rapporteur for the opinion of the Committee on the Internal Market and Consumer Protection*. – Mr President, dear Madam Commissioner, this report calls for a ban on facial recognition systems in public space. That's an important step in fighting against mass surveillance. Unfortunately, amendments have been tabled by a group of Members with the aim of torpedoing the ban and asking for legal means to spy on citizens. I ask you to vote against these amendments.

Just last night, thanks to work by 600 journalists worldwide, we learned about tax avoidance and money laundering committed by billionaires and high profile-politicians. For instance, we learned that Czech Prime Minister Andrej Babiš used offshore companies to buy a castle in France. With mass surveillance, journalists cannot possibly do their work safely. Two journalists were murdered in the Union just this year. With facial recognition in public space, oligarchs would have even more tools in their hands to persecute and oppress journalists. I speak about oligarchs who systematically work on breaches of the rule of law and on dismantling democracy. The Central and Eastern Europeans used to live under the eye of the Big Brother, and we don't want that to return.

**Ангел Джамбазки**, *докладчик по становището на комисията по правни въпроси*. – Г-н Председател, колеги, и аз се присъединявам към благодарностите към колегата докладчик Витанов за работата по тази тема – поздравления колега!

Съгласен съм с вас, че залегналите в доклада му тези за нужна защита на основни права при употреба на изкуствен интелект в сферата на наказателното право и използването на полицията и съдебните органи по наказателноправни въпроси са полезни. Както вече подчертах в становището на комисията по правни въпроси, изкуственият интелект и свързаните с него технологии биха имали множество ползи за намаляване на равнището на престъпност, борба с трафика на хора и сексуалната експлоатация на деца, анализ на данни и т.н.

Но дори когато трябва да ги похвалим, колеги, стигаме до параграф номер 9. Той подчертава – много от използваните понастоящем технологии за идентификация, основани на алгоритми, допускат непропорционално много грешки при идентифицирането и класифицирането и по този начин причиняват вреди на хората, които са в неравностойно положение вследствие на расизъм, лицата, принадлежащи към определени етнически общности, ЛГБТИ и така нататък и така нататък. Колеги, някой от вас предполага, че изкуственият интелект е расист, мизогинист и човек, който мрази ЛГБТИ?

Много често съм чувал в тази зала, че някакви хора отвънка говорили срещу този Съюз и се опитвали да го разрушават. Не, колеги, това не е нужно! Такива параграфи и такива твърдения правят много повече от всички врагове на този Съюз. Замислете се за това!

**Tom Vandenkendelaere**, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Mr President, AI will shape our future. It will change how we work and live, whether it is in health care, agriculture or, yes, law enforcement. The question isn't whether we like it or not, the question is how Europe will deal with this change. And one thing is clear: AI is here to stay.

Already today, criminals are shifting their operations. Whether it is in organised crime, terrorism, child porn, money laundering or human trafficking, it happens online. For me, law enforcement authorities must be able to use the full potential of AI to fight criminals. It will allow them to fight criminality faster, more efficiently and in a more targeted way. And yes, that includes facial recognition in public spaces – on the condition that all fundamental rights are guaranteed and that there is no room for bias.

And, colleagues, don't get me wrong. This does not mean that we want to give police forces carte blanche to do whatever they want. It's our duty as policymakers to set up a strong legal framework within which they can safely use AI while guaranteeing the safety of our citizens. It's too easy to argue for moratoria or bans without taking into account the challenges our police officers deal with on the ground. If we really want to be serious about setting up, putting people at the core of trustworthy AI, as we said we would, then it is also about their safety and the benefits AI can bring to better protect ordinary citizens and police officers alike.

How do we do that? It's simple. Let's not get trapped in focusing on certain AI applications and tools, but let us assess each use in its specific context against a set of principles and values, and that is what we should be discussing. Proportionality, necessity, limiting the use in time and place, transparent and strong democratic oversight, and prior legal authorisation where necessary. That's why I think this report falls short of the expectations people have and why my Group presented amendments to it.

Digitalisation of our society is inevitable. We cannot be blind to this new reality. It is our duty, all together here in this House, to find the right balance between the use of new technologies on the one hand and the protection of our fundamental rights on the other hand. We have to remain vigilant, but we should not throw the baby out with the bathwater.

**Brando Benifei**, *a nome del gruppo S&D*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, mentre il Parlamento si accinge a esaminare la proposta di regolamento sull'intelligenza artificiale, con questa relazione diamo un messaggio chiaro e poniamo già un importante punto fermo: in Europa non c'è posto, secondo noi, per la sorveglianza biometrica di massa e la sicurezza e il contrasto al crimine non possono avvenire a scapito dei diritti fondamentali dei cittadini.

L'identificazione per mezzo di dati biometrici in luoghi accessibili al pubblico rischia infatti di determinare gravi abusi sul diritto alla vita privata e su altri principi alla base dei nostri sistemi democratici. Lo ha detto il Garante europeo della privacy: questi sistemi avrebbero un impatto negativo diretto sull'esercizio della libertà di espressione, di assemblea, di associazione, fino alla stessa libertà di movimento.

Pensiamo poi a cosa potrebbe avvenire in luoghi non così attenti alla separazione dei poteri o alle libertà fondamentali, siano essi Stati o città. Il rischio di abuso è troppo forte. Per questo riteniamo che le eccezioni all'articolo 5 sulle pratiche proibite della proposta di regolamento debbano essere eliminate.

Allo stesso modo, tecniche predittive per attività di contrasto portano con sé un gravissimo rischio di discriminazione, oltre alla mancanza di evidenze sulla loro accuratezza, minando una delle basi fondamentali dei nostri ordinamenti democratici, ovvero la presunzione di innocenza.

Nessuna supervisione umana né set di dati senza errori saranno sufficienti ad assicurare che decisioni di questo tipo da parte di sistemi di intelligenza artificiale siano prese rispettando garanzie costituzionali e diritti fondamentali dell'Unione, anche laddove questi processi decisionali fossero reversibili.

A maggior ragione questi sistemi non possono sottostare a una mera autovalutazione di conformità prima di essere immessi sul mercato, come proposto dal regolamento nella sua prima bozza a nostro esame. Una autovalutazione espone infatti a rischi inaccettabili di errori e violazioni, che sarebbero scoperti solo in seguito dalle autorità di vigilanza se ne avranno i mezzi per farlo, e ciò avverrebbe a danni ormai avvenuti, anche irreparabili, per le vite delle persone.

Nell'Unione abbiamo già oggi le leggi più avanzate al mondo sulla protezione dei dati personali. Per noi è un modello, un modello che vogliamo portare nel resto del mondo, e non possiamo permetterci di arretrare neanche di un millimetro da questa impostazione quando ci troviamo a regolamentare l'intelligenza artificiale. Dobbiamo, anche in questo campo, tutelare fino in fondo i diritti dei cittadini. Penso che questo sia il modo con cui possiamo agire per un'Europa che abbia il proprio modello centrato sui diritti umani dell'intelligenza artificiale.



**PŘESEDNICTVÍ: MARCEL KOLAJA***místopředseda*

**Dragoș Tudorache**, *on behalf of the Renew Group*. – Mr President, dear Commissioner, dear colleagues, the use of artificial intelligence in law enforcement is a political decision, not a technical one. Our duty is to apply our political worldview to determine what are the allowed uses of artificial intelligence and under which conditions. Europe is built on a set of values. They constrain the realm of the possible, dictating what we cannot do. And our values also guide our way into the future, dictating what we can and what we should do.

What we cannot do is to allow the use of technology to lead to a breach of our values. We must only allow AI technologies to be used with straight safeguards and oversight, and we must ensure that human rights are protected throughout.

What we also cannot do is to allow authorities to use technology for mass surveillance, mass social scoring or any type of government control over citizens. We must be doubly cautious in protecting our values when dealing with law enforcement, as law enforcement is the prerogative of the state.

On the other hand, what we can – and should – do is to seek to use AI to reduce the biases and discriminations plaguing our society, including in law enforcement. Technology is a tool. We should invest in it until it is good enough to serve our values. What we also can and should do is ensure law enforcement is competitive and has the best tools at its disposal to fight crime. Fighting crime is also a way to protect our values and should be a top priority for us.

We must therefore strengthen the democratic fibre and resilience of our institutions. And tomorrow's challenges will not come from the tools themselves but from our ability or inability to use them in accordance with our values.

**Kim Van Sparrentak**, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Mr President, without knowing, we are all being tracked, followed and identified on the streets by facial recognition cameras. This is dangerous, intrusive and disproportionate. Imagine waking up one day with the police barging into your house after AI has flagged you as a suspect. Then it's up to you to prove your innocence. It is you versus the computer. And the myth that a calculation is more ethical than a human is dangerous, especially where decisions impact people's lives.

So to my colleagues from the EPP: let's be realistic. AI is not a quick solution to fight crime or terrorism. An AI camera will not detect radicalisation, and automating police work is not a substitute for police funding and community workers. Looking at the US, in New York City and Boston, replacing AI-driven predictive policing with community policing lowered crime rates. And San Francisco and Boston have already banned biometric surveillance in public spaces.

So not only is a ban perfectly feasible, we in the EU are far behind in our ethical AI choices. And if we as Parliament are serious about making the EU a leader in ethical AI and fundamental human rights, let's ban biometric surveillance in public spaces.

**Jean-Lin Lacapelle**, *au nom du groupe ID*. – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, l'intelligence artificielle est un outil admirable et un formidable potentiel pour nos peuples et nos nations. Mais comme à son habitude, l'Union européenne le gâche de la pire manière, en le transformant en un instrument de lutte idéologique.

Ainsi, en matière policière et judiciaire, là où l'informatique peut permettre des progrès décisifs pour la sécurité de nos concitoyens, notamment de nos enfants, vous en limitez l'usage. Vous affirmez que l'intelligence artificielle reproduirait et même amplifierait les discriminations, ce qui obligerait à lui interdire certaines conclusions et à se montrer aussi aveugle que vous dans la lutte contre la délinquance.

Vous refusez un système intelligent de détection des mensonges aux frontières de l'Union européenne, alors que 80 % des prétendus mineurs isolés sont en fait majeurs et que 70 % des demandes d'asile sont rejetées parce qu'infondées.

Vous affirmez que l'affaire américaine George Floyd, qui ne nous concerne pourtant pas, est la preuve d'un prétendu racisme des forces de police, et exigez des plans nationaux de lutte contre le policier plutôt que contre les voyous.

Nous attendions de ce rapport qu'il parle d'intelligence artificielle, d'efficacité pénale, de sécurité de nos concitoyens et nous n'avons que du laxisme pour les délinquants et des leçons idéologiques pour les forces de l'ordre et les honnêtes citoyens. Puisque l'Europe ne veut pas contrôler sérieusement ses frontières et lutter contre la criminalité, alors les États membres devront reprendre leur destin en main et se prononcer par l'élection ou le référendum sur les questions vitales de la sécurité et de la souveraineté: c'est exactement ce que Marine Le Pen proposera en France en mars 2022.

**Eugen Jurzyca**, za skupinu ECR. – Vážený pán predsedajúci, rozumiem obavám z toho, že by sme algoritmom prenechali kontrolu nad rozhodnutiami, ktoré môžu vážne ovplyvniť ľudský život. Napríklad preto, že algoritmy môžu robiť chyby. Nesúhlasím ale s tým, aby sme len na základe takýchto obáv plošne zakázali použitie umelej inteligencie všade tam, kde to môže mať právny dosah na jednotlivca, ako to navrhuje táto správa. Mali by sme mať analýzy, ktoré by poctivo porovnávali funkčnosť a efektívnosť ľudského a algoritmického rozhodovania, a rozhodnúť sa pre to lepšie. Už dnes pritom existujú príklady úspešného použitia umelej inteligencie v trestných veciach, ktoré viedli k efektívnejšiemu a spravodlivejšiemu systému. Napríklad reforma väzobného stihania v štáte New Jersey.

**Cornelia Ernst**, im Namen der Fraktion The Left. – Herr Präsident! Ich will es ganz klar sagen: Für unsere Fraktion ist biometrische Gesichtserkennung im öffentlichen Raum inakzeptabel. Gesichtserkennung sollte grundsätzlich nur in streng geregelten Fällen in begrenztem Maße Anwendung finden. Die Wahrung der Grundrechte ist Maß eines jeden Rechtsstaates. Wir wollen eben nicht, dass der Abgleich von biometrischen Gesichtsmarkmalen schleichend zum Standardverfahren polizeilicher Arbeit wird. Allein das technisch Machbare, die Erleichterung von Polizeiarbeit rechtfertigt eben nicht einen automatischen Einsatz einer solch grundrechtlich invasiven Technologie.

Und deshalb werden wir auch gegen die Änderungsanträge der EVP-Fraktion stimmen. Wir haben einen starken Bericht auf dem Tisch, der das Diskriminierungspotenzial durch KI deutlich benennt, weil Algorithmen soziale und rassistische Denkmuster befördern können. Die Änderungsanträge der EVP-Fraktion konterkarieren das. Bei biometrischer Gesichtserkennung ist eben nicht nur die Gefahr relevant, dass die Bürgerinnen und Bürger automatisch zum Verdachtsobjekt werden. Es gibt auch genügend Hinweise für Fehler – dass unschuldige Menschen in Schwierigkeiten gebracht werden. Biometrische Gesichtserkennung ist, einmal als Standard akzeptiert, Massenüberwachung und ein gravierender Eingriff in die Privatsphäre. Und genau deshalb muss jede Form von anlassloser Überwachung verboten werden.

**Mislav Kolakušić** (NI). – Poštovani predsjedavajući, poštovane kolege, poštovani građani, svjedoci smo posljednjih godina kako su se neke dobre ideje i neke ne tako dobre ideje u početku pretvorile u potpunu katastrofu. Ideja zaštite osobnih podataka nas je dovela do toga da danas skoro svaki građanin Europske unije mora svakoju banci svakoju tvrtki s kojom se susretne dati gotovo sve svoje podatke koje nikada prije nije morao davati.

COVID putovnice koje su uvedene da bi se moglo lakše putovati, danas onima koji su potpuno zdravi, a ne posjeduju je, prijete da se koriste zdravstvenim uslugama, da kupuju na benzinskim postajama. Uskoro više neće smjeti kupovati ni hranu.

Sada ova ideja biometrijskog praćenja građana, iako u početku samo u kaznenim postupcima, uvjeren sam da će se odnositi na praćenje svakog građanina u svakom trenutku, a to je nedopustivo.

**Jeroen Lenaers** (PPE). – Mr President, Commissioner, dear colleagues, new technologies often bring enormous opportunities and benefits. But at the same time, we also see often that they provide new avenues for organised crime. It was true for the internet, it is certainly also true for artificial intelligence and machine learning. And at the same time, these technologies can also help us to have huge potential in helping the 1.5 million police officers in the EU to effectively fight crime.

They can help in identifying criminals on the run. They can help forecasting criminal activity, and they can help us in finding counterfeit goods and currencies. And we need to look at that potential with an open mind and avoid a situation where criminals profit from AI but law enforcement cannot use it to fight them.

Yes, there are risks involved, and good safeguards absolutely need to be in place. AI needs to be transparent and trustworthy, and we need to make sure that using AI in the field of law enforcement will never compromise our values.

But let's also not be naive. Let's not make the mistake to only focus on the risks and ignore completely the potential. Several colleagues have said it already: AI is here to stay, and its use will only grow in the coming years. And we only have to look at some countries outside the European Union to see what we should not be doing. We need a balanced approach. We need a European approach, because innovation is in our European DNA, as is our ability to create artificial intelligence in a trustworthy, human-centred and valued-based way. Let that be our European trademark in the world, also for law enforcement applications.

**Ibán García Del Blanco (S&D).** – Señor presidente, quisiera, en primer lugar, dar las gracias y felicitar al ponente por su informe, que creo que es absolutamente equilibrado y que va en la línea de lo que ya este Parlamento en algunas ocasiones ha planteado. Tenemos que encontrar, efectivamente, un equilibrio entre el riesgo para la protección de los derechos y, desde luego, el desarrollo tecnológico que nos facilite de alguna forma la consecución de objetivos de carácter social.

Pero estamos, eso sí, ante un asunto que afecta directamente a los derechos fundamentales. Varios de ellos están comprometidos en el desarrollo jurídico de esta tecnología, o en el ámbito jurídico que ordene esta tecnología, y, al mismo tiempo, también está en juego la paz social cuando hablamos de cuestiones que afectan a la seguridad y al propio orden establecido y a las reglas por las que nos regimos.

Se trata de que, efectivamente, algunas de esas realidades que nos ha anticipado la ciencia-ficción en el pasado —algunas de ellas son ya una realidad hoy en cuanto al desarrollo tecnológico— no se conviertan en una suerte de distopía en nuestros tiempos de esos planteamientos de películas como *Minority Report*, donde la policía se anticipa incluso a la comisión del delito o a la intención manifestada porque es capaz de prever mediante tecnologías como estas la posible comisión de un delito; o, sin ir más lejos, que tengamos algún día esos jueces robots que de alguna manera también hubieran hecho las delicias de algunos revolucionarios franceses cuando decían aquello de «la boca que dice la ley», buscando una pretendida imparcialidad en la expresión de la justicia del pueblo.

Pero, al mismo tiempo, tenemos también que evitar que existan trabas para el desarrollo de herramientas que efectivamente nos pueden hacer conseguir algunos de los objetivos que pueden hacer nuestras sociedades mejores; desde luego, en el ámbito de la propia administración de justicia, pero también como herramienta de soporte para nuestras propias fuerzas de seguridad.

No podemos obviar esas posibilidades que da la inteligencia artificial y entorpecer su desarrollo. Por eso quiero también apoyar este informe, que creo que se incardina perfectamente —y esto es algo que quisiera recordar a algunos de mis compañeros— en el planteamiento que aprobó este propio Parlamento hace prácticamente un año —asunto sobre el que yo fui ponente, además—, que hablaba de ética aplicada a tecnologías de inteligencia artificial y que creo que iba en el mismo sentido, tratando de evitar escenarios que no son deseables, pero intentando también al mismo tiempo no entorpecer.

Señorías, este informe no puede abrir completamente las barreras y dejar que cada uno vaya por su lado y, al mismo tiempo, ser tan intrusivo como denuncian otros compañeros. Creo que se trata precisamente de un informe que encuentra el término medio, que plantea cuestiones muy interesantes.

**Svenja Hahn (Renew).** – Herr Präsident! Innovation durch künstliche Intelligenz ist ein schier unglaublicher Pool für Fortschritt. Auch bei Polizei und Justiz kann es Entlastung bringen und die Arbeitsqualität erheblich verbessern. Der Einsatz von KI in der Strafverfolgung allerdings braucht oft das Label „Hochrisiko für Bürgerrechte“.

Und manches gilt es gänzlich zu verhindern. Massenüberwachung durch automatische Gesichtserkennungssoftware im öffentlichen Raum ist ein No-Go. Deshalb ist es so wichtig, dass der Parlamentsvorschlag eine klare Position pro Bürgerrechte und gegen Gesichtserkennung einnimmt. Menschen und Bürgerrechte sind nicht verhandelbar, besonders nicht beim Einsatz neuer Technologien durch staatliche Stellen. Und es wundert mich kein bisschen, dass es wieder die konservativen Kollegen der EVP sind, die auf biometrische Überwachung drängen. Mit Ihren Änderungsanträgen stellen Sie wiederholt zum x-ten Mal Überwachungsträume – Ihre Überwachungsträume – über den Schutz unserer Grundrechte.

Diese Abstimmung ist auch ein Signal für das geplante Gesetz zu künstlicher Intelligenz, welchen Stellenwert das Europäische Parlament unseren Bürgerrechten in der digitalen Zukunft zumisst. Und ich sage Ihnen eines: Ich werde mich jeden Tag dafür einsetzen, dass das KI-Gesetz unsere Grundrechte in der EU stärkt und nicht untergräbt.

**Sabrina Pignedoli (NI).** – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, quando si parla di intelligenza artificiale in uso alle forze dell'ordine non c'è solo la questione del riconoscimento facciale, un tema delicato su cui occorre trovare un equilibrio.

*Hacker* e gruppi criminali in tutta Europa entrano con troppa facilità nei sistemi informatici di istituzioni pubbliche e aziende private. Hanno colpito per esempio strutture sanitarie in Italia, Francia, Germania e Spagna, mettendo a rischio il loro funzionamento. L'intelligenza artificiale deve diventare uno strumento fondamentale in mano alle forze dell'ordine per contrastare più efficacemente il *cybercrime*.

Ma non c'è solo la repressione dei fenomeni criminali. Occorre investire molto di più nella prevenzione, rinforzando le difese dei dati personali che altrimenti possono finire nel mercato nero dei dati.

Bisogna creare barriere efficaci contro gli *hacker* e utilizzare l'intelligenza artificiale come una sorta di infiltrato, grazie a cui le forze dell'ordine possono bloccare possibili attacchi prima che si verifichino. La prevenzione è molto più efficace della cura.

**Javier Zarzalejos (PPE).** – Señor presidente, no hay duda de que la inteligencia artificial es una tecnología estratégica del siglo XXI y que esta tecnología tiene cabida también en el ámbito de la justicia penal y del cumplimiento de la ley.

Hoy existen formas de delincuencia que solo pueden combatirse con la eficacia que deseamos si ponemos a disposición de las fuerzas de seguridad y de los tribunales herramientas tecnológicas innovadoras. Pensemos en el blanqueo de dinero, en la financiación del terrorismo, en la proliferación de contenidos terroristas en línea, en el tráfico de seres humanos por las mafias de la inmigración o para propósitos de explotación sexual o laboral, o en la proliferación de contenidos de abuso sexual de menores, que exigen un trabajo de identificación de las víctimas y de identificación de los perpetradores y de los lugares donde se han cometido los abusos y que ponen a prueba la resistencia psicológica de los que tienen que hacer este trabajo de identificación.

Es cierto que los algoritmos tienen que mejorar y que sus riesgos exigen rodear su uso de grandes salvaguardias. Pero no soy partidario de prohibiciones absolutas, sino de garantías como las que las enmiendas presentadas por mi grupo establecen en relación con la autorización judicial previa.

Tenemos que ofrecer un entorno que facilite el desarrollo de la inteligencia artificial, también en aquellas áreas que se pueden calificar de «alto riesgo», con las debidas garantías.

Y permítanme que, cuando se habla de ejemplos de otras ciudades o de otros países, les diga que me da la impresión de que los sesgos racistas en estos casos no están precisamente en los algoritmos.

**Karen Melchior (Renew).** – Mr President, it's not all algorithms or artificial intelligence that are problematic, but predictive profiling and risk assessment artificial intelligence and automated decision-making systems are weapons of mass destruction. They are as dangerous for our democracy as nuclear bombs are for living creatures and life. They will destroy the fundamental rights of each citizen to be equal before the law and in the eye of our authorities. It is not only a question of getting the technology good enough. We must not allow mass surveillance to strip us of our most fundamental rights as citizens, for example the right to unite in demonstrations in public spaces.

Madam Commissioner, thank you for underlining the need for modern tools for our judicial authorities. But where is the legal framework that will ensure strict safeguards against misuse and strict democratic control and oversight?

**Miroslav Radačovský (NI).** – Vážený pán predsedajúci, správa pána Vitanova, pokiaľ sa týka využívania umelej inteligencie v trestnom konaní, je dobrá, je vyvážená, je profesionálne spracovaná. Som teda toho názoru, že skôr dobrá spočíva v tom, že poukazuje na pozitíva umelej inteligencie v trestnom konaní, a poukazuje aj na negatíva. Podľa môjho názoru ako dlhoročného sudcu som toho názoru, že je treba byť opatrný pri použití umelej inteligencie v čase rozhodovania na súde. Tam predsa by mal len prevyšovať ten ľudský prvok, pretože rozhodovať o vine a o treste je vždy individuálne a žiadne algoritmy to asi nemôžu na danú situáciu aplikovať. Veď aj tu v tejto miestnosti pán predsedajúci rozhoduje momentálne z času na čas, musí rozhodnúť, a keby tomu tak nebolo, tak namiesto pána predsedajúceho by tu sedela umelá inteligencia a namiesto europoslancov by sedela umelá inteligencia, pretože na základe algoritmov by

sme vedeli, ako máme rozhodnúť. Je treba vyvarovať sa možnostiam zneužitia umelej inteligencie pri ochrane ľudských práv a slobôd, ale v princípe a v zásade je umelá inteligencia prínosom pre boj s kriminalitou a je treba ju podporovať, je treba ju rozvíjať.

**President.** – Thank you. I hope no one wants to replace me with artificial intelligence as well as the MEPs.

**Tomislav Sokol (PPE).** – Poštovani predsjedavajući, povjerenice, kolegice i kolege, ranija dijagnostika zloćudne bolesti, bolje upravljanje prometom ili pak racionalnije korištenje energentima samo su neki od primjera očite koristi koje primjena umjetne inteligencije donosi. Međutim, ako ona nije primjereno zakonodavno uređena, umjetna inteligencija može ugroziti privatnost pojedinca i dovesti do različitih oblika diskriminacije. Stoga ne čudi podatak da čak 88 posto građana smatra da se njome treba pažljivo upravljati.

Borba protiv sofisticiranih, dobro financiranih i opremljenih terorističkih i kriminalnih skupina u 21. stoljeću ne može se zamisliti bez korištenja umjetne inteligencije. S druge strane, primjer umjetne inteligencije naročito je osjetljiv u području kaznenog prava jer uključuje mogućnost geometrijskog prepoznavanja i algoritamskog donošenja odluka.

Kako bi zaštitila građane od njezine zlouporabe, ali i postala svjetski predvodnik u pametnim tehnologijama, Europska unija treba novi, sveobuhvatan pristup umjetnoj inteligenciji. Takvim pristupom treba zabraniti koncept društvenog vrednovanja kojim se pomoću algoritama može prikupljati široki spektar podataka o građanima i njihovom ponašanju.

S druge strane, uporabu sustava biometrijske identifikacije, odnosno prepoznavanja lica na javnim mjestima za potrebe kaznenog progona u skladu s načelom proporcionalnosti treba ograničiti na situacije kao što su potraga za nestalim djetetom, sprečavanje konkretne i neposredne terorističke prijetnje i otkrivanje, lociranje, identificiranje ili istraga protiv počinitelja teškog kaznenog djela ili osumnjičenika za takvo djelo.

Moramo postići balans između korištenja umjetne inteligencije u svrhu hvatanja kriminalaca s jedne strane i zaštite ljudskih prava s druge strane, ali bez širenja histerije i paranoje čemu danas, nažalost, ovdje svjedočimo.

**Fabienne Keller (Renew).** – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Commissaire, mes chers collègues, les domaines policiers et judiciaires n'échappent pas aux évolutions technologiques et parmi celles-ci, l'intelligence artificielle est une technologie nouvelle et puissante.

L'utilisation de cet outil s'est révélée être un réel atout dans le cadre de certaines enquêtes criminelles, de la lutte contre le terrorisme ou du contrôle des frontières. Ainsi, dans l'affaire terrifiante des attentats de Paris du 13 novembre 2015, c'est en partie grâce à cette technique de l'intelligence artificielle et de la reconnaissance faciale que les enquêteurs ont pu identifier, localiser et arrêter les terroristes présumés.

Cependant, son utilisation doit bien sûr se faire dans le cadre d'un contrôle strict. En effet, son usage doit être limité et proportionné, et toujours être accompagné de supervision humaine. Il doit y avoir un vrai travail de transparence quant aux technologies utilisées, ainsi qu'un contrôle démocratique et surtout judiciaire dans son utilisation, permettant d'éviter tout biais et d'assurer le respect des droits fondamentaux.

Chers collègues, l'utilisation de l'intelligence artificielle dans les affaires pénales peut être un atout pour les enquêtes criminelles et pour la justice européenne. Ne nous en privons pas, dans le respect des libertés fondamentales.

**Maite Pagazaurtundúa (Renew).** – Señor presidente, gracias, comisaria Johansson. Que el Parlamento se plante la aplicación de la inteligencia artificial en el Derecho penal y en asuntos penales resultaba necesario, aunque sea un asunto sensible. Es necesario que busquemos el equilibrio entre seguridad y libertad cuando cambian las circunstancias sociales o tecnológicas, y el hecho es que han cambiado.

No hay soluciones mágicas para asuntos complejos, pero la policía o los jueces deben poder utilizar tecnologías que eviten parte de la impunidad de la ciberdelincuencia más sofisticada o del terrorismo cuando este tiene gravísimos objetivos y cuenta con enormes recursos. Porque la impunidad también constituiría una degradación del derecho a la justicia que tienen la sociedad y, muy específicamente, las víctimas.

Ahora bien, la tecnología es tal, tan potente es, que la habilitación de ciertas medidas, como el reconocimiento facial, solo debería darse bajo control judicial estricto. Es imprescindible que se preserve, en sentido general, la privacidad de las personas e incluso algunas otras garantías. Yo personalmente tengo dudas sobre la moratoria del apartado 27, pero no tengo dudas con respecto a que tenemos que seguir trabajando sobre la base de este informe, que marcará nuestra posición política, y que el objetivo debe ser tener reglas muy afinadas, con grandes, fuertes consensos, muy mayoritarios, de esta Cámara.

**Ylva Johansson**, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, dear honourable Members, I would like to thank you very much for this debate. Many of you have raised serious concerns on important aspects of artificial intelligence, and I have listened very carefully to your interventions. I will try to answer some of the issues that have been raised in this debate.

First, on mass surveillance. I said it already in the beginning, and I completely agree with all of you that have raised this: there's no room for mass surveillance in the EU and in our societies. And we have already strong safeguards in place, and the AI proposal from the Commission will add additional ones.

EU data protection rules prohibit, in principle, the processing of biometric data for the purpose of uniquely identifying a natural person, except under very specific conditions. The conditions are clearly laid out in our acquis, the GDPR and the Law Enforcement Directive. This ensures that the use is proportionate and respects the right to data protection and provides for fundamental rights.

Further, the AI Act includes the prohibition of real-time remote biometric identification in publicly-accessible places by law enforcement authorities, with very narrow expectations and strong safeguards. The AI Act follows a risk-based approach: the higher the risk, the stricter the rules are. The majority of AI applications are used for purely administrative purposes like translation systems or workflows and do not pose any concerns and require no regulation intervention, while other-use cases, for example the profiling systems used to detect or investigate a crime, or to identify a person remotely, are qualified as high-risk.

Many of you have also raised the concerns of facial recognition. Facial recognition is of outstanding importance for law enforcement to identify perpetrators of victims of crime, not just in publicly-accessible spaces but also in the online environment. Such systems are in operation, and they save lives.

I have to note that the accuracy of AI technologies is 10 times higher than non-AI technologies, and the overall accuracy of such systems has significantly increased in the last years.

In addition, we should not forget that each potential match must be confirmed by the experts before action is taken. Let me be clear: artificial intelligence is not allowed to make decisions to break into a person's home or to arrest a person. Of course not. AI is a necessary tool to help human beings in law enforcement to make the right and timely decision. It's necessary with safeguards: the more intrusive effects, the stronger safeguards are necessary.

I'm very glad that we all agree that we need a European approach and a common European regulation based on our values.

Finally, I would like to say don't put the protection of fundamental rights in contradiction of protecting human beings and protecting societies. It's simply not true that we have to choose. We are capable of doing both. To be able to do so, to find the right balance, we need this kind of open, free democratic debate like we have this evening here in Parliament. Let's continue that debate together to protect both societies, lives and fundamental rights.

**Petar Vitanov, rapporteur.** – Mr President, I am also happy with this debate, because we agree on two things: the benefits of AI in law enforcement on one hand, and, of course, every single colleague here mentioned human rights, fundamental rights. Well, of course, there are divisions. There are definitely two groups. The first one, to which I belong, says that we keep fundamental rights by not letting the use of the unreliable application of AI in order to keep the fundamental rights, and the other group says, and they are convincing us about the conditions of the use of the same unreliable applications in their intentions to protect the unconditional human rights. Of course, it's a political choice.

My choice is simple. I urge you not to reject all of the amendments tabled, because they will significantly alter the spirit of this report. But of course, if you prefer the second option, please try to convince that single mother that works 12 hours a day in a poor neighbourhood because she cannot afford to live in a better neighbourhood, in a fancy neighbourhood, raising her own children, that her children are potential criminals, or try to convince the poor, the coloured, the immigrants, the foreigners that they are potential criminals only because the AI says so. Is this the world that we want to live in? Is this the world that we want for our children? Will we be able to sleep freely at night? To be honest, I cannot.

**President.** – The debate is closed. The vote will take place on Tuesday, 5 October 2021.

*Written statements (Rule 171)*

**Laura Ferrara (NI), per iscritto.** – L'intelligenza artificiale è destinata ad avere un ruolo strategico per un'efficace lotta contro la criminalità e garantire la sicurezza dei cittadini.

Le opportunità e i vantaggi che essa può offrire nella giustizia penale sono indiscutibili sotto l'aspetto della prevenzione, delle indagini, dell'accertamento e perseguimento di reati, purché sia garantita la compatibilità delle tecnologie con il rispetto dei diritti fondamentali e con i principi di necessità e proporzionalità.

Forme di sorveglianza di massa e polizia predittiva attraverso sofisticati algoritmi che giudicano comportamenti sociali o tratti della personalità per anticipare le condotte di determinati soggetti non ci mettono al riparo dal rischio di processi decisionali opachi, o peggio, da teorie lombrosiane di nuova generazione e pericolose violazioni di diritti.

Un quadro normativo comune a livello europeo è indispensabile per agevolare le autorità di contrasto nell'uso di servizi e strumenti di intelligenza artificiale che rispondano a criteri di trasparenza, imparzialità ed equità, evitando pregiudizi e discriminazioni tra persone o gruppi sociali, rischi di violazione della privacy e della dignità umana.

**Karol Karski (ECR), na piśmie.** – Tempo digitalizacji, rozwoju technologii, a zwłaszcza narzędzi wykorzystujących sztuczną inteligencję od wielu lat wyprzedza tempo prac legislacyjnych w tym obszarze. Z uwagi jednak na stale postępującą cyfryzację w dziedzinie bezpieczeństwa wewnętrznego nie możemy pozwolić sobie na wstrzymanie rozwoju nowych technologii. Stosowanie nowych rozwiązań musi być adekwatne i proporcjonalne przy jednoczesnym zagwarantowaniu, z jednej strony, wysokiego poziomu ochrony praw podstawowych, a z drugiej, warunków do korzystania przez organy ścigania z rozwiązań analitycznych i statystycznych, które efektywnie wspierają realizację celu, jakim jest zapewnienie bezpieczeństwa obywateli.

Nieodzownym elementem każdego narzędzia wykorzystującego sztuczną inteligencję w realizacji zadań w obszarze porządku publicznego, zarządzania granicą, migracją oraz azylem jest nadzór ludzki jako czynnik umacniający zaufanie w obszarze bezpośredniego oddziaływania technologii na prawa obywateli. W kontekście rozpatrywanego sprawozdania należy uwzględnić specyfikę organów ścigania oraz w miarę możliwości zapewnić ich potrzeby, nie wpływając na zmniejszenie ochrony praw podstawowych, których utrzymanie jest priorytetem. Uzasadnione byłoby wydzielenie problematyki wykorzystania narzędzi sztucznej inteligencji w systemach wspierających realizację zadań w obszarze ochrony bezpieczeństwa wewnętrznego z przedmiotowego projektu rozporządzenia o wykorzystaniu sztucznej inteligencji i uregulowanie jej w ramach odrębnego aktu prawnego. Dalszy rozwój efektywnych narzędzi analitycznych, statystycznych jest niezbędny wobec nowych wyzwań i zagrożeń, ale tylko przy zachowaniu wysokiego poziomu ochrony praw podstawowych.

## 14. Wpływ, jaki na kobiety i dzieci wywierają przemoc ze strony partnera oraz prawo pieczy nad dzieckiem (debata)

**President.** – The next item is the debate on the report by Elena Kountoura, on behalf of the Committee on Women's Rights and Gender Equality, and Luisa Regimenti on behalf of the Committee on Legal Affairs, on the impact of intimate partner violence and custody rights on women and children (2019/2166(INI)) (A9-0254/2021).

**Luisa Regimenti, relatrice.** – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, è per me un onore oggi introdurre, con la collega correlatrice Kontoura, questa discussione sulla relazione di iniziativa sull'impatto della violenza domestica e i diritti di custodia su donne e bambini.

Il voto che oggi siamo chiamati a esprimere, come Parlamento europeo, è di grande importanza, e ritengo sia nostro dovere lanciare un messaggio forte, chiaro e di speranza per tutte le donne che hanno subito e ancora subiscono atti di violenza fisica, psicologica ed economica da parte del partner e che lottano ogni giorno per la sopravvivenza propria e dei figli.

La violenza domestica è un problema sociale serio e spesso nascosto, che causa un trauma fisico e psicologico sistematico, con gravi conseguenze per le vittime e con un grave impatto sul benessere emotivo, economico e sociale dell'intera famiglia.

Le vittime di questo stigma non sono solo le donne, che soffrono in prima persona dei maltrattamenti del coniuge, ma anche i figli che spesso sono testimoni degli atti di violenza nei confronti della madre, con gravissime conseguenze sul loro sviluppo psicologico ed emotivo.

Con questa relazione condanniamo, con la massima fermezza, tutte le forme di violenza domestica e di violenza nei confronti delle donne e chiediamo che, in particolare nei procedimenti di separazione dei coniugi e di affidamento parentale, sia assicurata una giustizia a misura di donna e di minore.

In troppi casi ancora la violenza domestica è trascurata e le decisioni giudiziali prevedenti l'affidamento condiviso o l'autorità genitoriale condivisa possono tramutarsi in condanne a morte per donne e bambini. Ciò accade anche perché i procedimenti penali derivanti da una denuncia di violenza domestica sono spesso trattati in modo completamente separato dai procedimenti civili di separazione e di affidamento.

I sistemi giudiziari nazionali dovrebbero inoltre dotarsi di un collegio di professionisti ed esperti, che possano essere dirimenti nei procedimenti giudiziari in cui sono coinvolti minori e donne vittime di violenza, per garantire che questi siano trattati secondo l'approccio più appropriato e per evitare ulteriori danni alle vittime.

Tutto ciò, però, non può non partire da una necessaria rivoluzione in termini di sensibilizzazione della comunità, nonché di formazione ed educazione contro la violenza in tutte le sedi e che non può prescindere da un sostegno comunitario e nazionale.

Anche a tal fine, con questa relazione chiediamo che la Commissione e il Consiglio aggiungano la violenza di genere all'elenco delle sfere di criminalità di cui all'articolo 83, paragrafo 1, del Trattato sul funzionamento dell'Unione europea, tenendo conto della particolare necessità di combattere tale reato sulla base di un fondamento comune.

Con il voto di oggi, onorevoli colleghi, abbiamo l'occasione di dimostrare a tutte le donne vittime di violenza fra le mura domestiche che non sono sole, che le istituzioni non le abbandonano, ma anzi le supportano attivamente. Questa lotta non ha colore politico, ma deve vederci tutti uniti verso il supremo obiettivo di tutelare i diritti fondamentali, l'uguaglianza fra i sessi, la sicurezza e la giustizia.



**Έλενα Κουντουρά, εισηγήτρια.** – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, κατ' αρχήν θέλω να ευχαριστήσω την κυρία Regimenti για την εξαιρετική έκθεση που συνδιαμορφώσαμε. Μία στις τρεις γυναίκες έχει βιώσει τον εφιάλτη της έμφυλης βίας, πολλές φορές μέσα στο οικογενειακό περιβάλλον, χωρίς την αναγκαία προστασία, δικαίωση και στήριξη. Κατά τη διάρκεια της πανδημίας η βία αυτή αυξήθηκε λόγω του αναγκαστικού εγκλεισμού στο σπίτι, δυσχεραίνοντας την πρόσβαση των γυναικών σε αποτελεσματική προστασία και υποστήριξη. Όμως το πλήρες φάσμα της βίας κατά των γυναικών δεν καταγράφεται και δεν αποτυπώνεται επαρκώς στα επίσημα ευρωπαϊκά στοιχεία. Σε αρκετά κράτη μέλη ο αντίκτυπος της ενδοσυντροφικής βίας στις γυναίκες και τα παιδιά υποτιμάται όταν λαμβάνονται αποφάσεις για την επιμέλεια ενός παιδιού και, παρ' όλο που η παιδική κακοποίηση αποτελεί σαφές κριτήριο για τον καθορισμό της επιμέλειας, σε περιπτώσεις ενδοοικογενειακής βίας εναντίον του άλλου γονέα και όχι του παιδιού πολλές φορές αγνοείται.

Αυτή η έκθεση είναι πολύ σημαντική, γιατί το Κοινοβούλιο βάζει για πρώτη φορά στο επίκεντρο των προτάσεων του όχι μόνο τον αντίκτυπο που έχει η βία στις κακοποιημένες γυναίκες αλλά και τον αντίκτυπο που έχει για τα παιδιά. Και στέλνουμε ένα ξεκάθαρο μήνυμα. Η αποτυχία της αναγνώρισης και αντιμετώπισης των περιστατικών ενδοσυντροφικής βίας κατά τον καθορισμό της επιμέλειας των παιδιών και των δικαιωμάτων επίσκεψης συνιστά παραβίαση του δικαιώματος των γυναικών και των παιδιών στη ζωή και σε μια ζωή χωρίς βία, ενώ είναι ασυμβίβαστη με το βέλτιστο συμφέρον του παιδιού. Σε περιπτώσεις ενδοοικογενειακής βίας η επιμέλεια είναι ασυμβίβαστη με τα δικαιώματα και την ασφάλεια των θυμάτων λόγω των σοβαρών επιπτώσεων που επιφέρει στις γυναίκες και τα παιδιά και του κινδύνου συνέχισης της βίας και μετά τον χωρισμό. Γι' αυτόν ακριβώς τον λόγο πιστεύουμε ότι η ανάκληση των δικαιωμάτων επιμέλειας και επίσκεψης του κακοποιητικού συντρόφου και η ανάθεση αποκλειστικής επιμέλειας στη μητέρα, εάν είναι θύμα βίας αποτελεί τον μόνο τρόπο για την αποτροπή περαιτέρω βίας και δευτερογενούς θυματοποίησης.

Κύριε Επίτροπε, βρισκόμαστε σε κατάσταση έκτακτης ανάγκης και το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο κρούει τον κώδωνα του κινδύνου. Σύμφωνα με αυτή την έκθεση η έμφυλη και ενδοοικογενειακή βία σε βάρος των γυναικών αποτελεί μάλιστα της κοινωνίας και, για να αναχαιτιστεί σε όλες τις εκφάνσεις, πρέπει να την κάνουμε υπόθεση όλων μας.

Πρέπει ως ύψιστη πολιτική και κοινωνική προτεραιότητα να την χτυπήσουμε στη ρίζα της και να βάλουμε τέλος σε καθετί που τη συντηρεί και την αναπαράγει. Πρέπει να κυρωθεί άμεσα και να εφαρμοστεί η Σύμβαση της Κωνσταντινούπολης από τα κράτη μέλη που δεν το έχουν κάνει, αλλά και από την ίδια την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση. Χρειαζόμαστε δεσμευτική ευρωπαϊκή νομοθεσία, μια ολιστική οδηγία για την πρόληψη και την αντιμετώπιση της έμφυλης ενδοσυντροφικής βίας. Πρέπει να εξασφαλιστεί η ασφάλεια και η πρόσβαση των θυμάτων σε δομές και υπηρεσίες υποστήριξης, με χρηματοδότηση από κρατικούς και κοινοτικούς πόρους και η καθολική και ποιοτική ιατρική και ψυχολογική υποστήριξη, συμπεριλαμβανομένων των υπηρεσιών σεξουαλικής και αναπαραγωγικής υγείας. Πρέπει να δημιουργηθούν θεσμοί εξειδικευμένων δικαστηρίων με εξειδικευμένους δικαστές, όπου με την υποστήριξη ειδικών επιστημόνων ψυχολόγων, παιδοψυχολόγων, θα αναλαμβάνουν να εκδικάζουν υποθέσεις οικογενειακού δικαίου. Πρέπει να προβλεφθεί η υποχρεωτική εκπαίδευση του δικαστικού, αστυνομικού και ιατροδικαστικού προσωπικού για όλες τις μορφές βίας και τους μηχανισμούς της. Πρέπει να δημιουργηθεί ένας μόνιμος μηχανισμός παροχής εναρμονισμένων αξιόπιστων και συγκρίσιμων στοιχείων για την έμφυλη βία, που θα χρησιμοποιηθούν για τη διαμόρφωση κατάλληλων πολιτικών πρόληψης και αντιμετώπισης. Πρέπει να αντιμετωπίσουμε την οικονομική βία εναντίον των γυναικών. Η οικονομική ανεξαρτησία αποτελεί απαραίτητη προϋπόθεση για να ξεφύγουν από μία κακοποιητική σχέση. Από αυτή την άποψη είναι πολύ θετική η πρόταση οδηγίας για επαρκή κατώτατο μισθό και την πρόταση για δεσμευτικά μέτρα διαφάνειας των αμοιβών. Τέλος, πρέπει να δημιουργηθεί ένα ευρωπαϊκό πρωτόκολλο για την πρόληψη της έμφυλης βίας και τη στήριξη των θυμάτων σε περιόδους κρίσης και έκτακτης ανάγκης όπως η πανδημία.

**Helena Dalli, Member of the Commission.** – Mr President, at the last plenary session, I addressed the high priority of tackling gender-based and domestic violence, in particular in the light of its increase during the pandemic.

Both the gender equality strategy and the EU strategy on the rights of the child put a strong focus on eradicating violence and ensuring that all women and children can live free from violence.

The victims' rights strategy pays special attention to ensuring that the most vulnerable victims, such as child victims and victims of domestic violence, can fully rely on their rights to support and protection. For this protection, it does not matter where in the EU and in what circumstances the crime took place.

Children are affected by gender-based and domestic violence committed within their family in many ways. Some children suffer from physical, emotional or sexual violence that is aimed directly against them. Some children suffer when witnessing such violence aimed against one of their parents or siblings. Some children may also suffer from violence in the context of joint custody and visiting rights, when such rights are awarded to a violent parent. Indeed, the failure to restrict custody or unsupervised visiting rights may result in tragic consequences, both for the other parent and the child concerned.

All such children suffer in one way or another from gender-based and domestic violence. All such children are victims of this terrible crime. We need to protect all victims, and in particular children, no matter how they experience violence in their families. They may not even be aware that violence is being committed in their families, yet they may still suffer the consequences.

Domestic violence has been shown to negatively impact the physical, mental, emotional and behavioural development of children. It can also have lasting effects on health, well-being and prosperity well into adulthood. We fully agree with Parliament that in order to keep our promise to children, to protect them and to ensure their well-being, we must combat all forms of gender-based and domestic violence. We must provide adequate support to children to prevent that the consequences of the violence they experience impact their future.

This is exactly what we are doing. The revised Brussels IIa Regulation, applying as of August 2022, reinforces the rights of the child in cross-border custody cases by ensuring that they are heard and their perspective is taken into account. The new rules ensure a more effective cooperation between central authorities, courts and child protection authorities, or other competent authorities.

The central authorities are the direct interface with parents and should continue playing a key role in supporting courts and competent authorities in applying the Regulation.

In addition the gender equality strategy announced new legislative measures to achieve the objectives of the Istanbul Convention within the limits of EU competences. In line with Parliament's request, the proposal for a directive on gender-based violence against women and domestic violence will propose measures to prevent such violence, including when perpetrated online, to protect and support victims, improve their access to justice and ensure better coordination between competent authorities.

The proposal will contain targeted measures aimed at criminalising specific types of conduct, in particular with regard to cyber violence. It will furthermore step up victims' rights, in particular on compensation, prevention and protection for victims of domestic violence, including children victims and witnesses of such violence.

All this can be done with the existing legal basis. In addition, we will present an initiative inviting the Council to include hate crime and hate speech in the list of Euro-crimes set out in Article 83. This would subsequently allow the Commission to propose criminalising misogynistic hate speech and hate crime at EU level, a request which you repeat in this report.

We are confident that the upcoming initiatives will achieve our shared objectives and we look forward to cooperating with you on these initiatives.

**Elżbieta Katarzyna Łukacijewska, w imieniu grupy PPE.** – Szanowni Państwo! Do przemocy dochodzi w domach ludzi wykształconych i bez wykształcenia, w domach polityków, lekarzy, policjantów czy pracowników fizycznych, w krajach bogatych i biednych. Brak szybkiej, adekwatnej reakcji odpowiednich organów, a także często odwracanie głowy czy po prostu społeczne przyzwolenie tylko ośmielają sprawców przemocy. Dlatego też tak trudno z nią walczyć. Statystyki nie napawają optymizmem, a pandemia COVID-19 i wprowadzone lockdowny zdecydowanie nasiliły i pokazały skalę tego zjawiska, które dotyka głównie kobiety.

W wielu krajach nie ma skutecznych programów walki z przemocą, nie wszystkie państwa Unii Europejskiej ratyfikowały Konwencję Sтамбульską. Słyszymy też o próbach jej wypowiedzenia pomimo faktu, że jej zapisy bezpośrednio przyczyniły się do wsparcia ofiar przemocy w wielu krajach. Nie zapominajmy, że tam gdzie dochodzi do przemocy, tam ofiarami są również dzieci. Sam fakt bycia świadkiem przemocy odciska piętno na psychice oraz późniejszym życiu dziecka. Dlatego tak ważne jest, abyśmy nie czekali, a reagowali. Ofiary przemocy domowej w każdym państwie członkowskim cierpią tak samo, a przemoc ma negatywny wpływ na całe społeczności.

Październik jest miesiącem świadomości przemocy domowej. Dlatego wykażmy się dzisiaj empatią, poprzyjmy sprawozdanie i zrobmy wszystko, aby walczyć z tym zjawiskiem. I powtórzę jeszcze raz: bez zrozumienia problemu i wsparcia ze strony mężczyzn długo będziemy zbierali negatywne owoce przemocy domowej.

**Pina Picerno**, a nome del gruppo S&D. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signora Commissaria, pianti, urla, suppliche, rumore di porte sfondate. Sono questi, signor Presidente, i rumori che accompagnano lo studio dei casi della cosiddetta «sindrome da alienazione parentale», come ha notato Daniela Poggio che è una femminista e una studiosa della PAS.

E la disperazione di quei bambini rimane appiccicata addosso e impedisce di dormire, di pensare ad altro, impone di chiederci come sia possibile che in Europa, nella patria dello Stato di diritto, in nome di una presunta sindrome rifiutata dalla comunità scientifica, madri e figli siano allontanati. La chiamano pure «sindrome della madre malevola» o «sindrome della madre simbiotica», così, proprio per non lasciare i dubbi al fatto che questa presunta sindrome si nutre di gravissimi pregiudizi di genere.

In Italia le avvocate Teresa Manente e Ilaria Boiano di *Differenza Donna* hanno censito, dal 2018 al 2020, 100 casi di bambini allontanati da un genitore per questa ragione. In 8 casi su 10 il rifiuto verso l'altro genitore è stato addebitato alla madre; in 9 casi su 10 il bambino non è stato mai ascoltato dal giudice; in 100 casi su 100, in tutti i casi, le madri sono state intimidite, sono state limitate nella loro libertà, devono tacere e devono subire la più crudele tra le violenze: la cosiddetta «ablazione della maternità», così viene chiamata. Devono tacere di fronte ai trattamenti obbligatori cui sono sottoposti i bambini che sono allontanati con la forza pubblica e condotti in strutture neutre, dove devono essere rieducati e riallineati, in questo caso evidentemente, sì, manipolati.

Le madri devono tacere anche quando vengono trattate come pericolose criminali e invece sono cittadine incensurate e, nella maggior parte dei casi, vittime di violenza dei partner.

Ma se fosse possibile, colleghi, stilare una classifica delle vittime del dolore e del danno che questa consuetudine consolidata nei tribunali infligge, il primo posto lo avrebbero i bambini. Perché è loro l'infanzia negata, perché loro vengono privati con la forza della loro mamma. È accettabile? Noi pensiamo di no, e in questo testo lo abbiamo ribadito. Ora la parola al Parlamento, che dovrà scegliere se stare dalla parte della civiltà, dello Stato di diritto, della scienza, o della barbarie.

**Karen Melchior**, on behalf of the Renew Group. – Mr President, this report is especially important in light of the shadow pandemic following the COVID pandemic, where we've seen a massive rise in violence against women – just because they are women – across the EU. We must prevent intimate partner violence in all its forms. It's not only a question of a black eye, a broken rib or a broken arm. Violence is often psychological before it becomes physical and it can take very insidious forms.

It can also continue after the end of the relationship and we must not allow our children to be weaponised. The continued violence through custody rights and visitation rights must not be permitted, just as withholding such rights for the other parent must not be allowed to be used as a weapon. As Renew shadow on the Committee on Legal Affairs (JURI), I would like to underline the importance of this right for women and children, examining the impact of intimate partner violence and custody rights on women and children.

The report examines the incompatibility of shared custody and unsupervised visits in the case of intimate partner violence, owing to the severe consequences for women and children, including the risks of extreme acts of femicide and infanticide. It calls for mandatory and targeted training for judicial and law enforcement officers and the establishment of specialised courts and judicial officers within the Member States, because femicide and infanticide follow a pattern and, if we recognise this pattern, we can save lives.

**Diana Riba i Giner**, *en nombre del Grupo Verts/ALE*. – Señor presidente, señora comisaria, es un orgullo ver cómo esta Cámara, poco a poco, pero sin pausa, va abordando con cada vez más profundidad las causas y las consecuencias de esta lacra que es la violencia de género. Una violencia que, tal y como hemos explicitado en el informe que hoy votamos, no solo afecta a las mujeres, sino que también tiene un impacto profundo en la vida de los niños y las niñas, a veces, incluso, arrebatándosela.

Por esto el texto es claro: es importante que la legislación considere como víctimas de violencia de género a los niños y a las niñas que hayan sido testigos de la violencia dentro de la pareja o que hayan sufrido violencia vicaria.

Necesitamos que la Unión Europea y sus Estados miembros legislen en este sentido y garanticen los derechos y el interés superior de los niños y de las niñas, para que estén protegidos en todas las situaciones y en todos los lugares. Desgraciadamente, en la actualidad esto no es siempre así y existe una gran disparidad de políticas y legislaciones en la Unión.

Por último, pero no menos importante, el informe que hoy votamos deja claro que se deben tener en cuenta los casos de violencia dentro de la pareja cuando se determinen los derechos de custodia y el régimen de visitas. Y esto es crucial —tengámoslo claro— porque un maltratador nunca será un buen padre.

**Christine Anderson**, *im Namen der ID-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident! Dieser Bericht ist ein weiteres Beispiel dafür, wie die EU vordergründig ein wichtiges Thema anzugehen vorgibt – aber es ist eben nur vordergründig. Es geht um Maßnahmen zur Bekämpfung von häuslicher Gewalt gegen Frauen. Das, was als politisches, richtiges und wichtiges Signal gegen die häusliche Gewalt gedacht war, entpuppt sich einmal mehr als bloßer Aufhänger für einen weiteren fantastischen Werbespot eines ganzen Potpourris an ideologischem Blödsinn.

Dass die EU nicht einmal davor zurückschreckt, den angeblichen Kampf gegen häusliche Gewalt zu nutzen, um die staatliche Souveränität der Mitgliedstaaten zu beschneiden, ist ja kaum noch der Aufregung wert. Aber Gewalt gegen Frauen zu instrumentalisieren, um ideologische Absurditäten zu implementieren, können Opfer häuslicher Gewalt nur als genau den Schlag ins Gesicht verstehen, von dem das EU-Parlament vorgibt, ihn verhindern zu wollen.

Es braucht also mehr Sexualaufklärung, und damit es richtig wirkt, fängt man am besten bei Dreijährigen bereits an. Die Folgen der entwürdigenden Schamgrenzverletzungen von Kindern wird dabei als zu billiger Kollateralschaden in Kauf genommen. Des Weiteren müssen selbstverständlich die sich als Allzweckwaffe im Kampf gegen unliebsame politische Meinungen immer größerer Beliebtheit erfreuenden sogenannten Hassreden unterbunden werden, verfassungsrechtlich garantierte Meinungsfreiheit hin oder her, ganz nach dem Motto: Die Freiheit der Rede garantieren wir schon noch, nicht aber die Freiheit nach der Rede.

Außerdem reicht es vor lauter Kultursensibilität nicht aus, viele im Kontext der Partnergewalt relevanten Fakten herauszustellen. Es ist eine Folge der desaströsen Migrationspolitik. Fast 70 % der Frauen in Frauenhäusern haben Migrationshintergrund.

In Deutschland ereignen sich inzwischen tagtäglich zwei Gruppenvergewaltigungen. Die Frauen werden dabei derart massiv körperlich misshandelt, dass sie neben den seelischen Verletzungen nicht selten ein Leben lang körperlich gezeichnet sind. Und die Täter, meine Damen und Herren, sind in aller Regel die noch nicht so lange hier Lebenden. Dabei könnte es so einfach sein. Die wohl grausamste Gewalt gegen Frauen in Europa könnte verhindert werden.

Ein wesentlicher Beitrag wäre schon erbracht, wenn man nur den illegalen Grenzübertritt von Millionen junger gewalttätiger Männer unterbände – die Sicherung des eigenen Staatsgebiets, bis vor Kurzem das selbstverständliche Recht eines jeden souveränen Staates. Aber darauf kommt die EU natürlich nicht. Nein, dieser denkbar wirksamste Schutz von Frauen muss hinter der Toleranzbesoffenheit der hier versammelten Weltverbesserer zurückstehen.

Aber, liebe im Stich gelassene, dieser importierten Gewalt hilflos ausgesetzte Frauen, verzagen Sie bitte nicht. Das EU-Parlament wird Ihnen sicherlich auch im nächsten Jahr wieder in zelebrierten Betroffenheitsreden darlegen, wie es Sie nicht zu schützen gedenkt.

**Raffaele Stancanelli**, *a nome del gruppo ECR*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, noi sosteniamo da sempre con forza la tutela della famiglia, delle donne e soprattutto dei bambini, e io mi complimento con le relatrici per la passione con cui hanno presentato la loro iniziativa.

Bisogna però fare molta attenzione, vista la delicatezza dei temi trattati, e non scadere nella mera generalizzata demonizzazione dell'uomo in base a una visione distorta della società. Veicolare, infatti, l'immagine di una società europea totalmente patriarcale e misogina, suggerendo anche alcune soluzioni legali che possono essere utilizzate con l'intento di stravolgere le relazioni tra uomini, donne e bambini all'interno della famiglia nel suo insieme, noi riteniamo che sia un grave errore.

Alcuni paragrafi della relazione invadono le competenze degli Stati membri in materia di diritto penale e diritto di famiglia in maniera del tutto fuorviante, onde secondo noi è meglio affidarsi alla sfera di competenza nazionale.

Ogni forma di violenza va contrastata, in qualsiasi modo, ma nell'azione di contrasto non ci deve essere spazio per l'ingerenza di valutazioni ideologiche per solamente influenzare l'azione giuridica e penale. Dobbiamo continuare a lottare per la tutela delle donne e dei minori nelle sedi opportune e la questione della custodia dei minori è troppo seria per essere soggetta a valutazione aprioristiche.

**Manon Aubry**, *au nom du groupe The Left*. – Monsieur le Président, «Est-ce que vous avez joui?», «Vous portiez une tenue provocante?», «Vous l'avez cherché?», «Votre amour était-il trop passionnel?»: voilà le genre de questions que des policiers posent aux victimes d'agressions sexuelles dans les commissariats français, quand ils ne les découragent pas tout simplement de déposer plainte, ou n'en profitent même pour les draguer. Les victimes sont traitées en coupables et pour ces femmes, c'est la double peine. D'abord brutalisées par des hommes violents, elles sont ensuite une nouvelle fois maltraitées et humiliées par les institutions mêmes qui sont censées les protéger. Combien sont-elles à n'avoir pas porté plainte, découragées par ce sexisme institutionnel? Combien ont préféré se taire par peur des questions insidieuses, culpabilisantes et sexistes?

Du commissariat jusqu'au tribunal, la parole des femmes est systématiquement contestée, minorée, ignorée jusque dans l'attribution des droits de garde, qui force près de trois quarts des mères violentées à partager l'autorité parentale, ce qui permet aux pères violents de poursuivre leur stratégie d'intimidation, d'isolement et d'emprise. Nous n'en pouvons plus de cette double peine.

Comme le réclame ce rapport, il est indispensable de former les policiers et les juges, d'augmenter le budget pour la protection des victimes et de prendre enfin en compte la violence du conjoint pour la garde des enfants. Ce sont ces défaillances de l'action publique qui garantissent l'impunité des agresseurs. Les violences conjugales ne cesseront pas tant que la police sera sexiste et que la justice sera complice.

**Ernő Schaller-Baross (NI)**. – Elnök Úr! A kapcsolati erőszak nem magánügy. Keresztény emberként megengedhetetlennek tartom, és elítélem a családon belüli erőszak bármely formáját. A szülői felügyeleti joggal kapcsolatos hatósági rendelkezéseknek a gyermekek mindenképp álló érdekén kell alapulniuk, kizárva annak lehetőségét, hogy a gyermekek bármely családon belüli visszaélés áldozatai legyenek. Ez a jelentés azonban ideológiai szempontok által vezérelt és sérti a nemzeti szuverenitást. Ismét az uniós intézmények lopakodó hatáskörbővítésével állunk szemben. Minden tagállamnak jogában áll saját szabályokat alkotni a partnerkapcsolati erőszak áldozatainak védelmére vonatkozóan. A magyar kormány a kapcsolati erőszak áldozatai mellett áll. Tíz éve folyamatosan fejleszti megelőzési és áldozatsegítési rendszerét. Az Isztambuli Egyezmény nem csodaszer, számos esetben gyengébb szabályokat határoz meg, mint a Magyarországon és a tagállamokon már meglévő jogi eszközök.

**Marion Walsmann (PPE).** – Herr Präsident, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Als EVP-Schattenberichterstatterin im Rechtsausschuss halte ich diesen Initiativbericht vor allem aus zwei Gründen für besonders wichtig: erstens weil die Anzahl der Frauen, aber auch Männer, die Opfer von physischer und psychischer Gewalt innerhalb der Partnerschaft, vor allem auch in der Pandemie, sind, dramatisch gestiegen ist. Hinter den Zahlen verstecken sich verheerende Einzelschicksale mit erheblichen Langzeitschäden für die Betroffenen. Wir fordern die Mitgliedstaaten auf, auch in solchen Zeiten den Zugang zur Justiz, zu Beratungen, Hilfseinrichtungen aufrecht zu erhalten und natürlich entsprechend auch finanziell abzusichern.

Zweitens: Von der Gewalt in Paarbeziehungen sind vor allem auch die Kinder erheblich betroffen. Sie sind die stillen Opfer und ganz besonders schutzbedürftig. Und deshalb darf kindgerechte Justiz europaweit nicht die Ausnahme, sondern sollte die Regel sein. Ermittlungs- und Justizbehörden müssen entsprechend geschult sein, um mit diesen sensiblen Fällen korrekt umgehen zu können. Das Kindeswohl sollte immer an oberster Stelle stehen. Und des Weiteren dürfen Verfahren wegen häuslicher Gewalt, Trennungs- und Sorgerechtsverfahren nicht isoliert voneinander, sondern müssen im Zusammenhang miteinander behandelt werden.

Ich würde mir wünschen, dass sich die Mitgliedstaaten den genannten Aspekten schnellstmöglich annehmen, damit es den Opfern von häuslicher Gewalt, seien es Erwachsene oder Kinder, gelingt, dem Täter schnellstmöglich zu entkommen, und sie endlich wieder ein gewaltfreies Leben führen können.

**Brando Benifei (S&D).** – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, dopo l'importante voto della scorsa plenaria sull'inserimento della violenza di genere tra gli «eurocrimini», crimini quindi particolarmente gravi su cui l'Unione può stabilire standard minimi per definire reati e sanzioni, questo Parlamento torna a esprimersi sul delicato tema della violenza di genere da parte del partner e del suo impatto sui bambini e sulle decisioni di custodia.

Non parliamo solo di femminicidio, che ne è l'espressione più grave. La violenza domestica di genere si manifesta infatti in molti modi, dalla violenza psicologica a quella finanziaria, in particolare, ma non solo, in casi di dipendenza economica, e ha gravi ripercussioni anche sui figli. Un problema che si è acuito anche nel nostro paese, in Italia, durante la pandemia, con la convivenza forzata in spazi ristretti e che ci chiede, a maggior ragione, di agire con una strategia a tutto tondo.

Con la relazione ribadiamo l'importanza della Convenzione di Istanbul e richiamiamo gli Stati membri che ancora non l'hanno fatto a ratificarla. Segnaliamo come, durante la pandemia, siano aumentate anche le violenze contro le persone LGBT. Chiediamo che in sede processuale le accuse di violenza siano esaminate prima delle decisioni sulla custodia dei figli e che questa non sia mai condivisa in casi del genere, per non aumentare ulteriormente i contatti con il partner violento. Chiediamo che il regolamento sulle decisioni in materia matrimoniale e genitoriale, il cosiddetto «Bruxelles 2 bis», sia esteso anche alle coppie non sposate e anche dello stesso sesso, e che gli Stati membri impediscano l'utilizzo in sede processuale, inoltre, della «sindrome da alienazione parentale», che non ha alcuna evidenza scientifica, per valutare i casi di violenza o l'idoneità ad accudire i figli.

Indichiamo anche la necessità di stabilire standard minimi a livello europeo su come condurre le audizioni dei figli in ambiente protetto e con personale adeguatamente formato. Chiediamo inoltre misure più ampie da maggiori fondi per la protezione delle vittime, al loro pieno accesso ai sistemi di protezione, fino a un protocollo comune europeo per combattere la violenza sulle donne in tempi di crisi.

E ribadiamo l'importanza di un intervento ampio, davvero generale, che promuova la parità di genere e l'indipendenza economica, l'istruzione e l'educazione sessuale, il ruolo dei media nel combattere gli stereotipi. Dobbiamo renderci conto che la violenza domestica di genere è tuttora una piaga delle nostre società, lungi dall'essere un retaggio del passato, una piaga da estirpare con ogni mezzo a livello nazionale ed europeo.

**Chrysoula Zacharopoulou (Renew).** – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Commissaire, mes chers collègues, frappés, humiliés, insultés, témoins de scènes de violence, tués, les enfants sont eux aussi des victimes de violences conjugales, avec des conséquences lourdes sur leur développement et leur santé, telles que des troubles du comportement et un sentiment de culpabilité, mais aussi sur leur capacité à socialiser. De plus, les victimes directes ou indirectes sont plus à même d'avoir un comportement violent à l'âge adulte.

Nous avons trop souvent dissocié violences conjugales et violences intrafamiliales, sans prendre en compte les besoins des victimes: les femmes et les enfants. Il est urgent de sensibiliser et de former plus de policiers et plus de juges aux violences intrafamiliales, car à l'heure actuelle, nos systèmes judiciaires ne tiennent pas compte de la réalité vécue dans les foyers et échouent à protéger les victimes.

Inspirons-nous alors des bonnes pratiques de nos États membres. En Espagne, la rapidité des procédures de protection des femmes et des enfants et les bracelets d'éloignement ont fait leurs preuves. En France, le gouvernement fait de la lutte contre les violences conjugales une priorité. Nous avons par exemple mis fin à l'autorité parentale et à l'obligation d'aide alimentaire en cas de féminicide.

Mes chers collègues, un homme violent n'est pas un bon mari et un mari violent n'est jamais un bon père. Alors protégeons les enfants, protégeons les femmes et déconstruisons ce patriarcat.

**Sergey Lagodinsky (Verts/ALE).** – Mr President, gender violence has dramatically increased as the lockdown measures have been lifted. So has the level of stupidity, dehumanisation and instrumentalisation that we heard from the right-wing parties here today, from the AfD and from Fidesz. In many countries like Spain and Germany, the number of fatal incidents has risen. One in two women in the EU have experienced sexual violence. What is your response to that?

Well, our response to that is the huge achievement of this Parliament that we all agreed in this report to emphasise the role of the Istanbul Convention, the convention that all Member States should sign and enforce. It is an important step forward that we all – except for you – agreed that access to justice and access to safety for victims and their children must be secured, regardless of economic and financial burdens.

We must uphold the conclusions of this report that 'parental alienation syndrome' should never serve as an obstacle to such justice. And yes, we, my group and myself as rapporteur in the Committee on Legal Affairs, we continue to insist that same-sex partnerships should be treated equally in cross-border cases. We are living in difficult times. Let's not forget about those who become victims of their domestic and intimate partners. Those attacks are not just everyday trivialities. Don't trivialise them. Those are grave crimes. It's time that we in the EU recognise them as such.

**Annika Bruna (ID).** – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Rapporteuse, Madame la Commissaire, l'application d'un principe de précaution quant à l'attribution des droits de garde dans un contexte de violences conjugales est nécessaire. Il s'agit de privilégier l'intérêt supérieur de l'enfant et d'assurer sa protection.

Les amendements et les idées que j'avais proposés au sujet des enfants témoins de violences conjugales, de l'impact de cette situation sur leurs comportements actuels et futurs, et de la nécessité de leur assurer un suivi psychologique ont été repris dans ce texte. Je vous en remercie et j'espère que nous pourrions ainsi sensibiliser les parties prenantes à la nécessité d'agir davantage dans l'intérêt de ces enfants, mais aussi de la société, car ils en seront les futurs acteurs. En effet, comme je l'avais déjà souligné, des études démontrent le lien de causalité entre une enfance marquée par la vision de scènes de violences domestiques et une reproduction de ce comportement à l'âge adulte.

Si je soutiens sur le fond une large majorité des propositions de ce texte, ma délégation, au nom de la souveraineté nationale, ne peut laisser l'Union européenne s'immiscer dans les politiques familiales et juridiques des nations. Nous estimons en effet que l'Union n'a pas vocation à s'ingérer dans les politiques régaliennes des États membres. C'est pourquoi nous nous abstenons.

**Margarita de la Pisa Carrión (ECR).** – Señor presidente, señorías, las legislaciones nacionales, en sus códigos, ya regulan los comportamientos violentos con carácter objetivo y no discriminatorio. Que la Unión se entrometa en estas materias supone una injerencia en su soberanía.

Las leyes deben garantizar seguridad jurídica y basarse en una premisa fundamental: todos somos iguales ante la ley, hombres y mujeres.

La agresividad no conoce de sexos y la violencia es reprobable en cualquier caso.

Un tema tan delicado como la custodia, pudiendo mediar una agresión, debería tener un tratamiento jurídico serio y riguroso. Y no de esta forma confusa incluyendo conceptos ideológicos variopintos, sin un significado preciso. Pueden conducir a interpretaciones y decisiones erróneas con fatales consecuencias.

En este informe se propone juzgar sobre la base de indicios no probados, interpretaciones subjetivas, presuponiendo siempre la culpabilidad... del varón, como si fuera un delincuente. Pero, ¿dónde está el derecho a la presunción de inocencia?

Esto supone un abuso de la justicia que lleva a las familias a litigios, a enfrentamientos que perjudican a los niños de por vida, dando pie a un cúmulo de denuncias infundadas, mientras que las víctimas reales siguen indefensas.

La introducción de la ideología de género en las normas provoca la desconfiguración del Estado de Derecho, introduce la desigualdad y la enemistad entre el hombre y la mujer y magnifica los conflictos, fomentando la división en las familias y generando todavía más violencia en la sociedad.

**Eugenia Rodríguez Palop (The Left).** – Señor presidente, un maltratador nunca, —insisto— nunca, es un buen padre. Por eso resulta sorprendente que, cuando las mujeres denuncian violencia contra ellas o sus hijos, se entreguen custodias exclusivas a los padres maltratadores. Sorprende que no se escuche a los niños que sufren violencia y se asuma que están siendo manipulados por sus madres, a pesar de contar con informes médicos y psicosociales que acreditan lo contrario.

En España, entre 2013 y 2021, 42 niños fueron asesinados a manos de sus padres maltratadores con el único fin de hundir a sus madres. El síndrome de alienación parental es una farsa repugnante.

Tenemos que ratificar el Convenio de Estambul y aplicarlo; asumir que la violencia de género es un eurodelito; articular una directiva marco sobre este asunto; obligar a los Estados a transponer y aplicar la Directiva sobre los derechos de las víctimas; mejorar la cooperación en casos transfronterizos; favorecer la investigación y obtener financiación, entre otras cosas, para combatir el negacionismo de esos que dicen defender a la familia.

Esto es defender a la familia. Basta de hipocresía y de falsa moral cristiana.

#### **PRESIDÊNCIA: PEDRO SILVA PEREIRA**

*Vice-Presidente*

**Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE).** – Señor presidente, la igualdad es uno de los valores fundamentales y un objetivo básico de la Unión Europea, consagrado de manera clara en todos sus Tratados. La violencia de género es una violación de los derechos humanos en toda regla y no se contempla en todos los Estados miembros de una manera igual. De hecho, hay distinta protección en un Estado que en otro. Por eso, lo primero que hay que hacer es pedir que forme parte de los eurodelitos para que tenga una protección similar y la persecución sea total.

Tiene múltiples formas —las conocemos— y causa consecuencias para las víctimas y para todas sus familias. Los niños y las niñas pueden sufrir una violencia presenciada, directa o indirecta, que sin duda afectará a su desarrollo psicológico y emocional y a su futuro. Por eso —lo decía muy bien la comisaria—, la ecuación de un procedimiento de separación tiene que ir unida siempre a la ecuación de un proceso penal de malos tratos.

Un maltratador jamás puede educar. Es lo contrario a valores, es lo contrario de educación y es lo contrario a un buen padre. Por eso, esos dos procesos tienen que ir interconectados y, siempre velando por el interés del niño, se tienen que supervisar la custodia, el derecho de visitas, protegiendo este interés, para evitar que no haya valores en esta Unión Europea y para evitar un mal que luego es irreversible.

Hablamos también de información, hablamos de sensibilización, pero, sobre todo, hablamos de futuro.



**Heléne Fritzon (S&D).** – Herr talman! Kommissionär Dalli! Ja, alla barn har rätt till en trygg och kärleksfull barndom. Inget barn ska behöva utsättas för eller uppleva våld, övergrepp eller kränkande behandling.

När vi pratar om mäns våld mot kvinnor och om föräldrar som utövar våld måste vi alltid ha ett barnperspektiv. När en förälder tar steget att lämna en våldsam partner måste det finnas ett skydd för barnen. Barnkonventionen är tydlig. Artikel 3: "Vid alla beslut som rör barn ska i första hand beaktas vad som bedöms vara barnets bästa" och artikel 12: "Barn har rätt att uttrycka sin mening och höras i alla frågor som rör barnet".

Vi måste säkerställa ett starkare skydd för barn mot föräldrar som har utövat våld. Så arbetar vi i Sverige och det vill jag att vi gör i hela EU, för barnets bästa ska alltid komma i första rummet.

**Samira Rafaela (Renew).** – Voorzitter, miljoenen vrouwen in Europa herkennen de eenzaamheid, de schaamte en de machteloosheid veroorzaakt door huiselijk geweld. En huiselijk geweld is een groot taboe, en wie zijn of haar verhaal publiekelijk deelt, heeft te maken met stigmatisering. "Maar waarom ging je niet bij hem weg?" is een vraag die alle slachtoffers zullen herkennen.

Huiselijk geweld wordt regelmatig afgedaan als een interne familieaangelegenheid, een uitspraak die enkel en alleen daders in bescherming neemt. En daarom, collega's, wil ik vandaag jullie aandacht vragen voor de duizenden kinderen die tussen deze scheidende ouders in zitten. Voor hen is een veilig thuis niet vanzelfsprekend omdat de bescherming van kinderen nog altijd onvoldoende prioriteit krijgt bij familierechtszaken.

En daarom roept dit Parlement op om de bescherming van kinderen in heel Europa centraal te stellen in het familierecht. Stem voor de resolutie en stem voor de versterking van de rechten van kinderen.

**Alice Kuhnke (Verts/ALE).** – Herr talman! Fru kommissionär. I Sverige lever ett av tio barn i en våldsam familj och tvingas se en förälder misshandlas. Inget barn ska tvingas till umgänge med en förälder som hotar, kränker, slår eller dödar. Svårare än så är det inte.

Det nya barnfridsbrott som vi har fått kämpa för i Sverige gör det brottsligt att i Sverige utsätta mamman till sina barn eller sin sambo för våld inför barnen. Det är ett stort steg i rätt riktning och ett skydd för alla barn. Och det ska vara ett skydd för alla barn, inte bara i Sverige utan i alla 27 medlemsländer.

Att sätta barnens bästa främst kan låta som en självklar sak. Samtidigt finns det politiker som driver en helt annan politik. De förminskar barnens rättigheter. Jag hoppas att det arbete vi nu gjort leder till förändring.

**Nicolaus Fest (ID).** – Herr Präsident! Ich glaube, niemand hier im Saal ist ernsthaft gegen den Schutz von Frauen und Kindern. Allerdings, wenn ich höre, dass die Liberalen jetzt schon Sondergerichte fordern, und auch Begriffe lese wie „Patriarchat“ oder „Femizid“, die vor keinem Verfassungsgericht der Welt Bestand haben werden, dann muss ich sagen: Diese Entschließung hat zwar einen vernünftigen Grund, in der Umsetzung ist sie aber schwach.

Und es gibt noch einen weiteren Grund, warum ich gegen diese Entschließung bin: Diese Entschließung zeigt, dass leider viele hier im Saal von der Materie wenig Ahnung haben. Ich habe in meiner Ausbildung selber längere Zeit als Staatsanwalt gearbeitet, und da kamen viele Frauen, aber auch Partner aus homosexuellen Beziehungen zu mir. Die waren schwer verdröschten worden, die hatten zerbrochene Nasen, Zähne waren ihnen ausgeschlagen worden, die Arme waren gebrochen, die Finger waren gebrochen. Das waren alles Folgen häuslicher Gewalt. Und meine damalige Staatsanwältin sagte immer, wenn ich mich sozusagen empört an die Arbeit machen wollte: Lassen Sie sich Zeit, es wird sowieso nicht zum Prozess kommen. Und leider war es in fast allen Fällen so. Immer wenn es zum Prozess kommen sollte, fiel der Hauptzeuge oder die Hauptzeugin um, weil sie nicht gegen ihren früheren Partner aussagen wollte. Der Partner war irgendwie einen Tag vor dem Prozess mit Blumen ins Krankenhaus gekommen, und damit platzte der Prozess, weil die Hauptzeugin nicht aussagen wollte. Das war leider die Erkenntnis: Die Leute fürchten Gewalt weniger als Einsamkeit, und deshalb wird auch ein neues Gesetz hier wenig ändern, so schade und so trostlos es ist. Aber der juristische Schutz der Frauen und auch der Kinder ist in den meisten Staaten gut geregelt, und eine europäische Regelung wird daran wenig verbessern.

**Ангел Джамбазки (ECR).** – Г-н Председател, колеги, без всякакво съмнение всяко едно насилие трябва да бъде преследвано, наказвано и порицано. Именно всяко едно насилие, без значение от кой от двата пола е извършено. Но ако човек ви слуша, ще остане с впечатлението, че мъжете са само и единствено насилници, само те извършват насилие и всички мъже извършват насилия. Ваше право е да го вярвате, въпреки че не може да бъде вярно.

Няколко пъти чух обаче, че най-важен бил интересът на детето. Интересът на детето го знаят най-добре неговите родители, защото те са тези, които са го създали, те са го родили, те го възпитават и го отглеждат. Тяхна е отговорността и затова трябва да направят всичко възможно детето да остане в семейството при майка си и при баща си. Много е нахално някой, който няма деца, отстрани да казва какъв е интересът на родителите, даже повече от нахално бих казал аз.

И накрая две думи по отношение на пропагандата, която се разобличава тук, защото всъщност този дебат е политически, а не правен. Освен че се намесват в правомощията на държавите членки, което е напълно недопустимо, непрекъснато се споменава Истанбулската конвенция. Нашата държава, нашият конституционен съд, е приел, че Истанбулската конвенция противоречи на нашата конституция и не може да бъде ратифицирана. Колкото и да призовавате, каквото и да призовавате, колеги, не е ваша работа да променяте българската конституция. Съжалявам, ако не ви харесва, но това е факт – тя е наша и ние решаваме как да управляваме своята държава!

**Frances Fitzgerald (PPE).** – Mr President, the shocking stories from around the world, including in all our Member States, remind us yet again that they are the starkest of reminders that we have not dealt with this issue of violence against women and it remains an absolute pandemic around our world.

I believe that the Commission's proposal to tackle gender-based violence, due later this year, cannot come soon enough. Domestic violence remains a total scourge in our society, a 30% increase during COVID.

While the immediate effects of intimate partner violence are clear – deaths, usually of women, the need for emergency shelter and support to escape a violent household – less discussed aspects include judicial proceedings and custody agreements where children are concerned, and the linkage between the granting of custody rights and domestic violence.

This report shines a light on that issue. What is crucial is that the voice of the child must be at the centre of proceedings, their well-being is paramount. Children who witness violence suffer, we know that, and it is imperative that our judicial proceedings and their consequences do not re-traumatise them.

I call on the Commission to include judicial proceedings within the Member States, of all types, including both criminal and civil, within their proposal. Let's strive again to make intimate partner violence and gender-based violence history.

**Caterina Chinnici (S&D).** – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la violenza domestica, che sia fisica o psicologica, in ambito familiare e nelle relazioni affettive, rappresenta una delle forme più diffuse di violenza di genere, costituisce una inammissibile violazione della dignità e dei diritti della donna e coinvolge drammaticamente anche i bambini, talvolta direttamente con episodi di violenza e infanticidio, o indirettamente nel caso di violenza assistita.

Ma donne e minori non sempre godono di pari protezione, a causa della diversità delle legislazioni nazionali. È necessario quindi garantire loro una maggiore protezione, aggiungendo la violenza di genere tra le sfere di criminalità di cui all'articolo 83 del trattato sul funzionamento dell'Unione, ed è necessario prevedere che la violenza domestica sia assunta quale criterio prioritario e decisivo nell'esame dei casi dei procedimenti di affidamento.

Garantire la massima protezione di donne e bambini vittime di violenza domestica non deve essere soltanto una scelta politica perché è di più, è molto di più: è e deve essere un imperativo morale per tutta l'Unione.

**Pierrette Herzberger-Fofana (Verts/ALE).** – Monsieur le Président, durant la pandémie de COVID-19, nous avons assisté à une augmentation accrue des cas de violences conjugales.

Au sein de l'Union européenne, les femmes et les enfants, touchés de manière disproportionnée par ce fléau, ne bénéficient pas d'une protection égale. Les enfants, témoins oculaires de ces actes de violences conjugales, en subissent les effets désastreux et les répercussions graves sur leur comportement, leur état psychologique et leur vie future.

Il est important d'introduire une perspective intersectionnelle, afin que toutes les femmes au sein de l'Union européenne se sentent protégées dans les cas de violences conjugales. Cela inclut par exemple la garantie que les femmes d'origines culturelles différentes puissent bénéficier de conseils judicieux et de soutien exempts de discrimination et de préjugés.

Dans les accords de séparation et de garde parentale, il faut s'assurer que l'intérêt de l'enfant prime. Il faut aussi tenir compte de la violence du partenaire, afin d'éviter que des cas de féminicide et parfois aussi d'infanticide ne se produisent.

Les États membres de l'Union européenne devraient tous ratifier la Convention d'Istanbul. Mais un point qui est très important, c'est que la protection des enfants est un droit de l'homme et que tout enfant a le droit de grandir dans un environnement où la violence est bannie.

**Beata Mazurek (ECR).** – Panie Przewodniczący! Pani Komisarz! Po raz kolejny Unia Europejska chce ingerować w sprawy, do których nie posiada kompetencji. Przypomnę, że polityki dotyczące rodziny, prawa karnego, zdrowia, edukacji czy kwestie związane z opieką nad dziećmi pozostają domeną państw członkowskich. Żeby była jasność: kobiety i dzieci należy bezsprzecznie chronić przed każdym rodzajem przemocy ze strony partnera. Mało tego, należy chronić każdego człowieka przed przemocą domową.

Rezolucja zarzuca Polsce wycofywanie się z konwencji stambulskiej, a przecież sprawa ewentualnego wypowiedzenia przez Polskę konwencji została skierowana do Trybunału Konstytucyjnego. Przypomnę, że Polska wprowadziła już m. in. ustawę, która pozwala na eksmisję sprawcy przemocy, wprowadziliśmy niebieską kartę, która chroni osoby i rodziny narażone na przemoc domową. Między innymi dzięki tym działaniom Polska jest krajem, w którym przemoc wobec kobiet jest na najniższym poziomie w całej Unii Europejskiej. Nie zapominajmy, że dobre prawo to takie, które jest nie tylko uchwalone, ale przede wszystkim szybko i skutecznie egzekwowane. Reasumując: tak dla ochrony kobiet i dzieci, nie dla zakłamywania rzeczywistości.

**Nathalie Colin-Oesterlé (PPE).** – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Commissaire, mes chers collègues, nous fêtons cette année le dixième anniversaire de la convention d'Istanbul. Ce texte est fondamental, puisqu'il est le premier instrument international contraignant visant à lutter contre la violence à l'égard des femmes et des enfants. Cependant, 2021 est un triste anniversaire pour la convention d'Istanbul: six États membres ne l'ont toujours pas ratifiée, un État membre souhaite en sortir et un pays candidat à l'adhésion, la Turquie, s'en est retiré, alors même qu'il en était le premier signataire. Comment ces États peuvent-ils s'éloigner d'un texte qui spécifie, par exemple, qu'il faut sanctionner la violence psychologique, le harcèlement, les violences physiques et sexuelles, le mariage forcé ou encore les mutilations génitales féminines?

Si, en signant la convention d'Istanbul en 2017, l'Union européenne s'est engagée à la ratifier, ce n'est pour autant toujours pas le cas. Est-ce toujours une priorité pour votre Commission? L'Union européenne doit envoyer un signal fort aux millions de femmes victimes de violences. Les coups n'attendent pas: rien qu'en France, 88 femmes sont décédées depuis le début de l'année. La dernière en date a d'ailleurs été tuée devant ses quatre enfants le 29 septembre dernier.

L'adhésion à la convention d'Istanbul est une première étape qui doit être suivie de réponses et d'actions concrètes. Je serai donc particulièrement attentive au texte législatif européen qui sera proposé d'ici la fin de l'année pour lutter contre les violences faites aux femmes. Je souhaite également que l'Union élabore un plan spécial pour prévenir les féminicides, visant à détecter les situations à risque, et à accompagner et protéger les victimes.

Les violences conjugales sont un drame qui ne se limite pas au couple. Elles ont aussi un impact majeur sur les enfants et l'intérêt supérieur de l'enfant doit toujours l'emporter, notamment en ce qui concerne le droit de garde et le droit de visite. Il doit faire l'objet de toute notre attention, avec une protection spéciale et appropriée, comme il est fait état, très justement, dans ce rapport.

**Lina Gálvez Muñoz (S&D).** – Señor presidente, señora comisaria, según la Agencia de los Derechos Fundamentales de la Unión Europea, el 73 % de las madres víctimas de violencia física, sexual, por parte de su pareja asegura que al menos uno de sus hijos o hijas fue consciente de esa violencia. Violencia que representa un grave problema social, que crea traumas físicos y psicológicos en las víctimas y que, sin duda, es una vergüenza para todos nosotros como sociedad.

Sabemos que un maltratador no es un buen padre. Por eso es necesario avanzar en la retirada de los derechos de custodia y de visita en esos casos. En España, el Partido Socialista impulsó una reforma del Código Civil que fue aprobada en mayo pasado y que es efectiva desde este septiembre.

Y en Europa debemos reconocer la violencia de género como un eurodelito y debemos establecer tanto la cooperación entre los Estados miembros como unas normas mínimas para la lucha contra la violencia de género contra las mujeres y para la protección de los hijos y las hijas de las víctimas de esa violencia. Porque es su derecho, es su futuro y debe ser también nuestro futuro.

**Cristian Terheş (ECR).** – Mr President, this report is another brick in the social engineering construct intended in the European Union that places Marxist ideology over biology and physiology, which, at the end, would lead to chaos. An important topic like domestic violence or child custody, which affects many couples especially now due to the pandemic, was hijacked by this report and transformed into an ideological weapon that is disregarding the EU Treaties, the solidarity principle and the biology.

Firstly, the proposals from this report are violating the EU Treaties, which say that according to the subsidiarity principle, the European Union has no competence for the development of policies related to family, criminal law, education and healthcare. All of these are prerogatives of the sovereign Member States and any intrusion of the institutions into these prerogatives is undermining the foundation of the European Union.

The report fails to identify and propose real solutions for women and their children faced with domestic violence, but proposes instead redefining norms and terms which lead to more confusion. A woman and her children that are abused do not need a redefinition of terms, but concrete measures to protect and safeguard them – measures which are not mentioned in this report.

In conclusion, Parliament proved once again that the social engineering construct intended to redefine and redesign the European Union is more important than providing concrete solutions to real problems in the European Union, like child abuse and domestic violence.

**Maria da Graça Carvalho (PPE).** – Senhor Presidente, Senhora Comissária, no ano passado vinte e sete mulheres foram mortas em Portugal em contexto de violência doméstica. A violência contra as mulheres e crianças é um flagelo com o qual lidamos há muito. As nossas autoridades, os nossos tribunais, atuam tarde e muitas vezes de forma ineficaz. No meu país, entre os agressores continua a imperar um sentimento de impunidade. As agressões verbais, e mesmo as agressões físicas, raramente chegam aos tribunais, raramente são condenadas, e até quando isso acontece o resultado é quase sempre uma condenação a pena suspensa.

A violência de género é intolerável, viola os princípios basilares da União Europeia, viola os direitos humanos. Por isso, saúdo as relatoras e acompanho todas as suas recomendações, nomeadamente que a Comissão e o Conselho considerem a violência de género um crime particularmente grave, de dimensão transfronteiriça. Mas defendo ainda que devemos ir mais além: os Estados-Membros devem ser instados a fazer o necessário, incluindo mesmo o agravamento das molduras penais, para mostrar aos agressores que os seus atos têm consequências que não passarão em claro.

**Łukasz Kohut (S&D).** – Panie Przewodniczący! Bardzo mnie martwi, że w poprzedniej debacie odnośnie przemocy wobec kobiet uczestniczą prawie same europosłanki, a to przecież nasz obowiązek stać po stronie kobiet, stać murem za kobietami. Bycie feministą jest sexy. Feminisci są potrzebni także dla równowagi informacyjnej. I mogłoby się wydawać, że pewne rzeczy w XXI wieku już się nie dzieją, ale niestety przemoc domowa jest dalej ogromnym problemem w wielu krajach Unii Europejskiej.

A wszystko zaczyna się – jak to zwykle bywa – od słów, a później są czyny, rozbite rodziny i połamane życiorysy. Dlatego, że na to pozwalamy. Dlatego, że przymykamy oko. Dlatego, że przecież nie pierze się brudów poza własnym domem, a często dlatego, że to przecież tylko u sąsiada, a my mamy 1000 ważniejszych spraw na głowie. Żadna kobieta nie może być cicho, gdy dzieje się jej albo innej kobiecie krzywda. I to samo powinno dotyczyć mężczyzn. Przemoc jest z nami od zawsze, ale wcale nie musi na zawsze z nami pozostać.

**Jadwiga Wiśniewska (ECR).** – Pani Komisarz! Panie Przewodniczący! Przemoc domowa, przemoc psychiczna, fizyczna, seksualna jest absolutnym złem. W ubiegłym roku uchwalono w Polsce ustawę antyprzemocową polegającą na szybkim izolowaniu sprawcy przemocy od ofiary i nakazującą natychmiastowe opuszczenie mieszkania przez sprawcę przemocy. Myślę, że to ważne, żebyśmy wymieniali się dobrymi praktykami. Myślę, że to jest bardzo ważne, żebyśmy przestrzegali prawa i mieli na uwadze, jakie kompetencje leżą w gestii państw członkowskich, a jakie są przynależne instytucjom unijnym.

Jeśli chcemy zaś mówić o przemocy i tak często jest tutaj podkreślana potrzeba ochrony dzieci przed przemocą, to po raz kolejny apeluję do Państwa: przestańcie uprawiać hipokryzję, zwróćcie uwagę na wielki problem, który wciąż istnieje w Unii Europejskiej, jakim są małżeństwa osób dorosłych z dziećmi. Czas zatrzymać to barbarzyństwo w XXI wieku. Czas z tym skończyć. Apeluję do Pani Komisarz o zajęcie się tym problemem.

**Helena Dalli, Member of the Commission.** – Mr President, Europe is a frontrunner when it comes to measures to tackle violence against women. Our upcoming proposals ensure the best added value at EU level to the actions already taken by Member States. It will strengthen other ongoing initiatives, such as the work on the Digital Services Act, with regard to gender-based cyber violence. It will also provide a solid basis for further work foreseen in the Gender Equality Strategy, such as the prevention network and the cooperation with online platforms.

In this way, we will ensure the complementarity of the proposed initiatives with other measures, through early education, awareness raising and combating gender stereotypes, to achieve a zero tolerance to violence approach. Women and children have the right to live free from violence, and they deserve a strong legal framework to protect them.

Ensuring that sufficient protection and support is available can make a real difference for the lives of millions of victims. Europe should remain the global champion, tackling gender-based violence and the guardian of women's and children's rights.

**Luisa Regimenti, relatrice.** – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, ringrazio la Commissaria Dalli per il suo intervento e tutti i colleghi per i loro interventi. Su un tema così importante non può che esserci un esteso e partecipato dibattito.

Il fascicolo in discussione ha visto la collaborazione di tutti i gruppi, che voglio ringraziare per l'impegno speso e la collaborazione dimostrata. La tematica che oggi si discute è un esempio cruciale dell'importanza di una Unione del diritto, soprattutto in tempi come questi, dove alla politica europea è richiesta la massima coesione.

È inevitabile che un argomento di tanta sensibilità faccia discutere, ma ricordiamo che l'obiettivo della relazione deve essere quello di tutelare le donne, le madri e i loro figli e di prevenire e contrastare la violenza domestica e i suoi nefasti risvolti sui minori oggetto di decisioni di affidamento e custodia.

In sede di votazione, dunque, prego i miei colleghi di voler riflettere sulla necessità di produrre una lettera scevra da ideologie politiche o considerazioni non attinenti alla fattispecie, cioè a tutela della certezza del diritto e della chiarezza del nostro messaggio istituzionale.

Oggi deve vincere il diritto delle donne e dei bambini ad essere protetti e a vivere una vita libera dalla violenza fisica e psicologica. Facciamo in modo che questa relazione sia un ulteriore passo verso una società in cui nessuna donna debba più temere abusi e maltrattamenti per sé e per i propri figli e in cui nessuna discriminazione e violenza possa essere tollerata.

**Έλενα Κουντουρά, εισηγήτρια.** – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, θέλω να ευχαριστήσω θερμά τους συναδέλφους που εργάστηκαν γι' αυτόν τον τόσο σημαντικό φάκελο. Είμαι πολύ περήφανη για το αποτέλεσμα στο οποίο κατέληξαν οι επιτροπές μας. Η έκθεση αυτή θα αποτελέσει σταθμό στη συζήτηση για μία κοινή ευρωπαϊκή απάντηση, που θα καταλήξει στο τέλος του έτους στις νομοθετικές προτάσεις της επιτροπής για την καταπολέμηση της έμφυλης και ενδοοικογενειακής βίας. Υιοθετήσαμε μία προοδευτική έκθεση που δημιουργεί ένα ολοκληρωμένο πλαίσιο για την αποτελεσματική προστασία των γυναικών και των παιδιών από την ενδοσυμβατική βία και για την επίλυση των ζητημάτων γονικής επιμέλειας με πρωταρχικό μέλημα το βέλτιστο συμφέρον του παιδιού.

Θέλω όμως να σταθώ σε ένα ιδιαίτερο σημείο: Είναι πολύ ανησυχητικό το γεγονός ότι σε ορισμένα κράτη μέλη γίνονται αποδεκτές έννοιες όπως είναι η «γονική αποξένωση» ή παρόμοιοι όροι ως κριτήριο ικανό να στερήσει την επιμέλεια σε μία κακοποιημένη μητέρα. Η πρακτική αυτή χρησιμοποιείται συχνά από τους κακοποιητικούς γονείς ως στρατηγική κατά των θυμάτων που επιχειρούν να καταγγείλουν περιπτώσεις παιδικής κακοποίησης ή έμφυλης βίας, και αυτό συμβαίνει ενώ οι σημαντικότεροι θεσμοί για την ψυχική υγεία, ο Παγκόσμιος Οργανισμός Υγείας, οι αμερικανικές ενώσεις ψυχολόγων, ψυχιάτρων, ιατρών και άλλες, έχουν απορρίψει τη χρήση του συνδρόμου «γονικής αποξένωσης», καθώς δεν διαθέτει απαραίτητη επιστημονική τεκμηρίωση. Με την έκθεση αυτή στέλνουμε ένα ξεκάθαρο μήνυμα προς πάσα κατεύθυνση. Καλούμε τα κράτη μέλη να μην αναγνωρίζουν το σύνδρομο «γονικής αποξένωσης» στη νομοθεσία τους και να αποθαρρύνουν ή ακόμα και να απαγορεύσουν τη χρήση του κατά τη διάρκεια των δικαστικών διαδικασιών, ιδιαίτερα κατά τον έλεγχο για τον καθορισμό της ύπαρξης ή μη βίας. Και το κάνουμε αυτό βαισιζόμενοι στις συστάσεις του GREVIO και του CEDAW και των ειδικών εισηγητών των Ηνωμένων Εθνών.

Κύριοι συνάδελφοι, η ισότητα των φύλων δεν μπορεί να υπάρξει αν δεν εξαλείψουμε πρώτα την έμφυλη βία. Σήμερα οφείλουμε να στείλουμε από εδώ, από το Κοινοβούλιο, ένα σαφές μήνυμα. Γι' αυτό σας καλώ να υιοθετήσουμε την έκθεση, όπως υπερψηφίστηκε από τις επιτροπές μας.

**Presidente.** – E com estas intervenções das nossas relatoras está encerrado este debate. A votação deste relatório sobre violência doméstica realizar-se-á amanhã.

*Declarações escritas (artigo 171.º)*

**Josianne Cutajar (S&D), in writing.** – It is strongly deplorable that in 2021 gender-based violence is still a plague spreading in our Union. The pandemic has made this phenomenon even worse, with a sharp surge in cases of domestic violence. We cannot overlook that, very often, the intimate partner is responsible for this violence, with strong repercussions on other members of the family, particularly children. Condemning such violence is however not enough: the European Union as well as all its Member States must ratify the Istanbul Convention as soon as possible. More concretely, adding gender-based violence to the list of areas of crimes under Article 83(1) TFEU and considering intimate partner violence in custody rights and visitation decisions are among those actions which are essential. I want a European Union that provides adequate emergency accommodation and shelter, as well as financial and legal aid and psychological support: victims of intimate partner violence cannot be left alone; they must not be left behind.

**Maria-Manuel Leitão-Marques (S&D), in writing.** – It is estimated that 22% of women in the EU have been victims of physical or sexual violence. Per day, in Europe, seven women die, on average, due to domestic violence. We cannot leave this silent pandemic without an answer. We have to do all we can to protect these women and their rights. I welcome this report. In specific, I welcome its focus on guaranteeing access to legal, financial and psychological support. Moreover, I would like to stress the importance of the report's calls for instances of domestic violence to be taken into account by courts, when determining children's custody, and for effective protections for victims in cases of shared custody.

**Guido Reil (ID), schriftlich.** – Gewalt gegen Frauen geht gar nicht. So einfach, so klar, so richtig. Sie sprechen von „heteropatriarchalischen Strukturen“, von „Machtasymmetrien“ und von „strukturellen und institutionellen Ungleichheiten“. Geschenkt. Solange Sie dafür sorgen oder zu sorgen versuchen, dass Frauen und Mädchen nicht mehr geschlagen werden und ihnen auch sonst nichts passiert, dürfen Sie sich ausdrücken, wie Sie wollen. Was nicht ok ist, ist, dass Sie den Straftatbestand „Gewalt gegen Frauen“ dafür missbrauchen, die EU-Verträge zu verändern. Sie nutzen wirklich jedes Schlupfloch, um an Ihrem EU-Bürokratie-Monster zu basteln, um die Nationalstaaten zu entmannen und um Ihren EUdSSR-Frankenstein zu erschaffen. Ich sag Ihnen mal etwas, so als ganz normaler, heterosexueller, weißer Mann, dem es nie einfallen würde, eine Frau auch nur böse anzuschauen: Wenn Ihnen wirklich etwas an den Frauen liegt und Sie wollen, dass es ihnen gut geht, dann helfen Sie ihnen nicht dadurch, dass Sie Familien- und Strafrecht EU-weit vereinheitlichen und das Konzept der geschlechtsspezifischen Gewalt einführen, sondern Sie helfen ihnen, indem Sie dafür sorgen, dass nicht Millionen von jungen, alleinstehenden Männern aus gewaltaffinen Kulturen importiert werden und selbst dann dauerhaft bei uns bleiben und frei herumlaufen dürfen, nachdem sie wiederholt verhaltensauffällig geworden sind und sich strafbar gemacht haben.

## 15. Ochrona osób z niepełnosprawnościami za pośrednictwem petycji – wyciągnięte wnioski (debata)

**Presidente.** – O ponto seguinte da ordem do dia é: o relatório do Deputado Agius Saliba – Proteção das pessoas com deficiência através de peticções: Ensinamentos tirados (2020/2209(INI)) (A9-0261/2021).

**Alex Agius Saliba, rapporteur.** – Mr President, on Wednesday we will be voting on my report on the protection of persons with disabilities through petitions – lessons learnt.

First of all, I would like to thank my colleagues and shadows for their important input in this report. There was a high degree of cooperation across all the political groups within the European Parliament.

I would also like to thank Inclusion Europe and also Autism Europe for providing us with an easy-to-read part of my report in order to make this report accessible to all persons with disabilities. Heartfelt thanks to you.

Approximately, there are 87 million persons with disabilities throughout our Union. Their situation may vary considerably from one Member State to another, but they are generally more likely to be exposed to social exclusion, more likely to be exposed to poverty, and it is more likely they are exposed to unemployment.

Despite all our common agreed values and also our treaties, people with disabilities continue to face multiple obstacles and discrimination, in their everyday lives, which prevent them from basically enjoying their most fundamental freedoms and rights as laid down in applicable EU law and also in UN legislative frameworks.

One of these is the mutual recognition of disability status between EU Member States, the lack of which tremendously hinders freedom of movement within the EU for persons with disabilities. Moreover, access to public transport, physical, sensory and cognitive accessibility of the built environment, goods, services and programmes, use of sign languages and all other means and types of accessible communication and information, financing of – and equal access to – education and also vocational training, access to the labour market, access to personal assistance schemes, community inclusion, equality in opportunity and treatment in employment and also in other occupations.

Let me stress that here the Committee on Petitions plays a very crucial role as a bridge between the EU citizens, Parliament and other EU institutions, and also has an important instrument for getting our citizens involved in a more active way in participatory democracy. The right to petition Parliament is one of the most fundamental rights of every EU citizen.

However, persons with disabilities are still facing enormous obstacles in exercising this right to petition. That is why it is important for the European Parliament to first of all ensure that its website is accessible for persons with disabilities, in line with the 'leading by example' policy. Moreover, it should allow the tabling of petitions in both international and national sign languages used in the EU, thus making the right to petition more accessible for sign language users.

Over the years, the Committee on Petitions has received many important petitions on the protection of persons with disabilities in the EU. Citizens regularly get in touch to express their concerns on accessibility, social protection and also employment rights. My report highlights these examined petitions, in which our citizens have raised issues on accessibility and social protection, mutual recognition of disability status in the Member States, as well as inclusive education and employment rights.

In the received petitions, the petitioners raise issues of obstacles that persons with disabilities face in various fields, such as access to public transport, the built environment, use of sign languages, financing of – and access to – education and also vocational training. This is a strong message for Europe to act.

The report is also very timely, taking into account the recent launch of the New Disability Strategy 2021-2030 by the European Commission. The new strategy aims to improve the lives of persons with disabilities in a barrier-free Europe and to protect the social and also economic inclusion and participation of persons with disabilities in our society, free from discrimination, in full respect of their rights and on an equal basis with all other citizens.

It is also important to mention the Commissioner for Equality, Helena Dalli, who played a significant instrumental role in establishing this new strategy for the rights of persons with disabilities.

Currently there is still no mutual recognition of disability status between EU Member States, which is still creating an obstacle for persons with disabilities when moving from one Member State to another to work, for studies or for any other reason.

The Strategy for the Rights of Persons with Disabilities is basically proposing an EU-wide disability card. The European Disability Card, I must say, will be a very important instrument to help persons with disabilities to exercise their right of freedom of movement, and therefore I have stressed in my report that the European Disability Card should become mandatory in each and every Member State.

The report also focuses on a number of barriers that children with disabilities encounter when it comes to inclusive education, especially children with intellectual disabilities, where such children with autism or children with hearing loss are still facing many obstacles when it comes to fulfilling their educational path.

I believe that the European Commission should continue to strengthen the role of the Child Guarantee in ensuring inclusion of children with disabilities and also that Member States should increase their educational systems' capacity to provide high-quality, inclusive education for all learners.

Last but not least, I stress in my report also the important role of focal points in the EU, in all institutions, in all agencies, including in Parliament and in the Council, with the central focal point being within the Commission's Secretariat-General, which would be supported by an appropriate interinstitutional mechanism. The report highlights the importance of prioritising the appointment of persons with disabilities to the role of disability coordinators.

**Radan Kanev**, *rapporteur for the opinion of the Committee on Employment and Social Affairs*. – Mr President, as rapporteur of the Committee on Employment and Social Affairs opinion on this very important report, I will use the opportunity to very briefly present the most important among our long list of suggestions. If I am to put it in one sentence, it would be: make lifelong education accessible and affordable, open the labour market, and provide for independent living.

Most people with disabilities are full members of our societies, not only by virtue of their equal rights, but also by virtue of their same abilities to learn, to work, to develop and to provide for themselves, their families and their communities. The only thing they need is an equal chance for development through independent living, and I'm afraid here is where we fail as Member States, societies and the Union, or at least that's what their petitions show us.

**Helena Dalli**, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, with today's report, the European Parliament shows once again its commitment towards the full inclusion of persons with disabilities. This is key to achieving a Union of equality for all. I thank the rapporteur, Mr Alex Agius Saliba, the Committee on Petitions, the shadow rapporteurs and the other associated committees for their observations.

The right to submit a petition to the European Parliament is one of the fundamental rights recognised by the EU Charter. Petitions are also a precious source of information for the Commission, for instance, in order to identify existing gaps. As your report points out, many barriers for persons with disabilities still remain, notably as regards accessibility, employment, education, the right to live independently in the community and mobility. I welcome your ideas and recommendations, and I look forward to our exchange today.



We agree that adopting a human rights approach is essential to ensure that persons with disabilities can effectively participate in all fields of life on an equal basis with others. The new Strategy for the Rights of Persons with Disabilities that the Commission adopted in March is our joint tool to improve the lives of people with disabilities in the EU and beyond in the next decade. Embracing a human-rights approach, the Strategy supports the EU in implementing the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and helps Member States in their efforts. It takes into account the diversity of disability and promotes an intersectional perspective in its implementation, a point emphasised in your report.

Over the next years we will roll out a number of actions and flagship initiatives, notably to improve accessibility, independent living and access to services, free movement and labour market outcomes for persons with disabilities. These are among the key concerns raised in the petitions that the European Parliament has examined and which your report highlights. EU funds, including under the Cohesion Policy and the Recovery and Resilience Facility, will play a key role in achieving these objectives. As noted in your recommendations, the Commission will continue to support Member States in ensuring accessibility, which is a precondition for autonomy and equality.

The European Accessibility Act has been a milestone. The Commission will launch next year a European resource centre – Accessible EU – to increase coherence and accessibility policies and facilitate access to relevant knowledge. Fighting discrimination and barriers is our common goal. Only half of all persons with disabilities are in employment, and this of course needs to change. We will step up our efforts in this area. Next year, the Commission will present a package to improve the labour market outcomes of persons with disabilities, seeking cooperation with the European Network of Public Employment Services, social partners and organisations of persons with disabilities.

Persons with disabilities have an equal right to live independently and be included in the community. By 2023, we will issue guidance recommending to Member States improvements in this field. We agree that EU funds should support independent living, including the shift from institutions to services in the community. To improve service delivery for persons with disabilities and enhance the attractiveness of jobs in this area we will present by 2024 a framework for social services of excellence. Persons with disabilities should enjoy all rights on an equal basis with others, including when moving to another Member State.

The Commission will propose the creation, by 2023, of a European disability card. It will build upon the ongoing EU disability card pilot project, with a view to being recognised by all Member States.

I welcome your support for this initiative and stand ready to exchange further. To achieve these objectives and implement this strategy successfully, we need coordinated action at both national and EU level, with a strong commitment from Member States and regional and local authorities. We will work closely with the Member States, persons with disabilities and their representative organisations, the European Parliament and stakeholders.

We all have a responsibility to take the needs of persons with disabilities into consideration when designing, implementing and monitoring policies, legislation and funding programmes through targeted action and mainstreaming. As you reiterate in your report, we call on all EU institutions and bodies, agencies and delegations to designate disability coordinators for their institutions and for their disability strategies. I count on our continuous cooperation to make the Union of Equality a reality for the 87 million persons with disabilities in Europe.

**Στέλιος Κυμπουρόπουλος**, εξ ονόματος της ομάδας PPE. – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, χαίρομαι ιδιαίτερα γιατί η υπό συζήτηση έκθεση είναι το επιστέγασμα αναφορών από Ευρωπαίους πολίτες, αποδεικνύοντας ότι το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο αφουγκράζεται τους προβληματισμούς τους.

Ας δούμε όμως τι λένε οι αριθμοί: Μόνο το 1% του συνόλου των αναφορών που λαμβάνει κάθε χρόνο η Επιτροπή Αναφορών αφορά ζητήματα αναπηρίας, τη στιγμή που υπάρχουν περίπου 87 εκατομμύρια ανάπηρα άτομα στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση. Το γεγονός αυτό πρέπει να μας κάνει να εξαντλήσουμε κάθε προσπάθεια, ώστε αυτό το εργαλείο να γίνει πιο ευρέως γνωστό. Η πολύ περιεκτική αυτή έκθεση θέτει στο επίκεντρο μια σειρά από θεμελιώδη ζητήματα για τη ζωή των αναπήρων στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, τα οποία υποστηρίζω και εγώ κατά τη διάρκεια των διαπραγματεύσεων ως σκιώδης εισηγητής εκ μέρους του ΕΛΚ: από την ανάγκη να καταλήξουμε επιτέλους σε κοινούς ορισμούς της αναπηρίας και της ανεξάρτητης διαβίωσης, να πείσουμε τα κράτη μέλη να πάρουν στα σοβαρά τα υψηλά ποσοστά ανεργίας των ανάπηρων ατόμων, να διασφαλίσουμε την ισότιμη πρόσβαση μας στην ιατροφαρμακευτική περίθαλψη, τον πολιτισμό, τον αθλητισμό και την ψυχαγωγία, μέχρι το να εξασφαλίσουμε την εναρμόνιση των ευρωπαϊκών προγραμμάτων χρηματοδότησης με τη σύμβαση του ΟΗΕ για τα δικαιώματα των ατόμων με αναπηρία.

Για να γίνει όμως αυτό πράξη, απαιτείται πραγματική κουλτούρα συμπεριληψης, καλύτερη συνεργασία των κρατών μελών και πιο αποτελεσματική ανταλλαγή βέλτιστων πρακτικών, πρωτίστως όμως η αποτελεσματική υλοποίηση της ευρωπαϊκής στρατηγικής για την αναπηρία, με τακτική μέτρηση της προόδου αλλά και διασφάλιση της συμμετοχής των αναπήρων σε όλα τα στάδια εφαρμογής της. Μόνο έτσι θα διασφαλίσουμε σύγχρονες ευρωπαϊκές συμπεριληπτικές κοινωνίες, όπου οι ανάπηροι θα μπορούν να απολαμβάνουν όλα τα δικαιώματα και τις ελευθερίες. Και όλα αυτά, κύριε Πρόεδρε, μπορούν να συγκεντρωθούν σε αυτήν εδώ την αίθουσα· στη μικρή μας κοινωνία των 705 ατόμων, όπου ένας άνθρωπος με αναπηρία, όπως είμαι εγώ, χρήστης αναπηρικού αμαξιδίου, δεν μπορεί να έρθει στο κεντρικό σημείο, στο κεντρικό πόντιουμ να μιλήσει, όπως μιλάνε και οι υπόλοιποι συνάδελφοι. Ας κάνουμε αυτή την αλλαγή σύντομα, έτσι ώστε να έχουμε μια ισότιμη συμμετοχή όλων μας.

**Milan Brglez**, v imenu skupine S&D. – Predsedujoči, hvala za besedo. Spoštovana komisarka, kolegice in kolegi. Zahvaljujem se kolegu Salibi za poglobljeno poročilo, ki skrbno preučil peticije v Evropskem parlamentu, mednarodna priporočila za uresničevanje Konvencije Združenih narodov o pravicah invalidov ter mnenje Odbora za zaposlovanje in socialne zadeve, kjer je pravzaprav največ tovrstnih pobud.

Vesel sem tudi velike stopnje soglasja na tem področju, vendar se razlikujemo glede dveh zadev. Najprej glede interpretacije tega, kaj pomeni, da je tudi Evropska unija poleg držav članic pogodbenica konvencije. In drugič, glede ambicioznosti pri zagotavljanju pravic invalidov in s tem gradnji vključujoče družbe.

Namreč, brez takšne ambicioznosti bo diskriminacija in pa vrzel v zaposlovanju invalidov še večja. Več bomo morali storiti za prilagoditev sistemov socialne varnosti potrebam invalidov in za njihovo mobilnost, tako v državah kot med njimi. Ker mislim, da je povsem upravičeno pričakovanje, da bo strategija za pravice invalidov 2030 — poleg vseevropske kartice ugodnosti in parkirne kartice Evropske unije — vsebovala tudi vzajemno priznanje statusa invalidov med državami članicami.

Vsekakor je prepočasen prehod od institucionalnega varstva k neodvisnemu življenju invalidov v skupnosti, zato pozivam Komisijo, naj prepreči zlorabo evropskih sredstev za deinstitucionalizacijo v nasprotju s konvencijo.

Vsekakor pa moramo najprej začeti pri sebi. Zato moramo zagotoviti vidnost in dostopnost mehanizma peticij v Evropskem parlamentu. Več moramo storiti pri pomoči in podpori za vlaganje peticij in pa uvesti možnost vlaganja peticij tudi v nacionalnih znakovnih jezikih, ker recimo slovenski primer zapisa takšnega znakovnega jezika v ustavo kaže na simbolni dejanski pomen.

Končno pa moram poudariti to, da bi lahko k temu pripomogla tudi pridružitev Evropskega parlamenta h globalnemu gibanju „We the fifteen“, k čemur sem s kolegicami in kolegi pozval tudi predsednika Evropskega parlamenta.

**Abir Al-Sahlani**, för Renew-gruppen. – Herr talman! Fru kommissionär! På min väggkalender står det år 2021. Men ändå, när det gäller rättigheterna för medborgare med funktionsvariationer känns på vissa håll unionen mer som 1950-talet.

Coronapandemin har slagit hårt mot våra samhällen. Men den har slagit ännu hårdare mot en viss grupp i vår union, nämligen människor med funktionsvariationer. Och nu när vi går mot allt större rörelsefrihet och lyfta restriktioner fortsätter just denna grupp av medborgare att diskrimineras.

Problemet är inte längre att vi har en dålig situation. Problemet är att det på flera håll i unionen finns länder som försämrar situationen för människor med funktionsvariationer, till exempel tillgången till hälso- och sjukvård, till exempel förhindrandet av spridningen av coronaviruset bland denna grupp av våra medborgare. Länder som Bulgarien och Rumänien bör skärpa sig och fullt ut följa konventionen om rättigheter för personer med funktionsnedsättning. Det skulle ge våra medborgare en möjlighet att rapportera eventuella kränkningar av sina rättigheter i sina hemländer.

Det är dags att kräva handling på riktigt, en gång för alla. Att all form av diskriminering upphör, att allas rätt att delta och kandidera i demokratiska val ska garanteras, att fullt ut ge alla medborgare möjligheten att utöva den fria rörligheten inom unionen. Endast då får vi en union utan restriktioner och med fri rörlighet för alla våra medborgare.

**Katrin Langensiepen**, *im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, sehr geehrte Frau Kommissarin! Am Mittwoch stimmen wir über den Bericht des PETI-Ausschusses zum Schutz von Menschen mit Behinderungen durch Petitionen ab – Titel: *Lessons learnt. Lessons learnt? Really?* Nein! Ansonsten müsste mein Kollege Stelios Kypouropoulos nicht da oben sitzen, während wir hier an diesem Podium sprechen. Der Saal ist immer noch nicht barrierefrei, rollstuhlgerecht, und das Podium ist immer noch nicht zugänglich für alle Menschen. Und das ist nicht schade, das ist eine Schande für dieses Hohe Haus! Das nur zu Beginn.

Als ich die Stellungnahme des EMPL-Ausschusses zum Bericht des PETI-Ausschusses verfolgte – vielen, vielen Dank, liebe Kolleginnen – war ich schockiert zu lesen, wie viel noch auf dem Spiel steht und was noch nicht getan ist. Die häufigsten Anliegen der Petenten sind hier Zugänglichkeit zu Informationen und zur Umwelt. Nur eine Woche vor der jährlichen Rede zur Lage der Nation von Frau Ursula von der Leyen im Europäischen Parlament wurde ich darauf aufmerksam gemacht, dass es keine Verdolmetschung in die Gebärdensprache gab. Ich bin sofort zum Übersetzungsdienst und habe diesen Dolmetschdienst angefragt und habe um Verdolmetschung gebeten. Auch da kam nichts zurück. Präsident Sassoli – herzlichen Dank für Ihre Initiative – hat sich dafür eingesetzt, leider ohne Erfolg.

Als diese jährliche Rede zur Lage der Nation vorbereitet wurde, wurde kein Antrag auf Verdolmetschung in die internationale Gebärdensprache gestellt. Ich frage: Warum nicht? Warum wurden automatisch 23 andere Sprachen beantragt, aber nicht die internationale Gebärdensprache? Die Rede zur Lage der Nation ist ein Mittel, um die in der EU lebenden Menschen über den Stand der Dinge und Pläne zu informieren. Sollen Menschen mit einer Hörbehinderung nicht informiert werden und an politischen Prozessen teilnehmen? Ich fordere von Ihnen, Kolleginnen hier im Haus, in der Kommission und im Rat, dass Sie aufhören, sich immer hinter diesen Strategien, Positionen und politischem Halbwillen zu verstecken. Eine inklusive europäische Gesellschaft muss eine Selbstverständlichkeit sein und keine Formalität. Das Präsentieren von Sportlerinnen im Europäischen Parlament, das ist vielleicht *good will*, aber es ist keine Inklusion, das ist ein Tropfen auf dem heißen Stein.

**Stefania Zambelli**, *a nome del gruppo ID*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signora Commissaria, le petizioni hanno da sempre rappresentato per tutti i cittadini europei uno strumento di partecipazione alla politica comunitaria.

Infatti, le petizioni sono per le persone con disabilità un utile mezzo per avanzare proposte per i loro diritti. Tramite le petizioni molti disabili ci hanno contattato recentemente, facendoci presente quali sono i problemi che ogni giorno devono affrontare, per esempio difficoltà nell'occupazione, difficoltà nella scuola, difficoltà ad accedere agli uffici pubblici, difficoltà a salire sui mezzi pubblici.

Sono davvero contenta che in questo testo siano state accettate le nostre proposte. È necessario però velocizzare l'attuazione della Carta europea della disabilità. Dobbiamo combattere ogni forma di discriminazione sui luoghi di lavoro. Dobbiamo aiutare le famiglie nel sostenere le persone con disabilità. Dobbiamo sostenere le scuole e gli istituti che ospitano bambini e ragazzi disabili. È nostro dovere affrontare con tutti i mezzi a disposizione i problemi legati alla disabilità, dando sostegno e aiuto a chi è meno fortunato di noi.

**Krzysztof Jurgiel**, *w imieniu grupy ECR*. – Panie Przewodniczący! Pani Komisarz! W sprawozdaniu zwrócono uwagę na wiele trudności, z jakimi borykają się osoby niepełnosprawne. Jest rzeczą oczywistą, że osoby niepełnosprawne potrzebują szczególnego wsparcia. Należy chronić ich prawa oraz dbać o ich godność, a także pomagać w szczególnie istotnych dla nich obszarach jak zdrowie i edukacja, aby umożliwić im szerokie uczestnictwo w życiu społecznym czy na rynku pracy.

W rezolucji mówi się też o cyfryzacji, która jest szansą na integrację słabszych grup społecznych, z drugiej strony wymaga inwestycji w odpowiednie umiejętności cyfrowe. Ważne jest jednak, aby oddzielić realną potrzebę pomocy potrzebującym od narzucania kwestii ideologicznych. Nie powinno się wspominać w rezolucji o konwencji stambulskiej, która zawiera szkodliwe elementy, jak na przykład ideę płci jako wyboru społeczno-kulturowego, którego można dowolnie dokonywać. Z tego powodu grupa ECR nie poprze wyżej wymienionego sprawozdania.

**Anne-Sophie Pelletier**, au nom du groupe *The Left*. – (*début de l'intervention hors micro*) relative aux droits des personnes handicapées, leur quotidien reste le parcours du combattant, que ce soit pour l'intégration dans le monde du travail ou l'accès à l'école et à la justice, en passant par tous les aspects de leur vie de tous les jours, et notamment leurs droits.

Le handicap se vit aussi dans les yeux des autres. Pourtant, ce sont bien les autres qui décident de leurs besoins. Ils ne demandent ni charité ni apitoiement, mais l'accès à leurs droits, en participant activement aux décisions qui les concernent: ils veulent devenir acteurs et non spectateurs. Pour cela, nous devons aussi changer les regards.

Il est de ces sujets où nos clivages politiques doivent être dépassés et avec ce rapport, nous posons les fondations d'une maison où il est écrit «équité». Cela fait bien trop longtemps que les premiers de cordée validistes ont coupé la corde et cela nous oblige à retisser le lien. On ne pourra faire société que si chaque politique est adaptée au handicap. Alors, débloquons la directive antidiscrimination et faisons-le maintenant, ici. Notre défi à saisir est de donner les clés et le cadre juridique aux États membres pour que les politiques concernant le handicap ne souffrent plus de cécité. Car même si l'essentiel est invisible pour les yeux et que l'on ne voit bien qu'avec le cœur, la frontière n'a jamais été œuvre de miracle, mais une politique équitable peut changer la vie des plus vulnérables.

**Ádám Kósa (NI)**. – Elnök Úr! Tizenkét éve dolgozom itt. Van fejlődés: már a jelentés első változatába számos olyan fontos elem is bekerült, amelyekért korábban külön kellett harcolni. Köszönöm a kiállást a kollégáktól a siket emberek mellett és a jelyelv mellett. Ugyanakkor a leghatározottabban elutasítom azt, hogy a jelentés nem kizárólag a fogyatékosokkal élőkre koncentrál. Behozza az interszekcionalitás kérdését, foglalkozik a migráció kérdésével és lsten tudja még mivel, ami nem tartozik a fogyatékoság témaköréhez. Kollegák, ez kontraproduktív, mindaddig, ameddig nem oldjuk meg a fogyatékosokkal élő polgárok helyzetét! Egyetlenegy adatot hoznék ide: a fogyatékosokkal élő munkavállalók mindössze 50,8%-a dolgozik. Ez a ház sem akadálymentes, a holnap sem akadálymentes, foglalkozzunk inkább ezzel!

Kérem, hogy a „semmit rólunk, nélkülünk” elv érvényesítése érdekében ebbe a munkába vonjuk be a fogyatékosokkal élőket képviselő szervezeteket. Ebben a Petíciós Szakbizottság élen jár, remélem, hogy maga az Európai Parlament is így tesz a jövőben.

#### VORSITZ: RAINER WIELAND

Vizepräsident

**Jarosław Duda (PPE)**. – Panie Przewodniczący! Pani Komisarz! To bardzo dobry i potrzebny dokument, zatem chciałem podziękować oczywiście sprawozdawcy, jak i kontrsprawozdawcom. Sprawozdanie w mojej opinii jest bardzo kompleksowe, rzetelne i bardzo dobrze odzwierciedla te wszystkie problemy, które były poruszane na forum naszej komisji.

Chciałbym zwrócić uwagę szczególnie na to, że dokument powstał również w formie łatwej do czytania. To nie zawsze niestety ma miejsce i dziękuję za to *Inclusion Europe* oraz *Autism-Europe*, bo oczywiste i kluczowe jest to, że osoby, których dotyczy to sprawozdanie, powinny umieć się z nim zapoznać.

Unia Europejska jest, Szanowni Państwo, w trakcie transformacji cyfrowej, zielonej, architektonicznej i te wszystkie kwestie zostały zauważone w sprawozdaniu. To ogromna szansa zarówno dla osób z niepełnosprawnościami, jak i osób, które są w podeszłym wieku, czyli dla osób starszych. Należy jednak dopilnować, aby usługi cyfrowe spełniały najwyższe standardy dostępności, żeby nowe rozwiązania technologiczne nie tworzyły kolejnych barier, ale je likwidowały. I cieszy mnie bardzo to, że w naszej komisji te problemy są bardzo często poruszane i są przyczynkiem do tego, aby był postęp w tej dostępności.

**Marc Angel (S&D).** – Mr President, in January 2011, the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (UNCRPD) came into force here in the European Union, but Member States, but also a little bit the European Union, have failed to fully promote, protect and assure equal enjoyment of all human rights and fundamental freedoms by all persons with disabilities. Efforts must be made, and I am very confident that the new EU disability strategy, presented by Helena Dalli, after a participatory process, will ensure better social and economic inclusion.

The report that we discuss today highlights the need for better monitoring of the compliance with the UNCRPD by the Commission, but moreover by the Member States, and I want to recall that we should not forget to include persons with disabilities in this monitoring process. The report recalls that 1% of petitions deal with disability rights when up to 87 million EU citizens have some form of disability; 1% is not enough, and it shows how difficult it is to make the voice of people with disabilities heard in this process.

I am proud that my political group fully supports the annual workshops and hearings on the rights of people with disabilities organised by the Committee on Petitions, which allows close cooperation with the Commission, with experts, with the Fundamental Rights Agency, with the European Ombudsman and representatives of civil society, such as the European Disability Forum. It is only together that we will be able to achieve the ambitious aims of the Commissioner's strategy.

The excellent work of our rapporteur, Alex Agius Saliba, sheds light on the absolute necessity to ratify the optional protocol of the UNCRPD. It will allow individuals to submit communications to the Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD) on alleged violations of their fundamental rights by a state party to the CRPD. Five Member States and the EU haven't ratified it yet, so we should stop being hypocrites. We all talk about participation, but we haven't ratified the protocol which allows participation for individuals.

**Véronique Trillet-Lenoir (Renew).** – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Commissaire, chers collègues, la politique du handicap est un marqueur de l'Europe inclusive que nous voulons construire, conformément à notre devise, «Unie dans la diversité».

La politique du handicap doit être présente dans toutes nos politiques: emploi, éducation, logement, transport, numérique et, bien sûr, santé. Le rapport que nous allons voter rappelle que près d'un Européen sur quatre signale un degré de limitation fonctionnelle du fait d'un problème de santé. Des maladies chroniques comme le diabète ou le cancer peuvent en effet entraîner une perte d'autonomie.

Une politique de santé ambitieuse doit être globale, allant des efforts de prévention en santé physique et mentale jusqu'à la réinsertion après une maladie invalidante. C'est ce que nous défendons également dans le plan européen pour vaincre le cancer et dans le prochain rapport sur le cadre stratégique pour la santé et la sécurité au travail.

Oui, il faut mieux prévenir et mieux guérir, mais il faut penser aussi à la vie avec et après la maladie: les survivants se heurtent trop souvent à un difficile retour à une vie sociale, affective et professionnelle normale.

**Tilly Metz (Verts/ALE).** – Herr Präsident, Frau Kommissarin! Ich begrüße diesen Bericht von ganzem Herzen. Die Menge an Petitionen, die von Rechten von Menschen mit einer Behinderung sprechen, zeigt, wie akut und weitverbreitet die Probleme noch immer sind. Menschen mit einer Behinderung müssen Zugang zu einer inklusiven Schule und Ausbildung haben, selbstbestimmt und gemeindenah leben dürfen, frei und flexibel reisen können, eine Chance im regulären Arbeitsmarkt bekommen, Zugriff auf persönliche Assistenz haben können.

Hierbei handelt es sich nicht einfach um Lappalien oder gar Mitleidsaktionen, sondern um Menschenrechte. Inklusion in allen Bereichen der Gesellschaft soll nicht nur eine Option sein, sondern eine Selbstverständlichkeit. Dieser Paradigmenwechsel ist aber nicht überall komplett vollzogen. Eine der Forderungen des Berichts, wie zum Beispiel die EU-weite *Disability Card*, wird bald Realität sein. Bei anderen Forderungen, wie zum Beispiel der Antidiskriminierungsrichtlinie, warten wir seit zehn Jahren, und die Zukunft davon ist ungewiss. Sie könnte aber vielen Menschen mehr Schutz in allen Lebensbereichen geben.

*(Der Präsident entzieht der Rednerin das Wort.)*

**Beata Mazurek (ECR).** – Panie Przewodniczący! Pani Komisarz! Szanowni Państwo! To sprawozdanie dotyczy wielu kwestii, które powinny być rozwiązane, by pomóc w codziennym życiu 87 milionom osób z niepełnosprawnościami żyjącym w Unii Europejskiej. Chcemy, by osoby z niepełnosprawnościami były akceptowane i doceniane, bo chociaż wszyscy jesteśmy równi, to jednocześnie każdy z nas jest wyjątkowy.

W sprawozdaniu wielokrotnie pojawia się sformułowanie, że wzywa się Komisję Europejską, Unię Europejską, państwa członkowskie do konkretnych działań. To pokazuje, jak wiele jest jeszcze do zrobienia, by osoby z niepełnosprawnościami mogły w pełni korzystać z przysługujących im praw społecznych, politycznych czy gospodarczych. Sprawozdanie dotyczy wielu obszarów ważnych dla osób niepełnosprawnych, takich jak zatrudnienie, edukacja, zdrowie czy ochrona socjalna. Dodatkowo znajdują się tu też kwestie, które niekoniecznie muszą być istotne z punktu widzenia osoby niepełnosprawnej. Musimy skupić się na rzeczach ważnych, takich, które skutecznie wpłyną na poprawę życia osób niepełnosprawnych, jednocześnie odrzucając te, które z realną pomocą nie mają nic wspólnego.

**Chiara Gemma (NI).** – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signora Commissaria, mi duole dire che non ci sarà una reale tutela dei diritti fondamentali per le persone con disabilità fino a quando il loro status non sarà riconosciuto reciprocamente tra gli Stati membri dell'Unione europea e fino a quando non ci sarà una rivoluzione culturale a favore della differenza. Senza questo passaggio fondamentale, tutti i nostri sforzi per garantire che i paesi applichino correttamente le disposizioni comunitarie in materia saranno vani.

Per questo motivo, la strategia europea per i diritti delle persone con disabilità 2021-2030 chiede entro la fine del 2023 la completa realizzazione della Carta europea della disabilità. Dobbiamo subito ampliare e rendere obbligatorio questo progetto pilota, insieme al contrassegno di parcheggio europeo per le persone diversamente abili. Solo così avremo a disposizione uno strumento strategico per aiutare le persone con disabilità a esercitare il loro diritto alla libera circolazione, in un'Europa senza barriere, in un'Europa senza esclusioni.

**Λουκάς Φουρλάς (PPE).** – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, κύριε Επίτροπε, τι μάθαμε λοιπόν από την πανδημία σε σχέση με τα δικαιώματα των ανθρώπων με αναπηρίες; Το πιο σημαντικό: Βιώσαμε για κάποιο διάστημα αυτό που και οι ίδιοι βιώνουν στην καθημερινότητά τους, τον αποκλεισμό και τα εμπόδια στην ελεύθερη πρόσβαση. Ελπίζω λοιπόν να μάθουμε το μάθημά μας και να αναλάβουμε επιτέλους το χρέος μας να τους διασφαλίσουμε το αυτονόητο: την προσβασιμότητα και το δικαίωμα της ένταξης στην εργασία. Έχω ήδη τοποθετηθεί και θα το επαναλάβω και ενώπιον, σας κύριε Επίτροπε, για την ανάγκη θεσμοθέτησης και νομικής κατοχύρωσης του δικαιώματός τους να μπορούν να εργάζονται όσοι το επιθυμούν με τηλεργασία και μετά την πανδημία. Τα κράτη μέλη οφείλουν να υλοποιήσουν πλήρως τη Σύμβαση των Ηνωμένων Εθνών για τα δικαιώματα των ατόμων με αναπηρίες.

Κύριοι συνάδελφοι, η αναπηρία είναι πρωτίστως θέμα ανθρωπίνων δικαιωμάτων και είναι υποχρέωσή μας ως κοινωνία των πολιτών, ως πολιτεία και ως θεσμικά όργανα να σεβαστούμε αυτά τα δικαιώματα. Και ο τρόπος είναι πάρα πολύ απλός: Με τις πολιτικές μας να βελτιώσουμε την ποιότητα ζωής τους.

**Sylvie Guillaume (S&D).** – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Commissaire, mes chers collègues, la pandémie de COVID-19 n'a pas épargné les personnes en situation de handicap, dont les situations se sont souvent aggravées. Aussi, je salue l'occasion de féliciter mon collègue Alex Agius Saliba et de discuter de ce rapport d'initiative, qui a le mérite de se baser sur de multiples pétitions portant sur la question du handicap qui ont été adressées ces dernières années et qui exigent une réponse, à savoir des propositions d'amélioration de la législation en vigueur et leur meilleure application. Je distingue, parmi toutes, quelques-unes des précieuses propositions qui m'apparaissent décisives pour une meilleure protection des personnes au niveau européen.

En premier lieu, la reconnaissance mutuelle du statut de personne handicapée dans les États membres, qui éliminera enfin un obstacle de taille au droit à la libre circulation et à l'installation dans un autre État membre pour y travailler, pour y étudier ou pour une autre raison, avec la perspective pour 2023 de l'élaboration d'une carte européenne pour les personnes handicapées.

En deuxième lieu, l'accessibilité. La directive de 2019 a certes constitué une avancée pour l'harmonisation des exigences en matière d'accessibilité applicables à certains produits et services, mais il nous faut aller plus loin et lever les restrictions persistantes sur son champ d'application.

Enfin, certaines mesures avancées concernant l'accès au marché du travail des personnes handicapées. Ce sont autant de pistes cruciales pour garantir à tous l'autonomie et la dignité.

**Sunčana Glavak (PPE).** – Poštovani predsjedavajući, povjerenice, kolegice i kolege, zahvaljujem na izvješću i želim reći da vrlo realno, no pomalo i kritički ukazuje na situaciju u kojoj se nalaze oni čije glasove možda ne čujemo dovoljno glasno.

Čuli smo već, gotovo četvrtina europskog odraslog stanovništva ima određeni stupanj oštećenja ili invalidnosti i zaštita osoba s invaliditetom je, naravno, na čemu Europska unija i svaka njezina članica treba raditi. Prije više od deset godina Europska unija pristupila je Konvenciji UN-a o pravima osoba s invaliditetom i naravno obvezali smo se na promicanje, zaštitu i praćenje prava osoba s invaliditetom u svim segmentima provedbe.

Te obveze implementirane su u europskoj strategiji od 2021. do 2030. Snažno podržavam pristupanje EU-a Konvenciji i svim međunarodnim instrumentima kojima se promiče zaštita osoba s invaliditetom, no činjenica je da implementacija nije ista u svim državama članicama. Stoga imam sjajan primjer iz Hrvatske, zemlje iz koje dolazim, koja je kao treća država u svijetu, prije brojnih gospodarski razvijenijih zemalja, ratificirala Konvenciju i pripadajući protokol.

Pravobraniteljica za osobe s invaliditetom postoji još od 2008. godine. 2017. donijeli smo nacionalnu strategiju kako bismo osobe s invaliditetom uključili u zajednicu, sve im učinili pristupačnijim i naravno uveli ih na tržište rada.

U proteklih pet godina postignut je najveći napredak u kvaliteti života osoba s invaliditetom, a postoji i jasna vizija za nadolazeće razdoblje. Štititi prava osoba s invaliditetom, reći ću na kraju, i predano raditi na poboljšanju njihove kvalitete života ... (*predsjedavajući je govorniku oduzeo riječ*)

**Cristina Maestre Martín de Almagro (S&D).** – Señor presidente, señorías, ya lo hemos dicho: si en la Unión Europea hay 87 millones de personas con discapacidad y solo el 1 % de las peticiones que debatimos aquí, en este Parlamento, tiene que ver con las personas con discapacidad, ¿quiere decir que está todo bien? No, quiere decir que no estamos haciendo todo bien. Y aquí se ha hablado de muchas deficiencias que ponen en evidencia las enormes desigualdades que todavía sufren las personas con algún tipo de discapacidad.

Y el informe de la Comisión de Peticiones es muy, muy explícito: garantizar el cumplimiento de la Convención de las Naciones Unidas sobre los Derechos de las Personas con Discapacidad. Y con este informe —por cierto, quiero felicitar al ponente y al resto de ponentes por la magnífica labor que han realizado— queremos ejercer esa responsabilidad ejerciendo el papel que tienen que tener el Parlamento Europeo y el resto de las instituciones, abriéndonos al resto de los ciudadanos, facilitando el lenguaje de signos, facilitando medidas de accesibilidad a las personas que se dirigen a nosotros y, ante todo, garantizando los derechos de las personas con discapacidad, que, hoy por hoy, en pleno siglo XXI, siguen sin estar culminados. Por lo tanto, felicito al ponente y también animo a la Comisión Europea a ejercer sus responsabilidades y sus compromisos aquí.

**Salvatore De Meo (PPE).** – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, fin quando ci sarà un dibattito o un provvedimento sui diritti delle persone con disabilità significa che esiste un problema e che c'è ancora molto da fare.

Questa risoluzione accende le responsabilità di ognuno, affinché si possa intervenire in difesa di quelle persone che ogni giorno affrontano ostacoli e discriminazione e sono private della libertà e dei diritti fondamentali alla base dell'Unione europea. Sicuramente oggi il Parlamento fa un passo in avanti per rendere ancora più forte e credibile l'azione dell'Unione europea in difesa di quasi un quarto dei suoi cittadini che soffre di una forma di disabilità.

Con questa risoluzione il Parlamento europeo non si limita ad affermazioni di principio, talvolta trascurate o poco considerate, ma impegna la Commissione e gli Stati membri ad intervenire concretamente per migliorare la qualità di tante persone con disabilità, ma soprattutto rimuovere gli ostacoli fisici e culturali che impediscono l'inclusione sociale ed economica e generano odiose discriminazioni che minano il fondamentale diritto di uguaglianza.

Sono tanti gli elementi di condivisione di questa risoluzione, ma voglio evidenziare l'importanza degli impegni assunti per prevenire le violenze sulle donne e gli impegni assunti per superare la disparità occupazionale e salariale delle donne con disabilità, che si aggiunge e amplifica quella altrettanto deprecabile che colpisce tutto il genere femminile.

Infine, vorrei evidenziare che questa relazione è il frutto di molteplici petizioni presentate da tantissimi cittadini europei nell'interesse di milioni di altri cittadini e conferma, a mio avviso, quanto sia necessario che anche il nostro Parlamento, in quanto eletto direttamente, abbia il potere di iniziativa legislativa per esprimere gli interessi di tutti i cittadini che ci hanno eletto.

**Miriam Lexmann (PPE).** – Vážený pán predsedajúci, petičné právo je jedným zo základných práv každého občana a jeho fungovanie je dôležité pre samotnú participatívnu demokraciu. Každoročne sa mnohé petície týkajú práve postavenia osôb so zdravotným postihnutím v Európskej únii. Poukazujú na prekážky, ktorým denne čelia, na neprístupnosť či diskrimináciu. Aj na základe týchto petícií vieme v našich politikách cielenejšie reagovať na ich skutočné potreby. A hoci je petičné právo deklarované pre každého, jeho využívanie je naviazané na to, aké prístupné sú samotné procesy podávania petícií. Tiež je v tomto ohľade dôležitá informovanosť občanov, ale aj otázka, koľko ľudí dokáže toto právo reálne uplatniť. Práve preto by som chcela opäť apelovať na to, aby sme pri zabezpečení prístupnosti nielen petičného práva, ale aj všetkých ostatných oblastí nezostávali iba pri vysokých ambíciách, ale aby sme prešli k činom. Implementujme riadne a včas prijatú legislatívu, ako je napríklad smernica o prístupnosti webových sídiel či audiovizuálna smernica. Prestaňme sa schovávať za množstvo výnimiek z prijatých pravidiel pre prístupnosť. A v neposlednom rade, využime dostupné všetky financie, inovácie, digitalizáciu a technologický pokrok na to, aby sme našu spoločnosť spravili inkluzívnou, bezbariérovou a aby sme plné zapojenie do nej zabezpečili skutočne pre každého.

**Helena Dalli, Member of the Commission.** – Mr President, I am grateful to honourable Members for their valuable opinions and recommendations. We agree on many of them to serve our common objective and to ensure that persons with disabilities can fully and equally enjoy their rights and participate in all areas of life.

The implementation of our new strategy has started. We will work closely with Member States, civil society and representative organisations of persons with disabilities. To step up this cooperation, we will launch the Disability Platform this year.

We will encourage Member States to adopt national strategies to foster the implementation of the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and of the EU strategy at national, regional and local level. We will promote the use of EU funding and support reforms in the Member States to help in this endeavour.

Finally, monitoring will be key to ensure effective delivery. The Commission will develop a monitoring framework for the objectives and actions of our strategy and develop data collection and new disability indicators supporting the European Semester. Petitions bring to our attention the struggles that people face in everyday life.

I thank you once again for this report that draws lessons from the petitions examined by the Parliament and gives recommendations to shape our policies. I look forward to working with you to promote the rights of persons with disabilities within a truly inclusive union of equality.

**Der Präsident.** – Die Aussprache ist geschlossen.

Die Abstimmung findet am Mittwoch, 6. Oktober 2021, statt.

*Schriftliche Erklärungen (Artikel 171)*



**Sylvia Spurek (Verts/ALE)**, *na piśmie*. – 16 procent wszystkich kobiet w UE żyje z niepełnosprawnością. To ponad 46 milionów, więcej niż populacja wielu państw członkowskich. Mimo to ich potrzeby pozostają niewidoczne dla prawa i polityk Unii Europejskiej. Kobiety z niepełnosprawnościami doświadczają przemocy ze względu na płeć i dyskryminacji krzyżowej. Mierzą się z wykluczeniem na rynku pracy, w opiece medycznej, w edukacji i transporcie publicznym. W Polsce mogą zostać całkowicie ubezwłasnowolnione ze względu na niepełnosprawność intelektualną, pozbawione fundamentalnego prawa do decydowania o sobie. Samodzielności i godności państwo odmawia im też w innych sytuacjach, zmuszając do życia w instytucjach albo nie dostosowując gabinetów ginekologicznych do potrzeb kobiet z niepełnosprawnością ruchową. Rezolucja, o której dziś dyskutujemy, zwraca uwagę na te problemy. Tylko kiedy zwrócą na nie uwagę Komisja i państwa członkowskie?

## 16. Ramy polityki bezpieczeństwa ruchu drogowego UE na lata 2021-2030 — zalecenia dotyczące kolejnych kroków w kierunku realizacji „wizji zero” (debata)

**Der Präsident**. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über den Bericht von Elena Kountoura im Namen des Ausschusses für Verkehr und Tourismus über den EU-Politikrahmen für die Straßenverkehrssicherheit im Zeitraum 2021 bis 2030 — Empfehlungen für die nächsten Schritte auf dem Weg zur „Vision Null Straßenverkehrstote“ (2021/2014(INI)) (A9-0211/2021).

**Έλενα Κουντουρά**, *εισηγήτρια*. – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, κάθε χρόνο χάνουν τη ζωή τους στους ευρωπαϊκούς δρόμους περισσότεροι από 20.000 συμπολίτες μας και παιδιά. Το τίμημα αυτό είναι τραγικό και απαράδεκτο αλλά όχι αναπόφευκτο. Αγαπητοί συνάδελφοι, αγαπητή Επιτροπε, βρισκόμαστε σε κατάσταση έκτακτης ανάγκης και το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο μέσα από την έκθεση αυτή ζητάει ισχυρή βούληση, δράση και άμεσα αποτελέσματα από όλους μας. Οι οικογένειές μας, οι αγαπημένοι μας και εμείς χρησιμοποιούμε τους δρόμους καθημερινά, είτε ως οδηγοί, είτε ως πεζοί, ως ποδηλάτες, και είμαστε όλοι δυνητικά θύματα της ασφάλτου. Η έκθεσή μας αποτελεί έναν οδικό χάρτη που θα φέρει αποτελέσματα και θα οδηγήσει την Ευρώπη στην επίτευξη του στόχου για μείωση των νεκρών και σοβαρά τραυματισμένων κατά 50% έως το 2030.

Ωστόσο, ο στόχος για το 2030 είναι μόνο το επόμενο βήμα. Πρέπει να θέσουμε ως ύψιστη πολιτική, κοινωνική και προσωπική προτεραιότητα να μηδενίσουμε τον αριθμό των νεκρών και των σοβαρά τραυματισμένων μέχρι το 2050, κάνοντας πράξη το όραμα μηδενικών απωλειών («vision zero»). Ο στόχος μας είναι φιλόδοξος αλλά είμαι πεπεισμένη ότι είναι και εφικτός. Ξέρουμε ήδη ποιοι παράγοντες ευθύνονται για τους περισσότερους θανάτους. Είναι γνωστοί τόσο από εμπειρικά δεδομένα όσο και επειδή έχουν μελετηθεί εκτενώς: η ταχύτητα, το αλκοόλ, οι προβληματικές υποδομές, η μη τήρηση των κανόνων οδικής κυκλοφορίας και η ατιμωρησία. Με ικανοποιεί το γεγονός ότι η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή έχει θέσει εκ νέου στόχο τη μείωση των νεκρών και σοβαρά τραυματισμένων κατά 50% μέχρι το τέλος της δεκαετίας και είναι ίσως πιο σημαντικό ότι για την επίτευξη του στόχου αυτού εισάγει μια νέα, ολιστική προσέγγιση, την προσέγγιση του ασφαλούς συστήματος. Η προσέγγιση αυτή βασίζεται στην παραδοχή ότι η αποφυγή θανάτων και σοβαρών τραυματισμών είναι εφικτή ακόμα κι αν τα ανθρώπινα λάθη δεν θα εκλείψουν ποτέ· πιο ασφαλή οχήματα, πιο ασφαλείς υποδομές, που θα περιορίσουν τον κίνδυνο από το ανθρώπινο σφάλμα, σε συνδυασμό με ένα ισχυρό υγειονομικό σύστημα που ανταποκρίνεται άμεσα στις ανάγκες πάνω στην ασφάλτο.

Στην έκθεσή μας θίγουμε τα πιο βασικά αίτια που προκαλούν θανάτους και σοβαρούς τραυματισμούς και προτείνουμε συγκεκριμένα μέτρα, τόσο σε ευρωπαϊκό όσο και σε εθνικό επίπεδο. Θα αναφέρω ορισμένα:

Ο ρόλος των υποδομών είναι κρίσιμος. Πρέπει να γίνει συστηματική καταγραφή και αξιολόγηση των ευρωπαϊκών δρόμων, ώστε να κατευθυνθούν οι επενδύσεις στα πιο επικίνδυνα σημεία κατά προτεραιότητα. Πρέπει επομένως να εξασφαλιστούν οι απαραίτητοι εθνικοί και ευρωπαϊκοί πόροι και να αξιοποιηθούν πλήρως όλα τα χρηματοδοτικά εργαλεία, συμπεριλαμβανομένου του ταμείου ανάκαμψης και ανθεκτικότητας.

Η ταχύτητα σκοτώνει. Είναι ανεπίτρεπτο η κοινωνία μας να αποδέχεται ως όριο ταχύτητας μέσα στις αστικές περιοχές όπου κινούνται πεζοί και ποδηλάτες τα 50 χιλιόμετρα την ώρα. Αν και μειώνονται σταθερά οι θάνατοι των οδηγών, δυστυχώς οι θάνατοι πεζών και ποδηλατών παραμένουν ανησυχητικά συχνοί, και μάλιστα αυξάνονται σε πολλές περιπτώσεις. Είναι πια πολλά τα παραδείγματα πόλεων που έχουν μειώσει το όριο ταχύτητας στα 30 χιλιόμετρα, και τα οφέλη είναι τεράστια. Περιμένουμε από την Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή να πράξει το σωστό και να προβεί αμέσως σε μία ευρωπαϊκή σύσταση για την καθιέρωση του ορίου των 30 χιλιομέτρων την ώρα οριζόντια σε όλες τις ευρωπαϊκές πόλεις. Αλλά και εκτός πόλεων η ταχύτητα πρέπει να μετριάζεται ακόμα και με τεχνικά μέσα όπως τα ευφυή συστήματα ελέγχου ταχύτητας. Τα αυτοκίνητα δεν είναι μέσο διασκέδασης και δημιουργίας συγκινήσεων, όπως προσπαθεί να μας πείσει η βιομηχανία, άλλα μέσα μεταφοράς με κυρίαρχο κριτήριο να είναι ασφαλή για όλους τους χρήστες των υποδομών.

Επίσης προτείνουμε μηδενική ανοχή στη χρήση αλκοόλ και ναρκωτικών και την ορθή επιβολή των κανόνων ακόμη και διασυνοριακά, ζητάμε δε τη διασφάλιση επαρκούς στήριξης προς τις οικογένειες των θυμάτων τροχαίων ατυχημάτων.

Πρέπει επιτέλους να κλείσει η ψαλίδα των επιδόσεων στην οδική ασφάλεια των ευρωπαϊκών χωρών. Τα κράτη με τις χειρότερες επιδόσεις χρειάζονται την ανάλογη στήριξη και τεχνογνωσία, και σε αυτό η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση μπορεί να παίξει καταλυτικό ρόλο. Γι' αυτό προτείνουμε τη δημιουργία ενός νέου ευρωπαϊκού οργανισμού για οδικές μεταφορές, στα πρότυπα των οργανισμών για τις σιδηροδρομικές, αεροπορικές και θαλάσσιες μεταφορές. Θα ήθελα επίσης να τονίσω το αίτημά μας να θεσπιστεί ευρωπαϊκό έτος για την οδική ασφάλεια, ώστε να ευαισθητοποιηθούν και να ενημερωθούν οι Ευρωπαίοι πολίτες για το «όραμα μηδέν», τον νέο ευρωπαϊκό στόχο μείωσης θανάτων κατά 50% το 2030, τη νέα μας στρατηγική και πώς μπορούν οι ίδιοι να σώσουν ζωές στους δρόμους της Ευρώπης.

Τέλος, θα ήθελα να ευχαριστήσω τους σκιώδεις εισηγητές για την εξαιρετική τους συνεργασία και γιατί εμπλούτισαν ουσιαστικά την έκθεση με σημαντικές προτάσεις που έχουν ενσωματωθεί με μεγάλες πλειοψηφίες. Ελπίζω ότι θα έχουμε την ευκαιρία να συνεχίσουμε τη συνεργασία μας και τα επόμενα χρόνια, με στόχο να γίνει πράξη η φιλόδοξη ευρωπαϊκή πολιτική για την οδική ασφάλεια. Θα συνεχίσουμε βέβαια και τη συνεργασία μας και με την Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή, και ειδικά τον συντονιστή για την οδική ασφάλεια, κύριο Baldwin, η αφοσίωσή του οποίου στη βελτίωση της οδικής ασφάλειας στην Ευρώπη είναι πραγματικά αξιοθαύμαστη και πολύτιμη.

**Helena Dalli**, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, honourable Members, on behalf of Commissioner Vălean, who was unable to be here this evening, the Commission very much welcomes this important report on road safety, and would like to thank Ms Kountoura and the Committee on Transport and Tourism for their continued strong support for our work on road safety.

While the number of road deaths fell by an unprecedented 17% in 2020, this was due largely to lower traffic volumes as a result of the pandemic. The figure of 19 000 fatalities across the EU remains unacceptably high. In the sustainable and smart mobility strategy, the Commission reiterated its commitment to implementing the EU road safety policy framework and bringing down to close to zero the death toll for all modes of transport.

However, I want to stress that the Vision Zero is a joint responsibility. Success will depend on all of us playing our part from European, national and regional and local authorities, to police and health services, from all road users, employers to bike share operators, to car makers. We all have an interest in making our roads safer in partnership. I can assure you the Commission is working very closely with the Member States to ensure an effective implementation of the safe-system approach throughout Europe.

Ms Kountoura's report includes a number of constructive proposals and recommendations to which the Commission will give due consideration. I shall highlight a few of these issues.

The Commission fully agrees that road safety is an integral part of sustainable and smart mobility. There can be no sustainability without safety. As we build transport infrastructure, we need it to be both green and safe. When we improve the infrastructure for cyclists and pedestrians for instance, we both encourage reduction of our carbon footprint, healthy active mobility and we make it safer.

Indeed, as the EU becomes more urban, road safety is becoming increasingly an urban question, and vulnerable road users, pedestrians, cyclists and motorcyclists now account for 70% of traffic fatalities in our cities. Much of our current focus is on preparing a new legislative package, including revisions of the Driving Licence Directive and the directive on cross-border enforcement of traffic rules.

We will also update the rules on roadworthiness where we will be looking both at emissions and safety elements, as well as odometer fraud. And we are also looking closely into factors such as speed and alcohol consumption and reflecting on possible EU recommendations to address them.

More specifically on speed, we take note of the Parliament's position and the strong engagement of stakeholders at global and local level. We are looking very closely into this issue, in particular assessing the gains for road safety in those European cities which set a maximum speed of 30 km per hour in residential areas. We are also working closely with our partners to ensure that EU funding can be targeted towards road safety projects.

Of course, better infrastructure is a key factor in improving road safety. We have encouraged investment in road safety upgrades as part of the Recovery and Resilience Facility. European Investment Bank loans, structural and cohesion funds and the Connecting Europe Facility also provide additional avenues to incentivise actions in this field.

The Commission is also grateful to the European Parliament for its support for the European Road Safety Exchange, which is a twinning project bringing safety professionals from different EU Member States together to help address specific road safety problems. The feedback today has been very positive. We are making good progress on establishing a first set of key road safety performance indicators based on a common methodology, and we expect the first set of results next year.

We look forward to engaging with the Member States and the Parliament to help shape future work. We have also relaunched an important European road safety tool, the European Road Safety Charter. This is a huge network of over 3 000 people, organisations, civil society and companies with an interest in road safety. It offers a perfect opportunity to share and reward good practice and to learn from each other.

The 2021 EU Road Safety Awards ceremony will take place on 18 November, and Parliament is invited to help us make this event a real success. The Commission fully shares the need for EU road safety policy to be adaptable to change, in particular with regard to the development of automated vehicles.

An EU partnership under Horizon Europe on connected, cooperative and automated mobility has been set up to promote and facilitate large-scale testing in this field. Our goal is to enable the safe introduction of automation on EU roads. The work of the partnership will go hand-in-hand with policy and legislative updates needed to take full advantage of these developments for safer, more sustainable and inclusive mobility.

The Commission takes note of your proposals for staging a European year of road safety and the creation of a new agency for road transport. We recognise the potential benefits of both, but also need to consider the costs, of course. We will continue to reflect on these options and report back to you on progress achieved.

Once again, I thank the rapporteur, Ms Kountoura, and the shadows for preparing this important report, and the Commission looks forward to its adoption in plenary later this week.

**Benoît Lutgen**, *au nom du groupe PPE*. – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Commissaire, Madame la Rapporteuse, d'abord merci de votre ouverture d'esprit lors des discussions et du débat; nous avons eu l'habitude de travailler ensemble, notamment sur le rapport «contrôle technique» et tout le paquet qui l'accompagnait.

20 000 personnes, 20 000 familles qui sont touchées en Europe chaque année, cela représente un peu plus qu'une ville comme la mienne, cela nous touche évidemment tous profondément. Il y a une grande disparité au niveau européen en matière de sécurité routière. Si l'on regarde les chiffres de plus près, on voit qu'il y a certes une baisse ces dernières années, mais qu'elle n'est pas la même partout, d'une part, et surtout qu'il y a un rapport de un à quatre fois plus d'accidents entre le meilleur pays, la Suède, et ceux qui sont moins bons en matière de sécurité routière. Quatre fois plus d'accidents, quatre fois plus de victimes.

C'est pourquoi, au-delà de l'évidence – réduire la vitesse, réduire la consommation de drogue et d'alcool au volant, être extrêmement strict et répressif en la matière, mais aussi éducatif, bien sûr, et cela se retrouve largement dans le rapport –, je pense que nous devons aller de l'avant dans le partage des bonnes pratiques et mettre en place dans tous les États membres – c'est l'ambition que la Commission doit avoir – les bonnes pratiques qui ont fait leurs preuves dans différents États membres.

C'est dans cet esprit de collaboration que l'Union, avec la Commission, pourra effectivement apporter des solutions sur le plan de la sécurité routière. Cela se fera avec les différents éléments que j'ai indiqués, mais aussi avec des éléments nouveaux, je pense notamment à la puissance des véhicules – et on trouvera une alliance entre sécurité et environnement – car elle représente aussi un danger pour l'ensemble des usagers, singulièrement les piétons et les cyclistes. Nous devons donc agir en amont sur la production de véhicules qui permettent d'éviter ce type d'accident.

Enfin, et ce sera ma conclusion, nous devons tous ensemble avoir la capacité de renforcer partout en Europe, dans tous nos territoires et singulièrement les territoires ruraux, la sécurité routière pour les jeunes et pour l'ensemble de nos habitants.

**Isabel García Muñoz**, *en nombre del Grupo S&D*. – Señor presidente, señora comisaria Dalli, cada año mueren alrededor de 22 700 personas y 120 000 resultan heridas de gravedad en las carreteras europeas. El compromiso de mi Grupo S&D con el objetivo de «visión cero» es firme, y para conseguirlo se necesita una clara apuesta por la inversión en seguridad vial. Hay que proteger a los usuarios de las vías públicas, sobre todo a los más vulnerables, hay que promover una actitud responsable al volante y hay que reforzar la seguridad de los vehículos y, sobre todo, invertir en las infraestructuras. Es clave para reducir la mortalidad en las carreteras.

Pero también necesitamos planes de movilidad que apuesten por modelos de transporte más sostenibles y seguros, como el transporte público, y que apoyen la movilidad activa. Es imprescindible abordar prácticas que se han intensificado con la pandemia, como el aumento de trabajadores de reparto, cuya seguridad y salud habría que garantizar desde un marco europeo, o el aumento de nuevos dispositivos de micromovilidad, como patinetes y bicicletas eléctricas, cuyo uso habría que regular también, así como habilitar zonas de aparcamiento que eviten que estos entorpezcan la vía pública.

Como ven, este informe propone medidas ambiciosas y, por eso, espero que la Comisión lo estudie a conciencia.

**Илхан Кючюк**, *от итето на групата Renew*. – Г-н Председател, колеги, потресаваща е статистиката: близо 23 хиляди смъртни случая при пътнотранспортни произшествия всяка година в Европа. За съжаление тя не бележи особено подобрене през последните няколко години, а зад тези цифри стоят прекършени човешки съдби и разбити мечти. Това е неприемлива и ненужна човешка цена за мобилността.

С колегите от комисията по транспорт работихме по препоръките за Рамка на Европейския съюз относно пътната безопасност за постигане на целта нулева смъртност, водени от убеждението, че трябва да променим тази статистика. Предложенията ни отчитат анализа, че само 8% от смъртните случаи стават на автомагистралите, а цели 54% — на второстепенни пътища в селски райони. Те са основани на три стълба: първо – по-безопасни превозни средства; второ – по-безопасни пътища и, разбира се, трето – подобрени спешни услуги.

Нужни са ни интензивни и съвместни усилия, прилагане на научни изследвания и иновации, хармонизиране на националните подходи за пътна безопасност, по-строги мерки и нулева търпимост към шофирането в нетрезво състояние, с единствената и ясна идея за спазването на правилата и опазването на живота и здравето на всички участници в пътния транспорт. Важно е и подобряването на аварийната инфраструктура, включително чрез предоставяне на въздушни медицински услуги в отдалечените планински райони.

**Tilly Metz**, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Mr President, last Friday, in Mondercange, a 91-year old woman was hit by a lorry on a zebra crossing. She died from her injuries. She is one of around 23 000 people still dying every year on EU roads, including many children. Furthermore, 120 000 also get seriously injured.

This is not acceptable! The EU has to step up its action to reduce deaths and serious injuries. Speeding is a factor in a third of all fatal road crashes. Therefore, we call for safe speed limits on all roads, and especially for 30 km per hour as a default speed in residential areas.

It is also key to promote lighter and smaller cars, which are much safer for all road users.

We also call for urban space to be redesigned, putting people and public transport at the centre and promoting active mobility with safe infrastructure for those walking and cycling because, when it comes to mobility, safety and sustainability go hand in hand.

**Roman Haider**, *im Namen der ID-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident! „Vision Null Straßenverkehrstote“, so lautet die plakative Überschrift des heutigen Berichts. Die Reduktion von Straßenverkehrstoten ist natürlich ein Ziel, dem sich alle Abgeordneten anschließen können. Aber, um es gleich in aller Deutlichkeit zu sagen: Es ist natürlich ein utopisches Ziel. Solange es Verkehr gibt, wird es leider auch Tote geben. Das müssen wir, so leid es uns tut, auch zur Kenntnis nehmen.

Daher kann es immer nur eine Annäherung an dieses Ziel geben. Die Verbesserung der Straßenverkehrssicherheit ist ein stetig andauernder Prozess. Es wird dabei nie ein Ende geben. Immer wieder werden neue Verbesserungen notwendig sein.

Neue technische Entwicklungen werden uns auch immer wieder vor neue Herausforderungen stellen, aber auch die Verkehrssicherheit verbessern. Dabei ist aber immer darauf zu achten, dass diese neuen Techniken auch wirklich hilfreich sind. Man hat ja manchmal den Eindruck, dass so mancher Hilfsassistent für den Autofahrer eher wie eine Plage wirkt und nur wenig hilfreich ist. Da wird manchmal übers Ziel hinausgeschossen, das muss man auch sagen.

Völlig übers Ziel hinausgeschossen wird jedoch in diesem Bericht bei zwei Vorschlägen. Das eine ist der Vorschlag „Tempo 30 in allen europäischen Großstädten“. Straßen dienen der Fortbewegung – der Fortbewegung und nicht dem Stillstand. Das ist ein typisches Beispiel von linker Verbotspolitik ohne Maß und Ziel. Als nächstes kommt dann wahrscheinlich „Tempo 80 auf Autobahnen“. Da geht jedes Verhältnis zwischen Nutzen und Schaden völlig verloren. Gleiches gilt auch für die Forderung von 0,0 Promille im Straßenverkehr. Die jetzigen Grenzen von 0,5 bzw. 0,8 sind völlig ausreichend.

Wieder einmal werden sinnvolle Ansätze durch völlig überschießende und utopische Forderungen konterkariert. Das zieht sich inzwischen wie ein roter Faden durch alle Politikbereiche der EU. Das zeigt auch, welch freiheitsfeindliches Denken in der EU da um sich gegriffen hat. Selbstverantwortung ist hier offensichtlich zu einem Fremdwort geworden.

**Kosma Złotowski**, *w imieniu grupy ECR*. – Panie Przewodniczący! Panie Komisarzu! Obserwowane w ostatnich latach spowolnienie tempa poprawy bezpieczeństwa ruchu drogowego w Unii Europejskiej to bez wątpienia sygnał, że najwyższy czas zrewidować dotychczasowe przepisy. Cel „wizji zero” jest ambitny, więc jeśli rzeczywiście chcemy go osiągnąć, musimy działać na wielu frontach.

Cieszę się, że udało nam się stworzyć sprawozdanie, w którym najważniejsze kwestie, takie jak zerowa tolerancja dla prowadzenia po alkoholu, konieczność zmian w zakresie limitów prędkości, bezpieczeństwo wrażliwych uczestników ruchu drogowego czy dbałość o bezpieczeństwo infrastruktury, zostały uzupełnione o szereg rozwiązań potrzebnych, ale mniej oczywistych.

Mam tu na myśli zaproponowane przez grupę ECR wdrożenie zachęt do zakupu najbezpieczniejszych samochodów, utworzenie platformy wymiany informacji z państwami trzecimi o popełnianych wykroczeniach drogowych, wprowadzenie obowiązku formowania korytarzy życia do krajowych kodeksów drogowych czy wypracowanie dokładniejszego systemu raportowania o ofiarach wypadków.

Szczególnie dziękuję sprawozdawcy za włączenie do dokumentu naszej poprawki dotyczącej dostępu do informacji o parametrach bezpieczeństwa systemów służących do przewożenia dzieci w transporcie samochodowym. Wzrost świadomości społecznej jest niewątpliwie naszym sprzymierzeńcem w walce o poprawę bezpieczeństwa ruchu drogowego, dlatego nie powinniśmy stawiać żadnych barier w dostępie do tak istotnych danych.

Jeszcze raz dziękuję za współpracę przy tym sprawozdaniu i mam nadzieję, że zaproponowane w nim rozwiązania staną się bodźcem do powrotu na ścieżkę...

(Przewodniczący odebrał mówcy głos)

**Kateřina Konečná**, za skupinu *The Left*. – Pane předsedající, paní komisařko, nejprve mi prosím dovolte poděkovat kolegyni Kountouraové za její povedený návrh usnesení, který se věnuje zásadnímu tématu bezpečnosti na silnicích. Každý rok přichází na silnicích v Evropské unii o život stále přibližně 22 700 osob a asi 120 000 jich je vážně zraněno.

Vnímám tedy pozitivně, že země EU potvrzují svůj dlouhodobý strategický cíl dosáhnout do roku 2050 téměř nulového počtu úmrtí a nulového počtu vážných zranění na unijních silnicích. V rámci této vize nulových obětí na cestách se vede debata o bezpečnosti silniční infrastruktury, moderních technologiích, značkách apod.

Domnívám se však, že by členské státy měly rovněž podporovat ty řidiče, kteří se chtějí zdokonalovat. I prostřednictvím zážitkových kurzů bezpečné jízdy, eventů, testováním automobilů na speciálních kluzných plochách si každý řidič může na polygonech EU ověřit své schopnosti nebo kvalitu svého vozidla. Jsou to tréninkové báze, střediska pro řidiče s vysokou společensky přidanou hodnotou, zážitková centra pro řidiče, které již dnes vnímá celá řada subjektů.

Jsem přesvědčena, že členské státy by měly tyto aktivity podporovat, jelikož zkušenosti nabitě z těchto zkušebních míst mohou vést ke správnému rozhodnutí ve chvíli, kdy se náš život dostane na křižovatku mezi životem a smrtí.

**Mario Furore (NI)**. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, l'obiettivo che ci siamo posti per il 2050 è ambizioso e purtroppo dobbiamo ricordare che non siamo riusciti a raggiungere l'obiettivo del 2020 di dimezzare i morti su strada e capire quali siano le debolezze da correggere.

Alcuni paesi sono in ritardo nell'attuazione delle misure da prendere, e a farne le spese sono le fasce più deboli della popolazione, anziani in primis. Abbiamo ancora molto da fare. Innanzitutto dobbiamo concentrarci sulla prevenzione, che passa attraverso l'educazione, la formazione, la messa in sicurezza delle infrastrutture. Dobbiamo potenziare le infrastrutture e adeguarle a una nuova idea di sicurezza stradale che si avvalga dell'evoluzione tecnologica e delle nuove modalità di spostamento delle aree urbane.

Concludo dicendo che è il momento di ripensare alla mobilità a misura d'uomo, mettendo le persone al centro delle politiche. Abbiamo ancora molta strada da fare. È tempo di iniziare.

**Андрей Новаков (PPE)**. – Г-н Председател, колеги, бях на 11 години, когато семейството ми успя да събере пари за кола за първи път. Разбира се, беше втора ръка. Разбира се, беше от Германия, като това беше единствената опция за личен транспорт. Сходно беше положението в семействата на моите връстници, то е сходно и в момента и то в повече държави в Европейския съюз, отколкото предполагате.

Често пъти сме казвали, че човешкият живот няма цена. Колите обаче имат и често пъти тя е непосилна за много хора. Често пъти единствената опция да имаш личен транспорт е да имаш кола втора ръка и затова искам да говоря за една измама, която има колосален мащаб. Според независими доклади 50% от колите втора употреба са с манипулиран километраж — всяка втора. Огледайте се следващия път, като излезете на улицата.

Преди време предложих на Европейската комисия пилотен проект, който се бори точно с тази измама — одобрен е и е финансиран. И въпреки това все още има държави, които не споделят реалния пробег на своите автомобили: този, който се събира по време на годишните технически прегледи и не разбирам защо. Няма причина за това. Когато продаваш кола на един милион километра, а твърдиш че е на 100 хиляди, не крадеш пари само от най-уязвимите, а крадеш безопасност от всички нас.

Нека сложим точка на това, нека всички държави се включат в този пилотен проект, нека сложим край на тази измама и най-после поне един от факторите за много от катастрофите в Европейския съюз да бъде премахнат.

**Johan Danielsson (S&D).** – Herr talman! Över 400 personer mister sina liv på vägarna i EU varje vecka. Det är lastbilschaufförer, busschaufförer, barnfamiljer, någons vän, föräldrar eller barn, och det är viktigt att komma ihåg att vägsäkerhet även är en arbetsmiljöfråga.

I Sverige har bara under de senaste tio åren 66 lastbilschaufförer dött på sitt arbete och det europeiska transportarbetarförbundet visade i en undersökning att 60 procent av lastbilschaufförerna regelbundet kör trötta. Problemen riskerar också att öka med den växande plattformsekonomin där arbetare oftast pressas till det yttersta. Ska vi minska dödsfallen på våra vägar måste vi fokusera på alla de män och kvinnor som kör lastbil, buss, taxi eller genomför vägarbeten.

Avslutningsvis vill jag också understryka vikten av standarder för krockdockor som representerar hela befolkningen. Att kvinnliga krockdockor i dag inte används är oacceptabelt och bidrar till försämrad vägsäkerhet.

**José Ramón Bauzá Díaz (Renew).** – Señor presidente, hasta ahora hemos estado escuchando cifras y números, pero yo les quiero hablar, en este caso, de personas y de un nombre en concreto: el de Paula Torrens, una chica que fue atropellada en Mallorca en el año 2018 por una persona que no tenía permiso de circulación, que iba ebria y que además se dio a la fuga. Y, como Paula, hay más de 2 500 personas que anualmente mueren como consecuencia de personas que están al mando de un vehículo y que conducen bajo los efectos del alcohol. Y por eso precisamente las instituciones debemos coordinarnos en todos los ámbitos institucionales, para que eso no pase y no vuelva a suceder. Estamos viendo cómo en países como es el caso de Austria, de Bélgica o de Francia, se están poniendo en marcha mecanismos con dispositivos antiarranque; y en España, gracias a Ciudadanos, también dentro de poco esto se podrá poner en marcha.

Y lo vemos ahora con el caso de los transportistas, pero también deberíamos ampliarlo a todo tipo de vehículos, para evitar que cualquier persona ebria pueda ponerse a los mandos de un vehículo.

Por lo tanto, señorías, debemos demostrar a los ciudadanos europeos que la Unión se preocupa por ellos y que además estamos empeñados en proteger su vida, porque así la tragedia de Paula no se volvería a producir nunca más en Europa.

**Ciarán Cuffe (Verts/ALE).** – Mr President, ‘One False Move’ was a study of children’s independent spatial mobility, published by Mayer Hillman and others almost 30 years ago. Mayer Hillman is one of my heroes, and in a week in which he celebrates his 90th birthday, it’s worth recalling his research on road safety from 1990.

He said then that children’s independent spatial mobility was being eroded by dangerously speeding cars. That campaign, ‘One False Move’, could now be described as victim blaming, and it continues to be deeply embedded in the thinking of road safety organisations who continue to disproportionately insist on high-vis clothing, helmets and flashing lights for pedestrians and cyclists. These well-meaning messages are abnormalising what should be the normal and sustainable behaviour of walking and cycling, or indeed playing in the street. That’s why we must lower speed limits, insist on the 30 km per hour limit in residential areas and give children the ...

*(The President cut off the speaker)*

**Krzysztof Hetman (PPE).** – Panie Przewodniczący! Pani Komisarz! Szanowni Państwo! Każdego roku w Unii Europejskiej dochodzi do blisko miliona wypadków drogowych, w których życie traci około 23 tysięcy osób. Tylko w moim kraju, w Polsce, w zeszłym roku życie na drogach straciło blisko dwa i pół tysiąca osób. Pomimo znaczącej poprawy sytuacji na przestrzeni ostatnich lat skala tego zjawiska w dalszym ciągu jest ogromna i przerażająca. Dlatego potrzebne są kolejne intensywne działania ukierunkowane na poprawę bezpieczeństwa drogowego. Będąc realistą wiem, że zapewne nie będziemy nigdy w stanie całkowicie wyeliminować wypadków drogowych. Jednak musimy dążyć do tego, by wypadki, jeśli już do nich dochodzi, nie powodowały śmierci lub ciężkiego uszczerbku na zdrowiu.

W tym celu konieczne są działania z jednej strony ukierunkowane na poprawę jakości infrastruktury drogowej, która powinna w sposób maksymalny zapewnić bezpieczeństwo użytkowników ruchu drogowego. Z drugiej strony musimy zapewnić, by pojazdy poruszające się po drogach wyposażone były w technologie wspierające kierowcę w bezpiecznej jeździe. Cieszę się, że już od maja przyszłego roku dodatkowe systemy bezpieczeństwa – takie jak inteligentne wspomaganie prędkości, czy zaawansowany system hamowania awaryjnego – będą musiały być instalowane w nowych pojazdach, co – mam nadzieję – przyczyni się do redukcji liczby wypadków.

**Vera Tax (S&D).** – Voorzitter, geachte commissaris, 60 procent van alle vrachtwagenchauffeurs is moe tijdens het rijden. Dat is gevaarlijk voor hen en ook voor ons allemaal op de weg. Daarom dit voorstel voor het verbeteren van de wegveiligheid op onze wegen. Er moet gericht actie worden ondernomen zodat chauffeurs niet moe zijn tijdens het rijden en goede arbeidsomstandigheden hebben.

In Nederland hebben we succes geboekt door alle nieuwe vrachtwagens verplicht uit te rusten met parkeerairco en -verwarming, zodat chauffeurs de juiste temperatuur in de cabine hebben als ze rusten. Ik ben dan ook blij dat mijn voorstel om de parkeerairco in heel Europa als onderdeel van verkeersveiligheid te onderzoeken, is overgenomen door het Europees Parlement.

En net zo belangrijk: ik spreek vaak met chauffeurs die vertellen dat de controle op de Europese transportregels in elke lidstaat anders is. Dat is frustrerend: EU-regels moeten in elk land gelden, in elk land gecontroleerd worden en op vergelijkbare wijze beboet worden. Daarom heb ik de Commissie gevraagd naar de uitvoering van alle lidstaten als het gaat om de handhaving van de regels van het mobiliteitspakket. Het heeft geen zin om heldere regels te hebben als de handhaving een chaos is. Er is een groot tekort aan beroepschauffeurs. Laten we werken aan betere en gezonde arbeidsomstandigheden.

**Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (Renew).** – Señor presidente, el factor humano es hoy la principal causa de accidentes de tráfico en la Unión Europea. Alcohol y drogas y exceso de velocidad, habitualmente combinados, están en el origen de más de la mitad del millón de siniestros que se producen cada año en la Unión Europea. Necesitamos tolerancia cero con estas infracciones, retirar de la carretera a los consumidores de estas sustancias, reforzar la formación, apostar por la digitalización; una conexión productiva entre infraestructuras y vehículos hará más seguras las carreteras.

Esas son las apuestas normativas y financieras que puede hacer la Unión a una seguridad vial que necesita mejores indicadores y un esfuerzo especial en las ciudades. Es urgente proteger mejor a peatones y ciclistas para fomentar con seguridad una movilidad más sostenible.

Bilbao, premiada por la Comisión por ser la primera ciudad europea en implantar el límite de treinta kilómetros por hora en todo el casco urbano, ha evitado en un año, con esta y otras medidas, uno de cada tres accidentes de los que se registraban en sus calles. Creo que puede servir de ejemplo.

**Helena Dalli, Member of the Commission.** – Mr President, I would like to thank you and the honourable Members for this debate. I have taken good note of your comments and will pass them on to Commissioner Vălean. The Commission is confident that, with the continued support of the European Parliament and with the buy-in of Member States, we will be able to deliver on our road-safety commitments for the decade ahead, whilst ensuring that the framework remains, as Ms Kountoura puts it, fit for the future.

**Der Präsident.** – Die Aussprache ist geschlossen.

Die Abstimmung findet am Dienstag, 5. Oktober 2021, statt.

*Schriftliche Erklärungen (Artikel 171)*

**Λευτέρης Χριστοφόρου (PPE), γραπτώς.** – Όπως σημειώνει η εισηγήτρια στη σχετική έκθεση, κάθε χρόνο συμβαίνουν περίπου 1 εκατομμύριο συγκρούσεις στην ΕΕ. Μόνο το 2019 σημειώθηκαν 23.000 θάνατοι και 12.000 σοβαροί τραυματισμοί. Μολονότι η ΕΕ και τα κράτη μέλη της έχουν επιτύχει σημαντική πρόοδο στον τομέα της οδικής ασφάλειας κατά τις τελευταίες δεκαετίες, οι αριθμοί αυτοί είναι ιδιαίτερα ανησυχητικοί. Η οδική ασφάλεια πρέπει να αποτελέσει προτεραιότητα σε πολιτικό, κοινωνικό και προσωπικό επίπεδο. Επιπλέον, αυτά τα τωρινά στοιχεία αντικατοπτρίζουν μελλοντικές τραγωδίες με αποτέλεσμα τεράστιο κόστος για την κοινωνία. Αυτός είναι ο λόγος για τον οποίο το μακροπρόθεσμο όραμα της ΕΕ είναι να επιτύχει την καλύτερη δυνατή προσέγγιση μηδενικών θανάτων εξαιτίας των οδικών μεταφορών έως το 2050 (Vision Zero). Το θεμελιώδες δικαίωμά μας στην κινητικότητα δεν θα πρέπει να συνοδεύεται από θανάτους από τροχαία ατυχήματα και η αρχή αυτή πρέπει να ενσωματωθεί σε όλες τις αποφάσεις σχετικά με την οδική ασφάλεια.



**Ангел Джамбазки (ECR), в писмена форма.** – Важен проблем има с водачите на тежкотоварни камиони, които идват извън страните от ЕС. Както знаете, в голямата си част, те не спазват забраните за шофиране повече от осем часа дневно без почивка. Многократно по пътищата на България, Румъния и Германия сме свидетели на заспали водачи, най-често от турски произход, които създават пътнотранспортни произшествия и, за съжаление, в повечето случаи те са с жертви. Както се казва и в резолюцията, най-голям процент, повече от половината, пътнотранспортни произшествия стават по пътищата в селските райони. За съжаление има цели региони в Европа, които не влизат, и за съжаление не виждам и намерение от ЕК да ги включи, в развитието на TEN-T мрежата. Разбира се, тук ще отбележа и бившия коридор номер 8, който свързва българските пристанища Варна и Бургас с италианските Бари и Бриндизи през албанските Драч и Вльора. Няма как да пропусна и пакета Мобилност I, искаме да намалим пътнотранспортните произшествия, а в същото време вземаме решение стотици празни камиони да се движат от единия край на Европа до другия, само за да може дадени колеги от Парламента да изпълнят предизборните си обещания, поети пред техните синдикални избиратели. За мен това е меко казано лицемерие.

**Andor Deli (NI), írásban.** – Az elmúlt évek statisztikai adatai alapján a közlekedési balesetekben életüket veszített vagy súlyos sérüléseket elszenvedő uniós polgárok száma még mindig magas, és stagnáló tendenciát mutat az egész EU területén. Átlagosan napi 500 ember veszíti életét, és 300 személy szenved súlyos sérüléseket az EU utjain, ami igen messze jár az Európai Bizottság „zéró-elképzelésétől”. Magyarországnak szintén sikerült jó eredményeket elérni a közlekedésbiztonság területén az utóbbi évtizedekben, a statisztikai adatok évről évre csökkenő irányvonalat mutatnak. Viszont minden súlyos közlekedési baleset egyben személyes tragédia és károkat okoz a társadalom egészének, ezért aktívan kell tenni a közlekedésbiztonság további javításáért tagállami szinten. Az infrastruktúra és a gépjárművek állapota jelentősen hozzájárul a közlekedésbiztonsági mutatók alakulásához. Ezért lépéseket kell tenni, hogy a modern vezetést segítő technológiák egyenlően elérhetőek és megfizethetőek legyenek az uniós polgárok számára minden tagállamban. Ezért kérem az Európai Bizottságot, hogy támogassa nagyobb mértékben az autópárai műszaki fejlesztéseket, és segítse a tagállami törekvéseket normatív és pénzügyi eszközökkel egyaránt, annak érdekében, hogy az új balesetmegelőzési technológiák könnyen elérhetővé és megfizethetővé váljanak az új gépjárművek lehető legszélesebb körében, árkatóriától függetlenül.

**Ελισάβετ Βόζεμπεργκ-Βρωονίδη (PPE), γραπτώς.** – Το ζήτημα της οδικής ασφάλειας μας αφορά όλους, καθώς περίπου 1 εκατομμύριο τροχαία ατυχήματα συμβαίνουν κάθε χρόνο στην ΕΕ. Οι αριθμοί των θανάτων στην ασφαλτο σίγουρα σοκάρουν. Χαρακτηριστικά, το 2019 σημειώθηκαν 23.000 θάνατοι και 12.000 σοβαροί τραυματισμοί. Οι στόχοι της Ένωσης για μείωση στο 50% των τροχαίων ατυχημάτων έως το 2030 και το «Vision Zero» για μηδενικούς θανάτους στις οδικές μεταφορές μέχρι το 2050 μπορούν να επιτευχθούν με συγκεκριμένη στρατηγική, πολιτική βούληση, αυξημένα και στοχευμένα μέτρα επιβολής καθώς και με επαρκή χρηματοδότηση. Η έκθεση για την οδική ασφάλεια θέτει τις βάσεις για ασφαλείς υποδομές, υπεύθυνους οδηγούς και κυκλοφοριακή παιδεία. Στο πλαίσιο αυτό, υποστηρίζουμε τη μείωση του ορίου ταχύτητας στον αστικό ιστό, τη μηδενική ανοχή στην οδήγηση υπό την επήρεια αλκοόλ, καθώς το αλκοόλ ευθύνεται για το 25% των θανατηφόρων τροχαίων ατυχημάτων και περισσότερα μέτρα ασφαλείας σε υποδομές και οχήματα.

Κλείνοντας, θα ήθελα να υπογραμμίσω τη σημασία που έχει να επενδύσουμε στην εκπαίδευση όσων κινούνται στους δρόμους και στη διαπαιδαγώγηση της νέας γενιάς οδηγών, που αποτελεί προτεραιότητα για τη βελτίωση της οδικής ασφάλειας και συμπεριφοράς. Όλα τα κράτη μέλη πρέπει να διασφαλίσουν την παροχή υψηλής ποιότητας εκπαίδευσης στον τομέα της οδικής ασφάλειας, που ξεκινά στο σχολείο και αποτελεί μέρος μιας συνεχούς διά βίου μάθησης!

## 17. Odbudowa stad ryb w Morzu Śródziemnym (krótka prezentacja)

**Der Präsident.** – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die kurze Darstellung des Berichts von Raffaele Stancanelli im Namen des Fischereiausschusses über den Wiederaufbau der Fischbestände im Mittelmeer: Bewertung und nächste Schritte (2019/2178(INI)) (A9-0225/2021).

**Raffaele Stancanelli, relatore.** – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, prima di tutto voglio ringraziare i relatori ombra per la loro disponibilità e per il contributo che hanno dato, permettendo che la relazione venisse approvata all'unanimità in commissione per la pesca, dimostrando come il mare e il settore ittico siano una priorità per tutti.

La relazione mira a sottolineare che la corretta attuazione della politica comune della pesca dovrebbe avere come obiettivo primario il raggiungimento del giusto equilibrio tra sostenibilità economica, ambientale e sociale.

Il Mar Mediterraneo sostiene da millenni le popolazioni costiere e le economie dei paesi che vi si affacciano. È anche uno dei mari più sfruttati, con livelli che possono arrivare all'80 % per determinate specie demersali.

Esistono tuttavia altri fattori ambientali alla base del declino di specifici stock ittici, in quanto la pesca e i suoi ecosistemi sono soggetti a fonti di pressione e degrado, quali l'inquinamento, il cambiamento climatico, lo sfruttamento degli idrocarburi, il dragaggio e la navigazione.

La volontà della Commissione di fissare elevati standard ambientali è assolutamente condivisibile e positiva, ma ciò non dovrebbe avvenire a costo di aumentare le importazioni e ridurre la produzione alimentare dell'Unione europea. In questi anni alcuni paesi hanno visto dimezzare flotte ed equipaggi, con una diminuzione della produzione di oltre il 50 % a favore dell'importazione, che attualmente arriva a circa l'85 % per i piccoli pelagici e le specie demersali.

Bisogna creare le condizioni perché la salvaguardia delle risorse e la redditività delle imprese coesistano e camminino di pari passo per non vanificare gli sforzi fatti fino a oggi. È necessario, nell'interesse generale e sempre per la salvaguardia delle risorse e della redditività delle imprese, armonizzare tutti i regolamenti emanati al fine di semplificare le attività di pesca e di non gravare ulteriormente sulle imprese.

È fondamentale, a distanza di oltre un anno dall'entrata in vigore di un regolamento, condurre un'immediata ricerca scientifica sullo stato di salute degli stock presi in considerazione, per ottenere i dati scientifici sull'efficacia delle restrizioni applicate e verificare la loro sospensione.

Un maggiore coinvolgimento degli operatori nei processi decisionali è di vitale importanza e i punti chiave dovrebbero essere, in primo luogo, un maggiore coinvolgimento e cogestione dei portatori di interesse e, in secondo luogo, integrare i dati scientifici con la conoscenza degli operatori del settore. Prendendo sempre e solo in considerazione i dati ambientali si rischia di tralasciare alcuni aspetti importantissimi come i risvolti socioeconomici delle limitazioni all'attività di pesca.

Garantire il principio dello Stato di diritto. Molteplici sono le convenzioni e i trattati firmati da paesi che si affacciano sul Mediterraneo e non solo per la gestione e la salvaguardia della pesca, ma nel concreto l'effettiva attuazione risulta estremamente diversificata e presenta concreti elementi contraddittori.

I presupposti per una reale ed effettiva collaborazione e cooperazione nella gestione della pesca nel Mediterraneo esistono e sono stabiliti con chiarezza, al fine di non rendere vani gli sforzi che vengono richiesti alle flotte dell'Unione europea, limitando le attività di pesca e di conseguenza anche la sostenibilità economica.

In questo contesto la Convenzione delle Nazioni Unite sul diritto del mare, sottoscritta a Montego Bay, dichiara che ogni Stato è libero di stabilire l'ampiezza delle proprie acque territoriali fino a un massimo di 12 miglia marine. Alcuni Stati applicano arbitrariamente limiti più che raddoppiati, creando situazioni di assoluto pericolo e rendendo le coste dei paesi che si affacciano sul Mediterraneo oggetto di sconfinamenti da parte di pescherecci provenienti da altri paesi, che si spingono fino a tre miglia sotto costa.

Le conclusioni a cui possiamo arrivare: un approccio olistico in grado di tenere conto di tutti gli aspetti che influenzano lo stato di salute del mare e il costante aggiornamento e raccolta di dati scientifici relativi alla situazione degli stock. Avere una pesca sostenibile significa garantire la sostenibilità dell'intero settore ittico e di tutta la filiera produttiva, con positive ricadute socioeconomiche.

**Helena Dalli**, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, I would like to thank the honourable Members of Parliament for this report. The Commission shares many of the views expressed therein. We agree that the Mediterranean Sea is one of the areas with the greatest biodiversity in the world, but that its current worrying environmental status is seriously endangering not only this biodiversity, but also the very survival of the fishing sector that depends on it.

We also share your analysis that the implementation of the new fisheries governance in the Mediterranean and the efforts made by the EU to ensure the sustainable exploitation of fisheries resources and the protection of the ecosystem are starting to give positive results. Nevertheless, strong efforts need to continue, as 87% of fish stocks in the Mediterranean are still overfished. The good health of the stocks is a precondition for the future and profitability of the sector.

The equation is very simple: no fish means no fishers. In the Mediterranean Sea, pollution and climate change have an important impact on the health of the stocks, and therefore it is necessary to tackle both pollution and climate change. However, the scientists have always explained that fishing activities continue to have the biggest impact on the health of Mediterranean fish stocks.

We therefore need to reduce fishing in the Mediterranean and adapt fishing capacity to the existing fishing opportunities. We also need to protect juveniles and spawners, including through marine protected areas, fisheries restricted areas and more selective fishing, to ensure the recovery of the stocks. We catch not only too much fish, but also fish which are too small.

In addition, we need to ensure that the rules are strictly respected. Our message is zero tolerance of illegal fishing activities. To this end, more efforts are needed to improve the capacity not only of the EU and Member States' authorities but also of third-country authorities to closely monitor the fishing activities all around the sea basin.

For the EU, the level playing field across the entire Mediterranean is crucial. Therefore, all the Mediterranean countries have to participate in these efforts. I am very happy that all the Mediterranean countries, upon the initiative of the EU, adopted last July a new strategy for the General Fisheries Commission for the Mediterranean. This new strategy includes concrete actions to address the challenges that you describe in your report.

The strategy is ambitious, and it will facilitate a green transition, support the coastal communities and preserve food security based on solidarity between all Mediterranean countries. The EU will bring its financial support to the implementation of the strategy and will work closely with the secretariat of the General Fisheries Commission for the Mediterranean in order to ensure the implementation of the strategy.

The strategy will also help countries to combat illegal fishing activities through the use of new technologies, through the establishment of inspection schemes and sighting procedures, and the EU will continue, through the European Fisheries Control Agency, and together with the Member States, to fight against illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing activities.

More particularly, the EU intends to reinforce its operational cooperation with Mediterranean countries such as Tunisia. In order to ensure the legality of catches, the EU will also continue to monitor the traceability of fisheries products. The EU will table proposals at the next annual session of the General Fisheries Commission for the Mediterranean to establish catch certificates for turbot and red coral.

I fully agree with the report that marine protected areas, such as the Jabuka/Pomo Pit in the Adriatic, are the best tool to protect the juveniles and the seabed. Therefore, I encourage both EU Member States and third countries within the General Fisheries Commission for the Mediterranean to adopt new fisheries restricted areas and to reinforce the ones in place. In this context, the inclusive approach is a key issue. We need to ensure that fishermen and women, scientists, NGOs and national administrations cooperate in order to put in place the marine protected areas and fisheries restricted areas.

The role of the fishers is crucial in this transition to the new fisheries governance. They are – and have to be – the guardians of the sea, and their efforts have to be recognised, as they are those who perfectly understand the need to ensure the recovery of the stocks. Fishers are ready to participate in co-management and to work on the improved selectivity of fishing gears. However, we need to support them to fully play their role. Fishers need adequate financial support through the European Maritime Fisheries and Aquaculture Fund to achieve our common objective of the sustainability of the stocks.

I agree with you that science is crucial. Therefore, data collection needs to be improved and solid scientific advice needs to be built. Scientists need to exchange their experience and build together a common methodology for the assessment of the stocks. In this context, the state of the environment is also a key driver for the health of fish stocks.

The Commission will table by the end of the year a proposal for a nature restoration law, which is a deliverable of our biodiversity strategy. I am confident that this proposal will deliver synergies with our efforts to better manage Mediterranean fisheries. I believe that, with the common fisheries policy, and with the support of the new tools we will put in place under the EU environmental policies, we have all the necessary tools to reverse overfishing and to rebuild stocks in the Mediterranean.

The Commission looks forward to our continued cooperation to ensure the full implementation of the common fisheries policy in the Mediterranean.

**Der Präsident.** – Die Aussprache ist geschlossen.

Die Abstimmung findet am Dienstag, 5. Oktober 2021, statt.

## **18. Porządek obrad następnego posiedzenia**

**Der Präsident.** – Die Sitzung ist geschlossen und wird morgen, Dienstag, 5. Oktober 2021, um 9.00 Uhr mit der Aussprache über den Bericht von Tonino Picula über die Zukunft der Beziehungen zwischen der EU und den USA (2021/2038(INI)) (A9-0250/2021) wieder aufgenommen.

Die Tagesordnung wurde veröffentlicht und ist auf der Website des Europäischen Parlaments verfügbar.

## **19. Zamknięcie posiedzenia**

*(Die Sitzung wird um 21.51 Uhr geschlossen)*

—

*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
ID	Grupa Tożsamość i Demokracja
Verts/ALE	Grupa Zielonych/Wolne Przymierze Europejskie
ECR	Grupa Europejskich Konserwatystów i Reformatorów
The Left	Grupa Lewicy w Parlamencie Europejskim - GUE/NGL
NI	Niezrzeszeni