

C/2024/5675

23.9.2024

PEŁNE SPRAWOZDANIE Z OBRAD 14 LUTEGO 2022 R.

(C/2024/5675)

PARLAMENT EUROPEJSKI

SESJA 2021-2022

Posiedzenia od 14 do 17 lutego 2022 r.

STRASBURG

Spis treści	Strona
1. Wznowienie sesji	4
2. Otwarcie posiedzenia	4
3. Zatwierdzenie protokołu poprzedniego posiedzenia	4
4. Oświadczenia Przewodniczącego / Przewodniczącej	4
5. Skład Parlamentu	5
6. Wniosek o uchylenie immunitetu	5
7. Skład grup politycznych	5
8. Skład komisji i delegacji	5
9. Negocjacje przed pierwszym czytaniem w Parlamencie (art. 71 Regulaminu)	5
10. Sprostowanie (art. 241 Regulaminu)	6

Spis treści	Strona
11. Podpisanie aktów przyjętych zgodnie ze zwykłą procedurą ustawodawczą (art. 79 Regulaminu)	6
12. Działania podjęte w związku z rezolucjami Parlamentu: patrz protokół	6
13. Interpelacje dotyczące kwestii pierwszorzędnych (składanie dokumentów): patrz protokół	6
14. Składanie dokumentów: patrz protokół	6
15. Porządek obrad	6
16. Uroczyste posiedzenie - 20. rocznica wprowadzenia euro	6
17. Europejski Bank Centralny: raport roczny za rok 2021 (debata)	10
18. Głosowanie	14
19. Europejski Bank Centralny: raport roczny za rok 2021 (ciąg dalszy debaty)	15
20. Sprawozdanie wykonawcze w sprawie dobrostanu zwierząt w gospodarstwach (debata)	26
21. Działalność Europejskiego Rzecznika Praw Obywatelskich – sprawozdanie roczne za 2020 r. (debata)	37
22. Europejska strategia na rzecz energii z morskich źródeł odnawialnych (debata)	47
23. Ocena wdrożenia art. 50 TUE (krótka prezentacja)	57
24. Wdrożenie szóstej dyrektywy w sprawie podatku VAT (krótka prezentacja)	58
25. Ocena wdrożenia art. 50 TUE (ciąg dalszy krótkiej prezentacji)	60
26. Wpływ krajowych reform podatkowych na gospodarkę UE (krótka prezentacja)	62
27. Wyzwania stojące przed obszarami miejskimi w okresie po pandemii COVID-19 (krótka prezentacja)	64
28. Jednominutowe wystąpienia w znaczących kwestiach politycznych	66
29. Wyjaśnienia dotyczące stanowiska zajętego w głosowaniu: patrz protokół	72

Spis treści	Strona
30. Korekty i zamiary głosowania: patrz protokół	72
31. Porządek obrad następnego posiedzenia	72
32. Zamknięcie posiedzenia	72

PEŁNE SPRAWOZDANIE Z OBRAD 14 LUTEGO 2022 R.

PRESIDENZA: ROBERTA METSOLA

President

1. Wznowienie sesji

President. – I declare resumed the session of the European Parliament adjourned on Thursday, 27 January 2022.

2. Otwarcie posiedzenia

(The sitting opened at 17.03)

3. Zatwierdzenie protokołu poprzedniego posiedzenia

President. – The minutes of the sitting of 27 January 2022 are available. Can I ask first of all whether there are any comments?

It does not seem to be the case.

(The minutes of the previous sitting were approved.)

4. Oświadczenia Przewodniczącego / Przewodniczącej

President. – This week, concerns about the situation at the Ukrainian border, dear colleagues, will dominate our discussions. On Wednesday, High Representative Borrell will be here to discuss with Parliament the latest developments on the ground. This will also be discussed at the Conference of Presidents, and our political groups in this House are currently working on a declaration on the situation in Ukraine.

Also on Wednesday, we will vote on granting EUR 1.2 billion of macro-financial assistance to Ukraine, to support Ukraine's stability and resilience in the current difficult circumstances.

On behalf of the European Parliament let me express our solidarity with the people of Ukraine, as they continue to face the uncertainty of the past weeks and fear of Russian military aggression. What we are witnessing is a serious threat to peace in Europe.

We all saw the people on the streets of Kyiv, who showed that they are not afraid. Now their defiance must be matched by continued European resolve and unity. The position of this House is clear – Ми з Україною – we are with Ukraine.

Ukraine is a sovereign state that must be free to decide on its future for the benefit of its people. No one should undermine that right. We are united in our respect for Ukraine's independence and territorial integrity. While we urge for a de-escalation of the current tension, this Parliament stands ready to support swift, forceful and concrete action. We do this in coordination with other European institutions and the international community, should the situation deteriorate.

In conclusion, we owe a strong show of support to the people of Ukraine and this week, this Parliament will do just that.

5. Skład Parlamentu

President. – With regard to other announcements, I have received notice from the competent authorities in Italy of the election of Ms Camilla Laureti as Member of the European Parliament to replace Mr David Maria Sassoli, with effect from 12 January 2022.

I have also received notice from the competent authorities in Germany of the election of Mr René Repasi as Member of the European Parliament to replace Ms Evelyne Gebhardt, with effect from 2 February 2022.

I would also like to welcome these new colleagues, and would point out that they will take their seats in Parliament and on its bodies in full enjoyment of their rights as provided for in the Rules of Procedure.

6. Wniosek o uchylenie immunitetu

President. – I have also received a request from the competent authorities in Greece for the parliamentary immunity of Mr Ioannis Lagos to be waived in order for criminal proceedings to be brought against him. This request is referred to the Committee on Legal Affairs as the committee responsible, in accordance with our Rules of Procedure.

7. Skład grup politycznych

President. – Maxette Pirkakas and Jörg Meuthen have left the ID Group and now sit with the Non-attached Members as from 2 February 2022 and 14 February 2022 respectively.

8. Skład komisji i delegacji

President. – The S&D and ID groups have notified me of decisions related to changes to appointments within committees. Those decisions will be set out in the minutes of today's sitting and shall take effect on the date of this announcement.

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

President. – The Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs 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 web page and its title will be published in the minutes of the sitting.

Pursuant to Rule 71(2), Members or political groups reaching at least the medium threshold may request in writing by tomorrow, Tuesday 15 February at midnight, that the decision to enter into negotiations be put to the vote. If no request for a vote in Parliament on the decision to enter into negotiations is made within this deadline, the committee may start negotiations.

10. Sprostowanie (art. 241 Regulaminu)

President. – The Committee on Industry, Research and Energy has transmitted a corrigendum to a text adopted by Parliament pursuant to Rule 241(4). This corrigendum will be deemed approved unless, no later than 24 hours after its announcement, a request is made by a political group, or members reaching at least the low threshold, that it be put to the vote. The corrigendum is available on the plenary web page and its title will be published in the minutes of this sitting.

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

President. – Since the adjournment of Parliament's session on 20 January, I have signed, together with the President of the Council, three acts 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 on Wednesday I shall sign, together with the President of the Council, two acts adopted under the ordinary legislative procedure. The titles of the acts will be published in the minutes of this sitting.

12. Działania podjęte w związku z rezolucjami Parlamentu: patrz protokół

13. Interpelacje dotyczące kwestii pierwszorzędnych (składanie dokumentów): patrz protokół

14. Składanie dokumentów: patrz protokół

15. Porządek obrad

President. – The final draft agenda as drawn up pursuant to Rule 157 by the Conference of Presidents at its meeting of 9 February 2022 has been distributed.

I have received no requests for changes to the final draft agenda.

I would like to inform you that the votes are distributed along 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, and the relevant information concerning the distribution of votes is available in the 'Priority Information' section on the website of the European Parliament.

The agenda is therefore adopted and the order of business is therefore established.

16. Uroczyste posiedzenie - 20. rocznica wprowadzenia euro

President. – The next item is the debate on the 20th anniversary of the euro.

I would invite you, dear colleagues, to watch a short video together.

(A video on the history of the euro was shown in the Chamber.)

President Lagarde, Commissioner Gentiloni, dear colleagues, 20 years since it was first introduced, the euro is the currency of over 340 million people in 19 EU Member States. A political, financial, social project that brought people together, that challenged perceptions and cemented what Europe is all about.

The biggest monetary changeover in history created beneficial impacts on people, businesses and governments alike, with 78% of respondents of the latest Eurobarometer survey stating that having the euro is a good thing for the European Union.

The single currency also unquestionably propelled Europe forward, as a key player in the European and the global economy. The stability of our currency makes it attractive for businesses around the world to trade with the EU. In fact, more than half of the EU's exports and almost 40% of all global cross-border payments use the euro. Sixty other countries and territories around the world have chosen to use the euro as their currency or to peg their own currency to it. The euro is truly one of the greatest achievements of the European Union.

A single currency to complete the single market, guaranteeing long-term prosperity, growth, competitiveness, protection from exchange-rate volatility, and price stability. An Economic and Monetary Union which ensures the confidence of our citizens. This is what the euro is all about. It is about European integration, unity, stability, identity and solidarity, and it is right here in our pockets as a tangible success story.

When there is a vision for the future of Europe and the political willingness to match it, anything is possible. And we have also seen this when the euro was faced with great economic challenges.

The global financial and sovereign debt crises led to a reform of the governance structure of the European Monetary Union where we, the European Parliament, played an important role as co-legislators. And together we acted swiftly to support our Member States and stabilise our economies.

Two years ago, we again joined forces to provide flexible solutions to our Member States, as we faced the economic challenges of the COVID-19 pandemic. We took bold decisions and adopted an unprecedented EUR 750 billion recovery plan – Next Generation EU – which is already supporting our economic recovery. This would not have been possible for the EU without the euro.

The euro is resilient. Nevertheless, challenges continue to lie ahead. We must ensure that the euro is fit for future generations. Generations who will know the euro as their only currency. And for this, the European Union must be at the forefront of green and digital transitions.

With over half of green bond issuance denominated in euro, and with our plan to digitalise our economies, including by launching the digital euro, we are on the right track. We must continue on this trajectory.

By reinforcing the international role of the euro we can contribute to a resilient EU banking sector and international financial system while strengthening the EU's open strategic autonomy.

With its credibility and cemented foundations, the euro will continue to grow and we will remain united. Ultimately, we should never lose sight of what this project is all about. Why it started, how it got us here and where it can take us. So here is to the next 20 years.

Christine Lagarde, *Présidente de la Banque centrale européenne*. – Madame la Présidente du Parlement européen, Madame Metsola, Monsieur le Commissaire à l'économie, Monsieur Gentiloni, honorables membres du Parlement européen, c'est un plaisir pour moi d'être ici, à Strasbourg, à l'occasion du vingtième anniversaire de l'euro, que nous célébrons. C'est aussi un plaisir de voir que, lorsque l'euro a été lancé, c'était une femme qui était aussi à la présidence et que, finalement, ceux qui auraient oublié les vingt années entre les deux ont sans doute le sentiment que le Parlement européen est toujours présidé par une femme.

So, the introduction of the euro banknotes and coins in 2002 was a milestone for European history, as it put – as Nicole Fontaine said – a tangible sign of European integration in the pocket and in the wallets of all Europeans. There were twelve countries only to begin with, and seven more to join later on.

Sharing a currency is more than just simply using the same measure, the same means of payment; it is part of a common endeavour. This feeling of shared identity is actually recognised by our fellow citizens. When you ask them, when you ask the European citizens what the European Union means to them, what comes second is actually the euro amongst the list of things that they most often think of in terms of the European Union.

The euro has simplified the lives of many Europeans – those who study, those who travel, those who conduct business. It has improved the efficiency of conducting business throughout an enlarged economic zone and I'm going to mention to you two numbers. From 1990 to 2002, trade between the soon-to-be 19 countries of the euro area increased by less than 5% – 5% more trade. If you look at the period since the euro has been introduced, trade between those same nations did not increase by 5% but by 200%.

Now, of course not all of it is attributable to the euro, but the fact that the exchange rate was no longer an issue that was to be discussed, put into contractual terms between parties, certainly had a role to play.

The second element that I want to bring to your attention as well: as you all know, the euro is the second international currency in the world after the dollar. What maybe not all of us know so well is that in 2021 about half of total green bond issuance around the world was denominated in euros – not necessarily issued from the euro area or Europe, but around the world.

So as you mentioned, Madam President, last year we launched the digital euro project. We will investigate how a digital euro could offer a convenient, cost-free means of payment, allowing people to pay anywhere in the euro area with risk-free digital money – for example, when making payments online, which preclude the use of cash.

I just would like to add that, of course, this digital euro will not replace cash but it will complement cash. That is one of the reasons why we launched the process of redesigning our banknotes. The redesign is part of a long-term development process to ensure that the next generation of euro banknotes will continue to be secure, accepted and an efficient means of payment. We will keep Parliament informed throughout the process, and we will seek input from citizens, through your intermediary, on the theme and design of the new banknotes before making our final decision in 2024.

Thereafter, the rollout of the new banknotes will be planned. The redesign of our banknotes is a unique opportunity to make them more relatable to Europeans of all ages and backgrounds, thereby offering a new symbol of European integration.

For more than 20 years, euro banknotes and coins have circulated smoothly. They are a tangible testament to the euro's success. The cash in our pockets reminds us that, despite our diversity, we share a common endeavour that goes way beyond our borders.

Paolo Gentiloni, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, Madam President of the European Central Bank, honourable Members, we are celebrating today one of the most tangible symbols of European integration and prosperity.

Since its launch, the single currency has come a long way. During this time, the euro area has grown from 12 countries to 19, and it will expand further in the near future. Croatia and Bulgaria are advancing towards this target.

The euro has delivered on its promises: the promise of a strong and stable currency underpinning the cohesion of our economies; the promise to lower barriers for businesses and make it cheaper to borrow and invest; the promise to make our economies more resilient by improving the conditions for fully exploiting our single market, as President Lagarde just said.

During the pandemic, having a single currency has been instrumental in coordinating responses across Europe and in avoiding further economic and social divergences. And today, as you remember, President Metsola, four in five citizens in the euro area think that the euro is a good thing – the highest level of support since its introduction.

With Next Generation EU, the Union will become one of the major debt issuers worldwide. This will offer benefits in terms of stability and that of the European bond market, by providing a euro-denominated, safe asset, covering all maturities. And we see a huge appetite for this.

As of today, we have already issued EUR 78.5 billion in Next Generation EU bonds and every issuance was heavily oversubscribed. By 2026, we will have issued close to EUR 1 trillion, providing an opportunity to establish global reference for international investors seeking to invest in euro-denominated assets. And with the issuance of up to EUR 250 billion in green bonds, we will also become a world leader in the international green bond market.

So today, we are celebrating, but this opportunity should also be a reminder of the need to complete and deepen our monetary union. This means completing the Banking Union and making further steps on the Capital Markets Union. It also means learning the right lesson from our coordinated fiscal response to the crisis and from the unprecedented tools we have put in place.

In today's multipolar economic system, there is scope to further increase the role of the euro. In today's geopolitical tension and uncertainty, there is scope to advance in the process of our strategic autonomy. The same political determination of those who designed and made possible the euro's introduction, overcoming divergent views and interests, is needed now to build a stronger Union.

Irene Tinagli, *Chair the ECON Committee*. – Madam President, 20 years is an important anniversary for anyone, but I think that if we look back at all that the euro has been through, well, then we realise how special this anniversary is.

At first, the introduction of the single currency in Europe seemed like a risky bet. Many feared it was too early. Others thought that there were other priorities. There was some fear about it. And later, after the financial crisis, many thought that the euro was at risk and that a restoration of national currencies was upcoming. Well, it turned out quite differently, and not only is the euro still here, but it's stronger than ever. Other Member States have decided to adopt it, and others will soon be able to do so.

The truth is that the euro has been the key element of the last 20 years of the Union. It has complemented the single market. It has made it easier to trade and live across different countries in the European Union. It has boosted European value chains, strengthening our economies. It has been the prerequisite for preserving the European monetary sovereignty in a globalised world. It has represented the cornerstone of a peaceful Union and a global actor after the end of the Cold War and German reunification. Without the euro, I'm quite sure we would be telling quite different stories.

The success of the euro is not a matter of chance. Its strength, its value and its very existence has constantly been guaranteed and preserved by the European Central Bank. Over the past 20 years, the ECB has been the true guardian of the Union's currency, and I'm confident that it will continue to play its role even in the coming years of big innovations and changes. We've heard about some of those.

But the euro's success was also the result of a strong political will. The euro was the best investment that we could have made to ensure a stable environment for the new generations. This awareness was the fundamental element that allowed us to overcome even the most difficult moments, and we've heard just a few minutes ago about some of those moments.

The euro has definitely brought to us many successes, but we have to also to acknowledge and to recognise that it has not delivered all the gains that it could have delivered in all the Member States and to all the European citizens. And this is partly due to some national issues and partly the result of the fact that the Economic and Monetary Union is still incomplete – as Commissioner Gentiloni just reminded us.

So, the way ahead, therefore, is to identify the changes that are necessary to make our monetary union work for the benefit of everybody. The experience of the euro shows that even the riskiest bets, if supported by political will, can be successful and can mark a great leap forward in the history of our Union.

17. Europejski Bank Centralny: raport roczny za rok 2021 (debata)

President. – The next item is the debate on the report by Dimitrios Papadimoulis, on behalf the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs, on the European Central Bank – annual report 2021 (2021/2063(INI)) (A9-0351/2021).

I would like to remind Members that for all the debates of this part-session there will be no catch-the-eye procedure, no blue cards will be accepted and, furthermore, as during recent part-sessions, remote interventions from Parliament's liaison offices in the Member States are foreseen.

I would also like to remind colleagues that interventions in the Chamber will be made from the central rostrum and I therefore kindly invite you to keep an eye on the speakers' list and to approach the rostrum when your speaking time is imminent.

Δημήτριος Παπαδημούλης, Εισηγητής. – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, κυρία Lagarde, κύριε Επίτροπε Gentiloni, κυρίες και κύριοι συνάδελφοι, θεωρώ ότι είναι ιδιαίτερα σημαντική η στιγμή που συζητούμε αυτή την έκθεση, γιατί η διαμόρφωσή της συμπίπτει με τρεις σημαντικές παραμέτρους. Η πρώτη είναι η θετική πολιτική της Ευρωπαϊκής Κεντρικής Τράπεζας για την αντιμετώπιση της κρίσης της πανδημίας. Το δεύτερο γεγονός είναι η επανεξέταση της στρατηγικής της Ευρωπαϊκής Κεντρικής Τράπεζας μετά από 18 ολόκληρα χρόνια. Και το τρίτο είναι αυτό που μόλις σημειώσαμε: η επέτειος 20 χρόνων από τη δημιουργία του ευρώ.

Η έκθεση καταγράφει ότι οι αποφάσεις νομισματικής πολιτικής της Ευρωπαϊκής Κεντρικής Τράπεζας για την αντιμετώπιση της πανδημίας ήταν ένα θετικό, σημαντικό βήμα, το οποίο προκάλεσε έναν θετικό αντίκτυπο στη ζώνη του ευρώ. Η εισαγωγή του PEPP, η αύξηση του όγκου των αγορών, η αυξημένη ευελιξία στην αγορά των ομολόγων και η χαλάρωση των κριτηρίων επιλεξιμότητας, η πολιτική των βασικών επιτοκίων συνέβαλαν στην οικονομική ανάκαμψη, στη βελτίωση των συνθηκών χρηματοδότησης, παρότι αυτή η ανάκαμψη ήταν άνιση και σε ορισμένες περιπτώσεις, μεγάλωσε τις κοινωνικές και τις περιφερειακές ανισότητες. Για αυτό, στην έκθεσή μας υποστηρίζουμε πως η υποστηρικτική πολιτική της ΕΚΤ πρέπει να παραμείνει για όσο διάστημα χρειάζεται για την ενίσχυση της ανάκαμψης και την ενθάρρυνση των δημόσιων και ιδιωτικών επενδύσεων. Θα ήθελα, στο σημείο αυτό, να ευχαριστήσω τους σκιώδεις εισηγητές, τους συνεργάτες μας, τη γραμματεία της επιτροπής ECON για τη συνεργασία τους στη διάρκεια αυτών των επίπονων διαπραγματεύσεων και να σημειώσω με ικανοποίηση ότι η έκθεση που συζητούμε σήμερα υπερψηφίστηκε στην επιτροπή ECON με τη μεγαλύτερη πλειοψηφία των τελευταίων ετών: 49 ψήφοι υπέρ, 8 κατά και μία αποχή. Θα ήθελα, επίσης, να εκφράσω την αισιοδοξία μου ότι και η ολομέλεια θα στηρίξει με την ίδια ευρύτητα και πλειοψηφία το κείμενο της έκθεσης όπως ψηφίστηκε και στην επιτροπή.

Στον χρόνο που μου απομένει θα ήθελα να σημειώσω ορισμένα πράγματα. Θα ήθελα να υπογραμμίσω και ένα θέμα που αφορά την πατρίδα μου την Ελλάδα, κυρία Lagarde. Η συμπερίληψη των ελληνικών ομολόγων στο πρόγραμμα PEPP αποτέλεσε και αποτελεί ένα σημαντικό θετικό βήμα. Παραμένει, ωστόσο, ανοικτό το ζήτημα ότι τα ελληνικά ομόλογα εξακολουθούν να μην είναι επιλέξιμα στο πλαίσιο του προγράμματος αγοράς στοιχείων ενεργητικού του δημόσιου τομέα, παρά τη σημαντική πρόοδο που έχει επιτευχθεί. Με την έκθεσή μας ζητούμε, με ευρύτατη πλειοψηφία, από την ΕΚΤ να επανεξετάσει, όσο διαρκεί ο σχετικός ορίζοντας των σχετικών ευέλικτων επανεπενδύσεων, αυτά που πρέπει να γίνουν και να παράσχει ειδικές συστάσεις, έτσι ώστε τα ελληνικά ομόλογα να παραμείνουν επιλέξιμα και η ανάκαμψη στην πατρίδα μου την Ελλάδα να μην κινδυνεύει από έναν νέο γύρο λιτότητας και μια νέα κρίση χρέους.

Τελειώνοντας, νομίζω ότι είναι πολύ σημαντικό να συνεχιστούν χωρίς υποχωρήσεις τα θετικά βήματα και στη δράση της ΕΚΤ στην καταπολέμηση της κλιματικής κρίσης, καθώς, επίσης, και να απαγκιστρωθούμε από δογματικές προσεγγίσεις στον τρόπο προσέγγισης της αρχής ουδετερότητας της αγοράς. Ήδη, η ΕΚΤ έχει παρεκκλίνει σε αρκετές περιπτώσεις, προκειμένου να πετύχει τους στόχους της, από αυτή την αρχή. Πρέπει να συνεχίσουμε με πραγματισμό και με ρεαλισμό. Τέλος, νομίζω ότι είναι σημαντικό να διευκολυνθεί η πρόσβαση των μικρών και μεσαίων επιχειρήσεων στη χρηματοδότηση που πάσχει σε πολλές χώρες, να ολοκληρωθεί επιτέλους, κύριε Gentiloni, κυρία Lagarde και κύριοι του Συμβουλίου που απουσιάζετε, το ευρωπαϊκό σύστημα ασφάλισης καταθέσεων, γιατί χωρίς τον τρίτο πυλώνα δεν υπάρχει τραπεζική ένωση, και να κάνετε περισσότερα βήματα στον τομέα της διαφάνειας, της επικοινωνίας με τους πολίτες και στην ισότητα των φύλων μέσα στην Ευρωπαϊκή Κεντρική Τράπεζα.

Christine Lagarde, *Présidente de la Banque centrale européenne*. – Madame la Présidente du Parlement européen, Monsieur le Commissaire à l'économie, Monsieur le rapporteur Papadimoulis, honorables membres du Parlement européen, à nouveau je suis très heureuse de me trouver ici, à Strasbourg, devant vous, pour discuter le rapport annuel de la Banque centrale européenne pour l'année 2020.

Let me continue in English. Today's debate is an important pillar in the ECB's accountability relationship with this Parliament. It is crucial for the ECB to explain its actions to the public and to you, as their elected representatives. But as I have said before, we need to be equally focused on listening, and it is in this spirit that I have read your report and that I look forward to hearing your views during today's debate.

What I will do in these preliminary remarks in front of you is, first of all, outline our view of the current economic situation in the euro area and explain our monetary policy stance. I had the opportunity to discuss these issues last week in the context of the regular dialogue with the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs, well known as ECON, chaired by Ms Tinagli. I will then briefly discuss how the ECB's new strategy addresses some of the key points identified in your report and ensures that our monetary policy strategy is fit for purpose both for today and in the future.

So let me turn to the economic outlook and our ECB monetary policy. Recent data confirms that quarterly growth slowed to 0.3% in the final quarter of 2021, which still allowed gross domestic product to recover to its pre-pandemic level. The moderation in growth momentum has resulted mainly from the rapid spread of the Omicron variant. The associated containment measures have dampened activity, particularly in consumer services such as travel, tourism, hospitality and entertainment. The current pandemic wave and associated restrictions are likely to continue to have a negative impact on growth at the start of this year, 2022.

Two other factors, namely supply bottlenecks and high energy costs, are also expected to dampen economic activity in the near term. However, the economic impact of the current pandemic wave appears to be less damaging to activity than previous ones. Moreover, the aforementioned bottlenecks will still persist for some time, but there are signs that they may be starting to ease a bit. This will allow the economy to pick up strongly again later this year.

Inflation has risen sharply in recent months, and it further surprised on the upside in January, with the rate increasing to 5.1% from 5% in December. Inflation is likely to remain high in the near term. Energy prices, as you also highlight in your report, continue to be the main reason for the elevated rate of inflation. Their direct impact accounted for over half of headline inflation in January, and energy costs are also pushing up prices across many sectors. Food prices have also increased owing to seasonal factors, elevated transportation costs and the higher price of fertilisers. In addition, price rises have become more widespread with the prices of a large number of goods and services having increased markedly.

Financing conditions for the economy have remained favourable. While market interest rates have increased since December, bank funding costs have so far remained contained. Bank lending rates to firms and to households continue to stand at historically low levels.

Turning now to the risk assessment, we continue to see the risks to the economic outlook as broadly balanced over the medium term. Uncertainties related to the pandemic have abated somewhat. At the same time, geopolitical tensions have increased and persistently high costs of energy could exert a stronger than expected drag on consumption and on investment. The pace at which bottlenecks are resolved is also a further risk to the outlook for growth and inflation. Compared with our projections in December, risks to the inflation outlook are tilted to the upside – particularly in the near term.

If price pressures feed through into higher-than-anticipated wage rises or if the economy returns more quickly to full capacity, inflation could turn out to be higher.

In a few weeks, the March ECB staff projections will provide an updated assessment, taking the most recent data into account. This will help the Governing Council better appraise the implications of the surprisingly high December and January inflation figures for the medium-term outlook. In particular, we will carefully examine how higher energy prices will transmit through the economy and affect the outlook overall.

Two channels could be at play, pulling inflation dynamics in different directions. On the one hand, rising energy costs can drive up prices directly by increasing the cost of production, as well as indirectly by having second-round effects on wages.

On the other hand, they can have a negative impact on the incomes of households and the earnings of companies, thereby reducing economic activity and dampening the inflation outlook.

In the past, the euro area has been vulnerable to the second channel as surges in energy prices weakened the spending power of households and reduced inflation over the medium term.

Obviously, in our assessment of the inflation outlook, we have to bear in mind that demand conditions in the euro area do not show the same signs of overheating that can be observed in other major economies. This increases the likelihood that the current price pressures will subside before becoming entrenched, enabling us to deliver on our 2% target over the medium term. Indeed, while moving up over recent months, indicators of longer-term inflation expectations are consistent with these expectations.

Survey-based measures point to inflation returning to 2% by 2023 and remaining close to this level thereafter. Market-based indicators have stabilised around levels somewhat below 2%. The solid anchoring of long-term inflation expectations in the euro area, which you also acknowledge in your report, is a reassuring development coming after a long period when they were overdue.

To sum up, the euro area economy has continued to recover, although growth is expected to remain subdued in the first quarter of 2022. While the outlook for inflation is uncertain, it is likely to remain elevated for longer than previously expected, but to decline in the course of this year.

At the Governing Council meeting earlier this month, we confirmed the decisions we took in December. Accordingly, we will continue reducing the pace of our asset purchases step-by-step over the coming quarters and we will end net purchases under the Pandemic Emergency Purchase Programme at the end of March.

In view of the current uncertainty, we need more than ever to maintain flexibility and optionality in the conduct of monetary policy. Our monetary policy is always data dependent, and this is all the more important in the situation that we are facing at the moment. We will remain attentive to the incoming data and carefully assess the implications for the medium-term inflation outlook.

Those implications are key parameters in our forward guidance. Our forward guidance has several dimensions. There is a defined sequencing between the end of our net asset purchases and the lift-off date. A rate hike will not occur before our net asset purchases finish. Moreover, there are three conditions that will have to be met before the Governing Council feels sufficiently confident that a tilt in our policy rate is appropriate. All three conditions are meant as safeguards against the premature increase in interest rates. Finally, any adjustment to our policy will be gradual.

Let me now turn to the topic of how we are making our monetary policy strategy fit for today, but also for new challenges. Last year, the ECB and the euro system at large concluded their first strategy review in almost two decades. I would like to reiterate my gratitude to the ECON Committee and all its members for their valuable input. I'm very pleased to read in your report that you welcome the outcome.

Our new strategy would ensure that we have a strong foundation to guide us in the conduct of monetary policy in the years to come. We are now working hard to put it into practice. I could discuss many areas in that strategy review, but I'm going to focus on only three that you highlighted in your report in which the review is having an impact on our daily work.

The first area is how we take our monetary policy decisions. In your report, you highlight the importance of ensuring the necessity, suitability and proportionality of all our monetary policy measures. Indeed, before taking any decision, the Governing Council conducts a careful evaluation of the effectiveness, the efficiency and the proportionality of its actions, including the potential side effects, based on an integrated assessment of all relevant factors.

This assessment builds on a revised analytical framework, which brings together the economic analysis and the monetary and financial analysis as well. Our new strategy recognises financial stability as a precondition for price stability and vice versa. In line with this, we undertook our first in-depth assessment of the inter-relationship between monetary policy and financial stability at our last meeting in December. We will continue to do so twice a year going forward.

The second area that I would like to point to, which you also mentioned in the report, is the impact of climate change. I'm pleased that your report welcomes our action plan on how to incorporate climate change considerations in our monetary policy framework. I'm equally pleased to tell you that the implementation of the Climate Change Action Plan is on track. The milestones for 2022 include a detailed plan for disclosure requirements in the collateral framework and asset purchases, a pilot stress test on the euro system balance sheet and proposals to adopt the framework of our corporate bond purchase programmes.

We are also working, together with other central banks across the euro area, on new exploratory climate related statistical indicators, and we are adapting our macroeconomic models.

Integrating climate-related indicators and risks is not a distraction. It is essential to better understanding how climate change is affecting the economy, is affecting the inflation outlook, is affecting monetary policy transmission and is affecting financial stability.

So the third and last area that I would like to touch on is how we communicate and engage with the people we serve and whom you represent. Good communication is crucial for our policy, for our credibility and for the trust people have in us. But communicating well to different audiences is challenging, in particular in the euro area. I welcome that the report encourages us to make further progress on this front. Our aim is to ensure that markets, elected representatives like yourselves and the wider public better understand how we reach our decisions, the reasons behind these decisions and how they affect people's daily lives. In other words, we need to be clear about what we call the three «A» s.

First: Aim. We must be clear about our aim. Our new symmetric inflation target of 2% over the medium-term is simple, clear and easy to convey to the wider public. Second: Assessment. We must be clear about our assessment. We need to clearly explain how we process incoming economic and financial data, what we judge to be short term movements and what we consider influential factors relevant for our medium-term horizon. Third: Actions. We must also be clear about actions taken. Our audience should be able to understand what we are trying to achieve with our measures, as well as why they are effective, efficient and proportionate to our aim.

Clearly communicating these three «A» s to different audiences often means being more simple and more straightforward – but being more simple doesn't mean that we should be simplistic. It means being more inclusive when we talk. Following on from our strategy review, we are using clearer, more narrative-driven language, together with visuals that people can relate to.

Finally, in our communication, we need to be open about what we can and what we cannot do as a central bank. For example, our monetary policy cannot fill a pipeline with gas, cannot clear backlogs at ports and cannot train more lorry drivers.

So let me conclude here. We're very well aware that many people across the euro area are concerned about the rising cost of living at the moment – as you also highlight in your report – and the burden is primarily borne, we know, by those with lower incomes who must face the day-to-day hardship of having to cope with higher prices.

We remain committed to delivering on our price stability mandate, as we have done over the past 20 years. Our target is an inflation rate of 2% over the medium term. To achieve this, we will take the right actions, at the right time.

But it is also a task to openly engage with people's concerns with regard to monetary policy. As I said when I first spoke to you here two years ago, the ongoing dialogue between the ECB and the European Parliament is the key channel for this. Independence and accountability are two sides of the same coin for the ECB. One will not exist without the other.

With that in mind, I look forward to our exchange this afternoon and to the final resolution on the ECB's annual report.

Paolo Gentiloni, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, President Lagarde, honourable Members, it's very important to discuss today the European Central Bank's annual report, on the basis of your report. So I would like, first of all, to thank the rapporteur, Dimitrios Papadimoulis, and the members of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs (ECON Committee) for their valuable assessment and reflections.

The Commission widely agrees with the general thrust of the committee's report. As you know, the EU economy lost momentum in late 2021 following a strong rebound in the previous two quarters. This slowdown can be attributed to the Omicron variant and to the continued global supply-side disruptions.

Furthermore, a recent increase in energy prices and inflationary pressures could weigh on economic activity. So the risks for growth in our forecast are balanced and the risk for inflation is tilted to the upside. But the fact that we have this high inflation doesn't mean that we currently see compelling evidence suggesting that high inflation could become entrenched. So, in our winter forecast, inflation is expected to reach 3.5% in 2022 before easing in 2023 and we share the ECB's clear assessment of the current situation.

We also agree with the ECON Committee's report that the ECB's policy response to the COVID-19 crisis was effective. Furthermore, let me say that fiscal and monetary policies have acted as strategic complements in their autonomy, of course, in stabilising economic activity against the adverse effects of the pandemic.

As regards fiscal policy for next year, the Commission will provide Member States with guidance in the coming weeks to facilitate the coordination. Furthermore, the Commission will share orientation on possible changes to the economic governance framework with the objective of achieving a broad-based consensus, well in time for 2023 — the year when the general escape clause is expected to be 'untriggered', so to say.

The ECON Committee's report further discusses the international role of the euro, digital payments, euro counterfeiting – topics we consider very important. The Commission and the ECB aim to ensure a strong European digital finance sector and a well-integrated payment sector. In this context, both institutions are jointly examining the possibility of a digital euro. The essential elements of the digital euro need to be set out in a legislative proposal, on which the colleges later will have the last word.

Our goal is to table legislation in early 2023, preceded by a consultation. The euro in the digital era would be a way to also deliver on the international role of the euro agenda. Thank you, and I welcome the debate today and the discussion we will have on this occasion.

VORSITZ: EVELYN REGNER

Vizepräsidentin

(Die Aussprache wird unterbrochen)

18. Głosowanie

Die Präsidentin. – Bevor wir mit den Aussprachen fortfahren, eröffne ich nun die heutige Abstimmungsrunde.

Wir stimmen über die in der Tagesordnung angegebenen Dossiers ab.

Die Abstimmungsrunde ist von 18.00 bis 19.15 Uhrgeöffnet.

Es kommt dasselbe Abstimmungsverfahren zur Anwendung wie auf den letzten Tagungen.

Über die Immunitätsangelegenheiten wird in geheimer Abstimmung abgestimmt. Die Mitglieder können ihre Stimme in herkömmlicher Weise abgeben. Allerdings ist aus dem Stimmzettel, den Sie erhalten und den Sie unterschreiben müssen, nicht ersichtlich, wie Sie abgestimmt haben, sondern nur, dass Sie abgestimmt haben.

Alle anderen Abstimmungen erfolgen namentlich.

Die Erklärungen zur Abstimmung können schriftlich eingereicht werden. Es werden Erklärungen zur Abstimmung mit höchstens 400 Wörtern akzeptiert.

Ich erkläre die Abstimmungsrunde für eröffnet. Sie können bis 19.15 Uhr abstimmen.

Die Ergebnisse der Abstimmungen werden morgen um 8.30 Uhr bekannt gegeben.

19. Europejski Bank Centralny: raport roczny za rok 2021 (ciąg dalszy debaty)

Die Präsidentin. – Wir setzen nun unsere Aussprache über den Bericht von Dimitrios Papadimoulis (A9-0351/2021) fort.

Γεώργιος Κύρτσος, εξ ονόματος της ομάδας PPE. – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, ο ρόλος της Ευρωπαϊκής Κεντρικής Τράπεζας στην αντιμετώπιση των οικονομικών συνεπειών της κρίσης της πανδημίας αποδείχθηκε στρατηγικής σημασίας το 2021. Οι οικονομίες της ευρωζώνης ανέκαμψαν γρήγορα και δυναμικά, αξιοποιώντας και τη νομισματική πολιτική που εφαρμόστηκε. Επίσης, τα νέα από την αγορά εργασίας είναι ιδιαίτερα ενθαρρυντικά έως καλά. Η συμβολή της ΕΚΤ αποτυπώνεται στην ετήσια έκθεση για το 2021, με τη θετική άποψη των περισσότερων ευρωβουλευτών για το έργο της διοίκησης.

Η Ελλάδα παραμένει ένας από τους αδύναμους κρίκους της ευρωζώνης, για αυτό, θέλω να υπογραμμίσω ότι οι επιλογές Lagarde στην Ευρωπαϊκή Κεντρική Τράπεζα και ο ένας χρόνος Draghi στην πρωθυπουργία της Ιταλίας συμβάλλουν στη σταθερότητα και δημιουργούν τις προϋποθέσεις για να ξεπεράσουμε τις δυσκολίες, εφόσον κάνουμε φυσικά αυτό που πρέπει. Προφανώς, στηρίζω την πρόταση Παπαδημούλη για μια ειδική μεταχείριση, θα έλεγα, των ελληνικών ομολόγων. Δεν θέλουμε μια νέα ελληνική κρίση, γιατί δεν υπάρχει ελληνική κρίση σε αυτές τις περιπτώσεις· υπάρχει ευρωπαϊκή κρίση.

Η Ευρωπαϊκή Κεντρική Τράπεζα λειτουργεί σε ένα διαρκώς μεταβαλλόμενο διεθνές περιβάλλον, το οποίο από το καλοκαίρι του 2021 άρχισε να στέλνει προειδοποιητικά μηνύματα. Ο πληθωρισμός αποδεικνύεται υψηλότερος και μεγαλύτερης διάρκειας από ό,τι είχε αρχικά εκτιμηθεί. Σε ορισμένες ευρωπαϊκές αγορές υπάρχουν προϋποθέσεις της λεγόμενης «φούσκας» στα ακίνητα. Σημαντικό τμήμα του υπό διαμόρφωση νέου τύπου χρηματοπιστωτικού συστήματος δεν υπόκειται στον αυστηρό έλεγχο της ΕΚΤ, όπως οι συστημικές τράπεζες. Μαζί, λοιπόν, με το θετικό έργο του 2021, ήρθαν και νέες προκλήσεις για την Ευρωπαϊκή Κεντρική Τράπεζα. Έχει μπροστά της το δύσκολο έργο να προωθήσει αποτελεσματικά τον καταστατικό στόχο για τον πληθωρισμό, χωρίς όμως ανεπιθύμητες οικονομικές παρενέργειες, όπως θα ήταν η ανακοπή της δυναμικής ανάκαμψης της οικονομίας λόγω υψηλών επιτοκίων.

Θέλω να ευχαριστήσω τον κύριο Παπαδημούλη για την πολύ καλή δουλειά που έκανε, συντόνισε όλες τις πολιτικές δυνάμεις με δημιουργικό τρόπο για να φτάσουμε σε ένα θετικό αποτέλεσμα. Θέλω, επίσης, να διαβεβαιώσω την κυρία Lagarde, την οποία συγχαίρω φυσικά για το έργο της, ότι μπορείτε να περιμένετε από εμάς δημιουργική κριτική αλλά και σταθερή υποστήριξη στο στρατηγικής σημασίας έργο σας.

Κώστας Μαυρίδης, εξ ονόματος της ομάδας S&D. – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, (απευθύνεται στην κυρία Lagarde και στον κύριο Gentiloni στα αγγλικά) με αφορμή την 20ή επέτειο του ευρώ, θα ήθελα να τονίσω τον σημαντικό ρόλο της Ευρωπαϊκής Κεντρικής Τράπεζας για την ανάκαμψη και ενδυνάμωση του ευρώ, ιδιαίτερα σε εποχές δύσκολες και δη, σε εποχές αμφισβήτησής του. Τότε, κυρία Lagarde, που η κατάρρευση του ευρώ ήταν πιθανό να οδηγήσει και στην κατάρρευση του ευρωπαϊκού εγχειρήματος. Υπάρχουν, όμως, σημαντικά βήματα που απομένουν και κάποια από αυτά, τα πλέον σημαντικά, είναι σε αυτή την έκθεση.

Θα αναφέρω μόνο μερικά. Οι επιπτώσεις από την πανδημία και από την άνοδο του πληθωρισμού, κυρίως στην αύξηση των τιμών της ενέργειας, είναι ζήτημα που απασχολεί όλους. Επικροτήσαμε την ταχεία ανταπόκριση της Ευρωπαϊκής Κεντρικής Τράπεζας και στηρίζουμε και σήμερα τη σταδιακή, μελετημένη απόσυρση των μέτρων, λαμβάνοντας υπόψη οικονομικές και κοινωνικές επιπτώσεις, με γνώμονα πρωτίστως να αποφευχθεί μια νέα ύφεση. Επιπλέον, πρέπει αυτή η ευελιξία να διοχετευθεί στην πραγματική οικονομία. Τρίτον, για έναν πιο δίκαιο ανταγωνισμό, κυρία Lagarde και κυρία Επίτροπε, χρειαζόμαστε, επιτέλους, πανευρωπαϊκή εγγύηση των καταθέσεων. Τίθενται επίσης ζητήματα κλιματικής αλλαγής και ίσης εκπροσώπησης των γυναικών. Καλούμε την Ευρωπαϊκή Κεντρική Τράπεζα να πραγματοποιήσει επιπλέον βήματα. Τέλος, άλλο ζήτημα είναι οι καταχρηστικές ρήτρες: υπάρχουν κράτη μέλη —ένα από αυτά είναι και η Κύπρος— όπου οι τράπεζες, δυστυχώς, συνεχίζουν

ακόμη και σήμερα να χρησιμοποιούν στις συμβάσεις τους με τους καταναλωτές καταχρηστικές ρήτρες· είναι δυσβάσταχτο αυτό το κόστος για έναν καταναλωτή.

Τελειώνοντας, θέλω να τονίσω την εξαιρετική δουλειά του κύριου Παπαδημούλη, ο οποίος κατέληξε σε μια ισορροπημένη έκθεση. Θεωρώ ότι είναι καθήκον όλων μας ή τουλάχιστον της πλειοψηφίας, όπως καταλήξαμε σε αυτό το κείμενο, να το στηρίξουμε και στην Ολομέλεια.

Engin Eroglu, *im Namen der Renew-Fraktion*. – Sehr geehrte Frau Präsidentin, sehr geehrte Frau Lagarde, sehr geehrter Herr Kommissar! Wir geben heute in unserem Bericht die Einschätzung des Europäischen Parlaments zur Politik der EZB ab, und das ist auch sehr wichtig, denn die Geldpolitik ist relevant. Das haben die Bürgerinnen und Bürger der Eurozone in den letzten Jahren durchaus gemerkt, und sie merken es jeden Tag, wenn sie an der Zapfsäule stehen oder zum Lebensmitteleinkauf gehen.

Im letzten Sommer hat die EZB ihre Strategie überarbeitet. Es ist also wirklich wichtig gewesen, es ist ein sehr, sehr wichtiger Prozess gewesen. Und man hat bei dem wichtigen Thema der Inflation, beim Inflationsrahmen die komplizierte Kommunikation von nahe unter zwei Prozent auf glatt zwei Prozent gesetzt. Das kann ich zwar nicht begrüßen, aber ich denke, es ist richtig und einfacher berechenbar, wenn man jetzt von glatten zwei Prozent Inflation redet. Wenn man sich jedoch überlegt, was das für das Vermögen bedeutet – in nur zehn Jahren mal zehn –, dann ist das ein Fall.

Was im letzten Herbst, als wir den Bericht verhandelt haben, noch nicht so ganz klar war, ist, wie die Inflation jetzt im Dezember und Januar ist. Wir hatten ein wirklich gutes Klima bei den Verhandlungen im Ausschuss. Dafür möchte ich mich bedanken. Deswegen begrüße ich die Anträge der EVP, und wir werden diesen auch Rechnung tragen und diese mit unterstützen. Denn die Inflation, die ist im Dezember auf über fünf Prozent gesprungen.

Liebe Frau Lagarde, ich möchte Sie wirklich bitten: Nehmen Sie die Inflation ernst, sie wird nicht von alleine verschwinden. Und wir merken ja auch durch den Druck, den die Fed durch die Zinserhöhung aufbaut, dass das kein Spiel ist, wo wir die Spielregeln festlegen, sondern dass die Währung im internationalen Wettbewerb steht. Und wir müssen den Menschen zeigen, dass wir es ernst meinen.

Henrike Hahn, *im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin! Die Teuerung trifft die Menschen in Europa mitten ins Herz ihrer Geldbeutel und trifft auch die Industrie, die kleinen und mittleren Unternehmen und die Start-ups. Die Inflation lag im Januar bei 5,1 %, und die Europäische Zentralbank erwartet, dass die Teuerungsrate kurzfristig weiterhin hoch bleibt.

Eine der Hauptursachen der Inflation sind die höheren Energiepreise, die natürlich auch zusätzlich die Preise für Waren und Dienstleistungen beeinflussen. Und klar ist: Auf die gestiegenen Preise und die Lieferengpässe im Energiesektor hat die EZB mit ihrer Geldpolitik keinen direkten Einfluss. Im Gegenteil: Eine zu schnelle und zu starke Erhöhung der Leitzinsen kann den Aufschwung und die Arbeitsplätze gefährden, so wie das schon 2011 in der Eurokrise passiert ist. Es ist gut, dass die EZB sich jetzt dem Ruf und Druck von außen nach Zinserhöhungen nicht vorschnell beugt.

Wir brauchen stattdessen die richtigen Lösungen, nämlich mehr Tempo und mehr Energie, mehr Ehrgeiz für eine Energiewende und für grüne Transformation in Europa. Das ist der richtige Weg, um unabhängig von externen Preisschocks, die an uns in Europa herangetragen werden, entsprechend agieren zu können. Und die EZB kann genau im Rahmen ihres Mandats aktiv etwas für Klimaschutz tun. Und in diesem Sinne ist die *Strategy Review 2021* der EZB ausdrücklich der richtige Schritt in die richtige Richtung. Vielen Dank dafür, Madame Lagarde.

Valentino Grant, *a nome del gruppo ID*. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signora Presidente Lagarde, da quando è stato redatto questo fascicolo sicuramente molte cose sono cambiate: l'inflazione non si può più considerare un fenomeno transitorio e la stabilità dei prezzi rappresenta un problema di difficile soluzione.

Tenendo conto di questi fattori, le banche devono sì considerare il rischio climatico come un elemento di valutazione, ma bisogna anche prendere in considerazione il fatto che la pandemia ha rallentato la transizione ecologica e, di conseguenza, tutti gli obiettivi stabiliti nell'accordo di Parigi dovrebbero essere rivalutati. Gli ambiziosi obiettivi *green* devono essere letti anche con pragmatismo. Standard ambientali elevati devono andare di pari passo con la sostenibilità economica. È necessario evitare che un'eccessiva rigidità, insieme a uno scarso realismo, possano avvantaggiare i paesi terzi a scapito dei paesi europei.

Le PMI, che rappresentano il 99 % di tutte le imprese dell'Unione europea e che danno lavoro a circa 100 milioni di persone, hanno bisogno di liquidità. Sono loro il traino della ripresa economica. È quindi necessario ritornare a un'economia in cui è il mondo produttivo ad essere finanziato, non un'economia dove la finanza è fatta per la finanza. Le famiglie hanno bisogno di lavoro e solo finanziando l'economia reale si possono creare nuove opportunità di lavoro.

A questo proposito, Presidente Lagarde, Lei, nell'ultima conferenza stampa di giovedì 3 febbraio e anche durante il dialogo monetario in commissione ECON, ha fatto ampio ricorso a due termini: incertezza e flessibilità. I mercati, tuttavia, hanno percepito l'incertezza sulle scelte future e hanno provocato un immediato rialzo dei tassi.

Nello scenario che si prospetta tra falchi e colombe nel *board* della BCE, vorremmo essere sicuri che le decisioni future siano basate su analisi economiche e non su semplici processi politici. La BCE nei prossimi mesi sarà ad un bivio e ci auguriamo che Lei, Presidente, sappia imboccare la strada giusta.

Johan Van Overtveldt, *on behalf of the ECR Group*. – Madam President, President Lagarde recently referred in an interview to not being prepared to take a turn in fifth gear. Now you're absolutely right to do that, but we all know that the car that has a fifth gear also has a fourth, a third, a second and a first gear. And in terms of adapting its policy to the new environment of high and still rising inflation, the European Central Bank's car at the moment is, I think, fair to say, in first gear.

Some speeding-up is urgently needed and not so much because of the inflation numbers themselves but because of two related phenomena. First of all, inflationary expectations – consumers, producers, investors are rapidly adjusting upwards their inflationary expectations and I think a significant move in monetary policy is needed to avoid further escalation of these inflationary expectations. Secondly, insufficient immediate action might and probably will necessitate much higher interest rates in the future than if indeed immediate action were to be taken now.

Manon Aubry, *au nom du groupe The Left*. – Madame la Présidente, Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Commissaire, l'essence, l'électricité, les pâtes, le riz: tout coûte plus cher. Partout en Europe, les gens sont pris à la gorge et certains en profitent pour appeler déjà la Banque centrale européenne à serrer la vis monétaire, comme si les taux directeurs étaient encore aujourd'hui le facteur déterminant de l'inflation.

Avant la pandémie, la BCE avait déjà injecté 4 000 milliards d'euros, sans que cela se traduise par le moindre point d'inflation, car la bulle financière a quasiment tout pris, ne laissant que des miettes à l'économie réelle.

La crise actuelle du pouvoir d'achat n'a rien à voir avec la monnaie. Elle est due, d'un côté, à la voracité des énergéticiens, comme Total, qui accumulent des profits historiques en faisant des consommateurs des vaches à lait, et de l'autre, au chaos dans les chaînes d'approvisionnement mondialisées, que la pandémie a totalement déstabilisées.

Vous le reconnaissez, d'ailleurs, Madame Lagarde: une hausse des taux, je vous cite, «ne résoudrait aucun des problèmes actuels». Pour une fois, je dois dire que je suis bien d'accord avec vous. Couper le robinet, comme après la crise de 2008, serait une catastrophe. Mais, dans ce contexte, j'ai une question pour vous: à quoi donc sert encore l'objectif principal de stabilité des prix de la BCE, que vous défendez tant, encore aujourd'hui?

Comme le souligne le rapport de mon collègue Papadimoulis, il faut interroger le rôle même de la BCE face à l'urgence sociale et écologique. Madame Lagarde, assumez cette rupture et engagez la refonte du mandat de la BCE. La monnaie n'est pas un outil technique, c'est un levier politique. L'Europe ne peut plus être le seul endroit où la politique monétaire n'est pas débattue démocratiquement, pour qu'enfin elle serve les véritables besoins économiques, et non ceux des spéculateurs en tous genres.

Enikő Győri (NI). – Elnök Asszony! Az Európai Központi Bank feladata az árstabilitás feletti őrökösés. A jelenlegi inflációs adatok pedig azt mutatják, hogy résen kellene lenni, mert az élelmiszer-, de különösen az energiaárak annyira elszálltak. Sajnálatos módon Brüsszel az ideologikus energiapolitikájával felfelé hajtja az árakat, a zöldítés terhére a lakosságra hárítva, ami súlyos hiba és az oly fontos zöld politikát diszkreditálja. Legalább az EKB-tól reménykedjünk a józan ész diadalában! Lagarde asszony, kérem álljon ellen a baloldaltól jövő nyomásnak! A zöldítés nem a Központi Bank feladata! Önök a stabilitáshoz az árak kordában tartásával, ezáltal kedvező beruházási környezet kialakításával járulhatnak hozzá. Józan ész kellene ahhoz is, hogy majd mikor térünk vissza a szabályokhoz, mind a monetáris, mind a fiskális politika terén.

Egyesek már most állandósítani akarnák az egyszeri Helyreállítási Alapot, ezzel végtelenül eladósítva az Uniót. Tudják, a baloldal mindig a más pénzén szeret kormányozni. Helyes volt a lazítás, segíti a növekedésorientált helyreállítást, de nem élhetünk örökké a jövő generációi pénzén! A fiskális szabályokat is majd ennek szellemében és szigorúan 27-es körben kell kiigazítani. És egy utolsó megjegyzés: Elnök Asszony, én szívből azt kívánom Önnek, hogy mindig Európa legjobb pénzügyi agyaival, szakértőivel dolgozhasson, függetlenül attól, hogy férfiak vagy nők.

Othmar Karas (PPE). – *Madame La Présidente*, Herr Kommissar, Frau Präsidentin, meine Damen und Herren!

Ich möchte Sie auf vier Punkte besonders hinweisen. Ich kann mich sehr gut erinnern, als vor mehr als 20 Jahren um Mitternacht am Wiener Westbahnhof der Zug ankam und wir den Euro in Empfang nehmen konnten. Er war für uns alle ein politisches Projekt der Einigung und Integration Europas, der Stärkung von Wachstum, Stabilität und Wohlstand. Er wurde zur zweitstärksten Währung der Welt. Ich kann mich sehr gut erinnern, als zehn Jahre davor der deutsche Bundeskanzler Helmut Kohl im Deutschen Bundestag gesagt hat: Mit dem Euro ist die europäische Integration unumkehrbar, denn wenn man sich eine gemeinsame Währung gibt, muss man die Europäische Union zur politischen Union weiterentwickeln.

Was sagt uns das? Der Euro ist nicht fertig. Wie jede andere Währung braucht auch der Euro eine gemeinsame Wirtschafts-, Budget-, Fiskal-, Investitions-, Sozial- und Beschäftigungspolitik. Geldpolitik alleine kann dies nicht schaffen, sondern nur politischer Wille. Und Jacques Delors hat vor 30 Jahren in diesem Haus gesagt, wir benötigen dazu Entschlossenheit, Solidarität, mitunter etwas Wagemut. Tun wir endlich das, von dem wir seit 30 Jahren wissen, dass es der Euro braucht: eine gemeinsame vertiefte Budget-, Wirtschafts- und Währungsunion, eine Banken- und Kapitalmarktunion.

Jonás Fernández (S&D). – Señora presidenta, señor comisario, señora presidenta del BCE. Discutimos este informe en un momento oportuno y me gustaría, por supuesto, felicitar al señor Papadimoulis y al resto de ponentes alternativos, especialmente al señor Costas Mavridesa, por este informe, y, como ellos, espero que este Pleno apruebe tal y como ha sido aprobado por la Comisión de Asuntos Económicos y Monetarios.

Hace apenas unos minutos celebrábamos el vigésimo aniversario del euro. Veinte años de éxitos donde una nueva generación de europeos se ha habituado a vivir con una moneda, con una moneda común, con la moneda única, pero también veinte años donde ha habido algún error en la gestión de la política monetaria. En mi opinión, uno de esos errores se cometió en abril de 2011, cuando el presidente del BCE —entonces Trichet—, decidió subir los tipos de interés, supuestamente para evitar posibles efectos de segunda vuelta. Creo que este ejemplo es oportuno y es necesario en estos momentos, cuando vemos que los precios suben y, como ha dicho la presidenta del BCE, por fundamentos, fundamentalmente debido al precio de la energía o a cuellos de botella en la estructura productiva y en los ritmos de recuperación.

Espero que ese error lo tengamos muy presente para seguir acompañando la recuperación en los próximos meses.

Billy Kelleher (Renew). – Madam President, inflation is a continuing challenge now at the moment. The Commission published its Winter 2022 Economic Forecast last week, and it said that inflation will be around 3% for most of this year. Of course, there are now the challenges with geopolitical tensions in Ukraine and Russia.

Now all eyes are on the ECB, but Madame Lagarde, I just want to bring your attention to the fact that in the event of there being a necessity to raise interest rates to address the issue of inflation, I want you to take into account the fact that we do not have uniform interest rates across the European Union.

And I do believe that the ECB and the European Banking Authority have an obligation to unleash the blockages that are causing significant difficulties for some countries in keeping interest rates low – and I significantly mention Ireland itself, where the capital requirements and prudential obligations on our banks are looking at it through the prism of the last financial crisis. We have reduced our non-performing loans, our banks are in a healthy state, yet our obligations are based on historical facts. I would believe and urge that you should act on this in the event of interest rates having to rise, because this would have a profound impact on Ireland and on other countries that have higher interest rates than the EU average.

Ernest Urtasun (Verts/ALE). – Señora presidenta, señor comisario, todos estamos preocupados por el impacto que el aumento de precios, y particularmente la factura de la luz, está teniendo en algunos de nuestros conciudadanos. Pero llegar a la conclusión, a partir de aquí, de que hay que retirar los estímulos monetarios y subir los tipos de interés, como parecen sugerir los grupos conservadores, es profundamente equivocado. Como muy bien ha dicho la presidenta, los tipos de interés no pueden manejar el precio de los combustibles fósiles y, por lo tanto, no es por ahí por donde podemos atajar este problema.

En cambio, si ahora repetimos los errores que cometimos —como se decía ahora— en abril de 2011, subiendo los tipos y retirando estímulos, lo que haremos es poner en peligro la recuperación, poner en peligro la buena marcha del empleo en la zona del euro y volver a generar problemas de *spreads* en distintos Estados miembros. Por lo tanto, esa no es de ninguna manera la solución.

En cambio, sí hay algo que el BCE puede hacer a medio y largo plazo para combatir ese precio de la energía —que supone el 50 % del aumento de precios—, que es acelerar la transición ecológica a partir de los instrumentos de política monetaria que se tienen; por ejemplo, garantizando una mayor perspectiva ecológica en los centros o, por ejemplo, retirando las compras de combustibles fósiles que se siguen aún haciendo de forma masiva a través de los programas de compra de activos. Eso sí debe hacer el BCE y no retirar estímulos, algo que ahora sería un profundo error.

Gunnar Beck (ID). – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Kommissar, Madame Lagarde! 30 Jahre Maastricht und 20 Jahre Euro: Die EZB feiert den Euro als großen Integrationsschritt und Garanten von Europas Wirtschaftskraft.

Doch unerwähnt bleibt die Lissabonner Agenda, die EU bis 2010 bereits zum weltweit wettbewerbsfähigsten wissensgestützten Wirtschaftsraum zu machen. Welche Hybris! Die Eurozone hat seit Jahren das niedrigste Wachstum der entwickelten Welt. In der Hochtechnologie sind wir abgeschlagen hinter China und den USA. Die Arbeitslosigkeit bleibt hoch und wäre noch höher, würden die Migranten nicht unterschlagen.

Und der Euro selbst ist die teuerste Währung der Welt, die jährlich mit Hunderten Milliarden gerettet werden muss. Den deutschen Sparer allein kostete der Euro 2021 rund 116 Milliarden Euro, denn die Inflation beträgt inzwischen fünfeinhalb Prozent – in der Schweiz liegt sie indes bei 1,5 Prozent. Unbezahlbar, volkswirtschaftlich desaströs und auf Dauer vertrags- und verfassungswidrig angelegt, denn die Euro-Rettung vollzieht sich seit 2010 durch ständigen Bruch der Artikel 123, 125, 127 und 311 der EU-Verträge.

Fazit: Der Euro ist ein Weg der Verwirrung und Verirrung, genauso wie Ihre Klimarettungsfantasien und unqualifizierte Massenmigration. Mein Kollege ermahnte mich, ich möge heute sanftmütig sein. Ich tat das mir Mögliche.

Michiel Hoogeveen (ECR). – Voorzitter, toen we twintig jaar geleden aan de euro begonnen, was beloofd dat de euro een sterke en betrouwbare munt zou zijn, gegarandeerd door een robuust stabiliteits- en groeipact. Dit is niet langer het geval. De eurozone is een ruziezone geworden – het spaarzame Noorden tegenover het spilzuchtige Zuiden.

De Europese Centrale Bank heeft ondertussen als doel prijsstabiliteit, maar bedrijft steeds meer politiek. Terwijl inflatie toeslaat in de eurozone en de schulden van bepaalde lidstaten onhoudbare proporties aannemen, is de ECB vooral bezig met klimaatveranderingsrisico's, terwijl die taak volgens mij ligt bij verzekeraars, kredietbeoordelaars en adviesbureaus.

In Nederland bedroeg de inflatie in de maand december 6,4 %. De huizenprijzen die zelf niet in de inflatie zitten, zijn vorig jaar met 20 % gestegen – een bubbel die op barsten staat! Mevrouw Lagarde, ik snap dat u werkt voor de gehele eurozone. Maar voor de Nederlanders, de spaarders, gepensioneerden, jongeren werkt dit niet meer. Ik roep u op hen niet te vergeten.

Sabrina Pignedoli (NI). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la BCE ha sicuramente agito con coraggio durante la pandemia. Il programma degli acquisti dei titoli di Stato e una politica monetaria accomodante hanno favorito l'attuale ripresa economica che, tuttavia, noi vorremmo fosse più equa verso tutti i cittadini.

La relazione annuale sulla BCE attesta il buon lavoro svolto, anche se per il futuro ci sono almeno due grandi sfide da affrontare: i rincari energetici e l'inflazione innanzitutto.

Alzando i tassi di interesse in modo improvvido rischieremo una crisi del debito sovrano e non possiamo permettercelo; continuiamo invece con gli strumenti di politica monetaria non convenzionali per aiutare le imprese e le famiglie.

Seconda emergenza: la BCE può dare il suo contributo nella lotta contro il riciclaggio e l'evasione fiscale. Ricordiamo che buona parte dell'evasione fiscale e del riciclaggio avviene anche tramite banche e che essi si appoggiano anche ai paradisi fiscali, che ci sono anche all'interno di questa Europa.

Sven Simon (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin Regner, Frau Präsidentin Lagarde, Herr Kommissar Gentiloni! Ich denke, dass diese Debatte heute auch wieder sehr deutlich zeigt, wie wichtig es ist, dass die Europäische Zentralbank politisch unabhängig ist.

Ich möchte zwei Aspekte ansprechen zu diesem Bericht: als Erstes natürlich die Inflation.

In der Tat müssen wir über die ernsthaften Folgen der Niedrigzinspolitik schon sehr ernsthaft sprechen, denn die hohe Inflation und die konstant hohe Inflationserwartung sind natürlich gefährlich für den Aufschwung und vor allen Dingen auch den sozialen Frieden in Europa. Und es sind auch nicht nur die Energiepreise, wie hier manchmal so suggeriert worden ist. Denn auch die Kerninflation, also die Inflation ohne Energie und Nahrungsmittel, war im Dezember bei 3,7 Prozent.

Und jetzt ist es gut, dass die EZB unabhängig ist. Und deshalb sollte sich die Politik zurückhalten in der Bewertung der Niedrigzinspolitik. Ich vertraue der Europäischen Zentralbank und ihren Experten auch voll und ganz, wichtig ist aber, Frau Präsidentin –und Sie haben das ja auch angesprochen –, dass Sie in der Öffentlichkeit kommunizieren und erklären, warum Sie zu diesem Ergebnis kommen und jetzt die Zinspolitik betreiben, wie Sie sie betreiben. Ich glaube, das ist ganz wichtig für die Akzeptanz unserer Währung.

Und dann ist noch einmal wichtig: Das Hauptmandat der EZB ist Geldwertstabilität. Wenn hier von linker und grüner Seite gefordert wird, dass Klimapolitik betrieben werden sollte, ist das falsch. Die Europäische Zentralbank ist keine Klima-Investitionsbank. Deshalb ist das, was die Europäische Zentralbank macht – vor dem Hintergrund des Klimawandels die Risikobewertung zu verändern –, genau richtig, das, was aber in dem Bericht auch gefordert wird – dass die Europäische Zentralbank aktiv Klimapolitik betreibt –, falsch, weil es außerhalb ihres Mandates ist.

Und abschließend: Geldpolitik kann kein Ersatz für vernünftige Wirtschaftspolitik in den Mitgliedstaaten sein. In dieser Klarheit vermisse ich das im Bericht, aber ich bin sehr zufrieden, dass ich Sie, Frau Präsidentin, und Ihre Institution auch bei diesem Aspekt an meiner Seite weiß.

Pedro Marques (S&D). – Senhora Presidente, Presidente Lagarde, Comissário Gentiloni, vinte anos depois da criação do euro, um dos mais notáveis instrumentos da integração europeia, como hoje foi bem recordado, sabemos, finalmente, completar esta zona monetária única com um orçamento europeu de estabilidade, na senda do NextGenEU, como também já foi referido hoje. Que as lições da crise COVID permitam que não voltemos para trás, para os tempos da ausência da política monetária e para a política orçamental pró-cíclica e recessiva no tempo das crises.

Os dados mais recentes mostram que a inflação da zona euro é um fenómeno maioritariamente provocado por fatores temporários: os preços da energia e falhas nas cadeias de produção, como abundantemente tem referido o BCE. Não temos a inflação estrutural dos Estados Unidos da América, como nos tem demonstrado também o BCE.

Por isso, perante o regresso das regras orçamentais que causa e causará durante alguns meses significativa incerteza, a Europa precisa de uma política monetária responsável que apoie a estabilidade de preços, mas também o crédito, o investimento e a retoma económica em toda a Europa.

Caroline Nagtegaal (Renew). – Voorzitter, *Madame la présidente*, commissaris, terwijl de prijzen in de supermarkt de pan uit rijzen en de energierekening daadwerkelijk door het dak gaat, blijft de ECB weigeren om in te grijpen. We horen eigenlijk het ene excuus na het andere: de inflatie is maar tijdelijk, er zijn meer data nodig om te analyseren, of een renteverhoging lost het probleem niet op. Waar de economie met tekorten kampt, heeft de ECB in ieder geval geen tekort aan excuses.

De ECB heeft wat mij betreft maar één taak en dat is zorgen voor de prijsstabiliteit. Stijgen de prijzen te hard? Dan moet de centrale bank ingrijpen. Maar na maanden van hoge en toenemende inflatie blijft de ECB nog altijd op haar handen zitten. Het is hoog tijd dat de ECB dit probleem eindelijk aanpakt door het monetaire beleid te normaliseren, door te stoppen met geld printen en door de rente te verhogen. Alleen zo krijgen we de inflatiegeest weer terug in de fles.

Claude Gruffat (Verts/ALE). – Monsieur le Commissaire, Madame la Présidente, chers collègues, la politique monétaire de la BCE a permis aux États de décupler leurs capacités budgétaires, ce qui, au demeurant, n'est pas une mauvaise chose. Mais, malheureusement, cela a été peu utilisé dans les investissements, pourtant si nécessaires à notre avenir. Aujourd'hui, je pense notamment à l'augmentation des prix de l'énergie, qui mène indubitablement à une augmentation des prix à la consommation. Certains États ont fait le choix de solutions temporaires, qui permettent certes aux gens de sortir la tête de l'eau, mais après, quoi?

Le «quoi qu'il en coûte» a permis à Total ou à LVMH de générer en 2021 des bénéfiques records. Même chose pour la Société générale ou la BNP, qui, en plus, continuent de soutenir les investissements bruns, comme un rapport l'a confirmé ce matin. Le CAC 40 est en pleine forme, et, en attendant, que se passe-t-il pour les salariés, les vrais gens, ceux qui comptent à la fin du mois?

Alors, je m'interroge, Madame Lagarde, non pas sur les dépenses faites par la BCE, mais sur la qualité de ces dépenses. La meilleure façon de lutter contre l'inflation, c'est de lutter contre la hausse des prix à l'énergie, parce que le véritable risque, c'est de retarder la transition énergétique. Un vrai signal de courage nécessaire pour faire baisser l'inflation, c'est d'investir dans le renouvelable, afin que notre économie s'éloigne le plus vite possible des sources d'énergie brutes, dont les prix augmentent déjà.

Du coup, deux questions. La première: comment la BCE envisage-t-elle de contribuer à cet objectif, étant donné que cela affecte déjà directement la stabilité des prix? Je vais m'arrêter là.

France Jamet (ID). – Mes chers collègues, Madame la Présidente, avec la nouvelle taxonomie qui entend diriger les financements européens vers les activités que la Commission juge écologiquement durables, la Banque centrale européenne devient le bras armé de l'écologie punitive.

Comme toujours, les risques, les tracasseries administratives intenable et les faillites ne frapperont que les entreprises à taille humaine – les TPE, les PME –, qui sont les vraies créatrices de richesse. Comme toujours, les grands groupes, soutenus par la haute finance, mondialisés, eux, n'auront rien à craindre. Ils collectiviseront leurs pertes et privatiseront les profits.

La vérité, Madame Lagarde, c'est que la Banque centrale européenne se détache d'année en année de l'économie réelle – l'économie qui produit, qui investit, qui fait vivre des familles, et non les traders de la haute finance.

Il est urgent que la BCE cesse d'être le marchepied de Goldman Sachs et participe enfin au financement de l'économie réelle, qui, après la crise de la COVID-19 et celle de l'énergie, donnerait de nouvelles perspectives et relancerait le pouvoir d'achat des peuples d'Europe.

Aurore Lalucq (S&D). – Madame la Présidente, Madame la Présidente, cher Commissaire, il y a ce que la Banque centrale peut faire, ce qu'elle ne peut pas faire et ce qu'elle doit faire. Elle ne peut pas – je crois que nous sommes tous d'accord – lutter contre une inflation de court terme liée aux prix de l'énergie, ni contre la déflation d'ailleurs, avec un taux d'intérêt. Elle doit gérer en revanche les écarts de taux, les *spreads*, compte tenu du fait que nous n'avons pas de mutualisation de la dette, et c'est là, en fait, son vrai mandat aujourd'hui.

En revanche, elle peut faire beaucoup dans le domaine de la transition écologique. Nous sommes tous ravis, je crois, d'assister au verdissement futur de la politique monétaire de la Banque centrale européenne, mais nous vous attendons aussi dans un autre domaine, qui est celui de la supervision. Depuis l'accord de Paris, les soixante plus grandes banques mondiales ont accordé quasiment 4 000 milliards d'euros de financements aux énergies fossiles. Parmi elles, de grandes banques européennes, qui tombent sous la supervision de la Banque centrale européenne.

Ces investissements sont risqués: ils sont risqués pour nos vies; ils sont risqués pour la stabilité financière. Le Comité de Bâle a toujours dit que plus un investissement était risqué, plus il devait se faire sur fonds propres et mobiliser les fonds propres des banques. Aussi nous attendons des propositions fortes dans ce domaine. Puisque nous avons déjà une crise écologique à gérer, ce serait dommage d'avoir en plus une crise financière à gérer.

Gerolf Annemans (ID). – Voorzitter, ik ben een Vlaming en ik heb dus de Belgische nationaliteit. België heeft in Europa de vierde hoogste inflatie, nu al. De overheidsuitgaven die worden verwacht in 2026 bedragen 55 %, de hoogste van Europa en weldra van alle industrielanden. Het in 2023 verwachte negatieve begrotingssaldo bedraagt 4,9 %, net als dit jaar het hoogste van Europa. België moet ook enkel Griekenland, Italië en Portugal laten voorgaan inzake de omvang van de staatsschuld.

Waarom doet België het zo slecht voor een West-Europees land? Wel, ik zeg u: om dezelfde reden als waarom ook de eurozone het slecht doet.

Men heeft België gesticht om politieke redenen en daarbij de economische realiteit en de onderliggende verschillen genegeerd. Ook in de eurozone werd de rijkdom van de verschillen in de vergruizer van de convergentiepolitiek gepropt, met alle gevolgen van dien. Performante landen zijn onafhankelijke en cultureel homogene landen waar dezelfde mensen voor uitgaven en inkomsten verantwoordelijk zijn.

De eurozone werd ondertussen – om de mislukkingen te verbergen – versmacht in de schulden. Maar burgers en vooral jongeren worden geconfronteerd met de gevolgen van uw schuldgedreven planeconomie: gruwelijke energieprijzen en de quasionmogelijkheid om nog normale huizen te kopen. En voor ons doemt nu ook nog uw inflatiepandemie op, die weldra tot een chaos gaat leiden die even groot zal worden als uw megalomanie.

Wij zullen uw nietszeggend ECB-verslag natuurlijk niet goedkeuren.

Joachim Schuster (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin, Frau Lagarde, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Die Inflationsrate ist deutlich gestiegen. Einige der Ursachen dafür sind temporär. Deswegen wird sich die Inflationsrate im Jahresverlauf wieder abschwächen. Aber wir werden auf absehbare Zeit ein deutlich höheres Inflationsniveau zu verzeichnen haben als in den vergangenen Jahren. Das nehmen einige zum Anlass, jetzt die EZB energisch zum Handeln aufzufordern. Viele sagen auch gleich, die Zinsen müssten endlich steigen, damit das Ganze wieder ins Lot kommt. Klingt einfach – aber so einfach ist die Welt nicht.

Eine adäquate Antwort auf die gestiegene Inflation erfordert es auch, ein Konstruktionsdefizit der Währungsunion anzugehen. Damals wurde nämlich nur die Geld- und Währungspolitik vergemeinschaftet, während die Wirtschafts- und Finanzpolitik in nationaler Kompetenz belassen wurde. Auf heute gemünzt: Die Handlungsspielräume der EZB zur Inflationsbekämpfung erweitern sich deutlich, wenn in einem ersten Schritt durch eine Reform der europäischen Fiskal- und Schuldenregeln gleichzeitig sichergestellt wird, dass die konjunkturpolitische Handlungsfähigkeit aller Mitgliedstaaten erhalten bleibt und die erforderliche Steigerung der Investitionen, insbesondere zur Bewältigung des Klimawandels, gewährleistet ist.

Hélène Laporte (ID). – Madame la Présidente, Madame Lagarde, Monsieur le Commissaire, mes chers collègues, depuis sa mise en circulation, des réformes empiriques ont permis à l'euro de traverser plusieurs crises majeures avec plus ou moins de résilience. D'une façon générale, l'environnement économique actuel doit nous amener à nous interroger sur la pertinence des choix de la BCE en matière de taux, mais aussi sur sa capacité à trouver de nouveaux outils pour intervenir en cas de nouvelles tensions. L'institution est actuellement confrontée à deux risques majeurs: l'inflation galopante et la question des écarts de taux auxquels les États membres de la zone euro empruntent.

Après deux décennies de stabilité des prix, le spectre d'une inflation forte fait son retour. De votre propre aveu, Madame Lagarde, l'inflation pourrait bien être beaucoup plus forte qu'anticipé. L'évolution des composantes de l'inflation, notamment relatives aux prix de l'énergie, seront déterminantes pour les projections. Les conséquences négatives sont multiples: réduction du potentiel de croissance par la hausse des taux de crédit, baisse du pouvoir d'achat, érosion de la valeur de l'épargne, correction des marchés immobiliers et financiers... Le retour d'expérience serait primordial. La BCE ne doit pas reproduire les erreurs d'une remontée des taux d'intérêt trop brutale, comme celle de 2008, qui a tari des liquidités alors que le prix du baril de pétrole était à 145 dollars, ou celle de 2011, qui a accéléré la récession de la zone euro à un moment où les politiques budgétaires devenaient restrictives.

En outre, la question de la fragmentation de la zone euro se pose avec acuité avec l'augmentation des *spreads*, aujourd'hui de plus de 200 points de base, reflétant la sous-optimalité de la zone et la confiance très variable des investisseurs dans les différentes dettes souveraines. Plus l'écart se creuse, plus il devient difficile pour des pays très endettés de financer leur dette.

Pour conclure, la zone euro rentre dans une forte zone de turbulences, et les épargnants et les salariés ne doivent pas être sacrifiés sur l'autel d'un changement de politique monétaire. La croissance européenne peine à rattraper sa trajectoire d'avant-crise et la BCE ne peut plus prendre le risque d'une nouvelle décennie européenne perdue.

Paul Tang (S&D). – Voorzitter, vandaag maakte ShareAction bekend dat de grote Europese banken zo'n 50 miljard euro hebben gestoken in olie- en gaswinning. Wat denken ze wel? De wetenschap is heel duidelijk: om de doelen van Parijs te halen, moet er een einde komen aan die olie- en gaswinning. En we willen die doelen halen! Dus moet de olie- en gaswinning, via een CO₂-prijs of via regulering, worden gestopt. Dat is een miljardenstrop voor de investeerders.

Maar banken blijven deze weddenschappen aangaan, omdat zij denken: "Met kop win ik, met munt verlies jij." Want als banken in de problemen raken, dan draait de belastingbetaler daarvoor op. De ECB kan ingrijpen, met verplichte transitieplannen voor banken, met extra kapitaaleisen voor deze destructieve weddenschappen.

Met twintig jaar euro gaan de gedachten terug naar "Whatever it takes" van Mario Draghi. Mevrouw Lagarde, voor u is de vraag dus: "Bent u ook bereid er alles aan te doen om ons door deze klimaatcrisis van destructieve weddenschappen te loodsen?"

Paolo Gentiloni, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, we all know that we have a historic challenge ahead of us, which is to transform the rebound of our economies into durable, sustainable and stable growth.

I think this discussion shows with this challenge, first, the awareness of the importance of the European Central Bank in this environment, in the framework we have ahead of us. Second, that we can't ask everything to be addressed and solved by monetary policy. So we also are asked to address the problems of the coordination of our fiscal policies, and the discussion going on is necessary to strengthen also the potentiality of monetary policy.

Third, I have to say that I feel reassured by the gradual and evidence-based approach illustrated by President Lagarde, and especially by the autonomous way the ECB will take its decision in the coming weeks.

Christine Lagarde, *President of the European Central Bank*. – Madam President, well, first of all, thank you very much to all of you, and thank you for your comments, for your concerns and for sharing them in this very well-managed organisation – if I may say Madam President, on this occasion.

I would like to not answer all of your questions, because there are too many of them, but I would like to focus on three key areas where I would like to give you some feedback.

One is I would like to identify yet again for you, what matters and what is the framework within which we make monetary policy decisions because I've heard here and there concerns about independence, about the mandate, about the focus, and I would like to clarify that one more time.

The second item that I would like to also quickly point you to is the fact that a lot of the actions that we've taken in the last couple of years have actually benefitted SMEs. I've heard here and there that the action benefits large corporate accounts and not so much the real economy, and I think that that stands to be corrected.

And third, I would like to make a few points in relation to climate change and how it actually impacts our monetary policy, both in terms of stance and transmission.

So, on the first one, which is the universe within which we make our decisions. We are guided by a number of things that you are familiar with. The first one, which is the sort of foundation for the action, is our mandate, which is price stability as a primary mandate with secondary objectives, but secondary objectives without prejudice to the first objective, which is price stability. So that's number one.

Number two, we spent nearly 18 months – all of us, governors of all the 19 national central banks and members of the Executive Board of the ECB trying to identify what our strategy was, what our objectives were, what our measurements were, what our tools were, and we reached a unanimous consent around our strategy review. So we know quite well what our objective is in terms of how we measure it. And that's the point that I made earlier in my introductory remarks when I referred to simple communication around the objective, which is this 2% symmetric medium term.

The third item, which is important as well, which guides us and which is relatively technical but also pretty straightforward, is our forward guidance. And our forward guidance in relation to rates includes three particular components: Are we on target, well ahead of our horizon? Is it going to be durable so that at the end of the horizon, we will be on target? And are we confident that today the progress that's made will take us to that target? That's our forward guidance and it's helping us identify whether we are on target for the medium term, as we have identified in our strategy.

The other element of forward guidance, which deals with the next point that I want to make, is the sequence, and that is the forward guidance that we've identified in terms of when do we look at interest rates relative to asset purchases? Well, we complete net asset purchases and only then do we look at interest rate hikes. So we have these elements that actually guide us in order to make decisions.

Final point, which is very important, is that the decisions we make are data-dependent. It cannot be just on the fly. It cannot be a political decision. It has to be rooted in data and determined by data. And it will be so in that sequential and gradual way that I have tried to identify in my introductory remarks.

Second point where I wanted to come back briefly, the two key instruments – there were others – but the two key instruments that we have used during the pandemic were the Pandemic Emergency Purchase Programme (PEPP) and the targeted longer-term refinancing operations (TLTROs). Well, the volumes that have been deployed, particularly under the TLTROs clearly benefited SMEs. Large corporate accounts have the technical skills, the expertise, understanding to go out on markets. SMEs, particularly the small ones, they don't have that option in many instances. So what do they do? They actually go to their banks. And as you all know, Europe and the euro area is largely dependent for its financing of its economic operations on banking support. SMEs have had the great benefit of TLTROs during this whole period of time.

Final point, because there have been many issues that were raised in relation to climate change, and I did tell you that we were on schedule, with reference to our action plan. So I would like to tell you and to share with you what it means, because being on schedule supposes that we all know inside-out what the action plan is, which is not necessarily the case.

So what does that mean? It includes actually a lot of work that we do together with the Commission and together with you, the European Parliament, and where you play a critical role. The Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive (CSRD), the Taxonomy Regulation and the Regulation on sustainability-related disclosures in the financial services sector are going to help us a great deal in properly managing the risks that we have on our balance sheet and actually expecting from banks in particular that they do comply with disclosure requirements.

You have a key role to play to facilitate the implementation of the ECB's action plan by ensuring a swift implementation of the relevant legislation. In particular, any delay in the implementation or the transposition of the CSRD might have a knock on effect on the timeline of the ECB action. So in that respect, we very much rely on the speed at which you can operate in order to, ourselves, apply those criteria and those disclosure requirements throughout our own activity.

So, rest assured that we are driven, dedicated to one mandate, which is that of price stability, but that we have to be very mindful of how climate change impacts the action that we have to take. We are not in the driving seat. You are, governments are. But, the central banks that are members of the euro system and the ECB at its heart, are very keen and have actually unanimously approved the fact that climate change is one of the components that we have to take into account for monetary policy determination for the macroeconomic framework and obviously for the supervision of the banking institution that we supervise throughout the European Union.

Δημήτριος Παπαδημούλης, Εισηγητής. – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, κυρία Lagarde, σας ευχαριστώ για τη συμβολή σας, καθώς και για τα θετικά σχόλια που κάνετε για την έκθεση που έχουμε ετοιμάσει στην Επιτροπή Οικονομικών και Νομισματικών Υποθέσεων. Θα ήθελα να σας ευχαριστήσω και εσάς, κύριε Επίτροπε Gentiloni, όπως και τους συναδέλφους, γιατί όλες οι τοποθετήσεις, ακόμη και αυτές που άσκησαν κριτική στην έκθεση, έδειξαν ότι μέσα από την ανταλλαγή απόψεων στην Επιτροπή Οικονομικών και Νομισματικών Υποθέσεων πετύχαμε σε πολύ μεγάλο βαθμό κάτι που περιγράφεται με μία λέξη που έχει ελληνική ρίζα: σύνθεση απόψεων.

Το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο πρέπει να παίξει έναν ακόμη πιο ενεργό ρόλο, γιατί αυτό που διαπιστώνουμε σήμερα είναι η ανάγκη συντονισμού της νομισματικής με τη δημοσιονομική πολιτική, με πλήρη σεβασμό στην ανεξαρτησία και τον σημαντικό ρόλο της Ευρωπαϊκής Κεντρικής Τράπεζας. Από τη συζήτηση, και η έκθεσή μας το υπογραμμίζει αυτό, προκύπτει η ανάγκη να διδαχθούμε από τα λάθη του παρελθόντος: να μη «σκοτώσουμε» τη βιώσιμη ανάκαμψη, να μην υπονομεύσουμε τους στόχους που έχουμε θέσει όλοι μαζί με τη δημιουργία και την ενεργοποίηση του Ταμείου Ανάκαμψης και Ανθεκτικότητας. Είναι φανερό ότι όλοι ανησυχούμε για τα εξαιρετικά υψηλά ποσοστά πληθωρισμού και τις συνέπειές τους, κυρίως στα φτωχότερα τμήματα του πληθυσμού. Ωστόσο, μια βιαστική και γρήγορη άνοδος των επιτοκίων δεν θα χαμηλώσει τις τιμές των καυσίμων· αντίθετα, μπορεί να δυσκολέψει, να υπονομεύσει τη βιώσιμη ανάπτυξη, την ανθεκτικότητα και τη σταθεροποίηση των τιμών που απαιτεί μια συνολική προσέγγιση.

Χαιρετίζω, στο πλαίσιο αυτών των σκέψεων, την πρόταση της Ευρωπαϊκής Κεντρικής Τράπεζας για τη δημιουργία μιας κεντρικής δημοσιονομικής ικανότητας και θεωρώ ιδιαίτερα σημαντικό, χωρίς καθυστερήσεις, η Επιτροπή να δώσει στη δημοσιότητα τις προτάσεις της για την αλλαγή του πλαισίου οικονομικής διακυβέρνησης όσο διαρκεί η αναστολή του συμφώνου σταθερότητας. Η καθυστέρηση δεν βοηθά. Μια τελευταία φράση: νομίζω ότι είναι θετικό ότι «πρασινίζει» η νομισματική πολιτική και σε αυτά τα βήματα, κυρία Lagarde, να θεωρείτε δεδομένη την υποστήριξη της μεγάλης πλειοψηφίας του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου.

Die Präsidentin. – Die Aussprache ist geschlossen.

Die Abstimmung findet am Dienstag, 15. Februar 2022, statt.

Ich möchte mich ganz ausdrücklich bei allen Abgeordneten, die sich zu Wort gemeldet und eingebracht haben, bedanken, aber natürlich vor allem bei Frau Präsidentin Lagarde und bei Herrn Kommissar Gentiloni.

Schriftliche Erklärungen (Artikel 171)

Csaba Molnár (S&D), írásban. – A koronavírus járvány következtében Európa gazdasága a 2008/09-es gazdasági válsághoz hasonló horderejű kihívásokkal néz szembe. Bár az Unió gazdasági teljesítménye 2021 harmadik negyedévében elérte a világválság előtti szintet, az omikron új variáns rohamos terjedésének következtében a gazdasági növekedés ismét csökkenő pályára állt. Az Európa-szerte magas infláció megfelelő kezelése elengedhetetlen! Üdvözlöm az Európai Központi Bank monetáris politikájának felülvizsgálatára vonatkozó törekvéseket, hiszen támogató költségvetési politikára és társadalmilag kiegyensúlyozott reformokra van szükség.

Sajnálatos, hogy hazámban, Magyarországon a gazdaságpolitikát nem az európai standardok szerint alakítják. Pár napja újabb csúcsot ütött meg a magyar infláció, a KSH adatai szerint a fogyasztói árak átlagosan 7,9%-kal voltak magasabbak, mint egy évvel korábban. Ez tarthatatlan! A Demokratikus Koalíció európai parlamenti képviselőjeként azt vallom, hogy a Covid19-válság gazdaságpolitikai kihívásaira csakis közösen, európai szintű válasszal tudunk hatékony eredményt elérni. Magyar képviselőként tovább folytatom a küzdelmet az euró bevezetéséért is!

20. Sprawozdanie wykonawcze w sprawie dobrostanu zwierząt w gospodarstwach (debata)

Die Präsidentin. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über den Bericht von Jérémy Decerle im Namen des Ausschusses für Landwirtschaft und ländliche Entwicklung über den Umsetzungsbericht über das Wohlergehen landwirtschaftlicher Nutztiere (2020/2085(INI)) (A9-0296/2021).

Jérémy Decerle, rapporteur. – Madame la Présidente, Madame la Commissaire, le rapport qui est présenté aujourd'hui devant notre assemblée sur le bien-être des animaux à la ferme est un rapport d'évaluation. Il vise à aider notre institution à formuler des propositions pour l'évolution de la réglementation européenne existante. Il ne se veut rien de plus et rien de moins.

Le bien-être des animaux est un sujet sensible. Certains préféreraient fermer les yeux sur cette préoccupation sociétale grandissante et éviter d'en parler. Ils voudraient que nous ne fassions rien du tout, sans même chercher à comprendre l'enjeu. D'autres, au contraire, qui en font leur combat, dénoncent ce qu'ils considèrent comme un manque d'action, promeuvent de nouvelles pratiques – souvent inadaptées –, réclament la suppression d'autres, quand ce n'est pas tout simplement la suppression de l'élevage. Ils attendent beaucoup de nous, nous observent et nous notent, même, parfois.

Nous ne sommes ni dans un camp ni dans l'autre. Nous sommes, pour la très grande majorité de ce Parlement, ceux qui font, ceux qui agissent, ceux dont la responsabilité est de proposer des moyens d'avancer ; car c'est bien là la question qui est devant nous: non pas de savoir à quel niveau de priorité nous plaçons le sujet du bien-être animal, ni si nous devons progresser ou pas, car, évidemment, il le faut toujours, mais plutôt – et c'est plus difficile – celle de savoir comment nous progressons.

Je tiens à remercier très sincèrement les rapporteurs des autres groupes, avec qui j'ai eu le plaisir de travailler, pour leur engagement et leur posture très majoritairement constructive. Nous sommes, je crois, parvenus à présenter un travail utile, que le Parlement adoptera, j'espère, et qui viendra nourrir les législations futures. Nous nous sommes appuyés sur des faits, et en premier lieu sur une étude pilotée par le Service de recherche du Parlement, une étude documentée, fondée sur des entretiens, et dont les enseignements étaient parlants. J'en ai pour ma part tiré quelques convictions, qui sont au cœur du rapport dont nous discutons aujourd'hui, lequel a été largement soutenu par la commission de l'agriculture et enrichi, bien sûr, de contributions de la commission de l'environnement.

Il y a quatre points sur lesquels j'aimerais insister, car ils me semblent être le fondement de notre message. Le premier, c'est qu'il n'y aura pas de nouveaux progrès possibles en matière de bien-être animal en élevage tant que nous n'aurons pas réussi à harmoniser la mise en œuvre et les contrôles des règles qui existent déjà. Relever la barre avant d'avoir réussi cela, ce serait, je crois, se faire plaisir, mais condamner toute efficacité tout en mettant à mal notre marché commun. Renforçons nos moyens de surveillance. Accompagnons les États membres et les acteurs économiques d'abord. Étendons le champ des espèces couvertes par la réglementation; beaucoup méritent des règles spécifiques et adaptées. Ensuite, nous pourrions revoir nos ambitions à la hausse.

Le deuxième point, c'est que nous ne parviendrons à rien en cherchant à agir contre les éleveurs, qui sont, que certains le veuillent ou non, les premiers acteurs du sujet, des acteurs qu'il faut encourager à continuer à bien s'occuper de leurs bêtes, ce que la plupart font déjà. C'est ce qu'il faudra commencer par reconnaître, justement, en rémunérant ces efforts, y compris quand ils vont au-delà de la réglementation.

Le troisième point, qui est lié, c'est que nous avons besoin, pour cette reconnaissance et cette rémunération, d'un étiquetage moins anarchique qu'aujourd'hui, plus encadré, qui s'appuie sur des cahiers des charges sérieux, mais qui laisse la place à des initiatives privées, d'États membres, de filières, d'ONG ou d'acteurs réunis. Pourquoi ne pas envisager un socle commun obligatoire et poser des garde-fous pour éviter les dérives et les demandes farfelues? Les consommateurs veulent de la lisibilité, certes, mais pas une approche trop normative.

Le quatrième et dernier point, c'est que le continent, qui a déjà choisi aujourd'hui, à juste titre, de se doter des standards les plus exigeants du monde, ne pourra continuer à les relever que s'il est capable de les faire respecter aussi par les produits importés. Sinon, encore une fois, nous pourrions nous targuer d'être exigeants, mais nos consommateurs n'en profiteront pas, et nous n'aurons fait qu'exporter le problème.

En responsabilité, je suis convaincu que nous devons intégrer ces principes si nous voulons vraiment avancer. Continuer à améliorer le bien-être des animaux est mon souhait, n'en doutez pas. C'est le souhait d'un nombre croissant de citoyens. C'est le souhait de la grande majorité des éleveurs et de cent pour cent de celles et ceux qui s'installent en élevage aujourd'hui. Nous n'atteindrons cette ambition que si nous appliquons ces principes d'harmonisation, de reconnaissance, de juste valorisation et de réciprocité.

Stella Kyriakides, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, honourable Members, last month in this Chamber I was here, we discussed together animal welfare during transport. Today I am pleased to be here with you again to discuss another important aspect of animal welfare.

I have stressed on a number of occasions, as I'm sure many of you recall, that animal welfare is a Commission priority in our Farm to Fork strategy. More than that, it is for myself a personal priority. Not only does it have serious ethical dimensions, but it also reflects clear demands from citizens for the highest welfare standards possible. And these demands are becoming stronger by the day.

So let me start by welcoming this Parliament's implementation report on farm animal welfare. This report is very relevant for two reasons: firstly because of its timing, because we are continuing our deliberations to revise EU legislation on animal welfare; and secondly, because the broad scope of the report will provide useful input in that process.

We have been working hard to lay solid foundations for the revision, in the form of a fitness check of the existing legislation and the impact assessment addressing the environmental, social and economic impacts of the legislative proposal. In doing so, I believe that we have taken the holistic approach that this House has been asking for.

In parallel, the European Food Safety Authority, EFSA, is putting in place another foundation stone for the revision, namely the scientific opinions on the welfare of several animal species. These will cover issues such as animal welfare indicators and options for housing systems, and additionally we are also carrying out extensive consultation activities.

The recent public consultation, for which we received almost 60 000 inputs, is one example. We are determined to bring about positive change in this important area and are listening very carefully, because every single opinion matters in this process.

Honourable Members, as I mentioned a moment ago, your report deals with many issues that the revision will have to cover. I am very aware of the multidimensional nature of animal welfare and the complexity of possible options, and your report reflects these well.

We do not yet have all the necessary information we need for revision and the reply to your recommendations. However, I can assure you that we are working hard to find these appropriate solutions, and the findings of ongoing scientific studies and impact assessments will help fill any gaps.

As we all know, the most recent legislation on animal welfare was adopted around 15 years ago. During that time, many aspects of our relationship towards animals and the food they produce have changed dramatically. These aspects are driving us to look at a number of new elements and take a more species-specific approach, as well as broadening the legislation to other species. We all know that if we improve animal welfare, we also improve animal health. This decreases the use of medicines in animals and directly supports our efforts to deal with what we call the 'silent pandemic' – that of antimicrobial resistance.

We are also conscious of our obligations and commitments to support our farmers. And I am pleased that your draft report includes recommendations on animal welfare labelling. Looking also at last year's Council conclusions on this topic, I find your recommendations to reflect the broad consensus that the EU has to act and adopt a relevant legislative framework. It should be consistent with the forthcoming proposal on sustainable food systems, labelling and empowering EU consumers to make informed animal welfare choices when they buy food. And on top of that, it needs to offer farmers incentives to apply welfare standards to go beyond what is required by law.

Ultimately, it should guarantee a level playing field for all business operators, so that animal welfare claims are both comparable and well substantiated. This should also apply to products coming from outside the European Union. Consumers have a right to know that these products come from animals raised in accordance with our rules.

So we will take note of your recommendations. We will present a proposal on animal welfare labelling to you, together with the revision of our animal welfare legislation, before the end of 2023.

And in ending, honourable Members, I know that I can count on you to be as supportive and constructive as always in the work that we undertake together, and after all, I believe that our aims are the same: better welfare for animals, better information for consumers, and also better rewards for business operators.

Marlene Mortler, *Verfasserin der Stellungnahme des mitberatenden Ausschusses für Umweltfragen, öffentliche Gesundheit und Lebensmittelsicherheit.* – Frau Präsidentin, Frau Kommissarin! Was brauchen Landwirte, um ihren Job für Tierwohl gut machen zu können? Sie brauchen dasselbe wie alle anderen Berufe auch: weniger Hindernisse, weniger Hemmnisse, weniger Bürokratie. Es muss folgender Grundsatz gelten: Erst die Tiere, dann die Papiere, denn gute Arbeit muss sichtbar und transparent sein.

Deshalb plädiere ich für eine verpflichtende Haltungs- und Herkunftskennzeichnung in Europa. Wir benötigen Benchmarking. Gutes Arbeiten und mehr Leistung müssen am Markt honoriert werden. Höhere Standards in Europa dürfen nicht nach außen verkauft und durch *Leakage*-Effekte importiert werden. Es braucht Fairness im Wettbewerb und im Tierschutz. Jagen wir unseren Landwirten also keine Mistgabel in den Hintern, wenn sie vor einer Steilwand stehen.

Farm to Fork muss anders funktionieren. Was nützt ein Ringelschwanz beim Schwein, wenn es keine Abnehmer oder Gerichtsprozesse um Tiere gibt, weil sie mit zu langen Schwänzen geliefert wurden? Es braucht also schnellstens ein Team mit Sicherungsseilen, nicht mit Strafen und Kontrollen, ein Team mit der Kommission an der Spitze, das unsere Landwirte befähigt, aktiviert und motiviert. Denn nur, wenn wir unsere Landwirte unterstützen, kommen wir unserem Ziel für mehr Tierwohl überhaupt näher.

(Die Präsidentin unterbricht die Rednerin)

... permanentem Wissenstransfer, um den Weg nach oben kontinuierlich freizuräumen. Setzen wir also auf *One Welfare*, auf *Animal* und auf *Farmers' Welfare*.

Michaela Šojdrová, za skupinu PPE. – Paní předsedající, vážení kolegové, paní komisařko, zpráva Zemědělského výboru o stavu životních podmínek hospodářských zvířat uznává pokrok, kterého zemědělci dosáhli, a zároveň upozorňuje na nutnost dalších změn a zlepšení. Zemědělský výbor žádá Komisi, aby předložila revizi legislativy do konce roku 2023. Tomu musí předcházet dopadová studie založená na nejnovějších poznatcích, která zohlední všechny možnosti i dopady přechodu na alternativní způsoby chovů. Zpráva výboru AGRI začlenila většinu toho, co pro zlepšení chovu zvířat požadují občané i organizace na ochranu zvířat. Konkrétně, stejně jako oni, i výbor AGRI požaduje celounijní zákaz klecových chovů nosnic po roce 2027.

Jsmě přesvědčeni, že jediný způsob, kterým docílíme zlepšení životních podmínek hospodářských zvířat, je ve spolupráci se zemědělci, a postupnými změnami. Podmínkou číslo 1 je jejich finanční podpora. Výbor AGRI zdůrazňuje také druhou podmínku, a to je reciprocita pro dovoz ze třetích zemí. Parlament proto nekompromisně žádá zákaz dovozu hospodářských zvířat nebo živočišných produktů, které nesplňují evropské normy. Tímto opatřením zabráníme znevýhodnění našich evropských zemědělců a pomůžeme prosadit tyto změny také mimo EU. Za důležité považují společný rámec pro dobrovolné označování, které je motivační pro zemědělce i spotřebitele.

Kolegyně a kolegové, zemědělci velmi dobře vědí, že zdraví je jen jedno. Vědí, že i naše zdraví je závislé na zdraví hospodářských zvířat, a proto je v jejich zájmu chovat zvířata v co nejlepších podmínkách. Zemědělci potřebují naši podporu, důvěru a vědomí, že si jejich práce vážíme. Proto v této chvíli vyzývám všechny kolegy, kteří ještě váhají, jak budou hlasovat: prosím, podpořte usnesení Zemědělského výboru, které je velkým krokem ve prospěch dobrých životních podmínek zvířat, a může to být tento Parlament, který ještě bude projednávat novou legislativu v roce 2023.

Merci, Jérémy, pour votre coopération et merci à tous ceux qui ont coopéré.

Carmen Avram, în numele grupului S&D. – Doamnă președintă, bunăstarea animalelor și bunăstarea fermierilor nu sunt negociabile și nici nu sunt concepte antagonice, așa cum mai insinuează unii, pur și simplu pentru că bunăstarea animalului depinde 100 % de capacitatea fermierului de a-i acorda cele mai înalte standarde de creștere. Aceste două concepte fiind interconectate, ele trebuie deci tratate concomitent și cu grade identice de atenție și responsabilitate.

Nu doar asta, ci pentru a se atinge țintele *Green Deal* și *Farm-to-Fork*, cele două concepte trebuie respectate și în exteriorul Uniunii, când vine vorba de importuri. Fără o clauză fermă de reciprocitate în acordurile de liber schimb, sectorul zootehnic european ar putea primi lovitura fatală, în timp ce 450 de milioane de consumatori europeni ar risca să mănânce ieftin și prost.

Fără astfel de angajamente și fără un sprijin puternic pentru sectorul zootehnic, bunăstarea animalelor ar rămâne un deziderat. De aceea, vă îndemn să susțineți acest raport în forma negociată alături de colegii mei, căroră le mulțumesc, pentru că acest raport conține un mesaj ferm: legislația privind bunăstarea animalelor trebuie revizuită urgent, dar fără a face rabat de la grija acordată fermierilor.

Ulrike Müller, im Namen der Renew-Fraktion. – Frau Präsidentin, Frau Kommissarin, verehrte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Ich möchte mich ganz herzlich bei dem Berichterstatter für seine hervorragende Arbeit bedanken.

Das Wohlergehen unserer Nutztiere liegt mir als Landwirtin besonders am Herzen. Ich unterstütze die in dem Bericht gestellte Forderung nach aktualisierten Regeln, basierend auf wissenschaftlichen Erkenntnissen. Auch eine einheitliche Umsetzung dieser Regeln in allen Mitgliedstaaten ist nur zu begrüßen.

Ich befürchte allerdings, dass die Entwicklungen in Deutschland schneller voranschreiten werden als das Erarbeiten dieser neuen Vorschriften auf europäischer Ebene, Frau Kommissarin. In Deutschland haben Discounter angekündigt, ab 2030 nur noch Frischfleisch aus Außenklimastall- und Premiumhaltung zu vermarkten. Abschlüge bei Milch aus Anbindehaltung müssen in Kauf genommen werden. Die Zahl der landwirtschaftlichen Betriebe mit Viehhaltung ist in den letzten zehn Jahren um 22 Prozent zurückgegangen. Tierbestände sinken drastisch. Das ist auch politisch gewollt und nicht erst seit dem neuen Regierungswechsel in Deutschland sichtbar.

Mehr Tierwohl führt aber immer zu großen Investitionen in den Betrieben. Und ich frage mich, wie das finanziert werden soll, ohne Preiserhöhungen bei Erzeugerpreisen. Zurzeit gibt es kein Signal vom LEH und den Discountern, diese Mehrkosten durch höhere Einkaufspreise auszugleichen. Somit entsteht zusätzlicher Druck auf deutsche Landwirtinnen und Landwirte. Es werden viele Existenzen gefährdet, vor allem die der kleinen Familienbetriebe.

Ich hoffe, dass wir vor lauter Tierwohl das Menschenwohl der Bäuerinnen und Bauern nicht aus den Augen verlieren.

Francisco Guerreiro, em nome do Grupo Verts/ALE. – Senhora Presidente, Cara Comissária, em discursos políticos, o bem-estar animal na União Europeia tende a ser caracterizado como um dos melhores no mundo. No entanto, precisamos de ser cautelosos quando expressamos este orgulho porque, na maioria dos casos, os animais que são explorados pelo setor da pecuária intensiva não têm uma vida digna, muito pelo contrário.

Na pecuária, estes animais não são livres de expressarem o seu instinto natural, vivem presos em jaulas e em todo o processo, desde a criação, transporte, até à sua morte, são tratados como meras mercadorias. E o relatório sobre o qual amanhã votamos deveria retratar isto – a deplorável condição de vida a que submetemos estes animais na pecuária – e fazê-lo de uma forma realista, factual e com base em dados científicos.

Infelizmente, contra a vontade dos Verdes, este relatório foca-se em aspetos como a competitividade no setor pecuário e as consequências económicas do investimento em melhores padrões de bem-estar animal. Sim, analisar estes aspetos é importante, mas não é central num relatório cujo mandato é a análise das falhas na implementação da legislação de bem-estar animal. E importa lembrar: este relatório não é sobre os agricultores, é sobre os animais que estão a cargo destes agricultores e a forma como lhes temos falhado em matéria de proteção e zelo.

Para além disto, e de modo incompreensível, este relatório afirma que a produção de *foie gras* respeita o bem-estar animal. Considera que as constantes violações da legislação europeia são apenas casos esporádicos, rejeita a rotulagem obrigatória para produtos alimentares que indique as normas de bem-estar animal e, numa tentativa de proteger os interesses económicos pecuários e contrariando a ciência, não reconhece que uma redução do consumo de carne e do número de animais por exploração é urgente.

Por tudo isto, colegas, e se realmente nos preocupamos com estes animais, peço-vos que amanhã apoiem a resolução alternativa da Comissão do Ambiente, que retrata muito mais fielmente os problemas na implementação da legislação do bem-estar animal e que apoiem as alterações dos Verdes para garantir que o relatório da agricultura seja, no fim, menos mau.

Krzysztof Jurgiel, w imieniu grupy ECR. – Pani Przewodnicząca! Pani Komisarz! W Polsce dobrostan zwierząt w gospodarstwach jest zachowany. Obowiązujące przepisy w tym zakresie są wystarczające i cały czas zwiększamy poziom dobrostanu. Sprawozdanie wykonawcze w sprawie dobrostanu zwierząt w gospodarstwach zawiera 55 wniosków i zaleceń, których część uznaję za słuszne.

I tak po pierwsze, dokonanie do końca 2023 r. przez Komisję Europejską oceny i przeglądu przepisów w zakresie dobrostanu zwierząt, w tym dotyczących transportu i uboju zwierząt. Po drugie, zapewnienie przez Komisję Europejską inwestycji w dobrobyt rolników zajmujących się zwierzętami gospodarskimi. Po trzecie, wezwanie Unii Europejskiej do zapewnienia środków finansowych i odpowiedniego horyzontu czasowego rolnikom w przypadku wprowadzania jakichkolwiek zmian w zakresie przepisów dotyczących hodowli zwierząt. Po czwarte, konieczność przeprowadzenia oceny naukowej i uwzględnienia siły nabywczej konsumenta przy wprowadzaniu zmian legislacyjnych. Po piąte, dobrowolne podejście dotyczące systemu etykietowania w zakresie dobrostanu zwierząt. Po szóste, apel o krótkie łańcuchy dostaw w obszarze żywienia i oparte na żywności produkowanej lokalnie. Po siódme, nie popieram punktu 17. sprawozdania dotyczącego poparcia przez Parlament Europejski inicjatywy obywatelskiej „Skończmy z chowem klatkowym” odnoszącej się do całkowitego zaprzestania chowu i hodowli zwierząt w systemie klatkowym.

Anja Hazekamp, *on behalf of The Left Group*. – Madam President, the rapporteur announced at the start of the negotiations that he wanted an objective debate without extreme positions. Is it possible for an active cattle farmer to write an objective report on animal welfare on farms, solely based on facts instead of his personal opinions? Clearly not. This report is not objective. It is not science-based and not even about animal welfare.

It is time that those who cried the loudest for scientific evidence start using scientific evidence themselves. I cannot emphasise enough how extremely disappointing it is that once again, animal welfare is hijacked by the ongoing debate on the future of farmers. A missed opportunity, but we can fix this by voting in favour of the alternative and objective reports written and adopted by the Committee on Environment, Public Health and Food Safety (ENVI).

Dear Commissioner, times are changing, but not everyone seems to be willing to embrace this change. I hope and expect from the Commissioner that she will use her common sense and base her legislative proposals on scientific evidence and on the welfare and needs of every animal species. That is what we need to tackle the numerous cases of non-compliance, the enormous animal suffering and the systemic inhumane treatment of animals exposed by multiple investigations and by your own inspections. The sooner, the better.

Dino Giarrusso (NI). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, le direttive europee sul benessere animale, nonostante gli studi e gli sforzi fatti dal Parlamento europeo, hanno sì consentito di ottenere cambiamenti strutturali riguardo alcune modalità di allevamento – direttive su galline ovaiole, suini e vitelli –, ma hanno avuto un impatto modesto se valutiamo la direttiva generale e la direttiva sui volatili.

La disomogeneità sembra il limite più importante all'interno dell'Unione: le direttive non specificano nel dettaglio i requisiti riguardanti le modalità di rispetto delle norme e di controllo, con conseguenze inaccettabili.

I sistemi europei di etichettatura relativi al benessere degli animali, in prevalenza privati, sono tutti volontari e nei fatti sono sistemi molto diversi fra loro in termini di funzionamento e concezione e non esiste nemmeno in prospettiva un'etichettatura obbligatoria e uguale nell'UE. La Commissione proceda dunque sulle direttive per aumentarne l'efficacia, migliorarne leggibilità e precisione e uniformare gli Stati membri.

La crisi sanitaria svela l'importanza di una corretta gestione degli allevamenti, anche per la salute nostra e dei nostri figli. Ascoltiamo gli operatori del settore e i medici per trovare un approccio definitivo, pragmatico e realistico sia riguardo le pratiche di allevamento che le prassi commerciali.

Herbert Dorfmann (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin, Frau Kommissarin, Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Das Wohl der Tiere – ganz gleich, ob in der Landwirtschaft oder auch der Haustiere – ist eine Aufgabe unserer Gesellschaft. Und deshalb, glaube ich, ist dieser Bericht wichtig. Wir müssen uns fragen: Wo stehen wir heute? Und was muss noch verbessert werden?

Tierwohl beginnt dort, wo Tiere gehalten werden, also auf unseren Bauernhöfen, aber es geht auch weit darüber hinaus. Tiere gehören ordentlich transportiert und auch ordentlich geschlachtet. Wir müssen also auf die gesamte Lieferkette schauen, vor allem, wenn wir daran denken, auch neue Labels in Europa einzuführen.

Aber Tierwohl, und das haben auch Vorredner gesagt, ist oft mit Kosten verbunden, mit Investitionen in Gebäude, in Anlagen, und diese Kosten dürfen nicht einfach beim Bauern hängen bleiben. Es ist ein bisschen zu einfach, wenn der Handel mehr Tierwohl einfordert, selbst Standards erfindet, den Bauern diese aufdrückt und damit beim Konsumenten wirbt, aber dann nicht bereit ist, beim Ladenpreis diese Auflagen auch einzupreisen. Und genauso geht es halt auch nicht, wenn der Konsument mehr Tierwohl fordert und dann Fleisch für zwei Euro und Trinkmilch für 50 Cent will.

Auf eines müssen wir nämlich aufpassen: Wenn wir die Kosten ganz einfach den Bauern aufdrücken, werden die Kleinen vor den Großen leiden. Wer nämlich 1 000 Kühe oder 10 000 Schweine hat, der tut sich oft leichter, höhere Standards umzusetzen, als der, der fünf, zehn oder 50 Kühe hat. Deshalb brauchen wir brauchbare, machbare, leistbare Standards, mit denen auch kleine Betriebe, vor allem auch in benachteiligten Gebieten, mithalten können. Sonst könnte der Schuss nämlich nach hinten losgehen. Wenn neue Regeln nur weiter die Konzentration der Betriebe fördern, schadet das unserer Landwirtschaft, unserer Umwelt – und die Tiere haben nichts davon.

Clara Aguilera (S&D). – Señora presidenta, señora comisaria, estamos hablando de un informe, lo digo porque oyendo a algunas de sus señorías...

Se trata de un informe sobre el bienestar de los animales de granja. Nada que ver ni con el transporte ni con el sacrificio; esos son otros informes que ya hemos debatido.

Creo que es un buen informe, señor Decerle, y quiero felicitarle por su trabajo, así como a mi compañera Carmen Avram y a todos los ponentes que han trabajado en él.

El informe concluye fundamentalmente en algunas cuestiones que a mí me gustaría destacar: hay que actualizar la normativa vigente, sin duda: la Comisión lo ha dicho ya en varias ocasiones. Hace quince años que tenemos la normativa y esta normativa debe adaptarse a las nuevas demandas de la sociedad, así como a los avances científicos y tecnológicos y a las buenas prácticas ganaderas.

Por lo tanto, creo que se trata de un buen informe y esperemos que la Comisión lo tenga en cuenta.

Reitero que las modificaciones deben construirse sobre bases científicas sólidas que, por supuesto, deben ir acompañadas previamente de un estudio de impacto que recoja los cambios que se introduzcan en la normativa.

Para terminar, quisiera señalar que probablemente sea necesario establecer plazos de adaptación y tener en cuenta la competitividad de toda la cadena alimentaria, pero especialmente de los ganaderos.

Martin Hlaváček (Renew). – Paní předsedající, paní komisařko, kolegové, ochrana životních podmínek zvířat má v Evropské unii dlouhodobou tradici a je silně regulována. Přináší významný etický rozměr produkce našich potravin, který jinde na světě v takové míře nenajdeme. Mrzí mě, že se často tváříme, jako by tomu tak nebylo, a že se snad nacházíme někde ve středověku. Necháme se od určitých aktivistů neprávem atakovat, a snaží se nám proto vysvětlit, že tito kolegové zde, v této sněmovně, podporují tyto myšlenky velmi primitivním způsobem. Rád bych je vyzval, aby toto úsilí soustředili především vůči zemím a producentům, kteří tato pravidla nedodržují. Nikoliv k laciné kritice evropských institucí.

Samozřejmě, že musíme jít v životních podmínkách dál, ale je třeba tak činit na základě vědeckých faktů, nikoliv zmanipulovaných emocí, a je třeba v samotném zájmu zvířat rozlišovat jejich potřeby podle druhu. Zkrátka králík a ryba potřebují jiná řešení. Jinak můžeme nadělat víc škody než užítku. A je třeba také přistoupit k harmonizaci, paní komisařko. Tam, kde řada členských států již pokročila, jako třeba u zákazu klecových chovů zvířat, tam je třeba zavést harmonizaci. A to nejpodstatnější. Dovážíme produkty ze zemí, kde se zvířata mají ještě hůř, kde proběhlo odlesňování, a tady je třeba postupovat nekompromisně. Je třeba zavést absolutní pravidla pro *tracking* a pro *tracing* z těchto třetích zemí... (*předsedající odebrala řečníkovi slovo*)

Manuela Ripa (Verts/ALE). – Frau Präsidentin, sehr geehrte Frau Kommissarin! Der Bericht zum Wohlergehen landwirtschaftlicher Nutztiere hat rein gar nichts mit dem Schutz dieser Tiere zu tun. Ich muss es so hart sagen, wie es ist. Dieser Bericht sollte eigentlich die extrem veralteten Vorschriften zum Schutz von Nutztieren auf den neuesten Stand bringen. Darin versagt der Bericht. Es mangelt ihm an Ehrgeiz, er wird von den Interessen der Tierhaltungsindustrie getrieben und überbetont die wirtschaftlichen Kosten einer besseren Tierhaltung.

Dieser Bericht ist ein Schlag ins Gesicht für all diejenigen, die mehr Tierschutz und mehr Wohlergehen für unsere Nutztiere wollen. Trotz einiger guter Änderungsanträge ist er definitiv abzulehnen. Vielmehr rufe ich dazu auf, in Form von Änderungsantrag 2 für die Stellungnahme des Umweltausschusses zu stimmen. Darin haben wir eine genauere und fortschrittlichere Perspektive in Bezug auf die Behandlung von Nutztieren reingeschrieben, die den aktuellen wissenschaftlichen Erkenntnissen Rechnung trägt und die vielen Millionen Bürger ernst nimmt, die einen deutlich besseren Schutz von Nutztieren fordern. Denn Tiere sind fühlende Wesen und keine Agrarprodukte. Es ist höchste Zeit, dies anzuerkennen!

Bert-Jan Ruissen (ECR). – Voorzitter, in de Bijbel, het meestgelezen boek ter wereld, kom je soms heel verrassende voorschriften tegen over dierenwelzijn. Zo mocht een boer vroeger in Israël een os tijdens het dorsen niet muilkorven, zodat het dier tijdens het werken ook gewoon nog af en toe een hapje kon eten.

De opdracht om goed te zorgen voor onze dieren is dus van alle tijden, maar iedere tijd kent daarbij wel zijn eigen uitdagingen. Wat nu belangrijk is, is zorg dragen voor een gelijk speelveld. Laten we daarom stoppen met het importeren van producten die niet aan onze dierenwelzijnstandaarden voldoen. Maar laten we ook zorgen voor een eerlijke prijs. Hier ligt, denk ik, een belangrijke verantwoordelijkheid voor de retail en ook voor de consument. En, last but not least, laten we samen met de sector blijven werken aan nieuwe concepten, zonder daarbij de toevlucht te nemen tot onwerkbare regels.

Mijn complimenten aan collega Decerle voor zijn evenwichtige verslag. En misschien moeten we toch wat vaker in de Bijbel gaan lezen. Zelfs over dierenwelzijn staan daar echt hele mooie dingen in.

Eugenia Rodríguez Palop (The Left). – Señora presidenta, señora comisaria. Está claro que la centralidad del bienestar animal por la que apuesta la estrategia «De la Granja a la Mesa», por ejemplo, responde a una cuestión ética, pero no solo.

En tanto los animales están dotados de capacidad de sufrir tenemos algunos deberes contraídos con ellos, el más básico de los cuales es el de no torturarlos. Que un animal no es una piedra, ya lo decía Jeremy Bentham hace más de dos siglos.

Pero es que el maltrato animal está asociado también a la contaminación de los acuíferos y de la tierra, a la proliferación de enfermedades, y al retroceso y el abandono del campo.

O sea, no hablamos solo de bienestar animal sino de ganaderos locales empobrecidos por la competencia desleal de las macrogranjas y de gente desplazada por la basura que generan.

El informe de ejecución que debatimos hoy es muy condescendiente con el expolio de la agroindustria y muy poco crítico con sus persistentes violaciones de la normativa europea. Y nosotras queremos apoyar la ganadería extensiva y familiar, fijar población al territorio y favorecer el desarrollo rural.

Sin bienestar animal no hay cambio en el modelo productivo, ni en el sistema alimentario.

Juan Ignacio Zoido Álvarez (PPE). – Señora presidenta, señora comisaria, hoy volvemos a demostrar una vez más en este informe que los ganaderos de la Unión Europea cumplen con los mayores estándares de bienestar animal en todo el mundo y que aun así continúan trabajando día a día para mejorarlos, porque no hay nadie más preocupado por el bienestar de los animales que los propios ganaderos, por mucho que los animalistas de salón traten de criminalizarlos.

Especialmente hoy demostramos una vez más que es compatible un sector ganadero competitivo, moderno, tecnificado y exportador, como es el europeo, con el respeto a los animales.

Lamentablemente, la izquierda radical sigue con su ceguera ideológica, tratando de poner nuevas exigencias y requisitos incumplibles para nuestros ganaderos. Pretenden con ello hacer imposible su trabajo y acabar con el sector cárnico europeo definitivamente. Se trata, en definitiva, de los mismos indocumentados que se atreven a afirmar que la carne española proviene de animales maltratados, tirando por tierra la merecida reputación de nuestras carnes.

Pues bien, frente a todos ellos, el Partido Popular seguirá, como siempre, del lado de los ganaderos y del campo español y europeo.

ΠΡΟΕΔΡΙΑ: ΕΥΑ ΚΑΪΛΗ*Αντιπρόεδρος*

Isabel Carvalhais (S&D). – Senhora Presidente, Caros Colegas, sabemos que os animais têm um valor intrínseco, independente da sua utilidade para os humanos. São seres sencientes e, como tal, não podem estar sujeitos a tratamentos degradantes que contrariem a sua natureza e os objetifiquem. Os animais não são meras coisas.

A regulamentação europeia tem permitido uma evolução positiva na forma como os animais são tratados no espaço europeu. Contudo, podemos e devemos fazer mais e melhor.

Como identificado pelo estudo de avaliação da implementação da legislação europeia, existem várias questões que exigem atenção e soluções. É o caso da ausência de provisões adaptadas às necessidades das diferentes espécies, a falta de harmonização na qualidade e na disponibilização dos dados, os problemas de implementação das regras legais, e, por vezes até, casos de deficientes controlos. Estes são problemas que queremos ver resolvidos na anunciada revisão, por parte da Comissão Europeia, da legislação do bem-estar animal.

Caros colegas, não nos esqueçamos que a nossa ética coletiva também se exprime na forma como tratamos os animais.

Elsi Katainen (Renew). – Arvoisa puhemies, kiitokset myös esittelijälle erinomaisesta työstä. On todella myönteistä, että yleinen kiinnostus eläinten hyvinvointiin on lisääntynyt.

EU:ssa eläinten hyvinvointiin on panostettu jo pitkään, ja jäsenmaasta riippuen toimet ovat hyvinkin edistyksellisiä. Toki tehtävää vielä riittää. Olisi ehdottoman tärkeää, että EU:ssa sitouduttaisiin myös jo olemassa oleviin lakeihin. Näin varmistaisimme paitsi eläinten hyvinvoinnin myös tasapuolisen kilpailun sisämarkkinoilla. Esimerkiksi EU:ssa edelleen katkotaan kanojen nokkia ja typistetään sikojen häntiä, vaikka muun muassa sikadirektiivi sen kieltää.

Uuden lainsäädännön on myös huomioitava maatalousyrittäjien kannattavuuskriisi, sillä vain taloudellisesti kannattava tila voi investoida tiukentuviin vaatimuksiin halutulla tavalla ja riittävin siirtymäajoin. Panostusten hyvinvointiin pitäisi ehdottomasti näkyä myös tuotteiden hinnassa ja tuottajan tuloksessa.

Zbigniew Kuźmiuk (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Pani Komisarz! W tej debacie chcę zwrócić uwagę na trzy kwestie.

Po pierwsze, moim zdaniem najlepszym instrumentem zachęającym do poprawy dobrostanu zwierząt są po prostu zachęty finansowe adresowane do rolników. Nie nakazy i zakazy, które bardzo często są proponowane. I mam nadzieję, że Komisja Europejska przypilnuje, żeby w planach strategicznych, które właśnie są dyskutowane w Komisji, tego rodzaju zachęty się znalazły, zarówno jeżeli chodzi o tzw. ekoschematy, jak i w drugim filarze wspólnej polityki rolnej. Konieczne jest także wsparcie inwestycji rolników w dobrostan zwierząt, bo sami sobie nie poradzą.

Druga kwestia to strategia „Od pola do stołu”. Ona przewiduje krótkie łańcuchy dostaw i to jest ten obszar, aby poprawić dobrostan zwierząt, a więc przetwarzać produkcję blisko miejsca jej wytworzenia.

I wreszcie po trzecie, sprawa umów handlowych. Tutaj musimy być bardzo stanowczy. Nie może być tak, że rolnicy europejscy spełniają określone normy związane z dobrostanem, a w umowach z krajami trzecimi na import takiego warunku – jeżeli chodzi o rolników pozaeuropejskich – nie ma. Komisja musi tego zdecydowanie pilnować.

Colm Markey (PPE). – Madam President, Commissioner, ladies and gentlemen, I'd like to welcome this report on animal welfare carried out by the Committee on Agriculture and Rural Development and thank the rapporteur and shadow rapporteur for the good work. It recognises the general high standard of animal welfare that exists across the EU. However, it is clear improvements can be made to bring about greater consistency across the Union.

This report recognises that any updated rules must be based on scientific data, impact assessments and a species-by-species approach that takes account of the individual needs. Science rather than sentiment is key to a successful outcome, and it must be coupled with practical experience.

We have to ensure that the least performing are brought up to standard, rather than setting ever higher standards for those who are endeavouring to comply. A voluntary labelling system champions those who deliver on best practice; making it mandatory fails to recognise their special efforts.

The report recognises that changing practices designed to improve animal welfare come at a cost, and additional support must be provided outside of the common agricultural policy. The CAP alone won't be enough.

Farmers and consumers are at one in the belief that respect for animals and animal welfare is paramount and should be central to our farming practices.

Paolo De Castro (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signora Commissaria, a meno di un mese dall'approvazione in quest'Aula delle raccomandazioni della commissione ANIT, torniamo a discutere di benessere animale, segno dell'attenzione dell'Unione a questa sfida.

La salute degli animali è infatti la nostra salute e i nostri agricoltori e allevatori sono consapevoli di questa interconnessione. Grazie ai loro sforzi oggi l'Unione è leader a livello globale nella difesa dei più alti standard di salute e benessere animale. Ma non basta e per questo, signora Commissaria, chiediamo una più rigida applicazione da parte di tutti gli Stati membri delle norme vigenti, affinché nessun allevatore possa trovarsi in una condizione di svantaggio competitivo solo per essersi preso cura dei propri animali.

Sta a noi ora saper guidare e incentivare i nostri agricoltori verso un ulteriore salto di qualità nei sistemi di allevamento, di cui beneficeranno cittadini e consumatori e che dovrà essere difeso a livello internazionale, garantendo il pieno rispetto da parte dei nostri partner commerciali.

Dacian Cioloș (Renew). – Doamnă președintă, doamnă comisară, calitatea vieții și sănătatea animalelor este un subiect tot mai sus pe agenda publică în Europa și, din acest motiv, revizuirea legislației pentru a completa lacunele, dar și a integra progresele științifice este un lucru firesc, însă trei lucruri aș vrea să subliniez.

În primul rând, avem nevoie de o mai bună armonizare a aplicării acestei legislații la nivel european între statele membre. În al doilea rând, pentru ca aceste norme să fie efective pe termen mediu și lung, fermierii trebuie susținuți financiar și aici mă aștept să văd o implicare a Comisiei în felul în care statele membre pun în aplicare planurile naționale strategice pentru a-și și susține financiar fermierii.

Și, un al treilea lucru la fel de important: aceste norme vor fi efective doar dacă reușim împreună să convingem și partenerii noștri comerciali să le aplice și pentru asta, în negocierea acordurilor comerciale, dar și în relația cu Organizația Mondială a Comerțului, trebuie să avem în vedere aceste lucruri pentru că altfel rămân doar pe hârtie în Europa.

Stella Kyriakides, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, honourable Members, first of all, I would like to thank you for this informative discussion. I have listened carefully to all your remarks. I have taken notes in response to many of your concerns. I have listened to your proposals. It's impossible to refer to all the comments made, but I just want to highlight some of the points made, because I think it's important that we pick up on these.

First of all, MEP Mortler, I spoke already at the very beginning of the need for a level playing field. MEP Šojdrová, I just wanted to say that we will be presenting our revised legislation by the end of 2023, and the EFSA scientific opinions will be finalised by early 2023.

Now, several of you mentioned the issue to do with the end-of-cage age. I just wanted to tell you here that we will be supporting farmers by offering training and relevant information and urge the Member States and stakeholders to do so as well. Member States, as you know, are encouraged to use the possibilities provided by the CAP to increase their support for animal welfare improvements.

MEP Avram, we will weigh all the available options to ensure that our policy objectives are not defeated by increased imports of products obtained with lower animal welfare standards. In fact, several Members mentioned this. We will be supporting farmers so that they are not at a disadvantage. MEP Ciolos, you also pointed this out, and the need for us to support farmers financially, and not only that, and I totally agree.

MEP Mortler, on tail docking, this is done because animal welfare is not respected by current farming conditions. Pigs with entire tails come from farms where there are good welfare conditions. This is not a question simply of market demands, as has been said.

MEP Hazekamp, I can reassure you that our review of the legislation will be ambitious. It will be far-reaching and it will broaden the scope to make enforcement easier. As you rightly said, and other MEPs have also pointed out, it needs to be aligned and we need to look at the scientific evidence.

MEP Giarrusso, the fitness check of current legislation detected vagueness, in fact, of certain provisions in EU legislation dating from more than 20 years ago, and the Commission will consider this problem in reforming and updating the animal welfare acquis.

A lot of points have been raised, and we will be taking them on board. I just want to share with you that the discussion today on the report clearly highlights the importance the Commission and I personally – as well as you yourselves, as the European Parliament – attach to animal welfare, and that we have a high level of responsibility towards the animals, the farmers and EU society. It is important that all our revised legislation serves our sustainability goals.

In the meantime, let me just state very clearly: we will continue to enforce current legislation, particularly on issues that have proved problematic such as animal transport and prevention of the routine tail docking of pigs.

I'm very much looking forward to presenting our proposal for revision of the legislation by the end of 2023. I know it is an ambitious undertaking, but I believe it is also a worthwhile investment in the future because this is not about our future now, but the future of our society, the future of our planet. I know that all of you in this House share that sentiment.

President. – The debate is closed.

The vote will take place on Tuesday, 15 February 2022.

Written statements (Rule 171)

Асим Адемов (PPE), в писмена форма. – Здравето на животните и хуманното отношение към тях са от ключово значение за общественото здраве, продоволствената сигурност и безопасността на храните, които консумираме. Добрият здравен статус на животните във фермата означава по-малко лекарства и антибиотици, по-нисък екологичен отпечатък от животновъдството, по-качествен краен продукт и в крайна сметка това, към което всички се стремим – по-добро общо благосъстояние на селскостопанските животни.

Затова приветствам резолюцията на ЕП, която насърчава по-нататъшното подобряване на законодателството на ЕС относно хуманното отношение към животните, в унисон с научния и техническия напредък в животновъдните практики, както и според специфичните нужди, характерни за всеки животински вид. Същевременно хуманното отношение към животните трябва да бъде съчетано с устойчив икономически подход, който да гарантира ясна възвръщаемост на инвестициите и по-високи производствени разходи, както и с подходящ преходен период за животновъдите, за да могат те да адаптират своите стопанства към по-високите стандарти.

Необходима е система от финансови стимули за животновъдите, за да се повиши мотивацията им да инвестират в подобряване на животновъдните практики. Така например, по линия на ОСП държавите членки могат да предвидят в националните си стратегически планове специални екосхеми за хуманно отношение към животните, подкрепа чрез инвестиции и обучения за внедряване на иновации и подобряване на системите за отглеждане.

Атидже Алиева-Вели (Renew), в писмена форма. – Европа има едни от най-високите стандарти по отношение на производството на храни, и в частност критериите за хуманно отношение към животните. Да, считам, че има възможност земеделските практики да се подобрят допълнително, но това не трябва да става само за сметка на земеделците. Инвестициите в подобряване на хуманното отношение към животните водят до по-високи производствени разходи за стопаните. Тези разходите не следва да се поемат единствено от производителите. ЕК и държавите членки следва да предвидят подходяща финансова рамка за подкрепа на животновъдите в тази насока, както по линия на ОСП, така и извън нея. Необходим е цялостен подход, който да предвижда широк набор от мерки и инструменти. Този процес може да бъде

значително подпомогнат и чрез внедряването на интелигентни технологии в селското стопанство.

Необходими са: - актуализация на действащото законодателство, за да се интегрира научният напредък в знанията за животните и техническият прогрес в земеделските практики; - добре функционираща регулаторна рамка, която да бъде пропорционална и да не застрашава конкурентоспособността на европейските земеделци; - оценка на въздействието на предложените промени, основани на актуални научни проучвания и оценка как животните, околната среда и земеделските стопани, особено малките земеделски стопани, ще бъдат засегнати; - всяка промяна задължително трябва да отчита времето, подкрепата и финансирането, необходими на земеделските стопани за изпълнението ѝ.

Sylwia Spurek (Verts/ALE), na piśmie. – Sprawozdanie komisji AGRI ws. dobrostanu zwierząt w gospodarstwach nie dotyka nawet problemów, które miały być jego przedmiotem. Pomija kwestie cierpienia zwierząt spowodowane złym wdrażaniem przepisów UE i brakiem ich egzekwowania. Skupia się natomiast na ochronie interesów, zwłaszcza finansowych, hodowców. Stoi to w sprzeczności z celami Europejskiego Zielonego Ładu, strategii „Od pola do stołu” oraz z promowanym przez KE podejściem polegającym na łączeniu zdrowia ludzi ze zdrowiem zwierząt i stanem środowiska.

Dlatego poparłam alternatywną rezolucję, przygotowaną ponadpartyjnie na podstawie opinii komisji ENVI. Rezolucja zakłada zrewidowanie aktualnego prawodawstwa UE dotyczącego dobrostanu zwierząt w kontekście najnowszej wiedzy naukowej. Przepisy dotyczące dobrostanu zwierząt w gospodarstwach należy dostosować do potrzeb poszczególnych gatunków zwierząt, ich sposobu odżywiania, zdrowia, naturalnego zachowania oraz ochrony środowiska.

Kluczowe jest również, aby obywatelki i obywatele UE mieli łatwy dostęp do zrozumiałych informacji na temat pochodzenia żywności, a kampanie społeczne promowały żywność pochodzenia roślinnego. Do tej pory w Parlamencie mocno wybrzmiewał głos Meat Party, polityków broniących *status quo* i *business as usual*, stojących de facto po stronie lobby przemysłowego. Czas na to, żeby wybrzmiały głosy rozsądku, nauki, ekspertów i ekspertek – na rzecz zwierząt, środowiska i zdrowia.

Tom Vandenkendelaere (PPE), schriftelijk. – Dierenwelzijn staat terecht hoog op de politieke agenda van het Europees Parlement, ook voor landbouwdieren. Dit is niet alleen in het belang van dieren en boeren, maar ook van de consumenten. We moeten oog hebben voor de inspanningen die boeren al doen en daarbij ook rekening houden met de lange afschrijvingstermijnen van investeringen in dierenwelzijn. Als we het welzijn van onze boerderijdieren willen verhogen, dan moeten we werk maken van een beleid dat wetenschappelijk onderbouwd is en dat de aanpak dier per dier bekijkt. De regels voor koeien kunnen niet zomaar toegepast worden op kippen, en omgekeerd. In een Europese en globale markt is verhoogde aandacht voor het gelijk speelveld onontbeerlijk: zowel voor de boeren binnen de EU als voor de handel tussen de EU en derde landen wint het gelijke speelveld, terecht, steeds meer aan belang. Ik ben tot slot ook zelf voorstander van een vrijwillig dierenwelzijnslabel. Een vrijwillig label staat landbouwers die extra inspanningen doen op het vlak van dierenwelzijn immers toe de kost door te rekenen op de eindfactuur. Dit kan tot een meerprijs op de markt leiden, waardoor we boeren belonen die bijkomende inspanningen en investeringen doen. Op naar een stimulerend beleid.

21. Działalność Europejskiego Rzecznika Praw Obywatelskich – sprawozdanie roczne za 2020 r. (debata)

President. – The next item is the debate on the report by Eleonora Evi, on behalf of the Committee on Petitions, on the annual report on the activities of the European Ombudsman in 2020 (2021/2167(INI)) (A9-0342/2021).

I should like to remind Members that, for all debates of this part-session, there will be no catch-the-eye procedure and no blue cards will be accepted.

Furthermore, as during recent part-sessions, remote interventions from Parliament's Liaison Offices in the Member States are foreseen.

Eleonora Evi, relatrice. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, io desidero innanzitutto complimentarmi con la Mediatrice europea per l'eccellente lavoro svolto anche nell'anno 2020. Il complesso delle sue attività, oggetto di questa relazione, ha confermato che la sua azione si sia rivelata nuovamente cruciale per salvaguardare i diritti fondamentali dei cittadini.

Nel 2020 l'ufficio del Mediatore europeo ha celebrato il venticinquesimo anniversario. L'impatto delle molteplici indagini compiute negli anni conferiscono indubbiamente a questo organo il ruolo di pilastro centrale nel contribuire a migliorare gli standard di buona amministrazione a livello unionale.

Emily O'Reilly, dal momento della sua elezione, ha saputo imprimere un ulteriore incremento qualitativo, che continua ad ottimizzarsi grazie all'implementazione della strategia da lei varata denominata «Verso il 2024», pienamente supportata da questa relazione.

Serve tuttavia una completa assunzione di responsabilità da parte delle istituzioni europee, chiamate a garantire ottemperanza piena e coerente, ancora oggi non sussistente del tutto, alle raccomandazioni a loro rivolte dalla stessa Mediatrice. Anche tale aspetto è esplicitato nel testo.

L'importanza di tale elemento la si coglie pienamente proprio analizzando quanto verificatosi nel 2020, anno tragico segnato dallo scoppio della pandemia di COVID-19. La Mediatrice ha svolto ininterrottamente un'instancabile opera di indagine sulla trasparenza e l'integrità dei processi decisionali correlati alle misure adottate per fronteggiare la pandemia. La sua voce si è levata alta per rammentare alle istituzioni europee il dovere di garantire, a maggior ragione in momenti drammatici e complessi, i più alti standard di buona amministrazione a tutela degli interessi generali.

Questo Parlamento, facendo leva anche su ciò, ha evidenziato inoltre ufficialmente che qualsiasi mancanza di trasparenza nel quadro della più grave crisi sanitaria pubblica dell'epoca moderna costituisce una violazione del diritto dei cittadini ad essere pienamente informati.

Purtroppo, però, la risposta innanzitutto della Commissione europea è stata di una censurabile noncuranza di tali assunti. L'esecutivo comunitario infatti ha continuato a negare, e continua a negare, piena trasparenza sul contenuto complessivo dei contratti siglati con le multinazionali farmaceutiche sui vaccini contro il COVID-19, realizzati anche grazie all'impiego di miliardi di euro di soldi pubblici. Questa relazione evidenzia questa criticità con nettezza e reclama piena trasparenza.

Nel testo sono riportate inoltre le gravi problematiche alla base delle attuali pratiche in seno al Consiglio dell'Unione europea, emerse a seguito dell'ennesimo caso di cattiva amministrazione rilevato dalla Mediatrice nel 2020. Il Consiglio, infatti, continua a impedire ai cittadini di beneficiare di un accesso diretto e tempestivo ai suoi documenti legislativi, in violazione del diritto di partecipazione efficace del pubblico al processo decisionale. La richiesta quindi rivolta al Consiglio – che ovviamente non è presente in Aula – è quella di modificare la propria condotta, conformandola finalmente al rispetto dei diritti democratici dei cittadini.

L'azione della Mediatrice si è rivelata meritoria anche su molti altri fronti. Sul tema dell'accesso pubblico ai documenti delle istituzioni europee, più volte la Mediatrice è stata determinante per permetterne la divulgazione, nonostante la legislazione applicabile dell'Unione sia obsoleta e necessiti una revisione tempestiva, come richiesto testualmente in questa relazione.

In materia di appalti pubblici, la Mediatrice è giunta a riscontrare gravi lacune giuridiche nelle norme vigenti in materia, tali da renderle inadeguate per contrastare i conflitti di interesse, per come è emerso, ad esempio, nell'indagine sulla grave decisione della Commissione europea di aggiudicare un contratto per la realizzazione di uno studio sull'integrazione degli obiettivi ambientali, sociali e di governance delle norme bancarie dell'Unione alla società BlackRock, che gestisce enormi investimenti di grandi compagnie petrolifere e bancarie, sulle quali andranno ad applicarsi quelle stesse norme.

Sul tema dei principi attivi impiegati nei pesticidi, le indagini della Mediatrice hanno confermato che la Commissione europea abbia continuato in maniera deprecabile a procedere alla loro approvazione, nonostante l'ufficiale identificazione di aree critiche o la necessità di dati aggiuntivi per confermarne la sicurezza, finanche in assenza di qualsivoglia uso sicuro.

Inoltre, in riferimento all'accordo commerciale UE-Mercosur, la Mediatrice, al termine delle sue indagini, ha attestato che la conclusione dei relativi negoziati da parte della Commissione europea, prima che venisse finalizzata la valutazione dell'impatto sulla sostenibilità, rappresentasse un altro grave caso di cattiva amministrazione. È emerso chiaramente come la Commissione avesse assunto quella decisione in un contesto privo di appropriate analisi sugli impatti sociali, ambientali ed economici di tale accordo, violando le sue stesse linee guida in materia. Nella relazione questi elementi sono analizzati in maniera circostanziata, insieme a vari altri, e ognuno di essi trova un corredo di richieste precise, che vanno nella direzione di garantire ai cittadini i più alti livelli di tutela dei loro diritti.

Concludo confermando il pieno sostegno all'azione della Mediatrice che, come indicato nella relazione, deve tradursi anche nell'attribuzione di maggiori risorse di bilancio per permetterle di gestire efficacemente il suo carico di lavoro complessivo, viste le ulteriori rilevanti responsabilità che le sono state attribuite di recente con l'approvazione del suo nuovo statuto.

Io concludo ringraziando tutti i relatori ombra per la collaborazione offerta e il lavoro complessivamente svolto su questo testo.

Emily O'Reilly, Ombudsman. – A Uachtaráin, ar dtús, lig dom cuimhneamh ar an Uachtarán Sassoli, nach maireann, cailliúint mhór é don Eoraip. Ba mhaith liom freisin tréaslú leis an Uachtarán Metsola tar éis a toghcháin.

A Chomhaltaí Uaisle, is mian liom mo bhuíochas a ghabháil leis an rapóirtéir, an Uasal Evi, agus leis na scáth-rapóirtéirí, as ucht a gcuid oibre ar an tuarascáil seo. Ós rud é gur teanga iomlán oifigiúil de chuid an Aontais Eorpaigh í an Ghaeilge, ó thús na bliana seo, is breá liom labhairt as Gaeilge anocht.

Ba bhliain dhúshlánach do chách í, céad bhliain na paindéime, leis an neamhchinnteacht a bhí chomh forleathan sin.

Cé go raibh ar an Aontas Eorpach gníomhú go tapaigh, ag an am céanna bhí sé fíor-riachtanach cloí go daingean leis an trédhearcacht agus an chuntasacht ionas go mbeadh tuiscint níos fearr ag saoránaigh ar an mbealach ina ndéantar cinntí.

'Sé chuid deo mo ról mar Ombudsman Eorpach ná cuidiú leis na hinstitiúidí sa phróiseas seo.

Ag tús na paindéime, scrúdaigh mé an chaoi inar chomhlíonaigh an Lárionad Eorpach um Ghalair a Chosc agus a Rialú (ECDC) a ról. Ba é toradh m'imscrúdaithe ná go raibh ECDC i bponc, ó thaobh faisnéis ábharthach a bhailiú go tráthúil, mar gheall ar cé chomh leisciúil is a bhíonn na Ballstáit an fhaisnéis a chur ar fáil.

Is iad na Ballstáit amháin a choimeádann an fhaisnéis ábhartha. Agus anailís déanta agam sa chás, chuir mé roinnt moltaí faoi bhráid ECDC faoi conas gur féidir a chuid measúnuithe agus moltaí a chur faoi bhráid an phobail ar bhealach níos réamhghníomhaí. D'aontaigh an Lárionad (ECDC) liom agus as seo amach, beidh ECDC níos réamhghníomhaí sa bhealach ina soláthraíonn sé faisnéis.

Tá áthas orm freisin go bhfuil cinneadh déanta ag na comhrechtóirí sainordú ECDC a athnuachan. Is sampla é seo faoi cé chomh gasta is gur féidir leis na hinstitiúidí gníomhú chun ceachtanna a fhoghlaim, agus feabhsaithe a dhéanamh, agus iad ag tabhairt aghaidh ar dhúshlán.

Ba é ceann d'iarbhairtí tosaigh na paindéime ná an t-aistriú a tharla chun cianoibrithe sna hinstitiúidí go léir. I gcás m'Oifige féin, tharla an t-aistriú seo go réidh agus go gasta. Agus ba mhaith liom mo bhuíochas a ghabháil le foireann m'Oifige faoin mbealach inar chinntigh siad go rachadh ár seirbhís don phobal ar aghaidh i gcónaí – in ainneoin na ndúshlán próifisiúnta agus pearsanta a bhí os ár gcomhair.

Leis an tuiscint go gcuireann an phaindéim brú níos géire orthu siúd atá leochailleach, i mí an Mheithimh 2020, chuir mé tús le tionscnamh straitéiseach faoin mbealach ina ndéanann an Coimisiún freastal ar riachtanais ball foirne faoi mhíchumas i gcomhthéacs na modhanna oibre nua seo.

In ainneoin na paindéime, d'fhan líon na ngearán chun m'Oifige seasmhach; agus, mar is iondúil, bhí m'obair dírithe ar thrédhearcacht, ar ionracas agus ar chearta bunúsacha.

Bhain imscrúdú tábhachtach le cinneadh an Choimisiúin i gcás an chomhlachta BlackRock. Chinn an Coimisiún conradh a bhronnadh ar BlackRock chun staidéar a dhéanamh ar mhaoiniú inbhuanaithe cé go bhfuil leasanna airgeadais ag an gcomhlacht sin san earnáil i gceist. Fiú amháin má bhíonn ach an fhéidearthacht ann i leith coinbhleacht leasa, d'fhéadfadh sé sin a bheith chun dochair d'inchreidteacht an Aontais Eorpaigh. Is mar gheall air sin gur mhol mé don Choimisiún gur fiú dó a threoirínite i leith soláthar poiblí a athnuachan. Mhol mé freisin don Choimisiún gur fiú smaoineamh ar na forálacha faoi choimbhleacht leasa, sa Rialachán Airgeadais, a neartú.

Bhí áthas orm a fheiceáil gur chuir an Pharlaimint m'imscrúdú san áireamh agus an Rialachán ábhartha á leasú aici. Is sampla soiléir é seo, nuair a thagann comhfhórsaí le chéile, den tionchar is féidir a bheith acu ó thaobh riarachán an Aontais Eorpaigh a fheabhsú.

Sampla eile den tionchar de chuid m'Oifige ná ceist a bhain le “doirse imrothlacha” [“*revolving doors*”] i gcas Stiúrthóir Feidhmiúcháin an Údaráis Baincéireachta Eorpaigh. Ghlac sé post mar phríomhoifigeach feidhmiúcháin le cumann a dhéanann uirioll ar son banc agus institiúidí airgeadais – comhlachtaí a thagann faoi mhaoirseacht an Údaráis. Ag cur san áireamh an chóimheá idir an ceart chun oibre agus damáiste do chlú an Aontais, mhol mé don Údarás rialacháin shoiléire a leagan síos a chuirfeadh cosc, i gcás baill foirne shinsearacha ag teacht chun am scoir, ar ghlacadh le poist shonracha. Mhol mé freisin don Údarás, i gcás baill foirne ar tí bogadh chuig an earnáil phríobháideach, rochtain ar fhaisnéis rúnda a chur ar fionraí. Chuir me fáilte roimh chinneadh an Údaráis glacadh le mo mholtaí, rud a thugann le fios go bhfuil an tÚdarás i ndáiríre faoi chaighdeán arda eitice a bhaint amach.

I rith na bliana, bhí ceist chosaint na gceart bunúsach idir lámha againn i gcónaí. D'eisigh m'Oifig treoirilínte, dírithe ar na hinstitiúidí, faoi cheist an ilteangachais. Chomh maith leis sin, rinne mé measúnú iar-iniúchta maidir leis an gcóras gearán á oibriú ag Frontex.

Idir an dá linn, tá ceist na hinbhuanaitheachta tar éis eirí níos ábhartha don Aontas Eorpach. Is mar gheall air sin, tar éis gearán faighte ag m'Oifig, gur chinn mé go raibh mí-riarachán i gceist nuair a shocraigh an Coimisiún an chaibidlíocht faoin gComhaontú AE-Mercosur a thabhairt chun críche roimh don mheasúnú inbhuanaitheachta agus tioncáir a bheith curtha i gcrích.

Le linn 2020, lean mé ar aghaidh ag obair ar cheist trédhearcachta an phróisis reachtaigh sa Chomhairle. Tá an cheist seo tábhachtach ó thaobh rialtais na mBallstát de sa chaoi ina ndíúltaíonn siad freagracht a ghlacadh as cinntí ag teacht, mar a dhéarfá, ón mBruiséil. I ndáiríre, is iad teachtaí na mBallstát féin a dhéanann na cinntí seo – fíric shimplí nach dtuigtear go minic. Cé gur glacadh céimeanna beaga i leith trédhearcachta, tá a lán fós le déanamh.

Ach cé go raibh deacrachtaí áirithe againn i rith 2020, ba bhliain chomórtha í freisin dúinn leis an gceiliúradh cúig bliana is fiche ar bhunú na hOifige. Bhí mé bródúil as a bheith in ann é seo a cheiliúradh le comhdháil ar líne le Líonra Eorpach na nOmbudsmán agus le Leas-Uachtarán an Choimisiúin Šefčovič, a ghlac páirt i gcruinnithe faoi impléachtaí COVID-19 i gcás oifigí Ombudsmán i gcoitinne. I mbliana, tionólfar comhdháil bhliantúil an Líonra seo, in áitreabh na Parlaiminte anseo in Strasbourg, ar an seachtú lá is fiche d'Aibreán, i dtaca le hUachtaránacht na Comhairle ag an bhFrainc, agus ag díriú ar shaincheist an digitithe agus riaracháin phoiblí.

Dhá bhliain tar éis thús na paindéime, tuigean muid go bhfuil cinnteoireacht oscailte agus cuntasach ríthábhachtach ó thaobh thacaíocht agus chosaint an phobail ag am seo an ghátair. Tá mé dóchasach, nuair a bheidh deireadh leis an bpaindéim seo, go mbeidh an tAontas níos láidre ná mar a bhí sé ar dtús. Agus tá súil agam go dtiocfaidh cuid de na feabhsuithe seo ón obair atá á déanamh ag m'Oifig fein – Oifig bheag, mar a deirim go minic, ach le sainordú mór.

Mo bhuíochas arís as ucht bhur dtacaíochta. Táim ag tnúth le dul ar aghaidh lenár gcomhoibriú amach anseo.

Maroš Šefčovič, *Vice-President of the Commission*. – Madam President, I think that the initial interventions we have seen and we have heard, on the report and resolution on the annual report of the European Ombudsman on her activities presented to this plenary, recall to us the importance of European citizenship and the specific rights associated with it.

These democratic and civil rights are aimed at encouraging the full participation of European citizens, businesses, associations and NGOs in the everyday life of the European Union. The right to submit a petition to the European Parliament and the right to complain to the European Ombudsman are of particular importance.

And I would like to thank Ms O'Reilly for her excellent and tireless work that she has been doing since she was first elected to this role in 2013, and notably, in 2020, despite the added burden caused by the COVID-19 pandemic.

I'm pleased to report that relations between the Commission, its services and the European Ombudsman continue to be constructive and mutually very helpful. The Commission duly takes into account the suggestions for improvement and recommendations of the European Ombudsman. This is precisely why a final finding of maladministration is very rare.

In 2020 and 2021, the Commission also worked with the European Parliament and the Council of the European Union on the new Statute of the European Ombudsman that entered into force in August last year. This has been an important achievement, granting the European Ombudsman additional rights and emphasising the importance of good administration in sensitive fields like harassment, whistleblowing and conflict of interest.

Let me also congratulate the rapporteur Ms Evi, the coordinators of the Committee on Petitions and all its members that were involved for their very informative and useful report, which provides the views of the European Parliament on the issues that it considers noteworthy in the area of good administration for the citizens. The report and resolution address a variety of important issues, including the transparency of the decision-making process, revolving doors, access to document requests, procurement and contractual issues and staff matters.

The Commission takes the report and resolution seriously, given the importance of the matters addressed and the fact that, being the largest EU institution, we are the main addressee of the inquiries of the European Ombudsman. The Commission will examine your resolution in the next few weeks and we will reply in detail to all the issues that concern the Commission.

To conclude, let me please reassure you that the Commission will continue working with the other institutions, bodies and agencies, including Ms O'Reilly and her team, to provide the best possible services and maintain the highest possible standards for the benefit of all European citizens.

Honourable President, I look forward to hearing the views of the honourable Members and I thank you for your attention.

Peter Jahr, im Namen der PPE-Fraktion. – Frau Präsidentin, sehr geehrte Ombudsfrau, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Meine Fraktion und auch ich ganz persönlich beglückwünschen die Ombudsfrau zu ihrer Arbeit und bedanken uns für die gute Zusammenarbeit mit dem Petitionsausschuss.

Die Bilanz kann sich sehen lassen. Im Jahr 2020 bearbeitete die Europäische Bürgerbeauftragte 2 200 Beschwerden und leitete 370 Untersuchungen ein. Sie leitete fünf Untersuchungen in Eigeninitiative ein. Aus dieser Sicht sollte der Tätigkeitsbericht der Ombudsfrau 2020 kein Problem sein – Zustimmung sicher.

So ist es aber leider nicht. Ich sage noch einmal leider. Denn unsere Berichterstatterin, Kollegin Eleonora Evi, konnte der Versuchung nicht widerstehen, den Bericht mit Dingen anzureichern, die einfach nicht reingehören. De facto werden hier die Aufgaben verschiedener europäischer Institutionen auf die Ombudsfrau konzentriert: Europäischer Staatsanwalt, die Korruptionsbehörde OLAF, der Haushaltskontrollausschuss des Parlaments, der Europäische Rechnungshof, zum Schluss auch noch der Petitionsausschuss. Und die Verantwortlichkeiten dieser Institutionen wurden quasi in ein großes Paket zusammengeführt und der Ombudsfrau zugeschrieben. Das heißt, wir würden der Ombudsfrau eine Machtfülle, einen Alleinvertretungsanspruch geben, den sie sich selber nicht wünschen kann. Denn Demokratie lebt halt nicht von Machtkonzentration, sondern von Machtbalance.

Frau Kollegin Evi, beim Aufsatz würde man sagen: damit auch teilweise am Thema vorbei.

Und ich bedauere außerordentlich, dass wir es nicht geschafft haben, ein politisches Schattenberichterstatter-Meeting stattfinden zu lassen. Aber es besteht noch Hoffnung. Meine Fraktion hat Änderungsanträge eingebracht, die diese Mängel dieses Berichtes wieder vom Kopf auf die Füße stellen, dass wir dem Bericht zustimmen können und – ich sage es noch einmal ausdrücklich – auch die Arbeit der Ombudsfrau würdigen können. Denn diese Würdigung hat sie sich fraktionsübergreifend in diesem Haus verdient.

Alex Agius Saliba, *fisem il-grupp S&D*. – Sinjura President, l-ewwel u qabel kolloxx nixtieq niringrazzja lir-rapporteur Eleonora Evi u anke lill-kollegi fi hdan gruppi politici differenti ghax-xoghol illi wettaqna lkoll flimkien b'rabta wkoll ma' dan ir-rapport importanti hafna dwar l-attivitat tal-Ombudsman ghas-sena 2020. It-tieni nett nixtieq nikkongratula u niringrazzja lill-Ombudsman, Emily O'Reilly, ghal xoghol illi wettqet matul is-sena li ghaddiet, sena daqstant mimlija b'diffikultajiet b'rabta mal-isfidi illi halliet fuqna l-pandemija.

Hidma illi zgurata illi Istituzzjonijiet Ewropej, l-Uffiċċji u l-Aġenziji jimxu mal-aqwa standards tal-aqwa amministrazzjoni, trasparenza u anke etika sabiex fl-ahhar mill-ahhar niprotegu d-drittijiet fundamentali u l-interessi vitali taċ-ċittadini taghna, sabiex insaħhu l-fiducja taċ-ċittadini fl-Istituzzjonijiet Ewropej. Hu ghalhekk importanti, u ha nkun qiegħed naghfas fuq dan il-punt, u hawnhekk fejn forsi ma naqblux anke mal-Grupp tal-Popolari. L-importanza li jkun hemm trasparenza totali fil-proċess li bih jittieħdu d-deċiżjonijiet, speċjalment fuq fajls leġiżlattivi, min-naħa tal-Kunsill. Trasparenza totali li hija tant u tant importanti f'dan il-proċess leġiżlattiv illi din in-nuqqas ta' trasparenza qiegħda twassal sabiex iċ-ċittadini taghna ma jkollhomx fl-ahhar mill-ahhar vizibilita' totali ghal dak illi għaddej minn din l-istituzzjoni importanti, l-istituzzjoni tal-Kunsill tal-Unjoni Ewropea.

Nixtieq ukoll qabel naghlaq, nikkongratula wkoll l-Uffiċċju tal-Ombudsman f'dan l-anniversarju ta' 25 sena. Uffiċċju li huwa vitali u importanti għaċ-ċittadini Ewropej. Jiena nhares 'il quddiem, illi bhala Parlament Ewropew, bhala Kumitat tal-Petizzjonijiet, inkomplu naghmlu d-differenza billi fl-ahhar mill-ahhar ilkoll kemm ahna nwarbu l-aġenda partigġ-jana taghna u nahdmu lkoll flimkien id f'id mal-Ombudsman sabiex inkomplu nagħtu vuċi aktar b'saħħitha liċ-ċittadini taghna.

Ramona Strugariu, *on behalf of the Renew Group*. – Madam President, the European Ombudsman is and should remain our natural ally in the fight for transparency, for high ethical standards and good administration in the EU.

I would like to congratulate you, Ms O'Reilly and your office, for the work undertaken in 2020. Under particularly difficult circumstances, you managed to continue working to safeguard our citizens' fundamental rights.

We appreciate in particular, the strategic work undertaken for evaluating the performance of the EU administration in the context of the COVID-19 crisis. As you have rightfully emphasised, in times of crisis, the obligations of transparency are not diminished. Abiding by them is even more crucial now in order to preserve citizens' trust.

We appreciate also the efforts to better inform the citizens about your mandate and to streamline the treatment of complaints, including in the framework of the strategy towards 2024. When it comes to defending the citizens' rights, we have a huge task ahead of us.

If we take the example of Next Generation EU, we need to ensure together better oversight on how these funds are used. 85% of citizens demand transparency and effective control on these funds, according to a special Eurobarometer for September 2021. I, myself, included such provisions in the text and I am counting on you and all our colleagues from all the political groups to fully support this approach.

Virginie Joron, *au nom du groupe ID*. – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Commissaire, chère Madame la Médiatrice européenne, je tiens tout d'abord à vous féliciter et à vous remercier au nom de beaucoup de mes compatriotes qui sont avides d'honnêteté, de transparence, et qui croient encore en la justice.

Pendant que M^{me} von der Leyen déclarait, il y a encore quelques jours, qu'elle souhaitait que les États membres réfléchissent à une obligation vaccinale pour tout le monde, la Commission continuait de cacher les SMS échangés entre elle et le PDG de Pfizer lors de la négociation du fameux contrat d'achat du vaccin, à 90 % caviardé. En même temps, Pfizer prévoit en 2022 de vendre 54 milliards de dollars de vaccins et de pilules anti-COVID-19.

Pourquoi ce manque de transparence de la part de la Commission? Pourquoi ce mépris? Pourquoi cette déconnexion avec les citoyens? Pourquoi tant de secret à Bruxelles, alors qu'ils n'hésitent pas à s'enlancer à Washington en s'autocongratulant? Continuez, chère Madame. Cette affaire est grave, et nous sommes avec vous.

Certains ne veulent pas voir ce convoi des libertés, cette manifestation pacifique et citoyenne à Bruxelles, Strasbourg et Paris, alors que c'est aussi la conséquence de ce mépris et de cette opacité de nos institutions européennes. Je vous remercie. Vous avez tout notre soutien.

Ryszard Czarnecki, *w imieniu grupy ECR*. – Pani Przewodnicząca! Pani Rzecznik! Panie Przewodniczący Komisji! Myślę, że to jest taki czas, kiedy powinniśmy mówić o rzeczach najważniejszych i o problemach, które stoją przed rzecznikiem w jego pracy. Mam wrażenie, że jednym z problemów, nad którymi rzecznik powinien się pochylić, jest kwestia deficytu demokracji, kwestia braku transparentności procesu decyzyjnego w Unii Europejskiej. Ja pamiętam, jak w kadencji 2004-2009 taki był plan *D as democracy* – D jak demokracja –ponieważ uznano, że w procesie decyzyjnym jest za mało demokracji. Po kilkunastu latach możemy powiedzieć to samo.

Myślę, że trzeba bardzo wyraźnie powiedzieć, że rzecznik praw obywatelskich jest także od tego, aby te procesy były bardziej transparentne, bo inaczej wystąpi deficyt zaufania do Unii Europejskiej wśród naszych wyborców i podatników.

Anne-Sophie Pelletier, *au nom du groupe The Left*. – Madame la Présidente, permettez-moi tout d'abord de remercier notre collègue pour son excellent rapport. Madame la Médiatrice, je voudrais aussi vous remercier sincèrement pour votre travail, qui met en exergue les dysfonctionnements administratifs de nos institutions. Le rapport constitue une fenêtre sur votre travail conséquent, qui donne à l'Union européenne les bases pour garantir la transparence, l'accès aux documents, et qui oblige les institutions à rendre des comptes aux citoyens européens.

Vous le savez peut-être, Madame: je ne fais pas partie des politiciens de profession. La politique s'est invitée dans ma vie alors que je luttais, avec d'autres, tous les jours, pour la rendre plus juste. Dès que j'ai intégré les bancs de cet hémicycle, je me suis promis de rendre l'Europe aux citoyens. Pourtant, vous l'avez montré, la route sera bien longue.

Que penser des SMS invisibles entre la présidente de la Commission et le PDG de Pfizer? Étaient-ils engageants, informels ou personnels? Le doute est là. Que penser quand, alors qu'une obligation qui ne dit pas son nom se dessine partout en Europe, l'accès aux contrats de vaccins nous est encore et toujours refusé? Le doute est là. Et que penser du Conseil qui, d'un revers de la main, et toujours sans que nous ayons accès aux négociations en cours, peut remettre en cause nos votes? Le fait que le Parlement est la seule institution démocratique élue de notre Union ne suffit-il pas pour avoir un droit de regard? Le doute est là.

Nos institutions, notre travail et, en soi, tout le projet européen n'existent que par la confiance que les citoyens nous portent. Cette confiance, on ne l'aura qu'en étant complètement transparents, entre nous, mais aussi – et surtout – envers eux. Alors soyons indignés et révoltons-nous contre ces ombres! Prétendons et exigeons de la lumière dans nos administrations, car c'est seulement ainsi que nous pourrions ensemble, Madame et chers collègues, rendre l'Union européenne à ses citoyens.

Mario Furore (NI). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, ringrazio la relatrice e il Mediatore europeo per il lavoro svolto.

Nel corso degli anni le raccomandazioni e il ruolo del Mediatore hanno avvicinato i cittadini alle istituzioni, ma restano ancora passi importanti da fare. Ancora troppo spesso le istituzioni, gli organi e gli organismi dell'UE non rispettano in modo pieno e uniforme le raccomandazioni della Mediatrice, penso in particolare a quella sulla trasparenza. La piena trasparenza in tutte le fasi del processo legislativo dell'UE è essenziale per promuovere i diritti democratici dei cittadini, così come è necessaria per prevenire conflitti di interesse e casi di corruzione.

In particolare, le istituzioni in prima linea dell'UE durante la pandemia avrebbero dovuto agire in massima trasparenza. È inaccettabile che ancora oggi il prezzo di acquisto dei vaccini e delle pillole anti-COVID sia segreto. I cittadini europei devono sapere quanto l'Unione europea ha pagato e quindi come ha negoziato con Big Pharma. Ne va della nostra credibilità. Per questo vorrei che la Commissione ascolti la Mediatrice e renda pubblici i messaggi tra il suo Presidente, Ursula von der Leyen, e il CEO della Pfizer.

Loránt Vincze (PPE). – Madam President, I would like to thank Madam Ombudsman for her commitment to achieving the highest standards of good administration within the EU institutions. I am glad to see that the activities of the European Ombudsman gain more and more visibility. You updated and made the communication channels with the public more effective. I also applaud your engagement towards multilingualism, including Irish. It is of utmost importance that we reach citizens so that they know about their rights and about what we can do for them.

As regards some proposals in the reports we are about to vote on, I am worried to see that several paragraphs aim to change the role of the Ombudsman office and maintain recommendations that do not fall under its competences as set out in the statutes. I believe that we must act based on democratic principles and rules and that we should not lay on the Ombudsman roles that are clearly played by other institutions, such as the Commission, the European Anti-Fraud Office (OLAF) and the European Public Prosecutor's Office (EPPO).

As regards transparency, I believe that improvements in this field are to be welcomed, for example, when minutes of the Council meetings are published. But we also have to acknowledge that we must leave room for an efficient political process, for reasoning, for negotiation, reasoning in our institutions. Dear Ms O'Reilly, please allow me to wish the office of the Ombudsman a further successful 25 years, and you can count on our support also in the future.

Cristina Maestre Martín De Almagro (S&D). – Señora presidenta, un año más valoramos la labor del Defensor del Pueblo, de esta importantísima institución europea, en este caso el año 2020, un año sumamente complicado para todos, en pleno auge de la pandemia y con las autoridades europeas tomando importantes decisiones: unas medidas que, como todo el mundo sabe, tuvieron que tomarse a contrarreloj para responder al impacto de esta enorme pandemia.

Pero la urgencia de las medidas no puede justificar laxitudes o incumplimientos en los estrictos controles y exigencias que nos hemos dado a nosotros mismos en las administraciones públicas y en las instituciones europeas.

La urgencia no está reñida con el cumplimiento de los procedimientos ni los procedimientos están reñidos con la transparencia, máxime teniendo en cuenta el importante número de acciones que han tenido que tomar la Comisión Europea y los Estados miembros.

Para hacer frente a la COVID-19 era necesario ser rápidos pero mantener el rigor en los procedimientos. Porque hay que tener mucho cuidado con aquellos que caen en la tentación de apelar a la libertad como excusa para entorpecer la labor de transparencia que tienen que tener determinadas instituciones, pero por la que, ante todo, tenemos que velar todos y cada uno de nosotros, y cumplirla.

Por lo tanto, aquí quiero reivindicar el importante papel que ha representado la Oficina del Defensor del Pueblo en este año tan sumamente significativo y, además, coincidiendo con el vigésimo quinto aniversario de la institución. Quiero poner de manifiesto y de relieve el importante papel que ejerce esta gran institución después de veinticinco años y que, ahora más que nunca, tenemos que reivindicar en pro de la garantía de transparencia que, a su vez, es garantía de democracia y garantía de derechos humanos.

Y quiero felicitar a la defensora del pueblo por el trabajo que ha hecho y también a los ponentes por el trabajo que han hecho en este informe de evaluación anual.

Marie-Pierre Vedrenne (Renew). – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Commissaire, Madame la Médiatrice, plus que jamais le médiateur européen doit poursuivre ses combats. La démocratie européenne ne doit jamais être considérée comme acquise, et le médiateur européen est un de ses garants. Il n'y a pas de démocratie sans transparence. Les citoyens doivent pouvoir participer à la vie démocratique. L'accès à toutes les informations et dans toutes les langues doit être garanti. On ne peut transiger avec le droit à l'information, et les Européens doivent savoir ce qui est fait en leur nom.

Il n'y a pas non plus de démocratie sans état de droit. La surveillance étroite des fonds européens dans chaque État membre et le respect des règles de déontologie sont des piliers de la démocratie européenne. À nous, avec vous, Madame la Médiatrice, de veiller à ce que démocratie rime avec état de droit. Une démocratie courageuse accepte de regarder en face ses faiblesses, et vous nous y obligez. Madame la Médiatrice, vous le savez et vous le voyez encore ce soir, le Parlement européen est de votre côté.

Sabrina Pignedoli (NI). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, voglio ringraziare la Mediatrice europea per il lavoro svolto, in particolare per il grande impegno che ha dedicato ad approfondire la risposta dell'Unione europea al COVID-19. Quando bisogna agire in emergenza i rischi per la trasparenza aumentano. Per esempio, ancora oggi non possiamo conoscere completamente il contenuto dei contratti per i vaccini anti-COVID. Non possiamo sapere se vi siano conflitti di interesse, né le cifre pagate.

Su conflitto di interessi e porte girevoli, un caso evidente ha riguardato il direttore esecutivo dell'*European Banking Authority*, divenuto amministratore delegato di una lobby finanziaria. Un caso grave, anche perché per un certo periodo di tempo l'ex funzionario ha avuto ancora accesso a documenti riservati dell'istituzione europea.

Dobbiamo cambiare i contratti. Al momento di accettare un incarico, il dirigente deve sapere che non potrà lavorare in un determinato ruolo nel settore privato per un certo periodo di tempo, e su questo punto, signora O'Reilly, avrà il nostro appoggio. Non devono esserci deroghe o discrezionalità, ne va della credibilità delle nostre istituzioni.

Marc Angel (S&D). – Madam President, I want to thank our ombudsman, Emily O'Reilly, and her office for her tireless fight for transparency. Transparency and information strengthen the rights of our citizens and let me remind you that without access to documents, there is no information and there is no transparency. And this becomes even more true in COVID times. Giving access to documents increases the accountability of all EU institutions.

And the Council, which is absent today, has the worst record of transparency. We, as the European Parliament, must continue to keep up our pressure together with the European Ombudsman, with national parliaments and with the civil society organisations to change this. Our call for Council transparency is nothing abstract; it is also a demand from citizens. This becomes very clear in the citizens recommendations in the framework of the Conference on the Future of Europe.

EU transparency law is now over 20 years old, dates from a pre-social media and pre-smartphone era, it needs to be modernised, and it needs to be updated. The Commission must adapt this outdated regulation.

Let me finish by thanking Emily O'Reilly once more for being a real influencer of change. And I also want to thank our rapporteur Ms Evi and the shadow rapporteurs for the excellent work they have done in the Committee on Petitions (PETI).

Gabriele Bischoff (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin, liebe Frau O'Reilly! Ich möchte mich wirklich bei Ihnen für Ihren unermüdlichen Einsatz bedanken, für volle Transparenz.

Sie wollen das Fenster weit aufmachen, damit die Bürgerinnen und Bürger wirklich reingucken können, wie Entscheidungen zustande kommen. Einige möchten es eigentlich nur einen Spalt aufmachen, damit man so ein bisschen einen Blick reinwerfen kann. Aber wir sehen, wie ernst Sie Ihre Arbeit nehmen, und ich glaube, das ist wichtig.

Ich habe Ihnen zugehört bei Ihrer Präsentation. In der Tat: 2020 war ein ganz besonderes Jahr, da musste schnell gehandelt werden. Und trotzdem ist es wichtig, dass Transparenz eingehalten wird und dass man auch eine klare Kommunikation hat, weil ohne das werden wir keine demokratische Resilienz erreichen. Und die Währung dafür ist wirklich Vertrauen.

Deshalb möchte ich mich noch einmal dafür bedanken, dass Sie wirklich den Finger in die Wunde gelegt haben und bei den Verträgen mit den Pharmaunternehmen darauf bestehen, dass hier wirklich Klarheit geschaffen wird, denn sonst werden nur Verschwörungsmymen unterstützt und – denke ich – gerade auch Fake News Vorschub geleistet. Das dürfen wir nicht zulassen.

Deshalb: Zukunft wird aus Mut gemacht. Davon haben Sie genug. Mit einem kleinen Office, aber trotzdem einem großen Auftrag. Und da haben Sie unsere volle Unterstützung als S&D-Fraktion.

Maroš Šefčovič, *Vice-President of the Commission*. – Madam President, I really would like to thank the honourable Members of the European Parliament for their important contributions and I would say that Mr Jahr opened with and Ms Bischoff concluded with what I would describe as universal praise and admiration for the work of Ms O'Reilly as the European Ombudsman and her office, as she described it, a small one but with a big mandate, and I totally agree with that description.

I also would like to underline at the conclusion of this debate that the Commission constantly strives to ensure a very high level of good administration, as called for by Mr Saliba and many other speakers. And I also would like to reassure all of you that we are totally committed to the right of good administration as laid down in the Article 41 of the EU's Charter of Fundamental Rights.

I agree with all of you who have been highlighting the fact that all members of our society who interact with the Commission, the European Parliament and other institutions, because the Council was referred to on several occasions – it doesn't matter if they are individual citizens, companies, associations or NGOs – all of them have the right to expect from us transparency – as was underlined by Ms Strugariu and Mr Czarnecki – accessibility and, of course, proper management.

Our close and constructive cooperation with the European Ombudsman helps us to provide citizens with very high administrative standards, which are based, in particular, on the principles of non-discrimination, impartiality, objectivity and also fairness. In this context, the Commission fully respects the rights of citizens to receive a response to their letters in their language, as underscored by Mr Vincze, but also the right to be heard and to submit observations and the right to receive a justified decision within a reasonable timeframe.

The report and the resolution of the European Parliament on the annual report on the activities of the European Ombudsman in 2020 contributes to this by highlighting the areas where our institutions do well and where they can improve. As I already mentioned in my introductory remarks, the Commissioner will assess in detail the issue raised in your resolution during today's debate and will respond in the next few weeks.

Several of the honourable Members, Madam President, also raised the issue of the text messages. I can confirm that the Ombudsman has sent the recommendation with regard to this matter to the Commission on 26 January of this year. The Commission is currently looking into this recommendation and will reply to the Ombudsman by 26 April of this year, which is the date by which the Ombudsman asked for a reply.

So once again, Ms O'Reilly, thank you very much for excellent work, for your great cooperation with the European Commission and other institutions, and also for the support which obviously will carry??? not only from this House but also from the European citizens. And thanks to your tireless work, I am sure that together we can provide better services to our citizens. Thank you very much, Madam President.

Emily O'Reilly, *Ombudsman*. – A Uachtaráin, Go raibh míle maith agaibh go léir as bhur gcuid tacaíochta, tuairimí agus ceisteanna. Níl an t-am agam anois freagra a thabhairt do gach duine nó ar gach ceist ach tá m'Oifig i gcónaí oscailte daoibh agus tá fáilte romhaibh go léir teagmháil a dhéanamh linn maidir le ceisteanna nó gearáin nó aon rud eile.

Normally at these hearings, there are a variety of issues that are brought up, but I think there was one dominant theme this evening and that is transparency in the decision making process.

And I think possibly the reason for that is not just the complaints or the investigations that we dealt with, but also because I think over the last two years we have seen the concrete importance of transparency. When so many frightened citizens looked as never before to their administrations, including the EU administration, for reassurance, they needed to know what decisions were being made to keep their families, themselves, their communities safe. But administrations also needed a citizens. They also looked to citizens for support in that work, so that they could be encouraged to take often very difficult measures to keep them safe and later to accept vaccines.

So it wasn't just the citizens that needed the administration. The administration needed the support and trust of citizens to remain effective. And transparency is obviously one of the major keys in achieving that.

As MEP Angel said, the regulation that governs access to EU documents is now over 20 years old and arguably no longer fit for purpose. The recent issue of the text messages – a case we're involved in at the moment, as you probably know – I think highlights the fact that we now communicate in a very different way than we did 20 years ago. And I think this should be recognised because I think people possibly arising out of this case or similar cases are realising that this is problematic.

It's not just problematic for citizens, it is problematic for the administration because there are obviously going to be greater calls for transparency in these areas of new communication. So I think that it is up to you to do what you will, obviously. But I think there is a big argument there for at least bringing the Regulation 1049/2001 up to date.

Mar fhocal scoir, ba mhaith liom buíochas a ghabháil arís leis an bParlaimint agus an *Petitions Committee* as a thábhachtaí atá sé do m'Oifig. Is mór agam é agus tá sé ríthábhachtach do mo chuid oibre. Tá súil agam go mbeidh seachtain thairbhiúil agus thaitneamhach agaibh in Strasbourg.

President. – The debate is closed.

The vote will take place on Tuesday, 15 February 2022.

22. Europejska strategia na rzecz energii z morskich źródeł odnawialnych (debata)

President. – The next item is the debate on the report by Morten Petersen, on behalf of the Committee on Industry, Research and Energy, on a European strategy for offshore renewable energy (2021/2012(INI)) (A9-0339/2021).

Morten Petersen, Ordfører. – Fru formand! Havvind er nøglen til at nå vores klimamål. Hvis vi på nogen måde skal gøre os forhåbninger om at indfri vores klimamål, så kræver det mere vedvarende energi – meget mere. Faktisk har vi så travlt, så det næsten ikke er til at fatte. FN's klimapanel har fortalt os, at det haster, og at selv om alle landes klimaalfter måtte blive indfriet, så vil de globale udledninger stadigvæk stige mere, end hvad Parisaftalen tilsiger.

Det Internationale Energiagentur IEA har fortalt os, at der er en vej til klimaneutralitet i 2050. Men den vej er smal, og for hver dag der går uden handling, ja så bliver det sværere, og stien bliver smallere. Vi er simpelthen nødt til at løfte vores klimaambitioner. Vedvarende energi og energieffektivisering er helt afgørende i den grønne omstilling. Vi har brug for at rulle alle tilgængelige, rene og effektive teknologier ud så hurtigt som muligt, og det gælder ikke mindst havvind. Potentialet er enormt. Vi har gode forudsætninger i Europa. Faktisk er Europa og europæiske virksomheder verdensførende i havvind. Vi ser i disse år energioer, der føres fra skriveborde og science fiction-planer ud i livet til konkret handling. Vi kan godt lide at sige i mit land, Danmark – jeg kan godt lide at prale af verdens første energioer – nu gør de os i Belgien rangen stridig. Det er et godt kapløb, for vi har drøn travlt, hvis vi skal nå det.

Betænkningen, som vi diskuterer her i aften, har tre hovedområder. For det første infrastruktur. Infrastrukturen skal udbygges og forbedres for at kunne tage højde for den øgede produktion af grøn strøm ude på havet og ind til land. Udfordringerne om infrastruktur kræver i øvrigt, at medlemslandene øger deres samarbejde i planlægning og udbygning af havvind, vel at mærke på tværs af grænser. For det andet har vi brug for et velfungerende marked for elektricitet i EU – et egentligt indre marked. Det har vi ikke i dag. Her vi kan se, at udvekslingen af elektricitet går i stå på tværs af landegrænser. Vi får brug for at kigge på markedsdesign for at sikre, at udviklere har de rette incitamenter til at bygge ud i en fart. Endelig for det tredje har vi det utroligt svære, komplicerede spørgsmål om tilladelser. Det tager ganske enkelt for lang tid i dag, og hvis ikke vi gør det anderledes og hurtigere, ja så kommer vi ikke i mål. Ganske enkelt. Jeg tror, at man kan sige, at hvad der har bragt os hertil, ikke vil tage os derhen, hvor vi gerne vil være i 2030.

Derfor foreslår vi i betænkningen, at der indføres tidsbegrænsninger i forhold til at udstede tilladelser. Det vil sige, når alle dokumenter måtte være indleveret, så kunne man forestille sig en bagkant, en tidsbegrænsning, således at udviklere ved, hvad de har at gøre med. Det var måske den vanskeligste del af betænkningen at få den vigtige og følsomme del på plads. Jeg er glad for, at det lykkedes.

De maritime planer, de såkaldte MSP'er, skal koordineres med medlemslandenes nationale energi- og klimaplaner, således at højre hånd ved, hvad venstre hånd gør og for at undgå forsinkelser i alt, hvad der vedrører tilladelser. Lad mig slutte med at takke ordførerne fra de politiske grupper. Jeg vil sige, at det har været en fornøjelse at samarbejde med alle grupperne om så vigtigt et emne. Jeg ser frem til debatten her en sen aften i Strasbourg, og jeg ser frem til at føre strategien ud i livet sammen med jer.

Kadri Simson, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, honourable Members of the European Parliament, I am very pleased to be here today. We are moving ever closer to 2050, and decarbonising our energy system becomes more important with every passing moment. We have set out a clear vision of how we believe we should get there, and offshore renewable energy is a big part of that vision.

Choosing the right path means hearing all viewpoints, learning from different perspectives, and that's why I am so pleased to be here discussing the own-initiative report on the European offshore energy strategy. I want to thank Morten Petersen for the hard work in preparing it. I can see that many of its recommendations are in line and support the Commission's own strategy.

To kick off this session, I'd like to frame our discussion today by speaking about the Commission's thinking behind this important part of energy in Europe. Let's start with simple facts.

The EU is a global powerhouse for offshore renewables. Offshore wind is not at the beginning of its journey here, it's a major technology: one with immense potential, potential to help us meet our 2030 and 2050 targets, potential to foster competitive energy prices and potential to boost European industry.

Despite publishing a dedicated strategy on offshore energy with some of the most ambitious targets globally, the EU still needs to overcome a number of challenges facing us. Having read Morten Petersen's report carefully, I was pleased to see that the Commission and Parliament identify the same opportunities and challenges for the offshore energy sector in the EU. The Parliament rightly pointed out a number of issues and needs for the Commission to address. Let me take them one by one right now.

First, an impact assessment on the economic and socio-economic impacts of offshore energy. This is a very useful comment which we will explore, I think, in the Horizon Europe programme, including through coal specifically tailored to the development of offshore energy.

Second, how can renewable sources pave the way for renewable hydrogen? As you know, the decarbonised gas market package highlights renewable sources, including offshore, as a priority to ramp up renewable hydrogen production.

Third, an EU-wide landfill ban on decommissioned wind turbine blades by 2025. Circularity is a constant consideration of our work. The Commission is already taking it into consideration in Horizon Europe goals. And fourth, tailoring Horizon Europe to the development of renewables. This is another area already considered in the strategy and currently under discussion when it comes to the ongoing shaping of the 2023-24 Horizon Europe goals.

There is much to do, but we should also take a moment to realise how far we have come already. It's been just over a year since we adopted the offshore energy strategy, and even in that short time we have achieved quite a lot in each of the key areas.

On infrastructure, last December the European Parliament and the Council found agreement on the new regulation of TEN-E. It contains critical provisions to steer the coordinated development of the needed offshore and onshore infrastructure at sea-basin level. The agreement contains a provision inviting Member States to come forward with clear commitments on the offshore renewable energy to be deployed within each sea basin by 2050.

Those commitments will include immediate steps in 2030 and 2040 and will be in line with the national energy and climate plans and the potential of each sea basin. I hope the European Parliament will endorse the agreement reached between the co-legislators so that it can enter into force in spring.

On legislation, we have been working hard to make sure that we have the best conditions to enhance the EU's role in offshore and onshore renewables. And I already mentioned the Fit for 55 package, and with the work that has been done to revise the Renewables Directive, we are creating these conditions. And this proposal is currently under discussion in the European Parliament and the Council.

And on permitting, we know that we face one of the key challenges for project development in the EU, so we are doing everything we can to make sure that Member States coordinate, streamline and facilitate the process. And we want to be able to look back at the current system, which is often overly complex and excessively long, as a relic of the past.

The first step towards achieving that is correctly transposing the Renewable Energy Directive, because unfortunately, most Member States have not fully transposed the Directive, even though the deadline was last July. So I should also mention here that we intend to issue, by this summer, further guidance on good practices to address overly-complex and excessively-long administrative procedures.

And last, on cooperation and consensus: in October we organised a conference for government ministries and public authorities to look more closely at the state of affairs for the offshore energy sector. From investments to public acceptance and from permitting to pre-planning, many of the most significant issues for large-scale deployment were dealt with at the same time, and I know that the participation of Morten Petersen and the Chair of the Committee on Industry, Research and Energy (ITRE) Mr Buşoi was highly appreciated.

So, ladies and gentlemen, I think what we can all agree on is that much has been done but there is still much left to do, and these are some of the most pressing issues identified in the Commission's strategy and addressed in the Parliament report. So thank you for listening and I'm looking forward to the discussions.

Catherine Chabaud, *rapporteuse pour avis PECH*. – Madame la Présidente, chers collègues, je voudrais d'abord saluer le travail de notre collègue Morten Petersen: vraiment, merci. J'ai toujours comparé les territoires littoraux et insulaires à des navires qui doivent rechercher leur autonomie énergétique avec ce que la nature leur offre. Je suis donc favorable à toutes les formes d'énergie en mer: celles qui utilisent l'énergie du vent, comme il en est question ici, mais aussi celles qui utilisent l'inépuisable énergie de la mer, de sa chaleur comme de ses courants, en particulier pour les régions ultrapériphériques de l'Union, dans une approche de mix énergétique terre-mer.

Je mets cependant deux conditions essentielles à leur développement: premièrement, l'impérieuse nécessité de penser leur implantation dans le cadre de la planification de l'espace maritime fondée sur les écosystèmes et sur les usages; deuxièmement, l'impérieuse nécessité d'aller plus loin que la simple réduction d'impact environnemental et social, en recherchant les cobénéfices pour les écosystèmes autant que pour les métiers.

Enfin, je voudrais souligner la rareté de nos débats sur la mer, qui est pourtant en danger, alors qu'elle est notre avenir – on le voit ici avec l'énergie. Tous les citoyens européens sont concernés par sa sauvegarde. Alors, dans la continuité du One Ocean Summit, les conférences internationales de 2022 sont une occasion pour agir. J'appelle donc à faire entrer l'océan dans cet hémicycle. J'appelle à un débat pour notre océan, qui est notre bien commun, avant la conférence de Lisbonne des Nations unies en juin prochain.

Pernille Weiss, *for PPE-Gruppen*. – Fru formand! For langt over 40 år siden cyklede jeg rundt i Jylland. Det var om sommeren, når vi børn ikke lavede sandslotte på stranden og fik sorte fødder af de olieklager, der skyllede ind fra havet. Som to små ællinger cyklede min søster og jeg bag ved vores forældre på landevejen. For dengang var cykelstier faktisk ikke opfundet endnu. På et tidspunkt så pegede min far, og mor begyndte at slingre på sin cykel: »Derinde bor hippierne!«, råbte far og trådte hårdere i pedalerne - »Derinde under vindmøllen!«, som dengang både var enestående og temmelig mærkelig.

Det er vindmøller heldigvis ikke længere. For vi har brug for dem. Især i store størrelser og store klumper ude på havet, hvor de sammen med andre havenergiteknologier kan bidrage til at dække vores enorme behov for grøn energi. For klimakrisen og energikrisen skal løses nu. Parisaftalen og klimamålene skal nås til tiden. Europa skriger på at blive selvforsynende af grøn og ren energi, der er til for almindelige familier og virksomheder at betale for. Som ordfører for PPE-gruppen er jeg især glad for, at vi har fået en bred aftale, som sikrer en livscyklus-tilgang til havenergiene, og som sætter dem ind i den helt nødvendige opskalering af produktion af grøn brint, så havets energi virkelig kan gøre nytte i de energikrævende sektorer rundt omkring i EU.

Vi er også enige om, at offentlige og private penge skal finde hinanden omkring projekter, der er store nok til at blive en god forretning. Og så er det en aftale, som forhindrer fiffige vindmølle-hippier i at mase sig ud på havet, uden at civilsamfund og andre høringsberettigede organisationer og interessenter får en fair chance for at råbe op, følge med og forhåbentlig bakke op om, at vi fremover henter masser af grøn strøm ind fra havet omkring Europa i stedet for at ødelægge vores landskab og det gode humør inde på land.

Niels Fuglsang, for S&D-Gruppen. – Fru formand! Jeg frygter, at vi ikke får sat gang i produktionen af grøn strøm hurtigt nok. Jeg er simpelthen bange for, at hvis vi ikke for alvor sætter farten op, så vil det de næste mange år være sort, dyr strøm fra kulkraftværker, der når vores stikkontakter. Heldigvis har vi mulighederne og løsningerne. Jeg kommer selv fra Danmark, fra Nordvestjylland, et sted, der hedder Thy. Vi kalder det Cold Hawaii, fordi der er mange vindsurfere, der boltrer sig på bølgerne deroppe, og jeg kan skrive under på, at der er masser af vind, som vi kan bruge. Vi er i gang med at bygge energiøer ude på havet til at producere strøm, men også til at fordele den grønne strøm mellem landene.

Jeg mener, at vi sender to klare signaler med vores strategi. For det første skal der skrues op for tempoet. Vi skal have op mod 79 gigawatt, mere end de 60 gigawatt, som Kommissionen foreslår i 2030. For det andet skal vi have udbygget infrastrukturen, så vi kan fordele den grønne strøm ud til alle Europas lande. Lad os gøre min frygt til skamme. Lad os vise, at vi mener det nu.

Christophe Grudler, au nom du groupe Renew. – Madame la Présidente, Madame la Commissaire, hydroliennes, éoliennes, usines marémotrices et osmotiques: le potentiel des énergies en mer est immense et multiple. C'est un fait: pour que l'Union européenne atteigne ses objectifs climatiques, elle doit déployer massivement des énergies renouvelables, notamment en mer. Un des grands avantages, c'est qu'en mer le vent, les marées et les courants sont presque continus. C'est pourquoi je me réjouis du rapport que nous adoptons ici cette semaine, qui propose une accélération encadrée du déploiement des énergies renouvelables en mer.

Nous appelons à un objectif de 60 GW minimum de capacité installés en mer en Europe d'ici 2030. Nous n'en avons que 12 aujourd'hui. Pour y arriver, il nous faudra simplifier les processus. Attendre quinze ans pour construire une éolienne, ce n'est pas tenable. La crise climatique, elle, n'attend pas. Par ailleurs, ces énergies en mer représenteront de très nombreux emplois de qualité non délocalisables le long de nos côtes européennes. Enfin, le développement de ces énergies renouvelables en mer participera pleinement à notre autonomie stratégique énergétique européenne, car toute l'énergie que nous produirons sur nos côtes sera autant d'énergie que nous n'aurons pas à importer d'ailleurs.

Jutta Paulus, im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion. – Frau Präsidentin, meine Damen und Herren! Zunächst möchte ich dem Berichterstatler Morten Petersen und auch allen Mit-Berichterstatlern für die gute Zusammenarbeit und die kooperative Atmosphäre bei diesem wichtigen Thema – erneuerbare Offshore-Energie – danken.

Bei Offshore denken die meisten Menschen an Windparks nahe der Küste, aber Offshore ist ja noch viel mehr: Es gibt mittlerweile schwimmende Windparks, es gibt die Nutzung von Wellenenergie, es gibt osmotische Kraftwerke, es gibt thermische Kraftwerke, es gibt schwimmende Solarkraftwerke, es gibt Strömungsturbinen. Unsere Ozeane bieten unglaublich viel Potenzial, sauber und kostengünstig Energie nutzbar zu machen.

Deshalb bin ich froh, dass wir in unserem Bericht festhalten, dass Naturschutzgebiete tabu sein müssen. Denn wir haben genug Platz. Wir müssen ihn nur intelligent nutzen. Dafür braucht es eine gute und vor allem eine gemeinsame Planung der Mitgliedstaaten – das spart Zeit, Geld und Ressourcen. Und in einem gemeinsamen Strommarkt ergibt es überhaupt keinen Sinn, wenn die Erzeugung auf See und der Netzausbau nicht untereinander koordiniert werden.

Unsere Klimaziele können wir nur einhalten, wenn die Erneuerbaren massiv ausgebaut werden. Und deshalb fordern wir in diesem Bericht mindestens 70 Gigawatt Offshore bis 2030 und ein Gesamtziel von 340 Gigawatt. Das bedeutet eine Versechsfachung des Bestands binnen acht Jahren.

Ja, das ist ambitioniert und erfordert Investitionen. Aber lasst uns doch lieber in Energien investieren, die keinen Brennstoff benötigen und die nicht von geopolitischen Verwerfungen betroffen sein können. Erneuerbare Energien kann man nicht zur Ware machen und nicht zum Spielball von Machtpolitik. Sie werden uns geschenkt: jeden Tag, jede Woche, jedes Jahr. Wären die Vorschläge, die wir in diesem Bericht machen, bereits früher angegangen worden, würden wir dieser Tage weder über hohe Energiepreise klagen noch befürchten, im Kalten und Dunkeln sitzen zu müssen.

Deshalb ist es umso wichtiger, dass die Kommission die zentralen Punkte baldmöglichst aufnimmt und in Gesetzesvorschläge umsetzt.

Paolo Borchia, *a nome del gruppo ID*. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signora Commissaria, io temo che abbiamo qualche problema sugli ordini di grandezza, nel senso che ci sono *report di advisor* a livello internazionale che stimano che la produzione potenziale di eolico offshore sarà proporzionalmente molto inferiore rispetto all'obiettivo dei 60 gigawatt che l'Unione europea, da sola, intende raggiungere entro il 2030.

Ho una domanda tutt'altro che secondaria: gli 800 miliardi di euro di investimenti che la Commissione vorrebbe mobilitare entro il 2050, dove pensiamo di trovarli?

Non sottovalutiamo inoltre i problemi di coesistenza con le altre attività marittime, pensiamo alla pesca e alla navigazione. Non minimizziamo neppure i problemi legati ai costi di manutenzione in mare aperto, all'usura che gli urti delle onde e la salinità inevitabilmente portano agli impianti eolici offshore.

Io lo ribadisco con convinzione: le rinnovabili possono essere il futuro ed è giusto promuoverle, ma una transizione energetica concreta e indolore ha bisogno soprattutto di fonti programmabili e di bollette che siano alla portata di imprese e famiglie. Quindi, se non adottiamo questo approccio realistico, restano le buone e costose intenzioni che spesso si infrangono con la gelida realtà.

Grzegorz Tobiszowski, *w imieniu grupy ECR*. – Pani Przewodnicząca! Pani Komisarz! Szanowni Państwo! Morskie źródła energii odnawialnej są jednym z ważniejszych elementów strategii europejskiej dotyczącej transformacji energetycznej. Dlatego też wyrażam zadowolenie z włączenia do sprawozdania mojej sugestii, apelu o objęcie wsparciem inwestycyjnym i planistycznym projektów krajowych połączonych bezpośrednio z lądem poprzez tzw. połączenia radialne. Pozwoli to państwu rozpoczynającym inwestycje w odnawialne źródła energii na morzu, w tym Polski, którą reprezentuję, na szybsze rozwijanie infrastruktury i szybsze zwiększenie wolumenu energii z tych źródeł.

Kluczowe jest też, aby szczegółowe decyzje dotyczące rozwoju morskich źródeł energii odnawialnych pozostały w kompetencji państw członkowskich. Państwa powinny mieć prawo do podejmowania decyzji w sprawach dotyczących na przykład planowania przestrzennego obszarów morskich, wydawania pozwoleń na budowę, czy udzielania koncesji na wytwarzanie energii elektrycznej z farm wiatrowych. Na koniec chciałbym podziękować sprawozdawcy panu Petersonowi za merytoryczną konstruktywną pracę, jak również wszystkim pozostałym kontrsprawozdawcom za owocną współpracę nad sprawozdaniem.

VORSITZ: KATARINA BARLEY

Vizepräsidentin

Cornelia Ernst, *im Namen der Fraktion The Left*. – Frau Präsidentin! Ja, es gibt zu den Erneuerbaren keine Alternative. Und daran ändert auch nichts, wenn man Atomkraft und Gas per Beschluss zur grünen Energie erklärt.

Wir brauchen mutige Schritte zum Ausbau der Erneuerbaren, und wir müssen es besser machen als bei den Fossilen. Wir brauchen eine wirkungsmächtige Offshore-Strategie als eine Säule zur Bekämpfung des Klimawandels, die gute Arbeitsbedingungen für die Menschen schafft, die dort arbeiten, die die Bewahrung der Meeresumwelt bei jeder einzelnen technischen Lösung beachtet. Der Gleichklang zwischen Umwelt, Natur, Mensch – darum geht es. Und es geht darum, dass wir über die Offshore-Standorte hinaus denken müssen: beispielsweise an *Just-Transition-Regionen*, die bei der Herstellung von Offshore-Anlagen mitgedacht werden könnten.

Alle Faktoren zusammen denken heißt auch, alle Akteurinnen und Akteure zusammen zu denken und zu mobilisieren, und nicht nur die privaten. Ganz ehrlich: Es wird wirklich Zeit, umzudenken, unsere Vorstellung von Politik und öffentlicher Hand zu ändern. Die öffentliche Hand ist doch mehr als ein Garant für private Profite, sondern ein gleichwertiger Player, gerade weil der Markt nicht alles richtet. Wir haben das in der Pandemie gesehen. Es wird Zeit, das Gemeinwohl in den Mittelpunkt jeder Entscheidung zu stellen, gerade wenn es um erneuerbare Energien geht.

Es steht zu viel auf dem Spiel, um zuzulassen, dass dieser strategische Sektor einfach nur von den größten Konzernen vereinnahmt wird, weil es wirklich um uns alle geht.

Cristian-Silviu Buşoi (PPE). – Doamnă preşedintă, potenţialul offshore este recunoscut; energia eoliană generată în largul mărilor şi cea a oceanelor vor deveni surse de energie tot mai competitive. Vreau să o felicit pe doamna comisară Kadri Simson pentru strategia foarte bună şi pe colegul meu, domnul Petersen, pentru raportul excelent.

Aşa cum indică raportul pe care îl vom vota mâine, şi preţul energiei va scădea pe măsură ce aceste surse de energie regenerabilă vor fi dezvoltate şi exploatate. Vântul şi-a dublat cota în mixul energetic global în ultimii cinci ani, iar ponderea capacităţii offshore va creşte în următoarea perioadă datorită accelerării pe pieţele-cheie europene a unor proiecte de exploatare offshore care au devenit recent funcţionale.

Dar, avem nevoie să dezvoltăm cât mai curând noi soluţii de stocare, reţele inteligente de *smart grid* şi să stabilim o adevărată piaţă europeană pentru stocarea energiei pentru a stimula investiţiile în noi capacităţi de stocare.

Ţara mea, România, are ieşire la Marea Neagră şi un potenţial considerabil atât pentru instalaţii eoliene fixate pe fundul mării, cât şi pentru cele plutitoare şi în acest context doresc să pun accentul pe potenţialul încă neexploatat la maximum din Marea Neagră, Marea Baltică sau Marea Mediterană şi să reamintesc Comisiei că avem nevoie, este nevoie de sprijin financiar din *Green Deal*, din *Fit for 55*, din alte fonduri, pentru ca ţările care au ieşire la aceste mări să îşi poată creşte contribuţia eoliană offshore în mixul energetic.

Trebuie investiţii în infrastructură, în porturi maritime moderne, pentru a găzdui turbine şi componente mai mari, pentru a atinge cu adevărat potenţialul pe care îl avem.

Patrizia Toia (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, mentre affrontiamo con proposte nuove e pienamente europee la complicata transizione energetica, i problemi del gas e del suo approvvigionamento e il caro bollette, dobbiamo però, senza tentennamenti, fare un cambio di rotta e imboccare con passo deciso la nuova direzione, che è rappresentata, con le nostre priorità energetiche, dalle rinnovabili, di cui dobbiamo aumentare moltissimo la produzione.

Tra le rinnovabili, le offshore hanno certamente un grande ruolo, se pensiamo che il nostro continente è circondato da mari e oceani. Allora sappiamo che incontreremo e ci saranno, ci sono già, delle resistenze per diversi motivi, compresi quelli paesaggistici, ma noi dobbiamo superare queste resistenze, con molta pazienza, con molto convincimento, cercando le soluzioni tecniche e ambientali migliori e più sicure, e ci sono.

La strategia offshore ha molti punti di forza, accanto ovviamente anche a punti critici. Ne voglio richiamare alcuni, a cui già la Commissaria ha accennato. Penso alla nostra capacità di ricerca e di tecnologia e alla nostra capacità industriale e alla possibilità di ottenere con le interconnessioni una maggiore cooperazione tra gli Stati membri.

Pierre Karleskind (Renew). – Madame la Présidente, Madame la Commissaire, cet après-midi, en venant, j'ai vu sur Twitter que j'avais été interpellé par quelqu'un qui me disait: «Mais vous allez discuter des énergies marines renouvelables alors que ça fait dix ans qu'on attend la première éolienne qui pourrait sortir de mer en France?» C'est vrai, alors qu'au Danemark, chez le rapporteur Morten Petersen, cela fait probablement une vingtaine d'années qu'il y en a qui tournent et qui fournissent de l'énergie.

Eh bien peut-être est-ce là l'intérêt de ce débat, l'intérêt de l'excellent rapport que notre collègue a commis. L'intérêt, c'est bien de débattre, d'échanger, de voir ce qui marche bien, ce qui a moins bien marché, comment on réalise au mieux ces champs, comment on développe au mieux cette ambition, et ce, évidemment, avec celles et ceux qui vivent de la mer. Nous leur devons de prendre ce temps pour nous assurer que les choix que nous faisons ne s'opposent pas à leur façon d'exister, à leur façon de vivre ni à leur façon de travailler.

Cependant, nous devons aussi être conscients que nous devons au climat et à l'humanité d'être capables d'aller chercher ces sources d'énergie renouvelable. Nous avons ici, sur nos côtes, un formidable potentiel, un des premiers potentiels mondiaux en matière d'énergie marine renouvelable. Nous le devons aussi aux océans, parce que rien ne serait pire qu'un océan qui se réchaufferait.

Ville Niinistö (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, this report is a fine response by the Parliament to an important strategy of the Commission. We really need to scale up the investments into renewables in order to tackle our climate responsibilities, but also in order to address the current energy crisis we have, since we are too dependent still on fossil fuels.

Wind power is already the cheapest investment in new investments in a lot of European countries, and offshore wind is going to become one in the future, when we hasten the build-up. But it's not just offshore wind we are talking about, it's also other hybrid solutions like tidal and wave solutions. We really need to tap into this potential in order to make sure that we can achieve fully-renewable systems.

The Greens made a scenario up to 2040 where we can be totally 100% renewable in Europe by 2040. And in this scenario we need to have 51% of renewables by 2030, and that is possible. That investment is economically possible also in the scenario, and the price of energy is not increasing. So we are just saying that we can do even more than the Commission is proposing, and this report is a step towards that.

Markus Buchheit (ID). – Frau Präsidentin, meine sehr verehrten Damen und Herren! Im Gegensatz zu meinen zahlreichen Vorrednern hier habe ich erhebliche Bedenken hinsichtlich des weiteren Ausbaus von Offshore-Windenergie, und zwar nicht nur in Bezug auf Fischerei und Umweltschutz, wie das schon zur Sprache kam, sondern auch in Bezug auf die Entwicklung der Energiepreise. Die Kosten sind nämlich auch bei der Offshore-Windenergie eben nicht wettbewerbsfähig und müssen durch teuer bezahlte Beihilfen gestützt werden, was den Markt nur noch weiter verzerrt.

Schauen wir uns die konkreten Zahlen an: Im Paket *Fit for 55* ist von 60 Gigawatt allein bis 2030 die Rede. Gegenwärtig haben wir eine Produktion von 12 Gigawatt. Die Investitionen für ein einzelnes Gigawatt betragen, günstig gerechnet, 2,5 Milliarden Euro, im praktischen, realistischen Fall etwa 4 Milliarden Euro. Für die Erweiterung bis 2030 wären damit 120 bis 192 Milliarden Euro zusätzliche Investitionen nötig – 120 bis 192 Milliarden Euro, die wir unseren Bürgern, die ohnehin schon unter den Strompreisen ächzen, aufbrummen wollen, weil es Ihnen im Grunde eben nicht um bezahlbare Energie geht, sondern um Megaprojekte einer kleinen Lobby, die jeden Tag kleiner wird.

Jessica Stegrud (ECR). – Fru talman! Överföringsproblem, låg tillgänglighet, volatila ökande priser, beroende av rysk gas och kinesiska komponenter. Negativ påverkan på miljö och fiske. Teknik från 1850-talet.

Låter det här verkligen som en vinnande strategi? Någoting för framtiden? Nej, den här massiva satsningen på havsbaserad vindkraft kan vara något av det mest verklighetsfrånvända jag hört här i EU-parlamentet. Förstår ni verkligen inte konsekvenserna av era beslut? För vanligt folk, för elsystemet, konkurrenskraften och i slutändan för miljön. Det är dags att sluta drömma nu och göra om och göra rätt.

Peter van Dalen (PPE). – Voorzitter, ik ben voor de Green Deal, maar bij de bouw van windmolenparken in zee zeg ik: "Eerst denken, dan doen." Want er is namelijk nog veel onbekend bij de bouw van windmolens in zee, bijvoorbeeld de langetermijneffecten op vissen en visbestanden.

Bij de bouw van windmolens in zee wordt er bijvoorbeeld geheid en daar komt 140 decibel bij vrij. Dat is gelijk aan een startende straaljager op twintig meter afstand. Wat doet dat met het gehoor van vissen en visbestanden? We weten het niet. En dan de vogels en de trekvogels. Wat hebben windmolens in zee voor effect op de trekvogels? We weten het niet. En dan de kabels die er worden aangelegd tussen de molens en het vasteland. Wat zijn de elektromagnetische effecten vanuit die kabels op bijvoorbeeld vissoorten als haaien en roggen? We weten het niet. En dan de effecten op de visserij zelf. Nu kan er wel worden gevist tussen windmolens, maar niemand doet dat, want de verzekeringspremies zijn veel te hoog en je loopt altijd risico's dat je net ergens vast komt te zitten.

Dus windmolens in zee bouwen kan alleen samen met de vissers. Anders is de toekomst voor de vis en de vissers duister. Denk bijvoorbeeld aan de bladen, de wieken van de windmolens. Die worden nu begraven. Die liggen er honderden jaren en die vergaan niet. Kortom: goed nadenken, grondige studies maken, want anders weten we niet wat voor effecten er optreden. Het ondoordacht uitrollen van windmolenparken in zee is een aanslag op de schepping.

Nicolás González Casares (S&D). – Señora presidenta, señora comisaria, señor ponente, este informe realiza peticiones y orientaciones muy importantes para una aceleración ordenada del despliegue de la energía renovable marina. Es un excelente documento para alcanzar las metas del paquete de medidas «Objetivo 55» y concretamente la Directiva sobre fuentes de energía renovables que estamos revisando. Las nuevas instalaciones marinas pueden servir para mejorar además las interconexiones de territorios que son islas eléctricas, como la península Ibérica.

Para que esta estrategia sea beneficiosa para todos, debemos tener en cuenta las distintas especificidades de los Estados miembros y reforzar la colaboración. No es lo mismo el mar del Norte que el sur del océano Atlántico, por lo que debemos dar un salto disruptivo para ser líderes en tecnologías como la tecnología de plataforma flotante. Tenemos conocimientos técnicos y será una gran oportunidad para nuestra industria naval, como la de mi país, Galicia.

Los mares y océanos ofrecen grandes recursos energéticos, pero el mar no está vacío. El desarrollo renovable debe respetar el Acuerdo de París: no debe comprometer el desarrollo también de la alimentación, debemos hacerlo compatible con la pesca. La energía renovable marina tiene que respetar especialmente también a aquellos que viven del mar.

Emma Wiesner (Renew). – Fru talman! Att säkra energiförsörjningen med förnybara alternativ inom unionen kommer att bli avgörande för att nå klimatmålen till 2030. Nu röstar vi om strategin för havsbaserad energiproduktion och vi ser tyvärr att alltför många satsningar på ny energi stoppas, inte minst i Sverige.

Vi ser dagligen hur projekt för att bygga havsbaserad vindkraft ges stopptecken, samtidigt som vi i det här huset vill ge grönt ljus till fossil gas. Det är helt fel. Vi behöver mer förnybar energi och vi behöver den nu. Det behövs fler strategier som den här för att bygga ut det förnybara och stärka Europas elnät. Ska vi lösa klimatkrisen gemensamt kan vi inte vara klimatnationalister.

Vi behöver samarbeta i Europa för att koppla ihop vårt elnät. Ett större energisystem med många sammankopplingar ökar leveranssäkerheten, men det möjliggör också högre användning av förnybar energi och det gör den förnybara energin mer konkurrenskraftig och lönsam.

Så nu hörs röster i den svenska debatten som talar i stället för en nedmontering av den gemensamma energimarknaden och elnätet, att varje land ska klara sig själv. Detta är skadligt inte bara för europeiska samarbetet, utan också klimatarbetet.

Jag tittar på er, Vänsterpartiet. Den senaste tidens utspel är ingenting annat än klimatnationalism och det skadar vårt värdefulla omställningsarbete för mer ny energi i Europa.

Ciarán Cuffe (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, offshore energy is key to our climate plans. We're fortunate that wind is a plentiful resource. This report from Morten Petersen is timely. More than 40 years ago, I visited Denmark for the first time and I saw wind turbines around Copenhagen harbour. I saw the future. Sometimes it takes a while for the good things to arrive.

Many countries have harnessed ocean energy, but there is vast untapped potential. Offshore wind is valuable, but we must better integrate this energy with our electricity demand. Making green hydrogen will help, but so too will the European supergrid. The Celtic Interconnector between Ireland and France is moving towards construction. But let's connect the electricity grids of Ireland with Spain and Portugal to better use this wind resource. That's a project of common interest that I think everybody would buy into.

But there's also a nature angle on this. 'It is a gift to nature', as my colleague Margrete Auken says, because offshore wind farms can protect areas from bottom trawling. And I think that can be a good thing.

Robert Roos (ECR). – Voorzitter, windenergie is onbetrouwbaar en inefficiënt. De energiecrisis is een direct gevolg van deze energiebron. Bovendien is zij schadelijk voor de maritieme biodiversiteit.

Met het plan om in 2050 300 tot 450 gigawatt opgesteld vermogen aan windturbines op zee te plaatsen, wil de Europese Commissie onze zeeën in een permanente bouwput veranderen. Dit zijn circa 75 000 windturbines. De grote verliezers van deze energietransitie zijn de belastingbetaler, de vissers en het leven in en op zee. Op zee zal alleen nog maar naar enorme subsidiepotten worden gevist door grote investeringsmaatschappijen en energie-reuzen. Geld van de belastingbetaler.

We moeten stoppen met de Europese zeeën te vervuilen met dure windturbines en in plaats daarvan inzetten op schone, betaalbare en betrouwbare kernenergie. Ik ben dan ook blij dat kernenergie door de Commissie is erkend als groene investering, want dat is de enige betrouwbare oplossing. Europa heeft geen strategie voor hernieuwbare offshore-energie nodig, maar wel een kernenergiestrategie!

Jerzy Buzek (PPE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Dziękuję również Pani Komisarz za wypowiedź w imieniu Komisji, ale przede wszystkim gratuluję koledze Mortenowi Petersenowi za bardzo dobre sprawozdanie w sprawie naprawę kluczowej dla Unii Europejskiej z dwóch powodów.

Po pierwsze, mamy realizację celów: 55% do 2030 r. i neutralności klimatycznej do 2050 r. razem z bezpieczeństwem energetycznym. A przecież wiatr to jest nasz własny surowiec energetyczny. Dlatego należy w pełni wykorzystać potencjał wszystkich europejskich mórz. Cieszy, że wymieniono także Morze Bałtyckie. Nad tym morzem leży bowiem aż osiem krajów Unii.

Po drugie, bardzo ważna jest zrównoważona niebieska gospodarka, czyli energetyka morska, zielona reindustrializacja. W niektórych gałęziach gospodarki, przemyśle energochłonnym nie można obniżyć emisji bez czystego wodoru, a wystarczającej ilości czystego wodoru na pewno nie będzie bez instalacji offshore. Potrzebne są zatem innowacje i nowe technologie, programy ramowe, pieniądze oczywiście – 800 mld euro w skali Unii – i równe traktowanie wszystkich inwestorów w krajach członkowskich. Ten ostatni aspekt jest bardzo ważny. Bez przejrzystych i niedyskryminacyjnych zasad gry dla każdego nie wykorzystamy w pełni potencjału morskiej energetyki odnawialnej, a przede wszystkim nie zmniejszymy rachunków za energię dla naszych obywateli.

Robert Hajšel (S&D). – Madam President, the EU strategy for offshore renewable energy is an opportunity to support investments, and the EU has the potential to be a global leader in this sector.

We have to make sure that the deployment and investments in offshore renewable energy will be cost effective. Member States should mobilise funds also from the Recovery and Resilience Facility, and investment from Horizon Europe should support the research and development of new technologies. We need to safeguard our climate and energy but also the diversity of targets, which is crucial for balance between large-scale deployment of offshore and the protection of biodiversity. We need co-existence between both.

Fossil fuels and especially fossil subsidies should be phased out as soon as possible, but the different starting positions as well as the different potential of Member States to produce renewable energy should be respected. In this context, it is fair also to allow at least some Member States to use decarbonised gas and nuclear energy for a very, I would say, transitional period under very strict emissions and safety requirements.

Maria da Graça Carvalho (PPE). – Cara Presidente, cara Comissária, caros Colegas, a energia offshore, do vento às ondas, é muito promissora. Devemos acautelar os seus impactos indesejáveis, nomeadamente, na pesca, na aquicultura, nos ecossistemas e na biodiversidade. No entanto, não há dúvidas sobre o seu potencial, em particular para as Regiões Ultraperiféricas.

Na União Europeia temos já projetos inovadores envolvendo estas tecnologias e Portugal, o meu país, tem estado na linha da frente, mas precisamos de ações específicas no sentido de uma integração plena e tecnologicamente neutra de todas as fontes e vetores da energia. Precisamos, ainda, de investir em investigação científica e na inovação, para atingirmos os nossos objetivos de neutralidade climática, e isto é ainda mais importante à luz da escalada dos preços da energia.

A revisão da Diretiva das Energias Renováveis é também uma oportunidade para acelerar o desenvolvimento de tecnologias offshore em fase inicial e dar as orientações mais claras às empresas e aos investidores. O mecanismo de incentivo ao investimento, com metas específicas para tecnologias mais inovadoras, seria, por exemplo, um passo importante nesse sentido.

Marek Paweł Balt (S&D). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Pani Komisarz! Najpierw chciałbym podziękować wszystkim za pracę nad tym ważnym sprawozdaniem. Cieszę się, że uwzględniono w nim oczekiwania dotyczące osiągnięcia naszych ambitnych celów klimatycznych poprzez wsparcie budowy większej ilości oraz różnych typów przybrzeżnych farm wiatrowych. Oczekuję od Komisji udzielenia znaczącej pomocy przy realizacji tych planów dla krajów takich jak Polska, które nie mają jeszcze doświadczenia z budową wież wiatrowych na wodach przybrzeżnych.

Uważam, że większe wsparcie Komisji Europejskiej może spowodować uzyskanie potrzebnych nawet 450 gigawatów dla osiągnięcia neutralności klimatycznej do 2050 roku. Istotne jest również, aby przy realizacji poszczególnych projektów hybrydowych Komisja dopilnowała uwzględnienia nieuchronnego wzrostu poziomu wody w morzach i oceanach w średniej i długiej perspektywie, tak aby infrastruktura energetyczna, która będzie budowana, była bezpieczna i mogła służyć kolejnym generacjom wież wiatrowych.

Μαρία Σπυράκη (PPE). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, Επίτροπε Simson, η σημερινή συζήτηση με θέμα τις υπεράκτιες ανανεώσιμες πηγές ενέργειας γίνεται σε μια στιγμή που η ενεργειακή αυτονομία της Ευρώπης εξελίσσεται σε υπαρκτό ζήτημα και υπαρκτό παράμετρο. Η επίτευξη του στόχου παραγωγής από υπεράκτιες ανανεώσιμες πηγές ενέργειας 60 GW έως το 2030 και 340 GW έως το 2050 απαιτεί συντονισμένες ενέργειες σε ευρωπαϊκό επίπεδο, απλοποίηση του αδειοδοτικού και ρυθμιστικού πλαισίου. Απαιτεί, όμως, πρωτίστως να υπάρχουν οι απαραίτητες υποδομές και να υπάρξει η δημόσια αποδοχή και συναίνεση για τη δημιουργία των υπεράκτιων αιολικών πάρκων που θα περιλαμβάνει και τη συμμετοχή τοπικών επενδυτικών σχημάτων. Ένας από τους λόγους που υπάρχει σοβαρότατη αντίδραση σε διάφορες περιοχές είναι το ζήτημα της ορθής χωροθέτησης υπεράκτιων αιολικών πάρκων και για τον λόγο αυτόν, η προϋπόθεση αυτή πρέπει να μας απασχολήσει όλους.

Στη Μεσόγειο, που είμαστε μια πολλαπλά υποσχόμενη τοποθεσία, δεν έχουμε εξαντλήσει τις δυνατότητές μας. Οι καλές πρακτικές που έρχονται κυρίως από τη Βόρεια Θάλασσα θα μπορούσαν να βοηθήσουν σε αυτή την κατεύθυνση. Θα μπορούσαμε, επίσης, να αναπτύξουμε το δυναμικό των υπεράκτιων ανανεώσιμων πηγών ενέργειας με καταλληλότερες διαδικασίες θαλάσσιου χωροταξικού σχεδιασμού, με τη συμμετοχή στη διαβούλευση των τοπικών κοινωνιών, με την επιτάχυνση της χρηματοδότησης της έρευνας και της ανάπτυξης στις καινοτόμες τεχνολογίες, όπως είναι οι πλωτές εγκαταστάσεις υπεράκτιας αιολικής, ηλιακής, κλιματικής και παλιρροϊκής ενέργειας, και η παραγωγή πράσινου υδρογόνου.

Κυρία Επίτροπε, κυρίες και κύριοι συνάδελφοι, χρειαζόμαστε 800 δισεκατομμύρια ευρώ σε ανανεώσιμες πηγές ενέργειας στις υπεράκτιες εγκαταστάσεις, προκειμένου να καλύψουμε το ευρωπαϊκό κενό. Είμαστε μπροστά σε ένα στοίχημα που οφείλουμε να κερδίσουμε για τη στρατηγική αυτονομία της Ευρώπης, μέρες που είναι.

Kadri Simson, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, I would like to thank the honourable Members for their valuable interventions.

Honourable Members, I welcome your positive remarks, acknowledging the strong contribution of offshore renewable energy to meeting our climate and energy goals, helping address the energy price crisis and supporting the recovery by creating new local jobs.

I also welcome the points on how to improve our work going forward. Your remarks are valid and the Commission will take them into account as we move on with our work on accelerating the deployment of offshore renewable energy. You are encouraging the Commission to move forward with new and concrete measures. We are committed to doing exactly that.

You referred to the need for the acceleration of offshore deployment. As I mentioned earlier in my introductory remarks, there will be guidance for Member States that aims exactly at easing their administrative process and sharing best practices, helping to speed up the renewables deployment.

I welcome the report and take it as an encouragement for the Commission to continue and identify its actions, and I hope that we can count on this House's full support in tackling them in order to create the huge acceleration in offshore renewable energy that we need in the coming years.

Morten Petersen, Ordfører. – Fru formand! Tak kolleger, tak kommissær Simpson. Tak for debatten her i aften. Det glæder mig, at der har været så bred opbakning, så bred politisk forankring til dette vigtige emne. For det er utroligt vigtigt, at der virkelig er et bredt funderet ejerskab til det med at sætte turbo på udbygningen af havvind.

Et par enkelte nedslag fra debatten: Jeg synes, kommissæren beskriver det fuldstændig rigtigt i forhold til, at EU vitterligt er verdens førende på dette område, at EU er et »powerhouse«. Og jeg tror, at det er vigtigt, at vi også understreger de industrielle perspektiver, der er forbundet med dette i forhold til skabelse af jobs i Europa, hvis vi bliver ved med at holde fast i de fordele, vi vitterligt har på dette område. Men det kræver jo, at vi handler. Det kræver, at vi ikke bare hviler på laurbærene. Much needs to be done, tror jeg, Kommissæren sagde. Det vil jeg også gerne gøre til mine ord.

Så var det et fælles træk i debatten, at tempoet skal op, at vi simpelthen er nødt til at øge ambitionerne, hvis vi skal leve op til vores egne handlingsplaner og strategier på området. Det betyder så, at vi nu skal koncentrere os om at få implementeret i lovgivningen alle de ord og bemærkninger, som er faldet her i aften, og som betænkningen er udtryk for. Må jeg i øvrigt tilføje, at jeg også synes, der var mange af ordførerne, der havde rigtig godt fat i bemærkningerne omkring det med autonomi, at i fald vi lykkes med at bygge ud med vedvarende energi i det tempo, vi gerne vil, så øger vi vores autonomi. Så gør vi os uafhængige af sheikerne i Mellemøsten og af Putins jerngreb i forhold til at bruge energi som våben. Så what's not to like? Det er om at komme i gang. Lad os få udbygget med vedvarende energi. Lad os få hævet energieffektiviseringen. Det gør Europa mere uafhængig af omverdenen, når vi på den måde kan nedbringe importen fra tredjelande. Og til allersidst: Jeg glæder mig til at føre strategien ud i livet. Det haster.

Die Präsidentin. – Die Aussprache ist geschlossen.

Die Abstimmung findet am Dienstag, 15. Februar 2022, statt.

23. Ocena wdrożenia art. 50 TUE (krótka prezentacja)

Die Präsidentin. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die kurze Darstellung des Berichts von Danuta Maria Hübner über die Bewertung der Umsetzung von Artikel 50 EUV (2020/2136(INI)) (A9-0357/2021).

Wir haben Probleme mit dem Ton, Augenblick.

Danuta, we will have to go to the next speaker because we have a technical issue. I'm sorry, but we will come back to you.

The alternative is that maybe the Commissioner takes the floor first. Would that be OK for you?

Kadri Simson, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, first of all, I would like to congratulate you, Ms Hübner and the honourable Members of this House, on the adoption of this excellent report. The Commission fully agrees with most of its findings. The report provides a comprehensive assessment of the way that Article 50 of the Treaty on the European Union was interpreted and applied for the first time ever in the context of the UK's withdrawal from the European Union.

For the European Union, for all of us, the UK's decision to leave the European Union triggered an entirely novel process and posed an unprecedented challenge, one which we from the very beginning pursued with the utmost sincerity and resolved to bring to a conclusion in an orderly manner, not least because the withdrawal had a severe impact on the lives of millions of citizens and we owed it to them to ensure legal certainty.

While we continue to regret the UK's decision to leave, we can attest that Article 50 has met its objectives of preserving the sovereign right of a Member State to withdraw from the European Union. Though not without challenges, it enabled an orderly withdrawal.

Even though Article 50 did not specify some aspects of the procedure, through deep reflection, as well as the highest level of interinstitutional coordination and transparency in the negotiations, the interpretation and implementation of Article 50 have proven to uphold the common values and goals that make up the foundation of the Union – particularly democracy, freedom and the rule of law.

The provisions of Article 50 on the notification and extension of the period have also proven sufficiently flexible to respond to the political challenges posed by the succession of the UK Government. During the process, unity and solidarity among the EU institutions and among Member States reigned.

We negotiated with the UK as one Union, one family. It was unprecedented and remarkable, and it contributed majorly to the successful conclusion of the negotiations. This unity now also provides a solid foundation for the implementation of the Withdrawal Agreement following our continued resolve to put peace and people above everything else. To protect citizens rights, to address the unique circumstances of the island of Ireland, to safeguard the Good Friday Agreement in all its dimensions, to protect the single market and to respect the integrity of the Union's legal order.

In this respect, I would like to thank the European Parliament for the excellent cooperation, its key role in representing EU citizens and commend all of you for the important work you have done.

As the report correctly points out, the article has shortcomings. It is silent on several issues. While we hope that we will not find ourselves in a situation in which Article 50 has to be applied in the future, we would take the lessons learnt from the past process and appropriately reflect upon them if the need arises.

Overall, the interpretation and application of Article 50 provided legal stability with minimal disruption and led to an orderly withdrawal, while achieving the core goal of protecting the integrity and interests of the European Union, its citizens and its Member States. Indeed, while the Article 50 process has been concluded, the unbinding of EU membership and implementation of the Withdrawal Agreement is a long-term process. The Commission appreciates that the Parliament continues to play its important role in the monitoring of the implementation of the Withdrawal Agreement and we will continue our excellent cooperation and keep the Parliament informed.

President. – Unfortunately, the technical issue with the studio in Brussels could not be fixed so we cannot switch over to Danuta Hübner yet. We will have to continue with the next report.

(The short presentation was suspended)

24. Wdrożenie szóstej dyrektywy w sprawie podatku VAT (krótka prezentacja)

Die Präsidentin. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die kurze Darstellung des Berichts von Olivier Chastel über das Thema „Umsetzung der Sechsten Mehrwertsteuerrichtlinie: Was fehlt, um die Mehrwertsteuerlücke in der Union zu verringern?“ (2020/2263(INI)) (A9-0355/2021).

Olivier Chastel, rapporteur. – Madame la Présidente, Madame la Commissaire, chers collègues, mon objectif ici en tant que rapporteur était de lancer un message fort afin de mettre fin au régime transitoire, source de failles creusant toujours davantage l'écart de TVA. Je veux remercier les rapporteurs fictifs pour leur collaboration. Ce rapport a été voté en commission ECON à une large majorité, montrant ainsi un front uni pour proposer des solutions à des questions restées en suspens depuis plus de quatre ans. Ce rapport de mise en œuvre porte en effet sur des problématiques particulièrement sensibles, qui touchent à la fois aux politiques des États membres, à l'efficacité du marché intérieur, à la transition numérique et environnementale et au bien-être de nos concitoyens.

Si l'écart de TVA dans l'Union est passé de 20 % en 2009 à 10 % en 2019, il varie considérablement d'un État membre à l'autre, ce qui nuit au budget de l'Union, aux entreprises et aux citoyens européens. À ce premier élément s'ajoutent l'ampleur des différences des taux standards entre les États membres et la multitude des taux réduits et spéciaux. Cette complexité est source d'opacité, de coûts de conformité, d'erreurs, mais aussi de fraudes. Elle limite fortement la cohérence et l'interopérabilité du système de TVA et fait perdre à l'Union quelque 134 milliards d'euros en 2019.

C'est pourquoi notre rapport propose plusieurs options stratégiques. Nous proposons tout d'abord d'identifier les bonnes pratiques existant au niveau national afin de les appliquer à une réforme à l'échelle européenne. Nous estimons ensuite indispensable de procéder à un examen minutieux des taux réduits et des taux spéciaux afin de réduire le coût de conformité et de moderniser et rationaliser le système fiscal dans un souci de cohérence. Nous estimons aussi que, si la pandémie a catalysé le développement de la numérisation pour toutes les transactions, il faut encore garantir la transparence, la responsabilité et la déclaration automatisée, indispensables pour un régime de TVA définitif, simplifié et pérenne.

Toutefois, la Commission doit aussi soutenir nos PME dans l'acquisition des technologies et du savoir-faire. En outre, nos entreprises ont urgemment besoin que la base de données «Impôts en Europe» soit pleinement opérationnelle et propose un accès rapide, actualisé et précis aux informations pertinentes sur la mise en œuvre du système de TVA dans les États membres, en particulier sur l'ensemble des taux de TVA standards et inférieurs.

Enfin, nous proposons d'accompagner la transition climatique en faisant sortir progressivement de la liste des dérogations aux taux standards les produits nocifs, mais aussi ceux qui sont hautement polluants. Un tel retrait progressif devra inclure des mesures de compensation et des taux réduits sur les produits de première nécessité, afin de venir en aide aux ménages à bas revenus.

Le 7 décembre dernier, les ministres de l'Ecofin ont approuvé la réforme tant attendue de la directive relative aux taux de TVA. Cette réforme prévoit, comme le souhaitait le Parlement, ce retrait progressif des combustibles fossiles ou des produits nuisibles à l'environnement ainsi qu'une accélération de la numérisation. Elle ne veut laisser personne au bord du chemin.

Il appartiendra donc aux États membres de l'Union européenne de garantir un juste équilibre entre le respect des taux standards et les dérogations admises, mais aussi d'éviter d'éroder l'assiette fiscale lorsqu'ils utiliseront les nouveaux taux réduits de TVA.

Kadri Simson, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, honourable Members of the European Parliament, billions of euros in VAT revenues are still lost every year in the EU.

A Commission study estimated the VAT gap, measured as the difference between VAT revenues and the revenues actually collected in EU Member States, at EUR 134 billion in 2019 alone. The report is thus very much welcomed, and we will totally take it into account in our actions to fight against VAT fraud and evasion.

As you rightfully state, there is a need to increase the transparency and robustness of VAT gap estimates. The Commission intends to work with national administrations to produce more targeted analyses of the components and reasons for the VAT gap at a national and EU level.

The idea would be to segment the overall VAT gap into separate elements that could be quantified and further analysed. I can also confirm that expert groups composed of experts from national administrations are meeting regularly to exchange good practices and improve a harmonised methodological approach as regards the analysis of the VAT gap.

I can also underline the collective work and achievements of EU Member States with the support and involvement of the Commission in the framework of the European multidisciplinary platform against criminal threats and its operational action plan, designed to disrupt the capacity of criminal networks and individual criminal entrepreneurs involved in missing trader intra community fraud.

As concerns the definitive system of VAT, I would like to underline that the Commission remains committed to its proposal. However, discussions in the Council have shown that a significant number of Member States have concerns on this proposal. The Commission stands ready to further support Council discussions in addressing these concerns. Further measures will also be put forward in order to strengthen the VAT system in the future.

As announced in the 2020 action plan for fair and simple taxation supporting the recovery, the Commission plans to adopt a proposal in the second half of 2022 concerning the VAT in the digital age package. One of the elements in this proposal will be taking advantage of digital technologies and policies to modernise VAT reporting obligations. It will in particular consider the implementation of real-time and transaction-based information, including on cross-border transactions.

The use of digital technologies and policies will not only reinforce the fight against VAT fraud and collection, but also reduce the VAT administrative burden and compliance costs. Digital reporting requirements have helped reduce the VAT gap in those Member States that have introduced them. The implementation of an EU-wide system for the reporting of transactions is thus expected to significantly contribute to the fight against VAT fraud, while also reducing the administrative burden that taxable persons operating in different Member States are facing due to the disparity of reporting obligations.

The expansion of the use of e-invoicing and the distributed ledger technology will be analysed in the framework of this initiative. The initiative will also adapt the VAT rules to new business models, in particular the platform economy.

Finally, another part of the initiative will be the single VAT registration in the EU, which will extend and further improve the newly introduced one-stop shop and import one-stop shop. This will allow businesses to supply goods and services across the entire EU without the need to have multiple VAT registrations. Registration in one Member State where the business is established will suffice.

Let me now briefly mention the proposal on the modernisation of the system of VAT rates on which negotiations in Council have concluded – the result of marathon negotiations. It shows that where there is a will there is a way, a European way forward. As you know, this proposal is important to ensure that all Member States can apply the same rules when it comes to VAT rates.

I fully agree that we need to avoid revenue erosion, and I am pleased that strong safeguards, notably a maximum number of reduced rates in a given Member State, have been agreed to that effect. A fine balance has been achieved, ensuring equal treatment of Member States without proliferation of lower rates, which would be harmful to fiscal consolidation in the post-COVID-19 era.

The new rules will also be aligned with our new health and environmental priorities, as well as better adapted to the digital transition. The European Parliament is being re-consulted on this proposal, given that the Council has introduced substantial changes and I look forward to hearing your position. I would like to conclude by thanking you once again for the excellent suggestions in your report and to assure you that the Commission is committed to using all the means at its disposal to continue fighting VAT fraud and evasion.

Die Präsidentin. – Damit ist dieser Tagesordnungspunkt geschlossen.

Die Abstimmung findet am Dienstag, 15. Februar 2022, statt.

25. Ocena wdrożenia art. 50 TUE (ciąg dalszy krótkiej prezentacji)

(Die kurze Darstellung ist wieder aufgenommen)

Danuta Maria Hübner, *rapporteur*. – Madam President, Madam Commissioner, thank you for your comments on Article 50. Now I will present my comments. As you know, Brexit has been an unprecedented process with undeniable political, legal, economic and social consequences. And all European institutions, including the European Parliament, have expressed regret regarding the UK decision, but we respected it.

We were strongly convinced that the withdrawal of the UK without an agreement would have dramatic negative consequences, and we felt responsible for ensuring the accomplishment of this process in the best interests of the Union and its citizens.

The cross-cutting legal dimension of the whole process with Article 50 as its core was fundamental. This is an implementation report that specifically looks at one article and assesses its operation from the constitutional and institutional perspective, informing the plenary how Article 50 of the Treaty on European Union was implemented in the framework of EU law as a whole.

First and foremost, I would like to thank everybody who, in the course of the work on this report, helped preserve the institutional memory of the process of implementing Article 50: the shadows and opinion-givers, but also all colleagues of AFCO, both in the previous and current legislatures; the AFCO Secretariat, all those who provided scholarly input and the Parliamentary Legal Service.

The report assesses the way the provisions of Article 50 were interpreted and applied and the way procedures of the withdrawal were organised and conducted under those provisions. The implementation of Article 50 allowed to draw lessons for and reflect on the constitutional order and institutional organisation of the Union. As an exit clause, Article 50 provides rules allowing the withdrawal to take place within the EU legal order, protects fundamentals of the integration process and preserves the interests of the Union. And this test, the article has passed successfully.

Its implementation allowed to set out the terms for orderly withdrawal and for disentangling the UK from rights and obligations undertaken as a Member State. The implementation of the article required, however, additional tools to be deployed, going beyond the letter of the article, leading to an active role played by politics.

Indeed, Article 50 deals with a confluence of the constitutional and institutional aspects of the process and the role of political constraints. This political component played an important role in protecting the rights of millions of EU citizens in the UK and UK nationals in the EU, and taking into account the special circumstances confronting the island of Ireland.

The main guiding political documents were an outcome of high-quality and responsible cooperation between European institutions. Acting in the interest of the Union, they identified core constitutional principles for the process, enriching the EU constitutional identity. During the implementation of Article 50, those principles played the role the Copenhagen Criteria play in case of enlargement, which is protecting EU interests.

In short, the core principles ensured that, while changing its membership, the Union could preserve constitutional integrity and autonomy of decision-making. Article 50, supported by Article 218, proved to be an empowering legal provision.

Let me can conclude, pointing to the fact that Article 50 involves, as well, the preparation of the post-exit relationship. It implies that negotiated orderly withdrawal gives a chance for a post-exit voluntary partnership. So Article 50, one can say, in combination with Article 8, can provide an integration-friendly outcome.

Die Präsidentin. – Damit ist dieser Tagesordnungspunkt geschlossen.

Die Abstimmung findet am Dienstag, 15. Februar 2022, statt.

Schriftliche Erklärungen (Artikel 171)

Guido Reil (ID), *schriftlich*. – Sich mit der Umsetzung von Artikel 50 der EU-Verträge zu beschäftigen, ist eine hervorragende Gelegenheit, um daran zu erinnern, wie Sie die Briten aus der EU getrieben haben. Die Briten haben keineswegs aus dem Blauen heraus entschieden, dass sie es mal wieder alleine probieren sollten, sondern Sie haben die Briten vergraut – mit Ihrer Intoleranz und mit Ihrer unerfreulichen Tendenz, alles über einen Kamm zu scheren. Sie haben es nicht ertragen, dass die Briten ein anderes Europa wollten als Sie. So wie Sie es jetzt nicht ertragen, dass die Polen und die Ungarn ein anderes Europa wollen. Aber anstatt dass Sie etwas aus dem Brexit gelernt hätten, machen Sie genau so weiter wie zuvor und verstärken sogar noch Ihren destruktiven Kurs: Mit Ihrem aktuellen Vorgehen gegen Ungarn und Polen versuchen Sie, die demokratischen Verfassungen dieser beiden Mitgliedstaaten auszuhebeln und stellen sich provokant über den Willen dieser beiden Länder, so wie Sie sich über den Willen Deutschlands gestellt haben, als Sie gegen die Bundesrepublik wegen des Urteils des Bundesverfassungsgerichts zum Anleihenkauf-Programm der EZB ein Vertragsverletzungsverfahren eingeleitet haben. Sie überschreiten Ihre Kompetenzen und stellen das Haus der EU auf den Kopf.

László Trócsányi (NI), *írásban*. – Két év telt el azóta, hogy az Egyesült Királyság elhagyta az Európai Uniót. A brit nép szuverén döntését sajnálattal vettük tudomásul, fontolgatva, hogy mi vezetett ide, mit tehattünk volna jobban ahhoz, hogy a kilépést elkerüljük. Az önvizsgálatra jó alkalommal szolgálhatna az Európa Jövőjéről szóló Konferencia, ha őszinte tükörbenézés lenne és minden véleményt meghallgatna. Az Európai Unióból való kilépés a tagállamok szuverenitásukból fakadó joga, a kilépési eljárás egyes jogi vonatkozásait, a felmerült problémákat azonban hasznos áttekinteni, elemezni, azokból következtetéseket levonni.

A tárgyalt jelentés sajnálatos módon a tárgyilagos elemzés helyett szükségtelenül megbélyegezi az Egyesült Királyságot. Valós következtetések megfogalmazása helyett a centralizációt sulykolja, és öncélú szerződésmódosításokra tenne javaslatot. A jelentéstervezet súlyos jogi hibákat is tartalmaz. A tervezet az Unió alkotmányos identitásának elemeit boncolgatja, holott az Európai Unió – szemben a tagállamokkal – nem állam, így nem rendelkezik alkotmánnyal és ebből kifolyólag nem rendelkezhet alkotmányos identitással sem.

A kilépési értesítés kapcsán a jelentés olyan – az Európai Unió Bírósága által nem osztott – elfogult értelmezést vázol fel, amely nem összeegyeztethető az uniós joggal. A 21. századi kihívások megoldásához az Európai Uniónak – a megbélyegző nyelvezetű jelentések elfogadása helyett – partnerként és szövetségesként kell az Egyesült Királyságra tekintenie.

26. Wpływ krajowych reform podatkowych na gospodarkę UE (krótka prezentacja)

Die Präsidentin. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die kurze Darstellung des Berichts von Markus Ferber über die Auswirkungen der einzelstaatlichen Steuerreformen auf die Wirtschaft in der EU (2021/2074(INI)) (A9-0348/2021).

Lídia Pereira, relatora suplente. – Senhora Presidente, a fiscalidade está na ordem do dia. Há poucas dimensões da soberania de um país que dizem tanto da relação entre Estado e cidadãos. Que impostos pagamos? Quanto pagamos? Como pagamos? E estas são as primeiras perguntas que nos ocorrem, olhando para nós próprios. E, quando olhamos para os nossos países, surgem-nos outras: que carga fiscal é justa para os cidadãos? Que nível de impostos é adequado para promover o crescimento económico e a competitividade das empresas? Como combatemos, de forma eficaz, a fraude e a evasão fiscais?

Se estas perguntas são essenciais para os cidadãos, as respostas são fundamentais para os Estados. Numa economia cada vez mais globalizada, digitalizada e integrada, os desafios que se colocam à política fiscal são cada vez mais exigentes e mais complexos. E a União é uma plataforma privilegiada para o debate e para a cooperação entre Estados-Membros. Mas a nossa União conhece muitas realidades diferentes. Enquanto uns Estados apostam na libertação de recursos para cidadãos e empresas, outros países espartilham os contribuintes com cargas fiscais exageradas. Não poucas vezes, esses países que sobrecarregam os seus contribuintes são os mais avessos a reformas na fiscalidade e, na verdade, a verdadeiras reformas económicas amigas do crescimento e do emprego.

Em matéria de impostos, fica clara a ideia de cada um sobre o papel do Estado. E a escolha é esta: ou um Estado gigante que se alimenta da sobrecarga fiscal que impõe aos seus contribuintes, ou um Estado suficiente que confia na iniciativa dos seus cidadãos e na inovação das suas empresas. Este relatório, que resulta de um trabalho notável do nosso colega Markus Ferber, surge na hora certa, quando nos preparamos para debater e decidir sobre importantes mudanças na fiscalidade das empresas, no seguimento do acordo internacional alcançado ao nível da OCDE. E parte de um pressuposto evidente: as reformas na fiscalidade têm um impacto significativo na economia dos Estados. E o que é que isso significa para nós, na nossa União?

Em primeiro lugar, que, quando falamos de fiscalidade, o poder soberano reside nos Estados-Membros e a União tem poderes legislativos limitados, concentrando-se mais num papel de coordenação. Mas esse papel de coordenação é essencial num contexto de um mercado interno aberto. Quando as políticas fiscais são mal coordenadas, as pequenas e médias empresas são as primeiras vítimas, porque não têm condições para ter departamentos legais ou de *compliance* tão grandes como a complexidade de 27 sistemas diferentes exige. E uma má coordenação abre também as portas a oportunidades para a fraude, a evasão ou o planeamento fiscal agressivo.

Este contexto demonstra a necessidade de termos uma Comissão empenhada na liderança desta cooperação. E em que áreas? Na harmonização das bases tributárias, sem receio de abordar a questão do viés do endividamento nas finanças empresariais, na criação de um contexto claro para os incentivos fiscais à investigação e desenvolvimento, e no lançamento de um painel de avaliação e comparação das políticas fiscais nacionais para a promoção de boas práticas. Estes são três exemplos claros do que aqui pedimos à Comissão Europeia.

Avancemos, pois, com confiança e empenho para as reformas de que os nossos Estados precisam e os nossos contribuintes exigem.

Kadri Simson, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, first let me thank the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs (ECON) for its own-initiative report on the impact of national tax reforms on the EU economy.

The committee rightly points to those challenges and complexities arising from a policy area which remains largely a responsibility of the Member States. While there are good reasons for that, as Member States are often best placed to take tax policy measures fit for the structure of their economy, it also bears risks in terms of fragmentation and disruption in the functioning of our single market.

In a context of close economic integration and deep interdependency, uncoordinated tax policies can lead to harmful tax practices and unfair tax competition, to the detriment of Member States' tax bases. They may also lead to double taxation or non-taxation, legal uncertainty and red tape, therefore discouraging cross-border activities and investment.

The report therefore calls for the right balance to be found in terms of coordination of national tax policies, and for a certain level of harmonisation to further strengthen single market integration and prevent tax base erosion. In particular, it provides useful recommendations in support of our EU tax priorities from the implementation of the global agreement on corporate taxation to the adoption of an ambitious EU business tax framework fit for the decades to come.

Let me dive into some of the new initiatives you mentioned in the report. The global agreement to reform international corporate taxation that was endorsed last year by G20 world leaders is historic, and the Commission is moving quickly to implement it at EU level. We have collectively committed to an implementation roadmap. The Pillar One and Pillar Two rules are due to come into effect in 2023. We already tabled on 22 December a proposal for an EU directive on implementing minimum taxation, known as Pillar Two. It will put a floor on excessive tax competition between jurisdictions, thus contributing to both fair taxation and to a sound business environment.

A proposal for a directive implementing Pillar One, dealing with a reallocation of taxing rights, is planned to be tabled in the course of this year to allow for the work to be finalised at the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD).

The implementation of the two pillars of the global agreement by 2023 will ensure that our tax system reflects the new reality of our economies and allows for a level playing field between all business models where all companies, including digital ones, pay their fair share of taxes in the right place.

As you will have noted, the digital levy remains on hold. The Commission considers the implementation of the OECD global agreement to be a key priority in the area of corporate taxation. The Commission has proposed last December an own resource that builds on Pillar One of the OECD agreement, and your report rightly calls for the debt bias in the corporate tax system to be addressed. The current debt bias induced by most EU tax systems not only leads to higher debt levels, which make companies more fragile and economies more vulnerable to crisis, it also discourages equity financing, which is crucial for innovation.

In the coming months, the Commission is planning to come forward with an initiative to help redress the current debt bias with a view to ensuring a better balance between the treatment of debt and equity for tax purposes. The initiative will help to develop a well-functioning capital markets union and supporting the re-equitisation of EU companies. This measure is only a starting point for a comprehensive reform of our EU business tax system. In 2023, as you know, the Commission will put forward a proposal that will move the EU towards a common tax rulebook, the 'Business in Europe: Framework for Income Taxation'.

Commissioner Gentiloni's services are currently at the stage of reflection and are consulting widely with stakeholders in order to properly frame the new challenges and assess which aspects of current corporate tax systems require reforms. Your contribution will be particularly valuable in this regard. The tax symposium that DG TAXUD will be organising during the second half of the year will include an important series of events for our benefit and will serve as an excellent opportunity to determine our way forward and an ambitious timeframe.

Die Präsidentin. – Damit ist dieser Tagesordnungspunkt geschlossen.

Die Abstimmung findet am Dienstag, 15. Februar 2022, statt.

27. Wyzwania stojące przed obszarami miejskimi w okresie po pandemii COVID-19 (krótka prezentacja)

Die Präsidentin. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die kurze Darstellung des Berichts von Katalin Cseh über die Herausforderungen für städtische Gebiete in der Zeit nach der COVID-19-Krise (2021/2075(INI)) (A9-0352/2021).

Katalin Cseh, rapporteur. – Madam President, since the start of the COVID-19 pandemic, our cities have been fighting for survival. They had no other choice but to face high rates of infection, dwindling economic activity and very rapidly exacerbating social inequalities.

We have also seen them showing leadership in managing the crisis on the front lines, helping to limit the spread of the coronavirus and mitigating its impact on the ground. And when we all thought that things could not get any worse, they did, at least in Hungary. Prime Minister Orbán has used the coronavirus response effort just as a pretext to take funding away from cities and towns. And why? What is the reason? It's very simple because many of them had the audacity to elect opposition mayors.

A colleague of mine is deputy mayor in charge of development of Szeged, the third largest city in Hungary, and he very regularly tells me that the government does not give any access to meaningful documentation about EU development aid, let alone consult him about the needs of his constituents. And mayors all across Hungary tell us just the same. They are ringing the alarm bell that EU funds are used as a political weapon to starve independent institutions of their financial resources.

Now, why am I telling you about these examples right now? Because I believe that engaging local stakeholders is the only guarantee to ensure this crisis relief reaches those communities who need it the most. In our report, we urge the Commission to make direct funding opportunities available to local and regional authorities and thus creating a powerful instrument that will enable the fight against political favouritism.

And in light of the upcoming ECJ ruling about the application of the rule of law conditionality mechanism, I believe direct funding is more crucial than ever because cities should never have to pay the price of the wrongdoing of governments. They are not responsible for that. Renew Europe has been calling for directly accessible EU funding to be part of the conditionality mechanism since day one. Now it's time to make it happen.

While working on this report, my aim was to prepare a general set of recommendations, addressing some of the most serious challenges that the urban areas are expected to face in the post-COVID-19 era. And while lack of proper funding, I believe, is one of the biggest ones, the list is not exhaustive, so I am only going to mention a few other points.

Let's note that more than 75% of Europeans live in urban areas and thus face very specific urban challenges, such as the lack of affordable housing, the risk of social exclusion, the increasing climate-related disasters, the deepening digital divide and also the growing gender inequalities. Because in addition to health risks, women are more vulnerable to the economic risks that are also associated with the COVID-19 pandemic, and they could find themselves further behind when the crisis ends. And while social distancing measures were necessary strategies to curb the spread of the virus, staying at home has put many women at risk of domestic violence, without an adequate network of support. And how could direct funding help cities to address this? They could use the money to support helplines for domestic violence victims or strengthen the care sector or support women to learn digital skills.

Cities can help us face these challenges, but first, we need to rethink and reform our existing structures because neither the pandemic emergency nor the future threats will limit themselves to our legal boundaries. So let's be brave, and let's move forward.

Kadri Simson, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, dear Vice-President, honourable Members, dear rapporteur Katalin Cseh, it appears Europe's cities are on the front lines: on the front lines of the current health and economic crises, on the front lines of the recovery, and key foot soldiers in the coming green and digital revolution. So this report is timely and valuable. My thanks to the Parliament and the rapporteur.

We agree with you on the importance of digital transformation and that smart city strategies can help us create more inclusive cities, especially in an increasingly digitalised world. Today, two in three people living in cities have access to high-speed broadband, as the Eighth Cohesion Report states. We must ensure that, when it comes to digital public services – education, administration, for example – there is also wide access to such digital services and that no one is excluded. So we very much agree, too, on the importance of inclusiveness. This is deeply rooted in cohesion policy through the partnership principle – local actors helping to design and deliver local projects.

As regards direct support, cities under the 2021-27 Cohesion Programme period, 8% of the European Regional Development Fund, so around EUR 17 billion, are ringfenced for sustainable urban development projects selected by the cities themselves. And our new European Urban Initiative will finance experiments in making urban development more sustainable and more participative.

We hope that the new European Powerhouse Initiative aiming for inclusiveness, sustainability and aesthetics in the places where we work and live will also be of interest to cities, and I hope that we will see cities embark on this transformational challenge as well.

In this context, I cannot speak of inclusive cities if citizens do not have quality, affordable housing. The Commission's renovation wave and the Affordable Housing Initiative will support local actors in their efforts to increase energy efficiency for a fairer transition. Inclusive cities also have high-quality public spaces that are safe. This requires good urban planning and design, urban policy for the common good, as set out in the new Leipzig Charter. As you know, we in the Commission subscribe to this charter.

We agree, too, that future cities must be sustainable. I have already mentioned the ring-fencing for sustainable urban development within cohesion policy. As you know, the EU supports cities through various other initiatives, including the Intelligent Cities Challenge, the Urban Mobility Framework, the 100 climate neutral and smart cities by 2030 mission or learning cities to ensure cities are sustainable, resilient, innovative and inclusive.

Finally, the report calls for tailor-made policy initiatives. We agree that cities cannot face these challenges alone. We must mobilise all levels of government. We welcome your reference to the urban agenda as a new model of multilevel governance. Our Europe Act programme will continue to support this with exchanges of good practice and capacity-building. The Next Cities Forum in early 2023 will mark and amplify this new wave of support for cities.

The next few years bring a once-in-a-generation investment, the combination of enhanced cohesion policy, the Recovery and Resilience Facility and other funding sources under the EU budget. Let us work together to make the most of these investments. Europe's cities have a bright future. Your report illuminates the next step.

Die Präsidentin. – Damit ist dieser Tagesordnungspunkt geschlossen.

Die Abstimmung findet am Dienstag, 15. Februar 2022, statt.

Schriftliche Erklärungen (Artikel 171)

Dan-Ștefan Motreanu (PPE), *în scris*. – În calitate de responsabil din partea Grupului PPE pentru această rezoluție, am evidențiat în primul rând faptul că redresarea economică post-Covid și dezvoltarea orașelor vor fi îngreunate considerabil de creșterea prețurilor la energie.

Astfel, am solicitat Comisiei adoptarea de măsuri pentru a consolida reziliența pieței europene a energiei, pentru a reduce dependența de factorii externi și pentru a asigura energie la prețuri rezonabile. În plus, am cerut încurajarea și finanțarea de programe masive de izolare a clădirilor și de instalare de panouri solare pe acoperișuri pentru a spori autonomia energetică a clădirilor publice și private.

O bună organizare administrativ-teritorială este un pilon de bază al dezvoltării urbane și al rezilienței în perioade critice. În UE, avem numeroase orașe care nu dispun de suficiente venituri proprii pentru a-și asigura buna funcționare și nici pentru a oferi locuitorilor servicii publice de calitate. Totodată, capacitatea acestora de a atrage fonduri europene sau investiții este limitată, fiind condamnate la subdezvoltare și la depopulare pe termen lung.

Astfel, una din prioritățile mele în raportul adoptat astăzi a fost să solicit Comisiei Europene să prezinte recomandări privind organizarea și reforma administrativ-teritorială și să încurajeze statele UE să facă schimburi de bune practici în acest sens.

Rovana Plumb (S&D), in writing. – Urban areas are facing a triple crisis in the wake of the pandemic: tackling the health impacts of COVID-19; dealing with the climate and ecological emergency; and addressing social and economic inequality. Despite these challenges, cities have the potential to become a major driving force for a green and just recovery in Europe – if they are actively involved in the decision-making process from the beginning. Although it is too early to know what the longer-term legacy of the pandemic will be for urban environmental sustainability, it is clear the unprecedented EUR 1.8 trillion stimulus package agreed by the EU will reshape cities in fundamental ways. The infrastructure investment will play an important role in stimulating urban economic activity after the crisis, creating an opportunity to align the recovery with climate, environmental and social equity agendas in cities. The key opportunities for a green and just recovery are found in the following sectors: rethinking urban mobility (implementing green mobility strategies and investing in green transportation infrastructure) and land use; modernising the urban building stock; enhancing the role of green infrastructure and nature-based solutions; and transforming urban food systems and the circular economy.

28. Jednominutowe wystąpienia w znaczących kwestiach politycznych

Die Präsidentin. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgen die Ausführungen von einer Minute zu wichtigen politischen Fragen (Artikel 172 GO).

Sie heißen „Ausführungen von einer Minute“. Da möchte ich extra darauf hinweisen.

Ich möchte Sie außerdem darauf hinweisen, dass Sie Ihren Redebeitrag im Rahmen der Ausführungen von einer Minute von Ihrem Platz aus halten können.

Anna-Michelle Asimakopoulou (PPE). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, δίνουμε μαζί πολλές μάχες για να υπερασπιστούμε τις αρχές και αξίες της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, τον ευρωπαϊκό πολιτισμό και τη δημοκρατία. Η Ευρώπη είναι λέξη ελληνική και ο μύθος της Ευρώπης είναι σύμβολο ευρωπαϊκού πολιτισμού. Η δημοκρατία γεννήθηκε στην Ελλάδα και το μνημείο της Ακρόπολης είναι παγκόσμιο σύμβολο της δημοκρατίας. Στέκομαι ενώπιόν σας ως Ελληνίδα και Ευρωπαία πολίτης με βαθύτατη συναίσθηση ότι η σημερινή ομιλία μου είναι το ελάχιστο καθήκον μου στη διαχρονική και μακροχρόνια μάχη που δίνει η πατρίδα μου για την επανένωση των γλυπτών του Παρθενώνα. Το δίκαιο αίτημα της Ελλάδας αποκτά νέα δυναμική στη βρετανική κοινή γνώμη, αλλά και διεθνώς, μετά την επιστροφή του θραύσματος της ζωφόρου του Παρθενώνα από την Ιταλία. Από την Ολομέλεια του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου, εδώ όπου χτυπά η καρδιά της ευρωπαϊκής δημοκρατίας, σας ζητώ, αγαπητοί συνάδελφοι, να παλέψετε μαζί μας στη δίκαιη μάχη για αυτό το κορυφαίο σύμβολο του ευρωπαϊκού πολιτισμού και της δημοκρατίας.

Victor Negrescu (S&D). – Doamnă președintă, doamnă comisară, în ultimele săptămâni Președinția franceză a Consiliului Uniunii Europene a propus reforma spațiului Schengen și crearea unui consiliu specific după modelul zonei euro.

Înainte să discutăm despre acest lucru, este important să vorbim de extinderea spațiului Schengen, mai exact de finalizarea procesului de aderare a României la această zonă de liberă circulație. Țara noastră a îndeplinit și respectă de foarte mulți ani toate criteriile tehnice. Suntem *de facto* parte din toate mecanismele specifice spațiului Schengen, dar nu beneficiem de un tratament egal, fie că vorbim de cetățenii români sau de accesul mărfurilor din România pe piața europeană.

Nu cerem nimic cadou, solicităm doar ca normele europene și drepturile cetățenilor români să fie respectate. De aceea, am lansat campania europeană „România merită în Schengen”, prin care solicităm liderilor europeni și guvernelor naționale să voteze în acest an primirea României.

Tensiunile de la frontiera de est a Europei întăresc nevoia de a suda coeziunea Uniunii, iar aderarea României la spațiul Schengen devine esențială pentru protecția frontierelor comune și siguranța cetățenilor.

Barry Andrews (Renew). – Madam President, the women of Afghanistan are asking the question, ‘Why are you starving us and our daughters in the name of women’s rights?’. This is because this is not a humanitarian crisis caused by conflict or by climate or by a natural disaster, as David Miliband told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee last week, this is a catastrophe of choice. It is as if it was designed by the western governments that first abandoned the Afghan people to the Taliban and now abandoned them to hunger and starvation.

I have written to the Minister of Foreign Affairs in Ireland to ask him to raise this issue as a priority in the European Foreign Affairs Council, and I have asked him to condemn in unambiguous terms the decision of President Biden to steal Afghan assets for the benefit of 9/11 victims. It is shameful and I would urge all MEPs to raise this with their ministries.

I was briefed by an NGO last week, and all of their female staff that they spoke to were asked if they had been victims of increased gender-based violence. All of them raised their hands, and I can’t provide them with an answer. Why are we starving them and their daughters in the name of women’s rights?

Christine Anderson (ID). – Frau Präsidentin! Weltweit gehen Millionen von Menschen auf die Straße, und wie schon 1989 in der DDR heute wieder für Freiheit und Demokratie. Und das zu Recht!

In Deutschland lässt das pauschale Verbot von Demonstrationen der maßnahmenkritischen Klientel den totalitären Anspruch auf Deutungshoheit der Staatssicherheit der DDR wiederaufleben. Bundesinnenministerin Frau Faeser twittert, man könne seine Meinung auch kundtun, ohne sich zu versammeln, und wischt dabei das garantierte Versammlungsrecht einfach beiseite. Und wenn Freiheit, Demokratie und Rechtsstaatlichkeit mitten in Europa bedroht sind, so ist es diesem Hause nicht eine einzige Debatte wert. Wie beschämend! Ich bin jedenfalls nicht bereit, darüber zu reden, ob und wenn ja unter welchen Umständen den Bürgern ihre Freiheit zurückgegeben werden kann.

Meine Damen und Herren, über Freiheit kann man reden – oder man hat sie. Ein jeder hat daher die Freiheit, jederzeit mit wem und wo auch immer spazieren zu gehen. Spaziergänge an der frischen Luft sind außerdem gesund. Und Montagabend, so höre ich, soll man viele nette Leute treffen. Wir sehen uns beim Spazierengehen. Ich lade Sie alle ein!

Michiel Hoogeveen (ECR). – Madam President, I fear a collective laziness is creeping into this House. It is now almost two years since the European Parliament was subject to COVID restrictions. We understood the situation, however, we now see COVID on the decline, Member States getting rid of restrictions and many colleagues in national parliaments fully back to work. Not the European Parliament, where some colleagues even say, ‘I want to keep remote voting and hybrid debates’.

Madam President, a parliament is more than voting and reading out statements in front of a screen. It is about debate, about meeting our colleagues and our voters in Parliament, face to face. That is something you cannot do from the couch in your living room. According to my book, you either show up to work or you don’t. Most people in this parliament show up every day: the cleaners, the ushers, security guards and the people working in restaurants. Do you think they can say, ‘from now on, I will work remotely?’ They cannot. Nor can we. So, President Metsola, I call on you: let’s get back to work.

João Pimenta Lopes (The Left). – Senhora Presidente, em Portugal vive-se numa situação preocupante de seca meteorológica desde novembro. Antevêem-se consequências diversas, desde o abastecimento para o consumo humano à produção agrícola ou produção de energia hidroelétrica. O impacto nas explorações agrícolas em várias regiões do país coloca a necessidade de recurso à rega, com o inevitável aumento dos custos de produção, no quadro da subida de outros fatores, como a energia e os combustíveis, e do esmagamento dos preços à produção e redução de rendimentos.

No imediato, são necessárias medidas e apoios aos setores afetados, nomeadamente à pequena e média agricultura. Mas não bastam medidas de mitigação. São necessárias medidas de prevenção que contemplem meios para o reforço da capacidade de armazenamento de água, a adaptação nas atividades produtivas, associada à definição de critérios de uso da água, que garantam o abastecimento público para consumo humano, a saúde pública, a preservação de rendimentos, a salvaguarda dos meios de produção e a segurança e manutenção das reservas de água.

Martin Sonneborn (NI). – Frau Präsidentin! Liebe Frau von der Leyen, anstatt uns hier in der vom Parlament angesetzten Debatte Ihr fortgesetztes Versagen bei der Durchsetzung des Rechtsstaatsmechanismus – Schutz der Demokratie in Polen und Ungarn – zu erklären, hatten Sie sich ursprünglich entschieden, lieber die Firma BioNTech in Marburg zu besuchen.

Ich lade Sie hiermit noch einmal nachdrücklich vor und weise höflich auf Artikel 45 der Rahmenvereinbarung über die Beziehungen zwischen Parlament und Kommission hin. Die Kommission – das sind Sie – hat, wenn es gefordert wird, der Teilnahme an Parlamentssitzungen gegenüber konkurrierenden Veranstaltungen Vorrang einzuräumen. Das gilt auch für Volkshochschulkurse, Demokratie für Anfänger 1, Friseurtermine oder Pharmapartys. Und den nächsten Milliardenvertrag mit Pfizer können Sie doch wieder per SMS verhandeln, aber anschließend – Sie wissen schon – das Löschen nicht vergessen, Zwinker-Smiley.

Daniel Buda (PPE). – Doamnă președintă, mulțumesc, în această seară am ales să vorbesc despre un subiect care domină primele pagini ale ziarelor din întreaga lume și care afectează în mod negativ viața tuturor cetățenilor.

Criza energetică din Europa a forțat fabricile de îngrășăminte să își reducă producția și a dus în mod inevitabil la creșterea prețurilor. Urmare a acestui fapt, avem costuri foarte mari pentru înființarea culturilor agricole, ceea ce duce fermierii în incapacitatea de a-și desfășura activitatea.

Creșterea prețului la energie generează scumpiri pe întregul lanț de aprovizionare, afectând în mod direct nu doar fermierii, ci și consumatorii. În acest context, atrag atenția că, în viitor, se poate ajunge la o criză alimentară severă și la o creștere inimaginabilă a prețurilor la alimente.

Uniunea Europeană, în colaborare cu statele membre, trebuie să vină cu soluții și sprijin financiar pentru fermieri. Aceștia trebuie să își poată continua activitatea și să își păstreze capacitatea de a produce alimente la prețuri accesibile pentru consumatori.

Jonás Fernández (S&D). – Señora presidenta, hace ya más de tres años que acompañé a un grupo de trabajadores asturianos a la vista judicial que tenían en Róterdam por el anuncio de cierre de una planta en Asturias y también en Galicia (en el caso de Asturias, con más de 250 trabajadores). Desde entonces, hasta el presente, ha ocurrido de todo: ventas fraudulentas, nuevos propietarios sin ningún tipo de programa industrial, levantamiento de bienes... Un proceso que está en manos de la Audiencia Nacional en España. Ha sido una larga agonía y en estos momentos ya difíciles, donde parece que no hay salida, quiero mostrar desde este Parlamento el respaldo, el cariño, la cercanía a esas 250 familias de asturianos. Y también desear que Europa, que se preocupa por los trabajadores («la Europa que protege») encuentre también vías de ayuda y de apoyo a esos trabajadores.

Nicolae Ștefănuță (Renew). – Doamnă președintă, vreau să vă transmit un mesaj din partea a 400 de cetățeni de etnie maghiară din Transilvania. Eu sunt deputat român, dar sunt și ardelean, sunt și european.

Ei spun:

„Ne dorim alegeri corecte în scrutinul din Ungaria, la care mai mulți maghiari din România pot vota. Ne opunem tuturor formelor de influențare a procesului de vot și împotriva fraudei electorale.

Campaniile de instigare la ură din ultimul deceniu au afectat relațiile noastre sociale. Nu există niciun motiv de frică. Refuzăm să ne temem de Bruxelles, de George Soros, de migranți sau de minorități sexuale. Nu avem nevoie de politicieni care să ne protejeze de ei.”

Doamnelor și domnilor, maghiarii nu sunt antieuropeni, așa cum vrea domnul Orban să credeți. Ei sunt frații noștri europeni, frații mei din România sau din afara ei.

Ahogyán élek, az a hazám.

a spus Balla Zsófia. „Aşa cum trăiesc, aşa e patria mea.”

Gunnar Beck (ID). – Frau Präsidentin! Die EU plant einen neuen EU-Migrationspakt mit schnellen Asylverfahren, neuen Zugangsrouten für Migranten, mehr Familienzusammenführung und mehr Aufnahmekapazitäten durch Umverteilung.

Das heißt: Dutzende Millionen neue Migranten bis 2040, denn auch Klimawandel und das Recht auf Abtreibung sollen zu Asylgründen werden. All das, so Frau von der Leyen, wollten die Bürger. Wirklich? Nach einer von meinen ID-Kollegen und mir in Auftrag gegebenen Umfrage weiß kaum ein Viertel der EU-Bürger von den EU-Plänen. 90 Prozent wünschen daher mehr Daten über die Kosten der Migration, und 80 Prozent der Bürger glauben, Migration gefährde die innere Sicherheit, unsere nationalen Identitäten und/oder den Sozialstaat. Kaum 16 Prozent meinen, Migration sei unbedenklich. Sind Sie hier entweder von Sinnen oder wollen Sie Europa ruinieren? Entweder, oder – zu bedauern ist beides.

Ангел Джамбазки (ECR). – Г-жо Председател, с огромно недоволствие прочетох и видях желанието на Европейската комисия да бъде гласувано в Парламента удължаването на „зеления сертификат“ за още една година. Сертификатът, който не е ефективен, който не работи, който не върши работа в тази ситуация, защото и ваксинирани, и неваксинирани, хората се разболяват, но който сертификат е дискриминационен и който унищожава и свива дребни и средни бизнеси, и който прави неравенство, и който отнема свободи. И това не ви го казва някой конспиратор, това го казва Клаус Шваб – човекът, който е председател на Световния икономически форум, и който в книгата си „Ковид-19: голямото зануляване“ (*Covid-19: The Great Reset*) прогнозира унищожаването на националните правителства, на националните държави и на средната класа.

Това прави този сертификат: унищожава бизнеси, ликвидира средната класа. Затова ви призовавам – правя формално предложение – искането на Комисията да бъде отхвърлено, да бъде гласувано срещу удължаването на този сертификат и да бъде приет документ, който да иска неговата отмяна. Защото е още по-срамно поведението на вашите любимци, като г-н Трюдо, който нарича протестиращите и тези, които се борят за свободата си, „незначително малцинство“. Откога станаха малцинствата незначителни? Нима тази зала не се бори за правото на всяка зелена еуглена да бъде зелена или червена, или жълта, или не знам си каква? Това е срам и позор, и на това трябва да бъде сложен край.

Clare Daly (The Left). – Madam President, two weeks ago, the Parliament had its big Afghan Women Day, focusing on the denial of access to education and work and, you know, it was grand to keep the focus on, and maybe it made us feel a bit better.

But, you know, you can't go to work or school if you're starving or if you're dead, and against the backdrop of the cataclysmic collapse of the Afghan economy, in a bitterly cold winter where the World Food Programme is predicting that one million children will die of starvation in two months.

Against that backdrop, the US, the world's most powerful economy, appropriates in broad daylight the resources of this, the world's poorest country, and we say nothing. EUR 7 billion in US banks belonging to the people of Afghanistan. No emergency meetings. No statements from the High Representative. No demands for international law to be upheld. No comment, even, on this colonial act of banditry. Biden's step will mean millions of Afghans suffering and dying for a crime that had nothing to do with them. It makes me sick. Shame on the US for its crimes against humanity, and shame on the EU for its complicity and silence.

Eugen Tomac (PPE). – Doamnă președintă, stimați colegi, avem în prezent prețuri de patru ori mai mari și stocuri tot mai mici la energie și această criză prin care trece Uniunea Europeană a afectat în mod profund consumatorii vulnerabili, dar și economia Uniunii Europene. Tocmai de aceea cred că majoritatea statelor membre se uită cu multă speranță spre Uniunea Europeană și așteaptă soluții pragmatice și eficiente imediate.

Cred că pe termen mediu și pe termen scurt, este esențial ca Uniunea Europeană să achiziționeze stocuri de gaz pentru toate statele membre și, de asemenea, trebuie să ne gândim că tranziția spre o energie verde este esențială, dar înainte de a renunța la ceea ce avem în prezent, trebuie să fim pregătiți de acest pas, pentru a nu mai produce șocurile pe care le trăim în aceste zile, pentru că ele produc adevărate drame în rândul cetățenilor Uniunii Europene.

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Doamnă președintă, doamnă comisară, în contextul în care trăim, când, în multe orașe din Europa, cetățenii sunt în stradă, nu puteam să aleg decât subiectul drepturilor omului și da, și drepturile copilului.

Doamnă comisară, instituțiile europene nu cred că pot să fie fericite și nu cred că pot să fie mulțumite de nivelul la care se respectă ce reglementăm. Avem reglementări legate de drepturile omului, avem reglementări legate de drepturile copilului, dar se încalcă flagrant și iată unde am ajuns!

Doamnă comisară, cred că este un moment în care trebuie toți să reflectăm cum putem să punem în aplicare ceea ce reglementăm și am să vă dau un singur exemplu. Cu ocazia pandemiei – și au mai vorbit aici colegi – multe state au îngrădit disproporționat, au încălcat regulamentul pe care noi l-am votat aici, iar din punctul de vedere al drepturilor copilului, au început să fie copii răpiți de instituții ale statului, așa cum s-a întâmplat cu copii din România, în Finlanda, în Suedia, acum în Danemarca, părinți arestați.

Nu cred că există o dragoste mai mare decât dragostea de mamă și eu cred că trebuie să revizuiți, să vedeți ce se întâmplă cu aceste instituții și ce se întâmplă cu drepturile omului.

Am avut în țara mea un ministru al justiției care a spus așa: „Drepturile omului sunt un lux”. Eu sper să nu își însușească și Uniunea Europeană acest dicton.

Vlad-Marius Botoș (Renew). – Doamnă președintă, doamnă comisară, dragi colegi, suntem 27 de state membre în Uniunea Europeană și, deși avem încă granițe, cetățenii europeni își pot alege să trăiască, să muncească și să contribuie la dezvoltarea Uniunii Europene în oricare din cele 27 de state.

Milioane de cetățeni europeni, milioane de români și-au făcut un rost în alte state decât cel în care s-au născut și, după zeci de ani, sufletul lor este legat atât de țara în care s-au născut, cât și de noua țară, unde trăiesc și muncesc. Este așadar firesc să își dorească să fie cetățeni de drept ai ambelor state și totuși, deși am stabilit că suntem o familie, deși am stabilit că între noi, cele 27 de state membre, sunt relații speciale, avem încă unele state care refuză dubla cetățenie.

Cred că trebuie să ne aplecăm în mod serios și din acest Parlament asupra acestei probleme și să încercăm să creăm cu adevărat sentimentul de apartenență la o mare familie europeană pentru toți cetățenii noștri, oriunde s-ar afla ei în Uniune.

Charlie Weimers (ECR). – Fru talman! Muslimska barn slits ur livmodern och förs bort vid födseln av svenska myndigheter som en del av ett krig mot islam.

Dessa lögner sprids i kanaler med miljontals följare av våldsbejakande, islamistiska organisationer och influencers, kriminella klanfamiljer och imamer med terrorkopplingar, statskontrollerade, utländska medier och radikala imamer på hemmaplan; de sprider budskapet vidare.

Hur ser det ut i verkligheten då ? De här barnen har omhändertagits i laga ordning för att skydda dem. Likt Muhammedkarikatyrerna finns en reell risk för våld och terrordåd, samtidigt som svensk myndighetsutövning riskerar att sättas ur spel. Utrikestjänstens kommunikationsbudget för att bemöta desinformation har fördubblats sedan 2002. Har EU överhuvudtaget gjort något för att hjälpa Sverige i denna situation ?

Mick Wallace (The Left). – Madam President, the EU did well to negotiate the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA) into existence but, sadly, the abrupt end of it represents a decline of multilateralism and a blow to the EU. Since then, the EU has reacted poorly to the bullying by the Americans, who seem determined to show that the EU is just a puppet of theirs.

The Americans didn't just withdraw: they pressured other members of the JCPOA not to comply with their commitments. So, incredibly, we had a situation where the US were threatening to punish other members of the UN if they complied with a UN Security Council resolution.

Biden campaigned during the election on renewing the JCPOA. He could have issued an executive order as soon as he got elected, but he didn't. Was he pressured by the Israelis? If the Israelis are so worried about Iran's nuclear programme, why don't they offer to give up their nuclear weapons in return for Iran not having a nuclear programme? We need the EU now to work for the original JCPOA, not a restricted American version of it, and the EU should also work for a completely nuclear-free zone in West Asia.

Peter Pollák (PPE). – Pani predsedajúca, som znepokojený, že súčasťou rodiny sociálnych demokratov aj tu v Európskom parlamente je naďalej slovenská strana Smer, ktorá pod hlavičkou sociálnej demokracie v Európe burcuje ľudí proti očkovaniu.

Šíri nehanebne klamstvá a navyše v podstate spolupracuje s fašistami, ktorí popierajú holokaust či oslavujú narodeniny fašistického prezidenta zo Slovenska počas druhej svetovej vojny, teda Jozefa Tisa.

V strane Smer dnes otvorene hovoria, že ak vyhrajú ďalšie voľby, spravia z fašistov, ktorí už raz boli odsúdení za rasizmus, ministrov v svojej vláde.

Dámy a páni, korupciou presiaknutá sociálna demokracia na Slovensku je ochotná spolupracovať s fašistami, lebo ich lídrom, ako aj ich mecenášom hrozí väzenie.

Títo ľudia nemajú nič spoločné so sociálnou politikou ani s demokraciou.

Vážený priatelia zo sociálnej demokracie, nedajte si, prosím, pošpiniť svoje meno a postavte sa proti konaniu strany Smer, ktorá zneužíva pandémie na šírenie bludov, podnecuje k eskalácii napätia a spolupracuje s odsúdenými fašistami.

Cristina Maestre Martín De Almagro (S&D). – Señora presidenta, el sector de las plantas aromáticas tiene un gran peso en Europa; además de beneficioso y saludable, es un cultivo sostenible por su escaso consumo de agua y contribuye a la protección del medio ambiente.

Sin embargo, en el contexto de la estrategia sobre productos químicos y de la revisión del Reglamento REACH de la Comisión Europea, hay quien pretende incluir la lavanda y el lavandín, entre otros, dentro de los productos químicos tóxicos. Esta decisión afectaría a cultivos de plantas aromáticas en España, en Bulgaria, en Francia, en Croacia y en Eslovenia. Y, especialmente, en el caso de los aceites esenciales, carecería de toda lógica y rigor científico, puesto que toda la elaboración es natural. Además, ignora el impacto que puede tener esta decisión en la cadena de suministro y en la actividad económica por la que se está apostando en la línea de la defensa del desarrollo sostenible.

Por eso, le pedimos a la Comisión Europea que en todo este proceso dé participación y garantías a los lavandicultores y también a las industrias asociadas y, ante todo, dé una respuesta justa para la permanencia y el futuro del sector.

Цветелина Пенкова (S&D). – Г-жо Председател, г-жо Комисар, цените на енергията допринасят най-силно за засилващата се инфлация в последните месеци. Най-сериозният проблем е, че за пореден път най-уязвимите граждани ще понесат кризата най-тежко. Те очакват от нас бързи решения, а не идеологически спорове.

За да решим този проблем, трябва да предложим силни и единни общоевропейски позиции, когато договаряме дългосрочните доставки на енергийни суровини от трети страни. Също така имаме нужда от развитието на доказани технологии като ядрената енергетика.

Представеният от Европейската комисия делегиран акт за таксономията е стъпка в правилната посока. Имаме нужда от практически и работещи решения, за да не изпадаме повече в подобни енергийни и ценови кризи.

Die Präsidentin. – Damit ist dieser Tagesordnungspunkt geschlossen.

29. Wyjaśnienia dotyczące stanowiska zajętego w głosowaniu: patrz protokół

30. Korekty i zamiary głosowania: patrz protokół

31. Porządek obrad następnego posiedzenia

Die Präsidentin. – Die Sitzung ist geschlossen und wird morgen, Dienstag, 15. Februar 2022, um 8.30 Uhr mit der Bekanntgabe der Ergebnisse der heutigen Abstimmungsrunde wieder aufgenommen.

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

32. Zamknięcie posiedzenia

(Die Sitzung wird um 22.47 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
Verts/ALE	Grupa Zielonych/Wolne Przymierze Europejskie
ID	Grupa Tożsamość i Demokracja
ECR	Grupa Europejskich Konserwatystów i Reformatorów
The Left	Grupa Lewicy w Parlamencie Europejskim - GUE/NGL
NI	Niezrzeszeni