

PEŁNE SPRAWOZDANIE Z OBRAD 30 LISTOPADA 2016 R.

(C/2024/2237)

PARLAMENT EUROPEJSKI

SESJA 2016-2017

Posiedzenia z 30 listopada i 1 grudnia 2016 r.

BRUKSELA

Spis treści	Strona
1. Wznowienie sesji	3
2. Zatwierdzenie protokołu z poprzedniego posiedzenia: patrz protokół	3
3. Weryfikacja mandatów pełnomocnictw: patrz protokół	3
4. Skład grup politycznych: patrz protokół	3
5. Skład komisji i delegacji: patrz protokół	3
6. Działania podjęte w związku ze stanowiskami i rezolucjami Parlamentu: patrz protokół	3
7. Pytania wymagające odpowiedzi ustnej (składanie dokumentów): patrz protokół	3
8. Składanie dokumentów: patrz protokół	3
9. Przesunięcie środków: patrz protokół	3
10. Porządek obrad: patrz protokół	3
11. Procedura budżetowa na rok 2017: tekst wspólny (debata)	4
12. Przegląd WRF (debata)	22

Spis treści	Strona
13. Wstępna Umowa o partnerstwie gospodarczym UE/Ghana (debata)	37
14. Umowa między Stanami Zjednoczonymi Ameryki a UE w sprawie ochrony informacji osobowych powiązanych z zapobieganiem przestępstwom, ich śledzeniem, wykrywaniem i ściganiem (debata)	42
15. Przekazanie światowej społeczności internetowej nadzoru nad IANA w październiku 2016 r. i nadchodzące Forum Zarządzania Internetem w Meksyku (w dniach 6-8 grudnia 2016 r.) (debata)	54
16. Fundusz Solidarności Unii Europejskiej: ocena - Sytuacja we Włoszech po trzęsieniach ziemi (debata)	58
17. Deklaracje komisarzy o braku konfliktu interesów – wytyczne (debata)	73
18. Odpowiedzialność, odszkodowania i zabezpieczenia finansowe w odniesieniu do działalności związanej ze złożami ropy naftowej i gazu ziemnego na obszarach morskich (krótka prezentacja)	81
19. Jednominutowe wystąpienia w znaczących kwestiach politycznych	83
20. Porządek obrad następnego posiedzenia: patrz protokół	86
21. Zamknięcie posiedzenia	86

PEŁNE SPRAWOZDANIE Z OBRAD 30 LISTOPADA 2016 R.**VORSITZ: MARTIN SCHULZ***Präsident**(Die Sitzung wird um 15.00 Uhr eröffnet.)***1. Wznowienie sesji**

Der Präsident. – Ich erkläre die am Donnerstag, dem 24. November 2016, unterbrochene Sitzungsperiode für wieder aufgenommen.

2. Zatwierdzenie protokołu z poprzedniego posiedzenia: patrz protokół**3. Weryfikacja mandatów pełnomocnictw: patrz protokół****4. Skład grup politycznych: patrz protokół****5. Skład komisji i delegacji: patrz protokół****6. Działania podjęte w związku ze stanowiskami i rezolucjami Parlamentu: patrz protokół****7. Pytania wymagające odpowiedzi ustnej (składanie dokumentów): patrz protokół****8. Składanie dokumentów: patrz protokół****9. Przesunięcie środków: patrz protokół****10. Porządek obrad: patrz protokół**

11. Procedura budżetowa na rok 2017: tekst wspólny (debata)

Der Präsident. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über den Bericht von Jens Geier und Indrek Tarand im Namen der Delegation des Europäischen Parlaments im Vermittlungsausschuss für Haushaltsfragen über den Standpunkt des Rates zum Entwurf des Gesamthaushaltsplans der Europäischen Union für das Haushaltsjahr 2017 (gemeinsamer Text) (11900/201614635/2016 — C8-0373/2016 - 2016/2047(BUD)) (A8-0353/2016).

Jean Arthuis, *président de la commission des budgets.* – Monsieur le Président, mes chers collègues, alors que l'Europe et le monde traversent une période d'instabilité, il est réconfortant que les institutions européennes puissent mettre de côté leurs différends et donner à l'Union un budget dans le temps imparti par les traités.

Contrairement à la légende qui voulait qu'une année sur deux la conciliation échoue, je me réjouis qu'en 2016, pour le budget 2017, comme en 2015, pour le budget 2016, nous ayons trouvé un accord.

Je suis heureux que, cette année, sûrement assagis par les nombreuses heures de négociations, le Parlement et le Conseil aient fait un pas l'un vers l'autre pour envoyer deux messages clairs.

Le premier message est que la priorité reste, plus que jamais, de prendre à bras-le-corps le problème des migrations en renforçant le contrôle de nos frontières extérieures, tout en permettant l'accueil digne des nouveaux arrivants et le retour humainement soutenable aux migrants qui ne peuvent prétendre au statut de réfugié. Ne nous berçons pas d'illusions, beaucoup reste à faire dans ce domaine et notre budget est extrêmement contraint en la matière, mais les avancées de l'autorité budgétaire pour 2017 vont incontestablement dans la bonne direction.

Le second message est que l'Europe investit dans sa jeunesse: 500 millions d'euros supplémentaires seront mis à disposition de l'Initiative pour l'emploi des jeunes. En fait, un milliard, si l'on y ajoute les dotations complémentaires du Fonds social européen. Par ailleurs, 200 millions de crédits supplémentaires ont été inscrits sur les programmes d'avenir, comme le soutien aux PME, l'interconnexion des infrastructures en Europe, Erasmus+ pour les étudiants et les apprentis – programme emblématique sur lequel la Commission avait déjà mis l'accent dans son projet de budget – et la recherche, avec le programme Horizon 2020.

Malgré tous les reproches que l'on peut faire à notre budget, et ils sont nombreux, cette édition 2017 envoie un message de confiance. Confiance dans la capacité de nos institutions à travailler ensemble et confiance dans notre jeunesse, qui reste notre plus prometteur investissement d'avenir.

Je remercie nos rapporteurs, Jens Geier et Indrek Tarand, qui ont su éclairer nos débats et nos ultimes arbitrages.

Enfin, je n'exprimerai qu'un seul regret. C'est, en effet, le dernier budget de la vice-présidente Georgieva, qui y aura imprimé sa marque, son expertise, son énergie, sa force d'entraînement et son charisme. Madame la Vice-présidente, acceptez notre gratitude et permettez qu'au nom de la commission des budgets, je forme pour vous des vœux chaleureux pour la réussite de votre action à la tête de la Banque mondiale. Nous aurons besoin de vous, Madame.

PRESIDENZA DELL'ON. ANTONIO TAJANI

Vicepresidente

Jens Geier, *Berichterstatter.* – Herr Präsident! Mir ist von den Diensten mitgeteilt worden, dass – obwohl bei mir nur drei Minuten Redezeit angezeigt werden – ich wohl sechs Minuten habe. Ich wäre dankbar, wenn Sie das kurz bestätigen würden, dass die Kolleginnen und Kollegen nicht völlig irritiert reagieren, wenn ich nach drei Minuten einfach weiterspreche. Herr Präsident, ich weiß jetzt nicht ganz genau, ob Sie mir zugehört haben. Die Bitte ist, dass Sie kurz bestätigen, dass ich sechs Minuten Redezeit habe. Danke schön. Gut.

Vielen Dank, dass ich hier das Wort ergreifen kann, als Berichterstatter des Europäischen Parlaments für den Kommissionshaushalt. Am Anfang gehört es sich, Dank zu sagen an alle diejenigen, die geholfen haben, dass das gelungen ist. Mein Dank gilt der slowakischen Ratspräsidentschaft. Ich habe ihre Verhandlungsführung jederzeit als fair, offen und zugänglich empfunden. Das war nicht immer so. Lassen Sie mich ausdrücklich danken, dass Sie für das Europäische Parlament ein fairer Gesprächspartner und guter Vermittler gewesen sind.

Mein Dank gilt auch Kristalina Georgieva. Ich schließe mich den Ausführungen unseres Ausschussvorsitzenden vollumfänglich an. Es ist heute Ihr letztes Auftreten im Plenum des Europäischen Parlaments, und ich finde, das gehört sich dann, dass wir als der parlamentarische Teil der Haushälterfamilie nochmal einen ausdrücklichen Dank sagen für eine außerordentlich profilierte Arbeit für den europäischen Haushalt. Sie haben viel bewegt, Sie haben *budget for results* auf den Weg gebracht, eine Diskussion darüber, was wir mit dem Geld eigentlich optimal erreichen wollen. Sie haben der Haushaltskontrolle weitergeholfen. Die Haushalte, die Sie unter Ihrer Ägide vorgeschlagen haben, haben sich oft an den Prioritäten des Parlaments orientiert. Wir sind in den Haushaltsverhandlungen mit Ihnen immer ein ganzes Stück weiter gekommen. Sie waren eine faire Partnerin und die Kommissionsdienste unter Ihrer Leitung ein ehrlicher Makler. Dafür ganz herzlichen Dank und viel Erfolg bei der Weltbank. Wir werden Sie vermissen, wünschen Ihnen aber trotz allem alles Gute für den weiteren Weg.

(Beifall)

Der letzte Dank gilt meinen Schattenberichterstattern und -berichterstatterinnen. Ich habe die Zusammenarbeit mit ihnen jederzeit als offen und kollegial empfunden. In den stressigen Momenten, die wir alle kennen – etwa wenn man morgens um 3 Uhr an wichtigen Fragen im Vermittlungsverfahren steht –, ist es gut, dass trotz aller Dinge, die uns trennen, über die Fraktionsgrenzen hinweg eine Solidarität unter den Haushälterinnen und Haushältern vorhanden ist und man hier und da sogar eine Lanze für Dinge bricht, für die man in der parlamentarischen Auseinandersetzung nicht unbedingt gestimmt hat. Ich finde, das ist eine ganz besondere Form der Zusammenarbeit, die wir da haben, die ich auch als sehr angenehm empfinde.

Wir wollen morgen über das Paket des Haushaltes 2017 abstimmen. Als Berichterstatter möchte ich Ihnen dringend die Annahme empfehlen, denn die Prioritäten des Europäischen Parlaments, so wie wir sie hier in diesem Saal beschlossen haben, finden sich, so gut es geht, in diesem Haushalt wieder. Wir haben 500 Millionen Euro neues Geld für die Bekämpfung der Arbeitslosigkeit, besonders bei Jugendlichen, in den Staaten Südeuropas, erhalten, und damit können wir dieses jetzt am Ende dann doch sehr erfolgreiche Programm weiterführen und weiter daran arbeiten, dass die Jugendarbeitslosigkeit in vielen Ländern der EU spürbar gesenkt wird. Wir haben 200 Millionen Euro mehr erreicht für Wachstum und Beschäftigung, für die kleinen und mittleren Unternehmen, für die Verkehrsinfrastruktur, für Forschungsprogramme und für die Förderung der Mobilität von Menschen im Programm Erasmus+.

Das sind die wichtigsten Überschriften. Dahinter gibt es viele wichtige Erfolge, die vor diesen beiden Überschriften ein bisschen zurücktreten, aber ich will zwei besonders hervorheben, weil sie mir am Herzen liegen. Das eine ist zusätzliches Geld für UNRWA, für das UN-Hilfswerk für die palästinensischen Flüchtlinge. Dieses Hilfswerk hängt maßgeblich von dem Geld, das die Europäische Union bereitstellt, ab. Uns muss ein palästinensischer Flüchtling genauso viel wert sein wie ein syrischer Flüchtling. Wir müssen dafür sorgen, dass die Menschen in den *Camps* eine soziale Perspektive haben, eine Ausbildungsperspektive für ihre Jugendlichen, und das, was wir da erreicht haben, ist eine Garantie dafür. Wir haben wichtige sozialpolitische Programme wie Progress ebenfalls verstärken können. Das freut – lassen Sie mich das dann doch sagen – einen Sozialdemokraten ganz besonders.

Wir haben auch viele Dinge nicht erreicht. Ich habe nicht verstanden – und diese Aufgabe kommt auf uns in den kommenden Jahren zu –, warum es nicht möglich ist, die Leiter der EU-Missionen da, wo sie in der Welt auch den Hut aufhaben als *special representatives* der Europäischen Union, in der Verwaltungskategorie zu erfassen! Das klingt sehr technisch. Am Ende geht es aber darum, ob wir für die Entwicklungspolitik und für die Außenpolitik mehr Geld haben und eine saubere Systematik im Haushalt. Hier gibt es offenbar keine Rechtsgrundlage, da muss die Kommission was tun, und ich selber finde es auch misslich und bin auch von den sozialen Netzwerken oft darauf hingewiesen worden, dass es uns nicht gelungen ist, die humanitäre Hilfe so zu verstärken, wie wir das gewollt haben.

Wir haben aber in der Entwicklungspolitik wichtige Instrumente stärken können. Mir ist es auch als Parlamentarier besonders wichtig, dass wir die Kommission und den Rat ein bisschen an die Kleiderordnung erinnert haben, wenn es um das Geldausgeben geht, nämlich zuerst die Rechtsgrundlage schaffen und dann die Gelder in den Haushalt einstellen. Deswegen werden wir jetzt geduldig darauf warten, dass für den Europäischen Fonds für nachhaltige Entwicklung die Rechtsgrundlage kommt. Wir werden uns nochmal unterhalten müssen, inwiefern wir dieses – dann am Ende sehr hektische – Verfahren mit den *joint conclusions* verbessern können. Das ist eine Aufgabe für die Zukunft.

Ich freue mich auf die Diskussion mit Ihnen und eine hoffentlich erfolgreiche Beschlussfassung morgen.

Indrek Tarand, *rapporteur*. – Mr President, first of all I would like to inform the plenary that before the vote tomorrow I have to make a technical adjustment. I am sorry about this but it is my duty. I would now like to congratulate and offer my gratitude to everyone who helped me to finish this adventurous and creepy road of budgetary process.

We achieved as much as we could, and the only complaint from my side would be that we did not meet the 20% of climate-related budgeting, which only recently came out from the Court of Auditors document. But let us try to do better next year. The conciliation meeting ended in a friendly atmosphere but in a bit of a rush. That is why, on the initiative of the Chair of the Committee on Budgets, Mr Arthuis, we had to make some technical clarifications. I must say that almost two thirds of them were very successful.

Unfortunately, the Commission failed to put in the necessary point about the reserves, which Parliament adopted with a large majority. The reserves were meant to improve the Code of Conduct for Commissioners, particularly for a cooling-down period for former Commissioners. I promise to this plenary, to the Commission and to everybody else that we will come back to this issue, because it seems that President Juncker has sent Mr Schulz a proposal about how to improve the Code of Conduct, although for me for the time being it does not look like a step in the right direction, but rather the opposite. It proposes a cooling-down period for former Commissioners and to allow them to be lobbyists at the same time and employed as advisers to Commissioners. It is too long a period. We can cool nuclear reactors much more quickly than former Commissioners, and sometimes these former Commissioners have not given as much energy as a nuclear power plant. So we will come back to this issue. Secondly, the External Action Services need to pay more attention to their strategic communication activities. We agreed on that and I am very grateful to the Council and the Commission for adopting it.

The most important thing is, of course, our own business. Political groups asked for 76 additional posts, and I, as a negotiator, made the utmost effort to get something. Finally we compromised in a budgetary-neutral way, and now the problem is with this House. I understand that the Secretary-General has been flexible enough to resolve it. I apologise to all the Parliament officials who feel that their share was reduced in order to increase the share of political workers, but that is the political decision.

I would like to thank Commissioner Georgieva, who was very helpful in these efforts to achieve the agreement, and also the shadows and everybody from Parliament's delegation, as well as Minister Lesay from the Slovak Presidency. I heard on the Bulgarian news that the Bulgarian Government is intending to appoint a replacement, Mr Ivailo Kalfin, who has a lot of experience in Parliament. His appointment as a Commissioner would relieve us from sophisticated debates over hearings, semi-hearings and mini hearings and allow Mr Oettinger to continue, under the experienced and firm supervision of Vice-President Ansip, on the digital area and perhaps also take some commercial flights.

To sum up, I am extremely grateful and indebted to the secretariat of the Committee on Budgets and many other people in different institutions who literally saved my skin on numerous occasions when I was lost in this budgetary jungle. The only thing I can promise next year, under the Estonian Presidency, is that we can try to do better.

Ivan Lesay, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Mr President, today it is my pleasure to attend the European Parliament's debate on the general budget of the EU for the financial year 2017. On behalf of the Council, I would like to welcome the positive outcome reached by the Conciliation Committee in the early hours of 17 November after long and sometimes difficult discussions between, but also within, our respective institutions.

We have been able to establish a realistic budget providing, on the one hand, the necessary appropriations to cover the needs expected in 2017 but leaving, on the other hand, sufficient margins to cope with unforeseen situations in the course of next year.

I would like to underline the constructive atmosphere during our budgetary negotiations. The agreement on the 2017 budget could only be reached due to the readiness for compromise on both sides of the table, with tremendous help from the Commission. Thanks to the excellent teamwork, professional attitudes, mutual trust and Europeanism, we have managed to avoid another crisis, which our citizens would certainly not have understood – and rightly so.

Parliament and the Council share the same two main priorities for the financial year 2017: to respond to the ongoing migration, refugee and security crisis, and to boost innovation, growth and employment in Europe. In the Union budget for 2017 we have been able to translate these priorities into concrete figures. Almost EUR 6 billion will be available for tackling migration issues within the Union, for dealing with its root causes and improving living conditions in our neighbourhood, and for reinforcing security in Europe and at its external borders. This amount corresponds to an increase of more than 11% compared to the budget of the previous year.

Furthermore, more than EUR 21 billion was agreed for programmes and projects supporting competitiveness for growth and jobs, which translates into an increase of approximately 12% if compared to 2016. Successful programmes such as Erasmus+ are even increased by 19%, and the European Fund for Strategic Investments will see an increase of 25%.

These figures are proof of our joint objective. Both Parliament and the Council want to make Europe a better and safer place to live, and to create training and job opportunities, notably for our young people. At the same time, the Union budget agreed for 2017 is a responsible compromise in these times of economic and financial crisis, which have led inter alia to major constraints on national budgets.

Let me underline the importance of our joint agreement on reducing the number of staff in all the institutions, bodies and agencies by 5% by 2017. This signal is of the utmost importance for European citizens, especially in times when anti-establishment political parties are gaining stronger support across Europe.

The package agreed by the Conciliation Committee includes a number of joint statements, and the Council strongly supports these statements and is fully committed to honouring them. After the successful outcome reached by the Conciliation Committee on 17 November, the Council formally approved the joint text on 28 November, and I am glad to inform you that No Member State voted against the compromise reached between our institutions.

Parliament's approval of the joint text tomorrow would allow the adoption of the general budget for the financial year 2017 within the deadline foreseen by the Treaty. For the first time, as was already mentioned by Mr Arthuis, for the first time since the entry into force of the Lisbon Treaty, two consecutive annual budgetary procedures will have then been completed successfully in conciliation without having recourse to a new draft budget to be submitted by the Commission and a second round of negotiations.

This outcome is also remarkable, as we had an additional challenge this year linked to the mid-term review or revision of the Multiannual Financial Framework. Due to the political momentum, the MFF revision has been a high priority, both for this Parliament as well as for the Council. Just in the following item on today's agenda, and State Secretary Ivan Korčok will be clear here on the next steps which are necessary to finalise the MFF revision.

Concerning the EU budget 2017, I would like to thank the Chair of the Committee on Budgets, Jean Arthuis, and the two rapporteurs, Jens Geier and Indrek Tarand – especially for your constructive approach, Jean, Jens and Indrek – during the whole annual budgetary procedure, for your openness to compromise and for the positive atmosphere. I would like to thank all the other colleagues from Parliament who during the long and stressful hours on the Council's premises showed patience and a strong spirit of compromise.

Finally, I would like to thank Vice-President Kristalina Georgieva for facilitating our negotiations. Without your support, it would have been far more difficult, if not even impossible, to reach a balanced and timely agreement. I wish you all the best in your future position, and I can say that you will be very much missed here.

Presidente. – Prima di dare la parola alla Commissione, alla signora Georgieva, anch'io volevo associarmi ai ringraziamenti che le sono stati rivolti: ho avuto il piacere di collaborare con lei quando eravamo entrambi commissari, ho avuto il piacere di collaborare col lei ancora oggi come vicepresidente del Parlamento responsabile della sicurezza e la commissaria e vicepresidente Georgieva responsabile per la sicurezza della Commissione. Grazie, grazie per il lavoro proficuo svolto assieme, in bocca in lupo e buona fortuna per la nuova, fantastica, avventura.

Kristalina Georgieva, Vice-President of the Commission. – Mr President, I join Mr Arthuis, rapporteurs Geier and Tarand, and Minister Lesay, in recognising that we have had difficult negotiations but very constructive negotiations, and through those hours, 18 hours during the very final stretch, we were all led by one objective: how to make best use of the scarce resources of the European Union. And of course we argued, because the needs are bigger than the resources that are available, and we had to make every effort to prioritise on the basis of what would do most for our people.

We have concluded that there are two overwhelming priorities: to manage migration flows and address the security threats, and to support the fragile recovery of our economy, especially with regard to what it means to be jobless for our young people.

I want to recognise each and every one of you who have worked towards finding the difficult, but finally successful room for compromise. This budget has already been described as remarkable because it injects additional funds for very valuable programmes that support the competitiveness of our economy such as Horizon 2020, Erasmus+, the Connecting Europe Facility and COSME. It has been emphasised that we have precious resources – a total of EUR one billion – for support for the Youth Employment initiative, and it has also been emphasised that we have not forgotten people who are depending on our kindness and generosity simply to survive, like the Palestinian refugees that Mr Geier talked about.

What I would add is that in this budget we have also been very careful to support innovation, new ideas, such as piloting a free access to rail for young people so that they can experience Europe, or supporting a European solidarity corps that would allow our young people to work together for Europe.

We have also not forgotten our farmers. In our budget we have EUR 528 million for the dairy sector and an additional EUR 100 million for the extension of the measures put in place to mitigate the impact of the Russian ban. To those of you who have been speaking up on behalf of those who are affected by the Russian ban, I just want to give you the reassurance that, indeed, their needs and the impact felt in the milk-sector are in our budget.

And finally, we have been very careful to allow the flexibility that has served us so well to be present in this budget, including by retaining a margin of EUR 1.1 billion, so that if a shock hits us we have the funds to respond.

Let me in these last hours standing in front of you finish with a word of gratitude to each and every one of you, for keeping me on my toes, for demanding of me and my colleagues to do our utmost, our best, so that our budget goes furthest for the people who rely so much on it. From the bottom of my heart, thank you.

(Applause)

Siegfried Mureşan, on behalf of the PPE Group. – Mr President, we have a budget for the European Union for next year. This in itself is good news. Herewith we are proving to the Council, Commission and Parliament that we are ready to act and to deliver a budget to the European Union in these difficult circumstances and, not only that we have a budget, but that we have a good budget for the Union for next year.

It responds to what we established at the beginning of the 7-year Multiannual Financial Framework as our main priorities: growth and jobs. In order to allow for more growth in the European economy to generate more jobs, we are investing the money which we have in innovation and infrastructure. It is those areas which will make the European economy stronger. We are also giving support to students, with EUR 50 million more for the Erasmus programme, and to SMEs and young entrepreneurs through investing EUR 50 million more into the COSME programme. As the Commissioner also said, we have not forgotten about farmers, and I want to see that, in addition to these additional priorities that we have had, we also respond to current and new challenges, making Europe safer again. We are strengthening Europol and Eurojust and we want to stop illegal migration to Europe and manage the refugee crisis which we have been tackling.

The negotiations were difficult. We managed to agree, but to my colleagues in Council I also want to say that, if Europe is expected to deliver in the coming years, especially in 2018, Member States have to understand that, if there are new priorities and new demands vis-à-vis the budget of the Union, then of course fresh new resources are clearly also needed. What we are delivering this year is a good budget under difficult circumstances but, if we are expected to deliver more next year, then of course more resources are needed.

To conclude, I would like to thank the main rapporteurs and the shadow rapporteurs, with whom we have worked in a good spirit. I would like to thank the Commissioner for the wisdom and the political sensitivity which she put into the negotiations – and sometimes passion too – to make this budget possible. I would also like to thank the Council for having been a good partner to us.

Derek Vaughan, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Mr President, can I also thank the Commissioner and, as was said, she will be sorely missed. I would also like to thank the Slovak Presidency for the way they have conducted the negotiations, and of course our two rapporteurs, who I think have done a fantastic job. Indeed, I would say this is probably one of the best budget agreements we have had for a number of years, and of course the headlines will be the extra EUR 200 million for Heading 1A, research and development money, which is vital if we are to encourage jobs and growth in the European Union, and secondly, the EUR 500 million for the Youth Employment initiative. I think the Youth Employment Initiative has got off to a slow start in many states, but I also believe that youth unemployment is still one of the great scandals of our time. Therefore it is absolutely vital we continue to put money into the Youth Employment Initiative to try and tackle the scourge of youth unemployment. Hopefully colleagues will welcome that.

Can I say on the 500 million and the written declaration from the Council, I think it is absolutely vital that they do allow the Commission to come forward with an amending budget next year. Too often in the past we have had written declarations, but when the time comes for the amended budget, the Council has backtracked and blocked it, so for the credibility of the European Union it is absolutely vital that the Council allows that to go ahead.

Finally, can I say something on the various flexibility instruments – the flexibility instrument itself, the global margin and the contingency margin. Used in the right way, these flexibility instruments allow us to adapt to changing priorities and problems in the European Union and the EU's budget, and hopefully we can learn lessons from that in the review of the MFF, and in the next MFF we must build in flexibility into a budget to tackle those new issues as they arise.

Bernd Kölmel, *im Namen der ECR-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident! Zunächst einmal darf auch ich den beiden Berichterstatern, den Kollegen Geier und Tarand, für ihre Arbeit, für den vorgelegten Bericht, herzlich danken. Leider Gottes geht dieser Haushaltsbericht wie in den Vorjahren auch in die falsche Richtung. Wir haben eine Zunahme der Verpflichtungsermächtigungen um 1,7 % auf 158 Milliarden Euro. Dabei sind unseres Erachtens die Schwerpunkte wieder einmal falsch gesetzt, denn die EU will auch 2017 72 % der Ausgaben für den Agrarbereich und die Kohäsionspolitik ausgeben. Dies entspricht ziemlich exakt den Werten der Vorjahre. Das heißt, wir sehen hier keine Veränderung der Politik, wir sehen keine grundsätzliche Neuausrichtung unserer Haushaltspolitik.

Der EU darf es aber nicht darum gehen, dass wir möglichst viel Geld für bestimmte Projekte ausgeben, sondern es muss darum gehen, dass wir dieses Geld in Bereichen ausgeben, in denen die EU einen Mehrwert erzeugen kann, in denen sie besser handeln kann als die Mitgliedstaaten für sich genommen. Nur dafür sollten wir auch Geld vorsehen. Und das trifft auf viele Bereiche im Agrarsektor nicht zu, jedenfalls dann nicht, wenn es sich um ein Nettozahlerland handelt. Diese Nettozahlerländer könnten ihre Subventionen auch ohne den Umweg über Brüssel ausschütten. Das wäre ein echter Beitrag für eine Entbürokratisierung.

Darüber hinaus haben wir in diesem Haushalt eine Lücke zwischen den Mitteln für Verpflichtungen und den Mitteln für Zahlungen von 23 Milliarden Euro. Ich bin mir leider Gottes ziemlich sicher, dass wir in der Zukunft hier wieder Probleme mit unbezahlten Rechnungen bekommen werden, denn wir versprechen mehr, als wir leisten können.

Ich möchte auch darauf hinweisen, dass wir von der ECR Kürzungsvorschläge in Höhe von 500 Millionen Euro gemacht haben, die allesamt im Haushaltsausschuss abgelehnt wurden. Insbesondere hatten wir auch vorgeschlagen, dass wir Mittel für den EU-Beitritt der Türkei in die Reserven umbuchen; das wurde leider Gottes auch abgelehnt. Gleichzeitig wissen wir, dass unser Parlament letzte Woche die Kommission mit großer Mehrheit aufgefordert hat, die Beitrittsverhandlungen mit der Türkei auszusetzen. Das zeigt, dass unser Vorschlag richtig war.

Gérard Deprez, *au nom du groupe ALDE*. – Monsieur le Président, c'est avec conviction que le groupe ALDE votera l'accord intervenu avec le Conseil sur le budget 2017.

Aucun budget, aussi bon soit-il, ne satisfait totalement nos aspirations et celui-ci comporte même des dispositions difficiles à avaler. Je veux parler des 76 postes supplémentaires pour les groupes politiques. Je dis aussi très clairement que nous pouvons rencontrer dans ce budget, au moins partiellement, les priorités qui sont les nôtres.

Nous soutenons la priorité donnée à la jeunesse par l'augmentation des crédits en faveur de la mobilité des étudiants et des apprentis, ainsi que les 500 millions pour lutter contre le chômage des jeunes. Nous soutenons le renforcement des crédits en faveur des PME par l'attribution de 50 millions supplémentaires au programme COSME.

Nous soutenons le renforcement des moyens en faveur de la recherche et du développement par le biais des crédits supplémentaires affectés à Horizon 2020. Nous soutenons les crédits supplémentaires affectés à «Connecting Europe Facility». Nous soutenons les moyens supplémentaires prévus pour aider les agriculteurs victimes de l'embargo russe, en particulier les producteurs de lait. Et nous soutenons l'effort sans précédent pour faire face à la crise migratoire et renforcer la sécurité à l'intérieur de l'Union européenne.

Je pourrais continuer longuement à expliquer les raisons de notre satisfaction, mais je préfère à ce stade, remercier les artisans de cet accord que –je dois l'avouer– à un certain moment, je n'ai pas cru possible.

Je remercie d'abord la commissaire Georgieva, dont nous regrettons tous le départ, pour la qualité de son projet de budget et l'intelligence de la lettre rectificative n° 1, qui constitue, en réalité, la vraie base de cet accord.

Remerciements à la délégation du Parlement européen et en particulier aux deux rapporteurs, MM. Geier et Tarand, qui, en symbiose avec le président Arthuis, ont fait preuve d'une rare ténacité et d'une grande efficacité.

Et enfin remerciements à la Présidence slovaque, qui, après un démarrage que j'ai trouvé laborieux et qui a même provoqué ma colère, a réussi à se hisser au niveau requis pour finaliser cet accord. Je la remercie, et je l'en félicite.

Bref, en un mot, je salue l'efficacité de tous ceux qui sont restés autour de la table et qui ont réussi finalement à aboutir au résultat que je soutiens aujourd'hui avec l'ensemble de mon groupe.

Liadh Ní Riada, *thar ceann an Ghrúpa GUE/NGL*. – Go raibh maith agat, a Chathaoirligh. Ba mhaith liom mo bhuíochas a ghabháil leis an dá rapóirtéir, an tUasal Tarand agus an tUasal Geier, as an obair fhónta atá déanta acu.

Tá an-díomá orm, caithfidh mé a rá, faoin gcomhaontú maidir le comhréitigh Bhuiséad an Aontais Eorpaigh 2017. Tá rialtais Bhallstáit an Aontais Eorpaigh tar éis faillí a dhéanamh ar na daoine – iad siúd atá i gcruachás, an ghéarchéim dhaonnúil agus caighdeáin shóisialta níos lú ná riamh. Agus is í an teachtaireacht atá ag teacht ón gComhairle ná Buiséad 2017 a chur chun tosaigh, cé gurb é sin an buiséad is ísle i dtaobh an tsealbhairthe íocaíochtaí le blianta fada.

Bhí réiteach eile le haimsiú. Bhí bealach eile atá féaráilte le haimsiú. Ach is easpa tola atá léirithe arís agus arís eile.

Cuirim i gcuimhne don gComhairle agus don gCoimisiún an fhreagracht a dúirt siad a bhí ar intinn acu chun an easpa comhionannais idir na tíortha agus Ballstáit a ísliú. Níl go leor infheistíochta san Eoraip; tá seirbhísí pobail ag fulaingt agus is iad an pobal a bhíonn i gcruachás dá bharr. Cá bhfuil an tiomantas agus an gealltanais a léirigh an Chomhairle i dtaobh fostaíocht a chruthú? Cá bhfuil an gealltanais i dtaobh ár ndaoine óga? Cá bhfuil an gealltanais i dtaobh tacú lenár SMEs? Tá an oiread sin dúshláin mar phráinn ag bagairt orainn agus tá an t-am tar éis sleamhnú chun déileáil leis seo go réadúil.

Táimse ag rá leat go mbeidh praghas i bhfad níos mó le híoc againn sa toadhchá, de bharr an easpa físe agus an easpa tola agus gan treoir éifeachtach agus treoir pholaitiúil a bheith ann ar son na ndaoine. Tá ár bhfeirmeoirí, ár n-iascairí, ár n-aeráid, ár dtodhchá ag brath ar an infheistíocht seo. Agus táim ag glaoch oraibhse anois seasamh le chéile agus seasamh dlúthpháirtíochta a thógaint ar son mhuintir na hEorpa uile.

Ernest Maragall, *en nombre del Grupo Verts/ALE*. – Señor Presidente, señora Georgieva, desde luego muchas gracias y todas mis felicitaciones, también a los ponentes y a todo el equipo del Comité. Desde luego es un presupuesto elaborado, trabajado con empeño, con sudor —digamos— y con un resultado indiscutible. Pero déjeme decir enseguida que la regla de los dos años a la que se refería el señor Arthuis, de que no tocaba este año llegar a un acuerdo, la hemos roto a un precio, al precio de aceptar un resultado desde luego lejano del planteamiento inicial de este Parlamento y lejano, sobre todo, de la conveniencia o la necesidad de la Unión Europea en su conjunto.

Puede decirse que la política es el arte de conseguir lo posible. De acuerdo. Y seguramente aquí tenemos el máximo posible, en el sentido de que el límite de este «posible» lo marca el Consejo, y lo marca con toda claridad y contundencia —«resources available», como decía la señora Georgieva—. No nos pidan como Parlamento que aceptemos esta lógica, porque si este Parlamento acepta esta lógica, está aceptando ser simplemente cámara de resonancia de decisiones que ya están tomadas por anticipado.

El problema no es para este Parlamento o para mi Grupo; es para la Unión Europea, para los compromisos que hemos tomado como Unión Europea en relación con el cambio climático, la Estrategia Europa 2020, los objetivos de desarrollo sostenible. Todos estos compromisos no se están respetando con este presupuesto.

Los 200 millones aparecidos en el último minuto significan lo que significan para las respectivas partidas —para Horizonte 2020, para COSME, para el Mecanismo «Conectar Europa», para Erasmus—. Hablen ustedes, como yo he hecho esta misma mañana, con el señor Bourguignon, del Consejo Europeo de Investigación, y verán lo que significa en resultado real, en valor real presupuestario.

Lo mismo sucede con los 500 millones de la Iniciativa de Empleo Juvenil que aparecerán —decimos— a lo largo del año, lejos, lejísimos de la continuidad mínima que nos marcaría 6 000 millones para los cuatro años o 1 500 para cada uno de ellos.

Y si a eso le añadimos la cuestión del Código de Conducta, que nos recordaba el señor Tarand, la conclusión es clara: estamos perdiendo también la batalla de la credibilidad, la batalla de la imagen y el respeto. Cuando protegemos actuaciones discutibles de exmiembros de la Comisión, estamos perjudicando en la misma proporción nuestra propia credibilidad institucional.

Last but not least, tenemos presupuesto, pero no tenemos MFP. Vamos a discutirlo en pocos minutos.

Nuestro Grupo ha compartido el esfuerzo y les ha acompañado hasta aquí. No podremos acompañarles, desde luego, en el voto final.

Jonathan Arnott, *on behalf of the EFDD Group*. – Mr President, when we come to this point in the year, I sometimes wonder why we don't just replay a recording of last year's budget debates rather than repeat the entire performance. Because it is the same thing that happens over and over again.

As it's Christmas, let's compare this to an annual pantomime. The Committee on Budgets, the Commission, the Parliament – well we all vote, don't we, for more EU, more spending, more taxpayers' money being thrown at this project? Then along comes UKIP and our colleagues in the EFDD – the Five Star Movement and others – and we suggest saving the taxpayer billions of euros. We show how it can be done, we show costs that can be cut and we show victimless cuts, saving money for ordinary people. Well, that makes us the pantomime villain. So you lot all boo. Oh yes you do. And Labour and Conservatives vote against whatever we come up with, and that sometimes shows how much they seem to care about saving money for ordinary people. And then the Council comes and proposes a smaller budget increase, and we have the 'will they, won't they?' moment where the audience wonders if a compromise can be reached. So we go into the early hours of the morning almost every year, wondering whether they can find a new trick to find more taxpayers' money without actually breaching the budget ceilings. And, after nail-biting tension, the audience on the edge of their seats, a compromise is always reached, the day is saved and everybody lives happily ever after – everybody, of course, except the general public, who have to pay for all of it despite, in the UK's case, having voted for Brexit. Never mind a 3.3% backdated pay increase for EU Commission officials that went through the Committee on Budgets last time, never mind draft amending budget No 5, which means that the UK will have to fire off another EUR 700 million cheque off to Brussels, and never mind the repeated Court of Auditors reports. You know what? I sometimes don't know whether this is a pantomime or a Kafkaesque farce. Well, the British people voted for Brexit and we're going to write the last chapter, we're going to play the final act and we're going to lower the curtain on this tragedy.

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

Doru-Claudian Frunzulică (S&D), *blue-card question*. – Mr Arnott, as you mentioned, the United Kingdom is going to leave the European Union. Why do you care so much about the European Union budget? Leave us, the countries that remain, to take care of the European Union budget.

Jonathan Arnott (EFDD), *blue-card answer*. – Well that is exactly what we want to do. Of course we want to leave the European Union, but right at this moment we're still here, and we're still paying into that budget. Everything that we vote for, for 2017, is money that the United Kingdom, as things stand at the moment, will have to pay into that budget, so of course I care about the British taxpayer having to pay into this place.

Auke Zijlstra, *namens de ENF-Fractie*. – Voorzitter, vandaag maakte de OESO trots bekend dat de belastingen nog nooit zo hoog zijn geweest en Brussel doet daar lekker aan mee. Het budget is dan ook een lange opsomming van kostbare mislukte dromen, miljarden voor zogenaamde vluchtelingen, miljarden voor een doodgeslagen economie en miljarden voor EU-propaganda.

In tegenstelling tot de sociaaldemocraten daarginds vind ik het een grote schande dat het budget voor de Palestijnen ook weer 10 procent omhoog gaat. Dat zijn namelijk diezelfde Palestijnen die op alle mogelijke manieren joden proberen te vermoorden. We gaan meer dan 300 miljoen per jaar geven aan de terroristen die raketten afvuren, bomaanslagen plegen en tegenwoordig bossen in brand steken.

En Brussel blijft maar volhouden dat dit allemaal beginnetjes voor vredesonderhandelingen zijn. Brussel, moreel failliet, wat kun je er anders nog van maken? Voorzitter, het moge dan ook duidelijk zijn dat mijn partij tegen dit budget zal stemmen.

(De spreker gaat in op een "blauwe kaart"-vraag (artikel 162, lid 8, van het Reglement))

Maria Grapini (S&D), *Întrebare adresată conform procedurii „cartonașului albastru”*. – Mulțumesc, domnule președinte. Stimată coleg, între altele, ați spus că impozitele sunt prea mari și că de vină este Bruxelles-ul. Vreau să vă întreb: știți cine are atribuții în domeniul fiscalității, stabilirea taxelor și impozitelor în statele membre?

Auke Zijlstra (ENF), *“blauwe kaart”-antwoord*. – Dank u wel voor de vraag. Het punt dat hier gemaakt is, is natuurlijk dat dit Europees Parlement zelf een Begrotingscommissie heeft en in die Begrotingscommissie is, nadat ik daarover amendementen heb ingediend, besloten dat er geen enkele uitgave is die ook maar een beetje naar beneden kan. Alles wat dit Parlement doet en alles wat Europa uitgeeft, is allemaal welbested. In geen enkel Europees land, in geen enkel land in de wereld is er ooit een budget dat helemaal perfect is, maar deze Begrotingscommissie vindt van wel. En dat is de bron van alle overschrijdingen op de begroting.

Paul Rübzig (PPE). – Herr Präsident! Um auf den Vorredner zurückzukommen: Natürlich haben der Rat und die Staats- und Regierungschefs beschlossen, diesen siebenjährigen Rahmen gegenüber dem letzten Rahmen um 4 % zu kürzen, und wir sparen pro Jahr 1 % der Dienstposten ein. Ich möchte wissen, welcher Mitgliedstaat genauso effizient ist wie die Europäische Union. Wir haben mit 40 000 Mitarbeitern das geringste Budget von allen politischen Ebenen, und ich wage zu behaupten, dass wir das effizienteste Budget haben.

Noch dazu haben wir in einer sehr demokratischen, und zwar basisdemokratischen, Art und Weise diesen Haushalt 2017 beschlossen. Ich möchte mich insbesondere bei der slowakischen Präsidentschaft bedanken. Herr Lesay hat diese Verhandlungen sehr umsichtig geführt. Ich glaube, dass zum Schluss eigentlich die wesentlichen Punkte, auf die es in der Europäischen Union ankommt, optimal umgesetzt wurden. Ich glaube, dass auch unsere Kommissarin Kristalina Georgieva – ich möchte mich sehr herzlich bei ihr bedanken – die Verhandlungen selbst um vier Uhr in der Früh noch mit voller Dynamik, mit vollem Einsatz und mit ihrem ganzen Charisma zu einem positiven Ende geführt hat. Wir sehen auch, dass die soziale Einstellung hier voll vorhanden war, zum Beispiel bei den Special Olympics, wo wir mit sechs Millionen wirklich den Ärmsten der Armen in der Europäischen Union geholfen haben, die Spiele hier vorbereiten zu können. Unser Abgeordneter Becker hat sich sehr gefreut, dass diese Initiative umgesetzt wurde. Wir haben Initiativen für den Arbeitsmarkt umgesetzt. Und meine lieben Freunde von der UKIP: Wir haben genügend Arbeitslose in vielen Ländern. Insbesondere die Europäische Union ist hier aufgefordert, wenn es Mitgliedstaaten nicht schaffen, die Arbeitslosigkeit zu beseitigen, hier neue Initiativen zu ergreifen, und mit EURES, mit Progress haben wir es geschafft, hier sehr weit voranzukommen. Mit COSME unterstützen wir die Selbstständigen und die kleinen und mittleren Betriebe mit über 50 zusätzlichen Milliarden, das *European Research Council* – das Vorzeigeprojekt weltweit – hat mehr Geld bekommen, um junge aktive Wissenschaftler zu unterstützen. Die *Connecting Europe Facility*, die diesen Binnenmarkt ermöglicht, haben wir auch umgesetzt.

Danke, danke, danke – ich bin stolz auf dieses Europa!

Victor Negrescu (S&D). – În primul rând, vreau să-i felicit pe raportori pentru munca depusă în obținerea acestui buget, care vine să schimbe, cel puțin parțial, logica austerității. Avem nevoie să lucrăm împreună pentru a rezolva multe din problemele cetățenilor europeni și să finanțăm acțiunile noastre la nivelul ambițiilor și așteptărilor celor pe care-i reprezentăm. Spre exemplu, sprijinirea tinerilor și combaterea șomajului. După lungi negocieri și multe apeluri ale noastre ca europarlamentari, iată că am obținut 500 de milioane de euro pentru inițiativa privind ocuparea forței de muncă în rândul tinerilor. În aceeași măsură, acest buget reduce 200 de milioane de euro pentru programele importante ale Uniunii Europene, Erasmus +, COSME, Orizont 2020 sau Connecting Europe Facility. Mi-aș dori ca acest tip de subiecte, referindu-mă aici, în mod special, la sprijinirea tinerilor, să nu mai devină o polemică între noi și între instituții. Avem nevoie de soluții concrete finanțabile la nivel european, pe măsura provocărilor cu care avem de-a face. Cel mai important în construcția bugetară este să nu uităm menirea sa. Noi, cei din familia social-democrată europeană și, în mod special, cei din Partidul Social-Democrat, gândim că cel mai important este să investim în oameni, lucru care este vizibil inclusiv în programul nostru de guvernare.

Nu în ultimul rând, mă bucur că acest buget confirmă aprobarea a două inițiative pe care le-am propus, în valoare totală de 3 milioane de euro, ce vor sprijini industria și sectorul digital la nivel european și, în mod special, în țara mea, România. Împreună putem face foarte multe, dar pentru asta trebuie să ieșim din retorica tehnocrată, corelând bugetul cu nevoile reale ale cetățenilor. Și, în acest sens, vreau să mulțumesc pentru aprobarea acestui buget.

Richard Ashworth (ECR). – Mr President, this budget responds to the migration, security and agricultural crises in a manner that is both timely and appropriate, and that is welcome, but I wish to express one reservation. Whilst I share my colleagues' concerns about youth unemployment, I am not convinced of the value of the Youth Employment Initiative. In common with the views of the European Court of Auditors, I too have seen plenty of similar schemes which actually deliver very little by way of value for money. Surely the two things that young people need most is, firstly, a quality education and training system, and, secondly, a strong, growing economy that creates job opportunities for all. Finally, may I finish with a word to Vice-President Georgieva. Commissioner, you have achieved a huge amount. Through your formidable skills you have transformed the budget, and you leave behind you a legacy which is huge and valuable. For that, we offer you our thanks, and we wish you well in your new job at the World Bank.

Nils Torvalds (ALDE). – Mr President, I would like to focus on two concepts, two terms central to any budgetary process. The first is the word ‘trust’. When we struggled with the first version of the EFSI Fund, one of the central themes was the willingness on the Commission side to take money out of the parliamentary budget. That was, of course, very hard for us to accept. During that process, Vice-President Georgieva showed that she understood our difficulties, and she did something which is probably unique in the relationship between the Commission and the Parliament: she built a fund of trust. When in this budget we were able to repair some of the ills created by the first round of EFSI, I think we established a trustful cooperation between the Vice-President and Parliament. We are going to miss her very much, particularly in the next round.

The second question is balance. There is an old saying: ‘No taxation without representation’. That was the golden rule when the monarchies were broken and their power was broken. Now we are going to see the same issues. The more subtle the budget becomes, the bigger the question of ‘No taxation without representation’ will be before us. I am deeply worried about the prospects for future deals in this House.

Xabier Benito Ziluaga (GUE/NGL). – Señor Presidente; señora Comisaria y señor representante del Consejo: 6,4 %, ese es el recorte en pagos acordado este año para este presupuesto. Se ha acordado uno de los presupuestos más austeros que se conoce en mucho tiempo. Se recorta en fondos de cohesión social y territorial; se recorta en salud y derechos e igualdad.

¿Y en qué se refuerza? Pues, por ejemplo, en el fondo fiduciario de Turquía, nuestro antidemocrático guardián de fronteras. También, el fondo de seguridad interna casi se duplica. Securizar; para eso sí hay fondos, pero para los objetivos de cambio climático, por ejemplo, no hay suficientes.

El 24 % de las personas que viven en Europa viven en riesgo de pobreza. ¿Y qué se les ocurre a los señores del Partido Popular? Repartir billetes de Interrail para todos los jóvenes. Muy útil. Los jóvenes hoy en día viajan para buscar trabajo.

Ustedes están rompiendo Europa. Son los que generan una Unión Europea de corruptos, con tratados antidemocráticos y con respuestas insuficientes a los problemas sociales de la gente. Europa necesita respuestas democráticas y Europa necesita cambios para los problemas de la gente.

Mara Bizzotto (ENF). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, l’Unione europea butta via miliardi di euro per gli immigrati falsi profughi e abbandona nella disoccupazione e nella povertà i cittadini italiani, spagnoli, greci, francesi. In Italia quasi un giovane su due è disoccupato, e uno su dieci vive in povertà assoluta. In Italia ci sono più di tre milioni di disoccupati, oltre quattro milioni e mezzo di cittadini poveri che non riescono nemmeno a mettere assieme il pranzo con la cena. La drammatica verità è che le nostre imprese chiudono: i nostri giovani sono i nuovi poveri, costretti ad emigrare, per lavorare, per sopravvivere! E cosa fa l’Unione europea nel suo bilancio? Stanzia soldi per mantenere 177 000 clandestini in Italia, mantenuti in hotel con colazione, pranzo e cena gratis, grazie al governo Renzi. E, non contenta, regala 6 miliardi di euro all’Islamica Turchia, piegandosi ai ricatti del dittatore Erdogan. Capite? Capite allora, perché i cittadini vogliono scappare da questa gabbia di matti che è l’Unione sovietica europea?

José Manuel Fernandes (PPE). – Senhor Presidente, caras e caros colegas, em primeiro lugar permitam-me que dê uma palavra para a Comissária. Fez novamente um excelente trabalho! Nós temos que lhe dizer obrigado pelo seu empenho, obrigado pela sua competência, pela qualidade que demonstrou. Colocou a fasquia tão alto que quem vier tomar a sua pasta vai ter dificuldades. Nós, no entanto, cá estaremos para ajudar.

Foi muito graças a si e ao seu empenho, às suas propostas e, nomeadamente, à proposta do orçamento, mas depois também à carta retificativa n.º 1, assim como às negociações, que conseguimos este acordo. Parabéns também à presidência do Conselho pela perseverança e também pela competência e um obrigado aos relatores Geier e Tarand pelo compromisso a que aqui chegámos.

A prioridade do orçamento é clara: é a juventude. Por isso reforçamos o Erasmus+, a iniciativa emprego jovem, mas uma juventude também precisa de uma economia que cresça e daí o reforço da competitividade da União Europeia em programas como a investigação, como a inovação e também ainda, para além do reforço Erasmus+, o reforço do COSME para as pequenas e médias empresas.

Para além disso, a este orçamento, que classificamos de positivo porque também responde à segurança na União Europeia e é solidário para com os refugiados, falta agora uma segunda parte para que seja perfeito: é que a ligação que ele tem à revisão do quadro financeiro plurianual seja efetiva. Os 500 milhões de euros que damos para a juventude neste orçamento devem ter consequências na revisão do quadro financeiro plurianual.

Os pagamentos que são necessários no orçamento têm de ter consequências em termos dessa revisão e precisamos de flexibilidade. Por isso, apelo ao Conselho para que haja uma verdadeira revisão do quadro financeiro plurianual para ajudarmos o próprio Conselho a assumir os compromissos e a concretizá-los, compromissos assumidos com os cidadãos da União Europeia.

Jean-Paul Denanot (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, en tant que rapporteur fictif pour les autres sections, au nom de mon groupe des socialistes et démocrates, je suis heureux que nous soyons arrivés à des résultats qui sont en conformité avec les réalités du moment, notamment sur la question du soutien des moyens du Parlement européen pour qu'il reste un lieu de démocratie, sur la question des ajustements qui sont liés à la sécurité et sur la question des mesures contribuant à réduire l'empreinte écologique liée à notre activité parlementaire. Je m'en félicite.

Mais, en tant que membre de la commission du budget, je souhaite faire également quelques observations sur le budget 2017 dans sa globalité. Je suis heureux de constater un vrai soutien au programme COSME, comme cela a été dit par plusieurs intervenants, en faveur des PME, au programme Horizon 2020, qui sanctuarise la recherche fondamentale européenne, à l'initiative pour l'emploi des jeunes, bien entendu. Je suis également heureux de constater que, pour la première fois, la quasi-totalité des instruments de flexibilité a été utilisée.

Mais je suis inquiet aussi de l'insuffisance globale du budget européen qui ne peut répondre aux immenses besoins auxquels l'Union européenne a à faire face, notamment en matière d'investissements. D'ailleurs, l'Union européenne se serait bien passée de ces 1,8 milliard d'euros en moins liés au change après le Brexit.

J'appelle clairement à une réorganisation budgétaire, dans laquelle le Parlement européen aurait enfin le pouvoir de voter les recettes, et pas seulement les dépenses, d'ailleurs de moitié avec le Conseil.

La politique reste le dernier refuge des aventuriers, répétait Wolinski. Il est désormais plus que temps que les États membres soient ces aventuriers. Le Parlement européen les appuiera.

Zbigniew Kuźmiuk (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! Pani Komisarz! Zabierając głos w tej debacie, chcę podkreślić wagę kompromisu zawartego przez Parlament i Radę, w wyniku którego kwota zobowiązań wynosi prawie 158 mld, a kwota płatności blisko 135 mld.

Na podkreślenie zasługuje próba odbudowy środków na programy „Horyzont 2020” i „Łącząc Europę” – wcześniej zmniejszonych w związku z finansowaniem tzw. planu Junckera – przekazanie dodatkowych środków na programy Erasmus+ i COSME czy też dodatkowe środki na programy zatrudnienia ludzi młodych, a także dodatkowe środki na interwencję na rynkach rolnych. Na szczególne podkreślenie zasługuje powiększenie środków w dziale trzecim i czwartym, co daje szansę wzmocnienia działań Unii poza jej granicami w celu wyeliminowania przyczyn migracji w krajach pochodzenia i tranzytu.

Może jednak niepokoić niski poziom środków na płatności dotyczący polityki spójności – zaledwie 37 mld euro, bo przecież rok 2017 będzie czwartym rokiem realizacji ram finansowych na lata 2014-2020. A to w praktyce będzie oznaczać większy niż do tej pory spływ rachunków do zapłaćenia.

Jan Olbrycht (PPE). Panie Przewodniczący! Pani Komisarz! Przede wszystkim chciałbym pogratulować i podziękować naszym sprawozdawcom, ale również prezydencji słowackiej, która wykazała się dużą otwartością, i Pani Komisarz, dzięki której – trzeba powiedzieć bardzo wyraźnie – nie opuściliśmy sali w czasie negocjacji. Bo to chyba tylko dzięki Pani determinacji postanowiliśmy zostać.

Myszę, że to jest dowód na głęboką wiarę w to, że rzeczywiście dzisiaj budżet jest potrzebny. Ten budżet pozwala wykazać, że uniknęliśmy czegoś, co zdarzało się w poprzednich latach – mianowicie bardzo dużych napięć, atmosfery konfliktu. W gruncie rzeczy doszliśmy do porozumienia i na tej sali widać, że generalnie strony są zadowolone. Wydaje mi się, że to jest bardzo ważny sygnał, w szczególności dzisiaj w Europie, że pokazujemy, że jesteśmy skłonni do kompromisu.

Po drugie, ten budżet wprowadza pewne elementy elastyczności, o których dyskutujemy przy wieloletniej perspektywie. I to jest niezwykle ważne, że ten budżet pozwala na uruchomienie pewnych mechanizmów w roku 2017 i otwiera pewne możliwości w latach następnych. To jest niezwykle ważne, że my, pracując nad budżetem 2017, *de facto* pracowaliśmy nad resztą perspektywy finansowej do roku 2020. Chciałem za to wszystkim Państwu bardzo serdecznie podziękować.

Daniele Viotti (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, il primo ringraziamento va alla Commissaria Georgieva, un ringraziamento per questi tre anni di accompagnamento di lavoro sul bilancio. Il secondo ringraziamento va alla Commissaria Georgieva, ma anche ai relatori Gahler e Tarand, per il lavoro buono fatto quest'anno sul bilancio. Un bilancio che ci soddisfa naturalmente, ma che io, come è stato detto, per le cose che state dette, che voglio considerare come un inizio, un inizio di un percorso e probabilmente – perché no? – magari, di una svolta. Noi abbiamo bisogno di un bilancio e di un quadro finanziario pluriennale, come è stato detto, più moderni, adeguati ai tempi che viviamo, alle difficoltà e alle sfide che stiamo vivendo. Un quadro finanziario pluriennale, un bilancio che siano più flessibili e che siano più sostanziosi anche, naturalmente, che abbiano più sostanza al loro interno.

Diciamo spesso che dobbiamo fare delle politiche per combattere i populismi che crescono e che nascono in Europa. A me non interessa questo. Io penso che l'Europa abbia un alto dovere: abbia il dovere di fare delle politiche per rispondere ai cittadini, alle richieste che i cittadini fanno all'Europa riguardo al lavoro, soprattutto i giovani, riguardo all'ambiente, riguardo ai temi dell'immigrazione che riguarda sia i migranti, ma riguarda anche i paesi e città e le comunità che accolgono i migranti che sono in grandi difficoltà. E poi sull'ambiente, il lavoro sulle imprese, abbiamo bisogno di puntare su questo e per ottenere questi risultati, per lavorare su queste materie, noi abbiamo bisogno di tornare a investire, abbiamo bisogno di avere un'Europa che torna a investire. Per questo io mi associo anche all'appello che faceva il collega Fernandes al Consiglio, rispetto al quadro finanziario pluriennale. Abbiamo bisogno ed è l'ultima cosa che dico Presidente, chiedendo scusa per il tempo rubato, abbiamo bisogno di riprovare a rispondere a un sogno, che i cittadini hanno: quello di un'Europa che torna a pensare ai cittadini e non soltanto più all'austerità.

Ingeborg Gräßle (PPE). – Herr Präsident! Frau Vizepräsidentin, Herr Ratspräsident, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Zum Ergebnis kann man eigentlich nur gratulieren. Man muss postmodern sagen: Der Weg ist das Ziel. Also Ihr habt es geschafft, zusammen zu gehen, und das ist ein großer Erfolg, weil wir ja alle wissen, wie schwer dies gerade heutzutage geworden ist. Deswegen meine ausdrückliche Anerkennung an alle Beteiligten – das haben sie toll gemacht! Vielleicht kann man ja daraus lernen.

Zum einen, finde ich es richtig, dass wir es nicht an den MFF geknüpft haben, weil dies, geheißen hätte, dass wir heute hier nicht stehen würden. Deswegen muss man sich meiner Ansicht nach genau überlegen, ob man das Ei im Küchschrank haben will oder das Omelett auf dem Teller. Für uns bedeutet es natürlich, dass wir umso mehr jetzt bei dem MFF, wo wir ja Ergebnisse erzielen müssen, in Sachen Flexibilität darauf angewiesen sind, dass die Wohlmeinenden auch einlenken. Es gibt viele gute Argumente, beim MFF zusammenzuhalten und nochmal zusammenzurücken, deswegen mein Appell.

Ich möchte auch daran appellieren, dass Solidarität keine Einbahnstraße ist. Wir brauchen in den Ländern, die Solidarität für sich reklamieren, mehr Verständnis dafür, dass Solidarität auch in Sachen Flüchtlinge gilt. Wir können nicht damit leben, dass die einen für die Flüchtlinge sorgen und die anderen nicht. Das wird einen großen Keil in die Europäische Union treiben. Deswegen kann ich nur sagen: Hier müssen sich die Nehmerländer viel mehr bewegen, als sie es bis jetzt tun, sonst halten wir diese Europäische Union nicht mehr zusammen.

Ein weiterer Appell an die Kollegen im Haushaltsausschuss, von Seiten der Haushaltskontrolle: Wenn wir zusammen arbeiten, und zwar noch besser, als wir es heute tun, dann können wir zusammen große Dinge erreichen. Deswegen glaube ich, ist heute ein guter Tag für die Europäische Union, nicht der letzte gute, aber einer von zahlreichen guten. Ich glaube, dass wir es den Antieuropäern, den „Antis“, gezeigt haben. Und wir brauchen die Antieuropäer nicht, um gemeinsam voranzukommen. Wir werden zeigen, dass wir gemeinsam stärker sind als jeder für sich allein. Danke.

(Die Rednerin ist damit einverstanden, eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“ gemäß Artikel 162 Absatz 8 der Geschäftsordnung zu beantworten.)

Paul Rübиг (PPE), *Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“*. – Herr Präsident Tajani! Recht herzlichen Dank. Ich hätte an Ingeborg Gräßle eine Frage. Solidarität ist ja etwas, was tagtäglich gelebt werden muss. Die Europäische Union hat hier in der Flüchtlingskrise viele Vorschläge unterbreitet. Wir haben jetzt das Problem, dass die Mitgliedstaaten sich hier bei der Solidarität nicht einigen können. Was könnte die Europäische Union Ihrer Ansicht nach noch tun, damit es zu einer Einigung zwischen den Mitgliedstaaten kommen kann?

Ingeborg Gräßle (PPE), *Antwort auf eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“*. – Das Zauberwort ist natürlich „Geld“. Wir müssen diejenigen, die mehr tun, belohnen, und denjenigen, die weniger tun, müssen wir Gelder wegnehmen. Ich habe selber ja drei Änderungsanträge eingereicht für den Haushalt, die noch abgelehnt wurden, dass nämlich diejenigen, die dem europäischen Recht nicht folgen – und es ist europäisches Recht – es auch spüren sollen, wenn es darum geht, wie viel Geld sie bekommen. Ich glaube, das ist der Weg in die Zukunft. Und Geld nicht zu bekommen, ist ja eine Sprache, die auch ohne Dolmetscher verstanden wird.

Андрей Новаков (PPE). – Г-н Председател, г-жо Вицепрезидент, да бъдем честни и открити пред нас и пред нашите избиратели! Наред с общите ценности, които споделяме, наред с вярата, която ни държи заедно – това, което държи този Съюз заедно още, е бюджетът и общата валута.

Ето защо това не е просто поредният бюджет, а това е бъдещето на Европа, разписано в цифри. И в тези турбулентни и буреносни времена постигнахме много: имаме половин милиард повече за нови работни места за младите хора, имаме 200 милиона повече за студентска мобилност, за подкрепа на малък и среден бизнес и за ключови инфраструктурни проекти. Наред с всички позитиви, трябва да си кажем обаче, че имаме и проблеми. Не може ДДС измамите да заемат такива колосални размери. И стъпка към решаване на този проблем са истински собствени приходи и единна ДДС система. Трябва ни и единна инвестиционна платформа – защо не и в сферата на туризма.

Накрая, но не на последно място – сигурен съм, г-жо Георгиева, че оставяте едно добро наследство на следващия комисар. Поздравявам Ви за работата!

Patricija Šulin (PPE). – Hvala obema poročevalcema, vsem sodelujočim v spravnem postopku, da imamo pred seboj ambiciozen proračun Evropske unije za leto 2017.

V njem je po zaslugi Evropskega parlamenta na voljo več sredstev za strateške postavke, za zaposlovanje, mala in srednja podjetja, prometno infrastrukturo, raziskave, inovacije, Erasmus in za našo varnost.

V današnjem paketu je tudi 50 milijonov evrov, s katerimi se zagotavljajo proračunska sredstva za predplačila v primeru nesreč iz solidarnostnega sklada.

Solidarnostni sklad Evropske unije je več kot le finančna podpora, je tudi politično sporočilo o solidarnosti, prizadetim državljanom pa ponuja potrebno pomoč.

Hitro odzivanje, tudi v znaprejšnjimi izplačili, bo Uniji pomagalo pri uresničevanju teh ciljev.

Gospe komisarki Georgievi želim uspešno nadaljevanje njene poklicne poti. V čast mi je bilo sodelovati z njo.

Interventi su richiesta

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – Pane předsedající, rozpočet nikdy nebyl a nebude takový, aby uspokojil všechna přání, všechny potřeby, ale musíme sledovat priority. Jestliže Evropa čelí tak zásadním výzvám, jako je bezpečnost a jako je soudržnost, pak musíme sledovat priority posílení vnitřní a vnější bezpečnosti a já jsem velmi ráda, že rozpočet na rok 2017 navyšuje kapacity jak personální, tak technické právě na bezpečnostní agentury. Pokud se týká budování soudržnosti v rámci Evropské unie, pak musíme myslet na mládež, na jejich vzdělání, na jejich zaměstnanost a uplatnění. Proto je důležité, aby fungoval efektivně a dostatečně finančně byl zajištěn program Erasmus plus, Kreativní Evropa, Evropa pro občany, Evropská dobrovolnická služba. To jsou ty programy, které budují a posilují evropskou identitu. Také chci poděkovat paní komisařce za její práci a popřát jí hodně úspěchů. A požádat, aby na Evropskou unii, na náš rozpočet nezapomínala.

Nicola Caputo (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, in questo bilancio, finalmente si intravedono timidi stimoli per favorire la crescita, per far fronte alla crisi migratoria e per rafforzare le politiche giovanili. Rispetto al 2016 è importante sottolineare l'aumento degli impegni per l'immigrazione, la sicurezza, per l'11,3%, per circa 5,9 miliardi di euro. Apprezzo particolarmente che l'accordo abbia recepito le richieste del Parlamento europeo per quanto riguarda il finanziamento aggiuntivo di 700 milioni, dei programmi Erasmus, Orizzonte 2020 e iniziativa giovani. Si registrano dunque miglioramenti nella distribuzione della spesa, che vanno nella giusta direzione, ma che non sono ancora sufficienti. Mi rammarico, in particolare per la riduzione degli impegni a favore dei paesi mediterranei e per il rinvio, per mancanza di base giuridica, del finanziamento del Fondo europeo per lo sviluppo sostenibile di 250 milioni per affrontare le cause profonde dell'immigrazione. Apprezzo infine la previsione di misure di emergenza intese a sostenere gli agricoltori europei costretti a fare i conti con difficilissime situazioni di mercato.

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, κατ' αρχάς θα ήθελα να συγχαρώ την κυρία Georgïena για τον διορισμό της στη Διεθνή Τράπεζα και να της ευχηθώ κάθε επιτυχία στο έργο της. Κύριε Πρόεδρε, βρισκόμαστε στο ίδιο έργο θεατές για άλλη μια φορά, με έναν προϋπολογισμό ο οποίος είναι προϋπολογισμός λιτότητας, και με αυτό τον τρόπο δεν μπορεί να αντιμετωπιστεί ούτε η οικονομική κρίση ούτε η προσφυγική κρίση.

Διατίθενται 41 εκατομμύρια ευρώ για την απασχόληση, 115 εκατομμύρια ευρώ για άσυλο και μετανάστευση. Βεβαίως πρέπει να επισημάνουμε ότι διατίθενται και 530 εκατομμύρια ευρώ στον τομέα της ασφάλειας και της ιθαγένειας, όμως τα ποσά αυτά είναι ψιχουλα, ιδίως τα ποσά που διατίθενται για την αντιμετώπιση της ανεργίας, μια και η Ευρώπη μαστιζείται από στρατιές ανέργων, κυρίως ανέργων που ανήκουν στη νέα γενιά. Επίσης, τα ποσά που διατίθενται για την προσφυγική κρίση δεν επαρκούν. Η Ελλάδα έχει δαπανήσει μέχρι στιγμής 2,5 δισεκατομμύρια ευρώ για την αντιμετώπιση της προσφυγικής κρίσης. Χρειάζονται λοιπόν πολύ περισσότερα ποσά για να αντιμετωπίσουμε τα μεγάλα προβλήματα που έχει σήμερα η Ευρώπη.

Τάκης Χατζηγεωργίου (GUE/NGL). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, νομίζω ότι δικαιολογημένα μεγάλο κομμάτι της συζήτησης αφιερώθηκε στην ανεργία των νέων αλλά θα ήθελα να προσθέσω τα εξής: Υπάρχουν χώρες στις οποίες η ανεργία των νέων ξεκινά από το 20% και χτυπά πολλές φορές το 40%. Αυτό αποτελεί ουσιαστικά μια βόμβα στα θεμέλια της Δημοκρατίας, γιατί, αν οι νέοι δεν έχουν δουλειά, αποστασιοποιούνται και από το οικοδόμημα της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, αποστασιοποιούνται και από το τι εστί Δημοκρατία, γιατί τίποτε χειρότερο από το να αισθάνεται κανείς ότι δεν είναι μέρος της κοινωνίας.

Θέλω να κλείσω με το εξής: Πρέπει να υπάρξουν ριζικές ενέργειες για την αντιμετώπιση της ανεργίας των νέων, οι οποίοι έχουν τόνους γνώσεων, πολύ περισσότερων από το αν προσθέσουμε τις γνώσεις όλων ημών μέσα σε αυτή την αίθουσα, και χτυπούν την πόρτα μας για να βρουν δουλειά και ντρεπόμαστε να τους πούμε ότι έχουμε δυσκολία να αντιμετωπίσουμε αυτό το πρόβλημα. Πρέπει να είναι συνολική, ριζική η προσπάθεια της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης να αντιμετωπίσει αυτό το θέμα, γιατί αύριο θα αντιμετωπίσουμε τον θυμό, την πίκρα τους και ίσως την αντίδρασή τους.

Vladimír Maňka (S&D). – Pán štátny tajomník Lesaj, som naozaj hrdý na slovenské predsedníctvo a na efektívnosť, vecnosť a férovosť rokovaní. Súhlasím s Vami, že znížovanie počtu zamestnancov o 1 % po sebe 5 rokov je veľmi dôležité. Bude však veľmi potrebné preskúmať, ako toto krátenie splnilo cieľ, lebo niektoré inštitúcie, ktoré prepustili tľmočníkov, tak ich zamestnávajú externe, lebo ich naozaj potrebujú.

Desať rokov som sa zúčastňoval na záverečných rokovaníach o rozpočte Európskej únie, preto môžem porovnávať a hodnotiť. Pani komisárka, Vaša odbornosť, ťah na bránu, empatia a obrovský záujem urobiť pre obyvateľov Európskej únie všetko, čo je vo Vašich silách, nám bude naozaj veľmi chýbať. Držím Vám palce a ešte raz ďakujem.

PRESIDE: RAMÓN LUIS VALCÁRCEL SISO*Vicepresidente*

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Mulțumesc, domnule președinte. Știm cu toții că bugetul este întotdeauna dificil să-l negociezi și este greu să accepți atunci când propunerea ta nu este acceptată. Însă, să nu uităm, resursele sunt limitate și cerințele mari. Personal, vreau să vă mulțumesc dumneavoastră, doamnă vicepreședinte, doamnă comisar, care ați negociat excelent și, evident, și raportorii, pentru forma finală de buget, pe care, personal, am să o susțin. Sigur, eu sunt o susținătoare a IMM-urilor, sunt o susținătoare a tineretului. Evident că așa fi vrut aici mai mult. Însă am înțeles că nu se poate. Eu cred că acum este rolul Consiliului și al statelor membre să vadă cum cheltuie acești bani pe care i-am alocat pe capitole foarte importante. Și cred, de asemenea, că mai este important să vedem colectarea, a mai spus un coleg de-al meu. Doresc să mai adaug că este nevoie ca pentru următorul buget să ne gândim mult mai mult cum putem stimula investițiile în zonele sărace, să creștem coeziunea socială, să dedicăm investiții pentru turism, pentru că pentru Europa este, într-adevăr, o oportunitate pentru creșterea locurilor de muncă în rândul tineretului și, evident, să nu uităm de inovare și educație. Vă mulțumesc personal și vă doresc mult succes în noul loc de muncă pe care îl aveți și să nu uitați, poate ne puteți ajuta de acolo.

Doru-Claudian Frunzulică (S&D). – Mr President, I welcome the fact that the European Parliament managed to restore the Commission's initial proposal on all lines cut by the Council. Furthermore, the European Parliament delegation managed to ensure a big amount of fresh reinforcements for the key programmes, such as growth and jobs and the Youth Employment Initiative. I also find fundamental the allocation of additional EUR 500 million to tackle the crisis in the agricultural sector, to support dairy and livestock farmers, and the additional 5.91 billion to tackle the migration and refugee crisis and reinforce security. Finally, I support the decision taken in order to accommodate a big part of these reinforcements to mobilise the special instruments available under the current Multiannual Financial Framework 2014-2020 Regulation.

(Fin de las intervenciones con arreglo al procedimiento de solicitud incidental de uso de la palabra («catch the eye»))

Kristalina Georgieva, Vice-President of the Commission. – Mr President, this has been a very engaged session and I am very grateful for the comments that have been made. Let me respond to some of the points that honourable Members have raised.

First, there are indeed grounds for concern about the level of payments in the budget for 2017 and, more specifically, about the level of payments for cohesion policy. It is unfortunate but true that the new programmes – the programmes under the current Multiannual Financial Framework – have taken some time to start, with the result that in many of them we are registering delays in implementation. We have been working very hard with Member States to encourage the availability of authorising bodies that can then certify expenditures so we can speed up implementation. That would, of course, have a positive impact on payments. So it is definitely not because we do not have the capacity to provide these funds. It is objectively because of the slower pace of the implementation of the programmes. We are working with the Council – as Minister Lesay would confirm – to find ways to speed up that process.

Secondly, a number of speakers made comments about the new ways in which we tried to fund new priorities, more specifically the Turkey Facility trust funds. One of the comments very clearly stated 'No taxation without representation'. There has to be a role for Parliament. On the Commission side we agree, and we are thinking of ways in which we can make sure that, if there is a need to mobilise extra budgetary resources, it is done in a fair way so that Parliament can have a say without creating processes that may slow down implementation. That is a fair point, and the three institutions will have to reflect on it and address it.

Third, I am fully mindful of the fact that there are demands for money that we have not been able to meet within the parameters of this budget. It is therefore up to us in the Commission to follow up implementation very carefully. Should there be a reason for any programme to be slower than anticipated, we would do what we have done in previous years: relocate funds to a higher priority. In other words, what we have done with the budget up to now in this financial framework, gearing up for more agility and more flexibility, we will continue in 2017.

Finally, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to the Slovak Presidency for – indeed as many of you have recognised – being fair, engaged and determined, and to the budget negotiators, the Chair of the Committee on Budgets, the two rapporteurs and each and every one of you who stayed in the room until four o'clock in the morning so we could have a budget that, as you recognised, is a sound budget. It is a good budget and now we have to implement it. Well, thank you.

(Applause)

Ivan Lesay, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Mr President, thank you for this very useful exchange of views. It has shown that we are united in our commitment to making progress for the benefit of Europe and its citizens. This debate closes long and sometimes difficult discussions between the European Parliament and the Council over several months. However, they have shown that our respective institutions share many objectives and that our positions are not that far apart. This has been my impression all the time, and that is why we have been confident that we would be able to reach a deal. It proved not to be too easy but we were happy to do it in the first round, and here we are with the compromise.

As I said, the negotiations on the 2017 budget took place under complex circumstances. In spite of this, we worked together in a constructive manner and we were able to reconcile our positions on how to finance the different priorities and actions of the Union. I am convinced that the agreement reached on the 2017 budget is a good and balanced result, allowing the Union to act and react to the various needs. I thank everybody once again. Thank you very much for your attention, and I wish you success during tomorrow's vote.

Jean Arthuis, *Président de la commission BUDG*. – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Vice-présidente, Monsieur le Ministre, mes chers collègues, le débat que nous venons d'avoir montre que si notre budget 2017 est un pas dans la bonne direction, il reste un petit pas là où l'Europe aurait besoin de grandes enjambées, notamment pour l'investissement, pour la croissance, pour l'emploi, et pour le contrôle des flux migratoires aussi. Car, ne nous méprenons pas, d'autres crises sont en vue, d'autres urgences justifieront que l'on torture le budget pour essayer de lui faire faire ce que, bien souvent, il n'est pas en mesure d'accomplir.

Regardez combien de protubérances budgétaires se sont multipliées, combien de satellites viennent densifier la galaxie budgétaire européenne. Fonds Juncker pour les investissements stratégiques, facilité budgétaire pour la Turquie, «Trust Funds» par-ci, «Trusts Funds» par-là, et demain Fonds Juncker pour l'Afrique ou Fonds européen de défense. Autant d'entités périphériques qui échappent au contrôle parlementaire.

La créativité de la Commission européenne ne pourra pas cacher longtemps l'indigence du budget européen et ces pratiques budgétaires sont, pour l'Union, un danger. Elles mettent l'Union européenne en danger tout d'abord parce que la multiplication des satellites budgétaires complexifie la lecture d'un budget européen déjà trop distant des citoyens.

N'oublions pas, mes chers collègues, que la société est en droit de demander compte à tout agent public de son administration, c'est une exigence démocratique fondamentale.

Sans lisibilité budgétaire, nous risquons la déconnexion. L'Europe se fragilise lorsqu'elle se révèle incapable de parler directement aux citoyens européens.

Enfin, pareille contorsion budgétaire tend à accréditer des illusions et, malheureusement, des déceptions. Une Union sans budget, engagée sur tous les fronts, risque de donner en spectacle son impuissance. L'urgence est de convenir des compétences que les États membres sont prêts à transférer à l'Union, parce qu'ils n'ont plus la capacité, à l'heure de la mondialisation, de les assumer. Le budget devra alors être doté en conséquence, pour afficher notre ambition de faire de l'Europe une puissance mondiale. Au-delà de la révision à mi-parcours du cadre financier pluriannuel, objet du tout prochain débat, il est déjà temps de nous projeter dans l'après-2020.

Avant de conclure, je voudrais remercier la Présidence slovaque, celle d'Ecofin, mais aussi celle du Conseil «affaires générales», pour leur brillante et bienveillante efficacité.

El Presidente. – Se cierra el debate.

La votación tendrá lugar mañana.

Declaraciones por escrito (artículo 162 del Reglamento)

Birgit Collin-Langen (PPE), schriftlich. – Ich befürworte die Einigung über den Haushalt für das kommende Jahr. Besonders erfreulich ist, dass auf Drängen des Parlaments die Mittel für die Beschäftigungsinitiative für junge Menschen um 500 Millionen Euro erhöht werden. Damit bekämpfen wir ein großes gegenwärtiges Problem in der EU, die erschreckend hohe Jugendarbeitslosigkeit. Mit der Beschäftigungsinitiative helfen wir jungen Arbeitslosen ganz konkret dabei, einen Job zu finden. Jetzt müssen wir weiter die Mitgliedstaaten auffordern, dafür Sorge zu tragen, dass diese Gelder ohne große bürokratische Anforderungen dort ankommen, wo sie gebraucht werden. Ebenso wichtig finde ich, dass auch die für KMU anwendbaren Programme aufgestockt wurden.

Tamás Deutsch (PPE), írásban. – Kiemelt fontosságú, hogy a 2017-ben felgyorsuló regionális fejlesztési programok tagállami végrehajtásával lépést tudjon tartani az uniós költségvetés és megfelelő nagyságrendben rendelkezésre álljanak a kohéziós források. Az uniós költségvetésben megvannak a források arra, hogy az Európai Bizottság maradéktalanul kifizesse majd azokat a számlákat, amelyek a megvalósult tagállami projektek végrehajtása során keletkeznek. Sikerült azt is elérnünk, hogy a migrációs válság kezelésére mozgósított forrásokat ne más, már működő EU-s programok rovására vonják el. A kohéziós és agrárpénzeket nem lehet csökkenteni a migrációs krízis kezelésére szolgáló források meghatározásakor. A 2017. évi uniós költségvetés végül nem tartalmazza a kötelező befogadási kvótákat elutasító tagállamok megbüntetésére vonatkozó rendelkezéseket. A szocialisták és liberálisok egy olyan költségvetési mechanizmust javasoltak bevezetni, amely pénzbüntetéssel sújtaná azokat a tagállamokat, amelyek a kötelező betelepítési kvótarendszer ellenére nem fogadnak be illegális bevándorlókat az országukba. Ezt a támadást a 2017-es költségvetés elfogadása során sikerült elhárítani.

Lidia Joanna Geringer de Oedenberg (S&D), na piśmie. – Zgodnie z porozumieniem, jakie udało się osiągnąć z Radą, środki na pokrycie zobowiązań w 2017 r. powinny wynosić 157,86 mld EUR, a środki na pokrycie płatności 134,49 mld EUR. Cieszy mnie fakt, że udało nam się wywalczyć dodatkowe 500 milionów EUR na inicjatywę na rzecz zatrudnienia ludzi młodych (YEI), wspierającą ich w poszukiwaniu pracy i zdobywaniu doświadczenia, oraz kolejne 200 mln EUR na projekty skupione na zatrudnieniu i wzroście, takie jak COSME, konkurencyjność małych i średnich przedsiębiorstw, instrument „Łącząc Europę”, przeznaczony na fundowanie projektów infrastrukturalnych, na program „Horyzont 2020”, który wspiera projekty badawcze, oraz na program Erasmus+. Ponadto, pakiet wartości 725 mln EUR zostanie przeznaczony na wspieranie funduszy migracyjnych, w tym 28 mln EUR zostanie przeznaczonych na UNRWA pomagającą uchodźcom palestyńskim oraz 3 miliony EUR na wspieranie procesów pokojowych. To dobry rezultat długich i niełatwych negocjacji z Radą.

Theodor Dumitru Stoiloian (PPE), în scris. – Cele trei instituții, Parlamentul European, Consiliul și Comisia Europeană, au convenit bugetul pe anul 2017, în suma de 157,8 miliarde euro pentru angajări de cheltuieli și de 134,5 miliarde euro pentru plăți efective. Au fost prevăzute resurse suplimentare pentru crearea de locuri de muncă destinate tinerilor, finanțarea întreprinderilor mici și mijlocii, ca și pentru schimburile de studenți. Cu toate acestea, consider că există încă programe aprobate la nivel european care sunt încă subfinanțate. De exemplu, finanțările pentru imigranți sunt insuficiente atât în Europa pentru integrarea imigranților, cât și pentru reducerea fluxului de imigranți, prin acțiuni în afara Europei. Este important ca Uniunea Europeană să nu adopte practica unor state membre de a aproba programe, fără ca finanțarea din bugetele publice cerută de realizarea acestor programe să fie asigurată.

Jarosław Wałęsa (PPE), *in writing*. – I am very glad that we have finally a budget for next year. In fact, it is very important that the EU will increase its commitments in the field of ‘competitiveness for growth and jobs’. In particular, I welcome the additional EUR 50 million on Erasmus+ as this programme enables youth to arrange friendships with Europeans from other countries, especially as very often such relationships can last for whole lives. Furthermore, within this programme there will be some amount of money allocated to support of handing out free InterRail tickets to all young Europeans when they turn 18. Such strengthening of Erasmus+ means that participants will have now even more opportunities to get their first international experience and visit many beautiful places in Europe. In addition, EUR 500 million more for the Youth Employment Initiative means simply better tackling unemployment in the poorest EU regions. Consequently, it is crucial that in light of the wave of euroscepticism spreading across the continent, the EU increases expenditure on activities leading to creation of jobs and the development of a common European identity in a young generation.

Bogdan Andrzej Zdrojewski (PPE), *na piśmie*. – Przyjęcie wspólnego tekstu budżetu UE w ramach procedury na rok 2017 bez wątplenia daje pozytywny sygnał odnośnie umiejętności instytucji UE do wypracowania wspólnego stanowiska w tej kluczowej kwestii. Słusznie tworzenie miejsc pracy i stymulowanie wzrostu gospodarczego pozostają dla nas jednym z podstawowych priorytetów. Ma temu m.in. służyć sięgające 200 mln EUR zwiększenie środków na Erasmus+, badania naukowe, infrastrukturę oraz wsparcie dla MŚP. Bez wątplenia idziemy w tym przypadku we właściwym kierunku. Pragnę jednak także przypomnieć o innych programach takich jak np. Kreatywna Europa, czy Europa dla Obywateli, które również stanowią strategiczną inwestycje w kapitał ludzki. Podkreślam, że ich adekwatne finansowanie jest warunkiem koniecznym dla efektywnego wdrażania i dostarczania wymiernych rezultatów. Zwracam również Państwu uwagę na to, że otoczenie makroekonomiczne w UE wpływa na zdolność państw członkowskich do wywiązywania się ze swoich zobowiązań w zakresie finansowania wobec instytucji i organów UE, a tym samym, jak doskonale wiemy, na zdolność UE do dalszego wdrażania unijnych polityk. Tym samym zaznaczam, iż nasze oczekiwania muszą być realistyczne i uwzględniać bieżącą sytuację makroekonomiczną, nie możemy jednak ustawać w staraniach o podnoszenie świadomości decydentów i obywateli o roli inwestycji w kulturę i edukację w stymulowaniu wzrostu gospodarczego i tworzeniu miejsc pracy.

12. Przegląd WRF (debata)

El Presidente. – El punto siguiente en el orden del día es el debate a partir de las declaraciones del Consejo y de la Comisión sobre la revisión del MFP.

Ivan Korčok, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Mr President, thank you very much for this opportunity to lead you through the process where the Slovak Presidency was engaged in the Council to explore possibilities on amendment to the Multiannual Financial Framework. I would like to lead you through, but we agreed with Vice-President Kristalina Georgieva that she will explain more in detail the components of the package that the Council is proposing. Instead, I will share with you a few political remarks, but I would like to start by saying that the Slovak Presidency has a clear guidance for the process of review/revision of the Multiannual Financial Framework, and that was given by the MMF Regulation agreed in 2013. I would like to quote what was written there, namely that the review shall, as appropriate, be accompanied by a legislative proposal for the revision of the MMF Regulation. So that was a clear guidance for us.

I would like to say that we started in the Council the work on MMF review/revision with a political debate, so this was not for us, Mr President, a technical exercise. On the contrary, we knew that we needed to have a frank and open political debate where we should ensure consensus, or an opinion, on whether the financial perspective, as agreed back in 2013, corresponds to new challenges both outside of the EU and inside the EU, and whether we have sufficient flexibility to react to unforeseen circumstances or events. So these two objectives were at the forefront of our effort. Number one: whether we need more in terms of financial resources, and to ensure more flexibility. I can say that the outcome of this political debate that we have had under our leadership in the Council was, yes, the Council recognised that the events outside of the Union and internal challenges in fact require additional resources, and that we need more flexibility to react swiftly to the challenges that I have referred to. So on that basis the Commission has proposed, in mid-September this year, a review and revision of the financial perspective that we have agreed in 2013.

The second point that I wanted to make is about the process. This was important. Of course the substance matters, but the process this time was extremely important. We all know, both Parliament and the Council and the Commission, that we have been working in a framework given by special legislative procedure. Nevertheless, we in the Council knew that Parliament has well-defined expectations when it comes to the need to revise the financial perspective; we were aware of the resolution that you have adopted, and that is why, in spite of this special legislative procedure, we, together with the Commission, have engaged in a very open dialogue with you, with Parliament. I want to thank your representatives, representatives of this House, led by Chair Arthuis and the two rapporteurs Madam Thomas and Mr Olbrycht. I have to say they were very tough negotiators. There were moments when really it was not easy for us to accommodate everything for which you, Mr Chair, Madam rapporteur, rapporteur Olbrycht, have been fighting for. It was very difficult with you. But, when I look back, I dare say that it was thanks to your perseverance that in fact we were able together to come up with a package, which I think duly reflects both the need for additional resources and for more flexibility, so I think it is to your credit and your merit that it is included in this package.

Thirdly, as I said, I will not go into details. I would like to kindly ask Kristalina to lead you through, but I would like to say that this package, when it comes to resources, is giving a chance to mobilise more than EUR 6 billion to be allocated for the most outstanding priorities until the end of this financial perspective. Two, I would like to say that 85% of these additional resources represent fresh money. Redeployment is part of it, but it was needed, because you know that the resources of the Member States are limited – they are scarce – so redeployment is a legitimate part of it. But 85% of additional resources represent fresh money, and this fresh money will be used in the most pressing challenges, starting with migration, with security, with youth unemployment. And when I speak about youth unemployment, I think that is not an issue of everyday practice that the Council has in fact agreed more than the Commission has proposed, so the Council is proposing for Youth Employment initiative 20% more than the original proposal of the Commission matched with additional resources. I think we will have a good deal to fight what are the concerns of our citizens, that is, youth unemployment.

Secondly, when it comes to flexibility, very quickly, we know we are living in difficult times, and we need to react swiftly to the events outside of the Union and inside the EU, and therefore I would just remind you that what the Council has agreed on is increasing the emergency aid reserve, the flexibility instrument – additional funds allocated by reshuffling of special instruments – and we increased the ceilings for global margin for payments and extended the scope for global margin for commitments to cover also the areas of migration and security. So this is just a fraction of what the flexibility and the changes to flexibility can bring if we agree on this revision.

In conclusion, I dare say that this is the moment where we have to bear in mind that it is possible to agree on a package (or it was not possible to agree on the package) where everyone's demands, requests and expectations can be met up to 100%. In politics this is rarely the case where everyone can be happy up to 100%. At the same time, I dare say, on behalf of the Presidency, when I look at the moment where we started in mid-September, and compare to where we are today, where the landing zone possibly could be, I am quite proud, because I would like to remind you that we started at the moment when the appetite to go beyond mere review in the Council and engage in a real revision which could be a result of our common effort, was very low. So I think we, all the three engaged institutions – the Commission, Parliament and the Council – can proudly present this package where the Council has found a broad agreement on its element on 15 November. And two, it is important for me to recall in this House that if you look at the package as it stands right now, I think the elements that are in there represent the maximum possible of what the European Parliament's demands were. And this is why I hope this House at the end of the day will look at it politically – look at it as a chance for our citizens – and in fact Parliament will be able to give consent for this Multiannual Financial Framework mid-term review. I thank you for your attention and I am looking forward to your interventions.

Kristalina Georgieva, *Vice-President of the Commission*. – Mr President, it is indeed very satisfying that this time, when I talk about the mid-term process, I will no longer use the word 'review'. I will talk about mid-term revision, because the proposal we have in front of us is a proposal for revision. Indeed a lot has been done – also in informal consultations with Parliament – to move us towards a place where the job of providing resources to our citizens for the remaining period is well done. I do, of course, fully recognise that there are aspects of this where Parliament does not feel completely satisfied. I realise that there will be opportunities today to debate, and perhaps to continue after today. But let me outline the key elements in this broad agreement that the Council has proposed.

First, a very important element is what we would call top-ups – in other words, additional financial resources towards our top priorities. The total of these additional resources is significant – EUR 5.1 billion – of which EUR 3.9 billion is for migration and security and EUR 1.2 billion for the Youth Employment Initiative. I do recognise that, while it is below what Parliament recommended, the proposal is above the original Commission proposal, which was for EUR 1 billion. We also have to put on record that for Heading 1A the Council's broad agreement falls behind the Commission proposal and even further behind Parliament's proposal. The Council has requested that these top-ups be financed from redeployments within Heading 1A. We think that there should be more flexibility regarding redeployments. We accept the fact that we have to squeeze the budget for priorities, but there has to be more flexibility, and they anyway need to be decided in the course of the annual budget procedures. I think that there is some room here for a pragmatic compromise solution that fully respects the prerogatives of the budgetary authority. It is not for the Commission but for the Council, the budgetary authorities and the Parliament to decide, but there may be some space here to reach a pragmatic outcome.

The second – and actually the most difficult and therefore the most valuable – part of this package is on flexibility. Why? Because any amendment of the MFF regulation requires unanimity. It requires all Members of the Council to agree. In that sense I genuinely congratulate the Slovak Presidency for guiding the Council towards that broad agreement on flexibility. What are we talking about? We are talking about sizeable increases in flexibility in terms both of commitments and payments. In very simple terms, if there is no agreement on this proposal – if it falls apart – we will have no funds available under the flexibility instrument in 2017, and that is the EUR 740 million that otherwise would be available.

Secondly, over the years 2017-2020 we would have additional availabilities for special instruments amounting to a bare minimum of EUR 1.3 billion. It would definitely be more than EUR 1.3 billion. Why? Because we are calculating only one year of what is left over from the European Globalisation Fund and European Union Solidarity Fund. It is very unlikely that in the other years there would be nothing left over based on historical evidence, but we have taken a very conservative approach to count only what we are certain would be available. This is critical for us in terms of building flexibilities as, without an agreement, the possibility to use the margins left under the ceilings in the previous financial year for financing additional measures via the global margin for commitments would end next year. If we want to continue, we will have to have unanimously agreed revision.

Last but not least, the Council has agreed to raise the global margin for payments available in 2019 and 2020 when we know that demand for payments will be highest by a total of EUR 6 billion at current prices. The Council has also agreed to settle in a very pragmatic and positive way the issue of the disputed EUR 350 million in payment appropriations which arose in 2014 in relation to the mobilisation of EUR 2.8 billion from the contingency margin to reduce the backlog of payments. So, from that perspective, what we see is a chance to expand flexibility that is pretty much exhausted as a result of the crises that have been pressuring us.

In conclusion, we have a very valuable opportunity to revise the MFF and give us more space. It is a matter of accepting our responsibilities – all of us – to make sure that we have that space to do what is necessary. From the Commission side, we would be happy to facilitate further discussions. We believe that we have all been putting our best foot forward in terms of bringing what we believe is right and to end this calendar year knowing that in the future we have more money and more space to do what is necessary.

Jan Olbrycht, w imieniu grupy PPE. – Panie Przewodniczący! Pani Komisarz! Panie Ministrze! Istnieje zasadnicza różnica pomiędzy poprzednią debatą a tą debatą. W poprzedniej debacie wyraźnie podkreślaliśmy, że doszliśmy wspólnie do końca pewnego działania, czyli osiągnęliśmy określony cel. W czasie tej debaty jesteśmy w dalszym ciągu w trakcie dochodzenia do celu, jesteśmy jeszcze przed końcem, w związku z czym również ton naszej debaty jest nieco odmienny.

Chciałbym podkreślić, że Parlament Europejski, przygotowując tę perspektywę, wyraźnie zaznaczył, że trzeba będzie w połowie okresu sprawdzić, czy rzeczywiście została ona dobrze skonstruowana. Trzeba zrobić przegląd, review, a jeżeli okaże się to konieczne, trzeba będzie przeprowadzić rewizję. Jesteśmy bardzo zadowoleni z tego, że pomimo pierwszych negatywnych reakcji na nasze propozycje rewizji, zarówno Komisja przygotowała swoją propozycję rewizji, jak również Rada, prezydencja słowacka, podjęła ten temat i zgodziła się co do tego, że wieloletnia perspektywa wymaga zrewidowania. Co znaczy wymaga zrewidowania? Wymaga zmiany. Skoro wymaga zmiany, to jest to kwestia podejścia do tego, co musi być zmienione. Pewne zasadnicze elementy zostały już wprowadzone w budżecie na rok 2017. One otworzyły pewne działania, a teraz musimy zrobić krok dalej i rzeczywiście poprawić lub zmienić perspektywę finansową na następne lata zgodnie z tym, co uzgodniliśmy w budżecie na rok 2017.

Parlament Europejski, my jako sprawozdawcy, bardzo doceniamy wysiłki prezydencji słowackiej zmierzające do tego, by wypracować jednolite stanowisko w Radzie na temat wieloletniej perspektywy i rewizji. Bardzo doceniamy również wkład Komisji Europejskiej w to, żeby ta propozycja była ważna, interesująca i rzeczywiście do zaakceptowania. Równocześnie jednak chciałbym powiedzieć, że Parlament Europejski z niezwykłą uwagą śledzi dynamikę tego, co się dzieje w Radzie. Widzimy, co się dzieje z protestem Włoch. Mamy informacje od rządu włoskiego, że rząd włoski oczekuje od prezydencji takiego prowadzenia rozmów, żeby rewizja była bardziej ambitna, żeby rewizja rzeczywiście wskazywała na większą elastyczność, na większe możliwości elastyczności w następnych latach.

Skoro tak jest, to rozumiemy, że propozycja Rady jest jeszcze niegotowa i że prace są w toku. Dziś jeszcze nie jesteśmy na etapie wyrażenia zgody – bądź nie – bo rozumiemy, że sytuacja w Radzie jest w dalszym ciągu dynamiczna. My to akceptujemy i wchodzimy, w związku z czym, w ten proces. Parlament Europejski w związku z tym oczekuje dalszych rozmów, które zbiegają się również z rozmowami z rządem włoskim. Chcielibyśmy również zwrócić uwagę na to, że Parlament Europejski na pewno będzie wskazywał na potrzebę wzmocnienia elementów elastyczności, dotyczących w szczególności zwiększenia elastyczności unijnego budżetu, instrumentu elastyczności, rezerwy na pomoc nadzwyczajną, globalnego marginesu zobowiązań i recydingu niewykorzystanych anulowań zobowiązań.

W tej sprawie wygląda na to, że zgadzamy się po części z oczekiwaniami rządu włoskiego. Oczekujemy od prezydencji słowackiej otwartości i rozmów, które będą zmierzały do osiągnięcia porozumienia po to, żebyśmy my w Parlamencie, zgodnie z procedurą zgody, mogli na końcu zatwierdzić, czy też potwierdzić nasze stanowisko. Oczekujemy otwartości prezydencji słowackiej i dalszych rozmów.

Isabelle Thomas, au nom du groupe S&D. – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Représentant du Conseil, permettez-moi de commencer par me joindre à l'hommage rendu par mes collègues à M^{me} la vice-présidente Georgieva, à qui je souhaite bonne route, même si je suis sûre, je l'espère en tout cas, qu'elle n'est pas tout à fait partie.

Pour évoquer la révision, il me faut revenir un instant sur le budget 2017, comme l'a fait mon collègue corapporteur. Ces négociations ont été rugueuses, ce qui me laisse toujours perplexe puisque nous partageons la plupart des priorités: l'emploi, la croissance et surtout la jeunesse.

Nous avons tenu le cap et, malgré l'heure avancée de la nuit, nous sommes parvenus à un accord acceptable, notamment grâce aux 500 millions d'euros pour l'emploi des jeunes et aux 200 millions d'euros supplémentaires pour la croissance et l'emploi.

Comme vous l'avez dit, Monsieur le Représentant du Conseil, il s'agit pour une fois d'argent frais et non de redéploiement, c'est-à-dire sans couper dans les programmes existants mais en mobilisant des marges budgétaires non utilisées et indispensables pour répondre aux défis actuels.

Le Parlement obtient donc la relance du programme européen de lutte contre le chômage des jeunes, qui n'avait plus de crédits d'engagement en 2016. Mais, si nous voulons combattre le chômage des jeunes, nous ne nous contenterons pas d'une rallonge pour le programme 2017 mais nous devons pouvoir dégager les moyens nécessaires afin que ce programme soit efficace dans les années à venir. Il en va de même pour nos instruments de relance économique.

Bref, le cadre financier de l'Union européenne 2014-2020, adopté en 2013, a besoin d'une révision ambitieuse et je salue tant la Commission que les efforts de la Présidence slovaque pour le reconnaître, et je vous remercie, Monsieur le Représentant du Conseil, d'accepter d'ouvrir la discussion en vue d'un compromis où personne ne sera satisfait à 100 %, ni le Parlement ni le Conseil. L'arrivée des réfugiés, les engagements de la COP 21, les crises agricoles, les sous-investissements, la sécurité intérieure, la défense, bref, tous ces bouleversements l'exigent.

Or, il faut être conscient que tout ce que nous avons obtenu dans le budget 2017 risque d'être perdu si nous acceptons la proposition du Conseil sur la révision du cadre financier de l'Union européenne telle qu'elle est aujourd'hui. Je sais que le Conseil n'a pas encore de position unanime, comme l'a dit mon collègue Olbrycht, que les discussions continuent, mais je me dois d'insister. Pour le moment, le compte n'y est pas, mais je suis sûre que nos discussions seront fructueuses.

Le Parlement ne pourrait accepter je ne sais quelle annexe qui réduirait le cadre financier pluriannuel et contraindrait encore davantage les budgets annuels, alors que nous constatons tous les défis supplémentaires qui sont apparus depuis 2013. Au contraire, cette révision doit être l'occasion d'accroître les flexibilités – vous l'avez dit, je crois que nous le partageons tous ici – pour que le budget européen puisse s'adapter à un monde en mutation.

Pour renforcer les instruments existants comme l'instrument de flexibilité, nous proposons 750 millions d'euros par an. Pour la réserve d'aide d'urgence, nous demandons 400 millions d'euros par an – vous voyez que nous sommes même plus bas que la proposition de la Commission. De même, la Commission européenne avait proposé que soient réintégrés dans le budget de l'Union les crédits d'engagement non utilisés. Nous proposons que soient réincorporés au budget les désengagements d'au moins deux rubriques: la rubrique 3 sur la sécurité de la citoyenneté et la rubrique 4 «Europe dans le monde» pour alimenter la marge globale d'engagements.

Sur les paiements, des mesures sérieuses doivent être prises contre une crise des paiements à la fin de la programmation budgétaire. Les plafonds maximums de la marge globale des paiements doivent être rehaussés. La comptabilisation hors des plafonds de paiement des instruments spéciaux reste en débat sur la table et sera un enjeu majeur en fin de période,

Gardons à l'esprit que le cadre financier actuel est à la fois inférieur au précédent et pourtant davantage sollicité. Il doit donc être pleinement utilisé. Car, si nous parlons aujourd'hui de la révision du cadre financier actuel 2014-2020, demain s'ouvriront les débats sur les prochaines perspectives financières et je veux rappeler une réalité qui est à l'origine de nombreuses difficultés que nous rencontrons: 90 % du budget l'Union repose sur les contributions directes des États membres. Ce système est intrinsèquement pervers puisqu'il incite chaque État à réduire le plus possible sa contribution au budget de l'Union afin de garder le maximum pour son budget national.

L'intérêt général européen est donc balayé au profit des égoïsmes nationaux par le système lui-même. Pire, le résultat global est un budget réduit, finalement contraire aux intérêts des États membres. Cette situation n'est pas une fatalité, des solutions existent. Ce sont les ressources propres. Comme ce fut le cas par le passé, les ressources propres doivent reprendre une place prépondérante dans le budget européen.

Nous attendons une proposition forte du groupe de haut niveau, bien sûr, et nous serions heureux, si ce n'est ravis, que le Conseil émette, lui aussi, un signal en ce sens.

Je vous remercie et bonne discussion dans les jours à venir!

Bernd Kölmel, *im Namen der ECR-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident! Zunächst bedanken wir uns bei allen, die an der bisherigen Entstehung dieser Argumentationslinien beteiligt sind. Diese Argumente zur Überarbeitung des MFR beleuchten aber zu wenig die wirklichen Anforderungen an die EU. Die EU muss schlanker werden. Und jeder, der hier arbeitet, darf niemandem weismachen, dass man mit staatlichen Programmen dauerhaft Arbeitsplätze schaffen kann. Das sind letztlich alles Marktverzerrungen. Denn wir müssen unterscheiden: Da, wo kurzfristig Hilfe erforderlich ist, kann und soll man sie natürlich leisten, aber die Hilfe, die die EU leistet, wird üblicherweise einmal begonnen und dann dauerhaft fortgesetzt. Das können und sollten wir uns nicht leisten. Wir sollten bei dieser Gelegenheit auch nicht ausblenden, dass wir mit vielen Euro Probleme beheben, die wir ohne den Euro gar nicht hätten. Deshalb sollten wir auch das Problem „Euro“ hier in den Fokus nehmen.

Abschließend möchte ich mich ganz herzlich bei Ihnen, Frau Vizepräsidentin Georgieva, für die fantastische Zusammenarbeit mit Ihnen bedanken. Es war mir immer eine große Freude, Sie in unserem Haushaltsausschuss zu sehen. Ihre Argumente und auch Ihre Gradlinigkeit sind vorbildhaft. Herzlichen Dank!

Gérard Deprez, *au nom du groupe ALDE*. – Monsieur le Président, dans cette affaire du cadre financier pluriannuel, nous nous trouvons devant trois questions essentielles.

Première question: faut-il une révision? Le Parlement européen a toujours dit oui, et il fallait de sa part une détermination sans faille pour la demander et cela a été fait lors de l'approbation par notre assemblée du bon rapport de M. - Olbrycht et de M^{me} Thomas.

Il fallait ensuite une bonne proposition législative de la Commission et, M^{me} Georgieva, vous avez répondu à nos attentes: il y a eu une proposition législative de la Commission et j'ai dit, dès que nous en avons eu connaissance, qu'elle constituait une bonne base de discussion pour arriver à un accord.

Il fallait ensuite une volonté positive de la part du Conseil, et là je dois dire à la Présidence slovaque qu'elle m'a heureusement surpris. Nous ne nous attendions pas, de la part du Conseil, à une attitude aussi positive par rapport à notre demande relayée par la Commission.

Deuxième question: faut-il des moyens supplémentaires? Oui! Le corset actuel est trop étiqué, le cadre financier ne permet pas de répondre aux besoins urgents devant lesquels nous sommes. Y a-t-il des moyens supplémentaires? Oui! Sont-ils bien affectés? Oui! Ils vont dans le sens des bonnes priorités, à la fois l'emploi des jeunes et la gestion de la pression migratoire et de la sécurité. Est-ce suffisant? Je pense que non et je pense en particulier, Monsieur le Président du Conseil, que le corset que vous faites pour la rubrique 1a n'est pas sage. C'est un domaine dans lequel ne pratiquer que par le redéploiement me semble une erreur par rapport aux exigences.

Troisième question: faut-il une amélioration de la flexibilité? Oui! Y en a-t-il une qui est proposée? Oui! Est-ce suffisant? Je pense qu'on peut faire encore un peu mieux et que, notamment, les demandes que nous avons formulées dans le rapport Olbrycht et Thomas me semblaient plus judicieuses que celles que vous avez retenues.

Je vous souhaite bonne chance et bon travail pour aboutir à un accord parce que j'espère que nous y arriverons.

Liadh Ní Riada, *thar ceann an Ghrúpa GUE/NGL*. – Go raibh maith agat, a Chathaoirigh. Ba mhaith liom buíochas a ghlacadh leis na rapóirtéirí as an obair atá déanta acu chuige seo.

A Choimisinéir Korčok, táthar ag moladh i mBuiséad Leasaitheach Uimh. 4 de 2016 go mbeidh íslíú de EUR 7.4 billiún ar ranníocaíochtaí ó na Ballstáit. Cuir leis seo Buiséad Leasaitheach Uimh. 5 ina mbeidh íslíú ar ranníocaíochtaí ó Ballstáit do 2017. Táthar anois tar éis airgead fíor, a raibh níos mó de ann ná an t-airgead úr seo atáthar ag tagairt dó – tá tú tar éis é sin a ghearradh. Is droch-chinneadh, drochphlean agus drochthoradh é, cosúil le Plean Juncker a bhí ann chun an AE a tharrtháil – rud nár dhein caithfidh mé a rá.

Ar phointe eile, ba mhaith liom tagairt a dhéanamh d'Éirinn atá neodrach. Táimid tiomanta, agus má fhéachann tú siar ar ár stair – go háirithe ar an bpróiseas síochána – ní féidir linn tacaíocht a thabhairt don struchtúr cosanta Eorpach ar chostas coinníollacha maireachtála ár ndaoine. Is maith an rud é go bhfuil solúbthacht ann, ach gan dabht braitheann solúbthacht ar thosaíochtaí.

Caithfear leanúint ar aghaidh leis an bplé seo agus caithfear freagracht a ghlacadh agus toradh dearfach a aimsiú.

Ernest Maragall, *en nombre del Grupo Verts/ALE*. – Señor Presidente; señor Korčok, señora Georgieva, yo creo que este debate tiene un pequeño defecto de origen, digamos. Y es que aún no tenemos en nuestras manos, como quizá hubiera sido conveniente, la propuesta formal, la propuesta que debería estar sometida ya a consideración formal y, por lo tanto, a un voto próximo inmediato.

No es todavía esa la situación. Tenemos su explicación, y la que nos acaba de dar la señora Georgieva, pero como ya se veía venir —un poco—, confirmamos que el mantra, que el nuevo mantra, la nueva palabra que lo arregla todo, que lo resuelve todo es «flexibilidad».

En «flexibilidad» cabe todo: los nuevos objetivos; los nuevos y no tan nuevos problemas; las urgencias; la inmigración; la economía; la seguridad, etc. Y es obvio que estamos abusando del concepto de flexibilidad.

Yo creo sinceramente que los Estados miembros le están diciendo una vez más «no» a Europa. Esa es la evidencia, al menos hasta este momento. Eso sí, con la abstención del Reino Unido y con una duda todavía sobre cuál será la posición final de Italia, pendiente más de su propio referéndum que de este debate tan europeo —o que, en todo caso, ha pedido tiempo en ese sentido—.

Creo sinceramente que el Consejo ha impuesto una separación indebida entre la revisión del marco financiero y la de los presupuestos anuales que lo desarrollan y aplican. La señora Georgieva nos decía el otro día, en el punto más caliente de la conciliación: «hay que concentrarse en el esfuerzo de ejercicio de la autoridad presupuestaria de cada año». Y es verdad, yo estoy de acuerdo con eso. Pero aceptemos también que la lógica, lo adecuado, sería que ese ejercicio de autoridad presupuestaria se diera en un marco efectivamente conocido, acordado, compartido, de previsión plurianual como debería ser el marco financiero.

En la propuesta que conocemos hasta ahora no hay crecimiento de los techos de gasto real. Hay una flexibilidad limitada y un uso generoso de los márgenes disponibles. Eso es todo.

Por eso, cuando ahora escuchamos al Presidente Juncker, por otra parte, hablar de crecimiento, de política fiscal, del giro para empezar a abandonar la austeridad, no podemos entender lo que parece incoherente: la rigidez contraproducente en la función del presupuesto de la Unión Europea, que sigue pareciendo la propuesta del Consejo, y por lo visto también de la Comisión.

La decisión ahora debería ser cómo lo hacemos crecer desde su dimensión inicial —ahora es Horizonte 2020, COSME, MCE—, y no cómo recuperar los recortes del FEIE, a qué ritmo y si los recuperamos todos —que no los recuperamos—. Deberíamos estar debatiendo cómo lo hacemos crecer. Deberíamos estar debatiendo cómo asumimos la responsabilidad que nos corresponde en la crisis de refugiados —y, por lo tanto, cómo añadimos recursos ahí—. Deberíamos estar debatiendo cómo disponemos de recursos suficientes para los temas de seguridad interior y exterior. En definitiva, la contribución del presupuesto europeo como valor añadido al desarrollo de la nueva etapa de crecimiento que Europa necesita y nuestros ciudadanos esperan. No tenemos esa perspectiva en este momento.

Marco Zanni, a nome del gruppo EFDD. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la situazione politica che si è venuta a creare sulla revisione del quadro finanziario pluriennale rappresenta il fallimento di questa Unione europea. Ho sentito tanti colleghi e anche la Commissaria richiedere nuove risorse per combattere la disoccupazione, per la crescita, per le piccole e medie imprese, per finanziare l'innovazione: è tutto bellissimo, ma per fare questo servono soldi e oggi i soldi non ci sono. Gli Stati membri sono riluttanti a dare denaro all'Unione europea, per due motivi: oggi stanno vivendo una crisi economica senza fine e un'austerità che ha compresso i redditi e le risorse degli Stati membri e oggi non credono – come diceva il collega Maragall – nell'Unione europea, nel fatto che l'Unione europea possa spendere bene questi soldi. È inutile parlare di flessibilità del quadro finanziario pluriennale e chiedere più risorse, quando alla prima occasione il falco di turno, come ha fatto ieri il presidente dell'Eurogruppo, invita esclusivamente al rispetto rigoroso delle regole.

Se vogliamo più risorse, dobbiamo far tornare gli Stati membri e l'Europa alla crescita, e sappiamo che oggi, il blocco principale alla crescita, ha un nome e c'è un responsabile. Questo responsabile è l'euro, la moneta unica che costringe alla compressione e all'austerità. Senza la liberazione da questo vincolo non andremo da nessuna parte. Possiamo discutere di flessibilità quanto vogliamo, ma non arriveremo a nessun risultato, sarà inutile. Inutile come la polemica del Primo ministro Renzi, che vuole porre il veto sul quadro finanziario pluriennale.

Crede che dopo il referendum del 4 dicembre, se ancora sarà il Primo ministro italiano, tornerà sui suoi passi e cederà subito alle pressioni di Juncker, della Merkel e dei suoi soci. Perché Renzi non dice ai cittadini italiani che, avendo votato sì al bilancio rettificativo numero 5, ha costretto i contribuenti italiani a versare un miliardo di euro aggiuntivo al bilancio europeo. Questa situazione non è sostenibile e questa flessibilità non ci aiuterà. Gli obiettivi di lungo termine devono essere conseguiti con ben altre risorse.

(L'oratore accetta di rispondere a una domanda «cartellino blu» (articolo 162, paragrafo 8, del regolamento))

Michael Theurer (ALDE), Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“. — Lieber Kollege Zanni! Michael Theurer ist mein Name. Sie haben gerade davon gesprochen, dass die Krise dazu führt, dass die Haushalte überbelastet werden. Das leuchtet aber nicht ein, denn unser Haushaltssystem ist ja an das Bruttoinlandsprodukt gekoppelt, also an die Wirtschaftskraft. Das heißt also: Wenn die Wirtschaftskraft niedriger ist, zahlen die Mitgliedstaaten auch weniger ein. Ihre Argumentation ist doch nicht schlüssig!

Das System ist doch sinnvoll: Jeder bezahlt ein Prozent ein, und wenn es einem Land schlecht geht, zahlt man weniger, und die Länder, denen es besser geht, zahlen mehr. Sind Sie bereit zu akzeptieren, dass dieses System gerecht ist?

Marco Zanni (EFDD), *risposta a una domanda «cartellino blu»*. – Per il motivo che c'è un blocco alla crescita, che è rappresentato dalle rigidità della moneta unica, non possiamo chiedere più risorse o più flessibilità nel rivedere il quadro finanziario pluriennale. Se noi, come Europa, saremo in grado di ritornare a politiche di crescita, allora anche il bilancio dell'Unione potrà avere più risorse e potrà investire di più per risolvere i problemi della disoccupazione, per fare più investimenti, per avere più risorse da dedicare alla ricerca. Ma, senza crescita e con le rigidità delle regole di Maastricht e del Patto di stabilità e crescita, non andremo da nessuna parte, non ci saranno le risorse necessarie per portare avanti queste politiche.

Ελευθέριος Συναδινός (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, το πολυετές δημοσιονομικό πλαίσιο υπό την παρούσα μορφή αποτελεί ένα αποτυχημένο μοντέλο κατανομής εις βάθος χρόνου των πόρων της Ένωσης· καθαρά τεχνοκρατικό, άκαμπτο δημοσιονομικά, περιορισμένης ευελιξίας και χωρίς αναπτυξιακό χαρακτήρα, οδηγεί με μαθηματικό τρόπο στην ύφεση. Χαρακτηριστικό παράδειγμα οι κινητοποιήσεις περιθωρίων για απρόβλεπτες ανάγκες του τρέχοντος και του επόμενου έτους που είναι προς ψήφιση για την αντιμετώπιση των λανθασμένων πολιτικών της Ένωσης στη λαθρομετανάστευση και, με βάση τους περιορισμούς που θέτει το πολυετές δημοσιονομικό πλαίσιο, δεσμεύονται κεφάλαια του 2018 και του 2019 από τώρα. Αυτό σημαίνει πρόβλεψη; Σημαίνει ανάπτυξη; Σημαίνει ευελιξία;

Ταυτόχρονα ο Ερντογάν εκβιάζει την Ένωση με ορδές λαθρομεταναστών και απειλεί ευθέως την Ελλάδα και την Κύπρο με εισβολή στα εδάφη τους. Είναι σε θέση η Ευρώπη να αντιμετωπίσει οικονομικά με τα υπάρχοντα εργαλεία μια τέτοια πιθανή εξέλιξη; Το πολυετές δημοσιονομικό πλαίσιο πρέπει να καταργηθεί. Τη θέση του να λάβει ένα επιχειρησιακό σχέδιο βάθους τριετίας με γενικές ποσοτώσεις επί των σημαντικών πτυχών της οικονομικής πολιτικής της Ένωσης, μεγάλα περιθώρια ευελιξίας, με έμφαση στην πραγματική ανάπτυξη, την εργασία, όχι απλά την απασχόληση των πολιτών και την αντιμετώπιση των οικονομικών ανισορροπιών μεταξύ των κρατών μελών.

Όπως έχετε αντιληφθεί, το οικοδόμημα που λέγεται Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση με τη μορφή που έχει μεταλλαχθεί σήμερα καταρρέει. Αν θέλετε να το σώσετε, πάρτε γενναίες αποφάσεις. Δημιουργήστε μια Ευρώπη των Εθνών. Είναι η μόνη διέξοδος, γιατί λίαν συντόμως θα πάρετε απάντηση από την Ιταλία, τη Γαλλία, την Αυστρία, την Ολλανδία.

José Manuel Fernandes (PPE). – Senhor Presidente, as instituições da União Europeia têm de ser credíveis. Para serem credíveis, têm de cumprir e cumprir é com os cidadãos, com as pequenas e médias empresas, com os jovens, com os investigadores, com as regiões, com as autoridades locais.

Nós queremos cumprir e ajudar o Conselho a cumprir, mas para cumprir não podemos fazer reafectações. O que é uma reafectação? É um corte de uma prioridade assumida. E nós, para novas prioridades, para novas políticas, temos de ter recursos excecionais. Está claro que a revisão do quadro financeiro plurianual é um imperativo que exige que as instituições se unam para não perderem credibilidade.

O Conselho faz muitas proclamações, mas tem de ser consequente depois com os recursos financeiros para dar seguimento a estas proclamações. Nós não podemos aceitar que se não passe dos discursos depois para os atos. Há uma coisa que me impressiona, e dirijo-me ao Conselho, é que eu não percebo por vezes a atitude masoquista que o Conselho tem.

80% do orçamento da União Europeia vão para os Estados-Membros. Temos um orçamento rectificativo de 7 300 milhões de euros, em que esse montante é devolvido. Isto mostra uma má execução dos fundos comunitários. Mas, depois, vamos ter de repor esse dinheiro, os Estados-Membros têm de repor esses montantes. O que é que isso significa? Que vamos precisar de flexibilidade. Flexibilidade no próprio interesse do Conselho, flexibilidade no interesse das regiões. Nós queremos uma coisa muito simples: é que os montantes que estão no orçamento sejam utilizados e que nenhum euro que está no orçamento seja desperdiçado.

Eu penso que isto é algo de fácil compreensão. Eu penso que isto devia ser partilhado por todos e, por isso, estamos no bom caminho, a proposta que está em cima da mesa pode ser melhorada, e deve ser melhorada no interesse das instituições, no interesse do próprio Conselho, desde logo, em primeiro lugar.

(O orador aceita responder a uma pergunta «cartão azul» (n.º 8 do artigo 162.º)).

Tibor Szanyi (S&D), *Kékkártyás kérdés*. – Elnök Úr! Tisztelt Képviselő Úr! Ön rugalmasságról beszélt. Bizonyos mértékig ebben én egyet tudok érteni. Ön mit tudna kezdeni azzal a helyzettel, amikor egy tagállami kormány rendszerszinten szervezi meg az európai uniós forrásoknak az eltérítését a közös céloktól, és a saját baráti körének adja oda, mint például ez történik Magyarországon. Sőt, adott esetben európai uniós pénzből fizetnek Európai Unió ellenes propagandát.

José Manuel Fernandes (PPE), *Resposta segundo o procedimento «cartão azul»*. – Os regulamentos da União Europeia têm de ser cumpridos. O acervo comunitário tem de ser respeitado. Para isso, temos a Comissão Europeia que obriga, ou deve obrigar, e outras instituições, a que os Tratados sejam cumpridos.

Depois, há o princípio da subsidiariedade e os Estados-Membros devem respeitar todo este acervo, devem respeitar os regulamentos comunitários e, depois, ter também liberdade para cumprirem os seus programas, os acordos de parceria, seja qual for o Estado-Membro.

Eider Gardiazabal Rubial (S&D). – Señor Presidente; *brexit*, Trump, el auge de los populismos, de los euroescépticos, de los eurófobos, crisis económica, crisis de refugiados, amenaza terrorista... ¿Qué más tiene que ocurrir para que los ministros que se sientan en el Consejo levanten la cabeza y vean que el mundo a nuestro alrededor ha cambiado y que nuestras respuestas ya no son válidas y tenemos que mejorarlas?

Quiero recordar una carta firmada por el Presidente Juncker, el Presidente Tusk y el Primer Ministro Bettel en el que decían: «Hacer que nuestras acciones se correspondan con nuestros compromisos es la mayor prueba a la que nos enfrentamos y es una prueba que no nos podemos permitir fallar.».

Pues yo creo que, de momento, estamos fallando, pero también creo que la revisión del marco financiero es una oportunidad para empezar a rectificar, para demostrar que la Unión tiene un proyecto de presente y de futuro ambicioso, con la mirada puesta en aquellos que más necesitan nuestra intervención y nuestro apoyo; un proyecto que pueda mirar a los jóvenes desempleados a la cara, que sea ejemplo de atención y de integración de los refugiados, que sea la envidia de la comunidad científica, que lidere la lucha contra el cambio climático, que considere la cultura y a los creadores como un sector estratégico y que sea referente en la cooperación al desarrollo; un proyecto que pueda volver a conquistar a nuestro continente. Y eso solo se puede hacer desde la política y desde los presupuestos.

Vicepresidenta Georgieva, le quiero agradecer muy sinceramente su trabajo y su compromiso durante estos últimos años y le quiero pedir una última contribución en sus días al frente de la cartera de Presupuesto: ayúdenos a conseguir con el Consejo esta revisión que tanto vamos a necesitar.

Zbigniew Kuźmiuk (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! Panie Komisarzu! Zabierając głos w debacie poświęconej przeglądowi wieloletnich ram finansowych, chciałbym przywitać z uznaniem rysujący się w Radzie kompromis w tej sprawie i wyrazić nadzieję, że także Włochy do niego przystąpią po rozstrzygnięciu referendalnym w najbliższą niedzielę. Na szczególnie podkreślenie zasługuje uzgodnienia wzrostu wydatków w działach trzecim i czwartym, co daje szansę na wzmocnienie działań Unii poza jej granicami w celu wyeliminowania przyczyn emigracji w krajach pochodzenia i tranzytu, a także skuteczniejszą niż do tej pory ochronę zewnętrznych granic Unii. Unia powinna odstąpić od realizacji kuriozalnego programu kwotowania imigrantów, który w ciągu roku został wykonany w zaledwie 3%, i zobowiązać kraje członkowskie, aby w zależności od swojego potencjału gospodarczego wspierały ze swoich budżetów narodowych unijną politykę pomocy imigrantom w krajach pochodzenia i tranzytu. Niepokoją jednak znaczące opóźnienia we wdrażaniu programów unijnych, co odzwierciedla choćby budżet korygujący numer cztery na rok 2016, co może doprowadzić do nowego kryzysu płatności, podobnie jak to było w końcówce realizacji poprzedniej perspektywy finansowej.

Xabier Benito Ziluaga (GUE/NGL). – Señor Presidente, esta revisión del marco financiero plurianual se convierte desgraciadamente en una oportunidad perdida. Veníamos de un marco financiero muy poco flexible, y muy insuficiente, sobre todo; un marco que no estaba adaptado a las necesidades del momento actual de urgencia que vivimos y que requiere de una inversión nueva. Y en este sentido, se ha decidido no hacer nada; nada para dotarnos de más presupuesto para hacer frente a la crisis social. En cambio, sí se ha decidido aumentar en externalizar fronteras vulnerando el derecho internacional al asilo de las personas refugiadas, como se hace con Turquía.

Vivimos un periodo de urgencia y de excepcionalidad pero tenemos contables tacaños, desgraciadamente. Si el reto es tener un marco presupuestario suficiente para que la Unión Europea dé respuesta a las necesidades de la gente, ustedes van en dirección contraria.

Tanto para el presupuesto de 2017, que debatíamos antes, como para este marco financiero, necesitamos un giro de 180 grados en la política presupuestaria que permita, por un lado, atender a las urgencias humanitarias y sociales y, por otro, un cambio de modelo productivo para hacer frente al cambio climático.

Helga Trüpel (Verts/ALE). – Herr Präsident, meine Damen und Herren! Ich möchte daran erinnern, dass die Grünen dem jetzt laufenden MFF nicht zugestimmt haben, weil wir gesagt haben, er ist zu unökologisch, er ist nicht flexibel genug, und vor allem, weil das Budget zum ersten Mal in der Geschichte der Europäischen Union gekürzt wurde; in einer Situation, wo eigentlich allen klar war, dass die Europäische Union mehr tun muss. Deswegen war klar: Wir wollen auf jeden Fall eine wirkliche *Midterm-Revision*.

Jetzt hat der Vertreter der slowakischen Präsidentschaft gesagt: Ja, es gibt frisches Geld. Genau das bezweifle ich. Es gibt nämlich nicht wirklich frisches Geld. Frisches Geld würde bedeuten, dass man politisch bereit ist, über die Obergrenzen, die gemeinsam mit Mehrheit beschlossen worden sind, hinauszugehen. Gerade das passiert aber nicht. Es wird innerhalb der Grenzen, auf die man sich verständigt hat, durch Umverteilung und durch das Ausnutzen bis zu den Obergrenzen Geld mobilisiert. Aber von wirklich frischem Geld zu sprechen, ist aus meiner Sicht eine Falschdarstellung, denn das würde bedeuten, dass man den politischen Mut haben müsste, wirklich etwas zu verändern.

Ich bin der Meinung, dass wir ein EU-Budget brauchen, das wirklich in der Lage ist, Fluchtursachen zu bekämpfen, das auf das Pariser Klimaabkommen entsprechend reagiert – auch das ist jetzt nicht der Fall –, und wo es mehr Investitionen in die ökologische Transformation und auch in die EU-2020-Strategie gibt. Alles das wird mit den Vorschlägen, die jetzt diskutiert werden, aber nicht erreicht.

Ein Blick auf das Erasmus-Programm: Das Parlament hätte gerne gesehen, dass wir 200 Millionen mehr haben bis 2020. Jetzt soll es 100 Millionen geben, 50 davon im nächsten Jahr. Das heißt aber, dass dann für die drei Jahre danach jetzt schon festgeschrieben werden soll, dass das Parlament dann jährlich nichts Zusätzliches verhandeln kann. Ich finde, das ist eine falsche Beschränkung des Parlaments, und deswegen bin ich auch gegen diesen Diskussionsstand, wie wir ihn jetzt haben.

Eine letzte Bemerkung: Es war von Anfang an klar: Wenn wir ein neues Modell brauchen, brauchen wir wirklich neue Eigenmittel wie die Finanztransaktionssteuer, ökologische Steuern, CO₂-Steuer oder Dieselsteuer. Bisher gibt es keine Signale auf Seiten des Rates, dass man zu einer solchen Reform wirklich in der Lage und bereit ist. Nur dann, finde ich, kann man von einer wirklichen Revision sprechen, wenn in allen diesen Feldern wirklich politische Bewegung da ist. Das sehe ich im Moment leider nicht.

Marian-Jean Marinescu (PPE). – Mulțumesc, domnule președinte, doamna comisar, îmi pare tare rău că plecați, vă mulțumesc foarte mult pentru ceea ce ați făcut până acum și sper că până la sfârșitul anului să mai faceți ceva în plus. Vă mulțumesc pentru această propunere de rectificare, nu de revizuire, este foarte importantă. Domnule președinte al Consiliului, vă mulțumesc pentru efort, primul pas făcut până acum, însă cred că mai trebuie să mai faceți eforturi pentru a ajunge la o soluție și mai bună. Statele membre s-au angajat acum trei ani să cheltuiască o cifră, o sumă de peste 900 de miliarde. Acești bani trebuie cheltuiți în totalitate. Pentru aceasta avem nevoie de flexibilitate și avem nevoie de câteva lucruri propuse de doamna comisar, dar care încă nu sunt acceptate de Consiliu. Avem nevoie ca banii dezangajați să rămână în buget pentru că sunt angajați de statele membre, deci trebuie să rămână în buget și să fie utilizați pentru lucrurile urgente. Avem nevoie de flexibilitate, iarăși, este extrem de important. Avem nevoie ca banii să rămână în buget pentru a nu ajunge din nou în situația în care am fost acum doi ani, neavând bani pentru a plăti politicile europene. Este inadmisibil, acum două săptămâni am aprobat bugetul pentru ca statele membre să primească peste 8 miliarde de euro anul acesta și, în același timp, să negocieze pentru 50 de milioane. Deci, doamna comisar, vă rog ca în continuare să faceți eforturi pentru ca în totalitate propunerea dumneavoastră de rectificare să fie acceptată de Consiliu. Mulțumesc foarte mult.

Vladimír Maňka (S&D). – Žijeme v období s historicky největší potřebou zdrojů. Ak nebude hospodársky rast, ak ľudia nebudú zamestnaní, nebudú nakupovať, nebude ani inflácia a dlhy budú rásť. Rada a Európsky parlament prijali záväznú stratégiu. Tá vedie k investíciám s vysokou pridanou hodnotou, ktoré rast a zamestnanosť prinesú. Zdroje na plnenie tejto stratégie sú však obmedzené.

Preto potrebujeme vytvoriť inteligentný rozpočet, ktorý Európskej únii poskytne vlastné zdroje na dosiahnutie cieľov, ale aj zníži príspevok štátov do rozpočtu Európskej únie. Na návrhu pracuje Montiho skupina na vysokej úrovni. Kým sa tak stane, kľúčovými prvkami revízie viacročného finančného rámca musia byť maximálna flexibilita, dodatočné zdroje, efektívne využitie zdrojov a platby načas. Akýkoľvek prebytok, ktorý vyplynie z nedostatočného plnenia rozpočtu Európskej únie alebo z postihov, by mal v rozpočte Európskej únie aj zostať – bez toho, aby sa upravovali príspevky krajín.

Intervenciones con arreglo al procedimiento de solicitud incidental de uso de la palabra («catch the eye»)

Ivana Maletić (PPE). – Gospodine predsjedniče, povjerenici Georgiovoj čestitam na kvalitetnom radu u Europskoj komisiji i želim puno sreće u budućem radu. Što se tiče revizije MMF-a, ono što moram posebno naglasiti je da nije jednostavno predvidjeti sve okolnosti koje će se dogoditi i zbog toga moramo imati fleksibilnost. Ovom revizijom pokazujemo da imamo fleksibilnost za ono što nam se događa – od migracija, preko nezaposlenosti mladih, krize u poljoprivredi, do nedostatka investicija, ulaganja u istraživanje i razvoj, u *startupove* – to je sve ono na što moramo odgovoriti.

Međutim, moramo voditi računa o prirodi pojedinih politika. Činjenica je da kohezijska politika u prvim godinama puno više ugovara, a tek kasnije se puno više plaća i ne smijemo ugroziti buduća plaćanja koja su potrebna za kohezijsku politiku. Zato višegodišnji okvir moramo stavljati uvijek u kontekst prirode pojedine politike koja se financira iz proračuna EU-a.

Nicola Caputo (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la relazione approvata da questo Parlamento lo scorso luglio in relazione alla revisione annuale del quadro finanziario pluriennale richiedeva stanziamenti più elevati per rispondere adeguatamente alle sfide che attendono l'Europa. Malgrado il mancato soddisfacimento di questa richiesta la proposta di revisione del quadro pluriennale finanziario va comunque nella giusta direzione. La previsione di risorse aggiuntive provenienti da riserve di bilancio per gli investimenti a sostegno della crescita e dell'occupazione e per fronteggiare la crisi migratoria, è sicuramente una novità da valutare positivamente. Occorre però trovare una soluzione al problema dei pagamenti: l'arretrato di fatture non pagate nel corso del precedente quadro finanziario pluriennale è passato da 5 miliardi di euro del 2010 ai 23 miliardi di fine 2013. Questo arretrato si è già esteso anche al quadro pluriennale finanziario attuale. Occorre fare tutto il possibile per evitare un ulteriore accumulo, con riferimento all'attuale programmazione.

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, το δημοσιονομικό πλαίσιο στην ουσία είναι ένας στενός κορσές μιας βίαιης δημοσιονομικής προσαρμογής που υπηρετεί τη μερκελική λιτότητα. Αυτό που χρειαζόμαστε άμεσα ως Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση είναι η αλλαγή πολιτικής: να ενισχυθεί η ανάπτυξη, να δημιουργηθούν θέσεις εργασίας, να υπάρξει επένδυση στην εκπαίδευση, την κατάρτιση, στις νέες τεχνολογίες. Μόνο έτσι μπορούμε να αντιμετωπίσουμε την τεράστια ανεργία των νέων και φυσικά να υπάρξουν κονδύλια για την προσφυγική κρίση. Σε αυτό αναφέρθηκα στην προηγούμενη ομιλία μου. Το δεύτερο που απαιτείται είναι η πολιτική αυτή να μπει στην υπηρεσία της Ευρώπης των λαών, της Ευρώπης των κρατών εθνών, της Ευρώπης των πατριδων. Το τρίτο είναι να μπει στην υπηρεσία της κοινωνικής Ευρώπης και της δίκαιης διανομής του πλούτου που παράγεται και τέλος το πολυετές δημοσιονομικό πλαίσιο πρέπει να είναι ένα ευέλικτο εργαλείο και στην ουσία να μετατραπεί και να αντικατασταθεί, θα έλεγα, με ένα στρατηγικό σχέδιο παραγωγικής ανασυγκρότησης της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης.

Jean Arthuis (ALDE). – Monsieur le Président, pendant ce débat, nos rapporteurs, M^{me} Thomas et M. Olbrycht, ont dit l'essentiel ainsi que tous nos collègues qui ont pris la parole.

Je voudrais lancer un appel spécifique en faveur des jeunes et de l'emploi des jeunes. Je note que les jeunes qui ont bénéficié de bourses Erasmus, que ces étudiants se protègent mieux contre le risque de chômage que les autres. Je note aussi que les jeunes qui ont été formés dans le cadre de l'apprentissage en Allemagne, en Autriche, aux Pays-Bas, ne connaissent pas le chômage. C'est pourquoi je souhaiterais que nous puissions développer la mobilité pour les apprentis, mais ceci suppose que nous ayons des crédits plus substantiels pour Erasmus. Je me permets donc en cette veille de Noël, de lancer un appel spécifique pour que l'enveloppe Erasmus soit encore réévaluée. Elle progresse de 20 % dans le budget 2017, que nous voterons demain, mais je crois qu'il faut aller au-delà, Madame la Vice-présidente, Monsieur le Ministre.

Victor Negrescu (S&D). – Rectificarea cadrului financiar multianual trebuie realizată în acord cu așteptările cetățenilor europeni, care își doresc într-adevăr o Europă mai implicată în îmbunătățirea calității și condițiilor de viață pe întreg teritoriul statelor membre. Acest lucru presupune menținerea fondurilor alocate pentru politica de coeziune, sprijinirea cu fonduri suplimentare a politicilor dedicate tinerilor și creșterea bugetului alocat situațiilor neprevăzute generate de criză. Și, pentru a răspunde unui europarlamentar britanic eurosceptic care a vorbit mai devreme, mă refer aici inclusiv la scăderea cursului lirei sterline, care a generat efecte grave pentru cetățenii britanici și pentru Uniunea Europeană. În acest sens, trebuie să integrăm în mecanismele cadrului financiar multianual o serie de principii generale, precum sprijinirea zonelor subdezvoltate, finanțarea politicilor destinate grupurilor și categoriilor defavorizate, bugetarea pe măsura așteptărilor a acțiunilor și programelor europene în domenii precum educația sau sănătatea. Cadrul financiar multianual trebuie să pună în prim-plan cetățeanul. Mulțumesc.

El Presidente. – Corresponde ahora el turno a la señora Georgieva, pero me permitiré, señora Georgieva, que yo también me sume a las palabras de reconocimiento y de agradecimiento por su brillante labor.

No sé si esto es o no muy correcto —hacerlo en este momento, desde este lugar—, pero pienso que, por encima de los protocolos, está precisamente el respeto a una labor y a una persona extraordinaria como usted.

Gracias por todo.

(Fin de las intervenciones con arreglo al procedimiento de solicitud incidental de uso de la palabra («catch the eye»))

Kristalina Georgieva, Vice-President of the Commission. – Mr President, I am deeply touched. We do have a critical task to complete. I heard many voices expressing the wish that it is completed before the end of this year. This is very wise, because we do need to be able to predict how we are going to approach the remaining time of this multi-year financial perspective, and we do need to have the certainty for funds that are going to be absolutely essential for our work to be done. Just to give you one example: we have agreed that it is critical for the European Union to better protect its external borders. For that reason we have proposed the creation of a new agency, the Border and Coast Guard Agency.

When we look into the future of implementation, we of course count on having the space to fund it, not only in 2017 — for which we do now have the money — but also in 2018, 2019 and 2020. Or when we think about how critical it is to address the needs of young people to have jobs and to be able to benefit from education, it is not good enough to know that we have boosted these funds for 2017. We do need predictability for 2018, 2019 and 2020. So, in that sense, reaching an agreement that allows us to provide these funds in the future so that the money will be there for multi-year programmes of that significance, I believe in my heart of hearts means that we have to find a space for an agreement that allows us to have this predictability.

Secondly, I agree with those who said that we cannot resolve everything with flexibility. That is very true but, if we have more flexibility in the budget, we can respond when unexpected events occur. I would remind us all that we have generated three times more money to deal with migration and refugees inside Europe and in their countries of origin because of the flexibility that Parliament demanded as part of the agreement for the MFF. But we are now coming close to exhausting the reserves we have had in terms of flexibility. Therefore we ought to build more and expand it further.

Third, is this really fresh money? Yes it is, because we are taking money from the margins and we are allocating it predictably. You might say that the margins are part of the MFF. Yes and no because, if we do not make a commitment and if we do not expand the global margin for commitment and make it available in future years, there will be no commitments to demand further payments from the budget. In fact EUR 5.1 billion extra is EUR 5.1 billion extra. It would have not been there without that revision. Is it true that we are facing more demands than we have resources? Yes; since 2012, every year we have been struggling to cope with the demands on the EU budget. However, we also need to be honest with ourselves. Unanimity is required to go above the ceilings, and this unanimity is not being met. It is quite simply not there. Should we continue – and I look at the Parliament – to advocate for the needs of European programmes? Yes. Maybe that moment will come when this unanimity to go above and beyond the ceilings is there, but it is not there today. If we do not tell ourselves the truth, we will not be able to do what we are here for, namely to serve our people. It is as simple as that: to make sure that everything is done to get the resources to them in a predictable and secure manner.

Do I have regrets? Yes. I thought we had come up with a very good proposal to create a crisis reserve using the commitments. We put it forward, we lobbied for it and we argued for it, but neither net payers nor net recipients liked it. They didn't like it. They didn't accept it – and, yes, I am looking at Mrs Thomas, who wants to have a second bite of this particular apple, bon appétit, hein? But I think, if I am to respond to what people have been saying, that we should continue to work – of course we will continue to work. The work is done only when it is done. I think, with goodwill and determination, the work will be done. We will play our part as sincerely as we have been doing up to now.

El Presidente. – Gracias, señora Georgieva. Le deseamos lo mejor.

Ivan Korčok, *President-in-Office of the Council.* – Mr President, first I would like to thank you sincerely for the words of recognition for our work – the work of the Slovak Presidency – and reciprocate by repeating my thanks for the excellent cooperation we have had with you during our meetings on this very important file. I shall try to once again reiterate what I said at the beginning, and I feel confirmed, after having listened to you, that the package that the Council has agreed on is a good package, and the question, I dare say, now is not whether the Council is ready to accept 100% of what Parliament would like to see there, but the question is whether with this package we are better off than we would be without it. And I dare say if you look at the elements that are already in there, with additional money mobilised and with increased flexibility, I dare say the EU and its citizens will be better off.

I know too, distinguished Members of the House, that you would like to see more, but this does not mean that the Council is less concerned about the challenges and the circumstances that are challenging us every day. It is not the case that the Council is less concerned. The question is whether we can land at a compromise which would be acceptable to all of us. I have to say as well, however, that it is very difficult for me to hear that additional resources and flexibilities are hot air. This is not hot air: this is exactly the opposite. This is something that we can have in addition to what was agreed back in 2013. I have to say, too, that I totally agree with Vice-President Georgieva when she explained why this is fresh money.

Frau Trüpel, ich glaube, man kann nicht sagen, dass es sich nicht um frisches Geld handelt. Die Begründung, die wir von Frau Georgieva gehört haben, ist eine ganz exakte Begründung. Und zusätzlich möchte ich noch sagen: Wissen Sie, warum das frische Geld ist? Es muss zusätzlich zu dem transferiert werden, was wir 2013 verabschiedet haben. Es muss von den Steuerzahlern aus den Mitgliedstaaten zusätzlich transferiert werden. Deshalb denke ich, kann man nicht sagen, dass es sich hier trotz der Tatsache, dass es sich innerhalb der Obergrenze bewegt, um nicht frisches Geld handelt. Denn wir könnten auch kein Geld haben. Deswegen ist es wichtig, dass wir das ganz realistisch sehen.

And finally, I have been listening very carefully to this debate, and I have to recognise that there is an expectation and there is a demand here to continue our exchange. However, I have to say, fairly, that I see very limited space, if any, for further amendments or changes to what the Council has agreed on the 16th. But after having four meetings with you, Mr President, with Madam Thomas and Mr Olbrycht, I see no obstacle to having another one on a political level before the Council sends a formal request for consent to this House. I think this will only confirm that both the Presidency and the Council are ready to listen, so I say: why don't we meet again in the days to come? But I would like to invite you to remain realistic when it comes to the possibilities of further improving the deal, because I would like to say that what we are offering is a good deal for our citizens.

So Mr President, Madam Vice-President, I am not saying goodbye just yet to you Kristalina, we will have further opportunities, but I would like once again to thank you all for your cooperation so far – and let's work on getting a good deal.

El Presidente. – Se cierra el debate.

Declaraciones por escrito (artículo 162 del Reglamento)

Clara Eugenia Aguilera García (S&D), por escrito. – La crisis económica, auge de los populismos, crisis de refugiados, amenaza terrorista, Brexit... El mundo a nuestro alrededor ha cambiado y la Unión tiene que dar respuesta a estos desafíos. La revisión del marco financiero es una oportunidad para demostrar que la Unión tiene un proyecto de presente y de futuro ambicioso, con la mirada puesta en aquellos que más lo necesitan. Y eso sólo se puede hacer desde la política y desde los presupuestos. El marco financiero de la Unión Europea 2014-2020, aprobado en 2013, necesita una revisión ambiciosa. Es el momento para poner «dinero fresco» encima de la mesa en vez de redistribución, es decir, no recortar los programas existentes. Esta revisión debería ser la ocasión para aumentar la flexibilidad para que el presupuesto de la Unión pueda adaptarse a un mundo cambiante.

José Blanco López (S&D), por escrito. – La crisis económica, auge de los populismos, crisis de refugiados, amenaza terrorista, Brexit... El mundo a nuestro alrededor ha cambiado y la Unión tiene que dar respuesta a estos desafíos. La revisión del marco financiero es una oportunidad para demostrar que la Unión tiene un proyecto de presente y de futuro ambicioso, con la mirada puesta en aquellos que más lo necesitan. Y eso sólo se puede hacer desde la política y desde los presupuestos. El marco financiero de la Unión Europea 2014-2020, aprobado en 2013, necesita una revisión ambiciosa. Es el momento de poner «dinero fresco» encima de la mesa en vez de recortar y redistribuir los programas existentes. Esta revisión debería ser la ocasión para aumentar la flexibilidad para que el presupuesto de la Unión pueda adaptarse a un mundo cambiante.

Vilija Blinkevičiūtė (S&D), raštu. – Paradoksas, kad šiuo metu Europos Sąjungoje, labiausiai išsivysčiusiame žemyne, daugiau negu vienas iš keturių vaikų gyvena skurde, o daugelyje šalių skurdas labiau gresia vaikams negu suaugusiems. Todėl esu įsitikinusi, kad mums reikalingos naujos konkrečios priemonės, kaip siūlo mūsų socialdemokratų frakcija. Mes primygtinai raginame Komisiją ir valstybes nares sukurti Vaikų garantiją, pagal kurią kiekvienas vaikas galėtų gauti nemokamas sveikatos ir vaikų priežiūros, ugdymo, deramo apgyvendinimo ir tinkamos mitybos paslaugas. Kad galėtume sumažinti vaikų skurdą, turime tam sukurti specialų ES biudžetą, nes be pinigų mes negalėsime nieko padaryti. Dabar turime skirtingų priemonių vaikų skurdo mažinimui, tačiau jos nėra suderintos ir dažniausiai pinigai iš fondų yra skiriami kitoms sritims, o investicijoms į vaikus pinigų tiesiog nebelieka. Todėl dar kartą raginu Komisiją, peržiūrint daugiametę finansinę programą (2014-2020), skirti specialų fondą Vaikų garantijai finansuoti. Deja, be finansinių lėšų (biudžeto) mes negalėsime nieko padaryti – mes negalėsime prisidėti prie vaikų skurdo mažinimo. Šalia to, ir nacionaliniuose biudžetuose kova su vaikų skurdu turėtų būti numatytas kaip prioritetas.

Rosa D'Amato (EFDD), per iscritto. – La presentazione del quadro finanziario pluriennale ha indubbiamente dimostrato che esiste un nuovo mantra: quello della flessibilità. Una flessibilità che è stata giustificata dalla necessità di reagire con prontezza agli eventi o di disporre «dello spazio necessario per fare quanto dobbiamo fare». Ma cosa sarà fatto nel triennio 2017-2020 per rispondere ai bisogni dei cittadini europei? Cosa sarà fatto per l'occupazione, per le micro, piccole e medie imprese, per il welfare, per un futuro sostenibile? O dobbiamo piuttosto chiedere quanti sprechi ancora ci saranno, a partire ad esempio dalle tre sedi del Parlamento europeo? Negli interventi in aula inoltre abbiamo sentito giustificare ancora una volta la flessibilità, oltre all'incremento di risorse, come passaggi necessari per intervenire sulle emergenze come l'immigrazione e la sicurezza. Così, da quando Erdogan è al potere, l'Europa ha già trasferito o promesso di stanziare alla Turchia 36,6 miliardi di euro. Altro che emergenze: qui, con la scusa della crisi dei rifugiati, si sta finanziando una dittatura! Infine, non bisogna dimenticare una contraddizione nei termini, dal momento che Consiglio e Commissione parlano di flessibilità, quando invece agli Stati membri sono imposte le catene dell'austerità e del rigore del patto di stabilità e di crescita.

Iratxe García Pérez (S&D), por escrito. – Crisis económica, auge de los populismos, crisis de refugiados, amenaza terrorista, Brexit... El mundo a nuestro alrededor ha cambiado y la Unión tiene que dar respuesta a estos desafíos. La revisión del marco financiero es una oportunidad para demostrar que la Unión tiene un proyecto de presente y de futuro ambicioso, con la mirada puesta en aquellos que más lo necesitan. Y eso sólo se puede hacer desde la política y desde los presupuestos. El marco financiero de la Unión Europea 2014-2020, aprobado en 2013, necesita una revisión ambiciosa. Es el momento para poner «dinero fresco» encima de la mesa en vez de redistribución, es decir, no recortar los programas existentes. Esta revisión debería ser la ocasión para aumentar la flexibilidad para que el presupuesto de la Unión pueda adaptarse a un mundo cambiante.

Michela Giuffrida (S&D), *per iscritto*. – L'occasione della revisione del quadro finanziario pluriennale, che a tanti può sembrare un tecnicismo burocratico come ne vediamo molti a Bruxelles, è in realtà un momento chiave. Si tratta infatti di decidere dove investire le risorse essenziali che abbiamo in questa fase di crisi economica e sociale. Il Consiglio ha scelto purtroppo di non introdurre nuovi fondi, ma di trasferire risorse con un'operazione che maschera tagli di bilancio non più sostenibili. La proposta presentata dalle istituzioni non ci soddisfa né come eurodeputati italiani e neppure come membri del gruppo socialdemocratico. Non possiamo accettare un immobilismo e una rigidità che stanno conducendo al crollo il progetto di coesione e solidarietà europeo. Insieme chiediamo maggiori investimenti laddove c'è più bisogno, in settori in cui il ruolo dell'Europa può fare molto meglio per rimettere al centro del nostro operato crescita, occupazione, flessibilità, immigrazione, sicurezza e sostegno ai giovani in un momento critico per il mercato del lavoro. Dobbiamo dimostrare che la volontà politica è cambiata. Piuttosto dell'approvazione della revisione così com'è, meglio sarebbe riflettere ancora e lasciare il tempo al Consiglio di elaborare una nuova proposta, o ancora ragionare su queste modifiche congiuntamente alla discussione sul bilancio europeo 2017, momento in cui potremo essere più ambiziosi.

Enrique Guerrero Salom (S&D), *por escrito*. – La crisis económica, auge de los populismos, crisis de refugiados, amenaza terrorista, Brexit,... El mundo a nuestro alrededor ha cambiado y la Unión tiene que dar respuesta a estos desafíos. La revisión del marco financiero es una oportunidad para demostrar que la Unión tiene un proyecto de presente y de futuro ambicioso, con la mirada puesta en aquellos que más lo necesitan. Y eso sólo se puede hacer desde la política y desde los presupuestos. El marco financiero de la Unión Europea 2014-2020, aprobado en 2013, necesita una revisión ambiciosa. Es el momento para poner «dinero fresco» encima de la mesa en vez de redistribución, es decir, no recortar los programas existentes. Esta revisión debería ser la ocasión para aumentar la flexibilidad para que el presupuesto de la Unión pueda adaptarse a un mundo cambiante.

Sergio Gutiérrez Prieto (S&D), *por escrito*. – La crisis económica, auge de los populismos, crisis de refugiados, amenaza terrorista, Brexit,... El mundo a nuestro alrededor ha cambiado y la Unión tiene que dar respuesta a estos desafíos. La revisión del marco financiero es una oportunidad para demostrar que la Unión tiene un proyecto de presente y de futuro ambicioso, con la mirada puesta en aquellos que más lo necesitan. Y eso sólo se puede hacer desde la política y desde los presupuestos. El marco financiero de la Unión Europea 2014-2020, aprobado en 2013, necesita una revisión ambiciosa. Es el momento para poner «dinero fresco» encima de la mesa en vez de redistribución, es decir, no recortar los programas existentes. Esta revisión debería ser la ocasión para aumentar la flexibilidad para que el presupuesto de la Unión pueda adaptarse a un mundo cambiante.

Javi López (S&D), *por escrito*. – La crisis económica, auge de los populismos, crisis de refugiados, amenaza terrorista, Brexit,... El mundo a nuestro alrededor ha cambiado y la Unión tiene que dar respuesta a estos desafíos. La revisión del marco financiero es una oportunidad para demostrar que la Unión tiene un proyecto de presente y de futuro ambicioso, con la mirada puesta en aquellos que más lo necesitan. Y eso sólo se puede hacer desde la política y desde los presupuestos. El marco financiero de la Unión Europea 2014-2020, aprobado en 2013, necesita una revisión ambiciosa. Es el momento para poner «dinero fresco» encima de la mesa en vez de redistribución, es decir, no recortar los programas existentes. Esta revisión debería ser la ocasión para aumentar la flexibilidad para que el presupuesto de la Unión pueda adaptarse a un mundo cambiante.

Eva Paunova (PPE), *in writing*. – The MFF does more than providing guidelines for the EU's spending – it is the tool that defines how we realise our vision and how we put our policy priorities into practice. It is the assurance that not a single euro of taxpayers' money is wasted.

I welcome the flexible nature of the MFF, as this would allow us to invest in skills reaction, innovations, the good business ideas and SMEs. Particularly, the increased resources for Horizon 2020, Erasmus+ and COSME (EUR 0.2 billion each), as well as the Youth Employment Initiative (EUR 1 billion), is a development in the right direction.

By dedicating funds to foster job creation, investment and economic growth, the MFF reaffirms the Commission's priorities and makes sure that the EU budget is future-proof and results-oriented.

In order to boost these results, I call on the Commission to dedicate sufficient effort in order to fulfil the key priorities it has set in the MFF revision, namely: easier access to EU funds; facilitate cooperation with key partners; citizens' involvement.

Inmaculada Rodríguez-Piñero Fernández (S&D), *por escrito*. – La crisis económica, auge de los populismos, crisis de refugiados, amenaza terrorista, Brexit,... El mundo a nuestro alrededor ha cambiado y la Unión tiene que dar respuesta a estos desafíos. La revisión del marco financiero es una oportunidad para demostrar que la Unión tiene un proyecto de presente y de futuro ambicioso, con la mirada puesta en aquellos que más lo necesitan. Y eso sólo se puede hacer desde la política y desde los presupuestos. El marco financiero de la Unión Europea 2014-2020, aprobado en 2013, necesita una revisión ambiciosa. Es el momento para poner «dinero fresco» encima de la mesa en vez de redistribución, es decir, no recortar los programas existentes. Esta revisión debería ser la ocasión para aumentar la flexibilidad para que el presupuesto de la Unión pueda adaptarse a un mundo cambiante.

Ivan Štefanec (PPE), *písomne*. – Potrebujeme vytvoriť inteligentný rozpočet, ktorý Európskej únii poskytne vlastné zdroje na dosiahnutie cieľov, ale aj zníži príspevok štátov do rozpočtu Európskej únie. Kľúčovými prvkami revízie viacročného finančného rámca by mala byť maximálna flexibilita, dodatočné zdroje, efektívne využitie zdrojov a platby načas. Akýkoľvek prebytok, ktorý vyplynie z nedostatočného plnenia rozpočtu Európskej únie alebo z postihov, by mal v rozpočte Európskej únie aj zostať. Som toho názoru, že je nevyhnutné trvať na zjednodušení a zefektívnení ďalších diskusií, ktoré povedú k žiaducim a pozitívnym výsledkom, ktoré budú okrem iného znamenať viac peňazí a vôbec, viac finančných prostriedkov na to, čo je potrebné uskutočňovať.

13. Wstępna Umowa o partnerstwie gospodarczym UE/Ghana (debata)

El Presidente. – El punto siguiente en el orden del día es el debate sobre la Recomendación, de la Comisión de Comercio Internacional, sobre el proyecto de Decisión del Consejo relativa a la celebración del Acuerdo de Asociación Económica interino entre Ghana, por una parte, y la Comunidad Europea y sus Estados miembros, por otra (12396/2016 — C8-0406/2016 - 2008/0137(NLE)) (Ponente: Christofer Fjellner) (A8-0328/2016).

Christofer Fjellner, *rapporteur*. – Mr President, this trade deal with Ghana is very important. It is especially important for Ghana. In 2015, Ghanaian exports to the European Union accounted for EUR 2.4 billion. 46% of Ghana's exports was to the European Union. The consequences of voting 'no' to this agreement, of not ratifying this agreement, would be dramatic for Ghana. They would face a wall of EU tariffs. Even though the average tariff for Ghana would be around 8.13% – it might not sound much but it is a prohibitive tariff level; for many products in areas where Ghana has a lot of exports, the tariffs are even higher. For bananas, for example, they would have most favoured nation duties of 19.7%, and for prepared tuna 20.7%. The consequences of saying 'no' to this would be dramatic for Ghana.

And why would they face this wall of tariffs? The answer is simple: because the current trade regime the EU has with Ghana – the Market Access Regulation – is running out in 2016. That is the reason why we have to take this decision now. And then one might ask: why does the current regime run out in 2016? The answer to that is actually pretty simple: it is because we in this House decided so. With a broad majority. I remember negotiating with my good friend and colleague David Martin, on specifically that date, to say that this existing trade regime should run out in 2016. But the thing with this trade agreement is that it is actually a pretty good agreement. It is a good agreement that we present instead of the current regime. Ghana will get duty-free access to the European Union from day one. 75% of Ghanaian tariff lines will be liberalised, yes, but they will be liberalised over 15 years.

People talk about the fact that we need to have asymmetrical agreements, taking into account that they do not have the same level of development in many areas and competitiveness. I would say if this is not asymmetrical, taking that into account, I cannot imagine what would be. They get free access: from day one, 75% of their lines will be liberalised, but over 15 years. It is worth repeating. And the tariffs removed in Ghana are mainly things like industrial machines, pumps, generators, turbines, certain vehicles, boats, aircraft, cars, certain chemicals – all of those are used as input to Ghanaian industries and not produced locally. Eliminating import duties on these products will reduce the cost of imports for local businesses and increase their competitiveness.

What we didn't liberalise is mainly agriculture, the sensitive stuff, things like chicken and other meat, tomatoes, onions, sugar, tobacco, beer, clothes, wheat, frozen fish, some industrial things like industrial plastics. We did take their needs into account. And there are safeguards in this agreement to protect the Ghanaian side. But not only that. The reason I speak about Ghana now and what this means to Ghana is no serious actors have questioned that this will have any serious implications on the European Union and our trade policy. Those who are criticising say it is bad for Ghana, but we should let Ghana decide what is good or bad for Ghana, and Ghana is a democracy. The government and parliament have with broad majority supported this, and why should we then reject it?

Let me therefore finish by quoting the Minister of Foreign Affairs from Ghana, Hanna Tetteh, in her letter to the Committee on International Trade, where she says: 'We believe, when it comes to determine the matter of what is in our best national interest, we, as elected representatives of the people of Ghana, the Parliament of the Republic of Ghana, have both the legitimacy and the mandate to make that determination, and not to any other third party, irrespective of however well intended such third party decisions might be'. Don't act as new imperialists here. Listen and respect the people of Ghana, and let them decide if it is good for them.

IN THE CHAIR: MAIREAD McGUINNESS

Vice-President

Cecilia Malmström, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, I would like to thank the rapporteur and the shadow rapporteurs for the work they have been doing.

This is actually the third time this year that I have had the opportunity to discuss with you in plenary the agenda of our Economic Partnership Agreements (EPAs) with Africa. I came in February, we had a debate on an oral question on the sustainable development provisions of the EU-West Africa EPA and we had a good debate in December on the SADC EPA, following which you gave your assent, so that has now entered into force and I thank you for that. We are now working with our friends in SADC countries with great enthusiasm to put that into practice and to make it to function as intended.

Throughout Africa we are moving to the implementation phase as more and more African parliaments are giving their ratification to the EPAs. The Trade for All communication recognised that fulfilling the promise of these agreements will be a major deliverable for the next few years. It is now for us and our partners to fully use trade as a tool for growth, sustainable development and employment.

In West Africa a large majority of countries have signed the regional EPA which, as you know, ultimately intends to foster and strengthen the regional integration process in that part of Africa. We are committed to the conclusion of that EPA together with the regional organisation. But, while that process is ongoing, Ghana and Côte d'Ivoire decided to keep up their economic development by preserving their access to the EU market.

They did so by reviving the best option available at the moment, an interim bilateral EPA. The interim EPA with Ghana remains compatible with our objective of achieving a regional EPA which will, of course, ultimately replace this one. We are continuing to work hard to get a West Africa EPA in place for the near future but today let us focus on the one we have on the table with Ghana.

It is a self-standing, WTO-compatible trade agreement of unlimited duration. It immediately guarantees Ghana's exporters duty-free, quota-free access to the EU market. The agreement protects local development through safeguard clauses and a limited and gradual liberalisation focusing on equipment and inputs. Many provisions deal with support for Ghanaian producers to meet EU standards, which is, of course, good for farmers and for the transformation of agricultural products. The EPA also contains cooperation provisions to accompany Ghana during the implementation of the agreement.

I would also like to highlight that the EPA is anchored in the provisions of the Cotonou Agreement. This includes the essential elements and sustainable development objectives, its provisions on labour, environment, democratic principles and human rights. This is very important to remember.

When I came here in February — I think it was in Strasbourg actually — I committed to having sustainable development as a strong element of the implementation of all our EPAs. It is true that this bilateral EPA with Ghana has been negotiated with 2018 in view and it does not contain a sustainable development chapter on top of what we have in the Cotonou Agreement. But it is linked to the Cotonou Agreement and this does not mean that we are not active in this area.

We are committed to engaging in a dialogue on sustainable development in the EPA Joint Committee that will be created by this Agreement. The same goes for involving civil society. There are provisions in the EPA that give us a hook for putting this into place. For example it is foreseen that civil society organisations can participate as observers in the EPA Joint Committee, and I can guarantee you that Ghana is very committed to doing this.

Ghana is one of the thriving democracies in the region. They have a well-developed civil society in place. That is not always the case in the region, but in Ghana it is. The Foreign Affairs Minister, Hanna Tetteh, made it clear when she came to the Committee on International Trade and she said to you — and I spoke to her as well — that they have already started to engage civil society and they are committed to sustainable development at the highest level.

This is about companies and about people. A substantial part of Ghana's trade is done with the EU. Ghana's exports to the EU amounted to EUR 2.6 billion last year. On cocoa and bananas they are heavily dependent on us, and non-traditional exports, such as processed tuna, depend on the EU market even more. Those exports contribute to building local value chains which involve SMEs and create jobs, directly and indirectly. So this provides a solid environment for local and foreign investors, which should not be underestimated because when European investors settle in Ghana, they increase the share of formal employment, which ensures more protection for Ghanaian workers as well.

Finally, I believe that the successful implementation of the EPAs with Ghana, Côte d'Ivoire and other African countries will be the best proof that our trade responds to the many challenges faced with our partners. It is also the best way to convince remaining partners to opt for the regional EPA, demonstrating on the ground the benefits of deepening trade relationships with us. I hope there will be strong support for this when you vote on it tomorrow in the plenary.

Jarosław Wałęsa, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. — Madam President, first of all I would like to congratulate the rapporteur on his great work and I would like to support his recommendation to give consent to this agreement, which opens up the door to its provisional application. West Africa is our largest trade partner in sub-Saharan Africa. At the same time, the European Union contributes to economic growth and development in the region and is the main export market for West African agriculture and fisheries products.

The deal on the Stepping Stone Economic Partnership Agreement with Ghana and Ivory Coast ensures a contractual safety net warranting a duty-free quota, free access to the EU market, and asymmetric gradual opening of Ghana's market to EU goods until the regional agreement comes into force. Moreover, the interim agreement includes provisions on development cooperation, trade defence and trade facilitation measures including sanitary and phytosanitary measures.

Furthermore I wish to call for swift implementation of this economic partnership agreement. If it comes into place without excessive delay, any discrepancies in tariff liberalisation schedules and tariff lines would be solved without any need for additional adaptation to the regional processes, which is highly advisable.

Jude Kirton-Darling, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. — Madam President, in the words of our rapporteur Christofer Fjellner's draft report, this agreement with Ghana is incomplete and outdated. We are only compelled to consider it because the Commission has failed to deliver a sustainable strategy for West Africa. To build a real economic partnership with Ghana and the rest of West Africa, we need far more than traditional trade liberalisation and old-fashioned power politics. The content of this agreement is poor, the methods employed to conclude it are far worse.

We have a duty to be coherent with our global sustainable development goals, and this agreement is not about value-based trade. On the contrary, it undermines our values by not even mentioning them in the core of the agreement. Finally, there are alternatives available to ensure market access for Ghanaian exporters, and no reason for us to rush through an interim solution, which could become very quickly a permanent bad deal for the EU and Ghana.

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

Christofer Fjellner, *rapporteur, blue-card question*. – Ms Kirton-Darling, if you are to quote me and my report would you be so kind as to quote me correctly the next time, and not only say that I think this agreement is insufficient, but that it is insufficient *compared to the final general regional Economic Partnership Agreement*. Because if you cut me like that, you actually lie.

Jude Kirton-Darling (S&D), *blue-card answer*. – I quoted directly from the draft report which was tabled in the Committee on International Trade (INTA). We are talking about the EU-Ghana Interim Economic Partnership Agreement and not about the Regional Economic Partnership Agreement, and those were your words in relation to the Interim Economic Partnership Agreement.

Helmut Scholz, *im Namen der GUE/NGL-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin! Frau Kommissarin, Sie wissen, dass ich viele positive Aspekte Ihrer überarbeiteten Handelsstrategie anerkenne, insbesondere was den höheren Stellenwert des fairen Handels und die Durchsetzbarkeit von verbindlichen Nachhaltigkeitskapiteln betrifft. Der Text dieses alten EPA, eines Interims-EPA mit Ghana, ist jedoch ein Gespenst aus der alten Zeit.

Wir verbieten dem Land Exportsteuern auf unverarbeitete Rohstoffe. Warum? Westafrika hat sich am 1. Januar 2015 auf gemeinsame Außenzölle geeinigt. Dieses alte EPA hat jedoch andere Werte. Wo ist unser Respekt für regionale Integration? Nach einem Brexit würden die Importe der EU aus Ghana um 32 % geringer sein. Wie kompensieren wir das? Ghana sah sich zur Unterschrift unter ein Abkommen genötigt, das nicht mehr europäischen und afrikanischen modernen Interessen entspricht. Wir müssen auf perspektivische Fragen des dritten und vierten Jahrzehnts unseres Jahrhunderts heute Antwortvorschläge unterbreiten – im Interesse der Menschen in Ghana, Afrika und der EU.

Meine Fraktion wird deshalb dieses alte, nicht regionale EPA morgen ablehnen.

Franz Obermayr, *im Namen der ENF-Fraktion*. – Frau Vorsitzende! Die Entwicklung Ghanas ist durchaus zu begrüßen, und auch die Marktöffnung Ghanas zu 83 Prozent mit dem kommenden Handelsabkommen hört sich zunächst positiv an. Allerdings wird dies zu einer Flutung Ghanas mit europäischen Produkten führen und damit zu einer stärkeren Abhängigkeit vom europäischen Markt. Zum Beispiel kostet ein Huhn in Ghana trotz niedrigen Lohnniveaus nach acht Wochen Zucht auf einem Bauernhof 3,60 Euro, und damit ist ein ghanaisches Huhn zirka um 100 Prozent teurer als ein Billigimporthuhn aus der Union.

Was wird das heißen? Für Ghanas Züchter und Bauern wird es unmöglich sein, mit diesen Importpreisen zu konkurrieren. Die werden die Existenzgrundlage zerstören. Und was wird weiterhin passieren? Die Leute werden sich auf den Weg nach Mitteleuropa machen, wo man dann mit einem Mindesteinkommen, mit einer Mindestsicherung von 800 Euro die Hühner nicht mehr auf dem Markt in Accra kaufen wird, sondern im Supermarkt in Berlin oder in Wien.

Adam Szejnfeld (PPE). – Porozumienie o partnerstwie gospodarczym, o którym dzisiaj mówimy, ale w szerszym aspekcie także umów o handlu, o wolnym handlu, o usługach, o inwestycjach, to są przykłady tego, jak kraje dobrze rozwinięte – kraje bogate, takie jak państwa członkowskie Unii Europejskiej – mogą współpracować z innymi biedniejszymi krajami, nie tylko w aspekcie gospodarczym, ekonomicznym, nie tylko po to zawiązywać tego rodzaju umowy, by zwiększać wymianę handlową, ale także po to, by wspierać rozwój swoich partnerów. Ghana – jak wiele innych krajów – to państwo szczególnie zasługujące na wsparcie Unii Europejskiej. Jest to jedno z najlepiej funkcjonujących państw w Afryce, nie tylko pod względem gospodarczym, ale także społecznym, szanujące – jeśli chodzi o kontekst afrykański – społeczeństwo obywatelskie, dbające o zasady demokracji. Mam nadzieję, że będziemy świadkami tego także niebawem, podczas wyborów w tym państwie. Umowa, o której mówimy, na pewno nie jest ideałem, jest bowiem pewnym rozwiązaniem, zresztą czasowym, ale jeśli podejmiemy ją i wdrożymy w życie, na pewno będzie dobrym elementem współpracy między Unią Europejską a Ghaną, a w przyszłości Afryką Zachodnią.

David Martin (S&D). – Madam President, while I of course acknowledge that the interim EPA does not fully meet my Group’s requirements for a free trade agreement – especially given the absence of a trade and sustainable development chapter – as we have just heard, we should remind ourselves that we are talking about Ghana: a vibrant, constitutional democracy, committed to implementing the UN Sustainable Development Goals, sadly almost an exception in Africa. Plus, this is only an interim EPA which will be applied until the regional one, ECOWAS, comes into force. This is an agreement that the Ghanaian Government and Parliament strongly want, as they believe it is good for their people. In fact, it was ratified unanimously by the 275 Ghanaian MPs, so who are we to say this is not good for them?

The current preferential trade regime MAR is not WTO-compatible and will cease to apply sooner or later. Ghana needs a more stable framework to attract and maintain foreign investment. Ghana does not want to keep the uncertain MAR preferences, does not want to apply for the less-favourable GSP+; they want this agreement, and we should respect their choice. I want to stand by the Ghanaian people, and therefore I will vote for this agreement.

Catch-the-eye procedure

Nicola Caputo (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, condivido la strategia commerciale dell’Unione europea volta ad aiutare i paesi in difficoltà economica. L’accordo di libero scambio con il Ghana, permetterà allo Stato africano di avere accesso al mercato europeo e la stabilità necessaria per i nuovi investimenti e la creazione di posti di lavoro. Vi è tuttavia da rilevare, la sostanziale inadeguatezza dell’attivazione di un accordo concluso nel 2007, rispetto alle mutate condizioni attuali. L’assenza di una dimensione regionale e di norme in materia di origine, nonché un quadro istituzionale incompleto, fanno di questa intesa una soluzione di ripiego, in attesa di definire il partenariato con l’intera regione dell’Africa occidentale. E proprio in vista di questo partenariato, tengo a sottolineare l’importanza dell’introduzione di misure di salvaguardia, che consentano di ripristinare i dazi nel caso in cui un aumento delle importazioni minacci di perturbare l’economia di un settore, come ad esempio quello ortofrutticolo, troppo spesso sacrificato dagli accordi conclusi con i paesi africani.

Νότης Μαρίας (ECR). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, άλλη μια συμφωνία απελευθέρωσης εμπορίου με μια χώρα της Αφρικής, που αυτό σημαίνει διάλυση των αγροτών του ευρωπαϊκού Νότου και ενίσχυση βεβαίως των βιομηχανιών του ευρωπαϊκού Βορρά, που θα εξαγουν προϊόντα. Το λέει άλλωστε και η έκθεση, ότι η Γκάνα εξαγει κυρίως φρούτα και ψάρια. Δεύτερον, στην Γκάνα υπάρχει παιδική εργασία, ιδίως στους τομείς της γεωργίας. Τι εισάγει όμως η Γκάνα; Πλοία, οχήματα, επομένως προϊόντα τα οποία αφορούν τις χώρες του Βορρά, οι οποίες εξαγουν. Από ‘κει και πέρα το 35% των ευρωπαϊκών εξαγωγών στην Γκάνα έχουν ήδη απελευθερωθεί. Αυτή είναι η πραγματική κατάσταση. Κι αν θέλουν οι Ευρωπαίοι αγρότες να εξαγουν προς την Γκάνα; Τότε, όπως λέει και η έκθεση, η Γκάνα μπορεί να εξαιρέσει ορισμένα ευαίσθητα γεωργικά προϊόντα.

Τέλος, θα έπρεπε σε τέτοιου είδους συμβάσεις να υπάρχουν και ρυθμίσεις για τα θέματα της μετανάστευσης, να δεσμεύονται οι χώρες αυτές στον τομέα της μετανάστευσης, διότι χιλιάδες υπήκοοί τους έρχονται στην Ευρώπη.

Maria Arena (S&D). – Madame la Présidente, l’accord Ghana qui nous est soumis aujourd’hui a été conclu en 2007 et il a été signé seulement neuf années plus tard.

Pourquoi ce délai si long? Parce que des négociations qui sont des négociations régionales se sont mises en place. Ces négociations régionales intègrent un pays important, le Nigeria, qui est la première puissance économique.

Aujourd’hui, alors que nous devrions mettre toute notre énergie pour aller vers cet accord régional, vous choisissez de privilégier des accords bilatéraux intérimaires tels que celui avec le Ghana.

Ces accords intérimaires, M^{me} Jude Kirton-Darling, l’a dit, ce sont des accords dépassés. Donc, plutôt que de mettre notre énergie dans des accords dépassés, tels qu’ils nous ont été présentés aujourd’hui, je plaide pour que nous ne votions pas cet accord intérimaire et que nous travaillions pour que l’accord régional puisse aboutir.

Mettons notre énergie dans cet accord régional, plutôt que de le tuer par un accord intérimaire.

(End of catch-the-eye procedure)

Cecilia Malmström, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, I would like to thank the Honourable Members for this debate. I believe that this interim agreement has the potential to provide growth, stability and development for Ghana.

Let us be honest, this is not something that will be of major importance to make the European economy grow. We are not doing this for the European economy. It will have marginal effects on the European economy. We are doing this to support the development, the diversification of the industry and the stability of a country like Ghana, a rare democracy in a region where that is not always the case. Ghana's commitment to the regional EPA is very strong. They want to integrate and to develop in a transparent manner. As the Foreign Minister, who we have been quoting here today, said in the letter to you, she is very committed to making this happen, and she has already started to work with the civil society organisations and will continue to jointly work with them.

There are indeed alternative options to the EPA that have been voiced, but they are not realistic. They do not provide the same advantages to Ghana as the EPA does. Some of them are not even WTO-compatible. But this agreement is something that Ghana wants. They have chosen it and they have decided on it in a parliamentary vote by their democratically elected Parliament. I am sure you have also read the letter where the Foreign Minister, Ms Tetteh, explains this very clearly.

It is true that we are working on a regional agreement but, as you know, there are some countries blocking this. Why should Ghana be blocked while we are waiting for this to happen? It will happen someday. We are working very hard on it, but we should not punish a country which wants to cooperate with us, which wants to be a close ally and which has chosen this path.

The regional EPA is a way to overcome the challenges regionally. We are working on this. It is of course up to West Africa to decide about the future, but for the moment that agreement is not available. So let us work together for a successful interim bilateral EPA with an important country which wants to engage with us and, at the same time, continue our advocacy, together with the West African regional organisation, for a regional EPA.

Thank you very much for your commitment here and, by the way, Mr Obermayr, chickens are not liberalised in this agreement. Thank you very much for your engagement in this.

Christofer Fjellner, *rapporteur*. – Madam President, I entered the plenary of the European Parliament, but listening to some colleagues from the S&D on my left, it sounds as if they wish to be members of the Ghanaian parliament instead, as they want to vote against it because they think it's bad for Ghana. Didn't you hear the democratically elected Foreign Minister of Ghana saying they think it is good and they want it? Don't you think that they're legitimate when taking that decision, or don't you think they really understand it? Because it has to be one of those two.

And if you win, if you manage to kill this trade agreement, forcing them to meet the tariff wall of the European Union, how can you explain to the poor farmers of Ghana that you thought you were in a better position than their elected representatives to actually choose the destiny of their future? Will you be able to look at yourselves in the mirror after doing that?

President. – The debate is closed.

The vote will take place on Thursday, 1 December 2016.

14. Umowa między Stanami Zjednoczonymi Ameryki a UE w sprawie ochrony informacji osobowych powiązanych z zapobieganiem przestępstwom, ich śledzeniem, wykrywaniem i ściganiem (debata)

President. – The next item is the report by Jan Philipp Albrecht, on behalf of the Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs, on the recommendation on the draft Council decision on the conclusion, on behalf of the European Union, of the Agreement between the United States of America and the European Union on the protection of personal information relating to the prevention, investigation, detection, and prosecution of criminal offenses (08523/2016 — C8-0329/2016 – 2016/0126(NLE)) (A8-0354/2016).

Jan Philipp Albrecht, *rapporteur*. – Madam President, Commissioner, colleagues, this is a historical breakthrough. For the first time in history, the United States of America are entering into a binding international agreement on data protection standards. This House has asked for such an agreement between the EU and the United States for years and, finally, we will have it.

So what is the agreement about? First, it establishes a comprehensive framework of data protection principles, safeguards and rights when personal data is transferred for criminal law enforcement purposes between the EU and the USA. Those protection standards do not only apply when law enforcement authorities exchange information, but also when private entities transfer data to law enforcement authorities, for example European airlines to the US Department of Homeland Security under the PNR Agreement.

Second, this framework does not only cover EU-US agreements, but also bilateral data transfer agreements between the EU Member States and the United States. This is a huge success, which has not been clear from the beginning because Member States resisted the inclusion of bilateral deals. It was finally included because the European Parliament consistently asked for it as one of the conditions for giving consent to such an agreement. The agreement establishes a right to judicial redress for EU citizens before US courts should they think their rights under this agreement have not been respected. It was again the heavy pressure from the European Parliament which in the end made it clear that the US needs to open up their judicial redress avenues to EU citizens in order to restore mutual trust. Earlier this year, the US Congress amended the Privacy Act in order to do this. I am not sure how often it has happened in history that the US Congress, which had a hard time agreeing on anything in recent years, has changed US law because we have asked them to do so.

It is also important to clarify what the agreement is not about. The Umbrella Agreement is not a data transfer agreement. Article 1 clearly specifies that the agreement cannot be a legal base for any transfer of personal data, and that a separate legal base shall always be required. The Umbrella Agreement does not limit any individual rights. On the contrary, it increases the level of data protection where data are being transferred already today. We have now made it crystal clear that if the US side restricts rights under this agreement, the EU authorities can consider that the USA is not delivering sufficient safeguards for data protection enshrined in the agreement and suspend data transfers. This is all clarified now in the Commission's declaration to the agreement, which I share and which will be published together with the agreement, so it will guide any legal interpretation. The uncertainty of the incoming Trump administration is just one more reason to conclude the agreement while President Obama still in office. If we conclude this agreement, the United States will be bound by international law, which gives unconditional data protection rights.

There are motions on the table to refer the agreement to the Court of Justice, and even though I am convinced – after intense discussions with our Legal Service, the Commission, data protection authorities, and other experts – that the agreement is good enough and fully complies with EU law, I have no problem voting in favour of this request if doubts remain with some of the Groups. But let me be clear: this agreement is a huge step forward for fundamental rights and, in particular, for the right to data protection in times when data exchange is key for effective law enforcement cooperation between the EU, its Member States, and other partners in the world. With the Umbrella Agreement, we will restore trust in the effective protection of personal data as a precondition for better law enforcement information exchange. Thank you very much.

Věra Jourová, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, the Umbrella Agreement on which you are asked to cast your vote tomorrow is of great importance for the protection of all Europeans whenever their personal data are transferred to the United States for law enforcement purposes. It is with this in mind that I ask you for your consent to the Agreement so as to allow its conclusion under the current US administration.

Let me briefly recall what the Umbrella Agreement is about and what type of immediate benefits it will bring to Europeans. First – and this is unprecedented, not only in the trans-Atlantic context, but also more generally at international level – for the first time we will have a genuine data protection agreement in the field of law enforcement cooperation. By that, I mean not an agreement that authorises transfers, but instead an agreement that focuses exclusively on data protection safeguards and the rights of individuals, an agreement that contains the same type of catalogue of principles, safeguards and rights that we have in our data protection legislation. These include purpose limitation, restrictions on onward transfers, the right to access and rectification, administrative and judicial redress, and independent oversight.

In assessing the value of the Umbrella Agreement, let us also recall the current situation and what the status quo would mean. As we speak, data is being shared between EU Member States and US law enforcement authorities. These exchanges are taking place on the basis of legal instruments, in particular bilateral agreements that very often lack basic privacy safeguards or contain only limited protections. As we know, these transfers will continue to take place and are likely to intensify, notably in response to terrorism threats. The Umbrella Agreement addresses this serious deficit of protection. With its entry into force, all these transfers will benefit from the additional safeguards and rights provided by the Umbrella.

In other words, this is an agreement that will bring immediate and very substantial improvements to the situation of the EU data subjects. In doing so, the Umbrella Agreement will also remedy the current imbalance of protections between both sides of the Atlantic. Today Americans already enjoy these protections when their data is transferred to the EU, while this is not the case for Europeans when their data is transferred to the United States. This is why you asked us, in your resolution of 12 March 2014, to put rights for EU citizens on an equal footing with rights for US citizens. The consequence of all this is clear. It is first and foremost the protection of the fundamental rights of our citizens which will benefit from the agreement. I see no benefit in delaying its conclusion. This will only be to our detriment.

I would like to warmly thank the rapporteur, Mr Albrecht, for his support on this important agreement. The help from the Parliament has also been essential to ensure the adoption by the US Congress of the US Judicial Redress Act, which extends important rights to our citizens that were previously reserved only for Americans. I would like to thank all of you for your continuous support on that.

I know that certain aspects of the Umbrella Agreement have raised questions among some Members of this House. The Commission has taken these concerns very seriously, and on various occasions provided explanations and clarifications to the Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs. Most recently we have transmitted to Parliament a statement that contains these clarifications. The Commission will issue this statement at the time of the conclusion of the Agreement by the EU and it will be published in the Official Journal.

While I understand that some of you still have reservations, I hope that our central message has been heard. This is a big leap in terms of data protection, and a major improvement compared to the status quo. This includes the adoption of the Judicial Redress Act, something which would not have been possible without the pressure stemming from the Umbrella Agreement negotiations. Making the Judicial Redress Act operational still requires that the US Attorney General designates the EU as being covered by the Act. This is a necessary step for full implementation, and we have agreed with the United States that the official notifications triggering the entry into force will only be exchanged once this designation has been made.

So time matters here. We understand that this can still happen in the coming weeks under the current administration.

Ангел Джамбазки, докладчик по становището на комисията по правни въпроси. – Г-жо Председател, г-жо Комисар Юрова, в качеството си на докладчик по становището на комисията по правни въпроси, подкрепих позицията на докладчика на водещата комисия, колегата Албрехт. Парламентът даде своето одобрение за сключване на това споразумение. То е важно и ще доведе до видими резултати.

Целта на споразумението преди всичко е създаването на широк набор от защитни мерки и гаранции, които ще се предлагат за предаването на лични данни за целите на наказателното правоприлагане между Съединените американски щати, Европейския съюз и неговите страни членки. Като условие за правна сигурност, защитата на личните данни е категоричен приоритет и тя е гарантирана в това споразумение.

Смятам, че това споразумение осигурява на високо ниво защитата на тези данни, допринася за правната сигурност и освен това ще подобри сътрудничеството в областта на правоприлагането със Съединените американски щати.

Важно е да се отбележи, че извън обхвата на споразумението остава обменът на данните на националните служби за сигурност, тъй като те не са в правомощията на Съюза.

Axel Voss, im Namen der PPE-Fraktion. – Frau Präsidentin, sehr geehrte Frau Kommissarin, liebe Kollegen! Lasst uns morgen gemeinsam für dieses Abkommen stimmen! Wir brauchen dieses Abkommen, und das wurde schon mehrfach betont.

Erstens regelt es den Schutz personenbezogener Daten beim Transfer der Daten in die USA zum Zwecke der Verhütung, Untersuchung und Aufdeckung sowie Verfolgung von Straftaten. Zweitens ergänzt es bestehende Abkommen zur strafrechtlichen Zusammenarbeit mit den USA durch zusätzlichen Datenschutz. Drittens ist das *umbrella agreement* auch notwendig, weil viele dieser Abkommen eben auch noch nicht an die technologischen Entwicklungen angepasst sind und deshalb hier zusätzlichen Datenschutz bieten. Viertens ist das Abkommen auch ein großer Erfolg für die Bürger Europas. Künftig haben sie nämlich immer – auch das wurde schon erwähnt – die Möglichkeit, auch vor den US-Gerichten entsprechend Rechtsschutz zu erhalten. Somit werden also auch hier die Grundrechte unserer Bürgerinnen und Bürger gestärkt.

Mit dem Ergebnis des Abkommens können wir zufrieden sein, wir befürworten es. Schließlich haben wir auch viele Jahre dafür gearbeitet. Der Kommission und der Kommissarin recht herzlichen Dank hier für ihre Arbeit, aber auch dem Berichterstatter Jan Philipp Albrecht herzlichen Dank für seinen Einsatz und sein Engagement. Er hat wirklich versucht, auch den Wünschen und Forderungen der Skeptiker und Kritiker in dem Verhandlungsteam des Europäischen Parlaments zu entsprechen.

Die nun eingereichten Entschließungsanträge hingegen sind mal wieder Ausdruck politischer Hilflosigkeit. Das würde die Annahme eines solchen Abkommens um Jahre verzögern und die Anhebung des Datenschutzes auch wieder entsprechend verzögern.

Deshalb möchte ich alle nochmal aufrufen: Wir sollten morgen mehrheitlich diesem *umbrella agreement* zustimmen!

Marju Lauristin, on behalf of the S&D Group. – Madam President, I also want to stress what was said by Commissioner Jourová that this is really the first international agreement between the EU and a third country – especially now the USA – which is implementing principles enshrined by us in our ‘police’ directive on data protection. That is a major step forward. The Umbrella Agreement improves the current regime of data protection in the existing bilateral agreements between the USA and EU Member States. We must know that the existing bilateral agreements are really weak and they do not provide our citizens with data protection safeguards. For example the treaties on mutual legal assistance in criminal matters between the USA and Germany, the USA and Spain, the USA and Finland, the USA and my own country Estonia, and many other countries, do not comprise important rights of the data subject such as the right to access, the right to rectification, the right to be informed about the process, onward transfer restrictions, enhanced protection of sensitive data, rectification in case of data breaches, the fight for judicial redress, and so on.

All of these rights will be provided to our citizens by the Umbrella Agreement. This means that delaying adoption of the Umbrella Agreement will, first of all, be at the expense of our citizens, and we have to understand that we have a very big political responsibility in this situation. I feel that we could have something ideal in an ideal world, but in the real world, with the incoming Trump administration, I think that delaying this decision means that we will be really naive to hope that we will have a better solution under this new administration compared to what we have.

At the same time, the Umbrella Agreement also foresees law enforcement cooperation. In situations of terrorism and all kinds of other international crimes, specifically cyber-crime for example, we need cooperation with America, even under the Trump administration. But in this situation we also need better and concrete safeguards, so I think that in order to have better safeguards for our citizens and better police cooperation we have to support this agreement and to try to implement it as fast as possible. Time really matters.

Helga Stevens, *namens de ECR-Fractie*. – Mevrouw de Voorzitter, de overkoepelende overeenkomst is een grote stap vooruit. Nooit eerder werd op zo'n hoog niveau van bescherming onderhandeld tussen de EU en de VS bij de uitwisseling van persoonsgegevens voor de bestrijding van terrorisme en georganiseerde misdaad. We zijn nog steeds een doelwit van terrorisme. Daarom zijn samenwerking en uitwisseling van gegevens inderdaad cruciaal voor de bescherming van onze maatschappij, maar we moeten en kunnen deze uitwisseling fatsoenlijk organiseren met inachtneming van onze Europese waarden, waaronder de bescherming van privacy.

Ik benadruk dat de gegevensbescherming en de strijd tegen terrorisme elkaar niet in de weg staan en een gemeenschappelijk kader voor gegevensbescherming juist tot betere samenwerking zal leiden. De critici proberen nu alsnog de overkoepelende overeenkomst te torpederen door haar te willen voorleggen aan het Europees Hof van Justitie. Dit klinkt nobel, maar het is niets meer dan een vertragingsmiddel. Uitstel doet de huidige situatie voortbestaan en die is heel wat slechter. Bovendien is er de garantie dat de overeenkomst voortdurend zal worden gemonitord en regelmatig geëvalueerd. Ook treedt de overeenkomst pas in werking wanneer de VS deze volledig invoert. Ik roep dus iedereen op de verwijzing naar het Hof van Justitie niet te steunen. De rapporteur geniet mijn volle steun.

Sophia in 't Veld, *on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – Madam President, my group, the ALDE Group, was one of the first groups about 10 years ago to ask for this kind of umbrella agreement, and on the surface it looks really good and contains very good safeguards. But it is a bit like with Swiss cheese – the cheese is fantastic but it is the holes that are the problem, as in this case. I would say to my colleague, Mr Voss, who is accusing me of political opportunism, or something like that, that there is a negative opinion by the Legal Service of this House, by Working Party 29, by the EDPS, by various legal experts, and also some pertinent and negative remarks by the Advocate-General of the European Court of Justice, so this is not politics. There are very legitimate legal concerns.

This may not have the effect of an adequacy finding, but it does have the effect of being a kind of green light, because it provides appropriate safeguards, as we say, so we have to look very closely at what we do. Now one thing, Madam Commissioner, is that the Commission has conceded that in order for the umbrella agreement to be fully implemented, it is necessary, it is a precondition, that the exemptions from the Privacy Act for PNR, TFTP and comparable programmes be repealed, because only then can the umbrella agreement be considered to be implemented. So what do you think the chances are that will ever happen? I think they are zero. They are zero under the Obama administration and they certainly are zero under the Trump administration, so what are you going to do if the United States will not repeal? What will the European Commission do? Will we be in the same situation as with Safe Harbour, which had to be repealed but it took the ECJ ruling to actually annul this.

Then the rapporteur said we have unconditional data protection rights. Well that is misleading, Mr Rapporteur, because there is a condition – namely for judicial redress, namely allowing for data transfer for commercial purposes. That smells a little bit of 'buying' our rights; that is not unconditional.

Finally, we all know that the rights do not extend to all EU citizens and they do not cover people living in the European Union without EU citizenship. Therefore, I do think that an ECJ opinion is not a stalling tactic, but will address very legitimate legal concerns which have been expressed not only by my group, but also by the legal experts that I have mentioned before. I find it remarkable that the rapporteur, the Green rapporteur, who is known as a privacy activist, now seems to rely on the word of Mr Trump for the safeguards of European citizens.

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

Tomáš Zdechovský (PPE), *otázka položená zvednutím modré karty*. – Vážená paní Sophie in 't Veldová, já nejsem Nizozemec, ale do dneška jsem si myslel, že ty díry do ementálu skutečně patří a že to je jeho součástí.

Ale to není to, na co jsem se chtěl zeptat. Jen mi přišlo to Vaše přirovnání trošku úsměvné, ale omlouvám se za tento vtípek. Spíš bych chtěl znát Váš názor. Co si myslíte, že chybí v této dohodě, aby ji Vaše frakce podpořila? Co je vlastně ten hlavní důvod nesouhlasu, protože já jsem doteď nepochopil?

Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE), *blue-card answer*. – But I suppose the problem is I come from a country where they make Gouda cheese, which doesn't have any holes, therefore we have a bit of trouble with that. But I think I've been very clear in the last 10 years that we've been discussing this; you can also read the details in my blog, if you'd like to. But one of the key elements is what I've just mentioned: the Commission itself has, in writing – including in the declaration that will be attached to this, conceded that the umbrella agreement can only be considered implemented if the exemptions to the US Privacy Act are repealed. This is a bit complex and technical, but the Commission has stated that, and that will happen when pigs fly; that's my problem.

President. – I am very sorry but you have had 30 seconds, and your reminding us of cheese might make us all hungry, so let's stick to the work in hand.

Malin Björk, *on behalf of the GUE/NGL Group*. – Madam President, I am here on behalf of our shadow, Cornelia Ernst, who could not be here tonight but who has, as you know, been working on this with colleagues for several years.

Like the former speaker, I want to highlight that, although there are improvements and good things in this Agreement, we are not satisfied. In our view, the Agreement does not meet the requirement of the Charter under EU law and fails to provide the required levels of protection. The wording is not strong enough when it comes to purpose limitation and onward transfer and, as the former speaker said, not all individuals are allowed to have effective judicial redress. It differentiates between EU citizens and non-citizens.

Legal actors have criticised the Agreement. It is an international agreement, which would mean it is very difficult – near impossible – to challenge its legality in court. It will, as such, override the EU's data protection legislation, endangering what we have fought very hard to have, our good data protection rights. For all of these reasons, we think that the Agreement has to go to the European Court of Justice so we can have clear legal guidance on the manner in which these international agreements in the field of law enforcement and data protection interlink and whether they comply sufficiently with EU law.

I must also add that I do not think that we should use Mr Trump as an excuse for bad European Union law-making. We have full responsibility here ourselves and we should refer this to the European Court of Justice. Otherwise our Group will have to vote against this Agreement.

Judith Sargentini, *namens de Verts/ALE-Fractie*. – Mevrouw de Voorzitter, de nieuwe spelregels voor het gebruik van gegevens van ons, Europese burgers, door politiediensten in de Verenigde Staten is, mijns inziens een grote stap vooruit. En ik hoor mevrouw in 't Veld zeggen dat het niet zo is, maar we kunnen eigenlijk alleen maar winnen. Óf zij gaan aan hun kant deze overeenkomst gebruiken en dan hebben we iets gewonnen, want tot nu toe zijn onze gegevens daar niet beschermd en kunnen wij daar niet naar de rechter stappen, óf ze doen er niets mee, dan is dit een waardeloze overeenkomst en hebben wij ook verder niets verloren.

En deze afspraken komen geen moment te vroeg met Donald Trump aan de macht. Ik vrees voor de veiligheid van Europese burgers, van Amerikanen natuurlijk ook, juist als mijnheer Trump verder de security aanscherpt. Gelukkig heeft Trump de rechters nog niet in zijn zak en kunnen wij daar naar de rechter.

Wat heel erg jammer is, is dat deze bescherming alleen maar geldt voor mensen met een Europees paspoort en niet voor iedereen die in Europa woont. Wij geven wel het goede voorbeeld. Als jij hier je recht wilt halen, maakt het niet uit welk paspoort je hebt. Goed voorbeeld doet goed volgen, zegt het gezegde. Maar misschien is dat wel te veel gevraagd voor president-elect Donald J. Trump.

Raymond Finch, *on behalf of the EFDD Group*. – Establishing tough data protection safeguards is something I'm sure we can all get behind. It's only fair that, when data is shared between nations for the purpose of prevention, detection and prosecution of criminal offences, these safeguards must be in place. They help to ensure that there is a fair data retention period, that there are fair rules on the use of sensitive information, and that there is accountability when data is lost or stolen. The latter, perhaps, is the most important, given the increased global security threat. Attached to this vote are two resolutions from the ALDE and GUE groups, who seek to postpone the signing of this agreement until the ECJ is given its opinion.

It probably goes without saying that UKIP reject the very existence of the ECJ, and that is putting it quite mildly. This is a real problem, that this agreement does not appear, at the moment, to be signed by the UK Government; we shall be watching it closely to see whether Prime Minister May actually does bring us into this, against all of things she said about getting us cleared of the ECJ, and we will absolutely be monitoring how all the UKIP UK MEPs vote on these amendments regarding sending disagreements to the ECJ.

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

John Stuart Agnew (EFDD), *blue-card question*. – I just wonder if Mr Finch would confirm that he feels this whole topic would be far better dealt with by an independent Britain post-Brexit, and that we shouldn't have to worry ourselves with the activities of the ECJ.

Raymond Finch (EFDD), *blue-card answer*. – Well, indeed, but the fact is that it will be in two to two and a half years' time that the UK should enforce its own data protection deals. The ECJ is not fit for purpose, and I will be extremely distressed if our present Prime Minister actually signs us into these. We do have an opt-out at present, and we will be watching extremely closely.

Harald Vilimsky (ENF). – *(Der Redner spricht ohne Mikrofon.)* ...Welt darauf achten muss und damit einverstanden sein muss, dass der Schutz personenbezogener Daten etwas Wichtiges ist und auch unterstützt wird. Auch ich unterstütze dieses Abkommen aus einer prinzipiellen Sicht. Aber man darf hier nicht Ursache und Wirkung verwechseln.

Auf der einen Seite bringen sie eine Vielzahl von Maßnahmen zur Dokumentation und zum Austausch personenbezogener Daten in die politische Pipeline. Es war die Vorratsdatenspeicherung, das SWIFT-Abkommen, die Fluggastrichtlinien und so weiter und so fort. Und überall, wo Daten dokumentiert werden, überall, wo Daten ausgetauscht werden, ist auch der Missbrauch dieser Daten vorhanden. Ich verstehe nicht, warum man generell die Dokumentation und den Austausch von Daten auf alle Mitglieder der Europäischen Union erstreckt, anstatt sich auf Risiko-Communities zu fokussieren. Es sind nicht die französischen und die deutschen Großmütter, deren Daten man überwachen muss, es sind politische und religiöse Extremisten. Und genau da muss man den Schwerpunkt setzen und darf nicht bezüglich aller Bürger der Europäischen Union hier Überwachungsmaßnahmen implementieren. Man geht damit einen falschen Weg.

Γεώργιος Επιτήδειος (NI). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, το Συμβούλιο έχει συντάξει ένα σχέδιο απόφασης για τη σύναψη συμφωνίας μεταξύ της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης και των Ηνωμένων Πολιτειών σχετικά με την προστασία των πληροφοριών προσωπικού χαρακτήρα, ούτως ώστε να παρέχεται η δυνατότητα να ανιχνεύονται, να διερευνώνται και να διώκονται ποινικά αδικήματα όπως εκείνο της τρομοκρατίας. Εάν εξετάσουμε τεχνολογικά το κείμενο της συμφωνίας, αυτό κινείται προς τη σωστή κατεύθυνση, διότι στηρίζεται σε μία ορθή νομική βάση, εγγυάται σε μεγάλο βαθμό την προστασία του δικαιώματος της ασφάλειας των προσωπικών δεδομένων και, σε συμφωνία με το Κογκρέσο των Ηνωμένων Πολιτειών, επιτρέπει να διώκονται από Ευρωπαίους πολίτες οι υπηρεσίες των Ηνωμένων Πολιτειών οι οποίες παραβιάζουν το απόρρητο των προσωπικών δεδομένων ατόμων που τους τα έχουν διαθέσει.

Όπως είπα προηγουμένως, όλα αυτά ακούγονται καλά. Η κακή εμπειρία όμως που έχουμε αποκτήσει από τη συμπεριφορά των Ηνωμένων Πολιτειών κατά τη διάρκεια των διαπραγματεύσεων για τη συμφωνία ΤΤΙΡ οφείλει να μας κάνει ιδιαίτερα προσεκτικούς, διότι τι θα συμβεί σε περίπτωση μαζικής επεξεργασίας και διαρροής δεδομένων προσωπικού χαρακτήρα; Πώς θα συμπεριφερθούν σε αυτή την περίπτωση οι αμερικανικές αρχές; Θα εφαρμόσουν τους όρους της συμφωνίας ή θα προσπαθήσουν να εξαιρέσουν από την εφαρμογή του αμερικανικού νόμου τις υπηρεσίες εκείνες οι οποίες παραβίασαν το απόρρητο; Άρα λοιπόν πρέπει να δούμε τη συμφωνία όχι τεχνολογικά αλλά ουσιαστικά και να συμφωνήσουμε μόνο υπό την προϋπόθεση ότι θα θεσπιστούν κανόνες που είτε θα περιορίζουν την πιθανότητα διαρροής πληροφοριών είτε, εάν συμβεί αυτό, θα διώκονται οι

.....

(Η Πρόεδρος διακόπτει τον ομιλητή.)

Емил Радев (PPE). – Г-жо Председател, приемането на споразумението „umbrella“ е изключително важна крачка напред за подобряването на сигурността в Европа, докато в същото време не се прави компромис с човешките права, и по-точно със защитата на личните данни на европейските граждани.

Тук, в този Парламент, многократно сме настоявали за засилване на сътрудничеството, както между правоохранителните служби в Европейския съюз, така и с международните ни партньори, с цел навременен обмен на качествена информация за заподозрени терористи, трафиканти и други престъпници. Това е необходимо, за да бъдат предотвратени бъдещи терористични атаки и европейските граждани да се чувстват по-сигурни в своето ежедневие.

Това сътрудничество, обаче, не може и не трябва да бъде за сметка на основните права и свободи, които сме си завоювали в Европа. Европейските граждани имат право да знаят, че данните им не се използват неправомерно, че държавата не ги следи, а напротив – прави всичко възможно да предпази тях и техните данни.

В конкретния случай на споразумението „umbrella“ със САЩ, Европейският съюз не предава безусловно личните данни на европейците. Целта на споразумението е да гарантира, че високите стандарти за защита на личните данни, които имаме тук в Европа, ще се прилагат и при обмена на данни с американските ни партньори.

Споразумението в никакъв случай не представлява свеждане на глава на Европа пред САЩ, а напротив – извоюва защита на европейските граждани пред американските правоохранителни власти и съдилищата, каквато досега не е съществувала. Затова в името на международното сътрудничество и защита на личните данни на европейските граждани, ние всички трябва да гласуваме в подкрепа на споразумението утре.

Birgit Sippel (S&D). – Vielen Dank. Ganz grundsätzlich ist es natürlich hilfreich, wenn es transatlantische Regelungen zum Schutz von Strafverfolgungsdaten gibt, die dann nicht immer wieder neu verhandelt werden müssen. Doch es bleiben Fragen. So gibt es berechtigte Zweifel, ob etwa die Beschwerdestelle auf US-Seite wirklich unabhängig ist und über ausreichende Kompetenzen verfügt. Wir wollen, dass dieser sogenannte *umbrella* auch für bereits beschlossene Maßnahmen wie PNR und TFTP gilt. Doch es gibt keine Klarheit, ob die US-Regierung die notwendigen legislativen Reformen unternehmen wird, damit Fluggast- und Bankdaten tatsächlich in den Anwendungsbereich des Abkommens fallen.

In der letzten Woche wurde eine Überweisung von CETA an den EuGH unter anderem mit der Begründung abgelehnt, wir sollten unserem *legal service* doch vertrauen. Das tue ich. Unser *legal service* ist der Auffassung, dass dieses Abkommen wie ein Angemessenheitsbeschluss wirken kann, und das könnte bedeuten, dass die USA auf Dauer als sicherer Hafen für unsere Strafverfolgungsdaten gelten, ohne dass klar wäre, wie unsere Seite bei Grundrechtsverletzungen Datenströme unterbinden kann. Und die USA können EU-Bürgern den Zugang zu einem effektiven Rechtsbehelf verwehren, wenn deren Heimatland keine kommerziellen Daten mehr über den Atlantik schiebt. Diese Vermischung von Bürgerrechten und kommerziellen Interessen finde ich schon bedenkenswert.

Nochmal deutlich: Diese Fragen sind umso wichtiger, als wir über ein Abkommen mit unbegrenzter Laufzeit abstimmen. Natürlich kann man auch ein solches Abkommen aussetzen, doch unsere Erfahrungen mit *safe harbour* stimmen mich da wenig optimistisch. Vielen Dank.

Kazimierz Michał Ujazdowski (ECR). – Jestem zdecydowanym zwolennikiem tego porozumienia i przekonują mnie te argumenty pani komisarz Jourovej, które wskazują na to, że w dotychczasowych dwustronnych porozumieniach poziom ochrony jest niższy niż w tym porozumieniu, które przyjmujemy w imieniu Unii Europejskiej. To jest nowa równowaga godząca efektywność z ochroną danych osobowych. Zawsze kiedy debatujemy na temat ochrony danych osobowych mamy ze strony skrajnej lewicy i ALDE popisy radykalizmu, ale świat jest tak zbudowany, że radykalizm zazwyczaj jest wrogiem dobra. Tak szeroko interpretujecie państwo wartości podstawowe, prywatność, że uniemożliwiłoby to jakąkolwiek efektywną ochronę bezpieczeństwa Europejczyków. I wreszcie: ja nie jestem sympatykiem Trumpa, ale obrażanie prezydenta Stanów Zjednoczonych to jest popis braku dyplomacji. Chyba nikt nie pragnąłby tego, by Amerykanie w ten sposób mówili o przewodniczącym Parlamentu Europejskiego czy o premierze Holandii, więc apeluje o większą dozę dyplomacji.

Beatrix von Storch (EFDD). – Frau Präsidentin! Wir debattieren also heute über ein Abkommen zwischen den USA und der Europäischen Union, das regelt, wie mit persönlichen Daten umgegangen werden soll, wie persönliche Daten bei strafrechtlichen Ermittlungen zu schützen sind. Die Linken sind schon deswegen gegen das Abkommen, weil es ein Abkommen mit den USA ist. Das ist ein Antiamerika-Reflex. Das ist vielleicht nicht der gute Ratgeber für Politik, das sollte Vernunft sein.

Das Abkommen betrifft nicht den Austausch kommerzieller Daten, sondern persönlicher Daten, und da es im Moment gar kein Abkommen gibt, wie diese Daten beim Austausch geschützt werden sollen, ist dieses Abkommen natürlich eine Verbesserung. Es ist nicht gut, aber es ist eine Verbesserung der jetzigen Lage. Vorratsdatenspeicherung und so etwas in der Art bleiben verkehrt, sind aber hierbei nicht gemeint. Es müssen weitere Verbesserungen kommen, und vor allem müssen wir regeln – in anderen Verträgen –, ob der Austausch persönlicher Daten überhaupt erfolgen soll oder nicht. Da müssen wir sehr, sehr enge Grenzen setzen.

Michał Marusik (ENF). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Szanowni Państwo! Musimy sobie zdawać sprawę przede wszystkim z faktu, że budowa dużych baz danych o obywatelach jest obiektywnie elementem systemu totalitarnej kontroli nad obywatelami. Jest to przepis o charakterze opresyjnym. Tego typu przepisy opresyjne powinny funkcjonować w taki sposób, by procederów w tego typu było jak najmniej, a nie jak najwięcej. Każde państwo powinno mieć możliwość ograniczania tego typu procederów do przypadków niezbędnych w danym kraju. Nie należy tworzyć uniwersalnych standardów, żeby nie poszerzać tych procedur na inne kraje, które sobie takiej totalitarnej kontroli w jakimś zakresie nie życzą. To prawo wcale nie jest takie złe, aczkolwiek poseł sprawozdawca pokazał bardzo wiele błędów i niedoróbek tego prawa, po czym w niezrozumiały sposób zarekomendował przyjęcie. Należy je odrzucić i zaproponować lepsze rozwiązania. Są łatwe do zredagowania.

Ana Gomes (S&D). – Senhora Presidente, este acordo sobre proteção de dados no quadro do combate ao crime e ao terrorismo visa restabelecer confiança na recuperação transatlântica afetada pelo que Snowden revelou sobre o programa de vigilância em massa da CIA e NSA em 2013.

O acordo assegura padrões europeus de proteção e segurança dos dados transferidos para os Estados Unidos, embora só se aplique a nacionais de países da União Europeia, discriminando questionavelmente não nacionais residentes. Ainda assim, com a eleição de Trump, este acervo de garantias, que pode e deve ser estendido a todos na União Europeia, é mais importante do que nunca. Cabe à Administração Trump o ónus de cumprir ou rasgar este acordo.

É, por isso, imperativo e urgente que o Parlamento dê o seu consentimento e se prepare para o acompanhar na sua aplicação, se os Estados Unidos o respeitarem. Agradeço a Jan Philipp Albrecht a liderança que tem tido nesta crucial legislação sobre proteção de dados pessoais.

Ruža Tomašić (ECR). – Gospodine predsjedniče, sporazum između SAD-a i EU-a o zaštiti osobnih informacija u vezi sa sprečavanjem, istragom, otkrivanjem i progonom kaznenih djela treba podržati jer nadopunjuje dosadašnje sporazume. Prije svega one bilateralne između država članica i SAD-a povećavajući i usklađujući prava osoba čiji se podaci obrađuju.

Ono što ova nadogradnja osigurava su zaštitne mjere za osobe čiji se podaci obrađuju i jednako postupanje prema građanima Unije i SAD-a u praktičnoj primjeni. To je kvalitetan korak u pravom smjeru.

Prevladavanje globalnih izazova u borbi protiv kriminala ne može biti bez brze i učinkovite razmjene podataka među partnerima. U toj borbi pritom moramo voditi računa da ne dođe do zlouporabe.

U tom sam kontekstu posebno zadovoljna odredbama sporazuma o točnosti, relevantnosti, ažurnosti i cjelovitosti prikupljenih podataka te o razdoblju njihovog čuvanja nakon obrade.

Catch-the-eye procedure

Nicola Caputo (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, l'accordo tra gli Stati Uniti e l'Unione europea istituisce per la prima volta un quadro completo di principi e garanzie in materia di protezione dei dati per il trasferimento di informazioni personali, relativamente al contrasto penale, anche in materia di terrorismo. Uno strumento di protezione applicabile in modo completo e coerente agli scambi transatlantici, di dati nel settore della cooperazione giudiziaria e di polizia, che costituisce, senza dubbio, un notevole passo in avanti nei rapporti tra gli Stati Uniti e l'Europa. L'accordo confermerà, nel contesto transatlantico, i requisiti generali sui trasferimenti internazionali di dati previsti dalla direttiva europea, adottata lo scorso aprile, a tutela delle persone fisiche con riguardo al trattamento dei dati personali, da parte delle autorità competenti per la prevenzione, indagine, accertamento e perseguimento di reati o esecuzioni di sanzioni penali. Esso costituirà in relazione ai futuri accordi Unione europea-USA, una rete di sicurezza, al di sotto della quale, il livello di protezione non potrà scendere.

Νότης Μαρίας (ECR). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, η προστασία προσωπικών πληροφοριών αποτελεί θεμελιώδες δικαίωμα και οποιαδήποτε επεξεργασία προσωπικών δεδομένων απαγορεύεται. Επιτρέπεται μόνο για λόγους δημοσίου συμφέροντος αλλά και υπό αυστηρές προϋποθέσεις και επίσης με δικαστική προστασία και σύμφωνα με τους νόμους της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης. Είναι προφανές ότι υπάρχει χάσμα ανάμεσα στις εγγυήσεις προστασίας των δεδομένων που προσφέρει η συμφωνία-ομπρέλα Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης-Ηνωμένων Πολιτειών και στις απαιτήσεις του Δικαίου της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης. Είναι αξιοπερίεργη η πίεση που ασκείται για να εγκριθεί η συμφωνία αυτή άρον άρον, τη στιγμή που εκκρεμεί η έκδοση απόφασης του Δικαστηρίου της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης για το PNR, στη συμφωνία δηλαδή Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης και Καναδά.

Πιστεύω λοιπόν ότι η παραπομπή της υπόθεσης στο Δικαστήριο της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης δίδει επιπλέον εγγυήσεις. Αν διαβάσει κανείς την αιτιολογική έκθεση βλέπει ότι υπάρχουν κενά στην προστασία. Στο σημείο 8, η επεξεργασία δεν θα γίνεται μόνο από την αρχή που το ζητά αλλά και από άλλες αρχές που ενδεχόμενα θα το ζητήσουν.

Τάκης Χατζηγεωργίου (GUE/NGL). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, συζητούμε ένα πάρα πολύ σοβαρό ζήτημα, γιατί κανένας δεν θέλει να πέσει θύμα τρομοκρατίας. Από την άλλη όμως κανένας επίσης δεν θέλει ως πολίτης, πιθανόν αθώος, να πέσει θύμα της τρομοκρατίας που θα έχει επιβληθεί από την απόφαση ή τη συμφωνία μεταξύ Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης και Ηνωμένων Πολιτειών. Υπάρχει μια έκφραση η οποία μπορεί να αποτελεί κλειδί για την απόφασή μας: «Προτιμότερο να υπάρχουν μερικοί ένοχοι έξω από τις φυλακές παρά ένας αθώος να σαπίζει μέσα στις φυλακές», και αυτό μάλιστα να μας έχει συμβεί μετά από τη συμφωνία που πιθανόν να εγκριθεί ή να μην εγκριθεί αύριο. Το γεγονός επίσης ότι υπάρχει μια βιασύνη, όπως έχει λεχθεί και από άλλους συναδέλφους, να κλείσει αυτή η συμφωνία πριν έρθει ο κύριος Trump, πέραν του ότι είναι ασφαλώς και προσβλητικό για τον ίδιο, ανεξάρτητα από τις απόψεις που έχει ο καθένας μας για τον νέο πρόεδρο των Ηνωμένων Πολιτειών, δείχνει ότι κινούμαστε με μια ταχύτητα η οποία μας βάζει σε κινδύνους. Και το τελευταίο: Εγώ προσωπικά δεν δέχομαι αυτή τη συμφωνία να αφορά μόνο Ευρωπαίους πολίτες και όχι κάποιους άλλους ανθρώπους που κατοικούν εδώ.

(End of catch-the-eye procedure)

Věra Jourová, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, honourable Members, I would like to thank you for your support, not only in today's debate but also in many years of negotiations of the Umbrella Agreement. Your consistent engagement also with your counterparts in the US Congress played a vital role in a securing new rights for our citizens under the Judicial Redress Act, and I count on you to continue engaging with the new US Congress to make sure that we maintain and build on what we have achieved.

As for myself, I am in contact with the US Attorney General Loretta Lynch to ensure that the United States side makes the necessary designations to ensure that this agreement enters into force as soon as possible. As for the other questions which have been raised, and some doubts concerning some of your questions, we tried to clarify everything in our clarification which, as I said before, will be published, and I will engage with the successor of Loretta Lynch as Attorney General, once confirmed, to work together on its full implementation. Against this background, I can only encourage the honourable Members of this Parliament to give their consent to this international agreement, which is so important for our people in Europe.

President. – I now give the floor to the rapporteur, Mr Olbrycht. I am sorry, I know that Madam in 't Veld is looking for the floor. Could I ask you, Madam in 't Veld, if you would speak to the Commissioner afterwards, or perhaps Commissioner, could I ask whether the questions can be put to you in writing? We have had the debate, the Commissioner has made a statement. I will give you the floor reluctantly because you had your chance during the debate, so perhaps you could very briefly make your case.

Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE). – I asked a very simple question. The Commission in the declaration that will be attached to tomorrow's document states very clearly that a precondition for the Umbrella Agreement to be valid, to be implemented, is the repeal of the exemptions to the Privacy Act. What does the Commissioner think are the chances of that happening? It's a precondition: without that the Umbrella Agreement is not valid.

Jan Philipp Albrecht, Berichterstatter. – Frau Vorsitzende! Sehr geehrte Damen und Herren! Wir haben einen historischen Fortschritt erzielt. Nach Jahren der Verhandlungen ist es endlich gelungen, verbindliche internationale Standards zum Datenschutz im Bereich der polizeilichen und justiziellen Zusammenarbeit mit den Vereinigten Staaten zu vereinbaren. Das ist ein wichtiger Schritt nach vorn für unsere Bürgerinnen und Bürger, nachdem wir viele Jahre viele Abkommen geschlossen und Gesetze verabschiedet haben, vor allem mit den Stimmen von Konservativen, Liberalen und Sozialdemokraten, die die Rechtsgrundlage zur Weitergabe von Daten in die USA beschlossen haben – also Überwachungs- und Datentransfermaßnahmen beschlossen haben.

Wir werden jetzt ein Abkommen auf den Weg bringen, das die Datenschutzrechte der Betroffenen stärkt, das dafür sorgt, dass es Rechtsschutz in den Vereinigten Staaten gibt und dass es verbindliche Standards gibt, wenn diese Daten transferiert werden.

Das *Umbrella*-Abkommen, das Datenschutzrahmenabkommen ist keine Rechtsgrundlage für weitere Datentransfers, es ist keine Überwachungsmaßnahme. Nein, im Gegenteil, es ist ein Datenschutzabkommen. Es stärkt das Grundrecht auf Datenschutz, und es ist ein Riesenfortschritt, dass der US-Kongress diese Rechte in Gesetz gegossen hat. Völlig klar ist auch: Wenn die USA die hohen Standards, die wir hier vereinbaren, und den unmissverständlich zugestandenen Rechtsschutz für alle EU-Bürger nicht voll implementiert, dann wird dieses Abkommen so nicht kommen und dann wird es auch keinen Vertrauenszuwachs und auch keine bessere Zusammenarbeit mit den USA geben können. Das ist unsere Grundvoraussetzung, und wir haben jetzt endlich etwas in der Hand, um die USA verbindlich zu zwingen, solche Rechte zu implementieren.

Das ist besser als zuvor und ich habe kein Problem damit, nochmals zu fragen, ob dieses Abkommen in Einklang mit dem Europäischen Gerichtshof steht. Ich habe kein Problem damit, ich frage mich aber, warum das dann hier bei einem Datenschutzabkommen so vehement eingefordert wird, während es anderswo, z. B. bei Handelsabkommen oder bei Überwachungsabkommen, gerade auch von Sozialdemokraten und Liberalen zurückgewiesen wird.

President. – The debate is closed.

The vote will take place on Thursday, 1 December 2016.

Written statements (Rule 162)

Kinga Gál (PPE), írásban. – Európa polgárai biztonságának garantálása érdekében elengedhetetlen a más államokkal megvalósuló bűnmegelőzési és bűnüldözési tárgyú adatcsere. Viszont az adatcsere csak az uniós állampolgárok személyes adatainak megfelelő védelmével valósulhat meg. Ezért is bír nagy jelentőséggel az Amerikai Egyesült Államok kormányával a bűncselekmények megelőzésével, kivizsgálásával, felderítésével és büntetőeljárás alá vonásával kapcsolatos személyes adatok védelméről szóló megállapodás elfogadása, amely keretjelleggel rögzíti azon előírásokat és követelményeket, amelyek az uniós tagállamok és az Egyesült Államok között cserélt adatok kezelésének feltételeire vonatkoznak. A megállapodásról elmondható, hogy megfelelő adatvédelmi garanciákat nyújt, ezáltal az adatalanyok jogainak magas szintű védelmét célozva meg. Fontosnak tartom kihangsúlyozni, hogy a megállapodás önmagában nem képez jogalapot a személyes adatok továbbítására az Egyesült Államokba. Kiemelném még, hogy az Európai Parlament kitartásának köszönhetően az amerikai fél jogalkotási intézkedésekkel biztosította az európai uniós állampolgárok részére a bírói jogorvoslatot az Egyesült Államokban.

Barbara Kappel (ENF), schriftlich. – Der personenbezogene Datenaustausch bei der Verhütung, Untersuchung, Aufdeckung und Verfolgung von Straftaten ist in einer globalisierten Welt notwendig und sinnvoll. Jedoch müssen bei solchen Datenaustauschprogrammen strengste Sicherheitsvorkehrungen zum Schutz der personenbezogenen Daten herrschen. Diese Sicherheitsvorkehrungen sehe ich mit dem Abkommen zwischen den Vereinigten Staaten von Amerika und den Mitgliedstaaten der Europäischen Union als nicht gegeben an. Daher vertrete ich zu diesem Abkommen einen kritischen Standpunkt. Die Abwägung zwischen Freiheit und Sicherheit ist kompliziert. Jedoch darf niemals die Freiheit des einzelnen Bürgers beschnitten werden. Ich schließe mich hier dem Berichterstatter an und akzeptiere, dass dieses Abkommen einen großen Fortschritt für den Schutz personenbezogener Daten, die zum Zwecke der Strafverfolgung zwischen den Mitgliedstaaten der EU und den USA übermittelt werden, bedeutet. Doch es ist nicht das bestmögliche Abkommen, das vorstellbar ist, auch nicht in der gegenwärtigen Situation. Hier werden lediglich neue Rechte und Schutzvorschriften für Fälle der Übermittlung im Rahmen der Zusammenarbeit zwischen den Mitgliedstaaten der Europäischen Union und den USA bei der Strafverfolgung hinzugefügt. Jedoch trete ich für eine weitere Verschärfung der Sicherheitsvorkehrungen zum Schutz der personenbezogenen Daten ein.

Karol Karski (ECR), na piśmie. – Wyrażam moje poparcie dla sprawozdania posła Albrechta i tym samym zgodę na zawarcie tzw. „umowy parasolowej” między Stanami Zjednoczonymi Ameryki a Unią Europejską w sprawie ochrony informacji osobowych powiązanych z zapobieganiem przestępczości, prowadzeniem postępowań przygotowawczych, wykrywaniem i ściganiem czynów zabronionych. Umowa ta ma znaczenie zwłaszcza ze względu na podejmowane wysiłki na rzecz zwalczania terroryzmu. Planowana umowa stwarza ramy dla ochrony danych osobowych, co przyczynia się do zapewnienia pewności prawa.

Umowa będzie w razie konieczności uzupełniać zabezpieczenia w zakresie ochrony danych w obowiązujących i przyszłych umowach dotyczących przekazywania danych lub w przepisach krajowych zezwalających na takie przekazywanie. Ponadto umowa będzie miała znaczny wpływ na współpracę policji i organów ścigania Unii Europejskiej i jej państw członkowskich oraz Stanów Zjednoczonych, dzięki ustanowieniu wspólnych i kompleksowych ram zawierających zasady i gwarancje dotyczące ochrony danych.

Umowa umożliwi organom ścigania w UE lub jej państwach członkowskich, z jednej strony, i w USA, z drugiej strony, bardziej skuteczną współpracę. Ustalenie wspólnych norm w tym obszarze współpracy może w znacznym stopniu przyczynić się do odbudowy zaufania w dziedzinie transatlantyckich przepływów danych. Dzięki zawartej umowie UE i USA nasilą współpracę, zapewniając jednocześnie wysoki poziom ochrony danych. Jest to szczególnie ważne ze względu na ogromne wyzwania stojące przed UE i USA.

David McAllister (PPE), *schriftlich*. – Das am 2. Juni 2016 von den USA und der EU unterzeichnete sogenannte „Umbrella Agreement“ schafft einen umfassenden Datenschutzrahmen für eine engere transatlantische Zusammenarbeit bei der Strafverfolgung. Es komplettiert bereits bestehende Abkommen mit den USA, welche den Zugang zu Fluggastdaten und Finanztransaktionen regeln. Dieses Abkommen wird für hohe Datenschutzstandards bei der Bekämpfung von Kriminalität und Terrorismus über den Atlantik hinweg sorgen. Es umfasst alle personenbezogenen Daten, die zwischen den USA und der EU zur Vorbeugung, Aufdeckung, Untersuchung und Verfolgung von Straftaten, einschließlich terroristischer Aktivitäten, ausgetauscht werden. Profitieren werden hiervon die Bürger der Europäischen Union, da sie das Recht erhalten, nach Datenschutzverstößen gegen US-Behörden zu klagen. Zudem ist die Speicherung der Daten nur befristet möglich und die Datennutzung wird beschränkt. Durch dieses Abkommen werden fundamentale Rechte, wie das Grundrecht auf Privatsphäre, gestärkt. Zudem trägt es auch dazu bei, die Kooperation im Bereich der Strafverfolgung zu vertiefen und das Vertrauen in den transatlantischen Datenaustausch wiederherzustellen.

Victor Negrescu (S&D), *in writing*. – The European Parliament called for an agreement that would provide data protection safeguards for personal information transferred between the EU and US. On 3 December 2010 the Council authorised the Commission to open negotiations on such an agreement that would provide the right to privacy with respect to the processing of personal data when this information is transferred to the competent authorities. On 8 September 2015 EU and US officials concluded the agreement, guaranteeing a high level of protection for all personal data that will be transferred between the law enforcement authorities of the two parts. The personal data will only be exchanged and processed with the scope of investigating, detecting or prosecuting criminal offences and acts of terrorism in the framework of police cooperation and judicial cooperation in criminal matters. Any citizen from the two parts that considers that his data has been misused will have access to several accessible and affordable dispute resolution mechanisms. This is the first time that personal data information is exchanged in a secured way with strong obligations on companies handling the data, clear safeguards and transparency obligations on US Government access and an effective protection of individual rights.

Tibor Szanyi (S&D), *írásban*. – Az Európai Unió szigorú adatvédelmi normákkal rendelkezik. Alapelv, hogy az adatokat soha nem szabad az eredeti céllal összeegyeztethetetlen célra felhasználni, valamint a személyes adatokat szigorú feltételek mellett, törvényes céllal, jogszerűen kell összegyűjteni és feldolgozni. Fontos, hogy ezeket az elveket az unió partnerei is osszák, így védve az európai polgárok adatait világszerte. Főleg az olyan közeli és fontos partnerek esetében lényeges ez, mint az Egyesült Államok, amellyel nem csak szoros kereskedelmi kötelékek fűzi össze az EU-t, de a bűnüldözés területén is szorosan együttműködünk. A nemrég létrehozott EU–USA adatvédelmi pajzs is az európaiak adatainak védelmét szolgálja, és ugyanezt várjuk az Amerikai Egyesült Államok és az Európai Unió közötti, a bűncselekmények megelőzésével, nyomozásával és felderítésével kapcsolatos személyes adatok védelméről szóló megállapodástól is. A személyes adatok magas szintű védelmének biztosítása mellett természetesen azt is szükségesnek tartjuk, hogy az adatvédelmi keretmegállapodásnak köszönhetően az Egyesült Államok és az Európai Unió, valamint tagállamai között a bűnüldözési információcsere hatékonyabbá válásával a nemzetközi bűnüldözés eredményessége is növekedjen.

15. Przekazanie światowej społeczności internetowej nadzoru nad IANA w październiku 2016 r. i nadchodzące Forum Zarządzania Internetem w Meksyku (w dniach 6-8 grudnia 2016 r.) (debata)

President. – The next item is the debate on the Commission statement on recent transition of the IANA stewardship to the global internet community in October 2016 and the upcoming Internet Governance Forum in Mexico (6–8 December 2016) (2016/2997(RSP)).

Corina Crețu, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, as you know, Parliament and the Commission have been working side by side on internet governance issues in support of the multi-stakeholder model for many years. Both institutions actively supported the completion of the IANA transitions, as well as the extension of the Internet Governance Forum (IGF) mandate, which was part of the successful outcome of the review of the World Summit on the Information Society one year ago in December 2015.

Recently a historical milestone for internet governance was finally achieved. The IANA contract has expired. As of 1 October 2016, the multi-stakeholder community is responsible for the overview of the IANA functions. In parallel, a series of improvements in economic accountability have come into force. This is a major step in making internet governance truly global and I warmly welcome it.

Parliament, our Member States and the Commission have long called for the globalisation of the IANA functions. We have all worked together with the rest of the global multi-stakeholder community for it to happen. Indeed the European input into this process has been substantial. However, the transition is not only the end of a process. It is, much more importantly, the beginning of a new phase. The multi-stakeholder model will now be put to the test. It is now up to all of us to live up to our new responsibilities.

My message to you is that it is even more relevant now for Europe to have a strong presence and voice in international discussions. While the United States has stepped back from its previous role, the continued threat from more authoritarian countries means that the EU must remain vigilant and play an even bigger role in the stewardship of the internet and defence of the multi-stakeholder model. Next will be the Internet Governance Forum in Mexico. It is a very good sign of Parliament's engagement that, as I understand it, 18 MEPs will be participating in this global meeting.

Now that the IGF's mandate has been extended, the challenge is to make it even more relevant and helpful for the whole multi-stakeholder internet community, which will face an ever-changing technological landscape. The internet of today is very different from the internet we will have in 10 years' time.

Europe can, and should, be a more active and powerful player in internet governance in line with the importance of the internet for the European economy and society. The role of the internet and digital has never been so high on the political agenda. In Europe we are working hard to deliver on the digital single market. A fundamental building block for our success is ensuring that the internet continues to function in a reliable and stable way and its governance is balanced, inclusive and transparent. I look forward to your contributions.

Pilar del Castillo Vera, en nombre del Grupo PPE. – Señora Presidenta; muchas gracias, Comisaria. Realmente, el año 2016 ha sido un año enormemente fructífero en la maduración de la gobernanza de internet. Hasta el 1 de octubre de este año, la gestión de la Autoridad para la Asignación de Números de Internet (IANA) estaba vinculada a la Administración de los Estados Unidos. A partir de 2016, la maduración de la gobernanza de internet ha culminado con su emancipación de ICANN, del Gobierno de los Estados Unidos, gracias al traspaso, el pasado 30 de septiembre, del contrato que tenía para el desempeño de las funciones de IANA desde la Administración estadounidense.

Esto es un hito realmente importante. Han sido muchos los años en los que este proceso se ha desarrollado. Ahora mismo nos encontramos ante una situación claramente definida por un enfoque *multistakeholder* para la gobernanza de internet.

Hay que decir, como decía la Comisaria, que la Unión Europea ha jugado un papel importante: la Comisión Europea, representando los intereses de todos los Estados miembros, por un lado, y también la presencia del Parlamento Europeo en todas las reuniones —y ya van a ser once— que, desde su fundación, ha tenido anualmente el Foro para la Gobernanza de Internet, que tiene que seguir manteniendo ese carácter abierto, no fragmentado y global de internet.

Carlos Zorrinho, *em nome do Grupo S&D*. – Senhora Presidente, no Fórum Global da Internet, em 2015, realizado em João Pessoa, no Brasil, foi possível prolongar por dez anos o acordo para a governação da Internet, continuando este a ser assegurado pela comunidade mundial de utilizadores, através de uma plataforma de parceria múltipla envolvendo os diversos *stakeholders*.

Nas conclusões desse fórum, foi dada ênfase ao compromisso do governo dos Estados Unidos de garantir a transferência das funções da IANA para a ICANN através de um processo transparente, acompanhado e verificado pela comunidade mundial de utilizadores.

Isso aconteceu. Em outubro de 2016, o processo de transferência foi consumado. Foi dado um passo importantíssimo para garantir um modelo aberto e participado de governação da Internet. Cabe agora ao Fórum Global de 2016, que decorrerá em Guadalajara, no México, entre 6 e 8 de dezembro, sob o signo da inclusão e do crescimento sustentável, consolidar o modelo de governação com provas dadas, fundado em valores democráticos e baseado em redes de fóruns de utilizadores estruturadas ao nível nacional, ao nível regional e ao nível global.

É fundamental garantir que, com a nova revolução digital e com as novas plataformas tecnológicas, a Internet continue a ser uma rede aberta, livre de ingerências, tecnologicamente neutra e capaz de conciliar a abordagem de mercado com as dimensões sociais da inclusão, da universalização de acesso e da generalização de serviços de utilidade pública.

A União Europeia tem sido um parceiro determinante na afirmação de uma visão aberta e plural na divulgação da Internet. Esta visão, associada a parcerias globais bem-sucedidas, fez a diferença em momentos-chave da decisão em que os arautos do controlo da Internet tentaram fazer valer a sua perspetiva e falharam.

Esta perspetiva europeia, vencedora do plano global, tem de ser também agora prevalecente na concretização da Agenda Digital e do Mercado Único Digital. A opção por uma Internet aberta, de acesso universal, inclusiva e ao serviço de cidadãos, enforma e motiva também a iniciativa Wifi for Europa de que sou relator.

Esta iniciativa afirma o modelo democrático e participativo, de facilitação do acesso à Internet pelas diversas comunidades e territórios, e pode e deve ter um efeito seminal, com princípios de ação que devem ser encorajados em todo o mundo e incluídos nas diretivas de cooperação externa da União.

Kosma Złotowski, *w imieniu grupy ECR*. – Szanowni Państwo! Internet jest narzędziem o zasięgu globalnym – to jasne. Finał procesu przekazywania funkcji porządkowania systemu domen i adresów IP przez rząd amerykański społeczności międzynarodowej to potwierdzenie tego faktu od strony administracyjnej. Intencje tego procesu są oczywiście jak najbardziej słuszne, jednak czy możemy być pewni, że globalna kontrola będzie bardziej efektywna niż dotychczas? Czy na dłuższą metę wypracowanie uniwersalnych standardów w zakresie podstawowych zasad funkcjonowania internetu jest możliwe, skoro nawet w kwestii praw człowieka nie mogliśmy się porozumieć? Trudno uwierzyć, że reżimy niedemokratyczne i prywatne korporacje nie wykorzystają swoich wpływów, aby dzięki tej zmianie wzmocnić swoją kontrolę nad siecią. Taki scenariusz byłby oczywiście niezwykle groźny dla nas wszystkich. Dlatego musimy rozmawiać z naszymi partnerami w międzynarodowych gremiach i szukać porozumienia w sprawie wspólnych zasad zarządzania internetem.

Kaja Kallas, *on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – Madam President, the recent internet governance transition to the global internet community is a symbolic step, but symbolic steps are quite necessary in these turbulent times, especially after the recent elections in the USA. Most people involved in the work of ICANN will say that it will not change much, as the US Commerce Department was only validating that decisions follow protocols, but this is how it was, and with new leadership things can change. So for non-Americans there is definitely a sense of relief that the transition has been done, not only because of the US political landscape, but because internet governance just cannot be under oversight of one specific country.

Trust and openness are at the heart of the internet, so people expect the internet to function and to be able to trust it; but maintaining that trust does involve a lot of technical work behind the scenes that most of us do not really see. The work of ICANN on domain names is a good example. Domain names are like phone numbers: if some of us have the same number, then it's a problem. So people need to trust that there is an inclusive and transparent process in place on how domain names are distributed and how name collisions are dealt with. The internet was created with the dream of free flow of information, but since then interests around controlling the internet from both the private sector as well as the public sector have been growing. Therefore this is an important time for multi-stakeholder internet governance to be successful. It is crucial to show even in a rather technical area that the process is independent and transparent.

Barbara Kappel, *im Namen der ENF-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin, Frau Kommissarin! Das *Internet Governance Forum 2016* steht unter dem Motto: „Inklusives und nachhaltiges Wachstum ermöglichen.“ Die Erhöhung der Konnektivität ist dabei eines der vorrangigen Ziele, und Konnektivität bedeutet in dem Zusammenhang, dass bis zum Jahr 2020 eine weitere Milliarde Menschen online gehen sollen.

Das diesjährige Forum hat drei Schwerpunkte, das sind *Cyber Security*, *Cyber Economy* und Menschenrechte, die sehr gut gewählt sind! *Cyber Security* – die Bedeutung ist nicht extra hervorzuheben. Jeder in Deutschland – rund 300 000 Personen waren von dem Ausfall bei der Deutschen Telekom betroffen –, weiß, dass *Cyber Security* heute nicht nur Unternehmen, sondern jeden privaten Haushalt ebenso betreffen kann.

Die digitale Wirtschaft generell ist der Schlüsselfaktor für Wachstum und Beschäftigung. Digitale Innovation, wie wir heute bei Blockchain zum Beispiel sehen, ist der Treiber für Hunderttausende neuer Arbeitsplätze. Die EU muss hier stark vertreten sein.

Die vom *Internet Governance Forum* gefassten Beschlüsse sind allerdings nur *agreements of principle*. Das heißt, sie können das digitale Wachstumspotenzial und die Auswirkungen auf eine globale Gesellschaft aufzeigen, eine Fragmentierung des Internets aber nicht verhindern. Die Fragmentierung ist aber die größte Gefahr für das Internet. Aus diesem Grund muss das Mandat des *IGF* verstärkt werden. Das Internet muss offen und frei zugänglich bleiben.

Jerzy Buzek (PPE). – Madam President, the internet is a global common resource and a springboard to economic, scientific and social development. The EU has to contribute actively to the evolving model of internet governance. Parliament has been committed to making the governance transparent and inclusive. We welcomed the transfer of supervision over the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority to the multi-stakeholder communities. This will help us keep the internet open and safe. Moreover, the Internet Governance Forum must remain high on the agenda of the EU institutions and the Member States.

Next week the Committee on Industry, Research and Energy (ITRE) will once again lead the European Parliament delegation to the Forum's meeting in Mexico. The European perspective must be communicated globally for the sake of our industry, business and citizens, especially citizens of course. Three preconditions are necessary: global efforts to improve access all over the world to the internet, joint strategies for raising the security of critical infrastructure, which is very important in times of so many hybrid threats, and ensuring internet communication for our citizens and companies, especially small and medium enterprises. That is a priority for us.

Lambert van Nistelrooij (PPE). – Madam President, next week the Internet Governance Forum (IGF) takes place just after the change of the IANA stewardship to the global internet community in October 2016 — an important milestone that has been supported by Parliament and the Commission for years.

The new arrangement is the outcome of political awareness and pressure. We have strengthened the position of the global internet community, internet governance. The principles of openness, security, reliability and independence from national states have been applied. In times of strong tendencies toward national solutions and attitudes, we have to make sure that the internet truly remains the free worldwide web. There can be No Balkanisation of the internet, where countries build virtual walls, fragmenting the worldwide web into national internets, limiting trade and communication, which are our principles.

A lot of work needs to be done, as Mr Buzek said, including in terms of involving the stakeholders from developing countries and our youth. It is important that young people take responsibility, and the Youth IGF next week in Mexico is a good start. It is a good sign that Parliament is sending a big delegation – a good high-level delegation – as is the Commission, to Guadalajara in Mexico.

Jiří Pospíšil (PPE). – Paní předsedající, mnoho už bylo k tomuto tématu řečeno, já pouze podtrhnu slova svých předřečníků. Je velmi dobře, že Evropská unie vysílá svoji delegaci na toto globální internetové fórum. Podoba internetu je mimořádně důležitou věcí. Patří ke svobodné společnosti. My musíme udělat maximum pro to, aby správa internetu, která přechází fakticky do soukromých rukou, do oblasti soukromého sektoru, tak aby byla vykonávána efektivně a aby některá klíčová témata, o kterých se diskutuje, jako je přístup k internetu pro mladé lidi, pro gendry, jako je přístup k internetu ve třetích zemích, jako je otázka ochrany osobních dat, ochrana lidských práv a ochrana svobody projevu na internetu, byla předmětem důsledné debaty. Já jsem pro absolutní svobodu projevu na internetu, na druhou stranu my musíme upozorňovat na to, že tato svoboda občas je zneužívána, například v případě České republiky ze strany Ruska, které šíří nepravdivé informace na internetu.

(Řečník souhlasil s tím, že odpoví na otázku položenou zvednutím modré karty (čl. 162 odst. 8 jednacího řádu).)

Miäpetra Kumpula-Natri (S&D), sinisen kortin kysymys. – On tärkeää, että Eurooppa on edustettuna. Meillä oli myöskin mahdollisuus kuulla asiantuntijoita, miten he näkevät tilanteen kehittymisen kaiken kaikkiaan internetin osalta, onko avoimuus lisääntynyt vai vähentynyt. Näiden eurooppalaisten itsestään selvien mielipiteiden vieminen eteenpäin on tärkeää. Siksi on tärkeää, että Euroopan delegaatio on siellä. Valitettavasti asiantuntijat kertoivat meille, että hyvään suuntaan emme ole kehittymässä vaan huonoon suuntaan.

Jiří Pospíšil (PPE), odpověď na otázku položenou zvednutím modré karty. – Nevím, zda byl špatný překlad, ale přímo jsem nezaznamenal otázku. Budu tedy reagovat na to, co paní kolegyně řekla.

Já absolutně souhlasím. Naším cílem má být to, abychom udělali vše pro to, aby internet byl otevřený, aby tam byla svoboda projevu, aby nedocházelo k jeho fragmentaci a aby víceméně internet byl přístupný občanům ve třetích zemích. To je palčivý problém, kde by Evropská unie měla jednoznačně podporovat, aby maximum lidí na této planetě mělo svobodný přístup k internetu.

Catch-the-eye procedure

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, το DNS αποτελεί έναν από τους πιο σημαντικούς πυλώνες του Διαδικτύου, καθώς συνδυάζει τις διευθύνσεις IP με τους παρόχους. Οι Ηνωμένες Πολιτείες είχαν πάντα τον τελικό έλεγχο σε ό,τι αφορά τον έλεγχο του DNS και η μεταβίβαση της διαχείρισης της IANA από την αμερικανική κυβέρνηση στη μη κερδοσκοπική οργάνωση ICANN αποτελεί το τέλος του ελέγχου και της διαχείρισης του Διαδικτύου από τις Ηνωμένες Πολιτείες. Η ενέργεια αυτή των ΗΠΑ είναι ένα βήμα ανοικτό, σταθερό και συνδυάζει τον πολυμερή έλεγχο του Διαδικτύου. Περιορίζει την εξουσία της Ουάσιγκτον στη διακυβέρνηση του Διαδικτύου και θέτει τον έλεγχο υπό το φάσμα μιας διεθνούς ομπρέλας. Τα εμπλεκόμενα μέρη πρέπει να διασφαλίσουν ότι το Διαδίκτυο θα είναι και θα παραμείνει ένα ενιαίο, ανοικτό, ουδέτερο, ελεύθερο και αδιάσπαστο δίκτυο και κατά τη μεταβατική περίοδο.

(End of catch-the-eye procedure)

Corina Crețu, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, honourable Members, let me first thank you for your support and engagement in this file. We are at a turning point for the evolution of the internet, an amazing technology that for good and for bad is a mirror of our societies. Now it is time to deliver what is needed to keep the internet open, unfragmented and reliable. Going forward, it will be important to continue to work together and make sure the EU acts as a coherent and positive partner in internet governance discussion at the global level. This will include working on how to improve the multi-stakeholder model and make it more inclusive, accountable, and transparent. In this context, stronger links with internet governance dialogue taking place at local and national level are also very important.

The internet governance forum has grown to become an important platform for these discussions, and I am confident with our input it will continue to improve and grow over the next coming years. I therefore wish the European Parliament delegation going to Guadalajara a fruitful meeting. The Commission will also be present there with a delegation from DG CONNECT. I am confident that you will be able to bring forward the discussion in many areas, and I am looking forward to hearing about the result of your discussions.

President. – The debate is closed.

Written statements (Rule 162)

Nicola Caputo (S&D), per iscritto. – Tra pochi giorni si terrà l'Internet Governance Forum 2016, importante appuntamento per discutere e codificare ulteriormente i miglioramenti necessari nel settore delle ICT. Queste discussioni guidano le azioni da parte dei governi nazionali, le agenzie regionali e globali e degli operatori. È di conseguenza importante sottolineare che l'IGF discuterà anche di questioni di politica pubblica pertinenti con internet, quali la sicurezza informatica e la privacy dei dati, argomenti sui quali mi sono più volte pronunciato. Devo dire che sarà imprescindibile il tema della governance di internet in un contesto globale, con alcune particolarità di rilievo: vi è una crescente competizione economica nel campo digitale; l'asse del cyberspazio globale non è quello solito, ma è intorno gli Stati Uniti e la Cina; dopo le decisioni della Corte di giustizia europea su Safe Harbor e diritto all'oblio, la privacy e la cybersecurity non sono più solo una questione di diritti umani. Ora sono anche un problema economico, anzi, di cybereconomy, è in quest'ottica che vanno risolte, con l'attivazione di una crescita inclusiva e sostenibile per i paesi in via di sviluppo.

Danuta Jazłowiecka (PPE), na piśmie. – Nadchodzące Forum Zarządzania Internetem jest nie tylko ważnym wydarzeniem na skalę światową, ale także ważnym elementem współpracy pomiędzy Unią Europejską a Meksykiem. Na ten aspekt chciałabym zwrócić Państwa uwagę jako członkini Delegacji ds. Stosunków z Meksykiem oraz jako członek delegacji Parlamentu Europejskiego z ramienia STOA na to właśnie wydarzenie. Meksyk, ze względu na swój potencjał naukowo-technologiczny, jest dla nas atrakcyjnym partnerem. Od początku nasza współpraca była intensywna i wydarzenia takie jak Forum Zarządzania Internetem jeszcze bardziej ją pogłębiają. Warto zwrócić uwagę na wspólne europejsko-meksykańskie projekty takie jak projekt LEADERSHIP, który wspiera dialog między Unią a państwami Ameryki Łacińskiej w dziedzinie współpracy na rzecz technik teleinformacyjnych (ICT). Dzięki realizacji projektu powołano specjalną grupę ekspercką, która jest trwałym mechanizmem wspierającym dialog. Mam nadzieję, że wydarzenia takie jak Forum Internetu zaowocują podobnymi pozytywnymi inicjatywami. Ponadto nadchodzące forum jest świetną okazją, aby porozmawiać o wpływie cyfryzacji na rynek pracy. Szczególnie interesująca może okazać się wymiana dobrych praktyk na temat nowych form pracy poprzez platformy cyfrowe. W Europie nadal nie znaleźliśmy idealnego rozwiązania, jak połączyć elastyczność z bezpieczeństwem pracownika. Dlatego też forum to może okazać się doskonałym źródłem informacji.

16. Fundusz Solidarności Unii Europejskiej: ocena - Sytuacja we Włoszech po trzęsieniach ziemi (debata)

President. – The next item is the joint debate on

— the report by Salvatore Cicu, on behalf of the Committee on Regional Development, on the European Union Solidarity Fund: an assessment (2016/2045(INI)) (A8-0341/2016),

— the oral question to the Commission on the situation in Italy after the earthquakes, by Ivan Jakovčić, Iskra Mihaylova, Matthijs van Miltenburg, Petras Auštrevičius, Norica Nicolai, Urmas Paet, Remo Sernagiotto, Raffaele Fitto, on behalf of the Group of the Alliance of Liberals and Democrats for Europe (O-000139/2016 – B8-1812/2016),

— the oral question to the Commission on the situation in Italy after the earthquakes, by Lambert van Nistelrooij, Antonio Tajani, Elisabetta Gardini, Salvatore Cicu, Constanze Krehl, Mercedes Bresso, Davor Škrlec, Ramón Luis Valcárcel Siso, Group of the European People's Party (Christian Democrats), Group of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats in the European Parliament, Group of the Greens/European Free Alliance (O-000140/2016 – B8-1813/2016),

— the oral question to the Commission on the situation in Italy after the earthquakes, by Rosa D'Amato, Laura Agea, Fabio Massimo Castaldo, Isabella Adinolfi, Rolandas Paksas, Daniela Aiuto, Piernicola Pedicini, David Coburn, on behalf of the Europe of Freedom and Direct Democracy Group (O-000141/2016 – B8-1814/2016), and

— the oral question to the Commission on the situation in Italy after the earthquakes by Curzio Maltese, Eleonora Forenza, Barbara Spinelli, on behalf of the Confederal Group of the European United Left – Nordic Green Left (O-000146/2016 – B8-1817/2016) (2016/2988(RSP)).

Salvatore Cicu, relatore. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signora Commissaria, dopo i tragici eventi alluvionali del 2002, l'Unione europea ha istituito il Fondo di solidarietà, per esprimere in maniera tangibile, una centralità rispetto a questi temi, verso i paesi colpiti da gravi catastrofi naturali. L'Italia si trova in questi ultimi anni, purtroppo, ad affrontare drammi importantissimi: l'alluvione in Sardegna, in Liguria, in Piemonte. Questo è di qualche giorno fa, ma il terremoto all'Aquila, nel Centro Italia è sicuramente impossibile prevedere tutte le situazioni di emergenza, tutte le catastrofi, ma è sempre possibile migliorare la gestione delle loro conseguenze. Preliminarmente vorrei anche dire che in questi casi le istituzioni europee devono essere sensibili, devono capire che la loro credibilità, la loro autorevolezza, dipende anche dalla capacità di essere presenti in questi momenti e di trasferire un messaggio, di capacità appunto, di gestione.

Noi sappiamo che, per quanto positive siano state le modifiche apportate dal regolamento 2014, cioè quelle riferite ai pagamenti anticipati fino al 10% dell'importo, l'ammissibilità dei costi legati alla preparazione e all'attenzione delle operazioni di emergenza e di ripristino, ma anche la proroga dei termini per la presentazione della domanda da parte degli Stati membri, l'introduzione del termine di sei settimane per la risposta della Commissione, le nuove disposizioni in materia di prevenzione, delle catastrofi naturali e miglioramenti delle relative procedure.

Credo fermamente però, che ancora molti passi in avanti possano e debbano poter migliorare l'efficacia del fondo e mostrare ai nostri cittadini, colpiti da catastrofi, che l'Europa è veramente vicina alle loro necessità, quindi è importante la presenza della Commissione europea quest'oggi per chiedere alla Commissaria che il Fondo di solidarietà, venga ancora migliorato, per superare alcune criticità che tuttora permangono. Quindi chiedo alla Commissione di valutare la possibilità, di aumentare la soglia dei pagamenti anticipati, dal 10 al 15%, perché è importante l'immediatezza della disponibilità, che i territori possono realizzare rispetto alle situazioni emergenziali, così come ancora in Italia, rispetto ai drammi che vive, ho appena citato, nonché la possibilità di abbreviare i termini per il trattamento delle sei domande da sei a quattro settimane.

Invito inoltre la Commissione a esaminare la possibilità di istituire una soglia di ammissibilità che dall'1,5% si realizzi invece, con il limite dell'1% del Pil regionale, e a considerare nella valutazione delle domande il livello di sviluppo socioeconomico delle regioni colpite. Chiedo però agli Stati membri anche, di agire con responsabilità, nel migliorare i loro mezzi di comunicazione e cooperazione con le autorità locali e regionali, sia durante il processo di valutazione iniziale dei danni ammissibili, per i quali viene richiesto il sostegno finanziario, perché troppe volte il ritardo e la poca capacità amministrativa, hanno causato ulteriori ostacoli.

Chiedo inoltre a questa Commissione che nel caso specifico del terremoto, venga data la possibilità di rivedere le regole sulla flessibilità e sul patto di stabilità, soprattutto con riferimento agli investimenti antisismici e sulla ricostruzione sostenibile, perché in questo caso specifico dovrebbero essere esclusi dal calcolo del deficit nazionale nel quadro del patto di stabilità, perché in questo caso non si può chiedere una deroga alla norma per ragioni elettorali, ma per salvaguardare la vita, la sofferenza di centinaia di persone che, nell'ambito di catastrofi naturali, hanno perso la vita.

PRZEWODNICTWO: RYSZARD CZARNECKI*Wiceprzewodniczący*

Lambert van Nistelrooij, *autor*. – Mr President, Mr Cicu has made a lot of very concrete proposals. It is now two years ago that we first spoke in this House about the Solidarity Fund, and it is indeed possible to be quicker, to be more effective and to have a reconsideration of the exact territory and figures. So my question to the Commissioner more generally is whether the Commission is able to take over these proposals and what kind of planning does it have to deliver these ameliorations. And it doesn't have to cost more. In fact, since the Solidarity Fund started we have spent EUR 3.8 billion, and it has been mobilised in 70 natural disasters in 24 countries of the Union. So as Mr Chico said in his report, it is very close to people and it can be used to act immediately. At this time of naturalistic, populist debates, this really is being close to the people when with floods, hurricanes and earthquakes things go totally wrong. I support Mr Cicu strongly on this.

The second question, harking back to the previous period and the proposal from Mr Kallas in 2007 on earthquakes, is that it is so important to have a good preventive alarm system, and also with our funds – combining the Solidarity Fund with the regional development funds – to put prevention in the forefront. I think we are having the right debate, especially as the situation in Italy makes this a timely debate, and I am very glad that the government recently brought the proposal to the European Commission. I hope we will have good follow-up to the proposal.

Ivan Jakovčić, *autor*. – Gospodine predsjedniče, posljedice potresa koji je zadesio Italiju ovoga ljeta još uvijek nisu uklonjene. Posljedice su 290 poginulih ljudi, preko 400 teško ozlijeđenih. Računamo da je oko 100 000 ljudi raseljenih ili će morati biti raseljeni. To su zaista stravične posljedice.

Zato ovom prilikom želim istaknuti da je vrlo važno da sutra usvojimo rezoluciju koju smo predložili, jer trebamo ukazati na probleme s kojima se suočavamo kada govorimo o Fondu solidarnosti u EU-u. Trebamo brže reagirati pa čak uključiti EIB kada govorimo o tome da neke stvari treba prefinansirati ili financirati u smislu ovakvih nepogoda koja zadešavaju područja iz kojih dolazimo.

Kao izvjestitelj za Jadransko-jonsku makroregiju govorili smo o specifičnosti tog područja. Nažalost, potresi su jedna od specifičnosti tog područja. Cijela Italija i Balkan su vrlo trusna područja. Znamo za povijesne potrese u Dubrovniku, Zagrebu, Skopju, Grčkoj, Crnoj gori. Znamo za te probleme i moramo učiniti sve kako bismo mogli prevenirati jer ljudski životi, svjetska kulturna baština nema cijenu. Moramo voditi dugoročnu politiku kako zaštititi od potresa tu svjetsku kulturnu baštinu na Jadransko-jonskom području. Da ne govorim o infrastrukturi i svemu onome što je bitno za život ljudi.

Na kraju želim svima onima koji su stradali u potresu u Italiji još jednom izraziti moju maksimalnu sućut i žaljenje.

Mercedes Bresso, *autore*. – Signor Presidente, ringrazio i colleghi che dimostrano che la solidarietà esiste in Europa, anche a nome del mio paese, in cui, come sapete, gli avvenimenti sismici sono stati di gravità eccezionale e in alcuni mesi hanno sconvolto una zona molto ampia del Centro Italia. Credo che oltre al ricordo delle vittime dobbiamo richiamare che sono stati prodotti danni ingenti ad abitazioni, gran parte delle infrastrutture sono state distrutte, le imprese sono state duramente colpite, gli edifici pubblici, scuole, ospedali, strutture sono in moltissimi casi non agibili. È dunque ancora una situazione di gravissima emergenza che si sta affrontando con misure rapide ma efficaci, a cui si sta già intervenendo, sia per la ricostruzione, che anche per la prevenzione, che i colleghi hanno molto opportunamente richiamato.

Nella risoluzione, di cui siamo coautori, un gruppo di rappresentanti dei diversi gruppi politici, accogliamo con piacere la disponibilità – che speriamo la Commissaria ci confermerà – e la concessione di una maggiore flessibilità per le spese relative all'emergenza, ma anche per quelle di messa in sicurezza, che sono (io credo) un elemento importantissimo per tutta l'area sismica, che, come ricordava il collega è italiana ma anche dei Balcani. E anche la rapidità e l'impegno alla rapidità nella messa a disposizione delle risorse, del fondo di solidarietà, anche in questo caso la rapidità e la capacità di dimostrare che l'Unione europea si muove quando è necessario, con la dovuta celerità.

Grazie, quindi se questi impegni verranno mantenuti e vorrei ricordare anche, tutti i volontari, che hanno offerto il loro enorme contributo, salvando vite umane e limitando i danni, molti dei quali anche stranieri. Speriamo che nel futuro il rafforzamento dei corpi di solidarietà a livello europeo permetta a molti giovani di fare un'analogia esperienza.

Igor Šoltes, *Avtor*. – Beseda solidarnost v tem poročilu igra zelo pomembno vlogo. In vsi ti zadnji potresi, ki so prizadeli osrednjo Italijo, od avgusta do konca oktobra, kažejo seveda, da je mati narava popolnoma nepredvidljiva in zato je ta solidarnostni sklad, ustanovljen že davnega leta 2002, tako pomemben.

Pomembno pa je tudi to, da ta finančna podpora za reševanje posledic in ublažitev posledic pride pravočasno, na prave naslove. Velikokrat pa so na tem področju seveda tudi administrativne ovire, ki načeloma naj bi preprečevale tudi zlorabe, korupcijo in pa seveda stvari, ki se včasih izkoriščajo v slabe namene.

In zato mislim, da bi Komisija tudi na tem področju lahko naredila korak naprej in pripravila na nek način tudi neki „guideline“ in navodila državam članicam – priporočila, kako, naj čim bolj učinkovito izkoristijo in seveda tudi zagotovijo razdeljevanje te pomoči. Po eni strani tiste iz solidarnostnega sklada in po drugi strani seveda tudi v okviru držav članic.

Bi se pa na tem mestu osredotočil tudi na en drug problem, in sicer včasih pozabimo tudi na tiste, ki pri reševanju ljudi in premoženja ob naravnih nesrečah, potresih, poplavalah, tvegajo tudi svoja življenja.

Govorim tudi o gasilcih, civilni zaščiti in tistih prostovoljcih, ki se postavljajo torej v zaščito – kot sem rekel – ljudi in pa seveda tudi premoženja.

In mislim, da del pozornosti mora Komisija v prihodnje nameniti tudi temu. Zlasti glede tega, ker mnogi prostovoljci, ki so v delovnem razmerju, od delodajalcev seveda ne dobijo ustreznega nadomestila za njihovo odsotnost, čeprav gre za požrtvovalno delo in pa solidarnost.

In mislim, da je to še dodaten izziv, na katerega moramo biti posebno pozorni, in seveda hvala vsem tistim, ki so se žrtvovali pri tej pomoči.

Rosa D'Amato, *autore*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, i recenti terremoti in Italia centrale hanno mietuto quasi 300 vittime e costretto centomila persone ad abbandonare le proprie abitazioni, le proprie attività, e procurato miliardi di euro in danni materiali. Non basta la solidarietà e la vicinanza, i cittadini vogliono risposte dall'Unione e dai governi, per rimettere in piedi un territorio duramente colpito.

L'Italia è a elevato rischio sismico ed è spesso sferzata da eventi climatici che provocano frane, alluvioni, smottamenti, come pochi giorni fa nel nord ovest del paese. I cittadini attendono risorse e vogliono che queste siano impiegate correttamente, per la prevenzione dei disastri, per il contrasto al dissesto idrogeologico, per la messa in sicurezza di case, scuole, ospedali e aziende. Sono decenni che se ne parla, ma i fatti smentiscono le promesse fatte da tutti i governi che si sono avvicendati. A complicare il quadro, ci sono poi le catene e i vincoli imposti da questa Europa, che toglie il fiato già nell'ordinaria amministrazione e che in casi di calamità, rischia di strangolare la popolazione e le attività produttive.

Il Movimento 5 Stelle dall'inizio della legislatura, insiste per lo scorporo dei fondi strutturali dal calcolo del deficit, uno dei parametri del Patto di stabilità e crescita. E oggi, coerentemente, chiede di escludere dal calcolo, la ricostruzione sostenibile, la prevenzione antisismica e le azioni cofinanziate con fondi strutturali secondo l'obiettivo tematico, cinque. Faccio un appello a tutti i colleghi, affinché il Parlamento sostenga e voti questa posizione, espressa nella risoluzione nel compromesso 11. La Commissione valuti la domanda del governo italiano per il Fondo di solidarietà, ma in maniera rapida e vigili affinché le risorse siano utilizzate in maniera opportuna. L'austerità non si combatte a corrente alternata, in occasione di emergenze o di scadenze elettorali, ma in maniera coerente e continua e non strumentale.

Curzio Maltese, *autore*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, tempestività, efficacia, prevenzione. Io credo che i colleghi, molti colleghi, al di là delle diverse posizioni, siano d'accordo, sul perseguire questi obiettivi. E la relazione è un passo in avanti, ma rimane da fare altro. L'esperienza ci dice che questo Fondo di solidarietà, pur essendo limitato, non è stato utilizzato appieno finora, nonostante le catastrofi naturali siano in aumento in Europa, anche per effetto dei mutamenti climatici. Nel 2014 per esempio sono stati spesi soltanto 126 milioni sui 500 disponibili. Anche perché le soglie di accesso sono troppo alte. Dobbiamo cambiare questo meccanismo. Renderlo più funzionale. In quale modo?

Il più semplice sarebbe di abbassare le soglie, che è stato proposto e gli Stati l'hanno rifiutato. Noi proponiamo come emendamento, anche un'altra soluzione, complementare all'abbassamento delle soglie, forse più equa, che è quella di calcolare le soglie non solo sulla base di un singolo evento, ma anche sommando i danni subiti da una stessa regione nell'arco di un anno, per effetto di catastrofi naturali e ripetute. Abbiamo portato qui, tutti noi, l'esperienza tragica delle popolazioni del Centro Italia che avevano appena cominciato a ricostruire le loro città, distrutte dal terremoto in agosto, quando altre tre devastanti scosse hanno annientato il lavoro fatto. Ma c'è anche l'esperienza di regioni, specialmente nel Sud Europa, in Italia, il Portogallo, Spagna, Grecia e Cipro, dove i mutamenti climatici, le cattive politiche del territorio, producono catastrofi che ormai si susseguono in serie, portando le popolazioni alla disperazione. Allora mi domando e vi domando, che senso ha valutare uno per uno eventi che ormai sono collegati, negando la nostra solidarietà a chi ne ha davvero più bisogno, sulla base di un gelido algoritmo burocratico?

Corina Crețu, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, I would like to start with Mr Cicu's report on the Solidarity Fund, and I would like to thank Mr Cicu and the Committee on Regional Development for this own-initiative report on the EU Solidarity Fund. Solidarity, as has been said here, is one of the fundamental values of the European Union. However, this value takes on even more importance when one of our Member States, regions or accession countries is hit by natural disasters.

The EU Solidarity Fund was created exactly for this purpose. As a speaker rightly said, two years ago we introduced a reform to make support from this fund better and simpler. We are currently assessing the impact of this reform, but we can already note some positive consequences.

First: clarity. Criteria for support from the Solidarity Fund are now much clearer. This means more transparency, but also greater ease for beneficiaries to prepare successful applications. Second: rapidity. Assessment and decisions on support are now speedier, not least thanks to Commission-streamlined procedures. Third: advance payments. Now we can ensure that shelter, clothes and food can be delivered while we are deciding on applications. Thanks to this possibility, Italy will be receiving EUR 30 million in advance payments already in December to help alleviate the consequences of recent earthquakes. But beyond these changes, the ongoing simplification of cohesion policy regulations should also help facilitate swift decisions on solidarity fund applications.

Sulla situazione in Italia dopo il terremoto quattro domande orali. Sono lieta di annunciare che le autorità italiane hanno recentemente introdotto la domanda per attivare il Fondo di solidarietà dell'Unione europea. Questa domanda riguarda i terremoti di agosto e di ottobre. Stiamo ancora lavorando con le autorità italiane per completare la valutazione dei danni causati dal terremoto in ottobre, poi saremo in grado di attivare concretamente il Fondo di solidarietà. Nel frattempo abbiamo già lanciato la procedura per assegnare un anticipo di 30 milioni di euro, che è il massimo consentito dal regolamento. Questo anticipo sarà già disponibile la settimana prossima e consentirà di sostenere gli interventi più urgenti. Ma, cari colleghi, e la solidarietà dell'Unione europea non si limita soltanto al Fondo di solidarietà. Anche la politica di coesione può e deve essere attivata. In questo contesto, la Commissione sta esaminando come i programmi della regione colpita dal terremoto possano essere adattati per sostenere la prevenzione delle catastrofi e il rilancio sociale ed economico nelle zone colpite da terremoti. Infine, ho proposto che i lavori di ricostruzione in caso di calamità naturali possono essere interamente coperti dai fondi strutturali, per esempio per la basilica di San Benedetto di Norcia.

Marco Valli, *relatore per parere della commissione per il controllo dei bilanci*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la commissione per il controllo dei bilanci ha redatto un testo molto chiaro, dove riteniamo fondamentale che il fondo di solidarietà si avvii verso una semplificazione delle procedure e dei criteri di valutazione per la richiesta di attivazione. Questo per essere il più tempestivo possibile in situazioni di emergenza, nel caso di spiacevoli catastrofi. Allo stesso tempo riteniamo che non sia però possibile effettuare un buon controllo senza la totale trasparenza, perché non deve essere minimamente consentito speculare sulle situazioni d'emergenza. Per questo nella relazione invitiamo gli Stati membri e la Commissione a rendere pubbliche e pienamente accessibili, tutte le informazioni sull'uso del Fondo di solidarietà, cosa che fino ad oggi non è stata fatta e ha permesso in alcuni casi, l'utilizzo improprio del denaro, tra cui

l'ultimo terremoto che era successo all'Aquila. Aggiungo personalmente, a nome del Movimento 5 stelle, che non è accettabile, sentir parlare di vincoli europei di spesa, in un momento di crisi della domanda come questo e come quello in cui ci troviamo, e men che meno quando ci sono di mezzo le catastrofi. Per questo, interventi di prevenzione e ricostruzione dovrebbero immediatamente essere esclusi da vincoli per l'Italia e per tutti i paesi. Questo non è populismo, non è demagogia, è semplicemente buonsenso.

Ramón Luis Valcárcel Siso, *en nombre del Grupo PPE*. – Señor Presidente, el año 2016 ha sido un año devastador para el pueblo italiano: Norcia, Amatrice, Preci. Cientos de vecinos a los que la tierra, en su virulencia, arrebató la vida. Miles de vecinos obligados a buscar refugio en otros lugares tras ver sus casas consumidas.

Destinar los fondos precisos para reconstruir hogares, colegios, centros de salud, iglesias, infraestructuras es sencillamente reconstruir vidas. Y es aquí donde el principio de solidaridad debe aplicarse con mayor intensidad. Viví una experiencia similar cuando la tierra se abrió en mi región, la región de Murcia, que entonces presidía, arrasando una histórica ciudad, la de Lorca, y, lo que es peor, llevándose por delante muchas vidas humanas. Por eso nuestro yo también mi solidaridad con Italia, en general, y con las zonas afectadas, de forma particular.

Soy consciente de las implicaciones económicas y humanas causadas por los terremotos. Sé que en estos momentos es cuando los ciudadanos más necesitan la respuesta de las instituciones políticas; la cercanía, especialmente, de las instituciones de la Unión Europea.

Por esta razón, señora Comisaria, pido a la Comisión mayor flexibilidad en el presupuesto con el que hacer frente a este tipo de tragedias y acontecimientos no previstos. Usted, señora Crețu, es una persona sensible y comprometida con estas situaciones y es en ello en lo que confiamos.

Tonino Picula, *u ime kluba S&D*. – Gospodine predsjedniče, Fond solidarnosti EU-a postoji zbog pružanja financijske potpore državama članicama i državama pristupnicama nakon velikih prirodnih katastrofa. Od osnivanja do kraja srpnja prošle godine ukupno je odobreno i isplaćeno 4 milijarde EUR na temelju 72 zahtjeva iz 24 zemlje.

Nakon nekoliko pokušaja 2014. konačno su prihvaćeni prijedlozi Komisije o izmjenama radi ubrzanja postupaka isplate. Uvode se predujmovi i daje više vremena za korištenje bespovratnih sredstava. Razjašnjava se područje primjene te potiče na prevenciju šteta od elementarnih nepogoda.

Međutim, najveći problem Fonda je svakako spora isplata odobrenih sredstava. Bez obzira na spomenute reforme, mora proći minimalno do 10 tjedana do isplate jer dopuštenje moraju dati i Vijeće i Parlament. U praksi je rok i duži. Primjerice, novac za poplave koje su pogodile Hrvatsku i ostale zemlje u regiji u svibnju 2014. Komisija je odobrila u listopadu, ali ga je Parlament potvrdio tek u prosincu iste godine nakon punih 7 mjeseci. U narodu postoji sljedeća izreka: „Tko pomaže odmah, pomaže dvostruko”.

Smatram da nedostaje jači financijski instrument kako bi se mogao pokriti veći udio u ukupnom trošku šteta. Trenutačno je riječ o svega 2 – 5 % ukupne štete. Treba povećati stopnju plaćanja akontacije s trenutačnih 10 %. Tako ćemo zaista iskazati solidarnost i zajamčiti brzu pomoć ljudima pogođenim velikim elementarnim nepogodama. Valja izbjeći situacije kada se žrtve osjećaju napuštenu u dugom razdoblju od katastrofe do uplate sredstava fonda.

Ovo izvješće i rezolucija o posljedicama katastrofalnih potresa u Italiji jesu dobar niz prijedloga pomoći stradalim građanima jer poboljšavaju rješenja Komisije. To se odnosi na trajanje isplate pomoći, prevencije, provedbu *ex ante* uvjeta u kohezijskoj politici, sinkronizaciju postojećih instrumenata EU-a, transparentnost u trošenju dodijeljenih sredstava i suradnju različitih razina odlučivanja.

Zahvaljujem kolegu Cicu na dobroj suradnji te vas pozivam da sutra izvješće usvojimo.

Remo Sernagiotto, *a nome del gruppo ECR*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, volevo ringraziare anche il Commissario per l'intervento, che ho apprezzato molto. Ma volevo partire dalla relazione dell'onorevole Cicu, che indica in modo puntuale di essere molto veloci in questi momenti. Vede, in queste terre così belle, ma così difficili del Centro Italia, terre che conosciamo molto bene, l'economia è tutta basata sull'agricoltura soprattutto e la sua trasformazione, e l'agricoltura – ieri parlavo con il sindaco di Amatrice – che mi spiegava che per 2 000 persone, 1 100, lì è inverno, c'è già la neve, fa molto freddo. Però quelle imprese non si possono lasciare, quelle imprese sono legate agli animali, perciò alle persone che vivono lì e che accudiscono.

Ma l'importanza di rimanere lì, perché il tempo potrebbe essere drammatico per quelle terre. Noi non le dobbiamo abbandonare, né le persone, né quel territorio. È un territorio strategico, perché abbandonato potrebbe diventare un territorio, difficile per tutti, non solo per quelli che lì ci vivono. Perciò occorre accelerare e dare delle risposte immediate. Intanto quella straordinaria fiducia, che quei cittadini, ma non solo quelli, quelli che vedono questi atti, capaci di dare risposte, potrebbero essere atti che aiuterebbero anche la nostra Europa, se devo essere sincero, perché oggi magari non è più vista con grande simpatia, invece, riteniamo che dobbiamo lavorare molto e in questi momenti, di più, per poter far diventare ancora una volta simpatica questa Europa a tutti i cittadini europei.

Matthijs van Miltenburg, *namens de ALDE-Fractie*. – Voorzitter, ik wil allereerst vanaf deze plek mijn medeleven uitspreken met alle slachtoffers van recente natuurrampen. Als Nederlandse europarlementariër weet ik wat natuurgeweld teweeg kan brengen. De watersnoodramp in Nederland van 1953 leeft in mijn land nog steeds voort en de noodzaak van preventie, de noodzaak van goed waterbeheer wordt ook van generatie op generatie doorgegeven.

Het is dus heel goed dat Europa een Solidariteitsfonds heeft en op die manier daadwerkelijk solidariteit kan betuigen met regio's, landen en slachtoffers die getroffen zijn door natuurrampen. Ik wil de heer Cicu van harte bedanken voor de inspanningen rondom zijn verslag, maar ik ben wel kritisch op de pogingen van een aantal politieke fracties die geprobeerd hebben in het verslag allerlei nieuwe aanpassingen te bewerkstelligen aan de huidige verordening. En de huidige verordening die ten grondslag ligt aan het Solidariteitsfonds is zeer recentelijk, in 2014, aangepast. De effecten van die aanpassing zijn eigenlijk nog nauwelijks meetbaar.

Dus nogmaals, ik ben kritisch op oproepen om de Commissie weer in stelling te brengen en met nieuwe voorstellen te komen om het huidige Solidariteitsfonds weer aan te passen. En ik ben ook kritisch, Voorzitter, als het gaat om de resolutie die in paragraaf 7 zegt dat investeringen in duurzaam herstel, in aardbevingsbestendige investeringen uitgesloten moeten worden bij de berekening van de nationale tekorten in het kader van het Stabiliteits- en Groeipact. Dat is voor mijn fractie, de ALDE, onacceptabel. Laten we vooral met elkaar voorkomen dat waar het gaat om natuurrampen, we niet gaan investeren, wat mogelijk gaat leiden tot kleine financiële begrotingsrampen. Tot zover.

Ángela Vallina, *en nombre del Grupo GUE/NGL*. – Señor Presidente, en general, estoy a favor del informe presentado porque se proponen cambios y mejoras de funcionamiento relacionados con la simplificación, la rapidez en la asignación de los fondos, la reducción de los tiempos de tramitación, y el incremento de la cantidad de los anticipos y la reducción de los umbrales. Sin embargo, considero que se pierde también una oportunidad importante de proponer mejoras de verdadero calado para las poblaciones afectadas por desastres.

Hubiera sido también el momento de ampliar los objetivos del Fondo de Solidaridad para incluir también catástrofes humanitarias y no solo catástrofes naturales; una oportunidad excelente de usar fondos comunitarios para paliar, por ejemplo, los efectos de la crisis migratoria, que está causando tantas muertes en nuestras fronteras.

Y, respecto al sistema de umbrales, si bien es cierto que se ha rebajado el umbral mínimo, se propone por igual para todas las regiones. Sería más justo que los países y las regiones más pobres tuvieran un acceso más fácil a los fondos, utilizando un sistema de umbrales progresivo, en el cual los países y las regiones más ricos tendrían umbrales más altos que los países y las regiones más pobres.

Respecto a la cantidad asignada para el Fondo —ya se ha comentado aquí: 500 millones de euros anuales—, hay que destacar que no ha variado desde su creación en 2002 y que las consecuencias del cambio climático muestran un incremento constante de catástrofes naturales y que la previsión es aún peor. Por lo tanto, el montante económico del Fondo debería ser incrementado.

Y, por último y, desde luego, no menos importante, yo creo que se debería haber considerado la introducción de políticas de igualdad de género como criterio de elección de las propuestas, ya que las mujeres son uno de los colectivos que sufren con mayor virulencia las consecuencias de los desastres naturales, tal y como reflejan muchos informes de organizaciones internacionales como la ONU o el Banco Mundial.

Bronis Ropė, *Verts/ALE frakcijos vardu*. – Ačiū, Pirmininke. Gerbiama Komisijos nare, gerbiami kolegos, šiandien svarstome klausimą dėl Europos Sąjungos valstybių narių draudimo nuo stichinių nelaimių poliso – Europos solidarumo fondo. Jis užtikrina Sąjungos galimybę pagelbėti stichinių nelaimių atveju. Ne mažiau svarbu, kad siūlyme yra numatytos ir veiklos efektyvumą didinančios priemonės, todėl nemanau, kad siūlymas kitų metų Europos Sąjungos biudžete šiam fondui rezervuoti kasmet skiriamą sumą sulauks didelio pasipriešinimo. Kartu noriu atkreipti kolegų dėmesį į žalingas tendencijas, pradėjusias ryškėti po neseniai įvykusių stichinių nelaimių. Kaip žinia, šiuo metu Parlamente yra svarstomas rezoliucijos projektas, kuriuo raginama iš valstybės deficito skaičiavimo išimti išlaidas, susijusias su atsparumo didinimu nuo vienos stichinių nelaimių rūšies – žemės drebėjimų – ir tik geografiškai ribojamoje teritorijoje. O kodėl tokiu atveju ignoruojamos kitos stichinių nelaimių rūšys, pavyzdžiui, potvyniai, nuošliaužos ir kiti regionai? Manau, tai yra pavojinga. Pavojinga dėl to, kad greta pagalbos, kurią gali suteikti Europos solidarumo fondas, valstybės narės įgaus galimybę vykdyti netvarią finansų politiką. Nesunku atspėti, ką viešųjų finansų valdymui ir Stabilumo bei augimo paktui reikštų precedentas, ypač kai seisminio atsparumo didinimo sąvoka yra ganėtinai neapibrėžta. Noriu pabrėžti, jog Europos solidarumo fondas yra efektyvi pagalbos priemonė, tačiau pagalbos priemonė turi turėti apibrėžtą biudžetą ir konkrečius tikslus ir, kas svarbiausia, negalima leisti, kad pasinaudamos stichinių nelaimių pretekstu kai kurios valstybės narės pateisintų gero ekonomikos valdymo taisyklių pažeidimus.

Laura Agea, *a nome del gruppo EFDD*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, io sono umbra, il 30 ottobre ero a casa con mia figlia e ho dovuto spiegarle che cosa stava succedendo. E la stessa cosa è successa nelle Marche ed è successa nel Lazio. Non è facile raccontare la paura. Non è facile raccontarla per me che vivevo comunque e vivo a 100 chilometri dall'epicentro del sisma. Immaginate quello che significano, pochi secondi che cancellano secoli di storia e distruggono le prospettive, il futuro, di migliaia di famiglie.

Questa è la realtà. Oggi, qua noi, raccontiamo, ci proponiamo delle azioni, ma oggi a Norcia le temperature sono sotto lo zero e ci sono persone che non hanno più una casa, persone che in pochi istanti hanno perso tutto. Allora quest'Europa, se ha un senso ancora, se esiste, se ha una ragione d'essere, oltre le parole, deve dimostrare con fatti concreti, azioni immediate, la sua essenza. La solidarietà è un valore ed è un principio solo se alla solidarietà aggiungiamo il fattore concreto, solo se le nostre parole diventano fatti, solo se le persone che oggi non hanno nulla, perché hanno perso tutto, vengono messe nella condizione di poter continuare a credere che esista un futuro.

Ci sono bambini che stanno cercando di ritornare alla normalità, ma ci sono scuole che sono inagibili e noi parliamo della difficoltà di poter svincolare certi investimenti dal patto di stabilità? Noi stiamo parlando del futuro dei nostri figli e voi parlate di vincoli di bilancio? Allora lo dovete venire a raccontare e a dire ai bambini di Norcia, ai bambini di Tolentino, ai bambini di Amatrice, che di fronte al disastro, alla paura nella quale vivono da mesi, c'è un'Europa che dice che la stabilità è un bene supremo. Perché per salvare le banche non c'è stabilità che tenga. E allora, io pretendo, a nome del Movimento 5 Stelle, a nome dei cittadini di Umbria, Toscana, Marche, Abruzzo, di avere un'Europa che si prenda cura dei suoi cittadini. Lo pretendo, perché ciò è dovuto al bene dei nostri figli. Le chiacchiere stanno a niente. La solidarietà è fatta di concretezza.

Mario Borghezio, *a nome del gruppo ENF*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la nostra Commissaria ci ha rassicurato su alcuni punti, però non ci dice se ritiene accettabile la proposta che viene dal popolo – e ripresa da noi populistici che siamo il peggio del mondo – che chiede insistentemente, che si faccia giustizia nei confronti di quel sangue che viene versato dal popolo, non dai signori delle banche o da quelli che dicono che ci parlano tutti i giorni di vincoli di bilancio. Cioè estrapolare dai vincoli di bilancio, le somme sacrosantamente destinate alla prevenzione e alla ricostruzione e al rilancio produttivo, sociale, di zone la cui popolazione si è rimessa subito a lavorare, è attaccata al territorio. Ci sono i pastori, che sono ancora là, non hanno abbandonato il territorio.

Due cose: la prima, noi vogliamo sapere se il governo italiano partecipa di questo moto popolare che chiede lo svincolo delle somme per la ricostruzione dal bilancio e in secondo luogo, se almeno, si decide a presentare, il governo italiano, la richiesta fortemente sostenuta dal sindaco di Amatrice a nome dei 600 sindaci delle zone terremotate, di realizzare la *no tax area*. È necessario per questo una procedura che parta dal governo italiano, ma da quello che lei ci ha detto, mi pare che non sia stata nemmeno posta in essere.

La ringrazio molto di quello che potrà fare, queste popolazioni lo meritano. Lei non guardi chi glielo sta chiedendo, guardi le facce attraverso le televisioni, le facce di questa gente straordinaria del nostro paese, che non merita di essere rappresentata da coloro che considerano i vincoli di bilancio, come le Tavole di Mosè. Non sono le Tavole di Mosè, sono le tavole delle banche e dell'alta finanza. Non sono le tavole del diritto dei popoli. Sono le tavole dell'internazionale finanziaria che comanda in Europa.

Κωνσταντίνος Παπαδάκης (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, τι σημασία έχουν για την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση οι κάθε τόσο πλημμυροπαθείς των εργατογειτονιών της Δυτικής Αθήνας ή η καταστροφική πυρκαγιά στη Θάσο, που έκανε στάχτη χιλιάδες στρέμματα καλλιεργιών δάσους και ζωικού κεφαλαίου; Ποια η σημασία για την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση της μεγάλης πυρκαγιάς στη Χίο, που κατέκαψε δάσος, μαστιχόδεντρα, καλλιέργειες, ή στη Βόρεια Εύβοια 25.000 στρέμματα πευκοδάσους και με τους ρετινοπαγωγούς ανέργους πλέον; Τι σημασία έχουν για την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση οι σεισοπαθείς εργατικές λαϊκές οικογένειες και οι αυτοαπασχολούμενοι στη Λευκάδα μετά τους σεισμούς εκεί; Ψιλά πράγματα ώστε να ασχοληθεί μαζί τους, πολύ περισσότερο και να τους αποζημιώσει, ενώ η ελληνική κυβέρνηση σε πολλές περιπτώσεις δεν μπαίνει καν στον κόπο να διεκδικήσει αποζημιώσεις από την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση από κονδύλια που είναι πολλαπλά πληρωμένα από τον ελληνικό λαό.

Η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή σε επίμονες ερωτήσεις του Κομμουνιστικού Κόμματος Ελλάδας παραδέχεται ότι, ακόμα κι αν τελικά αποζημιώνει η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση τους πληγέντες, θα επρόκειτο για ψιχούλα. Ξεκαθαρίζει μάλιστα ότι δεν αποζημιώνει εργατικά λαϊκά νοικοκυριά και αυτοαπασχολούμενους, που είναι αυτοί που αντικειμενικά πλήττονται περισσότερο από τις φυσικές καταστροφές, όντας ανοχύρωτοι και ευάλωτοι σε αυτές. Την ίδια στιγμή προκλητικά θεωρούνται ως επιλέξιμα τα κονδύλια που αφορούν υποδομές που ιεραρχούν οι μεγάλοι επιχειρηματικοί όμιλοι, στους οποίους κατευθύνεται ο μεγάλος πακτώλος των χρημάτων του Ταμείου Αλληλεγγύης όσο και των άλλων ευρωκονδυλίων. Το Κομμουνιστικό Κόμμα της Ελλάδας απαιτεί την άμεση και πλήρη αποζημίωση όλων των πληγέντων από τις φυσικές καταστροφές, άμεση κάλυψη των χρόνιων τραγικών ελλείψεων σε υποδομές και σύγχρονα μέσα προστασίας από αυτές.

Joachim Zeller (PPE). – Herr Präsident! Frau Kommissarin, Kollegen und Kolleginnen. Die EU ist eine Solidargemeinschaft, und damit das nicht nur ein Schlagwort bleibt, ist unter anderem dieser Solidaritätsfonds ins Leben gerufen worden, um besonders von Naturkatastrophen heimgesuchten Regionen Hilfe bei der Überwindung der angerichteten Schäden zu gewähren und gleichzeitig soweit möglich menschliches Leid zu mindern. Der Fonds hat sich, seitdem er ins Leben gerufen wurde, sicherlich bewährt. Allerdings, und das zeigt der Bericht des Kollegen Cicu, gibt es noch viele Vorschläge, wie er in seiner Anwendung verbessert werden kann – besonders was die Beschleunigung von Hilfsmaßnahmen und die Bereitstellung von finanziellen Mitteln anbelangt.

Auch wäre jetzt ein weiterer Sonderbericht des Rechnungshofes wünschenswert, der uns zeigt, ob die Mittel auch wirklich alle für die Zwecke, für die sie vorgesehen waren, verwandt wurden. Nicht vergessen sollten wir aber auch, dass der beste Schutz vor Katastrophen immer noch vorbeugende Maßnahmen sind und hier bedarf es weiterhin einer länderübergreifenden Zusammenarbeit, auch eines Erfahrungsaustausches innerhalb der EU. Denn in vielen Ländern haben wir noch nicht einmal Katastrophenschutzpläne vorliegen. Allerdings haben der Katastrophenschutz und Hilfe in Katastrophenfällen für mich nichts mit dem Stabilitäts- und Wachstumspakt zu tun. Das ist eine Verbindung, die an dieser Stelle – denke ich – nicht zulässig ist.

Enrico Gasbarra (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, anch'io, come la collega Angea ero lì, il 24 notte e il 30 mattina alle 7.40, ho vissuto insieme alla comunità quel terribile sisma. Un sisma che non si ferma, signor Presidente, signora Commissaria. Ho sentito i colleghi, li ringrazio, tutti i colleghi italiani che sono intervenuti e anche gli altri colleghi, che hanno ovviamente dato piena solidarietà e sostegno, ma è un sisma particolare, una calamità, particolare. Le scosse stanno continuando, si stanno allargando alle vecchie faglie. Ieri il sisma all'Aquila, stamattina il sisma vicino Reggio Emilia.

La situazione è particolarmente grave e quindi, raccolgo l'appello dei colleghi che ringrazio della commissione per gli affari regionali, che hanno preparato questa risoluzione, importante anche all'articolo 7, collega dell'ALDE, ringrazio il collega Cicu, che attraverso la sua relazione chiede alla Commissione un intervento più puntuale, perché questa Europa deve fare presto, con meno vincoli e più sostegni. Questa Europa deve stare accanto a chi soffre, se non è accanto a chi soffre, a chi ha perso la casa, a chi è morto, a chi deve stare accanto? Come potrebbero capirci i nostri cittadini, se non ci siamo in queste, almeno in queste, occasioni.

Ruža Tomašić (ECR). – Gospodine predsjedniče, isplata predujma pri mobilizaciji Fonda solidarnosti uvedena je ubrzo nakon što sam postala zastupnica u ovom domu i tad sam ju doista svesrdno podržala. Nažalost, mobilizacija Fonda još uvijek nije dovoljno brza i učinkovita, a isplata predujma kao vatrogasna mjera obezvrijeđena je administrativnim zavrzlamama i sporošću birokracije.

Netom prije europskih izbora 2014. Hrvatsku su pogodile strašne poplave i puno je ljudi ostalo bez svojih domova i usjeva. Njihova je egzistencija izravno bila ugrožena, a država je reagirala što je brže mogla. No, po mom mišljenju, nedovoljno brzo i ne pretjerano učinkovito.

Upravo hrvatski primjer najbolje pokazuje prostor za nadogradnju ovog mehanizma, a to je izravna financijska, ali prije svega logistička pomoć članicama dok se humanitarna katastrofa odvija na njihovom teritoriju. Sva je ostala pomoć naravno dobrodošla, ali će uvijek biti percipirana kao zakašnjela i nedovoljna.

Eleonora Forenza (GUE/NGL). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, io vorrei in primo luogo rinnovare la mia solidarietà alle popolazioni colpite, a chi ha perso la casa, a chi è vittima di un terremoto che non accenna a terminare, di ben tre eventi sismici concentrati in un lasso di tempo molto breve. Credo che sia importante in quest'aula sottolineare anche il mio ringraziamento per chi sta autogestendo l'emergenza, per tutte quelle realtà, come le Brigate di solidarietà attiva, che portano ogni giorno, assistenza e conforto alle donne e agli uomini colpiti.

Credo che quest'Europa debba decidere se conta più la stabilità delle banche o la stabilità dei suoi cittadini e delle sue cittadine. Ed è evidente che lo scorporo dal patto di stabilità e l'attivazione del fondo è una misura necessaria, ma non è una misura sufficiente. Ad oggi, ad esempio, non ci sono abbastanza tecnici per effettuare i sopralluoghi e c'è chi li aspetta dal primo sisma del 24 agosto. Credo che sia necessario contrastare lo spopolamento delle zone montane ed evitare che vengano costruiti in quell'area, come paradossalmente, si accinge a fare il governo Renzi, mega inceneritori e addirittura un oleodotto Snam. Progetti che sarebbero stati folli a prescindere e che in questo momento sono addirittura grotteschi.

Steeve Briois (ENF). – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, si nous exprimons une critique sans concession des politiques de l'Union européenne, nous sommes cependant favorables à la solidarité entre les nations européennes, surtout face aux catastrophes naturelles.

Oui, l'Europe des nations que nous appelons de nos vœux, c'est une Europe qui protège les plus faibles de nos compatriotes. Et c'est face au drame qu'elle peut le mieux s'exprimer.

Alors oui, le Fonds de solidarité de l'Union doit être rendu plus accessible, plus performant, notamment pour aider nos amis italiens face aux terribles séismes qui ont frappé la ville d'Amatrice.

Mais si l'on veut réellement aider l'Italie, il faut désormais que, dans le pacte de stabilité, chaque euro dépensé pour la reconstruction soit exclu du calcul du déficit et que tous les fonds européens alloués à cette région soient reprogrammés pour la reconstruction des régions sinistrées.

Enfin, la Commission doit garantir que le Fonds de solidarité sera exclusivement consacré aux Européens confrontés à des catastrophes naturelles, et non à des politiques d'accueil des migrants, comme certains semblent le souhaiter.

Je dis oui à la solidarité européenne à l'égard des Italiens, et non au gaspillage pour les migrants.

Președinte: ADINA-IOANA VĂLEAN*Vicepreședinte*

Giovanni La Via (PPE). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, dalla sua istituzione a oggi, il Fondo di solidarietà si è rivelato utilissimo per aiutare in 24 paesi differenti persone in difficoltà per circa settanta calamità naturali, mettendo a disposizione 3,8 miliardi di euro. Si tratta di uno dei simboli dell'Unione europea in termini di solidarietà, per venire incontro a quelli che hanno perso talvolta tutto quello che possedevano. Domani mattina voteremo su uno strumento che però è perfettibile.

La relazione del collega Cico, che ringrazio, va appunto in questa direzione: serve a migliorare lo strumento, perché i profili di miglioramento ci sono sicuramente. Voteremo domani anche un *transfer* di bilancio, per mettere a disposizione subito 50 milioni di euro al fondo, per venire incontro alla realizzazione degli anticipi e non attendere – come talvolta purtroppo accade – che ci sia un iter per arrivare all'erogazione delle somme. Ho ascoltato in quest'aula colleghi schierarsi contro la possibilità di sottrarre gli investimenti antisismici o di ricostruzione dai calcoli del patto di stabilità. Da italiano ed europeo, io credo che ogni euro che viene speso per evitare morti e disastri, per aiutare persone in difficoltà, debba essere speso e sottratto alle rigide regole dell'austerità.

Michela Giuffrida (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, l'Italia sta vivendo un momento difficilissimo, non è ancora passato lo shock e tra l'altro i terremoti continuano, uno al giorno, anche più, tutti i giorni. Passato il momento delle manifestazioni di vicinanza, le regioni colpite chiedono ora all'Europa di applicare e agire secondo due principi: flessibilità e semplificazione. Le procedure e i tempi di applicazione del Fondo di solidarietà sono lunghi e l'anticipo servirà a cominciare ad agire, ma flessibilità e semplificazione servono soprattutto ad intervenire con i fondi strutturali.

Le spese per la ricostruzione devono essere assolutamente escluse dai vincoli di bilancio, così come le spese per la prevenzione. Perché se è vero che purtroppo i terremoti non sono prevedibili, è invece dimostrata l'inadeguatezza delle strutture pubbliche e delle case nelle maggiori aree sismiche italiane e la necessità di renderle ora sicure. Quello che è crollato in Italia è un pezzo di Europa e noi non chiediamo all'Europa di sostituirsi alle nostre amministrazioni locali, chiediamo invece con forza all'Europa di mettere il nostro governo e le nostre regioni nelle condizioni di fare gli investimenti, di ricostruire e di ammodernare, perché altrimenti quei vincoli, più che vincoli, sarebbero ostacoli insormontabili.

Antonio Tajani (PPE). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, innanzitutto voglio ringraziare tutti i parlamentari non italiani che hanno manifestato la loro solidarietà nei confronti di un territorio così vasto del nostro paese che continua a essere sottoposto a continue scosse di terremoto. Dirlo è facile. Vivere ogni giorno e ogni notte, con la paura che la terra si apra ancora, significa vivere in condizioni di totale precarietà e purtroppo nel nostro paese quasi ogni anno ci sono terremoti devastanti. Dopo l'Aquila, c'è stata l'Emilia Romagna, c'è stato il Veneto, c'è stata la Lombardia e quest'estate, due scosse continue. Eravamo tutti là, noi, in zona di terremoto. Vicino a Roma la terra ha continuato a tremare e si vive continuamente nella situazione di instabilità.

L'impressione perché essendoci continue scosse di assestamento, magari di 2.2 e 2.3, che non producono danni, però danno l'impressione sempre di vivere su un terreno che non è e solido, che non è fermo. Ecco, quindi, per questo, io credo che sia importante rendersi conto delle difficoltà che ci sono, dei danni che continuano a provocare i terremoti. Io sono ben lieto che il Presidente della Commissione abbia deciso di impegnarsi personalmente, anche perché si possa ricostruire la chiesa di San Benedetto a Norcia. Abbiamo ascoltato anche la parole della Commissaria. Ben venga l'anticipo di 30 milioni di euro, bisogna sostenere il turismo e forse anche, utilizzando il pacchetto Orizzonte 2020, cercare di utilizzare fondi per la ricerca nel settore sismologico.

Perché la situazione è molto più grave di quello che si possa immaginare e sono morti – e concludo – signor Presidente, anche i suoi concittadini. Non sono morti soltanto cittadini italiani, sono morti cittadini rumeni, quindi cittadini europei, che lavoravano, vivevano nel nostro paese. Quindi, ripeto, l'appello è a rendersi conto di quella che è la situazione eccezionale, anche per quanto riguarda la prevenzione. Non so se è giusto o meno toccare il patto di stabilità. Non credo che si debba toccare il patto di stabilità in generale, però, per questa particolare situazione, io credo che debba essere rivolto uno sguardo molto attento. È giusto avere i conti pubblici in ordine, ma qui siamo in una situazione di emergenza tale, che soltanto chi l'ha vista, chi l'ha vissuta e l'ha conosciuta può rendersi conto di quanto sia grave, di

quanti danni possono esserci e quanta paura possa esserci in futuro. Non è facile vivere 365 giorni l'anno con la pressione della paura costante di dover morire, di vedersi crollare addosso la casa.

Elena Gentile (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, come hanno detto i colleghi che mi hanno preceduto, la terra continua ancora a tremare nel cuore dell'Italia, di quell'Italia che rappresenta in Europa storie di civiltà e di grande bellezza: luoghi, testimonianze artistiche, architettoniche, culturali, espressioni anche del profondo sentimento religioso, capacità di impresa che hanno reso unica l'Italia in un'Europa che non può non farsi carico del destino di un territorio e di una comunità che le appartiene. Superare i vincoli che oggi rendono difficile la ricostruzione non è negli interessi di un solo governo, ma deve rientrare negli obiettivi di un'Europa custode delle sue realtà territoriali, che nella fattispecie rappresentano l'Italia, che non si rassegna all'ineluttabilità del suo destino. Oggi a fronte di un impegno politicamente rilevante del governo italiano, che dichiara di voler affrontare con determinazione il passaggio della ricostruzione del tessuto abitativo, ma anche di impresa di quel territorio e non solo, in un intervento mai realizzato nel nostro paese, quello della messa in sicurezza del patrimonio pubblico e privato, l'Europa non può rimanere indifferente.

Silvia Costa (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signora Commissaria Crețu, ho apprezzato la sua verità, anche linguistica. Ieri abbiamo ricevuto qui in Parlamento alcuni studenti e insegnanti provenienti dalla scuola prefabbricata che è stata allestita ad Amatrice, uno dei comuni più colpiti, insieme a Norcia e tanti altri. Ho spiegato che l'Europa sarebbe stata loro vicina. Le priorità per il governo italiano, lo sapete, sono state la protezione dei cittadini, la riapertura subito delle scuole, la dotazione di alloggi prefabbricati, che stanno cominciando finalmente a essere, dopo i container, la prosecuzione delle attività economiche, come l'allevamento, l'agricoltura e le piccole imprese di commercio, la messa in sicurezza di case e del grande patrimonio culturale delle aree sismiche.

Ma, l'Europa deve fare la sua parte, riconoscendo un maggior livello di flessibilità nel calcolo del deficit, escludendo dal patto di stabilità, come è stato detto, gli investimenti per la ricostruzione e la prevenzione, mentre apprezziamo, e lo dico alla Commissaria Crețu, la disponibilità e l'anticipo dei 30 milioni del fondo solidarietà. È necessario però, e spero che su questo ci sia una grande apertura, modificare anche i piani operativi dei fondi strutturali, per investire nella prevenzione e qualità della ricostruzione antisismica che riguarda in Italia l'area, tutta la fascia appenninica. Grazie anche per la disponibilità del Presidente Juncker, ribadita anche qui, per la ricostruzione della basilica di San Benedetto di Norcia, che ricordiamo è il patrono d'Europa.

Andrea Cozzolino (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, si tratta di una risoluzione assolutamente positiva, che riconosce a partire dalla straordinaria eccezionalità del caso italiano sia gli sforzi che il governo sta compiendo, sia il bisogno di trovarci meglio preparati di fronte ai rischi di eventi straordinari. Sicuramente è un passo in avanti la proposta di modifica del regolamento del fondo di solidarietà che accelera le procedure, snellisce e rende più immediata l'erogazione delle risorse rispetto anche alla decisione assunta; è un modo per avvicinarci ai bisogni dei cittadini. Ma è una risoluzione che va oltre, ringrazio davvero tutti i colleghi con cui abbiamo lavorato alla stesura finale, perché prende atto che di fronte a situazioni eccezionali non possiamo limitarci ad attendere, ma dobbiamo prevenire e ridurre i rischi al minimo. Per questo domani sarà importante votare e approvare i paragrafi 6 e 7, per chiedere non solo il massimo della flessibilità possibile, ma per ribadire l'urgenza e l'esclusione dal patto di stabilità e crescita degli investimenti realizzati attraverso i fondi strutturali per mettere in sicurezza i territori e le aree più a rischio. Non si tratta di una richiesta italiana. C'è un'ampia area nell'Europa del Mediterraneo e in quella orientale che, come riconosce la stessa risoluzione, è fortemente a rischio per eventi naturali. È un'esigenza di tutta l'Europa consentire un piano strategico di messa in sicurezza, agevolando e derogando alle norme del patto di stabilità e crescita lo dobbiamo a tutti i cittadini europei. Quindi davvero grazie per questa discussione.

Procedura „catch the eye”

Caterina Chinnici (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signora Commissaria, grazie per la concretezza del suo intervento. Il sisma del 24 agosto e quello successivo di ottobre scorso, lo abbiamo detto in tanti, hanno profondamente colpito l'economia di diverse regioni dell'Italia centrale e distrutto interi paesini, annientato la vita di tantissime persone. E purtroppo il terremoto continua. Di fronte a una situazione così triste e problematica, è più che mai necessario e urgente che le istituzioni europee esprimano e dimostrino vicinanza alle popolazioni colpite, accordando all'Italia l'accesso al Fondo di solidarietà dell'Unione europea e accelerando le procedure per l'erogazione del finanziamento. Occorre infatti che l'economia delle regioni dell'Italia centrale colpite dal sisma possa ripartire al più presto, per restituire

a migliaia di famiglie serenità e speranza; e in generale credo che in un periodo particolarmente difficile della storia dell'integrazione europea, in circostanze così drammatiche, si debba dimostrare la vicinanza dell'Unione ai bisogni dei suoi cittadini e la disponibilità dell'Unione, una disponibilità concreta a intervenire per restituire dignità e speranza alle persone.

Nicola Caputo (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, l'Italia è una delle regioni europee maggiormente soggette a rischio sismico. La sua storia è interamente segnata da questo genere di eventi calamitosi. I recenti terremoti che hanno raso al suolo interi paesi e sconvolto la vita di decine di migliaia di persone sono catastrofi naturali causate da motivi geologici e dunque destinati a ripetersi periodicamente. La grave situazione deve spingerci a favorire un uso ottimale di tutte le risorse disponibili, creando sinergie tra i vari fondi esistenti, compresi i fondi strutturali e il Fondo europeo di investimento, e garantendo che le risorse siano utilizzate in modo efficace per le attività di ricostruzione e tutti gli altri interventi necessari, in piena collaborazione con le autorità nazionali e regionali italiane. Ringrazio la Commissaria per le rassicurazioni date. Sulla scia di quanto già proposto in una lettera indirizzata al Presidente Juncker, mi associo alla richiesta dei tanti colleghi di escludere dal calcolo del deficit nazionale nel quadro del patto di stabilità e crescita gli investimenti per la ricostruzione sostenibile e per le operazioni antisismiche.

Νότης Μαρίας (ECR). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, εκφράζω εκ μέρους των Ελλήνων πολιτών την αλληλεγγύη προς τους πληγέντες από τους πρόσφατους σεισμούς στην Ιταλία. Το ταμείο αλληλεγγύης είναι αποφασιστικό εργαλείο και πρέπει να αξιοποιηθεί και κονδύλιά του να δοθούν για τη στήριξη των πληγέντων από τους σεισμούς στην Ιταλία. Το ίδιο ισχύει βέβαια και για την αποκατάσταση των ζημιών από θεομηνίες, πλημμύρες και φωτιές που έπληξαν φέτος την Ελλάδα.

Όπως τόνισα σε ερώτησή μου προς την κυρία Crețu, τέσσερις περιοχές της Ελλάδας, ο δήμος Θερμαϊκού, η Καλαμάτα, η Θάσος και ο Πύργος, πρόσφατα υπέστησαν καταστροφές από ακραία καιρικά φαινόμενα. Στην απάντησή σας αναφέρατε, κυρία Crețu, ότι στην Ελλάδα διατίθενται 400 εκατομμύρια ευρώ από το Ευρωπαϊκό Ταμείο Περιφερειακής Ανάπτυξης και το Ταμείο Συνοχής. Όμως το ερώτημα είναι το εξής: Δεδομένων των ζημιών που υπέστησαν οι κάτοικοι των περιοχών αυτών και δεδομένου του υψηλού οικονομικού κόστους που έχουν αυτές οι ζημιές για τις τοπικές αρχές, ποια μέτρα προτίθεται να πάρει η Επιτροπή, κυρία Crețu, προκειμένου να αποζημιωθούν οι κάτοικοι των εν λόγω περιοχών. Αυτό είναι σημαντικό ζήτημα και θα ήθελα, αν μπορείτε, να δώσετε μια απάντηση.

(Încheierea procedurii „catch the eye”)

Corina Crețu, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, thank you very much for your contributions to this rich debate, which of course highlights the importance of EU solidarity and of cohesion policy support, in particular in the dramatic situation that people are experiencing in central Italy.

As I said, and I repeat today, the Commission adopted a proposal to amend the Common Provision Regulation (CPR) to allow for 100% co-financing – so it's not co-financing any more – regarding the construction costs in areas hit by natural disasters. This is not only available for earthquakes, it is not only available for Italy – because I had this question by Mr Ropé: 'why only earthquakes?' – it is everything related to natural disasters, and we did this not only for earthquakes but this year we just paid for Madeira for fires, for Cyprus for drought and fires, for Greece as well, so now with this amendment for the CPR all the reconstruction will be done by EU money without any need for co-financing. This is news today.

On this report by Mr Cicu, which is very important, on the Solidarity Fund, this own-initiative report presented by the Committee on Regional Affairs (REGI) and drafted by Mr Cicu emphasised also the main challenges we are facing. As I said two years ago, the reform of the EU Solidarity Fund allowed support to be made clearer and swifter, but also fairer, thanks to the advance payments. So, as I said, EUR 30 million will go next week to Italy as advance payments, and I would like to remind you that we have received the application from Italy just at the end of October, so of course we will assess the final sum, but we are coming as quickly as possible with the advance payment. The ongoing evaluation of this reform we adopted two years ago will provide further light on these improvements and allow for a possible further revision in the context of the future MFF post-2020.

For the Commission, flexibility and responsiveness of the Solidarity Fund is only one objective. Another one is respect for sound financial management, as well as assurances on the legality and the regularity of spending – as Parliament, especially the Committee on Budgetary Control regularly and rightly recalls. The Commission has to strike this balance between these two objectives which can obviously have an impact on the speediness of closure procedures.

On the situation in Italy after the earthquake, in any case, as I say the Commission is supportive, is currently working with the Italian authorities to ensure that the EU Solidarity Fund is mobilised as soon as possible following the payment of the advance. Unfortunately Italy has been the leading beneficiary of the Solidarity Fund since 2002 with an amount of EUR 1.3 billion, so we are very much aware that there is a big problem, and it is the frequency of the earthquakes which is really very dramatic. Don't forget that I am also coming from a country who lost many people in Amatrice, and I will be there in several days to speak with the Italian authorities in Rome, I will visit Amatrice and also Norcia, so we will see on the ground whatever it takes to help – and to help the citizens first of all, this is our first objective. We also stand ready to work with Italy on possible revisions of the programmes of the European Structural and Investment Funds. We have offered this opportunity and we are very open to rapidly change some operational programmes if needed and if the Italian authorities require. We expect these solidarity instruments to be supplemented by support from the European Solidarity Corps once it is established as announced by President Juncker.

Finally, we are exploring possibilities to help Member States and regions better handle the period between the disaster and the payment of EU support. In this context, one possibility could be setting up a bridging loan facility with the European Investment Bank which would help bridge this gap.

I would like to take this opportunity to reiterate the Commission's full commitment to strengthen the various solidarity instruments of the European Union. I saw that there have been recurrent inquiries about the Stability and Growth Pact. I am not responsible for this, it is my colleague Mr Moscovici, but as you know short-term emergency and reconstruction costs related to major natural catastrophes are excluded from the Member States' final effort. Regarding investments related to seismic risks, the Commission's assessment will require ex-ante and ex-post data to be provided by the Italian authorities.

Salvatore Cicu, relatore. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signora Commissaria, è evidente che c'è uno sforzo comune di grande responsabilità e di grande equilibrio ed è uno sforzo comune – che come lei ha ricordato – riguarda tutti gli Stati membri. L'Italia avrebbe voluto fare a meno di questa destinazione di fondi, ma avrebbe voluto fare a meno anche dei morti ed è una demolizione di un sistema culturale, imprenditoriale, di uomini, donne e giovani che oggi si trovano a vivere il dramma della perdita delle cose più importanti per loro. È evidente che mi verrebbe da dire che siamo rientrati nell'ordinarietà finalmente della gestione della risposta, perché i tempi, rispetto a queste situazioni, non possono essere i soliti, non possono essere quelli, come dire, inseriti nel calderone dell'ordinarietà. Se si chiama emergenza, se si chiama grave emergenza, se si chiama ripristino di speranza, credo che sia normale che la tempistica sia quella più adeguata e quindi quella più consona.

E come lei sa, molto meglio di me, i 30 milioni sono il tetto previsto dal regolamento, l'ha ricordato anche lei. Noi, è chiaro che apprezziamo, quindi il lavoro che tutti stiamo portando avanti come obiettivo, ma nello stesso tempo, però, non è che vogliamo insistere su un aspetto che riguarda una cosa molto complessa, e cioè il deficit nazionale, il deficit di bilancio, quindi un problema strutturale che attiene al sistema paese. Ma quello che noi nella risoluzione soprattutto al punto 7 chiediamo, è che nei casi specifici, quindi non per l'Italia, ma per tutti i casi specifici, ci possa essere la possibilità che i fondi strutturali con il cofinanziamento e tutti i fondi destinati, non tanto all'intervento dell'urgenza, ma a quello che poi significa prevenzione e quindi minor costi nell'eventuale situazione che si dovesse di nuovo attivare lo stesso dramma. Quindi c'è anche, come dire, la possibilità che i territori vengano consolidati, ristrutturati e ci sia un investimento antisismico. Per cui noi non siamo i populistici. Noi non abbiamo, come dire, la voglia di rappresentare criticità. Noi abbiamo voglia di rappresentare positività, soprattutto nei suoi confronti per il lavoro apprezzato che svolge, ma nello stesso tempo noi chiederemo a questo Parlamento che questo passaggio venga approvato e venga riferito poi naturalmente alla competenza dei Commissari che lei ha citato.

President. – I have received eight motions for resolutions tabled in accordance with Rule 128(5) of the Rules of Procedure.

The debate is closed.

The vote will take place on Thursday, 1 December 2016.

Written statements (Rule 162)

Isabella Adinolfi (EFDD), per iscritto. – Alla luce della situazione grave in cui si trovano le aree colpite dal terremoto, è necessario escludere, dal calcolo dei disavanzi pubblici nazionali nel quadro del patto di stabilità e crescita, gli investimenti a favore della ricostruzione sostenibile e della prevenzione antisismica e altresì a considerare l'eventualità di estendere il calcolo esistente del Fondo di solidarietà, che è attualmente basato sugli effetti dei danni causati da un singolo evento catastrofico, a un calcolo cumulativo dei danni causati da diverse catastrofi naturali nella stessa regione in un anno. Voglio inoltre sottolineare l'importanza di rispettare i requisiti relativi alla costruzione di infrastrutture ed edifici antisismici. Preso atto della domanda di intervento a titolo del Fondo di solidarietà dell'Unione europea presentata dal governo italiano, invito la Commissione a prendere tutti i provvedimenti necessari per esaminare tempestivamente le richieste di assistenza a titolo del Fondo al fine di garantirne la rapida mobilitazione.

Fabio Massimo Castaldo (EFDD), per iscritto. – Il terremoto verificatosi nell'Italia centrale nel 2016 sono andati a colpire le case, la cultura, le persone e gli affetti più cari. È necessario intervenire in modo tempestivo ed efficace, non solo per assicurare una vita decente ma anche, e soprattutto, per mettere in sicurezza queste zone e il paese intero. Si tratta di interventi assolutamente necessari e urgenti e, grazie al nostro apporto, la risoluzione adottata invita la Commissione a consentire lo stralcio degli investimenti per la ricostruzione dal computo del debito ai fini del rispetto del patto di stabilità. Si tratta di un risultato molto importante per il nostro paese, a cui speriamo seguirà una decisione della Commissione in tal senso.

Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu (S&D), în scris. – Creat în 2002, Fondul de solidaritate al Uniunii Europene (FSUE) reprezintă un instrument financiar nerambursabil necesar pentru acțiuni de urgență și salvare desfășurate de autorități în urma dezastrelor naturale care au un impact direct asupra vieții oamenilor, mediului natural sau economiei într-o anumită regiune afectată. De-a lungul timpului, FSUE a suportat mai multe revizui, în vederea dezvoltării sale, cel puțin din perspectiva procesului, procedurilor, perioadei de timp, conținutului, noțiunilor cu care operează, indicatorilor de evaluare a eficienței ajutorului, domeniului/sferei de aplicare. Aceasta deoarece evidența arată că, drept rezultat al schimbărilor climatice, dezastrele naturale în cadrul UE se află într-o continuă creștere sub aspectul numărului, gravității și intensității lor. Impactul și importanța FSUE în promovarea de soluții durabile crește dacă, în acest context, sunt utilizate în mod corespunzător și sinergetic și alte fonduri structurale și de investiții europene (fondurile ESI) de către autoritățile naționale, locale și regionale, mai ales în scopul prevenirii dezastrelor naturale, având drept fundament strategii specifice eficiente. Evident, autoritățile trebuie să disemineze prin mijloace moderne publicului larg informațiile referitoare atât la ajutorul ce poate fi acordat prin FSUE (inclusiv monitorizarea derulării acestuia), cât și la rezultatele ajutoarelor deja acordate din 2002 și până în prezent.

Romana Tomc (PPE), pisno. – Obžalujem dejstvo, da so Italijo letos pretresli kar trije močni potresi. Zadnji, ki je bil oktobra letos, je pustil velike posledice. Ranjenih je bilo ogromno ljudi, kar 290 pa jih je umrlo, materialna škoda je bila gromna. Ob tej priložnosti izražam našim sosedom, globoko in iskreno sožalje.

To, kar se je zgodilo v Italiji, se lahko zgodi prav vsem izmed nas, zato menim, da je bistvenega pomena, da smo kot Evropska unija v tej situaciji solidarni in Italiji, ki našo pomoč potrebuje, tudi pomagamo. Menim, da bi Komisija morala v čim krajšem času sprejeti ukrepe za takojšnjo obravnavo prošenj za pomoč prizadetim območjem v okviru Solidarnostnega sklada Evropske unije.

S tem bi omogočili, da bi v prizadetih območjih v čim krajšem času obnovili stavbe in tako tudi hitreje odpravili posledice potresa. Bistveno je tudi, da pristojni organi na vseh ravneh poenostavijo upravne postopke, da bi bil dostop do sredstev čim bolj enostaven in hiter, saj so le-ta za prebivalce prizadetih območij, nujna.

Janusz Zemke (S&D), *na piśmie*. – Fundusz Solidarności Unii Europejskiej – chociaż finansowany jest poza budżetem UE – stanowi ważny instrument wspólnego reagowania państw członkowskich w razie wystąpienia groźnych katastrof lub klęsk żywiołowych. W ramach funduszu uruchomiono dotychczas 3,8 mld EUR jako reakcję na ponad 70 klęsk, prawie we wszystkich państwach Unii Europejskiej. Jest to zatem wyraźny symbol unijnej solidarności w trudnych czasach. Pozytywnie oceniam dokonaną w ostatnim czasie reformę zasad funkcjonowania funduszu, dzięki której uproszczone zostały procedury wnioskowania o pomoc oraz wprowadzono możliwość wypłaty zaliczek. Mając jednak na uwadze względy szybkiego reagowania, Komisja powinna rozważyć podwyższenie progu wypłacanych przedpłat oraz skrócenie terminów rozpatrywania wniosków. Skuteczna pomoc ofiarom klęsk żywiołowych wymaga również lepszej koordynacji na poziomie państw członkowskich oraz usprawnienia ich procedur działania w stanach nadzwyczajnych. W trakcie przyszłych dyskusji na temat Funduszu Solidarności UE należy także rozważyć możliwie szerokie wykorzystanie jego środków na pomoc państwom członkowskim dotkniętym atakami terrorystycznymi oraz w celu zapobiegania tym zagrożeniom. W takim przypadku traktatowa klauzula solidarności zobowiązuje bowiem Unię i jej państwa członkowskie do wspólnego działania z wykorzystaniem wszystkich instrumentów będących w ich dyspozycji.

17. Deklaracje komisarzy o braku konfliktu interesów – wytyczne (debata)

President. – The next item is the report by Pascal Durand, on behalf of the Committee on Legal Affairs, on Commissioners' declarations of interests – guidelines (2016/2080(INI)) (A8-0315/2016).

Pascal Durand, *rapporteur*. – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Commissaire, nous sommes là dans un débat qui est absolument majeur. Il peut sembler technique puisque l'on va parler de la modification éventuelle d'un code de conduite et des conflits d'intérêts.

En réalité, ce débat s'inscrit, vous le savez, dans un contexte très particulier pour l'Europe, au moment où les citoyens européens doutent, parfois à raison, du fait que l'Europe défende l'intérêt général, le bien commun, et pas nécessairement des intérêts privés ou des intérêts particuliers.

Nous devons donc être très attentifs à cette question. La question de la transparence, du contrôle et du fonctionnement de nos institutions est, en l'état actuel de la question européenne, d'une importance majeure. La transparence est un des piliers de la démocratie et, plus que jamais, nous avons besoin d'être exemplaires à cet égard.

La situation s'est aggravée ces derniers temps. Un certain nombre de débats, pour ne pas utiliser de mots trop forts, ont eu lieu, notamment avec le passage de l'ancien président de la Commission, M. Barroso, dans une banque privée, Goldman-Sachs, qui a eu un lien tout à fait direct avec la crise financière de 2008. Bien entendu, ces éléments-là sont à prendre en compte. Parfois, je me demande si la Commission a parfaitement conscience de cette réalité.

Lorsque nous avons interpellé à ce propos M. le commissaire Moscovici, qui était à votre place récemment, il nous a expliqué qu'il n'y avait aucun problème, et que le code de conduite de la Commission et des commissaires était peut-être parmi les meilleurs – je ne sais pas s'il n'a pas même dit «le meilleur» – au monde! Pour moi, c'est juste un déni de réalité; c'est la méthode Coué qui consiste à dire que tout va bien. Non, tout ne va pas bien!

Pour que les choses évoluent, pour que nous puissions avancer vers plus de transparence et plus de contrôle, deux commissions de ce Parlement européen ont approuvé, et j'insiste là-dessus, à l'unanimité les deux rapports – la commission du contrôle budgétaire puis la commission des affaires juridiques.

Cette unanimité doit également interpeller la Commission, puisqu'elle montre à quel point le Parlement européen est, je dirais, uni dans cet effort visant à modifier des règles qui, actuellement, dysfonctionnent. Alors, qu'est-ce qui dysfonctionne? J'aborderai très rapidement deux éléments, à savoir les conflits d'intérêts et le code de conduite.

Parlons d'abord des conflits d'intérêts. Au moment où les commissaires prennent leur poste, à ce stade, ils ne doivent déclarer que ce qu'ils considèrent eux-mêmes comme étant de nature à créer un conflit d'intérêts. Or, cette notion n'est définie nulle part.

La première chose à faire est donc de définir ce qu'est un conflit d'intérêts. Nous le faisons dans ce rapport, et nous demandons à ce que ce soit la commission juridique du Parlement européen qui puisse vérifier les déclarations financières et le patrimoine afin de déterminer si, oui ou non, il y a conflit d'intérêts. Il s'agira là simplement d'appliquer la séparation des pouvoirs. C'est une avancée qui est de taille, et il faut la mettre en œuvre.

Nous demandons la même chose en cours de mandat, quand il y a une modification du patrimoine, des intérêts financiers ou du portefeuille. Voilà pour la question des conflits d'intérêts et, naturellement, cette exigence doit être étendue aux intérêts familiaux puisque c'est le cas en cours de mandat.

La deuxième question est celle du code d'éthique et du code de bonne conduite. À ce stade, vous êtes tenu, Monsieur le Commissaire, ainsi que tous vos collègues, à un devoir d'honnêteté et de délicatesse. Cela n'est défini nulle part. Définissez ce que l'on entend par honnêteté et par délicatesse. Faites en sorte que le comité d'éthique, actuellement en charge du suivi, soit composé d'experts indépendants, et soit totalement mis à l'abri des pressions des intérêts privés ou de la Commission.

J'ajouterai un troisième élément. Nous vous demandons de faire en sorte que, pendant les trois ans qui suivent votre mandat, vous n'ayez pas la possibilité d'aller travailler dans le privé pour des secteurs que vous avez eu à connaître dans l'exercice de vos fonctions de commissaire. Les commissaires sont rémunérés pour cela; ce n'est pas scandaleux.

Vous voyez, les modifications que nous demandons ne sont pas exagérées. Ce que l'on veut, c'est simplement un alignement des règles de fonctionnement de la Commission sur ce qui se passe dans l'ensemble des démocraties partout dans le monde.

Andrus Ansip, *Vice-President of the Commission*. – Madam President, honourable Members of the European Parliament, the Commission welcomes the contribution to the debate from Mr. Durand's report on envisaged guidelines for Commissioners' declarations of interests. This shows Parliament's interest in this subject, which is of course an important part of the democratic scrutiny exercised by this House of the Commission and its Members. Let me therefore respond to a few issues.

I would first thank Mr Durand for the report and the other Members and committees for their work. The President of the European Commission, whom I am replacing here today, considers the highest ethical behaviour to be of paramount importance for the credibility of the EU institutions. I would also recall that the rules of the Treaties and the Code of Conduct of our Commissioners are clear; they represent standards that go well beyond those applied in the majority of Member States and in the other European Union institutions.

With its Code of Conduct, the Commission is subject to the highest ethical standards. Let me underline that some of the matters covered by the report already correspond to the current ethical framework and procedures. For instance, it is already the case that any situation entailing a possible conflict of interest which might impair the independence of a Member of the Commission during his or her mandate has to be notified to the President of the Commission. The President will then take appropriate measures, including reallocation of the file to another Member of the Commission, if necessary. The President will also inform in due time the President of the European Parliament of his decision to reallocate any file to another Commissioner.

Regarding membership of what the report describes as secret societies which could interfere with the exercise of the function of public bodies, I should stress that the Treaties themselves and the Code of Conduct already provide that Commissioners must discharge their duties in the general interest of the Union without seeking or taking instructions from any other body.

In addition, other recommendations are already being implemented. For example, the report mentions the three-year transitional allowances for former Commissioners. Let me point out that these rules were recently, in February this year, amended by the Council. The new rules will apply to all Commissioners and other EU public office holders who took up office after 4 March 2016. The transitional allowances will in the future be paid for a maximum of two years.

The report proposes the extension of former Commissioners' cooling-off periods to two years. President Juncker wrote to President Schulz on 23 November 2016 informing him of his intention to modify the Code of Conduct in order to extend this period from 18 months to three years, as regards the President of the Commission, and to two years, as regards the other Members of the Commission.

I would like to underline that the Ad Hoc Ethical Committee is composed of personalities who are not Members of the Commission or Commission staff.

Their qualifications and independence are beyond any doubt and they gave a very independent opinion to the Commission. Allow me to note that the European Parliament's Advisory Committee on the Conduct of Members, which gives guidance on the interpretation and implementation of the Code of Conduct for Members, is composed of Members of the same Parliament.

Finally, I would like to recall that, in line with the Framework Agreement between the European Parliament and the Commission, the Commission has the right to be consulted before any changes in Parliament's Rules of Procedure directly affecting the Commission are decided. The possible need to amend the Framework Agreement also needs to be examined. The Commission will pursue its dialog with Parliament and will come forward with further remarks and comments as and when needed. Thank you very much.

Ingeborg Gräßle, *Verfasserin der Stellungnahme des mitberatenden Haushaltskontrollausschusses*. – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Vizepräsident, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Schön, dass wir darüber sprechen können. Herr Vizepräsident, ich hätte mir schon etwas mehr gewünscht von dem, was Sie denn bereit sind, an Bord zu nehmen von unseren Vorschlägen, sowohl aus dem Bericht des Kollegen Durand als auch aus meiner Stellungnahme des Haushaltskontrollausschusses, der sich schon sehr lange mit dem Thema *Code of Conduct* beschäftigt. Wir wollen, dass er überarbeitet wird, dass finanzielle Interessen und Vermögenswerte, Verbindlichkeiten, die über 10 000 Euro sind, dort angegeben werden. Wir wollen, dass sämtliche Interessen – Anteile, Mitgliedschaften in Verwaltungsräten, Beratungstätigkeiten, Mitgliedschaften in angeschlossenen Stiftungen und allen Unternehmen, denen künftige Kommissare angehört haben – offengelegt werden. Wir wollen dies auch auf unterhaltsberechtigte Angehörige ausdehnen. Warum? Weil wir die Sache des Interessenkonfliktes eben sehr ernst nehmen müssen, weil wir künftigen Skandalen vorbeugen wollen.

Wir wollen auch den Ethikausschuss neu aufstellen. Es ist eben nicht so, dass dieser unabhängig ist. Er besteht aus ehemaligen Mitarbeitern oder ehemaligen Beratern. Er arbeitet nicht transparent. Wir wollen, dass seine Beschlüsse veröffentlicht werden. Wir wollen, dass man nachvollziehen kann, wie er arbeitet und was er gemacht hat. Es gibt bis jetzt keinen Jahresbericht über seine Tätigkeit, es gibt gar nichts. Deswegen kann ich nur sagen: Machen Sie nicht so weiter wie die Kommission Barroso! Es gibt fast ganz umsonst Dinge, die den Ruf der Kommission verbessern. Und es wäre unser dringender Wunsch, dass Sie darauf eingehen, solange noch Zeit ist.

Tadeusz Zwiefka, *w imieniu grupy PPE*. – Pani Przewodnicząca! Panie Komisarzy! Najważniejszą rzeczą jest, abyśmy dzisiaj byli przekonani co do jednego: że Parlament Europejski i Komisja Europejska w tej sprawie stoją po jednej stronie. My nie jesteśmy przeciwko Komisji – Komisja nie jest przeciwko Parlamentowi. Musimy dbać o to, aby dobre imię instytucji europejskich, osób w nich pracujących, nie podważyła zaufania obywateli do Unii Europejskiej. I wtedy dojdziemy na pewno do celu, o którym wspomniała koleżanka Gräßle, i o którym mówił kolega Durand.

Dlaczego Komisji Prawnej tak bardzo zależy na tych zmianach? Otóż my jesteśmy odpowiedzialni za przeprowadzenie na wstępie, podczas tworzenia kolegium komisarzy, takiego małego śledztwa – mimo że nie jesteśmy ani prokuratorem, ani sądem – czy wszystko to, co znajduje się w oświadczeniach finansowych, jest rzeczywiście zgodne z rzeczywistością i czy nie występuje konflikt interesów. Nie mamy natomiast jako Komisja Prawna odpowiednich instrumentów, aby mieć rzeczywiście pełne przekonanie, że sprawdziliśmy to, co dało się sprawdzić. Zatem te nasze prośby idą w kierunku usprawnienia procesu weryfikacji po to, byśmy mogli razem osiągnąć sukces.

Członkowie kolegium komisarzy to najwyżsi urzędnicy w Unii Europejskiej. Jeżeli pojawiają się tam jakieś niepewności, jeżeli pojawiają się tam jakieś kwestie, które mogą prowadzić do skandalu, to nie jest tylko i wyłącznie odpowiedzialność indywidualnego komisarza czy kolegium komisarzy – to jest kamień rzucony w spokojną wodę całej Unii Europejskiej. A my nie chcemy tego jeziora wzburzać, my chcemy, aby było ono spokojne, abyśmy mogli wspólnie pracować dla dobra obywateli Unii Europejskiej.

Evelyn Regner, *im Namen der S&D-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin! Die Erklärungen der finanziellen Interessen der designierten EU-Kommissare sollen ein Höchstmaß an Transparenz, Ehrlichkeit, Uneigennützigkeit und Verantwortung sicherstellen – das ist für uns Sozialdemokraten oberste Maxime. Die europäischen Institutionen besitzen hier eine Vorbildfunktion. Fälle wie jener von Neelie Kroes dürfen in Zukunft nicht mehr auftreten. Aktivitäten wie die von Miguel Arias Cañete müssen von vornherein ausgeschlossen werden.

Wir im Rechtsausschuss prüfen nicht nur, ob die Erklärung ordnungsgemäß ausgefüllt wurde, sondern auch, ob ein potenzieller Interessenskonflikt vorliegt. Das Nichtvorliegen eines Interessenskonflikts ist zwingende Voraussetzung für die Anhörung der designierten Kommissare und Kommissarinnen, und dieses weitergehende Prüfungsrecht hatten wir bei der amtierenden Kommission eben nicht. Mir ist besonders wichtig, dass nicht nur Ehegatten oder Partner in der finanziellen Interessenserklärung angegeben werden, sondern auch Einzelheiten zu jeder vertraglichen Beziehung, die zu einem Interessenskonflikt für die designierten Kommissare und Kommissarinnen führen können, während sie ihren Verpflichtungen als EU-Kommissare nachgehen.

Pirkko Ruohonen-Lerner, *ECR-ryhmän puolesta*. – Arvoisa puhemies, pidän erittäin tärkeänä komission jäsenten sääntöjen muuttamista sellaisiksi, että ne edistävät päätöksenteon läpinäkyvyyttä. Sidonnaisuuksien piilottelusta tulee määrätä selkeät sanktiot, jotta sidonnaisuudet todellakin ilmoitettaisiin.

Esimerkiksi entisen komissaarin Neelie Kroesin kytkökset offshore-yrityksiin jäivät alkuperäisessä sidonnaisuuksien tarkastelussa ilmoittamatta. Tuolloin hänet valittiin niukalla enemmistöllä komissaariksi. Jälkikäteen paljastuneiden kytköksten johdosta Kroesille ei voida enää langettaa sanktioita, joten rangaistukset sääntöjen rikkomuksista ovat selvästi riittämättömiä. Myös sidonnaisuuksien määritelmiä on selkeytettävä, jotta ilmoittamisvelvollisuuteen ei jää tulkinnan varaa. Tämä on välttämätöntä päätöksenteon uskottavuuden kannalta.

Κώστας Χρυσόγονος, *εξ ονόματος της ομάδας GUE/NGL*. – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, η έκθεση σχετικά με τις δηλώσεις οικονομικών συμφερόντων των μελών της Ευρωπαϊκής Επιτροπής, που εξετάζουμε σήμερα, έχει ως κεντρική ιδέα ότι ο έλεγχος των δηλώσεων αυτών πρέπει να γίνει πιο ενδελεχής και πιο αυστηρός. Τούτο είναι απολύτως αναγκαίο για την προστασία της αξιοπιστίας της ίδιας της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, τη στιγμή μάλιστα κατά την οποία από μια σειρά γεγονότων, όπως παραδείγματός χάριν η τοποθέτηση του πρώην Προέδρου Barroso σε καιρία θέση σε ιδιωτική τράπεζα λίγο καιρό μετά την αποχώρησή του από την Επιτροπή, συνάγεται ότι υφίστανται αφανείς διασυνδέσεις με ιδιωτικά συμφέροντα. Εξάλλου, κατά την εξέταση των δηλώσεων οικονομικών συμφερόντων των μελών της επιτροπής Juncker το 2014 έγινε φανερό ότι χρειάζεται να δοθούν περισσότερες αρμοδιότητες και πιο άνετα χρονικά περιθώρια στην Επιτροπή Νομικών Υποθέσεων του Ευρωκοινοβουλίου, προκειμένου αυτή να μπορεί να διαπιστώσει τις τυχόν αναλήθειες ή παραλείψεις των δηλώσεων αυτών. Υπήρξαν περιπτώσεις Επιτρόπων, όπως του κυρίου Cañete, όπου από το περιεχόμενο της δήλωσης ή από άλλα στοιχεία προέκυπταν ανοικτά ερωτήματα αλλά αυτά δεν διερευνήθηκαν επαρκώς. Οι Επίτροποι δεν αρκεί να φαίνονται τίμιοι. Πρέπει να είναι τίμιοι. Συνεπώς η Ευρωπαϊκή Αριστερά θα στηρίξει την έκθεση αυτή στην αυριανή ψηφοφορία και ελπίζουμε ότι θα ακολουθήσουν οι επιβεβλημένες από τα πράγματα τροποποιήσεις των σχετικών κανόνων.

Gilles Lebreton, *au nom du groupe ENF*. – Madame la Présidente, le code de conduite des commissaires adopté en 2011 n'est pas assez exigeant en ce qui concerne le contrôle des intérêts financiers des commissaires. Ce laxisme a débouché sur plusieurs scandales, dont le plus célèbre concerne Neelie Kroes, l'ex-commissaire à la concurrence, dont on vient de découvrir qu'elle dirigeait une société offshore pendant son mandat.

J'approuve donc le rapport Durand, qui s'efforce d'améliorer ce contrôle. Je doute toutefois que l'on atteigne une quelconque efficacité. Fondamentalement, le Conseil, la Commission et le Parlement européen ne veulent pas que l'on enquête trop profondément sur les intérêts financiers des eurocrates. J'en veux pour preuve la décision de nommer puis de maintenir comme commissaire à l'énergie M. Miguel Arias Cañete, malgré les conflits d'intérêts que l'on a découverts et dénoncés à plusieurs reprises.

L'Union européenne a renié les valeurs européennes au profit du culte du veau d'or. Elle est entièrement dominée par les lobbies, les puissances financières et la soif de profit. C'est pourquoi elle couvre les agissements de ses dirigeants qui en sont les dignes représentants. La lutte contre les conflits d'intérêts suppose la disparition préalable de l'Union européenne.

Pavel Svoboda (PPE). – Paní předsedající, pane komisaři, návrh podporuji, ale chtěl bych se zastavit u jednoho konkrétního tématu. Je jistě dobrá zpráva, když slyšíme, že většina chápe, že střet zájmů je nebezpečný pro demokracii, a chce zajistit, aby se na rozhodování v konkrétních oblastech v rámci správy věcí veřejných přímo nepodíleli ti, kteří jsou ve střetu zájmů. To je dobrá zpráva, protože voliči to po nás požadují.

Druhá otázka ale je, jakým způsobem chceme tento cíl realizovat. A zde musím bohužel říci, že nejsem přesvědčen o tom, že všechny postupy, které jsou ve zprávě navrhovány, zajistí efektivní realizaci těchto cílů.

Skrze minimalizaci střetu zájmů ve veřejné sféře chceme především zajistit, aby naši občané měli větší důvěru ve své instituce. Každá instituce má své místo v systému a má mít kompetence odpovídající tomu postavení v systému. Evropský parlament není podle mého názoru tou institucí, která by měla působit jako instituce vyšetřující. Myslím, že k tomu není v principu nadána, její úspěch v těchto aktivitách není tak zaručen a v důsledku to naopak může uškodit naší reputaci.

Doufám, že moje obavy se nenaplní, doufám, že zvýšení transparentnosti a omezení střetu zájmů skrze tento návrh bude dosaženo.

Victor Negrescu (S&D). – În calitate de membru în Comisia pentru afaceri juridice din cadrul Parlamentului European, salut inițiativa colegilor noștri de a schimba cadrul legal privind regimul incompatibilităților comisarilor și declarația de interese. Modificările aduse de acest nou document reprezintă un pas înainte pentru combaterea abuzurilor, pentru susținerea transparenței și - de ce nu? - pentru creșterea încrederii în instituțiile europene. Profit, astfel, de ocazie pentru a menționa un exemplu vehiculat de presă, dar și în dezbaterile care au avut loc pe această temă în Parlamentul European. Mă refer aici la fostul comisar pentru agricultură, Dacian Cioloș, care, în prezent, are două venituri. Primește o diurnă în calitate de fost comisar în valoare de aproximativ 8 300 de euro pe lună, în timp ce încasează din banii contribuabililor români salariul de prim-ministru. Nu știu dacă putem să ne referim la acest lucru ca la o incompatibilitate, dar cu siguranță s-a profitat de absența unor prevederi legale clare. Sunt trist că astfel de posibile abuzuri pot fi comise de un politician cu experiență, dar mă bucur că am reușit în acest proiect final privind regimul incompatibilităților și declarația de interese să combatem asemenea soluții imorale prin introducerea unor măsuri precise privind asemenea situații. Mulțumesc.

Νότης Μαρίας (ECR). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, πρόσφατα επιβεβαιώθηκε αυτό που ήδη γνωρίζαμε, ότι δηλαδή κορυφαία στελέχη της Ευρωπαϊκής Επιτροπής, ακόμη κι ο ίδιος ο Πρόεδρος της, ο κύριος Μπαρόζο, είναι εκτεθειμένοι σε σύγκρουση συμφερόντων. Αυτό το γεγονός καθιστά επιτακτικό και απολύτως απαραίτητο να συσταθούν επιτέλους αυστηρότερα πλαίσια ελέγχου της σύγκρουσης συμφερόντων που κυριαρχεί σε πολλά επίπεδα στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση. Αυτό επισημαίνει και η δική μου έκθεση, που εγκρίθηκε την προηγούμενη Πέμπτη στο Στρασβούργο, και αφορούσε τη δράση της Ευρωπαϊκής Διαμεσολαβητριας. Εκεί δίνεται η εντολή στην Ευρωπαϊκή Διαμεσολαβητρια να ελέγξει τη νομιμότητα του διορισμού του κυρίου Μπαρόζο στην Goldman Sachs. Αυτό ανάγκασε επίσης τον κύριο Γιούνκερ να αλλάξει ρότα και να προτείνει, την ημέρα που συζητήθηκε η έκθεσή μου στο Στρασβούργο, την αλλαγή του κώδικα δεοντολογίας των ίδιων των Επιτρόπων. Αποδεικνύεται λοιπόν ότι χρειάζονται μέτρα και δράση για πλήρη διαφάνεια στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, για να μην υπάρχει σύγκρουση συμφερόντων σε όλα τα επίπεδα.

Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE). – Señora Presidenta, efectivamente, el principio de integridad y el principio de independencia impuestos a los miembros de la Comisión están en el propio corazón de los Tratados. Es necesario que su gestión se ajuste siempre al interés general y nunca a intereses que puedan ser incompatibles con la dignidad o con su cargo, tanto durante el periodo de desempeño del cargo como después.

La eliminación de cualquier conflicto de intereses es lo que pretende la propuesta, en la línea del Parlamento, que también comparte —veo— la Comisión. En realidad, eliminar cualquier tipo de duda sobre un conflicto de intereses lo que hace es reafirmar la independencia de la propia Comisión y fortalecerla. Por eso es importante que la Comisión esté a la cabeza en los estándares de ética y en los estándares de democracia. Tiene que tratarse verdaderamente de una política al servicio de la integridad.

Acabo diciendo algo. He oído alusiones a Miguel Arias Cañete. Cumplió escrupulosamente con todo el Código de Conducta, incluso fue más allá del Código. También con su declaración de intereses, de su mujer y de su familia. En ningún caso hubo conflicto de intereses. Y se dice una mentira cuando se falta a la verdad. Se falta a la verdad cuando se reitera permanentemente una cosa que no es cierta y, por lo tanto, quiero recordar a sus Señorías que, si predicamos seriedad, por favor la prediquemos también en los discursos y no atribuyamos algo que no ha sucedido a la persona de Miguel Arias Cañete.

Virginie Rozière (S&D). – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Commissaire, vous nous dites en substance: «Circulez, il n'y a rien à voir; il n'y a pas de problème!». Mais, une nouvelle fois, nos débats ont justement à voir avec les conflits d'intérêts des commissaires européens. Cela devient presque une habitude.

En octobre dernier, nous parlions du cas de M^{me} Kroes et des *Bahamas Leaks*, auparavant, c'était M. Barroso et *Goldman Sachs* et, maintenant, c'est M. Oettinger et ses vols avec un lobbyiste proche de Moscou. C'est un nouveau conflit d'intérêts que le président Juncker voudrait «sanctionner» par une promotion, au mépris de l'opinion de ce Parlement. C'est tout simplement inadmissible!

Ce que nous demandons, c'est que ce Parlement ait à se prononcer, et de manière plus forte encore, non seulement au moment de l'investiture des commissaires, mais aussi à intervalles répétés en cours de mandat et, en particulier, en cas de changement de portefeuille. Nous voulons pouvoir vérifier l'absence de conflit d'intérêts, et nous voulons aussi pouvoir nous assurer que, dans le code de conduite tel qu'il sera revu, l'on évite les conflits d'intérêts après la fin du mandat des commissaires.

Il y a urgence à revoir nos règles parce que c'est la transparence et l'exemplarité qui redonneront du sens au projet européen.

Tibor Szanyi (S&D). – Elnök Asszony! Majdhogynem köszönettel tartozunk Oettinger biztos úrnak, hogy az összeférhetlenségi problémakör állatorvosi lovaként éppen most jelentkezett a jelenleg tárgyalat határozati javaslatunk alátámasztására. Konkrétan arról beszélek, hogy Magyarország kormánya az Európai Unió érdekeivel, közös politikáival szemben, súlyos korrupciós gyanútól övezve a végsőig kiszolgáltatja Magyarországot egy külső hatalomnak – konkrétan Oroszországnak – a Paks II atomerőmű szerződésével. Ennek a minden szempontból megkérdőjelezhető szerződésnek az átnyomását az Európai Bizottságon egy orosz párti lobbista közbeiktatásával, a hivatalban lévő Oettinger biztos segítségére, befolyására, tanácsaira támaszkodva mozdítaná elő, aki, Oettinger úr egyébként ennek a lobbistának a magánrepülőgépén utazgat Magyarországra. Hát ha a Barroso-ügy után egy ilyen evidens szabálysértés is következmények nélkül marad, ez önmagában is sürgős ok az Európai Bizottság összeférhetlenségével kapcsolatos szabályainak alapos felülvizsgálatára. De most már az Európai Parlament feladata, és felelőssége is, hogy véget vessünk a Bizottság átláthatatlan, etikátlan, önfelmentő gyakorlatának.

Sergio Gaetano Cofferati (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signor Commissario, ha completamente ragione il relatore Durand quando dice che dopo vicende come quelle che hanno interessato l'ex Commissario Barroso occorre agire e agire rapidamente, ne va la credibilità delle istituzioni europee. È chiaro che se arriva un nuovo codice di condotta per i Commissari, questo nuovo codice deve essere scritto da un comitato indipendente. Io penso anche che il comitato indipendente debba avere la possibilità di un intervento autonomo, non condizionato dagli equilibri e dalla politica interna alle istituzioni. Servono sanzioni più pesanti. La pesantezza delle sanzioni deve essere il corrispettivo del reato eventualmente individuato e deve avere anche un effetto deterrenza, sempre importante in questi casi. Ancora il tempo di sospensione tra la fine attività e il nuovo ciclo professionale deve essere più lungo, ma aggiungo che per alcune attività credo che sarà necessario prevedere addirittura la preclusione di una possibile collocazione in futuro da parte dei Commissari.

Procedura „catch the eye”

Nicola Caputo (S&D), – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, il controllo delle dichiarazioni di interessi finanziari e più in generale dei potenziali conflitti di interessi concernenti i membri della Commissione non può limitarsi alla sola procedura di nomina. Qualsiasi modifica sostanziale degli interessi finanziari di un Commissario in corso di mandato o qualsiasi ripartizione delle responsabilità tra i membri della Commissione deve essere oggetto di una procedura di esame da parte del Parlamento. La dichiarazione di interessi finanziari deve includere gli interessi o le attività presenti o passate negli ultimi due anni di natura patrimoniale, professionale e personale, anche estesa alla famiglia. La Commissione deve rivedere e rendere più severo il codice di condotta per aderire a standard etici elevati ed assicurare che la dichiarazione di interessi finanziari fornisca al Parlamento e ai cittadini informazioni accurate. È fondamentale estendere il periodo di incompatibilità dagli attuali 18 mesi ad almeno cinque anni per i Commissari e per il presidente della Commissione. Norme più severe non sono certo sufficienti ad assicurare un comportamento eticamente corretto, ma rappresentano senza dubbio un indispensabile punto di partenza verso un rapporto più trasparente.

(Înceierea procedurii „catch the eye”)

Andrus Ansip, Vice-President of the Commission, – Madam President, to conclude, let me emphasise that the Commission welcomes Parliament’s input into the reflection on how the code of conduct for Commissioners can be improved, and will inform Parliament about the follow-up it will give to the present reports. I, myself, I agree with all the speakers who have practically said that that the behaviour of politicians not only has to be impeccable, but also has to be perceived as impeccable.

Elnökváltás: GÁLL-PELCZ ILDIKÓ

alelnök

Pascal Durand, rapporteur, – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Vice-président, Monsieur le Commissaire, j’irai droit au but: puisque vous nous avez entendus, faites en sorte de rapporter à la Commission et à son président que le Parlement est unanime pour demander à ce que l’on mette en place des règles qui, tout simplement, nous feraient grandir ensemble.

L’Europe à laquelle nous sommes attachés et nous tenons est une Europe démocratique, en construction; elle évolue. Elle se grandirait, nous grandirions tous et nous aurions un poids beaucoup plus fort dans la société civile, si nous montrions qu’effectivement, la transparence et l’absence de conflits d’intérêts sont au cœur des préoccupations de la Commission et du Parlement européen.

Alors, faisons en sorte que cette Europe grandisse, faisons-le ensemble, naturellement, et pas les uns contre les autres. Faisons en sorte, comme la France l’a fait, par exemple, de mettre en place une haute autorité indépendante. Tout le monde y gagne et, petit à petit, la confiance se remet en place. C’est simple, c’est démocratique et nous avons tous à y gagner.

Elnök asszony, – A vitát lezárom.

A szavazásra holnap, 2016. december 1-jén kerül sor.

Írásbeli nyilatkozatok (162. cikk)

Matt Carthy (GUE/NGL), in writing, – The rules regarding Commissioners’ declarations of interests are woefully vague. So much so that it is almost completely at the subject’s discretion, what financial details are put forward for consideration. Commissioners decide, completely on their own, what financial interests or activities might be ‘likely to constitute a conflict of interest’ and there is no regular reporting when these interests are updated. This report, which I will be supporting is a move in the right direction however it must be followed up by the European Commission. I will further be supporting an amendment which will extend Commissioners’ post-office employment restrictions to three years.

Benedek Jávör (Verts/ALE), in writing. – Since 2014 scandals have been highlighting the problems related to the Commissioner's declaration of interest. Commissioner Canete's scandal, President Barroso's case has proven that we need a Code of Conduct, which improves the restrictions of the post-office employment and strengthens the competence of the ad-hoc Ethical Committee responsible for the assessment of conflict of interests. Unfortunately the proposal President Juncker presented recently, which would increase the lobby ban from 1.5 to 3 years for the President of the Commission and to extend the cooling-off period for Commissioners from 1.5 to 2 years is an insufficient one. Former commissioners are entitled to a transitional allowance for three years, precisely prevent conflicts of interest, but in the meanwhile they can start working as a lobbyist after only two years? That is unacceptable and imbalanced. Such measures are exactly the reasons for extremists and Euro-sceptics to criticizing the EU institutions. Besides the 3 years ban former Commissioners should be required to make publicly available all information on their meetings and telephone calls with officials of the European Institutions or officials of the governments of the Member States up to 10 years after they have ceased to hold office.

Csaba Molnár (S&D), írásban. – Ha az Európai Bizottság és vele az egész Európai Unió hiteles kíván maradni a választók szemében, akkor nem megengedhető, hogy a korábbi bizottsági elnök a gazdasági világválság kirobbantásában oroszlánszerepet játszó Goldman Sachs-hez igazoljon át másfél évvel mandátuma lejárta után. Az sem megengedhető, hogy a korábbi energiaügyi biztos egy oroszpartí üzletember magángépén repüljön Budapestre paksi bővítés kapcsán tanácsot adni a magyar kormánynak. Ezen változtatni kell, ilyen többet nem fordulhat elő! A magatartási kódex szigorítására van szükség a még hivatalban lévő és a már távozott biztosok esetében is. Ezért teljes mértékben támogatom azt a javaslatot, hogy az uniós biztosok megbízatásuk lejárta után három évig kizárólag a testület engedélyével helyezkedhetnek el. Csak olyan állást vállalhatnak, amely nem veti fel az összeférhetlenség gyanúját. Nem lehet valaki olajipari lobbista, ha előtte környezetvédelméért felelős uniós biztos volt. Ez az alapja egy működőképes, hiteles és demokratikus Európai Uniónak. A magatartási kódex betartatása az Európai Parlament politikai felelőssége. Választott EP-képviselőkként minden esetben fellépünk a jövőben is, ha azt látjuk, hogy valamely biztos tevékenysége etikai kérdéseket vet fel.

Marc Tarabella (S&D), par écrit. – Ce n'est pas un dossier à prendre à la légère. Barroso, Kroes, l'affaire cette semaine des perturbateurs endocriniens, les multiples scandales centrés sur la Commission entretiennent une image désastreuse des institutions européennes et d'une éthique défaillante! Il faut aborder à la fois les procédures internes au Parlement européen, lors de la nomination de la nouvelle Commission et durant la durée de son mandat et les obligations de transparence incombant aux membres de la Commission. La vérification de l'absence de conflit d'intérêts ne saurait être mise au même niveau que l'évaluation des compétences du candidat. Elle doit donc constituer un préalable indispensable à l'audition. Le contrôle des déclarations d'intérêts financiers et plus largement des conflits d'intérêts potentiels concernant les membres de la Commission doit s'étendre au-delà de la seule procédure de nomination de la Commission. J'attends également de la Commission une série de modifications de son code de conduite et des déclarations d'intérêts visant à assurer que ces dernières comprennent les informations suffisantes à l'évaluation des intérêts financiers des commissaires et que le Parlement soit informé de toute modification.

Indrek Tarand (Verts/ALE), in writing. – Increasing the level of scrutiny regarding the Commissioner-candidates' declarations of financial interests is absolutely necessary and does not come a moment too soon. We should do our utmost to verify the truthfulness of the declarations by actually investigating, instead of accepting them prima facie. We really do not need more scandals like those that arose out of Cañete and Kroes' omissions. This report rightfully calls for a revision of the Commissioners' code of conduct; however, I am disappointed by the fact that the proposal to put some of the Commission's budgetary resources in reserve, until this revision actually happens, was not adopted. This would have motivated the Commission to implement substantial, not merely cosmetic, changes. Right now, they seem to be so out of touch with reality that they didn't even blink an eye when Oettinger made controversial remarks and accepted a flight on a lobbyist's private jet. Instead of appropriate repercussions, Oettinger received a promotion to the post of vice-president. Even his hearing in the Parliament was replaced with a simple exchange of views. These sorts of practices play right into the hands of pro-Kremlin eurosceptics.

18. Odpowiedzialność, odszkodowania i zabezpieczenia finansowe w odniesieniu do działalności związanej ze złożami ropy naftowej i gazu ziemnego na obszarach morskich (krótka prezentacja)

Elnök asszony. – A következő napirendi pont a Kostas Chrysogonos által a Jogi Bizottság nevében készített, a tengeri olaj- és gázipari tevékenységekre vonatkozó felelősség, kártérítés és pénzügyi biztosítékokról szóló jelentés rövid ismertetése (A8-0308/2016) [2015/2352(INI)]

Κώστας Χρυσόγονος, Εισηγητής. – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, η έκθεση σχετικά με την ευθύνη για τις υπεράκτιες δραστηριότητες εκμετάλλευσης κοιτασμάτων πετρελαίου και φυσικού αερίου είναι το αποτέλεσμα μιας μακράς προσπάθειας να κάνουμε αλλαγές προς όφελος της Ευρώπης και των πολιτών της. Οι προτάσεις της έκθεσης αυτής δεν επηρεάζουν μόνο οικονομικές δραστηριότητες αλλά έχουν επίσης ως στόχο να υποστηρίξουν τις περιβαλλοντικές ανάγκες της ευρωπαϊκής περιφέρειας. Οι εργασίες που σχετίζονται με την παραγωγή πετρελαίου και φυσικού αερίου έχουν σημαντικό οικονομικό αντίκρουσμα αλλά και υψηλή περιβαλλοντική επικινδυνότητα. Το μεγαλύτερο μέρος των δραστηριοτήτων εκμετάλλευσης κοιτασμάτων πετρελαίου και φυσικού αερίου πραγματοποιείται είτε στη Βόρεια Θάλασσα είτε στη Μεσόγειο. Λόγω της φύσης των εργασιών αυτών είναι εξαιρετικά σημαντικό να εξασφαλιστεί η προστασία των επιχειρήσεων, οι οποίες συνδέονται άμεσα με το περιβάλλον. Ο τομέας της εμπορικής αλιείας και οι άνθρωποι που εμπλέκονται στον τομέα της ιχθυοκαλλιέργειας μπορούν να υποστούν σημαντικές οικονομικές απώλειες από ατυχήματα ή λανθασμένη χρήση χημικών ουσιών. Οι επιχειρήσεις στον τομέα του τουρισμού θα μπορούσαν επίσης να έχουν οικονομικές απώλειες από τη μείωση των πελατών λόγω πιθανών σχετικών ατυχημάτων.

Συνεπώς είναι προφανές ότι πρέπει να θέσουμε κανόνες για την προστασία όλων αυτών των οικονομικών δραστηριοτήτων που είναι τοποθετημένες κοντά σε υπεράκτιες δραστηριότητες, εκμετάλλευση κοιτασμάτων πετρελαίου και φυσικού αερίου, δεδομένου μάλιστα ότι πάνω από το 90% του πετρελαίου και το 60% του φυσικού αερίου που παράγεται στην Ευρώπη προέρχεται από τέτοιες υπεράκτιες δραστηριότητες. Επίσης, είναι υψίστης σημασίας να υπάρχουν μηχανισμοί αποζημίωσης για ζημιές που προκαλούνται από υπεράκτιες δραστηριότητες αλλά και αντίστοιχοι μηχανισμοί που θα στοχεύουν στην αποκατάσταση των οικοσυστημάτων.

Η ισχύουσα ευρωπαϊκή οδηγία καθιστά τους κατόχους αδειών υπεράκτιων δραστηριοτήτων υπεύθυνους για την πρόληψη και την αποκατάσταση κάθε περιβαλλοντικής ζημίας που προκύπτει από τις δραστηριότητές τους. Απαιτεί επίσης από τα κράτη μέλη να θεσπίσουν διαδικασίες για τον χειρισμό των αξιώσεων αποζημίωσης. Ωστόσο η οδηγία δεν ασχολείται με θέματα ευθύνης για τη ζημία σε φυσικά ή νομικά πρόσωπα όσον αφορά τραυματισμούς ή οικονομική ζημία ούτε με την ποινική ευθύνη για υπεράκτια ατυχήματα. Επιβάλλεται λοιπόν να εκτιμηθεί η σημασία της θέσπισης περαιτέρω εναρμονισμένων κανόνων καθώς και ενός μηχανισμού αποζημίωσης για υπεράκτια ατυχήματα, προκειμένου να διευκολυνθεί η πρόσβαση των θυμάτων στη δικαιοσύνη. Για να προωθηθεί αυτή η εναρμόνιση, θα μπορούσε επίσης να εξεταστεί η δυνατότητα δημιουργίας ενός ταμείου με βάση τα τέλη που θα καταβάλλονται από βιομηχανίες υπεράκτιων δραστηριοτήτων. Χρειαζόμαστε εξάλλου ένα σχέδιο δράσης της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης για την πρόληψη και την καταπολέμηση των συνεπειών ατυχημάτων που σχετίζονται με το πετρέλαιο και το φυσικό αέριο. Ο αντίκτυπός τους έχει σοβαρές και μακροχρόνιες επιπτώσεις για το θαλάσσιο περιβάλλον και τούτο θα πρέπει να λαμβάνεται υπόψη στην οδηγία.

Η Επιτροπή πρέπει να συνεργαστεί με τα κράτη μέλη, προκειμένου να επιταχυνθούν οι σχετικές διαδικασίες. Θα μπορούσε επίσης να δημοσιεύεται τακτικά ανάλυση κινδύνων και εκτίμηση περιβαλλοντικών επιπτώσεων για υπεράκτιες δραστηριότητες, σύμφωνα με παραμέτρους όπως η βιοποικιλότητα, η κλιματική αλλαγή, η βιώσιμη χρήση του εδάφους, η προστασία του θαλάσσιου περιβάλλοντος και η κατάλληλη εκπαίδευση του προσωπικού πριν από οποιαδήποτε αδειοδότηση των επιχειρήσεων. Αποτελεί προσωπική μου πεποίθηση ότι η πρόληψη είναι καλύτερη από τη θεραπεία και η θεσμοθέτηση ποινικών ευθυνών σε πανευρωπαϊκό επίπεδο θα μπορούσε να αποτελέσει έναν επιπλέον λόγο αποτροπής, πέραν των υφιστάμενων αστικών κυρώσεων, οδηγώντας έτσι σε καλύτερη προστασία του περιβάλλοντος αλλά και των πολιτών.

„Catch the eye” eljárás

Tibor Szanyi (S&D). – Elnök Asszony! Nagyon is egyetértek a jelentéssel, minden környezetet és emberi életet károsító tevékenységet kollektív jogorvoslattal kell összekötni, és komoly szankciókat kell alkalmazni. A vonatkozó 2013-as irányelv mégsem került átültetésre az összes tagállamban, ezért felszólítom a Bizottságot, hogy minden lehetséges eszközzel ösztönözze a tagállamokat ennek orvoslására.

Mindemellett a károk elhárítása egyik fontos eszközének tartom a „szennyező fizet” elvet, amelyet más területeken is aláhúztunk már, például a magyarországi vörösiszap-katasztrófával kapcsolatos állásfoglalásban. A magam részéről teljes egészében kivezetném a fosszilis kőolaj és földgáz használatát, természetesen a fokozatosság biztosítása mellett, hiszen ez egy végtelen kockázatos művelet. A Bizottságnak e téren is azt kellene ösztönöznie, hogy a tagállamok minél nagyobb hangsúlyt fektessenek a megújuló energiaforrásokra.

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, πετρέλαιο και φυσικό αέριο αποτελούν το μισό ενεργειακό μείγμα της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης και θα συνεχίσουν να συνιστούν τις κύριες πηγές ενέργειας για αρκετά χρόνια ακόμη. Ταυτόχρονα όλο και μεγαλύτερο ποσοστό αυτών των πηγών προέρχεται από υπεράκτιες δραστηριότητες. Είναι λοιπόν μείζονος σημασίας θέμα να διασφαλιστεί το υψηλό επίπεδο ασφάλειας και η πρόληψη των φυσικών καταστροφών από τις υπεράκτιες αυτές δραστηριότητες.

Το ατύχημα του Deepwater Horizon στον Κόλπο του Μεξικού κόστισε δισεκατομμύρια δολάρια στην αμερικανική οικονομία. Καταλαβαίνουμε λοιπόν ότι ένα αντίστοιχο ατύχημα σε μια κλειστή θάλασσα όπως η Μεσόγειος θα ήταν πολλαπλάσια καταστροφικό, γι' αυτό και πρέπει να θεσπιστούν αυστηρότεροι κανόνες και πρότυπα σχετικά με την ευθύνη των εταιρειών πετρελαίου και, επειδή οι καταστροφές αυτές δεν σταματούν στα σύνορα των κρατών, αυτή η υψηλή ασφάλεια στις υπεράκτιες δραστηριότητες πετρελαίου πρέπει να ισχύσει παντού. Ειδικότερα, ενόψει των εργασιών στο Ιόνιο και την Αδριατική θα πρέπει η Αλβανία να συμμορφωθεί με αυτούς τους κανόνες και να πάψει επιτέλους να διεκδικεί την ελληνική ΑΟΖ.

A „catch the eye” eljárás vége.

Andrus Ansip, Vice-President of the Commission. – Madam President, let me first thank this House, and in particular the rapporteur Mr Chrysogonos, for your support and work on this complex legal fight. I would also like to thank you for your thoughts and comments on our report on liability, financial security and compensation in the offshore oil and gas sector.

Let me address some of the vital issues that came up in your report and today's debate. You have asked the Commission to take new initiatives which may have a large impact on citizens and the offshore oil and car gas industry. After an initial analysis, the Commission will examine in detail your proposals and consider how best to carry out the assessment and the collection of more information, as suggested. Your report provides valuable policy lines for the offshore oil and gas sector, which will guide our work. It underlined certain weaknesses of the current legal framework with regards to many questions surrounding liability when offshore accidents happen. We are very grateful for this constructive and substantive contribution, which provides a structure of issues to be dealt with in the near future.

Furthermore, before deciding on new legal initiatives, we need to know what progress has been made on these subjects in Member States when implementing the directive. The deadline for implementation of the Offshore Safety Directive was 19 July 2015. At the latest in 2019, when the Commission will assess the implementation of the directive, taking into account the efforts of Member States, specifically their competent authorities, the report will include as appropriate its proposals for amending the directive and, if necessary, for additional initiatives. It is clear that the issues examined in the 2019 report, also in line with your proposals, should include an in-depth analysis of questions regarding liability, compensation and financial security for offshore and gas operators, with the objective of addressing potential shortcomings.

In the meantime, the Commission will exchange and discuss with the Member States respective experiences of practical implementation on a permanent basis, and specifically in the framework of the existing European Offshore Authorities Group. When carrying out the dialogue with Member States on these sensitive issues, we will take the utmost account of the contribution from the European Parliament, upon which we can build. We will bring your issues forward in the European Offshore Authorities Group, and in any other available forum. Both in expert groups and high-level groups, the Commission will refer to your report, which establishes clear guidance and potential target lines of where we should get to, for the benefit of EU citizens.

Elnök asszony. - A vitát lezárom.

András Gyürk (PPE), írásban. – 2010 áprilisában egy baleset követően elsüllyedt a Deepwater Horizon olajfúrótorny, minek következtében a tengervízbe ömlött közel 5 millió hordó nyersolaj. A bajt csupán egy eszköz – a kitérésigáló meghibásodása – okozta, de mégis a valaha volt egyik legnagyobb természeti katasztrófaaként vonult be a történelembe. Természetesen jogos elvárás, hogy tanulva az amerikai példából, Európa ne csak megpróbálja megelőzni egy hasonló katasztrófa bekövetkezését, hanem fel legyen készülve annak kezelésére mind technológiailag, mind pedig jogilag. Ugyanakkor nagyon óvatosnak kell lennünk, nehogy pont az effajta igyekezet fojtja meg azt az iparágat, amelyet szabályozni akarunk. Európa energiaellátásában alapvető jelentőségű az északi-tengeri és földközi-tengeri kőolaj- és földgázki-termelés.

Fontos, hogy az ezekben a régiókban kitermelést végző vállalatok ne azt érezzék, hogy az ellehetlenítésükre törekszünk, hanem segítő kezet lássanak az Unióban, ami rendezi a jogviszonyokat és segít a kockázatok minimalizálásában. A meglévő kitermelés védelme mellett, legalább olyan fontos, hogy ne riasszuk el a potenciális jövőbeli beruházásokat sem. A Fekete-tenger, a Földközi-tenger keleti medencéje, vagy éppen a Barents-tenger ásványkincsei hosszú távú megoldást jelenthetnek Európa energiaellátásában, amelyek nagyban segítenék a függőség csökkentését a külső szállítóktól. Törekednünk kell arra, hogy minden szabályozás amit bevezetünk stabilizálja az üzleti környezetet és kiszámíthatóságot teremtsen.

Paloma López Bermejo (GUE/NGL), *por escrito*. – Me gustaría felicitar al ponente por su trabajo en este informe, que es fundamental para minimizar los daños de un posible accidente en las operaciones de gas y petróleo mar adentro: más aún cuando la Unión está impulsando su desarrollo sin tener en cuenta sus riesgos y su impacto ambiental, social y económico. En particular, comparto la necesidad de establecer un mecanismo de compensación para proteger a sectores potencialmente afectados, como el pesquero y el turístico, de facilitar que las víctimas puedan recurrir a la justicia y de asegurarse, mediante contribuciones específicas, de que la industria del petróleo y del gas mar adentro realmente paga. Medidas que, como resalta el informe, deben extenderse al marco global. Espero que la Comisión tome buena nota de estas recomendaciones para conseguir que sean las compañías que se lucran con las actividades de gas y petróleo mar adentro las que paguen, realmente, el coste de cualquier accidente.

19. Jednominutowe wystąpienia w znaczących kwestiach politycznych

Elnök asszony. – A következő napirendi pont a fontos politikai kérdésekkel kapcsolatos egyperces felszólalások (az eljárási szabályzat 163. cikke.).

Daniel Buda (PPE). – Mulțumesc, doamna președintă. Preocupările fermierilor de azi sunt legate, în principal, de valorificarea produselor la prețuri acceptabile, care să le permită să supraviețuiască pe piață. Marile lanțuri de magazine alimentare, în special din vestul Europei, au un parteneriat strâns cu fermierii locali, ceea ce este un lucru foarte bun. România a implementat acest concept prin legea 150/2016, astfel încât comercianții urmează să achiziționeze anumite produse provenite din lanțul scurt de aprovizionare. Aceasta implică un număr limitat de operatori economici angajați în activitatea de dezvoltare economică, precum și relații strânse între producători, procesatori și consumatori. Comisia Europeană a dat dovadă însă de exces de zel în acest caz, demarând proceduri preliminare celei de *infringement*, pe care o apreciez însă la limita legalității tratatelor. Menționez că prin legea adoptată nu se limitează prezența produselor agroalimentare europene pe raftul comercianților din România, astfel nu este vorba de un obstacol în calea comerțului intracomunitar, iar această lege trebuie aplicată în mod cert în România. Mulțumesc.

Nicola Caputo (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, l'European Center for disease prevention and control riporta che dal 2012 al 2015 il fenomeno della resistenza agli antibiotici è cresciuto enormemente. Le Nazioni Unite giudicano la resistenza agli antibiotici una emergenza sanitaria pari a quella di Ebola e Aids, di cui domani ricorre la Giornata mondiale. L'abuso di antibiotici è quindi un'altra grande sfida europea ed italiana, amplificata dall'uso smodato di antibiotici negli allevamenti. L'Italia è il terzo più grande utilizzatore europeo di antibiotici negli allevamenti, con criticità negli intensivi. Il 71% di quelli venduti in Italia va agli animali d'allevamento e il 94% dei trattamenti è di massa. Questa modalità di utilizzo rende la nascita di super batteri sempre più probabile, come il rischio di propagazione dagli allevamenti all'uomo, innalzando il numero di morti dovuti alla loro resistenza, circa 7 000 solo in Italia. Non c'è quindi altro mezzo per contrastare la resistenza agli antibiotici diverso dalla loro significativa riduzione. Chiedo alla Commissione di adottare linee guida sull'uso corretto degli antibiotici nell'uomo e negli animali e di fare di più nell'attuazione e applicazione delle misure e nel coordinamento delle politiche sanitarie e agricole, per aumentare l'efficacia dell'azione europea contro la resistenza agli antibiotici.

Marek Jurek (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Francuska Rada Stanu podtrzymała decyzję Wysokiej Rady Audiowizualnej odmawiającej praw reklamy społecznej spotowi, w którym dzieci z zespołem Downa śmieją się, mówią o sobie, pokazują, jak żyją. Obie instytucje uznały, że beceremonialne opowiadanie tych dzieci o swym prawie do życia, radości życia, może razić kobiety, które dokonały, zacytuję, innego legalnego wyboru, krótko mówiąc, które nie pozwoliły urodzić się innym podobnym dzieciom.

Decyzja ta uznająca niestosowność, ze względu na wzbudzone reakcje, obecności dzieci z zespołem Downa w przestrzeni publicznej, to odrażający akt dyskryminacji czyniący z tych osób trędowatych XXI wieku. Oczekuję w tej sprawie stanowiska wszystkich przedstawicieli władz Unii Europejskiej, którzy z urzędu zabierają głos w sprawach niedyskryminacji.

Ivan Jakovčić (ALDE). – Gospođo predsjednice, gospodine povjereniče, Hrvatska se danas osjeća kao jedna vrsta kante za smeće. Zato što u Hrvatsku dolaze proizvodi koji se žele prodati, a stari su po 40 godina. Govorim konkretno o slučaju mesne industrije. Građani u Hrvatskoj vrlo su zabrinuti za svoje zdravlje i želim vas upozoriti da je očito da sustav koji je uspostavljen u Europi u mnogim zemljama ne funkcionira kako treba. Nema kvalitetne kontrole.

Tzv. *Rapid alert system for food and feed* očito u nekim zemljama ne funkcionira kako treba. Mi građani smo zabrinuti, zabrinuti smo za naše zdravlje i želimo jasno poručiti da oni koji nas žele trovati, oni koji truju građane EU-a, moraju snositi velike kazne ili na kraju krajeva, zatvoriti vlastitu proizvodnju.

Josep-Maria Terricabras (Verts/ALE). – Señora Presidenta, hace solo unas horas, nos hemos reunido en este Parlamento el grupo de doce eurodiputados que vamos a abordar el *brexit*. Me complace ser el primero que tiene la ocasión de informar de ello en esta Cámara.

Ha sido una reunión muy informal, presidida por el Presidente del Parlamento, a la que ha asistido como invitado especial Michel Barnier, designado por la Comisión como el negociador principal con el Reino Unido. Es una persona que me da confianza para la negociación.

Me complace ser miembro de este reducido grupo como presidente de la Alianza Libre Europea. Para mis compañeros escoceses y galeses, es importante que su Grupo se halle presente en este proceso, y lo es para Cataluña, mi país, porque la retirada del Reino Unido implica también que debemos redefinir la Europa del futuro en la que naciones como Cataluña o Escocia quieren tener su lugar.

Laurențiu Rebegea (ENF). – Doamnă președinte, domnule comisar, doresc să atrag atenția asupra condiționalităților *ex ante* impuse statelor membre. Aceste cerințe reprezintă un instrument utilizat ca mijloc de aplicare forțată a politicii Comisiei Europene și un alt caz de depășire a competențelor conferite prin tratate. Sub pretextul stabilirii unor condiții pentru implementarea eficientă a fondurilor, Comisia Europeană obligă, de fapt, statele să pună în practică la nivel național anumite reforme structurale și strategii. Necesitatea acestora este stabilită în mod unilateral de către Comisia Europeană, fără a putea fi ulterior discutate sau modificate în funcție de particularitățile naționale concrete. Spre exemplu, România i-au fost impuse 36 de condiționalități de îndeplinit până la sfârșitul acestui an, inclusiv pentru domenii care sunt de competența exclusivă a statelor membre, precum sănătatea și educația. Statele membre au sesizat complexitatea ridicată și neclaritatea acestor condiționalități. Dacă adăugăm la acestea și pericolul suspendării fondurilor, atunci instituțiile naționale vor înclina spre adoptarea unor măsuri formale doar pentru a evita sancțiunile. În contextul actual, când tot mai multe voci solicită simplitate și claritate în reglementări, consider că este absolut necesar ca aceste condiționalități să fie revizuite și alocarea fondurilor să nu fie afectată de stadiul implementării lor. Vă mulțumesc.

Κωνσταντίνος Παπαδάκης (NI). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, στο όνομα του χρέους, της αξιολόγησης, στον βωμό της ανάκαμψης της κερδοφορίας του κεφαλαίου κυβέρνηση ΣΥΡΙΖΑ-ΑΝΕΛ, Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, Διεθνές Νομισματικό Ταμείο εκβιάζουν και ζητούν νέες λαϊκές θυσίες, την επιβολή και διά νόμου όσων εφιαλτικών για τους εργαζόμενους προωθούνται σήμερα στην πράξη στους χώρους δουλειάς με επιχειρησιακές και ατομικές συμβάσεις. Το ευρωπαϊκό κεκτημένο σας είναι το να μην μείνει όρθιο κεκτημένο εργατικό δικαίωμα. Οι βέλτιστες πρακτικές της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης που σερβίρει η κυβέρνηση κατά παραγγελία των εργοδοτών στην Ελλάδα είναι η απελευθέρωση των δουλεμπορικών γραφείων, οι συνθήκες γαλέρας και οι μισθοί πείνας, οι συμβάσεις μηδενικών ωρών, οι ομαδικές απολύσεις. Ξέρετε καλά από πού να φυλάγεστε, γι' αυτό βάζετε στο στόχαστρο το απεργιακό δικαίωμα. Γνωρίζετε ότι κίνδυνος για σας και πραγματική διέξοδος για τους εργάτες βρίσκεται στην ανασύνταξη του κινήματός τους, στην οργανωμένη πάλη τους ενάντια στα αντιλαϊκά μέτρα για την ανάκτηση των απωλειών και την ικανοποίηση των σύγχρονων αναγκών. Στις 8 Δεκέμβρη η εργατική τάξη με μια μεγάλη μαζική πανελλαδική απεργία απαντά για όλα.

Jiří Pospíšil (PPE). – Paní předsedající, chci využít tohoto prostoru a oslovit odtud zástupce Komise a zástupce Rady a vyjádřit se k bodu, který včera projednával výbor IMCO, a to je dialog nad směrnici o kontrole a nabývání zbraní.

Včera jsme se dozvěděli, že bude politickou snahou toto jednání ukončit ještě za slovenského předsednictví do konce tohoto roku. Já jsem chtěl vyzvat zástupce orgánů, které se účastní dialogu, aby opravdu nebrali jako politický úkol za každou cenu rychle ukončit jednání nad směrnicí, která (alespoň v České republice) vyvolává mimořádné emoce, je mimořádně negativně vnímána všemi legálními držiteli zbraní. A aby opravdu příslušné orgány dialogu podrobně projednaly celou věc a řešily věci, které v praxi činí problémy. A to je otázka deaktivace zbraní a otázka konverze zbraní.

Takže moc prosím, pane komisaři, vnímejte toto téma jako mimořádně politicky citlivé a nemějte jako politický úkol jednání za každou cenu ukončit, ale řešme, jaké výsledky to jednání přinese.

Victor Negrescu (S&D). – 1 decembrie este Ziua Națională a României și a tuturor românilor, marcând un moment de mare însemnătate istorică, 98 de ani de la Marea Unire înfăptuită la Alba Iulia. Este momentul care omagiază sacrificiile făcute de sute de mii de români de-a lungul secolelor pentru realizarea unității naționale. Peste 300 000 de soldați români au murit în Primul Război Mondial pentru acest obiectiv. Dintre aceștia, peste 22 000 au murit și au fost înhumați peste hotarele țării. Pentru că această zi este a tuturor românilor, oriunde s-ar afla ei, am decis să mă reculeg la mormintele celor opt soldați români uciși în Primul Război Mondial aici, în Belgia, la Mons. Iar locul cel mai important sufletului meu și al românilor rămâne Alba Iulia, localitatea de unde a renăscut România modernă. De aceea, îmi doresc ca, în 2018, când se va împlini Centenarul României, Alba Iulia să beneficieze de un plus de recunoaștere din partea statului român și să devină un reper pentru tot ce înseamnă viitorul României. Vă invit pe toți partenerii europeni să fiți alături de noi în susținerea acestui proiect de țară. La Mulți Ani, România, La Mulți Ani, Alba Iulia, La Mulți Ani tuturor românilor!

Urszula Krupa (ECR). – Po przyjęciu na ostatniej sesji w Strasburgu rezolucji w sprawie przystąpienia Unii do konwencji sambiulskiej w sprawie zapobiegania i zwalczania przemocy wobec kobiet mam propozycję, a nawet apel do Europejskiego Instytutu ds. Równości Płci, aby zbadał problem, jakim jest sytuacja kobiet imigrantek w obozach uchodźców w Europie, gdzie, według instytucji humanitarnych, dochodzi do przemocy wobec kobiet, szczególnie chrześcijanek. Ale także muzułmanki traktowane są jak przedmioty, kiedy mężowie oddają je innym mężczyznom w zamian za odpowiednią zapłatę. Dane ONZ, które dotyczą ubiegłego roku, wykazywały, że 75 % imigrantów to młodzi mężczyźni, a reszta to rodziny z dziećmi, jakby kobiet w rodzinach nie było. Albo nie są zauważalne nawet przez organizacje badawcze. Niestety na stronie instytutu nie znalazłam żadnego sprawozdania w tej sprawie.

Gilles Lebreton (ENF). – Madame la Présidente, le président de la Commission de Bruxelles, Jean-Claude Juncker, vient de choquer une grande partie de l'humanité en rendant hommage à Fidel Castro. Il a notamment prononcé la phrase suivante: «Le monde a perdu un homme qui était un héros pour beaucoup». Cet hommage est honteux! Il est une insulte pour les milliers de morts et pour les deux millions d'exilés qui sont les victimes de Castro.

Jean-Claude Juncker fait honte à l'Europe en présidant depuis deux ans la Commission en récompense de son rôle de grand architecte de l'évasion fiscale. Voilà à présent qu'il lui fait honte par sa cruauté! Castro n'était pas un libérateur, mais un dictateur. Voilà ce que Jean-Claude Juncker aurait dû dire en hommage à ses victimes.

Qu'un tel chef puisse diriger l'Union européenne en dit long sur ce qu'est l'Union européenne: une Europe de l'argent et du mépris, coupée des aspirations des peuples, et à cent lieues de l'Europe des nations que j'appelle de mes vœux.

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Paní předsedající, Evropa stojí před mnoha výzvami. Já bych se chtěl dnes věnovat výzvě, která stojí před regiony. A to je odstraňování rozdílů mezi regiony. To je součástí politiky soudržnosti – snižování a odstraňování rozdílů, to EU dělá ve své politice soudržnosti, nicméně pořád je řada zaostalých regionů, které právě toto znevýhodnění odstraňují velmi pomalu a dohání vlastně průměr Evropské unie jen velmi pozvolným tempem.

Výzvou je rovněž demografické stárnutí řady regionů a vystěhovávání obyvatel. Měli bychom, podle mého soudu, vytvořit nové nástroje, které doplní ty stávající nástroje na podporu regionů. Něco jako pobídkový systém pro velké firmy, aby investovaly v těchto regionech, zakládaly tam podniky a projekty. Mám za to, že stávající nástroje už nejsou dostatečné, a nechtěl bych se dožít toho, že za dvě desetiletí budeme svědky kolapsu řady regionů.

Andrejs Mamikins (S&D). – Madame la Présidente, chers collègues, le résultat principal de l'élection présidentielle aux États-Unis est que l'élite politique américaine a été punie pour son arrogance et son ignorance des intérêts d'une large part de la population. Il y a quelques mois, un signal similaire a été envoyé par la population de la Grande-Bretagne, lors du référendum sur la sortie du pays de l'Union européenne.

Les gens n'ont pas voté pour Donald Trump ni pour le Brexit, ils ont voté contre les inégalités, les injustices et le mépris continu de leurs opinions. Le système politique actuel est à la traîne derrière la réalité et est devenu inefficace. Non seulement il ne peut pas résoudre les problèmes actuels, mais il en crée souvent d'autres. Les gens ne veulent pas accepter le fait que le système actuel n'apporte pas de stabilité et de bien-être à leur famille. La société ne peut pas être divisée entre une petite minorité riche et une grande majorité qui vit dans la pauvreté, la peur du chômage et du sans-abrisme.

Νότης Μαρτιάς (ECR). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, οι μεγάλες χώρες της Δύσης που προκάλεσαν την ανάφλεξη της Μέσης Ανατολής και δημιούργησαν караβάνια προσφύγων τώρα σφυρίζουν αδιάφορα και αφήνουν τον ευρωπαϊκό Νότο να μετατραπεί σε αποθήκη ψυχών, ψελλίζοντας μάλιστα δήθεν ανθρωπιστικά επιχειρήματα. Δεν είναι όμως ανθρωπισμός να στοιβάζονται οι πρόσφυγες σε πρόχειρους καταυλισμούς και στη συνέχεια να εξυπηρετούν το κοινωνικό ντάμπινγκ που επιβάλλουν οι πολυεθνικές. Οι προσφυγικές και μεταναστευτικές ροές πρέπει να αντιμετωπιστούν αποφασιστικά από την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση.

Πρέπει λοιπόν να ενισχυθεί η προσπάθεια ειρήνευσης της Μέσης Ανατολής, να χτυπηθούν τα κυκλώματα των διακινητών και να υπάρξει πίεση στον Ερντογάν για την εφαρμογή της συμφωνίας Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης-Τουρκίας. Πρέπει επίσης να εφαρμοστεί η συμφωνία της Βαλέτα, να ολοκληρωθούν οι μετεγκαταστάσεις προσφύγων από Ελλάδα και Ιταλία σε άλλες χώρες της Ένωσης και να αλλάξουν επιτακτικά οι αναποτελεσματικοί και άδικοι κανόνες του Δουβλίνου III. Δεν πρέπει ο ελληνικός λαός να πληρώσει τις αντιπαραθέσεις και την κοντόφθαλμη πολιτική της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης. Η Λέσβος, η Χίος, η Σάμος και τα άλλα νησιά του Αιγαίου δεν αντέχουν άλλους πρόσφυγες και παράνομους μετανάστες. Η Ελλάδα δεν είναι αποθήκη ψυχών.

Tomáš Zdechovský (PPE). – Paní předsedající, pane komisaři, chtěl bych upozornit na jeden z aspektů romské problematiky, který v současné době není příliš řešen. A je to otázka řešení protiromské rétoriky na internetu. Evropská komise se většinou zabývá řešením tohoto problému dáváním peněz různým neziskovým organizacím a vládním agenturám. Podle mě tento boj proti protiromské rétorice není účinný.

Osobně bych navrhoval zapojit do samotného řešení tohoto problému především Romy, kteří dokážou nejlépe vysvětlit svoje postoje, svoje činy a dokážou sami přinést pozitivní příklady. Bohužel protiromská rétorika se za posledních deset let téměř vůbec v zemích Evropské unie nezměnila, a bylo to právě na základě toho, že Evropská komise dostatečně nerozuměla problematice a snažila se problém vyřešit množstvím peněz dávaných různým agenturám a neziskovým organizacím.

Elnök asszony. - A napirendi pont ezzel lezárul.

20. Porządek obrad następnego posiedzenia: patrz protokół

21. Zamknięcie posiedzenia

(Az ülést 22.10-kor rekesztik be.)

Skróty i symbole

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

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

Rozwinięcia skrótów nazw komisji parlamentarnych

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

Rozwinięcia skrótów nazw grup politycznych

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