

## IV

(Informacje)

INFORMACJE INSTYTUCJI, ORGANÓW I JEDNOSTEK ORGANIZACYJNYCH  
UNII EUROPEJSKIEJ

## PARLAMENT EUROPEJSKI

## PYTANIA PISEMNE Z ODPOWIEDZIĄ

Pytania pisemne skierowane przez posłów do Parlamentu Europejskiego i odpowiedzi  
na te pytania udzielone przez instytucję Unii Europejskiej

(2013/C 68 E/01)

Treść	Strona
<b>E-000031/12</b> by Andreas Mölzer to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Ban on cluster bombs	
Deutsche Fassung .....	13
English version .....	14
<b>E-000032/12</b> by Franz Obermayr to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> The Inn valley motorway: sectoral traffic prohibition for HGVs	
Deutsche Fassung .....	15
English version .....	17
<b>E-000033/12</b> by Maria Eleni Koppa to the Council	
<i>Subject:</i> Revealing statements by former Turkish Prime Minister, Mr Yilmaz	
Ελληνική έκδοση .....	18
English version .....	19
<b>E-000034/12</b> by Georgios Koumoutsakos to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Public health concerns caused by Poly Implant Prothese (PIP) implants	
Ελληνική έκδοση .....	20
English version .....	21
<b>E-000035/12</b> by Nikolaos Chountis to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Participation of Greece in Regulation (EC) No 1040/2002	
Ελληνική έκδοση .....	22
English version .....	23
<b>E-000037/12</b> by Georgios Toussas to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Safety of life at sea	
Ελληνική έκδοση .....	24
English version .....	25

<b>E-000038/12</b> by Nikolaos Salavrakos to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — Treatment of the Christian minority in the Middle East	
Ελληνική έκδοση .....	26
English version .....	27
<b>E-000039/12</b> by Nikolaos Salavrakos to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Abominable treatment of protestors, especially female protestors, in Egypt	
Ελληνική έκδοση .....	28
English version .....	29
<b>E-000040/12</b> by Nikolaos Salavrakos to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Dangerous mutation of H5N1 manufactured in Holland	
Ελληνική έκδοση .....	30
English version .....	31
<b>E-000041/12</b> by Nikolaos Salavrakos to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Funds to improve detention conditions of illegal immigrants in Greece	
Ελληνική έκδοση .....	32
English version .....	33
<b>E-000042/12</b> by Nikolaos Salavrakos to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Unreasonable response by Turkish courts to case of police beating	
Ελληνική έκδοση .....	34
English version .....	35
<b>E-000043/12</b> by Nikolaos Salavrakos to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Fears of US forces stationed in Europe	
Ελληνική έκδοση .....	36
English version .....	37
<b>E-000044/12</b> by Nikolaos Salavrakos to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Massive humanitarian crisis in the Central African Republic	
Ελληνική έκδοση .....	38
English version .....	40
<b>E-000045/12</b> by Nikolaos Salavrakos to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Last-ditch support for Burgas-Alexandroupoli oil pipeline	
Ελληνική έκδοση .....	41
English version .....	42
<b>E-000046/12</b> by Nikolaos Salavrakos to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Price increases by Greek supermarket chains	
Ελληνική έκδοση .....	43
English version .....	45
<b>E-000047/12</b> by Nikolaos Salavrakos to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — Outcome of Egyptian elections	
Ελληνική έκδοση .....	46
English version .....	47
<b>E-000049/12</b> by João Ferreira to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Milk prices charged by major retailers in Portugal	
Versão portuguesa .....	48
English version .....	50
<b>E-000051/12</b> by Vasilica Viorica Dăncilă to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Innovation and research in agriculture	
Versiunea în limba română .....	52
English version .....	53
<b>E-000052/12</b> by Nigel Farage to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Amendments to the EU Treaties	
English version .....	54

<b>E-00055/12</b> by Charles Tannock to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — Recent tribal unrest in South Sudan and EU assistance to that country	
English version .....	55
<b>E-00056/12</b> by Monika Flašíková Beňová to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Asylum policy in Hungary	
Slovenské znenie .....	56
English version .....	57
<b>E-00057/12</b> by Monika Flašíková Beňová to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Asylum system in Italy	
Slovenské znenie .....	58
English version .....	59
<b>E-00058/12</b> by Monika Flašíková Beňová to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Europe-wide protection for victims of crime	
Slovenské znenie .....	60
English version .....	61
<b>E-00059/12</b> by Monika Flašíková Beňová to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> REACH chemicals legislation	
Slovenské znenie .....	62
English version .....	63
<b>E-00060/12</b> by Monika Flašíková Beňová to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> EU Energy Roadmap 2050	
Slovenské znenie .....	64
English version .....	65
<b>E-00062/12</b> by Monika Flašíková Beňová to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Cyprus EU Presidency	
Slovenské znenie .....	66
English version .....	67
<b>E-00063/12</b> by Monika Flašíková Beňová to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Agreement between the EU and Morocco on fisheries	
Slovenské znenie .....	68
English version .....	69
<b>E-00064/12</b> by Monika Flašíková Beňová to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Discrimination against Israeli Arabs	
Slovenské znenie .....	70
English version .....	71
<b>E-00065/12</b> by Monika Flašíková Beňová to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> The drug situation in the European Union	
Slovenské znenie .....	72
English version .....	73
<b>E-00066/12</b> by Monika Flašíková Beňová to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> European media industry	
Slovenské znenie .....	74
English version .....	75
<b>E-00067/12</b> by Monika Flašíková Beňová to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Externalisation of migration policies	
Slovenské znenie .....	76
English version .....	77
<b>E-00068/12</b> by Monika Flašíková Beňová to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> French asylum law	
Slovenské znenie .....	78
English version .....	79

<b>E-000069/12</b> by Monika Flašíková Beňová to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> The JRS evaluation report	
Slovenské znenie .....	80
English version .....	82
<b>E-000088/12</b> by Monika Flašíková Beňová to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Right to access to international protection	
Slovenské znenie .....	80
English version .....	82
<b>E-000070/12</b> by Monika Flašíková Beňová to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> The Internet and EU citizens	
Slovenské znenie .....	84
English version .....	85
<b>E-000071/12</b> by Monika Flašíková Beňová to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Isolation of the British financial sector	
Slovenské znenie .....	86
English version .....	87
<b>E-000072/12</b> by Monika Flašíková Beňová to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> <i>Kanagaratnam and others v Belgium</i>	
Slovenské znenie .....	88
English version .....	89
<b>E-000074/12</b> by Monika Flašíková Beňová to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Intergovernmental agreement on tighter budget and debt rules	
Slovenské znenie .....	90
English version .....	91
<b>E-000075/12</b> by Monika Flašíková Beňová to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Germany's migration policy	
Slovenské znenie .....	92
English version .....	93
<b>E-000076/12</b> by Monika Flašíková Beňová to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> The monitoring system aimed at tackling child poverty	
Slovenské znenie .....	94
English version .....	95
<b>E-000077/12</b> by Monika Flašíková Beňová to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Violence in the media	
Slovenské znenie .....	96
English version .....	97
<b>E-000079/12</b> by Monika Flašíková Beňová to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Dangerous investments in Ukraine	
Slovenské znenie .....	98
English version .....	99
<b>E-000080/12</b> by Monika Flašíková Beňová to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> The new directive in the field of pharmacy	
Slovenské znenie .....	100
English version .....	101
<b>E-000081/12</b> by Monika Flašíková Beňová to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> New rules for motor vehicles	
Slovenské znenie .....	102
English version .....	103
<b>E-000082/12</b> by Monika Flašíková Beňová to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> A new governmental trend — technocrats	
Slovenské znenie .....	104
English version .....	105

<b>E-000083/12</b> by Monika Flašíková Beňová to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Civil societies and regulation of the financial markets	
Slovenské znenie .....	106
English version .....	107
<b>E-000084/12</b> by Monika Flašíková Beňová to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Renewed EU immigration strategy	
Slovenské znenie .....	108
English version .....	109
<b>E-000086/12</b> by Monika Flašíková Beňová to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Measures to protect biodiversity	
Slovenské znenie .....	110
English version .....	111
<b>E-000087/12</b> by Monika Flašíková Beňová to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Rights of persons with disabilities	
Slovenské znenie .....	112
English version .....	113
<b>E-000089/12</b> by Monika Flašíková Beňová to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> The Commission's survey of social issues	
Slovenské znenie .....	114
English version .....	115
<b>E-000090/12</b> by Monika Flašíková Beňová to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> LIFE Programme	
Slovenské znenie .....	116
English version .....	117
<b>E-000092/12</b> by Monika Flašíková Beňová to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Anti-terrorist measures of the EU Member States	
Slovenské znenie .....	118
English version .....	119
<b>E-000093/12</b> by Monika Flašíková Beňová to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Racist attacks in Italy	
Slovenské znenie .....	120
English version .....	121
<b>E-000094/12</b> by Monika Flašíková Beňová to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> The difference between the richest and the poorest in the OECD	
Slovenské znenie .....	122
English version .....	123
<b>E-000104/12</b> by Monika Flašíková Beňová to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Annual review of Employment and Social Development in Europe	
Slovenské znenie .....	122
English version .....	123
<b>E-000096/12</b> by Monika Flašíková Beňová to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Directive on energy efficiency	
Slovenské znenie .....	124
English version .....	125
<b>E-000097/12</b> by Monika Flašíková Beňová to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Social benefits and immigrants	
Slovenské znenie .....	126
English version .....	127
<b>E-000098/12</b> by Monika Flašíková Beňová to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Common sales law	
Slovenské znenie .....	128
English version .....	129

<b>E-000099/12</b> by Monika Flašíková Beňová to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Ways of strengthening economic governance in the eurozone	
Slovenské znenie .....	130
English version .....	131
<b>E-000100/12</b> by Monika Flašíková Beňová to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Stabilisation of the fiscal situation at an intergovernmental level	
Slovenské znenie .....	132
English version .....	133
<b>E-000101/12</b> by Monika Flašíková Beňová to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Tactics of the Moroccan and Spanish law enforcement agencies in relation to immigrants	
Slovenské znenie .....	134
English version .....	135
<b>E-000103/12</b> by Monika Flašíková Beňová to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> 2011 elections in Russia	
Slovenské znenie .....	136
English version .....	137
<b>E-000105/12</b> by Monika Flašíková Beňová to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Construction of the Evros fence in Greece	
Slovenské znenie .....	138
English version .....	139
<b>E-000107/12</b> by Monika Flašíková Beňová to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Misleading information to the media on the Energy Roadmap 2050	
Slovenské znenie .....	140
English version .....	141
<b>E-000109/12</b> by Nikolaos Salavrakos to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — Violence against women in Afghanistan	
Ελληνική έκδοση .....	142
English version .....	143
<b>E-000110/12</b> by Nikolaos Salavrakos to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Massive job losses in the tertiary sector in Greece	
Ελληνική έκδοση .....	144
English version .....	146
<b>E-000111/12</b> by Nikolaos Salavrakos to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Abolition of nationalities for the Albanian State	
Ελληνική έκδοση .....	147
English version .....	148
<b>E-000112/12</b> by Nikolaos Salavrakos to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Claim for support from the European Globalisation Adjustment Fund for local authorities	
Ελληνική έκδοση .....	149
English version .....	150
<b>E-000113/12</b> by Nikolaos Salavrakos to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Policies to prevent damaging speculation to the European and international economy	
Ελληνική έκδοση .....	151
English version .....	153
<b>E-000115/12</b> by Chris Davies to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Supplemental question on 'Funding of the Israeli Antiquities Authority'	
English version .....	155
<b>E-000117/12</b> by Elena Băsescu to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Operation AKKERMAN 2011 to combat contraband	
Versiunea în limba română .....	156
English version .....	157

<b>P-000118/12</b> by Marc Tarabella to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Health risks of injectable products used for aesthetic purposes	
Version française .....	158
English version .....	159
<b>E-000119/12</b> by Franz Obermayr to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> EU patent on animal breeding — Semen patent of US company XY LLC	
Deutsche Fassung .....	160
English version .....	161
<b>E-000120/12</b> by Elisa Ferreira to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Possible suspension of Structural Funds	
Versão portuguesa .....	162
English version .....	163
<b>E-000124/12</b> by Auke Zijlstra to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> 'Energy Roadmap 2050'	
Nederlandse versie .....	164
English version .....	165
<b>E-000125/12</b> by Chris Davies to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Marketing practices of computer hardware and software manufacturers	
English version .....	166
<b>E-000126/12</b> by Matteo Salvini to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Public sector employees in Rome	
Versione italiana .....	167
English version .....	168
<b>E-000128/12</b> by Jean-Luc Bennahmias to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> The presence of nitrates in organic products	
Version française .....	169
English version .....	170
<b>E-000130/12</b> by Syed Kamall to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Use of red diesel in non-UK waters by pleasure craft	
English version .....	171
<b>E-000131/12</b> by Syed Kamall to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Requirements for healthcare providers to disclose risks associated with procedures	
English version .....	172
<b>E-000132/12</b> by Syed Kamall to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Carbon trading and environmental taxation	
English version .....	173
<b>E-000135/12</b> by Graham Watson to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — City officials' involvement in looting in Baku (Azerbaijan)	
English version .....	174
<b>E-000137/12</b> by Graham Watson to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Subsidies for fishing fleets	
English version .....	175
<b>E-000138/12</b> by Graham Watson to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — Destruction at Karni Crossing	
English version .....	176
<b>E-000140/12</b> by Graham Watson to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — Tony Blair — Quartet Special Representative — declaration of interest	
English version .....	177
<b>E-000141/12</b> by Graham Watson to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — Tony Blair — Quartet Special Representative — mission residence in Sheikh Jarrah	
English version .....	178

<b>E-000142/12</b> by Graham Watson to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — Tony Blair — Quartet Special Representative — time periods undertaking this role English version .....	179
<b>E-000143/12</b> by Graham Watson to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — Tony Blair — Quartet Special Representative — status with regard to the EU English version .....	180
<b>E-000144/12</b> by Graham Watson to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — Israel to relinquish Palestinian Neighbourhoods English version .....	181
<b>P-000145/12</b> by Vladko Todorov Panayotov to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Atmospheric pollution in the city of Sofia българска версия .....	182
English version .....	183
<b>P-000146/12</b> by Fiona Hall to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Concerns regarding the Light Aircraft Pilot's Licence and Regulation (EU) No 178/2011 English version .....	184
<b>E-000147/12</b> by Lucas Hartong and Laurence J.A.J. Stassen to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> New CO <sub>2</sub> levy Nederlandse versie .....	185
English version .....	186
<b>E-000149/12</b> by Vladko Todorov Panayotov to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Energy projects in Cyprus българска версия .....	187
English version .....	188
<b>E-000150/12</b> by Fiona Hall to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Palestinian child prisoners English version .....	189
<b>E-000152/12</b> by John Stuart Agnew to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Pesticides and the 'parallel trade' English version .....	190
<b>E-000153/12</b> by John Stuart Agnew to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Pesticides and 'parallel trade' representation English version .....	190
<b>E-000154/12</b> by Vicky Ford to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Exemption of <i>Drosophila</i> from Directive 91/496/EEC English version .....	191
<b>E-000155/12</b> by Jörg Leichtfried to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Member States' data regarding systems of production for laying hens Deutsche Fassung .....	192
English version .....	193
<b>E-000156/12</b> by Sven Giegold to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Hedging of bank bonds by Member States of the Eurozone Deutsche Fassung .....	194
English version .....	196
<b>E-000157/12</b> by Michail Tremopoulos to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Violation of environmental legislation by an olive-pomace oil extraction plant in Vassiliki in Lefkada Ελληνική έκδοση .....	197
English version .....	198



<b>E-000158/12</b> by Patrick Le Hyaric to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Legal and economic protection for European media	
Version française .....	199
English version .....	201
<b>E-000159/12</b> by Patrick Le Hyaric to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Monitoring of medical devices in the light of the PIP scandal	
Version française .....	202
English version .....	204
<b>E-000160/12</b> by João Ferreira to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Beekeeping and honey imports from third countries	
Versão portuguesa .....	205
English version .....	206
<b>E-000161/12</b> by João Ferreira and Ilda Figueiredo to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Commission study on the impact of austerity measures	
Versão portuguesa .....	207
English version .....	208
<b>E-000162/12</b> by João Ferreira and Ilda Figueiredo to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Reconciling work, personal and family life	
Versão portuguesa .....	209
English version .....	210
<b>P-000163/12</b> by Johannes Cornelis van Baalen to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — Elections in Taiwan	
Nederlandse versie .....	211
English version .....	212
<b>P-000165/12</b> by Frank Vanhecke to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Development aid for African countries	
Nederlandse versie .....	213
English version .....	214
<b>P-000166/12</b> by Jürgen Creutzmann to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Modification of the German State Treaty on Gambling	
Deutsche Fassung .....	215
English version .....	216
<b>E-000167/12</b> by Simon Busuttil to the Council	
<i>Subject:</i> The EU and the Arab League	
Verżjoni Maltija .....	217
English version .....	218
<b>E-000168/12</b> by Simon Busuttil to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Visa liberalisation — Brazil	
Verżjoni Maltija .....	219
English version .....	220
<b>E-000169/12</b> by Frank Vanhecke to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> European aid to the Palestinian territories	
Nederlandse versie .....	221
English version .....	222
<b>E-000170/12</b> by Frank Vanhecke to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Commissioners' missions in 2011	
Nederlandse versie .....	223
English version .....	224
<b>E-000744/12</b> by Frank Vanhecke to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> European Commissioners' missions in 2011	
Nederlandse versie .....	223
English version .....	224

<b>E-000171/12</b> by Cornelia Ernst to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Software and hardware for surveillance purposes at Europol	
Deutsche Fassung .....	225
English version .....	227
<b>P-000174/12</b> by Silvia-Adriana Țicău to the Council	
<i>Subject:</i> Danish EU Presidency — Lifting labour market barriers to Bulgarians and Romanians	
Versiunea în limba română .....	229
English version .....	230
<b>E-000175/12</b> by Raül Romeva i Rueda to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Amendment to the digital levy	
Versión española .....	231
English version .....	232
<b>E-000177/12</b> by Klaus-Heiner Lehne to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Collective Agreement and Public Procurement Act, North Rhine-Westphalia — TVgG — NRW	
Deutsche Fassung .....	233
English version .....	234
<b>E-000178/12</b> by Franz Obermayr to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Uniform safety standards in aluminium production	
Deutsche Fassung .....	235
English version .....	236
<b>E-000180/12</b> by Marietta Giannakou to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Public works and financing in Greece for 2012	
Ελληνική έκδοση .....	237
English version .....	238
<b>E-000181/12</b> by Marietta Giannakou to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> European Central Bank and Greek Government bonds	
Ελληνική έκδοση .....	239
English version .....	240
<b>E-000183/12</b> by Syed Kamall to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — Nigerian Same-Sex Marriage (Prohibition) Bill	
English version .....	241
<b>E-000184/12</b> by Syed Kamall to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> EU regional housing policy	
English version .....	242
<b>E-000185/12</b> by Syed Kamall to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Compensation for medical treatment	
English version .....	243
<b>E-000189/12</b> by Izaskun Bilbao Barandica to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Problem with PIP breast implants	
Versión española .....	244
English version .....	246
<b>E-000190/12</b> by Jarosław Leszek Wałęsa to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Port Package III and its impact on the maritime economy in the European Union	
Wersja polska .....	248
English version .....	250
<b>E-000192/12</b> by Fiorello Provera to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — US citizen sentenced to death in Iran on charges of espionage	
Versione italiana .....	252
English version .....	253

<b>E-000193/12</b> by Fiorello Provera to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — Aid workers targeted in Somalia	
Versione italiana .....	254
English version .....	256
<b>E-000196/12</b> by Izaskun Bilbao Barandica to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Cuts to investment in R+D+I in Spain	
Versión española .....	258
English version .....	260
<b>E-000197/12</b> by Werner Langen to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Implementation by Turkey of the agreement with the EU on the establishment of a customs union	
Deutsche Fassung .....	261
English version .....	262
<b>E-000198/12</b> by Michail Tremopoulos to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> New dam on the River Aliakmonas in Nestorio, Kastoria	
Ελληνική έκδοση .....	263
English version .....	265
<b>E-000200/12</b> by Georgios Papanikolaou to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Greek Gaming Supervision and Control Commission	
Ελληνική έκδοση .....	267
English version .....	268
<b>E-000202/12</b> by João Ferreira to the Council	
<i>Subject:</i> Changes in average life expectancy according to income	
Versão portuguesa .....	269
English version .....	270
<b>E-000203/12</b> by João Ferreira to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Changes in average life expectancy according to income	
Versão portuguesa .....	271
English version .....	273
<b>E-000204/12</b> by João Ferreira to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — Murders of journalists in Honduras	
Versão portuguesa .....	274
English version .....	275
<b>E-000205/12</b> by João Ferreira to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Income supports for fishermen who are prevented from exercising their activity for long periods	
Versão portuguesa .....	276
English version .....	277
<b>E-000206/12</b> by João Ferreira to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Controlling the red palm weevil (II)	
Versão portuguesa .....	278
English version .....	279
<b>E-000207/12</b> by João Ferreira to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Banning of yellow skate fishing in Portugal	
Versão portuguesa .....	280
English version .....	281
<b>E-000208/12</b> by João Ferreira to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Privatisation of public companies in the IMF-EU programme	
Versão portuguesa .....	282
English version .....	283
<b>E-000212/12</b> by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Prostheses for maimed children	
Versione italiana .....	284
English version .....	285

<b>E-000213/12</b> by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Overproduction of solar panels, crisis amongst producers	
Versione italiana .....	286
English version .....	287
<b>E-000214/12</b> by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Opium production in Burma and neighbouring countries	
Versione italiana .....	288
English version .....	289
<b>E-000215/12</b> by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> ECB liquidity injection for Italian banks	
Versione italiana .....	290
English version .....	292
<b>E-000216/12</b> by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Employment situation in Italy according to ISTAT data	
Versione italiana .....	293
English version .....	294
<b>E-000217/12</b> by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — Expulsion of Venezuelan consul from the US	
Versione italiana .....	295
English version .....	296
<b>E-000218/12</b> by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Violation of the European Treaties concerning the circulation of a currency other than the euro	
Versione italiana .....	297
English version .....	298
<b>E-000219/12</b> by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris and Antonio Cancian to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Lay-offs in Murano — call to mobilise the EGF	
Versione italiana .....	299
English version .....	300
<b>P-000224/12</b> by Iliana Ivanova to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Labour restrictions for Bulgarian and Romanian citizens within the EU	
българска версия .....	301
English version .....	303
<b>E-000228/12</b> by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Water with anti-tumour properties	
Versione italiana .....	304
English version .....	305

(Deutsche Fassung)

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-000031/12**

**an die Kommission**

**Andreas Mölzer (NI)**

(11. Januar 2012)

*Betrifft:* Streubombenverbot

2010 trat die — von 111 Staaten unterzeichnete (darunter die meisten EU-Staaten sowie die Nato-Staaten) — Oslo-Konvention zur vollständigen Ächtung von Streumunition in Kraft. Das Übereinkommen verpflichtet die Vertragsstaaten, auf Einsatz, Entwicklung, Herstellung und Lagerung sowie den Im- und Export von Streumunition zu verzichten und vorhandene Bestände zu vernichten. Die Streubomben-Konvention soll dabei helfen, Leiden vor allem unter Zivilisten (98 % der Opfer) einzudämmen. Heute sollen 69 Länder nach wie vor Vorräte dieser Waffen halten. Nur 12 Staaten sollen einen Teil ihrer Bestände vernichtet haben. Weltweit sollen Schätzungen zufolge rund 610 200 Streubomben existieren. Die USA betrachten Streubomben als legitime Waffen und lehnen das internationale Verbot ab.

Streubomben gelten als besonders heimtückisch, da von Flugzeugen abgeworfene Sprengsätze sich in der Luft in Hunderte kleine Bomben teilen, die sich über große Flächen verteilen und diese wegen der hohen Zahl von Blindgängern auch nach dem Ende eines Konflikts verseuchen. Die im Boden verbleibenden Streubomben explodieren dann bei der geringsten Berührung, etwa durch ein zufällig spielendes Kind oder durch einen Bauern bei der Feldarbeit.

1. Wie steht die Kommission zum Streubombenverbot?
2. Welche Ergebnisse brachte die vierte UN-Überprüfungskonferenz über konventionelle Waffen in Genf, und wurde die kolportierte Aufweichung des Verbots (es sollen keine älteren Streubombenbestände verwendet werden dürfen, nach 1980 produzierte Waffen allerdings schon) durchgesetzt?

**Antwort von Frau Catherine Ashton — Hohe Vertreterin/Vizepräsidentin im Namen der Kommission**

(9. März 2012)

Das Übereinkommen über Streumunition ist ein wichtiger Schritt zur Lösung humanitärer Probleme, die durch diese Art von Munition verursacht werden. Alle Mitgliedstaaten — ob nun Vertragsparteien dieses Übereinkommens oder nicht — hegen die gleichen Bedenken in Bezug auf dieses humanitäre Anliegen und führen hierüber Diskussionen in der betreffenden Arbeitsgruppe des Rates (CODUN). Diese könnten schließlich zur Entwicklung eines einheitlicheren Standpunkts führen.

Auf der vierten Überprüfungskonferenz zum Übereinkommen über bestimmte konventionelle Waffen (CCW) wurde keine Einigung über ein mögliches neues Protokoll zur Regelung der Verwendung von Streumunition erzielt. Im Rahmen der CCW wurde kein Mandat zur Weiterführung der Verhandlungen über Streumunition erteilt.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000031/12  
to the Commission  
Andreas Mölzer (NI)  
(11 January 2012)**

*Subject:* Ban on cluster bombs

In 2010 the Oslo Convention on the complete banning of cluster munitions, as signed by 111 states (including most EU Member States and the NATO states), took effect. The agreement requires its signatories to ban the deployment, development, manufacture, storage, import and export of cluster munitions and to destroy existing stocks. The Convention on Cluster Munitions is intended to curtail injuries of civilians (who account for 98 % of victims). Today, it is believed that 69 countries continue to keep stocks of these weapons. Only 12 states have apparently destroyed part of their stocks. According to estimates there are approximately 610,200 cluster munitions in existence around the world. The US regards cluster munitions as legitimate weapons and opposes the international ban on them.

Cluster munitions are particularly insidious. Explosive devices launched from aircraft divide into hundreds of small bombs in the air which spread over large areas and contaminate them even after the end of a conflict due to the large number of unexploded devices. Cluster bombs that remain in the earth explode at the slightest touch, whether by a child playing nearby or a farmer working the land.

1. What is the position of the Commission with regard to cluster munitions?
2. What was the outcome of the fourth UN Review Conference on conventional weapons in Geneva, and was the general softening of the ban carried out (no old cluster munition stocks to be used, at least those produced after 1980)?

**Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission  
(9 March 2012)**

The Convention on Cluster Munitions represents an important step forward in responding to the humanitarian problems caused by this type of munition on the civilian population. All Member States, whether Parties or not yet Parties to the Convention on Cluster Munition, share the same humanitarian concerns. Discussions among all Member States continue within the relevant Council Working Group (CODUN). These discussions could prove helpful in moving towards a more unified position.

At the Fourth Review Conference of the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons (CCW), no agreement was reached on a possible new protocol regulating the use of cluster munitions. No mandate has been given to continue the negotiations on cluster munitions in the CCW framework.

---

(Deutsche Fassung)

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-000032/12**

**an die Kommission**

**Franz Obermayr (NI)**

(11. Januar 2012)

*Betrifft:* Inntalautobahn — sektorales Fahrverbot für LKW

Im jüngsten EuGH-Urteil in der Rechtssache C-28/09 wurde das Fahrverbot für LKW, die bestimmte Güter befördern, als unvereinbar mit dem freien Warenverkehr erklärt. So kippte der EuGH erneut das sektorale LKW-Fahrverbot auf der Inntalautobahn in Tirol (Österreich). Das Inntal ist der sensibelste Gebirgsraum des gesamten Binnenmarktes. Daraus resultieren folgende Fragen:

1. Sollten Gesundheit und Umwelt im Sinne der Nachhaltigkeit nicht grundsätzlich wichtiger sein als der freie Transit?
2. Laut Lissabon-Vertrag sind Begrenzungen des Warenverkehrs dort möglich, wo Gesundheits- und Wirtschaftsinteressen massiv belastet werden, wie ist das mit dem gegenständlichen Urteil vereinbar?
3. Auch in der Grundrechtecharta der EU ist das Grundrecht auf Gesundheit festgeschrieben, steht dies nicht im klaren Widerspruch zur Wertung des EuGH?
4. 2005 hob der Europäische Gerichtshof das Fahrverbot bereits zum ersten Mal auf. Danach ergriff Tirol schrittweise neue Maßnahmen, unter anderem ein variables Tempolimit und ein Fahrverbot für LKW bestimmter Euro-Klassen. Da sich die Luftqualität nicht verbesserte, erließ Tirol erneut ein Fahrverbot für LKW über 7,5 Tonnen, die bestimmte Güter befördern. Wie kann die Kommission angesichts dessen noch argumentieren, dass Tirol nicht bereits versucht hat, ein gelinderes Mittel anzuwenden, welches offenkundig nicht ausreichend war?
5. Wie steht die Kommission zu dem Argument, wonach ein ständiges Tempolimit von 100 km/h in der Praxis nicht befolgt würde? Dies war auch der Fall bei regelmäßigen Kontrollen und Sanktionen. Wie kann die Kommission eine Regel, die de facto niemand befolgt, als probate Lösung vorschlagen?

**Antwort von Herrn Tajani im Namen der Kommission**

(23. Februar 2012)

Die ersten drei Punkte der Anfrage des Herrn Abgeordneten drehen sich um die Frage, ob der freie Warenverkehr mit dem Schutz des sensiblen Alpenraums vereinbar ist. In seinem kürzlich ausgesprochenen zweiten Urteil über ein sektorales Fahrverbot auf der A12 in Tirol erinnerte der Gerichtshof daran, dass der Schutz von Gesundheit und Umwelt Kernziele der Europäischen Union sind. Er erinnerte auch daran, dass der ständigen Rechtsprechung zufolge der Schutz der Gesundheit und der Umwelt von höherem öffentlichem Interesse sind als mögliche Begrenzungen des freien Warenverkehrs auf nationaler Ebene. Dies gilt in der Annahme, dass die jeweilige nationale Maßnahme angemessen ist und nicht über die Schritte hinausgeht, die notwendig sind, um das verfolgte Umweltschutzziel zu erreichen.

Im Hinblick auf die vierte Frage hat der Gerichtshof bekräftigt, dass die österreichischen Behörden andere, weniger einschränkende Maßnahmen, wie z. B. das Ausweiten eines Fahrverbots für Lkws in bestimmten Euro-Klassen oder ein ständiges Tempolimit, genau hätte prüfen müssen, bevor eine radikale Maßnahme, wie z. B. eine komplettes Fahrverbot auf einer wichtigen Strecke zwischen zwei Mitgliedstaaten, ergriffen wird.

Was die letzte Frage betrifft, so hat zwar der Gerichtshof das Argument akzeptiert, dass die Wirkung eines Tempolimits abgeschwächt werden könnte, wenn es von Autofahrern nicht respektiert wird. Er brachte aber auch klar zum Ausdruck, dass es in der Verantwortung der österreichischen Behörden liege, die Durchsetzung der von ihnen eingesetzten Mittel sicherzustellen, falls notwendig durch sanktionsbewehrte Zwangsmaßnahmen.

Die Kommission verpflichtet sich weiterhin dazu, die Umsetzung der EU-Rechtsvorschriften zur Luftqualität sicherzustellen und ist weiterhin um größtmögliche Zusammenarbeit mit den österreichischen Behörden bemüht, im Rahmen der EU-Gesetzgebung Lösungen zur Verbesserung der Luftqualität im Inntal zu finden. In der kürzlich verabschiedeten Überarbeitung der Richtlinie zur Eurovignette <sup>(1)</sup> werden zusätzliche Möglichkeiten aufgezeigt, unter anderem die Befugnis, für schwere Nutzfahrzeuge Gebühren zu erheben, um soziale Kosten in Zusammenhang mit Lärmbelastung oder Luftverschmutzung abzudecken.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Richtlinie 2011/76/EU des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates vom 27. September 2011 zur Änderung der Richtlinie 1999/62/EG über die Erhebung von Gebühren für die Benutzung bestimmter Verkehrswege durch schwere Nutzfahrzeuge, ABl. L 269 vom 14.10.2011, S. 1-16.



(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000032/12  
to the Commission**

**Franz Obermayr (NI)**

(11 January 2012)

*Subject:* The Inn valley motorway: sectoral traffic prohibition for HGVs

The most recent ECJ judgment in Case C-28/09 declared the traffic prohibition on lorries carrying certain goods to be incompatible with the free movement of goods. The ECJ thus overturned once again the sectoral traffic prohibition on HGVs on the Inn valley motorway in the Austrian Tyrol. The Inn valley is the most sensitive mountain region of the entire internal market. The following questions now arise:

1. Should not health and the environment as seen from the point of view of sustainability be fundamentally more important than the free transit of goods?
2. According to the Lisbon Treaty, limitations on the movement of goods are possible if health and economic interests are placed under a significant burden. How can this be reconciled with the present judgment?
3. The Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union also lays down the fundamental right to health. Is this not clearly contradicted by the ECJ's evaluation?
4. The European Court of Justice removed the traffic prohibition for the first time in 2005. Following this the Province of Tyrol undertook staged new measures which included a variable speed limit and a traffic prohibition on HGVs of specific Euro classes. As air quality did not improve, Tyrol again imposed a traffic ban on HGVs of over 7.5 tonnes carrying certain goods. In view of this, how can the Commission argue that the Tyrol has not already attempted to apply less stringent rules, which evidently were not sufficient?
5. What is the position of the Commission with regard to the argument that a permanent speed limit of 100 km/hour was in practice not observed? This proved the case during regular control checks and enforcement measures. How can the Commission propose a rule that, de facto, no-one observes as a proven solution?

**Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission**

(23 February 2012)

In his first three questions the Honourable Member asks how the free movement of goods can be reconciled with the protection of a fragile Alpine environment. In its recent second judgment on a sectoral driving ban on the Tyrol A12 motorway the Court recalled that protection of health and the environment are essential objectives of the EU. It also recalled that according to settled case law the protection of health and the environment are overriding public interests that may justify national restrictions on the free movement of goods, provided that the national measure in question is appropriate and does not go beyond what is necessary for attaining the environmental aim pursued.

As regards the fourth point, the Court reiterated that before adopting a measure as radical as a total traffic ban on a vital route between Member States, the Austrian authorities had to carefully examine other, less restrictive measures, such as an extension of traffic prohibition for lorries in certain Euro classes or permanent speed limits.

Concerning the last point, while the Court accepted the argument that the effect of a speed limit may be weakened if it is not respected by drivers, it also clearly stated that it is the responsibility of the Austrian authorities to ensure the enforcement of the measures they put in place, if need be by adopting compulsory measures with penalties.

The Commission stays committed to safeguard the implementation of the EU ambient air quality laws and will continue to do its utmost to work together with the Austrian authorities to identify solutions compatible with the EC law that will help improve air quality in the Inn valley. The recently adopted revision of the Eurovignette Directive <sup>(1)</sup> offers additional possibilities by *inter alia* allowing to charge heavy goods vehicles for external costs related to noise and air pollution.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Directive 2011/76/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 27 September 2011 amending Directive 1999/62/EC on the charging of heavy goods vehicles for the use of certain infrastructures, OJ L 269, 14.10.2011, p. 1-16.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-000033/12**  
**προς το Συμβούλιο**  
**María Eleni Koppa (S&D)**  
(11 Ιανουαρίου 2012)

**Θέμα:** Αποκαλυπτικές δηλώσεις του πρώην πρωθυπουργού της Τουρκίας κ. Γιλμάζ

Ο πρώην πρωθυπουργός της Τουρκίας, Μεσούτ Γιλμάζ, δήλωσε σαφώς πως οι τουρκικές μυστικές υπηρεσίες και το παρακράτος είχαν συμμετοχή στις καταστροφικές πυρκαγιές που ξέσπασαν σε δάση της Ελλάδας μεταξύ του 1995 και του 1997, όταν πρωθυπουργός της Τουρκίας ήταν η Τανσού Τσιλέρ.

Λαμβάνοντας λοιπόν σοβαρά υπόψη τις αποκαλυπτικές αυτές δηλώσεις του πρώην πρωθυπουργού, ερωτάται το Συμβούλιο αν προτίθεται να καταδικάσει την εγκληματική πρακτική υποψήφιας χώρας εναντίον κράτους μέλους.

Προτίθεται να ζητήσει άμεσες διευκρινήσεις από τον ίδιο τον κύριο Γιλμάζ αλλά και από την σημερινή κυβέρνηση της Τουρκίας;

Θα υπάρξουν επιπτώσεις στην ενταξιακή της πορεία;

**Απάντηση**  
(12 Μαρτίου 2012)

Το Συμβούλιο δεν έχει συζητήσει σχετικά με το συγκεκριμένο θέμα και δεν είναι αρμόδιο να σχολιάζει δηλώσεις πολιτικών προσώπων στα μέσα μαζικής ενημέρωσης.

Γενικότερα στο πλαίσιο αυτό, το Συμβούλιο παραπέμπει στα συμπεράσματα της 5ης Δεκεμβρίου 2011 για τη Διεύρυνση και τη Διαδικασία Σταθεροποίησης και Σύνδεσης.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000033/12  
to the Council**

**Maria Eleni Koppa (S&D)**

(11 January 2012)

*Subject:* Revealing statements by former Turkish Prime Minister, Mr Yilmaz

The former Turkish Prime Minister, Mesut Yilmaz, has clearly stated that the Turkish secret services and rogue elements were involved in the devastating fires which broke out in forests in Greece between 1995 and 1997, when the Turkish Prime Minister was Tansu Ciller.

Taking serious account of these revelations by the former prime minister, does the Council intend to condemn the criminal practices of this candidate country?

Does it intend to demand an immediate explanation from Mr Yilmaz and from the present Turkish government?

Will its progress towards accession be affected?

**Reply**

(12 March 2012)

The specific matter has not been discussed by the Council, and it is not for the Council to comment on statements made in the media by political figures.

More generally in this context, the Council recalls its conclusions on Enlargement and the Stabilisation and Association Process of 5 December 2011.

---

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-00034/12**  
**προς την Επιτροπή**  
**Georgios Koumoutsakos (PPE)**  
(11 Ιανουαρίου 2012)

**Θέμα:** Προβληματισμός για τις επιπτώσεις στη δημόσια υγεία από τα εμφυτεύματα της εταιρείας Poly Implant Prothese (PIP)

Στις 30.3.2010 ο γαλλικός οργανισμός φαρμάκων (Agence Française de Sécurité Sanitaire des Produits de Santé) αποφάσισε να αποσύρει από την αγορά τα εμφυτεύματα με τζελ σιλικόνης της εταιρείας Poly Implant Prothese (PIP) μετά από αρκετά περιστατικά ρήξης των εν λόγω εμφυτευμάτων καθώς και περιστατικά φλεγμονής μετά την επέμβαση. Πρόσφατα αποδείχθηκε ότι η εταιρεία PIP χρησιμοποιούσε ένα είδος σιλικόνης που δεν ήταν «σύμφωνη» με την αυστηρή ισχύουσα νομοθεσία για χρήση του υλικού αυτού στην ιατρική.

Μάλιστα σε συνέχεια σειράς σχετικών δημοσιευμάτων, η γαλλική κυβέρνηση προέβη σε έκκληση προς χιλιάδες γυναίκες να προβούν σε ενέργειες προστασίας της υγείας τους από τυχόν αρνητικές επιπτώσεις και παρενέργειες που μπορεί να προκαλέσουν τα συγκεκριμένα εμφυτεύματα.

Λαμβάνοντας υπόψη την οδηγία 2003/12/EK για την ανακατάταξη των εμφυτευμάτων στήθους στο πλαίσιο της οδηγίας 93/42/ΕΟΚ περί ιατροτεχνολογικών προϊόντων, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Πώς εξασφαλίζεται η προστασία της υγείας των ευρωπαίων πολιτών, εφόσον εταιρείες που εδρεύουν σε κράτη μέλη της ΕΕ δεν συμμορφώνονται με τις προδιαγραφές που έχουν οριστεί σε κοινοτικό επίπεδο;
2. Είχε δοθεί κοινοτική έγκριση για την κυκλοφορία των εμφυτευμάτων αυτών;
3. Πώς σχολιάζει μελέτες που συνδέουν τη ρήξη των εν λόγω εμφυτευμάτων με τη δημιουργία νεοπλασιών;

**Απάντηση του κ. Dalli εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής**  
(14 Φεβρουαρίου 2012)

Πρέπει να τονίσουμε ότι στην προκειμένη περίπτωση, η κατασκευάστρια εταιρεία Poly Implant Prothese δολίως χρησιμοποίησε χαμηλής ποιότητας σιλικόνη, διαφορετικής από αυτή που δήλωσε στον κοινοποιημένο οργανισμό κατά τη διαδικασία αξιολόγησης της συμμόρφωσης. Ωστόσο, προκειμένου να αυξηθεί περισσότερο η προστασία των ασθενών από παρόμοιες περιπτώσεις, η Επιτροπή αναλύει προσεκτικά το θέμα έτσι ώστε να αντιμετωπιστούν οι ανεπάρκειες του ισχύοντος ρυθμιστικού πλαισίου στην επικείμενη πρόταση αναθεώρησης της νομοθεσίας της ΕΕ για τα ιατροτεχνολογικά προϊόντα. Ιδιαίτερη προσοχή θα δοθεί στους κοινοποιημένους φορείς, όσον αφορά ιδίως τον διορισμό τους και την παρακολούθησή τους, για την επαγρύπνηση και την εποπτεία της αγοράς, και την ανιχνευσιμότητα των ιατροτεχνολογικών προϊόντων.

Η ΕΕ δεν έχει αρμοδιότητες για την έγκριση ιατροτεχνολογικών προϊόντων. Η αξιολόγηση των ιατροτεχνολογικών προϊόντων πριν από την κυκλοφορία στην αγορά πραγματοποιείται από κοινοποιημένους φορείς που διορίζονται και παρακολουθούνται από τα κράτη μέλη.

Μέχρι σήμερα, και σύμφωνα με τα διαθέσιμα στοιχεία, η σχέση μεταξύ των εμφυτευμάτων στήθους που κατασκευάστηκαν από την εταιρεία Poly Implant Prothese και του καρκίνου του στήθους δεν έχει αποδειχθεί επιστημονικά. Ωστόσο, η Επιτροπή εξετάζει λεπτομερώς το περιστατικό, μαζί με τα κράτη μέλη και άλλα ενδιαφερόμενα μέρη. Στη συνάρτηση αυτή η Επιτροπή ζήτησε τη γνώμη της επιστημονικής επιτροπής για τους ανακλύπτοντες και τους πρόσφατα εντοπιζόμενους κινδύνους για την υγεία (EEANKY) σχετικά με την ασφάλεια των εν λόγω εμφυτευμάτων στήθους για τη διευκόλυνση της λήψης αποφάσεων για τη διαχείριση κινδύνων από τα κράτη μέλη.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000034/12  
to the Commission**

**Georgios Koumoutsakos (PPE)**

(11 January 2012)

*Subject:* Public health concerns caused by Poly Implant Prothese (PIP) implants

On 30 March 2010, the French Health Products Safety Agency (Agence Française de Sécurité Sanitaire des Produits de Santé) decided to withdraw silicone gel implants manufactured by Poly Implant Prothese (PIP), following several cases of ruptured implants and post-surgical infection. It recently came to light that PIP was using a type of silicone which did not comply with strict legislation in force for the use of this material in medicine.

The French Government has issued a series of announcements calling on thousands of women to take action to protect their health from any adverse and side effects from these particular implants.

In light of Directive 2003/12/EC on the reclassification of breast implants in the framework of Directive 93/42/EEC concerning medical devices, I would like to ask the Commission:

1. How can the health of European citizens be protected, when companies established in the EU Member States are failing to comply with specifications laid down at EU level?
2. Has EU authorisation been obtained for the marketing of such implants?
3. What are its comments on studies connecting the rupture of these implants with tumour growth?

**Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission**

(14 February 2012)

It needs to be highlighted that in the present case, the manufacturer Poly Implant Prothese fraudulently made use of low-quality silicon different from that declared to the notified body during the conformity assessment procedure. However, in order to further increase protection of patients against such cases, the Commission is carefully analysing the issue in order to address possible shortcomings of the existing regulatory framework in its forthcoming proposal to revise the EU medical device legislation. Specific attention will be paid to notified bodies, in particular their designation and their monitoring, to vigilance and market surveillance, and to traceability of medical devices.

The EU has no competences in approving the medical devices. The pre-market assessment of medical devices is conducted by notified bodies designated and monitored by the Member States.

To date, and according to the information available, the link between the breast implants manufactured by Poly Implant Prothese and cancer is not scientifically established. However, the Commission is examining the incident in detail, together with the Member States and third parties. In that context the Commission has asked the Scientific Committee on Emerging and Newly Identified Health Risks (SCENIHR) for its opinion on the safety of the breast implants concerned to facilitate risk management decisions by the Member States.

---

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-000035/12**  
**προς την Επιτροπή**  
**Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)**  
(11 Ιανουαρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Συμμετοχή της Ελλάδας στον κανονισμό (ΕΚ) αριθ. 1040/2002

Με την Εκτελεστική Απόφαση της Επιτροπής, υπ' αριθμ. E(2011)9243, εγκρίθηκε η χορήγηση κοινοτικής συνδρομής από την Ένωση για το 2011 με σκοπό την κάλυψη των δαπανών που πραγματοποιήθηκαν από τη Γερμανία, την Ισπανία, την Ιταλία, την Κύπρο, τη Μάλτα, τις Κάτω Χώρες και την Πορτογαλία για την καταπολέμηση οργανισμών επιβλαβών για τα φυτά ή τα φυτικά προϊόντα. Μεταξύ των επιβλαβών οργανισμών περιλαμβάνονται έντομα όπως το ρυγχοφόρο σκαθάρι των φοινικοειδών, η *Tuta absoluta* της τομάτας, αλλά και ορισμένες ασθένειες οι οποίες τα τελευταία χρόνια έχουν εμφανιστεί και στην Ελλάδα και έχουν προξενήσει σοβαρές ζημιές.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

Γιατί δεν περιλαμβάνεται η Ελλάδα μεταξύ των χωρών που έχουν χρηματοδοτηθεί με την απόφαση E(2011)9243;

Υπάρχουν συγκριτικά στοιχεία για τη συνδρομή που έχουν λάβει χώρες μέλη με βάση τον κανονισμό (ΕΚ) αριθ. 1040/2002 τα τελευταία έτη;

**Απάντηση κ. Dalli εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής**  
(21 Φεβρουαρίου 2012)

Η Ελλάδα δεν περιλαμβάνεται στην απόφαση χρηματοδότησης 2011/868/ΕΕ<sup>(1)</sup>, επειδή δεν έχει υποβάλει αίτηση συγχρηματοδότησης το 2011 στο πλαίσιο των άρθρων 22 και 23 της οδηγίας του Συμβουλίου 2000/29/ΕΚ<sup>(2)</sup>, η οποία καθορίζει τις διατάξεις για συγχρηματοδότηση της ΕΕ σε θέματα υγείας των φυτών, που είναι γνωστή ως «αλληλεγγύη».

Η Επιτροπή δεν εκπονεί συγκριτικά στοιχεία σχετικά με τη συγχρηματοδότηση της ΕΕ σε θέματα υγείας των φυτών που έλαβαν τα κράτη μέλη. Ωστόσο, τέτοια στοιχεία υπάρχουν στην τελική έκθεση του Μαΐου 2010 σχετικά με την αξιολόγηση του ευρωπαϊκού καθεστώτος για την υγεία των φυτών, ιδίως στις σελίδες 76-77 και στα παραρτήματά της. Η έκθεση και τα παραρτήματα διατίθενται στο διαδίκτυο<sup>(3)</sup>.

<sup>(1)</sup> [http://eur-lex.europa.eu/Result.do?T1=V3&T2=2000&T3=29&RechType=RECH\\_naturel&Submit=Search](http://eur-lex.europa.eu/Result.do?T1=V3&T2=2000&T3=29&RechType=RECH_naturel&Submit=Search).

<sup>(2)</sup> [http://eur-lex.europa.eu/Result.do?T1=V4&T2=2011&T3=868&RechType=RECH\\_naturel&Submit=Search](http://eur-lex.europa.eu/Result.do?T1=V4&T2=2011&T3=868&RechType=RECH_naturel&Submit=Search).

<sup>(3)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/food/plant/strategy/docs/final\\_report\\_eval\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/food/plant/strategy/docs/final_report_eval_en.pdf) and [http://ec.europa.eu/food/plant/strategy/docs/annexes\\_eval\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/food/plant/strategy/docs/annexes_eval_en.pdf)

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000035/12  
to the Commission**

**Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)**

(11 January 2012)

*Subject:* Participation of Greece in Regulation (EC) No 1040/2002

In its implementing decision no C(2011)9243, the Commission approved a Union financial contribution for 2011 to cover expenditure incurred by Germany, Spain, Italy, Cyprus, Malta, the Netherlands and Portugal for the purpose of combating organisms harmful to plants or plant products. These harmful organisms include insects such as *Rhynchophorus ferrugineus*, *Tuta absoluta* in tomatoes and certain diseases which have also appeared in Greece over recent years and caused serious harm.

Will the Commission answer the following:

Why is Greece not included in the countries financed under Decision C(2011)9243?

Are comparative figures available for the assistance received by Member States under Regulation (EC) No 1040/2002 over recent years?

**Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission**

(21 February 2012)

Greece is not included in the financing Decision 2011/868/EU <sup>(1)</sup> because it had not introduced any co-financing request in 2011 under the framework of Articles 22 and 23 of Council Directive 2000/29/EC <sup>(2)</sup>, which lays down the provisions for the EU plant health co-financing known as 'solidarity'.

The Commission does not prepare comparative figures of the EU plant health co-financing received by Member States. Nevertheless, such data can be found in the final report of May 2010 on the evaluation of the Community plant health regime, in particular at pages 76-77 of its Annexes. The report and Annexes are available online <sup>(3)</sup>.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> [http://eur-lex.europa.eu/Result.do?T1=V3&T2=2000&T3=29&RechType=RECH\\_naturel&Submit=Search](http://eur-lex.europa.eu/Result.do?T1=V3&T2=2000&T3=29&RechType=RECH_naturel&Submit=Search).

<sup>(2)</sup> [http://eur-lex.europa.eu/Result.do?T1=V4&T2=2011&T3=868&RechType=RECH\\_naturel&Submit=Search](http://eur-lex.europa.eu/Result.do?T1=V4&T2=2011&T3=868&RechType=RECH_naturel&Submit=Search).

<sup>(3)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/food/plant/strategy/docs/final\\_report\\_eval\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/food/plant/strategy/docs/final_report_eval_en.pdf) and [http://ec.europa.eu/food/plant/strategy/docs/annexes\\_eval\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/food/plant/strategy/docs/annexes_eval_en.pdf)

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-000037/12**  
**προς την Επιτροπή**  
**Georgios Toussas (GUE/NGL)**  
(11 Ιανουαρίου 2012)

**Θέμα:** Προστασία της ανθρώπινης ζωής στη θάλασσα

Οι ισχυρισμοί της ΕΕ, της συγκυβέρνησης ΠΑΣΟΚ, ΝΔ, ΛΑΟΣ και των εφοπλιστών που συνδέουν την κατάργηση του «καμποτάζ» των ακτοπλοϊκών και των τουριστικών πλοίων με τη βελτίωση της ζωής των ναυτεργατών, των εργαζομένων κατοίκων των νησιών και συνολικά του λαού μας, έχουν διαψευστεί πανηγυρικά από τα ίδια τα γεγονότα.

Οι ακτοπλοϊκές συγκοινωνίες, που βρίσκονται κάτω από τον έλεγχο ισχυρών μονοπωλιακών ομίλων, έχουν απελευθερωθεί ήδη για τα πλοία με κοινοτική σημαία, όπως προβλέπει ο κανονισμός (ΕΟΚ) αριθ. 3577/1992 της ΕΕ και ο νόμος 2932/2001, χαρακτηρίζονται από: όξυνση των προβλημάτων στην εξυπηρέτηση των νησιών, εκτίναξη της τιμής των εισιτηρίων και των ναύλων, πακτωλό κρατικών επιδοτήσεων των ακτοπλοϊκών εταιρειών για τις «άγονες γραμμές» (129,6 εκατομμύρια ευρώ μόνο για το 2011, αύξηση κατά 1080 % σε σχέση με το 2002!), εντατικοποίηση της δουλειάς των ναυτεργατών, κατάργηση δικαιωμάτων, ανεργία και ανασφάλεια, μεγάλο αριθμό υπερήλικων πλοίων και υποβάθμιση των κανόνων αξιοπλοΐας.

Χαρακτηριστικά, επισημαίνουμε ότι, με ευθύνη του υπουργείου Ανάπτυξης και Ναυτιλίας και της εταιρείας «Hellenic Seaways», αποσύρθηκε το πλοίο «Νήσος Μύκονος» που εξυπηρετούσε τα νησιά Ικαρία — Φούρνοι — Σάμος, και δρομολογήθηκε το πλοίο «Ιεράπετρα» εταιρείας ANEK, που είναι 37 χρόνων, υπερήλικο, μετασκευασμένο με σοβαρή κλίση, χωρίς βασικές προϋποθέσεις αξιοπλοΐας. Τίθεται σοβαρό ζήτημα ασφάλειας της ανθρώπινης ζωής στη θάλασσα. Κυβέρνηση και πλοιοκτήτες είναι υπεύθυνοι για κάθε περίπτωση ναυτικού ατυχήματος. Έχουμε το προηγούμενο του Ε/Γ — Ο/Γ «ΕΞΠΡΕΣ ΣΑΜΙΝΑ» που θρηνήσαμε πάνω από 80 νεκρούς κ.α.. Αυτή η κατάσταση έχει δημιουργήσει γενικότερα σοβαρά προβλήματα για τους εργαζόμενους, τους κατοίκους των απομακρυσμένων νησιών, γιατί οι εφοπλιστές και τα αρμόδια υπουργεία διαμορφώνουν το δίκτυο των ακτοπλοϊκών συγκοινωνιών με βάση την μεγιστοποίηση της κερδοφορίας των εφοπλιστών και όχι τις σύγχρονες λαϊκές ανάγκες.

Πώς τοποθετείται η Επιτροπή απέναντι στη απαίτηση των αγωνιστικών ναυτεργατικών συνδικάτων, των εργαζομένων, κατοίκων των νησιών, για την άμεση απόσυρση του Ε/Γ — Ο/Γ πλοίου «Ιεράπετρα» και των άλλων υπερήλικων — αναξιόπλων πλοίων για την προστασία της ανθρώπινης ζωής στη θάλασσα καθώς και για να δρομολογηθούν άμεσα σύγχρονα, ασφαλή πλοία με φτηνό εισιτήριο;

**Απάντηση του κ. Kallas εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής**  
(8 Φεβρουαρίου 2012)

Η Επιτροπή κατανοεί τις ανησυχίες του αξιότιμου μέλους του Κοινοβουλίου όσον αφορά την παροχή υπηρεσιών θαλάσσιων ενδομεταφορών στην Ελλάδα. Όπως αναφέρθηκε από την Επιτροπή στις απαντήσεις της στις γραπτές ερωτήσεις E-4158/08 (<sup>1</sup>), E-4324/2011 (<sup>1</sup>) και E-008677/2011 (<sup>1</sup>), ο κανονισμός (ΕΟΚ) αριθ. 3577/92 του Συμβουλίου (<sup>2</sup>), στον οποίο αναφέρεται το αξιότιμο μέλος του Κοινοβουλίου, προβλέπει ότι τα κράτη μέλη μπορούν να επιβάλουν υποχρεώσεις δημόσιας υπηρεσίας και να συνάπτουν συμβάσεις ανάθεσης δημόσιας υπηρεσίας για την προστασία των θαλάσσιων συνδέσεων με νησιά τα οποία δεν εξυπηρετούνται επαρκώς από την αγορά. Η απόφαση όσον αφορά την έκταση και την ποιότητα της δημόσιας υπηρεσίας προς νησιά εμπίπτει αποκλειστικά στην αρμοδιότητα των εθνικών αρχών. Ειδικότερα αυτές οι αρχές αποφασίζουν κατά πόσον υπάρχει πραγματική ανάγκη για τη δημόσια υπηρεσία, ορίζουν τη συχνότητά της, τον τύπο σκαφών που πρέπει να χρησιμοποιηθούν καθώς και τη χρηματοδότηση της υπηρεσίας, στις περιπτώσεις που αυτό είναι αναγκαίο.

Εφόσον τα πλοία που πραγματοποιούν θαλάσσιες ενδομεταφορές πληρούν τις ισχύουσες απαιτήσεις ασφαλείας, η Επιτροπή δεν έχει αρμοδιότητα να απαιτήσει την αντικατάστασή τους.

Οι ελληνικές αρχές πρέπει να διαπιστώσουν την αξιοπλοΐα των σχετικών πλοίων και να διασφαλίσουν την τήρηση των απαιτήσεων ασφαλείας που ισχύουν γι' αυτά. Εάν η Ελλάδα δεν λάβει μέτρα για να διασφαλίσει ότι τηρούνται οι εν λόγω απαιτήσεις ασφαλείας, η Επιτροπή μπορεί να κινηθεί διαδικασίες παράβασης. Το αξιότιμο μέλος του Κοινοβουλίου καλείται να διαβιβάσει στην Επιτροπή λεπτομερή στοιχεία σχετικά.

(<sup>1</sup>) Καταχωρημένη στη διεύθυνση <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/application/search.do>.

(<sup>2</sup>) Κανονισμός (ΕΟΚ) αριθ. 3577/92 του Συμβουλίου, της 7ης Δεκεμβρίου 1992, για την εφαρμογή της αρχής της ελεύθερης κυκλοφορίας των υπηρεσιών στις θαλάσσιες μεταφορές στο εσωτερικό των κρατών μελών (θαλάσσιες ενδομεταφορές — cabotage), ΕΕ L 364 της 12.12.1992.



(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000037/12  
to the Commission**

**Georgios Toussas (GUE/NGL)**

(11 January 2012)

*Subject:* Safety of life at sea

The allegations by the EU, the PASOK, New Democracy and LAOS unity government and shipowners, linking the abolition of cabotage by coastal vessels and cruise ships with a higher standard of living for seafarers, island workers and residents and our nation as a whole, have been roundly disproven by events themselves.

Cabotage, which is under the control of strong monopoly groups and has already been liberalised for EU-registered vessels in accordance with Regulation (EEC) No 3577/1992 and Law 2932/2001, is marked by: increasing problems with island services, rocketing ticket and freight prices, State aid packages for cabotage companies for 'unprofitable routes' (EUR 129.6 million for 2011 alone, a 1080 % increase over 2002), conditions of increasing slavery for seafarers, the abolition of rights, unemployment and insecurity, a large number of obsolete vessels and reduced seaworthiness requirements.

For example, the *Mykonos Island*, which served the islands of Ikaria, Fournoi and Samos, has been withdrawn by decision of the Ministry of Development and Shipping and Hellenic Seaways and replaced by the ANEK vessel *Ierapetra*, a 37-year-old vessel which has been refitted and has a serious list and does not meet basic seaworthiness requirements. This raises the serious question of the safety of life at sea. The government and shipowners are responsible for every accident at sea. We already have the precedent of the *Express Samina* ferry, which caused 80 deaths, and there have been others. This situation is causing serious problems overall for remote island workers and residents, because the shipowners and competent ministries are implementing a cabotage system based on maximum profit for shipowners, not modern-day, grassroots needs.

What is the Commission's position on the demand by seafarers' trade unions and island workers and residents that the *Ierapetra* ferry and other obsolete, unseaworthy vessels be withdrawn from service immediately, in order to protect life at sea, and that modern, safe vessels be introduced with cheap tickets?

**Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission**

(8 February 2012)

The Commission takes note of the concerns of the Honourable Member regarding the provision of maritime cabotage services in Greece. As mentioned by the Commission in its replies to Written Questions E-4158/08 <sup>(1)</sup>, E-4324/2011 <sup>(1)</sup> and E-008677/2011 <sup>(1)</sup> the Council Regulation (EEC) No 3577/92 <sup>(2)</sup>, referred to by the Honourable Member, provides that Member States may impose public service obligations and conclude public service contracts in order to protect the maritime links with islands which are not adequately served by the market. The decision regarding the extent and quality of public service to islands is the sole responsibility of the national authorities. In particular, it is the competence of those authorities to determine whether there is a real need for the public service, define its frequency, the type of vessels that should be deployed as well as to finance such service where necessary.

As long as the vessels providing maritime cabotage meet the applicable safety requirements, the Commission has no competence to require that they should be replaced.

It is for the Greek authorities to determine the seaworthiness of vessels concerned and ensure that they meet the applicable safety requirements. The Commission may open infringement procedures if Greece does not take measures in order to ensure that those safety requirements are met. The Honourable Member is invited to provide the Commission with relevant detailed information.

<sup>(1)</sup> Available at <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/application/search.do>.

<sup>(2)</sup> Council Regulation (EEC) No 3577/92 of 7 December 1992 applying the principle of freedom to provide services to maritime transport within Member States (maritime cabotage), OJ L 364, 12.12.1992.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-000038/12**  
**προς την Επιτροπή (Αντιπρόεδρος/Υπατη Εκπρόσωπος)**  
**Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)**  
(18 Ιανουαρίου 2012)

Θέμα: VP/HR — Αντιμετώπιση της μείωσης των Χριστιανών της Μέσης Ανατολής

Σύμφωνα με το Pew Research Centre on Religion and Public Life, η περιοχή απ' όπου ξεκίνησε ο χριστιανισμός έχει τη μικρότερη αναλογία Χριστιανών σε σχέση με τις υπόλοιπες περιοχές του κόσμου. Μόλις το 4 % των κατοίκων της Μέσης Ανατολής και της Βόρειας Αφρικής είναι Χριστιανοί. Πολλοί εκ των Χριστιανών της Μέσης Ανατολής αναγκάζονται να διαφύγουν σε χώρες της ΕΕ, μεταξύ άλλων, για να μην έχουν προβλήματα στην ελεύθερη άσκηση των θρησκευτικών τους καθηκόντων.

Το 2012 βρίσκει τους Χριστιανούς, κυρίως σε Αίγυπτο, Λίβανο και Ιράκ να κινδυνεύουν. Στην Αίγυπτο λόγω της αυξανόμενης δύναμης που αποκτούν οι ισλαμιστές (λιγότερο ή περισσότερο ακραίοι) στην πολιτική και στην κοινωνία, με το κόμμα Αλ-Νουρ να επιτίθεται ανοιχτά κατά των Χριστιανών.

Στο Λίβανο, διότι ο φόβος των εμφύλιων ή ακόμα και δια-θρησκευτικών συγκρούσεων δεν εκλείπει. Το παράδειγμα των όσων συνέβησαν μετά τη δολοφονία του Ραφίκ Χαρίρι και την απόσυρση των συριακών στρατευμάτων, με τις βομβιστικές επιθέσεις κατά χριστιανικών στόχων είναι ακόμα φρέσκο στις μνήμες.

Στο Ιράκ, η ύπαρξη αμερικανικών στρατευμάτων κατέστησε του Χριστιανούς του Ιράκ εύκολο στόχο για τους φονταμενταλιστές Μουσουλμάνους.

Ερωτάται η Ύπατη Εκπρόσωπος:

1. Σε ποιές κινήσεις σχεδιάζει να προβεί για τη βελτίωση της θέσης των Χριστιανών στη Μέση Ανατολή για το 2012;
2. Υπάρχει σχεδιασμός για τη διάθεση κονδυλίων από το νεοπαγές «Ευρωπαϊκό Ταμείο για τη Δημοκρατία» σε οργανώσεις με δράση για τη δια-θρησκευτική ανεκτικότητα στη Μέση Ανατολή;

**Απάντηση της Ύπατης Εκπροσώπου/Αντιπροέδρου Ashton εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής**  
(27 Απριλίου 2012)

Η ΕΕ ανησυχεί σοβαρά για τον διαρκώς αυξανόμενο αριθμό περιστατικών διωγμού Χριστιανών σε αραβικές χώρες, όπως στο Ιράκ, την Αίγυπτο και το Μπαχρέιν, αλλά και σε άλλα μέρη του κόσμου, όπως στη Νιγηρία. Ενώ η ιστορία και οι βασικοί λόγοι αυτών των διωγμών ποικίλλουν σημαντικά σε όλες τις περιπτώσεις, η ΕΕ καταδικάζει σθεναρά κάθε βίαιη και τρομοκρατική πράξη κατά των Χριστιανών, ακριβώς με τον ίδιο τρόπο που καταδικάζει και τις πράξεις εκείνες που στρέφονται κατά μελών άλλων θρησκευτικών κοινοτήτων.

Η ελευθερία θρησκείας ή πεποιθήσεων είναι ένα οικουμενικό ανθρώπινο δικαίωμα που πρέπει να τηρείται σεβασμού και προστασίας οπουδήποτε και από οποιονδήποτε. Είναι πρωταρχικό καθήκον των κρατών να προστατεύουν τους πολίτες τους και όσους άλλους ζουν στην επικράτειά τους, και να εξασφαλίζουν το σεβασμό των δικαιωμάτων τους. Ακριβώς μέσα στο πλαίσιο αυτό ενεργεί η ΕΕ όταν εγείρει θέματα θρησκευτικών διακρίσεων και διωγμών στις, σε διάφορα επίπεδα, επαφές της με τις εμπλεκόμενες χώρες, ζητώντας τους χωρίς υπεκφυγές να λάβουν τα αναγκαία προληπτικά και προστατευτικά μέτρα.

Δυνάμει του ευρωπαϊκού μέσου για τη δημοκρατία και τα δικαιώματα του ανθρώπου (ΕΜΔΑΑ), η προστασία των ατόμων που ανήκουν σε μειονότητες και η καταπολέμηση των διακρίσεων, συμπεριλαμβανομένων και εκείνων που βασίζονται στη θρησκεία, είναι ενέργειες που έχουν προτεραιότητα σε ό,τι αφορά τη χρηματοδότηση. Το ΕΜΔΑΑ χρηματοδοτεί και θα συνεχίσει να χρηματοδοτεί δραστηριότητες που έχουν στόχο την προστασία των ατόμων που υφίστανται διωγμούς και των θρησκευτικών μειονοτήτων, συμπεριλαμβανομένων των Χριστιανών, σε χώρες όπου διατρέχουν τους μεγαλύτερους κινδύνους.

Συγκεκριμένα, το δικαίωμα στην ελευθερία της σκέψης, της συνείδησης και της θρησκείας ή των πεποιθήσεων συνιστά μία από τις κύριες στρατηγικές προτεραιότητες της πρόσκλησης υποβολής προτάσεων «ΕΜΔΑΑ Στόχος 1» που χρηματοδοτεί δράσεις σε δύσκολες χώρες και έχει παγκόσμια κάλυψη.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000038/12  
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)**

**Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)**

(18 January 2012)

*Subject:* VP/HR — Treatment of the Christian minority in the Middle East

According to the Pew Research Centre on Religion and Public Life, the region in which Christianity began has the smallest ratio of Christians compared with other regions of the world. Just 4 % of the inhabitants of the Middle East and North Africa are Christian. Many Christians in the Middle East are forced to flee to EU Member States and elsewhere, in order to avoid problems in the free practice of their religion.

In 2012, Christians in Egypt, Lebanon and Iraq in particular will be in danger. In Egypt, more or less extremist Islamists are acquiring more power in politics and society and the Al Nour party is openly attacking Christians.

In Lebanon, the fear of civil war or even religious conflict persists. The example of what happened following the murder of Rafik Hariri and the withdrawal of Syrian troops, with Christian targets being bombed, is still fresh in our memory.

In Iraq, the presence of US troops has made Christians in Iraq an easy target for fundamental Muslims.

I would like to ask Baroness Ashton:

1. What action does she intend to take to improve the situation of Christians in the Middle East in 2012?
2. Are there any plans to provide funds from the newly established European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights to organisations taking action to secure religious tolerance in the Middle East?

**Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission**

(27 April 2012)

The EU is seriously concerned about an increasing number of cases of persecution of Christians in Arab countries, such as in Iraq, Egypt or Bahrain, but also in other parts of the world, like in Nigeria. While the background and root causes vary considerably in all cases, the EU strongly condemns any act of violence and terrorism against Christians, just as well as those perpetrated against members of other religious communities.

Freedom of religion or belief is a universal human right which needs to be protected and respected everywhere and for everyone. It is the primary duty of States to protect their citizens and other people living in their jurisdiction, and to safeguard their rights. It is on this basis that the EU raises cases of religious discrimination and persecution with the countries concerned, at various levels, calling firmly for preventive and protective action.

Under the European Instrument for Human rights and Democracy (EIHRD) the protection of persons belonging to minorities and the fight against discrimination, including on religious grounds is retained as a priority for the funding. Projects for the protection of persecuted individuals and religious minorities, including Christians, in countries where they are most at risk, are being funded and will continue to be funded in the future under the EIDHR.

In particular the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion or belief is one of the main priorities of the Call for proposal of the 'EIDHR Objective 1' strategy that finances actions in difficult countries and has a worldwide coverage.

---

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-000039/12**  
**προς την Επιτροπή**  
**Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)**  
(11 Ιανουαρίου 2012)

**Θέμα:** Αποτρόπαια αντιμετώπιση διαδηλωτών και –κυρίως– διαδηλωτριών στην Αίγυπτο

Σύμφωνα με δημοσίευμα του in.gr, χιλιάδες γυναικών διαδήλωσαν στους δρόμους του Κάιρου ζητώντας να τερματιστεί η σωματική και (σε πολλές περιπτώσεις) σεξουαλική βία που ασκούν πάνω τους οι δυνάμεις ασφαλείας με σύνθημα «Η τιμή μας είναι κόκκινη γραμμή». Πολλές μιλούσαν για συστηματική και σκόπιμη γελοιοποίηση των γυναικών από τις Αρχές.

Δεν λείπουν ακόμα και λεκτικές επιθέσεις και σεξιστική συμπεριφορά από διαδηλωτές ή αντι-διαδηλωτές κατά των γυναικών που συμμετέχουν στις διαδηλώσεις της πλατείας Ταχρίρ ή αλλού.

Η βία που ασκούν οι δυνάμεις ασφαλείας είναι τελείως εξοργιστική και πέραν κάθε ανθρώπινης λογικής. Στο διαδικτυο κυκλοφορεί βίντεο που δείχνει αποτρόπαια δράση κατά διαδηλωτών και, κυρίως, διαδηλωτριών και αποκαλύπτει ότι ίσως η καταπίεση των ορμών, που είναι ιδίον μιας ανελεύθερης θρησκευτικής αντίληψης έχει τέτοιες εξαχρεωτικές επιπτώσεις. Διότι, αν το Ισλάμ εκδηλώνει έναν πουριτανισμό, σε συνθήκες όχλου, οι Αιγύπτιοι διαδηλωτές, αντιδιαδηλωτές και αστυνομικοί έχουν δράσει με απελπιστική αναισχυντία.

Η υπουργός εξωτερικών των ΗΠΑ κα Κλίντον μίλησε για «συστηματική υποβάθμιση των Αιγυπτίων γυναικών». Παράλληλα, το Στρατιωτικό Συμβούλιο δήλωσε ότι λυπάται βαθιά για τις όποιες παραβιάσεις και θα ερευνήσει τις καταγγελίες.

Ίσως η ανάγκη συνεργασίας με τους θρησκευτικούς ηγέτες της Αιγύπτου, που επηρεάζουν μεγάλο τμήμα του πληθυσμού, γίνεται απαραίτητη, καθώς ο ρόλος του ισλαμισμού στη χώρα μοιάζει να βαίνει αυξανόμενος.

Ερωτάται η Αντιπρόεδρος:

1. Σε ποιές κινήσεις σκοπεύει να προβεί για να εξασφαλίσει τη δέσμευση της παρούσας και της μελλοντικής αιγυπτιακής κυβέρνησης για τη προστασία των γυναικών σε όλες τα κοινωνικά επίπεδα στην Αίγυπτο;
2. Σκοπεύει να επιδώξει συνεργασία για το συγκεκριμένο ζήτημα με τους θρησκευτικούς ηγέτες της Αιγύπτου;

**Απάντηση της Υπατης Εκπροσώπου/Αντιπροέδρου Ashton εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής**  
(12 Μαρτίου 2012)

Οι γυναίκες έχουν συμβάλει σημαντικά στην προώθηση της αλλαγής στη βόρεια Αφρική, και η προαγωγή της ισότητας των φύλων αποτελεί μακροχρόνια προτεραιότητα της δράσης της ΕΕ στην Αίγυπτο. Η ΕΕ επιδιώκει να προαγάγει την ισότητα των φύλων στην Αίγυπτο, υποστηρίζοντας τις προσπάθειες των αιγυπτιακών αρχών να προαγάγουν τα δικαιώματα των γυναικών, ενσωματώνοντας τη διάσταση της ισότητας των φύλων στον πολιτικό της διάλογο με τις αιγυπτιακές αρχές και υποστηρίζοντας προδραστικά τις πρωτοβουλίες της κοινωνίας των πολιτών που προάγουν τα δικαιώματα των γυναικών. Έτσι, η Αντιπροσωπεία της ΕΕ ενέκρινε τοπική στρατηγική το 2010 για την καταπολέμηση της βίας κατά των γυναικών.

Η Υπατη Εκπρόσωπος/Αντιπρόεδρος Ashton συναντήθηκε με εκπροσώπους των γυναικών και άκουσε τις ανησυχίες τους επ' ευκαιρία της τρίτης επίσκεψής της στο Κάιρο, στις 14 Απριλίου 2011. Με τον τρόπο αυτό, έγινε αναφορά — σε αμφότερες τις ανακοινώσεις σχετικά με τη γειτονία που εκδόθηκαν στις 8 Μαρτίου και στις 25 Μαΐου 2011 — στον πρωταρχικό ρόλο που διαδραμάτισαν οι γυναίκες στα γεγονότα της Αραβικής Άνοιξης, καθώς και στη σημασία που ενέχουν τα θέματα του φύλου για τη στήριξη που θα παράσχει στο μέλλον η ΕΕ. Ο σεβασμός των δικαιωμάτων των γυναικών θα αποτελέσει ένα από τα βασικά κριτήρια για την αξιολόγηση της προόδου που σημειώνει η Αίγυπτος ως προς τα ανθρώπινα δικαιώματα και τη δημοκρατία, καθώς και για την ανάλογη προσαρμογή της βοήθειας της ΕΕ.

Στις δεσμεύσεις που έχει αναλάβει με τις αιγυπτιακές αρχές, τους πολιτικούς φορείς και τους εκπροσώπους της αιγυπτιακής κοινωνίας, η ΕΕ επιδιώκει να διασφαλίσει ότι τα δικαιώματα των γυναικών γίνονται και θα εξακολουθήσουν να γίνονται σεβαστά.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000039/12  
to the Commission**

**Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)**

(11 January 2012)

*Subject:* Abominable treatment of protestors, especially female protestors, in Egypt

According to an article published on in.gr, thousands of female protestors took to the streets of Cairo to call for an end to physical and (in numerous cases) sexual violence perpetrated against them by the security forces under the slogan 'Our honour is a red line'. Many spoke of systematic and deliberate ridicule of women by the authorities.

Women participating in protests in Tahrir Square and elsewhere are also subject to verbal attack and sexist behaviour by male protestors or counter-protestors.

The violence perpetrated by the security forces is totally infuriating and beyond any human understanding. A video has been released on the Internet, showing abominable action against protestors, especially female protestors, thus revealing that the suppression of impulses, which is the same as a restricted religious perception, has very corrupting consequences, because if Islam expresses puritanism under mob conditions, the Egyptian protestors, counter-protestors and police have acted with desperate indecency.

US Secretary of State Hillary Clinton has spoken of the 'systematic degradation of Egyptian women'. At the same time, the Military Council has stated that it deeply regrets any infringements and will investigate the charges.

Perhaps there is a need to cooperate with the religious leaders in Egypt, who affect a large section of the population, given that the role of Islam in the country appears to be growing.

I would like to ask Baroness Ashton:

1. What action does she intend to take to secure a commitment from the present and future Egyptian government to protect women at all levels of society in Egypt?
2. Does she intend to seek cooperation on this particular issue from religious leaders in Egypt?

**Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission**

(12 March 2012)

Women have played a crucial role in pushing for change in North Africa. Promoting gender equality has been a longstanding priority of the EU's action in Egypt. The EU seeks to promote gender equality in Egypt by supporting Egyptian authorities' efforts to promote women's rights, by mainstreaming gender equality in its political dialogue with the Egyptian authorities and by proactively supporting civil society initiatives that promote women's rights. Thus, the EU Delegation approved a local strategy in 2010 for combating violence against women.

The High Representative/Vice-President Ashton met with women representatives and listen to their concerns at the occasion of her third visit to Cairo on 14 April 2011. Thus, a reference was made to the major role played by women in the events of the Arab Spring as well as to the importance of gender aspects in future EU support, in both Communications on the Neighbourhood adopted on 8 March and 25 May 2011. The respect of women's rights will be one of the key criteria to assess the progress made by Egypt as regards human rights and democracy and to adjust the level of EU aid accordingly.

In its engagement with the Egyptian authorities, political actors and representatives of the Egyptian society, the EU seeks to ensure that women's rights are and will remain respected.

---

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-000040/12**  
**προς την Επιτροπή**  
**Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)**  
(11 Ιανουαρίου 2012)

**Θέμα:** Επικίνδυνο στέλεχος του H5N1 παρασκευάστηκε στην Ολλανδία

Σύμφωνα με τον ιστότοπο fimotro (20/12), ολλανδικό εργαστήριο παρασκεύασε επικίνδυνο στέλεχος του ιού της γρίπης H5N1 προκειμένου να συμβάλει στην κατανόηση της λειτουργίας του και στην μελλοντική κυκλοφορία εμβολίων και φαρμάκων. Οι Ολλανδοί επιστήμονες εξετάζουν το αν θα δημοσιοποιήσουν τη μέθοδο παρασκευής του ιού, ο οποίος μπορεί να αφανίσει δεκάδες εκατομμύρια ανθρώπων.

Ορισμένοι Αμερικανοί επιστήμονες έχουν εκφράσει ήδη την άποψη ότι το εγχείρημα είναι παρακινδυνευμένο, αφενός διότι δεν τηρήθηκαν οι πιο αυστηροί κανονισμοί ασφαλείας (όπως εκείνοι των στρατιωτικών εργαστηρίων) και, αφετέρου, για το ενδεχόμενο δημοσιοποίησης της μεθόδου.

Οι ΗΠΑ, μέσω της Εθνικής Επιστημονικής Επιτροπής για τη Βιοασφάλεια, απηύθυναν έκκληση να παραμείνει η δημοσίευση στο πλαίσιο των γενικών κατευθύνσεων της έρευνας, αποφεύγοντας μεθοδολογικές λεπτομέρειες τις οποίες κάποιος σαν τον Μπρέβικ θα μπορούσε να αντιγράψει, ανοίγοντας το κουτί της Πανδώρας για την ανθρωπότητα.

Η απάντηση των Ολλανδών ερευνητών ήταν ότι θα λάβουν μεν υπόψη τους τις αμερικανικές παρααινέσεις, αλλά επιφυλάσσονται για την τελική τους απόφαση.

1. Γνωρίζει η Επιτροπή τη συγκεκριμένη έρευνα;
2. Θα κινηθεί για την αποτροπή δυσμενών εντυπώσεων εκ της τυχόν εφαρμογής της;
3. Γνωρίζει για την ύπαρξη αντίστοιχων ερευνών που λαμβάνουν χώρα στο ευρωπαϊκό έδαφος και θα μπορούσαν να προκαλέσουν μαζικές απώλειες ζωών παγκοσμίως;

**Απάντηση του κ. Dalli εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής**  
(14 Φεβρουαρίου 2012)

Η Επιτροπή επικοινωνήσε με τις ολλανδικές αρχές, οι οποίες δήλωσαν ότι τα δείγματα του ιού είναι αποθηκευμένα με ασφαλή τρόπο και ότι το ερευνητικό σχέδιο διέπεται από τον κώδικα δεοντολογίας για τη βιοασφάλεια της Βασιλικής Ακαδημίας Επιστημών των Κάτω Χωρών, ο οποίος έχει στόχο να επιστήσει την προσοχή των επιστημόνων στις δυνητικές συνέπειες και επιπτώσεις της έρευνας τους όσον αφορά την ασφάλεια.

Πραγματοποιήθηκαν επίσης συζητήσεις μεταξύ της Επιτροπής, του ευρωπαϊκού κέντρου για τον έλεγχο των νόσων και εκπροσώπων των Κάτω Χωρών, κατά τις οποίες διευκρινίστηκε ότι η ολλανδική νομοθεσία για την ασφάλεια των εργαστηρίων ευθυγραμμίζεται με την ευρωπαϊκή<sup>(1)</sup> και ότι είχαν χορηγηθεί οι απαραίτητες άδειες πριν από την έναρξη του προαναφερθέντος ερευνητικού σχεδίου. Τονίστηκε επίσης ότι η έρευνα τηρεί όλα τα διεθνή πρότυπα ISO και ανταποκρίνεται στις απαιτήσεις βιοασφάλειας των ΗΠΑ.

Τον Φεβρουάριο του 2012 θα συγκληθεί η επιτροπή ασφαλείας της υγείας για να εξετάσει με όλες τις εθνικές αρμόδιες αρχές της ΕΕ το εν λόγω ερευνητικό σχέδιο και τις επιπτώσεις του.

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2006:010:0016:0016:EN:PDF>, <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2006:237:0001:0027:EN:PDF>

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000040/12  
to the Commission**

**Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)**

(11 January 2012)

*Subject:* Dangerous mutation of H5N1 manufactured in Holland

According to blogs on the website *fmotro* on 20 December, a Dutch laboratory has manufactured a dangerous mutation of the H5N1 influenza virus, in order to help understand how it functions and for the purpose of marketing future vaccines and drugs. Dutch scientists are considering whether or not to release the method used to produce the virus, which could wipe out tens of millions of people.

Some US scientists have already expressed the view that endeavour is dangerous, firstly because the strictest safety rules were not applied (such as military laboratory rules) and, secondly, in terms of the possible publication of the method.

The US has called, via the American Biological Safety Association, for publication to remain within general research guidelines, avoiding methodological details which someone like Brevik could copy, thereby opening a Pandora's Box for mankind.

The Dutch researchers responded that they would take account of US concerns and reserved their final decision.

1. Is the Commission aware of this particular research?
2. Will it take steps to prevent any adverse impact from its application?
3. Does it know of any similar research being conducted on EU territory that could cause mass loss of life globally?

**Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission**

(14 February 2012)

The Commission has contacted the Dutch authorities who have indicated that the virus samples are safely stored and that the research project is bound by the Code of Conduct on Bio-security set by the Royal Dutch Academy of Science, which is intended to draw the attention of scientists to the potential consequences and security implications of their research.

There have also been discussions between the Commission, the European Centre for Disease Control and Dutch representatives during which it has been clarified that the Dutch legislation on laboratory security is in line with the European legislation <sup>(1)</sup> and that the necessary permits had been granted prior to commencing the aforementioned research project. It was also emphasised that the research was in line with all international ISO standards and respond to US's bio safety requirements.

A meeting of the Health Security Committee will be convened in February 2012 to discuss this research project and implications with all national and EU competent authorities.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2006:010:0016:0016:EN:PDF>, <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2006:237:0001:0027:EN:PDF>

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-000041/12**  
**προς την Επιτροπή**  
**Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)**  
(11 Ιανουαρίου 2012)

**Θέμα:** Κονδύλια για τις συνθήκες κράτησης των παράνομων μεταναστών στην Ελλάδα

Η πλειοψηφία των βουλευτών του γερμανικού κοινοβουλίου, με κοινό τους ψήφισμα, κατήγγειλαν τις συνθήκες κράτησης των παράνομων μεταναστών στην Ελλάδα. Σύμφωνα με το βουλευτή του CSU Στέφαν Μάγερ, η ευρωπαϊκή βοήθεια προς την Ελλάδα για τη βελτίωση των συνθηκών κράτησης κατά τα έτη 2010-2012 αγγίζει τα 223 εκατ. ευρώ.

Η Ελλάδα λοιπόν, χωρίς να έχει ουσιαστική βοήθεια στην αντιμετώπιση του προβλήματος, γίνεται και στόχος αρνητικών σχολίων.

Εφόσον ισχύει το ύψος της βοήθειας προς την Ελλάδα για το συγκεκριμένο ζήτημα, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Είναι αρκετό αυτό το ποσό;
2. Εξ αυτού του ποσού, πόσα χρήματα έχουν αντληθεί για τα έτη 2010-2011 και σε ποιά έργα έχουν διατεθεί;
3. Όσον αφορά στο υπολειπόμενο ποσό, υπάρχουν προτάσεις της ελληνικής κυβέρνησης για τις οποίες έχουν ζητηθεί περαιτέρω εκταμιεύσεις;
4. Τι ποσό θεωρεί ότι δεν θα διατεθεί λόγω έλλειψης σχεδίου;
5. Διατίθεται στήριξη για τη δημιουργία κέντρων κράτησης παράνομων μεταναστών, άμα τη αφίξει, για το οποίο ακόμα δεν έχει παρουσιαστεί σχέδιο από την ελληνική κυβέρνηση;
6. Πώς προτίθεται να βοηθήσει η ΕΕ την Ελλάδα για τη ριζική αντιμετώπιση του προβλήματος;

**Απάντηση της κας Malmström εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής**  
(15 Φεβρουαρίου 2012)

Η Επιτροπή έχει επίγνωση των πολύ δύσκολων συνθηκών κράτησης των παράνομων μεταναστών και των αιτούντων άσυλο στην Ελλάδα, ιδίως στην περιοχή του Έβρου, και ανησυχεί ιδιαίτερα σχετικά με την ανθρωπιστική κατάσταση σε αυτούς τους τόπους κράτησης.

Για την περίοδο 2010-2012, χορηγήθηκαν στην Ελλάδα κονδύλια συνολικού ύψους 227 618 450 ευρώ από τα τέσσερα Ταμεία του Γενικού Προγράμματος «Αλληλεγγύη και διαχείριση των μεταναστευτικών ροών», δηλ. από το Ταμείο Εξωτερικών Συνόρων, το Ευρωπαϊκό Ταμείο Επιστροφών, το Ευρωπαϊκό Ταμείο για τους Πρόσφυγες και το Ταμείο ένταξης υπηκόων τρίτων χωρών. Τα ελληνικά ετήσια προγράμματα που υλοποιούνται στο πλαίσιο των τεσσάρων Ταμείων καλύπτουν ευρύ φάσμα δραστηριοτήτων, οι οποίες περιγράφονται στην απάντηση που έδωσε η Επιτροπή στην κοινοβουλευτική ερώτηση E-10318/2010<sup>(1)</sup>.

Το 2010 και το 2011, η Επιτροπή ενέκρινε τα αντίστοιχα ετήσια προγράμματα στο πλαίσιο των τεσσάρων Ταμείων με συνολική χρηματοδότηση της ΕΕ ύψους 137 384 225 ευρώ. Για περισσότερο λεπτομερείς πληροφορίες σχετικά με τα συγχρηματοδοτούμενα έργα, καθώς και για την πρόοδο της εκτέλεσης των προγραμμάτων στην Ελλάδα, η Επιτροπή θα ήθελε να παραπέμψει το Αξιότιμο Μέλος στις απαντήσεις που έδωσε στις κοινοβουλευτικές ερωτήσεις E-010361/2011 και E-0095/2012.

Όσον αφορά τη βελτίωση των συνθηκών κράτησης και τη δημιουργία κέντρων ελέγχου, η Επιτροπή παραπέμπει το Αξιότιμο Μέλος στην απάντηση που έδωσε στην κοινοβουλευτική ερώτηση E-008720/2011.

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB>.



(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000041/12  
to the Commission  
Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)  
(11 January 2012)**

*Subject:* Funds to improve detention conditions of illegal immigrants in Greece

The German parliament has passed a resolution, upheld by the majority of members of parliament, condemning the detention conditions of illegal immigrants in Greece. According to CSU member Stephan Mayer, Greece received close to EUR 223 million between 2010 and 2012 to improve detention conditions.

Greece basically has no help in dealing with this problem, and yet it has become the target of negative comment.

If this is indeed the amount of aid given to Greece for this particular issue, I would like to ask the Commission:

1. Is this amount enough?
2. Of this amount, how much money was taken up in 2010 and 2011 and what projects was it used for?
3. Does the Greek Government have any proposals for the remainder for which further disbursements have been requested?
4. How much does it think will not be disbursed due to a lack of plans?
5. Is support being given to create a detention centre for incoming illegal immigrants for which the Greek Government has not yet presented a plan?
6. How does the EU intend to help Greece take radical steps to address the problem?

**Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission  
(15 February 2012)**

The Commission is aware of the very difficult conditions in which irregular migrants and asylum-seekers are being detained in Greece, in particular in the Evros region, and is very concerned about the humanitarian situation in these places of detention.

For the period 2010-2012, Greece has benefited from a total allocation of EUR 227 618 450 under the four Funds of the General Programme 'Solidarity and Management of Migration Flows', namely the External Borders Fund, the European Return Fund, the European Refugee Fund and the European Fund for the Integration of third-country nationals. The Greek annual programmes under the four Funds cover a wide range of activities which were described in the Commission reply to parliamentary Question E-10318/2010 <sup>(1)</sup>.

In 2010 and 2011, the Commission approved the respective annual programmes under the four Funds with the total EU co-financing of EUR 137 384 225. For more detailed information on the co-financed projects as well as on the actual execution of the programmes in Greece, the Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its replies to parliamentary questions E-010361/2011 and E-0095/2012.

As regards the improvement of detention conditions and the establishment of screening centers, the Commission would refer the Honourable Member to the Commission reply to parliamentary Question E-008720/2011.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB>.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-000042/12**  
**προς την Επιτροπή**  
**Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)**  
(11 Ιανουαρίου 2012)

**Θέμα:** Παράλογη αντιμετώπιση περιστατικού ξυλοδαρμού από αστυνομικούς από την τουρκική Δικαιοσύνη

Σύμφωνα με την ηλεκτρονική έκδοση της βρετανικής εφημερίδας «Daily Mail», ένα ακόμα περιστατικό ξυλοδαρμού από αστυνομικούς στη Τουρκία προκαλεί την οργή. Η γυναίκα που συνελήφθη με την κατηγορία ότι δεν έφερε μαζί της ταυτότητα, ξυλοκοπήθηκε άγρια από δύο αστυνομικούς, ενώ της είχαν περάσει χειροπέδες και βρισκόταν εντός του αστυνομικού τμήματος Σμύρνης.

Η κατάχρηση εξουσίας από τους κρατικούς λειτουργούς που έχουν καθήκον να επιβάλλουν τη δημόσια τάξη και την ασφάλεια δημιουργεί τρόμο στη τουρκική κοινωνία και δημιουργεί σκέψεις για το αν ο σκοπός του περιστατικού και της κυκλοφορίας του βίντεο ήταν αυτός, φέρνοντας στο μυαλό εικόνες από τη ταινία «Το εξπρές του μεσονυχτίου». Είναι σημαντικό να λεχθεί ότι όλο το περιστατικό κατεγράφη από κάμερα και εδόθη αργότερα στη δημοσιότητα.

Το περιστατικό αποκτά περισσότερο ενδιαφέρον αν σημειωθεί ότι οι δύο αστυνομικοί αντιμετωπίζουν ενδεχόμενη ποινή φυλάκισης 18 μηνών για «πρόκληση τραυματισμού λόγω υπερβάλλουσας δύναμης (excessive force)». Παράλληλα η γυναίκα αντιμετωπίζει ποινή κάθειρξης έως και έξι ετών για «αντίσταση κατά της αρχής και απερίσκεπτη συμπεριφορά».

Το «Ίδρυμα για τα Τουρκικά Ανθρώπινα Δικαιώματα» αναφέρει ότι οι κατηγορίες για βασανισμούς από την αστυνομία έχουν αυξηθεί κατά το τελευταίο έτος.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Εφόσον έχει γνώση του συγκεκριμένου περιστατικού, ποια είναι η στάση της για την αντιμετώπιση της γυναίκας και των δυο αστυνομικών από τη τουρκική Δικαιοσύνη;
2. Θα ληφθεί το περιστατικό υπ' όψιν στην έκθεση προόδου για την Τουρκία και συγκεκριμένα στο κεφάλαιο περί Δικαιοσύνης και Ανθρωπίνων Δικαιωμάτων, εφόσον θεωρεί την αντίδραση της τουρκικής Δικαιοσύνης ασύμβατη με τα ευρωπαϊκά κριτήρια;

**Απάντηση του κ. Füle εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής**  
(21 Φεβρουαρίου 2012)

Η Επιτροπή είναι ενήμερη σχετικά με την υπόθεση στην οποία αναφέρεται το Αξιότιμο Μέλος και παρακολουθεί εκ του σύνεγγυς την αντίδραση των σχετικών δικαστικών αρχών.

Στην έκθεση προόδου για το 2011, η Επιτροπή υπογράμμισε ότι οι προσπάθειες που καταβάλλει η Τουρκία για την αντιμετώπιση την ατιμωρησίας όσον αφορά παραβάσεις ανθρωπίνων δικαιωμάτων δεν ήταν επαρκείς. Στους αστυνομικούς υπαλλήλους που βρέθηκαν ένοχοι για βασανισμό, κακομεταχείριση ή θανατηφόρους πυροβολισμούς επιβλήθηκαν ποινές σύντομης διάρκειας ή ποινές με αναστολή. Οι ποινικές διώξεις για καταγγελίες βασανιστηρίων συχνά πραγματοποιούνται σύμφωνα με διατάξεις του ποινικού κώδικα, επιτρέποντας την επιβολή ελαφρύτερων ποινών ή τη δυνατότητα επιβολής ποινής με αναστολή.

Η Επιτροπή θέτει τακτικά το εν λόγω πολύ σημαντικό θέμα στις τουρκικές αρχές, δεδομένου ότι η καταπολέμηση των βασανιστηρίων και της ατιμωρησίας παραμένει κεντρικό στοιχείο των πολιτικών κριτηρίων που πρέπει να εξακολουθήσει να πληροί η Τουρκία στο πλαίσιο των διαπραγματεύσεων προσχώρησης με την ΕΕ.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000042/12**  
**to the Commission**  
**Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)**  
(11 January 2012)

*Subject:* Unreasonable response by Turkish courts to case of police beating

According to the online edition of the British newspaper *Daily Mail*, yet another case of a police beating in Turkey has caused an outcry. A woman arrested on charges of not carrying an identity card, who had been handcuffed and was being held at Izmir police station, was savagely beaten by two policemen.

The abuse of power by State officials charged with imposing public order and security is terrifying the Turkish public, which is wondering if that was the precise purpose of the incident and of the video circulated, which brings images from the film 'Midnight Express' to mind. It is important to note that the entire incident was recorded on camera and then released.

What makes this incident even more curious is that the two policeman may be facing 18 months in prison for causing injury due to excessive force, while the woman is facing up to six years in prison for 'opposition to the authority and irresponsible conduct'.

The Human Rights Foundation of Turkey reports that charges of police torture have risen over the past year.

Will the Commission answer the following:

1. Inasmuch as it has knowledge of this particular incident, what is its position on the treatment of the woman and the two police officers by the Turkish courts?
2. Will this incident be taken into account in the chapter on justice and human rights in the progress report on Turkey, inasmuch as the response of the Turkish courts is considered incompatible with the Turkish *acquis*?

**Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission**  
(21 February 2012)

The Commission is aware of the case mentioned by the Honourable Member and is following closely the follow-up by the relevant judicial authorities.

The Commission has highlighted in its 2011 Progress Report that efforts by Turkey to fight impunity for human rights violations have not been sufficient. Law enforcement officers found guilty of torture, ill-treatment or fatal shootings received short or suspended sentences. Prosecutions of allegations of torture are often conducted under penal code provisions allowing lighter sentences or the possibility of imposing a suspended sentence.

The Commission regularly brings up this very important issue with the Turkish authorities, as the fight against torture and impunity remains a key aspect of the political criteria which Turkey needs to continue to fulfil in the framework of its accession negotiations with the EU.

---

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-000043/12**  
**προς την Επιτροπή**  
**Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)**  
(11 Ιανουαρίου 2012)

**Θέμα:** Φόβοι των αμερικανικών δυνάμεων που σταθμεύουν στην Ευρώπη

Ο αρχηγός των στρατιωτικών επιτελείων των ΗΠΑ εξέφρασε «φόβους για ξέσπασμα ακόμα και εμφυλιοπολεμικών συγκρούσεων στην Ευρώπη», εάν εξακολουθήσει να χειροτερεύει η οικονομική κρίση στην ευρωζώνη. Η κρίση αυτή θα μπορούσε να θέσει σε κίνδυνο ακόμα και την εξέλιξη κορυφαίων προγραμμάτων ανάπτυξης οπλικών συστημάτων, επισήμανε, όπως το αεροσκάφος F-35 JSF (Joint Strike Fighter), στο οποίο οι ΗΠΑ έχουν Ευρωπαίους συνεταιρούς όπως η Βρετανία και την Ιταλία.

Κατά την άποψή του, οι συγκρούσεις θα είχαν συνέπειες και για την ίδια την παρουσία των αμερικανικών στρατευμάτων στο ευρωπαϊκό έδαφος, εννώντας τους πάνω από 80 000 Αμερικανούς στρατιωτικούς και 20 000 πολιτικούς υπαλλήλους που ζουν και εργάζονται στις βάσεις των ΗΠΑ στην Ευρώπη, οι περισσότεροι στη Γερμανία.

Τέτοιες δηλώσεις μπορούν να είναι είτε αποτέλεσμα ελλιπέστατης γνώσης της κατάστασης στην ΕΕ, είτε να έχουν άλλους σκοπούς. Σε κάθε περίπτωση ενοχλούν διότι προσβάλλουν την ωριμότητα των ευρωπαϊκών κρατών.

Λαμβάνοντας υπ' όψιν το ρόλο που μπορεί να έχει η ύπαρξη ξένων στρατευμάτων στην Ευρώπη, ο οποίος έχει εκλείψει πριν από τουλάχιστον δυο δεκαετίες, η δήλωση για απειλή των αμερικανών στρατιωτικών από το ενδεχόμενο εμφυλιοπολεμικό κλίμα στην Ευρώπη φαίνεται κάπως ειρωνική.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

Εφόσον θεωρείται ότι δεν υπάρχει κίνδυνος εμφυλίων αναταράξεων και κοινωνικών εκρήξεων στο έδαφος της ΕΕ, σε ποιές ενέργειες προέβη προκειμένου να καθησυχάσει την διεθνή κοινή γνώμη από τις ανωτέρω διατυπώσεις της στρατιωτικής ηγεσίας των ΗΠΑ;

**Απάντηση της Ύπατης Εκπροσώπου/Αντιπροέδρου κας Ashton εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής**  
(9 Μαρτίου 2012)

Η ΥΕ/ΑΠ δεν είναι ενήμερη όσον αφορά τέτοιες δηλώσεις που διατύπωσε επίσημα ο αρχηγός των στρατιωτικών επιτελείων των ΗΠΑ. Η ΕΕ βρίσκεται σε συνεχή επαφή με την κυβέρνηση των ΗΠΑ, σε όλες τις βαθμίδες, για διάφορα θέματα, συμπεριλαμβανομένων και των εξελίξεων στην ευρωζώνη. Επιπλέον, μέσω της αντιπροσωπείας της στην Ουάσινγκτον, η ΕΕ προβαίνει σε ενέργειες για την εξήγηση των πολιτικών της ΕΕ που εφαρμόζονται για την αντιμετώπιση των δυσκολιών στην ευρωζώνη και των επιπτώσεών τους στο κοινό και τους πολιτικούς ιδύνοντες των ΗΠΑ.

Η κατάσταση στην ευρωζώνη αποτέλεσε ένα από τα κύρια θέματα της τελευταίας συνόδου κορυφής ΕΕ/ΗΠΑ στις 28 Νοεμβρίου 2011 στην Ουάσινγκτον, και της συνάντησης μεταξύ των νομοθετικών σωμάτων της ΕΕ και των ΗΠΑ (Διατλαντικός Διάλογος των Νομοθετών) στις 2-4 Δεκεμβρίου 2011 στο Jacksonville της Φλόριντα. Ο επικεφαλής της αντιπροσωπείας της ΕΕ στις ΗΠΑ, Joao Vale de Almeida, παραχώρησε σειρά συνεντεύξεων και εκφώνησε σειρά ομιλιών σχετικά με αυτό το θέμα, στις ΗΠΑ (για τον πλήρη κατάλογο: <http://www.eurunion.org/eu/Ambassadors-Corner/Select-Speeches-Video-and-Media-Appearances-of-Ambassador-Joao-Vale-de-Almeida.html>).

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000043/12  
to the Commission  
Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)  
(11 January 2012)**

*Subject:* Fears of US forces stationed in Europe

The US military command has expressed fears that civil war could break out Europe if the economic crisis in the euro area continues. This crisis might even jeopardise important plans to develop weapons systems, such as the F-35 joint strike fighter aircraft being developed by the US in partnership with Britain and Italy.

In its opinion, conflict would also have consequences for the very presence of US troops on European soil, meaning over 80 000 US troops and 20 000 civil servants living and working on US bases in Europe, mostly in Germany.

Such statements may either be the result of very poor knowledge of the situation in the EU or may serve other purposes. In any event, they are worrisome, because they challenge the maturity of the EU Member States.

Bearing in mind the role that may be played by foreign troops in Europe, which vanished at least two decades ago, the declaration that US troops are at risk from a climate of civil war in Europe appears to be somewhat ironic.

Will the Commission answer the following:

Inasmuch as it considers that there is no risk of civil unrest and social outbreaks on EU territory, what action has it taken to reassure international public opinion following the above statements by the US military command?

**Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission  
(9 March 2012)**

The HR/VP is not aware of any such statements made officially by the United States (US) military command. The EU is in constant contact, on all levels, with the US administration on a range of issues including developments in the Eurozone. Furthermore, via its Delegation in Washington, the EU is active in explaining EU policies to resolve the difficulties in the Eurozone and their implications for the US public and policymakers.

The situation in the Eurozone was one of the main subjects of the last EU-US Summit on 28 November 2011 in Washington, and the meeting between EU and US legislators (Transatlantic Legislators' Dialogue) on 2-4 December 2011 in Jacksonville, Florida. The Head of the EU Delegation to the US, Joao Vale de Almeida, has also held a series of interviews and speeches in the US on this subject (for complete list: <http://www.eurunion.org/eu/Ambassadors-Corner/Select-Speeches-Video-and-Media-Appearances-of-Ambassador-Joao-Vale-de-Almeida.html>).

---

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-000044/12**  
**προς την Επιτροπή**  
**Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)**  
(11 Ιανουαρίου 2012)

**Θέμα:** Τεράστια ανθρωπιστική κρίση στη Κεντροαφρικανική Δημοκρατία

Σύμφωνα με τις τελευταίες εκδόσεις της οργάνωσης «Γιατροί Χωρίς Σύνορα», ένα τεράστιο ανθρωπιστικό δράμα εκτυλίσσεται στην Κεντροαφρικανική Δημοκρατία, με τα ποσοστά θνησιμότητας σε κάποιες περιοχές να ξεπερνούν κατά τρεις φορές το όριο μιας ανθρωπιστικής κρίσης. Επίσης, αναφέρεται ότι η ιατρική βοήθεια που παρέχεται σήμερα δεν μπορεί να καλύψει την κλίμακα των ιατρικών αναγκών. Η τελευταία έκθεση της οργάνωσης υποδεικνύει την ανάγκη να εμπλακούν περισσότεροι φορείς, αναπτύσσοντας ευρύτερες ιατρικές επιχειρήσεις που να καλύπτουν περισσότερο πληθυσμό.

Το σύστημα υγείας της χώρας σπαράσσεται από μακρόχρονη πολιτική και στρατιωτική αστάθεια, τεράστια οργανωτικά προβλήματα και έλλειψη ασφάλειας στις βόρειες και ανατολικές περιοχές της χώρας. Όλοι αυτοί οι παράγοντες έχουν καταστροφικές συνέπειες στην υγεία του πληθυσμού και δείχνουν, σε μεγάλο βαθμό, τα αίτια των εξαιρετικά υψηλών ποσοστών θνησιμότητας. Ενδεικτικά αναφέρεται ότι στην κεντροαφρικανική πόλη Καρνόντ τα επίπεδα θνησιμότητας ξεπερνούν κατά τρεις φορές τα ποσοστά της θνησιμότητας στον καταυλισμό Νταντάμπ της Κένυας, που φιλοξενεί Σομαλούς πρόσφυγες υπό άθλιες συνθήκες διαβίωσης. Η άμεση ανθρωπιστική βοήθεια στη χώρα είναι απαραίτητη.

Στη πρώην γαλλική αποικία, όπου το ημερήσιο κατά κεφαλήν ΑΕΠ δεν υπερβαίνει τα δυο δολάρια, το 11 % του πληθυσμού είναι, σύμφωνα με τα Ηνωμένα Έθνη, φορείς του ιού HIV και η βοήθεια είναι απαραίτητη.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Σε ποιές κινήσεις για τη στήριξη της Κεντροαφρικανικής Δημοκρατίας έχει προβεί για το 2011 και ειδικά για την αντιμετώπιση της ανθρωπιστικής κρίσης και σε ποιές κινήσεις σχεδιάζει να προβεί για το 2012;
2. Λαμβάνοντας υπ' όψιν ότι ο πληθυσμός της χώρας ασχολείται κυρίως με τον πρωτογενή τομέα, θα μπορούσε να παρασχεθεί τεχνολογία για τη μεγιστοποίηση της παραγωγής;
3. Κρίνει ότι η χώρα παρέχει ευκαιρίες για επενδύσεις, οι οποίες μπορεί να αξιοποιηθούν με τη σταθεροποίηση της πολιτικής κατάστασης, εις τρόπον ώστε να υπάρχουν οφέλη για τους πολίτες της χώρας και για τους επενδυτές;

**Απάντηση του κ. Piebalgs εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής**  
(2 Μαρτίου 2012)

Δεκαετίες πολιτικής αβεβαιότητας έχουν καταστρέψει σε μεγάλο βαθμό την οικονομία και τις υποδομές της Κεντροαφρικανικής Δημοκρατίας. Το συνολικό ανθρωπιστικό πλαίσιο είναι πολύπλοκο και, όπως εξηγούν οι «Γιατροί Χωρίς Σύνορα» στην έκθεσή τους για την Κεντροαφρικανική Δημοκρατία, το σύστημα υγείας πάσχει από προσωπικό χαμηλής εξειδίκευσης και από περιορισμένες κυβερνητικές επενδύσεις.

Η ΕΕ χρησιμοποίησε 9,6 εκατ. ευρώ το 2011 για ανθρωπιστική βοήθεια σε 255 000 άτομα, συμπεριλαμβανομένων 50 000 εκτοπισθέντων ατόμων. Περίπου 30 % αυτού του ποσού διατέθηκε για έργα στον τομέα της υγείας και για παροχή ελεύθερων ιατρικών υπηρεσιών από ανθρωπιστικούς φορείς, πράγμα που οδήγησε σε δείκτες του τομέα της υγείας χαμηλότερους από τα όρια έκτακτης ανάγκης στις υπό ενίσχυση περιφέρειες. Στην περαιτέρω στήριξη περιλαμβάνεται το πόσιμο νερό, οι εγκαταστάσεις αποχέτευσης, η προστασία, και η παροχή ειδών εκτός τροφίμων. Στο πλαίσιο του 10ου Ευρωπαϊκού Ταμείου Ανάπτυξης δεσμεύθηκαν μέχρι τώρα 149 εκατ. ευρώ, κυρίως για διακυβέρνηση (διαχείριση των δημόσιων οικονομικών, κράτος δικαίου, εκλογές), πόλους ανάπτυξης και υποδομές (πρόσβαση σε απομακρυσμένες περιοχές). Η γενική δημοσιονομική στήριξη ανεστάλη το 2011 λόγω της μη ικανοποιητικής προόδου όσον αφορά τα κριτήρια επιλεξιμότητας.

Η ΕΕ, μέσω της γραμμής προϋπολογισμού για τον επισιτισμό, χρηματοδοτεί σήμερα, από κοινού με τον FAO, δύο έργα (11 εκατ. ευρώ) και έξι έργα από κοινού με ΜΚΟ (4,7 εκατ. ευρώ). Τα εν λόγω έργα θα αυξήσουν την παραγωγικότητα στον γεωργικό τομέα μέσω της χορήγησης εξοπλισμού, σπόρων και επαγγελματικής κατάρτισης σε μικροκτηματίες. Επιπλέον, η ΕΕ χρηματοδοτεί ένα ευρύτερο πρόγραμμα πόλων ανάπτυξης (ETA 48 εκατ. ευρώ) που καλύπτει 30 % του πληθυσμού και το οποίο θα ενισχύσει την τοπική οικονομική υποδομή και θα συμβάλει στη βελτίωση της παραγωγικότητας όλων των οικονομικών τομέων.

Η στήριξη της ΕΕ στη χρηστή διακυβέρνηση και στην ανάπτυξη θα δημιουργήσει ένα περισσότερο ευνοϊκό περιβάλλον για οικονομικές επενδύσεις.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000044/12**  
**to the Commission**  
**Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)**  
(11 January 2012)

*Subject:* Massive humanitarian crisis in the Central African Republic

According to recent reports by *Médicins sans Frontières*, a massive humanitarian disaster is unfolding in the Central African Republic, with mortality rates in certain areas over three times the limits for humanitarian crisis. They also report that the medical assistance currently being provided is well below the scale of the medical assistance needed. The organisation's most recent report recommends that more agencies become involved, by developing broader medical operations catering for more people.

The health system in the country is crumbling under long-term political and military instability, massive organisational problems and a lack of security in the northern and eastern areas of the country. All these factors are having catastrophic consequences on the health of the population and are, to a large extent, the cause of the exceptionally high mortality rates. For example, it is reported that in the central African town of Carnot, mortality rates are three times higher than the mortality rate in Dadab camp in Kenya, where Somali refugees are living in abominable conditions. The country needs immediate humanitarian aid.

According to the United Nations, 11 % of the population in the former French colony, where per capita GDP is less than two dollars, are HIV positive and aid is needed.

Will the Commission answer the following:

1. What steps did it take to support the Central African Republic in 2011, especially to address the humanitarian crisis, and what steps is it planning to take in 2012?
2. Bearing in mind that the population of this country is employed mainly in the primary sector, could expertise be generated to maximise production?
3. Does it consider that the country provides opportunity for investment that could be developed by stabilising the political situation, so as to benefit both the citizens of that country and investors?

**Answer given by Mr Piebalgs on behalf of the Commission**  
(2 March 2012)

Decades of political instability have largely destroyed the Central African Republic's (CAR) economy and infrastructure. The overall humanitarian context is complex and, as explained by *Médecins Sans Frontières* in its report on CAR, the health system suffers from poorly qualified staff and limited government investment.

The EU provided EUR 9.6 million in 2011 in humanitarian assistance to 255 000 people including 50 000 displaced persons. Around 30 % of this amount was allocated to health projects and the delivery of free medical services by humanitarian actors, which resulted in health indicators staying below the emergency thresholds in the assisted regions. Other support included drinking water, sanitation facilities, protection, and provision of non-food items. Under the 10th European Development Fund, EUR 149 million has been committed so far, mainly for governance (public financial management, rule of law, elections), development hubs and infrastructure (access to remote areas). General budget support was suspended in 2011 due to unsatisfactory progress on eligibility criteria.

The EU, through its Food budget line, currently funds two projects with the FAO (EUR 11 million) and six projects with NGOs (EUR 4.7 million). These projects will increase productivity in the agricultural sector through the provision of equipment, seeds and training for smallholder farmers. In addition, the EU is funding a wider-reaching development hubs programme (EDF EUR 48 million) covering 30 % of the population which will reinforce local economic infrastructure and so contribute to improved productivity in all economic sectors.

The EU's support to good governance and development should generate a more favourable environment for economic investment.



(Ελληνική έκδοση)

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-000045/12**  
**προς την Επιτροπή**  
**Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)**  
(11 Ιανουαρίου 2012)

**Θέμα:** Υστατη στήριξη στον πετρελαιοαγωγό Μπουργκάς-Αλεξανδρούπολη

Όπως έκανε γνωστό την προηγούμενη εβδομάδα το ρωσικό Υπουργείο Εξωτερικών, η βουλγαρική κυβέρνηση αποσύρεται από το σχέδιο για την υλοποίηση του πετρελαιοαγωγού Μπουργκάς-Αλεξανδρούπολη, διότι δεν μπορεί να αντεπεξέλθει στις οικονομικές υποχρεώσεις που ανέλαβε με την τριμερή συμφωνία του 2007 με την Ελλάδα και τη Ρωσία.

Εφόσον το βουλγαρικό υπουργείο Περιβάλλοντος έκρινε ότι δεν υπάρχει περιβαλλοντικός κίνδυνος, πρέπει να στηριχθεί η Βουλγαρία για να ξεπεράσει τους φόβους της.

Θεωρώντας ότι αυτό το σχέδιο είναι τεράστιας σημασίας για την προμήθεια της Ευρώπης με πετρέλαιο, τη στιγμή που υπάρχουν φόβοι για προβλήματα στην προμήθεια από το Ιράν αλλά και άλλα κράτη, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Θεωρεί το έργο σημαντικό για τη κάλυψη των αναγκών της ΕΕ;
2. Σχεδιάζει να παρέμβει για τη στήριξη του έργου και, αν ναι, με ποιους τρόπους;
3. Εφόσον κρίνει ότι η Βουλγαρία μπορεί να αντιμετωπίσει βραχυπρόθεσμα προβλήματα χρηματοδότησης του έργου της, μπορεί να εξασφαλιστεί ευρωπαϊκή δανειακή κάλυψη, λαμβάνοντας υπόψη ότι τα μακροπρόθεσμα κέρδη θα υπερκαλύψουν το κόστος;

**Απάντηση του κ. Oettinger εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής**  
(9 Φεβρουαρίου 2012)

Η Επιτροπή παραπέμπει το Αξιότιμο Μέλος του Κοινοβουλίου στην απάντηση στη γραπτή ερώτηση E-5314/10 της κας Τζαβέλα (<sup>1</sup>). Πέραν όμως του σωληναγωγού Μπουργκάς-Αλεξανδρούπολη, υπάρχουν και άλλα ανάλογα σχέδια υπό εξέταση, ουσιαστικά δε εναπόκειται στις οικείες εταιρείες και χώρες να αποφασίσουν ποιές από τις πολλές πιθανές οδεύσεις θα μπορούσαν και θα πρέπει να επιλεγούν, όπως και να συμφωνήσουν σχετικά με τις προϋποθέσεις.

Το ερώτημα εάν θα μπορούσε να διατεθεί ένα ευρωπαϊκό δάνειο για το έργο αυτό θα πρέπει να απευθυνθεί στην Ευρωπαϊκή Τράπεζα Επενδύσεων. Η τράπεζα είναι εξουσιοδοτημένη να παρέχει δάνεια για τη χρηματοδότηση των προτεραιοτήτων της ευρωπαϊκής υποδομής και τελικώς είναι καθήκον της να εκτιμήσει με την επιβαλλόμενη δέουσα επιμέλεια εάν το έργο θα μπορούσε να λάβει τέτοιο δάνειο.

(<sup>1</sup>) <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/>.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000045/12**  
**to the Commission**  
**Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)**  
(11 January 2012)

*Subject:* Last-ditch support for Burgas-Alexandroupoli oil pipeline

As the Russian Ministry of Foreign Affairs announced last week, the Bulgarian government is withdrawing from the plan to implement the Burgas-Alexandroupoli oil pipeline, because it cannot honour the financial commitments undertaken in the 2007 tripartite agreement with Greece and Russia.

As the Bulgarian Ministry of Environmental Affairs found that there is no environmental risk, Bulgaria needs support in overcoming its fears.

Given that this plan is of huge importance to European oil supplies, at a time when there are fears over supplies from Iran and other states, I would like to ask the Commission:

1. Does it consider this plan to be important in meeting EU demand?
2. Does it plan to intervene to support the plan and, if so, how?
3. If Bulgaria can deal with short-term financing problems, could a European loan be granted, bearing in mind that the long-term profits will more than cover the cost?

**Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission**  
(9 February 2012)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to the answer to Written Question E-5314/10 by Mr Tzavela <sup>(1)</sup>. Besides Burgas-Alexandroupolis there are, however, other pipeline projects under consideration and it is essentially up to the companies and countries concerned to consider which of the many possible routes could and should be chosen and to agree on conditions.

The question if a European loan could be made available to this project should be addressed to the European Investment Bank. The bank is mandated to provide loan financing to European infrastructure priorities and it would ultimately be its task to carry out the due diligence needed to assess if this project could get such loan.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/>.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-000046/12**  
**προς την Επιτροπή**  
**Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)**  
(11 Ιανουαρίου 2012)

**Θέμα:** Αύξηση των τιμών από τις ελληνικές αλυσίδες σούπερ μάρκετ

Σύμφωνα με το Κέντρο Προστασίας Καταναλωτών ([www.kepka.org](http://www.kepka.org)), μια ανεξάρτητη, μη κερδοσκοπική, μη πολιτική ένωση, που είναι μέλος της Consumers' International (CI) και της Ευρωπαϊκής Οργάνωσης Καταναλωτών (BEUC), στην Ελλάδα παρατηρείται το εξής παράλογο:

Παρά τις διαρκείς μειώσεις εισοδήματος που έχουν υποστεί οι Έλληνες δημόσιοι και ιδιωτικοί υπάλληλοι για την αντιμετώπιση της κρίσης, σημειώνεται μια σημαντική πραγματική αύξηση των τιμών, όπως φαίνεται από την έρευνα για το κόστος του «χριστουγεννιάτικου τραπέζιου» για τη μέση οικογένεια, το οποίο θα κοστίσει φέτος 0,89 % έως 4,31 % ακριβότερα σε σχέση με πέρυσι.

Ο συγκεκριμένος δείκτης είναι αντιπροσωπευτικός και περιλαμβάνει 27 ευρέως καταναλισκόμενα προϊόντα. Με αυτόν τον τρόπο γίνεται σαφές ότι στο βάρος της μείωσης των μισθών δε συμμετέχουν οι αλυσίδες σούπερ μάρκετ, οι οποίες ασκούν επιπλέον πίεση στην ελληνική κοινωνία.

Πρέπει να σημειωθεί ότι σύμφωνα με δημοσίευμα της εφημερίδας Καθημερινής (18/12), παρατηρούνται μεγάλες αυξήσεις στα προϊόντα ιδιωτικής ετικέτας, που φθάνουν μέχρι και το 32 % μέσα σε διάστημα ενός έτους από τις αλυσίδες σούπερ μάρκετ. Παράλληλα, τα αντίστοιχα επώνυμα προϊόντα πωλούνται σε χαμηλότερες ή ίδιες τιμές σε σχέση με πέρυσι.

Καθώς παρατηρεί τις απώλειες στα κέρδη που υφίσταται την τελευταία διετία, λόγω της συρρίκνωσης της κατανάλωσης και εκμεταλλευόμενο τη στροφή των καταναλωτών στα προϊόντα ιδιωτικής ετικέτας, το οργανωμένο λιανεμπόριο επιχειρεί, μέσα από τις ευρείες ανατιμήσεις στα δικά του σήματα, να αντισταθμίσει τις απώλειες του με ανεύθυνο τρόπο για την ελληνική κοινωνία.

Απέναντι στη λογική και τις προσπάθειες για, αν μη τι άλλο, σταθεροποίηση των τιμών, η αύξησή τους στην Ελλάδα είναι γεγονός αλλά επιβάλλεται να αντιμετωπιστεί μεσοπρόθεσμα.

Γι' αυτό το λόγο, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Με ποιούς τρόπους μπορεί και σκοπεύει να παρέμβει για να πετύχει μείωση ή τουλάχιστον σταθεροποίηση των τιμών των προϊόντων ευρείας κατανάλωσης, για το 2012;
2. Εφόσον διαπιστώνεται η δυσκολία να μπουν στην αγορά νέοι παίκτες, σε ποιές διαπιστώσεις καταλήγουν οι έρευνες για την ενδεχόμενη ύπαρξη καρτέλ από τις συγκεκριμένες αλυσίδες στην Ελλάδα;

**Απάντηση του κ. Dalli εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής**  
(14 Φεβρουαρίου 2012)

Πρωταρχικός στόχος του Ευρωπαϊκού Συστήματος Κεντρικών Τραπεζών είναι η διατήρηση της σταθερότητας των τιμών (άρθρο 127 παράγραφος 1 της Συνθήκης για τη λειτουργία της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης). Η Επιτροπή υποστηρίζει πλήρως τα μέτρα που ελήφθησαν από το Ευρωπαϊκό Σύστημα Κεντρικών Τραπεζών και από την Ευρωπαϊκή Κεντρική Τράπεζα για την επίτευξη αυτού του στόχου.

Οι αγορές λιανικής τείνουν να είναι εθνικές, πράγμα που σημαίνει ότι οι εθνικές αρχές ανταγωνισμού είναι οι πλέον κατάλληλες για την παρακολούθηση και τη διερεύνηση τυχόν παράβασης των κανόνων του ανταγωνισμού που επηρεάζει τις αγορές στην αντίστοιχη εθνική επικράτεια τους. Η Επιτροπή γνωρίζει ότι η ελληνική Επιτροπή Ανταγωνισμού έλαβε πολλά μέτρα επιβολής όσον αφορά τις αγορές τροφίμων και λιανικού εμπορίου. Σχετικά με τα σουπερμάρκετ, το 2005 η ελληνική Επιτροπή Ανταγωνισμού επέβαλε στον ΣΕΣΜΕ και σε πολλά μέλη του πρόστιμα, επειδή συμμετείχαν σε οριζόντιες συμφωνίες· το 2008 στη Dia Hellas, επειδή καθόριζε τις λιανικές τιμές των δικαιοδόχων της· και το 2010 στην εταιρεία Carrefour, λόγω καθορισμού των τιμών μεταπώλησης, δηλαδή επιβολής των τιμών λιανικής καθώς και περιορισμού των διασταυρούμενων πωλήσεων μεταξύ των διανομέων — δικαιοδόχων. Η ελληνική Επιτροπή Ανταγωνισμού παρακολουθεί επίσης τις αγορές τροφίμων και λιανικού εμπορίου, δεδομένου ότι είναι αποφασισμένη να εξασφαλίσει αποτελεσματικό ανταγωνισμό στον εν λόγω τομέα. Τον Μάιο του 2011 η Επιτροπή Ανταγωνισμού πραγματοποίησε, μεταξύ άλλων, μια δημόσια διαβούλευση σχετικά με το θέμα αυτό.

Η Επιτροπή επιθυμεί, επίσης, να επισημάνει ότι δεν έλαβε καμία επίσημη καταγγελία για ενδεχόμενη παράβαση των κανόνων ανταγωνισμού στην αγορά λιανικού εμπορίου στην Ελλάδα. Μπορούμε, ωστόσο, να διαβεβαιώσουμε τον κ. βουλευτή ότι η Επιτροπή θα εξετάσει διεξοδικά όλες τις συγκεκριμένες πληροφορίες που λαμβάνει και από τις οποίες προκύπτει ότι i) οι εν λόγω αυξήσεις τιμών είναι το αποτέλεσμα παραβάσεων των κανόνων ανταγωνισμού ή ii) υπάρχουν άλλες πιθανές πρακτικές παράβασης των κανόνων ανταγωνισμού στον τομέα λιανικού εμπορίου.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000046/12  
to the Commission**

**Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)**

(11 January 2012)

*Subject:* Price increases by Greek supermarket chains

According to the Consumer Protection Centre ([www.kepka.org](http://www.kepka.org)), an independent, not-for-profit, non-political association, which is a member of Consumers' International (CI) and the European Consumers' Organisation (BEUC), the following inconsistency has been observed in Greece:

Despite constant pay cuts in the public and private sectors in Greece in order to deal with the crisis, there has been a significant increase in real prices: according to a survey, Christmas dinner for the average family cost between 0.89 % and 4.31 % more than last year.

This particular index is a representative index covering a basket of 27 products. Clearly, supermarket chains are not shouldering their share of the burden from wage cuts and are exerting additional pressure on Greek society.

According to an article in the newspaper *Kathimerini* on 18 December, there have been big increases in supermarket chains over the past year in own-label goods, which now account for 32 %. At the same time, branded products are being sold at lower or the same prices as last year.

Given the reduction in profits over the last two years, due to the fall in consumption, the organised retail trade is taking advantage of the fact that consumers are turning to own-label products and is repricing its own brands across the board, in a bid to offset its losses, in what is very irresponsible conduct towards Greek society.

In light of plans and efforts being made to at least stabilise prices, price increases in Greece are a fact that needs to be addressed in the medium term.

I would therefore like to ask the Commission:

1. How can and does it intend to intervene to achieve price reductions or, at the very least, stable prices for basic consumer products in 2012?
2. Inasmuch as it has been established that new players are finding it difficult to penetrate the market, have investigations concluded that there are cartels between certain chains in Greece?

**Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission**

(14 February 2012)

Maintaining price stability is the primary objective of the European System of Central Banks (Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, Article 127.1). The Commission fully supports the measures taken by the European System of Central Banks and by the European Central Bank to achieve this objective.

Retail markets tend to be national, which means that National Competition Authorities ('NCAs') are particularly well placed to monitor and investigate any anticompetitive behaviour affecting these markets in their respective national territories. The Commission is aware of several enforcement actions taken by the Greek NCA in respect of food and retail markets. Regarding supermarkets, the Greek NCA imposed fines in 2005 on Sesme and several of its members for having participated in horizontal agreements; on Dia Hellas in 2008 for having engaged in vertical restrictions; and on Carrefour in 2010, for having engaged in vertical restrictions, namely imposing retail prices as well as restricting cross-supplies. The Greek NCA has also monitored food and retail markets which is evidence of its determination to ensure effective competition in the sector. It has notably undertaken a public consultation regarding this subject in May 2011.

The Commission further wishes to point out that it has not received any formal complaint regarding potential competition infringements in the Greek retail market. The Honourable Member may however be assured that the Commission would examine closely any concrete information provided which indicates that (i) the price increases in question are the result of anti-competitive behaviour or (ii) there are other potentially anti-competitive practices in the retail sector.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-000047/12**  
**προς την Επιτροπή (Αντιπρόεδρος/Υπατη Εκπρόσωπος)**  
**Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)**  
(18 Ιανουαρίου 2012)

Θέμα: VP/HR — Αποτέλεσμα αιγυπτιακών εκλογών

Στις εκλογές που διεξήχθησαν στα τέλη του περασμένου Νοεμβρίου στην Αίγυπτο, τα ισλαμικά κόμματα συγκέντρωσαν περίπου τα 2/3 των έγκυρων ψήφων. Με το κόμμα των «Αδελφών Μουσουλμάνων» να αναδεικνύεται κυρίαρχο και τους Σαλαφιστές συμπληρωματική δύναμη, το νέο Σύνταγμα της χώρας δεν αναμένεται ιδιαίτερος φιλελεύθερο.

Ίσως, εφόσον υπάρχουν πιέσεις για ομοφωνία των κυρίαρχων δυνάμεων στη σύνταξη του κειμένου, μπορούμε να ελπίζουμε σε μια Αίγυπτο, που θα βρίσκεται εγγύτερα στις δημοκρατικές αξίες.

Σε διαφορετική περίπτωση, εκφράζονται φόβοι για τη θέση των Γυναικών, των Χριστιανών Κοπτών και όσων δεν ευθυγραμμίζονται με τις επιταγές του Κορανίου.

Επίσης, ο κίνδυνος για την ειρήνη στη Μέση Ανατολή θα είναι μεγάλος σε περίπτωση που καταγγελθεί μονομερώς η συνθήκη ειρήνης του 1979.

Ερωτάται η Αντιπρόεδρος της Επιτροπής:

1. Υπάρχει σχέδιο κοινής δράσης με τις ΗΠΑ για παρέμβαση στην Αίγυπτο, ώστε το Σύνταγμα να ευθυγραμμιστεί, στο μέτρο του εφικτού, με τα δυτικά συνταγματικά πρότυπα;
2. Σε ποιές κινήσεις σκοπεύει να προβεί για να
  - α) υπάρχει συνεργασία όλων των πολιτικών δυνάμεων στη σύνταξη του νέου Συντάγματος;
  - β) εξασφαλίσει την αποφυγή μονομερούς καταγγελίας της συνθήκης ειρήνης με το Ισραήλ;

**Απάντηση της Υπατης Εκπροσώπου/Αντιπροέδρου Ashton εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής**  
(10 Απριλίου 2012)

Δεν υπάρχει κοινό σχέδιο δράσης ΕΕ/ΗΠΑ για παρέμβαση στον σχεδιασμό του μελλοντικού αιγυπτιακού συντάγματος. Η θέσπιση νέου συντάγματος αποτελεί εσωτερική υπόθεση της Αιγύπτου. Ωστόσο, η ΕΕ ελπίζει ότι οι διατάξεις του νέου συντάγματος θα διασφαλίσουν την ισότητα και την πλήρη συμμετοχή όλων των δυνάμεων της αιγυπτιακής κοινωνίας, θα θέσουν τον στρατό και την αστυνομία υπό τον έλεγχο των πολιτικών αρχών και θα εγγυηθούν την ανεξαρτησία του δικαστικού σώματος.

Όσον αφορά τη συνθήκη ειρήνης με το Ισραήλ, η ειρήνη και η σταθερότητα ολόκληρης της περιοχής αποτελούν στρατηγικό στόχο για την ΕΕ, και αυτή δεν πρέπει να απειληθεί ούτε να εξασθενήσει με κανέναν τρόπο. Το Ανώτατο Συμβούλιο των Ενόπλων Δυνάμεων έχει αναλάβει τη δέσμευση να παραμείνουν σε ισχύ όλες οι διεθνείς συμφωνίες που είχαν συναφθεί προηγουμένως, μεταξύ των οποίων και η συνθήκη ειρήνης που υπεγράφη μεταξύ Αιγύπτου και Ισραήλ. Θα συνεχίσουμε να προτρέπουμε τις νέες δημοκρατικά εκλεγμένες αρχές να τηρήσουν αυτές τις αρχές.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000047/12**  
**to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)**  
**Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)**  
(18 January 2012)

*Subject:* VP/HR — Outcome of Egyptian elections

Islamic parties won approximately 2/3 of valid votes cast in the elections held in Egypt at the end of November last year. With the Muslim Brotherhood party winning the biggest majority, followed by the Salafists, the new constitution for the country is not expected to be especially liberal.

Perhaps with pressure for unanimity between the ruling forces in the preparation of the text, we can hope for an Egypt closer to democratic values.

Otherwise, fears are being expressed about the position of women, Coptic Christians and anyone who does not obey the commands of the Koran.

Also, peace in the Middle East will be in greater danger if the 1979 Peace Treaty is terminated unilaterally.

I would like to ask Baroness Ashton:

1. Is there a joint action plan with the US to intervene in Egypt, in order to ensure, if at all feasible, that the constitution is in keeping with western constitutional standards?
2. What action does she intend to take to:
  - (a) foster cooperation between all the political forces in the preparation of the new constitution?
  - (b) ensure that the Peace Treaty with Israel is not terminated unilaterally?

**Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission**  
(10 April 2012)

There is no joint EU/US action plan to intervene on the drafting of the future Egyptian constitution. The adoption of a new constitution is an Egyptian internal affair. However, the EU hopes that the provisions of the new Constitution will ensure the equality and full participation of all the constituents of the Egyptian society, will put the army and the police under the control of civilian authorities and will guarantee the independence of the judiciary.

As regards the Peace Treaty with Israel, peace and stability of the whole region is a strategic objective for the EU. It must not be threatened or weakened in any way. The Supreme Council of the Armed Forces has guaranteed that all international agreements previously concluded shall remain valid, including the Peace Treaty signed between Egypt and Israel. We will continue to urge the new democratically elected authorities to adhere to these principles.

---

(Versão portuguesa)

**Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-000049/12**

**à Comissão**

**João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)**

(12 de janeiro de 2012)

*Assunto:* Preços do leite praticados pela grande distribuição em Portugal

A Associação Nacional de Produtores de Leite e Carne (APLC) denunciou publicamente, no passado dia 2 de janeiro, que um grupo português da grande distribuição (Continente/SONAE) desencadeou uma campanha de promoção com a venda de leite «ao preço simbólico de 13 cênt./litro». A campanha estende-se a outros produtos vendidos por este mesmo grupo. A batata francesa, por exemplo, está a ser vendida a 16,5 cênt./kg. Esta situação configura, manifestamente, uma venda a preços abaixo dos custos de produção.

São conhecidas as graves dificuldades que o setor agrícola e, em especial, o setor leiteiro atravessam em Portugal, com milhares de explorações a falirem e com muitas outras em grandes dificuldades, mesmo recebendo muito acima do preço a que esta grande superfície vende agora ao consumidor final. Neste caso concreto, a suspeita de que este leite foi importado a preços de «saldo», num quadro de dumping, levou a APLC a anunciar a apresentação de uma queixa à Autoridade da Concorrência e à Comissão Europeia.

Há muito que a situação dos produtores de leite nacionais se vem agravando — o que motivou já perguntas anteriores à Comissão, seja sobre o «encharcamento» do mercado português com leite importado, seja sobre a possibilidade de instauração de um regime de quotas de comercialização de produção nacional nos países alvo dos programas ditos de assistência financeira. Lamentavelmente, as respostas dadas pela Comissão, assim como as medidas que adotou até à data, em nada contribuíram para alterar o quadro atual, muito preocupante, bem pelo contrário.

Em face do exposto, solicito à Comissão que me informe sobre o seguinte:

1. Que informações tem sobre esta situação e que medidas já tomou para lhe fazer face?
2. Que medidas estão previstas para pôr cobro a operações de dumping entre Estados-Membros?
3. Tendo em conta a persistência e o agravamento dos desequilíbrios ao nível da balança agroalimentar de países, como Portugal, que enfrentam maiores dificuldades financeiras, que medidas vai adotar para defender a produção nacional nestes países e, por essa via, o contributo que a mesma pode dar para combater a crescente dívida externa?

**Resposta dada por Dacian Cioloș em nome da Comissão**

(14 de fevereiro de 2012)

A Comissão examina atualmente os factos a que se refere o Senhor Deputado.

Uma das questões colocadas consiste em determinar se a empresa em causa tem vendido leite abaixo do custo. Essa venda pode constituir uma infração ao artigo 102.º do Tratado, caso tenha sido levada a cabo por uma empresa dominante e afete o comércio entre Estados-Membros. A ocorrência pode ser investigada pela Comissão ou pelas autoridades nacionais no domínio da concorrência. A Comissão intervém em casos de comportamento predatório nos quais uma empresa dominante exclua ou possa excluir concorrentes reais ou potenciais, suportando perdas ou prescindindo de benefícios com o objetivo de reforçar a sua posição no mercado.

O caso pode também ser investigado pelas autoridades nacionais no domínio da concorrência se o direito nacional for mais estrito que o da UE ou se o comportamento da empresa não afetar o comércio entre os Estados-Membros.

Na atualidade, não é claro se os factos justificam uma investigação ao abrigo da legislação da UE no domínio da concorrência. Por conseguinte, a Comissão convida o Senhor Deputado a dirigir-se também à autoridade nacional neste domínio.

A Comissão não prevê tomar medidas que infrinjam o princípio do comércio livre na UE.



No que diz respeito à margem de manobra dos Estados-Membros na implementação de programas orientados de desenvolvimento rural, à possibilidade de atribuir uma parte dos pagamentos diretos a setores que enfrentam dificuldades e ao programa de apoio às regiões ultraperiféricas, remetemos o Senhor Deputado para a resposta à sua pergunta escrita E-006708/2011. Por outro lado, o chamado «Pacote Leite» <sup>(1)</sup> reforçará o poder de negociação dos produtores de leite, conferindo às organizações de produtores a possibilidade de negociar contratos com os transformadores e aumentando a transparência na cadeia de abastecimento de leite.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Proposta de Regulamento do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho que altera o Regulamento (CE) n.º 1234/2007 do Conselho no que diz respeito às relações contratuais no sector do leite e dos produtos lácteos (COM(2010)728 de 10.12.2011) ([http://wcmcom-ec-europa-eu-wip.wcm3vue.cec.eu.int:8080/agriculture/milk/index\\_en.htm](http://wcmcom-ec-europa-eu-wip.wcm3vue.cec.eu.int:8080/agriculture/milk/index_en.htm)).

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000049/12  
to the Commission  
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)  
(12 January 2012)**

*Subject:* Milk prices charged by major retailers in Portugal

The association representing milk and meat producers in Portugal, publicly denounced, on 2 January, the launch of a promotional campaign for the sale of milk 'at the token price of 13 cents per litre' by a major Portuguese retailer (Continente/SONAE). The campaign extends to other products sold by this very same retailer. The French potato, for example, is being sold at 16.5 cents per kg. This situation clearly constitutes a sale at prices below production costs.

The serious difficulties faced by the agricultural sector and, in particular, the dairy sector in Portugal are well known. Thousands of farms have gone bankrupt and many others are experiencing major problems, despite making significantly more than the price this major retailer charges the final consumer. In this specific instance, the suspicion that this milk was imported at 'sale' prices, within a dumping framework, led to the lodging of a complaint by the APLC with the Portuguese Competition Authority and with the European Commission.

The situation of national milk producers has been getting worse for a long time, which has resulted in previous questions to the Commission, both on the 'flooding' of the Portuguese market with imported milk and on the possible implementation of a system of quotas for marketing domestic products in countries with so-called financial assistance programs. Unfortunately, the answers provided by the Commission, as well as the measures it has adopted to date, have done nothing to change the current framework; in fact, alarmingly, quite the contrary.

Considering the above, can the Commission respond to the following:

1. What information does it have concerning the situation and what measures has it taken to address it?
2. What measures have been planned to put an end to dumping operations among Member States?
3. Given the persistence and worsening of the agro-food imbalance in countries, such as Portugal, that are facing considerable financial difficulties, what measures is it going to adopt to protect domestic production in these countries and, in this way, contribute to combating increasing foreign debt?

**Answer given by Mr Ciolos on behalf of the Commission  
(14 February 2012)**

The Commission is currently examining the letter mentioned by the Honourable Member.

One issue raised is whether a company has been selling milk below cost. The latter may constitute a violation of Article 102 of the Treaty if this has been carried out by a dominant undertaking and trade between Member States is affected. Such a case may be investigated either by the Commission or by National Competition Authorities (NCA). The Commission intervenes in cases of predatory conduct where a dominant undertaking forecloses or is likely to foreclose actual or potential competitors to strengthen its market position by incurring losses or foregoing profits.

NCA may also investigate the case if national law is stricter than EC law or if the behaviour of the undertaking does not affect trade between Member States.

It is not clear at this stage if the facts warrant an investigation under EU competition legislation. Therefore the Commission invites the Honourable Member also to solicit the National Competition Authority.

The Commission does not intend to take measures that would go against the principle of free trade within the EU.

The Honourable Member is referred to the answer given to his Written Question E-006708/2011 on Member States' room for manoeuvre in implementing targeted rural development programmes, the possibility to dedicate part of direct payments to sectors facing difficulties as well as the support programme for outermost regions. In addition, the so-called Milk Package <sup>(1)</sup>, will strengthen the bargaining power of milk producers, by giving producer organisations the possibility to negotiate contracts with processors, and increase transparency in the milk supply chain.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council amending Council Regulation (EC) 1234/2007 as regards contractual relations in the milk and milk products sector, COM(2010)728, 10 December 2011:  
[http://wcmcom-ec-europa-eu-wip.wcm3vue.cec.eu.int:8080/agriculture/milk/index\\_en.htm](http://wcmcom-ec-europa-eu-wip.wcm3vue.cec.eu.int:8080/agriculture/milk/index_en.htm)

(Versiunea în limba română)

**Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-000051/12**  
**adresată Comisiei**  
**Vasilica Viorica Dăncilă (S&D)**  
(12 ianuarie 2012)

*Subiect:* Inovare și cercetare în agricultură

Sectorul agroalimentar și producția agricolă reprezintă nucleul de bază al economiei naționale în mai multe state membre.

Dezvoltarea conceptului de inovare și cercetare în agricultură este esențială pentru creșterea producției și pentru a face față noilor provocări (mai ales schimbărilor climatice).

Promovarea cercetării științifice, a inovațiilor și a transferului tehnologic reprezintă baza dezvoltării viitoare în agricultură, industria de prelucrare și a zonelor rurale.

Comisia propune în cadrul reformei PAC introducerea inovării în cadrul pilonului II, dar se pune întrebarea cum vor reuși fermierii români să acceseze măsurile respective, în condițiile în care inovarea necesită cofinanțare și o informare corespunzătoare.

Având în vedere aceste probleme, care este abordarea Comisiei pentru a permite accesul fermierilor români la inovare și la rezultatele cercetării agricole?

**Răspuns dat de dl Ciolos în numele Comisiei**  
(8 februarie 2012)

Pentru a îmbunătăți accesul la inovare și la rezultatele cercetării în domeniul agriculturii, Comisia propune un Parteneriat European pentru Inovare (PEI) „Productivitatea și durabilitatea agriculturii”. PEI va avea rolul de a facilita comunicarea dintre cercetători și comunitatea fermierilor, în special prin crearea unei rețele care va încuraja cooperarea și va implica fermieri, cercetători, consilieri, întreprinderi și alți factori angajați în dezvoltarea și testarea abordărilor inovatoare. Această rețea va facilita schimburile dintre părțile interesate, va oferi informații și va înlesni accesul la finanțare și la rezultatele cercetării în domeniul agriculturii. Ea va permite aplicarea mai rapidă a proiectelor inovatoare în domeniul practicilor agricole și va furniza cercetătorilor feedback cu privire la necesitățile existente în acest sens. Rețeaua pentru inovare va sprijini, în egală măsură, activitățile grupurilor operaționale, prin organizarea de seminarii și prin crearea unor baze de date. Ea va avea și rol de helpdesk și va organiza schimburi de experiență și de bune practici.

În ceea ce privește finanțarea acțiunilor concrete în materie de inovare, PEI în domeniul agriculturii se va axa pe acțiuni aferente politicii de dezvoltare rurală și cadrului UE pentru cercetare și inovare Orizont 2020. O parte dintre principalele măsuri în domeniul inovării din cadrul politicii de dezvoltare rurală pot fi cofinanțate într-o proporție mai mare, de până la 80% (90% în regiunile mai puțin dezvoltate); este vorba despre măsurile legate de cooperare (inclusiv cooperarea în domeniul dezvoltării tehnologice), transfer de cunoștințe și strategii de dezvoltare locală în cadrul programului Leader. Alte măsuri importante în domeniul inovării sunt legate de investițiile fizice, utilizarea serviciilor de consultanță și dezvoltarea generală a întreprinderilor. Acestea pot fi cofinanțate în proporție de până la 50% (85% în regiunile mai puțin dezvoltate).

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000051/12  
to the Commission  
Vasilica Viorica Dăncilă (S&D)  
(12 January 2012)**

*Subject:* Innovation and research in agriculture

Agro-food industry and farming represent the nucleus of the national economy in several Member States.

It is essential to develop the concept of innovation and research in agriculture in order to increase production and to face new challenges (especially environmental changes).

The basis of future development in agriculture, manufacturing and of the rural areas is represented by targeting scientific research, innovation and the transfer of technology.

The Commission proposes the introduction of innovation in Pillar II as part of CAP reform, but the question that arises is how Romanian farmers will be able to access the respective measures, as innovation requires co-financing and being appropriately informed.

Considering these problems, what is the Commission's approach in order to allow Romanian farmers to have access to innovation and the results of agricultural research?

**Answer given by Mr Ciolos on behalf of the Commission  
(8 February 2012)**

In view of improving access to innovation and outcomes of agricultural research, the Commission proposes a European Innovation Partnership (EIP) 'Agricultural Productivity and Sustainability'. The EIP shall serve to bridging the gap between the research world and the farming community, notably by creating a network. The network will encourage cooperation, involving farmers, researchers, advisors, enterprises and other actors who engage in developing, and testing innovative approaches. The network aims at enhancing the exchange among stakeholders, providing information and facilitating access to funding and to results of agricultural research. It will help with a faster application of innovative approaches to farming practice and provide a feedback on practice needs to researchers. The innovation network will also support the work of operational groups through seminars and databases, serve as helpdesk and organise experience sharing and exchange of best practices.

As regards the funding of concrete innovative actions, the agricultural EIP will rely on actions of rural development policy and of the EU Framework for Research and Innovation Horizon 2020. Some of rural development policy's key measures related to innovation can be co-financed at an enhanced rate of up to 80 % (90 % in less developed regions) — these are the measures related to cooperation (including cooperation in technological development), knowledge transfer and local development strategies under the Leader approach. Other relevant measures for innovation relate to physical investments, the use of advisory services and general business development; these can be co-financed at a rate up to 50 % (85 % in less developed regions).

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000052/12  
to the Commission  
Nigel Farage (EFD)  
(12 January 2012)**

*Subject:* Amendments to the EU Treaties

An EU spokesman stated on 3 January 2012 that some Member States have submitted amendments to the Treaty on European Union. Is the UK one of these countries? If not, can the Commission state which countries are calling for amendments, and what they want to amend?

Can the Commission also reveal its own suggested amendments?

**Answer given by Mr Barroso on behalf of the Commission  
(24 February 2012)**

At the midday press briefing of the Commission, no spokesperson of the Commission mentioned amendments to the Treaty on European Union. The Commission cannot say whether this was as well the case for spokespersons of the other EU institutions. With regard to the negotiations on the international Treaty on stability, coordination and governance in the Economic and Monetary Union, the Commission spokesperson was referring to the general procedure set up by the Council. Detailed questions on the contributions sent to the Council should be sent to the Council of Ministers.

Proposals for the amendment of the EU Treaties have to be addressed to the Council (Article 48(2) TEU — Ordinary revision procedure) or to the European Council (Article 48(6) TEU — Simplified revision procedure). To the knowledge of the Commission the latest proposals for amendment of the Treaties concern the integration of a Protocol on the application of the Charter on Fundamental Rights to the Czech Republic and a Protocol on the concerns of the Irish people on the Treaty of Lisbon. The Parliament and the Commission are currently consulted on these texts, which were proposed by the Czech Republic and Ireland respectively.

The Commission has not proposed amendments to the EU Treaties.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000055/12**  
**to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)**  
**Charles Tannock (ECR)**  
(17 January 2012)

*Subject:* VP/HR — Recent tribal unrest in South Sudan and EU assistance to that country

The High Representative may have seen recent reports emanating from the Pibor region of Jonglei state in South Sudan of violent conflict between Lou Nuer and Murle tribes that has resulted in up to 100 foreign aid workers from the Médecins Sans Frontières charity evacuating a hospital and fleeing into the surrounding bush. The attacks took place despite an estimated force of 800 UN military peacekeepers present in South Sudan and South Sudanese army units also allegedly present in the area. Reportedly, thousands of local people have also become internally displaced in what is a hostile physical environment stricken with poverty and almost entirely lacking in civil infrastructure. Large-scale tribal conflicts, which mainly come about through cattle-rustling, threaten to destabilise this young country before fully functioning government structures, including a viable civilian police force and judiciary, are able to establish themselves and enforce a workable criminal justice and law enforcement system.

Can the High Representative comment on this recent disturbing violent civil unrest, and will the High Representative outline the assistance — both financial and practical — that the EU is currently providing to South Sudan in terms of building up its governmental infrastructure, i.e. political and judicial institutions that meet international standards, so as to prevent a reoccurrence of this unrest? Does the High Representative plan to open a permanent EU delegation in Juba in the near future?

**Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission**  
(7 March 2012)

The High Representative/Vice-President shares the concern about the situation in Jonglei State and the devastating impact of the ongoing conflict between the Murle and the Lou Nuer people. Given the enormous internal displacement this conflict has caused, the EU's immediate response has been to provide humanitarian assistance. At present, the European Union is supporting a response coordinated by UN OCHA to address the needs of the affected population, including the provision of emergency healthcare, water and sanitation services. Given the lack of basic infrastructure, the European Union also supported the mobilisation of a regionally-based helicopter to facilitate the delivery of humanitarian assistance and allow partners to conduct needs assessments. The Government of South Sudan is in the process of implementing a buffer zone between the two tribes and supporting peace negotiations to prevent further instances of conflict.

It is clearly important in stabilising the situation and preventing future conflict that the capacity of the Government of South Sudan to ensure law and order as a basis for development is increased. In May 2011, Member States at the European Council approved an allocation of EUR 200 million for the benefit of the population and public institutions. A response strategy has been developed, focusing on five priority areas; rule of law, health, education, water management, and rural economy. In addition, the EU is now ready to implement an additional EUR 85m, decided by the European Council in July 2010 which will support pro-poor actions in similar sectors. Looking forward, the EU hopes that the Government of South Sudan will ratify the Cotonou agreement in the near future so that the EU can continue to support the development objectives of the Government of South Sudan through the EDF.

The EU has an office in Juba which has been formally upgraded to an EU delegation following the signing, on December 9th 2011, of an Establishment Agreement between the EU and the Republic of South Sudan. In December the High Representative announced the appointment of the EU Head of Delegation to South Sudan, Mr Sven Kuehn Von Burgsdorff, who is expected to take up his appointment in February after the South Sudan authorities have given the *agrément*.

(Slovenské znenie)

**Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-000056/12**

**Komisií**

**Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)**

(13. januára 2012)

Vec: Azylová politika Maďarska

Maďarský Helsinský výbor, člen skupiny ECRE, nedávno zverejnil výsledky svojho prieskumu, z ktorého vyplýva, že Maďarsko nerešpektuje práva žiadateľov o azyl, ktorí sa do Maďarska vracajú z iných európskych krajín v súlade s Dublinským nariadením. Maďarsko nezabezpečuje primerané podmienky prijímania týchto osôb a popiera ich právo na prístup k azylovému konaniu. Výbor taktiež vyzval jednotlivé členské štáty, aby vzhľadom na prenasledovanie, ktoré týmto osobám v Maďarsku hrozí, dôkladne preskúmali každý jeden prípad, kedy má byť utečenec do krajiny vrátený v súlade s Dublinským systémom. Z výsledkov prieskumu totiž vyplýva, že všeobecná prax v Maďarsku je okamžité vydávanie príkazov na vyhostenie a Maďarsko bežne využíva aj inštitút zadržania, pričom súdne preskúmania rozhodnutí o zadržaní alebo predĺžení väzby sú neúčinné.

Bude sa komisia zaoberať zisteniami Maďarského Helsinského výboru?

Ak áno, aké konkrétne opatrenia plánuje v tejto súvislosti prijať?

**Odpoveď pani Malmströmovej v mene Komisie**

(16. februára 2012)

Komisia vie o správe Helsinského výboru a v súčasnosti sa zaoberá týmito aktuálnymi údajmi, ktoré vzbudzujú obavy týkajúce sa situácie žiadateľov o azyl v Maďarsku. Komisia venuje svoju pozornosť predovšetkým tvrdeniam v správe o nebezpečenstve vyhostenia alebo vrátenia osôb poslaných do Maďarska v rámci Dublinského konania a tvrdeniam o nezákonnom zadržaní.

Komisia oslovila maďarské orgány s cieľom získať objasnenie toho, čo robí štátna správa pre to, aby zaručila dodržiavanie *acquis* EÚ v oblasti azylu, a najmä dodržiavanie ustanovení, ktoré zaručujú, že žiadatelia o azyl, ktorí podliehajú Dublinskému konaniu, sa v príslušnom členskom štáte znova začlenia do konania o azyle. Ako vo všetkých podobných prípadoch, ak to bude potrebné, Komisia podnikne ďalšie kroky, aby v tomto členskom štáte zaistila dodržiavanie právnych predpisov EÚ v oblasti azylu.



(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000056/12  
to the Commission**

**Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)**

(13 January 2012)

*Subject:* Asylum policy in Hungary

The Hungarian Helsinki Committee, a member of the European Council on Refugees and Exiles (ECRE), recently released results of its survey, which shows that Hungary does not respect the rights of asylum-seekers who were returned to Hungary from other European countries in accordance with the Dublin Regulation. Hungary does not provide adequate conditions for the admission of these persons and denies their right to access to asylum procedures. The Committee also called on each Member State, given the persecution that these persons face in Hungary, to carefully examine every single case where a refugee should be returned to the country in accordance with the Dublin system. The survey shows that general practice in Hungary is the immediate issue of expulsion orders and Hungary regularly uses detention, whereby judicial reviews of detention or extension of remand periods are ineffective.

Will the Commission address the findings of the Hungarian Helsinki Committee?

If so, what specific measures does it intend to take in this respect?

**Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission**

(16 February 2012)

The Commission is aware of the report of the Helsinki Committee and is currently looking into this recent information on concerns with the situation of asylum-seekers in Hungary, in particular the claim in the report of risks of refoulement of persons sent to Hungary under the Dublin procedure and unlawful detention practices.

The Commission has contacted the Hungarian authorities in order to request clarifications in respect of what the national administration is doing to ensure compliance with the EU *acquis* on asylum and in particular with those provisions guaranteeing that asylum-seekers subject to the Dublin procedure re-integrate the asylum procedure in the responsible Member States. As in all similar cases, if need be, it will take further action in order to ensure that the EC law on asylum is respected in this Member State.

---

(Slovenské znenie)

**Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-000057/12**

**Komisií**

**Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)**

(13. januára 2012)

Vec: Azylový systém v Taliansku

Výročná správa Systému ochrany žiadateľov o azyl a utečencov SPRAR poukázala na mnohé nedostatky talianskeho azylového systému. Správa hovorí o nedostatku koordinácie a vysokom riziku neúčinnosti systému prijímania. V súčasnosti v Taliansku fungujú tri druhy prijímacích centier, pričom ich jednotlivé podmienky prijímania sú výrazne odlišné. Rozdiely sú badateľné v súvislosti s materiálnym zabezpečením týchto centier či ich celkovou kapacitou. Vzájomná komunikácia medzi centrami je buď neúčinná, alebo úplne zlyháva. Negatívne dôsledky takéhoto stavu sa prejavujú na službách, ktoré sú žiadateľom o azyl a utečencom poskytované.

Bude sa komisia touto správou zaoberať, a ak áno, akým spôsobom mieni byť v tomto smere aktívna?

**Odpoveď pani Malmströmovej v mene Komisie**

(15. februára 2012)

Komisia si je vedomá obáv uvedených v správe, ktoré sa týkajú úrovne ubytovania poskytovaného žiadateľom o azyl v niektorých regiónoch Talianska. Komisia pozorne sleduje situáciu a prijíma kroky nadväzujúce na tieto správy s cieľom zabezpečiť, aby sa *acquis* EÚ v oblasti azylu, a najmä smernica Rady 2003/9/ES, plne dodržiavalo. Komisia osloví talianske orgány s cieľom získať vysvetlenie.

Európsky fond pre utečencov (ERF) podporuje opatrenia členských štátov zamerané na zabezpečenie primeraných noriem ubytovania pre žiadateľov o azyl. Taliansko získalo v roku 2011 celkovú sumu 12 miliónov EUR v rámci núdzových opatrení fondu ERF na zvýšenie kapacít pre prijímanie utečencov.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000057/12  
to the Commission**

**Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)**

(13 January 2012)

*Subject:* Asylum system in Italy

The annual report of the Protection System for Asylum Seekers and Refugees (SPRAR) highlighted many shortcomings in the Italian asylum system. The report mentions the lack of coordination and the high risk of inefficiency in the reception system. Currently in Italy there are three types of reception centre, and their respective reception conditions largely differ. The differences are noticeable in relation to the material organisation of these centres and their total capacity. Mutual communication between the centres is either inefficient or completely fails. The negative consequences of this situation are reflected in the services provided to asylum-seekers and refugees.

Will the Commission deal with this report and, if so, how does it intend to be active in this respect?

**Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission**

(15 February 2012)

The Commission is aware of reported concerns regarding the level of accommodation standards provided to asylum-seekers in some areas of Italy. The Commission is closely monitoring the situation and is following up on these reports in order to ensure that the EU asylum acquis, and in particular Council Directive 2003/9/EC, is fully respected. It will contact the Italian authorities to seek clarifications.

The European Refugee Fund (ERF) supports Member States actions aimed at ensuring appropriate accommodation standards for asylum-seekers. In 2011 Italy received a total amount of EUR 12 million under the ERF emergency measures with a view to improving reception capacities.

---

(Slovenské znenie)

**Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-000058/12**

**Komisii**

**Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)**

(13. januára 2012)

Vec: Celoeurópska ochrana obetí trestných činov

Opatrenia na ochranu obetí trestných činov pred agresormi už existujú vo všetkých členských štátoch EÚ, no na základe vnútroštátnych predpisov strácajú platnosť v momente, keď sa obeť (chránená osoba) presťahuje do inej členskej krajiny. Smernica o Európskom ochrannom príkaze (EOP), ktorá už bola dohodnutá medzi EP a vládami členských štátov, má túto situáciu zmeniť. Obete trestných činov budú môcť na jej základe požiadať o rozšírenie ochrany, aj keď sa presťahujú do inej členskej krajiny. Pravidlá EOP sa budú vzťahovať na obeť všetkých trestných činov, nielen na obeť rodového násillia. Väčšina opatrení platných v súčasnosti je zameraná na ochranu obetí násillia páchaného na ženách, EOP však bude okrem nich garantovať bezpečnosť aj obetiam iných kategórií trestných činov, a to bez ohľadu na pohlavie. Nové predpisy budú teda chrániť obeť a možné obeť proti všetkým trestným činom inej osoby, ktorá by mohla nejakým spôsobom ohroziť ich život alebo telesnú, duševnú a sexuálnu integritu, ako aj ich dôstojnosť či osobnú slobodu. Takéto konanie bude zahŕňať trestný čin obťažovania, únosu, prenasledovania, ale aj iné formy nepriameho nátlaku.

Akým spôsobom plánuje komisia prispieť k ochrane obetí trestných činov v roku 2012?

**Odpoveď pani Redingovej v mene Komisie**

(16. februára 2012)

V máji 2011 Komisia predstavila súbor opatrení zameraných na posilnenie práv obetí trestných činov vrátane smernice, ktorou sa stanovujú minimálne normy v oblasti práv, podpory a ochrany obetí trestných činov, a nariadenia o vzájomnom uznávaní ochranných opatrení v občianskych veciach, ktorým sa dopĺňuje smernica o európskom ochrannom príkaze. V súčasnosti sú oba tieto nástroje predmetom rokovaní v rámci spolurozhodovacieho postupu a Komisia dúfa, že budú v roku 2012 prijaté. V súlade s dokumentom Rady z roku 2011 s názvom Plán posilňovania práv a ochrany obetí, najmä v trestných konaniach Komisia v súčasnosti skúma možnosti ďalších opatrení na zlepšenie situácie obetí trestných činov v EÚ.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000058/12  
to the Commission**

**Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)**

(13 January 2012)

*Subject:* Europe-wide protection for victims of crime

Measures to protect crime victims from aggressors already exist in all EU Member States, but under national laws these cease to apply at the moment when the victim (protected person) moves to another EU Member State. The European Protection Order (EPO) directive, already agreed between the EP and national governments, should change this situation. Crime victims will be able to apply for the extension of this protection, even when moving to another EU Member State. EPO rules will cover all victims of crime, not just victims of gender violence. Most existing measures are aimed at protecting female victims of violence; however the EPO will also guarantee the safety of victims of other categories of crime, regardless of gender. The new rules will therefore apply to victims or possible victims against a criminal act of another person which may, in any way, endanger his life, physical, psychological and sexual integrity as well as his dignity or personal liberty. Such acts could include harassment, abduction, stalking and other forms of indirect coercion.

How does the Commission intend to contribute to the protection of crime victims in 2012?

**Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission**

(16 February 2012)

In May 2011, the Commission presented a package of measures aimed at strengthening the rights of victims of crime, including a directive establishing minimum standards on the rights, support and protection of victims and a regulation on the mutual recognition of civil law protection measures which complements the directive on the European Protection Order. Both instruments are currently being negotiated through the co-decision procedure and the Commission hopes that they will be adopted in 2012. In accordance with the Council's 2011 Roadmap for strengthening the rights and protection of victims, in particular in criminal proceedings, the Commission is currently researching on further actions to improve the situation of crime victims in the EU.

---

(Slovenské znenie)

**Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-000059/12**

**Komisií**

**Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)**

(13. januára 2012)

Vec: Chemická legislatíva REACH

Prísna chemická legislatíva REACH vstúpila do platnosti v roku 2007. Toto nariadenie vyžaduje od podnikov, aby zaregistrovali viac ako 100 tisíc na trhu sa najčastejšie vyskytujúcich substancií. Tie musia následne prejsť bezpečnostnou kontrolou, aby mohli získať autorizáciu. Zoznam Európskej chemickej agentúry ECHA obsahuje viac ako 50 nebezpečných substancií. Revízia nariadenia REACH je naplánovaná na rok 2012. Vlády niektorých členských štátov však tvrdia, že táto legislatíva znevýhodňuje malé a stredné podniky a spomaľuje rast. REACH podľa nich predstavuje pre malé a stredné podniky obrovskú administratívnu a finančnú záťaž a dokonca ohrozuje existenciu niektorých firiem. Tvrdia, že dôsledkom je oslabovanie konkurencieschopnosti európskeho chemického priemyslu, a preto je nutné pravidlá REACH zmeniť.

Akým spôsobom bude komisia čeliť takýmto pomýleným tlakom niektorých členských štátov, ktoré uprednostňujú aspekt konkurencieschopnosti pred aspektom ochrany verejného zdravia a životného prostredia?

**Odpoveď pána Tajaniho v mene Komisie**

(24. februára 2012)

Ciele nariadenia REACH uvedené v článku 1 sú „zabezpečiť vysokú úroveň ochrany zdravia ľudí a životného prostredia, [...] ako aj voľný pohyb látok na vnútornom trhu, a zároveň zlepšovať konkurencieschopnosť a inovácie“. Tento komplexný súbor cieľov sleduje viacero mechanizmov uvedených v texte predpisu.

Komisia je preto presvedčená, že nariadenie REACH môže tieto ciele dosiahnuť súčasne a že si tieto ciele vo svojej podstate vzájomne neodporujú.

Komisia začala rozsiahlejšie preskúmanie s cieľom posúdiť, či sa všetky ciele sledujú v súlade so zámerom zákonodarcu, a zväziť praktické prístupy v záujme lepšieho vykonávania súčasnej legislatívy. Začala tiež viacero tematických štúdií zameraných na všetky procesy a zainteresované strany vrátane vplyvu na ľudské zdravie a životné prostredie, a tiež na konkurencieschopnosť, inovácie a malé a stredné podniky. Útvary Komisie zanalyzujú informácie od všetkých zainteresovaných strán s cieľom zabezpečiť, aby sa vypočuli a transparentne zohľadnili všetky názory.

Komisia môže v súlade s článkom 138 a vzhľadom na svoje právo iniciatívy prípadne predložiť legislatívny návrh založený na výsledkoch preskúmania.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000059/12  
to the Commission**

**Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)**

(13 January 2012)

*Subject:* REACH chemicals legislation

The stringent REACH chemicals legislation entered into force in 2007. This regulation requires companies to register more than 100 000 of the most commonly occurring substances on the market. These must then go through safety checks in order to receive authorisation. The European Chemicals Agency (ECHA) list contains more than 50 hazardous substances. A review of the REACH regulation is scheduled for 2012. Some Member State governments, however, argue that the legislation discriminates against small businesses and slows growth. According to them, REACH represents a huge administrative and financial burden for small and medium-sized businesses and even threatens the survival of some firms. They argue that this results in a weakening of the competitiveness of the European chemical industry, and it is therefore necessary to change the rules of REACH.

How will the Commission deal with such misguided pressure from some Member States, which place the aspect of competitiveness ahead of the aspects of public health and the environment?

**Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission**

(24 February 2012)

The objectives of REACH as enumerated in Article 1, are to 'ensure a high level of protection of human health and the environment [...] as well as the free circulation of substances on the internal market while enhancing competitiveness and innovation'. A number of mechanisms in the legal text pursue this complex set of objectives.

The Commission therefore believes that REACH can achieve these objectives simultaneously and that there is no preconditioned conflict between them.

The Commission launched a broader review exercise to assess whether all objectives are pursued as intended by the legislator and to consider practical approaches to better implement the current legislation. The Commission launched a number of thematic studies with focus on all processes and stakeholders including the impact on human health and the environment, as well as on competitiveness and innovation and SMEs. Information from all interested parties will be analysed by the Commission services in order to ensure that all voices are heard and addressed transparently.

As foreseen in Article 138 and taking into account the Commission's right of initiative, the Commission may, if appropriate, present a legislative proposal based on the review outcomes.

---

(Slovenské znenie)

**Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-000060/12**

**Komisii**

**Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)**

(13. januára 2012)

Vec: Cestovná mapa EÚ v oblasti energetiky do roku 2050

Komisia nedávno predstavila cestovnú mapu Európskej únie v oblasti energetiky do roku 2050. EÚ si totiž ešte v októbri 2009 určila dlhodobý cieľ redukovať spoločné emisie do roku 2050, a to v porovnaní s rokom 1990 o 80 – 95 %. To je v súlade s odporúčaniami Medzivládneho panelu pre klimatickú zmenu (IPCC), ako sa vyhnúť katastrofickým zmenám na Zemi. Cestovnej mape však chýbajú priebežné ciele. Mapa obsahuje programovú medzeru od roku 2020 do roku 2050.

Plánuje Komisia túto situáciu v dohľadnej dobe napraviť a určiť pre obnoviteľnú energiu jasný politický rámec a pevné ciele, ktoré v cestovnej mape chýbajú?

**Odpoveď pána Oettingera v mene Komisie**

(7. februára 2012)

V Pláne postupu v energetike do roku 2050 sa dospelo k záveru, že členské štáty a investori potrebujú konkrétne míľniky a že ďalším krokom je vymedzenie rámca politiky do roku 2030. Takisto sa v ňom zdôraznilo, že cieľ EÚ, ktorým je dosiahnuť 20 % energie z obnoviteľných zdrojov, sa doteraz ukazuje ako efektívny hnací mechanizmus v oblasti rozvoja energie z obnoviteľných zdrojov v EÚ a že v tejto súvislosti by sa mali včas posúdiť možnosti míľnikov do roku 2030. Komisia prediskutuje potrebu a povahu míľnikov s ostatnými inštitúciami EÚ, členskými štátmi a zainteresovanými stranami na základe Plánu postupu v energetike do roku 2050 a podľa potreby predloží ďalšie iniciatívy.



*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-000060/12  
to the Commission**

**Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)**

*(13 January 2012)*

*Subject:* EU Energy Roadmap 2050

The Commission recently presented a roadmap for the European Union in the field of energy by 2050. In October 2009, the EU identified a long-term target of reducing collective emissions by 80-95 % by 2050 compared to 1990 levels. This is in line with the recommendations of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) for preventing catastrophic changes on Earth. However, the roadmap is lacking interim targets. The roadmap contains a policy gap between 2020 and 2050.

Does the Commission intend in the foreseeable future to correct and identify a clear policy framework and firm goals, which are missing in the roadmap?

**Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission**

*(7 February 2012)*

The Energy Roadmap 2050 concluded that Member States and investors need concrete milestones and that the next step is to define the 2030 policy framework. It also pointed out that the EU's 20 % renewable energy target has so far proven an efficient driver in development of the renewable energy in the EU and that timely consideration should be given to options for 2030 milestones in this context. The Commission will discuss the need and nature of milestones with other EU institutions, Member States and stakeholders on the basis of the Energy Roadmap 2050 and will present further initiatives as appropriate.

---

(Slovenské znenie)

**Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-000062/12**

**Komisií**

**Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)**

(13. januára 2012)

Vec: Cyprus ako predsednícka krajina EÚ

Turecko už v minulosti vyhlásilo, že ak sa Cyprus v júli 2012 ujme rotujúceho predsedníctva ešte predtým, ako bude dosiahnutá dohoda o opätovnom zjednotení etnicky rozdeleného ostrova, zmrazí svoje vzťahy s Úniou. Turecko, ktoré obsadilo severnú časť ostrova, totiž neuznáva Cyprus ako suverénny štát. Rada EÚ plánuje v tejto súvislosti vyzvať Turecko, aby Cyprus ako predsednícku krajinu v roku 2012 plne rešpektovalo.

Plánuje komisia zaujať podobné stanovisko a vyzvať Turecko, aby rešpektovalo Cyprus ako predsednícku krajinu EÚ?

**Odpoveď pána Füleho v mene Komisie**

(17. februára 2012)

Komisia odkazuje váženú pani poslankyňu na závery zasadnutia Európskej rady z 9. decembra 2011, v ktorých Európska rada vyjadruje vážne znepokojenie v súvislosti s vyhláseniami a hrozbami Turecka a vyzýva na plné rešpektovanie úlohy predsedníctva Rady, ktoré je základným inštitucionálnym prvkom EÚ stanoveným v zmluve.

Komisia popritom v plnej miere podporuje prebiehajúce úsilie o dosiahnutie komplexného vyriešenia cyperskej otázky – naďalej zdôrazňuje naliehavú potrebu dosiahnuť takéto riešenie a vyzýva vedúcich predstaviteľov oboch komunit na Cypre, aby sa chopili príležitosti a využili prebiehajúce rozhovory na dosiahnutie dohody.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-000062/12  
to the Commission**

**Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)**

*(13 January 2012)*

*Subject:* Cyprus EU Presidency

Turkey has already declared that if Cyprus takes up the rotating presidency in July 2012 before an agreement has been reached on the reunification of the ethnically divided island, it will freeze its relations with the European Union. Turkey, which occupies the northern part of the island, does not recognise Cyprus as a sovereign state. The European Council plans in this regard to urge Turkey to treat Cyprus with due respect when it takes over the presidency in 2012.

Does the Commission intend to adopt a similar stance and urge Turkey to respect Cyprus' EU Presidency?

**Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission**

*(17 February 2012)*

The Commission refers the Honourable Member to the Conclusions of the European Council of 9 December 2011, in which the European Council expresses serious concern with regard to Turkish statements and threats and calls for full respect of the role of the Presidency of the Council, which is a fundamental institutional feature of the EU provided for in the Treaty.

Meanwhile, the Commission fully supports the ongoing efforts to reach a comprehensive settlement of the Cyprus issue; it continues to stress the urgent need to reach such a settlement and calls on the leaders of both communities in Cyprus to grasp the opportunity of the ongoing talks to reach agreement.

---

(Slovenské znenie)

**Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-000063/12**

**Komisií**

**Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)**

(13. januára 2012)

Vec: Dohoda medzi EÚ a Marokom o rybolove

Najnovší protokol k Dohode o partnerstve v sektore rybolovu medzi EÚ a Marokom bol parafovaný 25.11.2011. Mal sa týkať obdobia jedného roka. V júli 2011 začal tento protokol predbežne vykonávať, a to retroaktívne od 28.11.2011. Prípadné uzavretie uvedeného protokolu v mene EÚ by bolo možné jedine v prípade, že by Európsky parlament súhlasil s jeho uzatvorením. Parlament však dňa 14.12.2011 hlasoval za neudelenie súhlasu na uzatvorenie. Európska únia preto nemôže uvedený protokol uzatvoriť. Maroko následne vyzvalo všetky rybárske lode Európskej únie na okamžité opustenie jeho národných teritoriálnych vôd. Protokol stanovoval rybolovné možnosti a finančný príspevok podľa Dohody o partnerstve.

Aký bude ďalší postup Komisie v súvislosti s týmito udalosťami?

Má komisia pripravený nejaký náhradný plán?

**Odpoveď pani Damanakiovej v mene Komisie**

(7. marca 2012)

Komisia by chcela odkázať váženú pani poslankyňu na svoje odpovede na písomné otázky P-012405/2011 a E-012552/2011.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000063/12  
to the Commission**

**Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)**

(13 January 2012)

*Subject:* Agreement between the EU and Morocco on fisheries

The latest Protocol to the Fisheries Partnership Agreement between the EU and Morocco was initialled on 25 November 2011. It was to cover a period of one year. Application of this Protocol started on a provisional basis in July 2011, and retroactively from 28 November 2011. Possible conclusion of the Protocol on behalf of the EU could be done only in the instance that the European Parliament agrees to its conclusion. However, Parliament voted on 14 December 2011 not to grant permission for its conclusion. The European Union cannot therefore conclude that Protocol. Morocco subsequently ordered all European Union fishing boats to leave its national territorial waters immediately. The Protocol laid down the fishing opportunities and financial contribution according to the Partnership Agreement.

What will the Commission's next step be in relation to these events?

Has the Commission prepared an alternative plan?

**Answer given by Ms Damanaki on behalf of the Commission**

(7 March 2012)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answers to Written Questions P-012405/2011 and E-012552/2011.

---

(Slovenské znenie)

**Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-000064/12**

**Komisií**

**Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)**

(13. januára 2012)

Vec: Diskriminácia izraelských Arabov

Palestína je ohniskom blízkovýchodného konfliktu. Na území bývalého britského mandátu vznikol v roku 1947 štát Izrael. Prevažnú väčšinu obyvateľov tvorili Arabi moslimského vierovyznania. Pre agresívnu politiku židovského štátu boli mnohí donútení opustiť svoje domovy a stali sa tak národom, ktorého polovica žije v utečeneckých táborech a v emigrácii, druhá polovica v okupácii alebo ako občania druhej kategórie v Izraeli. Izraelské zaobchádzanie s menšinami je v súčasnosti veľký problém. V marci napríklad prešiel v krajine zákon, ktorý zakazuje Arabom kúpu alebo predaj pozemkov v približne 500 obciach. So všetkými obyvateľmi Izraela by sa malo zaobchádzať rovnakým spôsobom a všetci by mali mať prístup k rovnakým možnostiam. V Izraeli žije približne 7,8 milióna obyvateľov, z toho tvoria Arabi približne 1,5 milióna. Ďalších 4,4 milióna Arabov žije v Izraelom okupovanom pásme Gazy a na Západnom brehu.

Akým spôsobom mieni Komisia prispieť k ukončeniu diskriminačného zaobchádzania s arabskými obyvateľmi Izraela?

**Odpoveď podpredsedníčky Komisie a vysokej predstaviteľky Ashtonovej v mene Komisie**

(10. apríla 2012)

Európska únia v súlade s univerzálnymi demokratickými hodnotami, na ktorých je založená, veľmi pozorne monitoruje, či izraelské a taktiež aj palestínske inštitúcie zaručujú úplnú rovnosť všetkým svojim občanom bez ohľadu na to, akej sú rasy a vierovyznania. Európska únia každoročne posudzuje pokrok Izraela dosiahnutý v oblasti ľudských práv, ako aj problémy v tejto oblasti, a to v rámci správy predkladanej v súvislosti s európskou susedskou politikou. Pokiaľ ide o bilaterálnu úroveň, EÚ pravidelne nastoľuje konkrétne problémy v rámci neformálnej pracovnej skupiny EÚ a Izraela pre oblasť ľudských práv, na pôde podvýboru EÚ a Izraela pre politický dialóg a spoluprácu, resp. na politickej úrovni, v rámci zasadnutí Rady pre pridruženie. Európska únia podporuje projekty, ktoré prostredníctvom rôznych programov (napr. Európsky nástroj pre demokraciu a ľudské práva) realizujú organizácie občianskej spoločnosti zameriavajúce sa na arabskú menšinu.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000064/12  
to the Commission**

**Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)**

(13 January 2012)

*Subject:* Discrimination against Israeli Arabs

Palestine is the focus of the Middle East conflict. In 1947 the State of Israel was established on the territory of the former British Mandate, and the vast majority of its inhabitants were Arabs of the Muslim faith. Due to the aggressive policy of the Jewish state, many were forced to leave their homes and thus became a nation, half of whom live in refugee camps and in exile, and the other half in the occupied lands or as second-class citizens in Israel. Israel's treatment of minorities is currently a major problem. In March, for example, the country passed a law that prohibits the Arabs from buying or selling land in about 500 villages. All the people of Israel should be treated the same way and everyone should have access to equal opportunities. In Israel there is a population of approximately 7.8 million inhabitants, of which Arabs constitute about 1.5 million. Another 4.4 million Arabs live in the Israeli-occupied Gaza strip and the West Bank.

How does the Commission intend to contribute to the ending of discriminatory treatment of Arab citizens of Israel?

**Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission**

(10 April 2012)

In line with the universal democratic values the EU is based upon, it closely monitors if both Israel and the Palestinian institutions fully guarantee equality to all their citizens regardless to their race and religion. The EU makes an annual assessment of progress and problems on human rights issues in the ENP Progress Report on Israel. Bilaterally, the EU raises concerns on specific cases in the framework of the EU-Israel informal working group on human rights, in the EU-Israel sub-committee on political dialogue and cooperation or at political level, in the Association Council, as appropriate. The EU supports projects by civil society organisations focused on the Arab minority through different programmes, such as the European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights (EIDHR).

---

(Slovenské znenie)

**Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-000065/12**

**Komisii**

**Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)**

(13. januára 2012)

Vec: Drogová situácia v Európskej únii

Z údajov výročnej správy „Stav drogovej problematiky“ vyplýva, že tradičné drogy, ako je kanabis či kokaín, sú na ústupe. Nahrádzajú ich nové syntetické drogy. Rastúce používanie hraničných nekontrolovaných alebo menej kontrolovaných psychoaktívnych látok je veľmi nebezpečné. Extáza, amfetamín a ďalšie syntetické drogy sa nelegálne vyrábajú v Európe z dovážaných chemických prekurzorov. Okolo 11 miliónov Európanov (3,2 % dospelých Európanov) skúsilo extázu a asi 12,5 milióna (3,8 %) amfetamíny. Nové drogy sa na trhu objavujú neustále. V roku 2010 zistila EÚ rekordný počet 41 nových látok, čo je o 24 viac ako v roku 2009. Tieto drogy sú v stále vyššom množstve k dispozícii na internete a rýchlo sa rozšírili do mnohých členských štátov, ktoré majú problém zabrániť ich predaju.

Aké konkrétne opatrenia zamerané na boj s momentálnou drogovou situáciou v Európe mieni Komisia v roku 2012 prijať?

**Odpoveď pani Redingovej v mene Komisie**

(15. februára 2012)

Komisia by chcela váženú pani poslankyňu odkázať na svoju odpoveď na písomnú otázku E-0010409/2011 <sup>(1)</sup>, v ktorej sa ozrejmuje, akým spôsobom Komisia plánuje reagovať na problémy súvisiace s novými psychoaktívnymi látkami. Komisia je odhodlaná vyvinúť zvýšené úsilie v reakcii na nelegálne drogy a na nové psychoaktívne látky, ktoré napodobňujú účinky nelegálnych drog, a v súčasnosti pracuje na legislatívnych návrhoch týkajúcich sa nových psychoaktívnych látok, ktoré predloží v neskoršom období tohto roka.

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/application/home.do?language=SK>.



(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000065/12  
to the Commission**

**Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)**

(13 January 2012)

*Subject:* The drug situation in the European Union

Data from the annual report on the 'State of the drugs problem in Europe' show that there is a slow transition from traditional drugs, such as cannabis and cocaine, towards new synthetic drugs. The increased use of borderline non- or less-controlled psychoactive substances is highly dangerous. Ecstasy, amphetamine and other synthetic drugs are manufactured illegally in Europe from imported precursor chemicals. Around 11 million Europeans (3.2 % of European adults) have tried ecstasy and about 12.5 million (3.8 %) have taken amphetamines. New drugs are coming onto the market all the time. The EU identified a record number of 41 new substances in 2010, which is 24 more than in 2009. These drugs are increasingly available over the Internet and have rapidly spread to many Member States, which face difficulties in preventing their sale.

What concrete measures does the Commission intend to adopt in 2012 to combat the existing drug situation in Europe?

**Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission**

(15 February 2012)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-010409/2011 <sup>(1)</sup>, which explained how the Commission is planning to respond to the challenge posed by new psychoactive substances. The Commission is determined to scale up its response to illicit drugs and to new psychoactive substances that imitate their effects, and is working on legislative proposals on new psychoactive substances which will be proposed later this year.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB>.

(Slovenské znenie)

**Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-000066/12**

**Komisií**

**Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)**

(23. januára 2012)

Vec: Európsky mediálny priemysel

Nedávno sa v Európskej komisii konalo prvé konzultačné stretnutie o otázke budúcnosti európskeho mediálneho priemyslu. Takýchto stretnutí by sa malo uskutočniť päť, pričom členov pracovnej skupiny tvorí 16 mediálnych odborníkov, zväčša zo súkromných spoločností, vydavateľa, manažéri, profesori, politici a aj americká produkčná spoločnosť. Na tomto Fóre Európskej únie o budúcnosti médií sa diskutuje najmä o vplyve digitálnej revolúcie na európsky mediálny priemysel. Cieľom je podpora pluralitného mediálneho sektora a kvalitnej žurnalistiky. Na prvom z týchto stretnutí však neboli, napriek svojej požiadavke, prítomní novinári, ktorí by sa mali na tejto diskusii zúčastniť.

Z akého dôvodu Komisia k diskusii o tejto otázke nepozvala aj novinárov?

Plánuje ich absenciu na prvom z týchto stretnutí nejakým spôsobom napraviť?

**Odpoveď pani Kroesovej v mene Komisie**

(16. februára 2012)

Európska komisia očividne považuje účasť žurnalistov na diskusii o pluralite médií za kľúčovú. Preto sú členmi skupiny štyria novinári resp. bývalí novinári. Fórum si navyše môže v prípade potreby kedykoľvek vyžiadať názor aj od iných žurnalistov.

Počet účastníkov fóra musel byť obmedzený v záujme efektivity a aby viedol ku konštruktívnym diskusiám a konkrétnym odporúčaniam.

Táto úloha bola o to zložitejšia, že sa v tejto skupine musela riešiť budúcnosť médií v širokom zmysle, ako aj trhové trendy ovplyvňujúce celé odvetvie tvorby kreatívneho obsahu, keďže toto odvetvie zahŕňa veľmi veľa subjektov, ktoré treba brať do úvahy.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000066/12  
to the Commission  
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)  
(23 January 2012)**

*Subject:* European media industry

The European Commission recently held the first consultation meeting about the future of the European media industry. It is expected that five such meetings will take place, and the working groups are made up of 16 media experts drawn mainly from private companies, publishers, managers, professors, politicians and an American production company. The main focus of the EU Media Futures Forum is to reflect on the impact of the digital revolution on the European media industry. The aim is to foster a pluralistic media sector and quality journalism. At the first of these meetings, however, and despite requests, journalists who should have participated in this discussion were not present.

Why did the Commission fail to invite journalists to discuss this issue?

Does it plan to somehow make amends for their absence at the first of these meetings?

**Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission  
(16 February 2012)**

The participation of journalists in a debate on media pluralism is obviously considered as key by the European Commission. That is why there are four journalists or former journalists present in the group. The Forum is able in addition to call at any time on other journalists' expertise if need be.

The number of participants in the Forum had to be limited to be effective and to lead to constructive discussions and concrete recommendations.

This was all the more complex given that this group needed to cover media futures in a broad sense; the market developments which affect the entire creative content sector and which involves very many actors needed to be taken into consideration.

---

(Slovenské znenie)

**Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-000067/12**

**Komisií**

**Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)**

(13. januára 2012)

Vec: Externalizácia migračných politík

Medzinárodná sieť mimovládnych organizácií Migreurop vydala výročnú správu s názvom Na hraniciach Európy: externalizácia kontrol migrácie. Správa kriticky hodnotí externalizáciu migračných politík národných vlád členských krajín Európskej únie. Podľa Migreurop tento proces zahŕňa rôzne negatívne aspekty, ako sú obmedzenia v súvislosti s udeľovaním víz, činnosti agentúry Frontex, či vykonávania dohôd o readmisii. Prvá časť správy sa zaoberá situáciou v Turecku, pričom druhá časť správy rieši problematiku ilegálnych pasažierov námornej dopravy a problematiku námorných prístavov v súvislosti s odchodmi a príchodmi utečencov a žiadateľov o azyl. Správa upozorňuje na otázky v súvislosti s neoprávneným zadržaním migrantov na miestach, ktoré sú ťažko prístupné a verejnosti málo známe. Cieľom je zmapovanie záchytných táborov v európskych krajinách a krajinách Stredozemia.

Bude sa Komisia zaoberať touto správou a odporúčaniami, ktoré zahŕňa?

Ak áno, akým spôsobom plánuje byť v tomto smere aktívna?

**Odpoveď pani Malmströmovej v mene Komisie**

(28. februára 2012)

Komisia vie o správe, o ktorej sa vážená pani poslankyňa zmieňuje. Komisia je pevne rozhodnutá podporovať dôveryhodnú migračnú politiku EÚ, ktorou sa posilňuje dodržiavanie základných práv migrantov a riadne migračné pohyby. V odpovedi na osobitné obavy vyjadrené v správe by Komisia chcela poukázať na tieto skutočnosti:

Pokiaľ ide o zaobchádzanie s čiernymi pasažiermi v prístavoch EÚ, smernica 2001/51 o zodpovednosti dopravcov objasňuje, že sa to nedotýka záväzkov členských štátov v prípadoch, ak štátny príslušník tretej krajiny požaduje medzinárodnú ochranu.

Pokiaľ ide o zadržanie osôb pred odsunom, smernica 2008/115 („smernica o návrate“) konkrétne obsahuje dôležité záruky týkajúce sa ľudských a dôstojných podmienok väzby v členských štátoch, najmä v článkoch 15 až 17. Členské štáty mali transponovať uvedenú smernicu do decembra 2010. Komisia prijme všetky nevyhnutné kroky na zabezpečenie súladu s normami stanovenými v tejto smernici.

Pokiaľ ide o Turecko, Komisia si uvedomuje skutočnosť, o ktorej už informovala, a to že legislatíva a administratívne praktiky tejto krajiny v oblasti hraničnej kontroly, medzinárodnej ochrany a zaobchádzania s migrantmi ešte nie sú v súlade s normami stanovenými Európskou úniou. Európska únia ponúkla Turecku finančnú a technickú pomoc na podporu dosiahnutia pokroku pri zosúladovaní.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000067/12  
to the Commission**

**Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)**

(13 January 2012)

*Subject:* Externalisation of migration policies

The international network of non-governmental organisations Migreurop issued an annual report entitled 'At the borders of Europe: The externalisation of migration controls'. The report is critical of the externalisation of the migration policies of the national governments of the European Union Member States. According to Migreurop, this process includes various negative aspects such as limitations on the granting of visas, the activities of the Frontex agency, and the implementation of readmission agreements. The first part of the report deals with the situation in Turkey, while the second part of the report deals with the issue of illegal sea passengers and maritime port issues relating to the departure and arrival of refugees and asylum-seekers. The report highlights issues relating to the unlawful detention of migrants in places that are difficult to access and little known to the public. The aim is to map the detention camps in European countries and Mediterranean countries.

Will the Commission deal with this report and the recommendations it includes?

If so, how does it intend to play an active role in this area?

**Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission**

(28 February 2012)

The Commission is aware of the report the Honourable Member refers to. The Commission is firmly committed to promote a credible EU migration policy which enhances both respect of fundamental rights of migrants and orderly migratory movements. In reply to the specific concerns expressed in the report, the Commission would like to point at the following facts:

Concerning the treatment of stowaways in EU ports, Directive 2001/51 on carriers' liability makes clear that it is without prejudice to Member States' obligations in cases where a third-country national seeks international protection.

With respect to pre-removal detention, the 'return Directive' 2008/115 specifically contains important safeguards relating to humane and dignified detention conditions in Member States, notably in Articles 15-17. The directive was to be transposed by Member States by December 2010 and the Commission will take all necessary steps to assure compliance with the standards provided in this directive.

As regards Turkey, the Commission is aware and has already reported on the fact that the legislation and administrative practices of this country in the areas of border control, international protection, and treatment of migrants, are not yet in line with the standards set by the European Union. Financial and technical assistance are being offered by the European Union to Turkey to promote progress towards alignment.

(Slovenské znenie)

**Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-000068/12**

**Komisii**

**Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)**

(13. januára 2012)

Vec: Francúzsky azylový zákon

Vo Francúzsku sa má novelizovať súčasne platný zákon o azyle. Za posledných osem rokov to už bude piata novela. Zmeny francúzsky azylový zákon výrazne sprísnia. Podmienky prístupu k právu na azyl sa sprísnia uložením lehôt na podanie azylovej žiadosti. Okrem týchto opatrení chce Francúzsko aj výrazne okresať rozpočet vyhradený na riešenie azylovej problematiky, čo sa dotkne najmä prijímacích stredísk, ktoré v súčasnosti riadia mimovládne organizácie. Francúzsko takouto politikou ohrozuje dodržiavanie svojho medzinárodného záväzku na poskytnutie ochrany osobám v núdzi. Reforma azylového zákona by nemala byť súčasťou predvolebnej kampane v krajine a otázka prístupu k právu na azyl by mala byť oddelená od problematiky riešenia migračných tokov.

Aká bude reakcie komisie na plánovanú reformu azylového zákona vo Francúzsku?

Mieni byť komisia v tejto súvislosti v určitom smere aktívna?

**Odpoveď pani Malmströmovej v mene Komisie**

(22. februára 2012)

Členské štáty majú právo rozhodovať o reformách svojich vnútroštátnych právnych predpisov v oblasti azylu. Avšak aj pri úprave svojich vnútroštátnych zákonov musia členské štáty zabezpečiť, aby boli v plnom súlade s medzinárodnými záväzkami a s *acquis* EÚ. Komisia ako strážkyňa zmlúv pozorne monitoruje všetky takéto reformy právnych predpisov v oblasti azylu a v prípade porušenia práva EÚ môže rozhodnúť o využití právomocí, ktoré má na základe zmlúv, vrátane možnosti začať konanie vo veci porušenia práva.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000068/12  
to the Commission  
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)  
(13 January 2012)**

*Subject:* French asylum law

In France, the asylum law that is currently in force is to be amended. This will be the fifth revision in the last eight years. The changes will significantly tighten French asylum law. Conditions for access to the right of asylum are to be tightened by the imposition of time limits for filing asylum applications. In addition to these measures, France wants to substantially trim the budget for dealing with the issue of asylum, which will in particular affect reception centres which are currently managed by non-governmental organisations. Through this policy, France risks non-compliance with its international obligation to provide protection to destitute persons. Reform of the asylum law should not be part of the country's election campaign and the issue of access to the right of asylum should be separated from the problem of resolving migration flows.

What will be the Commission's response to the planned reform of the asylum law in France?

Does the Commission intend to play an active role in this respect in any particular way?

**Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission  
(22 February 2012)**

Member States have the right to decide reforms of their national asylum legislation. However, also when modifying their national laws, Member States have to ensure that they fully comply with international commitments and the EU *acquis*. As guardian of the Treaties, the Commission monitors carefully all such reforms to asylum legislation and, in cases of violations of EC law, it can decide to use the powers conferred on it by the Treaties, including launching an infringement procedure.

---

(Slovenské znenie)

**Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-000069/12**

**Komisií**

**Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)**

(13. januára 2012)

Vec: Hodnotiaca správa JRS

Medzinárodná katolícka organizácia JRS – Jezuitská služba utečencom zverejnila správu, v ktorej prezentuje skúsenosti utečencov s prekračovaním európskych hraníc. JRS v tejto správe predstavila dôkazy o tom, že národné vlády členských štátov Európskej únie sa vedome aktívne bránia prijímaniu utečencov. Nedávne udalosti arabskej jari odhalili neochotu členských krajín zabezpečiť utečencom právo na prístup k spravodlivému azylovému konaniu. V súvislosti s touto správou boli prezentované aj osobné skúsenosti štátneho príslušníka štátu Eritrea. Skúsenosti tohto utečenca poukazujú na brutalitu a utrpenie, ktoré prežíval počas svojich piatich pokusov o útek z Líbye po Stredozemnom mori. Viacerí odborníci taktiež vyslovili sklamanie nad veľmi nízkou mierou pokroku, ktorú Európska únia v súvislosti s ochranou utečencov v priebehu posledného obdobia dosiahla.

Plánuje Komisia s poukazom na túto kritiku adresovať národným vládam členských krajín EÚ výzvu na okamžitú reakciu, ktorá pomôže zlepšiť situáciu utečencov, ktorí sa utiekajú o pomoc v krajinách EÚ?

**Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-000088/12**

**Komisií**

**Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)**

(13. januára 2012)

Vec: Právo na prístup k medzinárodnej ochrane

Európska kancelária Červeného kríža vydala správu s názvom „Právo na prístup k medzinárodnej ochrane.“ Dokument zahŕňa oficiálne stanovisko národných spoločností Červených krížov všetkých členských štátov Európskej únie, Medzinárodnej federácie spoločností Červeného kríža, ako aj spoločností Červeného polmesiaca. Správa poukazuje na skutočnosť, že imigračná politika členských štátov Európskej únie, ktorá je zameraná na zníženie a kontrolu nelegálnej migrácie, má negatívny vplyv na prístup potenciálnych žiadateľov o azyl k medzinárodnej ochrane a ochrane v členských štátoch EÚ. Správa upozornila, že žiadosť o medzinárodnú ochranu osôb, ktoré utekajú pred porušovaním svojich ľudských práv a základných slobôd, je možné podať, iba ak tieto osoby prekonajú neúmerné množstvo prekážok. Dokument Červeného kríža takisto dôrazne odsúdil zamedzovanie prístupu k nevyhnutnej humanitárnej pomoci osobám v tiesni a Európsku úniu a jej členské štáty vyzval na zosúladenie ich právnych noriem s medzinárodnými právnymi normami upravujúcimi problematiku azylu a migrácie. Členské štáty a kompetentné orgány EÚ vyzýva na zabezpečenie dodržiavania práva na azyl a prístupu k spravodlivému azylovému konaniu.

— Mieni Komisia vydať konkrétne opatrenia, ktoré budú v súlade s touto výzvou?

**Spoločná odpoveď pani Malmströmovej v mene Komisie**

(16. februára 2012)

Právne predpisy EÚ obsahujú povinné ustanovenia, na základe ktorých musia členské štáty zabezpečiť štátnym príslušníkom tretích krajín, ktorí usilujú o medzinárodnú ochranu, prístup k azylovým konaniam. Tieto predpisy musia byť za každých okolností dodržiavané, a to vrátane situácií zmiešaných tokov a prípadov, v ktorých sa osoby nachádzajú na hraničnom priechode alebo v oblastiach blízko vonkajšej hranice Únie. Ide o hlavnú zásadu *acquis* EÚ v oblasti azylu a migrácie a jej cieľom je zabezpečiť dodržiavanie zásady *non refoulement*.

Komisia pozorne monitoruje, ako si členské štáty plnia tieto povinnosti. Komisia okrem toho predložila návrhy<sup>(1)</sup> na zlepšenie právnych predpisov EÚ v oblasti azylu zvýšením stupňa harmonizácie a zlepšením noriem v súlade s medzinárodnými záväzkami.

(<sup>1</sup>) KOM(2008) 820; KOM(2009) 551; KOM(2011) 319; KOM(2011) 320.



Návrhmi sa posilnia právne predpisy určené na zabezpečenie dostupnosti azylových konaní pre osoby, ktoré sa chcú uchádzať o medzinárodnú ochranu. V návrhoch sa okrem iného spresňuje, že úradníci, ktorí sa ako prví dostanú do kontaktu s osobami usilujúcimi o medzinárodnú ochranu, najmä úradníci vykonávajúci hraničné kontroly a dozor nad pozemnými aj morskými hranicami, by mali dostať inštrukcie a potrebné školenie o tom, ako rozpoznať a riešiť prípady ľudí žiadajúcich o medzinárodnú ochranu. Cieľom je zabezpečiť adekvátnu rovnováhu noriem, ktorá by bola spravodlivá a zároveň efektívna. Komisia zohráva aktívnu úlohu pri podpore rokovaní s cieľom dosiahnuť prijatie legislatívneho balíka do konca roka 2012, ako je to naplánované v Štokholmskom programe.

Komisia okrem toho podporí Európsky podporný úrad pre azyl (EASO) pri rozširovaní cieľových skupín pre vzdelávací program v oblasti azylu (European Asylum Curriculum) tak, aby do neho boli zahrnutí aj členovia pohraničnej stráže. Táto iniciatíva sa uskutoční v spolupráci s agentúrou Frontex.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000069/12  
to the Commission**

**Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)**

(13 January 2012)

*Subject:* The JRS evaluation report

The international Catholic organisation JRS — Jesuit Refugees Service — published a report in which it presents the experience of refugees crossing European borders. In this report JRS presented evidence that the national governments of EU Member States knowingly actively hinder refugee arrivals. Recent Arab Spring events have revealed the reluctance of Member States to provide refugees with the right of access to fair asylum processes. In the context of this report the personal experiences of an Eritrean national were also presented. The experiences of this refugee highlight the brutality and suffering that he went through during his five attempts to escape from Libya via the Mediterranean. Several experts also expressed disappointment at the very low rate of progress attained by the European Union over the recent period regarding the protection of refugees.

Does the Commission, with reference to this criticism, plan to address EU Member State national governments with a call for immediate action to help improve the situation of refugees who are turning for help to EU Member States?

**Question for written answer E-000088/12  
to the Commission**

**Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)**

(13 January 2012)

*Subject:* Right to access to international protection

The European Office of the Red Cross issued a report entitled 'Right to Access to International Protection'. The document comprises the position paper of the National Red Cross Societies of the Member States of the European Union, the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies. The report points out that the immigration policy of the Member States of the European Union, which aims to reduce and control illegal immigration, has a negative impact on access to potential asylum-seekers to international protection and the protection of the EU Member States. The report noted that a request for international protection for persons fleeing violations of their human rights and fundamental freedoms can be made only if such persons overcome an excessive amount of obstacles. The Red Cross document also strongly condemned the denial of access to necessary humanitarian assistance to persons who are in distress and urged the European Union and its Member States to harmonise their laws with international legal standards governing the issue of asylum and migration. It challenges the EU Member States, the EU and their agencies to ensure respect for the right to asylum and access to fair asylum procedures.

— Does the Commission intend to take specific measures that are consistent with this challenge?

**Joint answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission**

(16 February 2012)

EU legislation contains mandatory provisions obliging Member States to ensure access to asylum procedures for third-country nationals seeking international protection. These provisions shall be respected in all circumstances, including situations of mixed flows and cases where such persons are present at the border crossing points or areas close to the external border of the Union. This is a key principle under EU asylum and migration *acquis* and aims to ensure respect for the principle of *non-refoulement*.

The Commission is closely monitoring Member States' compliance with these obligations. In addition, the Commission has presented proposals <sup>(1)</sup> to improve EU asylum legislation by increasing the degree of harmonisation and enhancing standards, in line with international obligations.

<sup>(1)</sup> COM(2008) 820; COM(2009) 551; COM(2011) 319; COM(2011) 320.

The proposals reinforce the provisions meant to ensure accessibility to the asylum procedure for persons who wish to apply for international protection. The proposals clarify, *i.a.*, that official who first come in contact with persons seeking international protection, in particular those carrying out border checks and surveillance of land or maritime borders, should receive instructions and necessary training on how to recognise and deal with people asking for international protection. The aim is to find a proper balance of standards which is both fair and efficient; the Commission is playing an active role in supporting the negotiations, with a view to an adoption of the legislative package by the end of 2012, as foreseen by the Stockholm Programme.

Moreover, the Commission will support EASO in broadening the target groups of the European Asylum Curriculum training in order to include border guards. This would be done in full cooperation with Frontex.

---

(Slovenské znenie)

**Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-000070/12**

**Komisií**

**Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)**

(13. januára 2012)

Vec: Internet a obyvatelia EÚ

Štatistický úrad Eurostat nedávno zverejnil údaje o používaní internetu obyvateľmi členských krajín EÚ. Zo štatistiky vyplýva, že štvrtina obyvateľov Únie internet nikdy nepoužila a medzi členskými štátmi pretrvávajú výrazné rozdiely. Oveľa lepšie sú na tom krajiny na severe ako na juhu. Kým vo Švédsku podiel ľudí vo veku 16 – 74 rokov, ktorí nikdy nesurfovali na webe, dosahuje 5 %, v Rumunsku je to 54 %. Okrem Švédska internet využíva aj väčšina obyvateľstva v Dánsku, Holandsku, Luxembursku a Fínsku. Na chvoste rebríčka sú okrem Rumunska aj Bulharsko, Grécko, Cyprus a Portugalsko. Tieto údaje však súvisia s tým, koľko domácností má k internetu prístup. Kým v Bulharsku ide o 45 %, v Holandsku o 94 %.

Bude sa Komisia týmto prieskumom zaoberať?

Plánuje Komisia v roku 2012 určitým spôsobom podporiť využívanie internetu v domácnostiach európskych krajín, ktoré stoja v tomto smere na chvoste rebríčka?

**Odpoveď od pani Kroesovej v mene Komisie**

(15. februára 2012)

Eurostat je útvarom Európskej komisie. Generálnym riaditeľstvom, ktoré uvedený prieskum Eurostatu („prieskumy IKT“) využíva najviac, je GR pre informačnú spoločnosť a médiá (INFSO). Výsledky prieskumu sa premietajú do cyklu tvorby politiky v rámci Digitálnej agendy pre Európu, ktorá je jednou z priorít v rámci iniciatívy Európa 2020. Údaje, ktoré poskytuje Eurostat, sa uvádzajú aj v hodnotiacej tabuľke digitálnej agendy za rok 2012 a použijú sa teda na posúdenie pokroku pri dosahovaní cieľov digitálnej agendy.

Cieľom Digitálnej agendy pre Európu je do roku 2015 o polovicu znížiť podiel obyvateľov EÚ27, ktorí ešte nikdy nepoužili internet, (teda znížiť ho na 15 %), ako aj zvýšiť podiel pravidelných používateľov internetu zo 60 % na 75 % a v skupine znevýhodnených osôb zo 41 % na 60 %.

Komisia už podnikla konkrétne kroky na propagáciu zručností IKT medzi všetkými skupinami – od základných používateľov, cez školy až po profesionálov v sektore IKT i za jeho hranicami. V roku 2012 Komisia podporuje dve veľké akcie zvyšovania informovanosti na celom území Európy – „Get Online Week“ ([www.getonlineweek.eu](http://www.getonlineweek.eu), týždeň pripojenia sa na internet) a „e-Skills Week“ (týždeň zručností v elektronickom svete). Obe akcie budú prebiehať od 26. do 30. marca 2012. Okrem toho podpredsedníčka Európskej komisie v týchto otázkach úzko spolupracuje s členkou Komisie zodpovednou za vzdelávanie, kultúru, viacjazyčnosť a mládež, napríklad pri problematike kompetencií používateľov IKT v kontexte európskeho kvalifikačného rámca, ktorý je ďalšou činnosťou v rámci Digitálnej agendy. Z dlhodobejšieho hľadiska sa digitálna gramotnosť stala jednou z priorít Európskeho sociálneho fondu (2014 – 2020) a transponuje sa do vnútroštátnych plánov. V neposlednom rade sú k dispozícii nemalé finančné prostriedky z programu PKI IKT PSP na rok 2012 a úsilie Komisie, vrátane výmeny najlepších postupov, podporuje aj platforma mnohých zainteresovaných strán:

[http://ec.europa.eu/information\\_society/events/cf/dae1009/item-display.cfm?id=5254](http://ec.europa.eu/information_society/events/cf/dae1009/item-display.cfm?id=5254)

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000070/12  
to the Commission**

**Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)**

(13 January 2012)

*Subject:* The Internet and EU citizens

The Eurostat statistical office has recently published data on Internet use by citizens of the EU Member States. Statistics show that a quarter of EU citizens have never used the Internet and that there are substantial differences between the Member States. The northern countries are much better in this regard than those in the south. While the proportion of people in Sweden aged 16-74 years who have never surfed the web is 5 %, in Romania it is 54 %. In addition to Sweden, a majority of the populations of Denmark, the Netherlands, Luxembourg and Finland use the Internet. In addition to Romania, Bulgaria, Greece, Cyprus and Portugal are at the bottom of the ladder. However, these data are related to how many households have Internet access. While this is 45 % in Bulgaria, in the Netherlands it is 94 %.

Will the Commission deal with this survey?

Does the Commission plan in 2012 in some way to promote the use of the Internet in households in those European countries that are at the bottom of the ladder in this respect?

**Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission**

(15 February 2012)

Eurostat is a service of the European Commission. The main user of the aforementioned Eurostat survey (the 'ICT surveys') is DG Information Society and Media (INFSO). The results of the survey feed the policy cycle of the Digital Agenda for Europe, one of Europe 2020 flagships. The data released by Eurostat also feed the Digital Agenda Scoreboard 2012. As a result they will also be used to assess progress against the targets of the Digital Agenda.

The Digital Agenda for Europe aims at halving the share of individuals in the EU-27 who had never used the Internet by 2015 (to 15 %) as well as to increase regular Internet users from 60 % to 75 % of individuals and from 41 % to 60 % for disadvantaged people.

The Commission has already taken concrete action on promoting ICT skills across the board — from basic users, through schools up to ICT professionals in the ICT sector and beyond. In 2012 the Commission supports two major awareness actions across Europe; the Get Online Week ([www.getonlineweek.eu](http://www.getonlineweek.eu)) and the e-Skills Week, both taking place from March 26-30, 2012. Additionally, the Vice-President of the European Commission and the member of the Commission responsible for Education, Culture, Multilingualism and Youth are working closely together in these matters, for example on competences of ICT practitioners and users, in the context of the European Qualifications Framework, another action under the Digital Agenda. From a longer term perspective, Digital literacy has become a priority in the European Social Fund (2014-2020), and will be translated into national plans. Finally, there is relevant funding available from CIP ICT PSP programme 2012, while a multi-stakeholder platform is active in supporting the Commission's efforts — including the exchange of best practices:

[http://ec.europa.eu/information\\_society/events/cf/dae1009/item-display.cfm?id=5254](http://ec.europa.eu/information_society/events/cf/dae1009/item-display.cfm?id=5254)

---

(Slovenské znenie)

**Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-000071/12**

**Komisii**

**Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)**

(13. januára 2012)

Vec: Izolácia britského finančného sektora

Na nedávnom summite Európskej únie Británia vetovala prijatie reformnej zmluvy, ktorá mala sprísniť fiškálne pravidlá v eurozóne. Zvyšok krajín teda prijal fiškálnu dohodu o prísnejších rozpočtových a dlhových pravidlách, ktoré sú nad platný rámec. Británia má však výhrady aj k takejto medzivládnej fiškálnej dohode. V tejto súvislosti je podľa Británie problematická najmä otázka inštitúcií EÚ. Európska komisia Britániu varovala, že krajina sa napriek výnimke z tejto medzivládnej dohody finančnej regulácii nevyhne.

Plánuje Komisia prijať opatrenia, ktoré by zabránili snahám britským politikov o izoláciu finančného sektora londýnskeho City od finančnej regulácie Európskej únie?

**Odpoveď pána Rehna v mene Komisie**

(6. marca 2012)

Komisia pripomína, že EÚ za posledné tri roky uskutočňovala rozsiahlu reformu štruktúry regulačného a kontrolného rámca pre finančné služby a že európske právne predpisy boli zakaždým prijaté na základe konsenzu všetkých členských štátov v Rade ministrov.

\_\_\_\_\_

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000071/12  
to the Commission  
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)  
(13 January 2012)**

*Subject:* Isolation of the British financial sector

At the recent European Union summit, Britain vetoed the adoption of the reform treaty that was to have tightened the fiscal rules in the eurozone. The other countries therefore adopted the fiscal agreement on tighter budget and debt rules, which are beyond the existing framework. However, Britain also has reservations about such an intergovernmental fiscal agreement. According to Britain, the issue of EU institutions in particular is problematic in this context. The European Commission warned Britain that, despite the exemption from the intergovernmental agreement, the country cannot avoid financial regulation.

Does the Commission intend to adopt measures to prevent attempts by British politicians to isolate the financial sector in the City of London from European Union financial regulation?

**Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission  
(6 March 2012)**

The Commission notes that over the past three years the EU has engaged in a extensive reform of the regulatory and supervisory architecture for financial services and that in all cases European legislation has been adopted by consensus among all Member States in the Council of Ministers.

---

(Slovenské znenie)

**Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-000072/12**

**Komisií**

**Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)**

(13. januára 2012)

Vec: Kanagaratnam a ďalší vs. Belgicko

Európsky súd pre ľudské práva vo svojom nedávno zverejnenom rozsudku vyslovil, že Belgicko v prípade Kanagaratnam a ďalší porušilo čl. 3 a čl. 5 Európskeho dohovoru o ochrane ľudských práv a základných slobôd. V tomto prípade išlo o nesprávne azylové konanie so srílanskou občiankou pani Kanagaratnam a jej tromi deťmi. Tá po svojom príchode na bruselské letisko požiadala o azyl. Táto žiadosť však bola zamietnutá. Štatút utečenca jej bol udelený až po podaní druhej žiadosti. Európsky súd pre ľudské práva zistil, že rodina bola takmer štyri mesiace zadržovaná v nápravnom zariadení pre nelegálnych migrantov v Belgicku, kde sa k nim správali v rozpore s čl. 3 dohovoru, a teda neľudským a ponižujúcim spôsobom, najmä s ohľadom na zadržiavanie detí, ktoré má ničivé dôsledky na ich duševné zdravie. Súd konštatoval, že toto zadržiavanie bolo takisto v rozpore s čl. 5 dohovoru. Deti boli zadržované v centre pre dospelých, kde neboli vytvorené podmienky na ich ochranu.

Akým spôsobom mieni Komisia prispieť k tomu, aby sa podobné situácie v budúcnosti neopakovali?

**Odpoveď pani Malmströmovej v mene Komisie**

(21. februára 2012)

Smernica Rady 2003/9/ES ukladá členským štátom povinnosť zabezpečiť žiadateľom o azyl životnú úroveň primeranú ich zdravotnému stavu a dostatočné prostriedky na živobytie. Táto smernica sa vzťahuje aj na azylové zariadenia.

Návrh Komisie na zmenu a doplnenie tejto smernice spočíva okrem iného v jasnejších pravidlách pre zadržanie a v zabezpečení vyššieho stupňa ochrany pre zadržaných žiadateľov o azyl v súlade so základnými právami. V návrhu sa stanovujú osobitné záruky týkajúce sa zadržaných zraniteľných osôb, ako sú rodiny s deťmi. Návrh konkrétne stanovuje, že zraniteľné osoby nemožno zadržať, pokiaľ sa po individuálnom zhodnotení ich situácie nepreukáže, že zadržanie im nespôsobí zhoršenie ich zdravotného stavu alebo životných podmienok. Pri zadržaní zraniteľných osôb by členské štáty museli zabezpečiť, aby boli tieto osoby pravidelne monitorované a aby im bola poskytovaná primeraná pomoc s prihliadnutím na ich osobitnú situáciu vrátane ich zdravotného stavu. V prípade zadržania rodín návrh uvádza, že sa im musí poskytnúť oddelené ubytovanie, ktoré im zaručí primerané súkromie. Ak sú zadržané maloleté deti, členské štáty by mali zaručiť, aby mali prístup k voľnočasovým aktivitám vrátane hier a rekreačných aktivít primeraných ich veku a aby mali možnosť pohybovať sa na čerstvom vzduchu.

Návrh je súčasťou balíka, ktorý Komisia v súčasnosti prerokováva s Európskym parlamentom a Radou. Európska rada v minulom roku opätovne potvrdila svoje odhodlanie prijať všetky tieto legislatívne návrhy do konca roka 2012. Pomôže to zabezpečiť lepší a zosúladenejší stupeň ochrany žiadateľov o azyl v celej únii. Komisia verí, že spoluzákonnodarcovia čoskoro dosiahnu názorovú zhodu, pokiaľ ide o tento návrh.



(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000072/12  
to the Commission**

**Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)**

(13 January 2012)

*Subject: Kanagaratnam and others v Belgium*

In its recently published judgment the European Court of Human Rights ruled that Belgium in the case of *Kanagaratnam and others* violated Articles 3 and 5 of the European Convention on Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms. In this case it was an unfair asylum procedure involving a Sri Lankan citizen, Mrs Kanagaratnam, and her three children. After her arrival at Brussels airport she applied for asylum; however, this application was rejected. She was granted refugee status after the second application. The European Court of Human Rights found that the family had been detained for nearly four months in detention facilities for illegal immigrants in Belgium, where they had been treated contrary to Article 3 of the Convention and therefore in an inhuman and degrading manner, especially with regard to the detention of children, which has had devastating consequences on their mental health. The court held that the detention was also in breach of Article 5 of the Convention. The children were detained in the centre for adults, where conditions for their protection had not been created.

How does the Commission intend to help prevent similar situations from recurring?

**Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission**

(21 February 2012)

Council Directive 2003/9/EC obliges Member States to ensure asylum applicants a standard of living adequate for their health and subsistence. It is also applicable in detention facilities.

The Commission has presented a proposal to amend this directive, *inter alia*, by introducing clearer rules on detention and ensuring that detained asylum applicants enjoy a higher level of protection, in line with fundamental rights. Specific guarantees are set out concerning vulnerable persons in detention, such as families with children. In particular, the proposal provides that vulnerable persons would not be detained unless, following an individual evaluation of their situation, it is established that detention will not cause their health and well-being to deteriorate. If vulnerable persons are detained, Member States would need to ensure regular monitoring and adequate support taking into account their particular situation, such as their health. Where families are detained, the proposal stipulates that they must be provided with separate accommodation guaranteeing adequate privacy. In the case of detained minors, Member States would have to ensure that they have the possibility to engage in leisure activities, including play and recreational activities appropriate to their age, and that they have access to open air spaces.

The Commission's proposal is part of a package currently being negotiated with the European Parliament and the Council. The European Council has reconfirmed last year the commitment to adopt all these legislative proposals by the end of 2012. This will help to ensure better and more harmonised level of protection for asylum applicants throughout the Union. The Commission hopes that the co-legislators will find soon an agreement on its proposal.

---

(Slovenské znenie)

**Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-000074/12**

**Komisií**

**Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)**

(13. januára 2012)

Vec: Medzivládna dohoda o prísnejších rozpočtových a dlhových pravidlách

Na stretnutí Európskej rady (8. – 9. decembra 2011) sa 26 z 27 členských štátov zhodlo na prijatí jednoznačných opatrení zameraných na riešenie dlhovej krízy, čím sa otvorí cesta medzivládnej zmluve, ktorá má priniesť väčšiu integráciu, disciplínu a konvergenciu. Nová zmluva by mala zabezpečiť dodržiavanie nových prísnejších pravidiel EÚ v oblasti dlhu a deficitu. Táto zmluva má obsahovať záväzok podporiť odporúčania Komisie prijaté v rámci postupu pri nadmernom deficite, čím sa má dosiahnuť väčšia automatickosť opatrení, a taktiež záväzok prijať pravidlo vyrovnaného rozpočtu na ústavnej, resp. ekvivalentnej úrovni, a uznať právomoc Súdneho dvora, pokiaľ ide o overovanie transpozície tohto pravidla. Otázka právomocí inštitúcií EÚ však v tomto smere nie je úplne jasná. Inštitúcie by totiž takýmto spôsobom začali slúžiť na jednej strane eurozóne a na druhej strane Európskej únii. Súdny dvor rozhodol, že členské štáty, ktoré konajú spoločne, môžu zveriť niektoré úlohy inštitúciám EÚ. Nie je však jasné, či toto pravidlo platí aj v prípade, že touto cestou sa rozhodnú ísť iba niektoré z členských krajín.

Môže podľa názoru Komisie skupina členských štátov na základe medzivládnej dohody zverovať inštitúciám vybudovaným pre všetkých 27 členských krajín určité kompetencie?

Bola by podľa názoru Komisie takáto dvojkoľajnosť využívania európskych inštitúcií v súlade s právom Európskej únie?

**Odpoveď pána Rehna v mene Komisie**

(12. marca 2012)

Pri vykonávaní Zmluvy o stabilite, koordinácii a správe v hospodárskej a menovej únii („medzinárodnej zmluvy“) budú inštitúcie EÚ konať v rámci svojich právomocí stanovených v zmluvách EÚ a právnych predpisoch EÚ. Pokiaľ ide o Komisiu, je táto zásada jasne vyjadrená v odôvodnení 10 samotnej zmluvy.

Právomoc Súdneho dvora pri overovaní, či zmluvné strany dodržiavajú povinnosť uplatňovať pravidlo vyrovnaného rozpočtu, vychádza z článku 273 ZFEÚ<sup>(1)</sup>, v ktorom sa uvádza, že „Súdny dvor má právomoc rozhodovať každý spor medzi členskými štátmi, ktorý súvisí s predmetom zmlúv, ak sa mu tento spor predloží na základe osobitnej dohody strán“.

(<sup>1</sup>) Zmluva o fungovaní Európskej únie.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000074/12  
to the Commission**

**Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)**

(13 January 2012)

*Subject:* Intergovernmental agreement on tighter budget and debt rules

At the European Council meeting of 8-9 December, 26 out of 27 Member States decided on the adoption of strong measures to address the debt crisis and on opening the way to an intergovernmental treaty for greater integration, discipline and convergence. The new treaty should ensure the respect of the EU's newly tightened rules on debt and deficits. The treaty should include a commitment to support recommendations the Commission makes in the framework of the Excessive Deficit Procedure, leading to greater automaticity, and also a commitment to adopt a balanced budget rule at constitutional or equivalent level, and recognise the jurisdiction of the Court of Justice to verify its transposition. The issue of the powers of EU institutions in this regard, however, is not entirely clear. The institutions would thus begin to serve the euro area on the one hand, and the European Union on the other. The Court held that the Member States who are acting jointly may entrust certain tasks to the EU institutions. It is unclear, however, whether this rule applies even if only a few of the Member States decide to take this route.

Does the Commission consider that it is possible for a group of Member States assign by intergovernmental agreement to assign certain powers to institutions designed for use by all 27 Member States?

In the Commission's view would such a two-track use of European institutions be in accordance with EC law?

**Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission**

(12 March 2012)

For the implementation of the Treaty on Stability, Coordination and Governance in the Economic and Monetary Union ('international treaty'), the EU institutions will act within the framework of their powers provided by the EU Treaties and EC law. This principle is clearly expressed in Recital 10 of the Treaty itself as regards the Commission.

The jurisdiction of the Court of Justice to verify compliance of the contracting parties with their obligation to give effect to the balanced budget rule is based on Article 273 of the TFEU <sup>(1)</sup>, which indicates that 'the Court of Justice shall have jurisdiction in any dispute between Member States which relates to the subject matter of the Treaties if the dispute is submitted to it under a special agreement between the parties'.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union.

(Slovenské znenie)

**Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-000075/12**

**Komisi**

**Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)**

(13. januára 2012)

Vec: Migračná politika Nemecka

Ministerstvo vnútra Spolkovej republiky Nemecko prijalo rozhodnutie, na základe ktorého plánuje v najbližších troch rokoch presídliť približne 900 utečencov, pričom toto číslo sa môže ešte zvýšiť. Presídľovanie sa bude týkať najmä sýrskych a líbyjských utečencov. Nemecko vydalo podobné rozhodnutie už v máji 2011, keď sa počas konferencie zameranej na relokáciu a presídlenie rozhodlo zaviazat' na presídlenie približne stovky utečencov.

Akým spôsobom bude Komisia motivovať ostatné členské krajiny EÚ, aby nasledovali príklad Nemecka?

**Odpoveď pani Malmströmovej v mene Komisie**

(10. februára 2012)

Komisia už veľa rokov obhajuje zvýšenie miery presídľovania utečencov do EÚ. Táto politika sa zakladá na pevnom presvedčení, že pre najzraniteľnejšie skupiny utečencov na celom svete treba zabezpečiť prístup k trvalým riešeniam – presídlenie je opatrením, ktoré sa zvolilo na zmiernenie pretrvávajúcej situácie utečencov v prípadoch, kde dobrovoľný návrat a miestna integrácia nie sú možné.

Komisia prostredníctvom finančných stimulov poskytovaných z Európskeho fondu pre utečencov (jednorazová suma na financovanie presídlenia utečencov patriacich do vybraných kategórií) povzbudzuje členské štáty, aby presídľovali utečencov. V rokovaní návrhu Komisie o „spoločnom programe EÚ pre presídľovanie“ dosiahli zákonodarcovia výrazný pokrok.

Cieľom tohto programu je zvýšiť presídľovanie utečencov do EÚ zlepšením financovania krajín, ktoré nedávno začali s presídľovaním. Tieto krajiny majú dostať 6 000 EUR za každého presídleného utečenca namiesto doterajších 4 000 EUR. Okrem toho krajiny, ktoré už raz v priebehu predchádzajúcich rokov použili na presídlenie finančné prostriedky z Európskeho fondu pre utečencov, dostanú jednorazovú sumu vo výške 5 000 EUR za každého presídleného utečenca. Program navyše ponúka široký výber kategórií utečencov. Tieto zahŕňajú konkrétne spoločné priority EÚ v oblasti presídľovania, ktoré sa sústreďujú na osobitné národnostné skupiny v krajinách s obzvlášť rozsiahlymi a zložitými prípadmi utečencov. Komisia povzbudzuje ďalšie členské štáty, aby vytvorili ročné národné programy presídľovania. Toto úsilie sa bude ďalej podporovať v rámci Fondu pre azyl a migráciu, ktorý zabezpečí zvýšenie finančných prostriedkov na presídľovanie do EÚ.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000075/12  
to the Commission**

**Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)**

(13 January 2012)

*Subject:* Germany's migration policy

The Ministry of Interior of the Federal Republic of Germany has made a decision on the basis of which it plans to resettle about 900 refugees over the next three years, and this number may yet increase. This resettlement will affect in particular Syrian and Libyan refugees. Germany took a similar decision in May 2011, when during a conference focused on relocation and resettlement it decided to commit itself to resettle approximately one hundred refugees.

In what way will the Commission encourage other EU Member States to follow the example of Germany?

**Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission**

(10 February 2012)

The Commission has for many years now advocated increased refugee resettlement to the EU. This policy is based on a firm conviction that the most vulnerable refugees worldwide must be ensured access to durable solutions — resettlement being the chosen measure to alleviate the protracted refugee situations in cases where voluntary return and local integration are not possible.

The Member States have been encouraged to resettle refugees through the financial incentives provided by the European Refugee Fund (lump sum financing the resettlement of refugee cases falling under selected categories). Concerning the negotiation of the Commission proposal on a 'Joint EU Resettlement Programme' substantial progress is being made by the co-legislators.

This Programme aims at increasing resettlement to the EU by providing more funding to the newly-resettling countries which are to receive EUR 6 000 per resettled refugee in place of EUR 4 000 available until now. Furthermore, the countries which used ERF funding for resettlement once in the course of the previous years will receive a lump sum of EUR 5 000 per resettled refugee. In addition, the Programme offers a wider choice of categories of refugees. These include specific common EU resettlement priorities which select particular national groups in countries with particularly large or difficult refugee caseloads. The Commission encourages more Member States to establish annual national resettlement schemes. This will be further promoted by the Asylum and Migration Fund which will ensure increased funding for EU resettlement.

---

(Slovenské znenie)

**Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-000076/12**

**Komisii**

**Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)**

(13. januára 2012)

Vec: Monitorovací systém zameraný na boj proti detskej chudobe

Finančná kríza tvrdo zasiahla verejné financie všetkých členských štátov Európskej únie. Deti však nesmú byť obeťami úsporných opatrení a škrtov národných vlád. V súlade so stratégiou Európa 2020 má Únia ambiciózný cieľ, a to do roku 2020 vytrhnúť z chudoby 20 miliónov obyvateľov. Dosiachnutie tohto cieľa nesmú národné vlády svojimi úspornými opatreniami ohrozovať a otázka boja proti detskej chudobe musí zostať prioritná za každých okolností, inak sa súčasné problémy v dlhodobom horizonte iba prehĺbia. Deti musia mať zabezpečený prístup k primeraným zdrojom, rovnakým možnostiam a kvalitným službám. Boj proti detskej chudobe však bude účinný jedine v prípade, že Komisia bude disponovať dostatočným množstvom relevantných informácií pochádzajúcich z presného monitoringu situácie v každej členskej krajine.

Mieni Komisia v roku 2012 zaviesť určitý monitorovací rámec, ktorý zabezpečí zber informácií dôležitých pre boj EÚ proti detskej chudobe v pravidelných intervaloch?

**Odpoveď pána Andora v mene Komisie**

(22. februára 2012)

V stratégii Európa 2020 je stanovený celkový alebo „hlavný“ cieľ, ktorým je znížiť v Európskej únii do roku 2020 celkový počet ľudí ohrozených chudobou aspoň o 20 miliónov. Komisia pozorne sleduje snahy členských štátov o splnenie svojich národných cieľov zameraných na znižovanie chudoby. Niektoré členské štáty vo svojich národných programoch reforiem stanovili osobitné ciele, ktoré sú zamerané na znižovanie chudoby detí.

Spoločný rámec hodnotenia v rámci stratégie Európa 2020 (Joint Assessment Framework, JAF), ktorý bol nedávno vytvorený, poskytuje základ pre monitorovanie reforiem v oblasti zamestnania a sociálnej politiky stratégie Európa 2020 a pre meranie pokroku, ktorý sa dosiahol pri plnení hlavného cieľa EÚ, a s ním spojených národných cieľov. Jedna z politických oblastí, ktorej sa venuje JAF, zahŕňa opatrenia zamerané na prelomenie kruhu medzigeneračného prenosu chudoby prostredníctvom vyvinutia úsilia na boj proti chudobe detí. Zaviedol sa súbor ukazovateľov priamo súvisiacich s chudobou detí, ktorým sa každoročne sleduje pokrok v jednotlivých členských štátoch.

Komisia takisto vypracúva odporúčanie, ktorým sa stanovujú spoločné zásady účinného riešenia problematiky chudoby detí v kľúčových oblastiach politiky a súbor ukazovateľov hĺbkovej kontroly a budúceho monitorovania.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000076/12  
to the Commission**

**Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)**

(13 January 2012)

*Subject:* The monitoring system aimed at tackling child poverty

The financial crisis has hit all the public finances of the Member States of the European Union hard. However, children must not become victims of austerity measures and cuts by national governments. In accordance with the Europe 2020 strategy, the EU has an ambitious goal, which is to pull 20 million people out of poverty by 2020. The achievement of this goal must not be threatened by national governments and their austerity methods and the fight against child poverty must remain a priority under all circumstances, otherwise in the long-term the current problems can only deepen. Children must be assured access to adequate resources, equal opportunities and high quality services. The fight against child poverty, however, will be effective only if the Commission has sufficient relevant information gleaned from accurate monitoring of the situation in each Member State.

Does the Commission intend in 2012 to establish a monitoring framework that will collect at regular intervals information relevant to the EU's fight against child poverty?

**Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission**

(22 February 2012)

The Europe 2020 strategy sets an overall or 'headline' target for reducing the total number of people at risk of poverty in the European Union by at least 20 million by 2020. The Commission is closely following the Member States in their efforts to meet their national poverty-reduction targets. Some Member States' national reform programmes set specific targets for reducing child poverty.

The Europe 2020 Joint Assessment Framework (JAF) developed recently provides a basis for monitoring reforms under the employment and social policy strands of the Europe 2020 strategy and measuring progress towards meeting the EU headline and related national targets. One policy area addressed by the JAF involves breaking the circle of intergenerational poverty transmission through efforts to tackle child poverty. A set of indicators of direct relevance to child poverty has been put into place to track annual progress in the Member States.

The Commission is also drafting a recommendation which entails common principles to effectively address child poverty in key policy areas, and a set of indicators for in-depth review and future monitoring.

---

(Slovenské znenie)

### Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-000077/12

Komisiu

Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)

(13. januára 2012)

Vec: Násilie v médiách

Médiá sú každodennou súčasťou našej spoločnosti. Odrážajú realitu, ktorá v mnohých smeroch vyvoláva pocity obáv, strachu a neistoty. Násilie sa v médiách vyskytuje veľmi často. Výsledky výskumov hovoria, že napr. dieťa v období do skončenia základnej školy vidí v médiách priemere stotisíc aktov simulovaného násilia a pred dosiahnutím plnoletosti je svedkom priebehu približne osemmástisíc vražd. Na základe odborných štúdií možno povedať, že vplyvom sledovania programov s násilnými obrazmi vzniká znižovanie vnímavosti na tieto javy v reálnom živote, čím sa zvyšuje tolerancia násilia. Niektorí odborníci dokonca tvrdia, že sledovanie programov s prvkami násilia a brutality v detskom veku zvyšuje sklony k agresívnemu správaniu v dospelosti.

Mieni Komisia prijať konkrétne opatrenia zamerané na ochranu maloletého diváka pred prvkami násilia, ktoré sa vyskytujú v médiách?

### Odpoveď od pani Kroesovej v mene Komisie

(20. februára 2012)

V rámci programu pre Bezpečnejší internet Komisia vypracúva politiky a financuje projekty, ktorých cieľom je zvýšiť informovanosť a povedomie verejnosti o škodlivom obsahu, s ktorým sa deti stretávajú na internete, ako aj zaviesť vhodné ochranné opatrenia <sup>(1)</sup>.

Smernica o audiovizuálnych mediálnych službách (smernica 2010/13/EÚ) ukladá členským štátom povinnosť prijať opatrenia na ochranu neplnoletých osôb pred akýmkoľvek obsahom televízneho vysielania a audiovizuálnych služieb na požiadanie, ktoré by mohli nepriaznivo pôsobiť na ich fyzický, psychický alebo morálny vývoj <sup>(2)</sup>.

Komisia v roku 2007 prijala oznámenie <sup>(3)</sup> a v roku 2009 odporúčanie <sup>(4)</sup> o mediálnej gramotnosti <sup>(5)</sup>.

V odporúčaní EÚ o ochrane neplnoletých osôb z rokov 1998 a 2006 <sup>(6)</sup> boli členské štáty a priemysel vyzvaní, aby podporili a rozvíjali vhodné rámcové podmienky. Komisia 13. septembra 2011 uverejnila správu o uplatňovaní týchto odporúčaní <sup>(7)</sup>. Rada v nadväznosti na to prijala závery 29. novembra 2011 <sup>(8)</sup>.

Komisárka pre digitálnu agendu vyzvala skupinu výkonných riaditeľov najväčších spoločností, aby preskúmali spôsoby, akými by sa mohlo deťom umožniť bezpečne surfovať po internete, a identifikovala päť osobitných oblastí, v ktorých by sa mali prijať opatrenia. Tridsať popredných spoločností sa medzitým zaviazalo vypracovať „vyhlásenie o zámere“ <sup>(9)</sup>.

V oznámení plánovanom na tento rok by Komisia mala predložiť ďalšie návrhy.

<sup>(1)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/information\\_society/activities/sip/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/information_society/activities/sip/index_en.htm)

<sup>(2)</sup> Články 12 a 27.

<sup>(3)</sup> KOM(2007) 833.

<sup>(4)</sup> KOM(2009) 6464.

<sup>(5)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/culture/media/literacy/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/culture/media/literacy/index_en.htm)

<sup>(6)</sup> Odporúčanie Rady z 24.9.1998 (98/560/ES) a odporúčanie Európskeho parlamentu a Rady z 20.12.2006 (2006/952/ES).

<sup>(7)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/avpolicy/reg/minors/rec/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/avpolicy/reg/minors/rec/index_en.htm)

<sup>(8)</sup> <http://www.consilium.europa.eu/homepage/showfocus?lang=en&focusID=78462>.

<sup>(9)</sup> <http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=IP/11/1485&format=HTML&aged=0&language=SK&guiLanguage=en>.



(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000077/12  
to the Commission**

**Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)**

(13 January 2012)

*Subject:* Violence in the media

The media is an everyday part of our society. It reflects reality, which in many ways causes feelings of concern, fear and insecurity. Violence in the media occurs very often. Research results suggest that for example by the time a child has completed primary school he or she will have seen in the media an average of one hundred thousand acts of simulated violence, and before the age of majority will have been witness to stories of approximately eighteen thousand murders. Based on these scientific studies it can be said that a reduced susceptibility to these phenomena in real life arises due to the watching of programmes containing violent imagery, thereby increasing the tolerance of violence. Some experts even say that watching programmes with elements of violence and brutality in childhood increases the propensity for aggressive behaviour in adulthood.

Does the Commission intend to adopt specific measures aimed at protecting minors from the elements of violence that occur in the media?

**Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission**

(20 February 2012)

The Commission with the Safer Internet Programme develops policies and funds projects to raise awareness and build knowledge about harmful content children encounter online and about implementing appropriate protection measures <sup>(1)</sup>.

The Audiovisual Media Services Directive (Directive 2010/13/EU) obliges Member States to take measures to protect minors against any content in TV programmes and on-demand audiovisual services which might impair their physical, mental or moral development <sup>(2)</sup>.

The Commission adopted in 2007 a communication <sup>(3)</sup> and in 2009 a recommendation <sup>(4)</sup> on media literacy <sup>(5)</sup>.

In the 1998 and 2006 EU Recommendations on Protection of Minors <sup>(6)</sup> Member States and industry were called upon to promote and develop appropriate framework conditions. On 13 September 2011, the Commission published a report on the application of these Recommendations <sup>(7)</sup>. The Council followed this up by adopting Conclusions on 29 November 2011 <sup>(8)</sup>.

The Digital Agenda Commissioner has called on a coalition of CEOs of major companies to explore ways to empower children to surf safely and identified specific five fields of action. Meanwhile 30 leading companies have committed to a 'statement of purpose' <sup>(9)</sup>.

In a communication, planned for this year, the Commission should make further proposals.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/information\\_society/activities/sip/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/information_society/activities/sip/index_en.htm)

<sup>(2)</sup> Articles 12 and 27.

<sup>(3)</sup> COM(2007) 833.

<sup>(4)</sup> COM(2009) 6464.

<sup>(5)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/culture/media/literacy/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/culture/media/literacy/index_en.htm)

<sup>(6)</sup> Council recommendation of 24.9.1998 (98/560/EC) and recommendation of the European Parliament and of the Council of 20.12.2006 (2006/952/EC).

<sup>(7)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/avpolicy/reg/minors/rec/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/avpolicy/reg/minors/rec/index_en.htm)

<sup>(8)</sup> <http://www.consilium.europa.eu/homepage/showfocus?lang=en&focusID=78462>

<sup>(9)</sup> <http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=IP/11/1485&format=HTML&aged=0&language=EN&guiLanguage=en>

(Slovenské znenie)

**Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-000079/12**

**Komisií**

**Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)**

(13. januára 2012)

Vec: Nebezpečné investície na Ukrajine

Obchodníci a diplomati už dávnejšie upozorňovali na skutočnosť, že investovať na Ukrajine je stále nebezpečnejšie. Je to najmä pre praktiky tzv. „obchodných razií“. Ide o formu útokov spočívajúcich v nepriateľskom prevzatí firmy, keď osoba pomocou úplatkov alebo vydierania prinúti súd, aby voči prosperujúcej firme vymáhal plnenie na základe falošného nároku. V extrémnych prípadoch takéto razie dokonca končievajú strelbou a následným usmrtením osôb. Väčšina obetí týchto praktík sú malé a stredné ukrajinské podniky pôsobiace v poľnohospodárskom sektore. Zahraničné podniky však proti takýmto raziám nie sú imúnne. Nekalé praktiky ukrajinských štátnych orgánov sa prejavujú aj vo forme zastrasovania európskych spoločností pôsobiacich na Ukrajine, a to napr. formou daňových sporov alebo neustálymi a neodôvodnenými kontrolami.

Plánuje Komisia prijať konkrétne opatrenia zamerané na ochranu podnikateľov z členských krajín Európskej únie, ktorí pôsobia na Ukrajine?

**Odpoveď podpredsedníčky Komisie a vysokej predstaviteľky Ashtonovej v mene Komisie**

(26. marca 2012)

Európska komisia opakovane vyjadrila znepokojenie vo vzťahu k Ukrajine v súvislosti so zlými podmienkami pre podnikateľov a investorov v tejto krajine a poukázala na potrebu prijať zosúladené opatrenia v záujme zlepšenia správy ekonomických záležitostí. Ukrajinské orgány boli upozornené na rad konkrétnych problémov, medzi ktoré patrí daňový systém (vrátane nepriamych daní), práva duševného vlastníctva, udeľovanie licencií, neodôvodnené kontroly zo strany štátnych orgánov, určovanie colnej hodnoty a súdne konania.

Tzv. obchodné razie majú celý rad podob, sú však prejavom rozsiahlejšieho systémového problému spočívajúceho v korupcii a nedostatočnej nezávislosti súdnictva. Prioritou politického dialógu EÚ s Ukrajinou a predpokladom poskytnutia podpory Ukrajine je prijatie protikorupčných opatrení a reforma justičného systému. Uvedené opatrenia (vrátane rozsiahlej a komplexnej zóny voľného obchodu) sa považujú za prierezové prvky v dohode o pridružení, ktorá sa v súčasnosti dokončuje. Dodržiavanie zásad právneho štátu sa považuje za základný prvok tejto dohody. Na dôvažok sa predpokladá, že táto dohoda bude obsahovať ustanovenia o vnútroštátnych právnych predpisoch a o iných otázkach, ktoré majú vplyv na obchodnú prax.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000079/12  
to the Commission**

**Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)**

(13 January 2012)

*Subject:* Dangerous investments in Ukraine

Traders and diplomats have long warned of the fact that investing in Ukraine is still dangerous. This is particularly so for the practice known as 'corporate raiding'. This is a form of attack consisting of the hostile takeover of a business whereby a person forces a court, using extortion or bribes, to enforce payments from a prosperous company on the basis of a false claim. In extreme cases, such raids even end up with shootings and subsequent death. The majority of the victims of this practice are small and medium Ukrainian enterprises in the agricultural sector. Foreign companies, however, are not immune to such raids. Unfair practices by Ukrainian state authorities are manifested in the form of intimidation of European companies operating in Ukraine, e.g. in the form of tax disputes or persistent and unreasonable controls.

Does the Commission plan to adopt concrete measures to protect entrepreneurs from the European Union who are acting in Ukraine?

**Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission**

(26 March 2012)

The European Union has repeatedly raised with Ukraine concerns about the poor business and investment climate in the country, and the need for concerted action to improve economic governance. A number of specific problems have been brought to the attention of the Ukrainian authorities, among them taxation (including indirect taxation), intellectual property rights, licensing, unjustified inspections by state authorities, customs valuation and judicial processes.

Corporate raiding has a range of manifestations, but is symptomatic of a broader systemic problem of corruption and lack of judicial independence: both anti-corruption and judicial reform are priorities for the EU's policy dialogue and support to Ukraine, and are recognised as cross-cutting elements in the Association Agreement (including a Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Area) which is currently being finalised. Respect for the principles of the Rule of Law is considered an essential element of this Agreement. In addition, it is envisaged that the Agreement will contain provisions on domestic regulation and other issues with an impact on business practice.

---

(Slovenské znenie)

**Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-000080/12**

**Komisií**

**Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)**

(13. januára 2012)

Vec: Nová smernica v oblasti farmácie

Európska komisia pripravuje novú smernicu v oblasti farmácie, ktorej cieľom má byť skvalitnenie spôsobu, akým farmaceutické spoločnosti prezentujú spotrebiteľom svoje produkty. Upraviť spôsob informovania ľudí o účinkoch liekov bolo tiež cieľom „farmaceutického balíčka“ návrhov Európskej komisie z decembra 2008. Nové zmeny sa však stali predmetom sporu, pretože by po prvýkrát umožnili farmaceutickým spoločnostiam poskytovať informácie spotrebiteľom priamo. Kritici tvrdia, že takéto pravidlá by umožnili, aby farmaceutické spoločnosti robili liekom na predpis reklamu a verejná reklama na lieky na predpis je v Európskej únii zakázaná. Na druhej strane však pacient, teda spotrebiteľ, musí mať k dispozícii čo najviac informácií, aby bolo jeho rozhodnutie dostatočne informované.

Akým spôsobom chce teda Komisia docieľiť, aby bol pacient, resp. spotrebiteľ čo najlepšie informovaný, ale aby zároveň nedochádzalo ku skrytej reklame zo strany farmaceutických spoločností?

**Odpoveď pána Dallího v mene Komisie**

(21. februára 2012)

Komisia by chcela váženú pani poslankyňu odkázať na svoju odpoveď na písomnú otázku E010135/2011<sup>(1)</sup>, v ktorej vysvetľuje, že súčasný zákaz reklamy na lieky viazané na lekársky predpis je zachovaný, pričom sa stanovujú kritériá pre prípadné poskytnutie informácií, ktoré majú farmaceutické spoločnosti dať k dispozícii.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB>.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000080/12  
to the Commission**

**Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)**

(13 January 2012)

*Subject:* The new directive in the field of pharmacy

The European Commission is preparing a new directive in the field of pharmacy, which is aimed at improving the way pharmaceutical companies present their products to consumers. The regulation of the method of informing people of the effects of medicines was also the objective of the European Commission's 'pharmaceutical package' proposals in December 2008. The new changes are still the subject of dispute, as for first time pharmaceutical companies would be able to provide information to consumers directly. Critics argue that such rules would allow pharmaceutical companies to make an advertisement from prescription drugs, and public advertising of prescription drugs is prohibited in the European Union. On the other hand the patient, i.e. the consumer, must have as much information available so as to be sufficiently informed.

How therefore does the Commission wish to achieve a situation whereby the patient, or consumer, is as well-informed as possible, yet at the same time avoiding hidden advertising by pharmaceutical companies?

**Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission**

(21 February 2012)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E010135/2011 <sup>(1)</sup>, in which it explained that the current advertising ban on prescription-only medicines is maintained while setting up criteria for possible information to be provided by the pharmaceutical companies.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB>.

(Slovenské znenie)

**Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-000081/12**

**Komisiu**

**Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)**

(13. januára 2012)

Vec: Nové pravidlá pre motorové vozidlá

Keby motocykle využívalo viac ľudí, na európskych cestách by bolo omnoho viac miesta. Technické záležitosti motocyklov v súčasnosti upravuje veľké množstvo smerníc, ktoré nie sú celkom jasné. Pravidlá by mali byť jednoduchšie a efektívnejšie. Európska komisia preto nedávno predstavila návrh o nových pravidlách na zlepšenie bezpečnosti a čistoty jednostopových motorových vozidiel, od mopedom a skútrov až po motorky. Motorky by mali byť na základe týchto pravidiel bezpečnejšie a ekologickejšie. Komisia v tejto súvislosti navrhla vybaviť motocykle tzv. palubným diagnostickým systémom OBD, ktorý pomáha jazdcovi a mechanikovi objaviť poruchy vozidla. Je však potrebné rozlišovať medzi stupňom OBD I a OBD II, ktorý je technicky náročnejší a zároveň omnoho drahší.

Plánuje Komisia povinné zavedenie systému OBD II?

**Odpoveď pána Tajaniho v mene Komisie**

(29. februára 2012)

Palubné diagnostické systémy (systémy OBD) poskytujú štandardizované informácie, ktoré výrazne pomôžu pri oprave vozidla. Získanie tejto diagnostickej informácie je prvým krokom pri oprave vozidla, za ktorým nasleduje analýza údajov a samotná oprava alebo výmena nefungujúceho komponentu alebo systému. Umožňuje to rýchlo určiť, kde je porucha v prípade pokazeného vozidla kategórie L, čo je názov radu vozidiel, do ktorých patria bicykle s pohonným systémom, motocykle s alebo bez postranného vozíka, trojkolky a štvorkolky.

Systém OBD prvého stupňa oznámi rozsvietením kontrolky poruchy na palubnej doske každý režim prevádzky, v ktorom dôjde k výraznému zníženiu krútiaceho momentu motora a ktorý môže predstavovať nebezpečenstvo. Tento systém taktiež monitoruje všetky elektrické poruchy systému regulácie emisií a podáva informácie o týchto jednoduchých poruchách, ktorých následkom je prekročenie emisných prahov OBD. Systémy OBD druhého stupňa monitorujú väčšie množstvo chýb a porúch systému regulácie emisií. Okrem toho umožňujú opravárovi vozidla lepšie identifikovať nefungujúci komponent alebo systém, ktorý ohrozuje životné prostredie alebo bezpečnosť a zabraňujú tak poškodeniu katalyzátora v prípade zlyhania zapalovania, čím ušetria vlastníčkovi vozidla nemalé peniaze za výmenu komponentu.

Komisia navrhla, aby boli systémy OBD prvého stupňa povinné pre všetky kategórie vozidiel L, s ich postupným zavádzaním od roku 2017 do roku 2020. Predpokladá sa, že v roku 2015 si nechá Komisia vypracovať štúdiu o vplyve s cieľom posúdiť, či by bolo z hľadiska nákladov a prínosu dostatočne efektívne od roku 2020 zaviesť povinnosť vybaviť niektoré kategórie vozidiel L, ako napr. motocykle a niektoré trojkolky a štvorkolky, systémami OBD druhého stupňa.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000081/12  
to the Commission**

**Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)**

(13 January 2012)

*Subject:* New rules for motor vehicles

If more people used motorcycles there would be much more space on Europe's roads. Technical matters regarding motorcycles are currently regulated by a large number of directives which are not entirely clear. The rules should be more simple and effective. The European Commission has therefore recently launched a proposal for new rules to improve the safety and cleanliness of motorcycles, from mopeds and scooters to motorcycles. On the basis of these rules motorcycles should be safer and greener. In this context it proposed that motorcycles should be equipped with the on-board diagnostic (OBD) system to help riders and mechanics discover faults in the vehicle. However, it is necessary to distinguish between OBD I and OBD II, which is technically more complicated and also much more expensive.

Does the Commission plan to introduce OBD II as a mandatory system?

**Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission**

(29 February 2012)

Onboard diagnostic systems (OBD) provide standardised information to effectively and efficiently repair a vehicle. Obtaining this diagnostic information is the first step in a vehicle repair cycle, subsequently followed by data analysis and the actual repair or replacement of a failing component or system. It allows determining quickly what is wrong with a broken L-category vehicle, which is the vehicle family name for powered cycles, motorcycles with and without sidecars, tricycles and quadricycles.

An OBD stage I system reports any operating mode that significantly reduces engine torque and which therefore may be safety critical by illuminating a malfunction checklight on the dashboard. The system also monitors for any electric failure of the emissions control system and reports those simple failures which result in the OBD emission thresholds being exceeded. OBD stage II systems monitor for a wider range of emissions control system faults and degradation. In addition it allows to better identify the failing environmental or safety critical component or system for the vehicle repairer and it helps protecting the catalyst from being damaged in case of misfire, preventing high replacement cost to the vehicle owner.

The Commission has proposed to make OBD stage I systems obligatory on all L-vehicle categories, phasing-in between 2017 and 2020. In 2015 it is foreseen that the Commission will conduct an effect study to assess if it is sufficiently cost beneficial to make OBD stage II systems obligatory for some L-vehicle categories such as motorcycles and certain tricycles and quadricycles as of 2020.

(Slovenské znenie)

**Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-000082/12**

**Komisii**

**Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)**

(13. januára 2012)

Vec: Nový trend vlád tzv. technokratov

Dôsledkom dlhovej krízy padli v niektorých členských štátoch Európskej únie národné vlády. Konkrétne ide o Grécko a Taliansko. Vo vyhrotenej situácii a pod tlakom finančných trhov prevzali vládu v týchto krajinách tzv. technokrati. Hoci im legitímnosť ako prechodným vládam odobrili oba parlamenty, chýba im poverenie voličskou verejnosťou. Tento stav má trvať až do momentu, keď v krajinách prebehnú riadne parlamentné voľby. V Taliansku sú naplánované na rok 2013 a v Grécku na február 2012. Dovtedy budú tieto krajiny, výrazne ohrozené krachom verejných financií, v takejto forme akejsi nútenej správy. Volených politikov talianskej a gréckej vlády nahradili finanční odborníci. Tento trend sa v novembri prejavil už aj v Španielsku. Demokraciu týmto spôsobom nahrádza akási technokracia.

Aký je postoj Komisie k takémuto druhu dočasného riešenia politickej situácie?

Myslí si Komisia, že sú vlády technokratov v súlade so zásadami demokracie?

Ide podľa názoru Komisie o pozitívny trend?

**Odpoveď pána Barrosa v mene Komisie**

(16. februára 2012)

Vlády, ktoré zmieňuje vážená pani poslankyňa, majú podporu národných parlamentov v súlade s ich príslušnými ústavnými požiadavkami. Inými slovami, neexistuje žiaden dôvod pochybovať o ich demokratickej legitimitate alebo demokratickom charaktere.

---



(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000082/12  
to the Commission**

**Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)**

(13 January 2012)

*Subject:* A new governmental trend — technocrats

In some European Union Member States, namely Greece and Italy, national governments have fallen as a result of the debt crisis. In extreme situations and under pressure from financial markets, governments in these countries have been taken over by so-called technocrats. Although their legitimacy as a transitional government has been vetted by both parliaments, they lack a mandate from the electoral public. This situation should last until such time that proper parliamentary elections take place in these countries. In Italy these are scheduled for 2013 and in Greece for February 2012. Until then, these countries' public finances are at significant risk of collapse under such a form of 'receivership'. Elected politicians in the Italian and Greek governments have been replaced by financial experts. This trend has already been seen in Spain in November. In this way democracy is being replaced by a kind of technocracy.

What is the Commission's attitude to this type of temporary solution to the political situation?

Does the Commission believe that governments run by technocrats are in accordance with democratic principles?

It is, in the view of the Commission, a positive trend?

**Answer given by Mr Barroso on behalf of the Commission**

(16 February 2012)

The governments mentioned by the Honourable Member are supported by national parliaments in line with their respective constitutional requirements. In other words, there is no reason to put into question their democratic legitimacy or doubt their democratic credentials.

---

(Slovenské znenie)

**Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-000083/12**

**Komisií**

**Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)**

(13. januára 2012)

Vec: Občianske spoločnosti a regulácia finančných trhov

Súčasná finančná kríza je čiastočne dôsledkom neefektívnej regulácie finančných trhov. Účasť občianskych spoločností fungujúcich v rámci Európskej únie je však v tejto oblasti nedostatočná. Jedným z dôvodov je zložitost právnej úpravy tejto otázky. Funkčná občianska spoločnosť ale nevyhnutne potrebuje dobrú legislatívnu podporu.

Mieni Komisia prijať opatrenia, ktoré zabezpečia lepšie a efektívnejšie zapojenie občianskych spoločností do oblasti regulácie finančných trhov?

Ak áno, aké konkrétne?

**Odpoveď pána Barniera v mene Komisie**

(24. februára 2012)

V roku 2011 Komisia posilnila svoj záväzok zvýšiť zaangažovanie konečných užívateľov a zainteresovaných strán zo sektora mimo priemyselného odvetvia v procese konzultácie pri príprave iniciatív. Skupina používateľov finančných služieb (Financial Services User Group – FSUG) zriadená na to, aby zastupovala záujmy finančných spotrebiteľov, drobných investorov a mikropodnikov v EÚ, fungovala počas celého roku 2011. Správa o jej ročnej činnosti bude čoskoro uverejnená na webovej stránke FSUG <sup>(1)</sup>.

S cieľom podporiť aktívnu účasť občianskej spoločnosti pri tvorbe politiky vnútorného trhu a úplne dosiahnuť primeranú rovnováhu zastúpenia zainteresovaných strán mimo priemyselného sektora v procese konzultácií v oblasti finančných služieb, sa Komisia rozhodla podporiť fungovanie nezávislého centra finančnej expertízy, aby poskytovalo poradenstvo organizáciám občianskej spoločnosti v oblasti finančných služieb. Bola uverejnená otvorená výzva na predkladanie návrhov <sup>(2)</sup> v objeme 1 250 000 EUR s termínom na podávanie žiadostí do 31. januára 2012.

Navyše, na zaistenie vyrovnanějšího zloženia v čisto „vládných“ skupinách odborníkov, ktoré poskytujú poradenstvo GR pre vnútorný trh a služby sa v roku 2011 vykonalo hodnotenie. Toto hodnotenie viedlo k racionalizácii existujúcich skupín a pretvoreniu tých skupín, ktoré mali nerovnomerné zastúpenie rôznych kategórií zainteresovaných strán, predovšetkým organizácií občianskej spoločnosti. Racionalizáciu sprevádzalo úsilie posilniť transparentnosť v ich riadení a zložení. Súčasťou tohto úsilia bolo aj zriadenie novej webovej stránky, ktorá má poskytovať prehľad o zložení a mandáte všetkých aktívnych skupín odborníkov <sup>(3)</sup>. Všetky tieto skupiny sú tiež zahrnuté vo všeobecnom registri skupín odborníkov Komisie <sup>(4)</sup>.

<sup>(1)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/internal\\_market/finservices-retail/fsug/fsug\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/finservices-retail/fsug/fsug_en.htm)

<sup>(2)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/internal\\_market/grants/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/internal_market/grants/index_en.htm); Výzva č.: MARKT/2011/175/H.

<sup>(3)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/internal\\_market/expert\\_groups\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/internal_market/expert_groups_en.htm)

<sup>(4)</sup> <http://ec.europa.eu/transparency/regexpert/index.cfm>.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000083/12  
to the Commission**

**Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)**

(13 January 2012)

*Subject:* Civil societies and regulation of the financial markets

The current financial crisis is partly due to ineffective regulation of the financial markets. Nevertheless, the participation of civil societies operating within the European Union is inadequate in this area. One reason is the complexity of legislation on this issue. However, a functioning civil society needs good legislative support.

Does the Commission intend to take measures to ensure better and more effective involvement of civil societies in the regulation of the financial markets?

If so, what specifically?

**Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission**

(24 February 2012)

In 2011, the Commission strengthened its commitment to increase the involvement of end-users and non-industry stakeholders in the consultative process when designing initiatives. The Financial Services User Group (FSUG), established to represent the interests of financial consumers, retail investors and micro-enterprises in the EU, was functional throughout 2011. Its yearly activity report will be published shortly at FSUG webpage <sup>(1)</sup>.

To further enhance the active participation of civil society in Internal Market policymaking and fully achieve a fair balance of non-industry stakeholders' representation in consultation processes within the area of financial services, the Commission has decided to support the functioning of an independent financial expertise centre to advise civil society organisations in the area of financial services. An open call for proposal for EUR 1.250.000 was published <sup>(2)</sup> with a deadline for the applications of 31 January 2012.

Moreover to ensure a more balanced composition in not purely 'governmental' Expert Groups which advise DG Internal Market and Services, a review was conducted in 2011. This review resulted in a rationalization of the number of existing groups and a re-shaping of those showing an imbalanced representation of the different categories of stakeholders, particularly civil society organisations. This was accompanied by efforts to enhance transparency on their management and composition. As part of this, a new web page has been set up to provide an overview of the composition and mandate of all active Expert Groups <sup>(3)</sup>. All these groups are also included in the general Register of Commission Expert Groups <sup>(4)</sup>.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/internal\\_market/finservices-retail/fsug/fsug\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/finservices-retail/fsug/fsug_en.htm)

<sup>(2)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/internal\\_market/grants/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/internal_market/grants/index_en.htm); Call No: MARKT/2011/175/H.

<sup>(3)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/internal\\_market/expert\\_groups\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/internal_market/expert_groups_en.htm)

<sup>(4)</sup> <http://ec.europa.eu/transparency/regexpert/index.cfm>.

(Slovenské znenie)

**Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-000084/12**

**Komisii**

**Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)**

(13. januára 2012)

Vec: Obnovená migračná stratégia EÚ

Migrácia je jednou z politických priorít Európskej únie. Arabská jar a udalosti, ku ktorým došlo v roku 2011 v krajinách južného Stredozemia, ešte viac zvýraznili potrebu ucelenej a komplexnej migračnej politiky na úrovni EÚ. Komisia preto nedávno predstavila návrh na posilnenie dialógu a operačnej spolupráce s partnerskými krajinami mimo EÚ v tejto oblasti. Tento nový globálny prístup k migrácii a mobilite by mal byť lepšie zosúladený s politikami v oblasti zamestnanosti a vzdelávania na európskej úrovni.

— Akým spôsobom zabezpečuje obnovená migračná stratégia EÚ právo migrantov na prístup k dôstojnej práci?

**Odpoveď pani Malmströmovej v mene Komisie**

(16. februára 2012)

Migrácia je dôležitým bodom politickej agendy Európskej únie. Komisia by chcela odkázať váženu pani poslankyňu na oznámenie o novom globálnom prístupe k migrácii a mobilite (GAMM), ktoré bolo uverejnené 18. novembra 2011 <sup>(1)</sup>. Oznámenie stavia do popredia kľúčové ciele Únie v oblasti politiky a migrácie vrátane zabezpečenia prispôbivej pracovnej sily s potrebnými zručnosťami, ktorá sa dokáže úspešne vyrovnat s rozvíjajúcimi sa demografickými a hospodárskymi zmenami. GAMM preto kladie veľký dôraz na určenie stratégií pre trh práce, o ktorých možno diskutovať s členskými štátmi a ktoré môžu byť premietnuté v dialógu s partnerskými krajinami. Dôraz sa kladie aj na posilňovanie schopnosti EÚ predvídať potreby trhu práce a odborných kvalifikácií. Samotná realizácia GAMM ešte nemôže „zabezpečiť prístup k dôstojnej práci“, proces dialógu a spolupráce v rámci GAMM však umožňuje zainteresovaným stranám zaradiť zamestnanosť do svojho programu a iniciovať spoluprácu v prípade, že je vhodná a potrebná.

(1) [http://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/news/intro/docs/1\\_EN\\_ACT\\_part1\\_v9.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/news/intro/docs/1_EN_ACT_part1_v9.pdf), [KOM(2011) 743 v konečnom znení].

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000084/12  
to the Commission**

**Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)**

(13 January 2012)

*Subject:* Renewed EU immigration strategy

Migration is one of the political priorities of the European Union. The Arab Spring and the events which occurred in 2011 in the countries bordering the southern Mediterranean further highlighted the need for a coherent and comprehensive migration policy at EU level. The Commission therefore recently put forward a proposal to strengthen the dialogue and operational cooperation with partner countries outside the EU in this region. This new global approach to migration and mobility should be better aligned with the policies on employment and training at a European level.

— How will an updated EU migration strategy ensure the right of migrants to decent work?

**Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission**

(16 February 2012)

Migration is an important subject on the European Union's political agenda. The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to the communication on a renewed Global Approach to Migration and Mobility (GAMM) published on 18 November 2011 <sup>(1)</sup>. The communication highlights key migratory and mobility objectives for the Union including *securing an adaptable workforce with the necessary skills which can cope successfully with the evolving demographic and economic changes*. The GAMM therefore places great importance on identifying labour market strategies that can be discussed with Member States and reflected in dialogues with partner countries. Emphasis is also placed on strengthening the EU's capacity to anticipate labour market and skills needs. To this extent, the GAMM itself will not 'ensure access to decent work', but the dialogue and cooperation process in the GAMM framework, allows for parties to put employment on the agenda and to initiate cooperation where appropriate and necessary.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/news/intro/docs/1\\_EN\\_ACT\\_part1\\_v9.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/news/intro/docs/1_EN_ACT_part1_v9.pdf)

(Slovenské znenie)

**Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-000086/12**

**Komisiu**

**Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)**

(13. januára 2012)

Vec: Opatrenia na ochranu biodiverzity

Ochranu biodiverzity je potrebné začleniť do všetkých relevantných politík Európskej únie. V Európe momentálne prevláda trend úbytku biodiverzity a degradácie ekosystémov. Je nevyhnutné, aby sa Európska únia pokúsila tento trend zvrátiť. Ministri členských štátov EÚ prijali nedávno v rámci Rady pre životné prostredie rozhodnutie, ktoré sa týka účinnosti zdrojov a ochrany biodiverzity. Podľa názoru ekologických aktivistov však toto rozhodnutie Rady pre životné prostredie opatrenia na ochranu biodiverzity výrazne oslabuje a podľa názoru ekologických mimovládnych organizácií je iba výsledkom silného lobbingu v oblasti poľnohospodárstva.

— Aký má Komisia názor na toto rozhodnutie Rady pre životné prostredie?

— Akým spôsobom plánuje Komisia v roku 2012 presadzovať ochranu biodiverzity v krajinách EÚ?

**Odpoveď pána Potočnika v mene Komisie**

(20. februára 2012)

Oba závery Rady týkajúce sa biodiverzity, prijaté v júni a decembri 2011, do značnej miery podporujú ciele a opatrenia uvedené v stratégii EÚ v oblasti biodiverzity do roku 2020. Ako uviedla Rada, mala by sa výrazne prehĺbiť integrácia biodiverzity do všetkých relevantných politík, najmä vzhľadom na prínos, ktorý biodiverzita a ekosystémové služby predstavujú pre mnoho odvetví. Súčasťou stratégie EÚ v oblasti biodiverzity do roku 2020 sú aj konkrétne integračné ciele a opatrenia zamerané najmä na poľnohospodárstvo, lesníctvo a rybárstvo. Uchovávanie a obnova biodiverzity v poľnohospodárstve a lesníctve sú základným predpokladom dosiahnutia našich cieľov. Komisia zastáva názor, že závery Rady z decembra 2011 mali užitočným spôsobom zdôrazniť konkrétne kroky, ktoré sú potrebné na väčší príspevok spoločnej poľnohospodárskej politiky k cieľom v oblasti biodiverzity. Túto skutočnosť Komisia uviedla vo vyhlásení o prijatí záverov.

Komisia začala prácu na vykonávaní stratégie EÚ v oblasti biodiverzity do roku 2020. V tomto kontexte a v zmysle záverov Rady z decembra Komisia spolupracuje s členskými štátmi na vytvorení spoločného vykonávacieho rámca, aby sa podporila účinnosť stratégie a zabezpečilo jej vykonávanie na úrovni EÚ a vnútroštátnej úrovni.

Už existujú špecializované pracovné skupiny v členských štátoch (a v rámci zainteresovaných strán), ktoré majú podporovať uskutočnenie opatrení stanovených v stratégii.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000086/12  
to the Commission**

**Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)**

(13 January 2012)

*Subject:* Measures to protect biodiversity

Biodiversity protection should be mainstreamed in all relevant EU policies. In Europe there is currently a prevailing trend of loss of biodiversity and degradation of ecosystems. It is essential that the European Union attempts to reverse this trend. Ministers of EU Member States recently adopted a decision in the Environment Council concerning resource efficiency and biodiversity conservation. According to environmental activists, however, the decision of the Environment Council significantly undermines the measures to protect biodiversity and in the view of environmental NGOs it is merely the result of strong lobbying in agriculture.

— What is the Commission's opinion in this decision of the Environment Council?

— How does the Commission intend in 2012 to promote the protection of biodiversity in the EU Member States?

**Answer given by Mr Potočník on behalf of the Commission**

(20 February 2012)

The two sets of Council conclusions on biodiversity adopted in 2011 (June and December) endorse to a large extent the targets and actions set out in the EU Biodiversity Strategy to 2020. As stated by the Council, further integrating and mainstreaming biodiversity into all relevant policies needs to be significantly strengthened, particularly considering the benefits that biodiversity and ecosystem services provides for a large number of sectors. The EU Biodiversity Strategy to 2020 includes specific integration targets and actions, in particular in relation to agriculture, forests and fisheries. Maintaining and restoring agriculture and forest biodiversity is essential to attain our biodiversity objectives. The Commission considers that the Council conclusions of December 2011 could usefully have underlined the specific steps that are required to strengthen the contribution of the Common Agriculture Policy to biodiversity objectives. The Commission stated so in a Declaration on the adoption of the conclusions.

The Commission has initiated the work on the implementation of the EU Biodiversity Strategy to 2020. In this context and as underlined in the December Council conclusions, the Commission is developing in close cooperation with Member States a common implementation framework to underpin the effectiveness of the strategy and ensure its implementation at EU and national level. Dedicated working groups in which Member States — and stakeholders — are involved have already been established in support of the delivery of actions set out in the strategy.

---

(Slovenské znenie)

**Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-000087/12**

**Komisií**

**Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)**

(13. januára 2012)

Vec: Práva osôb so zdravotným postihnutím

V Európskej únii žije približne 80 miliónov ľudí so zdravotným postihnutím. Práva týchto osôb sú zakotvené v Dohovore OSN o právach osôb so zdravotným postihnutím a rovnako aj v sociálnych cieľoch stratégie Európa 2020. Úsporné opatrenia, ktoré v poslednom čase často prijímajú národné vlády členských štátov však dodržiavanie práv takýchto osôb výrazne ohrozujú. Následkom zlých reforiem je potom sociálne vylúčenie, diskriminácia, marginalizácia, negramotnosť či negatívne stereotypy. V snahe o presadzovanie zohľadňovania práv zdravotne postihnutých osôb v Európskej únii pri tvorbe sociálnych či ekonomických politík členských štátov je dôležité zvyšovanie povedomia a šírenie osvetu, aby bola predstava o takýchto osobách správna a nevedla k sociálnej stigmatizácii.

— Akým spôsobom Komisia presadzuje zvyšovanie povedomia o právach ľudí so zdravotným postihnutím?

**Odpoveď pani Redingovej v mene Komisie**

(3. februára 2012)

Európska komisia si uvedomuje význam zvyšovania povedomia o zdravotnom postihnutí a vplyv, ktorý môže mať správne pochopenie zdravotného postihnutia na tvorbu politík a na uplatňovanie základných práv. Zvyšovanie povedomia preto bolo označené za kľúčový nástroj na dosiahnutie cieľov Európskej stratégie pre oblasť zdravotného postihnutia 2010 – 2020 <sup>(1)</sup>.

Ako sa zdôrazňuje v tejto stratégii, EÚ bude svojou činnosťou podporovať a dopĺňovať vnútroštátne kampane na zvyšovanie povedomia o schopnostiach a prínose ľudí so zdravotným postihnutím. Naše činnosti v oblasti zvyšovania povedomia sa zameriavajú na dva osobitné ciele: 1. zabezpečiť, aby si ľudia so zdravotným postihnutím uvedomovali svoje práva, aby vedeli, ako tieto práva uplatňovať, a aby boli oboznámení s činnosťami EÚ zaručujúcimi tieto práva; 2. presadzovať myšlienku dizajnu pre všetkých a univerzálneho dizajnu s cieľom vytvoriť prístupnejšiu a inkluzívnejšiu spoločnosť.

K činnostiam plánovaným na rok 2012 patria napríklad usporiadanie každoročného udeľovania ceny Access•City a zorganizovanie viacerých podujatí v rámci Európskeho roka aktívneho starnutia 2012, pričom sa dôraz kladie na vzťah medzi starnutím a zdravotným postihnutím.

Pokiaľ ide o vykonávanie Dohovoru OSN o právach osôb so zdravotným postihnutím, Komisia v spolupráci s akademickou sieťou európskych expertov pre zdravotné postihnutie (ANED) pripravuje webový nástroj poskytujúci prehľad základných opatrení a právnych predpisov, ktoré prijali členské štáty a EÚ na účely vykonávania tohto dohovoru OSN.

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2010:0636:FIN:SK:PDF>.



(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000087/12  
to the Commission**

**Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)**

(13 January 2012)

*Subject:* Rights of persons with disabilities

In the European Union there are approximately 80 million people with disabilities. Their rights are enshrined in the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, as well as the social target of the Europe 2020 strategy. The fiscal constraints recently adopted by national governments of Member States however pose serious risks to the observance of the rights of such persons. The result of these bad reforms is social exclusion, discrimination, marginalisation, illiteracy and negative stereotypes. In order to promote consideration of the rights of persons with disabilities in the European Union in the creation of social and economic policies of Member States it is important to raise awareness and broaden education in order to ensure that the portrayal of such persons is done correctly and does not lead to social stigmatisation.

— How will the Commission raise awareness of the rights of people with disabilities?

**Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission**

(3 February 2012)

The European Commission is conscious of the importance of raising awareness on disability, and the impact that a correct appreciation of disability can have on policymaking and on the realisation of fundamental rights. For this reason, awareness-raising has been identified as a key instrument to achieve the objectives of the European Disability Strategy 2010-20<sup>(1)</sup>.

As outlined in the strategy, EU action will support and supplement national public awareness campaigns on the capabilities and contributions of people with disabilities. Our awareness-raising actions focus on two specific objectives: (1) ensuring that people with disabilities are aware of their rights, of how to exercise them and of the EU activities to guarantee these rights; (2) promoting the concepts of design for all and universal design to create a more accessible and inclusive society.

Among the actions in 2012 are the organisation of the annual Access·City Award, and several events within the frame of the European Year 2012 for Active Ageing, highlighting the relationship between ageing and disability.

As regards the implementation of the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, the Commission, together with the the Academic Network of European Disability experts (ANED), is setting up a web-based tool providing an overview of the essential measures and legislation put in place by member states and by the EU to implement the UN Convention.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2010:0636:FIN:EN:PDF>.

(Slovenské znenie)

**Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-000089/12**

**Komisii**

**Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)**

(13. januára 2012)

Vec: Prieskum Komisie o sociálnych otázkach

Komisia nedávno zverejnila výsledky svojho výskumu, ktorý sa zaoberal sociálnou problematikou v členských krajinách Európskej únie. Na otázky odpovedala vzorka 1000 obyvateľov a výskum sa konal 24. septembra a 9. októbra 2011. Z výskumu vyplýva, že dôvera ľudí v pozitívny vplyv Európskej únie na sociálnu politiku a zamestnanosť prudko klesla vo všetkých členských štátoch. Kým pred hospodárskou krízou bola úroveň podpory pre sociálnu politiku EÚ niekoľko rokov stabilná a pohybovala sa v rozmedzí 62 – 78 % respondentov, v súčasnosti tieto hodnoty výrazne klesli a pohybujú sa v rozmedzí 48 – 67 %.

— Čo konkrétne z tohto prieskumu Komisii vyplýva?

— Ako chce Komisia bojovať proti skutočnosti, že európski občania Únii nedôverujú v tom, že im dokáže pomôcť v otázkach sociálnej politiky, najmä v boji proti nezamestnanosti a pri vytváraní nových pracovných príležitostí?

**Odpoveď pána Andora v mene Komisie**

(23. februára 2012)

Hospodárska kríza, ktorou trpí EÚ v súčasnosti, spolu s pokračujúcou globalizáciou a technologickými zmenami vyvíjajú naliehavý tlak na trhy práce a sociálnu súdržnosť EÚ. Komisia si je plne vedomá výziev, ktoré ju čakajú, a prijíma všetky možné opatrenia, aby pomohla znížiť dopad hospodárskeho útlmu a začať obnovu bohatú na pracovné príležitosti. Vzhľadom na hospodársky vývoj za posledné roky, dosiahnutie cieľa zvýšenia miery zamestnanosti EÚ na 75 % a zníženia počtu ľudí, ktorým hrozí chudoba alebo sociálne vylúčenie, minimálne o 20 miliónov do roku 2020, si vyžaduje zvýšené úsilie a dôrazné kroky.

Ročný prieskum rastu za rok 2012 a Spoločná správa o zamestnanosti uvádzajú, že v záujme podpory rastu a riešenia sociálnych dôsledkov krízy sú potrebné výrazné štrukturálne reformy trhu práce: členské štáty sa vyzývajú, aby zvýšili svoju kapacitu tvorby pracovných miest, zaviedli komplexné stratégie zamestnávania mladých ľudí, prijali ciele aktívne opatrenia trhu práce, zlepšili efektívnosť svojich systémov sociálnej ochrany a zmodernizovali a zefektívnili svoje vzdelávacie systémy a systémy odbornej prípravy. Tieto aspekty odrážajú usmernenie jarného zasadnutia Európskej rady a budú zohľadnené v odporúčaní pre jednotlivé krajiny v roku 2012.

Vykonávanie záväzkov jednotlivých štátov v rámci stratégie Európa 2020 je dôležité, ale dá sa urobiť viac aj na úrovni EÚ, ako napríklad v prípade iniciatívy Príležitosti pre mladých, ktorú Komisia predstavila v decembri 2011. Ako bolo oznámené v jej pracovnom programe na rok 2012, Komisia preto na jar predloží politickú iniciatívu zameranú na hlavné výzvy, ktorým čelia trhy práce EÚ. Táto iniciatíva bude vychádzať z ročného prieskumu rastu za rok 2012 a Spoločnej správy o zamestnanosti a dopĺňať ich.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000089/12  
to the Commission**

**Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)**

(13 January 2012)

*Subject:* The Commission's survey of social issues

The Commission recently published the results of its survey which dealt with social issues in EU Member States. A sample of 1 000 inhabitants responded to the poll, which took place on 24 September and 9 October 2011. Research indicates that people's confidence in the positive impact of European Union social policy and employment has fallen sharply in all Member States. Whilst before the economic crisis the level of support for EU social policy remained stable for several years and ranged from 62 to 78 % of respondents, in the latest poll these values have dropped significantly and now range from 48 to 67 %.

— What do these survey results specifically show the Commission?

— In what way does the Commission intend to combat the fact that European Union citizens do not trust it to help in matters of social policy, particularly in combating unemployment and creating new job opportunities?

**Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission**

(23 February 2012)

The economic crisis affecting the EU today, combined with continuing globalisation and technological change, is putting the EU's labour markets and social cohesion under acute pressure. The Commission is fully aware of the challenges ahead and is taking all measures possible to help reduce the impact of the economic downturn and bring about a job-rich recovery. Given the economic developments of the last years, raising the EU employment rate to 75 % and reducing the number of people at risk of poverty or social exclusion by at least 20 million by 2020 calls for an extra effort and resolute action.

The 2012 Annual Growth Survey and Joint Employment Report identify the major structural labour market reforms needed to support growth and address the social consequences of the crisis: the Member States are invited to increase their capacity for job creation, establish comprehensive strategies for youth employment, adopt targeted active labour market measures, improve the efficiency of their social protection systems, and modernise their education and training systems and make them more effective. Reflecting the guidance from the Spring European Council, these aspects will be addressed in the 2012 country-specific recommendations.

Implementing national commitments under the Europe 2020 strategy is essential, but more can be done also at the EU level, as in the case of the Youth Opportunities Initiative presented by the Commission in December 2011. As announced in its Work Programme for 2012, the Commission will therefore put forward during the spring a policy initiative addressing the major challenges facing the EU's labour markets, building upon and complementing the 2012 Annual Growth Survey and Joint Employment Report.

(Slovenské znenie)

**Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-000090/12**

**Komisií**

**Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)**

(13. januára 2012)

Vec: Program LIFE

Európska komisia schválila vyčleniť v novom rozpočtovom období (2014 – 2020) sumu 3,2 miliardy EUR na nový program ochrany životného prostredia a klímy. Má nadväzovať na úspech existujúceho programu LIFE+, ktorého rozpočet vo výške 2,1 miliardy vyprší v roku 2013. Návrh vyčleňuje 800 miliónov na klimatickú zmenu a má podporiť financovanie environmentálnych projektov zo zdrojov EÚ, národných vlád a rovnako aj súkromných organizácií. Environmentálne organizácie ale považujú návrh za nedostatočný. Investícia 3,2 miliardy počas nasledujúcich siedmich rokov predstavuje len 0,3 % celkového rozpočtu.

— Považuje Komisia vyčlenenú sumu vzhľadom na predmet financovania za skutočne dostatočnú?

**Odpoveď pána Potočnika v mene Komisie**

(20. februára 2012)

Nový program na ochranu životného prostredia a klímy na roky 2014 až 2020 (LIFE) nemá byť hlavným nástrojom na riešenie všetkých problémov v oblasti životného prostredia a klímy v EÚ. Jeho cieľom je ďalej rozvíjať svoju úlohu pri podporovaní vykonávania politiky EÚ v oblasti životného prostredia a klímy a pri integrácii otázok životného prostredia a klímy do iných politík EÚ a súvisiacich finančných mechanizmov v záujme dosiahnutia maximálneho celoeurópskeho prínosu. Súčasťou všetkých návrhov, ktoré Komisia predložila v oblasti poľnohospodárstva, rybárstva, kohéznej politiky, výskumu a inovácií, ako aj medzinárodnej spolupráce, sú aj dôležité environmentálne ciele, ktorým zodpovedajú aj značné finančné zdroje.

V posúdení vplyvu, ktoré je sprievodným dokumentom návrhu nariadenia o vytvorení programu na ochranu životného prostredia a klímy (LIFE) <sup>(1)</sup>, Komisia zanalyzovala rôzne možnosti budúceho programu LIFE, aby získala kritickú masu projektov a želaný environmentálny a klimatický dosah. Z hodnotenia vyplýva, že ak sa majú dosiahnuť ciele programu, budúci program LIFE by mal mať rozpočet vo výške 3,2 miliardy EUR. Táto suma zahŕňa rozpočet podprogramu na ochranu klímy.

<sup>(1)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/environment/life/about/documents/COMM\\_PDF\\_SEC\\_2011\\_1542\\_annexes\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/environment/life/about/documents/COMM_PDF_SEC_2011_1542_annexes_en.pdf)

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000090/12  
to the Commission**

**Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)**

(13 January 2012)

*Subject:* LIFE Programme

The European Commission has approved the allocation of EUR 3.2 billion in a new Programme for the Environment and Climate Action in the new budget period (2014-20). This will build on the success of the existing LIFE + Programme which, with a budget of EUR 2.1 billion, is due to expire in 2013. The proposal allocates EUR 800 million to climate change and seeks to promote funding for environmental projects from EU funds, national governments, and also private organisations. However, environmental organisations consider the proposal to be insufficient. Investment of 3.2 billion over the next seven years represents only 0.3 % of the total budget.

— Does the Commission consider that the allocation of this amount, in light of the subject of financing, to be realistically sufficient?

**Answer given by Mr Potočník on behalf of the Commission**

(20 February 2012)

The new Programme for the Environment and Climate Action for the period 2014-2020 (LIFE) is not designed to be the main instrument for addressing all the environmental and climate problems in the EU. It has the objective of developing further its role in promoting the implementation of EU environmental and climate policy and in integrating environmental and climate related concerns into other EU policies and related financial mechanisms, in order to maximise the EU added value. The proposals put forward by the Commission for agriculture, fisheries, cohesion, research and innovation and international cooperation all have important environmental objectives, accompanied by significant resources.

In its Impact Assessment accompanying the proposal for a regulation on the establishment of the Programme for the Environment and Climate Action (LIFE) <sup>(1)</sup>, the Commission has analysed different options for the future LIFE Programme to achieve a critical mass of projects and the desired environmental and climate impact. It has been evaluated that in order to achieve the Programme objectives and targets, the future LIFE should have a financial envelope of EUR 3.2 billion. This amount includes the budget for the sub-programme for Climate Action.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/environment/life/about/documents/COMM\\_PDF\\_SEC\\_2011\\_1542\\_annexes\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/environment/life/about/documents/COMM_PDF_SEC_2011_1542_annexes_en.pdf)

(Slovenské znenie)

**Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-000092/12**

**Komisii**

**Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)**

(13. januára 2012)

Vec: Protiteroristické opatrenia členských štátov EÚ

Európsky parlament vyzval členské štáty Európskej únie, aby predložili správy o ekonomickej efektívnosti svojich protiteroristických opatrení a o vplyve týchto opatrení na dodržiavanie občianskych slobôd, ako aj ich posúdenie z hľadiska demokratickej kontroly. Tieto informácie chce následne predložiť Európskej komisii s cieľom vypracovať celoeurópske hodnotenie. Pre objektívne posúdenie toho, do akej miery sa Európskej únii darí dosahovať stanovené ciele v tejto oblasti, sa toho totiž zatiaľ urobilo žalostne málo. Európska komisia by mala využiť svoje právomoci, ktoré sú zakotvené v Lisabonskej zmluve, a vypracovať úplné a podrobné hodnotenie týchto politík. Správa by mala zahŕňať prehľad výdavkov na online snooping, prehľad o opatreniach súvisiacich s ochranou osobných údajov, prehľad financovania výskumu boja proti terorizmu, ako aj prehľad o všetkých relevantných výdavkoch. Komisia by sa mala taktiež zaoberať vymenovaním koordinátora EÚ na boj proti terorizmu a jeho personálu.

Aký bude teda ďalší postup Komisie v tejto oblasti?

**Odpoveď pani Malmströmovej v mene Komisie**

(27. februára 2012)

Pokiaľ ide o otázku váženej pani poslankyne týkajúcu sa koordinátora EÚ pre boj proti terorizmu, uznesenie Európskeho parlamentu zo 14. decembra 2011 „Správa o politike EÚ v oblasti boja proti terorizmu: hlavné úspechy a budúce výzvy“<sup>(1)</sup> zahŕňa výzvu na objasnenie rozdelenia práce medzi koordinátorom pre boj proti terorizmu a vysokou predstaviteľkou. Touto otázkou sa podrobne zaoberali „Záver Rady o posilnení prepojení medzi vnútornými a vonkajšími aspektmi boja proti terorizmu“, ktoré prijala Rada pre spravodlivosť a vnútorné veci v Luxemburgu v dňoch 9. – 10. júna 2011<sup>(2)</sup>.

Komisia bude o svojej reakcii na uvedené uznesenie informovať Parlament v súlade s platnými pravidlami týkajúcimi sa následných opatrení Komisie, pokiaľ ide o nelegislatívne uznesenia Parlamentu.

<sup>(1)</sup> 2011/0577.

<sup>(2)</sup> [http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms\\_data/docs/pressdata/en/jha/122505.pdf](http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/en/jha/122505.pdf)

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000092/12  
to the Commission**

**Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)**

(13 January 2012)

*Subject:* Anti-terrorist measures of the EU Member States

The European Parliament has called on European Union Member States to submit reports on the economic effectiveness of their anti-terrorism measures and on the impact of these measures on respect for civil liberties and their assessment in terms of democratic control. It then wants to submit this information to the European Commission in order to draw up a Europe-wide evaluation. Precious little has yet been done to objectively assess the extent to which the European Union is succeeding in achieving the objectives set in this area. The European Commission should use its powers enshrined in the Lisbon Treaty to draw up a full and detailed evaluation of these policies. The report should include an overview of spending on online snooping, an overview of measures relating to protection of personal data, an overview of the funding of research to combat terrorism, and an overview of all relevant expenditure. The Commission should also deal with the appointment of an EU anti-terrorism coordinator and his staff.

What, then, will the Commission's next step be in this area?

**Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission**

(27 February 2012)

Concerning the Honourable Member's question pertaining to the EU Counter-Terrorism Coordinator (EU CTC), the European Parliament's resolution of 14 December 2011 on 'the EU Counter-Terrorism Policy: main achievements and future challenges' <sup>(1)</sup> calls for the clarification of the division of labour between the EU CTC and the High Representative. In fact, this issue has been dealt with comprehensively by the 'Council conclusions on enhancing the links between internal and external aspects of counter-terrorism' adopted by the Justice and Home Affairs Council in Luxembourg on 9-10 June 2011 <sup>(2)</sup>.

The Commission will inform Parliament of its reply to the resolution mentioned above in accordance with the rules in force concerning the follow-up by the Commission regarding non-legislative resolutions of Parliament.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> 2011/0577.

<sup>(2)</sup> [http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms\\_data/docs/pressdata/en/jha/122505.pdf](http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/en/jha/122505.pdf)

(Slovenské znenie)

**Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-000093/12**

**Komisií**

**Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)**

(13. januára 2012)

Vec: Rasistické útoky v Taliansku

Talianskom nedávno otriasol prípad päťdesiatročného muža, ktorý na námestí Piazza Dalmazia vo Florencii zastrelil dvoch Senegalčanov a ďalších postrelil. Vrah, ktorý následne po svojich činoch spáchal samovraždu, bol členom extrémne pravicového a protipristaňovaleckého hnutia Casa Pound. Starosta Florencie označil tento čin za rasovo motivovaný. Rasisticky motivované útoky v európskych krajinách stále pribúdajú. Európska sieť proti rasizmu ENAR vyhlásila, že členské štáty Európskej únie neboli v poslednom desaťročí úspešné v boji s rastúcim vplyvom xenofóbie a s útokmi extrémnej pravice.

Plánuje Komisia adresovať členským krajinám Európskej únie odporúčania, v ktorých navrhne postupy predchádzania takýmto činom?

**Odpoveď pani Redingovej v mene Komisie**

(9. februára 2012)

Komisia ostro odsudzuje všetky formy a prejavy rasizmu a xenofóbie, keďže sú v rozpore s hodnotami, na ktorých je EÚ založená. Komisia takisto pripomína, že verejné orgány a lídri, ktorí ovplyvňujú verejnú mienku, by sa mali jednoznačne dištancovať od všetkých rasisticky alebo xenofobicky motivovaných činov a mali by aktívne bojovať proti takémuto správaniu.

Rámcové rozhodnutie Rady 2008/913/SVV<sup>(1)</sup> ukladá členským štátom povinnosť trestať úmyselné verejné podnecovanie k rasistickému alebo xenofobickému násiliu alebo nenávisti a pri akýchkoľvek iných trestných činoch považovať rasistickú alebo xenofobickú motiváciu za priťažujúcu okolnosť alebo ju brať do úvahy pri určovaní trestov. Členské štáty boli povinné transponovať toto rámcové rozhodnutie do vnútroštátnych právnych poriadkov do 28. novembra 2010.

V súčasnosti Komisia čo najdôkladnejšie monitoruje vykonávanie rámcového rozhodnutia, ktoré ak sa uskutoční v plnom rozsahu a zodpovedajúcim spôsobom významne prispeje k prevencii i potrestaniu rasistického alebo xenofobického násilia v členských štátoch.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Rámcové rozhodnutie Rady 2008/913/SVV z 28. novembra 2008 o boji proti niektorým formám a prejavom rasizmu a xenofóbie prostredníctvom trestného práva, Ú. v. EÚ L 328, 6.12.2008.



(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000093/12  
to the Commission  
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)  
(13 January 2012)**

*Subject:* Racist attacks in Italy

Italy was shocked recently by the case of a fifty-year-old man who shot dead two Senegalese in Piazza Dalmazia in Florence and fired at others. The murderer, who subsequently committed suicide, was a member of the extreme right and anti-immigrant movement Casa Pound. The mayor of Florence described the act as racially motivated. Racially motivated attacks in European countries are constantly rising. ENAR, the European Network Against Racism, declared that EU Member States have been unsuccessful in the last decade in combating the growing impact of xenophobia and extreme right-wing attacks.

Does the Commission intend to make recommendations to the EU Member States setting out steps to prevent acts of this type?

**Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission  
(9 February 2012)**

The Commission strongly condemns all forms and manifestations of racism and xenophobia as they are incompatible with the values on which the EU is founded. The Commission also recalls that public authorities and opinion leaders should unequivocally distance themselves from any racist or xenophobic acts and actively fight against such behaviour.

Council Framework Decision 2008/913/JHA <sup>(1)</sup> obliges Member States to penalise the intentional public incitement to racist or xenophobic violence or hatred and to take the racist or xenophobic motivation of any other offence into consideration as an aggravating circumstance or in the determination of the penalties. All Member States were obliged to transpose this framework decision into their national legislation by 28 November 2010.

The Commission is currently monitoring, as closely as possible, the implementation of the framework decision, which — if done in full and correctly — will greatly contribute to the prevention and punishment of racist or xenophobic violence in the Member States.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Council Framework Decision 2008/913/JHA of 28 November 2008 on combating certain forms and expressions of racism and xenophobia by means of criminal law, OJ L 328.

(Slovenské znenie)

**Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-000094/12**

**Komisií**

**Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)**

(13. januára 2012)

Vec: Rozdiel medzi najbohatšími a najchudobnejšími v rámci OECD

Medzinárodná Organizácia pre hospodársku spoluprácu a rozvoj (OECD) združujúca tridsať ekonomicky najrozvinutejších štátov sveta nedávno zverejnila správu, ktorá sa zaoberá problematikou zvyšovania nerovností. Správa konštatuje, že rozdiel medzi bohatými a chudobnými v rámci týchto krajín dosiahol za posledných tridsať rokov najvyššiu úroveň. Priemerný príjem najbohatších 10 % je deväťnásobne väčší ako priemerný príjem najchudobnejších 10 % obyvateľov krajín OECD.

Aká je reakcia Komisie na tieto zistenia?

Aké opatrenia zamerané na znižovanie nerovností v rámci krajín EÚ mieni Komisia prijať v roku 2012?

**Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-000104/12**

**Komisií**

**Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)**

(13. januára 2012)

Vec: Výročné hodnotenie zamestnanosti a sociálneho rozvoja v Európe

Dňa 15. decembra Komisia predstavila prvé výročné hodnotenie o otázke zamestnanosti a sociálneho rozvoja v Európskej únii. Z výsledkov vyplýva, že miera chudoby v EÚ je stále vysoká. V roku 2010 bolo chudobou a sociálnym vylúčením ohrozených približne 115 miliónov Európanov, čo je asi 23 % európskej populácie. Viac ako 8 % zamestnaných ľudí žije na hranici chudoby, ide o tzv. chudobných pracujúcich. Z výskumu ďalej vyplýva, že súčasná hospodárska kríza zhoršila európske štrukturálne nedostatky najmä v oblasti nerovnosti príjmov. Výsledky poukazujú na skutočnosť, že nerovnosti sa zvyšujú aj v krajinách, ktoré sa v minulosti vyznačovali nízkou mierou nerovností, teda najmä v severovýchodných krajinách, pričom prognóza je, že tento stav sa bude ešte zhoršovať. Problematika nerovností je však zatiaľ stále najviac viditeľná v členských krajinách východnej Európy.

— Akým spôsobom plánuje Komisia prispieť k znižovaniu nerovností najmä v krajinách východnej Európy?

**Spoločná odpoveď pána Andora v mene Komisie**

(21. februára 2012)

Zistenia OECD možno doplniť nedávnou správou Eurostatu o chudobe a vylúčení (21/2012). Bohužiaľ, v dôsledku očakávaného nárastu dlhodobej nezamestnanosti sa nerovnosti môžu ďalej zväčšovať, pričom bude rásť počet detí a dospelých žijúcich v domácnostiach bez práce, ktorých živobytie bude závisieť od dávok. Až 88 % Európanov si myslí, že rozdiely v príjmoch medzi ľuďmi v ich krajinách sú nespravodlivé. Nerovnosti však predstavujú aj plytvanie ľudskými zdrojmi. Ako bolo zdôraznené v ročnom prieskume rastu na rok 2012, Komisia požiada členské štáty, aby venovali osobitnú pozornosť zmierňovaniu sociálnych dôsledkov krízy. Komisia tiež vyzve členské štáty, aby intenzívnejšie realizovali stratégie aktívneho začleňovania zahŕňajúce aktívne opatrenia v oblasti trhu práce a vhodné a dostupné sociálne služby a tak predchádzali marginalizácii zraniteľných skupín. Komisia v tejto súvislosti vydá v roku 2012 správu, v ktorej vyzdvihne efektívne spôsoby realizácie takýchto stratégií v období veľkých rozpočtových obmedzení. Členské štáty by pri reforme svojich systémov dávok mali predchádzať dlhodobému vylúčeniu a závislosti od dávok a mali by venovať pozornosť primeranosti a aktivácii. Komisia v prípade potreby navrhne konkrétne odporúčania pre jednotlivé krajiny.

Ďalším dôležitým nástrojom na spájanie rôznych politík, ktoré prispievajú k inkluzívnemu rastu, je Európska platforma proti chudobe a sociálnemu vylúčeniu, ktorá vytvorená v decembri 2010.

Komisia tiež vyzýva členské štáty, aby čo najlepšie využili pomoc zo štrukturálnych fondov EÚ na podporu integrácie ľudí, ktorí sú najviac vzdialení od trhu práce. Komisia navrhla, aby sa 20 % rozpočtu Európskeho sociálneho fondu na roky 2014 – 2020 vyhradilo na podporu aktívneho začleňovania.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000094/12  
to the Commission**

**Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)**

(13 January 2012)

*Subject:* The difference between the richest and the poorest in the OECD

The International Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), an association of the thirty most economically developed countries in the world, recently published a report discussing the issue of increasing inequality. The report states that the gap between the rich and the poor within these countries has reached its highest level in the last thirty years. The average income of the richest 10 % is nine times greater than the average income of the poorest 10 % of the population in OECD countries.

What is the Commission's response to these findings?

What measures aimed at reducing inequalities within the EU does the Commission intend to adopt in 2012?

**Question for written answer E-000104/12  
to the Commission**

**Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)**

(13 January 2012)

*Subject:* Annual review of Employment and Social Development in Europe

On 15 December the Commission presented the first annual review of Employment and Social Developments in Europe. The results show that the poverty rate in the EU remains high. In 2010 approximately 115 million Europeans are at risk of poverty or social exclusion, which about 23 % of European population. Over 8 % of people with a job are at risk of poverty — the so called 'working poor'. The review's findings also show how the current economic crisis has aggravated Europe's structural weaknesses, especially in income inequality. The review shows that inequality has increased also in traditionally egalitarian Member States, in particular the Nordic countries, and the general trend remains upwards. The issue of inequality is however most visible in the Member States in Eastern Europe.

— How does the Commission intend to help to reduce inequalities, particularly in Eastern Europe?

**Joint answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission**

(21 February 2012)

The OECD findings can be complemented by a recent Eurostat report on poverty and exclusion (21/2012). Unfortunately with the expected raise of long-term unemployment, inequality might increase further with a growing number of children and adults living in jobless households, and having to rely on benefits for a living. Not only do 88 % of Europeans think that income differences between people in their country are unfair but inequalities also constitute a waste of human resources. As pointed out in the Annual Growth Survey 2102 the Commission will ask Member States to give specific attention to mitigating the social consequences of the crisis. The Commission will also call on Member States to step up active inclusion strategies encompassing labour market activation measures, and adequate and affordable social services to prevent marginalisation of vulnerable groups. On this the Commission will issue a report in 2012 highlighting efficient ways to implement such strategies in a period of high budgetary constraints. Member States when reforming their benefit systems should prevent long-term exclusion and benefit dependency and pay attention to both adequacy and activation. Where required, the Commission will propose country-specific recommendations.

The European Platform against Poverty and Social Exclusion launched in December 2010 is another important tool for bringing together various policies that contribute to inclusive growth.

The Commission also calls on the Member States to make the best use of EU Structural Fund assistance to promote the integration of people furthest from the labour market. The Commission has proposed that 20 % of the European Social Fund budget for the 2014-20 period be earmarked for promoting active inclusion.

(Slovenské znenie)

**Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-000096/12**

**Komisií**

**Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)**

(18. januára 2012)

Vec: Smernica o energetickej účinnosti

Účelom navrhovanej smernice o energetickej účinnosti nie je len šetrenie energie, ale taktiež podpora hospodárskeho rastu a tvorba pracovných miest. Prostriedky, ktorými sa majú tieto ciele dosiahnuť, však stále nie sú konkretizované. V smernici chýba jasne vymedzený zámer. Niektoré členské štáty sa už dlhší čas dokonca snažia smernicu oslabiť.

— Plánuje Komisia v dohľadnom čase objasniť prostriedky, za pomoci ktorých sa má účel smernice dosiahnuť?

— Ako sa Komisia stavia k tendencii niektorých členských štátov smernicu oslabiť?

**Odpoveď pána Oettingera v mene Komisie**

(27. februára 2012)

V novom návrhu smernice o energetickej účinnosti<sup>(1)</sup> sú vymenované konkrétne opatrenia, medzi ktoré patria posilnenie postavenia verejného sektora, povinnosť členských štátov zriadiť systémy povinných úspor energie alebo alternatívne nástroje politickej podpory, požiadavky na meranie spotreby, vyúčtovávanie, audity veľkých spoločností a požiadavky na širšie zavádzanie kogenerácie.

Aby sa využil existujúci potenciál v oblasti šetrenia energiou, ekonomiky a zamestnanosti, musí mať výsledok riadneho legislatívneho postupu rovnako vysoké ciele ako legislatívny návrh Komisie.

---

(<sup>1</sup>) KOM(2011) 370 v konečnom znení.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000096/12  
to the Commission**

**Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)**

(18 January 2012)

*Subject:* Directive on energy efficiency

The aim of the proposed directive on energy efficiency is not only to save energy but also to promote economic growth and create jobs. The means by which these goals are to be achieved, however, have still not been specified. The directive lacks a clearly defined plan. Some Member States have even been trying to weaken the directive for some time now.

— Does the Commission, in the foreseeable future, intend to clarify the means of achieving the aim of the directive?

— What is the opinion of the Commission with regard to the tendency of some Member States to weaken the directive?

**Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission**

(27 February 2012)

The new proposal for a directive on Energy Efficiency <sup>(1)</sup>, enumerates concrete measures, among others, to increase the role of the public sector, an obligation on Member States to establish energy efficiency obligation schemes or alternative policy support tools, requirements on metering and billing and audits for large companies and requirements for increased uptake of cogeneration

Tapping the existing energy saving, economic and employment potential requires that the final outcome of the ordinary legislative procedure maintains the level of ambition of the Commission's legislative proposal.

---

(1) COM(2011)370 final.

(Slovenské znenie)

**Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-000097/12**

**Komisií**

**Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)**

(13. januára 2012)

Vec: Sociálne dávky a imigranti

Nemecký inštitút pre výskum práce IZA so sídlom v Bone publikoval štúdiu, ktorá sa zaoberá vzťahom podpory v nezamestnanosti a imigrácii v 19 krajinách Európy. Autori výskumu použili údaje o migračných tokoch, HDP, nezamestnanosti a podiele výdavkov na programy podpory v nezamestnanosti na HDP pre 19 krajín Európy za roky 1993 – 2008. Analýzou týchto dát sa snažili vysvetliť, čo ovplyvňuje príliv migrantov do jednotlivých krajín. Zo štúdie vyplýva, že pri rozhodovaní sa imigrantov, či do určitej krajiny prídu alebo nie, nehrá nastavenie sociálneho systému takmer žiadnu rolu a obavy z prílivu migrantov do krajín EÚ kvôli využívaniu sociálneho systému sú neopodstatnené. Migranti si totiž vyberajú krajiny primárne podľa priaznivých ekonomických podmienok, teda napr. podľa miery nezamestnanosti alebo výšky HDP.

— Plánuje Komisia výsledky tejto štúdie verejne propagovať a zabrániť tým populizmu v rámci jednotlivých členských štátov?

**Odpoveď pani Malmströmovej v mene Komisie**

(10. februára 2012)

Komisia ďakuje pani poslankyni za upozornenie na túto štúdiu Nemeckého inštitútu pre výskum práce (IZA), v ktorej sa skúma, či štedrosť sociálneho systému určitej členskej krajiny ovplyvňuje prisťahovalectvo z iných krajín EÚ alebo z krajín mimo EÚ. Autori usudzujú, že prisťahovalectvo v rámci EÚ nie je motivované dávkami v nezamestnanosti, hoci podotýkajú, že to isté nemožno nutne tvrdiť o migrácii z krajín mimo EÚ.

Toto tvrdenie do veľkej miery zodpovedá záveru, ku ktorému sa dospelo v štúdií medzinárodnej organizácie pre migráciu z roku 2010 <sup>(1)</sup> financovanej Komisiou, v ktorej sa uvádza, že v dlhodobej perspektíve migrácia nemá žiadny závažný negatívny vplyv na zamestnanosť a platy a jej účinky sú často kompenzované vytváraním pracovných miest a úsporami z rozsahu. Migranti prispievajú k dopytu po tovaroch a službách, ktoré konzumujú, a tým ešte viac zvyšujú dopyt po pracovných silách. Napokon v nedávnom prieskume národného inštitútu Spojeného kráľovstva pre hospodársky a sociálny výskum sa nezistila žiadna spojitosť medzi prisťahovalectvom a nezamestnanosťou <sup>(2)</sup>.

Štúdiu citovanú pani poslankyňou už inštitút IZA publikoval. Pokiaľ ide o druhý spomínaný prieskum, je to dobrý zdroj Komisií, aby mohla vyvracať mylné predstavy o migrácii. Komisia si jasne uvedomuje potrebu racionalizovať diskusiu o migrácii a čeliť populizmu na základe faktov, dôkazov a kritických rozborov.

<sup>(1)</sup> Migrácia, zamestnanosť a politiky integrácie na trhu práce v Európskej únii (2000 – 2009).

<sup>(2)</sup> <http://www.niesr.ac.uk/index.html>

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000097/12  
to the Commission**

**Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)**

(13 January 2012)

*Subject:* Social benefits and immigrants

The Bonn-based German Institute for Study of Labour (IZA) has published a study which deals with the impact of unemployment benefits and immigration in 19 European countries. The authors used data on immigration flows, GDP, unemployment and the share of expenditure on unemployment benefit programmes on GDP in 19 European countries for the period 1993-2008. Through analysis of this data they have tried to explain what influences the influx of migrants into each country. The study shows that when immigrants decide whether to go to a particular country or not, the social security system plays almost no role, and concerns about the influx of immigrants into the EU due to the use of the social security system are unfounded. Immigrants select a country primarily according to favourable economic conditions, i.e. for example according to levels of unemployment or GDP.

— Does the Commission intend to publish the results of this study and thereby prevent populism in each of the Member States?

**Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission**

(10 February 2012)

The Commission thanks the Honorable Member for having highlighted this study by the German Institute for Study of Labour (IZA) which explores whether countries' welfare generosity affects immigration, from other EU countries and from outside the EU. The authors conclude that immigration within the EU does not respond to unemployment benefit incentives, although they mention that the same cannot necessarily be concluded for non-EU migration.

This conclusion corresponds to a large degree to that reached by the 2010 International Organisation for Migration study <sup>(1)</sup> funded by the Commission which suggested that in the long-term migration does not have any substantial negative effect on employment and wages, and impacts are usually offset by job creation and economies of scale. Migrants contribute to demand for goods and services that they consume and hence further increase demand for labour. Finally, recent research by the United Kingdom's National Institute of Economic and Social Research found no link between immigration and unemployment <sup>(2)</sup>.

The study quoted by the Honorable Member is already published by IZA. As the other research mentioned it is a good source for the Commission to counter misconceptions about migration. The Commission is acutely aware of the need to rationalise the debate about migration and counter populism through facts, evidence and critical analysis.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Migration, Employment and Labour Market Integration Policies in the European Union (2000-2009).

<sup>(2)</sup> <http://www.niesr.ac.uk/index.html>

(Slovenské znenie)

### Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-000098/12

Komisií

Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)

(13. januára 2012)

Vec: Spoločné pravidlá predaja

Európska komisia zverejnila návrh spoločnej európskej úpravy predaja. Ten by mal zabezpečiť, že zmluvné pravidlá budú vo všetkých krajinách rovnaké. Upravovali by nielen vzťahy medzi firmami a zákazníkmi, ale aj vzájomne medzi podnikmi. Vzťahovali by sa dokonca aj na obchodovanie so zahraničím, avšak druhá strana by musela mať pobočku v členskej krajine. Systém by bol založený na dobrovoľnej báze. Riadil by sa ním cezhraničný predaj tovaru vrátane internetovej ponuky. Existujúce zmluvné právo členských štátov by fungovalo paralelne s týmto novým nástrojom. Tieto pravidlá by však kládli na malé a stredné podniky priveľkú byrokratickú záťaž. Niektoré podniky by takto prišli o miliardy eur. Takisto existujú pochybnosti o nevyhnutnosti takejto úpravy. Najväčšie prekážky cezhraničného obchodu sú totiž obavy z podvodov a nedoručenia tovaru. Navrhovaná úprava by však ani jeden z týchto problémov nevyriešila.

— Skutočne považuje Komisia úpravu predaja na európskej úrovni za nevyhnutnú?

— Ak áno, akým spôsobom odstráni vysokú mieru výskytu byrokratických prekážok, ktoré návrh obsahuje?

### Odpoveď pani Redingovej v mene Komisie

(29. februára 2012)

Vážená pani poslankyňa pravdepodobne vie, že v rámci prekážok týkajúcich sa cezhraničného obchodu patria prekážky spojené s rozdielmi medzi zmluvným právom členských štátov medzi tie najväčšie v oblasti zmlúv medzi podnikmi a spotrebiteľmi (B2C) a zmlúv medzi podnikmi (B2B) <sup>(1)</sup>. Strach z podvodu sa medzi najzávažnejšími prekážkami neuvádza. Hoci problémy s dodávkou boli označené za prekážku v obchodovaní, neboli tak závažnou prekážkou ako rozdiely v zmluvnom práve. Iné prekážky nie sú predmetom tohto návrhu, ich riešeniu však venuje Komisia pozornosť v rámci iných iniciatív.

Obchodníkom vznikajú pri transakciách B2C dodatočné transakčné náklady kvôli rozdielom v zmluvnom práve jednotlivých štátov. Tieto náklady bránia obchodníkom vo vykonávaní cezhraničného obchodu alebo negatívne ovplyvňujú objem obchodu. Spotrebiteľia sa musia vyrovnávať s menšou ponukou a vyššími cenami a zdráhajú sa nakupovať za hranicami, pretože nemajú istotu, pokiaľ ide o ich práva. Najviac zasiahnuté touto situáciou sú mikropodniky predstavujúce 90 % všetkých podnikov v EÚ, pretože dodatočné transakčné náklady sa ich dotýkajú v neúmernej miere. Vo všeobecnosti dosahuje pre EÚ strata príležitosti hodnotu 26 mld. EUR ročne <sup>(2)</sup>.

Na odstránenie týchto prekážok, zníženie nákladov MSP a na pomoc MSP, aby dosiahli úsporu z rozsahu, Komisia prijala návrh spoločného európskeho kúpneho práva <sup>(3)</sup>, ktoré umožní MSP predávať ich výrobky do iných krajín na základe jediného zmluvného práva. Návrh nevytvára žiadnu dodatočnú záťaž pre MSP. Jeho hlavnými cieľmi je zníženie existujúcej administratívnej záťaže, ktorá je dôsledkom nutnosti uplatňovať rozličné úpravy zmluvného práva, ďalej vytvorenie stimulov pre MSP, aby predávali za hranice a dosahovali úsporu z rozsahu, a súčasne zabezpečenie vysokej úrovne ochrany spotrebiteľov.

<sup>(1)</sup> Prieskumy Eurobarometer 321 a 20 o európskom zmluvnom práve pri transakciách B2C a B2B.

<sup>(2)</sup> Pracovný dokument útvarov Komisie „Posúdenie vplyvu. Sprievodný dokument k návrhu nariadenia Európskeho parlamentu a Rady o spoločnom európskom kúpnom práve“ z 11.10.2011, SEC(2011)1165 final.

<sup>(3)</sup> Návrh nariadenia Európskeho parlamentu a Rady o spoločnom európskom kúpnom práve, KOM(2011) 635 v konečnom znení.



(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000098/12  
to the Commission**

**Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)**

(13 January 2012)

*Subject:* Common sales law

The European Commission published a proposal for a common European sales law. This should ensure that contract rules are identical in all countries. They would not only govern relations between businesses and consumers, but also business to business. They would even apply to international trade, but the other party would have to have a subsidiary in a Member State. The system would be run on a voluntary basis and would apply to cross-border sales of goods, including those sold online. Existing Member States' contract laws would run in parallel with this new instrument. These rules would however place a huge bureaucratic burden on small and medium businesses. Some companies would in this way lose billions of euros. There are also doubts as to the necessity of such laws. The greatest obstacles to cross-border trade are the fear of fraud and failure to deliver goods. The proposed laws would not, however, solve any of these problems.

— Does the Commission truly consider the sales law at a European level to be necessary?

— If so, how will it remove the high degree of bureaucratic obstacles contained within the proposal?

**Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission**

(29 February 2012)

The Honourable Member might be aware that among the obstacles related to cross-border trade, those linked to differences between the contract laws of the Member States rank high in both business-to-consumer (B2C) and business-to-business (B2B) contracts <sup>(1)</sup>. Fear of fraud was not mentioned among the most important obstacles. While problems with delivery have been identified as obstacles to trade, they were less important than the differences in contract laws. Other obstacles are not the object of this proposal, but are addressed by the Commission in other initiatives.

Traders incur additional transaction costs in B2C transactions because of differences of national contract laws. These costs deter traders from engaging in cross-border trade or affect negatively the volume of trade. Consumers suffer from reduced offers and higher prices and are reluctant to shop cross-border because of uncertainty about their rights. Micro enterprises representing 90 % of all EU enterprises are affected the most as the additional transaction costs affect them disproportionately. Overall, for the EU, the opportunity loss amounts to EUR 26 billion per year <sup>(2)</sup>.

To address these obstacles, decrease SMEs costs and help them develop economies of scale, the Commission has adopted the proposal for a Common European Sales Law <sup>(3)</sup> which allows SMEs to sell their products on the basis of one single contract law to other countries. The proposal not only does not create additional burdens for SMEs. Its main objectives are to reduce existing administrative burdens which stem from the need to deal with different contract laws, to create incentives for SMEs to sell cross-border and develop economies of scale, and at the same time to ensure a high level of consumer protection.

<sup>(1)</sup> Eurobarometers 321 and 320 on European contract law in B2C and B2B transactions respectively.

<sup>(2)</sup> Commission Staff Working Paper 'Impact Assessment Accompanying the document "Proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on a Common European Sales Law" on a Common European Sales Law' of 11.10.2011, SEC(2011) 1165 final.

<sup>(3)</sup> Proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on a Common European Sales Law, COM(2011) 635 final.

(Slovenské znenie)

**Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-000099/12**

**Komisii**

**Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)**

(13. januára 2012)

Vec: Spôsoby sprísnenia hospodárskej správy v eurozóne

Premiéři členských krajín Európskej únie sa síce zhodli na tom, že je nevyhnutné sprísniť fiškálnu disciplínu, zmeny základnej zmluvy však nie sú možné. Za otvorenie Lisabonskej zmluvy by totiž muselo hlasovať všetkých 27 členských štátov. Hlavný problém predstavuje v tomto smere Británia, ktorá požaduje ústupky, na ktoré nie sú Nemecko a Francúzsko ochotné pristúpiť. Keďže zmeny nie je možné dosiahnuť absolútnym konsenzom, v Bruseli sú snahy na sprísnenie hospodárskej správy v eurozóne bez zasahovania do Lisabonskej zmluvy. Konkrétne ide o návrh na postup podľa článku 126 ods. 14 Zmluvy o fungovaní EÚ.

— Aký má Komisia názor na postup podľa tohto ustanovenia?

**Odpoveď pána Rehna v mene Komisie**

(8. marca 2012)

Nedávno sa 25 členských štátov EÚ (všetky okrem Spojeného kráľovstva a Českej republiky) dohodlo na Zmluve o stabilite, koordinácii a správe v hospodárskej a menovej únii. Zmluva, ktorá kladie do centra pozornosti fiškálnu dohodu, sa má podpísať do začiatku marca 2012. Je zameraná na sprísnenie správy ekonomických záležitostí a rozpočtovej disciplíny v signatárskych členských štátoch. Komisia sa podieľala na rokovaní, aby sa zabezpečilo, že uvedenou zmluvou sa nebude zasahovať do zmlúv Únie a že sa bude uznávať prvoradosť práva Únie.

Skutočne veľké množstvo sprísňujúcich opatrení v oblasti správy ekonomických záležitostí sa ustanovuje prostredníctvom sekundárnej legislatívy, do čoho sú zapojené Rada a Európsky parlament. Komisia je toho názoru, že väčšina pravidiel z tejto novej zmluvy by sa mala zahrnúť do jej legislatívnych návrhov pre eurozónu, o ktorých sa v súčasnosti diskutuje (o posilnení hospodárskeho a rozpočtového dohľadu v členských štátoch, ktoré majú vážne problémy so svojou finančnou stabilitou alebo sú ohrozené takýmito problémami <sup>(1)</sup>), o spoločných ustanoveniach týkajúcich sa monitorovania a posudzovania navrhovaných rozpočtových plánov a o tom, ako zabezpečiť odstránenie nadmerného deficitu členských štátov <sup>(2)</sup>). Komisia takisto navrhne spoločné zásady korekčného mechanizmu a fiškálnu radu, ako sa uvádza v článku 3.2 novej medzivládnej zmluvy.

Okrem toho sa v uvedenej zmluve ustanovuje, že do piatich rokov od nadobudnutia jej účinnosti, sa prijmú opatrenia na zavedenie jej podstaty do právneho rámca Únie.

<sup>(1)</sup> KOM(2011) 0819 v konečnom znení.

<sup>(2)</sup> KOM(2011) 0821 v konečnom znení.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000099/12  
to the Commission**

**Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)**

(13 January 2012)

*Subject:* Ways of strengthening economic governance in the eurozone

Although the prime ministers of the EU Member States have agreed that it is necessary to tighten fiscal discipline, variations to the basic treaty are not possible. In order to re-open the Lisbon Treaty all 27 Member States would have to vote. The main problem in this respect is Great Britain, which seeks concessions that Germany and France were unwilling to accept. Because amendments cannot be achieved by absolute consensus, in Brussels there are efforts to tighten economic governance in the euro area without encroaching on the Lisbon Treaty. This specifically concerns the proposal for a procedure under Article 126(14) of the Treaty on the Functioning of the EU.

— What is the Commission's opinion on the procedure under this provision?

**Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission**

(8 March 2012)

Recently 25 EU Member States (all except the United Kingdom and the Czech Republic) have agreed on a Treaty on Stability, Coordination and Governance in the Economic and Monetary Union. This Treaty, at the heart of which is a 'fiscal compact' and which is set to be signed by early March 2012, aims at tightening economic governance and budgetary discipline in the signatory Member States. The Commission has participated in the negotiations in order to ensure that it does not encroach on the Union Treaties and recognises the primacy of Union law.

Indeed much of the tightening of economic governance is set to occur via secondary legislation, involving the Council and the Parliament. The Commission is of the opinion that most of the rules of this new Treaty should be included in its legislative proposals for the euro area currently under discussion (on the strengthening of economic and budgetary surveillance of Member States experiencing or threatened with serious difficulties with respect to their financial stability <sup>(1)</sup>, and on common provisions for monitoring and assessing draft budgetary plans and ensuring the correction of excessive deficit of the Member States <sup>(2)</sup>). The Commission will also propose the common principles of the correction mechanism and the fiscal council referred to in Article 3.2 of the new intergovernmental Treaty.

Moreover, the said Treaty stipulates that within five years of its entry into force, steps will be taken to bring its substance within the legal framework of the Union.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> COM(2011) 0819 final.

<sup>(2)</sup> COM(2011) 0821 final.

(Slovenské znenie)

**Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-000100/12**

**Komisii**

**Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)**

(13. januára 2012)

Vec: Stabilizácia fiškálnej situácie na medzivládnej úrovni

Na summite Európskej únie, ktorý sa konal v dňoch 8. – 9. 12. 2011, sa členským štátom Európskej únie nepodarilo dosiahnuť konsenzus ohľadne spôsobu stabilizácie súčasnej fiškálnej situácie. Dohoda všetkých členských krajín EÚ nebola prijatá, pretože Británia formulovala podmienky, ktoré Nemecko a Francúzsko odmietlo splniť. 26 členských štátov sa teda dohodlo na uzatvorení medzivládnej dohody. Otázky, ktoré sa týkajú celej Európskej únie, by sa však mali riešiť na komunitárnej úrovni, a nie prostredníctvom medzivládnych dohôd. Komunitárne riešenia majú totiž väčšiu demokratickú legitimitu, pretože sa zabezpečí možnosť, aby sa do jednotlivých procesov zapojili všetky inštitúcie Európskej únie, vrátane Európskeho parlamentu.

— Akým spôsobom Komisia zabezpečí, aby sa na rozhodovaní o metódach riešenia fiškálnej situácie podieľal aj Európsky parlament, keďže Únia sa odkláňa od možnosti riešenia situácie na komunitárnej úrovni?

**Odpoveď pána Barrosa v mene Komisie**

(6. februára 2012)

Komisia by váženu pani poslankyňu chcela odkázať na vyhlásenie, ktoré v súvislosti s medzinárodnou dohodou predniesol predseda Komisie počas plenárneho zasadnutia Parlamentu 18. januára 2012 <sup>(1)</sup>.

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=SPEECH/12/15>.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000100/12  
to the Commission**

**Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)**

(13 January 2012)

*Subject:* Stabilisation of the fiscal situation at an intergovernmental level

At the European Union summit, which took place on 8-9 December 2011, the European Union Member States failed to reach a consensus on how to stabilise the current fiscal situation. The treaty between all EU Member States was not adopted as Britain had formulated conditions with which Germany and France refused to comply. Twenty-six Member States thus agreed to conclude an intergovernmental agreement. Questions relating to the whole European Union should however be addressed at a Community level and not through intergovernmental agreements. Community solutions have in fact a greater democratic legitimacy, because they ensure the possibility for all EU institutions, including the European Parliament, to become involved in each process.

— How will the Commission ensure that the European Parliament also participates in decision-making on methods for addressing the fiscal situation, as the EU is moving away from the possibility of resolving the situation at Community level?

**Answer given by Mr Barroso on behalf of the Commission**

(6 February 2012)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to the statement on the international agreement made by the Commission's President in the Parliament's plenary on 18 January 2012 <sup>(1)</sup>.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=SPEECH/12/15>.

(Slovenské znenie)

**Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-000101/12**

**Komisií**

**Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)**

(13. januára 2012)

Vec: Taktiky marockých a španielskych orgánov činných v trestnom konaní v súvislosti s migrantmi

Dňa 25. októbra 2011 sa uskutočnili pokusy španielskych a marockých orgánov činných v trestnom konaní o zachytenie migrantov, ktorí sa po mori snažili dostať z Maroka na pobrežie španielskej enklávy Ceuta. Taktiky marockých a španielskych orgánov činných v trestnom konaní však boli v tomto prípade zjavne neprimerané. Konali násilným spôsobom, ktorý v niektorých prípadoch viedol dokonca k smrti. Niekoľko ľudí sa utopilo, iní boli násilne zatknutí a následne násilným spôsobom vrátení na alžírsku hranicu bez toho, aby bola skúmaná ich osobná situácia. Tieto operácie opäť odzrkadľujú opakované taktiky úradov, ktoré vo významnej miere ohrozujú a porušujú ľudské práva a základné slobody migrantov.

— Plánuje Komisia v súvislosti s týmito udalosťami podniknúť nejaké kroky?

**Odpoveď pani Malmströmovej v mene Komisie**

(24. februára 2012)

Pri vykonávaní činností súvisiacich s kontrolou hraníc členské štáty musia postupovať v súlade s ustanoveniami Kódexu schengenských hraníc <sup>(1)</sup>, najmä s jeho článkom 6. To znamená, že musia rešpektovať základné práva a zdržať sa prijatia akýchkoľvek opatrení, ktoré by predstavovali porušenie zásady zákazu vrátenia alebo vyhostenia (*non-refoulement*).

Z informácií, ktoré vážena poslankyňa Európskeho parlamentu uviedla, Komisia nedokáže jednoznačne zistiť, o ktoré konkrétne udalosti išlo, a konštatovať s určitosťou, či došlo k porušeniu *acquis* EÚ alebo ľudských práv.

<sup>(1)</sup> Nariadenie Európskeho parlamentu a Rady (ES) č. 562/2006 z 15. marca 2006, ktorým sa ustanovuje kódex Spoločenstva o pravidlách upravujúcich pohyb osôb cez hranice (Kódex schengenských hraníc).

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000101/12  
to the Commission**

**Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)**

(13 January 2012)

*Subject:* Tactics of the Moroccan and Spanish law enforcement agencies in relation to immigrants

On 25 October 2011, the Spanish and Moroccan law enforcement agencies attempted to capture immigrants at sea trying to reach the Spanish enclave of Ceuta from Morocco. The tactics of the Moroccan and Spanish law enforcement agencies were, however, in this case manifestly excessive. They acted in a violent manner, which in some cases even led to death. Several people were drowned; others were forcibly arrested and then violently returned to the Algerian border, without any investigation into their personal situation. These operations once again reflect the repeated tactics of the authorities which significantly threaten and violate the human rights and fundamental freedoms of immigrants.

— Does the Commission intend to take action over these events?

**Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission**

(24 February 2012)

When carrying out border control activities, Member States must act in compliance with the provisions of the Schengen Borders Code <sup>(1)</sup> and in particular its Article 6. This means that they must respect fundamental rights and they must refrain from taking any measures which would be in violation of the principle of *non-refoulement*.

Based on the information provided by the Honourable Member of the European Parliament it is not possible for the Commission to establish with clarity the events and ascertain whether there has been a violation of EU *acquis* or human rights.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Regulation (EC) No 562/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 15 March 2006 establishing a community code on the rules governing the movement of persons across borders (Schengen Borders Code).

(Slovenské znenie)

**Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-000103/12**

**Komisií**

**Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)**

(13. januára 2012)

Vec: Voľby 2011 v Rusku

Dňa 4. decembra 2011 sa v Rusku uskutočnili voľby do Štátnej dumy. Priebeh volieb však ukázal, že Rusko neplní štandardy, ktoré stanovila OBSE. Z predbežných zistení, ktoré vyplývajú zo správ OBSE a Úradu pre demokratické inštitúcie a ľudské práva ODIHR, je zrejmé, že boli narušené pokusy o nezávislé pozorovanie voleného procesu a taktiež nebola zabezpečená dostatočná neustrannosť médií. Proces registrácie viedol k vylúčeniu viacerých opozičných strán a od začiatku ohrozoval slobodu združovania, politickú súťaž a pluralizmus. V tejto súvislosti boli taktiež predložené správy o podvodoch a zastrašovaní.

— Plánuje v súvislosti s momentálnou politickou situáciou v Rusku vydať Komisia konkrétne stanovisko?

**Odpoveď podpredsedníčky Komisie a vysokej predstaviteľky Ashtonovej v mene Komisie**

(12. marca 2012)

Európskych volebných pozorovateľov vyslali OBSE, Úrad pre demokratické inštitúcie a ľudské práva (ODIHR), ako aj Parlamentné zhromaždenie Rady Európy. ODIHR medzičasom (12. januára 2012) vydal o voľbách do ruskej Štátnej dumy, ktoré sa uskutočnili 4. decembra 2011, komplexnú záverečnú správu. Komisia nemá v úmysle v súvislosti s týmito voľbami vydať ďalšie špecifické stanovisko.

Európska únia pravidelne pripomína Rusku jeho záväzok uskutočňovať slobodné a spravodlivé voľby, ktorý na seba táto krajina prevzala v rámci OSN, Rady Európy a OBSE. Ostatný raz tak EÚ urobila na samite EÚ a Ruska 15. decembra 2011.

Komisia chce uviesť, že pozorovatelia OBSE a Úradu pre demokratické inštitúcie a ľudské práva (ODIHR) už boli Ruskom pozvaní, aby sledovali prezidentské voľby 4. marca 2012, a to za podobných podmienok ako v prípade volieb do Štátnej dumy. Na mieste mohlo pôsobiť 40 dlhodobých a 160 krátkodobých pozorovateľov. Európska únia vyzvala Ruskú federáciu, aby sa zaoberala zisteniami obsiahnutými v správach ODIHR o voľbách do Štátnej dumy, a to v záujme zabezpečenia slobodného a spravodlivého priebehu prezidentských volieb. Rusko ubezpečilo EÚ, že sa tak stane, a v tejto súvislosti oznámilo, resp. prijalo, určité opatrenia.



(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000103/12  
to the Commission**

**Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)**

(13 January 2012)

*Subject:* 2011 elections in Russia

On 4 December 2011 elections to the Russian Duma were held. The elections showed, however, that Russia does not meet the standards established by the OSCE. From the preliminary findings arising from the reports of the OSCE Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR), it is clear that attempts at independent observation of the electoral process were disrupted and also media impartiality was inadequate. The registration process led to the exclusion of several opposition parties and since the beginning it has threatened freedom of association, political competition and pluralism. In this context, reports of fraud and intimidation have also been submitted.

— Does the Commission plan to issue a specific opinion in connection with the existing political situation in Russia?

**Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission**

(12 March 2012)

European election observers were sent by OSCE/ODIHR and the Council of Europe's Parliamentary Assembly. ODIHR has already issued a comprehensive final report on 12 January 2012 on the Russian State Duma elections of 4 December 2011. The Commission does not intend to issue an additional specific opinion.

The EU regularly recalls Russia's commitments to free and fair elections as taken in the frameworks of the UN, the Council of Europe and the OSCE. Most recently, the EU raised these issues at the EU-Russia Summit on 15 December 2011.

The Commission notes that OSCE/ODIHR election observers have already been invited by Russia to observe the presidential elections on 4 March 2012, on similar conditions as for the Duma elections. 40 long-term and 160 short-term observers can be fielded. The EU has called on Russia to address the findings expressed in ODIHR's reports on the Duma elections, and to ensure that the upcoming presidential elections will be free and fair. Russia has given assurances that this will be the case and announced or already taken certain measures in this regard.

(Slovenské znenie)

**Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-000105/12**

**Komisií**

**Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)**

(13. januára 2012)

Vec: Výstavba plotu Evros v Grécku

Dňa 7. decembra 2011 schválil grécky Dvor audítorov zákonnosť zmluvy o výstavbe plotu v oblasti Evros na grécko-tureckých hraniciach. V ten istý deň oznámilo grécke ministerstvo na ochranu obyvateľstva, že podpíše zmluvu s dodávateľom na začatie stavebných prác. Grécka vláda takto koná napriek vyjadreniu komisárky Malmströmovej, že toto opatrenie nie je dostatočne účinný nástroj v snahe Grécka o reguláciu prílivu migrantov a pašerákov na jeho územie. Európska komisia už v minulosti vyhlásila, že stavanie múrov a oplotení je opatrenie len na krátky čas a z dlhodobého hľadiska situáciu nerieši. Malmströmová zdôraznila, že EÚ je pripravená spolufinancovať iné, účinnejšie opatrenia, ktoré by pomohli vyriešiť problém prúdov utečencov, ktorých vstupnou bránou do Európskej únie je práve Grécko.

— Aký má Komisia názor na takýto postup gréckej vlády aj napriek vyjadreniam komisárky Malmströmovej o nedostatočnej účinnosti výstavby plotu Evros?

— Mieni byť Komisia v tejto súvislosti určitým spôsobom aktívna?

**Odpoveď pani Malmströmovej v mene Komisie**

(24. februára 2012)

Komisia zastáva názor, že výstavba technickej prekážky v oblasti Evros na grécko-tureckých hraniciach nie je účinným opatrením na reguláciu nelegálnej migrácie a informovala Grécko, že nesúhlasí s tým, aby sa plot zahrnul do ročného programu Fondu pre vonkajšie hranice (EBF) na rok 2011.

Komisia zároveň potvrdila pripravenosť na spolufinancovanie iných, účinnejších opatrení v rámci komplexnej stratégie, ktorú grécke orgány plánovali realizovať s cieľom zabezpečiť integrovaný systém riadenia hraníc pozdĺž celej pozemnej hranice medzi Gréckom a Tureckom.

Grécke orgány do nej zahrnuli celý rad opatrení, ktoré by mali byť predmetom spolufinancovania v rámci ročného programu EBF na rok 2011, okrem iného nákup špeciálnych vozidiel vybavených monitorovacím zariadením, napríklad termovíznymi kamerami a/alebo RTG systémom, a nákup vrtuľníka na účely monitorovania hraničnej čiary a na podporu pozemných hliadok.

Hoci Komisia zastáva názor, že úsilie by sa malo sústreďovať na tieto účinnejšie opatrenia, Grécko má naďalej možnosť rozhodnúť podľa vlastného uváženia o výstavbe technickej prekážky zo zdrojov štátu.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000105/12  
to the Commission**

**Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)**

(13 January 2012)

*Subject:* Construction of the Evros fence in Greece

On 7 December 2011, the Greek Court of Auditors approved the legality of the contract for the construction of a fence in Evros on Greece's border with Turkey. On the same day, the Greek Ministry announced that for the protection of the population, it would sign a contract with the contractor to commence construction work. The Greek Government is acting in this way despite the comment by Commissioner Malmström that this measure is not a sufficiently effective tool in its endeavour to regulate the influx of Greek immigrants and smugglers to its territory. The European Commission has previously stated that erecting walls and fences is only a short-term measure and does not resolve the situation in the long-term. Malmström emphasised that the EU is prepared to co-finance other, more effective measures that would help to address solve the problem of the flows of refugees, whose gateway to the European Union is Greece.

— What is the Commission's opinion on the action of the Greek Government, despite the statements of Commissioner Malmström on the lack of effectiveness of the construction of the Evros fence?

— Does the Commission intend to be active in some way in this respect?

**Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission**

(24 February 2012)

The Commission considers that the construction of a technical barrier in Evros at the Greek/Turkish border is not an effective measure to counter irregular migration and has informed Greece that it would not accept that the fence be included in the 2011 External Borders Fund (EBF) Annual Programme.

At the same time, the Commission confirmed its readiness to co-finance other more effective measures within the comprehensive strategy that Greek authorities have planned to establish to ensure an integrated border management system for the whole length of the land border between Greece and Turkey.

The Greek authorities have included a number of such measures by co-funding under the 2011 EBF Annual Programme, among others, the purchase of special vehicles with surveillance equipment such as thermal cameras and/or X-ray system and the purchase of a helicopter to be used for surveillance of borderline and support of patrols on the ground.

While the Commission considers that efforts should concentrate on these more effective measures, Greece remains free to decide to finance the construction of a technical barrier with national resources.

---

(Slovenské znenie)

**Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-000107/12**

**Komisií**

**Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)**

(13. januára 2012)

Vec: Zavádzajúce informácie médií v súvislosti s energetickou cestovnou mapou do roku 2050

Európska komisia nedávno zverejnila dlho očakávanú energetickú cestovnú mapu do roku 2050. Médiá však v tejto súvislosti následne prezentovali množstvo nepravdivých a zavádzajúcich informácií. Klamlivé informácie sa týkajú najmä údajných vysokých nákladov na dekarbonizáciu a obnoviteľné zdroje. V skutočnosti však cestovná mapa poukazuje na skutočnosť, že všetky energetické scenáre do roku 2050 vrátane scenára o využívaní obnoviteľných zdrojov budú mať rovnaké celkové náklady na systém. Toto však nie je prvýkrát, čo médiá prezentujú nepravdivé situácie a obyvatel'ov Európskej únie takýmto spôsobom zavádzajú.

— Akým spôsobom sa bude Komisia brániť voči nepravdivým mediálnym informáciám?

**Odpoveď pána Oettingera v mene Komisie**

(24. februára 2012)

Plán postupu do roku 2050 vrátane technických aspektov bol plne vysvetlený a sprístupnený všetkým médiám pri jeho prijímaní. Komisia pokračuje v informovaní o tomto pláne, pretože je predmetom živej verejnej diskusie.

---

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-000107/12  
to the Commission**

**Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)**

*(13 January 2012)*

*Subject:* Misleading information to the media on the Energy Roadmap 2050

The European Commission recently published its long-awaited Energy Roadmap 2050. However, the media then presented a number of pieces of false and misleading information. The misleading information concerned in particular the alleged high cost of decarbonisation and renewable resources. In fact, the roadmap points to the fact that all energy scenarios to 2050, including the scenario on the use of renewable resources, will have the same overall system costs. This is not the first time that the media has presented a false situation and has misled EU citizens in this way.

— How will the Commission defend itself against false information in the media?

**Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission**

*(24 February 2012)*

The Roadmap 2050, including its technical aspects have been fully explained and made available to all media at the time it was adopted. The Commission continues to communicate about the roadmap since it is the subject of an intensive public debate.

---

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-000109/12  
προς την Επιτροπή (Αντιπρόεδρος/Υπατη Εκπρόσωπος)  
Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)  
(18 Ιανουαρίου 2012)**

Θέμα: VP/HR — Βία κατά των γυναικών στο Αφγανιστάν

Σύμφωνα με την αφγανική Επιτροπή Ανθρωπίνων Δικαιωμάτων το τελευταίο τρίμηνο του 2011 έχουν καταγραφεί περισσότερες από χίλιες περιπτώσεις βίας εναντίον γυναικών στη χώρα, ενώ για το 2010 είχαν καταγραφεί συνολικά 2 700 περιπτώσεις.

Σύμφωνα με έκθεση της Oxfam, το 87 % των γυναικών του Αφγανιστάν έχουν δηλώσει ότι έχουν υποστεί σωματική, σεξουαλική ή ψυχολογική βία, ενώ έχουν οδηγηθεί σε αναγκαστικούς γάμους.

Η θέση των γυναικών σε μια κοινωνία είναι χαρακτηριστική του γενικότερου κοινωνικού κλίματος. Σήμερα δε μπορούμε να πούμε ότι ικανοποιούμαστε από τη κατάσταση που επικρατεί στο Αφγανιστάν, βλέποντας την ουσιαστική επανάκαμψη του ακραίου Ισλάμ.

Μια κοινωνία που δε προοδεύει αλλά κινείται προς την αντίθετη κατεύθυνση πνίγει κάθε δημιουργική φωνή, και η καλλιέργεια ευνοϊκού κλίματος για κοινωνική και οικονομική άνθηση εμποδίζεται.

Ερωτάται η Υπατη Εκπρόσωπος:

1. Έχουν υπάρξει δεσμεύσεις από πλευράς αφγανικής κυβέρνησης για βελτίωση της θέσης των γυναικών στην αφγανική κοινωνία;
2. Σε ποιές κινήσεις προτίθεται να προχωρήσει μέσα στο 2012 για τη βελτίωση της θέσης των γυναικών στο Αφγανιστάν;
3. Διατίθεται στήριξη για οργανώσεις που συμβάλλουν στη χειραφέτηση των γυναικών στη χώρα;

**Απάντηση της Υπατης Εκπροσώπου/Αντιπρόεδρου Ashton εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής  
(26 Μαρτίου 2012)**

Η αφγανική κυβέρνηση έχει αναλάβει σταθερές δεσμεύσεις για τη βελτίωση της θέσης των γυναικών στο πλαίσιο διεθνών διασκέψεων που πραγματοποιήθηκαν το 2010 στο Λονδίνο και την Καμπούλ, τον Δεκέμβριο του 2011 στη διάσκεψη της Βόννης και σε μια δήλωση της 18ης Ιανουαρίου 2012.

Εξακολουθεί να είναι ιδιαίτερα σημαντική η διασφάλιση και επέκταση της προόδου που σημείωσε το Αφγανιστάν στον τομέα των ανθρωπίνων δικαιωμάτων, και πιο συγκεκριμένα των δικαιωμάτων των γυναικών μετά το 2001. Η ΕΕ θέτει λοιπόν σε κάθε ευκαιρία άμεσα το ζήτημα, στην κυβέρνηση του Αφγανιστάν και καθιστά σαφή τη θέση της μέσω δημόσιων δηλώσεων (για παράδειγμα, τον Φεβρουάριο του 2011, σχετικά με τα καταφύγια γυναικών στο Αφγανιστάν): επίσης έχει επιβεβαιώσει τη θέση της στα συμπεράσματα του Συμβουλίου της 18ης Ιουλίου και 14ης Νοεμβρίου 2011. Επιπλέον, η βία κατά των γυναικών θα εξεταστεί το 2012 από την ΕΕ και από τα κράτη μέλη της στα αντίστοιχα προγράμματα βοήθειας.

Η Υπατη Εκπρόσωπος/Αντιπρόεδρος έχει συζητήσει το θέμα με τις αφγανικές αρχές στη διάσκεψη της Καμπούλ και σε αυτή της Βόννης, καθώς και σε πρόσφατη συνάντησή της με τον αφγανό Υπουργό Εξωτερικών τον Δεκέμβριο του 2011.

Τα προγράμματα βοήθειας της Ευρωπαϊκής Επιτροπής εξακολουθούν να εστιάζουν την προσοχή τους στη διακυβέρνηση, συμπεριλαμβανομένης της μεταρρύθμισης του τομέα της ποινικής δικαιοσύνης και των θεσμών της, που είναι αναγκαία για την υποστήριξη των δικαιωμάτων των θυμάτων βίας κατά των γυναικών. Επιπλέον, η ΕΕ έχει ξοδέψει πάνω από 31 εκατομμύρια ευρώ σε σχέδια που είτε αφορούν άμεσα τις γυναίκες είτε αντιμετωπίζουν πιο σφαιρικά την κοινωνική, πολιτιστική και οικονομική τους περιθωριοποίηση. Στο πλαίσιο αυτό, η ΕΕ στηρίζει τις κοινωνικές υπηρεσίες προς τις πιο ευπαθείς ομάδες, οι οποίες περιλαμβάνουν παροχή συμβουλών, νομική συνδρομή και διαμεσολάβηση για γυναίκες που έρχονται σε σύγκρουση με τις παραδόσεις. Άλλα προγράμματα καλύπτουν μακροπρόθεσμους στόχους, όπως η ενίσχυση των υφιστάμενων φορέων ώστε να καταστεί δυνατή η άσκηση κοινωνικής προστασίας και η προστασία των δικαιωμάτων των αφγανών γυναικών κάθε ηλικίας που κινδυνεύουν από ενδοοικογενειακή βία ή είναι θύματα της.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000109/12**  
**to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)**  
**Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)**  
(18 January 2012)

*Subject:* VP/HR — Violence against women in Afghanistan

According to the Afghan Human Rights Commission, more than one thousand cases of violence against women were recorded in Afghanistan in the last quarter of 2011, compared with a total of 2 700 cases in 2010.

According to an Oxfam report, 87 % of women in Afghanistan have stated that they have suffered physical, sexual or psychological violence and have been forced into arranged marriages.

The position of women in society is illustrative of the more general social climate. We cannot say today that we are satisfied with the situation prevailing in Afghanistan, given the basic revival of Islamic extremism.

A society which, instead of progressing, moves in the opposite direction, strangles any creative voice and prevents the cultivation of a climate which is beneficial to social and economic prosperity.

I would like to ask Baroness Ashton:

1. Has the Afghan government made any pledges to improve the position of women in Afghan society?
2. What steps does she intend to take in 2012 to improve the position of women in Afghanistan?
3. Is any support available for organisations helping to emancipate women in Afghanistan?

**Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission**  
(26 March 2012)

The Afghan Government has made firm commitments to improve the position of women in the context of the international conferences held in 2010 in London and Kabul, in December 2011 at the Bonn Conference and in a statement issued on 18 January 2012.

It remains particularly important to safeguard and expand on the progress Afghanistan has made in the field of human rights and rights of women in particular since 2001. The EU, therefore, brings up the issue directly with the Government of Afghanistan whenever appropriate and makes its position clear through public statements (for example on women's shelters in Afghanistan in February 2011) but has also reconfirmed its position in the Council conclusions of 18 July and 14 November 2011. Furthermore, violence against women will be addressed in 2012 both by the EU and its Member States in their respective assistance programmes.

The High Representative/Vice-President has discussed the matter with the Afghan authorities at both the Kabul and Bonn Conferences, and most recently in a meeting with Afghan Foreign Minister in December 2011.

EC assistance programmes continue to focus on governance, including reform of the justice sector and its institutions, which is indispensable to uphold the rights of victims of violence against women. Furthermore, the EU has spent more than EUR 31 million on projects in direct support of women or addressing more broadly their social, cultural and economic marginalisation. In this context, the EU supports social services to the most vulnerable including counselling, legal aid and mediation for women in conflict with traditions. Additional programmes address long-term objectives, such as strengthening existing bodies to exercise social protection and protect the rights of Afghan women and girls at risk or victims of domestic violence.

---

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-000110/12**  
**προς την Επιτροπή**  
**Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)**  
(16 Ιανουαρίου 2012)

**Θέμα:** Μεγάλη απώλεια θέσεων εργασίας στον τριτογενή τομέα της Ελλάδας

Σύμφωνα με στοιχεία της Ελληνικής Στατιστικής Αρχής (ΕΛΣΤΑΤ), από το τρίτο τρίμηνο του 2008 έως το ίδιο τρίμηνο του 2011, δηλαδή από τότε που ξέσπασε η χρηματοπιστωτική κρίση την οποία διαδέχθηκε η δημοσιονομική κρίση, οι απασχολούμενοι στον τριτογενή τομέα μειώθηκαν από 542 600 άτομα σε 419 000 άτομα. Οι θέσεις εργασίας στην ελληνική μεταποίηση που χάθηκαν, ανήλθαν σχεδόν σε 123 600.

Ειδικότερα, το τρίτο τρίμηνο του 2011, σε σύγκριση με το ίδιο τρίμηνο του 2010, οι απασχολούμενοι στις βιομηχανίες της χώρας μειώθηκαν από 465 200 άτομα σε 419 000 άτομα. Χάθηκαν έτσι, μέσα σε ένα έτος, 46 200 θέσεις εργασίας.

Από το δεύτερο τρίμηνο του 2010 ως το ίδιο τρίμηνο του 2011, παρόλο που παρουσίασε συγκυριακή άνοδο, λόγω εποχικής απασχόλησης σε 5 κλάδους (στην ξυλεία, στα παράγωγα πετρελαίου, στα βασικά μέταλλα, στα μηχανοκίνητα οχήματα και στις αποκαλούμενες άλλες μεταποιητικές δραστηριότητες), ο αριθμός των εργαζομένων σε βασικούς κλάδους του τομέα μειώθηκε.

Πολύ μεγάλη απώλεια θέσεων εργασίας, σε σχέση με την προ της κρίσης περίοδο παρουσιάζουν και άλλοι κλάδοι.

Λόγω και της υψηλής φορολογίας, το πλήγμα στην ελληνική βιομηχανία, θα συνεχιστεί και, κατά συνέπεια, όλο και περισσότεροι Έλληνες εργαζόμενοι θα χάσουν τη δουλειά τους.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Υπάρχει συνεργασία με την ελληνική κυβέρνηση και τους κοινωνικούς εταίρους για την κατάρτιση ενός προγράμματος για παροχή κινήτρων σε επιχειρήσεις που δεν προβλίνουν σε μείωση προσωπικού, ώστε να μπορέσει η ελληνική βιομηχανία να βρει το βηματισμό της και να συγκρατηθούν οι συνθήκες κατάρρευσης της απασχόλησης στην ελληνική κοινωνία;
2. Θεωρεί ότι η μεταβολή της πολιτικής της ελληνικής κυβέρνησης, ώστε να δημιουργηθεί ένα ευνοϊκότερο κλίμα για τη βιομηχανία, είναι απαραίτητη για τη βιωσιμότητά της;

**Απάντηση του κ. Tajani εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής**  
(15 Μαρτίου 2012)

1. Η Επιτροπή είναι αποφασισμένη να προωθήσει τον κοινωνικό διάλογο σε όλη την Ένωση, λαμβάνοντας δεόντως υπόψη της την πολυμορφία των εθνικών συστημάτων εργασιακών σχέσεων. Στο πλαίσιο του προγράμματος οικονομικής προσαρμογής, η Επιτροπή ζήτησε επίμονα από την Ελληνική Κυβέρνηση να εξασφαλίσει τη συμμετοχή των κοινωνικών εταίρων στον καθορισμό ενός προγράμματος μεταρρυθμίσεων και προσαρμογής με σκοπό την υποστήριξη της απασχόλησης και της ανταγωνιστικότητας, τη βελτίωση του κοινωνικού διαλόγου και την προαγωγή μιας αγοράς εργασίας που, συνολικά, θα λειτουργεί ομαλά.

Στο επιχειρησιακό πρόγραμμα «ανάπτυξη των ανθρώπινων πόρων 2007-2013», που συγχρηματοδοτείται από το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινωνικό Ταμείο (ΕΚΤ), έχουν προβλεφθεί 52 εκατομμύρια ευρώ για δράσεις των κοινωνικών εταίρων που υποστηρίζουν την προσαρμοστικότητα των εργαζομένων και των επιχειρήσεων. Περισσότερες πληροφορίες σχετικά με τις παρεμβάσεις των κοινωνικών εταίρων στο πλαίσιο του ΕΚΤ στην Ελλάδα μπορούν να παρασχεθούν από την ΕΥΣΕΚΤ<sup>(1)</sup>, την υπηρεσία συντονισμού και παρακολούθησης των δράσεων του ΕΚΤ, ή από τη διαχειριστική αρχή του ΕΠ για την ανάπτυξη των ανθρώπινων πόρων<sup>(2)</sup>.

<sup>(1)</sup> Κοραή 4, 105 64, Αθήνα· τηλ. +30 210-5271400· φαξ +30 210-5271420· δικτυακός τόπος: [www.esfhellas.gr](http://www.esfhellas.gr); διεύθ. ηλεκ. ταχ.: [eysekt@mou.gr](mailto:eysekt@mou.gr).

<sup>(2)</sup> Κοραή 4, 105 64, Αθήνα· τηλ. +30 210-5201200· φαξ +30 210-5241311· δικτυακός τόπος: <http://www.epanad.gov.gr>; διεύθ. ηλεκ. ταχ.: [eydanad@mou.gr](mailto:eydanad@mou.gr).



2. Για την υπέρβαση των μεγάλων προβλημάτων που αντιμετωπίζει η ελληνική οικονομία απαιτείται ευρύ φάσμα συνεπών μεταρρυθμίσεων και μέτρων, ώστε να μεταβληθούν βαθιά ριζωμένα χαρακτηριστικά σε πολλούς τομείς της οικονομίας και να βελτιωθεί το επιχειρηματικό περιβάλλον. Με τον τρόπο αυτό θα δημιουργηθούν οι όροι για επενδύσεις στην Ελλάδα και, συνεπώς, για οικονομική ανάπτυξη και διατηρήσιμες θέσεις εργασίας. Τα μέτρα που εγκρίθηκαν το 2010-2011 αποσκοπούν να αντιμετωπίσουν ορισμένες στενώσεις του επιχειρηματικού περιβάλλοντος, όπως, για παράδειγμα, να απλουστεύσουν τη σύσταση επιχειρήσεων και την αδειοδότηση επιχειρηματικής δραστηριότητας. Μια ακόμη πολιτική δέσμευση είναι ο σχεδιασμός και η υλοποίηση ενός προγράμματος για μια φιλική προς τις επιχειρήσεις Ελλάδα, με σκοπό την άρση των σοβαρότερων φραγμών για την επιχειρηματικότητα.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000110/12**  
**to the Commission**  
**Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)**  
(16 January 2012)

*Subject:* Massive job losses in the tertiary sector in Greece

According to data from the Hellenic Statistical Authority (ELSTAT) for the period from the third quarter of 2008, when the financial crisis broke, to be followed by the fiscal crisis, and the third quarter of 2011, the number of people employed in the tertiary sector fell from 542 600 to 419 000. Nearly 123 600 jobs were lost in manufacturing in Greece.

In fact, in the third quarter of 2011, compared with the third quarter of 2010, the number of people employed in Greek industry fell from 465 200 to 419 000, meaning that 46 200 jobs were lost in the space of a year.

Between the second quarter of 2010 and the second quarter of 2011, the number of workers in basic industries in the sector fell, despite a short-term increase due to seasonal employment in five industries (timber, petroleum products, base metals, the automotive industry and so-called other manufacturing activities).

There have also been massive job losses in other sectors, compared with the period before the crisis.

Due to high taxation, the damage to Greek industry will continue and, therefore, more and more Greek workers will lose their job.

Will the Commission answer the following:

1. Is the Greek Government cooperating with the social partners on the preparation of a programme to provide incentives to businesses which do not make staff cutbacks, so that Greek industry can get back on track and the collapse of employment in Greek society can be contained?
2. Does it consider that Greek Government policy needs to be changed, in order to create a more favourable climate for industry and guarantee its survival?

**Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission**  
(15 March 2012)

1. The Commission is committed to promoting social dialogue throughout the Union with due regard for the diversity of national industrial relations systems. In the context of the Economic Adjustment Programme, the Commission has urged the Greek Government to involve social partners in the definition of a reform and adjustment agenda to support employment and competitiveness, to improve social dialogue and to favour an overall well-functioning labour market.

In the operational programme 'Human Resources Development 2007-13', co-financed by the European Social Fund (ESF), EUR 52 million has been earmarked for actions by the social partners in supporting the adaptability of workers and enterprises. More information on the interventions under the ESF in Greece by the social partners can be obtained from EYSEKT <sup>(1)</sup>, the coordination and monitoring authority for ESF actions in Greece or the managing authority of the Human Resources Development OP <sup>(2)</sup>.

2. Overcoming the big challenges the Greek economy is facing require a broad range of consistent reforms and measures to tackle deep-seated features in various areas of the economy and to improve the business environment. That will create the conditions for investment in Greece and thereby for economic growth and sustainable jobs. Measures adopted in 2010-2011 are aimed at addressing some business environment bottlenecks such as simplifying business start-ups and business licensing. Another policy commitment is the design and implementation of a plan for a Business Friendly Greece to remove the most important barriers to entrepreneurship.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> 4 Korai Street, 10564 Athens; tel. +30 210-5271400; fax +30 210-5271420; website: [www.esfhellas.gr](http://www.esfhellas.gr); email: [eysekt@mou.gr](mailto:eysekt@mou.gr).

<sup>(2)</sup> 4 Korai Street, 10564 Athens; tel. +30 210-5201200; fax +30 210-5241311; website: <http://www.epanad.gov.gr>; email: [eydanad@mou.gr](mailto:eydanad@mou.gr).

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-000111/12**  
**προς την Επιτροπή**  
**Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)**  
(16 Ιανουαρίου 2012)

**Θέμα:** Κατάργηση των εθνικοτήτων για το αλβανικό κράτος

Το Συνταγματικό Δικαστήριο της Αλβανίας αποφάσισε την κατάργηση του όρου «εθνικότητα» από τις ληξιαρχικές πράξεις και άλλα επίσημα έγγραφα, επικαλούμενο τα προσωπικά δεδομένα, γεγονός που δημιουργεί φόβους για την ακεραιότητα της ελληνικής μειονότητας της χώρας.

Σύμφωνα με την απόφαση, οι διατάξεις του ληξιαρχικού νόμου του 2009 αντιτίθενται σε άρθρα του αλβανικού Συντάγματος. Ειδικότερα, το άρθρο 20 προβλέπει ότι «τα άτομα που ανήκουν στις εθνικές μειονότητες δικαιούνται να εκφράσουν ελεύθερα, χωρίς να εμποδιστούν, ούτε να υποχρεωθούν, την εθνική, πολιτιστική, θρησκευτική και γλωσσική ταυτότητά τους». Επιπλέον, το άρθρο 35 αναφέρεται στην υποχρέωση για προστασία των προσωπικών δεδομένων. Με την απόφαση αυτή, στα επίσημα έγγραφα, δεν θα αναγράφεται η αλβανική, ελληνική ή οποιαδήποτε άλλη εθνική καταγωγή, κάτι που θα καταστήσει απαγορευτική οποιαδήποτε διεκδίκηση αναγνώρισης εθνικής μειονότητας.

Ενδεικτική της πολιτικής σημασίας αυτής της πράξης είναι η δήλωση του προέδρου της αλβανικής εθνικιστικής οργάνωσης Ερυθρόμαυρη Συμμαχία, Κρεσνίκ Σπαχίου: «Από εδώ και στο εξής, όποιος ζει στην Αλβανία πρέπει να ζήσει ως Αλβανός».

Γίνεται αντιληπτό ότι η νομική κατοχύρωση των μειονοτήτων δεν είναι καθόλου σίγουρη, λόγω του εθνικισμού που επικρατεί, ο οποίος αποσκοπεί στην καθιέρωση ενός καθαρού ομοιογενούς κράτους.

Σύμφωνα με κοινή γραπτή δήλωση των ελλήνων βουλευτών του αλβανικού Κοινοβουλίου, Κώστα Μπάρκα και Βαγγέλη Τάβου, η επίμαχη απόφαση του Συνταγματικού Δικαστηρίου «βλάπτει την ακεραιότητα της εθνικής ελληνικής μειονότητας και ενθαρρύνει τις εθνικιστικές και αντιευρωπαϊκές τάσεις στην Αλβανία».

Λαμβάνοντας υπόψη ότι η Αλβανία επιθυμεί μακροπρόθεσμα να καταστεί μέλος της ΕΕ, της οποίας οι θεμελιώδεις συνθήκες κατοχυρώνουν την προστασία των εθνικών μειονοτήτων και εν γένει της διαφορετικότητας, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

Θεωρεί ότι η εν λόγω απόφαση αντιβαίνει στη δεδηλωμένη βούληση της Αλβανίας για ένταξη στην ΕΕ και παραβιάζει ευθέως το Χάρτη Ανθρωπίνων Δικαιωμάτων του ΟΗΕ;

**Απάντηση του κ. Füle εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής**  
(12 Μαρτίου 2012)

Η Επιτροπή έχει επίγνωση των αλλαγών ως προς τον τύπο και το περιεχόμενο των πιστοποιητικών που εκδίδουν οι ληξιαρχικές υπηρεσίες, μεταξύ των οποίων περιλαμβάνεται η παράλειψη του εθνικού/εθνοτικού στοιχείου. Η Επιτροπή έχει πληροφορηθεί ότι παρόμοια έγγραφα με την πληροφορία αυτή μπορούν να χορηγηθούν, κατόπιν αιτήσεως, στους πολίτες. Το δίκαιο της ΕΕ δεν απαιτεί τη συμπερίληψη εθνοτικών στοιχείων στα επίσημα έγγραφα. Αντιθέτως, σύμφωνα με το άρθρο 8 παράγραφος 1 της οδηγίας 95/46<sup>(1)</sup>, στην ΕΕ, απαγορεύεται η επεξεργασία δεδομένων προσωπικού χαρακτήρα που παρέχουν πληροφορίες για τη φυλετική ή εθνική καταγωγή, εκτός αν πληρούνται οι προϋποθέσεις και οι απαιτήσεις που προβλέπονται στην παράγραφο 2 ή 4 του εν λόγω άρθρου.

Ο σεβασμός και η προστασία των μειονοτήτων αποτελεί ουσιώδες στοιχείο των πολιτικών κριτηρίων προσχώρησης της Κοπεγχάγης. Η Επιτροπή παρακολουθεί εκ του σύνεγγυς την πρόοδο της χώρας στον τομέα αυτό και προβαίνει σε εκτίμηση των εκθέσεων και των συστάσεων των αρμόδιων θεσμικών οργάνων, όπως της συμβουλευτικής επιτροπής της σύμβασης-πλαίσου για την προστασία των εθνικών μειονοτήτων (ΣΠΠΕΜ). Το αλβανικό σύνταγμα προβλέπει την προστασία των αστικών, οικονομικών, κοινωνικών και πολιτικών δικαιωμάτων των μειονοτήτων. Η χώρα ενθαρρύνεται να εντείνει τις προσπάθειές της για την υλοποίηση των δεσμεύσεων που έχει αναλάβει στον τομέα αυτό, και συγκεκριμένα να άρει τα εμπόδια στη διδασκαλία μειονοτικών γλωσσών, σύμφωνα με τις συστάσεις της συμβουλευτικής επιτροπής της ΣΠΠΕΜ.

(<sup>1</sup>) ΕΕ L 281 της 23.11.1995.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000111/12**  
**to the Commission**  
**Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)**  
(16 January 2012)

*Subject:* Abolition of nationalities for the Albanian State

The Constitutional Court of Albania has decided to abolish the term 'nationality' from certificates of civil status and other official documents containing personal data, prompting fears for the integrity of the country's Greek minority.

Under this decision, the provisions of the 2009 law on Civil Status are not in line with articles of the Albanian Constitution. In particular, Article 20 stipulates that 'people from ethnic minorities are allowed to express freely, without being prevented from doing so or being obliged to do so, their ethnic, cultural, religious and linguistic identity'. Furthermore, Article 35 refers to the obligation to protect personal data. With this decision, Albanian, Greek or any other ethnic background will not be recorded in official documents which will prohibit any claim for recognition of ethnic minority.

The political significance of this decision is demonstrated in the statement made by the president of the Albanian nationalist organisation, the Red and Black Alliance, Kreshnik Spahiu: 'From now on, whoever lives in Albania must live as an Albanian.'

It is understood that the legal protection of minorities is by no means certain as a result of the prevailing nationalism which aims to establish a pure, homogenous State.

According to a joint written declaration by the Greek members of the Albanian Parliament, Kostas Barkas and Vangelis Tavos, the contested decision of the Constitutional Court 'undermines the integrity of the ethnic Greek minority and encourages nationalist and anti-European tendencies in Albania'.

Considering that Albania, in the long-term, wants to become a member of the EU, whose treaties guarantee the protection of ethnic minorities and diversity in general, will the Commission say:

Whether it considers that this decision goes against Albania's declared desire for EU accession and directly contravenes the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights?

**Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission**  
(12 March 2012)

The Commission is aware of the changes in the form and content of the certificates issued by civil status offices, including the omission of the element of nationality/ethnicity. The Commission has been informed that separate documents including this information can be issued to citizens upon request. EC law does not require the inclusion of ethnic data in official documents. On the contrary, according to Article 8 (1) of Directive 95/46 (<sup>(1)</sup>), in the EU, the processing of personal data revealing ethnic origin is in principle prohibited unless the conditions and requirements provided for in paragraphs 2 or 4 of that Article are complied with.

Respect for and protection of minorities is an essential element of the Copenhagen political criteria for membership. The Commission follows closely progress of the country in this area and assesses the reports and recommendations of the competent institutional bodies such as the Advisory Committee of the framework Convention for the protection of National Minorities (FCNM). The Albanian Constitution provides for the protection of the civil, economic, social and political rights of minorities. The country is encouraged to upgrade its efforts to implement commitments in this field, including for instance removing obstacles to minority language education, in line with the recommendations of the Advisory Committee of FCNM.

---

(<sup>1</sup>) OJ L 281, 23.11.1995.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-000112/12**  
**προς την Επιτροπή**  
**Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)**  
(16 Ιανουαρίου 2012)

**Θέμα:** Διεκδίκηση στήριξης από το Ευρωπαϊκό Ταμείο Προσαρμογής για Οργανισμούς Τοπικής Αυτοδιοίκησης

Σύμφωνα με το Δήμαρχο Πατρέων, η οικονομική κατάσταση για πολλούς κατοίκους του Δήμου έχει χειροτερέψει, αφού αναφέρει ότι «είναι τραγικό αυτό που συμβαίνει στην Πάτρα. Είναι απίστευτη η ανέχεια σημαντικού τμήματος του πληθυσμού. Πλέον, είναι πολλοί αυτοί που δεν έχουν ούτε να φάνε»

Ενδεικτικό της κατάστασης που επικρατεί είναι ότι αυτές τις γιορτινές μέρες η Τράπεζα Τροφίμων του Δήμου διένειμε τρόφιμα σε πάνω από 1 000 άπορες οικογένειες της περιοχής, έναντι 425 οικογενειών πέρυσι. Δηλαδή, μέσα σε ένα χρόνο οι διαπιστωμένα άποροι στην Πάτρα αυξήθηκαν τουλάχιστον κατά 236 %. Και δυστυχώς δεν προβλέπεται βελτίωση, τουλάχιστον κατά το 2012, καθώς η τάση της ανεργίας είναι αυξητική.

Η πορεία της οικονομικής κρίσης έχει απελπιστικά αποτελέσματα με γεωμετρική πρόοδο, όταν η υψηλή επιβράδυνση της οικονομίας συνδυάζεται με τις αναπόφευκτες πολιτικές λιτότητας.

Όμως είναι κατανοητό ότι αυτό το κοινωνικό πρόβλημα είναι απόρροια της έκθεσης της ελληνικής οικονομίας στην παγκοσμιοποιημένη αγορά, στην οποία ο ρόλος των κερδοσκοπικών επιθέσεων σε ευάλωτες οικονομίες είναι αυξανόμενος.

Θεωρώντας ότι η άσχημη οικονομική κατάσταση των δημοτών στην Πάτρα, αλλά και σε πολλές άλλες πόλεις κρατών μελών, μπορεί να αντιμετωπιστεί, λαμβάνοντας υπόψη τη θεμελιώδη αρχή της ευρωπαϊκής αλληλεγγύης, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

- Διατίθεται ενίσχυση από το Ευρωπαϊκό Ταμείο Προσαρμογής στην παγκοσμιοποίηση για Οργανισμούς Τοπικής Αυτοδιοίκησης, όπως ο Δήμος Πατρέων, εφόσον αποδεικνύεται ότι η δραματική αύξηση της ανεργίας είναι αποτέλεσμα έκθεσης στις διακυμάνσεις της διεθνούς οικονομίας;

**Απάντηση του κ. Andor εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής**  
(21 Φεβρουαρίου 2012)

Η Επιτροπή γνωρίζει την κοινωνική δυσφορία που η οικονομική κρίση προκαλεί στα περισσότερο ευπαθή μέλη της κοινωνίας και θεωρεί την αλληλεγγύη στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση ως ένα στοιχείο των προσπαθειών για την αντιμετώπισή της. Ωστόσο, το Ευρωπαϊκό Ταμείο Προσαρμογής στην Παγκοσμιοποίηση (ΕΤΠ) δημιουργήθηκε για να παράσχει ενίσχυση σε εργαζομένους (και όχι στις τοπικές αρχές) που απολύθηκαν μαζικά εξαιτίας της παγκοσμιοποίησης και προβλέπει ενεργητικά μέτρα για την αγορά εργασίας, όπως η ενίσχυση για την αναζήτηση θέσης εργασίας, η κατάρτιση και η προαγωγή της επιχειρηματικότητας. Η Επιτροπή παραπέμπει τον κ. βουλευτή στον κανονισμό ΕΤΠ <sup>(1)</sup> και στον δικτυακό τόπο του ΕΤΠ <sup>(2)</sup> για περαιτέρω λεπτομερή στοιχεία.

<sup>(1)</sup> Κανονισμός (ΕΚ) αριθ. 1927/2006 του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου και του Συμβουλίου, της 20ής Δεκεμβρίου 2006, σχετικά με τη σύσταση του Ευρωπαϊκού Ταμείου προσαρμογής στην παγκοσμιοποίηση, ΕΕ L 406 της 30.12.2006.

<sup>(2)</sup> <http://ec.europa.eu/egf>.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000112/12  
to the Commission  
Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)  
(16 January 2012)**

*Subject:* Claim for support from the European Globalisation Adjustment Fund for local authorities

According to the Mayor of Patras, the financial circumstances of numerous residents of the municipality have deteriorated. In his words, 'what is happening in Patras is a tragedy. A large section of the population is living in unbelievable poverty. Many can no longer afford to eat'.

The prevailing situation was illustrated over the holidays by the fact that the municipality distributed food to over 1 000 impoverished families in the area, compared with 425 last year. In other words, in the space of a year, the number of impoverished persons in Patras has risen by at least 236 %. Unfortunately, with unemployment rising, there is no improvement in sight, at least not in 2012.

The economic crisis is having desperate results, which will increase exponentially as the massive slowdown in the economy is compounded by the inevitable austerity policies.

However, it is obvious that this social problem is the result of the exposure of the Greek economy to the globalised market, where speculative attacks on vulnerable economies are taking on an increasingly important role.

Given that the unfortunate economic circumstances of the residents of Patras — and of numerous other towns in Member States — can be addressed on the basis of on the fundamental principle of European solidarity, will the Commission say:

- Is assistance available from the European Globalisation Adjustment Fund for local authorities such as the Municipality of Patras if it can be proven that the drastic increase in unemployment is the result of exposure to fluctuations in the international economy?

**Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission  
(21 February 2012)**

The Commission is aware of the social distress that the economic crisis is causing society's most vulnerable members, and regards solidarity across the European Union as one element in efforts to address it. However, the European Globalisation Adjustment Fund (EGF) was established to provide assistance to workers (as opposed to local authorities) made redundant because of globalisation and involving active labour market measures, such as job-search assistance, training and entrepreneurship promotion. The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to the EGF Regulation <sup>(1)</sup> and the EGF website <sup>(2)</sup> for further details.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Regulation (EC) No 1927/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 20 December 2006 on establishing the European Globalisation Adjustment Fund, OJ L 406, 30.12.2006.

<sup>(2)</sup> <http://ec.europa.eu/egf>.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-000113/12**  
**προς την Επιτροπή**  
**Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)**  
(16 Ιανουαρίου 2012)

**Θέμα:** Πολιτικές έναντι της κερδοσκοπίας εις βάρος της ευρωπαϊκής και διεθνούς οικονομίας

Οι βολές στην αξιοπιστία της οικονομικής επιτυχίας της Ευρωζώνης για το νέο έτος έχουν ξεκινήσει από τους οίκους αξιολόγησης.

Ενδεικτικά, η Morgan Stanley εκτιμά ότι η οικονομία της έχει ήδη εισέλθει σε μια νέα ύφεση και για τον λόγο αυτό μείωσε και την πρόβλεψή της για το ΑΕΠ της ευρωζώνης το 2012 στο  $-0,20\%$  (από  $0,85\%$  στην προηγούμενη πρόβλεψή της).

Αναλόγως δυσοίωνα είναι και οι προβλέψεις του Ευρωπαϊκού Κέντρου Οικονομικών Ερευνών (Centre for Economics and Business Research — CEBR).

Οι ειδικοί του Κέντρου εκτιμούν πως μέσα στο 2012 «τουλάχιστον μια χώρα θα αποσυρθεί από την ευρωζώνη και θα σηματοδοτήσει την έναρξη της διάλυσης της νομισματικής ένωσης του ευρώ».

Σε κάθε περίπτωση, δηλώνουν πως η στατιστική τους ανάλυση δίνει πιθανότητες  $60\%$  να αρχίσει η διάσπαση του ευρώ εντός του 2012. Οι ειδικοί του CEBR εμφανίζονται βέβαιοι ότι αυτή είναι μια μη αναστρέψιμη διαδικασία. Ως εκ τούτου, επισημαίνουν πως «η πιθανότητα διάλυσης του ευρώ στην ερχόμενη 10ετία έχει αυξηθεί στο  $99\%$ ».

Το κλίμα που δημιουργούν αυτές οι ανακοινώσεις μπορεί να είναι μοιραίο για τη τύχη του ευρώ μακροπρόθεσμα. Όμως πρέπει να διασαφηνιστεί κατά πόσο αυτές οι προβλέψεις αντικατοπτρίζουν τη πραγματικότητα και κατά πόσο δικαιούνται οι οίκοι αξιολόγησης να καθορίζουν τη πολιτική και κοινωνική μοίρα της Ευρώπης, των ΗΠΑ και του κόσμου εν γένει.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Υπάρχουν σκέψεις για το συντονισμό των κινήσεων με άλλες οικονομίες σε διεθνές επίπεδο για τη συγκρότηση ενός διακρατικού και αντικειμενικού οίκου αξιολόγησης, αδέσμευτου από επιχειρηματικές παρεμβάσεις για κερδοσκοπία έναντι των κρατών;
2. Υπάρχει, και αν ναι, σε ποιο επίπεδο, συνεργασία με τις ΗΠΑ, την Ιαπωνία, τη Κίνα, την Ινδία και τη Βραζιλία για την αντιμετώπιση της κερδοσκοπίας έναντι της διεθνούς οικονομικής σταθερότητας;

**Απάντηση του κ. Rehn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής**  
(8 Μαρτίου 2012)

Ενώ οι λόγοι που προκάλεσαν την κρίση δημόσιου χρέους στη ζώνη του ευρώ είναι πολλαπλοί, η κρίση αποκάλυψε επίσης ορισμένες αδυναμίες του τομέα της αξιολόγησης. Πολλές από αυτές έχουν ήδη αντιμετωπιστεί στην πρόσφατη πρόταση της Επιτροπής της 15ης Νοεμβρίου 2011 σχετικά με τους οργανισμούς αξιολόγησης πιστοληπτικής ικανότητας (ΟΑΠ) <sup>(1)</sup>, που περιέχει μεγάλης εμβέλειας τροποποιήσεις του ισχύοντος κανονισμού: λιγότερη εξάρτηση των επενδυτών από τις αξιολογήσεις, πλέον διαφανείς και έγκαιρες αξιολογήσεις χωρών, μεγαλύτερη ποικιλομορφία, ανεξαρτησία, διαφάνεια και συγκρισιμότητα των ΟΑΠ, καθώς και αστική ευθύνη για τους τελευταίους.

Η πρόταση αποσκοπεί επίσης στην ενίσχυση του ανταγωνισμού στην αγορά αξιολογήσεων, όπως με υποχρεωτική εναλλαγή των ΟΑΠ. Δεν δόθηκε συνέχεια στην επιλογή δημιουργίας ενός νέου ανεξάρτητου ευρωπαϊκού ΟΑΠ, λόγω υψηλού κόστους και αβεβαιότητας όσον αφορά την αξιοπιστία και ανεξαρτησία του. Ωστόσο, η Επιτροπή εξετάζει τρόπους προώθησης ενός δικτύου μικρών και μεσαίων οργανισμών αξιολόγησης πιστοληπτικής ικανότητας.

<sup>(1)</sup> Πρόταση για κανονισμό του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου και του Συμβουλίου για την τροποποίηση του κανονισμού (ΕΚ) αριθ. 1060/2009 για τους οργανισμούς αξιολόγησης πιστοληπτικής ικανότητας και πρόταση για οδηγία του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου και του Συμβουλίου για την τροποποίηση της οδηγίας 2009/65/ΕΚ για τον συντονισμό των νομοθετικών, κανονιστικών και διοικητικών διατάξεων σχετικά με ορισμένους οργανισμούς συλλογικών επενδύσεων σε κινητές αξίες (ΟΣΕΚΑ) και της οδηγίας 2011/61/ΕΕ σχετικά με τους διαχειριστές οργανισμών εναλλακτικών επενδύσεων όσον αφορά την υπέρμετρη στήριξη στις αξιολογήσεις πιστοληπτικής ικανότητας.

Η Επιτροπή ευρίσκεται σε συνεχή διάλογο με άλλες χώρες, όπως οι Ηνωμένες Πολιτείες, και παρακολουθεί στενά τις διεθνείς εξελίξεις των κανονιστικών ρυθμίσεων που αφορούν τις αξιολογήσεις πιστοληπτικής ικανότητας. Επιπλέον, η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση συνεργάζεται με τους διεθνείς εταίρους της, μεταξύ άλλων τις ΗΠΑ, την Ιαπωνία, την Κίνα, την Ινδία και τη Βραζιλία, ώστε να διασφαλιστεί παγκόσμια οικονομική και χρηματοπιστωτική σταθερότητα στο πλαίσιο της G20. Η Επιτροπή στοχεύει στην ενδυνάμωση της παγκόσμιας οικονομικής συνεργασίας για την ενίσχυση της παγκόσμιας οικονομικής σταθερότητας. Ιδιαίτερη σημασία στο πλαίσιο αυτό έχουν δύο συγκεκριμένοι άξονες δράσης. Το αποκαλούμενο πλαίσιο της G20 για ισχυρή, βιώσιμη και ισόρροπη ανάπτυξη, που στοχεύει στην αντιμετώπιση των παγκόσμιων μακροοικονομικών ανισορροπιών, και οι εργασίες της G20 για την αστάθεια των τιμών των εμπορευματικών αγαθών.

---



(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000113/12**  
**to the Commission**  
**Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)**  
(16 January 2012)

*Subject:* Policies to prevent damaging speculation to the European and international economy

The credit rating agencies have resumed their attacks on the credibility of the eurozone's economic success in the new year.

For example, Morgan Stanley considers that the eurozone economy has already entered another recession and has reduced its GDP forecasts for the euro area in 2012 to -0.20 % (compared with previous forecasts of 0.85 %).

Forecasts by the Centre for Economics and Business Research (CEBR) are equally gloomy.

The Centre's experts are forecasting that at least one country will leave the eurozone in 2012 and that this will mark the beginning of the break-up of euro monetary union.

At the very least, their statistical analysis has led them to forecast a 60 % probability that the euro will start to break up in 2012. The CEBR experts appear to be certain that this is an irreversible process and, as such, they have revised their forecast of the probability of a break-up of the euro within the next decade upwards to 99 %.

The climate created by such pronouncements may be fatal to the euro in the long term. However, we need to establish to what extent these forecasts reflect reality and to what extent credit rating agencies are entitled to determine the political and social fate of Europe, the US and the world in general.

I would like to ask the Commission:

1. Has any thought been given to coordinating action with other economies at the international level, in order to set up an objective transnational credit rating agency independent of business intervention by speculators that is to the detriment of individual states?
2. Is the EU cooperating with the US, Japan, China, India and Brazil to combat speculation damaging to international economic stability and, if so, at what level?

**Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission**  
(8 March 2012)

While the reasons behind the euro area sovereign debt crisis are manifold, the crisis has also revealed some weaknesses of the rating sector. Many of these have been addressed in the recent Commission's proposal on credit rating agencies (CRA) <sup>(1)</sup> of 15 November 2011, containing far-reaching amendments to the current regulation: less investor reliance on ratings; more transparent and timely sovereign ratings; more diversity, independence, transparency and comparability of CRA, as well as civil liability for these.

The proposal also aims to boost competition in the rating market, such as by mandatory rotation of CRAs. The option to establish a new independent European CRA has, due to high costs and uncertainty regarding its credibility and independence, not been pursued. However, the Commission is considering ways to promote a network of small and medium-sized credit rating agencies.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council amending Regulation (EC) No 1060/2009 on credit rating agencies and directive of the European Parliament and of the Council amending Directive 2009/65/EC on the coordination of laws, regulations and administrative provisions relating to undertakings of collective investment in transferable securities (UCITS) and Directive 2011/61/EU on Alternative Investment Funds Managers in respect of the excessive reliance on credit ratings.

The Commission is in constant dialogue with other countries, such as the United States, and follows closely international regulatory developments related to credit ratings. Furthermore, the European Union cooperates with its international partners, including US, Japan, China, India and Brazil, to ensure global economic and financial stability in the context of the G20. The Commission aims at strengthening global economic cooperation to strengthen global economic stability. Two specific work streams are especially relevant in this context. The so-called G20 Framework for Strong, Sustainable and Balanced Growth, which aims at addressing global macroeconomic imbalances, and the G20 work on the volatility of commodity prices.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000115/12  
to the Commission  
Chris Davies (ALDE)  
(16 January 2012)**

*Subject:* Supplemental question on 'Funding of the Israeli Antiquities Authority'

In its response to Question E-009280/2011 on 'funding of the Israeli Antiquities Authority', the Commission refers to the 'effective recovery procedure in respect of Israeli entities' established in the Science and Technology Cooperation Agreement.

Can the Commission outline the specific criteria for ruling activities to be ineligible under the Science and Technology Agreement? Is this restricted solely to the postal codes provided by the Israeli authorities, or further checks to verify the location of activities conducted by projects which apply for such funding?

In how many cases has that recovery procedure been invoked, and what were the projects involved?

Will the 'precise operational guidance' referred to clarify how EU funds to Israeli partners will be prevented from supporting projects in the Occupied Palestinian Territories?

**Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission  
(13 March 2012)**

The Agreement on Scientific and Technological Cooperation between the European Community and the State of Israel does not set the criteria for defining a participant or activity ineligible for projects under the 7th Framework Programme (FP7). It specifies, rather, that Israeli legal entities shall participate in indirect actions subject to terms and conditions established by or referred to in Annexes I and II of the Agreement (Article 2(1)). Neither the Agreement nor Rules for Participation require explicit verification of the location where activities from FP7 projects are carried out by the participants.

The recovery procedure is defined in paragraph VII of Annex IV to the Agreement. In accordance with this provision, a decision on recovery of funds that may be taken by the Commission under FP7 is enforceable in Israel through the Israeli Courts in accordance with the Israeli rules of procedure. Verification of the authenticity of the Commission decision takes place. The Commission can enforce recovery orders in Israel in a similar way as they are enforced, on the grounds of Article 299 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, in the EU.

The recovery procedure has not yet been invoked in the case of Israel.

The precise operational guidance on the eligibility of Israeli partners for EU funding will provide satisfactory clarification concerning the question of Israeli entities established in the Occupied Palestinian Territory and the Golan Heights.

---

(Versiunea în limba română)

**Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-000117/12**  
**adresată Comisiei**  
**Elena Băsescu (PPE)**  
(16 ianuarie 2012)

*Subiect:* Operațiunea de combatere a contrabandei AKKERMANN 2011

Cooperarea regională realizată cu sprijinul UE prin intermediul misiunii de frontieră EUBAMM s-a dovedit a fi deosebit de eficientă acest an, în special prin organizarea operațiunii de combatere a contrabandei AKKERMANN 2011. FRONTEX, EUROPOL, INTERPOL și OLAF au susținut proiectul, la care au participat ofițeri din Italia și Germania. Beneficiarii direcți au fost atât Republica Moldova, cât și Ucraina.

Luați în considerare posibilitatea permanentizării acțiunilor de acest tip la granițele Republicii Moldova?

**Răspuns dat de dna Ashton, în numele Comisiei**  
(12 martie 2012)

EUBAM efectuează în fiecare an operațiuni comune de control la frontieră, împreună cu serviciile sale partenere din Ucraina și Republica Moldova, precum și cu serviciile de resort din statele membre ale UE (polițiști de frontieră, agenți de poliție și autorități vamale), cu serviciile Comisiei competente în materie, în special, OLAF, cu agențiile UE (de exemplu, EUROPOL, FRONTEX) și cu agențiile internaționale (de exemplu, INTERPOL și SELEC).

Operațiunea AKKERMAN 2011 a fost a opta operațiune de acest tip. Aceasta a fost precedată, în 2010, de operațiunea TYRA, în 2009, de operațiunea NIKONYI și, anterior, de operațiunile FOCUS-2, FOCUS și COURIER. În 2006, prin misiunea EUBAM s-a sprijinit organizarea și desfășurarea a două operațiuni comune de control la frontieră, în aprilie și octombrie.

EUBAM pregătește în prezent a noua operațiune de control comun la frontiera dintre Ucraina și Republica Moldova, intitulată EURO-2012.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000117/12  
to the Commission  
Elena Băsescu (PPE)  
(16 January 2012)**

*Subject:* Operation AKKERMAN 2011 to combat contraband

The regional cooperation fostered by the EU via its EUBAM border assistance mission has proved particularly effective this year, especially through the running of the AKKERMAN 2011 operation. Frontex, Europol, Interpol and OLAF have supported the project, in which officials from Italy and Germany have participated. Moldova and Ukraine have been direct beneficiaries.

Are permanent measures of this type on the borders of Moldova being considered?

**Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission  
(12 March 2012)**

EUBAM conducts every year joint border control operations together with its partner services from Ukraine and the Republic of Moldova as well as the relevant services from EU Member States (border guards, police and customs), competent Commission Services, in particular OLAF, EU agencies (e.g. Europol, Frontex) and international agencies (e.g. Interpol and SELEC).

The AKKERMAN 2011 operation was the eighth operation of this kind. It was preceded in 2010 by the TYRA operation; in 2009, by the NIKONYI operation and beforehand by the FOCUS-2, FOCUS and COURIER operations. In 2006 the EUBAM mission helped organise and carry out two joint border control operations, in April and October respectively.

EUBAM is currently preparing the ninth Ukraine/Moldova joint border control operation, EURO-2012.

---

(Version française)

**Question avec demande de réponse écrite P-000118/12**  
**à la Commission**  
**Marc Tarabella (S&D)**  
(13 janvier 2012)

*Objet:* Risques pour la santé des produits injectables utilisés à des fins esthétiques

Dans ma question écrite à la Commission (E-3878/2010), j'avais attiré l'attention de la Commission sur les effets dangereux pour la santé de certains produits injectables utilisés à des fins esthétiques. Toutes les dispositions juridiques invoquées par la Commission dans sa réponse alambiquée ont démontré hélas, suite aux événements récents liés à l'injection d'implants mammaires ou de comblement de rides, être inappropriées et/ou insuffisantes pour contrôler ou empêcher la mise sur le marché et la circulation de ces produits.

— La Commission n'estime-t-elle pas avoir trop tardé dans la mise sur pied de systèmes et d'organes de contrôle pour remplacer l'autocertification effectuée par les fabricants de ces produits?

— La Commission peut-elle faire savoir pourquoi elle n'a pas encore présenté la proposition législative promise dans sa réponse en 2010, alors que la consultation des parties intéressées remonte à 2008?

— La Commission estime-t-elle suffisant d'assurer la traçabilité de ces produits au lieu d'interdire purement et simplement la circulation des produits à risque au nom du principe de précaution?

— La Commission ne considère-t-elle pas que la circulation de ces produits soit en infraction avec la directive générale sur la sécurité des produits 2001/95/CE qui impose aux fabricants de ne mettre sur le marché que des produits sûrs?

— La Commission estime-t-elle normal que des produits soient considérés comme dangereux dans certains États membres et non dans l'État membre voisin?

**Réponse donnée par M. Dalli au nom de la Commission**  
(6 février 2012)

Les produits injectables utilisés aussi bien à des fins médicales qu'esthétiques ne sont pas autocertifiés par les fabricants. Conformément à la législation sur les dispositifs médicaux, ils figurent dans les classes qui regroupent les dispositifs présentant les risques les plus élevés, et l'évaluation de leur conformité doit faire l'objet d'une vérification par un organisme notifié<sup>(1)</sup>. Ladite législation établit les procédures que les autorités nationales doivent suivre pour retirer du marché les dispositifs dangereux.

L'inclusion dans la législation sur les dispositifs médicaux des produits injectés ou implantés destinés exclusivement à des fins esthétiques faisait partie des options proposées par la Commission dans la consultation publique qu'elle a lancée en 2008<sup>(2)</sup>, étant donné que ces produits ne sont couverts ni par la directive 2001/95/CE<sup>(3)</sup> ni par aucun autre texte législatif de l'UE. À l'époque, les parties prenantes consultées avaient considéré que la révision était prématurée. Elles avaient renvoyé à la directive 2007/47/CE<sup>(4)</sup>, qui devait être transposée pour le 21 mars 2010 au plus tard, et à l'adoption du nouveau cadre juridique pour la commercialisation des produits<sup>(5)</sup>, qui devait prendre effet à compter du 1<sup>er</sup> janvier 2010. Dans l'intervalle, la Commission a continué à recueillir des données, à définir des solutions pratiques et à élaborer l'analyse des incidences.

Dans le contexte de son projet de révision de la législation sur les dispositifs médicaux, prévue pour cette année, la Commission examine la possibilité d'étendre le champ d'application de ladite législation aux produits esthétiques en question. Cela permettrait d'éviter que ces produits ne soient couverts par des législations nationales différentes et garantirait aux citoyens, grâce au régime harmonisé en résultant, un même degré de sécurité à travers toute l'Union européenne.

<sup>(1)</sup> Directive 93/42/CEE relative aux dispositifs médicaux — JO L 169 du 12.7.1993.

<sup>(2)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/sectors/medical-devices/files/recast\\_docs\\_2008/public\\_consultation\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/sectors/medical-devices/files/recast_docs_2008/public_consultation_en.pdf)

<sup>(3)</sup> Directive 2001/95/CE relative à la sécurité générale des produits — JO L 11 du 15.1.2002.

<sup>(4)</sup> JO L 247 du 21.9.2007.

<sup>(5)</sup> Règlement (CE) n° 765/2008 fixant les prescriptions relatives à l'accréditation et à la surveillance du marché pour la commercialisation des produits et abrogeant le règlement (CEE) n° 339/93.

(English version)

**Question for written answer P-000118/12  
to the Commission**

**Marc Tarabella (S&D)**

(13 January 2012)

*Subject:* Health risks of injectable products used for aesthetic purposes

In my written question to the Commission (E-3878/2010), I drew the Commission's attention to the serious adverse effects of certain injectable products used for aesthetic purposes. Alas, all the legal provisions invoked by the Commission in its convoluted response have, following the recent events linked to the insertion of breast implants and the injection of wrinkle fillers, proven themselves to be inappropriate and/or insufficient as a means of controlling or preventing the release onto the market and circulation of such products.

— Does the Commission not think that it took too long to establish monitoring systems and bodies to replace the self-certification carried out by manufacturers of these products?

— Can the Commission explain why it has not yet presented the legislative proposal promised in its answer of 2010, even though the consultation with stakeholders dates back to 2008?

— Does the Commission consider it sufficient to guarantee the traceability of these products instead of simply banning the circulation of unsafe products, in line with the precautionary principle?

— Does the Commission not consider that the circulation of these products contravenes Directive 2001/95/EC on general product safety, which imposes an obligation on manufacturers to market only safe products?

— Does the Commission find it acceptable that products considered to be dangerous in some Member States are not considered so in a neighbouring Member State?

**Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission**

(6 February 2012)

Filling products intended for both medical and aesthetic purposes are not self-certified by manufacturers. According to the medical device legislation <sup>(1)</sup>, they are classified in the highest risk classes and their conformity assessment requires the verification by a Notified Body. This legislation establishes procedures which national authorities need to follow to withdraw unsafe devices from the market.

The inclusion in the medical device legislation of injected or implanted products intended exclusively for aesthetic purposes was part of the options proposed by the Commission in its public consultation in 2008 <sup>(2)</sup>. The reason was that these products are covered neither by Directive 2001/95/EC <sup>(3)</sup> nor by any other EU legislation. At this time, respondents considered the revision premature. They pointed to Directive 2007/47/EC <sup>(4)</sup>, to be implemented by 21 March 2010, and the adoption of the New Legal Framework for the Marketing of Products <sup>(5)</sup> which was due to take effect as of 1 January 2010. In the meantime, the Commission has continued gathering data, developing policy options and elaborating the impact assessment.

In its proposals to revise the medical device legislation, foreseen for this year, the Commission is looking into the possible extension of the scope to cover these aesthetic products. This would avoid that these products are covered by different national legislations and it would ensure, through the harmonised regime, the same level of citizen safety in the European Union.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Directive 93/42/EEC concerning medical devices — OJ L 169, 12.7.1993.

<sup>(2)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/health/medical-devices/files/recast\\_docs\\_2008/public\\_consultation\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/health/medical-devices/files/recast_docs_2008/public_consultation_en.pdf)

<sup>(3)</sup> Directive 2001/95/EC on general product safety — OJ L 11, 15.1.2002.

<sup>(4)</sup> OJ L 247, 21.9.2007.

<sup>(5)</sup> Regulation (EC) No 765/2008 setting out the requirements for accreditation and market surveillance relating to the marketing of products and repealing Regulation (EEC) No 339/93.

(Deutsche Fassung)

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-000119/12**

**an die Kommission**

**Franz Obermayr (NI)**

(18. Januar 2012)

*Betrifft:* EU-Patent auf Tierzucht — Samenpatent des US-Unternehmens XY LLC

Medienberichten zufolge beanspruche das US-Unternehmen XY LLC (Tochter des US-Unternehmens Inguran LLC) ein Patent für ein Zuchtverfahren, mit welchem das Geschlecht der Nachkommen bestimmt werden kann. Dabei werde Sperma für künstliche Besamungen mithilfe einer Apparatur selektiert. Der Patentanspruch soll sich auch auf das so ausgewählte Sperma erstrecken. Da die künstliche Besamung insbesondere in der Rinder- und Schweinezucht weit verbreitet ist, könnte das Patent erhebliche Auswirkungen auf Landwirtschaft und Tierzucht haben. Darüber hinaus gäbe es bereits weitere Patentanmeldungen anderer Firmen auf Zuchtmaterial und Nutztiere. Das Samenpatent könnte für die Tierzucht zu einem ähnlichen Präzedenzfall werden wie das Brokkoli- und Tomaten-Patent für die Pflanzenzucht.

1. Wie steht die Kommission zu diesem Fall?
2. Welche Auswirkungen könnte ein Samenpatent auf die heimische Tierzucht und Landwirtschaft haben?
3. Was gedenkt die Kommission gegen allfällige negative Auswirkungen zu unternehmen?
4. Steht ein Samenpatent im Widerspruch zum EuGH-Urteil C-34/10 gegen Patente auf Leben?
5. Sollen Samenpatente von einem einheitlichen europäischen Patent erfasst werden? (anstehende Entscheidung des EU-Ministerrats vom 22.12.2011)

**Antwort von Michel Barnier im Namen der Kommission**

(20. Februar 2012)

1. Die Kommission geht davon aus, dass es in dem besagten Fall um ein europäisches Patent <sup>(1)</sup> für ein Verfahren zur Konservierung von Rindersperma geht, das aufgrund eines bestimmten Merkmals, beispielsweise des Geschlechts, selektiert wurde. Gemäß der Richtlinie 98/44/EG <sup>(2)</sup> ist ein Verfahren, mit dem biologisches Material hergestellt, bearbeitet oder verwendet wird, patentierbar, sofern die Erfindung neu ist, auf einer erfinderischen Tätigkeit beruht und gewerblich anwendbar ist <sup>(3)</sup>.

2 und 3. Bislang wurden nur wenigen Patente auf Verfahren in der Tierzucht erteilt und negative Auswirkungen konnten nicht festgestellt werden. Darüber hinaus schließt die Erteilung eines Patents rechtliche Beschränkungen oder Verbote hinsichtlich der Nutzung patentierter Produkte nicht aus <sup>(4)</sup>.

4. Das besagte Urteil <sup>(5)</sup> befasst sich mit der Frage der Patentierbarkeit von Erfindungen im Zusammenhang mit embryonalen Stammzellen. Das von dem Herrn Abgeordneten angesprochene Patent scheint nicht im Widerspruch zu diesem Urteil zu stehen.

5. Die Praxis des Europäischen Patentamts (EPA) auf dem Gebiet der biotechnologischen Erfindungen ist weitestgehend von der Richtlinie 98/44/EG beeinflusst, da wesentliche Bestimmungen dieser Richtlinie in die Durchführungsvorschriften zum Europäischen Patentübereinkommen (EPÜ) aufgenommen wurden. Biologisches, natürlich vorkommendes Material ist weder auf der Grundlage der Richtlinie noch auf der Grundlage der Durchführungsvorschriften oder des EPÜ patentierbar. Daraus folgt, dass Sperma als solches nicht patentierbar ist, wenn es nicht aus seiner natürlichen Umgebung isoliert oder auf technischem Wege oder in einem technischen Verfahren hergestellt wurde. Der „Vorschlag für eine Verordnung des Rates über die Umsetzung der Verstärkten Zusammenarbeit bei der Schaffung eines einheitlichen Patentschutzes“, in dem die Vorschriften für vom EPA erteilte europäische Patente mit einheitlicher Wirkung festgelegt sind und der sich mit der Frage der Patentierbarkeit nicht befasst, würde nach seiner Verabschiedung hieran nichts ändern.

<sup>(1)</sup> EP 1257168.

<sup>(2)</sup> Richtlinie 98/44/EG über den rechtlichen Schutz biotechnologischer Erfindungen: ABl. L 213 vom 30.7.1998, S. 13-21.

<sup>(3)</sup> Artikel 3 Absatz 1 der Richtlinie 98/44/EG.

<sup>(4)</sup> Siehe Erwägungsgrund 14 der Richtlinie 98/44/EG sowie das Urteil des Gerichts vom 9. Oktober 2001, C-377/98.

<sup>(5)</sup> Rechtssache C 34/10 vom 18. Oktober 2011.



(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000119/12  
to the Commission**

**Franz Obermayr (NI)**

(18 January 2012)

*Subject:* EU patent on animal breeding — Semen patent of US company XY LLC

According to media reports, the US company XY LLC (a subsidiary of the US company Inguran LLC) is filing a patent for a breeding procedure that can determine the sex of offspring. The procedure uses equipment to select sperm for artificial insemination. The patent claim apparently also extends to the selected sperm. As artificial insemination is widespread, particularly in cattle and pig breeding, the patent could have significant effects on farming and animal breeding. Furthermore, other patent applications relating to breeding material and livestock have already been applied for by other companies. The semen patent could create a similar precedence for animal breeding as the broccoli and tomato patent did for plant breeding.

1. What is the Commission's opinion on this case?
2. What effects could a semen patent have on domestic animal breeding and farming?
3. What action would the Commission consider taking against any negative effects?
4. Does a semen patent conflict with ECJ Judgment C-34/10 against patents on life?
5. Should semen patents be covered by a standard European patent? (decision of the EU Council of Ministers of 22 December 2011 pending)

**Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission**

(20 February 2012)

1. The Commission assumes that the case referred to relates to a European patent <sup>(1)</sup> for a method of preserving bovine semen that has been selected for a specific characteristic such as sex-type. On the basis of Directive 98/44 <sup>(2)</sup>, 'a process by means of which biological material is produced, processed or used shall be patentable', provided that the invention is new, involves an inventive step and is susceptible of industrial application <sup>(3)</sup>.

2 and 3. As yet, not many process patents in animal breeding have been granted and negative effects have not been identified. In addition, the grant of a patent does not preclude legal limitations or prohibitions applying to the exploitation of patented products <sup>(4)</sup>.

4. The judgment <sup>(5)</sup> referred to addresses the question of the patentability of inventions related to embryonic stem cells. The patent referred to by the Honourable Member does not appear to conflict therewith.

5. The practice of the European Patent Office (EPO) in the area of biotechnological inventions is to large extent influenced by Directive 98/44 since the main provisions of Directive 98/44 have been incorporated into the Implementing Regulations (IR) to the European Patent Convention (EPC). Biological material naturally occurring in nature is patentable neither on the basis of the directive nor on the basis of the IR to the EPC. This implies that semen as such is not patentable if not isolated from its natural environment or produced by a technical means or a technical process. The 'proposal for a Council Regulation implementing enhanced cooperation in the area of the creation of unitary patent protection', which sets out rules on unitary effect for European patents granted by the (EPO) and does not address issues of patentability, would, if adopted, not change this.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> EP 1257168.

<sup>(2)</sup> Directive 98/44/EC on the legal protection of biotechnological inventions: OJ L 213, 30.7.1998, pp. 13-21.

<sup>(3)</sup> Article 3(1) of Directive 98/44.

<sup>(4)</sup> See Recital 14 of Directive 98/44 as well as the judgment of the Court of 9 October 2001, C-377/98.

<sup>(5)</sup> Case C-34/10 of 18 October 2011.

(Versão portuguesa)

**Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-000120/12**  
**à Comissão**  
**Elisa Ferreira (S&D)**  
(17 de janeiro de 2012)

*Assunto:* Possível suspensão de fundos estruturais

O compromisso atingido nas negociações do pacote do Governo Económico foi o resultado de uma longa e exigente negociação entre o Conselho e o Parlamento Europeu com a importante mediação da Comissão.

Desse compromisso resultam várias formas de sanções possíveis para os Estados-Membros que não respeitem os compromissos acordados quer no âmbito do Pacto de Estabilidade e Crescimento quer na correção dos desequilíbrios macroeconómicos.

Para grande parte dos membros do Parlamento estas sanções reforçadas foram consideradas exageradas e contraproducentes, nomeadamente porque a ausência de políticas que promovam o crescimento, a convergência e o emprego nos Estados-Membros torna o cumprimento das metas do défice e da dívida insustentáveis a médio prazo. Apesar disso, essas sanções foram aceites como parte integrante do espírito de compromisso interpartidário e interinstitucional que presidiu ao acordo.

Nunca, nas negociações, esteve em cima da mesa a possibilidade de reforçar o quadro sancionatório, nomeadamente através da suspensão de fundos estruturais.

1. Qual a razão para que a Comissão, semanas após a aprovação do pacote legislativo do Governo Económico, venha apresentar, na sua proposta COM(2011)615 Final (2011/0276 (COD)) (chapter IV, article 21 on «*macroeconomic conditionalities*» of the Structural Funds, in particular paragraph 6&7), uma extensão das sanções em caso de violação das regras do Pacto de Estabilidade e Crescimento e do processo de supervisão macroeconómica, introduzindo a suspensão automática de pagamentos e compromissos de todos os fundos estruturais?
2. Qual a justificação de uma sanção que irá penalizar precisamente os Estados-Membros com problemas estruturais de convergência, sendo que é a divergência das economias reais na união monetária uma das razões do incumprimento?
3. Qual a coerência desta opção com a acertada e justa decisão tomada pelo Presidente da Comissão de reforçar os fundos estruturais (e reduzir as contrapartidas nacionais) para os países presentemente «sob programa», estimulando o seu relançamento económico?

**Resposta dada por Johannes Hahn em nome da Comissão**  
(23 de fevereiro de 2012)

1. A fundamentação das condicionalidades macroeconómicas é a de que a consecução dos objetivos da política de coesão depende de boas políticas fiscais e económicas. Por conseguinte, a política de coesão deve alinhar-se pela governação económica da UE. Este processo será gradual, começando com alterações ao contrato de parceria e aos programas que apoiam as recomendações do Conselho destinadas a corrigir os desequilíbrios macroeconómicos e as dificuldades socioeconómicas. Nos casos em que, não obstante a utilização reforçada dos fundos da UE, um Estado-Membro não tome medidas eficazes, a Comissão terá o direito de suspender a totalidade ou parte dos pagamentos e das autorizações.

2. O elemento desencadeador da suspensão de pagamentos não é o facto de um Estado-Membro se deparar com dificuldades macroeconómicas, mas o de o Conselho considerar que um Estado-Membro não adotou as medidas necessárias para corrigir o seu défice excessivo. Do mesmo modo, a proposta de regulamento da Comissão <sup>(1)</sup> prevê que as decisões de suspensão de fundos da UE devem ter como justificação um incumprimento intencional do programa de ajustamento. Tal decisão teria em plena consideração circunstâncias exógenas e seria proporcionada e eficaz. A suspensão será revogada e os fundos de novo disponibilizados logo que as ações necessárias sejam tomadas.

3. As disposições sobre as condicionalidades macroeconómicas não estão em contradição com a decisão de aumentar temporariamente a taxa de cofinanciamento nos chamados países do programa. Esta medida foi adotada com o propósito de ajudar os Estados-Membros num momento de crise e de contribuir para os objetivos gerais dos programas de ajustamento. Assim, se um Estado-Membro cumprir as condições do programa, não haverá suspensão de autorizações nem de pagamentos.

<sup>(1)</sup> COM(2011)0819 final.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000120/12  
to the Commission  
Elisa Ferreira (S&D)  
(17 January 2012)**

*Subject:* Possible suspension of Structural Funds

The compromise reached in the negotiations on the economic governance package was the result of a long and demanding negotiating process between the Council and European Parliament, with the Commission playing an important mediation role.

This compromise makes provision for various possible forms of sanctions against Member States that do not comply with the commitments agreed upon either within the scope of the Stability and Growth Pact or in relation to correcting macroeconomic imbalances.

Many Members of Parliament considered these reinforced sanctions to be exaggerated and counterproductive, especially because the lack of policies to promote growth, convergence and employment in the Member States renders compliance with the deficit and debt targets unsustainable in the medium term. Despite this, the sanctions were accepted as part of the spirit of cross-party and interinstitutional compromise evident at the time of the agreement.

At no time during the negotiations was the possibility raised that the range of sanctions could be strengthened, particularly by suspending the Structural Funds.

1. Why does the Commission, weeks after the adoption of the economic governance package of legislation, now propose extending sanctions in the event of an *infringement of the rules of the Stability and Growth Pact or the macroeconomic supervision process, introducing the automatic suspension of payments and commitments under all the Structural Funds (COM(2011) 615 final (2011/0276 (COD), Chapter IV, Article 21 on 'macroeconomic conditionalities' of the Structural Funds, in particular paragraphs 6 and 7)?*
2. What is the justification for a sanction that will penalise precisely those Member States which have structural convergence problems, since the divergence between real economies in the monetary union is one of the reasons for non-compliance?
3. How is this option consistent with the correct and fair decision taken by the President of the Commission to increase the Structural Funds (and to reduce national contributions) for the countries currently 'under the programme', thereby stimulating their economic recovery?

**Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission  
(23 February 2012)**

1. The rationale of macroeconomic conditionality is that the achievement of the objectives of cohesion policy depends on sound fiscal and economic policies. Consequently, cohesion policy shall be aligned with the economic governance of the EU. This process will be gradual, starting with amendments to the Partnership Contract and to the programmes in support of Council recommendations to address macroeconomic imbalances and socioeconomic difficulties. Where, despite the enhanced use of EU funds, a Member State fails to take effective action, the Commission will have the right to suspend all or part of the payments and commitments.

2. The trigger for the suspension of payments and commitments is not that a Member State faces macroeconomic difficulties, but that the Council takes a decision that a Member State has failed to take the necessary actions to correct its excessive deficit. Similarly, the Commission's proposed Regulation <sup>(1)</sup> foresees that decisions to suspend EU funds would be based on intentional non-compliance with the adjustment programme. Any such decision would take full consideration of exogenous circumstances must be proportionate and effective. The suspension will be lifted and the funds made available again as soon as the necessary actions are taken.

3. The provisions on macroeconomic conditionality are not in contradiction with the decision to temporarily increase the co-financing rate in the so-called programme countries. This measure was adopted to help Member States at a time of crisis and to contribute to the overall objectives of the adjustment programmes. Thus, as long as a Member State complies with the programme conditionality, there will be no suspension of commitments or payments.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> COM(2011) 819 final.

(Nederlandse versie)

**Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-000124/12**  
**aan de Commissie**  
**Auke Zijlstra (NI)**  
(17 januari 2012)

Betref: „Energy Roadmap 2050”

Op 15 december 2011 heeft de Commissie de „Energy Roadmap 2050” uitgebracht.

1. De Commissie beschrijft in de eerste alinea het belang van veilige, betrouwbare, hernieuwbare en betaalbare energie. De Roadmap schetst vervolgens de wijze waarop de CO<sub>2</sub> doelstellingen kunnen worden gehaald (laatste alinea pagina 2). Is de Commissie het met de PVV eens dat daarmee het denken over de energiedragers van 2050 wordt gegijzeld door de zorg over broeikasgassen? Zo ja, wanneer kunnen wij een rapport verwachten waarin wordt ingegaan op veilige, betrouwbare en betaalbare energie?
2. De Commissie heeft zeven scenario's gepresenteerd voor vermindering van CO<sub>2</sub>-uitstoot als gevolg van energiegebruik. In de Roadmap heeft de Commissie echter geen voorkeur uitgesproken voor een van de geschetste scenario's. Is de Commissie het met de PVV eens dat, door geen beleidskeuzes te maken over de wijze waarop die doelstellingen van broeikasgasvermindering moeten worden bereikt, de onzekerheid van investeerders, regeringen en burgers blijft bestaan en het doel van de Roadmap niet wordt bereikt?
3. De Commissie voorziet dat er grootschalige investeringen nodig zijn om de doelstellingen van 2050 te halen. Is de Commissie het met de PVV eens dat deze investeringen uiteindelijk moeten worden opgebracht door de consument? Zo ja, hoe wil de Commissie de doelstelling van betaalbare energie bereiken?
4. De Commissie voorziet in de Roadmap een grote rol van de EU. Onder andere om de kosten te drukken (pagina 18 laatste regel). Kan de Commissie aangeven met welke concrete maatregelen zij de energieprijzen voor de consument (na 2030) zal verlagen?
5. De Commissie stelt dat verstoringen in de interne energiemarkt (o.a. door kunstmatig laaggehouden prijzen) moeten worden vermeden. Kan de Commissie exact aangeven welke EU-subsidies voor hernieuwbare energiedragers worden ingetrokken?

**Antwoord van de heer Oettinger namens de Commissie**  
(27 februari 2012)

Het Energiestappenplan 2050 heeft tot doel een basis te leggen om een Europees technologie neutraal langetermijnkader te ontwikkelen om zo aan de doelstellingen van duurzaamheid, concurrentievermogen en voorzieningszekerheid te voldoen. Het stappenplan beschrijft een aantal elementen die onder alle omstandigheden no regret-opties zijn voor het toekomstige Europese energiesysteem. De Commissie plant een iteratief proces tussen de lidstaten en de EU om concrete mijlpalen te bereiken in het kader van de doelstelling van een koolstofarme economie en daarmee dan de investeringszekerheid te doen toenemen.

Uiteindelijk zullen de consumenten de kosten van de diensten en verbruikte producten dragen.

Het stappenplan toont aan dat terwijl de elektriciteitsprijzen tot 2030 zullen stijgen, nieuwe energiesystemen daarna in lagere prijzen kunnen resulteren.

Als duurzame energiebronnen een centrale plaats innemen in de energiemix van Europa, verandert hun rol. Deze veranderende aard van duurzame energiebronnen vereist beleidswijzigingen.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000124/12  
to the Commission  
Auke Zijlstra (NI)  
(17 January 2012)**

*Subject:* 'Energy Roadmap 2050'

On 15 December 2011, the Commission issued the 'Energy Roadmap 2050'.

1. In the first paragraph of the Roadmap, the Commission describes the importance of safe, reliable, renewable and affordable energy. The Roadmap then outlines ways in which CO<sub>2</sub> targets can be achieved (last paragraph of page 2). Does the Commission agree with the PVV that ideas about potential sources of energy for 2050 will be pushed off the table by concerns about greenhouse gases? If so, when can we expect a report which addresses safe, reliable and affordable energy?
2. The Commission has presented seven scenarios for reducing CO<sub>2</sub> emissions as a result of energy consumption. However, in the Roadmap the Commission has stated no preference for any of the scenarios outlined. Does the Commission agree with the PVV that, having failed to make any policy choices about how those greenhouse gas reduction targets should be achieved, it is perpetuating uncertainty amongst investors, governments and citizens and undermining the purpose of the Roadmap?
3. The Commission envisages that large-scale investments will be needed to achieve the 2050 targets. Does the Commission share the PVV's view that these investments will ultimately have to be borne by the consumer? If so, how does the Commission intend to achieve the goal of affordable energy?
4. The Commission foresees a major role for the EU in the Roadmap, in order to keep costs down (last line on page 18), amongst other things. Can the Commission indicate which specific measures it intends to use to reduce energy prices for consumers (after 2030)?
5. The Commission argues that disturbances in the internal energy market (due to prices being kept artificially low, for example) should be avoided. Can the Commission specify exactly which EU subsidies for renewable energy carriers will be withdrawn?

**Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission  
(27 February 2012)**

The Energy Roadmap 2050 seeks to be a basis to develop a long-term European technology-neutral framework to meet the objectives of sustainability, competitiveness and security of supply. The Roadmap identifies common elements of all scenarios that are 'no regrets' options for the future European energy system. The Commission envisages an iterative process between Member States and the EU to provide concrete milestones towards achieving the decarbonisation objective and thereby enhancing investment security.

Consumers will ultimately bear the costs of the services and products consumed.

The Roadmap demonstrates that while electricity prices will rise until 2030, new energy systems can lead to lower prices thereafter.

As renewables move to the centre of the energy mix in Europe, they change their role. This changing role of renewables requires changes in policy.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000125/12  
to the Commission**

**Chris Davies (ALDE)**

(17 January 2012)

*Subject:* Marketing practices of computer hardware and software manufacturers

The Commission will be aware of the practice whereby major designers and manufacturers of computer hardware and software seek to maximise their profits by refusing to provide drivers (device driver software) which ensure that hardware remains compatible with new software or operating systems, instead requiring consumers to purchase new equipment as operating systems are upgraded. In consequence, computer users who have upgraded software (operating systems) are left with little choice but to discard peripheral hardware that is perfectly capable of many years of further operation, unnecessarily adding to their costs and contributing to an increase in the volume of waste electrical and electronic equipment.

— Does the Commission intend to take any action in a bid to curb this wasteful and expensive practice?

— Does the Commission consider that the draft operational criteria developed in the IEEE 1680.2 Standard Working Group for the Environmental Assessment of Imaging Equipment will be sufficient to encourage producers to provide updated drivers for older hardware?

**Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission**

(1 March 2012)

The Commission does not at present have reports or studies to enable a full assessment of the situation described, in particular on how significant is the issue from an environmental or consumer protection point of view, and has not yet planned to take initiatives in this area.

IEEE 1680.2 is currently under development. It will define environmental performance for televisions, television combination units, and component television units. The Commission has not assessed the draft operational criteria developed in the IEEE 1680.2 Standard Working Group for the Environmental Assessment of Imaging Equipment.

---

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000126/12**

**alla Commissione**  
**Matteo Salvini (EFD)**  
(17 gennaio 2012)

Oggetto: Dipendenti pubblici a Roma

Il comune di Roma con i suoi 62 mila dipendenti non teme confronti con colossi bancari quali Intesa San Paolo (70 mila) e supera abbondantemente Finmeccanica (45 mila) e Enel (37 mila).

Secondo l'Ifel, il centro studi dell'Associazione dei comuni in Italia, i dipendenti comunali hanno in media una proporzione di 7,59 ogni mille abitanti. A Roma ce ne sono invece 9,10.

Si tratta è vero della capitale del Paese, ma, se confrontata con Milano, emergono tendenze completamente divergenti. In quattro anni i dipendenti comunali di Milano sono diminuiti di 1 500 unità; mentre a Roma hanno continuato a crescere, soprattutto nelle municipalizzate.

Tra gli esempi più emblematici: Atac (Agenzia del trasporto autoferrotranviario del Comune di Roma) i cui dipendenti sono aumentati di 3 500 unità tra il 2008 e il 2010; Ama (l'azienda che si occupa della raccolta dei rifiuti) che ha toccato nei due anni un incremento del 24 % e Acea (l'azienda dell'elettricità e dell'acqua) che nel 2010 aveva 435 dipendenti in più rispetto al 2008.

Infine il comune di Roma possiede anche una compagnia assicurativa, la Adir, caso unico in tutta Italia, dove anche lo Stato ha abbandonato da tempo questo settore.

Non crede la Commissione sia opportuno intervenire attraverso gli strumenti di cui essa dispone al fine di porre limitazioni al numero di dipendenti pubblici che creano gravi problemi di spesa pubblica e di equità sociale?

**Risposta data da Olli Rehn a nome della Commissione**

(15 febbraio 2012)

La Commissione controlla da vicino l'evoluzione della situazione delle finanze pubbliche in Italia, e riconosce gli sforzi compiuti negli ultimi anni nel tenere a freno le dinamiche di spesa, sia a livello centrale che locale. In una situazione di questo tipo, il governo a tutti i suoi livelli è invitato ad evitare eccedenze di spesa pur continuando a migliorare l'efficienza della pubblica amministrazione e il comune di Roma dovrebbe certamente contribuire a tale sforzo. In base al titolo VIII (politica economica e monetaria) del trattato sul funzionamento dell'Unione europea e al diritto derivato, spetta alla Commissione sorvegliare l'evoluzione dei bilanci nazionali e garantire che siano coerenti con le disposizioni del patto di stabilità e crescita. Tuttavia, in linea di principio è di competenza delle autorità nazionali stabilire le modalità per conseguire questo obiettivo. La Commissione non può giudicare le scelte specifiche concernenti la quantità di organico impiegato in imprese di proprietà totale o parziale dei comuni. Questi ultimi possono scegliere il metodo più adeguato per fornire servizi a livello locale rispettando i vincoli nazionali fissati nel patto di stabilità nazionale.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000126/12  
to the Commission  
Matteo Salvini (EFD)  
(17 January 2012)**

*Subject:* Public sector employees in Rome

The City of Rome, with its 62 000 employees, stands comparison with banking giants such as Intesa San Paolo (70 000), and easily surpasses Finmeccanica (45 000) and Enel (37 000).

According to Ifel, the study centre of the association of municipalities in Italy, there is an average ratio of 7.59 municipal employees for every one thousand inhabitants. In Rome, the average stands at 9.10.

While Rome is admittedly the capital city, the differences with Milan are striking. Over four years, the number of municipal employees in Milan declined by 1 500, while in Rome it continued to grow, especially in city-owned entities.

Among the best examples are: Atac (the Rome public transport agency), whose workforce has increased by 3 500 between 2008 and 2010, Ama (the company in charge waste collection) which has registered an increase of 24 % in two years, and Acea (the City's electricity and water company) which in 2010 had 435 more employees than in 2008.

Finally, the City of Rome also owns the insurance company Adir. This is a unique case in Italy, where the State itself withdrew from this sector a long time ago.

Is the Commission not of the opinion that it should intervene with the tools at its disposal so as to limit the number of public sector employees, who are creating serious problems in terms of public spending and social equity?

**Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission  
(15 February 2012)**

The Commission closely monitors public finance developments in Italy, and acknowledges the efforts made in the past few years to rein in expenditure dynamics, both at the central and local level. In this context, all levels of government are called to avoid expenditure slippages while continuing to improve the efficiency of the public administration and the municipal authority of Rome should certainly contribute to this effort. The Commission's responsibility under the economic and monetary policy title of the Treaty on the Functioning of the EU and secondary legislation is to monitor national budgetary developments and make sure that they are consistent with the requirements of the Stability and Growth Pact. However, the specific arrangements through which this is attained fall in principle under the responsibility of the national authorities. The Commission cannot judge on the specific choices concerning the size of the workforce in companies owned, in all or in part, by the municipalities. The latter can choose the most appropriate way to deliver local services, within the national constraints set in the Domestic Stability Pact.

---



(Version française)

**Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-000128/12  
à la Commission**

**Jean-Luc Bennahmias (ALDE)**

(17 janvier 2012)

**Objet:** Présence de nitrates dans les produits bio

La Commission européenne est engagée dans un processus de promotion de l'agriculture biologique visant à garantir l'innocuité et la qualité des produits issus de ce système de production aux consommateurs européens. Elle a fait connaître ce rôle au grand public grâce au slogan «Le bio. Bon pour la nature, bon pour nous».

L'additif E250 ou nitrite de sodium est utilisé pour donner une couleur rose aux produits de charcuterie. Il donne le sentiment au consommateur que le produit est frais. Toutefois, la présence de nitrites dans les charcuteries et notamment dans le jambon est de plus en plus décrite par les experts; une consommation élevée augmenterait les risques de développer certains types de cancers.

Cet additif est pourtant interdit dans plusieurs pays comme la Belgique mais reste autorisé dans les autres États membres. Plus spécifiquement, le problème à soulever est celui de son incorporation dans des produits bio, ce qui semble assez contradictoire avec les attentes des consommateurs de produits bio.

1. La Commission est-elle consciente des effets néfastes d'une consommation élevée de nitrites sur la santé des consommateurs?
2. Prévoit-elle de modifier le cahier des charges pour obtenir le label bio européen afin qu'il vise à empêcher l'utilisation de nitrites dans la composition des produits bio?
3. Enfin, la Commission envisage-t-elle d'unifier la législation européenne au sujet des additifs potentiellement dangereux au nom du principe de précaution?

**Réponse donnée par M. Ciołoș au nom de la Commission**

(16 mars 2012)

En ce qui concerne la première question, les nitrites sont utilisés comme conservateurs dans les produits à base de viande pour lutter contre la prolifération éventuelle de bactéries nocives, notamment *Clostridium botulinum*. L'utilisation de nitrites dans la viande peut toutefois entraîner la formation de nitrosamines cancérigènes. Actuellement, l'autorisation des nitrites en tant qu'additifs alimentaires <sup>(1)</sup> <sup>(2)</sup>, qui repose sur un avis scientifique de l'Autorité européenne de sécurité des aliments <sup>(3)</sup>, établit des quantités maximales d'utilisation sûres.

Pour ce qui est de la deuxième question de l'Honorable Parlementaire, la Commission a déjà réexaminé l'utilisation des nitrites dans la production biologique, en tenant compte de l'expérience des États membres, conformément à l'article 27, paragraphe 3, du règlement (CE) n° 889/2008 de la Commission <sup>(4)</sup>. La Commission a proposé à deux reprises — en 2008 et en 2010 — d'inscrire cette question à l'ordre du jour de réunions du comité permanent de l'agriculture biologique. Bien que certains États membres n'aient pas recours aux nitrites pour la transformation de la viande biologique, la plupart d'entre eux sont opposés au retrait de la substance de l'annexe VIII pour des raisons de sécurité sanitaire des denrées alimentaires et faute de solutions de remplacement. La Commission a entrepris une évaluation du cadre juridique de l'agriculture biologique, qui porte notamment sur l'utilisation des additifs.

Quant à la troisième question, le règlement (UE) n° 257/2010 de la Commission <sup>(5)</sup> établit un programme pour la réévaluation de tous les additifs alimentaires qui ont été autorisés dans l'Union avant le 20 janvier 2009. La Commission procède aussi actuellement à la collecte d'informations sur l'utilisation concrète des nitrites dans les États membres.

<sup>(1)</sup> JO L 61 du 18.3.1995, p. 1.

<sup>(2)</sup> JO L 204 du 26.7.2006, p. 10.

<sup>(3)</sup> <http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/efsajournal/doc/14.pdf>

<sup>(4)</sup> Règlement (CE) n° 889/2008 de la Commission du 5 septembre 2008 portant modalités d'application du règlement (CE) n° 834/2007 du Conseil relatif à la production biologique et à l'étiquetage des produits biologiques en ce qui concerne la production biologique, l'étiquetage et les contrôles, JO L 250 du 18.9.2008.

<sup>(5)</sup> JO L 80 du 26.3.2010, p. 19.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000128/12  
to the Commission**

**Jean-Luc Bennahmias (ALDE)**

(17 January 2012)

*Subject:* The presence of nitrates in organic products

The European Commission is engaged in the process of promoting organic farming with a view to assuring European consumers of the safety and quality of organic products. This has been brought to public attention under the slogan 'Organic farming: Good for nature, good for you.'

The additive E250 — sodium nitrite — is used to give a pink colour to pork products. This makes the consumer feel that the product is fresh. However, the presence of nitrites in pork products, especially ham, is increasingly criticised by experts on the grounds that high consumption of such products appears to increase the risk of developing certain types of cancer.

Although this additive is banned in several countries, including Belgium, it is still permitted in other Member States. The specific problem raised here is its incorporation in organic products, which does not seem to be consistent with the expectations of consumers of organic products.

1. Is the Commission aware of the harmful effects of high nitrite consumption on the health of consumers?
2. Does it plan to modify the specifications for the award of the European organic label in order to prevent the inclusion of nitrites in the composition of organic products?
3. Finally, does the Commission plan to unify the European legislation concerning potentially dangerous additives in line with the precautionary principle?

**Answer given by Mr Ciolos on behalf of the Commission**

(16 March 2012)

As regards the first question, nitrites are used as preservatives in meat products to control the possible growth of harmful bacteria, in particular *Clostridium botulinum*. The use of nitrites in meat may, however, lead to formation of carcinogenic nitrosamines. The current authorisation of nitrites as food additives <sup>(1)</sup> <sup>(2)</sup>, based on a scientific opinion of the European Food Safety Authority <sup>(3)</sup>, establishes safe maximum use levels.

As regards the second question, the Commission has already re-examined the use of nitrites in the organic production taking into account Member States' experience, according to Article 27(3) of Commission Regulation (EC) No 889/2008 <sup>(4)</sup>. The Commission has proposed twice this item for discussion on the agenda of the Standing Committee for Organic Farming in 2008 and 2010. Although in some Member States organic meat is processed without the use of nitrites, a majority of Member States opposed the withdrawal of the substance from Annex VIII on grounds of food safety and lack of alternatives. The Commission is currently carrying out an evaluation of the legal framework for organic farming in which the use of additives is one of the topics to be addressed.

As regards the third questions, the Commission Regulation (EU) No 257/2010 <sup>(5)</sup> sets up a programme for the re-evaluation of all food additives that were permitted in the Union before 20 January 2009. The Commission is also collecting information on the practical use of nitrites in Member States.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ L 61, 18.3.1995, p. 1.

<sup>(2)</sup> OJ L 204, 26.7.2006, p. 10.

<sup>(3)</sup> <http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/efsajournal/doc/14.pdf>

<sup>(4)</sup> OJ L 250, 18.9.2008, Commission Regulation (EC) No 889/2008 of 5 September 2008 laying down detailed rules for the implementation of Council Regulation (EC) No 834/2007 on organic production and labelling of organic products with regard to organic production, labelling and control.

<sup>(5)</sup> OJ L 80, 26.3.2010, p. 19.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000130/12**  
**to the Commission**  
**Syed Kamall (ECR)**  
(18 January 2012)

*Subject:* Use of red diesel in non-UK waters by pleasure craft

I have been contacted by a constituent who is concerned that UK-registered sailors are being challenged and in some cases fined significant amounts of money for using 'red' diesel.

My constituent understands that the UK Government recently negotiated a settlement on the tax status of red diesel which allows UK-registered pleasure craft to buy red diesel in the UK with Value Added Tax (VAT) and duty being paid at current UK rates.

My constituent claims that Belgian and Dutch customs officers have confronted British sailors, stating that red diesel cannot be used or transported in those countries' waters even if UK VAT and duty have been paid.

Unsurprisingly, UK sailors are concerned that they will be fined or have their boats impounded by custom officers because of this situation, which is made worse by the fact that the UK customs authorities appear reluctant to provide assistance or documents to support UK nationals who use or carry red diesel abroad. This is also a problem for sailors from other Member States who, when they visit UK waters, need to buy red diesel — often the only type of fuel available — and are then stopped by customs officers when they return to their home Member States.

It would appear that this rule works against the basic right to free movement of persons and vessels throughout the EU. My constituent is also concerned that some Member States are seeking to have the UK red diesel taxation scheme scrapped, a move which could have severe ramifications for UK sailors.

Can the Commission state:

1. whether it is aware of this situation;
2. whether it considers this patchwork of regulations to be a barrier to the free movement of persons and vessels in the EU;
3. what attempts it is making to improve coordination of the taxation of different types of diesel fuel in the EU;
4. whether the Belgian and Dutch customs officers are acting in breach of EC law, and, if so, what action it plans to take against the Belgian and Dutch authorities?

**Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission**  
(28 February 2012)

The Commission is aware of the problems faced by yachtsmen using marked diesel purchased in the UK to propel pleasure boats when navigating across territorial waters of other Member States.

The UK has been authorised until 31 December 2006 to subject gas oil used to power pleasure craft to a lower level of taxation than that established by the Energy Directive (Directive 2003/96/EC). Member States are required by Directive 95/60/EC to apply a fiscal marker to gas oil that has been exempt from, or is subject to, excise duty at a rate other than the standard rate for motor fuels. The Commission believes that allowing the use of marked gas oil to power private pleasure craft after the expiry of the derogation where the fuel has neither been exempted nor subject to a reduction of excise duty, runs counter Directive 95/60/EC and does not allow the tax authorities of other Member States to quickly and adequately check that the tax status of the fuel (e.g. exemption) matches with the use to which the fuel is put. As a consequence, the Commission has started investigations with the UK authorities.

The Commission at this stage has no information leading it to believe that, in light of Directive 95/60/EC, the measures taken so far by the Belgian and Dutch customs authorities are infringing EC law.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000131/12  
to the Commission  
Syed Kamall (ECR)  
(18 January 2012)**

*Subject:* Requirements for healthcare providers to disclose risks associated with procedures

I have been contacted by a constituent who wants to know whether there is any EU legislation requiring healthcare providers to disclose risk levels associated with specific procedures.

My constituent underwent a high-risk dental operation in Hungary which required further treatment on returning to the UK. Because she was not aware whether there is any requirement for dentists in Hungary to disclose potential risks, the UK Ombudsman refused her compensation claim, resulting in a significant loss of income.

Can the Commission:

1. confirm whether there is any EU legislation which requires medical/dental personnel to fully disclose the risks associated with the treatment offered;
2. confirm whether my constituent is able to claim compensation on the basis that this legislation was violated, and, if so, indicate who can she contact to assist her claim?

**Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission  
(21 February 2012)**

There is no EU legislation currently in force which requires healthcare providers (including individual health professionals) to fully disclose the risks associated with any treatment which is offered.

However, Directive 2011/24/EU <sup>(1)</sup> on the application of patients' rights in cross-border healthcare, which is due to be transposed by Member States by 25 October 2013, contains certain relevant provisions in this regard. The directive requires the Member State of treatment to ensure that healthcare providers make available information to help patients to make an informed choice, including on treatment options, the applicable quality and safety standards, and the quality and safety of the healthcare they provide.

This directive further requires Member States to ensure that complaint procedures are in place to allow patients to seek remedies if they suffer harm arising from the healthcare they receive in another Member State.

If, in the future, a similar case occurred and these provisions of the directive were not observed, then the patient would have the option of pursuing the authorities in the Member State of treatment for failure to comply with the provisions of the directive in the same way as for any other breach of obligations under EC law.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ L 88, 4.4.2011.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000132/12  
to the Commission  
Syed Kamall (ECR)  
(18 January 2012)**

*Subject:* Carbon trading and environmental taxation

I have been contacted by a constituent who is concerned that the European Union's policies on carbon trading and environmental taxation are resulting in higher energy bills for consumers.

Could the Commission state:

1. Whether it has any plans to request that consumer energy bills include a figure representing the amount of tax paid along the supply chain in respect of the quantity of energy supplied?
2. If no such plans exist, whether it will consider giving consumers the right to request that the amount of tax paid along the supply chain be stated on their energy bills?
3. Whether it will consider requiring energy companies to provide their customers with a quantitative breakdown of the energy produced, categorised by source of energy production?

**Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission  
(27 February 2012)**

The existing EU legislation does not require detailed information to be provided on the energy bills concerning taxation of individual sources. However, information on the applicable tax rates on energy products and electricity in all Member States is published on the Commission website <sup>(1)</sup> and updated twice a year. How to improve information provision to consumers is a topic of attention for the European Commission, and is being discussed in the Citizen's Energy Forum <sup>(2)</sup>.

Directive 2009/72/EC on common rules for the internal market in electricity <sup>(3)</sup> includes provisions in Article 3(9) ensuring that customers receive in or with their bills information on the contribution of each energy source to the overall fuel mix of the supplier over the preceding year.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/taxation\\_customs/taxation/excise\\_duties/energy\\_products/rates/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/taxation_customs/taxation/excise_duties/energy_products/rates/index_en.htm)

<sup>(2)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/energy/gas\\_electricity/forum\\_citizen\\_energy\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/energy/gas_electricity/forum_citizen_energy_en.htm)

<sup>(3)</sup> Directive 2009/72/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 July 2009 concerning common rules for the internal market in electricity and repealing Directive 2003/54/EC, OJ L 211, 14.8.2009.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000135/12**  
**to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)**  
**Sir Graham Watson (ALDE)**  
(17 January 2012)

*Subject:* VP/HR — City officials' involvement in looting in Baku (Azerbaijan)

State officials in Azerbaijan continue to intimidate the residents of Baku and expel citizens from their homes. I understand that on 18 December 2011 Baku City's Executive Official even led looters attacking homes in Samed Vurgun Street and Shamsi Badalbeyli Street, with the police failing to intervene. The looters were allowed to expel the residents from their apartments and demolish the properties. Those evicted then also faced violence from the police that did attend the scene.

The properties destroyed had court orders protecting them from demolition by city officials.

— Is the Vice-President/High Representative aware of this incident?

— What representations are being made on behalf of the EU to halt these evictions and demolitions of citizens' lawful homes?

**Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission**  
(16 March 2012)

This event is one of a number of eviction cases of which the HR/VP has been made aware. On 12 August 2011, a local statement of the EU in Baku condemned the demolition of a building belonging to non-governmental organisations (NGOs). As for the event of 18 December 2011, the EU has been able to establish that police did indeed not protect the rights of the residents.

The EU has repeatedly raised the issue of evictions with the authorities, calling for full transparency of the process and protection of property rights, including on the occasion of the EU-Azerbaijan Cooperation Committee meeting in September 2011 in Baku as well as the EU-Azerbaijan Cooperation Council meeting in November 2011 and also the meeting of the EU-Azerbaijan Sub-Committee meeting on Human Rights, also in November 2011. Moreover, the HR/VP collected first-hand information in discussing the issue of house evictions with Leila Yunus, a prominent human rights activist, on her visit to Baku in November 2011. The EU Delegation in Baku also met with civil society activists, including Leila Yunus, and continues to monitor the situation on the ground.

The HR/VP regrets that despite best efforts made by a number of Azerbaijan's partners, including the EU, there has been no progress on the handling of expropriation and evictions in Baku so far. The HR/VP believes that the issue will need to be taken into account in the report that the European External Action Service (EEAS) and the Commission in April 2011 will jointly issue on the progress (or lack thereof) made, by Azerbaijan, in implementing the EU-Azerbaijan Action Plan.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000137/12  
to the Commission**

**Sir Graham Watson (ALDE)**

(17 January 2012)

*Subject:* Subsidies for fishing fleets

The Commission has identified overcapacity as one of the primary drivers of overfishing, yet a recent Commission report has shown that many Member States do not even assess the overcapacity of their fishing fleets.

I understand that between 2000 and 2008 the EU provided subsidies amounting to EUR 33.5 million for the modernisation of the bluefin tuna fleet, which targets a species that is classified as endangered by the International Union for Conservation of Nature.

Within the reform of the common fisheries policy, what steps is the Commission proposing to ensure the non-continuation of subsidies which are damaging to sustainable fishing?

**Answer given by Ms Damanaki on behalf of the Commission**

(17 February 2012)

The Common Fisheries Policy (CFP) reform Impact Assessment indeed concludes that overcapacity is a primary driver of overfishing. Successive policies to adapt fishing capacity to fishing opportunities have largely failed in spite of EUR 2.7 billion spent by the EU and by Member States since 1994 in decommissioning. The recent report by the European Court of Auditors reinforces that view.

That is the reason why the Commission, in its CFP reform package, is proposing to deal with overcapacity in a more regionalised approach whereby Member States manage the capacity of their fleets in a way more adapted to the specificities of the regions and fisheries concerned, amongst others by introducing market based instruments for the large scale fleets. In addition the Commission proposes to discontinue, in the European Maritime and Fisheries Fund (EMFF), most measures for fleet support (including decommissioning and temporary cessation). The EMFF still supports fleets and fishermen but this support has been reoriented towards achieving the objectives of the CFP. That is why measures such as the increase of gear selectivity, the reduction of discards, the protection of ecosystems, lifelong learning or the improvement of safety conditions onboard are supported. In the same vein, measures for support of modernisation of fishing vessels have been restricted. In that respect engine replacement or modernisation are not allowed anymore.

This alignment with CFP objectives affects all measures under the EMFF and is crucial for the success of the CFP.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000138/12  
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)**

**Sir Graham Watson (ALDE)**

(17 January 2012)

*Subject:* VP/HR — Destruction at Karni Crossing

The Karni Crossing cargo terminal, located in the north-east of the Gaza Strip, was opened in 1994 in order to allow Palestinian merchants to export and import goods.

The crossing was closed after Hamas came to power in the Gaza Strip in 2007. Reports indicate that on 2 January 2012 the Israeli defence forces destroyed buildings at the crossing.

Is the Vice-President/High Representative aware of this demolition? What representations have been made to Israel regarding its actions?

**Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission**

(17 April 2012)

The EU is aware of the situation at the Karni crossing point, which was closed down in March 2011 by the Israeli authorities who have cited security reasons. The dismantling of infrastructure is a recent occurrence.

The EU has constantly called for the immediate, sustained and unconditional opening of all crossings for the flow of humanitarian aid, commercial goods and persons to and from Gaza. The EU considers the policy of closure to be unacceptable and politically counterproductive. In addition, the EU will contribute to the ongoing upgrading of the Karem Abu Salem/Kerem Shalom crossing point at the southern end of the Gaza Strip, which, once completed, will enable a greater flow of goods in and out of the Gaza Strip.

---



*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-000140/12  
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)  
Sir Graham Watson (ALDE)  
(17 January 2012)**

*Subject:* VP/HR — Tony Blair — Quartet Special Representative — declaration of interest

The High Representative notes in response to my Questions (E-009365/2011 and E-009366/2011) on the current Quartet Special Representative to the Middle East, Tony Blair, that Mr Blair has not declared any possible conflicts of interest in relation to a specific list of organisations. Such declarations of interest have an important role in retaining public confidence in those holding office, and both Commissioners and MEPs are rightly obliged to file such disclosure.

Would the Vice-President/High Representative be willing to invite the current Quartet Special Representative to make such a public declaration with regard to this role?

**Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission  
(25 June 2012)**

Tony Blair undertakes his work as Quartet Representative on a pro bono basis. He is not a holder of public office and undertakes no executive, legislative or administrative function. He undertakes this work with a specific mandate from, and reporting to, the Quartet, whose principals do hold public office and make any such declarations in accordance with the practice of their respective institutions.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000141/12  
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)**

**Sir Graham Watson (ALDE)**

(17 January 2012)

*Subject:* VP/HR — Tony Blair — Quartet Special Representative — mission residence in Sheikh Jarrah

The Quartet Special Representative to the Middle East, Tony Blair, has recently moved with his Quartet staff into a new building in the Sheikh Jarrah district of East Jerusalem. This part of the city was annexed by Israel in the 1967 war.

Does the Vice-President/High Representative consider this to be a prudent choice of location, in the light of the Representative's sensitive role?

**Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission**

(29 March 2012)

It is correct that the office of the Quartet Representative Tony Blair recently moved from the American Colony Hotel in Sheikh Jarrah to a Palestinian-owned building in Sheikh Jarrah. This is a very prudent location allowing easy access for parties, bearing in mind security requirements. The EU Delegation's current main office is housed in similar circumstances, i.e. a Palestinian-owned building in Sheikh Jarrah. The EU has never recognised the annexation of East Jerusalem by Israel.

---

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-000142/12  
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)**

**Sir Graham Watson (ALDE)**

*(17 January 2012)*

*Subject:* VP/HR — Tony Blair — Quartet Special Representative — time periods undertaking this role

The Office of Quartet Representative Tony Blair is in part funded from the EU budget, under the Instrument for Stability and the ENPI global allocations. It received EUR 1.5 million in 2010 and 2011 to support Mr Blair's activities in this role.

Could the Vice-President/High Representative confirm for each year since Tony Blair's appointment how many days he has spent actively undertaking work in relation to this role?

In addition, could the Vice-President/High Representative provide a breakdown of these figures relating to Mr Blair's time active in the Middle East and within the Quartet's partner states?

**Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission**

*(17 April 2012)*

As Quartet representative, Tony Blair visited Israel and the oPt on 22 occasions in 2011. In addition, he spent a significant amount of time working on MEPP issues whilst in the UK and other countries. He visits the Quartet partner states regularly and keeps them fully informed of the work he is doing.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000143/12  
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)**

**Sir Graham Watson (ALDE)**

(17 January 2012)

*Subject:* VP/HR — Tony Blair — Quartet Special Representative — status with regard to the EU

The office of Quartet Representative Tony Blair is in part funded from the EU budget, although I note he does not draw a salary.

Nonetheless, can the High Representative confirm Mr Blair's legal status with regard to:

1. the receipt by his office of EU funds;
2. his role as Quartet Special Representative;
3. whether he is in any way classed as a Commission representative or staff member, even if unpaid?

**Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission**

(17 April 2012)

The EU contribution to the costs of the office of the Quartet Representative Tony Blair is provided through a standard grant contract with the United Nations Development Programme. The Representative's role is pro bono and he has a mandate from the Quartet. The Quartet Representative Tony Blair is not a Commission representative or staff member in any respect.

---

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-000144/12  
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)**

**Sir Graham Watson (ALDE)**

*(17 January 2012)*

*Subject:* VP/HR — Israel to relinquish Palestinian Neighbourhoods

In mid-December, Israel opened a new border crossing point in East Jerusalem's Shoafat neighbourhood. I understand that Jerusalem's Mayor, Nir Barkat, subsequently called on Israel to relinquish the Palestinian neighbourhoods of the capital situated beyond the City's separation barrier. It would appear the Civil Administration in the West Bank is to assume responsibility for providing services to residents of the area between the security barrier and the new municipal boundary.

An alteration of the City's municipal boundaries and reclassification of those regarded as resident within the City would see up to 70 000 Palestinians lose their status as Jerusalem residents. Along with this change of status, Palestinian residents would forfeit associated rights such as entitlement to assistance from the social services as well as the right to work and study in Jerusalem.

Is the Vice-President/High Representative aware of the Mayor's plans? And, what representations if any has the European Union made to the Israeli authorities on this issue?

**Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission**

*(30 March 2012)*

The EU Representative's Office in East Jerusalem together with EU's Member States' diplomatic representations on the ground follow developments in East Jerusalem very closely.

The facts contained in the Honourable Member's question correspond to the information obtained locally regarding the Shoafat neighbourhood, except that it is not totally clear exactly how many people would be affected by the possible alteration of the municipal boundary. It is also to be noted that changing the municipal boundary would require a positive decision by the Knesset. The EU, however, has never recognised the Israeli annexation of East Jerusalem.

---

(българска версия)

**Въпрос с искане за писмен отговор P-000145/12**

**до Комисията**

**Владко Тодоров Панайотов (ALDE)**

(16 януари 2012 г.)

Относно: Атмосферно замърсяване в град София

Атмосферното замърсяване на град София е сериозно, особено по време на зимния период, когато източниците на замърсяване включват остарели отоплителни системи и незаконни действия, като например горене на гуми — за отопление или за извличане на метал, който се продава.

Това води до общо понижаване на качеството на въздуха доста под необходимите европейски стандарти и съществува специфичен основен проблем с емисии на твърди частици PM 10, като всичко това оказва въздействие не само върху околната среда, но също така и върху здравето на гражданите на столицата.

Какви стъпки смята да предприеме Комисията, за да се справи с тези проблеми по неотложен начин, и как по-специално може да се спре незаконната практика на горене на гуми?

**Отговор, даден от г-н Поточник от името на Комисията**

(14 февруари 2012 г.)

Комисията е наясно със ситуацията около ФПЧ10 в град София. Българските органи в своя последен годишен доклад (2010 г.) уведомяват Комисията за превишаване на дневните и годишните пределно допустими стойности за ФПЧ10 във всички зони. Освен това Комисията реши да заведе дело срещу България за неприлагането на пределно допустимите стойности за ФПЧ10 в редица зони на следене на качеството на въздуха в продължение на няколко години, включително в зоната на София. Процедурата е в ход.

Незаконното изгаряне на отпадъци в жилищни зони като източник на отопление буди безпокойство поради потенциалното отрицателно отражение върху общественото здраве. Такива незаконни действия с отпадъците трябва да бъдат адекватно и ефективно контролирани от компетентните органи, за да се гарантира спазването на разпоредбите на членове 13 и 15 от Рамковата директива за отпадъците. Това изисква, наред с останалото, да се забрани неконтролираното депониране на отпадъци и държавите-членки да гарантират, че отпадъците се събират и обработват по подходящ начин съгласно съответното законодателство на ЕС.

България не разполага с капацитет за правилна преработка на употребявани гуми, за тяхното раздробяване и използване в различни приложения или за добиване на енергия. През ноември 2009 г. Комисията реши да заведе дело в Съда срещу българските органи за неспазване на Рамковата директива за отпадъците. Процедурата за нарушение е временно прекратена, за да се предостави на България необходимото време за въвеждане на екологосъобразен и разходно ефективен в дългосрочен план Столичен общински проект за управление на отпадъците.

(English version)

**Question for written answer P-000145/12  
to the Commission**

**Vladko Todorov Panayotov (ALDE)**

(16 January 2012)

*Subject:* Atmospheric pollution in the city of Sofia

The atmospheric pollution in the city of Sofia is severe, especially during the winter when sources of pollution include obsolete heating systems and illegal practices such as the burning of tyres — for heating, in the case of certain sections of the population, or for purposes of extracting steel, which is saleable.

The result is that the air quality generally falls well below required EU standards and there is a specific major problem with PM 10 — all of which affects not only the environment but also the health of the capital's citizens.

What steps is the Commission considering to address these problems as a matter of urgency, and how, in particular, can the illegal practice of tyre burning be stopped?

**Answer given by Mr Potočník on behalf of the Commission**

(14 February 2012)

The Commission is aware of PM<sub>10</sub> situation in the city of Sofia. The Bulgarian authorities, in their last annual report (2010), informed the Commission about the PM<sub>10</sub> exceedances of the daily and annual limit values in all the zones. Moreover, the Commission has decided to take Bulgaria to the Court for failure to apply the PM<sub>10</sub> limit values in several air quality zones and over several years, including the zone where Sofia is located. The procedure is ongoing.

Illegal waste burning in residential areas as a source of heating raises concerns because of the potential adverse public health implications that this may entail. Such illegal waste activities need to be adequately and effectively controlled by the competent authorities in order to ensure compliance with Articles 13 and 15 of the Waste Framework Directive. This requires *inter alia* that the uncontrolled disposal of waste is prohibited and that Member States shall ensure that waste is collected and properly treated following the relevant EU legislation.

Adequate capacity to properly treat used tyres — which can be shredded and used in various applications, or used for energy recovery — does not exist in Bulgaria. The Commission decided to refer the Bulgarian authorities to the Court in November 2009 for failure to comply with the Waste Framework Directive. The infringement procedure is currently suspended in order to provide Bulgaria with the necessary time to implement an environmentally compliant and long term cost-efficient Sofia Municipal Waste Management Project.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer P-000146/12  
to the Commission  
Fiona Hall (ALDE)  
(16 January 2012)**

*Subject:* Concerns regarding the Light Aircraft Pilot's Licence and Regulation (EU) No 1178/2011

Regulation (EU) No 1178/2011 will ensure that the same pilot licensing requirements and related safety levels apply in all Member States, and will enter into force as Community law by April 2012.

Currently in the UK, people with Type 1 Diabetes have been able to fly solo under the National Private Pilot's Licence (NPPL) scheme, which allows diabetics to train for and fly aircraft weighing less than 2000 kg. Pilots must hold a declaration of medical fitness which must be endorsed by a doctor, and pre- and in-flight blood sugar testing requirements must be met. The UK Civil Aviation Authority recognised the wealth of medical evidence from the US on the effects of Type 1 Diabetes on pilots, which found there was no basis to ban diabetics from flying so long as proper checks were in place.

What action will the Commission take to ensure that the new regulation and the introduction of the Light Aircraft Pilot's Licence, which will replace the British NPPL, will not prohibit Britons with Type 1 Diabetes from flying light aircraft?

**Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission  
(8 February 2012)**

Insulin used for treatment of diabetes mellitus carries the risk of inducing hypoglycaemia (low blood sugar), which may lead to an incapacitation of the pilot inflight. Therefore, according to international and regional standards <sup>(1)</sup>, insulin dependant diabetes mellitus leads to an unfit assessment for private and commercial pilots. However, the UK allows holders of UK national private pilot licence (NPPL) who suffer from insulin dependant diabetes to hold a medical certificate but restrict the licence of these pilots to their national territory.

Regulation 1178/2011 <sup>(2)</sup> does not contain detailed mandatory rules with regard to medical conditions for the European leisure pilot licence (LAPL). Those details are contained in acceptable means of compliance (AMC) adopted by EASA <sup>(3)</sup>. Under those AMC, the use of insulin will be possible, under stringent control, for those pilots who hold a LAPL and suffer from one specific type of diabetes that is normally treated with different medication. This does not include pilots with insulin dependant diabetes where the risk of hypoglycaemia is higher.

A rulemaking task to review the medical provisions of Regulation 1178/2011 has been initiated by EASA and includes the review and the assessment of any type of diabetes mellitus treated with insulin. Consultations will take place with specialists in the field, relevant studies will be reviewed, and experience made in the UK, US and Canada will be taken into account to come to a conclusion that can be supported by all and which carries no air safety risk.

The medical provisions for the European leisure pilot licence (LAPL) will become applicable from 8 April 2012 but Member States are allowed to defer the implementation of LAPL provisions until 8 April 2015 and to continue with their national regulations until that moment.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> ICAO Annex A and JAR-FCL 3.

<sup>(2)</sup> OJL 311, 25.11.2011, p. 1-193.

<sup>(3)</sup> European Aviation Safety Agency.



(Nederlandse versie)

**Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-000147/12  
aan de Commissie**

**Lucas Hartong (NI) en Laurence J. A. J. Stassen (NI)**

(18 januari 2012)

*Betreft:* Nieuwe CO<sub>2</sub>-heffing

Vandaag maakten diverse Europese luchtvaartmaatschappijen bekend <sup>(1)</sup> dat zij de kosten voor hun CO<sub>2</sub>-uitstoot vanwege nieuwe ridicule EU-milieumaatregelen gaan doorberekenen aan de klant. Zo maakte KLM bekend dat die kosten alleen al voor dit jaar rond de 70 miljoen euro extra liggen. In dat kader de volgende vragen:

1. Vindt de Commissie het verantwoord om op grond van een volstrekt niet aannemelijk te maken fabel omtrent „klimaatopwarming door CO<sub>2</sub>-uitstoot” uitsluitend Europese luchtvaartmaatschappijen op te zadelen met deze extra miljoenen kosten en daarmee dus de klant?
2. Is de Commissie bekend met het feit dat hiermee een oneerlijke positie in concurrentiekracht wordt gecreëerd, aangezien luchtvaartmaatschappijen uit o.a. de VS, China, Rusland en India weigeren deze kosten te betalen en dus niet hoeven door te berekenen aan hun klanten?
3. Is de Commissie bekend met het feit dat de VS zelfs wetgeving klaar hebben liggen om Amerikaanse luchtvaartmaatschappijen op grond van deze ridicule wetgeving en heffing te verbieden om te vliegen op Europese luchthavens? Is zij het met de PVV eens dat Europa zich hiermee volstrekt belachelijk maakt, isoleert en zelfs een directe handelsoorlog met de trans-Atlantische partner(s) riskeert?
4. Is de Commissie voornemens om deze ridicule wetgeving en heffing, afkomstig uit de koker van totaal wereldvreemde linkse milieufanataten, zo spoedig mogelijk in te trekken zodat de economie van de Europese lidstaten zo spoedig mogelijk weer kan floreren en niet langer wordt afgeremd?

**Antwoord van mevrouw Hedegaard namens de Commissie**

(24 februari 2012)

1. en 2. De EU-regeling voor de handel in emissierechten (ETS) is een niet-discriminerend systeem met alle vluchten van alle luchtvaartmaatschappijen van en naar Europese luchthavens om zo marktverstoringen te vermijden. De wetgeving geldt zowel voor EU- als voor niet-EU-luchtvaartmaatschappijen die actief zijn op de EU-markt. Alle grote luchtvaartmaatschappijen leven de EU ETS na en in de wet staan sancties en boetes die worden opgelegd bij niet-naleving.
3. De Commissie erkent dat derde landen zich zorgen maken over de wetgeving, en gaat actief de dialoog aan, zowel bilateraal als internationaal in de ICAO, om hierop een antwoord te bieden.
4. De aandacht van het geachte Parlementslid wordt gevestigd op het feit dat de EU ETS-richtlijn is goedgekeurd door een overgrote meerderheid van het Europees Parlement en met een unanieme steun van de lidstaten. Deze richtlijn is nu in werking getreden en kan en zal niet zomaar worden „ingetrokken”. De zal wet geen grote economische gevolgen hebben voor de sector of voor de economie in het algemeen. Het merendeel van de emissierechten voor de luchtvaart zal de luchtvaartmaatschappijen gratis worden toegekend. Daarom zijn de bijkomende kosten per vlucht laag.

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://www.elsevier.nl/web/Nieuws/Economie/326681/Vliegen-duurder-vanwege-nieuwe-EUregels-CO2uitstoot.htm>

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000147/12  
to the Commission  
Lucas Hartong (NI) and Laurence J.A.J. Stassen (NI)  
(18 January 2012)**

*Subject:* New CO<sub>2</sub> levy

Various European airlines have announced today <sup>(1)</sup> that they are going to pass the cost of complying with the EU's new ridiculous regulations on CO<sub>2</sub> emissions on to the customer. For example, KLM announced that those costs for this year alone will represent an additional amount of approximately EUR 70 million.

1. Does the Commission think it is responsible to saddle exclusively European airlines, and consequently the customer, with these extra costs amounting to millions on the basis of a completely implausible fairy tale about 'global warming caused by CO<sub>2</sub> emissions'?
2. Is the Commission aware that this creates unfair competition as airlines from countries such as the USA, China, Russia and India refuse to pay these charges and therefore do not have to pass them on to their customers?
3. Is the Commission aware that the USA has drafted legislation which forbids American airlines to fly to European airports because of this ridiculous legislation and levy? Does it agree with the PVV that Europe is making itself completely ridiculous with this, isolating itself and even risking a direct trade war with our transatlantic partner/partners?
4. Does the Commission intend to withdraw as soon as possible this ridiculous legislation and levy, dreamed up by totally unworldly leftist environmental fanatics, so that the economy of European Member States will be able to flourish once more and not be hampered?

**Answer given by Ms Hedegaard on behalf of the Commission  
(24 February 2012)**

1 and 2. The EU emissions trading system (ETS) is a non-discriminatory system that includes all flights into and out of European airports by all airlines, thereby avoiding any market distortions. The legislation applies equally to EU and non-EU airlines active in the EU market. All major airlines are in compliance with EU ETS and the law has sanctions and penalties for non-compliance.

3. The Commission recognises that third countries have concerns about the legislation, and is engaging actively in discussions both bilaterally and internationally in ICAO in order to address these concerns.

4. The Honourable Member's attention is drawn to the fact that the EU ETS Directive was adopted by overwhelming majority of the European Parliament and with unanimous support of the Member States, and that it is now in force and can not and will not just be 'withdrawn'. Regarding the impacts, the law will not have significant economic impact on the sector or on the economy as a whole. The majority of the emission's allowances for aviation will be distributed to the aircraft operators free of charge. The additional costs per flight are therefore low.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://www.elsevier.nl/web/Nieuws/Economie/326681/Vliegen-duurder-vanwege-nieuwe-EUregels-CO2uitstoot.htm>

(българска версия)

**Въпрос с искане за писмен отговор E-000149/12**

**до Комисията**

**Владко Тодоров Панайотов (ALDE)**

(18 януари 2012 г.)

Относно: Енергийни проекти в Кипър

Проучванията в Изключителната икономическа зона, южно от Кипър откриха огромни количества газ и вероятно ще открият и нефт.

Запасите от газ само в един от проучените участъци се оценяват на 7 трилиона кубични фута.

Според предложението регламент относно трансевропейската енергийна мрежа (TEN-E) настоящият проект и свързаните с него проекти трябва да се считат като проекти от общ интерес.

По какъв начин планира Комисията да подкрепи предвижданите проекти, включително като първа стъпка, едно съоръжение за втечен природен газ и свързаните с континенталния бряг тръбопроводи, както и тръбопроводите за транспортиране на газ до други държави-членки на ЕС?

С оглед на това ново развитие, а също така с оглед на проекта „Израели Левиатан“, не трябва ли Комисията да преразгледа проекта „Набуко“, при който доставката на газ не е сигурна и вместо това изцяло да подкрепи един чисто европейски проект, т.е. проекта в Кипър, евентуално в сътрудничество с проекта „Левиатан“?

Подобен проект и свързаните офшорни тръбопроводи за пренос на газ от Кипър до ЕС биха осигурили доставката на газ за ЕС и представляват ключов алтернативен източник за доставки. Той би представлявал също така ключов конкурент на проекта за тръбопровод „Южен поток“, с по-голяма добавена стойност.

Може ли Комисията да заяви своята позиция по горепоставените въпроси и да обясни по какъв начин планира да превърне визията европейски предвидените в Кипър проекти, включително по отношение на съфинансирането от страна на ЕС?

**Отговор, даден от г-н Йотингер от името на Комисията**

(21 февруари 2012 г.)

В съответствие с предложението регламент относно насоките за инфраструктурата на трансевропейската енергийна мрежа (TEN-E) проект от общ интерес би могъл да получи финансова помощ от Съюза под формата на безвъзмездни средства (съфинансиране), ако поражда съществени странични ползи, но няма стопанска жизнеспособност.

В газовия сектор регламентът е насочен към преноса, съоръженията за съхранение и приемането на втечен/сгъстен природен газ. Инфраструктурата за производство на газ не попада в обхвата на регламента.

Като част от Южния газов коридор, който е определен за приоритетен коридор в приложение I към предлагания регламент, Кипър ще бъде включен в процеса на идентифициране на конкретни проекти, които ще бъдат сметени за най-подходящи да допринесат за диверсификация на доставките на газ.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000149/12  
to the Commission**

**Vladko Todorov Panayotov (ALDE)**

(18 January 2012)

*Subject:* Energy projects in Cyprus

The explorations in the Exclusive Economic Zone in the south of Cyprus have identified huge quantities of gas and are likely to identify oil also.

In one of the plots explored alone, 7 trillion cubic feet of gas are estimated to exist.

According to the TEN-E proposed regulation this project, and the associated ones, should be considered as projects of common interest.

How is the Commission planning to support the projects envisaged, including an LNG facility as a first step, and the associated pipelines to the mainland as well as pipelines to transport the gas to the other EU Member States?

Taking into account this new development, as well as the Israeli Leviathan project, should not the Commission reconsider the Nabucco project, where the supply of gas is not secure, and instead fully support a purely European project, i.e. the Cyprus project, possibly in cooperation with the Leviathan project?

Such a project, and the associated offshore pipelines to bring the gas from Cyprus to the EU, would secure the supply of gas to the EU and constitute a key alternative source of supply. It would also constitute a key competitor to the South Stream pipeline project, with greater added value.

Can the Commission state its position on the above points and explain how it plans to make the projects envisaged in Cyprus fully European, including in terms of EU co-financing?

**Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission**

(21 February 2012)

In line with the proposed regulation on guidelines for TEN-E infrastructure, a Project of Common Interest could receive Union financial assistance in the form of a grant (co-financing) if it has significant positive externalities but lacks commercial viability.

In the field of gas, the regulation focuses on transmission, storage facilities and reception of liquefied/compressed natural gas. Gas production infrastructure is not covered by the scope of the regulation.

Being covered by the Southern Gas Corridor, which is identified as a priority corridor in the Annex I of the proposed regulation, Cyprus will be involved in the process of identification of concrete projects that would be considered as best placed to contribute to the diversification of gas supply.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000150/12  
to the Commission  
Fiona Hall (ALDE)  
(18 January 2012)**

*Subject:* Palestinian child prisoners

At the end of February 2010 there were 41 Palestinian children under the age of 16 detained in Israel. It was stated in a recent debate in the UK Parliament that the total was now 150. In the prisoner exchange in which Gilad Shalit and more than 1 000 Palestinians were released, it is reported that none of the Palestinian prisoners were children.

The Britain-Palestine All-Party Parliamentary Group, on a recent visit, witnessed teenagers attending court hearings in handcuffs and leg irons and often without the presence of a responsible adult or legal representation. Children accused of throwing stones are frequently arrested and interrogated in harrowing circumstances and denied parental visits. Numerous disturbing accounts have been collected by, among others, Physicians for Human Rights Israel and Defence for Children International.

The United Nations Committee on the Rights of the Child states that the arrest and detention of children must be used only as a measure of last resort, and for the appropriate period of time, and that the juvenile detainees must be separated from adults, allowed contact with their families, and receive appropriate assistance, including access to education, recreation and rehabilitation. None of these conditions are complied with in the Palestinian case. This heavy-handed treatment of Palestinian minors at the hands of the Israeli authorities can only have a detrimental effect on the peace process when these children become adults.

What is the European Union doing to ensure that these Palestinian children's rights are respected?

What progress has the Military Court for Juveniles made in improving the treatment of minors?

**Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission  
(10 April 2012)**

The issue of administrative detention and the detention of children, in particular, is closely monitored by the EU delegations in Tel Aviv and in East Jerusalem, and is regularly raised in bilateral contacts with the Israeli authorities. These issues were thoroughly discussed during the September 2011 EU-Israel informal working group on human rights and the December 2011 EU-Israel sub-committee on political dialogue and cooperation. The EU has urged Israel to adopt the necessary measures to address shortcomings and possible human right violations in these areas.

The EU is not aware of any recent changes in policy with regard to the Military Juvenile Court. The detention of children is and will remain a high priority among the human rights issues that the EU follows in its relations with Israel.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000152/12  
to the Commission**

**John Stuart Agnew (EFD)**

(18 January 2012)

*Subject:* Pesticides and the 'parallel trade'

Is the Commission confident that the intended Guidance Document on Article 52 of the Pesticides Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009 — currently in preparation — will achieve the declared objectives of removing obstacles to, and facilitating, the parallel trade in these products, thereby also creating a genuine single market and effective competition in the sector?

**Question for written answer E-000153/12  
to the Commission**

**John Stuart Agnew (EFD)**

(18 January 2012)

*Subject:* Pesticides and 'parallel trade' representation

Is the Commission confident that the composition of the body advising it on the planned Guidance Document on Article 52 of the Pesticides Regulation is truly representative, particularly of the parallel traders and smaller businesses in this sector?

**Joint answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission**

(16 February 2012)

Article 52 of Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009 <sup>(1)</sup> lays down provisions for parallel trade with plant protection products in the EU.

The Commission is currently drafting a guidance document which reflects a thorough discussion with experts from Member States and representatives from all relevant stakeholder groups.

The Commission is confident that this will lead to a harmonised application of the rules laid down in the legislation.

---

(1) OJ L 309, 24.11.2009.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000154/12**  
**to the Commission**  
**Vicky Ford (ECR)**  
(18 January 2012)

*Subject:* Exemption of *Drosophila* from Directive 91/496/EEC

Council Directive 91/496/EEC requires that all consignments of animals be checked on entry at an approved border inspection post (BIP) to ensure that they comply with the EU's animal health and welfare rules. However, the directive does not distinguish between different species of animal and applies to all animals, including insects such as *Drosophila*, which are not vectors for animal diseases.

Consequently, invertebrates for research purposes must be checked on entry at an approved BIP, which can often lead to delay or even the destruction of insects. This can severely hamper scientists and researchers who use this model organism.

In response to a written question I submitted on 23 November 2010 on veterinary checks on low-risk invertebrates, the Commission noted that 'the current rules on imports of insects may appear unnecessarily burdensome to some operators' and stated that 'the Commission plans to examine this matter further, in order to explore if the legislation in place is to be amended to take these concerns into consideration.'

A petition on exempting the fruit fly *Drosophila melanogaster* from the directive has been signed by leading scientists from across Europe and is currently with the European Parliament's Committee on Petitions. The scientists claim that the inconsistent, unscientific, inaccurate and sometimes arbitrary application of Directive 91/496/EEC represents a serious and unacceptable breach of the internal market, is a serious barrier to research within the EU and could seriously damage EU competitiveness vis-à-vis other continents.

Can the Commission confirm what progress has been made with regard to examining the possibility of the exemption of *Drosophila* from Directive 91/496/EEC, and state whether it will give urgent consideration to amending this legislation?

**Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission**  
(15 February 2012)

EU legislation on import controls of live animals, as laid down in Council Directive 91/496/EEC<sup>(1)</sup>, requires that veterinary checks are carried out at approved border inspection posts (BIPs) on all consignments of live animals. By definition, this includes live insects such as *Drosophila* imported for research purposes. However, it should be noted that, in accordance with Article 5 of Commission Decision 97/794/EC<sup>(2)</sup>, live animals, including insects, will not be subject to individual clinical examination or sampling as part of a veterinary check, but are only required to undergo observation of their state of health as a group. If no anomaly is identified, no further checks are necessary. These controls are needed to ensure that animals imported into the Union are as stated in the accompanying documentation and are not risk vector animals.

The Commission is aware that the current rules on imports of insects may appear burdensome to some operators and has agreed to look into this within the review of the relevant legislation. This process is ongoing and the Commission is examining if concerns for certain laboratory bred insects may be taken into consideration during the veterinary checks. A Commission proposal to amend Regulation (EC) No 882/2004<sup>(3)</sup>, including general provisions for imports of live animals, is under preparation. Within the envisaged legal framework detailed rules on imports of live animals could then be drawn up taking into account concerns made on insects such as *Drosophila*.

The Commission would also refer the Honourable Member to its answers to Written Questions P-009820/2010 and E-004576/2010<sup>(4)</sup>.

<sup>(1)</sup> Council Directive 91/496/EEC of 15 July 1991 laying down the principles governing the organisation of veterinary checks on animals entering the Community from third countries and amending Directives 89/662/EEC, 90/425/EEC and 90/675/EEC, OJ L 268, 24.9.1991.

<sup>(2)</sup> Commission Decision 97/794/EC of 12 November 1997 laying down certain detailed rules for the application of Council Directive 91/496/EEC as regards veterinary checks on live animals to be imported from third countries.

<sup>(3)</sup> Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 29 April 2004 on official controls performed to ensure the verification of compliance with feed and food law, animal health and animal welfare rules. OJ L 165, 30.4.2004. Corrected version in OJ L 191, 28.5.2004.

<sup>(4)</sup> <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB>.

(Deutsche Fassung)

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-000155/12**  
**an die Kommission**  
**Jörg Leichtfried (S&D)**  
(18. Januar 2012)

*Betrifft:* Daten der Mitgliedstaaten über Haltungsformen für Legehennen

Nach einer Tagung am 19. Januar 2011 in Brüssel sind die Mitgliedstaaten aufgefordert, der Kommission regelmäßig Übersichtstabellen mit Daten über den Grad ihrer Übereinstimmung mit Artikel 5 Absatz 2 der Richtlinie 1999/74/EG des Rates zur Festlegung von Mindestanforderungen zum Schutz von Legehennen vorzulegen.

In diesen Unterlagen ist anzuführen, wie hoch der Bestand an Legehennen in den einzelnen Haltungsformen ist: Freilandhaltung, Bodenhaltung, Käfighaltung mit ausgestalteten oder herkömmlichen Käfigen. Da seit dem 1. Januar 2012 herkömmliche nicht ausgestaltete Käfige verboten sind, jedoch in manchen Mitgliedstaaten weiterhin illegal verwendet werden, muss anhand der zur Verfügung stehenden Daten in Erfahrung gebracht werden, welche Mitgliedstaaten die Richtlinie 1999/74/EG des Rates einhalten und welche nicht.

1. Könnte die Kommission detaillierte Angaben zur Situation am 1. Dezember 2011 und am 1. Januar 2012 im Hinblick auf die Haltungsformen (herkömmliche Käfige, ausgestaltete Käfige, Bodenhaltung, Freilandhaltung) pro Mitgliedstaat machen?
2. Könnte die Kommission erläutern, wie anhand des gezeigten Grades von Einhaltung/Nichteinhaltung in den Mitgliedstaaten Kontrollen, Untersuchungen oder Prüfungen des Lebensmittel- und Veterinärsamts terminlich geplant werden?

**Antwort von Herrn Dalli im Namen der Kommission**  
(21. Februar 2012)

1. Nach mehreren Aufforderungen durch die Kommission haben die Mitgliedstaaten Angaben zur Anzahl der Legehennen und der Legehennenbetriebe nach Haltungsart vorgelegt. Die vorliegenden Daten werden ständig auf den Sitzungen mit den Mitgliedstaaten überprüft. Aus diesen Daten geht hervor, dass in 14 Mitgliedstaaten auch nach dem 1. Januar 2012 immer noch nicht ausgestaltete Käfige in Gebrauch sind. Das Ausmaß der Verstöße ist in den verschiedenen Mitgliedstaaten höchst unterschiedlich und reicht von 1,4 % bis 45 %.
2. Im November 2011 hat die Kommission diejenigen Mitgliedstaaten kontaktiert, bei denen anhand der Datenlage abzusehen war, dass sie wahrscheinlich die Vorschriften nicht bis zum 1. Januar 2012 erfüllen würden. Aufgrund ihrer Antworten beschloss die Kommission dementsprechend am 25. Januar 2012, Vertragsverletzungsverfahren gegen die Mitgliedstaaten einzuleiten, die gegen die Vorschriften verstoßen. Die zuständigen Kommissionsdienststellen werden Inspektionen durchführen, um das rechtliche Verfahren zu unterstützen.



(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000155/12  
to the Commission**

**Jörg Leichtfried (S&D)**

(18 January 2012)

*Subject:* Member States' data regarding systems of production for laying hens

Following a meeting held on 19 January 2011 in Brussels, Member States have been asked to periodically provide the Commission with tables summarising data on their state of compliance with Article 5(2) of Council Directive 1999/74/EC laying down minimum standards for the protection of laying hens.

These documents detail how many laying hens are kept in each system of production: free-range, barns, enriched cages or conventional cages. As, since 1 January 2012, conventional barren cages have been banned, but are still illegally used in some Member States, it is essential to know, using the available data, which Member States are complying with Council Directive 1999/74/EC and which are not.

1. Could the Commission give details of the state of play on 1 December 2011, and on 1 January 2012, regarding each system of production (conventional cages, enriched cages, barns, free-range) per Member State?
2. Could the Commission give details of the way in which FVO inspections, investigations or audits will be scheduled according to the level of compliance/non-compliance shown in the Member State data?

**Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission**

(21 February 2012)

1. Following a number of requests by the Commission, Member States provided data on the number of laying hens and laying hens' production sites by farming system; the data available are constantly being reviewed with Member States during meetings. Based on these data, it appears that in 14 Member States the use of unenriched cages has not been completely discontinued after 1 January 2012. The level of non-compliance across the Member States is very different ranging from 1.4 % to 45 %.
  2. In November 2011 the Commission contacted the Member States which, according to the data, would probably not be compliant on 1 January 2012. Based on their replies and as appropriate, the Commission decided on 25 January 2012 to initiate infringement procedures against non-complying Member States. Inspections by the Commission's inspection service will be carried out to support the legal process.
-

(Deutsche Fassung)

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-000156/12**  
**an die Kommission**  
**Sven Giegold (Verts/ALE)**  
(18. Januar 2012)

*Betrifft:* Sicherung von Bankschuldverschreibungen durch Mitgliedsländer der Eurozone

Medienberichten ist zu entnehmen, dass Euro-Mitgliedsländer Bankschuldverschreibungen besichern, die dann von Banken zum Erhalt von Zentralbankliquidität eingereicht werden. Dazu frage ich Sie:

- In welchem Umfang wurden Bankschuldverschreibungen von EU-Mitgliedstaaten besichert (in Mrd. EUR)?
- Wie haben sich diese Sicherungslasten nach Mitgliedsländern aufgeschlüsselt über die Zeit verändert (in Mrd. EUR)?
- Wie werden die Risiken aus der Besicherung von Bankschuldverschreibungen und ggf. anderer Finanzinstrumente bei der Berechnung des übermäßigen Defizits und der Schuldenstände der EU-Mitgliedsländer berücksichtigt?
- Wird sich die Berücksichtigung dieser Risiken nach der Umsetzung des „Sechserpakets“ verändern, insbesondere durch die Richtlinie des Rates über die Anforderungen an die haushaltspolitischen Rahmen der Mitgliedstaaten?

**Antwort von Herrn Rehn im Namen der Kommission**  
(26. März 2012)

Die EU-Banken begannen ab Mitte 2008 staatliche Garantien zu nutzen <sup>(1)</sup>, wobei im Sommer 2009 mit über 900 Mrd. EUR der Höchststand erreicht wurde. Seitdem ist das Volumen der Garantien kontinuierlich auf rund 600 Mrd. EUR im April 2011 gesunken. Nominal wurden die staatlichen Garantien am meisten von Banken im Vereinigten Königreich und in Irland genutzt, gefolgt (allerdings mit einem weitaus geringeren Volumen) von Banken in Frankreich, Spanien, Griechenland, Dänemark und Deutschland. Relativ gesehen entfallen die meisten garantierten Bankverbindlichkeiten auf Irland. Das ausstehende Volumen an garantierten Verbindlichkeiten in Irland betrug im April 2011 mehr als 75 % des BIP <sup>(2)</sup>. Zum selben Zeitpunkt kamen die garantierten Anleihen in Dänemark und Griechenland auf rund 20 % des BIP, während Zyperns ausstehendes Volumen ebenfalls beträchtlich war, aber noch knapp unterhalb dieses Wertes lag. Die Nutzung garantierter Anleihen war außerdem beträchtlich in den Mitgliedstaaten Vereinigtes Königreich, Belgien, Spanien, Niederlande, Österreich, Schweden, Frankreich, Portugal und Luxemburg. Aktuelle Daten zur Nutzung von Staatsbeihilfen durch die EU-Banken werden zurzeit gesammelt.

Auf Anfrage des Parlaments hat die Kommission eine detaillierte Prüfung der Entscheidungen vorgenommen, die im Rahmen der Anwendung der vorübergehenden, aufgrund der Finanz- und Wirtschaftskrise ergriffenen Beihilfenvorschriften erlassen wurden <sup>(3)</sup>. Der Bericht enthält Daten zum Gesamtbetrag der Beihilfen in Form von zugesagten und genutzten Garantien sowohl auf EU-Ebene <sup>(4)</sup> sowie für jeden Mitgliedstaat <sup>(5)</sup>.

Staatliche Garantien, die für Finanzinstitute gegeben werden, sind implizite Verbindlichkeiten und werden als solche nicht in der volkswirtschaftlichen Gesamtrechnung der Regierungen aufgeführt; deshalb werden sie in den Verfahren, die im Wachstums- und Stabilitätspakt festgelegt sind, nicht unmittelbar berücksichtigt <sup>(6)</sup>.

<sup>(1)</sup> Die für die Preisgestaltung der staatlichen Garantien für Bankschuldverschreibungen geltenden Beihilfenvorschriften sind in den vorübergehenden Beihilfenvorschriften für die Prüfung der staatlichen Unterstützungsmaßnahmen für Finanzinstitute während der Krise niedergelegt. Die Mitteilung der Kommission vom 1. Dezember 2011 im Besonderen bietet ausführliche Informationen bezüglich der Preisgestaltung dieser Garantien (siehe §15 und 22 sowie Anhang).

<sup>(2)</sup> Den letzten Informationen zufolge.

<sup>(3)</sup> Veröffentlicht im Oktober 2011 — Bericht der Kommission:  
[http://ec.europa.eu/competition/publications/reports/working\\_paper\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/competition/publications/reports/working_paper_en.pdf)

<sup>(4)</sup> Siehe Bericht Seite 38.

<sup>(5)</sup> Siehe Bericht Seite 39.

<sup>(6)</sup> Allerdings werden Daten in Verbindung mit staatlichen Garantien, die aufgrund der Finanzkrise gegeben wurden, von Eurostat gesammelt und veröffentlicht.

Die Umsetzung der Richtlinie 2011/85/EU über die Anforderungen an die haushaltspolitischen Rahmen der Mitgliedstaaten hat keinen Einfluss darauf, ob die in der vorliegenden Anfrage angesprochenen Risiken berücksichtigt werden, da die Berechnung von übermäßigen Defiziten und Schulden ausschließlich anhand der Daten zu den Staatsfinanzen vorgenommen wird, die an Eurostat gemeldet und von Eurostat validiert werden.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000156/12  
to the Commission**

**Sven Giegold (Verts/ALE)**

(18 January 2012)

*Subject:* Hedging of bank bonds by Member States of the Eurozone

Media reports suggest that Euro Member States are securing bank bonds, which are then being deposited by banks in order to obtain liquidity from the Central Bank. Therefore I ask:

- To what extent have bank bonds been secured by EU Member States (in bn euros)?
- How have these hedging burdens changed over time in each Member State (in bn euros)?
- How are the risks of securing bank bonds and, if applicable, other financial instruments, taken into account when calculating the excessive deficits and debt levels of EU Member States?
- Will consideration of these risks change once the 'six-pack' is introduced, particularly through the Council Directive on requirements for budgetary frameworks of the Member States?

**Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission**

(26 March 2012)

The use of state guarantees by EU banks started in the second half of 2008 <sup>(1)</sup>, peaked in the 2009 summer at over EUR 900 billion. Since then, their volume has declined continuously to approximately EUR 600 billion in April 2011. The heaviest state guarantees users in nominal terms have been banks from the United Kingdom and Ireland, followed to a much lower extent by banks in France, Spain, Greece, Denmark and Germany. In relative terms, Ireland is by far the most important issuer of guaranteed bank liabilities. The outstanding volume of guaranteed liabilities in Ireland exceeded 75 % of GDP in April 2011 <sup>(2)</sup>. On the same date, guaranteed bonds in Denmark and Greece amounted to approximately 20 % of GDP while in Cyprus the outstanding volume was also very significant but slightly below this amount. Guaranteed bonds were also important in other Member States such as the United Kingdom, Belgium, Spain, the Netherlands, Austria, Sweden, France, Portugal and Luxembourg. More recent data on the use of state aid by EU banks is currently being gathered.

In reply to a call of the Parliament, the Commission prepared a detailed evaluation of decisions adopted within the framework of the application of the temporary state aid measures in response to the financial and economic crisis <sup>(3)</sup>. This report provides data on total aid amount in the form of guarantees pledged and used at EU level <sup>(4)</sup> as well as for each Member State <sup>(5)</sup>.

State guarantees granted to financial institutions are implicit liabilities and as such they are not recorded in the government's national accounts; therefore, they are not directly considered in the procedures established in the Stability and Growth Pact <sup>(6)</sup>.

The implementation of Directive 2011/85/EU on requirements for budgetary frameworks of the Member States has no impact on the consideration of the risks raised in his question due to the fact that the calculation of excessive deficits and debts are strictly based on public finances data notified to and validated by Eurostat.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> The state aid rules applicable to the pricing of the state guarantees for bank debt have been spelled out in the temporary state aid control rules to assess public support to financial institutions during the crisis. In particular, the Commission Communication, adopted on 1 December 2011, provides detailed guidance with regard to the pricing of these guarantees (§15 to 22 and Annex).

<sup>(2)</sup> According to the last information available.

<sup>(3)</sup> Published in October 2011 - Commission's report: [http://ec.europa.eu/competition/publications/reports/working\\_paper\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/competition/publications/reports/working_paper_en.pdf)

<sup>(4)</sup> See report page 38.

<sup>(5)</sup> See report page 39.

<sup>(6)</sup> Nevertheless, data linked to state guarantees granted in relation to the financial crisis is collected and published by Eurostat.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-000157/12**  
**προς την Επιτροπή**  
**Michail Tremopoulos (Verts/ALE)**  
(18 Ιανουαρίου 2012)

**Θέμα:** Παραβίαση περιβαλλοντικής νομοθεσίας από πυρηνελαιουργείο στη Βασιλική Λευκάδας

Στη Βασιλική Λευκάδας της Περιφέρειας Ιονίων Νήσων ξεκίνησε τον Ιανουάριο του 2011 η επαναλειτουργία ενός πυρηνελαιουργείου σε περιοχή που έχει χαρακτηριστεί «γη υψηλής παραγωγικότητας», κατόπιν άδειας που έδωσε η Νομαρχία Λευκάδας. Κατά την επταετία που το εργοστάσιο δεν λειτουργούσε, η τουριστική και οικιστική ανάπτυξη της γύρω περιοχής υπήρξαν ραγδαίες. Όπως και στο παρελθόν, η λειτουργία της συγκεκριμένης μονάδας δημιούργησε αμέσως σημαντικά περιβαλλοντικά προβλήματα, τα οποία καταγγέλληκαν από ομάδα ενεργών πολιτών, κάτι που οδήγησε στην προσωρινή διακοπή της λειτουργίας του εργοστασίου από την Περιφερειακή Αρχή. Από τον επιτόπιο έλεγχο που πραγματοποιήθηκε αμέσως μετά από την Ειδική Υπηρεσία Επιθεωρητών Περιβάλλοντος του ΥΠΕΚΑ, προέκυψε σειρά παραβάσεων της κείμενης περιβαλλοντικής νομοθεσίας<sup>(1)</sup>, όπως η μη εφαρμογή της προβλεπόμενης αντιρρυπαντικής τεχνολογίας για αέρια απόβλητα, η μη παρακολούθηση αερίων εκπομπών, ελλείψεις αναφορικά με την παρακολούθηση της θερμοκρασίας ξήρανσης και του χώρου αποθήκευσης ελαιοπυρήνα, έλλειψη αντιρρυπαντικής τεχνολογίας για τα υγρά απόβλητα, ανεξέλεγκτη απόρριψη υγρών αποβλήτων, πλημμελής παρακολούθηση της ποιότητας των υγρών αποβλήτων και των υδάτων, καθώς και υπέρβαση των θεσμοθετημένων ορίων θορύβου. Παρόλα αυτά, η ιδιοκτήτρια εταιρεία ζήτησε αμέσως την άρση της απόφασης της Περιφερειακής Αρχής. Ύστερα από την απόρριψη του αιτήματός της από την Αποκεντρωμένη Διοίκηση<sup>(2)</sup>, προσέφυγε στο αρμόδιο ΣτΕ καθώς και ενάντια σε πολίτες της Λευκάδας, που κατήγγειλαν την προβληματική λειτουργία του εργοστασίου.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Σκοπεύει να ζητήσει αναλυτική ενημέρωση για το θέμα από τις ελληνικές αρχές;
2. Δεδομένου ότι το συγκεκριμένο εργοστάσιο αποτελεί βιομηχανική μονάδα μεσαίας όχλησης, σκοπεύει να ενθαρρύνει και να συνεργαστεί με τις ελληνικές αρχές για τη μετεγκατάσταση της μονάδας σε προβλεπόμενο για τέτοιες δραστηριότητες χώρο καθώς και για τη συμμόρφωση της εταιρείας με την ευρωπαϊκή νομοθεσία;

**Απάντηση του κ. Ροτσοπνίκ εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής**  
(5 Μαρτίου 2012)

Η οδηγία 2008/1/EK σχετικά με την ολοκληρωμένη πρόληψη και έλεγχο της ρύπανσης<sup>(3)</sup> (ΟΠΕΡ) εφαρμόζεται σε εγκαταστάσεις που παράγουν προϊόντα διατροφής από φυτικές πρώτες ύλες, των οποίων το δυναμικό υπερβαίνει τα όρια του παραρτήματος 1 της εν λόγω οδηγίας<sup>(4)</sup>. Εν προκειμένω επιβάλλεται στα κράτη μέλη να διασφαλίζουν ότι οι εγκαταστάσεις λειτουργούν έτσι ώστε, μεταξύ άλλων, να λαμβάνονται όλα τα δέοντα προληπτικά αντιρρυπαντικά μέτρα, ιδίως μέσω της εφαρμογής των Βέλτιστων Διαθέσιμων Τεχνικών (ΒΔΤ) καθώς και ότι δεν προκαλείται σημαντική ρύπανση.

Οι ΒΔΤ για τις βιομηχανίες τροφίμων, ποτών και γάλακτος ορίζονται σε ευρωπαϊκό επίπεδο με ένα έγγραφο αναφοράς για τις ΒΔΤ (BREF)<sup>(5)</sup>, συμπεριλαμβανομένου του πυρηνελαιίου.

Επιπλέον, η οδηγία 1999/13/EK για τον περιορισμό των εκπομπών πτητικών οργανικών ενώσεων (VOC) λόγω χρήσης οργανικών διαλυτών σε ορισμένες δραστηριότητες και εγκαταστάσεις<sup>(6)</sup> ισχύει για τα φυτικά έλαια και τα ζωικά λίπη καθώς και για τις δραστηριότητες εξευγενισμού των φυτικών ελαίων, εφόσον σημειώνεται υπέρβαση του ορίου δυναμικότητας<sup>(7)</sup>.

Από τις πληροφορίες που παρέχει το Αξιότιμο Μέλος του Κοινοβουλίου, δεν είναι σαφές ότι η μονάδα στη Βασιλική της Λευκάδας, θα πρέπει να καλύπτεται από την οδηγία IPPC ή την οδηγία για τις πτητικές οργανικές ενώσεις. Επιπλέον, φαίνεται ότι τα περιβαλλοντικά θέματα που σχετίζονται με την εγκατάσταση αντιμετωπίζονται από τις εθνικές αρχές και, ως εκ τούτου, δεν χρειάζεται να αναληφθεί δράση εκ μέρους της Επιτροπής.

<sup>(1)</sup> Εισαγγελία Πλημμελειοδικών Λευκάδας, Αριθμός Πρωτοκόλλου Οικ. 1548/26-4-2011 και 1549/26-4-2011.

<sup>(2)</sup> <http://static.diangeia.gov.gr/doc/4%CE%91%CE%A78%CE%9F%CE%A11%CE%A6-5%CE%9D5>.

<sup>(3)</sup> ΕΕ L 24 της 29.1.2008.

<sup>(4)</sup> Στο σημείο 6.4(β) του παραρτήματος Ι, το κατώτατο όριο δυναμικού ορίζεται ως εξής: τελική ημερήσια δυναμικότητα παραγωγής άνω των 300 τόνων ημερησίως (μέση τιμή σε τριμηνιαία βάση).

<sup>(5)</sup> <http://eirpcb.jrc.es/reference/>, βλ. κεφάλαια 5.2.4 και 2.2.4.6.

<sup>(6)</sup> ΕΕ L 85 της 29.3.1999.

<sup>(7)</sup> Στο σημείο 19 του παραρτήματος ΙΙ Β, ορίζεται όριο κατανάλωσης διαλυτών άνω των 10 τόνων/έτος.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000157/12  
to the Commission**

**Michail Tremopoulos (Verts/ALE)**

(18 January 2012)

*Subject:* Violation of environmental legislation by an olive-pomace oil extraction plant in Vassiliki in Lefkada

In January 2011 in Vassiliki in Lefkada of the Ionian Islands Region, an olive-pomace oil extraction plant relaunched its operations in an area classified as 'high productivity land', after being licensed by the Prefecture of Lefkada. During the seven years during which the plant had suspended its operations, tourism and residential development in the surrounding areas was very rapid. As in the past, the operation of this particular unit immediately created serious environmental problems, which were reported by a group of active citizens, which led to the temporary shut-down of the plant by the Regional Authorities. A spot check by the Hellenic Environmental Inspectorate of the Ministry of Environment, Energy and Climate Change revealed a series of violations of the current environmental legislation <sup>(1)</sup>, such as a failure to implement the proposed anti-pollution technology for waste gases, a failure to monitor gas emissions, omissions regarding the monitoring of the drying temperature and of the pomace's storage area, lack of anti-pollution technology for liquid waste, uncontrolled disposal of liquid waste, insufficient monitoring of the liquid and water waste quality, as well as excessive noise over the statutory limits. Nevertheless, the owner company immediately requested the annulment of the Regional Authorities' decision. Following the rejection of its request by the Decentralised Administration <sup>(2)</sup>, it appealed to the Council of the State in the face of opposition from the citizens of Lefkada who complained about the problems caused by the operation of the plant.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

1. Does it intend to request detailed information on this matter from the Greek Authorities?
2. Given that the industrial plant in question is a medium polluter, does it intend to encourage, and cooperate with, the Greek Authorities to ensure that the unit is relocated in an area set aside for this kind of activity and that the company complies with European legislation?

**Answer given by Mr Potočník on behalf of the Commission**

(5 March 2012)

Directive 2008/1/EC concerning integrated pollution prevention and control <sup>(3)</sup> (IPPC) applies to installations producing food products from vegetable raw materials, for which the capacity exceeds the thresholds in Annex A to that directive <sup>(4)</sup>. It requires Member States to ensure that installations are operated such that, *inter alia*, all the appropriate preventive measures are taken against pollution, in particular through the application of the Best Available Techniques (BAT), and that no significant pollution is caused.

BAT for the food, drink and milk industries is described at European level in a BAT reference document (BREF) <sup>(5)</sup>, including for olive-pomace oil extraction.

In addition, Directive 1999/13/EC on the limitation of emissions of volatile organic compounds due to the use of organic solvents in certain activities and installations <sup>(6)</sup> (VOC) is applicable to vegetable oil and animal fat extraction and vegetable oil refining activities, provided that the capacity threshold is exceeded <sup>(7)</sup>.

From the information provided by the Honourable Member, it is not clear that the plant in Vassiliki, Lefkada, would be covered by the IPPC or the VOC Directives. In addition, it appears that environmental issues related to the plant are being addressed by the national authorities and, therefore, no Commission action is required.

<sup>(1)</sup> Lefkada State Prosecutor's Office of First Instance, Protocol Ref. Nr. 1548/26-4-2011 and 1549/26-4-2011.

<sup>(2)</sup> <http://static.diavgeia.gov.gr/doc/4%CE%91%CE%A78%CE%9F%CE%A11%CE%A6-5%CE%9D5>.

<sup>(3)</sup> OJ L 24, 29.1.2008.

<sup>(4)</sup> Point 6.4 (b) of Annex I lays down a capacity threshold as follows: a finished production capacity greater than 300 tonnes per day (average value on a quarterly basis).

<sup>(5)</sup> <http://eippcb.jrc.es/reference/>, see Chapters 2.2.4.6 and 5.2.4.

<sup>(6)</sup> OJ L 85, 29.3.1999.

<sup>(7)</sup> Point 19 of Annex IIB lays down a solvent consumption threshold of more than 10 tonnes/year.

(Version française)

**Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-000158/12  
à la Commission**

**Patrick Le Hyaric (GUE/NGL)**

(18 janvier 2012)

*Objet:* Protection judiciaire et économique pour les médias européens

La crise frappe durement la presse écrite européenne par le double effet des baisses des recettes publicitaires ainsi que des politiques d'austérité qui remettent en cause des aides publiques essentielles à la survie de nombreux journaux en Europe. Ce double mouvement met en danger la pluralité de la presse européenne dont la diversité de publications risque de se réduire davantage.

En ce début d'année, le groupe espagnol Mediapubli, qui édite le quotidien espagnol *Publico*, a fait savoir que celui-ci était en cessation de paiement du fait de la baisse des rentrées publicitaires. En Italie, une centaine de journaux sont menacés par des coupes dans les budgets nationaux, comme *l'Unita*, *El Manifesto* ou le quotidien catholique *l'Avvire*. En France, des journaux ferment, d'autres sont menacés. S'ajoutent à ceci des restrictions budgétaires des États à leur télévision ou radio publique.

Les traités obligent l'Union européenne et les États à protéger la liberté d'expression et la liberté des médias, notamment en s'opposant résolument à tout texte attaquant la liberté des médias sous couvert de lutte contre la diffamation ou de propos incorrects, comme c'est le cas en Hongrie.

Le pluralisme de la presse, de l'information et des médias ne peut exister si la presse et les secteurs audiovisuels publics sont économiquement asphyxiés.

À quelles mesures la Commission a-t-elle songé pour faire vivre le pluralisme des médias en Europe?

La Commission songe-t-elle à un statut particulier pour les aides publiques aux médias lorsqu'elle évalue les budgets des États afin que ces crédits publics soient encouragés et au minimum maintenus?

À quelles actions la Commission songe-t-elle pour défendre les médias contre toute procédure judiciaire limitant la liberté d'expression et contre les demandes de réparations financières en cas de condamnation par des tribunaux dont l'objectif est de déstabiliser financièrement le média visé?

**Réponse donnée par Mme Kroes au nom de la Commission**

(22 février 2012)

La liberté d'expression et le pluralisme des médias constituent l'un des fondements essentiels des sociétés démocratiques et sont consacrés par l'article 11, paragraphe 1, de la Charte des droits fondamentaux de l'UE. Le suivi minutieux des questions juridiques et économiques qui ont une incidence sur ces droits fait partie des priorités de la Commission. En réponse aux préoccupations du Parlement européen, la Commission a élaboré une double approche. Un groupe de haut niveau indépendant chargé du pluralisme et de la liberté des médias <sup>(1)</sup>, présidé par le professeur Vike-Freiberga, examine les questions de gouvernance et les aspects juridiques. Un forum sur l'avenir des médias étudie leur durabilité économique <sup>(2)</sup>. Les résultats des travaux des deux groupes seront disponibles pour la fin 2012.

Compte tenu du principe de subsidiarité, les États membres conservent leur compétence principale de protection du pluralisme des médias. Il n'est pas envisagé d'apporter un soutien financier direct aux médias à l'échelon de l'UE. Les pouvoirs publics des États membres peuvent apporter leur soutien mais en veillant à ce que les appuis financiers directs aux médias soient pleinement conformes aux règles en matière d'aides d'État et ne restreignent pas indûment la concurrence.

<sup>(1)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/information\\_society/media\\_taskforce/pluralism/hlg/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/information_society/media_taskforce/pluralism/hlg/index_en.htm)

<sup>(2)</sup> IP/11/1506.

Dans le cadre de ses compétences, la Commission s'est toujours efforcée de veiller à ce que la liberté d'expression et d'information soit strictement respectée étant donné que celle-ci constitue le fondement même d'une société libre, démocratique et pluraliste. La Commission tient toutefois à rappeler que les dispositions de la Charte des droits fondamentaux, conformément à son article 51, paragraphe 1, ne s'adressent aux États membres que lorsqu'ils mettent en œuvre le droit de l'Union. Dans les situations ne relevant pas du droit de l'UE, c'est aux autorités nationales qu'il incombe de veiller à ce que les droits fondamentaux — découlant des accords internationaux et de la législation interne — soient pleinement respectés.

---



(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000158/12  
to the Commission**

**Patrick Le Hyaric (GUE/NGL)**

(18 January 2012)

*Subject:* Legal and economic protection for European media

The crisis is hitting the European print media hard, with the double blow of a decline in advertising revenue and austerity measures which have placed a question mark over the state aid which is essential for the survival of many European newspapers. These two developments threaten press plurality in Europe, where there is a danger of further reductions in the range of publications.

At the beginning of this year the Spanish group Mediapubli, which publishes the Spanish daily *Publico*, announced that it was in suspension of payments due to the decline in advertising revenue. In Italy around a hundred newspapers are threatened by national budget cuts, including *l'Unità*, *Il Manifesto* and the Catholic daily *Avvenire*. In France, some newspapers are closing, others are threatened. Added to this there are reductions in Member States' budgets for public radio and television broadcasting.

The European Union and Member States are obliged by treaty to protect freedom of expression and media freedom, particularly by resolutely combating any attempt to attack freedom of the media under the pretext of challenging defamation or wrong information, as is happening in Hungary.

Press, information and media pluralism cannot exist if the press and public audiovisual sectors are subject to economic strangulation.

What measures does the Commission envisage in order to safeguard media pluralism in Europe?

Does the Commission envisage a specific status for public funding of the media when it evaluates Member States' budgets so that such public funds can be encouraged, or at the very least retained?

What actions does the Commission envisage to protect the media against any judicial intervention aimed at limiting freedom of expression and against demands for financial damages in the event of a court sentence aimed at destabilising the media organisation targeted?

**Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission**

(22 February 2012)

Freedom of expression and media pluralism constitute one of the essential foundations of democratic societies, enshrined in Article 11(1) of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the EU. Careful monitoring of legal and economic issues affecting them is a Commission priority. In response to EP concerns, the Commission has devised a two-pronged approach. An independent high-level group on Media Pluralism and Media Freedom <sup>(1)</sup> chaired by Prof. Dr Vike-Freiberga is examining governance and legal issues. A Media Futures Forum is enquiring into future economic sustainability <sup>(2)</sup>. Results from the two groups will be available by end 2012.

Taking into account the subsidiarity principle, Member States retain the main competence for protecting media pluralism. Providing direct financial support at EU level to the media is not envisaged. Member State public authorities can be supportive, while at the same time careful that direct financial support to the media fully complies with state aid rules and does not unduly restrict competition.

Within its competences, the Commission has always sought to ensure that freedom of expression and information is strictly respected since it lies at the very base of a free, democratic and pluralist society. However, the Commission recalls that, according to Article 51(1) of the Charter of Fundamental Rights, its provisions are addressed to the Member States only when they are implementing Union law. In situations falling outside the scope of EC law, it is up to national authorities to ensure that fundamental rights — resulting from international agreements and from their internal legislation — are fully respected.

<sup>(1)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/information\\_society/media\\_taskforce/pluralism/hlg/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/information_society/media_taskforce/pluralism/hlg/index_en.htm)

<sup>(2)</sup> IP/11/1506.

(Version française)

**Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-000159/12**  
**à la Commission**  
**Patrick Le Hyaric (GUE/NGL)**  
(18 janvier 2012)

*Objet:* Surveillance des dispositifs médicaux en lien avec le scandale PIP

Le scandale sanitaire dit des prothèses mammaires PIP touchant entre 400 000 et 500 000 femmes de par le monde remet profondément en question le système d'homologation et de surveillance de la directive de 2007 sur les dispositifs médicaux.

Le système de vigilance après commercialisation avec communication des incidents a mis beaucoup trop de temps à se mettre en place et ce, alors même que les prothèses mammaires sont classées dans la catégorie III de la directive, c'est-à-dire la plus surveillée.

Les différences d'approche entre autorités sanitaires nationales et les délais qui en ont résulté sont aussi des plus dommageables et limitent l'impact des décisions prises en vertu du principe de précaution, lesquelles doivent assurer en priorité la sécurité des patients.

La Commission a annoncé une refonte de la directive de 2007 pour la fin du premier semestre 2012:

1. Comment compte-t-elle renforcer la traçabilité et la sécurité des 10 000 dispositifs médicaux couverts par la directive, notamment les plus surveillés de la catégorie III?
2. Comment compte-t-elle renforcer le système d'homologation délivrée par les autorités nationales? Que pense-t-elle d'un système d'homologation et de surveillance commun alliant plusieurs expertises avant et après commercialisation?
3. Comment compte-t-elle renforcer les mécanismes d'alerte existants? Entend-elle imposer le principe de précaution aux autorités nationales afin d'éviter des différences d'approche qui désorientent les patients tout en les exposant plus longtemps aux dangers décelés?

**Réponse donnée par M. Dalli au nom de la Commission**  
(16 février 2012)

La Commission envisage, dans le contexte des propositions législatives visant à la révision du cadre réglementaire de l'Union européenne sur les dispositifs médicaux prévue pour 2012, de renforcer la traçabilité des dispositifs médicaux par la mise en place d'un système d'identification unique des dispositifs fondé sur l'analyse des risques.

Conformément aux trois directives régissant les dispositifs médicaux, les directives 90/385/CEE du Conseil <sup>(1)</sup>, 93/42/CEE du Conseil <sup>(2)</sup> et 98/79/CE du Parlement européen et du Conseil <sup>(3)</sup>, les organismes dits «notifiés» désignés par les États membres sont associés à l'évaluation de la conformité desdits dispositifs. L'un des principaux axes de révision envisagés par la Commission est le renforcement du contrôle sur les organismes notifiés, afin de garantir que tous les organismes désignés s'acquittent de leurs tâches selon les mêmes normes élevées. Ce renforcement passera notamment par le contrôle de la désignation des organismes, leur suivi et la possibilité qu'un comité d'experts au niveau de l'Union puisse examiner les différentes évaluations de la conformité des dispositifs à haut risque.

La Commission envisage également d'améliorer la vigilance et la surveillance du marché en accroissant la coordination entre les autorités nationales compétentes, par la centralisation du signalement des incidents, l'analyse des tendances, une évaluation coordonnée et, au besoin, des mesures prises à l'échelle de l'Union. En vertu de l'article 168 du TFUE, les recommandations aux patients ou au public devraient toutefois rester de la compétence des États membres.

<sup>(1)</sup> JO L 189 du 20.7.1990.

<sup>(2)</sup> JO L 169 du 12.7.1993.

<sup>(3)</sup> JO L 331 du 7.12.1998.

Il convient de souligner que, dans l'affaire en question, le fabricant, la société *Poly Implant Prothese*, a frauduleusement utilisé un silicone de mauvaise qualité, différent de celui déclaré dans la documentation technique adressée à l'organisme notifié au cours de la procédure d'évaluation de la conformité. Néanmoins, la Commission utilisera cet incident dans une «simulation de crise» qui permettra d'analyser en profondeur les points faibles du système actuel et, au besoin, de proposer des modifications qui seraient intégrées dans la révision envisagée.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000159/12**  
**to the Commission**  
**Patrick Le Hyaric (GUE/NGL)**  
(18 January 2012)

*Subject:* Monitoring of medical devices in the light of the PIP scandal

The PIP breast implant health scandal affecting between 400 000 and 500 000 women worldwide raises fundamental questions about the 2007 Directive's approval and monitoring system.

The implementation of the post-marketing vigilance system with incident reporting has been far too slow, even though breast implants fall into category III, the most closely monitored.

Differences in approach between national health authorities and consequent delays have also been highly injurious and have limited the impact of decisions taken under the precautionary principle, which should have made patient safety a priority.

The Commission has announced that the 2007 Directive will be reformulated by the end of the first semester of 2012:

1. How does it intend to strengthen the traceability and safety of the 10 000 medical devices covered by the directive, particularly those in the most closely monitored category III?
2. How does it intend to strengthen approval systems delivered by national authorities? What is its opinion of a common approval and monitoring system involving a range of expert assessments pre- and post- marketing?
3. How does it intend to reinforce existing warning mechanisms? Does it intend to impose the precautionary principle on national authorities in order to avoid differences in approach which are confusing to patients and expose them to hidden risks for a longer period?

**Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission**  
(16 February 2012)

The Commission envisages, in the context of the legislative proposals aiming at the revision of the EU regulatory framework for medical devices scheduled for 2012, to reinforce the traceability of medical devices by means of a risk-based introduction of a Unique Device Identification System.

According to the three Medical Devices Directives 90/385/EEC <sup>(1)</sup>, 93/42/EEC <sup>(2)</sup> and 98/79/EC <sup>(3)</sup>, so-called notified bodies, designated by the Member States, are involved in the conformity assessment of medical devices. One of the main aspects the Commission intends to address is strengthening the control on Notified Bodies to ensure that all designated bodies perform their tasks in accordance with the same high standards. This includes a control of their designation, their monitoring and the possibility of an expert committee at EU level to scrutinise individual conformity assessment for high risk devices.

The Commission also envisages improving vigilance and market surveillance by enhancing the coordination between national competent authorities, by means of central reporting of incidents, trend analysis, coordinated assessment and, where appropriate, Community measures. Under Article 168 of the TFEU, recommendations to patients or the public, however, would remain the competence of the Member States.

It should be underlined that in the case in question the manufacturer, Poly Implant Prothese, fraudulently made use of low-quality silicone different from the one declared in his technical documentation to the notified body during the conformity assessment procedure. Nevertheless, the Commission will use the incident as a 'stress test' to thoroughly analyse weaknesses of the current system and propose changes, if and as necessary, in the upcoming revision.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ L 189, 20.7.1990.  
<sup>(2)</sup> OJ L 169, 12.7.1993.  
<sup>(3)</sup> OJ L 331, 7.12.1998.

(Versão portuguesa)

**Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-000160/12**

**à Comissão**

**João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)**

(18 de janeiro de 2012)

**Assunto:** Situação da apicultura e importações de mel de países terceiros

A apicultura, em Portugal, como noutros países da UE, enfrenta sérias ameaças. Ao declínio das abelhas — fenómeno com causas ainda não completamente esclarecidas, mas que, consabidamente, não é dissociável da intensificação da atividade agrícola nem da poluição química que lhe é inerente — somam-se as dificuldades ao nível da comercialização do mel, em virtude da entrada na UE de mel e das chamadas «misturas de mel» com proveniências diversas (China, Argentina, Índia, etc.), que chega às grandes superfícies comerciais a preços muitas vezes abaixo dos custos de produção a nível nacional.

Em resposta à pergunta E-008319/2011 (datada de 28 de outubro de 2011), sobre mel contaminado com pólen transgénico, a Comissão Europeia refere que estaria a realizar «uma análise aprofundada das implicações do acórdão [do Tribunal de Justiça Europeu] na produção de mel na UE e na importação de mel de países terceiros».

Em face do exposto, pergunto à Comissão:

1. Que medidas tomou ou vai tomar para fazer face ao problema do declínio das abelhas? Considera a proibição de alguns produtos agroquímicos nocivos para a saúde das abelhas? Que seguimento tiveram as recomendações constantes da resolução aprovada pelo Parlamento Europeu sobre este assunto?
2. Que mecanismos garantem a qualidade do mel e das misturas de mel importadas de países terceiros?
3. Que mecanismos de apoio aos apicultores estão disponíveis? Que medidas irá implementar para evitar a concorrência desleal que hoje enfrentam?
4. Qual o resultado da análise que efetuou sobre as implicações do acórdão do Tribunal de Justiça Europeu sobre a produção de mel na UE e sobre a importação de mel de países terceiros?

**Resposta dada por John Dalli em nome da Comissão**

(1 de março de 2012)

1. A Comunicação da Comissão ao Parlamento Europeu e ao Conselho relativa à Saúde das Abelhas <sup>(1)</sup> apresenta em geral as medidas tomadas ou previstas para enfrentar o problema do declínio das populações de abelhas.

No que se refere às ações tomadas pela Comissão sobre as substâncias agroquímicas, a Comissão remete o Senhor Deputado para as respostas às perguntas escritas E-003326/2011 e E-011166/2011 <sup>(2)</sup>.

2. A Diretiva 2001/110/CE do Conselho <sup>(3)</sup> relativa ao mel estabelece os critérios da composição e os requisitos de rotulagem aplicáveis ao mel importado de países terceiros e misturas que contenham esse mel. Os Estados-Membros devem proibir a comercialização de mel que não esteja em conformidade com as disposições da diretiva.

3. O artigo 106.º do Regulamento (CE) n.º 1234/2007 do Conselho, que estabelece uma organização comum dos mercados agrícolas e disposições específicas para certos produtos agrícolas (Regulamento «OCM única») <sup>(4)</sup>, prevê várias medidas para melhorar as condições de produção e de comercialização dos produtos da apicultura.

4. No que diz respeito às implicações do acórdão do Tribunal de Justiça da União Europeia sobre o pólen do milho MON 810 <sup>(5)</sup>, a Comissão remete o Senhor Deputado para a resposta à pergunta escrita P-011752/2011 <sup>(6)</sup>.

<sup>(1)</sup> COM(2010)0714 final ([http://ec.europa.eu/food/animal/liveanimals/bees/docs/honeybee\\_health\\_communication\\_pt.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/food/animal/liveanimals/bees/docs/honeybee_health_communication_pt.pdf)).

<sup>(2)</sup> (<http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/application/home.do?language=PT>).

<sup>(3)</sup> JO L 10 de 12.1.2002.

<sup>(4)</sup> JO L 299 de 16.11.2007.

<sup>(5)</sup> Acórdão do TJUE, de 6 de setembro de 2011, Processo C-442/09, Karl Heinz Bablok/Freistaat Bayern.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000160/12  
to the Commission  
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)  
(18 January 2012)**

*Subject:* Beekeeping and honey imports from third countries

Beekeeping in Portugal, as in other European Union countries, is facing serious threats. The decline in the bee population, a phenomenon whose causes are still not completely understood, but which, as we know, is inseparable from the intensification of agriculture and the chemical pollution this entails, is added to the marketing difficulties caused by entry onto the European market of so-called 'mixed honey' from a range of countries (China, Argentina, India, etc.) which arrives in supermarkets at prices that are often lower than the costs of production at national level.

In its answer to Question E-008319/2011 (dated 28 October 2011) on honey contaminated by GM pollen, the Commission stated that there should be 'an in-depth analysis of the implications of the ruling [of the European Court of Justice] on production of honey within the EU and import of honey from third countries'.

In light of this, the Commission is asked to answer the following:

1. What measures has it taken or will take to address the problem of decline in bee populations? Has it considered banning the use of certain agrochemical products which are harmful to bees? What action has been taken on the recommendations contained in Parliament's resolution on this issue?
2. What measures are in place to guarantee the quality of the honey and mixed honey imported from third countries?
3. What support mechanisms are available for beekeepers? What measures will the Commission take to avoid the unfair competition they are currently facing?
4. What were the findings of its analysis of the implications of the European Court of Justice ruling on honey production in the EU and honey imports from third countries?

**Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission  
(1 March 2012)**

1. The Commission's communication to the Parliament and the Council on Honeybee Health <sup>(1)</sup> gives an overview of the measures, taken or planned, to address the problem of decline in bee populations.

As regards actions taken by the Commission on agrochemical substances, the Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answers to Written Questions E-003326/2011 and E-011166/2011 <sup>(2)</sup>.

2. Council Directive 2001/110/EC <sup>(3)</sup> on honey lays down the composition criteria and labelling requirements concerning honey imported from third countries and blends containing such honey. Member States must prohibit the marketing of honey which fails to conform to the provisions of the directive.
3. Article 106 of Council Regulation (EC) 1234/2007 establishing a common organisation of agricultural markets and on specific provisions for certain agricultural products (Single CMO Regulation) <sup>(4)</sup> sets down a series of measures for improving the conditions for the production and marketing of apiculture products.
4. As regards the implications of the ruling of the European court of Justice on the maize MON 810 pollen <sup>(5)</sup>, the Commission would also refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question P-011752/2011.

<sup>(1)</sup> COM(2010) 714 final, [http://ec.europa.eu/food/animal/liveanimals/bees/docs/honeybee\\_health\\_communication\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/food/animal/liveanimals/bees/docs/honeybee_health_communication_en.pdf)

<sup>(2)</sup> <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB>.

<sup>(3)</sup> OJ L 10, 12.1.2002.

<sup>(4)</sup> OJ L 299, 16.11.2007.

<sup>(5)</sup> Decision of the ECJ of 6 September 2011 (Case C-442/09) *Karl Heinz Bablok v Freistaat Bayern*.

(Versão portuguesa)

**Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-000161/12  
à Comissão**

**João Ferreira (GUE/NGL) e Ilda Figueiredo (GUE/NGL)**

(18 de janeiro de 2012)

*Assunto:* Estudo da Comissão Europeia sobre as consequências das medidas ditas de austeridade

O estudo publicado pela Direção de Emprego, Assuntos Sociais e Inclusão, da Comissão Europeia, intitulado «The distributional effects of austerity measures: a comparison of six EU countries», aponta para um impacto especialmente agressivo das medidas ditas de austeridade nas camadas da população de rendimentos mais baixos, em Portugal. O estudo evidencia que são os mais pobres quem mais sofreu com as medidas — que vão do aumento de impostos aos cortes nas prestações sociais e pensões, entre outras — levadas à prática entre 2008 e 2011. Isto sucede num país com níveis de desigualdade social muito elevados, face à média da UE, no qual crescem de forma alarmante a pobreza, a exclusão social e as desigualdades.

Não obstante, as medidas contidas no programa da troika FMI-BCE-CE (cujo período de aplicação não é coberto pelo estudo) mantêm o sentido das medidas, ditas de austeridade, cujas consequências são avaliadas no estudo e aprofundam-nas. Elevam-nas mesmo a patamares de uma inaudita violência social.

Em face das conclusões deste estudo, perguntamos à Comissão:

1. Que alterações determinam estas conclusões na postura da Comissão Europeia face a Portugal, tendo em conta o memorando da responsabilidade conjunta da UE e do FMI, cuja aplicação está a conduzir a consequências desastrosas, do ponto de vista social e económico, em Portugal?
2. Não considera necessário travar as manifestas injustiças sociais que decorrem da aplicação das medidas ditas de austeridade em Portugal e que este estudo vem assinalar?

**Resposta dada por Olli Rehn em nome da Comissão**

(6 de março de 2012)

É importante referir, em primeiro lugar, que, embora tenha sido financiado pela Comissão, o estudo foi publicado sob a responsabilidade dos autores e não reflete, necessariamente, a opinião ou posição da Comissão, como se encontra claramente expresso na exoneração de responsabilidade que o acompanha.

Em substância, o estudo considera que, sem as medidas de austeridade, as prestações sociais teriam evoluído em Portugal com base numa regra de indexação. Todavia, nas condições atuais dos mercados financeiros, essa evolução teria conduzido, muito provavelmente, o Estado a graves dificuldades financeiras, com consequências sociais muito mais negativas do que os efeitos das medidas de contenção orçamental. Importa referir, a este propósito, que o programa de ajustamento económico procura, tanto quanto possível, proteger os grupos muito vulneráveis, como o ilustra, por exemplo, o modo como foram efetuadas as reduções recentes ao nível das pensões.

Os autores do estudo reconhecem que a análise que efetuam não incide nos efeitos do conjunto alargado de medidas do programa de ajustamento. Apenas apresentam estimativas dos efeitos distributivos diretos das medidas de austeridade, sem se debruçarem sobre os efeitos do conjunto alargado de medidas. Porém, também é importante ter em conta os efeitos estruturais positivos das medidas incluídas no programa de ajustamento. Previsivelmente, essas medidas melhorarão o funcionamento do mercado de trabalho e reforçarão o potencial produtivo da economia, pelo que se espera que aumentem os níveis de emprego a longo prazo, elemento importante numa estratégia de redução da pobreza.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000161/12  
to the Commission  
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL) and Ilda Figueiredo (GUE/NGL)  
(18 January 2012)**

*Subject:* Commission study on the impact of austerity measures

The study published by the Commission's Directorate-General for Employment, Social Affairs and Equal Opportunities entitled 'The distributional effects of austerity measures: a comparison of six EU countries', points out that these austerity measures have had a particularly harsh impact on low-income groups in Portugal. The study shows that it is the poorest who have suffered most from the measures introduced between 2008 and 2011, ranging from tax increases to cuts in social benefits and pensions. This is taking place in a country with extremely high levels of social inequality compared to the EU average, in which poverty, social exclusion and inequalities are increasing at an alarming rate.

However, the measures contained in the IMF-ECB-EC troika's programme (whose implementation period is not covered in this study) are even more severe than the austerity measures whose impact is highlighted in the study, causing still greater social devastation.

In the light of the conclusions of this study, the Commission is asked to answer the following:

1. To what extent will these conclusions cause the Commission to change its position in relation to Portugal, taking into account the EU-IMF joint responsibility memorandum, whose implementation would lead to disastrous social and economic consequences in Portugal?
2. Does it not consider it necessary to counter the clear social injustices resulting from the implementation of austerity measures in Portugal, as highlighted in the Commission's study?

**Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission  
(6 March 2012)**

It first has to be pointed out that, although financed by the Commission, the study was published under the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily reflect the opinion or position of the Commission, as is clearly mentioned in the disclaimer of the study.

On substance, the study assumes that in the absence of the austerity measures social benefits in Portugal would have evolved on the basis of an indexation rule. However, at current financial market conditions such an evolution would have led most likely to the serious financial difficulties for the state, with adverse social consequences that would have gone much beyond the effects of the fiscal retrenchment measures. It has to be noted, in this context, that the economic adjustment programme aims at protecting the highly vulnerable groups whenever possible, as witnessed, for instance, by the way the recent reduction in pension entitlements has been implemented.

The authors of the study acknowledge that their analysis is not about the effects of the broader set of measures of the adjustment programme. They only estimate the direct distributional effects of the austerity measures while ignoring the effects of the broader set of measures. Yet it is important to also consider the favourable structural effects of the measures included in the adjustment programme. In as much as they can be expected to improve the functioning of the labour market and raise the production potential of the economy, these measures will lead to higher employment in the longer term, which is an important element in a strategy of reducing poverty.

---



(Versão portuguesa)

**Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-000162/12  
à Comissão**

**João Ferreira (GUE/NGL) e Ilda Figueiredo (GUE/NGL)**

(18 de janeiro de 2012)

*Assunto:* Conciliação entre a vida pessoal, familiar e profissional

O relatório do Instituto Europeu da Igualdade de Género (EIGE), sobre conciliação entre a vida pessoal, familiar e profissional, divulgado esta semana, revela que metade das crianças abaixo dos três anos que vivem na UE ficam com os pais e não em creches ou noutros serviços de apoio à infância. Em 21 dos 27 Estados-Membros da UE, mais de 40 por cento das crianças abaixo dos três anos estão a cargo exclusivamente dos pais.

O próprio relatório reconhece que a disponibilidade nos equipamentos oficiais de apoio à infância para o grupo das crianças com menos de três anos é «crucial para a reconciliação da vida pessoal, familiar e profissional», particularmente para as mulheres «expostas a riscos mais elevados durante a reintegração no trabalho após a maternidade». Sublinha também que «as mulheres continuam a ser as principais cuidadoras na infância» e que «as mulheres entre os 25 e os 44 anos gastam, por dia, três vezes mais tempo do que os homens a cuidar das crianças».

Em face das conclusões deste relatório, solicitamos à Comissão que nos informe sobre que medidas e iniciativas pensa apoiar e desenvolver para promover a conciliação entre a vida pessoal, familiar e profissional — um fator decisivo para uma efetiva promoção da igualdade de género.

**Resposta dada por Viviane Reding em nome da Comissão**

(26 de março de 2012)

A Comissão acolheu com agrado o relatório preparado pelo Instituto Europeu para a Igualdade de Género (IEIG) sobre a conciliação da vida profissional, pessoal e familiar. As conclusões apresentadas neste relatório vão ao encontro dos compromissos da Comissão na Estratégia para a igualdade entre homens e mulheres 2010/2015 <sup>(1)</sup> adotada em 2010. No contexto da Estratégia Europa 2020, as linhas de orientação para as políticas de emprego dos Estados-Membros definem que devem ser criadas políticas de conciliação da vida profissional com a vida pessoal e familiar e incluir estruturas de acolhimento a preços acessíveis. Quando necessário, a Comissão propõe medidas específicas para um determinado país.

O Senhor Deputado poderá consultar a resposta dada à pergunta escrita E-008113/2011 <sup>(2)</sup> sobre estruturas de acolhimento de crianças. Além disso, a nova Diretiva 2010/18/UE sobre licença parental <sup>(3)</sup>, atribui a cada trabalhador com filhos o direito a licença por um período mínimo de quatro meses após o nascimento ou adoção de uma criança (anteriormente até três meses). Pelo menos um dos quatro meses não pode ser transferido para o outro progenitor — significando que se perderá se não for usado — oferecendo incentivos aos pais para que gozem da licença. A nova Diretiva prevê igualmente uma melhor proteção contra a discriminação e um regresso ao trabalho facilitado. A data limite para a transposição da Diretiva para os Estados-Membros foi 8 de março de 2012 e a Comissão irá analisar cuidadosamente a sua correta transposição para todos os Estados-Membros.

A Comissão reconhece também a importância da conciliação da vida profissional com a vida privada na sua proposta para os regulamentos relativos aos fundos estruturais para 2014/2020, com um investimento prioritário dedicado à «Igualdade entre homens e mulheres e a conciliação da vida profissional e privada» proposto para o FSE e nos investimentos em infraestruturas sociais previstos ao abrigo do FEDER.

<sup>(1)</sup> (<http://ec.europa.eu/social/home.jsp?langId=pt>).

<sup>(2)</sup> (<http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/application/home.do?language=PT>).

<sup>(3)</sup> Diretiva 2010/18/UE do Conselho de 8 de março de 2010 que aplica o Acordo-Quadro revisto sobre licença parental celebrado entre a BusinessEurope, a Ueapme, o CEEP e a CES e que revoga a Diretiva 96/34/CE.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000162/12  
to the Commission  
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL) and Ilda Figueiredo (GUE/NGL)  
(18 January 2012)**

*Subject:* Reconciling work, personal and family life

The report from the European Institute for Gender Equality (EIGE) on reconciling work, personal and family life, published this week, shows that half of children under the age of three who live in the EU stay with their parents and not in crèches or other childcare facilities. In 21 of the 27 EU Member States, more than 40 % of children under the age of three are exclusively cared for by their parents.

The report itself acknowledges that the availability of official childcare facilities for children under the age of three is 'crucial to reconciling work, personal and family life', especially for women 'exposed to higher risks on returning to work following maternity leave'. It also emphasises that 'women continue to be the primary caregivers in infancy' and that 'women between the ages of 25 and 44 spend, daily, three times longer taking care of children than men'.

In light of the conclusions contained in this report, can the Commission say what measures and actions it will support and develop in order to promote reconciliation of work, personal and family life — a decisive factor for the effective promotion of gender equality?

**Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission  
(26 March 2012)**

The Commission has welcomed the report done by the European Institute for Gender Equality (EIGE) on reconciling work, personal and family life. The conclusions drawn in this report are in line with the commitments taken by the Commission in its Strategy for equality between women and men 2010-2015 <sup>(1)</sup> adopted in 2010. Within the context of the Europe 2020 strategy, the guidelines for the employment policies of the Member States refer to work-life balance policies and the provision of affordable care. Where appropriate, country specific recommendations on this topic are proposed by the Commission.

The Honourable Member is invited to refer to the reply given to the Written Question E-008113/2011 <sup>(2)</sup> on childcare facilities. Furthermore, the revised Directive 2010/18/EU on Parental Leave <sup>(3)</sup> gives each working parent the right to at least four months leave after the birth or adoption of a child (previously up to three months). At least one of the four months cannot be transferred to the other parent — meaning it will be lost if not taken — offering incentives to fathers to take the leave. The new Directive also provides for better protection against discrimination and a smoother return to work. The deadline for transposition of the directive in Member States was 8 March 2012 and the Commission will carefully analyse its correct transposition in all Member States.

The Commission recognises the importance of the reconciliation of work and private life also in its proposal of the structural funds regulations for 2014-2020, with a dedicated investment priority 'Equality between men and women and reconciliation between work and private life' proposed for the ESF and investments in social infrastructure foreseen under ERDF.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=418>

<sup>(2)</sup> <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB>

<sup>(3)</sup> Council Directive 2010/18/EU of 8 March 2010 implementing the revised Framework Agreement on parental leave concluded by BUSINESSEUROPE, UEAPME, CEEP and ETUC and repealing Directive 96/34/EC.

*(Nederlandse versie)*

**Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord P-000163/12  
aan de Commissie (Vicevoorzitter — Hoge Vertegenwoordiger)  
Johannes Cornelis van Baalen (ALDE)**

*(17 januari 2012)*

*Betref:* VP/HR — Vragen betreffende verkiezingen Taiwan

Is de Vicevoorzitter bekend met het feit dat tussen de uitslag van de presidentsverkiezingen (14 januari 2012) en de inauguratie van de nieuwe president (20 mei 2012) een politiek luwe periode bestaat?

Is de Vicevoorzitter het met de vragensteller eens dat in deze periode geen onomkeerbare besluiten mogen worden genomen ten aanzien van de relaties tussen Taiwan en de Volksrepubliek China (cross-strait relations)?

Is de Vicevoorzitter bereid haar mening aan zowel president Ma Ying-jeou als aan de autoriteiten van de Volksrepubliek China mede te delen?

**Antwoord van Hoge Vertegenwoordiger/vicevoorzitter Ashton namens de Commissie**

*(23 februari 2012)*

Volgens onze informatie zal er geen politiek vacuüm zijn.

---

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer P-000163/12  
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)  
Johannes Cornelis van Baalen (ALDE)**

*(17 January 2012)*

*Subject:* VP/HR — Elections in Taiwan

Is the Vice-President aware that between the announcement of the results of the presidential elections (14 January 2012) and the inauguration of the new President (20 May 2012) a political vacuum will exist?

Does the Vice-President agree that during that period no irreversible decisions may be taken affecting relations between Taiwan and the People's Republic of China (cross-strait relations)?

Will the Vice-President inform both President Ma Ying-Jeou and the authorities of the People's Republic of China of her opinion?

**Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission**

*(23 February 2012)*

According to our information there will be no political vacuum.

---

*(Nederlandse versie)*

**Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord P-000165/12**

**aan de Commissie  
Frank Vanhecke (EFD)**

*(16 januari 2012)*

*Betreft:* Ontwikkelingssteun Afrikaanse landen

Kan de Commissie mij meedelen hoeveel Europese financiële steun naar onder vermelde Afrikaanse landen is gevloeid in 2011 en dit via het Europees Ontwikkelingsfonds, de algemene begroting, het Directoraat-generaal humanitaire hulp en het stabiliteitsinstrument?

Het gaat om volgende landen: Zuid-Afrika, Zimbabwe, Zambia, Uganda, Tsjaad, Togo, Tanzania, Swaziland, Somalië, Sudan, Sierra Leone, Seychellen, Senegal, Sao Tomé en Príncipe, de Salomonseilanden, Rwanda, Nigeria, Niger, Namibië, Mozambique, Mauritius, Mauritanië, Mali, Malawi, Madagaskar, Lesotho, Liberia, Kenia, Kameroen, Kaapverdië, Ivoorkust, Guinee, Guinee-Bissau, Ghana, Gambia, Gabon, Ethiopië, Eritrea, Djibouti, Congo, de Comoren, Centraal-Afrikaanse Republiek, Burundi, Burkina Faso, Botswana, Benin en Angola.

**Antwoord van de heer Piebalgs namens de Commissie**

*(7 februari 2012)*

De officiële ontwikkelingshulp die de EU aan de Afrikaanse landen verleend heeft waarnaar het geachte Parlementslid verwijst, bedroeg 2,9 miljard in 2011 — 1 miljard EUR uit de EU-begroting en 1,9 miljard EUR uit het Europees Ontwikkelingsfonds.

Een bijlage met de cijfers per land wordt rechtstreeks naar het geachte Parlementslid en naar het secretariaat van het Parlement gezonden.

Tabel 1 focust op niet-humanitaire hulp die geen betrekking heeft op vredesoperaties (die niet in de OESO-definitie van officiële ontwikkelingshulp vervat zitten).

Tabel 2 toont humanitaire EU-hulp waarbij de Commissie zich in 2011 verbonden heeft tot het betalen van 0,5 miljard EUR steun aan die landen.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer P-000165/12  
to the Commission  
Frank Vanhecke (EFD)  
(16 January 2012)**

*Subject:* Development aid for African countries

Can the Commission say how much financial aid the European Union granted to the African countries listed below in 2011 through the European Development Fund, the general budget, the Directorate-General for Humanitarian Aid and Civil Protection, and the Stability Instrument?

This concerns the following countries: South Africa, Zimbabwe, Zambia, Uganda, Chad, Togo, Tanzania, Swaziland, Somalia, Sudan, Sierra Leone, the Seychelles, Senegal, São Tomé and Príncipe, the Solomon Islands, Rwanda, Nigeria, Niger, Namibia, Mozambique, Mauritius, Mauritania, Mali, Malawi, Madagascar, Lesotho, Liberia, Kenya, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Côte d'Ivoire, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Ghana, Gambia, Gabon, Ethiopia, Eritrea, Djibouti, Congo, the Comoros, the Central African Republic, Burundi, Burkina Faso, Botswana, Benin and Angola.

**Answer given by Mr Piebalgs on behalf of the Commission  
(7 February 2012)**

Official Development Aid (ODA) provided by the EU to the African countries to which the Honourable Member refers amounted to EUR 2.9 billion in 2011 — EUR 1 billion from the EU budget and EUR 1.9 billion from the European Development Fund (EDF).

An annex presenting the figures per country is sent directly to the Honourable Member and to Parliament's Secretariat.

Table 1 focuses on non-humanitarian aid other than peace-keeping operations (which are not included in the OECD definition of ODA).

Table 2 shows EU humanitarian aid where the Commission contracted EUR 0.5 billion in relation to these countries in 2011.

---

(Deutsche Fassung)

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung P-000166/12  
an die Kommission**

**Jürgen Creutzmann (ALDE)**

(16. Januar 2012)

*Betrifft:* Änderung des deutschen Glücksspielstaatsvertrags

Am 15. Dezember 2011 haben die deutschen Bundesländer den Ersten Staatsvertrag zur Änderung des deutschen Glücksspielstaatsvertrags unterzeichnet. Der neue Vertrag wird aber nur in Kraft treten, wenn die Kommission seine Konformität mit dem EU-Recht bestätigt.

Es scheint jedoch, dass der neue Glücksspielstaatsvertrag die von der Kommission in ihrer detaillierten Stellungnahme zum Vertragsentwurf vom 18. Juli 2011 geäußerten Zweifel nicht ausräumen kann. Denn der Vertrag wird aus verschiedenen Gründen auch weiterhin nicht den vom EuGH festgelegten Anforderungen an Kohärenz und einen systematischen Ansatz zur Begrenzung des legalen Glücksspielangebots gerecht:

Die Begrenzung der Anzahl der zu vergebenden Konzessionen auf 20 ist willkürlich und sachlich nicht zu rechtfertigen. Zudem schafft der Entwurf wirtschaftliche Barrieren für den Markteintritt privater Anbieter. Die im internationalen Vergleich hohe Abgabe in Höhe von fünf Prozent des Einsatzes auf Sportwetten macht den deutschen Markt für private Anbieter derart unattraktiv, dass die Nachfrage nach Sportwetten im Internet nicht durch legale Angebote abgedeckt werden kann. Als Folge wird der Großteil der Verbraucher weiterhin auf illegalen Seiten spielen, die keinerlei Regulierung unterliegen, und sich damit erheblichen Gefahren aussetzen.

Somit stellt der Vertrag aus meiner Sicht eine Verletzung der wesentlichen Grundfreiheiten für eine gute Funktionsweise des europäischen Binnenmarktes dar, die im EU-Vertrag niedergelegt sind.

1. Stimmt die Kommission der oben geäußerten Einwände gegen den neuen Glücksspielstaatsvertrag zu?
2. Gedenkt die Kommission, in Folge dieser Bedenken eine erneute Notifizierung zu verlangen?

**Antwort von Herrn Barnier im Namen der Kommission**

(14. Februar 2012)

1. Die Kommissionsdienststellen sind der Ansicht, dass der am 15. Dezember 2011 unterzeichnete geänderte Glücksspielstaatsvertrag bestimmte Bedenken, die die Kommission in ihrer detaillierten Stellungnahme vorgebracht hat, insbesondere bezüglich der Konzessionserteilung, berücksichtigt. Sie begrüßt daher die diesbezüglichen Änderungen des Vertragstextes. Sie wird die Erläuterungen der Bundesländer, die diese in Beantwortung der Bemerkungen der Kommission zum ersten Entwurf des Staatsvertrags abgegeben haben, im Lichte der ständigen Rechtsprechung des Gerichtshofs sorgfältig darauf prüfen, auch ob die vorgeschlagenen Änderungen geeignet sind, alle Bedenken der Kommission zu zerstreuen.

2. Die Richtlinie 98/34/EG verpflichtet die Mitgliedstaaten, der Kommission den Entwurf einer technischen Vorschrift mitzuteilen (oder unter bestimmten Bedingungen erneut mitzuteilen, siehe unten). Hat ein Mitgliedstaat alle sich aus der Richtlinie ergebenden Verpflichtungen erfüllt, kann er zur Annahme des endgültigen Entwurfs schreiten.

Gemäß Artikel 10 der Richtlinie 98/34/EG muss der Mitgliedstaat einen Entwurf nicht erneut mitteilen, wenn er den Entwurf im Anschluss an die erste Mitteilung entsprechend einem Antrag der Kommission zum Zweck der Beseitigung eines Handelshemmnisses oder eines Hemmnisses für den freien Dienstleistungsverkehr ändert. Artikel 8 der Richtlinie 98/34/EG schreibt demgegenüber vor, dass der Mitgliedstaat den Entwurf einer technischen Vorschrift erneut mitteilen muss, wenn durch Änderungen des Entwurfs beispielsweise Spezifikationen oder Vorschriften hinzugefügt oder verschärft werden. Diesbezüglich müssen sich die Mitgliedstaaten der möglichen Rechtsfolgen einer unterlassenen Mitteilung bewusst sein, nämlich der Nichtanwendbarkeit der fraglichen Vorschriften<sup>(1)</sup>.

Mit der Annahme der technischen Vorschriften ist das der Richtlinie 98/34/EG unterliegende Verfahren abgeschlossen. Dies beeinträchtigt jedoch nicht die Möglichkeit der Kommission, gegebenenfalls ein Vertragsverletzungsverfahren einzuleiten.

<sup>(1)</sup> Siehe Urteile des Europäischen Gerichtshofs in der Rechtssache C 194/94, CIA Security, und Rechtssache C 443/98, Unilever.

(English version)

**Question for written answer P-000166/12  
to the Commission**

**Jürgen Creutzmann (ALDE)**  
(16 January 2012)

*Subject:* Modification of the German State Treaty on Gambling

On December 15, 2011 the German Federal States signed the first state treaty concerning the modification of the German State Treaty on Gambling. However, the new agreement will only become law when the Commission confirms its conformity with EC law.

It appears, however, that the new German State Treaty on Gambling is unable to remove doubts expressed in their detailed opinion concerning the draft treaty dated July 18, 2011. This is because the agreement continuously fails to fulfil the requirements established by the European Court of Justice in terms of coherence for a variety of reasons and does not fulfil a systematic approach to limiting of legal gambling offers:

The limiting of the number of concessions to be forgiven to 20 is arbitrary and must not be justified objectively. In addition, the draft creates economic barriers for the market entry of private vendors. The internationally comparative high tax in the amount of five per cent of the stake money on the betting on sports events makes the German market unattractive for private vendors so much that the demand for betting on sports events on the Internet cannot be covered by legal offers. As a consequence, the majority of users continue to play on illegal pages, which are not subject to any regulation at all and they thereby expose themselves to considerable risks.

By doing this, the agreement presents a violation of the principle fundamental freedoms for a good functionality of the internal European market in my opinion, which is set forth in the EU treaty.

1. Does the Commission agree with the objections against the new German State Treaty on Gambling, which are expressed above?
2. Is the Commission thinking of requesting a new notification as a result of these concerns?

**Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission**

(14 February 2012)

1. The Commission services are of the view that the revised State treaty on gambling signed on 15 December 2011 takes into account certain concerns raised by the Commission in its detailed opinion, in particular as to the licensing regime, and welcomes the amendments to the text made to that effect. It will now carefully analyse, in the light of the Court's case-law, the explanations of the German Federal States given in response to the Commission's observations on the first draft treaty, and if the changes proposed are apt to alleviate all the Commission's concerns.

2. Directive 98/34/EC imposes on a Member State an obligation to notify (or to re-notify under certain circumstances, as explained below) a draft technical regulation to the Commission. When a Member State has fulfilled all its obligations resulting from this directive, it can proceed with the adoption of its final draft.

According to Article 10 of Directive 98/34, if a Member State amends the draft text after its initial notification in accordance with a Commission request and with a view to removing an obstacle to the free movement of services or the freedom of establishment of service operators, it will not have to notify the draft again. However, Article 8 of Directive 98/34 stipulates that the Member State shall re-notify the draft technical regulation when changes made to the draft have the effect of *inter alia* adding specifications or requirements, or making the latter more restrictive. In this respect, Member States need to be aware of the potential legal consequences of an omitted notification, i.e. the non-applicability of the rules in question <sup>(1)</sup>.

After the adoption of the technical regulation, the procedure under Directive 98/34 is finalised. This is however without any prejudice to the possibility for the Commission to initiate infringement proceedings, as appropriate.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> See judgment of the European Court of Justice in Case C-194/94 *CIA Security* and in Case C-443/98 *Unilever*.



(Verzjoni Maltija)

**Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-000167/12  
lill-Kunsill**

**Simon Busuttil (PPE)**

(20 ta' Jannar 2012)

Suġġett: L-UE u l-Lega Għarbija

Fil-laqgħa tal-Kunsill tal-Hamis, 1 ta' Diċembru 2011, il-ministri tal-affarijiet barranin tal-UE sostnew li l-UE kienet lesta li "tesplora modi li jagħtu lid-djalogu UE-Lega Għarbija format aktar viżibbli u ta' impenn".

Il-Kunsill kif qiegħed jippjana li jmexxi din l-inizjattiva "l quddiem fid-dawl tal-bidliet li gābet magħha r-Rebbiegħa Għarbija?

F'dan il-kuntest, il-Kunsill xi rwol jipprevedi għall-uffiċċju ta' kollaborazzjoni UE-Lega Għarbija f'Malta?

**Tweġiba**

(26 ta' Marzu 2012)

Fid-dawl tal-avvenimenti fid-dinja Għarbija u l-Mediterran tan-Nofsinhar, l-Unjoni Ewropea u l-Lega tal-Istati Għarab (LAS) iddeċidew li jirrieżaminaw l-istat tar-relazzjoni tagħhom. L-UE hija tal-istess opinjoni tas-Segretarjat Ġenerali tal-LAS, is-Sur Nabil al-Araby, li r-relazzjonijiet aktar mill-qrib bejn iż-żewġ organizzazzjonijiet ser jgħinu fil-kontribut għas-sigurtà reġjonali, l-istabbiltà u l-prosperità.

F'dan l-isfond, fit-23 ta' Jannar 2012, il-Kunsill issottolinja l-appoġġ tiegħu għall-isforzi tal-Lega Għarbija biex ittemm iċ-ċiklu ta' vjolenza fis-Sirja, u biex tintbagħat il-missjoni tagħha ta' monitoraġġ. Dan jinkludi it-twaqqif ta' sala ta' kontroll għida tal-Lega Għarbija għal rispons f'hin reali għal diżastri naturali jew krizijiet politiċi li fihom is-Segretarjat tal-LAS ser ikollu rwol x'jaqdi.

Minbarra appoġġ politiku u operattiv aktar immedjat, l-UE u l-Lega Għarbija dahlu wkoll f'diskussjonijiet rigward il-kooperazzjoni medja u fit-tul tagħhom fl-oqsma ekonomiċi, soċjali, edukattivi, kulturali u legali. Uħud mill-proġetti li jirriżultaw jistgħu jinvolvu l-implimentazzjoni mill-Uffiċċju ta' Kollegament UE-Lega Għarbija f'Malta. Bhalissa din il-hidma qed issir mill-punti fokali permanenti li ġew maħtura riċentement fis-Servizz Ewropew għall-Azzjoni Esterna u l-Lega Għarbija.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000167/12  
to the Council**

**Simon Busuttil (PPE)**

(20 January 2012)

*Subject:* The EU and the Arab League

At the Council meeting held on Thursday, 1 December 2011, EU foreign ministers stated that the EU was ready to 'explore ways of giving the EU-Arab League dialogue a more visible and engaged format'.

How is Council planning to take this initiative forward in the light of the changes brought about by the Arab Spring?

In this context, what role does the Council foresee for the EU-Arab League liaison office in Malta?

**Reply**

(26 March 2012)

Given the events across the Arab world and the Southern Mediterranean, the European Union and the League of Arab States (LAS) have decided to review the state of their relationship. The EU shares the view of the LAS Secretary General, Mr Nabil al-Araby, that closer relations between the two organisations will help contribute to regional security, stability and prosperity.

Against that background, on 23 January 2012 the Council underlined its support for the Arab League's efforts to end the cycle of violence in Syria, and for the deployment of its monitoring mission. This includes the setting up of a new Arab League situation room for real time response to natural disasters or political crises in which the LAS Secretariat will have a role to play.

In addition to more immediate political and operational support, the EU and the Arab League have also engaged in discussions regarding their medium and long-term cooperation in the economic, social, educational, cultural and legal fields. Some of the resulting projects may involve implementation by the EU-Arab League Liaison Office in Malta. This work is currently being undertaken by the permanent focal points which were recently designated within the European External Action Service and the Arab League.

---

(Verzjoni Maltija)

**Mistoqsija ghal twegiba bil-miktub E-000168/12**  
**lill-Kummissjoni**  
**Simon Busuttill (PPE)**  
(20 ta' Jannar 2012)

Suġġett: Liberalizzazzjoni tal-viża — il-Brażil

Waq t il-laqgħa tal-Kumitat għal-Libertajiet Ċivili, il-Gustizzja u l-Intern tal-Parlament Ewropew fil-5 ta' Diċembru 2011, l-Ambaxxatur tal-Brażil għall-UE, l-Eċċellenza Tiegħu Ricardo Neiva Tavares, gie mistoqsi meta l-Brażil se tirratifika l-ftehim dwar l-eżenzjoni mill-viża għall-passaporti ordinarji li jippermetti liċ-ċittadini tal-Estonja, il-Latvja, Malta u Ċipru li jivvjaġġaw lejn il-Brażil mingħajr viża.

L-Ambaxxatur wieġeb li din id-deċiżjoni issa tinsab f'idejn il-Kungress Nazzjonali tal-Brażil biss.

Peress li l-Parlament Ewropew approva dan il-ftehim fi Frar 2011 u s-sitwazzjoni attwali qiegħda tohloq konfużjoni għaċ-ċittadini dwar jekk jeħtiġux viża jew le biex jidhlu l-Brażil, x'mizuri beħsiebha tiegħu l-Kummissjoni biex tikkonvinċi lill-awtoritajiet Brażiljani biex jikkonkludu din il-kwistjoni malajr kemm jista' jkun u biex jonoraw ukoll l-impenji tagħhom dwar ir-reċiproċità f'dan il-qasam?

**Twegiba mogħtija mis-Sra Malmström f'isem il-Kummissjoni**  
(16 ta' Frar 2012)

Il-Kummissjoni heġġet lill-awtoritajiet tal-Brażil sabiex jizguraw ir-ratifika mghaġġla tal-ftehim għall-eżenzjoni mill-viża bejn l-UE u l-Brażil għal dawk il-persuni li għandhom passaport ordinarju għall-okkażjonijiet kollha u fil-livelli kollha, inkluż għal waqt it-13 il-Kumitat Kongunt UE-Brażil li seħh fl-1 ta' Lulju 2011 u waqt is-Samit UE-Brażil tal-4 ta' Ottubru 2011. Fil-kuntatti tagħha mal-awtoritajiet Brażiljani, il-Kummissjoni enfasizzat l-importanza li l-UE tagħti lir-ratifika kemm jista' jkun malajr mill-Brażil tal-ftehim għall-eżenzjoni mill-viża, u enfasizzat li s-sitwazzjoni attwali mhix aċċettabli għaladarba ċittadini ta' erba' Stati Membri (Ċipru, l-Estonja, il-Latvja u Malta) għadhom suġġetti għall-obbligu ta' visa mill-Brażil bi ksur tal-prinċipju ta' reċiproċità.

Il-Kummissjoni kienet infurmata li l-ftehim għall-eżenzjoni mill-viża kien trażmess mill-awtoritajiet Brażiljani lill-Kungress Nazzjonali, għalkemm b'dewmien twil, fit-30 ta' Settembru 2011. Il-Kummissjoni se tkompli ssegwi din il-kwistjoni mill-qrib u hija fiduċjuża li l-awtoritajiet Brażiljani jonoraw l-impenji tagħhom.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000168/12  
to the Commission  
Simon Busuttill (PPE)  
(20 January 2012)**

*Subject:* Visa liberalisation — Brazil

During the meeting of the European Parliament's Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs on 5 December 2011, the Ambassador of Brazil to the EU, His Excellency Ricardo Neiva Tavares, was asked when Brazil would ratify the visa waiver agreement for ordinary passports which will enable citizens of Estonia, Latvia, Malta and Cyprus to travel into Brazil without a visa.

The Ambassador replied that this decision is now solely up to Brazil's National Congress.

Since the European Parliament approved this agreement in February 2011 and the current state of play is creating confusion for citizens over whether they need a visa or not to enter Brazil, what measures does the Commission intend to take to persuade the authorities in Brazil to finalise this issue as soon as possible and also to honour their commitments on reciprocity in this area?

**Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission  
(16 February 2012)**

The Commission has urged the authorities of Brazil to ensure a speedy ratification of the EU-Brazil visa waiver agreement for ordinary passport holders on every occasion and at all levels, including at the 13th EU-Brazil Joint Committee held on 1 July 2011 and at the EU-Brazil Summit on 4 October 2011. In its contacts with the Brazilian authorities, the Commission has emphasised the importance which the EU attaches to having the visa waiver agreement ratified by Brazil as soon as possible and stressed that the current situation is not acceptable as citizens of four Member States (Cyprus, Estonia, Latvia and Malta) are still subject to the visa obligation by Brazil in breach of the reciprocity principle.

The Commission was informed that the visa waiver agreement was transmitted by the Brazilian authorities to the National Congress, albeit with a long delay, on 30 September 2011. The Commission will continue to follow this issue very closely and trust that the Brazilian authorities will honour their commitments.

---

*(Nederlandse versie)*

**Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-000169/12  
aan de Commissie  
Frank Vanhecke (EFD)  
(18 januari 2012)**

*Betreft:* Europese hulp naar Palestijnse gebieden

Kan de Commissie mij meedelen hoeveel Europese financiële hulp naar de Palestijnse gebieden is gevloeid in 2011?

**Antwoord van de heer Füle namens de Commissie  
(13 maart 2012)**

In 2011 bedroeg de totale EU-hulp aan bezet Palestijns gebied en de Palestijnse bevolking (met inbegrip van de bijdragen aan de Organisatie van de VN voor hulpverlening aan Palestijnse vluchtelingen (UNRWA)) 441,09 miljoen EUR. Dit cijfer omvat niet alleen middelen van het Europees nabuurschaps- en partnerschapsinstrument, maar ook humanitaire hulp van de EU, steun in het kader van het stabiliteitsinstrument en thematische begrotingslijnen voor bijstand aan het maatschappelijk middenveld.

---

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-000169/12  
to the Commission  
Frank Vanhecke (EFD)  
(18 January 2012)**

*Subject:* European aid to the Palestinian territories

Can the Commission say how much financial aid the European Union granted to the Palestinian territories in 2011?

**Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission  
(13 March 2012)**

The total EU aid given to the occupied Palestinian territory and to the Palestinian people (including contributions to the UN Relief and Works Agency (UNRWA) for the benefit of Palestine refugees) amounted to EUR 441.09 million in 2011. This figures includes funds not only from the European Neighbourhood and Partnership Instrument but also EU humanitarian assistance, support under the Instrument for Stability and also thematic budget lines providing assistance to civil society.

---

(Nederlandse versie)

**Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-000170/12**  
**aan de Commissie**  
**Frank Vanhecke (EFD)**  
(18 januari 2012)

*Betreft:* Dienstreizen commissarissen in 2011

Kan de Commissie mij een overzicht geven van de dienstreizen van alle commissarissen gedurende 2011?

Meer in het bijzonder zou ik graag voor elke commissaris een overzicht willen hebben van de reisbestemmingen, de duur van de reis, de reden van de reis, de activiteiten van de betreffende commissaris in het land van bestemming, en de kostprijs van al haar of zijn dienstreizen, met inbegrip van de kostprijs van de delegatie die de betreffende commissaris vergezelt.

**Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-000744/12**  
**aan de Commissie**  
**Frank Vanhecke (EFD)**  
(31 januari 2012)

*Betreft:* Dienstreizen Europese commissarissen in 2011

Kan de Commissie mij een overzicht geven van de dienstreizen van al de Europese commissarissen gedurende 2011?

Meer in het bijzonder zou ik graag voor elke Europese commissaris een overzicht willen hebben van de reisbestemmingen, de duur van de reis, de reden van de reis, de activiteiten van de betreffende commissaris in het land van bestemming, en de kostprijs van al haar of zijn dienstreizen, met inbegrip van de kostprijs van de delegatie die de betreffende commissaris vergezelt.

**Antwoord van de heer Šefčovič namens de Commissie**  
(28 februari 2012)

De cijfers over dienstreizen gemaakt in 2011 zijn terug te vinden in het begrotingsverslag van de Commissie van november 2011 (december nog niet beschikbaar) via de volgende link:  
<http://www.cc.cec/budg/bud/finrep/financial-reports-2011-en.html>  
(per beleidsterrein, hoofdstuk 25, begrotingsonderdeel 25 01 02 13).

Krachtens artikel 317 van het Verdrag betreffende de werking van de Europese Unie, voert de Commissie de begroting van de Europese Unie uit. Het Europees Parlement heeft kwijtingsbevoegdheid en de begrotingsuitvoering wordt gecontroleerd door de Rekenkamer.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000170/12  
to the Commission  
Frank Vanhecke (EFD)  
(18 January 2012)**

*Subject:* Commissioners' missions in 2011

Can the Commission provide an overview of the missions for all Commissioners during 2011?

More specifically, I would like to have for each Commissioner an overview of the destinations, the duration of the trip, the reason for the trip, the activities of the Commissioner concerned in the country of destination, and the cost of all of his or her missions, including the cost of the delegation accompanying the Commissioner.

**Question for written answer E-000744/12  
to the Commission  
Frank Vanhecke (EFD)  
(31 January 2012)**

*Subject:* European Commissioners' missions in 2011

Can the Commission provide me with an overview of the missions carried out by all the European Commissioners in 2011?

More specifically, I would like an overview for each Commissioner of the destinations, the duration of the mission, the reason for the mission, the activities of the Commissioner concerned in the country of destination, and the cost of all her or his missions, including the cost of the delegation that accompanied the Commissioner concerned.

**Joint answer given by Mr Šefčovič on behalf of the Commission  
(28 February 2012)**

The figures for mission expenses during 2011 (December not yet available) are available in the Commission's budget report of November 2011 via the following link:

<http://www.cc.cec/budg/bud/finrep/financial-reports-2011-en.html>  
(by policy area item, Chapter 25, budgetary line 25 01 02 13).

Pursuant to Article 317 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, the Commission implements the budget of the European Union and is subject to the budget discharge authority of the European Parliament and to the audit of the Court of Auditors.

---



(Deutsche Fassung)

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-000171/12**  
**an die Kommission**  
**Cornelia Ernst (GUE/NGL)**  
(18. Januar 2012)

*Betrifft:* Soft- und Hardware zu Überwachungszwecken bei Europol

Europol will zum *World-class centre of excellence* auch im IT-Bereich werden. Europol nutzt laut seinem Jahresbericht (*Europol Review*) hierfür diverse digitale Überwachungstechnologien und bietet die Nutzung eines *24/7 operational centre* an. Über die Funktionsweise der Anwendungen und technischen Dienstleistungen ist wenig bekannt. Bürgerrechtler und Bürgerrechtlerinnen, netzpolitische Aktivisten und Aktivistinnen, Anwälte und Anwältinnen, soziale Bewegungen und Parlamentarier und Parlamentarierinnen müssen hierzu jedoch einen Einblick erhalten. Die zunehmend „vorausschauende“ digitale Überwachung setzt die Unschuldsvermutung außer Kraft. Risikoanalysen geraten zum Profiling, wenn auf mehrere Datensätze zugegriffen werden kann.

1. Welche computergestützten Anwendungen für Vorgangsverwaltung, Ermittlungs- oder Analysezwecke, Data-Mining oder Bildersuche in polizeilichen oder im Internet zugänglichen Datensätzen kommen bei der EU-Polizeiagentur Europol zum Einsatz? Bitte Namen und Details nennen.
2. Welche technischen Dienstleistungen oder Kapazitäten werden vom *24/7 operational centre* der EU-Agentur Europol entwickelt und angeboten, und für welche Angelegenheiten können diese genutzt werden?
3. Über welche technischen und organisatorischen Funktionalitäten verfügen die *mobile offices*, die *powerful mobile office solution* und die *expert-operated mobile toolkit for computer data forensics*, und wo sind diese in der Regel stationiert oder eingesetzt?
4. Über welche weitere „forensische Ausrüstung“ verfügt Europol wie im Jahresbericht 2010 angegeben?
5. Wie viele *mobile phone scanners* welcher Hersteller bevorratet die Agentur, und wie ist deren Nutzung geregelt?
6. Wie ist die technische Funktionsweise des Werkzeugs zur Analyse sozialer Netzwerke (*SNA tool*), das 2009 bei der *Operation Most 25* Verdächtige aus 1 Million überwachter Telefongespräche extrahierte?
7. Welche Anwendungen sind gemeint, die Europol im Jahresbericht 2010 mit *state-of-the-art facility to extract and analyse crime-related information from digitised data* bewirbt?

**Antwort von Frau Malmström im Namen der Kommission**  
(15. Februar 2012)

1. *I2* für Analysen und Datamining, *Themis* für Textmining und *Open text* für die Dokumentenverwaltung. Das SIENA-System für einen sicheren Informationsaustausch und das Europol-Informationssystem wurden intern entwickelt.
2. Das Einsatzzentrum von Europol bearbeitet sämtliche eingehenden Anfragen und gibt eine erste Antwort auf operative Anfragen mit Vorschlägen für mögliche Einsätze.
3. Das MO<sup>(1)</sup> ist ein gesicherter Laptop, über den Europolkräfte von jedem beliebigen Standort aus auf ihre Informations- und Analysensysteme zugreifen können.
4. Europol unterzieht speziell angefertigte und industriell hergestellte Geräte, die bei der Herstellung oder in Lagern sichergestellt wurden, technischen Untersuchungen. Mit dem EILCS<sup>(2)</sup>-System werden fotografische und technische Informationen über Herstellungs- und Lagerorte sowie Deponien von synthetischen Drogen analysiert, um Übereinstimmungen zwischen Geräten, Stoffen und Chemikalien feststellen zu können.
5. Europol verfügt derzeit über zwei solcher Geräte, die von CELLEBRITE hergestellt wurden. Nur speziell ausgebildete Europol-Bedienstete dürfen diese Geräte benutzen. Sie dienen ausschließlich der forensischen Untersuchung von sichergestellten Mobiltelefonen und werden nur eingesetzt, wenn dies von einer zuständigen nationalen Behörde im Einklang mit einzelstaatlichem Recht beantragt wurde.

<sup>(1)</sup> Mobile Office.

<sup>(2)</sup> „Europol Illicit Laboratory Comparison System“.

6. Die Europol-Analysten verwenden akademische Software und einen speziellen Analyserahmen, um Netzkomponenten, Subnetze und Schnittpunkte zu analysieren, Zentralität zu ermitteln und die wichtigsten Akteure herauszufiltern. Mit Hilfe dieser Technik können die wesentlichen Merkmale krimineller Netze ermittelt werden. Beispielsweise lassen sich mit einem der verwendeten Freeware-Tools (Pajek) bis zu 10 Millionen Objekte bearbeiten. Die Kommunikationsdaten der Operation Most wurden auf diese Weise analysiert.

7. Das Forschungs- und Entwicklungslabor für Computer-Forensik verfügt u. a. über eine Entschlüsselungsplattform. Es werden verschiedene Anwendungen verwendet, darunter X-ways, FTK und ENCASE.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000171/12  
to the Commission**

**Cornelia Ernst (GUE/NGL)**

(18 January 2012)

*Subject:* Software and hardware for surveillance purposes at Europol

Europol intends to become a world-class centre of excellence, not least in IT. According to its annual report, Europol uses various digital surveillance technologies for this purpose and offers the use of a 24/7 operational centre. Little is known about the function of the applications and technical services. Civil rights activists, network activists, lawyers, social movements and parliamentarians must, however, obtain insight into this. Increasing 'anticipatory' digital surveillance invalidates the presumption of innocence. Risk analyses lead to profiling when multiple records can be accessed.

1. What computerised applications are used at the Europol EU police agency for process management, investigation or analysis purposes, data mining or image searches in police or Internet-accessible records? Please give names and details.
2. What technical services or capacities are developed and offered by the Europol EU agency's 24/7 operational centre and in what areas can they be used?
3. What technical and organisational functionalities are the mobile offices, the powerful mobile office solution and the expert-operated mobile toolkit for computer data forensics equipped with and where are these normally stationed or used?
4. What additional 'forensic equipment' does Europol have at its disposal as stated in the 2010 annual report?
5. How many mobile phone scanners and from which manufacturer does the agency stock and how is its usage regulated?
6. What is the technical functioning of the tool for the analysis of social networks (SNA tool), which extracted 25 suspects out of 1 million monitored telephone conversations during Operation Most in 2009?
7. What applications are meant, which Europol promotes in the 2010 annual report with state-of-the-art facility to extract and analyse crime-related information from digitised data?

**Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission**

(15 February 2012)

1. I2 for analysis and data mining software, *Themis* for text mining packages and *Open text* for the Document Management System. The secure information exchange system (SIENA) and the Europol Information System were developed in-house.
2. The Europol Operational Centre processes all incoming requests and gives a first-level response to any operational request, suggesting possible operational actions.
3. The MO <sup>(1)</sup> is a secure laptop that allows operators to access Europol's information and analysis systems and database from any location.
4. Europol carries out technical investigations of custom-made and industrial equipment seized from production and storage units. The EILCS <sup>(2)</sup> analyses photographic and technical information on synthetic drug production, storage and dump sites, to identify matches between equipment, materials and chemicals.
5. Europol currently has two such devices, provided by Cellebrite. Only specifically trained Europol staff may operate them. They are used solely for forensic examination of seized cell phones and are deployed only on request from a competent national authority, in compliance with national legislation.

<sup>(1)</sup> Mobile Office.

<sup>(2)</sup> Europol Illicit Laboratory Comparison System.

6. Europol's analysts use academic software tools and a specific analytical framework that consists of components, sub-groups, cut points, centrality and key player measures. The technique helps identify the main characteristics of criminal network structures. For example, one of the freeware tools used (Pajek) can handle up to 10 million entities. The analysis of communication data in Operation Most used this method.
  
  7. The research and development laboratory for computer forensics includes amongst others a decryption platform. Several applications are used such as X-ways, FTK and Encase.
-

(Versiunea în limba română)

**Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris P-000174/12**  
**adresată Consiliului**  
**Silvia-Adriana Țicău (S&D)**  
(16 ianuarie 2012)

*Subiect:* Președinția daneză a UE— Ridicarea barierelor pentru lucrătorii români și bulgari

Libertatea de circulație a persoanelor constituie una dintre libertățile fundamentale garantate de tratate, acest lucru incluzând dreptul cetățenilor UE de a trăi și de a lucra în alt stat membru.

Președinția daneză a Consiliului UE și-a propus ca pe perioada mandatului său să consolideze dimensiunea socială a unei economii europene integrate în piața unică. Având în vedere că încrederea în piața unică și libera circulație a serviciilor trebuie să fie consolidată prin respectarea drepturilor lucrătorilor, Președinția daneză și-a propus să consolideze aplicarea directivei care reglementează detașarea lucrătorilor și pentru a face clar faptul că drepturile lucrătorilor și ale întreprinderilor în ceea ce privește libera circulație au statut egal.

Aș dori să întreb Președinția daneză a Consiliului care sunt măsurile concrete pe care le are în vedere pentru asigurarea liberei circulații a forței de muncă în cadrul UE, în special pentru ridicarea barierelor pentru lucrătorii români și bulgari?

**Răspuns**  
(5 martie 2012)

Libertatea de circulație a persoanelor constituie una dintre libertățile fundamentale garantate de tratat și de legislația secundară. Aceasta include dreptul cetățenilor UE de a trăi și de a lucra în alt stat membru.

În ceea ce privește restricțiile temporare prevăzute de tratatele de aderare, trebuie amintit faptul că este la latitudinea fiecărui stat membru al UE-25 care aplică încă restricții în urma aderării din 2007 să evalueze impactul asupra propriei piețe a forței de muncă și să decidă în ceea ce privește continuarea sau diminuarea restricțiilor rămase. Tratatul de aderare nu conferă Consiliului sau Președinției competența de a lua inițiativa în vederea extinderii accesului lucrătorilor români și bulgari la piețele forței de muncă ale statelor membre. Cu toate acestea, Consiliul a invitat statele membre care continuă să aplice restricții în temeiul măsurilor tranzitorii prevăzute în tratatele de aderare să ridice restricțiile în cea de a treia etapă, dacă nu se poate determina că există perturbări grave ale piețelor forței de muncă ale statelor membre în cauză sau amenințarea unor astfel de perturbări <sup>(1)</sup>.

Majoritatea statelor membre care au menținut restricțiile și-au simplificat procedurile sau au redus restricțiile în privința unor sectoare/profesii. În orice caz, restricțiile în cea de a treia etapă a măsurilor tranzitorii se pot aplica până la 31 decembrie 2013 <sup>(2)</sup>.

<sup>(1)</sup> 6480/09.

<sup>(2)</sup> <http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=508&langId=en>.

(English version)

**Question for written answer P-000174/12  
to the Council**

**Silvia-Adriana Țicău (S&D)**

(16 January 2012)

*Subject:* Danish EU Presidency — Lifting labour market barriers to Bulgarians and Romanians

The freedom of circulation of people represents one of the fundamental liberties guaranteed by treaties and it includes the right of EU citizens to live and work in another Member State.

The Danish Presidency of the EU Council has set out to strengthen the social dimension of an integrated single market economy in Europe during its mandate. Considering that trust in the single market and freedom of circulation of services must be reinforced by respecting the rights of workers, the Danish Presidency has set out to consolidate the enforcement of the directive regulating relocation of workers in order to clarify as well that with regards to freedom of circulation, workers' rights and companies' rights have an equal status.

I would like to ask the Danish Presidency of the Council what actual measures it has in view in order to ensure free circulation of labour within the EU and particularly to lift the labour market barriers to Romanian and Bulgarian workers.

**Reply**

(5 March 2012)

Freedom of movement for persons is one of the fundamental freedoms guaranteed by the Treaty and the secondary legislation. This includes the right of EU citizens to live and work in another Member State.

As for the temporary restrictions provided by the Accession Treaties, it is to be recalled that it is up to each EU-25 Member State still applying restrictions following the 2007 accession to assess the impact on its labour markets and to decide whether to continue or to ease the remaining restrictions. Accession treaties do not give a power to the Council or the Presidency to take the initiative in order to spread the access to the labour markets of Member States to Romanian and Bulgarian workers. However, the Council has invited those Member States that continue to apply restrictions under the transitional arrangements set out in the accession treaties to lift restrictions in the third phase if serious disturbances to the labour markets of the Member States concerned, or a threat thereof, cannot be established <sup>(1)</sup>.

Most of the Member States that have maintained restrictions have simplified their procedures or have reduced restrictions in some sectors/professions. In any case, restrictions in the third phase of the transitional arrangements may apply until 31 December 2013 at the latest <sup>(2)</sup>.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> 6480/09.

<sup>(2)</sup> <http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=508&langId=en>.

(Versión española)

**Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000175/12  
a la Comisión**

**Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)**

(24 de enero de 2012)

*Asunto:* Modificación del canon digital

El nuevo Gobierno del Estado español ha modificado, mediante Real Decreto-Ley 20/2011 de 30 de diciembre, el canon digital cuya aplicación indiscriminada había sido declarada ilegal por el Tribunal de Justicia de la Unión Europea en octubre de 2010 con la sentencia del Asunto Padawan (cuestión prejudicial del Asunto C-467/08). El nuevo ejecutivo suprime el sistema de compensación equitativa por copia privada previsto en la Ley de Propiedad Intelectual —conocido popularmente como «canon digital»— que no era conforme con el Derecho comunitario y ahora establece un procedimiento de pago de la compensación con cargo a los Presupuestos. Este esquema de compensación por copia privada es similar al que prevé Noruega desde hace años como alternativa exitosa al obsoleto y discriminatorio sistema de cánones por copia privada. El 23 de noviembre de 2011, el Comisario Barnier anunció la designación de António Vitorino para actuar como mediador en el proceso de diálogo sobre la reforma de los cánones por copia privada para desarrollar durante la primera mitad de 2012, que tiene como objetivo establecer las bases para tomar acciones legislativas a nivel de la Unión sobre la copia privada. Asimismo, el 11 de enero de 2012, la Comisión Europea adoptó la Comunicación sobre comercio electrónico y otros servicios en línea, que anuncia una iniciativa legislativa sobre los cánones por copia privada en 2013.

El procedimiento de mediación y la iniciativa legislativa correspondiente ¿tienen como objetivo excluir la posibilidad de que los Estados miembros puedan decidir cuál es el sistema más adecuado para compensar por la copia privada e imponer forzosamente un sistema de cánones por copia privada como única alternativa posible de compensación?

¿Se trata de una iniciativa legislativa que tiene por objetivo modificar la Directiva 2001/29/CE, dejando sin efecto la jurisprudencia del TJUE, que ha puesto freno a los abusos que venían siendo cometidos en la definición y gestión de la compensación por copia privada? ¿Se trata, por el contrario, de que cualquier desarrollo legislativo sobre el canon por copia privada se fundamente en la jurisprudencia existente sobre la Directiva 2001/29/CE y la respete?

¿Cómo piensan asegurar que no se paga compensación alguna por la copia de obras que se encuentran en el dominio público o las que se realizan con la autorización de los titulares de derechos en el ejercicio de su derecho exclusivo de reproducción?

**Respuesta del Sr. Barnier en nombre de la Comisión**

(5 de marzo de 2012)

La Comisión saluda con satisfacción el cambio legislativo aludido por Su Señoría. Como se establece en la disposición adicional décima del Real Decreto-Ley 20/2011, de 30 de diciembre de 2011, el procedimiento de pago de una compensación equitativa se establecerá reglamentariamente. Puesto que la reglamentación correspondiente todavía no ha sido promulgada, la Comisión no puede aún analizar el nuevo sistema vigente en España ni opinar sobre su compatibilidad con el ordenamiento de la UE, en particular con la Directiva 2001/29/CE.

De acuerdo con la Directiva 2001/29/CE, los Estados miembros pueden establecer excepciones al derecho de reproducción en concepto de copia privada siempre que los titulares de derechos obtengan una compensación equitativa. Pero en lo relativo a la forma y los medios para lograr dicha compensación, la Directiva es neutral. El TJUE dictaminó, en el Asunto C-467/08, que los Estados miembros disponen «de la facultad [...] para determinar, dentro de los límites impuestos por el Derecho de la Unión y, en particular, por la propia Directiva [la Directiva 2001/29/CE], la forma, las modalidades de financiación y de percepción y la cuantía de dicha compensación equitativa». Parece, por lo tanto, que los Estados miembros pueden determinar un sistema de compensación equitativa basado en pagos procedentes de los presupuestos del Estado.

Si el sistema de compensación concebido por España se ajusta o no a las exigencias de la normativa de la UE es algo que sólo podrá dilucidarse una vez se adopte el reglamento correspondiente. La Comisión no puede, por ello, dictaminar sobre la opción escogida por el Gobierno español, tanto si el sistema de compensación equitativa por copia privada se basa en pagos con cargo a los presupuestos del Estado, o si se confía a la sociedad perceptora SGAE la función de hacer llegar las aportaciones del Estado a los titulares de derechos. Tampoco puede la Comisión comentar acerca de la oportunidad, desde el punto de vista económico, de tal elección.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000175/12  
to the Commission**

**Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)**

(24 January 2012)

*Subject:* Amendment to the digital levy

The new Spanish Government has amended, by Royal Legislative Decree 20/2011 of 30 December, the digital levy, indiscriminate application of which had been declared illegal by the Court of Justice of the European Union in October 2010 in its judgment on the Padawan Case (preliminary ruling on Case No C-467/08). The new Executive scraps the system of fair compensation for private copying, provided for in the Intellectual Property Law and popularly known as the 'digital levy', which did not comply with Community law, and now establishes a procedure for payment of compensation to be made from the budget. This private copying compensation scheme is similar to the one that has existed in Norway for some years as a successful alternative to the outdated and discriminatory system of private copying levies. On 23 November 2011, Commissioner Barnier announced the appointment of António Vitorino as mediator in the dialogue on the reform of private copying levies, to be carried out in the first half of 2012 with the aim of establishing the bases for taking legislative action on private copying at European Union level. On 11 January 2012, the European Commission adopted the communication on e-commerce and other online services, which announces a legislative initiative on private copying levies in 2013.

Are the mediation process and the corresponding legislative initiative intended to exclude the possibility of Member States deciding on the most suitable system to compensate for private copying, and to forcibly impose a system of private copying levies as the only possible type of compensation?

Does this legislative initiative aim to amend Directive 2001/29/EC, thus annulling the ECJ case-law which has curbed abuses being committed in the definition and management of compensation for private copying? Or does it mean, on the contrary, that all legislative developments regarding the private copying levy are based on the existing case-law for Directive 2001/29/EC, and will respect it?

How will the Commission ensure that no compensation is paid for copying works in the public domain, or for copying carried out with the authorisation of rights holders in the exercise of their exclusive right of reproduction?

**Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission**

(5 March 2012)

The Commission acknowledges the legislative change in Spain referred to by the Honourable Member. As stipulated in Additional Provision 10 of Royal Legislative Decree 20/2011 of 30 December 2011, the procedure for the payment of the fair compensation will be set out in a regulation. As this regulation has not yet been adopted, the Commission is at this stage not in the position to carry out an analysis of the new Spanish system and to express an opinion as to its compatibility with EC law, in particular Directive 2001/29/EC.

According to Directive 2001/29/EC Member States may provide for a private copying exception to the reproduction right on the condition that rightholders obtain fair compensation. The directive is neutral with respect to the form and means chosen to ensure fair compensation. The CJEU held in Case C-467/08 that Member States may 'determine, within the limits imposed by European Union law in particular by that directive [i.e. Directive 2001/29/EC], the form, detailed arrangements for financing and collection, and the level of that fair compensation'. It therefore seems that Member States may provide for a system of fair compensation based on payments from state funds.

Whether the compensation system envisaged by Spain complies with the requirements of EC law can, however, only be assessed after the adoption of the abovementioned regulation. The Commission is therefore not in a position to give an opinion on the policy choice of the Spanish Government to base the system of fair compensation for private copying on state funds or the possibility that the collecting society SGAE could be entrusted with the task of remitting the state funds to rightholders. Neither is the Commission in a position to comment on the economic legitimacy of this choice.



(Deutsche Fassung)

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-000177/12  
an die Kommission**

**Klaus-Heiner Lehne (PPE)**

(18. Januar 2012)

*Betrifft:* Tariftreue- und Vergabegesetz Nordrhein-Westfalen — TVgG — NRW

Das vom Landtag Nordrhein-Westfalen am 21.12.2011 verabschiedete Gesetz über die Sicherung von Tariftreue und Sozialstandards sowie fairen Wettbewerb bei der Vergabe öffentlicher Aufträge sieht in § 4 eine Tariftreuepflicht vor. Danach können öffentliche Aufträge nur an Unternehmen vergeben werden, die sich bei Angebotsabgabe durch Erklärung gegenüber dem öffentlichen Auftraggeber schriftlich verpflichten, ihren Arbeitnehmerinnen und Arbeitnehmern gewisse sich unter anderem aus Tarifverträgen ergebende Mindestarbeitsbedingungen einschließlich eines Mindestentgelts zu gewähren.

Im Hinblick auf die Rechtsprechung des Europäischen Gerichtshofs zu Tariftreue Regelungen (vgl. zum Beispiel das Ruffert-Urteil, Rs. C-346/06) ist unter anderem fraglich, ob die Tariftreue- und Mindestlohnregelung mit der Dienstleistungsfreiheit vereinbar ist. Es besteht insbesondere die Gefahr, dass Bieter aus anderen EU-Mitgliedstaaten durch die Regelung mittelbar oder unmittelbar diskriminiert werden.

Ist das Gesetz über die Sicherung von Tariftreue und Sozialstandards sowie fairen Wettbewerb bei der Vergabe öffentlicher Aufträge (Tariftreue- und Vergabegesetz Nordrhein-Westfalen — TVgG — NRW) und insbesondere dessen § 4 nach Ansicht der Kommission mit EU-Recht vereinbar?

**Antwort von Herrn Andor im Namen der Kommission**

(29. März 2012)

Die Kommission möchte dem Herrn Abgeordneten mitteilen, dass das Tariftreue- und Vergabegesetz Nordrhein-Westfalen (TVgG-NRW) am 26. Januar 2012 veröffentlicht wurde und am 1. Mai 2012 in Kraft treten wird. Die Kommission hat bislang nur eine erste Prüfung vorgenommen. Demnach unterscheidet sich Artikel 4 TVgG-NRW offensichtlich maßgeblich von der fraglichen Bestimmung des Ruffert-Urteils des Gerichtshofs der EU vom 3. April 2008 (C-346/06), das nicht allgemein verbindliche Tarifverträge im Bausektor betraf. Nach Artikel 4 Absatz 1 TVgG-NRW muss der Bieter das Mindestentgelt gewähren, das durch einen für allgemein verbindlich erklärten Tarifvertrag vorgegeben wird. In Artikel 4 Absatz 3 TVgG-NRW wird darüber hinaus dieses Mindestentgelt gesetzlich genau vorgeschrieben.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000177/12  
to the Commission  
Klaus-Heiner Lehne (PPE)  
(18 January 2012)**

*Subject:* Collective Agreement and Public Procurement Act, North Rhine-Westphalia — TVgG — NRW

Article 4 of the law adopted by the Landtag of North Rhein-Westphalia on 21 December 2011 on safeguarding collective agreements, social standards and fair competition in the awarding of public contracts makes provision for an obligation to comply with collective bargaining agreements. Accordingly, public contracts can only be awarded to companies which, on issuing an invitation to tender, undertake in writing, through declaration to the contracting authority, to guarantee to their employees specific minimum working conditions, including a minimum wage, prescribed, amongst other things, by collective agreements.

With regard to the case-law of the Court of Justice on collective agreement regulations (cf. for example, the *Rüffert* judgment, Rs. C-346/06), it is questionable whether the collective agreement and minimum wage regulation is compatible with the freedom to provide services. In particular there is a danger of direct or indirect discrimination against providers from other EU Member States.

Does the Commission believe that the law on safeguarding collective agreements, social standards and fair competition in the awarding of public contracts (Collective Agreement and Public Procurement Act, North Rhine-Westphalia — TVgG — NRW), and in particular Article 4 of this act, is compatible with EC law?

**Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission  
(29 March 2012)**

The Commission would like to inform the Honourable Member that the Collective Agreement and Public Procurement Act of North Rhein-Westphalia (TVgG — NRW) was published on 26 January 2012 and will enter into force 1 May 2012. So far, the Commission has only carried out a preliminary analysis. On that basis, it appears that Article 4 TVgG — NRW is significantly different from the provision at stake in the *Rüffert* judgment of the Court of Justice of the EU of 3 April 2008 (C-346/06) which referred to non-universally binding collective agreements in the construction sector. Article 4(1) TVgG NRW requires the bidder to comply with the minimum wages set by universally applicable collective agreements. Moreover, Article 4(3) TVgG NRW sets a concrete minimum wage by law.

---

(Deutsche Fassung)

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-000178/12**

**an die Kommission**

**Franz Obermayr (NI)**

(18. Januar 2012)

**Betrifft:** Einheitliche Sicherheitsstandards bei der Aluminiumerzeugung

Laut WWF existieren in Ungarn weitere Absatzbecken der Aluminiumerzeugungsindustrie, die wie in Kolontár eine ungenügende und unsachgemäße Bauweise aufweisen. Die geschätzten 55 Millionen Kubikmeter Rotschlamm in Ungarn bedrohen die Umwelt. Die Giftaufangbecken werden von Experten und dem WWF als einfache und unzureichend abgedichtete Erdwälle bezeichnet und sind oft aus Platzmangel unsachgemäß erhöht. Durch auftretende Risse und Lecks können Schwermetalle wie z. B. Arsen und Quecksilber austreten und die umliegenden Böden verschmutzen. Jeder einzelne Regen schwemmt die Gifte noch weiter aus, die Flüsse und das Grundwasser werden kontaminiert. Die Folgen eines weiteren Dammbruchs wären für Mensch und Umwelt verheerend. Als Beispiel für weitere hochgefährliche Anlagen gelten die Giftschlammdeponie Almásfüzitő in Ungarn und das rumänische Aluminiumwerk Tulcea. Da Rotschlamm nicht schon von Beginn der Betriebsgenehmigungen an als „gefährlicher Abfall“ klassifiziert worden ist, waren und sind sämtliche Rechtsvorschriften der EU und die Kontrollen des bei der Aluminiumproduktion entstehenden hoch alkalischen Schlamms unzureichend (siehe Bergbau-Richtlinie 2006/21/EG). Daraus ergeben sich folgende Fragen:

1. Warum gilt nach Meinung der Kommission diese Art von Rotschlamm, der bei der Aluminiumerzeugung anfällt, nicht als Sondermüll im europäischen Abfallkatalog, was der WWF schon seit Langem bemängelt?
2. Wie gedenkt die Kommission die Sicherheitsstandards für die Abfallentsorgung in der Bergbauindustrie anzupassen, um Unfälle wie in Kolontár oder die Umweltkatastrophe in Baia Mare zu verhindern?
3. Rotschlamm wird laut EU-Vorgaben trotz seiner stark ätzenden Wirkung und der vielen enthaltenen Giftstoffe nicht als hochgradig gefährlich eingestuft. Wie schätzt die Kommission mehr als ein Jahr nach dem schrecklichen Unglück in Kolontár die besagte Richtlinie heute ein, und welche Erkenntnisse gibt es bis zum heutigen Tag?
4. Wenn die EU-Mitgliedstaaten laut Antwort der Kommission vom 14. April 2011 auf meine Anfrage E-000925/2011 in vollem Umfang für alle Maßnahmen verantwortlich sind, die zur Überwachung, Inspektion, Sanierung und Sicherheit der Bergbaudeponien erforderlich sind — welche Möglichkeiten sieht die Kommission dennoch, um in den Mitgliedstaaten Maßnahmen gegen nicht ausreichende und ungenügend kontrollierte Dammkonstruktionen und gegen ein unsachgemäßes Management der Absetzanlagen sowie eine ausreichende behördliche Kontrolle einzufordern?

**Antwort von Herrn Potočník im Namen der Kommission**

(28. Februar 2012)

1. und 3. Welche Art Rotschlamm von der Aluminiumindustrie erzeugt wird, ist abhängig von der Technologie, die in einer Anlage zum Einsatz kommt. Ohne eine genaue Bewertung des Verfahrens und der Zusammensetzung des Rotschlammes ist es nicht angebracht, diesen grundsätzlich als „gefährlich“ einzustufen.

2. und 4. Die Richtlinie 2006/21/EG über die Bewirtschaftung von Abfällen aus der mineralgewinnenden Industrie<sup>(1)</sup> wurde insbesondere erlassen, um den Erfahrungen aus dem Unglück von Baia Mare Rechnung zu tragen. Damit sich ein solches Unglück nicht wiederholt, muss diese Richtlinie unbedingt vorschriftsmäßig und genau angewandt werden. Die Kommission unternimmt große Anstrengungen, um für die vollständige Anwendung der Richtlinie durch die Mitgliedstaaten zu sorgen, etwa durch die Erarbeitung von Leitlinien zur Inspektion dieser Art von Anlagen.

<sup>(1)</sup> ABL L 102 vom 11.4.2006.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000178/12  
to the Commission  
Franz Obermayr (NI)  
(18 January 2012)**

*Subject:* Uniform safety standards in aluminium production

According to the WWF, extensive sediment basins of the aluminium manufacturing industry such as those in Kolontár are of inferior and inappropriate construction. An estimated 55 million cubic meters of red mud in Hungary are a threat to the environment. Experts and the WWF characterise the toxin collection basins as simple and inadequately sealed earth levees that are frequently inappropriately raised in height due to a lack of space. As a result of breaches and leaks, heavy metals, such as arsenic and mercury leak and contaminate the surrounding soils. Every time it rains the toxins are washed even further, and rivers and groundwater become contaminated. The consequence of a further levee break would be catastrophic for humans and the environment. The toxic mud deposit in Almásfüzitő in Hungary and the Romanian aluminium plant in Tulcea are considered examples of additional highly hazardous facilities. Since the red mud was not already classified as 'hazardous waste' when the operating licenses were issued, all the legal regulations of the EU and the checks of the highly concentrated alkaline mud that forms during aluminium manufacture are insufficient (see Mining Waste Directive 2006/21/EC).

1. In the opinion of the Commission, why is this type of red mud, which occurs during aluminium manufacture, not considered a special mud in the European Waste Catalogue, something that the WWF has criticised for a long time?
2. In what way does the Commission envisage adapting the safety standards for waste removal in the mining industry in order to prevent accidents like the one in Kolontár or the environmental catastrophe in Baia Mare?
3. According to EU requirements, red mud is not classified as highly hazardous despite its highly corrosive effects and the many toxic compounds it contains. How does the Commission assess the abovementioned guideline today, more than one year after the terrible accident in Kolontár, and what data exist today?
4. If the EU Member States are fully responsible in accordance with the Commission's reply of 14 April 2011 to my Question E-000925/2011 for all measures required for the monitoring, inspection, cleanup and safety of the mining industry deposits, what scope does the Commission nevertheless see for demanding that the Member States take steps against insufficiently and poorly monitored levee constructions and the inexpert management of the sediment facilities and adequate government control?

**Answer given by Mr Potočník on behalf of the Commission  
(28 February 2012)**

1 and 3. The type of red mud produced by the aluminium industry depends on the technology in place in each installation. Without a proper assessment of the process and of the composition of the red mud it is disproportionate to classify them a priori as 'hazardous'.

2 and 4. Directive 2006/21/EC on the management of extractive waste <sup>(1)</sup> was adopted notably to take into account the lessons learnt from the Baia Mare accident. A proper and full application of the directive is essential to avoid this kind of accident. The Commission is making substantial efforts to ensure the full implementation of the directive by Member States, for instance through the development of guidance on inspection for this type of facility.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ L 102, 11.4.2006.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-000180/12**  
**προς την Επιτροπή**  
**Marietta Giannakou (PPE)**  
(18 Ιανουαρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Δημόσια έργα και χρηματοδότηση στην Ελλάδα για το έτος 2012

Λόγω της δύσκολης οικονομικής συγκυρίας στην Ελλάδα και των αρνητικών προβλέψεων για την ανάπτυξη της για το έτος 2012, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Έχει καταρτίσει κατάλογο με τα δημόσια έργα (οδοποιία, υποδομές, λιμάνια κλπ.) που σκοπεύει να χρηματοδοτήσει εντός του έτους 2012 στην ελληνική επικράτεια;
2. Αν ναι, ποιο θα είναι το ποσοστό της συγχρηματοδότησης για κάθε προβλεπόμενο δημόσιο έργο ξεχωριστά.

**Απάντηση του κ. Hahn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής**  
(22 Φεβρουαρίου 2012)

Η Επιτροπή παραπέμπει τον κύριο βουλευτή στην απάντησή της στη γραπτή ερώτηση E-012655/11 <sup>(1)</sup>.

---

(<sup>1</sup>) <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/home.jsp>

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-000180/12  
to the Commission**

**Marietta Giannakou (PPE)**

*(18 January 2012)*

*Subject: Public works and financing in Greece for 2012*

In light of the harsh economic situation in Greece and the negative growth forecasts for 2012, will the Commission say:

1. Has it drawn up a list of public works (road works, infrastructure, ports etc.) which it intends to finance in Greece in 2012?
2. If so, what will be the rate of co-financing for each envisaged public works project, individually?

**Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission**

*(22 February 2012)*

The Commission would like to refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-012655/11 <sup>(1)</sup>.

\_\_\_\_\_

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/home.jsp>

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-000181/12**  
**προς την Επιτροπή**  
**Marietta Giannakou (PPE)**  
(18 Ιανουαρίου 2012)

**Θέμα:** Ευρωπαϊκή Κεντρική Τράπεζα και ελληνικά κρατικά ομόλογα

Διαθέτει η Επιτροπή αναλυτικά στοιχεία σχετικά με τον ακριβή αριθμό ελληνικών ομολόγων και την αξία τους που έχει στη κατοχή της η Ευρωπαϊκή Κεντρική Τράπεζα (ΕΚΤ), μέσω των παρεμβάσεων της στη δευτερογενή αγορά ομολόγων; Επιπλέον, διαθέτει στοιχεία για τον αριθμό των ελληνικών κρατικών ομολόγων που κατέχει η ΕΚΤ υπό την μορφή collateral εγγυήσεων των ελληνικών τραπεζών;

**Απάντηση του κ. Rehn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής**  
(8 Μαρτίου 2012)

Η Ευρωπαϊκή Κεντρική Τράπεζα δεν δημοσιεύει λεπτομερή κατανομή των ομολόγων που διακρατεί τα οποία έχει αγοράσει στη δευτερογενή αγορά, ούτε των ενεχύρων που λαμβάνει από τις τράπεζες σε πράξεις αναχρηματοδότησης. Πληροφορίες σχετικά με εκκρεμή οφειλόμενα ποσά που αντιστοιχούν σε αγορασθείσες από την ΕΚΤ καλυμμένες ομολογίες (στο πλαίσιο των προγραμμάτων αγοράς καλυμμένων ομολογιών) και κρατικά ομόλογα (στο πλαίσιο του προγράμματος για την αγορά κινητών αξιών) σε συγκεντρωτικό επίπεδο παρατίθενται στον ακόλουθο σύνδεσμο:  
<http://www.ecb.int/mopo/implement/omo/html/index.en.html>

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-000181/12  
to the Commission**

**Marietta Giannakou (PPE)**

*(18 January 2012)*

*Subject:* European Central Bank and Greek Government bonds

Does the Commission have any detailed information regarding the precise number and value of Greek bonds held by the European Central Bank (ECB) through its interventions in the secondary bond market? In addition, does it have any information on the number of Greek Government bonds held by the ECB in the form of collateral guarantees of Greek banks?

**Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission**

*(8 March 2012)*

The European Central Bank does not publish a detailed breakdown of its bond holdings purchased in secondary markets and of the collateral it receives from banks in refinancing operations. Information about the ECB's outstanding amounts purchased of covered bonds (under the Covered Bond Purchase Programmes) and sovereign bonds (under the Securities Market Programme) at an aggregated level can be found under the following link: <http://www.ecb.int/mopo/implement/omo/html/index.en.html>

---



(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000183/12  
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)**

**Syed Kamall (ECR)**

(18 January 2012)

*Subject:* VP/HR — Nigerian Same-Sex Marriage (Prohibition) Bill

I have received a letter from a constituent who is concerned at the victimisation of the lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and inter-sex community in Nigeria by the Same-Sex Marriage (Prohibition) Bill 2011, which is proceeding through the Nigerian Parliament. Among many discriminatory measures, the Bill would criminalise any display of affection by persons in same-sex amorous relationships.

Will the High Representative/Vice-President be expressing to the Nigerian Government the EU's concerns at the human rights violations that would be brought about by the passing of this Bill into law?

**Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission**

(9 March 2012)

The draft legislation is a matter of great concern. It is at odds with Nigeria's international human rights obligations. If passed into law, it would constitute a serious threat to human rights — with consequences well beyond the LGBT community — since criminal penalties are proposed for anyone who supports the registration, operation and sustenance of gay societies, organisations, processions or meetings. The Honourable Members can be assured that the HR/VP will continue to work actively on this situation, in line with the EU's toolkit to promote and protect the enjoyment of all human rights by LGBT people

The EU Delegation in Abuja, and the local EU human rights working group (composed of representatives from the diplomatic missions of EU Member States there), have been actively monitoring developments, in contact with civil society organisations. On 13 October 2011 a meeting was held between the EU Delegation and the Chair of the Senate Committee on Judiciary, Human Rights and Legal Affairs; and on 6 December the Head of Delegation, joined by the United States Ambassador, met with the Chair of the Justice Committee of the House of Representatives.

The subject was raised at the local informal human rights dialogue on 3 February 2012, and it was on the agenda for the EU-Nigeria Ministerial meeting on 8 February 2012.

---

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-000184/12  
to the Commission  
Syed Kamall (ECR)  
(18 January 2012)**

*Subject:* EU regional housing policy

I have been contacted by a constituent who is concerned at the lack of resources for building new houses in parts of the EU with higher levels of employment and at the number of empty properties in other parts of the Union.

Does the Commission have any policy or plan to spend resources on incentivising residents of the EU to move to empty properties and to stimulate economically depressed areas?

**Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission  
(23 February 2012)**

The Commission has no competency in setting up policy or plans to spend resources in order to provide incentives for residents move to empty properties and to stimulate economically depressed areas. However, housing expenditure is eligible for co-financing from the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) 2007-2013 under the following specific circumstances:

- expenditure on energy efficiency improvements and on the use of renewable energy in existing housing shall be eligible up to an amount of 4 % of the total ERDF allocation;
  - expenditure on housing within the framework of an integrated approach for marginalised communities in urban and rural areas.
-

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000185/12  
to the Commission  
Syed Kamall (ECR)  
(18 January 2012)**

*Subject:* Compensation for medical treatment

I have been contacted by a constituent who would like to find out more information about claiming compensation from the UK National Health Service (NHS) under Article 56 of the Lisbon Treaty. She tells me that this is on account of medical treatment she received in Germany.

My constituent tells me that her Primary Care Trust (PCT) does not know which is the correct compensation form, and that her general practitioner (GP) does not know how to complete the form which he has received from the PCT.

Could the Commission confirm:

1. what healthcare is provided for EU citizens under Article 56?
2. whether it knows who is responsible in the UK as regards the issue of the correct claim form, who should complete the form, where the form should be submitted and what the procedure is for approving and making payments?
3. whether it knows what arrangements are in place to provide advice and support to GPs completing such forms?
4. whether it has any further advice for my constituent on how to make a compensation claim for an operation she has paid for?

**Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission  
(22 February 2012)**

The Court of Justice of the European Union's case law on Article 56 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union sets out the principle that patients are entitled to receive reimbursement from their home Member State for treatment received in another Member State, if that treatment is one which they would have been entitled to receive in their home Member State.

Under the case law, the patient's entitlement to reimbursement is limited to either the actual cost of treatment, or the cost of that treatment in their home system (whichever is the lower).

Member States may also require patients to seek prior authorisation before travelling abroad for treatment for certain treatments: care requiring an overnight stay, or requiring the use of highly-specialised and cost-intensive infrastructure or medical equipment.

Whilst these are current legal obligations, Directive 2011/24/EU <sup>(1)</sup> on the application of patients' rights in cross-border healthcare codifies and supplements the case law of the Court of Justice of the European Union and is due to be transposed by Member States by 25 October 2013.

The Commission is not able to provide detailed advice on how the United Kingdom has currently implemented the case law. The Commission would advise the Honourable Member to contact the United Kingdom's Department of Health <sup>(2)</sup>.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ L 88, 4.4.2011.

<sup>(2)</sup> <http://www.dh.gov.uk/en/Healthcare/Entitlementsandcharges/OverseastreatmentguidanceforNHS/index.htm>

(Versión española)

**Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000189/12**  
**a la Comisión**  
**Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE)**  
(18 de enero de 2012)

*Asunto:* Problemática con implantes mamarios PIP

La crisis desatada en toda Europa por la utilización de implantes de silicona PIP para operaciones de cirugía estética mamaria, que afecta en todo el continente a decenas de miles de mujeres, ha puesto de actualidad tanto el informe de la Comisión Europea sobre implantes mamarios elaborado en 2001 como la propuesta aprobada por el Parlamento en torno a ese documento el 21 de enero de 2003. Ambas actuaciones tuvieron su origen en quejas y reclamaciones de mujeres que habían sufrido lesiones o problemas de salud a consecuencia de malas prácticas quirúrgicas o de mala calidad en las prótesis e implantes empleados en las mismas.

En concreto y tras estas quejas se modificó la clasificación de las prótesis mamarias en el marco de la Directiva de productos sanitarios mejorando la información que debía incluirse en el etiquetado de estos implantes y la que debía suministrarse a las pacientes. Igualmente se animaba a los Estados miembros a compartir los resultados de las medidas de control y seguimiento que se adoptasen para poder efectuar una evaluación a nivel de la Unión de las incidencias registradas en este tipo de operaciones. Por todo ello quisiéramos saber:

1. ¿Dispone la Comisión de datos globales sobre la incidencia de esta crisis en los países de la Unión? Si es así ¿podría ofrecer datos desglosados por número de prótesis defectuosas implantadas, Estados en los que se localizan las incidencias, número de mujeres afectadas, plazo medio de duración de las prótesis defectuosas y tipología de los centros en que se implantaban?
2. Del análisis de los datos disponibles ¿qué Estados miembros han sido más sensibles y receptivos a las sugerencias de la Comisión y cuales no lo han sido en absoluto?
3. ¿Hay alguna orientación comunitaria para responder con criterios homogéneos a esta crisis?
4. A la vista de lo ocurrido, ¿contempla la Comisión la posibilidad de modificar la normativa en vigor para mejorar el control de calidad de los implantes y obligar a los Estados miembros a efectuar un seguimiento pormenorizado de los postoperatorios?
5. ¿Qué opina la Comisión sobre la puesta en marcha de un registro europeo que recogiese datos sobre el tipo de intervención y seguimiento postoperatorio además de sobre empresas suministradoras de implantes profesionales habilitados para realizar las intervenciones y centros en que pueden llevarse a cabo con garantías?

**Respuesta del Sr. Dalli en nombre de la Comisión**  
(20 de febrero de 2012)

La Comisión está siguiendo el asunto con gran atención y está en contacto con las autoridades nacionales competentes. Los Estados miembros comunican actualizaciones periódicas de la situación y de las recomendaciones que hacen a las mujeres con implantes mamarios PIP.

Estos implantes estaban disponibles en casi todos los Estados miembros, y se utilizaron sobre todo en el Reino Unido (40 000 mujeres), Francia (30 000), España (10 000) y Alemania (7 500).

La tasa de ruptura de este tipo de implantes varía entre los Estados miembros ya que, en la actualidad, no existe una legislación a escala de la UE que contemple la notificación obligatoria por parte de los profesionales sanitarios, por lo cual varían las disposiciones al respecto, especialmente en el ámbito de la cirugía estética, en el que tanto se han utilizado los implantes mamarios PIP.

La Comisión pidió al Comité Científico de los Riesgos Sanitarios Emergentes y Recientemente Identificados un dictamen sobre la seguridad de los implantes mamarios PIP. Este dictamen se adoptó el 1 de febrero de 2012 y está publicado en el sitio web de la Comisión Europea (<sup>1</sup>). La Comisión ha pedido al Comité Científico que siga investigando a fondo la cuestión, y a los Estados miembros que compartan los datos de que dispongan, para que podamos proceder a la mejor evaluación posible de los riesgos que constituyen dichos implantes.

(<sup>1</sup>) [http://ec.europa.eu/health/scientific\\_committees/emerging/docs/scenih\\_r\\_o\\_034.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/health/scientific_committees/emerging/docs/scenih_r_o_034.pdf)

Además, la Comisión estudiará con los Estados miembros cómo reforzar inmediatamente la vigilancia de los productos sanitarios en el marco legislativo existente y está preparando un plan de medidas de aplicación inmediata, en 2012, sobre la base de la actual legislación.

En paralelo, se está escrutando la legislación sobre productos sanitarios para determinar la mejor manera de abordar, en la revisión de este marco ya prevista para 2012, los interrogantes que este asunto plantea.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000189/12**  
**to the Commission**  
**Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE)**  
(18 January 2012)

*Subject:* Problem with PIP breast implants

The crisis caused throughout Europe by the use of PIP silicone implants for cosmetic breast surgery, affecting tens of thousands of women across the continent, has called attention to both the European Commission report on breast implants, drawn up in 2001, and to the proposal adopted by Parliament regarding this document on 21 January 2003. In both cases, action was triggered by complaints and claims from women who had suffered injuries or health problems as a result of surgical malpractice or poor-quality prostheses and implants used in the surgery.

In particular, following these complaints the classification of mammary prostheses was changed within the framework of the directive on medical devices, improving the information that must be included in the labelling of these implants and that must be provided to patients. Member States were also encouraged to share the results of the control and monitoring measures adopted in order to evaluate incidents recorded in this type of operation at European Union level. In light of the above, we would like to know:

1. Does the Commission have overall data on the incidence of this crisis in the European Union Member States? If so, could it provide data broken down by the number of defective prostheses implanted, Member States in which incidents have occurred, number of women affected, average duration of the defective prostheses and types of centres in which these were implanted?
2. According to analysis of the available data, which Member States have been most sensitive and receptive to the Commission's suggestions and which not at all?
3. Is there any Community guidance on responding to this crisis with uniform criteria?
4. In the light of what has happened, is the Commission considering the possibility of amending current legislation to improve quality control of implants and to oblige Member States to carry out a detailed follow-up of postoperative patients?
5. What is the Commission's opinion on implementing a European register to gather data about types of operation and postoperative follow-up, implant supplier companies, professionals qualified to carry out operations and centres where they can be carried out with guarantees?

**Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission**  
(20 February 2012)

The Commission is following the case with great attention and is in contact with national competent authorities. Member States provide regular updates on their situation, and on the recommendations made to women who have PIP breast implants.

These implants were available in nearly all Member States, but they were mainly used in the United Kingdom, France, Spain and Germany, where respectively 40 000, 30 000, 10 000 and 7 500 women were implanted.

The rupture rate of these implants varies between the Member States since, currently, there is no EU obligation for healthcare professionals to report and therefore, reporting obligations vary, especially in the field of aesthetic surgery where the PIP breast implants were widely used.

The Commission has asked the Scientific Committee on Emerging and Newly Identified Health Risks for its opinion on the safety of the PIP breast implants. This opinion has been adopted on 1 February 2012 and is published on the European Commission website<sup>(1)</sup>. The Commission has asked the Scientific Committee to continue its in-depth scientific investigation into the matter and has asked Member States to share their data in order to us to reach the best possible assessment of the risks posed by PIP implants.

<sup>(1)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/health/scientific\\_committees/emerging/docs/scenihhr\\_o\\_034.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/health/scientific_committees/emerging/docs/scenihhr_o_034.pdf)

In addition, the Commission will discuss with the Member States how surveillance of the medical devices can be reinforced immediately within the existing legislative framework. It is preparing a plan for immediate actions to be implemented on the basis of the present legislation in the course of 2012.

In parallel a stress test of the legislation on medical devices is being conducted in order to identify how best the questions raised by this issue can be addressed in the revision of this framework already foreseen for 2012.

---

(Wersja polska)

**Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-000190/12  
do Komisji**

**Jarosław Leszek Wałęsa (PPE)**

(18 stycznia 2012 r.)

*Przedmiot:* Pakiet portowy III i jego wpływ na gospodarkę morską w Unii Europejskiej

W ostatnim czasie powraca na forum europejskim debata na temat funkcjonowania portów w ramach gospodarki morskiej UE, czyli tzw. Ports Package III oraz chęć wprowadzenia koncesji w portach UE.

Dla funkcjonowania gospodarki Unii Europejskiej – swobodnego przepływu pasażerów, obsługi towarów handlu zagranicznego, rozwoju bardziej ekologicznych form transportu – porty morskie mają dziś kluczowe znaczenie.

Komisarz Siim Kallas zapowiedział, że w 2013 r. zostanie ogłoszony pakiet propozycji mających na celu zwiększenie konkurencyjności portów, tzw. Ports Package III. Jak wiemy, po szerokich konsultacjach społecznych dwa poprzednie pakiety zostały odrzucone.

Poprzedni Ports Package II w głosowaniu w Parlamencie Europejskim w 2006 r. dostał 532 głosy przeciw i 120 głosów za. Głównymi wadami projektu były:

- znaczne zmniejszenie bezpieczeństwa inwestycji. Inwestycje w portach są niezwykle kosztowne, a okres ich zwrotu jest bardzo długi. Projekt zakładał znaczne ograniczenie czasowe dostępu do źródła zarobkowania, np. infrastruktury portowej – dzierżawy na 8 do maksymalnie 30 lat. Przed podobnym problemem stanęliby również inni usługodawcy, np. przedsiębiorstwa holownicze;
  - zezwolenie na dokonywanie prac wyładunkowych w portach przez załogi statków, co znacznie zmniejszyłoby bezpieczeństwo pracy i postawiłoby europejskich dokerów w niekorzystnej sytuacji wobec nowej konkurencji – utrata miejsc pracy na rzecz nisko opłacanych marynarzy z krajów trzeciego świata, w praktyce likwidacja firm stevedorskich;
  - podejście „jeden rozmiar jest dobry dla wszystkich”: próba opracowania reguł obowiązujących wszystkie porty, od gigantów przeładowujących miliardy ton po małe przystanie.
1. Istnieją poważne obawy, że podobnymi wadami obciążony będzie również Ports Package III. Dlatego chciałbym dowiedzieć się, czy w ramach pracy nad nową propozycją Komisja wyciągnęła wnioski z porażki Ports Package II oraz co do tej pory Komisja zrobiła w celu udoskonalenia zawartości pakietu?
  2. Na jakim etapie znajdują się teraz prace nad pakietem oraz czy zapowiadane na 2012 rok społeczne konsultacje i ich wyniki zostaną szeroko uwzględnione w końcowym projekcie?

**Odpowiedź udzielona przez Wiceprzewodniczącego Siima Kallasa w imieniu Komisji**

(15 lutego 2012 r.)

We wrześniu 2011 r. Komisja ogłosiła zamiar dokonania przeglądu kierunków polityki portowej, które ustalono po raz ostatni w roku 2007<sup>(1)</sup>. Planowany przegląd polityki będzie obejmował przeprowadzenie szeroko zakrojonych konsultacji z zainteresowanymi stronami oraz kompleksowej oceny skutków.

Zgodnie ze strategią „Europa 2020” celem Komisji jest zapewnienie wkładu sektora portowego na rzecz długoterminowego zrównoważonego wzrostu gospodarki UE i tworzenia nowych miejsc pracy. Przegląd powinien również przyczynić się do skutecznej realizacji zrewidowanych unijnych wytycznych<sup>(2)</sup> dotyczących rozwoju transeuropejskiej sieci transportowej (TEN-T). Wytyczne przewidują wzmocnienie roli portów morskich w zakresie wdrożenia nowych sieci TEN-T (kompleksowej i bazowej), które obejmują około 400 portów w 22 przybrzeżnych państwach członkowskich UE.

Wnioski, jakie Komisja wyciągnęła z odrzucenia w 2006 r. tzw. „pakietu portowego II”, zostały wyjaśnione w 2007 r. w komunikacie w sprawie europejskiej polityki portowej. Wnioski te zostaną uwzględnione na potrzeby rozpoczętego w 2011 r. przeglądu polityki.

<sup>(1)</sup> Komunikat Komisji w sprawie europejskiej polityki portowej, COM(2007) 616 wersja ostateczna z 18.10.2007.

<sup>(2)</sup> Wniosek dotyczący rozporządzenia Parlamentu Europejskiego i Rady, COM(2011) 650/2 z 19.10.2011.



Komisja rozpoczęła już prace przygotowawcze dotyczące przeglądu polityki, inicjując ocenę skutków oraz przeprowadzając szereg spotkań z zainteresowanymi stronami. Warsztaty mające na celu przedstawienie wstępnych ustaleń Komisji zainteresowanym stronom odbędą się przed latem 2012 r.

Wynik końcowy i treść ewentualnego nowego wniosku(-ów), które planuje się na 2013 r., zostaną ustalone z pełnym uwzględnieniem konsultacji i konkluzji wynikających z oceny skutków.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000190/12  
to the Commission**

**Jarosław Leszek Wałęsa (PPE)**

(18 January 2012)

*Subject:* Port Package III and its impact on the maritime economy in the European Union

Recently, there has been a debate at European level about the operation of ports within the EU maritime economy (the so-called Port Package III), and the wish to introduce licences in EU ports.

Sea ports are nowadays vital for the functioning of the EU economy — free movement of passengers, international goods trade, development of more environmentally friendly forms of transport.

Commissioner Siim Kallas has announced that a new package will be published in 2013 containing proposals aiming to increase the competitiveness of ports. This is the so-called Port Package III. As we know, following broad public consultation, two previous packages were rejected.

The earlier Port Package II received 532 votes against and 120 votes for in the European Parliament in 2006. The main disadvantages of that project included:

- a significant reduction in investment security. Port investments are particularly costly and their payback period is very long. The project anticipated a significant time limitation in terms of access to the source of earnings, e.g. the port infrastructure — a lease of between eight and a maximum of 30 years. Other service providers, e.g. towage firms, would also face a similar problem;
  - authorisation for unloading work in ports to be carried out by ship crew, which would significantly reduce work safety and put European dockers in an unfavourable situation with regard to the new competition, entailing the loss of jobs to Third World sailors, whose pay is much lower, which in practice would mean the elimination of stevedoring companies;
  - the 'one-size-fits-all' approach: an attempt to develop binding rules for all ports, from huge ports handling billions of tons of cargo to small harbours.
1. There are serious concerns that Port Package III will have similar drawbacks. Therefore, I would like to know whether during the work on the new proposal the Commission drew conclusions from the failure of Port Package II, and what the Commission has done so far to improve the contents of the package.
  2. What stage has work on the package reached? Will the public consultations to be held in 2012 and the results thereof be widely considered in the final project?

**Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission**

(15 February 2012)

In September 2011, the Commission announced its intention to review the EU Ports Policy orientations, which were established last time in 2007 <sup>(1)</sup>. The intended policy review will involve extensive consultation with interested parties and a comprehensive impact assessment exercise.

In line with the Europe 2020 strategy, the Commission objective is to ensure the contribution of the port sector to the long-term sustainable growth of the EU economy and to the creation of jobs. The review should also contribute to the successful implementation of the revised Union guidelines <sup>(2)</sup> for the development of the trans-European transport network (TEN-T). The guidelines foresee a reinforced role of maritime ports for the implementation of the new TEN-T comprehensive and the core networks, which include some 400 ports in the 22 coastal Member States of the EU.

The conclusions that the Commission drew from the rejection in 2006 of the so-called Port Package II were explained in 2007, in the communication on a European Ports Policy. Those conclusions will be taken into account for the purposes of the policy review exercise started in 2011.

<sup>(1)</sup> Communication from the Commission on a European Ports Policy, COM(2007) 616 final of 18.10.2007.

<sup>(2)</sup> Proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and the Council, COM(2011) 650/2 of 19.10.2011.

The Commission has already started the preparatory work of the policy review, launching an impact assessment study and conducting a number of meetings with the stakeholders. A workshop for presenting the preliminary findings of the Commission to the interested parties will be held before summer 2012.

The final result and the content of the possible new proposal(s), which are planned for 2013, will be determined taking full account of the consultations and conclusions of the impact assessment exercise.

---

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000192/12  
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)**

**Fiorello Provera (EFD)**

(18 gennaio 2012)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Cittadino statunitense condannato a morte in Iran per spionaggio

Il 9 gennaio 2012, diversi media hanno annunciato che un cittadino statunitense di origine iraniana, Amir Mirzai Hekmati è stato condannato a morte con l'accusa, in base a quanto riportato dall'agenzia di stampa semi-ufficiale Fars, di «aver collaborato con un Paese ostile, di essere membro della CIA e di aver tentato di coinvolgere l'Iran nel terrorismo». Il governo iraniano sostiene che, in qualità di ex membro del corpo statunitense dei *marines*, Hekmati era stato addestrato presso le basi USA in Afghanistan e Iraq per essere poi inviato in Iran in una presunta missione di raccolta d'informazioni riservate di *intelligence*. Tuttavia, la famiglia di Hekmati continua a sostenere che il ventottenne si trovava in Iran per visitare i nonni.

Hekmati è stato arrestato in agosto, ma verso la fine di dicembre i media di stato iraniani lo hanno mostrato mentre stava presumibilmente confessando di far parte di un complotto orchestrato a nome dell'Agenzia Centrale di Intelligence Americana (CIA). Secondo quanto riportato dall'agenzia di stampa AFP, la famiglia di Hekmati ha cercato invano di assumere un avvocato iraniano per l'ex *marine*. I famigliari hanno affermato che: «È stato commesso un grave errore e abbiamo autorizzato i nostri rappresentanti legali a stabilire contatti diretti con le autorità iraniane perché trovino una soluzione a questo malinteso». Prima del processo, ai diplomatici svizzeri che gestiscono gli affari diplomatici degli USA è stato negato il consenso a prendere contatti con Hekmati. Il governo statunitense ha richiesto il rilascio dell'ex *marine* sostenendo che le accuse mosse nei suoi confronti «sono false».

Secondo quanto riportato, Hekmati sta venendo processato come iraniano, anche se è nato negli Stati Uniti, perché il governo iraniano non riconosce la sua doppia nazionalità. Al momento, a Hekmati rimangono soltanto venti giorni per presentare appello contro la condanna.

1. Il Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante è a conoscenza del caso di Amir Mirzai Hekmati?
2. Il VP/AR può confermare se l'UE è o meno pronta a invitare le autorità iraniane ad offrire assistenza legale adeguata e a consentire ai diplomatici svizzeri di entrare in contatto con il Signor Hekmati?
3. L'UE sta adottando misure atte a monitorare casi di altri iraniani condannati a morte?
4. Il VP/AR è in grado di fornire informazioni circa le procedure adottate dall'UE al fine di persuadere le autorità iraniane a commutare le pene di morte?

**Risposta data dall'Alto Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione**

(15 marzo 2012)

L'Alto Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Ashton è a conoscenza del caso di Amir Mirzai Hekmati e ha espresso forte preoccupazione per le numerose esecuzioni in Iran, soprattutto nel 2011, anno in cui sono state giustiziate centinaia di persone. L'Alto Rappresentante/Vicepresidente si è detta profondamente turbata dalla mancanza di processi equi in molti di questi casi, in cui gli imputati sono stati privati del diritto d'appello e condannati per reati che, in base agli standard internazionali, non dovrebbero comportare la pena capitale.

Migliaia di persone sono a rischio di esecuzione in Iran, incluso Amir Mirzai Hekmati. In varie occasioni, l'Alto Rappresentante/Vicepresidente ha manifestato grande preoccupazione per tali esecuzioni. In una dichiarazione rilasciata il 5 gennaio 2012, l'Alto Rappresentante/Vicepresidente ha esortato l'Iran, come del resto tutti gli altri Stati che continuano ad applicare la pena di morte, a fermare le esecuzioni pendenti e a introdurre una moratoria, che comprenderebbe anche il caso di Amir Mirzai Hekmati. La rappresentanza locale dell'UE in Iran, assicurata dall'Ungheria e dalla Polonia nel 2011 e dalla Danimarca nel corso del primo semestre del 2012, segue da vicino i casi di pena capitale, mentre l'UE continua a sollevare la questione direttamente con le autorità iraniane a Teheran, a Bruxelles e nelle altre capitali dell'UE, nonché attraverso le organizzazioni multilaterali. L'Alto Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Ashton continuerà pertanto a seguire attentamente il caso di Amir Mirzai Hekmati.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000192/12  
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)**

**Fiorello Provera (EFD)**

(18 January 2012)

*Subject:* VP/HR — US citizen sentenced to death in Iran on charges of espionage

On 9 January 2012, various news media announced that a US citizen of Iranian descent, Amir Mirzai Hekmati, had been sentenced to death on grounds, according to Iran's semi-official Fars news agency, of 'cooperating with a hostile nation, membership of the CIA and trying to implicate Iran in terrorism'. The Iranian government claims that, as a former US marine, Hekmati received training at US bases in Afghanistan and Iraq before being sent to Iran on an alleged intelligence-gathering mission. However, Hekmati's family insists that the 28-year-old was visiting Iran in order to see his grandparents.

Hekmati was arrested in August, but in late December Iranian state media represented him as supposedly confessing to being part of a plot orchestrated on behalf of the American Central Intelligence Agency (CIA). According to the AFP news agency, Hekmati's family have tried in vain to hire an Iranian lawyer for him. They have said that 'a grave error has been committed, and we have authorised our legal representatives to make direct contact with the Iranian authorities to find a solution to this misunderstanding'. Before his trial, Swiss diplomats who handle US diplomatic affairs were refused access to Hekmati. The US government has demanded his release saying that he has been 'falsely accused'.

According to reports, he is being tried as an Iranian, even though he was born in the US, because the Iranian government does not recognise his dual nationality. At present, Hekmati has just twenty days in which to appeal his sentence.

1. Is the Vice-President/High Representative aware of the case of Amir Mirzai Hekmati?
2. Can the VP/HR confirm whether or not the EU is prepared to call on the Iranian authorities to offer adequate legal assistance and grant access for Swiss diplomats to Mr Hekmati?
3. Is the EU taking measures to monitor cases of other Iranians who have been sentenced to death?
4. Is the VP/HR able to offer information on the procedures adopted by the EU in order to persuade the Iranian authorities to commute death sentences?

**Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission**

(15 March 2012)

High Representative/Vice-President (HR/VP) Ashton is well aware of the case of Amir Mirzai Hekmati. She has expressed deep concern regarding the number of individuals executed in Iran, particularly during 2011. Hundreds of individuals were executed last year, and the High Representative/Vice-President was particularly concerned with the lack of fair trials in a number of those cases, whereby defendants were deprived of their right of appeal and sentenced for offences which according to international standards should not result in capital punishment.

Thousands of individuals remain at risk of execution in Iran, including Amir Mirzai Hekmati. HR/VP has, on numerous occasions, expressed her deep concern regarding these executions and in a statement issued on 5 January 2012, called on Iran, as it does on all states which insist on maintaining the death penalty, to halt pending executions and introduce a moratorium. This includes the case of Amir Mirzai Hekmati. The local representation of the EU in Iran, ensured by Hungary and Poland in 2011, and by Denmark during the first semester of 2012, is following death penalty cases very closely, and the EU continues to raise its concerns directly with the Iranian authorities in Tehran, in Brussels, in EU capitals, and through multilateral organisations. HR/VP Ashton will therefore continue to monitor the case of Amir Mirzai Hekmati closely.

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000193/12  
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)**

**Fiorello Provera (EFD)**

(18 gennaio 2012)

Oggetto: VP/HR — operatori umanitari presi di mira in Somalia

All'inizio di gennaio l'organizzazione umanitaria Medici Senza Frontiere (MSF) ha dichiarato che i membri del personale di base in Somalia sono spesso oggetto di attacchi e corrono il rischio di essere sequestrati. Due operatori umanitari di MSF sono stati uccisi agli inizi di gennaio mentre stavano attuando progetti di assistenza di emergenza nella capitale somala di Mogadiscio. Durante il mese di ottobre 2011, due operatori umanitari spagnoli, Montserrat Serra e Blanca Thiebaut sono stati sequestrati dal campo profughi di Dadaab nel nord del Kenya.

MSF opera attivamente in Somalia dal 1991 aiutando entrambe le parti in conflitto. Negli ultimi sei mesi, ha curato 225 000 pazienti in tutta la Somalia, vaccinando 110 000 bambini, nonché occupandosi dei bambini affetti da malnutrizione. Inoltre, MSF offre aiuto ai profughi somali sia in Kenya che in Etiopia. Sfortunatamente, in seguito al peggioramento delle condizioni di sicurezza, molti somali non sono in grado di ottenere gli aiuti umanitari di cui hanno disperatamente bisogno.

Alla fine del 2011, a causa di sequestri e di raid transfrontalieri dei quali era stato accusato il gruppo di miliziani al-Shabaab, le truppe keniate hanno attraversato il confine con la Somalia. Tale gruppo ha reso molto difficili le operazioni delle agenzie umanitarie.

L'Unione europea sta già lavorando per offrire assistenza in risposta alla crisi in Somalia attraverso contributi alla missione dell'Unione africana in Somalia (AMISOM). All'inizio di dicembre, la Commissione ha annunciato di voler offrire altri 50 milioni di euro, per un contributo totale di 258 milioni di euro erogati dal 2007. L'Alto Rappresentante ha dichiarato che «l'UE sta collaborando con l'Unione africana per porre fine alla crisi in Somalia. Tale sostegno ad AMISOM fa parte dell'approccio globale che abbiamo sviluppato in favore del Corno d'Africa in termini di sicurezza e di lotta alla pirateria, aiuto allo sviluppo e aiuti umanitari».

1. Quali passi sono attualmente intrapresi grazie ai contributi dell'UE alla missione AMISOM per garantire la sicurezza degli operatori umanitari che operano in Somalia e nei paesi confinanti?
2. Quali sono alcune delle misure di sicurezza attualmente in vigore?
3. Quali misure stanno prendendo l'UE e AMISOM per garantire che Montserrat Serra e Blanca Thiebaut siano rilasciati in sicurezza?
4. Può il Vice presidente/Alto Rappresentante può confermare se vi siano stati o meno dei progressi a tale fine?

**Risposta data dall'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione**

(17 aprile 2012)

La situazione della sicurezza in Somalia resta grave a causa del conflitto armato in corso e degli attacchi asimmetrici del gruppo Al-Shabaab rivolti anche contro gli operatori umanitari. La sicurezza degli operatori umanitari nazionali e internazionali è una questione della massima importanza per l'UE. Per ridurre i rischi, le agenzie umanitarie adottano tutta una serie di misure precauzionali, principalmente sulla base di una consapevolezza dei rischi e dei principi umanitari di neutralità e indipendenza. In casi estremi, quando sia necessario l'uso di scorte, alcune agenzie ricorrono anche alla AMISOM, che è finanziata dall'UE. Va comunque sottolineato che la AMISOM opera soltanto a Mogadiscio.

Anche se il personale risponde in definitiva alle agenzie umanitarie, l'UE seleziona attentamente i partner di attuazione in Somalia come in ogni altro paese. Le agenzie umanitarie che attuano progetti finanziati dall'UE devono stabilire e sviluppare protocolli di sicurezza per i progetti da realizzare. Inoltre, sono concessi finanziamenti per formare adeguatamente il personale impegnato in contesti pericolosi e anche per usufruire di servizi di consulenza in materia di sicurezza.

Malgrado l'adozione di misure di attenuazione del rischio, i rapimenti in Somalia e nei paesi vicini continuano, come dimostra il caso degli operatori di Médecins Sans Frontières (MSF) Montserrat Serra e Blanca Thiebaut.

MSF si adopera autonomamente a favore del rilascio dei suoi operatori rapiti e non ha chiesto l'intervento dell'UE o il sostegno dell'AMISOM. L'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente non è pertanto in grado di fare commenti sul caso in questione.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000193/12**  
**to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)**  
**Fiorello Provera (EFD)**  
(18 January 2012)

*Subject:* VP/HR — Aid workers targeted in Somalia

In early January, the humanitarian organisation Médecins Sans Frontières (MSF) reported that their staff based in Somalia are frequently subject to attack and face the risk of being kidnapped. Two MSF aid workers were killed in early January while implementing emergency assistance projects in the Somali capital Mogadishu. In October 2011, two Spanish aid workers, Montserrat Serra and Blanca Thiebaut were abducted from Dadaab refugee camp in northern Kenya.

MSF has been active within Somalia since 1991, assisting both sides of the conflict. Over the last six months, it has treated 225 000 patients across Somalia, performed vaccinations on 110 000 children, as well as caring for children suffering from malnutrition. In addition, MSF also provides aid to Somali refugees in both Kenya and Ethiopia. Unfortunately, owing to the deteriorating security situation, many Somalis are unable to obtain the humanitarian assistance they desperately need.

In late 2011, Kenyan troops crossed into Somalia due to kidnappings and cross-border raids blamed on the militant group al-Shabaab. The group has made it very difficult for aid agencies to operate.

The European Union is already working to provide assistance in response to the crisis in Somalia through contributions to the African Union Mission in Somalia (Amisom). In early December, the Commission announced that it would provide a further EUR 50 million to a total contribution of EUR 258 million since 2007. The High Representative stated 'The EU is working with the African Union to bring to an end to the crisis in Somalia. This support to Amisom is part of the comprehensive approach we have developed in support to the Horn of Africa, in terms of security and the fight against piracy, development assistance and humanitarian aid'.

1. Through the EU's contributions to the Amisom mission, what steps are being taking at present to ensure the safety of humanitarian aid workers operating within Somalia and in neighbouring countries?
2. What are some of the current security measures in place?
3. What measures are the EU and Amisom taking in order to secure the safe release of Montserrat Serra and Blanca Thiebaut?
4. Can the Vice-President/High Representative confirm whether any progress has been made to this end?

**Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission**  
(17 April 2012)

The security situation in Somalia remains dire due to continued armed conflict, asymmetrical attacks by Al-Shabaab and the targeting of humanitarian aid workers. The safety of national and international aid workers is of utmost importance to the EU. To mitigate risks, humanitarian agencies make use of a whole set of precautionary measures, primarily on an 'acceptance-basis' building on the humanitarian principles of neutrality and independence. As 'last resort' some agencies also make use of security escorts, wherever appropriate, including by Amisom, which is funded by the EU. However, it should be noted that Amisom only operates in Mogadishu.

While the 'duty of care' of humanitarian personnel ultimately lies with the humanitarian agencies themselves, the EU carries out a thorough selection of implementing partners in Somalia and elsewhere. Humanitarian agencies implementing EU funded projects need to have established and rolled out security protocol for the project(s) to be implemented. In addition, appropriate training for staff operating in unsafe environments and security advisory services are also supported.

Despite risk mitigation measures adopted, kidnapping incidents continue unfortunately to occur in Somalia and neighbouring countries, such as the case of Médecins Sans Frontières (MSF) workers Montserrat Serra and Blanca Thiebaut.



MSF has undertaken independent efforts to achieve the release of its staff; it has not sought EU public advocacy or Amisom support for the release of the kidnapped workers. The HR/VP is not therefore in a position to comment on progress made in this case.

---

(Versión española)

**Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000196/12**  
**a la Comisión**  
**Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE)**  
(18 de enero de 2012)

*Asunto:* Recortes en la inversión I+D+I en España

El pasado 30 de diciembre el recién elegido gobierno de España anunció varias medidas macroeconómicas destinadas a paliar el déficit de sus cuentas públicas. Se trataba de compensar así una desviación en cerca de dos puntos respecto a las previsiones de ahorro que manejaba el ejecutivo anterior. Entre las medidas adoptadas figuran la prórroga de los actuales presupuestos, la congelación de los salarios de los funcionarios y del salario mínimo interprofesional, una subida generalizada del impuesto sobre la renta de las personas físicas (IRPF) y recortes igualmente en programas de inversión. Según publicaban diversos medios de comunicación, dichas medidas fueron aplaudidas por portavoces oficiales de la Comisión Europea.

Reconociendo que es necesario el equilibrio de las cuentas públicas de los Estados miembros, algunos de los recortes practicados tendrán una incidencia negativa sobre las ya débiles expectativas de crecimiento, por la contradicción que algunas de las reducciones de gasto anunciadas tienen con líneas básicas para el desarrollo de la Unión Europea. Tal es el caso del anunciado recorte de 600 millones en los presupuestos destinados a impulsar la inversión en investigación, desarrollo e innovación, que contradicen de plano las líneas maestras marcadas en la Estrategia 2020. Este recorte afecta además a un Estado que fue incapaz de cumplir las previsiones en la materia de la estrategia de Lisboa y que, de acuerdo con el estudio *European Innovation Scoreboard (2005)*, figura entre los países que pierden posiciones en materia de innovación junto a Estonia, Bulgaria, Polonia, Eslovaquia, Rumanía o Turquía, también evaluada en el informe. La tendencia seguía igual en 2009, según respuesta remitida por la Comisión a esta parlamentaria el 31 de agosto de 2010. Corregir esta situación es básico para contribuir a un cambio en el tejido productivo español y mejorar sus opciones de desarrollo. Por ello queremos preguntar:

1. ¿Considera la Comisión que este recorte en la inversión española en I+D+I es también positivo, o matiza sus primeras declaraciones?
2. ¿Considera la Comisión que una iniciativa en este sentido es compatible con un adecuado cumplimiento de los objetivos de la Estrategia 2020 por parte del Estado español?
3. ¿Cree posible la Comisión abordar un proceso de recuperación económica duradero, por mucho que se corrijan los déficits presupuestarios sin un plan ambicioso de reactivación económica, una mejora de las condiciones de financiación de las empresas y una apuesta decidida por la innovación aplicada?

**Respuesta del Sr.Rehn en nombre de la Comisión**  
(20 de marzo de 2012)

En el caso de España, el saneamiento presupuestario es una medida crucial para volver a encauzar las finanzas públicas por la senda de la sostenibilidad. Dicho saneamiento debería ir acompañado de reformas estructurales que permitan recuperar la competitividad y estimular a medio plazo el crecimiento y el empleo. Entre las medidas a adoptar debe figurar el establecimiento de una norma sobre estabilidad presupuestaria que mantenga el crecimiento del gasto público por debajo de la tasa de crecimiento del PIB a medio plazo, estableciendo paralelamente como prioridad la previsión de un gasto sostenible y que incentive el crecimiento en ámbitos tales como la educación, la investigación, la innovación y la energía, como ya se ha destacado en el Estudio Prospectivo Anual sobre el Crecimiento de 2012.

El fomento de la investigación, el desarrollo y la innovación es uno de los objetivos estratégicos centrales de la UE. La Estrategia Europa 2020 sitúa la I+D y la innovación en el núcleo de los cambios que deben conducir al logro de una economía basada en el conocimiento. Durante el Semestre Europeo de 2011, la Comisión reconoció que España precisa un cambio hacia una economía más sostenible y basada en el conocimiento. El logro de un crecimiento y un empleo sostenibles depende considerablemente de la inversión pública y privada en I+D e innovación. Ahora bien, el impulso de la innovación empresarial exige asimismo una mejor coordinación entre los distintos niveles de la Administración, así como el control de la eficacia del gasto. Durante el Semestre Europeo de 2012, la Comisión evaluará los progresos realizados por los Estados miembros y, en su caso, actualizará las recomendaciones encaminadas a apoyar los esfuerzos realizados por los Estados miembros en la aplicación de las reformas.

La Comisión concede un apoyo muy significativo a la innovación y la I+D a través de los Fondos Estructurales. Para el periodo 2007-2013, España obtuvo más de 6 000 millones de euros con cargo al Fondo Europeo de Desarrollo Regional destinados a financiar acciones en estos ámbitos. La Comisión ha propuesto que, en el periodo de programación 2013-2020, la innovación se mantenga como uno de los principales ámbitos de ayuda de la Unión.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000196/12**  
**to the Commission**  
**Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE)**  
(18 January 2012)

*Subject:* Cuts to investment in R+D+I in Spain

On 30 December 2011, the newly-elected Spanish Government announced several macroeconomic measures aimed at remedying the deficits in its public accounts. Through these actions, the government was making up for the nearly two-point discrepancy with the savings forecast by the previous administration. The measures adopted include the extension of current budgets, freezes on government salaries and the national minimum wage, and a general increase in the personal income tax, as well as cuts to investment programmes. Various media outlets reported that official spokespersons of the European Commission applauded the measures.

Whilst recognising the need for Member States' public accounts to be balanced, some of the cuts will have a negative impact on already weak prospects for growth, since some of the spending cuts announced are contradictory to the basic outlines for the development of the European Union. Such is the case with the announced cut of 600 million from the funds allocated to promote investment in research, development, and innovation, flatly contradicting the guidelines laid out in the 2020 strategy. Furthermore, this cut affects a country that was unable to meet the Lisbon strategy's projections in this area and that, according to the European Innovation Scoreboard (2005), is among the countries falling behind when it comes to innovation, together with Estonia, Bulgaria, Poland, Slovakia, Romania or Turkey, which was also evaluated in the report. The trend continued unchanged in 2009, according to the response sent by the Commission to this Member of Parliament on 31 August 2010. Remedying this situation is essential in order to promote a change in Spain's productive structure and improve its options for development.

1. Does the Commission think that this cut in Spain's investment in R+D+I is also positive, or does it qualify its initial statements?
2. Does the Commission think that an initiative of this kind is compatible with the Spanish government's adequately achieving the objectives of the 2020 strategy?
3. Does the Commission think it possible to undertake a lasting economic recovery process, regardless of how much budget deficits may be remedied, without an ambitious economic stimulus plan, an improvement in business credit conditions, and strong support for applied innovation?

**Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission**  
(20 March 2012)

Fiscal consolidation in Spain is critical to bring public finances back on a sustainable path. It should be accompanied by structural reforms to restore competitiveness and boost medium-term growth and employment. These should include a budgetary stability rule that keeps public expenditure growth below medium-term trend GDP growth, while prioritising sustainable, growth-friendly expenditure such as education, research, innovation and energy, as highlighted in the 2012 Annual Growth Survey.

Encouraging research and development and innovation is one of the EU's central policy objectives. Europe 2020 puts R & D and innovation at the heart of the shift towards a knowledge-based economy. During the 2011 European Semester, the Commission acknowledged that Spain needs a change towards a more sustainable and knowledge-intensive economy. Public and private investment in R & D and innovation is important for sustainable growth and employment. But boosting business innovation also requires better coordination between different levels of administration and monitoring of the effectiveness of expenditure. During the 2012 European Semester, the Commission will assess progress made by Member States, and, where appropriate, update recommendations to assist Member States in their reform efforts.

The Commission strongly supports R & D and innovation through structural funds. Over EUR 6 billion from the European Regional Development Fund for 2007-2013 has been allocated to Spain to support actions in this field. For the programming period 2013-2020 the Commission proposed to keep innovation as one of the main fields for EU support.

(Deutsche Fassung)

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-000197/12  
an die Kommission  
Werner Langen (PPE)  
(18. Januar 2012)**

*Betrifft:* Umsetzung des Abkommens zur Zollunion mit der EU durch die Türkei

Die Türkei widersetzt sich anhaltend einer vollständigen Umsetzung des Abkommens zur Zollunion mit der Europäischen Union und damit der Öffnung ihrer Häfen und Flughäfen für Waren aus Zypern.

Welche Schritte wird die Kommission in den ersten Monaten des Jahres 2012 zur Lösung dieser Problematik unternehmen, insbesondere im Hinblick auf die im zweiten Halbjahr 2012 anstehende Ratspräsidentschaft Zyperns?

**Antwort von Herrn Füle im Namen der Kommission  
(13. März 2012)**

Die laufenden Bemühungen um eine Einigung in der Zypern-Frage, die Zypern und der EU insgesamt zugute käme, werden von der Kommission voll und ganz unterstützt. Darüber hinaus erwartet die Kommission von der Türkei, dass diese das Zusatzprotokoll zum Assoziationsabkommen uneingeschränkt anwendet; sie verfolgt die Entwicklungen und steht in regelmäßigem Kontakt zu allen Beteiligten. Gegenwärtig konzentrieren sich die Überlegungen und Bemühungen vor allem auf die Verhandlungen, die im Rahmen der Vereinten Nationen geführt werden, um zu einer umfassenden Lösung der Zypern-Frage zu gelangen.

---

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-000197/12  
to the Commission**

**Werner Langen (PPE)**

*(18 January 2012)*

*Subject:* Implementation by Turkey of the agreement with the EU on the establishment of a customs union

Turkey continues to resist the full implementation of the agreement on a customs union with the European Union, and hence the opening up of its ports and airports to goods from Cyprus.

What steps will the Commission take in the first months of 2012 to resolve this problem, particularly in the light of the fact that Cyprus is due to assume the Presidency of the Council in the second half of 2012?

**Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission**

*(13 March 2012)*

The Commission fully supports the ongoing efforts at reaching a settlement of the Cyprus problem, which would be to the benefit of Cyprus and the EU in general. In addition, the Commission expects Turkey to fully implement the Additional Protocol to the Association Agreement, and monitors closely any developments and remains in regular contact with all stakeholders. For the moment, minds and efforts are concentrated primarily on the negotiations in the UN framework to reach a comprehensive settlement of the Cyprus issue.

---

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-000198/12**  
**προς την Επιτροπή**  
**Michail Tremopoulos (Verts/ALE)**  
 (18 Ιανουαρίου 2012)

**Θέμα:** Κατασκευή φράγματος επί του ποταμού Αλιάκμονα, στο Νεστόριο Καστοριάς

Φράγμα ύψους 75 μ. πρόκειται να κατασκευαστεί επί του ποταμού Αλιάκμονα, στην περιοχή Νεστόριο Καστοριάς, με ευρωπαϊκή συγχρηματοδότηση, σύμφωνα με τον υπουργό Αγροτικής Ανάπτυξης (1). Το έργο θα δημιουργήσει μια τεχνητή λίμνη εμβαδού 823 στρεμμάτων, η οποία θα κατακλύσει φάραγγι με σπάνιους γεωλογικούς σχηματισμούς, σημαντική πανίδα, αλλά και χιλιάδες στρέμματα παραγωγικού δάσους, τα οποία περιλαμβάνουν και συστάδες οικοτόπων προτεραιότητας (2) (3) (4). Επομένως, η συγκεκριμένη επέμβαση έρχεται σε θεματική και χρηματοδοτική αντίφαση με το τρέχον έργο LIFE09NAT/GR/00333 που αφορά στο είδος *Ursus arctos* αλλά και με προηγούμενα έργα LIFE. Επίσης, η λίμνη θα επιβαρύνει την ποιότητα των νερών, ενώ είναι πιθανό να επηρεάσει αρνητικά το κλίμα της περιοχής, να αυξήσει τη σεισμικότητα και να επιταχύνει τη διάβρωση των πρανών (5). Τέλος, πρόκειται να ανατρέψει τον αναπτυξιακό προσανατολισμό δεκαετιών προς τον οικουρισμό, στρέφοντάς τον σε αμφίβολα κέρδη από αρδευόμενη εντατική καλλιέργεια καλαμποκιού και μηδικής. Η Μελέτη Περιβαλλοντικών Επιπτώσεων, με την οποία δόθηκε άδεια στο έργο, δεν εξετάζει άλλες εναλλακτικές λύσεις, τόσο ως προς την άρδευση όσο και ως προς την ηλεκτροπαραγωγή, ενώ δεν έχουν συνεκτιμηθεί οι επιπτώσεις από τα δεκάδες άλλα τεχνητά έργα που επιβαρύνουν το ποτάμιο σύστημα του Αλιάκμονα (6) (7) (8). Επίσης, σημειώνεται ότι, μέχρι αυτή τη στιγμή, δεν έχει καν εκπονηθεί προσχέδιο Διαχείρισης Λεκάνης Απορροής στο Υδατικό Διαμέρισμα 09 (Δυτ. Μακεδονία), ως οφείλει η χώρα στο πλαίσιο της Οδηγίας 2000/60/ΕΚ (9).

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Έχει ενημέρωση από τις ελληνικές αρχές για το συγκεκριμένο έργο;
2. Συμφωνεί ότι αυτό παραβιάζει την ελληνική και ευρωπαϊκή νομοθεσία, ιδιαίτερα την Οδηγία 92/43/ΕΟΚ (άρθρο 6), επηρεάζοντας αρνητικά οικοτόπους και είδη προτεραιότητας;
3. Συμφωνεί ότι υπάρχουν συγκρούσεις μεταξύ προγραμμάτων χρηματοδότησης;
4. Εκτιμά ότι οι αποφάσεις για έργα αυτού του είδους θα έπρεπε να λαμβάνονται μετά την κατάρτιση Σχεδίων Διαχείρισης Λεκανών Απορροής και όχι πριν;

**Απάντηση του κ. Ροτοčνίκ εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής**  
 (14 Μαρτίου 2012)

Τα κράτη μέλη δεν υποχρεούνται να διαβιβάζουν πληροφορίες σχετικά με ζητήματα σχεδιασμού και ανάπτυξης δημοσίων και ιδιωτικών έργων στην Επιτροπή, αν δεν πρόκειται για συγχρηματοδοτούμενα μεγάλα έργα, όπως προβλέπεται από τον κανονισμό 1083/2006 (10) του Συμβουλίου (άρθρα 39-41).

Σε όλες τις περιπτώσεις πρέπει να τηρείται η νομοθεσία της ΕΕ. Το έργο αποτέλεσε αντικείμενο εκτίμησης περιβαλλοντικών επιπτώσεων, σύμφωνα με τις απαιτήσεις της οδηγίας 2011/92/ΕΕ (11), η οποία ολοκληρώθηκε με την έκδοση της κοινής υπουργικής απόφασης 132858/12.9.2007. Ωστόσο, κατά τον σχεδιασμό και την αδειοδότηση του φράγματος πρέπει να τηρούνται οι απαιτήσεις της οδηγίας 92/43/ΕΟΚ (12), ιδίως των άρθρων 6 (ανάγκη ενδεδειγμένης εκτίμησης των επιπτώσεων του έργου σε κάθε τόπο του Natura 2000 που ενδεχομένως επηρεάζεται από αυτό) και 12 (που αφορά την αυστηρή προστασία των ειδών) καθώς και η οδηγία-πλαίσιο 2000/60/ΕΚ για τα ύδατα (13).

(1) <http://www.minagric.gr/greek/press/2011/06/greek010611.shtml>.

(2) Μπούμπουρας Δ. (Συντονιστής-Υπεύθυνος Σύνταξης) 1999. Ειδική Περιβαλλοντική Μελέτη για την περιοχή Γράμμου & Β.Δ. Βοίου. Πρόγραμμα LIFE-NATURE «ΑΡΚΤΟΣ-2η φάση».

(3) ΗΠΕΙΡΟΣ ΑΕ (Συντονιστής-Υπεύθυνος Σύνταξης: Χ. Παπαϊωάννου) 2009. Επικαιροποίηση Ειδικής Περιβαλλοντικής Μελέτης «Κορυφές Όρους Γράμμος» (GR 1320002).

(4) Η καταγραφή και μελέτη του οικοτόπου 9180 (δάση με φλαμουριές και άλλα ευγενή πλατύφυλλα), αλλά και άλλων του Παρ. (I) της Οδηγίας 92/43/ΕΟΚ είχε αποτελέσει αντικείμενο στο πλαίσιο 2 κοινοτικών προγραμμάτων LIFE-Nature (LIFE96NAT/GR/003222 & LIFE99NAT/GR/006498).

(5) <http://www.callisto.gr/images/upload/nestorio%20fragma.pdf>.

(6) 4 μεγάλα φράγματα σε λειτουργία, 2 υπό κατασκευή, 1 υπό σχεδιασμό, πάνω από 20 Μικρά Υδροηλεκτρικά υπό σχεδιασμό. Έτσι, η μισή ροή του Αλιάκμονα πρόκειται να μετατραπεί σε δεξαμενή, δημιουργώντας τεράστια εμπόδια στις μετακινήσεις μεγάλων θηλαστικών.

(7) Επιστολή Αρχτούρου προς ΥΠΕΧΩΔΕ, με θέμα «Ανάγκη προστασίας του μέσου ρου του Αλιάκμονα και αποφυγή φραγμάτων», και αρ. πρωτ. 72/17-03-2008.

(8) <http://www.callisto.gr/docs/aliakmon.pdf>.

(9) [http://wfd.ypeka.gr/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=4&Itemid=11](http://wfd.ypeka.gr/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=4&Itemid=11).

(10) ΕΕ L 49 της 31.7.2007.

(11) ΕΕ L 26 της 28.1.2012.

(12) ΕΕ L 206 της 22.7.1992.

(13) ΕΕ L 327 της 22.12.2000.

Η Επιτροπή θα διερευνήσει την υπόθεση για να εξακριβώσει εάν τηρήθηκε η περιβαλλοντική νομοθεσία της ΕΕ και εάν υπάρχουν συγκρούσεις μεταξύ των προγραμμάτων χρηματοδότησης.

---



(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000198/12  
to the Commission**

**Michail Tremopoulos (Verts/ALE)**

(18 January 2012)

*Subject:* New dam on the River Aliakmonas in Nestorio, Kastoria

According to the Minister for Rural Development, a dam 75 metres high co-financed by the EU is to be built on the River Aliakmonas in the region of Nestorio, Kastoria <sup>(1)</sup>. The project will create a reservoir of 823 000 square metres, which will flood a gorge with important geological formations and fauna and thousands of hectares of productive forest containing clusters of priority habitats <sup>(2)</sup> <sup>(3)</sup> <sup>(4)</sup>. Consequently, this particular intervention is thematically and financially at odds with the current LIFE09NAT/GR/00333 project relating to the species *ursus arctos* and previous LIFE projects. Moreover, the reservoir will adversely affect the quality of the water and it may have an adverse effect on the climate in the area, increase the risk of earthquake and speeding up erosion of the banks <sup>(5)</sup>. Finally, it is likely to reverse the direction of decades of ecotourism-oriented development in favour of intensive irrigated maize and alfalfa crops which may or may not generate a profit. The environmental impact assessment used to obtain permission for the project did not consider any alternative solutions, either in terms of irrigation or in terms of electricity production, nor has the impact of dozens of other artificial works along the Aliakmonas River system been taken into consideration <sup>(6)</sup> <sup>(7)</sup> <sup>(8)</sup>. It should also be noted that, so far, no preliminary basin management plan has been drawn up for Section 09 (Western Macedonia), as required of Greece under Directive 2000/60/EC <sup>(9)</sup>.

Will the Commission say:

1. Have the Greek authorities notified it of this particular project?
2. Does it agree that it is in breach of Greek and European legislation, especially Directive 92/43/EC (Article 6), in that it will have an adverse impact on priority habitats and species?
3. Does it agree that there are clashes between financing programmes?
4. Does it consider that decisions on such projects should be taken after basin management plans have been drawn up, not before?

**Answer given by Mr Potočník on behalf of the Commission**

(14 March 2012)

Member States are not obliged to send information concerning planning and development issues of public and private projects to the Commission, unless these are co-funded Major Projects as foreseen under Council Regulation 1083/2006 <sup>(10)</sup> (Articles 39-41).

In all cases EU legislation has to be respected. The project was subject to an environmental impact assessment, in accordance with the requirements of Directive 2011/92/EU <sup>(11)</sup>, which was concluded by the adoption of the Joint Ministerial Decision 132858/12.9.2007. However, the planning and authorisation of the dam has to comply with the requirements of Directive 92/43/EEC <sup>(12)</sup>, in particular Articles 6 (need for appropriate assessment of the implications of the project on any Natura 2000 site affected by it) and 12 (related to strict protection of species). The Water Framework Directive 2000/60/EC <sup>(13)</sup> may also be relevant.

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://www.minagric.gr/greek/press/2011/06/greek010611.shtml>.

<sup>(2)</sup> D. Bousbouras (Coordinator/Chief Editor) 1999. Special Environmental Study for the area of Grammos and NW Voios. LIFE-NATURE programme 'ARCTOS-Stage 2'.

<sup>(3)</sup> A.E. Ipeiros (Coordinator/Chief Editor: X. Papaioannou) 2009. Updated Special Environmental Study 'Peaks of the Grammos Mountains' (GR 132002).

<sup>(4)</sup> The record and study of Habitat 9180 (linden and other broad-leaved forests) and of others species listed in Annex I to Directive 92/43/EC was the subject of two EU LIFE-Nature programmes (LIFE96NAT/GR/003222 and LIFE99NAT/GR/006498).

<sup>(5)</sup> <http://www.callisto.gr/images/upload/nestorio%20fragma.pdf>

<sup>(6)</sup> Four large dams are in operation, two are under construction, one is on the drawing board and there are plans for over 20 small hydroelectric plants. Thus half the flow of the River Aliakmonas will be turned into a reservoir, creating massive obstacles to movements of large mammals.

<sup>(7)</sup> Letter from Arcturos Bear Sanctuary to the Ministry of Environmental Affairs, Physical Planning and Public Works on the need to protect the average flow rate of the River Aliakmonas and avoid dams, Ref. No 72/17-03-2008.

<sup>(8)</sup> <http://www.callisto.gr/docs/aliakmon.pdf>

<sup>(9)</sup> [http://wfd.ypeka.gr/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=4&Itemid=11](http://wfd.ypeka.gr/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=4&Itemid=11).

<sup>(10)</sup> OJ L 49, 31.7.2007.

<sup>(11)</sup> OJ L 26, 28.1.2012.

<sup>(12)</sup> OJ L 206, 22.7.1992.

<sup>(13)</sup> OJ L 327, 22.12.2000.

The Commission will investigate the case in order to verify whether the EU environmental legislation has been complied with and whether there are clashes between financing programmes.

\_\_\_\_\_

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-000200/12**  
**προς την Επιτροπή**  
**Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)**  
(18 Ιανουαρίου 2012)

**Θέμα:** Επιτροπή Εποπτείας και Ελέγχου Παιγνίων και ρύθμιση της αγοράς παιγνίων στην Ελλάδα

Στις 28.12.2011 υπογράφηκε στην Ελλάδα η σχετική υπουργική απόφαση για τη νομιμοποίηση των τυχερών και ψυχαγωγικών τεχνικών παιχνιδιών. Σύμφωνα με αυτή, η Επιτροπή Εποπτείας και Ελέγχου Παιγνίων θα έχει ως βασική αποστολή την προστασία των καταναλωτών, ειδικά των ανηλικών και άλλων ευαίσθητων κοινωνικών ομάδων από τον εθισμό στα παιχνίδια, θα διασφαλίσει ότι τα τυχερά και τα ψυχαγωγικά τεχνικά παιχνίδια οργανώνονται και διεξάγονται σύμφωνα με το νόμο και δεν γίνονται αντικείμενο παράνομης εκμετάλλευσης και αισχροκέρδειας και θα κατευθύνει την ψυχαγωγική και στοιχηματική δραστηριότητα σε νόμιμους παρόχους, ώστε να εξαλειφθεί ο παράνομος στοιχηματισμός και τα ποινικά αδικήματα που υποθάλπει.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Αξιολογεί ως ικανοποιητική και σύμφωνη με την κοινοτική νομοθεσία τη ρύθμιση της αγοράς τυχερών παιγνίων στην Ελλάδα;
2. Εκτιμά πως έχουν εκλείψει οι λόγοι της καταδικαστικής απόφασης για την Ελλάδα (C-109/08) σύμφωνα με την οποία η χώρα καταβάλλει πρόστιμο άνω των 32 000 ευρώ ημερησίως;

**Απάντηση του κ. Barnier εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής**  
(29 Φεβρουαρίου 2012)

1. Η Επιτροπή παρακολουθεί στενά τις εξελίξεις όσον αφορά τις κανονιστικές ρυθμίσεις στον ελληνικό τομέα των τυχερών παιγνίων. Οι πρόσφατες μεταρρυθμίσεις της ελληνικής νομοθεσίας σχετικά με τα τυχερά παίγνια, περιλαμβανομένης της σύστασης της Επιτροπής Εποπτείας και Ελέγχου Παιγνίων την οποία αναφέρει το Αξιότιμο Μέλος του Κοινοβουλίου, εξετάζονται επί του παρόντος από την Επιτροπή. Η εξέταση αυτή θα επιτρέψει στην Επιτροπή να προσδιορίσει κατά πόσον έχουν παύσει να υφίστανται οι λόγοι που την οδήγησαν να κινηθεί τη διαδικασία επί παραβάσει 2007/4094 σχετικά με τη συμμόρφωση του ελληνικού νομικού πλαισίου για τα τυχερά παίγνια με το κοινοτικό δίκαιο. Η Επιτροπή εξακολουθεί να είναι σε τακτική επαφή με τις ελληνικές αρχές για το θέμα αυτό.
2. Η Επιτροπή παρακολουθεί την εφαρμογή του ελληνικού νόμου της 22ας Αυγούστου 2011 για τη ρύθμιση της αγοράς των μηχανών τυχερών παιγνίων και είναι σε στενή επαφή με τις ελληνικές αρχές οι οποίες είναι υπεύθυνες για την πλήρη συμμόρφωση με την απόφαση του Δικαστηρίου των Ευρωπαϊκών Κοινοτήτων στην υπόθεση C-65/05 (βλ. απόφαση του Δικαστηρίου στην υπόθεση C-109/08). Μέχρι στιγμής, η παράβαση που απορρέει από τη μη πλήρη εφαρμογή της απόφασης του Δικαστηρίου εξακολουθεί να υφίσταται.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000200/12  
to the Commission  
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)  
(18 January 2012)**

*Subject:* Greek Gaming Supervision and Control Commission

On 28 December 2011, Greece signed a ministerial decision legalising games of chance and gaming machines. Under the terms of that decision, the Gaming Supervision and Control Commission's basic mission is to protect consumers, especially minors and other vulnerable social groups from gambling habits, and to ensure that games of chance and gaming machines are organised and managed in accordance with the law and not run illegally by profiteers and that recreational games and betting are channelled towards legal providers, in order to eliminate illegal betting and the crimes that it covers up.

Will the Commission answer the following:

1. Does it consider that the regulation of games of chance in Greece is satisfactory and in keeping with EU legislation?
2. Does it consider that the reasons for the decision (C-109/08) imposing a fine of over EUR 32 000 a day on Greece no longer apply?

**Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission  
(29 February 2012)**

1. The Commission has been monitoring the regulatory developments in the Greek gambling sector very closely. The recent reforms of Greek gambling regulations, including the establishment of the gambling regulatory authority referred to by the Honourable Member, are currently under examination by the Commission. This examination should allow the Commission to determine whether its concerns about compliance with EC law of the Greek legal framework for gambling, raised in infringement proceeding 2007/4094, have been removed. The Commission remains in regular contact with the Greek authorities on this issue.

2. The Commission is monitoring the implementation of the Greek Law of 22 August 2011 regulating the market for gaming machines and is keeping in close contact with the Greek authorities, whose responsibility is to ensure full compliance with the judgment of the Court of Justice in Case C-65/05 (see ruling of the Court in case C-109/08). To date, the infringement resulting from the failure to fully implement that ruling of the Court is still ongoing.

---

*(Versão portuguesa)*

**Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-000202/12  
ao Conselho**

**João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)**

*(18 de janeiro de 2012)*

*Assunto:* Evolução da esperança média de vida em função do rendimento

A União Europeia tem vindo a desenvolver pressões no sentido de aumentar a idade da reforma nos Estados-Membros. O chamado Pacto para o Euro Mais é disso exemplo elucidativo (mas não isolado). Em vários países este aumento tem vindo a ser feito, com o argumento do aumento da esperança média de vida.

Mas um estudo do governo federal alemão, recentemente divulgado, vem demonstrar que a evolução da esperança média de vida varia em função dos rendimentos auferidos. Assim, segundo o estudo, o aumento da esperança média de vida apenas se verifica entre os que auferem rendimentos médios ou superiores. Já a esperança média de vida das pessoas com rendimentos mais baixos passou, na Alemanha, de 77,5 anos em 2001 para 75,5 anos em 2010. É, evidentemente, verosímil que o mesmo se passe noutros países, tendo em conta os ataques que têm vindo a ser dirigidos aos sistemas de proteção social e a erosão dos rendimentos de amplas camadas da população (em especial, das de mais baixos rendimentos), como sucede agora, de modo especialmente grave, nos países alvo dos programas FMI-UE.

Estes dados deitam, assim, por terra o pretexto evocado pelos diferentes governos para aumentar a idade da reforma.

Em face do exposto, solicito ao Conselho que me informe sobre o seguinte:

1. Tem conhecimento do referido estudo? Que avaliação faz das suas conclusões?
2. Em face destas conclusões, considera a possibilidade de mudar as orientações que têm prevalecido a este respeito (designadamente no chamado Pacto para o Euro Mais)?

**Resposta**

*(27 de fevereiro de 2012)*

Não compete ao Conselho fazer observações sobre quaisquer estudos específicos, como aquele a que o Senhor Deputado faz referência, nem prestar informações sobre questões relacionadas com os regimes de pensões, que são da competência dos Estados-Membros.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000202/12  
to the Council**

**João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)**

(18 January 2012)

*Subject:* Changes in average life expectancy according to income

The European Union has increasingly encouraged raising the retirement age in the Member States. The 'Pact for the Euro' is a particularly good illustration of this (though not the only one). Various countries have raised the retirement age on the basis of the argument that life expectancy is increasing.

However, a recently released German Government study has shown that average life expectancy trends vary according to income. Therefore, according to the study, the increase in average life expectancy only really applies to people on middle or high incomes. In contrast, the average life expectancy for people on low incomes in Germany fell from 77.5 years in 2001 to 75.5 years in 2010. Clearly, the same is likely to be true in other countries, bearing in mind the current attacks on social welfare systems and the pay cuts affecting many people (in particular, those on lower incomes), which are most severe in the countries targeted by the IMF-EU austerity programmes.

These figures therefore show the pretext used by different governments to raise the retirement age to have been false.

In view of the above, the Council is asked to answer the following:

1. Is it aware of the aforementioned study? How does it view the study's conclusions?
2. Does the Council have any information about the situation in the other Member States?

**Reply**

(27 February 2012)

It is not for the Council either to comment on any specific studies, such as the one the Honourable Member refers to, or to provide information on pension provision issues which are within the competence of the Member States.

---

(Versão portuguesa)

**Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-000203/12**  
**à Comissão**

**João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)**

(11 de janeiro de 2012)

**Assunto:** Evolução da esperança média de vida em função do rendimento

A União Europeia tem vindo a desenvolver pressões no sentido do aumento da idade da reforma nos Estados-Membros. O chamado Pacto para o Euro Mais é disso exemplo elucidativo (mas não isolado). Em vários países este aumento tem vindo a ser feito com o argumento do aumento da esperança média de vida.

Porém, um estudo do governo federal alemão, recentemente divulgado, vem demonstrar que a evolução da esperança média de vida varia em função dos rendimentos auferidos. Assim, segundo o estudo, o aumento da esperança média de vida apenas se verifica entre os que auferem rendimentos médios ou superiores. Já a esperança média de vida das pessoas com rendimentos mais baixos passou, na Alemanha, de 77,5 anos, em 2001, para 75,5 anos, em 2010. É, evidentemente, verosímil que o mesmo se passe noutros países, tendo em conta os ataques que têm vindo a ser dirigidos aos sistemas de proteção social e a erosão dos rendimentos de amplas camadas da população (em especial, das de mais baixos rendimentos), como sucede agora, de modo especialmente grave, nos países alvo dos programas FMI-UE.

Estes dados deitam, assim, por terra o pretexto evocado pelos diferentes governos para aumentar a idade da reforma.

Em face do exposto, solicito à Comissão que me informe sobre o seguinte:

1. Tem conhecimento do referido estudo? Que avaliação faz das suas conclusões?
2. Dispõe de informações sobre a situação nos demais Estados-Membros?
3. Considera a possibilidade de passar a disponibilizar, nas estatísticas relativas à esperança média de vida, a variação para os diferentes níveis de rendimento da população?
4. Que alterações considera introduzir nos planos da sua responsabilidade que atualmente vigoram em países como Portugal, Grécia e Irlanda, em face destas conclusões?

**Resposta dada por László Andor em nome da Comissão**

(8 de março de 2012)

Na sua comunicação «Solidariedade na saúde: Reduzir as desigualdades no domínio da saúde na UE» <sup>(1)</sup>, a Comissão reconhece que as disparidades neste plano representam um importante desafio para a UE, estando, por esse motivo, vivamente interessada nas conclusões de estudos como o referido pelo Senhor Deputado. Em estreita cooperação com o Eurostat, estão a ser elaborados indicadores que deverão ser publicados na lista de indicadores de saúde da Comunidade Europeia <sup>(2)</sup>.

De momento, a Comissão não pode efetuar, a nível da UE, um estudo similar ao recentemente publicado na Alemanha, porquanto não estão disponíveis dados comparáveis em matéria de esperança de saúde por escalões de rendimento nos Estados-Membros. Escasseiam também fontes que permitam relacionar com precisão os rendimentos auferidos por cada indivíduo ao longo da vida e o seu estado de saúde ou a sua idade ao morrer. Não obstante, a Comissão (Eurostat) divulgou resultados preliminares sobre a esperança de vida por níveis de habilitações literárias (e não por rendimento, como no estudo alemão), calculados com base num certo número de hipóteses, que apenas estão disponíveis para 13 Estados-Membros <sup>(3)</sup> relativamente ao período 2007/2010. Estes dados estão disponíveis no sítio Web do Eurostat <sup>(4)</sup>. Tais resultados preliminares apontam para uma relação inversa entre mortalidade e níveis de habilitações literárias.

<sup>(1)</sup> COM(2009)0567, em: (<http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=89&langId=en&newsId=619&furtherNews=yes>) e ([http://ec.europa.eu/health/social\\_determinants/policy/commission\\_communication/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/health/social_determinants/policy/commission_communication/index_en.htm)).

<sup>(2)</sup> ([http://ec.europa.eu/health/indicators/echi/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/health/indicators/echi/index_en.htm)).

<sup>(3)</sup> Bulgária, República Checa, Dinamarca, Estónia, Itália, Hungria, Malta, Polónia, Portugal, Roménia, Eslovénia, Finlândia e Suécia.

<sup>(4)</sup> ([http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/statistics/search\\_database, com o código demo\\_mlexpedu](http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/statistics/search_database, com o código demo_mlexpedu)).

Ver a seguinte publicação, datada de 2010: ([http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/cache/ITY\\_offpub/ks-SF-10-024/EN/KS-SF-10-024-EN.PDF](http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/cache/ITY_offpub/ks-SF-10-024/EN/KS-SF-10-024-EN.PDF)).

A Comissão examina periodicamente a aplicação dos programas de ajustamento estabelecidos pelas autoridades em Portugal, na Grécia e na Irlanda. No âmbito das políticas de pensões, a Comissão apoia, tal como foi salientado na Análise Anual do Crescimento para 2012, a associação entre idade da reforma e aumento da esperança de vida, por forma a incrementar a viabilidade dos sistemas de pensões. Atualmente, a Comissão não tenciona recomendar outra via aos países em causa.

---



(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000203/12  
to the Commission**

**João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)**

(11 January 2012)

*Subject:* Changes in average life expectancy according to income

The European Union has increasingly encouraged raising the retirement age in the Member-States. The so-called New Pact for the Euro is a particularly prescient example (though by no means isolated). In various countries, this increase has been carried out, given the argument about increasing life expectancy.

In relation to this, a recently released study by the German Federal Government has shown that the increase in average life expectancy varies according to income. Therefore, according to the study, the increase in average life expectancy only really applies to people with middle or high incomes. In contrast, the average life expectancy for people with low incomes, in Germany, fell from 77.5 years in 2001 to 75.5 years in 2010. Clearly, it is likely that the same shall happen in other countries, taking into account the attacks on social welfare systems and the reduction of many people's salaries (in particular, those with lower incomes), as is happening now, most severely, in the countries targeted by the IMF-EU austerity programmes.

Therefore, these data show the lie behind the pretext used by different governments to raise the retirement age.

In view of the above, I ask the Commission to tell me about the following:

1. Do you know about the aforementioned study? What evaluation shall you make from its conclusions?
2. Do you have any information about the situation in the other Member-States?
3. Shall you consider the possibility of making these statistics regarding average life expectancy publically available, especially regarding the variation for different income groups?
4. What alterations shall you consider introducing in your own plans in force in countries like Portugal, Greece and Ireland, in light of these conclusions?

**Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission**

(8 March 2012)

In its communication 'Solidarity in health: Reducing health inequalities in the EU' <sup>(1)</sup>, the Commission recognises that health inequality is a major challenge for the EU. It is therefore very interested in research findings such as those to which the Honourable Member refers. Indicators are being developed in close cooperation with Eurostat and should be published in the list of European Community health indicators <sup>(2)</sup>.

For the time being, the Commission cannot carry out an EU-level study of the sort published recently in Germany as comparable data are not available on health expectancy by income groups in the Member States. There is also a lack of sources allowing income over the individual's lifetime to be matched precisely with his or her health status or age at death. However, the Commission (Eurostat) has made available preliminary results on life expectancy by educational attainment (and not by income as in the German research), calculated under a certain hypotheses and available only for 13 Member States <sup>(3)</sup> for the years 2007-2010. Data are available on the Eurostat website <sup>(4)</sup>. These preliminary results show an inverse relationship between educational attainment and mortality.

The Commission regularly reviews the implementation of the adjustment programmes set out by the authorities in Portugal, Greece and Ireland. In the field of pension policies, the Commission supports, as highlighted in the 2012 Annual Growth Survey, linking the retirement age to increases in life expectancy so as to enhance the sustainability of pension systems. At present, there are no plans on behalf of the Commission to recommend a different course of action for these countries.

<sup>(1)</sup> COM(2009) 567, at: <http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=89&langId=en&newsId=619&furtherNews=yes> and [http://ec.europa.eu/health/social\\_determinants/policy/commission\\_communication/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/health/social_determinants/policy/commission_communication/index_en.htm)

<sup>(2)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/health/indicators/echi/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/health/indicators/echi/index_en.htm)

<sup>(3)</sup> Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Italy, Hungary, Malta, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovenia, Finland, Sweden.

<sup>(4)</sup> [http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/statistics/search\\_database\\_under\\_the\\_data\\_code\\_demo\\_mlexpedu](http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/statistics/search_database_under_the_data_code_demo_mlexpedu). The following publication was issued in 2010: [http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/cache/ITY\\_OFFPUB/KS-SF-10-024/EN/KS-SF-10-024-EN.PDF](http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/cache/ITY_OFFPUB/KS-SF-10-024/EN/KS-SF-10-024-EN.PDF)

(Versão portuguesa)

**Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-000204/12**  
**à Comissão (Vice-Presidente / Alta Representante)**  
**João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)**  
(19 de janeiro de 2012)

Assunto: VP/HR — Assassinatos de jornalistas nas Honduras

Dois anos e meio após o golpe de Estado que derrubou o presidente democraticamente eleito, Manuel Zelaya, o homicídio de jornalistas e a repressão de manifestantes fazem parte do quotidiano das Honduras.

No início do mês de dezembro, deu-se mais um assassinato de profissionais da comunicação social: a jornalista Luz Marina Paz e seu operador de câmara Delmer Canales seguiam num automóvel que acabou crivado por mais de 20 balas, disparadas a partir de motorizadas em andamento, técnica na qual a polícia antiterrorista e antiterrorista foi instruída pela sua congénere colombiana. Já antes, o diário La Tribuna foi alvo de um atentado; o presidente do Comité para a Defesa dos Direitos Humanos e a sua equipa foram ameaçados de morte; o ex-assessor do ex-presidente Zelaya para o tráfico de estupefacientes foi assassinado; e uma multidão de professores, que se manifestava pelo pagamento dos salários de 2011, foi reprimida com recurso a canhões de água e gás lacrimogéneo.

É o próprio ministro da Administração Interna que admite que o homicídio dos jornalistas pode ter motivações políticas, não obstante o facto de o Estado não só não investigar estes casos como ser cúmplice com a impunidade dos que procuram impedir o exercício do jornalismo e das liberdades democráticas, como também afirmou o Presidente do Comité para a Livre Expressão das Honduras.

Perante estes factos, pergunto à Alta Representante para os Negócios Estrangeiros e a Política de Segurança:

1. Como avalia esta situação? Que implicações foram ou vão ser daqui retiradas, no âmbito das relações bilaterais entre a UE e as Honduras?
2. Como avalia o facto de que, desde a chegada às Honduras dos militares de elite colombianos, o número de assassinatos ligados ao crime organizado ter ainda aumentado mais?
3. Não considera necessário expressar a condenação destes atos junto das autoridades hondurenhas e colombianas?

**Resposta dada pela Alta Representante/Vice-Presidente Catherine Ashton em nome da Comissão**  
(19 de março de 2012)

A promoção dos direitos humanos constitui uma parte importante do diálogo político que a UE mantém com o Governo das Honduras, tanto a nível local como em Bruxelas. O assassinato de jornalistas e a proteção da liberdade de expressão são parte central do diálogo que é realizado através de contactos sistemáticos com o Ministério da Justiça e dos Direitos Humanos, o Supremo Tribunal, o Ministério Público e o Ministério da Segurança.

A Delegação da UE nas Honduras efetuou diligências no sentido de obter informações junto do Ministério de Segurança sobre os inquéritos relativos ao assassinato de jornalistas. De acordo com as informações obtidas, o Ministério Público ainda está a investigar estes crimes.

Relativamente aos acontecimentos lamentáveis mais recentes, os Chefes de Missão da UE em Tegucigalpa emitiram uma declaração pública, imediatamente após o homicídio de Luz Marina Paz e o ataque contra o jornal La Tribuna, manifestando grande preocupação, condenando os ataques e pedindo uma investigação exaustiva para que estes crimes não fiquem impunes.

A delegação da UE continuará a acompanhar o evoluir das investigações relativas ao homicídio de jornalistas.

Relativamente à presença de soldados de elite colombianos, a Delegação da UE nas Honduras não tem conhecimento dessa presença, e, por conseguinte, não tem motivo para tecer qualquer comentário.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000204/12  
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)**

**João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)**

(19 January 2012)

*Subject:* VP/HR — Murders of journalists in Honduras

Two and a half years after the coup d'état which overthrew the democratically elected President, the murder of journalists and repression of demonstrators are part of daily life in Honduras.

At the beginning of December, another murder of media professionals occurred: the journalist Luz Marina Paz and her camera operator Delmer Canales were in a car that was hit by more than 20 bullets, fired from passing cars, a technique that was taught to the anti-riot and antiterrorist police by their Colombian counterparts. Previously, the newspaper *La Tribuna*, was the target of a bomb attack; the chair of the Committee for the Defence of Human Rights and his team received death threats; and a teachers' demonstration, calling for payment of their 2011 salaries, was broken up using water cannons and tear gas.

Even the Minister of the Interior admits that the murder of the journalists may be politically motivated. However, the State has not only failed to investigate these cases, but has also allowed those who seek to hinder the work of journalists and the exercise of democratic freedoms to act with impunity, as the chair of the Honduran Committee for Free Expression has also stated.

Given these facts, the High Representative for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy is asked to answer the following:

1. How does she view the situation? How has this affected — or will it affect — bilateral relations between the EU and Honduras?
2. How does she view the fact that, since Colombian elite soldiers arrived in Honduras, the number of illegal killings linked to organised crime has increased even further?
3. Does she not consider it necessary to make representations to the Honduran and Colombian authorities, expressing her condemnation of these acts?

**Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission**

(19 March 2012)

The promotion of human rights is an important part of the political dialogue the EU maintains with the Government of Honduras, both locally and in Brussels. The killings of journalists and the protection of freedom of expression are an essential part of this dialogue which is carried out through systematic contacts with the Ministry for Justice and Human Rights, Supreme Court, Public Prosecutor's Office and Security Ministry.

The EU Delegation in Honduras carried out a demarche in order to obtain information from the Security Ministry on the investigations of killings of journalists. According to information obtained, the Public Prosecutor's Office is still investigating these crimes.

Concerning the most recent and regrettable events, the EU Heads of Mission in Tegucigalpa issued a public statement immediately after the killing of Luz Marina Paz and the attack against *La Tribuna* newspaper expressing strong concern, condemning these attacks and calling for a full investigation so that the crimes do not go unpunished.

The EU Delegation will continue to monitor the progress of investigations of killing of journalists.

Concerning the presence of Colombian elite soldiers in Honduras, the EU Delegation is not aware of any such presence, and, therefore, there is no reason to comment.

(Versão portuguesa)

**Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-000205/12**

**à Comissão**

**João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)**

(18 de janeiro de 2012)

**Assunto:** Apoios ao rendimento dos pescadores impedidos de exercer atividade durante períodos prolongados

Em Castelo do Neiva (Viana do Castelo), as difíceis condições marítimas e o assoreamento do pequeno porto de pesca local impediu os pescadores de saírem para o mar durante várias semanas, situação que se poderá repetir. Tal coloca em causa a subsistência de muitos pescadores e das suas famílias, conforme veio alertar recentemente a Associação de Armadores daquela localidade, onde operam cerca de 40 embarcações de pesca tradicional.

Esta situação vem tornar mais urgente a realização de intervenções no pequeno porto de pesca, de forma a aumentar a segurança de pescadores e embarcações (incluindo ações de desassoreamento).

Em pergunta anterior dirigida à Comissão (E-010755/2010), solicitei informações sobre que apoios comunitários poderiam ser mobilizados para apoiar estas intervenções. Em aditamento a esta pergunta e em face da resposta que então me foi dada, solicito à Comissão que me informe sobre o seguinte:

1. Quais as taxas de cofinanciamento previstas em cada caso (FEP e FEDER) para a realização das intervenções referidas?
2. Que mecanismos estão previstos, no âmbito da futura Política Comum de Pescas, para apoiar os pescadores, em especial da pesca tradicional, que, em virtude das condições meteorológicas adversas, não possam exercer a atividade durante períodos prolongados, pondo assim em causa a sua subsistência?

**Resposta dada por Maria Damanaki em nome da Comissão**

(12 de março de 2012)

1. A taxa média de cofinanciamento para o programa operacional português do FEP é de 75 % das despesas públicas, o que corresponde à taxa máxima permitida pelo Regulamento (CE) n.º 1198/2006 do Conselho<sup>(1)</sup> no respeitante às regiões de convergência.

A taxa média de cofinanciamento do FEDER para o programa «Norte» (2007/2013) é de 83,01 % das despesas totais. Contudo, mediante decisão da autoridade de gestão, o financiamento de operações específicas pode ascender a 85 %.

2. Como deve ser do conhecimento do Senhor Deputado, a proposta da Comissão relativa ao Fundo Europeu dos Assuntos Marítimos e das Pescas (FEAMP) está a ser analisada no Conselho. De acordo a proposta, o FEAMP poderá apoiar investimentos nos portos de pesca e locais de desembarque, bem como para a construção ou modernização de abrigos, com vista a melhorar a segurança dos pescadores.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> JO L 223 de 15.8.2006.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000205/12  
to the Commission**

**João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)**

(18 January 2012)

*Subject:* Income supports for fishermen who are prevented from exercising their activity for long periods

In Castelo do Neiva (Viana do Castelo), the difficult maritime conditions and the silting in the small local fishing port have prevented fishermen from going out to sea for many weeks. This problem might well occur again in the future. According to a recent report from the local shipowners' association, this is jeopardising the livelihoods of many fishermen and their families, in a town where more than 40 traditional fishing boats operate.

This situation has made it all the more urgent to carry out work on the small fishing port in order to increase the safety of fishermen and boats (including dredging measures).

In an earlier question to the Commission (E-010755/2010), I asked what Community support could be used to fund such improvements. In addition to this question and, in response to the answer I was given, I ask the Commission to provide the following information:

1. What co-financing rates are applied in each case (FEP and FEDER) for such improvement measures?
2. What mechanisms are provided for under the future Common Fishing Policy, to support fishermen, especially in the traditional fishing sector, who, due to adverse weather conditions, cannot carry out their activities over long periods and whose livelihoods are thus jeopardised?

**Answer given by Ms Damanaki on behalf of the Commission**

(12 March 2012)

1. The average co-financing rate for the Portuguese EFF Operational Programme is 75 % of the public expenditure, which coincides with the maximum admitted by the Council Regulation (EC) No 1198/2006 <sup>(1)</sup> for Convergence regions.

The average co-financing rate for the Programme Norte 2007-2013 co-financed by ERDF is 83.01 % of the total expenditure. However individual operations can be financed up to 85 % being up to the Managing Authority to decide.

2. As the Honourable Member is certainly aware the Commission proposal for the European Maritime and Fisheries Fund (EMFF) is now under discussion in the Council. According to this proposal, the EMFF may support investments in fishing ports, landing sites and the construction or modernisation of shelters in order to improve the safety of fishermen.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ L 223, 15.8.2006.

(Versão portuguesa)

**Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-000206/12**

**à Comissão**

**João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)**

(19 de janeiro de 2012)

**Assunto:** Combate ao escaravelho vermelho das palmeiras (II)

O escaravelho vermelho da palmeira (*Rhynchophorus ferrugineus*) tem vindo a alargar a sua área de distribuição em Portugal. Depois de ter dizimado centenas de plantas no Algarve, o escaravelho tem vindo a causar estragos consideráveis na região metropolitana de Lisboa, tendo também sido já detetado noutras áreas das regiões Norte e Centro do país. Só no concelho de Lisboa foram já mais de uma centena as plantas infetadas. Estão ameaçados exemplares com elevado valor botânico.

Existem claras dificuldade em travar a disseminação desta praga. Em parte, tal deve-se ao elevado custo quer do tratamento preventivo (cerca de 400 euros por planta), quer do abate das árvores infetadas (1 000 a 2 000 euros por planta), que se revela essencial para travar a contaminação de outros exemplares. De acordo com notícias recentes na imprensa portuguesa, o Ministério da Agricultura não tem, neste momento, fundos para o combate a esta praga.

Em resposta à pergunta escrita (E-010929/2010), sobre este mesmo assunto, a Comissão refere que o 7.º programa-quadro de investigação e desenvolvimento tecnológico (7.º PQ) havia lançado um convite à apresentação de propostas que incluía um tópico sobre o *Rhynchophorus ferrugineus*. E acrescentava que «serão dedicados 3 milhões de euros à preparação de estratégias de erradicação e contenção da praga».

Tendo em conta a evolução da situação, solicito à Comissão que me informe sobre o seguinte:

1. Que utilização foi feita, até à data, dos 3 milhões de euros acima mencionados e que estratégias de erradicação e contenção da praga foram elaboradas?
2. Que apoios comunitários poderão ser mobilizados para apoiar as autoridades portuguesas no combate a esta praga?
3. Dispõe de alguma informação (ainda que intercalar) sobre os resultados dos dois projetos de investigação sobre o escaravelho vermelho das palmeiras, no âmbito do 7.º PQ (Q-Detect e Isefor)? Qual a participação de Portugal neste projetos?

**Resposta dada por Máire Geoghegan-Quinn em nome da Comissão**

(29 de fevereiro de 2012)

O projeto Palmproject (estratégias para a erradicação e contenção das pragas invasoras *Rhynchophorus ferrugineus* Olivier e *Paysandisia archon* Burmeister) <sup>(1)</sup>, financiado pelo 7.º Programa Quadro de Investigação e Desenvolvimento Tecnológico (7.º Programa-Quadro, 2007/2013), iniciou-se em 1 de janeiro de 2012. Por conseguinte, é muito prematuro apresentar qualquer resultado. Espera-se que este projeto contribua para o desenvolvimento de tecnologias que permitam detetar precocemente e monitorizar aquelas pragas (por exemplo dispositivos acústicos e métodos de deteção térmicos) e para o desenvolvimento de métodos de erradicação e contenção dessas pragas e de luta contra as mesmas (nomeadamente métodos de luta físicos, químicos, biológicos e semioquímicos).

No que se refere ao apoio financeiro, ao abrigo do regime fitossanitário da União instituído pela Diretiva 2000/29/CE do Conselho <sup>(2)</sup>, os Estados-Membros podem receber, a seu pedido e mediante determinadas condições, uma contribuição financeira da UE para «luta fitossanitária», destinada a cobrir despesas diretamente relacionadas com as medidas necessárias que tiverem sido tomadas com vista à erradicação ou contenção do *Rhynchophorus ferrugineus*.

O projeto Q-Detect <sup>(3)</sup> do 7.º Programa-Quadro está a desenvolver e a ensaiar métodos acústicos de deteção do escaravelho vermelho da palmeira sobretudo baseados na monitorização do movimento e da mastigação das larvas no interior das palmeiras. O Isefor <sup>(4)</sup>, por sua vez, apresentará resultados intercalares nos próximos meses. Nenhum destes consórcios conta com a participação de parceiros portugueses.

<sup>(1)</sup> Strategies for the eradication and containment of the invasive pests *Rhynchophorus ferrugineus* Olivier and *Paysandisia archon* Burmeister, ([http://ec.europa.eu/research/bioeconomy/agriculture/projects/palm\\_protect\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/research/bioeconomy/agriculture/projects/palm_protect_en.htm)).

<sup>(2)</sup> JO L 169 de 10.7.2000.

<sup>(3)</sup> ([http://qdetect.org/0\\_home/index.php](http://qdetect.org/0_home/index.php)).

<sup>(4)</sup> (<http://www.isefor.com/>).

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000206/12  
to the Commission**

**João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)**

(19 January 2012)

*Subject:* Controlling the red palm weevil (II)

The red palm weevil (*Rhynchophorus ferrugineus*) has been steadily extending its distribution area in Portugal. After decimating hundreds of plants in the Algarve, the beetle has caused considerable damage in the metropolitan region of Lisbon and has been detected in other areas in the northern and central regions of the country. In the municipality of Lisbon alone, more than 100 plants have already been infected. Specimens with a high botanical value are under threat.

There are clear difficulties in stopping the spread of this plague. This is partly due to the high costs involved, both for preventive treatment (about EUR 400 per plant) and for the felling of infected trees (EUR 1 000 to 2 000 per plant), which is essential to stop the contamination of other plants. According to recent Portuguese press reports, the Ministry of Agriculture does not, at this time, have funds to stop this pest.

In response to Written Question E-010929/2010 on the same subject, the Commission stated that the Seventh Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development (FP7) had launched a call for proposals that included a topic on *Rhynchophorus ferrugineus*. It added that 'EUR 3 million will be dedicated to develop eradication and containment strategies against the pest'.

In light of developments, the Commission is asked to answer the following:

1. How, to date, has the EUR 3 million mentioned above been employed and what strategies have been devised to eradicate and contain the pest?
2. What Community support can be mobilised to support the Portuguese authorities in controlling this pest?
3. Does it have information (even if only provisional) regarding the results of the two research projects on the red palm weevil, within the ambit of FP7 (Q-Detect and ISEFOR)? What role does Portugal play in these projects?

**Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission**

(29 February 2012)

The project PALMPROTECT (Strategies for the eradication and containment of the invasive pests *Rhynchophorus ferrugineus* Olivier and *Paysandisia archon* Burmeister) <sup>(1)</sup>, funded by the 7th Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development (FP7, 2007-2013), started on 1 January 2012. It is therefore too early to present any result. PALMPROTECT is expected to develop technologies for the early detection and monitoring of these pests (e.g. acoustic devices, thermal detection) and methods to eradicate, control and contain them (including physical, chemical, biological and semiochemical-based control methods).

As regards financial support, under the Union plant-health regime established by the Council Directive 2000/29/EC <sup>(2)</sup>, Member States may receive, at their request and subject to certain conditions, a 'plant health control' EU financial contribution to cover expenditure relating directly to the necessary measures which have been taken for the purpose of eradication or containment of *Rhynchophorus ferrugineus*.

The FP7 project Q-Detect <sup>(3)</sup> is currently developing and testing acoustic methods for detection of the red palm weevil mainly by monitoring movement and chewing of the larvae within the palm trees. ISEFOR <sup>(4)</sup>, on the other hand, will present its interim results in the next months. No Portuguese partners are involved in these two consortia.

<sup>(1)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/research/bioeconomy/agriculture/projects/palm\\_protect\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/research/bioeconomy/agriculture/projects/palm_protect_en.htm)

<sup>(2)</sup> OJ L 169, 10.7.2000.

<sup>(3)</sup> [http://qdetect.org/0\\_home/index.php](http://qdetect.org/0_home/index.php).

<sup>(4)</sup> <http://www.isefor.com/>.

(Versão portuguesa)

**Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-000207/12**

**à Comissão**

**João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)**

(18 de janeiro de 2012)

**Assunto:** Interdição da pesca de raia amarela em Portugal

Em Portugal, o Sindicato dos Trabalhadores da Pesca do Sul alertou recentemente para o problema da interdição da apanha de raia e, bem assim, para as consequências que esta interdição está a ter sobre os pescadores.

Segundo o sindicato, a espécie designada Raia Amarela existe em grande quantidade nas águas portuguesas, não existindo qualquer perigo ou ameaça para a espécie decorrente da sua pesca. Assim, considera-se que esta interdição é desajustada da realidade portuguesa, não tendo em conta a especificidade nacional. Ademais, ela prejudica grandemente o já baixo rendimento dos pescadores da pesca artesanal.

Em face do exposto, solicito à Comissão que me informe sobre o seguinte:

1. Que espécies de raia têm atualmente a apanha interdita?
2. Que avaliação foi feita quanto ao estado de conservação dos stocks dessas espécies, nas águas portuguesas?
3. Qual a situação específica da Raia Amarela?
4. Tendo em conta a precária situação do setor, para a qual são determinantes a desvalorização do preço do pescado na primeira venda e o aumento galopante dos custos dos fatores de produção, que medidas comunitárias poderão ser mobilizadas para apoiar estes pescadores?

**Resposta dada por Maria Damanaki em nome da Comissão**

(28 de fevereiro de 2012)

O nome comum empregue pelo Senhor Deputado não permite à Comissão identificar a espécie a que se refere entre as espécies efetivamente abrangidas pela regulamentação da União Europeia (UE) em vigor <sup>(1)</sup>

A principal quota portuguesa de raias (todos os rajiformes) ao abrigo dos TAC (totais admissíveis de capturas) fixados pelo Conselho diz respeito às subzonas CIEM VIII e IX. Para 2012, foi atribuída a Portugal uma quota de 1 298 toneladas, de um TAC de 4 222 toneladas. No entanto, esta quantidade só abrange capturas de espécies de raia que não:

- Raia-curva (*Raja undulata*)
- Raia-oirega (*Dipturus batis*)
- Raia-taigora (*Rostroraja alba*)

De acordo com as normas da UE que regem a utilização das quotas ao abrigo deste TAC, os espécimes das espécies supramencionadas capturados acidentalmente não devem ser danificados e devem ser rapidamente soltos no mar.

Convida-se o Senhor Deputado a indicar à Comissão se a espécie a que se refere na pergunta está incluída na lista das espécies sujeitas a proteção específica acima indicadas. Em caso afirmativo, a Comissão terá todo o prazer em fornecer-lhe as fontes de pareceres científicos disponíveis sobre a espécie em causa.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Regulamento (UE) n.º 43/2012 do Conselho, de 17 de janeiro de 2012, que fixa, para 2012, as possibilidades de pesca de determinadas unidades populacionais de peixes e grupos de unidades populacionais de peixes, que não são objeto de negociações ou acordos internacionais, disponíveis para os navios da UE e Regulamento (UE) n.º 44/2012 do Conselho, de 17 de janeiro de 2012, que fixa, para 2012, as possibilidades de pesca disponíveis nas águas da UE e as disponíveis, para os navios da UE, em certas águas fora da UE no respeitante a determinadas unidades populacionais de peixes e grupos de unidades populacionais de peixes que são objeto de negociações ou acordos internacionais.



(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000207/12**  
**to the Commission**  
**João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)**  
(18 January 2012)

*Subject:* Banning of yellow skate fishing in Portugal

In Portugal, the Southern Fishing Workers' Union has recently drawn attention to the issue of the ban on catching skate and the consequences that this ban is having on fishermen.

According to the union, the species known as Yellow Skate occurs in large quantities in Portuguese waters, and fishing poses no threat or danger to the species. The ban is therefore not appropriate to the Portuguese reality, because it does not take national specificity into account. Furthermore, this severely affects the incomes of small-scale fishermen, which are already particularly low.

In view of the above, the Commission is asked to answer the following:

1. What species of skate are currently prohibited from being caught?
2. What assessment has been made of the state of conservation of stocks of these species in Portuguese waters?
3. What is the specific situation of Yellow Skate?
4. In view of the sector's precarious situation, the main causes of which are the fall in fish prices at the initial point of sale and the galloping increase in production costs, what Community measures can be mobilised to support these fishermen?

**Answer given by Ms Damanaki on behalf of the Commission**  
(28 February 2012)

The Honourable Member refers to a species by a common name which does not allow the Commission to identify it among the species specifically dealt with in the European Union (EU) regulations currently in force <sup>(1)</sup>.

Portugal holds its main quota for fishing rays (all rajiformes) under the TAC (Total Allowable Catches) set by the Council for ICES Areas VIII and IX. For 2012, Portugal has been allocated a quota of 1 298 tonnes, out of the TAC of 4 222 tonnes. However, this tonnage can only comprise catches of ray species other than the following:

- Undulate ray (*Raja undulata*)
- Common skate (*Dipturus batis*)
- White skate (*Rostroraja alba*)

According to the EU rules that govern the use of the quotas under this TAC, specimens of the above species shall not be harmed when caught accidentally and shall be promptly released back to the sea.

The Honourable Member is invited to indicate to the Commission whether the species referred to in his question is included in the list above. The Commission will be pleased to refer him to the available sources of scientific advice concerning the species in question, if indeed it is among those subject to specific protection as described.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Council Regulation (EU) 43/2012 of 17 January 2012 fixing for 2012 the fishing opportunities available to EU vessels for certain fish stocks and groups of fish stocks which are not subject to international negotiations or agreements, and Council Regulation (EU) 44/2012 of 17 January 2012 fixing for 2012 the fishing opportunities available in EU waters and, to EU vessels, in certain non-EU waters for certain fish stocks and groups of fish stocks which are subject to international negotiations or agreements.

*(Versão portuguesa)*

**Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-000208/12**

**à Comissão**

**João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)**

*(18 de janeiro de 2012)*

*Assunto:* Privatização de empresas públicas no programa FMI-UE

Na resposta à pergunta P-009843/2011, sobre a situação da empresa Groundforce Portugal, a Comissão Europeia refere o seguinte: «Importa sublinhar que a legislação da UE não prescreve a privatização de empresas públicas; na verdade, o Tratado é estritamente neutro no que respeita a propriedade privada ou pública, e a Comissão segue esta linha de modo igualmente estrito».

Ora, em face desta afirmação e tendo presente o conteúdo do programa FMI-BCE-CE estabelecido para Portugal (com a designação «memorando de entendimento sobre condicionalismos específicos de política económica»), pergunto à Comissão:

Como justifica a inclusão no referido programa da imposição de privatização de numerosas empresas públicas, associadas a setores estratégicos, como os transportes e a energia?

**Resposta dada por Olli Rehn em nome da Comissão**

*(29 de fevereiro de 2012)*

Portugal está a receber uma assistência financeira substancial da UE, a qual se tornou necessária porque os mercados perderam a confiança na sustentabilidade das finanças públicas portuguesas. Para renovar essa confiança, Portugal tem de reduzir consideravelmente o défice e a dívida públicos e de tomar medidas de grande alcance, que melhorem a competitividade da economia do país.

Muitas empresas públicas portuguesas têm contribuído para o desequilíbrio das finanças públicas. Por conseguinte, é importante que as empresas em causa sejam reestruturadas e, se possível, preparadas para serem privatizadas. Se essas empresas forem rentáveis, a sua privatização contribuirá para a melhoria das finanças públicas que é necessária a curto prazo.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000208/12  
to the Commission  
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)  
(18 January 2012)**

*Subject:* Privatisation of public companies in the IMF-EU programme

In its answer to Question P-009843/2011 on the situation at the Groundforce Portugal company, the Commission states as follows: 'It is important to stress that EC law does not prescribe the privatisation of public undertakings; indeed the Treaty is strictly neutral as regards private or public ownership and the Commission equally strictly follows this line'.

In view of the above and the content of the IMF-ECB-EC programme established for Portugal (known as 'Memorandum of Understanding on specific economic policy constraints'), the Commission is asked to answer the following:

How can it justify the inclusion in the said programme of compulsory privatisation of numerous public companies associated with strategic sectors, such as transport and energy?

**Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission  
(29 February 2012)**

Portugal is currently receiving substantial financial assistance from the EU. Such assistance has become necessary because markets have lost confidence in the sustainability of Portuguese public finances. To regain this confidence, Portugal needs to reduce substantially its government deficit and debt and implement wide-ranging measures that improve the competitiveness of its economy.

Many of the state-owned enterprises in Portugal have exerted a significant drag on public finances. It is therefore important that efforts are made to re-structure such companies and, if feasible, make them ready for privatisation. To the extent that these enterprises are profitable, their privatisation will contribute to the needed short-term improvement in the public finances.

---

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000212/12  
alla Commissione**

**Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)**

(18 gennaio 2012)

Oggetto: Protesi per bambini mutilati

A causa della grave crisi umanitaria generata dal terremoto del 2010, oltre che da una situazione nazionale che richiede da tempo la presenza delle forze ONU, molti sono oggi i bambini invalidi, soprattutto a seguito di inevitabili amputazioni degli arti che li costringono ad una vita diversa da quelli di tanti loro coetanei. Un giovane ingegnere italiano, visto il numero di ragazzi con problemi deambulatori e considerato il loro handicap permanente, ha pensato di allestire il primo laboratorio ortopedico. La missione, sostenuta anche dalla Fondazione Rava, ha già impiantato una ventina di protesi. L'esperimento doveva durare una decina di giorni, ma visto il successo ottenuto e la necessità di protesi ad Haiti, l'ingegnere è ritornato sul posto ed ha iniziato a brevettare e a produrre (ormai dal 2007) protesi ipertecnologiche, leggere e resistenti in fibra di carbone. Queste vengono offerte ai bambini bisognosi di Haiti al prezzo di produzione.

È tuttavia facile comprendere, che per mantenere una tale lodevole iniziativa, servano fondi, tecnici di ortopedia, laboratori, ecc.

I fondi sono giunti sinora grazie a raccolte del Lions e alle donazioni dei soci, a banchetti in piazza, a feste di beneficenza, a iniziative delle banche: di tratta di denaro importante, se si calcola che ogni protesi, necessaria per far camminare di nuovo un bambino, costa mille euro.

Alla luce di quanto sopra esposto, può la Commissione chiarire:

1. se e come possono essere finanziate tali esemplari iniziative, affinché la missione possa essere sostenuta ed affiancata dalle forze umanitarie e di polizia europee presenti sul posto e non rischi di dover chiudere i battenti a causa della mancanza di fondi;
2. se la Commissione è a conoscenza e collabora con missioni simili a quella descritta nell'isola di Haiti.

**Risposta data da Kristalina Georgieva a nome della Commissione**

(27 febbraio 2012)

La Commissione (Direzione generale Aiuti umanitari e protezione civile — DG ECHO) fornisce assistenza d'urgenza e soccorso alle vittime di disastri naturali o conflitti armati all'esterno dell'Unione europea. La Commissione opera finanziando progetti realizzati da organizzazioni non governative registrate in uno Stato membro dell'Unione europea o da organizzazioni internazionali, in entrambi i casi specializzate nel settore umanitario. Questi due criteri sono cumulativi e obbligatori.

Per essere finanziate, le organizzazioni candidate devono seguire una procedura di selezione che può portare alla firma di un contratto quadro di partenariato (CQP). Ulteriori informazioni sono disponibili sul sito della DG Aiuti umanitari: [http://ec.europa.eu/echo/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/echo/index_en.htm).

La Commissione ha sostenuto Handicap International (Francia e Belgio) nella fase di emergenza e ricostruzione rapida. Nella fase di emergenza, il sostegno si è focalizzato sulla cura di pazienti feriti (operazioni, preparazione dell'arto) e sulla fornitura di protesi temporanee. È stato inoltre sostenuto un progetto di follow-up realizzato da Handicap International France volto a sostituire le protesi temporanee con protesi definitive, formare personale nella preparazione di protesi, accompagnare i pazienti attraverso gruppi di discussione, consulenza pratica nonché sostegno psicosociale. Handicap International è attualmente finanziato per fornire opportunità di sostentamento ai diversamente abili o per fornire soluzioni (incluso l'adattamento delle loro abitazioni) che permettano loro condizioni di vita sostenibili.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000212/12  
to the Commission**

**Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)**

(18 January 2012)

*Subject:* Prostheses for maimed children

Due to the serious humanitarian crisis caused by the 2010 earthquake in Haiti, as well as by a national situation that for some time has been requiring the presence of UN forces, today the number of disabled children is high, mostly due to unavoidable amputations of limbs that force them to live a life that is different from that of many of their peers. Given the number of children with walking problems, and in view of their permanent disability, a young Italian engineer has decided to set up the first orthopaedic laboratory. The mission, which is also being supported by the Rava Foundation, has already fitted around twenty prostheses. The trial run was to last ten days, but given the resulting success and the need for prostheses in Haiti, the engineer returned there and started to patent and produce (since 2007) high-tech, light and hard-wearing carbon fibre prostheses. These are being offered to needy children in Haiti at production price.

However, it is easy to understand that funds, orthopaedic technicians, laboratories, etc. are needed to maintain such a worthy initiative.

The funds received so far have been collected by the Lions and through donations from members during open air dinners and charity parties, as well as through initiatives organised by banks: this money is important, especially in view of the fact that each prosthesis, needed to help a child walk again, costs one thousand euro.

In light of the foregoing, can the Commission clarify:

1. whether and how such exemplary initiatives can be funded, so that the mission can be supported and assisted by humanitarian organisations and European police forces present on the ground, and avoid having to close its doors due to lack of funds;
2. whether the Commission is aware of and is working with missions similar to the one described and operating on the island of Haiti.

**Answer given by Mrs Georgieva on behalf of the Commission**

(27 February 2012)

The Commission (Directorate-General Humanitarian Aid & Civil protection (DG ECHO)) provides emergency assistance and relief to the victims of natural disasters or armed conflict outside the European Union. The Commission operates by funding projects implemented by non-governmental organisations registered in a Member State of the European Union or international organisations, both having to be specialised in the humanitarian field. These two criteria are cumulative and both compulsory.

To be financed, applicant organisations must go through a selection procedure that may lead to the signature of a Framework Partnership Agreement (FPA). More information can be found in the Humanitarian Aid website: [http://ec.europa.eu/echo/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/echo/index_en.htm)

The Commission has supported Handicap International (France and Belgium) in the emergency and early recovery phase. In the emergency phase, the support focused on treating wounded patients (operations, preparation of the limb) and on the provision of temporary prostheses. Support was also provided for a follow-up project implemented by Handicap International France aimed at replacing temporary prostheses with permanent ones, training people in the preparation of prostheses, accompanying patients through focus-group discussions, practical advice and psychosocial support. Handicap International is currently being funded to provide handicapped people with livelihood opportunities or to provide them with solutions (including adaptation of their homes) to allow them to access livelihoods.

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000213/12  
alla Commissione**

**Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)**

(25 gennaio 2012)

**Oggetto:** Pannelli fotovoltaici in sovrapproduzione, crisi delle aziende produttrici

Dopo il primo anno di pieno successo per il fotovoltaico, in Italia così come nel resto d'Europa la corsa alla produzione di energia da fonte solare sembra aver diminuito il suo appeal. Il crollo del prezzo dei pannelli, che da un lato favorisce la diffusione di questa tecnologia, dall'altro sta mandando in crisi alcune tra le più grandi industrie.

Negli anni scorsi generosi incentivi sono stati concessi per l'installazione dei pannelli solari da molti governi, compreso quello italiano, ma ora il fotovoltaico rischia ora di rimanere vittima del suo stesso impeto, schiacciato dall'eccesso di capacità produttiva. Nel 2011 i sussidi sono stati tagliati un po' dappertutto, ed il calo della domanda sta provocando un eccesso produttivo di materia prima, moduli e pannelli, che sta avendo conseguenze negative sulle grandi aziende produttive di polisilicio od altri elementi necessari alla costruzione degli elementi del fotovoltaico. Proprio per il polisilicio, la produzione in eccesso del 20 % rispetto alla domanda, ha fatto calare i prezzi di vendita del 93 %.

La conseguenza è che le diverse previsioni concordano sull'inesorabile discesa del valore azionario delle società del settore con rischio il loro stesso fallimento.

A seguito di quanto esposto, può la Commissione spiegare:

come intende reagire ad una crisi annunciata del settore delle aziende produttrici di fotovoltaico, causata in parte anche dalla diminuzione dei sussidi europei?

**Risposta data da Günther Oettinger a nome della Commissione**

(24 febbraio 2012)

In questo mercato di massa, relativamente nuovo, l'andamento dei costi è stato particolarmente volatile. Il crollo generale dei costi del fotovoltaico deve tuttavia essere accolto con favore, in quanto consente di ridurre gli incentivi finanziari e di contenere i costi a carico dei consumatori. L'attuale quadro europeo per l'energia rinnovabile dovrebbe dare stabilità agli investitori e aiutare a promuovere una crescita continua del mercato del fotovoltaico a beneficio dell'industria, grazie alla creazione di innovazione e occupazione. Se è vero che per evitare sovracompensazioni potrebbero rendersi necessari aggiustamenti al ribasso dei livelli di sostegno, è altrettanto vero che questi ritocchi devono essere trasparenti, prevedibili e non retroattivi. Gli Stati membri sono responsabili di determinare autonomamente il proprio mix di tecnologie nonché di decidere con quali regimi di sostegno realizzarlo per conseguire gli obiettivi nazionali vincolanti nel campo delle energie rinnovabili. Essi devono tuttavia garantire, insieme ai tribunali nazionali, il rispetto dei principi della legislazione UE, compresa la certezza giuridica e la protezione delle legittime aspettative.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000213/12  
to the Commission**

**Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)**

(25 January 2012)

*Subject:* Overproduction of solar panels, crisis amongst producers

After the first year of complete success for solar panels, in Italy as in the rest of Europe, the race to produce solar energy seems to have lost its appeal. The fall in the price of panels is encouraging the spread of the technology but is also plunging some of the biggest companies into crisis.

In past years many governments, including the Italian Government, gave generous incentives for the installation of solar panels, but now the sector risks becoming a victim of its own success, crushed by excess production capacity. In 2011 subsidies were cut nearly everywhere, and a decrease in demand is leading to overproduction of raw materials, modules and panels, which is adversely affecting large producers of polysilicon or other materials necessary for the manufacture of solar panel components. In the case of polysilicon alone, production is 20 % above demand, and this has caused retail prices to fall by 93 %.

As a result, the forecasts all point to an unremitting decline in the share prices of companies in the sector and to the risk of bankruptcy.

How will the Commission respond to the crisis announced by companies in the solar panel sector, caused partly by the decrease in European subsidies?

**Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission**

(24 February 2012)

The evolution of costs in this relatively new mass market has been more volatile than desirable. However, the overall decline in the costs of PV is to be welcomed, since it allows financial incentives to be reduced, along with the costs to energy consumers. The current European framework for renewable energy should provide stability to investors and help promote continuous PV market growth, to the benefit of the industry, generating industrial innovation and employment. While downward adjustments in support levels might be necessary to avoid overcompensation, these changes have to be transparent, predictable and not retroactive. Member States are responsible for deciding on their own technology mix and on which support schemes to implement in order to achieve their national mandatory renewable energy targets. However, they have to ensure, together with their national courts, that the principles of EC law are respected, including legal certainty and the protection of legitimate expectations.

---

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000214/12  
alla Commissione**

**Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)**

(18 gennaio 2012)

Oggetto: La produzione di oppio in Birmania e nei paesi vicini

Un recente rapporto sul Sudest asiatico dell'agenzia Onu sulle droghe e il crimine rivela che in Birmania la coltivazione del papavero da oppio sta aumentando vertiginosamente (+14 %) e sale anche la produzione di droga finita (+5 %, per un totale di 670 tonnellate). I prezzi alla vendita in conseguenza sono in ascesa dal 2002: se nel 2010 in Birmania un chilo di oppio valeva 305 dollari, quest'anno siamo a 450 dollari, +48 %. Il pericolo ora è che, grazie ad un potenziale guadagno in continuo aumento, altri paesi confinanti con la Birmania possano convertirsi alla massiccia produzione (quali la Cina, la Thailandia e il Laos).

Nessuna politica antidroga in Birmania ha mai avuto alcuna possibilità di successo, se non la si lega a una reale soluzione politica alla guerra civile ed un significativo processo democratico. Il narcotraffico è inciso nella storia della Birmania, un business che è stato definito dall'ONU un commercio nel Sudest asiatico in mano a gang africane ed iraniane.

A seguito di quanto esposto, può la Commissione spiegare:

1. come intende agire per evitare il dilagare della produzione dell'oppio ad altri Paesi asiatici?
2. intende affiancare o prevedere azioni europee ad hoc simili alle missioni delle Nazioni Unite, per sconfiggere la produzione di oppio, e promuovere la sostituzione di questa coltura con altre più utili al paese ed ai suoi cittadini?
3. è in possesso di dati sull'importazione all'interno dell'UE di oppio sia dalla Birmania, così come da altri paesi produttori?

**Risposta data dall'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione**

(1° marzo 2012)

L'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente è consapevole del problema della droga in Myanmar e nei paesi vicini. Oltre alla produzione di oppio, per la quale il Myanmar occupa il secondo posto seguendo a distanza l'Afghanistan, desta preoccupazione anche l'aumento degli ATS (stimolanti di tipo anfetaminico) e di altre droghe sintetiche. Il valore delle importazioni di oppio dal Myanmar in Europa resta inferiore rispetto a quello delle importazioni da altri paesi, come rivela l'indagine sull'oppio condotta dall'UNODC per l'Asia sudorientale:  
[http://www.unodc.org/documents/crop-monitoring/sea/SouthEastAsia\\_2011\\_web.pdf](http://www.unodc.org/documents/crop-monitoring/sea/SouthEastAsia_2011_web.pdf).

La distruzione delle coltivazioni di papavero o la loro sostituzione con altre colture richiederebbero una strategia globale sul modello dello «sviluppo alternativo», ivi compreso il miglioramento di infrastrutture, istruzione e servizi sanitari, nonché l'accesso ai mercati dei prodotti alternativi. Oltre ad essere costosa, l'operazione è resa impossibile dalle misure restrittive attualmente applicate dall'UE. Mentre il governo del Myanmar è impegnato a combattere la produzione di oppio e droghe sintetiche, in questo momento l'UE non ha né il mandato politico, né i mezzi finanziari, per collaborare con le Nazioni Unite e il governo allo sviluppo alternativo.

Questa situazione potrebbe cambiare in modo significativo se l'evoluzione e le tendenze positive in atto nel paese venissero ulteriormente consolidate.



(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000214/12  
to the Commission**

**Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)**

(18 January 2012)

*Subject:* Opium production in Burma and neighbouring countries

A recent report on South-East Asia by the UN Office on Drugs and Crime reveals a rapid increase in opium production (+14%) and an increase in production of the refined drug (+5%, giving a total of 670 tonnes). Consequently, prices have risen since 2002: whereas in 2010 a kilo of opium was worth USD 305, this year the figure has risen to USD 450, in other words by 48%. The danger is, given the ever increasing potential profits, that countries bordering Burma (China, Thailand, Laos etc.) could turn to mass production.

No drug enforcement policy has ever stood any chance of success in Burma, but change could come about if the necessary measures were to be combined with a real political solution to the civil war and a significant democratic process. Drug trafficking is ingrained in Burma's history and, as far as South-East Asia is concerned is a business which the UN has described as being controlled by Iranian and African gangs.

1. How will the Commission act to stop the tide of opium production reaching other South-East Asian countries?
2. Will it support or plan ad hoc European actions similar to the UN missions, in order to destroy opium production and promote the replacement of opium with other crops more useful to Burma and its citizens?
3. Does it have figures on opium imports into the EU, both from Burma and from other producer countries?

**Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission**

(1 March 2012)

The High Representative/Vice-President is well aware of the drug situation in Myanmar and the neighbouring countries. Apart from the production of opium — where Myanmar is a distant second after Afghanistan — the increase in ATS and other synthetic drugs is causing concern. Opium imports from Myanmar to Europe are still smaller in value than from other countries, as indicated in the UNODC opium survey for South-East Asia: [http://www.unodc.org/documents/crop-monitoring/sea/SouthEastAsia\\_2011\\_web.pdf](http://www.unodc.org/documents/crop-monitoring/sea/SouthEastAsia_2011_web.pdf)

The destruction or replacement of poppy field by other crops would require a comprehensive strategy along the lines of 'alternative development', including better infrastructure, education and health services, and market access for alternative products. This is not only a costly undertaking, but also not possible under the current restrictive measures applied by the EU. While the Government of Myanmar is committed to fight the production of opium and synthetic drugs, the EU has at this moment neither the political mandate nor the budget to work with the UN and the Government on alternative development.

This situation could change significantly as current positive developments and trends in the country are further consolidated.

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000215/12  
alla Commissione**

**Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)**

(18 gennaio 2012)

Oggetto: Iniezione di liquidità della BCE alle banche italiane

Recentemente la BCE, con un tasso di interesse dell'1 %, ha versato alle banche italiane 116 miliardi di euro.

Questa iniezione di liquidità, voluta dalle istituzioni europee, era finalizzata a sostenere la crescita e lo sviluppo attraverso una politica di sostegno al credito.

Al contrario, il sistema bancario italiano ha impiegato gran parte di questo denaro, ottenuto a condizioni oggettivamente vantaggiose, per acquistare titoli del debito pubblico, approfittando dell'alto rendimento di questi titoli e lucrando sulla significativa differenza del tasso di interesse.

Il mondo della politica ed il sistema delle imprese italiane denunciano, a tal proposito, come i crediti agevolati destinati alle famiglie e alle imprese non siano affatto aumentati dopo questa iniezione di liquidità, e comunque siano rimasti ancorati a tassi di interesse e condizioni di accesso esagerate e, per gran parte dei soggetti che vi aspirerebbero, assolutamente proibitive.

In questo modo, la finalità del prestito della BCE, piuttosto che «fondo salva Stati» finalizzato a sostenere la crescita degli Stati membri, si configurerebbe come un «fondo pro banche», destinato a sostenere operazioni capaci di garantire utilità certa ai soli istituti di credito.

Tutto ciò premesso, si chiede alla Commissione:

1. se non intenda immediatamente promuovere uno studio per verificare quanti dei fondi versati dalla BCE a tasso agevolato alle banche italiane sono stati effettivamente usati per garantire linee di credito a favore di imprese e famiglie;
2. se e come sono migliorate le condizioni del credito in Italia a seguito di questa immissione di liquidità nel sistema bancario nazionale;
3. se, a seguito di questo studio, da effettuarsi con tempi e modalità urgenti, non intenda rivedere i criteri con cui ripartire eventuali ulteriori risorse destinate agli Stati membri per affrontare la crisi economica e sostenere la crescita e lo sviluppo.

**Risposta data da Olli Rehn a nome della Commissione**

(14 marzo 2012)

Le misure rafforzate di sostegno al credito recentemente realizzate dalla Banca centrale europea (BCE) sono volte a sostenere i prestiti bancari e la liquidità nei mercati monetari dell'area dell'euro. Le iniezioni di liquidità e le modalità di assegnazione delle operazioni di rifinanziamento della BCE continueranno a sostenere le banche dell'area dell'euro e con esse il finanziamento delle imprese e delle famiglie. Nel corso della conferenza stampa del consiglio direttivo della BCE, svoltasi il 12 gennaio 2012, il presidente Mario Draghi ha affermato che la BCE osservava chiari segnali del fatto che i prestiti concessi dalla BCE alle banche non rimanevano un semplice deposito presso la banca centrale, ma circolavano nel sistema economico.

Visto che non sono ancora disponibili i dati necessari all'analisi, è prematuro trarre conclusioni in merito al miglioramento o meno delle condizioni di credito in Italia a seguito dell'iniezione di liquidità della BCE. Ad ogni modo è degno di nota il fatto che nel corso del mese di gennaio alcuni segmenti dei mercati finanziari dell'area dell'euro abbiano mostrato segni di ripresa (ad esempio, l'aumento dell'emissione di obbligazioni societarie, la diminuzione dei rendimenti sui titoli di Stato italiani e di altri Stati membri, la riduzione del costo dei finanziamenti in dollari per le banche dell'area dell'euro), il che suggerisce che sia stata evitata una stretta creditizia.

La Commissione sta monitorando attentamente i mercati finanziari e i relativi settori in tutti i paesi dell'UE. Il settore finanziario è diventato una componente importante della sorveglianza rafforzata degli Stati membri. La procedura per gli squilibri macroeconomici ha consentito di intensificare le procedure di controllo, che comprendono anche la valutazione degli sviluppi nel settore bancario e i trend sul fronte del credito.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000215/12  
to the Commission**

**Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)**

(18 January 2012)

*Subject:* ECB liquidity injection for Italian banks

Recently the ECB provided Italian banks with EUR 116 billion at a 1 % interest rate.

This liquidity injection, sought by the EU institutions, was aimed at encouraging growth and development through a credit support policy.

The Italian banking system, however, has used the majority of these funds, obtained at objectively advantageous conditions, to buy sovereign debt, taking advantage of their high yield and profiting from the significant interest rate difference.

Italian politicians and companies have exposed how subsidised loans for family and businesses did not increase at all after this liquidity injection and are still characterised by excessive or — for the majority of the individuals that would like to take them up — absolutely prohibitive interest rates and access conditions.

In this way, the ECB loan, rather than being ‘a bailout fund for States’ aimed at supporting the growth of Member States, seems to be a ‘pro-bank fund’ aimed at supporting operations that can provide guaranteed profits for the usual credit institutions.

In light of the foregoing, could the Commission state:

1. Whether it intends to launch immediately a study to verify how much of the ECB received by Italian banks at a subsidised interest rate has been actually used to guarantee credit lines to companies and families?
2. Whether and how credit conditions have improved in Italy following this liquidity injection into the national banking system?
3. Whether, following this study — to be carried out as a matter of urgency — it intends to review the criteria for allocating any further resources to Member States, with which to tackle the economic crisis and support growth and development?

**Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission**

(14 March 2012)

The enhanced credit support measures recently launched by the European Central Bank aimed at supporting bank lending and liquidity in the euro area money markets. The provision of liquidity and the allotment modes for refinancing operations of the ECB will continue to support euro area banks, and thus the financing of firms and households. At the ECB's Governing Council press conference held on 12 January 2012, President Mario Draghi said that the ECB was seeing clear signs that the money lent by the ECB to banks was not simply staying in the deposit facility, but was circulating in the economy.

With regard to whether credit conditions have improved in Italy following the ECB's liquidity injection, it is still early to draw definitive conclusions as data are not yet available to conduct this analysis. It is nevertheless noteworthy that some segments of the euro area financial markets have shown signs of improvement in the course of January (e.g. issuance of corporate bonds has increased, yields of Italian sovereign bonds have declined, dollar funding costs have decreased) which suggest that a credit crunch has been avoided.

The Commission monitors closely financial markets and sectors in all EU countries. The financial sector has become an important component of the enhanced surveillance of Member States. The monitoring procedures have been stepped up with the Macroeconomic Imbalances Procedure, which also includes an assessment of developments in the banking sector and credit trends.

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000216/12  
alla Commissione**

**Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)**

(18 gennaio 2012)

Oggetto: Situazione occupazionale italiana secondo i dati ISTAT

Gli ultimi dati ISTAT relativi al mese di novembre 2011 presentano un quadro della situazione occupazionale italiana assolutamente preoccupante. Infatti, le categorie più penalizzate sono, ancora una volta, giovani e donne.

In particolare, a fronte di una disoccupazione media dell'8,6 %, la disoccupazione dei giovani tra 15 e 24 anni tocca quota 30,1 %, con un aumento dell'1,8 % rispetto allo stesso mese dell'anno precedente.

Sul fronte della disoccupazione femminile, la percentuale è del 9,9 % (contro il 7,6 % di quella maschile).

Tutto ciò premesso, si chiede alla Commissione di conoscere:

1. quali sono i programmi già attivati dalla Commissione per favorire l'inclusione nel mondo del lavoro di categorie tradizionalmente deboli, come giovani e donne;
2. quali ulteriori iniziative intenda adottare per sostenere concrete politiche di sostegno all'occupazione giovanile e femminile, con particolare riferimento alla citata situazione italiana.

**Risposta data da László Andor a nome della Commissione**

(22 febbraio 2012)

La Commissione è al corrente della situazione dell'occupazione in Italia.

Tra gli obiettivi principali della strategia Europa 2020 vi è il raggiungimento di un tasso di occupazione del 75 % (persone dai 20 ai 64 anni) e la riduzione della dispersione scolastica che andrebbe portata al 10 %. In tale contesto, l'Italia ha iniziato il recepimento di una raccomandazione specifica volta a promuovere una maggiore partecipazione delle donne nel mercato del lavoro <sup>(1)</sup>. La Commissione segue i progressi compiuti alla luce di tale raccomandazione nel contesto del semestre europeo corrente.

Esistono diversi programmi e politiche UE di lunga data o nuovi, compresi Eures <sup>(2)</sup>, Youth on Move <sup>(3)</sup>, l'iniziativa Opportunità per i giovani <sup>(4)</sup> e Progress <sup>(5)</sup>.

I principali strumenti finanziari dell'UE in questo ambito sono i Fondi strutturali, in particolare il Fondo sociale europeo (FSE). L'FSE 2007-2013 cofinanzia in Italia 24 programmi operativi (PO) per un importo complessivo di circa 15 miliardi di euro (contributo FSE più quota nazionale). Esso sostiene, tra l'altro, le azioni di mainstreaming e gli interventi specifici per accrescere la partecipazione sostenibile delle donne e la loro progressione nel mondo del lavoro nonché l'accesso dei giovani all'occupazione e l'investimento nel capitale umano.

Le autorità di gestione dei PO sono direttamente responsabili della loro attuazione. La Commissione prevede però di organizzare una riunione con loro nel primo semestre del 2012 per discutere di un'eventuale revisione delle attività del PO italiano al fine di accrescere il sostegno all'occupazione dei giovani.

L'occupazione giovanile e femminile sarà anche al centro dei negoziati per il prossimo periodo di programmazione del FSE. La proposta di regolamento del FSE avanzata dalla Commissione identifica «l'accesso all'occupazione», «i giovani» e «la parità tra gli uomini e le donne» tra le priorità di investimento.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> «intensificare gli sforzi, aumentando la disponibilità di asili e servizi di assistenza in tutto il paese e fornendo incentivi finanziari alle persone che costituiscono le seconde fonti di reddito familiare per accedere ai posti di lavoro in un modo neutro in termini di bilancio». Raccomandazione del Consiglio 11408/11 del 20/06/2011.

<sup>(2)</sup> <http://ec.europa.eu/eures/home.jsp?lang=en>

<sup>(3)</sup> <http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=950&langId=en>

<sup>(4)</sup> <http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?langId=en&catId=950&newsId=1143&furtherNews=yes>

<sup>(5)</sup> <http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=987&langId=en>

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000216/12  
to the Commission**

**Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)**

(18 January 2012)

*Subject:* Employment situation in Italy according to ISTAT data

The latest ISTAT data pertaining to the month of November 2011 paint an extremely worrying picture of Italy's employment situation. As a matter of fact, the most disadvantaged categories are, once again, young people and women.

Specifically, against the backdrop of an average unemployment rate of 8.6 %, unemployment among 15- to 24-year-olds has reached 30.1 %, 1.8 % more compared to the same month of the previous year.

9.9 % of women are unemployed (against 7.6 % of men).

In the light of the foregoing, could the Commission state:

1. Which programmes it has already mobilised in order to facilitate participation in the workforce for traditionally disadvantaged categories such as young people and women?
2. Which additional initiatives it intends to adopt in order to encourage tangible youth and female employment support policies, with specific reference to the aforementioned situation in Italy?

**Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission**

(22 February 2012)

The Commission is aware of the Italian employment situation.

The Europe 2020 strategy key targets include the attainment of an employment rate of 75 % (20-64 year-old people) and the reduction of drop-outs to 10 %. Within this context, in June 2011 Italy was addressed a specific recommendation to promote greater participation of women in the labour market <sup>(1)</sup>. The Commission monitors progress towards this recommendation in the context of the ongoing European semester.

A number of long established or new EU policies and programmes are in place, including Eures <sup>(2)</sup>, Youth on Move <sup>(3)</sup>, the Youth Opportunities Initiative <sup>(4)</sup> and Progress <sup>(5)</sup>.

The main EU financial instruments in this field are the Structural funds, in particular the European Social Fund (ESF). The 2007-2013 ESF co-funds in Italy 24 operational programmes (OPs), for a total amount of about EUR 15 billion (ESF plus national share). It supports *inter alia* mainstreaming and specific action to increase women's sustainable participation and progress in employment as well as youth access to employment and investment in human capital.

The Managing Authorities of the OPs are directly responsible for their implementation. The Commission is nevertheless envisaging a meeting with them in the first half of 2012 to consider some possible revision of Italian OP activities to increase support to young people's employment.

Youth and female employment will also be central in the negotiation for the next ESF programming period. The ESF regulation proposal by the Commission identifies 'access to employment', 'young people' and 'equality between men and women' among the investment priorities.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> 'step up efforts, by increasing the availability of care facilities throughout the country and providing financial incentives to second earners to take up work in a budgetary neutral way'. Council Recommendation 11408/11 of 20.6.2011.

<sup>(2)</sup> <http://ec.europa.eu/eures/home.jsp?lang=en>

<sup>(3)</sup> <http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=950&langId=en>

<sup>(4)</sup> <http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?langId=en&catId=950&newsId=1143&furtherNews=yes>

<sup>(5)</sup> <http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=987&langId=en>

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000217/12  
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)**

**Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)**

(18 gennaio 2012)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Espulsione console venezuelano dagli Stati Uniti

Il Dipartimento di Stato americano ha ordinato l'espulsione di Livia Acosta Noguera, console venezuelano a Miami, a seguito di un episodio di guerra informatica organizzato nel 2006 da Venezuela e Iran per introdursi via internet in impianti sensibili degli Stati Uniti, quali centri legati alla difesa, industrie e siti nucleari.

Diverse indagini hanno anche dimostrato come il tandem Hezbollah-Iran stia lavorando da anni sullo scacchiere latino americano, con attività di spionaggio e creazione di avamposti, sotto la copertura di imprese commerciali, insediati nell'isola di Margarita in Venezuela, Ciudad del Este in Paraguay e altre località, tra cui una anche a Cuba. Inoltre, Teheran avrebbe usato un collegamento aereo con il Venezuela per trasferire materiali e personaggi sospetti.

Alla luce della gravità dei fatti citati, si chiede al Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante di rispondere ai seguenti quesiti:

1. È il Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante a conoscenza dell'episodio riferito?
2. Quali iniziative intende intraprendere per verificare la serietà e l'affidabilità della rete diplomatica e dei rapporti che intercorrono tra istituzioni europee e Venezuela, anche in considerazione dei sempre più frequenti legami tra Iran e paesi dell'America Latina, concretizzatisi nella missione internazionale che in questi giorni impegna il presidente iraniano Ahmadinejad in Venezuela, Nicaragua, Cuba ed Ecuador?

**Risposta data dall'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione**

(12 aprile 2012)

1. L'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton è al corrente del fatto che nel gennaio 2012 il dipartimento di Stato USA ha dichiarato «persona non grata» Livia Acosta Noguera, il console venezuelano a Miami. Il Dipartimento di Stato non si è espresso sul motivo dell'espulsione.
  2. A Caracas l'UE è rappresentata dalla sua delegazione. Il servizio europeo per l'azione esterna e altre istituzioni europee hanno adottato diverse iniziative volte a mettere in sicurezza la loro rete anche attraverso lo sviluppo di un sistema informatico globale che permetta una comunicazione sicura tra le istituzioni. Il SEAE e la Commissione stanno lavorando per migliorare l'affidabilità della rete diplomatica tra le delegazioni dell'UE e le ambasciate degli Stati membri in paesi terzi.
-

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000217/12**  
**to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)**  
**Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)**  
(18 January 2012)

*Subject:* VP/HR — Expulsion of Venezuelan consul from the US

The US Department of State has ordered the expulsion of Livia Acosta Noguera, the Venezuelan consul in Miami, following an episode of 'cyberwar' masterminded in 2006 by Venezuela and Iran with the aim of hacking by means of the Internet into sensitive US systems, including those connected with defence, industry and nuclear plants.

Various investigations have revealed how the Hezbollah-Iran duo has been operating for years on the Latin American 'chessboard', by means of espionage activities and the creation of forward positions, under the cover of businesses located in Isla Magartia in Venezuela, Ciudad del Este in Paraguay and elsewhere, including a location in Cuba. Furthermore, Tehran appears to have used an air link with Venezuela to transfer suspect materials and individuals.

In light of these grave facts:

1. Is the Vice-President/High Representative aware of this episode?
2. What initiatives will the Vice-President/High Representative take to verify the reliability of the diplomatic network and the relationship between the European institutions and Venezuela, considering also the ever more frequent links between Iran and Latin American countries, as currently manifested in Iran's President Ahmadinejad's international mission to Venezuela, Nicaragua, Cuba and Ecuador?

**Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission**  
(12 April 2012)

1. The High Representative/Vice-President is aware that, in January 2012, the US Department of State declared *persona non-grata* the Venezuelan Consul in Miami Livia Acosta Noguera. The State Department did not comment on the reason for the expulsion.
  2. The EU is represented in Caracas through the Delegation of the European Union. The EEAS and other European institutions have taken a number of initiatives in order to secure their network including through the development of a global IT system that facilitates secure communications between Institutions. The EEAS and the Commission are now working to enhance the reliability of the diplomatic network between EU Delegations and Member States' embassies in third countries.
-



*(Versione italiana)*

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000218/12  
alla Commissione**

**Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)**

*(25 gennaio 2012)*

**Oggetto:** Violazione dei trattati europei in merito alla circolazione di una moneta diversa dall'Euro

Il comune di Filetino, in provincia di Frosinone — in Italia, avrebbe organizzato un referendum tra i suoi abitanti (715 partecipanti in tutto), decretando di autodeterminarsi in principato autonomo. A tale stravaganza, avvenuta a distanza dal periodo di carnevale, è seguita quella di nominare provvisoriamente un principe reggente.

Lo stesso, rilasciando recentemente un'intervista su un quotidiano italiano a diffusione nazionale, ha confermato la circostanza, annunciando addirittura di essere in procinto di chiedere il riconoscimento della Chiesa Cattolica, e che «cinesi e giapponesi» starebbero per riconoscere il principato.

A questa somma di stravaganze si aggiunge però un episodio che viola palesemente la Costituzione Italiana e il principio dell'unione economica e monetaria europea: sarebbe stata infatti stampata una moneta, il «fiorito», che viene accettata da alcuni esercizi commerciali del paese.

Alla luce di quanto sopra esposto, può dire la Commissione quali sono le possibilità che una parte del territorio all'interno dell'Unione Europea abbandoni volontariamente la moneta unica e che cosa comporterebbe una siffatta decisione?

**Risposta data da Olli Rehn a nome della Commissione**

*(20 marzo 2012)*

A norma del regolamento (CE) n. 974/98 <sup>(1)</sup> del Consiglio, la valuta avente corso legale sul territorio italiano è l'euro.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> GUL 139 dell'11.5.1998.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000218/12  
to the Commission**

**Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)**

(25 January 2012)

*Subject:* Violation of the European Treaties concerning the circulation of a currency other than the euro

The municipality of Filetino (Frosinone province, Italy), would seem to have organised a referendum of its inhabitants (715 in total), decreeing that it wishes to declare itself, on the basis of self-determination, an autonomous principality. This unusual event took place around the beginning of Lent, and culminated in the provisional nomination of a 'prince regent'.

The 'regent', when interviewed by an Italian national newspaper, confirmed these facts, even claiming that he was within his rights in requesting recognition from the Catholic Church and that the 'Chinese and Japanese' were about to recognise the principality.

This bizarre chain of events has, however, been followed by a blatant violation of the Italian Constitution and the principle of economic and monetary union: a currency, the 'fiorito', has apparently been issued and is being accepted by certain local businesses.

Bearing the above facts in mind, what are the possibilities for a given part of EU territory to abandon the single currency of its own volition, and what would be the implications of any decision to that effect?

**Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission**

(20 March 2012)

Pursuant to Council Regulation (EC) No 974/98 <sup>(1)</sup>, the currency being the legal tender in the territory of Italy is the euro.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ L 139, 11.5.1998.

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000219/12  
alla Commissione**

**Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE) e Antonio Cancian (PPE)**

(18 gennaio 2012)

Oggetto: Licenziamenti a Murano — richiesta di attivazione del FEG

Murano, isola simbolo per la produzione di vetreria artistica, sta attraversando una grave crisi, poiché da 6 000 addetti nel 1990 si è passati a circa 1 000 unità lavorative impiegate nel 2011.

Ciò è causato dalla delocalizzazione di parte delle produzioni in Cina, con conseguente svendita dei manufatti a prezzi ridotti e mancanza di mercato per i manufatti artigianali ancora prodotti a Murano. La crisi di queste aziende, oltre a rappresentare un dramma sotto il profilo occupazionale, rischia di decretare la fine di una località simbolo a livello mondiale per la produzione di manufatti in vetro di alto pregio.

La Confindustria di Venezia ha recentemente elaborato un progetto per coinvolgere artisti italiani finalizzato a coniugare la lavorazione del vetro all'arte contemporanea, creando così manufatti non imitabili.

Può la Commissione far sapere:

1. quali iniziative anticontraffazione dell'artigianato tipico di Murano possono essere attivate;
2. quali ulteriori azioni concrete l'Unione può mettere in campo per promuovere l'artigianato muranese;
3. vista l'entità della riduzione del livello occupazionale, se sia possibile attivare il fondo europeo di adeguamento alla globalizzazione?

**Risposta data da Antonio Tajani a nome della Commissione**

(24 febbraio 2012)

1. Varie sono le misure disponibili per tutelare e far applicare i diritti di proprietà intellettuale (DPI) nell'UE e nei suoi Stati membri. In questo caso specifico i titolari di DPI, ad esempio marchi commerciali o indicazioni geografiche, possono appellarsi alle disposizioni idonee nell'ambito della legislazione italiana che riguardano misure di esecuzione della direttiva sul rispetto dei diritti di proprietà intellettuale <sup>(1)</sup>. Quanto alle merci importate da paesi terzi, le autorità italiane competenti possono operare conformemente al regolamento dell'UE <sup>(2)</sup> sulle autorità doganali. Infine, la Commissione attribuisce notevole importanza alla tutela efficace dei DPI europei nei mercati terzi e, se del caso, affronta il problema con i suoi partner commerciali.

2. La Commissione sta formulando e applicando politiche e programmi destinati a migliorare il carattere innovativo e la competitività delle PMI europee <sup>(3)</sup>. Le PMI hanno inoltre un ruolo importante nella strategia europea dell'innovazione <sup>(4)</sup>. Obiettivo è quello di rafforzare l'andamento innovativo dell'Europa, basato su una ampia definizione di innovazione non limitata all'innovazione tecnologica. La Commissione inoltre fornisce sostegno sul terreno tramite la rete Enterprise Europe, che offre assistenza personalizzata alle imprese, all'innovazione e consulenza sull'accesso ai finanziamenti.

3. Qualora lavoratori debbano essere licenziati a seguito della delocalizzazione della produzione in paesi terzi, l'Italia ha la possibilità di chiedere sostegno dal Fondo europeo di adeguamento alla globalizzazione (FEG). Per ulteriori dettagli sulle norme del fondo in questione e i tipi di misure che esso può cofinanziare, la Commissione consiglia agli onorevoli parlamentari di consultare il regolamento relativo all'FEG, oppure la persona di contatto per l'FEG per l'Italia per sapere se è stata programmata una domanda. I particolari sono disponibili sul sito web dell'FEG <sup>(5)</sup>.

<sup>(1)</sup> Direttiva 2004/48/CE.

<sup>(2)</sup> Regolamento 1383/2003.

<sup>(3)</sup> Cfr. comunicazioni della Commissione «Small Business Act» per l'Europa (COM(2008)394 definitivo e riesame «Small Business Act» per l'Europa COM(2011)78 definitivo del 23.2.2011.

<sup>(4)</sup> Cfr. comunicazione della Commissione «L'Unione dell'innovazione» COM(2010)546 definitivo.

<sup>(5)</sup> <http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=581&langId=it>.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000219/12**  
**to the Commission**  
**Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE) and Antonio Cancian (PPE)**  
(18 January 2012)

*Subject:* Lay-offs in Murano — call to mobilise the EGF

Murano, an island that is the very symbol of artistic glass production, is going through a deep crisis, having seen its number of workers decrease from 6 000 in 1990 to approximately 1 000 in 2011.

This has been caused by the partial relocation of production to China, which has resulted in a dumping of low-cost products and a lack of demand for the handicrafts that are still produced in Murano. Not only is the crisis that these companies are undergoing having a devastating impact on employment, but it is likely to spell the end of a place that is a byword for the production of high-quality glassware worldwide.

The Venice branch of Confindustria has recently drawn up a plan to involve Italian artists in combining traditional glassmaking techniques with contemporary art, in order to create inimitable products.

Can the Commission therefore answer the following questions:

1. What anti-counterfeiting measures can be taken to protect Murano's traditional handicrafts?
2. What other specific measures can the Union take to promote Murano's handicrafts?
3. Given the amount of job losses involved, would it be possible to mobilise the European Globalisation Adjustment Fund?

**Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission**  
(24 February 2012)

1. Several measures are available to protect and enforce intellectual property rights (IPRs) in the EU and its Member States. In this specific case holders of IPRs, such as trademarks or geographical indications, could rely on the appropriate provisions under Italian law encompassing the implementation measures for the IPRs Enforcement Directive <sup>(1)</sup>. Regarding the goods imported from third countries, the competent Italian authorities can act according to the EU Customs Regulation <sup>(2)</sup>. Finally, the Commission attaches great importance to the effective protection of the European IPRs in third markets and, where appropriate, addresses this issue with its trading partners.

2. The Commission is formulating and implementing policies and programmes to increase the innovativeness and competitiveness of the European SMEs <sup>(3)</sup>. SMEs have also a prominent place in the European innovation strategy <sup>(4)</sup>. The aim is to boost Europe's innovation performance, based on a wide definition of 'innovation' not limited to technological innovation. The Commission also provides support on the ground through the Enterprise Europe Network, providing tailor-made business support, innovation assistance and advice on accessing funding.

3. In case workers have to be made redundant due to the relocation of production to third countries, Italy has the possibility to apply for support from the European Globalisation Adjustment Fund (EGF). The Commission would refer the Honourable Members to the EGF Regulation for more details on the rules of this Fund and the types of measures it can co-finance. The Honourable Members may also wish to contact the EGF Contact Person for Italy to know whether an application is being planned. The relevant details can be found on the EGF website <sup>(5)</sup>.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Directive 2004/48/EC.

<sup>(2)</sup> Regulation 1383/2003.

<sup>(3)</sup> See the Commission communications on the 'Small Business Act' for Europe (COM(2008) 394 final and on the Review of the 'Small Business Act for Europe' COM(2011) 78 final 23.2.2011).

<sup>(4)</sup> See the Commission Communication on the Innovation Union COM(2010) 546 final.

<sup>(5)</sup> <http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=581&langId=it>.

(българска версия)

**Въпрос с искане за писмен отговор P-000224/12**

**до Комисията**

**Илиана Иванова (PPE)**

(16 януари 2012 г.)

Относно: Ограничения за работа в ЕС на български и румънски граждани

Според Договора за присъединяване на България и Румъния към ЕС държавите-членки имат право да налагат ограничения за работа на български и румънски граждани (ЕС-2) общо за период от седем години, т.е. до края на 2013 г.

Преходният период е разделен на 3 етапа. Вторият етап изтече на 31 декември 2011 г. Според „Преходните разпоредби“ държава-членка може да удължи ограниченията за последния (трети) етап, ако навреме уведоми Комисията и представи доказателство за сериозно сътресение на нейния пазар на труда или застрашаване от такова. Девет държави-членки вече уведомиха, че ще продължат ограниченията за работа след 2011 г. (до края на 2013 г.). Тези държави са: Австрия, Белгия, Германия, Нидерландия, Ирландия, Обединеното кралство, Люксембург, Малта и Франция.

Това повдига следните въпроси:

1. Всичките тези девет страни мотивирали ли са своето решение за удължаване на ограниченията за работа за държавите от ЕС-2? Всички те представили ли са ясни доказателства за сериозни сътресения или застрашаване от такива на своите пазари на труда?
2. Може ли Комисията да уточни конкретните аргументи, изтъкнати от деветте държави-членки, които са решили да продължат прилагането на ограничителни мерки за свободния достъп до техните пазари на труда за работниците от ЕС-2?
3. Ако държава-членка не е представила ясни и недвусмислени мотиви за такова решение, има ли право да продължи да налага ограничения за работа? Това не противоречи ли на процедурите, предвидени в Договора за присъединяване?
4. Ако се установи, че съществува нарушение на разпоредбите на Договора за присъединяване и противоречие с основното право на свободно движение, гарантирано на гражданите на ЕС, би ли предприела Комисията съответни мерки, за да защити както правото на ЕС, така и правата на европейските граждани?

**Отговор, даден от г-н Андор от името на Комисията**

(1 февруари 2012 г.)

В съответствие с преходните разпоредби държава-членка, която в края на втория етап все още прилага ограничения за свободния достъп до пазара на труда, може в случай на сериозни затруднения на своя пазар на труда или при заплаха от такива и след като уведоми Комисията, да продължи да прилага ограниченията за още най-много две години.

В Договора за присъединяване не се съдържа определение на „сериозни затруднения на пазара на труда“ или „заплаха от такива“. Тъй като пазарът на труда в различните държави-членки е твърде различен, всяка държава-членка трябва самостоятелно да прецени дали изпитва сериозни затруднения в тази област, или е заплашена от такива. Комисията обаче ясно е заявила, че очаква от държавите-членки заедно с уведомлението да предоставят подробни подкрепени с данни доказателства и сериозни доводи.

1. Както бе изискано от Комисията, деветте държави-членки, които уведомиха Комисията за своето решение да продължат да прилагат ограниченията, предоставиха придружени с данни обяснения, както и доводи, свидетелстващи за сериозни затруднения на пазара на труда и/или за заплахи от такива.
2. Шест държави-членки обясниха, че са под въздействието на сериозни затруднения на пазара на труда и че пълното отваряне на пазара на труда би изострило обстановката. Три държави-членки се обосноваха, като обясниха, че са заплашени от сериозни затруднения на пазара на труда.

3 и 4. Комисията понастоящем подробно разглежда уведомленията и възнамерява да представи заключенията си на следващото заседание на Съвета по заетост, социална политика, здравеопазване и потребителски въпроси на 17 февруари 2012 г.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer P-000224/12**  
**to the Commission**  
**Iliana Ivanova (PPE)**  
(16 January 2012)

*Subject:* Labour restrictions for Bulgarian and Romanian citizens within the EU

According to the Treaty of Accession of Bulgaria and Romania to the EU, Member States are allowed to impose labour restrictions for Bulgarian and Romanian (EU-2) citizens for a total period of seven years, i.e. up to the end of 2013.

The transitional period is divided into three stages. The second stage expired on 31 December 2011. According to the 'Transitional Provisions', a Member State may prolong the restrictions for the last (third) stage, provided it has duly notified the Commission and has presented evidence of a serious disturbance of its labour market or threat thereof. Nine Member States have already notified that they will prolong the labour restrictions after 2011 (up to the end of 2013). These states are: Austria, Belgium, Germany, the Netherlands, Ireland, the UK, Luxembourg, Malta and France.

This raises the following questions:

1. Have all these nine countries motivated their decision to prolong the labour restrictions for EU-2 countries? Have all of them presented clear evidence of serious disturbances or threats for their labour markets?
2. Can the Commission specify the concrete arguments advanced by the nine Member States which have decided to continue applying restrictive measures on free access to their labour markets for EU-2 workers?
3. If a Member State has not presented clear and unambiguous motives for such a decision, does it have the right to continue imposing labour restrictions? Is this not in contradiction with the procedures provided for in the Accession Treaty?
4. Should it be established that there is violation of the provisions of the Accession Treaty and contradiction of the fundamental right of free movement guaranteed to EU citizens, would the Commission take any relevant measures in order to safeguard EC law and protect the rights of European citizens?

**Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission**  
(1 February 2012)

In accordance with the transitional arrangements, a Member State that still applies restrictions on free labour market access at the end of the second phase may, in case of serious disturbances of its labour market or threat thereof and after notifying the Commission, continue to apply them for two more years at the most.

The Accession Treaty does not define 'serious disturbances' or 'threat thereof'. As the Member States' labour markets are very different from each other, each Member State will have to assess by itself whether it is undergoing, or is under threat of, a serious labour market disturbance. However, the Commission has made it clear that it expects Member States to provide a full justification with data and pertinent arguments with the notification.

1. As requested by the Commission, the nine Member States that have notified the Commission of their decision to extend restrictions have provided explanations with data and arguments concerning a serious labour market disturbance, and/or threat thereof.
2. Six Member States have explained that they are undergoing a serious labour market disturbance and that opening their labour markets fully could exacerbate the situation. Three Member States have argued that they face the threat of a labour market disturbance.
- 3 and 4. The Commission is currently studying the notifications in greater detail and plans to present its conclusions at the next EPSCO Council meeting on 17 February 2012.

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000228/12  
alla Commissione**

**Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)**

(25 gennaio 2012)

Oggetto: Acqua con proprietà anti-tumorali

Nella puntata del 28 dicembre scorso di un programma televisivo che va in onda su Canale 5, in un servizio si è parlato di un'acqua con proprietà antitumorali.

Nella dimostrazione, registrata a Corsano in provincia di Lecce, un pesce in stato di putrefazione veniva bagnato con il particolare liquido. A questo punto avveniva una rigenerazione delle cellule morte e il pesce da putrefatto diventava commestibile. Secondo il professore intervistato lo studio scientifico in corso è coordinato dal dipartimento di Fisiologia dell'Università del Salento.

Alla luce dei fatti sopraesposti, s'interroga dunque la Commissione per sapere:

1. è a conoscenza dello studio del dipartimento di Fisiologia dell'Università del Salento sull'acqua con proprietà anti-tumorali?
2. Ritiene opportuno avviare una ricerca per fare chiarezza sull'argomento e per finanziare lo studio scientifico in atto?

**Risposta data da Máire Geoghegan-Quinn a nome della Commissione**

(2 marzo 2012)

La Commissione è a conoscenza del servizio menzionato dall'onorevole parlamentare sull'acqua con «proprietà antitumorali», andato in onda il 28 dicembre 2011 in un programma televisivo di Canale 5. Il 14 gennaio 2012 nello stesso programma è stato dichiarato che non vi è alcun dato scientifico a sostegno di tale ipotesi <sup>(1)</sup> <sup>(2)</sup>. Vista la mancanza di dati scientifici verificati da esperti indipendenti, per ora la Commissione non intende occuparsi dell'argomento.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://www.striscialanotizia.mediaset.it/video/videoextra.shtml?14496>.

<sup>(2)</sup> <http://catodicamente.blogspot.com/2012/01/ancora-sullacqua-miracolosa-di-striscia.html>



(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000228/12  
to the Commission  
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)  
(25 January 2012)**

*Subject:* Water with anti-tumour properties

A television programme broadcast on the Italian Canale 5 on 28 December 2011 carried a report on a type of water with anti-tumour properties.

During the demonstration, recorded in Corsano in the Province of Lecce, a rotting fish was immersed in the water in question. At that point the dead cells regenerated, and the rotten fish became edible. According to the professor interviewed, a scientific study is being coordinated by the Department of Physiology at the University of Salento.

1. Is the Commission aware of the study being conducted by the Salento Department of Physiology on water with anti-tumour properties?
2. Does it believe that an investigation should be launched with a view to shedding light on the matter and determining whether the study should be funded?

**Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission  
(2 March 2012)**

The Commission is aware of the television programme on water with so-called 'anti-tumoral properties' broadcasted on 28 December 2011 by the Italian Canale 5, mentioned by the Honourable Member. On 14 January 2012, the same TV channel explained the total lack of scientific evidence to underpin these claims <sup>(1)</sup> <sup>(2)</sup>. In the absence of peer-reviewed scientific evidence, the Commission does not intend to address this issue at this stage.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://www.striscialanotizia.mediaset.it/video/videoextra.shtml?14496>.

<sup>(2)</sup> <http://catodicamente.blogspot.com/2012/01/ancora-sullacqua-miracolosa-di-striscia.html>