

ВТОРНИК 21 АПРИЛ 2009 Г.  
 MARTES 21 DE ABRIL DE 2009  
 ÚTERÝ, 21. DUBNA 2009  
 TIRSDAG DEN 21. APRIL 2009  
 DIENSTAG, 21. APRIL 2009  
 TEISIPÄEV, 21. APRILL 2009  
 TPITH 21 ΑΠΡΙΑΙΟΥ 2009  
 TUESDAY, 21 APRIL 2009  
 MARDI 21 AVRIL 2009  
 MARTEDI' 21 APRILE 2009  
 OTRDIENA, 2009. GADA 21. APRĪLIS  
 2009 M. BALANDŽIO 21 D., ANTRADIENIS  
 2009. ÁPRILIS 21., KEDD  
 IT-TLIETA, 21 TA' APRIL 2009  
 DINSDAG 21 APRIL 2009  
 WTOREK, 21 KWIETNIA 2009  
 TERÇA-FEIRA, 21 DE ABRIL DE 2009  
 MARȚI 21 APRILIE 2009  
 UTOROK 21. APRÍLA 2009  
 TOREK, 21. APRIL 2009  
 TIISTAI 21. HUHTIKUUTA 2009  
 TISDAGEN DEN 21 APRIL 2009

---

**VORSITZ: HANS-GERT PÖTTERING**  
*Präsident*

*(Die Sitzung wird um 17.05 Uhr eröffnet.)*

## **1 - Wiederaufnahme der Sitzungsperiode**

**Der Präsident.** – Ich erkläre die am Donnerstag, dem 2. April 2009, unterbrochene Sitzungsperiode für wieder aufgenommen.

## **2 - Erklärung des Präsidenten**

**Der Präsident.** – Liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Bei dem schwersten Erdbeben der letzten Jahrzehnte in Italien haben in der Region Abruzzen 295 Menschen auf schreckliche Weise ihr Leben verloren. Am schlimmsten wurde die Stadt L'Aquila getroffen. Wir alle sind erschüttert von der Gewalt dieser Naturkatastrophe und ihren tragischen Auswirkungen. Bis zu 40 000 Menschen wurden durch das Hauptbeben und die zahlreichen Nachbeben obdachlos. Schätzungen zufolge wurde jedes dritte Haus in der besonders betroffenen Provinz L'Aquila zerstört oder beschädigt. Im Namen des Europäischen Parlaments möchte ich anlässlich der heutigen Plenartagung unser tiefstes Beileid mit allen Opfern dieses schrecklichen Erdbebens aussprechen.

Ich möchte auch in unser aller Namen den Familien der Verstorbenen unser tief empfundenes Beileid und Mitgefühl bekunden sowie unsere Solidarität mit Italien, seinen Bürgerinnen und Bürgern und seinen Behörden in dieser Zeit der Trauer. Wir sind in Gedanken bei den Verstorbenen, den Verletzten, den Obdachlosen und allen von dieser Katastrophe betroffenen Menschen. Ich darf Sie bitten, sich zu einem stillen Gedenken von Ihren Plätzen zu erheben.

*(Das Parlament erhebt sich zu einer Schweigeminute.)*

Ich danke Ihnen!

2-007

### **3 - Genehmigung des Protokolls der vorangegangenen Sitzung: siehe Protokoll**

2-008

### **4 - Prüfung von Mandaten: siehe Protokoll**

2-009

### **5 - Gewalt gegen Frauen (schriftliche Erklärung): siehe Protokoll**

2-010

### **6 - Unterzeichnung von Rechtsakten, die im Mitentscheidungsverfahren angenommen wurden: siehe Protokoll**

2-011

### **7 - Berichtigungen (Artikel 204a der Geschäftsordnung): siehe Protokoll**

2-012

### **8 - Mitteilung des Präsidenten: siehe Protokoll**

2-013

### **9 - Vorlage von Dokumenten: siehe Protokoll**

2-014

### **10 - Hinfällige schriftliche Erklärungen: siehe Protokoll**

2-015

### **11 - Petitionen: siehe Protokoll**

2-016

### **12 - Übermittlung von Abkommenstexten durch den Rat: siehe Protokoll**

2-017

### **13 - Schriftliche Erklärungen (Vorlage): siehe Protokoll**

2-018

### **14 - Mittelübertragungen: siehe Protokoll**

2-019

### **15 - Arbeitsplan**

2-020

**Der Präsident.** – Der endgültige Entwurf der Tagesordnung, wie er von der Konferenz der Präsidenten in ihrer Sitzung vom Donnerstag, 16. April, gemäß den Artikeln 130 und 131 der Geschäftsordnung festgelegt wurde, ist an Sie verteilt worden. Zu diesem Entwurf wurden folgende Änderungen beantragt:

*Dienstag:*

Die Fraktion der Grünen beantragt, den Bericht Hökmark zum Gemeinschaftsrahmen für nukleare Sicherheit von der Tagesordnung zu streichen.

2-021

**Monica Frassoni (Verts/ALE).** – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, occorre rinviare la relazione Hökmark su un quadro comunitario per la sicurezza nucleare per due ragioni: la prima ragione, perché la commissione giuridica ha approvato l'idea che esiste un problema formale costitutivo nella proposta della Commissione perché, come prescrive la norma di Euratom, la Commissione deve ottenere il parere di un comitato tecnico prima di lavorare su questa proposta, cosa che per due volte non ha fatto e la commissione giuridica ha riconosciuto che questo è un vizio costitutivo, cioè un vizio che richiede il ritiro e la ripresentazione della Commissione coerentemente con le norme vigenti; e la seconda ragione è che non c'è nessuna ragione di avere fretta perché queste normative si applicheranno esclusivamente a centrali che saranno forse costruite dopo il 2015. Quindi non c'è nessuna ragione di avere fretta, non abbiamo nessuna ragione di approvare un testo che ha questo vizio formale così importante.

2-022

**Gunnar Hökmark (PPE-DE).** – Herr talman! Jag tycker självfallet att vi ska fatta beslut i denna fråga under denna sammanträdesperiod. Det finns många skäl till det. För det första handlar det om ett förslag som parlamentet tidigare har behandlat, som nu återkommer, och som man i rådet har diskuterat sedan 2003. Nu börjar tiden bli mogen för att till slut fatta beslut. När den gäller den rättsliga situationen är det så att den grupp av experter som Frassoni hänvisar till har gett sin synpunkt på detta förslag. Därefter har sedan justeringar gjorts. Den skiljelinje som finns mellan den absolut stora majoriteten i industriutskottet och företrädarna för gruppen De gröna är om detta är ett nytt förslag eller om det är ett förslag som vi hållit på med sedan 2003. Jag tror att alla andra är överens om att detta är ett förslag som vi arbetat med under lång tid. Någon gång måste man kunna fatta beslut, inte minst eftersom det nu faktiskt är så att man i en lång rad olika länder planerar för att bygga kärnkraft. Då tycker jag att det är utomordentligt viktigt att vi har ett stabilt och starkt regelverk på plats för Europeiska unionen. Jag föreslår därför att vi idag röstar för att vi under denna vecka ska rösta om kärnsäkerhetsdirektivet.

2-023

*(Das Parlament lehnt den Antrag ab.)*

*Mittwoch:*

2-024

**Der Präsident.** – Die Fraktion der Liberalen beantragt, die Abstimmung über die Entschließungsanträge über die Aufnahme von Verhandlungen im Hinblick auf die Annahme eines internationalen Vertrags über den Schutz der Arktis zu vertagen.

2-025

**Diana Wallis (ALDE).** – Mr President, we did have a brief discussion about this when we voted during the last plenary session.

The problem is this: when we had the debate with the Commission and Council, it became clear to many of us in the House that it was not appropriate for us to vote on the resolution, and we therefore asked for it, at that stage, to be postponed.

I think our view now is that there is no need for a resolution. Parliament expressed itself on this subject a couple of months ago; that is absolutely sufficient; there is no need to do it again at this stage. The debate that we had with the other institutions was valuable, but there is no need for a resolution.

2-026

**Véronique De Keyser (PSE).** – Monsieur le Président, je vous avoue que je suis un petit peu étonnée, dans la mesure où, lorsque nous avons débattu de cette résolution, personne ne la jugeait inutile. Absolument personne, Mme Wallis en premier lieu.

Ensuite, il est vrai, la Commission a invoqué le fait que l'Union européenne souhaitait faire partie du Conseil de l'Arctique, etc. Quant à moi, il me semble que, justement, conformément au souhait exprimé par la Commission, cette nouvelle résolution, qui dit très clairement que nous voulons un moratoire sur les forages et que nous voulons une zone démilitarisée dans l'Arctique, est une résolution particulièrement importante au moment où les pays frontaliers sont en train de faire de la musculation, y compris de la musculation militaire dans cette zone, pour revendiquer leur propriété et leurs possibilités de forages.

Donc, d'un point de vue politique, il est absolument important de voter ce texte, et cette volte-face de Mme Wallis – et d'une partie de l'hémicycle, d'ailleurs – ne se justifie absolument pas, compte tenu des débats que nous avons eus.

2-027

*(Das Parlament nimmt den Antrag an.)*

*Mittwoch:*

2-028

**Der Präsident.** – Die UEN-Fraktion beantragt, eine Erklärung der Kommission über das Erdbeben in der italienischen Region Abruzzo in die Tagesordnung einzufügen.

2-029

**Roberta Angelilli (UEN).** – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, dopo aver consultato i gruppi politici e i capi delle delegazioni italiane, a nome del mio gruppo, le chiedo appunto di voler inserire all'ordine del giorno di domani un dibattito sul terremoto in Abruzzo. Credo che le popolazioni colpite apprezzino la vicinanza dimostrata dalle istituzioni europee e da lei personalmente con le condoglianze e il minuto di silenzio e apprezzeranno altresì l'eventuale sostegno finanziario e legislativo per la ricostruzione. Per questi motivi, un dibattito alla presenza della Commissione europea può fornire alle istituzioni nazionali e locali molte ed utili informazioni su quanto potrà fare l'Unione europea.

2-030

**Gianni Pittella (PSE).** – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, voglio esprimere il consenso del gruppo socialista alla proposta che è venuta dalla collega Angelilli. Voglio ringraziare il Presidente Pöttering per le parole che ha espresso e tutta l'Aula per aver manifestato alle popolazioni colpite la propria solidarietà affettuosa. Anch'io ritengo che nel dibattito di domani pomeriggio possano venir fuori non soltanto delle rinnovate solidarietà, ma soprattutto delle proposte concrete, perché dall'Europa può venire un contributo importante alla ricostruzione, oltre che all'emergenza che stanno vivendo i cittadini abruzzesi.

2-031

*(Das Parlament nimmt den Antrag an.)*

2-032

**Astrid Lulling (PPE-DE).** – Monsieur le Président, j'ai constaté avec tristesse et amertume que la question orale avec débat sur les vins rosés et les pratiques œnologiques autorisées que nous avons introduite dans les délais avec mes collègues d'un grand nombre de groupes politiques, ne figurait pas à l'ordre du jour de cette semaine.

Au nom de tous les signataires, je demande qu'il soit remédié à cette situation. J'ai en effet parlé à des collègues présidents de groupes politiques et il me semble soit qu'ils ont été mal informés sur cette demande, soit qu'elle a été passée sous silence.

Je vous prie donc de bien vouloir inscrire la question orale introduite dans les délais à l'ordre du jour de cette semaine.

2-033

**Der Präsident.** – Frau Kollegin, ich bin gerade unterrichtet worden, dass geplant ist, den Rosé-Wein im Mai zu behandeln. Dann wird auch genügend Redezeit sein, was heute nicht der Fall wäre.

2-034

**Νικόλαος Βακάλης (PPE-DE).** – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, θα ήθελα να εκφράσω, ως μου επιτραπεί η έκφραση, το παράπονό μου και την απορία μου γιατί έχω καταθέσει προφορική ερώτηση με συζήτηση την οποία προσυπέγραψαν 48 ευρωβουλευτές και πληροφοριακά αναφέρω ότι η συλλογή των υπογραφών έγινε σε χρόνο μηδέν και ότι ακόμη, μέχρι τούτη τη στιγμή, υπάρχουν συνάδελφοι που δηλώνουν ότι επιθυμούν να την προσυπογράψουν και εντούτοις μου κάνει εντύπωση ότι πάνω σ' αυτό το θέμα ουδείς μου απάντησε γιατί, τότε, πώς και με ποια κριτήρια αποφασίστηκε να μη γίνει η προφορική ερώτηση με συζήτηση.

Τώρα ξαφνικά συναντώ έναν άλλο είδους σεισμό; Είναι καινούργιος σεισμός, είναι άλλη η αφετηρία; Επαναλαμβάνω λοιπόν και πάλι, λαμβάνοντας αφορμή από τον τελευταίο φονικό σεισμό και τα θύματά του που εσείς αναφέρατε -εγώ θα προσθέσω και την συνεπακόλουθη πολιτιστική ζημιά και καταστροφή- ότι θα ήθελα να αναδείξουμε την ευρωπαϊκή διάσταση του φαινομένου. Δεδομένου ότι υπήρξα και εισηγητής στην μοναδική έκθεση που υπάρχει σε ευρωπαϊκό θεσμικό όργανο στο θέμα των σεισμών, γνωρίζω πολύ καλά ότι πολλά μπορούν και πρέπει να γίνουν σε ευρωπαϊκό επίπεδο. Σας ευχαριστώ και αναμένω μια απάντηση.

2-035

**Der Präsident.** – Herr Kollege Vakalis, ein solcher Antrag muss eine Stunde vor Beginn der Sitzung gestellt werden. Mir wird gesagt, dass dies nicht der Fall ist. Es betrifft Artikel 132. Meine Empfehlung ist – anders können wir aufgrund der Geschäftsordnung auch nicht verfahren –, dass wir das im Mai berücksichtigen.

2-036

**Astrid Lulling (PPE-DE).** – Herr Präsident! Ich möchte Sie bitten, dass Sie das Haus fragen, ob das auf die Tagesordnung kommen soll. Das können Sie doch nicht allein entscheiden. Fragen Sie doch einmal, ob die Kollegen einverstanden sind.

Sie werden ganz sicher ein paar Minuten finden, damit wir dieses wichtige Thema, das viele Regionen in unserer Union sehr betrifft, behandeln können, und zwar beizeiten behandeln, denn im Mai ist es zu spät.

2-037

**Der Präsident.** – Frau Kollegin, das entscheidet nicht der Präsident alleine, sondern ich folge der Geschäftsordnung. Ausschlaggebend ist der Artikel 132, an den sind wir gebunden. Es hätte eine Stunde vor der Sitzung beantragt werden müssen. Ich werde der Konferenz der Präsidenten empfehlen, dass wir uns im Mai mit dem Anliegen befassen.

Die Fraktion der Grünen hat beantragt, eine Erklärung der Kommission über gentechnisch veränderten Mais – MON 810 in die Tagesordnung aufzunehmen.

2-038

**Monica Frassoni (Verts/ALE).** – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la situazione è veramente surreale, nel senso che siamo veramente fra coloro che sono sospesi: la maggioranza degli Stati membri non vuole rinunciare alla sua capacità di fare delle moratorie sugli OGM e la Commissione, ovviamente, deve portare a casa questo risultato negativo pur potendo agire, se vuole. A questo punto siamo stiano!

Mi sembra che un su tema così importante sarebbe opportuno capire cosa la Commissione vuole fare: se continuare, se smettere, se ritirare, se presentare una proposta legislativa. L'unica cosa che noi vogliamo è che la Commissione ci dica cosa vuole fare, e quindi lo dica pubblicamente, in un dibattito nel Parlamento!

2-039

**Lutz Goepel (PPE-DE).** – Herr Präsident! MON 810 ist 1998 in der Europäischen Union zugelassen worden. Diese Zulassung ist nicht verpflichtend für die Mitgliedstaaten. Jeder Mitgliedstaat kann selbst entscheiden, ob er dieser Zulassung zustimmt, sie anwendet oder ein Verbot ausspricht, dass dieser Mais angebaut wird.

Ich gehe davon aus, dass das jüngste Urteil in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland zu dieser Anfrage den Grund gegeben hat. Ich darf hier sagen: 2005 wurde in Deutschland MON 810 zugelassen, 2007 wurde die Aussaat gestoppt, und im Dezember 2007 hat Monsanto einen Plan zur allgemeinen Überwachung des Anbaus vorgelegt. Daraufhin wurde er 2008 wieder zugelassen und jetzt vor ein paar Tagen in Deutschland verboten.

Frau Frassoni meint, dass es viele Mitgliedstaaten sind, die diesen Anbau ablehnen: Es sind exakt vier Staaten – Frankreich, Österreich, Ungarn und Luxemburg und Deutschland gehört jetzt dazu, also sind es fünf Mitgliedstaaten von 27. Dies ist eine rein nationale Entscheidung auf der Grundlage der Subsidiarität, und so sollten wir damit das Parlament nicht belasten.

2-040

**Martin Schulz (PSE).** – Herr Präsident, vielen Dank! Wir sind nicht dafür, so zu verfahren, wie das die Kollegin Frassoni beantragt hat, aber aus einem anderen Grund als der Kollege Goepel, und deshalb bin ich Ihnen dankbar, dass ich das kurz darlegen darf.

Eine umfassende Debatte, nicht nur über diesen Punkt, sondern über die Frage, wie wir mit gentechnisch veränderten Lebensmitteln umgehen wollen, ist notwendig. Das können wir aber nicht in der kurzen Zeit bis übermorgen erledigen. Deshalb glaube ich, dass wir das neue Parlament nach den Wahlen bitten sollten, eine umfassende Debatte über den Einsatz von gentechnisch veränderten Lebensmitteln zu führen. Vielen Dank.

2-041

*(Das Parlament lehnt den Antrag ab.)*

*(Der Arbeitsplan ist somit angenommen.)*

2-042

## 16 - Ausführungen von einer Minute zu wichtigen politischen Fragen

2-043

**Der Präsident.** – Als nächster Punkt folgen die Ausführungen von einer Minute zu wichtigen politischen Fragen.

2-044

**Γεώργιος Παπαστάμκος (PPE-DE).** – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, ως γνωστόν οι διεθνείς εμπορικές ροές εμφανίζουν ανησυχητική τάση συρρίκνωσης. Συνεπώς, η άμεση αναστροφή της κατάστασης αυτής συνιστά θεμελιώδη παράμετρο της ζητούμενης οικονομικής ανάκαμψης. Εκτιμάται ότι το αυξημένο κόστος δανεισμού και η μειωμένη ροή πιστώσεων ευθύνονται σε ποσοστό της τάξεως περίπου 10-15% για την επιβράδυνση στις εμπορικές αλλαγές. Η πολυμερής πρωτοβουλία χρηματοδότησης του εμπορίου που υιοθετήθηκε στο Λονδίνο από την Ομάδα των 20 είναι αναμφισβήτητα θετική. Κατά τη γνώμη μου, η Ένωση καλείται να συνεχίσει να πρωταγωνιστεί και στην **έμπρακτη** εφαρμογή του πακέτου του Λονδίνου, προς τρεις κατευθύνσεις:

- πρώτον, τη στοχευμένη παρέμβαση των πολυμερών και περιφερειακών χρηματοοικονομικών ιδρυμάτων,
- δεύτερον, τις συντονισμένες δημόσιες παρεμβάσεις σε εθνικό επίπεδο, και
- τρίτον, τις προσαρμογές των σχετικών πολυμερών κανόνων.

Αυτό το μήνυμα απευθύνεται προς την Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή για την ανάληψη σχετικών πρωτοβουλιών.

2-045

**Pierre Pribetich (PSE).** – Monsieur le Président, des relents islamophobes dans les discours d'un leader d'une extrême-droite populiste aux Pays-Bas, la multiplication des attaques contre les Roms en République tchèque, des propos inqualifiables, insoutenables, du président iranien sur la création d'un gouvernement raciste en Palestine, faisant allusion à la création de l'État d'Israël dans une conférence de l'ONU sur le racisme, destinée avant tout à promouvoir la tolérance et la diversité.

Comment notre Parlement, au-delà de l'indignation, ne pourrait-il pas adresser, de manière forte et symbolique, un message pour promouvoir cette diversité, la nécessaire tolérance dans un monde globalisé, en condamnant avec force de tels propos? Comment notre Parlement ne pourrait-il pas demander au Conseil européen, à la Commission, d'adresser une mise en garde solennelle aux États qui s'inscrivent dans cette logique agressive, même verbale, car l'histoire nous a trop souvent enseigné que les actes suivaient, hélas, de trop près de tels discours?

Comment, au cours de cette session, Monsieur le Président, notre Parlement pourrait-il rester sans voix face à de telles attitudes racistes, xénophobes, dans un contexte de crise économique où le repli des peuples sur eux-mêmes, le protectionnisme, germe, hélas, comme les graines au printemps?

2-046

**Cristian Silviu Bușoi (ALDE).** – Sunt foarte îngrijorat de evenimentele care au avut loc în ultimul timp în Republica Moldova. Cele mai grave sunt încălcările drepturilor omului, arestările, răpirile, tortura, intimidările, expulzarea unor jurnaliști. Voința cetățenilor moldoveni a fost viciată de către autorități prin numeroasele neregularități care pot susține cu argumente supoziția că alegerile au fost fraudate. Listele suplimentare, buletinele de vot tipărite în plus, hărțuirea opoziției, interzicerea accesului la posturile publice de televiziune, campania pe care instituțiile statului au făcut-o pentru Partidul Comunist. Deși în aceste săptămâni au fost numeroase voci care au protestat la nivel european și internațional, din păcate situația din Republica Moldova nu s-a îmbunătățit. Sper ca la dezbaterea din această săptămână, precum și cu ocazia misiunii ad-hoc care se va deplasa în Republica Moldova, dar mai ales prin intermediul rezoluției pe care o așteptăm la ultima sesiune din mai, Parlamentul European să dea un mesaj foarte clar că Uniunea Europeană nu tolerează încălcările drepturilor omului și să ceară deschis repetarea alegerilor în Republica Moldova.

2-047

**Mieczysław Edmund Janowski (UEN).** – Panie Przewodniczący! W Wielkanoc, 13 kwietnia w nocy, jeszcze przed świtem, doszło do wielkiej tragedii w polskim mieście Kamień Pomorski niedaleko Szczecina. W budynku spłonęło żywcem ponad 20 osób, w tym dzieci. To był i jest wielki ból dla całej Polski.

Dziś chciałbym z tego miejsca zaapelować do rządów wszystkich państw członkowskich, do przedstawicieli władz lokalnych i regionalnych o to, aby pilnie podjęli działania sprawdzające stan bezpieczeństwa przeciwpożarowego we wszystkich budynkach mieszkalnych, a zwłaszcza w obiektach socjalnych. Chodzi mi tu zarówno o stosowanie odpowiednich materiałów służących do budowy tych budynków, jak i o bezwzględną kontrolę przestrzegania przepisów przeciwpożarowych. Dramat w Polsce jest jednym z wielu takich przypadków, które niestety zdarzały się w Europie. Niech ten pożar i jego ofiary będą wielkim wołaniem i ostrzeżeniem na przyszłość.

2-048

**László Tóké (Verts/ALE).** – Ez év március 23-i felszólalásomban az Európai Parlament és az Európai Bizottság közbelépését kértem a romániai Verespatak védelmében, melynek kiszolgáltatott lakosságát és épített örökségét, valamint természeti környezetét végveszély fenyegeti egy kanadai–román vegyesvállalat bányanyitási terve következtében.

Akkori félelmeink beigazolódtak, ugyanis kétévi felfüggesztés után az új román kormány végképp szabad utat akar engedni a beruházásnak, mely az európai normákkal ellentétes ciántechnológián alapuló kitermelés alkalmazása által nemcsak a közvetlen környezetet, hanem az egész román–magyar határ menti térséget ökológiai katasztrófával fenyegeti.

Felszólalásommal egy időben több képviselőtársammal együtt megkereséssel fordulunk Stavros Dimas biztos úrhoz a ciántechnológia betiltása céljából. Kérem az Európai Bizottságot, hogy európai környezetvédelmi politikájának szellemében küldjön kivizsgáló bizottságot Romániába, távlatilag pedig gondoskodjék a bányakitermelés uniós szintű megfelelő szabályozásáról.

2-049

**Vittorio Agnoletto (GUE/NGL).** – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, vorrei intervenire a proposito di quanto è accaduto all'interno della Fiat a Bruxelles. La Fiat si è inventato un sequestro – che non c'è mai stato – dei suoi dirigenti da parte dei lavoratori, con l'unico obiettivo di decapitare il sindacato. Non vi è stato nessun sequestro, né il 9 aprile né mai. La notizia è stata diffusa ad arte dalla Fiat nel tentativo di screditare i lavoratori che difendono il loro futuro contro 24 licenziamenti. La Fiat si rifiuta di avere qualunque incontro, qualunque discussione e qualunque trattativa con i rappresentanti sindacali. L'unico obiettivo è quello di licenziare 24 lavoratori, tra i quali 12 sono rappresentanti sindacali. Io credo che sarebbe opportuno che il Parlamento discutesse non solo di questo fatto, ma del comportamento antisindacale,

non rispettoso dei diritti dei lavoratori, della Fiat e di tantissime grandi multinazionali europee, che traggono poi invece beneficio dalle regole e parecchie volte e anche dalle sovvenzioni degli Stati nazionali e dell'Unione europea e che non rispettano invece i diritti dei lavoratori.

2-050

**Γεώργιος Γεωργίου (IND/DEM).** – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, про ολίγων ημερών, πολυμελής ομάδα από συναδέλφους ευρωβουλευτές επισκεφθήκαμε τα νοτιο-ανατολικά σύνορα της Ευρώπης.

Αυτά που είδαμε και ζήσαμε στην περιοχή που επισκεφθήκαμε, δεν μας έκαναν καθόλου περήφανους. Πρέπει να σας πω ότι υπάρχουν εκεί ευρωπαίοι πολίτες οι οποίοι ζουν σε μικρά νησιά των 120 - 130 ατόμων, και το κάθε ένα από τα νησιά αυτά δέχεται καθημερινώς 150, 200, 250 λαθρομετανάστες, και όλοι μαζί ζουν υπό άθλιες συνθήκες επειδή δεν υπάρχουν υποδομές.

Εδώ λοιπόν σ' αυτήν την αίθουσα, ακούω συνεχώς να μιλάμε για το Νταρφούρ, το Νότιο Σουδάν, για την Μιανμάρ, και καλώς πράττουμε αλλά, εν πάση περιπτώσει, κάποια στιγμή θα πρέπει να ρίξουμε μια ματιά και σ' αυτούς τους ευρωπαίους πολίτες οι οποίοι ζουν εκεί, και είναι τόσο ευρωπαίοι όσο αυτοί που ζουν στο Παρίσι, στη Μαδρίτη ή στο Βερολίνο! Θεώρησα λοιπόν υποχρέωσή μου να σας το αναφέρω κ. Πρόεδρε, και ελπίζω στις ενέργειές σας.

2-051

**Слави Бинев (NI).** – Господин председател, скъпи колеги, над българското общество в момента е надвиснала опасност, а именно превръщането на полицията от орган за закрила на обществото в средство за изпълняване на политически рекет и гангстерски поръчки. Вечерта на Великден общинският съветник от община Бургас - 64 годишният Петко Петков, е повален на земята и пребит от двама униформени полицаи пред погледа на множество свидетели пред църквата. В официалната полицейска сводка на другия ден случаят въобще не е отбелязан. Това е поредното полицейско насилие над членове на партия Атака след побоя над евродепутата Димитър Стоянов и над общинския съветник от София. Нито едно от тези посегателства не бе подложено на разследване.

Показан за умишлената неефективност на полицията в случаи, в които има поръчка, е и факта, че в България няма нито един разкрит случай на отвлечане, а вече има над 15, последните два отново в този месец. В обществото ни се е породило чувство на страх и безпомощност. За да си полицаи в България се е превърнало в синоним на изгоден бизнес. Когато служителите на реда са престъпници, тогава от кого да се пазим и кой ще защити хората? Въпросът остава.

2-052

**Richard James Ashworth (PPE-DE).** – Mr President, I draw the attention of this House to the impact of the unlawful blockade of the cross-Channel ports of Calais, Boulogne and Dunkirk by members of the French fishing industry last week. This industrial action brought very serious disruptions to flows of freight through this vital trans-European route. It adds enormous cost and delay to industry and severely disrupts and inconveniences the lives of people living in the South East of England.

This has been a frequently recurring problem, and I ask of the Commission that they use their powers to intervene to ensure that this interruption to the free movement of goods and people within the European Union is brought under control. Furthermore, I ask of the Commission: is, in their view, the award of EUR 4 million to the fishermen by the French Government state aid, and would it therefore be anti-competitive and unlawful within the rules of the common fisheries policy?

2-053

**Ioan Mircea Pașcu (PSE).** – Mr President, the recent negative developments in Moldova illustrate a number of issues worth mentioning. The first is our response to the violations of EU core values by the Moldovan authorities during the reprisals against young people and journalists, following the protests against the results of the elections. Any lenience on our part would cast a shadow over EU credibility in this respect.

The second is the EU response to the procedural breach by the Moldovan authorities in implementing their agreements with us and by discriminating against European citizens on nationality grounds. Again, EU credibility and authority are at stake.

The third is EU solidarity in the face of the false accusations against one of its members, a possible pretext for freezing the military situation in the area in breach of important undertakings in the field.

Fourthly, the EU reaction will emphasise once again the difference in status between countries sharing a similar destiny in 1940 and indicate the future direction of EU-Russia relations.

2-054

**Chris Davies (ALDE).** – Mr President, if one of our constituents fraudulently claims welfare benefits, they will be prosecuted and could go to prison.

Sometimes things seem different here. Newspapers reported publicly last November that one of our Members, Den Dover, had paid expenses worth GBP 750 000 intended for the employment of staff to a company owned by his wife and daughter and had used some of this money for the purchase of expensive cars and for other matters of personal gain.

Most people regard Dover as no better than a thief, a crook who should be in jail, and I invite you, Mr President, to tell us how much of that money has now been repaid.

This Parliament should be a shining example of openness, honesty and transparency, and instead there sometimes seems to be a code of secrecy here to keep hidden the true extent of abuse of allowances by some Members. Our refusal to introduce the same sort of principles of financial transparency that we would expect of any other European institution brings shame upon us all.

2-055

**Der Präsident.** – Herr Kollege! Sie können davon ausgehen, dass auch in diesem Fall nach Recht und Gesetz vorgegangen wird.

2-056

**Ewa Tomaszewska (UEN).** – Panie Przewodniczący! Kwiecień przynosi kolejną refleksję nad skutkami obu totalitaryzmów. Przypomina zbrodnię katyńską, wymordowanie kilkunastu tysięcy polskich oficerów – więźniów Ostaszkowa, Starobielska, Kozielska – skazanych na śmierć jeszcze w marcu 1940 r. rozkazem Berii. Przypomina też wybuch powstania w warszawskim getcie w 1943 r. w proteście przeciw masowemu wywożeniu Żydów przez niemieckiego okupanta do obozów zagłady.

Dramat w getcie przełamuje dzisiejszy Marsz Żywych, gwarantując pamięć i zapobieganie powtarzaniu się takich doświadczeń. Niestety nadal nie osądzono zbrodni katyńskiej i jej sprawców. Nadzieję budzi przyjęcie przez nasz Parlament pisemnego oświadczenia uznającego dzień 23 sierpnia Dniem Pamięci Ofiar obu totalitaryzmów.

2-057

**Den Dover (PPE-DE).** – Mr President, I understand that Mr Davies may have made a speech about a situation concerning myself, and, therefore, I would like the right of reply on that matter. I only heard the last 10 words. He at least sent me an email in the last 20 minutes saying that he intended to speak on it.

All I would like to say is that the big fuss and bother about my parliamentary assistance expenses, covered by the media over the last nine or twelve months, has been a harrowing experience. I have lodged my papers with the Court of First Instance, so I intend to fight a very robust case. I understand I have a very good case and, along with that, I have gone for interim measures, which means that no money will be payable until the Court has heard all the evidence and made the appropriate decision. I beg leave to delay the House and thank you for this opportunity.

2-058

**Gerard Batten (IND/DEM).** – Mr President, after 36 years of membership, what has the European Union meant for Britain? It means that we no longer govern ourselves. Between 75% and 85% of our laws now come from the EU and not from our own parliament. The EU costs Britain at least GBP 56 billion per annum – or the equivalent of GBP 900 per annum for every man, woman and child. We no longer control our own borders and suffer unlimited and uncontrolled immigration.

EU human rights legislation means that we can no longer effectively protect ourselves from foreign criminals, illegal immigrants and bogus asylum seekers. The European arrest warrant and trials *in absentia* mean that we have lost our most basic protections from unjust arrest and imprisonment.

EU membership is a disaster for Britain. It is a grievous and unnecessary self-inflicted wound. The only solution to the problem is Britain's unconditional withdrawal from the European Union.

2-059

**Milan Horáček (Verts/ALE).** – Herr Präsident! Vor wenigen Wochen hat eine unheilige Allianz von EU-befürwortenden tschechischen Sozialdemokraten, dem EU-gegnerschen Präsidenten Klaus und den Kommunisten zum Sturz der Regierung Topolánek geführt. Nun wird an der Aufstellung der Übergangsregierung gearbeitet, die ab Mai bis nach den Neuwahlen im Oktober die Regierungsarbeit leisten soll. Ich hoffe, dass dieses neue Kabinett die bisher sehr gut geführte Ratspräsidentschaft Tschechiens zu Ende führt und die notwendige Ratifizierung des Vertrags von Lissabon in Tschechien mit ermöglicht. Das wäre ein wichtiges, ein positives Zeichen für Europa.

2-060

**Zsolt László Becsey (PPE-DE).** – Az utóbbi hónapokban újra a félelem az új az Észak-Szerbiában lévő, több nemzetiség – főleg magyarok – lakta Vajdaságban. Bár parlamentünk 2004-ben és 2005-ben is határozatot fogadott el az itteni nem szerb lakosok elleni fizikai és lelki támadások ügyében, bár parlamentünk példamutató módon tényfeltáró delegációt küldött a térségbe 2005-ben, az erőszak, a megfélemlítés és a megalázás az ottani kisebbségek – elsősorban a magyarok – ellen folytatódik, sőt felerősödni látszik.



Év eleje óta összesen tizenöt morális és öt fizikai támadás történt, kettő súlyos. Sajnos a rendőrség iránti bizalom gyenge. Ezt erősíti az a tény, hogy máig nem került sor olyan büntetésre, amelyben ilyen etnikai támadás esetén végrehajtás is sorra került volna, ami az igazságszolgáltatás elégtelen működését és sajnos, a hosszú évek tapasztalata alapján, elnéző hozzáállását is jelzi. Ezt erősíti az a tény, hogy a mai napig a szerb többség nem tudja tudomásul venni, hogy meg kell emlékezni sok tízezer ítélet és egyéni bűnösség nélkül kivégzettekre is.

Meddig tűrheti az Európai Unió, hogy európai nyelvet beszélő őshonos lakosokat fizikailag és lelkileg terrorizálnak egy potenciális tagállamban a XXI. század elején? Hol van a minimális presztízszünk?

2-061

**Jo Leinen (PSE).** – Herr Präsident! Gestern ist in Genf die Anti-Rassismus-Konferenz der UNO eröffnet worden. 22 Länder der EU nehmen teil, 5 Länder haben sich entschieden, nicht teilzunehmen. Das wirft ein schlechtes Licht auf die Geschlossenheit der Europäischen Union gegenüber einem so wichtigen Ereignis.

Nun lese ich, dass das eine oder andere Land überlegt, im Laufe der Woche doch noch nach Genf zu fahren, und deshalb möchte ich Sie bitten, auf die tschechische Ratspräsidentschaft einzuwirken, dass wir als EU eine einheitliche Haltung haben zu dieser Anti-Rassismus-Konferenz.

Es kann doch nicht sein, dass eine fürchterliche Rede des iranischen Staatspräsidenten die EU teilt und die UNO schwächt. Das darf nicht das Ergebnis dieser Rede sein, und daher meine ich, dass nochmals Anstrengungen gemacht werden müssen – wie Generalsekretär Ban Ki-moon das auch gewünscht hat –, dass alle 27 EU-Staaten und die EU gemeinsam wirklich dort das Abschlussdokument unterstützt und den Millionen Menschen auf der Welt hilft, die von Rassismus und von Diskriminierung betroffen sind. Vielen Dank.

2-062

**Marco Cappato (ALDE).** – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, in occasione dell'ultima plenaria l'avevo sollecitata sul rispetto degli impegni del Parlamento e sulla pubblicazione dei dati sulle presenze dei parlamentari alle attività parlamentari. Lei, Presidente, mi aveva garantito che alla successiva riunione del *Bureau* – che è quella che si terrà tra esattamente 40 minuti – questo punto sarebbe stato discusso. Ora, mi risulta invece, che questo punto non è all'ordine del giorno della riunione del *Bureau* delle ore 18.30. Siccome manca ormai poco più di un mese alle elezioni e il Parlamento ha preso un impegno nella pubblicazione dei dati e delle informazioni sulle presenze dei parlamentari alle attività parlamentari, e ormai ci saranno pochissime occasioni, non so se forse una riunione del *Bureau* formalmente per affrontare la questione, il Segretariato generale si era impegnato a fornire un rapporto sulla base del quale la Presidenza avrebbe potuto prendere una decisione; io le chiedo Presidente: potranno i cittadini, gli elettori europei, avere queste informazioni, come richiesto e previsto e deciso da questo Parlamento, prima delle elezioni europee di giugno o invece dovremmo violare il nostro stesso impegno e le nostre stesse decisioni?

2-063

**Etelka Barsi-Pataky (PPE-DE).** – Tegnap megalakult az új magyar szocialista kormány. Én most nem a politikai vonatkozásokról szeretnék szólni, hanem arról a körülményről, hogy ennek az új kormánynak egyetlen női tagja sincs. Mégiscsak furcsa, hogy 2009-ben Európában megalakulhat úgy egy kormány, hogy a kormányt alkotó tizennégy miniszterből egy sem nő. A skandináv országokban a kormánynak több mint a fele nő. Franciaország is közelít ehhez. Németországban több mint az egyharmada. Ez az általános, bevett európai gyakorlat.

Ebben a házban az elmúlt öt évben tizenegy jelentést fogadtunk el, amely a férfiak és a nők esélyegyenlőségéről szól. Európai értékeken alapuló, fontos cél ez, de mit sem ér, ha nem válik gyakorlattá. Megkérem tehát képviselőtársaimat – ez esetben szocialista képviselőtársaimat –, hassanak oda, hogy hazájukban, ahol ez még nem történt meg, alkalmazzák is ezeket a fontos és nemes törekvéseket.

2-064

**Neena Gill (PSE).** – Mr President, the other day I was in Birmingham. I was knocking on doors – a particularly British way of campaigning – and, unsurprisingly, not a single person whose doorstep I was on had the slightest clue that there was to be a European election in less than six weeks' time.

I am sure that you know that statistics in the UK show that only 16% of the public know about the elections, but what should be of concern to you is that these statistics are no better across the other Member States. In fact, 30% have no intention of participating in the forthcoming elections. This lack of interest and awareness is as much the responsibility of this Parliament as of anybody else. The millions that have been spent on communications with the citizens have been to no avail.

What is particularly frustrating for me is that the promised election awareness advertisement has spectacularly backfired. A work-life balance advertisement has upset working women and groups trying to encourage breastfeeding. It is yet another own goal. Mr President, you need to deal with this situation urgently, have the offending advertisement withdrawn and make sure that we have a simple message as to why people should participate in the forthcoming elections. This needs to be visible and easily understood.

2-065

**Μαρία Παναγιωτοπούλου-Κασσιώτου (PPE-DE).** – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, , και εγώ θα μιλήσω για το ίδιο θέμα, ήτοι για τη συμμετοχή στις προσεχείς ευρωεκλογές η οποία προδιαγράφεται ότι δεν θα είναι και τόσο υψηλή. Στους λόγους περιλαμβάνονται και η προεκλογική εκστρατεία που έχει οργανωθεί από το Κοινοβούλιο η οποία δεν είναι αρκετά θεαματική, αλλά κυρίως οι βολές κατά της κατάκτησης της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, της κοινωνικής οικονομίας της αγοράς , του μοντέλου που αναπτύχθηκε με τόσους αγώνες και δίνει καρπούς στους εργαζομένους στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση. Οι πολίτες βλέπουν με αρνητικό μάτι τις εξελίξεις που δεν προδιαγράφονται ευχάριστες και ικανοποιητικές. Είναι κρίμα λοιπόν όσοι βρισκόμαστε εδώ να έχουμε αντιπαραθέσεις σε θέματα που θα έπρεπε να μας ενώνουν προς το συμφέρον των ευρωπαίων πολιτών.

2-066

**Catherine Guy-Quint (PSE).** – Monsieur le Président, en tant que membre de la commission des budgets, je suis allée avec Costas Botopoulos, les 14 et 15 mars derniers, dans les régions du Péloponnèse les plus touchées par les incendies de l'été 2007. Nous avons constaté, à notre grand étonnement, que les 89,7 millions d'euros promis et venant du Fonds de solidarité de l'Union européenne ne sont pas encore arrivés sur ces territoires.

Nous appelons donc solennellement l'attention de la Commission à ce sujet et nous voudrions savoir où se situent les blocages dans la mise en œuvre des décisions prises par l'autorité budgétaire. Pourquoi cette aide, votée il y a plusieurs mois, n'a-t-elle toujours pas produit d'effet significatif dans ces régions où le besoin de solidarité européenne se fait chaque jour plus criant?

Au-delà du contrôle a posteriori exercé par la Commission, nous voudrions obtenir des explications du gouvernement grec quant à l'utilisation de cette aide européenne. Il y a une véritable urgence, humaine et économique. Et attendre deux ans, c'est vraiment beaucoup trop.

2-067

**Călin Cătălin Chiriță (PPE-DE).** – Doresc să atrag atenția că tot mai desele întâmplări nedorite, care au început de anul trecut cu Armenia și au continuat anul acesta cu Georgia, respectiv Moldova, ne dau de gândit datorită faptului că sunt două lucruri pe care le au în comun: toate trei țările sunt membre în parteneriatul estic și scenariul este identic. Cred că ar trebui să luăm în calcul acest lucru.

Săptămâna trecută președintele Moldovei, domnul Voronin, a și declarat că dorește să renunțe la acest parteneriat estic pentru a-și putea duce mai departe lucrurile nedorite pe care le face împotriva drepturilor omului în Moldova și cred că Uniunea Europeană ar trebui să lucreze îndeaproape cu Consiliul Europei și cu OSCE-ul.

2-068

**Jim Allister (NI).** – Mr President, glorification of terrorism takes many forms, but when a Member of this House eulogises vile murderers, whose killing careers came to an end when they met their just desserts at the hands of lawful security forces, then that Member has put herself at variance with everything that this House has ever said in condemning terrorism and those who sanitise and justify it. Yet this is exactly what Sinn Féin Member de Brún did on Easter Sunday, when she described IRA terrorists as decent, selfless and honourable. There is nothing decent or honourable about terrorism, past or present. Shame on any Member who proclaims such obscene adulation of men of blood!

2-069

**Jelko Kacin (ALDE).** – Predsednik Ahmadinedžad s populistično in trdo nacionalistično retoriko zelo škodi ugledu in podobi Irana. Ogroža tudi zmerni zahodni islam in o njem širi negativne stereotipe.

Odločno se moramo odzvati na provokacije. Iranski režim je z obsodbo Roxane Saberi dokazal, da je v bistvu šibak in strahopeten. V verbalni konfrontaciji z ZDA si izbira talce, tokrat žensko, novinarko, da ideološko mobilizira ljudi. Požvižga se na vse demokratične standarde.

Osnovne človekove pravice so v temeljih Evropske unije, tudi boj za pravice do obveščenosti. Sedma sila, mediji in novinarji, so pomembno orodje za vzpostavljanje demokratičnih standardov. Oblast, ki se boji novinarjev, najprej udari po njih. Nedemokratične režime je vedno strah, zato novinarje preganjajo, zapirajo, mučijo, celo ubijajo.

2-070

**Kinga Gál (PPE-DE).** – Május elsején lesz öt éve, hogy számos közép-kelet-európai országgal együtt tagja lettünk az Uniónak. Akkor úgy tűnt, hogy az új tagállamok mindegyikében betartják az Unió alapelveit, a diszkrimináció tilalmát, védik és értéként kezelik a nyelvi sokszínűséget, a nemzeti kisebbségek jogait.

Mégis megtörténhet öt év uniós tagság után is, hogy nyíltan, diszkriminatív módon az őshonos nemzeti kisebbségek nyelvhasználatát ellenében védik a többségi nyelvet, mint ahogy történik most Szlovákiában, ahol egy 1995-ös, már akkor is komoly nemzetközi bírálatokat kiváltott nyelvtörvényt élesztettek most újjá. Ez a nyelvtörvény-tervezet veszélyezteti a kisebbség nyelvhasználatát az élet minden területén, annak a félmillió lélekszámú őshonos magyar kisebbségnek is például Szlovákiában, aki ott él. Nemhogy elősegítené a nyelvi sokszínűséget, a kisebbség identitásának megőrzését, de gyakorlatilag nyelvi felügyelőket, inspektorokat enged rá a kisebbségre, hogy komoly pénzüsszegekkel bírságozzanak, ha

nem tartják be a Brüsszelből nézve agyamentnek minősülő rendelkezéseket. Ezért kérem a nyelvi sokszínűségért felelős biztosát az Uniónak, hogy lépjen közbe, érvényesítse gyakorlatban a nyelvi sokszínűséget Szlovákiában is.

2-071

**Csaba Sándor Tabajdi (PSE).** – A tíz új tagállam öt éve van az Európai Unióban. Ideje mérleget vonnunk. A mi ciklusunk is a végéhez közeledik. Eleinte a régi tagállamok részéről volt egy bizalmatlanság, de ez fokozatosan oldódott, sőt egy idő után bebizonyosodott, hogy az új tagállamok számos kérdésben – például a szolgáltatási irányelvben, vagy a munkavállalás szabadságában – az Unió reformjának élharcosai voltak. Ezért azt hiszem, hogy elmondhatjuk, hogy ez az öt év egy nagyon komoly tanulmány volt. Ugyanakkor rá kell mutatnunk arra, hogy vannak még diszkriminatív intézkedések az új tagállamokkal szemben. Elég arra utalnom, hogy az új tagállamok gazdái az idén is csak a 60%-át kapják annak, amit a régi tagállamok gazdái. Ezzel együtt azt kell mondjam, hogy az uniós csatlakozás egy win-win – kölcsönösen előnyös – lépés volt, és ezúton szeretném megköszönni az Európai Parlamentnek, hogy befogadtak bennünket, új tagállamiakat. Teljesen egyenrangúnak éreztük itt magunkat az elmúlt öt évben.

2-072

**PRESIDENZA DELL'ON. LUISA MORGANTINI**  
*Vicepresidente*

2-073

**Presidente.** – Questo punto è chiuso.

2-074

**17 - Norme comuni per il mercato interno dell'energia elettrica - Agenzia per la cooperazione fra i regolatori nazionali dell'energia - Accesso alla rete per gli scambi transfrontalieri di energia elettrica - Norme comuni per il mercato interno del gas naturale - Accesso alle reti di trasporto del gas naturale - Etichettatura dei pneumatici in relazione al consumo di carburante - Rendimento energetico nell'edilizia (rifusione) (discussione)**

2-075

**Presidente.** – L'ordine del giorno reca, in discussione congiunta,

– la raccomandazione per la seconda lettura di Eluned Morgan, a nome della commissione per l'industria, la ricerca e l'energia, sulla posizione comune del Consiglio in vista dell'adozione della direttiva del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio relativa a norme comuni per il mercato interno dell'energia elettrica e che abroga la direttiva 2003/54/CE (14539/2/2008 - C6-0024/2009 - 2007/0195(COD)) (A6-0216/2009)

– la raccomandazione per la seconda lettura di Giles Chichester, a nome della commissione per l'industria, la ricerca e l'energia, sulla posizione comune del Consiglio in vista dell'adozione del regolamento del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio che istituisce un'Agenzia per la cooperazione fra i regolatori nazionali dell'energia (14541/1/2008 - C6-0020/2009 - 2007/0197(COD)) (A6-0235/2009)

– la raccomandazione per la seconda lettura di Alejo Vidal-Quadras, a nome della commissione per l'industria, la ricerca e l'energia, sulla posizione comune del Consiglio in vista dell'adozione del regolamento del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio relativo alle condizioni di accesso alla rete per gli scambi transfrontalieri di energia elettrica e che abroga il regolamento (CE) n. 1228/2003 (14546/2/2008 - C6-0022/2009 - 2007/0198(COD)) (A6-0213/2009)

– la raccomandazione per la seconda lettura di Antonio Mussa, a nome della commissione per l'industria, la ricerca e l'energia, sulla posizione comune del Consiglio in vista dell'adozione della direttiva del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio relativa a norme comuni per il mercato interno del gas naturale e che abroga la direttiva 2003/55/CE (14540/2/2008 - C6-0021/2009 - 2007/0196(COD)) (A6-0238/2009)

– la raccomandazione per la seconda lettura di Atanas Papanicolas, a nome della commissione per l'industria, la ricerca e l'energia, sulla posizione comune del Consiglio in vista dell'adozione del regolamento del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio relativo alle condizioni di accesso alle reti di trasporto del gas naturale e che abroga il regolamento (CE) n. 1775/2005 (14548/2/2008 - C6-0023/2009 - 2007/0199(COD)) (A6-0237/2009)

– la relazione di Ivo Belet, a nome della commissione per l'industria, la ricerca e l'energia, sulla proposta di direttiva del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio sull'etichettatura dei pneumatici in relazione al consumo di carburante e ad altri parametri fondamentali (COM(2008)0779 - C6-0411/2008 - 2008/0221(COD)) (A6-0218/2009)

– la relazione di Silvia-Adriana Țicău, a nome della commissione per l'industria, la ricerca e l'energia, sulla proposta di direttiva del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio sul rendimento energetico nell'edilizia (rifusione) (COM(2008)0780 - C6-0413/2008 - 2008/0223(COD)) (A6-0254/2009)

2-076

**Eluned Morgan, rapporteur.** – Madam President, this energy package is the culmination of years of hard work in which Parliament can be very proud of the changes that will now be put in place. We should, in particular, be proud of the fact that the EU's energy consumers have now been put right at the centre of the energy debate for the first time and the issue of energy poverty has now been recognised at European level. The inherent conflict of interests that arises when a company owns both transmission and generation of electricity has been addressed, and the regulatory regime governing the energy markets has been strengthened.

The Electricity Directive, for which I was rapporteur, is part of a package of five measures which seeks improvements in the way the electricity and gas markets work across the continent, to ensure that the markets are better integrated and operate in a fairer and less discriminatory way.

Let me say how grateful I have been for the enormous cooperation from the other rapporteurs on this package, as well as from the shadows, the Commission and the Czech Presidency, for helping us to come to a conclusion on what was sometimes a very challenging debate.

The legislation has seen a raft of new consumer protection measures set out, including ensuring that customers are able to switch suppliers within three weeks, the provision in each Member State of an independent and robust complaints system, and the right to compensation if service levels are not met. This legislation will also ensure that every household in the EU will be fitted with so-called 'smart meters' by 2022. These smart meters will enable customers to better control their energy use and increase energy efficiency, helping to cut energy costs and reduce carbon emissions.

On the European Parliament's initiative, the new legislation also includes special protection measures for vulnerable energy consumers, and the issue of energy poverty will now have to be taken seriously for the first time.

I would like to ask Commissioner Piebalgs if he will now make a commitment that, in future, the energy framework of the EU, in addition to addressing security of supply, sustainability and competitiveness, will also now add a fourth leg – that of affordability – to all future energy policy proposals. An EU-backed report has recently concluded that up to 125 million citizens are affected by energy poverty. Member States now must take appropriate measures which could lead to the prevention of hundreds – if not thousands – of deaths in the poorest households across the continent. We will also see the end to discriminatory pricing on prepayment meters.

The most controversial part of the package centred on whether there was a need for full ownership unbundling in the energy markets – in other words, a total separation of transmission systems from generation. The market structure in some Member States means that the monopoly enjoyed by transmission system operators, who also own the means of generating electricity, offers no incentive to encourage other players onto the market, thereby undermining competition. Parliament has now accepted a compromise that will allow ownership of both transmission and generation on condition that we see increased checks and balances to ensure the removal of the inherent conflict of interest that arises. Many of us reluctantly accepted the compromise because we believe that the wind is blowing in the direction of wholesale separations, and these integrated companies are likely to separate regardless of this directive.

The Commission's efforts in exposing the abuses of some companies is starting to pay off, with examples of companies like E.ON and RWE agreeing to sell their transmission networks following anti-trust investigations. We are also going to see a strengthening of national regulatory authorities.

I would like to thank everybody for their cooperation, and I think we should be proud of what we have done for the consumers of the EU.

2-077

**Giles Chichester, rapporteur.** – Madam President, this package is, I hope, more a case of 'third time lucky' than 'work in progress'. I view the future role of the Agency for the Cooperation of Energy Regulators as crucial in achieving the long-desired internal market in gas and electricity.

During the trialogue negotiations, it became clear to me that the improvements put forward by me on behalf of Parliament are essential for fair and effective energy markets. My objective has been to create an agency with greater independence and decision-making powers. In particular, if it is to contribute effectively to the development of a single, competitive, energy market, the Agency needs more powers to tackle cross-border issues and encourage effective cooperation between transmission system operators (TSOs) and national regulatory authorities (NRAs).

However, with greater power there should be greater accountability and transparency. I have in mind the general principle that we should reinforce the independence of the Agency so as to make it both more effective and more credible by increasing the ways in which the Agency is accountable, in particular to this Parliament. I believe this will happen.

I should say that a number of the roles we have given to the Agency sound more consultative than concrete, but we have tried to create opportunities for innovative regulation by drawing attention to areas where action is needed but the Agency does not have the appropriate powers to act.

Let me first emphasise the increased forms of accountability that we have negotiated. The director will appear before the relevant committee of this House, both prior to appointment and during his or her term of office, to make a statement and answer questions. Likewise, the chairman of the board of regulators can attend the relevant committee and give an account of their work. Parliament has gained the right to nominate two of the members of the administrative board. All of this gives the Agency a forum in the public domain to make its voice heard on issues of its choice.

Turning to the roles I mentioned, I believe that monitoring internal markets in gas and electricity, participating in the development of network codes, contributing to the implementation of the guidelines on trans-European energy networks, monitoring progress on implementation of projects to create new interconnector capacity, having the power to decide on exemptions from requirements for investments in infrastructure, monitoring implementation of the 10-year network investment plans and having powers to issue opinions and recommendations to TSOs – along with other aspects that I do not have the time to enumerate – will all give the Agency ample opportunities to bring about change.

Finally, we have introduced requirements for streamlined decision-taking. I hope that the Agency will rise to the challenges we have posed. We have also created the opportunity for the Commission to come forward with its report on the working of the Agency and to make suggestions as to further tasks and roles that the Agency might fulfil, in the light of experience.

I would like to thank our fellow rapporteurs, the other two institutions and the Commissioner in particular for their hard and constructive work in achieving the final compromise package. I hope the fact that I have been invited to speak second, not fifth, is clear recognition of the true significance and importance of this proposal.

2-078

**Alejo Vidal-Quadras, rapporteur.** – Madam President, I would like to start by sincerely thanking the rapporteurs, the shadow rapporteurs, Commissioner Piebalgs and Ambassador Reinišová for the excellent cooperation during the first three months of this year. That cooperation has been the main engine of the successful outcome we will be voting on this week. Negotiations have been long, complex and sometimes tough, but I think we have managed to get an agreement that is satisfactory to all parties.

Regarding the overall package, as it has been negotiated, Parliament can be proud of the final text. Indeed, our very strong first-reading agreement on ownership unbundling gave the negotiating team a lot of leverage during the talks. This has allowed us to obtain a much tighter regulatory framework, in particular in countries with the ITO model in place, where the competencies of national regulators will be increased, with independence from both governments and industry. This new role will reduce the risk of uncompetitive behaviour, especially in circumstances where vertically integrated companies abuse their position to stop investments in new capacity.

Furthermore, agreement has been reached on the review clause that will allow us to check, in a few years, whether all models satisfy our goals of achieving a fully competitive and legalised market. Moreover, we have substantially increased the provisions on consumer protection with regard to, among other things, billing information and improved conditions for switching suppliers.

Finally, another big success has been the introduction of a new provision in the third-country clause, whereby the certification of a transmission system operator (TSO) from a third country could now also be denied if the security of supply of the Union as a whole, or that of an individual Member State, other than the one where the certification is requested, is threatened.

Concerning the electricity regulation, I would like to make clear that this regulation plays a crucial role, since it gives Member States the tools needed to significantly increase interconnection capacity within the Union by the development and establishment of binding network codes to be applied by all transmission system operators to exchanges, thus removing one of the main physical barriers to the completion of the internal electricity market.

The agreed text also enhances the role of the Agency for the Cooperation of European Regulators in this process, in line with the first reading in the European Parliament. I must admit that Parliament hoped for a much more ambitious agency. However, we understand that this is only the first step in a long process of integration of regulatory frameworks.

We have managed to include a new provision whereby the Agency will be able to propose the basic criteria to be included in the granting of exemptions for new interconnections. This is particularly relevant since it is one of the main obstacles investors in new capacity face when dealing with different Member States. Having to follow several different regulatory procedures can sometimes lead to confusing results and put off investors – take, for example, Nabucco.

This regulation also establishes, and gives a defined role to, the European Network of Transmission System Operators for Electricity (ENTSO), which will be in charge of drafting the network codes to be submitted to the Agency, as well as developing coordinated mechanisms for emergency situations such as the European Union-wide blackouts we have suffered in the recent past.

I would like to finish by thanking all the technical staff, whose work has enabled us to obtain an agreement which, at the very beginning of the negotiations, we at times lost faith in reaching.

2-079

**Antonio Mussa, relatore.** – Signor Presidente, cari colleghi, ringrazio la presidenza ceca, la Commissione, il presidente della commissione energia ed industria on. Niebler e i colleghi relatori di questo pacchetto energia, i relatori ombra, il segretariato della commissione con tutti i suoi funzionari per la collaborazione e la competenza dimostrata in questo dossier.

Possiamo e dobbiamo essere tutti orgogliosi del risultato raggiunto; lo sono io, pensando allo sforzo compiuto quando ho ereditato la direttiva relativa al mercato interno del gas, con delle problematiche di non facile soluzione. Sono lieto di aver fatto coincidere questa mia seconda esperienza di deputato europeo con la fase conclusiva di questo pacchetto, che reputo tra i dossier più importanti di questa legislatura, in favore dei cittadini europei nostri elettori.

La direttiva *gas* che entrerà in vigore a partire dal 2011, apporta delle novità significative nel settore: bisogna sottolineare come risultato importante il raggiungimento dell'opzione ITO, che garantisce l'apertura dei mercati ed una reale progressione verso un sistema che permetta veramente all'Unione europea di parlare a una sola voce in materia di energia. L'ITO è la vera novità di questo pacchetto ed è quella sulla quale si può dire che il Parlamento europeo abbia avuto il miglior risultato.

La nuova direttiva *gas* dà molta importanza alle *authority* per il gas ed all'agenzia. Questa direttiva legittima le *authority* nel loro ruolo, in particolare in quei paesi ove devono cominciare l'attività ex novo. Pertanto è di fondamentale importanza aver disegnato il ruolo e le competenze di questi organi, aver dato loro ampi poteri, poiché tocca alle *authority* il difficile compito di controllare il mercato energetico comune.

Un altro tassello, che in fase di trilogia è stato inserito, è l'esenzione dalle regole comuni dei cosiddetti sistemi chiusi, vale a dire aeroporti, ospedali, stazioni, siti industriali, ecc., per le loro particolari peculiarità sono sottoposti ad un regime più favorevole e questo a dimostrazione dell'attenzione che la nuova direttiva dà alle esigenze del cittadino europeo.

Proprio il cittadino europeo è, a mio avviso, colui che sarà realmente avvantaggiato da questa direttiva, poiché con l'utilizzo dei contatori intelligenti avrà accesso a tutte le informazioni relative alla bolletta e potrà valutare la migliore offerta sul mercato e scegliere il proprio fornitore a seconda della convenienza, perché se pur vero che per vedere gli effetti di questa liberalizzazione dovranno passare anni, comunque è innegabile che l'entrata di nuovi operatori sul mercato porterà ad un abbassamento dei prezzi e a delle condizioni di mercato più favorevoli ai cittadini dell'Unione.

Altro elemento importante è il riconoscimento di sistemi di reti europee di trasmissione che permetterà la sicurezza dell'approvvigionamento del gas ai cittadini europei. Tutto ciò passa anche attraverso il rinforzo e la creazione di nuove infrastrutture come i rigassificatori e le sedi di stoccaggio che saranno il motore del terzo pacchetto. Pertanto si richiede l'apertura di un mercato competitivo che garantisca gli investimenti e i contratti a lungo termine da parte delle aziende del settore, in particolare nei nuovi paesi membri dove le creazioni di nuove infrastrutture permetterebbero anche di risolvere problemi di dipendenza secolare.

Si è tenuta in considerazione la protezione del consumatore più debole dando la possibilità all'*authority* nazionale e regionale di garantirgli l'approvvigionamento del gas nei momenti più critici. Il felice risultato della direttiva sul gas di tutto il pacchetto energia mette ancora una volta in evidenza il ruolo dell'Europa e delle sue istituzioni per i cittadini europei.

2-080

**Атанас Папаризов, докладчик.** – Уважаема госпожо председател, уважаеми господин комисар, на първо място бих искал да изразя своето удовлетворение, че бе постигнато съгласие между Европейския парламент и Съвета по Третия енергиен пакет, включително по Регламента по условията за достъп до газопреносните мрежи, по който съм докладчик. Бих искал да отбележа приноса на чешкото председателство и активната подкрепа на Европейската комисия за намиране на общи решения.

В областта на достъпа до газопреносните мрежи, целите на Третия енергиен пакет са постигнати. Създадена е основата за изграждането на общ европейски енергиен пазар, основаващ се на правила, детайлно разписани в мрежови кодекси със задължителен характер. Увеличени са възможностите за развитие на регионалното сътрудничество, където наред с европейската мрежа на операторите на преносни системи и националните регулатори, съществена стимулираща роля ще има и Агенцията за сътрудничество между енергийните регулатори.

Значително се повишава сигурността на доставките и се стимулира изграждането на нова инфраструктура чрез разработването от европейската мрежа на операторите на десетгодишен мрежов инвестиционен план, чието изпълнение се контролира от националните регулатори и се наблюдава от Агенцията. Дава се възможност на всички участници на пазара чрез ясно разписани процедури да участват в разработването на мрежовите кодекси и да предлагат тяхното изменение, в случай че практиката покаже такава необходимост. Засилват се условия за конкуренция между доставчиците чрез по-стриктни правила относно информацията и прозрачността на дейността на преносните оператори.

Бих искал особено да благодаря на участниците в преговорите за подкрепата за предложенията, които направих по отношение на десетгодишния инвестиционен план и на развитието на регионалните инициативи за сътрудничество. Освен това съм удовлетворен, че в резултат на проведените преговори бе постигнат по-добър баланс между правомощията на европейската мрежа на операторите на преносни системи, на Агенцията за сътрудничество между националните регулатори и на Европейската комисия с цел осигуряване изграждането на функциониращ, ефективен и конкурентен пазар.

Специално бих искал да подчертая, че работата по петте законодателни акта от Третия енергиен пакет се осъществяваше в тясна взаимовръзка. Така бе създадена обща рамка, където отделните елементи се допълват и усилват един друг. Бих желал да отбележа значимия резултат от активната съвместна дейност с моите колеги докладчици - госпожа Eluned Morgan, господата Mussa, Vidal-Quadras и Chichester. Отправлям своите благодарности към докладчиците в сянка, които на всички етапи на преговорите допринасяха с конструктивни и много полезни предложения. Специално благодаря и на председателя на комисията ITRE и на неговия секретариат.

Уважаема госпожо председател, 2008 година започна с прекъсването на доставките на газ за България и Словения, с рязкото им намаляване за други страни от Централна и Източна Европа. Вярвам, че на основа на Третия енергиен пакет, неочакваните предложения от Европейската комисия за даване на ново съдържание на Директивата за сигурността на доставките на газ, както и чрез проектите за свързване на газопреносните мрежи, подкрепени от Плана за икономическо възстановяване, в края на 2008 година Европейският съюз ще бъде готов да противодейства с повече материални възможности и с по-голяма солидарност на евентуални нарушения на доставките. Постигнатите резултати ми дават основание да призова всички колеги да подкрепят на второ четене представения ви общ текст със Съвета.

2-081

**Ivo Belet, Rapporteur.** – De etikettering van energiezuinige autobanden zit hier vandaag een beetje vreemd geprangd tussen de elektriciteit en het gas. Niettemin gaat het over belangrijke en zeer tastbare maatregelen die voor alle consumenten, alle automobilisten, de meesten onder ons in Europa, rechtstreeks van belang zijn.

Het is een concrete ingreep die weinig of niets kost en die een wezenlijke bijdrage zal leveren tot het behalen van onze ambitieuze klimaatdoelstellingen. De band van een auto - ik weet niet of u dat weet - is verantwoordelijk voor 20 tot 30% van het totale brandstofverbruik van een auto. Het is dus logisch dat daar een enorm potentieel voor energie-efficiëntie en voor besparingen ligt.

Wat gaan wij concreet doen? Wij gaan alle autobestuurders, het gros van de bevolking dus, proberen ertoe te bewegen om voortaan aandacht te schenken aan de energiezuinigheid en de geluidsemissie van de banden. Wij verplichten niemand, we informeren enkel, zoals wij dat vandaag ook doen met ijskasten bijvoorbeeld, aan de hand van een duidelijk etiket, een label of een sticker. Wie wil er als consument nog met een B- of een C-band rondrijden als hij ook met een milieuvriendelijke A-versie kan rondrijden? Een A-versie die bovendien op termijn nog voordeliger is voor de portemonnee. Dat is pure winst, zoals dat heet, winst voor de consument en winst voor het milieu vooral.

Eén cijfer: uit de effectevaluatie blijkt een potentieel aan besparingen tot anderhalf miljoen ton CO<sub>2</sub>. Dit komt overeen met de verwijdering van de CO<sub>2</sub>-uitstoot van om en nabij één miljoen personenauto's op de Europese wegen. Als deze maatregel eenmaal op kruissnelheid is, betekent dit dat de CO<sub>2</sub>-uitstoot van één miljoen personenauto's wordt weggenomen. Dat is toch indrukwekkend!

Er is uiteraard ook winst voor de bandenfabrikanten zelf. Wij hebben uiteraard - dat is logisch - bij de totstandkoming van deze maatregel met de sector zelf overlegd. Het mag hier toch gezegd worden: het heeft geen zin om aan een sector die bijzonder zwaar te lijden heeft onder de crisis in de autosector, nieuwe regelgeving op te leggen als die extra geld kost en bureaucratische overlast met zich meebrengt. Dat zijn argumenten die hout snijden en die je niet zomaar aan de kant kunt schuiven. Deze etiketteringsrichtlijn is ook een goede zaak voor de fabrikanten van kwaliteitsautobanden. Daarom hechten wij zoveel belang aan de controle op de implementatie, die essentieel is voor het creëren van gelijke concurrentievoorwaarden, maar dan op hoog niveau.

Het spreekt voor zich dat de milieuvriendelijkheid nooit ten koste mag gaan van de veiligheid en daarom hebben wij ook in deze zin geamendeerd. Veiligheid blijft uiteraard criterium nummer één bij een autoband.

Nog een woord over het criterium geluidsemissie. Dat zit er ook in, dat weet u, omdat geluidsoverlast een van de grote ziektes van deze tijd is. Het is daarom een goede zaak, daarvan ben ik overtuigd, dat wij in dit verband een voorzichtig en haalbaar criterium hebben ingebouwd om ook de geluidsoverlast verder terug te dringen, maar zoals gezegd nooit ten koste van de veiligheid van de auto en de autoband.

Een laatste woord over de tijdslijn, de *timing*. Wij hebben hier volgens mij een ambitieus maar toch redelijk compromis bereikt. Wij rekenen er uiteraard op dat, zoals met de CO<sub>2</sub>-emissies van de auto's zelf, de constructeurs van de autobanden op dit terrein al veel vroeger met producten op de markt zullen komen die aan de milieuvriendelijkste normen zullen beantwoorden.

2-082

**Silvia-Adriana Țicău, Raportoare.** – Domnule comisar, stimați colegi, clădirile sunt responsabile de 40% din consumul de energie primară și de 40% din emisiile de gaze cu efect de seră. De aceea a întreprinde cu caracter de urgență măsuri pentru îmbunătățirea performanței energetice a clădirilor reprezintă calea cea mai sigură, mai rapidă și mai puțin costisitoare pentru reducerea emisiilor de gaze cu efect de seră. Creșterea performanței energetice a clădirilor prezintă însă și un potențial imens pentru redresarea economică a Uniunii, prin crearea a peste 250 000 de noi locuri de muncă, prin investițiile necesare pentru promovarea energiilor din surse regenerabile și a clădirilor eficiente din punct de vedere energetic și, nu în ultimul rând, prin îmbunătățirea calității vieții cetățenilor europeni, prin reducerea valorii facturilor pentru utilități.

Noua propunere a Comisiei, de modificare a directivei existente prevede eliminarea pragului de 1000 de m<sup>2</sup>, stabilirea unor cerințe minime de performanță energetică a clădirilor și un proces de convergență între cerințele minime stabilite la nivel național, promovarea clădirilor care produc local o cantitate de energie din surse regenerabile egală cu energia primară utilizată, finanțarea din surse publice doar a construcției de clădiri care respectă cerințele minime de performanță energetică.

Parlamentul a introdus modificări importante precum: extinderea scopului directivei pentru includerea sistemelor centralizate de încălzire și răcire, creșterea rolului și standardizarea formatului certificatelor de performanță energetică a clădirilor, stabilirea unei metodologii comune pentru stabilirea cerințelor minime de performanță energetică, implementarea în cazul instituțiilor publice a recomandărilor din certificatul de performanță energetică pe durata de valabilitate a acestuia, noi prevederi privind informarea consumatorilor, formarea auditorilor și a experților, precum și acordarea, începând din 2019, a autorizațiilor de construcție pentru clădirile care produc local energie din surse regenerabile, într-o cantitate cel puțin egală cu energia produsă din surse convenționale, precum și introducerea de noi prevederi privind inspecțiile la instalațiile de încălzire sau răcire.

Invit colegii ca în această săptămână să viziteze expoziția referitoare la acest tip de clădiri – Net zero building – care este prezentă în Parlamentul European, organizată împreună cu WWF.

Deși directiva privind performanța energetică a clădirilor există din 2002, implementarea sa în diferitele state membre nu este satisfăcătoare. Statele membre au identificat lipsa finanțării ca fiind principala barieră în calea bunei implementări a directivei. De aceea, Parlamentul European a propus finanțarea măsurilor privind performanța energetică a clădirilor din Fondul European de Dezvoltare Regională, crearea unui Fond European pentru Performanță Energetică a clădirilor și promovarea energiei din surse regenerabile prin contribuția BEI, a Comisiei Europene și a statelor membre, posibilitatea utilizării unui TVA redus pentru servicii și produse din domeniul eficienței energetice a clădirilor, dezvoltarea unor programe naționale care să sprijine creșterea eficienței energetice a clădirilor prin adoptarea unor instrumente financiare și a unor măsuri fiscale specifice.

Nu în ultimul rând, doresc să mulțumesc raportorilor din umbră, personalului tehnic din Comisia ITRE, precum și personalului PESC din Comisia ITRE cu care am lucrat în mod exemplar. Aștept cu interes observațiile colegilor.

2-083

**Andris Piebalgs, Member of the Commission.** – Madam President, it is not easy in five minutes to give the Commission response to seven excellent reports, but I should not miss this opportunity to thank all the rapporteurs – Mrs Morgan, Mrs Țicău, Mr Chichester, Mr Vidal-Quadras, Mr Mussa, Mr Paparizov and Mr Belet – and all the shadows. I also would like to thank Mrs Niebler who worked really hard to let us come to this report in a very limited amount of time.

I will start with the internal energy market because two years ago we started with an ambitious goal: to create a truly competitive and truly European energy market for the benefit of the citizens of the European Union. The tool to achieve this goal is the third internal energy market package for gas and electricity.



Today we are close to the adoption of this package and thus to achieving this goal. The trialogue has now succeeded in agreeing to the compromise. The Commission fully supports this compromise. If adopted tomorrow by plenary, it will give the European Union the clear regulatory framework needed to ensure a properly functioning internal market and to promote much-needed investment.

First, it will facilitate cross-border energy trade with the establishment of an agency for the cooperation of national energy regulators, with binding decision powers, to complement national regulators. This ensures the proper handling of cross-border cases and enables the European Union to develop a real European network.

Secondly, the new legislation will promote cross-border and regional collaboration and investment with a new European network for transmission system operators. EU grid operators will cooperate and develop network codes and security standards, as well as plan and coordinate the investments needed at EU level.

Thirdly, it will provide for more effective regulatory oversight from national regulators that will be much more independent and have all the necessary means.

Fourthly, it will ensure effective unbundling of the generation and transmission of energy so as to eliminate any conflict of interests, promote network investment and prevent discriminatory behaviour.

This legislation will also ensure greater transparency, thereby guaranteeing equal access to information, making pricing more transparent, increasing trust in the market, and helping to avoid any possible manipulation or any sort of manipulation of the market.

This is not just about a properly functioning internal market but more generally about ensuring that the EU can rise to the challenges we are facing in the field of energy: climate change, increased import dependency, security of supply, global competitiveness.

In particular, a functioning internal market is a key element of the EU's effort to tackle climate change. Without a competitive electricity market, an emissions trading scheme will never work properly, and our aims regarding renewable energy will not succeed.

The compromise reached also strikes a good balance between the positions of Parliament and the Council. The rapporteurs have already presented to you the key elements on which the political compromise reached strengthens the common position adopted by the Council in January 2009.

I would like to highlight a few key issues.

Parliament's call for stronger consumer protection and the fight against energy poverty is now enshrined in the legislative texts. Smart meters, allowing for consumers to be precisely informed of their consumption and promoting energy efficiency, are provided with a target of 80% of consumers to be reached by 2020. The powers and independence of national regulators have been strengthened, as well as the powers of the agency, and the rules on effective unbundling have been made more efficient.

Most importantly, we have also seen developments on the ground. A lot of companies have restructured their business and how they deal with networks and consumers. Today at the Hannover Messe, I saw that smart metering is making good progress and companies are taking these decisions on board.

Energy efficiency is definitely one of the key policies of the European energy policy. The building sector still has considerable potential to further improve its energy efficiency, at the same time creating new jobs and stimulating growth.

I warmly thank Parliament for its support for the Commission's proposal on the recast of the Energy Efficiency of Buildings Directive. The discussions and proposals demonstrate that Parliament shares the policy objectives and wishes to vigorously improve current performance. It is not an easy area, as there is a lot of subsidiarity, so we need to strike a good balance. The Directive provides a framework to upgrade the energy performance of the EU's buildings.

There is a lot of clarification, and this reinforces the effect of the directive, like the principles on the 'cost-optimal' method, requirements on control mechanisms and many definitions.

There is the issue of financing instruments that are very important for stimulating energy efficiency measures, but these need to be tackled in the appropriate legislation and initiatives. Consequently, the Buildings Directive is constrained in what it can do with respect to financial and fiscal issues.

Very efficient buildings, whether they are called low- or zero-energy buildings, or next-generation buildings, are a new feature introduced into the Directive by the Commission.

It is essential to make this provision ambitious but realistic, and with some flexibility given the EU's varied climate and economic conditions. Unified requirements like net zero-energy buildings would not exactly fulfil this requirement and would therefore be excessive.

Harmonisation is crucial for the internal market. I fully support Parliament's wish to have a single methodology for calculating cost-optimal levels of requirements. However, prescribing a common methodology for the energy performance calculation itself could be counter-productive, causing delays in the implementation of the Directive by several years due to the complexity of Member States' building codes.

This is therefore very complex and difficult legislation, but I very much rely on Parliament strengthening this legal instrument.

The rapporteur also spoke about tyres that can play a significant part in reducing road transport energy intensity and emissions. The combined impact of this proposal together with the type-approval legislation on tyres should bring around 5% fuel savings on the total EU fleet by 2020. This proposal will provide consumers with standardised information on fuel efficiency. It will also give information on wet grip, which is another essential parameter for tyres, and external rolling noise. By doing so, the label will pull the market towards better-performing tyres while avoiding improvements on one aspect being achieved at the costs of others.

The report which will be put to the vote this week will add some significant improvements to the initial proposal, such as the change from a Directive into a Regulation, which will reduce transposal costs and ensure that the same application date for the label applies to all. The inclusion of snow tyres within the scope of the label, with the adoption of a specific grading as soon as possible, will also benefit those driving in ice or snow conditions.

It is important that we find the best way of displaying the label. There is some discussion on this. We would very much like you to support our proposal to integrate the label on the stickers which are currently delivered with each tyre to indicate their dimension, load index etc.

I believe we have really made remarkable progress on the energy dossier during this legislation and, most importantly, it is supported by our citizens and by industry. Having been at the Hannover Messe, we have seen a huge drive from industry for energy efficiency, not only in the areas we have now legislated on, but also in other branches of industry such as different appliances used for end consumption and to produce tools for different types of industry.

Energy efficiency, energy and Europe: these are the key words for what we have achieved during this legislation. I would like to thank all those involved and particularly all Members of the European Parliament that supported this.

As a final word of apology, I could have another five minutes but I will use only one minute when I am given the floor for the second time. Thank you for letting me finish this speech.

2-084

**Rebecca Harms**, *Verfasserin der Stellungnahme des mitberatenden Ausschusses für Umweltfragen, Volksgesundheit und Lebensmittelsicherheit*. – Frau Präsidentin! Vielen Dank, Herr Piebalgs, für diese konzentrierte Rede. Ich glaube, dass man die Fortschritte am besten daran messen kann, was man sich zu Beginn der Debatte als Ziel gesetzt hat. Die Ausgangssituation erinnere ich als eine, in der unter anderem Neelie Kroes mit der Analyse kam, dass trotz mehrerer Liberalisierungspakete auf europäischer Ebene die Marktmacht von immer weniger *Playern* – großen Konzernen im Energiebereich – in immer mehr Staaten der Europäischen Union, also die Konzentration im Energiesektor, im Elektrizitätsbereich genau so wie im Gasbereich, zunimmt. Ich war deshalb sehr froh, dass zu Beginn der Debatte sowohl die Kommission als auch dann später das Europäische Parlament gesagt haben, dass das wirkungsvollste Instrument gegen diese Konzentration – gerade auch im Strombereich – die Trennung von Erzeugung und Netz ist.

Ich würde heute an dieser Stelle mit Ihnen die Wette eingehen, dass wir ohne diese Trennung – so wie Sie sie zuerst auch befürwortet haben – keinen wirklichen Schutz der Verbraucher vor willkürlichen Preisen auf dem Energiemarkt hinbekommen. Ich würde auch gerne mit Ihnen Wetten darüber abschließen, dass dieses Parlament in absehbarer Zeit über dieses Instrument neu diskutieren wird. Denn das, was wir jetzt beschließen, wird nicht ausreichen, diese Macht, diese Vormachtstellung einiger Energiekonzerne zu brechen. Es wird nicht ausreichen zu verhindern, dass trotz immer größerer Gewinne im Energiebereich die Strom- und Gaspreise immer weiter ansteigen. Es wird nicht ausreichen, tatsächlich für Transparenz und Verbraucherschutz zu sorgen, wie das hier von vielen Kollegen gutmeinend versprochen wird.

Ich muss anerkennen, dass hier von den Kollegen sehr hart gekämpft worden ist. Ich muss aber auch feststellen, dass die Konzerne und einige Mitgliedstaaten und nicht die weitschauenden europäischen Politiker sich an dieser Stelle

durchgesetzt haben. Ich hoffe, Sie nehmen die Wette an, und dann werden wir in vier Jahren über den nächsten Liberalisierungsschritt diskutieren und dann wirklich über die Entflechtung.

2-085

**Gunnar Hökmark, on behalf of the PPE-DE Group.** – Madam President, I would like to thank Mrs Morgan for her report on the electricity markets. As a shadow rapporteur it has been a pleasure to work together with her, and I think it is fair to say that we have been able to achieve a liberalisation of the energy markets. At least, we have made some important steps, and thereby we have opened up the market. I think it is fair to say that the report on electricity also played the lead in the process that we are discussing here today.

I think it is important to state that this is also in contrast to those in different countries who would like to have more protected borders regarding energy markets. We have a debate in Sweden in which there are those who would like to have some sort of protectionism regarding the export of electricity. But that would hinder and damage all the things that we can achieve by an open electricity market.

It is by opening up the markets that we can do something about climate change and can make the best use of renewables and nuclear power. We can also ensure that we have a good supply of energy all over the Union, binding countries and markets together. I think the steps we are taking with this energy market package should be seen as important ones. Although there are more steps to be taken, we have contributed to the energy security of Europe and to the fight against climate change.

2-086

**Edi Herczog, on behalf of the PSE Group.** – Madam President, the third energy package is about harnessing the sector with the aim of providing more security and transparency, as well as sustainable and affordable energy for all European citizens and enterprises. It is about facing the energy challenges in front of us. It is about reducing Member States' dependency on single outsource countries. It is about more customer and consumer satisfaction. It is about avoiding market distortions, especially between those countries which produce cheaply and those countries which wish to buy cheaply, which are not necessarily the same. It is about attracting investors in the field of energy.

The European Agency will have a key role to play and, as my colleague the rapporteur, Mr Chichester, has said, we have achieved a strong and independent agency and we have been able to increase the role of the European Parliament to satisfy those targets which I mentioned above. I think it was wonderful working together. Somehow it is a pity that we are ending this energy package.

2-087

**Anne Laperrouze, au nom du groupe ALDE.** – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Commissaire, chers collègues, en septembre 2007, la Commission européenne présentait son troisième paquet "énergie" relatif au fonctionnement du marché intérieur. Très vite, les débats se sont focalisés sur la question importante, mais non unique, de la séparation des activités de production et du transport d'énergie.

La question de la propriété des réseaux, insuffisamment traitée à mon sens en première lecture, semble avoir été prise plus au sérieux. La coexistence de différentes options, dont la fameuse troisième voie, renforcée et clarifiée, m'apparaît comme une bonne chose, ce qui est une évidence car j'étais coauteur de cet amendement.

Mais, fort heureusement, résumer ce troisième paquet à l'*ownership unbundling* serait une erreur. Les avancées sont réelles: plus de droits pour les consommateurs, plus de pouvoirs aux régulateurs, plus de coopération entre régulateurs, des plans d'investissement à dix ans, plus de transparence pour faciliter le développement des renouvelables, plus de coopération technique entre les opérateurs de réseaux, et aussi des outils pour mieux consommer, comme les compteurs intelligents.

C'est un nouveau pas vers la solidarité européenne. La clause "pays tiers", même si elle paraît moins sensationnelle que celle rédigée initialement par la Commission, indique explicitement qu'un État membre a le droit de refuser la certification d'un opérateur si cela met en péril la sécurité de son approvisionnement énergétique ou la sécurité d'approvisionnement d'un autre État membre.

Peut-être un regret concernant l'Agence de coopération des régulateurs de l'énergie; notre souhait aurait été de créer une agence forte, indépendante, et à même de prendre des décisions sans l'aval de notre organe. Nous nous sommes heurtés au fameux arrêt Meroni. Ne nous leurrions pas, la construction d'une véritable politique européenne de l'énergie nécessitera encore de nombreuses avancées, et notamment institutionnelles.

La sécurité de l'approvisionnement, la lutte contre le changement climatique, la régulation des marchés, tous ces objectifs devraient être poursuivis selon une approche pragmatique et non dogmatique.

Ce que les citoyens européens attendent, ce n'est pas l'application de théories économiques, mais des preuves concrètes que l'ouverture des marchés leur apporte des bénéfices: la liberté de choisir son fournisseur, des prix raisonnables, stables et prévisibles.

Merci à mes chers collègues, à notre cher commissaire et au Conseil pour ce travail constructif.

2-088

**Zbigniew Krzysztof Kuźmiuk**, w imieniu grupy UEN. – Pani Przewodnicząca! Panie Komisarzu! Zabierając głos w tej debacie w imieniu grupy UEN, chcę zwrócić uwagę na cztery kwestie.

Po pierwsze, należy pozytywnie ocenić rozwiązania zmierzające do oddzielenia działalności wytwórczej, obrotowej w zakresie energii elektrycznej i gazu od działalności przesyłowej. Powinno to pozwolić na konkurencję pomiędzy wytwórcami nośników energii, a tym samym obniżenie cen świadczonych usług.

Po drugie, ważne jest, że poszczególne kraje członkowskie, mając obowiązek wprowadzenia rozdzielania wytwarzania energii od jej przesyłania, mogą przyjąć jeden z trzech modeli tego rozwiązania: najdalej idący rozdział właścicielski, przekazanie zarządzania sieciami niezależnemu operatorowi systemu, wreszcie możliwość zachowania integralności wytwarzania i przesyłu energii, ale przy spełnianiu reguł zapewniających, że te dwie części przedsiębiorstwa będą jednak działać w praktyce niezależnie.

Po trzecie, na podkreślenie zasługują rozwiązania dotyczące wzmocnienia pozycji odbiorcy na rynku energii elektrycznej i gazu, szczególnie możliwość zmiany dostawcy nośników energii w ciągu maksymalnie trzech tygodni bez ponoszenia jakichkolwiek dodatkowych opłat.

Wreszcie po czwarte, na szczególną uwagę zasługują rozwiązania o charakterze socjalnym, zobowiązujące państwa członkowskie do świadczenia pomocy odbiorcom energii elektrycznej i gazu, których nie stać na zapłacenie rachunków.

2-089

**Claude Turmes**, on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group. – Madam President, first, on the Țicău report, the Greens will vote for it: it has a green mark, and I thank all the team who negotiated.

I want to spend the few seconds I have here on internal markets. It is already clear this evening that we need a fourth package on liberalisation, with five items: firstly, ownership unbundling for pipelines and grids; secondly, access to storage of electricity and of gas; thirdly, more power for the EU Agency for the Cooperation of Energy Regulators; fourthly, public ownership of the power exchanges, because otherwise it will never function; and fifthly, we need a specific cartel law for infrastructure-based economies.

Although Eluned Morgan has fought hard for the consumers, consumers can only gain when the wholesale market is functioning. Enel is taking over Endesa, RWE is taking over Nuon and Vattenfall is taking over Essent. We will end up with 10 mega-players who do not have any interest in either an environmental agenda or a consumer agenda. This will be a cartel, and to face this cartel we need stricter laws. In this sense we have a defeat this evening, orchestrated by Mr Reul, Ms Niebler and others of their like. It is a big victory for the energy oligopolies and it is a defeat for consumers in Europe.

2-090

**Vladimír Remek**, za skupinu GUE/NGL. – Vážený přítomní, v omezeném čase není možné se věnovat celému tzv. energetickému balíčku. Přesto chci v první řadě poděkovat všem těm, kteří se zasloužili o vznik materiálů, které máme na stole. Buďme ale realisty. Výsledek má k dokonalosti ještě daleko. Nicméně si myslím, že v dané chvíli nebylo možné dosáhnout více. Určitě to ovlivnil i fakt, že se chýlí ke konci mandát současného Parlamentu. Osobně se chci vyjádřit především k materiálu o zřízení Agentury pro spolupráci energetických regulačních orgánů předkládanému kolegou Chichesterem. Jako stínový zpravodaj jsem se mimo jiné zasazoval o to, aby agentura přispěla k vytváření regionálních trhů. Zatím nebylo možné naplnit ambici, která by byla ještě prospěšnější. Tou by byl vznik nadnárodního celoevropského regulátora.

Prosazoval jsem také potvrzení původního návrhu Komise, aby byl při rozhodování v Radě regulátorů zachován princip jeden člen, jeden hlas. To je velice důležité pro malé členské země Unie. Snaha především velkých států, jako je Německo a Francie, prosadit tzv. vážený poměr hlasů by malé země znevýhodňovala. Kupříkladu České republice, ale i dalším zemím zachování principu umožní lépe čelit snahám některých velkých provozovatelů přenosových sítí o dominanci. V tomto směru jsem rád, že moje úsilí nebylo marné, a považuji to i za úspěch českého předsednictví.

Ne všechno ohledně Agentury pro spolupráci regulátorů se podařilo dotáhnout do konce. Otevřená je například stále otázka sídla. Osobně by se mi líbilo, kdyby agentura byla na Slovensku, které o ni má zájem. Nejnešťastnějším řešením by však byla tzv. dočasná varianta a agentura by zůstala v Bruselu. Tam už je jich – i jako výsledek původní dočasnosti – až dost.

2-091

**Jim Allister (NI).** – Madam President, from time to time I have heard the single electricity market on the island of Ireland held up as an example of such concepts in action. Judged by what matters most to consumers – namely price – I have to say it is not a success. When Minister Dodds launched it, he promised efficiency savings and enhanced competition to help minimise the wholesale costs of electricity, with the vast bulk of the benefits going to the consumer. This rings rather hollow now, not least to the consumers from Northern Ireland who are in the public gallery listening to this debate.

In my view, part of the problem is an ineffective regulatory process that is too aligned to the industry and too excusing of continuing high prices, even when the price of oil has radically fallen. Forward buying at the top of the market, giving sky-high prices today, barely raises a whimper from the regulator, leaving hard-pressed consumers without the relief that he should be providing.

2-092

**Herbert Reul (PPE-DE).** – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Kommissar, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Wir waren uns einig, dass wir dafür sorgen wollen, dass die Menschen ein höheres Maß an Versorgungssicherheit bei Energie bekommen, dass sie ausreichend Energie haben, dass sie Energie zu günstigen Preisen kaufen können. Wir waren uns nicht einig in der Frage, mit welchen Instrumenten man das am besten erreichen kann.

Wir haben aber heute ein Ergebnis vorliegen, das sich sehen lassen kann, das gut ist, das differenziert ist, denn die Fragestellung ist eben auch kompliziert, und eine einfache Antwort gibt es nicht. Die Lösung heißt: Wir müssen dafür sorgen, dass im Energiebereich mehr investiert wird, in Netze, in Interkonnektoren, in neue Kraftwerke. Das ist eine ganz wichtige Fragestellung, und dafür muss auch das nötige Kapital zur Verfügung gestellt werden.

Umgekehrt müssen wir dafür sorgen, dass diejenigen, die Energie anbieten, kontrolliert werden und dass wirklich Wettbewerb hergestellt wird. Ich glaube, dass es die richtige Lösung war, bei der Organisation der Unternehmen differenzierte Modelle zuzulassen und andererseits eine starke Kontrolle sicherzustellen, eine starke Agentur, eine starke Zusammenarbeit der Regulierungsbehörden, und dafür zu sorgen, dass nicht jeder machen kann, was er will. Dass aber durchaus differenzierte Angebote – auch nach besonderen nationalen Gegebenheiten – gemacht werden, ist eine kluge Lösung. Wenn sie richtig genutzt wird, ist sie auch eine, die zukunftsfähig sein kann und die uns ein wesentliches Stück voran bringt. Übrigens – auch das ist ja die Wahrheit – konnte man während unseres Prozesses, während der Diskussion in den Mitgliedstaaten durchaus schon beobachten, wie Veränderungen stattfanden. Es ist ja heute nicht mehr so wie zu Beginn der Umfrage, die die Kommission durchgeführt hat. Die Daten und Fakten sind heute schon viel vielfältiger, und wir sind schon ein wesentliches Stück weiter, aber das, was wir jetzt beschließen, bringt uns noch weiter.

2-093

**Norbert Glante (PSE).** – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Kommissar, sehr verehrte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Ich habe schon einmal in einer kleineren Runde gesagt, dass diese Debatte über das Energiepaket nicht unbedingt eine Frage von schwarz oder rot, links oder rechts war. Sie war allerdings ideologiebehaftet. Das haben wir heute wieder gesehen. Ich würde meiner Kollegin aus Deutschland, Frau Harms, gerne anbieten, die Wette anzunehmen, dass wir in vier Jahren nicht ein viertes Paket auf den Tisch legen, sondern dass wir mit den Instrumenten, die wir haben, zurechtkommen: den Markt regulieren, die Netze zugänglicher machen, so wie es in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland schon gelungen ist. Man kann sich positive Beispiele ja mal anschauen. Ich bin dafür, dass wir einfach die Füße stillhalten und die Instrumente nutzen, die uns gegeben sind, und schauen, dass sie umgesetzt werden.

Zweitens möchte ich dafür plädieren, dass die neu gegründete Agentur der Regulierer maßgebliche Kompetenz bekommt, durchgreift und die *best practice* aus den Mitgliedstaaten zur Anwendung bringt. Wenn das geschieht, ist mir nicht bange, dass wir ein gutes Ergebnis erzielen werden.

2-094

**Leopold Józef Rutowicz (UEN).** – Pani Przewodnicząca! Debata dotycząca pakietu energetycznego dla rynku wewnętrznego energii elektrycznej i gazu jest potrzebna. Regulacje, aby dobrze funkcjonowały, powinny mieć odpowiedź m.in. na następujące pytania: czy w perspektywie w Unii ma powstać jeden wspólny rynek energii czy należy koordynować rynki krajowe? Jaki rodzaj energii w perspektywie trzydziestu lat zabezpieczy stabilne i wystarczające jej dostawy po względnie niskich cenach, co jest istotne dla gospodarki Unii i obywateli? Jakie źródła energii będą najlepiej ograniczały efekt cieplarniany i zmniejszą koszty jej ograniczenia?

Niestety dotychczas podejmowane działania w tym zakresie nie są przejrzyste i przekonywujące, co może spowodować złe skutki dla obywateli i gospodarki w perspektywie piętnastu lat.

2-095

**Jerzy Buzek (PPE-DE).** – Pani Przewodnicząca! Trzeci pakiet energetyczny miał za zadanie służyć klientom przede wszystkim na naszym kontynencie. I to się udało – klient jest najważniejszy, ale trzeba byłoby uwzględnić też podstawowe interesy producentów i wytwórców energii. Mieliśmy przed sobą dwa najważniejsze zadania.

Po pierwsze: bezpieczeństwo dostaw. I to się udało. Moim zdaniem, w porównaniu z pierwszym i drugim pakietem, nastąpił naprawdę znaczący postęp. Tworzenie wspólnego rynku energii staje się faktem, zasada solidarności jest dzisiaj oczywista. Możemy także, gdy wymaga tego nasze bezpieczeństwo, inwestować poza granicami Unii

Po drugie: zasada otwartej konkurencji na europejskim rynku energetycznym. To się nie w pełni udało i może trzeba myśleć o kolejnych, bardziej konkretnych rozwiązaniach. Od zaraz musimy jednak zadbać o to, aby dla inwestorów z krajów trzecich warunki na europejskim rynku były takie same, jak dla inwestorów z krajów Unii, a nie lepsze. I żeby nasze koncerny energetyczne na zasadzie wzajemności mogły konkurować i swobodnie inwestować poza granicami Unii.

Chciałem podkreślić, że trzeci pakiet to poważne wydarzenie polityczne, a nie tylko techniczne i gospodarcze. I naprawdę należy uznać go za wielki sukces Unii Europejskiej.

2-096

**Hannes Swoboda (PSE).** – Frau Präsidentin! Ich glaube, dass hier – ich war Schattenberichterstatter meiner Fraktion für den Gassektor – ein Kompromiss gefunden worden ist, der aber auch in den anderen Bereichen ein Kompromiss ist, dem wir zustimmen können. Deswegen, weil man nicht ideologisch nach dem Markt gesucht hat, sondern praktisch. Ein gemeinsamer europäischer Markt heißt vor allem, dass wir den nationalen Regulatoren mehr Möglichkeiten geben, mehr Macht geben, dass wir die Kriterien gemeinsam europäisch erarbeiten, so dass nicht ein Regulator ganz anders entscheidet und der eine von der Regierung abhängig ist und der andere nicht, und dass wir eine europäische Agentur haben, die in Zusammenarbeit mit der Kommission wirklich danach trachten kann, dass sich ein europäischer Markt bildet.

Das zweite Element, das sehr wesentlich ist, besteht darin, dass die Konsumentenrolle gestärkt wird. Das ist in mehreren Bestimmungen – ich hätte es mir noch mehr gewünscht – im Grundsatz hier enthalten. Es geht darum, dass die Konsumentinnen und Konsumenten bei diesem wichtigen Versorgungsbereich auch Möglichkeiten und Rechte haben und Transparenz erleben können. Diese beiden Bedingungen sind erfüllt, und daher stimme ich diesem Paket zu.

2-097

**Inese Vaidere (UEN).** – Godātais komisāra kungs un kolēģi! Pagājušā ziema spilgti parādīja, cik ļoti esam atkarīgi no gāzes importa un kā šī atkarība tiek izmantota kā ārpolitikas instruments. Tāpēc īpaši vēlos uzsvērt nepieciešamību pēc iespējas ātrāk izveidot Eiropas Savienībā vienotu, atvērtu un efektīvu dabasgāzes iekšējo tirgu, izstrādājot tīkla kodeksu, lai nodrošinātu pārredzamu piekļuvi pārrobežu pārvades tīkliem, lai būtu iespējama ilgtermiņa plānošana un attīstība. Ilgtermiņa plānā jāiekļauj gan gāzes pārvades tīkli, gan reģionālie starpsavienojumi. Ir jāpilnveido noteikumi, kas nodrošina nediskriminējošu piekļuvi infrastruktūrai. Vienlaikus īpaši uzsvēršu enerģijas avotu diversifikācijas nepieciešamību, izstrādājot reālus stimulus atjaunīgo avotu plašākai ieviešanai. Tā kā ēkas rada 40 % no Eiropas Savienības kopējā energopatēriņa, to energoefektivitātei, ekonomijai, siltināšanai, uzsvaram uz atjaunīgo energoresursu izmantošanu ir pirmšķirīga nozīme. Eiropas Savienības, valsts un pašvaldību pasākumi, kā arī finanšu stimuli ir jāaslēdz vienotā sistēmā. Paldies!

2-098

**Ján Hudacký (PPE-DE).** – Prv než pristúpim k niektorým aspektom tejto správy, dovoľte mi poďakovať sa spravodajkyni pani Ťicau a ďalším tieňovým spravodajcom za korektnú spoluprácu na formovaní tejto správy.

Mojím záujmom, ako aj záujmom mojej politickej skupiny bolo, aby táto správa predstavovala dobrý predpoklad pre skorú finálnu dohodu medzi Európskou komisiou, Európskou radou a Parlamentom v prospech pragmatických opatrení na zlepšenie situácie v oblasti energetickej účinnosti budov v jednotlivých členských štátoch.

V tejto súvislosti musím povedať, že som bol kritický k niektorým návrhom, ktoré predstavujú zbytočné byrokratické opatrenia a taktiež príliš ambiciózne záväzné ciele pre jednotlivé členské krajiny a ktoré v konečnom dôsledku by predstavovali vážne bariéry praktickej realizácie nevyhnutných projektov. Významným aspektom tejto správy je dohoda na jednotnej harmonizovanej metodológii pre kalkuláciu nákladovo optimálnej energetickej účinnosti, na základe ktorej členské štáty budú stanovovať ich minimálne štandardy, pričom sa budú rešpektovať aj regionálne klimatické rozdiely.

Nakoniec by som sa chcel zmieniť aj o aspektoch finančnej podpory, ktorá je nevyhnutná pre realizáciu opatrení na zvyšovanie energetickej účinnosti v jednotlivých členských štátoch. Súhlasím s návrhom, ktorý uvažuje o etablovaní európskeho fondu v spolupráci s Európskou investičnou bankou, ktorý by vytváral podmienky na generovanie finančných zdrojov na tvorbu národných alebo regionálnych fondov prostredníctvom tzv. pákového efektu. Oceňujem tiež návrh, ktorý by mal stimulovať k lepšiemu využívaniu štrukturálnych fondov pre zlepšenie energetickej účinnosti v jednotlivých členských krajinách.

Na záver mi dovoľte zdôrazniť veľmi dôležitý fakt, ktorý sa týka skorého dôsledného uvádzania opatrení ohľadom zlepšovania energetickej účinnosti v jednotlivých členských krajinách. Oživenie sektora energetickej účinnosti budov okrem výrazného zníženia....

*(Predseda prerušil rečníka.)*

2-099

**Reino Paasilinna (PSE).** – Arvoisa puhemies, kiitän erityisesti mietinnön esittelijöitä, jotka tuossa keskustelevat. Tämä on tärkeä vaihe, jossa me nyt olemme. Me olemme oikealla tiellä, vaikka kuten sanottu, mikään ei tänä päivänä riitä. Meillä on paljon työtä edessä.

Älykkäät mittarit, energiajärjestelmän on oltava toimiva, sen on oltava avoin ja kilpailun on oltava todellista. Nämä ovat niitä sanoja, joita me pidämme tärkeinä, kuten myös kuluttajan oikeuksia. Energiaköyhyys on muodostunut merkittäväksi asiaksi. Energian hinta kallistuu, se on kallis hyödyke, ja tämän vuoksi ihmisten oikeudet on turvattava. Siksi energiasta tehdään tässä lakikokonaisuudessa julkista palvelua, mikä osoittaa oman ryhmäni – sosiaalidemokraattien – kannalta sen, että me puolustamme kuluttajien etua ja näin ollen teemme markkinoista mahdollisimman läpinäkyvät. Jatkakaamme tällä tiellä eteenpäin, kiitoksia.

*(Suosionosoituksia)*

2-100

**Neena Gill (PSE).** – Madam President, from the beginning of our negotiations on the Belet report we found that all the stakeholders – from the tyre manufacturers to the environmental lobbyists – were broadly in agreement on the need for this legislation. I would like to congratulate the rapporteur on the way he has dealt with this particular report and the way he has worked with the shadows.

I believe this legislation is needed right now. It will give a boost to the car industry at what is a very difficult time. I recently visited Michelin in Stoke and Jaguar Land Rover factories in my constituency, where I saw how research and development into green technology is already very much in place. Any support the industry receives during the downturn must focus on the requirements to adapt to the environmental challenge.

Legislation such as this will ensure our manufacturers become world leaders in the technology we so urgently need. It is a win-win proposal, because it will also help the consumer by providing much-needed clarity. Tyres are not cheap, yet most individual buyers are forced into uniform purchases. This information will help make the move towards goods that reduce emissions as well as noise pollution. Through this proposal we can promote a truly competitive market in greener goods.

2-101

**Dragoș Florin David (PPE-DE).** – Domnule comisar, primul avantaj de care vor beneficia cetățenii în noul scenariu de tip piață liberă își are rădăcinile în chiar chintesența conceptului de democrație. Mă refer la libertate. Piețele funcționale în care nou-veniți au oportunitatea de a pune la dispoziția cetățenilor servicii energetice vor reprezenta o alternativă benefică pentru consumatori. Astfel, din beneficiari pasivi ai unui serviciu, ei vor deveni jucători activi pe piață. Vor putea să își schimbe furnizorul dacă serviciile sunt de proastă calitate, dacă există întreruperi în alimentarea cu energie electrică sau dacă prețurile sunt prea mari. Libertatea de a alege va permite consumatorilor să participe activ la lupta împotriva schimbărilor climatice, de vreme ce vor putea să aleagă furnizori care oferă energie regenerabilă sau cu emisie mică de carbon. Noul pachet de măsuri va aduce cu sine prețuri mai mici, produse inovatoare și o calitate crescută a serviciilor. Un alt mod prin care cetățenii vor beneficia de pe urma liberalizării sectorului energetic este securitatea aprovizionării cu energie. Salut introducerea în noua legislație a măsurii speciale de protecție a consumatorilor vulnerabili.

2-102

**Romana Jordan Cizelj (PPE-DE).** – Prav je, da je Evropski parlament postavil v središče svojih pogajanj potrošnika, kajti notranji trg potrebuje potrošnika z več pravicami, potrošnika z jasnimi informacijami. Potrošnik mora imeti možnost izbire ponudnika storitev in zato potrebuje tudi pametne števece.

Zadovoljna sem, da smo dosegli sporazum o tem obsežnem in strokovno zahtevnem sveznju. Vendar pa menim, da izpogajani kompromis na področju ločevanja lastništva še vedno dopušča velike organizacijske razlike na trgu elektrike in plina med državami članicami. In upam, da bodo mehanizmi in določila, ki so v tem paketu, kot na primer večja neodvisnost nacionalnih regulatorjev, uspešni pri preseganju teh razlik in pri vzpostavljanju enotnega trga z elektriko in plinom.

2-103

**Czesław Adam Siekierski (PPE-DE).** – Pani Przewodnicząca! Dla powodzenia przedsięwzięcia, jakim jest utworzenie jednolitej przestrzeni energetycznej, konieczne są wspólne i skoordynowane inwestycje w infrastrukturę energetyczną. Kluczowym zadaniem jest zwiększenie mocy wytwórczych europejskich elektrowni oraz rozwój sieci transgranicznych. Równocześnie należy mieć na uwadze dobro środowiska naturalnego i założenia pakietu klimatyczno-energetycznego. Kolejnym wyzwaniem, jakie pojawia się przy okazji ujednolicenia unijnego rynku energii, jest kwestia zapewnienia bezpieczeństwa dostaw surowców energetycznych z zewnątrz.

Ze względów ekonomicznych, jak również z uwagi na bezpieczeństwo należy dążyć do dywersyfikacji dostaw oraz zwiększyć wysiłki na rzecz rozwoju energetyki europejskiej. Wreszcie sprawa ostatnia: istnieje obawa, że całkowite otwarcie rynku energii na konkurencję może stanowić zagrożenie dla najbiedniejszej ludności Unii, której często nie stać

na regularne opłacenie rachunków. Warto w tym miejscu rozważyć możliwe instrumenty na rzecz zagwarantowania, że takie osoby nie zostaną pozbawione prądu.

2-104

**Илияна Малинова Йотова (PSE).** – Госпожо председател, бях докладчик в сянка за газовия пазар от страна на Комисията за вътрешен пазар и защита на потребителите. Вярвам всички ще се съгласите, че най-голямото постижение по отношение на Третия енергиен пакет е защитата на европейските потребители и граждани. За първи път такива текстове бяха ясно записани. Искам да обърна специално внимание върху определението за енергийна бедност и невъзможността за прекъсване на доставките, за възможността безплатно да се сменят доставчиците, за леснодостъпните и прозрачни договори. Бъдещето на това законодателство, обаче, е в още по-големите гаранции за потребителите, защитни мерки за уязвимите хора, по-голяма прозрачност и сравнимост на договорните отношения. Следващия основен въпрос пред нас европейските депутати ще бъде за цените и мерките за тяхната регулация в условията на все по-голямото им покачване. Вярвам, че това законодателство ще продължи напред в тази посока.

2-105

**Paul Rübiger (PPE-DE).** – Frau Präsidentin, sehr geehrter Herr Kommissar! Ich möchte Ihnen vor allem zu diesem Paket gratulieren. Es ist ein großer Fortschritt für unsere Bürgerinnen und Bürger in Europa. Sie werden es alle in der eigenen Geldbörse, auf dem eigenen Konto spüren. Es ist ein großer Fortschritt auch für die kleinen und mittleren Betriebe, weil die gerade jetzt in Zeiten der Wirtschafts- und Finanzkrise wettbewerbsfähiger werden müssen, und hier ein derartiges Energiepaket der richtige Ansatz ist.

Auch dass wir einen europäischen Regulator bekommen, der den eigenen Betrieben hilft, in den anderen 26 Mitgliedstaaten auf gleicher Ebene behandelt zu werden, dass also die Energieversorger in den anderen 26 Märkten neue Chancen bekommen, ist ein wesentliches Merkmal dieser Regulierung, so dass hier völlig neue Chancen entstehen.

Ferner zur Gesetzgebung über Passivhäuser, über Aktivhäuser: Dass wir mit unserer Gebäudeeffizienz sorgfältig umgehen, lässt für die Zukunft hoffen, dass auch hier neue Arbeitsplätze entstehen.

2-106

**Presidente.** – L'onorevole Stolojan, visto che lei è stato così presente in questa discussione, anche se le avevo detto che ha superato il numero, penso che la sua responsabilità e la sua presenza debbano essere premiati, quindi in via eccezionale le do la parola per un minuto.

2-107

**Theodor Dumitru Stolojan (PPE-DE).** – Doamnă președintă, aș dori să felicit pe toți raportorii pentru excelenta treabă făcută și sigur că ne întrebăm cu toții de ce nu avem încă o piață comună pentru energia electrică și o piață comună pentru gazele naturale și cred că aici fiecare stat membru care încă nu a îndeplinit prevederile directivelor europene ar trebui să o facă.

În al doilea rând salut decizia de înființare a Agenției de Cooperare a Autorităților de Reglementare în Domeniul Energiei și doresc să informez Parlamentul European că România și-a depus candidatura pentru a oferi găzduire acestei agenții.

2-108

**Andris Piebalgs, Member of the Commission.** – Madam President, I promise that this will be very short. I am satisfied with the package that is to be adopted. There is no ideal legislation. This is legislation that is being adopted by debate and through compromises. We started very much divided, but at the end of the day the Council adopted the proposal practically with unanimity.

In Parliament's Committee on Industry, Energy and Research there was a huge majority in favour of this compromise. That means that we have got it right.

I know that now there is a lot of work to do in terms of implementation, follow-up and the Agency's needs, but we really have provided the basic instruments for our citizens.

Thank you very much for the work done. We can be really proud of it.

2-109

**Eluned Morgan, rapporteur.** – Mr President, I would like to thank colleagues once again for their cooperation. I would also like to thank Bethan Roberts and René Tammist who have been a great help in preparing this report.

This is my swan song after 15 years in the European Parliament, and I am delighted that we have made such a significant improvement in the energy markets on behalf of the European public. It is far from perfect but it is definitely a step forward.



I think that the energy crisis will become more acute in future years, so getting the right market framework in place, and creating the right kind of incentives for the right kind of investment, is crucial. We need an estimated EUR 1 trillion worth of investment in the markets to stop the lights from going out in future.

But there is a huge amount more to do. You know that there are 12 countries in the European Union where one company dominates 70% of the electricity market. What we have at the moment is the worst of both worlds. We think we have competition, but what we have is the massive power of very large companies dominating certain markets. It will require action on the part of national regulatory authorities and competition authorities to make sure that we do not continue in this way.

The real challenge in future will be implementation. Let us not forget that there are many EU laws that already exist in the energy markets, and it is precisely because these laws were not being respected that the revision of this law needed to take place. Whether we need a fourth package or not will depend on the Commission ensuring implementation and good policing of these new laws by national regulatory authorities and competition authorities. So let us see a bit of action from the Commission, and also from the national regulatory authorities.

2-110

**Giles Chichester, rapporteur.** – Madam President, can I first of all say that my colleague Mr Vidal-Quadras sends his apologies? He is not able to take up his slot. He has urgent business elsewhere, but he asked me to say – which was very nice of him – that the two of us agree that I will speak on behalf of our group.

I would like to pick up one or two points that have come up in the debate. The first is the colleague who expressed concern that we will end up with a concentration of power in very few utilities. Should that happen, the Commission possesses powers under the competition rules to address that, and we have precedent in other parts of the world, including the United States, where they have tackled entrenched monopoly or dominant market power. So that is the ultimate resort, should this legislation fail.

Should we come back for a fourth package? I have to remind the Commissioner that I urged upon him caution in embarking upon the third package: that it would be better to wait and see what the second package achieved once it was implemented. I think now we must allow time for this package to be transposed: to implement it and see how it works before deciding whether anything is needed.

I have to say that my disappointment about our lack of success in tackling ownership unbundling is offset by my optimism about the possibility of the Agency imaginatively using the powers that we have given it to deal with the situation, and I would like to thank my other colleague who demands more power for the energy regulators.

Market forces are already moving in this direction. Two German utilities are divesting themselves of their transmission systems because they have realised there is better value in doing that.

Finally, could I restate the case for competition? It means better value and service for consumers, and it means a more efficient use of resources. That is why it is a good thing to do.

2-111

**Antonio Mussa, relatore.** – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, da questa discussione congiunta è emerso un sentimento molto forte: la grossa soddisfazione di aver creato con il terzo pacchetto ITRE, un pacchetto importante per i cittadini europei. Effettivamente non sarà l'ultimo, perché – voi sapete – c'è una grossa spinta all'utilizzo di altre fonti di energia, quelle rinnovabili e quelle nucleari, ma sicuramente serve in questi 10-15-20 anni a sopperire la fame e il bisogno di energia e prevedere, e ovviamente proteggere, i consumatori e specialmente quelli più deboli.

Credo che l'on. Morgan, il sottoscritto e tutti gli altri onorevoli, abbiamo giocato molto questo ruolo nella difesa del consumatore debole, dando una grossa forza all'*authority* sia nazionale che regionale, che può, in momenti di criticità, modificare, non dico dare gratuitamente l'energia, ma sicuramente modificare e permettere un approvvigionamento continuo di questa energia.

L'altro punto fondamentale è questo: che su tutto ciò che noi abbiamo fatto, la Commissione, il Consiglio, il Parlamento, su questo pacchetto che è fondamentale per i consumatori di energia – l'avete visto in questo inverno cosa è successo – però la popolazione europea non è a conoscenza. Io penso, che non c'è nulla di più grave, di non far sapere a chi viene beneficiato da un grosso lavoro senza informarlo. Io penso, che il compito che dovrà spettare alla Commissione, al Consiglio e al Parlamento, prima ancora di preoccuparsi di applicare questo pacchetto, è far sapere ai consumatori che esiste questo pacchetto, quello che è stato fatto per loro, in loro funzione e per loro ancora.

2-112

**Atanas Paporizov, rapporteur.** – Madam President, like my colleagues I would like to say that, although it is not perfect, the third energy package is a very good basis for developing our common market, especially in gas, and for enhancing gas security.

For countries like mine, which is a small country in the European Union, to reach a compromise on ownership unbundling is very important, because it gives us an assurance that we can still ensure our energy security within the context of the whole package of the enhanced rules, transparency, the third-country clause, and all the other components of the package that will give us the opportunity to put the issue of energy security at the forefront.

The package also gives an assurance to consumers that they can pursue their rights, and it creates a better competitive framework for the development of the energy markets and for their efficient functioning. This package depends on implementation, as my colleague Eluned Morgan has just said, and I do not believe that the fourth package is the solution. Rather, the solution is exact implementation and solidarity among Member States in creating the market, especially by developing new initiatives for regional cooperation, especially for countries most vulnerable to energy supplies and to countries that, for the moment, are part of energy islands.

2-113

**Ivo Belet, Rapporteur.** – Over de etikettering van energiezuinige autobanden, een maatregel die ook in dit pakket is beland. Graag nog een woord over de kosten. Het gaat om een maatregel die de bandenindustrie en dus ook de consument eigenlijk bijna niets kost. Voor de fabrikanten zijn de kosten begroot op minder dan 1 eurocent per autoband en dat is dus verwaarloosbaar voor wie daarop kritiek zou hebben. De eventuele meerkosten van energiezuinige autobanden voor de consument zullen volgens berekeningen na acht maanden zijn terugverdiend. Dan begint de winst voor de automobilist en voor het milieu.

Dit gezegd zijnde, wil ik nog even nader accentueren dat het essentieel is dat deze maatregel op gelijke wijze wordt toegepast in alle lidstaten en voor alle producenten binnen en buiten de EU. Daarom gaat onze voorkeur ook uit naar een verordening in plaats van naar een richtlijn.

Nog één puntje ter afsluiting: wij beseffen dat op een aantal punten nog uiteenlopende meningen tussen een aantal fracties in dit Parlement bestaan, maar wij hopen toch dat wij deze maatregel morgen met een grote meerderheid zullen goedkeuren. Op kruissnelheid zullen wij met deze eenvoudige ingreep een besparing op de CO<sub>2</sub>-uitstoot realiseren die gelijkstaat met het van de weg halen van één miljoen personenauto's. Het spreekt derhalve voor zich dat wij hiermee eerder vroeg dan laat moeten beginnen.

Tot slot een woord van dank aan de schaduwcollega's, aan Alix Chambris van de Europese Commissie en aan Alfredo Sousa Pinto van de EVP-Fractie, voor de prima samenwerking.

2-114

**Silvia-Adriana Țicău, Raportoare.** – Stimați colegi, propunerea de modificare a directivei privind eficiența energetică a clădirilor este una dintre cele mai importante măsuri pe care Parlamentul le-a adoptat, atât pentru creșterea calității vieții cetățenilor europeni, cât și pentru redresarea economică a Uniunii. Cetățenii europeni așteaptă acțiuni și soluții concrete la problemele și nevoile foarte concrete pe care aceștia le au.

Personal, consider că o creștere de până la 15% a cotei din Fondul European de Dezvoltare Regională ce poate fi utilizată de către statele membre pentru finanțarea performanței energetice a locuințelor este o necesitate. Aceasta ar da statelor membre o mai mare flexibilitate și posibilitatea de a folosi revizuirea la mijloc de termen de anul viitor privind modul de utilizare a fondurilor structurale pentru ca acestea să își redefiniească în mod corespunzător programele operaționale în scopul unei mai bune absorbții a fondurilor structurale.

Doresc să subliniez că această directivă are un potențial foarte mare pentru crearea de noi locuri de muncă: aproximativ 500 000 de locuri de muncă ar putea fi create la nivel european cu implicații majore pe piața regională sau națională a forței de muncă.

Domnule comisar, sper să susțineți în continuare inclusiv introducerea unei cote minime din Fondul European de Dezvoltare, pe viitor cel puțin, pentru eficiența energetică a clădirilor. Mulțumesc încă o dată raportorilor din umbră, personalului din Comisia ITRE și, de asemenea, colegilor raportori care ne-au sprijinit și cu care am avut o colaborare excelentă.

2-115

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

La votazione si svolgerà mercoledì 22 aprile 2009.

La votazione sulla relazione di Silvia-Adriana Țicău si svolgerà giovedì 23 aprile 2009.

*Dichiarazioni scritte (articolo 142)*

2-116

**Adam Gierek (PSE), na piśmie.** – Jeszcze niedawno zamieszkanie w domu z wielkiej płyty stanowiło awans społeczny i cywilizacyjny dla wielu milionów ludzi. Tania energia sprzyjała temu, że nie przejmowano się kosztami ogrzewania.

Dzisiaj blisko 100 mln ludzi mieszka w budynkach z wielkiej płyty. Zwracam się do Komisji Europejskiej o szerokie wsparcie projektów modernizacji tych budynków i całych osiedli - zwłaszcza w Europie Środkowej i Wschodniej - środkami Unii Europejskiej. W ramach przeglądu śródokresowego ram finansowych na lata 2007-2013 powinny znaleźć się środki na ten cel. Dotychczasowy 3% limit środków w Funduszu Rozwoju Regionalnego na mieszkalnictwo to stanowczo zbyt mało.

Podjęcie na wielką skalę modernizacji i rewitalizacji budynków i całych osiedli z wielkiej płyty w UE obniży wydatki na ogrzewanie, podniesie standard zamieszkania, utworzy dziesiątki tysięcy nowych miejsc pracy i zmniejszy zużycie energii. Przełoży się to bezpośrednio na takie zmniejszenie emisji gazów cieplarnianych, które przybliży nam cel 3x20.

Wsparcie modernizacji istniejącego budownictwa z wielkiej płyty winno się stać jednym z zadań Parlamentu Europejskiego nowej kadencji. Popyt na tego rodzaju usługi może bowiem w dużym stopniu przyczynić się do zwalczania obecnego kryzysu gospodarczego i bezrobocia oraz do walki z ubóstwem.

2-116-500

**Louis Grech (PSE), in writing.** – Energy costs are growing at an alarming rate, contributing to a substantial increase in energy-related poverty across the EU. However, the market price of energy is only one side of the problem. There is a significant, additional financial burden on consumers due to energy market inefficiencies and distortions. For example, in Malta consumers and businesses saw an exorbitant increase in their energy bills when the price of oil was at its high, but there was no decrease even when the price of oil dropped more than half. What we need is an EU-wide policy to protect consumers and SMEs from pricing malpractices carried out by public utility companies. One solution may be a national independent regulator which would create the necessary checks and balances against any abusive or non transparent conduct by private traders and/or government owned entities in respect of any price increases on public utilities like gas, electricity, water, airport charges and others.

This should be implemented through improving the existing E.U. legislation and directives involving consumer protection especially to ensure :

- Better standard of transparency and rationality governing price increases as well as better access and information regarding consumer rights.
- Less costs and less bureaucracy for the consumer who has a genuine case in order to seek redress.

2-117

**András Gyürk (PPE-DE), írásban.** – Nagy jelentőséget tulajdonítunk annak, hogy az Európai Parlament immár második olvasatban is jóváhagyhatja a harmadik energetikai csomagot. Az új szabályozás élénkebb versenyt eredményezhet az uniós áram- és gázpiacon. A javaslat elfogadása előtt azonban nem mehetünk el szó nélkül amellett, hogy a végleges jogszabály sokat veszített ambíciójából a Bizottság eredeti előterjesztéséhez képest.

A csomag tárgyalása során a termelői és rendszerüzemeltetői tevékenységek szétválasztása váltotta ki a leghevesebb vitákat. Ennek végkimenetele alapjaiban befolyásolja az uniós energiapiac szerkezetét. Úgy vélem, hogy a tagállamok által kialakított kompromisszum nem eredményez majd átlátható szabályozást ezen a téren, hiszen a tagállamok három különböző szétválasztási modellt is alkalmazhatnak. Ennek következtében továbbra is jelentős különbségek tagolják majd az uniós energiapiacot.

Üdvözlendő ugyanakkor, hogy a tanácsi kompromisszum tükrözi a Parlament fogyasztóvédelemmel kapcsolatos számos javaslatát. A három héten belüli szolgáltatóváltás lehetősége, a részletesebb számlainformációk, vagy a kártérítési eljárások egységesítése az állampolgárok szélesebb köre számára teszi érzékelhetővé a piacnyitás előnyeit. Fontos fejlemény emellett, hogy az új szabályozás nehezebbé teszi a harmadik országok irányából érkező felvásárlási kísérleteket. Többek közt ennek is köszönhetően, az elfogadásra váró energetikai csomag egy fontos lépés a közös uniós energiapolitika megteremtése felé vezető úton.

2-118

**Zita Pleštinská (PPE-DE), písomne.** – Cena a spoľahlivosť dodávok energie sú kľúčovými faktormi nielen pre konkurencieschopnosť EÚ, ale hlavne pre blahobyť jej občanov. Z tohto dôvodu EP postavil vo svojom treťom energetickom baličku spotrebiteľa do stredu svojej pozornosti. Aby mal spotrebiteľ úžitok z tejto dôležitej legislatívy, EP zrevidoval a vylepšil smernicu o energetickej hospodárnosti budov, ktorá predstavuje okolo 40 % celkovej spotreby energie v EÚ.

Projektanti a stavební inšpektori dostanú prostredníctvom tejto smernice primerané usmernenia. Za veľmi dôležitú pokladám metodiku nákladovo optimálneho výpočtu a určenie minimálnych požiadaviek hospodárnosti konštrukčných

prvkov obvodového plášťa a technických systémov budov a ich uplatňovanie v nových i existujúcich budovách. Významným prvkom prepracovaného znenia smernice sú ciele pre budovy s nulovou čistou spotrebou energie.

Vítam vytvorenie Európskeho fondu pre energetickú účinnosť a energiu z obnoviteľných zdrojov na podporu vykonávania tejto smernice. Doteraz bolo povolené obmedzené využívanie štrukturálnych fondov na energetickú účinnosť budov iba v novej EÚ-12. Teraz sa táto možnosť rozšíri na všetky členské štáty. Zároveň sa zvýši maximálny podiel prostriedkov ERDF na takéto projekty z 3 % na 15 %.

Pre úspešné vykonávanie smernice je nevyhnutné, aby členské štáty konzultovali všetky aspekty vychádzajúce zo smernice so zástupcami miestnych a regionálnych orgánov a rovnako aj so združeniami na ochranu spotrebiteľa.

2-118-500

**Katrin Saks (PSE), kirjalikult.** – Tahaksin tänada raportööri, kes tegelesid energia paketi eelnõudega ja erilist tänu avaldada raportöör Morganile, kes tegi palju olulist tööd tarbijakaitse teemadega. Mul on eriti hea meel, et uus pakett pöörab tähelepanu ka energiavaesuse küsimusele. Liikmesriigid, kes seda ei ole veel teinud, sealhulgas minu koduriik Eesti, peaksid koostama energiavaesusega võitlemiseks riikliku tegevuskava, et vähendada energiavaesuse all kannatavate inimeste arvu. Eriti praegustes majandustingimustes on see väga vajalik. Eestis on tõsine vajadus selle küsimusega tegeleda, sest viimastel aastatel on küttearved oluliselt tõusnud. Otsetoetused vähemkindlustatud tarbijatele, nagu seda tehakse Suurbritannias on üks oluline meede, kuid võiks ka parandada elamute energiatõhusust, mis oleks eriti efektiivne just Eestis.

2-118-750

**Andrzej Jan Szejna (PSE), na piśmie.** – Przed Europą stoi wiele wyzwań związanych z popytą i popytem na energię w perspektywie krótko-, średnio- i długoterminowej.

Jako Wspólnota Europejska założyliśmy sobie bardzo ambitne zadanie. Zamierzamy do roku 2020 obniżyć emisję gazów cieplarnianych o 20%, a także zmniejszyć zużycie energii o 20%.

W związku z tym uważam, że należy zwrócić szczególną uwagę na kwestie charakterystyki energetycznej budynków, jako że odpowiadają one za aż 40% ogólnego zużycia energii.

Tym samym pragnę wyrazić swoje poparcie dla sprawozdawcy. Uważam, że powinniśmy zorganizować kampanię informacyjną mającą na celu uświadomienie obywateli o możliwości oszczędzania pieniędzy poprzez ocieplenie budynków, tym samym apelując do rządów we wszystkich krajach Wspólnoty o możliwe dofinansowanie tej inicjatywy. Powinniśmy sporządzić zbiór norm minimalnych jednakowych w całej Unii, dotyczących ocieplania budynków.

Popieram także rozszerzenie wykorzystywania funduszy strukturalnych na rzecz efektywności energetycznej budynków na wszystkie kraje Wspólnoty oraz zwiększenie kwoty alokacji z EFRR, która mogłaby zostać przeznaczona na realizację projektów w tym obszarze, z 3% do 15%.

2-119

## **18 - Modifica del regolamento (CE) n. 717/2007 (telefonia mobile) e della direttiva 2002/21/CE (comunicazioni elettroniche) (discussione)**

2-120

**Presidente.** – L'ordine del giorno reca la relazione di Adina-Ioana Vălean, a nome della commissione per l'industria, la ricerca e l'energia, sulla proposta di regolamento del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio che modifica il regolamento (CE) n. 717/2007 relativo al roaming sulle reti mobili pubbliche all'interno della Comunità e la direttiva 2002/21/CE che istituisce un quadro normativo comune per le reti ed i servizi di comunicazione elettronica (COM(2008)0580 - C6-0333/2008 - 2008/0187(COD)) (A6-0138/2009).

2-121

**Adina-Ioana Vălean, Raportoare.** – Doamnă președintă, doamnă comisar Reding, stimați colegi, se întâmplă rar ca un liberal să promoveze intervenția pe piață prin reglementarea prețurilor, fie și doar prin fixarea de limită maximă. Totuși, în cazul tarifelor de telefonie mobilă în roaming, acest lucru este necesar și nu poate fi realizat decât colectiv, la nivelul Uniunii Europene. Este necesar pentru că tarifele excesive ridică obstacole practice în calea liberei circulații și în calea comunicării între cetățenii europeni. Eliminarea acestor obstacole reprezintă unul dintre obiectivele fundamentale ale Uniunii Europene și unul dintre obiectivele mele personale ca parlamentar european. De aceea am preluat responsabilitatea de a fi raportor pentru acest regulament, dar și pentru raportul Parlamentului European adoptat la începutul lunii cu referire la barierele administrative și juridice ridicate de statele membre în calea liberei circulații a cetățenilor europeni.

Prezentul regulament este necesar pentru micul întreprinzător aflat în vizită de afaceri care trebuie să comunice cu colaboratorii de acasă pentru a rezolva o problemă. Este important pentru jurnalistul care trimite prin email o știre direct de la locul evenimentului, este important pentru tânărul care trimite un mesaj-text iubitei sale, este important pentru lucrătorul din străinătate care dorește să audă la telefon vocea copiilor săi. Toți acești cetățeni europeni au plătit și încă plătesc adesea

de trei sau patru ori mai multe pentru a folosi telefonul mobil, doar pentru că se află la câțiva kilometri de propria țară, chiar în interiorul spațiului comunitar.

Prin intermediul regulamentului pe care îl vom adopta mâine, prețurile excesive vor fi eliminate. Limitele maxime fixate de regulament permit încă operatorilor să obțină o marjă de profit importantă și să concureze oferind prețuri mai scăzute. Avem în față o problemă complexă legată de fragmentarea și de funcționarea pieței de telefonie mobilă în Europa.

Atunci când consumatorul își alege operatorul de telefonie mobilă, se uită în primul rând la tarifele naționale sau la prețul oferit pentru un nou model de telefon mobil, dar analizează mai puțin tarifele de roaming. Dacă trece frontiera într-un alt stat al Uniunii este supus acestor tarife, chiar și atunci când doar primește un apel. Consumatorul nu poate decât să aleagă să nu comunice cu telefonul mobil. Concurența dintre operatori nu funcționează din acest punct de vedere. La rândul lui, operatorul din țara de origine trebuie să îl plătească pe operatorul din rețeaua vizitată pentru a purta semnalul.

Unele țări, cum ar fi destinațiile turistice primesc mulți vizitatori într-o perioadă scurtă de timp, altele dimpotrivă, au mai mulți cetățeni care pleacă în străinătate, cererea și oferta sunt astfel dezechilibrate și de aici rezultă tarife de *gross* ridicate și între operatori. În plus, în unele țări costul instalării și operării rețelelor de telefonie mobilă este mai ridicat, de asemenea, operatorii mai mici sau cei nou intrați pe piață au arătat că sunt adesea supuși la prețuri discriminatorii din partea operatorilor mari paneuropeni. Până la urmă, tot consumatorii sunt cei care plătesc.

Regulamentul pe care îl vom adopta mâine este o soluție pe termen scurt. Nu putem reglementa prețurile la nesfârșit, deoarece acest lucru afectează inovarea și poate afecta competitivitatea. De aceea, regulamentul prevede obligația pentru Comisia Europeană de a analiza diverse alte mijloace de reglementare a pieței. O parte din aceste mijloace sunt sugerate chiar de regulament: peste doi, trei ani vom putea dezbate mai multe opțiuni, având la dispoziția noastră mai multe informații. Sper că atunci vom putea să realizăm un cadru legislativ pentru a avea tarife de roaming competitive pe termen lung.

În afară de acest aspect, Parlamentul a îmbunătățit regulamentul, în opinia mea, din mai multe puncte de vedere. Am redus până la 50 de cenți pe megabyte tarifele maxime de *gross* pentru transferul de date în roaming pentru a încuraja utilizarea acestui serviciu și concurența corectă în domeniu. Am sporit transparența în ceea ce privește comunicarea către clienți a tarifelor pentru accesarea Internetului pe mobil în roaming, am flexibilizat considerabil prevederile menite să limiteze la 50 de euro facturile lunare pentru transferul de date în roaming, pentru cei care doresc acest lucru. SMS-urile cu tarif de roaming ce se transmit odată ce consumatorul intră într-o rețea străină vor conține și o referire la numărul unic de urgență 112, am redus tarifele maxime pentru apelurile primite și efectuate, păstrând o marjă de profit pentru operatori, am interzis operatorilor care încă mai practică acest lucru să taxeze clienții aflați în străinătate pentru simplul fapt că cineva le lasă un mesaj vocal.

În încheiere, aș dori să mulțumesc colegilor din celelalte grupuri politice, doamnei comisar Reding și colaboratorilor săi, doamnei ambasador Reinisova, reprezentanților președinției cehe și franceze, Consiliului, precum și colaboratorilor noștri din Parlamentul European, pentru eforturile depuse într-o perioadă scurtă de timp, astfel încât în această vară milioane de cetățeni să se bucure de tarife corecte în roaming.

2-122

**Viviane Reding**, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, I could not agree more with the rapporteur, whom I would like to congratulate on the swift and efficient work done.

We are facing here an obstacle to freedom of movement because, if you punish citizens on their phone bill when they cross a border, that is frankly not the internal market we strive for and that we wish to construct. So in order to give this freedom of movement to our citizens we have to get rid of those obstacles. Those obstacles concern a lot of people. There are roughly 150 million citizens in the European Union who use their mobile phone at least once per year for roaming while they are abroad, and they have to pay the price. It is the students, the travellers and the holidaymakers, but it is also the cross-border workers, the journalists and the businesspeople who are handicapped because of very high charges for communication.

That is why I thank the European Parliament for having so swiftly responded to the Commission's proposal. I think we have managed to get a proposal put into practice in the shortest ever time in the European Union – only seven months from proposal to implementation. That is a first of its kind, and it is a first of its kind in the interests of the European consumers.

I would just like to say a few words about what the first roaming package has achieved. On voice roaming it has achieved a 60% lower price for the citizen and 30% more traffic for the industry. The industry has also – and this is interesting – seen a steady rise in the penetration rate of the mobile phones used by citizens. We now have an average penetration rate in Europe of 119%. That is an absolute world record and, with the prices for roaming going down, that allows freedom to those citizens who utilise their mobile phone. It also gives good money to the industry because their traffic is rising continuously. At the same time, national prices are going down. Since the Barroso Commission took things in hand,

domestic prices for mobile communication have decreased by roughly 35%. That is as an answer to those who say that, if we bring down the cost of roaming, national prices go up. That is not the case. The statistics show just the contrary.

Now we are going a step further: firstly, of course, on voice roaming. I think it is very good that we are continuing to bring down the caps so that the competition of the offers can take place under the caps. It is very important that we add to this SMS roaming, because every year in the European Union 2.5 billion text messages are sent. The value of the revenue from this for the industry is roughly EUR 800 million. Now, who is sending the SMSs? Mainly our young people: 77% of young people up to the age of 24 use text messages when they are abroad because it is easier and cheaper for them. So they are punished when they have to pay an extraordinarily high price with regard to the cost to the operator when they are roaming. Good: we are bringing those prices down so that text messaging will become a normal thing if you are at home or if you are in a neighbouring country. So consumers will greatly benefit from this. The reduction – which will be voted by Parliament tomorrow – means 60% for text messaging. Concerning the per-second billing for roaming calls: simply said, do not make the people pay for what they have not utilised, only make them pay for what they have really utilised. We will also bring today's hidden charge of 24% down, so that you pay only for what you have really consumed. And for data roaming, where we believe that this is a future development.

But, whilst we want to have a future development so that you can download, wherever you are, a film, a newspaper article or a photograph to send to your friends, today you have shocking bills. I have received copies of bills where people have been in another country for three or four days and have to pay several thousands of euros just because they have downloaded their favourite television show or newspaper articles, which they are used to utilising. This will stop now, also because in the new regulation there will be a cut-off limit facility which, on 1 July 2010, will become a default limit to apply automatically in order to protect our consumers.

So it is a great day for Europe and a great day for European consumers. Thank you to Parliament, which has acted very swiftly. I think the people outside will understand that this Parliament works for the citizen.

2-123

### PRZEWODNICZY: MAREK SIWIEC

*Wiceprzewodniczący*

2-124

**Syed Kamall**, *rapporteur for the opinion of the Committee on the Internal Market and Consumer Protection*. – Mr President, can I start off by first of all thanking the Committee on the Internal Market's shadow rapporteurs from all the groups, their staff and advisers? I think that in the Internal Market Committee we can all be proud that we have reached a consensus on increased transparency and ways to finally eliminate the problem of bill shock. Bill shock was not good for the reputation of the mobile operators but more importantly, bill shock was not good for consumers.

However, when it comes to price capping, I still have some concerns. We need to ask which consumers will benefit from the Soviet economics of price caps. Given that at most only 35% of consumers actually roam and that the figure for regular roamers is much lower and, as the Commissioner herself admitted, given that this legislation will mostly benefit a narrow group of privileged consumers such as Commission officials, MEPs, lobbyists and businessmen, let us hope that we are not robbing the poor to pay for cheaper phone calls for the rich.

2-125

**Μανώλης Μαυρομμάτης**, *Εισηγητής της γνωμοδότησης της Επιτροπής Πολιτισμού και Παιδείας*. – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, κυρία Επίτροπε, αγαπητοί συνάδελφοι, κατ' αρχάς θα ήθελα να συγχαρώ τόσο την εισηγήτρια κ. Vălean, όσο και τον εισηγητή του πρώτου κανονισμού για την περιαγωγή, κ. Rübig, για την εξαιρετική συνεργασία που είχαμε στην Επιτροπή Πολιτισμού, όπου ήμουν και γνωμοδότης, πάνω σ' ένα θέμα που ενδιαφέρει βεβαίως, 150 εκατομύρια καταναλωτές, αλλά και τη βιομηχανία τηλεπικοινωνιών.

Μετά την επιτυχή εφαρμογή του πρώτου κανονισμού πριν από δύο χρόνια, το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο καλείται να υιοθετήσει την αναθεώρησή του που θα καλύπτει τις τιμές των γραπτών μηνυμάτων και των δεδομένων.

Προσωπικά, θα ήθελα να σταθώ στα οφέλη του νέου κανονισμού, ιδίως για όσους ταξιδεύουν για επαγγελματικούς λόγους. Οι επαγγελματίες των μέσων ενημέρωσης για παράδειγμα, χρησιμοποιούν σε μεγάλο βαθμό τη λειτουργία 'τηλεφόρτωσης' αρχείων που λαμβάνουν στο κινητό τους τηλέφωνο.

Η αναθεώρηση του κανονισμού αποτελεί δικλείδα ασφαλείας κατά των υπερβολικών και ανεξέλεγκτων χρεώσεων που έως τώρα υπέβαλαν οι εταιρείες κινητής τηλεφωνίας, όπως είπε και η κυρία Επίτροπος. Για το λόγο αυτό θεωρώ, ότι η υπερπήφιση της έκθεσης θα αποτελέσει ακόμη μια νίκη του Κοινοβουλίου υπέρ της προστασίας των καταναλωτών και θα είναι ένα ακόμη μεγάλο βήμα που θα δώσει νέα πνοή στην εσωτερική αγορά.

Τέλος, λόγω συναίνεσης μεταξύ των θεσμών, ελπίζω και εύχομαι, κυρία Επίτροπε, ο κανονισμός να τεθεί σε ισχύ από το καλοκαίρι, έτσι ώστε οι ταξιδιώτες να προστατευθούν από τις ενδεχόμενες αδιαφανείς υποχρεώσεις και υπερχρεώσεις των εταιρειών.

2-126

**Paul Rübig, im Namen der PPE-DE-Fraktion.** – Herr Präsident, danke! Ich möchte vor allem der Berichtsteratterin Vălean gratulieren, aber auch Frau Kommissarin Reding, die sehr engagiert die Roaming II-Regelung verhandelt hat. Ich glaube, dass durch dieses Verhandeln und natürlich auch die Zielrichtung, die nationalen Preise und die Preise, die wir in den anderen europäischen Ländern zahlen, auf ein Niveau zu bringen, ein wesentlicher Schritt erreicht wurde.

Es ist auch gut, dass die nationalen Regulierungsbehörden jetzt noch zusätzlich für das Roaming zuständig sind und damit Kontroll- und Monitoringfunktionen übernehmen, die uns ganz einfach mehr Transparenz bringen. Transparenz ist das Wichtigste für das Funktionieren eines Marktes. Bis jetzt hat es in vielen Bereichen mangelnde Transparenz gegeben, aber auch klar und deutlich Marktmissbrauch.

Wenn im Datenroaming oft bis zum Tausendfachen mehr verlangt wurde, dann ist das nicht korrekt. Auch die Sekundenabrechnung bei eingehenden Gesprächen wird in Zukunft einen deutlichen Fortschritt und Kostenvorteile für Europas Bürgerinnen und Bürger bringen.

2-127

**David Hammerstein, en nombre del Grupo Verts/ALE.** – Señor Presidente, cuando el mercado no funciona hay que intervenir. Hemos vuelto a romper un tabú: el mercado libre no es sagrado y, menos aún en tiempos de crisis, cuando el bolsillo del consumidor europeo sufre más que nunca.

Con este acuerdo destinado a establecer unos límites a los abusivos precios de las llamadas y de los SMS en «roaming», gana el consumidor, gana la comunicación entre los países europeos y gana la Europa útil y positiva.

La factura de teléfono de millones de europeos podría bajar o, al contrario, al costar sólo once céntimos el SMS, uno podría estar tecleando todo el día y acabar gastando igual.

Especialmente positivas son las medidas de transferencia que consiguen unos cobros por segundo a partir de los treinta segundos. Los precios máximos para los SMS y para el envío de datos podían haber sido algo más bajos, pero, en aras de un acuerdo, hemos llegado a esta transacción.

Gracias Comisaria Redding, gracias señora Vălean, gracias a los ponentes de todos los grupos, porque hemos dado un ejemplo feliz de la acción de la Unión Europea durante estos tiempos de crisis.

2-128

**Przewodniczący.** – Jest to *happy end* bardzo ważny również przed wyborami. W ramach procedury „Zgłoszenia z sali” proszę panią posel Țicău.

2-129

**Silvia-Adriana Țicău (PSE).** – Domnule președinte, doamnă comisar, doresc să felicit colegii pentru munca și pentru raportul efectuat, da, Parlamentul European lucrează în interesul cetățenilor europeni și îmi aduc aminte că la dezbaterile anterioare de acum doi ani privind reducerea tarifelor pentru telefonie mobilă în sistem roaming era o foarte mare dezbateră. Mă bucur că acum nu au mai fost puncte de vedere divergente, ci cu toții am adoptat rapid această reducere de tarife. Vreau să apreciez ca fiind deosebit de importantă reducerea în continuare și mai mult a tarifelor existente pentru telefonie mobilă, atât pentru apeluri în ieșire, cât și pentru cele primite, dar mai ales reducerea tarifelor pentru SMS-uri.

Într-adevăr, ne adresăm nu doar generației tinere, ci tuturor celor care călătoresc în Uniunea Europeană și într-adevăr această măsură este pe de o parte pentru protecția consumatorilor, dar în același timp este și un bun exemplu privind modul în care piața poate fi reglementată în interesul cetățenilor europeni.

2-130

**Czesław Adam Siekierski (PPE-DE).** – Panie Przewodniczący! Pani Komisarz! Telefon komórkowy i Internet stały się swoistymi symbolami mobilności i innowacyjności. Obywatele powinni mieć więc szeroki i łatwy dostęp do usług telekomunikacyjnych. Pomimo wielu apeli ze strony Pani Komisarz ceny sms-ów wysyłanych z innych państw wciąż są średnio znacznie droższe i znacznie przewyższają krajowe ceny tych usług. Należy dążyć do zmiany tej sytuacji. Wysoko oceniam działalność Komisji i Pani Komisarz w tym względzie.

Podobnie wygląda sprawa Internetu. Dlaczego korzystanie z tej usługi za pomocą telefonu komórkowego ma być luksusem? Wszyscy jesteśmy za zapewnieniem jak najszerszego dostępu do Internetu. Obniżenie cen transferu danych w roamingu na pewno się temu przysłuży. Ważne jest, że sprawa ta dotyczy w dużej mierze najmłodszej grupy naszego społeczeństwa.

2-131

**Bogusław Liberadzki (PSE).** – Pani Komisarz! Panie Przewodniczący! Wyrażam zadowolenie z kierunku, w jakim rozwijamy się, to znaczy z radykalnego obniżenia opłat (jest to krok pierwszy, myślę, że będą następne) za rozmowę, roaming, a także dostęp do Internetu. To są czynniki, które mogą spowodować przyspieszenie realizacji strategii lizbońskiej. Jest to ważne dla procesu edukacyjnego, dla młodego pokolenia. Ważne jest, że urządzenia sieciowe mogą być dostępne dla ludzi względnie biednych czy o niższym poziomie dochodów. Jest to dobry kierunek. Tę wiadomość nasze społeczeństwa na pewno przyjmą z zadowoleniem. Dziękuję za to Komisji.

2-132

**Alojz Peterle (PPE-DE).** – Iskrene čestitke gospe poročevalki in gospe komisarki. Pred nekaj leti sem vam, gospa komisarka, dejal, da ne bi bil rad kaznovan, kadar telefoniram v drugo državo. In nisem pričakoval, da se bo moje počutje kot potrošnika tako kmalu izboljšalo, s to direktivo še posebej.

Ta direktiva dokazuje, da se Evropska zveza s skupno politiko lahko približa državljanom tako, da to začutijo v žepih, kjer je občutek najboljši. Ta direktiva pomeni več Evrope, tudi več konkurenčnosti in enega gospodarstva, in je zame eden od ključnih dosežkov tega mandata Komisije in Parlamenta. Jaz si samo želim, da bi v tem duhu in s tako pozornostjo do potrošnikov nadaljevali tudi v naslednjem mandatu. Še enkrat čestitke in hvala lepa.

2-133

**Viviane Reding, Member of the Commission.** – Mr President, I should like principally to thank the Members who have done a wonderful job. First, of course, the rapporteur, Mrs Vălean, but also the rapporteurs of the other committees, the shadow rapporteurs and the spokespersons of the groups. They have made it possible, in just seven months, for a very important proposal for the free movement of citizens and the bringing down of excessive charges to become a reality. I think it is a great moment for the internal market. It is a great moment which shows to citizens that MEPs are taking them seriously.

If you would just permit, I would like nevertheless to say – with all due respect to Mr Kamall, for example – that when the market does not function, it is for the political leadership to intervene. I would like somebody here in this House to explain to me how the market can be said to be functioning when the cost to operators for transferring a text message from one country to another is less than 11 cents, while the average consumer has to pay more than 28 cents. Then something is not going well.

So if we now fix a cap of 11 cents I think there is ample room for manoeuvre; there is ample room for competition to develop. Like most of you in this Chamber I would have wished the market to have functioned, so that we did not need to do this. Well let us hope that we will not need to do so again in the future, and let us hope that after this decision the market really will function in the interests of the industry, in the interests of the citizen, in the interests of free movement, and in the interests of the internal market where every citizen can travel without being punished by a telephone bill.

2-134

**Adina-Ioana Vălean, Raportoare.** – Reducerea prețurilor la roaming este necesară, absolut, piața nu funcționează, de acord. Cum reglementăm este un lucru pe care încă putem să îl mai discutăm.

Propunerea Comisiei de stabilirea a unor tarife maxime este cea pe care o discutăm acum. Este cel mai bun instrument? Nu știm, dar este singura opțiune pe care o avem la dispoziție în acest moment. Sper ca în viitor să putem găsi metode alternative.

Un ultim cuvânt pe care aș dori să îl adresez referitor la industria din domeniu: nu trebuie să lăsăm să se înțeleagă că industria de telefonie mobilă este un exploatator nemilos al consumatorilor. O astfel de idee ar putea fi periculoasă pentru că industria este una de succes care se traduce în locuri de muncă, contribuții semnificative la bugete și inovație tehnologică. De aceea, cred că este important pentru noi, cei care reglementăm piața, să nu ne declarăm satisfăcuți pe deplin de munca noastră și să avem în vedere să o îmbunătățim pentru a obține efecte benefice pe termen lung.

Mulțumesc tuturor celor implicați în acest raport și sper să discutăm același lucru și cu un alt prilej.

2-135

**Przewodniczący.** – Zamykam debatę.

Głosowanie odbędzie się w środę, 22 kwietnia 2009 r.

2-136

## 19 - Absolutoria budżetowe 2007 (debata)

2-137

**Przewodniczący.** – Kolejnym punktem porządku dziennego jest wspólna debata nad



- sprawozdaniem sporządzonym przez Jean-Pierre'a Audy w imieniu Komisji Kontroli Budżetowej w sprawie udzielenia absolutorium z wykonania budżetu ogólnego Unii Europejskiej na rok budżetowy 2007 (SEC(2008)2359 – C6-0415/2008 – 2008/2186(DEC)) (A6-0168/2009),
- sprawozdaniem sporządzonym przez Bogusława Liberadzkiego w imieniu Komisji Kontroli Budżetowej w sprawie absolutorium z wykonania budżetu siódmego, ósmego i dziewiątego Europejskiego Funduszu Rozwoju na rok budżetowy 2007 (COM(2008)0490 – C6-0296/2008 – 2008/2109(DEC)) (A6-0159/2009),
- sprawozdaniem sporządzonym przez Paula Casakę w imieniu Komisji Kontroli Budżetowej w sprawie udzielenia absolutorium z wykonania budżetu ogólnego Unii Europejskiej na rok budżetowy 2007, sekcja I: Parlament Europejski (C6-0416/2008 – 2008/2276(DEC)) (A6-0184/2009),
- sprawozdaniem sporządzonym przez Søren Bo Søndergaard w imieniu Komisji Kontroli Budżetowej w sprawie udzielenia absolutorium z wykonania budżetu ogólnego Unii Europejskiej na rok budżetowy 2007, Sekcja IV - Trybunał Sprawiedliwości (C6-0418/2008 – 2008/2278(DEC)) (A6-0151/2009),
- sprawozdaniem sporządzonym przez Søren Bo Søndergaard w imieniu Komisji Kontroli Budżetowej w sprawie udzielenia absolutorium z wykonania budżetu ogólnego Unii Europejskiej na rok budżetowy 2007, Sekcja V - Trybunał Obrachunkowy (C6-0419/2008 – 2008/2279(DEC)) (A6-0152/2009),
- sprawozdaniem sporządzonym przez Søren Bo Søndergaard w imieniu Komisji Kontroli Budżetowej w sprawie udzielenia absolutorium z wykonania budżetu ogólnego Unii Europejskiej za rok budżetowy 2007, Sekcja 6 – Europejski Komitet Społeczno-Ekonomiczny (C6-0420/2008 – 2008/2280(DEC)) (A6-0155/2009),
- sprawozdaniem sporządzonym przez Søren Bo Søndergaard w imieniu Komisji Kontroli Budżetowej w sprawie udzielenia absolutorium z wykonania budżetu ogólnego Unii Europejskiej za rok budżetowy 2007, sekcja VII, Komitet Regionów (C6-0421/2008 – 2008/2281(DEC)) (A6-0153/2009),
- sprawozdaniem sporządzonym przez Søren Bo Søndergaard w imieniu Komisji Kontroli Budżetowej w sprawie udzielenia absolutorium z wykonania budżetu ogólnego Unii Europejskiej na rok budżetowy 2007, sekcja 8 – Europejski Rzecznik Praw Obywatelskich (C6-0423/2008 – 2008/2282(DEC)) (A6-0156/2009),
- sprawozdaniem sporządzonym przez Søren Bo Søndergaard w imieniu Komisji Kontroli Budżetowej w sprawie udzielenia absolutorium z wykonania budżetu ogólnego Unii Europejskiej za rok budżetowy 2007, sekcja IX – Europejski Inspektor Ochrony Danych (C6-0424/2008 – 2008/2283(DEC)) (A6-0154/2009),
- sprawozdaniem sporządzonym przez Christofera Fjellnera w imieniu Komisji Kontroli Budżetowej w sprawie absolutorium z wykonania budżetu Europejskiej Fundacji Kształcenia za rok budżetowy 2007 (C6-0437/2008 – 2008/2264(DEC)) (A6-0157/2009),
- sprawozdaniem sporządzonym przez Christofera Fjellnera w imieniu Komisji Kontroli Budżetowej w sprawie absolutorium z wykonania budżetu Europejskiej Agencji ds. Bezpieczeństwa Sieci i Informacji za rok budżetowy 2007 (C6-0442/2008 – 2008/2269(DEC)) (A6-0158/2009),
- sprawozdaniem sporządzonym przez Christofera Fjellnera w imieniu Komisji Kontroli Budżetowej w sprawie absolutorium z wykonania budżetu Europejskiego Kolegium Policyjnego za rok budżetowy 2007 (C6-0444/2008 – 2008/2271(DEC)) (A6-0160/2009),
- sprawozdaniem sporządzonym przez Christofera Fjellnera w imieniu Komisji Kontroli Budżetowej w sprawie absolutorium z wykonania budżetu Eurojust za rok budżetowy 2007 (C6-0436/2008 – 2008/2263(DEC)) (A6-0161/2009),
- sprawozdaniem sporządzonym przez Christofera Fjellnera w imieniu Komisji Kontroli Budżetowej w sprawie absolutorium z wykonania budżetu Europejskiej Agencji Leków za rok budżetowy 2007 (C6-0435/2008 – 2008/2262(DEC)) (A6-0162/2009),
- sprawozdaniem sporządzonym przez Christofera Fjellnera w imieniu Komisji Kontroli Budżetowej w sprawie absolutorium z wykonania budżetu Europejskiej Agencji Bezpieczeństwa Lotniczego za rok budżetowy 2007 (2008/2266(DEC)) (A6-0163/2009),
- sprawozdaniem sporządzonym przez Christofera Fjellnera w imieniu Komisji Kontroli Budżetowej w sprawie absolutorium z wykonania budżetu Organu Nadzoru Europejskiego GNSS za rok budżetowy 2007 (C6-0446/2008 – 2008/2273(DEC)) (A6-0164/2009),

- sprawozdaniem sporządzonym przez Christofera Fjellnera w imieniu Komisji Kontroli Budżetowej w sprawie absolutorium z wykonania budżetu Europejskiej Agencji Kolejowej za rok budżetowy 2007 (C6-0443/2008 – 2008/2270(DEC)) (A6-0165/2009),
- sprawozdaniem sporządzonym przez Christofera Fjellnera w imieniu Komisji Kontroli Budżetowej w sprawie absolutorium z wykonania budżetu Europejskiej Agencji Zarządzania Współpracą Operacyjną na Zewnętrznych Granicach Państw Członkowskich Unii Europejskiej za rok budżetowy 2007 (C6-0445/2008 – 2008/2272(DEC)) (A6-0166/2009),
- sprawozdaniem sporządzonym przez Christofera Fjellnera w imieniu Komisji Kontroli Budżetowej w sprawie absolutorium z wykonania budżetu Europejskiej Agencji ds. Bezpieczeństwa na Morzu za rok budżetowy 2007 (C6-0438/2008 – 2008/2265(DEC)) (A6-0167/2009),
- sprawozdaniem sporządzonym przez Christofera Fjellnera w imieniu Komisji Kontroli Budżetowej w sprawie absolutorium z wykonania budżetu Europejskiej Agencji Odbudowy za rok budżetowy 2007 (C6-0429/2008 – 2008/2256(DEC)) (A6-0169/2009),
- sprawozdaniem sporządzonym przez Christofera Fjellnera w imieniu Komisji Kontroli Budżetowej w sprawie absolutorium z wykonania budżetu Europejskiego Centrum ds. Zapobiegania i Kontroli Chorób za rok budżetowy 2007 (C6-0441/2008 – 2008/2268(DEC)) (A6-0170/2009),
- sprawozdaniem sporządzonym przez Christofera Fjellnera w imieniu Komisji Kontroli Budżetowej w sprawie absolutorium z wykonania budżetu Europejskiej Agencji Ochrony Środowiska za rok budżetowy 2007 (C6-0432/2008 – 2008/2259(DEC)) (A6-0171/2009),
- sprawozdaniem sporządzonym przez Christofera Fjellnera w imieniu Komisji Kontroli Budżetowej w sprawie absolutorium z wykonania budżetu Europejskiego Urzędu ds. Bezpieczeństwa Żywności za rok budżetowy 2007 (C6-0440/2008 – 2008/2267(DEC)) (A6-0172/2009),
- sprawozdaniem sporządzonym przez Christofera Fjellnera w imieniu Komisji Kontroli Budżetowej w sprawie absolutorium z wykonania budżetu Europejskiej Fundacji na rzecz Poprawy Warunków Życia i Pracy za rok budżetowy 2007 (C6-0428/2008 – 2008/2255(DEC)) (A6-0173/2009),
- sprawozdaniem sporządzonym przez Christofera Fjellnera w imieniu Komisji Kontroli Budżetowej w sprawie absolutorium z wykonania budżetu Europejskiej Agencji ds. Bezpieczeństwa i Ochrony Zdrowia w Miejscu Pracy za rok budżetowy 2007 (C6-0433/2008 – 2008/2260(DEC)) (A6-0174/2009),
- sprawozdaniem sporządzonym przez Christofera Fjellnera w imieniu Komisji Kontroli Budżetowej w sprawie absolutorium z wykonania budżetu Europejskiego Centrum Monitorowania Narkotyków i Narkomanii za rok budżetowy 2007 (C6-0431/2008 – 2008/2258(DEC)) (A6-0175/2009),
- sprawozdaniem sporządzonym przez Christofera Fjellnera w imieniu Komisji Kontroli Budżetowej w sprawie absolutorium z wykonania budżetu Agencji Praw Podstawowych Unii Europejskiej za rok budżetowy 2007 (C6-0430/2008 – 2008/2257(DEC)) (A6-0176/2009),
- sprawozdaniem sporządzonym przez Christofera Fjellnera w imieniu Komisji Kontroli Budżetowej w sprawie absolutorium z wykonania budżetu Europejskiego Centrum Rozwoju Kształcenia Zawodowego za rok budżetowy 2007 (C6-0427/2008 – 2008/2254(DEC)) (A6-0177/2009),
- sprawozdaniem sporządzonym przez Christofera Fjellnera w imieniu Komisji Kontroli Budżetowej w sprawie absolutorium z wykonania budżetu Centrum Tłumaczeń dla Organów Unii Europejskiej za rok budżetowy 2007 (C6-0434/2008 – 2008/2261(DEC)) (A6-0178/2009),
- sprawozdaniem sporządzonym przez Christofera Fjellnera w imieniu Komisji Kontroli Budżetowej w sprawie udzielenia absolutorium z wykonania budżetu Wspólnotowej Agencji Kontroli Rybołówstwa za rok budżetowy 2007 (C6-0447/2008 – 2008/2274(DEC)) (A6-0179/2009), oraz
- sprawozdaniem sporządzonym przez Christofera Fjellnera w imieniu Komisji Kontroli Budżetowej w sprawie zarządzania finansami i kontroli finansowej agencji UE (2008/2207(INI)) (A6-0148/2009).

l'exécution du budget de la Commission européenne et des agences exécutives pour 2007. J'associe à ces remerciements les services de l'administration.

Je voudrais également saluer l'immense travail réalisé par la Cour des comptes européenne sous la conduite de son président, Vítor Caldeira, avec des moyens limités face à l'ampleur de la tâche à accomplir.

Quelques mots sur le contexte de cette décharge. 2007 est la première année du nouveau cadre financier pluriannuel 2007-2013 où bon nombre de nouvelles règles ont été mises en œuvre. C'est également en 2007 la dernière procédure de décharge de l'actuelle Commission, qui, au début de son mandat, avait promis – vous vous en souvenez, Monsieur le Commissaire, par l'intermédiaire de votre président – d'obtenir une déclaration d'assurance positive de la part de la Cour des comptes européenne.

Or, depuis quatorze ans, la Cour délivre une déclaration négative sur la légalité et la régularité des opérations sous-jacentes de la très grande majorité des dépenses en les considérant, à des degrés divers, comme étant affectées de manière significative par des erreurs même si, et il faut s'en réjouir, les comptes consolidés et les dépenses administratives font l'objet d'une déclaration d'assurance positive.

Enfin, 2007 est le dernier vote de décharge avant les élections du Parlement européen. Dans ce contexte particulier, et au-delà des nombreuses réserves sur la gestion des fonds communautaires qui figurent dans le projet de résolution, j'ai voulu essayer, à travers mon rapport, d'analyser la procédure de décharge et d'apporter une contribution dans le difficile chemin qui doit nous conduire à une déclaration d'assurance positive, en étant bien conscients de la limite de l'exercice. Et c'est la raison pour laquelle je suis impatient de connaître la position de la Commission, des groupes politiques et de mes collègues parlementaires qui vont s'exprimer.

Au terme du travail accompli sur ce dossier, j'ai un sentiment mitigé entre la conviction que les choses s'améliorent, mais de manière insuffisante et trop lente, et le fait que, dans le même temps, il n'est pas tenable de rester dans une situation où, depuis quatorze ans, la Cour des comptes européenne ne donne pas d'assurance positive et où le Parlement européen vote quand même la décharge.

Le citoyen va finir par croire que le Parlement ne remplit pas correctement son rôle de contrôle. C'est pourquoi je propose, en raison de la gravité de la situation, d'organiser rapidement une conférence interinstitutionnelle qui impliquerait tous les acteurs concernés par la gestion et le contrôle des fonds communautaires, afin d'entamer une réflexion globale permettant d'envisager les réformes nécessaires à l'obtention d'une déclaration d'assurance positive le plus tôt possible. J'attends avec impatience les raisons qui poussent certains groupes politiques à s'opposer à cette réflexion.

Une attention particulière doit également être portée au rôle des États membres qui gèrent environ 80 % du budget de l'Union. Or, c'est dans cette gestion partagée que nous avons le plus de problèmes. À ce sujet, je regrette que le banc du Conseil soit vide, et les difficultés politiques actuelles de la République tchèque ne sont pas suffisantes pour expliquer qu'il n'y ait pas de continuité dans la présence politique du Conseil, sauf à interpréter cette absence et ce silence comme une indifférence, ou pire, un désintérêt.

Concernant le compte rendu de la gestion partagée par les États membres, j'insiste sur le rôle des déclarations de gestion nationale, mais également sur le rôle des résumés annuels d'audit qui sont autant d'éléments permettant d'aller vers une DAS positive.

Par ailleurs, et en application de l'article 248 du traité, je propose que soit accentuée la coopération entre les institutions de contrôle nationales et la Cour des comptes européenne pour le contrôle de la gestion partagée.

Je suggère que soit étudiée la délivrance, par les institutions de contrôle nationales en qualité d'auditeurs externes indépendants, et dans le respect des normes internationales d'audit, d'attestations nationales d'audit sur la gestion des fonds communautaires qui seraient remises aux gouvernements des États membres en vue de leur production au titre du processus de décharge selon une procédure interinstitutionnelle appropriée à mettre en place.

Je tiens, enfin, Monsieur le Président, à souligner mon étonnement quant au fait que les comptes annuels consolidés soient présentés avec des fonds propres négatifs à hauteur de 58 milliards d'euros, et je suggère d'étudier la création d'un fonds de pension pour externaliser les engagements de 33,5 milliards d'euros vis-à-vis du personnel.

Je conclus en estimant qu'il est temps de réformer notre système, et je pense sincèrement que cette réforme doit passer par un dialogue approfondi et sincère de tous les acteurs budgétaires.

niestandardowy region, niestandardowe państwa, niestandardowe problemy. W roku 2007 pod względem wykonania funduszu odnotowujemy wzrost płatności i wzrost zobowiązań, jednocześnie oznacza to także wzrost efektywności i jest to niewątpliwie punkt pozytywny. I od tego chciałbym zacząć.

Fundusz składał się z dwóch części: z części, którą zarządzała Komisja Europejska i części, która pozostała w gestii Europejskiego Banku Inwestycyjnego. Część, którą zarządzała Komisja Europejska, to część, której dotyczy właśnie dyskusja absolutoryjna, natomiast część, którą zarządza Europejski Bank Inwestycyjny, pozostaje póki co poza naszym zasięgiem. Do tej sprawy będę chciał powrócić.

Podstawą naszej debaty jest stanowisko Trybunału Obrachunkowego. Trybunał Obrachunkowy jasno stwierdził, iż obroty, zobowiązania i dochody za rok 2007 jako całość były legalne i prawidłowe, wystąpiło natomiast wysokie ryzyko powiernicze związane ze wsparciem budżetowym, w tym także z powodu dokonywanej przez Komisję tak zwanej „dynamicznej interpretacji” kryterium kwalifikowalności. Przeprowadzona kontrola wykazała jednak istotny poziom błędów i wskazała, – z tym się zgadzamy – że jest niezbędne szybkie ulepszenie w zakresie nadzoru i kontroli. Możliwości takie istnieją i podzielamy ten punkt widzenia.

Próbka pobrana do rozpatrzenia przy kontroli obejmowała 6 krajów, czyli 250 transakcji. Nasuwa się jedno bardzo ważne stwierdzenie: Komisja nadal nie jest w stanie przedstawić pełnych informacji księgowych. Przyjęliśmy z zadowoleniem deklarację, że od lutego 2009 r. nowy system będzie funkcjonował. Mam nadzieję, że Pan Komisarz Kallas potwierdzi ten fakt.

Kolejna bardzo ważna sprawa to rozróżnienie w ramach umów między słowami i czynnościami. Sporządzanie i podpisywanie powoduje wiele niejasności. Komisja musi to wyjaśnić, zwłaszcza, iż państwa regionu też różnie się do tego stosują. Rzeczą bardzo ważną z naszego punktu widzenia jako Parlamentu jest nie tylko dokonanie oceny prawidłowości *post factum*, ale także nadanie charakteru kontroli i audytu, tak abyśmy zapobiegali ewentualnym odchyleniom. Zapobieganie odchyleniom pomaga również w ocenie korzyści, jakie osiągamy z alokacji środków. Nie chodzi li tylko o księgowe rozliczenie prawidłowości, lecz także o stopień osiągania celu i z tego punktu widzenia zwracamy uwagę na potrzebę współpracy z parlamentami narodowymi, które powinny w dużej mierze zrozumieć tę kwestię. Chodzi o współpracę z władzami, rządami, a także ze społeczeństwem obywatelskim.

Aspekt, który wydaje się szczególnie ważny, dotyczy kwestii kontroli środków, którymi zarządza Europejski Bank Inwestycyjny. Europejski Bank Inwestycyjny pozostaje z naszego punktu widzenia instytucją nie do skontrolowania. Bardzo wyraźnie w sprawozdaniu potwierdzamy, że Europejski Bank Inwestycyjny dysponował kwotą 2,2 mld euro. To były środki publiczne, a nie pochodzące z rynków finansowych. Europejski Bank Inwestycyjny wydaje się zatem najmniej demokratyczną instytucją dysponującą funduszami publicznymi.

Na zakończenie chciałem podziękować Panu Komisarzowi Kallasowi za współpracę w tej kadencji. Na ręce członka Trybunału Obrachunkowego Jacka Łuczkiwicza kieruję podziękowania dla Trybunału. Dziękuję koleżankom i kolegom z Komisji Rozwoju oraz Komisji Kontroli Budżetowej, która była sprawnie i merytorycznie kierowana przez pana Herberta Bösch.

2-140

**Paulo Casaca, relator.** – Senhor Presidente, Senhor Vice-Presidente da Comissão Europeia, Senhor Presidente da Comissão do Controlo Orçamental, caros Colegas, estamos perante a conclusão da mais profunda reforma de sempre do Parlamento Europeu, com a criação de estatutos, tanto para os seus membros como para os assistentes, com o fim da inaceitável discriminação salarial entre os seus membros, com o fim de um sistema pouco transparente para o pagamento das nossas deslocações e com o fim de um sistema discriminatório de pensões.

Como relator para a quitação das contas do Parlamento, como membro há já dez anos da Comissão do Controlo Orçamental e como porta-voz dos Socialistas, tenho muito orgulho no que conseguimos e acho que não seria pedir muito ver a nossa opinião pública registar estas mudanças que ela mesma reclamava insistentemente.

Posto isto, sou hoje, como fui sempre, absolutamente favorável à total transparência na utilização de fundos públicos e estou plenamente de acordo com os pareceres do Sr. Provedor de Justiça Europeu nesta matéria. Sou hoje, como fui sempre, contrário à utilização de fundos públicos para cobrir resultados de riscos privados. Sou hoje, como fui sempre, desfavorável a sistemas de pensões voluntários que ignoram diferenças salariais, criando desigualdades de tratamento.

É para mim inaceitável que se façam generalizações absolutamente abusivas, apresentando todos os deputados europeus como tendo direito a duas pensões.

Como autor deste relatório, gostaria de frisar que, ao fim de dez anos de exercício do mandato de deputado europeu e de passagens mais breves pelo parlamento português e pelo parlamento regional dos Açores, vou agora sair da actividade parlamentar sem ter direito rigorosamente a nenhuma pensão – nacional, regional ou europeia.

Gostaria a este propósito de dizer que estão profundamente enganados os que entendem que a negação dos direitos dos seus representantes, que são comuns nas nossas sociedades, contribui para fazer uma Europa melhor.

Pelo contrário, estou convencido de que a única forma de ultrapassar a desconfiança de qualquer cidadão nos seus representantes é limitar ao mínimo o estabelecimento de regras específicas para os parlamentares que são os responsáveis pela sua aprovação. Creio mesmo que a única questão que o Parlamento deveria decidir era sobre o lugar relativo do deputado no quadro da administração europeia.

Lamentando a falta de clareza que existiu no passado entre o dever público e o interesse privado no sistema de pensões, gostaria que fosse reconhecido o trabalho de todos os que, nomeadamente na nossa Comissão do Controlo Orçamental, têm levado um combate sem tréguas pelo rigor e transparência das contas europeias.

A todos quero prestar aqui uma sentida homenagem, e deixo também aqui os votos de que o trabalho que a nossa comissão desenvolveu até hoje seja prosseguido na próxima legislatura, com o mesmo vigor e com o mesmo compromisso que teve até hoje com uma Europa mais rigorosa, mais justa e mais solidária.

O Parlamento que vai ser eleito em Junho irá funcionar com regras muito mais transparentes e equitativas, e isso é algo que todos os que aqui estamos hoje temos razões para celebrar.

2-141

**Przewodniczący.** – Kolejnym mówcą będzie pan poseł Christofer Fjellner. Informuję, że sprawozdawca, pan Søren Bo Søndergaard, przybędzie później ze względu na opóźnienie samolotu, w związku z tym udzieli mu głosu później.

2-142

**Christofer Fjellner, föredragande.** – Herr talman! Jag var imponerad av att ni åtminstone gav er in på försöket att räkna upp alla dessa decentraliserade myndigheter. De är ju nämligen väldigt, väldigt många. Jag skulle vilja påstå att ansvarsfriheten för EU:s myndigheter har blivit allt viktigare just eftersom antalet myndigheter har ökat. Även budgeten och personalen har ökat.

Totalt har antalet myndigheter ökat från 11 stycken 1995 till 27 stycken i dag. År 2007 var budgeten för alla myndigheter 1 243 500 000 euro. År 1995 var den genomsnittliga budgeten för en myndighet 7 miljoner euro men är i dag över 22 miljoner euro. Personalen har ökat på samma dramatiska sätt. År 1995 arbetade det i genomsnitt 38 personer på varje myndighet och i dag 155. Denna ökning tycker jag är anmärkningsvärd i sig och något som vi måste fundera på, dvs. om det är ett rimligt instrument och om det är rimligt med denna typ av ökning. Det ställer också större krav på oss när vi behandlar ansvarsfriheten och att vi ägnar mer tid och kraft till den.

Vi har därför valt att behandla 21 av dessa myndigheter som vi ansvarar för i specifika betänkanden och också att utarbeta ett horisontellt betänkande som tar upp de problem som är gemensamma för de allra flesta av myndigheterna.

Jag över glad över att kunna konstatera att majoriteten av myndigheterna får rena revisionsförklaringar av revisionsrätten. De sköts således på ett korrekt sätt. Samtidigt har många av dem – ja, nästan alla – fortfarande år efter år problem med stora överskott, med efterlevnaden av budgetförordningen och personalföreskrifter. Detta är något som vi måste fundera på, dvs. det faktum att vi år efter år upprepar viss kritik samtidigt som det inte sker någon förändring. Det betyder att vi måste fundera mer på hur vi utkräver ansvar av dessa myndigheter och hur vi egentligen styr dem. I det horisontella betänkandet föreslår jag bland annat därför att vi bör göra schablonminskningar när man inte använder tillräckligt mycket av budgeten eller när man inte kan tillsätta alla tjänster. Dessutom föreslås att vi bör få en gemensam värmyndighet som hjälper de små myndigheterna med de tunga administrativa uppgifterna. Det tror jag nämligen är väldigt viktigt.

Vi valde i år att specifikt titta på fyra myndigheter som av revisionsrätten fick orena revisionsförklaringar, och som har särskilt stora problem. Det var Europeiska polisakademien, Tillsynsmyndigheten för det europeiska GNSS-systemet, som vi brukar kalla Galileo, Europeiska järnvägsbyrån och Frontex. Jag är glad över att kunna slå fast att tre av dessa, Galileo, järnvägsbyrån och Frontex, har kunnat beviljas ansvarsfrihet efter genomgången av alla de uppgifter som de har lämnat till oss.

Fortfarande är det tyvärr så att Cpol, dvs. Europeiska polisakademien, har lämnat mycket information, men långt ifrån all. Därför kan vi ännu inte bevilja ansvarsfrihet. Det problem som kvarstår är frågan om privat användning av EU-medborgarnas skattepengar, såsom privat användning för att köpa möbler, privata mobiltelefonsamtal och privata resor. Vi har krävt information om detta men inte fått fullgod information. Därför föreslår jag och utskottet att vi skjuter upp beviljandet av ansvarsfrihet tills Cpol har förklarat allt detta. Dessutom pågår det ju en bedrägeriutredning i Olaf om denna myndighet. Det är allvarligt, och vi måste visa att vi tar detta på allvar och går till botten med det. Det är därför vi skjuter upp beviljandet av ansvarsfrihet. Det är inget jag gör med glädje, men jag skulle vilja påstå att det är det enda ansvarsfulla att göra. Vi måste ha alla papper på bordet innan vi kan bevilja ansvarsfrihet.

2-143

**Siim Kallas, Vice-President of the Commission.** – Mr President, this is the fifth time I have stood before you as you prepare to vote on a Commission discharge resolution. And, for the fifth time, I must admit that – despite unquestionable progress in budget execution – we still do not have a positive DAS.

In the draft resolution before you (paragraph 58), the rapporteur...

2-144

"demande, sans délai, à la Commission de livrer ses propositions pour atteindre l'objectif d'une DAS positive".

2-145

So I will do this, '*sans délai*'.

I will give the three main reasons why, in my view, we did not achieve a positive DAS, although this was the objective set at the beginning of the current Commission mandate.

We probably relied too much at the beginning on Member States sharing our concern about the negative public and political impact of the negative DAS when, in fact, our call for action only really became effective when backed up by the policy of 'warn, solve or suspend payments'. So there was too much carrot and too little stick initially.

We have also pursued evolution rather than revolution. We put aside more radical solutions, for instance on simplification, in our pioneering attempt to fix the DAS.

Obviously, five years for our Action Plan was not enough. Some results of our Action Plan are only now starting to show their impact. The next Commission will reap the benefits, which without the Action Plan could not be expected.

But your question is, 'how and when can you guarantee a positive DAS?' First, I should remind honourable Members what the so-called 'negative DAS' is.

Article 248 of the Treaty gives the Court of Auditors the task of providing a Statement of Assurance 'as to the reliability of the accounts and the legality and regularity of the underlying transactions'. It was inserted into the Maastricht Treaty at the last moment without any real discussion about the implications. This has proven highly problematic since.

The so-called negative DAS is part of the Court of Auditors' opinion. It says that certain areas of expenditure are still materially affected by errors, although to different levels. The Court also states that our annual accounts are reliable and gives many positive and adequate comments about our financial management. As such, the DAS does not sound at all special, compared to how audit opinions are generally phrased.

But we face a highly politicised and often deliberate misinterpretation of this sentence. So I must confess that it has surprised me how difficult it is to convince elected politicians and public opinion that budget management in the European Union is much better than what is reflected in this sentence. So we must do something to end this damaging political assessment of the use of European funds.

For urgent, more guaranteed results, one could imagine three options:

Option one: change the Treaty. The way the current Treaty is phrased, the reasonable public expectation for sound financial management has been undermined – automatically and almost inevitably – every year since the Maastricht Treaty entered into force.

During the Intergovernmental Conference on the Lisbon Treaty, I looked at whether one could fix Article 248 of the Treaty. Together with the Court, we looked at what could be a more realistic task for the Court, perhaps covering the budget over a three-year cycle, rather than annually, and asking the Court to take into account that most Commission control systems are multi-annual, ensuring that errors are corrected over time. We contacted several national delegations: they all agreed; nobody acted.

Option two: I now come to the second option and the most radical short cut to the positive DAS. Under the current Treaty we should perhaps stop allocating funds to management schemes so complex that we cannot meet the current low thresholds for error.

If we cannot collectively handle the current sophistication, then we must simplify. 'Simplify' is a nice word which everybody likes. There are millions of transactions to check. How could 480 auditors, based in Luxembourg, however competent, working with a very complex legislative environment, in 27 Member States with 23 official languages, possibly have the basis for issuing a statement each year on the legality and regularity of all underlying transactions in all spending areas?

If you wish simplification to have a quick and effective impact on the error rate, my view is that it means abandoning shared management in some areas. It means reducing the number of transactions from millions to a few thousand.

Taking the example of the Structural Funds, it would mean clearly defining the responsibilities that are currently shared. To achieve that, the Structural Funds could be turned into budget support to the poorer regions. An eligible region or Member State would see EU funds channelled into the state budget, to be spent via national systems, under the exclusive accountability of the minister of finance, and audited by the supreme audit institutions of Member States.

A Member State would get one annual tranche from the EU budget, and would be accountable to its own citizens and other Member States based on results. Eligibility rules, procurement procedures and absorption rates would no longer be a European problem.

In this radical scenario, we would drop the millions of projects too small and sophisticated to be under arms-length oversight from Brussels. No more small, creative projects ending up being ridiculed in the Euro-sceptic press!

Option three: If you cannot change the Treaty or its interpretation, we could perhaps discuss what it means for a given type of transaction to be 'OK'. We could set realistic and cost-effective thresholds for what 'legal and regular' is.

This is the discussion about tolerable risk. For the moment, the Court applies a uniform 2% materiality threshold across the board. The Court itself has asked for better risk analysis and political agreement on the tolerable risk in various budget areas.

To move this discussion forward, you now have a communication from the Commission on the table. Your rapporteur is suggesting welcoming this communication as a 'solid methodological basis' and calls for further analysis, data collection, dialogue and concrete proposals. I would be grateful for this support and suggest we move ahead as quickly as possible. The Council also now seems ready to engage.

Based on your overall political support, the Commission would like to proceed with proposals to set specific tolerable risk levels, budget heading by budget heading. For each future spending proposal, you would be asked to 'tolerate' a carefully calculated level of risk, so that the Court – hopefully – would adjust its materiality threshold on that basis.

We must start now. If we wait for a revised Financial Regulation, or indeed the next Financial Perspectives after 2013, this would not be reflected in the discharge procedure for the next five years.

Ladies and gentlemen, today you are preparing to vote on whether to grant discharge for 2007, a year for which the auditors now say that for all budget areas except that the Structural Funds, as much as 95% or more of the payments are free from serious financial error.

This is the best DAS ever, an improvement over last year, for a year with higher payment levels, in an increased number of Member States, the EU-27. Our financial management is steadily improving and it is certainly good enough to deserve discharge. But it cannot stand the test of perfection.

The EU was created to bring peace and prosperity. It has delivered so far. Obviously, looking at the EU's institutional set-up, it is possible that no auditor was present at its creation and so it is not perfect. But audit perfection is a rare phenomenon anywhere in the world.

Thank you for your attention and please vote in favour of discharge. You will see no complacency from the Commission.

2-146

**Luca Romagnoli**, *relatore per parere della commissione per i trasporti e il turismo*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la commissione dei trasporti e il turismo si compiace del fatto che nell'ambito dei progetti TEN i tassi di utilizzazione di stanziamenti di impegno e di pagamento continuano ad essere elevati, raggiungendo quasi il 100%, e chiede agli Stati membri di assicurare che i bilanci nazionali mettano a disposizione fondi adeguati per far fronte a questo impegno dell'Unione.

Esprime preoccupazione, per il basso tasso di utilizzazione degli stanziamenti di impegno, destinati alla sicurezza dei trasporti e all'autorità di vigilanza Galileo, e di pagamento destinati al mercato interno e all'ottimizzazione dei sistemi di trasporto nonché ai diritti dei passeggeri.

Rileva con soddisfazione che il tasso massimo dell'aiuto finanziario per i progetti transfrontalieri è aumentato al 30% e la soglia minima di finanziamento è salita a euro 1 milione, un miliardo e mezzo. Ricordo inoltre che sono migliorati la procedura di valutazione per la selezione dei progetti e il relativo monitoraggio, ma nel contempo, deplora che la struttura per la descrizione dei lavori non sia stata armonizzata e i controlli tecnici e finanziari non siano stati uniformati.

2-147

**Jan Andersson,** *föredragande av yttrande från utskottet för sysselsättning och sociala frågor.* – Herr talman! Sysselsättningspolitiken ingår i sammanhållningspolitiken. Det finns fortfarande en del fel och brister på detta område samt en del saker i övervakningen som man kan ha synpunkter på. Ungefär 27 procent av sammanhållningspolitiken tillhör sysselsättningsutskottet. När det gäller utbetalningarna är de flesta av dem från perioden 2000–2006. Det som är glädjande är att 100 procent av betalningsbemyndigandena har använts under perioden.

Det som ibland är ett problem är bristen på bevis för de indirekta kostnaderna och personalkostnaderna samt överskattningar av dessa. Därför har vi också uttalat oss för att vi ska ha ett mer schablonmässigt sätt att ange detta, kombinerat med bättre kontroller på medlemsstatsnivå som vi har under den nya perioden, vilket kan göra att det blir bättre i framtiden.

2-148

**Péter Olajos,** *A Környezetvédelmi, Közegészségügyi és Élelmiszer-biztonsági Bizottság véleményének előadója.* – A 2006-os évet követően engem ért a megtiszteltetés, hogy elkészítem a Környezetvédelmi, Közegészségügyi és Élelmiszer-biztonsági Bizottság véleményét az európai és a hozzánk tartozó öt ügynökség 2007-es pénzügyi évre vonatkozó költségvetésének végrehajtásával kapcsolatban.

Összességében kielégítőnek tartom ezen a területen a költségvetési tételek végrehajtásának általános mértékét, ami 94,6% volt. Kiemelkedő a LIFE+ program kötelezettségvállalási előirányzatainak végrehajtási aránya, ami 98,87%-os volt. Az ügynökségek közül kiemelkedett az Európai Környezetvédelmi Ügynökség, amely mind a kötelezettségvállalások, mind a kifizetések tekintetében elérte a 100%-ot, és a Betegségmegelőzési és Járványvédelmi Központ is. Van azonban még mit javulni a költségvetés területén az Európai Gyógyszerügynökségnek, az Európai Élelmiszerbiztonsági Hatóságnak és az Európai Vegyipari Ügynökségnek – ez utóbbinak ugye a 2007-es volt működésének első éve. Mint az ENVI véleményadója, javaslom, hogy a Bizottság ügynökségei 2007-ben mentesítést kapjanak a környezetvédelmi politika, a közegészségügyi és az élelmiszerbiztonság területén a költségvetés végrehajtása tekintetében.

2-149

**Jan Olbrycht,** *autor projektu opinii Komisji Rozwoju Regionalnego.* – Panie Przewodniczący! Panie Komisarzu! Komisja Rozwoju Regionalnego bardzo dokładnie analizowała wyniki prac Trybunału Obrachunkowego, ale również aktywnie uczestniczyła w niezwykle wnikliwych pracach prowadzonych przez Komisję Kontroli Budżetowej. Przyglądając się wynikom, które pojawiły się przy poprzednim absolutorium, jak i przy tym, możemy stwierdzić zasadniczy postęp w działaniach Komisji, jeżeli chodzi o poziom kontroli. Jednakże pierwsze widoczne efekty – zdajemy sobie z tego sprawę – po wprowadzeniu planu działania będą widoczne dopiero w następnych latach.

Dla naszej komisji ważne jest, żeby wyniki, które pojawiają się w sprawozdaniu Trybunału, nie zakłócały zrozumienia istoty polityki spójności w politykach Unii Europejskiej i żeby nie podważały celów tej polityki. Również zwracamy uwagę na to, żeby wskazane błędy nie były mylone z nieprawidłowościami i z ewentualnymi nadużyciami. Generalnie uważamy, że widoczny jest postęp i będziemy starali się popierać udzielenie absolutorium Komisji.

2-150

**Маруся Иванова Любчева,** *докладчик по становището на комисията по правата на жените и равенството между половете.* – Докладът за освобождаване от отговорност на Европейската комисия за 2007 година показва напредък, макар че все още се нуждаем от сериозно синхронизиране на дейности и контролни механизми за повишаване ефективността на използване на средствата, за намаляване броя и тежестите на нарушенията и за по-висока прозрачност и целенасоченост, особено към джандър бюджетирването.

Отговорността на Комисията да сътрудничи с държавите-членки и институциите не бива да се пренебрегва. Сътрудничеството и комуникацията са важен инструмент и често сме свидетели на резултати от пропуски в това отношение. Без да омаловажавам някои нарушения в най-новите страни-членки България и Румъния, считам за необходимо гарантирането на равнопоставено третиране на всички страни-членки.

За двете страни се прилага специален механизъм на сътрудничество, който не трябва да бъде отежняван. Неприемливо звучат някои текстове в доклада и особено предложения механизъм за изготвяне на тримесечни отчети за България и Румъния, както и специални доклади за използване на структурните фондове. Настоявам тези текстове да отпаднат. Това ще даде възможност на страните да се съсредоточат върху преодоляване на възникналите проблеми.

2-151

**Przewodniczący.** – Chciałem Państwa poinformować, że nie wysłuchaliśmy opinii Komisji Rozwoju, Komisji Rynku Wewnętrznego i Ochrony Konsumentów, Komisji Transportu i Turystyki oraz Komisji Kultury i Edukacji, ponieważ posłowie sprawozdawcy nie przybyli na czas na obrady, stąd zmiana kolejności mówców. Kontynuujemy dyskusję. W imieniu Europejskiej Partii Ludowej - Europejskich Demokratów głos zabierze pan poseł Markus Ferber, półtorej minuty.

2-152



**Markus Ferber, im Namen der PPE-DE-Fraktion.** – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar, liebe Kolleginnen, liebe Kollegen! Ich denke, dass wir in dieser Legislaturperiode, was die Entlastungsprozedur der europäischen Institutionen betrifft, einiges miteinander auf den Weg gebracht haben. Ich bedaure es aber, dass es so lange Zeit gedauert hat, weil wir im Prinzip jetzt erst alles das abgearbeitet haben, was sich schon mit dem Rücktritt der Kommission 1999 – also vor zehn Jahren – abgezeichnet hatte. Das zeigt, dass wir in unserer Arbeitsweise und in unseren Prozeduren durchaus noch etwas nachbessern und dafür sorgen müssen, dass die notwendige Transparenz schneller einkehrt, wenn es darum geht, dass die Bürgerinnen und Bürger erfahren, wofür die Steuergelder eingesetzt werden.

Ich darf mich insbesondere beim Kollegen Casaca bedanken, mit dem ich die Ehre hatte, für die EVP-Fraktion an der Parlamentsentlastung zu arbeiten. Ich bedaure es sehr, dass ein Kollege, der sich sehr intensiv über die Presse zu verschiedenen Dingen des Europäischen Parlaments äußert, weder an den Beratungen im Ausschuss noch an den Abstimmungen im Ausschuss noch hier an der Plenardebatte teilnimmt. Das will ich an dieser Stelle sehr deutlich sagen, damit es auch für die Nachwelt erhalten ist und erhalten bleibt!

Wir wissen sehr wohl, dass es hier eine Reihe von Problemen gab und gibt, und es waren die Abgeordneten, die jetzt hier sind, die in den letzten fünf Jahren dafür gesorgt haben, dass die notwendigen Reformen an einer Vielzahl von Stellen im Interesse der Abgeordneten erreicht wurden. Dafür an alle ein ganz herzliches Dankeschön! Wir haben das getan, was notwendig ist, und wir haben nicht dafür gesorgt, dass alles zwar breit in den Medien ausgetreten wird, aber nicht mitgearbeitet wird. Dafür ein Dankeschön für die seriöse Zusammenarbeit.

2-153

**Κώστας Μποτόπουλος, εξ ονόματος της ομάδας PSE.** – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, αγαπητοί συνάδελφοι, θα ξεκινήσω με αυτό που διατυπώνω πάντοτε όταν συζητάμε θέματα προϋπολογισμού και ελέγχου του προϋπολογισμού, ότι δηλαδή εδώ έχουμε να κάνουμε όχι με μια τεχνική αλλά με μια βαθιά πολιτική διαδικασία.

Έχει μεγάλη σημασία η εικόνα που δίνει το Κοινοβούλιό μας, αλλά και γενικά η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση απέναντι στους πολίτες. Πόσο δηλαδή, και με τί τρόπο χρησιμοποιούμε τα λεφτά του ευρωπαίου πολίτη και τί εικόνα δίνουμε για τη διαφάνεια αυτής της διαχείρισης στον ευρωπαίο πολίτη. Άρα, είναι μια πολιτική διαδικασία και έχει πολύ σημασία να εξετάσουμε τις γενικές γραμμές, την εντύπωση που κάνουμε σαν Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση και όχι κάποιες λεπτομέρειες που αφορούν συγκεκριμένες χώρες, χωρίς αυτό να σημαίνει ότι δεν πρέπει να μιλήσουμε για όλες τις χώρες.

Αυτή η παρατήρηση με ωθεί να αναφέρω ότι και οι εκθέσεις μας έχουν πολύ μεγάλη σημασία. Ένα παράδειγμα που αναφέρθηκε είναι το παράδειγμα της βελτίωσης που, επιτέλους, κάναμε στον χώρο του καθεστώτος των βουλευτών και των βοηθών των βουλευτών, μετά από πολλά χρόνια προσπάθειας και στο σημείο θέλω και εγώ με τη σειρά μου να χαιρετίσω την προσπάθεια του συνάδελφου του κ. Casaca. Έχουμε ένα πολύ καλύτερο αποτέλεσμα σήμερα και αυτό δείχνει ότι οι εκθέσεις μας έχουν σημασία και αποτέλεσμα και πρέπει να τις προσέξουμε.

Θα ήθελα να προσθέσω δύο λόγια για τα αποτελέσματα της φετινής μας προσπάθειας. Θα πω αυτό που είπε και ο εισηγητής κ. Audy, ότι σημειώσαμε βεβαίως πρόοδο αλλά ότι αυτή δεν είναι ακόμη αρκετή. Το μεγάλο ζήτημα είναι το πρόβλημα του πεδίου της συνοχής, αλλά εδώ θέλω να πω ότι εμείς οι σοσιαλιστές ζητούμε βελτίωση, αξιοπιστία, αποτελεσματικότητα, απλοποίηση όπως είπε και ο Επίτροπος, και εδώ νομίζω κ. Επίτροπε πρέπει από την 'evolution' να περάσουμε στη 'revolution' στο πεδίο της απλοποίησης, αλλά όλα αυτά όχι για να καταργήσουμε την συνοχή η οποία είναι μια βασική πολιτική της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, αλλά για να την κάνουμε καλύτερη και αποτελεσματικότερη.

Και τέλος, ένα σημαντικό θέμα που τίθεται επίσης στην έκθεση είναι το θέμα της δυνατότητας της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης να αντιμετωπίζει τις κρίσεις. Πρέπει ν' αντιμετωπίζουμε τις κρίσεις μόνοι μας και να μην παρέχουμε αυτή τη δυνατότητα σε άλλα ενδιάμεσα Σώματα.

2-154

**Jan Mulder, namens de ALDE-Fractie.** – Ik zou in de eerste plaats de rapporteurs willen bedanken en ook mijnheer Audy, die wat mij betreft een uitstekende rede gehouden heeft. Ook mijn dank aan de commissaris en aan de diensten van de Commissie. Zij hebben altijd een open houding tegenover het Parlement ingenomen en ik heb dat zeer gewaardeerd. Er waren zo nu en dan enige dissonanten, maar waar komt dat niet voor?

De Commissie moet volgens mij worden beoordeeld op hetgeen zij heeft gezegd aan het begin van de periode en op het huidige resultaat. Welnu - de commissaris heeft het al gezegd - de Commissie heeft bij lange na niet kunnen bereiken wat zij voor ogen had, te weten een positieve DAS. Zij is er zelfs heel ver vandaan uitgekomen en dat is een probleem. De commissaris heeft een aantal heel interessante suggesties gedaan. Het is jammer dat die suggesties aan het einde van de periode komen. Misschien ware het mogelijk geweest - ik weet het niet - als wij deze drie jaar na zijn aantreden al hadden kunnen bespreken, want er waren een heleboel interessante suggesties bij.

Wat mij betreft is de essentie nog steeds - en de commissaris heeft het er ook over gehad - het gemeenschappelijk beheer. Kunnen wij dat overlaten aan de lidstaten of niet en hoe kunnen wij de lidstaten beter controleren? Wij hebben in het interinstitutionele akkoord gezegd dat wij verklaringen op een bepaald politiek niveau willen. Dat is vertaald in het

Financieel Reglement. De grote vraag is voor mij altijd geweest: is dit voldoende of niet? Ik heb daar op het ogenblik onvoldoende inzicht in. Ik dank de commissaris voor de uitvoerige rapportage die hij alsnog heeft gestuurd, maar het is voor mij niet helemaal duidelijk. Waar zijn, zoals dat heet, de *carrots* voor lidstaten die het wél goed doen en de *sticks* voor de lidstaten die het niet goed doen? Het is mij niet duidelijk en dat zou onderdeel van de politiek moeten zijn.

Ik denk dat de discussie over een positieve DAS intensief moet worden voortgezet. Het is voor de publieke opinie bepaald slecht als de situatie met steeds een negatieve DAS voortduurt.

2-155

**Mogens Camre, for UEN-Gruppen.** – Hr. formand! Vores gennemgang af regnskaberne for 2007 viser igen i år, at der ganske enkelt ikke er styr på de store midler, medlemslandene stiller til rådighed for EU. Udvalgets glimrende betænkninger udtrykker klart de alvorlige mangler, og lad mig bare komme med et citat. Om samhörighed skriver udvalget, at det er meget bekymret over, at Revisionsretten anslår, at mindst 11 % af det samlede godtgjorte beløb for strukturpolitiske projekter ikke skulle have været godtgjort.

Jeg erkender, at hele EU's uoverskuelige netværk af lovgivning og administrative organer kombineret med dårlig administration og ligefrem korruption i nogle medlemslande gør ansvarlig økonomisk forvaltning vanskelig, men det er og bliver uacceptabelt. Der er kun én løsning, og det er at ophøre med at betale de mange penge til EU og dermed stoppe hele EU's omfordelingscirkus.

Mit lille land, Danmark, sender i år tæt ved 20 milliarder danske kroner til EU. Vi ville aldrig finde på at bruge disse penge til det, som EU bruger dem til. Selve det at sende medlemslandenes penge i omfordeling via Bruxelles betyder en forringelse af nytteværdien af disse penge og medvirker til en øget ulovlig omgang med borgernes penge. EU's medlemslande må finansiere sig selv og ikke beskatte naboerne.

Til slut vil jeg gerne takke Budgetudvalgets formand, hr. Bösch, for en fremragende ledelse af arbejdet, takke ordførerne, mine kolleger, udvalgets sekretariat og alle medarbejdere for et enestående engagement og et meget fint samarbejde.

2-156

**Bart Staes, namens de Verts/ALE-Fractie.** – Ik ga mij deze keer beperken tot de begroting van het Parlement en mijn blijdschap uitspreken over het verslag van de heer Casaca, vooral over het hoofdstukje inzake het vrijwillig pensioenfonds. Wij hebben daarin een tiental paragrafen goedgekeurd en een aantal daarvan zijn oorspronkelijk amendementen van mijn hand die hier volgens mij nodig waren.

Wat er nu gebeurt met dat vrijwillig pensioenfonds is door de eurosceptici op de straatstenen gegooid. Terecht, want het is een schandaal! Het is onethisch wat er gebeurt en wij moeten daartegen optreden. Wij kunnen niet aanvaarden dat in tijden zoals deze parlamentsleden eerder denken aan hun eigen inkomen dan aan het inkomen van de burgers. Samen met de heer Ferber wil ik zeggen: inderdaad, eurosceptici, jullie zitten daar, het zijn allemaal lege stoelen. Jullie hebben op geen enkele manier tijdens deze zittingsperiode geprobeerd op constructieve wijze enige bijdrage te leveren tot het wegwerken van fouten.

Ik zou de collega's willen vragen om heel uitdrukkelijk paragraaf 105 met betrekking tot het vrijwillig pensioenfonds goed te keuren. Deze zal ervoor zorgen dat het Bureau van dit Parlement ertoe gedwongen wordt om belastinggeld niet te gebruiken om het enorme tekort aan te vullen, want dit is niet verdedigbaar. Ik roep dus alle collega's op het verslag-Casaca grotendeels te steunen en goed te keuren. Ik heb een hoofdelijke stemming aangevraagd. Iedereen moet met de billen bloot!

2-157

**Véronique Mathieu (PPE-DE).** – Monsieur le Président, en cette période de récession économique, il était important que l'Union européenne continue d'afficher sa solidarité envers les pays en voie de développement. Rappelons qu'en 2007, la Communauté européenne et les États membres ont ensemble contribué, à hauteur de 60 %, à l'aide totale au développement, faisant de l'Union européenne le premier donateur au monde.

Les Fonds européens de développement permettent de lutter contre la pauvreté, tout en promouvant le développement économique et la démocratie. Je me réjouis donc que, pour les pays ACP, un budget de 23 milliards d'euros ait été alloué pour la période 2008-2013 dans le cadre du dixième FED, ce qui représente pratiquement le double du montant prévu pour le neuvième FED.

La Cour des comptes, dans son rapport, conclut que les comptes des septième, huitième et neuvième FED sont, d'une manière générale, fidèles, légaux et réguliers. On ne peut que se féliciter des niveaux records d'exécution des contrats et des paiements de la mise en œuvre des FED.

Toutefois, je constate également que des progrès doivent encore être accomplis pour renforcer le dispositif de contrôle et de surveillance car il existe toujours un niveau significatif d'erreurs affectant certaines transactions.

De même, il existe un risque trop souvent élevé en matière d'appui budgétaire et il convient, à mon avis, de mieux évaluer ces risques. À ce sujet, je partage l'idée que l'appui budgétaire ne devrait être octroyé que si le pays bénéficiaire a la capacité de gérer les fonds de manière transparente, responsable et efficace.

Parmi les priorités sur lesquelles nous devons travailler à l'avenir, je souhaiterais mentionner l'intégration du FED dans le budget général de la Communauté car cela renforcerait l'efficacité et la transparence de l'aide au développement.

Pour conclure, Monsieur le Président, je souhaite remercier le rapporteur pour son excellent rapport, les représentants de la Cour, mais également tout le personnel de la Commission qui a fait un excellent travail sur place, et je regrette, évidemment, l'absence du Conseil, et en particulier de la Présidence tchèque.

2-158

**Edít Herczog (PSE).** – Az Európai Parlament ebben a ciklusban egyre több és több ügynökség gazdálkodása felett gyakorolt ellenőrzést – ahogy ezt Fjellner képviselőtársam is elmondta. A Parlament, az ügynökségek, valamint az Európai Számvevőszék között az ellenőrzés során kialakult konstruktív párbeszéd növekvő transzparenciát és javuló gazdálkodási fegyelmet eredményezett. A jelen nehéz gazdasági és pénzügyi helyzetben az ellenőrzési munka jelentősége minden korábbinál fontosabbá vált.

Visszatekintve az eltelt időszakra, megelégedéssel tölt el, hogy a költségvetési ellenőrzési munka során nem csak a szabályosságot, vagy annak hiányát állapítottuk meg, hanem előremutató javaslatokat is tudtunk adni az ellenőrzött intézményeknek, akik ezeket igyekeztek eredményesen megvalósítani. Fontosnak tartom, és támogatom, hogy az ügynökségek ne csak abszolút mértékben kerüljenek megmérettetésre, hanem saját magukhoz képest való fejlődésüket is vizsgáljuk. Különösen támogatom, hogy ügynökségek új tagországokban is létesüljenek, hogy az Európai Unió munkája közelebb kerüljön az ott élő emberekhez. Fjellner úrral majdnem mindenben egyetértünk, holnap kiderül a végső álláspont.

2-159

**Ingeborg Gräßle (PPE-DE).** – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar, liebe Kolleginnen, liebe Kollegen! Der Bericht Audy – herzlichen Dank an den Berichterstatter – bringt uns wirklich weiter, weil er innovative Elemente enthält, nämlich *naming* und *shaming* – ein Meilenstein in der Haushaltskontrolle. Zielgenaue Kritik statt pauschaler Anklagen. Dass gerade die sozialistische Fraktion nun einen Rückzieher macht und lieber die Wahrheit unter den Teppich kehren will, ist ein Skandal und ein Bärendienst an unseren Kontrollaufgaben. Die Glaubwürdigkeit des Parlaments steht auf dem Spiel, und ich appelliere an die Kollegen, das nicht zuzulassen.

Ein Wort zu unseren größten Sorgenkindern Rumänien und Bulgarien. Das Versagen der Kommission bei der Vorbereitung der Beitritte wird hier am greifbarsten. Wir haben viel Geld verloren. Die Kommission hat lange zugesehen und erst 2008 Gelder eingefroren – für Bulgarien mittlerweile über eine Milliarde Euro, für Rumänien rund 142 Millionen Euro. Geld einfrieren ist aber keine Lösung der Probleme. Der Kooperations- und Verifikationsmechanismus, für den der Kommissionspräsident selber verantwortlich zeichnet, ist ein Papiertiger, und die Fortschrittsberichte verdienen den Namen nicht. Hier macht der Bericht Audy Vorschläge, wie es besser gehen könnte. Die EU-Kommission hat das Parlament über die Beitrittsreife dieser Länder getäuscht, und eigentlich müsste der Erweiterungskommissar daraus Konsequenzen ziehen. Uns geht es aber um das Management künftiger Beitritte, und deswegen bleibt dieses Thema auf der Tagesordnung.

Unsere Fraktion wird der Kommission die Entlastung erteilen, aber ich persönlich werde der Kommission die Entlastung verweigern. Leider ist der Reformeifer der Kommission, von dem man im letzten Jahr wieder einen kleinen Funken erahnen konnte, bereits wieder erloschen. Stillstand in der Betrugsbekämpfung, nichts zum Thema Prävention, mehr Ethik nicht erwünscht und so weiter. Über eines sollten sich die Kommission und insbesondere Kommissar Kallas im Klaren sein: Wer in der neuen Kommission dabei sein will, ist auf die Unterstützung des Parlaments angewiesen!

2-160

**Siim Kallas, Vice-President of the Commission.** – Mr President, I thank honourable Members for their remarks. I can only say that during these five discharge procedures I have enjoyed and been very happy with our cooperation. The process has always been complicated, but always constructive and very professional. So thank you all for this contribution to the complicated discharge machinery.

Just two remarks. To Mr Liberadzki I would say that the EDF accounts were successfully transferred to ABAC in February 2009. We raised the issue, but these are now merged.

Jan Mulder's question as to why these radical proposals come so late was very good. Four years to see this kind of proposal maturing is not too long. In Europe things take time, and in this case we are trying to use all possibilities in the framework of our Action Plan since we see that something really serious must be done to get rid of this problem.

So I do not think this is too late, but I regret of course that this has taken so much time.

2-161

**Dragoș Florin David (PPE-DE).** – Domnule președinte, domnule comisar, o intervenție scurtă: în concluziile principale la descărcarea gestiunii pentru Comisia Uniunii Europene, în raportul domnului Audy, la punctul 4 se precizează că este de părere că aderarea României și a Bulgariei nu a fost tratată de către Comisie cu seriozitatea necesară, că cele două candidate la integrare – raporturile pentru cele două țări candidate au fost eronate și că regretă faptul că această informare eronată a dus la situația actuală, în care au fost eliberate fonduri de coeziune unor state membre cu sisteme administrative și juridice nefuncționale și că acest lucru a dus în eroare opinia publică și Parlamentul în detrimentul reputației Uniunii.

Aș dori sincer ca colegii Dan Jørgensen și Paulo Casaca, care au făcut acest amendament și colegii care au aprobat în Comisia de buget să explice aceste raționamente, pentru că consider că atât România, cât și Bulgaria au sisteme administrative și juridice care funcționează, poate nu la parametri care ar trebui să fie, dar ele funcționează și nu cred că cineva și-a permis să ducă în eroare opinia publică, cu atât mai puțin Parlamentul și Comisia.

2-162

**Jean-Pierre Audy, rapporteur.** – Monsieur le Président, le cas de la Roumanie et de la Bulgarie mériterait, je crois, des échanges, mais nous sommes vraiment dans une situation extrêmement grave.

Concernant les conclusions, je voudrais remercier les rapporteurs des groupes politiques, remercier tous les intervenants, et notamment la commission du contrôle budgétaire, et je voudrais conclure sur plusieurs thèmes.

Premièrement, dans le budget, nous n'avons pas de fraude. Deuxièmement, nous avons beaucoup d'erreurs, et nous avons beaucoup d'erreurs pour deux raisons: la première, c'est que nos règlements sont trop complexes et que, du coup, les bénéficiaires finaux ont beaucoup de mal à appliquer des règlements trop complexes et commettent des erreurs qui ne sont pas si graves. Et la deuxième raison est que la Cour des comptes européenne applique un seuil de signification trop bas: 2 % sur tous les secteurs; en termes de méthodes d'audit, ce sont là des méthodes qui doivent être réexaminées.

Alors, les choses vont mal, dit-on, mais parce que nous sommes tous responsables. La Commission est responsable car elle n'a pas tenu sa promesse et merci, Monsieur le Commissaire, d'avoir pris la mesure des propositions pour la prochaine mandature. Le Conseil est responsable parce qu'il se désintéresse: il n'est pas là. Les États membres sont responsables parce qu'ils appliquent les règlements avec une rigueur insuffisante. La Cour des comptes européenne est responsable car elle doit s'interroger sur ses méthodes d'audit, et notamment sur les taux de signification; c'est à elle, et non à la Commission ni au Parlement, qu'il incombe de fixer les seuils de signification. Le Parlement est responsable car il doit être lucide sur les imperfections actuelles et accepter les réformes.

Bref, je crois que nous avons un ensemble de coresponsabilités. La synthèse est faite à la fin de cette mandature. Eh bien, nous appelons de nos vœux que cette réforme se fasse pour que, dans les prochaines perspectives financières, nous ayons enfin une déclaration d'assurance positive et que, si nous avons une déclaration d'assurance négative, nous ayons un vote négatif du Parlement, de manière à avoir une cohérence politique entre les instances qui doivent décider du contrôle budgétaire.

2-163

#### PRÉSIDENCE DE M. GÉRARD ONESTA *Vice-président*

2-164

**Herbert Bösch, Verfasser der Stellungnahme des mitberatenden Haushaltskontrollausschusses.** – Herr Präsident, meine Damen und Herren! Ich habe die ehrenvolle Aufgabe, mich zu bedanken. Und zwar zum einen bei den Berichterstattern, die eine große Arbeit geleistet und gute Berichte vorgelegt haben – über einen werden wir morgen noch zu reden haben. Zum zweiten bedanke ich mich bei einem hervorragenden Sekretariat, das uns in den letzten Jahren zur Seite gestanden hat. Ich kann denen, die nach uns kommen, nur solche Mitarbeiterinnen und Mitarbeiter wünschen.

Was ich nicht verstehe, Herr Präsident, ist etwas anderes. Wenn man in die Pressevorschau – Vorschau der Plenartagung 21.-24. April – reinschaut, kann man zwar über die wichtigen Berichte über die Immunität von Abgeordneten lesen, aber nichts über die Entlastung für das Haushaltsjahr 2007. Wenn wir die Rechte des Parlaments nicht wahrnehmen, wer soll uns dann in der Öffentlichkeit wahrnehmen und uns ernst nehmen und am 7. Juni wählen gehen, wenn wir so mit dem stärksten Recht verfahren, das dieses Parlament hat? Nämlich zu kontrollieren, wie diese über 100 Milliarden im Jahre 2007 ausgegeben wurden.

Wenn wir uns nicht über Fakten unterhalten, dann werden wir uns eben über Gerüchte zu unterhalten haben. Der Herr Kollege Ferber ist auf diesen Punkt schon eingegangen. Wir müssen dieses Europa auf Fakten aufbauen, wir brauchen die Zusammenarbeit und die konstruktiven Ideen, die wir ja in den letzten Jahren entwickelt haben. Es ist kein Wunder, dass wir am Ende dieser Periode eigentlich auch die größte Schaffenskraft und die größte Klarheit in dieser Periode entwickelt haben. Es liegt zum Teil an den handelnden Personen, denen ich gratulieren möchte, aber es liegt auch daran, dass wir uns über verschiedene Dinge klar geworden sind, nämlich was Kontrolle letztendlich für den europäischen Steuerzahler heißt.

Wir sollten wissen, dass wir über dieses eine Jahr 2007 auch hinausgehen. Natürlich wissen wir, dass es Fehlentwicklungen gab, die wir zum Teil abgestellt haben. Ich bin sehr dankbar dafür, was Costas gesagt hat. Wir haben in dieser Periode ein Assistentenstatut geschaffen. Dafür sind wir vor einigen Jahren noch geprügelt worden. Wir haben ein Abgeordnetenstatut geschaffen. Auch dafür sind wir geprügelt worden. Da mag das eine oder andere noch nicht ganz hundertprozentig sein, aber vergessen wir auch als Kontrollausschussmitglieder nicht: Es kann nicht alles à la carte nach deutschem, portugiesischem, österreichischem oder spanischem Muster geschaffen werden. Wir brauchen ein europäisches Muster. Das ist manchmal etwas schwierig und gerade in Wahlkampfzeiten gelegentlich auch schwer darzustellen. Ich bin all denjenigen sehr dankbar, die den Versuchungen des kommenden Wahlkampfes widerstanden haben und gesagt haben: Wir bleiben bei den Fakten, wir sind auch bereit, diese Fakten den Kolleginnen und Kollegen und auch den Wählerinnen und Wählern zu erklären.

Herr Kallas, ich möchte noch einen Punkt anfügen, denn darüber werden wir auch in der Entlastung Audy – die ich sehr begrüße – noch reden. Es geht um eine unterstellte Bankgebühr. Die Kommission ist seit Jahren säumig mit der Berechnung des Bruttoinlandsprodukts der Europäischen Union, um das BNE, was eigentlich vorgeschrieben ist, auf ordentliche Beine zu stellen. Das kostet verschiedene Mitgliedstaaten viele Millionen Euro. Wir haben es angesprochen. Ich hoffe, Sie oder Ihre Nachfolger werden das entsprechend ausräumen.

Herr Präsident, ich bin sehr dankbar für diese tolle Arbeit, die von meinem Ausschuss geleistet wurde, und Sie wissen, morgen werden wir eine Nichtentlastung empfehlen. Ich bin sehr froh darüber, Vorsitzender dieses Ausschusses zu sein! Dankeschön!

2-165

**Christofer Fjellner, föredragande.** – Herr talman! Det blir mycket tackande, men jag vill ändå passa på att tacka vår eminenta ordförande Herbert Bösch. Jag tycker att han har lett utskottet på ett fantastiskt sätt under de gångna två och ett halvt åren.

Det blev ju inte så mycket debatt om mina betänkanden om ansvarsfriheten för myndigheterna. Jag hoppas därför att alla kolleger väljer att stöda dem, *oavsett* hur man har röstat i utskottet eller vad man har antytt tidigare. Det är viktigt att parlamentet uttalar sig enigt i dessa frågor.

Eftersom detta är en gemensam debatt för alla betänkanden skulle jag vilja kommentera ett annat betänkande än mina egna. Jag känner nämligen väldigt starkt för Casacas betänkande, som jag tycker är väldigt bra, särskilt punkt 105, där vi har slagit fast att parlamentet inte ska skjuta till extra pengar för att täcka underskottet i den frivilliga pensionsfonden för oss europaparlamentariker. Jag vet att det är flera som tycker att dessa punkter är mycket kontroversiella, men för mig är de i alla fall en självklarhet. Det är många som har kritiserat denna fond under väldigt många år. Jag skulle vilja säga att jag tycker att fonden i sig är något av en skandal. Vi drabbas just nu alla av den globala finanskrisen. I en tid då vanliga människor drabbas genom att de får sina pensioner sänkta får ju inte politiker rädsla sitt eget skinn genom att använda mer av skattebetalarnas pengar för sina egna pensioner.

Detta är ett budskap som jag hoppas att parlamentets ledning verkligen tar till sig och inte fyller på fonden med mer skattepengar. Vi måste tvärtom få ett slut på detta – och det så snart som möjligt.

2-166

**Le Président.** – La discussion commune est close.

Le vote aura lieu jeudi 23 avril 2009.

### *Déclarations écrites (article 142)*

2-167

**Bárbara Dührkop Dührkop (PSE), por escrito.** – La Comisión de Libertades Públicas ha pedido que se aprobara la gestión de la Comisión, así como la de las cinco agencias comunitarias que están dentro de sus atribuciones.

Nuestra comisión, no obstante, está inquieta ante el bajo nivel de ejecución de los créditos de pago en el Espacio de Libertad, Seguridad y Justicia en comparación con 2006 (60,41 % en 2007 y 86,26 % en 2006).

Somos conscientes, sin embargo, de que la responsabilidad no recae tanto en la Comisión como en los Estados miembros y que la baja ejecución se debe, muy especialmente, a la aprobación, en mayo y junio de 2007, de los fondos incluidos en el marco de la solidaridad y de la gestión de los flujos migratorios y a los retrasos en la ejecución de otros programas específicos (por ejemplo, los programas en materia de justicia civil e información y prevención en materia de drogas).

Como decía, la Comisión de Libertades Públicas ha recomendado que se aprobara la gestión de:

- la Agencia de los Derechos Fundamentales,
- el Observatorio Europeo de las Drogas y las Toxicomanías de Lisboa,

- Frontex,
- Eurojust, y
- CEPOL.

Sobre estas dos últimas agencias querría señalar lo siguiente:

- esperamos que Eurojust reduzca el excesivo número de prórrogas de créditos (*carry-overs*) y que se regularice la forma de hacer los contratos, tal como afirma la Agencia;
- teniendo siempre en cuenta las críticas formuladas a CEPOL por nuestra comisión, no creemos que se deba posponer la aprobación de la gestión de esta Agencia. Por lo que hemos podido saber, el Director de CEPOL ha colaborado intensamente con la Comisión de Control Presupuestario y está haciendo lo necesario para modificar los defectos de gestión detectados.

2-167-500

**Silvana Koch-Mehrin (ALDE), schriftlich.** – Nach wie vor werden etwa 80% der EU-Gelder von den Mitgliedstaaten verwaltet und ausgegeben. Und nach wie vor gibt es offene Fragen und Unregelmäßigkeiten im Umgang mit dem Geld der Europäischen Union. Der Europäische Rechnungshof hat in seinen jährlichen Prüfberichten bereits 14 Mal in Folge die Rechtmäßigkeit und Ordnungsmäßigkeit der EU-Finanzvorgänge nicht bestätigt. Eine lückenlose Offenlegung und Kontrolle der EU-Ausgaben ist unverzichtbar. Es ist notwendig, dass die Finanzminister der Mitgliedstaaten für alle verwendeten EU-Gelder eine nationale Zuverlässigkeitserklärung vorlegen.

2-168

## 20 - Cadre communautaire pour la sûreté nucléaire (débat)

2-169

**Le Président.** – L'ordre du jour appelle le rapport de Gunnar Hökmark, au nom de la commission de l'industrie, de la recherche et de l'énergie, sur la proposition de directive du Conseil (Euratom) établissant un cadre communautaire pour la sûreté nucléaire (COM(2008)0790 – C6-0026/2009 – 2008/0231(CNS)) (A6-0236/2009).

2-170

**Gunnar Hökmark, rapporteur.** – Mr President, I think it is fair to say that we are now in a new era of energy policy, where there is a need for energy policy to be consistent with a policy for stopping climate change, and at the same time to be combined with a policy for energy security. Those three legs – energy policy, climate policy and energy security – must function together.

From my perspective this highlights the importance of nuclear power. It is important that the existing nuclear power plants are managed in as safe and secure a way as possible, but it is also important that we have clear rules to ensure that the future power plants of the European Union are as secure and safe as possible.

This is not only a matter of preparing the ground for more nuclear power. I think that there is rather large support for such a policy in the European Union, that it is growing and that we need to live up to the responsibilities that this gives us all. I respect those who are hesitant about or are against the use of nuclear power, but whatever opinion and whatever view we have on nuclear power, there can be no disagreement on the need for the rules to be as safe and secure as possible for the nuclear power we have.

It is from this perspective that I would like to present this report on the Community framework for nuclear safety. There is a legal basis for this and there has been a debate in committee on whether all the procedures have been fulfilled. A letter has been sent from the Committee on Legal Affairs to the Committee on Industry, Research and Energy saying that if it is a new proposal then there is a need for a new opinion from the group of experts. My view, and the view of the majority of the committee, is that this is a revised proposal which we have been working on in the European Union for nearly seven years. It has been changed because of an opinion from the group of experts and because of the opinion given by Parliament and I must say that now is the time to reach a decision. I hope that Council will be able to take this decision this spring.

If we do not and if we delay this process, we will see in reality that new nuclear power plants will be planned and constructed without this Community framework. So this is the time for action. Those who are trying to hinder this because of their attitude to nuclear power are in reality preventing the European Union from having a Community framework establishing as safe and secure rules as possible.

I have tried to position my report in three ways. First of all to give a clear structure on the responsibilities of Member States and governments, licence holders and national regulators. Secondly, I have been very clear about the independence that the national regulators will have and I am strengthening the requirements on national regulators, meaning that they must be able to act when they see any risk of a nuclear power plant not fulfilling the security rules.

Thirdly, we are including in an annex the rules of the IAEA as binding rules, thereby making this Community framework clear, strict and firm, and that is the note on which I end.

2-171

**Andris Piebalgs**, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, nuclear safety is an absolute priority for the European Union, as the rapporteur said, and I would like to thank the rapporteur for a very strong, clear and comprehensive report.

As the use of nuclear energy in the European Union is a reality and will be a reality, and nuclear safety is not constrained by national borders, we need a Community-wide framework aiming at achieving, maintaining and continuously improving nuclear safety in the European Union.

This is the objective of the revised proposal for a directive that sets up a Community framework for nuclear safety. The fundamental goal of the proposal is to establish binding legislation, the only solution that offers guarantees that political and industrial commitments to continuously improve nuclear safety are followed by concrete measures. These International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) Safety Fundamentals and the obligations of the Convention on Nuclear Safety constitute the core of the directive. De facto, their transposition into binding Community legislation would bring legal certainty.

The proposal also aims at ensuring that national regulatory authorities in charge of nuclear safety are independent from any governmental decision-making body and any other organisation that would have an interest in nuclear matters. They can, therefore, preoccupy themselves solely with the safety of installations.

The proposal aims to enhance the role of regulatory authorities by ensuring that the Member States provide them with adequate authority, competence and human and financial resources to fulfil their responsibilities.

The revised proposal takes into account the outcome of a consultation process that started in 2004 with the Council's Working Party on Nuclear Safety. It was discussed, before adoption, with the European Nuclear Safety Regulators Group, as well as in other fora. It also reflects the substance of the opinion given by the Scientific Group of Experts, referred to in Article 31 of the Euratom Treaty, and the current nuclear safety proposal is a second revision of the regional proposal in the area of nuclear safety. Article 31 of the Euratom Treaty does not require a resubmission of the revised proposal to the Scientific Group of Experts. Moreover, close cooperation with the International Atomic Energy Agency has ensured consistency with international practices.

The Commission agrees with most of the proposed amendments that reinforce the line taken. The report clearly recognises the obligation of the Member States to respect the Safety Fundamentals stemming from the IAEA and the provisions of the Convention on Nuclear Safety, as well as seeking to reinforce the role of nuclear regulatory authorities and ensure their independent decision-making role.

I am, therefore, confident that the Council will take into consideration Parliament's position whenever it contributes to improving and clarifying the objectives of the directive.

2-172

**Rebecca Harms**, *Verfasserin der Stellungnahme des mitberatenden Ausschusses für Umweltfragen, Volksgesundheit und Lebensmittelsicherheit*. – Herr Präsident, sehr geehrte Kollegen! Das Parlament hat in dieser Sache eigentlich gar nichts zu sagen; es wird angehört, und es macht sich zum Instrument bei der Vorbereitung einer Richtlinie, die nicht zu mehr Sicherheit im Atomsektor beitragen wird, sondern der Fortsetzung der Unsicherheit dienen wird. Diese Richtlinie ist irrelevant für alle bestehenden Atomanlagen in der Europäischen Union. Diese Richtlinie ist auch nicht relevant für Hochrisikoprojekte, wie sie derzeit in Bulgarien, in der Slowakei und in Rumänien geplant werden. Sie kommt da überhaupt nicht zum Tragen.

Diese Richtlinie wird auch dann, wenn sie trägt, nämlich bei zukünftigen Planungen, die jetzt noch gar nicht begonnen haben, nicht die heute höchst verfügbaren Standards von Wissenschaft und Technik festlegen, sondern sie empfiehlt die Einhaltung von Prinzipien.

Ich frage mich, warum wir als Parlament uns an dieser Stelle in dieser Alibiveranstaltung so instrumentalisieren lassen, der Sicherheit von Bürgerinnen und Bürgern dienen wir damit nicht.

2-173

**Herbert Reul**, *im Namen der PPE-DE-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar, liebe Kolleginnen, liebe Kollegen! Das ist ein kluger Beschluss, eine kluge Vorlage, und es ist eine kluge Entscheidung, dass das Parlament einen Beitrag dazu leistet, in Europa zu Vereinheitlichungen zu kommen und mehr Sicherheitsbestimmungen zu realisieren. Das ist unsere Pflicht.

Frau Kollegin Harms, es ist nicht in Ordnung, einerseits immer mehr Sicherheit im nuklearen Bereich einzufordern und zu beklagen, dass nukleare Technologien nicht ausreichend gesichert sind, und andererseits jede Chance zu nutzen, solche Beschlüsse hier zu verhindern. Ich kann nicht beklagen, dass das Europäische Parlament sich um dieses Anliegen kümmert, und auf der anderen Seite dann unzufrieden sein und sagen, die nukleare Technologie ist nicht sicher genug.

Wir haben unsere Pflicht heute wahrgenommen. Wir kümmern uns darum, wir versuchen, einen Beitrag zu leisten, um nukleare Technologie europaweit mit Mindestsicherheit auszustatten, und natürlich auch einen Beitrag dazu zu leisten, dass – wie wir es in anderen Beschlüssen hier gemeinsam mit großer Mehrheit festgelegt haben – die nukleare Technologie als eine von mehreren Möglichkeiten im Energiemix stabilisiert und unterstützt wird. Dazu gehört auch die Antwort auf die Frage: Wie sieht es mit der Sicherheit aus? Die Antwort muss man geben, man kann sie nicht nur ständig einfordern.

Dieser Vorschlag liegt heute vor, und ich hoffe, dass er morgen eine Mehrheit bekommt.

2-174

**Edít Herczog, a PSE képviselőcsoport nevében.** – Egy nagyon fontos vitát zárunk le holnap ennek a javaslatnak a megszavazásával, amely egyértelműen az európai polgárok biztonságát és biztonságérzetét növeli. Nem az a cél, hogy megoldást találjunk, hanem az a cél, hogy előrelépünk a mostani helyzethez képest, és mindenképpen úgy érzem, hogy a nemzeti szabályozásnál a közösségi szabályozás megteremtése egy komoly előrelépést jelent. Ezért teljesen egyértelműen támogatjuk a Bizottság által benyújtott irányelvet és Hökmark úr jelentését. Módosító indítványainkkal ezen próbáltunk tovább javítani. Úgy gondolom, az európai polgárok megérdemlik, hogy az egyébként villamosenergia-ellátásukban 32%-ot kitevő atomenergia területén egy lépést megtegyünk előre. Tegyük meg közösen!

2-175

**Anne Laperrouze, au nom du groupe ALDE.** – Monsieur le Président, mon groupe soutient complètement l'objectif de cette directive, qui est d'établir un cadre communautaire afin de maintenir et de veiller à l'amélioration continue de la sûreté des installations nucléaires dans l'Union européenne.

Notre Parlement a toujours insisté sur la nécessité urgente de mettre en place une législation claire et rigoureuse et d'adopter des mesures concrètes au niveau communautaire dans des domaines touchant à la sûreté nucléaire, à la gestion des déchets radioactifs et au déclassement des installations nucléaires.

Nos débats ont soulevé notamment la question de la formation et des connaissances. Il est primordial que l'Europe, qui possède une expertise nucléaire, préserve cette connaissance, et notamment en s'assurant de la formation et de la qualification des contrôleurs de la sûreté des centrales.

Enfin, je suis satisfaite que la commission de l'industrie ait accepté un amendement à la résolution législative pour inviter la Commission européenne à consulter le groupe d'experts, conformément à l'article 31 du traité.

Je le répète, nous exigeons la transparence, et nous voulons une législation claire et rigoureuse. Et je remercie M. Hökmark, notre rapporteur.

2-176

**Paul Rübig (PPE-DE).** – Herr Präsident, sehr geehrte Damen und Herren! Der vorliegende Vorschlag ist zu begrüßen. Ich bedanke mich bei Kommissar Piebalgs, und auch Kommissarin Palacio vor Ihnen hat schon gesehen, dass es wichtig ist, an die Sicherheit zu denken und ich glaube, dass die Verbesserung der Unabhängigkeit der nationalen Regulatoren wichtig ist.

Wenn alle in den anderen Ländern so unabhängig wären wie der Regulator in Frankreich, wäre das schon ein großer Fortschritt. Noch besser wäre es natürlich, wenn man EU-weit einen Regulator hätte, der die Möglichkeit hat, im *peer review* gefährliche Atomkraftwerke vom Netz zu nehmen. Es ist auch wichtig, strenge verbindliche Sicherheitsstandards zu haben und die Ausführung der Abschaltung durch den europäischen Regulator zu gewährleisten.

Sicherheit und Sicherung spielen für die Gesundheit der Bevölkerung eine ganz wichtige Rolle und erhalten von uns die volle Unterstützung. Hier muss in Zukunft mehr getan werden.

2-177

**Атанас Папаризов (PSE).** – Бих искал и аз на свой ред да отбележа значението на предложението на Комисията за рамкова директива за ядрена безопасност. Считаю, че този документ е добра основа, което да даде задължителни норми в Европейския съюз по този въпрос и да даде също така увереност на всички държави, включително тези които не ползват ядрената енергия, че ядрената енергия произвеждана в Европейския съюз е безопасна.

Искам да подчертая, че съм удовлетворен от поправките, които са приети и които направих по отношение на конкретизиране обхвата на директивата, осигуряване на редовен обмен на най-добри практики между държавите-членки и по-ясно разпределение на отговорността между държавата, притежателя на лиценз и регулаторния орган.

Бих искал да подчертая, че тази директива още веднъж подчертава правото на всяка страна да избира своя енергиен микс, ако пожелае това да бъде ядрената енергия, която е енергия спестяваща въглероден двуокис и полезна за околната среда.



2-178

**Andris Piebalgs, Member of the Commission.** – Mr President, as has been rightly said the aim of this proposal is to create a Community-wide framework. It was not easy to achieve this. We based our work on the Western European Nuclear Regulators' Association (WENRA) and on experience in the High Level Group on Nuclear Safety and Waste Management. We also worked together with the Council, which had discussed more or less the same proposals in 2003.

I believe that it strikes the right balance at this stage; I believe it gives European citizens a clear understanding that there is a Community-wide framework. I am confident this framework will evolve with time, but I very much welcome Mr Hökmark's report because it strengthens the proposal while keeping the balance we need. It is the national regulators who are responsible for the safety of the installations running in their countries. These issues are so sensitive that we cannot, and should not, sidestep them, but we do need constantly to improve nuclear safety standards. I believe this directive gives us that opportunity.

2-179

**Gunnar Hökmark, rapporteur.** – Mr President, first of all I think it is important to say that no one should be against increasing the level of safety and strengthening the safety rules. There must be no tendency, just because one dislikes nuclear power and is against its use, to underplay the importance of the rules we need.

In that sense, I think it is a step forward that we have a common Community framework because it creates a consistency, a transparency and an opportunity to ensure our common development towards higher standards. This directive really does apply to existing power plants because it increases the importance and the independence of national regulators – which is crucial – and it paves the way for us to secure higher and higher requirements in order to have, as it were, a 'race to the top' regarding safety.

Let us be very frank about this. We will have nuclear power in the future, whatever all of us here today agree about on this issue. In my view, it is important that we can lay the ground for having more nuclear power plants. They must be credible and there must exist a credibility in public opinion, but – even more importantly – there must be a substantial, real safety in managing nuclear power, as there should be in every other thing we do.

The existing rules are good and strong, but we are making them more consistent, and that is a step forward. I would like to thank you for your cooperation and for the discussion. I think that we have achieved a better result, and I hope that the Council will listen to this opinion.

2-180

**Le Président.** – Le débat est clos.

Le vote aura lieu mercredi 22 avril 2009.

### *Déclarations écrites (article 142)*

2-180-500

**John Attard-Montalto (PSE), in writing.** – I would like to draw my attention to the environmental situation of Marsaxloqq Bay. The most picturesque bay in Malta was destroyed when a power station was built. This has had a health impact on the residents in its region especially those of Marsaxloqq. Now an incineration plant is being planned in this bay and once again the inhabitants of this region are going to be subject to environmental nightmare. In addition, there is a health hazard which cannot be estimated.

When I was the lawyer in a case trying to prevent the construction of a power station in the bay I was able to prove that discharges were not all being absorbed by the atmosphere. Some discharges were found too heavy to evaporate and would find themselves falling in the vicinity of the station. Tiles in open places were visibly stained by a rust-coloured substance. It resulted that those stains were a result of discharges. What is the situation going to be when increased discharges from the incineration plant will be allowed into the atmosphere?

2-181

**Владимир Уручев (PPE-DE), в писмена форма.** – След почти 6 години отлагане, днес ЕС е близо до приемане на директива за ядрената безопасност, един важен политически документ за ядрената енергетика в Европа, която произвежда почти 1/3 от електроенергията на ЕС.

Страните-членки имат изключителното право сами да решават дали да разчитат на ядрена енергия. За тях, но и за неприемащите тази енергия страни, е еднакво важно прилагането на най-високите стандарти за безопасност в ядрената енергетика.

Приветствам включването на основните принципи за безопасност на МААЕ като анекс към директивата. По този начин най-добрите разработки в областта на стандартите за ядрена безопасност стават неразделна част от Европейското законодателство и съответно задължителни за спазване от държавите - членки.

Отсъствието в ЕС на общоприети изисквания за ядрена безопасност позволи в близкото минало на някои присъединяващи се към ЕС страни да бъдат наложени политически решения за тяхната ядрена енергетика, които днес не кореспондират с целите на ЕС за ограничаване на климатичните промени и сигурността на енергийните доставки.

Днес, когато редица нови ядрени централи в ЕС са в процес на строителство или се планират, своевременното приемане на директивата за ядрената безопасност е не само оправдано, но и задължително заради гаранциите за безопасността и спокойствието на населението.

2-182

## **21 - Combattre la déforestation et la dégradation des forêts pour lutter contre le changement climatique et la diminution de la biodiversité - Obligations des opérateurs qui mettent du bois et des produits dérivés sur le marché (débat)**

2-183

**Le Président.** – L'ordre du jour appelle la discussion commune sur:

- la déclaration de la Commission - Combattre la déforestation et la dégradation des forêts pour lutter contre le changement climatique et la diminution de la biodiversité, et

- le rapport de Caroline Lucas, au nom de la commission de l'environnement, de la santé publique et de la sécurité alimentaire, sur la proposition de règlement du Parlement européen et du Conseil établissant les obligations des opérateurs qui mettent du bois et des produits dérivés sur le marché (COM(2008)0644 - C6-0373/2008 - 2008/0198(COD)) (A6-0115/2009).

2-184

**Σταύρος Δήμας, Μέλος της Επιτροπής.** – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η αποψίλωση των δασών ευθύνεται για το 20% περίπου των εκπομπών αερίων θερμοκηπίου σε παγκόσμια κλίμακα. Κατά συνέπεια, από τη σκοπιά των κλιματικών αλλαγών, η αντιμετώπιση της αποψίλωσης των δασών αποτελεί σημαντική προτεραιότητα. Συγχρόνως, η αντιμετώπιση της αποψίλωσης των δασών συμβάλλει στην επίτευξη και άλλων σημαντικών στόχων, όπως είναι η εξάλειψη της φτώχειας και η ανάσχεση της απώλειας της βιοποικιλότητας που είναι η άλλη μεγάλη περιβαλλοντική απειλή για τον πλανήτη μας.

Η αποψίλωση των δασών έχει πλέον αναχθεί σε κύριο θέμα στις διεθνείς διαπραγματεύσεις, τόσο για τις κλιματικές αλλαγές όσο και για τη βιοποικιλότητα. Με σκοπό να προωθήσει την πολιτική για την αντιμετώπιση του θέματος αυτού, η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή εξέδωσε ανακοίνωση τον Οκτώβριο του 2008, την οποία το Συμβούλιο αποδέχθηκε πλήρως τον περασμένο Δεκέμβριο. Η ανακοίνωση αυτή αναφέρεται στο ζήτημα της αποψίλωσης και της υποβάθμισης των δασών στις αναπτυσσόμενες χώρες και προτείνει, μεταξύ άλλων, την ανάπτυξη ενός μηχανισμού χρηματοδότησης με στόχο να δοθούν κίνητρα ώστε να διαφυλαχθούν τα υπάρχοντα δάση.

Η πρόταση αυτή συζητείται ήδη και αποτελεί αντικείμενο περαιτέρω επεξεργασίας στις υπό εξέλιξη διεθνείς διαπραγματεύσεις για τις κλιματικές αλλαγές. Στην ανακοίνωσή της η Επιτροπή αναγνωρίζει επίσης ότι οι διάφορες ευρωπαϊκές πολιτικές, τόσο στο εσωτερικό πεδίο, όσο και διεθνώς, είναι πιθανόν να προκαλούν έμμεσες επιπτώσεις στους παγκόσμιους δασικούς πόρους. Ως εκ τούτου, η Επιτροπή ανέλαβε συγκεκριμένες δεσμεύσεις με σκοπό την ενίσχυση της συνοχής των ευρωπαϊκών πολιτικών.

Στα προτεινόμενα μέτρα συγκαταλέγεται μεταξύ άλλων τα εξής:

- μελέτη των επιδράσεων της κατανάλωσης εισαγόμενων αγαθών στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση που μπορεί να συμβάλλουν στην αποψίλωση των δασών·
- συνέχιση της διαδικασίας αναθεώρησης της συνοχής της αναπτυξιακής μας πολιτικής που απαιτείται για τη στήριξη των αναπτυσσόμενων χωρών στις προσπάθειές τους για την επίτευξη των αναπτυξιακών στόχων της χιλιετίας.

Οι δεσμεύσεις αυτές θα υλοποιηθούν και μέσω της πολιτικής της Ευρωπαϊκής Επιτροπής για την αειφόρο κατανάλωση και παραγωγή. Με την πολιτική αυτή επιδιώκεται η τόνωση της ανάπτυξης και της ζήτησης αειφόρων προϊόντων ή υπηρεσιών στα οποία συμπεριλαμβάνονται η ξυλεία και τα βασιζόμενα στην ξυλεία προϊόντα που προέρχονται από δάση στα οποία εφαρμόζονται αειφόρες μέθοδοι διαχείρισης.

Επιτρέψτε μου τώρα να αναφερθώ σ' έναν από τους κύριους παράγοντες αποψίλωσης των δασών: την παράνομη υλοτομία. Η παράνομη υλοτομία αποτελεί πολύ συχνά το πρώτο βήμα για την ευρύτερη μετατροπή των φυσικών δασών. Κατά συνέπεια, η αντιμετώπιση της παράνομης υλοτομίας και γενικότερα η βελτίωση της διαχείρισης των δασών έχουν θεμελιώδη σημασία εάν θέλουμε να πετύχουν οι προσπάθειες περιορισμού της αποψίλωσης και της υποβάθμισης των δασών. Σύμφωνα με το σχέδιο δράσης της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης του 2003 για την εφαρμογή της δασικής νομοθεσίας, τη διαχείριση και το εμπόριο, η Επιτροπή πρότεινε σειρά μέτρων για την αντιμετώπιση του προβλήματος της παράνομης υλοτομίας και του εμπορίου που συνδέεται μ' αυτήν.

Κεντρικό στοιχείο του ανωτέρω σχεδίου δράσης ήταν η σύναψη εθελουσίων συμφωνιών εταιρικής σχέσης με τρίτες χώρες παραγωγούς ξυλείας. Πιστεύουμε ότι οι εν λόγω συμφωνίες μπορούν να συμβάλουν στην αντιμετώπιση των βασικών αιτίων της παράνομης υλοτόμησης. Παράλληλα όμως, η Επιτροπή έχει αναγνωρίσει ότι οι συμφωνίες αυτές από μόνες τους ενδεχομένως να μην αρκούν για την αντιμετώπιση του προβλήματος και έτσι χρειάζεται να διερευνηθούν και άλλες δυνατότητες.

Με βάση τα αποτελέσματα της μελέτης επιπτώσεων, η Επιτροπή υπέβαλε πέρσι, πρόταση πολιτικής που βασίζεται στην ‘αρχή της δέουσας επιμέλειας’. Σύμφωνα με τον προτεινόμενο κανονισμό, οι επιχειρηματικοί φορείς οφείλουν να ελαχιστοποιούν τον κίνδυνο διάθεσης στην αγορά παρανόμως υλοποιημένης ξυλείας και συναφών προϊόντων επιδεικνύοντας, όταν διαθέτουν τα προϊόντα αυτά στην αγορά της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, τη δέουσα επιμέλεια για την απόκτηση πληροφοριών ως προς την προέλευση και τη νομιμότητα των εν λόγω προϊόντων.

Θα ήθελα να ευχαριστήσω ιδιαίτερος την εισηγήτρια κ. Lucas, τους σκιώδεις εισηγητές και τον συντάκτη της γνωμοδότησης κ. Ford για την εξαιρετικά επιμελημένη εργασία τους. Η Επιτροπή έχει εξετάσει τις τροπολογίες που προτείνει το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο στο σχέδιο κανονισμού της, και θα ήθελα να σχολιάσω εν συντομία τις τροπολογίες αυτές:

Η τροπολογία που απαγορεύει την εμπορία παρανόμως υλοτομημένης ξυλείας και συναφών προϊόντων, είναι πολύ σημαντική. Η απαγόρευση αυτή συμπεριλαμβανόταν στις επιλογές που εξέτασε η Επιτροπή, όταν συνέταξε την πρότασή της. Ωστόσο, ενώ η προσέγγιση αυτή είναι εκ πρώτης όψεως αρκετά ελκυστική, παρουσιάζει σημαντικές δυσκολίες πρακτικές και πολιτικές. Γι' αυτόν ακριβώς τον λόγο, υιοθετήσαμε μια πρόταση που βασίζεται στην αρχή της δέουσας επιμέλειας. Με την προσέγγιση αυτή επιτυγχάνεται η καλύτερη δυνατή ισορροπία ανάμεσα στην αποτελεσματικότητα της αντιμετώπισης των παράνομων πρακτικών, τη δυνατότητα εφαρμογής των μέτρων αυτών χωρίς να επιβαρύνονται άσκοπα οι επιχειρηματικοί φορείς και, τέλος, τη συμβατότητά τους με τους κανόνες του Παγκόσμιου Οργανισμού Εμπορίου.

Οι τροπολογίες με τις οποίες υποχρεούνται οι πάσης φύσεως επιχειρηματικοί φορείς σε όλα τα στάδια της εμπορικής αλυσίδας να διασφαλίζουν τη δέουσα επιμέλεια, δεν φαίνεται ότι ακολουθούν την αρχή της αναλογικότητας. Στην περίπτωση που ελεγχθεί η νομιμότητα της ξυλείας όταν κυκλοφορεί αυτή για πρώτη φορά στην αγορά, δεν φαίνεται ότι είναι ανάγκη να συνεχίζονται οι έλεγχοι και σε όλα τα επόμενα στάδια της εμπορικής αλυσίδας.

Επίσης, θα ήθελα να σημειώσω την τροπολογία του Κοινοβουλίου, με την οποία προτείνεται ένας ευρύτερος ορισμός της ‘νόμιμης ξυλείας’. Ο ορισμός αυτός αποτελεί το επίκεντρο της πρότασης και αναμφίβολα θα αποτελέσει θέμα συζητήσεων με το Συμβούλιο. Η Επιτροπή θα εξετάσει προσεκτικά τις συνέπειες της υιοθέτησης ενός τέτοιου ευρύτερου ορισμού.

Ως προς τις τροπολογίες που αφορούν την αναγνώριση οργανισμών εποπτείας και ελέγχου, πιστεύουμε ότι η αρχική μας πρόταση συμβαδίζει καλύτερα με την αρχή της επικουρικότητας αναθέτοντας στα κράτη μέλη την ευθύνη αναγνώρισης των οργανισμών αυτών.

Οι λόγοι για τους οποίους έχει προταθεί η συγκρότηση συμβουλευτικής ομάδας είναι απολύτως κατανοητοί. Η Επιτροπή είχε ανέκαθεν την πρόθεση να διαβουλευέται με τους εμπλεκόμενους φορείς, όπως έχει εξάλλου επισημάνει στην αιτιολογική έκθεσή της. Ωστόσο, καθώς αποτελεί δικαίωμα πρωτοβουλίας της Επιτροπής η συγκρότηση τέτοιων συμβουλευτικών ομάδων δεν είναι απαραίτητο να συμπεριληφθεί στον κανονισμό σχετική διάταξη.

Τέλος, αντιλαμβανόμαστε επίσης τους λόγους για τους οποίους προτείνεται η τυποποίηση της εφαρμογής του νόμου στα κράτη μέλη. Από την πλευρά μας θεωρούμε ωστόσο ότι οι εν λόγω τροπολογίες θα πρέπει κατ' αρχήν να ανταποκρίνονται στην αρχή της επικουρικότητας.

Κλείνω εδώ την παρέμβασή μου και θα παρακολουθήσω με ενδιαφέρον τη συζήτηση.

2-185

**Caroline Lucas, rapporteur.** – Mr President, I should like to start by saying how relieved I am that, at long last, we finally have before us a proposal for legislation to tackle the problem of illegal logging. Parliament has been waiting for this for an enormous amount of time and I warmly thank my colleagues for their persistent efforts to see it brought forward. I would also like to thank my colleagues for their outstanding cooperation in bringing us to the point of tomorrow's vote; shadows and staff have truly pulled out all the stops so that we could complete Parliament's first reading in the shortest possible time, so as to be in a position to seek a first-reading agreement and thus to avoid any further delays.

Sadly, however, the painfully slow rate of progress in the Council has put paid to that idea. So it seems that we will have to be content with concluding this work in the autumn, following political agreement by the Council in June, and that is very disappointing both to myself and to many colleagues who have worked so hard. Had the Council been here I would have liked to have asked them for a guarantee tonight that they will do everything possible to reach a common position before the summer, because this situation is incredibly urgent.

Illegal logging is a hugely serious problem, against which the EU has preached for many years, yet all the while continuing to provide one of the world's biggest markets for illegally logged timber and timber products. Between 20% and 40% of global industrial wood production is estimated to come from illegal sources, and up to 20% of that finds its way into the EU. That depresses timber prices, it strips natural resources and tax revenue, and it increases the poverty of forest-dependent peoples. The longer-term effects are even more serious, as Commissioner Dimas indicated, since deforestation, of which illegal logging is a major driver, accounts for nearly one fifth of global greenhouse gas emissions.

With the Copenhagen Climate Conference now on the horizon, credible EU action on illegal logging is ever more important. But credible action means effective, binding legislation. While the voluntary partnership agreements conceived under the 2003 FLEGT Action Plan have the potential to drive positive change, to date only one has been signed and, as long as their coverage is not universal, the risks of money-laundering and circumvention are just too high.

The good news is that we do finally have EU legislation; the bad news is that the Commission proposal is distressingly weak and will need comprehensive improvement in order to become meaningful and effective.

In spite of Commissioner Dimas' good words about the importance of tackling illegal logging, the Commission proposal as it stands simply is not up to the job. The preamble to the proposal states that 'weak rules to prevent trade in illegally harvested timber' are at the root of the prevalence of illegal logging, but what the Commission has come up with, I am afraid, will do nothing to change that. Quite simply, the Commission proposal as it stands will not achieve our aim of ensuring that the EU no longer provides a market for illegally logged timber.

The most glaring, gaping hole in the proposal is that it does not actually prohibit the import and sale of illegally logged timber – perverse as that sounds. It requires only that operators at one particular point in the supply chain put in place a due-diligence system while everyone else is immune from any obligation as to the legality of the timber or the timber products that they trade.

Now that stands in stark contrast to the revised US Lacey Act adopted in May 2008, which does enact an explicit prohibition on the import and sale of illegally logged timber, and there is absolutely no good reason why the EU cannot emulate this. So, while my report maintains the Commission's suggestion that only operators who place timber and timber products on the EU market for the first time should be required to put in place a full due-diligence system – since they are clearly the actors with the most influence – it makes clear that all operators in the market share responsibility for trading only legally sourced wood and that failing to do that may constitute an offence.

I should like to say to Commissioner Dimas that I really do believe that our proposals are supplementing due diligence: they are making it more effective, they are making it operational and there is no problem at all with WTO rules. If the US can do it, we should do it, and that is why Parliament is seeking to amend this proposal.

2-186

**Péter Olajos**, a *PPE-DE képviselőcsoport* nevében. – Mint az EPP vezérszónoka, az előttünk lévő két anyagot: a bizottsági állásfoglalást, illetve Caroline Lucas jelentését egyformán fontosnak tartom. Az erdőirtás, az erdőpusztulás és a biodiverzitás csökkenésének megállításához – véleményünk szerint – mindkettőre nagy szükségünk van. Jelenleg évente közel 13 millió hektár – egy Görögországnyi – erdő tűnik el, ráadásul az erdőirtás a világ széndioxid-kibocsátásának majd 20%-áért felelős, ami több mint az Európai Unió teljes üvegházhatású gázkibocsátása. Az erdőirtás felelős a biodiverzitás jelentős csökkenéséért, és bizonyos fajok kihalásáért, valamint a Földön működő ökológiai szolgáltatás hanyatlásáért. Nem vitás tehát, cselekedni kell, a globális politikai válasz kialakításában pedig az Európai Uniónak vezető szerepet kell vállalnia.

A trópusi erdők mellett különösen fontosnak tartom a Közép-Kelet-Európában zajló erdőirtás megállítását, valamint a faanyagok, illetve a fából készült termékek esetében a szigorú fenntarthatósági kritériumrendszer felállítását. Zöld közbeszerzésekre és fenntarthatósági kritériumokra van szükség a megújulóenergia-termeléshez felhasznált fa és egyéb biomassza tekintetében. A széndioxid-kibocsátás csökkenéséből származó aukciós bevételek egy részét az erdőirtás megállítására kell fordítani, üdvözlöm Lucas képviselő jelentésében az ellenőrzés szigorítására és a hatékony büntetőrendszer kialakítására irányuló törekvést. Végül különösen fontosnak tartom az ellenőrző szervek felállítását, és olyan pénzbüntetés alkalmazását, amely valóban tükrözi a környezeti kár megtérítését.

2-187

**Riitta Myller**, *PSE-ryhmän puolesta*. – Arvoisa puhemies, ympäristövaliokunnassa suurella enemmistöllä hyväksytty mietintö laittomien hakkuiden kieltämiseksi on tasapainoinen. Samalla kun se on riittävästi kunnianhimoinen kieltäessään laittomat hakkuut ja niistä tuotettujen tuotteiden tuonnin ja kaupan, se ei aiheuta lisää byrokratiaa toimijoille, jotka jo nyt hoitavat asiansa moitteettomasti.

Laittomien hakkuiden suitsiminen on välttämätöntä. Laittomat hakkuut ovat huomattava syy globaaliin metsäkatoon, joka taas – kuten täällä on todettu – aiheuttaa 20 prosenttia globaaleista kasviuonepäästöistä ja on merkittävä syy biologisen

monimuotoisuuden heikkenemiseen. Ympäristöongelmien lisäksi laiton puunkorjuu heikentää metsäalan laillisten toimijoiden kilpailukykyä ja aiheuttaa valtioille mittavia tulonmenetyksiä.

Haluan esittää esittelijä Lucasille suuret kiitokset hänen työstään, jonka ansiosta voimme huomenna äänestää hyvää pohjaehdotuksesta.

2-188

**Magor Imre Csibi**, *on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – Mr President, by the time allocated to this debate, one might say that Parliament attaches little importance to saving forests. This stops the disappointment of discovering the shy Commission approach to addressing illegal logging, but what disappointed me the most was the repetition of the argument that we should not punish the good-faith EU operators in order to solve an external problem.

Part of solving a problem is also creating awareness about the problem, and it is high time we acknowledged that some European regions – like mine – are also confronted with rampant deforestation. The illegal logging regulation does not aim to punish or to hinder trade but rather to better control trade. It is true that the Commission proposals were not really clear on how the system should work in practice.

I am pleased that the EP managed to strengthen and clarify the proposal by covering all timber products and requiring all operators to exercise some sort of due diligence by introducing a new baseline for financial penalties and providing clear criteria for a credible and independent monitoring system. Now our challenge is to have this system adopted and implemented sooner rather than later. We need to give consumers the guarantee that they are not fuelling the environmental degradation by accidentally buying illegally harvested timber products.

2-189

**Stavros Dimas**, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, I wish to thank all the speakers in tonight's debate for their constructive contributions. It is important to underline that tackling global deforestation and forest degradation is a complex issue. Solving it requires real political will and actions on the demand side.

We should keep in mind that patterns of tropical deforestation are the result of the interaction of a number of different factors which vary in importance in different locations. Forest cover is not only affected by forest policies, but also by other policies such as taxation policy, land tenure and rights.

In the European Union we understand that working on the coherence of our policies must go hand in hand with supporting countries in their efforts to strengthen national and local institutions and make progress towards effective governance and use of forest resources. I wish to thank again Ms Lucas, Mr Ford and the shadow rapporteurs for their excellent work. I am encouraged that Parliament, while endorsing the approach of the Commission, wants to reinforce it further and has made amendments to this end.

Let me assure you that I fully share Parliament's objective of putting in place an ambitious regulation to address illegal logging and its associated trade. I also want to assure you that the Commission will give careful consideration to the amendments of the proposed regulation.

To conclude, I would like in particular to comment on two of the issues addressed tonight. Firstly I would like to refer to the due-diligence approach, which is more comprehensive than just a certificate of legality. The principle of due diligence reflects the legal obligation of a proactive behaviour to a certain legality and needs to be demonstrated on a basis of comprehensive measures which will enable legality to be reasonably assured.

In some cases a certificate of legality will only be a starting point, the first measure included in the due diligence procedure. Where the risk assessment has shown that the country of origin presents a higher risk of administrative corruption, or in countries where enforcement of national laws is weak, additional guarantees are necessary to underpin the certified legality.

The other issue I would like to address is the proposed extension of the scope to cover downstream operators. According to the principles of better regulation and a reduction of administrative burden, requiring distributors and retailers to demand proof of the due diligence from the proceeding market obligators appears to be excessive. If timber was made subject to due-diligence enquires when first placed on the market, why unduly burden downstream operators?

In summary, out of the 75 proposed amendments, the Commission can support fully, in part, or in principle, 37. I will provide Parliament's secretariat with a list detailing the Commission's position on the amendments.

2-190

**Caroline Lucas**, *rapporteur*. – Mr President, I should like to thank my colleagues, and Commissioner Dimas, very much for their comments.

One important point I would like to make is that great care has been taken in our amendments not to reinvent the wheel. I have learnt from meetings with numerous industry representatives and other stakeholders that many countries, and also many companies, already have in place excellent systems which would fulfil most, if not all, requirements of the due-diligence system.

It makes sense, then, that all the work that has gone into establishing those systems does not go to waste and that we do not create unnecessary extra administrative burdens; that is far from being our intention.

That being so, we have been very careful and have made use of good advice on including wording which would enable good existing systems to qualify under the regulation without the need to establish whole new structures.

So we have taken very seriously the message that we should not be disproportionate, that we should not be putting too much burden on the different players in the trading system, and that is exactly what our report aims to do: to make sure that all players in the trading system have a responsibility, that we do not put everything onto those who first put the products onto the market. That is what seems disproportionate. I think it is much more sensible that everybody has a role to play.

I would also add that many elements of our proposals are actually supported by industry. It is rather ironic that in many senses industry seems to be far more ambitious in this area than even the Commission itself.

I have heard directly from industry how much they appreciate not only the fact that the Committee on the Environment's report provides them with much greater clarity on what will be expected of them, but also precisely this fairer and more effective sharing of responsibility across the different parts of the supply chain which I have just described.

As far as European operators are concerned, I would like to say very clearly that the regulation as we have amended it should do nothing but benefit responsible European operators, since the vast majority of them already do most of what is being asked, and the existence of the regulation will prevent them from being undercut by other, less scrupulous, operators.

So we should be very clear that there is nothing in this report that makes life difficult for European operators. We have also got some special measures for smaller operators, so we have taken very seriously the risk of being disproportionate; I think we have addressed that very sensibly in the report that we have put before you.

Having heard again your comments, Commissioner, on the Environment Committee's report, I am afraid I do maintain my view that the Commission's proposal as it stands is disappointing and weak and simply will not do what it claims to do. I fail to see how you can have legislation aimed at preventing the sale of illegally logged timber which does not actually make doing so an offence. The way in which the whole Commission proposal is written is very patchy and it is very timid.

I think most European consumers would be genuinely shocked to realise that the EU does not already have in place legislation against illegal logging, and I suspect that all those who concluded, in response to the Commission's own consultation, that legislation was the only way to really address the problem would not see the particular proposals by the Commission, the due-diligence system on its own, as sufficient to be able to address the problems that we face.

I will end my comments tonight by seeking – maybe via your good offices, Commissioner – to put some pressure behind the Council to speed up their work, because we really do want to make sure we get a common position from the Council before the summer so that we can move swiftly on with this in the autumn.

As I said earlier, we had really hoped to get a first-reading agreement. Parliament did everything it could to enable that to happen. It is, frankly, deeply disappointing that the Council has not acted with equivalent seriousness and speed, but I hope I can ask you once again, Commissioner, to do all you can to ensure that the Council does move swiftly on this.

2-191

**Le Président.** – La discussion commune est close.

J'ai reçu conformément à l'article 103, paragraphe 2, une proposition de résolution, au nom de la commission de l'environnement, de la santé publique et de la sécurité alimentaire<sup>1</sup>.

Le vote sur cette proposition de résolution aura lieu jeudi 23 avril 2009.

Le vote sur le rapport de Mme Caroline Lucas aura lieu mercredi 22 avril 2009.

---

<sup>1</sup> Voir procès-verbal.

*Déclarations écrites (article 142)*

2-192

**Véronique Mathieu (PPE-DE), par écrit.** – La lutte contre le commerce illégal du bois doit, bien sûr, être une priorité, en raison de ses conséquences sur les écosystèmes et de la concurrence déloyale qu'elle provoque pour les acteurs "légaux" de la filière forêt-bois-papier.

Toutefois, si nous imposons des contraintes démesurées, notamment en matière de traçabilité, à l'opérateur qui met du bois sur le marché, cela se traduira par une perte de compétitivité de nos entreprises sans pour autant réduire l'exploitation illégale du bois, qui sera redirigée vers d'autres marchés. En effet, il serait illusoire de considérer que seule une législation européenne très contraignante résoudrait les problèmes de corruption ou de déficit d'État, comme cela est souvent le cas dans les pays qui pratiquent cette activité illégale.

De même, j'estime que ce rapport va trop loin en remettant en cause la proposition initiale de la Commission, qui convient aux opérateurs. Ainsi, il ne me semble pas opportun de remettre en cause les systèmes de certification mis en place par les professionnels, d'exclure les organisations professionnelles et les organisations de contrôle financées par des opérateurs de la filière, ni de supprimer l'autorité nationale compétente pour désigner les organisations de contrôle. Je considère que l'on doit maintenir les professionnels du secteur au cœur du dispositif et éviter de leur imposer des démarches administratives trop lourdes.

2-193

## **22 - Régime communautaire de contrôle afin d'assurer le respect des règles de la politique commune de la pêche (débat)**

2-194

**Le Président.** – L'ordre du jour appelle le rapport de Raül Romeva i Rueda, au nom de la commission de la pêche, sur la proposition de règlement du Conseil instituant un régime communautaire de contrôle afin d'assurer le respect des règles de la politique commune de la pêche (COM(2008)0721 - C6-0510/2008 - 2008/0216(CNS)) (A6-0253/2009).

2-195

**Raül Romeva i Rueda, Ponente.** – Señor Presidente, quería empezar por recordar que hace unas semanas Greenpeace denunció ante la Fiscalía española que una empresa gallega, Armadores Vidal, había estado recibiendo subvenciones del Gobierno español, concretamente por valor de 3,6 millones de euros, entre 2003 y 2005, a pesar de que esta empresa acumula desde 1999 numerosas sanciones en varios países por pescar ilegalmente en medio mundo.

La Comisión, de hecho, ha estado denunciando este asunto últimamente.

La semana pasada empezó la temporada de pesca del atún rojo. Los científicos nos dicen que hace tiempo que ya hemos superado los límites aceptables de pesca sostenible de esta especie en claro riesgo de desaparición.

Estos días, la Ministra española de Defensa se encuentra en Somalia dirigiendo el operativo de protección de la industria atunera desplegada en el Índico, frente a los ataques de la piratería.

Si los atuneros europeos tienen que alejarse tanto de sus casas para trabajar se debe, primero, a que los *stocks* más cercanos están a punto de colapsar y, segundo, a que contamos con una flota excesivamente subvencionada y claramente sobredimensionada que busca rentabilidad a costa, incluso, de acabar con el principal elemento que sustenta su actividad, los peces.

El problema común en todos estos casos –y en otros muchos– es, una vez más, la sobrepesca, la sobredimensión de la flota europea y, sobre todo, la falta de control y de capacidad sancionadora.

Por ello defendemos en este informe que la aplicación no discriminatoria y efectiva de las normas debe ser uno de los pilares fundamentales de la Política Pesquera Común.

Por ello pedimos, por ejemplo, que se prohíba explícitamente dar ayudas públicas a quien actúe de forme ilegal, como es el caso de Armadores Vidal.

El cumplimiento de las normas y la adopción de un enfoque coherente constituyen la mejor manera de proteger a largo plazo los intereses del sector pesquero.

Dicha política está condenada al fracaso si los agentes del sector pesquero, desde la gente de mar hasta los comerciantes que venden el pescado a los consumidores, no cumplen con las normas. Las poblaciones de peces están condenadas a desaparecer junto con quienes dependen de ellas.

La Comisión y el Parlamento Europeo hemos lamentado en varias ocasiones el bajo grado de cumplimiento y hemos pedido, entre otras cosas, que los Estados miembros intensifiquen los controles, que armonicen los criterios de inspección, así como las sanciones, y que los resultados de las inspecciones sean transparentes. Además, hemos pedido también que se fortalezcan los sistemas de inspecciones comunitarios.

La propuesta de reglamento motivo de este informe aborda la necesaria reforma del régimen de control existente y plantea una serie de recomendaciones que hay que añadir a las ya existentes tras la aprobación del Reglamento sobre pesca ilegal, no declarada y no reglamentada –la pesca «you-you»– o del Reglamento relativo a la autorización de las actividades pesqueras.

Probablemente la cualidad más importante de un sistema de control que se aplica a 27 Estados miembros consiste en que todas las partes sean tratadas por igual y, sobre todo, que todos los agentes de la cadena de producción –pescadores, intermediarios, compradores, personas vinculadas al sector de la pesca recreativa y otros– sientan que no están siendo discriminados, pero también que tienen su parte de responsabilidad en este aspecto.

Debe asegurarse, por tanto, la igualdad de condiciones en toda la Comunidad pero también en toda la cadena de custodia.

La propuesta que presentamos –en todo caso, apoyamos también en gran parte a la propuesta original de la Comisión– incluye una serie de aspectos que permitirían avanzar considerablemente en esta dirección.

Yo quiero mencionar simplemente, como aspecto señalado, la necesidad de que la Agencia Comunitaria de Control de la Pesca tenga un papel especialmente importante que desempeñar, dada su naturaleza comunitaria y su mandato de imparcialidad.

Por ello espero que las enmiendas que hemos presentado a última hora, para acabar de concretar el informe, sean aceptadas por el resto de los colegas como ya ocurrió en el debate que tuvimos en comisión y espero, efectivamente, que sea un instrumento útil para salvar a quienes debemos salvar, que son no solamente los *stocks*, sino las poblaciones que viven de ellos.

2-196

**Joe Borg, Member of the Commission.** – Mr President, first of all allow me to thank the rapporteur, Mr Romeva i Rueda, who has undertaken some impressive work on this report. What is even more noteworthy is the fact that the rapporteur has undertaken to meet with numerous international and Community stakeholders in several capitals. This file was complex and delicate. The Commission would like to thank Mr Romeva i Rueda for his work on this report.

As you know, the current regulation on fisheries control dates back to 1993. It has since been amended a dozen times, in particular in 1998, to include the control of fishing effort, and in 2002 on the occasion of the last reform of the common fisheries policy (CFP). However, the resulting system has serious shortcomings that prevent it from being as effective as it should be. As both the European Commission and the European Court of Auditors have highlighted, the current system is inefficient, expensive, complex, and it does not produce the desired results. This in turn undermines conservation and effort management initiatives. Control failures thus contribute to the negative performance of the common fisheries policy.

The main aim of the control reform is to ensure the respect of the CFP rules by building a new standard framework which will enable the Member States and the Commission to fully assume their responsibilities. It establishes a global and integrated approach to control, focusing on all aspects of the CFP and covering the whole chain of catch, landing, transport, processing and marketing – ‘from catch to consumer’. In order to achieve this, the reform is built on three axes.

Axis 1: the creation of a culture of compliance and responsibility of the sector. The aim of this objective is to influence the behaviour of all stakeholders involved in the wide range of fishing activities in order to achieve compliance through not only monitoring and control activities, but as a result of an overall culture of compliance where all parts of the industry understand and accept that playing by the rules is in their own long-term interest.

Axis 2: instituting a global and integrated approach to control and inspection. The proposal ensures uniformity in the implementation of the control policy, while respecting the diversity and the specific characteristics of different fleets. It establishes a level playing field for the industry by covering all aspects from capture through to the market.

Axis 3: the effective application of CFP rules. The reform also aims to clearly define the roles and responsibilities of Member States, the Commission and the Community Fisheries Control Agency. Under the CFP, control and enforcement are the exclusive competence of the Member States. The role of the Commission is to control and verify that the Member States are implementing the CFP rules correctly and effectively. The current proposal does *not* try to change this allocation of responsibilities. However, it is important to rationalise procedures, and to ensure that the Commission has the means to actually see to it that the Member States equally implement CFP rules.



I would also like to emphasise the fact that the proposal will reduce administrative burdens and make the system less bureaucratic. The Commission's impact assessment found that if the reform is adopted, the total administrative costs for operators could be reduced by 51% – from EUR 78 to EUR 38 million – largely through the use of more modern technologies, such as the extension of the use of ERS, VMS and AIS.

Existing paper-based tools will be replaced at all stages of the fisheries chain – i.e. logbook, landing declarations and sales notes – except for vessels below 10 metres overall length. For fishermen, the electronic system will make it easier to record and communicate data. Once the system has been introduced, a number of reporting requirements will be removed.

The system will be quicker, more accurate, less expensive and will allow for the automated processing of data. It will also facilitate cross-checking of data and information, and the identification of risks. The result will be a more rational and risk-based approach to control actions at sea and on land, the latter being inherently more cost-effective.

The proposal will also remove the current obligation on Member States to transmit lists of fishing licenses or fishing permits to the Commission, which will instead be made accessible by electronic means to the national control services, to those of other Member States, and to the Commission.

Now turning to the report, I would like to comment on the amendments proposed.

The Commission welcomes the fact that the European Parliament supports the legislation in principle and considers that a new control regulation is necessary. Whilst the Commission can go along with certain amendments that are in line with the discussion within the Council working group, it considers it fundamental to retain certain key elements of the proposal.

The Commission can agree with an important number of amendments, in particular Amendments 3, 6, 9, 10, 11, 13 to 18, 26 to 28, 30, 31, 36, 44, 45, 51 to 55, 57, 58, 62, 63, 66 to 69, 82, 84, 85, and 92 to 98.

The Commission cannot, however, accept the following amendments, which could be summarised as follows:

Concerning the monitoring of fishing activities: Amendment 23 modifies the margin of tolerance to be applied to logbook catch entries to 10%, instead of 5% as in the proposal. This will seriously affect the accuracy of the logbook data that is essential when using such data for cross-checks. Since such cross-checks will be used to identify data inconsistencies as indicators of illegal behaviour on which Member States should concentrate their scarce control resources, this amendment would also negatively affect the operation of the computerised validation system foreseen in Article 102(1) of the proposal which is considered to be the backbone of the new control system. The most important argument is, however, that fishermen can indeed estimate their catches within an accuracy level of 3%. After all, fish is stored and transported in boxes and they know how much weight of fish a box can hold.

Regarding Amendment 29 on prior notifications, the Commission believes that the idea to reserve the granting of exemptions to the Council would complicate enormously the procedure and would not allow for timely reactions to developments on the ground.

The Commission also finds that the reallocation of unused quotas is a management matter that should be dealt with in the context of the CFP reform. Thus, Amendment 41 on corrective measures cannot be accepted.

On transshipments of stocks subject to multiannual plans, Amendment 42 deletes the entire Article 33. This is not acceptable because, as you know, transshipments have been used in the past to conceal illegal catches. For that reason it is essential to maintain Article 33 and that quantities to be transhipped are weighed by an independent body before they are taken on the transport vessel.

Amendment 47 deletes the entire section on real-time closure of fisheries. By accepting this, the Commission would lose a very important instrument for the protection of stocks. Real time closures are directly linked to control issues. Therefore, this amendment cannot be accepted.

Amendment 102 is not acceptable since it deletes the article on the ability for the Commission to close fisheries if so required by the Commission. A similar provision exists already in the current control regulation, and it is a necessary tool to ensure that, if a Member State fails to close a fishery, then the Commission is entitled to close that fishery in order to ensure the respect of quotas – and this we did last year for the bluefin tuna and the year before for cod in the Baltic Sea.

Similarly, the Commission cannot accept Amendment 103, which deletes the provisions on corrective measures. This would weaken the role of the Commission as the guardian of EU law ensuring that all Member States are able to take full advantage of their fishing opportunities. Moreover, this provision already exists in current legislation.

As regards new technologies: concerning the Vessel Monitoring System (VMS) and the Vessel Detection System (VDS), Amendment 19 foresees the entry into force of these electronic devices for vessels between 10 and 15 metres as of 1 July 2013, instead of 1 January 2012, as laid down in the proposal. Amendment 20 foresees that the installation of VMS devices and electronic logbooks is eligible for funding, with 80% cofinancing from the EU budget.

Regarding Amendment 19, the proposal already provides for a transition period, as this obligation would only apply as of 1 January 2012, whereas the entry into force of the regulation is foreseen for 1 January 2010. Since the new control system intends to make the best possible use of modern technologies, in order to develop an efficient automated and systematic system of cross-checking, it is important that these provisions apply on the date foreseen in the proposal, so as not to further delay the implementation of the new approach to control.

Regarding the concerns on the cost of introducing these new technologies, the cofinancing by the Commission is already available under Council Regulation (EC) No 861/2006, which establishes cofinancing rates, and in the framework of this Regulation the Commission will consider increasing such rates. It would, however, go against the budgetary rules to lay down in another legislative act the rates for cofinancing.

Concerning recreational fisheries: on this controversial subject, I would like to indicate that, in contrast to what has been widely reported, the draft regulation does not aim to place a disproportionate burden upon individual anglers or on the leisure fishing industry. What is proposed is to subject certain recreational fisheries on certain specific stocks, namely those subject to a recovery plan, to certain basic conditions on permits and catch reporting. These requirements will also help to obtain information allowing the public authorities to evaluate the biological impact of such activities and, where necessary, to prepare the measures needed.

Concerning the EP report, the Commission welcomes the fact that a definition of 'recreational fisheries' is provided for in Amendment 11, and that Parliament foresees that, where a recreational fishery is found to have a significant impact, catches should count against the quotas. It also welcomes the fact that the EP agrees that the marketing of catches from recreational fishing shall be prohibited except for philanthropic purposes. However, I would like to stress that it is important to maintain an obligation for Member States to evaluate the impact of recreational fisheries as set out in Amendment 93, and not just the possibility to do so as contemplated in Amendments 48, 49 and 50.

The Commission, of course, wants to ensure that the final regulation adopted by the Council achieves a fair balance between, on the one hand, obtaining accurate information on the impact of recreational fisheries on recovery stocks – following a case by case analysis – and, on the other, ensuring that recreational fishers, whose catches clearly have a negligible biological impact, are not burdened with disproportionate requirements.

Concerning sanctions and enforcement: Amendment 64 inserts a new Article 84(2a) indicating that as long as a holder of a fishing authorisation has been given 'penalty points' the holder should be excluded from receiving EU subsidies or national public aid during that time. The Commission cannot accept this amendment. In the same vein, Amendment 61 cannot be accepted.

In fact Article 45, point 7, of Regulation (EC) No 1005/2008 establishing a Community system to prevent, deter and eliminate illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing already provides the possibility to ban offenders temporarily or permanently from access to public assistance or subsidies. To introduce such a rule additionally in the context of the penalty point system would be disproportionate.

Amendment 107 deletes the minimum and maximum levels of sanctions proposed by the Commission. This is not acceptable, since comparable sanctions in all Member States is an important element to achieve the same degree of deterrence in all Community waters and thus create a level playing field through the establishment of a common framework at the Community level. The provision does not affect the discretion of Member States to determine which infringements are to be characterised as serious.

Concerning the powers of the Commission: Amendment 71 imposes the presence of an official of a Member State during inspections carried out by the Commission, and in the same vein, Amendment 108 limits the possibility for the Commission to carry out inquiries and inspections only in cases where a Member State has been previously informed. The capacity of the Commission to undertake autonomous inspections would be seriously affected when officials of the Member State concerned have to be always present during inspections. By not providing an official, the Member State concerned could even prevent an autonomous inspection from taking place.

Amendments 104, 108, 109 and 110 are also problematic since they restrict the competencies of Community inspectors, restrict their ability to perform autonomous verifications and autonomous inspections. Without such competencies for Community inspectors, the Commission cannot ensure the same quality of application of CFP rules in all Member States.

Amendment 72 takes away the basis according to which Community financial assistance can be suspended or cancelled when there is evidence that provisions of the regulation have not been complied with. The Commission cannot accept this amendment. With this amendment the simple conclusion by the Commission that the Member State concerned has not taken adequate measures would be sufficient to take measures against that Member State.

On the other hand, Amendments 111 and 112 limit the competence of the Commission to suspend Community financial assistance. This would seriously undermine the capacity of the Commission to apply this measure. Furthermore, the amendment does not clarify who, instead of the Commission, is supposed to take such a decision.

Concerning the closure of fisheries: Amendment 73 limits considerably the cases in which the Commission will be able to close a fishery for failure to comply with the objectives of the common fisheries policy. 'Evidence' of non-respect will be much harder to prove than 'reason to believe'. In order to ensure that the rules of the CFP are equally applied in all Member States and to avoid a particular threat to sensitive stocks, it is important that the Commission has the possibility to close a fishery when the relevant Member State fails to do so itself. In the same vein, the Commission cannot accept Amendment 113, which proposes to delete this article.

Amendments 74 to 78 reduce substantially the pressure on Member States to respect national quotas. Acceptance of these amendments would simply mean maintaining the status quo. The amendments reduce substantially the possibility for the Commission to take measures to ensure that Member State fishers do not fish on a regulated stock for which the Member State has no quota or has a small quota. This would be particularly detrimental in cases where such fishing effectively prevents other Member States from fishing their quotas.

Amendments 79 and 80 delete Articles 98 and 100, which give the Commission the possibility of deducting quotas and to refuse quota exchange for failure to comply with the objectives of the CFP. The Commission wishes to maintain this provision, which is an important instrument, to ensure the respect of the CFP rules by Member States. It responds to the recommendation of the Court of Auditors to reinforce the capacity of the Commission to put pressure on Member States. It will also help demonstrate to national fishing industries that the respect of the CFP rules by their national administrations is also in their interest, and they can be expected to exert a positive pressure on their national administrations to that effect.

Amendment 114 proposes the deletion of Article 101 on emergency measures. The Commission cannot accept this amendment since this provision is an important instrument to ensure the respect of the CFP rules by the Member States.

I would once again like to thank Mr Romeva i Rueda for the report and the committee for the attention it has given to this very important issue. This report is a significant contribution to a truly efficient control system. I would like to apologise for taking up so much time.

2-197

**Carmen Fraga Estévez**, *en nombre del Grupo PPE-DE*. – Señor Presidente, Señor Comisario, hay una primera objeción mayor que plantear a esta propuesta, y es su absoluta falta de consulta con el sector.

Es inadmisibles que la Comisión siga proclamando que toda su política pesquera se basará en el diálogo con las partes interesadas y que sea justo a la hora de redactar el reglamento que más graves consecuencias inmediatas tiene para la flota cuando se hurta al sector ese diálogo y esa consulta previa.

Mal comienzo para intentar instaurar esa cultura del cumplimiento que tanto repite la Comisión. Muy discutible es también el momento elegido.

Si bien es verdad que la política de control es uno de los fallos más clamorosos de la Política Pesquera Común, también lo es que la Comisión la mantiene desde 1993, y se decide a modificarla justo cuando presenta los trabajos previos para una reforma de la PCP que anuncia una revisión profunda del sistema de conservación y gestión.

Puesto que el control es parte indisoluble de cualquier sistema de gestión, mucho más razonable hubiera sido coordinar ambas reformas sin correr el riesgo de que la de 2012 deje obsoleta esta propuesta, algunas de cuyas medidas no van a entrar en vigor, como pronto, hasta ese mismo año 2012.

Estos dos errores mayores desvirtúan lo que podrían haber sido grandes aciertos, como los intentos de armonizar las infracciones y las sanciones y el objetivo de responsabilizar de una vez a los Estados miembros ante las evidentes faltas de voluntad política para aplicar las medidas de control.

Sólo me queda, señor Presidente, dar las gracias al ponente por su trabajo y siento que tengamos tan poco tiempo para trabajar en una materia tan importante.

2-198

**Emanuel Jardim Fernandes**, *em nome do Grupo PSE*. – Senhor Presidente, Senhor Comissário, caros Colegas, o relatório do colega Romeva, que felicito pela sua abertura, tem como principal objectivo assegurar o respeito das regras na política comum de pescas.

O respeito por estas regras e uma abordagem europeia das pescas constituem a melhor forma de zelar pelos interesses do sector. Se todos os agentes do sector – da tripulação a bordo até aos comerciantes que vendem o peixe – não respeitarem as regras, a sobrevivência destes estará condenada. Contribuição para o fracasso será também a tentativa de aplicação de regras europeias sem reflectir a diversidade das frotas europeias.

Por isso propus uma mais adequada adaptação da proposta da Comissão à realidade das frotas artesanais – embora gostasse de ir mais longe – de menor dimensão, existentes um pouco por toda a União Europeia, designadamente nas RUP, sem nunca esquecer que uma política comum de pescas necessita de adequadas medidas de controlo.

Por várias vezes, enquanto relator para o orçamento das pescas, lamentei um insuficiente grau de cumprimento das regras europeias, tendo solicitado, designadamente, um melhor controlo por parte dos Estados-Membros, a transparência dos resultados das inspecções, o reforço da política comunitária de inspecção, desde que acompanhados por medidas financeiras de apoio ao sector.

É certo que gostaríamos de ir mais longe, mas não posso deixar de felicitar o relator pela proposta e pelas medidas que apresentou, esperando do Sr. Comissário uma resposta cabal a este assunto.

2-199

**Elspeth Attwooll**, *on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – Mr President, beyond congratulating Mr Romeva i Rueda on his report, I would like to address the content in the wider context of the common fisheries policy.

In the last 10 years I have heard many criticisms of it, including the lack of a level playing field, insufficient stakeholder involvement, inadequate balancing of economic, social and environmental imperatives and too much by way of micro-management from the centre.

Recently, though, I have been able to assure people that the policy is undergoing significant change. Of course there is still a long way to go – eliminating discards, for example – and there are times when the Commission still seems to veer towards micro-management. I mention here Article 47 of the control regulation, at least in its original version. I have often said, though, that the common fisheries policy is a bit like an oil tanker: it takes a considerable time to turn round, and I do believe that the control regulation will go a long way to achieving the necessary level playing field where enforcement and sanctions are concerned, just as the development of regional advisory councils shall do much to bring improvements in other respects.

So I would like to finish on a personal note, by expressing my appreciation of the valuable work done by members of the Fisheries Committee throughout and by thanking Commissioner Borg and his team for all that has been achieved in their five years at the helm.

2-200

**Pedro Guerreiro**, *em nome do Grupo GUE/NGL*. – Senhor Presidente, Portugal abrange o território historicamente definido no continente europeu e os arquipélagos dos Açores e da Madeira. A lei define a extensão e o limite das águas territoriais, a zona económica exclusiva, e os direitos de Portugal aos fundos marinhos contíguos. O Estado não aliena qualquer parte do território português ou dos direitos de soberania que sobre ele exerce.

O artigo 5.º da Constituição da República Portuguesa não podia ser mais claro. Daí, em consonância e pugnando pelo respeito do consagrado na lei fundamental de Portugal, termos apresentado uma proposta de alteração que estabelece que a presente proposta de regulamento respeita e não coloca em causa a competência e a responsabilidade que incumbe aos Estados-Membros quanto ao controlo do cumprimento das regras da política comum das pescas.

No entanto, as alterações da Comissão das Pescas, apesar de alguns pontos minimizarem aspectos negativos da inaceitável proposta da Comissão Europeia, não salvaguardam princípios que consideramos centrais.

Nomeadamente, entre outros gravosos e inadequados aspectos, é inaceitável que a Comissão tenha a competência de efectuar inspecções sem aviso prévio e de forma independente nas zonas económicas exclusivas e território dos Estados-Membros, possa de forma discricionária proibir as actividades de pesca e suspender ou anular pagamentos da assistência financeira comunitária de um Estado-Membro ou que um Estado-Membro possa inspecionar os seus navios de pesca na zona económica exclusiva de qualquer outro Estado-Membro sem a sua autorização.

Termino recordando o que este mesmo Parlamento aprovou: a importância do controlo na gestão das pescas, cuja competência é dos Estados-Membros. Esperemos que, uma vez mais, não dê agora o dito por não dito – aliás como, infelizmente, tem sido seu hábito.

2-201

**Nigel Farage, on behalf of the IND/DEM Group.** – Mr President, I must declare an interest in this subject. I am a lifelong keen sea angler, as are most of my family. I enjoy this because it is one of the last basic freedoms that we have. We can go onto the beach or out in our boats, catch a few fish and take them home to eat.

Now, for some years, recreational sea anglers have been lobbying for their sport to be included as part of the CFP. I have said for years, ‘be careful what you wish for’. Well, now it has happened and it is called Article 47, and it is called this Maltese Commissioner, Joe Borg. There are over one million of us in Britain: we are conservation-minded; we are sensible. We do not need regulating, Mr Borg, by the likes of you. That is why we need an outright rejection of Article 47 because nothing else will do. If you get this power, you can come back year after year. We may say now that beach angling has been exempted, but once it is under the auspices of people like you, Mr Borg, you can come back next year or the year after and start to regulate it.

As far as boat angling is concerned, the door with all of this is open for everybody being required to have licences and to report. Any mini-victory that we feel that we won at committee stage by changing the words ‘Member States shall’ to ‘Member States may’ start to collect this data is lost: I am afraid, with Defra back home, I feel they will take any opportunity to use EU rules to control us in any way that they can.

Sea angling needs encouragement. We should be building offshore reefs. We should be recognising – as the Americans have done – the enormous economic impact that it can have. Instead, we have a common fisheries policy that has been an environmental disaster already. It is prejudiced against the British working fleet and it will now ruin sea angling in Britain if we give this man, and people of his ilk, power. So, Commissioner Borg, my advice is ‘sling your hook’!

2-202

**Jean-Claude Martinez (NI).** – Monsieur le Président, merci pour Sète. Il y a effectivement des ressources halieutiques, un nouveau système de contrôle dont nous discutons ce soir, mais il y a surtout les pêcheurs, leur métier, leur vie, et pêcheur, c'est le plus dur métier du monde. Ce n'est pas fonctionnaire ou député et ça façonne des hommes libres, mais aujourd'hui désespérés, d'où les révoltes des thoniers en Méditerranée, à Sète, au Grau-du-Roi ou des pêcheurs en colère à Boulogne, en France.

Nous leur réglementons la pêche depuis 1983, soit 26 ans. Mais, dès le traité de Rome, les articles 32 à 39 sur la PAC les concernaient aussi, et le tout premier règlement communautaire sur la pêche était de 1970. Cela fait 39 ans que nous légiférons: sur le choc de l'arrivée de l'Espagne en 1986, du Danemark en 1993, les filets maillants, dérivants, les agents de pêche, les TAC, les quotas, les aides, la restructuration des flottes, la modernisation.

Nous légiférons sur les sanctions, les repos biologiques, les stocks, les rejets, les systèmes de surveillance, les hommes, les espèces, les cabillauds, les merlus, les thons rouges, et même les accords internationaux. Et maintenant, la pêche récréative! Et ça ne marche toujours pas. L'Europe bleue est de plus en plus grise.

Pourquoi? Parce que la pêche fait partie du défi alimentaire planétaire du XXI<sup>e</sup> siècle, c'est au niveau mondial qu'il va falloir la gérer. Comme la crise financière, les pandémies, le climat, l'immigration, la grande criminalité, les poissons sont des altermondialistes.

Ils ne respectent ni les frontières, ni le droit communautaire. L'Europe est trop petite pour réglementer la ressource pêche et, du Pérou au Japon, de Moscou à Dakar, l'Irlande, Valencia, il va falloir des règlements de la copropriété planétaire de la ressource halieutique. C'est la voie, Monsieur le Président, que Bruxelles devrait contribuer à prendre.

2-203

**Le Président.** – Bien, après cette marée verbale, la parole est à M. Stevenson.

2-204

**Struan Stevenson (PPE-DE).** – Mr President, you are probably aware that two fishermen, a father and son, from Northern Ireland, who fish out of Peterhead, have been jailed in Liverpool after being fined GBP 1 million and that the Assets Recovery Agency, which is an agency normally used for measures against drug dealers and gangsters, was utilised to hammer these two working fishermen, who, admittedly, were involved in landing illegal catches, which no one would condone – but to treat working fishermen, even guilty of that offence, as criminals, as gangsters, in the same way as we would treat drug dealers, is appalling. This proves why we definitely need some measure to introduce a level playing field as is contained in Mr Romeva i Rueda's report, because a similar offence in some parts of the EU would probably merit a fine of just EUR 2 000 or EUR 3 000.

I want, however, to use the remainder of my time to talk about Article 47, not surprisingly, because I believe that there is a need to differentiate between the word ‘shall’ and the word ‘may’ as contained in Amendments 93, 48, 49 and 50. We won considerable support in committee for my amendment that contained the word ‘may’, but now you have informed us, Commissioner, that you would reject that in any case, so it seems we have been wasting our time.

I do hope you will consider this again. If a Member State does not think it is necessary to pursue this course of action, I hope you would respect the subsidiarity principle.

2-205

**Nils Lundgren (IND/DEM).** – Herr talman! Som EU-skeptiker känner jag ofta en viss skadeglädje när olika EU-institutioner kommer med orimliga och löjliga förslag som artikel 47. Sådana förslag bidrar till att undergräva den omotiverade respekt som många medborgare i EU-länder känner inför EU:s strävanden – strävanden att flytta makten från demokratiska medlemsländer till ett byråkratiskt Bryssel. Kampen mot centralisering och byråkrati underlättas därför av sådana förslag. Samtidigt tar jag emellertid min roll här i Europaparlamentet på allvar. Vi måste stoppa denna utveckling, och jag hoppas att en majoritet av kammarens ledamöter känner likadant. Om inte, så hoppas jag att en majoritet åtminstone känner fruktan för väljarnas dom i början av juni och därför inser att de i eget välförstått intresse måste säga nej till detta förslag. Om subsidiaritetsprincipen inte ens kan förmå EU att hålla tassarna borta från sportfisket i Stockholms skärgård, då är framtiden mörk för det europeiska projektet.

2-206

**Avril Doyle (PPE-DE).** – Mr President, I would like to tell the Commissioner that I too favour ‘may’ and not ‘shall’. I am a co-signatory as well.

The whole culture of compliance with the common fisheries policy will not be established until we have equity and fairness at the centre of the inspection policy and of subsequent proceedings taken against our fishermen. We do need, as this regulation proposes – and as the rapporteur also says – Community-level control and compliance which the needs of this situation reflects, while leaving ultimate responsibility to Member States.

At the moment it is appalling that fines range from EUR 600 to EUR 6 000 for similar offences in different Member States. There is no respect at all for the common fisheries policy, which is commonly agreed to be a flawed instrument. We do not need this at the centre of it.

On Article 47, recreational fishing, I welcome the definition, which was missing in the draft proposal. We need a commonsense reaction. Yes, Member States can evaluate if there is serious impact on quotas of vulnerable stocks, but we should not let it be the rule of thumb. It must be the exception and not the rule. Please move on discards – it is immoral and totally unacceptable that we are criminalising our fishermen. We must not encourage by-catches, but we must not criminalise fishermen for landing them either. Get the balance right, please, Commissioner Borg.

2-207

**Paulo Casaca (PSE).** – Senhor Presidente, Senhor Comissário, esta sua proposta é absolutamente fundamental. Quem ler o relatório do Tribunal de Contas sobre o estado do controlo da política comum das pescas não pode ter alguma dúvida de que esta iniciativa da Comissão Europeia era absolutamente indispensável.

Mas não é menos verdade que o nosso relator fez aqui um trabalho absolutamente excepcional, e conseguiu ter em conta muitas das características específicas – nomeadamente da pequena pesca – e teve em conta algumas das nossas sugestões. Eu gostaria de felicitar muito o trabalho exemplar que ele fez.

Mas eu gostaria de dizer que sou pela subsidiariedade. Só que não pode haver subsidiariedade no controlo se não há subsidiariedade na lógica da política comum das pescas.

E é esse o desafio que o Sr. Comissário tem pela frente na reforma da política comum das pescas, e eu desejo-lhe muito empenho e muitas felicidades para cumprir esse desafio que é essencial para toda a pesca na Europa.

2-208

**Joe Borg, Member of the Commission.** – Mr President, first of all I would like to thank you for this interesting debate. Clearly we are equally strongly aware of the need for a meaningful reform of our control systems.

Let me try to touch on a number of points that have been raised, first of all with regard to the question concerning recreational fisheries. As I said, this is a very contentious topic, probably the most contentious of all the control provisions contained in the proposal.

However, it has given rise to a number of misconceptions as to what the real objective and purpose of the provisions is. I said that we are prepared to accept the definition that is proposed in one of the amendments.

I will be setting out clearly our position on the definition and on the proposed regulation of recreational fisheries in the coming days, including by writing directly to the anglers’ representatives in order to spell out the objectives, the parameters and the details concerning recreational fisheries.

Then, I hope, I will be receiving feedback from them and, if necessary, we will look into the provisions in order to make them more finely-tuned to the only objective that we need to target.

We have a significant problem with recovery stock. There are certain recreational activities which impose big pressures on such recovery stock and we need to address this point.

This is only fair for the professional fishermen that we address this. Otherwise we can never hope to turn the situation around if there is pressure from a significant fishing effort, even though it is carried out in a recreational manner and no earnings are derived from it. The stock cannot hope to recover if there is significant effort, as scientific reports have indicated to us.

*(Interjection from the floor: 'No science for that at all!')*

Concerning the total lack of consultation of the sector, I think that we have consulted the industry. I myself took part in such a conference in Scotland some time ago. All RACs have submitted their opinions and, furthermore, as in any other legislation, we organised a public Internet consultation. The sector was specifically consulted in the framework of the Advisory Committee for Fisheries and Aquaculture in the course of 2008.

Concerning the point made on small-scale vessels, the Commission believes that the small-scale fleet can have a significant impact on resources. This is the reason why there is no general exemption for this fleet in the proposal.

However, the proposal provides specific exemptions for certain categories of vessels, in general those under 10 metres, and in particular on the VMS, on log book, on prior notification and landing declarations. In this regard, the proposal respects the principle of proportionality.

Financial aspects are also taken into account at the level of EU cofinancing of up to 95% of the costs for those electronic devices, to help the stakeholders to use the new technologies. Exemptions will be examined further within the final Presidency compromise.

I would also like to say, with regard to the points made by Mr Guerreiro, that many of the points that he mentioned already exist in the existing control provisions. Therefore, were we to take up the amendments that he suggests, we would actually be moving backwards with regard to control and enforcement, rather than strengthening the provisions that need to be strengthened.

We are seeking a level playing field in the sanctions provisions as contained in the proposed regulation. Obviously we are prepared to look into them further in order to see whether there needs to be further fine-tuning, but the main objective of the provisions on sanctions in the proposed regulation is to ensure that there are no significant discrepancies, such as exist today, between sanctions given by certain Member States, or by the judicial authorities of certain Member States, and sanctions that are given by the judicial authorities of other Member States.

Finally, I would like to thank Mr Farage for his confidence shown in my staying here for a second term!

2-209

**Raül Romeva i Rueda, Ponente.** – Señor Presidente, quiero dedicar estos últimos dos minutos de intervención a dar las gracias.

En primer lugar, a la Comisión, no solamente por el trabajo y la oportunidad: yo creo que, efectivamente, siempre es difícil plantear una cuestión de estas características y de esta dimensión, pero creo que era necesario, al menos, abrir el debate. Lo ha hecho con valentía y, lógicamente, siempre habrá quien piense que nunca es el momento, pero creo que, al menos, el debate ha servido y servirá para que se pongan claras algunas de las dificultades que tenemos para regular más y mejor ese sector.

En segundo lugar, quiero dar las gracias al resto de ponentes, de ponentes en la sombra, porque, efectivamente, como se ha visto en el debate, partimos de puntos de vista muy distintos y hemos hecho un gran esfuerzo por llegar a transacciones.

Quiero reconocer el esfuerzo que han hecho todas y todos en este trabajo. El punto final al que hemos llegado es posible que no sea el que cada una y cada uno de nosotros quisiéramos. Por ejemplo, en cuanto al margen de tolerancia, yo estoy de acuerdo con la Comisión, o sea, a mí me parece que el 5 % ya era suficiente. El 10 % forma parte de esta transacción, porque había otros colegas que iban mucho más allá.

Lo mismo ocurre con la posibilidad de ampliar o, en todo caso, prorrogar el plazo de puesta en práctica del sistema electrónico.

También quiero recordar, porque a veces se olvida, que esto no supondrá un coste adicional. En todo caso hay recursos especiales para ello por parte de la Comisión.

Y en relación con el último aspecto, quizás el más polémico pero no necesariamente el asunto central de esta resolución, la cuestión de la pesca recreativa, quiero insistir en un aspecto, que es el de la no discriminación. Si aquí no entendemos que todos tenemos que asumir nuestra parte de responsabilidad, es muy difícil que consigamos el resultado esperado.

En la negociación conseguimos una transacción que era, lógicamente, difícil, pero que era, para mí, bastante aceptable. Sin embargo, fuera del acuerdo quedó esa cuestión sobre si teníamos que realizar de forma voluntaria o de forma obligatoria el estudio sobre el impacto que pudiera tener la pesca recreativa.

Pienso que, al menos, dado que se están planteando algunas excepciones para el sector recreativo, sería bueno que existiera una posibilidad de compromiso –más que una obligación, un compromiso– por parte de los Estados a facilitar la información necesaria, porque, insisto, la responsabilidad o es compartida o al final todos, también el sector recreativo, se van a ver afectados por la falta de control.

2-210

**Le Président.** – Le débat est clos.

Le vote aura lieu mercredi 22 avril 2009.

2-211

### **23 - Conservation des ressources halieutiques par des mesures techniques (débat)**

2-212

**Le Président.** – L'ordre du jour appelle le rapport de Cornelis Visser, au nom de la commission de la pêche, sur la proposition de règlement du Conseil relatif à la conservation des ressources halieutiques par des mesures techniques (COM(2008)0324 - C6-0282/2008 - 2008/0112(CNS)) (A6-0206/2009).

2-213

**Carmen Fraga Estévez, Ponente suplente.** – Señor Presidente, quiero dar las gracias al ponente, que ha puesto de relieve algunas de las mayores preocupaciones que suscita la propuesta de la Comisión.

Una es la tendencia que empieza a aparecer para regular por zonas materias que son pilares de una política común. Si bien en el caso de las medidas técnicas esta aproximación puede ser, en principio, comprensible, habrá que estar muy atento a que los reglamentos regionales subsiguientes se limiten a aspectos puramente de aplicación y de regulación de detalles técnicos.

Y digo esto porque la elaboración de reglamentos marco que contienen unas medidas mínimas seguidos luego por distintas legislaciones por áreas es, junto con un recurso cada vez mayor a la comitología, una de las vías que está dispuesta a agotar la Comisión ante la perspectiva de una codecisión en materia pesquera, como la propia DG MARE confiesa sin ambages en el Libro verde para la reforma de la Política Pesquera Común.

Y hay que tener en cuenta que no estamos hablando de cualquier política, sino de una política común, lo que exige tener muy claro lo que puede suponer una más o menos disimulada devolución de competencias a los Estados miembros o una territorialización excesiva de lo que deberían ser normas comunes destinadas a no perturbar la competencia y a evitar discriminaciones entre flotas.

Por ello, si bien puede ser razonable que las especies muy locales tengan su talla mínima regulada en los reglamentos regionales, esos casos deberían ser los menos y las tallas mínimas en general, como las medidas de las mallas o los criterios con arreglo a los cuales se puede desembarcar y vender, deben ser comunes y aprobados por el Consejo y el Parlamento.

También en este sentido van algunas de las principales modificaciones que ha introducido la Comisión de Pesca tratando de reducir la aplicación del procedimiento de comitología a los aspectos más puramente de detalle e insistiendo en que deben quedar en manos del Consejo normas para la fijación de las vedas, las dimensiones de las mallas o las medidas para la eliminación o reducción de los descartes, ya que entendemos que todos los operadores comunitarios deben quedar obligados a unas mínimas reglas de juego iguales para todos.

Hay que recordar que lo único verdaderamente comunitarizado de esta política que llamamos común es el acceso a los mercados, mientras que la política de conservación y gestión –y no digamos ya la política de control– dejan un margen de maniobra que los Estados miembros suelen utilizar sin reparos para beneficiar a sus flotas en detrimento de otras.

Acabamos de ver la fuerte apuesta de la Comisión por comunitarizar y homogeneizar el control y no se podría entender cómo, a través del resto de medidas, por el contrario, se disgrega, se fragmenta y se crean normas distintas para el mismo juego según dónde se juegue.



Esto pone en riesgo toda la credibilidad de la Política Pesquera Común y su propio futuro como tal, algo que no debería presuponerse antes de la reforma de 2012.

Finalmente, en cuanto a la polémica norma de la red única, creo que el Parlamento ha ofrecido a la Comisión un buen planteamiento alternativo indicando en qué casos puede ser inviable y debería, por tanto, ser admisible llevar a bordo más de una red de pesca.

Espero que la Comisión pueda, por tanto, ser sensible a lo que han demostrado ser grandes preocupaciones del sector pesquero y de nuestra propia Comisión de Pesca.

2-214

**Joe Borg, Member of the Commission.** – Mr President, let me express my thanks to the rapporteur, Mr Visser, Ms Fraga and the Fisheries Committee for the draft report on the Commission's proposal for technical measures for the Atlantic and the North Sea.

This is a very technical file and, as you are aware, technical conservation measures in the Atlantic and the North Sea originate to a large extent from existing rules. In Community legislation the measures are spread out in different regulations: the 1998 general technical measures regulation for the Atlantic and the North Sea; the additional technical measures regulation for the recovery of cod and hake; and the annual TAC and quota regulation, which also contains a number of technical conservation measures. Apart from this legal complexity, the present rules are in some cases very complicated and difficult to implement and control.

The Commission adopted the proposal for a new Regulation on technical conservation measures for the Atlantic on 4 June of last year. The proposal was drafted after extensive consultation of stakeholders and Member States during 2006 and 2007. It groups together all the relevant rules into one single legislative act, which will therefore improve legal consistency. Furthermore, the proposal seeks to simplify, clarify and streamline the various rules. Special attention has been paid to simplifying onboard inspections and reducing the costs for fishermen. There are also some additional rules to reduce discards, such as the establishment of a legal framework for real-time closures, already applied in the North Sea.

A new decision-making structure is being proposed, using a Council-level decision for the general and essential provisions and comitology for the more detailed and technical region-specific provisions, thereby avoiding micro-management at a political level. This new approach is not supported in your report, where Amendments 1, 6, 7, 25 and 26 call for Council regulations both for general and for detailed technical rules. The Commission, particularly in the framework of the CFP reform, does not want to continue with micro-management measures at a political level. However, taking into account the point made in the report regarding comitology, the Commission is ready to study any procedure which, while maintaining comitology for regional technical rules, will enable the raising at Council level of any matter which appears to be essential or political.

The Commission can partially accept Amendments 2 and 3, relating to additional illustrations of fishing gears, if needed, and to certain specific market provisions, particularly on the minimum size of species, with the aim of harmonising measures.

In line with discard policy, the Commission is proposing new rules about real-time closures and moving-on provisions for specific fisheries in order to reduce discarding practices. Both measures are considered to be efficient tools and, in order to reduce discards, are important in order to allow for a switch from rules dealing with landings to provisions on real catches. For that reason, the Commission cannot accept Amendments 4, 5, 21, 23 and 24. However, Amendment 20, only in so far as it calls for 'quantity' to be replaced by 'weight' to define the level of by-catch, is acceptable. In addition we can positively consider the second part of the amendment regarding the derogations on distance. The parameters of such a derogation, however, would have to be studied in some detail and will be laid out in the implementing regulation.

The Commission, mainly for inspection purposes, intends to implement the one-net-rule provision, which should be applicable to most European fisheries. The Commission is ready to examine possible derogations for specific fisheries, where these are justified and well argued, and where they take into account the criteria set out in Amendment 11. Such derogations should be part of the regional regulations.

The other aspects of the Commission's proposal are very technical, with many details related to the construction and use of fishing gears in the Atlantic. I note that the rapporteur and the Fisheries Committee also addressed the very technical elements of the proposal and suggested a number of amendments, with the intention of improving the proposal. However, I must express my reservations regarding Amendments 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 and 22. The technical rules proposed on the basis of scientific advice have been simplified in comparison with current legislation, and will facilitate inspection on board and reduce costs for fishermen. The Commission cannot accept Amendments 18 and 19, since the provisions proposed are already in force, subsequent to a political agreement in Council on a proposal from the Commission based on scientific advice, and no new information is available to justify any modification.

I can support the idea set out in Amendment 27, and therefore, when introducing new technical measures, the Commission agrees to delay their entry into force so as to allow fishermen enough time to make the necessary adaptations.

Let me again express my gratitude to the rapporteur and the Committee for their work on this proposal.

2-215

**Paulo Casaca**, *em nome do Grupo PSE*. – Senhor Presidente, quero também felicitar a Comissão por esta sua iniciativa legislativa, e o nosso relator, aqui representado pela nossa colega Carmen Fraga.

Penso que é verdade que estávamos perante uma urgência absoluta de proceder à simplificação do corpo legislativo nesta matéria. Mas penso também que temos de ir ainda bastante mais além, nomeadamente em duas coisas fundamentais, a primeira das quais é nas rejeições.

Eu penso que a reforma a que vamos proceder deve, pura e simplesmente, proibir por princípio qualquer rejeição. As rejeições devem ser absolutamente proibidas. E, em segundo lugar, penso que deve ser instituído o princípio do respeito de normas mais rigorosas do que as europeias por todas as embarcações em regiões em que assim o entendam as autoridades regionais ou nacionais.

São dois princípios fundamentais que aqui estão ausentes e que eu espero que venham a ser tidos em consideração na reforma da PCP.

2-216

**Avril Doyle (PPE-DE)**. – Mr President, I welcome these measures to encourage selective fishing practices, which minimise harm to the complex ecosystem in which the resources are found, while enabling responsible fishing to continue, and to maximise returns while minimising by-catches and subsequent discards. We must get to the point of banning discards as soon as possible, Commissioner.

The variety of the fishing grounds found in the EU is part of our strength, but consequently an additional complication when producing legislation that is adequate, responsive and coherent. Each of the seas in Europe has its own specificity, and it is important to recognise the level of knowledge and expertise that can be provided by the stakeholders on the ground and to resist the temptation to micro-manage on an EU level.

As this is our last debate on fisheries in this political mandate, I would like to thank you, Commissioner, and all your staff for your huge commitment and thorough knowledge of your brief and for the time and attention you always gave to the PECH Committee. You were always available for us. It has been much appreciated and noted and the comparison made with other Commissioners' availability.

2-217

**Joe Borg**, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, first of all I would like to thank Mrs Davis for her kind words just expressed. I would like to say that with regard to this regulation, as I said in my opening statement, the issue of comitology is aimed at simplifying the currently over-complex system of decision-making on very technical issues.

However, I agree that we have to have a procedure in place that will nevertheless allow an issue to be raised at Council level should any matter appear to be of a significant or political nature.

On the question of discards, we have already started to take measures to reduce discards, in particular within the parameters of the North Sea and of the cod recovery plan. We will continue and we will be coming up with further proposals, for example on the banning of high grading, in a general manner which we will be proposing for 2010, and we hope that we will be dealing with this issue holistically in the discussions on the reform of the common fisheries policy with a view, I hope, to the final result being the total elimination of discards.

I would like myself to thank the Members of Parliament, in particular the members of the Fisheries Committee, for the constant support they have given the Commission in dealing with the sometimes intricate and politically sensitive issue of fisheries.

2-218

**Carmen Fraga Estévez**, *Ponente suplente*. – Señor Presidente, yo agradezco al señor Comisario sobre todo una cosa que ha dicho, que es que está dispuesto a replantearse la posición de la Comisión en el tema de la comitología. Y lo celebro, porque este Parlamento ha demostrado claramente, a lo largo de este debate en la Comisión de Pesca, que no está de acuerdo con esta intención de la Comisión, que también refleja en el proyecto de Libro Verde sobre la reforma de la PCP, de recurrir con cierto interés y con cierta demasía al tema de la comitología.

Y la Comisión lo justifica en el Libro Verde, además, aduciendo que ahora, de cara al procedimiento de codecisión que este Parlamento, por primera vez, una vez que entre en vigor el Tratado de Lisboa, va a aplicar en el ámbito de la pesca, pueden retrasarse los procedimientos.

Creo que esto no es verdad; creo que muchas veces los procedimientos legislativos se retrasan no por culpa del Parlamento ni por el procedimiento de codecisión, sino porque, a veces, la Comisión también se retrasa en la presentación de sus propuestas. Por tanto, yo creo que este es un tema que se ha de debatir y creo que es interesante.

Entiendo lo que dice el Comisario, que en un reglamento tan técnico como éste hay aspectos técnicos que deben ser decididos por comitología y que no puede pasar todo a manos del Consejo.

Pero, señor Comisario, yo creo que entre la interpretación de lo que usted considera «técnico» y lo que consideramos en el Parlamento «técnico» hay una cierta diferencia. Nosotros somos más restrictivos de lo que lo son ustedes.

Y ya, para terminar, porque no me quiero extender en un tema en el que además yo no he sido ponente, está la regla de la red única. Señor Comisario, a lo largo de los debates que hemos tenido en la Comisión de Pesca, lo que ha quedado claro es que la Comisión defiende este principio principalmente por motivos de control.

Todos entendemos que el tema del control es muchísimo más sencillo con la regla de la red única, pero también este tema plantea serios problemas en ciertas pesquerías, como usted muy bien sabe.

Por tanto, no nos escudemos siempre en el tema del control para, a veces, ser muy restrictivos, cuando a veces no es necesario tomar ciertas decisiones.

2-219

**Le Président.** – Le débat est clos.

Le vote aura lieu mercredi 22 avril 2009.

2-220

## **24 - Une politique commune de l'immigration pour l'Europe: principes, actions et instruments (brève présentation)**

2-221

**Le Président.** – L'ordre du jour appelle une brève présentation du rapport de Simon Busuttil, au nom de la commission des libertés civiles, de la justice et des affaires intérieures, sur une politique commune de l'immigration pour l'Europe: principes, actions et instruments (2008/2331(INI)) (A6-0251/2009).

2-222

**Simon Busuttil, Rapporteur.** – Li kieku kelli nagħsar ir-rapport tiegħi f'zewġ sentenzi, ngħid li, l-ewwel nett, il-Parlament Ewropew huwa favur bil-qawwa ta' politika komuni dwar l-immigrazzjoni, u t-tieni nett illi l-Parlament ma jridx aktar politika frammentata dwar l-immigrazzjoni, iżda jrid politika koerenti, għaliex hija politika koerenti li tkun effettiva.

Qed ngħid dan aktar u aktar fid-dawl tal-każ riċenti, li għadna kif rajna f'dawn l-aħħar jiem, fil-każ tal-vapur Pinar li salva lil 154 immigrant f'ibhra internazzjonali. Dan il-każ ikompli jurina proprju kemm hija mehtieġa politika komuni. Fil-fatt dan il-każ jurina wkoll il-prezz li qegħdin inhallsu, proprju għax m'għandniex politika komuni b'saħħitha. X'inhu l-prezz? Il-prezz hu li kulhadd ifarfar ir-responsabilità fuq haddiehor u li kulhadd jipponta subajgh lejn haddiehor, mingħajr, iżda, ma naslu għal soluzzjoni u, fl-istess hin, għandna nies li qegħdin jegħrqu u jmutu kuljum quddiem wiċċna.

Hija tal-misthija kif pajjiż ta' 60 miljun jipprova jittfa' r-responsabilità bil-liġi tiegħu fuq pajjiż ta' anqas minn nofs miljun ruh. Jiena nittama li dan kien biss każ iżolat fejn Ministru Taljan mill-Lega Nord kien qiegħed jilgħab għall-gallarija f'tit ġimġat qabel l-elezzjoni tal-Parlament Ewropew. Il-*gimmicks* politiċi kulhadd jinduna bihom imma ma jfissirx li huma aċċettabbli. Nixtieq insellem l-ispirtu kostruttiv li wrew il-Prim Ministru ta' Malta u l-Prim Ministru Taljan bl-intervent tagħhom biex żblukkaw is-sitwazzjoni tal-każ tal-vapur Pinar. Grazzi għall-intervent tagħhom, ir-raġuni rebbet fuq it-teatrini. Rebah is-sens komun fuq l-intranżiġenza, u rebah ir-rispett tal-liġi fuq il-liġi tal-gungla.

Jiena nittama li, minn dan l-inċident tal-Pinar, kulhadd jifhem li, filwaqt li huwa faċli li tfarfar ir-responsabilità fuq haddiehor u li tipponta lejn haddiehor, it-triq faċli ma twassalx għal soluzzjoni. Hija t-triq ta' politika tassew komuni Ewropea li twassal għal soluzzjoni, minkejja li hi diffiċli.

Il-punti ewlenin tar-rapport tiegħi, jiena ngħid, huma sitta: l-ewwel nett, li t-tragedja umana li għaddejja bħalissa minhabba l-immigrazzjoni illegali għandha titwaqqaf darba għal dejjem; it-tieni, li l-mekkanizmu ta' *burden sharing* li hemm fil-patt dwar l-immigrazzjoni għandu jiġi implimentat minnufih u għandu jinbidel fi strument legali li jorbot; it-tielet, għandha ssir enfasi akbar fuq ir-ritorn tal-immigranti li m'għandhomx dritt jibqgħu fit-territorju Ewropew; ir-raba', li kull ftehim ma' pajjiż terz li tikkonkludi l-Unjoni Ewropea, għandu jkopri wkoll il-qasam tal-immigrazzjoni; il-hames, li l-Aġenzija FRONTEX għandha tissaħħaħ, mhux biss finanzjarjament, imma aktar importanti fil-mezzi tagħha; u fl-aħħar nett, li għandna nħarrxu l-ġlieda tagħna kontra l-kriminalità organizzata.

Biex nikkonkludi, fir-rapport irnexxielna nilhqu kompromess fuq bosta punti. Sfortunatament baqa' punt wiehed li ddahhal minhabba maġġoranza li ffurmaw il-Grupp Soċjalista dwar id-dritt tal-vot lill-immigranti. Haġa li għaliġa ma kinitx aċċettabbli. Minhabba dan, jiena pprezentajt riżoluzzjoni alternattiva għar-rapport, biex inbiddel ir-referenza dwar id-dritt tal-vot b'kompromess li għandu formulazzjoni differenti.

2-223

**Joe Borg, Membru tal-Kummissjoni.** – Għan-nom tal-Kummissjoni Ewropea nixtieq nifrah lill-On. Simon Busuttil għar-rapport importanti mhejji minnu. Dan ir-rapport jikkonċerna sugġett ċentrali li għandu x'jaqsam mal-iżvilupp kontinwu tal-Unjoni Ewropea, jiġifieri dwar politika komuni tal-immigrazzjoni. Kif ġie indikat fir-rapport stess, il-Patt tal-Immigrazzjoni adottat mill-Kunsill Ewropew is-sena li għaddiet, serva ta' spunt mill-ġdid għal politika komuni fil-qasam tal-immigrazzjoni u l-ażil.

Issa rridu niżguraw li l-impenji mfasslin f'dan il-Pjan jiġu fis-sehħ. Il-Kummissjoni, ix-xahar id-diehel, se tipproponi mezzi li bihom tkun tista' tiġi segwita l-implimentazzjoni ta' dan il-Patt u dan permezz ta' rapporti annwali min-naħa tal-Kummissjoni. Dawn ir-rapporti jservu sabiex jithejja dibattitu annwali fil-Kunsill Ewropew fuq il-politika tal-immigrazzjoni u l-ażil b'effett mis-sena 2010.

Id-definizzjoni tal-għanijiet ġenerali tal-politika komuni kif stabbiliti minn dan il-Patt se jkomplu jitfasslu fi programm pluriennali, jiġifieri l-Programm ta' Stokkolma li għandu jiġi adottat iktar tard din is-sena taħt il-Presidenza Żvediza. Ir-Rapport Busuttil jipprovdil lill-Kummissjoni b'materjal utli hafna għall-kontribuzzjoni li beħsiebha tagħmel il-Kummissjoni permezz ta' Komunikazzjoni li għandha tiġi adottata qabel is-sajf li ġej. Nixtieq nenfasizza l-konverġenza ġenerali tal-ideat tagħna.

F'diversi partijiet fejn ir-Rapport Busuttil jagħmel appell lill-Kummissjoni sabiex tiehu azzjoni, nixtieq ngħid li l-Kummissjoni diġà impenjat ruhha attivament pereżempju, f'dak li għandu x'jaqsam mal-iżvilupp ta' faċilitajiet għall-immigrazzjoni temporanja u ċirkolari, it-titjib fil-ġbir u l-analizi ta' data, it-tixrid ta' informazzjoni kemm fuq l-opportunitajiet realiści u r-riskju tal-immigrazzjoni illegali u kemm dwar koperazzjoni ma' pajjiżi terzi.

Ridit insemmi hawnhekk qabel qasam wiehed fejn l-On. Busuttil esprima thassib u dan huwa l-qasam tas-solidarjetà bejn l-Istati Membri fuq materji ta' immigrazzjoni. Kif l-On. Busuttil tenna fl-intervent tiegħu, il-ġrajjet li sehew fil-Mediterran f'dawn l-aħħar granet regghu aċċentwaw il-problemi u l-pressjonijiet serji li jaffaċċjaw ċerti Stati Membri partikolari. Nixtieq nassigurak On. Busuttil li l-Kummissjoni hija impenjata sabiex jinstabu soluzzjonijiet halli jiġu mghejjuna dawk l-Istati Membri li huma taħt pressjoni partikolari ta' immigrazzjoni.

Hawnhekk nista' nsemmi tliet eżempji ta' miżuri li diġa ttiehdu jew li dalwaqt se jittiehdu f'dan ir-rigward. Ir-Regolament ta' Dublin se jiġi emendat b'tali mod li tkun possibbli s-sospensjoni tat-trasferimenti lill-dawk l-Istati Membri li jkunu taħt pressjoni partikolari, il-*European Asylum Support Office* li se jitwaqqaf sabiex jagħti apoġġ lil dawn l-istess Stati Membri u l-fondi li huma disponibbli għall-Istati Membri għal skopijiet ta' ridistribuzzjoni interna u voluntarja tal-immigranti.

2-224

**Le Président.** – Le point est clos.

Le vote aura lieu mercredi 22 avril 2009.

### *Déclarations écrites (article 142)*

2-224-500

**Corina Crețu (PSE), în scris.** – Comisia Europeană estimează ca, până în 2050, UE va avea nevoie de 60 milioane de lucratori din tari terțe, în condițiile în care populația activă va scădea într-un ritm accelerat. Asadar, pe termen lung, obiectivele ambițioase ale Strategiei de la Lisabona sunt condiționate de aportul fortei de muncă din afara Uniunii.

Deocamdata, însa, în condițiile crizei economice, rata somajului cunoaște o creștere semnificativă, printre cei afectați de pierderea locurilor de muncă aflându-se numeroși lucratori transfrontalieri din noile statele membre. În consecință, este esențială conexarea politicilor în materie de migrare și de ocupare a fortei de muncă, pentru o poziție echitabilă și eficientă, cu respectarea principiului preferinței comunitare. Consider nedrept să acordăm imigranților dreptul la mobilitate în interiorul UE, în timp ce românii și bulgarii nu se bucură de libertate deplină de mișcare pe piața europeană a fortei de muncă.

Este imoral și periculos să incurajăm exodul creierelor din țările în curs de dezvoltare, fără a avea în vedere riscul efectului de bumerang și fără a ne preocupa discriminarea care rezerva majorității imigranților locuri de muncă sub nivelul calificării lor, în special femeilor - victime ale stereotipurilor și practicilor negative din țara de origine și a celor existente în statele UE.

2-225

**Jamila Madeira (PSE), *por escrito*.** – Segundo o EUROSTAT, o envelhecimento demográfico da UE será uma realidade a médio prazo. A imigração poderá funcionar como um importante estímulo para alcançar bons resultados económicos na UE. Neste sentido, é necessário reconhecer o carácter essencial do fenómeno migratório para a UE.

O combate ao trabalho ilegal é crucial, pois viola em absoluto os direitos dos trabalhadores imigrantes; devemos promover uma política europeia que favoreça a regularização dos trabalhadores imigrantes ilegais, assegurando que não se caia em processos de regresso sumários violadores dos seus direitos. Esses trabalhadores já se encontram numa posição de inferioridade quando chegam à Europa e é claro que uma gestão adequada dos fluxos migratórios poderá beneficiar simultaneamente a UE e os países terceiros.

O subaproveitamento de competências dos trabalhadores imigrantes verificado recorrentemente deve ser combatido. Estes trabalhadores sujeitam-se frequentemente a trabalhos que exigem qualificações muito inferiores às que detêm, fenómeno particularmente assinalável entre as mulheres.

Penso que a Comissão deve tratar com especial atenção a questão do reconhecimento de competências, assim como o incentivo à aprendizagem ao longo da vida, assegurando-se igualmente o direito aos imigrantes à aprendizagem da língua do país de acolhimento como forma de integração social, profissional e cultural na União Europeia.

2-225-500

**Bogusław Rogalski (UEN), *na piśmie*.** – Migracje do Europy to zjawisko, które niezmiennie trwa od długiego czasu, a sprzyjają mu czynniki takie jak znaczne różnice materialne w poziomie życia między Europą a innymi regionami świata.

Europa zdecydowanie potrzebuje wspólnego podejścia do imigracji w UE. Bezczytność jednego państwa członkowskiego może mieć bezpośredni wpływ na inne państwa. Złe zarządzanie migracją może mieć poważne konsekwencje dla krajów pochodzenia oraz samych imigrantów.

Należy mieć na uwadze, iż legalna imigracja jest zjawiskiem pozytywnym, daje możliwości, z których korzystać może wiele stron. Migranci odegrali bardzo istotną rolę w rozwoju Unii Europejskiej w ostatnich dekadach, która w dalszym ciągu potrzebuje ich pracy. W związku z powyższym potrzebna jest wspólna wizja polityczna bazująca na przeszłych osiągnięciach jak i odnosząca się do przyszłości. Do osiągnięcia tego celu potrzebna jest skuteczniejsza współpraca. Szczególnie na nowych południowych oraz wschodnich granicach Unii znajduje się wiele osób decydujących się na przekroczenie granicy z narażeniem życia oraz zdrowia. Tysiące z nich ginie w morzu poszukując lepszego.

Imigracja jest jednym z najpoważniejszych wyzwań, przed jakimi stoi obecnie Europa, od nas zależy jak na nie odpowiemy. Możemy przekształcić je w szansę bądź zaszkodzić wielu przez jej niewłaściwe potraktowanie.

2-225-750

**Daciana Octavia Sârbu (PSE), *în scris*.** – În contextul în care Europa este principala destinație pentru imigranți, armonizarea cadrului legislativ în domeniul imigrării trebuie să fie una dintre prioritățile Uniunii.

Dacă noi, europenii, nu vom lua măsuri pentru a avansa acum o politică de imigrare comună, mai târziu vom suporta consecințele de a nu fi făcut-o la timp.

Am în minte imaginea a mii de imigranți ilegali care își pierd viața pe mare și consider ca este de datoria noastră să împiedicăm pierderea de vieți omenești. În acest sens este obligatoriu să ne angajăm într-o cooperare activă cu țările de proveniență a imigranților ilegali.

Cred ca politica europeană comună de imigrare trebuie să se dovedească o politică de solidaritate cu statele membre care se află la frontierele Uniunii, și care suportă mari fluxuri de imigranți.

Sustin faptul că lupta împotriva imigrației ilegale se poate face numai prin promovarea unei imigrări legale controlate, și fiecare stat membru în parte trebuie să își ia angajamente ferme pentru crearea de premise favorabile pentru imigrarea legală.

Salut acest raport, care s-a dovedit destul de ambițios și sper că va trece cu brio de votul din plen.

2-226

## 25 - Contrôle de l'exécution budgétaire de l'instrument de préadhésion (brève présentation)

2-227

**Le Président.** – L'ordre du jour appelle une brève présentation du rapport de Rodi Kratsa-Tsagaropoulou, au nom de la commission du contrôle budgétaire, sur le contrôle de l'exécution budgétaire de l'instrument d'aide de préadhésion (IAP) en 2007 (2008/2206(INI)) (A6-0181/2009).

2-228

**Ρόδη Κράτσα-Τσαγκαροπούλου, Εισηγήτρια.** – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, κύριε Επίτροπε, κύριες και κύριοι συνάδελφοι, επιτρέψτε μου κατ' αρχάς να υπενθυμίσω ότι ο μηχανισμός προενταξιακής βοήθειας είναι ο νέος δημοσιονομικός μηχανισμός της Ένωσης, για την παροχή προενταξιακής βοήθειας κατά την περίοδο 2007-2013, ο οποίος αντικατέστησε τα προηγούμενα προγράμματα για τις υποψήφιες και εν δυνάμει υποψήφιες χώρες· αναφέρομαι στα προγράμματα PHARE, CARDS, ISPA κ.λπ.

Ο νέος μηχανισμός περιλαμβάνει πέντε συνιστώσες οι οποίες καλύπτουν τις προτεραιότητες που καθορίζονται σύμφωνα με τις ανάγκες των δικαιούχων χωρών και, συγκεκριμένα, τη βοήθεια που καλύπτει τη μεταβατική περίοδο και τη θεσμική ανάπτυξη, τη διασυνοριακή συνεργασία, την περιφερειακή ανάπτυξη, την ανάπτυξη ανθρωπίνων πόρων και την αγροτική ανάπτυξη.

Με αφορμή την έκθεσή μας, το Κοινοβούλιο εξετάζει για πρώτη φορά την εφαρμογή αυτού του νέου μέσου, με ένα διπλό στόχο:

- πρώτον, να ευθυγραμμισθούν καλύτερα τα χρηματοδοτούμενα έργα στις προενταξιακές προτεραιότητες, ιδίως στο περιβάλλον, στην ισότητα των φύλων, στην πυρηνική ασφάλεια, στην αύξηση της απασχόλησης·
  - δεύτερον, να αποφευχθούν τα λάθη του παρελθόντος, όπως αυτά που όνιμα διαπιστώθηκαν στην εφαρμογή των προγραμμάτων PHARE, SAPARD και ISPA στη Βουλγαρία και τη Ρουμανία.
- Πιστεύουμε πως κάτι τέτοιο, μπορεί να επιτευχθεί καλύτερα αν το Κοινοβούλιο εξαρχής παρακολουθεί προσεκτικά την εφαρμογή του νέου μέσου και γι' αυτό ζητήσαμε να συντάξουμε αυτή την έκθεση πρωτοβουλίας.

Στην πρόταση ψηφίσματός μας το Κοινοβούλιο εκφράζει την ικανοποίησή του για το υψηλό ποσοστό υλοποίησης των δεσμεύσεων του μηχανισμού για το 2007, αλλά και τη λύπη του για τις σημαντικές καθυστερήσεις που σημειώθηκαν τόσο στην έγκριση των σχετικών κανονισμών, όσο και στην υλοποίηση των προγραμμάτων τα οποία άρχισαν το 2008. Επισημαίνουμε επίσης ότι ο στόχος του κοινοβουλευτικού ελέγχου επί της προενταξιακής βοήθειας δεν είναι μόνο να εξεταστεί εάν οι διαθέσιμοι πόροι χρησιμοποιήθηκαν νομοτύπως, αλλά και να αξιολογηθεί κατά πόσον πράγματι διατέθηκαν στις ενταξιακές προτεραιότητες και κατά πόσον έχουν επιτευχθεί τα επιδιωκόμενα αποτελέσματα.

Στην έκθεσή μας ζητούμε καλύτερη ισορροπία μεταξύ των έργων που αποσκοπούν στην εκπλήρωση των πολιτικών κριτηρίων και αυτών που αποσκοπούν στην ευθυγράμμιση με το κοινοτικό κεκτημένο, ζητούμε ενίσχυση των οριζόντιων και περιφερειακών προγραμμάτων. Επίσης, ζητούμε ιδιαίτερη έμφαση στην αντιμετώπιση της διαφθοράς, του οργανωμένου εγκλήματος αλλά και στην αντιμετώπιση της ανεργίας, κυρίως της ανεργίας των νέων. Ζητούμε περισσότερους πόρους για την ενίσχυση των δικαιωμάτων των γυναικών και, γενικότερα, της ισότητας των ευκαιριών. Ζητούμε και ενίσχυση της διασυνοριακής συνεργασίας ώστε να προωθηθεί περισσότερο η συμφιλίωση και οι σχέσεις καλής γειτονίας μεταξύ των δικαιούχων χωρών, αλλά και αυτών με τα κράτη μέλη της Ένωσης.

Καταλήγοντας, θεωρούμε ότι ο μηχανισμός προενταξιακής βοήθειας αποτελεί ένα ορθολογιστικό και ευέλικτο μέσο για τη βελτιστοποίηση της παροχής δημοσιονομικής βοήθειας στις υποψήφιες και εν δυνάμει υποψήφιες χώρες. Για να αποδώσει όμως τα μέγιστα χρειάζεται διαρκή ευθυγράμμιση με τις ενταξιακές προτεραιότητες, αλλά και τις κοινωνικές και πολιτικές ιδιαιτερότητες κάθε χώρας. Για τον σκοπό αυτόν, το Κοινοβούλιο φιλοδοξεί να διαδραματίσει έναν ουσιαστικό ρόλο στην εφαρμογή και προσαρμογή αυτού του μέσου.

2-229

**Joe Borg, Member of the Commission.** – Mr President, on behalf of the Commission I would like to thank Parliament for giving us the opportunity to comment on the report on the control of budgetary implementation of the Instrument for Pre-accession Assistance (IPA) for 2007, and to extend our thanks to the rapporteur, Mrs Kratsa-Tsagaropoulou, for the very valuable report that she initiated and prepared.

We can, overall, concur with the findings and recommendations of the report, which are fully in line with the views of the Commission on how best to use financial assistance for the Western Balkans and for Turkey.

The Commission acknowledges the late launch of IPA 2007 programmes because of the late adoption of the legal framework for IPA. I can assure you, however, that the Commission made all efforts to limit the delay of implementation on the ground, and that preparation of management structures and detailed project design were pushed ahead all through 2008.

Within this framework the Commission will ensure that the impact of IPA will become visible in the beneficiary countries.

Allow me to elaborate on some of the issues raised in the report. As regards the balance between political criteria and transposition of the *acquis communautaire*, the Commission has already increased the allocations for projects in the area of the political criteria in IPA 2008 in all countries, and will continue to do so gradually.

However, in the face of the current financial crisis, we will also need to strike an appropriate balance in the 2009 and 2010 programmes between continued support for political reforms and financial assistance to help the countries mitigate the consequences of the economic downturn.

In this regard the report rightly identifies the challenges generated by the financial crisis and the need for an EC response. To that end, the Commission has put together an IPA crisis response package of about EUR 250 million at the end of 2008 with the aim of leveraging some EUR 600 million in loans from international financial institutions.

Measures will focus on support to private sector SMEs, energy efficiency investments, and support to investments and infrastructure under national IPA programmes in close coordination with international financial institutions.

The Commission also fully concurs with the need to establish the decentralised management system as a step to promoting ownership and responsibility of candidate countries and potential candidates. Guidance and assistance is being given to them in order for these countries to build the required public management structures and public financial control systems.

According to the principles of IPA, environmental protection, good governance, civil society development, gender equality and non-discrimination are all cross-cutting issues and are an integral part of project design.

Civil society organisations are now more actively involved in the development and the initiation of projects. In 2008 the Commission launched the civil society facility as a tool for promoting civil society development and advancement of regional cooperation, for which an indicative budget of EUR 130 million is earmarked for 2008-2010.

The Commission also shares the rapporteur's views as regards the importance of education, regional and cross-border cooperation and gender equality, to name but a few issues.

The services of the Commission have fully taken on board the recommendations of Parliament and we look forward to reviewing progress with you during our regular rendezvous where we have the opportunity to discuss the financial assistance strategies and their implementation.

This will allow the further enhancement of the ongoing dialogue between our respective institutions.

2-230

**Le Président.** – Le point est clos.

Le vote aura lieu mercredi 22 avril 2009.

2-231

## **26 - Exécution effective des décisions judiciaires dans l'Union européenne: la transparence du patrimoine des débiteurs (brève présentation)**

2-232

**Le Président.** – L'ordre du jour appelle une brève présentation du rapport de Neena Gill, au nom de la commission des affaires juridiques, sur l'exécution effective des décisions judiciaires dans l'Union européenne: la transparence du patrimoine des débiteurs (2008/2233)(INI) (A6-0252/2009).

2-233

**Neena Gill, rapporteur.** – Mr President, behind the Commission consultative paper on debtors' assets is the concern that late payment and non-payment of debts jeopardise the interests of businesses and consumers. This is particularly the case when the creditor and the enforcement authorities have no information about the debtor's whereabouts or his or her assets. The problem can be resolved where the debtor has assets in the EU and it is possible to trace them and bring legal proceedings.

The Commission, in its report, suggested drawing up a manual of national enforcement laws and practices and highlighted the possibility of increasing access to population registers. It also raised questions on whether enforcement authorities should be given better access to social security and tax registers. The proposal suggested that the cooperation between public enforcement bodies might be improved and, lastly, it put forward the idea of a European assets declaration, which would oblige debtors to disclose all their assets in the European judicial area, possibly backed by sanctions.

My report, as voted by the committee, suggested that creditors would benefit from the introduction of a simpler, more flexible procedure, effective throughout the EU, to obtain an order to disclose information about assets which may then be made the subject of a judgement. Such measures could take the form of an interim payment order, giving the creditor immediate payment pending resolution of the underlying dispute. The report also calls for a study into how the present national systems work, with a comparison between common-law countries, such as Britain, and other European jurisdictions, and how existing arrangements could be improved. It also highlights the need to consider areas in which

further cooperation with Member States could have a positive effect and how the proposals will work alongside existing data protection and human rights legislation.

We have endeavoured to shape the report along these lines and the compromises arrived at by the committee have already ironed out some of the discrepancies between Member States' legal systems. Many of the additions we have made are designed to make the proposal more transparent and easier to use for the creditor.

It will therefore be imperative to ensure that the proposed manual of national enforcement laws and practices is kept updated and that the information is provided in easy-to-use format and that it should be written in an accessible language. It will also be crucial for the initiative to act in tandem with – rather than replacing the work of – national courts. This will require the legislation to be restricted only to cross-border cases. By bearing this caveat in mind, the enforcement of this legislation will be made to work efficiently and proactively.

Overall the report will do much to help small businesses and enterprising individuals to overcome a significant obstacle to their success because they lack the resources of large enterprises to track down debtors and bring legal action against them. Small businesses are affected disproportionately by people defaulting on payments. If companies are thereby discouraged from trading abroad, this represents a real threat to the very functioning of the common market. It will be vital to protect the activities of small businesses at this difficult time because SMEs make up a large proportion of our economy.

I would like to thank the Legal Affairs Committee secretariat and to praise the excellent support they have given me on this report. Thanks must also go to colleagues from other groups who have made very constructive suggestions.

What is key, I believe, is for this legislation to be brought forward as soon as possible. I call on the Commission to act on Parliament's recommendations with urgency. Much of the good work that the Member States have been doing in responding to the market downturn has to be focused for large-scale enterprises.

2-234

**Joe Borg, Member of the Commission.** – Mr President, I am very pleased to have this opportunity to discuss Parliament's concerns regarding the issue of debt recovery abroad. I would also like to thank Ms Gill for the report.

What is at stake? Both Parliament and the Commission agree that the problems of cross-border debt recovery may constitute a serious obstacle to the free circulation of payment orders within the European Union and may impede access to justice. Furthermore, this is key for the survival of small businesses in the current economic climate.

Against this background and in accordance with the principles of subsidiarity and proportionality, what should be the Community objectives? The European Union has an impressive set of legal measures to ensure access to justice in cross-border cases and to facilitate the free circulation of civil and commercial decisions within the Union.

However, there is no doubt – as stated in the Hague programme on mutual recognition adopted by the European Council – that it would in fact be much easier to enforce judgments within the European Union if it were possible to obtain accurate information on debtors' financial positions.

The Commission published a green paper on the transparency of debtors' assets in March 2008, and all the replies – including a summary – can now be accessed by consulting the public web site.

Most of the respondents agreed with the need for measures at Community level to increase the transparency of debtors' assets, though views differ as to what can be done in practice.

I am grateful to Parliament for presenting such a detailed response to the green paper. The report is rather sceptical of the ideas put forward in the green paper, believing that the main problem is that of recalcitrant debtors who are unscrupulous.

The report is also very concerned about the data-protection/privacy issues related to obtaining information about people's financial situation. The Commission is also committed to protecting privacy and the personal data of citizens.

The report instead calls for the adoption of national directories of foreign lawyers working in other Member States as a way to help creditors and suggests a Community provisional measure.

I would like to inform Parliament that improving the practical enforcement of judgments will be a high priority of the Commission in the future Stockholm programme in the area of justice, freedom and security for the period 2010-2014 that the Commission will present in 2009.

However, the Commission has not yet programmed any specific legislative measure in terms of follow-up to its green paper.



Finally, in the light of the first results of the consultation, the Commission believes that this proposal – that is, to draw up a manual of national enforcement laws, to increase access to commercial and public registers, to improve cooperation between enforcement authorities and to create a compulsory assets declaration by the debtor – will go some way towards fulfilling our objectives.

In this respect, of course, careful consideration will be given by the Commission to Parliament's resolution on the different issues incorporated in this report.

2-235

**Le Président.** – Le point est clos.

Le vote aura lieu mercredi 22 avril 2009.

2-236

## **27 - Rapport annuel sur les activités de la commission des pétitions 2008 (brève présentation)**

2-237

**Le Président.** – L'ordre du jour appelle une brève présentation du rapport de Mairead McGuinness, au nom de la commission des pétitions, sur les délibérations de la commission des pétitions durant l'année 2008 (2008/2301(INI)) (A6-0232/2009).

2-238

**Mairead McGuinness, rapporteur.** – Mr President, by its very nature this report contains a great deal of statistics. You can look at, read and analyse those, but obviously the work of the committee throughout the last 12 months is there on view.

This committee that I sit on is a peculiar committee of Parliament. It has very direct links with citizens and it deals with problems raised by individuals and groups. Yes, people come to this committee with problems that we very often cannot solve, but at least they have a port to call on and, where cases are inadmissible, we try to redirect.

We deal with many, many problems from across Member States but, as the statistics show, some countries use the services of the committee more widely than others, perhaps because there are members of the committee who are from those countries and therefore they attract problems from their constituents. I am always fascinated by the reality, particularly in an Irish context, that sometimes people complain that Europe is too powerful and yet, when they have a problem and turn to Europe for help, they sometimes complain that Europe is not powerful enough. I think that is quite significant.

The Petitions Committee works, in my view, on the basis of 'soft power' and I think the work of the last 12 months has been about trying to influence Member States who are not implementing legislation in the manner that they should to change their ways. But we can only work by virtue of the people who come to us with problems and address them and their particular needs.

I want to talk about some of the issues we dealt with, not in detail but just to give a flavour. Obviously, the environment is the major area where complaints come to us from citizens of the European Union. Some of the major ones relate to water quality. The Baltic Sea issue was a very contentious one dealt with by the committee in harmony with other committees of the Parliament. Property rights are a very major concern for citizens and one that I fear will become increasingly so, if I judge by the complaints coming into my own constituency office from citizens who have purchased properties across Member States of the European Union. Our powers in this regard are limited but this does not mean that we cannot speak on these matters and try and make improvements.

In relation to business directories – where companies, individuals, schools, have been trapped into paying money to companies that publish names and then require payment, where people initially did not believe payment was necessary, or indeed required, or worse still, where people did not want the service at all – we are still inundated by individuals who are trapped and feel powerless to resist the pressures of these unscrupulous business directory companies. We have called for the Commission to take action in this regard.

We also stress in this report that we are concerned about the lack of progress on Equitable Life, on which the Petitions Committee did some work in 2007 and on which I chaired the Committee of Inquiry. We would urge the UK authorities to take on board all of our recommendations: apologise, yes, but also compensate those who were so severely affected.

In my final few seconds, let me talk about the committee itself and the procedures under which we work. We would rather only admissible petitions came our way and we need to work very hard with citizens so that they know what we can and cannot deal with. I want the timeframe in which complaints are dealt with to be improved as we go forward. As one who has served on this committee in this parliamentary term, I believe that, because it deals directly with citizens, it has a great

role to play in reducing what I discussed in a school in Ireland yesterday, the so-called democratic deficit. At least people come here to the Parliament and they are heard and listened to. I think that is extremely important.

As we move to another year, let me thank the secretariat of the committee, the group staff and my own staff for their assistance in this report.

2-239

**Joe Borg**, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, first of all I would like to express my appreciation for the work of Mrs McGuinness on this report, which I know she did in difficult circumstances. She has succeeded in illustrating the great variety of the work of the Committee on Petitions and I would like to reconfirm, as I have no doubt she expects, the Commission's willingness to cooperate in all ways we can with the work of the committee.

I would just like to pick up on two of the points she makes in the brief presentation of the report. Mrs McGuinness, first of all you underline the importance of direct contact between Parliament and the everyday, very real concerns of citizens who petition you. I agree, and I should know. You have dealt with nearly a hundred petitions coming from Malta since 2004, which is a rather high rate when taken pro rata to the population.

Some of these petitions are common to many other Member States as well, but many were quite specific to Malta. This demonstrates the useful direct contact with the citizen that the committee provides. In addition it is also true to say that a good collaboration with the national authorities and the organisation of fact-finding missions are definitely useful ingredients for your work.

Besides agreeing on the importance of working directly with citizens, the second thing I would like to pick up on is the general issue of fundamental rights. They crop up in many places in your report, whether about nationality and related rights, individual and family rights or the right of property, and as you know it very often happens that people who petition Parliament about their fundamental rights end up being disappointed. This is because such rights, more often than not, turn out to be outside the scope of Community law, as you have just rightly pointed out.

To use your own words, there is a lot to be done to separate the wheat from the chaff, those concerns which we can work on and those on which we cannot. My wish, my very sincere wish, is that your report will help people to see this clearly and realistically.

With these two comments, which I am sure will be taken in the spirit in which they are intended, I would just like to say that I wish the rapporteur every success and thank her again for this report.

2-240

**Le Président**. – Le point est clos.

Le vote aura lieu mercredi 22 avril 2009.

2-241

## **28 - Approche intégrée de l'égalité entre les hommes et les femmes dans le cadre des travaux des commissions et des délégations (brève présentation)**

2-242

**Le Président**. – L'ordre du jour appelle une brève présentation du rapport d'Anna Záborská, au nom de la commission des droits de la femme et de l'égalité des genres, sur l'approche intégrée de l'égalité entre les hommes et les femmes dans le cadre des travaux des commissions et des délégations (2008/2245(INI)) (A6-0198/2009).

### ***Déclarations écrites (article 142)***

2-243

**Anna Záborská**, *spravodajkyňa*. – V posledných rokoch dôstojnosť ženy a jej poslanie nadobudli inú dimenziu. Je to viditeľné hlavne v rámci horizontálnych politík Spoločenstva, ktoré sú definované v Lisabonskej stratégii, demografických výzvach a v zosúladiení rodinného a pracovného života, ako aj v boji proti násiliu voči ženám a obchodovaniu s ľudskými bytosťami.

Správa o integrovanom prístupe medzi ženami a mužmi v práci parlamentných výborov a delegácií je súčasťou pravidelných správ výboru FEMM, ktorú mám tu česť dvakrát počas legislatívneho obdobia prezentovať tomuto Parlamentu. Ak niektorí vítajú nárast zastúpenia žien v Európskom parlamente, výbor FEMM ľutuje, že ženy sú stále nedostatočne zastúpené vo vysokých funkciách orgánov Parlamentu. Na úrovni generálnych riaditeľstiev je zastúpenie žien stále nedostatočné. Podporujeme vytváranie sietí úradníkov sekretariátov, výborov a delegácií, ktorí budú osobitne vyškoľení v tejto problematike, s cieľom pravidelne si vymieňať osvedčené postupy.

Správa vyzýva generálny sekretariát, aby pokračoval v uplatňovaní integrovanej stratégie zameranej na zosúladienie rodinného a pracovného života a uľahčenie kariérneho postupu žien – úradníčok. Správa zdôrazňuje, že integrovaný prístup k rovnosti predstavuje pozitívny vývoj tak pre ženy, ako aj pre mužov. Zdôrazňuje, že požiadavka rovnosti žien a mužov sa musí prejavovať praktickým prístupom, ktorý nestavia ženy a mužov proti sebe.

Výbor pre práva žien podčiarkuje potrebu, aby výbory i delegácie disponovali vhodnými nástrojmi pre optimálne znalosti týkajúce sa integrovaného prístupu k rovnosti. Potrebne sú ukazovatele, údaje a štatistiky rozdelené podľa pohlavia, ako aj potreba rozdelenia rozpočtových zdrojov z hľadiska rovnosti žien a mužov.

Pozývame politické skupiny, aby pri menovaní osôb do vyšších funkcií zohľadňovali vyváženú účasť mužov a žien. Správa o integrovanom prístupe k rovnosti medzi ženami a mužmi je výsledkom spolupráce parlamentných výborov s Výborom pre práva žien a rodovú rovnosť.

Ako predsedníčka výboru FEMM a spravodajkyňa úprimne ďakujem za túto prácu. Ďakujem hlavne kolegom a kolegyniam jednotlivých výborov, ktorí boli za túto prácu zodpovední, práca bola jednomyselne prijatá vo výbore a veľmi si to vážim. Výbor vytvoril nový metodologický model, ktorý dovoľuje vyhodnotiť prácu v každom parlamentnom výbore. Model je podrobne popísaný v dôvodovej správe. Vyhodnotenie by malo určite vyššiu výpovednú hodnotu, keby boli odpovedali všetky výbory a delegácie Európskeho parlamentu.

V rámci diskusie boli prijaté viaceré pozmeňovacie návrhy a bola posilnená váha tejto správy. Vážim si, že táto správa vznikla na základe pluralistickej parlamentnej diskusie a podčiarkla dôležitosť tejto témy. V kontexte európskych volieb by som veľmi rada podčiarkla dôležitosť, aby voliči a hlavne voličky vynaložili čo najväčšie úsilie, aby boli ženy reprezentované na úrovni Európskeho parlamentu v čo najväčšom počte.

2-244

**Le Président.** – Les femmes sont en majorité, ce soir, au Parlement, dans l'hémicycle. Je tiens à le signaler.

Le point est clos.

Le vote aura lieu mercredi 22 avril 2009.

### *Déclarations écrites (article 142)*

2-245

**Gabriela Crețu (PSE), în scris.** – Apreciez faptul că au fost făcute unele progrese în ceea ce privește reprezentarea echilibrată în cadrul pozițiilor de administrator și asistent la nivelul secretariatelor comisiilor. Sperăm ca măsuri similare să fie adoptate și cu referire la posturile de conducere din cadrul grupurilor politice, cât și, mai ales, la nivelul funcțiilor politice din Parlament. Nu ne putem abține a remarcă însă că aceste schimbări sunt doar un aspect minor a ceea ce presupune integrarea dimensiunii de gen.

Aplicarea principiului de „gender mainstreaming” ar însemna ca fiecare act legislativ să fie însoțit de un studiu premergător referitor la impactul de gen; în egală măsură, sensibilitatea la problemele de gen și o minimă expertiză ar fi necesare în fiecare comisie. Realitatea ne arată că în legislatura 2004-2009, niciun act legislativ propus de Comisie nu a fost respins din cauza lipsei acestui studiu de impact, în ciuda faptului că prezența sa ar fi obligatorie după Tratatul de la Amsterdam. Din păcate, trebuie să recunoaștem că rezultatele pozitive sunt minore, iar obiectivul egalității de gen încă îndepărtat.

2-245-125

**Livia Járóka (PPE-DE), írásban.** – Szeretnék gratulálni Anna Záborská képviselőtársamnak jelentéséhez, amely rámutat arra, hogy bár az Európai Parlament néhány szakbizottságában van elfogadott stratégia a nemek közötti esélyegyenlőség előmozdítására, továbbra is hiányosságok mutatkoznak az elv következetes érvényesítése terén. A jelentés több előremutató javaslatot is megfogalmaz: ilyen például az a kezdeményezés, melynek értelmében az Európai Parlamentben dolgozó tisztviselők esélyegyenlőségi képzésben vennének részt, hiszen a megfelelő ismeretek nélkülözhetetlenek az elv gyakorlati alkalmazása során.

A férfiak és nők közötti egyenlőség a közösségi jog egyik alapelve, az Európai Parlament pedig csak akkor őrizheti meg hitelességét állampolgárai irányában, ha az intézmény falain belül is megköveteli a nemek közötti esélyegyenlőség előmozdítását célzó intézkedések meghozatalát, illetve maradéktalan végrehajtását, különösen a szakbizottságok és küldöttségek tekintetében.

Ennek érdekében olyan stratégiát kell felmutatnunk, amely konkrét célkitűzéseket fogalmaz meg az esélyegyenlőség lendületes előmozdítása érdekében és a nemek közötti egyenlőség horizontális érvényesítése tekintetében. Sajnálatos tény, hogy a Záborská képviselőtársam által 2007-ben, ugyanebben a témában készített jelentés óta jóformán semmiféle előrelépés nem történt; reméljük, hogy az újabb állásfoglalás több eredményt hoz majd.

2-245-250

**Zita Pleštinská (PPE-DE), písomne.** – Ženy predstavujú 52 % európskej populácie. Úlohou nás žien aktívnych v politike je presvedčiť najmä voličky, že participácia žien aj v európskej politike je dôležitá pre budúce generácie a pre dobré fungovanie demokratických systémov.

Som presvedčená, že zastúpenie žien v politike by nemalo byť na základe zavedenia povinných kvót, ktoré by stanovovali minimum zvolených žien, ale na základe schopností političiek hľadať, prijímať a presadzovať také odporúčania, ktoré pomôžu ženám vyriešiť ich aktuálne problémy.

Ako členka výboru pre práva žien som na pôde EP mnohokrát hovorila o podnetoch, ktoré som získala pri stretnutiach so ženami. Hlavne započítavanie výchovy detí do dôchodku a viac jasli, materských škôl považujem za nosné pri zosúladení rodinného a pracovného života. Som presvedčená, že politička vychádzajúc aj zo svojich osobných skúseností v materstve a v rodinnom živote, rozumie najlepšie ženským problémom.

Správa kolegyne Anny Záborskej o integrovanom prístupe k rovnosti mužov a žien v rámci práce výborov a delegácií je svedectvom, že výbor pre práva žien pracoval v EP mimoriadne aktívne. Prijal množstvo správ a stanovísk, ktoré by si boli zaslúžili viac pozornosti zo strany ostatných výborov EP. Aj z tohto dôvodu by sa mal počet žien – poslankýň v EP zvýšiť z tretiny na polovicu.

2-245-500

**Rovana Plumb (PSE), în scris.** – În zilele noastre din ce în ce mai multe femei participă la politică și la luarea de decizii în companii. În 2006, 32,6% din managerii din UE erau femei. Numărul femeilor în Parlamentul European a crescut de la 16,3% în 1979, când au avut loc primele alegeri europene, la 31% în 2009.

Apare însa necesitatea de a adopta și de a aplica o strategie care să aibă obiective concrete în ceea ce privește o abordare integrată a egalității de gen în cadrul politicilor comunitare care țin de competența comisiilor și a delegațiilor parlamentare.

Sustin necesitatea de a dispune, în cadrul comisiilor și al delegațiilor parlamentare, de instrumente adecvate pentru a face bine cunoscută abordarea integrată a egalității: indicatori, date și statistici clasificate în funcție de sex, precum și repartitia resurselor bugetare din punctul de vedere al egalității între femei și bărbați;

Toate aceste instrumente trebuie să încurajeze schimbul constant de bune practici în vederea aplicării strategiei integrate care vizează concilierea vieții de familie cu viața profesională și facilitarea evoluției carierei femeilor funcționar.

Ca social-democrata consider foarte buna initiativa de a se transmite parlamentelor nationale modelul pozitiv oferit de PE în ceea ce privește egalitatea de gen (în Parlamentul României 11% sunt femei).

2-246

## 29 - Livre vert sur l'avenir de la politique du RTE-T (brève présentation)

2-247

**Le Président.** – L'ordre du jour appelle une brève présentation du rapport d'Eva Lichtenberger, au nom de la commission des transports et du tourisme, sur le Livre vert sur l'avenir de la politique du RTE-T (2008/2218(INI)) (A6-0224/2009).

2-248

**Eva Lichtenberger, Berichterstatterin.** – Herr Präsident! Herzlichen Dank, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen, die für dieses Thema noch hier geblieben sind, das eigentlich viel wichtiger ist, als es durch die Anwesenheit von Kollegen hier zum Ausdruck kommt. Es geht um die Revision der Verkehrspolitik in Bezug auf die transeuropäischen Netze. Lassen Sie mich am Anfang den Kolleginnen und Kollegen meinen Dank aussprechen, die dazu beigetragen haben, vor allem der Kommission und dem Sekretariat, die sehr gute Unterstützung geleistet haben.

Die transeuropäischen Netze haben eine lange Geschichte. Fünfzehn Jahre lang wurden Projekte vorgestellt, Listen diskutiert und Entscheidungen hinausgeschoben. Das war und ist Anlass, sich diese gesamte Geschichte einmal genauer anzuschauen, zu revidieren und zu sehen, inwieweit Ziele erreicht worden sind und erreicht werden können. Nicht immer waren die transeuropäischen Netze erfolgreich. Das liegt – wie so oft in der Europäischen Union – auch am Geld. Und hier liegt es vor allem am mangelnden Geld der Mitgliedstaaten, die noch dazu eine sehr unselige Praxis pflegen, indem sie von der Europäischen Union sehr viel Unterstützung einfordern. Wenn es aber um die Entscheidung zur Dotierung des Budgets der Union geht, dann wird der Sack fest zugeschnürt, und es wird wenig herausgegeben.

Nun, da von nichts nichts kommt, blieben auch viele Projekte im Sand stecken, und es ist notwendig, sich das noch einmal genauer anzuschauen, vor allem angesichts der neueren Herausforderungen, vor denen wir stehen, wenn es um die Verkehrspolitik in der Union insgesamt geht. Einerseits sind wir mit neuen Herausforderungen konfrontiert, die der Klimawandel mit sich bringt. Wir müssen darauf reagieren. Die Frage der Nachhaltigkeit im Verkehr, die Frage der Klimaschädlichkeit bestimmter Verkehrsmittel muss immer wieder neu gestellt werden und muss sich auch im Handeln der Mitgliedstaaten und der Europäischen Union niederschlagen.

Der zweite Punkt, der uns natürlich sehr stark zu beschäftigen hat, ist die gegenwärtige Finanzkrise, die die Handlungsfähigkeit einiger Mitgliedstaaten unter Umständen noch weiter einschränken wird, wenn es um die Infrastrukturen und die damit verbundenen notwendigen Investitionen geht. Wir stehen durch die Erweiterung aber auch vor völlig neuen Aufgabenstellungen in Europa, die noch nicht existierten, als über die Liste der transeuropäischen Netze entschieden wurde. Deswegen fiel die Entscheidung nach langen Diskussionen im Ausschuss zugunsten einer Vorgangsweise, die genau auf diese Dinge reagieren sollte.

Zum einen sollten die unterschiedlichen Verkehrsmittel wesentlich besser als bisher vernetzt werden. Das war in der Vergangenheit ein Manko. Besonders betrifft das Häfen und Hinterland, was in den letzten Jahren viel zu wenig berücksichtigt wurde und nun einen Schwerpunkt in diesem Bericht gebildet hat. Dazu braucht es aber auch die Entwicklung eines Kernnetzes und der Verbindungen eines Netzwerks, auf dem das Ganze ruht, mit dem das Ganze in Verbindung steht, damit eine gute Entwicklung im Verkehrsbereich möglich ist und immer besser gemanagt werden kann. Es muss also nicht nur eine geografische Vernetzung erfolgen, sondern es muss auch eine konzeptionelle Vernetzung zwischen den Verkehrsträgern, bessere intermodale Verknüpfungen und bessere Vernetzungsarbeit im technischen Sinn geben. Hier geht es um Software und nicht nur um Hardware. Das steht im Mittelpunkt unseres Berichts, und ich hoffe, dass wir uns auf diese Entschließung einigen können, die breite Unterstützung hatte, und dass nicht ein Rückschritt erfolgt, wie es in einer alternativen Entschließung derzeit angedeutet wird!

2-249

**Joe Borg, Member of the Commission.** – Mr President, since the trans-European transport network policy was established 15 years ago, it has contributed significantly to the functioning of the internal market and to economic, social and territorial cohesion. It now needs to be adjusted to new challenges.

The green paper on the TEN-T policy review addresses these challenges and proposes measures to tackle them at both the network planning and the project implementation stages.

The Commission appreciates very much that the European Parliament is following this revision process from the outset, as reflected in this resolution. This underlines the determination of both institutions to develop a future-oriented TEN-T policy.

There is a high degree of conformity between our proposals and the objectives and calls set out in Ms Lichtenberger's report as adopted by the Committee on Transport: that is, a more integrated and coherent network approach is necessary, in which intermodal connections such as rail connections to ports and airports and intermodal terminals, the link between long-distance and urban transport systems as well as interoperability must be strengthened so as to improve the basis for efficient, safe and high-quality services for passengers and for freight transport.

The Commission also shares the view set out in the report that – in particular in the freight sector – it is vital to facilitate co-modal chains in which waterborne and rail transport play an important role and intelligent transport systems help to optimise infrastructure use.

In the draft report, the Transport Committee has chosen option three, a dual layer consisting of a core and a comprehensive network. By supporting this option, Parliament confirms the need to combine traditional transport infrastructure policy with an appropriate consideration of new conditions and circumstances; the need for more flexibility and responsiveness to changing situations and more openness for the identification and support of infrastructure measures resulting for transport service requirements; and the economic and environmental challenge to promote a coordinated improvement of transport corridors through a series of small infrastructures and ITS projects.

We note that, after the vote on the draft report by the Transport Committee, an alternative resolution has been proposed which supports option two, a single-layer network with priority projects or a priority network only, and therefore without a comprehensive network. This is, as we see it, in contradiction with some other points of the draft resolution.

I would also like to recall on this occasion the advantages and disadvantages of the comprehensive network. While being too large to allow for clear priority-setting and the focus of Community instruments to stimulate its implementation, it contributes to ensuring the TEN-T access function and to facilitating cohesion. It has also proved to be vital as a reference framework for various transport policy actions and legislation: in particular, interoperability in the railway sector and road safety. Elimination of the comprehensive network would therefore have some perverse effects.

On the network implementation side, we fully agree with the view set out in the report that Member States have a crucial role in deciding, planning and financing transport infrastructure. Sufficient financial resources are needed under the TEN-T budget and coordination of territorial development objectives and TEN-T policy need to be enforced, whereas public/private partnerships have to be further promoted.

The Commission also underlines that TEN-T investment is key to sustainable economic development and thus is an essential way of helping to overcome the current crisis.

To conclude, we are very grateful for the motion for a resolution on the future of the trans-European transport networks policy. We would like to thank the Transport Committee for its constructive debate on it, and in particular Ms Lichtenberger for her comprehensive work. It will constitute a valuable contribution to the next steps of the process in the debates with the other institutions.

2-250

**Le Président.** – Le point est clos.

Le vote aura lieu mercredi 22 avril 2009.

### *Déclarations écrites (article 142)*

2-250-500

**Krzysztof Hołowczyc (PPE-DE), na piśmie.** – W dobiegającej końca, obecnej kadencji Parlamentu Europejskiego, mamy okazję wypowiedzieć się na temat planowanych przez Komisję w niedalekiej przyszłości zmian w podejściu do największego projektu infrastrukturalnego Wspólnoty, jakim jest transeuropejska sieć transportu.

Obecny etap tworzenia sieci to budowa jej fragmentów na terytoriach państw członkowskich. Logiczną kontynuacją, i zarazem ostatnim etapem tworzenia sieci w spójną całość, będzie integracja poszczególnych jej elementów z komponentów krajowych w organizm transeuropejski.

Unia Europejska jest bytem o zmieniającej się geografii. Dlatego uzasadnioną wydaje się potrzeba wprowadzenia korekt mapy przebiegu sieci. Zmianie ulegają w związku z tym potrzeby finansowe tej inwestycji. Ostatni, integracyjny etap scalania sieci powinien kłaść większy nacisk na finansowanie jej elementów transgranicznych.

Podnoszenie jakości istniejących oraz budowa nowych, nowoczesnych połączeń transportowych Europy wpływa na zmniejszenie ilości wypadków drogowych, co pozostaje naszym nieustającym priorytetem w walce o lepszą mobilność obywateli UE. Zarazem wprowadzanie wszelkich innowacji technologicznych, ostatnio upowszechnianie inteligentnych systemów transportowych, znajduje uzasadnienie w priorytetach europejskiej infrastruktury XXI wieku.

2-251

### **30 - Ordre du jour de la prochaine séance: voir procès-verbal**

2-252

### **31 - Levée de la séance**

2-253

**Le Président.** – Il me reste à remercier notre public, réduit mais attentif, pour sa présence. Il me reste également à clore ce qui est certainement ma dernière présidence de séance de nuit.

*(La séance est levée à 23 h 45)*