

LUNDI 11 JANVIER 2010

BRUXELLES

COMMISSION DES BUDGETS

AUDITION DE M. JANUSZ LEWANDOWSKI

COMMISSAIRE DESIGNE

BUDGET ET PROGRAMMATION FINANCIERE

1-002

**PRÉSIDENCE DE M. ALAIN LAMASSOURE**

*(La réunion est ouverte à 13H00)*

1-003

**Le Président.** – Monsieur le candidat commissaire, Monsieur le Président de Magistris, Mesdames, Messieurs, je demande à la presse de bien vouloir libérer la salle. Nous la remercions de sa présence. Je rappelle que le candidat commissaire sera à la disposition de la presse après l'audition. Après ce pool images, nous allons pouvoir commencer nos travaux.

Nous allons les commencer d'autant plus rapidement que nous sommes soumis à un règlement horaire qui est extrêmement strict. Le candidat Lewandowski a droit à trois heures, pas une minute de moins, mais pas une minute de plus non plus, car nous devons ensuite évacuer la salle pour la laisser libre pour une audition suivante.

Cette audition est diffusée en direct sur Internet. C'est une réunion publique de la commission des budgets. Des membres de la presse, des membres des autres institutions européennes, des membres du corps diplomatique sont présents, je les salue. Cette réunion est placée sous la présidence de la commission des budgets, avec le concours de la commission du contrôle budgétaire. Je salue le président de Magistris. Lui-même et ses membres auront droit à 35 minutes de temps d'échanges avec le candidat commissaire dans le cadre de cette audition.

J'ajoute qu'à leur demande, la commission de l'agriculture et la commission du développement régional ont également été invitées, et il m'a été indiqué que, dans chacun des cas, c'est le président ou la présidente de la commission correspondante qui viendra poser des questions au nom de sa commission.

Je voudrais souhaiter la bienvenue à M. Janusz Lewandowski, qui est commissaire désigné pour la programmation financière et le budget. M. Lewandowski n'est pas un inconnu parmi nous, mais le candidat commissaire Lewandowski n'est pas connu de nous.

Conformément aux lignes directrices pour l'approbation de la Commission, qui sont fixées par l'annexe XVII du règlement, le Parlement doit évaluer les commissaires désignés sur la base de leur compétence générale, de leur engagement européen et de leur indépendance personnelle. Il doit également évaluer la connaissance de leur portefeuille potentiel et leurs capacités de communication.

Je rappelle que, avant l'audition, le commissaire désigné a répondu par écrit à un questionnaire. Les réponses écrites ont été distribuées à l'ensemble des députés, dans toutes les langues. Sont également disponibles, dans la salle, un certain nombre de documents: l'ordre du jour, bien entendu; le curriculum vitae de M. Lewandowski, distribué en anglais, en allemand et en français; la déclaration d'intérêts de M. Lewandowski, en anglais; le "mission statement", c'est-à-dire la mission conférée par le président Barroso à M. Lewandowski; et le questionnaire adressé au commissaire désigné et ses réponses, ainsi que la lettre de saisine du président Barroso.

Je voudrais enfin préciser les conditions de déroulement de l'audition et m'excuser à l'avance auprès du commissaire désigné et des membres des commissions ici présentes, des parlementaires ici présents, du fait que nous sommes astreints à des temps de parole très très stricts, et du fait que je serai obligé d'avoir le rôle ingrat d'interrompre tous ceux ou toutes celles qui dépasseraient leur temps de parole, qui est de dix minutes pour l'exposé introductif du candidat commissaire et d'une seule minute pour les intervenants, avec la possibilité d'une réponse d'une minute du commissaire et un droit de réponse, par la suite, de la personne qui a posé la question ou d'un autre membre du même groupe, si la personne qui a posé la question souhaite céder son droit de réplique à un autre membre du même groupe. Mais nous tenons ici, au secrétariat, un décompte rigoureux des temps de parole, groupe parlementaire par groupe parlementaire, de manière à être sûrs que nous respectons les règles que nous nous sommes fixés nous-mêmes, en réunion des coordinateurs et en accord avec la commission CONT, sur la répartition des temps de parole.

Le commissaire va nous faire une introduction orale de dix minutes. Elle sera suivie d'environ 2 h 45 de questions. Ensuite, s'il nous reste un peu de temps, je

proposerai à M. Lewandowski de faire quelques remarques pour conclure.

Je propose maintenant que nous entendions l'exposé introductif du candidat commissaire. M. Lewandowski, vous avez la parole.

1-004

**Janusz Lewandowski**, *Commissioner-designate*. – Thank you, Chair. You are sitting behind me, but I am not responsible for this arrangement. Let me start with a few words in my mother tongue, Polish.

1-005

Dlatego, że język w czasach trudnych był narzędziem przetrwania kultury i tożsamości narodowej, a ja należę do pokolenia, które ma pamięć tamtych czasów, zna cenę wolności, docenia wartość uczestnictwa w Unii Europejskiej i jestem zwolennikiem wielojęzyczności w Unii Europejskiej, tak jak László Surján, który jest wśród nas. Jestem zarazem praktykiem i pragmatykiem, dlatego aby ułatwić pracę tłumaczom i naszą wzajemną komunikację, będę kontynuował po angielsku.

1-006

Expressing my special feeling to be in the old place but in the new role, formally still a Member of Parliament, feeling at home here with the old family but in the new role really.

By the way, Danuta Hübner, who should be with us, is moving the opposite way, now chairing the Regional Committee in Parliament and ready to grill the future Commissioner for Regional Policy. That is how we Poles are contributing new colours and new innovations to the hearing procedure.

Now of course I can capitalise, I can draw on my experience accumulated here in Parliament. But let me recall two pleasant discoveries from the time when I was a newcomer.

The first one: I was sitting in the presidium, and behind me were Reimer Böge, Jan Mulder and Ralf Walter. All of them much more experienced than me but tolerant and assisting the newcomer, as was the case with my more experienced colleagues from my group: Salvador Garriga Polledo, Alain Lamassoure and Inga Gräßle. James Elles was also at that time in our group.

And the second discovery: the way the other groups, including the opposition –unforgettable – Catherine Guy-Quint, Jutta Haug, Anne Jensen – who could be the model of responsible policymaking – Helga Trüpel and the others were handling their differences, expressing their different values, but united when it was needed to defend the common position.

This was very strange for the Parliament, and that is why Parliament expanded its powers, now incorporated into primary law. But this very virtue of unity, when necessary, has its equivalent on the side of the Commission: it is called 'collegiality', and I fully subscribe to this principle, that we are the team to endure

the coherence of European politics, everybody contributing their own, but all sharing responsibility once the decision is made.

It might be inconvenient at times, but it is also convenient for me today, when I am refraining from too many declarations, because our new college has not yet decided.

I am not underestimating the challenges we are to confront immediately this year and which I partly enumerated in my written answers. The Commission is coming to action late, therefore we have an agenda full of very much politicised, controversial issues to confront in the near future, beyond the routine annual procedure that is now adjusted to the Lisbon Treaty.

My basic assumption is as follows. The European Union is a major, very ambitious regulator trying to impose its rules worldwide, but it is not always successful, as was the case in Copenhagen recently. But this big regulator is equipped with rather modest budgetary means, equivalent to 1% of GDP, 2% of overall public expenditure, more or less the size of the budget of Austria, less than half of the budget of France and a small fraction of the budget of Germany.

We are to navigate with these rather modest resources in the very turbulent surrounding of nowadays. I think that there is no danger of outgrowing the budget in the coming future in the post-crisis Europe, with Member States agonising about their deficits and over their own problems. We are in a period of hardship, and that means that we, with scarce resources, have to confront unforeseen events, with additional needs coming rapidly and also with political commitments and promises sometimes neglecting financial limits. Therefore we are forced to seek more flexibility in the ongoing Financial Perspective and leverages in cooperation with the private sector, with the European Investment Bank and the other institutions.

What comes after adjustment to Lisbon is a forward-looking agenda reforming the budget. For me that means evolution and not revolution. Innovating, not being trapped in the past but, on the other hand, discovering and respecting the wisdom of these arrangements accumulated over the years that have proved their value, including not so much own resources, because it is a really difficult to detect wisdom in this arrangement, but in the multilevel cohesion, for example, to be consolidated.

Also in some forms of assistance to rural areas, because this is also a part of our European model of life. Not everything traditional is immediately outdated. To strike a balance as it is, for example, with the financial regulation, to be more user-friendly, one can say, but on the other hand we need – and we are promised and we are striving towards – positive declarations of assurance, the first ever in the future.

So to be user-friendly and citizen-oriented could be a leitmotif and a motto for the mandate of the Commission – and not only the Commission. But in order to connect with people, the Commission has to upgrade its relationship with the people elected by the people in various parts of our continent and sitting here in this room.

I hope, as a future – hopefully honest broker – to start with a good relationship, and I am ready for a grilling: three hours – that means *bien cuit*, I think, at least!

1-007

**Le Président.** – Monsieur le candidat Commissaire, je vous félicite d'avoir parlé huit minutes, ce qui vous donnera droit à une conclusion un peu plus longue en fin de séance.

Je donne maintenant la parole, dans un premier tour de questions, aux coordinateurs, en commençant par le coordinateur du groupe PPE, Salvador Garriga.

1-008

**Salvador Garriga Polledo (PPE).** – Señor Lewandowski, si existe un perfil ideal de candidato a Comisario europeo encargado del Presupuesto, ese perfil es el suyo. Tiene experiencia política y económica, llegó a Bruselas como observador y fue después diputado de pleno derecho, ha desempeñado la presidencia de la Comisión de Presupuestos durante la negociación del marco financiero anterior y tiene un perfecto conocimiento del Parlamento y de sus complejas relaciones con el Consejo. Todo eso hace que usted sea un candidato perfecto y estoy seguro de que va a hacer de usted un Comisario cercano a la perfección.

Mi pregunta es simple: como va a ser usted el primer Comisario que aplicará el Tratado de Lisboa, que concede a la Comisión una extraordinaria competencia de iniciativa en materia presupuestaria, ¿va a hacer uso usted de esa competencia de iniciativa para situar los temas financieros y presupuestarios en el centro de las decisiones políticas de la Comisión ejecutiva?

Usted ha contestado que va a ser un *honest broker* a la hora de relacionarse con el Parlamento Europeo. Pues bien, ¿impulsará usted algún mecanismo cuasi permanente de concertación con nuestros ponentes en los expedientes más importantes, como la revisión a medio plazo, el Reglamento financiero o el servicio de acción exterior?

1-009

**Janusz Lewandowski, Commissioner-designate.** – Thank you and I would welcome more questions of this kind. Nobody is perfect. We have to adjust to Lisbon. That needs transitional arrangements, which are under way and to some extent already agreed at the level of conciliation in November.

As for cooperation with Parliament, there is a spirit and there is a formal side. As to the spirit, it is looking promising. As to the formal side, we are to renegotiate the framework agreement, to update the framework

agreement to the level of the increased competences of Parliament. I should be present whenever my presence is wanted in this or any other of Parliament's rooms.

This is very much according to the guidelines of President Barroso – to upgrade the relationship with Parliament – and there are concrete proposals. One of them has already been achieved: since October we have had 'Question Hour' in Parliament, and presence in the Conference of Presidents. I would also reply to your request for more intense and more formalised meetings between us.

1-010

**Göran Färm (S&D).** – Mr Lewandowski, the budget is not just about numbers – it is also about political values. Things often get controversial with regard to the budget for social inclusion policies, anti-discrimination, gender equality and family planning etc. In the 2010 budget, we had a tough conflict on social inclusion. The funding of the new microfinance facility for the coming years is still not resolved because the Council wants to finance it by cutting our main social inclusion programme, Progress. Where do you stand on this, Mr Lewandowski? Can we not afford to raise our ambitions in the field of social inclusion?

My second question is this: we have also had tough discussions on the Lisbon Strategy, with some centre-right politicians wanting to narrow the aims to economic growth purposes only, reducing the focus on social issues. Where do you stand on this in the debate on the new EU 2020 programme?

Finally, where do you stand on the controversy we have often had in EU development policies, including the very important issues of family planning and women's sexual and reproductive health in EU development policies? Where do you stand on this, Mr Lewandowski?

1-011

**Janusz Lewandowski, Commissioner-designate.** – As to inclusion, there are various means at our disposal. You mentioned the Progress microfinance facility. I think nobody is contesting it as a facility. It should be very useful along with the other ways of promoting entrepreneurship and assisting in finding jobs for the younger generation. What is controversial is whether it should come from the margin – I know this is the position of Parliament – or at the cost of the existing Progress programme that was increased in the final round of negotiations for the new Financial Perspective.

This increase in the envelope was Parliament's achievement, but I know that there is an intention today, given the very tight margins, for Progress to be reallocated. What will happen when I take up office in the Commission is too early to say, but I really appreciate the importance of devices such as microfinance facilities.

Coming to the next question, the prospect of the Lisbon Strategy being only about growth was not quite realised, and the other dimensions are important as well. In

Lisbon we have for the first time, for example, the notion of territorial cohesion, and not just social and economic cohesion. This is a new concept for which money needs to be found.

The final question was about development but I did not quite understand the question.

1-012

**Göran Färm (S&D).** – If I could come back on that. It is one of the controversies we have had in the votes in the European Parliament on EU development policies, which have often been on family planning and women's sexual and reproductive health issues. For example, the vote in the 2010 budget contained a number of amendments on development aid concerning exactly this issue – amendments intended to prevent the EU from supporting family planning programmes including information about abortion and from financing measures to improve women's sexual and reproductive health. You voted in favour of those restrictions. You did so in spite of the fact that the European Union has stated that universal access to reproductive health is vital to achieving the UN Millennium Goals.

For example, in 2008 we had a report on the application of the principle of equal pay – because this is also about discrimination – a report on equal pay for men and women. We also had the Buitenweg report. You voted against the right to take legal action in cases of wage discrimination. On the Buitenweg report you voted for rejecting the legislative proposal on equal treatment of persons irrespective of religion, age or sexual orientation. So I have to ask you: where do you stand on those development and discrimination issues, on women's rights, on abortion, on gay rights etc.?

1-013

**Janusz Lewandowski, Commissioner-designate.** – I fully recognise the sensitivity of this issue at European level, at the level of the European institutions. Of course you are right to ask about my voting record as I was voting within my political family.

We can go, via budgetary means, to reach the needs of the developing world. The European Union, on a scale of EUR 10 billion annually, is the biggest donor in the world, the most charitable institution in the world. However, we could differ on some points: not just gender equality but how to achieve gender equality or age equality via budgetary means. I am a little more sceptical here as to whether everything concerning equality, gender or the other issues you mentioned can be settled via budgetary means. And you were right: I voted on these issues with my political family.

1-014

**Anne E. Jensen (ALDE).** – I have very high hopes for the Commissioner-designate, who will have a very difficult task with the mid-term review of the budget and also with the new Financial Perspective.

One of the issues in which Parliament has some limited influence is the revenue side, which you briefly

mentioned, and which is a very complex issue, involving rebates, and rebates on rebates.

The distinguished chairman of this committee has tried to put forward suggestions that could be helpful for Member States in this respect.

I would like to hear whether you are ready to relaunch an in-depth discussion on this issue and what your visions are on how this process concerning own resources should be designed.

1-015

**Janusz Lewandowski, Commissioner-designate.** – I remember the story of our President. His charm was broken when he mentioned European taxation, and this was the sign that Europe is probably not yet ready for the new form of taxation because it could be detrimental to the link between citizens, contrary to what one assumes.

I have to respect all the work done in Parliament. This is a question for review. A review has to touch upon all the aspects, including resources.

We are obliged to present a new proposition for the new Financial Perspective. In order to do so properly, we should take into account all the reports by Alain Lamassoure, because this was a very sincere effort to contact also the national parliaments and to widen the scope of discussion. I think it is easier to find the drawbacks of the existing arrangement:

1-016

Ce sont les exceptions contradictoires du traité de Rome. Je le dis en français pour honorer notre président.

1-017

It is easier to establish a diagnosis, it is much more difficult to find a reasonable solution – and reasonable because of unanimity and because the fiscal sovereignty of the Member States should be politically feasible. I think the time has not yet come for the purely fiscal system of own resources, because it does not meet the criterion of political feasibility. So what we should strive at is improvement, perhaps in two phases, as was recommended in the Parliament reports, because in these documents – in the reports by Alain – we can find everything that is feasible at this stage. This is for the review and for the Financial Perspective.

1-018

**Anne E. Jensen (ALDE).** – We know that this discussion will also be linked to the discussion on the future of the common agricultural policy, and there is much talk about changing the common agricultural policy towards paying for public goods relating to the environment, animal welfare and food safety. Would you help initiate studies in this field?

The European Parliament did in fact put in the 2009 budget a pilot project for conducting research in this area, and yet nothing has happened. So I would also like to ask you whether, as Commissioner, you would make

sure that you fulfil the wishes of the budgetary authority and do something in the field of that pilot project.

1-019

**Janusz Lewandowski, Commissioner-designate.** – My respect for you is enough to say yes, of course, I shall take it on board. The CAP is actually changing. It is not the same proportion of the budget as it was in the 1980s – this was between 70% and 80%, and now it is going to be 33% at the end of this financial perspective – but this is the most criticised area of common policy.

What we need – and this is my personal stance – is not renationalisation of agricultural policy, because this is the end of communal policy, but what I would call following the mood of modulation, more on a voluntary basis, and it should also be more voluntary for the Member States to channel the assistance to agriculture. What is important is to preserve some scope of rural areas and rural economy in Europe. The Commission is fully conscious of the extent to which this is the most criticised area of common policy.

1-020

**Isabelle Durant (Verts/ALE).** – Monsieur le Président, je souhaite la bienvenue M. Lewandowski. Ma première question concerne le résultat de la consultation menée par la Commission sur la révision du budget. Vous l'avez vu, à ce moment-là, le changement climatique a été considéré par une majorité des répondants comme la première priorité, d'autres étant la compétitivité et l'énergie. Je voudrais savoir si vous entendez maintenir cette priorité comme priorité numéro un, d'autant que, dans certaines déclarations que vous avez faites avant d'être candidat commissaire, j'ai cru comprendre que la compétitivité vous apparaissait comme plus importante.

Deuxième chose: vous avez parlé de la politique agricole. Je voudrais là aussi vous demander – vous avez partiellement répondu – comment vous entendiez orienter les aides directes. Par ailleurs, quand vous parlez de "base volontaire", je pense, quant à moi, qu'il faut quelque chose de plus contraignant, qui vise en particulier à orienter l'agriculture vers le développement durable, et qu'il faut une vraie agriculture rurale sur une base obligatoire.

Ma troisième question porte sur la stratégie 2020 de l'Union européenne, que la Commission semble vouloir précipiter. Quel lien faites-vous, là aussi, entre stratégie 2020 et calendrier budgétaire?

1-021

**Janusz Lewandowski, Commissioner-designate.** – We are discussing the issue of climate warming in a slightly different context – behind our windows. We were confronted, as usual, with new commitments after the final conciliation. Fortunately, as for commitments from the communal budget, this is not about EUR 2.4 billion, which is the pledge of the Member States, but about EUR 150 million to be found in the communal budget. Thanks also to Parliament's increasing the relevant horizontal programmes by 50 million for 2010, we have 2010 more or less under control.

What comes next is to find additional money for 2011 and 2012. What is completely unknown is how to finance the climate issue in 2013, and for the future the major question is whether it should be financed from the communal budget, under full control, or whether a separate climate fund should be established. That is one of the questions I am going to answer in the near future.

As for agriculture, I am in many areas a partisan of the 'bottom-up' approach and of seeking local wisdom – original wisdom – but in the reorientation of agricultural policy we have cross-compliance that is no longer voluntary, but its orientation, which is now affecting more the so-called 'old' European Member States, with purely some adjustment for the new ones, is a wise solution because there is a problem of how to get rid of the hell of dirty technologies of the COMECON area in part of Europe and move to the paradise of the more clean environmental technologies of today's Europe.

2020 should precede review. That is the connection, with first priorities agreed – I am afraid not at the Spring Council this year, but at the June Council – and then a review following the agreement of political priorities.

1-022

**Helga Trüpel (Verts/ALE).** – Nachdem ich Ihnen jetzt einen Moment zugehört habe, Herr Lewandowski, würde ich Sie doch gerne einmal nach Ihrem Grundverständnis Ihrer politischen Führungsrolle als designierter Kommissar in diesen ganz entscheidenden Haushaltsfragen ansprechen. Wir haben die gescheiterte Konferenz von Kopenhagen, und wir wissen, dass wir sowohl politisch – was sich dann auch im Haushalt niederschlagen muss – Wesentliches ändern müssen, wenn wir in den nächsten Jahren ökologisch bessere Ergebnisse erzielen wollen, aber auch wenn wir ökonomisch erfolgreich sein wollen und dass wir beides verbinden müssen. Die Zeiten sind vorbei, in denen man Ökologie gegen Ökonomie ausspielte. Man muss vielmehr zu einem neuen Grundverständnis kommen. Das würde auch große Veränderungen in der neuen mittelfristigen finanziellen Vorausschau bedeuten.

Ich würde Sie gerne noch einmal nach Ihrem Grundverständnis fragen, ob so eine abwägende Haltung, wie Sie sie bisher hier präsentiert haben, wirklich das ist, was die neue Kommission braucht, oder ob man nicht vielmehr treibende Kraft und politische Führungsspitze für dieses Europa mit dem Lissabon-Vertrag sein muss?

1-023

**Janusz Lewandowski, Commissioner-designate.** – What I do not like to see in the European Union is when political commitments are poorly funded. This was the case with the climate change commitments coming from Copenhagen, and the problem of how to finance them following a political decision that fell below the expectations of everybody at this stage.

In the Europe 2020 strategy, environmental issues and the European environmental programme have been

upgraded to top priority. I have said that what follows for the budgetary dimensions, including review, should be residual from 2020. That is why we are still waiting. There is also the danger that we will be too pressed for time as regards the review, which should come in July, after the acceptance of the 2020 strategy. In the 2020 strategy, climate is the number one priority.

Therefore, yes, there should be consequences, if you are asking about a real link and not slogans as regards the budgetary dimensions.

1-024

**Derk Jan Eppink (ECR).** – Mijnheer de Voorzitter, ik zal mijn vraag in het Nederlands stellen. Het gaat over de eigen middelen. We hebben het zojuist al even gehad over de eigen middelen. U zegt dat u in principe wat voorzichtig bent om daar een sterk vervolg aan te geven, maar hoe ziet u een Europese belasting, mijnheer de commissaris? De heer Dehaene, die achter u zit, is daar een groot voorstander van, de heer Verhofstadt is een nog grotere voorstander van een Europese belasting en de heer Van Rompuy heeft gezegd dat dit misschien mogelijk moet zijn in een groen jasje. Dan gaat het toch in de richting van een Europese belasting. Ik vraag u daarom: bent u voor of tegen een Europese belasting, desnoods in een groen jasje?

1-025

**Janusz Lewandowski, Commissioner-designate.** – We have a big review behind us, thanks to our President, and we know that, of the many countries in the European Union, the Netherlands and Austria were likely to investigate the issue of a purely fiscal system of own resources. What we should respect is, firstly, the question of unanimity of decision in the Council on own resources, and, secondly, the fiscal sovereignty of states, which makes us eager to find politically feasible solutions.

We have enumerated; there are candidates for taxation, for increasing the role of own resources, also in Ms Schreyer's proposal from 2004. We have on the table the other proposals. We have a set of taxation candidates for the auctioning of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, a very interesting new proposition as the basis for own resources.

All of this has to be investigated from the angle of simplicity, fiscal neutrality and the cost of collection of that sort of taxation, so I am not excluding own resources. But I am in favour of a two-phase or three-phase approach towards changing the system towards the original spirit of the Treaty of Rome. Now we are contradicting the spirit of the Treaty of Rome as it relates to the question of own resources.

1-026

**Le Président.** – Un empereur romain avait déclaré que l'argent n'avait pas d'odeur. Nous aurons à décider si l'argent a une couleur.

1-027

**Miguel Portas (GUE/NGL).** – Senhor Candidato a Comissário, a minha pergunta é esta: eu ouvi-o falar sobre os recursos próprios de três maneiras diferentes. A

primeira maneira é o problema da unanimidade. O segundo problema é dizer "não excluo nenhuma solução para aumentar os recursos próprios". E a terceira foi especificamente sobre a possibilidade de taxar transacções financeiras, dizer que acha que pode ser prejudicial à economia.

Aquilo que eu sei sobre as transacções financeiras é que mesmo Primeiros-Ministros da sua família política, muito em particular Sarkozy, têm passado a adoptar - e Gordon Brown de outra família política -, têm feito declarações favoráveis à existência de um imposto sobre as transacções financeiras. Portanto, o que lhe pergunto é por que é que se mantém, tendo em conta esta alteração na posição de vários dos Primeiros-Ministros mais significativos, por que é que se mantém numa posição contrária. Porque não é, seguramente, principalmente por causa da unanimidade. Pode ser por causa da sua opinião pessoal.

1-028

**Janusz Lewandowski, Commissioner-designate.** – The fact is that I am very open – and have proved this in the proceedings of the Budgetary Committee in Parliament – towards any new idea which meets certain criteria.

I know that, apart from the other candidate taxes, the financial transaction tax is on the table as one of the options. As far as I know, Mr Tobin recently refrained from supporting it completely, but it is on the table as one of the options, as is the seigniorage of the European Central Bank. I am open to investigating this, without a final conclusion on costs, at the level of the coming review that will follow the priorities set in the 2020 strategy. At that point we will be obliged to propose different methods, and not continuity of the existing own resources system. Such was the conclusion of the Council of December 2005. The criteria are very clear: feasibility, simplicity, fiscal neutrality and the cost of collecting the taxation.

My position remains that I am open to proposals for alternative European Union resources, keeping to all sorts of limits, which are already well enumerated. Many already exist in the think tanks in the world surrounding our institutions, based on different criteria.

1-029

**Miguel Portas (GUE/NGL).** – A segunda pergunta diz respeito ao problema da coesão, não apenas territorial, mas também da coesão social. Creio que todos estaremos de acordo que a coesão territorial é importante para a coesão social, mas não chega. Ora nós não temos políticas significativas em matéria de coesão social. A pergunta que lhe coloco é se estaria aberto à consideração, no plano da revisão das próximas Perspectivas Financeiras, a considerar a possibilidade da criação de um fundo europeu complementar para os sistemas de segurança social mais fracos na União Europeia.

1-030

**Janusz Lewandowski, Commissioner-designate.** – My position so far is to respect it as an integral part of the

European Union. We also have problems, well enumerated, with agencies and all sorts of independent funds. I know Parliament is for budgetisation of the European Development Fund, for example. The question remains open as to how to finance climate, whether to have a special climate fund or an integral part of the European budget. So far, my position on cohesion is rather to respect the existing arrangement and not to build the other financial vehicles that could be budgeted outside the existing budget.

If we are mushrooming any sorts of vehicles that are budgeted that are outside the budget, we are losing some sort of control over the integrity of the European budget. My position is rather to find place in the budget, with a special fund. That is the position today.

1-031

**Monika Hohlmeier (PPE).** – Herr Vorsitzender, Herr Kommissar! Ich darf Ihnen folgende Frage in Bezug auf die Gebäudepolitik stellen: Inwieweit sind Sie als neuer Kommissar bereit, den Haushaltsausschuss frühzeitig über neu entstehende Planungen zu unterrichten und in geeigneten Etappen in die Projektierung und die Planungsphasen miteinzubeziehen, um bei der abschließenden Genehmigung im Haushaltsausschuss keinerlei Verzögerungen zu verursachen? Werden Sie dem Haushaltsausschuss eine gesamtplanerische Übersicht über den Bestand und den Zustand von Immobilien, den Vermehrungsbedarf und geplante Neuvorhaben vorlegen, um eine schlüssige Immobilienstrategie für den Raumbedarf von Kommission und Agenturen haushaltsmäßig zügig und gut planen und absichern zu können?

1-032

**Janusz Lewandowski, Commissioner-designate.** – The joint declaration from the November conciliation included an agreement on a longer-term vision of building policy. That vision was always somehow accidentally broken by piecemeal acquisitions in the form of last-minute requests to Parliament for transfers.

This was our fate, because I was also responsible for more or less the same dossier, so there was a request for a strategy – not just looking for synergies between the Commission, Parliament and the other institutions, which is the other issue – when buying something abroad, in third countries outside the European Union. There is a long-standing demand of Parliament to place acquisitions in the framework of a long-standing strategy, because the preference of the European Union is now to buy and not to rent. I should be ready to place the overall picture, accumulated from the other institutions, at your disposal.

1-033

**Le Président.** – Nous allons maintenant passer aux questions de la commission du contrôle budgétaire et, pour trente-cinq minutes, je vais donner la présidence et le marteau à M. de Magistris, président de la commission du contrôle budgétaire.

1-034

**PRESIDENZA DI LUIGI de MAGISTRIS**

**Presidente.** – Signor Presidente, la saluto e la ringrazio, come saluto anche il Commissario designato Lewandowski.

Prima di dare la parola ai componenti dei gruppi politici della commissione CONT per il tempo strettamente stabilito vorrei introdurre alcuni temi proprio come presidente della commissione per il controllo dei bilanci.

Ho letto con molta attenzione quello che lei ha scritto. Vorrei qualche chiarimento su come intende, signor Commissario, trovare l'equilibrio tra la semplificazione per una maggiore efficacia delle somme erogate per raggiungere i loro fini, le regole necessarie per eliminare i rischi di gravi errori e le frodi. In particolare, quindi, come intende semplificare senza eliminare le regole chiare, che sono un argine per le frodi, e in particolare come intende individuare, come intende intervenire sul cosiddetto rischio di errore tollerabile.

Ho letto che lei ha indicato con precisione che intende proseguire sulla linea della pubblicizzazione dei beneficiari dei fondi europei. Intende anche indicare coloro che violano, gli Stati che producono violazioni in materia di fondi europei? E come intende procedere il suo ufficio nei confronti degli Stati che reiteratamente si rendono responsabili di violazioni per quanto riguarda le somme erogate dall'Unione europea?

1-035

**Janusz Lewandowski, Commissioner-designate.** – There is nothing more complex than a simplification of financial rules. The story is as follows. It is very well-known, for example, to my colleagues Ingeborg Gräßle and others, that the 2002 Financial Regulation was an overreaction to the fate of the Santer Commission. Then came an extraordinary effort to simplify it and make it more user-friendly in 2006, which has been in force since January 2007.

Now what is at stake is three annual revisions of the Financial Regulation, and the Commission has very ambitious goals to introduce not only the concept of tolerable risk of error but also the new financial leverage instruments, in cooperation with the European Investment Bank, and more public and private partnerships.

The tolerable risk of error is, of course, a concept coming from the Court of Auditors, but it should be broken down somehow to take into account the complex nature of different sorts of politics. At the beginning this is going to be about research, as here is the most evident complaint about red tape. Research, transport and energy are coming, I think, in the first round. It should be ready for the middle of 2010 when the other areas are.

So we have to differentiate from this 2% red line for the various policies. I think this is very well enumerated concerning the paragraphs and articles of the existing Financial Regulation. This is a different job from

adjusting to Lisbon because this is about really making the Financial Regulation more user-friendly in many areas. Also the Commission has the very ambitious goal, set in 2005, of receiving the first ever positive declaration of assurance.

1-036

**Ville Itälä (PPE).** – Arvoisa komission jäsen ehdokas Lewandowski, kysymykseni liittyy rakennerahastoihin. Rakennerahastojen kaikista kustannuksista vähintään 11 prosenttia kärsii epäsäännönmukaisuuksista, joista aiheutuu rakennerahastobudjetin selkeää tehottomuutta. Taloudelliset tarkastukset ja perimiset toimivat vain osittain. Esimerkkejä näistä epäsäännönmukaisuuksista löytyy monista jäsenvaltioista. Kaksi vuotta rakennerahastojen *action planin* julkaisemisen jälkeen tulokset eivät vielä ole näkyviä, se herättää tietysti epäilyksiä *action planin* tehokkuudesta. Kysymys Teille kuuluukin: mitä aiotte tehdä korjataksenne maksujen ja sanktioiden epäsäännönmukaisuuksia ja muuttaaksenne komission asennetta enemmän arvoa rahalla - lähestymistapaan?

1-037

**Janusz Lewandowski, Commissioner-designate.** – Eleven per cent is not a tolerable scale of error and this is indeed the estimated level of error of the cohesion policy. But on the other hand we should note the improvement between 2004 and 2008, which is to some extent reflected in the 2008 discharge procedure: not only were the accounts given a clean evaluation by the Court of Auditors, there has also been an improvement that has reduced the overall volume of error in execution of the budget.

As you know, and as everybody knows, the problem is that cohesion is 80% managed by the Member States and at the level of multi-level governments, so this is mainly the responsibility of the Member States. The ambitious goal of having the declaration certified by the national audit offices from around the European Union is not yet accomplished; it is not even very realistic in the near future.

But here is the problem: there are different standards in different Member States. That is why I am hearing the very familiar request from the floor to name and shame, *inter alia* by revealing the names of several states that are lagging behind in the execution, take-up and implementation of a cohesion policy.

But this is very unpopular with the Council and I am caught in between. The requests of Parliament are very familiar to me, as they are to the beneficiaries of the available European funds. But I am also very familiar with the problem of the national assurance statements from the Member States – mainly, it should be said, federal states.

1-038

**Ville Itälä (PPE).** – Toinen tärkeä asia liittyy täällä esillä olleeseen maatalouspolitiikkaan. DG AGRI:n toimintaraportissa virheet maatalousvaroissa vuonna 2007 olivat 1,85 prosenttia. Ne vaihtelevat eri maissa

rajusti, omassa kotimaassani Suomessa ne ovat 0,8 prosenttia, Saksassa 0,3 prosenttia ja Espanjassa 0,6 prosenttia. Muutamassa maassa nämä luvut ovat ihan toisenlaisia: Bulgariassa yli 13 prosenttia ja Romaniassa 12,5 prosenttia. Nämä luvut kertovat, että valvontajärjestelmä ei toimi kunnolla. Komission käyttämä sanktiomenettely, jossa on jäädytetty rahoja ja maksuja palautettu, ei ole toiminut. Mitä aiotte tehdä, jotta tilanne paranisi Romanian ja Bulgarian...

(*Puheenjohtaja keskeytti puhujan.*)

1-039

**Janusz Lewandowski, Commissioner-designate.** – This was already a case of blame and shame, but this is very well-known. There is a wide range of diversity in implementation between countries with irregularities of 0.3%, in this instance Germany, and others with more than 10%.

But again your question is leading to the conclusion as to the different standards in the different Member States and also to the standards in judicial systems.

As for their recoveries, I think this is improving. It was EUR 2.9 billion last year and this is looking quite good, so please remember that not everything that is called error is the equivalent of fraud. It might be a formal error and not a waste of money. So I am insisting very strongly for a public perception that error is not equal to fraud. Some of the cases are in OLAF, but only some of them.

1-040

**Jens Geier (S&D).** – Herr Lewandowski, welche Versicherung können Sie uns geben, dass das auswärtige Handeln der EU eine Gemeinschaftspolitik bleibt und nicht künftig zwischenstaatliche Politik wird? Wie schlagen Sie vor, die finanzielle Transparenz für diesen Bereich sicherzustellen und konsequenterweise die volle Einbeziehung des neuen Europäischen Auswärtigen Dienstes in das Haushaltsentlastungsverfahren sicherzustellen?

1-041

**Janusz Lewandowski, Commissioner-designate.** – The External Action Service is most likely to gain high visibility in the immediate follow-up of the entry into force of the Lisbon Treaty. Under the Council guidelines it will be a *sui generis* institution, managing its own administrative resources expenditure. The real problem now for the Financial Regulation is how to make this feasible: what sort of arrangement should be made in the Financial Regulation to incorporate its operational expenditure.

If the final decision is that the EEAS is placed in the Commission section of the budget while being a separate institution in the administrative part, it will remain in both areas fully accountable to Parliament, and I think this is the most important issue.

But, whatever the solution, whether there is separate administrative management in a *sui generis* institution



called the External Action Service to be set up by the end of April, or the administrative expenditure falls within the Commission's normal responsibility under the Treaty, in both areas the responsibility for discharge lies with Parliament. In other words, either way it is fully accountable to Parliament.

But if you want to make the Lisbon Treaty visible we should set up an External Action Service without adding too much burden to the human resources; as the human resources should come firstly from the Commission, secondly from the Council and lastly from the Commission delegations abroad.

1-042

**Jens Geier (S&D).** – Wenn Sie gestatten, habe ich noch eine Nachfrage zu den Fragestellungen insbesondere des Kollegen Itälä.

Sie haben in der Tat Recht, dass kaum etwas komplizierter ist, als Vereinfachung, und Sie haben in Ihren Eingangserklärungen als Leitlinie den Begriff der Benutzerfreundlichkeit verwendet, um einen Eindruck davon zu vermitteln, wie Sie sich das vorstellen. Ich halte das allerdings für ein Etikett. Unser Ziel muss doch sein, dass wir nationale Erklärungen zur Mittelverwaltung von den Nationalstaaten bekommen, um bei der Haushaltskontrolle eine größere Verlässlichkeit zu erreichen. Mich würde interessieren, wie Sie zu dieser Frage stehen.

1-043

**Janusz Lewandowski, Commissioner-designate.** – I tend to think along the lines of the Commission. The Commission's position is that it would be better for reliability to have declarations by the Member States.

But then we come up against the will of the Member States, and of course we also need certification – in all its different manifestations throughout the European Union – by the national audit service of a particular state.

1-044

**Jorgo Chatzimarkakis (ALDE).** – Herr Vorsitzender, Herr Lewandowski! Der Haushaltskontrollausschuss ist ja dazu da zu prüfen, ob Zahlungen korrekt waren und ob es Unregelmäßigkeiten gab. Sie haben ja durch Ihre Ausführungen klargemacht, dass Sie sich da sehr gut auskennen.

Jetzt haben wir aber einen neuen Schwerpunkt. Wir wollen im Haushaltskontrollausschuss nicht nur prüfen, ob etwas korrekt war, sondern auch, ob es effizient ist. Eine Kontrolle danach ist zwar gut aber eigentlich viel zu spät. Das heißt, bevor die Auszahlung erfolgt – da sind Sie am Zuge –, könnte man schon vorab prüfen, ob eine Maßnahme überhaupt Effizienz verspricht. Meine Frage an Sie ist: Was können Sie tun, um insbesondere gegenüber den Mitgliedstaaten Ihre Position klarzumachen, dass eine Maßnahme gegebenenfalls eben nicht effizient ist? Denn viele sinnlose Ausgaben werden durch die Mitgliedstaaten getätigt. Die zweite Frage, die sich anschließt, lautet: Wie stimmen Sie sich mit Ihren Kollegen ab, den großen Auszahlern – also Regionalfonds, Agrarfonds? Da gibt es aus der

Vergangenheit zu berichten, dass die Abstimmung zwischen den Generaldirektionen und den Kommissaren nicht ausreichend war.

1-045

**Janusz Lewandowski, Commissioner-designate.** – The starting point in discussion of irregularities should be that there is progress reflected in the 2008 discharge procedure. It is more difficult to introduce the criteria of efficiency because they are by nature more discretionary than the formal criteria and that is why it is easier to judge an evaluation from a formal point of view

But this is the natural development of the Financial Regulation, to take on board not only that this is a user-friendly simplification, but that this is rational. However, in operational terms quantification is much more difficult to accomplish. But this is for three annual revisions of the Financial Regulation. This is coming. We have accumulated a lot of remarks from around the European Union, because a sort of public consultation was started in this respect in October last year. I think more than 200 amendments to the Financial Regulation have already been submitted. Many of them of course come from beneficiaries; that is rather more about simplification than additional criteria.

1-046

**Jorgo Chatzimarkakis (ALDE).** – Ich will doch noch einmal nachhaken, denn die Mitgliedstaaten sind ja hier in der Pflicht. Sie haben gerade schon von *naming and shaming* gesprochen, als Ihrer Waffe, die Sie haben. Sind Sie bereit, *naming and shaming* zu tun, denn nur das hat in der Vergangenheit dazu geführt, dass es – wie Sie angesprochen haben – eine Verbesserung bei der Verminderung der Unregelmäßigkeiten gab. Wo setzen Sie Ihren Schwerpunkt? Was ist für Sie im Zweifel effizient: Infrastruktur oder Forschung und Innovation?

1-047

**Janusz Lewandowski, Commissioner-designate.** – We have started the round of naming and shaming today so I am not going to abstain. Of course, it would be better from the beginning to do it on a bilateral basis, as the Commission has a well documented list of irregularities, and it is very well-known what is the focus of our attention.

But I did not quite understand your second question: if you were referring to the priorities for the tolerable risk of error, the priority for improvement in the Financial Regulation is definitely research. Most of the complaints are coming from research.

It is a pity, but sometimes the European Union pays lip service to increasing research and then, in Amending Budget No 10 of 2009, under heading 1a it effected a reduction! Research is about competitiveness, so this sends a signal that there is something wrong with the projects in research.

1-048

**Helga Trüpel (Verts/ALE).** – As we are now talking about simplification and how to do it, I would like to know how to improve it – whether you are in favour of

calling on the Member States to give national declarations on how they improve their management of financing.

1-049

**Janusz Lewandowski, Commissioner-designate.** – I am afraid that it would be easier to draw up a report of how we are improving – we, the Member States – if there were a declaration of assurance of a Member State. I have forgotten, in reply to all sets of questions on irregularities, that we are in a very specific period, with two rounds of simplification prepayments and also the proposal to scrap cofinancing and the social fund not accepted by the Commission. But we are in a time of crisis, and this is very relevant for the discussion of the financial regulation: Inge Gräßle knows this perfectly well.

But all sorts – two rounds of simplifications, prepayments, lump sums, and all that is more user-friendly and enabling to create via the grants and cohesion policy and anti-crisis devices – this is not always in line with sound financial management and control, and these two trains are really conflicting. We have to make life easier at a time when there is no approach to banking credit to make the lives of all the beneficiaries easier, because this is an anti-crisis device. But, on the other hand, we are under strong pressure to improve sound financial management.

So this is sometimes like a vicious circle, but it has to be treated in this triennial modification of the Financial Regulation – apart from the new devices about public/private partnership, new financial instruments and the concept of tolerable risk of error, it is to be introduced into the Financial Regulation with a specification for various policies. But please remember that we are in an extraordinary environment created by the crisis, with a lot of expectations that we are channelling, delivering policy promises via simplification and prepayments.

1-050

**Helga Trüpel (Verts/ALE).** – I would like to come back to this problem. I think that we can both agree that we are not calling for more red tape – that is clear – nor for more bureaucracy or paperwork, but the question of how to improve the management of financing is one of political spirit and commitment.

The Member States are responsible for more or less 80% of this, so it is really a question of how to make them deliver, act in a common spirit and improve. That is the question: how to have the best models to make them improve their financial management. It is therefore not a question of having more paper as decoration, but of how to change the political thinking and spirit in the Member States.

1-051

**Janusz Lewandowski, Commissioner-designate.** – I have to say, and this is important for so-called ‘Eastern Europe’, that, despite all sorts of complaints, the exercise involving European finance has been a big

exercise in financial programming at the local and regional level.

This was really something new, and it has improved the quality of administration in the new countries, which were to blame for many of the irregularities – though not necessarily in cohesion recently.

However, I am trying to be positive. I have been seeing a real improvement in the knowledge of financial programming, about internal control, about financial management, and this is all as a result of the take-up of European finance in many of the new countries – I am not speaking about the so-called ‘old Member States’.

So please see the brighter side. There has been a revolution in financial programming at the local and regional level in the Europe I know.

1-052

**Ryszard Czarnecki (ECR).** – Do komisarza z Polski oczywiście pytanie po polsku. Chciałbym pogratulować Panu doskonałych odpowiedzi i świetnej prezentacji. Jako koordynator mojej grupy politycznej w Komisji Kontroli Budżetowej chciałbym zapytać Pana, gdzie Pańskim zdaniem są największe błędy, jeśli chodzi o pewne marnotrawstwo środków unijnych, ich nieszczelność z punktu widzenia Komisji Europejskiej, co wykazują liczne kontrole; jak to uszczelnić w przeciągu najbliższych pięciu lat? Pytanie drugie, istotne: jak przewiduje Pan koszty potencjalnego rozszerzenia Unii Europejskiej, zwłaszcza o kraje bałkańskie, w nowej perspektywie finansowej Unii Europejskiej?

Życzymy powodzenia, Panie Komisarzu.

1-053

**Janusz Lewandowski, desygnowany komisarz.** – To może być modelowy przykład bycia w opozycji między sobą w kraju, ale wzajemnej współpracy na płaszczyźnie europejskiej.

Już dużo powiedzieliśmy o wadach obecnego systemu z punktu widzenia implementacji budżetu. Dwie dziedziny, gdzie ta implementacja pozostawia dużo do życzenia, to jest po pierwsze kohezja, już omówiona (najwyższy poziom nieprawidłowości), drugim są stosunki zewnętrzne (*external affairs*). To są dwie dziedziny, gdzie potrzebny jest istotny wkład w poprawienie szczelności systemu budżetowego i jego racjonalności. A więc nie np. administracja, choć w popularnej percepcji tym źródłem marnotrawstwa jest administracja, która ma wbrew pozorom, stosunkowo skromny udział w budżecie Unii Europejskiej – jeśli chodzi nie tylko o audyt rachunków, ale również o audyt tej dziedziny, wychodzi na tle innych rozdziałów budżetu europejskiego całkiem dobrze.

Jeśli chodzi o rozszerzenie, wstępne przymiarki już są, były one również robione na poziomie Parlamentu Europejskiego. Oczywiście to co zwraca największą uwagę, to ewentualne pojawienie się w gronie członków (co jest problemem spornym) Turcji, gdyż Turcja

konsumowałyby ponad 60% funduszy strukturalnych wszystkich krajów, które są w orbicie kandydowania, przedkandydowania i w ogóle w orbicie Unii Europejskiej. Ja znam jeden wstępny szacunek wszystkich dodatkowych kosztów, właśnie wliczając w to Turcję, ale wolałbym na razie się nie narażać tutaj wszystkim, wymieniając te wielkie liczby. Nie jest to problem roku 2010.

1-054

**Ryszard Czarnecki (ECR).** – Dziękuję bardzo za ciekawe i w drugiej części dyplomatyczne odpowiedzi. Chciałbym tylko zauważyć, że wydatki administracji są porównywalne z wydatkami na sprawy zewnętrzne, na politykę zewnętrzną Unii Europejskiej. Myślę, że te proporcje trzeba zmienić, to będzie także Pana zadanie i to wpisuję do Pańskiego sztambucha, Panie Komisarzu, trzymając za Pana kciuki. Mam nadzieję, że Pana misja będzie efektywna.

1-055

**Janusz Lewandowski, desygnowany komisarz.** – Ma pan rację, rzeczywiście rozdział piąty lekko przewyższa swoim wolumenem rozdział czwarty, który w tej chwili staje się prerogatywą osoby przesłuchiwanej równolegle do mnie, czyli pani Ashton. To jest budżet na siedmioletni okres w okolicach 45 bilionów euro, przy czym ciągle nie zamknięta jest kwestia zorganizowania, jak mówiliśmy już, tego co nazywamy *European External Action Service*.

1-056

**Miguel Portas (GUE/NGL).** – Nós temos estado aqui a falar de eficiência do ponto de vista da correção ou da diminuição de irregularidades e de desperdícios. Mas há um outro factor da eficiência, que é o que diz respeito ao acerto das escolhas políticas com incidência orçamental. E, como o Senhor Comissário sabe, muitas das rubricas orçamentais obedecem, ao longo da História, a acordos contingentes entre diferentes interesses. A minha pergunta é: se considera que é necessário discutir, no âmbito das próximas Perspectivas Financeiras, aquilo a que nós poderíamos chamar "Perspectivas Financeiras de Base Zero", ou seja, que obedçam a uma rediscussão global das prioridades e dos instrumentos da União.

1-057

**Janusz Lewandowski, Commissioner-designate.** – Thinking about the future and the future financial perspective, we have the lesson of the past. The lesson of the past is as follows: the earlier we agree the political priorities, the easier it is to equip them with financial headings.

The problem for the future – one of the very many problems – is how to find the key orientation. This could be, for example, climate or the environment, but it has to appeal to the people, because all the former packages had some key orientation: for example, the single market in the case of the first Delors package; then monetary union in the case of the second Delors package. Then it was Prodi with enlargement, with mixed sentiments in Europe. Now, the first Barroso package concerned the Lisbon Agenda, but this does not provoke many positive sentiments.

Now we have the problem of how to find the key orientation around which we should concentrate the political prioritisation and financial prioritisation of a Financial Perspective. This was said also to be the task of the review, but the review is late. It was a wise decision to delegate the review to the next College of Commissioners, and this was also well received in the Parliament. But now, given that Mr Barroso wants Strategy 2020 accepted first – this is a political priority, and most likely in June – we have the earliest date for the review as July, if this is in connection with prioritisation in the political sense. Then we are very close to the calendar of the next multiannual financial framework, as regards prolongation and so on, but I think these questions will come.

1-058

**Miguel Portas (GUE/NGL).** – Aproveito porque a resposta do Senhor Comissário ajuda. A minha interrogação é a seguinte: Exactamente porque nos estamos a aproximar do calendário das próximas Perspectivas Financeiras, porque é que não usamos o processo de revisão destas Perspectivas Financeiras, ampliando-o temporalmente até 2015-2016, como verdadeiras novas Perspectivas Financeiras?

1-059

**Janusz Lewandowski, Commissioner-designate.** – I am afraid that in raising this issue you are begging the question from someone very much behind the idea of prolongation.

This is one of the solutions to the problem of matching the mandate of Parliament with the duration of the Financial Perspective. My innovative idea to extend the mandate of Parliament to seven years was not widely accepted, for unknown reasons, and now, if we are talking about matching – it is in the Treaties as a minimum of five years – of course, prolongation, which may be discussed and developed later as an issue, is not the only way to match both mandates, but it is one of the proposals clearly gaining a majority in Parliament.

1-060

#### PRÉSIDENTE DE M. ALAIN LAMASSOURE

1-061

**Le Président.** – Je suis très impressionné par la manière dont les membres de la commission du contrôle budgétaire et leur président respectent les règles et je suis persuadé que les membres de la commission des budgets auront maintenant à cœur de faire de même.

Je donne la parole, au nom du PPE, à M. Reimer Böge, et M. Lewandowski est conscient du fait qu'il est, en quelque sorte, géographiquement coincé entre ses deux successeurs.

1-062

**Reimer Böge (PPE).** – Herr Vorsitzender! Wir haben den designierten Kommissar ja als unseren Ausschussvorsitzenden, aber auch als unseren Verhandlungsleiter zur finanziellen Vorausschau gut kennengelernt. Deswegen sage ich vorweg, dass für

mich seine fachliche Kompetenz und seine parlamentarische Offenheit über jeden Zweifel erhaben sind.

Trotzdem haben wir beide auch kennengelernt, wie in schwierigen Zeiten dieser Verhandlung 2006 die gesamte Kommission nicht immer intensiv genug hinter ihren eigenen Vorschlägen gestanden hat. Deswegen haben wir auch einige Defizite und *left overs*, mit denen wir es heute zu tun haben.

Deshalb möchte ich Folgendes fragen: Erstens im Hinblick auf die Umsetzung der haushaltspolitischen Konsequenzen des Lissabon-Vertrags: Wann in etwa werden Ihre künftigen Dienststellen eine Schätzung der erforderlichen Mittel vorlegen können, die wir für die Lissabon-Umsetzung nicht nur zur GASP sondern in der ganzen Bandbreite der neuen politischen Prioritäten – in welchen Stufen auch immer – zu diskutieren und zu integrieren haben? Zweitens: Ist nicht die angedachte Halbzeitüberprüfung eine passende Gelegenheit, um rechtzeitig über die Frage Verlängerung, Überprüfung und Halbzeitbewertung der Mehrjahresprogramme sowie mehr Flexibilität bei den Instrumenten nachzudenken und dies nicht auf die Zeit nach 2014 zu verschieben?

1-063

**Janusz Lewandowski, Commissioner-designate.** – Reimer Böge assisted me in my ‘learning by doing’ which began in 2004.

As for adjustment to Lisbon, this is not purely a technical issue. We will very soon be ready to submit what is, apart from agreed transitional solutions for transfer amendments, a practical timetable, which was fortunately agreed in conciliation to ensure a smooth procedure in 2011 while awaiting the adoption of primary law on the legal regulation on the Financial Perspective and the Interinstitutional Agreement.

I am conscious that these two documents are essential. They are under consultation internally in the Commission. Both are needed: it is stated in the Treaty that the Council, after receiving the assent of Parliament, lays down the issues of the multiannual framework in its regulation.

The Interinstitutional Agreement – and the report on the Interinstitutional Agreement – should then be the occasion for dealing with more flexibility, whether the existing instruments – such as the aid reserve, solidarity fund, globalisation fund and flexibility – are enough in this environment of very tight margins of the present perspective.

As I said in my introductory remarks, I would like to seek the other leverages going beyond the budget, because without them we are not able to finalise additional needs. You know that we have modified – practically revised – the Financial Perspective three times. 2006 was the financial year I wanted to forget.

1-064

**Jutta Haug (S&D).** – Häufig sind die Agenturen mein Thema, so auch jetzt. Agenturen fallen nicht vom Himmel, das wissen wir alle. Wir machen sie selbst, und zwar per gesetzgeberischem Akt.

Wie schätzen Sie, Herr designierter Kommissar, die derzeitige Situation ein? Denken Sie, wie einige Ihrer Kollegen, aber auch einige meiner Kollegen, dass die unabhängigen Agenturen als Teil der europäischen Administration die Rolle der Kommission und deren Einfluss auf die Umsetzung europäischer Politik schwächen? Wenn ja, würden Sie das gerne ändern, und wie? Wenn nein, bin ich mir sicher, dass Sie mit mir eins für ganz wichtig halten, nämlich, dass wir mehr Effizienz ins Verwaltungshandeln bekommen. Das betrifft aber nicht nur die Agenturen, sondern das betrifft auch alle Kommissionsdienste. Wenn nein also, hielten Sie es dann nicht für angemessen, den europäischen Gesetzgeber ein bisschen anzuregen, die Finanzierung neuer Agenturen – und nicht nur den gesetzlichen Rahmen – näher zu betrachten? Dazu könnte man sich vorstellen, dass diese Anregung darin bestünde, eine Kategorie oder eine Unterkategorie für alle diese Agenturen in der nächsten Finanziellen Vorschau zu schaffen.

1-065

**Janusz Lewandowski, Commissioner-designate.** – The development of agencies – I mean centralised or regulatory agencies – was a very ad hoc development, without a broader vision or regulation – although, since 2004, with your participation we have had regular new impact assessments set up. As for the budgetary dimension of what might happen in the future, it should not be more than inflationary adjustment. It should not be more in terms of costs, with the exception of the three new authorities that are the follow-up of the de Larosière report, which should be more than EUR 40 million. So this is an additional cost really. Three more agencies for the supervision of financial markets, which are the consequence of a financial crisis and the conclusions of the de Larosière group.

As to the management, we know a lot about what is missing: parameter-oriented behaviour and management of these agencies. This was in the communication of the Commission from last year as a follow-up, part of the evaluation of this work in progress. An interinstitutional group has been set up: Ms Haug, by nature of her duties and interests, is in it, as are Ingeborg Gräßle and Anne Jensen. We will meet at the level of this interinstitutional group to improve what we call the deficiencies in the management. But as for complicating the budget, one of the conclusions – and I think this is also the idea coming from Parliament – one of the ways of making the European budget more flexible is to reduce the number of headings, for example: making more flexibility in the arrangements is one of the ideas. But this goes against the idea of any more complications and subtitles in the budget.

1-066

**Alexander Alvaro (ALDE).** – Commission President Barroso outlined in his work programme two main

priorities among others. The first one was combating the financial and economic crisis; the other one is research and development. We are involved in both issues as the Committee on Budgets.

Concerning the combating of the financial and economic crisis, I would like to have your personal views. As Commissioner on the European Globalisation Fund, would you call it a success? Has the right mechanism been chosen, for example in terms of cofinancing, and in what way could we come close to something like a budget line in the future should we want it, or what legal basis will be there? I should like to know what will happen in the future on that one.

In terms of research and development, I would like to know from you the ideal time, scope and depth of the mid-term assessment of the seventh Framework Programme. How can we more efficiently follow up on the use of research funding – for example, what do we actually get for our money? And last, but not least, from the budgetary point of view, what are your personal ideas for the eighth Framework Programme?

1-067

**Janusz Lewandowski**, *Commissioner-designate*. – The Globalisation Fund was set up perhaps as responding more to fears revealed in the French referendum and not as an answer to the economic crisis, but now it has to play the role, as dislocation happens more and more – also the dislocation of employment. We were discussing the Globalisation Fund as regards the rules on certain occasions, including the famous case of Dell being transferred from Ireland and the redundancies receiving money. Then there is a question of public support for the new venture in Poland – in my country.

What was important in the time of crisis was the special modification of the Globalisation Fund, in terms of reducing the number of redundancies needed to apply for the Globalisation Fund from 1 000 to 500. That was about a bigger framework, that was about the other devices to make it more available if needed, but this is of course very much a discretionary device in operation.

Whoever comes first takes the money and I know that there are areas of Europe, including the shipbuilding industry in my home town of Gdańsk, which were not ready to find the way to the Globalisation Fund. This was a mistake because these were the redundancies going for more than 10 000 people, but we should find room in the next Financial Perspective for more flexibility devices than now, whether or not in the present form, and this is now to be placed in a residual interinstitutional agreement. As to the research, I am afraid it should be a follow-up question because I am out of time.

1-068

**Le Président**. – Si l'objectif du Fonds de globalisation était de rendre la globalisation populaire en France, il a totalement échoué, hélas.

1-069

**Alexander Alvaro (ALDE)**. – It is good that we have follow-up questions. Obviously, people are queuing up for the Globalisation Fund, as we see in the numbers which have been asked for – about 10% – but we will see what happens in the future. I would especially like to know how it will collide or not collide with the European Social Fund, where, actually, money is taken out and transferred – but you know the procedure as well as I do.

My follow-up gives you the opportunity to go in depth into the research and development questions put forward.

1-070

**Janusz Lewandowski**, *Commissioner-designate*. – I have to respond on the issue of research, partly already discussed from the angle of availability and simplification of procedure. But in this respect we have big heavyweight unknowns for future budgets. Two of them must be mentioned: ITER, as the scope of financing might be more than we can afford; and the second is Galileo. These are two heavyweights, apart from the other problems of smaller-scale research.

1-071

**Helga Trüpel (Verts/ALE)**. – I would like to come back to some of your speeches in Parliament in the last period, Mr Lewandowski, where you argued that the environment is detrimental to economic recovery.

Of course, if this is your position, that would have a certain impact on the planning of the new budget lines. I think now we have some proof that it is more or less the other way around – that, when we are very clever and combine sustainability and green technologies, we have new jobs, a new economic outcome and economic recovery. Therefore I would like to know whether you are ready to change your opinion.

1-072

**Janusz Lewandowski**, *Commissioner-designate*. – Congratulations on your way of preparing. That is the real background, and you already have three hits at this hearing.

Yes, I was defending the problem or setting out the problem of a carbon-built energy country – my country. That is a real problem. We are very weak. Poland is very much pro-European, with one general problem that is connected with the fight against climate warming.

Electricity is, for more than 90%, built on carbon. Of course this is also an opportunity and you rightly mentioned that this is the opportunity, partly cofinanced in the framework of the recovery plan, for new techniques of storage or gasification. I can agree and this is probably the change in my position. I can agree that the green industry is one of the best promises for Europe in the future, and this is about industry growing out of environmental arguments in the future.

So I can understand it because I see now also in my country, built on coal, a serious effort to somehow keep

up to the standards of the European Union. This is about self-sufficiency and natural resources, but this is dirty technology.

Fortunately, here are also opportunities: the gasification pilot plant is part of the recovery plan and this is also a lesson also for my compatriots that it could be an opportunity.

1-073

**Le Président.** – En ce moment-même, dans ma circonscription, le groupe français Total inaugure le premier projet pilote de captage et de stockage du carbone. Cette audition m'a empêché d'assister à cet événement historique.

1-074

**Isabelle Durant (Verts/ALE).** – Monsieur le candidat Commissaire, vous avez travaillé, vous l'avez cité, dans le cadre de la réforme portuaire en Pologne. À cet égard, je voudrais vous demander – j'ai aussi lu vos déclarations antérieures sur la question de la compétitivité – comment vous voyez la compétition, finalement, entre des secteurs libéralisés et les aides d'État ou le lien entre l'intervention ou la régulation de l'Union européenne et les aides d'État.

J'aurais voulu connaître votre point de vue sur les aspects de compétition liés, justement, à la restructuration de certains secteurs, et, par ailleurs, la vision que vous avez des aides d'État et de la façon dont l'Union européenne doit pouvoir les encadrer.

1-075

**Janusz Lewandowski, Commissioner-designate.** – I think you cannot find a better laboratory in this respect than my home country, which was affected in the case of the shipbuilding industry – and these were the three big shipyards – by the severe competition laws of the European Union. So we agreed to the logic of competition law and that you cannot build your competitive position with the assistance of public money. It cannot be like that because this is a distortion of competition and not real competition.

However, one could also understand – and *comprendre, c'est pardonner* – it is extremely difficult to switch immediately within a short period of time from the former industrial arrangements and to adapt to the new. We had to take your road, which was covered in many years, in a very short period of time, and here is the fate and laboratory of competition: three big Polish shipyards being eliminated from the landscape.

1-076

**Paweł Robert Kowal (ECR).** – Chciałbym poruszyć Panie Komisarzy, mam nadzieję w przyszłości Panie Ministrze, sprawy finansowania polityki zewnętrznej Unii Europejskiej. Proszę o Pana stanowisko w tej sprawie, jak Pan sobie to wyobraża, jakie środki powinny być przeznaczone na finansowanie polityki zewnętrznej, która ma być taką nowinką w traktacie lizbońskim, ale jest sprawą szalenie ważną. Proszę Pana o to, żeby Pan szczególnie odniósł się do kwestii finansowania partnerstwa wschodniego. Jak Pan wie,

jest to projekt ważny, ale gdybyśmy mogli szczerze sobie powiedzieć, w zbyt małym stopniu finansowany. Szczególnie, jeśli weźmiemy założoną kwotę w rozbiu na lata i na poszczególne kraje, nie jest to kwota duża. Proszę powiedzieć, jaki jest Pana konkretny plan działania w tej sprawie i jak Pan widzi optymalną sytuację, jeśli chodzi o finansowanie projektów partnerstwa wschodniego, tak żebyśmy byli konkurencyjnym graczem wobec państw partnerstwa wschodniego, w stosunku do choćby zaangażowania Rosji na tym terenie w różnych dziedzinach.

1-077

**Janusz Lewandowski, desygnowany komisarz.** – Rozdział czwarty, czyli polityka zagraniczna, to był notoryczny ból głowy w corocznych negocjacjach i najczęstszy powód rewizji i trudnych negocjacji co do budżetów rocznych, dlatego że tu mamy do czynienia z największą ilością nowych zadań, które nie mieszczą się w pułapach perspektywy finansowej na dany rok. Mógłbym wyliczyć tutaj wiele takich rzeczy oprócz partnerstwa wschodniego, od Kosowa, Palestyny czy innych nagłych do sfinansowania potrzeb zaczynając.

Jeśli chodzi o partnerstwo wschodnie, ono było najpierw nieopryzrządowane, najpierw było jedną z wielu polityk ogłoszonych jako zasada, ale nieopryzrządzonych w pieniądze. W tej chwili w ramach ogólnej koperty polityki sąsiedztwa mamy 600 milionów euro na partnerstwo wschodnie, które nie pochodzą z nowych źródeł, to nie są nowe pieniądze, to jest margines wynikający z przesunięcia, który składa się na te 600 milionów euro przeznaczone na partnerstwo wschodnie – innego sposobu jak dotąd nie było. Mądre zagospodarowanie jest tym bardziej istotne, gdy mamy do czynienia z niewielką kwotą i dużym obszarem geograficznym. Jeśli chcemy te pieniądze pomnożyć, to trzeba je zespolić z pieniędzmi płynącymi spoza budżetu europejskiego. W roku 2010 i chyba w 2011 nie ma jakiejś wielkiej możliwości, zważywszy, że tam nie ma praktycznie marginesów swobody. Dokładnie w tym rozdziale czwartym nie ma możliwości skokowego przyrostu pieniędzy na politykę wschodnią.

Jeśli chodzi o cele, sposoby zagospodarowania tych pieniędzy w sensie adresatów, to Pan ma większą wiedzę pod tym względem ode mnie.

1-078

**Надежда Нейнски (PPE).** – Уважаеми г-н Lewandowski, по стечение на обстоятелствата г-н Włosowicz почти изчерпа въпроса, който исках да Ви задам, но ще ми позволите да го конкретизирам в две посоки.

В своите писмени отговори до Европейския парламент Ви поемате като конкретен ангажимент на новата Комисия да бъде ускорено преразглеждането на Финансовия регламент във връзка със създаването на Европейската дипломатическа служба. Можете ли да се ангажирате с ориентировъчен график кога това нещо би било възможно?

И втори подвъпрос, като постоянен докладчик по въпросите на общата външна политика и политика за сигурност и бюджетната комисия, бих искала да Ви попитам как виждате своята роля на комисар по бюджета и финансовото планиране в диалога със Съвета и Парламента, именно в областта на общата външна политика и политиката на сигурност?

1-079

**Janusz Lewandowski, Commissioner-designate.** – I do not wish to repeat myself too much as regards the European External Action Service. It is not an easy question to answer in relation to the Financial Regulation revision, which is going to be a fast-track revision, contrary to paragraph 17 of Parliament's recent resolution on the 2010 budget, which demanded that all the issues connected with the financial revision should be dealt with on the occasion of a triennial revision of the financial perspective, and explicitly not at the time of a so-called fast-track revision.

However, if we want to accomplish our task – which is to set up the Service by the end of April – we should have fast-track revision of the Financial Regulation, contrary to what Inge Gräßle thinks about this – and I know perfectly what her position is.

The real problem, which I have already described, is that it has to be an independent institution in terms of the Financial Regulation. That means that it should be responsible for administrative expenditure, but operational expenditure is rather different. We are talking in parallel. Mrs Ashton is also answering questions in this respect, so I want to keep matters open, but in the logic of full responsibility of the Commission for operational expenditure, there should be Commission control as part of the Commission budget. The most important thing is that in both respects – administrative as a separate institution and operational – it should be fully accountable to Parliament in terms of a discharge. It is an accountable institution.

1-080

**Ivailo Kalfin (S&D).** – We all know that the budgetary resources of the European Union are far from being sufficient when it comes to financing the development of the European economy in times of economic crisis, and especially in this post-crisis period, which seems to be quite protracted.

Therefore, the EU has to do everything possible to maximise the efficiency of its own scarce resources, and one possible direction might be to increase the involvement of the European Investment Bank.

Indeed, in the political guidelines for the next Commission, Mr Barroso calls for an increased blending of EU funds and European Investment Bank loans within the existing instruments.

What is the limit of the participation of the European Investment Bank in sharing the budgetary priorities of the European Union? Are you not concerned that Mr Barroso is placing too much unrealistic hope on the

EIB? What is your assessment of the effect of the instruments launched by the European Investment Bank in 2007 in the field of research, TEN-T and SMEs? Are you prepared to consider the creation of new EIB instruments to facilitate access to EU funds in order to finance long-term investments, despite the call by Mr Barroso not to create new instruments?

1-081

**Janusz Lewandowski, Commissioner-designate.** – The major vehicle and response of the communal budget to the economic crisis is the recovery plan, and we were part of the story of financing the recovery plan, but it is coming rather late and with a modest capacity of EUR 5 billion in relation to the stimulus packages of nation states going much beyond that amount. So for me, parallel to your question, what should also be mentioned is the availability of European funds – general availability – for example the decision to advance more than EUR 6 billion in cohesion was one of the anti-crisis devices.

As for the role of the European Investment Bank, it is growing, and this was on purpose to increase capitalisation of the Investment Bank, to increase its capacity also in respect of the credits channelled to small and medium-sized enterprises. This was via intermediaries, as you know, but there is a legal obligation of intermediaries, the banking system profiting from the loans from European Investment Bank, to engage themselves twice as much as they are receiving from the loans. This is a contractual obligation so this is a device, and that is why we can say that the volume of credits of EUR 75 billion annually for example is worth, with all the leverage effects, more than EUR 200 billion – but because of the leverage. That is why I am thinking so strongly in terms of new financial instruments to be integrated for expanding the possibilities of a European budget.

1-082

**Ivailo Kalfin (S&D).** – If the role of the European Investment Bank is increased, would you consider some measures so as not to allow the creation of a parallel budget to the EU budget?

If we imposed too many tasks on the parallel financial instruments, including private-sector participation, then the budgetary policy of the European Union might be put at risk by having a parallel budget.

Would you consider some additional measures to increase the transparency of using these extra, or off-balance, funds in terms of promoting European policies?

1-083

**Janusz Lewandowski, Commissioner-designate.** – One of the options is to see the European Investment Bank as a sort of IMF institution for the eurozone. That means very much an upgraded role for the European Investment Bank. However, if it is to be efficient it has to blend somehow with grants from the Community budget. In terms of transparency, this is about public

money and about control over public expenditure. In various countries, including my country, there are problems. Public/private partnership is not functioning in Poland, not least because of prejudice towards private companies because of problems that include fraud.

This is a difficult exercise for countries which in the last 20 years have been building a completely new type of civil service, but that is inevitable. If we want to expand our possibilities, the only way is via new financial instruments, and the European Investment Bank is one of the essential vehicles.

1-084

**Ivars Godmanis (ALDE).** – I would like to ask Mr Lewandowski about how to complete the whole 2000–2006 Financial Perspective for the structural funds. The deadline for the Social Fund and the Development Fund has passed and EUR 4.45 billion will not be attracted and adopted by Member States. Instead of 95% fulfilment we have only 92.8%.

The Cohesion Fund deadline is the end of this year. It could be that this EUR 4.4 billion will grow into a total outstanding figure of EUR 16 billion. So that means that the Member States have not fulfilled their tasks concerning the financial perspective.

The question is, what is your opinion on how this money should be used? Will it go for other needs, on a rollover basis, for globalisation, solidarity or whatever else, or will it be used to pay back the Member States? It is not clear. What is your opinion on this?

1-085

**Janusz Lewandowski, Commissioner-designate.** – They committed commitments, but this of course was the signal that the political promise was not delivered. But, apart from all the rigours, we have not achieved our goals in this type of policy.

Of course, the major resource *qui reste à liquider* of outstanding commitments is and will be cohesion policy, due to this logic of n+2 and +3 for some countries.

I cannot commit myself now. Of course it is a very well recognised problem that, either coming after recycling of the money – a difficult exercise given the crisis situation and budgetary deficits in the net paying zone of the European Union – either recycling or decommitting. There is also one particular additional point that is looking not bad: point 17 of the interinstitutional agreement on the upgrading of some envelopes including, possibly, my country.

But please, do not expect from me now – and this is the collegiality of the Commission – my commitment to how to solve the well-enumerated and precisely expressed problem.

1-086

**Ivars Godmanis (ALDE).** – The second question is about the existing future. As a reaction to the crisis, the Commission has increased advance payments for

cohesion, by 10%, and 7% for development funds. But it could still be a problem with the Committee on Regional Development and the Committee on Budgets. Because there is a project still circulating, whereby people are asking, because of the problems of banks and governments, to minimise the cofinancing from the Member States, so the EU will pay instead of them. I have to say that the question is that the pressure will be very great on this one. If you look today, the latest one: 1 October, 24% fulfilment payment rate, but the difference between countries is 350%. So the question is, what will be your attitude, if the pressure is very high at a time of crisis, banks will not provide financing and governments have no budgets to cofinance: to increase advance payments or, to come back to the question which the Council has refused, no cofinancing from the Member States, with the EU instead taking this over, at least for the next two years?

1-087

**Janusz Lewandowski, Commissioner-designate.** – So-called decommitment and the other issues in cohesion are double-faced. On the one hand it is disciplining but on the other it is producing some problems. I would not come back to the idea of completely eliminating cofinancing, given the position already taken by the Council. I think it would be 'mission impossible' to repeat the exercise, so it is better to concentrate on advanced payments and on the other precautions undertaken in two rounds by the Commission. There was a first round in 2008, then a second round in 2009, of how to increase the availability of cohesion funding precisely as the anti-crisis device. So let us concentrate on what is feasible and politically acceptable.

1-088

**Le Président.** – De toute façon, tant que le budget communautaire est financé comme il l'est – on dirait, en France, que "c'est le chien qui se mord la queue" –, ce sont, de toute manière, les États membres qui financent. La question politique qui se pose est de savoir si les États membres financent sur leur budget national ou à travers le budget communautaire. Politiquement c'est très différent, mais c'est un des grands thèmes que nous auront à traiter ensemble.

Un petit intermède: la commission de l'agriculture et la commission du développement régional avaient demandé à pouvoir poser une question. Je salue donc la présence du président De Castro, qui représente sa commission et qui a droit à cinq minutes – je m'excuse, c'est très court. L'ensemble durera cinq minutes: une question d'une minute du président De Castro, une réponse de deux minutes de M. Lewandowski, puis M. De Castro pourra reprendre la parole pour une minute.

1-089

**Paolo De Castro (S&D), Presidente della commissione AGRI.** – Presidente Lamassoure, la ringrazio anche a nome della commissione per l'agricoltura e lo sviluppo rurale di questa opportunità.



Signor Commissario, il dibattito sul futuro assetto del bilancio comunitario impegna parallelamente anche quello sulla politica agricola europea post-2013, per la quale frequentemente viene evocata l'opportunità di tagli alle risorse. Richiami espliciti in tal senso sono contenuti anche in documenti ufficiosi che sono circolati nelle settimane addietro.

La prospettiva di un taglio di risorse contrasta, però, con gli auspici di un maggiore e più incisivo contributo dell'agricoltura rispetto a due fondamentali emergenze in atto: quella della sicurezza alimentare e quella della sicurezza ambientale.

Su questo punto, Signor Commissario, faccio rilevare che la recente crisi del settore lattiero-caseario ha dimostrato come, senza un intervento della politica agricola comune, si rischi di spendere di più – se confrontiamo ad esempio gli interventi nazionali di Francia, Germania e Spagna – e si creino spesso distorsioni del mercato comune.

Analogamente, gli Stati Uniti nell'ultimo anno hanno visto crescere la loro spesa per il settore, superando nel 2009 i 120 miliardi di dollari, soprattutto grazie alla crescita delle risorse destinate ai pagamenti anticiclici e al programma nazionale di assistenza alimentare.

Tra l'altro, gli USA spendono questa cifra a fronte di 2 milioni e mezzo di agricoltori, contro i circa 10 milioni di agricoltori europei e i 50 miliardi di euro che stanziava l'Unione.

Signor Commissario, qual è la sua posizione rispetto al tema delle risorse future da dedicare alla politica agricola comune, atteso che facendo un confronto omogeneo, l'Unione europea dedica all'agricoltura meno dell'1% della spesa pubblica totale, molto meno di quanto fanno gli Stati Uniti?

1-090

**Janusz Lewandowski, Commissioner-designate.** – You are right, but contrary to popular perception, the expenditure on agriculture is less than 1% of accumulated GDP – less, even, than 0.5 % of GDP – maybe around 35, as this is a purely Community policy – with some topping-up in the new Member States owing to this discrepancy as to the level of direct payments. So it has moved from consuming more than 70% of the budget in the 1980s to consuming 33% or 34% at the end of this Financial Perspective.

What I expect is some 'pre-cooking' of agricultural policy, as was done in 2002, which was really programming the Financial Perspective for 2007 to 2013. This was the famous agreement between France and Germany on the future.

The same 'pre-cooking' is going on now, in the capital city of Alain Lamassoure's country where there are and will be meetings of agricultural ministers, the majority of them from countries where the agricultural lobby is quite well organised. In Europe, again contrary to

popular assumption, more than 20 ministers from various countries, with different farming structures, are in favour of continuing with the agricultural policy.

I am told that this is also part of the European model. However, we should modify it. One of the modifications should be cross-compliance and taking on board more of the environmental issues when channelling money; modulation should probably be a part of a deal on agriculture, but I cannot imagine completely scrapping or renationalising this area, which is a major area of European communal efforts in budgetary terms as in other respects.

1-091

**Paolo De Castro (S&D), Presidente della commissione AGRI.** – Signor Commissario, la ringrazio di questa risposta e proprio in merito a quello che ha detto alla fine, le chiedo: lei è d'accordo nel ritenere che la rinazionalizzazione comporterebbe distorsioni di concorrenza?

1-092

**Janusz Lewandowski, Commissioner-designate.** – The answer is yes. This was one of the arguments in our dispute against renationalisation. This is the complex issue of cofinancing in agriculture and in cohesion policy. This is the complex issue of the place of a regional development plan, and fund: whether it should be a part of territorial cohesion, as it was before this Financial Perspective, or a part of heading 2 – that is, agricultural policy. Modulation, yes; renationalisation: I have objections.

1-093

**Danuta Maria Hübner (PPE), Chair of the Committee on Regional Development.** – In your written response to Question 4, you say that it will be necessary to focus the future budget on well-identified challenges, competitiveness, climate change and energy. I am also sure you know that the 2006 reform of the cohesion policy has refocused this policy on exactly those challenges, competitiveness and innovation, the climate-change-related risks, energy efficiency and renewable energy.

So my question is short. I would be very grateful if you could explain why you seem to assume that what you call 'traditional policies' do not respond to future challenges.

1-094

**Janusz Lewandowski, Commissioner-designate.** – That is not quite correct. In my introduction too I said that not everything traditional is outdated, and that we should strike a balance between innovating and detecting the wisdom of the existing arrangements.

This also applies to the cohesion policy, including multi-level governance of that policy, which was the device for a much better quality of financial programming and other skills at local level. This cannot be forgotten, and was a lesson which was, in a way, 'learning by doing', including in our local communities in Central and Eastern Europe.

There has been a paradigm shift in the evaluating and the vision of the cohesion policy. We should be in agreement that this is not merely about redistribution, but that it might also be about exploiting the potential of the regions – not just breaking down barriers but also exploiting positively the potential of a region.

There is nothing wrong, in this paradigm shift, in viewing cohesion as a vehicle of development, competitiveness, and green economy, partly already taken on board in the framework of the so-called ‘Lisbonisation’ of cohesion policy, partly to be done in the future. This does not contradict the notion of territorial cohesion that appears in the Lisbon Treaty, as a novelty in the primary law of the European Union.

1-095

**Danuta Maria Hübner (PPE)**, *Chairman of the Committee on Regional Development*. – I am extremely grateful to you for, if I understand correctly, expressing an assumption which is different from what I thought, in that you consider cohesion policy to be a modern policy. I want you to remember that when you are facilitating the adoption and preparation of the new Financial Perspective.

I would also like you to know that most of the activities, actions and investments that we need in the context of climate change and in the context of innovation require actions at the subnational level – at local and regional level.

1-096

**Le Président**. – Nous revenons maintenant aux membres de la commission des budgets et je donne la parole pour une minute à M. José Manuel Fernandes, pour le PPE.

1-097

**José Manuel Fernandes (PPE)**. – Relativamente ainda às alterações climáticas, a Europa tem-se mostrado solidária, não se esquece dos outros, e a prova é que os líderes europeus, mesmo sem consultar o Parlamento, que também tem competências nessa matéria, decidiram atribuir um fundo de 7,2 mil milhões de euros aos países em desenvolvimento, aos países pobres, até 2012. E temos falado muito deste fundo, que é importante.

Mas a Europa também não se pode esquecer dela própria e a pergunta é se não considera que, desde já, em termos de investigação científica, em termos de projectos-piloto, a Europa, os Estados-Membros, para não perderem competitividade e conseguirem conjugar a competitividade com a ambição das alterações climáticas, não devem investir, desde já, e reforçar os programas nesta área tendo, por isso, com certeza, repercussões, desde já também, neste quadro financeiro plurianual.

1-098

**Janusz Lewandowski**, *Commissioner-designate*. – Research, and public expenditure on research, makes sense if this is then transformed into commercially viable patents and improvements, but expenditure on

research should not be a goal in itself: it should be commercially viable afterwards, and here lies the European Union’s problem.

In the proportion of public expenditure devoted to research, we are probably not lagging very much behind the other countries. What is missing is the link with the private-sector ingredient, as we saw with the fiasco of Galileo, which was originally seen as a public/private partnership and now is purely a public-money exercise imposing a heavy burden – an opportunity, but also in budgetary terms a question mark for future budgets.

So here is my response as to the public financing of research. It has to do not only with the amount of money spent. It has to do with the business culture, with an innovative spirit in society, the spirit of entrepreneurship, and all the social environment that is needed to transform public money on research into the improvement of competitiveness in the real economy.

But you started with the other issue, namely our commitments to the poor countries, and there really now seems to be a pledge by Member States to share the burden of EUR 2 billion annually. This is only a small fraction of the money but this means EUR 150 million between 2010 and 2012 coming from our budget, from our Community budget.

1-099

**Francesca Balzani (S&D)**. – Oggi abbiamo sentito più volte la parola flessibilità, e questo è inevitabile, perché un bilancio è tanto più incisivo ed efficace quanto è più flessibile.

Lo strumento di flessibilità previsto per il nostro bilancio europeo dall'accordo interistituzionale è uno strumento non abbastanza forte, come ha rivelato la necessità e la grande difficoltà trovata per rispondere alla crisi economica.

A lei, che è uomo di grande esperienza e grande competenza, chiedo: come pensa concretamente di dare maggior flessibilità al bilancio europeo?

1-100

**Janusz Lewandowski**, *Commissioner-designate*. – This was one of the most important statements I made, that we should see to giving the constraints more flexibility.

It has to be done in different ways. Flexibility is only one of the instruments, and it was used in the negotiations on annual budgets on many occasions. Last time it was more than EUR 190 million I think, altogether. That was some EUR 190 million of flexibility for 2010.

However, what is good about a flexibility instrument is that it can be rolled over to the next years, that is why the volume of flexibility which is in this instrument is growing, and we have a chance to exploit this in budgets that are to encounter a really large number of unknowns – not only unforeseen events, but new pledges and new commitments which are sometimes surprising for

Parliament, sometimes surprising for the Commission, followed by a request that we should somehow deploy money, find fresh money.

Elasticity of EUR 200 million annually is not that much, but if we add EUR 221 million of emergency aid reserve, EUR 500 million from the Globalisation Fund and up to EUR 1 billion from the Solidarity Fund, that adds up to something, and one of the big achievements of the negotiations for the 2007-2013 Financial Perspective will be to expand continually going beyond these devices.

1-101

**Francesca Balzani (S&D).** – Pensa che sia prioritario intervenire quanto prima almeno sui tetti massimi delle rubriche che sono più delicate, più problematiche, penso ad esempio alla 1A e alla 4?

1-102

**Janusz Lewandowski, Commissioner-designate.** – I have here the table of what is coming as the problem for the next years. If you look at the budget 2010, we have a very nice picture. Heading 1a: zero margin; heading 1b: zero margin; heading 3a: EUR 19 million, which is practically a non-existent margin; heading 4: EUR 1 million margin. So we are without margins, and this will not grow in the coming years. We have somehow to go beyond, via flexibility: there is no other way out. Of course, there is a big question mark about how we should treat the review: whether this is an occasion for review or for revision. We have revised many times the financial framework – fortunately, recently – but not a good message for heading 2, this being the major source of money.

1-103

**Le Président.** – Cet alignement de zéros est sans doute une des réponses qui a le plus de substance cet après-midi.

Je donne la parole à celui qui a sauvé la Convention européenne, la Belgique, et qui va maintenant sauver le budget européen, Jean-Luc Dehaene, pour une minute.

1-104

**Jean-Luc Dehaene (PPE).** – Dank u, mijnheer de Voorzitter, u bent te vriendelijk. Mijnheer de commissaris, u hebt terecht bij een van uw antwoorden erop gewezen dat het Verdrag van Rome een andere betekenis geeft aan eigen middelen dan wij vandaag doen. De eigen middelen waren oorspronkelijk douanerechten die rechtstreeks aan de Europese Unie toekwamen. Intussen zijn we die term oneigenlijk gaan gebruiken om middelen aan te duiden die rechtstreeks uit de nationale begrotingen komen. Enerzijds stellen we vast dat de meeste nationale lidstaten met hun budget in moeilijkheden geraken, mede als gevolg van de financiële crisis, en anderzijds meer vragen van Europa en via de verdragen, onder meer het Verdrag van Lissabon meer opdrachten geven aan Europa. Men geraakt daar dus in contradictie met zichzelf en, zoals de voorzitter zojuist zei, men loopt achter zijn eigen staart. Daarom denk ik dat het onvermijdelijk is dat in de volgende periode de kwestie van de eigen middelen

centraal komt te staan, of men dat wil of niet. U hebt er terecht op gewezen dat besluiten met eenparigheid genomen moeten worden, maar ik denk dat de Commissie daar een actieve rol in moet spelen. Mijn vraag is dus: bent u van plan dit met de Commissie te doen en wilt u dit probleem ook in de Commissie op een actieve manier aan de orde stellen?

1-105

**Janusz Lewandowski, Commissioner-designate.** – When we talk about own resources, we are of course recurrently evoking the name of Alain Lamassoure because he started the debate on a review of own resources and of their future. That is in his working documents and in his encounters with a national parliament. You have already mentioned in the course of our hearing that the diagnosis is pretty much the same – that the present system, complicated as it was in the conclusions of the Council in 2005, has never been so complicated, with so many exceptions to the exception.

So this is very far from the Treaty of Rome and very far from the original idea of own resources. Seventy-five per cent of it depends on the contributions of the states, which lead directly to the mentality of ‘I want my money back’. That is the mentality of the net balance and net position of each state.

So, as to the diagnosis, this is very clear. As for the proposals, it is no accident that the Barroso I team for example was passive on the issue of own resources after the experience of Commissioner Schreyer, who had put three candidates for tax proposals on the table.

There was a Finnish proposal going more in the direction of clean own contributions from each Member State.

There is a list of possible solutions in the reports of Parliament resolutions under the influence of Alain Lamassoure, because he was very convincing in this respect.

Now it is my responsibility to respond in two stages. One stage is review, and the second is the new proposal. Of course we are to table a new proposal on own resources, but I would like to have it as a politically feasible one at the centre of my portfolio. In fact, however, this is very much the domain of the Member States, and in recalling this ill-starred saga, I can also quote Prime Minister Brown that when we recently tried new taxation we lost America. That is also the warning.

1-106

**Stéphane Le Foll (S&D).** – Monsieur Lewandowski, je voudrais vous poser une question suite à ce qui vient d'être évoqué.

Au fond, vous avez répondu comme un très bon gestionnaire et un bon connaisseur du budget. Mais quel est, au fond, votre sentiment sur le niveau du budget européen?

Il y a la question des ressources – les ressources propres vous venez d'y répondre – mais que pensez-vous de ce qui suit: est-ce qu'on se résout, de manière définitive, à avoir un budget européen petit, réduit, ou êtes-vous un commissaire qui allez porter l'idée d'un budget européen suffisamment fort pour donner à l'Europe sa capacité d'être un acteur de demain dans les domaines évoqués, sur le développement durable, sur l'innovation et la recherche?

Voilà la question que je voulais vous poser et je vous ferai juste une remarque aussi sur la politique agricole: vous avez dit "modulation", "politique volontaire" mais pas "renationalisation". Êtes-vous alors, ou non, un partisan du cofinancement des deux piliers de la PAC?

1-107

**Janusz Lewandowski, Commissioner-designate.** – Somebody who has a budgetary portfolio: the bigger the better, of course, because this is increasing his role. But I have to take into account the reality around, and this is the reality of post-crisis Europe or Europe in the crisis. Therefore I am trying to be realistic.

We cannot make the same gap between the initial proposal of the Commission in 2004 and the final result of negotiations in 2006, closing the deal over the 2007-2013 Financial Perspective. It should be closer. These figures should be closer, so that we cannot do as is done now in Parliament in the procedure of Parliament readings – probably fewer 'asterisk' amendments, because we need a new procedure and more conciliation afterwards.

The realistic assumption about the European budget is that we have to go ahead with scarce resources in the context of rising needs. This is the paradox of more Europe not for less money, because this is growing – this is again a prejudice to say that we are declining. There is indexation of the budget. The budgets are growing, but of course public expenditure – even without crisis and anti-crisis stimulus packages – was growing at a much larger speed. Public expenditure and budgets at national levels are growing more than the European budget, but this is mainly about a small indexation.

Costs: here is the centre of the problem, because it is always easier to cut contributions to the communal budget than to the national budget. That is easily accountable to democratic opinion in every Member State.

So I am trying to be realistic about this.

1-108

**Stéphane Le Foll (S&D).** – Juste une interrogation. Est-ce que cela signifie que vous serez plutôt du côté des chefs d'État pour être réaliste ou est-ce que vous serez plutôt ambitieux avec le Parlement européen?

1-109

**Janusz Lewandowski, Commissioner-designate.** – Whether this is simple we shall see in practice, but that is the position of the honest broker. I would like to have

much bigger resources, because I see what the challenges are, and these huge challenges are part of a climate commitment. We have a really big heavyweight problem with financing ITER and Galileo and the other big projects that demand billions of euros and not millions of euros.

But that is a question of practical tests. I shall be pragmatic about it. I am from a cohesion country. I come from a country which is the biggest net beneficiary of public spending, of communal spending. But now I have, somehow, 'denationalised' myself a little bit.

1-110

**Le Président.** – Ce sera donc à nous de décider si toute personne qui n'est pas avec nous est contre nous, ou si toute personne qui n'est pas contre nous est avec nous.

Entre-temps, nous avons noté l'arrivée tardive, compte tenu des conditions atmosphériques, de deux membres qui devaient prendre la parole en début de séance. Je vais donc donner la parole à Mme Andreasen, au nom du groupe EFD. Selon les règles, elle pose une question d'une minute, M. Lewandowski répond deux minutes et elle pourra, si elle le souhaite, reprendre la parole pour une minute.

1-111

**Marta Andreasen (EFD).** – I would like to put two questions. In the last decades at least, the European Union budget has not been spent in its entirety by the end of each financial year. Between 10% and 15% remains unspent, and, although this is portrayed as being the result of complex regulation, in my view it appears to indicate that there is not enough analysis and consultation put in place for the preparation of the budget.

I think the requests need to come from the Member States, and these complex regulations should not affect the proper process of planning. The first thing I would like to ask you is how you plan to organise the budgeting and programming work for the coming years. The second question I would like to put is what you think about the European Parliament having the power to increase the level of expenditure in different lines.

1-112

**Janusz Lewandowski, Commissioner-designate.** – There are two different issues: one is about outstanding commitments which '*restent à liquider*', which is in the nature of financial programming and in the nature of having, on one side, payments going beyond the financial perspective, and on the other side commitments. The level of outstanding commitments is huge, totalling over EUR 150 billion, and all that is possible is to manage the link between payments and commitments, because there is a gap and always will be.

The second issue is that of unspent money, which concerns commitments committed, which is, as I have told you already, the fiasco of a policy. If there is not just an error – that is another issue – but money committed for a policy which was equipped with this

money and simply not delivered, that is the fiasco of a policy. This is a well-known issue and it has been discussed on many occasions in Parliament, in the Commission and in the Council, whether the only solution is not a revision of the Financial Regulation to make things easier. You should know about this better than me, because this concerns the very complex issue of how to modernise the Financial Regulation to have less unspent money and less red tape.

As to the programming, this should be along the same lines in the near future. What cannot be expected this year is an annual policy strategy, because this year the College is coming into action very late, so we cannot expect one. Normally the preliminary draft budget is preceded by the annual policy strategy. I am not sure, but it seems that this time we are too late to make an annual policy strategy, which is the beginning of a cycle of programming.

1-113

**Marta Andreasen (EFD).** – The second part of the question was ‘What do you think about the European Parliament increasing certain lines?’

1-114

**Janusz Lewandowski, Commissioner-designate.** – Parliament is growing in powers, with full codecision in what is now called the ordinary legislative procedure, but it is not powerful enough to unilaterally change the budget as the consent of the two arms of the budgetary authority is needed.

It is always easier to find room in Parliament for increases to equip policies with money than it is on the side of Council, which is, on many occasions, represented by finance ministers who have their own calculations to make. They are responsible for national contributions, while the money goes to regions. Hence, the calculation from the point of view of finance ministers is completely different to the overall flow of money between Brussels and the relevant region or country.

However, it is beyond the powers of Parliament, even with the new Treaty, to go ahead with unilateral modifications.

1-115

**Angelika Werthmann (NI).** – Auch ich möchte mich für die Reiseverspätung aufgrund der Wettersituation entschuldigen.

Ich habe zwei Fragen. Die erste betrifft den Globalisierungsfonds. Wie wird tatsächlich sichergestellt, dass das Geld auch bei den Betroffenen ankommt? Da geht es mir besonders darum, dass man das nicht unbedingt den Staaten überlässt. Wie können wir das von unserer Seite – von Seite der EU her – überprüfen? Die zweite Frage betrifft das *follow-up*. Es wurde bereits über die Gebäudepolitik gesprochen. Ich hätte gerne gewusst, wie die Kohärenz der Gebäudepolitik hier spezifiziert werden kann.

1-116

**Janusz Lewandowski, Commissioner-designate.** – Globalisation and building have already been discussed partly in the course of the hearing. As for globalisation, we have a mechanism. We cannot dispute that mechanism or the rules of the game if they are in place. We can verify and modify them, but that is not a task for the modified interinstitutional agreement that is coming soon, but one that requires much more profound discussion.

I would not overestimate the Globalisation Fund. I appreciate all the commitments by the Commission to reduce the threshold and increase the availability of the Globalisation Fund in 2009. Funds are easily available now, given for example a threshold of redundancies that is 500 and not 1 000, as it was in the original Regulation. This is just one of the very useful devices to make our scarce budgetary resources more flexible in response to different unforeseen needs and the effects of relocating companies.

As for buildings policy, I think that apart from the Vatican we are the biggest real estate owner in Europe now, with the priority on buying instead of renting. Having three places for executive agencies and so many places for regulatory agencies, we should seek synergies between the different sorts of representations of European institutions in the various Member States and outside Europe. However, this will not be enough because we need – and this was my response to Mrs Hohlmeier – a long-standing building policy vision and strategy to stream the different institutions together.

1-117

**Ingeborg Gräßle (PPE).** – Als Berichterstatterin für die Haushaltsordnung fällt mir vor allem die große Zahl von Regelwerken auf, die eingehalten werden müssen. Im Europäischen Sozialfonds gibt es ein Merkblatt von 1,5 Seiten nur mit Überschriften der Richtlinien und Verordnungen.

Die erste Frage: Sind Sie bereit, in Ihrer Amtszeit eine Zusammenfassung aller speziellen Finanzregeln für jeden Fonds einzig in der Haushaltsordnung zu veranlassen, indem die dortigen speziellen Kapitel für die einzelnen Fonds ausgebaut werden? Die zweite Frage richtet sich an den ehrlichen Makler: Wie ehrlich ist denn dieser „ehrlliche Makler“, wenn er auf einem *fast track* für den diplomatischen Dienst besteht, ohne dass wir wissen, wie denn dieser Dienst überhaupt aussehen soll, und ohne dass wir die Höhe seiner Kosten kennen? Warum verzichtet denn die Kommission darauf, sich in dieser Frage das Parlament zum Verbündeten zu machen und auf Gemeinschaftselementen zu bestehen? Warum verzichtet die Kommission darauf, auch ihre eigenen Experten in dieser Frage heranzuziehen – die bis jetzt ja weitgehend außen vor waren – um diesen Dienst zu gestalten?

1-118

**Janusz Lewandowski, Commissioner-designate.** – Inge Gräßle is the undisputed authority and point of reference when discussing all sorts of modifications and the past history of the Financial Regulation. I have to admit that,

thanks to her involvement, Parliament was much more involved in the 2006 modification than it was seen to be formally. Now and in the future the Financial Regulation is subject to codecision.

I am not ready to answer your first question, and I was even advised before the hearings to say at least once that I was not ready to answer a question, so I would like to take this opportunity not to do so. In honesty, as a broker, at least give me this chance and do not test my good will on this very important issue, though it does not cover the whole story of budgetary issues.

With regard to fast-track or not, this was part of the discussion Baroness Ashton and I had before the hearing. I warned her that, in the first hour of the first hearing, we would probably come into conflict with Parliament's resolution, because if we need an External Action Service by the end of April, this is going to be fast-track, which was not in the resolution.

If you take a look at the wording of the resolution, paragraph 17 is rather flexible on this issue, it is not so sure that this is definitely to be done altogether on the occasion of the tri-annual revision. However, you are for sure the major player and I can assure you that when discussing all sorts of issues your name is that most often mentioned.

1-119

**László Surján (PPE).** – Én is elégedett vagyok azzal, hogy a biztosjelölt úr azonnal kiállt a nyelvi sokszínűség és az anyanyelvhasználat mellett, amikor elkezdtük ezt a beszélgetést. Azt gondolom, hogy az Európai Parlament, mint a költségvetési hatóság egyik karja, a saját politikáját szeretné számokban kifejezve látni a költségvetésben. Ez a politika a Parlament összetételének folyamata, fő jelszavai a biztonság, a gazdasági növekedés, szabadság és más szükséges dolgok, mint a klímaváltozás. Szívem szerint hozzátenném a szociális ügyeket is, de hát azokban a fő feladat a tagállamokra esik. A Parlament költségvetésének sok fejezete azonban alulfinanszírozott. Az új elképzeléseket a legfontosabb, legnagyobb kiadások terhére, a mezőgazdaság és a kohéziós kiadások terhére akarják megvalósítani.

Lát-e lehetőséget biztosjelölt úr, a kohéziós kiadások csökkentésére olyan szituációban, amikor jelenleg a legnagyobb a regionális eltérés az Unió különböző területén?

1-120

**Janusz Lewandowski, Commissioner-designate.** – Yes, if this is your first experience when negotiating the 2010 budget: what are the margins, what are the possibilities?

You are also known as a proponent of multilingualism. I was trying for a minute in Polish, but only for one minute, because I am very pragmatic and I want to make this communication easier with translation. We would be at question number 15 or 16 if I were using my mother tongue, so here is the cost-benefit analysis of a language

we use, although we would like to treat all of them on an equal basis.

You also know, because you are the rapporteur, that the main lifebelt, apart from the mysteries of Heading 5, was agricultural policy, but this is to some extent for financing the recovery plan and as the major issue for the 2010 budget.

But this is to a great extent, apart from direct payments, a less predictable type of channelling money than relates to market intervention; our exercise with the milk fund, which was an achievement of Parliament, is a very good illustration of it. Now the prices are increasing, but there was a desperate situation when negotiating the budget for 2010. So I would be very cautious upfront speaking about a reduction in the agricultural heading, because of the nature of this agricultural policy, which is partly intervention in the agricultural market, which is something that I cannot understand. It is very far from the neoclassical theory of economics, the functioning of the agricultural market. Therefore, less predictable.

1-121

**Sidonia Elżbieta Jędrzejewska (PPE).** – Moje pytanie dotyczy budżetu Wspólnot na rok 2011. Jestem bardzo ciekawa Pana stanowiska, co do wyzwań, które stoją przed przyszłym rokiem. Ja widzę oczywiście wyzwania proceduralne, bo budżet na rok 2011 będzie pierwszym budżetem Wspólnot uchwalanym według zapisów traktatu z Lizbony. Oczywiście istotne będzie moim zdaniem, jak Unia Europejska sprosta potrzebom związanym z finansowaniem polityki zagranicznej, polityki szeroko rozumianego bezpieczeństwa energetycznego, jak Unia Europejska zamierza zapewnić efektywne wykorzystanie i wdrożenie środków na politykę spójności, a także w końcu jak budżet 2011 zamierza sfinansować zobowiązania instytucji Unii Europejskiej wobec swoich pracowników i swoich funkcjonariuszy.

Podsumowując, chciałabym Pana zapytać, jak Pan sobie wyobraża wstępny projekt budżetu (*Preliminary Draft Budget*), który będzie opublikowany już wkrótce i mam nadzieję, będzie opublikowany już pod Pana kierunkiem?

1-122

**Janusz Lewandowski, Commissioner-designate.** – On one side, let us stick to this language, which will enable perhaps one more question. On my side there is a procedure. Of course, we are not ready with the procedure translated into the secondary legislative acts at the time of the PDB; thus, what is needed is agreement on how to proceed: partly, fortunately, done according to the pragmatic calendar. But we need agreement in April for the Conciliation Committee and the other issues that are Lisbon-related issues to go smoothly ahead with a budgetary procedure.

The second issue is the content of a budget. Of course, as usual – apart from unforeseen interventions (mainly in the area of foreign policy), we have to deal with another 75 million for decommissioning – this was one

of the invasive issues for 2010, but another 75 for 2011. We have to find 50 million at least for climate pledges from the communal budgets; there is Copernicus and there are some unknowns as to the other programmes. So this is the content of the PDB, which is in elaboration already – but on the basis of provisional agreement as to the procedure.

Then comes agreement, which is translated from the soft law of declarations into the real law of the secondary law of the European institutions. I have enumerated only a few out of many challenges that are, as to the content, introduced to the budget. As for CFSP, you know what the game usually is, but now as to the putting of some reserves – I am at the end, this is the final word: now, what is codecision on reserves? That is a major modification I want to inform my colleagues from the Parliament about: codecision on reserves.

1-123

**Derek Vaughan (S&D).** – Earlier, Mrs Hübner mentioned her concerns about the recent proposals on the future of cohesion policy from 2013.

I wonder if you could tell us how you could persuade your colleagues in DG Budget and colleagues in the Council that they should not renationalise cohesion policy from 2013.

Of course, in the run up to 2013, many other budget issues will be outstanding, and I think you accepted that a little earlier when you said that there might be a need for a revision or review of the current Financial Perspective.

I wonder if you would agree that that review, if it takes place, should not only include the overall budget – i.e. the ceilings – but also take a look at our priorities as well. That would allow us to perhaps make some radical changes and some radical movements between budget headings.

1-124

**Janusz Lewandowski, Commissioner-designate.** – We can now address the so-called ‘non-paper’ or ‘non-existent paper’ because we have a follow-up in the form of the exchange of views between Mrs Hübner and President Barroso, as an exchange of letters, and the Samecki paper on cohesion, which was the position of the outgoing Commissioner.

There was a question of renationalisation. The only argument I can follow is that, if we want a concentration or prioritisation of cohesion policy, that is more easily done top-down and not bottom-up, but that is not my point of view. That would not be my line of argument at all. I simply disagree with that approach and it should probably not appear. Nobody now is authorising the so-called ‘non-paper’, the mysterious paper, the ‘non-existent’ paper.

1-125

**Giovanni La Via (PPE).** – Commissario Lewandowski, abbiamo appena sentito del fatto che lei disconosce

sostanzialmente i contenuti del cosiddetto “non-paper”, documento che, pur essendo uscito su carta intestata della Commissione, di fatto non ha trovato una paternità e quindi i relativi contenuti non trovano lei favorevole.

Abbiamo anche sentito nel corso dell'audizione la sua contrarietà alla rinazionalizzazione della politica agricola, quindi mi viene da desumere che questa politica continuerà ad avere un peso e una priorità nell'azione dell'Unione europea in termini di bilancio, ma anche mi viene da chiederle, se ritiene – così come mi sembrava di aver percepito in una sua precedente risposta – che il livello di finanziamento della stessa debba essere mantenuto e sostenuto?

1-126

**Janusz Lewandowski, Commissioner-designate.** – Quickly once more as to cohesion. Yes, this is, for me, non-paper now – really, non-existent paper. As for agriculture, this is already down, because this is the follow-up of an agreement between Chirac and Schroeder in 2002. But the proportion of agricultural policies is going down to around 33% by 2013. I have also said that I think that in two major areas of the budget – now this is 75 cohesion plus agriculture – we have to take into account the developments in the real political world, and the real political world is the meetings of friends of cohesion – the Member States and ministers – and in agriculture this is the meetings of farming ministers from various countries. If more than 20, that means something for pre-cooking of this important expenditure in the budget.

1-127

**Carl Haglund (ALDE).** – Thank you for your flexibility concerning the questions. Let me get back to the framework programme for research and development and a question put earlier concerning the Seventh Framework Programme, the evaluation of which is scheduled to be done in conjunction with the upcoming mid-term review.

My question to you is: what is in your view the ideal time, scope and depth of the mid-term assessment for the Seventh Framework Programme? When do you think we should start with this and how do you consider that it should be done?

1-128

**Janusz Lewandowski, Commissioner-designate.** – On the one hand this is a serious question as this is a major expenditure on 1a out of more than 80 million for the whole period until 2013, but this is about the research programme. On the other hand, there is the problem, because here we have red tape and the problems of money coming back to countries, so I see it more from the point of view of making available research funding to the beneficiaries. For me this is a major problem. Right now I do not think we have a problem of size, of volume. It has been cut: from the Commission proposal 1a was cut by 20% in this final round of negotiations by the Council. But for me, research is about delivery, not about volume now. I am worried, reading Amending Budget 10, about reductions in this precise area; that

means we are not using this limited amount of money. That is my answer for today.

1-129

**Le Président.** – Nous n'avons plus que trois minutes pour disposer de cette salle et je voudrais donc rapidement remercier le candidat commissaire de s'être prêté à l'exercice avec beaucoup de sérieux, beaucoup de compétence, et d'avoir tenu à répondre de manière précise à toutes les questions avec beaucoup de patience. C'est quelque chose que tous les membres, je crois, ont apprécié.

Je voudrais également remercier tous les membres de la commission des budgets et des commissions associées d'avoir respecté les règles, et notamment le temps de parole.

Monsieur Lewandowski, nous vous avons accueilli avec des "mixed feelings": les uns, parce qu'on vous jalousait – nous aurions préféré être à votre place –, les autres, et notamment les plus jeunes, en souhaitant suivre un jour votre exemple. Ce qui me frappe dans les échanges extrêmement riches que nous avons eus cet après-midi, c'est que nous voyons bien que nous sommes en train de changer de système.

Les questions qui vous ont été posées l'ont été à quelqu'un qui aurait pu aussi bien être candidat pour être commissaire à l'agriculture, à la politique régionale, à la recherche et au développement, à la politique étrangère et de sécurité commune et même aux transports. Ce qui veut dire, en fait, que dans le traité de Lisbonne, le commissaire au budget doit prendre, au sein du collège – bien sûr, c'est un collège, la décision est collective, vous nous l'avez rappelé – l'importance, le poids politique qu'un ministre du budget ou des finances joue au sein d'un gouvernement national. Ce n'était pas le cas jusqu'à présent, ça doit l'être maintenant.

Vous avez dit, à plusieurs reprises, et nous vous comprenons, que vous devrez tenir compte de la situation politique et être réaliste. Nous sommes bien d'accord. Mais, en même temps, dans l'Union européenne, si l'on est seulement réaliste, il ne se passe rien. Jean Monnet avait eu une belle formule lorsqu'il avait dit: "Il faut tenir compte des faits mais pas des fatalités". Il n'y a pas de fatalité européenne, et je pense que l'échange que nous avons eu cet après-midi montre qu'il y a, en tout cas, une grande convergence d'esprit. Nous souhaitons utiliser pleinement les nouveaux pouvoirs, le nouveau contexte institutionnel du traité de Lisbonne, en tenant compte, bien entendu, de la situation politique européenne et internationale, et de la situation économique, sans accepter les fatalités et en se montrant créatifs.

Merci Monsieur Lewandowski, je vous souhaite bonne chance.

*(Applaudissements)*

Pour le reste, je rappelle aux coordinateurs et aux membres du Bureau que nous avons, à 17 heures, une réunion pour nous mettre d'accord sur le jugement écrit, l'évaluation que nous ferons de cette audition.

*(La réunion est levée à 16H05).*